UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 113—PART 4

FEBRUARY 23, 1967, TO MARCH 6, 1967
(PAGES 4227 TO 5572)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1967

NOV 2 7 1968

OBERLIN COLLEGE LIBRARY
N 26 '68
DEPOSITORY ITEM

serial

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

Thursday, February 23, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, who art the author of peace, and whose mercy is broader than the measure of man's mind, Spirit of God descend upon our hearts. Lead us this day in the paths of righteousness for Thy name's sake. Enable us to fulfill swift hours with mighty deeds—to think truly, to act kindly, to play manfully our part in the life of our times.

When great ideals, whose days have come beckon us to be their servant, save us from giving ourselves to the dead past rather than to the living future. Enable us to strike our blow for freedom, keeping to the end of our brief days the unbroken vigil of the inner life.

Bring us to a golden tomorrow for all Thy children when the shared plenty of the good earth shall wash the slums of the world into vague, unhappy memories.

Send us forth to our work today, saying of Thee, as Thy servants have said across all the changing centuries, "He restoreth my soul."

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 22, 1967, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the names of three more Senators be added as cosponsors to my Joint Resolution 30, to establish a commission to formulate plans for a memorial to astronauts who lose their lives in line of duty in the U.S. space program. The Senators who have asked that their names be added are the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Hatfield], and the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits.]

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 213, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to restore to individuals who have attained the age of 65 the right to deduct all expenses for their medical care, and for other purposes, the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] be added as a cosponsor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

Patent Reform Act of 1967

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the general revision of the Patent Laws, title 35 of the United States Code, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Expansion of Food Service Programs for Children

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to strengthen and expand food service programs for children (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Amendment of Act Relating to Surveys of Timber and Other Forest Resources of the United States

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 702), as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 581h), relating to surveys of timber and other forest resources of the United States, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on Reapportionment of an Appropriation

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for "Grants to States for public assistance," for the fiscal year 1967, had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Approval of Loan to Cooperative Power Association, Minneapolis, Minn., for Financing of Certain Transmission Facilities

A letter from the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to Senate Report No. 497, September 12, 1963, on the approval of a loan to the Cooperative Power Association, of Minneapolis, Minn., in the amount of $19,512,000, for the financing of certain transmission facilities (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report on Armory Project To Be Undertaken for Army National Guard

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), reporting, pursuant to law, on an additional armory project proposed to be undertaken for the Army National Guard, at Danvers, Mass.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report of Defense Procurement From Small and Other Business Firms

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on defense procurement from small and other business firms, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on Mobile Trade Fair Activities

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on mobile trade fair activities, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act of 1950

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act of 1950 (Public Law 845–81) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Frequency Management Within the Executive Branch of the Government

A letter from the Director, Office of Telecommunications Management, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on frequency management within the executive branch of the Government, dated October 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Final Valuations of Properties of Certain Carriers

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on final valuations of the properties of certain carriers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Publication of Federal Power Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a publication entitled "Steam-Electric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1965" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

Proposed Legislation Relating to the District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, to provide that a judgment or decree of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia shall not constitute a lien until filed and recorded in the office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize project grants for construction and modernization of hospitals and other medical facilities in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Elimination of Certain Duplications in Federal Benefits Now Payable for the Same, or Similar, Purpose

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 902 of title 38, United States Code, to eliminate certain duplications in Federal benefits now payable for the same, or similar, purpose (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

Modifications of Law Relating to Payment of Disability Compensation for Arrested Tuberculosis

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to modify the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to the payment of disability compensation for arrested tuberculosis (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

Transfer of Credit Between the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System and the Social Security System

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize (1) a transfer of credit between the Foreign Service retirement and disability system and the social security system and (2) social security minimum benefits for Foreign Service annuitants, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1967

A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world to achieve economic development within the framework of democratic economic, social, and political institutions, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report on Disposal of Excess Property in Foreign Countries

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, on the disposal of excess property in foreign countries, for the calendar year 1966; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on potential savings available through establishment of gasoline outlets at certain postal installations, Post Office Department, dated February 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Anthracite Mine Water Control and Mine Sealing and Filling Program

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the anthracite mine water control and mine sealing and filling program, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Central Arizona Project Act

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the central Arizona project, Arizona-New Mexico, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report of Office of Coal Research

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Office of Coal Research, for the calendar year 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Scenic Rivers Act

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reserve certain public lands and other lands for a nationwide system of scenic rivers, to provide a procedure for adding additional lands to the system, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act of 1967

A letter from the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide Federal assistance to courts, correctional systems, and community agencies to increase their capability to prevent, treat, and control juvenile delinquency; to assist research efforts in the prevention, treatment, and control of juvenile delinquency, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Report on Third Preference and Sixth Preference Classification for Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on third preference and sixth preference classification for certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Welfare and Pension Plan Protection Act of 1967

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to strengthen and improve the protections for the interest of participants in and beneficiaries of employee welfare and pension benefit plans, under the act of August 28, 1958, as amended (72 Stat. 997) (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mental Retardation Amendments of 1967

A letter from the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the public health laws relating to mental retardation to extend, expand, and improve them, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Report on Positions in Grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions on grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18, for the calendar year 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITION OF THE SEVENTH LEGISLATURE OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a copy of bill 3172 of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands, St. Thomas, V.I., which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

Bill 3172

(Seventh Legislature of the Virgin Islands of the United States, regular session, 1967)

A bill to memorialize the 90th Congress of the United States of America, urging prompt approval of S. 450, which amends certain provisions of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands

Whereas H.R. 11777, which would have provided for the popular election of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, was passed unanimously during the Second Session of the Eighty-Ninth Congress of the United States of America by the House of Representatives and, in an amended version, by the Senate; and

Whereas a similar bill, S. 450, has been introduced in the Senate during the present First Session of the Ninetieth Congress of the United States and is pending committee hearings; and

Whereas the People of the Virgin Islands appreciate in full the principles that maturity and responsibility are prerequisites to the ability of self-government and that once such maturity and responsibility have been acquired the mature and the responsible have earned the right, concomitant to the ability, to govern themselves; and

Whereas the People of the Virgin Islands have demonstrated by every indicia of maturity and responsibility—political, governmental, social, and economic—that they have the capacity to direct their own destiny within the context of the federal system and of the relationship of their beloved Islands to the United States; and

Whereas the People of the Virgin Islands, proud of that relationship and actuated by the obligations of their citizenship, have constructively and rationally urged through their elected representatives, assembled in Constitutional Convention, that they be granted the powers of self-governance, which powers are but incidental to their rights as mature and responsible citizens and as free men; and

Whereas S. 450, referred to above, is solemnly regarded by the People of the Virgin Islands as reasonable and necessary means towards the rightful and fully justified end of the control of the people by the people and for the people, over their executive authorities and officials; and

Whereas the Seventh Legislature of the Virgin Islands, assembled in Regular Session on this 16th Day of February, 1967, is the only representative entity and is thereby the only voice that can effectively and accurately articulate the will of the People of the Virgin Islands; Now, Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands, That said Legislature, acting in unanimity, on behalf of its electorate, expresses the resolute desire of the People of the Virgin Islands that the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled, act promptly and favorably on S. 450, and that the Legislature of the Virgin Islands respectfully urges such action by the Senate and the House of Representatives; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the United States Department of the Interior, to the Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate of the United States, to each member of said Committee, to the Chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of said Committee.

Thus passed by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands on February 16, 1967.

Witness our Hands and the Seal of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands this 16th Day of February, A.D., 1967.

Earle B. Ottley,
President.
A. David Puritz,
Legislative Secretary.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works:

Francis C. Turner, of Virginia, to be Director of Public Roads.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 1050. A bill to require the use of competitive bidding to the greatest practicable extent in the procurement of property and services by all executive departments and agencies of the United States through the establishment of specific standards governing the use of negotiated contracts for such procurement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 1051. A bill for the relief of A1c, Vaughn A. White, U.S. Air Force; and

S. 1052. A bill for the relief of Nicholas S. Cvetan, U.S. Air Force (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 1053. A bill for the relief of Dr. Christos A. Antoniou;

S. 1054. A bill for the relief of Gerhard Hofacker; and

S. 1055. A bill for the relief of Georgios Markatis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH (by request):

S. 1056. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish a national system of minimum retirement payments for all aged, blind, and disabled individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Church, Mr. Clark, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Morse, Mr. Nelson, and Mr. Yarborough):

S. 1057. A bill to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Gruening when he introduced the above bill, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Mr. Bartlett):

S. 1058. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell lands embraced in certain terminated entries, and for other purposes; and

S. 1059. A bill to amend the act relating to the leasing of lands in Alaska for grazing in order to make certain improvements in such act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Gruening when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1060. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 1061. A bill to prohibit the use of mail covers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Long of Missouri when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 1062. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended, to prohibit slaughter of livestock under certain conditions which reduce the bargaining power of livestock producers generally and interfere with a free market, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. Hatfield, and Mr. Church):

S. 1063. A bill to amend section 8c(2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to permit marketing orders issued under such section to be applicable to canned and frozen onions; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. PELL:

S. 1064. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946 to provide for compensation for certain alien employees of the Foreign Service who are imprisoned by a foreign government as a result of their employment by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Pell when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 1065. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide that the entire cost of health benefits under such act shall be paid by the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BREWSTER (by request):

S. 1066. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide career incentives for certain professionally trained officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 1067. A bill for the relief of Richard L. Bass; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hansen, Mr. McGee, and Mr. Moss):

S. 1068. A bill to amend section 613 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

DECLARATION OF SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO CERTAIN ASPECTS OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. Clark) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) to declare the sense of the Congress relative to certain aspects of the administration of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

CREATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE TO INQUIRE INTO THE ACTIVITIES OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY IN QUASI-FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC ACTIVITIES

Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and Mr. Young of Ohio) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 85) to create a Select Committee to inquire into the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency in quasi-foreign and domestic activities, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. McCarthy, which appears under a separate heading.)

VETERANS SERVING IN VIETNAM BEFORE AUGUST 5, 1964, SHOULD BE ELIGIBLE FOR VETERANS READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on January 31, 1967, the Committee on Finance reported out S. 16, the Vietnam Era Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act. The bill provides a needed equalization in the benefits provided to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era with benefits previously provided to veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict. S. 16 was passed by the Senate on February 7, 1967, and is now awaiting action in the House.

However, I believe that S. 16 is unnecessarily restrictive, inadequate, and unfair in that it defines the "Vietnam era" as having begun August 5, 1964, the day of the Gulf of Tonkin incident.

Considerable doubt has been thrown on the facts surrounding the so-called Gulf of Tonkin incident. However, whatever the actual facts may be concerning that incident, it is true that U.S. involvement in hostilities in Vietnam began much earlier than August 5, 1964. So-called advisers from the Armed Forces of the United States had been in South Vietnam since 1954. For the U.S. military adviser riding a helicopter over South Vietnam and facing Vietcong machinegun fire—with possibly getting killed or wounded—the fighting was just as serious and just as dangerous whether the engagement took place on August 4 or August 5, 1964, or on August 5, 1961. The family of the U.S. soldier killed by hostile action in Vietnam on August 4 can be just as needy as the family of a soldier killed the next day.

The artificial distinction which the administration seeks to create between events before and after the Gulf of Tonkin incident bears no relationship whatsoever to the realities of the situation. The facts cannot be changed. History cannot be rewritten.

Between January 1, 1961, and January 1, 1964, 194 armed service personnel were killed in Vietnam; 146 of these were killed as a result of hostile action.

During this period 1,100 servicemen were wounded in Vietnam; 15,000 servicemen have served in Vietnam.

These men who were injured or killed in Vietnam before August 5, 1964, were not there of their own volition. They were ordered there by their own Government. However misguided may have been the policies of their Government in sending them to Vietnam in such an equivocal role, they and their families should not be forced to bear the burdens of their Government's follies.

The bill I am introducing today is identical to S. 16 in providing veterans with disability compensation at wartime rates, pensions for non-service-connected disabilities and deaths, allowances for burial expenses, benefits for drugs and therapeutic devices, and automobile allowance for seriously disabled veterans. The only change contained in the bill I offer from S. 16 is that these benefits are extended to all military personnel who served in Vietnam from February 1, 1955, through August 4, 1964. The benefits provided by S. 16 to all members of the Armed Forces, who served at any time subsequent to August 4, 1964, regardless of where they served, are the same as they were in S. 16.

On behalf of myself and my colleagues, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. YARBOROUGH, I send to the desk a bill to accomplish this objective and ask that it be printed in full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1057) to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1057

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act shall be known as the "Vietnam Era Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act".

SEC. 2. (2) Paragraph (11) of section 101 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read:

"(11) The term 'period of war' means the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, the Vietnam era, and the period beginning on the date of any future declaration of war by the Congress and ending on the date prescribed by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress."

(b) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(29) The term 'Vietnam era' means (A) the period beginning on February 1, 1955, and ending on August 4, 1964, in the case of any veteran who at any time during such period served in the Vietnam zone (as defined by the President), and (B) the period beginning August 5, 1964, and ending on such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress."

SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 521 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Administrator shall pay to each veteran of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era, who meets the service requirements of this section, and who is permanently and totally disabled from non-service-connected disability not the result of the veteran's willful misconduct or vicious habits, pension at the rate prescribed by this section."

(b) Such section is further amended by amending subsection (g) to read as follows:

"(g) A veteran meets the service requirements of this section if he served in the active military, naval, or air service—

"(1) for ninety days or more during either World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era;

"(2) during World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era, and was discharged or released from such service for a service-connected disability;

"(3) for a period of ninety consecutive days or more and such period ended during World War I, or began or ended during World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era; or

"(4) for an aggregate of ninety days or more in two or more separate periods of service during more than one period of war."

(c) The catchline of section 521 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 521. Veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era".

(d) Subsection (a) of section 541 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Administrator shall pay to the widow of each veteran of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era who met the service requirements of section 521 of this title, or who at the time of his death was receiving (or entitled to receive) compensation or retirement pay for a service-connected disability, pension at the rate prescribed by this section."

(e) Paragraph (1) of subsection (e) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(1) before (A) December 14, 1944, in the case of a widow of a World War I veteran, or (B) January 1, 1957, in the case of a widow of a World War II veteran, or (C) February 1, 1965, in the case of a widow of a Korean conflict veteran, or (D) before the expiration of ten years following termination of the Vietnam era in the case of a widow of a Vietnam era veteran; or".

(f) The catchline of section 541 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 541. Widows of World War I, World War II, Korean conflict, or Vietnam era veterans".

(g) Subsection (a) of section 542 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "or the Korean conflict" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era".

(h) The catchline of section 542 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 542. Children of World War I, World War II, Korean conflict, or Vietnam era veterans".

(i) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out

"521. Veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict."

and substituting in lieu thereof

"521. Veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era.";

by striking out the subheading

"World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict

and substituting in lieu thereof

"World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, and the Vietnam era";

by striking out

"541. Widows of World War I, World War II, or Korean conflict veterans."

and substituting in lieu thereof

"541. Widows of World War I, World War II, Korean conflict, or Vietnam era veterans.";

and by striking out

"542. Children of World War I, World War II, or Korean conflict veterans."

and substituting in lieu thereof

"542. Children of World War I, World War II, Korean conflict, or Vietnam era veterans."

(j) Chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out the subheading "WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND THE KOREAN CONFLICT" immediately preceding section 541 of such title, and substituting in lieu thereof "WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, THE KOREAN CONFLICT, AND THE VIETNAM ERA".

SEC. 4. (a) Section 602 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 602. Presumption relating to psychosis

"For the purposes of this chapter, any veteran of World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era who developed an active psychosis (1) within two years after his discharge or release from the active military, naval, or air service, and (2) before July 26, 1949, in the case of a veteran of World War II, or February 1, 1957, in the case of a veteran of the Korean conflict, or before the expiration of two years following termination of the Vietnam era in the case of a Vietnam era veteran, shall be deemed to have incurred such disability in the active military, naval, or air service."

(b) Subsection (h) of section 612 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(h) Any veteran who as a veteran of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era is receiving increased pension under section 521(d) of this title based on need of regular aid and attendance may be furnished drugs or medicines ordered on prescription of a duly licensed physician as specific therapy in the treatment of an illness or injury suffered by the veteran."

Sec. 5. (a) Section 1901(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "World War II or the Korean conflict" and inserting in lieu thereof "World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era".

(b) Section 1905 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1905. Applications

"The benefits of this chapter shall be made available to any veteran who meets the eligibility requirements of this chapter and who makes application for such benefits in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator."

Sec. 6. Except as provided in section 7, the amendments made by sections 2 and 3 of this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar month which begins more than ten days after the date of enactment of this Act. The amendments made by sections 4 and 5 of this Act shall become effective upon enactment.

Sec. 7. (a) The amendments made by this Act relating to the payment of burial benefits in the case of veterans of the Vietnam era shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) If the burial allowance authorized by section 902 of title 38, United States Code, is payable solely by virtue of the enactment of this Act, the two-year period for filing applications, referred to in section 904 of such title 38, shall not end, with respect to an individual whose death occurred prior to the enactment of this Act, before the expiration of the two-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act, or, in any case involving the correction of a discharge after the date of enactment of this Act, before the expiration of two years from the date of such correction.

A BILL TO AID SETTLERS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell lands embraced in certain terminated entries. The bill would permit entrymen on the public *domain to buy lands in the public domain* on which entries are made in good faith but the entrymen are prevented from full compliance with legal requirements for property improvement and thus are required to give up the land. The bill would also provide an equitable means for dealing with the unhappy situation which has occurred repeatedly in which a settler on the public domain discovers that the land he has occupied and cultivated was withdrawn prior to his entry, thus making it unavailable for patent.

The entrymen on homesteads, small tracts, trade and manufacturing sites, homesites, and other settlement or use and occupancy claims would be given a preference right to purchase the land by meeting the high bid when it is offered at public auction by the Interior Department. In a case where the entryman becomes the purchaser of the land in question his purchase price would be reduced by any value added by him or his predecessors in interest.

If a purchaser other than the entryman acquires the land in a case where the original settler cannot or does not meet the price set at auction, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to compensate the entryman from the purchase price for the value of improvements added to the land by the entryman or his predecessors in interest where such value is included in the appraised price.

In the case of removable improvements, an entryman who does not purchase the land in question may, with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior, remove or sell to the purchaser those improvements which he or his predecessors in interest made; which can be removed without substantial injury to land, and were not included in the appraised price.

The proposed legislation appears to provide a solution to the extremely difficult problems repeatedly presented by cases of individuals who, in good faith, enter upon the public domain for the purpose of establishing a home, but then find themselves unable to comply with the myriad rules and regulations of the Department of the Interior and are, thus, forced to give up their effort. This is a problem which has concerned me greatly ever since I came into the Senate 8 years ago and has been the subject of constant efforts on my part on behalf of Alaska's settlers.

As the Interior Department has recognized, it is highly desirable that legislation be enacted to protect the interest of settlers on the public domain who, through no fault of their own, are unable to obtain title to their land.

Individuals who attempt to acquire land by meeting requirements of the homestead or desert land laws, the Small Tract Act and other public land laws, must expend considerable sums of money and great physical efforts in making improvements which are unfortunately only too often met with failure because they cannot meet all the standards required by the Department of the Interior.

As more entries are made in the State of Alaska on the public domain than any other State, the people of Alaska have *a special interest in this legislation.* Of course, more land is found in the public domain in Alaska than in any other State. The latest estimate of the Bureau of Land Management—Public Land Statistics for 1965—shows that nearly *100 percent—99.773 percent—of Alaska's* land is owned by the Government.

For many Alaskans the only way of acquiring land on which to establish a home is by application under one of the public land laws and heroic efforts to meet the rules, regulations, policies, whims, and fancies of the officials of the Bureau of Land Management. Due to the extraordinary extent of Federal ownership of land in Alaska, the startling situation exists that, although Alaska has the largest land area of any State in the Union, it is extremely difficult to buy land there. Real estate, where available, is astonishingly high in cost because a shortage of land in private ownership exists. Hopefully, this situation will eventually change and the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service will become less intransigent in attitudes toward release of land by ownership by the State of Alaska. However, for the time being Alaskans are forced to rely very largely on the Federal settlement laws to acquire a piece of property.

Thus, Alaska leads all the States by far in the number of entries made in 1965 on the public domain—700 in Alaska as compared with the next highest number for that year, reported in Nevada, 158. The statistics of the Bureau of Land Management indicate that the State in which the largest acreage on which final entries were approved in 1965 was the State of Nevada—47,343 acres of land passed from the public domain to permanent ownership in 1965 although the number of entries was far below the 700 entries recorded in Alaska. Following Nevada, in 1965, 30,967 acres of land were approved for patent to entrymen on the public domain in New Mexico. In California nearly 20,000 acres of land was granted to private owners after compliance with requirements of Federal law. Thus, while this legislation is of great importance to Alaska, it is also significant for everyone of the public land States.

The entries completed and for which patent is issued are, however, a very small number of all those for which application is made. Unfortunately, it is the repeated experience of Alaskans that their best efforts are unavailing in their attempt to overcome the many obstacles placed in their way to final success.

Being well aware of the heartbreak and suffering caused by failure to complete requirements for patent on a homestead, I am pleased to introduce legislation which would give some relief by establishing in an entryman a preference right to buy land on which an effort has been made to complete requirements for patent. I believe the provision that would, in any case, provide compensation for improvements made on the land by an unsuccessful entryman is extremely useful.

I would remind the Senate that the *legislation I introduce today was submitted* to the 89th Congress by the Secretary of the Interior with a recommendation for enactment. It is my hope the Department of the Interior will still agree with me that this legislation is badly *needed and that it should be enacted.*

I request unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of the remarks the bill and statement of the Department of the Interior submitted with this legislation under date of May 4, 1966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1058) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell lands embraced in certain terminated entries, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Gruening (for himself and Mr. Bartlett), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1056

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purpose of this Act—

(a) The word "entry" means or includes (1) a right to acquire title to public lands upon compliance with improvement requirements which may include, but are not limited to, irrigation and cultivation of the lands; (2) an application erroneously allowed embracing withdrawn lands; (3) any uncanceled allowed application even though not in good standing; or (4) any claim to withdrawn land in Alaska based upon settlement, use or occupancy, and purportedly initiated under the public land laws.

(b) The word "entryman" includes, in addition to its usual meaning, qualified assignees where the public land law under which the entry was made authorizes the leasing or assignment thereof.

(c) The term "value added to the land by the entryman or his predecessors in interest" means the increase in market value of the land due to work performed, or improvements made, by such entryman or his predecessors in interest.

(d) The term "good faith" means honest intent and does not necessarily relate to the degree of compliance with statutory or regulatory requirements. With respect to withdrawn land, the term "good faith" also means the exercise of diligent inquiry and efforts leading to a reasonable inference that the land was open and available for appropriation under the particular public law invoked.

(e) The word "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2. Where the Secretary determines with reference to any pending entry made under the public land laws, other than the mining laws, whether made before or after the effective date of this Act, that—

(a) the entry man has in good faith made an attempt to comply with the law;

(b) there is no reasonable prospect that such entryman will be able to comply with the law to the extent necessary to earn title to the entered land;

(c) the land is proper for disposition under this Act, considering such factors as, but not limited to, Federal program requirements, sound land use and conservation principles and effective management of the public lands; and

(d) in the case of withdrawn land, there has been demonstrated by substantial, positive, and compelling evidence that diligent inquiry was made by the claimant showing that the land in the entry was open and available for appropriation under the particular public land law invoked;

the Secretary is authorized to sell at public auction all or part of the land included in the entry for not less than its current fair market value. No land shall be offered for sale until after termination of the entry and after reasonable public notice. The entryman shall have a preference right to purchase the land by meeting the high bid within ten days after the date of the auction, or such further period as the Secretary may allow.

SEC. 3. (a) The determination of fair market value shall be made by the Secretary through appraisal which shall not include improvements which can be removed without substantial damage to the land; if the improvements cannot be so removed their value shall be separately appraised and added to the appraised value of the land.

(b) If the entryman acquires the land pursuant to the sale, the Secretary shall grant him a reduction in the purchase price for the value, as determined by the Secretary as of the date of the bidding, added to the land by the entryman or his predecessors in interest if such value was included in the appraised price of the land.

(c) If a party other than the entryman acquires the land pursuant to the sale, the Secretary shall compensate the entryman from the purchase price for the value, as determined by the Secretary as of the date of the bidding, added to the land by the entryman or his predecessors in interest if such value was included in the appraised price of the land. The determinations by the Secretary under this subsection and subsection (b) shall be final and not subject to review.

(d) If a party other than the entryman acquires the land pursuant to the sale, the entryman, with the consent of the Secretary, may remove or sell to the party acquiring the land the improvements which (1) were made by the entryman or his predecessors in interest; (2) can be removed without substantial injury to the land; and (3) were not included in the appraised price of the land.

SEC. 4. Where the land has been withdrawn in aid of a function of a Federal department or agency, or of a State, county, municipality, water district, or other local subdivision or agency, the Secretary may dispose of such land only with the consent of the head of the governmental unit concerned and under such terms and conditions as such head may deem necessary.

SEC. 5. Any patent issued under this Act shall contain a reservation to the United States of (a) any of the following named minerals for which the land is deemed by the Secretary of the Interior to be valuable or prospectively valuable as of the date of issuance of patent: coal, native asphalt, solid and semisolid bitumen, and bituminous rock (including oil-impregnated rock or sands from which oil is recoverable only by special treatment after the deposit is mined or quarried), oil, gas, oil shale, phosphate, sodium, and potassium, and for lands in the States of Louisiana and New Mexico sulphur also; and (b) the right of the United States, its lessees, permittees, or licensees to prospect for, mine, and remove them under applicable provisions of law.

SEC. 6. At least ninety days prior to the sale of any land under this Act, the Secretary shall notify the head of the governing body of the political subdivision or other instrumentality of the State having jurisdiction over comprehensive planning and zoning in the area within which the land is located or, in the absence of such political subdivision or instrumentality, the Governor of the State, in order to afford the appropriate body a reasonable opportunity to take such action as may be necessary to assure that the conveyance of the land, and the provisions thereof, will be consonant with local planning and development needs. If no such action is taken, no disposal of the land shall be made under this Act unless the Secretary determines that such disposal is reasonably consonant with State and local land use and development needs.

The statement presented by Mr. GRUENING is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 4, 1966.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell lands embraced in certain terminated entries, and for other purposes."

We recommend that the proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and we recommend that it be enacted.

The Public Land Law Review Commission will undoubtedly consider the issues involved in this proposal. Ideally, the subject could await Commission's deliberations. However, it is remedial in nature, designed to assist persons who appear to be receiving harsh treatment from their Government. As such, we think the Congress would want to consider enacting the proposal so that equity may be served over the next three or more years. If necessary, we would have no objection to making the legislation temporary as was done in the case of Public Laws 88-607 and 88-608 in 1964.

The objective of the bill is to mitigate the hardship encountered by public land claimants. The bill would provide an equitable approach in certain situations where the existing relief laws would not be applicable. For example, from time to time situations arise where entrymen under the homestead or desert land laws, lessees under the Small Tract Act, and other persons in good faith expend considerable sums of money in making improvements on public lands, but for one reason or another fail to qualify for patent under the law.

The Desert Land Act, as amended, 26 Stat. 1096 (1891), 43 U.S.C. § 321 (1958), casts the problem into sharp focus. Some desert land entrymen, after expending thousands of dollars in efforts to reclaim the land and "prove up", fail to do so after exhausting all relief provisions (i.e. Act of March 4, 1915, 38 Stat. 1161, 43 U.S.C. § 337 (1958) and the Act of March 4, 1929, 45 Stat. 1548, 43 U.S.C. § 339 (1958)) of existing law. We have no way of protecting their investment in the land. We think that such protection should be afforded to them consonant with the public interest.

Under existing public land practices, an entryman who has placed valuable improvements on his entry, upon its termination, is permitted to remove those improvements. Where a person has placed improvements on public lands and the lands are disposed of to another party, the Department has taken steps to assure that the person acquiring the land will reimburse the owner of the improvements for the reasonable value thereof which are left on the land and which are of value to the person acquiring the land. See *Lee Kisner et al.*, A-27189 (November 7, 1955); *Keith Specking et al.* v. *Charles S. Carter et al.*, A-26190 (July 24, 1951); *Maynard R. Stutzman*, A-25844 (May 17, 1950).

However, an entryman whose entry fails and who has expended money in disking, harrowing, etc., thus improving the land, is without recourse. Our proposal would afford relief to him and to others who have expended funds on entries in vain efforts to acquire title thereto.

Some of the problems which this bill is designed to meet stem from archaic laws, addressed to an essentially agrarian economy. The Public Land Law Review Commission will undoubtedly consider the suitability of these laws, and the need for continuing them or modifying them. Regardless of the recommendations offered by the Commission, however, some entries arising under these laws will be in effect for a number of years. We therefore believe that the enactment of the proposed legislation need not be deferred until the Commission study has been completed. The bill will serve an immediate and useful purpose, and it will not prejudice the work of the Commission.

Our bill is not an amendment of the equitable adjudication provisions, Rev. Stat. §§ 2450-2451, 2455-6-7 (1875), as amended, 43 U.S.C. §§ 1161-1164 (1958), but rather takes up where equitable adjudication ends. Equitable adjudication governs public land cases ". . . where the law has been substantially complied with, and the error or informality [e.g., the late filing of annual proof] arose from ignorance, accident, or mistake which is satisfactorily explained . . .", Rev. Stat. § 2457 (1875), as amended, 43 U.S.C. 1164 (1958). The bill is applicable where there has not been substantial compliance with the law, albeit good faith is present. This bill differs from equitable adjudication in that equitable adjudication requires substantial compliance with the law and permits the conveyance of land without regard to its fair market value. However, such substantial compliance is not necessary under the bill, but the fair market value of the land must be paid to the United States.

Therefore, the bill is not a duplication of equitable adjudication, but may afford a vehicle for relief where patent cannot issue under the equitable adjudication laws or under any other statute.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell at public auction any or all of the land in a terminated entry, made other than under the United States mining laws, where he finds that (1) the entryman has made a bona fide effort to meet the requirements of the law to earn patent; (2) there is no reasonable prospect that he will be able to do so; and (3) the land is proper for disposal under the bill, considering such factors as, but not limited to, Federal program requirements, sound land use and conservation principles, and effective management of the public lands. Such sale could be held only after adequate public notice of the sale.

If the former entryman becomes the purchaser, he would be entitled to buy the land at his bid price less any value added to the land by the entryman or his predecessors in interest. The entryman would have a preference right to buy the land by meeting the high bid. Any patent issued under the bill would reserve to the United States those minerals which are leasable under the Mineral Leasing Act, as amended, 74 Stat. 781 (1960), and supplemented, 30 U.S.C. §§ 181–287 (Supp. V, 1964), for which the Secretary deemed the land to be valuable, or prospectively valuable on the date of the issuance of the patent.

The bill would (1) embrace entries, inadvertently allowed on withdrawn lands; (2) apply to trade and manufacturing sites, homesites and other settlement or use and occupancy claims in Alaska, and to asserted claims under such laws, but made on withdrawn lands; (3) apply to entries which are not in good standing by reason of failure to meet statutory requirements, e.g., the filing of annual proofs in desert land cases. The term "good faith" as employed in the proposed bill is not intended to be equated with the degree of compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements. No withdrawn lands would be disposed of without the consent of the governmental agency for which the land is withdrawn and subject to such terms and conditions as that agency might deem appropriate. However, no lands in national parks, national monuments, national wildlife refuges and other areas dedicated to fish and wildlife purposes, national forests, and no Indian lands would be subject to disposal under the bill.

The provisions in the bill would not require the Secretary of the Interior to sell the land, but rather would permit him to do so in appropriate circumstances. We believe that the bill would obviate consideration of individual bills, e.g., S. 394, 88th Cong., culminating in the Act of May 17, 1963 (Private Law 88–4), H.R. 2291, 88th Cong., culminating in the Act of April 26, 1963 (Private Law 88–2), and H.R. 5302, 88th Cong., culminating in the Act of August 13, 1964 (Private Law 88–281).

We believe that the appraisal of the land should not encompass any improvements which can be removed without injury to the land, whether or not such improvements under the general rules of real property would be regarded as a part of the realty.

If the improvements are not so removable, their value would be separately included in the appraisal of the land. If the entryman acquired the land pursuant to the sale, he would be afforded a deduction in the purchase price for any improvements made by him or his predecessors in interest to the extent that the value of such improvements was an element in the appraised value. If another person acquired the land, the entryman would be compensated out of the purchase price by the Government for nonremovable improvements to the extent of the appraised value of the improvements. Furthermore, where a person other than the entryman acquired the land pursuant to the sale, the entryman, with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior, could remove the removable improvements or sell them to the person acquiring the land. The consent of the Secretary to such actions is deemed necessary to assure that (1) substantial injury to the land would not occur as a result of the removal of any improvements, and (2) the person acquiring the land would not be put in a position of paying both the Government and the entryman for the improvements.

In brief, where the entryman acquired the land pursuant to the sale, he would not be required to pay for the value added to the land resulting from improvements by him or his predecessors in interest. If the land is sold to anyone else, the entryman would be compensated for such improvements either by the Government or the purchaser of the land.

Our proposal requires the Secretary, 90 days before making a sale, to notify the head of the governing body of the political subdivision or other instrumentality of the State having jurisdiction over comprehensive planning and zoning in the area within which the land is located, or in the absence of any such instrumentality, the Governor of the State, in order to afford the appropriate body an opportunity to take appropriate land planning or zoning action to meet local planning and development needs. If no such action is taken, no conveyance of the land is to be made unless the Secretary determines that the conveyance, and the provisions of the conveyance, will be reasonably consonant with local land use and development needs.

This provision is similar to section 2 of P.L. 88–608, 78 Stat. 988, an Act "To provide temporary authority for the sale of certain public lands."

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this draft bill from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. CARVER, Jr.,
Under Secretary of the Interior.

Enclosure.

A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO SELL LANDS EMBRACED IN CERTAIN TERMINATED ENTRIES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of this Act—

(a) The word "entry" means or includes (1) a right to acquire title to public lands upon compliance with improvement requirements which may include, but are not limited to, irrigation and cultivation of the lands; (2) an application erroneously allowed embracing withdrawn lands; (3) any uncanceled allowed application even though not in good standing; or (4) any claim to withdrawn land in Alaska based upon settlement, use or occupancy, and purportedly initiated under the public land laws.

(b) The word "entryman" includes, in addition to its usual meaning, qualified assignees where the public land law under which the entry was made authorizes the leasing or assignment thereof.

(c) The term "value added to the land by the entryman or his predecessors in interest" means the increase in market value of the land due to work performed, or improvements made, by such entryman or his predecessors in interest.

(d) The term "good faith" means honest intent and does not necessarily relate to the degree of compliance with statutory or regulatory requirements. With respect to withdrawn land, the term "good faith" also means the exercise of diligent inquiry and efforts leading to a reasonable inference that the land was open and available for appropriation under the particular public law invoked.

(e) The word "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2. Where the Secretary determines with reference to any pending entry made under the public land laws, other than the mining laws, whether made before or after the effective date of this Act, that—

(a) the entryman has in good faith made an attempt to comply with the law;

(b) there is no reasonable prospect that such entryman will be able to comply with the law to the extent necessary to earn title to the entered land;

(c) the land is proper for disposition under this Act, considering such factors as, but not limited to, Federal program requirements, sound land use and conservation principles, and effective management of the public lands; and

(d) in the case of withdrawn land, there has been demonstrated by substantial, positive and compelling evidence that diligent inquiry was made by the claimant showing that the land in the entry was open and available for appropriation under the particular public land law invoked;

the Secretary is authorized to sell at public auction all or part of the land included in the entry for not less than its current fair market value. No land shall be offered for sale until after termination of the entry and after reasonable public notice. The entryman shall have a preference right to purchase the land by meeting the high bid within ten days after the date of the auction, or such further period as the Secretary may allow.

SEC. 3. (a) The determination of fair market value shall be made by the Secretary through appraisal which shall not include improvements which can be removed without substantial damage to the land; if the improvements cannot be so removed their value shall be separately appraised and added to the appraised value of the land.

(b) If the entryman acquires the land pursuant to the sale, the Secretary shall grant him a reduction in the purchase price for the value, as determined by the Secretary as of the date of the bidding, added to the land by the entryman or his predecessors in interest if such value was included in the appraised price of the land.

(c) If a party other than the entryman acquires the land pursuant to the sale, the Secretary shall compensate the entryman from the purchase price for the value, as determined by the Secretary as of the date of the bidding, added to the land by the entryman or his predecessors in interest if such value was included in the appraised price of the land. The determinations by the Secretary under this subsection and subsection (b) shall be final and not subject to review.

(d) If a party other than the entryman acquires the land pursuant to the sale, the entryman, with the consent of the Secretary, may remove or sell to the party acquiring the land the improvements which (1) were made by the entryman or his predecessors in interest; (2) can be removed without substantial injury to the land; and (3) were not included in the appraised price of the land.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any provision of this Act to the contrary, the Secretary, prior to the issuance of patent, may vacate any sale held pursuant to this Act if he finds that the land, or any portion thereof, included in the sale is needed for Federal program requirements.

SEC. 5. (a) Where the land has been withdrawn in aid of a function of a Federal department or agency, or of a State, county, municipality, water district, or other local subdivision or agency, the Secretary may dispose of such land only with the consent of the head of the governmental unit concerned and under such terms and conditions as such head may deem necessary.

(b) Nothing in this Act shall apply to land in any national forest, national wildlife refuge, wildlife range, game range, wildlife management area, waterfowl production area, or area reserved for the protection and conservation of fish and wildlife which are threatened with extinction, or to any Indian land or land set aside or held for the use or benefit of Indians, including land over which jurisdiction has been transferred to the Secretary by Executive order for the use of Indians, or to any land administered by the Secretary under the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented.

Sec. 6. Any patent issued under this Act shall contain a reservation to the United States of (a) any of the following named minerals for which the land is deemed by the Secretary of the Interior to be valuable or prospectively valuable as of the date of issuance of patent: coal, native asphalt, solid and semisolid bitumen, and bituminous rock (including oil-impregnated rock or sands from which oil is recoverable only by special treatment after the deposit is mined or quarried), oil, gas, oil shale, phosphate, sodium, and potassium, and for lands in the States of Louisiana and New Mexico sulphur also; and (b) the right of the United States, its lessees, permittees, or licensees to prospect for, mine, and remove them under applicable provisions of law.

Sec. 7. At least ninety days prior to the sale of any land under this Act, the Secretary shall notify the head of the governing body of the political subdivision or other instrumentality of the State having jurisdiction over comprehensive planning and zoning in the area within which the land is located or, in the absence of such political subdivision or instrumentality, the Governor of the State, in order to afford the appropriate body a reasonable opportunity to take such action as may be necessary to assure that the conveyance of the land, and the provisions thereof, will be consonant with local planning and development needs. If no such action is taken, no disposal of the land shall be made under this Act unless the Secretary determines that such disposal is reasonably consonant with State and local land use and development needs.

ALASKA GRAZING ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in the developing economy of Alaska an agricultural pursuit has been advancing which is of great potential value and interest to all concerned. The raising of livestock in sections of Alaska found to be valuable for this purpose is becoming increasingly important. Although the livestock industry in Alaska dates back to Russian colonial days, it has developed very slowly because of expensive transportation in some areas, the lack of it in others, the high cost of supplemental feeding in the winter, the remoteness of location, the lack of slaughtering and marketing facilities, and, in some areas, the losses to predators. However, since the recent construction of a slaughterhouse on Kodiak Island and the improvement in transportation which has occurred since the introduction of the Alaska State ferry system and related land carrier transportation, ranching in Alaska is becoming economically profitable and a promising area for investment.

Grazing lands in the moist, grassy climate of the Aleutian chain and in the agricultural regions of the Kenai Peninsula represent a very important resource which it is in the interest of the Nation to develop.

The comparatively few number of ranchers now operating in raising cattle on ranches in Alaska are enthusiastic about the potential of this enterprise. However, in order that livestock raising in Alaska may be successful, it is important to make changes in the Federal law governing leasing of grazing areas which was enacted 40 years ago—in 1927. Obviously, as is the case with so many pieces of legislation governing the administration of the public domain, laws approved many years ago do not meet modern needs.

Today, I introduce a bill, of which my colleague, Senator Bartlett, is a cosponsor, which would make the most important changes needed in Alaska's Federal grazing legislation to give impetus and assistance to an increasingly important industry. The bill I introduce today would:

First. Extend the term of grazing leases in Alaska from 20 to 55 years, to agree with the provision of Alaska State law governing lease terms which provide for leases for as long as 55 years. The importance of this was described in a letter urging this revision from Mr. James S. Bynum, secretary-treasurer of the Umnak Co., Inc., which holds a grazing lease on Umnak Island where, despite the "many unusual and trying difficulties that are peculiar to pioneering in a remote and undeveloped country," the company was, last year, raising 10,000 head of sheep, 100 head of cattle and 17 head of horses. Mr. Bynum, in explaining the importance of extending Federal lease terms to the same period allowed by the State of Alaska, pointed out that "it takes large sums of cash just to start an enterprise such as this." Thus, in order to obtain necessary financing for a ranching operation in Alaska, those who are now engaged in this field find it is imperative that lease terms be lengthened to assure a reasonable change of adequate financial resources.

Second. Allow negotiation for renewal of existing leases at any time within the last 5 years prior to expiration. Obviously, this would improve security, tenure and, again, improvement of possibilities for financing the operation.

Third. Authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell land leased for grazing purposes where it is found not to be needed for Federal Government purposes. The bill would provide that, upon termination of a lease, the land could be sold at public auction to the highest bidder under conditions allowing the lessee to be given a right to meet the amount of the highest bid and a preference right of purchase. Long experience has shown that occupation of land owned by the Federal Government carries with it no security of tenure and results in an unfortunate instability in planning any changes of expansion of investment in a business. Only ownership in fee of land occupied can give the businessman or farmer the necessary security that will allow full and optimum development of the property. Therefore, it is recommended that sales of land be allowed for ranching operations in Alaska under the terms provided in this bill.

The bill would also require the Secretary of the Interior to notify grazing lessees of any contemplated changes in the classification of land included in a grazing lease, plans for withdrawal of land or any other actions adversely affecting a rancher's operations. In cases where the Department of the Interior changes the boundaries of a grazing district or a withdrawal of land held under a grazing lease for other purposes, the legislation would require the conduct of a hearing at which all concerned would have a right to state their views.

With these changes in the law, we may well expect important progress in this agricultural enterprise. I am sure the results will be beneficial not only for the State of Alaska but for the economy of the Nation.

Before introducing this legislation, I have consulted the State office of the Bureau of Land Management at Anchorage, Alaska, and Mr. Roscoe E. Bell, director of the division of lands of the Department of Natural Resources of Alaska for advice on the change in legislation urged by the cattlemen. At the conclusion of these remarks, I request unanimous consent that the record include the bill and the letters I have received from the Bureau of Land Management and the Alaska State Division of Lands, together with the letter of Mr. James S. Bynum, secretary-treasurer of Umnak Co. to which reference was made above.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letters will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1059) to amend the act relating to the leasing of lands in Alaska for grazing in order to make certain improvements in such act, introduced by Mr. Gruening (for himself and Mr. Bartlett), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1059

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the protection, development, and utilization of the public lands in Alaska by establishing an adequate system for grazing livestock thereon," approved March 4, 1927 (44 Stat. 1452), is amended to read as follows:

"NOTICE OF ESTABLISHMENT AND ALTERATION OF GRAZING DISTRICT

"Sec. 5. Before establishing or altering a district the Secretary shall publish once a week for a period of six consecutive weeks in a newspaper of general circulation in each judicial division in which the district proposed to be established or altered is located, a notice describing the boundaries of the proposed district or the proposed alteration, announcing the date on which he proposes to establish such district or make such alteration and the location and date of hearings required under this section. No such alteration shall be made until after public hearings are held with respect to such alteration in each such judicial division after the publishing of such notice."

Sec. 2. (a) Subsection (a) of section 7 of such Act of March 4, 1927 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 7. (a) All leases shall be made by the Secretary for a term of fifty-five years except where the Secretary determines the land may be required for other than grazing purposes prior to the termination of such term; or where the applicant desires a shorter term, and in such cases leases may be made for a shorter term."

(b) Such section 7 is further amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(d) Each lease shall provide that the lessee may renew such lease, subject to the provisions of this Act, at any time during the final five years of the term of such lease."

SEC. 3. Section 14 of such Act of March 4, 1927, is amended by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 14" and by inserting at the end of such section a new subsection as follows:

"(b) The Secretary shall take no action which will adversely affect rights under any lease pursuant to this Act until notifying the holder of such lease that such action is proposed and giving such holder an opportunity for a hearing."

SEC. 4. Such Act of March 4, 1927, is further amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SALE OF LAND

"SEC. 17. If the Secretary determines that any land leased pursuant to this Act is not needed for Federal Government purposes, he may upon the termination of such lease sell such land at public auction to the highest bidder except that in any case in which the lessee under such lease is not such highest bidder such lessee shall first be given the opportunity to purchase such land for the amount of such bid. Such sale may be made subject to such conditions and reservations as the Secretary determines are in the public interest."

The letters presented by Mr. GRUENING are as follows:

UMNAK CO., INC.,
Amarillo, Tex., June 23, 1966.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: In 1956 our company obtained a grazing lease on a portion of Umnak Island, Alaska from the Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Department of Interior. We shipped up to Umnak Island a little over 2,100 head of Columbia yearling ewes plus 11 head of hereford cattle and 8 head of horses.

We have worked under many unusual and trying difficulties that are peculiar to pioneering in a remote and undeveloped country. In spite of discouragements, difficulties and back-sets, we feel that we have made splendid progress in the last ten years. We now have approximately 10,000 head of sheep, 100 head of cattle and 17 head of horses.

Ten years experience has certainly not destroyed our enthusiasm but it has made more realistic our appraisal of the area and its future in the range livestock business. I would like to point out some of the facts that affect this development in Alaska.

First of all, it takes large sums of cash just to start an enterprise such as this. There is no source that we know of from which money can be borrowed on a new and untried venture in this country. Once started, resources must be found to operate and develop the raw land over a period of years. This development includes capital expenditures for housing, fences, shearing facilities, corrals, barns, storage warehouses, road and bridge building, water supplies, sewage disposal, electric power, etc.

Our income is limited a great deal more than most sheep ranches because we have never been able to develop an economically feasible market for lambs, mutton or beef. So we have to depend on the sale of our wool as our income.

Our expenses are also unusual for a sheep ranch. Once a year, all of our supplies are brought in by boat from Seattle, Washington. The freight on livestock feed is $53.85 per ton. Emergency supplies are flown in from Anchorage at the rate of $.35 per pound. All of our wool has to be shipped to Portland, Oregon to be placed on the market. This one item of "freight" costs us about $9,000 per year. Another unusual expense incurred by us is travel expense for our employees. We send shearers to our ranch from Idaho, Montana, Washington, etc. It costs us over $500 in travel expense for each of these temporary employees that come from these areas. Last year our employee's travel expense amounted to almost $4,500. In addition to these unusual expenses, farm labor in Alaska receive average wages well above any other state. The Alaska Crop & Livestock Reporting Service, Statistical Reporting Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture reported from Palmer, Alaska on March 31, 1966 that "California is the only state that comes fairly close to Alaska in wages paid for farm labor. But even California's high farm wages for 1965 were considerably below those paid for Alaska farm labor. Alaska's farm labor wages in 1965 averaged $410 per month with house" . . . "This compares with the average wages paid in California of $339 with house". I might add that recruiting competent and experienced help at a remote location such as ours has proved to be our most vexing problem.

Senator Gruening, I know how vitally interested you are in the development of Alaska. I have very briefly outlined some of the problems that face ranchers in developing the livestock industry in the state. I believe that the "Alaska Grazing Act" can be amended to compensate for some of these unusual problems that face livestock growers in Alaska.

First of all, I would like to suggest a longer lease term for agricultural purposes. The present grazing leases issued by the Bureau of Land Management are for a term of 20 years. It is my understanding that similar leases are made by the State of Alaska on State owned land for a term of 55 years. It appears that the State recognizes the conditions and that long term leases are desirable for all parties concerned for the development of the land. It seems only fair that lease holders of Federal and State grazing leases should be on an equal footing in this matter of the term of the lease. This would have a number of desirable effects. It would improve chances for long term financing so necessary in a development program. It would give the individual an increased incentive to pioneer. It would certainly give the lessee an assurance that he could make substantial capital investment in improvements on the lease.

The second change I would recommend to the "Alaska Grazing Act" would be to permit the negotiation for the renewal of an existing lease at least five years prior to the expiration of the lease. Our present lease contract is for a period of 20 years and it states "and if at the end of said period the Area Administrator shall determine that a new lease should be granted, the lessee herein shall be accorded preference rights thereto upon such terms and for such duration as may be fixed by the Area Administrator." Although we will have preference rights, we will not know what the terms will be until *after* our lease has expired. The terms might be entirely unacceptable to us and we might be forced into a rapid and ruinous liquidation. For that matter, we have no assurance that a determination by the Area Administrator that a new lease should be granted at all until the end of our present term. This will leave us in a hesitant and uncertain position during the last portion of our lease term. During this period, we will always be wondering whether we should continue capital improvements on the lease. However, if we could negotiate five years prior to the expiration of the lease, we would know where we stood and be able to make an orderly withdrawal or continue our improvement program in accordance with the outcome of the negotiations.

A third amendment to the Alaska Grazing Act which I feel is very important to the development of this new country is a provision to permit the Bureau of Land Management to negotiate for the sale of lands to the lessee. Australia has recognized the importance of this and does permit lessee to purchase portions of the lease over a long period of time. I believe it is axiomatic that development is more rapid where the land is privately owned. Alaska needs this basis of wealth—privately owned land—very much. I feel that in the long run, it would benefit the U.S. Government too.

A fourth recommendation that I would suggest is that the Bureau of Land Management be required to notify lessee directly of any contemplated withdrawals from the Public Domain, reclassification or other changes affecting the lessee. Lessee should be afforded the opportunity to learn why such changes are needed, how it will affect him and to express his views on the contemplated changes at a hearing. In our own case, we signed the lease contract with the Bureau of Land Management thinking we would have the grazing rights on the lease subject only to the restrictions in the lease. However, Public Land Order 2262, issued February 7, 1961, reserved to the Federal Aviation Authority approximately 7,500 acres around Fort Glenn Airport and about 1,800 acres around Berry Field, both on our grazing lease. At no time were we notified that we could appear for a hearing to express our views on this proposed withdrawal or told how it would affect us. We were notified that the withdrawal was an accomplished fact and it came as quite a shock to us. Doubtless, the legal requirements were fulfilled by proper notice in the Federal Register. However, we do not subscribe to the Federal Register and doubt that any other livestock producers in Alaska do subscribe to it. A requirement that the Bureau of Land Management notify directly the lessee affected of any proposed changes and afford an opportunity for a hearing certainly should not place any undue burden on the Bureau of Land Management. Lack of this notification certainly places a great burden and uncertainty on lessee.

It may be that all parties concerned would profit by transfer of Bureau of Land Management grazing leases to control of the State of Alaska. I do not know about this as I have not investigated it. It is my understanding that the two airports on Umnak Island were transferred from F.A.A. to State control. I presume this was done to advantage of both Federal Government and the State.

To summarize, our experience leads me to believe that the four changes to the Alaska Grazing Act would help materially in the development of the livestock industry in Alaska. These changes are: (1) Authorize 55-year grazing leases, (2) Permit negotiation for renewal of an existing lease five years prior to the end of the term of the lease, (3) Provide for the Bureau of Land Management to negotiate the sale of leased land to lessee and (4) Require Bureau of Land Management to notify lessee directly of any contemplated changes affecting his lease, giving him an opportunity to express his views on the proposed changes.

Senator Gruening, we respectfully solicit your aid in trying to bring about these changes. I believe these changes are necessary to attract capital and know-how to our 49th State. It would be a positive step toward the greater development of the State.

Sincerely yours,

UMNAK CO., INC.,
JAMES S. BYNUM,
Secretary-Treasurer.

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Bureau of Land Management,
Anchorage, Alaska, July 8, 1966.
Hon. Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: In your letter of June 28, 1966, you forwarded comments by Mr. James S. Bynum about the Bureau of Land Management grazing leases in Alaska. Mr. Bynum's comments and suggestions are well taken and we sincerely appreciate you forwarding them to us. They will be made a part of the record for our future consideration of changes in the Alaska grazing regulations.

Initially I should indicate that the Bureau of Land Management and the State of Alaska have informally worked out a system whereby administration of public domain or State selected lands is as economical as possible. This long range system or program is that each agency provides major administrative actions in those areas where its land ownership pattern is the greatest. The program also provides that the State fully select all lands in various areas to eliminate dual administration as much, and as soon as possible. Hence, the State selection of Bureau of Land Management grazing lease areas on the Kenai and the proposed selection of leases on Kodiak Island. We have previously written you about this.

Because of the exceptional conditions in Alaska mentioned by Mr. Bynum, special leasing provisions have been made. Fees in Alaska are 5¢ per AUM as against more than 30¢ in the lower 48. Lease periods are 20 years in Alaska and 10 elsewhere. There are many other differences.

The State of Alaska has issued a few 55 year grazing leases at a minimum charge of 10¢ per acre. If the Bureau of Land Management would use this system, Mr. Bynum's lease rental would amount to $21,000 per year rather than the $960 per annum he is now paying. It is my understanding that the State is no longer making 55 year grazing leases.

Mr. Bynum's suggestion about negotiating prior to the end of a lease period is good and we will give it full consideration the next time the regulations are revised. He should be aware of the fact that in all cases, no adverse action has been taken on a lease in Alaska without full and adequate protection of the lessee. For the most part, leases have been cancelled for non-compliance and adequate warnings given.

Authority exists for Bureau of Land Management to sell land. Persons may purchase 80 acre headquarters sites under the Trade and Manufacturing Act of May 14, 1898 (30 Stat. 413). Regulations pertaining to this Act are found in 43 CFR 2213. In addition, PL 88–608 allows sales of land not exceeding 5,120 acres. The State of Alaska must zone the area prior to any sale. Some ranchers have homesteaded 16 acres around their headquarters sites.

In each instance, Bureau of Land Management notifies the interested public of proposed withdrawals. See 43 CFR 2311.1–3. In the particular case mentioned by Mr. Bynum, Mr. Norman Moser, Vice-President of Umnak Company was notified in 1956 of the proposed Federal Aviation Agency withdrawal. By letter of December 12, 1956, Mr. Moser outlined critical areas involved in the F.A.A. withdrawal. By letter of December 31, 1956, we also advised the F.A.A. of these critical areas and requested that agency to coordinate with Mr. Moser. The withdrawal was made on February 7, 1961, to protect Federal investments existing prior to the Umnak lease.

On July 6, 1966, Mr. Bynum appeared before the Public Land Law Review Commission hearing in Alaska and made proposals similar to the ones in his letter of June 23, 1966.

In summary, I should add that grazing lease conditions in Alaska differ from other states to reflect Alaskan conditions. Lease terms are favorable to the leases and yet protect the public's interest in multiple use management of public lands.

If there is additional information needed, kindly let me know.

Sincerely yours,
R. Don Christman,
Acting State Director.

Enclosure.

State of Alaska,
Department of Natural Resources,
Division of Lands,
Anchorage, September 1, 1966.
Hon. Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: We hope you will pardon the long delay in answering your letter relative to those questions that were contained in the letter you received from the Umnak Company, Inc. relative to the federal laws on grazing leases. We solicited information relative to grazing practices employed by most of the western states on a state basis on the premises that this may be helpful in initiating the state program and some of the information gathered may be of interest to you. We will remark specifically about the questions that were posed by Mr. Bynum in the last paragraph of his letter.

With respect to the term of the lease, we feel that a lease for a period up to 55 years would present no material problem so long as, by the terms of the lease, the management authority retains complete freedom to classify the lands for other purposes when a higher and better use develops. The second question as to whether the lessee should have the prerogative to negotiate for a renewal prior to the end of the 5 year term would present no problem so long as the authority to reclassify as stated above exists. The third proposition contained in Mr. Bynum's letter is something that should be considered very carefully in our judgment. We feel very strongly that a competitive atmosphere should exist in the disposal of all public lands except, of course, when the land is to be used for some governmental purpose. A negotiated disposal, in spite of today's advanced appraisal techniques, can lead to criticism from the public standpoint. Such a procedure would place the lessee in a position where he could acquire the land and thus divest himself of those regulations which require utilization and development under the grazing program. If, in fact, the grazing activity is the highest and best use of the land and in view of the current rental figures, it would appear to us that those safeguards now provided by the grazing regulations should be maintained. We would see no objection whatsoever to the fourth proposal in granting the lessee an opportunity to be heard in the event that any classification changes were contemplated in connection with the leasehold.

As I mentioned, we gathered information from the western states relative to grazing practices and what we learned may be summarized somewhat as follows.

The longest lease the western states utilizes is for a 12 year period. Four out of five states can sell the land under lease. Most all of the states protect leasehold improvements but the manner in which they achieve this varies considerably under the different programs. Most of the states do provide for a preference right but the trend seems to be toward competitive bidding and generally speaking the lessee is generally afforded an opportunity to meet high bid.

We trust that the foregoing information will be of some assistance to you.

Cordially yours,
Roscoe E. Bell,
Director.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROCUREMENT AND CONSTRUCTION IN THE COAST GUARD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury, a bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, together with his explanatory memorandum, be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and memorandum will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1060) to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1060

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1968 for the use of the Coast Guard are as follows:

VESSELS

For procurement, extension of service life, and increasing capability of vessels, $39,776,000.

A. Procurement:

(1) one high-endurance cutter;
(2) one oceanographic cutter;
(3) two large patrol craft;
(4) two river tenders; and
(5) design of icebreaker.

B. Increasing capability:

(1) install balloon tracking radar on four high-endurance cutters;
(2) obtain precision navigational equipment for high-endurance cutters; and
(3) increase fuel capacity and improve habitability on six high-endurance cutters.

C. Extension of service life:

(1) improve icebreakers.

AIRCRAFT

For procurement of aircraft, $25,475,000.

(1) nine medium-range helicopters;
(2) twelve short-range helicopters;
(3) one transport aircraft; and
(4) search and rescue reconfiguration of medium-range aircraft.

CONSTRUCTION

For establishment or development of installations and facilities by acquisition, construction, conversion, extension, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including the preparation of sites and furnishing of appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following, $37,963,000.

(1) Base, Mobile, Alabama: industrial facility;

(2) Base, Ketchikan, Alaska: sewage disposal system;

(3) Training Center, Alameda, California: recruit barracks;

(4) Radio Station, San Francisco, California: operations and receiver building and receiver antennas at Fort Cronkhite; transmitters and transmitting antennas at San Bruno;

(5) Academy, New London, Connecticut: auditorium; recreation hall; rehabilitation of existing Chase Hall barracks;

(6) Base, New London, Connecticut: bulkheads; wharf; dredging;

(7) Station, Panama City, Florida: barracks, messing, and operations building; industrial facilities; mooring facilities;

(8) Air Station, Barbers Point, Honolulu, Hawaii: helicopter hangar; nose-dock facility;

(9) Air Station, Chicago, Illinois: modify existing Navy building at Naval Station, Glenview, Illinois, for Coast Guard use;

(10) Station, Jonesport, Maine: barracks, messing, and operations building; mooring facilities; public family quarters;

(11) Yard, Curtis Bay, Maryland: barracks; sewage disposal system; fabricating shop;

(12) Station, Sassafras River, Kennedyville, Maryland: barracks, messing, and operations building; mooring facilities; public family quarters;

(13) Moorings, Vicksburg, Mississippi: establish moorings for aids to navigation tender;

(14) Station, Wellesley Island, Alexandria Bay, New York: barracks, messing, and operations building; public family quarters;

(15) Station, Fire Island, New York: barracks, messing, and operations building; public family quarters;

(16) Base, Governors Island, New York: industrial facilities; barracks;

(17) Training Center, Cape May, New Jersey: water tank and system;

(18) Station, Wrightsville Beach, North Carolina: barracks, messing, and operations building; mooring facilities; public family quarters;

(19) Moorings, Fort Sallisaw, Oklahoma: establish moorings for aids to navigation tender;

(20) Reserve Training Center, Yorktown, Virginia: student barracks;

(21) Base, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: barracks, messing, and recreation building;

(2)) Loran Station, Gagil-Tomil Island, Yap, Western Caroline Islands, Pacific Ocean; fuel-oil system;

(23 Various locations: aids to navigation projects including, where necessary, advance planning and acquisition of sites;

(24) Various locations: automation of manned light stations;

(25) Various locations: advance planning, construction design architectural services and acquisition of sites in connection with public works projects not otherwise authorized by law; and

(26) Various locations: public family quarters.

SEC. 2. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1968 for payment to bridge owners for the cost of alteration of railroad and public highway bridges to permit free navigation of navigable waters of the United States in the amount of $3,800,000.

The letter and memorandum presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.
Washington, February 9, 1967.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a bill, "To authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard."

This proposal is submitted under the requirements of Public Law 88–45 which provides that no funds can be appropriated to or for the use of the Coast Guard for the procurement of vessels or aircraft or the construction of shore or offshore establishments unless the appropriation of such funds is authorized by legislation.

The proposal includes, as it has in past years, all items of acquisition, construction, and improvement programs for the Coast Guard to be undertaken during fiscal year 1968 even though the provisions of Public Law 88–45 appear to require authorization only for major facilities and construction. Inclusion of all items in the proposal obviates the necessity for separation of the programs into two parts; one requiring authorization and the other not requiring authorization.

The proposed bill does not, however, itemize all construction items under certain general headings involving aids to navigation, public family quarters, and advanced planning projects. Inclusion of particulars under these general headings would have unduly lengthened the bill. It should be noted that the authorization for aircraft includes replacement of existing aircraft as well as augmentation aircraft. Additionally, it includes associated spare parts and ground-support equipment.

There is attached a memorandum listing in summary form the procurement and construction programs for which appropriations would be authorized by the proposed bill. In further support of this legislation, the cognizant legislative Committee will be furnished detailed information with respect to each program for which fund authorization is being requested in a form identical to that being submitted in explanation and justification of the Budget request. Additionally, the Department will be prepared to submit any other data that the Committee or its staff may require.

It would be appreciated if you would lay this proposed bill before the Senate. A similar bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that the proposed legislation would be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. FOWLER.

MEMORANDUM—SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 1968 U.S. COAST GUARD PROGRAM FOR PROCUREMENT OF VESSELS AND AIRCRAFT AND FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SHORE AND OFFSHORE ESTABLISHMENTS

VESSELS

For procurement, extension of service life, and increasing capability of vessels.

Procurement:	
1 high-endurance cutter to replace 1 large overage cutter	$14,500,000
1 oceanographic cutter	12,000,000
2 large patrol craft to replace 2 overage medium-endurance cutters	3,000,000
2 river tenders, 1 to service aids to navigation on the Lower Mississippi River and 1 to service aids to navigation on the Arkansas River (see items below for construction of moorings)	1,522,000
Preliminary to procurement, conclude icebreaker design	1,500,000
Increasing capability:	
Install 4 balloon tracking radars of improved capability on high-endurance cutters	800,000
Obtain 20 shipboard loran–C and 4 Navy navigation satellite receivers for installation aboard high-endurance cutters for the precise positioning required for oceanographic surveys	1,244,000
Increase fuel capacity and improve habitability on 6, 327-foot high-endurance cutters	2,500,000
Extension of service life:	
Overhaul main motors, modernize communication equipment, and improve habitability on icebreakers	2,710,000
Total vessels	**39,776,000**

AIRCRAFT

For procurement of aircraft:	
9 medium-range recovery aircraft to replace 9 overage medium-range search airplanes	$13,865,000
Evaluate, test, modify and reconfigure a medium-range aircraft to meet Coast Guard requirements for search and rescue	1,500,000
12 short-range recovery aircraft for deployment to icebreakers, for conducting search and rescue operations at Chicago (see construction item 9), and for support	7,310,000
1 turbo-jet powered transport aircraft to replace 2 overage piston-engined transport aircraft	2,800,000
Total aircraft	25,475,000

CONSTRUCTION

For establishment or development of installations and facilities by acquisition, construction, conversion, extension, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including the preparation of sites and furnishing of appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following:

Base, Mobile, Ala.: industrial facility	$1,000,000
Base, Ketchikan, Alaska: sewage disposal system	110,000
Training Center, Alameda, Calif.: recruit barracks	1,380,000
Radio Station, San Francisco, Calif.: operations and receiver building, and receiving antennas at Fort Cronkhite, transmitters and transmitting antennas at San Bruno	823,000
Academy, New London, Conn.: auditorium; recreation hall; and rehabilitation of existing Chase Hall barracks	3,350,000
Base, New London, Conn.: bulkheads; wharf; and dredging	2,354,000
Station, Panama City, Fla.: barracks, messing, and operations building; industrial and mooring facilities	1,125,000
Air Station, Barbers Point, Honolulu, Hawaii: helicopter hangar and nose-dock facilities	1,785,000
Air Station, Chicago, Ill.: modify for Coast Guard use a Navy building at Naval Air Station, Glenview, Ill. (see aircraft item 3)	289,000
Station, Jonesport, Maine: barracks, messing, and operations building; mooring facilities; and public family quarters	1,145,000
Yard, Curtis Bay, Md.: barracks; sewage disposal systems; and fabricating shop	995,000
Station, Sassafras River, Kennedyville, Md.: barracks, messing, and operations building; mooring facilities; boats; vehicle; and public family quarters	747,000
Moorings, Vicksburg, Miss: to support lower Mississippi River aids to navigation tender (see Vessels item A.4)	228,000
Station, Wellesley Island, Alexandria Bay, N.Y.: barracks, messing, and operations building and public family quarters	562,000
Station, Fire Island, N.Y.: barracks, messing, and operations building and public family quarters	1,004,000
Base, Governors Island, N.Y.: industrial facilities and barracks	3,894,000

Training center, Cape May, N.J.: water tank and system	$260,000
Station, Wrightsville Beach, N.C.: barracks, messing, and operations buildings; mooring facilities; vehicle; and public family quarters	467,000
Moorings, Fort Sallisaw, Okla.: to support Arkansas River aids to navigation tender (see Vessels item A.4)	392,000
Reserve training center, Yorktown, Va.: two student barracks	2,650,000
Base, Milwaukee, Wis.: barracks, messing, and recreation building	308,000
Loran station, Gagil-Tomil Island, Yap, Western Caroline Islands, Pacific Ocean: fuel-oil system	575,000
Various locations: aids to navigation projects including, where necessary, advance planning and acquisition of sites. Also includes replacement aids to navigation in one or more locations for overage lightships, the number dependent upon studies now underway for substitutes for offshore structures such as the very large buoy at the entrance to New York Harbor	3,208,000
Various locations: Automation of Manned Light Stations	1,011,000
Various locations: advance planning, construction design, architectural services, and acquisition of sites in connection with public works projects not otherwise authorized by law	2,000,000
Various locations: public family quarters	6,301,000
Total shore establishments	37,963.000
SECTION 2	
Various locations: Fiscal year 1968 payments to bridge owners for the cost of alteration of railroad and public highway bridges to permit free navigation of navigable waters of the United States	3,800,000

PROHIBITION OF USE OF MAIL COVERS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on February 8, I introduced the proposed Right of Privacy Act of 1967 recommended by the President. This bill, S. 928, would prohibit wiretapping and eavesdropping except where the national security is involved and further would prohibit the manufacture, interstate shipment and interstate advertisement of devices which are primarily useful for wiretapping and eavesdropping.

Today, I introduce a bill to protect privacy against yet another abusive Government practice, the mail cover. In conducting a mail cover or mail watch, the Post Office Department systematically records all information on the outside of all mail addressed to a particular address or addressee. By this means, the Government is able to ascertain who is communicating with a particular party.

About a century ago, the Supreme Court placed the protection of the fourth amendment over letters in the mail. Not being able to seize and open letters, it was only natural that Government agencies adopted the next best snooping technique, the scrutinizing of the outside of all letters addressed to a suspect, his friends, or his family.

Once this practice became common and mail was sidetracked from its normal channels for this purpose, it was only a small step to return to the practice of opening mail. In 1965, the Congress learned that the Post Office Department and the Internal Revenue Service were conspiring to seize and open mail without warrants under the guise of the IRS levy authority. So Congress enacted legislation which, in effect, told these two agencies that they, like the rest of the Government, were subject to the limitations of the Constitution and could not seize and open mail without a warrant.

If similar abuses of the mail are to be prevented in the future, I believe it is necessary that the Post Office Department drop its role as a policeman for other Government agencies and limit its activities to delivering the mail.

Not too long ago, any law enforcement officer, Federal, State, or local could go to a postmaster and request a mail cover on anyone if he alleged its purpose was to locate a fugitive from justice. Likewise, any Government agency could go to any postal inspector and request a mail cover for any reason. The chances were pretty good that the request would be honored if the purpose was official business.

When the Senate Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee began its hearings in 1965 on Government practices that invade privacy, the Post Office Department was the first Federal agency to testify. The subcommittee explored the use of mail covers and it was disclosed that about 1,000 covers a month were used. Subsequent to this testimony, the Postmaster General issued new regulations which for the first time placed realistic controls on the use of mail covers.

Despite these regulations, I recently learned that over 1,800 covers were used during the past year. The Congress has never authorized nor intended the Post Office Department to have this "big brother" power.

Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prohibit the use of mail covers. This bill would go beyond the current regulations and prohibit completely the use of this practice. In considering legislation, the burden should be on the Department to show the need for any continued use of covers. To date, its evidence has not been very convincing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1061) to prohibit the use of mail covers, introduced by Mr. LONG of Missouri, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1946 RELATING TO COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN ALIEN EMPLOYEES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, during this period of America's extensive relationships with nations throughout the world, there are frequently times of stress which lead to violence and breakdown of law and order. Such crises frequently work a painful strain on local national employees of the American embassy. There are, in Communist nations, too, occasions when these employees are imprisoned by local authorities as the very result of being employed by the U.S. Government, often falsely accused of espionage.

I urge that such an individual who is thus penalized in terms of harsh treatment and loss of liberty, and time, personal comfort and salary be at least compensated where appropriate for the salary income lost during the period of his imprisonment.

Accordingly, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to this effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1064) to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946 to provide for compensation for certain alien employees of the Foreign Service who are imprisoned by a foreign government as a result of their employment by the United States, introduced by Mr. PELL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CREATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE TO INQUIRE INTO THE ACTIVITIES OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY IN QUASI-FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC ACTIVITIES

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, in behalf of myself and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], a resolution that, in order to assure that the conduct of the foreign policy of the United States is not adversely affected by clandestine domestic activities of the Central Intelligence Agency, there be created a select committee to be known as the Committee to Study the Foreign and Domestic-Related Activities of the Central Intelligence Agency.

The committee shall consist of seven Senators appointed by the President of the Senate and shall report its findings and recommendations to the Senate no later than January 1, 1968.

The purpose of the proposed select committee is to make a full and complete study and investigation of the foreign and domestic-related activities of the Central Intelligence Agency with particular emphasis upon the effect of such activities upon domestic, private, and public American institutions and organizations and of the effect of such activities on American foreign policy.

The resolution I am submitting would authorize the select committee to include in its investigations such matters as the subsidization of organizations within the United States which have an influence on public opinion, the covert use or subsidization of academic institutions, student groups, foundations, trade unions, emigre groups, or other educational, economic, or special groups or individuals in the United States which might affect the foreign policy of the Nation, directly or indirectly. The select committee would also be authorized to investigate the subsidization of publications, radio broadcasts and other informational media disseminated in U.S. activities.

The Central Intelligence Agency has been the subject of controversy during most of its 20-year history since its establishment in 1947. It has frequently been accused of making foreign policy, and in so doing of usurping the roles of the President and of the Senate. Yet, perhaps at no other time in its history have the activities of the CIA provided the occasion for as much comment and as much controversy—in the press, among the public at large, as well as in the Congress—as during the past few days.

The very extensive information which has appeared in the press in recent days makes unnecessary a detailed review of the most recent charges against the CIA.

It appears that the CIA's purpose in supplying these organizations with funds and attempting to place in leadership positions either its own men or those whom it could control was to improve the image of the United States abroad and thus to strengthen U.S. foreign policy. Regardless of the intent, serious questions of impropriety and imprudence are now raised, as are also questions about the lack of perception and sensitivity about the meaning of educational and similar institutions in a free society. It also appears that some became so dedicated to carrying out what they thought to be the national purpose that they lost sight of the basic principle accepted by a democratic society: that the end does not justify every means.

In proposing a select committee I am not suggesting that the Nation does not need a Central Intelligence Agency. We all hope that a day will come when the Nation could feel secure without the need for clandestine intelligence and operations in foreign relations. That day is not here. It is my belief that the kind of study I am proposing would improve the effectiveness of the CIA.

Neither is it my intention that a select committee would harass or question the integrity of the extensive lists of leaders of business, academic, social philanthropic, labor, and similar organizations who one way or the other have been identified with CIA activities. The proposed investigation is to review the effect of CIA activities upon domestic institutions only for the purpose of preventing future adverse effects on the conduct of foreign policy.

We may properly question the extent and methods of CIA activities with domestic institutions without questioning the dedication of leaders outside Government who responded to the invitation to serve the Government without credit or reward. In any case, we in Congress must assume some responsibility. The activities of the Central Intelligence Agency have been the concern of many Members of Congress over the years. The Hoover Commission in 1955 recommended a joint committee. The CIA has been the subject of over 150 proposals for investigation or for stricter supervision introduced by Members of Congress in the past 20 years.

Of all of the resolutions relating to the Central Intelligence Agency that have been submitted in the Senate, only two have ever come to the floor. The first was in 1956, when the Committee on Rules and Administration reported the proposal of the present majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] for the creation of a Joint Committee on the Central Intelligence Agency. That proposal, which originally had wide sponsorship, was defeated by a vote of 27 to 59 on April 11, 1956.

The only other proposal on the CIA which has ever come to the floor of the Senate was that reported last year by the Committee on Foreign Relations, where it reported a resolution which would have created a Senate Committee on Intelligence Operations made up of membership from the Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Relations Committees.

The Senate was not permitted to vote on the substance of this proposal. As Senators will recall, on July 14 of last year, this resolution was defeated on a procedural motion and referred to the Armed Services Committee whose chairman had stated that its subject matter was within his exclusive jurisdiction.

The information now revealed about the widespread involvement of the CIA in domestic institutions has moved the issue for the Senate beyond the question of a jurisdictional dispute.

Very serious questions have been raised about the effect of the past activities of the CIA on our domestic and foreign policies.

These questions cannot be answered satisfactorily unless the Senate makes a thorough study of the situation. It is my view that the future effectiveness of the CIA requires that the Senate, with its special responsibilities in foreign policy, make such an investigation and report its recommendations. I believe that nothing less than a study of this kind will allay suspicions about the CIA in the future and restore public confidence, insofar as possible, about the propriety of its future operations.

The study by a select committee which would be provided by the resolution I am submitting today would restore the public confidence in some national institutions, in their independence of undue Government influence.

It would help protect the CIA from unsubstantiated charges that hinder the Agency in its primary task of collecting and disseminating to appropriate persons within the Government the intelligence on which an effective U.S. foreign policy can be based.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 85), submitted by Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio), was received, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. RES. 85

Resolved, That in order to assure that the conduct of the foreign policy of the United States is not adversely affected by domestic activities of the Central Intelligence Agency, there is hereby created a select committee to be known as the Committee to Study the Foreign and Domestic-Related Activities of the Central Intelligence Agency which committee shall consist of seven Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate as soon as practicable after the date of adoption of this resolution.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of such committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of the foreign and domestic-related activities of the Central Intelligence Agency, with particular emphasis upon the effect of such activities upon domestic, private and public American institutions and organizations and upon the effect of such activities on the conduct of American foreign policy. The study and investigation shall include but not be limited to such matters as the subsidization of organizations within the United States which have an influence on public opinion, the covert use, or subsidization of academic institutions, student groups, foundations, trade unions, emigre groups, or other educational, economic or special groups or individuals therein in the United States which might affect the foreign policies of the United States, directly or indirectly, and the subsidization of publications, radio broadcasts, and other informational media disseminated in the United States.

The committee shall report its findings and recommendations to the Senate no later than January 1, 1968. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee, and such committee shall not have power to report by bill or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

SEC. 3. The said committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

SEC. 4. A majority of the members of the committee or any subcommittee thereof shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 5. The committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duty. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the various departments and agencies of the Government to the extent that such services, information, facilities, and personnel, in the opinion of the heads of such departments and agencies, can be furnished without undue interference with the performance of the work and duties of such departments and agencies.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the committee, in an amount not to exceed $ shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

INCOME-TAX CONVENTION WITH TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive F, 90th Congress, first session, the income-tax convention with Trinidad and Tobago, signed December 22, 1966, transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States, and that the convention, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President was

referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the convention between the United States of America and Trinidad and Tobago for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, and the encouragement of international trade and investment, signed at Port of Spain on December 22, 1966.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Secretary of State with respect to the convention.

Technical discussions between officials of the two Governments have been in progress with a view to the conclusion of a comprehensive income tax contention along the lines of those presently in force between the United States and numerous other countries. It is hoped that such a comprehensive convention can be concluded during 1967. Meanwhile, a convention of limited scope has been signed as an interim measure and dealing with a reduction of withholding rates on dividends and certain branch profits and an allowance of an appropriate foreign tax credit. It will have the effect of permitting U.S. corporations to receive dividends from their subsidiary corporations in Trinidad and Tobago at a reduced rate of withholding tax, a reduction from 30 to 5 percent. Also, it will have the effect of reducing from 30 to 5 percent the Trinidad and Tobago tax on profits, after payment of a corporation tax of 44 percent, derived in Trinidad and Tobago by a permanent establishment of a U.S. corporation. The interim convention will, therefore, be of considerable benefit to American enterprises having interests in Trinidad and Tobago.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to this convention with Trinidad and Tobago.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 23, 1967.*

PRINTING OF REPORT ON STUDY OF FEDERAL REIMBURSEMENT POLICY FOR WORK BY STATES AND OTHER NON-FEDERAL ENTITIES ON AUTHORIZED WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS (S. DOC. NO. 10)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated January 13, 1967, from the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the provisions of section 314 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1965—Public Law 89-298—setting forth the results of a study of the need for, and the feasibility of, legislation which would authorize the reimbursement of expenditures made by States and other non-Federal public entities in connection with water resource development projects authorized as Federal undertakings.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REPORT ON ST. FRANCIS BASIN, ARK. AND MO. (S. DOC. NO. 11)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated September 14, 1966, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a report on St. Francis Basin, Ark. and Mo.—local cooperation requirements—requested by section 204, Flood Control Act of October 27, 1965—Public Law 89-298.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with an illustration, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors of the following bills:

Authority of February 2, 1967:

S. 810. A bill to provide for a White House Conference on Indian Affairs: Mr. BIBLE, Mr. FONG, Mr. HART, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

Authority of February 6, 1967:

S. 852. A bill to amend section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization, and for other purposes: Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HART, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

Authority of February 9, 1967:

S. 944. A bill relating to the establishment of parking facilities in the District of Columbia: Mr. KENNEDY of New York.

S. 949. A bill to establish a Judicial Service Commission: Mr. BENNETT, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. THURMOND.

S. 950. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months: Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MUSKIE, and Mr. TYDINGS.

S. 951. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions: Mr. CHURCH, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS BY THE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL LAWS AND PROCEDURES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate and others who may be interested, I announce that the first of a series of hearings by the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures of the Committee on the Judiciary will begin on Tuesday, March 7, 1967, at 10 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building. This series will continue through Thursday, March 9, 1967.

The subject matter to be considered and the evidence to be heard will relate to proposed legislation designed to combat the crime menace in our country. Under study will be some of the measures which the President outlines in his February 6 message on crime in America.

The following is a partial listing of the bills upon which testimony will be received:

S. 300, to amend section 401 of title 18 of the United States Code, dealing with the power of the courts of the U.S. to punish for contempts of its authority. (Sen. Thurmond.)

S. 552, to amend title 18 of the United States Code in order to provide that committing acts dangerous to persons on board trains shall be a criminal offense. (Sen. Burdick.)

S. 580, to amend chapter 18, United States Code, to prohibit the importation into the U.S. of certain noxious aquatic plants. (Sen. Holland.)

S. 674, to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to the admissibility in evidence of confessions. (Sen. McClellan, for himself and Senators Byrd of W. Va., Ervin, Hollings and Hruska.)

S. 675, to prohibit wiretapping by persons other than duly authorized law enforcement officers engaged in the investigation or prevention of specified categories of criminal offenses, and for other purposes. (Sen. McClellan for himself and Sen. Hruska.)

S. 678, to outlaw the Mafia and other organized crime syndicates. (Sen. McClellan.)

S. 798, to provide compensation to survivors of local law enforcement officers killed while apprehending persons for committing Federal crimes. (Sen. McClellan, for himself and Sen. Scott.)

S. 824, to provide assistance for the improvement of State and local law enforcement agencies through acquisition of equipment for those agencies and provision of educational opportunities to their personnel, and for other purposes. (Sen. Tydings, for himself and Senators Burdick, Inouye, Kennedy of N.Y., Long of Mo., Magnuson, Metcalf, Mondale, Montoya, Moss, Pell, Randolph, Smathers and Yarborough.)

S. 915, to provide for the establishment of a Federal Judicial Center. (Sen. McClellan, by request, for himself and Senators Metcalf and Tydings.)

S. 916, to assist in combating crime by creating the United States Correction Service, and for other purposes. (Sen. McClellan, by request.)

S. 917, to assist State and local governments in reducing the incidence of crime, to increase the effectiveness, fairness, and coordination of law enforcement and criminal justice systems at all levels of government, and for other purposes. (Sen. McClellan, by request, for himself and Senators Byrd of W. Va., Ervin, Harris, Hart, Hruska, Javits, Mundt, Scott, Tydings and Yarborough.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 8002 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the Speaker had appointed Mr. MILLS of

Arkansas, Mr. King of California, Mr. Boggs of Louisiana, Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin, and Mr. Curtis of Missouri, members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, on the part of the House.

JUSTICE AND INCREASED CRIME

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the problem of steadily increasing crime in our Nation has become of growing concern to Congress, as witnessed by the many remarks on the subject in the Senate. I should like to urge my colleagues to give serious thought to an aspect of the matter which sorely needs constructive action—that of the burden that recent court decisions has placed on police officers in their efforts to enforce the law.

Prior to the President's recent message to Congress on the need for renewed war on crime, David Lawrence discussed this aspect of the crime situation in an article, entitled "More Funds Needed To Fight Crime," in the January 26 issue of the Washington, D.C., Evening Star; and James L. Kilpatrick echoed the sentiment in his article in the same newspaper, "Fruits of Court Decisions Ripen."

Significantly, the President's message did not touch on this aspect of the crime situation. An editorial in the Evening Star on February 7 took cognizance of this fact, emphasizing that, in this respect, his message to Congress was disappointing. David Lawrence further developed the seriousness of the problem resulting from recent court decisions in his Evening Star article of February 13, "Severe Blows to Law Enforcement."

Now there has come to public notice a dismaying example of the crippling effect these decisions are having upon the efforts of law enforcement officers to protect the innocent public. As reported in the February 21 Washington, D.C., Post, on February 20 in New York, a murder indictment was dismissed because the confessed killer—charged with six murders—was not "briefed on his rights before he confessed." The Brooklyn supreme court justice who presided at the trial spoke for all of us, I believe, when he stated:

> It makes one's blood run cold and it makes any human being's stomach turn to let a thing like this out on the street.

To have a confessed killer of six people roaming the streets is indeed a fearsome thing. Yet it is just such mishappenings that make it imperative for Congress to take constructive action in this area.

I would remind my colleagues, since this is the week in which the birth of George Washington has been commemorated, of his words:

> The Administration of justice is the firmest pillar of government.

I ask unanimous consent that these newspaper articles be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 26, 1967]

More Funds Needed To Fight Crime

(By David Lawrence)

With all the billions of dollars to be spent on the Great Society, it's amazing that virtually nothing is being provided to organize an effective war on crime throughout the country.

The rate of crime is growing every year, and in the nation's capital the rise in serious crime is three times the national average. But a bill dealing with the problem in the District of Columbia was recently vetoed by President Johnson because of its "possible" unconstitutionality.

It seems certain now that one of the biggest issues in the 1968 campaign will be crime—the inability of the citizen to walk the streets in safety.

Senator John L. McClellan, D-Ark., in a speech to the Senate yesterday, pointed out not only that the federal government has a responsibility to act, but that the Supreme Court by its decisions has made it easier for the criminal to escape punishment. The President has promised to recommend legislation to help. One problem, however, is how the states are going to get enough money to do the job.

Apart from the inadequacy of public funds for states and cities to multiply the number of their policemen and detectives, the biggest single obstacle today is the attitude of the Supreme Court of the United States, which has made it more difficult to convict persons who have committed a crime. Numerous technicalities have been interjected, so that criminals have more and more ways to evade the law.

McClellan said in his speech that federal legislation is urgently needed with respect to the admissibility of evidence obtained through voluntary confessions and other statements made by suspects after their arrest. The Arkansas senator said:

"Congress simply must rectify the mockery of justice and protect society from the dire consequences of a number of recent 5-to-4 Supreme Court decisions that allow self-confessed, vicious criminals to go free.

"Self-confessed criminals should be punished—not liberated. These enemies of law and order and decent society should be penalized—not freed on the basis of frivolous and dubious technicalities . . .

"A majority of the Supreme Court appears to be so obsessed in its quest of discovering new rights for the criminal and so enthusiastic in its efforts to magnify and articulate them that it has lost sight of law enforcement—an indispensable ingredient of our internal security."

The senator referred to what is known as the "Miranda" case, in which the Supreme Court declared that no confession—even if wholly voluntary—can be admitted in evidence in state or federal criminal proceedings unless, before any questioning by the police, the accused is given a lengthy warning about his rights. Just why policemen must give preference to the rights of the criminal, instead of to the rights of the public, is difficult to understand.

McClellan recited what has happened in a number of cases, including the following:

"Recently a self-confessed murderer was turned loose in Columbus, Ohio, because of the Miranda decision. He had voluntarily confessed and told where the murder weapon, a shotgun, could be found. It was found, and tests proved it was the weapon used in the commission of the crime. Both confession and gun had to be excluded from the evidence. As a consequence, that murderer walks the streets today—free and unpunished for his terrible crime."

The American people are bewildered and dismayed by decisions of the high court and have been expecting President Johnson, as the leader of his party, to recommend to Congress a comprehensive program to halt the rise in crime. His apparent indifference to conditions in the District of Columbia has already resulted in much criticism.

It is evident now that, without waiting for the President to act, Congress itself will have to do something about the nationwide problem. Otherwise, in the 1968 campaign, the issue could bring about the defeat of many Democrats seeking re-election.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 26, 1967]

Fruits of Court Decisions Ripen

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

New York.—The conversation of cab drivers, shop clerks and old drinking companions offers an admittedly poor basis for drawing conclusions on the leading topic of conversation in New York these days. Yet it is curious, all the same, that here one subject crops up so constantly—crime. A visitor finds it at the very top of public concerns.

The concern goes to more than crime as such. New Yorkers have always known bloody crime. Out of random conversations, one gains an impression that many residents of the big town are experiencing a sort of crisis of confidence in their courts. It is a feeling not confined to New York alone. As the effects of several Supreme Court decisions become more evident, the fruits of Mallory, Escobedo and Miranda begin to ripen. New theories of criminal treatment, of which much more soon will be heard, suddenly are emerging in the public view. And the public is not amused.

This last Friday, there appeared before the bar of the State Supreme Court here in New York a 23-year-old defendant by the name of Charles Wright. He had confessed to the brutal murder of two women whom he had stabbed to death. There was no question of the man's guilt. Yet inadvertently he had not been informed of his right to counsel before making his 41-page confession. Reported the New York Times:

"A distraught young assistant district attorney, who said he had taken the confession, moved to dismiss the charges to the dismay of court personnel and a courtroom filled with spectators."

"I cannot help but note," said the prosecutor, "that if it were not for assaults upon eight other women, many of whom were prepared to testify against the defendant, I would now by virtue of the Supreme Court decisions hailed and praised in many circles, be recommending that your honor return this admitted killer to a community that he ravaged for more than five months."

Presiding Justice Charles Marks, "with much reluctance," granted the motion to dismiss the two murder charges. As it happened, the defendant did not go free, even though he addressed the court eloquently on the subject of his "constitutional rights." He already had pleaded guilty to a separate and unrelated charge of first-degree rape. On this charge he was sentenced to 30 to 40 years in prison. Otherwise, the rule of Miranda would have set him free.

On the same day that the Times was reporting the abortive trial of Charles Wright, the World Journal Tribune was reviewing the tragic tale of a young architect, Edward Orman. He was shot and left paralyzed during the Christmas season by a mental patient, Theodore Neely, who was walking the streets of Manhattan on holiday parole from the Central Islip State Hospital. It appeared that Neely had an obsession against germs. He somehow got it into his head that Orman threatened him with contagious disease; so he shot him. Orman's young wife, the mother of two children, asked the anguished question, "Why did the hospital give this man parole?"

Under different circumstances, the two cases might be rationalized. Most persons would agree that coerced confessions, obtained by third-degree methods, ought not to be received in evidence. Everyone would agree that the very system of probation and parole, whether from mental or from penal institutions, entails an element of risk. Some degree of recidivism must be accepted. Yet here the evidence was that Wright had been abundantly advised of everything except his right to counsel before he launched into his detailed confession. There was nothing "coerced" about it. In the case of the obsessed Neely, the fact of the paralyzed young architect attests the hospital's error in judgment.

But the dismissal of the murder charges against Wright, and the granting of a holiday parole to Neely, are typical manifestations of the new school of thought in criminal jurisprudence. Within the next two or three weeks, the President's Commission on Crime will release its massive report. Enough has been leaked from inside sources to support a prediction that the commission's heart will bleed with solicitude for the criminals that infest American society.

Once more we will be told (as we were told in the recent report of a separate commission on crime in the District of Columbia) that punishment is not the answer. The answer, it will be said, lies in better housing, better jobs, better education, greater rehabilitation and strict observance of all the new constitutional rights.

As the D.C. commission's staff said of recidivists, "backsliding need not be taken as evidence of failure."

The New Yorkers one talks with are developing a slow burn against the coddling of criminals and lunatics. Their feeling, one surmises, is shared widely across the nation. It is a feeling the Supreme Court of the United States cannot wisely ignore. In the fruits of Miranda lie the seeds of a terrible loss of confidence in our courts. As surely as the high court sows this wind, a whirlwind will be reaped.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 13, 1967]

SEVERE BLOWS TO LAW ENFORCEMENT

(By David Lawrence)

Although President Johnson sent to Congress a lengthy message last week proposing the expenditure of federal funds to deal with crime prevention and law enforcement in states and cities, no attention was given by the President to the harmful effects of court decisions which provide criminals with technicalities enabling them to go free.

The District of Columbia, for example—which is under direct supervision of the federal government—has today perhaps the worst crime record in the country. This has developed since the famous "Mallory" decision was rendered in 1957 by the Supreme Court of the United States, and after subsequent rulings.

Rep. John L. McMillan, Democrat of South Carolina, chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, replied recently to a letter from Washington bankers, written to the President and other government officials, complaining about the crime problem. He says:

"Beginning in 1958, the trends in crime in the District of Columbia reversed. From that date to the present, the volume of crime has increased nearly 300 percent, a far greater increase than in any other comparable city in the nation."

McMillan refers to cases in which persons convicted in lower courts have been released, and adds that "the criminal mind is alert to court decisions which provide a means of escape from conviction."

He declares also that members of the House District Committee spent "thousands of hours" during the last six years in hearings, studies and conferences to draft effective legislation against crime in the District. The measure, known as the omnibus crime bill, passed the House by a two-to-one majority in three successive congresses. Last year the bill reached the point of conference between the House and Senate for the first time, and was passed by both houses in the closing days of the session, only to be vetoed by President Johnson after Congress had adjourned. Thus no opportunity was afforded to override the veto or revise the legislation.

McMillan says that while improvement in the police system and the provision of extra funds for law enforcement are decidely helpful, all this will be of little avail unless the courts are cooperative in battling crime. He continues:

"Nationwide, it appears that we may have been concentrating on the wrong answers to crime for many years. Forty years ago, we had more poverty, more slums, poorer schools, lower educational achievement, but a crime rate which was significantly lower than today.

"In the meantime, we have tried to reduce crime through expenditures for education, housing programs and slum clearance, counselors and psychiatrists for our juveniles, indeterminate sentences, probation, parole, and rehabilitation for criminals, only to find a rapid acceleration in the crime rate.

"A recent national study indicated that 85 percent of those persons apprehended for crimes were repeat offenders."

Unfavorable sociological conditions alone are not to blame for the situation here, as McMillan points out that the operating expenses per pupil in schools in the District of Columbia are probably the highest of any comparable city. Welfare and public health expenditures have been doubled within recent years, while large sums have been spent for slum clearance and public housing. McMillan mentions also that this city has one of the lowest unemployment rates of any city in the nation and that the per capita income levels are high. He adds:

"Despite these facts, the crime rate has increased almost 300 percent in 10 years, about double the national average rate, and crime clearance here has dropped from 57 percent to 25 percent. During the same time the District of Columbia prison population at Lorton has dropped from approximately 2,200 to about 1,100. Such results are not primarily because of any basic defect in organization, inefficiency, or inadequacy of facilities of the Metropolitan Police Department."

For some undisclosed reason, the administration has ignored the severe blows to law enforcement that have come from the Supreme Court in recent years.

[From the Evening Star, Feb. 7, 1967]

THE "PLAGUE" OF CRIME

Lawlessness, President Johnson has told Congress, is "like a plague" in this country. No one can accuse him of exaggeration.

The recommendations which he put before the legislators are generally consistent with proposals which he previously made. And, in the main, they will be helpful, even essential, in any successful effort to combat the spread of crime.

Basically, his message was a call for millions of dollars to bolster law enforcement at the local level—to provide better salaries, better training, better equipment and the like. He also urged several innovations at the federal level which should be of substantial assistance. Finally, the President put appropriate stress on the need to alleviate conditions in the slums and elsewhere which nurture the roots of crime. In two respects, however, one affirmative and one negative, the message was a disappointment.

Mr. Johnson again called for legislation within "the full reach of the constitutional powers of the federal government" to outlaw wiretapping, public and private, wherever and whenever it occurs, as well as "all willful invasions" of privacy by electronic devices such as radio transmitters and concealed microphones. The only exception would be in matters of national security.

The President made this affirmative recommendation after receiving the report of his National Crime Commission, a report which will be made public later this month. It has been indicated, however, that a majority of the crime commission did not share the President's view, and that the report itself will spell out the majority belief that court-supervised eavesdropping by the police is essential to combat organized crime.

This, we believe, is the right view. And we hope that Congress, when and if it acts on this subject, will authorize the use of wiretaps and electronic devices in major cases by law-enforcement agencies, subject to strict supervision, and that all other taps and "bugs" will be outlawed and that any illegal use made subject to severe penalties.

On the negative side, Mr. Johnson had not a word to say about legislation to ease the heavy burden which court decisions have laid on law-enforcement officials. Some correction of this sort is also essential, however, if the "plague" of crime is to be abated, and we hope that Congress will follow Senator McClellan's lead and adopt remedial legislation in spite of the President's silence on the point.

President Johnson concluded his message by saying: "Thus, it is the citizen who will be determining whether the streets will be safe to walk, whether homes will be secure, whether property rights will be respected, whether integrity and honest dealing will govern relationships between men."

No one doubts that the role of the citizen in any war on crime will be important. But the citizen, not to mention the police, will need more effective tools than the President seems willing to give him.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 21, 1967]

CONFESSED KILLER OF SIX IS SET FREE

NEW YORK, February 20.—A murder indictment was dismissed today because the confessed killer—charged with six murders—was not briefed on his rights before he confessed.

The indictment against Jose Suarez, 23, was dismissed "reluctantly" by Brooklyn Supreme Court Justice Michael Kern, who added: "It makes one's blood run cold and it makes any human being's stomach turn to let a thing like this out on the street."

Suarez was accused of fatally stabbing his common-law wife, Maria Torres, 24, and five children ranging from 11 months to 6 years in age. Suarez was said to be the father of three of the children.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ALARMING TREND TOWARD POLICE-STATE TACTICS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I think there is cause to be deeply disturbed by a number of developments recently which seem to indicate an alarming trend in this country toward the use of police-state tactics.

I refer to the following developments:

First. The lavish subsidization of the National Student Association and other private domestic organizations by the Central Intelligence Agency.

Second. The widespread use of wiretapping and eavesdropping by Government agencies.

Third. The subsidization of supposedly legitimate books by the U.S. Information Agency, primarily for propaganda purposes.

Fourth. The use of private detective agencies by large corporations such as General Motors to harass a private citizen such as Ralph Nader.

Fifth. The widespread practice of industrial spying to discover competitors' corporate secrets.

Sixth. The use of a private detective agency by the State of Florida, allegedly to conduct a widespread investigation into crime and corruption.

All of these developments have provoked considerable publicity, and most of them have been criticized in one way or another. When we view all of these developments and others like them as a developing trend or pattern in our society, I think we have reason to be gravely concerned as to whether the United States of America, perhaps unwillingly and unwittingly, is veering away from its traditional role as a free society and drifting toward a passive acceptance of the repulsive practices of a police state.

All of these disturbing developments have certain things in common.

In the first place, all have been carried out under a cloak of secrecy. That alone raises grave questions of public policy. Although there might be a few selected instances where secrecy can be justified by Government agencies or by giant corporations dealing with public questions, as a general rule secrecy is inevitably contrary to the public interest and a step toward corruption and tyranny.

Even more important than their common cloak of secrecy, all of these six activities have involved an element of dishonesty.

When our world-famed intelligence service took over the largest student organization in America, it was not merely an act of secrecy. It was an act of out and out dishonesty. Time after time our Government has denied Communist charges that American students abroad were being used as spies. Now it appears possible or even probable that these statements issued by our Government by students themselves and even their parents were lies. Note that the CIA urged the NSA to deny it was subsidized—in other words, to state that Ramparts magazine, rather than the NSA or the CIA, was lying about this secret arrangement. This was a clearly dishonest arrangement.

When Federal agencies tap telephones and bug hotel rooms, they are not merely acting in secret—they are acting dishonestly. For the law, Government regulations, and the comments of high Government officials have all reassured us that these things were not being done. These assurances, it now appears, were lies.

The subsidizing of books by the U.S. Government is more than an act of secrecy. It is an act of dishonesty, for anyone buying such a book without knowing that it is paid, Government propaganda, is being cruelly deceived.

In the Ralph Nader case, neither General Motors nor the private detective which it hired, Vincent Gillen, seemed to understand that one of the most loathsome aspects of this case was its dishonesty—not just its secrecy.

Detective Gillen lied repeatedly in conducting his investigation; he lied about his name, he lied about his purpose, and he lied about his sponsors. Gillen now tells us that General Motors also lied in saying that the purpose was to find out if Nader was behind lawsuits involving Corvair automobiles. Documentary evidence plus Gillen's own testimony now indicate that dishonesty prevailed throughout this sordid case.

Now the same secret, reprehensible tactics are being employed on a grand scale in the State of Florida. The newly elected Governor has engaged a close personal friend, George R. Wackenhut, and directed him to unleash his detective agency throughout Florida in search of "corrupt officials."

The Wackenhut Corp. has 5,000 employees in 28 offices stretching from Puerto Rico to Hawaii, with subsidiaries in several Latin American countries. Mr. Wackenhut, himself, is deeply involved in politics, both national and at the State level. His firm reportedly does $23 million a year in business. In 1955 he was cited for contempt of court in Dade County circuit court and fined $100 for intimidating a witness. In this case, Wackenhut reportedly lied in telling the witness that Wackenhut had secretly recorded a conversation with the witness through use of a concealed dictaphone. Wackenhut's board of directors include members of the John Birch Society and a number of persons active in national political organizations.

According to the Washington Post, Wackenhut's firm is paid $3 million a year by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Now this gigantic organization, with its tentacles involved in politics and other affairs over much of the globe, has gone to work for a high public official. Presumably it will have access to all manner of official documents, police files, FBI files and other material generally available only to responsible public officials.

I have said that all of these deplorable developments have in common the elements of secrecy and dishonesty. Yet they have in common something even worse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the worst thing about all of these practices is that the main victims are our own citizens and in many cases these victims are citizens completely innocent of any wrongdoing. Furthermore, these innocent American citizens in many cases will find themselves completely unable to make a satisfactory defense against these secret, police-state tactics.

That is what makes these practices so un-American, and that is why they should not be tolerated by the American people.

I think that American citizens generally are shocked by such tactics, but let me address myself for a moment to those who may not be so shocked.

After all, the Central Intelligence Agency is designed to protect us against communism and, since we all know Communists use ruthless tactics, why cannot we use similar tactics to defend ourselves? Government agencies which tap telephones and bug bedrooms are really fighting crime so what is wrong with that? Books subsidized by the U.S. Information Agency can be a powerful antidote to Communist propaganda, so why cannot we tell our story in the same way the Communists tell theirs? Ralph Nader spent a lot of time getting the goods on General Motors, so why cannot General Motors hire detectives to get the goods on Ralph Nader? The Governor of Florida cannot eliminate crime with the limited police and special investigators available to him. So what is wrong with hiring a good, free enterprise corporation to help accomplish a job that needs doing?

In my opinion, these are questions which clearly answer themselves. But for the benefit of those who, I am sure, raise them in all sincerity let me cite some of the answers.

The most important answer which applies to all of these practices is this:

"We cannot conquer communism or crime by adopting Communist or criminal tactics."

Also, it must be remembered, in every one of these cases, as I have said, the probable victims are not Communists and criminals, but innocent citizens. The whole purpose of the U.S. Constitution and its world-famed Bill of Rights is to protect innocent citizens from arbitrary tactics by the agencies of government. If a citizen does commit a crime, specific constitutional procedures are spelled out under which the charges must be documented and filed against him and he must have an opportunity to confront his witnesses and defend himself in a court of law. The Constitution specifically forbids that any citizen be deprived of his constitutional rights without due process of law.

Wiretaps and microphones hidden behind family portraits or in a martini olive are not a part of what the Constitution means when it talks of "due process of law." In fact, these are tactics which are used to get around due process.

Since the Constitution says you cannot make a man testify against himself, government and private detective agencies try to secretly record his conversations with his wife, his children, his neighbors, and his business associates to get information which they can use against him and which they cannot obtain in a constitutional manner.

Wiretaps and bugs have not yet been invented which will record only the conversations of the guilty. They record far more conversations of the innocent.

Yet even the most innocent conversation, placed in the hands of government agencies or private detectives, can be used to destroy the reputation and the economic standing of almost any citizen in this Nation.

When the Central Intelligence Agency moved in on the National Student Association with its bulging suitcase filled with taxpayers' dollars, it was not damaging international communism—it was damaging an important American institution—a free association of college students. Without the knowledge of most of the students themselves, the CIA transformed this free student association into a Government-operated spy nest and destroyed the value of almost everything these idealistic students strove to accomplish over a 15-year period.

The only basis for holding our young people up as examples to the world is the fact that they are free. They are not the paid stooges of the Government as many Communist students are. By infiltrating the National Student Association with CIA agents and taxpayers' dollars, we have undermined the most important thing that our students stood for. The next time our students cite their all-important American freedom, they will receive smirks from the other side of the aisle.

You cannot adequately judge the evil of any of these practices I have cited if you think of how they affect only Communists and criminals. One must consider first of all how they affect innocent American citizens, how they tarnish the American ideal, how they corrode the free society of our ancestors so valiantly fought to create.

Secret slush funds such as the CIA used, wiretapping devices such as Government agencies use, secretly subsidized American books and cloak-and-dagger private detective agencies are not subject to the checks and balances so cherished by free American citizens.

If you should be one of those who think it all right for the CIA to finance the NSA, then what conceivable check would you provide on such activity? Would you allow an individual agent to pass out $400,000 a year to such an association in any way he saw fit? Could he bestow such funds on his friends within the organization? Could he use them conceivably for immoral purposes? Since we did not know that this was being done in the first place, how would we know that the amount of money poured into this sordid scheme was a wise investment? In other words, what kind of budget review could a free society carry out on this secret operation? We have already read how CIA money was used to finance a ludicrous book-selling operation run by a group of high living, naive young businessmen.

Police officers are subjected to strict rules and regulations. Many of them serve heroically for a lifetime at low pay, even in the face of great danger. They live in a goldfish bowl because society holds them to high standards of conduct. What standards do we apply to private detectives and secret agents who are now padding about the country, financed by taxpayers' dollars, subjected to none of the rules and regulations applied to policemen, with virtually no budget review as to how they spend the taxpayers' money, free to operate in almost any way it suits their purpose and the purposes of their farflung clients?

I think it is worthwhile considering for a moment what happened in Germany.

After World War I, Germany was a defeated nation suffering from severe economic problems and political disunity which bordered on anarchy. The problems of the nation were so great and the morale of its people was so low that they put themselves into the hands of a dictator who promised to correct the greatest problems. By crusading against what he described as corrupt and sinister minority forces—primarily communism and members of the Jewish faith—he managed to unite much of the nation. By constructing a mighty war machine he managed to put the German factory and workers back to work again. So the great concerns of the German public appeared to have been met. Yet he did this at a terrible cost. He instituted police-state terrorism. He abolished the constitutional guarantees such as we have in our Constitution and Bill of Rights. He developed propaganda into an art form. In his case too, the intelligence service, the wiretapping, the propaganda publications and the cloak and dagger investigations were aimed at Communists and criminals—at least as he defined them.

The United States of 1967 is by no means the Germany of 1933; I do not mean to exaggerate. But if the people of America tolerate the intrusions of the CIA into free domestic institutions such as the National Student Association, if they tolerate indiscriminate wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping by Government agencies, if they allow their taxes to be spent to corrupt authors and subsidize what appear to be legitimate books, if they allow private detectives to silence those who would criticize our society, we will have gone a long way toward embracing the police-state psychology which gripped Germany following World War I and sowed the seeds of disaster.

It is not enough to say that "it could not happen here." These recent developments have shown that it can—without our knowing it. It may be that the last several Presidents and a few selected congressional leaders were aware that the National Student Association was a front for our international, secret intelligence operation. But most Congressmen and Senators were unaware of it; certainly the press was not aware of it nor was the public and, therefore, this secret intelligence service was in a position where it could have done grave harm to American democracy without our even knowing it.

It may be that the last few Presidents and a few key Government officials are aware that Federal agencies are tapping telephones, bugging offices and homes, but Secretary of the Treasury Dillon assured Senator LONG of Missouri on July 13, 1965, that wiretapping was absolutely banned by the Internal Revenue Service. To his embarrassment, the Secretary's own counsel informed him that the IRS was tapping public telephones in the IRS building in Washington. It was revealed later that the Internal Revenue Service and the Treasury Department had been conducting a course for agents in the art of electronic snooping.

The president of General Motors has assured us that he did not know that his firm had hired Vincent Gillen to probe into every aspect of the personal life of Ralph Nader in an obvious attempt to silence him. I am sure we will soon hear of something done by the Wackenhut Corp. of which the Governor of Florida was blissfully unaware.

What this shows is that democratic institutions cannot control police-state tactics once they are set in motion. If secret agents are given millions of dollars to dispense in secret, if investigators are allowed to break into homes and install eavesdropping devices, then the people given these special, secret powers become a kind of new government all their own. That is why the secret police in Germany and Russia become so powerful, once they were allowed to do things which were outside the law and forbidden to other agencies. Once they acquired these powers and gathered their secret information, they became a law unto themselves.

Once we embark upon the use of police-state tactics, even if we piously protest that we are using these tactics only on Communists and criminals, we take a long step away from democratic self-government.

I think the time has come to call a halt. I think that the President of the United States, the Congress, the Federal agencies, State and local government and large corporations which carry heavy public responsibility should all pledge themselves to abstain from such practices in the future.

I do think the Congress should inquire into this whole sordid business and find out just how widespread and just how vicious it has become. I think that kind of cartharsis would be helpful. But I am primarily concerned about the future. Even if we cannot purge ourselves of all that has happened before, we should make a clear, firm promise that these things will not be done again. If government and the public does not insist upon such a promise, I fear for the future of democracy in these United States.

Wiretapping by Government should certainly be limited to cases involving national security.

All private bugging should be outlawed with stiff penalties.

The CIA's jurisdiction and method of supervision should be overhauled.

The employees of the CIA are certainly dedicated American citizens. The organization has a critical intelligence gathering function. The national security must be protected by the effective performance of that function. However, recent events would seem to clearly indicate that the limits of its role must be more clearly delineated and its activities more carefully supervised.

Wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping should be used only in the interest of national security. This should apply to subversion and organized crime, under court authorization with annual review by Congress.

THE GOVERNMENT'S POLICY IN VIETNAM—MEMORIAL

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I present a memorial signed by 259 students, teachers, and friends of the Daniel Webster High School, Tulsa, Okla., protesting against the policy of our Government in Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that the memorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Honorable RICHARD RUSSELL:

We, the undersigned students, teachers and friends of Daniel Webster High School, Tulsa, Oklahoma, do protest the policy of our government on the following counts:

1. The way in which our government agrees to a truce policy in which all interested parties do not have to abide by the rules. In the latest truce the Viet Cong were agreeable to the terms, but the North Viet forces were not.

2. We protest our involvement in future truce agreements unless a sincere desire for peace is evidenced on both sides.

3. We protest any stopping in the bombing of vital targets and would actually like to see more important targets hit.

4. Since the truce of January 1966, and the latest so-called truce were both used by the enemy to build up supplies and manpower, we would like to see a halt to these "farce" truces which only end in more Americans getting killed to get the job done.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST NATIONAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, today, February 23, 1967, marks the 50th anniversary of the signing of the first National Vocational Education Act by President Woodrow Wilson. Since 1917, public vocational education has been a cooperative effort between the Federal Government and the States, the Federal Government providing much of the financing and the States operating and controlling their own programs.

Today, only 10 percent of our work force is employed in occupations that require a baccalaureate or higher degree; another 7 percent are employed in jobs that require no formal education, the so-called unskilled occupations; and the remaining 83 percent are employed in jobs that require some type of vocational or technical education. These jobs range in skill level from simple to highly skilled and technical, many requiring 1 or 2 years of post-high-school occupational education.

As parents, we oftentimes equate success with a college degree, and for this reason we are not always objective in judging our children's abilities or their occupational outlook. We cannot deny, however, that the industrial and military supremacy that our Nation enjoys today is due to the high productivity of each member of our work force. In order to maintain this supremacy, we must realistically appraise our need for more and better trained workers in the years ahead. Mechanization, automation, and data processing have completely revolutionized the needs of the labor market, so much so, in fact, that almost every new job today requires not only more vocational education but also more highly specialized vocational education than ever before.

It is obvious, therefore, that we must provide some type of vocational or technical education for the majority of our students—that 83 percent—before they enter the labor force. In contrast to this large segment of our population that should be enrolled in vocational or technical education, nationwide, only 22 percent of the high school population is enrolled in vocational or technical education.

One of the newest innovations in teaching vocational education is the cooperative method in which students are enrolled in a full-time curriculum, yet split their day evenly between academic classes and part-time work in a local business establishment. More important than the wages students earn is the fact that this is a teaching-learning situation in their chosen career and is conducted under the supervision of their vocational teacher working cooperatively with the director of the local training station. This is a valuable learning activity for students and helps to prepare them for gainful employment upon completion of their formal education.

It is not easy to put a price tag on an educational program, but students enrolled in cooperative vocational programs last year in Arizona earned $1,796,956, an amount almost equal to the total Federal allotment for vocational education. Without exaggeration, the vocational-technical education program being conducted in Arizona is one of the most successful and economical nationwide, a fact largely due to the excellent leadership of Mr. J. R. Cullison, State director, and his dedicated staff.

Although one can justify the vocational programs on the basis of the occupational competency developed through these programs, I believe that some of the more enduring benefits derived from these programs are those developed through the youth organizations that are part of the regular vocational programs. Certainly, no one can deny the good citizenship and leadership training that our Future Farmers, our Future Homemakers, our DECA—distributive education—members, and more recently our VICA—vocational industrial—members gain from planning and participating in a youth organization that is meaningful and challenging to each of them because it is dedicated to promoting their occupational interest.

On the threshold of a new era in the history of vocational education, I commend, too, the work of the teachers and leaders as well as the students in vocational education and pledge my continued support to this very worthwhile segment of our educational program.

THE BOMBING OF NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, among the matters discussed by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., in his column of February 19 was one of great interest to us all—the bombing of North Vietnam.

I believe that the views of this well-respected, veteran journalist merit consideration. There is in them a logic and directness that I have found to be largely missing from the emotion-charged discussions of this issue.

Mr. Hearst observes the bombing for what it is—a military weapon. And he concludes that it must be pretty effective to cause Hanoi to demand its cessation before negotiations can begin.

If—as is popularly charged—America is deliberately raiding North Vietnamese cities, why are they still almost entirely intact?

And his main point: stopping bombing would relieve Ho Chi Minh of some of his main concern, and we are not there to help Ho Chi Minh.

I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore News American,
Feb. 19, 1967]

U.S. BOMBING HURTS HANOI

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

The resumption of American bombing of North Vietnam, and the subsequent howls of anguish it evoked, is keeping this aspect of the Vietnam war firmly in place as the most controversial issue in the news.

For this reason alone, Defense Secretary Robert McNamara—often pretty controversial himself—has done practically everyone a favor by clearing the air regarding the bombing and by placing its results in correct perspective.

In his inimitable computer-like style, the secretary pointed out that (A) the bombing is achieving most of its objectives; (B) it cannot win the war by itself—this can be done only on the ground in South Vietnam, and (C) the bombing's impact can be best judged "by the great efforts of North Vietnam to force us to stop . . ."

Playing this back through our own computer, the third point seems to emerge as the most significant of all. Hanoi simply "doth protest too much" about the bombing. Its outrage about the attacks and its insistence that they cease before any peace negotiations can begin have become its obsession, almost to the exclusion of protests about anything else.

This is the clearest possible giveaway that the bombing is hurting, and hurting bad. In turn, nothing could be a greater argument for continuation and intensification of this form of attack, all howling to the contrary.

Much of the stop-the-bombing campaign—both domestic and foreign—is based on accusations that the United States is deliberately attacking civilian areas of North Vietnamese cities.

To anyone who knows anything about air raids, this is ridiculous. For one thing, if the U.S. was indeed attacking such areas then not much of Hanoi or Haiphong would be left standing by now. The fact that these cities are almost entirely intact is proof of the almost painful precision with which the U.S. is concentrating on military targets.

Rigid conditions, in fact, place greater than normal hazards on our pilots in North Vietnam's skies. They may only fly when the weather is clear enough to minimize the possibility of mistakes in identifying targets on the ground. Many attacks, in addition, may only be made from certain directions so as to avoid flights over residential areas. Enemy gunners, equipped with sophisticated Soviet weapons, are aware of these factors and are able to add to their already formidable anti-aircraft defense.

The bombing, moreover, obviously bears no similarity whatsoever to the frankly "terror" raids of World War II. These were begun by the Germans, then repaid by the British, enraged at the wanton destruction of their cities. Even during those grim times of all-out, declared war, however, it was the United States that adhered more than anyone to the principle of "precision" bombing, in contrast to the "carpet" bombing of others. Such bombing could only be conducted in daylight, at terrible danger to men and planes, but the U.S. did it anyway.

It is obvious that the same basic principle is being followed over North Vietnam. The pilots of today's Air Force and Navy, moreover, are a far cry from the often impetuous, dashing, "flyboys" who graced our brave aerial forces of World War II. Today they are careful, meticulous professionals, dispassionately flying the most complex assemblies of gadgetry in the entire arsenal of push-button war. To characterize them as deliberate murderers of women and children is abominable.

The true assessment of their efforts, mostly conducted through anti-aircraft fire "thick enough to walk on," is reflected in Secretary McNamara's estimate that the raids have diverted some 300,000 people to the repair of railroads, bridges and supply centers. In addition, the secretary said, the troop infiltration from North Vietnam to the south appears to have "leveled off" within the past six months, while the bombing has had the additional effect of raising the morale in South Vietnam.

The lessons of the bombing are therefore clear: The North Vietnamese government is obviously deeply concerned about the bombing's effect on its war effort. So to stop or "pause" again would merely relieve old Ho of some of his main concern, and that's not what we're there for.

WHY GIVE AID AND COMFORT TO THE COMMUNISTS?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, former Representative Hamilton Fish, of New York, who served his State and district well and effectively for more than 20 years, and who headed one of the first congressional committees set up to study the tactics employed by conspiratorial communism in this country and elsewhere, has taken a sincere interest in the outcome of the proposed ratification of the Consular Convention with Russia. He offered to come to Washington at his own expense to testify against it, but the very limited time provided by the committee for opposition witnesses precluded his appearance.

Hamilton Fish has therefore sent me a copy of a resolution offered by him at a recent meeting, held in the Park Sheraton Hotel, New York City, opposing the ratification of the convention at this time. The resolution was unanimously adopted by the meeting, which a letter from Mr. Fish states was attended by more than 500 citizens of New York. He has asked me to make the resolution a part of the record of testimony concerning the treaty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the resolution submitted by former Representative Hamilton Fish.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY GIVE AID AND COMFORT TO THE COMMUNISTS?

Whereas Edgar Hoover in an address before the National Convention of the American Legion stated that "we are at war with Soviet Russia and the sooner the American people know it, the better" and as Lenin said, "promises like pie crusts, are made to be broken" and

Whereas we appeased Soviet Russia at Yalta and made half the world safe for Communism, in China we turned a friendly nation into a bitter Communist enemy, entered into 52 agreements with Soviet Russia of which 50 were violated and at the present time Soviet Russia is continuing to arm Cuba and train infiltrators and revolutionists for guerrilla warfare in Latin America, Africa and in the Near East and its main objective is to destroy Capitalism (Free Enterprise) in the United States and in all Free Nations and

Whereas Soviet Russia is sending arms and munitions to kill our soldiers in both South and North Vietnam and

Whereas Soviet Russia has sent more than 3000 anti-aircraft guns to North Vietnam with radar equipment and skilled technical crews to operate them and

Whereas Soviet officers and technicians are receiving the finest possible war training and experience, shooting down our army, marine and navy flyers like clay pigeons every day.

Therefore be it resolved by the Anti-Communist International at its meeting held at the Park Sheraton Hotel, New York City on Sunday, February 19, 1967 that we urge the Congress to recommit all proposed legislation in any way appeasing Soviet Russia such as the Consulate Treaty and Bridges for Communist Trade until the end of the war when they could be properly considered on their merits as ratification or adoption now would be an open and brazen insult and repudiation of our soldiers fighting and dying in Vietnam against our Communist enemies and be it further resolved that as long as members of our armed forces are being killed by Communist weapons from Soviet Russia favorable action on such measures by Congress would be a tragic gesture of appeasement to our enemies, cause suspicion of our motives, weaken the unity of the NATO and at the same time by ignoring and trampling on the blood of our wounded and dead heroes while war against the World Communist Conspiracy continues, would be near treason as "giving them (our enemies) aid and comfort."—Article 3 Section 3, U.S. Constitution.

This resolution introduced by Hon. Hamilton Fish was adopted unanimously by more than 500 people attending the meeting and ordered to be sent to all U.S. Senators and to the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives.

SALT LAKE TABERNACLE CENTENNIAL

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, whenever I am introduced as a man from Utah to a group of people anywhere in the United States someone in the group can hardly say "How do you do?" before he tells me:

> I listen to the Mormon Tabernacle Choir from Salt Lake City every Sunday morning on the radio—I have been listening for years.

I hear this comment everywhere. I hear it not only out across the width and breadth of our own land, but I hear it from Americans living overseas, who follow the short wave or recorded broadcasts, or who have warm memories of Mormon Tabernacle Choir recitals they have heard in the past—and who tell me how much they miss them. Utah and the Mormon Tabernacle and the glorious music which comes from its great organ and its 375-voice choir are almost synonymous.

I am sure that there is no way we would rather be identified. The choir was founded more than a century ago by Brigham Young. The tabernacle—the great domed structure which stands in the heart of Temple Square in Salt Lake City—will celebrate this 100th anniversary of the opening of its doors in October of this year. We are vastly proud of the tabernacle and the choir.

When we celebrate the centennial of the tabernacle this fall, we celebrate also the love of the Mormon people for music and the way in which it has sustained them during all the years of their history.

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, as the church is properly known, was founded in northern New York State, and to escape persecution, its members moved from there to Harmony, Pa., to Kirtland, Ohio, to Jackson County, Mo., to Nauvoo, Ill., and finally to the barren valleys of Utah, where the Mormon pioneers arrived on July 24, 1847. Between 1846 and 1851, more than 30,000 members of the church left the populated centers of Central and Eastern United States and moved west across the Missouri River into an unsettled wilderness. By ox-drawn wagon or on foot they pushed through hundreds of miles of country filled with hostile Indians and blocked by surging rivers and precipitous mountains.

They endured incredible hardship and heartbreak. Some of them perished along the way. Those who survived, constantly sought sources of inner strength to see them through the ordeal. So they gathered around their campfires each night to sing. Some of them even sang as they walked through the dusty sagebrush. I know that many Senators have heard one of their hymns which was written by William Clayton in 1846 as the pioneer wagons creaked across the prairies:

Come, come ye Saints, no toil nor labor fear.
  But with joy wend your way;
Though hard to you this journey may appear,
  Grace shall be as your day.

When the pioneers finally arrived in Great Salt Lake Valley, they rejoiced in song, and one of their first acts was to build a simple bowery where they could meet and worship and sing together. It was here that the choir had its actual beginning. In 1849, John Parry, an Englishman, came to Utah and became the choir's first regular director.

Ten years later, in 1857, an adobe tabernacle was constructed, and a pipe organ built by a Mormon convert in Australia was brought to Utah and housed in it. The choir and a pipe organ were joined, and the choir has sung to the accompaniment of pipe organ music ever since.

It was not until 1863, some 16 years after the first of the Saints arrived in the valley, that they had built enough homes, and stored food from a sufficient number of good growing seasons, to concentrate on the building of a permanent meeting place, and the great Salt Lake Tabernacle was planned and started.

This remarkable building is still one of the finest auditoriums in the world.

It seats 8,000 people, is 250 feet long, 150 feet wide, and 80 feet high. The ceiling, a 10-foot-thick shell, is a lattice work between ceiling and roof of heavy timbers held together chiefly by wooden dowels and rawhide thongs.

As anyone knows who has ever visited it, the accoustics are so sensitive and perfect that if you stand at one end, you can hear a pin dropped 250 feet away. The Utah Symphony Orchestra offers its concerts in this remarkable structure.

The domed roof of the tabernacle resembles an umbrella. The design is said to have originated in the fertile mind of Brigham Young. When discussions were underway as to how to build a structure which could house the growing number of church members at the church's semiannual conferences, President Young is said to have pushed open his umbrella and inquired of church architect William Harrison Folsom:

> Would a roof of this design work?

The church architect thought it would. A pioneer Utah builder, Henry Grow, suggested that the roof could be latticed, and made to hold up that way. And so the work was undertaken.

Huge timber slabs, 3 inches thick, a foot wide and 12 feet long, were made pliable through steaming and then bent to shape. Once the proper curve was formed, they were set in cold water. The beams were then arched into place, six at a time, and holes were bored through which pegs or dowels were inserted. The dowels were smeared with glue made from the hooves of cows.

Some of the dowels were oversized and had a tendency to split the beam. When this happened, the splitting timbers were bound in rawhide which had been soaked in water. As the rawhide dried, it shrank, and the dowels were sealed in the beams. They have lasted to this day—a hundred years later.

It took 3 years and 3 months of hard, dedicated work to complete the tabernacle. Its completion in this short time was an amazing feat. The work was chiefly volunteer. The materials all came from surrounding forests and land, and had to be prepared from scratch. Many of the tools were handmade. The pioneers used what was at hand. The nearest railroad was still many miles away—the golden spike, which linked the bands of steel from coast to coast at Promontory, Utah, and inaugurated transcontinental railroad passenger and freight service, was not driven until 1869, 2 years after the tabernacle was completed. We often say in Utah that the tabernacle was built without nails, and this is almost true.

The tabernacle opened its doors for the first time on October 5, 1867, and the Saints gathered for the first time in the edifice for a general conference on the following day. The building has been the setting for the semiannual conferences of the church ever since.

A new organ was established in the tabernacle when it was opened, and it was further expanded until by 1874 most of the pipes a person sees today had been put in place. When one of the million tourists who visit Temple Square each year goes in the tabernacle to participate in the famous pin-dropping ritual, and to hear a noon recital of the 1,000-pipe organ, parts of the original organ are used.

At the time the new tabernacle was opened in 1867, some 20 years after the first pioneers arrived in the valley, the Utah community was the center of an inland empire that covered 350,000 square miles, 186 permanent settlements, and scores of chapels and schools and thousands of permanent homes.

Today, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has expanded far beyond its inland base of a hundred years ago. Church membership exceeds 2 million, and there are over 4,000 congregations scattered throughout the world. From a one-stody adobe church office building, its administrative quarters have expanded into a handsome granite building of Ionic Greek design. Its president, David O. McKay, is widely known, as are his four counsellors in the first presidency, Hugh B. Brown, Nathan Eldon Tanner, Joseph Fielding Smith, and Thorpe B. Isaacson.

As the church has grown, so has the reputation of its famous choir. By 1893, the fame of this spectacular singing organization had so spread that the choir was invited to sing at the Columbian Exposition in Chicago. A California tour followed, and then appearances in Madison Square Garden in New York City in 1911, and an invitation from President and Mrs. William Howard Taft to sing at the White House. In 1934, the choir sang at the Century of Progress Exposition in Chicago, and the following year at the California Pacific International Exposition in San Diego.

In more recent years the Mormon Tabernacle Choir has performed in Great Britain, Holland, Germany, France, in numerous tours of cities throughout the United States, and was invited to sing for the inauguration of President Lyndon B. Johnson in 1964. The choir won the "Grammy" award in 1959 for the best choral recording of the year, "The Battle Hymn of the Republic." President Eisenhower congratulated the choir on its 25th anniversary of weekly CBS radio network programs. It has been featured in two Cinerama productions as well as several major films, has been heard many times on TV, has made many recordings of the disk type and was featured from Mount Rushmore National Memorial on the first intercontinental telecast via "Telstar" satellite. Its Sunday morning broadcast is the oldest continuous coast-to-coast broadcast on American radio.

Present tabernacle choir director is Richard P. Condie, and Alexander Schriener is the chief tabernacle organist. The choir president is Isaac M. Stewart, and the narrator for its Sunday radio programs is Richard L. Evans.

In August of last year, I joined with the other members of the Utah congressional delegation, Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, Representative DAVID S. KING, and Representative LAURENCE J. BURTON to ask Postmaster General Laurence F. O'Brien to issue a stamp to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the completion of the Mormon Tabernacle on Temple Square in Salt Lake City.

Every President since Theodore Roosevelt, with the exception of Calvin Coolidge, has appeared in the Salt Lake Tabernacle. Presidents Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, Wilson, Harding, Hoover, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Truman, Kennedy, and Johnson have all appeared in the tabernacle during their term in the White House. President Eisenhower appeared as a candidate in 1952. President Grant was actually the first President to visit this historic structure.

We have sent the Postmaster General all the necessary historical material to submit to the Citizens Stamp Advisory Committee. The Utah delegation, and the million citizens of the State of Utah, most sincerely hope that our request will receive favorable action. It is appropriate that one of the most prominently known cultural and religious centers in the United States be recognized by the issuance of a commemorative stamp on the occasion of its 100th anniversary.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS ACTS TO RESTRICT BROADCASTING OF MATERIAL ON LSD

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the National Association of Broadcasters has taken what I consider to be a commendable and courageous first step toward keeping off the public airwaves presentations which would suggest that the use of LSD and other hallucination-producing drugs might be proper or desirable. The TV Code Board of the NAB, meeting in Scottsdale, Ariz., has expanded its guidelines on the television presentations of narcotic addiction and drunkenness to include the proviso that "the use of hallucinogenic drugs shall not be shown or encouraged as desirable or socially acceptable."

This addition to the board's code has been approved and is subject to ratification by the association's board of directors expected to meet in June. I would hope that the language could be made a part of the radio code, as well.

This is, on its face, very simple and unbinding language; however, that broad section of the television industry which has subscribed to the NAB's code of conduct is obligated to abide by the features of the code. The action taken in Scottsdale marks what is, to my knowledge, the first formal notice taken by the television industry of the danger of LSD and other hallucenogenics.

I was informed of the code board's action this morning when I was phoned by NAB's vice president for government affairs, Paul B. Comstock. I had wired the board meeting last Tuesday urging that action be taken "to establish prohibitions on TV presentations suggesting the desirability of LSD and other hallucination-producing drugs."

As I pointed out in my telegram to NAB President Vincent Wasilewski:

> I know of only one instance in which a television program with a sizeable national audience has presented the use of LSD as an enjoyable or proper experience . . . however, the opportunity presented by your board meeting to face the LSD problem head-on should not, I feel, be lost.

I ask unanimous consent that the text

of my telegram to Mr. Wasilewski and a New York Times article to which I shall allude be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the New York Times this morning presented a graphic text and photo account of the increase in LSD addiction and the terrifying experiences which accompany misuse of the drug.

A few quotes from the text of the story by Gladwyn Hill should serve to point out that far from being a simple conscious-expanding drug, LSD is a brain bomb which can induce insanity, irrationality, and sometimes death.

> Four teenagers were arrested in Hermosa Beach near Los Angeles . . . The police chief said the driver seemed to be in a trance and kept trying to climb the jail cell wall, yelling, "I'm a graham cracker. Oops, my arm crumbled off . . ."
>
> The chief hope for combating the spreading use of LSD seems to be, as Mr. Hill points out, "education—simply spreading the word about how tricky and dangerous the seemingly innocuous white powder can be."

In the Times story, a young woman is pictured screaming on the floor. The caption says:

> It was terrifying to me . . . I got scared . . . I was just afraid to be left alone . . . I experienced the desire to die . . . to rip my skin off and pull my hair and face off.

And such is the "expanded consciousness" produced by a psychedelic "trip."

For readers of the RECORD who might wish a balanced presentation on the effects of LSD—a presentation which includes statements supporting its use as well as those explaining its dangers—I suggest the record of hearing before a Judiciary Subcommittee of which the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is chairman. The hearings were held in January, May, June, and July of last year during the consideration of the Narcotic Rehabilitation Act of 1966.

To the National Association of Broadcasters, which has taken official cognizance of the growing problem of LSD, I extend felicitations and a sincere expression of gratitude. As the preamble to the NAB's TV code asserts:

> Television and all who participate in it are jointly accountable to the American public for respect, for the special needs of children, for community responsibility, for the advancement of education, and culture, for the acceptability of the program materials chosen, for decency and decorum in production, and for propriety in advertising.

In moving to restrict the broadcasting of LSD material, the National Association of Broadcasters is in harmony with these splendid principles.

EXHIBIT 1

TEXT OF SENATOR HANSEN'S TELEGRAM TO MR. WASILEWSKI

I respectfully urge that in your ongoing TV Code Board Meeting you give serious consideration to the inclusion of prohibitions on the broadcasting of material suggesting desirability of possession, use and distribution of LSD and other hallucinogenic drugs. I know of only one instance when television program with sizeable national audience presented the use of LSD as an enjoyable or proper experience. I feel, however, that abundant evidence exists proving use of LSD is on the increase to warrant attention to the drug in the code of ethics of what is today one of the most potent instruments for the molding of public opinion.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare points out that incidences of the use of LSD are on a rapid upswing. Dr. James L. Goddard, Commissioner of Food and Drugs, HEW, testified May 23 before a Judiciary Subcommittee: "During the past year there has been a marked increase in the illegal use of hallucinogenic drugs throughout the nation. Some of our investigations have confirmed the tragic results of LSD use by juveniles and young adults."

Abundant evidence exists as to the dangers of the unsupervised use of hallucination producing drugs. Again quoting Dr. Goddard, ". . . the ingestion of minute quantities of LSD has profound effects on the mental processes. The oral ingestion of as little as 100 to 150 micrograms of the drug results in illusions, hallucinations, and delusions. These are associated with significant alteration of orientation, of consciousness, of sensory perception, of motor coordination, of mood affectivity, and alteration of personality, including impairment of consciousness . . .

"Effects from the drug may include hallucinations, serious mental changes, psychotic manifestations, nervous breakdowns, and suicidal tendencies.

"Despite 20 years of clinical investigation of LSD-25, and about 2,000 published papers in the scientific literature, this drug still has not attained a place in medical practice and is suitable only for clinical investigation under carefully controlled conditions. We have not approved the drug for commercial marketing, and indeed the evidence may never justify such approval."

The broadcasting industry is to be commended for the self-discipline exhibited to date; however, the opportunity presented by your code meeting to face the LSD problem head-on should not, I feel, be lost.

I respectfully urge that you broaden your code provisions with respect to narcotic addiction and illegal drugs to place LSD and hallucinogenics in analagous categories, particularly in programs aimed at teen and young adult audiences.

CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
U.S. Senator.

[From the New York Times. Feb. 23, 1967]

LSD SPREAD IN UNITED STATES ALARMS DOCTORS AND POLICE—AUTHORITIES SEE EDUCATION AS KEY HOPE IN CURBING PERIL OF THE HALLUCINATORY DRUG

(By Gladwin Hill)

LOS ANGELES, Feb. 22.—"We just don't know how to cope with it . . ."

The speaker was one of the leading psychiatrists who has been battling with the nation's newest scourge: the hallucinatory drug LSD.

His admission of helplessness is seconded by an array of other medical men and law enforcement officers who have watched aghast as the use and depredations of the drug have spread during the last year.

The chief hope they have at this point is in "education"—simply spreading the word about how tricky and dangerous the seemingly innocuous white powder can be.

A few months back an LSD victim in Los Angeles, gripped by the horrible psychoses the drug may induce, knew he could stagger to the Neuropsychiatric Institute at the University of California here, where there is 24-hour emergency service for the mentally disturbed.

"But we had to shut the door on him," said Dr. J. Thomas Ungerleider, one of the nation's foremost LSD researchers. "It just became too much. We're basically a teaching institution, and we didn't have enough beds for all these people. Now we must tell them to go to the County Hospital."

"Heaven knows we've got enough cases to study," the white-jacket psychiatrist said grimly. "We've got an out-patient, huddled in his room near here, who thinks he's an orange, and that if anybody touches him he'll squirt juice."

He continued: "We've got a mother of 23 and her baby. She was giving the baby LSD as a tranquilizer. The baby seems all right, but the mother is all confused.

"We had a girl flown in from Kings County Hospital, New York, the other day for treatment by a doctor who had handled her before. She was a straitjacket case."

EXTENSIVE USE

No one has any firm data on the extent of LSD use on the West Coast or elsewhere in the country—except that it is deplorably extensive. Legal bans on LSD went into effect only last year, and no crime statistics distinguishing its use from other drugs have been compiled.

One LSD expert, Dr. Donald Louria of New York's Bellevue Hospital, guesses that LSD use has extended to "no more than" 1 per cent of the population. That figure would represent 200,000 persons—an alarming number, in view of what is becoming known about the drug.

A student at a small California college said this week he knew of eight LSD users in a student body of 200.

At the Los Angeles County General Hospital Dr. Walter Tietz, resident psychiatrist, said admissions of LSD victims reached a peak of about one a day last June, but since have tapered off to about two a week—"hopefully, because the word is getting around about how harmful it can be."

"I don't think it's particularly a West Coast problem," says Dr. Ungerleider. "I think it's more of a national problem—a metropolitan problem. Wherever you have a big city, where conditions are favorable for making and distributing the stuff, I think the problem is about the same."

LSD has been publicized as a compound that essentially just heightens sensory perceptions, often to the point where they are weirdly distorted. This has been depicted as having the beneficial potential of "opening up the mind," even to the extent of awakening latent talents.

Dr. Ungerleider and a number of his colleagues consider that such expectations are either still conjectural or demonstrably wrong, and are overshadowed by long-term effects, appearing with increasing frequency, which add up to chronic mental derangement.

The chronicle of weird and tragic consequences of LSD use gets longer by the week.

In Santa Cruz Feb. 1 the police picked up the 19-year-old son of a foreign Ambassador when he nearly rammed his car into a school bus. Officers quoted him as saying he had just swallowed two capsules of LSD obtained on a nearby junior college campus.

Four teen-agers were arrested in Hermosa Beach, near Los Angeles, in mid-January after their car rammed a house, killing a 3-year-old child. The police chief said the driver seemed to be in a trance and kept trying to climb the jail cell wall, yelling, "I'm a graham cracker—oops, my arm crumbled off . . ."

Dr. Ungerleider has reported in medical journals that several years' research he has conducted, in collaboration with Dr. Duke Fisher, indicates:

> It is impossible to predict such long-term aberrations, even with an individual who has taken LSD repeatedly without apparent bad effects.
>
> It is impossible by advanced psychological testing to differentiate "adverse reactors."

There is no necessary correlations between dosage and effects.

"The nominal dose is 250 micrograms—less, in pure form, than would fit on the head of a pin," he says. "But we have observed chronic effects from doses as small as 100 micrograms."

LSD—lysergic acid diethylamide—is a compound involving one of the principal ingredients of ergot, a fungus that grows on rye.

PERIL IN MANUFACTURE

It can be made by someone with just an elementary knowledge of chemistry—although some of the bad effects may be resulting from unknown extraneous substances that are introduced during the process of amateur manufacture. Pure LSD can have drastic physical effects. A massive experimental dose killed an elephant.

Last year LSD was banned by the Federal Food and Drug Administration, and in California and some other states its sale, or possession by nonprofessionals, is considered a crime.

Dr. Ungerleider described its impact as follows:

"LSD has been called a consciousness-expanding drug. In fact it is quite the reverse. It decreases one's ability to select and pay attention. Therefore it decreases conscious functions. Sensations do become intensified. Perception, however, is not enhanced, and visual and auditory acuteness are not revolutionized but rather are distorted."

Of all of LSD's effects, the worst may be none of the violent aberrations but a very subtle one: a seemingly permanent dulling of users' objective judgment and its replacement by purely subjective values. This effect has been noted by observers as widely separated professionally as psychiatrists and law-enforcement officers.

A distinctive effect of LSD is the "missionary" zeal it engenders in users to get others to join them. Some habitues will insist on giving away handfuls of impregnated sugar cubes or capsules that, at the going rate of several dollars a dose, represent considerable money.

Suppression of LSD is impeded by a number of other factors different from those applying to long-established drugs. These include:

Its relatively easy procurability.

Technical difficulties it presents to regular law-enforcement operations.

The possibility that it has constructive applications.

Its association with the reputably sponsored religio-esthetic "psychedelic" movement.

AUTHORITIES STUMPED

A survey of law-enforcement agencies in Los Angeles, the nation's second-largest metropolis, indicates that LSD use has authorities stumped.

A user cannot be readily detected. The effects can either be less obvious than, or indistinguishable from, other intoxicants such as alcohol, marijuana, barbiturates or heroin.

Since LSD was outlawed last year the Los Angeles police department and the Los Angeles County sheriff's office have referred about 100 LSD arrests to the District Attorney's office. Of these 100, prosecutions have been prepared in 27 cases, but none has gone beyond the preliminary hearing stage. There is no record of any prosecutions elsewhere in California.

Burnell Blanchard, Southern California director of the State Bureau of Narcotics Enforcement, painted this picture:

"I could tie up every agent in this office—30 of them—just on LSD. We haven't been able to aim at the situation from a user standpoint at all, and I suspect the other law-enforcement agencies haven't either.

"We've been going after sellers. And we can only give LSD a certain amount of attention. Since last June our marijuana seizures exactly doubled over the previous six months, in terms of quantity, and there was a 70 per cent increase in the number of defendants."

Drug arrests of adults have risen to nearly 25,000 a year among California's 20 million residents. About 40 per cent of the arrests are marijuana cases. About half the LSD use that has been coming to light has been coupled with marijuana.

"This LSD problem is a serious one," said Mr. Blanchard, an official of national repute who has been in drug-law enforcement for 25 years. "Our insane asylums are going to be filled if the young people continue to use it."

No specific means has yet been found for neutralizing the effects of LSD. At the U.C.L.A. clinic, the most effective medicines in severe cases of derangement have been several of the so-called "major tranquilizer" drugs. Following that, psychiatric treatment is indicated.

Even the optimum law enforcement against LSD, says California's Attorney General Thomas Lynch, is "only a partial solution to the problem." Beyond that, Mr. Lynch thinks, there is need for a great educational effort to expose hallucinogens as fraudulent escapism.

"We have in every large student community," he says, "what has been described as a 'head culture'—the drug users who reject the social consciousness of their contemporaries and seek a more passive way out of modern dilemmas."

He continued:

"They devote energy and ingenuity to taking 'trips,' which they equate with 'experience.' This is ironic, because a 'trip' is the antithesis of experience—it is a flight from reality. Our goal must be reversing the retreat from reality within the student community."

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, there are still those who believe that air pollution is a problem about which only the very largest cities in our Nation need to be concerned.

This is certainly not the case. Our growing metropolitan areas have just as much at stake in the fight against polluted air as does New York, Chicago, or Los Angeles. For, if we are able to place effective controls on the problem now, perhaps these developing cities will not be faced with air pollution in the threatening proportions that presently engulf our largest urban centers.

We need more public awareness—more public concern. It will not arise overnight. But it will be the result of continued efforts by a great number of people over a long period of time. The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] has been in the front ranks for many years leading the fight against air pollution.

I ask unanimous consent that an address by Senator NELSON to the National Conference on Air Pollution on December 13, 1966, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GAYLORD NELSON, NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON AIR POLLUTION, WASHINGTON, D.C., DECEMBER 13, 1966

As a boy growing up in a small town in northern Wisconsin, I fell in love with the out of doors—of which we seemed to have so much back in Clear Lake.

To a boy, the trees seemed wondrously tall, the hills seemed very high, the waters seemed deep and pure, and the wildlife seemed magically mysterious.

It came as a shock to learn that these wonderful features in our great out of doors were all being threatened by the very progress which we had been taught in school to anticipate with such great expectations. It seemed impossible that anything done by man could actually destroy that wide world of nature. But I have been seeing it happen every day since then.

The biggest thing of all in this world outdoors was the sky. It was the sky I always thought of when they first taught us the meaning of infinity. It was the open air we always wanted to escape into.

Who could have foreseen the day when man would be on the verge of turning the very air we breathe into poison?

But that is the problem we are here today to consider in this historic conference.

Partly because of my background the urgent need for preserving some significant part of our world of nature has preoccupied me throughout much of my service as a state legislator, as Governor, and as a United States Senator.

Through the past decade of work in this field, I have come to the conclusion that the No. 1 domestic problem facing this country is the threatened destruction of our natural resources, and the disaster which would confront mankind should such a destruction occur.

Air pollution is just one part of the massive threat which faces our resources, all across the country and all around the world.

The same powerful forces which create the crisis of air pollution are also threatening our fresh water resources, our woods, our wildlife, and the scenic beauty of the nation. These forces are the rapid increase in population, industrialization, urbanization, and scientific technology.

It is now entirely conceivable that these forces set in motion by man will prove so powerful and so irreversible as to destroy the natural environment we have known in the past, and even to threaten the future of life on this planet.

More than any other public problem with which I am familiar, the threat to our natural environment poses a challenge to our system of self-government.

There is a real question as to whether this nation, which has spent some 200 years developing an intricate system of local, state and Federal government to deal with the public's problems, will be bold, imaginative and flexible enough to meet this supreme test.

Our governmental system survived two World Wars. It appears fully equal to complete with Communism in the struggle for world leadership. But will it be adequate to cope with our own hell-bent drive to destroy our resources?

Before we talk about what government must do to control air pollution, let us just review for a moment what government has already done—or at least what it has allowed to be done—to our environment.

In northern Wisconsin, and in much of the nation, we destroyed our forests. Our own northland once had 200 billion board feet of white pine, one of the greatest concentrations of wealth anywhere in the world. We wiped it out in an eyewink of history and left behind 50 years of heartbreak and economic ruin. Forest fires raged through the slash left behind by the loggers. Crystal clear trout streams silted in. Hundreds of thousands of acres of land became tax delinquent, and local units of government faced economic chaos.

Then we destroyed our rivers. Our cities and our developing new industries converted many of them into sewers, killing their fish, ruining them as a recreational resource, threatening the health of those who use them as a water supply.

At present we are destroying our lakes.

Our small inland lakes are being ruined by overdevelopment and by septic tanks, and our mightiest bodies of water such as the Great Lakes are being slowly and steadily destroyed by municipal, industrial and shipboard wastes. Lake Erie is almost gone, the pollution of southern Lake Michigan has been branded practically irreversible.

Stripminers and bulldozers are destroying our natural landscape. Pesticides, now being used at the rate of 700 million pounds a year, are spreading all across the land and the water, poisoning the soil, killing fish and wildlife, and posing a potential threat to human health. DDT is being found in reindeer and in penguins and its concentration is soaring as it progresses up the food chain—from water, to plants, to fish, to birds and presumably to man.

And now the very air we breathe!

Our factories, our automobiles, our public incinerators and our homes are filling the air with noxious gases and dangerous particles of pollutants at a terrifying rate.

Automobiles alone are discharging enough carbon monoxide to pollute a blanket of air 400 feet thick, six miles wide, stretching from New York City to Los Angeles.

Our coal burning furnaces alone are discharging enough sulfur dioxide to pollute a similar blanket of air, 400 feet high and from coast to coast, 15 miles wide.

Thousands of deaths have officially been traced to air pollution, and many thousands more were almost certainly caused by it. Polluted air is causing or aggravating bronchitis, asthma, emphysema, and lung cancer. It is making people more susceptible to pneumonia. It is making it hard for elderly persons to breathe, and it is interfering with the delicate systems by which the human body filters out irritants and makes use of the vital ingredients in fresh air. It is making it difficult for pilots to see the ground as they fly in to our greatest cities.

Our scientists tell us that air pollution does some $10 to $12 billion damage every year. It damages farm crops as much as 100 miles from the source of the pollution. It blights pine trees, kills orchids, damages orange groves and grapevines and ruins spinach. It corrodes metals, weakens fabrics, discolors paint, etches glass, cracks rubber, and spreads its filth over everything. It turns white snow black, and it soils wash on the line before it even can be worn.

These are the things we can see with our eyes, breathe with our lungs and feel with our hands. But up there in the once blue sky, concealed behind a blanket of smog, things are happening which no average person can detect.

A Cornell University scientist, Dr. LaMont Cole, testified before our Senate Interior Committee on my bill to authorize research into ecology—the relationship of all the different elements in our environment. Dr. Cole said:

"Man is burning fossil fuel at an ever increasing rate, and it is probable that more than half of the fuel ever burned by man has been burned in this century. One result of this is to release carbon dioxide into the atmosphere more rapidly than it can be taken up by green plants or dissolved in the oceans and eventually precipitated . . . It appears probable that the carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere has increased by at least 10% since the turn of the century.

"Atmosphere carbon dioxide (Dr. Cole continued) is believed to have drastic effects on climate, and there are now diametrically opposed hypotheses as to what effect this change may have. One hypothesis predicts that world temperatures will increase and melt the icecaps from Greenland and Antarctica, thus raising sea level and drastically altering the world's coastline; for example, all of Florida would be under water. The other hypothesis contends that precipitation, including snowfall, will increase so much that glaciers will start to advance and bring on a new ice age."

The scientists also remind us that this orgy of fuel burning—which strokes the fires of American industries and powers our autos and planes—is using up oxygen at an accelerating rate. Again, Dr. Cole of Cornell University testified:

"The only reason the earth's atmosphere contains oxygen for us to breathe, and with which to burn fossil fuels, is that oxygen is constantly being given off by green plants. If we reach a point at which the rate of combustion exceeds the rate of photosynthesis, the oxygen content of the atmosphere will start to decrease. Almost a year ago I made an intense effort to estimate how near we are to the balance point which will signal the end of expansion, of our present type of industrialization, but satisfactory data of the necessary sort do not exist. I suspect that we are close to the critical point, but I shall not try to defend this opinion."

Scientist after scientist offered similar testimony at our Ecology Bill hearings. For instance, Dr. Bostwick H. Ketchum, president of the Ecological Society of America and associate director of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution testified:

"In the long run, the very survival of mankind may depend on what we do today and in the near future to use and exploit our environment."

As I have emphasized, the crisis of air pollution is seriously complicated by the fact that chemical changes occur in the atmosphere which we understand only slightly and which we have little power to control or even detect. This is true with relatively simple pollutants such as automotive exhausts. Think of the implications for air pollution in nuclear testing!

Two years after water in the western Pacific was contaminated by radioactive fallout, clams were found to contain fantastic concentrations of the radioisotope Cobalt–60. Scientists tell us that Cobalt–60 is not produced by atomic fission. It must have been produced by the action of radiation on some chemical in the water. These findings involving Pacific Ocean clams showed that dangerous new chemicals can be accumulated in the tissues of animals up to several million times the concentration in the surrounding water.

In the light of such findings, think of the implications for our environment if we were to adopt the suggestion to use nuclear explosions to dig a canal across Central America.

Let us take a brief look at what our governments are presently doing about air pollution.

Many of our cities and some counties have developed local air pollution programs. These started out as "smoke control" programs. We know now that the problem is much more complex than controlling local smoke. Relatively few states have strong anti-pollution programs.

The Federal government's role in air pollution consists of making grants to local air pollution agencies so they can operate their own programs, pretty much as they please.

The Federal Clean Air Act as amended this year makes $46 million available for the fiscal year ending next June, and $70 million for the following year. The states presently are spending slightly over $5 million for air pollution control programs, and communities are spending about $15 million.

While leaving full responsibility for air pollution control programs at the state and local level, the Clean Air Act did put the Federal government clearly in charge of reducing automobile exhaust pollution. It authorized Federal standards for systems to control auto exhausts, beginning with 1968 models.

To anyone familiar with state and local government, I think the shortcomings of our present national air pollution control program should be obvious.

Air pollution is a massive problem of the greatest urgency. It is utterly unrelated to traditional political boundaries. It can be nation-wide, even world-wide, in its effects. It taxes the technical knowledge of our leading scientists. Clearly, this is one public problem which cannot simply be left to local government to handle as it sees fit.

Many of our air pollution problems are *regional* in nature. The boundaries of regional air pollution problems are determined partly by geography, partly by the patterns of air movements, partly by the pattern of urban sprawl.

The most obvious regional air pollution problem is the New York City, New Jersey, Connecticut area. What can the suburban communities in New Jersey and Connecticut do about the mushroom-like cloud of pollution which often envelops Manhattan and all but obliterates the sun on some occasions?

What can city air pollution authorities in Chicago do about the suffocating pollution pouring out of steel mills in that giant, three-state industrial complex at the southern end of Lake Michigan?

The No. 1 reform needed in our national air pollution program is the immediate development of *regional governmental authorities* to fight air pollution on the scale that it occurs.

Our present Clean Air Act offers financial incentives to so-called regional programs. But the mere linking up of two communities, which is sufficient to qualify under the law, does not create a regional program. We need regional programs involving several cities and several states—boundary lines drawn to suit the air pollution problem which exists, not to conform to other lines of the map. These regional programs should encompass an entire geographic area which has a common air pollution problem.

If offering financial incentives does not get this job done, then the Federal government should have the authority to establish the regional units which we need, made up of representatives from existing units of government.

A regional program involving the great industrial complex of Chicago, Gary, Hammond and Whiting, Indiana, would provide an excellent model for the development of a truly coordinated and comprehensive air pollution control and waste disposal system.

In addition to regional air pollution control units, we need to take another step forward and give the Federal government authority to set *air quality standards and emission standards.*

Few communities have the facilities to develop proper standards. And private industry should not be faced with widely differing standards from city to city. This creates the old problem of competitive disadvantage and encourages some industries to threaten to move away if tough standards are set.

The rationale for Federal standards on auto exhausts is that cars move from state to state, and the problem is the same everywhere. But the smoke from a huge electric generating plant in New Jersey moves into New York just as autos do, and the problem of controlling such emissions is the same regardless of where they originate.

Next we must admit that despite the increase in our recent authorizations, our *financial support* for air pollution control is still only a fraction of what it ought to be.

If we calculate our losses to air pollution at $10 to $12 billion a year, would it not be worth some sizeable portion of that amount to conquer it?

But most important of all is our basic approach to all these threats to our environment. We must see them all as part of a common phenomenon with potentially ruinous consequences for our civilization. For 200 years we have plundered the resources of this continent, thinking that there always would be plenty more where they came from.

That is no longer true. Just as we have completely destroyed many species of wildlife, we now have it within our power to destroy our rivers, our Great Lakes, and even the air we breathe.

As Dr. Sidney Galler of the Smithsonian Institution testified before the Senate Interior Committee:

"Throughout the history of the world various nations have risen and fallen in accordance with overexploitation and deterioration of their resource bases. If we are to avoid the same pitfall, we must provide a scientific foundation for conservation, development and effective use of our resources. It is essential to our survival as a nation to take effective action on these problems."

We need a broad new program of Federally supported ecological research. With our resources gradually disappearing, with our capacity to destroy the environment growing every day, we must know the impact on our environment of every step we take from now on.

We must know in advance that wiping out forests destroys the soil, ruins lakes and streams, even affects the climate and causes some agricultural crops to die. We must know that digging a canal to the ocean can admit sea lampreys and wipe out our lake trout fishery. We must know that phosphates in detergents will fill our lakes with fast growing algae.

If we are to do these things—if we are to save the natural resources of this land to sustain ourselves and future generations—then we must begin at once to develop the governmental programs and institutions which will accomplish that life or death goal.

SENATOR BREWSTER ON THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, because of the Vietnam war, because of statements by certain officials of our Government, because of a controversy over placement of the Federal Maritime Administration, the U.S. merchant marine is receiving some long-overdue public discussion.

There are indications that at long last an administration is going to propose a maritime program. I say "an administration" for in all fairness it should be noted that Congress has been waiting for administration maritime proposals for more than 20 years.

At any rate, the need for such a program is abundantly clear. As the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] put it in a recent speech, "Our fleet is a disgrace." Because of his experience as a key member of the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Senator BREWSTER is eminently qualified to comment on the state of our merchant marine and to suggest remedies to correct this national disgrace.

Because of the national importance of upgrading our merchant marine, because of the Senator's expertise in this area, and because of the need for wide public discussion on this topic, I ask unanimous consent that Senator BREWSTER's address to the Port and Industrial Development Committee of the Baltimore Junior Association of Commerce be printed in the RECORD.

I also ask unaminous consent that an editorial from the February 17 edition of the Baltimore News-American commenting on the Senator's address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR DANIEL B. BREWSTER, DEMOCRAT, OF MARYLAND, AT THE ANNUAL WINTER LUNCHEON, PORT AND INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE, BALTIMORE JUNIOR ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE, BALTIMORE, MD., FEBRUARY 16, 1967

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure for me to appear today before this distinguished group. As I look around, I see old friends from every part of the maritime industry, and friends from other industries as well. We are all united by a common bond: a deep concern for the welfare of the port of Baltimore.

We also share a concern for the welfare of this Nation. And while the merchant marine plays a key role in the health of the economy of Baltimore, it also is vital to the best interests of the United States. We have at least two reasons, therefore, to promote a strong American merchant marine.

Given this audience, there is little need for me to go into the importance of the fleet to this port. Baltimore handled some 27 million tons of cargo last year, up 6 percent from the year before. One and a half billion dollars worth of goods came through the port. It ranks as the third largest in the country on a tonnage basis. (My own private criteria ranks it as the *best* port in the country, but that's partly prejudice!)

This port nets the city of Baltimore nearly $700 million a year in extra income. It means jobs for 30,000 Marylanders.

It's easy to see how important the merchant marine is to Baltimore. It's sometimes a little harder to see how vital it is to the country. And that's precisely the problem—there aren't enough people who appreciate the vital role of the fleet.

It's not hard at all to say that jet planes are important. They are glamorous; they have sex appeal. So we will vote billions for jet planes. And we certainly should, for they are important in the commercial and defense effort of the United States.

But, my friends, the merchant marine is just as important to the commerce and the defense of this Nation, even if it's not as glamorous. Jet planes roar off into the horizon, while *ships* get on with the hard work, delivering *98 percent* of our cargo to Vietnam. Most of the American soldiers now in Vietnam got there by ship. And there weren't any foreign flag ships waiting to take them there. They had to go in American bottoms. Thank God that we had enough ships to carry them, even if they were rustbuckets and we had just barely enough of them.

I could go on and on in this vein, but perhaps it would be more to the point to recall a little history. Take a look at each of the major wars this country has fought. What was the state of the fleet?

Because we had allowed our shipping strength to decline in Colonial days, we found ourselves with virtually no fleet at the time of the Revolutionary War. We built a fleet for that conflict, but dismantled it immediately thereafter.

The pattern continued in later wars. America would let her fleet decline; a war emergency would arise; the American fleet would be rebuilt—usually too late to help very much in the war; and then the fleet would be allowed to decline again.

This happened in the War of 1812, the Civil War, the first world war, the second world war, and then Korea.

Clearly this is the situation which confronts us today. Our fleet is a disgrace. I venture to say that there is no other single item of equipment in use in the war effort that is as old as the victory ships which are used to transport men and equipment over there.

Can you imagine the furor if we equipped our men with 1943 rifles? or 1943 planes? But we use 1943 ships for our vital logistic efforts, and not an eyebrow is raised.

I could go on and on about the need for a strong fleet and a strong shipbuilding capacity. But you ladies and gentlemen are the last ones who need to be reminded about that. Let me talk, instead, about what the government can do concretely, to help the merchant marine and the Port of Baltimore.

The first thing we can do is to spotlight the condition of the merchant marine. As I mentioned before, the maritime picture has no sex appeal. It seems dull and drab in comparison with other programs which demand the attention of the Congress.

As a result, minimal attention is being paid to the situation. To remedy this, I have introduced legislation which would give the Commerce Committee of the Senate power to authorize such funds for the merchant marine as it thinks proper.

Senator Magnuson, chairman of the Commerce Committee, and Senator Bartlett, chairman of the Merchant Marine Subcommittee, are both cosponsoring my bill. I would hope that we may get favorable action by the Senate at an early date. This is step number one to resolve the maritime crisis.

This legislation would give the committee a chance to evaluate in depth the needs of the merchant marine. If it develops that we need to construct a specified number of ships in a given year, then the money can be authorized. Operating subsidies, where appropriate, can also be voted. The critical fact is that, for almost the first time, the merchant marine would be getting the type of attention which it vitally needs.

Step number two is to map out a long range plan to build up and maintain our fleet. This Nation now has no merchant marine policy. We desperately need one.

The Merchant Marine Subcommittee will be holding hearings later this month to deal with this question. We intend to have the top administration officials who are concerned with the maritime up on Capitol Hill. Industry and union representatives will also testify. We will find out what kind of a policy they advocate, and why. And if the executive branch abdicates its responsibility in this matter, then the Congress will provide a strong maritime policy.

There are some indications that the administration is at least contemplating a forward-looking maritime policy right now. I have seen a copy of the informal position paper, currently circulating in the government, which suggests the construction of 720 to 960 ships over the next two decades.

It is hard to believe that this represents the official administration line. But it is at least encouraging that the executive branch is thinking about a substantial shipbuilding program.

I have my own suggestions as to what such a national policy ought to be. I have expressed them before, two years ago, in a letter to Alan Boyd, and I will be doing so again. As a bare minimum, three things ought to be done:

1. This country should begin right now to build 30 to 40 ships a year. They should be modern vessels, some of them bulk carriers.

2. This country should maintain its cargo preference policy, under which at least 50 percent of government cargo must be carried in American bottoms.

3. This country should have a pro-maritime policy, not an anti-maritime policy. We should not have a secretary of defense constantly sniping at the merchant marine. We should not choose the only nuclear-powered merchant ship in the United States as the place to chop $3 million off a $135 billion budget. We need a positive approach to the merchant marine.

There are other steps which the Congress can take to help the fleet and to help the port of Baltimore. We should certainly seize every opportunity to encourage foreign commerce, since 27 million tons of it move through this great port.

There are a number of foreign aid projects which deserve to be implemented, for foreign policy and humanitarian reasons. These programs also benefit Baltimore. To cite but one example, U.S. wheat shipments to India helped to increase Baltimore's grain shipping tonnage by 90 percent last year.

Federal programs of oceanography will be of long-range benefit to this port, too. The Senate Commerce Committee, of which I am a member, has been extremely active in the oceanographic field. We passed a bill into law last session establishing a national oceanographic council. Further exploration and exploitation of the sea's resources is vital to the United States, and important for Baltimore as well.

Finally, Federal activities right here in Baltimore can be of immense importance for this port. The urban renewal in the inner harbor will doubtless induce new commerce here. The possibilities of deepening the channel will make the port more attractive. And you may be sure that I will exert every bit of influence I have to see that Baltimore continues to get its share of the Federal pile.

I started today by painting a gloomy picture. Let me close on a more optimistic note. The future for the merchant marine and the port of Baltimore is brighter than it has been for a number of years. We have, in my judgment, a Congress more alert to the problems involved. We have a variety of Federal programs designed to benefit this city (and its port). Hopefully we may push hard enough, to produce an administration merchant marine policy. Those of us in the Senate intend to do our part.

[From Baltimore (Md.) News-American, Feb. 17, 1967]

BELAY MARITIME NEGLECT

Our second-place merchant marine—suffering rapid deterioration, using World War II Victory ships, and practically ignored by Congress—has nonetheless delivered 98 percent of our cargo and most of our troops to Vietnam.

Its importance is obvious.

It is therefore almost incredible that this country has allowed Russia's Merchant Marine to pass it (1,422 ships to 1,040 for the U.S.); that we are attempting to supply a modern war with a number of WW II-vintage ships; and that Russia will spend $1 billion in 1967 on ship construction while we will spend only $106 million.

Sen. Daniel B. Brewster puts it simply: "Our fleet is a disgrace."

He has called for a national maritime policy and has co-sponsored a bill to empower the Senate Commerce Committee to authorize funds for ship construction and ship subsidies.

The Senator's proposal includes:

Building 30 to 40 ships a year, beginning immediately.

Maintaining a cargo-preference policy requiring at least 50 percent of government cargo to move in American-flag ships.

Sen. Brewster's views deserve the favorable consideration of Congress. Since a strong merchant fleet is a mainstay of the national economy.

NATURAL GAS PIPELINE STANDARDS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I was especially pleased with the President's consumer message dealing with insuring the safety of natural gas pipelines. A major explosion caused by a pipeline break in Milwaukee a few days ago luckily resulted in only a few injuries. A matter of only a few minutes prevented death and injury to 250 persons in a new school building. Several years ago a series of gas explosions in Madison demolished more than a city block of residential homes. Other blasts have done serious destruction in Appleton and Merrill, Wis. I believe it is time the Federal Government stepped into the situation and established a set of standards which will guarantee safety from gas pipeline explosions.

In Milwaukee, our largest city, a series of three explosions, caused by a break in a natural gas pipeline, virtually destroyed a new combination church and school. Fourteen were seriously injured in the explosion, which occurred only moments after 250 persons were evacuated from the building.

It is ironical that this untimely disaster should come at a time when Congress will soon be considering minimum safety standards for natural gas pipelines.

The explosion in Milwaukee is perhaps a good example of how this Nation's growth has compounded the gasline safety problem. This explosion demolished the Saint Adalbert Church and its brandnew school addition. When the pipeline that broke was first buried in 1952, the new church addition was not even on the drawing boards.

Likewise, much of this country's three-quarters of a million miles of natural gas pipeline was buried when suburban communities were nonexistent. Now shopping centers and suburban housing are entombing vest networks of natural gas distribution lines. Interstate transmission lines originally built in rural areas are now lodged beneath endless strings of new communities. The result is that while pipeline failures are more difficult to locate and repair, more people have become exposed to areas of potential danger.

Gas companies report that 33 percent of pipeline ruptures are caused by that most vital sign of progress—the bulldozer and its related equipment. Weld failures and corrosion are next in line as the most common causes of gas leaks.

Legislation will soon be before Congress that would establish safety standards for all natural gas lines. I welcome this measure as one who is firmly against courting disaster. We were very lucky in the Milwaukee explosion. We do not need to wait for another disaster to prod us into action.

The Nation's gas companies already have a safety code for pressure piping called the American Standard Code—ASA. But the public's interest is so great in this field of safety in terms of the risk to human life that no company, or the industry collectively, should alone have to bear the burden of establishing the standards that would apply to designing, construction, maintaining, and operating natural gas pipelines.

The industry should be commended for developing many new methods of protecting the underground pipelines. Better welding techniques and radiographic inspections are now in use. Better coating and cathodic protection of pipes have been developed.

But the fact is, none of these improvements have any effect on pipeline that is already in the ground. Wrinkles caused by the bending of pipes is a constant source of leakage. While this bending process is no longer used, much existing pipeline still contains the outdated wrinkles.

Some natural gas pipeline has been in the ground since 1886. Approximately 50,000 miles of it was buried prior to 1931. While the American Standard Code is essentially a good one, it is purely voluntary and it does not apply to pipeline already underground. Several States have adopted this code and in some cases have even strengthened it. But 21 States and the District of Columbia have no code at all.

There presently exists approximately 1,000 municipally owned gas distribution systems throughout the Nation. Only a handful are presently subject to any regulation by State commissions.

The Reverend Raymond Mrozinski, assistant pastor of the St. Adalbert Church, said it was a miracle the explosion did not happen when they were all in the building. The Congress cannot make miracles, but we can help lessen the need for them.

I believe industry and Government should strive for the common goal of providing the American public the most efficient and reliable use of natural gas consonant with the safest possible operation of natural gas facilities.

This can best be accomplished, I believe, through uniform Federal standards.

CONTINUED ACTION REQUIRED TO SAVE ENDANGERED WILDLIFE SPECIES

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in past sessions I have invited the attention of Senators to the problems facing our country in connection with the preservation of rare and endangered species of America's fish and wildlife.

About 2 years ago, I introduced a $350,000 proposal to commence the development of a special endangered species facility at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center near Laurel, Md. This proposal was presented after several years of study and I am happy to report that this study paid off, for the proposal was adopted by the Congress and has given new hope to conservationists throughout the Nation that all possible efforts would be extended to prevent the extinction of any additional wildlife species.

Last spring, I was able to establish the $350,000 funding level as the initial operating budget of the new Endangered Wildlife Research Station and also I obtained authority for six additional positions for assignment to this vital work.

Many members of the staff of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife have been most helpful as I have tried to develop and move this program forward. John S. Gottschalk, Director of the Bureau; Eugene H. Dustman, Director of the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center; and Ray C. Erickson, Director of the Endangered Species Facility, have been most cooperative in providing information and background material which I have requested. These dedicated public servants, along with many other members of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife staff, are due a vote of thanks from conservationists everywhere.

I am delighted that we are making progress with this program. However, much remains to be done. We dare not delay longer if we are to have a chance to avoid the real danger of losing many species of our American wildlife now on the rare and endangered list. During the course of the next year I shall from time to time offer additional suggestions designed to move this program ahead. I hope that this program will have the unanimous support of my colleagues both in the House and Senate.

This is more than a Mundt program. This is more than a conservation program. This is a real investment in America. The interest payments will accrue to our children and our children's children.

I should like to review briefly the progress and provide Senators with a status report on the program.

The goal of this program as stated in my original proposal remains unchanged; namely, to determine the needs and devise solutions to the problems of rare and endangered wildlife in the United States. This will be accomplished by carrying out ecological and behavioral studies of threatened wildlife in the wild, in pens, and in the laboratory to determine their characteristics and requirements, and to maintain these species in captivity to produce stock which can be used to bolster or restore populations in the wild. The captive stock will also serve as insurance against complete loss of a species if it is exterminated in the wild, a definite hazard where remaining numbers are small and locally concentrated, as is true with such species as whooping cranes, California condors, and Attwater's greater prairie chickens.

I am happy to report some encouraging initial progress toward these goals. The captive wildlife stock, previously held on a refuge near the town of Monte Vista in southern Colorado, were transported last February to the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center. Here, on 355 acres dedicated to this new program, temporary pens, ponds, and a small metal storage building have been prepared for them. This transfer of stock, including the renowned whooping crane, "Canus," was made without the loss of a single bird.

A topographic survey of the general site of initial construction, a pilot plan of proposed development in the propagation area, a preliminary plan and colored rendering of a laboratory, and final plans of a propagation building, service building, an earthen water storage reservoir, two wells, utilities service installations, and a breeding enclosure complex comprise the planning completed to date. Construction currently in progress will be completed during spring on the service and the propagation buildings, a flight enclosure, the reservoir, water lines, electricity, and sanitary disposal facilities. An item of $50,000 is included in the administration's fiscal year 1968 budget to allow the development of final plans and specifications for the above-mentioned laboratory building.

A total of 16 permanent positions to date have been authorized by Congress for this program, all of which have been or are in the process of being filled. These positions consist of the following assignments: one supervisory biologist in charge of the program, one secretary, nine biologists, a veterinarian, three biological technicians, and one hatcheryman. Six additional positions are included in the budget for fiscal year 1968.

In order to reveal the populations and distribution of threatened wildlife species, and to determine the factors limiting their numbers as well as to devise remedial management measures to assure their survival, it is necessary to study the most threatened forms as they occur in their natural habitats. Four research biologists already have been assigned to these studies, and two will be hired within the next few weeks.

One biologist, headquartered at the Hawaii National Park near Hilo, is responsible for research upon the unique native Hawaiian species which comprise over half of the endangered birds of the United States listed in the recently issued Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife "Redbook." Included are the Hawaiian goose or nene, the State bird of Hawaii, and 18 other kinds of birds. The fact that the Hawaiian Islands have lost more native bird species in the last 100 years than all of the other 49 States combined lends special urgency to this work.

A second biologist is located in the mountains of southern California intensively studying the great California condor. Principal objects of this research are to improve the accuracy of census methods and to evaluate the reaction of condors to human-caused disturbances of all kinds. This information will make possible a more accurate prediction of the likely effects of proposed changes in local land and water use on the survival prospects of this impressive glider with 10-foot wingspread, only 51 of which were counted in an extensive, carefully coordinated census last fall.

A third biologist is in Florida carrying out research on the Everglades kite and other threatened species of the Southeast, including the rare eastern brown pelican, the State bird of Louisiana. The greatest number of Everglades kites located thus far is 22 in the vicinity of Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge northwest of Miami and southeast of Lake Okeechobee. This species appears to depend almost entirely upon a type of large snail for food. Changes in water conditions in southern Florida have seriously reduced the numbers of this mollusk and, in turn, the population of the kite.

The fourth biologist is investigating the life history and limiting factors of the unique and little-known black-footed ferret, a weasellike animal which lives in prairie dog colonies, spending most of its life below ground. An important part of the problem concerned with the survival of the ferret is to determine methods of locating ferrets and arranging for their protection during the prairie dog control operations whch are necessary to maintain the productivity of farm and range lands in the Great Plains.

Of the remaining two biologists, one is to be assigned to study the masked bobwhite, formerly found in southern Arizona but now completely extirpated within the United States. A very few of these quail apparently still survive in Mexico, and some are being raised in captivity at several locations. The other biologist will be assigned to assist in the study of highest priority Hawaiian birds.

Although the birds at Monte Vista were shipped to Patuxent just prior to the breeding season last spring, they soon recovered from the experience and began to form pairs. Eggs laid by sandhill cranes and dusky grouse proved infertile, but eggs laid by Aleutian Canada geese and the masked bobwhite produced young which were reared successfully. The temporary facilities provided less than optimum conditions for breeding, but construction now in progress should improve operational efficiency and the safety of this stock.

Studies now in progress with three different types of sandhill cranes for eventual application of the findings with whooping cranes illustrate the procedures which will be employed with other threatened species.

Earlier research on the whooping crane revealed much information about the life history and habits of this endangered species, and recent examinations of their population and production record suggests that the time will soon be at hand when a limited number of whooping crane eggs should be taken from wild nests and reared in captivity. The birds produced thereby will be retained as breeders to produce stock for eventual release to the wild. Tests with wild sandhill cranes have demonstrated that one egg can be removed and the female will still continue incubating the remaining egg of the clutch. An agreement between Canada and the United States outlines the basis for taking such eggs from the wild. By this means, the customary high rate of loss of eggs on the breeding grounds and the apparent substantial mortality of immature birds may be avoided and a nucleus captive flock created.

Research with the greater, lesser, and varieties of Florida sandhill crane, respectively, Grus canadensis tabida, Grus canadensis canadensis, and Grus canadensis pratensis, are being carried out to determine suitable diets of young and adult cranes, enclosure dimensions, isolation needs, sanitation and other protection from disease and parasites, predator control, overwintering accommodation for the less hardy forms, and a host of other details regarding their habits and care. Preliminary testing with more common kinds of wildlife help to remove many uncertainties and increase the safety of similar attempts with threatened species. Because incubation methods are of special concern, comparisons are being made with mechanical equipment, bantam hens, and domestic muscovy ducks as foster "parents." Portable incubators in which eggs may be transported 3,000 miles or more are being given exhaustive tests for reliability.

The work is not limited to cranes. Comparable studies are also being undertaken with the huge Andean condor and the unique South American snail kite to obtain information on captive hatching and rearing methods which may eventually help to preserve their threatened northern hemisphere cousins, the

California condor and the Florida everglade kite. This research will be extended to many other wildlife species besides the 17 different kinds now at the station, and the quantity of breeding stock could double itself annually during each of the next 5 years. No item is included in the current or fiscal year 1968 budgets for construction of propagation facilities for this program.

Laboratory investigations furnish supporting research in physiology, nutrition, behavior, and other basic science disciplines, as well as diagnostic and clinical services, to the propagation and ecology sections. It will also accomplish more fundamental studies of less direct application. The budget for fiscal year 1968 contains an item for the preparation of final plans for a small laboratory-administration building.

This building will be the headquarters for the Bureau's endangered wildlife research program, and will contain office and laboratory space for the technical staff as well as an administrative component. The first specialist now being recruited for this section is a veterinarian who will monitor the physiological condition of all captive stock, perform diagnostic and clinical studies as necessary, and participate in construction planning toward avoiding disease- and parasite-producing features in pen and pond construction.

Planned for sometime in the future is a visitors' center where representative specimens of endangered species would be on view for the benefit of the public. Visitors are increasing at the center each week and the various news media are becoming more and more interested. Consideration will soon have to be given to moving this phase of the project forward. One of the most heartening aspects of the entire proposal is that it has received the personal endorsement of President Johnson. The President took time out from his busy schedule while in Texas in September 1965, to issue a press release wholeheartedly backing my proposal.

So that Senators who may have missed reading this Presidential endorsement might know of the President's strong personal interest in this program, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Johnson today approved the setting aside of 300 acres at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center in Laurel, Maryland, as part of an intensive effort to rebuild native stocks of birds and mammals threatened with extinction in the United States. In all, 78 kinds of birds, mammals, reptiles, fishes, and amphibians are on the endangered list.

In less than 150 years, the United States has lost forever nearly 40 species of birds and mammals. Half these have vanished since 1900.

Main objective of the experiment station at Patuxent will be to raise rare specimens, train the young to contend with conditions of the wild, and release them to the wild for hoped-for survival and propagation.

First arrivals at the special haven at Patuxent will be specimens of wildlife now housed at the Monte Vista National Wildlife Refuge in Colorado. These include greater sandhill cranes a whooping crane that was injured in Canada and was saved through the joint efforts of Canadian and United States wildlife experts, Aleutian Canada geese, and other species of geese.

Next spring the propagation studies program at the sanctuary will be expanded to include the snail hawk and the tule white-front goose. Specimens of the black-footed ferret will be requested from the State of South Dakota.

In keeping with the international theme of the research, the Department of Interior plans to cooperate with Canadian officials to obtain wild whooping crane eggs for hatching.

In the near future the Department's Fish and Wildlife Service will dispatch a team of experts to the field to conduct special studies on survival problems. One will concentrate on Hawaii, since half its bird species are on the endangered list.

Another biologist will be sent to Los Padres National Forest in southern California to study the condor, the Nation's largest soaring bird, of which only about 40 remain.

A third expert will be based in South Dakota, home of the remaining black-footed ferrets.

A fourth biologist will study problems of the southern states' rare species, including the ivory-billed woodpecker, the Florida everglade kite, and the eastern brown pelican.

A total of 12 experts ultimately will be assigned to special field studies.

By 1969 or 1970, a large laboratory will be ready at Patuxent to support research there and in the field. It will concentrate on all phases of propagation and also will permit public viewing of those rare specimens that are overaged or otherwise unsuited to be returned to the wild.

Initial work at the sanctuary has been made possible by a $350,000 congressional appropriation.

GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK APPROVED BY TEXAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, with extreme pleasure I report to the Senate that the Texas Legislature has today completed its action on legislation that will result in establishment of the Guadalupe Mountains National Park.

Just last year, Congress gave final approval in Public Law 89–667 to a project which I had strongly advocated since 1963, the creation of a national park in the Guadalupe Mountains of west Texas. That bill authorized the establishment of a 77,000-acre park covering these rugged mountains that contain El Capitan and Guadalupe Peak, the highest point in Texas.

The bill as passed by Congress provided that before the park could be established, the State of Texas would agree to donate to the National Park Service its extensive but nonproductive mineral interests in the area. Both houses of the Texas Legislature have now approved the donation that clears the way for acquisition of the land for the park. I congratulate them for their wisdom and foresight in acting to preserve this scenic area for the benefit of future generations of Americans.

Since my efforts for this park began in 1963, I have seen no better description of this mountain area in a desert setting than that appearing in the article "The New Guadalupe Mountains National Park," written by Natt N. Dodge, and published in the National Parks magazine of February 1967. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

(77,500-acre unit in scenic highlands of west Texas presents a variety of plant and animal associations in an outstanding geologic setting.)

(By Natt N. Dodge)

Picture, if you will, two rugged mountain systems resembling a great V, or two sides of an isosceles triangle, converging to form a fastness of canyons, sheer cliffs and peaks blanketed with a wealth of native herbs, shrubs and primeval forest. Thus, rising from the desert near the southwestern corner of New Mexico, the Brokeoff and Guadalupe Mountains of Otero County and the Barrera del Guadalupe of Eddy County thrust their combined bulk southward across the state line to merge, in Texas, like the head of a giant javelin.

Southernmost tip of this massive spear-point is the imposing 1000-foot rock face of El Capitan, behind which towers the 8751-foot summit of Guadalupe Peak. This Texan climax to New Mexico's Guadalupe Mountain complex has recently been authorized as a 77,500-acre addition to the national park system—the Guadalupe Mountains National Park.

From Guadalupe Peak and its surrounding canyon-cut, pine-covered highlands the vigorous hiker or horseman may look down a vertical mile, across cliff and canyon, to the hot, dusty barrens of west Texas; the Salt Basin to the west; the Delaware Plains to the east. Extending south to the distant, hazy horizon, where the Rio Grande marks the frontier of northern Mexico, there spread the vast reaches of the Chihuahuan Desert with its array of thorny plants, drought-resistant shrubs and dwarf trees.

Stretching away to the northeast is the mesa-like Barrera del Guadalupe with its steeply dipping, deeply incised, south-facing escarpment behind which lies famous Carlsbad Caverns and, quite possibly, other great caves not yet discovered. To the northwest, imposing Dog Canyon separates the cliff-girt Brokeoff Mountains from the main range of the Guadalupes, whose mélange of pine-clad peaks fades into the distant Pecos Valley beyond the northern limit of vision.

To the lay visitor the chief attraction of the high Guadalupes lies in their scenic splendor; but the geologist sees in them a rare phenomenon, the acme of the world's most extensive fossil reef. In Permian times, some 235 million years ago, a large part of west Texas and southern New Mexico lay beneath the waters of a shallow sea. A 10,000-square-mile portion, roughly oval in shape—the Delaware Basin—was connected to the open ocean by a broad channel leading toward the southwest. For millions of years the deposits of lime-secreting algae and other creatures gradually built, along the margin of the basin, a massive limestone reef extending for more than 350 miles around the basin's periphery.

With the great convulsion of the earth's crust of some 60 million years ago (geologists call it the Laramide Revolution) the entire region was raised and the reef stood exposed to the destructive agencies of mechanical and chemical weathering. Time and erosion have since carved deep canyons, reduced surface rock to soil, and dissolved and removed great volumes of limestone along fracture lines to leave caves and caverns in the very heart of the reef.

The Texas portion of the Guadalupe Mountains shows outstanding exposures of many of the old Permian rocks that were deposited in the Delaware Basin, including superb canyon-cut cross-sections of the reef.

Here is a magnificent story of earth history clearly visible to the trained geologist and, with a little graphic interpretation, understandable to the layman. It is this remarkable display of marine deposits and of reef-building and cave formation that has made the Guadalupe Mountain region classic in geology.

Although no caves of a grandeur comparable to nearby Carlsbad Caverns have been discovered in the Guadalupe Peak terrain, a number of grottos and solution chambers have been found, some of them containing evidence of use or occupation by prehistoric men. A March, 1965, excavation of one such cave near the mouth of McKittrick Canyon by archeologist Albert Schroeder of the National Park Service uncovered a cremation burial and numerous artifacts including shells of *Olivella*, a marine mollusk. If the shells came from the Gulf of California, they might indicate trade into the Guadalupe region as early as 500–600 A.D. If they were brought from the Gulf of Mexico a much earlier period of human occupation might be inferred.

Archeological studies in the Guadalupe Mountains beginning in 1925 have provided evidence that man may have been in the region almost continuously for at least 6000 years. Bones of now-extinct mammals like the musk-ox, four-horned antelope, and Taylor bison have been found associated with cave sites showing human occupation. Hermit Cave, in Last Chance Canyon, has produced carbon-14 dates of more than 12,000 years before the present.

Finds of pottery approximately 600 years old point to cave occupation of more recent times, and numerous mescal-roasting pits scattered throughout the lower elevations give evidence of the domestic activities of Apache Indians. Most recent inhabitants were Mescalero Apaches, who were present when Coronado traveled northward along the Rio Grande Valley to pass west of the Guadalupe Mountains. In the late 1500's two Spanish groups followed up the Pecos, paralleling the eastern base of the Guadalupe uplift. Might it have been one of these that named the range in honor of the Virgin of Guadalupe, patroness saint of Mexico?

Beginning in 1849 the U.S. Army sent forces into the region to explore and to protect from Indian attack travelers bound for the goldfields of California. In 1854 Captain John Pope, surveying a route for the Pacific Railroad, passed close below the southern tip of the Guadalupes, and in 1858 the Butterfield Line (Tipton, Missouri, to San Francisco in 25 days by stage) established a station at the mouth of Pine Spring Canyon. Ruins of the station still stand.

Following the end of the Civil War, ranchers began to settle in the Pecos Valley and in the canyons of the Guadalupes where springs provided adequate water. Sheep and goat ranches were established higher in the mountains in the early 1900's. Fortunately, the owner of nearly all of the Texas portion of the Guadalupes concentrated his goat herds farther north, in the Dog Canyon area in New Mexico, basing his management of the Texas highlands on sound conservation principles. Since the early 1920's he and his father had not only protected the native vegetation and animal life of the highlands but had also re-established forms known to have been present earlier in the Guadalupe Mountains. Prominent among the animals are elk and wild turkey, both presently increasing in numbers.

Reached only afoot or on horseback—except for one rough and dangerous Jeep trail—the Texas Guadalupes have remained relatively inaccessible for four decades. They provide a rare ecological exhibit approaching the climax types throughout, and show little evidence of human activity.

Contributing as much to the scenic aspects of the Gaudalupes as cliff and gorge is the diverse vegetation blanketing slopes and canyon bottoms. Climbing the lower bajadas of the foothills and invading the mouths of many canyons, creosotebush, saltbush, javelinabush, snakeweed, lechuguilla, walkingstick cholla, prickly pear, and other plants typical of the surrounding desert dominate the ground cover. Higher on the slopes these mingle with and gradually give place to sotol, century plant, several varieties of acacia and mimosa, Texas madrone and scrubby one-seed juniper. In the sandy channels of dry watercourses occupying canyon bottoms, such small trees as desert willow, netleaf hackberry and Texas walnut cast a sparse shade.

Here are found such flowers as greenthread goldeneye, desert senna and globemallow. Jackrabbits lope across open flats and cottontails scuttle for cover at the approach of their arch-enemy the gray fox. Three species of skunks search for mice, dig for grubs, or harvest tunas—the juicy, mahogany-colored fruits of prickly-pear cactuses. Rock squirrels sun themselves on stony outcrops, a wary eye turned skyward where a hunting redtail hawk makes wide circles in the blue. At night raccoons and ringtails come out of hiding, and the booming voice of the great horned owl echoes from limestone walls.

Bird life is abundant throughout the canyons of the Guadalupes. Cactus wrens, thrashers, mourning doves, roadrunners and black-throated sparrows prefer brushy flats and open canyon mouths. Vireos, tanagers, sapsuckers, flycatchers and flickers hunt insects among the shrubs on rocky slopes, or fly from tree to tree along the bottoms of narrow gorges. On north-facing slopes, where ponderosa pine finds suitable conditions, white-breasted nuthatches, brown creepers and winter wrens investigate nooks and crannies where insect larvae might hide. As dusk deepens, the haunting call of the poorwill is borne on the breath of a down-canyon breeze.

WATER, THE MAGIC KEY

Water is the vital ecological control in this arid country, and where seeps and springs christen cliff-bases with the magic touch of moisture a luxuriant growth of native grasses and herbs brings an aura of springtime to the canyon floor. At such moist locations—and particularly along stretches of South McKittrick Canyon, which boasts a permanent stream harboring rainbow trout and sunfish—thickets of chokecherry, chinquapin oak, Rocky Mountain juniper, walnut and madrone crowd the canyon floor. Here the broken walls of the defile are covered with grasses and shrubs with an occasional ponderosa pine, gray oak or alligator-bark juniper.

As the winding canyons penetrate deeper into the mountain wilderness they become narrower, with steeper walls. Trees found on the lower slopes are replaced here by limber pine, hoptree, shrubby big-tooth maple, and occasionally a spectacular faxon yucca reaching a height of 15 to 18 feet. Sending up a spike of creamy-white blossoms in April, *Yucca faxoniana* is a fitting rival of the giant dagger, *Y. carnerosana*, of Big Bend National Park.

Some of the canyons head behind the high rim of the escarpment, thus topping out on the crest of the mountains adjacent to the depression between peaks known as The Bowl. This rolling, 7800-foot highland wilderness is covered with an open forest of ponderosa and limber pines, with piñon pine on the south-facing slopes. Here, too, are thickets of Gambel oak, a scattering of velvet ash and serviceberry and, on northern exposures, stands of Douglas fir and quaking aspen.

In addition to elk, mule deer, bear, and a few mountain lions, smaller animals find a favorable habitat among the pines and Douglas fir covering the Guadalupe highlands. Porcupines leave their feeding-scars on the trunks and branches of trees. Coyotes and bobcats help to hold in check the otherwise burgeoning populations of chipmunks, ground squirrels, mice and other rodents. Birds are numerous in all sizes, from the tiny "hummer" to the golden eagle and wild turkey.

White-throated swifts sweep the air for flying insects, and soaring vultures ride the rising thermals that sweep up the faces of perpendicular cliffs. Band-tailed pigeons and acorn woodpeckers frequent oak thickets, while mountain chickadees and western bluebirds tend their young in nest holes in pine trunks. Chirping sparrows and gray-headed juncos are summer residents of the highlands., descending in a leisurely fashion to lower, warmer elevations for the winter.

When, in 1959, Wallace F. Pratt donated to the National Park Service his McKittrick Canyon summer home with 5632 acres in North McKittrick Canyon—accepted in 1961—he provided Americans with an exceptional, if fragile, ecological laboratory. Biological studies conducted there during the summer of 1962 by Dr. Frederick R. Gehlbach, presently a member of the Biology Department staff of Baylor University, revealed a wealth of plant and animal life with communities and associations varying greatly because of such factors as slope, exposure, soil, presence or absence of moisture, elevation, previous activities of mankind, and other conditions.

Now the addition of South McKittrick Canyon and the highlands surrounding Guadalupe Peak to the Pratt donation has provided another major unit for our national park system—a preserve of scenic splendor and a scientific exhibit featuring a mountain wilderness in a desert setting.

MR. AND MRS. STEPHEN CURRIER

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the current issue of Life magazine contains an article, entitled "The Resonance of Charity," written by Loudon Wainwright, in tribute to Mr. and Mrs. Stephen Currier. This remarkable young couple, who lost ther lives in an accident in the Caribbean last month, had dedicated their fortune—and beyond this their lives—to philanthropy at the highest level. They supported, and in many instances, organized a wide variety of activities of importance to American life, including that of civil rights.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wainwright's tribute be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Resonance of Charity

Certainly one of the most poorly practiced social arts in comfortable America today is the art of giving. Even in a culture which has suddenly grown conscious of the pressing needs of enormous numbers of its members, we often give haphazardly—if not downright reluctantly—without much real sense of the destination and direction of our gifts. One sometimes contributes to certain causes less because of their obvious worthiness than in guilty or craven response to insistent demands for a high rate of success from the funds' solicitors. We are urged not to let good old Pleasantown's rating slip below 97% on the generosity thermometer. We shuffle through the growing pile of requests for money and pay according to our inability to resist. And once the payment is made, the charity, such as it is, is done. Purchasers of one quarter of a crutch, we don't much care how it is used.

When a small chartered airplane disappeared in the Caribbean last month, it carried to their deaths two young people who were surely among the most extraordinary givers of this time. They were Stephen Currier, 36, and his wife Audrey, 33, and if the Curriers were rich beyond the capacity of most people to understand, their generosity, too, was remarkable, not only for its magnitude but for its variety and creativity. "Stephen was beginning to find his style as a philanthropist," one of Currier's acquaintances said to me recently, and in that regretful remark was the unmistakable sense that the best sort of giving involves much more than writing checks.

To the Curriers the whole business of philanthropy—of giving where it mattered most in ways that would most stimulate improvement and growth among the beneficiaries—was almost totally absorbing. It is beside the point that the Curriers could well afford this interest. Indeed they could: Mrs. Currier's personal fortune was estimated to be in the hundreds of millions. But how much they had and how much they gave matters much less than how they gave it.

In 1966, largely through their Taconic Foundation, they gave more than $3 million, much of it in the field of civil rights where they had for several years been among the nation's biggest contributors. Amounts also went to welfare agencies, schools and colleges, cultural programs, beautification and conservation efforts. Through an organization founded by Currier and called Urban America, Inc., they were deeply and expensively involved in a wide program of study and action on the great problems of the cities. In all of this the Curriers remained careful of one of the great dangers of philanthropy, that a big gift might change the character of a project and the recipients might become intimidated by sheer largesse. "Currier believed it was not healthy philanthropy to build dependency on one source," an associate recalled, and to this end Currier worked hard to get support from other givers.

Like any other specialists, the men of philanthropy have a certain vernacular of their own, and one of Stephen Currier's favorite words was "resonance." When he said that a gift should have resonance, he meant that it should have qualities that would echo or reverberate beyond its immediate value. For example, not long ago he set aside a sum of money to be given to small museums for collection purchases. The museum directors would select and buy the paintings themselves; the only stipulation was that the paintings be the work of less well-known contemporary artists. The museums did not know the identity of their benefactor, for Currier did not want that echo. But through this resonant technique the museums got their pictures and, in a piling up of benefits, the artists got needed money while their work was given prominent public display.

Currier also used the word "enablement," and by this he meant that the application of a special plan or perhaps a little extra funding might enable a sluggish project to get going. A colleague who had worked closely with him remarked, "We'll have trouble replacing Currier's money. We cannot replace him as a person." Currier's drive in philanthropy took huge amounts of his time and energy, and he was capable of impatience. "He was used to doing things his own way," the same man remembered, "and he had to learn to work with others. But he learned fast. After all, he was only 36, and he'd never really had a job."

Both Stephen and Audrey Currier, who was very shy and remained in the background, placed the highest importance on money generating possibilities for others, and on these others then making things work for themselves. There are "sure things" in philanthropy, like giving to big, well-established programs. But Currier often preferred the risk of a new venture where the results were not so predictable. One program, which Currier called the "Harvard Gamble," has been working successfully now for four years. Currier gave scholarship funds with the condition that they must be spent on students with good possibilities who wouldn't otherwise have gone to Harvard or even considered going there. But for all his generosity, Currier was no sitting duck for every pleader with a plan. A friend remembers him turning down one proposal with the words, "the trouble is there isn't any fun in it."

The possibility that philanthropy could be fun had simply never occurred to me. Of course, the niggardly nontithing indulged in by most of us deserves a less grand word than philanthropy, but it is giving all the same, and it seems too bad we take so little joy in it. Perhaps part of the problem is that we have grown accustomed to sitting tight and waiting for charities to badger us. When they do—inevitably and regularly—we treat them with the grudging distaste ordinarily reserved for bills and tax forms. When a cause is unbearably worthy or a contribution is otherwise mandatory ("If we don't help, they'll think we're finks"), we pay—and forget it. There is no involvement beyond the money.

Maybe some of the Currier standards for gargantuan philanthropy can be applied to the game of small giving. At any rate on the next go-round I hope I have the nerve and verve to turn down a sure thing and instead look around for a project with resonance.

THE REVOLUTION OF RISING EXPECTATIONS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, "In East Europe the Past Is Passé." That is the title of an interesting and perceptive article by Henry Kamm which appeared in the February 19 issue of the New York Times. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PELL. Mr. Kamm makes several points that I believe deserve the close attention of Members of the Senate. For we will soon face the question of voting on the Consular Convention with the Soviet Union and on the Outer Space Agreement. Other measures that relate to East-West relations are before the House of Representatives.

May I, therefore, take a few moments, Mr. President, to cite some statements made by Mr. Kamm. He observes that "unnatural unity between disparate partners is waning in Communist Europe and one reason may be that the sterile rigidity of the systems in power is waning too." He notes that "the conflict between two generations is breaking the facade of Communist rigidity." He writes that "the urge to draw closer to the non-Communist world for the economic strength it represents has made deep inroads into the rigid patterns of thought and life in Eastern Europe." And he concludes that "there is little doubt that when the Communist leaders loosen their reins they do so not from a new-found belief in democratic freedom but only when pressures leave them no other choice."

I agree with these observations I have quoted, Mr. President. I reached similar conclusions in the course of a study mission I made last December to East Berlin, Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia. My report on that study mission is being released at noon today. I would like to quote just two paragraphs from that report, in the hope that these paragraphs will tempt Senators to read the full report, for I feel strongly that our relations with East Europe and the Soviet Union involve delicate and decisive questions which deserve the deliberate attention of this great deliberative body:

> Each of these countries is moving, each in a different way and at a different speed, out of bondage. In some cases the emphasis is on developing an independent foreign policy for the country; in others it is on liberalizing life within the country.
>
> We have heard of the revolution of rising expectations in the developing countries of the world. The Communist countries of Eastern Europe are caught, it seems to me, in a counterrevolution of rising expectations. All men have certain natural drives which, in the political and economic spheres, include the desire for political expression, for human contact and for property. As standards of living improve in Eastern Europe, as adequate housing, health care and education become generally available, as communication and direct exposure with Western societies increases through tourists who visit from the West and through occasional trips to the West, these drives become stronger. They force Communist governments to change to adjust to these drives. The first demand may be freedom to choose one's work. The inevitable result is freedom to choose how to dispose of the gains of work—more choice, in other words, in what to buy and where to travel. And eventually, although this end is certainly not yet in sight, there will undoubtedly be a demand for freedom of choice in politics.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Feb. 2, 1967]

IN EAST EUROPE THE PAST IS PASSÉ

(By Henry Kamm)

VIENNA, Feb. 18.—The Soviet bloc is deeply divided on a major issue—Germany. That much has been made clear by the Warsaw meeting last week of the seven Eastern European foreign ministers. Alarmed by Rumania's decisions to establish diplomatic relations with West Germany without the time-honored Communist preconditions—West German recognition of East Germany and of Poland's western frontier—the Polish and German Communist Governments sought to induce their other allies from following Rumania's example. The final Warsaw communiqué indicated failure in that purpose.

There have been rumblings of discord in the Soviet bloc before, but the present situation is new. Unnatural unity between disparate partners is waning in Communist Europe. And one reason may be that the sterile rigidity of the systems in power is waning too.

POLAND LED THE WAY

Poland herself led the way a decade ago, when it went to the brink of armed conflict with the Soviet Union to establish the right of a nation to follow a national policy without leaving the Soviet camp. But in many ways the Poles were more unfettered then than today, and their lead is now doubtful.

In the current stirring of unrest among Polish intellectuals over the failure of the hopes of 1956 to bear fruit, a number have quit the Communist party after the ouster of Leszek Kolakovski, the philosopher who made himself the spokesman of pent-up frustration. But there is a kind of progress even in this. "In the old days," said a Polish intellectual, "who would have dared to quit the party in protest?"

The other countries of the Communist bloc did not make the considerable strides Poland did, but at varying rates they have taken steps to make the lives of their people more comfortable not only physically but also spiritually.

CRITICISM VARIES

In Czechoslovakia and Hungary, particularly, the press, the theater and films have become more accurate reflections of life as it is really lived and have served as media for presentation of conflicting views. Open criticism, however, remains restricted to individual performance and does not extend to party or government policy.

Hungarians and Poles delight in criticizing their leaders in private conversations. Czechoslovaks do so more circumspectly. Bulgarians concede their disappointments. In Rumania free speech and easy association with foreigners remain hopes for another day.

In all these countries, however, ideological cant, for years the substitute for honest thinking and practical discussion, is increasingly being left to the party hacks. The leadership is showing more realistic concern with practical problems, and younger Communists are honestly and painfully seeking to adapt an inherited body of thought to conditions to which it does not correspond. They do not hide their uncertainty over whether that can be done.

EATING OF CROW

In the last decade the Eastern European regimes have had to denounce many persons they used to venerate and restore to honor many they had killed or banished as traitors. In trying to revive their stagnating economies they have also had to turn to devices and practices they used to condemn as antisocial and capitalistic. To cleanse these devices of ideological taint has not been easy.

So much eating of crow has been unsettling for those who had kept the faith and fought for it. For those who grew up without a romantic commitment to Communism the process has been less agonizing but even more sobering. The conflict between the generations is breaking the facade of Communist rigidity.

"They laugh at us and what we created for them," a professor in Warsaw said. "They know only the advantages, we suffered to create them. Without us they would never have seen the university. We have opened for everybody what only the rich had before. They accept it, but they don't know what it cost us."

A young writer in Sofia said: "My poor father. All his life he shouted 'Long Live Stalin.' Now he hears the same people shout 'Down With Stalin.' He has stopped shouting and I will never shout anything."

DEEP INROADS MADE

The urge to draw closer to the non-Communist world for the economic strength it represents has made deep inroads into the rigid patterns of thought and life in Eastern Europe. The ever-increasing flow of Western businessmen and tourists cannot be cut off from the people of the countries. To take advantage of research and development in the West students and scholars have gone out and returned with wider horizons.

Even some of the rise in intellectual freedom has direct economic roots. Commenting on the intellectual honesty of current Czechoslovak films, a man close to the movie industry said, "But the new Czech movies bring in more hard currency than the Skoda works."

It was a quip and he was exaggerating. But there is little doubt that when the Communist leaders loosen their reins they do so not from a new-found belief in democratic freedom but only when pressures leave them no other choice.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. PELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. My friend is a valued member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I believe has sat through most if not all of the hearings on the Consular Treaty.

I take it from what the Senator has said he intends to support that treaty; is that correct?

Mr. PELL. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. For about an hour and a half this afternoon, a number of Senators, most of them on the right side of the aisle, made very strong speeches in opposition——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? The Senator meant the right-hand side of the aisle.

Mr. CLARK. The right-hand side; the Senator is correct.

Perhaps, to make it perfectly clear, I should say the Republican side of the aisle, although one of our valued Democratic colleagues appeared to agree with them.

The argument is made, and appears to have weight with some Senators, as perhaps it has with the Senator from Rhode Island himself, that it would be immoral and improper for us to enter into a treaty with the Soviet Union while Soviet weapons are being used to kill American boys in South Vietnam.

I wonder what response my friend the Senator from Rhode Island would make to that argument.

Mr. PELL. I think it is a comparison of apples and oranges.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator has a good point there. If I may elaborate a little bit—because he speaks to some extent in a parable—I take it the Senator would accept the position that if a particular agreement with the Soviet Union is very much to the advantage of the United States of America, as I believe the proposed agreement would be, we should consummate it, regardless of what the situation might be in Vietnam or anywhere else? Does the Senator agree?

Mr. PELL. I think that would be correct.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator.

WATER IMPORTATION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, a most interesting comment on water importation was published recently in the Christian Science Monitor. It is datelined Salem, Oreg. It now seems that the Pacific Northwest, which has always been considered a surplus water area, and therefore an area of possible water export, now fears it may not have enough water to see it through the years ahead, and is seeking to import water from Alaska and Northern Canada through the so-called NAWAPA plan. I only ask, if the Pacific Northwest is running out of water—can NAWAPA be further delayed?

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Northwest Seeks Out New Water Resources," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 18, 1967]

NORTHWEST SEEKS OUT NEW WATER RESOURCES

(By Malcolm Bauer)

SALEM, OREG.—While the thirsty Southwest looks to Columbia River water, the Columbia River country is looking north to Canada and Alaska.

Oregon Gov. Tom McCall says that the federal government soon may have to go into "intensive negotiations" with Canada to tap northern waters. He predicts that current studies will reveal that the Northwest needs all its water. Solution to the West's water problem, he thinks, lies to the north.

Governor McCall specifically endorsed in principle the North American Water and Power Alliance (NAWAPA) plan to build a huge water system stretching from Alaska to Mexico. The $100 billion, 30-year plan was drawn by a los Angeles firm of engineers, Ralph M. Parsons Company. It would require Canadian agreement.

DATA ROUNDUP URGED

"NAWAPA would double our supply (of water) in the Columbia Basin," Governor McCall said. "We should find out what Canada would do.

"The thing is to get our figures, and have a really strong case," he added, referring to Oregon's inventory of future water needs, begun last year. "I think the figures will show we are short [of water] for the next 100 years."

The Governor said he hoped the target date for the water-inventory report could be advanced from June, 1969, to January, 1969. Other Northwest states are conducting similar inventories. Federal agencies in the Northwest are also at work on a projection of water needs here.

If his forecasts prove correct, Governor McCall said, he would "move immediately to the White House level" to obtain United States-Canadian negotiations on the NAWAPA plan or something like it.

CONSTRUCTION DISTANT

The NAWAPA project would be history's biggest public-works undertaking. It would, through a system of dams, reservoirs, canals, and pumping stations, draw water from Alaska and northern Canada into a natural trench in the Rocky Mountains and redistribute it south to Mexico and east to the Great Lakes region. Auxiliary canals would tap Hudson Bay. The project would also generate an estimated 70 million kilowatts of electricity.

The Pacific Northwest is receptive to major water projects. Many of its citizens, including Governor McCall, can remember when Grand Coulee Dam was just a dream and when the new Bonneville Dam was called a "white elephant."

SFC. JAMES H. GILBERT, WATERLOO, IOWA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, Sfc. James H. Gilbert of Waterloo, Iowa, is one of the thousands of brave but unsung heroes of the war in Vietnam.

He did not have to go to Vietnam: A 7-year-old daughter and his mother-in-law are ill with leukemia.

But Sergeant Gilbert volunteered because, as his wife remarked, "He feels he has a job to do."

He accepted assignment as a military

adviser with the Vietnamese Army and is stationed in an area which serves seven villages, 80 miles north of Saigon.

As a medic, he is administering to the needs of these villagers.

Mr. President, I think the story of this serviceman merits notice by my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that an article, dated February 15, 1967, by Patty Johnson, feature editor for the Waterloo Courier, be placed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Sergeant Gilbert's Own Child Has Leukemia—He Aids Those Who Need It Most—Iowans Sent Clothing for Vietnamese

(Editor's Note: *The name of Sergeant First Class James H. Gilbert is a familiar one to all the Waterloo Daily Courier readers who responded generously to his Christmas season plea for clothing for the people of Vietnam. Here is the story behind the real gallantry of this man and his family in Waterloo*).

(By Patty Johnson)

Each time a Vietnamese child dies in Jim Gilbert's arms, his heart breaks a little.

He thinks of his own daughter who has leukemia and of his mother-in-law who has it also.

Why would a man kiss his wife goodbye on their wedding anniversary last Aug. 15 and volunteer for a year in Vietnam, knowing of the sacrifice it meant?

ASSIGNED TO MEDICAL CORPS

It's a long story that had its beginning in 1953 when Jim Gilbert entered the Army and was assigned to the Medical Corps. In the years since, he's served three years in Germany, four in Alaska, and now Vietnam.

Jim is the son of Harvey Gilbert of 1827 Sager Ave. His wife is the former Beverly Smith, daughter of the William H. Smiths of 1118 Fairchild St. and now there are five children: Debra, 12; Dorene, 11; the 4-year-old twins, Donald and Denise; and 7-year-old Diane who has leukemia.

Jim and his family have been living at Columbus, Ga., and the Medical Corps has become Jim's life.

But when his outfit was sent to Vietnam, Jim was allowed to stay behind. He and Beverly had been told Diane had only 15 months to live.

LOYAL TO FRIENDS

And then came the tragic news that many of his best friends in his outfit had died there.

"Jim took it pretty hard," says his wife. "He felt he should have been with them."

So he accepted assignment as a military adviser with the Vietnamese Army, serving seven villages 80 miles north of Saigon.

Although neither he nor the Vietnamese medic with whom he works are doctors, they have become so to the people.

"Viet Cong will never kill you," they tell him. "You good Boxie (doctor)."

Jim is a good Boxie because his wife has managed to send him a medical book via a Ft. Benning doctor, because he has 14 years of experience in his field and because he fights endlessly for both medicine to treat the suffering and clothing to cover the naked.

COURIER READERS HELPED

"I received wonderful response to the article in the Courier," he writes. "I wish to thank each and every individual who participated in that drive, as well as the clubs and organizations from Waterloo, Cedar Falls and Wellsburg. They have helped me to stay here with a little more safety."

Jim re-enlisted Dec. 12 as a career Army man and he's been offered a chance to transfer to the coast to a desk job. He refused, his wife says, even if it meant a delay in another stripe toward which he's been working for two years.

"He was afraid the next medic might be a little lazy," says Mrs. Gilbert, "and not do as much as he could for the people who need it so badly."

But Jim was permitted to stay in Vo Dot and his stripe was added. He treats as many as 227 Vietnamese patients per day.

CAN HELP A LITTLE

These people need so much and I've been able to do a little with the help of the people from Iowa. I've been here longer than any other medic since the military adviser team started. No one likes it because of the V. C. harassment and no modern conveniences."

Jim, himself, isn't always happy about it. Some days he is ordered to wear his armored vest and carry grenades. And Beverly isn't happy about it either, though she has a great pride in him.

"I think they'll want him to extend his service there," she worries. "But I'm hoping he'll be coming home in August."

RETURNING TO GEORGIA

On Christmas Day at her home in Georgia she received the news of her mother's leukemia to add to her concern over Diane's. She and the children arrived here on Dec. 28 and are returning Thursday to their home, although Mrs. Smith is bedfast much of the time and receiving blood transfusions.

"I'll come back to Waterloo whenever I'm needed," she says, "but I want to get the children back in school. Diane goes, too, although she has to be careful. It will be two years in May since we learned of her leukemia but now she seems to be in a remission period.

"Knowing all this is hard on me and it's hard on Jim, too. But he feels he has a job to do."

SENATOR ERVIN SPONSORS ADMINISTRATION'S WIRETAP BILL—RIGHT TO PRIVACY ACT OF 1967

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I am happy to join the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long] in sponsoring the administration's proposed Right to Privacy Act of 1967. I endorse the judgment of National Crime Commission that legislation to define the legal limits of wiretapping and eavesdropping is urgently needed.

The President is to be commended for his efforts to enact a meaningful bill, and I have consistently supported those efforts, just as I did the legislation proposed by President Kennedy.

In fact, the subject of wiretapping was the first on which hearings were held by the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee after I became chairman in 1961; and it was shortly after those hearings closed that the Kennedy administration sent us its first bill. Unfortunately, neither that bill nor its successors have been enacted. Congress can wait no longer. The earlier investigations of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights and the more recent ones by the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure have made that frighteningly clear.

This is not to say that the present bill, S. 928, is perfect. No legislation ever is. However, the bill is well drafted in what I believe is an effective attempt to strike the proper balance between the rights of the individual and the requirements of security. Thorough and responsible hearings in the tradition of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure should provide the Senate with the information to cure any defects which may turn up.

For myself, I would hope the subcommittee will consider especially the feasibility of requiring court orders for wiretapping and eavesdropping where that is authorized by the bill. The right which is sought to be protected in S. 928 is essentially the same right the framers intended to protect in drafting the prohibitions of the fourth and fifth amendments applying to search and seizure and self-incrimination. The requirement of a court order has been an element of each of the previous bills proposed by the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, and we should look carefully at the issues before discarding the concept of such a control.

Probably the most difficult issue which the subcommittee must face is whether exception to the ban should be allowed in investigations of organized crime; each of the earlier bills made that exception.

As a former member of the Senate Rackets Committee, I am acutely aware of the pervasive insidious ways by which organized crime, according to its very definition, operates. I know how it has spread its sickness throughout our country, and how hard that sickness is to eradicate. I know, too, that the full force of our present legal resources, and the force of new resources yet to be developed, must be brought down against this national enemy. I have considered all this carefully.

It is my firm conviction that we can and should win without using methods antiethical to the spirit of the Constitution—that this enemy can be destroyed without resorting to the enemy's tactics, that constitutional shortcuts are no substitute for good police work.

Subsequent to my service on the Rackets Committee I have also served on the Judiciary Committee as chairman of the special subcommittee which insured the President's first Law Enforcement Assistance Act and as chairman of the permanent Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. During this time I have been made aware of two other growing national problems fully as menacing as organized crime: The rising rate of unorganized crime and the wholesale invasions of privacy of the American citizen.

If we can tap the wires of those who deal in gambling and narcotics, why grant special immunity for those who rob, rape, and kill? The truth is that we need the same comprehensive war on all crime. And we need the same right of privacy for all Americans.

The investigations of various committees of Congress, including the Government Operations Subcommittees of Representatives Moss and Gallagher, have shown conclusively the need for an attack on privacy invasions in a number of areas. Thus far, all we have had are rearguard actions. But with S. 1035, to protect the privacy of Government employees and S. 928, to restrict wiretapping and eavesdropping, I hope we can begin the rollback I hope we can postpone New Year's Day 1984.

Two days ago I detailed the reasons which have prompted 53 Senators to cosponsor S. 1035. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long] has detailed the painstaking work of his subcommittee revealing incredible violations of the personal conversations and activities of Americans—violations perpetrated by the Federal Government, by industry, and by fellow Americans. In both cases, the need is clear, the demand is great, the Senate should act with dispatch.

NATIONAL TEACHERS CORPS IN WISCONSIN

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, Senators are aware that we shall soon be asked to consider the supplemental budget request for the National Teachers Corps.

During its first few months of operation the Teachers Corps has had a tremendous impact upon the disadvantaged school districts where corpsmen are working.

Dedicated, imaginative interns have worked long hours to reach the hard core problem children of the inner city and poor rural schools. They have been praised by school officials and teachers alike.

The Milwaukee Journal recently published an excellent article describing the work being done by Teachers Corps teams in Wisconsin.

I have the comments of principals of Wisconsin schools utilizing Teachers Corps teams as well as comments of school officials throughout the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the Milwaukee Journal article and the letters and remarks of the several school administrators be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Feb. 15, 1967]

Teacher Corps Pushes Ahead

(By Ralph D. Olive)

Classes were over for the day at Racine's Garfield elementary school, but not all the pupils—or teachers—had gone home.

Fifth grade boys were playing basketball in the gymnasium. In a room just off the gym, several other boys were working with plaster molds. On the auditorium-gymnasium stage, a boy and a girl worked together, repairing the school's puppet theater. Each of these activities was supervised by a member of the national teacher corps.

At about the same time, a pupil in Milwaukee's Rufus King high school had stayed after school to receive a special lesson in algebra—from a member of the teacher corps.

PROGRAM IS NEW

The national teacher corps program is something new. It is a plan to find dedicated, well educated men and women and to give them the special training to teach where they are needed most—in the central areas of large and medium sized cities, where so many children need special help. Although there are some corps programs in rural areas, the emphasis is on cities.

The teacher corps was organized nationally with the idea of helping children who are having considerable trouble in school, and who probably will drop out if they do not receive help and encouragement. Most of these pupils are members of minority groups—Negro, Puerto Rican, Indian, Mexican—and are from poor homes.

The aim of the teacher corps is to give these boys and girls at least some of the same educational opportunities that the majority of American children have today.

In Wisconsin, five schools are co-operating in the teacher corps program—Garfield school in Racine, and Wells Street junior high, Rufus King senior high, Vieau elementary and Fifth Street elementary schools in Milwaukee. The University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee and the Racine and Milwaukee public school systems are joint sponsors of the project.

Wisconsin's program, like those in other states, has two aims: To prepare teachers and to give special help to underprivileged pupils. The interns are men and women who want to teach in central city schools and are willing to devote two years of rigorous work and study to prepare themselves for such assignments.

The typical Wisconsin intern has a bachelor's degree, but not in education. The program aims to help the intern build on the knowledge and experience he already has and to give him teaching skills. At the end of the two years, the intern will receive a master's degree from the UWM and certification to teach. The intern's time is divided three ways: Taking classes at UWM, teaching and working in community activities.

UNITED STATES PAYS 90 PERCENT OF COST

Harvey Goldman, director of the Wisconsin program, explained that federal funds financed 90% of the program. The two public school systems involved—Racine and Milwaukee—pay 10% of their costs. The interns work with other teachers and administrators in the schools where they are assigned. Goldman, 28, is on the staffs of both UWM and the Milwaukee school system. He received a doctor's degree in education from Michigan State university last year and has had several years' experience teaching underprivileged children.

Although the teacher corps is a national program, it is carried out "very much on a local basis," Goldman said. There are 63 university centers for corps programs in the country and 130 public school systems are taking part. Sen. Nelson (D-Wis.) and Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) were co-sponsors of the legislation establishing the corps.

The program began last summer, with introductory courses at UWM for the interns. Many spent the summer living in Milwaukee's inner core, to get a grasp of the problems of children they would later teach.

Each school has an experienced teacher, called a team leader, who directs activities of the interns. Mrs. Mary Hansen, team leader at Garfield school in Racine, said: "My job is to act as co-ordinator, and help the interns become good teachers."

During the first semester this year, the interns tutored and worked with pupils in activities. This semester each is teaching two classes.

"WE'RE MAKING PROGRESS"

What is it like to be an intern in such an intensive program? Said Ladislaus Duic, 43, of Racine:

"I feel we're making progress. But sometimes it is discouraging. The kids like something new—then they all want to take part. But they soon lose interest; then you have to find something else."

One of Duic's more successful projects was a class newspaper.

"For the first issue, everyone wrote a story," he said. "But now no one has turned in anything for two weeks."

Duic's experience, Goldman said, is typical of teacher corps problems.

"These children have a short attention span," he said. "You have to keep changing activities."

Le Roy Fochs, also of Racine, has found the intern program rewarding but tiring. Fochs, 23, had little previous experience with urban poverty.

He has found the children are responsive, "if you use the right approach."

"They have a lot of enthusiasm, but they need direction," he said.

At Milwaukee's Rufus King high school the pupils are older, but the problems are much the same.

WHOLE NEW CAREER

Although King is not an inner city school in the usual sense, it does have a number of pupils who live in poor neighborhoods and have severe educational problems.

One of the interns there is beginning a whole new career at the age of 53. He is William Ware, who retired as an air force lieutenant colonel in December, 1965, after 28 years of service. Now he plans to be a teacher.

Miss Patricia Wiser, 25, of 1869 N. Cambridge av., has found that the key to teaching and counseling is to tie school work in with things that interest the pupils.

Miss Wiser assigned the pupils to write a report on the recent boxing match between Cassius Clay and Ernie Terrell. The result: Some of the best papers she has seen from her English class.

Another intern, Jerald Hauser, 26, of 4600 N. 49th st., said:

"I feel I have been able to do something—I have helped four or five students, directly, that I know of."

One of the pupils Hauser helped is Thomas Henry, 17, of 3355–A N. 10th st., a sophomore at Rufus King.

"Last year, I was failing all my subjects," Henry said. "Then Mr. Hauser started working with me. He came out to my house—asked me what I was interested in. I told him I liked to repair radios and record players. I'm interested in electronics. He encouraged me, and helped me get the job as manager of the basketball team. And he helped me with my subjects—I always did all right in math, but not so good in English and reading. Now I'm going to school regularly, and studying, and I'm passing all my subjects."

WILL COMPLETE SCHOOL

Now Henry, who last year was thinking of dropping out of high school, plans to graduate.

"I definitely plan to finish high school," he said. "I'm not sure about college—but I may go, or go to a technical school. I would like to study electronics."

So it goes in the life of a teacher corps intern—good moments and bad, enthusiasm and discouragement.

But, in moments of fatigue, the interns can take encouragement from those who appreciate their work. Such a person is John A. Powers, principal of Rufus King.

"I think the interns are doing a tremendous job," Powers said. "They have helped us a great deal. They have fresh ideas; they are not tied down to old concepts."

And that is what the teacher corps is about—fresh approaches to old problems.

Wells St. Junior High School,
Board of School Directors,
Milwaukee, Wis., February 15, 1967.

Hon. Gaylord Nelson,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Nelson: As we enter the second half of the school year which offered our first experience with the National Teacher Corps, I should like to take this opportunity to report to you on the progress of our Teacher Corps Team.

Wells Street Junior High School is a central city school with a non-white enrollment of approximately 60% and a large number of culturally disadvantaged pupils of various social and ethnic groups. Our total enrollment is 1068. Our Teacher Corps Team consists of four young interns, two men and two women, and a very competent team leader who has had teaching experience at this school.

I must admit that I had some reservation regarding the effectiveness of a National Teacher Corps when I was first approached regarding the assignment of such a group to this school. I questioned the administrative and teaching time involved and the facilities required in relation to expected results. I also considered the matter of relations between the team members and our regular teaching staff. However, my apprehensions proved to be groundless, and the Teacher Corps Team, under the capable direction of its team leader, has proven to be a valuable asset to the school and to its instructional program. Corps members have involved themselves in community activities and home contacts. They have offered valuable assistance in our attempts to improve attendance and tardiness, both of which are severe problems at this school. They have offered academic help to pupils individually and in small groups and have involved themselves in counseling on a one-to-one basis with problem pupils. They have acquainted themselves with pupil control problems by assisting our regular staff in the supervision of corridors and cafeteria.

The one problem which presented itself during the first half of this year was beyond the control of our school system and the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. This resulted from the uncertainty of funding when the Congress failed to provide the funds to carry out the program. Should the program continue—and I strongly recommend that it should—it is most advisable that the people in the program be given the status and security that comes with knowledge that their efforts are acceptable. Every effort should be made to provide funds and to plan for the coming year well in advance.

On behalf of the teaching staff of Wells Street Junior High School I wish to offer my sincerest appreciation for your interest and efforts in making the Teacher Corps a reality.

Sincerely yours,

John Schertzl,
Principal.

Rufus King High School
Board of School Directors,
Milwaukee, Wis., February 17, 1967.

Hon. Gaylord Nelson,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Nelson: I am very happy to restate my sentiments, concerning the National Teacher Corps.

Here at Rufus King High School we have seen the results of a remarkably happy marriage between an ingenious plan and a team of intelligent, sympathetic, energetic, and devoted, young Corps members. There has been a lessening of the work load for all; a marked increase in teacher morale; and, most important, an abrupt about-face in attitudes toward citizenship and scholarship on the part of some of our most difficult pupils.

We have exposed the Corpsmen to the entire scope of school experience, and they have passed each test admirably. Solutions for many of the problems they have tackled are not readily apparent. However, their ideas are fresh, and their concepts are new. They are not tied down to old, worn-out practices. We have every reason to hope that in the forseeable future the National Teacher Corps will contribute valuable insights into methods of dealing with deprived youngsters.

Very truly yours,

J. A. Powers,
Principal.

Unified School District No. 1,
Racine, Wis., February 17, 1967.

Hon. Gaylord Nelson,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Nelson: Garfield Elementary School in Racine has a Teacher Corps Team on its staff this year. As principal of the school, I feel they have been of much help to us. Garfield is an inner-city school with many socially, educationally, and economically disadvantaged children among its enrollment. The Team has been working in the areas of tutoring individuals and small groups, helping teachers with units of study in the classroom, making home visits and contacts, and operating after school activities for the children.

We have seen positive results educationally for many children because of the individual help the Team has provided. With the help of a Team member, the classroom teachers have been able to try and accomplish some exciting and interesting projects that have motivated learning for their students. The after school activities are correlated with learning situations during the regular school day. Because of these activities many children have a more positive attitude towards school and life in general.

I am looking forward to having this Team with us again for the next school year. I trust funds will be made available for this purpose.

Sincerely,

Roger M. Jones,
Principal.

Vieau School,
Milwaukee, Wis., February 17, 1967.

Hon. Gaylord Nelson,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Nelson: Last June three interns of the *National Teachers Corps* and a supervisor were assigned to Vieau for the summer session. Since the administrator of the summer school was my vice principal, I received a fine briefing on their performance and thereby had a good idea of what could be expected of them in fall. Then, too, I attended an orientation meeting in late summer which served to acquaint me fully with the program.

My expectations have been more than fulfilled. With the addition of two more interns (in January) we have a fine team of alert, conscientious and energetic young people in the process of learning and practicing the arts of teaching.

These interns, under the excellent immediate supervision of Miss Mary McLaughlin have been a boom to our school and community.

They have done some excellent work in small group and "one-on-one" intensive tutoring and counseling. They have taken "class disturbers" and have given these children a willing ear in which to pour their attention needs. They have increased the self concept—the sense of importance of our love starved problem children, and thereby alleviated the regular classroom teachers' frustrations on this score.

Our interns have organized and rehearsed various groups of children for school programs in connection with special projects and holiday recognition. They have refereed scheduled intramural athletic contests.

They have gone into the community, visited parents and have improved the school-home rapport.

In a word, they have been *invaluable* to our school and community.

Currently, they are engaged in full scale "practice" teaching. Each intern works under the classroom supervision of a master teacher. While it is impossible to continue the diverse activities afore mentioned while intensively engaged in student teaching, many of the individual tutoring programs are still maintained where there is a need.

In closing let me say that we at Vieau feel very fortunate in having the NTC with us. Their dedication, their flexibility (which is, perhaps, one of their greatest attributes) and their cooperation, have meant much to our school and community. They are valuable members of the team; we hope their training here will make them valuable members of our teaching profession.

Sincerely,

K. G. Place,
Principal.

COMMENTS ON THE TEACHER CORPS

I believe that the National Teacher Corps is one of the very best of all the new programs in education. I am constantly observing the fine fruits of this organization.

Jack J. Efurd,
Superintendent, Gentry Public Schools, Gentry, Ark.

There is no aspect of our society that needs more serious attention than that of education. There is no aspect of education that needs more serious attention than teacher training. There is no aspect of teacher training that needs more attention than the encouragement of young people to enter the teaching profession. The National Teacher Corps is an exciting new attempt to provide the encouragement needed for young people to enter teaching.

William N. McGowan,
Executive Secretary, California Association of Secondary School Administrators, Burlingame, Calif.

For the past four years my principal assignment has been working with and developing projects that have either been funded through Federal or State sources. I have seen many projects in operation, but as far as I am concerned the Teacher Corps stands far in the forefront as an excellent example of a joint partnership between the local school district, the University and the Federal government. The dedication and commitment on the part of the Corps members is truly outstanding. The Corps is a beacon light for those of us who have worked for many years in disadvantaged areas. Don't allow this light to burn out!

Don Hodes,
Assistant Superintendent, Enterprise City School District, Compton, Calif.

Teachers and residents of the Willowbrook School District are requesting additional teams of National Teacher Corpsmen. Their ability to work with teachers, parents and pupils has strengthened the total educational program. We have never witnessed such radical changes in a school district in such a short period of time.

Thurman C. Johnson,
Assistant Superintendent, Special Projects, Willowbrook School District, Los Angeles, Calif.

The program is an excellent one, for it has brought into the field of education people who are very much interested in the educational program for the disadvantaged. In order to really evaluate the success or failure of the program, it should be extended.

I would recommend that the school district be brought in to aid in the program of the interns' university work. There is a need for much closer communication with the university and also to strengthen the role of the team leader.

Robert L. Seaton,
Director, Special Projects, Jurupa Unified School District, Riverside, Calif.

The National Teacher Corps offers an outstanding opportunity to use a full year or more of intensive training or internship for potential teachers. This method of developing creative young people into professional educators to meet one of our country's great needs is imperative.

Unfortunately Colorado does not have a program operating by which direct comparison can be made.

CARL E. SLATT,
Director, Special Service, Sheridan Public Schools, Fort Logan, Colo.

My major reason for writing this letter is to suggest that as your program expands you might find members of the Teacher Corps who might be interested in coming to Hartford. When and if this occurs we will cooperate in every way. Perhaps as people leave the Teacher Corps they may be looking for permanent positions. If they are, I hope you will place Hartford on your list, for we will be interested in people who have warmth, concern, and a special love for kids.

MEDILL BAIR,
Superintendent of Schools, Hartford, Conn.

We believe the National Teacher Corps is serving several needs in education. 1. Many who would not otherwise enter teaching, are enrolled and are getting very fine training. 2. Children are receiving more individual help and direction which is already proving worthwhile in our schools here in Centralia. 3. The use of Corps teachers is causing services to be given to students and teachers which could not be given in the past for lack of personnel. The value is now obvious and Boards of Education will provide some of these services to their schools in the future. 4. By having 21 Corps members in our schools, we have seen orientation and innovation really in operation. This is good, I believe, since we're prone to continue exactly the same year after year. Teachers who hardly knew how to use assistance are definitely expanding their room programs, to the good of the youngsters.

W. E. MCALLISTER,
Superintendent, Centralia City Schools, Centralia, Ill.

The AFT is still keenly interested in the National Teacher Corps and we will do every thing possible to help make the NTC a vital force in American education . . .

Confusion regarding the purpose of the Teacher Corps has been responsible for much of the opposition to it. Teacher professionalists have feared that poorly trained youngsters trying to teach on enthusiasm alone will be put into positions which should be filled by fully certificated teachers . . . Other opponents have claimed that the Corps takes teachers out of the classroom instead of putting more teachers to work.

. . . The NTC should not be in the business of supplying "cannon fodder" for the high casualty sectors of the educational wars. Instead, the Corps should be a training ground for highly motivated and specially prepared new teachers who could not only survive but could also succeed in their educational missions . . . The NTC will begin to inject better prepared additional teachers into the nation's teaching force beginning with the 1968–69 school year, and the job cannot be done in any less time. Teacher Corps graduates can be expected to be more likely to make teaching their career than would teachers who have not had the benefit of such training. Thus teacher turnover would be reduced, and the total number of active teachers would be increased.

Experience has shown that it is wasteful to send beginning teachers with only a term of practice teaching into the schools on a sink-or-swim basis. The National Teachers Corps can perform a function not now being done adequately by our teacher training institutions. Furthermore, this is the proper function of the Corps, a function which fills a great and pressing national need.

CHARLES COGEN,
President, American Federation of Teachers, Chicago, Ill.

The Citizens Schools Committee voted at its board meeting of January 4 that it "affirm continuation of the National Teacher Corps," and that a committee be appointed to plan procedures toward this end.

ROBERT J. AHRENS,
President, Chicago Citizens Schools Committee, Chicago, Ill.

As an administrator in charge of two (Teacher Corps) teams functioning in our school district, I am not just a casual observer. The work of the interns has been well acepted by the children and teachers in our schools.

The head-teacher (team leader) constitutes a weak link in the program.

H. T. PETERSON,
Special Assistant to the Superintendent, Maywood Public Schools, Maywood, Ill.

Wolfe County School System was denied the N.T.C. for school year 1966–67 because of no housing. We are very sorry, for we need the program badly.

FRANK ROSE,
Superintendent, Wolfe County Schools, Compton, Ky.

It is a little program that is making a big difference in our system.

JOHN W. AMBROSE,
Acting Superintendent, Lexington City Schools, Lexington, Ky.

The Teacher Corps has every mark of being an effective and efficient means of solving one of our most serious national problems. It brings the university, the local education agency, the teachers in service, and corpsmen to grips with the *real* situation. Things will never be the same once the Corps has been there. We are all growing because of the Teacher Corps.

Sister M. LOYOLA,
Director, Teacher Education, Xavier University, New Orleans, La.

There are no National Teacher Corps persons in the State of Maine. We had applied, but were refused because none were trained for this area. We feel that the National Teacher Corps could perform a definite service in our system and we hope that the program will be continued so that our children will benefit.

RAYMOND BRENNICH,
Superintendent of Schools, Madawaska, Maine.

I am writing this letter to you as a general plea for the continuation of the National Teacher Corps established under the Higher Education Act of 1965. As a counselor to students in their senior year of college, I have an excellent opportunity to discuss their career choices with them. As you may realize, a significant portion of them are interested in a teaching career. What may interest you even more is that many of these students want to be able to combine the teaching experience with the more general aspect of social service to the people in underdeveloped and impoverished areas. As the federal programs stand presently, students interested in such a program are forced to go into the Peace Corps.

However, many students feel that in addition to the opportunities provided by the Peace Corps, there are many places in the United States (E.G., Appalachia) which would provide just such an opportunity. At its inception, the National Teacher Corps satisfied the need for this type of program. It combined all the good aspects of the teaching profession with the needs of the impoverished areas in this country. Students were interested in the program when it was organized and, if anything, they are even more interested in it now. I hope that as the year progresses, the need for the continuation of this program will be realized and that it will receive the support from the Congress that it so rightly deserves.

LAWRENCE F. STEVENS,
Assistant Director, Office for Graduate and Career Plans, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Our participation in a program with the National Teacher Corps has provided a new avenue in which we might mutually attack problems inherent in disadvantaged areas.

In the opinion of those of us working closely with these problems, Corpsmen have made a very vital contribution toward making life richer for the children of poverty.

I suggest 1) that during the two-year period, a well structured, formalized practice teaching period be incorporated; and 2) that a much closer working relationship between the local education agency and the participating college be effected.

JOHN E. DEADY,
Superintendent of Schools, Springfield Public Schools, Springfield, Mass.

We have some great people in our Teacher Corps and I hope to find similar competence in Minneapolis.

JOHN B. DAVIS, Jr.,
Former Superintendent of Schools, Worcester Public Schools, Worcester, Mass., Superintendent of Schools, Minneapolis, Minn.

We had the opportunity of having four members of the National Teacher Corps join our staff in September of 1966. We have found their services to be extremely helpful and beneficial to the students with whom they have been working.

The members of our team have a sincere dedication to their work and their contributions have been many.

They have worked with children with reading disabilities, offered opportunities in creative dramatics, provided individual help to students in Language Arts, participated in an after school study center, cooperated with Head-Start teachers in creative dramatics, worked with individuals and small groups in elementary science projects and given help to students in creative writing activities.

We have found our Teacher Corps members to be very interested in this program and have devoted many hours over and above that normally expected in helping students they service.

As stated above, their contributions have been many. We are proud to be a part of the National Teacher Corps program and have witnessed the progress children can make under the guidance and influence of people in this program.

ROBERT E. BAILEY,
Assistant for Instruction, Oak Park School District, Oak Park, Mich.

The work of the three Teacher Corps teams in the Pontiac area has been outstanding. As a method of teacher training and community service it is one of the most useful innovations implemented by the federal government.

B. C. VANDOUGHNETT,
Director, Community Action Programs, Pontiac School District, Pontiac, Mich.

I think the N.T.C. is a very fine program and can do lots of good in our schools. It will help train people to go into the teaching profession that are needed so badly now. The team we have in our country is doing a wonderful job. I hope there will be money appropriated to continue this worthy program.

CARL LOFTIN,
Superintendent, Marion County Schools, Columbia, Miss.

The National Teacher Corps is the brightest beam of hope the children on the (Indian) reservation have yet seen. Our remote locale and the low salaries we pay have impeded our attempts to get qualified teachers.

ALFRED GILPIN,
President of Tribal Council, Member of the School Board, Macy, Nebr.

The Teacher Corps is one of the most practical ways of training teachers specifically for poverty and under-privileged children that I have encountered. It takes degreed people who desire to serve in this capacity and places them in situations where they get practical experience in methods and further attitude development. The Corps is essential to metropolitan school districts because no other agency is adequately facing this problem in this time of teacher shortage. This work, which supplements the work done at the colleges and universities, must continue if we are to face the problem of educating children in poverty area schools at this time.

PAUL J. TURNQUIST,
Assistant Superintendent, Omaha Public Schools, Omaha, Nebr.

I am most pleased to endorse the concept of the National Teacher Corps. While we have had a number of problems with the program this first year in Trenton, we have been generally pleased with the progress being made. The inner city school today needs assistance from the federal level in many ways, and the National Teacher Corps is a dramatic way of expressing federal concern for our problems. The Teacher Corps team at our Jefferson School is beginning to make a significant contribution. We have recently set up a planning committee in this school to assist this team in learning better ways of meeting the needs of the inner city child and in carrying out a number of innovative programs.

My only suggestion is that there should be more participation in the early stages by the public school personnel before a Teacher Corps team is sent to a community.

RICHARD T. BECK,
Superintendent of Schools, Trenton, N.J.

The Teacher Corps team assigned to our school district has been of outstanding help in working with low-income, Spanish-speaking children who are in need of extra help and encouragement in school work. Additionally, we view the Corps as an exceptionally practical way to prepare teachers who have both the techniques and understanding needed to work with such children.

We feel that the team leader's salary is set too high. For example, our team leader is paid more than the principal of the school in which he works. Let me emphasize, however, that the program has been very worthwhile, and that our principal in this situation would not for one moment give up his team because of the compensation factors. It is *my* feeling that he is being dealt with unfairly when he contributes freely so much time and effort on behalf of a group whose leader is being paid more than he is for doing a much smaller job.

JAMES P. MILLER,
Assistant Superintendent, Gadsden Independent School District, Anthony, N. Mex.

We feel that the Teacher Corps team at Hatch Valley Municipal School, Hatch, New Mexico, is fulfilling the expectations we had in requesting it.

In personal qualities and professional dedication the interns are the kind of prospective teachers we are happy to employ.

M. E. LINTON,
Superintendent, Hatch Valley Municipal School District No. 11, Hatch, N. Mex.

I know an arithmetic teacher named Mr. Fenton Strickland, who is a Teacher Corps intern. He is a nice man. I like when he comes to get me to go with him. He never scolds me, so I am good with him. I am good all the time and also I do my homework. He only helps me with the problems. I do all the rest. I hope that I can go to arithmetic with him every day.

ANTHONY STRICKLAND,
(no relation)
Sixth Grade, School 8, Buffalo, N.Y.

Numerous Columbia students are inquiring at this office about the National Teacher Corps, but we have been able to give them little current information. They are interested in applying, but when I telephoned headquarters last week they said the future is uncertain.

As far as Columbia University goes, the uncertainty of your future programs is a shame, since National Teacher Corps appeals to many here as a first-class introduction to teaching and service together. There is so much enthusiasm for the program among some of our best students that we would hate to see it founder. With what they could offer the program and what the program could offer them, we hope the kinks get ironed out. Please keep us posted.

RICHARD M. GUMMERE, Jr.,
Director, Career Planning Division, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

One of the most encouraging aspects of education today is the interest which both professional educators and enlightened members of the community are taking in finding better approaches to the solution of our problems. It is only natural, therefore, that we should be interested in the National Teacher Corps and what it is trying to do not only to increase the supply of competent teachers but also to stimulate further improvement in those who are already teaching.

HARRY R. RIVLIN,
Dean of the School of Education, Fordham University, New York, N.Y.

We have been pleased and impressed with the manner in which the National Teacher Corps program is operating at the present time. Not only are the corpsmen being gradually inducted into the teaching profession, but they have been getting fine training in successful ways in which to teach disadvantaged children. Moreover, they have been rendering valuable community service working directly with children from the schools to which they are assigned. We feel confident that at the end of their training period the corpsmen will develop into outstanding teachers of disadvantaged youth.

We suggest that the program be shortened to consist of an initial preservice summer program, a full school year of internship, and a second summer of course work. At the end of this full calendar year the corpsmen should be ready to take over full-time teaching assignments.

THEODORE H. LANG,
Deputy Superintendent of Schools, New York City, N.Y.

I should like to call your attention to the outstanding service the Teacher Corps is performing at our school. Not only are they doing very effective work in their small-group instruction, but they also help out in time of special need or emergency situations. They have been most helpful and cooperative. They have become good teachers and are performing an essential service to the school.

JOSEPH STRELL,
Principal, Public School 155, New York, N.Y.

While it is too early to base support of the National Teacher Corps on actual performance, there is no doubt whatever as to the usefulness and the value of this program. Because of uncertainties over funding, difficulties were encountered in New York City last summer but those teachers who were trained and placed, according to preliminary reports, are living up to the high expectations that accompanied the plan.

NTC can make a tremendous contribution to the improvement of the education and well-being of children in the disadvantaged area of New York and other large cities and it is our fervent hope that Congress can be brought to understand the importance of this project and to arrange for adequate longterm support.

FREDERICK C. MCLAUGHLIN,
Director, Public Education Association, New York, N.Y.

We have the Teacher Corps in our school system and it is doing a wonderful job for us. Corpsmen are helping the minority groups in our school develop a better self-image of themselves and also their work has improved immensely with the aid of the Corps. We have been able to offer many things for these students which we were unable to do before this time.

I think it has been handled very well this year. The only thing wrong was the delay in funding the program which caused a delay in our plans. However, I realize that it was not your fault in this matter.

MARVIN STOKES,
Superintendent of Schools, Byng School, Ada, Okla.

The team from the National Teacher Corps that has been working in our school during the 1966–67 school year is doing fine work. Corpsmen have assessed the school situation here well and in most instances have cooperated in an excellent way with our school faculty, students, parents, and other citizens of this community. I feel that it is a very worthwhile program.

A. W. BARRETT,
Superintendent, Konawa Public Schools, Konawa, Okla.

What we are doing at the college is learning from National Teacher Corps. Oh, we are teaching. We have some very good teachers working with the Corpsmen. No doubt! But more than that, *we are learning*. What Dr. Sorber said about the already visible effects of NTC upon our programming is truer than even he knows. Truer, perhaps than even I know, but I do know that we are even now planning to revise our total undergraduate and graduate teacher education program. The kinds of things we are learning through NTC about involving potential teachers with people in the community—the kinds of things we are learning about involving potential teachers with other teachers in the school in which these potential teachers are working, and with administrators and students in these schools, the kinds of things we are learning about giving these people an opportunity to use their own creative abilities and intelligences instead of constantly telling them precisely what it is that they ought to do so that they can be made in our mold. It is teaching us what we need to do in teacher education. I think it's very safe to predict that the fringe benefit of the NTC money will be to revitalize teacher education throughout the United States.

LEON OSVIEW,
Assistant Dean, College of Education, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.

I have had the pleasure of seeing several of our Teacher Corps teams in operation during the past four months.

I have been delighted with their services to the school, and especially their services to the community.

I would very much like to see this program not only continued but expanded greatly because of what it is doing to help disadvantaged children.

THOMAS C. ROSICA,
Director of Federal Programs, Board of Education, the School District of Philadelphia, Pa.

If the Corps should end tomorrow, the College of Education at Temple would never be the same. We are constantly incorporating the new techniques we've learned with Teacher Corps into the regular curriculum for all education majors.

DR. EVAN SORBER,
Assistant Professor of Early Childhood and Elementary Education, Assistant Director, Teacher Corps Project, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.

While the National Teacher Corps has been plagued with a variety of problems, I am one who still stands strongly behind the program. It is a fine beginning toward improved practices of recruiting and training of teaching personnel for schools in our country serving substantial numbers of disadvantaged boys and girls. I still look for this program to change for the better but I think it would be a mistake to stop what we have begun.

You might well borrow the President's phrase which he used shortly after taking office, "Let us continue."

PHILIP EBY MCPHERSON,
Director of Development, Pittsburgh Public Schools, Pittsburgh, Pa.

The Teacher Corps has been a boon in the Moore Elementary School. Small groups working with the interns have been provided with individualized instruction in art, science and reading. Teachers are delighted with their competence and cooperation.

We hope that this innovative program will continue and that we can secure the services of more interns.

WHELER MATTHEWS,
Principal, Moore Elementary School, Sumter School District No. 17, Sumter, S.C.

We are pleased to have a Teacher Corps program in operation in our school district and hope that the program will be continued and, if possible, expanded.

MORGAN E. EVANS,
Superintendent, Galveston Independent School District, Galveston, Tex.

My school was fortunate in being able to secure the services of two teachers from the National Teacher Corps program. These two teachers are working in our elementary schools with children from low income families. Marked improvement, after four months, is noted in the attitudes and learning processes of these children as a result of the work of these two Corps members. My school's finances could not have made possible the services of these teachers except for the Teacher Corps.

I need one more teacher from the Teacher Corps for high school work, especially in the field of choral music and speech.

F. C. BURNETT,
Superintendent, Fannindel Schools, Ladonia, Tex.

Our school has one Corps teacher. He is working with seven teachers as a trainee which relieves them for a few minutes each day and helps over two hundred students from grades one to six. The Corps makes this possible. Just arrange for more.

JOHN R. MEADOWS,
Superintendent, Simms Common School District 6, Simms, Tex.

Staff members from two school systems where the NTC members are employed have stated that these new employees have enriched their curriculum and express the desire to continue the employment of Corps members.

REX SMITH,
State Superintendent of Schools, West Virginia.

The National Teacher Corps as I know it in my district has made a definite contribution to the education of educationally disadvantaged children. An investment in education is certainly not money misused.

HENRY A. RAY,
Assistant Superintendent, Wayne County Schools, Wayne, W. Va.

As principal of an inner city elementary school, I have greatly appreciated our Teacher Corps team and their efforts this year. Being able to have greater individualization of instruction, starting community school activities for our children, and enriching the experiences of disadvantaged youth are just a few of the present benefits. The greatest good will be realized when these specially trained personnel become inner city teachers.

ROGER M. JONES,
Principal, Harfield Elementary School, Racine, Wis.

The Corpsmen come prepared to accept the situation. They have a very realistic approach to teaching, and their work on a one-to-one basis has lessened the demand on the students who are beginning to think of the school in a new light—one of helpfulness. The Corps is very important to this school.

KENNETH PLACE,
Principal, Vieau School, Milwaukee, Wis.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS: THE MANAGEMENT POINT OF VIEW

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, Mr. Virgil B. Day, vice president of personnel and industrial relations services, General Electric Co., recently made a speech before the annual personnel conference, American Management Association in New York. In my opinion, his talk is one of the best I have seen in the labor relations field in some time. His analysis of the urgent problem confronting Congress and the Nation should receive the serious attention of all of us.

Mr. Day states the problem, in brief, this way: Unless labor-management confrontations stop injuring the bystanders—public—more than the participants, the public is going to force a substitute procedure for free collective bargaining and the right to strike.

Legislation that truly would be helpful would preserve the right to strike while limiting its impact to the company and employees involved. One important step would be to prohibit coalition bargaining and industrywide bargaining, both of which escalate the prospects of national emergencies. Another step: Provide safeguards for employees—such as secret ballot—to enable them to register in safety their views on such vital decisions as strikes.

Imposed settlements cannot work. And measures somewhere between present collective bargaining procedures and compulsory arbitration—such as fact-finding boards, temporary government seizure of plants, and so forth—are merely "delaying and decorative."

The threat of third-party intervention—and this does not include the work of the Mediation and Conciliation Service—bars any incentive to settlement through negotiation, Mr. Day points out. Labor knows that it can gain by provoking intervention, so the incentive is to threaten the public with the prospect of a damaging strike in order to provoke an early push on the intervention panic-button.

Even the worst injury to the public from a strike-caused interruption of service is only temporary, however. The injury to the public from unsound settlements may be felt for a generation. Therefore, there is no national profit in a smoothly running, strike-free, painless method of negotiating outsized labor costs that feed inflation. Nor is there national profit in giving away employee rights and management rights as the price for industrial peace.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S AHEAD FOR LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS?

THE MANAGEMENT POINT OF VIEW

(Remarks of Virgil B. Day, vice president, personnel and industrial relations services, General Electric Co., before the annual personnel conference, American Management Association, New York, N.Y., Feb. 8, 1967.)

Gentlemen. I note that at lunch we are to hear from Vince Lombardi, a notably successful manager of a business organization known as the Green Bay Packers (and they do mean business). I have heard that a colleague of Mr. Lombardi's once objected to the description of football as a contact sport. Dancing is a contact sport, he said—football is a *collision* sport.

Perhaps we should say that collective bargaining, too, has become not a contact sport, but more frequently collision bargaining—and innocent by-standers are more and more being hurt in the crash.

This pervasive trend—a really new development—has given the public all too much reason for irritation and sometimes indignation, and even a loss of confidence, in the collective bargaining process. If not corrected, this drift of events could lead to the substitution by the public's representatives in Government of some mechanism to replace collective bargaining and the right to strike.

The public is becoming rightfully concerned over labor-management disputes apparently growing out of the reckless pursuit of self-interest, at the expense of the *common* interest in a healthy economy.

Item: The apparently growing frequency and seriousness of national emergency and "public-inconveniencing" strikes;

Item: Increasing disputes over new attempts to rearrange the structure of bargaining so as to escalate the impact of labor-management disputes, through industry-wide bargaining, or the new union technique of "coalition" bargaining, or other devices, which often seem aimed at . . .

Item: making Government intervention more and more seem necessary, as the Administration sees vital public needs threatened by one dispute after another;

Item: adoption of the strike as an economic weapon in places where we are not accustomed to seeing it used—local government, school, hospitals, even symphony orchestras, are striking this discordant note.

And there are other aspects as well that appear to have an increasingly adverse impact upon the public.

Many legislative programs are advanced these days as panaceas for the current crisis in labor-management relations. Rather than add my own pet contributions to this tower of babel, I would like to use the next brief minutes for three basic considerations which hopefully may help get in focus the more specific question of what to do.

I

For the first point, I think it is useful to look at what has happened from an historical perspective.

The strike originally was developed as an economic weapon with which *unions* could pressure the enterprise for which management is accountable, so as to achieve better wages, hours, or working conditions for *employees*.

The main source of public agitation *now*, absent which there would be no great demand for legislation, is basically this: that the strike has now become a weapon, used by *unions* still, but which injures the *public* almost more than *management* or the enterprise at times.

Management never welcomes a particular strike; but basically management must be willing to pay the price of free collective bargaining and is *more* concerned over what *alternatives* might be imposed, if the public eventually gets fed up and blows the whistle.

Management is thus in the seemingly paradoxical position of seeking to redirect the prime impact of the strike back on itself, back on the enterprise, and away from the public. This is not altruistic position, but pure self-interest; if the public is not better protected from the impact of strikes, it will demand legislation imposing alternatives which management would find far *less* palatable than strikes.

Such historical perspective is useful in pointing the way toward *what* kind of legislation might be helpful. What we need basically are measures which would *preserve* the strike but *limit* its impact to the *enterprise* and the management against which it is directed, *protecting* the *public*. This is what the current Taft-Hartley 80-day injunction procedure attempts to do for truly national emergency situations. A far more basic way of limiting the impact of strikes on the public would be measures which would *de-escalate* the scope of bargaining impasses. If this is true, the rise of such new approaches as coalition bargaining, like the old one of industry-wide bargaining, go in precisely the *wrong* direction. The very *purpose* of coalition bargaining seems to be to escalate the prospects of industry-crippling strikes and thereby create the kinds of national emergencies which are going to kill collective bargaining if they do not stop.

The key to our legislative problem may be to find ways to limit the scale of bargaining confrontations, so that the public can continue to get the service it needs, while simultaneously not interfering with a proper balance of management and union strategies for dealing with each other within the framework of free collective bargaining. Carefully drawn legislative restraints on coalition bargaining may be needed, if pursuit of this tactic continues to generate crisis bargaining situations. Over the years, other proposals have been advanced that try to go in this direction.

Some of these proposals may seem a bit stiff, and perhaps politically unpopular. But if Congress is serious about wanting to *protect* the *public* from the *impact* of "intolerable" strikes, while still *preserving* the *right* to strike and its impact on the *employer*, some such approach will be necessary. Hopefully, thoughtful union and management leadership will be far-sighted enough to recognize the nature of this growing threat to the voluntary processes of bargaining and will demonstrate new resourcefulness responsive to the institutional needs of the parties, and the requirements of the public.

Furthermore, an additional objective should be to provide *employees* with safeguards that enable them to register their views on vital decisions, such as whether or not to strike. For example, it might be useful in today's new climate to re-examine the usefulness of requiring that all strike decisions be made by secret ballot, as then-Congressman John F. Kennedy approved in 1947. Despite the fact that secret ballot votes may have seemed superfluous at an earlier time, such recent trends as members rejecting agreements, centralized bargaining and other new facts in the picture make a re-examination of this requirement well worthwhile—particularly if we consider ballots taken *after* a strike has been called, say, 10 days or 30 days after, or at stated intervals. While we're at it, why not require that a majority of the members of the bargaining unit (not just those encouraged to vote) be required to authorize a strike?

II

Now let me turn to a second general proposition, which is simply this: in dealing with disputes which the public regards as intolerable, *either* the parties solve their own disputes between themselves; *or* settlements will, in fact, be imposed by third parties (normally compulsory arbitration).

Fact-finding by public boards, recommendations, temporary Government seizure, or the currently popular proposal to provide the President with a varied "arsenal of weapons"—the notion that such in-between measures can successfully stop short of third-party settlement is an illusory one. Such techniques have been described as merely "delaying and decorative," on the road to compulsory arbitration. Fundamentally, either a third party takes over the decision-making, or it doesn't.

I realize that this proposition robs many current proposals of their aura of novelty or sophistication. But experience leaves little doubt that whenever an imposed settlement is available down at the end of the road, the party which thinks it might gain from such intervention will make sure that the dispute gets dragged down that road.

Let me offer a personal reminiscence about the bargaining in the electrical industry last fall. In the case of the national contract with the IUE, the Union's eleventh-hour decision as to whether to accept our offer or not seemed clearly to hinge on the prospects for intervention. Just imagine the logic of those who wanted to try the intervention route. They were in the position of saying roughly this:

"Why take this company offer when you haven't even tried to see whether intervention will bring more? You have nothing to lose by going to Washington and possibly something to gain. So what point is there in signing now and not at least trying the intervention route?"

Under the circumstances that existed then, it must be conceded that this was an entirely logical argument. Its application in almost any other negotiations were third-party intervention was available would seem equally logical.

In our case, the rest of our negotiations were spent in Washington, D.C., at the invitation of the President, where we engaged in free collective bargaining with the help of Secretary McNamara, Secretary Connor, Secretary Wirtz, numerous under secretaries and assistant secretaries, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and about everyone else in Washington, except Mr. Powell, whom I believe was busy in either Puerto Rico or Bimini.

It has been sagely observed that, in this business, if the President of the United States hangs out his shingle, he'll get all the business. The same, in lesser degree, can be said about imposed settlements of any kind.

I want to make it very clear that these observations relate to imposed settlements, not to the entirely different and useful role of the Mediation Service. Mediation, depending as it does on the creative ideas of the mediator, without any element of compulsion, is in clear contrast to the essentially compulsive nature of the other route. Unfortunately, the public does not generally understand the extent to which already free collective bargaining does proceed successfully with access to the Mediation Service when this is useful. Perhaps part of the needed legislative correction might be found in some strengthening of the mediator role.

Nor should my objections to imposed settlements be misconstrued as critical of the Taft-Hartley injunction procedure for truly national emergency situations. The public is entitled to such protection where vital national interests are a stake. Furthermore, the injunction procedure does not *impose* a settlement; it merely extends bargaining—and in almost all cases where the injunction has been involved, a settlement has been reached *by the parties themselves* during the 80-day period.

Imposed settlements don't work and won't work in the public interest. If the employees don't like them, they won't ratify the agreement; if the agreement is rammed down their throats, they'll still walk off the job. If the employer doesn't like an imposed agreement, he often has little choice, though I would hope a sense of fairness would concede his right not to have to accept it either; after all, he is accountable to his share owners for running a profitable business after the terms are put into effect.

So, while Congress considers what legislation to enact or not to enact, they might want to consider this cogent point recently made by economist Irving Siegel:

"Sometimes it is better just to stand there and think a while than to do something that happens to have been recommended by an itinerant or casual expert; or by a scholartician privileged for a spell to sit at a console of state and to practice his curiosity at public risk, without a requirement to post a personal performance bond."

Of course, under imposed settlements, the third party that makes the decision doesn't have to live with the results. In a very real sense, the union and management negotiators *do* post a personal performance bond every time they negotiate, in that they are held accountable—by their union members in the one case, and their top managers or boards of directors in the other.

The only workable answers to labor-management disputes then are ones which the parties work out themselves, one way or another.

The basic problem can be seen in this light: there is no *incentive* to settle through negotiations where one party or the other thinks it will probably gain by provoking intervention; in fact, there is a positive incentive to threaten the public with the prospect of a damaging strike so that, politically, the intervention panic button must be pushed.

If this is the case, the creation of more sophisticated or ingenious methods of third-party imposed settlements is missing the whole point. Those who earnestly urge such a course are in the position of the driver who knows he's taken a wrong turn and is headed in the wrong direction but takes consolation in the knowledge that at least he's making good time.

Actually, a more fundamental approach would be to try to remove the basic conditions which enable disputes to reach the level at which they are intolerable to the public. This brings us back again to some type of proposal which would limit the scope of bargaining confrontations.

I really do not think the thorny issue of public emergencies or major inconveniences is going to be ever put to rest unless we face up to scaling down the *economic power* to inflict such damage on the public. The only alternatives are to destroy free collective bargaining—and nobody wants to do this—or to let the present situation drift—and the parties had better understand that the public won't tolerate this.

III

Now, let me move on briefly to the third general consideration I wish to raise.

This much of what I have said has all concerned the *mechanics* of reaching agreements—not the substantive *content* of the agreements reached. But the public has at least as much reason to be concerned about the economics of the agreements reached as it is about the admittedly more dramatic controversies through which we pass in trying to reach them. In fact, the inconvenience of interrupted service during an unresolved dispute is at least a *temporary* injury to the public; the injury which results from an unsound level of settlements may be felt for a generation.

So when all of the debate and discussion about the *mechanics* of negotiating agreements is over, we should always come back and look at the *results* of those agreements. The ends never justify the means—but the means don't justify the ends either.

We don't want to end up with a smoothly-running, strike-free, painless method of negotiating such outsized labor costs that inflation is never again under control. Nor do I, for one, want to watch employees rights or management responsibilities given away across the bargaining table as the price of industrial peace.

The efforts of Government to promote a wage-price policy consistent with economic stability have been productive of only one new tool that steers clear of the control route. This is the much buffeted concept of guideposts.

To some in both union and management circles, the real subtitle of the new Economic Report of the President is "Gravestones for Guideposts." Indeed, many seem to be actually crowing over the alleged demise of the noninflationary guidepost, as if someone could gain some kind of a victory by destroying the basis for a noninflationary wage-price policy.

An objective reading of the Economic Report itself, as contrasted with the headlines, shows that the reports of death are exaggerated. The Council is indeed explicit in stating its belief that:

"the government must take an active and *continuing* interest in interpreting and explaining the guideposts."

Note the use of the word "continuing." The Council Chairman testified in Congressional hearings last week that once price stability is regained, "we can have a more specific standard again." Couple this with another official's recent suggestion that we will need "second generation" guideposts, and it might be more accurate to say that the guideposts are not dead, but in hibernation. Perhaps, like the groundhog, they saw the shadow of something and decided to go back in hiding for awhile.

But let us not make the short-sighted mistake—so short-sighted, it would be blind—of supposing that in the meantime all bets are off on price-cost stability . . . and hold on to your hats and grab all you can get before everybody else does. The public will not forever accept a three percent plus rate of inflation; nor will it tolerate an attitude of putting private economic gain ahead of the national interest in economic stability.

As an educational tool, the guideposts may have been helpful to the public in evaluating the desirability of specific wage or price actions. If they are not now appropriate, what is to be used in their place. Is the public left to fall back on curbstone judgments of conflicting claims and counterclaims? Or is the power of persuasion to be replaced entirely by the persuasion of power?

It may turn out that the guideposts' principal value was as a sophisticated technique for dampening the impact of union power. If we refuse to accept guideposts or some suitable alternative (and, if so, what?) in the way of a noninflationary standard, we may have to come face to face with the existence of economic power in our system today.

In the last analysis, no private power or political authority can alter certain basic economic interrelationships of wages, productivity and prices; average wage increases over the long run need to keep in step with national productivity increases, if we are to avoid cost inflation, in which a rising cost of living will rob workers of much of what they think they have gained.

When the wage-price spiral gets rolling, we all need to bring ourselves up short and remind ourselves of several basic economic propositions: that whether or not any precise "guidepost" is the right figure, real incomes for the economy as a whole cannot long increase at a faster pace than the economy's productivity increases (assuming high-level employment)—that is, that we cannot, as an economy, pay ourselves more real income than we produce; that if one group tries to force through greater money wage increases than improved national productivity will support, something has to give (and someone has to lose); that any increase in product prices must today be weighed in the light of *new worldwide competitive forces* that have never been as significant for the American economy as they have now become.

Collective bargaining is often judged and found wanting today on its inability to produce prompt and peaceful settlements. But, while we bend our best efforts toward improving the *process* of reaching settlements, let us remember that history will judge collective bargaining on the responsibility and relevance of those settlements, far more than how they were reached. Will history judge that free collective bargaining failed? The answer is in substantial measure up to us.

BIG BROTHER

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the American Bar Association is again to be commended for its efforts in explaining to the general public various complex problems of law and policy. In yesterday's Denver Post, the "Family Lawyer" column discussed some ramifications of wiretapping and eavesdropping as it relates to the individual privacy of our American citizens. The "Family Lawyer" column, according to the Denver Post, is designed as general commonsense outlines of legal issues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article from the Denver Post of February 15, 1967.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FAMILY LAWYER

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is another in a series of discussions by Will Bernard, a member of the American Bar Association. The columns are designed as general common sense outlines of legal issues and are not intended as legal advice upon which to base court action. The Denver Post cannot answer questions on matters of law. The Family Lawyer will appear each week in The Post.)

Inside the olive of a martini, under the handle of a briefcase, behind the knob on a dashboard, within the cavity of a tooth—in all these places, electronic "bugs" have been hidden for the purpose of eavesdropping.

The startling sophistication of such devices has lent new cunning to both the spy and the counterspy, to both the law violator and the law enforcer.

It has also raised one of the touchiest legal issues of the day: should the information obtained in this manner be valid evidence in the courtroom?

Since the circumstances vary so widely, there can be no simple answer. However, certain basic principles are already pretty well established.

Thus eavesdropping evidence is not acceptable if it was obtained by unlawfully breaking into a person's home.

In one case, police broke into the home of a suspected bookie and planted an electronic bug under a chest of drawers. Sure enough, the recordings indicated that the man was guilty.

But a court rejected this evidence, because the police had ignored the constitutional ban on unreasonable search.

"It is preferable that some criminals go free," said the court, "than that the right or privacy of all the people be set at naught."

On the other hand, the mere fact that the eavesdropping was done secretly does not spoil it as evidence. For example:

A revenue agent, talking with a suspected tax dodger, had a wire recorder hidden in his pocket. During the conversation the man offered a bribe, duly recorded on the wire.

But in this case there had been no breaking into private quarters. Furthermore, the suspect, by merely talking to the revenue agent, had knowingly taken the risk that the agent might tattle on him.

Holding this evidence admissible, the court pointed out that the agent himself could testify to the conversation—and the recording device simply did the job better.

In short, the law is seeking to strike a fair balance between the desire for personal privacy and the need for fighting crime. Research and study in this area are intense. And, as legal arguments go, the debate is passionate.

But so it should be. In a free land, this is basic business.

MULTILATERAL FOREIGN AID

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am pleased to note that President Johnson has given special emphasis to multilateral assistance in his foreign aid message to the Congress. It is a matter of concern to me and to many of my colleagues.

Our foreign aid agency, the Agency for International Development, clearly intends to expand its efforts to work through multilateral agencies and arrangements.

AID Administrator William S. Gaud said recently that he believes strongly that the United States must work both through multilateral aid agencies, like the World Bank, and also through bilateral programs between ourselves and other individual nations.

Mr. Gaud's statements to the effect that AID is working more and more through consortia is very encouraging. I am in full support of this technique whereby we join with other donor nations and multilateral agencies themselves to work out development programs for individual nations and regions as well.

I am also very interested in the continuing assistance that the United States gives to the United Nations, the World Bank, its International Development Association and its International Finance Corporation, the Inter-American Development Bank.

United Nations development assistance, provided through a variety of programs and agencies, has increased steadily, reaching a total of $279 million in fiscal year 1966. U.S. contributions to 71 international organizations and programs during fiscal year 1965 totaled $326 million.

The United States has been a leader in encouraging international coordination of aid. It has made great strides in setting up and using international and regional organizations and multilateral institutions to coordinate aid in some countries. More than 84 percent of our development lending proposed for fiscal year 1967 was committed through multilateral consortia or consultative groups.

Benefits derived from cooperating with international organizations in foreign aid include the generation of additional financial and technical resources from other developed countries and the more favorable reception of programs when offered by multilateral organizations rather than by a single donor country.

A PLUS FOR PEACE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, no one in this Chamber, I am sure, can be oblivious to the great chorus of praise for the space treaty.

Men everywhere are weary of hostility and implore their leaders to work for peace in every way possible.

The space treaty is a significantly promising way. Quick approval is called for by a trenchant editorial in the Houston Post.

As the Post puts it:

> An enduring peace is something that must be built slowly, step by step. The space treaty is only one brick in the structure. But it could be a very important one, and its placing could lead to the placing of other bricks.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Houston Post of February 10, 1967, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Houston Post, Feb. 10, 1967]

QUICK SPACE PACT VOTE ASKED

President Johnson has asked the United States Senate for prompt ratification of the treaty worked out within the framework of the United Nations by which practically all nations of the earth would agree not to use outer space or celestial bodies for military purposes. There should be a minimum of argument and delay.

In effect, the pact limits the arms race and the continuing East-West conflict to this planet, its atmosphere and the nearer reaches of space which might be entered by intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Since the treaty was opened for signatures on Jan. 27 in Washington, London and Moscow, more than 60 nations have signed it. All members of the UN and some others are expected to subscribe to the agreement, but the pact really is between the United States and the Soviet Union since they are the only countries which have a significant ability to operate in space at this time.

President Johnson said that the pact is "a first step, but a long step, toward assuring the peace." It will be if everyone lives up to its terms, and it will be practically impossible to conceal any violations.

Under terms of the treaty, no nuclear weapons or other means of mass destruction would be introduced into space, into orbit around the earth or on celestial bodies. No subscribing nation would make a claim to sovereignty over outer space or over celestial bodies, and none would establish military bases or conduct weapons tests on the moon or other celestial bodies.

All signatory nations would have access to vehicles and installations in outer space. They would report their space activities and results for the benefit of all nations. They would avoid harmful contamination of outer space, and they would return safely astronauts of another nation who might land on their territory.

Operation of the "spy" satellites used by both the United States and the Soviet Union to keep each other under surveillance would not be affected.

People of the earth have been plagued by a haunting fear ever since a space capability began to be developed that outer space and celestial bodies might be used for military purposes. The treaty should ease these fears, although it will be necessary to maintain a vigilant watch to see that it is observed strictly. At the very least, the day when human quarrels and conflicts will be extended beyond the earth and its immediate environs should be delayed.

Actually, space experts of both the United States and the Soviet Union believe that there is no practical value in using space or celestial bodies for military purposes. Any weapons placed in orbit or launched from the moon not only would be excessively expensive but would be inaccurate and slow in comparison with missiles launched from the surface of the earth. Neither side feels that it actually is giving up anything of vital importance. Still, it has taken nearly a decade to work out the ageement.

The treaty will not detract from national security, but could strengthen it, to whatever extent it contributes to an easing of tensions and conflicts among nations and, more particularly, between the world's two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union.

An enduring peace is something that must be built slowly, step by step. The space treaty is only one brick in the structure. But it could be a very important one, and its placing could lead to the placing of other bricks.

As one of the "bridges" President Johnson is seeking to build over the chasm that separates the Communist and non-Communist worlds, the space treaty is of infinitely greater importance than the proposed bilateral consular treaty with the Soviet Union and other pending legislation. It deserves an appropriate priority.

AMERICAN HISTORY EVENING AT THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I had the privilege of attending a very pleasant occasion on Washington's Birthday—an American history evening at the Smithsonian Institution. On that occasion Prof. John Morton Blum, a distinguished historian, spoke on the subject which he expressed in the title: "George Washington and Parson Weems."

Prof. John Blum is a bipartisan biographer of Presidents. His works on Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson portray their subjects with an understanding which extends to the entire political arena of their times, and in his studies of Henry Morgenthau and Joe Tumulty he describes men who work with Presidents. Professor Blum has taught at Yale University since 1957, and held the distinguished Pitt professorship at Cambridge University in 1963 and 1964. He formerly taught at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He received his B.A. and Ph. D. degrees at Harvard University and served during World War II with the U.S. Navy, where he atttained the rank of lieutenant.

Mr. President, I believe Senators will wish to read Professor Blum's original and entertaining speech. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GEORGE WASHINGTON AND PARSON WEEMS

(Remarks of Prof. John M. Blum, chairman of the department of history, Yale University, on American History Evening, Smithsonian Institution, Feb. 22, 1967)

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Members of Congress, ladies and gentlemen, I can not accurately say that my friend Dillon Ripley, when he invited me to speak tonight, wholly repeated the remarks of the little girl on shipboard who approached Mark Twain and admonished him to "say something funny." Dillon was more subtle than that. He merely instructed me to speak lightly and not too long. Given the subject—George Washington—the assignment carried its ironies, but I was glad to have the occasion to be here, as I still am, and I shall, I promise you, abide by the contract which the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution so generously but so precisely offered me.

George Washington, beyond the degree most of us ordinarily assume to be applicable, remains in some circumstances an historical figure of moment. Just a couple of weeks ago I returned from a short visit to England. On one occasion while there I dined at a celebrated college at Cambridge University where I was placed at the Master's right. Soup had barely been served when he turned to me and said: "I say, Blum, what are you Yanks now thinking about George III?" Both stunned by the question and stopped for an appropriate answer, I sipped some soup and replied: "I say, Master, what are you English now thinking about George Washington?" With that the dialogue temporarily ceased.

We Americans over the years have thought a number of different things about George Washington. Yet whatever we think individually we tend to repair collectively, as we do tonight, to the position so well defined by Calvin Coolidge. Some of you will recall that during the 1920's William Woodward published a best-selling, debunking biography of the first President. Not long thereafter newspapermen at the White House asked Coolidge what he thought of the book. Coolidge swivelled in his chair, looked out of the window, and said: "Well I see the Monument's still there."

So, of course, it was, as it had long been and as it remains. And there's the nub. Washington in most times and for most Americans has been rather more monument than man. The explanations for that metamorphosis are several.

There is, to begin with, the palpable fact of Washington's personal austerity, perhaps an essential precondition for his ultimate majesty. Dixon Wecter, among others, told the story of Gouvernor Morris who boasted in 1787 to Alexander Hamilton that "he could be as familiar with Washington as with any of his other friends." To win his bet of a supper and wine, Morris walked up to Washignton at the next reception, bowed, shook hands, laid his left hand on Washington's shoulder, and said, "My dear General, I am very happy to see you look so well!" Washington withdrew his hand, stepped suddenly back, fixed his eye on Morris for several minutes with an angry frown, until the latter retreated abashed. "I have won the bet,' Morris later told Hamilton, "but paid dearly for it, and nothing could induce me to repeat it."

Beyond Washington's austerity there was the extraordinary record of his magnificent accomplishments in his three great roles—as Commander in Chief of the Continental Army, as presiding officer at the Constitutional Convention, and as first President of the United States. There were, of course, heated controversies about his purposes and his performance in all those parts. If most of the soldiers of his army followed his leadership and found in it inspiration for a grim and prolonged military service, others deserted, not least because of his proclivity for employing the bull whip as a favored punishment, and influential non-soldiers bemoaned and criticized his necessary and preferred tactic of strategic retreats. So also, the Constitution in 1788–89 had its enemies in a number nearly equivalent to its friends. And there was little serene about Washington's Presidency, about the controversies over domestic policy between Hamilton and Jefferson and their respective adherents, about the unpopularity of Washington's foreign policy with its distinctive abhorrence of revolution in France. Indeed the Jeffersonian publicist Philip Freneau—in Washington's phrase "that rascal Freneau"—set a standard for vitriol in attacks on the chief executive which today's journalists, even today's playwrights, rarely dare to approach.

But dissent, criticism, even vitriol notwithstanding, Washington's public record, coming at the time it did and carrying the thrust it did, engraved on the minds of his contemporaries and of their immediate descendants an indelible impression of magisterial accomplishment. Within his own lifetime he achieved a kind of apotheosis, he became "the Savior of His Country," "the conquering Hero." The cult imbued one characteristic tribute of 1783, rendered by the then President of Yale University, Ezra Stiles:

"O Washington! How I love thy name! How have I often adored and blessed thy God, for creating and forming thee the great ornament of human kind! . . . Thy fame is of sweeter perfume than Arabian spices in the gardens of Persia . . . listening angels shall catch the odor, waft it to heaven, and perfume the universe!"

It is easy to locate the origin of the cult to which Stiles so fully subscribed. Before 1800 the image Americans held of Washington had in large degree merged with the image they held of their nation. With that merger, he came to represent the United States, its successful war for independence, its ongoing struggle for freedom, its discreet and special nationality. The mirror of the whole idea of the United States was Washington—an American Zeus, an American King Arthur, an American Jeanne d'Arc, all-in-one. In the phrase of one contemporary, he was "a Roman hero and a Grecian god." His austerity, his remoteness, permitted his countrymen to see in him sundry, sometimes conflicting, always enticing national expectations. And the hard facts of his career supported the softer sentiments surrounding him, sentiments associated with character and duty, sacrifice and loyalty—in the words of Washington's most popular biographer, "piety and patriotism . . . industry and honor . . . self esteem and universal respect." Washington himself drove that lesson home. "The name of American," he said in his most celebrated address, "which belongs to you, in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism." The name of American nationality, of American patriotism was Washington—a symbol of reverence for generations to come, for a century and more. In the words even of Henry Adams, always a sophisticated and often a cynical man, Washington was "a primary . . . an ultimate relation, like the Pole Star."

The monumental quality of the figure of Washington proceeded, then, in part from the austerity of the man himself, in part from the distinction of his offices and achievements, in part from the merging of his resulting reputation with the nationalism of his fellows. Taken together, those factors in themselves account sufficiently for the continuing inability of Americans to love Washington whom instead they revere. When they celebrate his birthday, as we do today, they celebrate themselves, they honor their country, they do not really remember a particular, highly talented, doubtless great but also mortal man.

Yet the separation of the man from the cult has derived also from the content of that cult as its chief priest first expounded it. The remoteness of Washington from reality owes much to Parson Mason Weems. An ordained Episcopal priest, Weems abandoned his calling in 1791 to undertake a long career as a promoter and salesman of books and pamphlets, many of which he wrote himself. As one fellow divine put it in 1792: "Was sorry to see Weems' peddling way of life but God knows best by what methods we can most directly answer to designations of his Providence." Weems answered with a spate of publications that included "The Lover's Almanac," doubtless for balance "The Bachelor's Almanac," and, in time, biographies, after a fashion, of Benjamin Franklin and George Washington, whose qualities he sometimes confused. But he never underestimated his market. "I've something to whisper in your lug," he wrote his partner in publishing in 1799, a month after Washington's death. "Washington, you know, is gone! Millions are gaping to read something about him. I am very nearly primed and cocked for 'em. Six months ago I set myself to collect anecdotes of him. My plan! I give his history, sufficiently minute . . . I then go on to show that his unparalleled rise and elevation were due to his great Virtues . . . 1. his Veneration for the Deity . . . 2. His Patriotism. 3d. his Magnanimity. 4. his Industry. 5. his Temporance and Sobriety. 6. his Justice, etc. Thus I hold up his great Virtues . . . to the imitation of our Youth . . . . I have . . . enlivened with Anecdotes apropos interesting and Entertaining . . . . We may sell it with great rapidity."

So they did, through six editions, each larger and more enlivened than its predecessor, and then another spate of editions based on the sixth. "Washington outsells anything I have," Weems reported in 1810, and it kept selling, through 29 editions by the time of Weems' death in 1825, and beyond.

What made it sell, in large measure, as Marcus Cunliffe has so well demonstrated, was the combination the Parson contrived of anecdotes entertaining and virtues instructional. If serious scholars soon discounted the result, youth, in the view of youth's parents and teachers, needed the message, and Sunday schools and juvenile publications borrowed and perpetuated the gospel according to Weems, an inveterate sermonizer whose moral lessons exactly suited the middle class culture of XIX century America.

In Weems' text Mary Washington, George's mother, appeared the Ideal Mother of XIX century popular biography and fiction. George could not have inherited his martial spirit from her, according to Weems, who had her say, after the battle of Trenton, "Ah, dear me! This fighting and killing is a sad thing! I wish George would come home and look after his plantation!"

As for George himself, Weems made him a prototype for XIX century American expectations. In successive editions he added anecdotes that he tried out orally on audiences he met during his travels. Those audiences were the folk who bought Bibles and religious tracts in quantity, who had wants that Weems satisfied—wants for religion (or perhaps religiosity); romanticism; patriotism. Weems supplied the folklore America lacked, a folklore that imbedded the qualities Americans admired in the figure of the Hero they adored and Weems embellished.

Weems's *Life of Washington* in its fully developed edition of 1809 begins with a statement by Napoleon, doubtless aprocryphal. "Posterity," Napoleon tells several Americans, "shall talk of [Washington] with reverence as the founder of a great empire, when my name shall be lost in the vortex of Revolution!"

But Washington's fame as a general and statesman, Weems immediately adds, would for posterity be not even half his fame: "True, he is there seen in greatness, but it is only the greatness of public character . . . It is not . . . in the glare of *public,* but in the shade of *private life,* that we are to look for the man . . . Give us his *private virtues!* In *these,* every youth is interested, because in these every youth may become a Washington."

There was the key. Let youth read about Weems' Washington and then emulate the lessons there writ clear, and youth would succeed in private and in public life alike. Weems' Washington served, as it were, as a way-station between *Poor Richard's Almanac,* which had provided the imagery Weems also attributed to Franklin, and the stories of Horatio Alger, Jr., whose pulp novels later captured the market Weems once dominated, and captured it using the same homilies only in a newer context. For Alger in his day, as for Weems earlier, the account of an heroic life became a series of secular parables whose purport no barely literate reader could possibly misunderstand, whose message no reasonably ambitious young man could afford to ignore.

The essence of that message was character, the all-encompassing virtue without which there could be no success. The constituents of character Weems explained in unequivocal terms. Washington, for one thing, was generous, thanks to his father's instruction. "Now George," said his father on one bountiful autumn day when George was very young, "look here . . . Don't you remember when this good cousin of yours brought you that large fine apple last spring, how hardly I could prevail on you to divide with your brothers and sisters; though I promised you that if you would but do it, God Almighty would give you plenty of apples this fall. Poor George could not say a word; but hanging down his head, looked quite confused . . . Look up, my son, continued his father, . . . and see how richly the blessed God has made good my promise to you . . . You see the trees loaded with fine fruit." George saw. "Well, Pa," he said, "only forgive me this time; see if I ever be stingy any more." No need for stinginess, we may still conclude, in a land of abundance, amidst a people of plenty.

So, too, the anecdote of the cherry tree, through which Weems taught how George became truthful, and the ensuring episodes that displayed his piety and morality. With his father's death, his mother continued his education, as also did his school master, Mr. Williams. At "reading," Mr. Williams said, or so Weems reported, "spelling, English grammar, arithmetic, surveying, bookkeeping and geography" Washington was "indeed famous." And in the *useful arts* Washington was "as great a scholar as himself." Without those useful arts the Americans of Washington's day and Weems' could not have transformed the wealth of the continent into the growing comforts and growing strength of their society.

Those virtues and all others Washington had in Weems' book. "Happily for America," the Parson wrote, "George Washington was not born with a silver spoon in his mouth." Accordingly he saw "no chance for rising in the world but by his own merits." And that was the best lesson of private virtue—the lesson of Franklin earlier and of Jackson and Lincoln later. With virtue a young man of humble estate could rise in the world, given also hard work, given also, as Weems put it, a concern for the "innocent" and not the "guilty" pleasures, and given the special circumstances of America. It was not just nationalism that Washington encapsulated in the regnant cult, but also, and just as important, the gospel of success, an attribute of American nationality but also an American creed in and of itself. Washington was great because he was good, and by projection, so also the United States which he symbolized.

The postulates of Weems' cult put Washington at a far remove in 1967 not least because Americans are no longer so sure about the postulates. The prudential virtues that Weems attributed to Washington no longer seem or are the virtues which most Americans believe essential to success or greatness. The useful arts have a lesser place in a culture of consumption than once they had in a culture of productivity. Piety for the sake of piety alone bears little saliency to the issues of our day. Veracity has suffered not only from the imperatives of national marketing but also, alas, from the exigencies of cold war politics. More and more it falls only to the quaint to contend that the change, however actual, may be unfortunate. The quaint in time may have another day, but as much as Weems, they now serve mostly as an object, perhaps not of scorn. but surely of amusement.

Weems, then, and Weems' cult added to the monumental image that has erased Washington the man, but added perhaps no more than has the passage of time and the attending cultural change that moves Americans to search for different kinds of heroes to symbolize their now different goals and different satisfactions. Yet something remains beside. On February 22 we still assemble. In the best of Washington we still see the best of the United States, and are glad there to see it. What are you Americans now thinking of Washington, the British still ask, not without cause. And with Coolidge, swivelling in our chairs, we reply with some humor but with more pride, with pride rooted in the traditions we still value, albeit sometime abashedly—we reply: the Monument's still there.

ASSISTANCE TO OTHER NATIONS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, charity toward less fortunate peoples has long been a feature of American foreign policy.

The President's program of foreign aid for fiscal 1968 is a thoughtful and correct extension of this tradition. Moreover, it is clearly in the national interest to provide assistance to other nations.

This program, says the Baltimore Sun, deserves the support of the American people and of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Feb. 11, 1967]

FOREIGN AID

President Johnson has recommended to Congress a foreign aid program for the next fiscal year which, in brief, would continue the present level of operations with modifications designed to meet changing needs. The modifications he has proposed are soundly based. The total of $3.1 billion, made up of some $2.5 billion in economic aid and $600 million in military aid, is relatively modest in comparison with the entire budget; it is in line with American efforts during the last two decades and can be justified in many ways. His program should have the support of the American people and of Congress, starting with the point that it is our own national interest to continue it.

As the President said, this is not a program of charity for foreigners. It is more properly an investment in the development of other nations, particularly those nations which show that they want to help themselves and which can make use of our aid for that purpose. In the end we will benefit, too. Greater emphasis will be put on multilateral and regional programs, notably in Africa, which has been splintered into small, interdependent states. Our economic aid will be focused toward improving agriculture, health and education.

"In particular," the President said, "we will wage war on hunger. Together, the world must find ways to bring food production and population growth into balance. My proposals make clear our determination to help expand food supplies. We must be equally ready to assist countries which decide to undertake voluntarily population programs."

Mr. Johnson's suggestion that Congress write a new Foreign Assistance Act, to restate our objectives and standards, should make for tighter administration and more clearly defined programs. The proposed national advisory committee, to advise Federal officials on the way in which nations are using their own resources to meet the self-help goals of our program, should be useful.

One other point: as the President put it, almost 90 per cent of our economic assistance and over 95 per cent of our military assistance is spent in the United States. He said the adverse effect on our balance of payments thus would be held to a minimum, and he noted that the aid programs serve to expand American trade and help to develop new trading patterns.

"NO SOCIETY CAN AFFORD TO TOLERATE VIOLENT AND DANGEROUS MASS CRIME"—THIS STATEMENT FROM CRIME COMMISSION REPORT HIGHLIGHTS SERIOUSNESS OF NATIONAL PROBLEM

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, "The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society," a report by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice and under the chairmanship of Under Secretary of State and former Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, is a significant study into crime in America.

The Commission recommendations are more than a list of new procedures, new tactics, and new techniques. They are a call for a revolution in the way America thinks about crime.

An important finding of the survey is that for the Nation as a whole there is far more crime than is ever reported. This fact was also pointed out by the report of the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia. Burglaries occur about three times more often than they are reported to law enforcement officials. Aggravated assaults and larcenies of over $50 occur twice as often as reported and there are 50 percent more robberies than reported. In some areas, only one-tenth of the total number of certain crimes are made known to police.

The report states that the criminal justice system has great potential for dealing with individual instances of crime but that it is not designed to eliminate the conditions in which crime breeds.

> Warring on poverty, inadequate housing, and unemployment is warring on crime—

The report concludes and further says that a civil rights law is a law against crime and that medical psychiatric and family counseling services are services against crime.

One of the more fully documented facts about crime is that the common serious crimes which worry people most—murder, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, and burglary—happen most often in the slums of large cities. Many studies, conducted in cities in all parts of the country, have traced the variations in the rates for these crimes and the results show that the offenses, the victims, and the offenders are found frequently in the poorest and most deteriorated and socially disorganized areas of the cities. The findings show that serious crimes occur in areas characterized by low income, physical deterioration, racial and ethnic concentrations, broken homes, low levels of education and vocational skills, high unemployment, high proportions of single males, overcrowded and substandard housing, high rates of disease and infant mortality, and high population density.

Further, the Commission found from studies conducted in high crime areas of two large cities that 43 percent of the respondents said they stay off streets at night because of their fear of crime; 35 percent said they do not speak to strangers; 21 percent said they use cabs and cars at night; and 20 percent said they would like to move to another neighborhood due to their fear of crime.

This report generally supports those of the local crime surveys as one-third of a representative sample of Americans say it is unsafe to walk alone at night in their neighborhoods.

An alarming fact brought out by the Commission is that the public school system in our Nation's Capital provided data for 1965, showing that a total of 26,500 window panes were broken and had to be replaced at a cost to the taxpayers of $118,000.

It is stated in the report that young people commit a disproportionate share of crime and the number of young people in our society is growing at a much faster rate than our total population.

Although the 15- to 17-year-old age group represents only 5.4 percent of the population, it accounts for 12.8 percent of all arrests. Alarming as it may be, 15- and 16-year-olds have the highest arrest rate in the United States. Therefore, the problem in the years ahead is dramatically foretold by the fact that 23 percent of the population is 10 or under.

As the report of the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia stated:

> Once a juvenile is apprehended by the police and referred to the juvenile court, the community has already failed.

Vice President HUMPHREY, while recently addressing the National Association of Christians and Jews, in Washington, told of the dire need for recreational facilities for youth. The Commission report bears this out by saying that lack of recreational facilities has been shown to be linked to negative attitudes toward the neighborhood and those attitudes in turn to repeated acts of delinquency by our youngsters.

One crucial presupposition of the juvenile court philosophy, that of a mature and sophisticated judge, wise and well versed in the law and the science of human behavior, has proved that fact too often unattainable. A recent study of juvenile court judges in the United States revealed that half had no undergraduate degree and a fifth had no college education at all.

Despite the seriousness of the problem today and the increasing challenge in the years ahead, the central conclusion of the Commission is that a significant reduction in crime is possible if the following objectives are vigorously pursued: Society must seek to prevent crime before it happens by assuring all Americans a stake in the benefits and responsibilities of American life by strengthening law enforcement and by reducing criminal opportunities; society's aim of reducing crime would be better served if the system of criminal justice developed a far broader range of techniques with which to deal with individual offenders; the system of criminal justice must eliminate existing injustices if it is to achieve its ideals and win the respect and cooperation of all citizens; more persons must be attracted to law enforcement, especially those with more and special knowledge, expertise, initiative, and integrity; there must be much more basic research in the problems of crime and criminal administration by both within and without the system of criminal justice; the police, courts, and correctional agencies must be given substantially greater amounts of money if they are to improve their ability to control crime; and individual citizens, civic and business organizations, religious institutions, and all levels of government must take responsibility for planning and implementing the changes that must be made if crime is to be reduced.

The report recommends various means of preventing crime, including police callboxes to be marked, "Public Emergency Callboxes," instead of being locked and inconspicuous as now.

Concerning the habitual criminal, the Commission reports the most striking fact about offenders who have been convicted of the common serious crimes of violence and theft is how often many of them continue committing crimes. Insistent testimony to the fact that these repeated offenders constitute the hard core of the crime problem is found in arrest, court, and prison records.

As for dealing with offenders, a specific and important example of the Commission recommendations is that every community consider establishing a youth service bureau, a community-based center to which juveniles could be referred by police, courts, parents, schools, and social agencies for counseling and educational and recreational programs as well as for job placement.

The Commission further recommends that adequate and appropriate separate detention facilities be made available for juveniles whose detention is made necessary only by the unavailability of adequate parental supervision. Such facilities could be made available by low-security community residential centers.

Many police officers and citizens believe that recent judicial interpretations of the Constitution have unduly and inappropriately inhibited the work of police and so have made it harder for police to protect the public. Part of this feeling stems, no doubt, from the sharp contrast between the tense, fast-moving situations in which policemen are called on to make split-second decisions, and the calm that prevails in the appellate courts while lawyers and judges argue the merits of those decisions, after having searched lawbooks and statutes for precedents.

The problems are illustrated by the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision in the case of Miranda against Arizona, which prohibited by a 5-to-4 decision the questioning of a suspect in custody unless counsel is present, or the suspect expressly waives his right to counsel. The majority of the Court concluded that interrogation in isolated settings of a police station constituted informal compulsion to confession. It is the Commission's belief that it is too early to assess the effect of the Miranda decision on law enforcement's ability to secure confessions and to solve crimes. However, this and other decisions do represent a trend toward the findings by the judiciary that previously permitted police practices are unconstitutionally offensive to the dignity and integrity of private citizens.

It is also suggested that State legislatures enact statutory provisions with respect to the authority of law enforcement officials to stop persons for brief questioning, including specifications of the circumstances and limitations under which these stops would be permissible.

A central problem of the present judicial system is the gross disparity between the number of cases and the personnel and facilities available to deal with them. For example, the report finds that, until legislation last year increased the number of judges, the District of Columbia court of general sessions had four judges to process the preliminary stages of more than 1,500 felony cases, 7,500 serious misdemeanors, and 38,000 petty offenses and an equal number of traffic offenses each year.

Judges face long calendars with the certain knowledge that their calendars tomorrow and the next day will be, if anything, longer and so there is no choice but to dispose of the cases.

The Federal Bail Reform Act of 1966 may serve as a helpful guide for States considering comprehensive legislation. The act states a presumption in favor of the release of defendants on their promise to return, or on an unsecured bond. Judges are authorized to place nonmonetary conditions on release, such as assigning the defendant to the custody of a person or organization to supervise him, restricting his travel, association or place of abode, or placing him in partial custody so that he may work during the day and be confined at night.

The Commission report states that the Office of Economic Opportunity's program of neighborhood legal assistance has been valuable. A defender system like Minnesota's, which pays county defenders on a part-time basis to defend indigent clients and allows them to represent paying clients as well, promises to be an effective way of attracting able lawyers to the criminal law. In at least nine States, third-year law students are permitted by law to represent indigent defendents, charged with misdemeanors at trials. This provides an opportunity for law schools in those States to give their students valuable training under proper supervision while at the same time improving the quality of representation previously available. Similar programs are currently being instituted by Harvard and Boston University Law Schools.

The National Training School for Boys, currently being constructed in Morgantown, W. Va., will be a model correctional institution. Such institutions were of primary concern to the Commission.

A survey showed that in 1965, more than 2 million Americans were received in prisons, juvenile training schools, or placed on probation. Approximately 40 percent of all male children now living in the United States will be arrested for a nontraffic offense during their lives.

On an average day in 1965, there were some 426,000 persons in correctional institutions. Whatever the difference in type and quality among these—from huge maximum security prisons to open forestry camps without guards or fences, from short-term detention homes for juveniles to penitentiaries where some men spend most of their lives—there remains an inherent sameness about places where people are kept against their will.

The Commission recommends that parole boards should be appointed solely on the basis of competence and should receive training and orientation in their task. They should be required to serve full time and should be compensated accordingly.

Universities and colleges are challenged to become involved in the planning, executing of changes and process of the criminal justice system. The report urges these institutions to increase their research on the problems of crime. It asks private welfare organizations and religious institutions to continue to experiment with advanced techniques of helping slum children to overcome their environment. Labor unions and businessmen can enlarge their programs to provide prisoners with vocational training, and professional, as well as community organizations, can help probation and parole workers with their important work.

The report further states that funds from Federal, State, and local governments and private foundations are specifically needed for research.

President Johnson asked the Commission to determine why organized crime has been expanding despite the Nation's best efforts to prevent it. The report delves into lengthy discourse on gambling, loan sharking, narcotics, and the infiltration of criminals into legitimate businesses.

It is the finding of the Commission that a central office in the Department of Justice should have proper recording facilities and should analyze intelligence information fed to it by all relevant Federal agencies, keeping current with events. A pool of information experts from the FBI, Secret Service, CIA, and other departments, as well as private companies, should help build this system which would employ punchcards, tapes, and other modern information storage and retrieval techniques.

What America does about crime depends ultimately on how America sees crime, the report contends. The government of a free society can act only in response to the desires of the governed.

An independent survey of 1,700 persons disclosed that 91 percent of the sample admitted they had committed acts for which they might have received jail or prison sentences.

We must become aware that the responsibility of the individual citizen runs far deeper than cooperation with police, or accepting jury duty. He must respect the law, refuse to cut corners, reject the cynical argument that, "Anything goes as long as you don't get caught."

On August 29, 1966, while speaking on the floor of the Senate discussing the national crime wave, I said:

> Let us look first to something most of us would rather dismiss, but which we cannot overlook: That most basic and most important of all institutions—the family. It is more the victim than the cause of our problem. In the final analysis, it is the solution to the predicament in which we find ourselves.
>
> It is here that the first corrective steps must be taken, for it is here that the seeds of lawlessness are often born.
>
> Children need a framework of rules, supported by discipline, under which to live. They need parents who take time to talk with them, counsel with them, and encourage them. Without discipline and counsel, our children will meander in their own way, pampered and indulged, not knowing how far they can or should go, not prepared for life in an orderly society, expecting the privileges of that society but unwilling and unprepared to shoulder the responsibilities expected of them.

It was gratifying, Mr. President, for me to read in the Commission report that same conclusion:

> The family is the first and most basic institution in our society for developing the child's potential, in all its many aspects: Emotional, intellectual, moral, and spiritual, as well as physical and social. Other influences do not even enter the child's life until after the first few highly formative years. It is within the family that the child must learn to curb his desires and to accept rules that define the time, place, and circumstances under which highly personal needs may be satisfied in socially acceptable ways. This early training—management of emotion, confrontation with rules and authority, development of responsiveness to other—has been repeatedly related to the presence or absence of delinquency in later years.

The report also stated that if one parent, especially the father of a son, is absent, if there are many children, if a child is in the middle in age among several children—such a family arrangement tends to reduce parental control and authority over children and consequently increases vulnerability to influences toward delinquent behavior.

Citizens must, through the organizations to which they belong, interest themselves in the problems of crime and criminal justice, seek information, express views, and become involved in this important battle.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate S. 665. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S.665) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

IMPROVEMENT OF THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I do not believe that our existing Selective Service System is meeting its responsibilities to the Nation, and I feel that it must be improved.

Our present system is neither fair, nor equitable, nor just. Its policies are discriminatory—students are deferred, nonstudents are drafted; good students keep their deferments, poor students may lose them. And its impact is uneven—a returning Peace Corps volunteer goes to the top of the list in one district, and to the bottom in another.

The list of indictments of the present system is a long one. And it is a list which will become familiar before this session is out.

I say we will soon become familiar with it because we will soon have to act to extend the authorization given the Selective Service to induct young men for military duty. Section 17 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act provides that "no person shall be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces after July 1, 1967." Before July 1, then, we must extend this induction authority if the Armed Forces are to be supplied with their military manpower needs.

Since we must, this session, act affirmatively to extend the induction authority if that authority is not to lapse, we have an opportunity to examine the statute which governs the operation of the Selective Service System. It is my firm belief that this statute must be thoroughly overhauled. If it is not, and if we only extend the induction authority, then we will continue to have not a fair system of determining who bears arms and who does not, but rather an outdated, patchwork system which works with shocking inequities.

I rise in the Senate today to offer two specific, necessary steps for meeting both the objections to the present system of the draft and the July 1 deadline for action.

First, I am submitting a concurrent resolution which would revise the operation of the Selective Service System.

Second. I am announcing jointly with the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] that the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will hold hearings on the effects of the draft upon the employability of this country's youth. Whether it is the difficulties encountered in getting a job while eligible for the draft, or the effect of military training and service upon employment after the service—the questions will be raised and discussed.

We in the Congress, this session, have the opportunity to make the Selective Service System operate with equality—with the equality which is the touchstone of our democratic society. Because we have this opportunity, we must take it. And because we can reform the draft, we must do so.

The concurrent resolution I submit today would express the sense of the Congress relative to the administration of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. I now send this concurrent resolution to the desk for appropriate reference, and ask that it be printed in full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution lie on the table for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the resolution being held at the desk?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I would like to be included as a cosponsor of this concurrent resolution.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may I be included as a cosponsor despite the fact that the resolution is not to be left at the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is included as a cosponsor.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Chair.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, are there additional ways in which those who would care to be made cosponsors of the resolution could be made cosponsors other than by leaving the resolution at the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They may become cosponsors only by obtaining the names of the other Senators before submitting it, or by unanimous consent.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, am I correct that if they wish to do so at a time within the next 10 days, and ask unanimous consent, that this alternative is also open to them?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding—and I stand corrected if I am wrong—that the Senator could make that request for a number of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct, if unanimous consent is granted.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator was kind enough to give me an advance copy of his statement. Unfortunately, I have to leave the Chamber for a brief moment. I commend him for the initiative he has taken with respect to revising the Selective Service policy.

I wish to ask the Senator whether it is not his intention that this resolution should be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for consideration.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I would hope, Mr. President, that it might, although the Committee on Armed Services has always in the past exercised jurisdiction over Selective Service.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator has expressed to me his hope that the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, of which I have the honor to be chairman, and of which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is an honored member, should hold hearings on the changes which might be desirable in the present Selective Service System. Is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator is correct. As the Senator from Pennsylvania has mentioned on many occasions, there are broad employment and educational considerations closely connected with the draft, and a wide range of other important matters, connected with questions of manpower policy, questions of employability, questions of poverty—all of which are the responsibility of the Senator from Pennsylvania. This is an area, consequently, which I think is quite appropriate for this subcommittee to look into.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I hope very much that the hearings in the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty will be comprehensive hearings on the draft, and I hope very much that the Senator from Massachusetts, as a member of the subcommittee, would be willing to take the initiative in acting as the chairman of those hearings, particularly in view of the heavy load with respect to the poverty program which this Senator is already carrying on.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I appreciate that.

I would like to mention at this point that some days ago I had the opportunity to visit with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services [Mr. RUSSELL], who is now in the Chamber.

At that time, I discussed with him the aims and scope of the studies which would be conducted by the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty. The Senator from Georgia reiterated what I knew was his longstanding interest in the question of the draft situation, as it bore on these studies.

At that time I gathered it was his feeling that the work of the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty could make an extremely useful contribution to the questions of draft reform, and he indicated that at some time in the future the Committee on Armed Services would be going into close consideration of this extremely important complex matter.

I feel that the particular hearing we are at the present time considering will provide information that will be extremely useful for the general deliberation of the Senate, in connection with this matter of draft reform, which must be deliberated before the end of June.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to make it clear to my friend from Georgia, whom I see in the Chamber, that there is no intention on the part of the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty to usurp the jurisdiction which has always been exercised with respect to the Selective Service Act by the Armed Services Committee; but it was our feeling that we had a supplementary role to play in this regard because of the serious implications of the draft on the manpower and employment problems of the young people of this country.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Massachusetts was gracious enough to discuss this matter with me, and I had understood that he was proposing to hold intensive hearings into all aspects of the utilization of manpower and that the draft, of course, would be a very important part of that study.

I told him at that time that I had absolutely no objection to the hearings, that I thought it would be beneficial, and that so far as I was concerned I would be happy to have him come before the Armed Services Committee and testify when we consider legislation to extend the Selective Service Act.

However, I would be very much opposed to denying jurisdiction of the Selective Service laws to the Armed Services Committee. This jurisdiction very clearly belongs in the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Georgia. I feel that there is no inconsistency both in the initial discussion we had a few days ago and to the representations we are making on the floor. We do feel that in view of the fact that we are into late February already, and since there is a responsibility on the part of the Senate to act before the end of June, as much information as can be gained in the next few months on this subject will be extremely important and useful to the Senate.

It is in this light that we are moving ahead in the Manpower, Employment, and Poverty Subcommittee.

Mr. RUSSELL. We welcome all the help we can get from any source because the draft is one of the most difficult problems which confronts not only the Armed Services Committee but also Congress as a whole—that is, obtaining the fairest method of distributing the honor of defending our Nation against foreign enemies.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. President, the concurrent resolution which I have sent to the desk would work five specific changes in the administration of the act.

First, it would eliminate the State-to-State and district-to-district irregularities which presently mark the Selective Service System. Yet, by retaining the State directors and local boards, it would preserve the reliance upon local knowledge which is a great strength of the present system.

Each State and even each district today has wide flexibility in its interpretations of the regulations issued by the Selective Service System. This, coupled with the system of State quotas under which each State must produce a fixed number of men, has produced wide geographical differences in the status of those young men drafted. Some cities, for example, draft 19-year-olds while others draft 22-year-olds. Married men are called up in one State, while many thousands of single men remain untouched in another. I have already mentioned the varying treatment accorded returning Peace Corps volunteers.

An accident of geography, it seems to me, is a poor reason for choosing one man over another.

The resolution would simply require

the establishment of uniform national standards, under the terms of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and then require that they be administered uniformly. This requirement would eliminate these geographical irregularities

The second change would require that draftees be chosen on the basis of a system of random selection.

Sheer force of numbers compels adoption of this change. In 1960, there were 1,300,000 young men aged 18. Just over 90,000 were drafted. In 1965, there were 1,720,000 young men aged 18, and just over 102,000 were drafted. In 1972, it is estimated that there will be 2,050,000 young men aged 18, and that about 75,000 will need to be drafted. In other words, while the number of 18-year-old men is growing rapidly, the projected number of draftees actually decreases. Thus, the selection process is very much more difficult—more and more young men are eligible, yet proportionately fewer and fewer will be drafted.

There will be serious problems of choosing the few to be drafted from among the many eligible. Unless we continue to increase the number and type of deferments, making qualitative judgments of those types of people who should not serve while others should serve, we will be faced with a steadily-rising median age at which young men are actually drafted.

The best resolution of this dilemma, it seems to me, is one based on a system of random selection. Such a system would be fair and impartial, and above charges of favoritism. It would be easy to administer. It has a basis in our own history, having been used in the First World War. It would discriminate in no way against any group or class. It would be based on equal chance, and would reflect our national commitment to equality.

I have elsewhere described how this system would work, and will do so again in testimony to the Armed Services Committee. I believe that if adopted, it will put the burden of nonvoluntary military service where it belongs—on those chosen impartially from among a group treated as equals.

The third change would eliminate the crazy quilt pattern of deferments which has built up over the years.

It is this system of deferments which, according to most polls on the draft, has caused the most objections to the Selective Service System. Be it the trick knee of professional athletes, the fellowship, the essential occupation, or some other reason—these are plainly loopholes in our present system.

The resolution would eliminate all deferments but one: that based on extreme hardship.

The extreme hardship deferment would retain in the Selective Service System a necessary element of compassion and flexibility. There will always be cases where induction would, in fact, cause serious disruption to the life of a family or would, in fact, cause serious disruption to some work connected closely and directly with the national security. These cases, which should be very small in number and subject to the most complete and open documentation, would of necessity continue to be the province of the local boards.

The problem of deferments for students is a difficult one. Charges have been made that this 2–S student classification is a haven for those with the financial or intellectual wherewithal to attend college, while others not so endowed must bear arms. Undoubtedly this is true in some cases. But there are others with a 2–S student deferment, who are in college on their own or their parents' savings, or working their way through, to whom college is the one chance to break out of a cycle of poverty or near poverty. They must not be denied this chance.

I do not believe, however, that attendance at college should be a way of avoiding military service. This service is a burden of our way of life, and it should be borne equally.

The resolution, therefore, would provide for postponing military service until the end of undergraduate study, but in no case for longer than 4 years. In this way, the 2–S student classification could not be used to avoid military service; only to postpone it. The postponement could not be used during wartime or during a national emergency, when the pressures on our manpower supply would be severe.

The educational experience of college is of great importance in the development of character; it should not be interrupted involuntarily except for the strongest of reasons.

The fourth change would require that the youngest eligible men be drafted before the older eligible men.

The present system drafts the oldest before the youngest. This meant that in 1963, before the manpower pressures of the Vietnam buildup, the average age of draftees had crept up to 23 years and 7 months. At this age, most young men have finished their education, started their business careers, and begun raising families. It is a violent disruption for these young men, at this particular juncture in their lives, to turn in their civilian clothes for military uniforms.

If, instead, these men were called to service at their 19th birthdays, the scope of disruption to their lives would not be nearly so large. Yet the burden of service, in length and otherwise, would be exactly the same.

Further, the military itself would prefer draftees in the 19-year-old bracket. They have more physical stamina, are more amenable to military discipline, and are quicker to learn than older draftees.

One other consideration militates in favor of drafting the youngest men before the oldest. Under the present system, men eligible for the draft must live under a cloud of uncertainty from the time of their registration at 18 until they reach 26, or even until 35, when they are no longer subject to the draft. This cloud of uncertainty creates large personal and employment difficulties. Thirty-nine percent of enlisted men, for example, who had entered the service between 22 and 25 years of age had been refused a job at least once because of their draft liability, while only 27 percent of those who entered at ages 19 to 21 and 11 percent of those at ages 17 to 18 reported this difficulty.

The resolution would require that the Selective Service System look to the youngest eligible men for its draftees, and exhaust this group before moving to the next older group. This would greatly reduce the uncertainties which presently cloud the lives of young men of draft age.

The fifth change would revise the mental and physical standards for military service.

As of April 30, 1966, there were 2,295,000 men of draft age classified 1–Y. These men, by reason of their mental or physical qualifications, are eligible for military service only in times of war or national emergency. Yet there are many noncombat, limited-duty tasks they could perform, either with or without remedial medical and educational assistance.

More than 10,000 men per month volunteer for military service but are found not qualified. Some, of course, might never find a place in the military service. But some could, if the mental and physical standards were revised and appropriate limited duty functions developed.

It has always seemed ironic to me that so many volunteers are rejected, while so many nonvolunteers are drafted. I am certain that if the twain would meet, the Nation would benefit. Fewer men would need to be drafted, while more volunteers would be accepted.

The resolution would revise the mental and physical qualifications for military service, and provide for noncombat, limited duty assignments.

These five changes in the administration of the Universal Military Training and Service Act would make our system of selective service more fair, more equitable, and more just, while meeting more closely the desires of the military in their manpower needs. These changes are long overdue, and we in the Congress should move quickly to insure their implementation.

All of these changes can be worked by Executive order. They do not, for their implementation, need legislation amending or altering the Universal Military Training and Service Act. The purpose of the concurrent resolution I have today introduced is to declare it the sense of the Congress that the administration of the act, and not the act itself, has been lacking. For while the present system has with great success supplied the quantity of men needed by the military services, it has not done so with the quality we must demand of it.

It is not my intent to demean those who selflessly administer the Selective Service System. There are more than 48,000 people who serve without compensation the local boards, and theirs is the responsibility for classifying the more than 33 million registrants. They are dedicated men and women, who deserve our praise for their work. They are assisted by about 8,000 paid clerks, at the 4,088 local boards, and these employees of the Selective Service System also deserve praise. They work long hours providing personal service and assistance to registrants and in many cases remain in their offices late into the evening for board hearings. And the knowledge and dedication of the Director of the Selective Service System, Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, is a matter of illustrious public record.

But the simple fact of the matter is that we have saddled these administrators with an outdated system, which has grown up piecemeal, bit by bit, and which has been accepted on faith for many years. We must look hard at it, and where we find flaws, we must direct that they be removed.

We in the Congress have already, in the Universal Military Training and Service Act, granted the authority to effect the changes I have proposed, and make them by Executive order. My resolution would have the effect of providing more explicit policy guidance to the executive in its development of a reformed Selective Service System.

The hearings we will hold in the Employment, Manpower, and Poverty Subcommittee will help to give us here in the Congress a fuller picture of the draft than we ever have had before.

The Selective Service System is perhaps the only window we have which looks into the life of every American young man. Virtually every male citizen is required, within 5 days of his 18th birthday, to register with his local draft board. He is therafter classified as to his eligibility for military service. This classification process entails physical and mental examinations.

Fully 33 percent of those registering fail to meet the mental, physical, or administrative qualifications for military service. Very often, these rejectees then simply drop out of sight, the window of draft registration has given us only a fleeting glimpse of them. When this happens, we have missed an extraordinary opportunity. We have also witnessed a tragedy.

For we spend millions of dollars and man-hours on rehabilitation programs: Physical, mental, medical, job training, counseling, and others. We should use the identification of young men with physical or mental problems, provided us by the Selective Service System, as an opportunity to offer these young men the tools for participating fully in our society. The Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and of Labor have made pilot attempts at doing just this, and in the hearings I intend to find out whether they have been effective.

This is only one aspect of the effect of the draft on American youth which the hearings will open up for us. There are many others as well. Colleges and universities, for example, have reported that many of their students are in school not for an education, but to stay out of the military service. I intend to find out to what extent this is true, and what problems it has caused for our educational institutions.

Many hundreds of young men have fled to Canada, with whom we have no extradition treaty, rather than face military service. Most are now classified delinquent by their local draft boards, and warrants for their arrest have been issued. If they return and are arrested and convicted, they face, under the law, up to 5 years in prison and/or a $10,000 fine. This is a situation which should disturb us all, and I want to find out more about it.

Many young men across the country, while expressing their reluctance to serve their country in the military service, have expressed an eagerness to join in some other form of service—Peace Corps, VISTA, Teachers Corps, or similar programs. This alternate or substitute or national service concept deserves a full and open discussion in the Congress, and in the hearings I intend to have considerable testimony on it.

The effect of the draft upon employability, which I mentioned earlier, is of great importance to employers and employees alike. I think it will be very useful to hear from some of our business leaders the extent to which the draft shapes their employment policies.

The administration has recommended the deletion of a rider on the 1967 Military Appropriations Act which prohibits use of funds in that act for STEP. This special training enlistment program would establish an experimental program of military training and educational and physical rehabilitation for a small number of men who, while not meeting existing military service standards, could do so with a short period of educational training or medical rehabilitation. This program holds exciting promise, but if, in the judgment of the Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, chaired by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], it does not properly belong in the defense establishment, then we should seek an alternate location. I am optimistic that, in the hearings, we will have recommendations on the future of this program.

Finally, much has been bruited about on the concept of a volunteer army. In theory, it seems desirable that those who bear arms should be those who want to, and that an increase in professional capabilities will result. But there have also been serious reservations expressed about the desirability of a military made up entirely of volunteers. I hope that, in the hearings, we can get to a resolution of these conflicting questions, and have realistic testimony on the costs of maintaining a volunteer armed service.

Let me conclude, Mr. President, by quoting briefly from the 1941 inaugural address of President Roosevelt. "A nation," he said, "like a person, is something larger than the sum of all its parts. It is that something which matters most to its future—which calls forth the most sacred guarding of its present."

The guardians of our present—our military forces—have a heavy burden to bear. In bearing it, many lose their lives.

The system which sends some men to guard our present, while not sending others, must be a system which is as fair, as equitable, and as just as we can make it. Our present system is not, and we must, this session, reform it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con Res. 12) was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 12

A concurrent resolution to declare the sense of the Congress relative to certain aspects of the administration of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended

Whereas, the lack of uniform national standards in the administration of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, has caused an unequal distribution of the burdens of military service among the residents of the several States and of different districts within the States;

Whereas, the expansion of the pool of men eligible for induction into military service has made finding rational and fair policy distinctions for inducting some and deferring others increasingly more difficult;

Whereas, the existing system of granting liberal deferments, authorized by regulations issued under the provisions of said Act, has caused an unequal distribution of the burdens of military service among men of different educational and family backgrounds and of different physical and mental capabilities;

Whereas, the policy of drafting the oldest eligible registrants before the eligible youngest registrants has worked to cause uncertainty and unpredictability detrimental to career planning, job opportunities, and development of family life;

Whereas, the present physical and mental standards for military service preclude limited or noncombat military service for many men anxious to serve their country, which service would permit them to lead more productive lives; and

Whereas, the authority granted to the President by said Act to issue regulations governing the administration of said Act permits him to change certain aspects of its administration to make it more fair, equitable and just: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is hereby declared the sense of the Congress that in the administration of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, the President should exercise the authority vested in him by law to effect, as soon as practicable, the following changes in the administration of said Act—

(a) Establish national criteria for the classification of persons registered under said Act and require such criteria to be administered uniformly throughout the United States;

(b) Require that the induction of persons under such Act be carried out on the basis of random selection and that the method of such selection be the same throughout the United States;

(c) Eliminate all deferments authorized by pursuing undergraduate work in colleges and universities: *Provided*, That such student deferments should not last longer than four academic years;

(d) Require that youngest registrants be inducted first; and

(e) Revise the physical and mental standards for military service so that persons who do not meet the physical and mental standards necessary for combat service may be inducted to perform noncombat or limited service.

SEC. 2. It is further declared to be the sense of the Congress that the student deferments specified in subsection (c) of section 1 of this resolution should be effective during all periods except a period of war hereafter declared by the Congress or a period of national emergency hereafter declared by the President.

IMPROVEMENT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on January 25, I introduced five bills designed to improve and promote efficient law enforcement. One of these measures in particular is intended to lessen the impact and adverse effect of some 5-to-4 Supreme Court decisions which have resulted in the freeing of a number of vicious criminals who had voluntarily confessed their guilt.

At that time I commented upon the dismay of the people throughout the land at these irrational and deplorable decisions that are playing so much havoc with the morale of law-enforcement officers, while lending great comfort and assistance to the criminal elements in our society who are endangering the security of our country.

That I was not mistaken in my judgment about the sentiments of our people is manifested by the public response I have received to these measures and the remarks I made at the time I introduced them. Since that time a veritable stream of commendatory letters from people in all walks of life has come to me. In many instances these writers fervently invoke the blessings of the Almighty upon those of us who are trying to secure the enactment of remedial legislation to aid in the war on crime.

Many of these letters are quite obviously written by men and women who are highly literate. Others are from people who have not had the advantage of much formal education. But all of them are from citizens who are deeply concerned and shocked at the deteriorating situation and dismayed at the implications and consequences of these unjust decisions by a bare majority of one. All of them urge immediate corrective action by the Congress.

Mr. President, the accused criminal has many advantages and every proper protection under our Constitution and criminal procedures. I daresay no society in history has accorded to the defendant such an extensive array of safeguards as he enjoys under our system. He has the right to a public trial at which he must be represented by counsel, provided at public expense if he is indigent. He has the right to confront his accuser and cross-examine witnesses who testify against him. He has the benefit of the legal presumption that he is innocent until his guilt is established beyond a reasonable doubt. He is granted the privilege against self-incrimination. He has the right in most cases to a jury trial. And finally, and perhaps most importantly, he is protected by a fantastic array of exclusionary rules of evidence under which many types of highly credible evidence are deemed inadmissible.

Mr. President, I am very much in accord with Judge Learned Hand's observation that—

> Our dangers do not lie in too little tenderness to the accused. Our procedure has been always haunted by the ghost of the innocent man convicted. It is an unreal dream. What we need to fear is the archaic formalism and the watery sentiment that obstructs, delays, and defeats the prosecution of crime.

The administration of justice should be a practical, realistic matter, not a lofty theoretical science. If the evidence against an accused person is overwhelming and there is no doubt of his guilt, his conviction and just punishment should not be precluded merely because some practice of the police or prosecution, wholly unrelated to the issue of guilt or innocence, did not meet with the approval of an appellate court.

To establish the truth and upon that basis determine the guilt or innocence of the accused should be the primary objective of the criminal trial. And society is not well served by Supreme Court decisions imposing limitations which hinder and frustrate reasonable attainment of that goal.

It is clear by now that we cannot solve the crime problem quickly. It will take many years, perhaps generations, to bring the rate of crime down to a respectable level. But we can take immediate steps to improve the administration of the criminal law, which plays a vital role in the control of crime. I know the notion is not popular among sociologists and other such groups, but I firmly believe that the single most effective deterrent to crime is the certainty of apprehension and punishment of criminals. Any change in procedure that makes such apprehension and punishment more swift and certain cannot but help to resolve the crime problem.

I hope my colleagues will give S. 674 their thoughtful consideration and will participate in or follow closely the hearings on the bill to be held before the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures.

Mr. President, there are four things that Congress can do—or, rather, there are three it can do; the other is to do nothing—about the deplorable situation that now prevails in this country respecting the enforcement of our criminal laws.

Congress could enact a bill such as S. 674, to permit the final decision as to whether a confession is voluntary to be made by a jury, after the evidence has been screened by the trial judge to make certain that the confession was not clearly coerced and therefore inadmissible as a matter of law.

The second possible remedy would be a constitutional amendment, which is cumbersome and would involve considerable delay, assuming it could be ratified.

The third would be to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and the inferior Federal appellate courts.

The fourth, as I have indicated, is to do nothing.

I think we have to make a choice. Conditions cannot continue as they are now; and the trend of court decisions aiding the criminal and penalizing society cannot indefinitely be tolerated if law and order are to be preserved.

With respect to the many letters that I have received, the few that I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD are only a sample. It is not practical to have all of the letters printed in the RECORD.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that a representative sample of these letters and excerpts from other letters, without violating the confidence of the writers, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A housewife in Missouri writes:

"I wish to congratulate you on your proposal that legislative measures be taken to correct injustices to our society brought about by recent split Supreme Court decisions in the Miranda, Escobedo cases and others. Our jails and penitentiaries are loaded with confessed murderers, rapists and other vicious criminals who stand to be released as a result of these decisions if their cases are returned to the courts. And this, not because they were denied any of their Constitutional rights, but rather because police officers, in handling their cases, did not put themselves in the position of defense counsel.

"There is a move to spend federal funds to train police officers on state and local levels in order to fight our growing crime problems across the land. I feel that these officers are, generally, well trained, capable and dedicated men who need only support such as that suggested by you in order to reverse the trend and restore effective law enforcement. To spend money for police training without supporting laws will be futile.

"The crime problem in this country poses a greater threat to our way of life than the war in Viet Nam. Anarchy and chaos results when law enforcement fails and an environment is produced where communism and other revolutionary movements flourish.

"You should receive a million responses from good Americans in support of your proposal."

A housewife in Delaware writes:

"I think the subject about which the American people are the most concerned is the continuous 5–4 decisions recently made by the U.S. Supreme Court."

A member of the National Council of Crime and Delinquency writes:

"Hope the President's Crime Commission report will come up with some effective remedies for the debacle. I would hate to see a condition of anarchy in the country, which is what we are fast approaching. More power to you, Senator. Hope Congress can come up with something to help the taxpaying citizens equate with criminals in the nation's courts, the Supreme Court notwithstanding."

A couple in California write:

"Hearty applause for your current efforts to help law-abiding citizens of our country. It is certainly one of the great tragedies of our time that the safety of millions is being jeopardized by the philosophical positions of five men, even a majority of one. We certainly believe that the first function of any government is to provide safety for its citizens. Our support and best wishes go out to you in this very vital matter."

A housewife in New Hampshire writes:

"Thank God someone has decided to do something about these Supreme Court decrees. You have no idea how frustrating it is to write to Washington time after time on this subject and get the answers 'There's nothing can be done to curb crime!' What are our representatives there for, if not for our protection and well-being? Thank you for starting the fight against the protection of criminals."

A housewife in New York State writes:

"After reading an article in the Buffalo Evening News today, in which you are concerned about losing sight of Law Enforcement in our country today, I am writing this informal letter to you about the way many, many people feel.

"I just get chills up my spine to hear all the Supreme Court rulings on many cases. Perhaps we ought to make policemen out of the same Supreme Court judges to see how they would feel under these conditions. At a club, a gas station, schools, church gatherings you hear the same feeling, today the law protects the criminal.

"Again, for your great interest in our country—may the Good Lord Bless and Keep You Many, Many Years."

A citizen from Long Island, New York writes:

"Silly Supreme Court decisions free murderers, rapists and others to roam the streets, when they have confessed to their crimes."

A businessman from Florida sent me a press clipping concerning bills I introduced on January 25th and writes:

"This clipping is the best news to come out of Washington in many years. Do what you can to get us back in a correct constitutional mood."

A housewife in Portland, Oregon writes:

"The enclosed clipping gave me a lot of satisfaction—that someone was interested in curbing criminal activities. The U.S. Supreme Court is not.

"I am with you right down the line—more power to you.

"With the laws as they now stand and the U.S. Supreme Court making more such laws, the enforcement officials hands are tied. Such officials should be given all the power they can use."

A woman at one of our colleges writes:

"I sincerely hope that you can get your crime bill passed. I have heard over and over that 'when people care enough, something will be done.' Well, I have been 'caring' for the last ten years, and have written letters of protest to the Star, other senators and Chief of Police, but my feeble protests have brought no results other than polite answers to my letters.

"I have been protesting that absurd Mallory Rule ever since it was established by the Supreme Court. *Freeing a criminal on a technicality is not justice.*

"All the Supreme Court decisions seem to give all the advantages to the criminal. I am fed up with all the excuses that are made for the criminal. Each person knows that he is responsible for his acts and I don't see why he should be allowed to go free of punishment.

"And now that Court has decided that communists can teach in our public schools! Don't you think it is time something is done about the Supreme Court Judges? Shouldn't they be elected and not appointed?"

A man from Arizona writes:

"I agree with you 100% that it is not fair that the vote of one person (5–4) should rule 190 million people. Why can't Congress make a law like the State of Missouri that the judges come to the people for their vote of approval. For the Supreme Court of the United States I would suggest every four years on presidential election."

A man in New York City writes:

"There is absolutely no reason why a voluntary confession—not extracted by threat or force—should be invalidated by the Supreme Court.

"More power to you in your bill to aid the crime-fighting forces. We live in great peril and anxiety in the big cities—and here in New York are not even allowed to possess a protective weapon. Only the criminals have them!"

A constituent in a small town in Arkansas writes:

"Crime is of prime importance to our beloved country. Matters, largely because of the decisions of our Supreme Court, are just moving in the wrong direction. It is very heartening to note that you have a real concern here. I do sincerely hope and pray that the day will come when the Congress, with you taking the lead, will take action to remove those men on this court who seem determined to wreck our nation."

Another constituent in a small Arkansas town writes:

"And then Chief Justice Earl Warren wants our peace officers to be nice and courteous to criminals when they arrest them. What Earl Warren needs is for a man to put a forty-five in his face and tell *him* what to do. Senator, I have had that experience. And I want to tell you they do not have any mercy on you nor leniency to the one they are holding up. I think if that were to happen to him, he would change his stubborn mind a little."

A housewife from Oklahoma writes:

"As a former resident of Arkansas, I am very proud of your concern about decisions handed down by the U. S. Supreme Court. I quote from *The Journal*, December 31, 1966: 'In the bewildering variety of changes that have been handed down by the Supreme Court alone, we either retreat into total cynicism, or if we are grasping for certitude within this realm, we seek to defy the process.' End of quote.

"The recent rulings upon Communist teachers in our schools, colleges, and universities, and the lack of prosecution for treason, I find not only myself but everyone that I meet and talk with in a state of shock to think that members of the highest court in this great nation would stoop to such degradation of the laws of our country. Protect the criminal, place the children under Communist teachers without a word of complaint from Congress, encourage lawlessness all over the land, and what else? We feel strongly against these decisions and the ones responsible for them. The function of the Supreme Court is not to make laws, but to interpret them, and they are clearly and flagrantly overstepping. The people of Oklahoma are most definitely disturbed about this situation, and I hope and pray that Congress will *once again* see its duty and use the power invested in it to put a stop to this before we become a hopelessly lawless nation. This, I pray for our children and those of the future. Let us leave them something to make up for the 'bills' of indebtedness that have been heaped upon them.

"God bless you for speaking out against this evil and *please* use the power invested in you as a fine Senator to bring this before Congress."

A farmer from my State of Arkansas writes:

"It is with great pleasure to learn that we do have a Senator who can and will speak up and out to denounce our members of the Supreme Court on its decisions. And you are so correct in saying that we the people are wanting answers to such actions. We have always hoped to have the best from our Supreme Court. But who do we have now? Puts one to wondering. Anyway I want to thank you for your action that is in our paper, The Harrison Daily Times, January 25, 1967."

A man from Illinois writes:

"Many of my friends share my growing concern over the U.S. Supreme Court's decisions freeing the guilty criminals who have admitted heinous crimes against society, as referred to in three editorials appearing Monday and Tuesday, copy attached."

A woman writes from the State of Washington:

"You have said the Congress may have to do something about the Supreme Court's decisions which are turning criminals lose to prey on society.

"I surely agree with you in this, and the sooner the better. The Supreme Court is no longer interpreting the laws; it is making them. And all in favor of the criminals or Communists."

A woman in Massachusetts takes Congress to task for inaction:

"At last! Action is long, long over-due, and Congress has been most remiss to wait so long. Thanks and appreciation."

A housewife in Connecticut writes:

"I am just one of millions who feel that the Supreme Court and other courts are not working for the best welfare of our country. Their law on crime seems utterly stupid to the majority of people who care for law and order. Just what is the Supreme Court trying to do to our beloved country, America? Are some of the members of the Court communistically minded? When people all over these United States of ours are worried about the flouting of law on every side, then our highest court makes it impossible for criminals to be punished. Just how utterly nonsensical can people grow?"

A housewife in New York State. writes:

"I am a resident of New York State but I read with great interest that you had made a speech to the Senate in which you stated the Supreme Court by its decisions has made it easier for the criminal to escape punishment.

"Enclosed are clippings from local papers and U.S. News and World Report which certainly confirm your statements.

"I have four grandchildren growing up in this great country and I am concerned about the growing crime rate and urge you to please keep up the pressure on Congress to do something about this problem."

A couple in Oklahoma write:

"We want to take this opportunity to highly commend you for speaking out about the lawlessness that is constantly being encouraged by the decisions of the United States Supreme Court and strongly feel that Congress must take any and all necessary steps to correct this situation or this great nation that we love so much will not long survive."

A Virginia housewife writes:

"A line of appreciation and to commend you for your statement about the Supreme Court and the criminal. I am sure there are a great many of our citizens who also say, 'Amen'. This wrecking crew on the Supreme Court has been aiding and abetting the criminal for all too long, as well as the communist, without anything being done about it. They really have made it complete now. They take God out of the schools and put the communists in. God have mercy."

A housewife in Tennessee writes:

"This is an article that recently appeared in our paper. Please, Sir, keep trying to get laws made that will put a stop to criminals being turned loose on the American public. It seems to the law abiding people that the ones who are being protected in this country are the criminals. The Congress should make and pass laws that curb the powers of any court that uses that power—to the disadvantage of—law and order—please untie the hands of our law enforcement officers—make rules that court judges should abide by. It seems to me The Federal Guide Lines are needed by nine men who should use their power to help law abiding people, not abuse that power by helping criminals."

A member of the Crime Commission of Greater Miami writes:

"I read your recent speech before Congress, in which you recommended new legislation to quell "the crime menace in America. . . . We in the Crime Commission here appreciate very much the extremely valuable service being rendered by you to our Government."

An attorney from St. Petersburg, Florida, writes:

"It was my pleasure recently to read in David Lawrence's column, in our local paper, your speech on the Senate Floor pertaining to crime and the recent decisions of our Supreme Court. May I take this opportunity to say that it is encouraging to have someone in high position, like you, take such a position as I personally feel the same way you do about these various decisions."

A man from Atlanta, Georgia, writes:

"I am delighted to know some one in Congress is aroused to the point of wanting to do something about the situation . . . The situation is more than serious. It is tragic and drastic measures are needed. Unless something is done and soon I fear many more fine women will be raped and brutally murdered. Women are no longer safe alone anywhere in this great country. What a shame it is."

A professor at Taylor University, Upland, Indiana, writes:

"I wish to commend you on your speech to the Senate regarding the need for legislation to control crime. If our high court is going to work harder to protect the rights of the criminal than the rights of the law-abiding citizen, then Congress certainly will have to step in and provide laws which can not be misinterpreted."

A woman from Madison, Wisconsin, writes:

"Thank you for saying this. It is true. We are afraid. We all know of instances in which the *criminal* is protected, even if he confesses. We are unhappy about the court's decision. If one of their own should be a victim, would they feel the same about 'rights of the criminal'?"

A businessman from Pineville, Louisiana, writes:

"I read recently the remarks you had made in Congress about the need to rectify recent Supreme Court decisions that allow many self-confessed criminals to go free. Many folks are deeply concerned about the state of affairs in that the Supreme Court apparently has so restricted the authority of our police that their hands are really tied.

"It would be appreciated if you could advise what your efforts are in this direction, if a bill is being prepared, so that interested citizens might bring about the pressure necessary to get proper legislation through the Congress."

A man from St. Petersburg, Florida, writes:

"It has been reported that you made a statement last week deploring the effect of many Supreme Court decisions which now aid and abet the criminal element.

"The increase in crime has now reached menacing proportions, and under our present policies admitted criminals are being turned loose to continue their depredations against society.

"Under the circumstances Congress has a grave responsibility to protect law-abiding citizens, and I indeed hope that you will stimulate your Congressional colleagues to take action to reverse some of the dangerous decisions of the court in recent years."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to study the bills that have been introduced, not only the bill to which I have specifically referred, S. 674, but also the 25 or 30 other bills dealing with the crime problem in this country which have already been introduced in this session of Congress.

Many of these bills will be referred to the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures of the Judiciary Committee. I am chairman of that subcommittee. Many of the bills will be processed by that subcommittee. I earnestly solicit the counsel, the interest, and the full cooperation of every Member of the Senate, to the end that these legislative proposals may be thoroughly considered and that we may be successful during this session of Congress in reporting and securing the enactment of new laws that are vitally needed to strengthen law enforcement in this country, and in eliminating the farce of turning confessed criminals loose on society to resume the pursuit of their nefarious activities.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 665) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russel] is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield without losing his right to the floor? I intend to suggest the absence of a quorum; and it will be a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield for that purpose?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I want it distinctly understood that I did not request the majority leader to ask for a quorum. He undoubtedly has some requests from other sources.

I do not believe that we have had a quorum call today. Therefore, I yield for that purpose, but I hope that Senators will know about it so that they may come to the floor. I am not trying to drum up an audience.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before I renew the request, the distinguished chairman of the committee is absolutely right. He has stated the case precisely. I think that the bill is important enough for us to have a quorum.

I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I hope that the attachés will immediately notify all offices so that we may get all Senators on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 32 Leg.]

Baker
Bartlett
Brooke
Byrd, W. Va.
Clark
Cotton
Curtis
Harris
Hill
Hollings
Hruska
Mansfield
McClellan
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Mundt
Percy
Russell
Stennis
Talmadge

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] are necessarily absent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the presence of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Ervin
Fannin
Griffin
Gruening
Hansen
Hart
Hartke
Hatfield
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Miller
Morse
Moss
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Symington
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Yarborough

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the pending legislation is a supplemental authorization of appropriation for the Department of Defense in fiscal year 1967. I am sure that the requirement for additional military funding in this fiscal year should be well known to anyone who has any degree of responsibility for, or interest in, our activities in southeast Asia.

Last year's hearings and reports clearly showed that, for budgetary purposes, money requirements had been calculated on the assumption, but not necessarily the expectation, that the conflict in Vietnam would end by July 1, 1967. Unhappily, it now seems equally clear that the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong have shown little, if any, interest in any kind of settlement other than our completely abandoning our original objective of assuring self-determination in South Vietnam. So far as one not officially responsible for the conduct of foreign relations can discern, the only response from the North Vietnamese to our many offers to discuss differences has been the equivalent of their saying "if you surrender we will consider talking to you." A nation that responded favorably to such a contemptuous attitude could hardly maintain its self-respect, nor would it deserve the respect of its peers.

Consequently, there seems to be no immediate alternative to continuing our military effort to keep the people of South Vietnam from being overrun and absorbed. This military effort is expensive—the new obligational authority requested for Southeast Asia is $12,275,870,000—but this cost in dollars is not nearly so dear as the loss of life and the suffering that military conflict causes.

Of the more than $12 billion in supplemental appropriations being requested for Southeast Asia, $4,467,200,000 must be authorized before appropriations are in order. The pending bill would provide this authorization.

Until the authorization has been approved, appropriations based on it would not be in order.

The authorization of appropriations for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles totals $3,705,600,000; for research, development, test, and evaluation, the total is $135 million; and for military construction $624,500,000 would be authorized.

Authorizations this large should not be justified in generalities. The committee report contains more specific details on what the authorization covers. I do want to mention three major influences on the size of this bill.

The first is that a large part of the authorization is intended to replace procurement programs that were temporarily deferred to secure funds to accelerate production of certain aircraft last fall. Technically these actions are called reprogramings. Lest I be charged with using a euphemism, I must say that what happened was, in effect, a borrowing against the supplemental funding now under consideration.

In other words, the Department of Defense borrowed from Peter on past authorizations and appropriations to pay Paul, represented by the conflict in Vietnam.

This authorization would restore those procurements earlier postponed to permit the funding of more urgent requirements.

I should say for the information of the Senate, Mr. President, that, in addition to these refunding and replacement operations, the amount of new spending authority sought by the military departments was more than $5 billion in excess of the amount approved by the Secretary of Defense for inclusion in this bill.

A second prominent determinant of this authorization's size is the need to buy more spares and repair parts and to modify many of our aircraft. The spares and repair parts are needed to keep our aircraft flying in Southeast Asia and the modifications are intended to enable these aircraft to deliver their weapons more accurately, as well as to give our pilots a better chance to survive antiaircraft tactics.

The third substantial contributor to requirements in this authorization is an increase in the number of pilots to be trained. This increase applies to both fixed-wing and helicopter pilots, and a result is that more trainer aircraft, both fixed-wing and helicopter, must be bought in order that their training may be accomplished.

In recent months we have seen some odd reactions to our bombings of North Vietnam. Anguished cries have come from some over the morality of the bombings. The difference between the reaction to bombings now and that during World War II causes one in some cases to wonder if the political orientation of the country being bombed does not strongly influence some of the moral judgments of the issue.

Although we do not like to reflect on this now, the truth is that much of our bombing in World War II was directed against cities generally.

In Tokyo an inferno of fire and terror was caused by fire bombs. Sixty-nine of the 164 square miles in Tokyo were destroyed or damaged. And in that unhappy city, our attacks resulted in 166,447 casualties, of whom almost 100,000 were killed.

In Germany, the RAF and the U.S. Air Force destroyed 2,150,000 dwellings and caused 7,500,000 people to be homeless. They killed 250,000 people and injured 420,000.

At the time Germany and Japan were governed by tyrannies of the right so-called fascists, and it could be that this is the reason there was silence then from some of those who rant today about the inhumanity or the immorality of accidental civilian death from bombing military targets in a country ruled by authoritarian leftists.

Another condition that strikes me as curious is the pretended surprise with which some persons received the news that some of our bombing in North Vietnam had caused civilian casualties. Until war is governed by the same kind of rules that apply to an athletic contest, military targets will often be located near civilian population, in fact, there is some evidence the North Vietnamese are deliberately placing instrumentalities of war in heavily populated areas, in the belief and hope that that is the safest place where they can be situated.

Despite our using extraordinary care, no one should have been surprised that not all targets had been hit precisely.

They need not express any surprise in the future if a bomb does not fall directly in the barrel on the military target. When one considers the speed of our aircraft today, it is manifest that the difference of a fraction of a second in the time of a bomb release makes a difference of many feet—indeed, many yards—in where the bomb hits.

North Vietnam is being bombed for several reasons. The most important of these reasons is that North Vietnam has sent troops and supplies to South Vietnam in an attempt to subjugate the people there. The United States has sent troops and supplies to South Vietnam in an attempt to give the South Vietnamese people a chance to determine their form of government. Those two forces are now in armed conflict.

Members of the Armed Forces of the United States are performing their duties in South Vietnam in a manner that reflects great credit on them.

As long as they are there—as long as they are there under the orders of their Government—Congress owes them the duty of not exposing them to avoidable risks. The administration owes them that duty, and our military commanders owe every member of our Armed Forces in Vietnam the responsibility of decreasing the risk to his life to the greatest possible degree.

If we stop the bombing of North Vietnam our forces are in greater jeopardy than if we attack the flow of men and material to the south. Personally, I could not support the continued deployment of our forces in South Vietnam if we are not to take every practical step available to us to improve their chances of survival. Thus, it seems to me that if we stop the bombing without some reciprocal restraint or withdrawal by the North Vietnamese, we should really reconsider whether to maintain a military presence in South Vietnam.

In its propaganda against the bombings, North Vietnam refuses to start at the beginning. The beginning was its support of the Vietcong. If North Vietnam will stop this, the President has made clear that our bombing of North Vietnam will stop. That much of the problem is perfectly clear, and to me it is very simple.

The United States has an effective method for attacking targets in North Vietnam that is not being used, though as a layman I have vigorously urged its use. That method is naval bombardment.

In the hearings on this bill I renewed my strong plea that a battleship be taken out of mothballs and returned to the active fleet. The weight of the fire from its 16-inch guns, the speed with which it could fire on targets, and the availability of its fire in all weather conditions are some of the reasons for my recommendation.

Since I have been unsuccessful so far in persuading those with the power of ultimate decision to use a battleship, I am now trying to convince them to use one or more of the cruisers that are already in an active status with the fleet. A battleship would be much more effective because it has a much longer range and its shells have about four times the weight of a cruiser's. But a careful examination of the maps shows that a cruiser could take under fire most of the railroad and much of the highway that run along the coast of North Vietnam, which are being used to supply the Vietcong, and the North Vietnam forces in South Vietnam.

To be sure, these targets can be bombed by aircraft.

But, Mr. President, the aircraft is over the target only for a matter of seconds; then it is gone. The moment the aircraft departs, the Vietcong start rebuilding the bridge or the railroad trestle, or whatever the target is. But a battleship or a battle cruiser can lie offshore and lob a shell in there every 35 or 40 minutes, and absolutely prevent the reconstruction of the bridges and of the railroad facilities that many American boys have given their lives to destroy. I simply cannot understand the hesitation to attack these North Vietnamese targets by naval gunfire.

I am told that it would be likely to start a greater war; but I cannot see that naval bombardment would be any more likely to escalate the war than using airplanes, and it would be much more effective in some cases. The committee was informed that there are between 500 and 600 targets that could be effectively reached by naval gunfire from the sea. Under the present conditions there this could be done without the loss of a single airplane, a single pilot, or a single American boy.

I intend, Mr. President, to harp on this matter on every available occasion until some better reason is found for the failure to use these ships than has been brought forward until now. For the life of me, I cannot understand how there is authority for making tremendous air attacks with bombs on North Vietnam, but at the same time there are strict orders that no ship can fire a shell against North Vietnam unless it is fired upon from the shore. To me, that does not make sense, and I have never hesitated to say so. My powers of comprehension just do not recognize the distinction.

Now, Mr. President, let me discuss for a moment the dollar costs of the war in Vietnam. Before doing so, I want to restate my view that these costs, as high as they are, are much less dear to us and of less concern to the American people than the loss of human life and the suffering that are a result of armed conflict.

In response to questions on the Senate floor last year I expressed an off-the-cuff opinion that the war in Vietnam was costing about $2 billion a month. This was at a time when the Department of Defense was answering that it could not estimate this cost within any useful range. That being the only figure in circulation, the $2 billion figure has been used often since then by many other people. I only wish the estimates I have made of some other imponderables and unknowns had proved to be as good as this one.

In his recent testimony, Secretary McNamara mentioned two different methods for estimating the cost of the war. One begins with the prewar expenditure figure of about $50 billion annually. To this is added $5.4 billion for pay increases granted by the Congress in the last few years. The sum is subtracted from the $73.1 billion in expenditures expected in fiscal year 1968 to produce a difference of $17.7 billion annually, or about $1.5 billion per month. He also said that by going through each appropriations account and trying to isolate specific costs that would not be incurred except for Vietnam, he came up with a figure of about $22 billion annually. Of course such a system is necessarily somewhat arbitrary, as was illustrated by the Secretary's rhetorical question as to what part of his salary should be treated as a part of the cost of the war.

I think neither method takes into account the depletion of stocks and supplies that were already on hand and that neither makes any allowance for diverting resources to Vietnam from tasks to which they were assigned before. With a reasonable allowance for stock depletion and diversion of resources, the cost of the war probably exceeds $24 billion annually.

Mr. President, I know all Senators regret the necessity for these expenditures that are occasioned by our presence in South Vietnam and contiguous waters and lands. But I know of no sensible alternative to approving this bill.

Whether our commitment to South Vietnam was ill-advised has been the subject of a great debate. It is sure to continue to be debated.

Last year I related to the Senate the account of my having strongly recommended against our first involvement during the middle fifties. My purpose then was not to dwell on that advice, and that is not my purpose now. I cite this only preliminarily before emphasizing my belief that, having made the commitment and having sent a half million American youth across the world to the scene of the conflict, we have no alternative to carrying this undertaking through to an honorable conclusion.

The procurement, research and development, and construction that this bill would authorize are intended to enable the members of our Armed Forces to carry out their orders as effectively, as safely, and as comfortably as possible while our Government continues its many different approaches to finding an end to this war. I am sure that the American people will accept any solution of this war that will enable our country to keep its self-respect, and that does not break faith with those who have given everything in the combat that still rages in Southeast Asia.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1967

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 355) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, in order that the Senate might proceed to the consideration of S. 665.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 665) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair). The Senator from Maine.

DEFENSE CREDIBILITY GAP

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, whether one does, or does not, approve of our involvement in Vietnam—whether one does, or does not, approve of our conduct of the war there—there can be no question but that we are there and that we have a very solemn obligation to give to our service personnel fighting there everything they need to defend themselves.

Consequently, I unreservedly join with the distinguished chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee in urging the enactment of this authorization bill—and I commend him on his firm and fair leadership on this matter.

As the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, I am cast in the role of the so-called loyal opposition. Our national security requires loyalty to our Commander in Chief and I have, and continue, to support him against his critics, most notably from within his own political party, who urge a pullout and literally a surrender in Vietnam.

But in that loyalty that I give him and in that support that I give to his resistance to the clamor for a pullout from Vietnam, I cannot in all good conscience muzzle my own criticism of some of the aspects of our national security under the administration and policies of President Johnson and Secretary of Defense McNamara.

This authorization bill demonstrates the seriously faulty judgment of the Johnson-McNamara administration on our needs in the Vietnam conflict. It reveals how badly they guessed on what would be required during fiscal year 1967 in the Vietnam fighting. This faulty judgment echoes the earlier faulty judgment of the Secretary of Defense in his optimistic predictions about when the American servicemen could be returned from Vietnam.

If anyone considers this to be partisan criticism, then I would call his attention to certain portions of the unanimous report of the Senate Armed Services Committee composed of 12 Democrats and six Republicans—specifically to those portions of the report stating:

> Some Members of Congress believed last year that it was practical and desirable to provide then some of the additional funding that would be required for our operations in southeast Asia. The Department of Defense insisted that the amount of the additional funding needed in this fiscal year was subject to so many contingencies and so much uncertainty that the supplemental needs could not be computed. Accordingly, while there is disagreement over whether at least a part of this additional funding should have been asked for last fall, there should be no surprise that the support of our Armed Forces in southeast Asia requires further authorization and appropriation in fiscal year 1967.

In connection with this authorization bill, I must in all good conscience point out other tragedies in the Johnson-McNamara handling of the Vietnam war and in providing for the requirements of that war. Specifically some of the tragedies are:

First. A pilot shortage and depletion of the resources and capabilities of our Tactical Air Command;

Second. Reported bomb shortages and shortages of other necessary materiel and supplies;

Third. The deterioration of the combat readiness of many of our military units in order to supply the Vietnam forces without making the authorizations and appropriations that leading members of the Appropriations and Armed Services Committee strongly feel should be made in excess of the amounts requested by Secretary of Defense McNamara;

Fourth. Permitting the Reserve and the National Guard to literally become havens for many draft dodgers and professional athletes;

Fifth. Promoting to general rank in the Reserve prominent and key Government officials, who are exempted from callup except in time of war and who, in all probability, would not be called up even then because their civilian Government positions are more important than their Reserve mobilization assignments;

Sixth. Seeking to promote to general rank even some reservists who are not required to do active duty training—and some who do not even take the trouble to do the active duty training that is required by regulations; and

Seventh. Punishing those officers, who dare, in the confines of the nonattribution halls of advanced military colleges, to speak of bomb shortages.

Despite the denials of the Secretary of Defense, the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, of which I am the ranking minority member, has determined that the first three tragedies that I have specified do exist. The subcommittee has made thorough investigations and has found these shortages of pilots, bombs, and materiel, and combat readiness.

The fourth tragedy of the Reserve and the National Guard being havens for too many draft dodgers and too many high-salaried professional athletes is common knowledge to the public.

The fifth tragedy—that of promoting to general officer rank reservists who will probably never be called to active duty even in wartime—is a matter that I have exposed through my own individual investigation.

The sixth tragedy—that of promoting to general officer rank reservists who are not required to do any active duty training—and that of attempting to promote to general officer rank reservists who even make no effort to meet their training requirements, promotions attempted one by the Air Force and one by the Secretary of Defense—is a matter that I have exposed through my own individual investigation.

The seventh tragedy involves the issue of academic freedom in the advanced professional military colleges. This tragedy happened recently at the Air War College at Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala. It has long been a historic tradition that, in the best interests of academic freedom, the students and faculty members would be encouraged to think independently and to voice their views frankly and forthrightly.

More than that, it has been the solemn rule that nonattribution would apply to such open discussions in closed sessions. I know this from firsthand knowledge—because I have lectured at the Air War College and at the National War College and under the stricture of nonattribution placed on all question-and-answer sessions following the delivery of the lecture. I now have been asked to lecture at the Naval War College but after the experience of the former commandant of the Air War College, I am hesitant to accept the invitation of the Naval War College lest the condition be that I can in no manner dissent with the Johnson-McNamara administration and policy and can in no way criticize it.

I have attempted to determine just exactly what happened in the firing of Maj. Gen. Jerry D. Page as commandant of the Air War College. All of the official responses that I have received were covered up originally by being made "classified documents" by the Department of Defense. Yet, I can see nothing in these responses that involve, or would in any manner compromise, our national security.

While I have refrained from revealing what was in these responses, I can discuss what has already been revealed in published press accounts. During the middle of last year, Maj. Gen. Jerry D. Page was selected to be the commandant of the Air War College. The reports were that he was selected because he was recognized as one of the best "thinkers" in the Air Force. More than that, his unhappiness with some aspects of the McNamara policy on weapons systems, nuclear capability, and national security was well known within the Air Force long before he was selected to be commandant of the Air War College. In fact, many felt he had even been blunt in many of his open expressions prior to his assignment to be commandant of the Air War College.

So that when he was made commandant of the Air War College, many observed this as proof positive of the academic freedom of that institution. Then there was a 3- or 4-day Senior Air Force Reserve and National Guard Colonels Orientation Course at the Air War College in mid-December 1966. In one session, General Page is reported to have stated in his lecture on December 15, 1966, that there had been bomb shortages in Vietnam. It is further reported that one of the Reserve colonels took umbrage at this on behalf of Defense Secretary McNamara and the Johnson administraton and heatedly took issue with General Page.

It has been charged by some of the colonels attending this short orientation course that the objecting Reserve colonel then made a report and a complaint to the Department of Defense against General Page for talking about bomb shortages—something many others have been talking about, including members of the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee.

The specified Reserve colonel has denied that he made a complaint to Secretary of Defense McNamara. Whether he did or not, the matter was called to the attention of the Secretary of Defense by someone, and he then referred the matter for action on to the Secretary of the Air Force. And shortly thereafter, General Page was suddenly and abruptly removed from command of the Air War College and ordered out of the country to Okinawa. And shortly thereafter the specified Reserve colonel was nominated for promotion to brigadier general.

These are the recorded facts. The Department of Defense and the Department of the Air Force refuse to disclose the full story. Whatever that full story is, there remain two undeniable facts. Of the two antagonists in this conflict, Major General Page has been stripped of his command—and the specified colonel has been nominated for promotion to brigadier general. In the absence of greater frankness on the part of the Department of Defense, the end results of the conflict, when viewed in the light of the secrecy clamped on the matter and the unresolved credibility conflict between the specified colonel and others attending the orientation course, do not present a picture to merit admiration for, and confidence in, the Department of Defense and the Department of the Air Force.

Added to the bizarre character of this controversy is the ironic fact that more than a month after the argument between the specified colonel and General Page and just before General Page's departure from the Air War College, in a publicized ceremony General Page was decorated with the Legion of Merit.

One thing is sure. The unresolved credibility conflict in the Page-Goddard case has had a damaging effect on not only the Department of Defense, the Department of the Air Force, and the Air War College but as well on the other advanced professional military colleges. The most specific damage is on the morale of the present class at the Air War College.

A student at the Air War College has written me and summed it up in this manner. I quote from his letter to me:

> We of the Air War College Class of 1967 would surely like to see this issue settled and to get the facts before we graduate and head out to the far flung bases of the USAF on 2 June 1967. The issue still appears to be shrouded in mystery as far as we are concerned. Either Colonel Goddard made the remarks or he didn't. If he didn't, then some other reserve officer attending the seminar made them or he didn't. Or, some other explanation must account for the rapid reassignment of Major General Page. . . . I can personally speak with absolute knowledge concerning the issue of shortages of bombs if required to. In this regard, Major General Page said nothing either publicly or privately to the regular Air Force members of the Air War College on the subject of munitions which was not common knowledge to hundreds of USAF officers in Viet Nam or Thailand during the months of February to May 1966.
>
> Unfortunately the "credibility gap" for truth appears to widen with the passage of each day. Here I cannot help but quote Senator Symington who volunteered the intelligence "that the morale of the Air Force is 'unprecedented.'" The morale of the Air War College Class of 1967 will be "unprecedented" unless a complete and honest explanation is provided over the Major General Page issue.

Mr. President, I am supporting the President on this authorization request, because I feel that we must give all-out support to our fighting men in Vietnam. But I do not want my support on this measure to be interpreted in the slightest as an all-out approval of the defense and national security policies and administration of Secretary McNamara and President Johnson.

To the contrary, I am disturbed with many aspects of their policy and administration, and these seven tragedies that I have outlined are but a few of the examples of why the credibility gap of the Johnson administration is widening instead of narrowing.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I commend the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the ranking Republican member thereof for the statements they have made this afternoon and which have just been completed.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, it was my privilege to attend some of the hearings last year when this vital subject was considered. I also attended some of the sessions this year.

It is encouraging and reassuring to be in the hands of leadership such as these two committees have—the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Armed Services. They are knowledgeable people; they have a judicious temperament; they are realists; they deal with conditions and not theories, to a point where all of us can take great comfort.

It will be my privilege to give what little support I can to their efforts to secure prompt passage of this crucial measure, S. 665.

PROPOSED UNITED STATES-SOVIET CONSULAR TREATY

Mr. **HRUSKA**. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations will shortly begin its executive deliberations on the proposed Consular Convention between the United States and the Soviet Union, after having held public hearings in which both proponents and opponents of the measure have expressed their views. At the same time, there are indications of substantial public opposition to the proposed convention, as evidenced by the mail being received by Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

As I understand the mounting public opposition, its basic objection is to the efforts to "build bridges" to the East, and principally to the Soviet Union, at a time when the entire Communist movement is unanimous in its moral and material support of continued aggression in Southeast Asia by the enemies of South Vietnam.

The consideration of the Consular Convention will have certain disadvantages. It is only one, Mr. President, of a number of bridges which have been proposed in the program of the President and his administration. It seems to me untimely to consider one of these bridges, one of the component elements of the entire program to be discussed, before the entire package will have been inquired into, before the various views on the same have been imparted to Members of this body and of the other body of the Congress and to the public.

Mr. President, in my judgment, it would not be sound policy or good procedure to consider the Consular Convention at this time, standing by itself and out of context with the remaining elements, which taken together could mean a fundamental change in our foreign policy. There is a practical and constructive alternative. We should wait until all administration bridge-building proposals are submitted, until all have been examined in extensive hearings by the respective committees to which they are referred for inquiry and hearings. We should wait until we have the printed hearings available to us and until we have time to reflect on their joint significance before we debate and vote on all or one of these bridge-building proposals.

Without exception, every Communist country is on record in condemnation of the United States as the "chief aggressor" in Vietnam, and as the "worldwide public enemy No. 1." What is more, every Communist country is on record as having committed itself to the defeat of the United States in the Vietnam war. There is indisputable evidence to demonstrate that the Communist movement has taken this commitment seriously, and that it does in fact seek to inflict upon us a humiliating military and psychological defeat.

That the public opinion of this country is now making itself heard on the proposed consular convention should not, therefore, occasion surprise on the part of the administration and the Senate Public opinion has apparently been able to perceive the contradiction between the policies of "bridge-building" to the East and continued all-around Communist support of aggression in Vietnam.

No amount of evasion or circumlocution can answer the fundamental question which citizens on such a large scale ask today: "Why should we extend the hand of friendship to Moscow while it continues to supply the weapons to kill American and Allied soldiers in Vietnam?" We should make no mistake in this respect—it is precisely this question which is the central issue in the debate, and it is precisely this question which we, as Senators, are going to have to answer.

The administration argues that it pursues the contradictory policy of extending the hand of friendship at this time because it must leave no stone unturned in the search for peace. I do not think that anyone would deny the need to continue the quest for peace, but we have an obligation to ask whether the measures advanced by the administration do in fact contribute to the quest for a genuine and lasting peace.

It is unnecessary for me to dwell at length upon the specific provisions of the proposed Consular Convention, because it is not the convention itself which is the central issue. We are being asked to approve the consular agreement as part of a much larger package of administration proposals designed to "build bridges." How can we render a proper decision on this proposal if it comes before us in isolation? If it is but one of a series of steps, can we say "yes" or "no" without being aware of the overall impact of the entire package? Are we to believe that the net effect of all the proposals will be anything less than a radical shift in the form and content of our foreign policy?

Mr. President, it appears that the administration is trying to eat its cake and have it, too, by taking two separate positions on each part of its package. On the one hand, it argues that the Consular Convention is a very minor matter which, in itself, will serve only to protect American citizens who travel in the Soviet Union. It further argues that, regardless of the action taken on it by this body, the President is still vested with the authority to negotiate a consular agreement. On the other hand, it argues that if it is not given Senate approval to establish consular relations with the U.S.S.R., then it will be severely hampered in its ability to deal effectively with what it chooses to call "the changing Communist world." Furthermore, the administration argues that, if it is unable to proceed with this "preliminary step," it will be unable to proceed with what it says are "more substantial steps."

Now, we ask: Which is it? Is the Consular Convention important or unimportant? Is it both an "isolated" agreement and an "integrated" agreement? Is it a separate foundation stone, or a "building block" designed to support larger loads?

As I see it, the administration's attempts to simultaneously minimize and maximize the importance of the Consular Convention is in itself a strategy which is designed to confuse the real issues at stake. What is being done is to set the stage for a "steamroller" approach to securing Senate approval for a series of agreements which, if considered together, would be confronted with overwhelming public and congressional opposition. In a sense, the administration has set up its ducks in a special way, with the easiest one coming first. By arguing the simultaneous and contradictory importance and unimportance of the Consular Convention, it hopes to secure Senate approval in order to create momentum for the far more important agreements which are yet to come.

With the momentum of this agreement, having been ratified, or consented to, the administration will then argue that the next "logical" step should be speedy Senate approval of the Treaty on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space—a treaty with broad ramifications, which may affect our entire strategic posture, and which may bear significantly on our long-range national security. Already, as a result of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty—which, it should be noted, received my affirmative vote—we find that our ability to build a new canal in Central America to replace the obsolescent Panama Canal by using nuclear devices is totally restricted. We therefore need to examine the proposed Space Treaty with a fine-tooth comb, considering carefully every effect which it might have on our long-range security and strategic interests. This can be done only by holding exhaustive hearings during which we will have to hear the views of the military, the research community, and outside experts.

But behind even these two preliminary agreements there looms what is undoubtedly the most critical and controversial issue of all—the East-West trade bill. In reality, the "preliminary steps" of the Consular Convention and the Space Treaty are designed to generate irresistible momentum for the passage of the East-West trade bill, a measure on which public opposition will be felt in every quarter of Congress and the executive branch.

It is abundantly clear that the administration feels it cannot justify its decision to expand trade and credits to the Communist world without having committed support for the "preliminary" measures which I have been discussing. If and when the time comes to consider the East-West trade bill, Mr. President, the administration will again argue that it cannot effectively continue the quest for peace without the authority to relax trade barriers and extend long-term credits to the East. It will further argue that it would be "senseless" to stop the process of bridge building at that point, and will then argue that the Consular Convention and the Space Treaty are rendered meaningless without this further step. It will, in effect, then argue the opposite of what it now argues—in other words, it will say that the earlier steps were important, and that they form the "logical framework" for our entire policy toward the Communist world.

It would be very foolish, Mr. President, for the Congress to offer only stubborn and unreasoned opposition to the proposals of the administration. What we need is a thorough examination and review of our relations with the Soviet Union and the Communist world, and a painstaking analysis of the goals of the Communist movement today. We are told that Communists everywhere are becoming less dogmatic, that they no longer espouse world revolution, and that they are slowly beginning to realize that they must cooperate with the West in order to "achieve world peace." We are told that they want increased "peaceful" trade in order to better the lot of their own citizens, and that they do not intend to use trade and commercial credits for the purpose of increasing their strategic power. But where is the evidence for these assertions? Who determines the uses to which they put their imports, we or they? Who can determine with the slightest degree of accuracy what is strategic and what is nonstrategic, and whether trade in goods and technology which appear to be "nonstrategic" do not allow them to divert their scarce resources for research and development of advanced weapons systems, or for the promotion of more "wars of national liberation?"

Mr. President, while we seek to expand trade, the official Soviet declarations, resolutions, and pronouncements continue to underscore dramatically the existing and expanding commitments to the Communist regime in Hanoi, and to the rapidly increasing efforts to promote subversion, class warfare, and open revolution in Latin America through the Cuban regime. Are we to conclude that official Soviet pronouncements, which are frequently supported by concrete evidence of execution, are simply meaningless?

Mr. President, it is clear that, in the matter of the Consular Convention, we are not dealing with a meaningless and isolated agreement. On the contrary, we are dealing with the first of a series of measures which affect in a most profound fashion all of our foreign policy objectives, our national security, and our long-range strategic interests. We cannot deny the importance of the links which bind each administration proposal to the rest. We cannot risk losing sight of the overall impact which they will have. As Senators, we have the obligation to consider these matters in the broadest possible perspective.

I am sure that many of my fellow Senators share these concerns, and I am sure that many of them feel as I do; namely, that the attempt of the administration to present to Congress on a piecemeal basis proposals which will have a profound impact on our security and well-being, is not to be taken lightly.

What I propose, therefore, is that the Senate take a long, hard look at the administration's package of "bridge-building" proposals in the entirety in order to assess their total significance. I propose that the whole package of measures be submitted to Congress, that each be subjected to rigorous scrutiny by means of committee hearings, and that no action be taken on any of them until both the Senate and the House have had the opportunity each within its proper and assigned jurisdiction to study them in the broadest possible context.

Action on the Consular Treaty by the Senate alone is a unilateral step on a much larger area of public policy. It would exclude the House from a fair and timely opportunity to share in a vital and precedent-making "first step."

Mr. President, it might be well to call attention to the fact that if the consideration of the Consular Convention will be followed shortly by the so-called Open Space Treaty, we will have witnessed the spectacle of this body having had to take action twice in matters which concern our entire foreign policy, but in which the House of Representatives will not be permitted, except on the basis of independent debate on the floor, to participate.

A far-reaching inquiry into our relations with the Communist world will enable our careful overall consideration of these related measures. It will provide an opportunity to clarify many of the key issues in those relations, and would help prepare the way for positive, constructive, and integrated approach to these important matters. It would seem that the Senate would prefer this comprehensive approach rather than disposing of one piece of the puzzle at a time.

Furthermore, I would think that the administration would be eager to have the Congress, and particularly the Senate, approach these questions in an orderly and constructive fashion, considering its proposals on an integrated, rather than a piecemeal basis.

Once the Senate has had the opportunity to examine all the arguments and all the evidence pertaining to the administration proposals, it will be able to deliberate on a much more effective basis, and—I daresay—will be able to deliberate more rapidly. Surely the administration would not object to this proposal as it relates to the Consular Convention, which has already been before the Senate for two and a half years. The additional delay of the vote until the Senate can gain a larger perspective, would certainly be of no consequence.

The administration as well as the Congress owe it to all America which they both represent, to bring to the full, open view of the citizenry all of the pertinent factors of the radical and substantial change in such a large part of our foreign policy.

In view of these considerations, Mr. President, in due time and at an appropriate point, I shall offer a resolution, the essence of which is that until full-scale hearings and opportunity for debate have been completed on the several phases, the Senate defer rendering a final decision in the matter of the proposed Consular Convention between the United States and the U.S.S.R., the treaty on the peaceful uses of outer space, the East-West trade bill, and any such other measures as the administration sees fit to transmit to the Senate on this general subject at this time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the draft of the proposed resolution be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

EXHIBIT 1

S. RES. —

Whereas the President has requested the advice and consent of the Senate to the ratification of the proposed consular convention between the United States and the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the official Soviet declarations and pronouncements continue to affirm the existing and expanding commitments of the Soviet Union to the Communist regime in Hanoi and to the rapidly increasing efforts to promote subversion and open revolution in Latin America; and

Whereas this consular convention is but one of a series of interrelated measures proposed or planned by the President concerning our relations with the Soviet Union and other Communist countries; and

Whereas these measures, considered as an integrated package, would have a profound effect on all of our foreign policy objectives, our national security, and our long-range strategic interests; and

Whereas it is imperative that the Senate consider these measures in the perspective of their overall impact, rather than on a piecemeal basis; and

Whereas the Senate cannot make a responsible determination on any of these measures until all of them have been fully and comprehensively considered, after complete hearings and studies thereon, by the appropriate committees to which these measures are referred: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Senate shall not proceed to the consideration of the Consular Convention between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the treaty on principles governing the activities of nations in the exploration and use of outer space, the proposed "East-West trade bill", or any other measures relating to relations between the United States and the Soviet Union or other Communist countries, until the appropriate committees of the Senate to which such measures are referred have conducted full and comprehensive hearings and studies on all such measures which are now before any committee of the Senate or which may hereafter be proposed by the President during this session of Congress.

Mr. **MUNDT**. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. **HRUSKA**. I am very happy to yield to my good friend from South Dakota, who is a very valuable and responsible member of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to say that the Senator from Nebraska serves the Senate and his country exceedingly well to point out publicly, and on the floor of the Senate, the interrelated programs of which the proposed ratification of the Consular Treaty is the first. This relationship has been played down by administration witnesses, but it has been emphasized over and over again by witnesses from the academic world, from the Defense Establishment, and from others who have testified in opposition to the treaty.

All we need to do to get the full impact of these related programs is go back to the state of the Union address of the President of the United States, our Commander in Chief, where he specifically linked together the proposal for a Consular Treaty and his plan to expand East-West trade even while the war rages on.

In a sense, I suppose, ratification of this Consular Treaty by the Senate now, devoid of hearings which would show the links it has with the rest of the program, could be considered a sort of ratification by Congress of the President's Executive order of October 12, 1966, when the President, confronted by the fact that the House one year and the Senate another year overwhelmingly passed legislation in opposition to supplying American weapons to Russia while Russia was supplying weapons to kill American boys in Vietnam, issued a directive authorizing shipments of some 400 types of exports to Russia.

In that Executive order, the President opened up exports without license to the Soviet Union for 400 new products and supplies. I rather fancy we will come to find out later, as the country begins to realize how those exports are being utilized in terms of helping Russia in supplying weapons to our enemy in Hanoi, that someday we will be confronted with the argument that Congress in effect ratified that action when it approved the Consular Treaty with Russia, if in fact we vote such approval. There is some indication of how serious this is in reading our increasing casualty lists and how witnesses not available to testify on this matter would argue were they able to be heard. I am talking about hundreds of thousands of American boys in Vietnam now, who are being shot at by Russian-supplied weapons.

Let me point out that in the past few months, really, probably in the past few weeks but certainly since this treaty was signed, the Soviet Union has been starting to supply North Vietnam with helicopters—the most modern helicopters they are able to make; because it has been realized that the tides of war in Vietnam have been moving in our direction by the wise and proper use being made of American helicopters. We now confront new helicopters of very new and effective construction supplied by the Russians to help decimate the troops we are sending into North Vietnam. And all those helicopters come from the same country to whom we are asked to build a bridge—the Communists in Russia.

Mr. HRUSKA. Several bridges.

Mr. MUNDT. Several bridges; over which to send American supplies which will help to fuel more effectively the war machine and supply arms to our enemy in Vietnam.

The Senator from Nebraska mentioned a point I think should be commented on; namely, that there is supposed to be a change in the attitude of communism, that there theoretically is a detente in existence.

Over and over again we asked the Secretary of State to tell us about that detente, to specify the steps which tend to add up to the detente. The Secretary of State said that the detente is a definable situation, whereby steps are taken to lessen the tensions among countries with different attitudes. Surely this is a desirable objective.

We said, "That sounds good. What has been done? What have the Russians done? What has actually happened to create such a detente?"

We all read history as much as the Secretary of State does, and we know that under earlier Communist governments the Russians were supplying weapons and supplies to the North Koreans and now they do the same for the Vietnamese to kill American boys. We know that under the present Russian administration, they are supplying even more modern weapons to North Vietnam to use in killing American boys.

That is not a detente. That is not a change. That is not a lessening of tensions.

We know that under Stalin, the Russians were sending persons in the guise of diplomats to the United States to engage in espionage, subversion, and sabotage. We know that the FBI was picking them up, sometimes before they had acquired a military secret and sometimes afterwards. Still, the FBI was doing a commendable job. We know that within the past few months, many of these same Communist diplomats have recently been sent into this country by the present administration of communism in Russia and 17 of them have been so far apprehended, arrested by the FBI, and either returned to their country, or expelled from the United States. How many still remain undetected nobody can say for sure.

That surely is not evidence of a detente. That is not a change.

I believe, in all candor, that we Senators and citizens throughout the country have a right to hear from the Department of State and from the President what kind of detente we do have. Where is the evidence to support the existence of a detente?

What has happened?

The State Department has a happy phrase, "We are up at the front edge of a detente."

I think that if we are, it is at the cutting edge. It is at the shooting edge. It is at the bloody edge which provides the Migs, the antiaircraft guns, 95 percent of the petroleum, the helicopters, and all the other sophisticated weapons going from the Communist regime of Russia to their Communist comrades in Hanoi, for the sole and only purpose of killing American boys and their associates in the loyalist South Vietnamese army.

If they want to talk about this illusionary and nebulous detente, let me give the Senate what the Russian leader, the President of the Soviet Union, Nikolai Podgorny, said about their attitude just last month.

> The Soviet Union is giving, and will continue to give, North Vietnam ever-growing aid until the full triumph of the just cause which the Vietnamese people are struggling.

Does that sound like a detente?

I submit, we serve our men in Vietnam very poorly if we now propose to build bridges over which to send additional supplies to equip the Russians so as to supply the Communists in Vietnam with what it takes to prolong the war and enhance and escalate our casualties.

Sometimes I wonder: Are we really trying to shorten the war, or do we just talk about it?

I should like to have someone stand up and give me any kind of reason he can think of as to why we do not deliberately prolong the war when we increase the shooting power, the fighting power, and the economic power of the enemy against whom we are arrayed.

Thus, I salute the distinguished Senator from Nebraska in properly calling to the attention of this country the basic issue which is involved. It is far more significant and epochal than a mere consular treaty.

A consular treaty in peacetime is one thing. It might be unimportant then. But a consular treaty wrapped up in a package to increase the exportation of American supplies to feed the stumbling economy of bureaucratic ridden Communist Russia is quite something else.

I believe, when the totals come in, in terms of more and more boxes draped with American flags containing the bodies of our boys who have died needlessly because of the money-mad grabbing for profits being engaged in by some in this country who propagandize for the authority and the resources to send still more aid to a Russian economy already straining itself to send steadily expanding shipments of munitions, planes, and war supplies to Hanoi in a desperate effort to prolong the war over there, more and more Senators will realize now is the time to plug up the loopholes rather than to build bridges and that ratification of the consular treaty should be at least deferred until the shooting stops or until Russia stops promoting the Red war in Vietnam.

Mr. HRUSKA. I am very grateful to the Senator from South Dakota for his contribution. I know that when he refers to the package of bridges he has in mind not only the state of the Union message of the President, but also the President's speech October 7, 1966, to the National Conference of Editorial Writers, given in New York City. In that speech he gave many of the component elements of the entire package which would result in this fundamental change in our foreign policy.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield to the Senator from Iowa with the similar request.

Mr. MILLER. I wonder whether the Senator from Nebraska would be good enough to yield to me so that I might ask a few questions of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] relating to some of his comments?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am very happy to do so.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, first, let me say that I commend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] for bringing to the attention of the Senate, and the public in general, what I believe is not a well understood program so far as the administration is concerned, this step-by-step approach to trying to achieve a detente which, of course, we would all like to see.

I am concerned about some of the things that have been said by the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from South Dakota. I believe I understood the Senator from South Dakota to say that some witnesses from the Military Establishment had opposed the proposed consular treaty.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MILLER. Does that mean some of these witnesses have come from the Department of Defense?

Mr. MUNDT. No. I am sure the Senator realizes that this administration is such that nobody presently employed by the executive branch is going to testify to a contrary view; but I can give the Senator the information that a former very distinguished member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. Arleigh Burke, did present his views, in opposition to the treaty, but he is no longer employed by the Commander in Chief.

Mr. MILLER. Of course, I have great respect for Adm. Arleigh Burke, but I am surprised to hear the Senator state that no Defense Department witness, such as from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, came before the committee to give his viewpoint as to the impact of such a treaty on the war in Vietnam.

Mr. MUNDT. They did not come before the committee.

Mr. MILLER. Have they been asked to appear?

Mr. MUNDT. I cannot speak for the chairman of the committee, but I do not believe they have been asked. Many of those of us opposing the proposed treaty did not want to jeopardize the position of anybody presently employed by the Executive by coming before the committee and expressing a contrary notion. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and I had an unfortunate experience with reference in that regard during the TFX controversy, and we lost two valuable members of our Chiefs of Staff. We do not propose to do that again.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator will remember the time when we had the open hearings on the proposed nuclear test ban treaty. I think everybody took it as a matter of course that the Joint Chiefs of Staff would appear and give their views on the treaty. They all appeared, as I recall, and gave their views. As I recall, they generally recommended approval of the treaty, subject to certain conditions that had to be made. The Senator will remember that the President of the United States wrote a letter to the Senate committing the President to fulfilling those conditions.

I cannot understand why the Joint Chiefs of Staff or other military leaders in the Department of Defense have not been called as witnesses before the Foreign Relations Committee to give their views as to the impact this treaty or that other follow-on arrangements might have on the war in Vietnam.

Am I to understand the hearings are closed?

Mr. MUNDT. I am afraid they are closed. The opposition was given the total amount of one day, plus one witness, because a witness appearing for the national department of the American Legion who opposed it was called to testify at the behest of the whole committee. Beyond that, we were given one day to hear witnesses. We had many others who wanted to be heard.

Mr. President, something as complicated as this issue cannot be discussed in one day. There was even a feeling among some of us that the whole subject should also be referred to the Armed Services Committee because of the possible impact the proposed treaty would have on prolonging the war. We have the general feeling that the treaty will not only prolong the war but discourage some of the allies who are now supporting us, because, if we are not going to protect our American soldiers from increased attacks, they may want to withdraw their troops. They cannot understand our sending to our enemies materiel which, through Russia, comes back to kill their boys and ours.

Mr. MILLER. I am not criticizing the opposition, but it seems to me it is not up to the opposition to have the Defense Establishment witnesses or the Joint Chiefs of Staff appear before the committee. I do not recall that the opposition to the proposed nuclear test ban treaty did such a thing. It was handled as a matter of course by the full committee.

The Senator says that there was only a 1-day hearing on which to hear the opposition witnesses. Is that correct?

Mr. MUNDT. One day for the opposition plus 1 day for the witness of National Department of the American Legion who appeared in opposition, who was heard on another day and by request of the full committee.

Mr. MILLER. How many additional days were added to the hearings?

Mr. MUNDT. Another day. The committee had 1 day for the witnesses in favor of the treaty. The committee appeared ready to rush it through until some of us felt we should stop and take a look and hear both sides. This was an unprecedented thing, because never before in American history have we been supplying materiel to the enemy to build munitions to shoot back at our boys. This is something new. It is going to make a big footnote in our American history. Never until the Johnson administration have we participated in such a bloody business during a war in which we are engaged. That is unprecedented. It writes new history. So we thought the other side should be heard. They gave us as much time as the proponents. The proponents had a day and the opponents had a day, but in both instances it was a grossly inadequate consideration for such a monumental departure from our national history and traditions.

I agree with what the Senator from Nebraska is saying. We ought to look at the package. I think the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] have an excellent idea when they ask, "Why not defer the activation date of the treaty until at least the President shall notify us either that the war is over or else that the Russians have quit supplying the warlords of North Vietnam with the materiel that they need to continue the war?"

I think the war would have long since been over if it had not been for the Russians supplies. How are the North Vietnamese fighting this war? Ninety-five percent of their petroleum supplies come from Russia. One way to stop the war would be to cut off those supplies. We seem to have a policy of bombing on alternate days. I think sometimes that the administration has a mania about bombing. If it does not know what to do, it decides to drop some bombs. When the press criticizes our bombing and it appears on the front page, then the bombing may be stopped. Then something else happens and we drop more bombs. There seems to be no consistency or well-considered program.

There is another way to stop the war, Mr. President, and that is to shut off the supplies from Russia which is supplying MIGS, and antiaircraft guns, petroleum, and many other implements of war. If we want to stop the war, the way to do it is to stop that supplying of materiel.

I would not want to do anything that gives North Vietnam a greater amount of supplies. Why should we do anything to prolong a war as distasteful as this one we are fighting in Vietnam? We prolong the war when we increase the means the Russian Communists utilize in providing supplies enabling Hanoi to continue to fight the war.

Mr. MILLER. The point I am making is that I cannot understand why, in view of the impact on the war in Vietnam of the consular treaty, the committee did not call witnesses from the Defense Department or the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Can the Senator tell us how long ago the hearings were concluded?

Mr. MUNDT. I do not know whether they are concluded. I do not want to say irrevocably that they are. Would our friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] say they are? I assume they are concluded. Would he agree? If so, they stopped on the 17th of February, because that was the last day we had hearings. We are now trying very hard, without too much assurance yet, to get at least a guarantee from the committee that the hearings will be printed before the committee acts and before the Senate votes. I am not sure that that will be done, because there are some things in the hearings that I know some people in this town would rather not have Senators read. As I said before, the committee and the Senate will cast this epochal vote on an unprecedented wartime policy, something which has never before happened in American history. At least Senators should have an adequate opportunity to carefully study all the hearings before casting their votes on a decision of such far-reaching implications.

Mr. MILLER. If the printing of the hearings for consideration by the committee, not to mention the membership of the Senate, is being held up——

Mr. MUNDT. It is not being held up; the pressure for fast, uninformed action is being accentuated.

Mr. MILLER. It appears to me that quite a long time has elapsed for 2 days of hearings to be printed. At least, I have seen hearings printed much more quickly than that. What was the big rush to conclude the hearings? The Senator said there was hurry to get the hearings over with. What was the big hurry to get the hearings over with if the committee is going to take its time to have the hearings printed and published, so that Senators can read them?

Mr. MUNDT. I certainly am in no rush to get the hearings over with, because I know that many other people in this country having military expertise and background, and also academicians and students of international policy, would like to be heard in opposition to the convention. Frankly, they cannot understand what logic is involved in encouraging Russia to supply arms to kill American boys in North Vietnam. They cannot comprehend how such a policy can do anything else but encourage Russia to expand such actions when we put a "good housekeeping" label on their policies by ratifying a consular treaty that the Russians would like to have.

Mr. MILLER. I do not wish to prolong the colloquy. I merely thought we ought to bring out the fact that there were no witnesses from the Department of Defense and that the hearings have not yet been published. I hope that the hearings will be published without delay, so that all Senators may read them. I would also hope that perhaps the hearings could be reopened, so that we could have the views of our military people concerning the impact that the treaty will have on the war.

I again commend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] for his approach in dealing with this subject. I think it would be most enlightening if all of us could have a better idea of the way these pieces fit together.

I thank the Senator from Nebraska very much.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator from Iowa has made a meaningful contribution to the discussion by raising the question as to why we do not have testimony from the military, such as the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

There is no question in my mind that if the other body, in embarking on the consideration of the East-West trade bill—and that bill must originate in the House—will call before the committee witnesses to testify to all the facets that are involved in the matter of the East-West trade, it will lend greater strength to the argument of the Senator from Nebraska that the Senate should defer action on the Consular Convention until such time as the executive department clarifies its position.

I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield for brief commentary or questions, but not indefinitely, if the Senator does not mind.

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree. I shall be very brief.

I came here for another purpose, and ran into this scholarly address by my friend from Nebraska, the emotional and able attack on the treaty by my friend from South Dakota, and the incisive questions asked by my good friend from Iowa, and I do not intend to get into a debate with my three Republican friends, at this point, on the treaty. I merely wish to clear up a couple of points where I think there is vast misunderstanding.

In the first place, this treaty is the same treaty which was reported to the floor by a vote of 12 to 5 by the Foreign Relations Committee in 1965, after hearings which were then considered adequately comprehensive.

When hearings were started again this year—because we had a new Congress—the Administration sent down the Secretary of State and the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Katzenbach, and they were given a good going over, if I may use the vernacular, by various committee members. Then, I think at the request of the Senator from South Dakota, we held two days of hearings for opponents of the treaty, at which point a very eloquent gentleman representing the American Legion appeared in opposition, and the Liberty Lobby made an impassioned attack on the treaty.

The Committee on Foreign Relations will have an executive session next Tuesday to mark up the treaty and determine what to do about it. The hearings are being printed and will be available in galley proof at that time. I hope within a week or two the committee will make it's report, accompanied by the printed hearings, so that all Senators will be able to discuss the matter in the light of the report and the hearings.

Speaking only for myself, I would guess the treaty will be reported at least as favorably as the 12 to 5 vote of two years ago; and I have great hope that we will have a number of Republican Senators among the proponents of the treaty.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I am most impressed by the analysis the Senator gave and also by the emotional and very dramatic statement made by the Senator from South Dakota. However, I am still concerned about a number of things and I would like to ask some questions to see if my information on this treaty is accurate.

Is it not true that if we had no treaty the President of the United States would still be able to exchange consulates with the Soviet Union?

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct. During the 1940's, as the Senator knows, the Soviet Union had three consulates in this country. They were in three major cities of America: San Francisco, Chicago, and New York. In addition, at their Embassy here in Washington many staff members were engaged in consular duties. The United States had only one consulate in Vladivostok.

That may be done again, if the President chooses to do so, by Executive order or through diplomatic channels.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the only purpose I can see, then, in proposing the treaty is either for the administration to avoid the responsibility for taking this step and placing the burden upon us, or because of the need to provide ground rules in case consulates are established?

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct. It would involve formalities to the extent the treaty explains how certain ground rules would govern the situation in the event of the establishment of Soviet Union consulates in America and American consulates in the Soviet Union.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, does the Senator know whether the degree of immunity which is being offered to our nationals in the Soviet Union, and to the Soviet Union nationals here, is something which would be worked out by Executive agreement; or must it be part of a treaty?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it had been made, in November 1933, the subject of formal exchange of letters between the two Governments prior to the formal recognition of the Soviet Union. These were part of the Roosevelt-Litvinov agreements. These agreements had been in full force and effect, and yet if they were—and I have every reason to believe they were right—they were flagrantly violated, abused, and disregarded on numerous occasions by the Soviet Union.

The agreements may not have had the dignity of a treaty; however the Soviet Union has violated its international obligations with impunity whether Executive orders, agreements or treaties solemnly ratified, consented to, and advised by the U.S. Senate.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, if this agreement had been put through by executive action only, would we then have been faced with the so-called most-favored-nation problems that we have in connection with the proposed treaty?

Mr. HRUSKA. We would not be, unless the Executive order or agreement contained a provision to that effect. It seems to me that the most-favored-nation clause in treaties with other nations could be invoked only by granting on a country basis to another country more favored provisions than those contained in the first treaty, as was the case in November of 1933. So I would say in answer to that question that I do not believe that question would arise if the arrangements and the ground rules were effected by Executive order.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I do not quite understand why the administration is pushing this as vigorously as it is, if the administration can do all of this without any congressional action of any kind. Why do they run the risk of getting a rebuff by sending it to the Senate?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is something within the jurisdiction and within the boundaries of the minds of the administration and the people who make it up. I would not be able to answer that question.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I have not made up my mind on what I should do or on what any of us should do, for that matter, with respect to this particular treaty.

Mr. HRUSKA. Presumably opportunity will be given to us to do so with access to printed copies of the testimony, between that time and the time we start debating the measure on the floor.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I listened with great interest to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota on the trade agreement.

As I have said on many occasions, both on the floor and in speeches, I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator. I can see no excuse whatsoever for the United States to increase the amount of trade by which we supply the Soviet Union and the eastern Soviet bloc with goods to strengthen their economy, at a time when they are busy around the world trying to destroy freedom and kill us in North and South Vietnam. Nevertheless, I do not see how that necessarily applies to a consular agreement.

It is my understanding that there are no provisions for specific consulates or for specific numbers of people in this particular treaty that is offered for ratification.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMINICK. It is also my understanding that the consulates which might be set up, could be placed in both countries solely for the purpose of helping visiting nationals of the other country and not for trade agreements of any kind.

Mr. HRUSKA. Except that a major purpose of a consulate is to promote trade between the countries that have exchanged consulates.

There are other matters—and they are important, to be sure—such as the notification of the incarceration in Russia of American tourists and ready access to them. The same would be true of any Soviet nationals incarcerated in this country. However, one of the most important purposes of a consulate is to promote trade between the two Nations that exchange consulates.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like the attention of my friend, the Senator from Colorado, very briefly.

In the first place, the Senate is always complaining that the executive arm of the Government is making executive agreements which ought to be presented to us for advice and consent in treaty form.

I suggest that it ill becomes us to take the position that we would rather have them do it by executive action.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I have been one of those who have been most critical of their failure to do this. I am just interested in knowing why they did it on this occasion and not on other occasions.

Mr. CLARK. I think the most important reason why they did it—although this will appear when the report comes out—is that the treaty would require a change in Russian law to give access to our citizens who might be incarcerated in Russia. Such access would be in violation of present Russian law.

I understand the Russians felt that if they were going to make this kind of change in their law it should be in treaty form.

Finally, I suggest to my friend, the Senator from Iowa—speaking only for myself and not for anyone else on the Committee on Foreign Relations—that I do not think the Joint Chiefs of Staff have anything to do with the treaty whatever. That is why they were not called on to support the President and the Secretary of State. If they are not going to support them, let them tell us.

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. May I say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that he could have made the same argument with respect to the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. But still the Joint Chiefs of Staff were heard, they testified; and I suggest that had they not done so, in the manner they did, the treaty would not have been ratified.

I believe that the military has an interest in treaties involving another nation which is supplying great materiel to one of our enemies.

I do not believe that it would do any harm at all, and I do not believe that they would feel compelled to come before the Committee on Foreign Relations and give their testimony right down the line exactly the way the State Department has supported it. They did not do so in the case of the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, and I do not see why they would do so in this case. I think it would be enlightening for the Members of the Senate to find out what the military thought.

Mr. CLARK. The nuclear test ban treaty was almost a military matter and involved the national security with respect to our weapons. The present consular treaty has nothing whatever to do in that regard.

I say again that the Joint Chiefs have made no request to be heard, and I doubt very much that they would care to be heard.

Mr. HRUSKA. It is not true, Mr. President, that the treaty stands alone and is not a matter that involves military, economic, social, political, and foreign relations implications. It is simply not true. It is a part of the package.

Repeatedly, our Chief Executive has said that we are engaged in a program of building bridges. In his speech in New York last October, it took two printed pages to outline this program by label alone.

Then we are called upon to act on this treaty. It is asserted that we do not need the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Department of State to tell us what a detente is. All they are concerned with is this little piece of the world that exists in this treaty. That is not true. It is a part of a larger pattern and a larger package.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator that it is not true that this treaty stands alone, by itself. Again speaking only for myself, I think it is perhaps the opening gun in a very important change in our foreign policy, a change of which I strongly approve. I think the new interest the administration has taken in it flows, to some extent, from the October speech of President Johnson, to which the Senator has referred. I agree with the Senator that this treaty does not stand alone. I disagree with him that it is any concern of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. We have enough of the military industrial complex running the Government already.

Mr. HRUSKA. It was not the intention of the Senator from Nebraska, necessarily, that the testimony of the Joint Chiefs of Staff be elicited on this item; but when this item is considered in conjunction with the other five or six major proposals, some of which do involve the military and have impinged heavily on the military posture of this country, then I say the testimony should be elicited.

All I am asking is that the Senate and the other body and the American public be fully informed on all these aspects before commitment is fastened down on any one of them.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania one question.

Would it be his position that the action by the Senate on the proposed Consular Treaty, one way or the other, would have absolutely no impact on the morale, one way or the other, of the men fighting in Vietnam?

Mr. CLARK. It certainly would. I do not believe that a man in Vietnam knows anything about the Consular Treaty or cares about it.

I may say that I am getting a little sick and tired of flags being wrapped around people, on the ground that our boys cannot afford this Consular Treaty. To me, this is the essence of demagoguery.

Mr. MILLER. May I say, in response, that I have received some mail from some men fighting in Vietnam, and they are very much opposed to this treaty. Maybe the Senator does not have a similar constituency. I am sure that many of his constituents are fighting in Vietnam.

I believe that the question is entirely proper, and I believe it is obvious that, one way or the other, this will have some impact on the morale of the men in Vietnam. Whether it is a good impact or a bad impact, I do not pretend to know the thoughts of everyone in Vietnam. I am simply pointing out that some of the men who have written to me are very much opposed. If a question of morale is involved, then the Joint Chiefs of Staff, by all means, have an interest in this treaty.

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It will take me 4 or 5 minutes, and this deals with the subject that the Senator from Nebraska has discussed.

Mr. President, on February 17 a letter was written to me by Mr. Wilbur L. Dunbar, the editor of the Courier-Crescent, of Orrville, Ohio. Orrville is a community of probably 2,000 people. Among several questions, he put this question to me:

> What measures should be taken (or can be taken) to improve international relations between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.? In this respect, how do you evaluate the proposed consular treaty?

The following is my answer:

> The United States government has been attempting in every way reasonable to bring about a lessening of tensions between Soviet Russia and the United States. I am distressed, however, to observe that there has not been much effort on the part of Soviet Russia to indicate in any way a desire to lessen tensions. It is sending military equipment to North Viet Nam now. It was a vigorous participant in the Tri-Continental Conference held in Havana, Cuba in January of 1966, attended by Communist delegations from about 86 countries and purposed to consolidate the efforts of the Communists to achieve their objectives in South America, Africa, and Asia.

By way of interpolation, the Tri-Continental Conference was concerned with the continents of South America, Africa, and Asia.

I read further from my answer:

> A 34-man delegation went to the Conference from the Kremlin; it was headed by a Sharaf R. Rashidov who quickly set the tone by stating:
>
> "The Soviet delegation came to this Conference to promote in every conceivable way the unity of anti-imperialist forces of the three continents so as to unfold on a still greater scale our common struggle against imperialism, colonialism, and neo-colonialism headed by the United States capitalists."
>
> In the final declaration issued by the Conference it called "for the use of every form of struggle necessary including armed battle" to achieve the objectives of the Communists of the world.
>
> The declaration reads as follows:
>
> "Imperialism will never voluntarily renounce its policy of exploitation, plunder, aggression and intervention.
>
> "The people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America know by their own experience that Yankee imperialism, the implacable enemy of all the peoples of the world, is the main redoubt of colonial oppression and international reaction.
>
> "Yankee imperialism covers the map with its capital, extracting millions of dollars yearly for its monopolies. Yankee imperialism commits all sorts of abominable crimes against the people and actively prepares attacks against socialist countries and against world peace."

But, Mr. President, that is not the end. They still go on.

> The proclamation continues:
>
> "The Conference hereby proclaims that the primary task of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America is to intensify the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and to win and consolidate national independence especially against the exploitation practiced by the Yankees. The merging of efforts will turn active solidarity on our continent into a new historical force of colossal dimensions."

Mr President, I shall repeat. This declaration was issued in Havana, Cuba, in January 1966, at the Tri-Continental Conference, with 83 countries represented by delegates of the Communist peoples of the world. As I stated earlier, 34 of the delegates were from Russia.

Mr. President, I shall continue to quote from my letter:

> I cannot bring myself to the conclusion that the people of the United States, or Congress, should adopt the attitude that the challenge to the security of our country has come to an end.

Mr. President, we simply cannot do it in the face of declarations that they are constantly making.

About 2 weeks ago Premier Kosygin of Russia had a 1-hour press conference in London, which was televised to the United States. I was at home and I made up my mind that I would listen to it thoroughly. The discussion was then in progress about the prospects of going to the negotiating table with Ho Chi Minh, and it was sort of said that Kosygin was going to say something that would bring us to the negotiating table. But what did Kosygin say?

> I listened to Kosygin hoping that he would utter some words showing a purpose on the part of Russian to relax the tensions existing between his country and ours. Not a word favorable to the United States was uttered by him.
>
> He was asked about our position in Vietnam; he quickly and emphatically declared that we were the aggressors; that we were taking the lives and injuring the bodies of innocent men, women, and children.

I continued to listen, hoping that he would say some one word in behalf of our country.

> He uttered not one word against the atrocities which have been clearly established and are legion in number perpetrated by the Communist North Vietnamese.
>
> Repeatedly Russian leaders are labeling our country as imperialist seeking to exploit by neo-colonialism various people of undeveloped nations in Africa, South America, and Asia.
>
> We are trying to improve our relations with Russia, but the Communists in Russia just as Ho Chi Minh, the Communist in North Viet Nam do not want any relaxation in tensions nor the achievement of peace.
>
> In 1965 when the Consular Treaty was before the Foreign Relations Committee, I cast my vote against it. I would like to go along with the President and approve the treaty if I can conscientiously and honestly bring myself to the belief that Russia has any purpose to actually—and by deed—to cultivate a state of peaceful coexistence. My present belief is that I will not vote for the Treaty.

Mr. President, in conclusion, we want peaceful coexistence. This Congress has tried to achieve it. We have shown a charitable and eleemosynary attitude toward people all over the world.

It is argued that Russia has let up on its perpetuation of the tensions. Can anyone point out tangibly where that lessening has occurred? I would like to hear it. I have tried to find it. I have searched for it. But instead of finding it, every word that comes to me indicates an avowed, unrelenting, eternal purpose to destroy our country.

Mr. CURTIS and Mr. ERVIN addressed the Chair.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, my colleague is to be commended for the position he has taken and the contribution he has made to the discussion in connection with the proposed treaty. The consideration of this Consular Treaty could well be one of the most important matters that the Senate will be called upon to consider for many, many years.

Thoughtful Americans are disturbed about what is happening in this country. As the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] pointed out, there is a great lack of any evidence that the Communists' overall strategy or characteristics has changed.

Also the country appears to be a victim of quite a snow job of propaganda. There is every effort being made to convince the rank and file of our citizens that kind, beneficent, unselfish Uncle Sam is an aggressor; that the young men who are fighting for our country are ruthless killers for the sake of killing; and that type of propaganda is being constantly and constantly drummed into the American public.

Certainly, when my colleague proposes that we look at the entire picture of what is proposed in connection with Soviet Russia, he is rendering a great service. Who can be opposed to such a procedure? What valid argument can be made to a suggestion that we look at everything involved and everything that might be associated with this treaty?

What is vulnerable about the individual who would oppose such a course? It seems to me that history carries some important lessons. I cannot recall a time when the Government of the United States has collaborated with the Russian Communists, whether it be the initial recognition of their government back in the thirties, or at any other time, that has proven wise, or that we could rely upon their treaties.

Mr. President, when urging that the Senate defer action on the Consular Convention, my distinguished colleague pointed out the necessity of considering all of the proposals concerning United States and U.S.S.R. relations, before passing on any one of them.

An example of the potential dangers of ad hoc legislation in an area requiring comprehensive analysis is the danger of opening up espionage outlets in cities in the United States under the consular accord. The concept of a "neighborhood spy store" conveniently located and staffed by a competent staff of Communist agents is not the type of marketing appreciated by the American public.

An excellent discussion of this aspect of the treaty appears in the February 28, 1967, issue of the National Review Bulletin, by M. Stanton Evans. Mr. Evans points up the prime danger of the treaty when he states—

> Principal effect of the consular agreement would be to allow the Soviet Union to open offices in major cities of the United States, adding several hundred people to the Communist diplomatic contingent on American soil. All these people would be granted diplomatic immunity for all crimes, including murder and espionage.

It is not consoling to listen to statements by the administration that espionage is "nothing the FBI can't handle," or that "we would derive similar advantages from our consulates in the

"U.S.S.R.," when, as Mr. Evans explains, "All these arguments are affirmatively misleading."

The article details, point by point, how we will get the short end of such an exchange, and concludes by pinpointing a crucial paradox in stating:

> Even if we ignore the one-sidedness of the transaction, this has to be accounted the most peculiar argument of all. Surely it is one of the few times in history that an exchange of sabotage outposts has been advertised as a method of improving international relations.

It is because of such known paradoxes in only one such proposal that it is necessary to defer action at the present time so that every aspect of all proposals concerning our foreign relations with the Kremlin may be investigated before we pass on any single one of them.

However sophisticated the administration may become in urging the adoption of the Consular Treaty, it cannot logically be disputed that it will affect other foreign policy proposals and be affected by them. It is only commonsense to determine the design of the bridge before the footings are dug.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD, and I recommend its reading to all my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AT HOME

The Johnson administration's all-out drive to secure ratification of the Consular Accord with the Soviet Union should settle any lingering doubts about the current direction of U.S. foreign policy.

The present line, all too clearly, is conciliation of and collaboration with the Kremlin—an objective apparently deemed important enough to justify indifference to matters of internal security and a campaign to erase from memory some major items of the historical record.

Principal effect of the consular agreement would be to allow the Soviet Union to open offices in major cities of the United States, adding several hundred people to the Communist diplomatic contingent on American soil. All these people would be granted diplomatic immunity for all crimes, including murder and espionage.

It is a known fact that existing Soviet diplomatic posts are used for espionage, terror, and intelligence work. FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover has testified that up to 80% of the personnel in these installations are used in intelligence assignments. In 1965, Hoover said a consular treaty increasing this sort of representation was a "cherished goal of Soviet Intelligence."

Hoover's testimony served to torpedo the agreement last year, and the State Department has taken precautionary steps to prevent a similar outcome in the 90th Congress. Having blandly ignored all such questions when the Accord was first brought forward, the Johnson team is now hard at work explaining away his statements.

The line of attack against Hoover's testimony has been threefold: (1) An effort, through an exchange of letters between Hoover and Secretary of State Dean Rusk, to suggest Hoover had retracted his testimony; (2) a contention, also derived from the exchange of letters, that any increase in Soviet espionage would be "nothing the FBI can't handle"; and (3) an argument that, even if the Communists did expand their intelligence operations on our soil, we would derive similar advantages from our consulates in the USSR.

All these arguments are affirmatively misleading. The facts of the case are in each instance at variance with the impression the treaty advocates have attempted to convey.

Rusk's effort in his exchange of letters with Hoover was to bring out and elaborate the technical point that the FBI chief had not actually opposed ratification of the treaty. The truth is that the FBI neither endorses nor opposes legislation of this sort; it does not deal in opinions, but in facts—and the facts are that the treaty would lead to a vast increase in the level of Soviet espionage in the United States.

Far from retracting his statement, Hoover explicitly reaffirmed it in a letter to Sen. Karl Mundt (R., S.D.). In answer to Mundt's questions, Hoover stated that "Communist-bloc diplomatic establishments in this country serve as focal points for intelligence operations" and that secret police agents in the Red diplomatic corps are at present "conducting an intensive campaign aimed at the most sensitive data regarding our scientific and technical developments, our military and defense programs."

Scarcely less convincing is the statement that the increased flow of Red espionage would be nothing the FBI can't handle. We are safe in presuming that, however great the affliction, the FBI will gird its loins and do its best to protect us. But is that any reason to make the agency's already difficult assignment even more difficult? Should we unleash murderers and other criminals to prey on the country on the grounds that "it's nothing the police can't handle"? The argument is absurdity itself. Suggestions that the Accord would yield equal benefits in spying and terrorism to both participants are also false. The American Embassy in Moscow is heavily "bugged," and we can be certain any consulates we set up would be similarly equipped. U.S. diplomats have testified that, when conversing in the Embassy, they always speak "for the mike," because they know the Soviets are picking everything up through hidden listening devices.

The unlikelihood of our being able to use these outposts for our own intelligence work is further indicated by the disparities in personnel practices at the two embassies. With few exceptions, personnel serving in Communist offices in the United States are Soviet citizens; but not all personnel serving in U.S. offices in Moscow are Americans. As of 1960, there were 195 Americans and 93 Soviets in the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, while there were 271 Russians and zero Americans in the Russian Embassy in Washington.

It becomes apparent that the United States will not get from its installations in the USSR the same benefits the Soviets get from their installations here. Like most such "exchanges," this one will work almost exclusively to the benefit of the Communists—which is of course the reason they are in favor of it.

What puzzles, in view of the foregoing, is why our own government is also in favor of it. In combatting Hoover's testimony, State concedes the Communists will use any consulates they establish here for intelligence, espionage and terror. Yet it continues to argue that establishing these facilities would be a step toward better understanding!

Even if we ignore the one-sidedness of the transaction, this has to be accounted the most peculiar argument of all. Surely it is one of the few times in history that an exchange of sabotage outposts has been advertised as a method of improving international relations.

M. STANTON EVANS.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish again to commend my colleague for his informative address and the very fine position he has taken, which certainly is in the public interest.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank my colleague very much. The remarks he has made are in keeping with his usual kindness and generosity.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I should like to lay down a premise and then ask my good friend from Nebraska a question or two.

I have attempted to do research in respect to this matter. My research satisfies me this will be the first time in the history of the United States that it has ever proposed to grant immunity from criminal prosecution to consuls and their employees who happen to be nationals of the country which establishes a consulate here.

Mr. HRUSKA. The conclusion reached by me, after similar research—not nearly so exhaustive and expert as that made by the Senator from North Carolina—but whatever research I have done results in that same conclusion.

Mr. ERVIN. Is not total immunity to criminal prosecution, which this proposed treaty would grant to Russian consuls and to the employees of the Russian consuls who are Russian nationals, something that we have never granted to any ally in the history of this Nation?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is my understanding.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it not notorious that a major portion of the weapons now being used in Southeast Asia to kill and maim American boys is being furnished to North Vietnam by Russia?

Mr. HRUSKA. It is reported that at least 80 percent of the armaments, ammunition, and war materiel going into North Vietnam comes from the Soviet Union—that all the sophisticated weapons in use come from the Soviet Union.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it not the understanding of the Senator from Nebraska that Russia is furnishing these weapons to North Vietnam without requiring payment for them?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is what the information seems to be. One would merely have to consider industrial capacity, economy, and the assets of North Vietnam, to know that that would be the inevitable conclusion.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator from Nebraska agree with the Senator from North Carolina that the fighting and the killing and maiming of American boys in Southeast Asia would come to a speedy end if Russia would stop furnishing North Vietnam with the weapons and ammunition to kill and maim our boys?

Mr. HRUSKA. I believe that to be a sound conclusion. The war effort on the part of North Vietnam would soon dwindle away and die if that were done.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not have the information that the Castro regime in Cuba is enabled to remain in existence and to enslave the Cuban people by reason of the fact that Russia is furnishing money to the Castro government?

Mr. HRUSKA. It is generally so regarded, and I believe it to be true.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to ask the Senator if the figures recently released by the Department of Defense do not reveal that more than 7,000 American boys have been killed and more than 47,000 American boys have been wounded in Southeast Asia as a result of the war, which war is being supported by Russia?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is true. And in addition some 1,200 planes with fixed wings and approximately 700 helicopters have been downed or destroyed during the period of hostilities.

Mr. ERVIN. Can the Senator from Nebraska suggest to the Senator from North Carolina how it will aid a good image of the United States to become prevalent in the eyes of the free world for the United States to be extending the hand of friendship to Russia while Russia with its own hands is furnishing weapons to kill and maim American boys in Southeast Asia?

Mr. HRUSKA. It is beyond the comprehension of this Senator to understand how anyone can live with this contradiction.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska, does he think that the Communist world would have an increase in respect for the United States now—if it had any in the first place—if the United States would take and extend the hand of friendship to Russia at a time when Russia is, figuratively speaking, staining its hands with American blood in Southeast Asia?

Mr. HRUSKA. I think it would result in a psychological victory for the Communist world—and the Soviet Union in particular. It would increase its prestige. By the same token, it would lower the regard which most of those nations would have for our own Nation.

Mr. ERVIN. Although almost all of us support the war in South Vietnam as the only reasonable thing to do, is not the Senator from Nebraska aware of the fact that, notwithstanding the conviction on the part of persons like myself, there is a great deal of feeling in the United States in respect to the war in Southeast Asia?

Mr. HRUSKA. There is no question about it. Our mail, personal contact with constituents, and the news we get from all over America, show that to be the fact.

Mr. ERVIN. Is the Senator from Nebraska able to give the Senator from North Carolina anything to support the belief that the ratification of this proposed treaty by the U.S. Senate will increase the morale of the American people in the prosecution of the war in Southeast Asia?

Mr. HRUSKA. I would only say it would not increase the morale; I think it would be a very great blow to the morale of our forces.

Mr. ERVIN. I wish to commend the Senator from Nebraska for the very fine statement he has made on this subject, not only today but also some days ago.

Mr. HRUSKA. Notwithstanding these interrogations and my answers with respect to the Consular Convention, I believe that the fashion in which this body should proceed is to discuss this matter thoroughly. We should not go forward until such time as we have had a thorough inquiry, in a formal fashion, in keeping with the committee system in both Houses, into all aspects of this bridge-building program.

Mr. ERVIN. I will ask the Senator from Nebraska if he does not agree with the Senator from North Carolina that, irrespective of what may have been said as to the merits or demerits of this question, the proposal that the U.S. Senate ratify the treaty at this particular time is an exercise in exceedingly unwise timing.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is my deliberate judgment.

I yield the floor.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 665) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, with respect to the pending bill, I wish to state I am in full support of it and I also wish to state my approval of the statement made by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in explaining the bill.

However, I should like to call attention to the fact that on page five of the committee report it is pointed out that:

> When the fiscal year 1967 Defense budget was presented to the Congress the Department of Defense assumed for planning purposes that the war in Vietnam would end by June 30, 1967. The record is clear that this assumption was not a prediction, but instead was a more or less arbitrary basis for determining the amount of the funding then sought, just as July 1 of one year through June 30 of the next are the more or less arbitrary limiting dates for determining the size of authorization and appropriation for any given year.

During the course of the hearings I sought to obtain testimony on this point. I ask unanimous consent that the marked portions of the record of hearings on pages 65 and 66 and at pages 180 and 181, the colloquy between myself and the Secretary of Defense, be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARBITRARY ASSUMPTION RELATIVE TO TERMINATION OF COMBAT OPERATIONS

Senator MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, on page 2 of your statement you refer to the "arbitrary assumption that combat operations would terminate June 30, 1967."

May I ask the source of that assumption?

Secretary MCNAMARA. Yes. It was done for budget purposes, Senator Miller, and was fully described at the time we last appeared here. We didn't do it because the Congress had recommended it, but the Congress did agree to assumptions of that kind for Korea, and as a matter of fact, I believe I am right in saying all of the budgets, including the budget of 1953 for the Korean war, were presented on assumptions of exactly that kind.

Now I mentioned earlier this morning that we have deviated from that practice. I think it is dangerous to deviate unless one is protected against loose financing. We think we have introduced such protection into the fiscal 1967 supplemental and 1968 budget.

Senator MILLER. I was wondering who originated that particular assumption of June 30, 1967. Would it have been General Westmoreland or the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Secretary MCNAMARA. The Joint Chiefs and General Westmoreland supported it, but it doesn't in fact, make any difference to them whether the budgeting is based on that assumption or some other assumption. All they are interested in is the adequacy of the flow of men and material, and the budgeting assumption has nothing to do with that.

REASON FOR SELECTION OF JUNE 30, 1967 DATE

Senator MILLER. The reason I asked is because about a year ago I was over there and I would guess, from the statements of people with whom I discussed this matter, there was not much possibility of seeing the end of the war in June 1967 and I was wondering why that particular date was selected.

Secretary MCNAMARA. Because it is necessary to have some date as a foundation for budget purposes. If it wasn't that date, it would have to be some other date. We picked a date such that we would not overbuy, yet which provided us with sufficient leeway so that we could buy enough to cover all leadtimes, and thereby avoid any interruption or cessation of supply, and that has proven a reasonable basis.

With hindsight I wouldn't do it any differently. I hope I can say as much a year from today with respect to fiscal year 1968. On the fiscal year 1968 budget and the fiscal year 1967 supplemental that lies in front of you, I should point out that when we move away from this kind of assumption, June 30, 1967, or its end budget year counterpart, which would now be June 30, 1968, we move into an extremely difficult area of prediction. To show the magnitude of the potential error, there have been flown against North Vietnamese targets from February 1965 to January 1 of this year on the order of 100,000 attack sorties.

BUDGETARY PROBLEM

Now I am budgeting in this supplemental to buy airplanes and munitions for another [deleted] sorties, just to show you the magnitude of the problem. We have lost over North Vietnam to hostile fire during that period 322 aircraft, I believe, from February 1965 to January 1 of that year. We are budgeting a loss of an additional [deleted] through December of 1969, for 36 months ahead. The money for 36 months worth of air losses [deleted] additional aircraft losses over North Vietnam for [deleted] additional sorties, is in this supplemental in large part and in the 1968 budget. So that is the alternative to a June 30, 1967, or its counterpart, June 1968 assumption.

I hope a year from now we will be proved prudent in having changed the assumption. I believe we will. But a year ago, even as I say with hindsight, I think we chose by far the most prudent course.

BUDGETARY ASSUMPTION OF WAR TERMINATION

Senator MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I just have one more question. I would like to go back to the question I asked you the other day, Mr. Secretary, about this July 1 assumption for the current fiscal year; that is, that the war would be ended by July 1 as an arbitrary assumption.

I asked you at the time whether there was any indication from our military people that this was a likely assumption. I would just like to ask again is there any indication from any of our military people, such as the Joint Chiefs of Staff or General Westmoreland, that there is anything but the remotest possibility that the war might be over by July 1, 1967?

Secretary McNamara. I don't think they were willing to predict one way or another, nor should they have been willing to predict under those circumstances. So there wasn't any indication that the war would be over, and I don't think there was any indication as to when it would be.

But neither was there any reason to believe then or now for that matter, that this was other than the most prudent basis on which to present the budget.

Senator Miller. In other words, there was really a divorce between military opinion on this, and budgetary considerations.

Secretary McNamara. Well, I think the military opinion fully supported the basis on which the budget was submitted.

The budget is a financial document, not a military plan or a forecast, and at no time did we ever state that we believed the war would terminate on June 30, 1967, or earlier. But we did state then—and I think with hindsight that we were correct—that the financing of the initial fiscal year 1967 budget operations through June 30, 1967, and not beyond, was by far the most prudent basis on which to submit that budget.

Senator Miller. I would be inclined to agree with you on that, and I recognize that the military people are only concerned with whether they are going to get what they need.

Secretary McNamara. Exactly.

CONFUSION OF PUBLIC MIND

Senator Miller. But at the same time when this date was used, I think there was some idea in the public mind that there was some euphoria on the part of possibly our military leaders that this conflict might end by that time. When I was over there a year ago, the impression I got, especially around Cam Ranh Bay, was that this was not going to end by July 1, 1967.

General Wheeler. I would like to comment on what you just said, Senator. I can assure you that the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a body, and in their service capacity as Chiefs of services, never thought this date of June 30, 1967, was anything more than a budget guideline, which, of course, the Secretary provides annually for the preparation of the budget for the forthcoming fiscal year.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the report, on page 5, continues:

> Members of Congress believed last year that it was practical and desirable to provide then some of the additional funding that would be required for our operations in southeast Asia.

I agree with that statement because I was one of them, but there is something that also ought to be brought out, and that is, whether or not additional funding was provided by the Congress at that time; namely, last summer or early last fall, I believe that the conclusion was compelling that there would be a very large follow-on supplemental defense budget. Therefore, prudence would have dictated either a tax increase or a substantial cut in nondefense spending, or both, in anticipation of this.

Unfortunately, no such action was taken. No such request was made by the President. No such action was taken by the Congress.

As a result, in the 6-month period from the end of June 30 to December 31 our national debt increased by $10 billion. I do not need to point out that inflation has become much worse and interest rates have gone as high as any in over 4 years.

I think the American people ought to understand that while this June 30, 1967, estimation for the end of the war was merely an arbitrary planning limitation for budgetary purposes, and no one is questioning that, what ought to be questioned is the failure of the administration and Congress to prudently do something in anticipation of what certainly would be a very large supplemental defense budget. The size of it could have been surmised by looking at the fact that the supplemental defense budget for 1966 was over $12 billion. So there should have been either a tax increase or a substantial reduction in domestic spending to make room for a supplemental defense budget somewhere in that proportion.

I thoroughly support the bill. I thought it would be proper to point out a little of the failure that occurred last year in connection with this item.

WHO DECLARES WAR?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in today's Wall Street Journal appeared an article entitled "Who Declares War?" written by Arlen J. Large. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Who Declares War?

(By Arlen J. Large)

The Constitution gives Congress sole power to declare war and issue letters of marque. It's futile to write your Congressman for a letter of marque; this special license to go a-pirating among the enemy's ships became obsolete long ago.

Similarly headed for the attic of Constitutional antiques, many lawmakers feel, is the Congressional declaration of war. Commitment of massive U.S. combat forces in Vietnam—and in Korea before that—without a formal legislative pronouncement that "war" exists seems proof that Congress has surrendered yet another of its prerogatives to the all-powerful Executive Branch.

"The President has presented Congress with a fact accomplished," said Sen. Sam Ervin (D., N.C.), a former judge who likes to thresh in the thickets of Constitutional law. "I don't think the President had the Constitutional authority to commit troops to Vietnam, but now that they're there we have to go ahead and win."

Actually, at no time since U.S. forces became open combatants in 1965 has there been much Congressional clamor for a formal declaration of war against North Vietnam; even Mr. Ervin concedes it's "immaterial" now. The Administration has argued persuasively that formalizing the conflict would only make Hanoi more reluctant to talk peace.

CONGRESS LOSES AGAIN

So the atom age Executive Branch would seem to have wrested from a compliant Congress one more checkrein assigned to the people's representatives by the Constitution's drafters. In 1848, freshman Congressman Abraham Lincoln (Whig, Ill.) interpreted the founders' intent this way: "Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This our convention understood to be the most oppressive of all kingly oppressions, and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that no one man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us."

In that light, the Congressional war-declaring power has been one of the least successful provisions of the Constitution. Far from being a recent encroachment, the Presidential license to involve the nation unofficially in foreign combat dates almost from the beginning of the Republic. Undeclared wars waged by Harry Truman in Korea and Lyndon Johnson in Vietnam have their parallels in conflicts directed by John Adams against France and Thomas Jefferson against Tripoli—the first two tests of the fledgling Congress' authority in matters of war and peace.

In both cases the lawmakers grudgingly let the Executive Branch control events. By 1797 so many American ships had been seized at sea by the fleets of warring Britain and France that Congress ordered construction of three frigates, established a Navy Department, restored lieutenant general's rank to the retired George Washington, issued some of those letters of marque, and otherwise prepared for war. There were numerous battles between U.S. and French ships, and American marines landed in Hispaniola to capture a French privateer. Yet Congress never felt salty enough to initiate a formal declaration, and President Adams never asked for one.

In 1847 the dispatch of an expedition into disputed Texas territory by President Polk resulted in a declaration of war by Congress after two battles had been fought. Rep. Lincoln and other Mexican war doves charged that the war "was unnecessarily and unconstitutionally commenced by the President," who merely asked Congress to recognize" the prior existence of a state of war. This likewise was the form of the resolution in three other cases: The Spanish-American War and the first and second World Wars.

Thus, of the five Congressionally declared wars, only the first—the War of 1812—was genuinely initiated by the lawmakers themselves in a resolution providing that "war be and the same is hereby declared to exist." Though President Madison had asked for the declaration, the main push came from Southern and Western "war hawks" eager to grab Canada and Florida while Britain was busy fighting Napoleon. Possibly even the undeclared Vietnam War has more solid public support than the elaborately legal 1812 conflict. All of New England opposed fighting Britain; the war resolution passed the Senate by a vote of only 19 to 13.

The idea of an 18-day debate climaxed by a stately roll call vote is rendered especially archaic by recollections of Japanese dive bombers surprising the Pearl Harbor battleships, and by forebodings of a 15-minute flight of nuclear-tipped rockets from Russia. The President as commander-in-chief must have power to make instant war these days.

Yet this isn't a notion unique to 20th-Century poachers on Congressional prerogatives. An early draft of the Constitution in 1787 would have given Congress power "to make war." Charles Pinckney of South Carolina persuaded the Philadelphia convention to change the verb to "declare," leaving the President with "power to repel sudden attacks." From the beginning, therefore, the Constitution was tailored to permit simple Congressional sanction of wars already begun.

A PRESIDENTIAL FREE HAND

What is new in recent years is the tendency for Congress to give the President a free hand to conduct military operations before a war has really started. Lawmakers in the late '50s gave President Eisenhower a resolution allowing him to determine whether a Red Chinese attack in the Formosa Straits would warrant a U.S. military response. President Johnson relies in part on the 1964

Gulf of Tonkin resolution in defending the legality of his subsequent commitment of troops to Vietnam; the resolution says the U.S. is prepared to take "all necessary steps" to defend Southeast Asian nations, "as the President determines."

Fifty years ago Congress refused to give President Wilson a similar blank check. Early in 1917, before the U.S. entered World War I, Mr. Wilson asked for authority to put Navy guns on merchant ships to defend them against German submarines. Additionally, he sought power to "employ any other instrumentalities or methods that may be necessary or adequate to protect our ships and our people in their legitimate and peaceful pursuits on the seas." The "any other" clause was the real sticking point both in the House and among the "little group of willful men" who blocked the bill with a Senate filibuster.

Once a war starts, declared or otherwise, Congress theoretically could stop it by refusing to appropriate any more money for the guns. But in fact this doesn't happen; most of the Senate's Vietnam doves don't dare open themselves to the charge of refusing to support our boys in the field. Indeed, the tendency of Congress is to press more defense money upon the Administration than it wants.

It is the President who has mainly decided questions of war or peace during the nation's history, with Congress just tagging along. His Constitutional authority as commander-in-chief, foreign policy spokesman and enforcer of treaties has proved to be bigger medicine than the Congressional power to christen war with a name. The real check on a President's war-making power is the voters' right to chuck him or his party out of office if they think he has abused it. This obviously happened to Harry Truman's Democrats in 1952 as the Korean War dragged on; the thought must be crossing Lyndon Johnson's mind that it might happen again next year.

Mr. MILLER. I point out that this article is perhaps helpful in understanding some of the history of the fact that many times the President, rather than Congress, for all practical purposes, takes action in recognizing the fact that we are in a war without a formal declaration by Congress. I would suggest to readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that they also bear in mind that there are other results that flow from a formal declaration of war which may in a given situation prejudice our combat operations. If they wish to be fully enlightened on this subject, I think they should research that point.

AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION'S DISTINGUISHED VOLUNTEER SERVICE AWARD TO MISS MARIE MUSHRO

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, last week the American Heart Association's Distinguished Volunteer Service Award was presented to a courageous young lady from my hometown of Sioux City, Iowa.

Miss Marie Mushro, whose own life was saved by heart surgery, is a former Miss Iowa, and during her reign she became a heart volunteer.

She has traveled more than 12,000 miles in making more than 250 speeches for Heart Association events throughout the Nation.

"Trophy," as she is known to her friends, is a true inspiration for our younger generation.

I ask unanimous consent that an article, dated February 17, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 17, 1967]

VOLUNTEER SAVED BY SURGERY WINS HEART SERVICE AWARD

Mrs. Johnson yesterday presented the American Heart Association's Distinguished Volunteer Service Award to Miss Marie Mushro of Sioux City, Iowa, a pretty brunette whose life was saved by heart surgery, and who later went on to win the title of "Miss Iowa."

It was during her year as "Miss Iowa" that Miss Mushro became a heart volunteer, determined to help others the way she had been helped. She has made more than 250 speeches and traveled 12,000 miles to participate in Heart Association events across the country.

Yesterday's presentation by the First Lady, held in the White House theater, was set at this time to call attention to the fact that February is Heart Fund Campaign Month. Two million volunteers will be ringing doorbells for donations on Sunday.

Thanking Mrs. Johnson for presenting the award and for words of encouragement, Miss Mushro said that "in a very real sense I owe my presence here today" to the fact that many volunteers before her had helped support the Heart Fund.

"The open heart surgery which gave me new hope and vigor is as much their victory as mine," she declared. "Mere words are not enough to express my appreciation. I can only say I will resume my volunteer activities with doubled energy."

REPORT OF PRESIDENT'S CRIME COMMISSION

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in July 1965, President Johnson established a 19-man President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice and gave it a gigantic assignment—to study crime and methods of controlling crime.

After an unprecedented study, the Commission last weekend released its findings and recommendations in a 340-page report. This comprehensive report offers a wealth of information on the crime problem and tells what must be done if America is to control the problem.

Favorable response to the report by public officials; private citizens and the press indicates that our Nation is prepared to take the necessary steps to control crime. Hopefully we will achieve a new degree of safety for all law-abiding citizens.

I am pleased to submit one editorial response to the report published in the Baltimore Sun of February 19. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR JUSTICE AND ORDER

When the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Criminal Justice surveyed the high crime areas in two large cities it found that 43 per cent of those questioned stay off the streets at night because they fear crime. The commissioners consider this intolerable and in a report of 340 pages they propose ways and means (a) to cope with crime as it happens and (b) to keep crime from happening.

Their prescription, summarized, is more knowledge, more personnel and more money—up to hundreds of millions of Federal dollars alone every year in aid of the states. Computer-based command-and-control systems would be tried, with police officers carrying two-way radios for instant response to cries for help. Tighter eligibility for police posts is urged, with three grades of officers and salaries improved toward the FBI levels.

Higher requirements in knowledge, expertise and integrity would be sought, as well, on the bench, in the prosecutor's office, in correctional institutions. Anti-poverty at every point would be pushed. Underlying and overriding all would be new stress on what has always been the basic rule: "Fair treatment of every individual—fair in fact and also perceived to be fair by those affected—is an essential element of justice. * * *"

The President's commissioners offer some overdue detail about the volume of crime and its categories. The big crimes, murder, rape, are less frequent than suspected, though the ratio is not minimized in the least. But crimes against property are overwhelmingly more numerous than offenses upon the person. Crime is not the product of any race or class or locale; the big business man guilty on a price-fix rap is a criminal despite his advantages and poor neighborhoods teem with decent and law-abiding people.

There is heavy reliance in the report on education as a counter to crime, though the commissioners are more rhetorical than precise when they say that better schools can "rescue the slum child from his environment." To be rescued from his environment he would have to be taken out of it, and this the relatively brief school hours can hardly accomplish. But certainly better schools will add recruits to the very large number of noncriminal youngsters in every poor neighborhood.

Aside from the myriad of detail in their proposals, it may be the commissioners' best service is in their statement of limitations. Unless there is general trust in the community no anti-crime plan can succeed. If the police are an army of occupation, then it has to be remembered that occupations always fail. Fear of crime, the commissioners say, is increasingly fear of the stranger. And the stranger is simply one outside the consensus.

Here the commission touches but does not elaborate on one of the subtlest problems: the assumption of personal accountability, involving ideals of moral choice on which our legal structure rests historically, is less generally accepted. New teachings of iron determinisms which condition and coerce men make many of the older views of responsibility, self-guidance, innocence and guilt, irrelevant. Yet social comity depends on consensual values and we must work hard to conciliate old and new teachings and so refresh and re-universalize the insight that law and order really do pay.

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF THE BIRTHDAY OF FREDERICK DOUGLASS—SPEECH BY DR. BENJAMIN A. QUARLES

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the class of 1967 of Morgan State College recently commemorated Negro History Week—February 12–18, 1967—with the 150th anniversary celebration of the birth of Frederick Douglass. Frederick Douglass stands among many Negroes who have contributed to the greatness of these United States.

The arts and sciences are just one area

in which many Negroes have succeeded. Athletics, education, and politics quickly come to mind as the list continues to grow. In every facet of American life and society, the creative expression of the American Negro demonstrates itself.

Dr. Benjamin A. Quarles, scholar, educator, and authority in the field of Negro history delivered the commemoration address at the anniversary celebration. Dr. Quarles who is the author of five works on the Negro in American history, has done extensive study in the field. Through his many writings, teaching, and service, Dr. Quarles has done much to enhance human and racial understanding.

As a Marylander and a man, he has given great service to his State and Nation.

His books, reviews, and numerous articles have brought forth the facts in the history of the Negro people—helping eliminate ignorance and prejudice in both races.

I commend Dr. Quarles' speech to the Members of the Senate. We should all take pride in the wisdom of those who seek to propel our society out of blindness—toward light and liberty and dignity for all men.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Quarles' speech be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Frederick Douglass: Challenge and Response

(By Benjamin Quarles)

I have always found it stimulating to turn my attention to Frederick Douglass and it is especially gratifying to do so in this particular city and under such happy auspices. Born in Maryland, Frederick Douglass spent eight years of his young manhood in Baltimore and was a frequent visitor to the city after the Civil War. On the Morgan campus stands a striking eight-foot bronze sculpture of Frederick Douglass, a proud addition to the public statutory of a historic metropolis which likes to call itself "the monumental city," a statue which is the work of James E. Lewis, chairman of the art department at this college.

The Senior Class at Morgan which is sponsoring this memorial convocation has already made a name for itself in community affairs, inspired by Dr. J. Haywood Harrison, faculty advisor. I am deeply honored by their invitation to take part in this program which brings to our campus such a roster of distinguished visitors and friends. This particular day selected by the Senior Class is especially appropriate for a Douglass celebration. This very day marks the sesquicentennial of his birth and three hours from now a new twenty-five cent Frederick Douglass stamp of general issue will be unveiled by the Post Office in Washington, D.C., where within the past five years a bridge has been named after Douglass and where his Anacostia Heights home has been taken over as a national shrine by the United States Department of the Interior.

But even aside from these circumstances of time and place, as symbolic as they are, the Senior Class at Morgan would seem to have good reason to direct our attention to Frederick Douglass. For in the career of this son of the Eastern Shore the usable past comes into its own. His words have a contemporary ring and his outlook is scarcely less instructive for our day than for his. If today the civil rights movement has become a major issue in our country, certainly this may warrant a fresh look at the race relations reformers of the nineteenth century. If today the voice of the Negro himself is now being listened to as never before, certainly this may warrant a fresh hearing to an eloquent Negro American reformer who lived in a day as unquiet as our own.

A figure of heroic proportions, one who contributed notably to making American democracy a viable force, Douglass was destined to cast a long shadow. "Were ever so many miracles crowded into a single life?" asked a contemporary. The day and year of his birth are uncertain, for he was born a slave. But when he died five state legislatures adopted resolutions of regret, and at his last rites, held in Washington on a winter afternoon in 1895, two United States Senators and a Supreme Court Justice were numbered among the honorary pall bearers. A *Washington Post* editorial stated that he "died in an epoch which he did more than any other to create."

Douglass indeed did symbolize many characteristic American traits, perhaps most obviously the driving force to pull oneself up by his bootstraps. After twenty years in slavery he fled to New Bedford, Massachusetts, where for three years he lived a hand-to-mouth existence. Things took a turn for the better in 1841 when he became an abolitionist lecturer, following the accidental discovery of a fluent tongue and a talent for the public platform.

His subsequent career reflected the central issues of his times. In 1847 at Rochester, New York, he became editor of an anti-slavery weekly which he published for sixteen years. In 1848 he took a prominent part in the Seneca Falls Convention in New York which formally inaugurated the woman's rights movement in the United States. During the Civil War he recruited troops for the Union Army, and he urged the Lincoln administration to strike forcefully against slavery. After the war he worked for a Reconstruction policy that would guarantee the right to vote without respect to race. Beginning in 1877 he received high federal appointments from three succesive presidents, becoming in turn Marshal of the District of Columbia, Recorder of Deeds for the District, and United States Minister to the Republic of Haiti.

What is it that makes Douglass a figure worthy of our attention? Let four of his well-known contemporaries suggest an answer. Frederick Law Olmsted, who traveled extensively in the slave states, wrote of Douglass in 1854: "All the statesmanship and kind mastership of the South has done less, in fifty years, to elevate and dignify the African race, than he in ten." Another contemporary opinion of Douglass was expressed by Mark Twain in a letter to President-elect James A. Garfield on January 12, 1881, urging him to reappoint Douglass as Marshal of the District: "I offer this position with peculiar pleasure and strong desire," wrote Twain, "because I honor this man's high and blemishless character and so admire his brave, long crusade for the liberties and elevation of his race."

Writing ten years earlier Senator (and later Vice-President) Henry Wilson struck an even broader note: "The main interest and importance of Mr. Douglass' career, are public, rather than personal. Full of thrilling adventure, striking contrasts, brilliant passages, and undoubted usefulness, as his history was, his providential relations to some of the most marked facts and features of American history constitute the chief elements of that interest and importance which by common consent belong to it." This more rounded view of Douglass was expressed by Governor Theodore Roosevelt when he went to Rochester on June 10, 1899, to speak at the unveiling of a monument to Douglass: "I am proud to be able to do my part in paying respect to a man who was a worthy representative of his race because he was a worthy representative of the American nation."

Like other men of mark in history, Douglass had much to overcome. One of the well-known life writers of recent times, Emil Ludwig, has pointed out that great men are not gods—that they have been gripped by the same all-too-human passions, repressions and encumbrances which afflict every other mortal—but that they achieved greatness because they fought through to their goals. The New Testament phrase, "He that overcometh," is personified in Douglass.

To say that Douglass' career was strewn with obstacles is to put him in the general class of achievers. The odds against Douglass, however, were especially great and they stand in stark contrast to the unusual kind of man he became—well-rounded, high principled, and of a spacious outlook. Hence, the distinctive, indeed peculiar, nature of his upstream career would seem to warrant our appraisal. What circumstances enabled Frederick Douglass to emerge from the shadows?

If anyone were entitled to be called a self-made man, surely it was Douglass. But even in his case there were outward circumstances that cannot be ignored. To begin with, Douglass came to manhood in a day when reformist movements were in foment. The quarter of a century preceding the Civil War was characterized by crusades, among them woman's rights, temperance, world peace, universal education, and prison improvement. Foremost of these reforms in shaping this country's destiny was the abolitionist crusade—the movement to wipe out slavery. Hence when Frederick Douglass joined the abolitionists in 1841, the times were favorable for a man of his antecedents and his talents. The anti-slavery platform was a school for the training of orators, and Douglass did not take long to become "a cataract that roared."

If the times operated to the advantage of Douglass, so did the locale—the particular places he lived. True he was born a slave, but at the age of eight he was sent to Baltimore. City slavery was less oppressive than plantation slavery, the former offering far more "elbow room." "A city slave," wrote Douglass, "is almost a freeman, compared with a slave on the plantation." "Going to live in Baltimore laid the foundation, and opened the gateway, to all my subsequent prosperity."

His first ten years in freedom Douglass spent in Massachusetts. At New Bedford, his first place of residence, he soon learned of an abolition society made up of Negroes. He joined their ranks, leaving only to become a full-time agent of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society. Here he met William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips and their fellow reformers. These dedicated men and women gave Douglass a helping hand. "To these friends, earnest, courageous, inflexible, ready to own me as a man and brother, against all the scorn, contempt, and derision of a slavery-polluted atmosphere, I owe my success in life," he wrote in later years. And, as Douglass himself noted, his early befrienders numbered many Negroes. The first two of these were David Ruggles, secretary of the New York Vigilance Committee, with whom he spent his first two weeks in freedom, and Nathan Johnson of New Bedford, who provided a roof for the young runaway and his bride, and bestowed upon him the surname Douglass.

After nearly ten years in Massachusetts, Douglass in 1847 moved to Rochester where he was to spend the next twenty-five years. Again during the shaping years of his life, he was fortunate in his place of residence. Douglass never regretted coming to Rochester. "I know of no place in the Union," he wrote in 1882, "where I could have located at the time with less resistance, or received a larger measure of sympathy and cooperation, and I now look back to my life and labors there with unalloyed satisfaction."

A final outward circumstance contributing to the rise of Douglass was his personal appearance. His looks helped him. He was well-proportioned, being tall and broad-shouldered. A newspaper editor, N. P. Rogers, described Douglass as he looked in 1841—the year in which he became an abolitionist lecturer. "A commanding person—over six feet, we should say, in height, and of most manly proportions. His head would strike a phrenologist amid a sea of them, and his voice would ring like a trumpet in the field. Let the South congratulate itself that he is a fugitive. It would not have been safe for her if he had remained about the plantations a year or two longer."

Like Rogers, James Russell Lowell, who saw the youthful Douglass frequently, was impressed by what he saw: "The very look and bearing of Douglass are eloquent," wrote Lowell in 1844, "and are full of an irresistible logic against the oppression of his race." Even after the first flush of youth, Douglass retained his power to make a lasting impression on people seeing him for the first time. On one occasion while waiting in President Lincoln's outer office on August 19, 1864, Douglass was the object of a close scrutiny by Joseph T. Mills, another White House visitor. Mills reported his impressions to Lincoln and then hurried home to write them down in his diary:

"Mr. President I was in your reception room today. There in a corner I saw a man quietly reading who possessed a remarkable physiognomy. I was rivetted to the spot. I stood and stared at him. He raised his flashing eyes and caught me in the act. I was compelled to speak. Said I, 'Are you the President?' 'No,' replied the stranger, 'I am Frederick Douglass.'"

His arresting appearance and the times in which he lived by no means account for the full measure of Douglass' accomplishments. Paul Lawrence Dunbar did not have Douglass in mind when he said that some men are born great, some men achieve greatness, and some men lived during Reconstruction times. Fame did not come to Douglass unearned. "Greatness was inherent in his being, and circumstances simply evoked it," wrote William H. Crogman, a late nineteenth century Negro college president.

His own qualities of mind enabled Douglass to move inexorably toward his goals. At the base of these mental qualities was a thirst for knowledge. The first great ambition of the young Douglass was to master the printed page. As a slave boy of 12 years old in Baltimore, he took the first pennies he ever owned and bought a popular book of orations. He then bribed white boys on the docks to teach him to read. Often he had no money left to buy writing materials. "During this time," as he tells it himself, "my copy-book was the board fence, brick wall and pavement, my pen and ink was a lump of chalk."

To Douglass freedom from chattel slavery was but half a victory unless followed by a liberation of the mind. He expressed the opinion that there was no useful thing a man might do that could not be better done by an educated man than an uneducated one. Referring to his slavery background, he wryly observed that some know the value of education by having it. "I know its value by not having it." Speaking at Storer College in 1880, Douglass shared his credo with students. "If," said he, "a man is without education, he is but a pitiable object; a giant in body, but a pigmy in intellect, and, at best, but half a man. . . . Education, on the other hand, means emancipation; it means light and liberty."

Throughout his life he exhibited this desire to learn, to lead a rich life in the brain. He acquired a personal library of over ten thousand volumes; he started to learn French when he was over seventy. Always to make a new man of himself—this was his goal.

Douglass was a learner because of his desire to increase his effectiveness as a reformer and to improve the quality of life itself. This twin purpose made Douglass a hard-worker, one to whom conscientious preparation became a way of life. He never wrote an article or gave a speech without first doing his homework carefully. Richard T. Greener, first Negro graduate of Harvard College, in speaking of Douglass at memorial exercises held by the city of Boston on December 20, 1895, took note of his thoroughness. "He seemed to have the grand miltonic scorn of coming into a contest of thought unprepared; with his blade not well sharpened, the hilt untried, and the point not tested."

As careful as he was with facts, Douglass was equally as meticulous in putting his thoughts in writing. The most cursory examination of his papers will show that he wrote over and over again, striving for clarity and precision. It may be that Douglass was so careful in composing his sentences because he knew that almost everything he wrote would find its way into print and perhaps into posterity. At any rate, Douglass would have agreed fully with a present-day literary critic, Herbert Hill, that "the urgencies of social protest cannot be invoked as an excuse for shoddy undisciplined writing. For writing without artistic quality can only lead to dull and ineffective protest literature. Indeed, for the writer, a serious and purposeful commitment to racial justice and social action requires the most intense devotion to literary technique and artistic discipline."

The sense of personal responsibility that went into his literary efforts was characteristic of Douglass. He did not believe in waiting for things to take a turn for the better. As a slave he made two attempts to escape, not losing heart because the first was thwarted. Desirous of freedom he began, as he put it, to pray with his legs. In 1894 Douglass was paid a visit by Daniel Hale Williams, first physician in the world to operate successfully on the human heart, and a charter member of the American College of Surgeons. Having his troubles as head of Freedman's Hospital in Washington, D.C., Williams drove out to the Douglass residence seeking advice. The words of the aged reformer, then 77, might have been a capsule of his own career: "The only way you can succeed, Dan, is to override the obstacles in your way. By the power that is within you, do what you hope to do."

These words to Dr. Williams were typical of Douglass. He was always urging Negroes to be up and doing whatever betide. He knew what it was to be black in his native land but he did not believe that prejudice absolved its victims from the exercise of personal responsibility. In the very first issue of his newspaper, the *North Star*, he stated his credo: "While advocating your rights, the *North Star* will strive to throw light on your duties: while it will not fail to make known your virtues, it will not shun to discover your faults."

To say that Douglass believed in racial self-reliance does not mean that he was against cooperating with whites. "It is gallant to go forth single-handedly, but is it wise?" he said in a speech on John Brown. Douglass was opposed to separate, all-Negro organizations, believing that a solid colored minority would tend to polarize racial resentments. Hence, he took a stand, for example, against the formation in 1888 of a woman's sufferage association of colored women. "I have associated with white people in various societies," wrote he, "in anti-slavery societies, temperance societies, literary societies, woman's sufferage societies, and I see no reason why educated and well informed colored women should not do the same."

Douglass reasoned that the Negro was an American and that inasmuch as there could be but one America, a nation within a nation would be an anomaly. In delivering the commencement address to the Colored High School of Baltimore in the closing year of his life, Douglass pointed out that "the evils now crushing us to earth have their root and sap in this narrow spirit of race and color, and we have no more right to foster it than men of any other race."

Douglass did not advocate a policy of "go-it-alone." But he did hold that the Negro's white friends could not do for him what he could do for himself. Douglass held it as an article of faith that the Negro's destiny was largely in his own hands. "If we succeed in the race of life, it must be by our own energies, and our own exertions," he said over and over. The Negro should be his own man, speaking up for himself. This was necessary, affirmed Douglass, not merely to inspire the colored people themselves but to furnish doubting whites with an object lesson in the Negro's readiness for equality.

Douglass knew what it was to become one's own spokesman, having taken this step in 1847 while on the threshold of his career. In that year he had broken with the Massachusetts abolitionists. As much as he admired them he left their ranks when he became convinced that their attitude toward him was to some degree patronizing, smacking of "father knows best." They wanted Douglass to stick to a script they had written for him, confining his speeches to his experiences as a slave rather than his reflections as a man. Douglass refused, having opened his eyes, as he phrased it, and looked out of them through another telescope. No people, observed Douglass, ever "stood forth in the attitude of freedom" unless some one from among themselves had arisen to lead them on to victory.

A final consideration of Douglass as a nineteenth century mover and shaker must take note of his qualities of the spirit. Foremost among these was a sense of humanity that crossed the barrier of race and color. Douglass was broad and encompassing in his outlook and sympathies. This ecumenical spirit was perhaps the more unusual inasmuch as Douglass was pro-Negro to the core. "Whatever character or capacity you ascribe to us," he told a New York audience in May 1853, "I am not ashamed to be numbered with this race. I utterly abhor and spurn with all contempt possible that cowardly meanness which leads any colored man to repudiate his connection with the race." One of Douglass's Negro critics in the 1880's T. Thomas Fortune, editor of the New York *Freeman*, paid tribute to his battle for the Negro. On April 2, 1886, Fortune wrote as follows: "Of course I do not agree to all your views, but the fight for the race is there and that satisfies me."

But Douglass was not ethnocentric; instead, his interests embraced the family of man. As he said on one occasion, the black people were his people, the yellow people were his people and the white people were his people. "Now, as always," he wrote in a private letter in April 1884, "I am for any movement whenever there is a good cause to promote, a right to assert, a chain to be broken, a burden to be removed, or a wrong to be redressed."

In part Douglass's broad outlook stemmed from his early association with such figures as William Lloyd Garrison and Wendell Phillips, whose reform interest were far-ranging. In part, too, Douglass's broad sympathies may have resulted from being a Negro. Paradoxically, it would seem, his belonging to a despised group had given him a deeper, more inclusive sense of human brotherhood. Douglass' deep interest in the plight of his fellow men may be viewed as a mark of maturity if we are to believe the new school of "ego psychology."

But whatever the reasons Douglass belonged to "the fellowship of the concerned." His own success never lulled his conscience, leading him to murmur, "Soul, take thine ease." He could be numbered among those who mourned man's inhumanity to man. Oppressed peoples in other lands evoked his words of support—the Irish under England, the Hungarians under Austria and the Cubans under Spain.

Of the non-racial domestic reforms that engaged Douglass' attention, woman's rights took highest rank. "Right is of no sex," said Douglass in 1847, and throughout his life no man was a more zealous woman's righter. Ignoring volleys of criticism and abuse, he took part in many of the state and national conventions held by the embattled women's groups. Age did not diminish his interest. On his last afternoon he attended a meeting of the National Council of Women in Washington, D.C., at which he was warmly received. He returned home and as he and his wife were talking after dinner, his heart gave away.

Nearly two hours later, as the National Council of Women opened their evening session, Mary Wright Sewall, the presiding officer, took solemn note of his passing. It was a historic coincidence, she said, that the man who embodied the struggle between liberty and oppression should have spent his last day in company with the seekers of "a new expression of freedom." It was a sentiment Douglass would not have quarreled with, being not wide of the mark.

In leaving Douglass it hardly need be added that most of what he said and stood for has a relevance for our times. His social insights were, on the whole, remarkable. Two brief final illustrations may be noted. A careful reader of the American character, Douglass knew that his countrymen, as heirs of the Declaration of Independence, were committed to the call of freedom and equality. In the dark days of the Dred Scott decision he had proclaimed that "the best defense of free American institutions is the hearts of the American people."

But Douglass also knew that America's dedication to freedom and equality could not be taken for granted—that his countrymen were prone to infringe upon the rights of the Negro. In a speech in Washington in 1889, under the auspices of the Bethel Literary and Historical Association, Douglass summed up the attitude of the mass of Americans, his statement as cogent now as it was then. "Justice and magnanimity are elements of the American character. They may do much for us. But we are in no position to depend upon these qualities exclusively. Depend upon it, whenever, the American people shall become convinced that they have gone too far in recognizing the rights of the Negro, they will find some way to abridge these rights. The Negro is great but the welfare of the nation will be considered greater. They will forget the Negro's service in the late war. They will forget his loyalty to the republic."

Finally, Douglass saw the Negro as the touchstone of American democracy, its inescapable test. In the main an optimist, he did not believe that human problems were so vast as to defy solution. But neither did he believe that they would go away of themselves. Hence one of Douglass' major contributions was in holding up a mirror to America, in making her face up to the unfinished business of democracy. The land of the free must needs come to grips with itself. America's inevitable self-confrontation was a theme of one of Douglass' greatest speeches, delivered in the nation's capital on the occasion of the twenty-first anniversary of emancipation in the District of Columbia, and subsequently reprinted upon the request of twenty prominent Negroes, headed by former United States Senator B. K. Bruce. The words of Douglass on that occasion could almost have been written today:

"What Abraham Lincoln said in respect of the United States is as true of the colored people as of the relations of those states. They cannot remain half slave and half free. You must give them all or take from them all. Until this half-and-half condition is ended, you will have an aggrieved class, and this discussion will go. Until the public schools shall cease to be caste schools in every part of our country, this discussion will go on. Until color shall cease to be a bar to equal participation in the offices and honors of the country, this discussion will go on. Until the trades-unions and the workshops of the country shall cease to proscribe the colored man, this discussion will go on. In a word, until truth and humanity shall cease to be living ideas, this discussion will go on."

THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, various aspects, segments, and programs of the war on poverty receive almost daily mention here on the floor of the Senate. What is unfortunate is that most of these remarks are somewhat derogatory in nature; it would appear that the endeavors of the Office of Economic Opportunity come under the public eye only when criticism can be made.

I have often thought that a $100 million missile or space probe can result in total loss, and there is no outcry for a Senate investigation; however, let $1 seemingly be misused when we are trying to help human beings, and the outcries are loud; ridicule and scorn are heaped upon the program; and investigations are called for.

I maintain that this is an unfortunate situation and one which should not be allowed to remain. There has been great success in the poverty program and, I am sure that it will continue to be successful to an even greater extent. I would like to think that for every half a step that we fall back due to mistakes of judgment or inexperience, we take three steps forward.

Roscoe Drummond, the nationally syndicated columnist, has contributed a forceful and very timely statement about the war on poverty and its Director, Sargent Shriver. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excellent article entitled "Poverty Disputes Unfair," written by Roscoe Drummond, and published in the Washington Post of Sunday, February 5, 1967.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Poverty Disputes Unfair

(By Roscoe Drummond)

It is unfair to attack the war on poverty just because it gets into recurring controversy. It is breaking new ground and is bound to stir controversy.

Controversy arises not because poverty programs are doing badly but because they deal with painful social conditions which are themselves surrounded by controversy in nearly every community.

The bitter dispute which for months stymied one slim slice of the Head Start program in Mississippi—because of the loose management by one local agency and because the agency was drifting into a for-Negroes-only program—is an example of how one limited controversy can so dominate the headlines as to make it appear as though nothing worthwhile is going on at all.

The truth is that program money is going where the poverty is greatest. Proportionate to population, more assistance is being given to the poverty programs in Mississippi, which by nearly every test is the poorest state in the Nation, than to any other state.

Despite the fact that Head Start requires integration of both pupils and faculty, the program is being widely utilized in Missisippi. In most instances the programs are being carried out by whites and Negroes working together. Almost 10 per cent of the Federal dollars for Head Start programs are going into Missisippi. Helping to break the cycle of poverty by training the very young, they are operating in 31 counties for 15,660 children.

There is no question that the war on poverty is having a considerable impact on the people of Mississippi. It is affecting the lives of its children—and its adults. It is helping them get more education and better job training.

The central fact is that Mississippi—the state most reluctant to break racial barriers, the state with 55 per cent of its housing substandard, with more than half its population below the poverty line and with an education expenditure-per-pupil of the lowest in the Nation—is being helped into a new era with large financial assistance through the war on poverty, combined with the leadership of Gov. Paul Johnson and local initiative.

I know of no administrator in Washington who is more courageously hewing to the workable center than Sargent Shriver. The soundness of most of what he is doing is best illustrated by the kind of critics who are incessantly firing at him.

He is condemned by the radical left and the radical right, blamed by some mayors for not doing enough and by some Congressmen for doing too much, criticized by the radical activists and by the racial segregationists, harried by the social welfare professionals as being too innovative and by the innovators for not being innovative enough.

And, of course, smeared by Adam Clayton Powell, who was always demanding his resignation as a price for something or other.

The war on poverty needs a man like Sargent Shriver. More important, it needs the support of the President—and is now getting it.

Mr. PELL. Recently the Rhode Island community action directors submitted to me a report of their activities. Thankfully, it was not a report of bland statistics and words of art; the usual scientific jargon was excluded. The report was simply a story of community action in Rhode Island and how it affected people: people like the public assistance recipient who, while working as a teacher's aid, completed her college education and is now a certified teacher; people like the neighborhood aid who was credited with saving a cancer patient's life by quick thinking action; people like the low-income residents who have been able to make their city take greater notice of them and provide them with requisite city services.

I think my fellow Senators would find this statement of activity in Rhode Island most interesting. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the full report of the Rhode Island community action directors.

There being no objection, the report

was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Report of Rhode Island CAP Directors

The Economic Opportunity program is showing real promise of providing new hope to thousands of needy residents of Rhode Island.

No community in the state, large or small, can claim long experience in implementing the Economic Opportunity Act. For periods ranging from two years to only a few months, a number of towns and cities have been attempting to use it to provide new weapons against an old enemy—poverty.

The tragedy of poverty may have different aspects in Rhode Island. It can be seen in a rat-infested tenement in South Providence, in a woodland shack in Burrillville. In the same way, the methods being used to fight it are different. Providence has community schools. Burrillville is trying to get a Foster Grandparent program to help needy old persons and institutionalized children at the same time.

Some of the efforts under way in Rhode Island already have borne fruit. Many more are showing the first signs of success. Now, while the first triumphs are being tasted, these programs face the threat of extinction or emasculation.

This bright promise must not be allowed to lapse into darkness. These citizens who have found new hope must be encouraged to continue their efforts to help themselves.

The United States Government has made a promise to these people. The commitment made in August of 1964, when the Economic Opportunity program was enacted, must be upheld and strengthened.

Here is a brief summary of some of the accomplishments of the Economic Opportunity program in Rhode Island:

In Providence, more than 500 poor persons from the target areas have been employed in anti-poverty programs, most of them receiving experience and training that will prepare them for long-term employment in the changing open job market.

Another 300 have served on Neighborhood Advisory Committees, many experiencing their first opportunity to influence the life of their community.

This activity has led to a new awareness of the individual's importance, so that attendance at such public forums as City Council and School Committee meetings, and hearings on renewal projects have increased substantially.

Neighborhood Aides were instrumental, recently, in relocating a score of families displaced by hospital expansion. Through the efforts of the aides, the threatened loss of heat and utilities by these families was prevented.

Seven thousand persons have benefited from the Community School program. One woman, a public assistance recipient who worked as a teacher's aide, completed her college credits to be certified as a teacher. At least one other woman is pursuing the same course.

One worker in the program, the single head of a family with ten children, has moved into private employment and has been able to leave public assistance.

Another woman has advanced twice to better positions, received an economic opportunity loan to open a store, and has purchased her own home.

A neighborhood aide has been credited by the hospital with saving a cancer patient's life by getting him to the clinic and interpreting for him with the hospital staff.

The new employment staff of the agency has placed fifty persons, mostly young people, in on-the-job training positions and has made more than one hundred direct job placements.

Of the twenty-six hundred average daily attendance in Community Schools last October, one thousand were adults.

Nine hundred poor persons were helped in the last quarter of 1966 with housing problems. The Providence Community Services staff reached out to six thousand different people during the same period.

A young girl from the Job Corps, denied a job with the telephone company for want of a high school diploma, was placed as a telephone operator in a private concern.

In Warwick, three families receiving a total of approximately $5,000 a year in welfare checks, were able to leave public assistance when their mothers enrolled their children in the all-year Head Start Day Care program.

Three Warwick teenagers who had attempted suicide received intensive casework treatment from trained social workers assigned to Community Action Youth Centers. About twenty-five needy youth center members were helped to find jobs, and eight boys and girls who had dropped out of school were persuaded to return. Another five youngsters were able to remain in school because Youth Corps jobs supplemented the family income.

In the Warwick Day Care center, more than half the fifty needy children who are enrolled have gained weight at considerably above the normal rate. Through medical checkups, about ten cases of serious handicaps or illnesses in these youngsters have been discovered.

In Newport, low-income residents have been able to get their streets and sidewalks re-paved, their street lighting doubled, and better enforcement of housing codes. In return, residents of "target areas" have pitched in to help their city in cleanup campaigns.

In Newport, thirty school dropouts have been enrolled in the Youth Corps since November. Two have found private employment as a result of their experience, and a third has joined the Job Corps. A total of sixty-eight children are enrolled in the Newport winter Head Start program. Teachers report that they see improvement in the families' attitude toward school and teachers, as well as in the children's behavior, attention span and motivation.

In East Providence, after school officials had tried unsuccessfully to find candidates for an Adult Basic Education program, Community Action aides were able to recruit seventeen enrollees. In another program, C.A.P. workers helped residents obtain a voice in planning a public housing project.

The East Providence program developed a weekly baby-sitting course for junior high school students, designed to increase their knowledge of baby care and to provide free baby-sitting time for low-income residents of the community.

In Pawtucket, Community Action neighborhood organizations, formed in public housing projects, won their fight for a parking lot, for better street lights, for more police protection and for a youth center.

As an example of what can be done, one low-income Pawtucket family has a boy in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, another who was a school dropout but returned after he was enrolled in the Upward Bound project, a child in Head Start, another in a cultural enrichment program, two volunteers in Head Start (one of them now wants to become a teacher), and the father is a member of the Community Action Program board.

In Pawtucket, one person has become the manager of a Community Center after being on relief for five years. A woman hired as a teacher's aide in Head Start now is becoming a practical nurse.

The Tri-Town Economic Opportunity Committee, which encompasses the communities of Johnston, North Providence, Smithfield and Burrillville, reports: "Were it not for our activities, an elderly, destitute woman would have gone without heating fuel or food because she misinterpreted the local welfare agency's rules; a young family burned out of their home would have had no food, clothing or toys during the Christmas holiday; the plight of six young, fatherless families would not have been brought to light; twenty-seven youngsters with medical or dental problems would not have had the advantage of early diagnosis and care; a blind person would not have had the activities of the Neighborhood Council and the assistance of the Aides to escape his dreary existence; a young boy, neglected and abused, would not have received a home at the Children's Center."

In Woonsocket, Neighborhood Councils raised their own funds and held a Halloween party that attracted seven hundred youngsters—so many that they had to be accommodated in three shifts. Armed with this success, these residents then obtained the free loan of four empty stores to establish neighborhood centers, and used their own money to make curtains and beautify the buildings. Several even donated their own rugs to make the centers more attractive.

Perhaps the Community Action program in Rhode Island could be summarized by this excerpt from a Cranston report: "The C.A.P. programs are concerned with neglected and disappointed people who are disillusioned. Often only through the repeated efforts and follow-up on the part of C.A.P. personnel can they be convinced to 'try it again.' "

DISTRICT SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the editorial published in the Tuesday, February 21, Washington Evening Star, which commented on the lack of unanimity in school board thinking in the District of Columbia, deserves commendation. It is a wise, effectively stated assessment of the situation, and it points out the wide variance in educational philosophy represented by the members of the school board. And, especially succinctly, it asks what responsible educator of stature could be expected to step into such troubled circumstances if Dr. Hansen, with his demonstrated patience, were to depart.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

One-Man Consensus

In disclosing his intention the other day to oppose the reappointment of Carl F. Hansen to another term as District school superintendent, school board member Benjamin H. Alexander expressed the view that other prominent educators are available with philosophies "more attuned to the thinking of this board."

What "thinking," precisely, is that?

Alexander has every right, of course, to speak for himself. But if there is a single certainty in the school board's present state of utter confusion, it is the absence of a consensus as to the educational philosophy which should be reflected in changed programs for District schools. At one stage of the board's seemingly endless public discussion of the subject last Thursday, another member, the Rev. Everett A. Hewlitt, commented that the board "has not fastened itself down firmly enough to decide what it wants, for the schools, to be able to decide who it wants as its chief adviser." That sums up the facts of the case with perfect clarity.

And if Hansen should depart from the scene, the board would be in no better position than now to evaluate the acceptability of a new man. Indeed, what responsible educator of stature could be expected to step into such muddy waters?

The fact is that the new board has not found Hansen to be a recalcitrant, obstreperous co-worker. He has demonstrated a willingness to adapt his substantial administrative abilities enthusiastically to those few innovative policy directives on which the board has managed to agree during the last year. We think it would be tragic for the city if Hansen were to depart—and it is encouraging that a substantial percentage of the board membership seems to have this view.

The issue is going to have to be resolved by the board as a whole, however, and no useful purpose will be served by further procrastination—particularly in the sort of fruitless semi-public spectacle which the board presented last week. If there is a need for any further discussion on Hansen's status, the board should hold it in private—and then proceed to cast its votes in open session without further stalling.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 665) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in order that Senators may be advised that we are now turning to the consideration of the pending business, having violated the rule against germaneness without objection during the last 3 hours, I suggest the absence of a quorum which, as far as I am concerned, will not be live.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, last Thursday I suggested on the floor that the pending bill, calling for the authorization of $4.5 billion for additional military expenditures for fiscal year 1967, was a bill of considerable importance which ought to be fully debated by the Senate and should not be passed during the tag end of the Washington Birthday recess.

I say now for the benefit of my colleagues that I would hope the debate on this measure would continue over until next week, as I have been advised by a number of my colleagues that they desire to be heard on the bill. This is because the bill does authorize the appropriation of a substantial amount of money which I fear will be used first to escalate the ground war in Vietnam and, second, to continue what, in my judgment, is an unwise bombing of North Vietnam by our Air Force and Navy bombers.

Mr. President, in order to somewhat crystalize my own thinking on this subject, I have prepared two amendments to the pending bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 99

The first is a sense of Congress statement that the bombing of North Vietnam should stop and should not be resumed unless there is a congressional declaration of war against North Vietnam; and further, that the level of U.S. forces in South Vietnam should not be increased above 500,000 unless Congress declares war against North Vietnam. Finally, the amendment would assist the efforts of men of good will throughout the world who are trying to prevent a widening of the war and trying to bring the conflict to an honorable end through a negotiated settlement.

I shall speak later at greater length in support of the proposed amendment. For the moment I send the amendment to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be printed and that the text of the amendment may be printed at this point in my remarks, the amendment to be designated Clark amendment No. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed and will be on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 99), ordered to be printed in the RECORD, reads as follows:

At the end of the bill add a new title, as follows:

"TITLE IV—STATEMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL POLICY

"SEC. 401. It is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress—

"(1) that none of the funds authorized by this Act or any other Act should be used to carry out military operations in or over North Vietnam or to increase the number of United States military personnel in South Vietnam above 500,000, unless there shall have been a declaration of war against North Vietnam by the Congress in accordance with article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States; and

"(2) that the Congress supports those efforts being made by men of good will throughout the world to prevent an expansion of the war in Vietnam and to bring that conflict to an end through a negotiated settlement which will preserve the honor of the United States, protect the vital interests of this country, and allow the people of South Vietnam to determine the affairs of that nation in their own way."

The second amendment is what may be called a fall-back position.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have first amendment read? Does the Senator from Pennsylvania object?

Mr. CLARK. Not at all, except that I am not calling it up now. I shall be glad to read it if the clerk will send it back.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator might save his vocal cords. I understand that he has extensive remarks to make.

Mr. CLARK. I am not calling up the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand; I am not trying to take advantage of the Senator. I am merely asking to have the amendment read and to have the amendment lie on the table until the Senator calls it up.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator would like to have the amendment read?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. I shall be happy to have it read.

Mr. President, may we have the amendment read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The legislative clerk read the amendment (No. 99), as follows:

At the end of the bill add a new title, as follows:

"TITLE IV—STATEMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL POLICY

"SEC. 401. It is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress—

"(1) that none of the funds authorized by this Act or any other Act should be used to carry out military operations in or over North Vietnam or to increase the number of United States military personnel in South Vietnam above 500,000, unless there shall have been a declaration of war against North Vietnam by the Congress in accordance with article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States; and

"(2) that the Congress supports those efforts being made by men of good will throughout the world to prevent an expansion of the war in Vietnam and to bring that conflict to an end through a negotiated settlement which will preserve the honor of the United States, protect the vital interests of this country, and allow the people of South Vietnam to determine the affairs of that nation in their own way."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I have asked the Senator to yield only because I wished to ask him if he would be willing to let me join him as a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to do so.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon may be joined as a cosponsor of the amendment just read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, my second amendment is what might be called a fallback amendment, to be offered in the event amendment No. 1 does not prevail. Its purpose is to state the sense of Congress, first, that all necessary support will be provided for our fighting men; second, to approve the efforts being made by men of good will everywhere to keep the war from expanding and to bring it to an end through political negotiations; and third, that Congress supports the 1954 Geneva Agreement as a basis for settlement of the war, and calls for a reconvening of the Conference.

I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be printed, that it may also be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, and that it may be read presently by the clerk, with the understanding that I am not calling it up now.

I further ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] may be joined as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the several requests of the Senator from Pennsylvania are granted. The amendment will be read.

The legislative clerk read the amendment (No. 100), as follows:

At the end of the bill add a new title, as follows:

"TITLE IV—STATEMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL POLICY

"SEC. 401. The Congress hereby declares—

"(1) its firm intentions to provide all necessary support for members of the Armed Forces of the United States fighting in Vietnam;

"(2) its support of efforts being made by men of good will throughout the world to prevent an expansion of the war in Vietnam and to bring that conflict to an end through a negotiated settlement which will preserve the honor of the United States, protect the vital interests of this country, and allow the people of South Vietnam to determine the affairs of that nation in their own way; and

"(3) its support of the Geneva Conference Agreement of 1954 and the Final Declaration of that Conference as a basis for a settlement of the Vietnam war, and to that end urges that the Conference be reconvened as soon as practicable for the purpose of formulating plans to effectively implement that agreement."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of my good friend from Georgia, I should like to ask him a few questions, if I may, about the report of the committee and the statement he made earlier today in support of the bill.

My first question is this: Does this authorization include anything which would authorize the deployment of antiballistic missiles?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, there is nothing in this bill for research on or procurement of an antiballistic missile system.

Mr. CLARK. So that we can consider this bill with the understanding that this is not an effort——

Mr. RUSSELL. No testimony presented to the committee indicated that there is any purpose to use a single cent of the money for that purpose.

Mr. CLARK. As I understand, this authorization bill is part of a package which, if and when approved by Congress, would result in a supplemental appropriations bill for the current fiscal year totaling in the neighborhood of $12,500 million.

Mr. RUSSELL. This bill would authorize a part of the supplemental appropriations. All of the functions of the Department of Defense do not have to be authorized from year to year. Take ammunition, for example. Appropriations may be made for that under continuing authorization, and there is no requirement for an annual authorization. This bill relates to those functions for which there must be specific authorization of appropriations.

About one-third of the total of the supplemental appropriations bill does require new authorization, and that is what is embraced in this bill. Twelve billion two hundred and seventy-five million dollars is the entire amount that is required for southeast Asia, and in this bill the amount is $4,467,200,000.

Mr. CLARK. If I correctly understand the Senator from Georgia, the balance, approximately $8 billion, has already been authorized and will in due course come before us as part of a supplemental appropriations bill, in the reasonably near future.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, it will be before us. We expect this bill to be followed rather expeditiously by the appropriations bill.

Mr. CLARK. Which will total about $12.5 billion?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. A little less than that.

Mr. CLARK. I think I understood the Senator correctly, that as he presented this bill he indicated the best he could make out of it was that we are spending about $2 billion a month for the war in Vietnam.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. If I had to make an estimate, that is the best one I could make, out of what knowledge I have of the bills that have been enacted and the requirements in the 1968 authorization, and appropriation.

Mr. CLARK. Would that run for the fiscal year as well as for the calendar year? Is there an acceleration, in other words? Was it less 12 months ago than it is now?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think it will accelerate greatly, because earlier there was considerable military construction, such as at Cam Ranh Bay and for various airfields and installations of that kind. I do not think that the total required for fiscal year 1968 would be much greater, because most of the construction should be funded.

Mr. CLARK. Did I correctly understand the Senator to quote Secretary of Defense McNamara as giving his best judgment—although he indicated that it was a very difficult question to answer—that for the current fiscal year ending June 30, the total expenditure for Vietnam would be in the neighborhood of $22 billion?

Mr. RUSSELL. In his testimony, the Secretary was not nearly so precise in his estimates of the cost of the war as he usually is. As I recall, he said somewhere between $17 billion and $22 billion.

He did point out—and it is understandable—the impossibility of completely segregating all of the expenditures attributable to the Vietnam operation—how to allocate some salaries, for example, and things of that kind that would continue whether we were in any difficulty in Vietnam or not.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator have any way of giving us an estimate as to how much a month the bombing of Vietnam costs?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, there is no way on earth I would undertake to estimate that. The different types of planes and different sized bombs and loss of lives—it sounds somewhat coldblooded to refer to it in terms of dollars and cents, but those things do require expenditures——

Mr. CLARK. The training of pilots.

Mr. RUSSELL. The training of pilots, which is a very expensive item.

Some of these planes cost about $1¾ million, and others cost $5 million or $6 million. So I would not undertake to estimate just what the bombing of North Vietnam does cost.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator have readily available—if, not, could he perhaps either get it overnight or tell me where I could get it—an up-to-date statement of the losses in aircraft, both in numbers and in dollar value, during calendar 1966?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, I have one, but it may be out of date. I shall be happy to get one this evening from the Department of Defense and place it in the RECORD tomorrow.

The losses from combat operations roughly equal those from sabotage and from operational difficulties and things of that kind.

Mr. CLARK. Perhaps the Senator could also tell me where I could find the casualties, both in deaths and wounded, of American boys during calendar 1966, divided, if possible, between those lost in the bombing of North Vietnam and those lost in combat in South Vietnam.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that would be possible. Of course, it is difficult to arrive at any exact figure because from time to time we find that some man we think has been killed is alive.

Mr. CLARK. For which, thank God.

Mr. RUSSELL. For which we all are duly grateful and thankful.

The number of lives being lost in the bombing of North Vietnam is not large in relation to the total number of casualties. Of course, even one life is more than we like to see lost. But in addition to the human values, the Government has a very extensive investment in the training of the pilots that have flown these missions in North Vietnam, because they have been the cream of the crop.

Mr. CLARK. Would I be correct in assuming that because we want our boys to have the best possible care, that the medical expenditures to take care of the wounds are a rather substantial amount?

Mr. RUSSELL. I would say they are a substantial amount. We have run into a great many difficulties over there.

For example, heretofore malaria had always been considered a low, flat country, water-proximity disease. But the malaria that we have encountered in Vietnam is highland malaria. We have had difficulty in the treatment of it, and preventive care and treatment that we have used before are ineffective in dealing with this new kind of malaria. We have had long lists of casualties, of men who have been hospitalized, and who have been compelled to return to the States incapacitated.

Mr. CLARK. Is malaria the principal disease from which our boys suffer in Vietnam? I imagine there would be a good deal of dysentery in addition.

Mr. RUSSELL. There has been a great deal of dysentery. I am disturbed by the high rate of venereal diseases. It is greater than it was in World War I or World War II.

Mr. CLARK. In addition, we have to take into account the cost, which we are all happy to pay, of caring for those who are wounded. That must be a substantial amount.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. As the Senator knows, those who are most seriously wounded are flown out of Vietnam. They are first given temporary care in a hospital there. Then, they may be treated at Clark Air Force Base in the Philippines. Some are then evacuated to the States, to the hospital at the Presidio, or to Walter Reed, or to other hospitals.

Mr. CLARK. Are we supplying hospital services for the South Vietnamese wounded?

Mr. RUSSELL. We are, and it has gone beyond the military forces of South Vietnam. A great many of these officers have been so touched by compassion that they use their off-duty hours to treat civilians in South Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator indicated in the beginning of his statement, and with respect to this I am sure he will indulge me if I disagree with him, that there was little interest of the other side in a settlement and that, therefore, we had to go all out to prosecute the war.

Mr. RUSSELL. I said that as far as I am concerned I have heard no indication whatever that Ho Chi Minh and those associated with him in the junta that dominates North Vietnam had evinced the slightest willingness to even discuss ending the war and, I believe I said, unless we first agree to stop bombing.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator will permit me to differ with him. I would like to call the attention of the Senator to an article which appeared in this morning's New York Times from Paris under the byline of Tom Wicker, whom I believe to be a most reputable and excellent reporter, in which he states he has had an interview with a North Vietnamese representative of Ho Chi Minh, who is presently living in Paris. I fear that I will not be able to pronounce his name correctly. However, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair.) Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is follows:

PARIS: TEATIME BENEATH THE CHINWHISKERS

(By Tom Wicker)

PARIS.—Mai Van Bo is a rather jovial North Vietnamese who puffs a pipe professorially, serves a pungent brand of tea, and receives visitors at No. 2 rue le Verrier near Montparnasse in a sitting room dominated by a large photograph of Ho Chi Minh.

In a conversation beneath the familiar chinwhiskers, Hanoi's representative in Europe made several intriguing points in his fluent French. One of these was the conversation itself, since it was learned elsewhere that his instructions have been to speak sparingly to reporters, particularly Americans.

Bo described what he called "the Burchett declaration"—remarks made by North Vietnam's Foreign Minister, Nguyen Duy Trinh, to the Australian reporter, Wilfred Burchett—as having been a "very positive" offer to enter talks with the United States if President Johnson would declare publicly a permanent and unconditional halt to the bombing of North Vietnam.

HOLDS OFFER STILL OPEN

He said this offer was still open and that it now was up to the United States to match it with a reciprocal step. Ho Chi Minh's letter to the Pope, restating Hanoi's four-point peace program, he said, referred to the terms of an ultimate settlement rather than to conditions for beginning talks.

Several points about all this provide the basis for some interesting speculations, particularly when considered together with other views available in Paris from extremely well-informed persons.

DEMAND FOR BOMBING HALT

First, despite President Johnson's rejection of the terms of the Burchett declaration and the resumption of bombing, Mai Van Bo made it plain—both by discussing the matter with American reporters and by the substance of his words—that the offer to talk remains on the table. But he coupled this with the tough demand that the President declare publicly that the bombing had been permanently and unconditionally halted, and the vehemently repeated assertion that Hanoi would never enter talks "under bombs."

If the conclusion to be drawn from this is that Hanoi indeed wishes to talk, but for reasons of policy and not of fear; that it would like to settle the war, not at any price but on the basis of reciprocal arrangements rather than of submission, then the views of other well-informed persons here become of considerable interest.

They feel President Johnson may have made a slight—but crucial—misreading of the meaning of the Burchett declaration. Washington's attitude has long been to avoid giving any sign of weakening will, and to search the air for the faintest suggestion that Hanoi might be weakening in its resolve. Thus Mr. Johnson may well have read the Burchette interview as such a signal of weakness and decided to wait for the better offer that increasing North Vietnamese despair might be expected to produce.

But some specialists here emphatically do not believe that a signal of weakness was raised in the Burchett interview. Rather, they say, it signaled the fact that the internal convulsion of Communist China has so reduced Chinese influence in Hanoi that Soviet diplomacy had at last made a breakthrough and convinced the North Vietnamese of the possibility and preferability of a political settlement. A former diplomatic colleague of the present Soviet Ambassador in Hanoi, for instance, said that the Ambassador had done little else in recent months but argue for a political settlement.

These persons believe China is convinced that American involvement in an Asian war can only result in an ultimate American defeat, and that the longer the involvement lasts and the deeper it goes, the more crushing will be that defeat when it comes. The Chinese, moreover, see the war in Vietnam as the one remaining barrier to the kind of Soviet-American *détente* and concerted action that Peking fears most.

BLOW TO PEKING SEEN

Thus, in this view, China desperately wants the war to continue and President Johnson's rejection of Hanoi's offer to talk has overlooked an opportunity to deal Peking a smashing defeat by settling the war. These persons do not underestimate the immense difficulties of negotiating a settlement with the hard-shelled North Vietnamese once talks begin, and particularly if the ground fighting is continuing.

But the possibilities are equally great if the solidarity of Hanoi and Peking has indeed been broken to the point that North Vietnam is willing to negotiate as an equal with the United States. The conversation with Mai Van Bo suggests that this is the case.

Mr. CLARK. For the benefit of my friend from Georgia, this gentleman, Mai Van Bo, who is said to speak excellent French, in a conversation with Mr. Wicker, stated, I take it, as follows:

Bo described what he called "the Burchett declaration"—remarks made by North Vietnam's Foreign Minister, Nguyen Duy Tranh, to the Australian reporter, Wilfred Burchett—as having been a "very positive" offer to enter talks with the United States if President Johnson would declare publicly a permanent and unconditional halt to the bombing of North Vietnam.

HOLDS OFFER STILL OPEN

He said this offer was still open and that it now was up to the United States to match it with a reciprocal step. Ho Chi Minh's letter to the Pope, restating Hanoi's four-point peace program, he said, referred to the terms of an ultimate settlement rather than to conditions for beginning talks.

From this article, I conclude, as I have concluded from reading a number of other press dispatches, that negotiations might be able to start if we would only stop bombing North Vietnam. While I realize we will be taking a serious calculated risk in this regard, I, for one, would be willing to take it. I have no doubt that my friend from Georgia disagrees with me.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do completely disagree with the Senator. I think we have been victimized by more tips and rumors in the operation over there than we ever have been in our history heretofore. Some Italian traveling man will come out of North Vietnam and say that he talked with Ho Chi Minh. This man to whom the Senator has referred, who is apparently one of the representatives of the North Vietnamese Government in France, tells Mr. Wicker, and I am sure he reported him correctly, that they would stop if we would stop bombing.

We have had rumor after rumor. I can tell the Senator from my knowledge what transpired. Every one of these rumors has been pursued, and as far as there being any basic foundation for them, Ho Chi Minh has never wavered from his requirement that we admit defeat, put our tail between our legs, and withdraw from South Vietnam before he would begin to discuss a peace treaty with us.

We have said again and again that we would stop the bombing if they would stop sending men and supplies into South Vietnam. We stopped once for 37 days, pursuant to one of these errant rumors floating about, and all that happened was that North Vietnam used that time to regroup forces, replenish supplies, and get into a better position to kill and maim a great many American boys.

There have been two or three other holidays during which we stopped the bombing. We stopped once during Tet, I believe they call it. We stopped for 2 days longer than the time agreed upon. Our intelligence indicated a most strenuous effort on the part of the North Vietnamese to resupply their forces, to regroup their forces, and to reinforce their forces during that period.

In my opinion all of these rumors going around are a form of propaganda to deceive the American people into believing the North Vietnamese are really craving peace and that we are bloodthirsty wretches that merely wish to see their women and children killed, and that we will pay no attention to their pleas for peace.

There are many issues on which I do not agree with the President, but I have been rather close to this subject from the beginning and he has been consumed with a desire to bring about a conclusion of the hostilities in Vietnam ever since the day he assumed office. He will pursue any tangible path that is open to peace and peace negotiations.

The fact is that in his earnestness for peace he has pursued the decoys which have been put out by the Vietnamese in their propaganda campaigns to an extent that is almost unseemly for an occupant of the highest office in our great land. He has sent representatives to every country on earth, almost, and has tried every intermediary believed to have any influence whatever with Ho

Chi Minh. When we cut through the rumors and got down to the actuality, however, we have been confronted with the same old four points to which the Senator from Pennsylvania refers.

I did not want this war. I did everything in the world I could to keep America out of it. I had just enough sense to know that we should not have gone in. However, we are there now and I do not know how to get out of it. But, so far as I am concerned, let us not fall for these trial balloons that Ho Chi Minh may be floating through some rug salesman out of Florence, Italy. It just means that that many more American boys will be dead and that many more American homes will be blighted by sorrow and a black wreath will be hanging on the door.

Mr. CLARK. With all deference to my good friend from Georgia, I must be permitted to disagree strongly with him. In my opinion, the bombing of the North is not productive. It is stiffening the will of North Vietnam. It is making it much more difficult to reach meaningful negotiations. Any military benefits it brings us are not at all commensurate with what we are losing in terms of getting promptly to the conference table.

In addition, in my judgment, the bombing of North Vietnam cannot be justified on moral grounds.

I noted that my good friend from Georgia, in the course of his earlier remarks, stated that he thought some of us who objected to the bombing might take a different point of view if our opponents were not Communists but were of some other political belief.

For myself, let me say that I do not care what the government of North Vietnam is, whether Communist, Fascist, Japanese, Nazi, even democratic——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not intend any personal reference. I was not necessarily referring to occupants of this Chamber. I was thinking about the world as a whole.

France, for example, has been highly critical of the fact that our aim in North Vietnam has gone awry on two or three occasions and has resulted in the killing of some civilians.

As I stated earlier, in a plane moving at a high rate of speed, it is impossible to pinpoint bombing, I care not how careful the bombardier is in such a plane.

But some of these very same critics rejoiced and held celebrations when we killed German civilians by the tens of thousands. When we kill one Vietnamese Communist, they immediately throw up their hands in holy horror and say, "Look at these brutal Americans."

We were heroes when we killed Germans, but now we are brutes, even when we go to the extent that no other country in the world has ever gone before in our efforts to avoid killing civilians.

No one knows this better than the North Vietnamese. They understand it so well that they have planted many of their military operations right in the heart of the civilian population because they know of the instructions our pilots have as well as we do. They have put their antiaircraft guns and many of their storage facilities in population centers. When we finally prevailed on the administration to knock out the big petroleum tank farms, the North Vietnamese began to buy 55-gallon barrels of oil in the floors of the homes of their civilians because they knew that we were trying to avoid striking civilians.

We have killed some civilians, I am sorry to say. However, if this war continues, we will unavoidably kill more—we will do it accidentally.

But, on the other hand, the North Vietnamese have willfully, deliberately, and with calculated brutality equaling that of Genghis Khan and Tamerlane at their very worst, killed tens of thousands of South Vietnamese. They have killed men, women, and children; and they have done it, in some cases, by torture refined in such a manner as to enable the victims to live long and to suffer so much that it would make the original American Indian ashamed of himself.

Her forces have willfully and deliberately killed civilians by the thousands. Our critics do not condemn them. But if an American pilot, traveling a thousand miles an hour, makes a split-second error in dumping his load, he is denounced as a villain who has gone out deliberately to kill men, women, and children.

I do not understand this thinking.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I certainly do not intend to be placed in the position of standing up for the Communists of North Vietnam. Far from it. I think that what my good friend from Georgia has said about them is no doubt true. They are, after all, defending what they consider to be their hearthsides and their families, and they are being bombed by an enemy whom they cannot touch.

From my point of view, there is very little difference between the ethics and morality being exercised either by the North Vietnamese or the South Vietnamese. The same activities are being executed by South Vietnam citizens in North Vietnam whenever they get a chance.

I deplore it in both instances. I believe it to be unjustified, unethical, and immoral.

I agree with my good friend from Georgia that I wish we never had to go into South Vietnam. I wish I knew of some way to get out of it. But I feel strongly that further escalation in this war is unwise as well as unsound. It is ineffective. It is unduly costly in terms of American lives. It is not accomplishing its objective.

Therefore, I hope, as a result of considering this bill, that Senators would be able to think through this problem and see whether they do not wish to make some sort of fresh start.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which was published in the Washington Post on February 8, 1967, written by the Communist Australian writer Wilfred Burchett.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED WRITER GIVES HANOI'S VIEWS

The author is an Australian Communist writer who has frequently been a spokesman for the Communists in East Berlin, Korea and Vietnam. He has just returned from North Vietnam to Cambodia. He wrote this article from the Communist viewpoint for the Associated Press when asked if he could clarify Hanoi's stand on peace talks.

(By Wilfred Burchett)

PHNOM PENH, CAMBODIA, Feb. 7.—Hanoi is ready to sit down with the United States to hold preliminary talks to explore what steps can be taken to end the war in Vietnam. It is also prepared to receive President Johnson in the North Vietnamese capital if this will facilitate ending the war.

The basic conditions are that bombings of North Vietnam and "other acts of war" against North Vietnam, such as coastal shelling, be permanently halted.

The next move—following Foreign Minister Nguyen Duy Trinh's declaration to me that if the bombings stopped "the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the United States could enter into talks"—is believed by the North Vietnamese to be up to Washington.

(Burchett's authorized report of the Trinh statement was relayed to Washington by diplomatic sources President Johnson said last week he had seen no "serious" signs of Hanoi's willingness to talk.)

"IT'S UP TO UNITED STATES"

In talks to the Vietnamese following the Trinh interview and seeking clarification, I was told:

"President Johnson said he was ready to go anywhere any time and do anything to end the war. It's up to the United States to act now. . . .

"If bombings cease completely, good and favorable conditions will be created for the talks. . . . President Johnson said he was only awaiting a sign. Well, he's had the sign. We've shown our good will, the United States must do the same."

When I asked why a move was not made earlier—and it's open knowledge that a number of Socialist bloc countries were urging such a move over a year ago—I was told that if talks were offered a year ago the United States would have taken it as a sign of weakness and bombings would have been intensified.

"Even now," one Vietnamese said, "Washington hawks probably think they have got us on the run and will urge escalated bombings."

"IMPROVEMENTS" CITED

(Burchett goes on to cite what he saw as economic, industrial and transportation improvements in North Vietnam in recent months and the confidence of North Vietnamese leaders based on their long experience together.)

Replies to my questions to the Foreign Minister were published the following day in Nhan Dan, Hanoi's leading daily, and the offer of talks if the bombings ceased caused tremendous excitement among the public.

While I believe the overwhelming majority of Vietnamese are ready to accept all sorts of sacrifices and fight as long as their leaders consider necessary, there is also a tremendous yearning for peace, reuniting with evacuated families and a return to normal life . . .

President Johnson's "I see no sign" statement was received in Hanoi glumly or with an exultant "I told you so" reaction, according to whom one spoke with, so far as the general public reacton was concerned.

SAY BOMBINGS MUST STOP

On the question of whether Hanoi is prepared to offer anything in exchange for a cessation of bombings, I was told officially:

"The Democratic Republic of Vietnam is a sovereign state. Bombings are a violation of this sovereignty. They must cease. This is not a matter for bargaining."

Hanoi will never agree to talks while bombing is continued nor even during a temporary cessation. The implication would be if the talks took place during a temporary cessation that the United States would use the threat of a resumption of bombings as a bargaining point. This is unacceptable.

U.S. "OBDURACY" CHARGED

According to diplomatic circles in Hanoi, there is another fundamental reason why Hanoi demands an unconditional end to bombardments before talks can start. It is asserted that this is also the reason for a phrase in the Foreign Minister's reply to my third question: "The United States . . . has shown an utmost obduracy and perfidy" on the question of talks.

According to these sources, two previous attempts to arrange first contacts for talks were foiled in the first place by the start of systematic bombing of North Vietnam in February of 1965 and secondly by the bombing of Hanoi last Dec. 13–14. [The United States maintains any bombing of civilian areas was accidental.] Both events are said to have coincided within days of concrete arrangements for contacts.

[Burchett did not make clear whether the "diplomatic circles" were Communist or not, but his last paragraphs seem to be the first reference from the Communist side to the December bombings as having disrupted peace efforts. Previous reports of this have come from non-Communist diplomats.]

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Kosygin Sees Way Open to Peace Talks—Cites Hanoi Aide's Demand for United States To Cease Bombing," written by Karl E. Meyer, and published in the Washington Post on February 10, 1967.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOSYGIN SEES WAY OPEN TO PEACE TALKS—CITIES HANOI AIDE'S DEMAND FOR UNITED STATES TO CEASE BOMBING

(By Karl E. Meyer)

LONDON, Feb. 9.—Visiting Soviet Premier Kosygin said today that a recent statement by the Foreign Minister of North Vietnam opened the way for peace talks with Hanoi if the United States unconditionally halted bombing raids on North Vietnam.

In an hour-long exchange with reporters that was packed with news, the imperturbable Premier also said:

The Soviet Union will do nothing whatever to "give any reason" to Communist China for a break in diplomatic relations. "It will all depend on the other side," he said.

West Germany would have to sign a treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons "whether she wants to or not." He said the United States and Russia are near a "common understanding" on a nonproliferation treaty.

Whether Britain joins or not, the six-nation European Common Market is not "common" enough, because it does not open the door to membership by all European countries.

A defensive antiballistic missile system was less likely to heighten international tensions than an offensive missile system.

These points emerged at a luncheon sponsored by the Foreign Press Association. Kosygin spent an hour this morning in private talks with Prime Minister Wilson amid a flurry of reports that President Johnson had communicated American views on Vietnam. He also addressed members of both houses of Parliament in the House of Lords this afternoon, where he proposed that Britain and the Soviet Union negotiate a mutual nonaggression pact.

Vietnam dominated questions at the press luncheon, and Kosygin repeatedly linked his comments to a recent interview given by Nguyen Duy Trinh, Foreign Minister of North Vietnam.

Trinh told Wilfred Burchett, an Australian Communist writer, that if the United States unconditionally halted bombings and other warlike acts against North Vietnam then there could be talks between Hanoi and Washington.

Kosygin called this statement "highly constructive," and urged Americans to take advantage of the offer, which he said "will enable the United States to find a way out of the present impasse."

He asserted that the North Vietnamese statement "provides a very convenient opportunity to start direct talks between the United States and North Vietnam."

But in his formal speech to Parliament, Kosygin admitted that Russia and Britain had "different views" on why the war was growing wider and who the actual aggressors were in the conflict.

Some observers saw in his speech at the House of Lords an indication that President Johnson had already rejected the Soviet appeal and was asking for more than assurances on talks as a price for ending the bombing raids. [Secretary of State Dean Rusk asked for "elementary reciprocity" in military de-escalation at a Washington press conference.]

Kosygin's remarks on China constituted a rare occasion when a high Soviet leader has been freely questioned on his country's mounting conflict with the Peking regime.

Asked whether he contemplated a complete diplomatic break with China or even an ultimate armed conflict, Kosygin replied, "I do not think the question arises of any possibility of armed conflict."

He insisted that adequate safeguards would have to be made for Russian diplomatic personnel in Peking and then quietly amplified: "We shall, for our part, do nothing whatever to give any reason to sever diplomatic relations. It will all depend on the other side."

He said the present upheaval in China points to an internal struggle for power following setbacks at home and abroad. But he said he held in high regard both the Chinese people and the Chinese Communist Party.

In both his press interrogation and in his speech to Parliament, the Soviet leader dealt abrasively with the West German government, suggesting rising anxieties in Moscow following Bonn's campaign to improve relations in Eastern Europe.

Asked about Rumania's decision to restore normal diplomatic relations with West Germany, Kosygin retorted that the question could be answered by the Rumanians themselves.

He added that in Russia's view, any diplomatic relations with Bonn had to be based on acceptance of German boundaries as set in the postwar Potsdam agreement.

Kosygin described Germany as the "crux" of the overall problem of European security, and said that Bonn had to take three steps to prove goodwill: Accept as inviolate the postwar boundaries, abandon all thoughts of revenge, and give up all hope of acquiring access to nuclear weapons.

The Soviet leader's words were notably hard in discussing the nonproliferation treaty that is to be taken up by a 17-power disarmament conference when it resumes talks in Geneva on Feb. 21.

Referring to Bonn, Kosygin said, "whether she wants to or not she will have to sign that treaty because we have no intention of allowing them to have access to nuclear weapons."

Of the United States, he said, "we will probably soon come to a common language, a common understanding in regard to banning the spread of nuclear weapons. "Russia favored the treaty, he went on, not out of fear of nuclear rivals but because it was convinced that nuclear weapons had to be done away with if mankind were to survive.

On the related disarmament issue of antiballistic missiles, the Premier had no encouraging words for Americans who hope to halt a race in producing the costly weapons.

Kosygin distinguished between defensive and offensive weapons, and said the latter were less likely to increase international tensions. He admitted that the ABM system was more expensive, but said cost could not be a criterion for the decision.

His words thereby chilled hopes for a tacit agreement between Washington and Moscow on preventing an ABM race.

On a matter of particular importance to Britain—the Common Market—the Soviet leader said the very name has "a serious drawback—it is not common." He said all kinds of restrictive markets were bad for Europe.

As to possible British entry into the Market, Kosygin said that Prime Minister Wilson was in a better position to reply.

In all, there were 15 questions—all but two in written form. However, unlike a similar encounter in Paris last December, there were no questions on the touchy problems of jailed Soviet writers or alleged mistreatment of Jews.

[But Jewish leaders in Britain sent Kosygin a plea for provision of adequate educational and religious facilities for Jews in Russia, Reuters reported.]

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask that these insertions be printed in the RECORD so that Senators may have an opportunity to weigh for themselves whether we are not—as I believe we are—drawing away from an excellent opportunity to get to the negotiating table and stop the shooting, by refusing to stop the bombing—for the third time, I agree—in order to determine whether the signals coming out of North Vietnam can be believed.

I invite the attention of all Senators to the strong statements which have been made by the President of the United States to the effect that all he wanted was some signal—almost any signal—and he would undertake to stop the bombing and go to the negotiating table.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon, provided that in doing so I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take about 15 minutes tonight to go on record with my main reasons for opposing the pending bill. It so happens, as I have explained to the majority leader, I must go to Oregon tomorrow, where I shall speak tomorrow night, under the auspices of a Democratic group, in an endeavor to raise some funds to pay off some Democratic deficits incurred in the last campaign. But I shall be back in the Senate on Monday.

In keeping with his record of complete understanding and cooperation with his colleagues in the Senate when they find themselves under such circumstances as I shall find myself tomorrow, the majority leader has agreed to give me a live pair in case there shall be a final vote on this measure prior to my return on Monday. That RECORD will show that had I been here, I would have voted against the measure.

I fully realize that voting against military appropriations is subject to misunderstanding and that it also subjects one to misrepresentation.

I have voted against military appropriations for the Vietnam war and I shall continue to vote against them until the foreign policy of my Government in respect to war activities is drastically modified.

That is what I consider to be a constitutional trust. The constitutional fathers wrote into the Constitution the checking power that enables Congress to deny to an administration funds with which to finance a policy with which Members of Congress disagree.

If the Congress would deny the President the funds he seeks for military expenditures, because of disagreement in connection with the use of those funds, the President would have to change his foreign policy. The check of the purse string in the Constitution is available to the Congress to check foreign policy as well as to check any other policy of the executive department of Government.

Many times in the debate last year I said that I was not going to vote to kill Americans in South Vietnam. Some of the superpatriots who want to misrepresent my position seek to create the impression that I am letting down the boys in Vietnam. My reply to them is that they are the ones who are letting the boys down, because they are voting money to kill them. If they did not vote money, the President would not send them there to be killed. This thinking of mine is the same as that of General Ridgway, or General Gavin, or General Shoup, who, in May, 1966, in a speech in California, pointed out, as I said 2 years ago, that the whole area was not worth the life of a single American boy. General Shoup was a Marine Corps commander. He pointed out that the administration should change its course of action in southeast Asia.

The issue is drawn by this bill, although this is only another installment. The American people are not given the bad news all at once. This time it is going to be $4,467,200,000 by way of a supplemental bill.

I want to give the American people these figures. I use only round numbers, but they are approximately correct. In 1968 it is contemplated, if the administration has its way, that the appropriations for the military and for defense will be some $75 billion out of a total budget of $144 billion—more than half. On an expenditure basis, the Department of Defense would spend more than $73 billion of $135 billion in total governmental expenditures.

I want the American people to know that, if I can help them understand it, more than half of their budget is going for military expenditures.

That fact bears upon my great fear that we are on the march toward a military state in the United States. If we continue the present military course of action of the United States, it will not be too many years before we shall have a military state under so-called democratic labels. In my judgment, the foreign policy of the United States is determined much more by the Pentagon than by any other factor in our whole Government setup. Therefore, I think that we must change the foreign policy of the United States before we continue to vote billions of dollars for the development of an American military imperialism.

We are becoming an imperialistic Nation—not an imperialistic Nation for the reasons the British Empire was imperialistic, or that the French or Dutch or Belgiums were imperialistic. We are not a nation which colonies for commercial exploitation. But we are an imperialistic Nation today from the standpoint of what we are doing in establishing an American military lifeline around the world, and imposing our military solutions upon other countries.

When one analyzes some of the military problems—and I shall read out of the RECORD—we get some indication of what is in store for us. We are building U.S. naval bases and U.S. military installations around the world so we can join the 6th Fleet and the 7th Fleet and establish what already the authorities are recognizing as an American military lifeline around the world, to replace the collapsed British lifeline.

I would have the American people remember that, with 6 percent of the population of the world, if we follow that course of action this Republic is doomed. In fact, if we do not stop our course of action, we are in the process of writing the first chapter in the history of the decline of the American civilization. In my judgment, we cannot successfully establish American military might that results in a lifeline around the world and survive as a nation. We are building up a fear for the United States around the world that is already appalling.

The trouble is that so many Americans are not reading or searching for the facts.

The difficulty is that this administration is brainwashing the American people with its propaganda. This administration fails to inform the American people of what our image around the world has become. We are becoming, as I have said, the most feared nation in the world.

APPROPRIATION IS TO EXECUTE WAR POLICY

This supplemental appropriation measure cannot be separated from our policy in Vietnam. We never had a right to be in there. We have no right to be in there today. We have been an outlaw nation in southeast Asia from the very beginning, because we were the intervenor. We were the nation that set up the South Vietnamese Government. Our administration says we are committed in South Vietnam. We are committed to our own illegitimacy, for we gave birth to this puppet nation when we supported the mandarin and oligarch, who had never fought the French, who comes from a family which exploited peasants of Vietnam, who fled to the United States and was here in exile. I refer to a man by the name of Diem, who worked with the American Defense Department and the American CIA and the war hawks in the State Department, was taken by the administration over to South Vietnam, was set up in the government, financed, and militarized.

Then we say, "Ah, we are committed to intervene in South Vietnam because we committed ourselves to the Diem government"; and we are killing American boys to support such tyrants as a Diem, a Minh, a Khanh, and now a Ky—not one of whom has fought against the French, but who in fact, including Ky, have fought with the French against their own people. To perpetuate those tyrants in power, we are slaughtering American boys in South Vietnam today. And we can force a surrender if we kill enough, destroy enough, and commit enough inhumanities to man, as our unfortunate record in this war shows us to have been doing thus far.

But, Mr. President, that does not make us right; and we are not made right by great patriotic appeals that "we are there and now we have got to stay and do what we are doing."

Once again I say, I will take the testimony of a General Gavin, I will take the testimony of a George Kennan, I will take the public pronouncements of a General Ridgway, and place much greater credence in them than in the warhawks that this President has running this war now, who seek to involve us ever deeper and deeper in southeast Asia.

Mr. President, what Congress has to do, and should do, is say to the President, "Until there is a change in the foreign policy, until you begin to follow, for example, the recommendation of General Gavin just this week from the witness chair, we will refuse to ratify these ever-increasing military appropriations."

Mr. President, I shall vote against this appropriation. I am going to vote against all military appropriations, until the military foreign policy of my Government is changed.

We see in the committee report that of this $4,467,200,000 authorization, $3,707,700,000 is for procurement; $135 million is for research, development, test, and evaluation; and $624,500,000 is for military construction.

Mr. President, the present military construction policy of the United States around the world must change, if we are to stop the trend toward military imperialism, and avoid foisting upon future generations of Americans the great danger of a military state here at home. Just to put out these figures, without relating the figures to foreign policy, is a great mistake. The real question before the Senate, as we consider this bill or any other military appropriation bill, is, "What kind of a foreign policy is this military material going to support?"

In my judgment, it is a foreign policy that is heading us into ever deeper and deeper trouble around the world.

On page 9 of the report, the committee says:

> The military construction program authorized to date in South Vietnam includes five deepwater ports, four major depot complexes, and eight jet-capable airfields, plus construction or improvement of a number of logistic support fields and troop cantonments and hospital facilities.

It does not say anything about Thailand. It does not say anything about what we are doing down in the area of the Indian Ocean, in order to enable the 6th Fleet to connect up with the 7th Fleet. It does not point out the reality that tied up in this type of appropriation and those that will follow is a foreign policy imperialism that will win for us not only the hatred of millions of people in the underdeveloped countries of the world, but the fear of even our European allies. It explains in part—but only in part—why De Gaulle is already kicking the United States out of France—and he should; if I were a Frenchman I would join in throwing the United States out of France, just as, as an American, I would join in throwing any large foreign military contingent out of the United States, if anyone sought to establish a contingent.

We have got to face up to the fact, Mr. President, that we are not going to change the determination of peoples in other countries for a strong nationalism, and should not want to. But we are seeking to infringe upon it, and are infringing upon it constantly.

The report says further that many of these items are expeditionary type facilities that must be upgraded to sustain future operations. Let us keep our eyes on the words "future operations," Mr. President. That is what the Pentagon has in mind. It has in mind the establishment of permanent American bases in Asia.

I do not buy, may I say, all the propaganda malarkey of the Johnson administration that we seek no bases abroad. We are building them. I do not buy the malarkey, Mr. President, that we have no plan to stay any length of time in these bases. I deny it. But the reputation of the Johnson administration has become so justifiably subject to attack on the ground of lack of credibility that I charge this afternoon that all statements of the Pentagon, the White House, and the State Department as to what our foreign military plans are simply lack credibility. The answer is before our eyes. We do not spend these billions of dollars of Americans' money and turn around and walk out on that investment overnight.

The fact is, Mr. President—and the American people ought to face it—that their Government is moving them in the direction of an American military imperialism around the world. As General Gavin pointed out in his brilliant and eloquent testimony this week, what we ought to be doing is working in the direction of international guarantees and international participation with our allies around the world. We ought to be engaged not in making war, but in setting up a program which will result in the keeping of peace around the world, and then joining, as he so brilliantly pointed out, and as Roosevelt recommended at the time of Teheran, in an international cooperative economic program that would bring to these people their economic freedom, which would be, in my judgment, a much more effective weapon against the advance of communism and a much more effective weapon against the advance of war than any other weapon we can use.

But we cannot do it with American bombs, nor can we do it with American bullets; and we should try to do it without sacrificing unnecessarily and unjustifiably the lives of American soldiers abroad, as we are sacrificing them in Vietnam.

Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Pennsylvania in supporting the view—as did, by the way, General Gavin in his testimony this week—that we ought to stop the bombing in North Vietnam.

The President's proposal is to stop the bombing only if they stop the infiltrating. Who is doing the major infiltrating It is not the North Vietnamese. It is the United States. We do not call it infiltrating because it is far more massive than anything the North is doing. The United States is pouring into South Vietnam manpower and materiel so far greater than that of North Vietnam that what North Vietnam is doing is de minimis in relationship to the infiltration by the United States.

This has been brought out by the witnesses before our committee, also. It sounds good for the President of the United States to utter the misleading propaganda that we are willing to stop the bombing if we can get some concessions from North Vietnam, and the concession that he names is that they must stop infiltration into the South.

Vietnam is at least their country. South Vietnam does not belong to the United States. It belongs to the Vietnamese, North and South.

Who are we to say that there must be two governments in South Vietnam? The Geneva agreement did not provide for two Vietnams. That is for the South Vietnamese to determine and not the United States. That is why we find witnesses such as General Gavin—and I cross-examined him on this point, too—saying that is where the international guarantee approach should come in. That is why the unilateral course of action on the part of the United States ought to stop.

Mr. President, the language of this report means that, what we are really doing is adding another $4 billion plus to the whole American military machine for the further development of an American military imperialistic program around the world. It can only result in organized resistance to the United States growing in all parts of the world.

We will be bogged down in Asia for many decades to come. We will be winning the military victories, yes, but losing the peace and losing the respect and the support of the rest of the world.

I should think, as these witnesses have been pointing out, that this administration would start to give heed to the ugly image that the United States has taken on in the eyes of hundreds of millions of people around the world and recognize that the foreign policy of the United States is deeply resented, and that we have neither the manpower nor the economic power to stand up against the world any more than did the Roman Empire. Oh, we are too close to it. We are too close to it in our time to see the probability of what is going to happen in connection with American history during the next 50 to 75 years if we follow this course of action.

That is why I intend to continue raising my voice in warning to try to get us to change this foreign policy and get back into the framework of international law, come out of the jungle of substituting military might for the rule of law and return to our ideals.

Mr. President, I am not going to vote money to kill American boys in South Vietnam. I am going to continue to do what I can to get my administration to change its foreign policy and bring us back to a foreign policy in which we say that there must be international guarantees for the enforcement of peace.

Therefore, I would have my President stop making only gestures to the United Nations. I would have my President insist that the signatories to that charter live up to the obligations of their signature, take over the jurisdiction of this threat to the people of the world in Asia, and pledge to the United Nations that we will follow its decrees. That would include a reconvening of the Geneva Conference. This time, we should cooperate with the Geneva Conference rather than scuttle it as we did in 1954 when we would not even sign the treaty because John Foster Dulles could not dictate the terms at Geneva and therefore picked up his satchel and came back to Washington.

Mr. President, I have made these remarks this afternoon because warnings ought to be made as to where these appropriation bills are leading us. It can be asked: "Does the Senator from Oregon want no money at all for American military security?"

Of course the answer is that I do, and I would vote for it. However, we have gotten ourselves in the position where, before we have any right to be passing any appropriations bill for military activity, we must first relate it to American foreign policy.

If we keep on appropriating the money, then we will have less and less chance of changing the foreign policy.

What we will be doing by voting this appropriation and the much larger ones that will be before us soon is to strengthen those who want to continue the massive military escalating operations in Asia.

We are heading for a collision with China; that will lead to war, also, with Russia, and out of that war no country, including our own, will come out a victor. The testimony of those from our own Defense Department today is that in the very early stages of such a war, that will be nuclear in nature, from 70 to 120 million Americans will be killed, twice that number will be killed in Russia, and much of civilization will be thrown back into the dark ages.

That is a moral question that is raised. Few are talking about morality these days. I close by saying, Mr. President, that we cannot justify our foreign policy on morality, either. When a nation ceases to be moral, it prepares its own doomsday.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks a statement put out by the American Friends Committee on National Legislation in opposition to this appropriation.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, I share many of the views set forth in that brief.

EXHIBIT 1

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO THE $12,300 MILLION SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION TO CARRY ON AND ESCALATE THE VIETNAM WAR

(By the Friends Committee on National Legislation)

Congress now has before it the President's request for the $12,300,000,000 Vietnam supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1967. These funds will add to the billions already appropriated by Congress last summer for the 1967 fiscal year. They will be used to carry on and escalate the Vietnam war.

This brief argues that the cause of mankind and United States national interest call for a vote against further funds for this tragic war. Members of Congress are given special responsibilities under our Constitution to exercise their own best judgment on these questions on behalf of the nation and their constituency. They are answerable to their own consciences and to the bar of history as well as the White House for their votes. Attention is called especially to Sections 19–23 on Congressional responsibility.

It is difficult in a document of this length to deal adequately, fairly and fully with all the details and nuances of an extremely tangled historical, political and military situation. We hope that brevity has not caused more dogmatic statements than the situation warrants.

AN ESCALATION BUDGET

1. *The 1967 Supplemental Defense Appropriation provides for further escalation of the war in Vietnam.*

In presenting the 1967 supplemental request for Southeast Asia to the appropriate Congressional Committees, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara[1] explicity described the proposed increase in expenditures as follows—

Military manpower---------- $1,363,870,000

The number of U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam, said the Secretary, "will continue to increase during the next year and a half, although at a very much slower rate than during the preceding year and a half," when U.S. troop strength in South Vietnam rose more than five-fold, from fewer than 72,000 men to 389,000.

Although the Secretary did not specify the number of new troops that might be assigned to South Vietnam, he asked Congress to provide $1.3 billion to increase the total troop strength by nearly 294,00 men by the end of June 1967, to "support the larger deployments and higher activity in Southeast Asia and to provide a more adequate training and rotation base for the longer pull."

The Secretary also asked for $365 million under "Operations and Maintenance" to employ another 123,000 civilians, largely for "Vietnam-related requirements," including 45,000 foreign nationals, "mostly South Vietnamese hired locally for the support of our forces in Vietnam." Many of the other civilian employees will replace uniformed servicemen, thus further increasing the number of them available for Vietnam.

Procurement--------------- $6,306,000,000

Munitions. One of the most marked characteristics of the American military operation in Vietnam has been the incredibly high consumption of munitions. Nevertheless, this Supplemental includes "a net *addition* of $677 million, of which 60% is for ground munitions and the rest is for air munitions. This Supplemental amount will bring the total for ammunition in Fiscal Year 1967 to about $4.6 billion, about *600 million more* than FY 1966."

According to Secretary McNamara:

"With regard to small arms ammunition, the Free World forces in Vietnam during the September–November 1966 period consumed, on the average, about 100 million rounds per month. We have provided in our budget for *much higher consumption* and production rates."

"U.S. and other Free World forces in South Vietnam during the September–November 1966 period consumed, on the average, about one million artillery rounds and about 0.7 million mortar rounds per month. We have provided in our FY 1967 Supplemental and the regular FY 1968 Budget for *considerably higher consumption rates* and the peak monthly production rates will be still higher.

"In the air munitions category, two of the principal items being *increased* are 500-lb. bombs and 750-lb. bombs, both of which are carried by the B–52s. We have also included funds for *additional* air-to-surface and anti-radiation missiles. . . ."

"The production program reflected in the FY 1967 Supplemental and the FY 1968 Budget," said Secretary McNamara, "will provide for *a rate of consumption almost equal to the total air ordnance consumed by U.S. forces in the peak year of World War II in Europe, and almost four times the consumption in the peak year of the Korean War.*"

Aircraft. Secretary McNamara testified that "Of the $3,715 million added to the FY 1967 program for aircraft, about $1,525 million is for the replacement of future combat losses," $439 million for training helicopters and expansion of current aviation units, and $1,751 million for spares and other aircraft equipment. According to Secretary McNamara, "the net increase for the Army is 936 aircraft, the Navy and Marine Corps 427, and the Air Force 425—for a total of 1,788."

These requests are based on the assumption that the war may continue into 1970. The Secretary of Defense stressed in his testimony that the production lead time on aircraft is 18 months and "we have included sufficient funds in the FY 1967 Supplemental and the regular FY 1968 Budget to cover deliveries at rates sufficient to offset combat attrition in Southeast Asia to January 1, 1970."

Other Equipment. A further increase of $1,927 million is provided for other vehicles, electronics and communications. This sum, too, is to be used to "provide both for the replacement of equipment to be attrited in Southeast Asia in the future and for the equipping of *new* units."

Operations and
maintenance ----------- $3,311,500,000

More than one-fourth of the Supplemental is allocated to Operations and Maintenance, which, according to Secretary McNamara, represents planned increases in U.S. commitments.

Secretary McNamara testified that "the increases in force levels, deployments, movements of men and supplies to Southeast Asia, activity rates, and the expansion of the training establishment and the rotation base will require an *additional* $3,312 million for Operations and Maintenance in FY 1967."

Research, construction, and
revolving funds---------- $1,294,500,000

These monies will be used for research on ways to improve the ability of U.S. troops to fight at night, reduce aircraft combat losses; construct projects in South Vietnam, Thailand and other Pacific areas; and increase Department of Defense inventories.

Thus, according to Secretary McNamara's own testimony, this is a budget which provides for escalation, not one which merely provides the supplies necessary to support the American boys now in Vietnam.

2. *The $13 billion supplemental appropriation passed last year permitted serious and extensive escalation of the war.*

An analysis of press reports and Department of Defense data in 1966 shows the following items of escalation during the year—

Overall U.S. casualties rose from 1636 killed and 7645 wounded on January 1, 1966 to 6644 killed and 37,738 wounded on December 31.

U.S. troops increased from 181,000 to 389,000.

U.S. air raids struck closer and closer to Hanoi, culminating on December 13–14 in raids in which U.S. bombs struck residential areas within the city limits.

U.S. ground forces assumed more and more initiative in search and destroy missions in Vietnam. In December, U.S. forces began a push into the populous Mekong Delta region.

The presence of some 25,000 U.S. servicemen in Thailand was disclosed in July, double the number reported six months earlier. There were 35,000 U.S. servicemen in Thailand by the end of December.

By mid-July, U.S. daily air strikes over Laos were 100 a day—more than double the number six months earlier.

U.S. planes began to use defoliation agents in Laos.

B–52s raided North Vietnam for the first time. One million pounds of bombs were dropped in a single B–52 raid in North Vietnam, April 12.

The demilitarized zone was bombed for the first time.

The presence of U.S. nuclear-powered submarines off the North Vietnam coast was disclosed.

U.S. naval units extended operations to the North Vietnam coast, attacking shore installations and hundreds of barges.

The average monthly consumption of artillery and small arms ammunition doubled during the year; consumption of mortar ammunition increased 86%.

B–52 strikes in South Vietnam increased from an average of 150 a month in June 1965 to an average of 425 a month in 1966.

The League of Red Cross Societies stated December 23 that, according to official statistics, there were 1,507,088 displaced Vietnamese at the end of October, of which 820,791 were considered resettled and 686,297 were awaiting resettlement.

[For citations and more detail, see "Escalation of American Involvement in Vietnam in 1966," Friends Committee on National Legislation, February 1967.]

3. *There are many new areas of escalation into which the United States could be drawn through the funds in this bill.*

All of the following have been seriously proposed over the past year for Vietnam; they give some indication of what may lie ahead if escalation continues indefinitely:

Bombing of dikes in North Vietnam. Breach of the dikes north of Hanoi in flood season could lead to hundreds of thousands of deaths from drowning and starvation.

Sealing of the de-militarized zone at the "provisional military demarcation line" between North and South Vietnam. This venture, which would take enormous quantities of men and materiel, has been discussed favorably by Ambassador Lodge and others.

---

[1] Secretary McNamara testified January 23, 1967 on the Fiscal Year 1967 Supplemental for Southeast Asia before a joint session of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations. He gave essentially the same statement February 2, 1967 to the House Armed Services Committee. Unless otherwise noted, references to Secretary McNamara's testimony refer to this source.

Expansion of the war into Laos or Cambodia or Thailand. The Supplemental appropriation, for example, provides $109 million for construction of U.S. facilities in Thailand.

Bombing of North Vietnamese airfields. There has been much pressure for this within the military.

Pursuit of planes over China. The Administration has stated that we recognize no air sanctuary, leaving this possibility open.

Massive use of regroupment camps. The forced resettlement of mass populations has already started with the Delta offensive and could, as in Algeria, uproot millions of people from their traditional homes in the hope of breaking their connections with the guerrillas.

Blockade of North Vietnam. Danger of direct confrontation with the Soviet Union and other powers would be courted by such a blockade, which has frequently been urged.

Mining Haiphong Harbor.

Saturation bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong.

Massive troop increases. The United States has increased its number of troops in Vietnam five-fold in the past year-and-a-half; many have suggested increases to 600,000, 1,000,000, or even 2,000,000 men.

Sending troops to invade North Vietnam. This has been proposed by Marshall Ky.

Attack on China. This is the ultimate logical conclusion of viewing the source of materiel as the source of aggression. Some have argued also that it is better to have a war with China now than when she develops her nuclear weapons capacity.

Use of nuclear weapons. The specter of the possible use of nuclear weapons has been raised from time to time even by such eminent persons as Presidential candidate Barry Goldwater and former President Eisenhower, but has been laid to rest so far. There is always the danger, however, the prolonged frustration over the stalemate could bring about a lashing out with nuclear weapons in an effort to achieve "victory."

FAILURE OF OUR VIETNAM POLICY

4. *Two years of a policy of military escalation has failed to achieve even U.S. military objectives.*

In his testimony [2] Secretary McNamara outlined the "basic tasks" which flow from our objectives in Vietnam:

"(1) to support the re-establishment of the authority of the Government of South Vietnam over its territory.

"(2) To interdict the flow of men and supplies from North Vietnam to South Vietnam.

"(3) To exert pressure on the Government of North Vietnam to cease its direction and support of the insurrection in South Vietnam."

Secretary McNamara's testimony, combined with information provided by reporters and others on the spot, gives an index of how effective the U.S. escalation policy has been in achieving these goals.

Government authority has not been reestablished

According to Secretary McNamara, "we have found that it is very difficult to clear, completely and permanently, any area in which the Viet Cong guerrillas were once well established. Even around Danang, where the U.S. Marines have been conducting clear and secure operations for some 18 months, guerrilla hit and run attacks still occur."

Washington Post reporter Ward Just, writing from Saigon on the current state of the war, said, "The effect of the massive military operations this year is not at all clear, except for the obvious fact that the enemy main forces have not been defeated and do not appear to be on the verge of being defeated. . . . In many areas, a persuasive case can be made . . . that security in the countryside is worse now than 12 months ago."—Dec. 27, 1966. (See also maps in the Washington Post, January 12, 1967, page A22.)

Assistant Managing Editor Harrison Salisbury of the New York Times, summing up after his recent visit to Hanoi, wrote "although rosy expectations of major victories against the Americans have not been fulfilled the [National Liberation] Front says that in 1966 it actually extended its territorial sway over larger areas than in 1965—a claim that some neutral observers believe is pretty well founded. The Americans have conducted some effective 'spoiling' operations in the South but when they are completed the control of the territory drifts back into the hands of the Viet Cong."—The New York Times, January 18, 1967.

The build-up of American forces has also undermined the attempt to win "the hearts and minds" of the South Vietnamese people. (See Section 8, page 9.)

The immensity of the task confronting the United States was noted by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge in a story in the December 5, 1966 New York Times in which it was reported that "The Ambassador estimated that there were 150,000 Vietcong terrorists in civilian clothes in South Vietnam, including 20,000 in Saigon. Pacification, he said, will involve elaborate police precautions, a thorough census, identity cards and systematic curfews. He said such a program would require 'city and village governments that can support the police function, and you won't get this until we've rebuilt the whole political, social and economic structure in this country.' "

Bombing of the north has not stopped infiltration of men and supplies

According to Secretary McNamara's testimony, a minimum of 48,000 men infiltrated from North Vietnam to South Vietnam in 1966. But "the number of North Vietnamese troops in South Vietnam appears to have leveled off in the second half of 1966, and the strength in December was about the same as in June, between 45,000 and 50,000."

On February 15, *The Washington Post* reported that Secretary McNamara in his Congressional appearances has been opposing an expansion of the bombing on the grounds it is relatively ineffective in reducing the flow of troops from North to South Vietnam. He is said to have testified in closed sessions: "Undoubtedly the bombings do limit the capability of the North Vietnamese to infiltrate men and equipment into the South. But it is not clear that the limit that results is below the level that the North Vietnamese planned on. In any event, it is not below the level necessary to support the force in the South at the present time. *I don't believe that the bombing up to the present has significantly reduced, nor any bombing that I could contemplate in the future would significantly reduce, actual flow of men and materiel to the South.*"

Earlier, Secretary McNamara had testified as to the general ineffectiveness of efforts to cut off supplies to the South: "Most of the war materiel sent from North Vietnam to South Vietnam is provided by other Communist countries and no amount of destruction of the industrial capacity of North Vietnam can, by itself, eliminate this flow. Our air attacks on North Vietnam petroleum resources have destroyed two-thirds of its storage capacity, but, as I pointed out to this Committee last year, the North Vietnamese could and have brought in petroleum 'over the beach' and have stored it at widely dispersed locations. Although we have taken a toll of this flow of supply, shortages of petroleum products do not appear as yet to have greatly impeded the North Vietnamese war effort."

Harrison Salisbury from Hanoi verified the problems Secretary McNamara described with regard to U.S. bombing of National Route 1, and the railroad running alongside it: "The railroad and highway have been bombed again and again, but it is doubtful that rail traffic has ever been held up more than a few hours, and the highway seems capable of operating almost continuously regardless of how many bombs are dropped.

"The results of American bombing of the route are readily visible—particularly in small villages and hamlets along the route. They have suffered severely, often being almost obliterated. But the effect on transportation has been minimal." *The New York Times,* December 27, 1966.

There is the additional important but unanswerable question of how much U.S. military equipment shipped to Vietnam finds its way into Viet Cong and North Vietnamese hands.

North Vietnam has not been persuaded to end its support of the insurgents in the south

There is no question that American bombing has resulted in major destruction for North Vietnam. Salisbury reports, "Whatever the explanation, one can see that United States planes are dropping an enormous weight of explosives on purely civilian targets."—*The New York Times,* December 26, 1966. "It is apparent that most American bombs are falling in mud and wattle villages, on dirt roads, on rice fields or around gun sites that are more often set in fields than in towns."—*The New York Times,* January 13, 1967.

But there is no convincing evidence that this has adversely affected North Vietnam's will to persist. In fact, U.S. bombing has seemed to harden attitudes and unite the North Vietnamese people. According to Harrison Salisbury's reports in *The New York Times:*

"The populace of [North Vietnam] has been aroused to a state of solidarity that represents a formidable asset for a country struggling against a foe many times more powerful in material means and techniques. . . .

"It is generally believed by non-Communist diplomats in Hanoi, rightly or wrongly, that American bombing in the North not only has strengthened the regime in its conviction that the Americans aim at its destruction but also has crystallized a national spirit of patriotism and self-defense that gives the country a united aspect in standing against the United States regardless of how some citizens may privately feel on the question of Communism." (January 18, 1967.)

"The net conclusion of many foreign residents of Hanoi is that while American bombing has damaged North Vietnam severely, causing heavy material and human losses and compelling the Government to invest men and material in the neutralizing attack, it is not likely to prove a decisive factor in maintaining the fight in the south or in compelling Hanoi to capitulate.

"Foreigners in Hanoi believe the North Vietnamese when they say they are prepared to sacrifice Hanoi, Haiphong, all their cities and towns, rather than yield under American bomb power." (January 12, 1967.)

"The basic question would seem to be: Has all this hurt the North Vietnamese so much that they are ready to quit? Their answer is, 'By no means!' And they say that they expect their task to get a lot harder before it gets easier." (January 1, 1967.)

It has long been argued that military force is no solution to the problems of Vietnam. Events bear out this judgment. This massive U.S. military intervention has failed to achieve the major military objectives and has made Vietnam's complicated political, economic and social problems infinitely more difficult to resolve.

---

[2] See footnote 1.

5. *The war in Vietnam has become an open ended quagmire.*

More than a year ago, Senators Mansfield, Aiken, and others, in their report "The Vietnam Conflict: The Substance and the Shadow" (January 6, 1966) warned, "if present trends continue, there is no assurance as to what ultimate increase in American military commitment will be required before the conflict is terminated. For the fact is that under present terms of reference and as the war has evolved, the question is not one of applying increased U.S. pressure to a defined military situation but rather of pressing against a military situation which is, in effect, open ended."

After a huge increase in manpower, firepower, and level of combat, the United States finds itself in precisely the situation against which Mansfield cautioned. In his State of the Union Message, January 10, 1967, President Johnson said, "I wish I could report to you that the conflict is almost over. This I cannot do. We face more cost, more loss, and more agony. For the end is not yet. I cannot promise you that it will come this year—or the next. Our adversary still believes he can go on fighting longer than we and our allies are prepared to resist him."

Two years ago or even one year ago it was possible to believe that a massive introduction of American military force into Vietnam might provide a basis for finding a solution to our problems there. Experience since then makes it clear, however, that, like the man fighting with the tar baby, each blow not only makes the situation stickier, but makes extrication more and more difficult.

6. *The United States is being drawn deeper into a guerrilla war which is a trap.*

Secretary McNamara, in his recent statement to Congressional committees, testified, "The Free World forces have won every major battle since their commitment in South Vietnam, and I believe it has been conclusively demonstrated that the Viet Cong main force units are simply not capable of winning any major battle against U.S. forces."

United States, South Vietnamese, and other "Free World" men under arms total more than 1,172,000, including more than 400,000 U.S. troops. Arrayed against this force are an estimated 275,000 Vietnamese insurgents including some 45,000 North Vietnamese regulars.

But this four to one superiority, while it is capable of winning major battles, has not succeeded and is not likely to succeed in dealing with the problem of guerrilla warfare. As Secretary McNamara testified, in clear and secure operations, designed to seize and hold territory permanently,

"Our progress has not been satisfactory. The military problem in this type of operation is to eliminate the Viet Cong guerrilla forces. These are, for the most part, local groups whose mission is harassment, sabotage, and the terrorizing of the local population, as well as the provision of intelligence, terrain guidance, supplies and recruits for main force units. Only when these local guerrilla forces are brought under control can the full range of revolutionary development measures [i.e., pacification] be undertaken on a permanent basis.

"Our own experience, e.g., the U.S. Marines in the First Corps area, has demonstrated that clearing and securing is a very slow and painstaking process, and that a military presence must be maintained for a considerable period of time after the area has been initially 'cleared.' In fact, we have found that it is very difficult to clear, completely and permanently, any area in which the Viet Cong guerrillas were once well established . . .

"But the ultimate success of our entire effort in South Vietnam will turn on the ability of the Government to re-establish its authority over its territory so that peaceful reconstruction can be undertaken. No matter how well the search and destroy operations are performed, they cannot substitute over the long run for the successful accomplishment of the clear and secure effort."

How successful has been that effort? A year ago, Senator Mansfield reported that in general, "what the Saigon government held in the way of terrain in the early months of 1965 (and it was already considerably less than was held at the time of the assassination of Ngo Dinh Diem), is still held. What was controlled then by the Vietcong is still controlled by the Vietcong. What lay between was contested at the outset of 1965 and is still contested." (January 6, 1966.)

As far as the populace is concerned, Premier Ky estimated in November 1965 that his government controlled about 25% of the population, in the sense that this number could vote in an election without fear of coercion or intimidation. Secretary McNamara in January 1966 estimated that under a looser definition of "control" Saigon exercised varying degrees of control over about 52 or 53 percent of the population. (Senate hearings on 1966 Vietnam Supplemental.)

The situation has changed little in the past year. See sources quoted above, page 5.

The U.S. difficulty in fighting a guerrilla war is explained by two British experts.

Sir Robert Thompson, head of the British Advisory Mission in South Vietnam, formerly Secretary for Defense of Malaya and the author of "Defeating Communist Insurgency," wrote:

"Time is the key to Giap's present strategy in Vietnam. He now knows that he cannot defeat the United States forces militarily and certainly not in a war of movement within Vietnam. He must, therefore, let time do his work for him.

"The battles of the last two years have been a perfect example of this. By maintaining high-scale guerrilla warfare he has traded manpower for space and time at, so far, an acceptable cost. In assessing cost there is an unfortunate tendency to compute insurgent losses optimistically in terms relevant only to a Western industrialized democratic society.

"The 50,000 Vietcong killed in 1966 were only a fraction of one year's age group, where all are subject to the draft. Two or three hundred thousand deployed to repair bomb damage to communications and services in North Vietnam are only a small part of the male, and female, labor force which could be made available without damaging the war effort (for example, infiltration has steadily increased). Revolutionary war is very cheap in terms of material and production in a society which only has to exist to breed. . . .

"If South Vietnam is to win, the country must in the end be restored as politically and administratively stable and economically expanding, capable of standing on its own feet.

"That alone is winning and will inevitably take time—10, 15, or even 20 years. . . ." *The Washington Post,* January 22, 1967, Outlook Section page 1.

How were the guerrillas able to hold out and even expand control against the overwhelming firepower and manpower of South Vietnam and its allies? As another British student of guerrilla warfare, Eric Hobsbawn, has written:

"Such forces . . . have proved themselves extraordinarily formidable. At their best they simply cannot be defeated by orthodox military operations. Even when less successful, they can be defeated, according to the calculations of British counterinsurgency experts in Malaya and elsewhere, only by a *minimum* of 10 men on the ground for every single guerrilla . . . orthodox military methods are quite beside the point: bombs don't work unless there is something other than paddies to make craters in." *Nation,* July 19, 1965.

The Algerian experience is also instructive. According to the U.S. Army Area Handbook for Algeria, "by mid-1965 the ALN [the Algerian Revolutionary Army] had developed a disciplined and well-organized force of over 20,000 men." Yet, "Despite the increase of the French military and police forces during 1956 to over 400,000 men, it became increasingly clear that neither side could gain a clear-cut military victory."

As now in Vietnam, so then in Algeria the insurgents were not capable of "holding large fixed positions and . . . did not try to engage large units in combat with the French army. Rather, the nationalists fought the war for independence entirely as guerrillas ambushing French army units, hitting French installations and disappearing into the hills, terrorizing the European and Moslem populations of the cities and generally maintaining an aura of insecurity and fear throughout most of the country."

In Malaysia, according to Robert Thompson, author of *Defeating Communist Insurgency,* at the beginning of the "Emergency" the 21,000 government troops had a five-to-one superiority over the armed Communist terrorists. By the early '50s the ratio had increased to about 12 to one. At their maximum, the insurgents had 10,000 armed men; the government armed forces and police had a numerical superiority of 14 to one.

This gives some indication of what may be in store if current American military objectives in Vietnam are continued.

7. *The Vietnam war is bogging the United States down in that "land war in Asia" against which U.S. military leaders have consistently warned.*

Such a war is clearly not in the best interests of the United States. It contradicts traditional American policy. It pits us against overwhelming numerical odds, with a supply line reaching halfway around the world, fighting where our actions can only bring back memories of the days of the white man's domination.

When asked by Senators in 1951 if he had said, "Anybody who commits the land power of the United States on the continent of Asia ought to have his head examined," General Douglas MacArthur replied, "I don't know whether I made the statement, but I confirm absolutely the sentiments involved." (Hearings before the Committee on Armed Services and Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, May 1951, page 156.)

8. *The continuation and expansion of massive American presence creates support for Viet Cong anti-Americanism.*

As Ward Just wrote January 23, 1967 in The Washington Post, "Anti-Americanism in Vietnam, particularly in the cities, is growing . . . the heavy weight of the American presence and 'advisory effort,' which has become in fact a parallel government reaching down further into Vietnamese society, is producing a new colonialism different in character but often similar in effect to the French." As the war continues and escalates, we can only expect increased resentment against the hundreds of thousands of foreigners who live like princes according to Vietnamese standards. A tragic sidelight is suggested by the estimate of the surgeon's office of the U.S. Military Command in Vietnam that 66,142 cases of venereal disease among U.S. troops were treated from November 1965 to November 1966, about one out of five of the average number of U.S. troops in the country through that time.

Further, the large number of foreign troops, taking over more and more of the governmental and police as well as military functions, tends to confirm the Viet Cong argument that theirs is a nationalist war against a foreign invader.

Thus, the continued escalation of American involvement in the war strengthens the very forces which feed the insurgency.

9. *Expansion of the war makes further Russian and Chinese involvement ever more likely.*

Russia, China, and several other Communist nations have offered to send "volunteers" to assist North Vietnam whenever they are requested; so far North Vietnam has not asked that such volunteers come to her aid. In fact, there are volunteers in several Communist countries who are eager to go; one Russian was even reported to have immolated himself in protest because he couldn't go.

Harrison Salisbury reported, on the basis of his talks in Hanoi, that North Vietnam was prepared to call in volunteers in the event of a major U.S. escalation of the war. (The New York Times, January 18, 1967.)

The commitment of troops from other Communist countries would set in motion an almost inexorable process in which the prestige and power of China and the Soviet Union would be committed to victory in Vietnam.

There is much evidence that Chinese leaders already believe that the Vietnam war is an opening salvo in a war against China. Each increase in American commitment in Vietnam increases China's sense of being threatened by a hostile army building up near her borders. In Korea, it was the threat of a hostile army approaching her borders which brought China directly into the Korean war. There is no reason to believe that at some point in the build-up of American forces China may not decide that "it is better to fight now in Vietnam than later in China" and commit herself directly in Vietnam.

The United States has looked to three factors to discourage Russian and Chinese involvement in Vietnam: Russian desire for a detente with the West, domestic turmoil in China, and Soviet-Chinese conflict. But as the Vietnam war continues, it tends to "unlock" these safety catches against the progression from a local to a world war.

The Vietnam war undermines the basis for detente between Russia and the West. As Senator Fulbright wrote in *The Arrogance of Power*: "If positions were reversed, if the Russians were conducting daily bombing raids against an American ally, it is just about inconceivable that we would confine ourselves to providing equipment to the country under attack." As the war continues, Russia will see less and less common interest between itself and the United States, and the pressures toward a reactivation of militancy will mount. There is too little recognition in the United States of the pressures in the Soviet Union to do more to aid the people of North Vietnam, who are seen as under unjustified attack.

So far China has remained preoccupied in internal conflict. But there is little evidence that any of the contending factions regard the United States with anything but hostility. Further, the Vietnam war offers Chinese leaders an opportunity to solve their internal quarrels by means of foreign adventures, a political ploy well honored in revolutionary history since the time of the French Revolution.

The Chinese-Soviet conflict forces Russia and China to compete for leadership of the world Communist movement. This creates a situation in which each must demonstrate its willingness and ability to aid Communist countries against the West. This very competition, then, limits the freedom of Russia and China to let America go its own way in Vietnam, but rather tends to draw them into the conflict, in order to prove their readiness to help an ally under attack.

10. *The Vietnam war has won the United States no popular support abroad. It has depleted the reservoir of good will toward America everywhere.*

The United States' allies have given little military support to this war, despite strong U.S. promptings. The only outside powers with combat troops in South Vietnam are the United States, South Korea and Australia, Thailand, New Zealand and the Philippines only have small numbers of "support troops."

Although the United States says it is supporting freedom in Southeast Asia, only one Southeast Asian mainland country, Thailand, supports our military operations in Vietnam and it does not send combat troops.

South Korea—totally dependent on the United States for its own defense—is the only non-white country in all of Asia, or for that matter the world, with combat troops in South Vietnam. The great non-Communist Asian powers—India, Pakistan, Japan, Indonesia, Burma—do not support U.S. military policy in Vietnam; yet these five Asian countries which oppose our policies have fifteen times as many people as the two Asian countries, South Korea and Australia, which have supported our effort with combat troops.

Even SEATO members France and Pakistan do not approve of U.S. actions in Vietnam.

According to Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, General Secretary, World Council of Churches, "part of our problem in South East Asia is that we are white people killing people of color and this is not helping us in terms of any understanding of our position in Asia." (C.B.S., Face The Nation, December 25, 1966.)

This liquidation of the goodwill the United States has retained from its post-war championing of independence for many Asian nations is similarly illustrated by a statement in the respected *Economic Weekly* of Bombay that "The people in Asia—and elsewhere—have a right to ask of the U.S. Government why it is involving them in this awesome risk. If the U.S. reply is that they feel insecure with each spread of communist hegemony even if it be ten thousand miles away from home, the answer of the people of Asia . . . will continue to be that they are scarcely interested in accepting martyrhood merely to satisfy the security psychosis of the United States' citizens." (March 13, 1965.)

In *The Arrogance of Power* Senator Fulbright wrote, "One detects in Europe a growing uneasiness about American policy, a feeling that the United States is becoming unreliable and that it may be better—safer, that is—to keep the Americans at a distance. One detects in the French withdrawal from NATO a great deal more than General de Gaulle's idiosyncrasies; the French action may be representative of a widespread loss of European confidence in American policy and judgment."

According to Senator Fulbright, this "Vietnam Fallout" is not limited to Europe. "I would guess that many a European or Asian or African or Latin American looking at America today feels overawed rather than reassured by our tremendous power. . . . far from being reassured by the uses of American military power in Vietnam, by the spectacle of American bombs falling on Vietnamese jungles and villages in a volume equal to that of the bombing of Germany's great industrial cities at the height of World War II, our friends abroad may be puzzled both by the destructiveness of American power and its apparent ineffectiveness. It is possible that the violence and inconclusiveness of the war have raised doubts in many minds abroad as to whether it is not worse to be saved than to be abandoned by the United States."

In contrast to the Korean War, this war has not won the support of the United Nations. In fact, not only has the United Nations not endorsed American policy or participated in it, but the majority of its members probably oppose that policy.

11. *America's commitment to the military defense of South Vietnam is tenuous at best.*

It is often asserted that America is committed to defend the Vietnamese and that this commitment has been stated by three Presidents and by the Senate in the SEATO treaty. But as former Director of the U.S. Information Agency Arthur Larson wrote, "The true fact is that the United States has had no obligation to South Vietnam or anyone else under the SEATO treaty to use its own armed forces in the defense of South Vietnam. . . . If one examines the major documents, speeches, press conferences, and communiques bearing on this subject since 1950, it is a curious fact that one cannot find the words 'commitment,' 'obligation,' or 'pledge' used to describe our relations to South Vietnam until the Johnson Administration." *Vietnam and Beyond*, 1965.

When John Foster Dulles, who negotiated the SEATO treaty for the United States, was asked by Senator Theodore F. Green of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (November 11, 1954) whether the United States would be obliged by the SEATO treaty to help put down a revolutionary movement, Mr. Dulles said, "No. If there is a revolutionary movement in Vietnam . . . we have no undertaking to put it down; all we have is an undertaking to consult together as to what to do about it." (Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing on Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, 1954, page 28.)

And Senator H. Alexander Smith, N.J., one of the two U.S. Senators to accompany Mr. Dulles to the treaty conference in Manila, explained that some nations had intended to establish "an organization modeled on the lines of the North Atlantic Treaty arrangements. . . . Such an organization might have required the commitment of American ground forces to the Asian mainland. We carefully avoided any possible implication regarding an arrangement of that kind. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 101, pt. 1, p. 1053.)

Assertions that America has a "Solemn Pledge" to defend South Vietnam have most often been based on a letter from President Eisenhower to President Diem, October 23, 1954. But careful examination of this letter reveals no commitment to the defense of South Vietnam. As Arthur Larson wrote, "The nearest thing to a commitment at this stage was an indicated willingness, subject to some stiff (and as yet unsatisfied) conditions and understandings, to provide economic and technical assistance, including military advisers, material and training." And if any credibility remained to this letter as a basis for claiming an American "commitment" to the military defense of Vietnam, it was dispelled August 17, 1965 by President Eisenhower himself. "We said we would help that country," he said; "we were not talking about military programs, but about aid." (*The New York Times*, August 18, 1965.)

The Vietnam war has become increasingly a U.S. military, political and economic undertaking on behalf of the South Vietnamese government. Whatever the U.S. commitment to South Vietnam was, it clearly did not contemplate this result.

As President Kennedy said, September 2, 1963, "In the final analysis, it is their [the Vietnamese] war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them, we can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it—the people of Viet-Nam—against the Communists."

And as Senator Mansfield and others reported to the President, February 25, 1963, "The role of the United States is supplementary, advisory, and perhaps exhortatory, but it is not, in the end, controlling. . . ." ("Vietnam and Southeast Asia.")

Yet the Americanization of the war—against which President Kennedy and Senator Mansfield warned and to which the United States had never clearly committed itself—is exactly what we are now embarked on.

By October 1966 the number of American troops in Vietnam had surpassed the number of men in South Vietnam's regular army, indicating the extent to which the United States is bearing the brunt of the war. Now in his testimony on the 1967 Supplemental, Secretary McNamara gives an indication of how much further this process has gone: "it has been agreed by all the parties concerned that the main weight of the effort of the South Vietnamese armed forces should be placed on clear and secure operations" or operations "designed to hold territory." Thus, the South Vietnamese army has ceased playing a major role in the offensive battle against the opposition.

12. *The Vietnam war is destroying the nation and people of Vietnam.*

The forced movement of whole villages; the destruction of massive areas of the countryside; the burning of villages and attacks on populated areas believed to harbor Viet Cong—these tactics tend to validate the Viet Cong argument that the Americans are making war on the people of Vietnam.

According to Secretary-General U Thant, "The Vietnamese people, in particular, have known no peace for a quarter of a century. Their present plight should be the first, and not the last, consideration. . . . the basic problem in Vietnam is not one of ideology but one of national identity and survival. . . . The survival of the people of Vietnam must be seen as the real issue. . . ." (Introduction to Annual Report, September 15, 1966.)

U.S. "PROTECTION"

As Martha Gellhorn wrote in the *Ladies Home Journal* (January 1967), "American weapons are killing and wounding uncounted Vietnamese children. Not 10 or 20 children, which would be tragedy enough, but hundreds killed and many more hundreds wounded every month. This terrible act is officially ignored: no Government agency keeps statistics on the civilians of all ages, from babies to the very old, killed and wounded in South Vietnam. I have witnessed modern war in nine countries, but I have never seen a war like the one in South Vietnam.

"There are 77 orphanages in South Vietnam and 80,000 registered orphans. (Another figure is 110,000.) No one can tell how many orphaned children have been adopted by relatives . . . the estimated increase in orphans is 2,000 a month. * * *

"Close air support for infantry in combat zones is one thing. The day and night bombing of hamlets, filled with women, children and the old, is another. Bombs are mass destroyers. The military targets among the peasants—the Viet Cong—are small, fast-moving individuals. Bombs cannot identify them. Impartially, they mangle children, who are numerous, and guerrilla fighters, who are few."

13. *The massive American military operation in Vietnam is not a necessary or effective way to prevent the advance of Communism in Asia.*

Former Ambassador to India John Kenneth Galbraith testified (April 25, 1966) before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: ". . . the so-called domino theory, which I don't hold for a moment, . . . is the kind of over-simplified thinking by formula which . . . has been most damaging in our foreign policy. . . . One of the errors of the cold war mystique has been to assume that the whole world is equally susceptible to communism, this is nonsense. Wherever one has great social injustice, . . . and if there is no good hope of change, then sooner or later there will be a response to the promise of communism. . . . On the other hand, . . . [where] there are widely distributed land holdings; or there are tribal landholdings . . . the problem of such a highly organized system as communism or socialism is too formidable. It just isn't going to happen."

Even if the South Vietnamese were to go communist, there is little reason for assuming that the rest of Southeast Asia would follow them. Many people, from the Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee to the Secretary-General of the UN have criticized the "domino theory" as an over-simplification. Each of the nations of Southeast Asia will have its future governed by its own interests, its own nationalism, its own leadership and political philosophy—and it is centrally important to realize that Vietnam is the only country in this entire area where the nationalist movement which won independence from colonial power was communist led and dominated.

On the other hand, as Bernard Fall wrote in *Foreign Affairs,* October 1966, "There is no more reason to believe that a free-world 'victory in Vietnam' is going to deter other revolutionary guerrilla wars than there was to have hoped that the Kaiser's defeat in World War I would teach Nazism a useful lesson in 1938; or to have expected that Communist guerrilla setbacks in Greece . . . would 'teach' guerrillas something in Cuba. . . . If it 'teaches' them anything at all, it may well be this: that unless the local regime undertakes a measure of true reforms, even the hugest military power in the world can be successfully stalemated for a long period of time by lightly-armed peasant guerrillas and the infantry in a tiny underdeveloped country."

Further, U.S. activities in Vietnam may themselves arouse sympathy for the small underdeveloped state of North Vietnam, while destroying the world's goodwill and support for America. This creates a "domino effect" of its own, in which individual citizens of Canada, Europe, Latin America, Asia, Africa become disillusioned with the United States as a competent world leader. When what are taken as the fruits of our form of government are seen in the skies over Vietnam and in its bombed-out villages, we should hardly be surprised to find citizens and governments of the world losing their faith in democracy. These dominoes are falling the wrong way, and in the long run will have a very adverse effect on the position of our nation in the world.

14. *The Vietnam war undercuts the most basic U.S. foreign policy objectives.*

According to President Johnson, one of our national foreign policy objectives now is to end the cold war with the Soviet Union. Yet the effect of the Vietnam war has been to make us enemies across the battle field, and to put a freeze on any attempts toward easing relations elsewhere. The current difficulties facing the Consular Convention and the East-West trade bill illustrate the problem of trying to build public support for detente policies while a shooting war is in progress.

The Vietnam war is a major factor in the current crisis in NATO. De Gaulle has stated that a part of his reason for disengaging France from NATO is the desire not to be connected with American adventures in Asia. Germans and others have worried that increasing focus by the United States on Asia represents a decreasing commitment to Europe.

At a time of great upheaval in China, a huge U.S. military presence close to her borders is likely to strengthen the belligerent, hard line forces internally rather than the more moderate elements.

America as a world leader sets an important example by its conduct. What kind of example does it set by its actions in Vietnam? It is discouraging the peaceful settlement of disputes. It is encouraging the use of mass violence in resolving international conflicts. It is emphasizing unilateral rather than multilateral action. It is undercutting respect for international law. It is setting an example of a great nation using its overwhelming military and political strength against a smaller one.

America recognizes that its long-range security can only rest in the building of a peaceful, lawful world. Yet this war undermines all attempts to build such a world.

The United States has weakened the United Nations, first, by not following its obligations under the Charter to solve its dispute by peaceful means and to join in international rather than unilateral actions to prevent aggression; second, by refusing to follow the advice of the Secretary General on how to achieve negotiations, and turning aside his offers to help achieve a cease-fire.

PUBLIC OPPOSITION GROWS

15. *Public disaffection with Vietnam war policy is growing.*

The following recent examples illustrate increasing doubt about the course the present Administration is following:

Business Executives in an open letter to the President in *The Washington Post,* February 8, 1967, protested escalation of the war in Vietnam and urged (1) cessation of bombing; (2) reduction of military activities; and (3) negotiation with all parties now fighting. It was signed by 174 business executives, including 89 presidents or chairmen of boards.

Student Body Presidents and Campus Editors from more than 100 colleges and universities (*The New York Times,* December 30, 1966) questioned whether "America's vital interests are sufficiently threatened in Vietnam to necessitate the growing commitment there" and whether "a war which may devastate much of the countryside can lead to the stable and prosperous Vietnam we once hoped our presence would help create." They warned that "Unless this conflict can be eased, the United States will find some of her most loyal and courageous young people choosing to go to jail rather than to bear their country's arms."

Clergymen and Laymen of various religious faiths from all parts of the country came to Washington to protest American policy and to urge their representatives in Washington to vote against the Vietnam Supplemental Appropriation and otherwise demonstrate their opposition to the war. More than 2,000 participated in the January 31–February 1 effort.

On February 8, 1967, *Former Peace Corps Volunteers* and others who worked in similar programs urged halting of the bombing of North Vietnam, acceptance of direct participation of the National Liberation Front in peace negotiations, and discontinuing the present military build-up with a view toward the disengagement of all foreign forces from Vietnam. Their letter to the President was signed by over 400.

College and University Faculty Members by the thousands have published ads and held teach-ins. Most recently, over 5,000 college faculty members and 1,000 persons from other professions joined in an appeal on January 15 and 22, 1967, in *The New York Times* saying, "Mr. President: Stop the Bombing."

Rhodes Scholars addressed a letter to President Johnson, saying that they found their "feelings of conscience and national obligation counsel skepticism and concern, not active support, of the Government's Vietnam policy." The letter was signed by 50 of the 68 Rhodes Scholars. (*The New York Times,* January 27, 1967.)

Artists organized a "week of the angry arts" against the war in Vietnam, January 29 to February 5, 1967, to "speak through their own work to dissociate themselves from U.S. policy in Vietnam;" performances included theater, movies, concerts, poetry readings, photography, and discussions by some of America's leading creative artists.

Architects, along with engineers, planners and other members of the design professions in an open letter to the President urged an immediate cease-fire, with negotiations on the basis of the 1954 Geneva Agreement, with all parties including the National Liberation Front represented. (*The New York Times,* January 22, 1967.) The letter was signed by over 300.

16. *The world's religious leaders are increasingly critical of American policy in Vietnam.*

Pope Paul VI said September 19, 1966, "We cry to them in God's name to stop. Men must come together and work out concrete plans and terms in all sincerity. A settlement should be reached now, even at the expense of some inconvenience or loss, for it may have to be made later in the train of bitter slaughter and involve greater loss."

The National Council of Churches stated, December 1965, "We believe that war in this nuclear age settles hardly anything and may destroy everything. . . . We believe that if the United States follows a unilateral policy in Vietnam, no conceivable victory there can compensate for the distrust and hatred of the United States that is being generated each day throughout much of the world because we are seen as a predominantly white nation using our overwhelming military strength to kill more and more Asians." And in December 1966, the General Assembly of the National Council of Churches in a study document called for the placing of the Vietnam issue on the United Nations agenda, urged the Administration to show more candor in its statements about Vietnam and to give serious consideration to a halt in the bombing of North Vietnam "even though there may be no advance assurance of reciprocal action by the North Vietnamese Government."

And the Synagogue Council of America, January 1966, said, "Along with Americans of all faiths, we confront with deep sorrow the loss of American and Vietnamese lives, both North and South, and the suffering of the civilian population in that agonized and war-torn country. Our religious conscience compels us to exert every influence so that the action in Vietnam can be moved from the battlefield to the negotiating table."

President of the Catholic Association for International Peace, Dr. William V. O'Brien, also director of the Institute of World Polity at Georgetown University, stated that the bombing raids on North Vietnam "come dangerously close to the category of direct attacks on population centers. Such attacks on population centers are morally impermissible. . . Certainly raids such as those conducted on December 13 and 14, 1966, in or near Hanoi should not be repeated." (*The New York Times,* December 31, 1966.)

A CRIME AND A SIN

The Catholic laymen's weekly *Commonweal* editorialized December 23, 1966, "the outcome in Southeast Asia will make a difference. But not the decisive difference needed to justify a war which may last longer than any American has ever fought, employ more U.S. troops than in Korea, cost more than all the aid we have ever given to developing nations, drop more bombs than were used against the Japanese in World War II, and kill and maim far more Vietnamese than a Communist regime would have liquidated—and still not promise a definite outcome. The disproportion between ends and means has grown so extreme, the consequent deformation of American foreign and domestic policy so radical, that the Christian cannot consider the Vietnam war merely a mistaken government measure to be amended eventually but tolerated meanwhile. The evil outweighs the good. This is an unjust war. The United States should get out." Indeed, what is being done in Vietnam, "despite the almost certain good intentions of those doing it, is a crime and a sin."

Fifteen Protestant, Catholic and Jewish groups have joined together in a joint program, "Vietnam: Challenge to the Conscience of America" of public education and Congressional interviewing on the Vietnam war.

17. *The Administration has not done all it could in the past to pursue negotiations.*

a) According to Robert H. Estabrook, correspondent for The Washington Post, in a February 4, 1967 front page story, "North Vietnam definitely agreed last December to an American suggestion for direct discussions toward settling the war" according to "a highly authoritative Western source. . . . The arrangements went so far as to specify Warsaw as the locale of the talks. But after the American bombing raids near Hanoi December 13 and 14—which Hanoi charged damaged civilian areas—North Vietnam withdrew its agreement, accusing the United States of bad faith."

U.S. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge and the Polish representative on the International Control Commission were apparently both involved in this. Mr. Estabrook reports that: "On or about December 4 a reply came from Polish Foreign Minister Adam Rapacki stating that Hanoi had agreed to talks at the ambassadorial level in Warsaw. North Vietnam asked that special representatives be dispatched from Washington for the purpose.

"Hanoi reportedly attached no conditions about a prior cessation of American bombing of North Vietnam to its agreement."

b) Before and during the Tet, Lunar New Year, truce in February 1967, there were many hints and reports of negotiating possibilities. One of the clear indications of a move to the conference table would have been an "unconditional" end of the bombing of North Vietnam. During the truce, Secretary of State Rusk seemed to harden the United States negotiating position by indicating that an appropriate response by North Vietnam to a U.S. end of its bombing would be to stop sending North Vietnamese men and supplies to the South rather than merely indicating a readiness to go to the conference table, which had earlier seemed sufficient.

After President Johnson had temporarily extended the bombing pause and just before the United States announced resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam on February 13, United Nations Secretary General U Thant issued a statement saying "Non-resumption of the bombing is a wise move. If it means cessation of bombing, then I believe that meaningful talks will take place within a few weeks." The Washington Post reported, February 14: "U.N. sources said the Secretary General's statement was based on firm information, not speculation. U.N. officials were stunned by the Pentagon announcement that followed, but said later that the Secretary General was standing on his statement."

c) These are only the most recent of a series of opportunities to pursue negotiations which have been missed by the United States. According to Eric Sevareid in "The Final Troubled Hours of Adlai Stevenson": "In the early autumn of 1964 . . . U Thant, the UN Secretary-General, had privately obtained agreement from authorities in North Vietnam that they would send an emissary to talk with an American emissary in Rangoon, Burma. Someone in Washington insisted that this attempt be postponed until after the Presidential election. When the election was over, U Thant again pursued the matter; Hanoi was still willing to send its man. But Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, Adlai went on, flatly opposed the attempt. . . .

"Time was passing, the war expanding. The pressures on U Thant . . . were mounting from all sides within the UN. So he proposed an outright cease-fire, with a truce line to be drawn across not only Vietnam but neighboring Laos. U Thant then made a remarkable suggestion: United States officials could write the terms of the cease-fire offer, exactly as they saw fit, and he, U Thant, would announce it in exactly those words. Again, so Stevenson said to me, McNamara turned this down, and from Secretary Rusk there was no response, to Stevenson's knowledge.

d) According to Philippe Devillers, Director of Southeast Asia Studies at the University of Paris, "Still another approach was made through France in February 1965. M. Couve de Murville went to Washington to inform the government there that both France and the U.S.S.R. felt that the time was propitious for a conference and were ready to work for it"; Hanoi was apparently ready to accept talks, and, according to Devillers, the Chinese had indicated they would not object. But the only U.S. response to this information was to continue to bomb North Vietnam.

Nor were these the only times that movement toward peace was disrupted by American military escalation of the war. A recent Citizens' White Paper, *The Politics of Escalation,* by Schurmann, Scott and Zelnik, submitted to the President over the names of many leading Americans including Eugene Carson Blake, Marriner S. Eccles, Jacob J. Weinstein, concluded: "A study of the chronology of American escalations within the political context reveals, however, that the major American intensifications of the war have been preceded less by substantially increased military opposition than by periods of mounting pressure for a political settlement of the war. . . . The most disturbing finding of this study is thus the pattern in which moves toward political settlement are brought to a close with an intensification of the war by the United States."

To take just two examples of their findings: "In the week of July 23, 1964, U Thant, President de Gaulle, and the Soviet Government all called for a Geneva conference. In the week of August 2, the United States made its first overt attack on ships and territory of North Vietnam." And later, "Efforts of Italian intermediaries La Pira and Fanfani in November and December of 1965 were followed on December 15 by the first bombing of the Haiphong area, which the Administration had been told would close the door to negotiations."

Equally important, the United States has not even tried the course suggested by U Thant in his "three points." Yet Thant and many other world leaders who have held discussions with both sides are convinced that cessation of bombing of North Vietnam, a scaling down of hostilities by both sides, and a willingness to hold discussions with all parties to the conflict are minimum conditions for initiating peace talks.

18. *There are alternatives to the policy of continued escalation.*

In fact, there have been a great many proposals by people such as President Charles deGaulle, President Sihanouk of Cambodia, Senator J. W. Fulbright, Senator Wayne Morris, Lt. General James M. Gavin, and many others, of which the following are just a few:

Begin execution of UN Secretary General U Thant's "three points" by unconditionally halting the bombing of North Vietnam, and stating U.S. willingness to negotiate with all parties including the National Liberation Front, and scaling down military action on a mutual basis.

Urge the South Vietnamese Government the Buddhists, and other major political groups in South Vietnam to enter negotiations with the National Liberation Front, making continued American support of the Saigon Government contingent upon the seriousness of such efforts.

Propose a military cease-fire among the four main belligerents: United States, South Vietnam, National Liberation Front, and North Vietnam.

Make the neutralization of North and South Vietnam and all of Southeast Asia, guaranteed by the great powers, the objective of U.S. policy.

Request that an independent peace force—UN, Afro-Asian, an expanded International Control Commission, or other—take responsibility for the Vietnam situation, providing for the withdrawal of foreign military personnel and free elections.

While negotiations are underway end bombing raids and search-and destroy missions, adopting a military strategy of defending the territory now held.

[See also "Neutralization in S.E. Asia—Problems and Prospects," a study prepared for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, October 10, 1966; and "Viet Nam in the Balance," by Bernard B. Fall, *Foreign Affairs,* October 1966, pages 17–18.]

19. *The Vietnam war must be weighed against other national priorities.* The period 1965 to 1970 is a "make or break" period in at least five areas. If rapid strides are not made toward solutions in this period, each of these situations may become so unmanageable that it can be corrected only at great human cost and suffering. These areas are: ending poverty and healing our growing racial and economic antagonisms here in the United States; solving the threat of world wide hunger and famine which sober analysts are clearly predicting; reducing the explosive population growth to manageable proportions; closing the dangerously widening gap between the developed and the less developed nations; bringing the increasingly critical arms race under control.

Progress toward the solution of every one of these problems is being seriously impeded by the Vietnam war. Every one of them requires large sums of money, trained manpower, organizational talent and applied intelligence to solve it. Most of that time, energy and money is now going into the Vietnam war. We see the war's effects graphically in cuts in important domestic and foreign programs, in diversion of many of the best brains and resources of the country to finding new ways to carry on the war.

Meanwhile, the problems multiply, the ghettos become more crowded, and dissatisfaction rises at home and abroad. The war creates an atmosphere in which the right wing feeds and grows, making solutions doubly difficult.

According to figures in the President's Budget Message *there would be a $16 billion surplus this fiscal year if the United States were not fighting the Vietnam war.* The projected surplus would be even larger in fiscal 1968. Think what it would mean to the United States and the world to spend this money for constructive rather than destructive purposes.

20. *Congressmen have a responsibility to their country to vote their best judgment on the great issues of war and peace.*

The United States is getting into a predicament in Vietnam from which it will have ever more difficulty extricating itself. Congressmen who take the lead in showing ways out of the quagmire are performing the greatest possible service to their nation.

There is great danger to the United States in the possible development of a domestic political climate which would make it difficult or impossible for the President to make peace with our opponents in Vietnam. A vote against escalation is really a vote of support for the President's peace aims.

Many people in the Congress and among the American public feel that it was a mistake to become enmeshed in Vietnam in the first place. Yet, now that we are in, they see no alternative to going along. But to suspend sound judgment about our future course is merely to compound past mistakes. Such abdication is paid for with the lives of our young men.

The Constitution divides political power among the three branches of government. Each is given an area in which to act and to serve in a system of checks and balances. None is asked to follow blindly. The Congress is not regimented like Tennyson's Light Brigade: "Theirs not to make reply, Theirs not to reason why, Theirs but to do and die." Rather, each Member of Congress is given the Constitutional responsibility to exercise his own best judgment about the issues of the time, and to vote according to that judgment. In addition, the principles enunciated at the Nuremberg trials emphasize the individual responsibility resting upon government officials.

As John F. Kennedy wrote in *Profiles in Courage,* "only the very courageous will be able to keep alive the spirit of individualism and dissent which gave birth to this nation, nourished it as an infant and carried it through its severest tests upon the attainment of its maturity. . . . Only the strength and progress and peaceful change that come from independent judgment and individual ideas . . . can enable us to surpass that foreign ideology that fears free thought more than it fears hydrogen bombs."

21. *A vote against the Vietnam war appropriation seems to be the real way to oppose the war and communicate with the White House.*

President Johnson counts votes, not speeches. As he said about the expected outcome of the 1966 Congressional elections, in a press conference November 4, 1966, "I don't think it is going to affect the Viet Nam situation in any event. They may talk, and argue, and fight, and criticize, and play politics, from time to time, but when they call the vote on supporting the men with the key defense bills, in the Senate, it will be 83 to two, and in the House, it will be 410 to five. Everybody can understand that."

Many Members of Congress signed a letter last year against "indiscriminate escalation." Other letters and communications from the Congress have urged movement toward peace. Yet the core of American policy has remained escalation of the conflict.

Unless Congressmen are willing to *vote* against escalation appropriations, the great American dissatisfaction with that policy will remain impotent, denied its democratic representation.

Here, as on all great issues, a minority, presenting a reasoned argument for a change in the course of public policy and mobilizing the support of a latent national sentiment, can persuade the majority and change the course of events—if it has the courage to make its voice and vote felt.

22. *The current level of war far exceeds anything reasonably anticipated when the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution was rushed through Congress two and a half years ago.*

This resolution, authorizing the President "to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression" has been used to justify the massive commitment of U.S. forces to Vietnam. Yet Senator Fulbright said, while acting as floor manager for the bill in August 1964, "I personally feel it would be very unwise under any circumstances to put a large land army on the Asian Continent." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 110, pt. 14, p. 18407.)

Senator Gaylord A. Nelson, Wisconsin, proposed an amendment to the resolution which said in part: "Our continuing policy is to limit our role to the provision of aid, training assistance, and military advice, and it is the sense of Congress that, except when provoked to a greater response, we should continue to attempt to avoid direct military involvement in the southeast Asian conflict." Senator Fulbright did not accept the amendment because it would require a Conference with the House and cause delay, but he said, "The Senator has put into his amendment a statement of policy that is unobjectionable. . . . I believe it is an accurate reflection of what I believe is the President's policy, judging from his own statements." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 110, pt. 14, 18459.)

Five months after the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, there were still only 23,000 U.S. military personnel in Vietnam—only 6,500 more than at the beginning of 1964. Even in May 1965—nine months after the resolution—there were still fewer than 50,000 U.S. troops in South Vietnam. "At that time the American force was still basically an advisory organization. Americans, in regular combat units, were not yet engaged on the ground. U.S. helicopter companies were in use but only to supply tactical transportation to regular Vietnamese units and the U.S. jet fighter-bombers in the country with the exception of two or three squadrons of aircraft were not yet engaged in support of the Vietnamese Armed Forces." ("Vietnam Conflict: The Substance and the Shadow," page 2.) In all of 1964 there were only 147 American deaths from hostile action in Vietnam.

Thus, there are currently about twenty times as many American military personnel in South Vietnam as there were at the time of the Tonkin resolution. The American force has now become the main fighting force in South Vietnam, while the South Vietnamese Army is no longer even playing a central part in offensive "Search-and-Destroy" operations.

It is very difficult to believe that the Gulf of Tonkin resolution supports the major undeclared land war now being carried on on the Asian mainland.

23. *The best way to support American boys in Vietnam is to end the war and bring them home. Support for this escalation appropriation "lets down the boys in Vietnam."*

In the words of Senator Mansfield, "We owe an unremitting search for a peaceful solution in Vietnam to the young Americans who have gone and who will go to that tortured land."

This appropriation makes more men available for deployment to Vietnam. It provides a continuing escalation which makes any final, peaceful settlement in Vietnam ever more difficult. It raises the specter of American youth sacrificing the next decade in an interminable guerrilla war in support of a people unwilling to fight for their own freedom. It increases the possibility of "volunteers" being sent to Vietnam from China, the Soviet Union, and other Communist countries, and the development of a great-power conflict in which thousands of American boys would be killed in a war nobody wanted.

In squandering the resources of our own society, we weaken the chance for freedom and a good life for the young men fighting in Vietnam. We let them down by spending over $2 billion a month on the Vietnamese war instead of building a U.S. society where they and their families can live decently—in good neighborhoods not ghettos, in good homes not slums, with a good education and good health.

We also need to ask what it will do to our boys to keep them in Vietnam. U.S. soldiers in Vietnam are fighting in a land where a large part of the populace is hostile and the local army uncommitted. The situation requires them to napalm women and children, entomb people in mountain caves, force villagers by the thousands to leave their homes and the graves of their ancestors—all in support of a corrupt and unrepresentative government in Saigon. Most can't tell friend from foe. They dispense aid with one hand and death with the other. They have become, in the words of Robert Sherrod, a "Foreign Legion." Is it for this that our boys need our support?

We are letting our boys down right now: by enlarging again and again the scope of conflict; by wasting their lives in a brutal and unnecessary war; by failing to pursue all possibilities for a peaceful conclusion of hostilities.

The only policy which does not let our boys down is one which will take all possible steps to end the war and bring them home.

.ESCALATION OF AMERICAN INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM IN 1966

On January 19, 1966, President Johnson requested a $13 billion supplemental for fiscal 1966 for the Department of Defense and for military and economic aid. The bulk of this money was to be used, according to the President, "to provide for the operations of our men in Vietnam and the weapons, ammunition, ports and airfields which should be available to support them if the aggression continues. . . . This is an opportunity for us to demonstrate once again," said the President, "that there is no difference between one party and another . . . when it comes to effective and sustained support of our fighting men and their allies . . . we are as one in support of our men in Vietnam."

When the President signed the authorization bill on March 15, he reiterated that "Congress has repeated its declaration to the American people that they stand behind our fighting men in Vietnam." "Our purpose," added the President, "is to demonstrate to the remaining advocates of violence that there is more human profit to be had from peace than there is from war. That is the real purpose of the more than 200,000 brave Americans who are at this moment risking their lives. . . . That is the real purpose of the Congress in registering such dramatic support for legislation of this kind."

Now that Congress is being called upon to approve another $12.3 billion supplemental for the Vietnamese war, it might be well to look back at what the 1966 supplemental accomplished. Did it protect the "boys in Vietnam"? Or did it provide the funds to commit more boys to the morass in Southeast Asia? Did it help move combatants to the negotiating table, or did it bring more suffering to the Vietnamese people? Were the funds used to escalate the war in the North and in the South, despite the pleas of the UN Secretary General? The following chronology seeks to contribute to examination of such questions. It is a shorthand summation of press reports and Department of Defense data:

Jan. 25–28, 1966: United States, South Vietnamese, and South Korean troops launched the largest offensive in central Vietnam since 1953. The total offensive involved more than 20,000 men, and included the biggest amphibious landing since the Inchon invasion during the Korean War.—New York Times, Feb. 2.

Jan. 28, 1966: The number of American soldiers engaged in five offensive actions to South Vietnam rose to about 40,000—the largest number yet involved in such operations at one time.—Le Monde, Feb. 1.

Jan. 31, 1966: U.S. bombing of North Vietnam was resumed.

U.S. air sorties[1] during month:	
Over North Vietnam	14
Over South Vietnam	350
U.S. military personnel:	
Killed in action in January	282
Wounded in action in January	1,318
Total U.S. troops in South Vietnam at end of month	196,000

Feb. 11, 1966: The U.S. refugee coordinator said the number of refugees had risen from 300,000 in May 1965 to 784,000.—Washington Post, Feb. 12.

Feb. 15, 1966: The U.S. Air Force began to use spray planes to destroy foliage along the Ho Chi Minh Trail in Laos.—Washington Post, Feb. 16.

Feb. 28, 1966: U.S. air sorties during the month:

Over North Vietnam	1,935
Over South Vietnam	10,608
U.S. Military personnel:	
Killed in action in February	435
Wounded in action in February	2,624
Total U.S. troops in South Vietnam	208,000

Mar. 8, 1966: 10,000 U.S. and Australian troops pushed through "War Zone D" in the "most massive penetration yet of an enemy stronghold 30 miles north of Saigon."—Washington Post, Mar. 15.

Mar. 12, 1966: Raids on North Vietnam were running at 3 times the prepause level.—New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 13.

Mar. 20, 1966: The South Korean National Assembly approved sending 20,000 additional troops to South Vietnam after a 21-hour continuous debate.—Washington Post, Mar. 20.

Mar. 31, 1966: U.S. air sorties during month:

Over North Vietnam	4,144
Over South Vietnam	13,137
U.S. military personnel:	
Killed in action in March	507
Wounded in action in March	2,960
Total U.S. troops in South Vietnam	231,000

Apr. 12, 1966: More than 1 million pounds of bombs were dropped over North Vietnam by B–52s. This was the heaviest single raid of the war in terms of tonnage, and the first B–52 raid over North Vietnam.—*New York Times*, April 13.

Apr. 17, 1966: U.S. planes hit missile sites 15 to 17 miles from Hanoi—these raids came closer to the city than any previous strikes.—*Washington Post*, April 18.

Apr. 19, 1966: U.S. jets struck a bridge 10 miles north of Haiphong, the closest raid of the war to that port since Dec. 24, 1965.—*New York Times*, April 21.

Apr. 21, 1966:

4,500 Australian soldiers were on their way to serve in Vietnam.—*New York Times*, April 22.

U.S. air sorties during the month:	
Over North Vietnam	5,183
Over South Vietnam	9,779
U.S. military personnel:	
Killed in action in April	316
Wounded in action in April	2,470
Total U.S. troops in South Vietnam	245,000

May 11, 1966: U.S. planes again bombed 10 miles from Haiphong striking on this raid two missile sites.—*Washington Post*, May 13.

May 31, 1966:

U.S. air sorties during month:	
Over North Vietnam	4,602
Over South Vietnam	10,131
U.S. military personnel:	
Killed in action in May	464
Wounded in action in May	2,882
Total U.S. troops in South Vietnam	255,000

June 29, 1966:

U.S. planes attacked oil depots 3½ miles from Hanoi and 2 miles from Haiphong marking "a radical change in U.S. tactics," which had previously seemed to bar air strikes that close to the two cities. "Reports from returning pilots described the raids as having sent up black clouds of billowing smoke 20,000 feet in the air over Haiphong and 35,000 feet high over Hanoi."—Washington Post, June 30.

U.S. air sorties during the month:	
Over North Vietnam	7,357
Over South Vietnam	11,797
U.S. military personnel:	
Killed in action in June	507
Wounded in action in June	2,779
Total U.S. troops in South Vietnam	267,000

July 11, 1966:

The United States was making more than 100 strikes a day over Laos, more than double the number six months earlier.—New York Times, July 12.

U.S. Air Force personnel in Southeast Asia had doubled in size over the preceding eight months to 40,000.—New York Times, July 12.

July 14, 1966:

President Marcos of the Philippines signed a bill committing the first Filipino troops to South Vietnam.—Washington Post, July 15.

July 25, 1966:

25,000 American servicemen were reported to be stationed in Thailand, or double the number reported there in January. This was several thousand more than there were in Vietnam in November 1963.—Washington Post, July 25.

July 30, 1966:

U.S. bombed the Demilitarized Zone for the first time.—Washington Post, July 31.

July 31, 1966:

U.S. air sorties during the month:	
Over North Vietnam	9,765
Over South Vietnam	11,835
U.S. military personnel:	
Killed in action in July	435
Wounded in action in July	2,327
Total U.S. troops in South Vietnam	277,000

Aug. 6, 1966: First random attacks by U.S. planes were made on troops in North Vietnam.—Washington Post, Aug. 7.

Aug. 15, 1966: 300-man vanguard of 17,000-man South Korean division landed.—Washington Post, Aug. 16.

Aug. 31, 1966:

U.S. air sorties during the month:	
Over North Vietnam	12,015
Over South Vietnam	11,900
U.S. military personnel:	
Killed in action in August	395
Wounded in action in August	2,470
Total U.S. troops in South Vietnam	296,000

Sept. 1, 1966: "The average number of ARVN [Saigon]-initiated battalion-size operations has slightly decreased over the past year while . . . the number of U.S. initiated battalion-size operations has trebled." Bernard B. Fall, Foreign Affairs, October.

Sept. 9, 1966: The United States took steps to triple its chemical-defoliation and crop-destruction capacity, which, during the first 8 months of 1966, had squirted 1,324,430 gallons of herbicide over 530,872 acres of South Vietnam.—New York Times, Sept. 10.

Sept. 22, 1966: Secretary of Defense McNamara announced that the Defense Department expected to increase previously planned production of warplanes in fiscal 1968 by about 30%. The bulk of the additional warplanes were said to be for the Navy, which had lost more planes in Vietnam than had earlier been foreseen.—New York Times, Sept. 23.

Sept. 30, 1966: U.S. air sorties during the month:

Over North Vietnam	12,673
Over South Vietnam	12,206
U.S. military personnel:	
Killed in action in September	419
Wounded in action in September	2,652
Total U.S. troops in South Vietnam	313,000

---

[1] A "sortie," says the Department of Defense, is 1 flight by 1 plane using bombs, etc., or flying reconnaissance. These data do not include flights by B–52's, or helicopters, defoliation missions, transport, or flights by South Vietnamese Army or Air Force planes. Since action over North Vietnam is officially recorded in "mission," or multiplane flights, the sortie figure used here is an approximation based on unofficial Defense estimates that each mission is made up of 3.5 planes. The official data are not released—apparently on the assumption that such data would provide the North Vietnamese with new information.

Oct. 2, 1966: More than 300,000 rounds of ammunition a month were fired by Seventh Fleet ships in support of American and Vietnamese forces, compared with 350 shells fired in May 1965.—New York Times, Oct. 3.

Oct. 13, 1966: The number of U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam reached 328,000 or more than the peak figure in Korea during the Korean war.—Washington Post, Oct. 14.

Oct. 15, 1966: The beginning of Operation Attleboro, involving more than 22,000 American troops, was the largest single American operation of the war to date.—Washington Post, Nov. 19.

Oct. 25, 1966: U.S. destroyers fired on the North Vietnamese shore for the first time (except in defense of downed pilots) and began destroying and damaging hundreds of barges.—New York Times, Nov. 19.

Oct. 31, 1966:

U.S. air sorties during the month:	
Over North Vietnam	10, 787
Over South Vietnam	11, 781
U.S. military personnel:	
Killed in action in October	341
Wounded in action in October	2, 189
Total U.S. troops in South Vietnam	342, 000

Nov. 11, 1966: U.S. destroyers extended operations to the 18th Parallel, 78 miles north of the border between North and South Vietnam. New York Times, Dec. 12.

Nov. 16, 1966: It was disclosed that American nuclear-powered submarines had been patrolling North and South Vietnamese waters. Washington Post, Nov. 17.

Nov. 18, 1966: First attack was made by naval gunfire on a North Vietnamese shore installation other than a gun site. Washington Post, Nov. 20.

Nov. 30, 1966: The average monthly consumption of artillery and small arms ammunition had doubled since January; consumption of mortar ammunition had increased 86%. Secretary of Defense McNamara, Jan. 23, and Department of Defense Press Office.

U.S. air sorties during the month:	
Over North Vietnam	7, 770
Over South Vietnam	12, 643
U.S. military personnel:	
Killed in action in November	475
Wounded in action in November	2, 998
Total U.S. troops in South Vietnam	355, 000

Dec. 2, 1966: Hagia oil storage complex 14.5 miles from Hanoi and a vehicle park 4 to 5 miles from the city were bombed for the first time. Washington Post, Dec. 6.

Dec. 4, 1966: The railroad yard at Yen Vien, six miles outside Hanoi, was bombed for the first time. Washington Post, Dec. 6.

Dec. 8, 1966: B–52 strikes in South Vietnam by individual planes increased from an average of 150 a month in June 1965 to an average of 425 a month in 1966. New York Times, Dec. 9.

Dec. 10, 1966: 34,000 U.S. servicemen were reported to be in Thailand. New York Times, Dec. 11.

Dec. 13–14, 1966: U.S. planes targeting in on the Yen Vien railroad yard six miles northeast of Hanoi, and the Van Dien truck depot, five miles south of the city apparently went off course and accidentally struck residential areas within the city limits of Hanoi. The Washington Post reported on Feb. 4, 1967 that "a highly authoritative western source" had revealed that these raids caused Hanoi to break off arrangements for U.S.-North Vietnamese talks at the ambassadorial level in Warsaw. New York Times, Dec. 15; Washington Post, Dec. 15; Feb. 4, 1967.

Dec. 23, 1966: The League of Red Cross Societies stated that according to official statistics, there were 1,507,088 displaced Vietnamese at the end of October, of which 820,791 were considered resettled and 686,297 were awaiting resettlement.—American Red Cross.

Dec. 28, 1966: Vietnamese paratroopers with American advisers launched the largest airborne assault of the war, deep in the Mekong Delta—New York Times, Dec. 28.

Dec. 31, 1966: United States and South Vietnamese consumption of air ordnance totaled 56,000 tons over the month. This was 40 percent above consumption the previous December. Secretary of Defense McNamara, Jan. 23, 1967; and Department of Defense Press Office.

Dec. 31, 1966:

U.S. air sorties during the month:	
Over North Vietnam	7, 291
Over South Vietnam	11, 312
U.S. military personnel:	
Killed in action in December	432
Wounded in action in December	2, 424
Total U.S. troops in South Vietnam[2]	389, 000

"At the close of 1966, we had a total of about 389,000[2] men in South Vietnam, 35,000 in Thailand, and 36,000 Navy forces aboard ship off the coast of Vietnam. The number in South Vietnam will continue to increase during the next year and a half. . . .

"The deployment of large U.S. forces in the Southeast Asia area has required some strengthening of our supporting bases elsewhere in the Western Pacific. A total of about 100,000 U.S. military personnel were stationed in this area in June 1965. By December 1966 the number had risen to about 123,000, a relatively modest increase considering the size of the U.S. forces now deployed in Southeast Asia." Secretary of Defense McNamara, Jan. 23, 1967.

THE ROAD TO NEGOTIATIONS? L.B.J. REJECTS HANOI BID AS UNSUBSTANTIAL

Read the February 3, 1967, headline in the *Washington Post*. It was based on the President's answers to repeated questions at his February 2 news conference on his assessment of the possibilities for peace in Vietnam. He said:

"In all candor, I must say that I am not aware of any serious effort that the other side has made, in my judgment, to bring the fighting to a stop and to stop the war. . . .

"We have made clear to them, and to the world, the principles that we believe must govern a peace meeting of this kind, and a settlement that we would hope would come out of it: The honoring of the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962, the right of self-determination for the people of South Vietnam, to insure that they are freed from the threat or use of force. . . .

"I must say as of today we have no indication that the other side is prepared in any way to settle on these limited and decent terms. . . .

"I can only repeat what I have said so many times: I will do anything I can on the part of this Government to go more than halfway to bring it to an end. . . . As of this moment, I cannot report that there are any serious indications that the other side is ready to stop the war. . . .

"With the information that I have, with the knowledge that is brought to me, I must say that I do not interpret any action that I have observed as being a serious effort to either go to a conference table or to bring the war to an end. . . ."

Q: Mr. President, we have said in the past that we would be willing to suspend the bombing of North Vietnam in exchange for some suitable step by the other side. Are you prepared at all to tell us what kind of other steps the other side should take for this suspension of bombing?

A: Just almost any step.

As far as we can see, they have not taken any yet. . . .

Would you consider a mere willingness to talk peace to be enough of a step on their part to halt bombing or would some military move be necessary?

A: I have seen nothing that any of them have said which indicates any seriousness on their part. I am awaiting any offer they might care to make.

The next day, February 4, the *Washington Post* carried a lead story entitled:

"1966 HANOI APPROVAL ON TALKS REPORTED

"(By Robert H. Estabrook)

"Washington Post Foreign Service

"UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., Feb. 3.—North Vietnam definitely agreed last December to an American suggestion for direct discussions toward settling the war, a highly authoritative Western source said today.

"The arrangements went so far as to specify Warsaw as the locale of the talks. But after the American bombing raids near Hanoi Dec. 13 and 14—which Hanoi charged damaged civilian areas—North Vietnam withdrew its agreement, accusing the United States of bad faith.

"The Western source revealed these diplomatic events after President Johnson asserted Thursday that there have been no "serious indications" of a Communist desire to talk peace. The President's denial has produced considerable skepticism here about American intentions among those who profess to be familiar with the details of the effort that failed.

"ORIGIN OF PROPOSAL

"The immediate proposal for direct talks is said to have originated in discussions between American Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge and the Polish representative on the International Control Commission, Ambassador Janusz Lewandowski, at the home of the Italian Ambassador in Saigon on Dec. 2 and 3.

"Lodge is reported to have asked the Polish representative to take the initiative in setting up contacts with Hanoi. He is alleged to have assured the Pole that the United States did not intend to create another Korean War situation in Vietnam.

"On or about Dec. 4 a reply came from Polish Foreign Minister Adam Rapacki stating that Hanoi had agreed to talks at the ambassadorial level in Warsaw. North Vietnam asked that special representatives be dispatched from Washington for the purpose.

"Hanoi reportedly attached no conditions about a prior cessation of American bombing of North Vietnam to its agreement.

"Communist sources here regard the reports that Hanoi agreed to talk without stipulating an end to the bombing as highly significant. One indicated that Hanoi had even encouraged Poland to establish contact with the United States.

"PREVIOUS DEMANDS

"Previously Hanoi had insisted publicly on acceptance of its own four-point peace plan, involving among other things an end to bombing and complete withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam, and settlement of South Vietnamese affairs in accord with the program of the National Liberation Front (Vietcong).

---

[2] In his testimony, Secretary McNamara actually used the figure 383,000 but this was an earlier estimate which has now been superseded.

"Then came the bombing near Hanoi; U.S. officials have described any damage to civilian areas as accidental. According to the Western diplomat, Rapacki subsequently relayed word to the United States that Hanoi had withdrawn its agreement for the meeting in Warsaw.

"Other knowledgeable sources say that Hanoi accused the United States of sabotaging the arrangement.

" 'Every time we have agreed to talks with the Americans,' North Vietnamese officials are quoted as commenting, " 'Washington has escalated the war.'

"This apparently was a reference to two agreements that United Nations Secretary General U Thant had obtained from North Vietnam late in 1964 and early in 1965 for talks with the United States in Rangoon, Burma.

"Adlai E. Stevenson, who was then American representative to the United Nations, relayed word in February, 1965, that the Administration had turned down the second proposal. Administration officials explained later that such talks might have toppled the South Vietnamese government during a politically unstable time.

"The next day American bombing of North Vietnam began. But the timing may have been coincidental in respect to the proposal for talks in Rangoon, for only a few hours previously the Vietcong had attacked an American barracks at Pleiku, causing many casualties.

"Some here view this as an independent attempt by the Vietcong to upset any efforts by Hanoi to negotiate with the United States.

"In any event, the newly revealed December, 1966, agreement from North Vietnam, the bombing of the Hanoi area and subsequent withdrawal of the agreement for talks came before American Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg wrote to U Thant on Dec. 19 asking him to use his good offices to arrange peace discussions with North Vietnam.

"STATE DEPARTMENT VIEW

"[In Washington, the State Department said it sees 'no merit' in the contention that the bombing of North Vietnam has interfered in any way with efforts to start peace talks. A statement reiterated that there had been no indication, 'direct or indirect,' from Hanoi of any 'reciprocal response which would justify the cessation of bombing of military targets in North Vietnam.']

"Before the reported request by Ambassador Lodge to the Poles in Saigon, Canadian External Affairs Minister Paul Martin had urged an initiative by the International Control Commission in conversation with Polish Foreign Minister Rapacki.

"Even after the North Vietnamese turndown, Polish representatives continued attempts to patch things up. A top-level representative of the Polish Foreign Office, Jerzy Michalowski, had an unannounced meeting with Thant when he was in New York briefly last month.

"ATTITUDE IN HANOI

"But the efforts came to naught because of the hardened attitude in Hanoi and the intensified suspicions of American intentions. At the moment the Poles are said to have suspended their individual initiatives altogether.

"Meanwhile, interest centers here on a new East European peace plan said to have the agreement of Hanoi. This would involve a cease-fire on existing lines, a caretaker government in South Vietnam composed of all factions including the National Liberation Front, internationally supervised elections and formation of a new government to discuss future relationships with the United States, Marshal Ky and the Vietcong.

"Several East European diplomats and at least one Asian have discussed this idea with Thant. A foreign minister of one major West European country also has expressed interest in the plan.'

In the February 5 *Washington Post,* Murrey Marder, staff writer, wrote:

"United States attempts to launch peace talks with North Vietnam are now in an extremely interesting and delicate phase," a White House adviser said yesterday.

"With that comment and variations upon it, the Administration declined to confirm or deny a report that the United States and North Vietnam had tried to start peace talks in Warsaw in December, at American initiative. . . .

"Rostow was questioned specifically by the students about the validity of a report in The Washington Post yesterday, by staff writer Robert H. Estabrook at the United Nations. . . .

"Rostow declined to get any more specific about that account except to repeat that 'this is a bad time to talk about a particular stand of what might be a negotiation.' "

Karl Meyer, *Washington Post* Foreign Service, wrote in the February 8 *Post:*

"London, Feb. 7.—Prime Minister Wilson today told Parliament that he had "all the details" of a peace-feeler from North Vietnam last December and blamed "a considerable two-way misunderstanding" for American bombing raids that reportedly aborted the peace effort."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, unless the Senator from Georgia or someone else wants to continue the debate on the pending measure, I am prepared to yield the floor.

I understand that the majority leader wants to bring up a conference report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I further understand that we will adjourn following the conference report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct, but there will be a vote on the conference report.

AMENDMENT NO. 98

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

"Sec. —. The Secretary of Defense is hereby directed that insofar as practicable all contracts shall be formally advertised and awarded on a competitive bid basis to the lowest responsible bidders."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have discussed this amendment with the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member. I understand they are agreeable to accepting the amendment.

The amendment is merely intended to spell out the intent of Congress that, to the fullest extent practical, all contracts entered into by the Defense Department should be awarded on a competitive bid basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, similar language in the form of a limitation on appropriations has been accepted in Department of Defense appropriation bills.

I know of no reason why the committee should not accept the amendment.

It has been our policy for years to encourage the Department of Defense to increase competitive bidding in military procurements.

Witnesses before us are continually asked what progress they have made in this respect.

In my opinion, the policy enunciated in this amendment is the policy of the Armed Services Committee. Therefore, I have no hesitancy in accepting the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives under date of January 16, 1967, be printed at this point in the Record along with the conclusions he reached in the report of that date.

The Comptroller General's report points up the unnecessary cost that results when contracts are negotiated rather than to award them by competitive bids.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Washington, D.C.,
January 16, 1967.

President of the Senate.
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The accompanying report summarizes our findings on the need for improving administration by the Department of Defense of the cost or pricing data requirements of Public Law 87–653 in the award of prime contracts and subcontracts. Our review was directed principally toward an examination into the extent that agency procurement officials were requiring prime contractors and subcontractors to submit cost or pricing data and a certificate prior to the award of negotiated contracts as required by Public Law 87–653 effective December 1, 1962.

During fiscal years 1957 through 1966, we submitted to the Congress 177 reports disclosing that Government costs on negotiated prime contracts and subcontracts were increased by about $130 million. The increased costs resulted primarily from the failure of contracting officials in negotiating contract prices to obtain accurate, current, or complete cost or pricing data upon which to establish fair and reasonable prices. As a result of certain of these reports, the Congress enacted Public Law 87–653 to provide safeguards for the Government generally where competition is lacking.

The findings summarized in the accompanying report were disclosed by the first phase of our review of 242 negotiated prime contracts and subcontracts awarded to 85 prime contractors and 89 subcontractors after October 1964. This examination was performed at 18 military procurement agencies and 31 prime contractor plants during the period April 1965 to June 1966.

The second phase of our review, which is currently in progress, includes an evaluation of the practices of the military services in negotiating the prices of 127 of the prime contracts we reviewed in the first phase. These contracts were selected for further detailed review because of our findings that procurement officials had no record identifying the cost or pricing data submitted and certified by the contractor in support of significant cost estimates included in the contract prices. In this second phase of our examination, we performed examinations at 79 prime contractor plants during 1965 and 1966. Our findings on this review will be the subject of further reporting to the Congress in the near future.

We found that 185 of the 242 procurements examined in the first phase were awarded under requirements of the law and the procurement regulations for submission of cost or pricing data and a certificate that the data submitted were accurate, complete, and current. However, in 165 of these awards, we found that agency officials and prime contractors had no record identifying the cost or pricing data submitted and certified by offerors in support of significant cost estimates.

As a result it appears that the certificate is not wholly effective since it may be impracticable to establish whether the offeror had submitted inaccurate, incomplete, or noncurrent data in instances where he had not identified the data he had certified. Further, the Government's rights under the defective-pricing-data clause required by the law to be included in these contracts may be impaired since in such cases it may be impracticable for the contracting officer to establish that erroneous data were relied on in the negotiation if data were not submitted or made a matter of record by the offeror.

We also found that, in the remaining 57 of the 242 procurements examined, agency and contractor records of the negotiation indicated that cost or pricing data were not obtained apparently because the prices were based on adequate price competition or on established catalog or market prices of commercial items sold in substantial quantities to the general public.

Public Law 87-653 waives the requirement for obtaining certified cost or pricing data under such circumstances. However, the records of these awards did not contain an explanation by the contracting officials of why cost or pricing data were not required and the reasons for determining that the prices were based on adequate price competition or on catalog or market prices of commercial items. As a result, it could not be ascertained whether the bases for these determinations were consistent with criteria established in the Armed Services Procurement Regulation.

During our examination of subcontract awards, we found that prime contractors also had no record identifying the cost or pricing data submitted by subcontractors in support of significant cost estimates even though agency contracting officials were required, under negotiated prime contracts other than firm fixed-price type, to ascertain that such data were being obtained. Therefore, there also appears to be a need for thorough reviews by agency administrative contracting officials to ensure that prime contractors are obtaining adequate cost and pricing data, where appropriate, in the award of subcontracts.

During our review, we found that agency officials in awarding prime contracts were not requiring prime contractors to use a new Contract Pricing Proposal Form ((DD Form 633) dated December 1, 1964. This form contains instructions to offerors which, if properly implemented, could, in our opinion, go a long way toward achieving compliance with the procurement regulations implementing the law. The Department of Defense has now taken steps to correct this matter. However, during our review of subcontracts, we found that prime contractors were not being required to use the new form in obtaining proposals from their subcontractors.

We proposed that the Department of Defense clarify its procurement regulations to provide that, where cost or pricing data are required in the award of prime contracts and subcontracts, agency officials and prime contractors be required to obtain from offerors written identification of the cost or pricing data, as defined in the regulations, in support of cost estimates along with certificates specifically covering the identified data and to retain such records in procurement files.

We proposed also that the prescribed certificate be revised to require the contractor to certify that a written identification of the cost or pricing data, as defined in the regulation, provided or otherwise made available to the contracting officer or his representative in support of the proposal, has been submitted and that such data are accurate, complete, and current as of the date agreed upon by the parties (which shall be as close to the date of agreement on the negotiated price as is practicable).

Further, we proposed that the Department of Defense take appropriate actions to emphasize and clarify certain existing requirements dealing primarily with the application of Public Law 87-653 to the award of subcontracts and to ensure that agency and contractor officials are complying with them.

The Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Procurement) advised us that a special group had been appointed under the guidance of his office to study all the material contained in our report. He assured us that the necessity of providing additional guidance on the subject of submittal and retention of data or identification in lieu of submittal will be considered. He indicated, however, that it was not possible to forecast the exact outcome of this study.

We have also completed a similar examination covering 138 contracts awarded by 15 offshore procurement agencies to prime contractors in Europe and the Far East. We have advised the Secretary of Defense of our findings which are essentially similar to those described above.

We also have submitted to the Department of Defense for comment similar findings stemming from our review at seven Army Corps of Engineer procurement offices in the United States and at six overseas locations of 195 contracts for construction work.

This report is being issued so that the Congress may be informed of the need for the Department of Defense to improve the effectiveness of its administration of the cost and pricing data provisions expressed by the Congress in the enactment of Public Law 87-653.

Copies of this report are being sent to the Director, Bureau of the Budget, and to the Secretary of Defense.

ELMER B. STAATS,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Summary of our findings

Findings	Number of procurements examined[1]		
	Total	Prime contracts	Subcontracts
Cost or pricing data required by Public Law 87-653 and ASPR:			
Inadequate or not submitted or identified in writing	165	102	63
Submitted or identified in writing and substantially adequate	20	14	6
Subtotal	185	116	69
Cost or pricing data not required under Public Law 87-653 and ASPR apparently because prices were considered to be based on—			
Adequate price competition	45	17	28
Catalog or market prices of commercial items	12	8	4
Subtotal	57	25	32
Total	242	141	101

[1] Details relating to the procurements covered by our examination were provided to the Department of Defense in a preliminary draft of this report dated June 1966.

Our findings relating to the 141 prime contracts we examined indicated a need for more extensive and thorough reviews by Department of Defense procurement management review and internal audit officials of the practices of contracting officials to ensure that the requirements of procurement regulations and Public Law 87-653 are being implemented. By letter dated October 29, 1965 (B-39995), we advised the Secretary of Defense of the results of our review of prime contracts. On January 26, 1966, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Procurement) advised us that procurement management review groups in the Department of Defense had been alerted to our findings and that a limited number of special reviews had been made. (See app. II.)

He advised us further that provisions for determining whether agency officials are requiring certified cost or pricing data in the award of contracts have been incorporated in future review programs for special attention and that the military services are initiating additional guidance and training in this area.

Our findings relating to the 101 subcontracts we reviewed indicated a need for more extensive and thorough reviews by agency contracting officers to ensure that prime contractors are obtaining appropriate cost or pricing data from subcontractors, where required, in the award of subcontracts. Current ASPR provisions require that, under negotiated contracts other than firm fixed price, the contracting officer ascertain whether such data are being obtained by prime contractors in reviewing and consenting to individual subcontracts and in approving the contractor's purchasing system. Even though these reviews by agency contracting officers were required, we found that prime contractors had no record of the cost or pricing data submitted or identified by subcontractors in support of significant cost estimates.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An amendment has been offered by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, would the Senator get the floor and then yield to me briefly, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, is the issue pending before the Senate the supplemental military authorization bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is. Senate 665, the authorization for the supplemental appropriations for the Vietnam military activity.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is not the debt ceiling item?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is coming in shortly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The

subject before the Senate is S. 665, as stated by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CRIME SKYROCKETS IN NATION'S CAPITAL CITY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the February 22 morning newspaper in Washington, D.C., Washington Post, published yet another in a long series of reports by the Metropolitan Police Department on the rising incidence of serious crime in the Nation's Capital City. But the rate of the crime increase is not just another mere percentage rise. As reported by the Post, the crime incidence during January of this year climbed 42 percent above the rate reported for January 1966.

I believe the people of this Nation will find this fact as shocking as I have. And I believe they will want to have a good look at just what is going on here. To help bring the facts back of this truly appalling crime increase into focus, I direct attention to the February 21 article, also in the Washington Post, "Woman Robbed, Raped, in Church," which reported the rape and robbery in the middle of the afternoon, February 20, of a young secretary at work in a Northwest Washington church.

I ask unanimous consent that these newspaper articles be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 21, 1967]

Woman Robbed, Raped in Church

A young secretary of a Northwest Washington church was robbed and raped in the church yesterday afternoon, police reported.

The woman was working in the office when a man entered about 3:30 p.m. and inquired about a job. The secretary told him to return in an hour, when the pastor would be there, according to police.

The man left, but returned a few minutes later, brandished a knife and demanded money. She gave him $2.

The assailant then forced her to the women's restroom where he warned, "If you do what I say, you won't get hurt," and then attacked her, police said. The woman was treated at D.C. General Hospital.

District of Columbia Crime Rises 42 Percent Above January 1966

Paced by a 64.2 per cent increase in armed robberies, the incidence of serious crime in Washington last month rose 42.4 per cent over January, 1966.

Auto thefts also continued their trend upwards, registering a 61.4 per cent increase over the number reported during the previous January, the Metropolitan Police Department's monthly summary disclosed.

Only one of the seven major crime index categories decreased. Criminal homicides were down 30 per cent for the comparable periods, with 14 reported last month as compared with the 20 reported in January of last year.

The report showed a total of 2,965 serious crimes reported last month as compared with 2,082 the previous January.

The rest of the January summary (with 1966 figures in parentheses) follows:

Rape, 13 (9)—up 44 per cent; robbery, 473 (288)—up 64.2 per cent; aggravated assault, 247 (168)—up 47 per cent; burglary (housebreaking), 1,165 (842)—up 38.4 per cent; larceny (over $50), 464 (390)—up 19 per cent, and auto theft, 589 (365)—up 61.4 per cent.

DETERRENT VALUE OF SWIFT, SURE PUNISHMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, crime reports, messages to Congress, newspaper editorials, magazine articles, and myriad other forms of communication have analyzed and discussed the need for and means of reducing crime in the United States. But there has been all-too-pronounced failure to realize the deterrent value of swift, sure punishment for criminal acts.

James J. Kilpatrick, in his discussion of the findings of the National Crime Commission, stated in his article, "National Crime Report as a Whole Falls Short," carried in the February 21 edition of the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star:

> But nowhere does the report suggest that the prospect of swift and certain punishment may also be a useful weapon in the war upon crime.

I agree with Mr. Kilpatrick that it is a serious failure when emphasis is not given to the basic fact that the criminal is considerably more apt to pursue a career of crime when he knows there is not necessarily to be any punishment for his criminal acts. I believe that the citizenry of our Nation would feel a lot safer if the climate of the times reflected more of the sentiment that swift and sure punishment will be given to those who break the law.

I ask unanimous consent that this newspaper article be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

National Crime Report as a Whole Falls Short

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Sunday's report of the National Crime Commission contains so much that is good and wise and constructive that one gropes uncertainly to explain just why the report as a whole falls short. It is a matter of tone, of emphasis, of attitude. A feeling will not go away that the commission's staff talked with too many sociologists, and not with nearly enough cops.

The report emerges as a textbook. Indeed, it is set in the double-column design, complete with largely useless photographs, familiar in every classroom. The approach is pedantic, professorial, antiseptic. The crime that is dissected in these statistical pages is a bloodless crime; all the passion has drained out; the outraged victims are embalmed in tabulated boxes.

Nowhere in the report—or almost nowhere—does the commission perceive any nexus between crime and punishment. The very word "punishment" seldom appears. Instead, the commission addresses itself chiefly to crime and "penalty," as if the consequence of crime somehow ranked with going down two, doubled, on a three-spade bid.

In only one brief portion of the 340-page report, if a fast first reading conveys an accurate impression, is there any strong suggestion that law-abiding people have rights that ought to be made secure. This is not even in the body of the report. It appears in a supplementary statement at the very end—and only seven of the 19 commissioners were willing to join in it.

As for the rest, the body of the report implies that law-abiding people are themselves largely to blame for the criminal sickness that afflicts society. They have failed "to motivate" the young hoodlum; they arouse temptation by leaving keys in unlocked cars; they suffer from petty thefts through their own carelessness in leaving their property lying around loose.

The report goes to some pains to belabor obvious truth, that "crime" covers a multitude of sins. It is obvious, and scarcely needed saying at any length, that tax evasion and rape at knife-point are quite different crimes, and require different procedures of law enforcement. The commission itself acknowledges that public concern is not directed at such offenses as bribery and violation of antitrust laws, but rather at crime in the streets. Yet the report's medical-school approach leaves us to contemplate the different fields of crime as no more than desiccated strains of staphylococci.

Doubtless there is something to be said for this laboratory view. Surely few persons would challenge some of the elementary correlations that are drawn in the commission's report. Slums breed crime, and crime breeds slums, and there is at least a reasonable hypothesis to be advanced that if we cure the slums, we cure the crime. But one wonders, all the same, if the commission's diagnosis is correctly drawn.

"Society insists that individuals are responsible for their actions," says the report, "and the criminal process operates on that assumption. However, society has not devised ways for ensuring that all its members have the ability to assume responsibility. It has let too many of them grow up untaught, unmotivated, unwanted . . ."

But nowhere does the report suggest that the prospect of swift and certain punishment may also be a useful weapon in the war upon crime.

These reservations having been expressed it is only fair to say that much of the report, and especially those sections dealing with improvement in police procedures and with judicial reform, ought to command the sober attention of civic groups and bar associations across the country. One quite minor recommendation—that police boxes be lighted, unlocked and designated as emergency telephones—makes great good sense. A National Criminal Research Foundation and a National Criminal Justice Statistics Center probably could contribute significantly to better law enforcement. The commission's concept of "Youth Service Bureaus," located chiefly in slum areas, may be idealistic and it may duplicate other community services, but there is much merit in the idea of working effectively with disadvantaged youngsters before they turn to serious crime.

The figures compiled by the commission on the incidence of crime are as familiar as they are appalling. They need no recapitulation. What matters to the average citizen is not so much the abstract of statistical problem, or even the sociologists' long-range solution. His concern goes to the mugger, the rapist, the dope-crazed thief, the arrogant young punks who infest his streets. What can be done about them now? One of the commission's answers is to provide textbooks for slum schools that are written in slum English. Okay, okay. But what can be done tomorrow, next week, next month, to lock up the hoods and thieves?

WE ARE LOSING THE WAR AGAINST HUNGER

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the world is running out of food.

That is a fact of life, and of death. Not just death for the hundreds of thousands who are starving routinely today, but for hundreds of millions—a scale comparable only to nuclear holocaust—within the next three decades.

Unless we truly fulfill President Johnson's promise to lead the world in a war against hunger, we face disintegration of our society and societies everywhere. "A hungry people," Seneca said, "listens not to reason, nor cares for justice." There can be no peace or safety on a planet ravaged by famine. Nikita Khrushchev told Red China that if there was nuclear war, the survivors would envy the dead. So it is with starvation.

The blunt fact is that population is outstripping food supplies. We are producing people faster than we can feed them, just as the English economic philosopher Thomas Malthus predicted in 1798, that we would. In the Malthusian equation:

> Population, when unchecked, increases in a geometrical ratio. Subsistence only increases in an arithmetical ratio.

Thus—

> the power of population is indefinitely greater than the power in the earth to produce subsistence for men.

Malthus did not foresee the technological advances or the opening of vast new farmlands in America and elsewhere that would for a time discredit his prophecies. Yet unless trends now gathering force are checked, the Malthusian nightmare will become a reality.

It is not that the earth lacks the capacity, or modern farmers the know-how, to produce subsistence for men, but rather that governments lack the will and the courage to bend their efforts to the task. Horrified historians may record that as the world sped on a collision course with starvation, its great powers fiddled with a war in Vietnam, a crisis in Berlin, a contest in arsenal building and a race to the moon.

Most Americans, discarding enough leftovers to still the hunger pangs of at least one underdeveloped nation, find it difficult to comprehend chronic hunger. Some are aware that thousands die when crop failures cause food shortages—even millions, as in the famines of India and China in the early 1940's. But—fresh from the groaning boards of the holidays and vowing to watch their waistlines in the new year—few realize the dimensions of the silent crisis now taking shape, soon to relegate to insignificance the high-priority issues of Vietnam, Berlin, arms, and space.

In 1961, while studying food problems in Latin America for the late President Kennedy, I experienced my first direct encounter with hunger. I still visualize the scene inside a small hut in Brazil's stricken northeast, where a young mother sat on the floor with her family at their noon meal. Two emaciated children lay ill, their heads resting in her lap. A younger child had died the previous day of smallpox complicated by the debilitating malnutrition plaguing the entire village.

> She is the symbol of the underdeveloped country.

Said a young Brazilian economist as we stared at the shapeless, prematurely aged mother.

In the following months, when I served as director of the U.S. food-for-peace program, I was to witness that scene countless times—in congested slums and benighted villages around the globe.

Hunger is not an occasional visitor but a constant companion to half of mankind. Half a billion humans suffer from too little food. Another billion lead brief half-lives because their diets lack proper proportions of protein, minerals, or vitamins. Three million children die each year from diseases induced or complicated by malnutrition. Unquestionably, hunger is the chief killer of man.

The ever-present companions of malnutrition—lethargy, disease, and early death—generate a vicious circle of listless, ineffective humans, powerless to break out of their misery. Yet they are capable of breeding more misery for later generations. The combination—a citizenry weakened by hunger and a mushrooming populace pressing ever harder against inadequate resources—is the chief barrier to development in the emerging nations. Students too lethargic to study, workers too weak to do a day's labor, mothers too burdened to care for their offspring—these are the most urgent concerns of a world striving for modernization. If anyone doubts that hunger is not the most painful fact of life for these multitudes, let him experiment with a daily diet of a bowl of rice or a crust of bread.

What are the chief factors behind this agony?

Fact No. 1: Food production is increasing at a rate of 1 percent annually, while population is growing at a rate of 2 percent.

This is the Malthusian equation in stark relief. Its meaning is clear: We are now losing the race between available food and the growing number of stomachs. It has taken mankind since the Garden of Eden to achieve a population of 3 billion; but before the end of the century—less than 33 years hence—world population will exceed 6 billion. When one considers that less than a billion people inhabited the earth in 1800 and that this figure was not doubled until 1930, the current rate of growth is phenomenal. These statistics testify to the marvels of modern science in extending human life, but they also remind us we are not coping with the population-food imbalance. There are more hungry people in the world today than there have ever been.

Fact No. 2: Population is growing fastest in areas where food production lags most.

World population, increasing by 70 to 80 million each year, will climb 1.2 billion or more by 1960, less than 13 years away. Five out of six of these people will be in the less-developed areas of the world—Asia, Africa, Latin America—where food is scarcest.

Latin America, with a human growth rate of 3 percent, will be confronted three decades hence by 600 million people competing for resources that now inadequately feed 250 million. Just 30 years ago, Latin America sold more grain abroad than any other region, including North America; today, its per capita grain production is down 16 percent, and it must import to survive.

Much the same is true in Asia—most notably in India and China—and in large areas of Africa. India's population has increased by 134 million in the last 15 years. As projected, it will rise from 500 to 700 million in the next 15 years. Unchecked, this would be catastrophic.

Fact No. 3: Food output is hardest to increase in areas where population pressure is most intense.

Today, only 10 countries produce more food than they consume. The United States in recent years has turned out more than 50 percent of the surplus food in the world, with Canada and Australia providing most of the balance. Argentina, France, New Zealand, Burma, Thailand, Rumania, and South Africa produce lesser amounts. These countries, endowed with a moderate birth rate and high food productivity, embrace only 15 percent of the world's people; the rest largely inhabit Asia, Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and the food-importing countries of Europe.

The heavily populated, underdeveloped regions of the world suffer from a number of handicaps in food production. Asia has only four-tenths of an acre of cropland per person as compared to 1.2 acres in the United States and Canada—a ratio three times more favorable for North America. India, with 2.2 percent of the world's land area, has 15 percent of the population.

Even more significantly, 80 percent of the world's inhabitants still live in primitive rural areas characterized by crude hand labor, an illiterate populace, an archaic land ownership and tax structure, meager credit facilities, ineffective leadership, and a lack of such modern farming assets as fertilizer, improved seeds, irrigation, and pesticides.

Given these enormous barriers to development, there is only a fighting chance, not a sure bet, that agricultural productivity can be speeded up and population growth slowed down in time to avert catastrophe by 1980. There is no doubt that man has the technical capacity to lift food production around the globe. But modern, scientific farming involves fundamental changes in the social structure of a nation, and that is a painfully slow process. Illiterate peasants are not likely to respond quickly to the demands of either scientific agriculture or family planning.

These peasant communities, comprising four-fifths of the world's people, are the prime target of international communism. Their counterparts provided the seedbed for the sweeping Communist revolutions that seized Russia and China. Marx thought communism would come as the logical next step after the advanced stages of capitalism. Instead, it came to the primitive peasant societies of China and Russia.

The ambitious leaders of China now call, not for industrial workers of the world to unite, but for rural people to launch a long-term struggle against the urbanized Western world. It is odd that such an appeal should come from Red China, like Russia a failure in agriculture, a field in which we excel fantastically. We can and must take the lead in a "people's war" against hunger—with corn instead of cannon, with farmers instead of marines, with agricultural technology instead of precision bombing, with food instead of fear. This is the most important war of our time.

What, then, are the best battle plans for victory in a world war on hunger? What are our sources of strength and weakness? In what combination do we use our weapons?

The first step to victory must be a clear recognition of the vital role that agriculture plays in our civilization. Unfortunately, the vast developing continents—Asia, Latin America, and Africa—have been slow to accept the fundamental importance of a strong agricultural base for economic development. Moreover, until recently, American technical advisers shared the view of leaders in India, Egypt, Brazil, and elsewhere that the first order of business should be a steel mill or an advanced transportation system, and not rural development. Seemingly forgotten, in the grab for something spectacular, was the growth of our own national greatness from a strong agricultural base.

With only 6.5 percent of our population engaged in farming, compared with twice that percentage in the Soviet Union, the bulk of our labor force is free to work in urban industry, business, and the professions. One American farmer can feed 37 city dwellers; one Soviet farmer, only six. And the American does it more cheaply than any other farmer. The U.S. food basket takes a smaller percentage of the family budget—18 percent—than in any other country at any time in history. It compares, for example, with 29 percent in Britain, 45 percent in Italy, 80 percent in India.

Farmers in the United States have been unfairly criticized because, during the 1950's, their phenomenal efficiency resulted in Government accumulation of surplus stocks. But today, food surpluses no longer exist. Voluntary acreage controls, cropland retirement, and increased exports—including an expanded food-for-peace program—have reduced food stocks to a level barely adequate for our own national reserve. Our once-bulging wheat stocks are down from 1.4 billion bushels in 1960 to 400 million. Corn and other feed-grain supplies have been cut in half. Soybeans, an essential protein source, are all but gone. Dairy products are so scarce that the Government has limited the overseas child and school feeding programs of CARE, Church World Service, Catholic Relief Services, Lutheran World Relief, and other voluntary agencies. Food-for-peace shipments of wheat have been cut 25 percent because of scant U.S. reserves.

The composite wheat, corn, and soybean reserve of the United States would not meet our needs for more than 90 days if disaster wiped out our annual production.

President Johnson has suggested setting aside a national strategic food reserve. If we were to establish food reserves sufficient for 6 months' consumption, we would have to end our overseas food-for-peace program immediately or drive for much greater production.

We have, in the Food for Peace Act of 1966, a means of raising food production to meet food needs abroad. The act removed the provision of Public Law 480 that limited food grants and concessional sales to surplus commodities. The Secretary of Agriculture has invited farmers to begin cultivating half of the 60 million acres idled under Government control programs. The remaining 30 million acres probably will be called into cultivation soon.

Congress has authorized the use of up to $7.4 billion over the next 2 years in launching a world war on hunger. The 1966 act highlights self-help in the developing nations and endorses population-control measures essential to the solution of the food and population crisis. By harnessing future production to the effort, it ends the paradox of surplus American food production in a hungry world, and it should do much to allay suspicion that Public Law 480 is a license to dump unwanted farm surpluses.

The overwhelming congressional approval of the Food for Peace Act was a magnificent response to the President's call to action in 1966:

> I propose that the United States lead the world in a war against hunger.

I am deeply concerned, however, about the timidity with which we are now implementing that war.

The ink was hardly dry on the President's signature before the Department of Agriculture let it be known that, despite the act:

> The total levels of food assistance in the near future are not likely to be substantially different from those in recent years.

This was certainly not the assurance farmers need to produce the quantities of food required. Nor is a price-support level of $1.25 a bushel adequate protection for farmers who are asked to gamble on the market impact of 16 million additional acres of wheat.

In spite of the rhetoric, the war on hunger began with a retreat. The whole program was floundering on an administrative merry-go-round. While there are hopeful signs of organizational efforts to implement the new act this year, the fact remains that the administration launched the most important war of our time—the war on hunger—without a chief of staff and without paying the troops: the U.S. food producers.

Instead of strengthening the hand of the Food for Peace Director, the administration took him out of the White House in 1965 and put him in a closet at the State Department. Then, when the 1966 act was passed, the administrative turmoil accelerated until Richard Reuter, my capable successor, resigned in dismay to avoid being pulled apart in a bureaucratic tug-of-war.

In Vietnam, we are willing to pour a million dollars in ammunition into the jungle if one VC sticks up his head. But hunger threatens to swallow civilization and we are hesitant to mount a solid counteroffensive.

Everybody is talking about it, and nobody is in charge, unless the President himself is going to direct Food for Peace personally. After grappling with that program as director for 2 years, I am convinced that even so capable a man as President Johnson cannot run a war in Vietnam and manage the White House and still lead the world in a victorious war against hunger.

Where is the General Westmoreland to lead the war on hunger? Where is the necessary incentive to farmers and technicians? Where is the Manila Conference to rally allies among other affluent nations?

We are spending seven-tenths of 1 percent of our gross national product for food and development assistance. This is only one-sixth the cost of our military operations in Vietnam. And the irony is that by not facing up to this overriding challenge of our time, we may be allowing the creation of many Vietnams.

Once the crucial nature of agriculture is comprehended and our bureaucracy put in order, the attack on hunger must move on two fronts.

First, the short-term effort—over the next 10 to 15 years—must be to make more effective use of our farm abundance abroad.

This will require not only stepping up our production at home, which is the easy part of the task; it will also require more technical guidance to the receiving countries in building up their port facilities, their storage structures and their entire system of food distribution.

In most cases, it is preferable, if not essential, for developing countries to supply most of their own food needs. But, for the foreseeable future, they cannot increase production fast enough to meet their needs, and thus must rely on shipments from the United States and other surplus food areas. Neither is it likely that efforts now underway to trim population growth in India and elsewhere can be pushed fast enough to have a marked effect before 1980. And so American farmers must carry a heavy responsibility in holding the line against hunger in the next decade and a half, while developing countries are reorganizing their agriculture and curbing population growth.

The second and more permanent front in the war against hunger is the urgently needed acceleration of food production abroad, combined with more energetic family planning measures. We and other advanced States must assist the developing world to undertake the kind of agricultural revolution we have experienced in the last 100 years. But the accent must be on self-help. There is a critical need for the knowledge and skills of our agricultural technicians, research scientists, extension workers, and experienced farmers. An American Farmers Corps, consisting of retired farmers or working farmers willing to take leave of their own farms for a time, could perform an invaluable service abroad. There is great need, too, for more fertilizer, pesticides, irrigation development, hybrid seed, and feed-mixing equipment. Enlightened landownership and tax policies and low-cost credit are essential to rural development. So is an improved system of rural education. Special programs are also needed in adaptive research on tropical agriculture, the development of high-yielding plants and the exploitation of fish-protein sources in the sea.

These types of aid are not cheap, nor are they simple to implement. This is also true of family planning assistance. But all are less expensive than military hardware and much more constructive and helpful. As we watched our two impoverished friends, India and Pakistan, shooting at each other with American-made tanks a year ago, it was difficult to avoid the conclusion that both need our food, our farm know-how, and population assistance more than they need our guns.

U.S. Government aid to the developing countries will be heavily supplemented by the private overseas investment and skills of private American fertilizer, farm machinery, and food and feed processing firms. For example, International Minerals & Chemical Corp., under the leadership of its dynamic president Thomas M. Ware is presently building a huge fertilizer plant in India. Quaker Oats is pushing for the adoption in Central America of its recently developed cereal mix, "Incaparina." The president of the Ralston Purina Co., Mr. R. Hal Dean, recently told a convocation of fellow business leaders:

> We must utilize our proven management abilities to augment the efforts of government. . . . I foresee a new era of coordination of private enterprise efforts with those of governmental aid programs.

Aside from the political and moral gains that would flow from a broad-scale attack on world hunger, the economic benefits to the American economy would be great. We are now spending $1.6 billion a year to reimburse farmers for retiring cropland and reducing production. By strenuous, expensive programs we have managed to take 60 million acres of farmland out of production. If we began now to divert a portion of the farm-control budget into the purchase, shipment and distribution of farm commodities abroad, we could double our food-for-peace effort with little increase in overall expenditures. The impact on the American economy would be much better than our present cropland-retirement programs. Idle farms and idle acres and idle farm labor means a loss of income to every farm community. In contrast, full farm production leads to the purchase of more farm machinery, more trucks and automobiles, more gasoline and tires, more seed, fertilizer, lime, and equipment of all kinds. Economists at South Dakota State University have told me that bringing the State's presently idled farmland back into cultivation for expanded overseas exports would add $120 million to the income of South Dakota farmers and would generate another $120 million annually on our main streets. Robert Liebenow, president of the Corn Industries Research Foundation, estimates that expanded food-for-peace exports in the next few years will cause U.S. farmers to add $3 billion a year to the $13 billion they are now spending for supplies and equipment. Increased exports would also be of inestimable value to our railroads, ports, and merchant shipping industry.

As a Member of Congress, I have supported acreage controls combined with price supports because such programs are essential until we develop greatly improved distribution methods to use our abundance abroad. It will doubtless continue to be necessary, given the unorganized pattern of American farm producers, to have a farm price stabilization program. American farmers are entitled to fair prices for the additional production they are called upon to supply. By large-scale cropland retirement is not an acceptable permanent farm policy for the United States in a hungry world.

Furthermore, the strengthening of the diets and the agricultural economy of the developing countries, far from removing them as potential American markets, would open the way for new U.S. long-range markets. Those nations with advancing agricultural and industrial productivity are also our best commercial customers. Canada, with a small fraction of the population of India, is a larger American customer than India. After benefiting from U.S. food and economic aid in the postwar period, Japan has become the largest purchaser of American farm produce.

The recently reoriented U.S. food-for-peace program commits our country to a world war on want. Our Secretary of Agriculture has authorized a 30-percent increase in wheat acreage allotments and a 10-percent increase in rice acreage for the current crop year. Feed grains, soybeans, and dairy products will also be stepped up to meet overseas needs. What is not so clear is the determination of the emerging nations to face up to the food-population imperative. The United States can contribute greatly to the battle against hunger, but long-range results will be determined not so much by decisions in Washington as by decisions in New Delhi, Cairo, and Brasilia. America and other advanced states have enough resources and know-how to lead the initial attacks against the ramparts of hunger, but victory or defeat will be determined largely by the actions and the tenacity of those vast armies of humans now caught up in the revolutions of the developing world.

As in all wars, the motivation of the soldier in the ranks will be the most essential factor. Farmers the world around love the land and the planting, cultivation, and harvesting of crops. But farming is so arduous that it demands the dedication of an interested owner who is assured of a reasonable return from his investment and toil. Neither the new Communist collectives nor the archaic feudal landlord ways still persisting in much of the world provide these essential conditions; nor have we yet provided an adequate profit incentive to stimulate farmers to achieve the additional production needed to win the war on hunger. Just as we offer an armaments manufacturer a cost plus profit assurance to secure the weapons of war; so must the warrior against hunger be compensated for his labor and investment.

The farmer supplying food for the tables of the world and transferring his know-how to the food producers of a developing world will be a greater hero than the astronaut landing on the moon.

Robert Ardrey writes in "The Territorial Imperative":

> If we think back we shall recall that farm and farmer have been the central problem of civilization, even as they have been its central cause.

A POLITICAL SPRING

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, with the approach of spring, the great rivers and lakes of the northern regions of our Nation are gradually being freed of the ice that has rendered them useless for commercial traffic.

I believe we are witnessing a similar phenomenon in international politics—a political springtime that could restore the throbbing life of commerce between East and West, a commerce long frozen by the uncompromising cold war.

The Atlanta Constitution, a fine, thoughtful newspaper, shares this optimism and suggests editorially two ways in which this deliberative body can hasten the thaw—by approving the consular treaty and by easing East-West trade restrictions.

I ask that this editorial be included in the Record. It is a message we would be wise to heed.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Atlanta Constitution, Feb. 14, 1967]

We Can Aid East-West Thaw

If anyone had predicted a year ago that West Germany and Rumania would open embassies in each other's capitals this winter, he most likely would have been ridiculed. Yet recently in Bonn these countries agreed to establish full diplomatic relations.

This latest development in East-West relations in Europe is but another phase of a thaw that has been developing for some time. It also is new proof that the East European Communist bloc is not as solid as many people think it is.

Last month a delegation of West German Foreign Ministry officials visited Prague, and there are indications that Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Bulgaria are interested in trade and better relations with the West. More and more these countries are declaring their independence from Moscow.

True, none of them are inclined to stomp hard on Moscow's toes. But Rumania's agreement with West Germany followed closely a typical Russian diatribe attacking "neo-nazism and militarism" in West Germany. Moscow's position has been that any diplomatic ties with Bonn should await West Germany's recognition of East Germany.

While the Soviet Union isn't on the verge of making overtures to Bonn, it also has been trying to ease tensions with the West. Premier Kosygin arrived in London last week, President Podgorny went to Rome last month. There are talks between the Soviets and the United States about a consular treaty and talks between the United States and East European countries about lifting trade restrictions.

There also are strong indications that much of Eastern Europe is eager to see meaningful negotiations begin to end the war in Vietnam. Many leaders in these countries are no less appalled than the Soviets over Red China's current upheaval and bellicosity. While turning to the West, they apparently are looking anxiously over their shoulders at their former ally in Asia.

While there are many "nervous nellies" in Congress opposing any relaxation in trade and diplomatic barriers between this country and East Europe, it would seem that now is the time to exploit this further fragmentation of the so-called "Soviet bloc." The consular treaty should be approved, and we should ease East-West trade restrictions.

CONSOLIDATION COAL CO. AND CONTINENTAL OIL CO. MERGER AFFECTS WEST VIRGINIA AND NATION—EDITORIALS CITED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, last year when the merger of Consolidation Coal Co. with Continental Oil Co. was announced, considerable comment was made on the degree of benefit which would come to West Virginia and our Nation from this transaction.

It was noted that the future of the fossil-fuel field is an unlimited horizon—the free world's needs for economic sources of fossil energies in electrical generation, transportation, and other basic industries will be doubled by 1980. Yet this unlimited horizon is not without challenges. There is a continuing demand for research in new uses of fossil fuels; there is the pressing need for development of air and water pollution control measures; and there is the need for modernization to keep fossil fuels competitive.

Mr. President, the joining of Consolidation Coal and Continental Oil constitutes a system with a high potential for research and development, which holds great promise for the continued upsurge of the coal industry in West Virginia and other States. Further, the total energy company will be an active participant in meeting the increasing demands for all forms of energy in not only the highly industrialized countries of the world, but also in the new developing nations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two meaningful editorials in the Wheeling (W. Va.) News-Register and the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times, Sept. 19, 1966]

A Fruitful Marriage

One of the major assets Consolidation Coal Co. brings to its new owner, Continental Oil Co., is an absolutely first class management team. All are in the very prime of life, mature enough as a result of their experience but still at an age when they can be counted on for many years of service.

Heading the Consol organization is John Corcoran, who recently moved up as president. Working closely with him are three executive vice presidents, Howard Hardesty of Fairmont, Jim Huegel and Bill Poundstone. Each is a specialist in his particular field and the combination should be a winning one.

There is still room in the Continental organization though, for men like George H. Love and G. Albert Shoemaker. Love will continue as Consol's board chairman and will become a director of the parent company. Shoemaker, just retired as Consol president, becomes consultant for coal on the Continental staff in New York City.

At a full-dress press conference in New York last Friday, L. F. McCullom, Continental chairman, remarked that he had persuaded Love to stay at the same salary he was getting. When the Consol chairman—who also is chairman of the Chrysler Corp. board—got a chance to say a word, he noted that after 65 an executive can't draw a pay check, but he indicated he was glad to remain in the business.

McCullom is a hearty Texan with a quick wit and an engaging personality. Doubtless he can crack the whip if necessary, in the first joint exposure of Continental-Consol he was the picture of affability. Beneath the surface however, it can be easily seen that "Mister Mac," as his people call him, has a mind like a steel trap.

Intricate as the deal was, there weren't many questions about the new combine that McCullom and Love couldn't answer without looking around for assistance. Only when it came to matters of research into the production of gasoline from coal and the development of shale and tar sands as oil producers did they turn to the experts.

The cordiality between McCullom and Love seems to carry down through the whole chain of command. The corporate marriage at which they officiated seems destined to be not only a history-making match but a fruitful one.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) News Register, Sept. 21, 1966]

Coal-Oil Merger To Benefit Area

In terms of money involved, last week's merger of Continental Oil Co. and Consolidation Coal Co., was indeed a staggering financial transaction, but in addition there was considerable significance for West Virginia and the Wheeling area attached to this deal.

Basically the merger means the uniting of two rival fuel sources, one being the eighth largest of America's oil-producing giants and the other the nation's largest coal producer. Involved was $538 million. Consol has 5.7 billion tons of coal in recoverable reserves; there is no comparable bank of energy on earth under the control of a single company.

As stated by L. F. McCullom, board chairman of Continental, "The most important aspect of this acquisition is the tremendous potential for coal and oil working together to meet worldwide demand."

He went on to point out that it no longer is a question of one source of energy pushing out another source. By 1980 the free world's need for economic sources of fossil energies for electrical generation, transportation and other basic industries will be doubled. West Virginia and the Appalachian coal fields are ideally situated to play an important role in the energy demands of the future. Pipelines from the southwest already cross the Appalachians and it will be no problem tying into them once research is completed on gasoline and pipeline gas from coal.

With this project the Wheeling area is directly involved. It is at Cresap, below Moundsville, that the $5 million pilot plant will test the coal to gasoline operation. When the testing is completed a vast new market will be opened for coal which could make the Appalachian coal fields a rival of the southwest petroleum and petrochemical industries.

In addition, Consol board chairman George Love, disclosed last week that eight or nine new mines are in the planning or development stage, including four in Northern West Virginia, one being the new Shoemaker Mine in Marshall County.

Consol's coal production last year was 50 million tons and it is expected to increase by 50 per cent in the next six or seven years. There is no question about King Coal's comeback and the future indeed is bright. Consol has firm commitments from power companies to build 86 new coal-burning plants in the United States between now and 1971. These plants will use approximately 140 million tons of coal per year—57 per cent of the total coal consumed by utilities in 1965.

Consol is in the forefront of research to upgrade coal to more versatile forms of energy, especially gasoline and high BTU gas. In terms of BTU content, Consol's coal reserves represent about two-thirds of the total equivalent reserves of liquid petroleum in the United States. The combined holdings now of Continental Oil and Consol represent enough energy to supply the world for hundreds of years.

All of this means that West Virginia and our own immediate area are in an excellent position to reap tremendous benefits from this merging of two primary fuel producers. We are on the threshold of a significant advance by the coal industry which should mean more jobs, more payrolls and improved prosperity in the years ahead. Indeed the outlook is most promising for coal, the magic mineral.

WEST VIRGINIA COMMUNITIES WIN TOP HONORS IN 1966 NATIONAL CLEANEST TOWN ACHIEVEMENT AWARDS CONTEST—SECRETARY FREEMAN ADVOCATES COUNTRYWIDE IMPROVEMENT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week, the 1966 National Cleanest Town winners were honored at a luncheon in Washington. Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman addressed the luncheon and his remarks were timely.

As Senate sponsor of the Highway Beautification Act and other programs designed to develop scenic areas in West Virginia and the Nation, I was pleased to attend the ceremony in which cities and towns in West Virginia were honored by being selected by the national bureau as winners in this annual competition.

Chairman Ray George and cochairmen, former Gov. W. W. Barron and State Treasurer John H. Kelly, of the Governor's cleanup and beautification program, were here for the awards presentation.

Also in attendance were Mrs. James Scarboro, West Virginia Department of Natural Resources; Mrs. Louise Miragliotta, West Virginia Department of Commerce; and Koder Collison, former director of the West Virginia Department of Commerce, and now with the Appalachian Regional Commission.

Secretary Freeman told the luncheon audience:

> There no longer remains a compelling reason why jobs cannot be distributed equitably throughout America . . . instead of building industry where people are—without considering whether they want to be there or even if it is good that so many of them are there—

we must start to build industry and provide jobs where the people want to be. There is beauty in the countryside. There is tranquility there and we have more than hope that tomorrow's America, urban and rural alike, can be a more orderly, tranquil and beautiful America. We have the beginnings of policy, programs and guidelines to do what must be done.

Mr. President, my home community of Elkins, W. Va., won the distinguished service award for 1966 in the continuing program for community improvement. Mayor and Mrs. Ralph S. Shepler, City Clerk and Mrs. George Sheets, and Willard "Bill" Phillips, Jr., executive secretary, West Virginia Pharmaceutical Association, and a former councilman active in civic programs, represented Elkins.

South Charleston and Oak Hill were presented with a like award. Mr. and Mrs. Sebert Price represented South Charleston and Mrs. Price, a councilwoman, accepted the award on behalf of the city. Mrs. Wanda Farrish accepted the award for Oak Hill.

Pleasant Dale was cited for honorable mention and Mrs. William Warner received the award. Mr. and Mrs. George St. Clair of that community were also in attendance.

Citizens of these areas are to be commended for their diligent work to increase the beauty of the cities and towns in which they live and work and I am gratified they have been rewarded for their efforts.

TWO IMPORTANT SENIOR CITIZENS BILLS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I speak today in support of two Republican sponsored bills, the enactment of which, I believe, will do a great deal to meet some of the pressing economic and social needs of our senior citizens.

Mr. President, no other group in our society has suffered more from the inflation of the past 18 months than have our senior citizens. Thus, they must view with considerable distress the prospect of the new Internal Revenue regulations which, commencing in 1967, will deny them a right that they had formerly enjoyed. Prior to this year, persons 65 years and over could claim as income tax deductions all medical expenses such as doctors fees and hospital bills and also all costs for medicines and drugs.

However, when medicare was enacted, this provision was eliminated on the grounds that because of the medicare program there was no longer any need to allow senior citizens to deduct all medical and drug expenses when filing their income tax returns. Thus, commencing in 1967 the law will require that only those medical expenses which exceed 3 percent of their adjusted gross income and only those costs for medicines and drugs which exceed 1 percent of their adjusted gross income can be claimed as deductions.

But the continued rise in the real cost of medical attention, now magnified by inflationary pressures, has clearly demonstrated the fallacy of this argument. S. 213 by the senior Senator from Illinois would restore to persons over 65 the right to deduct all medical and drug expenses without regard to the 3- and 1-percent restrictions. The arguments supporting enactment of this bill are many. The objections to it are necessarily few.

Another important proposal before the Senate, S. 291 by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would correct one of the present inequities of the social security system. Under present law those persons receiving social security retirement payments cannot earn more than $1,500 in outside income without having their benefit payments substantially reduced or entirely forfeited. This provision may have been appropriate at the time of its enactment, but it is now entirely outmoded. S. 291 proposes that social security recipients be allowed to earn up to $3,000 annually in outside earned income and still be permitted to draw full social security payments.

The enactment of this bill would first of all serve to recognize the tremendous increase in the cost of living over the past few years.

In addition, Mr. President, it will also serve to encourage the senior citizen to remain more actively employed for a much greater time. This would not only contribute to the elderly's own sense of self-dignity, but could also serve as a significant contribution to the American economy as a whole.

THE MANY PROBLEMS FACING THE AVIATION INDUSTRY

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, once again, as so often happens, the attention of Congress is being drawn to problems after they have grown to the proportion of an ugly crisis. There is no question but that many problems exist today in the airline industry. And these problems are not peculiar to the major airports and air carriers. Because of existing conditions, everyone from the largest commercial airline to the private pilot is being affected. It used to be advertised that "getting there is half the fun." Today that proposition is questionable.

Mr. President, our airports are jammed. Terminal facilities are overcrowded, ticket counters are overtaxed, baggage systems are overloaded, and parking lots are overcrowded. Even though air travel time has decreased 50 percent in the last 15 years, it now takes twice as long to get to and from the airport on the ground. Air traffic at our major airports during peak travel times is now overflowing. Such congestion causes frequent delays in scheduled take-off and landing times which bring inconvenience to the passengers. And let me emphasize that by the time present problems can be corrected, a whole new set of needs brought on by the advent of the giant 747 airliner and the SST will be upon us.

The Federal Airport Act of 1946 authorizes the Federal Government to pay up to 50 percent of the advance planning, engineering, and construction costs for airport development. However, this Federal money cannot be used for terminal buildings or for parking facilities. It is estimated that $2 billion is needed by 1970 to upgrade airport facilities. State, county, and local government units say they can supply approximately $1.3 billion. This would leave $700 million—far more than the annual $75 million now being allotted for airport development—to be funded by the Federal Government. Clearly the Federal Government must do more.

Mr. President, I have directed a letter to Mr. Alan S. Boyd, the very able Secretary of Transportation and a past member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, asking him to accelerate his planning on airport development in the new Department. But meanwhile Congress must take the initiative. We must see that the airports of our Nation keep pace with the jet age of the airline industry. For without the proper airport facilities, the benefits of the jumbo jets and the supersonic transports will be lost.

CONSUMER DOLLAR STUDY

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, as a newly appointed member of the Consumer Subcommittee of the Commerce Committee, I have recently been in touch with a number of consumer-oriented groups. They are all interested in various measures which the subcommittee is considering this session, such as household safety and credit advertising.

But each of these groups has another, major interest: in helping the consumer to spend his or her money wisely. Magazines and newsletters are published with this end in mind. Yet there is surprisingly little information made available about the way in which consumer money is spent.

One example is the widely discussed strike of Denver housewives against what they felt were high food prices last year. The strike was successful in many areas, including some supermarkets to abandon trading stamps and thereby lower their prices.

Another example: The consternation surrounding the rise in milk and bread prices last year. Separate studies by different groups, including the Agriculture Committees here in the Congress, indicated the same result: retailing costs had caused most of the increase, not farm prices.

It seems to me that this information, the breakdown of what part of the housewife's expenditure goes into whose pocket, ought to be available to all consumers. In this way, the housewife would be aware of the factors in the prices she is paying.

Some of this information is already available. The President appointed a National Commission on Food Marketing which made its report last June, dealing with the breakdown of the food dollars.

This report was strangely ignored. I read scarcely a single newspaper report about it, despite the fact that it showed that 68 cents of the food dollar goes to the marketing process, and only 32 cents to the farmer.

The report went into considerable depth in evaluating 21 of the most important food products. For processed vegetables, for example, here were the findings:

	Cents
Farmer	21
Building, etc	5
Containers	14
Labor	24
Advertising, promotion	6
Transportation	4
Administration	22
Marketing profits	4
Total	100

The Commission made similar findings for other products. The unfortunate fact is that this was a one-shot, limited evaluation of where the consumer's food dollar goes. This is the sort of information that ought to be compiled on nonfood products, at regular intervals.

For this reason, I will introduce legislation to authorize the Federal Trade Commission to compile a regular report on the component costs of various consumer items. I would anticipate that such a study would include the cost of raw materials; the cost of manufacturing; the cost of transportation, labor, marketing, overhead, advertising, promotion, and profit at all levels.

Such figures would, for example, tell how much of the grocery dollar is going to pay for trading stamps—a fact which every shopper ought to know. The National Commission's report indicated that over 2 percent of the cost of groceries is taken up in food stamp promotion. And since four out of every five chain supermarkets in the country use trading stamps, this fact should be of considerable significance to the housewife.

My proposal would include far more than groceries, however. It has been estimated that a budget of $1.5 million would permit a detailed study of some 65 commodities. Various food items, motor vehicles, shoes and other clothing items, gasoline, electrical appliances, and other products could be evaluated. These 65 commodities—and I am only suggesting figures which have been advanced before—would cover more than half of the average consumer's expenditure. It would not give the buyer a complete breakdown on everything he purchases, but it would give him a good indication of where his money is going.

The study would involve an analysis of the patterns of production and distribution. It would trace particular sample products, from their initial raw materials, through the manufacturing and distributing process, to the hands of the consumer. At each point the price would be determined. This is the approach which produced a most useful report for the national commission. The Federal Trade Commission can utilize the same method to produce a broader range and continuing study of consumer prices.

This is not a new proposal. A decade and a half ago, in fact, President Truman recommended a similar study, but a short-sighted Congress killed it. It seems to me that the need to provide this information is even more vital today than it was in 1952. I would hope that the Congress will pass the legislation to make such information available.

For this type of continuing study would benefit not only the consumer, but every segment of society. Labor would be able to point to its real productivity contributions. Management would have the same information available for collective bargaining. One of the strongest selling points of this type of plan in 1952 was that, by making precise figures available, it would dampen the wage-price spiral which then—as now—threatened the economy.

These figures would be of inestimable value to manufacturers and processors in keeping competitive. They would help retailers to decide whether their promotion and advertising is paying off.

I have based the estimated authorization figures, as well as the number of products to be studied, on the 1952 proposal—with adjustment for the increased cost of such a study now—and other suggestions. This is merely a takeoff figure for discussion. I would hope that hearings on such a proposal would develop more precisely the kinds of data which should be compiled, and the cost of developing them.

BEGINNING OF HEARINGS ON HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS SIGNALS NEW SENATE AWARENESS OF OUR FAILURE TO RATIFY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this morning the ad hoc Subcommittee on the Human Rights Conventions of the Committee on Foreign Relations began hearings on three Human Rights Conventions: forced labor, political rights of women, and slavery.

The very fact that these hearings are being held signals a new and refreshing awareness on the part of the Senate to the fundamental importance of human rights. The Senate must realize that the United States, a world trailblazer in the recognition and establishment of human rights, has failed to offer to the people of the world our leadership and encouragement in this vital struggle. The world has a right to expect U.S. leadership. The United States has an obligation to provide that leadership.

The chairman of the subcommittee conducting these hearings is the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. The first witness, who pleaded very forcefully and convincingly the case for the U.S. ratification of the conventions, was our former Secretary of Labor, former Justice of the Supreme Court, and present Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Arthur J. Goldberg.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the excellent statements of the chairman [Mr. DODD] and Ambassador Goldberg be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, we cannot escape the inescapable. We cannot avoid reality. Human rights are indivisible. Human rights must not and cannot be alternately granted and then grabbed at the whim of any despot or demagogue. They must be guaranteed without qualification, without equivocation to every member of the human family.

Another great U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, the late Adlai E. Stevenson perceived this elementary fact so clearly and expressed it so brilliantly when, after emphasizing the interdependence of mankind and the minuteness of our planet, he stated:

> All wars are civil wars and all killing is fratricide.

The Senate must recognize that any compromising of human dignity anywhere is an offense to all men. When we recognize this, then I am sure that the Senate will move with dispatch to ratify these human rights conventions on forced labor, political rights of women, and slavery.

EXHIBIT 1

OPENING STATEMENT BY SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS, FEBRUARY 23, 1967

The Subcommittee will please come to order.

The Subcommittee will take testimony this morning on three Human Rights Conventions approved by the U.N. General Assembly, which still await ratification by the U.S. Senate. The three Conventions in question are:

The Convention on Political Rights of Women;

The Convention on the Abolition of Forced Labor; and the

Supplementary Convention on Slavery.

These three Conventions touch on the subjects long dealt with by our own Constitution and laws. The observance of these Conventions in other parts of the world would contribute significantly to the sum total of human freedom. In our own country, the ratification of these conventions would require no amendment of our own laws; it would simply amount to an affirmation of our desire to universalize those rights which now prevail in the United States.

The Convention on the Political Rights of Women provides that women shall be eligible for election, and shall be entitled to hold public office, without discrimination and on equal terms with men.

The Forced Labor Convention obliges the parties to it to suppress and abolish any form of forced or compulsory labor, as a means of political coercion or education; as punishment for holding or expressing political views which are contrary to the established political, social or economic system; as a method for mobilizing and using labor for economic development; as a means of labor discipline; as punishment for having participated in strikes; or as a means of racial, social, national or religious discrimination.

The Supplementary Slavery Convention would require the abolition of the incidents of slavery such as debt bondage, serfdom, involuntary marriage, the sale of women, the transfer of widows as inherited property, and the exploitation of children. Under this Convention it would be a crime to engage in the slave trade and to mutilate, brand or mark a slave.

These three humanitarian conventions were concluded in the 1950's but not submitted to the Senate until 1963.

In asking for the Senate's constitutional consent to ratify these Conventions, President Kennedy said: "The United States cannot afford to renource responsibility for support of the very fundamentals which distinguish our concept of government from all forms of tyranny."

I am particularly honored to preside over this subcommittee because of my deep interest and belief in the rights of all people of all nations. We have made giant strides in our own country over the past decades in eliminating the inequities inherited from the past. But there are other countries where the curve has been downward rather than upward, and where forced and indentured labor and even slavery are still widespread phenomena. It is in terms of the pressure they would exercise in these countries to reform their ways that the Human Rights Conventions now before us will make their most significant contributions.

It is my hope that our deliberation in this Subcommittee on the three other human rights conventions approved by the U.N. General Assembly will lead us in this session to the long overdue consideration of the Genocide Convention, which has been pending before the Senate since 1950.

In connection with the Human Rights Conventions now before us, the Subcommittee will want to explore fully their effect on relations between the States and the Federal Government under our Constitution, their effect on domestic legislation, the reasons why it took so long for them to be submitted to us, the effect on United States prestige and leadership of further deferring action on them, and many other questions.

Because of the importance of these conventions, I have invited all members of the Committee on Foreign Relations to participate in these hearings and hope they will do so.

Our distinguished witness this morning is the Honorable Arthur J. Goldberg, our United States Representative to the United Nations.

It is my understanding that with him to answer questions in their areas of expert competence are Joseph J. Sisco, the Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, and Richard D. Kearney, the Deputy Legal Adviser of the Department of State, and Mrs. Esther Peterson, Assistant Secretary for Labor Standards, Department of Labor.

Mr. Ambassador, we are very pleased to have you with us this morning.

STATEMENT OF ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG, PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE UNITED NATIONS, BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, FEBRUARY 23, 1967

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: It is a great pleasure to be here today. I very much appreciate the chance to take part in the opening hearings on three important international conventions on human rights—those concerning slavery, forced labor, and the political rights of women. The United States participated in the drafting of all three conventions and has lent them its support at various stages of their preparation. It was only after a careful review by the Executive Branch that they were submitted to the Senate, in July of 1963.

As you know, the Administration strongly supports ratification of these conventions. It believes them to be important agreements, to which the United States should adhere. For they not only are consistent with the traditional values and ideals of this country; they express the same profound concern for human rights that has come to be recognized everywhere as the hallmark of the United States. I believe we should welcome the opportunity to participate in agreements reflecting our high standards on an international scale.

Indeed, adherence to these conventions would underscore the fact that the United States is concerned with the realization of human rights, not only within its shores, but throughout the world. In recent years, we in this country have been engaged domestically in a tremendous effort to advance the rights of our citizens through the processes of law. And that effort, which quite rightly has held the attention of men everywhere, has reaped tremendous gains for the people of the United States. I do not believe, however, that we can now rest upon these domestic victories, and disclaim interest in the same evils abroad that we have abrogated at home. It is only fitting that a country which has taken such great strides should play a leading role in the attempt to see human rights respected in all sectors of the globe.

I would point out, too, that ratification of these conventions would accord with our commitment to the Charter of the United Nations and to the principles for which it stands. Indeed, one of the main purposes of the United Nations is to achieve international cooperation in solving the kinds of problems with which these conventions are concerned. Countless times the United States has spoken publicly in support of the Charter and, specifically, in support of its human rights provisions. Why should we hesitate to ratify conventions that give such provisions a real meaning and force?

I must emphasize that I am not speaking of purely altruistic reasons for ratification, but in terms of our immediate national interest. Concern for the welfare of all peoples is a principal feature of our foreign policy. But if the United States is not interested enough in human rights to participate in even modest and broadly supported international conventions, what will be the attitude of those many countries who look to us for guidance and advice? Our views and our declarations will not be taken seriously.

And there is a practical consideration of perhaps even greater importance. Experience has taught us to seek the roots of most political frictions and disputes in social abuses—discrimination, arbitrariness, inhumanity. We have learned that, until these abuses are eradicated, until a high minimum standard for the observance of human rights prevails throughout the world, we shall not see the dawn of a truly peaceful day. It was President Kennedy who so eloquently put this thought in the form of a question: "Is not peace in the last analysis basically a matter of human rights—the right to live out our lives without fear of devastation—the right to breathe air as nature provided it—the right of future generations to a healthy existence?"

I do not say that these present conventions are a panacea, or even that they will guarantee complete solutions for the problems to which they are addressed. But I do say that they constitute steps in the proper direction, and that the United States has a strong interest in taking such steps.

It is sometimes forgotten that the United States has already taken such steps in the past, that it is a party to two significant international human rights agreements. These are the convention on slavery, which we ratified during the Administration of President Herbert Hoover; and the agreement on the nationality of women, ratified during the Administration of President Franklin Roosevelt. I submit that the United States, the greatest power in the world, should build upon these precedents in joining worthwhile international efforts in the human rights field.

It is the part of totalitarian states, not that of a great democratic nation, to shy away from human rights conventions. They have reason for difficulty with such conventions. But I do not conceive that, in light of our Constitution we have any reason that is substantial.

* * * * *

Before I comment specifically upon each of these agreements, two points are worth emphasis: first, that the provisions of these conventions coincide with fundamental rights already guaranteed by our Federal Constitution. To find the domestic sources of these rights, one need look no further than the First, Fifth, Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Nineteenth Amendments. There is thus no question of conflict between the provisions of the conventions and State law, and no possibility of these conventions altering the existing balance between the jurisdiction of the Federal Government and the jurisdiction of the States. There is nothing in these conventions that is not already within the ambit of Federal Constitutional protections. There is nothing in these conventions that in any way contravenes any provision of our Constitution. And there is nothing in these conventions that in any way runs counter to the valid enactment of any State.

Second, it is important to note that each of the Constitutional rights in question either requires no implementing legislation or has already been translated into such legislation. Ratification of these conventions by the United States would require no domestic laws other than those we already have.

These two general points will reappear in my discussion of the contents of each convention.

I shall first deal with the Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade, the Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery, which was opened for signature at Geneva on September 7, 1956. On January 1, 1967, 68 states were parties to this convention.

As its name indicates, the agreement is supplementary to the earlier convention on slavery that was concluded in 1926 and ratified by the United States in 1929. Under Article One of the present convention, states parties are to take all practicable and necessary legislative and other measures to bring about the abolition or abandonment of certain institutions and practices akin to slavery, where they still exist. These institutions and practices are: debt bondage, serfdom, delivery of children by parents or guardians to others for purposes of exploitation, involuntary marriage or transfer of women for consideration, and transfer of widows as inherited property. In states parties where these last practices—relating to the status of women—still exist, those states undertake in Article Two to prescribe suitable minimum ages of marriage, to encourage the use of facilities whereby the consent of both parties to a marriage may be freely expressed, and to promote the practice of enregistering marriages. Of course, Article Two has no application in the United States, since we have long ago banished the practices against which the article is aimed.

Other articles of the convention provide that the slave trade should be prohibited, that the act of enslaving another person should be a criminal offense, and that any slave taking refuge on board a vessel of a state party to this convention shall be free.

To the ears of Americans, all of these provisions have a familiar ring. The 13th Amendment to our Constitution, ratified in 1865, abolished slavery as an institution and gave Congress the power to enforce its terms by appropriate legislation. Under this authority Congress has enacted a number of laws, such as the Slave Trade Prohibition Act (46 U.S.C. 1355) and the Peonage Laws (18 U.S.C. 1581, 42 U.S.C. 1994), which proscribe the practices forbidden by the convention.

The *second* agreement that I shall briefly describe, the Convention on the Abolition of Forced Labor, was adopted by the International Labor Organization in Geneva on June 25, 1957. As of January 1, 1967, 75 states were parties.

This convention requires ratifying states to suppress and not to make use of any form of forced or compulsory labor for certain specific purposes; namely, as a means of political coercion or education or as a punishment for holding or expressing particular social, economic, or political views; as a means of mobilizing labor for purposes of economic development; as a means of labor discipline; as punishment for having participated in strikes; or as a means of racial, social, national, or religious discrimination. Ratifying states are required to take effective measures to secure immediate and complete abolition of these proscribed uses of force or compulsory labor.

These undertakings are wholly within the Federal competence, and, indeed, are already contained in our laws. No new legislation is necessary as a result of ratifying the convention. The use or tolerance of forced labor by the Government, except as a punishment for crime, would run squarely into the terms of our Thirteenth Amendment. The use of forced labor as a punishment for crime would not be Constitutionally permissible in the cases enumerated in the convention, because the particular areas in question have the protection of Constitutional guarantees. Thus, a statute providing for forced labor for violating an arbitrary rule of racial, social, or religious discrimination would contravene the Fifth or Fourteenth Amendment. Forced labor imposed as a means of punishing the mere expression of political views would not be possible, because any criminal statute providing for this would run afoul of the First Amendment. Of course, the convention, like the First Amendment, applies only to the holding or expressing of views. There is no immunity for those who advocate or attempt the violent overthrow of the Government.

A word of explanation in regard to the provisions of the convention relating to labor strikes and labor discipline may be in order. It is apparent from the drafting history that the agreement was not intended to preclude the application of penal sanctions for certain kinds of labor activities. Thus, the convention would have no application to criminal sanctions for violations of court orders—such as those commonly issued under the National Labor Relations Act. Nor would it cast any doubt on punishments for illegal activities, for example, assaults, in connection with a strike. Nor, finally, would the convention apply to sanctions imposed for having participated in an illegal strike or for other illegal labor activities. The convention merely establishes that forced labor shall not be used as a punishment for those labor activities that are the inherent right of men everywhere and that are protected by our own Constitution and laws.

It is axiomatic that forced labor cannot be imposed in this country as a result of labor strikes or activities that are legal. Forced labor can in no event be tolerated in the United States except as punishment for an act that has validly been classified as criminal.

Parenthetically, you may be interested to know that the Soviet Union, which has ratified the other two conventions under consideration, has not ratified this one. The concern of the ILO with charges of forced labor in the Soviet Union is a matter of record.

The third convention, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in late 1952 and opened for signature in 1953, deals with the political rights of women. As of January 1, 1967, there were 51 states parties to this convention.

Here again, there is no doubt that Constitutional guarantees and legislation now in force already reflect the aims and purport of the convention. We need no additional laws to ensure that women shall, on equal terms with men, be entitled to vote in all elections, be eligible for election to all publicly elected bodies established by national law, and be entitled to hold public office and exercise all public functions established by national law.

The first of these rights, the right of women to vote on equal terms with men, is the precise mandate of the Nineteenth Amendment to our Constitution. The Supreme Court, in Breedlove v. Suttles (303 U.S. 277, 283 (1937)), has ruled that the Amendment "by its own force supersedes inconsistent measures whether federal or state." Thus there can be no question of any divergence in this country from the standard set out in the convention.

The other rights provided for in the agreement relate to publicly elected bodies, public office and public functions *"established by national law."* In the United States, the term "National Law", as it appears in this convention can only be taken to mean Federal law. The history of and official United Nations commentary on the convention fully support this interpretation of the term.

That the Constitution bars arbitrary discrimination against women in their eligibility for Federal elected bodies and in their right to hold Federal office or to exercise functions in the Federal Government cannot be doubted. On the other hand, categorizations dependent upon the natural differences between women and men are permitted under our Constitution, and I understand such categorizations to be permissible under the present convention. Thus, for example, the history of the convention establishes that the terms "public office" and "public functions" were not intended to apply to military service. In voting for the convention, the United States delegate, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, stated the understanding of the United States in this regard, adding that we understood the term "public office" to be coterminous with "public function".

If the Senate were to decide to give its advice and consent to United States accession to the convention, it might wish to indicate its understanding on these two points. Although I personally believe that this is not necessary, in light of Mrs. Roosevelt's statement, I would note that President Kennedy recommended such an understanding when he submitted the convention to the Senate in 1963.

As you can see, then, each of these conventions coincides very closely with the expressed principles and values of the United States. Each is a simple, forthright document, aimed at the achievement of a common international standard on matters of interest to the international community. And each is concerned with the eradication of social abuses that could and that have, at times, become sources of bitter differences among nations. In my view there is no doubt that these agreements are valid and proper subjects of the treaty power.

Before concluding, however, I wish to lay before you several further considerations that seem to me to indicate the advisability of United States ratification of these agreements.

The first is that there is a widely shared view in this country that we should take immediate steps to live up to our public professions of interest in the human rights field. Judging by the expressions of opinion that have come to the attention of the Administration, ratification would appear to fulfill the wishes of the American people.

The second point I want to make is that now is a particularly appropriate time for favorable consideration of these conventions. The General Assembly of the United Nations has proclaimed 1968 as the International Year for Human Rights, a year for new achievements and progress in this most important of areas of international concern. In my view we would usher in the International Year for Human Rights most felicitously by adherence to these conventions. For in so doing, we would demonstrate that this nation will not stand aloof from a major world effort to elevate human rights standards everywhere.

Thirdly, and perhaps most significantly, there are the tremendous consequences of our decision whether to ratify these conventions. I do not mean solely the consequences for the United States, which I have previously mentioned. I am referring, also, to the consequences for the conventions themselves, for their effectiveness and for the respect their provisions can command. Without the support of the United States, these agreements may appear insignificant to many other countries. If we do not consider it important to sign the conventions, why should they? And more importantly, why should they implement the conventions?

With United States ratification, on the other hand, these conventions would have a new life. In expressing our acceptance and in faithfully implementing the provisions of these agreements, we would encourage states that have thus far withheld adherence to reconsider their position. When there are departures from the standards that the conventions lay down, the United States would be able, as a state party, to exert its influence to bring about renewed observance of those standards.

A tremendous impetus would thus be provided for the worldwide battle for human rights. And the solemn human rights provisions of the United Nations Charter would receive some real content. I believe that the United States, with its profound commitment to the rule of law, can only contemplate such a prospect with approval.

We are, after all, a nation that stands for something in world history. "Certain unalienable rights," were proclaimed in 1776 as the heritage of "all men"—not just Americans. Abraham Lincoln said there was "something in that Declaration giving liberty not only to the people of this country, but hope for the world, for all future time."

It is deep in our American character to believe in this. And the influence of those brave words of 1776, in country after country, generation after generation down to our own day, is solid proof that these ideas are universal and that they can move men to action on a very large scale. When such ideas come to the surface anywhere in the world, our national conscience does not allow us to be indifferent to them.

I would urge your Committee to recommend to the Senate that it advise and consent to all three of the conventions before you.

THE WASHINGTON POST CITES STATESMANSHIP OF AMERICAN MOTORS IN PRICE CUT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Wednesday, February 22, American Motors Corp. announced extraordinary news—a price cut of $234 in its Rambler American 220 two-door sedan.

This report also contained the information that American Motors, to meet head on the competition from imports, was going to limit its future model changes to only essentials to further enhance the safety and reliability of these cars. This is, indeed, good news for the driving public.

The Washington Post, in a fine editorial today, praised the price reduction by American Motors Corp., indicating such price competition in the auto industry would benefit the U.S. economy.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN CUTS PRICES

Many manufacturers quietly reduce prices in the face of keen competition without winning accolades from Congress and the press. But there is much that is extraordinary about the automobile industry and the American Motor Company which has just reduced Rambler prices and renounced yearly model changeovers.

It is an article of faith in the auto industry, which contributes about $30 billion to Gross National Product, that demand is not at all responsive to price. And after buttressing that contention with spurious statistical evidence, industry spokesmen have argued that it is futile to cut prices. Nonetheless, there were modest price reductions in 1956, when production outraced demand after a banner year of sales in 1955.

And in subsequent periods of slack demand, price competition took the surreptitious form of higher trade-in allowances than were justified by prices in the used car market, the inclusion of optional equipment at no extra cost and the arrangement of installment credit on more favorable terms.

But American's reduction in Rambler prices, which range between 6.7 and 11 per cent and will shave $234 from the price of a two-door sedan, is especially noteworthy. It will result in larger price reductions than those effected in 1956; and it was made with the avowed purpose of competing with the foreign and domestic makers of compact cars.

American Motors is poor fourth among the auto giants, and for that very reason—fewer dealers and a thinner market for its used cars—this laudable effort to increase sales by reducing prices may fail. But one hopes that it will not. Consumers, indeed the entire economy, would benefit from a return to the vigorous price competition on which the auto industry thrived in its heroic period.

INCREASE IN PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4573) to provide for the period ending on June 30, 1967, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see p. 4995 of House proceedings of March 1, 1967.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this bill increases the debt limit from $330 billion to $336 billion for the rest of this fiscal year. There was one Senate amendment involved in the conference. It was offered by Senator Williams of Delaware on behalf of himself and Senator Hartke, and would have made the $336 billion limit permanent. The House bill, on the other hand, continued the historical pattern of having a $285 billion permanent limit and a temporary limit on top of that. Under the House bill, the temporary limit which would have applied through June 30, 1967, was $51 billion.

Mr. President, the Senate conferees were not happy about yielding to the House on this amendment. However, the House conferees advised us that they had been working closely with the Secretary of the Treasury in trying to solve a number of problems concerning the application of the debt limit with respect to guaranteed and insured loans. The House conferees indicated that they were planning to consider this other matter in connection with review of the debt limit in June of this year, and they would like to consider the question of raising the permanent limit at that time, also.

As a matter of fact, the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the Honorable Wilbur D. Mills, advised the Senate conferees that he would recommend to his committee that they consider making the debt limit permanent commencing in fiscal 1968.

The statement of managers on the part of the House is to include the following language:

> The Conferees on the part of the House stated they will recommend that an increase in the permanent debt limitation be considered by the Committee on Ways and Means in connection with the Committee's next review of the debt limitation, which must occur prior to July 1, 1967.

Mr. President, that is about as strong a commitment as anyone can ever get out of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and he is a man of his word.

I think that I can summarize what we have agreed to with the House—taking into account the statement in the report for the managers for the House—by saying that the Senate can expect to obtain everything that it asked for in this bill within a period of approximately 4 months. In other words, I think we have every prospect of doing away with the temporary ceiling and having only a permanent ceiling by this next June 30.

I move that the conference report be agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the conference report.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I voted for this bill as it was passed by the Senate. It contained an amendment which would have done away with this farce of operating on a $285 billion ceiling by calling all of the $336 billion a permanent ceiling.

Prior to this bill being proposed, under the existing law we had on the statute books a permanent ceiling of $285 billion. A series of increases over the past several years have brought the temporary ceiling to $330 billion.

The bill reported by the House of Representatives would have raised the $330 billion temporary ceiling to $336 billion on a temporary basis until June 30. This would have put us in a position, whereby if we did not act by June 30 the ceiling would have reverted back to $285 billion. This would have resulted in repudiating $51 billion in outstanding bonds, the difference between the $285 and the $336 billion ceiling. Mr. President, we cannot afford to let that happen. For that reason I said that if we are going to have a ceiling of $336 billion let us make it permanent, strike out $285 billion and put in $336 billion. Then next year if they must increase the ceiling again we can do it without having the threat over our heads that if we do not vote for it we are repudiating outstanding bonds.

Mr. President, I have made the suggestion to stop this farce the last half dozen times that this proposal to increase the debt ceiling has been before us. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson] made this proposal first and I supported it, and I have offered it time and time again in trying to get the administration to face the fact that we were raising not a temporary debt ceiling but a permanent debt ceiling, and that the country should know it.

The committee by a vote of 9 to 1 adopted the Williams amendment, the Senate unanimously adopted the amendment, and by an overwhelming majority passed the bill and sent it to the House of Representatives, which would have made this a permanent ceiling and eliminated this farce.

Why was this provision rejected? I do not believe that any Senator in this Chamber would object or say one word to the effect that what we did in the Senate did not make sense. No Member of the House of Representatives will quarrel with the fact that when we made it permanent we made sense.

The conferees from the other body protested but I got the distinct impression that they were favorably inclined. If that is true, why are we back here now? We are back here now because the Treasury Department, with its representatives at this conference, asked the conference to reject the Williams amendment because they wanted to perpetuate this farce. They want this as temporary. This puts them in a position, if we do not give them what increase they want on June 30, we will be repudiating $51 billion in outstanding bonds. In my opinion, this position of the Treasury Department is the most irresponsible action I have ever seen taken by this Department since I have been a member of the committee.

There is no reason in the world why they do not face up to this situation. We perpetuate also the farce of the 4¼-percent interest ceiling on long-term Government bonds with the net effect that we are having many problems with our national debt by selling nothing but short-term securities paying 5 to 5½ percent.

I think the time is long past due when the administation should stand up and face the true fiscal situation. Let us tell the American people the truth of what we are spending. We will keep losing our gold. Why—because of the irresponsible fiscal policies of this administration.

Mr. President, I shall not delay the vote tonight. I told the chairman of the committee I was going to state my position. Later I shall discuss in greater detail the various reasons why I think this administration and its spokesmen in the Treasury Department are not facing up to the realities. The result is this so-called credibility gap. The credibility gap exists because the American people have lost confidence in what this administration tells them.

They are now asking Congress to pass a bill this afternoon raising the debt ceiling by $6 billion on a temporary basis on the premise that it will go back to $285 billion June 30. It is not possible for that to happen. They know it. It is not true to tell the American people that there is any possibility of that happening, and I will have no part of trying to perpetuate this farce.

I think the Treasury Department has

failed completely to fulfill its responsibility. Some day Congress and the administration will have to face up to the fact that these deficits are being incurred and that it will be necessary to raise the permanent debt ceiling, raise taxes, or cut spending. Thus far, we have an administration that will not take a position on anything except giving money away.

I regret having to oppose this proposal at this time, but I know of no other way to express my opinion on the position of the administration. As one who believes in fiscal responsibility, I will not be a party to any such farce.

Suppose June 30 came and Congress did not act until July 10. We would technically have invalidated $51 billion of outstanding Government bonds. I know and the American people know that sooner or later Congress would have to make those bonds good. I am not so much concerned about the fear that would arise in this country, but we must recognize, as well, our position internationally. The central banks of Europe are already highly suspicious of American monetary policy.

If the administration were to invalidate $51 billion of bonds, which could precipitate a run on our remaining gold reserves, all semblance of security would be wiped out. The administration is encouraging the fanning of the fires of inflation by such irresponsible fiscal actions. Let this administration take the responsibility. The administration asked for it when they told the conferees, in my presence, that they wanted this farce perpetuated. Why? Because they could hold a club over Congress and say, "If you don't act by June 30 and give us another increase, the outstanding bonds would be invalid."

When the Secretary of the Treasury testified before the Committee on Ways and Means on behalf of the bill, he said, "If the bill is not passed within 10 days, social security payments will have to be stopped, railroad retirement payments will have to be stopped, and civil service retirement checks will have to be stopped." That is not true. When the Secretary was pressed by our committee for an explanation, he said that the statement was not true and reluctantly admitted that he should not have made it in the first place.

Mr. President, I am concerned about an administration that seeks to perpetuate fear, which tries to scare the American people into providing what the Government wants on the threat that if it does not receive it, it will withhold social security, railroad retirement, and civil service pension checks.

That is legislative blackmail.

Those funds are financed by trust funds. The Secretary of the Treasury is only the trustee. There are $20 billion in social security and several billion in the railroad retirement funds, which are invested in Government securities. Whether we approve this increase or not, those pension checks will be paid. I am getting tired of the Treasury Department's trying to keep a club poised over the heads of the American taxpayers.

There is only one way I know to tell them that Congress means business. So far as I am concerned, I will have no part in perpetuating this farce to the Americans people. I shall vote against the conference report.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to state that I hope every Member of the Senate will take seriously the remarks which have just been made by the Senator from Delaware.

I was a member of this conference and I want to say this for the chairman and every member of the conference, that we did everything we could to insist that the House accept our position. Unfortunately, they refused to do so and were adamant in their oposition.

However, I agree with the distinguished Senator from Delaware that this is just the beginning of a policy. It is going to need sound, definite, and constructive action and not let this thing drift along as we have been doing for the past few years.

We had an amendment in the bill which was sound, constructive, and defensible. Again, I say, I regret that we could not get the House to accept our position; but in view of the situation which confronted us, the fact that February 28 is almost here, and that some action must be taken, it was for these reasons that I signed the conference report, and not with any thought that we were solving a very serious and difficult problem.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I close my remarks by saying that the time is long past due when Congress and the administration should stand up and meet its responsibilities.

We are dealing now with an authorization bill to finance the war in Vietnam. We are drafting half a million men and sending them to Vietnam. Fortunately for America those men are displaying more courage on the battlefield than the political leaders in Washington are displaying.

The reason why the administration is so desperate to have this report agreed to by the deadline of March 1, and the reason why they are in here at such a late date is that up until January of this year they were insisting upon telling the American people they were going to close the books in fiscal 1967 with only a $1.8 billion deficit. It was not until January of this year that they admitted the truth of what every man on the Finance Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, and the Appropriations Committee already knew; namely, that the administration is spending and has been spending for the past 18 to 20 months over a billion dollars a month more than it is taking in.

The administration has not told the American people the truth about the deficit.

I will say again before the administration comes down and asks for a truth in lending bill, and a truth in packaging bill, let the administration start telling the American people the truth.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in approaching my responsibility to vote either for or against the conference report now pending, I have asked myself several questions.

First, what is the reality and the truth about the national debt? Is it true that the $285 billion now declared to be the permanent debt, reflects the actuality?

On the other hand, is it true that the actuality is that we do have a permanent debt at least of $336 billion?

The report states that $285 billion is now the maximum permanent debt.

Can I, in truthfulness, say that that is the fact, or am I obliged to declare that the permanent debt of the Nation now is at least $336 billion?

My answer to those questions is that I cannot factually say that $285 billion is the permanent debt, and that $336 billion is the temporary debt.

Senators may ask why I make that statement. I am reinforced by what I have said by the knowledge that within the next year the administration has already stated it will ask for an increase in the $336 billion debt ceiling to at least $340 billion.

Second, what was the purpose of adopting the debt ceiling by Congress?

I ask all Senators to meditate what the answer should be to that question.

Why did we adopt a law fixing the debt ceiling?

My understanding is that it was adopted as a deterrent against extravagant spending. It was not expected that we would disregard the ceiling and indulge in the vanity, each year, of making a request that the permanent ceiling be lifted because we spend more than is allowed by law.

What has become of the honest, legitimate purpose of the law? It is a fiasco. It is a nullity. Each year, two or three times—at least once—we lift the debt ceiling. We give approval to extravagance and indefensible expenditures. Some day we shall have to face reality.

I voted for the bill when it was before us last week, raising the permanent debt limit from $285 billion, as is now written into law, to a new limit of $336 billion. I did so because I was convinced that $285 billion was an unrealistic, untruthful ceiling. I do not think there is a Member of the Senate on this floor who can legitimately say that $285 billion is realistic.

To have voted against raising the permanent ceiling from $285 billion to $336 billion, as was set forth in the bill that was before us last week, in face of the reality that the United States would default in the payment of its obligations to the extent of $51 billion, being the difference between the ceiling of $285 billion and the actual debt of $336 billion—was unthinkable to me.

The Secretary of the Treasury said our permanent debt ceiling was $285 billion and that our temporary debt was $336 billion, and that unless we approved of a temporary ceiling of $336 billion this Government would default in the amount of $51 billion.

It was also stated that within the next several months he would again ask for a raise and for a right to go into debt from a level of $336 billion to a higher figure of about $340 billion.

The conference committee deleted the Williams amendment from the bill. I am glad to hear the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] say the Members of the Senate conference did everything within their power to keep the $336 billion permanent ceiling in effect. I want to express gratitude to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] for the obvious fight he also made to achieve that objective.

Mr. President, I cannot approve the action of the conference committee in the face of the certainty that the administration, when it next asks for relief, will be able to argue that, unless a temporary approval is made of a $340 billion ceiling, the Government will become delinquent in meeting its obligations in the amount of $55 billion. I voted for the bill as it came to the Senate last week. I shall not vote for the conference report.

In conclusion, let me say that about a month ago one of the Washington papers carried an editorial which, in substance, stated, "Congress, you created the debt. You provide the money for paying the debt."

I respectfully submit, Mr. President, that I am not one of those who are responsible for the spending in which we have indulged, and which has brought about this debt from $265 billion in 1950 to $340 billion in 1966. I shall vote against the report, with full thanks to members of the conference committee who fought to preserve the Senate position.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL, S. 810

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the names of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] added as cosponsors of S. 810, to provide for a White House Conference on Indian Affairs, at its next printing.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

WHEAT SUPPORT BILL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of S. 7, to provide a special export wheat payment to farmers for a portion of crops of wheat and to provide that price support for corn, beginning with the 1967 crop, shall be at a national average rate of not less than 90 per centum of parity, and for other purposes, introduced by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], at its next printing.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech I recently made in Oklahoma on this and various other subjects.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF U.S. SENATOR FRED R. HARRIS, DELIVERED AT OKLAHOMA FARMERS UNION CONVENTION AT OKLAHOMA CITY, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1967

I am glad to be here. I am pleased to address those who are involved in Agriculture and who are involved in the rural areas and towns of Oklahoma.

In a country of 195 million people this month, projected to become 340 million people in just 33 years, and in a world whose present population of 3.3 billion is projected to grow to 7.5 billion in those same short 33 years, the future of American agriculture, the hope for easing restrictions and using our tremendous productive capacity, is bright indeed.

But you and I must live and make our living in the present, and the present situation is not good, or as good as it ought to be.

A source of greatest dissatisfaction for me with the present economic picture in our country is that many people blame the farmer for higher food prices, when the truth is that much of what he buys has doubled or tripled, while he gets less for what he sells.

I don't profess to have become an agricultural economist over night, and I don't have all the right answers. But my actions since going to the Senate reflect my dissatisfaction, and I need your help and advice at every step.

First of all I think we have come to the place in this country when we need to do something about the rural to urban shift of our population which has caused tremendous problems in the mass centers of population of our country, which have made many of our cities very unhealthy to live in and raise children. That is why we are involved in some research in my office to devise some kind of tax incentive, perhaps initially on an experimental basis, to induce industry to build and expand in the rural areas of the country. I include all of Oklahoma in the definition of rural areas of our country. Some people can stay where they are, where their life is a good deal less difficult and complex and where their problems are much less than they are if they move into the major cities where we already have such tremendous problems.

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS

I have found also since I came to the Senate that there are a good number of people who come from so-called "consumer states" who feel that the farmer is getting special benefits to which he is not entitled. Therefore, late in the last session of Congress I co-sponsored with Senator Walter F. Mondale of Minnesota a bill which would require a breakdown of the Agriculture Department budget so that it will become obvious that much of the budget is spent for the consumer, for foreign considerations and for other reasons which do not have to do with the farmer. This bill received the unanimous vote of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but did not reach the Floor of the Senate until the next to the last day of the session, and, therefore, time ran out on us before we were able to bring it to a vote of the Congress. Senator Mondale has assured me that he intends to reintroduce the bill again this session, and I can assure you that I will again join with him to push vigorously for its passage.

FARM PRICES

Further, I have strongly opposed any actions of the government which would have the effect of holding down or depressing farm prices. In this regard, I co-sponsored last year with Senator George McGovern of South Dakota a bill to prohibit any agency of the federal government from taking any action which would hold down or depress farm prices so long as they remain below fair levels. This bill would have prohibited the action last year by the Department of Commerce to put export controls on cattle hides. Fortunately, our protest got this action partially rescinded. The bill would also have prohibited the action last year, which, again, our protest got rescinded, by the Defense Department to stop purchases of pork for a while. The bill, Senate Resolution No. 88, was reported unanimously by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and passed the Senate by a unanimous vote last year. No action was taken on the measure in the House. But it is still needed, and I hope this year it will be reintroduced and enacted into law.

WHEAT

As a former wheat raiser and one who went all the way to North Dakota in the wheat harvest nine summers in a row, I am particularly disturbed with the wheat price situation. Several of us from wheat states are doing our best to see if we can get wheat prices more in line with what farmers buy, because it is now out of all proportion. There is some real hope in the wheat situation in that we don't have the surpluses we once had, and population growth, domestic and foreign, means expanded markets for wheat. In the meantime, we've got to have a better floor under wheat prices. Senator McGovern of South Dakota early this year introduced a bill which would provide a 65 cent export certificate on 35 percent of the farmers wheat production for export. I endorse this bill, and I am going to co-sponsor it, because I feel it offers the best presently available avenue for more equitable prices for wheat. Under the provisions of the McGovern wheat bill, farmers would receive in the neighborhood of at least $2 per bushel as a blend price for their wheat. Although this is not as good as we might like, it certainly is better than the presently depressed price situation. As you know, in the past few years we have redoubled our efforts to create a better foreign market for our wheat and feed grains. It is imperative that we continue to foster these foreign markets in order to provide an outlet for our tremendous productive capacity. The difficulty with cutting off control on wheat and feed grains all at once is that the United States could produce at least twice as much wheat as we now produce, and, if we did, it would have disastrous effects due to the creation of tremendous surpluses and depression of market prices. I believe that in the future the demand for United States wheat and feed grains will be sufficient to require us to bring into production every available acre without price loss and I know that you, as well as I, look forward to the day when the demand for our farm products comes closer in line with our capacity to produce.

CATTLE

Since becoming a member of the Senate, I have supported controls on beef imports. As you know, the Congress passed in 1964 a bill to control the quantity of beef imports for any given year. Although I support the intent of this legislation, passed before I came to the Senate, I am concerned about its effectiveness. Under the Import Controls Act of 1964 the Secretary of Agriculture determines, at the first of each calendar year, the number of pounds of foreign beef that can be imported into the United States for that year. Then each three months he determines how much beef has been imported into the United States, deducts it from the yearly total, and comes up with the number of pounds that still may be imported for that year. This procedure, I feel, has shortcomings and needs revision. For instance, during the first three months of 1966 our total foreign beef imports amounted to 172 million pounds. During the second three months this increased to 220 million pounds. During the third three months, and this is significant, our beef imports increased to 264.6 million pounds, and during the last three months of 1966, our beef imports were

237 million pounds. This is a grand total of 893 million pounds of imported beef for 1966. By way of comparison, the average price in August of 1966 for cutters and canners was $17.90 and $16.76 per hundred weight, respectively. In November, the first month following the quarter in which we imported the high of 264 million pounds of foreign beef, the prices dropped on cutters and canners to $16.66 and $15.58 respectively. This is more than a dollar per hundred decrease in both categories, and it indicates that beef imports have a considerable impact on our domestic market. Since the Beef Import Control Act was passed, we have not yet had sufficient imports to require the use of the quota. However, I don't feel this is the problem. I feel that the problem lies in the fact that we can have a situation, such as we had last year, where our imports were significantly higher during one three-month period than at any other time, with the resulting effect of driving down domestic prices. I feel that the Beef Import Control law needs a thorough reexamination, with an eye toward amending it to provide for *specific monthly quotas* or at least quarterly quotas on the number of pounds of foreign beef which can be imported into the United States. This would, I feel, go a long way toward stabilizing the domestic market, and it is this kind of reexamination and revision I am working for.

Also, I feel that, like the grain producing segment of our agricultural industry, cattle producers are going to have to look to foreign markets as an added outlet for our productive capacity. As a member of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, I have worked directly with some success to expand our beef exports to other countries. The United States produces the best beef in the world, but most countries are not accustomed to the high quality of the beef we are attempting to sell them. This means that our promotional efforts, both public and private, must be redoubled. We have recently made some inroads in the European market for our high quality choice beef and the demand is rising yearly, but this beginning must be vigorously built upon, and this is my constant aim.

DAIRY

Like the beef industry, the dairy industry is also feeling the adverse effects of the growing level of imports of dairy products. In an effort to curtail further price reductions for domestic dairy products because of increasing importation of foreign dairy foods, Senator William Proxmire of Wisconsin has introduced this year a bill calling for import controls on dairy products. I am a co-sponsor of this legislation, and will do my best to see that it is passed by the Congress.

COTTON

There has also been a great deal of dissatisfaction over conditions within the cotton producing segment of our agricultural industry. Producer prices have shown a marked decline over the past year and cotton farmers are naturally becoming increasingly alarmed. For many years our government reduced cotton acreages year after year, creating a price umbrella over the rest of the world. The result was that world production of cotton expanded fantastically, as ours declined each year. Prices were held high on cotton in the United States with the result that synthetics started taking over gradually in the domestic market. Because of this fact, we found ourselves last year with a surplus of some 13 million bales of cotton, the largest in the history of the United States. We were obviously losing the export market, and the Congress felt it was necessary to try to revise the laws relating to production of cotton and eliminate surpluses. The supports on cotton were reduced so it could compete with synthetics and also flow into foreign trade. Income to the farmers was to be made up by compensatory payments for diversion. One of the main objectives of the new cotton program was to expand the use of cotton and meet competition, both of foreign cotton and synthetics, so that the United States cotton farmers could continue to produce. A major effect of the new program has been to increase exports to about 5 million bales in this marketing year, compared with only 2.9 million bales in the preceding marketing year. Also, domestic consumption has risen to over 9.5 million bales, as compared to less than 9.4 million bales in 1964 and only 8.5 million bales in 1963. Thus the program has had some definite good effects on the overall cotton industry. However, the cotton price situation is a matter of serious dissatisfaction to me, and I certainly solicit any suggestions that you, as a group, or individually, have to make to help bring about better handling of cotton acreages and more equitable prices. This is one of the most difficult agricultural problems we have, and I need your advice to help solve it.

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

The farmers of Oklahoma have for years provided a tremendous amount of leadership in the conservation of our soil and water resources. As a result of your leadership and willingness to cooperate, Oklahoma is still leading the nation in the upstream flood control and small watershed programs. Oklahoma's soil and water conservation districts have taken advantage of the technical assistance programs available to them through the Soil Conservation Service, and as a result we should never again suffer a disaster like the dust bowl days of the 30's, nor do we have the threat of the ravaging floods which used to plague our state each spring. Under the agricultural conservation progams the farmers of Oklahoma have cleared brush from their farms, sprigged bermuda grass and other protective covering and constructed farm ponds which provided needed stock water supply and also contribute a great deal to the control of erosion. The Farmers Home Administration is now making it possible for farmers, not only in Oklahoma but across the nation, to have adequate quantities of good quality water through the rural water system program, and the Farmers Home Administration is also making available funds so it will be possible for our small rural communities across Oklahoma to construct sewer and water systems for the future.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

The rural electric cooperatives, which have possibly contributed as much to the well-being of our farmers as any other program created by Congress, are now sponsoring legislation which would provide them with a means of supplemental and private financing to enable them to keep up with the growing demand for electricity in rural areas. If the rural electric cooperatives of Oklahoma are going to be able to continue to provide adequate, dependable, low-cost electric service to our rural and farm populations, it is imperative that they have available to them a sufficient amount of growth capital to meet the needs of the future without having to depend totally each year on Congress and the federal government. Therefore, I support and am a co-sponsor of a bill which has been introduced by Senators Mondale of Minnesota and John Sherman Cooper of Kentucky to provide such supplmental financing for rural electric cooperatives. I plan to work vigorously for its passage in this session of Congress.

Agriculture is and will remain a basic segment of the economy of Oklahoma and America, more basic than, for example, the automobile manufacturing industry which affects us all so greatly. But, unlike agriculture, the production and marketing of automobiles is in such few hands that they can control the amount of production, and, therefore, the prices of their product, which they regularly do. The automobile industry has surpluses also, surpluses in unused plant capacity and in the productivity of its workers. Though this is an invisible surplus, because it does not result in a pile up of automobiles such as we have, say, in cotton, it is nevertheless a surplus which the American consumer subsidizes in the form of higher prices than would otherwise result. That is, of course, the American way.

But the agricultural situation is different.

American farmers are highly numerous, and they are, naturally, only loosely organized, and, therefore, control neither the production nor marketing of their products. They have virtually no control over the amount or quantity of their products, nor the prices those products bring.

That's why, though we look forward with hope to the day when a booming population's growing demand allows a relaxation of the government's role in agriculture—and it has relaxed a little—the people's government in America must continue to assist toward a healthy agriculture, because the people must eat and be clothed.

INCREASE IN PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4573) to provide for the period ending on June 30, 1967, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I shall speak very briefly on the conference report. I was a cosponsor of the amendment to set the debt limit at $336 billion on a permanent basis. I think it was a good amendment. The action of the Senate and the action of the Finance Committee were also good moves. I think it would have been a good move if the House of Representatives had agreed to the permanent $336 billion debt limit.

I quite agree with the Senator from Delaware that there is no question that this is a provision for a temporary uplift of the $6 billion. If we had a $330 billion permanent debt ceiling and the administration came in to us and said, "We need $6 billion," it would not be truthful, for the simple reason that we know that they are going to be back on June 30 asking for another increase in the permanent ceiling or the debt limit by the end of the fiscal year. But yet they come back to us, losing sight of the fact that there has not been a straightforward presentation before us of what is being spent in Vietnam. I call attention to the fact that, in the Finance Committee, when the debt ceiling was set at $330 billion on a temporary basis, it was estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Budget that the war in Vietnam was going to cost about $10 billion for this fiscal year. At that time we presented evidence, which did not come from any classified sources, holding that a more realistic approach would be an estimate of at least $20 billion.

This would mean that the administration underestimated the cost of the war by about $10 billion. We find, upon examination of the hearings, that Mr. Schultze said it was not quite $10 billion;

it was only $9.6 billion. This is a 100-percent mistake in the estimate.

Last fall, during consideration of the suspension of the 7-percent investment tax credit, I asked the Director of the Budget and the Secretary of the Treasury whether or not a supplemental request was coming in from the Department of Defense. They said that none was coming. Now I understand the pending business before us is a supplemental request for $4 billion and that another $8 billion supplemental bill is coming at the same time.

Mr. President, I point out that the American people are capable of facing up to the truth. They will pay their bills if they know what they are. If we are going to run a government by terror and panic, then there is no clear-cut way to know how to pay the bills.

I do not approve of the administration policy in this instance. As much as I do disapprove of it, as much as I disapprove of the policy which brought us into the terrible predicament we are in, I recognize that we are still going to have to pay the bill. We ought to face up to it and pay the bill. How can the Finance Committee write any legislation when it does not have presented to it the truth of what the bills are and how we can estimate them for the future?

Has the administration asked for an increase in taxes? Frankly, I am confused, and the American people are confused. The statement was made that the administration was going to ask for a 6-percent tax increase across the board. Before the Finance Committee, the administration witnesses said that although they still think they might ask for it, they want to wait until May before they decide whether to do it.

Why are we being asked to delay? For the very simple reason that they do not know where the economy is going. I think as a result of the tight money policy, together with the misrepresentation which has occurred as to the cost of the war in Vietnam, we are faced with a drastic slowdown in our economy. The housing industry is in a recession. Industrial production is at the level of 6 months ago. Automobile production is down. You can read the results across the board.

I think it is time we go about the business of operating the Government on an honesty basis, and that we have a fair and honest audit of the books of America. I intend to vote for this increase in the debt limit for the simple reason that we cannot agree to refuse to pay the bills.

But they will be back. We might as well vote for a permanent debt limit of $1, as to say that we can have a permanent debt limit of $336 billion. I am sorry we find ourselves in this position. But I say to the Senate now that I think we will be in the same basic position next June, when they will again ask us to continue operating this Government from motives of terror and crisis.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, this is the ninth time that the debt limit has been raised since June 1961. But we are not called upon to raise the debt limit because of the Vietnam war.

In 1961, the total expenditures were $81.5 billion. The Vietnam war costs, including military and economic foreign aid increases since 1961, have increased $28.4 billion.

The projection of our receipts and revenues for next year amounts to $126.9 billion. In other words, if we took the expenditures of 1961 and added $28.4 billion of additional war expenses, we would still have a surplus of $15 billion. But that surplus has been consumed by spending for social purposes.

The other day I quoted Mr. James Reston, who said:

> The administration has put through more programs, social and economic, in the last two years, than it could absorb. The 89th Congress alone passed 21 new health programs, 17 new educational programs, 15 new economic development programs, 12 new programs for cities, 17 new resources development, and 4 new manpower training programs.

Mr. President, I share the view expressed by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], which prevailed in the Finance Committee and prevailed in the Senate, that the debt ceiling should be placed at one figure, and that we should not pass a bill knowing that we are creating a situation where we cannot act, the next time the matter comes up, in a judicious manner, but will again be forced to take emergency action in an unsound way.

I oppose the conference report.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the only point we have at issue here is whether the Senate should insist on further conference with regard to a Senate amendment that would seek to eliminate the distinction between the temporary debt limit and the permanent debt limit.

Mr. President, I do not quarrel with the amendment the Senate has agreed to. I voted against it in the committee, but I voted for it on the floor. I voted against it in the committee because I felt we would have great difficulty in persuading the House conferees to accept it; and I was on notice that that was the view of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, who would be the chairman of the House conferees at the time we voted on the amendment.

For that reason alone, I voted against the amendment in the committee but cheerfully accepted the position of the committee when a majority voted contrary to my vote.

But, Mr. President, this difference between the permanent debt limit and the temporary debt limit was not the doing of the House of Representatives. It all started with a Senate amendment initiated by the Committee on Finance. The amendment was the brainchild of our very much revered and beloved senior Senator from Virginia, at that time the chairman of the committee, the late Honorable Harry Byrd, Sr., whose son is so well carrying on in his father's tradition.

The distinction between the temporary and permanent limits started when we increased the debt limit for the fiscal year 1955 from $275 billion to $281 billion. At that time, it was the feeling of Senator Harry Byrd, Sr., that by making this $6 billion increase merely a temporary increase, he might thereby have leverage upon the administration to control spending.

As I say, it started, in complete good conscience and complete good faith, as an effort to bring about further economy in government. Senators will notice that the table in the committee report on this bill, on page 2 of the report, details the levels of government debt limits for selected years from 1947 on.

In 1956, when President Eisenhower was the Chief Executive, the Senate will notice that the debt limit was decreased, so that in 1957 we again voted for a $275 billion debt limit, but with a temporary figure of $278 billion—only $3 billion above the $275 billion permanent limit, which would indicate that progress was being made toward the objective that Senator BYRD, the chairman of the committee, was seeking at that time.

Then in the period 1958 to 1960, it became necessary to increase the temporary figure $10 billion, and also to increase the permanent ceiling. At that time, it was felt that there was no hope, any time soon, of going back to the $275 billion permanent limit. So the temporary debt ceiling was made $295 billion in the fiscal year 1960, which was $10 billion above the figure that was made the permanent limitation.

Subsequently, starting in 1961, we had a $8 billion temporary ceiling above the $285 billion, so that the temporary ceiling was reduced from $295 billion to $293 billion.

In 1962, the $285 billion permanent limit figure was maintained, and has been held to since that time. As the debt has gradually increased since that time, the temporary limit has been raised until today we find it $51 billion above the permanent limit.

I find much in the Senator's amendment with which I can agree, and I would have been pleased to have held out in conference quite a while longer for the Senate amendment, and come back tomorrow or the day after, if the sponsor of the amendment had felt, that by staying in session for another day or two days or three days, the House might have been inclined to yield on this point. But it was not the feeling of any Senate conferee that by spending more time there we were likely to change the position of the House conferees. If anyone had felt that way, I would have been glad to hold out for another day or two on this subject.

But, Mr. President, there is nothing for which the sponsor of the amendment is contending that he cannot expect to prevail within 4 months.

In other words, everything that the amendment would achieve; namely, a permanent debt ceiling, we can hope to attain in the next 4 months when the debt limit is again considered.

All of those hopes can be expected to be realized 4 months from now when the House sends to us, as the House conferees virtually assured us it will, a bill stating the debt limitation in terms of a permanent limitation for the 1968 fiscal year and undertaking to deal with guaranteed loans in connection with the debt limit.

Mr. President, the chairman of the

House committee and the ranking minority member of the committee on the House side have told us they will recommend to the committee, and tell the Secretary of the Treasury that when he comes to testify he should be prepared to testify with respect to, a realistic permanent figure.

The ceiling that we are voting on right now, as a practical matter, could be a temporary ceiling for a different reason. The additional expenditures for Vietnam in 1967 are expected to be $9 billion above the initial 1967 budget and if those expenditures continue past June, they are going to require us to raise the debt ceiling still further shortly after that time.

Unless we can foresee an early end to hostilities there, we will be forced to vote for a higher figure. It is perfectly all right with this Senator to make the figure we vote on some 4 months from now a permanent figure although that too may have to be changed.

We have not been able to act on the bill as soon as I would have liked but we certainly should not delay action on this report.

The Treasury Department has informed me that it may be required to do several things which do not constitute good debt management in order to draw down cash balances from all sources and use them to meet the bills coming due this next week, particularly on March 1.

It may have to disinvest $700 million of the exchange stabilization fund. It may have to go into the market with civil service retirement funds and buy $200 million of outstanding obligations instead of investing these funds in new special issues. Also, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board may have to go out into the market and buy $300 million to $400 million of outstanding marketable securities instead of investing in special Treasury issues. While it is not good debt management to take the actions I have outlined to you, this would not be the first time such actions had to be taken. Similar acting were taken in 1957–58 but then the actions were continued for several months. Now they will be continued only for a day or two.

None of these transactions which I have described would the Treasury have to undertake if this bill could become law by the end of this month. However, the House leadership is under an agreement not to have any votes until next Wednesday, and as a result the House cannot complete action on this report until after the end of this month.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I point out that it is not the fault of the Senate that the House will not act until Wednesday. It is not the fault of either the House or the Senate that the administration is in this position of needing such quick action.

Until January of this year they were perpetuating the farce that the 1967 fiscal year deficit would only be $1.8 billion. Everyone knew that was not true, but the administration would not admit it until January of this year.

That is the credibility gap. They do not tell the American people the truth.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I do not propose to be partisan about the matter. I do not agree with the Senator in all that he has said but I do not propose to get into a partisan discussion.

As far as this Senator is concerned, we have a responsibility to pay bills when they fall due.

The Government has not defaulted on its obligations. It has never declined to pay its bills in the past. I do not believe it will do so this time.

I would not be a part of any arrangement by which the Federal Government was unable to pay its obligations, whether they be payments owed to veterans, servicemen, Government employees, or anybody else.

My guess is that anyone who does vote in a manner which obtains that result will come to regret it later, no matter how much he may blame the other fellow for the activities or the lack of activities on the part of some other people who did not do what he thought they could have done.

As far as this Senator is concerned, if we vote for this conference report today, we will have discharged our responsibility. We will have discharged our responsibility in sufficient time that no one will be required to engage in any undesirable Government debt management practices in order to pay the bills of the Government when due.

Mr. President, the Senator made the statement that the Treasury opposed his amendment. I do not recall that to be the case.

My understanding is—and I was there—that the Treasury made no recommendation in this question of a permanent or temporary debt limit. The Treasury merely insisted that we should, if possible, try to act on this measure in a manner that it might be the law before March 1, which apparently seems to be beyond the realm of possibility—not because of the Senate, but because the House will be unable to act before that time.

It was also suggested that we would be repudiating Government bonds in the event we had to go back to the $285 billion debt ceiling.

That is not my understanding.

As I understand it, the outstanding bonds would continue to be valid and we would pay them.

However, in that circumstance we could not issue any further obligations of the Federal Government and therefore would not be able to meet all of our new bills coming due. The money would not be available to cover all of them and we could not issue new obligations.

Mr. President, I say further that if anyone fears that social security payments will not be made, or that railroad retirement payments would not be made if the limit is not raised, this is not correct.

It was explained quite carefully to the Finance Committee that the Secretary of the Treasury would undertake to make those payments whatever the debt limit was.

Of course, that would not be true with regard to other payments coming due where there is a trust fund to protect the payee.

Examples of payments which might not be made promptly under such situations are those dealing with the ordinary phases of government, such as payments owing to civilians in the employ of the Federal Government and contractors who have done work for the Government.

Mr. President, I find reason to feel optimistic about the Senator's amendment. As far as this Senator is concerned, any time I offer an amendment and get it agreed to by the Senate the first time I offer it, if I can then obtain assurance from the House conferees that they are going to consider the amendment carefully and bring us a bill within 4 months that is likely to carry out that principle, this Senator would be very happy about that matter.

We do have assurance that what he is seeking here—that is a wiping out of any difference between the permanent debt limitation and the temporary debt limitation—will be recommended by the House conferees to the House committee. I believe that if anybody wants to vote for a permanent debt limit, he will certainly have an opportunity to do so within 4 months.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this matter is rather easy of resolution. We cannot consummate action on this proposal today. That would constitute only action by the Senate. However, inasmuch as the House, in its infinite wisdom, has seen fit to recess until next Wednesday, or whenever it is, nothing can be done to consummate that action until next Wednesday.

The House, therefore, will have ample time, when they come back, to ponder this matter, to reflect upon the advisability of adopting the word "permanent" and lifting us from fiction into the realm of fact.

Actually, what we are trying to do here is to perpetuate a fiction. There is no such thing as a temporary debt. A debt is a debt. It is a hard, fast obligation; and when you attach the word "temporary," that is only a slender gossamer hope.

The idea is that by curtailing expenditures or by some other mystical magic, we are going to find a way to get back down to that level. Whenever that day comes, Mr. President, I want to be able to turn a few cartwheels right on this Senate floor, because I have been around these diggings for a quarter of a century and I have not seen it happen yet.

So, we talk about the temporary debt, and everybody knows as a fact that it is going to be larger than that before we get through. Now, why perpetuate a fiction? Why not call it what it is?

Was it P. T. Barnum who said, "There ain't no such animal," when he first saw a giraffe? Well, "There ain't no such animal" as a temporary debt.

What we are actually doing is politely fooling the people. I do not call it deception. Why, government does not deceive people. It politely and courteously fools them at times. But there is no intent to deceive. But this is a fiction, pure and simple. Frankly, by our solemn oaths, we have to say to the country whether or not we want to perpetuate that fiction; and I, for one, am very reluctant to do it. That is the reason why I think there ought to be a show of support for the Williams amendment, offered in the committee and adopted by the Committee on Finance and approved by the Senate and rejected by the House, presumably at the instance of the Treasury.

Now, of course, the Treasury has its own reasons, and I was very interested in the recital of my very distinguished and courageous friend, the Senator from Louisiana, with respect to all the gyrations that the Treasury Department is going to pursue—Home Loan Bank bonds and the civil service retirement fund. Goodness knows, that fund is in such bad shape that a couple of hundred million dollars more or less does not make a particle of difference, because we are $41 billion in debt to that fund now, which the Government has never paid.

We agreed, when we put a Civil Service Act on the books, that we pay half and the employee pay half. Well, for a while we paid half. We gibbled it out of the employee's pay. He cannot help himself. He cannot get his pay without it being taken out. That is the law. Then we quit paying our share.

If you have any doubt as to what we owe that fund, call up John Macy, Chairman of the Civil Service retirement system. He will tell you—I will bank on this figure—that we owe that fund $42 billion right now, and nobody has come along with any proposal yet about how to pay it.

Was it last year or the year before that I offered an amendment on this floor for a billion dollars out of the Treasury in order to at least pay our share for 1 year? Someone said, "You should not do that. You are getting the budget askew." Well, you do not care about this obligation. And we owe it to the people who have paid their share, and the Federal Government has not paid its share.

Now, what are we going to do? Repudiate it? Well, for the $200 million that is involved, I guess Mr. Fowler and his associates can do business there without any real difficulty.

We have this matter of participation certificates. There is no place in the budget to show that is a debt. But who can show me how one can grab a handful of governmental assets in the form of notes and mortgages and stick them in a fund and then issue participation certificates against it, without having incurred a debt, which is a charge upon the people and the Government of this country? But they do not show it. However, they are going to use the money.

That is a funny kind of business. There are so many fictions now, no wonder a justice on one of our circuit courts said there is no such thing as congressional intent; congressional intent is only a fiction; congressional intent is what the courts say it is. Well, that is a funny kind of—what is the word—"ratiocination," or "reasoning," to come to that kind of conclusion.

Well, I just do not buy fictions like that, and I would rather not buy this fiction of a temporary debt, because it is an amorphous dream. It is just a transient, fleeting something or other that is wafted away on the afternoon zephyrs.

Do I make myself clear to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. COTTON. Yes, even to me. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. If not, I will try all over again.

So, Mr. President, I hope that this body will support the distinguished Senator from Delaware in his effort to abolish and banish and cast this fiction into outer darkness once and for all, and let the people know that this is a permanent debt. They owe it, and they are not going to see this so-called temporary debt level, even though it is a lovely chimerical dream, done in full color, as channel 4 has said, and it makes it all the more appealing but all the more mystical.

My favorite story about this debt is about the fellow who was in the hospital in Peoria. He got up on the floor where they had the babies, in the baby ward, and he walked down the corridor, and there they were. Some of them were in these little baskets, slumbering, and some were squalling and some were bawling, making all sorts of noises. When the nurse came down, she looked at them with a rather dour visage, and he said:

> Nurse, what are those little brats squalling about?

She had calculated what each one's share of the public debt was, probably about $1,700 or $1,800. So she said:

> Well, if you were out of a job and you owed $1,800 on the public debt, and your pants were wet, you would squall, too.

Now, do we kid them and say, "Well, actually, you do not owe $1,800; you only owe $1,200; that is the temporary debt," when, as a matter of fact, they owe $1,800 as their share of the public debt?

Why not tell them what the share is, and be done with it, and not fool them?

So I hope that we will support the distinguished Senator from Delaware and reject the conference report, in the hope that over the weekend the House will go into prayerful meditation and come to the conclusion that, as always, the Senate is right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "nay," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER and Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senators from California [Mr. KUCHEL and Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 31, as follows:

[No. 33 Leg.]

YEAS—39

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Clark
Dodd
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Inouye
Jackson
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McGee
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Randolph
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington

NAYS—31

Aiken
Allott
Baker
Boggs
Brooke
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Case
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Ervin
Fannin
Hansen
Hatfield
Hollings
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McGovern
Miller
Mundt
Pearson
Percy
Proxmire
Russell
Smith
Spong
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—30

Bennett
Church
Cooper
Eastland
Ellender
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Hickenlooper
Holland
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kuchel
McCarthy
McClellan
Morton
Murphy
Pell
Prouty
Ribicoff

Scott
Smathers
Talmadge
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 301 of the 78th Congress, the Chair appoints Senator INOUYE to the Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy.

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 207 of the 81st Congress, the Chair appoints Senator RIBICOFF to the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy.

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 1028 of the 84th Congress, the Chair appoints Senator HRUSKA to the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy, in lieu of Senator CLIFFORD CASE, resigned.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LONG OF LOUISIANA TO THE ECONOMIC CLUB OF NEW YORK ON JANUARY 18, 1967

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at the beginning of this session of the Congress, my good friend, the distinguished majority leader, very wisely counseled the Members of this body to direct their attention primarily to a review of legislative programs enacted in recent years with a view to eliminating inefficiencies and supplying whatever remedial correctives that our inquiries might show to be necessary. In this the majority leader performed a notable service by supplying us all with a most helpful perspective for the work of this Congress.

Recently the majority leader's valiant cohort, the distinguished majority whip, who is also chairman of the Finance Committee, made a perceptive analysis of some of the existing areas of legislative inquiry which cry out for our searching attention. The majority whip is second to none in this body in political courage. His capacity for piercing to the heart of complex political issues and casting them into the bold relief of commonsense finds no greater example than his remarks delivered to the Economic Club of New York on January 18, 1967.

For the benefit of those Members of this body who may not have had access to the text of those remarks and for the enlightenment of the body politic generally, I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The interest of the Members of this body will be drawn to these remarks when I inform them that my good friend from Louisiana included in his remarks an analysis of our national debt, the level of interest rates and the respective roles of the Congress and the Federal Reserve Board defining policy in regard to interest rates, opposition to a tax increase, the need to limit expenditures in the poverty program to those areas that have definitely proved their value, and the need for American prudence in regard to the maintenance of armed forces in Europe and Japan in view of the prosperity of our European allies and of Japan and their comparative unwillingness to shoulder a greater portion of the burden of their own self-defense.

In the area of the sinews of American economic strength, my distinguished friend, the chairman of the Finance Committee, very properly noted the failure of our trade program to maintain American industry at the desired level. With an emphasis that I find entirely appropriate to the necessities of the situation, he declared:

> Our trade policies need a thorough new look and some hard-headed American businessmen are needed to devote a great deal of independent thought and study to the overall program.

Though the chairman and I did not collaborate in our separate public statements on the matter of trade policy, I am heartened with the realization that the chairman of the Finance Committee, which has the responsibility for tariff and trade legislation in this body, sees our Nation's current dilemma in foreign trade policy and administration in much the same light that I do. I call attention particularly to his statement:

> The tendency in recent years has been to reduce American tariff protection while foreign countries have given little if anything in return, other than to agree to continue their existing practices, without making trade more onerous for us than it had been in the past.

In particular, I wish to second the chairman's view, so well expressed in his remarks to the Economic Club of New York, that we have it within our power to correct these evils which so unfavorably affect our balance of payments and our balance of trade. I agree with him:

> We can do it by expanding our Merchant Marine, by providing more rather than less protection for any American industry that is threatened, by insisting upon a quid pro quo from those countries which are enjoying favors from Uncle Sam.

Finally, I agree with him completely:

> The most imperative item is that we must stop American negotiators from committing this nation to international agreements which bind our hands and prevent us from using those tools which could save us in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the remarks of the distinguished majority whip to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR RUSSELL B. LONG OF LOUISIANA TO THE ECONOMIC CLUB OF NEW YORK, JANUARY 18, 1967

Mr. President and Members of the Economic Club of New York, while I am not familiar with all of your impressive history, I feel a deep sense of kinship to your group, dating back to the fall of 1962 when the late President John F. Kennedy was your speaker.

On that occasion he described his attitude toward our nation's tax laws. He said they were antiquated, designed to meet the problems of an earlier day, that they should be modified to meet the problems of his day and the challenge of the future.

At that time our much beloved friend, the late Harry F. Byrd, was chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance. From the first moment I saw the John Kennedy speech, I knew, as did everyone else, that the Kennedy proposal for a major tax reduction, which necessarily involved a substantial federal deficit for at least two years, could not and would not meet with the approval of that consistent, dedicated conservative who learned his economics before John Kennedy was born on this earth, and who had not conformed to the thinking of the New Deal of 1933 or the Fair Deal of 1948, much less the New Frontier. It was my guess that Robert Kerr of Oklahoma, the ranking member of the Committee on Finance, would speak for the Kennedy Administration if and when the ideas that John Kennedy outlined before you on that occasion should come to a vote in the Senate. The thought never occurred to me that, before this imaginative suggestion could come to a vote in the Senate, Allen Frear would have been defeated and that Bob Kerr and John Kennedy would have passed on to meet their reward, and that I, the number four Democrat on the committee at the time of the speech, would be the committee spokesman for the largest revenue measure in the Nation's history—the first major bill to be enacted under President Johnson.

As you will recall, the bill which emerged from John Kennedy's speech to you on that occasion involved a reduction of federal taxes by more than 14 billion dollars. It provided great reductions in personal income taxes, to increase demand and consumption of new production. It provided major reductions in corporation income taxes. It provided incentives for new investments. When the bill came to a final vote, I pointed out that this nation was enjoying the longest continued prosperity in its history. At that point the nation had enjoyed more than 45 months of continued increases in production, income and employment. It was my argument, and that of the Administration, that this bill, the Revenue Act of 1964, would mean a continued increase in production, income, and employment for as far into the future as any of us were then privileged to see. The events that have transpired since that date are worthy of study in connection with the predictions which we made at the time. Our predictions for employment and production were safely within the events that have transpired. Our prediction for national growth was vindicated.

The only prediction on which we fell short was that we would have by now achieved a balanced budget. With regard to the budget, it is fair to submit that, had this nation not elected to make an expensive and determined sacrifice to prevent a Communist takeover in Southeast Asia, we could easily have had a balanced budget for last year and for this year.

While the national debt has increased in terms of dollars, it has declined in terms of the ability of our people to pay. For example, in 1962 the federal debt was 53 per cent of our gross national product. In 1965 it was less than 46 per cent of our gross national product.

Furthermore, when we talk about our national debt, it is appropriate that we make a distinction between our gross national debt and our net national debt. Of the national debt which we are required to report to the American people, approximately 113 billion dollars of that figure is money that the federal government owes to the federal government.

When I speak of money that the federal government owes to itself, I am thinking of the government bonds and funds held by the Federal Reserve Board and other agencies of the federal government. Included in that figure would be government-held trust funds, such as the social security fund of 22 billion dollars plus.

Some of my more conservative-thinking friends challenge my view that a government held trust fund in the last analysis is money which the federal government owes to the federal government.

If I might use the social security fund as an example, we have contingent liabilities running into hundreds of billions of dollars. Yet, insofar as the federal government holds money in the social security trust fund, it is that much ahead in meeting its obligations. Other trust funds financed by federal taxes and appropriations appear to me to fall in the same category. Therefore, when I speak of the national debt of 329 billion dollars, I am tempted to point out that 113 billion dollars of this debt is money that the federal government owes to the federal government and that debt which the federal government owes to the public is actually 217 billion dollars.

Then when we relate our national debt to our gross national production, we find that our net federal debt in 1945 was approximately 116 per cent of our gross national product, and today it is approximately 28 per cent of our gross national product. It is comforting to note that the tangible assets held by the federal government in terms of property, real and personal, exceed our national debt in value without reference to the nation's greatest financial asset: its ability to tax the income and the property of its citizens.

With the combination of the increases in our population and production, together with the inflation that we experienced after World War II, our per capita net federal debt has declined in terms of 1966 dollars from $2,901 to $941—less than one-third of what it was 22 years ago.

Therefore, I am inclined to say when businessmen talk to me about the national debt, "Look who's talking." Measured by a relative standard, our debt is 75 per cent less while yours has increased by anywhere from 50 per cent to 200 per cent.

Of course, this is not a fair comparison, because each decision to increase the amount of debt outstanding involves a different set of problems. Inasmuch as we have an enormous public and private debt, exceeding one trillion 500 billion dollars, we would do well to recognize that the growth of our economy, the expansion of our assets, the increase in the number of jobs, as well as the increase in the pay which those jobs earn, have been made possible during the past 26 years by a steady increase in the public and private debt of the United States, the overwhelming bulk of that increase being in the private sector. So long as our economy continues to grow in any way that is acceptable to any man here tonight, the total figure of public and private debt outstanding will continue to grow. It is well for us to recognize that most of this debt was incurred for good reason, that it was soundly based, that it has created a credit without which the growth of our economy could hardly have occurred.

It stands to reason that we can carry on indefinitely with continued prosperity, or even as we have done for the past 6 years, so long as the debt which we owe is soundly based. The soundness of our debt is greater because we have a number of government programs to assure that Americans stand together in guaranteeing the payment of most of it.

Perhaps I am overly optimistic about the future, but I am satisfied that, if we continue the kind of economic approach that we have been pursuing in recent years, nothing can destroy the strength and greatness of our nation, other than a devastating war beyond anything that we have ever witnessed.

Such a war we constantly pray and strive to avoid.

Having recognized the existence of a large public and private debt, I would like to make it clear that this Senator, for one, favors the lowest practical level of interest rates, in order that the burden of carrying our debts may be as light as possible. In the last analysis, the interest cost of carrying our debts falls on the consumer and on the taxpayer. While it is true that corporations pay large amounts of interest, it is a cost of doing business and, so long as competition will permit, they will pass it along to their customer in the price of the product.

Forthrightness compels me to express my difference of opinion with the Federal Reserve Board.

There is much misunderstanding about the degree of independence which the Federal Reserve Board should possess. The board is not a creature of the executive branch. If a majority of the board desires to do so, it may exercise a judgment contrary to the views of the executive branch of the government. If anyone has ever contended that the board is independent of the Congress, it has never come to my attention.

Thirteen months ago the Federal Reserve Board, by a majority of one vote, decided to embark upon a monetary program against the advice of the executive and without the concurrence of the Congress.

Having protested about the matter, President Johnson then bowed to what he seemed to regard as inevitable and undertook to adjust his policies accordingly. Since that date, some members of that board have undertaken to suggest that we in Congress should adjust this nation's tax laws to conform to economic policies decided by this small group which meets in an imposing building on Constitution Avenue. It has been suggested that some of us in the Congress should sit down with members who can speak for the Federal Reserve Board and agree to a given tax policy to conform to the judgment of a majority of the Federal Reserve Board.

Lest it be misunderstood by any source I want to make it crystal clear that, as far as this Senator is concerned, the Federal Reserve Board is a creature of the Congress; they are exercising powers which properly belong to us. We are elected to represent 190 million people of the United States, as is the President. Whenever the Congress and the President can agree upon fiscal and monetary policy, it is the duty of the Federal Reserve to modify its policies to come into accord with us, not the other way around.

The tight-money, high-interest-rate policy of the Federal Reserve Board for the past 13 months will find very little approval beyond the offices of the moneylenders who, while powerful and highly regarded, constitute a small minority of the population of this nation. Those policies have imposed an almost disastrous depression in the housing industry. Those policies have increased the cost of government. They have had a retarding effect upon the growth of our economy. Those policies forced me to suspend the investment credit. From the point of view of most of us, we rejoice that the Federal Reserve is now retreating from that policy as some of us have been advocating it should do.

Now it has been suggested by the President that Congress should increase taxes, which would further retard an economy which at this moment is showing signs of becoming sluggish, with the suggestion that, if we do so, the Federal Reserve would further ease its tight grip on the nation's money supply.

We are willing to consider the President's suggestion on some other basis. At the moment there is no economic case for the proposed tax increase. Few economists, if any, are attempting to make any such case.

The request for tax increase is based on the assumption that a failure to increase taxes will lead to a large federal deficit. It is argued that, while men fight and die on the field of battle, it is a small enough sacrifice for Americans to pay more taxes. Yet, a tax increase of 10 times the size recommended by the President would still not begin to equate with the sacrifice of our courageous young men fighting and dying in the swamps and jungles of Vietnam, Americans who are enjoying income and prosperity greater than they have ever known.

It has not yet been demonstrated that large reductions cannot be made, not that expenditures cannot be postponed, until some later date. Nor has it been demonstrated that a number of new programs which the President is recommending even now might not better be deferred than to increase the taxes on the American people.

The Congress is not disposed to deny the best weapons, the best food, and every benefit of medical science to our fighting men. The Congress *is* disposed to make reductions in new domestic programs and even in old domestic programs before it votes another tax increase.

As an example of a new domestic program that can be cut, I would point to the poverty program, which is poorly and inefficiently managed. Many of the activities of that program are of very doubtful value. Most Americans would support a poverty program, or any part of it, so long as they are getting 70 cents or even 50 cents return for their investment. They will not in conscience support any part of such a program which yields them less than 10 per cent return on the dollar—and some parts of that program appear to be yielding an even negative return. In peacetime, the poverty program could cost several billion dollars annually. But, with the pressure of a war on our hands, it is well that this program be confined to those areas where it has definitely proved its value and that it serve more in the nature of an experimental pilot program to prove the merit or demerit of new ideas before we attempt to expand it into a multi-billion dollar undertaking.

As an example of an old program that can be cut, I would point to the policy whereby this nation continues to maintain approximately one million Americans at taxpayers' expense on European soil. This matter was studied by the Democratic Policy Committee. That committee of fifteen Senators included some of the most outstanding members of the Committees on Foreign Relations, Armed Services, Appropriations and several other major committees in the Congress. It included some of the most trusted friends of the President. Having discussed this matter with the Secretary of State, the Ambassador to the West German Republic and the other able spokesmen suggested by the Administration, this group, composed of Democratic leaders in the Senate, signed a unanimous proposal that the number of troops and dependents in Europe should be drastically reduced.

Thus far, our suggestion has met with nothing more than a few additional flimsy and weak reasons for continuing a program which no longer makes sense long after the facts of life which dictated it have changed drastically, compelling a different answer.

One of the facts of life which has changed since the troops for Europe proposal was voted in 1949, my first year in the Senate, has been that this program, along with other grants—or, to use a better world, giftprograms—have so depleted our supply of gold that this nation is finding it necessary to plead with former beneficiaries of our largesse not to call upon us to pay in the only recognized international currency, gold, the money which we owe to them. In replying these nations which we have aided in the past are exercising their proper right to insist upon this nation doing things which we would not otherwise do in the absence of our monetary distress. Of all the items which would relieve this nation's difficulties with its balance of payments, none would do as much good or make as much sense as a reduction, a major reduction, of American troop strength in Europe.

This nation's contribution to the defense effort is roughly 10 per cent of our national product. Our European allies are making a contribution which is 5 per cent or less, of their national product. Those nations and Japan are the most prosperous nations on earth, except for the United States. If they are not so concerned about the threat of aggressive communism that they will not make a sacrifice to compare with our own, then we have no business and no proper right bleeding this nation white economically until America becomes an international beggar, to do for our friends things which they are well able to do for themselves.

The strongest single reason for continuing the existing level of American troop strength in Europe from the viewpoint of a European is the bountiful blessing of the money that this policy pours into their domestic economy. While some of us may not begrudge this blessing to the economy of Europe, we can no longer afford it.

Another best argument for a continuation of this situation has been that the Soviet Union might be willing to agree to withdraw some of its troops from Eastern Europe if we withdraw some American troop strength. But why should the Communist world wish to arrive at any such arrangement? The maintenance of a million Americans on European soil is the largest reduceable item of those factors that are making the leader of world capitalism an international pauper. Any such program which brings us to our knees before first one lesser power and then another serves the purpose of international communism, in that it undermines and destroys the ability of the leader of the capitalistic world to continue to lead.

It is my fervent hope that this nation may soon reach an honorable termination of hostilities in Vietnam. When we are able to do that, we should embark immediately upon a number of policies which the future and prosperity of our nation would require. Meanwhile, we should be planning for them so that they could be put into effect immediately. The investment tax credit should be restored, if indeed it has not been restored before that time. We should make up for lost time in providing adequate highways and eliminating slums, rebuilding the center of our great cities, beautifying our countryside, eliminating pollution from water and air.

At the first possible moment, we should start rebuilding our American Merchant Marine, to provide this nation with the strength on the seas and in world trade which that arm of our national policy once possessed. The neglect of our Merchant Marine has been so tragic and so lacking in understanding of the overall problem that the present trend would make this nation impotent to carry its strength around the world to meet emergencies. Russia is launching a dozen new merchant ships for every time this nation launches one. To meet this problem and to help with our balance of payments problem in the future, I will introduce a bill to place a small tax on all cargo entering and leaving this country, and directing the receipts from that tax to the reestablishment of the American Merchant Marine to its proper position among maritime powers.

In other trade programs, the combination of taxes, tariffs, and quotas has not been successful in maintaining American industry at the desired level. Our trade policies need a thorough new look and some hard-headed American businessmen are needed to devote a great deal of independent thought and study to the overall program. This nation in its trade and aid programs has played the part of an Andy Gump until it is on the verge of becoming an international Barney Google. Personnel that have manned the international giveaway programs for a great number of years are poorly equipped to change customs and play the opposite role for the future even if their intellectual make-up could be so transformed.

This next year we will be passing additional trade legislation. The tendency in recent years has been to reduce American tariff protection while foreign countries have given little if anything in return, other than to agree to continue their existing practices, without making trade more onerous for us than it had been in the past. The reduction in levels of American tariffs has brought an increase in imports. The program has not brought us a corresponding increase in our exports. The result is that our favorable balance of trade is being reduced to the vanishing point.

When our unfavorable balance of tourist trade is added to the scales, together with our foreign aid program, troops for Europe and the war in Vietnam, we find ourselves in a serious deficit position which is steadily growing worse. It cannot be corrected entirely while the Vietnam war continues, but we must start improving the situation so that it can be corrected when the Vietnam war is over.

This nation has it well within its power to correct all of these things which give an unfavorable balance of payments and move toward an unfavorable balance of trade. We can do it by expanding our Merchant Marine, by providing more rather than less protection for any American industry that is threatened, by insisting upon a quid pro quo from those countries which are enjoying favors from Uncle Sam.

The most imperative item is that we must stop American negotiators from committing this nation to international agreements which bind our hands and prevent us from using those tools which could save us in the future.

Lest someone be confused that I have expressed some opinions at variance with the Johnson Administration, I believe it well to make it clear that I am elected to represent the State of Louisiana and its three million people. Under our Federal system it was intended that there be room for differences of opinion. That is one of the reasons we have so many Congressmen and Senators. The fact that a man is chosen by his colleagues to be a part of their leadership does not reduce for one moment his duty to his nation, to the people who elect him, and to his convictions. As a part of the leadership, he has the duty to go an extra mile in bringing men of good will together to support policies and agree on decisions which are good for this country. So long as he remains a part of the legislative branch, he does not relinquish his duty to speak for what he believes.

This great and powerful nation holds its place in the world in spite of many mistakes, disasters and adversities with which its people have been confronted. It holds its place foremost among free people because we have realized our mistakes in time and with the guidance of a merciful Lord we have been able to correct our mistakes and find the right course to justice, wealth, and leadership. From time to time we would do well to rejoice in our good fortune. Having done so, we should then rededicate ourselves to the task ahead and accept whatever danger or sacrifice may be necessary to achieve it.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, earlier this month, the Senate confirmed the appointment of Mr. Joe W. Fleming II, of Arkansas, to be Federal Cochairman, Appalachian Regional Commission. Also, the Special Subcommittee on Economic Development of the Senate Committee on Public Works held hearings on S. 602, authorizing funds for the Appalachian Regional Development Act programs for fiscal years 1968 and 1969. In company with my colleagues, I was pleased to support Mr. Fleming's appointment, and I wish to express my good wishes to him for a continued success in the administration of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

I testified before the special subcommittee that the Appalachian Regional Development Act was, in my considered opinion, one of the most successful, effective and efficiently administered Federal programs now in operation. I believe that it has begun to bring to reality the legislative intent of the Congress, for although the program has been in existence for less than 2 years, we are already witnessing some extremely significant benefits. This success is undoubtedly due to good administration and because the Appalachian States have been given a new hand in solving their own problems, thus demonstrating an ideal relationship between the Federal Government and the States working in cooperation. I only wish this same degree of enthusiasm were possible in describing other Federal programs soon to be brought before the Senate.

Because the Senate will need to vote on appropriations to carry forward the Appalachian Regional Development Act programs, I feel an appraisal of their operations is in order. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I was instrumental in securing initial funds for fiscal year 1965 to permit the establishment of the Appalachian Commission. The subsequent effectiveness of the act makes it gratifying to me to have fought successfully to secure these funds and to work to provide adequate financing to enable the orderly progression of its programs.

Members of the Senate will doubtlessly be interested in some of the operations of these programs, so that they may have an effective yardstick in judging the merits of others, also to be considered for Federal financing in the foreseeable future. For this purpose, I wish to have my testimony during the February 3 hearings of the Special Subcommittee on Economic Development placed in the Record.

I ask unanimous consent that this testimony be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Chairman. Senator Byrd, we are gratified that you have arranged your schedule, a busy one this morning, to appear and testify before our special subcommittee on economic development and you may proceed as you desire to bring to the attention of the members of the subcommittee the important points that you believe we should consider as we extend the legislation, legislation which you joined in as a co-sponsor and have worked with the various elements in developing the region over such a long time.

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT C. BYRD, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Senator Byrd. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee. I am grateful for the privilege of appearing before your subcommittee and I want to express my gratitude for your kindness in allowing me to come over on such short notice.

Mr. Chairman, it is an extreme pleasure for me to join you, my colleague and distinguished chairman of this committee, in endorsing legislation which will authorize again the Appalachian Regional Development Act.

I join, also, Governor Hulett Smith of West Virginia in recognizing the value of this legislation and the genuine effort that was made by the Federal Government to correct the inequities which have long existed in this region.

As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I was pleased to do my part to give life to the authorizing legislation by amending the Supplemental Appropriation Bill of Fiscal Year 1965 by adding the first funds for the measure—$800,000 to establish a commission and to organize the administrational structure of the Act.

Again, in April, 1965, I was extremely happy to move for the restoration of $7.9 million which had been stricken by the House of Representatives from the Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill of 1965.

As you know, this motion was accepted by the Senate Appropriations Committee and the membership of the Senate. It was adjusted by a Senate-House conference to $5.3 million. Again, last fall, I moved to restore the funds for supplementary grants from $25 million to $30 million and I shall continue in my efforts, Mr. Chairman, to be helpful in this regard.

May I make this observation—that among the many programs which the Federal Government has launched in recent years, the Appalachian Program has, in my opinion, one of the most outstanding records, if not the most outstanding record, of success—both from an administrative view and from its acceptance by the people in the region which it serves.

And in saying this, Mr. Chairman, I am considering the Accelerated Public Works Program and the Area Redevelopment Program, both of which were excellent programs in my judgment. Particularly was the former of the two.

This program has not been the subject of attack by critics because, I believe, it has proper objectives and it has been conducted admirably, efficiently, and well.

Although it has been in existence less than two years, the program has already produced some significant benefits. The Appalachian Development Highway System is beginning to offer visual proof that the region's historic barriers to commerce, tourism and general mobility can and will be destroyed.

More than 390 miles of the system have been approved for construction at a total estimated cost of $690 million. This includes $387 million in Appalachian funds. The State of West Virginia, the only State entirely within the boundaries of the region, now has more than 100 miles of the 428 miles allocated to it either under construction or in the final contract stages.

In addition to the development highway program, 55 access road projects had been approved by the Appalachian Commission by January of this year. The economic benefits of these roads can be measured specifically by the industrial, commercial, recreational and residential sites they serve.

The Land Stabilization section of the Appalachian Act has allowed more than 7,000 farmers in Appalachia to introduce such practices as terracing, flood control ponds, and the planting of leguminous crops. This program not only enhances the income of the needy farmer, but also serves broader economic benefits by preventing siltation and flooding. More than 540 land stabilization contracts have been signed by farmers in my State.

I am confident that more of us realize the importance of upgrading the skills of Appalachia's unemployed and providing new skills to those about to enter the labor force. The Appalachian Commission's vocational education program is expected to provide new and expanded facilities for almost 45,000 students as a result of the projects already approved or now pending.

As of the first of the year, the Commission had approved 31 vocational education projects using a total of $7,544,000 in Appalachian funds, while another 28 projects reaching a total of $9,725,500 are now under review at the Commission or in the State education departments.

The supplemental grants section of the Appalachian program strikes at the heart of a major impediment to the development of some Appalachian communities—a lack of the local funds needed to participate in other Federal grant-in-aid programs.

As hoped, Section 214 supplemental funds have proved to be "seed money" in attracting other Federal, State and local funds to the region.

On the basis of Section 214 grants made as of January 1, 1967, every dollar of Appalachian money accounted for $1.85 in other Federal funds, $1.90 in State and local money, and $4.75 in total projects.

These supplemental grants enabled West Virginia to launch a total of 28 major developmental projects in the State. I am told that we invested a total of $5,105,324 in supplemental funds which produced $24,431,305 in new projects for the State in the first 22 months of the program.

Most of the projects funded under this section of the Act were for higher and vocational education, hospitals, libraries, airports and sewage treatment plants. This concentration alone indicates a considerable amount of economic planning on the part of the individual States and on the part of the Commission.

This planning, conceived within the Commission's State-Federal partnership arrangement, could be a benefit even paramount to the program's economic benefits. This Commission's State-Federal relationship has given the States unprecedented responsibilities in the decision-making and policy-making of the program.

The result has been truly regional planning and cooperation in solving the problems of the region.

A good example is the construction of demonstration health centers in Appalachia. Recognizing the significance of comprehensive health care, the Commission delayed implementation of that section of the Act until proper guidelines and criteria could be established to insure that all health projects were truly comprehensive in nature.

It is my understanding that one project has been officially submitted now to the Commission and that several others are expected to be submitted within the next two or three months. I am informed that a West Virginia health project is among these.

The Appalachian Program has proved to be of singular importance in my State, and I believe, in the entire Appalachia region.

I support, Mr. Chairman, the proposed amendment to the Act which allows for direct funding of the Appalachian program. Commission officials and members tell me that the current system of fragmenting appropriations to it throughout the Federal budget is not efficient. It is obvious that the States and the Commission have illustrated time and again their ability to plan and judge project proposals on the basis of merit.

We have given the Appalachian States a new hand in solving their own problems. I hope we continue to assist them through this fine program.

It is my understanding, may I interpose, Mr. Chairman, before I conclude, that the U.S. Soil Conservation Service believes that the Appalachian Act now permits the use of Appalachian supplementary funds for the development of watersheds.

However, as there is some confusion concerning this issue, may I recommend that this committee go on record as stating that Section 214 funds be used to assist local communities in the development of watershed projects.

Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful for your courtesy and kindness in allowing me to present my statement.

The Chairman. Senator Byrd, we are grateful for your statement and you have been specific in pointing out areas in which progress has been made not only in the region as a whole, but you are intimately acquainted with the development in the State of West Virginia.

I wonder if Senator Cooper would wish to make comment or discuss any of the subject.

Senator Cooper. No. I am very happy that Senator Byrd has testified before the committee because of his intimate knowledge of West Virginia and the region.

His suggestions have been helpful to us and I certainly appreciate the support that you have given this program from its very beginning.

The Chairman. Senator Baker?

Senator Baker. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Thank you again, Senator Byrd, for coming before the subcommittee this morning.

On the matter of the appropriation, the fragmentation, and the one-package preferable procedures which have been discussed during these hearings, you have bore down on this subject as a member of the Appropriations Committee. We are grateful especially for your comment in this area of our thinking.

Senator Byrd. Mr. Chairman, may I close by expressing my sincere appreciation to you and your distinguished colleagues for the fine hearings that you have conducted. I know that you are seeking, as I indicated yesterday, a broad-based support. You are seeking to determine the weaknesses, if there be some, and you are seeking information which will enable you and your committee to reach a very considered and careful judgment as you proceed to prepare legislation for consideration by the full Senate.

I know that out of these hearings will come an improved legislative measure, and not only do we in the Senate who represent States in Appalachia owe you and the committee a debt of gratitude, but our people, perhaps more than we, owe you a debt of lasting gratitude for the efforts that you are making.

I again want to compliment you and again want to thank you.

The Chairman. Thank you, Senator Byrd, for your contribution to our subject, for counseling with members of the subcommittee.

Senator Byrd. Thank you.

THE WASHINGTON POST SUPPORTS TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Washington Post on February 20 published an excellent editorial regarding the President's consumer message and the truth-in-lending bill, which I introduced on January 11. The Post concludes that it is not at all difficult to calculate the annual rate for credit and believes the dissemination of such information would be of material assistance to consumers. Mr. President, I congratulate the Washington Post for its excellent editorial stand, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 20, 1967]

A Fine and Crucial Line

President Johnson delivered another strong message replete with recommendations for legislation that would protect consumers. The motive is laudable, and so, in most instances, are the concrete proposals. But the Congress, in considering them, must draw the fine and crucial line between the genuine protection of consumers and measures that would on balance reduce economic efficiency by interfering with the operation of markets.

Consider first the President's endorsement of the "truth in lending legislation" that is designed to provide accurate information on the actual costs of consumers credit. This proposal, long championed by Paul H. Douglas, has been variously attacked as both impractical and as an effort to impose a Federal usury regulation—a ceiling on the interest rates charged for consumers credit. But neither objection carries much weight.

It is not at all difficult to calculate the true rate at which consumers credit is extended, no matter if the contract is complicated by discounting and repayment provisions. Indeed, the Bowery Savings Bank of New York has for some time distributed a "Quick Credit Cost Computer," a simple cardboard device that permits one to calculate the true cost of consumers credit at a glance. Nor is the usury objection very weighty. Informing the consumer that he is really paying more than 12 per cent interest when he pays one per cent interest a month on the outstanding balance of a one-year loan is hardly tantamount to a ceiling on interest rates. Disseminating such information may encourage some consumers to save more and borrow less. But surely thrift is not an unmitigated vice.

The case for legislation to regulate mutual funds, about which the President was far more circumspect, is very doubtful. The Securities and Exchange Commission in its December report made many valuable recommendations for eliminating the abusive practices of "insiders" in the management of mutual funds. But the SEC proposal for generally limiting sales commission charges—the "sales load"—to 5 per cent is quite another matter. This proposal for price control in the distribution of mutual funds would be necessary if Congress would eliminate the resale-price maintenance provisions of the Investment Company Act of 1940, thus introducing price competition instead of compelling the distributors of mutual funds to sell only at prices set by fund managements.

There is no more justification for placing a ceiling on the commissions earned by mutual fund salesmen than there is for limiting the commissions of insurance salesmen or putty knife salesmen. Ceilings on sales commissions will inhibit entry into the mutual fund industry and could require a bureaucratic army for enforcement.

Most of the other recommendations of the President appear to be unexceptionable. But Congress, if it is to provide genuine protection for the consumer, should in each case weigh the benefits of regulation against probable losses in efficiency.

TIME FOR A REASONABLE SOLUTION ON TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on February 20 Mr. James Michaux, the Washington representative of the Federated Department Stores, delivered a speech on truth in lending. Mr. Michaux' remarks were most constructive and contained what I believe to be sound advice to the credit industry. Although I do not agree with everything Mr. Michaux has said, I certainly appreciate the spirit in which he said it. I do, however, agree with his main conclusion that the credit industry should adopt a sensible attitude toward truth in lending and propose constructive alternatives where it believes the present language might be unworkable.

I sincerely believe it is possible to pass a bill which is both fair to the consumer and workable to the credit industry. I congratulate Mr. Michaux for his statesmanlike remarks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the "Conclusion" of Mr. Michaux' speech be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the "Conclusion" of Mr. Michaux' speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of James Michaux of the Federated Department Stores on Truth in Lending

CONCLUSION

In conclusion: Look back over the last two years at the experience of those who are now covered by a Federal Packaging Law and those who are subject to the Federal Auto Safety Law. Pick up any daily newspaper published during the time these fights were being waged and you will find emotional displays of tempers, threats, etc. which filtered through the halls of Congress. I doubt whether the public image of those who fought these laws was enhanced by the adverse publicity which accompanied this fight. We who are interested in consumer credit must ask ourselves: Is this the kind of a fight in which we want to be involved during the 1967–68 Congress on the issue of truth-in-lending?

I can't help but wonder why cooler heads in the industries who would have to live with any Federal credit law cannot get together and try to come up with some kind of an affirmative proposal. I believe that it would be possible to come up with one which would be workable from their point of view and at the same time provide a reasonable answer for the average Congressman who feels that some kind of Federal Credit Disclosure Law is in the public interest.

If businessmen come up with constructive proposals, I'm confident that their ideas will be welcomed by a majority of the Congressmen. It's no secret in Washington that many members of Congress are getting tired of the bickering over this issue and would welcome a reasonable solution.

Congressmen face many problems which are more difficult to solve and would have a greater impact on the country than the question as to how much truth is there in the truth-in-lending bill. Many Congressmen feel that the truth-in-lending issue has taken enough of their time. They intend to pass some kind of a law and then move on to the next issue.

This is the challenge facing the industries which consider credit to be in the cornerstone of their business. Certainly there are risks in advancing a positive solution. But in 1967 and on this issue, there are greater risks in being negative.

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL FAVORS TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal has published an excellent editorial endorsing the truth-in-lending bill, which I and 22 cosponsors introduced on January 11. The Journal believes that the average person faced with a bewildering array of credit plans may find himself baffled and unable to make an informed choice of the best terms.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Truth in Lending

Wisconsin Sen. Proxmire thinks there is a good chance that a "strong and practical" truth in lending bill will be reported favorably this spring by the senate banking and currency committee, on which he is the No. 2 Democrat.

This cause was a major concern of former Sen. Douglas of Illinois, defeated for re-election last fall. The bill was pigeonholed in the last congress. Now Proxmire is carrying on the crusade. The bill would require full disclosure of the cost of credit so that the borrower knows precisely what he is paying in interest. It would not regulate interest charges.

Faced in the market place by a bewildering array of credit plans—installment buying, home mortgages, small loans, department store revolving charge accounts—the consumer may find himself baffled, unable to make an informed choice of the best terms.

The bill got a brief but sturdy assist from President Johnson in his state of the Union message: "We should do more to protect the consumer, he said. "We should demand that the cost of credit be clearly and honestly expressed. Indeed we should.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of amendment No. 90 to S. 1, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] be added to the list of cosponsors.

Inadvertently, their names were left off the first printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL, S. 612

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] and the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] be added as cosponsors at the next printing of the bill (S. 612) to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A CALM APPRAISAL OF CIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it is my feeling that, in arriving at the true facts, and not being overwhelmed by the excitement which has been generated in the public arena by the revelation that the CIA has assisted in financially supporting the National Student Association, two very important factors should be emphasized. One is that the Communists have subsidized virtually every kind of world student convocation in order to pack these supposedly open discussions with their own people. To combat this, the CIA attempted to provide the means whereby our country could secure dependable information concerning the student activities and perhaps counteract Communist forces working through the student congresses.

Second, there has been no claim that the CIA attempted to influence the activities of the student organizations or hinder them in their freedom of speech or ideas.

It is good that the President has ordered a review of such CIA activities. So, while we should not, at the moment, exculpate the agency, we should also be willing to wait until all the evidence is in before we automatically convict the CIA of wrongdoing.

Similar views have been expressed in newspaper editorials and articles here in Washington, D.C. These include the February 19 editorial, "What Are We Trying To Do to the CIA?", published in the Sunday Star; the article written by Crosby S. Noyes, "CIA Flap Hardly as Shocking as All That," in the February 21 issue of the Evening Star; and the article written by David Lawrence, "The CIA Issue, In Simplest Form" appearing in the same issue of the Evening Star.

I ask unanimous consent that these newspaper items be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Sunday Star,
Feb. 19, 1967]

WHAT ARE WE TRYING TO DO TO THE CIA?

It is just possible, if we all manage to work ourselves into a wild enough lather, that the current flap over the CIA can be escalated to the point where it will destroy the nation's intelligence organization. It almost seems that this is what some of the breast-beaters would like to do.

One day we have a disclosure that a student organization has been receiving covert funds so that young Americans can compete with young Communists at world student meetings. Then, suddenly, nothing will do but that every traceable operation of the CIA must be laid bare to public view, commented upon in tones of pious horror, investigated, sermonized, deplored and punished, until the terrible guilt of it all has been established for all time, for all the world to see.

And what, precisely, are we guilty of? Why, of using our wits and available means to compete in a battle just as real, dirty and deadly serious as any shooting war in which we could engage.

Confronted by adversaries who threw the full power and wealth of the state into the effort to mold and control world opinion, we did not abandon the field to them. Instead, we devoted some public funds to seeing to it that Americans could confront the totalitarians in the intellectual lists abroad, speaking their minds in representing the views of a relatively free society.

It worked, incidentally. A wide variety of Americans, most of whom never knew the source of the funds backing them, proved more than able over the years to hold their own in confrontation with disciplined, professional Communist agents. They prevented the takeover of numerous international organizations and established others which have contributed substantially to the global cause of freedom.

Consider, for example, the experience of Gloria Steinem, as interestingly reported in yesterday's Washington Post. A New York writer, Miss Steinem was director of something called "The Independent Research Service," which took CIA money to send several hundred young Americans to World Youth festivals in Vienna and Helsinki in 1959 and 1962.

Miss Steinem said she worked closely with CIA agents on the program, but that few of the students who took those trips knew that the CIA was picking up the tab.

"I never felt I was being dictated to at all," she said. "I found them (the CIA men with whom she worked) liberal and far-sighted and open to an exchange of ideas. . . . They wanted to do what we wanted to do—present a healthy, diverse view of the United States."

She was backed up by Dennis Shaul, another spokesman for the organization, who said: "We had Minnesota schoolteachers who were further right than Bill Buckley as well as members of Students for a Democratic Society. Nobody told them what to do."

Bear in mind, except for such American participation financed by CIA funds, these festivals were completely dominated by Communists, all financed and controlled by their governments. Yet says Shaul, "The Helsinki festival was a disaster from their point of view, and I think we can take a good deal of credit for that."

Well now, why not? Is this really something that has to be apologized for? Who is corrupted by such an operation? Who would have paid the Americans' expenses if the CIA hadn't?

"The CIA," says Miss Steinem, "was the only (organization) with enough guts and foresight to see that youth and student affairs were important." And here, the lady puts her finger on an important point.

Of course, it would have been better if this sort of thing could have been done without subterfuge. It is too bad that private funds were not available for these purposes. It would have been healthier, lacking such private sources, for our government to have appropriated openly the necessary monies through the State Department, U.S. Information Agency or some other "respectable" organization. Even though no such alternative may have been available when these programs were initiated in the early 1950s, it would have been advisable to switch them away from CIA support as soon as that became possible.

No one, moreover, can possibly defend all the details of any one of these operations. No doubt there have been messy procedures which, when exposed, prove embarrassing. There is, one inevitably recalls, a saying about making omelettes and breaking eggs.

What is beyond comprehension in all this, however, is the monumental naivete involved in the apparent shock reaction to these disclosures on the part of otherwise knowledgeable people. After all, what have the outraged gentlemen supposed was going on all this time on the sprawling acres out at Langley? Of all the endeavors of the CIA, the effort to create outlets abroad for the expression of American opinion must surely rank as one of the milder. This is not, be it noted, a tea party that we have been engaged in. This is a viciously contested undercover war against shrewd, dedicated enemies who happen to be quite unhampered by nice-Nellie scruples. The need to press this fight has all along been recognized by the top leadership of the country. The procedures that suddenly evoke such outraged reactions were not dreamed up privately by the CIA. They were directed from the top, and properly so.

The idea that an organization like the CIA can conduct its operations while restrained by a sort of daisy-chain of clergymen, den mothers and liberal politicians—such a notion is simply absurd. For our part, we hope that the present hysteria will be calmed with a rational inquiry conducted by responsible and realistic men who have some knowledge of the very serious problems involved. We are inclined to suspect that they and the public will end up concluding that the world has not, after all, ended—and that, in doing a job which had to be done, our intelligence organization has not done too badly.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star,
Feb. 21, 1967]

CIA FLAP HARDLY AS SHOCKING AS ALL THAT

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

It's a curious thing about the Central Intelligence Agency. For a bunch of professional rascals, they have a remarkable tendency to come unhinged in times of stress.

Let the CIA blow one and everybody from the President on down suddenly loses his cool and starts acting like a kid caught with his hand in the cookie jar. And just about everything that is said by way of explanation or justification make the situation that much worse.

The present flap is no exception. The excuses made by the State Department on behalf of the CIA of why it was necessary to slip several million dollars to the National Students Association amounts to something of a masterpiece of gratuitous self-incrimination.

Consider, for instance, the official explanation of the need for secrecy as opposed to open government support of the student organization. According to the department's spokesman, "Overt governmental support of these NSA activities abroad would have destroyed their utility because NSA would hence have been subjected to attacks as an instrument of the government."

On the face of it, this statement makes little sense, since NSA in fact did receive open support from a number of government agencies, including the Agency for International Development, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Office of Economic Opportunity and the State Department. And it is quite clear that if the association survives at all, a good deal more of the same sort of open support will have to be forthcoming.

It also, however, manages to put the worst possible interpretation on the original arrangement. For if NSA would have been denounced as an agent of the government under a system of open support, what can be expected now that the source of its secret funds has been revealed? It is almost as if CIA, once the usefulness of NSA had been compromised, was stepping forward with the traditional dose of cyanide.

This is exactly the kind of "explanation" that is guaranteed to generate the absolute maximum reaction of outraged innocence at home and wondering disbelief over the naivete of Americans abroad. When it comes to anything having to do with the CIA, the American politician has an almost limitless capacity for righteous indignation. And to judge from the screams from Capitol Hill about the "threat to free American institutions" the storm will not blow over quickly.

While it lasts, the serious problems will probably not get much attention. The fact that the Communists are spending hundreds of millions of dollars to capture and control student organizations all over the world apparently makes little impression on our indignant legislators. Quite apart from the question of subsidizing students, the whole idea of propaganda and intelligence gathering offends the sensibilities of the simon-pure idealists.

It may be that the original decision to subsidize NSA with secret funds was as stupid, immoral and preposterous as everyone is now saying it was. Yet it remains to be explained why an arrangement that made sense over a period of 15 years to responsible officials in the administrations of Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson, a Senate committee and four successive directors of the CIA should suddenly be the object of such horrified denunciation.

It is also at least questionable that the purity of our youngsters has been permanently and irreparably defiled by the support which they have received from any agency of the American government.

The CIA is, after all, on our side of the ballgame, whatever the editors of Ramparts magazine may think. Student organizations everywhere make promising targets for subversion. And an effort to have them promote American interests is hardly as shocking as all that.

At least not outside of the United States. The one thing that we can be sure of is that these sensational revelations will cause little amazement among our friends abroad who have long since stopped thinking of us as a nation of boy scouts. So far as they are concerned, the long arm of CIA is assumed to be behind almost every unexpected happening on the international scene. In this case, the only wonderment may be that the rich Americans have been so niggardly compared to the Russians in footing the students' bills.

THE CIA ISSUE, IN SIMPLEST FORM

(By David Lawrence)

Many people throughout the United States are reading derogatory criticism or seeing cynical cartoons about the methods of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency. Few persons, however, know what the gathering of "intelligence" really means to the future of the nation itself.

To take an example, if an enemy country possesses nuclear weapons that could result in the sudden destruction of 130 million Americans, wouldn't it be worthwhile to get the facts and bring them to the attention of the military authorities in our own country so that countermeasures could be taken to prepare a defense system which would act as a deterrent against the carrying out of any such lethal plan?

Today America is in grave danger of potential attack by the Russians. Within the last year, the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff learned through intelligence channels that the Russians had started to build antimissile defenses around Moscow, Leningrad and other key population centers at the rate of half-a-dozen each year.

The Russians, it turned out, had broken a pledge by ignoring the moratorium on nuclear explosions as they made some tests in 1961 and 1962 which encouraged them to go further with the development of their weapons. These tests were the most extensive ever conducted and convinced the Soviet leaders that what is known as an "antimissile missile" was worth building at once. Some important facts about the situation now have come out into the open, and members of the Armed Services Committees in both houses of Congress are urging the Defense Department to begin counter-measures.

It was not until after news articles were published last autumn telling the story of the antimissile system which the Russians are building that the Defense Department itself confirmed the information. Congress now is confronted with the problem of spending $30 billion, spread over the next few years, to build a defense system that could cut the total casualties in the United States in the event of war by at least 70 million lives.

It has just been published that 1952 was the year when the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency began to subsidize some student organizations affiliated with the National Student Association. This correspondent recalls a conversation in London that same year with a British intelligence officer of high rank, who had been asked by the writer for an evaluation of intelligence systems of different countries in the world. The intelligence officer said:

"Your own intelligence work in the United States is in its infancy. It is going to take you 10 to 20 years to find out how to do the job effectively. It sometimes takes many years merely to establish lines of communication in certain parts of the world, and you Americans are just beginning. It will cost a good deal of money. But the job has to be done—and in secret."

It is, of course, as important to keep secret the mistakes sometimes made in intelligence work as it is to refrain from boasting about successes. Intelligence is a continuously secret operation. Yet a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is already proposing an open investigation of the CIA. This would indeed be a boon to the Russians.

What possible benefit, it will be asked, can come from lining up American student organizations? What do such groups know about war operations or preparations? They may know very little, but they can find out a great deal if they become intimate with the students of enemy countries who assemble in meetings in various parts of the world. Sometimes there are students of Communist countries who want to defect. Their parents may be engaged in military service. Students may gather scraps of information which, when pieced together with data obtained in some other way, begin to make a case for efforts in pursuit of further intelligence.

Anybody who joins in CIA activities has to be sworn to secrecy all his life. It is amazing that anybody in the National Student Association was so ill-advised as to make public what his own government is doing.

Gathering intelligence is as important as fighting at the battlefront. In its simplest form, the issue is whether the United States should keep up-to-date in collecting vital information to defend itself or take chances while an irresponsible enemy builds up its power to blackmail the other nations of the world.

RECESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.) the Senate recessed until tomorrow, Friday, February 24, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 23, 1967:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Alfred Robert Zipf, of California, to be a member of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for a term expiring August 3, 1970.

Dr. Kathryn M. Smith, of Colorado, to be a member of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for a term expiring August 3, 1970.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Environmental Science Services Administration:

To be lieutenant commanders

Ralph J. Land
Leonard E. Pickens
Dee E. Kimbell
George M. Cole, Jr.
Freddie L. Jeffries

To be lieutenants

Clifford A. Wells
Thomas F. Scygiel, Jr.
William T. McMullen
Theodore Wyzewski
Fidel T. Smith
Kenneth F. Burke
Floyd S. Ito
Charles H. McClure
Christopher C. Mathewson
Roger H. Kerley
Paul M. Hale
Irving Menessa
William M. Noble
Richard F. Coons
James W. Leggate
Arthur J. Kuhn
Stanley M. Hamilton
Leonard M. Larese-Casanova
Dennis E. Youngdahl
Kirk P. Patterson
Otto F. Steffin
Merritt N. Walter
Richard E. Newell

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Terry C. de la Moriniere
David J. Lystrom
James L. Ogg
Leonard D. Goodisman
Keith A. Boe
Jeremy R. Hutt
James R. Vandell

To be ensigns

Kanezo A. Domoto
Richard T. Sheahan
Calvert D. Iles
David M. Mauthe
Anthony Vecino
Roger G. Svendsen
George B. Wharton, Jr.
Gary R. Polvi
Bradford W. Roth
Jimmy R. Eddlemon
George H. Bragg, Jr.
Peter L. Cook
David F. Blanchard
Thomas H. Stockton
Alexander Hogue, Jr.
David McCall
Brian D. Wool
David L. Vannieuwenhoven
Raymond O. Severy
Michael L. Smith
Gerben Hoekstra
Frank P. Rossi
Roger F. Anderson
John T. Atwell
Glenn Tober
Steve F. Yoshida
Norman D. Smith
William J. Budd, Jr.
Richard A. Sundholm
John L. Heagle
Richard S. Wilson
Lowell J. Genzlinger
Mark E. Harbert
Richard A. Dowd
John D. Uetz
David E. Durdall
Gary J. Lillesve
Kenneth C. Markve
Thomas W. Griffin
David C. Harrison
Carl W. Garrett
Brian E. Morgan
Steven S. Nakao
Keith F. Bradley
Birchell C. Eversole, Jr.
John W. Myers
Robert E. Knollenberg
Jonathan R. Carr
Malcolm L. Macfarlane
James A. Disbrow

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.—Matthew 5: 5.

O God and Father of us all, in these anxious moments and uncertain hours, we come to Thee with needs and longings only Thou canst help us meet. As we live through these troubled days, grant unto us beliefs big enough, hearts honest enough and spirits strong enough to make us more than a match for the mood of this modern time.

By Thy spirit help us to rise above all that is narrow and petty and selfish, and with increased devotion may we work together for the well-being of our Nation and for the welfare of all mankind.

To this end guide us in our thinking, direct us in our speaking, and govern us in our living, that at the end of the day we may hear Thy voice say, "Well done, good and faithful servant." In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SELECT COMMITTEE UNDER HOUSE RESOLUTION 1—PERMISSION TO FILE ITS REPORT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the select committee under House Resolution 1 have until midnight tonight to file its report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 4573

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House have until midnight tonight to file their report to accompany the bill H.R. 4573.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman what this bill is?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, this is the bill on the debt ceiling.

Mr. GROSS. The debt ceiling?

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman, and withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF FEBRUARY 27, 1967

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of the week, and the agenda for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the distinguished minority leader's inquiry, there is no further legislative business except unanimous-consent matters today, and for this week, and I will ask to go over at the conclusion of today's business until Monday.

Mr. Speaker, Monday is District Day, but there are no District bills.

On Monday, we will call up House Resolution 168, authorizing investigations by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and House Resolution 203, authorizing investigations by the Committee on Public Works.

Tuesday, we have no legislative business scheduled.

Wednesday, H.R. 4573, the public debt limit, temporary increase, conference report.

Also on Wednesday will be the report on the resolution of the special investigative committee pursuant to House Resolution 1.

On Thursday, H.R. 4515, supplemental military procurement, research and development, and construction authorization for fiscal year 1967.

Any further program will be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, I might say for the edification of the Members that the second matter I mentioned on Wednesday is from the Celler investigating committee.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next, March 1, 1967.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, February 27, 1967.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF NATIONAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I join with school and community leaders throughout Arkansas, and throughout the Nation, in commemorating the signing of the first National Vocational Education Act, 50 years ago, today, by President Woodrow Wilson.

The ensuing half-century has seen development of an educational system that has been instrumental in preparing young people and adults for their place in the industrial revolution that has taken place and is taking place and, at the same time, has improved agricultural education available to those who felt that their calling in life was to produce the food and fiber needed to feed and clothe the Nation.

Within 11 days after approval of the Smith-Hughes Act, the Arkansas General Assembly passed a law to qualify our State for Federal aid to set up a program of vocational education and has acted similarly to qualify our program for participation in the Federal programs added by additional Federal legislation in the years since.

If I may, let me cite just a few statistics to underscore the extent to which the Arkansas program has expanded.

The enrollment in vocational classes for youth and adults during 1965–66 was 92,724, 233 times the 397 individuals enrolled in 1917, following passage of the Smith-Hughes Act.

During 1965–66, preemployment and supplementary instruction were provided in almost 100 occupational classifications; and our program includes 297 departments of vocational agriculture, 384 departments of home economics, 27 distributive education programs, 13 programs in office occupations, 15 schools for practical nurse instruction, 70 high school trade and industrial programs, and six area vocational-technical schools operated by the State board for vocational education for training of students who have left or graduated from high school. When the expansion begun following enactment of the Federal Vocational Education Act of 1963 is completed, Arkansas will have in operation 10 area vocational-technical schools for postsecondary students, 2 community colleges with vocational-technical school programs, 2 area vocational-technical high schools operated by local school districts, and 1 postsecondary program operated on the campus of a 4-year college.

The best evidence of their effectiveness, I think, comes from the fact that one of the biggest problems the faculties face is retaining a student until graduation, because employers are willing and anxious to hire students before they reach maximum proficiency.

For this and other reasons, and as one who has supported this program since coming to Congress, Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join in this tribute to an excellent addition to our educational system and in the commemoration of the signing 50 years ago today of the Smith-Hughes Act.

FILING OF REPORT BY COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES ON THE BILL, H.R. 4515

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight Friday to file a report on the bill, H.R. 4515, fiscal year 1967 supplemental appropriation act for southeast Asia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS DESIGNATED AS MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read:

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 23, 1967.
The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 8002 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the following Members of the Committee on Ways and Means have been designated as members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation: Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS Hon. CECIL R. KING, Hon. HALE BOGGS, Hon. JOHN W. BYRNES, Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS.

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman.

WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT—WORK PLANS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read and with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

NINETIETH CONGRESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1967.
Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, The House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture today considered and unanimously approved the work plans transmitted to you by Executive Communication and referred to this Committee. The work plans involved are:

WATERSHED, STATE, AND EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

Big Coon Creek, Alabama and Tennessee, 2763, 89th Congress.

Cold River-Old Course Saco, New Hampshire and Maine, 2822, 89th Congress.

Dick's Creek-Little Muddy Creek, Ohio, 2822, 89th Congress.

Ebenezer Creek, Georgia, 2763, 89th Congress.

Eli Whitney, Georgia, 2822, 89th Congress.

Hobbsville-Sunbury, North Carolina and Virginia, 2763, 89th Congress.

Lower Wakarusa, Kansas, Kansas, 2822, 89th Congress.

Mill Creek, Kentucky, 2763, 89th Congress.

Rock Creek, Indiana, 2838, 89th Congress.

South Tyger River, South Carolina, 2809, 89th Congress.

Spillman Creek, Kansas, 2763, 89th Congress.

Little Auglaize River, Ohio, 2809, 89th Congress.

Middle branch of the Little Auglaize River, Ohio, 2809, 89th Congress.

Prairie Hoaglin Branch of the Little Auglaize River, Ohio, 2809, 89th Congress.

Sincerely yours,

W. R. POAGE,
Chairman.

UNNECESSARY RECENT INCREASES IN DOMESTIC GASOLINE PRICES

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the White House today to take steps to force down the recent 1-cent-a-gallon retail hike in gasoline by major refining companies.

In my judgment, the price boost in gasoline is inflationary, will net the major oil companies an estimated $750 million a year, and will hit the average American car owner right where it hurts, in the pocketbook. The fact that the Humble Oil & Refining Co. has announced no price increase would indicate to me that the penny-a-gallon hike in the retail price of gasoline was not justified by other major oil companies last week.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks at this point the telegram I sent to President Johnson, and an editorial from yesterday's Washington Post concerning the increase in the retail price of gasoline:

FEBRUARY 23, 1967.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

The American people are justifiably angered at the one-cent per gallon boost in gasoline prices. Legislative proposals in your Consumer Message to Congress point up your great concern for the American consumer. The penny-a-gallon price hike will cost the consumer an estimated $750 million a year. In my judgment, this is a serious situation that calls for White House intervention. I respectfully urge you direct the Secretary of Interior to liberalize oil import quotas to increase the quantity of cheaper foreign petroleum and thus force a reduction in gasoline prices.

EDWARD P. BOLAND,
Member of Congress.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1967]

RITUAL DANCE

The fencing between the Government and the petroleum industry over higher gasoline prices resembles nothing so much as a ritual in which elaborate gestures mask relationships between the dancers. By restricting oil imports, the Government makes it possible for some companies to raise gasoline prices. But the same Government is also the friend of the consumers who must pay more than $750 million a year for every penny increase in the price of a gallon of gas. It is ambivalence that explains the terpsichorean exercise.

At first there was curious public silence, curious because gasoline price increases are far more inflationary than the advance in the price of aluminum that was beaten back by the White House with a sledge hammer. Then the Government moved by announcing what it might do to frustrate the wicked price boosters. If persuasion and "appeals to patriotism" won't work, a high official told the press, "the other thing that can be done is to increase the supply." This clear threat to the oil-import control program evoked a cry of pain from one refining executive. This is not the time, he warned, for the Government "to toy with such an essential defense program."

In point of fact the oil import quotas, imposed by a Presidential decree in 1959, have little to do with defense and much to do with protecting the industry—and its structure of domestic prices—from the influx of cheap crude oil from abroad.

The public interest will best be served by increasing imports and rolling back prices. But there are clear preferences among the feasible methods of achieving that end. Short of dismantling the quotas, the best solution is a Presidential decision to increase the import quotas. The second best move would be the lifting of production restrictions on the offshore wells. There is no reason why the Federal Government must cooperate with the oil cartel operated by the State governments. Third, the Pentagon should be compelled to resume overseas purchases of gasoline and other fuels, thus reducing demand in the domestic market.

Other moves being considered by the Government should be avoided. Awarding the Pentagon's quota to the refiners is tantamount to giving them gift certificates worth about $1.25 a barrel, a gesture that is appropriate only in the Christmas season. Nor should the Government complicate the already arbitrary quota system by allowing certain companies to import more oil through Puerto Rico.

This dance will lose much of its charm as the public begins to understand the issues at stake. The process of concealment becomes artless as the performers grow weary.

UNNECESSARY RECENT INCREASES IN DOMESTIC GASOLINE PRICES

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend President Johnson and the administration in efforts to roll back and restrain unnecessary recent increases in domestic gasoline prices. If the contemplated price rises are permitted to stand, the consumers of America will shoulder an additional burden of $750 million a year, which will be added to their living costs.

The price rise is excessive, ill-timed, and unrelated to any economic need of the industry which cannot make a case for this price increase.

The oil import control system, while cloaked in the ostensible garment of national security, is only an arrangement by which the domestic industry is protected and assured of price stability. This device should work both ways, to prevent unreasonable imports which would cripple domestic producers with unfair competition and to work in the interest of the consumer when arbitrary and unjustified price increases are planned by the domestic producers to take unfair advantage of the oil and gasoline consumer.

The oil import quota system should be developed into a stabilizing force for both the industry and the consumer.

THE 49TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF THE REPUBLIC OF ESTONIA

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1918, the people of Estonia threw off the oppression of czarist Russia and proclaimed themselves to be a free people. For 21 years the Estonian Republic ruled itself in peace as did the sister republics of Latvia and Lithuania. But World War II was brewing and the three Baltic States were to be among its first victims. In the summer of 1939 Stalin and Hitler signed a 10-year nonaggression pact and agreement was reached between the two vicious dictators that Russia was to annex the three tiny states along the Baltic. The following year Russian troops moved into the three countries and the annexation was a fact. In our more sophisticated world today we would call this armed aggression but in 1939 some of us were unfamiliar with the ways of the Communists and National Socialists. We were to learn the hard way.

Mr. Speaker, we join with Estonians everywhere today in saluting their anniversary of freedom. But more than that we join them in the hope and prayer that their homeland will once again know what it means to be free and their people, who have suffered so long, will once again enjoy the blessings of liberty. That they will once again be free is a certainty; for no dictator, no Communist, no despot of any kind can keep men who have been free from longing for that freedom. Ideas and ideals do not die because someone says kill them. Just as free men have had to learn some of the ways of the Communists, so the Communists will some day be forced to learn the ways of free men. And when they do, this will be a better world.

LEGISLATION REQUESTING RESTORATION OF 7-PERCENT INVESTMENT CREDIT AND ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION FOR COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation calling for the immediate restoration of the 7-percent investment credit and accelerated depreciation for commercial and industrial buildings.

As we know, these measures were suspended last year in moves to head off a threatened inflationary spiral. Along with other measures instituted by the Federal Reserve Board and the White House, these moves were effective in taking much of the steam out of an overheated economy. It is clear now that price stability has been restored. Indeed there are now signs of a threatened dropoff in the economy.

In my district one employer has announced plans to lay off 70 percent of its work force because of a decline in orders for the railroad equipment it produces. The company, the Symington-Wayne Corp., attributes the decline in orders to the suspension of the 7-percent investment credit. It is well known that the railroad industry is deferring purchases until the end of this year when the investment credit is due to be restored.

There are evidences that other industries are being similarly affected. I believe it is time that we gave the economy a tonic shot in the arm and urge favorable consideration of my bill.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST SPEECH BY WINNER MARY KATHRYN BALCH

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, we are very proud of Mary Kathryn Balch, who presented the winning speech from Mississippi in this year's Voice of Democracy Contest, conducted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary. This year over 350,000 school students participated.

Miss Balch reflects credit on her school, her city of Tupelo, Miss., and our State, and I am pleased to present a copy of her speech to the Members of the House, as follows:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Mary Kathryn Balch, Tupelo, Miss.)

In an address made to Congress in April, 1917, President Woodrow Wilson made this statement—"The world must be made safe for democracy." At that time the United States was about to be thrown into the chaos of World War I, and Americans were beginning to realize more than ever before how very much they cherished their freedom—their democracy. Thousands of Americans valued it so highly that they gave their lives in order that this democracy might survive for future generations.

If democracy meant that much to our predecessors, what should it mean to me as a present-day American? Today, with many dangers threatening our democratic way of life, I as an alert citizen, must have a thorough knowledge of our type of government. But more important, I must be able to defend and support it.

The word democracy comes from two Greek words—demos and kratos. When they are combined, they mean "authority of the people." This is what democracy meant to the ancient Greeks. Basically, this is what democracy means to me. I have lived in an atmosphere of freedom since my birth. To me, democracy is a way of life as well as a form of government. Each day, everywhere I go, I see evidences of democracy in action—in school elections, in the right to attend the church I prefer, in the right to discuss national politics with friends, and in the right to read and think what I choose.

I believe American democracy has given me the opportunity to develop as an individual. No one has forced me into a mold to make me as everyone else. Although in a democracy there are rules to protect our country's officials from ridicule and slander, the government does not compel me to admire our national leaders or accept their policies. The one great quality which democracy inspires in me is self-discipline. In America I am free to do whatever I choose, as long as I do not infringe upon the rights of others. I could march in protest against the war in Vietnam if I did not support it, but I choose not to do this because I know that it would undermine the American image. When I become an adult citizen, I could refuse to vote if I wished, but I will vote because I want to have a part in choosing leaders who will keep America free. I could refuse to serve on a jury, but I will accept that privilege because I want to have a hand in American justice.

As a student in a United States high school, I am studying about America's hard-won heritage in order that I will develop a deep appreciation for my freedom. The road to democracy has been bedecked with great achievements—our Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Monroe Doctrine. These represent the American people's love of personal freedom and democracy.

The American generation of which I am a part has a vital role to play in keeping the United States strong and free. No longer must we face mere physical forces which seek to overrun America, but we must guard against undermining doctrines which work to destroy our country from within. As James Madison once reminded us, "There are more instances of the abridgment of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachments than by violent and sudden usurpation."

We must be ever watchful for the forces which would destroy our liberty—our caution should take the form of active interest in political affairs, awareness of local and national policies, a sincere pride in our heritage, and an optimistic faith in the future. Thomas Jefferson put it this way, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Only with vigilance shall we be assured of our "unalienable rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Our generation has a date with destiny, and we must realize that freedom is every man's responsibility.

STUDY OF BANK STOCK OWNERSHIP AND CONTROL

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Finance magazine, a monthly publication which calls itself "the magazine of money," ran an unsigned critique of a subcommittee staff report published last December by the Banking and Currency Committee on "Bank Stock Ownership and Control."

While the article started out promising enough by stating that "a number of banks are seriously considering full-fledged information programs about their activities," it went on neither to refute in detail any of the finds of the staff report nor to present any new facts on this subject.

This article was highly critical of the study, using such terms in describing the study as "blatant misinformation," "innuendo," "ignorance," "remarkable lack of understanding," and making other vague charges.

Let me make this statement at this time. The Finance magazine article typifies the defensive and negative reaction that the financial community almost invariably displays whenever a study or investigation of its activities is undertaken. The economy of our country, just as every other area of our life, has changed greatly in the last 25 or 30 years. There is nothing sacrosanct about the laws regulating banks and other financial institutions, most of which were passed many years ago. The sooner that the financial community stops crying "wolf" every time the Banking and Currency Committee or others criticize certain activities or developments, and participates in a sincere and constructive discussion of the new problems that have arisen and the specific issues created by these problems, the better chance the country will have to obtain effective modern regulation of financial institutions to adequately protect the public interest.

I have sent the editors of Finance magazine a detailed rebuttal of their article. I include the article and my letter at this point in the RECORD:

PATMAN REPORT TOO PAT—NO BROAD STROKES, SENATOR, JUST THE FACTS, PLEASE

Congressman Wright Patman will be interested to know that bankers aren't passively accepting the report on "Bank Stock Ownership and Control" recently issued by his House Committee on Banking and Currency.

To put it mildly, bank trust men have been stunned by the many fallacies, factual errors and half-truths contained in the study. Accordingly, a number of banks are seriously considering countering its murky allegations with full-fledged information programs about their activities.

Bankers are saying that if a group of researchers operating under Congressional immunity can spread on the record blatant misinformation about an important aspect of banking, a concerted effort will have to be made to set the record straight in general, nontechnical media. The public then will be able to judge for itself.

The report contends that many major banks can potentially abuse the public interest through their "startling degree" of control over their own stock as well as over the stock of competitive institutions.

CHARGE WITHOUT PROOF

Try as it might, however, the report fails to substantiate this sweeping charge. For one thing, the report cites no specific instances of abusive practices—although many bankers concede that occasional abuses occur. But what bankers resent most is the report's attempt to build a case to the effect that the mere possession of bank stock in a bank trust department implies that the shares can be, and are being, used to feather the bank's own nest.

This innuendo, bankers say, is not only unwarranted, but also betrays ignorance on the part of the report's writers about the exacting restraints imposed on trust men in their fiduciary capacity.

In a trust, to be sure, a trustee does hold title to property for the beneficiary, and so he conceivably would be in a position to use it for self-gain. But the laws require that the trustee, in performing his fiduciary duties, be completely responsive to the best interests of his beneficiary, and to no one else—including his employer, the bank. The trustee, moreover, must be prepared to prove his intentions in court—a very real weapon, bankers will agree, that brings out the "prudent man" in most trust administrators.

Nevertheless, the cynical observer of the trust scene might contend that, in reality, the trust man still usually accommodates his trust decisions to the best interest of the concern that employs him.

TRIMMING THE SAILS

Few bankers would deny that this temptation exists, and that some fiduciaries might, indeed, trim their sails to jibe with the bank's interests on occasion.

But even granting the worst, the subcommittee on domestic finance, which wrote the report, is guilty of factual error in suggesting that all assets under the supervision of a bank trust department are the same, legally and operationally. What the report fails to recognize is that the responsibilities of a bank trust department, far from being uniform, vary with the type of account entrusted to its care. In a trusteeship, as we have seen, the bank assumes vast powers, and thus must exercise the greatest discretion in handling shares (whether of banks, steel companies or what have you.)

Bank trust departments also manage sizable numbers of investment agency accounts and, in addition, frequently they act simply as the custodian for securities left in the care of the bank. In the latter two instances, the trust department serves only in the role of an agent for the principal, who retains full title to the shares.

INDISCRIMINATE LUMPING

But from reading the report you would never have known this distinction existed. The study lumps together all assets of bank trust departments indiscriminately—reporting a total of $215-billion as representing the value of investment management agency accounts—which by no stretch of the imagination belong to the banks; many of these agency accounts, indeed, are handled on a nondiscretionary basis, meaning the customer must be consulted on virtually every move the manager makes.

It's this kind of misconception, of course, that taxes the report's credibility and leaves doubts about its over-all authoritativeness. Surely someone on the research staff should have known the difference between trust and agency accounts, and what that distinction meant in terms of the report's conclusions.

The study might have avoided still other pitfalls if the researchers had only bothered to question banks about their actual practices in the penetrating way that a newspaperman or a magazine writer would. The committee, to be sure, collected voluminous records from thousands of banks in preparing the study on the activities of the largest 300. But from the looks of the final effort, it would appear that the writers of the report let the statistics overwhelm them, rather than provide meaningful information.

AWARENESS OF PROBLEMS

If the researchers, for example, had asked the right questions, they would have learned that where a trust department falls heir to the stock of its own bank, say as part of an estate, it is usually under standing instructions to sell those shares. Long before Mr. Patman grew interested in the subject, banks were aware of the delicacy of the problem, and set a policy to resolve it.

But frequently the client will not permit the sale of the bank's stock that has been turned over to it in trust. Corporate pension plans administered by banks, for example, frequently have an investment committee of the client corporation serve as co-trustee, and this committee may insist that the shares be retained. In such cases, the trust agreement generally provides for the co-trustee or a third party to vote the portfolio shares.

All told, the Patman report charged that of the 30 largest commercial banks, nearly 30 per cent have sole or partial voting control over at least 5 per cent of their shares, while 12 per cent have this influence over 10 per cent or more of their shares. It's in the latter situation that the report saw the greatest cause for alarm, asserting that the bank management could thus exercise effective control of the institution, if it so desired, possibly leading to "self-dealing, self-perpetuation and other conflicts of interest."

But the committee wasn't content only to charge that banks could use their own bank stocks to wrest control from unsuspecting public stockholders. It made the additional discovery, in analyzing the statistics supplied by the banks, that 47 per cent of 275 major banks have at least 5 per cent of their voting shares held by other financial institutions, including other commercial banks, mutual savings banks and insurance companies. As a consequence of such "interlocking bank-stock holdings," the report declared, the "concentration of economic power in financial institutions in general appears to be considerably greater than generally had been thought."

The conspiratorial possibilities of such interlocking relationships clearly left the staff breathless with excitement. Pursuing its premise to the ultimate, it decided that "there are probably many situations where it might have appeared that financial institutions were in competition with each other, when in fact they are controlled or largely influenced by the same people or groups with which they are supposed to compete."

Seemingly a very plausible bit of reasoning, except for one flaw—it's the kind of thing that rarely happens, if at all, in the real world. The reason that institutional investors own a goodly amount of bank stocks is simply that bank stocks are greatly favored by institutional investors—and many other kinds of investors as well, for that matter. But since there are only a couple of hundred major banks in the United States, it is not surprising that many institutional investors own shares of the same banks.

The committee, of course, could have learned all this by making simple inquiries. It would have learned, too, that institutions held bank stocks strictly as an investment, not as a devious way of influencing a bank's decisions or to control a bank.

Except for those rare instances where a proxy fight may prompt institutional and other investors to choose sides, there are few recorded instances where institutional owners have sought to grab control of a bank.

BANKS HAVE GOOD REASON

When banks themselves own stocks of other banks, they are generally quite frank to say why they do. "We buy them because we're convinced that bank stocks are a good investment," one of the country's prominent trust officers explained the other day. In such an investment, he says, his bank is only seeking a good dividend payout—and price appreciation—as in any other investment. He says the bank, far from wanting to control a rival institution (an impossible objective anyway), seeks to compete all the more vigorously against them.

The intensely competitive situation in New York City (where the Patman report says all six top banks own stocks in each of the others) certainly belies any conclusion to the contrary.

The Patman report doesn't square with reality, not only because it shows a remarkable lack of understanding of a bank's fiduciary responsibilities, but also because it ignores the role played in the supervision of bank trust work by the bank regulatory agencies—the United States Comptroller of Currency, the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the banking supervisors of the states.

Actually, the regulatory authorities are very much involved in seeing to it that bank trust activities adhere to established standards of practice and law.

Ironically, the committee's report relies on the National Banking Review, a publication of the Comptroller's office, for its statistics on the size of total bank trust department assets. It apparently never occurred to the committee staff that the Comptroller's interest in the subject was considerabaly more than academic.

Shortly after the Patman report was released late last year, the American Bankers Association issued a statement that went right to the heart of things in noting the study's most glaring deficiencies. Charles E. Walker, executive vice president of the prestigious trade association, said in the statement that he found it "neither surprising nor sinister" that bank stocks are so widely held in accounts ministered by bank trust departments.

Bank stock, Mr. Walker noted (with the proper amount of tactful and tactical understatement), has always been regarded as a "standard prudent long-term investment" and is to be expected to be found in any well-diversified investment portfolio.

Essentially, Mr. Walker is remarking on not only the stocks but also basically on the competence of the banks that issue the stocks. For if the banks as a group were in any way suspect of the wild allegations contained in the Patman report, investors wouldn't touch their shares with a 10-foot pole.

The fact is, however, that bank stocks are very much in demand, which seems to be a source of deep puzzlement to the Texas Congressman and his aides. But to people who have confidence in the proven integrity of the country's business and financial leaders, it's not the least bit perplexing.

FEBRUARY 18, 1967.

EDITOR, FINANCE MAGAZINE,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: The unsigned article in the February issue of *Finance Magazine* discussing the recent staff report on "Bank Stock Ownership and Control" issued by a subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee, started out promisingly when it stated that ". . . a number of banks are seriously considering . . . full-fledged information programs about their activities." I wholeheartedly support a full-fledged disclosure of the financial condition and activities of banks, including detailed information on holdings in their trust departments. If, indeed, the banks do begin to provide such information, it will be a startling departure from their previous policy of secrecy.

The above mentioned staff report was itself an attempt to lift the veil of secrecy surrounding the *holding* and *voting* of certain types of securities, i.e. bank stocks, by various types of financial institutions. This was only a beginning and it was and is contemplated that more detailed studies of this subject would be undertaken.

Your strong attack on the report, however, requires detailed reply. While you charge that the report has ". . . many fallacies, factual errors and half truths . . .," no specific examples are given.

In addition, you misrepresent the thrust of the report when you say that it charges that banks in particular instances use their large holdings of their own stock ". . . to feather the bank's own nest". The report does not say this. It does say that there is a great potential for such activity when banks hold and vote large blocks of their own shares. This potential for abuse cannot be challenged. You virtually admit this in your article when you say that ". . . a trustee . . . conceivably would be in a position to use it [trust property] for self gain." If this were simply a theoretical potential and not a problem with any practical consequences, as you evidently believe, why have seven states, as pointed out in the staff report, prohibited bank trust departments from voting their own shares? And why have there been investigations and lawsuits at the State level involving this question, as well as heavy bank lobbying against a legislative remedy to this problem? In short, substantial evidence points to the fact that this is a real and serious problem which must be seriously looked into, not cavalierly written off as a purely theoretical problem.

Your article also suggests that the report on "Bank Stock Ownership and Control" treats all trust assets in the same way, not distinguishing between different types of accounts. Anyone who has carefully examined the report will see that this is not the case. Simply from an examination of Table VI of the report, which you reproduced in part, it can be seen that a clear distinction was made between stock in which the bank had sole voting rights, partial voting rights and no voting rights. In addition, the footnotes at the bottom of the table, which define the three above mentioned categories, distinguishes among the several different ways in which the stock is held in trust departments.

It is even more inaccurate to charge that the study did not take into consideration the difference between stock held by a trust department or a bank nominee where these entities were the stockholder of record, and a situation in which the trust department of the bank serves ". . . only in the role of an agent for the principal, who retains full title to the shares." The questionnaire and the letter sent to the banks requesting information on their holdings of bank stock asked them to list bank stocks for which they or their bank nominee were stockholders of record. In cases where the bank was merely a custodian for the securities and the stock was held in the name of the true beneficial owner, no report was necessary. Many banks that inquired about this point were so informed and presumably did not report these holdings. Therefore, the charge that no distinction was made among different kinds of accounts is unfounded.

Your article makes the interesting statement that when ". . . a trust department falls heir to the stock of its own bank . . . it is usually under standing instructions to sell those shares." If this is truly the case in practice how have so many banks accumulated such large blocks of their own stock? More specifically, to take an example, the "Bank Stock Ownership and Control" report has a table which compares the bank stockholdings of the six largest New York banks. This table includes the percentage held by these banks of their own shares in 1962 and 1966. Over this short four-year period 5 of these 6 banks showed substantial increases in the percentage of shares held in their own banks. This, it seems is some indication that many banks in fact are not to any substantial degree selling their own shares acquired by the trust department.

Your article goes on to ridicule the report for emphasizing the interlocking nature of bank stockholdings among various types of financial institutions, including commercial bank trust departments, mutual savings banks and insurance companies. You state that it is only natural for institutional investors to own a substantial amount of bank stocks because bank stocks ". . . are greatly favored by institutional investors . . . ." This statement is subject to challenge in that it is widely believed by investment advisors that bank stocks are not top rated investments and therefore are not in fact ". . . greatly favored by institutional investors . . . ." Evidence of this fact can be shown by a recent survey of the portfolios of 475 investment companies whose combined assets totaled $45 billion. Only $477 million, or just over 1 percent, of the total was invested in bank stocks. In contrast, Table VII of the staff report shows that the 657 financial institutions which were surveyed held roughly $6.2 billion worth of bank stocks in 275 major banks. Therefore, it appears that financial institutions are much more heavily invested in bank stocks than strictly investment criteria would warrant.

In addition, as subsequently planned studies will show, the investment in bank stocks by financial institutions is not, in many cases, widely diversified at all. On the contrary, many of these institutions have heavily concentrated their bank stock investments in one or a few banks. The percentage held in a bank is, in some cases, very substantial. This I believe tends to refute your assertion, ". . . that institutions held bank stocks strictly as an investment, not as a devious way of influencing a bank's decisions or to control a bank."

At one point in your article you mention the interest that the Federal bank supervisory agencies have in policing trust department operations. You also comment on the fact that studies on trust department asset holdings have been published in the *National Banking Review*, a publication of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and cite this as an example of the Comptroller's interest in policing trust management. First of all, the *National Banking Review* publishes scholarly articles written on banking subjects without regard to whether the Comptroller's Office agrees or approves of their conclusions. If publication of an article in this journal had any relationship to the policies followed by the Comptroller, it is clear, for instance, that many of the mergers approved by the former Comptroller of the Currency in the last five years would not have been approved, since a number of articles have appeared in the *National Banking Review* in the last few years showing increased concentration in banking due to mergers and how this trend is against the public interest. I should also point out that a recent check of the thoroughness with which trust departments are examined by the Federal banking agencies has indicated that such examinations of trust departments are extremely superficial and do not delve into the problems raised in the staff report on "Bank Stock Ownership and Control".

In closing let me say that, although there have been many instances in recent years of abuses and irregularities in the operation of banks, no one, including myself, is charging the banking system in general with large-scale illegal activities. This does not mean, however, that because the structure operations, economic power, and the relationships between banks and other financial and non-financial institutions has been changing rapidly in recent years (as has been pointed out by many eminent scholars) through such activities as mergers, interlocking stockholdings, management and director interlocks and other activities, that a full investigation of the detailed nature of these changes should not be undertaken and that the laws which govern the regulation of banks and other financial institutions should not be revised where necessary to protect the public interest. It seems to me that most of the financial community regards every investigation and discussion of revision of these laws as a reflection on their basic honesty and integrity. There is absolutely nothing sacrosanct about the Federal Reserve Act, the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, the National Bank Act, or other laws governing the regulation of banking and other financial institutions. The sooner the financial community stops crying "wolf" every time this Committee and others criticize certain activities or developments, which I again emphasize are not necessarily illegal, and participates in a real discussion and constructive debate on the specific issues involved, the better the situation will be for the financial community and the public at large.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

REPRESENTATIVE MACHEN DEFENDS THE YEAR 2000 PLAN

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MACHEN**. Mr. Speaker, a number of recent newspaper articles contain certain adverse comments pertaining to the farsighted year 2000 general plan, or as it is known in the two suburban counties of Prince Georges and Montgomery "on wedges and corridors."

It seems that a few officials in both suburban counties believe that the radial wedges and corridors concept of development should be gutted in favor of some sort of sprawl type of growth that has characterized so much development over the years. These officials would use the Capital Beltway as the major guideline for future development and inasmuch as the Capital Beltway is circular it can only be assumed that they advocate circular sprawl development away from the core city.

It is interesting to note that the "wedges and corridors" general plan considered sprawl pattern and average density pattern forms of development—and rejected both out of hand. Of the sprawl pattern, the general plan said:

> New growth would follow its present trend of expanding outward in all directions at low densities, seeking always the lowest price land. Sprawl takes place naturally in the absence of energetic and coordinated public policies to guide new development.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the general plan says that sprawl pattern development "is largely the result of permissive and even passive planning—planning by reaction rather than by initiation of positive public policies."

Discussing "average density pattern" development, which also is similar to that suggested by the one official to replace the wedges and corridors concept, the general plan characterizes it as "controlled sprawl," and states that it is "an evolutionary stage between uncontrolled sprawl and the highly compact satellite and corridor patterns." I certainly think that we have evolved way past that stage with the wedges and corridors general plan.

Apparently these officials would use the Capital Beltway as the line of demarcation for new growth, in complete disagreement with the wedges and corridors plan. One official said that more beltway interchanges would be required, but I can see this would necessarily destroy the usefulness of the beltway as a high-speed limited access superhighway. I doubt that the Federal Government, which paid for almost all of the beltway, would approve of that idea.

In addition, one Prince Georges County proponent of gutting the year 2000 plan stated, and I quote from the Washington Post of February 17:

> Our rapid transit planning is not following the radial pattern and there's no reason our other planning should either. What we need is to move from place to place in our counties and not just back and forth to Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I have to admit that it is news to me that our rapid transit planning "is not following the radial pattern," as the paper quoted. I believe that person is simply wrong or misguided. It has been my distinct impression that the very beginning of our balanced transportation system would be a rapid transit system emanating from Washington into the suburbs. If that is not radial then the transit planners better take notice of the changes. I would also like to add that one of the backbones of the wedges and corridors plans is a radial balanced transportation system, which is just what we are building.

The plan states that:

> Under corridors additional services and choices will be available along the radial transportation routes centering on downtown Washington where the greatest number of employment, business and social opportunities concentrate. The need for circumferential travel between corridors will be restricted largely to limited access beltways.

On the question of preserving open spaces, the wedges and corridors plan remarks that:

> Satellite and corridor patterns propose the preservation of the largest possible rural open spaces within easy reach of most urban areas.

As a public official who has spent practically a majority of my time and effort in the fight to preserve open and scenic space, such as at Piscataway Park and the George Washington Memorial Parkway, I will oppose any general plan advocated by persons in responsible public positions that fails to match or surpass the standards set by the wedges and corridors plan for preservation of open space.

Speaking of the George Washington Memorial Parkway, I want to point out that the year 2000 plan calls for preservation of the Potomac River shoreline in Prince Georges County, as does the GWMP which I have been fighting for here in the House of Representatives. Are those who want to drastically revise the year 2000 plan in favor of revising the parkway out of existence? We do not know.

Mr. Speaker, a number of us who live in Prince Georges County believe that the year 2000 is the only general guide for development of the region. We do not believe that it is "obsolete and shortsighted," as one official said, or even "outdated" as another remarked. We realize that the year 2000 plan is not perfect; few plans are. But it is a vision, a goal for us to reach for, if you wish. If it has imperfections, let us make the necessary amendments. Let us not throw the whole general plan in the ashcan. That would be a great disservice to the people of the suburban counties.

Perhaps the problems which some cities in the year 2000 plan are really the faults of others. I think that the Washington Star hit the nail on the head in its editorial of February 20, entitled "The Purpose of Planning."

The Star said:

> The plain fact is that a plan which is not backed up with political muscle is worthless.

As long as the year 2000 plan—or any general plan for that matter—remains unenforced by the local governmental units responsible for enforcing it, then such plans will remain ineffective. I submit that our professional planners and our county officials could publish a different general plan each year but as long as they don't back them up with muscle these plans will only make nice wallpaper. I suggest that the time for putting some muscle behind the general plan is long overdue. Until this approach is tried, recommendations to gut the year 2000 plan remain hollow and baseless and should be rejected. We have certainly seen that the Federal Government is putting some muscle behind the general plan.

We saw late last week that in reinstituting the processing of funds for the Montgomery County open space program the Department of Housing and Urban Development was still reserving a final decision dependent on recent rezoning of land to a higher density than that proposed in the year 2000 plan. It is clear that this Department puts a large degree of credence in the general plan, and were it to be scuttled, there would be no basis on which to apply for Federal open space funds.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, this coming June 30 a section of the Metropolitan Development and Demonstration Cities Act goes into effect and it requires strict coordination in the spending of Federal grants and loans with comprehensive metropolitan master planning. Without a year 2000 plan on which to base applications for funds there would be little chance of securing any form of Federal grant or loan for Prince Georges County after June 30.

In light of these events and developments on the Federal level, I am surprised at the apparent lack of knowledge as to the Federal role in planning which was demonstrated by those who advocate scuttling the year 2000 plan.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to reiterate that while the year 2000 plan is not beyond criticism, it should not be scuttled.

A POSITION PAPER ON STEEL IMPORT POLICIES

Mr. **SAYLOR**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. **SAYLOR**. Mr. Speaker, in order that Members of Congress may have for their information a brief but concise outline of the status of American steel procedures in today's unprecedented struggle for world markets, I will insert in the RECORD a memorandum that has been prepared by the American Iron & Steel Institute.

This memorandum should be utilized as essential reference material with respect to the steel industry's recommendation for an immediate temporary levy on imported steel products and pig iron. It also contains guidelines that will need to be observed when the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 expires later this year.

The memorandum has other urgent and vital implications. It contains an

explanation of why, because of the surge of foreign steel and products into the United States and an attendant decline in our own producers' share of the world market, the outlook for improving the U.S. balance-of-payments position is not bright. It points out the substantial gap in wages and other benefits of production that create distinctively unbalanced economic and social levels between American workers and their contemporaries abroad, thus explaining conclusively how foreign producers are able to undersell American industry despite our enormous investments in modern plant and equipment.

In this document, Mr. Speaker, there is also a warning that unless the Federal Government acts to provide some measure of protection against the growing mountains of steel being heaped upon both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of our country, employment in the steel industry and alined industries will remain in a highly precarious position. It would be futile to attempt to avert massive layoffs after a decline in steel demand develops. The danger must be allayed now. The temporary levy is mandatory. Revisions in our foreign trade alliances must then follow.

I submit that an understanding of the following memorandum of the American Iron & Steel Institute is essential to judicious action.

The memorandum follows:

BACKGROUND MEMORANDUM ON AMERICAN IRON AND STEEL INSTITUTE STEEL IMPORT POLICY

For a number of years, American Iron and Steel Institute has endorsed the general principles of free international trade in steel. This was confirmed as recently as 1962 in its statement on "United States Foreign Trade Policy," which read in part:

"We believe in and subscribe to the objective of a free and growing two-way international trade for this country. No industrial nation like the United States can have any other objective in its own best economic and political interest."

The statement also called attention to various factors which have made it increasingly difficult for the American steel industry to compete with foreign steel producers in the United States and in international trade. The Institute urged that it was necessary to: "bring labor, taxation and other relevant policies between (major steel producing) countries into an equitable relationship in order that freedom from tariffs and other international trade barriers can be beneficially achieved."

In the five years that have passed since the Institute last stated its position, adverse factors abroad affecting international commerce in steel have grown in importance and their effects have intensified. Although there is reason to hope that, in time, economic forces will reverse this trend, there is also reason to fear that the damage to our country will have become irreparable before that occurs. To prevent this from happening, we must now seek assistance from our government as a counterpoise to the assistance provided by other governments to the steel industries of their countries.

Government assistance to steel industries abroad takes many forms, such as policies which effectively ban imports in Japan, tax remission for exports and capital funds at less than commercial rates in Western Europe, and outright government subsidies in many of the developing countries. This country could not possibly match such a bewildering variety of measures even if it wished. Furthermore, support by our government must be designed to encourage the development of sound conditions of international trade. There are a number of ways of meeting this requirement. The most direct is a temporary levy on imports of foreign made steel and pig iron to narrow the differences between prevailing domestic prices in the United States and the distressed, world market prices at which steel is imported. The Institute is proposing that such a measure be adopted.

That measure would not relieve the many competitive pressures on American producers to continue and intensify their efforts, through research and development and capital investment, to make sure that our industry and its products are the best in the world. It would create a climate of more equitable competition among domestic and foreign producers in the American market for steel. It would encourage other nations to fit their steelmaking plans more realistically to world requirements. And it would discourage the potential use of steel exports as a weapon in economic warfare.

The keystone of our foreign economic policy, reflected in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, is the principle of comparative advantage. In simple terms, this concept means that goods and services should be produced throughout the world at locations which have the best combination of economic factors for their production. In theory, productive facilities should be located in those areas having the most advantageous balance of labor supply, skills, climate, availability of raw materials, transportation and markets. The reasoning goes that, if production were rationalized everywhere in the world on this principle, there would be no need for restrictive tariffs and other impediments to trade.

The principle is exemplified, according to its adherents, by the economy of the United States. Here, there are few artificial barriers to the movement of people, goods and capital from one state or region to another. Communication from region to region is quick and unimpeded. Skills can be transferred rapidly through our school system and our industrial complex. As a consequence, productive facilities are generally located to achieve the most efficient balance among the relevant economic factors.

It is apparent, however, that this simplified picture of comparative advantage in action is not entirely accurate even in the United States. Our so-called pockets of poverty and disadvantaged regions are evidence of that. Although our Constitution forbids the levying of taxes or duties on interstate commerce, many of our states impose taxes which have this effect; and states and regions also compete vigorously with each other for new factories and other commercial establishments. Their methods are varied, but in every case they are designed to overcome a natural economic weakness or accentuate an economic advantage. In short, all those devices are contrary to the pure theory of comparative advantage.

If the theory does not apply in the United States, with its comparatively homogeneous population, fairly uniform educational and political systems and reasonably well understood and supported national goals and interests, it is even more obviously inapplicable to the world as a whole. The enormous diversity among nations, as to ideologies, educational systems, political institutions, standards of living, ability and willingness to generate capital and other factors not listed by the proponents of the principle of comparative advantage, makes it impossible for their governments to act as though they were preparing for the establishment of a United States of the World in the immediate future. Supporters of free trade based on that principle believe that economic differences among nations are growing smaller and, therefore, that factors, such as government assistance, not included among those on which the principle is based can be ignored. There is little current evidence to support this thesis.

Despite all efforts to reverse the trend, the gap between average standards of living in most of Asia, Africa and South America and developed countries has widened over the last decade. National development plans intended to narrow the gap do not follow the principle of comparative advantage. On the contrary, they are devised to provide a broad range of industries rather than those to which the country is best adapted. This has, for example, led nations not suited to the production of steel in terms of skills, climate, availability of raw materials, transportation or markets to construct steel plants.

Strict application of the principle of comparative advantage to world trade is clearly impossible now. Its supporters often recognize this but urge that the United States, as the world's richest and most powerful nation, should nevertheless lead the way in removing barriers and encouraging others to do so. Thus, they advocate the reduction of tariffs through the medium of GATT and encourage the establishment of larger regional markets through the development of such institutions as the Common Market in Europe and LAFTA in Latin America. Unfortunately, tariff reductions accomplished under GATT have sometimes been offset by increases in non-tariff barriers and other restrictions. An unforeseen result of the creation of common markets is that, while developing the means for reducing trade barriers among member countries, they become strongly protectionist with respect to the rest of the world.

A danger inherent in the course of our present foreign trade policy is that it will place such basic industries as steel at the mercy of what may be temporary differences of a political or economic origin among nations which are at widely different stages of development. To an industry like steel, one of the most important is differences among standards of living. A comparison between the advantages of the American and the Japanese steel industries illustrates the point.

There is little to choose between the two as to labor supply, skills and climate. The United States may have some advantage in the availability of raw materials, although this is shrinking as new, high-grade ore and coal sources open up around the world and highly efficient ocean bulk carriers go into service. The United States has the most modern and diversified transportation system in the world—a real advantage—but the location of all major Japanese plants on the coast is a partially balancing factor. As to markets, there is no comparison; the U.S. market for steel is the largest and most diversified anywhere. On balance, therefore, the steel industry of the United States would seem to have a clear edge on Japan.

The most significant difference among the economic factors affecting the two industries is in employment costs, a reflection of the respective standards of living. The difference is on the order of $30–$35 a ton, much more than the average profit per ton before income taxes. So long as a difference of that kind remains, and the Japanese continue to increase their penetration of the U.S. market, application of the principle of comparative advantage to steel trade between the countries can only result in the deterioration of the steel industry in the United States.

Governments of most other countries, recognizing the weakness of the theory of comparative advantage in light of existing political and economic conditions, have faced squarely the question whether or not to apply it to their basic industries, including steel. Without exception, they have concluded that they cannot do so. Here we have a new and growing factor in world steel economics—the use, by virtually every other government, of its steel industry as an instrument of national policy. And this results in the protection of that industry by its government. The protective measures adopted take many forms but they are designed to protect domestic markets and stimulate exports. The effect of these measures is to make the theory of comparative advantage, as generally understood, inapplicable to world steel trade today.

Present imbalances in world steel trade are caused primarily by the large excess of capacity over consumption. In the ten years from 1955 to 1965, world steel output increased by more than two-thirds—from nearly 300 million to 500 million ingot tons. Over the same period, world capacity to produce steel increased even more rapidly, according to latest United Nations' reports, from approximately 300 million tons to 575 million tons. Thus, there is now an excess of some 75 million tons of capacity hanging over world steel markets. What is more, planned expansion for the future will certainly not diminish and may, in fact, aggravate the problem. A major part of this new capacity was installed in Western Europe and Japan after World War II—much of it within the last five years—and some of it has been built expressly for export purposes.

The continually growing excess of steelmaking capacity in industrialized nations abroad is further complicated by the construction of steelmaking plants in many developing countries. In the last decade some 20 countries have joined the ranks of the steel producers for the first time and more are coming. The emerging countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America have nearly tripled their steel production and have almost doubled their share of world output. As a result, imports by the less-developed countries have tended to stabilize and the import share of their steel supply has declined sharply. To add to the problem, some of them are now exporting steel.

Growth in steelmaking capacity relative to demand increases the pressure to export, particularly where internal political and financial conditions appear to encourage continued high levels of production. Thus, world exports of steel mill products more than doubled—from 23 million tons in 1955 to over 51 million tons in 1965, excluding trade within the European Common Market, although total steel use increased by only about two-thirds. At the same time, the character of world steel trade underwent a drastic change. From the traditional pattern of shipments by the industrialized steel-producers to the less developed countries it has gone increasingly to penetration of the markets of the industrialized nations, with the United States by far the major recipient. The share of total world imports (exclusive of intra-Common Market trade) accounted for by the less-developed countries declined from 50 percent in 1955 to a little over 30 percent in 1965, while imports into the United States rose from 4 percent to 20 percent of total world trade during the same period.

The changed pattern was accompanied by falling export prices, as producers offered steel in the world market at lower and lower prices in the hope of maintaining volume. As will be discussed later in more detail, domestic prices declined in some countries as home producers, striving to slow imports, aligned on reduced prices of products from other countries.

Inevitably, this sequence of events has led to sharply lower revenues even at relatively high levels of output, shrinking or disappearing profits, and a serious reduction in capital funds available for product and plant improvement. In short, the steel industries affected have been seriously weakened, particularly in Western Europe. Their governments have been unwilling to let nature take its course and have reacted in a variety of ways intended to prevent demoralization and decline of the steel industries.

The best available forecasts suggest continued growth in world steel production to about 645 million ingot tons and in capacity to roughly 725 million tons by 1970. Major capacity additions are projected for Western Europe and Japan, even though the evidence is that their own home market demand and steel imports by the less-developed countries will not increase sufficiently to absorb the additional capacity.

As the world steel market has become less stable, measures by foreign governments to prevent the deterioration and collapse of steel industries in their countries have increased. There are now a great variety of these measures in effect or proposed. They fall into five basic categories:

(a) Measures to increase the cost of entry into the domestic market—tariffs and border taxes.

(b) Measures to limit entry regardless of cost—embargoes, quotas, restrictions on foreign exchange, import licensing and "buy-domestic" policies.

(c) Measures to encourage exports—permission to form cartels, tax rebates on exports, remission of transactions taxes, export credit insurance, export credits, grants for export trade promotion and indirect subsidies.

(d) Measures to stabilize domestic markets and, incidentally, provide a base for low-priced exports—permissive attitudes toward cartels and other arrangements for establishing minimum domestic prices and production quotas and encouragement of "rationalization" through mergers of competing companies.

(e) Measures to reduce apparent operating costs and promote modernization—low cost capital, support of applications for loans from the World Bank or Export-Import Bank, raw materials subsidies, subsidized transporation, and government employment subsidies.

These measures apply to what are, ostensibly, privately owned steel companies. In the growing number of countries where steel producing plants are owned directly by government, there is no way of determining the extent or nature of government support.

Unfortunately, many of these measures add to the instability of world steel trade because, in various ways, they lessen the adverse effects of selling steel products abroad at prices below those charged at home and apparently below total costs. This promotes not free trade but more government assistance and greater restrictions on trade. As we shall see later, there is no effective private response to measures undertaken by other governments.

Over the last decade, annual steel imports into the United States have grown from about one million to about 11 million tons. Exports over the same period have shrunk from about 4 million to under 2 million tons. A substantial share of present exports are A.I.D. financed. If present trends continue, imports into the United States will double over the next ten years and, in doing so, will constitute nearly 20 percent of domestic supply. This unhealthy balance will take much of the anticipated growth in steel requirements in our market. Some idea of the scale of imports can be had from the fact that the 10 million tons imported in 1965 were equal to the combined shipments of Jones & Laughlin Steel plus Armco last year. These two companies employ about 79,000 people.

Despite the adverse impact of steel imports during the last ten years, the U.S. steel companies have made impressive progress in their efforts to improve technology and hold costs in line. Investment in improved plants and equipment totaled about $13 billion and has accelerated in recent years. It is now at the record level of more than $2 billion a year. These amounts are inadequate now to take full advantage of existing technology and they do not show promise of growing at anything like the pace of the increase in our knowledge of steel products and production methods. Availability of capital funds depends ultimately on the profits of the steel companies and these, in turn, depend on being able to benefit from growth in steel demand. If imports are allowed to keep on skimming the cream off that growth, additional capital will be even harder to come by, as steel, already ranked low in the U.S. capital markets relative to other industries, sinks even lower.

Historically, the U.S. steel industry was able to compete in the world market and pay the highest wages because it enjoyed technical superiority. The industry, after the war, was hard-pressed to supply the steel needed to meet extraordinary domestic requirements generated during more than 15 years of depression and war and, in addition, to provide much of the steel for the reconstruction of war-torn countries abroad. Because of the effects of those years of depression, high taxes and price controls, it did not have the financial and productive resources to take full advantage of new technology during the first postwar decade. Meanwhile, the steel industries of many other parts of the world were rebuilt virtually from the ground up with ready access to our technology and operating practices, and our nation's success in helping to revitalize the economies of other countries encouraged rapid expansion of their steel industries. The net result was that our technical advantage shrank and so did our ability to compete in world markets. This is the condition which the steel companies are doing their utmost to overcome through heavy and growing expenditures for research and development and investment in new and improved productive facilities.

If the steel companies fail in their efforts, we can look forward to an industry with declining employment and reduced ability to improve the living standards of its employees. We can also expect the present adverse balance of payments resulting from steel imports, now amounting to about one billion dollars a year, to grow rapidly.

Private steel companies can attempt to deal with the problem of a growing volume of imports in essentially three ways. They can provide a better product by developing and introducing new types of steel and improving the quality of established products; they can improve customer service and delivery; and they can reduce prices to equal those at which imports are offered. The success of the first two approaches depends on the companies' financial resources. As we have noted, the steel companies in the United States are using all the resources available to them to increase research and development activity and to improve the efficiency of their plants. And the more capital funds they have, the better they can do this essential job. They have not, however, generally tried to match distressed import prices; they have had mixed success in those attempts they have made, but this kind of effort has its limitations. Any broad-scale attempt to meet low import prices would turn today's modest profits into serious losses.

As we have noted earlier, low world market prices are the product of growing overcapacity. Thus, as excess capacity increased, world prices tended to fall below domestic prices in the countries of origin. This is a profitable game only so long as domestic prices and volume remain high enough to cover all fixed costs. If domestic prices fall to the point where the home market fails to generate sufficient revenues to cover all fixed costs plus the direct costs of products sold domestically, the practice produces losses instead of gains.

The sobering experience of Western

European steel producers who have attempted to reduce imports by means of flexible pricing is instructive, for it is not a hypothetical case. As excess steelmaking capacity grew, prices at which imports were offered began to fall in certain Western European countries. Steel producers in many of these countires, faced with both a decline in domestic steel requirements and imports at less than quoted prices in the Community, began to align their domestic prices on those of imports. As a result, European domestic prices and the companies' financial returns have declined. It is believed that, in many cases, domestic prices in Western Europe now exceed the depressed prices on the world market only by the amounts of Common Market tariffs. In other words, many European steel producers are receiving for their total output something close to world prices and some, at least, are in serious financial trouble.

It is this sad sequence of events which has led to the rash of mergers, domestic cartel arrangements, requests for raw materials subsidies and subsidized loans which has broken out in the Community during recent years and is now increasing in intensity.

The evidence points clearly to the conclusion that the principle of comparative advantage cannot be applied unilaterally to world steel trade under present conditions. Thus, our government must face the same questions already answered by the governments of other steel producing nations—does the country need a strong, efficient steel industry, and, if it does, does the industry need government assistance to offset adverse trade conditions? In the real world of today, the answers to both questions must be "Yes", as they have been in other countries.

The remaining question then is—what form should that assistance take? Present measures have not been effectual. It appears unlikely that the long-term solution to this vexing world-wide problem is to be found in any one measure that might be adopted. It is desirable, indeed, that studies at the industry, national and international levels be accelerated in the search for lasting solutions. Meanwhile, current world conditions in steel trade demand more immediate action.

At this critical time, the steel industry recommends that the Congress give immediate consideration to a temporary levy on imported steel products and pig iron which would narrow the differences between prevailing domestic prices in the United States and the prices of the imported products.

Under that measure American steel producers would still be affected by many competitive pressures to continue and intensify their efforts to discover and develop new products, improve service and delivery, raise their already high quality standards and reduce production costs while providing their employees with a rising standard of living.

The measure would create a climate of more equitable competition between producers, domestic and foreign, who seek a share in the United States market.

Finally, the measure would discourage the future use of steel exports as a weapon in economic warfare. Traditional controls on the flow of trade—tariffs, transactions taxes and anti-dumping laws—cannot be applied effectively to exporters, such as Communist Bloc countries, whose domestic prices are artificial and can be changed by the stroke of a pen.

American Iron and Steel Institute urges that such a measure be promptly adopted.

THE PRESIDENT'S CRIME MESSAGE

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing four bills which form an anticrime package aimed at rooting out the multibillion-dollar take of organized crime in America.

My first bill would establish a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Crime in the Department of Justice, structured along the lines of the National Institutes of Health, which would research the causes and prevention of the moral disease of organized crime just as the NIH researches the causes and prevention of physical diseases. While the National Institutes of Health looks to the Nation's physical health, a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Crime is needed to look to the Nation's moral health.

The National Institute of Law Enforcement and Crime would be an effective means of curbing the growing criminal octopus and improve the quality of State and local law enforcement personnel. My bill calls for regional training institutes to be established serving one or more States, which would provide for programs of education and training, and prepare individuals for employment in programs for the prevention and control of crime and juvenile delinquency, as well as in the field of correctional rehabilitation. In addition, regional advisory boards with Governors and Federal members would be created. This legislation would also provide for grants to public and private nonprofit agencies and institutions to assist State and local law enforcement agencies. The Institute would also make studies and undertake research programs concerning law enforcement organizations, techniques, and practices; and would collect, compile, publish, and disseminate crime statistics on both Federal and State crimes.

Another bill contained in my anticrime package would establish a Joint Committee on Organized Crime in the Congress to undertake investigations and study all aspects of organized crime in the United States as well as the effects and relationship of international organized crime on organized crime in this country. The committee would be required to make legislative proposals to the Congress.

Two other bills which I am introducing today would make it a Federal offense to obstruct criminal investigations carried on by the U.S. Government, and provide for the granting of immunity to witnesses who are needed to testify against criminals in order to provide a means of compelling underlings to give information needed to reach upper-echelon members of crime syndicates.

In my opinion, the President's crime message and recommendations of legislation did not include a number of aspects that I think are essential such as those provided in the bills I am introducing today.

OHIO'S MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAM

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, my home county was privileged to hear an address on Ohio's mental health programs by Mike Gorman, the distinguished executive director of the National Committee Against Mental Illness. I believe the speech is of general interest, particularly as it points out the need for citizen participation if the States, counties, and cities are to cope with the problems of mental illness. I would like to include with my remarks an editorial from the Canton Repository emphasizing that the public must express its interest if the problems are to be solved, as well as the text of Mr. Gorman's speech. They follow:

[From the Canton Repository, Feb. 2, 1967]

Help for Mental Health

The director of the National Committee Against Mental Illness visited Stark County Tuesday and had some interesting things to say.

Mike Gorman, addressing the annual meeting of the Stark County Mental Health Association, hammered at the need for more money, but he added something new.

He tossed out ideas on how to improve programs already in effect in the county.

Use of the foster grandparent program to add importance to the lives of the aged was suggested.

The director said there are too many children in the wards of state hospitals, including Massillon State.

He felt something should be done through community mental health service centers to provide care for these children without cutting them off from the needed help of teachers, families, ministers and family doctors.

He pointed out the need for an aroused public to support programs for additional funds.

No one attending the meeting or reading the account of his speech can feel much pride in Ohio's mental health record.

Ohio is 14th in the nation in per capita income and ranks 47th in money spent for mental health.

There is a tendency to blame state officials for not paying more attention to mental health needs. But the public must shoulder a portion of the blame because state officials always will pay attention to a concerted voice if they hear it.

Public officials want to know that Ohioans are receptive to mental health programs and willing to meet their costs.

So far the public voice has not been loud enough to make itself heard.

A Citizen Army: The Key to Progress Against Mental Illness in Ohio

(Speech at annual meeting, Stark County Mental Health Association, January 31, 1967, Canton, Ohio, by Mike Gorman,[1] Washington, D.C.)

The temptation is always present for an out-of-town speaker to dwell pontifically upon the national scene in the field of mental health, thereby avoiding the necessity for the homework necessary to a discussion and evaluation of the state and local situation.

---

[1] Executive Director, National Committee Against Mental Illness; Member, National Advisory Mental Health Council, U.S.P.H.S.; Executive Secretary, International Committee Against Mental Illness; Fellow, American Psychiatric Association (Hon.); Fellow, American Public Health Association.

Resisting that temptation, I should like to begin with some remarks directly related to the present situation both here in Ohio and in Stark County. Looking over my rather voluminous Ohio files, I find that I have been in your good state eight times in the past decade, the most recent occasion being April, 1966 when I addressed the District Branch of the American Psychiatric Association. Furthermore, I have called upon the statistical resources of the National Institute of Mental Health and the American Psychiatric Association for additional comparative data not present in my files.

I imagine that most of you here are fairly familiar with the basic data documenting the low ranking of Ohio in comparison with its sister states in the entire field of mental health. In this regard, I want to commend the Mental Health Federation for the excellent job it has done in getting together material these past few years pointing up the serious comparative deficiencies of the Ohio mental health program.

Rather than inundate you with a carload of statistics, may I point to one central indicator of your ranking: In figures recently released by the National Institute of Mental Health for 1966, Ohio is listed as spending $6.38 per day for every resident in its state mental hospitals. This is far below the national average of $7.52, and is only about half the per diem expenditures in your sister states of Iowa and Kansas.

For community mental health services, you spent an average of only thirty cents per capita in 1965, as against the national average of sixty cents.

These low expenditures are all the more shocking in light of the fact that you are 14th in the nation in per capita income—far above the national average. In very simple terms, it is really quite incredible that you spend a dollar a day less for care of your mental patients than neighboring Kentucky, which is 47th in the nation in per capita income.

In justification of these expenditures, you cannot plead lack of awareness of the size of the problem. In 1963, the Congress voted sizable sums of money for a two-year effort in which citizens of every state were given the opportunity to assess their mental health resources and recommend new programs to rectify existing shortcomings. May I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the enlightened actions of the Congress in recent years? The planning monies it voted in 1963 were not recommended by the Administration, and in both prior and subsequent years, it has frequently voted sums of the National Institute of Mental Health far in excess of Administration recommendations. Through all these years, this has been a truly bi-partisan effort and your own Congressman Frank Bow, as the ranking minority member of the powerful House Appropriations Committee, has played a leading role in these enlightened actions.

The extensive planning surveys in Ohio turned up the fact that approximately one million people in this state are in need of some type of psychiatric intervention. Proportionately, very few are getting this necessary treatment. In addition to the 32,000 patients in your mental hospitals and schools for the mentally retarded, your survey estimates conservatively that at least an equal number are being treated in general hospitals, private hospitals and other facilities. Furthermore, the report notes that none of your big state hospitals was certified then by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals.

I was particularly impressed by the Stark County mental health survey. Pointing to the existing fragmentation of diagnostic and treatment services, the report concludes that "we must put together a comprehensive program of mental health services." I like the stress in the report on continuity of treatment services. As I have said over and over again in many parts of the country, you don't need a fancy new building to bring a network of coordinated treatment to sick people. In Massillon State Hospital, Woodside Receiving Hospital, Mercy and Aultman Hospitals and the Stark County Guidance Center, you have a strong base for possible segments of a comprehensive mental health center. Any one of these hospital units can provide the inpatient beds, day or night hospital services and emergency, 24-hour psychiatric services. Outpatient services can be provided either through one of the hospitals or through the Guidance Center, and the fifth mandatory service of a center—educational and referral services—should ideally be provided by the Stark County Mental Health Association.

I am not suggesting that this is the only alternative; in many states, because of geographical, jurisdictional and other considererations, it has been necessary to start from scratch in constructing a comprehensive mental health center. This is a matter for your own judgment, but I do urge you not to overlook existing resources both in the state system and in the many agencies in the community—Family Services, the courts, the schools, the Rehabilitation Clinic, etc.

As of the close of 1966, federal aid for either construction and/or staffing had been approved for five centers in Ohio—in Cincinnati, Columbus, Dayton, Youngstown and Zanesville. It is my understanding that the Department of Mental Hygiene and Correction would like to see a center started in Canton, and I respectfully urge all of you to move without delay in this direction.

In connection with the national community mental health centers program, I would like to correct a prevalent misconception that the launching of these centers must always wait upon federal aid. Over the past three or four years, a number of states have constructed centers without any federal money. As a result of a bond issue passed in 1960, Illinois is currently constructing seven regional centers. In 1963, the Missouri Legislature appropriated $10 million for the construction of three centers in that state. In the East, Connecticut and Massachusetts are building a number of centers, some with and some without federal matching monies. New York State, which has received federal money for approximately six centers, is planning to build 20 centers with state and local money.

In providing the financial sinews for a comparable program here in Ohio, it is absolutely necessary that you enact a community mental health services law providing for matching state and local funding. At present, 28 states have such laws and they are among the leaders in the new era of community mental health.

I have had an opportunity to examine the Community Mental Health Act proposed by the Ohio Department of Mental Hygiene and Correction, and I find it an excellent one. It is most realistic in providing two-thirds state matching funds for new clinics, and 75% state funding for clinics in depressed areas. Furthermore, in proposing a 50% state contribution toward the capital construction of community mental health centers, it provides an enormous incentive to local jurisdictions to move into the field. The proposed legislation provides for continuing involvement of county officials in the appointment and administration of local community mental health boards; this is an absolute prerequisite to the success of any community venture.

I hope and trust that a citizen army will descend upon Columbus this year to see that this legislation is enacted. However, one word of caution: A few states have enacted very fine community mental health services laws, but have not provided sufficient funds to get the program off the ground.

I note that here in Ohio you collect more than $10 million a year from patients and their families, which is over and above the amount they pay in taxes for the support of state institutions. This money now goes into the general treasury. I think this is absolutely wrong—if people are required to pay for psychiatric services over and above those provided by the taxing power of the state, the money so collected should go to the improvement of the mental health program. What better way to use this $10 million a year than in building additional community mental health centers so that thousands of Ohioans no longer have to be committed to state institutions. Illinois has been doing this for the past fifteen years, and it has been a tremendous resource for community mental health programs and for the training of psychiatric personnel.

As a member of the National Mental Health Advisory Council, I can tell you that in the years to come the federal contribution will be only a small part of the money needed to build a powerful network of community mental health centers from one end of the land to the other. In recognition of the need for all levels of government to participate in this endeavor, the 1965 National Governors' Conference unanimously passed a resolution requesting the Council of State Governments to convene a conference "for a thorough consideration of the *future* role of each level of government in multiple-source financing of community mental health programs."

At the three-day conference held in Chicago in December, 1965, and co-chaired by Governor Otto Kerner of Illinois and Senator A. M. Spradling of Missouri, scores of state legislators and county commissioners hammered home the point that the federal contribution to community mental health services, even with the inclusion of the 1963 and 1965 legislation, fell far below that made by most states and many local communities. Arguing for a renewal and broad expansion of the Community Mental Health Centers Act of 1963, the major resolution of the conference—unanimously adopted by the delegates—stated:

"Of the total annual public mental health expenditures of $2 billion in this country, only $115 million, less than four percent, is available for ongoing local community mental health services. The share of the Federal Government in this funding is less than ten percent . . . It is therefore imperative that the Federal Government, which receives the largest share of the tax dollar from our people, provide critically needed additional seed money for these programs.

"It is the consensus of the conference that the national goal of 2,000 new community mental health centers to be established by 1975, as envisioned by the landmark 1963 and 1965 Federal legislation, will not be realized without expanded Federal, State and local support."

In the current session of the 90th Congress, we must ask for a renewal of the community mental health center construction authority originally passed in 1963. Those of us who testified on behalf of the 1963 legislation assured the Congress that the states and localities would do their part in creating a new day for the mentally ill in the heart of the community. It is therefore very important that Ohio, as one of the largest states in the nation, provide both the authority and the funds in 1967 to match the additional effort we are requesting of our national government.

On December 8, 1961, speaking to the annual meeting of the Ohio Mental Health Federation in Columbus, I summarized the revolutionary recommendations of the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health. I then asked: "Can a nation make so dramatic a break with tradition in a relatively short period of time? In other words, can it provide a comprehensive battery of community mental health services designed to eventually replace the present chain of state institutions?"

Let us start with the long neglected problem of the emotionally disturbed child.

There is a seeming national consensus that there are about four million children under the age of fourteen who are in need of some kind of psychiatric intervention because of emotional difficulties. Of this number, anywhere from a half million to a million children are so seriously disturbed that they require immediate psychiatric help.

Very few of these children are getting the treatment which they need. Although close to 300,000 children were seen in outpatient psychiatric clinics last year, in most cases the "treatment" consisted of one or two diagnostic interviews followed by the admission that there were no facilities in the particular area for prolonged treatment.

We have some fairly reliable data which indicate that about 14,000 of these children are confined in state mental institutions. We also know, on the basis of a trend which has been developing over the past five years, that by 1970 the number of children aged ten to fourteen hospitalized in these institutions will have doubled.

But those of us who visit a number of state hospitals each year are convinced that these estimates do not reflect the full extent of hospitalization for childhood mental illness. Furthermore, applications to the National Institute of Mental Health for Hospital Improvement Grants over and over again include data which document the point that an amazingly high percentage of their long-term residents were first admitted as children or adolescents.

For example, an analysis of a 5,000 bed state hospital at Tuscaloosa, Alabama reveals that more than half of the male schizophrenic group who have been in that hospital twenty years or more were first admitted between the ages of fourteen and twenty-nine. The Alabama report estimates that one in every four young patients "can anticipate being permanently hospitalized for the next fifty years of their lives."

It is my contention that the increasing flood of these young children in the hospitals is not being reflected in existing national data. For example, ten percent of the 7,000 patients at Rockland State Hospital in New York are children under sixteen years of age, and plans have already been completed for an additional 400-bed unit at that hospital to handle the rising tide of disturbed children being admitted annually.

If time permitted, I could cite comparable data from many other state hospitals across the land. In many of these institutions, where there is no specialized unit for children, the child is put on an adult ward which is frightfully overcrowded and understaffed.

In addition to the state mental hospitals, there are a handful of residential treatment centers which care for about 2,500 children a year. In fifteen of our states there are no such facilities, either public or private; in twenty-four of our states, there are no public units to care for children from low and middle income groups.

To sum up, it is an undeniable fact that there is not a single community in this country which provides an acceptable standard of services for its mentally ill children running the spectrum from early therapeutic intervention to social restoration in the home, the school and in the community.

As a nation, we now have a precious opportunity to create a new pattern of appropriate services for these disturbed children. Every state in the country is now engaged in completing plans for new community mental health services; it is incumbent upon all of us to insist that services for children be an integral and major segment of these new community mental health centers.

We need a more flexible, less doctrinaire approach to the whole problem of the disturbed child. It isn't all just black or white—successful adjustment or an institution several hundred miles away. It is in the intermediate areas where we can do the most effective job for the majority of these children—in the schools, in the mental health clinics, the day care centers, the courts, and so on. By developing the screening and treatment potential of these familiar agencies, we don't run away from the problem—we face it and we bring many untapped human resources to it.

We have just begun to scratch this great potential of people who can help people. In Washington, D.C., we are using mothers whose own children have completed their education. They are given a year's training in psychiatric concepts and then work on the psychiatric service at Children's Hospital.

In many cities in the country, trained youth workers are going into neighborhoods where trouble exists and applying their knowledge and affection to those children who are in revolt against the "norms" of modern society. As the noted psychiatrist Dr. Kenneth Appel has pointed out, there is a deep and tragic irony in the fact that millions of Americans—unemployed, retired, or otherwise rendered unproductive by society—seek a meaningful role in life, while millions of our children, our mental patients and others sunk in despair seek a helping hand. Dr. Appel pleads for a linkage between this great untapped human potential and the vast needs of the troubled and submerged in our democracy. Automation may eventually provide most of the material wants of our society, but it cannot ever replace the hand-to-hand and heart-to-heart relationship which is at the core of the helping services.

During this past summer's experience with Project Head Start—which reached more than 600,000 children under the age of six—thousands of adults and children served as volunteers.

The first several thousand trainees of VISTA—Volunteers in Service to America—are now serving in all regions of the country. A sizeable percentage of these dedicated people have chosen to work in the mental health field and, having addressed several groups of VISTA trainees, I can assure you they will make wonderful workers in the vineyard of childhood mental illness.

There have been exciting developments in other areas of childhood mental illness which have highlighted the necessity for a comprehensive survey of existing needs and the selection of a set of priorities for the next decade and beyond.

We are engaged in a comparable national effort to build community mental health centers in every part of the country, and none of it will be easy to come by. I am told that the particular trouble spot right now is county government, which does not have the tax resources of the other levels of government and yet is closest to the wrath of the irate taxpayer. Over the past few years, I have done a lot of business with county commissioners in all parts of the country; I have found most of them willing to propose additional revenues when the program was explained to them in a clear and somewhat aggressive manner.

After all, the National Association of Counties enthusiastically endorsed the 1963 and 1965 community mental health legislation, and they knew what they were doing when they endorsed it. In fact, their position was so clear that they invited me to write an article for the May, 1966 issue of their official publication on the *necessity of additional taxes* to support better mental health services at the local level. Now that's like asking Barry Goldwater to write an article on the virtues of Lyndon Johnson, but I did the article and the response was most favorable. In that article, I stressed the point that citizens had no right to ask county commissioners for additional mental health services until they presented the commissioners with a hard-hitting cost estimate of these services and also pledged their support in educating the public on the need for additional tax revenues, if necessary, to finance these expanded services. May I quote from that article?

"In speaking to county groups in many parts of the country over the past fifteen years, I have constantly stressed the point that citizens asking county governments to provide new services for the mentally ill must not only present these officials with a realistic cost estimate of these services, but they must also indicate their willingness to help educate the public on the need for additional tax revenues to finance them. Unless there is strong citizen identification and support for these new programs, it is irresponsible to ask county governments to assume the additional fiscal burdens required to put them into action."

The job can be done, and has been done in a number of states. At a National Governors' Conference on Community Mental Health Programs in December, 1965 in Chicago, a Minnesota county commissioner had this to say:

"Our county board would sooner reduce its county highway program than to cancel out our participation in our regional mental health center."

The county commissioners in Minnesota are sold—there are 22 centers in business operating in 80 of the 87 counties; the counties provide 50% of the operating costs to match the state formula grant.

Can you good people of the Ohio Mental Health Federation do the job? I don't really know, but I suggest that you ought to start thinking about it. At present, as I said last July in Virginia at a conference sponsored by the National Association for Mental Health, you people in the mental health association movement don't have very much clout with county and state legislators. Rightly or wrongly, they view you as a small group of do-gooders who understand little or nothing about the difficulties a local politician faces when he backs a new program which requires additional onerous taxes.

For the most part, my political friends are correct in their assessment of your efforts. You haven't really done your homework on the tax situation and, furthermore, you don't talk to a county commissioner in the same direct, aggressive manner as an irate housewife who wants her garbage removed or a contractor who wants to get a paving contract. In my experience, I have found that local officials appreciate a hard-hitting presentation—they respect you when you talk about human beings as havings a higher priority than garbage removal or a new highway.

Can we afford this leap into the future? The total price tag on the Kennedy legislation is less than $500 million over a three-year period.

This year we will achieve a gross national product of approximately 740 billions of dollars. Last year, the American people spent $20 billion on recreation; $12 billion for alcohol, and $7 billion for tobacco products. In that same year, they spent $500 million for greeting cards—$200 million more than the entire research, training and community centers budget of the National Institute of Mental Health.

In the period from 1957 to 1972, we will spend more than $55 billion for interstate highways and freeways. Last year we spent $10 billion for highways to accommodate 80 million cars which killed 50,000 Americans and seriously injured one million Americans.

As a nation, we are committed to an expenditure on the order of 20 to 30 billions of dollars to land a man on the moon by 1970. Can we not spend a few hundred million dollars to put thousands upon thousands of additional men, women and children back on their feet on this planet by 1970?

We live in an affluent society in which the U.S. appliance industry so successfully stocked the American home with its basic wares a few years back that it thought it faced a virtually saturated market. Not so. Our ingenious manufacturers have opened fantastic new markets for electric tooth brushes, shoe polishers, slicing knives, drink mixers, cradle rockers, footwarmers, ice crushers, plate warmers, electric sweater dryers, and so on ad infinitum. The housewife can also now get small and highly necessary appliances to buff floors, mash potatoes, peel carrots and warm her towels.

In this kind of economy—where the gold toothpick is now a family necessity—it is nonsense to talk of our inability to provide adequate mental health services.

Are we equal to this challenge? I think we are, and I have answered the negativists and the nihilists over these past few years with these words of the late Dr. Will Menninger:

"Further progress in the difficult field of mental illness and mental health will come only when millions know enough, care enough and are willing to work together hard enough to make it come."

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Friday, February 24 marks the 49th anniversary of Estonian Independence Day. Unfortunately, the brave people of Estonia are now among the captive peoples of communism, and this great day in their history cannot be celebrated in their homeland because of the tyranny of their Red rulers.

The Estonians proclaimed their independence in 1918 after the tsarist government fell and enjoyed a period of freedom and progress until 1940, when their country fell to the Communist forces.

We must not only commemorate historic national days such as Estonian Independence Day, Mr. Speaker, but we must take practical steps to indicate our interest in the restoration of freedom to the captive peoples of communism. One such practical move would be the establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations, an action which I have repeatedly urged the House to take.

Mr. Speaker, we must rededicate ourselves on this great historic day for the Estonians to continue efforts to see that freedom is restored to these proud people and all the other captives of communism.

THE UNITED STATES-U.S.S.R. CONSULAR CONVENTION: ANOTHER TRAGIC MISCALCULATION IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that ratification of the proposed United States-U.S.S.R. Consular Convention is a matter of Senate concern, every Member of the House is, I am sure, equally concerned with the merits and demerits of this treaty, particularly at a time when our chief enemy in Vietnam is Moscow and its determining aid to the Red totalitarian regime in Hanoi.

The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the junior Senator from Arkansas, Mr. Fulbright, is obviously determined to fulfill the wishes of the administration in this instance and through rigged hearings and deliberate distortions of fact, slip the treaty through a half-awake Senate.

On January 6, 1967, I wrote to Chairman Morgan pointing out the overall interest in this case, hoping to have public hearings by our House Foreign Affairs Committee on the entire concept of foreign affairs, but my request has been politely ignored.

Please note that in the Senate hearings on the Consular Convention testimony was carefully procured from proponents far out of proportion to the views of existing spokesmen. The obvious predetermination which existed developed a record completely one sided in whitewashing this measure. Diabolically, the few opposing voices heard included selected groups such as the Liberty Lobby, which bears a label of right-wing extremism and, therefore, these groups were expected to discredit rather than aid their own point of view.

Mr. Speaker, last Friday testimony was given by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of Georgetown University and also chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, who brought out several points which deserve the sober consideration of every American. But, since his points were not challenged by any committee members, I believe they deserve special consideration. These points are as follows: First, the treaty is based on false preconceptions about the U.S.S.R. which our State Department displayed when we first recognized the Soviet Union back in the 1930's; second, the Consular Convention with the U.S.S.R. coincides with the myth of Russia as a nation-state and undermines the spirit and hopes of the numerous non-Russian peoples of the U.S.S.R.; third, the treaty is superfluous as concerns the protection of American citizens in the U.S.S.R. since the Roosevelt-Litvinov assignment has remained in force to this day, and even Supreme Court decisions are based on it; fourth, the complete protection of American citizens in the U.S.S.R. is not guaranteed by the treaty, and arbitrary arrest and brainwashing in 3 days can nullify the whole, touted notification and access provision; fifth, the treaty opens up a Pandora's box for Soviet espionage in our hemisphere since our fellow American States have little reason not to follow the example set by the United States and would be susceptible to pressure from the Soviets to open vehicles for infiltration throughout the hemisphere; and, sixth, Dr. Dobriansky points out that we can outmaneuver the Soviet Union by offering to recognize Ukraine and Byelorussia, the Soviet puppet creations which are nonexistant, but which have votes in the U.N. This would be a practical alternative to the proposed Consular Convention.

Mr. Speaker, since these points were not even challenged at the hearing, I place the entire testimony by Dr. Dobriansky in the Record for the serious consideration of those who did not attend the hearing and yet must decide on this vital issue:

The United States-U.S.S.R. Consular Convention: Symbol of a Politico-Cultural Lag

(Testimony of Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics, Georgetown University, chairman, National Captive Nations Committee, to the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Feb. 17, 1967)

Mr. Chairman and distinguished Members, I'm most grateful for this opportunity to testify in opposition to Senate ratification of the US-USSR Consular Convention. My statement addresses itself by way of refutation to every salient argument that has been advanced in favor of the treaty, and it raises several, additional objections to it, along with a little known contradiction in State Department thinking regarding our relations with the Soviet Union. On the scale of careful politico-diplomatic calculation the treaty definitely does not rest on a quid pro quo basis—indeed, it exposes us to a grave net disadvantage and grants a windfall to imperio-colonialist Moscow—and, from a positive viewpoint, should be replaced by a concrete alternative which, on net balance, really upholds the principle of reciprocity and mutual advantage.

Contrary to the remarks of Secretary Rusk and others, this treaty is far more than just another consular convention. We're not dealing in arrangements with Zambia or Chad; instead, we're dealing with the power and survival base of the entire Red Empire which challenges us on every major continent and, considering its relatively inferior resources, has done an historically phenomenal job, in the instant time of fifty years, to negate the principles of national independence and freedom. It would be naive of us to consider and evaluate this treaty merely in the vacuum of "little difference" from other consular conventions. For, in content, it contains an unusual diplomatic immunity privilege that no other existing convention does and, in terms of political and security ramification and implication, it stands uniquely alone with all the net disadvantage it would heap upon us. In short, the treaty cannot be considered in void of realities both within the USSR and here, the Cold War struggle itself, as well as principle and even morality, Viet Nam, the East-West trade issue, and our own serious politico-cultural gap in understanding the Soviet Union.

By its own textual evidence the treaty is a pitiful product of this gap in our knowledge and understanding of the USSR. Though it wasn't consummated then, it is a vestigial remain of the 30's when similar illusions were generated in this country about the great transformation and economic changes taking place in the USSR, about "the great Soviet experiment" in what was and, in some quarters, still is foolishly called "Russia", about the "good Communists" in America who joined in humanitarian projects and worked for "world peace", and about increased trade and understanding with "Russia", which was one of the illusory arguments in support of diplomatic relations with this empire-state. This vestigial remain was revived in the 50's, when an over-abundance of lip-service and timidity caused a realistic policy to remain stillborn, and now is being pressed for acceptance under shopworn vagaries of "windows in Russia", "mutual understanding", "improving communications" and "normalizing relations".

The basic, ideational structure of the treaty is not new: it is stale, unimaginative, maladjusted to evolving reality, and highly disadvantageous to us, both politically and morally. The treaty is based on the archaic, preconceptual notion that the USSR is "Russia", and its branch principle of consularism, extended to Leningrad today but tomorrow, once general Senate consent is in the pocket, to Riga or Odessa or Tbilisi or even Tashkent, defies the multinational, governmental reality of the USSR and plays neatly into colonialist Moscow's hands. Though well known to some scholars long before, one would think that the massive disclosures of World War II about the deep and invincible multinational drives for independence and freedom by the captive non-Russian nations in the USSR would have made some imprint on the framers of this treaty. Indeed, they might have even profited from the Senate's own study in 1965, *The Soviet Empire,* and have deduced to what extent this treaty really places its blessings on Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism within the USSR, truly an imperium in imperio.

LEGAL INVALIDITY

Clearly reflecting this false, conceptual structure of the treaty are the patent expressions in its very contents. The treaty is studded with the notion of a Soviet national, a Homo Sovieticus or Red Moscow's equivalent of "Russian". Throughout you read "a national of the sending state", the "national flag of the sending state," "the national coat-of-arms of the sending state" and so forth. If you will permit me the lingual luxury of some Brooklynese, there ain't no such political animal in existence as a Soviet national or a national of the Soviet Union. Nor are there such objects in existence as a "national flag" of the USSR or a "national coat-of-arms" of the USSR. These concepts are applicable to the United States, which is a nation-state, but they are myths as concerns the USSR, which is an empire-state made up of numerous captive, national republics. Whoever wrote up this treaty, either has never read the USSR Constitution, the plethora of official pronouncements on Russian/non-Russian relations, and the United Nations' output of both Ukrainian and Byelorussian delegations or, if he has, then is vulnerable to a number of conjectures, one of which is the impress of outmoded preconceptions.

In logic and reason this fact alone invalidates this convention. Because of its gross misrepresentation of the other party, if such a contract were brought into a court of law, one doesn't have to be a lawyer to know what the judge's decision would be. Mythical beings and objects would scarcely be deserving of serious judicial thought, and the contract would be thrown out of court. So, here, you as Senators and some also as lawyers are asked to judge this contract, this treaty. Can you in rational conscience agree to a treaty that in its very wordage and concept entertains mythical objects?

This is not a matter of mere semantics. Words have meaning, and in an issue as serious as this, in time they can have tragic meaning for us and also for half of the population of the USSR. Let there be no mistake about it, such myth-making on our part, at that gratuitously proffered, serves Moscow well in its dual policy of projecting a Soviet national, a "Soviet" like an "American," and accomplishing its cultural and other types of genocide on the non-Russian nations. Of course Moscow welcomes this treaty and its fantastic conceptual contents, even to the extent of making a so-called concession regarding the arrest of Americans in the Soviet Union, for the treaty is in essence a diplomatic affirmation of Moscow's imperium in imperio and an encouragement for its subtle, genocidal policies.

BRANCH CONSULARISM: ONE COUNTRY MYTH

Reinforcing and reflecting the underlying myth that the USSR is a nation-state is the branch principle of consularism, the instrument that supposedly attests to the "national" integrality of the USSR. Aside from the utter legal defectiveness of the treaty, State Department spokesmen make a great point of the distinction between the treaty, with even greater emphasis on the touted notification and access provision, and the subject of further negotiations for the location of consulates. This is more for the easy sale of the treaty and its ratification, evading objections on grounds of the non-Russian nations in the USSR, than serving any real, intellectual point. For obviously, on the basis of the conceptual framework of the treaty as shown here, negotiations will go beyond Leningrad to Odessa and so forth where Americans travel, too. In fact, a ratified treaty would justify such further negotiations, logically forcing them into such non-Russian national directions regardless of the forms of national sovereignty involved in each and every non-Russian republic.

Mr. Rusk is on record admitting that a dilemma would arise if consulates were set up in the Baltic republics. But there would be a similar dilemma with reference to other non-Russian republics—not in terms of recognizing the free legations of the Baltic nations and refusing to recognize the latter's forced incorporation into the USSR, but in equally important terms of recognizing the distinctive national identities and historical credentials of these nations and refusing to reduce them to a populational and territorial expression deserving of only a consulate, a branch office of our Moscow Embassy. In two cases, the dilemma would be legal with our complete recognition of original Charter Members of the United Nations, Soviet Ukraine and Soviet Byelorussia; in all cases, the dilemma would be politico-moral when, on the one hand, our leaders talk about "friendship with *all* peoples"—"the fifth and most important principle of our foreign policy is support of national independence . . . the right of *each* people to govern themselves and to shape their own institutions. We follow this principle by encouraging the end of colonial rule"—and on the other hand, they would enforce a treaty that conceptually and instrumentally undermines this "most important principle of our foreign policy". A perfect example of State Department double-talk and double standard behavior is provided in point 13 of the *Questions and Answers* sent, I presume, to each Senator on February 6 by Mr. MacArthur II. It not only contradicts the Secretary of State's own testimony, but also demonstrates the psycho-political incompetence of those in the Department.

In addition to these basic intellectual, legal, political, and moral aspects of the treaty, there are the security, economic, and general diplomatic features. Let's examine each briefly but essentially. Aside from the superficial selling point of protecting U.S. citizens in the USSR, much is made of the so-called Russian concession on notification and access. But is it really a concession? It is as much a concession as a thief giving up stolen property. This civilized provision should have been demanded long ago on the purely diplomatic, ambassadorial level—on the very basis of the Roosevelt-Litvinov Agreements of November, 1933 that legally have remained in force to this very day, and upon which several Supreme Court decisions are based—and on the principle of reciprocity. Applying this principle, there's no net gain here, as the treaty's proponents would have us believe. If we really believe in this principle, we should press for this provision now, at long last, within the present context of our diplomatic relations with the USSR and without paying the heavy price of net disadvantage in the convention. This treaty is clearly a sham performance of improving relations. Our right to the protection of American citizens was established in the Executive Agreements of 1933. And even aside from all this clear legalism, it should be strongly emphasized that notification and access do not afford real, complete protection to our citizens no matter how many consulates we seek to establish; arbitrary arrest can easily continue, and brainwashing may be accomplished in 3 days with ease.

Moreover, there is no guarantee in this make-believe concession that important U.S. citizens might not be arrested and held incommunicado by the Russians indirectly and indefinitely, namely by the police in Poland, Czecho-Slovakia and elsewhere in the outer empire. They work through their associates in other spheres of activity; they can make fitting arrangements for this type of activity. It is not the aggregate number of Americans who travel to the USSR that is important, the few important Americans for them in given circumstances is what counts, and this business can be undertaken on neighboring terrain.

We are also told that risks of espionage have to be assumed in our open society. Life is full of risks, but we don't recklessly assume them; rationally, we assume them when seeking the realization of net gain and advantage. In the narrow context of espionage activity alone, and although spying is a two-way street, only a relative disadvantage would be our lot here. One does not have to be a FBI agent to arrive at this estimate when one considers the dominant fact that exceptionally well spy-trained Russians would enjoy a larger pond to fish in here than we there. Also, to merely cite that no more than ten or fifteen Russian consular officers would be here overlooks the coefficiency of their spy effectiveness. Even in the broader context of the treaty's analysis, there is no sufficient aggregate advantage to offset this particular disadvantage.

The risks not only of espionage but also of coercion, bribery, blackmail of American citizens with relatives in the USSR, some of which the Rumanians have been engaged in, and even sundry political warfare tactics directed against ethnic groups here are accentuated by the most gratuitous provision in the treaty of diplomatic immunity for crimes beyond misdemeanors. Even our friends and allies don't enjoy this privilege and, as admitted by the State Department, this privilege would be sought by others on a most-favored nation basis, including other totalitarian Red governments. Guided by the Department's testimonies on these points, if I am correct in all of this, then trading for the so-called concession on notification and access our real concessions of politically slighting the captive non-Russian nations in the USSR, granting diplomatic immunity to consular officers, and accepting greater risks of espionage and political warfare activity in our open society renders the treaty a bum deal.

The current shell game of manipulating figures—10 or 15 or 20 Russian consular personnel in this country—not only misleads the public as to the qualitative determinants of effective espionage (it took only a handful of spies to rob us of our atomic secrets for the expedition of totalitarian Russian nuclearity) and the mentioned most-favored-nation sieve but also conceals the fact that a Senate confirmation of this treaty would open up a Pandora's box of Soviet Russian pressure against every free government in Latin America. The immediate objective would be similar consular conventions; the ultimate objective would be a really intensified political warfare in the area with a network of consulates as the prime instrument. This at a time when many of our own officials have been warning us to expect stepped-up Red subversion throughout the continent!

In the misplaced spirit of "easing tensions", "normalizing relations", "pursuing peace" and other homiletical spurities, what Latin American government could refuse the request for a consulate after the supposed leader of the Free World has extended this benefit to the rulers of the Kremlin. Beginning with 10 or 15 here we may well end up with several hundred additional Russian operatives in the hemisphere—and cloaked with diplomatic immunity.

Concerning the economic aspect, Mr. Rusk has argued that the treaty would contribute to "increasing trade between our two countries". In 1965 I appeared before this Committee on the East-West trade issue and stressed the dangers of repeating our economic errors of the 20's and 30's in regard to the Soviet Union. This isn't the place to elaborate on them again except to say that as a trade wedge the treaty may have as much potential commercial value, not to speak of other values, as the expectations nourished by the British who today are accusing Moscow of reneging on its promises to buy more British goods, the purchases last year being lower than in '63. As to other values it appears quite irrational to really aid the USSR economy through trade while it chiefly supports the Red totalitarian ally in Hanoi to decimate Americans.

Finally, in support of the treaty we have heard about the inadequacy of our Embassy in Moscow, the need for mutual understanding, normalizing relations, improving communications, opening up more windows in "Russia," and pursuing the goal of peace. Good intentions and objectives are oftentimes marred and, in time, liquidated by imprudent means, lip-serviced principles, and timid accommodation. It is interesting that for years the Department has opposed the proposal for direct diplomatic relations with Byelorussia and Ukraine because it would mean more Communists here and yet, now, is prepared to allow for more through the consular medium. The net advantage of having this kind of windows in the Soviet Union—in Byelorussia, Ukraine, Armenia and even Kazakh Turkestan; in Minsk, Kiev, Yerevan, and Alma Ata respectively—is that all the good intentions and objectives mentioned would have the chance of being realized, all the glaring defects of the consular treaty would not exist, and all the accruing illusions about "Communism" tagged on an old broken-down record of the 30's would quickly dissipate. Aiming our diplomatic efforts at the captive non-Russian nations in the USSR, which is even accommodated by the USSR Constitution, is a new, fresh, more realistic alternative that this Committee should positively and constructively explore. Broken-down records about "changes in Communism," consulates in "Russia", understanding through trade and other familiar tunes of the 30's will not enable us to cope with the ever-widening penetrations of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism in the Free World, including even our own hemisphere. These penetrations are systematically executed through and by leaps over our Maginot wall of containment.

Marx, who in the last century had keener insights into the historic process of Russian expansionism, both overt and covert, than some of our experts have today left us one which deserves our sober contemplation: "The prestige of Russian diplomacy and the renown of Russia's military strength can be maintained far more easily and securely in peace than in war . . . A system of intimidation is far less expensive than actual warfare".

Very frankly, Senators, if in some degree you are intimidated by Soviet Russian nuclearity, at that in part launched by espionage in the 40's while Moscow was our great "democratic" ally; if, for whatever reason, you don't give a hoot about the freedom aspirations of some 120 million non-Russians in the USSR; if you want, albeit inadvertently, to lend your support to the perpetuation of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism and, as so many of our leaders in the past, to become the unsuspecting guardians of Moscow's imperium in imperio; if, in your conscience, you believe that American citizens will really be "protected" in the USSR and that this treaty is not a sham performance in "building bridges of understanding"; if you think the floodgates would not be opened to disproportionate Russian espionage and political warfare in our hemisphere; if perhaps you're striving for another Russo-American alliance—an empire and a democracy, this time against the so-called yellow peril—to insure the grounds of our chief enemy and in inevitable time to undermine the grounds of our national security and independence, then you have no choice but to vote for this anachronism of the 30's. If not on each and all of these relevant points, your right choice is to reject it, consider my proposed alternative in tune with the 60's, and also call for a thorough review of U.S. policy toward the USSR, a sort of a Great Debate, one which we have never had in our history and for which I offer this proposed resolution to any of you who might be interested. It's as simple as this: this treaty is both a symbol of our politico-cultural lag in relation to the multinational empire-state of the USSR and a gift to colonialist Moscow's psycho-political strategy and war against the Free World.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my statement and, at this point, for the further elaboration of the arguments advanced here, I request the inclusion into the record of these hearings of my more comprehensive article on "Ten Reasons Against the U.S.–U.S.S.R. Consular Treaty" and also an article on "Historical Lessons in Totalitarian Trade" and the proposed resolution:

"RESOLUTION ON REVIEW OF U.S. POLICY TOWARD THE U.S.S.R.

"Providing for a thorough review of U.S. policy toward the U.S.S.R.

"Whereas in his 1967 State of the Union Message the President declared "the genius of the American political system has always been expressed through creative debate that offers reasonable alternatives"; and

"Whereas U.S. policy toward the U.S.S.R. is most crucial to the issue of global peace or war, and the cumulative evidence of the past two decades, including Greece, Iran, Korea, Cuba, the Congo, the Dominican Republic, and Vietnam, casts a reasonable and heavy doubt on the peace-insuring efficacy of the pursued policy; and

"Whereas there has never been a thorough Congressional review of our policy toward the U.S.S.R., even at levels below another Great Debate, examining and illuminating questionable preconceptions, arrant conceptual confusion, contradictions to fact and principle, and high-level counter-contradictions that have surrounded this policy; and

"Whereas proposed particular measures, such as the U.S.–U.S.S.R. Consular Convention, U.S.-Soviet trade, cultural exchange agreements etc., depend for their accurate and proper evaluation on the soundness or no of the underlying assumptions and criteria in the general policy; and

"Whereas these assumptions and criteria have been too frequently conveyed by official assertions that are patently contrary to fact and/or principle, and especially at this time deserve to be openly and thoroughly examined; and

"Whereas, to cite one example, on the highest level an old, imperial Tsarist Russian usage, albeit fictional to present conditions, has been revived in the thought 'The common interests of *the peoples of Russia* and the United States are many'; and

"Whereas, by way of further example, the notion expressed by one of our Presidents, 'no nation in the history of battle ever suffered more than the Russian suffered in the course of the Second World War', contradicts the facts that the ravaged territories in the USSR were largely non-Russian and the losses of Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Ukrainians, Armenians and other non-Russian nationals were equal if not greater; and

"Whereas, in additional contradiction to fact, more than one national leader has voiced the mythical constructions of '200 million Russians' in existence and the USSR as 'Russia'; and

"Whereas, to mention another apt example, a high-level conception misjudges 'areas, such as the Ukraine, Armenia, or Georgia' as constituting 'traditional parts of the Soviet Union . . . an historical state', which factually has been in existence for only forty-five years; and

"Whereas, in sharp contradiction to this quoted misconception, an outstanding official U.S. statement in the United Nations emphasizes: 'An independent Ukrainian Republic was recognized by the Bolsheviks in 1917' and later 'with the help of the Red Army, a Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic was established and incorporated into the USSR'; also, 'In 1920, the Soviet army invaded, and Armenian independence, so long awaited, was snuffed out'; also, 'In 1921, the Red Army came to the aid of Communists rebelling against the independent State of Georgia and installed a Soviet regime'; and

"Whereas these selected examples of basic confusion, contradictions of reality, and official counter-contradictions are compounded by growing doubts related to operating principles, double-standards, and policy inconsistencies, even at a time when the USSR and its syndicated Red associates supply the totalitarian Red regime in North Vietnam to kill increasing numbers of American defenders of independent South Vietnam; and

"Whereas on the basis of these and numerous other points of evidence, it is not inconceivable that the forthcoming fiftieth anniversary of the Russian Bolshevik Revolution, which gave rise to Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism and its worldwide aggressive ambitions, might elicit in 'the spirit of peaceful coexistence' harmful expressions virtually equating this fraudulent revolution with our own American Revolution and its symbolization of national independence, individual liberty, and freedom; and

"Whereas a genuine policy of peaceful coexistence means progressive reciprocity, substantial reduction of barriers year by year, the absence of controlled movements, an intensified understanding between nations in the U.S.S.R. and the United States, and surcease from indirect provocation in other parts of the free world, none of which has been realized in the past decade; and

"Whereas a policy founded on basic misconceptions, myths, and internal contradictions generates a grand illusion which in the long run can only lead to disastrous results for our independence and national security and certainly, in the short run and with reference to the nations in the U.S.S.R. fails to validate the President's declaration in his 1966 state of the Union message: 'The fifth and most important principle of our foreign policy is support of national independence—the right of each people to govern themselves and to shape their own institutions . . . We follow this principle by encouraging the end of colonial rule': Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a complete and thorough review of United States policy toward the U.S.S.R. be undertaken. The review shall be conducted by means of public hearings, designated studies relevant to all essential aspects of the subject, and scheduled symposia consisting of Members of the Senate, representatives of interested areas in our Government, and invited participants from the private sector of

our society. The results of this comprehensive review will be made available by publication and other media to the American public. On the basis of the results the Senate shall determine what 'reasonable alternatives' exist to our present policy toward the U.S.S.R."

THE VOICE OF AMERICA

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the 25th birthday of the Voice of America will be marked with no fanfare or celebration. The Voice will continue to beam its message to the world on February 24, 1967, as it did on February 24, 1942, when its first message was directed to Germany.

An editorial in the Washington Star, which I submit for the RECORD, summarizes succinctly 25 years of accomplishment. The employees of the Voice of America deserve the congratulations and thanks of the people of this country, as well as of free men across the globe.

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 22, 1967]

THE VOICE AT 25

The Voice of America, the most far-ranging and perhaps the most important operation of the United States Information Agency, is 25 years old this week. Its first program was beamed to Germany on February 24, 1942. It said, "We shall tell you the truth."

Inevitably, in undertaking to project a good image of our country around the world, the VOA over the past quarter of a century has from time to time embroidered the truth. This has aroused criticism in some quarters. The Voice is an enterprise designed to compete with and counter much more lavishly financed Communist projects of the same kind. As such, it can hardly be a totally detached observer of the world scene. It is an arm of our government, and a necessary one, and it must do its difficult job accordingly.

Everything considered, the VOA has performed creditably in a field where impeccably correct journalism is hardly possible. We salute it. It deserves the honors marking its silver anniversary.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1967, Estonians in the United States and throughout the world are commemorating the 49th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Estonia. I am most pleased to join with my colleagues in the House, the Estonian community in the United States and all men and women who place a high value on freedom in expressing publicly the sincere hope that this Baltic nation will once again enjoy freedom.

In 1940 the Soviet Union annexed the free Republic of Estonia, along with its sister Republics of Latvia and Lithuania. The seizure was possible only because the world had become engaged in World War II. It grew out of the notorious Ribbentrop-Molotov Agreement of August, 1939, when the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany cynically divided up a number of Eastern European nations.

As we in the United States have learned since those confused days over a quarter of a century ago, the Soviet Union's thirst for conquest is insatiable. The United States and the free portion of the world have since spent hundreds of billions of dollars and tens of thousands of lives to halt that Soviet-Communist drive for conquest. In spite of the cost in goods and lives, it has been worth the price. The Communist threat is being halted. We stopped it in Greece, in West Germany and now are halting a companion drive in South Vietnam, supported for the most part by Communist China.

Mr. Speaker, I am firmly convinced that the ruthless Communist attempt to take over the world will be stopped. I am also hopeful the Communist rulers of Estonia, in time, will be thrown out. When this will come about none of us know. But freedom will be once more granted to the grave people of Estonia. In spite of the sufferings the Estonian people have had to endure, they have not lost their hope to regain freedom and independence.

In commemorating this day of Estonia's independence, I ask my fellow Members of Congress and free men everywhere, to renew a pledge we have made many times: That all people have the right of self-determination, a right that has been denied the people of Estonia and hundreds of millions behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

Several thousand people from the three Baltic nations have fled to the State of Minnesota. They have quickly worked themselves into the fabric of our society, and are fine citizens. But I know, having talked to many of them, they want to return to their homelands, bringing with them freedom.

CURBING UNWARRANTED AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, farm parity prices have dropped to a near-record low of 75 percent. In view of this unhappy fact, I am renewing my 8-year fight to curb unwarranted agricultural imports that threaten the entire food-producing structure of American agriculture.

It was 8 years ago when I first introduced legislation to curb agricultural imports. It was obvious even then that these imports interfered with U.S. farm programs and if permitted to rise unchecked, would lead to serious problems in the future. The events of the past 8 years have confirmed the legitimacy and urgency of that concern, as crisis after crisis occurred in commodities such as beef, other meats, Cheddar cheese, general dairy products, eggs, and even grains that could have been used in the production of other commodities. We even saw the reverse when export controls were imposed on our cattle hide producers. All of these events have hurt the American farmer, with the present administration showing little or no regard for improving the situation.

There is one encouraging note, however. I am encouraged by the number of other Members of Congress who now see this growing danger of uncurbed imports, and have joined me in the fight by introducing legislation similar to the bills I have promoted since coming to Congress.

I first introduced bills aimed at curbing unwarranted agricultural imports in 1959 and have authorized import-control bills in every Congress since. My general import bill in 1961 is the prototype being used by myself and many others this year in seeking a limit on dairy imports. My sugar bills have long sought to give the U.S. producer a greater share of the American market instead of relying so heavily on unreliable foreign imports. I have appeared on many occasions before the U.S. Tariff Commission in an effort to have U.S. agricultural trade policies reviewed and to protest U.S. relaxation of import restrictions while other nations tightened theirs. I was one of those who were successful in petitioning the Commerce Department's order to restrict hide exports.

These all were efforts to put teeth in our trade agreements and laws, efforts to get the various agencies of Government to use existing laws to protect the future of American agriculture. It is now apparent that we must go much further, and it is up to the Congress to tighten existing laws and pass new ones. With our surpluses almost gone, with the world facing a food crisis, and the American farmer being asked to produce more food without any guarantee of an adequate price, these rising imports present a serious threat to the entire future of American agriculture. Action is needed that will encourage, rather than threaten, this Nation's ability to produce food.

AN INCENTIVE PROGRAM TO ENCOURAGE AND FACILITATE THE INSTALLATION OF INDUSTRIAL AIR AND WATER POLLUTION CONTROL DEVICES

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H.R. 6000, which is a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage installation of industrial air and water pollution control facilities by providing for a 60-month amortization of the cost of such facilities.

President Johnson in his state of the Union message recognized the need for immediate action in air and water pollution control and has, indeed, sent a special message to Congress on these problems of urgent concern. These are nonpartisan subjects on which all Americans agree much more must be done quickly.

These problems have concerned me for almost 20 years. In 1949, the city of Columbus adopted a smoke control ordinance which I drafted as an assistant city attorney at the direction of the then mayor of Columbus, James A. Rhodes. This ordinance has served as model legislation for many other cities. In 1961, I introduced a bill in the Ohio General Assembly to encourage installation of industrial air and water pollution control facilities. The bill became law for air pollution control in 1963 and for water pollution control in 1965, each bill being signed into law by Gov. James A. Rhodes. These bills have been modeled after by at least 12 other States.

I mention this ordinance and the Ohio laws to emphasize my longtime interest in the incentive approach to installation of air and water pollution control facilities which I take in the bill I have introduced in the Congress of the United States.

Much has been done in this area. It would be horrible to contemplate our situation if nothing at all had been done relative to this problem of such national concern. But we are losing the battle for clean air and water. If we continue to lose, this will be an Armageddon.

In recent years much public discussion has been heard on the need for increased action in the field of air and water pollution control, both governmentally and industrially. At the Federal level, particularly, ways have been sought to stimulate both public and private investments in facilities to protect our Nation's air and water resources.

For local governmental units, substantial assistance has come in the form of loans, direct grants, and matching fund programs financed by Federal appropriations. For industry, however, little has been done to ease the financial burden of constructing and operating an expensive, nonproductive air and water pollution control facility for the public benefit.

PRACTICAL INCENTIVE

While I do not advocate direct governmental subsidies for constructing private pollution control facilities, I do urge tax relief which has proved to be an effective stimulant to public benefit investment by private resources in States where this kind of legislation has been enacted. Thus, the bill which I have introduced is designed to provide a practical incentive program for installation of public-benefit air and water pollution control facilities at no cost to the Federal Government.

While the specific purpose of the bill is to grant tax relief for the installation of such facilities, the broader purpose is to stimulate construction of air and water pollution control facilities and thereby provide pure air and water for the public use.

CONTROL FACILITIES COSTLY

There are many practical reasons why many companies have not been able to move ahead in this area as fast as they would like. One is the relationship between high cost of constructing abatement facilities and narrow profit margins. The cost of pollution control facilities ordinarily cannot be reflected in a company's prices because of competitive conditions. Thus, the necessity of having to pay high State, local, and Federal taxes year after year, on nonproductive control facilities serves to further limit profit margins and thereby detract from the potential for new job growth.

Fortunately, during the past decade the rate of cleaning up the air and our streams has been accelerating. Twenty years ago we did not have crises such as those in New York 3 months ago and in Los Angeles before that and which, although not so pronounced, are commonplace occurrencies in many large cities today. Twenty years ago we had few streams with decaying, putrifying sludge deposits. That picture is changing rapidly. There is another change also. Fifteen years ago the common approach was to point the finger at the other man as being responsible. Within the last 4 years a decided change has been seen in the thinking of most people concerned with this problem. We now realize that air and water resources belong to all of us, are used by all of us, and affect all of us. Instead of pointing fingers, the question now is how to achieve clean air and clean streams at the least cost to all.

President Johnson has highlighted the need for more action in this area. Senator RIBICOFF, who served as Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has led a drive to speed up a legislative program by offering proposals along the lines of my bill. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], among many others, have introduced similar legislation in the House in past years.

There are many good reasons for this approach. The fastest approach to pollution clean-up is by "incentive" sales talk and not by enforcing laws. We all know that a program moves faster when there is cooperation by all concerned rather than where there is resistance more likely to occur when the bludgeon approach is used. Enforcement may be needed with a few industries, but that is the time-consuming approach.

PUBLIC BENEFITS

Whether companies are large or small, the expense of constructing facilities, the expense of operating them, and the expense of added taxes on the value of the facility are three big hurdles to overcome. Also, we do not want to stop production by closing factories—that would put people out of work—or by levying punitive fines, which would have the same effect. I have learned, too, that small companies which can destroy small streams, often have a more difficult time meeting the cost of installing pollution control facilities. The theory behind the bill which I have introduced is that, if the company pays for the facility and operates it, the benefits are for the public, not the company. Why should the company pay taxes on the money used to produce the facility which adds nothing to the product produced by the industry? There is a parallel in those cases where a company discharges into a city sewer. The city constructs the treatment plant and operates it. The company pays its share of the cost of construction and operation but does not pay additional taxes on the treatment plant.

I have participated in many discussions on this problem. One such meeting involved representatives of the Legislature of Ohio, industry, conservation, the League of Women Voters, labor, and others in Columbus, Ohio. There was a frank discussion with all aspects of the problem being aired fully. The recommendations from this committee which assisted in the passage of the law in Ohio took the approach of the bill I have introduced. The theme of the meeting was that clean air and clean streams are a cost. How this cost can be diminished so that there will be more money available for other needs, and how clean air and streams can be a reality most quickly without putting industry and the Nation at an economic disadvantage and jeopardize jobs, was the central theme. Our conclusions are incorporated in this proposed bill.

PROVISIONS OF H.R. 6000

The bill which I have introduced would provide substantial incentives to industry while having a limited effect on Federal tax revenues. But if we can reverse the trend as far as pollution of our air and water are concerned the dividends in purer air and water will far exceed the cost of the incentives.

Designated the "Pollution Control Facilities Amortization Act," my proposal would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a 60-month amortization of the cost of equipment used primarily for control of pollution.

In addition to the 5-year writeoff of the cost, it is contemplated the 7-percent investment tax credit which a year ago was suspended for all new plant additions, except air and water pollution control installations, would be continued.

APPROVAL BY STATE

The bill calls for approval of qualification for such credits to come from State agencies meeting standards of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for air and the Department of the Interior for water.

The advantages of the incentive plan I have proposed are:

Amortization will bring speedier action, without the need to await approval and payment under a Government grant plan;

Placing approval in the hands of the States will encourage them to establish or improve their own programs for control of pollution; and

No cost to State or Federal Government is involved.

The plan removes a major obstacle for firms delaying installation of pollution controls because of high costs for this nonproductive operation, especially where profit margin is low.

The plan I propose is a familiar procedure; only its application to a peacetime problem "on the home front" is new. The same speedy writeoff of costs was used in World War II, to help industries convert from peacetime products to military equipment.

We are in an emergency today which affects all our people. There is every reason to revive now, in the public interest, a plan which helped us to victory in World War II.

I do not suggest that this bill is a panacea to all our problems in air and water pollution. However, I feel, it will provide a great psychological and practical stride toward a deceleration of the problem, and I urge the Members of Congress to give it serious consideration.

TRANSPORTING MAN'S WORLDLY GOODS

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUTTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of emphasis has been given to the problems of transporting people. Some have even encouraged the construction of a giant passenger plane that will carry people across the land at supersonic speeds. But problems of transporting goods are at least as important as those of transporting people.

In our Nation alone it is estimated that the amount of freight hauled equals 1.6 trillion ton-miles a year, and that it will double in the next two decades.

Alan S. Boyd, Secretary of the newly created Department of Transportation, has said:

> There is going to be so much business, both passenger and cargo, waterborne, land and air, that the real problem is whether any of these modes of transportation is going to be far-sighted enough to keep up with demand.

Keeping up with demand depends on the cooperation of the best minds of society and government working together on new ideas. To solve the problems, a sound understanding by the general public is necessary.

I would therefore like to call the attention of my colleagues to a report on transportation that has recently been published by Worthington Corp. to aid this effort. I am proud to say that Alco Products, Inc., a subsidiary of Worthington in Schenectady, has been contributing to the solution of the problems of transportation for 119 years through the production of locomotives to keep man's goods on the move.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that this report, entitled "Transportation," will contribute to a greater national awareness of our transportation problems and alternative solutions to those problems. I commend Worthington Corp. for what I consider an outstanding public service.

As the booklet points out, virtually every industry is dependent on transportation. Not only does something as basic as food have to get to markets from the farms, but items such as fertilizer have to get to the farms so food can be grown in the first place.

Because of highly advanced transportation, a country as highly advanced as ours can exist, for transportation allows specialization to flourish. Man no longer must be self-sufficient, but he can do what he wants to do and knows he can do best. With transportation, he can understand and enjoy the fullest expression of freedom.

Transportation is our third largest cost of doing business, following labor and materials. More than one-sixth of the gross national product is spent on transportation; in 1965 it took $125 billion of the $675 billion total.

Mr. Speaker, the following are key excerpts from "Transportation":

Excerpts From "Transportation"

(By the Worthington Corp.)

Through most of history man has expended more effort getting things from one place to another than he has on any other activity. As he has found more efficient means of transportation he has freed himself to put more energy into creating goods than into moving them.

Today there are exotic new kinds of vehicles that show promise. But nothing on the horizon suggests that rails, ships, trucks, pipelines or barges will become obsolete. On the contrary, these traditional modes will continue to carry the great bulk of man's basic materials. They are today transforming themselves to do a more efficient job more cheaply.

Today in the United States, the nation with the most extensive transportation network, you can ship a ton of average freight on a barge or ocean vessel for less than one-third cent for each mile. If your ton is oil, a pipeline will carry it for the same price. If you want faster delivery for your ton, or want to reach more points of origin and destination, rail freight will cost only 1¼ cents for each mile. For shorter hauls and door-to-door delivery, trucks will carry your ton for about seven cents for each mile. If you are in a great hurry and your ton must go a long distance, you can ship it by air freight for 20 cents a mile.

For contrast there is the animal transport still common in much of the world. India has ten million animals hauling about 100 million tons a year. The cost of hauling a ton by ox cart, horse, burro, camel, donkey or bullock is something like 50 or 60 cents per ton-mile. That's enough to quadruple the price of many products.

CHANGE AND EXCHANGE

With better transport, people whose isolation forced them to supply almost all of their own needs by inefficient and small-scale means can concentrate on what they do best. They can use whatever advantages they have in skills, soil and climate to become specialists and then trade their increased output for cash to meet other needs. When vegetable growers begin to trade with protein producers their health improves. When farmers sell to mills they get cash to buy goods from factories farther away.

Better roads and rails also bring the technical expert and adviser. The farm agent, with his demonstrations of fertilizer, pesticides, better seeds and new practices, can come to many more people when he doesn't have to slog through mud. By road or rail he perhaps can revisit a planting when the crop ripens and make sure the lessons sink in.

Transportation also contributes to unifying peoples, making them feel part of a larger group, helping to weld them into a nation or at least a larger producing area. It forms people into markets, and it is not surprising that people get much more attention from the world when they become a market. Transportation makes centralized schools possible, gets more children to them and raises attendance in bad weather.

Because transportation's role is to take things from one place and deliver them to another, it is sometimes said not to be a creative force; it brings nothing into being and does not in itself cause prosperity. Yet its roles as a conveyor and connector make it also a stimulator and a catalyst. The expensive creation of a transportation system in any developing area is itself a great leaven of progress and prosperity. When it is carefully planned it unleashes productive forces even if it does not call them into existence. Transportation often forges far ahead of other industrial progress.

In most of the developing world, transportation grows faster than productivity, faster than average national incomes and even faster than population. Rail freight in Europe grew 28 per cent during the decade of the 1950's, but in Asia both rail and truck freight grew by about 230 per cent.

While in the advanced nations the rate of growth in freight is slower than in the developing countries, the amount of growth projected is a challenge: it is estimated that the amount of freight hauled in the United States, now 1.6 trillion ton-miles a year, will double in 20 years. World trade grew by 78 per cent from 1955 to 1964.

About 30 per cent of World Bank loans to developing countries go into transportation projects.

UNHAPPY MEETING PLACE

Among the worst trouble spots in all modes of transportation are the points where they meet. It is here that things must be wrestled out of one kind of vehicle and piled up in another. Bulk fluid and dry commodities cause relatively little difficulty. They are often conveyed on belts, speedily pumped from tank car to ship or from ship to pipeline or dumped from hopper car into barge. Some are sucked up into grain elevators by air compressors and dropped by gravity or blown into ships, freight cars and barges. Cost-saving improvements are constantly being made in bulk handling. It is the more valuable and diverse products, the fabricated goods, that cause the most difficulty.

At trans-shipment points the carrier's expensive equipment and manpower are tied up in long terminal and turn-around times and the savings gained by faster vehicles are lost. Here is where pilferage and a large amount of breakage occur. Such terminal points generate excess paperwork and allow goldbricking.

A model transportation system—a practical impossibility but an ideal goal—would keep things constantly moving, as rapidly as possible, from their origin as raw materials through processing or manufacture, and deliver them in a continually flowing supply to ultimate consumers. Moreover, they would arrive in the exact quantities required and at the precise times when they are needed. They would not be shifted en route from one mode to another, they would never stop moving, and only the smallest amounts would be stored in tanks, depots and warehouses, or held in inventory to await demand. And it is not simply that inefficient transportation raises costs; it eats up the shipper's capital.

The closest thing to this model is the piping of gas from wellhead to consumer in a constant flow that meets needs, but even gas suffers from fluctuations of demand that require expensive storage.

"Keeping the distribution pipelines full" is a phrase you can hear from manufacturers of appliances, automobiles and other fabricated goods. They find the analogy expressive despite the non-flowing nature of their products.

Suppose that you were a manufacturer of air conditioners; you'd want to keep your distribution "pipeline" full so that you would not miss any sales. The fewer units it takes to do this the better for you. If Worthington, for example, must keep 1000 air conditioning units in stock, in transit and in regional warehouses, and each is worth $600, the company has $600,000 tied up in inventory. If the required number can be cut by half, through transportation that is more regular, more reliable and faster, the gain is $300,000 of "free" capital that can be put to work elsewhere making profit.

If transport efficiencies could similarly reduce this one company's "pipelining" of standard models of compressors, construction tools, large valves, refrigeration units, pumps and other stock items, millions of dollars of the best kind of money could be saved. The prospects for this are improving.

REINVENTING THE BOX

A promising development for speeding up the integration of various modes of transportation and increasing their interdependence is—the box. Boxes and containers are nothing new in shipping. But the scheduled use of standardized containers in an integrated system that allows them to be transferred quickly and easily from train to truck to ship to barge, and soon to giant airfreighters, gained enough impetus and cooperation between modes in the past two years to qualify as a new concept. It is the versatile new shipping box.

The standard container is either 20 or 40 feet long and eight feet in both height and width. There are in-between lengths of 10 and 30 feet. Some containers become trailers by having rear wheel carriages, called bogies, fitted onto them. When they are being loaded they are merely large packing cases, though handy; on trains they convert a flatcar into a boxcar; on trucks they are trailers. They are an outgrowth of piggyback, the truck trailer carried on a flat car, and might not have been successful if piggyback had not shown the advantages of a convertible box.

A manufacturer in the Middle West packs a container at his plant and slides it onto a flat car at his siding or onto a truck that takes it to a freight yard. At an East or West Coast port it is swiftly hoisted onto a ship by pushbutton lifts. At an Asian or European port it goes back onto train or truck and is delivered to a customer's door. The goods inside have not been handled, stowed, dropped, stacked and unstacked, nor been jumbled in a cargo net. They require less special packing for protection.

Because there is no pilferage from the locked container, high-cost items can be sent with minimum packing and insurance. The Matson Navigation Co. says that it saved $1 million in a year on pilferage and damage losses. The container is proving a fine way to ship whisky, except that the customs inspector sometimes chooses to check a lot that is packed up in the nose end of the container.

Containers carry canned goods from the Middle West to Hawaii and bring back pineapples. With regular train and ship scheduling, goods can make it from Minneapolis to Antwerp or elsewhere in Europe in two weeks instead of five or six. Refrigerated farm produce from California has reached England in 16 days.

Containers travel by truck, rail, ship and through several countries, all on one waybill. Eventually they should cut much of the paperwork of exports and imports. They reduce turn-around time of trains, trucks and ships. Some already travel the rails at passenger train speeds.

The Maritime Administration says that about five per cent of the non-bulk cargo that crosses the Atlantic is now in containers but that 75 per cent of it could be containerized. The agency estimates that $300 million is now committed for containerships that will be built by 1970.

In the past year shipping lines began ordering containerships by the dozens. Some of those being built will be capable of carrying 1000 mixed 20- and 40-foot containers. Many existing ships are being converted to carry more containers. It is predicted that even larger containerships will be built and that they may be served from shallow ports, or widely dispersed areas, by hydrofoil vessels.

Containerships are being loaded in 12 hours with cargoes that formerly took 72 hours. Some containerships have been speeded up from 20 to 23 knots, larger ones on order will make 27 knots and there are predictions of 40 knots—that's 45 miles per hour.

Air freight so far carries only small containers. But the giant C–5A cargo jet plane that will be delivered to the Military Air Transport Service in 1969 will be a large container carrier. A civilian version would be able to carry 24 containers of the 8x8x20-foot size. That would equal the load of three boxcars. If this plane were converted for passengers it would carry 1033 of them.

Barges are not being left out, and some already double as either small barges or oversized containers. Some, holding 140 tons, have been carried on ships and lifted off to serve as lighters to get cargo into shallow ports. As the idea grows it is easy to see that such floating containers could be assembled into barge tows and reach up into inland waterways for large cargoes that would not need to be reloaded into ships and unloaded again. This would greatly reduce the turn-around time of ships. A proposed fast, large ship would carry 100 barges, dropping them off at Mediterranean ports and picking up others loaded with return cargo.

Some inherent advantages of each different mode of transportation depend on the way it overcomes four forces: inertia, gravity, friction and the resistance of air or water. The ship and barge are suspended at no cost by water, but this liquid lubricant is relatively dense and puts up a resistance to motion that rises rapidly as speed is increased. So ships and barge tows travel slowly but cheaply.

Pipelines cut across any terrain with little concern for forces except friction, and gravity in the case of oil. But there is a surprisingly large amount of friction between gas or oil and the walls of a pipe.

The steel wheels of a railroad train ride on steel rails with only 3/10ths of a square inch of contact. Thus a mile-long train of 100 freight cars has 800 wheels which make a total contact with the rails of less than two square feet. A large trailer truck can have more than that amount of friction contact between its rubber tires and the concrete road. While this makes the truck less efficient in pulling, the increased friction adds to the truck's ability to climb hills and to stop in short distances.

With a freight train on level track it takes only about four pounds of motive force to move a ton, although in practice locomotives are rated to deliver five pounds of draw-bar pull for each ton of load. The resistance is about equal to that of a large, bulk-carrying ship of 20,000 tons. The comparison is made at ten miles an hour for each, since water resistance builds up much faster than the rail friction and air resistance of a train.

The force required to move a ton becomes almost 19 pounds for a trailer truck (a modern jet airplane must use 100 pounds of force to lift and move a ton). The truck however has an advantage on hills. Its friction resistance is already so high that it need exert only twice as much pull to get up a one-per-cent grade (a rise of one foot in 100). To get up such a slight rise requires a locomotive to exert five times as much force, while a two-per-cent grade will require ten times the tractive effort. That's why most rail grades are kept to one per cent and seldom exceed two per cent.

The way in which great power at slow speeds saves money on water is illustrated by new Alco diesels that propel Mississippi river towboats. With 7500 horsepower one of these large towboats can push barges carrying 45,000 tons at about six miles an hour; that is 1/16 horsepower for each ton.

BON VOYAGE

Rocket trains may travel through deep rock tunnels at half the speed of sound. Submarine tankers and underwater barges have been proposed. The monorail is not a dead idea. Airplanes that take off and land vertically may play an important role in intercity transportation. There are many prospects for ground effects machines, riding on cushions of air to escape from friction and capable of carrying high-priority cargoes and people over rough land, water, ice and swamps.

These are exciting possibilities, but even the ones that prove successful are not likely to outmode or replace existing ways of transporting the great bulk of essential goods. Some of these new developments may bring new loads to old modes and serve to extend and connect present forms as well as supplement them.

The real future of transportation will lie, for a long time to come, in the kind of improvements that are now apparent in the conventional modes. These modes will continue to do the heavy work, and fortunately have shown that they can transform themselves and use new methods to meet new needs. Their story is less glamorous than forecasts of exotic new solutions, and that is precisely why we have chosen to look at them.

Present modes are being transformed by computers, electronics, and other new technologies, by large doses of old-fashioned ingenuity, and above all by new kinds of men who are not merely vocational specialists in a single mode but professionals solving problems in the over-all field of transportation. Such men will continue, no matter how vigorously they compete with each other, to coordinate and dovetail their tracks and pipes, their barges, ships, trucks and airplanes, until these conveyances become one big, interconnected pipeline. It may one day be as simple to ship something across the world as it is to mail a letter—and much faster and cheaper.

PROHIBITION ON U.S. BUSINESSMEN IN COOPERATING WITH ARAB BOYCOTT

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced H.R. 6031 which, if enacted, would once and for all, clearly prohibit U.S. businesses from cooperating with the Arab boycott of the sovereign State of Israel.

It seems tragic to me that my bill had to be introduced at all. Two years ago, when the Export Control Act was before the House Committee on Banking and Currency, a majority of our committee signed a minority report insisting that the time had long since passed when the Congress should act in a forthright fashion to prohibit U.S. firms from cooperating with the Arab boycott. It was our feeling at that time that the only way to provide protection to U.S. firms under pressure from the Arab boycott was to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 in such a manner as to make it convenient for U.S. firms to refuse to furnish such information having the effect of furthering or supporting restrictive trade practices. By enacting such a prohibition, these firms could have had something concrete to fall back on when the Arab boycott office demanded information.

Notwithstanding the fact that a clear majority of our committee, as well as an overwhelming majority of the House, favored enactment of such a prohibition, at the last minute the Department of State prevailed, and virtually meaningless legislation was enacted.

One need only refer to front-page headlines during the past year to realize how meaningless were the 1965 Export Control Act provisions. Company after company has been threatened with reprisals by the Arab boycott for conducting business with the State of Israel. Recently, the Ford Motor Co. refused outright to adhere to the boycott threat, but many smaller firms are not in the same position as Ford and cannot, for business reasons, stand up to the pressure as well.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress should waste no time in enacting remedial legislation. It is my fervent hope that the House Committee on Banking and Currency or one of its subcommittees will hold hearings and report favorably this legislation. Recent experience shows clearly that the promises and vague hopes of the Departments of State and Commerce have been dashed by an increasingly bellicose attitude by the leaders of the Arab boycott.

I hope this time we can do the job that we should have done 2 years ago.

PAYING THEIR WAY

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the eminent economist, Milton Friedman, in Newsweek magazine of February 20, 1967, has some hard-nosed words of advice concerning the financing of higher education. Based on California's experience with its free education policy, Mr. Friedman points out that in 1963 more than half the students in California State colleges and the University of California came from the top quarter of families whose incomes exceeded $10,000 a year.

Only 5 percent or so of the students came from the 18 percent of the families with incomes less than $4,000. His point is, of course, that the free education policy is benefiting in the main those who can afford to pay. His recommendation that loans be provided for those who wish to gain an education should be given more widespread consideration. With this arrangement, State-financed schools would then compete with private institutions for the student's tuition fee. This would have the beneficial effect of removing the State institutions from State politics and making such institutions more responsive to student interests.

This recommendation deserves serious study, and for this reason I include it in the RECORD at this point:

ON "FREE" EDUCATION

(By Milton Friedman)

Gov. Ronald Reagan has stirred up a hornet's nest by proposing that students who attend state colleges and the University of California be required to pay tuition of $150 to $250 a year in addition to present student fees of $90 to $275 a year. Professors and students have risen almost as one man in protest at such an outrageous suggestion. Make the students pay for their own schooling? Preposterous. "'Free" education is an ancient tradition in California, and this is one tradition that even the campus rebels are disposed to defend with all their might and main—after all, their pocketbooks are at stake.

Unfortunately, low-income taxpayers and youngsters not in college are much less effective than students and professors in presenting their case to the public. "Free" tuition is highly inequitable to them. In addition, it lowers the quality of higher education. Governor Reagan's proposal is long overdue and unduly modest, not only for the state of California, but for other states as well.

EQUITY

The cost of higher education to the state of California is roughly $2,000 per student per year. The youngster admitted to a state school automatically gets a scholarship of that amount. By reason of this subsidy, he can expect to earn a higher income for the rest of his life than youngsters of equal ability who do not go to college. He will repay a small part of the subsidy himself—in the form of taxes on the increase in his income. But the greater part of the subsidy is paid by the rest of the taxpaying public, including his fellow citizens who are not able to take advantage of the "free" education.

Despite the rhetoric to the contrary, state colleges and universities serve mainly the well-to-do. For California, more than half the students in 1963 came from the top quarter of families—whose incomes exceeded $10,000 a year. At the other end of the scale, only 5 per cent or so of the students came from the 18 per cent of the families with incomes less than $4,000. Yet, the idealistic students march in the name of social justice.

It is eminently desirable that every youngster, regardless of his or his parents' income, social position, residence or race, have the opportunity to get higher schooling—*provided he is willing to pay for it either currently or out of the higher income the schooling will enable him to earn*. There is a strong case for providing generous *loan* funds to assure opportunity to all. There is a strong case for disseminating information about the availability of such funds and for urging the underprivileged to take advantage of the opportunity. There is no case for subsidizing those who get higher schooling at the expense of those who do not.

EDUCATIONAL QUALITY

California in effect says to its high-school graduates: "If you are in the top half or so of your class, you automatically qualify for a scholarship of $2,000 a year—provided you attend a state-run school. If you are so foolish as to go to Stanford or Claremont, let alone Harvard or Yale or Chicago, not a penny for you." If California is going to give scholarships, it would be far better to give them to the youngsters directly and let them decide which schools to attend—as under GI educational benefits. State-run institutions would then finance themselves by tuition fees and would compete on more even terms with private institutions. If they were more attractive to students, they would flourish; if not, they would decline.

The need to compete for students would force colleges to be more responsive to student interests. Berkeley is justly famed for the quality of its research faculty—not for the quality of undergraduate teaching. As California is demonstrating, state schools have developed to a high pitch the art of appealing to the legislature and influencing public opinion—that is the way now to get funds—while all the time demanding independence from political influence. Far better that they develop to a high pitch the art of schooling youngsters—that would make them truly independent of politics.

When the smog clears, perhaps California will have shown other states how to broaden educational opportunity, raise the quality of college training and simultaneously relieve the budget—all by exploiting the insight that people value what they pay for and will pay for what they value.

AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a joint resolution today which would permanently designate the month of February as "American History Month."

Last November, President Johnson declared February 1967, American History Month, but only for the current year. My resolution would designate February as a permanent time for directing attention to our Nation's glorious past.

February is already the month in which we pause in our endeavors to observe the anniversaries of two towering figures of our Nation's past, Presidents George Washington and Abraham Lincoln.

These two and the many other great men, women, and events which make up our American heritage are remembered in history classes and individually on national holidays set aside to commemorate their importance. But I feel it is also important that these people and events—American history as the whole sum of our tradition and accomplishments—be remembered by all Americans at a time set aside for this purpose.

By setting aside each February as

American History Month, we would be accomplishing this purpose. We would be giving more encouragement to the study and appreciation of our history, a record of one of the great struggles to gain and maintain human liberty.

We would be directing attention to our historic past and awakening the dormant interest of most citizens in the background of our long struggle for responsible government.

Students would be given renewed energy in their history classes if American History Month were adopted. They would gain a better understanding of our Nation, whose future is in their hands; a future which will be secure only in the hands of those who know of its past.

This is why, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced my resolution. I urge its speedy consideration and adoption by my colleagues.

SENATOR COTTON DISCUSSES THE CRIME PROBLEM

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, once again I take great pleasure in calling to the attention of my colleagues some especially pertinent and timely remarks of my longtime friend, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire, NORRIS COTTON.

Last week, the President sent to the Congress his message on crime. While there is little question that crime in this Nation has increased, and while we all know something must be done to halt this increase, many of us question whether the path outlined by the President is the correct one to follow.

In some of our minds, there is the lurking suspicion that while Federal grants-in-aid are helpful, money and more money is not the whole answer to all of our Nation's problems.

Senator COTTON has long been noted for the craftsmanship and cogency of his biweekly reports to his constituents. I have received my copy of his newsletter for this week and was pleased to note that he has, with his usual clarity and conciseness, cut right to the heart of the Nation's crime problems.

My colleagues from both sides of the aisle will do well to read and ponder the Senator's remarks, which follow:

NORRIS COTTON REPORTS TO YOU FROM THE U.S. SENATE

The President has sent Congress his Message on Crime. Certainly it was needed.

Crime has jumped six times faster than the Nation's population. A home is robbed every 27 seconds, an assault takes place every 2½ minutes, a murder every hour. Only one-fourth of all our crimes are solved. Neither men nor women dare to venture forth alone on city streets at night.

What does the President propose to do about it?

He says state and local enforcement agencies must be strengthened—and he is right.

To strengthen them, he calls for an elaborate program of Federal grants to local enforcement agencies to provide better trained police officers, to improve courts and correctional systems, to combat organized crime and juvenile delinquency. Federal contributions could run into the billions for they range all the way from 60 to 100 percent of each new project.

Thus, in effect, the President wants to push law enforcement into the same area as health, education, and housing where Federal grants-in-aid have become accepted national policy. In those programs we have found that, though money helps, it's not the whole answer. In the field of law enforcement, this is doubly true. Here, initiative and a sense of responsibility by local authorities are even more vital. These qualities could be weakened rather than strengthened by too great reliance upon Federal grants and Federal guidelines.

The police officer doesn't want a crutch—he wants a weapon. In the President's Message there was not a word, not a syllable, not a hint about what law enforcement officers almost universally regard as the heart of the crime problem—the need for laws to counteract Supreme Court decisions which have made it next to impossible to convict criminals. Most of the damage stems from the famous Mallory decision against "unnecessary delay" before bringing a suspect into Court. On this ground, Mallory's confession of rape was thrown out. He was freed and stayed free for 33 months—until he raped again. In his case, "unnecessary delay" meant 7½ hours. In 1962 the Courts said three hours was unreasonable, in 1964 thirty minutes, in 1965 five minutes. In that time, a guilty person could hardly tell the truth if he wanted to, and an innocent one could be subjected to the stigma of being arraigned in Court when a few simple questions might have totally exonerated him.

The impact of the Mallory decision has been devastating. In the five years preceding it, crime in Washington had been reduced 37 percent. In the nine years following it, crime more than doubled. Hold-ups, purse-snatchings, and assaults skyrocketed 305 percent. Speaking of the murder of eight Chicago nurses, Truman Capote, student of criminology and author of a book on multiple murder, said, "It seems almost unbelievable that the police force of one of our major cities is literally frightened to death to ask the prime suspect a single question for fear their case against him might be jeopardized." Interestingly, Capote, a political liberal, adds: "While many in our society are wailing about the rights of the criminal suspect, they seem to totally ignore the rights of the victims."

No wonder police officers hesitate and law enforcement lags. A 21-year-old policeman may have to make a snap decision in a situation that the Supreme Court may take weeks to study and then decide, 5–4, that the officer did the wrong thing.

Many of us in the Senate are pushing for a law which will loosen the shackles on enforcement officers and still preserve the rights of the suspect. Senator McClellan, Chairman of the Committee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, has a well-reasoned and careful bill for this purpose. We believe that as long as these Court decisions stand, a million Federal handouts will never control crime. We feel that by refusing to meet this issue, the President is declaring only a "limited" war on crime. We agree with Mr. Justice Jackson who, at a time when the Supreme Court had only started on its binge to make good guys out of the criminals and bad guys out of the police, said:

"Unless the Court starts to temper its doctrine with logic and a little bit of common sense, you are going to turn the Bill of Rights into a suicide pact."

FORTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF THE REPUBLIC OF ESTONIA

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 24 the people of Estonia and their friends, relatives, and descendants in the United States and throughout the world will celebrate the 49th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Estonia.

Unfortunately, those in Estonia will be unable truly to commemorate the event because of their subjugation to the Soviet Union.

I have heretofore expressed myself with respect to this type of imperialism, among others, in connection with the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 21, page 28295; the 49th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 16, 1967, at page 3538; and my insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 20, 1967, at page 3874 with regard to the 49th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence—and will express myself again on this question on March 9, 1967, with respect to Tibet and the Red Chinese.

All people of good will throughout the world sympathize with the Estonians in their present plight and join with Americans of Estonian heritage in the hope for restoration of independence to the Republic of Estonia.

THE ELIMINATION OF SILVER FROM OUR HALF DOLLARS

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on April 5, 1965, I rose on this floor to call for legislation to eliminate the use of all silver from our coinage system. It was by no means the first time that I had spoken to this great body on that subject. As a member of the Treasury Post Office Appropriations Subcommittee since 1958, when I was first privileged to join the Members of this body, I had been deeply involved with the complex and difficult problems that this country faced concerning the future of its coinage system and had worked closely with the responsible members of the Treasury Department concerning this matter.

I became convinced that the only satisfactory solution to the national dilemma which we found ourselves faced with, was the total removal of silver from our coins.

I rise again today to speak for this

proposition. I do so because my conviction that this is a correct position is as strong today as it has been in the past, and because there still remains one vestige, namely the silver half dollar, from the coinage system which the President and the 89th Congress found in 1965 to be totally outmoded to meet our current needs.

In the spring of 1965 this country was faced with a twofold problem concerning its coinage system, a shortage of coins in circulation, and a mounting shortage of silver for its many and growing industrial uses.

At hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee of this House, on the bill which eventually became the Coinage Act of 1965, I stated my view that the weakness in the proposal, under consideration by the committee, to deal with the existing coinage and silver problems, was the fact that it called for the retention of silver in the half dollar. I further stated that because of the critical silver situation, the continued use of any silver in our coinage system was a luxury which this country could no longer afford.

The bill which was enacted into law, while providing for the complete removal of silver from the dime and the quarter, nevertheless went on to provide for a new half dollar with a 40-percent silver content.

In the year and one-half since the Coinage Act of 1965 was enacted, we have successfully traversed the transition period during which our basic coinage system was revised, to the extent where we are no longer faced today with the problem of a coinage shortage as such. Unfortunately the same cannot be said with respect to our shortage of the precious metal silver. In fact, this problem has become more and more acute to the point where it now demands, at a minimum, the immediate end of the manufacture of the silver half dollar.

In 1966 we saw the establishment of a new record for the industrial use of silver in this country. Increasing commercial use of this metal in such areas as photography, electronic components, batteries, sterling silver, and many other products, resulted in industrial consumption in this country of some 150 million ounces, a rise of about 9½ percent over 1965.

At the same time some 54 million ounces of silver were used in the production of half dollars. It is not insignificant that this amount measurably exceeded our silver production in this country for 1966; 25,500,000 ounces of the amount used in 50-cent pieces was used to make the new 40-percent silver half dollar while the rest was used to make the old 90-percent silver half dollar which was being phased out.

The total consumption in the United States in 1966 of some 204 million ounces of silver when compared with the total production here during that same period of only approximately 42 million ounces of silver, gives clear and striking evidence of the silver gap in existence in this country today. This silver deficit was further burdened last year by the fact that our exports of silver exceeded our imports for the year by some 22 million ounces.

The gap between production and consumption of silver in this country, has been largely filled from the reserves of the Treasury Department. As a result, the Department's stock of silver bullion declined last year by 202 million ounces. Estimates of the American Mining Congress and the Department of the Interior disclose that world silver production will continue to fall far below industrial requirements in the years to come. This can only result in continuing increased strain on the silver reserves of the Treasury Department.

The figures as of February 9, 1967, show that Treasury had total silver reserves of 561 million ounces, not including over 2 million silver dollars. But the great percentage of this Treasury silver is monetized by law to secure silver certificates and thus only 129 million ounces of that total was unobligated or free silver available for industrial and coinage purposes. This is a drastic decline from the 295 million ounces of free silver which was available at the time that the Coinage Act of 1965 became effective on July 23, 1965.

The Coinage Act of 1965 authorized the President to establish a Joint Commission on the Coinage to study the considerations relevant to the maintenance of an adequate and stable coinage system, including among other things, such matters as the availability of various metals, and the time when and circumstances under which the United States should cease to maintain the price of silver. The Commission is to advise and make recommendations to the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Congress regarding its determinations.

The establishment of this Commission has not yet been carried out by the President some 19 months after it was authorized. The failure of the President to take the steps necessary to activate the Commission has resulted in the silver shortage problem growing more and more critical without the flexible means for studying and dealing with this situation being available which Congress provided by authorizing the creation of the Commission.

Thus such questions as, whether we should declare a certain amount of silver certificates as being lost or destroyed or whether we should provide for a cutoff date for the redemption of silver certificates for silver, either of which would result in an increase in our unobligated silver reserves, are areas which should have been under consideration by the Coinage Commission during the last year and a half. This has not been possible however because the President has not seen fit to put the Commission into action by naming the members which he is required to appoint.

To understand how critically short of free or unobligated silver we are at the present time, one only need look at the silver stockpile objective which has been established by the Office of Emergency Planning for this country. That Office has taken the position that 165 million ounces of unobligated silver are required to be reserved by the Treasury Department for the national stockpile. This amount represents 36 million ounces more than the free silver available at the Treasury as of February 9, of this year.

At a time when we do not even have available the amount of free silver deemed necessary for our national needs and interests how in the world can we continue to use this precious commodity in our coins.

We have placed approximately 32 million ounces of silver in 40-percent silver half dollars and approximately 174 million ounces in the now phased out 90-percent silver half dollars since the passage of the Coinage Act of 1965. The Treasury Department estimates that silver requirements for half dollars in 1967 will be somewhere between 30 and 35 million ounces. We cannot afford it. We could not afford it if it were half that amount.

In terms of the demands on silver in our society today and the priorities for its usage, there is no place for silver in the half dollar. It is as simple as that.

What makes this inappropriate use of our dwindling supply of silver even more painful, is the fact that it is not even serving a utilitarian purpose. The primary purpose of a coinage system, and therefore of course of the silver half dollars, is to provide a circulating medium of exchange for the buying and selling of goods and services.

I testified at the hearings on the Coinage Act of 1965, that I was convinced that so long as we were minting a silver content coin, we would be minting a coin that would not be circulated. I have often expressed my fear, at meetings of the Treasury Post Office Appropriations Subcommittee, that silver half dollars would be taken out of circulation as fast as they were being put into it. Treasury officials have agreed with my views in testifying before the subcommittee.

Unfortunately but not surprisingly this is exactly what has happened. Such articles as "Who's Hiding All the Half Dollars?" printed in the January 1967 issue of Changing Times tell the story without having to proceed past the title.

This article points out that most of the 900 million 50-cent pieces minted since 1948 have "gone into hiding" and that few of the more than 106 million 40-percent silver Kennedy half dollars minted as of September 1966 are circulating. The supply of half dollars in the Federal Reserve banks and their branches is extremely limited, again indicating the fact that half dollars are not being kept in circulation.

These coins into which we are presently putting one of our most precious metals are just not being used for the purpose for which they were made.

One of the main reasons advanced in the past for the retention of some silver in our coins is the desire to continue the 173-year-old tradition of American silver coinage. Secretary of the Treasury Fowler in making this argument in behalf of establishing the 40-percent silver, at hearings on the Coinage Act of 1965, stated that we could expect, barring unforeseen changes in industrial demand for silver, to have adequate silver to produce the 40-percent half dollar in normal amounts for an indefinite time.

I believe, however, that the facts today as I have described them clearly establish that such adequate silver does not exist now and will not exist in the future.

I am not one to underestimate the meaning and significance of tradition in our country. But we cannot serve the callings of tradition where to do so would completely contradict the immediate and pressing needs and demands of our society.

The coins today that are being made with silver are not being used as money. The silver being used in the manufacture of these coins cannot be spared for this purpose. I therefore call for the immediate termination of the manufacture of silver half dollars in this country. I also call upon the President to complete the naming of the members to the Coinage Commission authorized by the Coinage Act of 1965 so that it can begin the necessary and important tasks that Congress created it to do.

BILL TO CREATE A JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND REPORT ON PROBLEMS RELATING TO INDUSTRYWIDE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND INDUSTRYWIDE STRIKES AND LOCKOUTS

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, 1967 may be a critical year in industry and labor relations. A large number of labor contracts are scheduled for renegotiation this year. In many cases, large portions of whole industries will be renegotiating agreements which expire at the same time. If acceptable contract terms cannot be agreed upon, the Nation will be confronted with a number of major industrywide strikes.

We experienced one such strike last year when the airline mechanics struck a substantial portion of our airline industry. We saw then the great damage to the public that can be caused by an industrywide strike. The victim of that strike was not only management, against whom labor has every right to strike, but also the public against whom labor had no grievance.

We have experienced other crippling industrywide strikes and strike threats in the recent past. When the railroad dispute over the employment of firemen arose several years ago, President Kennedy managed to avert a major crisis by requesting and receiving ad hoc authority to submit the dispute to compulsory arbitration. Although this scheme worked in this instance, it was not a satisfactory answer from either the union's or management's standpoint and solving these matters on an ad hoc emergency basis is generally unsatisfactory to the public.

It seemed that the dangers of industrywide strikes were recognized by the administration when President Johnson, in his state of the Union message last year stated:

> I also intend to ask Congress to consider measures which without improperly invading state and local authority will enable us effectively to deal with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest.

However, nothing was forthcoming from the President in the months following his state of the Union message. Nothing was forthcoming in July and August, when the airline strike was imposed upon the public. And nothing has been forthcoming from the President since the strike was settled. No mention was made in the President's state of the Union message this year. There were only recommendations for fiscal and monetary policies which would aggravate the labor situation in an already crucial year.

It seems that the old adage, "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" has been ignored by the administration and by the Congress. Both appear to be afraid that to strike at the illness in this case may endanger the doctor. The doctor refuses to operate because the operation may cause pain.

At the time of the railroad dispute over the employment of firemen, then Representative and now Senator ROBERT P. GRIFFIN and I introduced legislation that would create a joint House-Senate Committee to study and report on problems of industrywide collective bargaining and industrywide strikes and lockouts. The measure was most recently reintroduced last year, but Congress failed to act on this or any other measure dealing with the problem.

The administration's reluctance to deal with the problem is explainable. First, the solution may not be a popular one. It may restrict the bargaining power or leverage of one party or both. Second, the administration's fiscal and monetary policies are in a large degree responsible for the increased demands made by labor on management. The union's demands are symptomatic of the inflationary psychology and hearings in depth would undoubtedly uncover this.

This year promises to be a crucial one for several reasons. I have already mentioned that a large number of major contracts will be up for renegotiation this year, considerably more than in 1966, when the number of workers striking was the largest since 1959. Major contracts in the trucking, communications, food products, automobile and machinery industries will expire this year. In addition, inflation was particularly severe in 1966. The average manufacturing worker's real disposable income actually declined in the past year while consumer prices rose well over 3 percent. Further increases are in prospect this year. Union demands in 1957 are, therefore, likely to be high and will likely contain increased demands for cost-of-living escalator clauses and wage guarantees. There are already indications that union demands may be stiff when labor contracts in the rubber industry expire in April.

On the other hand, corporate profits are leveling off and in many cases falling and there are some signs of a recession in the economy, particularly in certain sectors. Payroll taxes and corporate taxes may rise this year. Industry may, therefore, be reluctant to meet anticipated union demands.

If serious industrywide strikes do develop this year, the effects may be grave. Industrywide strikes not only cause economic damage to the whole economy but also reduce tax revenues to the Federal Government. We cannot afford either loss at any time, but particularly while we are supporting a war in Vietnam. We cannot wait another year then for the administration to propose its solution as promised by the President in his 1966 state of the Union message.

One of the reasons that Congress has failed to deal with this problem is the split of authority within the House of Congress. The House Committee on Education and Labor, the seemingly obvious body to deal with the problem shares its jurisdiction with the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and the Judiciary Committee. Each of these committees deals with the problems in its own peculiar province and comprehensive approach is lacking. The same sort of fragmentation occurs in the Senate. With the increasingly interrelated nature of our economy, this lack of capacity to deal fully with these problems should be rectified.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I am again introducing a proposal which calls for the establishment of a joint congressional committee to study and report on problems relating to industrywide collective bargaining and industrywide strikes and lockouts. This committee would consist of eight Members of each House of Congress with the membership split equally between the majority and minority parties. The committee membership would also be drawn from those committees which presently have some significant authority in this area. On the House side, it would include those committees which I mentioned a moment ago. On the Senate side, membership would be drawn from the Committees on Labor and Public Works, Commerce, and the Judiciary.

This joint committee would provide the vehicle for extensive hearings and studies which would reflect reasoned and deliberate congressional thinking on the matter. Too often in the past have solutions of expediency been made in national crises because of the aura of emergency surrounding a dispute calling for reasoned consideration. The long range effects of such solutions are barely touched upon in such situations.

I believe that the measure which I am introducing today offers excellent prospects for taking into account the needs of all parties involved—management, labor, and the public—and developing a mechanism whereby Congress could, in the future, deal effectively and comprehensively with these situations before they reach the stage when the danger to the Nation from inaction or unhurried action is acute.

Should there be an open congressional study of this matter, which I would urge there must be, representatives of both labor and management and other interested parties should be allowed to state their positions in an open and full debate and be subject to examination and cross-examination. In this connection I have been puzzled by the silence of the national labor leaders; especially AFL–CIO President George Meany and UAW President Walter Reuther. These individuals have lectured the Government and Congress over the years about every conceivable subject, including recently foreign policy. I have always welcomed the fact that the national labor leaders have spoken up, but it is now quite strange that they are silent on this area directly affecting them just as they were during the serious Metropolitan New York transit strike in January of 1966. A national dialog on this subject is most necessary and labor leaders should play an important part. An open congressional study would be the most appropriate vehicle for this.

Mr. Speaker, the essential issue for a congressional inquiry is the relationship of concentrations of power to the national interest. The economic well-being of our country is threatened when centralization and concentrations of power, capable of paralyzing whole industries, can undermine the public interest. Just as business concentrations of power were found to require certain legislative controls over their activities, so today should it be recognized that labor monopolies have long passed the point where legislative action should have been initiated. Certainly there are various courses of legislative action which should be explored.

One idea I would like to see examined by a study committee stems from the distinction between labor's right to strike against management as opposed to their striking against the public. Labor has a right to strike against management which I have defended and will continue to defend. This right is labor's major tool for achieving a satisfactory settlement. It is part of the economic discipline: management loses profits and labor loses wages until an agreement is reached.

However, there is no economic or other justification for labor to strike or otherwise bring pressure to bear on the public through secondary boycotts or other means, for their grievance is properly directed against management alone. The technique of the nationwide strike is inherently against the public as it is designed to cause public misery and inconvenience such as experienced last year in the airline transportation area. The public is made the conduit for pressure on management in a nationwide strike, and public inconvenience and misery is therefore an essential ingredient of such operations.

A solution to the problem of nationwide strikes, while still protecting labor's right to strike against the specific management against whom it has a disagreement, may be reached by prohibiting any two contracts by the same union in the same industry from coming up for reconsideration at substantially the same time. This would of course be exactly contrary to Teamster President Hoffa's goal of coordinating the expiration date of all contracts in his industry in order to obtain considerably greater power to reach the settlement through the "public misery-public pressure" technique. Prohibiting simultaneous expiration will force the union to direct its strike efforts against management only, the management with which the disagreement exists, as it should be.

I urge the Congress to undertake serious study of this question at the earliest date. By delaying we risk serious harm to the economy, we risk the loss of the right to free collective bargaining and we risk the loss of the opportunity for reasoned and fair solutions which are the product of extensive free and open debate. This bill provides a coordinated mechanism for a comprehensive examination of the problem.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 49th anniversary of a most notable event in the history of free men everywhere. I speak of the proclamation by the Estonian National Council of the independence of this gallant Baltic nation on Februray 24, 1918.

The heritage of the Estonian people is indeed one of which to be proud. They are a strong, hard-working, freedom-loving nation who have always defended the dignity of man and his right to live in a free society.

History is witness to the ability to Estonians to form and exercise an effective government. During the years from 1918 to 1939 the world recognized the significant advancements made culturally, educationally, and economically by this Baltic Republic. Estonia was truly a model of progressive and prosperous democratic principles in action.

The unforgivable tyranny of the Soviet Union cut short the development of this brave new Estonian nation when the Red army invaded Estonia in 1940, and in August of that year Estonia was politically annexed as a portion of the Soviet Union.

Once again the Kremlin has deluded itself by assuming that the forcible incorporation of a soverign nation will change the basic ideals of the captive people. The U.S.S.R. should know by now that it is still dealing with Estonians, not additional Russians, and that the determination aflame in the heart of all Estonians to live as a free people will long survive the total defeat of communistic oppression.

An ideology nurtured by a noble people for centuries can hardly be obliterated by a mere decade of Soviet degeneracy.

I know, Estonian Americans know, enslaved Estonians know, the free world knows, and all those who would espouse the cause of communism know, that as children of God we must live in freedom. All nations must live in freedom.

Estonia will again live in freedom.

AN IMPROVED APPROACH TO THE NEEDS OF EDUCATION

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues of the minority in proposing legislation to aid our local school systems by sharing a portion of Federal revenue with them for use in elementary and secondary education.

The bill would establish an educational assistance trust fund, into which 1 percent of the revenue received from the Internal Revenue Code and tariff schedule would be deposited the first year, 2 percent the second year, up to 5 percent the fifth year, and thereafter.

Tax sharing for education is based on a two-part formula: half of the money would be returned to the States on a per-student basis; the other half would be based on the amount of effort each State is currently putting into education. "Effort" is defined as the percent of gross personal income spent on public elementary and secondary education.

While the Federal Government continues to drain off more and more in taxes, leaving less for the States, the cost of those services which State and local governments must provide have risen sharply. Since the mid 1940's, the cost of educating our young people has risen over 700 percent. By the early 1970's it is expected that education will cost this country nearly $50 billion a year.

Yet State and local taxes have gone about as far as they can go in many places, with the Federal Government's preempting so much of our national income. The localities have turned to Washington for desperately needed help.

At the same time, during the last decade the American people have witnessed an alarming and ever-increasing expansion of Federal control and power in nearly every facet of their lives. The reason for this is not that Washington is better informed about and better able to cope with local problems, but rather that State and local governments simply do not have the necessary funds to deal with the growing dilemmas they face.

The idea of tax sharing is very attractive to those of us who are concerned over these trends because it would combine the respective strengths of the Federal and State Governments. The Federal Government has the power to raise a great deal of revenue through Federal income taxes, and the State governments, because of their sensitivity to local needs and problems, know where this money should be spent most effectively.

I do not have to tell you that in this great country of ours we have 50 States with 50 different educational situations. How can the Federal Government, which has stipulated that its subsidies for education be distributed by a set formula, be in a position to know the various needs and peculiarities of a particular State better than that State itself?

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately experience has taught us that Federal subsidy brings Federal control. For example, in the past few months I have received a great many letters from constituents who are alarmed at the increasing control the Office of Education is assuming with respect to school textbooks. Recent activities in the Office of Education has indicated that many there have hope of using the vast power of the Federal purse to compel a rewriting of textbooks. They look ahead to a time when the Commissioner of Education will withhold Federal grants from a school system that refuses to adopt these rewritten books.

This is but one example of the power over local systems which is being exercised here in Washington. Our every experience with Federal programs is that as Federal money replaces State and local money, Federal control moves in with the funds to replace local efforts. Tax sharing would avoid this by leaving determination on the State and local level.

Built into the formula is the assurance that no State will decide to sit back and let Uncle Sam pay the bills, for the amount a State receives depends in great part upon its own per student expenditures. If anything, this will spur the States on to greater effort.

To assure that the money is spent for education, plans will be submitted by the Governor to the Comptroller General of the United States each year, and at the end of the year an audit must be submitted to show actual use. This approach gives a tremendous boost to the education of our young people. Per pupil expenditures can increase greatly through Federal contributions and at the same time, incentive will be provided for each State to make even more effort on its own.

There would be no need for a great expansion of Federal personnel in Washington to administer the program, for it would be handled by local officials already on the job. It is interesting to note that employment figures of the Office of Education have more than doubled in the past 6 years, pointing up the fact that our tax money has gone into salaries to pay Washington officials when it could instead have gone directly into the State educational systems.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that every Member will give this bill careful study and consideration. It represents, I think, an important step in restoring a more meaningful balance in our democratic system of government.

HAND-DELIVERED NEWS RELEASES OF BUREAUS

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, bureaucracy has some strange aspects, but the strangest is one which has recently been adopted by the various bureaus of having the supposed news releases from those bureaus hand-delivered to the congressional office interested. The most interesting part is that the delivery is normally made 1 or 2 days after the release has already been carried by the news media in the district.

It is my understanding that Federal employees receive monetary rewards for suggested economic savings in Federal procedures. While I am not seeking such a reward, I am, however, certain that our Government could save the taxpayers thousands of dollars each year if it would simply mail these so-called "hot announcements" instead of paying someone a salary, transportation, and everything else, to hand deliver them.

A couple times each week a special messenger, who had undoubtedly been chauffeured to Capitol Hill in a special car, or came up in a cab, comes into my office and I know into the other offices, with a very important letter which must be signed for. The envelope contains nothing, only some cheery remarks about how the Great Uncle Sam is going to assist some community with some kind of a grant. Oddly enough, this same news blast has been carried in the newspapers at home at least 2 days before our faithful messenger delivered it to our office.

I, of course, do not know who the Departments are trying to fool, but several times each week, certainly a number of times every month, this happens. What I resent most of all, Mr. Speaker, is that these bureaucrats downtown think Congressmen are stupid enough to imagine they are getting something special when a special messenger walks in, asks someone in the office to acknowledge receipt, and then dutifully returns to his downtown office. It is another waste of time, money, and manpower which is being poured into this little stunt. I only wish there was some way the Appropriations Committee could block the appropriation for this kind of foolishness.

THE 49TH ANNIVERSARY OF ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is with real pleasure that I join with my colleagues today as we commemorate the 49th anniversary of Estonian independence. Today we join with our Estonian friends throughout the world in observance of a glorious day in their rich history.

On February 24, 1918, the executive committee of the Estonian National Council made the proud announcement that—

> As of today, Estonia, within its historical and ethnic boundaries, is proclaimed an independent, democratic republic.

This declaration set forth the national boundaries of Estonia, guaranteed the basic principles of a bill of rights, provided for the government of the country, and declared Estonia to be a neutral nation. Independence day marked the culmination of aspirations for freedom harbored for hundreds of years, for although the land had enjoyed national freedom until the 13th century, from that time onward it had been governed by a succession of foreign countries, culminating in the conquest of the Estonian territory by Imperial Russia in 1710.

The era of independence that followed World War I was star studded with great achievement as the courageous and inventive Estonian people worked to build a self-sustaining national economy, to enrich their cultural heritage, and to realize much social progress, such as free and compulsory elementary education for all citizens. Yet, sadly enough, Estonia was not to enjoy the blessings of sovereignty for long. World War II brought Soviet annexation of the beautiful little land, which ultimately resulted in incorporation into the U.S.S.R. as a constituent republic.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the world has not forgotten the gallant Estonian people, who even today languish behind the Iron Curtain. We of the free world know that freedom is indivisible, that as long as one man remains subjected to another, then no human being is truly free. Thus, on this Estonian Independence Day, as we salute our many Estonian friends everywhere, let us renew our commitment to the great cause of liberty and justice for all men throughout the world.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—XXIII—THE NEGRO AND THE DRAFT

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present the percentages of nonwhite draft rates, on a monthly basis, of four induction centers between July 1965 through May 1966.

	Induction centers			
	Jackson, Miss.	Fort Jackson, S.C.	New Orleans, La.	Shreveport, La.
Negro population (percent), 1960	40.2	35.5	32.0	32.7
	Nonwhite percent of inductions			
1965—July	43.1	41.1	38.5	41.8
August	37.9	62.7	36.8	40.8
September	47.5	39.2	31.3	39.8
October	44.5	45.1	37.9	49.0
November	46.3	34.5	35.3	44.2
December	29.0	41.9	29.9	32.5
1966—January	42.8	43.4	40.1	39.1
February	44.7	35.2	39.6	30.9
March	50.9	41.3	50.4	44.3
April	68.4	59.3	67.6	62.7
May	54.0	52.9	53.7	40.0

The implications of these statistics shall be the topic of future statements.

CASA LOMA COLLEGE: A MEANS OF LEARNING TO EARN THEIR WAY UP

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Smith-Hughes Act, the first national vocational education act in the history of this Nation. A major purpose of the 1917 act was to prepare youths, and adults for employment.

I am particularly happy today to offer a statement relative to a new college in my district—the Casa Loma College—a unique, new type of college dedicated, however, to preparing youths and adults for employment exactly as the Smith-Hughes Act provided 50 years ago.

In a world where so many are engulfed in turmoil, cynicism, and frustration, Casa Loma College plans to offer an enlightening, unique, innovative, and optimistic outlook for the future. The board of regents' confidence in today's youth, and tomorrow's workers, and leaders gives encouragement to those who might doubt the outcome of our changing world.

Casa Loma College, although privately administered, and conducted with the public interest at heart, will have as its major thrust, concern with vocational training, and education within a 4-year college framework and organization.

The Casa Loma College concern with the vocational, and technical parameters of our life in this country depicts the Nation's and people's continuous interest in practical vocational education programs which have, and will continue to prove to be of greater service to the people and the Nation.

The documents to be entered in the RECORD describes the developmental phases of Casa Loma College, and they are commended to the attention of our colleagues:

The leadership, idea and main thrust of Casa Loma College was a seven-year dream of an imaginative and dedicated educator, Dr. Lewis T. Kohler. Dr. Kohler found other dreamers who believe as he does in Bloody Mary's words (South Pacific) when she asked so eloquently, "If you don't have a dream, how you gonna make a dream come true?"

These dreamers, dedicated creators and cobuilders of Casa Loma are: Rev. John G. Simmons, inspirational leader in health and theology; Dr. C. C. Trillingham, creative and dynamic educational administrator of international reputation; Dr. J. Harold Williams, dedicated servant and Leader of higher education; Dr. Tracy J. Putnam, noted neurosurgeon; Mr. George Shector, health specialist; Lt. Col. Albert Elton, creative member of the Aerospace segment of our nation and authority on leadership.

At this time, I wish to pay tribute to their courage and leadership by remembering these words of Thomas Jefferson:

"There is a debt of service due from every man to his country proportioned to the bounties which Nature and Fortune have measured to him."

The Casa Loma College is a college of applied sciences and arts. Its rationale is: "Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day . . . Teach him to catch a fish and you feed him for a lifetime."

Our American educational system provides the opportunity for every person to develop himself. This equality of opportunity has been of great benefit to the one-third of our American youth who excel in academics and continue their education into college. It has not provided a solution to the dilemma created among those whose dismal economic, cultural and social conditions limit their academic achievement.

Upward Bound projects have provided one means by which the borderline achiever can, with special assistance, continue upward into college. Nothing meaningful has been done, however, for the "dropout" or those who complete a secondary education with little college potential. There needs to be a realization that in this group lies the real challenge to the educator. Too long has the education system been chained to a myth of scholasticism. Too long has emphasis been placed on pure academic subjects with little regard for the provision of competence in a profession to those who do not academically excel.

An "Equal Education Opportunity" is hardly real to a person whose background has limited his ability to either perceive the opportunity or appreciate it. Cultural, social and economic deprivation not only limits educational achievement but blurs the accurate measurement of the potential of the disadvantaged student.

Almost all of our social action effort has been directed at this disadvantaged student. But, in many instances, this effort has fragmented into training programs wherein trainees find only jobs with such poor pay that they remain poor *or* find only "deadend" jobs that do not lead into careers *or* find *no* jobs waiting at the end of the training. The emphasis has not been to career-educate them but rather to enable them to acquire skills of a temporary nature in jobs on the under side of the economy. These training programs do not create enough visible reward to induce or motivate continuing effort by the individual to grow with the economy. As a result, much of our poverty program effort is little else than a temporary source of public assistance.

There is a great need, as part of this country's new offensive in the age-old war against poverty, to test and, hopefully, to destroy some of the myths and untested generalizations regarding the ability of indigent, low-achieving high school graduates to acquire the skills and information necessary to successfully complete an advanced education program. Among these myths, the following are the most pertinent to the goals of Casa Loma College:

1. Most youth who drop out of high school or graduate from high school in the lower range of their graduating class either inherently lack the intellectual competence to cope successfully with the demands of a college program of study, or

2. Their intellectual and motivational abilities for adequate academic performance have been so atrophied by environmental deficits that appropriate remedial and rehabilitative programing is not feasible.

It is the firm belief of all of those associated with Casa Loma College that the concepts of education in the Applied Sciences and Arts provide an immediate and permanent solution to the dilemma. The under-achiever must be directed into fields of study that offer him a place in the upper strata of careers in these Applied Sciences and Arts.

Casa Loma College was incorporated in September, 1966 and chartered by the State of California in October, 1966 as a non-profit four-year institution of higher education to promote educational activity in four major fields:

1. Professional, pre-professional, practical, vocational and technical education and training.

2. Continuing education and training in literacy and the basic skills.

3. Liberal education for responsible citizenship and the cultivation of individual capacity for a satisfying standard of living, and

4. Advanced scholarship and research.

Casa Loma College is located in the Educational Plaza, a college-hospital complex dedicated to the health, welfare and education of the underprivileged youth and adults of the greater San Fernando Valley through its academic, medical, technical and administrative services. This innovational college is allied with the Pacoima Memorial Lutheran Hospital.

FACILITIES

The college-hospital complex is located on ten acres and was constructed with Hill-Burton funds. It is a 63,000 square foot acute general hospital of 100 beds with excellent laboratory, X-ray, surgical and related facilities. There is a recently completed 22,000 square foot building that houses the classrooms, student laboratories and administrative offices of the college. Also, a 5,500 square foot building, located in the center of Pacoima, is a part of the complex. It is a modern, air conditioned building slated for use as the adult and continuing education center and recreational and cultural community and student activities. There are six acres remaining for development in the main college-hospital complex.

ORGANIZATION

The Casa Loma College Board of Regents is composed of five eminent public servants of the area:

The Chairman of the Board is *C. C. Trillingham, Ph. D.*, at present the Superintendent of Schools in Los Angeles County, member of the Board of Regents of Whittier College, member of the Board of Regents of the University of California, California College of Medicine and Past President of the AASA, a department of the National Education Association. Holder of three honorary doctorates in Laws and Humanities.

The other four members are:

Tracy J. Putnam, M.D., neurosurgeon and Founder of the Tracy J. Putnam Foundation for Research, Welfare and Education.

J. Harold Williams, Ph. D., Provost Emeritus at University of California, Santa Barbara; former Dean of UCLA Summer Sessions; former Associate Director of UCLA Extension; Statewide Coordinator, University of California; former Director of California Bureau of Juvenile Research and Professor Emeritus, University of California at Los Angeles.

Reverend John G. Simmons, Incorporator and former member and Secretary of the Board of Regents of California Lutheran College, former President of the Urban League, former Chairman of Citizens Charters Committee—Minneapolis, Outstanding Citizen of the Year 1956–57, North Hollywood. Administrator, Pacoima Memorial Lutheran Hospital.

Lewis T. Kohler, Ed. D., Vice Chairman, Board of Regents and President of Casa Loma College. Educational Consultant to Pacoima Memorial Lutheran Hospital, International Appraisal Company, Imperial Bank and Idaho State Tax Association. Former Chairman of first California Industrial Education Leadership Conference, former President of Los Angeles Industrial Education Association, Visiting Professor at the universities in Wisconsin, Idaho and Washington as an authority in vocational adult and occupational education, school finance and administration.

The college is organized into four centers: (1) Center for Applied Sciences, (2) Center for Adult and Continuing Education, (3) Center for the Applied Arts, and (4) Center for Leadership Development.

The Center of Applied Sciences, through its Division of Basic Medical Sciences, will offer education and training in the following career fields.

1. Clinical Laboratory Technology
a. Laboratory Technician's Aide
2. X-ray Technology
a. X-ray Technician's Aide
3. Inhalation Therapist
4. Medical Technologist
5. Physical Therapist Aide
6. Surgical Technician's Aide
7. Licensed Vocational Nursing (1–2 years)
8. Anesthesia for Nursing
9. Hospital Nursing (3 years)
10. Ward Clerk
11. Hospital Food Services
12. Hospital Custodial Services
13. Health Services Social Work Aides

The Center of Adult and Continuing Education consists of three divisions:

1. Division of Adult Education
a. Literary Training and the Basic Skills
2. Division of Continuing Education
a. Upgrading of Technical Skills
b. Providing new information relative to occupations and vocations
3. Division of Workshops, Conferences and Institutes
a. Cultural events for students and community participation

The Center of the Arts consists of three divisions:

1. Division of Fine Arts
a. Development of innate and latent abilities in art
2. Division of Liberal Arts
a. General studies in the Humanities with special interest in the potential teacher and social worker
3. Division of Applied Arts
a. Practical, vocational, technical education and training and related applied arts fields

The Center of Leadership Development, through its Division of Professional Studies, offers education and training in executive and secretarial fields, elementary teaching education, business.

OBJECTIVES

The specific objectives of Casa Loma College are:

1. To awaken in underprivileged youth a desire to develop themselves into wholesome, useful members of society.

2. To provide an opportunity for the development of a set of values and aspirations consistent with their potential.

3. To provide opportunities for these young people to know what is required of them to move from an encapsulated position to one consistent with their abilities.

4. To encourage those that are found capable to return to the local high school and/or junior college environment.

5. To offer them training and education in technical, vocational and in occupational skills currently needed by the community.

6. To encourage in them the expression of art and stimulate interest in the liberal arts.

7. To provide them with the basic resources, notably verbal, and conceptual skills for leading a fuller life and for social survival.

8. To enable these young people to live adequately within the "middle class" society into which they will move on completion of their education at Casa Loma.

9. To develop a creative approach to the education of the disadvantaged youth through research and experimentation.

10. To create an educational model for adoption by other depressed communities as a solution to the long-range problem of education of the underprivileged.

THE PLAN EMBRACES—

I. The educational plaza concept

A. Blends a four year college institution with the idea of the hospital research and laboratory arm. The educational plaza is an innovation in land use. It improves the quality of instructional resources available to all students in a given community.

B. Rather than a college plant, unified buildings ranging from classrooms, library facilities, mental health facilities and hospital facilities will be available of joint use.

C. *Benefits:*

1. Improved distribution of opportunities for learning.

2. Improved quality of formal and informal learning.

3. Improved ability of educational plaza personnel to serve children, youth and adults.

II. Plans for the educational plaza in Pacoima

A. Improving integration.

B. It will be located to serve students of diverse ethnicity.

C. It will be located as to maximize the educational, social, economic advantages which are inherent in the educational plaza concept.

D. Flexibility: Opportunity available for the expanding or changing of the educational plaza so as to include additional buildings, centers, community organization facilities and the like.

E. Located with reference to the student population and community being served and with reference to transportation routes, business and industry.

F. Located to draw an extensive student population in the college grade levels to be served immediately and in the future without excessive travel time.

G. Standards established will make it clear that the Educational Plaza can be a powerful aid in securing quality college and adult education, integration and in building a community in an impoverished area of Los Angeles.

H. Demographic projection based on social and economic factors—likelihood for stability.

I. The Educational Plaza concept is a promising community solution to many problems. The Educational Plaza can be defined as a clustering of educational facilities in a campus park-like setting, utilizing centrally organized common facilities and drawing its student body from a large community.

J. From an administration point of view, the Educational Plaza is a device through which a number of formerly separate units are grouped together on a common campus with a minimum of central control.

K. The Educational Plaza concept has validity because it aims for better and higher quality education for youth and adults. This new adventure and idea will create an educational structure which can break the shackles of the past and create new leadership and new procedures more relevant to education in our modern age.

L. Better articulation between different college-business centers, since the Educational Plaza will function as a middle unit.

M. *Greater opportunity for Division of Labor and consequently More Efficient Service to the Youth and Adults.*

1. Greater internal specialization in such areas as science, arts, music and the like.

2. Ability to service within the complex students with special abilities and educational disabilities.

3. Better use of specal services, such as medical, psychological or psychiatric help, social workers, librarians and remedial teachers.

N. *Greater opportunity for Educational Innovation and Consequent Benefit.*

1. Possibility for innovation and originality resulting from new organizations and buildings, closed circuit TV, automated library equipment.

2. Greater opportunity for individualization of instruction.

O. *Opportunity for Special Facilities*

It will be more possible to establish facilities of high quality, such as a College Library without books, remedial educational centers, music centers, museums, etc.

P. *Economy*

1. Economy resulting from sharing and greater use of facilities, faculties, special staff and land use.

2. Economies resulting from centralization of such functions as lunch service, clerical services (computer use), heating, delivery of supplies.

3. Economies in construction of college and hospital facilities due mainly to joint use of both entities.

Q. *Higher Quality Integrated Education of College Grade*

1. Positive effect on stabilization of communities.

2. Reflection in school of a full range of community diversity.

3. Better preparation of student for life and study in college.

R. *Greater Understanding and Participation by Physicians, Educators and Lay Public*

1. Greater use of facilities by community for Adult Education, Vocational Training and Recreation.

2. Possibility of including such community services as museum, parks, little theater.

3. Probability of better inter-community relations, since students, public and educators will become better acquainted.

4. Greater out-of-school hour possibilities and summer pupil activities, Boy Scouts, Little League, community and civic groups.

5. Greater community pressure for improved school and college services since the entire community will be striving together for a worthwhile cause.

6. Gain for pupils and parents of membership in a larger, more diverse, educational and social community.

The Educational Plaza Concept—an avenue leading to the achievement of quality education of college grade, which is highly responsive to the needs of education in modern urban society.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE GIVES CASA LOMA COLLEGE NEW DIMENSIONS

What are the circumstances in which Casa Loma College has been chartered? Why should anyone seek to establish another institution for highest education at this particular time?

Although the idea of a new college is always exciting and challenging, this would not be enough by itself to merit your support. The question to be answered is, therefore, "What's different about it?"

The explanation is found in the College's mission:

1. To provide higher education which has a vocational thrust-particularly in the paramedical fields as a means of meeting the increasing needs for qualified personnel in health-related occupations.

2. To provide educational opportunities for students with average academic backgrounds who might otherwise be denied the privilege of higher education.

3. To provide trade, technical and terminal educational programs in a college environment for those who are not seeking to earn Associate or Bachelor's degrees, but who might benefit from the opportunities available to take additional courses in the College's academic areas.

4. To provide leadership in the areas of adult and continuing education through short courses aimed at meeting specific needs for preparation as a means of qualifying for occupational employment.

5. To serve as an educational-cultural-social and civic catalytic agent for the entire Valley area, particularly in those areas which are in need of an educational institution which is concerned with their problems.

Some of these objectives are unique to Casa Loma College. Some are shared with other colleges. What is different, however, is the vocational thrust of the institution. It is not expected that everyone will seek a degree. The college aims to provide many alternative choices: One student might spend a year qualifying as a practical nurse, another might spend ten weeks learning a specific trade, another might spend four years and complete a degree. Whatever their choice, all student are within the College environment with none of the typical discrimination which so often attaches to those who elect courses in vocational areas as contrasted to those who pursue strictly academic work.

But even these worthy purposes may not be sufficient to justify creation of another institution of higher education at this time. The really unique thing about Casa Loma College is that it is committed to doing something specifically for the student from a limited cultural background, handicapped by disadvantaged circumstances, bound to a restricted economic future by educational limitations, is a particular concern of Casa Loma College. Opening the doors through education and personal development is the most important and most justifiable reason for creating this college.

We hope to provide these opportunities by assisting students to qualify for positions in the various paramedical fields, particularly. Not only has Medicare made it necessary to find additional personnel to fill health-needs, but in providing service to others, graduates of the college will make substantial contributions to the welfare of society as a whole. Meeting the manpower needs of an expanding economy demands that efforts be made to utilize the strengths of all segments of society. As Casa Loma College moves to meet these needs by giving consideration to a previously neglected potential group of students, it has earned and deserves your support in a truly revolutionary educational endeavor. Of all the innovative programs in education of recent years, only the Head Start project matches this in its hopes for building a new and better society.

This social mission of the College has attracted the support and services of leading educators, business men, and civic leaders from the entire Los Angeles area, as well as help, contributions and services from similar leaders throughout the United States.

WHY THIS COLLEGE HERE AND NOW?

Here the opportunity is unlimited. The time is now!

Education must be continuous throughout the life of every person. Education must be related realistically to the rapidly changing world of work. Dignity must be experienced by all useful persons.

Only twelve in every one hundred persons will have any future in the professions of medicine, law, teaching, engineering.

Over eighty percent of the young people entering the world of work will be needed in occupations other than these professions.

Education must be appropriate for the individual. Every person must have as much appropriate education as his capacity will permit. Every person must understand the inter-relationship between freedom and responsibility in a democratic society.

The application of ideas of the applied sciences and the arts to the human situation has never been more necessary. We have been reaping a harvest of failures as we have persisted in educational policies and practices that make inevitable failure for one-third of our people.

This College is a must.

This Community is the environment needed.

Now is the time!

VEHICLE SAFETY STANDARDS

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment this morning on the new vehicle safety standards.

In 1966, there were 52,500 funerals where the hearse was not the only automobile involved. These traffic fatalities are the most senseless form of carnage that modern man has yet devised. The new traffic safety standards issued last week by the Government restores some sense and reason to man's relationship to his second best friend—his car.

In an age when most people spend a portion of every day in some sort of moving vehicle, it seems reasonable that an individual's concern for his car should be as important as that for his life.

Undoubtedly, a greater concern for either of these two elements could save considerable wear and tear on the Nation's hearses and ambulances. We can not do too much about the individual's concern for his own life, except interrupt Sunday's football game as often as we dare with driving safety tips. But we can, and I believe have, taken a giant step in concerning ourselves with the automobile.

In the Traffic Safety Act of 1966, we asked for reasonable, practical, and appropriate safety standards that could be accepted as meaningful to both the public and industry. I believe the National Traffic Safety Agency's motor vehicle safety standards are an adequate beginning.

The fact is that while motor vehicles may never be as safe as some would like, the driver now has more built-in safety insurance to count on.

PREVENTICARE—A HEADSTART FOR BETTER HEALTH

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, with a strong sense of urgency, I introduced on February 21 a bill to establish a limited number of federally supported health screening centers for the early detection of chronic disease and crippling illness.

Popularly known as preventicare, this legislation would launch a necessary and meaningful Operation Headstart for better health program in which the familiar ounce of prevention would be applied to spare the pound of cure.

This bill, officially entitled the Adult Health Protection Act of 1967, is identical to one introduced in the Senate on January 18 by U.S. Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, of New Jersey.

It is my intention to lead an all-out effort to win early enactment of this measure, for its passage will provide a promising beginning to what hopefully will become a full-scale Federal program to prevent and reduce chronic disease—and the anguish and suffering that accompanies it—through the detection of such disease in its earliest stages.

The bill authorizes a maximum of five regional centers to administer tests and provide computer and other services for community health protection centers that would be linked to them.

The program, as we envision it, offers two separate and important benefits, either of which, considered alone, is sufficiently compelling to merit instant and enthusiastic support for its adoption.

From the humanitarian viewpoint, the program is designed to prevent unnecessary human suffering through the prevention of disease and the detection of disease in an early stage—before it has the opportunity to inflict severe and permanent damage and injury to its victim.

From the economic viewpoint, the program can save millions of dollars each year because it would be keyed to detecting disease early enough that it can be treated and cured without costly hospitalization and terribly extensive, expensive care.

Expert medical testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly confirmed that modern techniques assure the success of early disease detection, and well-informed witnesses emphasized the urgent need for establishing the proposed screening centers.

These centers would provide free and voluntary service to persons 50 years of age and older. They would be neither treatment nor diagnostic centers, I want to emphasize, but laboratories that would gather and forward data to practicing physicians, who would interpret such data, and deal directly with their patients in those cases where consultation is indicated.

Recently gathered figures show that chronic disease takes an annual economic toll of $57.8 billion in direct and indirect costs in the United States.

At this moment 87 million persons in the country suffer from at least one chronic disease, including more than seven out of every 10 persons who are 45 years of age or older.

Of those who are afflicted, 22.6 million are obliged to limit their physical activity in varying degrees, and of the 1.5 million persons in medical institutions well over half are there today because of a chronic condition.

The proposed program of prevention and early detection can substantially reduce the staggering cost of chronic disease and ease the tragic toll of human pain and torment.

The program can be likened to a federally financed flood control project. In place of erecting a dam to hold back the ravages of anticipated flood, we are proposing to establish screening centers to prevent the predictable ravages of disease. In both instances we are investing money in projects today to avert future calamities in which the losses would be far greater than the modest expenditures required to prevent them.

As a preventive technique, screening centers may prove to be as dramatically effective in reducing chronic disease as the Salk and Sabin vaccines have been against polio.

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS

This bill would authorize the Surgeon General to make grants to medical schools, community hospitals, health departments, and other public or nonprofit agencies to establish and operate health protection centers.

REGIONAL HEALTH CENTERS

The regional health protection centers would provide a series of basic tests to detect abnormalities in the cardiovascular, respiratory, gastrointestinal, genitourinary and musculoskeletal systems, as well as defects in metabolism and organs of special sense. Specific diseases or conditions to be tested for might include: hypertension, heart muscle enlargement, cancer, diabetes, kidney disease, glaucoma, tuberculosis, rheumatoid arthritis, gastrointestinal bleeding, anemia, obesity, respiratory insufficiency, vision and hearing impairment, hypercholesterolemia and gout.

Tests would be administered by technicians, nurses, and medical specialists using automated or semiautomated equipment which has already been proven to give swift, accurate, and reliable results. The test results, along with data furnished by the person being tested, would be fed into a computer. It is estimated that the battery of tests could be completed within 2½ hours.

Results of the tests, summarized by the computer, would be referred to the private physician of the person tested. In cases where the person did not have a private physician or was medically indigent, the test would be referred to a physician in accordance with local practice.

The centers are intended to provide an efficient means for the detection of abnormalities or indications of disease. They would not replace full examinations. Their purpose is to place in the hands of the examining physician a summary of basic data and to place promptly under a physician's care a person with indications of possible disease.

Centers would be under the supervision of physicians, but they would be principally staffed by technical personnel. Health counselors would be on the staffs of the centers to explain the purpose of the tests, to insure proper referral and to follow up those cases where prompt medical treatment was indicated.

Health appraisals and disease detection tests would be available to any person age 50 or above on a voluntary basis.

The centers would conduct training programs in the operation of technical disease detection procedures and would research and develop new disease detection tests and equipment. Additional grants to the regional centers would be authorized for operational research and for the establishment of internships to give on-the-job training to physicians, nurses, social workers, and technical personnel. The centers would also conduct community education programs on preventive health care.

The availability of these testing services would be intended to encourage men and women approaching retirement to take regular health examinations and to facilitate the giving of full examinations of practicing physicians.

COMMUNITY HEALTH PROTECTION CENTERS

The Surgeon General would be authorized to make grants to medical schools, community hospitals, and other community health service agencies for the establishment of community health protection centers. They would be linked by data transmission lines to the regional centers and could use the more sophisticated electronic equipment and other facilities of the regional centers for the evaluation of some tests.

One of the criteria for awarding grants to regional centers would be their ability to provide services to the small community centers. Although the community centers would be directly connected to the regional centers, they would not necessarily be operated by the same institutions which ran the regional centers. Community centers would make services of the regional centers more widely available to a greater number of people. Special facilities might be developed to meet particular needs, such as mobile units in rural areas.

OTHER PROVISIONS

A 12-man Advisory Council on Adult Health Protection would be established to advise and assist the Surgeon General in the administration of this program.

The Surgeon General would be authorized to contract with educational institutions or other appropriate organizations for the conduct of educational programs. He would also be authorized to contract with profit and nonprofit organizations for the research and development of equipment, systems, or processes which would improve disease detection procedures.

This bill requires that in every case the results of the screening test be given to a practicing physician. The centers would not be equipped or intended to provide treatment, although the staff of the centers would be expected to follow up cases and to make certain that a participant was promptly brought under a doctor's care if treatment were indicated by the tests. Even should the screening tests show no indications of possible disease, the data would provide basic information to a physician on his patient which would be extremely helpful for a full physical examination by a doctor or as base line data in future examinations.

Doctors would thus be given more time to perform the executive, expert functions that only they can perform. They would be given more time and more facts to help them help more people, and the shortage of time is already a critical problem today for physicians and others in the health professions.

ESTONIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the denial of Estonia's liberty and self-determination is a striking example of the evil aspects of Soviet Russian international behavior which must not be muted by our desires for peace. The brutal suppression of Estonia's independence was bad in itself, and the manner in which this was done is an even more terrible reminder of what a domineering great power, driven by historical and ideological considerations, may do to a small neighboring nation.

After almost two centuries of domination and enforced Russification by the empire of the Romanovs, the representatives of the people of Estonia proclaimed their national independence 49 years ago on February 24. The rulers of Russia tried to destroy this bid for an independent Estonian nation. After 2 years of failure against the brave stand of the small nation, the regime of Lenin signed a peace treaty in February 1920 in which all territorial claims against Estonia were renounced. For the next 20 years the people of Estonia showed the world that they were worthy members of the community of peace-loving nations and that they were dedicated to building a just social and economic order.

Then, in June 1940, the Soviet Government began its move to reincorporate Estonia in its new empire. They demanded a new government which would be friendly to Russia. This newly imposed regime turned the country over to occupying Soviet Communist troops in a month. The result was the end of Estonia's independence.

After this act of perfidiousness, there came a series of outrages as the Communists destroyed opposition by executions and deportations. The destruction of the ancient Estonian culture was carried on with great force. Today, Estonia is still a captive nation within Moscow's jurisdiction.

Deceived by their neighbor, overwhelmed by Russian power, and denied the right to celebrate the anniversary of their freedom, the people of Estonia deserve our act of commemoration of that great anniversary in their history. We who prize freedom and national self-determination must take the stand publicly that the state of affairs in Estonia is an affront to human decency and a gross violation of international rules of conduct. Therefore, I would like to add my voice to those of many of my colleagues here and to those of thousands of friends of Estonia around the world in recalling the great anniversary of Estonian history and in wishing that the bright promise of those short 22 years of liberty may again soon be a reality.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE EDUCATION ACT OF 1967

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss H.R. 5989, the Public Service Education Act of 1967, which I introduced in the House of Representatives yesterday, February 22, 1967.

Mr. Speaker, the genesis of the Public Service Education Act lies in a concern I am sure that all of us in this body share: it is that the genius of the American constitutional system lies in our reliance on effective government at all levels, local, State, and regional, as well as Federal.

The federal system, with its many powers, sometimes overlapping, sometimes distinct, has been called a great laboratory for social experiment. Federalism has encouraged a diversity of solutions to the many problems with which the American people have wrestled throughout our history.

But the American brand of federalism implies that State and local, as well as regional governments are all viable partners in the political system. The social laboratory cannot be directed from Washington alone if it is truly to be a force for diversity. So we must set ourselves to the task of revitalizing government at all levels. The Public Service Education Act, by enabling all levels of government to attract and train able men and women for public service, will provide a vital tool in renewing the capacity of State, regional, and local government to participate creatively in the federal system.

The problems we face today in our States, our cities, and metropolitan areas are growing with extraordinary swiftness. Their complexity is staggering. Consider even a brief list of the difficulties we must overcome in the years ahead:

We must rebuild the inner cores of our cities, indeed entire cities.

We must reclaim the streams and rivers from their increasing pollution.

We must insure that the very air we breathe is safe for human life.

We must reestablish confidence in the integrity and ability of our legal system to maintain a just order and to prevent the loss of property and life.

For many of our young people, we must work to make the schools of our country centers of intellectual and community activity, not cells where they wait until ready for employment, military service, or the ranks of the aimless unemployed.

We must establish in practice what we have so long preached—that every American is entitled to an equal opportunity to the opportunities afforded by a true and open society.

We must provide a level of medical and other social services consistent with the great riches which our economy continues to produce in astonishing abundance.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on to list still more tasks which face us as a nation. But the point is clear: we have much to do and government at all levels—local, State, regional, and Federal—will play an important role in helping us accomplish what we must.

Yet no government has deeper knowledge, greater foresight, or richer imagination than the men and women who do its necessary work. It is because we need more than ever before the most able and well-educated public servants we can get that I have introduced H.R. 5989, the Public Service Education Act of 1967.

The Public Service Education Act of 1967 is a three-pronged measure aimed at attracting talented persons to government at all levels, but chiefly at the State and local level. This measure can help produce more and better men and women for government not only in Washington, D.C., but in Maine and California and Indiana, in towns and cities and counties across the Nation.

The Public Service Education Act of 1967 seeks to improve the quality of government through three main lines of approach: support for graduate study at colleges and universities by those who plan to pursue careers in public service; fellowships for university study and inservice training for those now in government at the local, State, regional, and Federal levels; grants to institutions of higher education to strengthen their capacity to meet the demand for more and better education for the public service. Let me outline the major aspects of the bill:

First. Fellowships for persons who plan to pursue careers in the public service: This bill will help to attract more talented young people into careers in local, State, regional, and Federal Government by providing fellowships for up to 2 years of graduate study for persons intending to follow public service careers. The bill authorizes $46 million for a total of up to 3,750 fellowships over the next 5 years. The fellowships are for graduate study in public administration and public affairs at colleges and universities in the United States.

As part of the fellowship programs, colleges and universities will be encouraged and enabled to arrange internships in State, local, and regional government, much as we in Congress and the executive branch now arrange during the summers for outstanding college students.

Towns and cities all over the country like South Bend, Mishawaka, Michigan City, Plymouth, and La Porte in my own district; county governments, or States like Indiana could employ able students of public administration during their summer vacations. Both the student and the local or State government would benefit greatly from these internships, as the experience with student internships here in Washington has shown.

Second. Opportunities for further education for those already in public service: The Public Service Education Act will enable men and women now working for State and local governments, as well as for the Federal Government, to improve their professional qualifications by graduate study and through short-term, inservice training.

State and local government: For example, city administrators, State water pollution experts, police officers, and a wide variety of other public officials could attend the best colleges and universities in the country to catch up on the newest techniques in their fields. Or they might attend inservice institutes designed to bring new knowledge and information from the classroom into city hall and the statehouse.

Under this part of the measure, States will receive Federal grants to enable State and local government personnel to do graduate work or participate in inservice courses. The bill authorizes $85 million over 5 years for such programs.

Federal Government: A similar measure, although contained in a separate title of the bill, will provide some 3,200 graduate fellowships for Federal employees similar to the fellowships proposed for local, State, and regional personnel. Present authority for graduate study by Federal employees is not framed to encourage its fullest use by Government agencies nor is it focused squarely on public administration. The Public Service Education Act is intended to correct these deficiencies.

The proposed act also establishes a system of sabbatical leaves for career Federal employees in the supergrade category, somewhat like the practice of periodic sabbaticals common for American college and university teachers. Under the sabbatical system in the bill, these high-level employees would be eligible to apply for 1 year of study, reading, or research out of every 7 years of high Federal service. Many of the eligible might choose to pursue formal academic programs, but they should have an opportunity for the kind of individual study which has proved so valuable in academic life.

Third. Grants to colleges and universities: The act provides grants over the next 5 years to colleges and universities to develop the strongest possible programs in public administration and public affairs. We need the best people obtainable in the public service and we cannot expect institutions of higher education alone to shoulder the financial burden of producing them.

The bill establishes a 5-year $70 million program of grants to participating colleges and universities to assist them in meeting the demands for more and better public servants. It is intended that at the end of a 5-year grant, the university should expect and would be prepared to sustain the program without further Federal support under this act.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to staff Government programs involving the expenditure of millions, sometimes billions of dollars, with less than the ablest and most highly trained men and women. That is why what we sow in the Public Service Education Act can reap such a rich harvest in the improvement of government in the United States.

As an American of Greek ancestry, I am acutely aware that my forebears knew well and appreciated fully the value of public service. In ancient Greece, to which we look for inspiration even today, the ideal of public service was a lofty one. Indeed, a man was judged by the character and quality of his public life and his contribution to the shared experiences of the city. I look to the day when public service at all levels will be as honored in this country as it was in the Greece of Pericles and to the time when we can acknowledge with even greater pride than we do today, the intelligence, ability, knowledge, and contributions of those who choose to serve in government, from the township to the highest levels of our Federal Government.

The Public Service Education Act, I think, can help us reach that goal.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert at this point in the RECORD, the text of H.R. 5989, the Public Service Education Act of 1967:

H.R. 5989

A bill to establish fellowships to enable persons in or planning a career in public service at the local, State, or Federal level to pursue graduate programs of education in public affairs, public administration and other related fields; to provide support for the development and strengthening of graduate level programs of public administration and public affairs at institutions of higher education; to provide support to State and local governments for the improvement of public service through short-term training programs for State and local government personnel; and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as "Public Service Education Act".

TITLE I—PUBLIC SERVICE FELLOWSHIPS

Statement of Purpose

SEC. 101. The purpose of this title is to improve the quality of government by providing fellowships for graduate study to persons who plan to pursue a career in public service in government at the local, State, regional or Federal level. For the purpose of this title, the term "career in public service" means a career as an officer or employee of a local or State government, a regional governmental organization established under a compact approved by the Congress of the United States, or the United States, in a executive, administrative or similar position which requires special competence in the fields of public affairs and public administration, including those which require qualifications in technical or professional fields.

FELLOWSHIPS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 102. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to award not to exceed 750 fellowships during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years, for up to two years of graduate study leading to a post-baccalaureate degree for persons who are pursuing or plan to pursue a career in public service. Such fellowships shall be awarded as provided in sections 103 and 104 of this title and for such periods as the Commissioner may determine, but not to exceed 24 months.

(b) In addition to the number of fellowships authorized to be awarded by subsection (a) of this section, the Commissioner is authorized to award fellowships equal to the number previously awarded during any fiscal year under this title but vacated prior to the time to the end of the period for which they were awarded; except that each fellowship awarded under this subsection shall be for such period of study, not in excess of the remainder of the period for which the fellowship which it replaces was awarded, as the Commissioner may determine.

ALLOCATION OF FELLOWSHIPS

SEC. 103. The Commissioner shall, in consultation with the Advisory Council on Public Service Education, allocate fellowships under this title to institutions of higher education with programs approved under the provisions of section 104(a) for the use of individuals accepted for study a program in accordance with such standards and priorities as he shall prescribe by regulation.

APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS

SEC. 104. The Commissioner shall approve a graduate program of an institution of higher education for purposes of this title only upon application by the institution and only upon his finding—

(1) that such program will substantially further the objective of improving the quality of education of persons who are pursuing or intend to pursue a career in public service,

(2) that such program is of high quality and either is in effect or readily obtainable, and

(3) that only persons who demonstrate a serious intent to pursue or to continue a career in public service will be accepted for study in the program.

In approving the application of institutions, the Commissioner shall give preference to those which are carrying on or have arranged for internship programs for the benefit of persons pursuing fellowships under this part.

(b) The Commissioner is authorized to obtain the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, to advise him with respect to the making of grants and contracts and the approving of programs under this title. Experts and consultants employed pursuant to this subsection may be compensated or so employed at rates not in excess of $100 per diem, including travel time, and may be allowed while away from their homes or regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistance) as authorized by section 5703, of title 5, United States Code, for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

STIPENDS

SEC. 105. (a) Each person awarded a fellowship under this title shall receive a stipend of $2,500 for the first academic year of study, and $3,000 for the second such year, plus an additional amount of $600 for each such year on account of each of his dependents. Where a person awarded a fellowship under this title for study at an institution of higher education pursues his studies as a regularly enrolled student at such institution during periods outside of the regular sessions of the graduate program of the institution, the Commissioner may make appropriate adjustments in his stipends and allowances for dependents.

(b) In addition to amounts paid to persons pursuant to subsection (a) there shall be paid to the institution of higher education at which each such person is pursuing his course of study $2,500 per academic year, less any amount charged such person for tuition and nonrefundable fees and deposits.

(c) In addition to the amounts paid pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of this section, the Commissioner may pay to institutions of higher education which carry on or arrange internship programs at the State, local or regional level of government for the benefit of persons pursuing fellowships under this part an amount up to $100 per week, for a period not to exceed ten weeks during each year of fellowship study, for each fellowship holder who participates in such an internship program. Such amounts shall be used to defray any salary paid to fellowship holders participating in an internship program by the participating State, local or regional governmental agency.

LIMITATION

SEC. 106 (a) No fellowships shall be awarded under this title for study at a school or department of divinity. For purposes of this section, the term "school or department of divinity" means an institution or department or branch of an institution whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

FELLOWSHIP CONDITIONS

SEC. 107. A person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this title shall continue to receive the payments provided in section 105(a) only during such periods as the Commissioner finds that he is maintaining satisfactory proficiency and devoting full time to study or research in the field in which such fellowship was awarded in an institution of higher education, and is not engaging in gainful employment other than such part-time employment in teaching, research, or similar activities related to his training, or as a participant in an internship or cooperative education program, as has been approved by the Commissioner.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 108. There are hereby authorized and appropriated to carry out this title, $4,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; $8,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; $11,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years; and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, as may be necessary to enable persons who have been awarded fellowships prior to July 1, 1972, to complete their study under such fellowships.

TITLE II—EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT FOR FEDERAL OFFICERS

PART A—FELLOWSHIPS FOR FEDERAL OFFICERS

SEC. 201. Chapter 41 or title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "S. 4119. Award of fellowship to employees.

"(a) During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years, the Civil Service Commission shall carry on a program under which it awards fellowships to employees for one year of graduate study at non-government facilities which are institutions of higher education.

"(b) To be eligible for a fellowship under this section an employee must (1) be in grade 11 to 15, inclusive, of the General

Schedule under section 5332, or be employed in a position of comparable responsibility, as determined by the Commission, and (2) be selected by the agency in or under which employed.

"(c) Of the fellowships awarded under this section, not less than 60 per centum shall be for study in postbaccalaureate programs concentrating in the social sciences and which will enhance the effectiveness of Federal executives, administrators, managers, and others on the general supporting staffs of agencies. The remainder of such fellowships shall be awarded for postbaccalaureate programs concentrating in the sciences, engineering, or other professions to allow Federal professional employees to expand and update their professional knowledge.

"(d) The number of fellowships awarded under this section shall not exceed the following percentages of those eligible in the fiscal year ending:

	Per centum
1. June 30, 1968	0.25
2. June 30, 1969	.5
3. June 30, 1970	.75
4. June 30, 1971	1.0
5. June 30, 1972	1.0

The number eligible shall be determined by the Commission in accordance with the requirements of part (b)(1) of this section.

"(e) The Civil Service Commission shall pay each non-Government facility at which a fellow is pursuing his course of study under this section the sum of $2,500 for each such fellows, less any amount charged such person for tuition and nonrefundable fees and deposits.

"(f) The head of an agency shall, as authorized by section 4109(a)(1), pay all of the pay (except overtime, holiday, or night differential pay) of an employee of the agency pursuing a fellowship awarded under this section. The head of an agency shall not make any payments under section 4109 (a)(2) which would constitute a duplication of a payment under subsection (e) of this section. Each agency which makes expenditures under section 4109(a)(2) on account of employees awarded fellowships under this section shall be reimbursed in full for such expenditures by the Civil Service Commission."

SEC. 202. (a) The analysis at the beginning of chapter 41 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the bottom thereof the following:

"4119. Fellowship training."

(b) Section 4106(a)(1) of such title is amended by inserting before the period the following: ", but the number of man-years of training for an agency shall not include fellowship training under section 4119".

(c) Section 4112(a) of such title is amended by inserting after "this chapter" the following: "(other than section 4119)".

PART B—SABBATICAL LEAVES

SEC. 211. Chapter 63 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 6325. Sabbatical leaves.

"(a) During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years, the Civil Service Commission shall carry on a program under which it authorizes one year sabbatical leaves at full pay for employees as defined in section 2105.

"(b) To be eligible for a sabbatical leave under this section such an employee must (1) be in grade 16 to 18, inclusive, of the General Schedule under section 5332, or be employed in a position of comparable responsibility, as determined by the Commission, (2) have been such an employee for not less than six years, and (3) have been employed for not less than three years in a grade not lower than grade 16 of such Schedule, or in a position of comparable responsibility, as determined by the Commission.

"(c) An employee shall be selected for a sabbatical leave on the basis of applications submitted by him showing a plan which he intends to pursue for a one-year program of graduate level study, travel, reading research, or a combination thereof. Such an application shall include an estimate of the expenses involved in carrying out the plan. Upon the examination of such applications, each agency shall select those of its employees to be given a sabbatical leave on the basis of the extent it is anticipated enhancement of the employee's effectiveness and of the overall benefit to the Government. During the period of his fellowship, no employee shall engage in any substantially gainful employment or activity other than as a Federal employee. The number of employees in or under an agency who may be given a sabbatical leave in any year shall be determined by the Civil Service Commission.

"(d) The Civil Service Commission shall pay the cost incurred by an employee in carrying out his approved plan, except that such payments shall not exceed $10,000, exclusive of the pay of such employee and, where the plan provides for full-time study by the employee at any institution of higher education, such institution shall be paid $2,500, less any amount charged the employee for tuition and nonrefundable fees and deposits. Where less than full-time study is provided for the Commission shall reduce the payment to the institution by an appropriate amount."

TITLE III—IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

PART A—PUBLIC SERVICE FELLOWSHIPS FOR STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 301. For the purpose of enabling the United States Civil Service Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") to make grants to States under this title, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum of $3,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, the sum of $6,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, the sum of $11,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, the sum of $15,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, the sum of $20,000,000.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 102. (a) From the sums appropriated under section 201 or any fiscal year, the Commission shall reserve such amounts, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as it may determine and shall allot such amount among the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this part. From the remainder of such sums, the Commission shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the product of—

(A) the population of the State, and

(B) the State's salary index (as determined under paragraph (2), bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

(2) The "salary index" for a State shall be 100 per centum less the product of (A) 50 per centum and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the average salary paid in the United States to State and local employees eligible for a fellowship under this part by the average salary paid to such employees of the State. The determination of the salary index for a State shall be made by the Commission on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to it. For the purpose of this section, (1) the term "United States" means the 50 States and the District of Columbia, and (2) the term "State" does not include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commission determines will not be required for fiscal year shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commission may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for that year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commission estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to section 301 shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

STATE PLANS

SEC. 303. (a) Any State which desires to receive grants, under this part shall submit to the Commission a State plan, in such detail as the Commission deems necessary, which—

(1) designates a single State agency to act as the sole State agency for administration of the State plan;

(2) sets forth a fellowship program under which—

(A) the State agency will award fellowships for one year of graduate level study at institutions of higher education,

(B) fellowships will be awarded only to employees of the State, or of a political subdivision of the State, whose duties are generally comparable to those of Federal employees in grades 11 to 15, inclusive, of the general schedule, under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

(C) not less than 60 per centum of the fellowships will be awarded for study in graduate programs concentrated in the social sciences and designed to enhance the effectiveness of State and local executives, administrators, managers, and general supporting staffs, and that the remainder of such fellowships will be awarded for graduate programs concentrating in sciences, engineering, or other professions and designed to enable scientists, engineers, and other professional employees to expand and update their professional knowledge.

(D) the persons awarded fellowships may elect to pursue their fellowship programs at any institution of higher education in a State which will accept them,

(E) persons granted fellowships will be paid their full salaries during the period of their study, and will be reimbursed for necessary transportation expenses and the expenses of the movement of their households, incident to the pursuit of their fellowships,

(F) the institution of higher education at which each fellow attends will be paid a supporting grant of $2,500 per annum for each fellow in attendance, less any amount charged such fellow for tuition and nonrefundable fees and deposits,

(G) the selection of fellows will be based on the needs of the State, as set forth in the State plan, or on the basis of the relative qualifications of the applicants as determined by standards and methods set forth in the State plan,

(H) provision is made for obtaining the participation of local government officials in the program,

(I) provision is made for providing reasonable opportunity for both State and local public service personnel to be awarded fellowships,

(3) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to insure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State under this part; and

(4) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commission may reasonably require to carry out its function under this part, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commission may find necessary to assure correctness and verification of such reports.

(b) The Commission shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 304. From the amounts allotted to each State under section 302 the Commission shall pay to that State an amount equal to the amount expended by the State in making the payments required by section 203 (a)(2) and (F). Such payments may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

PART B—GRANTS TO STATES FOR SHORT-TERM EDUCATION AND TRAINING

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION

SEC. 311. For the purpose of making grants to assist in the establishment and carrying out of more comprehensive programs of short-term, in-service training for State and local governmental officials, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum of $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, the sum of $10,000,000.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 312. (a) From the sums appropriated for carrying out this part for any fiscal year, the Commission shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as it may determine and shall allot such amount among the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this part. From the remainder of such sums, the Commission shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the population of that State bears to the population of all the States. The population of a State and of all the States shall be determined by the Commission on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to it. For purposes of this subsection the term "State" shall not include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commission determines will not be required for such fiscal year shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commission may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotment to such State under subsection (a) for that year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commission estimates each States needs and will be able to use for such year; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to section 311 shall not be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

STATE PLANS

SEC. 313. (a) Any State which desires to receive grants under this part shall submit to the Commission a State plan, in such detail as the Commission deems necessary, which—

(1) designates a single State agency (which may be the State agency designated for purposes of part A) to act as the sole State agency for administration of the State plan;

(2) provides for establishing and carrying out programs of short-term education or training (including specialized extension courses, management and executive development seminars, and full-time intensive programs of study) such programs to be carried out through contracts or other arrangements with public or nonprofit educational institutions;

(3) provides for obtaining the participation of local governmental officials in carrying out the program;

(4) provides reasonable opportunity for both State and local public service personnel to receive education and training;

(5) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including any such funds paid by the State to any other public agency) under this part; and

(6) provides for making such reports, in such form, and containing such information, as the Commission may reasonably require to carry out its functions under this part, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commission may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(b) The Commission shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 314. From the amounts allotted to each State under section 312, the Commission shall pay to that State an amount equal to one-half of the amount expended by the State in carrying out its State plan. Such payments may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, when necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

PART C—ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLAN; JUDICIAL REVIEW

ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLAN

SEC. 321. (a) The Commission shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this title, or any modification thereof without first affording the State agency administering the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Commission, after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to such State agency, finds that—

(1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 303(a) or 313(a), as the case may be, or

(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provisions, the Commission shall notify such State agency that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program affected until the Commission is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 322. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commission's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under section 303(a) or 313(a), as the case may be, or with its final action under section 321(b), such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States Court of Appeals for the Circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commission. The Commission thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which it based its action as provided in section 3112 of title 28, United States Code.

(b) The findings of fact by the Commission, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commission to take further evidence, and the Commission may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify its previous action, and shall certify to the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commission or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

TITLE IV—ASSISTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION FOR IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS AND ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS

AUTHORIZATION FOR GRANTS

SEC. 401. The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education to assist them to carry out comprehensive programs, not to exceed five years in duration, to expand or improve the graduate education in public affairs and public administration provided at the institution, including programs designed to renew the professional knowledge of Federal, regional, State, and local governmental officials. Such programs may include the expansion or improvement of graduate instruction in those social sciences which form the basis for effective education programs in public affairs and public administration. Grants under this title may be for projects and activities which are an integral part of such a comprehensive program such as—

(1) planning for the development or expansion of graduate education in public affairs or public administration,

(2) increasing and training faculty,

(3) teaching, research, curriculum development, and other related activities,

(4) acquisition of additional library resources,

(5) research on problems of government,

(6) developing and carrying out short-term intensive courses to renew the professional knowledge of public service employees.

GRANTS

SEC. 402. The Commissioner may make a grant under this title to an institution of higher education to assist it to carry out a program which he determines meets the requirements of section 401. No grants under this title shall exceed 75 per centum of the cost of the expenses incurred by the institution in carrying out the program with respect to which the grant was made or continue for more than five years with respect to any one program. Payments under this title may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

PRIORITIES

SEC. 403. The Commissioner shall, in consultation with the Advisory Council on Public Service Education, establish a system of priorities to be used by him in making grants under this title where the funds available are insufficient to permit him to approve all eligible applications.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 404. For purposes of carrying out this title, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum of $5,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, the sum of $10,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, the sum of $15,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, the sum of $20,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, the sum of $20,000,000, and for the four succeeding fiscal years such sums as may be necessary to enable institutions of higher education to complete programs begun before July 1, 1972.

TITLE V—ADVISORY COUNCIL AND GENERAL PROVISIONS

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON PUBLIC SERVICE EDUCATION

SEC. 501. (a) There is hereby established an Advisory Council on Public Service Education which shall consist of the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, who shall be Chairman, of the Advisory Council, the Commissioner of Education, and ten additional members appointed by the President. Of the ten additional members, one shall be an officer or employee of the Federal Government, three shall be officers or employees of State or local governments, and three shall be officers or employees of institutions of higher education, and three shall be representative of the general public.

(b) The Advisory Council shall advise the Commissioner and the Commission on policies, procedures, criteria, and regulations implementing this Act, and such members of the Advisory Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the President, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 502. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(2) The term "Commission" means the United States Civil Service Commission.

(3) The term "institution of higher education" has the meaning given it by section 103 (b) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

(4) The term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

FEDERAL CONTROL PROHIBITED

SEC. 503. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over any officer or employee of any State or local government, over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any education institution or school system, or over the selection of library resources.

A NEED TO SIMPLIFY THE PATENT SYSTEM

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson, this week, transmitted a bill to the Congress proposing changes in the patent laws.

This has come about because of the "technology explosion" which has been and is being reflected in the number and complexity of patent applications. Despite the excellent streamlining of methods and procedures in the Patent Office, and despite the cooperation of the patent bar in expediting the examination of patent applications, the Patent Office has had a persistent backlog of over 200,000 pending applications. The average period of pendency of a patent application from its filing until its final disposition is more than 2½ years with a substantial number of applications pending 5 or more years; this is particularly discouraging to the older inventor, and is burdensome to all inventors. These delays cause uncertainties for the owner of an invention while retarding the public disclosure of technological advances.

With these considerations in mind, President Johnson, in July 1965, appointed a Commission on the Patent System to determine how well the present system meets our needs and goals; devise possible improvements in this system, and to recommend any changes to strengthen the patent system.

The Commission was composed of 10 leading citizens from business, the academic community, the bar, inventors and Government representatives from Commerce, DOD, NSF with observers from the Office of Science and Technology and the State Department.

The legislation recommended by the President is designed to bring our patent system up to date by raising the quality and reliability of U.S. patents, reducing time and expense of obtaining and litigating patents, accelerating the public disclosure of new technology, and harmonizing our system with the practices and procedures of other nations, with long-range goals of an international patent system.

This bill should do much to assist the lone inventor, by enabling him to protect his claim to a patentable idea in the early stages of development and to do this with a very small initial fee.

In President Johnson's economic message to this Congress a few weeks ago he stated:

> To aid the advance of technology on which economic progress depends, I now urge congressional support for a long overdue modernization of our patent system.

I am pleased to give my support to this proposed reform and to introduce legislation to this effect.

Every American is a potential inventor who has a stake in the future and strengthening of our patent system. I invite every Member of this legislative body to study this bill and to lend support toward its passage.

THE MASTER TEACHER

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, our life in the jet age has brought about changes not only in transportation but in communication as well. Now an idea, when publicly stated, immediately triggers an active response in modern-day communications. Since August, when I introduced a bill for educational television, ETV proposals have been flooding the news market. And these imaginative and resourceful suggestions have rekindled the faith and promise I have long held in educational television.

One of the most inspiring eulogies on the potential of ETV was written by the essayist E. B. White in his letter to the Carnegie Commission:

> I think television should be the visual counterpart of the literary essay, should arouse our dreams, satisfy our hunger for beauty, take us on journeys, enable us to participate in events, present great drama and music, explore the sea and the sky and the woods and the hills. It should be our Lyceum, our Chautauqua, our Minsky's and our Camelot.

And I think educational television, by its very nature of flexibility and immediacy, can be every man's hope and dream. It can be the rural child's trip to the city or a remembrance of idyllic days to cosmopolitan adults. But to all Americans of all ages and places, educational television can be a master teacher. It can explain the wonders of technology to an ever curious audience and can contribute to progress by training working adults.

By amending the Communications Act of 1934 to extend the existing program for an additional 5 years and raise the per-State limitation from $1 to $3 million for educational television broadcasting facilities, I believe we can make curious Americans into even more enlightened Americans. The world seems to become increasingly smaller because of rapid transportation. Perhaps educational television can bring world understanding to the peoples of our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and renew educational television as a medium of greatness.

A BILL PROVIDING THE FRANCHISE TO 18-YEAR-OLDS

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the cause of human progress has many enemies, some of them obvious, others not so obvious. The actions of gangsters and dictators unquestionably are hostile to the democratic process. On the other hand, there are many things damaging to democracy which are not so recognizable to the naked eye.

Actually, there is nothing so definitely destructive of progressive purpose as some old, wornout, useless, meaningless stumbling block which has managed, over the centuries, to become a great tradition in the minds of the people.

And there is no doubt in my mind that the legal voting age of 21 is exactly that kind of tradition. In the last session of Congress I introduced legislation granting the vote to Americans 18 years of age, and I am proud on this occasion to support legislation looking to the same result. For surely, there is no ground for denying the franchise to 18-year-old Americans except in deference to the grand old tradition that says you are not adult until you are 21. In truth, our 18-year-olds have proven themselves the masters of many things and there is no longer any reason for standing between them and the ballot box. They are fully prepared to be recognized as full-fledged junior partners in the world of human experience.

The ideal behind our American system is to extend the suffrage to as many as possible who are able to exercise it properly. If this ideal and the doctrine of the inherent rights of man be accepted, the problem then is simply: "When does a boy become a man?" What are the traditions behind the setting of the age of 21 as the "beginning of manhood"? Are they valid today or have they been outmoded by modern knowledge and customs?

Let us look back on the origin of the custom of beginning manhood at 21. It started in medieval times when serfs were allowed to farm their own plot of ground when they became 21. From that time it has become accepted as the age when a boy becomes a man.

There are many reasons, however, for reexamining this age-old tradition, to see if perhaps, with the passage of time, it has become an absurdity.

Clearly, the youth of today are brought up in an entirely new environment. Every young person is now required to attend school. Travel has become swift and simple; and radio, television, newspapers, magazines, and books bring important, up-to-the-minute events into every home. So, it is time for us to change to laws that fit the present times.

Eighteen-year-old suffrage has many benefits. The period between the age of 18 and the age of 21 is a dramatic span of time, full of hope and opportunity, triumph and defeat. It is the longest 3-year period imaginable. Between the ages 18 and 21 a person generally becomes an optimist or a cynic, one or the other. And whatever he becomes, in this period, he generally remains for the rest of his life. By instilling in our young people a personal pride and a sense of importance, at this particular period of their lives, we well can turn them toward the path of optimistic enthusiasm, to the benefit of the Nation at large.

As of now, a lot of 18- and 19-year-olds lose interest in politics and government before they ever get around to voting. As they see it, they have no part in politics, or that their part is so small as to be unimportant. By the time they reach 21 they have developed the cynical attitude of, "What's my one vote worth, anyway?" This would not happen if they were allowed to vote when they were fresh out of high school and were able to put to use immediately what they had learned in history and civics classes, and in their studies of politics and current events.

Eighteen-year-old suffrage would be one of the best character builders that we possibly could have. It would prove beyond a doubt the validity of the promises of our American system, and hence develop among young Americans stronger convictions about the superiority of freedom over totalitarianism. Much of this is lost in the needless, senseless political void between the ages of 18 and 21.

In addition to all this is the dramatic fact that thousands of 18-year-old Americans are subject to the conscription laws, and in Vietnam today many are either being killed or wounded for a country in which the Congress denies them the right to vote. There is a strong absence of justice in this arrangement, to say the least.

CONGRESSMAN CLAUDE PEPPER INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO ELIMINATE AN UNFAIR SITUATION IN THE OPEN SPACE PROGRAM.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on April 19 of the 89th Congress I had the privilege of introducing H.R. 14468, to amend the open space provisions of the Housing Act to broaden the eligibility of open space areas for development funds provided under that act. This amendment was recommended by the Banking and Currency Committee of this body and was included in the housing legislation sent to the other body in the closing days of the last Congress. However, in the last-minute rush for adjournment, this particular provision was dropped by the other body. I am today reintroducing this bill and hope that it will receive the same favorable consideration it received last year by the House and that the Members in the other body will see fit to adopt it. At this time I would like to again point out the need in eliminating this unfair situation. This clearly states my position in this matter and gives a brief explanation of the attendant objectives of the proposed legislation.

During my years in the Congress, I have always strongly supported legislation in helping to conserve the great outdoors of our country. In recent years the Congress has recognized the need to assist and encourage open space in our great urban areas as well as in the rural and less sparsely settled areas. This great need was first dealt with in title VII of the Housing Act of 1961, Public Law 87-70. This first step was carried forward in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, which legislation I strongly supported. This act, among other matters, increased the Federal assistance to local communities by providing for 50-percent grants for the acquisition and development of the urban open space lands. This was the first legislation to provide assistance in the developmental costs, which is an essential element in gaining the desirable benefits of an open space program. However, the language of this legislation is such that a community seeking developmental assistance of an open space parcel of land, is limited to assistance for land acquired only under the open space land program. This is an unfair limitation factor in such situations where the local community has acquired the land by other means, such as gifts, purchase, and through governmental agency, such as the General Services Administration, and still desires to develop with assistance under the open space program. This limitation serves to defeat the objective of the open space program in developing the maximum amount of open space in our urban areas, and accordingly I am today introducing an amendment to the legislation governing the open space program that would permit the Department of Housing and Urban Development to make developmental grants for open space projects regardless of whether or not the particular parcel of land was acquired under the open space program, so long as it meets the other requirements of the open space program.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS FOR RETIRED PUBLIC EMPLOYEES

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, last year the Congress provided—and I might say very wisely—for paying social security benefits to people who are now over 72 or who will be 72 in the next few years even though those people had little or no social security coverage. This provision though does not pay social security benefits to many retired State and local people who live in Florida and the other 49 States.

The benefits paid under this provision are not very big—only $35 a month. But then neither are the pensions paid to these older retired public employees.

I think it only fair that these benefits should be made available to retired public employees. The bill I have introduced today will make the benefits available to these public employees, and I urge my colleagues attention to this bill so we may get it adopted.

EQUITY FOR MEN RETIRING AT AGE 62 UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the Social Security Amendments of 1965 have been described as the greatest social legislation since the original enactment of the system in 1935. They not only strengthened the system by adding a medical and hospital care program for the aged, but they also increased benefits by 7 percent and liberalized the amount of earnings allowed without reduction of benefits.

I approved the benefit increase, as well as the increase in the wage base from $4,800 to $6,000 to bring retirement income more nearly in line with wage income. But, today, I am concerned with another feature of existing law which actually lowers the retirement income of men and their dependents. I refer to the acturial reduction applied to men who retire at age 62, which supposedly was to put men on a par with women as to early retirement. Under the measure, adopted in 1961, the period for computing benefits and insured status for men is based on the period up to age 65—rather than age 62 used in early-retirement benefits for women—thereby adding the 3-year period between 62 and 65 as "penalty" years which further reduce the amount of the benefit. This action was taken for cost rather than retirement policy considerations. Specifically, what happens is that, although the reduction rates—6⅔ percent per year prior to 65—are the same for men and women, the average monthly earnings for men are computed over a period equivalent to the number of years up to attainment of age 65, whereas for women they are computed only over a period equivalent to the years up to age 62.

The Advisory Council on Social Security—a group of distinguished laymen—in its 1965 report recommended that the period used for computing benefits for men who retire early be shortened by 3 years, making it the same which has applied to women since the 1965 amendments. As they put it:

> The Council is concerned about the low benefits payable to men who have been coming on the benefit rolls before age 65, especially those whose retirement has been involuntary. Almost one-half of the men awarded old age benefits in the fiscal year 1964 get reduced benefits because they came on the rolls before age 65, and their benefits are, on the average, much lower than the benefit amounts payable to men who come on the rolls at age 65 and after—for fiscal year 1964 awards, $75 for men who came on before 65 as compared to $103 for men who came on at or after 65.
>
> The reduced benefits which are now paid to men and their wives who start to get old-age benefits before age 65 are below what they can be expected to live on. As a result it may be anticipated that many will sooner or later have to apply for assistance: and the role of public assistance in providing income for people who can no longer work—a role which has diminished over the years as the social security program has grown—can be expected to expand. The proposal to end the computation period for men at 62 instead of 65 will alleviate this situation.

The Council recommended that the Social Security Administration conduct a study of the situation of early retirees, to learn the reasons for early retirement. Such a study, in their opinion, should show how many had been regular full-time workers over the greater part of their lives, how many had been only intermittently or casually employed; how many are unskilled workers or workers whose skills have become obsolete, how many are retiring voluntarily, and how many had been out of employment for some time.

The results of these ongoing studies are beginning to come in. The 1963 survey of the aged showed that men beneficiaries aged 62 through 64 were "characterized by low income, low employment rates, poor health and very little voluntary retirement." About three-fifths of the men who applied for reduced benefits were not employed at that time. Further studies have confirmed these findings. In a study released in October 1965 by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Saul Waldman presented the figures leading to his conclusions that—

> The extent of early retirement among men largely reflects their labor force status . . . most men enter their early sixties as members of the labor force, but there is a substantial degree of unemployment, especially long-term unemployment, among older men. . . . The data clearly indicate that those retiring early would generally receive lower benefits apart from the reduction. The primary insurance amount of this group averaged 82 percent of that for men who waited until 65 or later to file for benefits.

His studies showed that only 14 percent of the men aged 62 through 64 had a benefit at or near the maximum compared with 48 percent of the men who could wait until age 65 or over before they retired.

Another researcher in this area, Lenore A. Epstein, presented data in November 1965 showing that—

> About 1 in 6 of the men who were 62 at entitlement had extended employment at very low wages—8 to 12 years at earnings that never reached $2,400. This was nearly 5 times as large a proportion as among men who waited till 65 for their benefits. In all, nearly one-third of the men claiming benefits at 62 never earned as much as $2,400 annually in covered employment during the 12 years, 1951–62, as compared with one-twelfth of those entitled at 65. . . .

Her study led her to conclude:

> Clearly, many of the men who apply for reduced benefits at age 62 are prompted to do so by a need for income, because of unemployment or to supplement earnings that were characteristically low or that had dropped off substantially.

Mr. Speaker, the evidence is mounting that, by continuing present policy, we are exacting a heavy penalty from those male workers who are unable to continue working until they are 65 years of age, either because of physical handicaps or because their job has disappeared in a mobile labor market. We are exacting a penalty on people whose meager skills have prevented them from enjoying the higher wages which many people enjoy. We have, on the one hand, recognized the special needs of low-income earners by weighing the standard benefit formula in their favor and then, with the other hand, we have insisted that if they cannot wait until age 65 to apply for benefits, they must suffer a substantial deduction in the amount of their benefit. And, bear in mind the fact that the reduced benefit is payable for the rest of their lives.

Can we, as a nation, afford to continue such a policy in an age of automation when retirement before age 65 under the social security program is increasingly becoming the typical retirement pattern for American workers? Because, nearly one-third of all the men who qualified for old-age benefits last year were under the age of 65. I feel sure that the Congress will wish to act to remove this inequity in our social security system. When it was adopted in the 1961 amendments, we had little idea of the hardship this provision would cause. Now we know that more men applied at the earlier age, even at cost to themselves, than had been anticipated. And we know that, too often, the reason was that they found themselves in a situation where less money was better than no money.

I am today introducing a bill which will rectify this inequity, in line with the recommendation of the Advisory Council. Such a change was also endorsed by the AFL-CIO. The evidence for action on this matter is in and, to my mind, the mandate is clear.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS FOR DISABLED WIDOWS

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, one of the features of our social security system which means much to the family breadwinners of this country is the fact that they know they are providing protection for their dependents as well as for themselves when they pay their social security tax. Toward this purpose we have, beginning with 1939 amendments, provided benefits for the wife and dependent children of the breadwinner at his retirement, and to his surviving widow with children at his death. Similar protection was provided for the family of disabled workers in the 1958 amendments. In the 1956 amendments we recognized the special problem of elderly widows by providing them full benefits at age 62, rather than requiring them to wait until age 65. In the 1965 amendments we reaffirmed our concern with the lot of the surviving widow of a worker who has died by making it possible for her to to receive actuarially reduced benefits at age 60.

All of these changes are desirable and they have saved much heartache and despair at a time of deep bereavement. But I am convinced that we have so far disregarded one group of widows who still may find themselves penniless on the death of their husbands; namely, those women not yet age 60 who are so severely disabled that they can never expect or hope to support themselves until they reach their 60th birthday. The bill I introduced today would provide that the disabled widow of an insured worker, if she became disabled before her husband's death, or before her youngest child became 18, or within a limited period after either of these events, would be entitled to widow's benefits—now 82.5 percent of the husband's primary benefit—regardless of her age.

The bill is drawn along the lines advocated by the most recent Advisory Council on Social Security which made its recommendation on this point in its report of January 1965. In the words of the recommendation:

> The Council believes that the disabled widow, like the widow who is aged 62 or over or the widow who has a child of the deceased worker in her care, needs benefits when her husband dies. The Council therefore recommends that benefits be paid to the widow so disabled that she cannot work—provided, however, that she was disabled at the time of her husband's death or before her youngest child reached age 18, or within a limited period after either of these events.
>
> The widows who would be protected are those who, when their husbands die, suffer a loss of support and who, because they are disabled themselves, have no opportunity to work and thus to substitute their own earnings for the loss of support.

Mr. Speaker, surely there can be no more appealing case for the liberalization of our social security system than the helpless widow left penniless by the untimely death of her husband. This change can be made, moreover, at small cost to the system itself. According to estimates furnished to me by the Chief Actuary of the social security system, the added cost of making this change would be just 0.05 percent of payroll—a very small cost for a very important improvement in the protection provided for our working people and their survivors.

I applaud the Advisory Council's proposal. Its recommendation came as one of 14 specific changes and improvements which, in the view of that distinguished body of laymen, should be made in the law. The Council had studied the social security program for a year and one-half prior to making these recommendations. Some of them—such as paying child's benefits beyond age 18 for children attending school—have already been adopted by the Congress in the 1965 amendments. I am convinced that it is incumbent upon us to move forward on behalf of helpless widows with equal dispatch. It is encouraging to me to see that several bills to bring about this change are beginning to appear. I urge the support of the whole Congress on this vital matter for I feel sure that the merit and humanity involved in this proposal will certainly lead to its enactment at some point in the further development of our social security system. Why not now?

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS FOR YOUNG DISABLED WORKERS

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce an amendment to the Social Security Act which is a necessity if our disability insurance program is going to provide real protection to the workers of this country. It is a little known fact that a young worker starting out on his working life is walking a tight rope as far as protection against permanent and total disability is concerned. If he manages to work 5 years he will have full social security disability protection. If he is unfortunate enough to become disabled in less than 5 years, he and his young family will be denied benefits and must rely totally on their own resources or on public or private charity.

I believe that all people who have really studied this situation come to the inevitable conclusion that remedial legislation is required. Last year the Advisory Council on Social Security, which was authorized by law, recommended the type of legislation I have introduced today. Moreover, the Congress in the 1965 amendments recognized the need for this bill when it authorized protection for young workers who are disabled because of blindness. My amendment would merely extend this protection to all young workers who are disabled, whether their disability was based upon blindness or some other equally grievous condition.

The provision for young blind workers in law, which would be made applicable to young disabled workers generally, establishes an alternative insured status requirement for workers disabled before age 31 of one-half of the quarters elapsing after age 21 up to the point of disability, with a minimum of six quarters. The minimum of six quarters equates disability protection with survivorship protection and eliminates the anomaly under existing law whereby the wife and children of a young worker would receive benefits if he died but would receive nothing if he was no longer able to work because he has had the misfortune to become disabled.

Mr. Speaker, the relatively minor cost of this amendment is greatly overshadowed by the inequity it eliminates. I urge the Committee on Ways and Means and Congress to take early action in eliminating this defect in our social security disability insurance program.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS FOR THE MOTHERS OF YOUNG BENEFICIARIES OVER 18 ATTENDING SCHOOL

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the historic 1965 Amendments to the Social Security Act, which included the medicare program, also made an important, if little noted, change in the cash benefits program on behalf of our young people when they provided that children entitled to benefits could continue to receive them beyond the age of 18 and up to age 22 if they were attending school. During the period September 1965 through June 1966, a total of 526,599 young people were in school and received benefits under this provision. Prior to that enactment the children of deceased, disabled, or retired persons were eligible for benefits only if they were under 18 and equal benefits were payable to mothers with such children in their care.

I could not agree more with the following rationale for last year's amendment, as set forth by the Committee on Ways and Means:

> The committee believes that a child over age 18 who is attending school full time is dependent just as a child under 18 or a disabled older child is dependent, and that it is not realistic to stop such a child's benefit at age 18. A child who cannot look to a father for support (because the father has died, is disabled, or is retired) is at a disadvantage in completing his education as compared to a child who can look to his father for support. Not only may the child be prevented from going to college by loss of parental support and loss of his benefits; he may even be prevented from finishing high school or going to vocational school. With many employers requiring more than a high school education as a condition for employment, education beyond the high school level has become a necessity in preparing for work. (House Rept. No. 213, 89th Cong., 1st session, p. 86)

Unfortunately, however, the 1965 legislation continued the cutoff for the mother's benefit when her youngest child reaches 18 even though the child continues to receive a benefit because he is attending school. As a result, I believe, the very laudable purpose set forth by the Committee on Ways and Means is watered down by a consequent reduction in family income which may also prevent young people from going to college, finishing high school, or going to vocational school. I therefore propose that this feature of the law be changed so that, in those relatively few circumstances where the mother's benefit is cut off when her youngest child reaches 18, she will continue to receive benefits as long as her child is in school or to his 22d birthday.

Let us be clear about the fact that the present law imposes this cutoff only in the case of the youngest child. It specifies that as long as there are children under 18 in the home the mother will continue to receive benefits. It follows that a mother with three children—one 19 and attending school, one 18 and not attending school, and one 14—will continue to receive benefits because she has one child under 18. But when the 14-year-old reaches age 18 and wants to go on to college, her benefit will be cut off under current law.

The report of the Advisory Council on Social Security, made in January 1965, which recommended the change made by the 1965 amendments took the position that the mother's benefit should not be continued because, in their view:

Where the only child is age 18 or over there is not the same reason to pay mother's benefits, since there is no need for the mother to stay home to care for the child.

Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand why, suddenly on the 18th birthday of her youngest child, there is no longer any need for the mother to stay at home. I fail to see why the rationale we used to continue that child's benefits if he is in school because he has been denied the support of his father's earnings will be furthered by reducing the family's social security income—suddenly and arbitrarily—by half. The average benefit payable to a child is now around $60 meaning that a total social security family payment of $120 is cut to $60 a month. It seems to me that the income provided by continuing the mother's benefit, along with the child's, may very well be a very important factor in enabling the child to continue his education.

Because of the relatively few cases to which it will apply each year the cost of making this improvement in our law is relatively minor. Therefore, I urge that the mother's benefit, too, be continued while the child is in school and receiving benefits, carrying out the purpose of enabling more children to continue in school as set forth for the 1965 enactment.

NATIONAL FARM POLICY CONFERENCE

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman invited leaders of every major farm organization and representatives of all major farm commodities to gather in Washington for a National Farm Policy Conference.

This was a most successful meeting. President Johnson invited a large group of participants to join him for lunch at the White House on that day, and Secretary Freeman and his key staff members spent the whole day discussing farm progress and problems with these farm leaders from around the Nation.

I believe my colleagues in the House will be interested in the remarks made to this group by our President during the luncheon which he hosted and the opening statement which Secretary Freeman made as the Conference started. I include both statements in the RECORD at this point:

Remarks of the President to a Group of Farm Leaders, the State Dining Room

Secretary Freeman, distinguished Members of Congress and particularly those who have dedicated their lives to the cause of agriculture, and my farmer friends and fellow Americans:

Mrs. Johnson and I are very happy that you could come to Washington and that you could meet here with us today in the White House. I hope that the exchange of information has been helpful to you and to us.

Not long ago I watched a television program on the Indian food problem. The first part of it showed how many millions of tons of wheat are being shipped to India. It took us through the Midwestern fields and their amazing mechanization. It took us to the great grain terminals. It took us through the ports in the United States and India.

Then began the long, arduous work of moving the wheat to distribution centers inland in that great country, to the villages and to the stores of the back country, and finally into the homes and stomachs of the people themselves.

The program went on to describe the state of American agriculture and Indian agriculture and the efforts that we have both made in an attempt to improve it by using better machinery, better farming techniques, better fertilizers, and better research and technical assistance.

I came away with many impressions, but uppermost was a renewed respect for the tremendous productive capacity of American agriculture.

Last night I was reading a speech that our foreign policy adviser is making in England next week. He says, in that speech, that our present population of 3 billion 400 million will increase in the next 13 years to 4½ billion, and that our average production increase in the developing countries that now runs 2 percent per year, for the last five years, will have to increase more than 4 percent per year, if we are not to have famine in the world.

Those figures, those times, and those dates are just around the corner out there. So I think it is good that all segments of this great basic industry can, from time to time, forget their sections, their religions, and their politics and come together to try to think and plan and work for the future of humanity throughout the world.

For no matter what decisions are made here in Washington about the dimensions of our Food for Freedom Program, none of those decisions are going to have any meaning, unless we have the ingenuity, unless we have the commitment, and unless, above all, we have some good luck and a lot of hard work from the American farmer.

I have been worrying ever since last August when I had my last rain down where I live.

I think the same thing is true of the programs that we are interested in that have helped us to feed and to strengthen the diets of at least 25 percent of all the people in the United States. Today, 45 million Americans benefit from the school lunch program, the special milk program, the food stamp program, and others.

Millions of poor children will be stronger and healthier in later life, because of what the basic industry does and because of these programs themselves.

Thanks to the farmer's skill, his efficiency, and his knowhow the average American consumer at this moment has abundant food for his family that costs him less of his take-home pay. For instance, in 1949 he spent 25 percent of what he made to feed his family. Today, his food bill amounts to about 18 percent of his take-home pay.

Finally, the wheat and feed grains, poultry, and other products we are shipping in the world commerce are now providing this Nation a very vital part of our export earnings.

The last thing I did before coming here was spend more than an hour with the Secretary of the Treasury talking about our international monetary situation and the critical problem that lies ahead of us in our dealings with France and some of our other neighbors across the sea.

Exports of our farms produced a record of about $7 billion last year. For one industry that is so well represented in this White House room today, that is quite a record. I think it deserves the recognition that we are paying it and I think it merits the gratitude of not only the 200 million people who live in our country, but the 3 billion 400 million who live in the world.

As an American who is interested in his country's foreign policy, as one who is deeply concerned with our domestic programs, as a consumer who pays some food bills, and as a part-time, unsuccessful rancher, I want each of you to know that the representatives of this great industry are always in my thoughts and always welcome in this house.

I think I know the debt that the country owes to the farmer. I know, too, that his share in the growth and prosperity of our economy is not what it should be and not what I would like it to be.

Parity of income between the farmer and the rest of the country is the constant goal of this Administration. I believe we are making some progress toward reaching it.

Despite a recent decline, farm prices are still about 4 percent higher than they were a year ago. Gross farm income in 1966 was 30 percent higher than it was in 1960. It was 18 percent higher than it was in 1963.

Net farm income was 31 percent over 1963 and per capita income of farm people has increased at a better rate than the income of others. But it is still—and this is important that we all bear in mind in every decision—two-thirds as large as that of the non-farmer.

Farmers are still about $900 short of equality with the rest of the country last year.

I have talked about farm income throughout this Nation—in more than 30 States last year. I have talked to the Members of Congress from the farm States almost daily. I have talked with farmers themselves and those in Government who are charged with improving farm income and farming conditions.

I know that farmers have been caught in a bind between higher prices, increased cost of living, higher implement prices, higher interest ratings, and stable or lowering prices for their farm commodities. I do hope there are some signs of hope for a substantial improvement in this situation.

We do have some things that we think are important. We have a four-year farm bill that the Congress has passed. We have the security that a long-term program like this permits us to plan for.

With our surpluses gone already in many commodities, the market is now operating more freely than it has generally in many years. The strong world demand, both in the commercial market and in countries receiving our food aid, gives us good prospects for, we hope, improving farm income.

The marketing skill of farmers will have a lot to do with farm income. Increased efficiency will have a lot to do with it. I believe so will Governmental policy in many areas both foreign and domestic.

For my part, I can promise you that parity of income for farmers is and will be the goal of our agricultural policy. I believe there is a good future for farmers. In the past few years the outlook has grown brighter.

As one who carries a considerable responsibility for the general welfare of our whole people, I know that I want very much for it to be better—and it had better be better, for on your shoulders the well-being of millions of your brothers rests and always will.

I know of no particular industry in time of peace or war that has more nearly lived up to its responsibilities or to the expectations of the American people than the agricultural industry.

I wish that I could promise you more and deliver on those promises. I genuinely feel that at this period in our national history when last year alone we added 2,900,000 jobs, when our Gross National Product is at an all-time high, when we are doing more in the field of education, health, and conservation than has ever been done in our national history, that we ought to have as fine a record as we can in agriculture and I am working toward that end.

In our system of checks and balances, we have three branches. The Executive proposes and the Congress disposes—and if it doesn't, the Court does. It is pretty difficult to get us all three on the same wave length at the same time.

I came here in 1931 in a period of great unrest in agricultural sections. While I don't want to ever go back to that period, I don't want to use it as a standard of measurement today, except to say that I genuinely believe that most of our dangers are from without and not from within.

I doubt that there has ever been a time when there is more patriotism, more judgment, and more cooperation evidenced between the Congress and the Executive than there is now.

So in the days ahead when there will be much testing and when our trials and tribulations will bear heavily upon all of us, I want to appeal to the farm industry in advance to give us your suggestions, your ideas, your counsel, and your patience.

There is much I would like to say to you today, but I know that you have been talked to and talked about, as people always are when they come to Washington.

I am reminded of a story that Mr. Rayburn told of one time when he went back to the place where he taught school and the old part-time farmer and part-time blacksmith asked him to stay all night with him. After they had talked until midnight, the wife and daughter went to bed and the men went out on the porch and sat there until a little after 2:00. They then went out in the yard.

As they came back to the rock steps and porch, Mr. Rayburn said, "Listen, Lee, I am going to have to go to bed. I am going to have to make seven speeches tomorrow in my campaign."

He said, "I guess that is right, Sammy. I just been down here using the hammer and riding the cultivator and trying to keep up with you and what you are doing there in Washington and I guess you do have to go on. It is 2:30 and," he said, "this is past my bedtime. But," he said, "I just shore wish I could talk to you all night long."

When I think about what is waiting for me over in my office now, I just wish I could talk to you all night long.

OPENING STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN AT NATIONAL FARM POLICY CONFERENCE IN MAIN CONFERENCE ROOM, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON, D.C., ON FEBRUARY 20, 1967

I want to welcome you this morning to this National Farm Policy Conference, for President Johnson, for myself, and for my colleagues in the Department of Agriculture. And it goes without saying that the Department of State welcomes you too by graciously lending us facilities that we do not have at USDA. In a very real sense it is not out of character for us to be here, for what happens in American agriculture becomes more important each year to the entire world.

Please bear with me for a few moments as I undertake the pleasant duty of launching this conference, which is one of the first of its kind. I'd like to make a brief opening statement, and then I'll turn the meeting over to you.

We did not ask you to come to Washington to listen to me, or to Under Secretary Schnittker here beside me or to the Assistant Secretaries on the platform—John Baker and George Mehren. We want to hear from *you*.

As I said in a year-end statement a month and a half ago, "1966 was a bench mark year for American agriculture that marked the end of one era and the beginning of another."

The year 1967 marks the dawn of a *new era* in American agriculture. The surpluses that all but suffocated us when I came to Washington in 1961 have been eliminated. And while disposing of those surpluses we were able to improve income. Now, with the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, and Food for Freedom Program of 1966, we have the tools, if we can cooperate to use them wisely and prudently, to prevent another piling-up of surpluses in the future together with the downward pressure on the market that accompanies an oversupply of commodities.

This is a Policy Conference. It is timely, then, that we ask: What does the elimination of crop surpluses signify for the agricultural policy of the United States? It means—it has meant, already—that today there is less government intervention in agricultural affairs than at any time in the past 30 years. Today, farmers operating under commodity programs that are largely voluntary possess more freedom of choice than they have had since the early Triple-A days of the New Deal. Today, the market operates more freely than has been the case for three decades.

With virtually no Government stocks on hand, with resale policies securely insulating the market from the negligible supplies in CCC hands, the Government's role in the market has been sharply diminished. The market functions as it will, responding to private forces in the market place, recording dollars-and-cents variations as a consequence of supply and demand and quality conditions.

Indeed, this is a new "ballgame" for American agriculture.

As the domestic scene has changed, so has that around the world. Global population is growing at the unprecedented rate of more than one million persons a *week*. At the same time, per capita demand is climbing steeply as the standard of living in most countries improves. As people earn more money, they insist upon more food, and better food. This means they consume more animal products . . . and as a result the long-term demand for United States farm products will continue to grow. Today, feed grains is the number one dollar earner of all American exports including non-agricultural exports.

Twin forces—more people and economic progress—give us a basis for confidence that for the foreseeable future worldwide demand will increase for the products of American field and farm. A substantial part of that demand will for some time be concessional rather than commercial, which presents us with very special and sensitive problems. But the demand is there and the world somehow must meet it.

All these various factors the 89th Congress took into consideration, and after weighing them carefully said in effect to the United States Department of Agriculture and to the American farmer and related agri-business institutions:

"Here, in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, is a four-year farm program. We have decided that, instead of changing the rules annually by passing new legislation each year as we have done in the past, you are to have the benefit of a consistent, predictable program of operation for four years.

"Now it is up to you to make it work . . . so that this country may continue to produce abundantly all the food and fiber it can use, to maintain its power and leadership and to bring to its producers a fair return commensurate with that of other segments of the American economy—in other words, Parity of Income."

This is a challenge we now seek to meet. It is up to us to take advantage of the new opportunity that is ours, and so operate our programs that we will at the same time produce abundantly and reward our producers fairly. In the process we will need to be open-minded and pragmatic so we can operate our programs better as we gain more experience, and be prepared to improve and strengthen them at the right time.

All this will not be easy. As always in agriculture we are subject to many forces beyond our control. We are required to make decisions 18 months in advance to meet, but hopefully not exceed, anticipated demand. Worldwide growing conditions—not just in Kansas, but in such far places as the Ukraine and India—may upset our calculations. With more than 115 million acres in feedgrains in the U.S., a not unusual variation in yield of 6 bushels per acre would mean nearly 700 million bushels more or less in supply. Such temporary but price-depressing supply conditions constantly threaten farm prices and income. Weather is a great imponderable, but not the only one. The best plans may come undone because of pestilence, floods, economic or political upheaval—because of all sorts of forces that make the modern-day world complex.

At the same time the cost-price squeeze always threatens. Somehow we must continue the advance of farm price over farm cost that made 1966 a year of improvement in farm income. So far in this calendar year of 1967, production costs are nullifying income increases.

I repeat that it won't be easy to hold supply and demand in balance, produce abundantly, and obtain parity of income for the farmer. Nonetheless, in my best judgment, if we exercise all the wisdom and prudence that we have individually and collectively . . . if we draw on lessons of the past . . . if we strive together to apply those lessons to the future . . . we can make our current system work effectively. We can meet our obligations to the American people and to the world. We can achieve a fair return for the American producer.

This is our mandate, as agricultural leaders. This is our opportunity, our responsibility. We must work together so this system will succeed.

I have asked you to come here today to consult with me as to how we can attain these goals. I earnestly solicit your advice and your counsel and guidance. This is your meeting. My associates and I are here with the sole objective of benefiting from your contribution to this free and open forum.

The press is with us today, and may be writing about your remarks, and filming and taping them, at any time.

Now with that formal introduction, allow me just a few minutes to detail the current situation with supporting charts which you will find in your information kit. Then we shall be pleased to hear from the first participant who raises his hand.

MISTER WAR ON HUNGER

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, emerging as "Mister War on Hunger" of this administration is a man who befits the title from his years of background and pioneering in the cause about which many are now aroused. He is Herbert J. Waters, formerly Assistant Administrator for Material Resources of the Agency for International Development.

Few men in or out of government have been more closely involved in the eventual development of what is now the war on hunger than Waters. In fact, if any one individual was primarily responsible for convincing this administration of the vital importance of giving greater priority to the world food and population problems, it was Waters.

Herbert Waters is eminently qualified to serve as head of the newly established Office of the War on Hunger in AID. Since the time Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan brought him into the Department of Agriculture in 1949, Waters has done an outstanding job in the area of food and agriculture. He has distinguished himself as an innovator, as an activist, and as a person who could keep things moving in the right directions.

Working in close unison with Secretary Brannan and subsequently as administrative assistant to the then Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Waters was a major architect in developing the Food for Peace Act and the food-for-freedom program. In the area of cooperatives, Waters has been a symbol for the implementation of the Humphrey amendment on cooperatives. Waters played a major role along with farm organizations in recognizing the leading role cooperatives could play in implementing the self-help principle of our foreign assistance programs.

Throughout his wide range of responsibilities—directing AID's programs in the use of our agricultural, industrial, and transportation resources to fulfill foreign assistance objectives—Waters has kept paramount his interest in the food-for-freedom program.

In establishing a new office in AID to consolidate all of the Agency's activities relating to hunger-population problems and nutrition, the administration could not have made a wiser selection than Waters to direct this vital program.

In his new assignment, he has indicated his conviction that the job can only be done well by the maximum involvement of private enterprise. He stands a good chance of mobilizing such private resources. He has always worked closely with the private sector. He has always emphasized the importance of the role of agriculture and business, working in unison and has been quietly working for months to bring about greater involvement of the private fertilizer industry which seems to offer the best immediate possibility of contributing to agricultural expansion.

SABBATH OBSERVANCE BY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, our country was founded on the principle of religious freedom, but we must constantly remain vigilant to keep this freedom alive for all Americans.

One of the most fundamental expressions of any religious heritage is to observe one day as the Sabbath, and in the spirit of our religious freedom the Federal Government must not stop an individual from observing the religious holidays of his church.

At present employees of the Federal Government whose religious holidays do not coincide with national holidays are not allowed administrative leave to let them follow the dictates of their conscience. We must remedy this situation at once. I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting a bill I will introduce in the next few days which would allow department and agency heads to grant time off for employees to comply with religious obligations prescribed by religious denominations of which such employees are bona fide members.

READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR VIETNAM VETERANS

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to provide for readjustment assistance to veterans who have served in our Armed Forces during the Vietnam conflict. This legislation, which has already been passed by the Senate, is especially timely as thousands of Vietnam veterans begin to return home seeking to continue their education or to find employment. The legislation will increase disability compensation to wounded veterans by 20 percent. A $250 burial allowance will be provided for veterans of the Vietnam conflict.

Of special interest is a provision which will provide for special hospital treatment to all veterans developing mental disorders and psychosis within 2 years after discharge.

The provisions of the bill would only cost the Treasury $9.7 million in the coming year and only $80 million in increased benefits over the next 5 years. This is a minor contribution for the great service which these men have given to their country.

IT IS SERVICE, NOT AGE, THAT COUNTS

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to grant retirement with full pension benefits to civil service employees with 30 years' service regardless of their age. Although the number of persons affected by this change will be small, I feel that the bill makes an important contribution to the liberality and fairness of the civil service system.

The Federal Government, as the foremost employer in the country, should be a leader in initiating a liberal retirement policy for those who work for it, but in recent years it has failed to do so. Last year's amendment to the Civil Service Retirement Act which allows retirement at age 55 after 30 years' service with full pension was a great step forward. However, Federal employees must still contend with an arbitrary rule which permits one man to retire on full pension at 55 while another at 52 or 53 cannot do so, even though both have served for the same amount of time. Such a distinction is not only unfair, it is unjust. It puts a higher premium on age than on length of service.

I truly believe that to change this arbitrary law can only be beneficial, both to the Government and to those who serve it. As the Cabinet Committee on Federal Staff Retirement Systems so rightly observed in its February 1966 report to the President, concerning the civil service retirement system—

> The chief problem with the existing structure is that many workers stay on the active duty rolls beyond their period of real effectiveness, and that certain provisions of the systems lend encouragement to that tendency. . . . It is widely recognized that individuals age at different rates.

The age requirement for retirement with 30 years' service does not encourage workers to stay on past their peak effectiveness, it forces them to do so. It flatly denies the difference in individual aging rates.

The Government is not likely to lose by thus improving its retirement policy. Most of those who would take advantage of the new opportunity my bill would create would fall into two groups: those who are compelled to retire for reasons of health or physical infirmity, but are not eligible for retirement under the disability clauses, and those who have either lost interest in their jobs or are no longer able to cope with the rapidly changing conditions under which they must work. A current advertising axiom states "You can't get tomorrow's jobs with yesterday's skills." Well, it certainly follows that you cannot do today's jobs efficiently with yesterday's skills, either. In both instances, the Government gains from the retirements by being able to replace older, less efficient, or even partially disabled workers with younger, more vigorous ones. And almost invariably, these younger workers will work at a lower grade than those whom they replace, so you realize a savings in both cost and efficiency.

There are other advantages to be gained from a liberalizing of the retirement system. One of the chief criticisms of the Civil Service in recent years has been its tendency to "pyramiding at the top" with the resultant reduction in opportunities for advancement of the younger worker. Allowing retirement after 30 years' service, regardless of age, can do much to reduce this effect, thus making a career in government more appealing to the young ambitious worker.

Furthermore, the more flexible a retirement system is, the more it will attract competent and dedicated persons.

Opponents of the change which my bill proposes claim that it will increase incentive to early retirement, thus robbing the Government of many valuable workers and that it will cost far too much for the retirement fund to support.

In answer to the objections, let me say that I feel they are ill-founded for several reasons. There is little proof that a more liberal retirement system encourages earlier retirement. The vast majority of workers eligible to retire in the 50-and-over age group are at the prime of their earning power and usefulness in their work. Jobs available to the over-50 worker in industry are at a premium today, so the percentage of those who would retire from Government service to accept positions in industry would necessarily be small. Furthermore, the average individual in his fifties is at a period when his family financial responsibilities are the greatest; he cannot afford to retire.

Perhaps a greater incentive to continuing work for the individual eligible to retire is that he is always increasing his annuity. The fact that it takes more than 40 years to build retirement credits up to the 80-percent maximum limit, and the fact that retirement benefits are based on the 5 years of highest salary mean a longer period of service will provide a correspondingly great annuity.

With all of these factors discouraging retirement, even for the eligible, the cost of this proposal can hardly assume major proportions. The question of increased costs is also one which is hard to document, as any estimate of cost must be based on an assumption of how many persons would retire given the opportunity, and this involves complex personal factors not easily reduced to statistics. Such costs as might be incurred are surely balanced by the benefits which the change would bring to those forced to retire early and by the increased flexibility of the retirement system which would make Government service a more appealing career choice to capable persons.

THEY CAN FIND ANYBODY A JOB—BUT WHERE AND FOR HOW MUCH?

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] recently inserted in the RECORD an article from the magazine Nation's Business entitled "America's Poor: Where They Can Get Jobs." This article, authored by that very articulate spokesman for conservatism, Mr. Holmes Alexander, seemed to suggest that there is a vast conspiracy among labor, intellectuals, Democrats generally, and the Labor Department to obscure what he considers to be the "fact" that there is no shortage of jobs, and that unemployment is basically a result of the unwillingness of the unemployed to work. The magazine, in its January 1967 issue, followed this up with another article entitled "We Can Get Anybody a Job," which continued to suggest that unemployment stemmed from some kind of character flaw in the unemployed. This is, of course, not a new argument. As a Queen of France once said: "If the poor have no bread, let them eat cake."

Two very capable and highly respected Washington economists, Sar Levitan and Garth Mangum, have responded to this argument in an article which appeared in the Reporter for November 17, 1966. And the Washington Post's very perceptive reporter, Mr. William Raspberry, has investigated the offer of Nation's Business with revealing results, which he described in his column of February 4. I include the Levitan-Mangum and Raspberry articles in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks:

[From the Reporter Magazine, Nov. 17, 1966]

COMING TO GRIPS WITH UNEMPLOYMENT

(By Sar A. Levitan and Garth L. Mangum)

The labor-shortage story, standard front-page fare in recent months, has now received the endorsement of the chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Gardner Ackley. Business publications report a frantic search for manpower that has put the handicapped and women to work pushing brooms and manning factory machines as in the days of the Second World War and the Korean conflict. Now, in a recent address, Ackley has argued that finding work for the nation's three million unemployed is no longer a task of increasing the number of jobs but of qualifying workers to fill the vacant jobs.

Nation's Business, a publication of the United States Chamber of Commerce, finds no difficulty in explaining this anomaly of millions of unemployed and job going begging. It asserts that unemployment could be virtually eliminated in the United States were it not for for a gigantic plot by Federal bureaucrats and advocates of the welfare state. According to *Nation's Business*, there are more job vacancies than idle men, but the government has shirked the responsibility of publishing job-vacancy data lest the reduction of unemployment weaken the case for further expansion of the welfare state by exposing malingerers.

Support for the claim that job vacancies are as widespread as unemployment comes not only from newspaper stories but also from "scientific" studies. A report of the Manpower Research Council, sponsored by Manpower Inc., a nationwide firm providing temporary help, has been widely publicized. Using a sample survey, the Manpower Research Council found that unfilled jobs among the surveyed corporations equalled four per cent of their total employment. Since that percentage approximates the national unemployment rate, some have reached the facile conclusion that full employment has been reached. The conclusion leads to two policy recommendations: cut back on Federal expenditures before labor shortages become more inflationary or accept four per cent unemployment but provide better services to its victims.

The argument is not a new one. Even in the first years of this decade, when unemployment hovered between five and six per cent, fiscal conservatives maintained that no job shortages existed. The problem, they claimed, was one of matching square pegs to round holes—the jobs were there but people had the wrong skills, or lived in the wrong places, or lacked incentives. Their solution for the problem of unemployment was the same as it is now: well-publicized government statistics about job vacancies and a modest government training program.

The result was the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, which provides income support for the unemployed while they undertake training. It was supported by fiscal conservatives as a substitute for stimulation of demand and by the fiscal liberals as good in itself. The measure has been revised three times. In each case Congress has given the program's administrators pretty much what they asked. And well they might, for MDTA has helped many unemployed individuals to find jobs and the benefits from the program—measured in increased earnings and higher taxes—have exceeded the costs. MDTA and other training programs have done very little to reduce unemployment, however, because training people does not create jobs, and lack of jobs was the basic problem between 1957 and 1965. The tax cut in 1964, followed by the buildup in Vietnam, not the training program, was primarily responsible for lowering the rate to four per cent. Anti-poverty measures have helped to cut unemployment below that level.

But much remains to be done to get our domestic economy in order. The incidence of unemployment among Negroes has remained double that among whites. And it is particularly disturbing that in the present tightening labor market Negro unemployment during recent months has actually increased. In central-city slum areas the level of unemployment is even higher than the national figure. Providing work for the hard core of "unemployable" persons is, indeed, not so much an economic problem as it is a matter of social urgency.

The widespread belief that jobs go begging for lack of applicants makes it harder to get support for programs to create new jobs. Regrettably, there is no conclusive evidence to disprove the claims that job vacancies actually equal the number of idle workers. We remain one of the few western industrial nations with no measure of job vacancies. Strangely, the absence of a job-vacancy measure must be attributed primarily to the organization that would have the most to gain from disproving the alleged unemployment=job vacancy equation: the AFL-CIO. The Department of Labor has been anxious to undertake a job-vacancy statistics program but has been stymied by AFL-CIO strategists who have a pipeline to the House Appropriations Committee subcommittee that controls the Labor Department's budget. Organized labor's opposition to the collection of job-vacancy data is based on the rather unconvincing argument that the public and Congress might be misled into minimizing unemployment problems if information that job vacancies also exist became generally available.

THE MATCH GAME

Job-vacancy data are not totally unavailable, however. Despite objections to a regular nationwide job-vacancy survey, Congress authorized the Department of Labor to conduct pilot studies in major metropolitan areas during 1965 and 1966 to develop survey techniques. The department has been forbidden to publish the results of the pilot surveys and precluded from undertaking a broader enumeration. Despite the secrecy, it is possible to put together a picture from testimony before Congressional committees based on the information collected by the Department of Labor. These data suggest that the number of job vacancies has increased as unemployment has dropped over the past two years. Still, after increasing from 1.1% in 1964 and 1.4% in 1965, the number of job vacancies in the United States in August, 1966, was apparently only 1.8 per cent of total employment, or less than half of the total unemployment in the country.

What are the policy implications of a 1.8 percent job-vacancy rate compared to a four percent unemployment? Of course, 1.3 million jobs (1.8 percent of those employed) is a lot of jobs and some of them should be matchable with some of the 2.9 million unemployed. Many see job-vacancy data as a means of bringing about that match. The expectation, however, reflects a misunderstanding of the nature of job-vacancy statistics.

The data, if available, would be no more likely to answer the questions on where the vacant jobs are, what their requirements are, and what they pay than unemployment data would describe who is unemployed, why, and what kind of job he is looking for. Employers in a job-vacancy survey are apt to be asked questions very much like those asked in present monthly surveys concerning unemployment, e.g., "How many vacancies were you actively seeking to fill last week?" Employers have shown a willingness to cooperate in answering this question, but they might not be if they thought it would be followed by a flood of referrals from the public employment services.

Job-vacancy data can serve as economic indicators, they can identify communities and occupations with a shortage of labor, and they can furnish guidance to training efforts. But only job orders placed with the public employment services can actually be used to refer the unemployed to job openings.

This type of information is already obtained from the United States Employment Service, which in co-operation with state governments operates some 1,900 employment offices throughout the country. While some of these local employment offices do an excellent job in obtaining information about job openings and in disseminating the information to job seekers, many more perform this task rather poorly. The need is to improve the local employment services. Not surprisingly, however, many people who advocate national job-vacancy data as a cheap panacea for unemployment problems consistently object to raising the budget of the USES.

DATA ARE NOT ENOUGH

Special programs are needed to raise the employability level of those stranded in depressed areas and central-city slums. For some of these jobless, basic education and training is the first step toward qualifying for employment. At the same time, basic income must be provided for them while they are learning. Others are unable to find jobs because of their isolated location. This applies not only to the unemployed miners in eastern Kentucky or West Virginia but also to the residents of some big cities. A major cause of high unemployment in Watts (exceeding thirteen per cent) is apparently the lack of public transportation facilities, and the same may be true in other central-city areas. As the jobs move to the suburbs, the residents of such areas can be stranded simply for the lack of better transport or a car.

Some idle workers who live far from sources of employment will have to be relocated. The young and the educated have always moved where employment opportunities exist and will continue to do so without any outside help. Most persons, however, need assistance to overcome such barriers to mobility as family obligations, community attachment, and the inadequacy of housing facilities in big cities. While Congress has been generous in appropriating money for training, it has supported relocation of the unemployed only sparingly. Congressmen, it seems, do not want Federal money used to relocate their constituents. So far, Federal assistance has been limited to a few pilot relocation projects, and a great deal more can be done in this area.

Job-vacancy data can also be helpful, but the mere knowledge that openings exist is not sufficient to fill jobs. Employer and union prejudices must be broken down. Automobile manufacturers in Detroit were actively seeking last summer to fill three thousand jobs. But in line with traditional requirements, these are "men" jobs though many of the vacancies could have easily been filled but for prejudice against hiring women in certain jobs.

Many potential workers have completely dropped out of the work force and are not even looking for jobs because of repeated disappointments and failure, either their own or the example of others in the slums where they have grown up. To bring these persons into the economic mainstream, they must be reached and encouraged to make the effort. The U.S Employment Service does very little to help those who are not actively seeking work. Some anti-poverty programs have focused on this problem. A major responsibility of neighborhood centers established by local anti-poverty agencies in slum areas is to identify both persons in need of work and available jobs in the community that they could fill. Some of these neighborhood organizations have had considerable success and their experience has stimulated some public employment offices to intensify their efforts to help place the most disadvantaged poor in jobs. But all the job-vacancy data and even the most effective work by the public employment services will not create jobs for many of the truly disadvantaged, persons who are either not equipped or not acceptable to employers under present conditions. The exact number of these is not known, but their number may exceed half a million.

In the past, unemployment of four per cent would have brought to the nation a comfortable feeling of self-satisfaction and public policy would have shifted from concern with unemployment to anti-inflation. That we now find ourselves wavering between the two at present is evidence of an increasing sensitivity to the plight of the disadvantaged in our society—in particular of the hard-core "unemployables," most of whom are Negreos.

Increased demand could generate increased employment, encouraging employers to reach more deeply into the ranks of the unemployed. The ability of Western European nations to maintain unemployment levels below two per cent is tantalizing, but we are unwilling to pay the price. Though low unemployment is accompanied by price increases that exceed our inflation tolerances, they do not generally appear to be causally connected. Most of the recent price increases are in food and services, particularly medical services, which are little related to the state of the economy. Even settlements are not in occupations with pressing labor shortages. Nevertheless, the prevailing opinion is that labor shortages are the cause of present inflationary pressures.

Fiscal and monetary policies have obviously been inadequate to meet the pressing needs of large groups in our population. Even the most optimistic administration spokesmen do not anticipate that these over-all economic measures will meet the needs of the deficiently educated, the unskilled, and the culturally deprived. With Chairman Ackley's warning against further attempts to reduce unemployment by stimulating the economy, we are left with only second-best alternatives: (1) leave unemployment where it is, either ignoring or mitigating by welfare measures its impact on those disadvantaged in the competition for jobs; (2) make marginal improvements in the ability of the labor market to match men and jobs through training, relocation, information, and better employment services; or (3) create jobs that fit the abilities and limitations of the hard-core unemployed. The last alternative deserves greater consideration than it has received thus far.

Despite technological development, unskilled jobs are not disappearing from the U.S. economy. Faced with the pressure of demand, employers will use the labor available; but if the obstacles are too great, they may consider it less costly to resort to overtime or to bid against each other for already employed workers than to dip more deeply into the unemployed.

THE PRICE IN BILLIONS

An important step toward matching job vacancies with jobless workers would be to open up housing for Negroes in the suburbs where the jobs increasingly are to be found. Indeed, public reluctance to take this obvious step is being subsidized by more costly and less efficient measures. Barring that approach, perhaps the most efficient way to provide employment for the chronically unemployed, as was recently suggested by the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, is for the Federal government to assume the responsibility for public-service employment as "an employer of last resort, providing work for 'hard-core unemployed' in useful community enterprises." There is ample socially useful work to be performed. Actually we have moved a considerable way down the special job-creation road. The poverty programs' Neighborhood Youth Corps, Work Experience, and related measures already provide jobs and training for some 400,000 youths and adult poor, at an annual cost of more than a billion dollars. Recent amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act will somewhat extend these programs.

The solution is not a cheap one, however. If the unemployed were supplied jobs at the prevailing minimum-wage rate—which will be raised next February to $1.40 an hour, thus making it still more difficult for the disadvantaged to get jobs in the open market—the annual cost of filling a public-service job would be about $4,500. This would include, in addition to wages and fringes, the cost of supervision and administrative overhead, as well as provision for the remedial basic education so necessary if these workers are to be boosted eventually into the competitive labor market.

Supplying such jobs to the chronically unemployed would be expensive but not inconceivable. The rub comes with the recognition that several million persons not protected by minimum-wage legislation now work at jobs paying less than the current minimum wage. Would the guarantee of employment at the minimum wage extend to them as well? It would require radical changes in our social attitudes to answer this question affirmatively, and pervasive institutional changes would be needed to implement such a commitment. There is no indication today that guaranteed employment at the prevailing statutory minimum wage carries high political priority.

Full employment is nearer today than it was two years ago but it is still elusive. The achievement of full employment is a costly business, but so is the social disorganization accompanying unemployment. Job-vacancy data might illuminate the dilemma but would contribute little to its solution.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 4, 1967]

BUSINESS GROUP BETS A JOB

(By William Raspberry)

No one has made a survey of it, but it's a safe guess that very few of the District's 16,000 unemployed men and women are regular subscribers to *The Nation's Business*, the organ of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Otherwise, they wouldn't be jobless.

Right there on page 35 of the January

issue, the editors come right out and say "We Can Get Anybody a Job." In red letters, a half-inch tall.

Editor Jack Wooldridge swears he means it. Well, almost, anyway. He did hedge enough to say that he couldn't guarantee placing and keeping alcoholics and drug addicts. But persons with criminal records who really want to work, well, no sweat.

"Government agencies daily hand out taxpayers' money to compensate the country's unemployed, a good chunk of whom could get productive jobs tomorrow if they had to," the magazine article declares.

It quotes officials of some of the Nation's biggest employment agencies on how Government programs are "taking initiative away from people" and how "there is too much fear of good hard work, of getting the hands dirty." Then comes the last paragraph of the piece:

"So *Nation's Business*, with the support of the Nation's private employment agencies, throws out the challenge: We can get anybody a job who is willing and able to work. Write the Editor, Nation's Business, 1615 H st. nw., Washington, D.C. 20006."

Wooldridge says he already has received "several hundred" letters, few of them from Washington, in response to the challenge. Each job-seeker is referred to a private employment agency in his area. Some 1500 agencies are involved.

Underlying both the article and Wooldridge's comments is the feeling that most people who don't have jobs simply don't want them. There is the suspicion, too, that the U.S. Employment Service—a natural enemy of the private agencies—isn't doing much of a job, partly because many jobless people come to USES just so they can pick up their unemployment checks.

Not so, on either count says Fred Hetzel, director of USES for the District. Hetzel, whose agency puts between 4000 and 5000 people to work every month, notes that he has to turn away hundreds every day, either because they have no skills or because criminal records make them virtually unemployable.

"They don't come here to get a check," he said. "Most of them aren't eligible for compensation."

Wooldridge makes one point that both explains how the magazine is able to make its startling guarantee and hints of a major problem with the plan.

"We are able to do better than the U.S. Employment Service," he said, "because we have a nationwide pool of jobs. We can exchange information and help get people and jobs together." He noted that some members of Congress have urged a similar national pool of jobs and jobless by USES.

The idea certainly has some advantages, but mostly for the highly skilled craftsmen, professionals or executives. A bright young Ivy Leaguer might well move to Chicago to take a junior executive's post. But few unskilled Washingtonians will be willing to move to Denver to take a $1.45-an-hour job as a porter.

"Well, the choice is up to him whether he wants to or not," Wooldridge observes. He also admitted, although it was not stated in the article, that since practically all of the placements would be made by private agencies, the prospective employe probably would have to pay a fee. These fees vary so widely depending on the agency, the city and the type of job, that it is impossible to guess what it might be.

One New York agency executive quoted in the magazine article said the Neighborhood Youth Corps in his city recently was awarded Federal grants of $10.5 million to put 3650 youngsters to work. "That comes to $2900 a placement," he said. "If they'd come to us, we'd get the same people better paying jobs for only $21.50 a placement."

While it's fair to point out some of the problems with the Chamber's proposal (even Wooldridge admits he doesn't expect 100 per cent success), it also is fair to give it a chance.

If Chamber of Commerce members can put all our jobless to work, they will have solved one of the Nation's most nagging and difficult problems. It would be a tragic joke, however, if the lovely dream of full employment turned out to be just a silly illusion.

PRICE PROTESTS AND CORPORATION PROFITS

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last fall we witnessed an unprecedented outbreak of protests and boycotts directed against the chain grocery industry and high food prices. Groups led by housewives sprang up spontaneously throughout the Nation and mass picketing was organized in numerous cities. In the judgment of many observers, including myself, concrete gains for the consumer and for the economy resulted from this activity.

For example, the columnist and consumer expert, Sidney Margolius, points out in a recent newspaper column that the food price protests brought about the following:

Some of the women's groups are continuing and are now engaged in consumer education, buying clubs, and increased contacts with organized consumer cooperatives.

The United National Consumers Association, headed by Mrs. Paul West who led the Denver boycott movement, has been formed.

Stores in a number of cities have discontinued games and other gimmicks, and a number have even discontinued trading stamps.

Some prices were reduced and planned milk price increases in some areas were temporarily canceled.

Some of the consumer co-ops are doing more to promote their own brands, which are 10 to 15 percent below nationally advertised brands.

Some families did manage to hold down their food costs a little by selective buying.

But Margolius' analysis of food prices in the large supermarket chains is very disturbing. He finds that during the first 9 months of 1966, when food prices rose sharply, 8 leading supermarket chains enjoyed average profit increases of 19 percent over 1965, and 11 large food manufacturers averaged increases of 10 percent. Further, while prices have fallen off somewhat, retail prices are still 3 percent higher than a year ago. Yet, the Dun & Bradstreet wholesale price index, covering all raw foodstuffs and meats, has gone down 3.7 percent from a year ago. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics price index also shows declines in wholesale prices while retail prices remain at higher levels than last year.

In other words, although retail food prices have gone down a little, they are still higher than they were a year ago, despite the fact that wholesale prices are lower than they were a year ago.

Mr. Margolius also sees evidence of new retail price hikes this summer. If he is correct, we can expect renewed price protests and boycotts by women and consumer organizations. Last fall, I conducted food price hearings in San Antonio to give those who were protesting as well as chain store owners and managers a forum for the expression of their views. These hearings were quite useful and informative. The focused attention, at least in the south and central Texas area, on the problem of rising food prices and on the games, gimmicks, and advertising costs which contribute to some measure to these prices. I believe new and enlarged hearings on this subject are warranted, and that Congress should not wait until the summer price increases to hold them.

With unanimous consent I am inserting Sidney Margolius' column from the Machinist, February 23, 1967. I am also inserting a news story on a related subject: corporation profits. Early figures show that corporation profits hit a record high in 1966. The story is from the Machinists, February 23.

[From the Machinist, Feb. 23, 1967]

PRICE PROTESTS HELPED

(By Sidney Margolius)

"How effective were the food price boycotts of last fall?" asks reader Anthony Persico. "Many people are discussing this question. Also, is there a trend to lower food prices?"

In this writer's judgment, the price protests did a lot of good. For one reason, they showed the grocery industry and some government officials that the public was not fooled by such slogans as "Food is A Bargain", and demanded a sincere effort to keep down rising distribution costs.

For another, some of the women's groups that spontaneously sprang up last fall in the U.S. and Canada are continuing, and have launched various efforts such as consumer education of members, informal buying clubs and increased contacts with the organized consumer cooperatives.

PAPERS UNCOOPERATIVE

In Knoxville, for example, a group of some 25 wives of workingmen, who last fall appealed to housewives to "stay out of stamp and gimmick stores and do selective buying," are continuing to meet, reports Rosemary Jury, one of the leaders. "Because it is difficult to get news into the papers," the women have distributed pamphlets throughout the city explaining their campaign, Mrs. Jury says.

In a number of other states and provinces, similar groups are maintaining contact. In fact, they have formed the United National Consumers Association, headed by Mrs. Paul West, who led the original Denver boycott movement.

Other results, some temporary and others more permanent, include:

Some stores in a number of cities have discontinued bonus bingo and similar games, and a few even have discontinued trading stamps.

In several areas, dairies cancelled, or at least temporarily postponed plans to increase milk prices, and some chain stores reduced a number of prices, again, perhaps only temporarily.

Some of the consumer co-ops have been stimulated to make more determined efforts to promote their own brands, at savings of 10–15 per cent, instead of futile efforts to save their members a penny or two on overpriced nationally-advertised brands.

At lease some families did manage to hold down their own food bills a little through selective buying, as evidenced by a drop in sales at retail grocery stores last fall, a University of Texas researcher reported.

If food prices rise sharply again this Summer, as they probably will, these already-organized groups will be able to rally even more support for selective boycotts. Many more women are willing to take part than did last fall. Elmer Roessner, business writer, reports a survey by *Progressive Grocer* trade magazine which found that while less than 1 per cent of the shoppers questioned had taken part in the demonstrations, 14 per cent said they would if asked. The survey also found that 38 per cent thought the boycotts were justified; 40 per cent did not; the rest were uncertain.

The truth is, despite their pleas that the increases were due to farmers, labor costs and "inflation," the supermarkets and food processors profited handsomely on the price rise. A survey by this writer finds that during the first 9 months of 1966, the period when food prices rose most sharply, eight leading supermarket chains enjoyed average profit increases of 19 per cent over the year before, and 11 large food manufacturers averaged increases of 10 per cent.

Nor are consumers getting much benefit from the current ebb in food prices from last fall's highs. Here are the facts: *retail prices are still about 3 per cent higher than a year ago. In contrast, the Dun & Bradstreet Wholesale Price Index, which covers all raw foodstuffs and meats, actually has gone down 3.7 per cent from a year ago.* Similarly, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics wholesale index shows that farm products have dropped 1.2 per cent, while the wholesale processed food index is still 1.1 per cent above a year ago, but as high as the retail index.

UPS AND DOWNS

A comparison of 21 staple foods by this writer shows that seven have come down, eight cost more than a year ago, and six are approximately the same. The most noticeable reductions are on eggs, poultry, pork, and canned and frozen orange juice. Beef prices are about the same. The most noticeable increase is on milk products, with cheese, for example, priced about 15 per cent higher than a year ago, still an outstanding food value in comparison to other protein foods.

Many food merchandisers have blamed housewives themselves for the high food prices, because—the merchandisers claim—the housewives insist on additional store services and on buying "convenience" foods. One of the best retorts came from Ida Delaney, writer for the Nova Scotia *Maritime Cooperator* who commented, "How quickly flattery turns to faultfinding." She pointed out that it is the manufacturers and stores who have been spending heavily on high-pressure advertising to get women to buy the convenience foods.

[From the Machinist, Feb. 23, 1967]

U.S. Corporation Profits Again Smash All Records

Corporation profits hit another new record in 1966. Only question now is whether 1967 will be still another history maker.

Company profits after taxes have broken the record every year since 1962.

All reports for 1966 are not yet in so it isn't official, but the financial writers are reporting that last year's earnings are running 6 to 8 per cent above 1965.

The *New York Times* surveyed the first 400 companies to report from manufacturing and service industries. They showed a profit increase of 6.7 per cent over the 1965 level.

The *Times* blamed high interest rates and tight money for the fact that this rise was less than half that shown on a comparable survey a year ago.

In 1966, the newspaper reported, four out of five companies surveyed made more money than the year before. About 15 per cent had lower earnings.

Among these were 13 out of 32 steel producers, the two top auto leaders—GM and Ford, two major airlines, two chemical producers, two large paper makers, three oil companies and a variety of others.

Overall, nine airlines showed a gain of 55 per cent over the year before.

Business Week magazine reports that the exports are estimating that 1966 profits will be up 8 per cent over 1965. The magazine commented:

"While many executives have expressed concern over 1966 earnings, returns so far indicate that profit margins in most industries have held up well."

Business Week said that a number of Wall Street analysts feel that the fourth quarter last year "was not as bad as it seemed and that easier money will ensure an improvement this year."

Some other analysts were reported not so optimistic.

U.S. News & World Report noted that for the first time in years "a goodly number of companies" are reporting declines in earnings as compared with the previous year."

"For industry as a whole, however," the magazine said, "the earnings statements now appearing make good reading."

VIETNAM CASUALTIES AND CONSCRIPTS

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, recently, I asked the Defense Department for the figures and statistics relating to casualties in Vietnam for Texas and for my district, San Antonio. I was told that there were none that specific, that all that was available was weekly casualty reports on which the names and homes of those killed were listed.

I obtained a complete collection of the casualty lists for 1966 and analyzed them with reference to my district. The figures show that 24 servicemen from San Antonio were killed in Vietnam in 1966. For the State of Texas the figure is 280. Of the 24 killed from San Antonio, 14 were in the Army, seven in the Marines, and three in the Air Force. A total of 15 of the 24 killed were of Mexican descent.

The fact that 15 of 24 killed from San Antonio were of Mexican descent is important for two reasons. It demonstrates once again the fact that this group is and has been in the forefront of our defense efforts. During World War II, for example, four of the seven Texans who were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor were of Mexican descent.

But the figures also show that the heavy burden of the war effort is falling on persons from the poorer classes. For most of the men killed were draftees.

It is of deep concern to me and it should be of equal concern to every Member of Congress that men and boys are being drafted, sent off to fight and perhaps to be killed in a war that has not been declared by Congress.

With unanimous consent I am inserting in the Record a copy of a news story from the San Antonio Light, February 16, 1967, and an editorial from the Light, February 20, 1967.

[From the San Antonio Light, Feb. 16, 1967]

Toll in Vietnam: 24 S.A. War Dead

Washington.—U.S. Rep. Gonzalez Thursday released figures showing that 24 servicemen from San Antonio were killed in action in Vietnam during 1966.

He said 280 servicemen from Texas were killed.

Gonzalez said the San Antonio figures included 14 from the Army seven from the Marines and three from the Air Force.

STILL PRELIMINARY

The congressman said he compiled the figures as part of a general study on the participation of Texans in Vietnam.

He said the study required a "page by page examination of sheets of paper a foot high." He added his compilations are still preliminary.

Gonzalez said 15 of those San Antonians killed were Mexican-Americans. The breakdown here included 11 from the Army, four from the Marines and none from the Air Force.

HIGH RATIO

"This shows that their participation is very high and reflects the Mexican-Americans' tremendous loyalty and service to their country," Gonzalez said.

He said that in this regard Vietnam is a repetition of the story of World War II and Korea "in which there was a high ratio of participation from our Latin sector."

The congressman said most of the Army men killed last year were draftees.

He said this statistics, when tied in with the high ratio of Mexican-Americans, bolstered his contention that the "onus of the draft naturally falls on those from the poorer economic classes."

"If the young man doesn't have the means or the academic ability to go to college, then he gets drafted," Gonzalez said.

[From the San Antonio Light, Feb. 20, 1967]

San Antonio Casualties

Rep. Henry B. Gonzalez has been analyzing the Vietnam war casualty figures for Texas as a whole and for San Antonio in particular.

Last year, he reports, 280 servicemen from Texas were killed in action and 24 of them were San Antonians.

Of the local victims, 14 were in the Army, 7 in the Marine Corps and 3 in the Air Force.

Mr. Gonzalez' analysis did not stop there. He looked at the figures from the ethnic point of view and related what he found to the effects of a draft law that has been almost universally criticized.

What the Congressman found was that 15 of the 24 San Antonians were of Mexican ancestry, and 11 of these were serving in the Army (the other 4 being Marines).

Noting that most of last year's Army dead were men who had been drafted, Mr. Gonzalez reasoned that the onus of the draft falls on the poor classes.

He echoed a familiar complaint by saying: "If the young man doesn't have the means or the academic ability to go to college, then he gets drafted."

What is needed now is a practical proposal for making conscription fair to all, if it is to be retained, but nobody has come up with it yet.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, in the hopes of encouraging a trend by Members of Congress toward the full public disclosure of their assets, income, and other related matters, and in keeping with similar reports made by a number of my colleagues, I am reporting herein the pertinent data with regard to my own finances. I express the hope that this Congress will act speedily to adopt reasonable standards of ethical conduct for all Members of Congress and that these standards will include the disclosure of their significant financial holdings.

I own approximately 3,250 shares of stock in Monarch Savings & Loan Association, 2201 North Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif., a business which I organized in 1960 and served as president of until elected to Congress. I currently serve as vice president and as a director of this association. My holdings are approximately 5 percent of the total stock issued.

I own 1,500 shares of stock in Pan-American National Bank, 3626 East First Street, Los Angeles, Calif., a business which I assisted in organizing in 1964. My holdings are 1½ percent of the total stock issued.

Both of the above businesses are in my congressional district. I have no other stock holdings of any significance.

I own a home in the District of Columbia. I have no other real estate holdings.

My congressional salary represents about 90 percent of my total personal income.

My wife has been continuously employed in my congressional office since my election to Congress. Her salary for 1966 was $11,747.60, and for the full period of her employment has averaged approximately $9,600 per year.

UNIFORM COMPLIANCE TO STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, because I feel that there is a need for uniform compliance to standards of conduct, I wish to express my support for a strict code of ethics to be followed in the House of Representatives. I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD the text of a report I have just made to my district related to my feelings in this regard. The report follows:

Impending action by the House of Representatives concerning Representative Adam Clayton Powell has dominated the scene in Washintgon this week. There is no real controversy over whether or not the former Chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor went too far. He undoubtedly has violated certain standards of conduct in the eyes of his fellow Members of Congress. The difficulty seems to be in determining just what these standards are—and, in the end, what they should be.

I certainly would agree that Powell did not act in a proper manner by maintaining his estranged wife on his payroll at a figure of more than $20,000 when she was doing no work and was living in Puerto Rico. The fact that she apparently was not even receiving the salary checks is even more damning, but the propriety of the situation would not be changed if she had.

The question then arises—at what point does "nepotism," the hiring of relatives, become unacceptable conduct? For instance, should President Kennedy have been prevented from appointing his brother Robert as Attorney General?

I have a special concern in the determination of these standards because, as is well known, I have employed my wife in my Congressional office since I was elected to Congress more than 4 years ago. In my own particular case, I feel that she has been one of my most hardworking and conscientious employees. She is one of more than 50 relatives working for various Congressmen in 1966. This situation has always been public knowledge and there has been no attempt to hide it. My constituents have benefited, of course, in a way that Adam Clayton Powell's constituents in Harlem have not benefited, since they were receiving no services as a result of his wife's employment.

The word "nepotism" is commonly misused, however. Webster's Dictionary describes it as "favoritism shown to a relative on a basis of relationship." This means that an individual is hired for a job *because* he is a relative—rather than a relative being hired *because he can do the job*.

Well, I think we would all agree that the trouble with Congressmen hiring relatives is that there seems to be a great temptation to abuse the privilege by a few—and, I would add, I believe this number to be quite small.

Nevertheless, the Powell situation indicates a need for corrective action. In disagreeing with the original action taken against Congressman Powell, I stated that I felt that it was necessary to establish reasonable standards of ethics for *all Congressmen* to follow and, then, to enforce them impartially. If he is punished and the matter is then dropped, without adoption of measures that would prevent similar situations from arising, I would feel that we were being most unfair.

Let us learn a lesson from Adam Clayton Powell. Since I did not see any way in which Congress could satisfactorily determine whether a relative is earning his or her pay in a Congressional office or not, I am fully supporting a Code of Ethics that would prohibit the hiring of close relatives by a Congressman. This would have to be a code that would be applied universally to all. It would prevent the punishment of one man who might appear to be "most guilty," while others, who may be "less guilty," stand in judgment of their colleague.

Other points in the Code of Ethics we should adopt are pointed up by the Powell case, the "Bobby" Baker case, and the accusations against Senator Thomas Dodd. They include prohibition of any profit as the result of legislation, prevention of misuse of the franking privilege, and a ban on the use of Federal airplanes, automobiles, communications or accommodations for private purposes.

This Code would also prohibit travel or reimbursement of expenses while on personal business, bar House Members and their employees from participating in joint ventures with lobbyists, and require full reporting of all income from all sources in the *Congressional Record* each year. Compliance with all applicable laws concerning campaign practices and expenditures would be required, as well as full attendance to business for a full week while Congress is in session.

I will support and vote for this entire Code of Ethics and urge my colleagues to adopt it. As a voluntary step in this direction, I have placed a statement of my financial assets and income in the *Congressional Record*.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION WEEK IN TEXAS

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] may extent his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, 1967, the 50th anniversary of the signing of the first National Vocational Education Act by President Woodrow Wilson will be observed. In an official memorandum signed by Gov. John Connally, of Texas, the week of February 19 through 25 has been proclaimed Vocational Education Week in Texas. The Texas Vocational Homemaking Teachers Association, whose membership totals more than 72,000 in our State, was instrumental in securing the Governor's proclamation, which follows:

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM BY JOHN CONNALLY, GOVERNOR OF TEXAS

GREETINGS: In the changing world of work, more and more young people in our schools are becoming aware of the importance of occupational training. Emphasis on providing an adequate force of skilled labor to meet tomorrow's reality is greater than ever. Within the high schools, the vocational-technical schools, the community colleges, the whole of education itself, a new era has begun—an era in which our rapidly expanding technology will reach into every community and every life.

For all of us, the changing world of work will have great meaning. Vocational educators in the schools of Texas are engaged in the vital task of training our youth and adults for leadership roles and careers in agriculture, distribution and marketing, home economics, office occupations, and industry.

It is most fitting to call attention to the efforts of our educational system to meet tomorrow's challenge. It is also proper to salute the young people and the older people, alike, who are seeking vocational and technical training so that they will be prepared for their tomorrow.

Therefore, I, as Governor of Texas, do hereby designate the week of February 19–25, 1967, as Vocational Education Week in Texas, and commend its observance to the citizens of our state.

In official recognition whereof, I hereby affix my signature this 13th day of February, 1967.

JOHN CONNALLY,
Governor of Texas.

NATIONAL GUARD TECHNICIANS

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, last September when H.R. 17195, the Reserve Forces bill of rights, was on the floor for consideration, I rose in support of the measure. I was particularly interested in title II of the act which dealt with the status of National Guard technicians. As a matter of fact, I introduced companion legislation to title II.

As you will recall, the House passed H.R. 17195 by an overwhelming majority. Unfortunately, however, the bill was pigeonholed in the Senate.

In January, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] reintroduced H.R. 17195 as H.R. 2, and I reintroduced my proposals on the status of the technicians. It was particularly gratifying to me on Monday of this week when the House once again saw fit to pass the measure by a vote of 324 to 13.

During floor consideration last September, I presented in some detail the plight that our technicians, particularly in New York State, find themselves in. With your permission, I would like to include those remarks at this point because I feel they place the problem in better perspective.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to join my colleagues in support of H.R. 17195, the Reserve Forces Bill of Rights and Vitalization Act and the National Guard Technicians Benefits Act.

I address my remarks especially to title II of this bill, that portion dealing with the status of technicians employed by the Army and Air National Guards. One of the first groups to seek my assistance shortly after I came to this Congress in January of 1965 represented our National Guard technicians. I was informed at that time that these men, both employees and at the same time members of the National Guard, were seeking congressional action to determine exactly who their employer was. They described to me a situation wherein neither the Federal Government nor the several States was willing to acknowledge them as employees.

The technicians are hired and fired by the State adjutants general, but their numbers and compensation are fixed by the Federal Government, they care for Federal property, they are paid directly by Federal finance officers from Federal appropriations, and they are governed in the main by Federal regulations. However, the Comptroller General of the United States has consistently ruled that National Guard technicians are not Federal employees. On the one hand, the Department of Labor considers the technicians covered by the Federal Employees Compensation Act, but on the other hand, the Supreme Court of the United States has held that they are not Federal employees within the meaning of the Federal Tort Claims Act. In my own State of New York, the courts there have held that the National Guard technicians are not State employees for purposes of the State's civil service laws. This situation is intolerable, and title II of this bill will make it clear that the technicians are, in law as well as in fact, employees of the U.S. Government.

In my judgment, the failure in the past to clearly define the status of the civilian technicians makes its greatest impact in the area of those normal fringe benefits which all of us have come to consider as part and parcel of civilized employment. At the present time New York's National Guard technicians are neither employees of the Federal Government nor employees of the State. Consequently they receive no protection for old age from either Federal or State retirement systems. Fortunately, the Federal Government does pick up the tab for the employer's share of the social security tax, and so the technician does have social security protection. In addition to this, they do receive retirement credits as a result of their military service. For the technicians, these benefits are payable at age 60 on the basis of 20 or more years of military service. For example, a sergeant major, E–9 rating, will receive $1,600 per year after 2 years of active duty and 18 years of nonregular creditable service. Consider also the E–7 rating, the old master sergeant, with 2 years of active duty and 18 years of National Guard duty, he will receive $720 per year. With 28 years of National Guard duty his retirement income will amount to $1,224 per year. My point here is that the civilian technician in New York, when he retires or is fired because he can no longer qualify for membership in the National Guard, has only this military retirement to live on until he becomes eligible for social security. This sort of thing is unreasonable and unjust, and title II will provide the necessary relief.

The National Guard ciivlian technician plays an important part in the military readiness of the Guard. The technicians constitute the full-time nucleus of key personnel assigned to the Guard. I feel that it is important that the Congress recognize the essentially Federal functions performed by the technicians by acting to declare that these dedicated men are employees of the United States, and as such, they are entitled to all the rights and benefits enjoyed by other Federal employees.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me reiterate my fond hope that the Senate will see fit to respond affirmatively to the needs of our dedicated National Guard technicians and will accord them the measure of respect which they so richly deserve.

RIO GRANDE SALINITY PROBLEM

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, while I was recently in Mexico attending the Seventh Interparliamentary Conference with Members of the Mexican Congress, President Johnson announced conclusion of an agreement with Mexico for a solution to the Rio Grande salinity problem. President Johnson's statement is carried in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

In the course of daily affairs, accomplishments of this nature pass almost unnoticed, except by those directly benefited, many of whom, in this instance are my constituents living in the fertile and fruitful lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas.

The problem was simple but the solution very difficult. For several years highly saline drainage from a Mexican irrigation project entered the Rio Grande above the points where water is diverted for the irrigation of about 580,000 acres in the United States. During the relatively frequent periods of low flows, this drainage made the river so saline that it threatened damage to seedlings, citrus, and salt-sensitive vegetables. Yet by treaty Mexico had the right to use the river to convey water belonging to it.

There were here the ingredients of a major international dispute. Instead of permitting them to develop, however, the International Boundary and Water Commission set about trying to find a mutually satisfactory means to avoid a dispute and find a solution to the problem. That it did so is now evident to all.

President Johnson has properly thanked the many Members of the Congress who made it possible for our Government to move quickly in adopting the solution recommended by the Commission.

It is my privilege to add my thanks particularly to our colleagues, the gentleman from New York, Representative ROONEY, and the gentleman from Alabama, Representative SELDEN. Additionally, I want to express my personal gratitude and the appreciation of the whole Texas lower Rio Grande Valley to the U.S. Commissioner on that Commission, Joseph F. Friedkin, and his able counterpart in Mexico, David Herrera Jordan.

Mr. Herrera is a devoted public servant—an able representative of his country—and yet always the perfect gentleman when discussing and deliberating the problems affecting our two countries and their mutual borders.

Mr. Herrera represents the best interests of his country to the fullest extent—with dignity and with courage—and he still has that so often aspired-for sense of practicability that ultimately is the ingredient most responsible for successful solutions to distasteful problems. We on this side of the border, as a symbol of respect and of admiration, salute him for a job well done.

And, of course, our own U.S. Commissioner Friedkin is well known to many Members of the House as a public servant in whom they have complete confidence and trust. Only a few of us have had the pleasure and satisfaction of working directly and closely with him. Only a few of us are aware of the long days and nights he spends at his desk—his tireless willingness to travel repeatedly the 2,000 miles of boundary that are entrusted to his care to go wherever he can be helpful—his conscientious devotion to the highest calls of duty—and the initiative and imagination with which he approaches every problem, determined to find a solution and present it to the President and to the Congress as quickly and ably as he can.

In the executive branch, few enjoy wider respect among their colleagues than Joe Friedkin. Among fellow engineers, he has earned a reputation for originality and attention to detail. I am told that it has been said in a committee of the Congress that if Joe Friedkin says it, we can rely on it. I know that in my district he is admired and praised. In Mexico, in the country with whose officials he must negotiate, he has won the same confidences and trust that he enjoys at home.

I will not burden the RECORD with a recitation of Joe Friedkin's many other accomplishments along the border with

Mexico. I will merely say, as I have been glad to say before, "Thank you, Commissioner Friedkin, for all your very fine work."

The President's statement follows:

Statement by the President, February 10, 1967

The Governments of the United States and Mexico have approved an agreement for a solution to the Rio Grande salinity problem recommended by the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico.

President Diaz Ordaz of Mexico joined with me in December 1965 in announcing the recommendations made by the Commission. The project consists of a canal to be constructed through the territory of Mexico to convey highly saline drainage from its Morillo Drain to existing drainage channels in that country, and thence to the Gulf of Mexico. The two countries will divide equally the costs of construction, operation and maintenance, and supervise the project through the International Commission.

Both of our Governments moved quickly to adopt the recommendations and start construction. Within less than a year, Congress enacted and I approved authorizing legislation, funds were appropriated for this country's half of the construction costs, and I was able to inform the Mexican Government that the United States was ready to proceed.

Meanwhile, Mexico completed its arrangements. Since construction will be entirely in Mexico, that Government made the detailed designs, arranged for rights of way, and organized construction work. Mexico has begun initial construction, and plans to complete the project early in 1968.

When the new works are in operation, the harmful drainage will no longer enter the river. Those who make their homes on both sides of the river will have better water. Their crops and lands will be free from dangerous concentrations of salts.

I personally thank the many members of the Congress who made it possible for us to move so quickly in the adoption of this solution to a difficult international problem. I congratulate the people in the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas who waited patiently while this solution was being developed, who responded so readily to the call for their advice and money, and who will soon enjoy the fruits of our joint labors with their neighbors to the south.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Helstoski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to the Estonian people as they commemorate the anniversary of Estonian independence. On February 24, 1918, almost a half century ago, the Estonian Diet proclaimed its country's autonomy.

The taste of freedom had not been granted to these resilient people for seven centuries. Their soil had served as a battleground for militant crusaders and invaders from many avaricious countries. Yet with each alleviation of the suppressor's hand, Estonian culture and nationalism flourished.

During the latter part of the 19th century, although Estonia was under Russian rule, a movement of national awakening swept through the Estonian countryside. Literary, theatrical, and musical groups sprang up, and their prolific works were distinctly flavored with Estonian nationalism.

The fall of the czarist regime in 1917 was followed by a period of chaos throughout the Russian territories. Lenin announced his recognition of the "right of Russia's peoples to free self-determination—including secession and establishment of independent states." The sense of that proclamation was reiterated on February 2, 1920, with the signing of the Tartu Peace Treaty. The war had ended, and the stage was set for a stable Estonian political structure.

The tone of the interwar period was liberal and creative. Governmental defects were acknowledged and amended readily. Similarly, the economic, religious, educational, and cultural sectors were reorganized to conform to the atmosphere of enlightenment, flexibility, and experimentation. Prosperity and tranquillity seemed to be in the offing.

The decade leading up to World War II saw numerous subtle Soviet encroachments on the determined Estonians. Thus, Molotov's scheme to place Estonia under the Soviet sphere of influence in his pact with Hitler was no surprise. The vulnerable Estonian arm was again twisted when Estonia was coerced to sign a mutual assistance treaty—a deceptive device by which the Soviet Union physically and quasi-legally overwhelmed the Estonians, who by then had been intimidated into submission.

Twenty-two years of freedom had nurtured and entrenched Estonian attitudes, customs, and institutions. Seeking to present a facade of voluntary revolution to the outside world, the Soviet leaders used every conceivable means of force to expunge nationalism from Estonian life. Following the war, Estonians were subjected to severe and brutal pressures for Russification of their country.

Midnight arrests, murder, and mass deportations were terroristic methods by which the Estonian country and its people were stripped of their nationalistic tendencies. Religious activity was curtailed and those participating were professionally condemned. The advanced, independent educational system, long the pride of the intellectual Estonian people, was completely revamped. Emphasis was shifted from the indigenous western orientation to Marxism-Leninism, the basis of Communist dogma. As the Soviet need for scientific and industrial knowledge grew, the active and fruitful cultural community was stifled, and often persecuted.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I could tell you that the situation today in Estonia is different, that the freedom so cherished by the Estonian people has been restored to them. Unfortunately, I cannot. From the little information released from Estonia, we see indications of a slightly higher standard of living and a greater awareness of Western influences than are found in Russia.

The crime, however, is that the Estonian people, whose immeasurable potential for cultural and political development, as evidenced during those 22 years of independence, is suppressed to such a tremendous degree. I thrill to think how rich could be their contributions to the world if they were free. And I bemoan their hapless plight as captives of the Soviet Union. In hopes for their eventual release from the bonds of imperialism, I extend to them my heartfelt support.

HON. EDWARD M. KENNEDY AT 35: A YOUNG SENATOR AT WORK

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the senior Senator from Massachusetts, the Honorable Edward M. Kennedy, observed his 35th birthday yesterday, February 22. I know I speak for my colleagues in wishing Senator Kennedy a happy birthday and many years of successful and fruitful accomplishments in public life. Miss Isabelle McCaig of the United Press International has written an interesting story on Senator Kennedy at 35. With permission granted, I place this article, which appeared in the Springfield, Mass., Daily News on Tuesday, February 21, with my remarks at this point in the Record:

Edward Kennedy: A Young Senator at Work

(By Isabelle McCaig)

Washington.—Ted Kennedy turns 35 Wednesday, a far more mature and forceful politician than in his first campaign which was marked by jokes that his mother flipped a coin over whether to send him to summer camp or the U.S. Senate.

The Democratic senator from Massachusetts now tells such jokes himself, showing flashes of the dry wit for which his brother, the late President John F. Kennedy, was famous.

If he ever feels overshadowed by his hard-driving brother, Bobby. it doesn't show.

Without denying the closeness of his famous family, Edward Moore Kennedy goes his own way, entering deeper and deeper into the complex fields of foreign relations, domestic crime, poverty, the draft and refugee problems.

He also has shouldered the many problems of the tumultuous Democratic state party in Massachusetts.

"Each year you are here your feeling for involved issues increases," Kennedy said in an interview as two photographers snapped photographs of him for a charcoal sketch.

"Foreign policy may seem somewhat remote to the people in the state," he continued, swiveling in his chair for a front view shot. "They have to be reminded of the importance of Southeast Asia and Vietnam.

"I try to write to the parents of boys who are lost. Each week there are six or seven. It is an awful reminder but it stresses again the importance of foreign affairs."

Although he is convinced President Johnson will run in 1968, the younger Kennedy declined to be drawn out on the outcome.

"It's hard to say accurately what will happen. The race will sharpen when the Republicans settle on one man.

"The President is coping with extremely difficult problems in Vietnam and the domestic economy."

PREDICTS STATE WIN

Kennedy did predict Johnson will win in Massachusetts.

A secretary darted in to say that Robert Kennedy was on the phone. As his brother's voice boomed over the telephone, the senator excused himself to take the call in another room.

The two talk to each other often but don't consult for purposes of joining together on current issues.

His interests this year center on an investigation of the draft and how military service prepares young men for civilian employment; a look at migratory labor problems in the Southwest; and expansion of the neighborhood health centers, pioneered at Boston's Columbia Point housing project.

Still confined to a stiff back brace as result of his near fatal plane crash during the 1964 election campaign, the husky Kennedy relaxes with swimming and painting.

Ted Kennedy travels to Massachusetts about one day a week where he meets with small groups, frequently from Harvard, to talk over state and national problems.

His introduction of a three-part crime program last week stemmed in part from the suggestions of Prof. Sheldon Glueck after Harvard held a seminar to make business management techniques available to local police officials.

HARD WORKERS

Kennedy's 23-member Washington staff under administrative aide Dave Burke had put considerable effort into the legislation and accompanying speech.

But everything that emanates from his office shows care and thought. Kennedy waited 16 months to make his maiden speech in the Senate after winning election in 1962, just a month past his 30th birthday, the legal age requirement for senators.

A watercolor he did of the view from his father's Cape Cod home at Hyannis was the Christmas card chosen by Kennedy and his lovely blonde wife, Joan last year.

1967 will bring a new addition to his family and maybe a new home. His wife is expecting their third child in June. They expect to break ground on a three-level home in McLean, Va., this spring.

The House, to be built on 200-foot high bluffs overlooking the Potomac River, will be a mile from his brother's Hickory Hill home and next door to Merrywood, the home where Mrs. John F. Kennedy grew up.

AN R.F.K. SUB

The brothers are the first to serve in the Senate since 1800 and there Ted is senior. Both sit on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

Ted substitutes for his brother on occasion, once to considerable embarrassment. He addressed a group of students here when Bobby couldn't make it and used part of the text the New York Senator had delivered to students in California last October. A national television network made the most of it, contrasting the two speeches paragraph by paragraph.

Nonplussed, Ted said he was a stand-in for his brother so thought it natural to use some of his words.

The brothers share the Boston accents of their late brother, his characteristic use of the phrase, "in my judgment," and even some of his finger-jabbing to drive home a point. They are a magic drawing card in the Senate.

WHEN LIGHTS GO

Many a committee chairman finds television cameras spotlighting a routine hearing when a Kennedy arrives, only to see the lights go out when the brother departs.

Though widely sought for speeches throughout the country, the younger Kennedy is "trying to keep them at an absolute minimum."

Like the astute politician he is, he wants to spend any time he has away from Congress in his home state.

His blue pin-stripe suit jacket draped over the back of a chair, he talked in shirtsleeves of how politics brings him close to the people.

With the glamor of his name and the charm of his personality, there are many who think he can't get close enough.

CONGRESSMAN JOHN E. FOGARTY WANTED THE BEST FOR THE LEAST AMONG US

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Commissioner Mary E. Switzer of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has written a moving tribute to our late beloved colleague, Congressman John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island.

What will Congress be like without John Fogarty of Rhode Island?

Asks Commissioner Switzer in the commendable and perceptive article which appears in the current issue of Rehabilitation Record.

In mourning him, we glow at the same time in the contemplation of his life and what it symbolized for America. His achievements have been widely recognized for what they have done to promote the Nation's health and welfare.

Mr. Speaker, with permission granted I place Commissioner Switzer's tribute to John Fogarty with my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

JOHN FOGARTY—"HE WANTED THE BEST FOR THE LEAST AMONG US"

What will Congress be like without John Fogarty of Rhode Island? In mourning him, we glow at the same time in the contemplation of his life and what it symbolized for America. His achievements have been widely recognized for what they have done to promote the Nation's health and welfare. Those who participate in the adulation given him seldom know—or if they do, fully realize—the combination of qualities that makes this success story. First, the broad human sympathy that made the boy who had to struggle for his place in the sun want the best for the least among us. But this would not bring about the health research, the facilities for the mentally retarded, the consistent growth of rehabilitation, and all of the other programs that are monuments to his career.

His skill as a committee chairman, as a master in handling appropriations and legislation, both in committee and on the floor of the Congress, has meant the difference between success and failure. Vocational rehabilitation knows this, for his skill as a minority member on the floor many years ago saved our program by one vote. As the majority head of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, handling Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, his ability to work with the minority and to bring his Republican colleagues along has been a satisfaction to them and a gain for all the programs of the two departments.

For this, he has been honored over and over, but of all these honors, the one that means most to the rehabilitation community is the President's Award of the National Rehabilitation Association—the highest award the rehabilitation workers of the country, through their organization can give to one who shares their concern for the disabled men, women, and children of our country. This award was presented in Providence, R.I., in September 1958. What I said at that ceremony is even more appropriate now:

"I have had reason to be especially appreciative—both personally and officially—for the understanding support he has given in his various capacities on the Appropriations Committee, both as a minority member and as Chairman. Our whole Department, from the Secretary down, shares in this debt to him. We feel he not only represents his constituency here in Rhode Island, but all America, for he is committed to forward-looking, worthwhile programs in medical research, public health, hospital construction, social welfare, education, and rehabilitation.

"Of course, we have come to take for granted his broad humanitarian interests, his ability to see into the future and to provide the resources to meet the country's needs. But in doing this I wonder if we realize how difficult has been the setting in which he has accomplished his remarkable achievements. It is not always easy to secure the passage of constructive legislation. A member of the Appropriations Committee—and particularly a chairman of an important subcommittee such as the Committee for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare which Mr. Fogarty heads—has to consider the extent of his support in the light of many difficult, almost impossible alternatives. He has to be cognizant of the economic condition of the country, of the fiscal policies of the Nation, of the demands upon the national budget and the treasury—and he has to do all these things objectively and with wise concern for the broad interests of our people.

"I think that a public official such as I, who comes before Mr. Fogarty's Committee over the years, admires the wonderfully human and warm reception that we get in an appropriation setting. But what is even more important, Mr. Fogarty has a quality all too rare in the world today—a quality of inner integrity which makes him objective, honorable, and fine in his dealings with all of us. No matter how much he likes an official personally, or believes in the program which that official represents, he is never diverted from seeking the pertinent facts and making the probing inquiry, which assures that his Committee has the information necessary to make a sound judgment. This quality of courage and character is an indispensable ingredient in the responsible promotion of the kind of programs for which we owe so much to John Fogarty. His deep humanity—his broad look on the world horizon—these are infinitely more precious because he has the integrity and inner spirit to honestly pursue his responsibilities."—MARY E. SWITZER.

ADMIRAL HINES DISPLAYS COURAGE AFTER HEARING SON, CAPT. RALPH E. HINES, IS KILLED IN VIETNAM

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, last Monday night, Rear Adm. John F. Hines, U.S. Navy, retired, the president of

American International College in Springfield, Mass., fulfilled a convocation address commitment at the Cambridge School of Boston only hours after learning the tragic news that his son, Capt. Ralph E. Hines, U.S. Marine Corps, had been killed in Vietnam.

Admiral Hines, with tears in his eyes, told the audience "it's what my son would have wanted me to do."

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Admiral Hines for this great display of courage, which has been cited in the New England newspapers, and to offer to him and Mrs. Hines, and to Captain Hines' widow and 2-year-old son, Scott, my profound sympathy on the loss of Captain Hines, who gave his life for his country. With permission granted, I include with my remarks at this point stories from the Springfield Daily News of February 20 on the loss of Captain Hines, and February 21 on Admiral Hines' courage in a tragic hour:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, Feb. 20, 1967]

ADMIRAL HINES' SON KILLED IN VIETNAM

Capt. Ralph E. Hines, USMC, 29, son of Rear Adm. John F. Hines, president of American International College, and Mrs. Hines, has been killed in combat in Vietnam. He had been there since Oct. 1, 1966.

Capt. Hines was married in March, 1963, to Elizabeth Florence Perry daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth W. Perry of Farmington Rd., Longmeadow. Mr. Perry is vice-president of Massachusetts Mutual Insurance Co.

Capt. and Mrs. Hines have a son, Scott, who will be two years old July 13. Mrs. Hines and their son currently live at Camp Pendleton, Calif.

In addition to his parents, wife and son, Capt. Hines leaves a brother, John F., Jr. of this city.

DETAILS NOT RELEASED

Details have not yet been released regarding the time or circumstances of Capt. Hines' death, except that he was killed in combat.

Capt. Hines was a graduate of Talbot Academy, Marion. He attended Duke University, Durham, N.C., and was graduated from American International College in 1961. His father presented him his Marine Corps second lieutenant's commission at commencement.

He was grandson of the late Adm. Ralph Earle, a former president of Worcester Polytechnic Institute, and the late Mrs. Earle.

In his senior year at AIC, Capt. Hines was listed in "Who's Who in American Colleges and Universities."

Adm. and Mrs. Hines live at 130 Arlington Rd., Longmeadow.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, Feb. 21, 1967]

ADMIRAL HINES: HIS FINEST HOUR

BOSTON.—It takes many qualities to rise to the rank of rear admiral in the Navy. Only a few persons do it.

Rear Admiral (Ret.) John F. Hines, president of American International College in Springfield, showed some of the courage such men are made of Monday night.

Scheduled to address the convocation of the Cambridge School of Boston at the John Hancock Hall, he learned shortly beforehand his son—Marine Capt. Ralph Hines, 28—had been killed while fighting in South Vietnam. Hines said he would continue his speech as planned.

There were tears in his eyes, but the admiral told his audience "it's what my son would have wanted me to do." His personal tragedy was not revealed until toward the end of the program.

Hines urged the graduates to use their "brains and talent" to follow wisely in the footsteps of those who have gone before.

When his son's death was revealed, the audience hushed, then tendered the admiral a five-minute standing ovation. He thanked them, said he was "truly honored," and stayed on stage for the rest of the program.

TREATY WILL NOT STOP NUCLEAR SPREAD OR ENHANCE SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago Members of Congress received from the State Department a 336-page volume entitled "Treaties in Force," listing over 4,600 treaties and other international agreements of the United States, effective at the beginning of this year. If, as the Johnson administration repeatedly states, treaties are so vital to the Nation's security and the peace of the world, one would think that this volume of international arrangements would see us in safer, more secure, and less warlike times than we now experience. Our total defense expenditures for the next fiscal year will run close to $78 billion, just short of World War II's peak of $81 billion. Vietnam casualty rolls continue to mount and there are ominous rumblings of strife elsewhere on the globe. Perhaps the problem is that the administration sees in the 4,600 treaties and agreements—and in many more which it proposes to negotiate—far greater opportunity for resolving international differences than is actually and realistically there.

Despite the harsh lessons of Potsdam, Yalta, and many other sites of disillusionment, Lyndon Baines Johnson's particularly potent passion for pacific palaver, pledges, pacts, and protocols painfully persists. The proposed nonproliferation treaty is a case in point. President Johnson has characterized the threat of nuclear spread as the "gravest of all unresolved human issues." He and his nuclear pacifist advisors see treaty promises as a sure means to halt the spread of nuclear weapons and thereby enhance U.S. security. They regard the vision of Americans who see possibilities that these treaties may neither halt, spread, nor enhance security as myopic. Shrugged off is the glaring fact that two-fifths of the nuclear powers, France and Red China, haughtily boycott the treaty negotiations, will refuse to take the pledge against proliferating their weapons, and remain free to do so should the notion strike them. Disregarded is the fact that some of the countries most capable of going nuclear on their own are showing less and less enthusiasm about tangling-up their future existence with a lot of other peoples' promises which can turn hollow. India is an example. When viewed realistically, the proposed treaty actually shows small likelihood of preventing significant nuclear spread.

Nor, when viewed realistically through the eyes of the nuclear "have-nots" who would sign the treaty, does there appear to be a genuine rather than an illusory possibility of enhancing U.S. security. Whether or not the "have-nots" possess any independent capability of their own to go nuclear, they believe they are giving up a "right" to do so and therefore should bargain to force the three-fifths of the nuclear "haves," the United States, the United Kingdom, and the U.S.S.R., to give up something in exchange. They talk in terms of "further concrete disarmament steps," and of "outlawing" nuclear weapons and of "extending" the test ban to underground tests. Any and all such moves would have the United States giving up the most and, sooner or later, would diminish our capability to deter a Soviet surprise attack, thereby increasing the risk of a world conflagration. They are the kind of moves which, because the Soviet Union can rely much more heavily on conventional military manpower than the United States, tend to weight the scales in Soviet favor.

At the same time, and in the face of a move threatening to weaken our capabilities, these same nuclear "have-nots" are demanding from the United States protection against aggressors, and the President is promising it. He guarantees that countries not going nuclear "will have our strong support against nuclear blackmail." How dangerous and risky to America will this nebulous Sir Gallahad role come to be? It is likely to turn out a far greater threat to U.S. security than a world without a nonproliferation treaty. It makes little sense to exchange one set of dreary circumstances for another which is even more dire—to jump from a frying pan into the fire. We could be triggered into crisis after crisis—confrontation after confrontation—by pleas to honor our promises to help.

When one takes a look at the nonproliferation treaty through the Kremlin's eyes instead of "boycott" eyes, "have-not" eyes, or Johnson administration eyes, the outlook is even more startling, shocking, and frightening. I intend to discuss that subject in the near future.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I have read with great admiration the series of statements the gentleman from California has been making regarding the treaty now under consideration at Geneva. It is my view he has made a great contribution in making these statements and pointing out the hazards which lie in that treaty, not only to U.S. interests but also to the interests of every other nation of the world. I am especially concerned about the adverse effects which may flow from this treaty to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which, in my view, is the most essential alliance institution we have.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman for his statement. I noted that only last week the gentleman from Ohio called upon the President to delay these treaty negotiations pending the satisfaction of the countries of NATO, which are our allies, as to whether or not, indeed, following such a treaty there could be an adequate defense of Europe against the threat of Soviet aggression. I intend to discuss that particular subject on Monday next.

NUCLEAR TEST DETECTION—BACKGROUND DATA FOR PUBLIC, EDITORS, AND WRITERS

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, wire service stories on December 21, 1966, claimed, with attribution to Pentagon officials:

> The United States has vastly increased its ability to detect, identify and locate underground nuclear test blasts inside Russia.

For the record I would like to make clear what the situation is with regard to detection and identification of underground nuclear explosions.

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have continued to follow actively, as has the committee, the research program known as Vela underground on the detection and identification of underground nuclear explosions. While the most recent executive hearing was held on June 21, 1966, in which members of the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency testified, we have continued in the committee to receive classified information as up to date as possible.

On October 20, 1966, the gentleman from California, Representative HOLIFIELD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, reported to the House of Representatives on the activities of the committee. In this report he stated:

> The Joint Committee believes that while progress in seismic research has been made since 1963, no adequate basis exists for the monitoring of a comprehensive test ban treaty without adequate numbers and types of on-site inspection.

I wholeheartedly subscribe to this conclusion and know of no information within the Department of Defense or any other executive branch agency with regard to research developments which would refute the committee's conclusion.

As I have pointed out above, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has closely followed the U.S. program—Vela—to improve the detection and identification of underground explosions. In the committee's hearings of March 1963 we heard testimony that the number of unidentified events in the Soviet Union above seismic magnitude 4 could be reduced to about 30 if we had a system of large array stations around the world and a workable system of ocean-bottom seismometers.

Subsequent to these hearings, on April 1, 1963, the United States and the United Kingdom, taking into consideration the use of improved national seismic systems and automatic seismic stations inside the territory of nuclear powers, proposed at Geneva the acceptance of an annual quota of seven on-site inspections in the territory of each nuclear power.

On September 14, 1965, Ambassador Foster at the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Conference, in discussing the application of a worldwide system of large seismic arrays to the identification problem stated:

> Our estimate is that in the Soviet Union, for example, about forty-five underground events [above seismic magnitude 4.0] in an average year would still remain unidentified as earthquakes even if no underground tests occurred. The number forty-five could be reduced somewhat by using ocean-bottom seismometers to eliminate from the list some of the Soviet earthquakes which occur nearby in the Pacific Ocean.[1]

The Joint Committee has received classified information on the Vela program as recently as November 1966. The information available to us would not indicate that our identification capabilities, as quoted by Mr. Foster in Geneva in September 1965, have improved significantly. There may be different methods of achieving the same results. However, there is no improvement known to the Joint Committee which would put the capabilities at a higher estimate than that which was made in front of the Joint Committee in open hearings in March of 1963.

I do not know of anything that has significantly changed since 1963. I believe it is necessary to put the fact into the public record that the situation has not changed for the better. Contrarily, it has changed for the worse.

Decoupling of an underground nuclear explosion in a subsurface cavity definitely was demonstrated by the sterling shot fired December 3, 1966, by the AEC in Mississippi. The Defense Department's advanced research projects agency has released details on the extent of decoupling possibilities determined by the experiment.

Decoupling is the isolation of much of the shock of an underground explosion by conducting it in a cavity. Explosive shock waves are cut off from the surrounding earth by the presence of a dampening air barrier.

Resulting seismic effects are considerably reduced. Signals of much smaller magnitude for any given kilotonnage yield are emanated when an underground test shot is decoupled compared to when it merely is buried in the ground. There is a reduction in seismic signals, particularly in the lower frequencies, on which detection systems must depend for distant discovery of underground nuclear events.

Decoupling reduces by a large magnitude the ability of seismic monitoring networks to discover underground tests. Chances of picking up a decoupled underground cheat test are 100 to 200 times less likely.

The theoretical possibility of decoupling was conceived by Dr. Albert Latter of Rand Corp. It was presented by Dr. Hans Bethe of the California Institute of Technology to the Geneva Technical Conference of experts during limited test ban treaty negotiation preliminaries in 1959. Russian experts scoffed at the idea. Latter's theory showed theoretical possibilities of reducing shock effects of underground shots by a factor up to 300. Subsequent high explosive tests in underground caverns in 1961 showed, experimentally, reductions by a factor of 200.

ARPA's figures on the nuclear experiment definitely establish the very distinct possibilities for undetected cheat testing of low yield—below 20 kilotons—and even intermediate yield devices in violation of any test ban extending to the underground environment. They show a 100-fold to 200-fold reduction in seismic signals, depending upon the wave frequencies involved.

In light of these actual confirmations of dangerous possibilities for a very large hole for cheaters' refuge in such a treaty, President Johnson should withdraw the U.S. offer to extend the present limited test ban treaty barring atmospheric, exoatmospheric, and underwater nuclear tests.

Cheating was the contingency which caused us to refuse to include underground tests in the treaty in the first place. Now that undetectable cheating has been proved even more possible than before believed, there is more reason than ever to stay away from this kind of a national security trap.

PROBLEMS WHICH FLOW FROM THE PURSUIT OF NATIONALISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] is recognized for 1 hour.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on the subject matter of this special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to enable a number of Members to reassert their continuing interest in the exploration of ways in which Western nations might join hands in their common concern to maintain the dignity of the individual, to work toward the common development and the growth of self-government within and without their common areas, and to pursue the problems of war and peace in concert.

The idea of political union among nations is a dream which goes back many years. It was the dream embodied in the integration of the 13 Original Colonies into one nation. It continues as a dream of many of us who today witness the powerful forces which cause tensions between nations and exacerbate differences in national interest.

---

[1] In Mr. Foster's September 14, 1965 statement he does not define what seismic magnitude he had in mind. He does refer to an earlier presentation by him of September 2, 1965, and in this presentation Mr. Foster stated the following: "In specific terms, we estimate that given a worldwide system including large arrays all natural seismic events of a seismic magnitude of 4.0 or greater could be detected." To apply this to the Soviet Union, it is our understanding that in an average year the number of *seismic events of this size* occurring in that country which could be detected but not identified as earthquakes by this worldwide system would be about forty-five. Moreover, even then certain of those forty-five unidentified events which occurred near an ocean could be identified through the use of the ocean-bottom seismometers which I mentioned earlier." (Emphasis added.)

This discussion today is appropriate since it follows by 1 day the commemoration of the birthday of George Washington. George Washington was the Father of Our Country and he understood the need at that time of the individual States not only to assert their independence from Great Britain but to assert their mutual interdependence, that is, a dependence upon one another by uniting through a federal system.

The problems which flow from the pursuit of nationalism today are many and will be compounded as the fear flowing from the cold war recedes and national interests loom ever larger. Today we discuss with the Soviets the continuing nuclear arms race which threatens to continue and to drain away the energies of the peoples of the nations involved in that race.

Both the United States and the British will probably have to withdraw troops from Western Germany. There today in Western Germany are the faint beginnings of a resurgent nationalist party emerging. The British are beleaguered by balance-of-payment problems and difficulties ensuing from their inability thus far to gain entrance into the European Common Market.

These events point up the tragedy of man's incapacity to enlarge his horizons and embrace those political relationships within which conflicts and concerns can be resolved without international conflict.

I was in Germany recently and participated in a discussion with representatives of parliaments and political movements from other nations—from 14 nations in all. The subject of the discussion there was NATO and the Communist world.

One of the striking aspects of that discussion was the rarity with which our NATO alliance and the NATO military role was mentioned. Yet at the same time it was acknowledged that the United States had to continue to be committed to the defense of Western Europe. It was generally agreed that should the United States withdraw all of its troops from Western Europe, it would severely shift the balance of power and set in motion trends which might have the gravest consequences.

Yet NATO, as constituted today, was set up only as a framework within which the military commitment of the United States to Western Europe would be continued. It was not set in its present form as the vehicle for further diplomatic or economic enterprises between the NATO nations. So it is that as long as NATO continues as it is today, it will play only this role of continuing the U.S. military presence and of providing a framework for that presence, a need which will undoubtedly be seen as less and less demanding as time goes by.

So we must turn our attention to the future. We must look for the ways in which the peoples of the Western World in whom sovereignty ultimately resides can join through those governmental mechanisms which will submerge national interests into the higher interest.

We must have some type of international organization which will best serve the expressions of the peoples embraced in that area.

Mr. Speaker, we are today faced with the fact that the executive branch is reluctant to speak out on this subject. It is unwilling to set the mark and identify the dreams that many Americans hold.

So a particularly heavy responsibility falls on this Congress as directly representative of the people of this Nation to speak out on the need for bringing nations together to end the conflicts which stem from nationalism and to indicate our willingness to explore with others who share our democratic values the ways in which we can combine to serve our mutual interests.

And, so, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that there are Members of Congress—a bipartisan group—who feel their collective responsibility to develop this subject and to explore the ways in which we can proceed.

Mr. Speaker, last fall I received a thoughtful letter representing one thinking American's concern. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this point to insert that letter in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
November 30, 1966.

DEAR MR. FRASER: I am especially thrilled by your statement that we must "do something more imaginative, more creative." In an effort to support your work, I offer some arguments you may be able to use in some way.

There is one thing a NATO federation could do that the UNO could *not* do: it could guarantee self-government to member-nations by guaranteeing freedom of opinion, communication, association, and election to federal citizens. To perform this function, federal agencies should have the power to arrest, try, and restrain any federal citizen violating the freedom of any other federal citizen. In other words, the next Hitler could be *arrested wtihout a war.*

This may be the only feasible way to resist one-party rule, whether of the left or the right. An excellent object lesson, probably ignored by the War Colleges that indoctrinate our State Department employees, is a comparison of the histories of Czechoslvakia and the state of Kerala, India. Czechoslovakia had all the advantages considered important for self-government, but Kerala had a federal government that restored free elections without a war.

Under the UNO rules, the supporters of one-party rule can extend their territory by subverting one government at a time, in the way that involves the lowest cost to them. Multiple-party governments can always be converted into one-party governments, but one-party governments can never be converted into multiple-party governments unless there is a federal government with the power to restore free elections (with the freedom of opinion, communication, and association that is essential to real freedom of election and to that continuous self-determination that is the only true form of self-determination).

Military technology is only destructive. To be constructive, we must endow, study, develop, and apply political technology. The way to make the world safe for human life is to make its rulers responsible to their people—to ordinary life-loving people. The task of promoting and extending self-government seems to be required for survival, and federalism is the most practical instrument for this task—invented in the United States, tested around the world, and now capable of further refinements as a means of extending the rule of law without conquest or subversion. . . .

Very sincerely yours,

J. M. BRADFORD.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], a gentleman whose leadership in discussing the problems of confederation among Western nations deserves the commendation of all who are concerned with the future of our Nation and Western values.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join my friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER], in this special order, which, in a sense, launches a drive in behalf of a resolution to establish an 18-member U.S. delegation to explore with similar delegations from other NATO nations the possibility of agreement on a declaration that the eventual goal of their peoples—NATO—is to transform the present alliance into a federal union "and to establish a timetable for the transition."

The resolution last year won the endorsement of 104 House Members and was given hearings by the Foreign Affairs Committee. I am hopeful the Foreign Affairs Committee, of which Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. FRASER, and myself are members, will take early action on the resolution.

The central and usually overlooked warning in Washington's Farewell Address was that alliances are not good enough as a means of keeping free peoples together. As our first President warned, alliances are always subject to interruptions and infractions, and so it is with our latest alliance—the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Washington warned that an alliance was not good enough for the 13 original States. He said, "A government for the whole is indispensable." We should act on his advice today, for certainly a government for the whole of NATO is needed.

Union of the free nations in NATO provides the most promising way to give freedom the protective shield it needs—whether it be antiballistic missile defense or other means—and at the same time wisely meet the perplexing problem of how to arrest the proliferation of nuclear weapons on a national basis.

It provides a means through which freedom-loving people can act jointly in meeting threats to freedom to themselves and to others. Through Atlantic Union the people of NATO could speak and act as one in foreign policy, and world security problems would be greatly simplified.

Federation of the NATO nations also offers the most promising means of meeting growing monetary problems. It would certainly make sense to develop through the union government a central banking system which would banish the problem of balance of payments within the union.

Support for the resolution last year was very gratifying. Resolutions and statements of support came to the total of 104—or approximately one-fourth the total membership of the House. This in itself is notable, as few pieces of legislation ever secure such broad support in advance of action on the House floor. The support was well distributed geographically and reflected almost exactly the ratio of party strengths in the House. It was truly a bipartisan effort, as is this special order today.

In addition to support within the Congress, the resolution received impressive endorsement from other prominent citizens. This was especially true on the Republican side, because it was strongly supported in written statements by former President Eisenhower, former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, former Senator Barry Goldwater, and by Governors William Scranton, of Pennsylvania, HATFIELD, of Oregon, Rockefeller, of New York, and Romney, of Michigan. Their statements of endorsement appear in the hearings on the resolution prepared by the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

This impressive range of support from what might be called the presidential level of the Republican Party led me to predict last year that the next Republican President will work actively to establish Atlantic Union. My hope is that the presidential level of the Democratic Party will soon catch up to the Republicans in this progressive, hopeful movement, and thus those who love freedom can be assured of Presidential action for Atlantic Union regardless of which party occupies the White House.

Under the leadership of Dr. Morgan, the Foreign Affairs Committee completed extensive hearings last year on the resolution, and we are very hopeful the committee will take action at an early date to report it to the House floor.

This would indeed be an historic day.

Last week the Georgia State Senate adopted a resolution in support.

Here is the text:

GEORGIA STATE SENATE RESOLUTION 21

Relative to the creation of an Atlantic Union Delegation; and for other purposes.

Whereas, in 1969 any party may withdraw from the North Atlantic Treaty, which was ratified in 1949 as a first rather than a last step toward unity; and

Whereas, since 1949 revolutionizing scientific, technological and other advances have outstripped it and made practical union of these allies imperative for prosperity, peace, and freedom; and

Whereas, the fragmentation of the world in new nations, now when the strongest democracies cannot live alone, also requires them to build the pilot plant needed to spread liberty and union both by example, and by admitting to their union other nations desiring this and able to uphold its principles; and

Whereas, they need but unite effectively their gold and other resources behind a common currency now to assure their citizens, and the developing nations enduring monetary stability and liquidity, and prevent their disunion from ending, as in 1931, in dictator-serving crash; and

Whereas, our original states, when beset by disunion's dangers under their confederation, sent delegates to the 1787 Convention, which traced their troubles to their Confederal structure and invented Federal union, which has enduringly safeguarded member states from domination by one another, equitably apportioned among their sovereign citizens voting power on common concerns—and the benefits and burdens of union—assured each State of independent government of state affairs, met other challenges facing the Atlantic allies now, and not merely worked but proved that free peoples can thus work wonders; and

Whereas, distant though the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's transformation into a federation of the free may seem, these allies can greatly speed it now by officially declaring that Federal union, within the framework of the United Nations, is their eventual goal, setting a timetable and providing democratic means for achieving the transition in safe time.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Georgia that the Congress of the United States is urged to take favorable action upon a concurrent resolution by means of which the Congress would create an Atlantic Union Delegation authorized to organize and participate in a Convention made up of similar Delegations from such North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies as desire to join in this enterprise to explore the possibility of agreement upon a means of Atlantic Union.

Be it further resolved that the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to furnish appropriate copies of this Resolution to the United States Senators and the members of the United States House of Representatives from the State of Georgia.

Senate Resolution 21.

By: Senator Wesberry of the 37th.

Read and adopted in Senate February 13, 1967.

HAMILTON MCWHORTER, JR.,
Secretary of the Senate.
GEO. SMITH,
President of the Senate.

It is highly appropriate that the State of Georgia—one of the 13 original States in the U.S. Union—should be the first State to take initiative for Atlantic Union by this means. The resolution is believed to be the first of its kind to be approved in any State legislature, and perhaps the first such to be introduced in any State legislature.

It was moved by Georgia State Senator James P. Wesberry, Jr., who is vice president of the National Society of State Legislators and a member of the Young Citizens Committee for an Atlantic Convention and of the Advisory Council of the International Movement for Atlantic Union.

This is also significant because a U.S. Senator from Georgia, the late Walter George, was a chief sponsor of a similar resolution for Atlantic Union in 1949–50.

I am hopeful that this initiative by the Georgia State Senate will lead to other similar movements.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I join my distinguished colleagues in introducing today a resolution that would create a bipartisan Atlantic Union delegation composed of 18 eminent and respected citizens and would authorize this delegation to organize and participate in a convention with similar delegations from such North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies as desire to participate in a unified effort to reach an accord that would transform the Atlantic alliance into a federal union. In addition to exploring thoroughly the feasibility of establishing an Atlantic Union, the delegation would be directed to devise a tentative timetable for the achievement of the ultimate goal of federal union. Finally, the American blue-ribbon delegation would be charged with the responsibility of working toward a firm agreement with its counterparts on the creation those institutions requisite to the development of workable means to realize the goal of a federal union in time to save their citizens "from another war, depression, or other manmade catastrophe, and let them enjoy, as soon as possible, the greater freedom and higher moral and material blessings which federation has brought to free people in the past."

At this time, I wish to commend my colleague from Illinois and other distinguished Members of this body who have introduced similar proposals for the leadership they have demonstrated in advancing an idea that will not only mean a great deal to the future of the free world allies but will also affect the nature of their relationship with nations throughout the world.

It seems that past efforts to realize in principle and in practice the beneficial returns that will flow from a genuine Atlantic alliance have fallen short of success. Now, as before we are confronted with strong evidence that indicates that those forces determined to destroy the bastion of free world unity that stands in the way of the very real threat of Communist subversion and military aggression are making steady gains. Now is the time to reverse this tide of events. Now is the time to engage in a concerted effort to create a mechanism for the realization of a unified approach to the political, economic, and military problems that plague each and every member of the Atlantic community. I strongly urge my colleagues—Republicans and Democrats alike—to give favorable consideration to the proposition contained in this resolution for it is a significant step forward in the development of a greater degree of unity in all of the free world.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to commend our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. PAUL FINDLEY, for having arranged permission for this special order on behalf of the Atlantic Union resolution.

I know that Congressman FINDLEY's appointment to the Foreign Affairs Committee is a fortuitous one with regard to this legislation. With his dedication and energy in the cause of Atlantic unity, he can certainly do much to enhance early action on this proposal.

For myself, I am happy to have this opportunity to join my colleagues in expressing support for the Atlantic Union resolutions which have been introduced into the Congress.

As a long-time sponsor of one of these resolutions, I believe that the time has come for the Congress to take action to appoint an Atlantic Union delegation which would organize and participate in a convention made up of similar delegations from our European allies.

Almost daily, it seems, we are reminded of the problems which the events of the 1960's have brought to NATO. It becomes ever more clear that temporizing and an emphasis on short-term solutions will not cure the ills of the Atlantic alliance.

We must, rather, begin the process of reevaluating and rethinking the relationships between Europe and North America. Our study must be on a broad front, encompassing not merely economic and military matters, but the whole panoply of social, cultural, political, and historical ties between the Atlantic nations.

Such matters, I believe, can best be treated through free and open discussion among distinguished citizens of the nations involved. Out of their deliberations may well come the new consensus which will be necessary to reorder on a firmer and more functional basis the relations among the NATO states.

As former Undersecretary of State Ball once said, "we live in an era of concentration." Yet there is nothing deterministic about unity and international cooperation. Men must continually work toward such objectives, conscious of the dangers which failure would bring.

The Atlantic convention envisaged by these resolutions would provide an opportunity for the great work to be carried forward. There men of good will and high purpose could help shape the future course of history.

Let us no longer delay, therefore. Let us resolve that an Atlantic Union resolution will be passed by Congress early in this session. By taking such action, this 90th Congress could well bring upon itself the plaudits of posterity for having had the vision and initiative necessary to a better and more peaceful world.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate today in this discussion on the proposal to create a delegation to a convention of north Atlantic nations. I strongly support this proposal and have joined many of my colleagues today in introducing legislation to this effect.

I think it is important to put this modest bill in perspective. We are not asking Congress to approve an Atlantic Union. We are not even saying in this proposal that formation of an Atlantic Union is desirable. All we are saying is that this is a matter deserving the attention of official delegates of north Atlantic nations, and we hereby create such a delegation, thereby giving impetus to the calling of a north Atlantic convention.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that there are differing views as to the merits of any plan to join together the various states of the north Atlantic region in any kind of union more cohesive than the present North Atlantic Treaty Organization. However, there are very strong arguments which can be made, both from an economic and political standpoint and from a military standpoint, to warrant such a move. I think these arguments need serious and thoughtful consideration.

What we propose in this legislation is to form a delegation of 18 prominent citizens headed by our two living ex-Presidents and to give this delegation authority to organize and participate in a convention which would explore the great questions relating to formation of an Atlantic Union. Perhaps we would find, in the end, that our fellow nations of the region had no interest, and the matter would be dropped. Perhaps the convention would be held, and from it would come a recommendation that no further implementation be made. Or, just possibly, the convention would recommend to each of the participating nations that they take steps to create such a union of nations into a new entity of such military and economic strength as to assure the world of freedom from wars for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, we are living in a period of history which has known little peace. Mostly we have known wars and preparation for wars. It behooves us, I believe, to do everything in our power to break this tragic pattern. Formation of an Atlantic Union may be just the step needed, for by so doing we might create an entity so powerful in every sense that no nation or block of nations could challenge it. In place of the old balance of power—more recently known as the balance of terror—we would supply a federal union of nations so powerful that arms races would no longer make sense. If this is more than a dream, if it is an option to be entertained—and I think it is—we of this Congress have a duty to see that it is given proper attention.

Last fall, Mr. Speaker, the Arizona Republic in Phoenix published an editorial on September 6, 1966, supporting the same legislation being offered today. Without objection I shall insert it in the RECORD at this point with my remarks:

ATLANTIC UNION BILL

As even its most passionate defenders admit, the United Nations has failed to unify the forces of freedom effectively. In his celebrated article in Foreign Affairs a couple of years ago, Sen. J. William Fulbright said the U.S. must look elsewhere for such unification, to a concert of free nations.

That is the idea behind the resolution (HJR 769), supported by dozens of Democrats and Republicans in both Houses of Congress, to establish a delegation of 18 prominent citizens (with former Presidents Eisenhower and Truman as co-chairman) to organize and participate in a convention to establish an Atlantic Union of the U.S., Canada, Britain, and the nations of Western Europe.

Eisenhower, NATO's first commander in chief, is on record as strongly favoring the bill. It is also favored by conservative Sen. Barry Goldwater and liberal Gov. Nelson Rockefeller. It has congressional sponsors and announced backers from more than three dozen states.

The long range plan of the Atlantic Union is a federated union—a community of nations with a common currency, a common economic market, a common defense force, and a common foreign policy. The monetary system would be backed by gold.

The Republic has consistently opposed proposals to transform the United Nations into a supergovernment with an international peace force and all the trappings of a global power. We have opposed it because we believed—and subsequent events have proved us right—that there was simply no way for 117 vastly different nations to agree on ethical, moral, or political questions in any but the unsatisfactory method of aiming at the lowest common denominator.

An Atlantic Union, on the other hand, would involve those nations of the West which are bound together by a common belief in the dignity of individual man, and by nations which share a common ethos and legal system.

Dr. Edward Teller, professor of physics at the University of California, told the House Foreign Affairs Committee that creation of the proposed delegation would bring the U.S. to grips with "the most important active problem of our time."

There is no doubt but what it is a crucial problem, and that it deserves a favorable vote in the House and then in the Senate.

HAS NATIONAL DEFENSE BECOME OUT OF DATE?

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, in recent days we have all been hearing and reading too many claims that this country should get out of Vietnam and let the Communists take it over by force, that we should put an end to the draft and take pot luck when it comes to manning our Armed Forces, and that any effort to find out what potential enemies around the world may be plotting against us is really beneath the dignity of a humane, civilized, and up-to-date nation.

So frequent and so shrill have been these claims that one even wonders, Mr. Speaker, whether perhaps some people think it has become passé, out of date, just too square for words, for the United States of America any longer to "provide for the common defense."

I was glad this morning to see that one eloquent commentator on the public scene, Mr. William S. White, has spoken out sharply and clearly against this ridiculous and dangerous trend.

In his column in the Washington Post Mr. White makes a point that desperately needs to be made these days if current events are to be kept in proper perspective.

After all, let us never forget that we in this Congress have all taken an oath to defend our country against all enemies foreign and domestic.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the admirable column by Mr. White:

MOBISM AT LARGE—NEED WE APOLOGIZE FOR CIA EFFORT?

(By William S. White)

This nation faces a creeping crisis infinitely graver than a dozen Vietnams.

It is nothing less than this: Can constitutional and responsible government and the undoubted will of a vast, inarticulate and tolerant majority in fact be long maintained under the unexampled challenges of a tiny, bitter minority which in some cases unwittingly and in some cases with conscious purpose seeks simply to drive this country from the field in the cold war?

Even to put such a query in this rich and privileged land seems at first glance to be extreme beyond belief. But the unbelievable must sometimes be believed; for we live now in an Alice in Wonderland world.

It is a world in which ugly mobism is only democratic protest; in which elected public officials are sometimes barely saved from physical violence; in which every agency of Government entrusted with this country's physical security is persistently attacked and smeared; in which night is day and truth is falsehood and patriotism has become a sour joke.

For at least two years now a fragment overwhelmingly defeated in every democratic test, whether at the ballot box or in Congress, has become an ugly tail that wags a huge and sleeping dog.

Campus "demonstrations" whose leaders openly wear the symbols of the Communist Vietcong are coddled and immensely publicized, and few of our great thinkers worry here about the "integrity of American education."

It is a terrible tale—a tale of demonstrable Communist infiltration into such movements as that for civil rights; of the progressive perversion of true liberalism by totalitarians who are its most savage enemies. The latest chapter is an attack upon the CIA for daring, for example, to use American funds to pay the bare expenses of non-Communist American students to world student convocations otherwise packed by subsidized Communists—which is without parallel in the experience of one man who has reported on public affairs for three decades.

This assault upon a necessarily secret agency operating in an unavoidable tough world has reached a stage of hysterical irresponsibility.

While 1700 students at Stanford University listen in civilized fashion to the Vice President of the United States some 300 "anti-Vietnam war demonstrators" outside mob his car, call him a "war criminal," and some among them shout that wonderful slogan of free speech, "Burn baby, burn." And in the face of all this, this same Vice President is moved to declare that he is "not at all happy" that the CIA has undeniably taken some small steps to try to prevent a total Communist capture of the international student movement.

THE TROJAN SEA HORSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on January 23, 1967, the Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, presented a prepared statement to a joint session of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations. The statement dealt with the fiscal year 1968–72 defense program and the 1968 defense budget. However, it also included several observations concerning the American maritime industry—both American shipbuilding and the American merchant marine.

Now, although one might be hard pressed to show any technical errors in the observation of the Secretary of Defense concerning the American maritime industry, there did appear to be several areas of significant omission or overzealous commission in support of Mr. McNamara's position, if not a combination of both.

Of the American shipbuilding industry, Mr. McNamara said in his prepared statement that:

> One general problem . . . which deserves special mention is [its] dolorous state—

And that it is—

> technically obsolescent compared to those of Northern Europe and Japan.

The Secretary continued by venturing to suggest that the fundamental solution to this problem "is to revitalize the American shipbuilding industry," and that one means of accomplishing this goal is with "the new procurement package approach, of which the fast deployment logistics (FDL) ship is an outstanding example."

Quite naturally, and with considerable justification, spokesmen for the American shipbuilding industry have taken exception to the somewhat gratuitous characterization of their business as being "dolorous" and "obsolescent." I myself have no desire to quibble over the Secretary's choice of descriptive adjectives, since for one thing it would constitute talking to oneself. The tenacity with which Mr. McNamara adheres to a concept after once having accepted and endorsed it is too well known. I have never known logic, let alone congressional intent or policy, to dissuade him in the past; I do not believe it will now.

I would like to point out, however, that approximately 75 percent of the work performed in privately owned American shipyards is derived from Federal programs. Therefore, if there exist any deficiencies in our shipyards, it would seem proper to conclude that a substantial portion of the blame rests with that industry's principal customer—the Federal Government—and its policies or programs or more appropriately, the possible lack of such policies or programs.

The plight of the American shipbuilding industry, especially with respect to merchant ship construction, has been a matter of general public knowledge for several years. Only recently, Lloyd's Register of Shipping reported that merchant shipping launched during 1966 reached a peacetime record for the third year in succession. Yet in that same year, the United States experienced a drop of more than 100,000 tons of merchant ship construction and the continuation of a steady decline to the lowest return since 1955. From his remarks, it appears to have taken Mr. McNamara an inordinate amount of time to come to the realization that the decline of the American shipbuilding industry is reaching crisis proportions.

I find this particularly disturbing in the light of the mandatory statutory obligation of the Secretary of Commerce "with the advice of and in coordination with the Secretary of the Navy, at least once each year" to survey the existing privately owned shipyards capable of merchant ship construction to determine whether their capabilities, "including facilities and skilled personnel," provide an adequate mobilization base at strategic points for purposes of national defense and security. I, therefore, can only assume one of two things—either such mandatory surveys have not been conducted or, if conducted during the past several years, there has been little, if any attention paid to them.

Furthermore, concerning this statutory obligation, Mr. McNamara's statement was completely silent on the matter of geographical distribution of American shipbuilding capability so as to "provide an adequate mobilization base at strategic points for purposes of national defense and national emergency." As a matter of fact, the so-called FDL project, providing as it does for multiship construction by a single contractor, may have the untoward result of undercutting this congressional intent of maintaining a geographical dispersal of ship production facilities by administrative fiat. If this conclusion appears to be overly skeptical, then I would like to point out that bitter experience has taught those of us who have to wrestle with the problems of our shipbuilding industry and our merchant marine to maintain a healthy respect for the effectiveness of administrative actions in subverting, be it intentional or otherwise, existing law or congressional intent.

Mr. Speaker, until the FDL project came along, it was my impression that St. Valentine's Day was but one day a year. However, in light of the manner in which I understand many of my colleagues are being wooed to endorse this project on the somewhat tenuous promise that the new or modernized shipyard needed to build these FDL ships will materialize in their district, I now question whether it is not each and every day of the year. Yet I feel that if anyone is so beguiled and lured by this tantalizing promise, he stands a very good chance of being abandoned on the steps of the church like a blushing bride. All present evidence indicates that there will be one and only one shipyard which will be either built anew or modernized initially, so it should be crystal clear that it would be virtually impossible to satisfy the desire of each and every interested congressional district to have the yard located in its area.

On the other side of the coin, however, and in all fairness to the Secretary, I must say that he did recognize in his statement that there has been public discussion of the shipbuilding problem. But, he continued by observing that it "has been focused on what is actually the minor part—its relationship to the merchant marine problem." Coming from any other source, I might take strenuous exception to characterizing any part of the current plight of the American maritime problem as being "minor." But, from the Secretary of Defense, it constitutes an admirable, albeit undesirable, consistency in the negative and hostile attitude which Mr. McNamara has displayed toward our maritime industry over the past several years.

In April 1962, the Secretary appeared before our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and made the following statement:

> From our [Defense] point of view, the reserve fleet plus the vessels in service, plus the construction program that has previously been outlind as a tentative program, appear adequate to our need.

Four years later, in a letter of January 25, 1966, to the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. McNamara reaffirmed this position even to the point of using the very same words. The net result was that the American merchant marine found an albatross hung about its neck which has continued and will continue to plague it. Yet, the law of the land, then as now, states that:

> *It is necessary* for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine . . . (b) *capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in all war or nationl emergencies.*

Mr. McNamara appears to have concluded otherwise.

Of our shipping requirements arising out of the conflict in Vietnam, the Secretary observed that southeast Asia "has focused our attention on the problem of providing lift support over the longer term," and that "we must rely in large part on merchant shipping." This admission by Mr. McNamara of our reliance upon commercial shipping in times of national emergency is in itself significant.

But in his usual form, the Secretary, after patting the industry on the head, went on to give it a swift kick in the pants. Mr. McNamara noted that:

> Simply in terms of size, the U.S.-flag Merchant Fleet, active and reserve, is adequate for such contingencies now and should continue to be so in the future.

Thus, we appear to have come full circle back to the Secretary's shell game of equating numbers of ships with adequacy.

There was, however, one desirable and heartening note in the Secretary's statement providing recognition, tacit though it may have been, that the real problem is the quality of American-flag ships. This is perhaps best demonstrated in his statement concerning the use of the American-flag unsubsidized tramp fleet and those vessels made available through reactivations from the national defense reserve fleet. Clearly, on this matter the Secretary was amply justified in stating that:

> While these resources [i.e., the unsubsidized tramp fleet and the N.D.R.F.] have successfully met the needs of the present emergency, they may not all be available in another emergency a decade hence. By 1975, most of the ships in the National Defense Reserve Fleet will be 30–35 years old and will require larger expenditures for conversion to assure satisfactory reliability. Moreover, the unsubsidized/irregular fleet will probably have disappeared because its aging World War II vessels cannot be replaced at an economical price. As a result, the Defense Department may, in another emergency, be far more dependent on the subsidized berthline operators than it is today.

The significance of this statement is that it represents an appreciation by the Secretary of the serious qualitative gap and bloc obsolescence problem facing the American merchant marine.

Yet even while recognizing the very distinct possibility that the Defense Department may find itself in a future position requiring greater dependence upon American-flag subsidized operators, Mr. McNamara immediately went on to state that:

> From the viewpoint of the Defense Department, there is a firm requirement for a reliable, responsive, sea lift augmentation for a wide range of limited war situations, *a requirement which the present subsidized U.S.-liner fleet, for various reasons, has not made.*

There was not the slightest recognition given by the Secretary of the contribution which American-flag subsidized operators already have made to the Vietnam war effort. Several American-flag operators have incurred substantial financial loss in responding to shipping requirements of the Department of Defense for southeast Asia as a result of the port congestion problem in Vietnam. Many of these same American-flag operators have served and are now serving as general agents for the more than 150 ships which have thus far been reactivated from our national defense reserve fleet. It has been a management service which has been performed willingly and at the outset at a per diem rate established almost 16 years ago during the Korean conflict, and which bordered on being noncompensatory. As a matter of fact, it is my understanding that according to a Standard and Poore's survey of subsidized American steamship lines during the years from 1960 to 1965, these lines realized an average annual net profit of something less than 5 percent on their total investment in the business. It is a level of return which places them in the lowest industry group in a survey of more than 100 industries predicated upon this criteria.

Yet with apparent ignorance of this factor, Mr. McNamara went on to discredit this sector of our merchant marine by referring to it as "a very costly form of sealift for the Defense Department to hire, just when it needs it the most." Then in the very next breath, the Secretary made the rather irrelevant observation that U.S.-flag ships are "twice as expensive to operate, even in normal times, as most foreign-flag ships." What possible bearing the operating cost of foreign-flag shipping may have upon the operation of Government-owned or Government-assisted shipping completely escapes me. I can only presume that this stems from past actions of the Military Sea Transportation Service in operating some of its ships with foreign rather than American crews. Or conceivably, it could arise from the use by the Agency for International Development of two ships only recently transferred to American registry and still manned by Chinese officers and crew, an employment, I might add, by AID while paying American-flag freight rates even though the ships have foreign crews and, therefore, minimal labor cost.

Perhaps the most significant point of the Secretary's statement is that it served to lay waste to and discredit all sectors of the American merchant marine with respect to their future ability to serve as naval and military auxiliaries in time of war or national emergency. It is upon the remains of this industry which he has laid to waste that Mr. McNamara then proposes the concept of the FDL ship project as the only possible salvation for the American maritime industry. I can only conclude, therefore, that while the Secretary recognizes and appreciates the plight of the American merchant marine, he is now using it as a vehicle to foist upon the American taxpayer a special ship construction program—the fast deployment logistics ship project—which could cost in excess of $1 billion.

The Congress already has authorized the construction of two FDL ships in fiscal year 1966 at an estimated cost of slightly more than $67 million. We are now being asked by the President in the coming fiscal year to authorize the construction of five more of these special project ships.

But what justification is there for what appears to constitute a blank check? A review of available public information concerning this project will reveal that little else than a concept has thus far been presented. Even the number of these special type ships to be constructed is not definitive. It has ranged from 20 ships to upwards of 40, so that we truly have no real idea of what the total price tag will be. I, for one, would hope that the Congress would demand substantially more justification than now appears to be present before authorizing any further funds, and particularly before the award of the contract to one of the three companies now under final consideration and which is scheduled to be awarded by June 30, 1967.

Terms such as the "procurement package approach" have a beguiling ring upon one's ears. However, I remember all too well the use of a similar coined term of "commonality" of parts in the controversial TFX warplane contract of 1963. I also recall the Secretary's decision in the same year to construct the aircraft carrier CVA–67—*John F. Kennedy*—with conventional rather than nuclear propulsion, only to subsequently recant and request authorization for the construction of another aircraft carrier with nuclear propulsion.

Nor am I alone in my doubts as to the merits of the FDL program. Even the Secretary himself has indicated this when on January 23 he stated:

> If this proves to be correct, and we have every reason to believe it will, the FDL program *may* pioneer the revitalization of the American shipbuilding industry.

This is an awful big and costly "if."

Mr. Speaker, these are honest and sincere nagging doubts which I entertain on this FDL program. Admittedly, there is a need for improvement in the American shipbuilding industry and in the American merchant marine, as there is in any industry. Yet there are limitations that should and must be recognized.

Multiship production will result in a reduction in the unit cost of a vessel. Liberty ship production in this country during World War II amply demonstrated this fact. However, this cost reduction predicated upon the so-called learning curve is, to my knowledge, not nearly as great as that experienced in the aircraft production field. It cannot serve, therefore, as a panacea to make American shipbuilders competitive in the world market.

Let it also be recognized that the total cost of these FDL ships, if authorized, will have to be paid by the American taxpayer. Unlike the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, there is no cost-sharing between the Government and the ship operator.

Let it also be recognized that, as I understand, the FDL ships will be operated by the Military Sea Transportation Service with civilian crews, plus nominal numbers of military personnel. Civilian crews employed by the MSTS operate under substantially the same collective bargaining agreements at wage rates comparable to those in commercial shipping. Therefore, except for the profit factor, which I have heretofore cited as being nominal, the operational cost will probably be comparable to that of regular commercial shipping. In fact, it may be even greater since under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 only certain operating costs are eligible for Government subsidy and then only a percentage of those costs. The total operating cost is not borne solely by the Government, as will in all probability be the case with the FDL ships.

For the Federal Government to assume the total construction and operating costs of the FDL ships hardly seems to be in keeping with the Secretary's frequently stated goal of getting "more bang for the buck." I would suggest, therefore, that the Congress explore in depth the possibility of utilizing other avenues for the expenditure of the funds which are being requested for the FDL ship project. Certainly, investment of these moneys requested under the cost-sharing provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 presents at less cost a much better investment in the national interest.

Now, rightly or wrongly, the American merchant marine has come to look upon the FDL project as a potential competitor—both for Federal ship construction funds and for Government-generated defense cargoes. I do not propose to debate the merits of this competitive fear here. However, the niggardly merchant ship construction budget requests of the past 2 fiscal years certainly provide sufficient reason for industry's concern over the ever-diminishing share of our resources being allocated to merchant ship construction. There would seem to be little doubt whatsoever that a Defense Department budget request bearing the stamp of being a national defense or national security requirement will be accorded a considerably higher priority than a similar request to assist in the construction of merchant ships. Yet, it has been said that "the FDL is not a combatant ship and will only be used in nonassault operations." Then what breed of cat is the FDL ship if not a glorified merchant cargo vessel?

Viewed as an advance-type merchant cargo vessel, the American merchant marine has every right to look upon the FDL ship as a potential cargo competitor. This is not quite as farfetched as one might presume. For example, in 1954, the then Secretary of Defense, Charles Wilson, and the then Secretary of Commerce, Sinclair Weeks, entered into a memorandum of agreement concerning the priority in utilization, transfer, and allocation of merchant ships. This is commonly referred to as the "Wilson-Weeks agreement," and to my knowledge is still used as a guideline on such matters. However, by letter of May 10, 1966, Vice Adm. Glynn R. Donaho, U.S. Navy Commander, Military Sea Transportation Service, submitted to our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries a statement of the Department of Defense position on priorities under the Wilson-Weeks agreement. That position paper states that:

> Once MSTS has acquired a time or voyage chartered U.S.-flag ship, *prudent management* requires that it be utilized to the extent possible.

An application of this doctrine of "prudent management" arose as recently as November 1966 when the MSTS reported a surplus of shipping tonnage to Vietnam and ordered all cargo bookings aboard privately owned berth lines ships destined from the Pacific coast for southeast Asia be canceled for a period of almost 2 weeks. This interpretation and its actual application clearly show that defense cargoes can be and have been, in fact, diverted from commercial bottoms to Government-hired and Government-controlled ships. Thus, it would seem highly possible, if not probable, that if Government-hired ships could, and did prove to be a competitive threat to commercial shipping in obtaining defense cargoes, then it would seem to be an even greater threat under the doctrine of "prudent management" where the vessels are, in fact, owned and operated by the MSTS in its nucleus fleet, as will be the case with the proposed FDL ships.

Past experience, therefore, shows the FDL ship to be a very real competitive threat in this sense. This cannot be idly dismissed, regardless of Defense Department protestations that the FDL ships will not be in competition with the American merchant marine, since both commonsense and past experience dictate that it can and may very well be otherwise. Certainly, the General Accounting Office may ultimately take a very dim view of tying up Federal funds to the tune of about $35 million a ship only to find that these rather expensive units are simply floating about the ocean in a nonproductive status. Congressional committees, likewise, would be justified in investigating the utilization of the FDL ships at some future date, so that in the final analysis the Defense Department, notwithstanding its presently voiced good intentions, might be forced into having to use the FDL ships for point-to-point carriage. If this does evolve, then let us recognize that the true threat of the FDL ships to the American merchant marine lies not simply in numbers of ships, but rather in the potential productivity of these ships.

The preponderance of our merchant fleet is composed of vessels 20 years or older, which are largely of the Victory-type or comparable class, built during World War II of about 10,000 deadweight tons and having a speed of about 15 knots. The FDL ships, on the other hand, will be of about 40,000 deadweight tons—four times the size of the average U.S. merchantman—and have a speed of at least 25 knots—almost twice that of our average merchant ship. In a competitive situation, the FDL ship, totally financed by the Federal Government, both in construction and in operation, represents such a major jump in vessel productivity over the average conventional American cargo vessel that it could clearly sweep a significant portion of commercially operated shipping from the seas.

There are already signs of a deepening depression in world shipping from overtonnaging, and the culprit most frequently cited is the newer, larger, and faster vessel such as the FDL ship. It seems ironic, therefore, that instead of bending every effort to preserve our position as a commercial maritime nation by meeting international competition, we appear determined to provide Federal sponsorship and funds to generate competition within our own economy, more particularly between the Federal Government and American commercial shipping.

Mr. Speaker, on balance I am concerned about the possibility that we in the Congress may be subjected to what Clark R. Mollenhoff referred to in his book "Despoilers of Democray" as "McNamara's rough judgment." If so, then I think we would do well to heed the observations of the former Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. George Anderson, who was quoted by Mr. Mollenhoff as stating:

> All of us must shun reasoning based on unquestioned assumptions that become self-deception.
>
> Napoleon, the classic case, in his earlier years so precise and discerning, gradually became intolerant of criticism in his own command. Finally, he lost his battle, his campaign, and his France.
>
> Congress must be a constant check on the use of either civilian or military power in the Pentagon.

I am sure that all of my colleagues are familiar with the stratagem of the Trojan horse. It was this huge, wooden horse in which a company of Greeks belonging to the besieging army concealed themselves and emerged at night to open the gates and sack the city of Troy.

Unless and until there is substantially more evidence than now appears to exist to justify the FDL ship project, I am constrained to look upon it as the "Trojan sea horse." I have no desire to be a party to a proposal which may serve to sack the U.S. Treasury of the American taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard reports that the White House is working on a new maritime policy. In this connection I hope most fervently if President Johnson does finally come up with a proposal that under any such plan no reliance will be placed on supplementing our American merchant marine with a fleet of high-speed Defense Department floating warehouse supply ships to cost more than $1 billion. What the United States needs is 100 new modern, privately owned and operated commercial cargo vessels to use in peace and war. These 100 ships could be built and operated at far less cost to the taxpayers, I am sure.

Mr. Speaker, the Roman poet, Virgil, once said: "Be favorable to bold beginnings." Well, I, too, would be favorable to bold beginnings such as the concept of the FDL ship project if it could, in fact, promise to bring about a revitalization of the American maritime industry, which is now long overdue. Unfortunately, it does not promise any such thing and therefore I oppose the FDL ship project and the amount of Federal expenditures which it entails. I hope the Congress will resist the idea and instead provide for the national security by carrying out the cost-sharing provisions of existing law and replacing our obsolete merchant fleet with new up-to-date ships under private operation.

NEBRASKA'S CENTENNIAL: 1867–1967

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DENNEY], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, shortly each of my colleagues will be receiving through my office, a centennial packet, compliments of the Nebraska State Centennial Commission.

March 1, 1967 is the hundredth anniversary of the admission of Nebraska to full statehood.

A century ago, the admission of Nebraska created only a mild national interest. Then, Americans were talking about the purchase of Alaska from Russia at about 2 cents per acre. They were concerned about the Emperor Maximilian of Mexico. They were thinking of what the creation of the new "Dominion" of Canada meant to them.

There was bitterness in Nebraska. Statehood came only 2 years after the Civil War. "Boys in blue" had settled next to "boys in gray." Old feuds broke out. But these disputes were settled in court. Our State was even then proving its motto: "Equality Before the Law."

Even then, the national origin of Nebraskans was diverse. Aside from our native Americans who had moved west there were Germans, Swedes, Danes, Bohemians—now Czechoslovakians—and Russians. There were Polish, French, English, Irish, Scotch, and Italian Nebraskans. Soon, all of these became Americans all, Nebraskans all—assured of equality before the law.

History did not begin on March 1, 1867. Coronado rode onto Nebraska soil in his search for the "Seven Cities of Gold." French fur traders followed Nebraska trails a century before our War for Independence. Lewis and Clark visited our State's land in their memorable expedition of 1803. Fur trader Manuel Lisa brought cattle, hogs, chickens, squash, lima beans, potatoes, and turnips to the site of what is now Omaha in 1807; thus becoming Nebraska's first real farmer. Maj. Stephen H. Long's expedition crossed Nebraska in 1819. Artist George Catlin painted Nebraska subjects in 1832, saying of what is now Nebraska:

> The soil in this region is rich and capable of making (it) one of the most beautiful and productive countries in the world.

Lt. John C. Fremont was responsible for naming our State, writing in his 1844 report to Secretary of War William Wilkins:

> The Platte or Nebraska River being the center stream would very properly furnish a name to the territory.

Yet, in spite of this background, this publicity, the 1854 territorial census included only 2,732 residents—exclusive of Indians.

After 1854, people literally poured into Nebraska. By the time of the 1870 census—a little over 15 years—the State of Nebraska, even then in its present boundaries, reported 122,993 persons. Why this phenomenal growth? It was largely based on the Homestead Act of 1862. Under this act the very first homesteader in the United States, Daniel Freeman, claimed 160 acres near the present site of Beatrice. He led a parade of 100,000 homesteaders to Nebraska.

Some people like to think of our State today as leading the others in the production of wild hay, corn, wheat, alfalfa, rye, barley, sugarbeets, farm animals, and buttermaking. It is true that Nebraska stands in the front ranks of all these varying crops and products.

Nebraska's educational system makes it possible for a Nebraskan to go from first grade to a Ph. D. degree without leaving his State.

Nebraska is second to none of its sister States in art, literature, science or religion.

But—to me—the greatest product of Nebraska is Nebraskans.

A great former Congressman from our State, Karl Stefan, said in 1949:

> A Nebraskan is a forward-looking American with a long, long memory.

Looking back over a full century of Nebraska progress, that definition is good enough for me.

I would like to personally invite my colleagues, on behalf of the people of the State of Nebraska, to attend our centennial and help us celebrate our 100th birthday.

SOVIET PROPAGANDA: ONE-WAY STREET

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the public are very much interested in any agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union and in knowing how our interests are being advanced under such agreements.

I am concerned that at least in one vital respect the interests of the United States under the current Cultural Exchange Agreement, which was signed and entered into with the Soviet Union on March 19, 1966, are not being advanced as actively or well as they should in comparison with what the Soviet Union is doing.

The Soviet Union is exercising initiative in disseminating information throughout the United States, apparently under the provisions of section IX of the Exchange Agreement, relating to exchanges in the field of publications, exhibits, radio, and television.

Two recent examples of this Soviet Communist initiative are first, the distribution through the United States last month of Sputnik, a digest-type magazine, which I believe clearly is a vehicle for disseminating official propaganda of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union; and, second, the February 9, 1967 hour-long presentation, over all U.S. nationwide television networks, of U.S.S.R. Premier Kosygin, a ranking, and full member of the Politburo of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

From these two examples, as well as other activities, it is apparent that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is working hard to increase the flow of literature and communication, embodying of course Communist propaganda, from the Soviet Union to the United States.

I have discussed this problem previously with the House of Representatives, in statements that appear in the January 18—page 817—and February 9, 1967—page 3062—issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, expressing concern that the United States was failing to achieve a reciprocal exchange of information with the Soviet Union.

To bring the House up to date, I am setting forth here copies of my most recent exchange of correspondence with the Department of State on this problem:

JANUARY 27, 1967.

The Honorable DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thank you for the Department's January 20 reply to my letter of January 6, 1967. It arrived in my office on January 24.

On the matter of exports of a magazine similar to *Sputnik* to the Soviet Union, the Department's letter states you "now await a reply" from the Soviet Embassy. (This refers to the fact that the United States after having permitted the import of the Communist Party magazine, *Sputnik*, then approached the Soviet Embassy and raised the question of reciprocal rights to export a similar magazine to the USSR.) As it becomes available, I would appreciate learning:

1. The date and nature of the Soviet reply (complete text is desired if the release of it will not harm the national security of the United States).

2. The date of the Department of State's message to the Soviet Embassy to which you "now await a reply".

At this time, I would also like to determine what arrangements the Department of State has made with regard to having an official of the United States Government appear on a telecast to the entire citizenry of the Soviet Union.

Sincerely yours,
GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 13, 1967.

Hon. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LIPSCOMB: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of January 27 regarding television appearances of United States Government officials in the Soviet Union.

The United States has been working continually to increase the flow of information from the United States to the Soviet Union. The basic framework for exchange of information between our two countries is the Exchanges Agreement. These agreements have contained provisions designed to encourage exchanges of radio and television programs.

The first broadcast of exchanged television programs took place in 1961. Apparent

Soviet unwillingness to use American programs has kept the rate of television exchanges low. Even before that, Vice President Nixon was able to speak over Soviet television during his visit to the U.S.S.R. in 1959, and on several occasions, the most recent in 1964, the American Ambassador in Moscow has spoken on Soviet television on July 4. The President, in an April 20, 1964 speech, suggested the exchange of television appearances by the leaders of both countries. The Soviet Government has not responded to this suggestion.

A number of Soviet leaders have appeared on American television, including former Premier Khrushchev, either during visits to the United States or in interviews with American correspondents. Since American television is privately-owned and operates in a free society, it makes its own decisions as to when it will provide opportunities for Soviet officials to appear on American television.

While opportunities for appearance on Soviet television have been limited, United States official statements are received regularly by the large Soviet audience of the Voice of America. This important source of authoritative information about the United States is heard in seven languages for a total of 14 hours daily in various parts of the U.S.S.R.

The United States will continue to press at every opportunity for a broader flow of communication with the U.S.S.R. in the interests of increasing mutual understanding and lessening international tensions.

We have not yet received from the Soviet Embassy a reply to our oral request of January 12 on the possibilities for circulation of additional American magazines in the Soviet Union.

Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

Mr. Speaker, it will be noted from the Department of State's letter dated February 13, 1967, in response to my inquiry that first, the administration has not obtained reciprocal rights to distribute throughout the Soviet Union a magazine in exchange for their distributing sputnik in the United States; and, second, the administration apparently has not obtained reciprocal rights to have an official of the U.S. Government appear on an hour-long telecast—or a telecast of any length for that matter—to the entire citizenry of the Soviet Union in exchange for the Premier Kosygin television appearance here.

The interests of the United States for increasing mutual understanding and lessening international tensions are in my view not being properly advanced if we have a situation where the Communists continue to press at every opportunity to broaden the flow of communication to the United States from the U.S.S.R. if on the other hand this is not done on the basis of reciprocity for the United States.

It would appear to me that the problem lies both in the Exchange Agreement, which the Department of State says is "the basic framework for exchange of information" between the United States and the Soviet Union, and in the way the State Department performs pursuant to the Agreement, including its failure to demand equal concessions from the Soviets. A totalitarian Communist Government such as in the U.S.S.R. can be expected to continue to press for every advantage it can get. We need to have the courage and backbone to stand up forcefully to their aggressiveness and machinations.

HALPERN URGES WIRETAPPING EXCEPTION TO HELP ARM FEDERAL OFFICERS AGAINST INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CARTELS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the report summing up the 18-month study by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice is an impressive document, worthy of the best efforts of the highly capable and dedicated gentlemen who drew it up.

It is a thoroughgoing and useful blueprint for action which can do a great deal to help law enforcement agencies in their everyday battle against lawbreakers, and to reduce crime.

It is interesting to note that the Law Enforcement Commission, submitting its report soon after the President's message on crime, did not agree with the President's unequivocal demand for legislation to "outlaw all wiretapping, public and private, wherever and whenever it occurs."

The Law Enforcement Commission stated:

> A majority of the members * * * believe that legislation should be enacted granting carefully circumscribed authority for electronic surveillance to law enforcement officers.

The President, in his message added:

> The only exceptions would cover those instances where the security of the Nation itself is at stake * * * and then only under the strictest safeguards.

Gentlemen, I submit that the international crime cartels which direct, and profit by, the illegal importation of narcotics threaten the very foundations of our country. They provide the means by which the vile contagion of addiction can spread and flourish.

In a bill I sponsored earlier this week, directing Federal financial aid to States and localities to help them construct and operate special hospital facilities for the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts, I pointed out:

> We have not been able to stop the flow of dope which comes into this country through seaports, airports and thousands of miles of border. It is well nigh impossible to seal off all means of narcotics entry, though we should certainly add to our pitifully small forces arrayed against it.

With that purpose in mind, I have today sponsored a bill to appoint 100 additional customs port investigators, 50 additional criminal investigators in the Bureau of Customs, and 50 additional enforcement agents in the Bureau of Narcotics. This is a highly necessary first step in augmenting our forces against the international criminal cartels.

But I must point out that manpower without the most modern scientific aids is of little use against the rich and arrogant lords of the underworld who command the most sophisticated equipment. It is as unreasonable to prevent our antinarcotics fighters from using modern electronic aids as it would be to prevent them from using radios, automobiles, and advanced laboratory equipment.

The President's Law Enforcement Commission called upon the Congress to "enact legislation dealing specifically with wiretapping." I am glad to be able to carry out that suggestion today by sponsoring a bill to permit wiretapping by an authorized Federal officer engaged in the investigation of illegal importation of narcotic drugs into the United States.

Both of my bills today carry out strong suggestions made by the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse, in its final report in November 1963. That report cited the inadequate manpower available to the Bureau of Customs, and called for appointments of additional customs port investigators and criminal investigators. The report stated:

> Additional investigative personnel, properly trained and properly equipped, would permit more frequent and more thorough searches. Tighter controls would result in more interceptions of narcotics and dangerous drugs and in greater quantities. While the smuggling of drugs can probably never be wholly eradicated, tighter controls would be a substantial deterrent to smuggling.

The same report also stated firmly:

> The Commission recommends the enactment of legislation authorizing the use of wiretapping by Federal law enforcement officials in limited circumstances and under strict controls to detect and prevent the international smuggling of narcotics.

Conceding the fact that the right to privacy "is a sacred right," the Commission nevertheless pointed out that wiretapping should be used only "to meet the most serious threats to society."

> The Commission believes that the illegal importation of narcotics into the United States is a threat of this magnitude.

In my bill, the right to tap is carefully circumscribed. It provides that wire communication may be intercepted to obtain evidence of a violation of section 2(c) of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act only after an ex parte order has been issued by a Federal judge permitting such interception.

The head of any executive department of the Federal Government responsible for investigation of violations of section 2(c) of the Narcotics Act, must first secure authorization from the Attorney General or his designated deputies. Then he may apply to a Federal judge for an order to permit interception.

The application to the court must contain full details of the communication facilities involved, information of previous applications involving the same facilities or persons, and any additional testimony or documentary supporting evidence required by the judge.

If the judge decides that the specified offense has been, is being, or is about to be committed; that the wiretap will be useful and necessary to obtain information, and that other means are not readily available for the same purpose, he may grant the order.

Each order so granted must specifically describe the facilities involved, and the specific period of time during which interception is authorized. Authorization is limited to a maximum of 45 days, and extensions may be granted for periods of not more than 20 days.

The information gained from authorized wiretapping may not be used as evidence in a Federal court criminal proceeding unless each defendant has been furnished with a copy of the court order not less than 10 days before the trial. However, a judge may waive the 10-day period if he finds that it was not possible to furnish the defendant with the required information 10 days before trial, and that the defendant will not be prejudiced.

The bill also provides for constant control and surveillance by the Congress. It requires the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts to make a full report to the Congress each March, listing the number of applications which were made, granted, and denied during the preceding calendar year.

This bill is similar to one I offered before the first session of the 89th Congress, which was never enacted. At that time, I stressed the critical need to place such modern weapons at the disposal of the Federal forces of law and order to strengthen our fight against the scourge of narcotics.

Each year that goes by sees the vice overlords reaping richer harvests of money from the misery of those they snare in their well-organized net of international narcotics distribution.

Gentlemen, the "bad guys" have armies of henchmen and untold resources working for them. Let us add what we can to the power of the "good guys." I urge you not to let another session go by without enacting this measure, and placing a little more weight in the right side of the scales of justice.

THE CIA-NSA AFFAIR—SOME BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, when Michael Wood, formerly the Director of Development for the National Student Association contacted Ramparts magazine and divulged the financial relationship of NSA and the CIA, the leftwing nature of the student organization was given national attention once again. Presumably the purpose of the CIA funds was to further the interests of the United States and to support present Government positions on important issues such as the Vietnam war. According to the New York Times of February 19 Mr. Wood said of the Vietnam war:

> I think it's bitterly brutal. It makes me ashamed of being associated with the present Government.

Of course, anyone who has followed the antics of NSA, especially in the 1960's is not surprised at the latest turn of events. To provide some idea of the support which NSA has given to Government policies on foreign policy issues, some of the resolutions passed by that organization in recent years are enlightening:

> Condemned the involvement of the U.S. Government in the Cuban refugee invasion of their former homeland in April of 1961—R–XIV, 1961, pages 129–131.
>
> Denounced the "extreme police brutality" of the Diem regime in South Vietnam and urged the United States government to "review its support of the Diem regime" without mentioning the atrocities committed upon the free people of South Vietnam by the Communist terrorists—e.g., the Vietcon—SR–XVI, 1963, page 157.
>
> Censured the U.S. Government for utilizing military force to suppress the anti-American riots in the Panama Canal Zone in January of 1964—R–XVII, 1964, pages 161–162.
>
> Asked the U.S. Government to propose the admission of Communist China to the United Nations at the next meeting of the General Assembly—SR–XVIII, 1965, pages 152–153.
>
> Recommended that the United States immediately cease the bombing of North Vietnam, suspend all offensive military action in South Vietnam, and extend its offer of "unconditional talks" to include separate National Liberation Front participation—SR–XVIII, 1965, pages 153–156.
>
> Condemned U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic in the spring of 1965—SR–XVIII, 1965, pages 158–159.
>
> R—Resolutions are statements of NSA policy on general issues passed by the annual NSA Congress and they remain in force until amended or repealed by a majority vote of the National Student Congress.
>
> SR—Special Resolutions are items of NSA policy which apply to particular situations and they are in force until the next National Student Congress unless otherwise specified.
>
> 1960, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65—Indicates the year in which the resolution was adopted by the National Student Congress.
>
> XIV, XV, XVI, XVII, XVIII—Indicates the Congress which passed the resolution.
>
> NSC—Passed by the National Student Congress.

Mr. Speaker, how the CIA could continue to finance an organization with such a record is a question of great interest at the present time. The practice of influencing international student endeavors in opposition to Communist efforts to infiltrate the ranks of uncommitted students from many countries was certainly an advisable practice. A Senate Internal Security report issued in 1963 and entitled "The Communist International Youth and Student Apparatus" gives the background of Communist efforts to influence students on a worldwide basis:

> At the end of 1946, the Communist Information Bureau or Comiform was created to control the activities of the Communist Parties. The year before, in London, the Communist youth organizations of the world joined with many non-Communist organizations to form the World Federation of Democratic Youth. Only a few years went by, however, before the non-Communist youth organizations realized that the WFDY was under complete Communist control and that there was no opportunity for expression of any point of view other than the Communist within its ranks. By 1948, almost all the non-Communist organizations had left and shortly after that the Communists were left isolated in the WFDY.

A second Communist international organization which was established in 1946 was the International Union of Students, a group which was affiliated with the WFDY. In 1947 both the CIA and NSA came into existence, but it was not until 1952 that CIA funds were first channeled to NSA to counteract Communist efforts in the international student area. During the intervening years those familiar with the CIA activities claim that the arrangement proved beneficial to the interests of the United States. However, the secret nature of the CIA and its structure as a Government agency make it difficult to explain why the arrangement was continued up to the present time. A review of the agency's structure and directorship indicate that not only the CIA itself was to blame.

The CIA was established under the National Security Act of 1947. Consisting of a Director and Deputy Director as its leadership and appointed by the President and with the advice and consent of the Senate, the CIA is under the direction of the National Security Council, a body which was also established by the same National Security Act. The National Security Council is composed of the President, Vice President, the Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. The functions of the agency are outlined as follows in the U.S. Government Organization Manual, 1966–67:

> PURPOSE
>
> For the purpose of coordinating the intelligence activities of the several Government departments and agencies in the interest of national security, the Agency, under the direction of the National Security Council:
>
> 1. Advises the National Security Council in matters concerning such intelligence activities of the Government departments and agencies as relate to national security.
>
> 2. Makes recommendations to the National Security Council for the coordination of such intelligence activities of the departments and agencies of the Government as relate to the national security.
>
> 3. Correlates and evaluates intelligence relating to the national security, and provides for the appropriate dissemination of such intelligence within the Government using, where appropriate, existing agencies and facilities.
>
> 4. Performs, for the benefit of the existing intelligence agencies, such additional services of common concern as the National Security Council determines can be more efficiently accomplished centrally.
>
> 5. Performs such other functions and duties related to intelligence affecting the national security as the National Security Council may from time to time direct.

As can be seen from the above listing, the phrase "national security" is a prime guideline for the agency activities. Also, it can be seen that the CIA is not an independent agency, but subject to the direction of the top leaders of the Government. Senator MILTON YOUNG, who is also on the Senate subcommittee which oversees the CIA, stated yesterday, according to newspaper accounts, that every investment the CIA made in an organization outside the Government was undertaken on written instructions, apparently from the National Security Council. He is reported to have said that CIA's checks were subject to scrutiny in the Bureau of the Budget, which, like the National Security Council, is a

White House agency, and that in some instances CIA financial support originally was promoted by the State Department. It would be interesting to learn, within the limits of national security, how many of the ill-advised uses of CIA funds were originated and supported by the State Department.

While the establishment of overall policy is in the hands of those in charge of the CIA, it is claimed that the agency itself fumbled the ball concerning the use of basic intelligence procedures and precautions. Columnist Ted Lewis of the New York Daily News, in his column of February 21, contends that the CIA in the NSA case committed one of the most horrendous flops ever made by the spy establishment:

> In the intelligence community a cover has to be a cover—has to be real, impenetrable and always safeguarded with periodic checks of those privileged to be privy to the secret operation . . . It (CIA) passed on the money through "foundations," each of which had employees without CIA clearance who knew where the government cash was coming from. And to top off that error in judgment, key officials of the NSA itself—young, starry-eyed idealists mostly—were told about how CIA financing was keeping the organization solvent—for a price.

Unfortunately, the damage caused by this affair extends to anti-Communist programs which now might suffer. The chairman of the Senate subcommittee which oversees CIA operations, Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, said that the dispute had greatly damaged the effectiveness of the CIA. He added that it now "might be well for the CIA to sever the financial connections with a great number of organizations." If the use of CIA funds for questionable purposes—newspaper accounts of recent days have pointed out a number of them—is reviewed and all future allocations made to stand the test of furthering the security and interests of the United States, then future efforts will benefit from this dispute. Surely, the elimination of NSA from the scene is a step in the right direction. However, any congressional probe into the operations of CIA should be conducted behind closed doors and by those who are knowledgeable on the operations of the CIA such as members of the Special Subcommittee on Central Intelligence Agency of the House Armed Services Committee.

As for NSA, it is hoped that the Internal Revenue Service's review of the tax-exempt status of the organization is a comprehensive one. Moreover, such a review would be useful as NSA, according to the New York Times of February 14, hopes to finance its activities in the future by a 'consortium' of private and open Government funds."

In addition, future contributors to the NSA kitty should, in all fairness, be apprised of any possible past misuse of organizational funds as reported by the Washington Post staff writer Andrew J. Glass in the February 16 issue:

> A source within the NSA hierarchy said CIA funds, funneled to his group through the Foundation, were sometimes diverted from international accounts and used for such domestic student activities as civil rights. Travel allowances for trips abroad were also juggled in order to finance NSA's domestic activities through the CIA's indirect contributions, the source said.
>
> Most commonly, the NSA's source said, administrative funds that came from the CIA were diverted for domestic programs, it was explained.

As for future operations in the international student area, private financial efforts should have, by virtue of the NSA affair, learned that the guideline of national security must be a prerequisite for their funds. Organizations that are realistic about the danger of the international Communist threat and its danger to our national security should receive first consideration. For instance, the organization, Young Americans for Freedom, has prepared its members, by the use of realistic and responsible study materials and programs, to recognize and thwart Communist designs directed at our young citizens. Although YAF has at times taken positions in opposition to Government policies, in cases involving directly the national security of our Nation as in the cases of the American intervention in the Dominican Republic, the admission of Red China to the U.N., and especially the necessity of a firm defense of the Vietnamese people in South Vietnam, YAF policies are essentially in agreement with the U.S. Government. Surely, members of organizations such as YAF are to be recommended to combat Communist influence among uncommitted students around the world than are those of NSA, an organization which has in recent years been parroting the Moscow line.

Another responsible organization which has prepared interested groups to cope with the international danger of communism is the Institute for American Strategy. A short history of accomplishments since its founding in 1958 should recommend it for serious consideration:

THE INSTITUTE FOR AMERICAN STRATEGY

> The Institute for American Strategy was founded in 1958 by a number of representative national organizations and educational institutions as a national clearing house and service center to work with government and private agencies to further public understanding of:
>
> 1. The foundations of American strength and freedom.
> 2. The Communist challenge to American freedom and to freedom everywhere.
> 3. How a free society can meet the Communist challenge.
>
> Its founding was the outgrowth of a series of seven annual National Military-Industrial and Educational Conferences, starting in 1955, at which government, military, industrial, educational and other leaders met to clarify understanding of Communist aims and strategy and to develop countermeasure psycho-political activity, within the framework of American principles, to offset this Communist threat.
>
> The Institute for American Strategy is a non-profit tax-exempt educational corporation. It was incorporated under the laws of Illinois on February 24, 1958 and maintains its headquarters at 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Illinois 60606.
>
> Institute for American Strategy educational programs have included the preparation of text and reference books, pamphlets, and film strips conducting seminars for governmental and private groups. In its activities, the Institute has not sought to influence legislation in any area.
>
> The Institute for American Strategy has sponsored and, with many national organizations, has co-sponored Cold War seminars throughout the country. The Institute initiated and, with the Reserve Officers Association, sponsored the first National Strategy Seminar for Reserve Officers at the National War College in 1959 and sponsored the second seminar a year later. These seminars were so successful that the Department of Defense made them a part of its regular educational program.
>
> The Institute served as consultant to Governor Farris Bryant, Chairman of the National Governors' Conference Committee on Cold War Education and as secretariat for the 1963 Conference on Cold War Education which brought together more than 70 top authorities for development of Cold War educational plans for the governors' consideration. The National Governors' Conference also selected the Institute to develop and conduct a seminar for gubernatorial aides in 1964.
>
> Among publications of the Institute are "American Strategy for the Nuclear Age" of which more than 100,000 copies were sold and distributed, "Strategy Seminar Handbook", "Readings in the Protracted Conflict", "Teaching About Communism and Democracy: Case Studies", "Current Communist Non-Military Strategy", and "Strategy, Survival and the Private Citizen"—to name a few.
>
> One widely-used Institute publication is "Education and Freedom in a World of Conflict". The members of the Editorial Board for this book were: Dr. Samuel M. Brownell, recently Detroit Superintendent of Schools and now Professor of Education at Yale University; Dr. William Y. Elliott, Professor-Emeritus of Government at Harvard and now at American University, and Benjamin C. Willis, Chicago's recently retired General Superintendent of Schools.
>
> These reference and guideline books are used widely by educators at the secondary school and college level.
>
> As the consultant to the Joint Committe of the National Education Association and the American Legion, the Institute assisted in its publication, "Teaching About Communism-Guidelines for Junior and Senior High School Teachers".
>
> It also has conducted extensive national surveys of the nature and extent of public school instruction about Communism's challenge to freedom.

In September, 1966, the Institute for American Strategy held dedication ceremonies for its newly founded Freedom Studies Center at Boston, Va. Approximately 2,000 people attended the ceremonies, with representatives and members of such Government agencies as the State Department, Joint Chiefs of Staff, the U.S. Senate, and the House of Representatives in attendance. Congratulatory messages were received from President Johnson, General Wheeler of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Director J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI, and Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK of the House of Representatives. The basic purpose of the center is to train personnel on various aspects of the cold war and Communist strategies and tactics.

Here is a responsible undertaking which is worthy of the consideration of anyone interested in helping those in foreign lands maintain and preserve their freedom. The center will train people from the Americas in addition to the training of present and future leaders from countries elsewhere in the world. Special courses for those from the developing nations of Africa and Asia will be stressed because of the urgent need for helping peoples of those areas to remain free. An outline of the center's proposed courses follows:

OUTLINE OF COURSES

Studies at the Freedom Studies Center will cover a broad spectrum. Seminars and formal studies of graduate students when year-round courses begin will be tailored to the special needs and interests of a group, or of a student. The following outline indicates the broad range of subjects from which a seminar program, or a course of study can be selected:

A. Economics, Ideology, Philosophy, Political Theory:

1. The Role of Ideology in Conflict and Crisis: The basic assumptions of theories of democracy and totalitarianism and practices based on these assumptions. Marxist-Leninist theories of conflict. Articulating the freedoms of free societies in the battle of ideas.

2. The Competitive Society and the Managed Society: The competitive society is one in which the individual and the private sector provide the wellsprings of growth, progress, and direction as contrasted to the managed society in which the course of society is plotted by an elite group. The competitive society accommodates conformity. Analysis of the strength and weakness of both societies with special reference to the potential of the competitive society for the mobilization of its creative and liberative powers.

3. Economic Surveys: Economic balance sheets of the Soviet Bloc, Communist China, the uncommitted countries, and the free world. Economic problems of the developing countries.

B. Strategy, Tactics, and Techniques of Struggle:

1. Conflict Organization and Management: The development of non-traditional methods of struggle. Soviet and Chinese Communist non-military forces.

2. Western Options: Focal points in conflict. The development of strategies for rendering harmless the new forms of forcible, semi-forcible, and non-forcible conflict. Psycho-political elements of non-military strategy. Contributions of the private sector in information, research, training, and other areas to Western assets.

3. Evolution of Twentieth Century Conflict: The dimensions of new and continuing forms of struggle. Semantic and strategic problems created by the obfuscation of the traditional peace/war line. The moral and psycho-political impact of nuclear weapons and the exploitation of nuclear and war psychoses. On-going patterns of conflict: Revolutionary warfare; unconventional warfare; proxy warfare; sanctuary warfare.

4. Tactics and Techniques: The role of intelligence and counter-intelligence in non-traditional forms of conflict. Propaganda indentification, analysis, and techniques. Psycho-political warfare: Propaganda, demonstrations, marches, and organizational techniques in group mobilization; "professional" students and educational warfare; organized non-violence. Economic sanctions, economic pacific blockade, financial operations, trade offensives, and other techniques of economic competition or conflict. Tactics and techniques of insurgency and counter-insurgency

C. Science and Technology and World Politics: Scientific and technological competition and the world balance of forces. Scientific and technological aid to the developing countries. Technological developments for conflict resolution.

D. Area Studies: The Center will not attempt to duplicate the excellent general area studies programs now being conducted by many colleges and universities. Rather the Center will focus attention on the problems and the problem-solving techniques of exploitable conflict situations in areas such as Africa, Latin America, and Southeast Asia.

Finally, in view of the fact that taxpayers' dollars have been paying NSA bills for the last 15 years, information concerning the structure, activities, and policies of this organization should be of value in appraising the worth of this body. The NSA report was prepared by Young Americans For Freedom, Inc., in 1966 and is current and comprehensive. It provides much food for thought, and for this reason I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

NSA: A REPORT ON THE U.S. NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION BY YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM, INC.

To adequately comprehend the significance of the organization known as the United States National Student Association within the context of the present political crises which confront the nations of the Free World, one need merely consider the enormous amount of influence wielded by student groups in other parts of the world. While the National Student Association may not influence popular opinion in this country to the extent that similar associations of university students do in nations like Japan and the developing nations of Asia and Africa, NSA does purport to be the recognized voice of the American intellectual community. Testifying before congressional committees, speaking on behalf of American college and university students at national and international youth conferences, and generally claiming to represent the views and aspirations of American youth, NSA deserves our most serious consideration and study. That is the purpose of this booklet, and we hope that through it, those who find themselves faced with the almost monolithic Liberal bureaucracy which has characterized NSA since its inception will find some practical suggestions for counteracting the grossly disproportionate influence of NSA in American student affairs.

GENESIS OF NSA

In the summer of 1946, twenty-five American students boarded a ship in New York for a voyage to Prague, Czechoslovakia, where they attended the World Student Congress and participated in the formation of the International Union of Students (I.U.S.) along with delegates from thirty-eight other countries. According to the official *History of USNSA*, the American delegation "could see the profound need for a forum of American student leadership, a body through which international representation and information could be maintained," and, upon returning to the United States, constituted themselves as "the Committee for the Chicago Student Conference". Supported by nine (9) of the organizations which had originally organized the American delegation to Prague, the Committee sent invitations to student leaders throughout the United States to attend a meeting at the University of Chicago during Christmas vacation in order to discuss the formation of a national union of students in this country.[1]

Students representing about 200 colleges and universities and a number of youth organizations answered the summons and attended the Chicago conference in December, 1946, which culminated in the election of a Continuations Committee which was assigned the task of drafting the organization's constitution and planning a constitutional convention.

NSA's Constitutional Convention was held at the University of Wisconsin in the summer of 1947. In addition to adopting the Association's constitution, the more than 300 delegates approved a budget of $25,000 and passed resolutions supporting the World Student Service Fund and United Nations Day. A proposition calling for "qualified affiliation" with the International Union of Students, which was recommended by the Continuations Committee, was defeated although the delegates decided to continue to investigate the possibilities of affiliation with the IUS.

In 1950, representatives of the National Student Association attended a meeting in Stockholm to discuss "new means of international cooperation." Delegates to the conference, including NSA representatives, agreed that no new international student organization should be formed and indicated that the meeting, which became known as the International Student Conference, "was not intended to be a Western international student organization to counter IUS."[2] However, the next conference, which was held in Edinburgh culminated in the formation of the Coordinating Secretariat of National Union of Students (COSEC). NSA joined the International Student Conference (ISC) in August of 1964 when the delegates to the 17th National Student Congress adopted the ISC Charter.

MEMBERSHIP IN NSA

It should be understood from the outset that what we are speaking of when we refer to NSA membership is *student government membership*. There is no such thing as *individual* memberships in the National Student Association, and students on a given campus are "represented" by virtue of their schools' student government membership in NSA—even if they are not cognizant of NSA or its activities. To sign-up member institutions, NSA rarely goes to the student body for approval, but, instead, seems to prefer to deal with a handful of student leaders.

According to Article II, Section A of the NSA Constitution, membership in the Association is open to any institution of higher learning which is recognized by the United States Office of Education or any institution of higher learning whose minimum course is two academic years or more and which teaches courses other than those which are primarily vocational in nature. This of course means that, with the exception of certain technical schools, any college, university, or junior college in the United States could affiliate with NSA.

Since it is technically the student government and not the school itself which may affiliate with NSA, schools with two or more student governments may send two or more delegations to the Association's annual congresses and, thus, be counted twice in votes on highly important and sometimes controversial issues. For example, Harvard College, Radcliffe College, and Harvard-Radcliffe Graduate School, and the men's and women's colleges of the University of Pennsylvania are all represented separately at the annual NSA Congress.

In May of 1961, the National Student Association claimed a total membership of 399 colleges and universities.[3] Although actual membership in the Association has fluctuated considerably since the organization was born in August of 1947, NSA has experienced an increasing number of disaffiliations in recent years. The mass exodus of member schools prompted a lengthy debate at the Seventeenth National Student Congress concerning the Association's political entanglements which many student leaders believed were detrimental to the Association's ability to function as a service organization, but a resolution which sought to limit NSA's political activism was defeated and, by October of 1965, NSA's total membership had plummeted to just below the three-hundred mark. Many of the schools withdrew because of the relative ineffectiveness of the Association's programming services or because of NSA's political pronouncements, while only a few withdrew for financial reasons.

---

[1] *A History of USNSA*, published by the U.S. National Student Association, Philadelphia, Pa., pg. 2.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 3–4.

[3] *Toward A Better Understanding of USNSA*, by the National Staff of USNSA, Philadelphia, Pa., May, 1961, pg. 1.

The following is a *partial* list of the colleges and universities which withdrew from the National Student Association between January of 1961 and January of 1966.

Colleges and universities which have withdrawn from N.S.A. 1961–65

Allegheny College (Pa.).
Amherst College (Mass.).
Antioch College.
Arkansas A&M.
Ball State College (Ind.).
University of Baltimore.
Bates College (Me.)
Beloit College (Wis.).
Bennington College.
University of Bridgeport.
California Western University.
Canisius College (N.Y.)
Catholic University of America.
Central College (Iowa).
University of Colorado.
Cornell University.
Cotty College (Mo.).
Dartmouth College.
University of Dayton.
Denison University.
DePauw University.
Duke University.
Earlham College.
Eastern Nazarene College (Mass.).
Elmhurst College (Ill.).
Gannon College (Pa.).
Hillyer College (Conn.).
Hofstra University.
Hollins College (Va.).
Illinois State University.
Indiana University.
Iowa State University.
Long Island University.
Lynchburg College (Va.).
University of Miami (Fla.).
Michigan State University.
University of Missouri.
Muskingum College.
North Carolina State University.
Northwestern University.
Ohio State University.
University of Oklahoma.
Otterbein College (Ohio).
Randolph-Macon's Woman's College.
University of Rhode Island.
Rosemont College (Pa.).
Shorter College (Pa.).
Siena College (Tenn.).
Stonehill College (Mass.).
University of Texas.
Trinity College (Conn.).
University of Washington.
Western Maryland College.
Vassar College.
Yale University.

(The list of withdrawals was compiled from copies of the official NSA *Codification of Policy* for the five year period, 1961–66, the *USNSA Report*, 1963, pg. 29; and from questionnaires which were mailed to member institutions.)

WHO DOES NSA REPRESENT?

One important point must be remembered by every student who attends a college or university which is affiliated with the National Student Association—NSA claims that it, and it alone, represents "a point of view which is the most representative that can be obtained by the democratic process".[4] NSA ". . . does claim to be the most representative of any student group existing in the United States today and to represent the views and opinions of the majority of American student leaders who have been democratically elected by their fellow students."[5] According to NSA literature, this "representation" is most direct at the annual National Student Congress of NSA which the Association refers to "as the most important student forum in the United States" despite the fact that less than fifty per cent of the NSA member institutions even bother to send delegates to the conclave and few of those "representatives" in attendance are, in fact democratically elected by their respective student bodies.

In addition, NSA "represents" American students nationally and internationally on numerous committees and groups including the American Council of Education, the U.S. Commission for UNESCO, the U.S. Youth Council, the American Association for the U.N., International Student Conference, the World University Service, and the National Scholarship Service. In these groups and others, NSA represents the ultra-liberal-leftist line to be the true opinion of American college and university students.

THE STRUCTURE OF NSA

NSA is geographically divided into twenty (20) regions each of which, with the exception of the State of New York, is composed of one or more states. New York State contains two separate NSA regions—the Metropolitan New York Region and the New York State Region which is composed of all the colleges outside the New York City area with the exception of Skidmore College in Saratoga Springs, New York, which was a member of the New England Region of NSA in 1965. The New England Region of NSA (Vermont, New Hampshire, Maine, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island) contained the largest number of member schools in 1965 with a total membership of 34 senior (four-year) colleges and universities out of 108 eligible institutions of higher learning in the same category.

Prior to the Sixteenth National Student Congress of NSA, the regional chairmen and vice-chairmen from the Association's 22 regions served as voting members of the highly controversial National Executive Committee (NEC). The NEC was responsible for the vast majority of the Association's legislation prior to 1963 and some hailed its dissolution, but it was quickly replaced with a new, smaller body known as the National Supervisory Board (NSB).

THE NATIONAL SUPERVISORY BOARD (NSB)

The National Supervisory Board of NSA came into existence at the Sixteenth National Student Congress which was held in Bloomington, Indiana, in the summer of 1963. The NSB replaces the highly controversial National Executive Committee (NEC) of NSA which had, during the course of its existence, been responsible for the enactment of a seemingly disproportionate share of the Association's legislation. It had been the practice to refer the resolutions which were not considered at the Plenary Session of the annual Congress to the NEC for action, but this power was not passed on to the NSB although the smaller National Supervisory Board does have the authority to enact certain interim or "emergency" policies for NSA when the need for such arises between meetings of the annual Congress.

The National Supervisory Board (NSB) consists of ten voting representatives who are elected from four great, consolidated regions at the annual NSA Congress plus the national officers. In addition to the "emergency" powers described above, the NSB has the authority to (1) enact the time and place of the annual Congress; (2) elect all of the National Advisors; (3) supervise the execution of the policies and programs as determined by the National Student Congress; (4) approve all appointments made by the President to fill vacancies on the Association's administrative staff; and (5) suspend or remove, by a two-thirds vote, the National Officers. All of these powers, which are enumerated in Article V, Section D, of the NSA Constitution, would certainly appear to indicate that the NSB's powers are, in fact, more extensive than those granted to the now defunct National Executive Committee. The power of the NSB was challenged in the spring of 1965 when the then NSA President, Stephen J. M. Robbins, issued a statement which strongly condemned United States intervention in the Dominican Republic. The statement, which was carried by the Collegiate Press Service (CPS), caused no small amount of controversy and, before the 18th National Student Congress began, Robbins apologized to the National Supervisory Board for not clearing the statement with them before making it public.[6]

ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISIONS

The policies and programs of NSA are, for for the sake of administration, divided into two distinct major areas. These administrative divisions are referred to as "Commissions".

The National Affairs Commission of NSA, which operates under the supervision of the Association's National Affairs Vice-President (NAVP), is, ostensibly, concerned with those issues which have some relevance to the academic community which NSA purports to represent. The National Affairs Commission deals with such problems as academic freedom, student housing, human relations, citizenship, and political awareness and action.[7] Items included under the jurisdiction of the National Affairs Commission, however, do not always bear a direct relationship to the campus per se, but, instead, extend outward to the surrounding community to include participation and/or support of community social action programs (e.g., civil rights) and debate on issues affecting the national security (e.g., abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities). In 1964, for example, the National Student Association operated "a literacy project" with the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) in Selma, Alabama.[8]

The International Affairs Commission of NSA is directed by the International Affairs Vice President (IAVP) and deals with the relations between American students and their foreign counterparts. One of the International Commission's projects is POLBACK; the Political Background Project of NSA. According to the POLBACK brochure, the purpose of the project is "to provide the American student with current information through sets of political background papers, to be used in seminars or in campus-wide programs . . . POLBACK provides information and analysis which cannot be found in textbooks. . ." As of April 1, 1965, the NSA listed a total of only seven (7) POLBACK booklets which were then available including *The Rise of the Latin American Left, Panama, Angola and Mozambique*, and *South and Southwest Africa*. The POLBACK entitled the *Rise of the Latin American Left*, by Michael Schwartz, is a fifty page summation of leftist or communist activity in eight (8) Latin American nations which is, at best, rather speculative and, at least, a relatively mediocre library paper with a leftist-oriented bibliography.

Another project of NSA which comes under the jurisdiction of the International Commission was announced in a pamphlet entitled "Aid to Angola" which was distributed at the 18th National Student Congress (August, 1965). The pamphlet said, "The United States National Student Association (USNSA) and the National Union of Angolan Students (UNEA) appeal for your assistance in helping the Angolan people who, suffering under Portuguese colonialism, have fled Angola and are now refugees in surrounding African countries." The pamphlet goes on to say that ". . . the Angolan people were forced to organize to protect themselves and work for their interests. Following the formation of political parties, the revolutionary war began in 1961 and continues today under the leadership of the Angolan Revolutionary Government in Exile (GRAE), whose aim is to obtain national independence." According to the *Background Readings: African Student Affairs* which was prepared for the 18th National Student Congress by the International Commission, the President of the GRAE is Holden Roberto who also happens to be chairman of the National Front for the Liberation of Angola (FLNA) which, in turn, is a front group for the Communist terrorist group known as the Union of Angolan Peoples or Uniao das Populacoes de Angola (UPA) and the Parti Democratique d'Angola (PDA). In an article which appeared on page 48 of *African Student Affairs*, Paul Touba, the Secretary for Information of the UNEA said, "We in UNEA are dedicated to full participation in the revolution of our people in the interests of achieving national independence. To this end, we must continue to support the National Front for Angolan Liberation. In time of revolutionary war it is important to have a well organized governmental machinery. The Front is our machinery and we back it and support it. . . ."

---

[4] *USNSA Report*, Philadelphia, Pa., 1963, pg. 15.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] *The Congress News*, U.S. Student Press Association, August 23, 1965, pg. 4.

[7] *Codification of Policy, 1965–66*, by USNSA, Washington, D.C., pg. 7.

[8] *The American Student*, by the International Commission of USNSA, Philadelphia, Pa., 1965, pg. 14.

THE NATIONAL STUDENT CONGRESS

Each summer, hundreds of delegates and alternates representing NSA member colleges and universities located throughout the United States travel to the campus of one of the largest midwestern universities in-order-to participate in the national legislative convention of the National Student Association known as the National Student Congress (NSC). NSA material states that the Congress has two principal functions: "It provides a meeting place for students from every area of the country to discuss mutual problems and ideas, and it is the official decision-making body for the policies and programs of USNSA." NSA claims that the NSC "remains the largest forum for the expression of the opinion and ideas of the American student community."[9] One might begin to question the value of this "forum" and the representative nature of the annual Congress, however, when it is realized that (1) less than fifteen per cent (15%) of the junior colleges, colleges, universities, and graduate schools which are eligible for membership in NSA actually belong to the Association; (2) less than fifty per cent (50%) of the member institutions generally send representatives to the National Student Congress; and (3) most of the delegates and alternates which "represent" member schools at the annual Congresses are not democratically elected by the students whose views and aspirations they purport to represent. This, then, is the National Student Congress: a forum of student opinion representing the views of a few hundred young men and women who, in reality, can claim to represent no one but themselves, since most of them were not democratically elected by their fellow students. The few who are elected by their constituents usually will admit that they did not base their campaigns on the issues which are discussed at the National Student Congress.

In 1964, the delegates to the 17th National Student Congress adopted an amendment to the NSA Constitution which ostensibly provided for the democratic election of delegates and alternates to the annual Congress. Article III, Section E (1) of the Constitution states that: "No more than two members in a delegation may be selected by means other than a democratic election by their entire student body as long as this procedure does not conflict with the constitution and bylaws of the member school."[10] The loophole is, of course, contained in the latter part of the sentence and might be similar to a mythical Supreme Court ruling which stated that every American should be permitted to vote except in those states where law prohibits the exercise of such franchise to certain groups. In view of NSA's purported concern for the civil rights of the individual, it is ironic that the Association should indirectly abrogate the right of a university student democratically to choose who he wishes to represent his views at a national student forum, but, apparently, the Association is more concerned with maintaining its status as a vestige of the so-called "New Left" than its responsibility as a "representative" of the American student community. Determined to preserve the "liberal" status of the Association, many student governments altered their by-laws to prohibit the election of Congress representatives and, consequently, few of the delegates to the 1965 NSA Congress were elected by their respective student bodies.

The National Student Congress generally lasts about two weeks with the first week usually devoted to committee and subcommittee sessions, regional caucuses, political caucuses, ad hoc study groups, workshops, and a number of special events (e.g., films, banquets, folkdancing) all of which vie for the attention of the delegates, alternates, and observers while the final week is generally dominated by the Congress Plenary Sessions which often last long into the night. While the summer Congress may represent two weeks of fun and frolic to some, the Congress and its pronouncements represent something far more serious for others. Writing of the 16th National Student Congress, William C. Wooldridge of Harvard College said: ". . . the Bloomington fiasco was the inevitable result of the Left's attempt to turn NSA into a sounding board for completely unrepresentative political opinions. Chief organ of the militant Left was the *Liberal Bulletin*, published by the Students for a Democratic Society. A typical Liberal effort, strong on emotional appeals (it had no headline with less than three exclamation marks), the *Bulletin* called the desire for 'more facts' indicative of a 'dangerous, self-defeating, and unbecoming mentality all too pervasive at this Congress.' Damn the uncertainties; full speed ahead!"[11] In a flash of insight, the October, 1965, issue of *Moderator* belatedly announced the emergence of the "New Left" as a dominant force in NSA. Following the 1965 NSA Congress, *Moderator* said: "Liberalism, or more properly the New Left, is in the ascendancy within USNSA. The organization took a turn toward a movement and away from being purely organizational at its Congress this summer."[12]

It is during the initial week of the Congress that delegates meet to discuss the issues upon which they must legislate during the final few days of the Congress. Armed with background papers which have been compiled by the NSA Staff, delegates begin their quest for truth by listening to the resource personnel which have been provided by the Association also. The background papers generally consist of a series of magazine reprints or excerpts from books. These materials reflect a liberal-left point-of-view and this mode of thought is usually complemented by the various speakers who appear. In 1965, for example, the background papers consisted primarily of reprints from magazines such as *The Student, The New Republic, The Commonweal,* and *Africa Report* as well as some contributions from the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and the Students for a Democratic Society. Referring to the February-March 1962 issue of the *Student*, a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate said that it "could almost have been an IUS publication".[13] In 1965, the *Student* was one of the principal sources of background material which NSA supplied to the delegates to the 18th National Student Congress.

HOW IS NSA FINANCED?

According to a recent brochure issued by the National Student Association: "USNSA is financed by membership dues, grants from foundations for special projects, the sale of publications, and gifts from interested individuals and corporations." Some of the groups which have been identified as contributors by NSA include the Field Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Foundation for Youth and Student Affairs, and the New World Foundation. During the summer of 1964, for example, the National Student Association conducted a "literacy project" in Selma, Alabama in cooperation with the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) under the auspices of the Norman Family Fund and the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO).[14] In October of 1965, however, when NSA moved its headquarters to Washington, D.C., the Association refused to name the benefactor(s) who gave NSA a fifteen-year lease on a Washington home and $20,000.00 with which to furnish it.[15] According to the financial statements issued by NSA, the Association operates on a budget of less than $100,000 per year, but reports filed with the Internal Revenue Service generally indicate that the Association's annual income from grants-in-aid, etc., is far in excess of this modest figure.

The National Student Association enjoys a tax exempt status under Section 501(c)(3) of the United States Internal Revenue Service Code of 1954. This section allows tax exemptions for "corporations . . . organized and operated exclusively for . . . *educational purposes . . . no substantial part of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation,* and which does not participate, or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements) any political campaign . . ."[16] The Code further provides that any organization which engages in prohibited activities will lose its tax exempt status and be taxed in full.[17]

The history of NSA's tax exempt status is rather interesting. NSA first applied for tax exemption as an educational organization in 1949. In a letter dated April 25, 1950, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue refused the requested exemption on the grounds that NSA did not qualify under the law. The ruling held that NSA was not operated exclusively for educational purposes and that "a substantial part of its activities consisted of attempts to influence legislation."[18] To get around this, the 1954 NSA president, James M. Edwards again wrote to the Commissioner on March 26, 1954. Edwards pleaded that "students" had prepared the previous request for exemption "without the assistance of counsel" and that they "were not familiar with the Internal Revenue Service procedure on such rulings."[19] Once again, he requested exemption, but this time he submitted a carefully selected stack of NSA publications all of which emphasized NSA's educational activities and ignored the political activities which the previous Commissioner had found as legal ground to refuse exemption. Bending over backwards to make his point, Edwards told the Commissioner:

---

[9] *The Eighteenth National Student Congress*, by USNSA, Philadelphia, Pa., 1965, pg. 2.

[10] *Codification of Policy, 1965–66*, by USNSA, Washington, D.C., pg. 13.

[11] William C. Wooldridge, "Fiasco at Bloomington," *National Review* (October 8, 1963), pg. 303.

[12] "Special Report: The National Student Congress," *Moderator* (October, 1965), pg. 29.

[13] *The Communist International Youth and Student Apparatus*, Washington, D.C., 1963, pg. 9.

[14] "Literacy: Project in Selma," *The American Student*, (Summer, 1965), pg. 14.

[15] Nancy Moran, "Student Unit Moves Into a Rent-Free, Plush Office Here," *The Washington Post*, October 10, 1965, pg. B–4.

[16] *Internal Revenue Code*, 501 et seq., Prentice Hall, Inc., 1962 ed.

[17] *Ibid.*, 503(a)(1)(A).

[18] Letter of March 26, 1954 from USNSA President James M. Edwards to the U.S. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, pg. 2.

"As a practical matter the resolutions (which concern legislation and are adopted by the NSA annual Congress) have not been implemented by any substantial activity on the part of the Association or its officers. Although in the summer of 1953, the Congress, without the advice of counsel, concluded that the Association should register as a lobbying organization, in the fall of 1953 the Staff considered this question, concluded that they and the Association did not engage in lobbying. . . ."[20]

Edwards then included, in his rather lengthy letter, a resolution which was apparently passed especially for the benefit of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The resolution, dated March 4, 1954, said:

"Resolved, the United States National Student Association was organized exclusively for the educational purposes stated in the preamble of its constitution and no substantial part of its activities may constitute influencing or attempting to influence legislation by propaganda, lobbying or other means. The President and Vice Presidents of the Association shall have the duty of enforcing this resolution."[21]

Apparently, Edward's letter, which was part of the sworn statement submitted by the National Student Association under penalty for perjury, was sufficiently convincing and, within a few months, the tax exemption was granted. The benefits of such a status become increasingly evident when one realizes that one of the principal sources of NSA funds is the tax exempt foundation which could not legally contribute to the Association if NSA, itself, did not continue to maintain its tax-free status.

Despite the legal restrictions regarding political activity noted above, a significant percentage of NSA's resolutions and program mandates do call for direct legislative action in a wide variety of areas. Whether or not this political involvement is in fact "substantial" depends upon your own definition of the term. Although the annual NSA Congress generally adopts more legislation concerning the academic community per se, most of the debate, and probably most of the thought, of the delegates to the National Student Congress are directed into other channels (e.g., political activism). At the 1965 Congress, for example, the major issue was the war in Viet Nam and, aside from that, nearly everything else played a secondary role. The 1962–63 *Codification of Policy* contained a resolution which commended and expressed support for demonstrations (e.g., picketing and sit-ins) designed to win legislative support for the recognition of labor unions in New York State hospitals and, more recently, in a resolution adopted at the 17th National Student Congress entitled "Public School Devotional Exercises," NSA urged the defeat of the Becker Amendment and other laws introduced in the United States Congress concerning the modification of the Supreme Court rulings regarding school prayer. The resolution also directed the Associations' National Staff to send copies of the aforementioned resolution "to the Hon. Emanuel Celler, Chairman, and to the Members of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives . . ."[22]

These activities constitute a flagrant violation of the Internal Revenue Code and it would be entirely just and proper for the Internal Revenue Service to revoke NSA's tax exempt status as has been the fate of other groups and organizations who violated their sworn statements concerning the true nature of their activities.

POLITICS AND THE ROLE OF THE STUDENT

The eleventh article of the NSA Constitution is entitled "Participation in Political Affairs" and is ostensibly designed to restrict the Association's activities to issues relevant to the academic community. This section is divided into three distinct parts which state:

A. No body acting on behalf of USNSA shall participate in sectarian religious activities or partisan political activities; they shall not take part in activity which does not affect students in their role as students.

B. No substantial part of the activities of the national and regional bodies of USNSA shall be devoted to carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation.

C. The Congress, or between sessions of the Congress, the National Supervisory Board, may declare the action of any body other than the Congress acting on behalf of USNSA to have violated sections A or B above and prohibit and disassociate USNSA from such action.[23]

The definition of "the student as student" clause has been the subject of much debate recently, but, according to NSA, its limits of concern are infinite. The Preamble to the NSA Constitution states that: "We, the members of the national union of students of the United States . . ." desire ". . . to maintain academic freedom, academic responsibility and student rights; . . . to promote international understanding and fellowship; . . . to guarantee to all people . . . equal rights and possibilities for primary, secondary and higher education regardless of sex, race, religion, political belief or economic circumstance. . . ." These lofty goals are the basis, or excuse, for NSA's political involvement. They are utilized to justify resolutions of a purely partisan political nature, i.e., the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities for allegedly abridging the academic freedom of students; the admission of Communist China to the United Nations to further international understanding; and the condemnation of the Diem regime in South Viet Nam for "the brutal suppression of Vietnamese students and religious leaders."

In practice, "the student as student" limitation has become a license for involving NSA in anything and everything in current national and international politics.

THE MYTH OF "WORLD STUDENT UNITY"

Many of the NSA officers and supporters are unquestionably sincere in their attitude as to what really concerns "students in their role as students." In almost every piece of NSA literature one can generally find a seemingly inordinate attachment to what is euphemistically known as "world student unity". Policy resolutions continually emphasize a "solidarity" with students in underdeveloped, oppressed, or newly-emerging nations. It is significant, as noted earlier, that the National Student Association was founded by a group of American students who had attended the World Student Congress in Prague, Czechoslovakia, in the summer of 1946. The Introduction to NSA's *Codification of Policy* attempts to define the limits of student concern and the relationship between the American student and his foreign counterparts when it states:

"Students in institutions of higher education have a legitimate concern with all issues which affect them in their role as students. This is one of the basic premises of the United States National Student Association. No matter where these issues arise, whether in this country or abroad, all students everywhere are affected for they belong to a 'single commonwealth of the mind.'"[24]

This paragraph is the basis for NSA's international involvement and, along with the Basic Policy Declaration on "International Student Cooperation" which was adopted by the 17th National Student Congress, it is also the basis for programs of assistance to the foreign student groups (e.g., the Union of Angolan Students—UNEA). NSA resolutions have pointed to such things as the overthrow of President Diem in Viet Nam, the overthrow of Batista by Castro, and the Japanese student riots against the impending visit of President Eisenhower as examples of "what students can do". Domestically, the NSA exults over the student involvement in the Southern sit-ins and the anti-HCUA riots which occurred in San Francisco in May of 1960. Following the anti-Draft and Viet Nam protests that the radical Left conducted in October of 1965, the NSA rushed to the defense of groups such as the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). Appearing at a press conference with SDS National Secretary Paul Booth, the 1965–66 President of NSA, Philip Sherburne, protested Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach's criticism of the anti-war demonstrations. Sherburne warned that such criticism might "serve to silence those who disagree with United States action in Viet Nam" and argued that the rights of all are threatened when the rights of a few (e.g., SDS) are abridged and the ". . . group is subjected to official harassment for its beliefs."[25]

Contrary to the pious pronouncements of "solidarity" with students in remote parts of the world, however, the fundamental concept of "world student unity" is pure fantasy. Most students are involved in the educational process of higher learning for about four years—six or eight at the most. Being a college student is not a profession nor is it a way of life; it is a transitional phase in which the child becomes an adult, and concentrates on *learning*—not on total involvement in the weighty issues of national and international politics.

NSA, however, seems to aim at the "professional student" as its base of support. Thus, speaking of its own "place in American society" NSA says: "Each year. . . . increases the necessity for its (NSA's) existence. For as the world becomes more complex and the four year college experience becomes more inadequate as a preparation for life and democracy, its potential as an organization becomes more vast".[26]

Secondly, students in different countries live in vastly different political atmospheres. In many parts of the world, students are politically important because there is no significant middle class, little industrialization, and a severe lack of professional and intellectual leadership. This is obviously not the case in the United States. The sit-in movement and the Leftist campaign against the House Committee on Un-American Activities are not entirely student-led and the effect of student involvement in both of these movements on public opinion has been minimal.

Thirdly, the various student activities in foreign countries have little in common with the activities of American college students except for the involvement of *students per se*. In many countries, these activities have a strictly ideological basis and often result in blood-shed and violence.

---

[19] *Ibid.*, pg. 2.

[20] *Ibid.*, pg. 16.

[21] *Ibid.*, pg. 17.

[22] *Codification of Policy, 1965–66,* by USNSA, Washington, D.C., pp. 73–74.

[23] *Ibid.*, pg. 16.

[24] *Ibid.*, pg. 7.

[25] "War Protestors Urge Jobs for Draft Foes," *The* (Washington, D.C.) *Evening Star* (October 20, 1965), pg. A–3.

[26] *USNSA Report,* 1963, op. cit. pg. 7.

THE INTERNATIONAL STUDENT CONFERENCE

As previously mentioned, the National Student Association sent representatives to the initial meeting of the International Student Conference (ISC) which was held in Stockholm in 1950, but NSA did not officially affiliate with the ISC until 1964 when the delegates to the 17th National Student Congress adopted the ISC Charter. The NSA resolution stated that the "Seventeenth National Student Congress. . . . Declares its commitment to the ISC as a framework for cooperation among national unions of students and affirms its full support for the Charter and the principles enunciated within it".[27] Excerpts from the ISC Charter were printed in the *Student*, the official magazine of the ISC, and the Charter states ISC's belief in a "Free University in a Free Society" which is ". . . fully sustained by the society of which it is a part . . ." and fulfills ". . . its vital role as a forum for the unfettered inter-play of ideas. . . . and as a center where even the most basic assumptions and institutions of society can be placed in doubt, without fear of reprisals by any political, economic, or social force". ISC states that "Economic justice shall be achieved only when equality of economic opportunity, adequate material standards of living and the equitable distribution of national wealth depend on precepts and methods of economic planning and growth based on popular needs and aspirations rather than the rigid adherence to any particular economic doctrine."[28]

The International Student Conference is supposedly the "non-Communist" alternative to the Communist-dominated International Union of Students (IUS), but in July, 1964, the delegates to the Eleventh International Student Conference held in Christchurch, New Zealand, adopted a resolution entitled "Universal Student Cooperation" which directed the Secretariat of the ISC (formerly COSEC) to enter into negotiations with the Secretariat of the IUS in order to achieve ". . . agreement on a set of common principles of cooperation between the two international organizations . . . the implementation of these principles of cooperation through initiatives supported by both international organizations . . . the expansion of bilateral, multilateral and regional cooperation between the members of the ISC and the members of the IUS. . . ."[29] At the same Conference, the ISC delegates adopted a resolution on Panama which indicated that: "The ISC deplored the illegal activities of the United States secondary school students in the Canal Zone for not obeying the Flag Convention of June, 1963, and for instigating the riots of January, 1964, condemned the system of racial and nationality discrimination that exists in the Canal Zone, and urged the Governments of Panama and the United States to continue to negotiate in order to abrogate the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty and allow the Panamanian people to determine the conditions under which the Canal ought to operate."[30]

On April 28, 1965, President Johnson dispatched American military forces to the Dominican Republic in order to protect the lives of more than 1,300 United States citizens and prevent the establishment of another Communist government in Latin America. The Dominican Republic was in a state of chaos as the result of a Communist-instigated revolution and the Dominican Government indicated that it could not guarantee the safety of U.S. citizens.[31] Despite these facts, the Secretariat of the International Student Conference issued a statement condemning United States intervention in the Dominican situation. The statement was carried in a Collegiate Press Service (CPS) release and said:

"The Secretariat of the International Student Conference has watched with great concern the events in the Dominican Republic particularly in light of the deep interest students have shown in the progress which the Dominican Republic made toward the establishment of a democratic government with the election of Mr. Juan Bosch as President in 1962. . . . The ISC has consistently protested against outside unilateral interference in the affairs of any sovereign nation. . . . The Secretariat of the ISC demands the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from the Dominican Republic and an end to the unilateral intervention of the U.S. Government in the affairs of the Dominican Republic."

The same Collegiate Press Service release carried a statement by the National Student Association which said: "United States National Student Association (USNSA) strongly condemns the unilateral military intervention of the United States in the internal affairs of the Dominican Republic." The ISC statement was released in Leiden, Netherlands, on May 7, 1965, and apparently in the spirit of "world student unity," the NSA statement was issued in Philadelphia on the following day. NSA's condemnation became official in August, 1965, when the delegates to the 18th National Student Congress adopted a special resolution on the Dominican Republic which stated that "USNSA condemns U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic" and, thus, reaffirmed their belief in the concept of a "single commonwealth of mind" which is ostensibly the basis for the international student movement. After all, NSA would probably consider it chauvinistic to defend American foreign policy regardless of its motivation (e.g., humanitarian) unless such policy was in agreement with the policies of the ISC (e.g., military intervention in the Union of South Africa).

NSA AND THE RADICAL LEFT

One of the principal reasons why so many people are concerned about the National Student Association and its influence in American student affairs is because of its relatively extensive political involvement and, more especially, its relationship to the extreme left-wing of American politics. Indeed, this is one of the primary reasons why many students oppose participation in NSA while others seem to delight in its existence and the controversy which many of the Association's policies tends to precipitate.

Almost since its inception, the domestic Left has recognized the value of NSA as a vehicle for its propaganda and a seemingly innocuous student lobby through which to push its socialistic legislation. The Left is generally well represented at the annual congresses and has generally succeeded in influencing the tenor of much of the Association's politically-oriented policies and programs.

At the 15th National Student Congress, which was held at Ohio State University in August of 1962, the Communist Party U.S.A. and other Leftist organizations were represented by some of their most articulate spokesmen including:

1. *Daniel Rubin*, the National Youth Director of the Communist Party and editor of *Communist Viewpoint* a monthly publication of the Communist Party U.S.A., specifically designed for youth.
2. *Phillip Luce*, an official of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee a Communist-sympathizing organization which has been cited as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States.
3. *Burton White*, an official of the Bay Area Committee for the Abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee and a key figure in the Communist-instigated riots against the Committee which occurred in San Francisco in May, 1960.
4. *Marvin Markman*, the Executive Vice President of Advance, the New York City Communist youth group which was ordered to register as a communist front organization, and, also, Vice Chairman of the Progressive Youth Organizing Committee, a national communist youth front.
5. *Susan Markman*, the Youth Secretary of the Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties, another Communist-sympathizing organization.

Much of the Association's legislation and programming has evoked considerable praise from some of the Left's leading journals including *Communist Viewpoint* and *The Worker*. For example, *The Worker* gave front-page headlines to NSA's Viet Nam resolution, which recommended a cessation in the bombings of North Viet Nam and all offensive military operations in the South and separate negotiation with the National Liberation Front which was adopted by the delegates to the 1965 NSA Congress. The following editorial under the title "Young Voices for Peace" appeared in *The Worker* on September 12, 1965:

"The National Student Association which recently concluded a two week convention in Madison, Wis., has made a contribution to the struggle to end U.S. aggression in Vietnam on the basis of self-determination, by its overwhelming support to a resolution setting forth some pre-conditions which the U.S. Government must accept in order to bring about serious and meaningful negotiations.

This body, representing students from all over the country, called for the U.S. to cease immediately all bombings and all other offensive military action. They called on the U.S. Government to specifically include the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam in its offer to negotiate.

These proposals, which are in line with the stand of such major peace organizations as Sane Nuclear Policy and Women Strike for Peace, place the responsibility for the war on the Johnson Administration, and in fact expose the talk of readiness for unconditional negotiations as nothing but a coverup for continued aggression and the escalation of the war to where it perils Southeast Asia and the entire world.

It is in this light that we must also review the proposals made public by Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, which it was officially announced were cleared with the White House. . . .

But the real test of willingness to negotiate is to be found in the willingness to accept such proposals as that of the National Student Association, to end the bombings and all other offensive actions, and to negotiate with the representatives of the fighting people of South Vietnam, the National Liberation Front. . . ."[32]

Communist Party functionaries (e.g., Daniel Rubin) have frequently participated in the annual congresses of the Association, but recently a more subtle, albeit more active, group of young radicals have managed to affect the mode of NSA policy. Operating under the guise of a "Liberal Study Group" and through the so-called Liberal Caucus, the organizations of the New Left (e.g.,

---

[27] *Codification of Policy, 1964–65*, by USNSA, Philadelphia, Pa., pg. 141.

[28] *International Student Affairs*, International Commission on USNSA, Philadelphia, Pa., 1965, pg. 32.

[29] *Ibid.*, pg. 94.

[30] *Ibid.*, pg. 36.

[31] "War Steps Up—Where It's Headed," *U.S. News & World Report* (May 10, 1965), pp. 31–33.

[32] "Young Voices for Peace," *The Worker*, September 12, 1965, pg. 3.

Students for a Democratic Society) have maintained the liberal-left persuasion of the Association. The defeat of a resolution at the 1964 NSA Congress which sought to limit NSA's political involvement to matters relevant to the academic community had a decided influence on the politically-oriented resolutions which were adopted at the 1965 conclave. The principal issue at the 18th National Student Congress was the war in Viet Nam, but the delegates also adopted resolutions which: (1) asked the United States Government to propose the admission of Communist China to the United Nations; (2) condemned United States intervention in the Dominican Republic; (3) endorsed rent strikes and school boycotts; and (4) recommended Government assistance for indigenous anti-poverty groups, e.g., the SDS-operated JOIN project in Chicago. These are but a few of radical policies which NSA endorsed in August of 1965, but they are indicative of the Association's policies as a whole. Some might assert that the policies which were adopted at the 18th National Student Congress were more inordinate than the politically-oriented resolutions which were adopted at previous congresses, but the ideological content of the propositions is not significantly different than the content of prior legislation. The Association's policies have always demonstrated an affinity for the programs of the domestic Left (e.g., the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities), but recently one might conclude that partiality has become an obsession.

As previously mentioned, NSA operated a "literacy project" in cooperation with the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) during the summer of 1964 and, in October of 1965, when the radical Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) became involved in a bitter debate with members of the Johnson Administration over its (SDS's) participation in the anti-draft and Viet Nam protests, the NSA President Philip Sherburne rushed to the defense of the Leftist group. Both of these organizations, the Students for a Democratic Society and the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee, are at the heart of the "New Left Movement" and their zeal for immoderation and their ideological commitment has been praised by such elite Leftists as Communist Party General Secretary Gus Hall who said: "Fronts are a thing of the past. We don't need them. We've got the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs, the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee, and Student for a Democratic Society going for us, but they're not, 'fronts' in the usual sense of the word. They're just a part of the 'responsible left'—that portion of American youth that realizes society is sick." [33]

The National Student Association has frequently pointed to the community action projects of organizations such as the Students for a Democratic Society as examples of student involvement and in 1965 urged Federal Assistance for the SDS-operated JOIN (Jobs or Income Now) project in Chicago. JOIN is, according to SDS, a predominantly white Uptown (Chicago) movement which has initiated rent strikes in the City's tenements.[34] Like most SDS projects, JOIN has a political education program which some might refer to as an indoctrination course since the SDS's cadre generally spend much of their time telling the poor how corrupt and undemocratic American society is.

In 1961 the delegates to the 14th National Student Congress of NSA adopted a resolution declaring NSA's approval of the objectives and programs of the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee.[35] More recently the delegates to the 17th Congress approved a resolution entitled "Civil Rights Programming" which directed NSA's National Affairs Vice President to institute "a program of aid in the form of office supplies, food, clothing and fund raising" on behalf of SNCC, the Northern Student Movement (NSM), and the SNCC-spawned Council of Federated Organizations (COFO). SNCC's membership in the New Left and its involvement in the Viet Nam protests as well as demonstrations against the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HCUA) have not affected NSA's relationship with the organization even though SNCC has been criticized by the more responsible civil rights organizations, e.g., NAACP. In January of 1966, for example, SNCC issued a policy statement concerning United States involvement in Viet Nam which was, according to SNCC Chairman John Lewis, approved by the entire national staff of SNCC *without dissent*. The SNCC statement urged draft-age Americans to avoid military service in Viet Nam by becoming involved in the "civil rights movement" and said:

> We maintain that our country's cry of "preserve freedom in the world" is a hypocritical mask behind which it squashes liberation movements which are not bound, and refuse to be bound, by the expediencies of the United States cold war policies.[36]

The SNCC statement brought quick reaction from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) in the form of a statement by the executive director of the NAACP, Roy Wilkins. Wilkins said that the NAACP "disassociates itself" from the SNCC policy statement and warned that SNCC's Viet Nam statement should not be considered as the policy of the "civil rights groups". Glouster Current, NAACP program director, criticized the SNCC statement and accused SNCC leaders of neglecting civil rights work and turning their interest to participation in peace parades.[37]

These organizations, and others of their kind, have exerted an increasing amount of influence in their efforts to dictate NSA policy. Year after year, with almost phenomenal consistency, the delegates to the Association's summer congresses have enthusiastically endorsed the policies and programs of the domestic Left. The congresses have pledged assistance to the Left and have praised their "community action programs" while condemning those agencies and laws which seek to preserve the national security. NSA's resolutions on international affairs generally coincide with the type of foreign policy advocated by the Left, e.g., the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

NSA AND NATIONAL SECURITY

The National Student Association has frequently stated its opposition to those laws and governmental agencies which, NSA asserts, restrict the free exchange of ideas. The basis for this mode of thought is defined in a Basic Policy Declaration (BPD) entitled "National Security and Civil Liberties" which states:

"USNSA believes that it is the obligation of any government committed to democratic principles to guarantee full due process to every citizen.

"In their efforts to identify and punish 'subversive' elements within the population, American governmental agencies have sometimes engaged in practices unworthy of a free democracy. USNSA believes that the governmental practices which automatically and indelibly brand as 'subversive' members of many dissenting organizations or those who have refused on Constitutional grounds to testify before a Congressional Committee, which deny American citizens freedom to travel abroad solely because of their political associations or beliefs, which restrict to certain countries the right of free travel, which disenfranchise or extradite naturalized citizens for their political associations and beliefs, which authorizes the deportation of purportedly 'subversive' aliens without judicial hearing, and which dictates to unions standards of political association and belief, are not consonant with standards of freedom and dignity embodied within the U.S. Constitution.

"USNSA repudiates the policy of denying federal education loans and grants to those with present or past membership in certain controversial organizations. USNSA further believes that loyalty oaths, political test oaths, or disclaimers as prerequisites for employment or as a basis for continued employment are procedurally ineffective and do not necessarily guarantee loyalty. USNSA believes that past associations with persons or organizations should not be considered in determining an individual's loyalty." [38]

URGES ABOLITION OF HCUA

At the 14th National Student Congress held in Madison, Wisconsin in August, 1961, the major debate centered around the House Committee on Un-American Activities, a favorite target of the extreme Left. The debate did not occur because students throughout the United States were concerned about the Committee. The Communist-spawned "National Committee to Abolish HUAC" had been conducting a national campaign, particularly on college campuses, against the Committee. (This Communist group later praised the NSA for its opposition to the House Committee on Un-American Activities and widely publicized the NSA's stand on the Committee).[39]

The NSA debate at Madison occurred because certain individuals and organizations had prepared the way for a major debate on the Committee. When NSA delegates arrived, they found the campus saturated with well-written and expensively printed literature advocating the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HCUA). The outcome of the debate was not difficult to predict. One NSA delegate wrote the following comment in the Queens College (N.Y.) *Phoenix:*

"The HCUA hassle was the great test of the 'conservative challenge' and it was no test at all. Those who didn't want abolition wanted revision; those who didn't want to do away with the witch-hunters still were able to list all the evils of such a body. There was one use of the 'atheistic Communism' argument, but the audience laughed." [40]

The Association formalized its opposition to the Committee in 1962 when the delegates to the 15th National Student Congress adopted a resolution urging the abolition of the HCUA (see Appendix). Continuing its opposition to the Committee, the 16th National Student Congress criticized the film "Operation Abolition" which documents Communist involvement in the anti-HCUA riots conducted in San Francisco in May, 1960. The NSA statement aserted that the charges made against the anti-HCUA rioters were unwarranted and expressed belief in the sincerity and "good intentions" of the students involved in the demonstrations.[41]

---

[33] Senate Internal Security Committee, *The Anti-Vietnam Agitation and the Teach-In Movement,* October 13, 1965, pg. 16.

[34] "A Movement of Many Voices," Students for a Democratic Society, ERAP, Ann Arbor, Michigan, pg. 12.

[35] *Codification of Policy,* 1963–64, by USNSA, Philadelphia, Pa., pg. 102.

[36] "Rights Group Says U.S. Is Aggressor," *New York Times,* January 7, 1966, pg. 3.

[37] "NAACP Decries Anti-Policy Move," Associated Press, New York, January 10, 1966.

[38] *Codification of Policy, 1963–65,* by USNSA, Philadelphia, Pa., pp. 43–44.

[39] *Abolition News,* published by the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, January, 1963.

[40] Article by Peter Wolff and Nanette Rainone; edition of October 3, 1961.

[41] *Codification of Policy, 1963–64,* by USNSA, Philadelphia, Pa., pp. 126–127.

THE M'CARRAN ACT

At the 15th National Student Congress held at Ohio State University in the summer of 1962, the question of gravest concern to the Communists and their sympathizers was the McCarran Act (Internal Security Act of 1950). Once again, the propaganda flowed. This time, the materials were supplied from the display booths of the Communist Party, the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, and the Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties. These subversive groups were permitted to set up display tables in the Ohio State Union Building. The Congress did not specifically call for the repeal of the McCarran Act, but the delegates did express "grave reservations" about the law and urged the U.S. Congress "to reconsider the McCarran Act." The Communists were elated about NSA's willingness to consider their views on a piece of legislation designed to restrict the activities of those groups dedicated to the overthrow of the United States Government. Commenting on the NSA Congress, Daniel Rubin wrote in *Communist Viewpoint:* "The Congress was notable for an expansion of areas of concern, a continued dynamic, liberal trend on domestic issues and the first crack in Cold War policies; and for the first time in NSA history an (admitted) Communist spokesman was present."

NSA's opposition to Federal legislation designed to restrict the activities of subversive organizations and individuals is not an innovation in Association policy. The 1953 NSA Congress passed a resolution introduced by NSA President James Edwards which read in part as follows:

"Fact: The Fifth National Student Congress urged the removal of those sections of the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952 which prohibited from entry into this country those persons who at any time have lent their support to a totalitarian government, who have held membership in such an organization, or who have subscribed to the economic or political doctrines upon which such a state or such an organization is based.

Declaration: The Congress believes that concrete steps must be taken to achieve such revision of the Act.

Action: NSA directs . . . this brief should be forwarded to our lobbying representative in Washington for appropriate action and also distributed to member schools as the basis for initiating a program of legislative pressure." [42]

CASE STUDY: NSA'S DOUBLE STANDARD

A comparison of two resolutions adopted by NSA, one dealing with the Dominican Republic and the other dealing with the Union of South Africa, clearly demonstrate the difference between NSA's attitude regarding a nation which is subjected to Communist-inspired revolution and a non-Communist nation. In the summer of 1965, the delegates to the Eighteenth National Student Congress condemned the United States for intervening in the Dominican Republic when a Communist takeover threatened to engulf the nation. NSA said that this military intervention violated the sovereignty of an independent state, but the very same Congress urged the United States to consider collective military action against the anti-Communist sovereign state of South Africa in-order-to end racial, economic, and political (e.g., restrictions on Communists and other subversives) discrimination in that country. Thus, it appears, NSA opposes unilateral military action to prevent the establishment of another Cuba in this hemisphere and to protect the lives of American citizens, but, at the same time, would sanction bilateral military action against a non-Communist state. It is also significant that the delegates to the 1965 NSA Congress adopted a resolution on the war in Vietnam which urged the United States to cease offensive military action in South Vietnam and bombings of the North and asked the Johnson Administration to recognize the National Liberation Front as a belligerent in the war, but, at the same time, the resolution did not comment on the brutality and terrorism employed by the Communists against the free people of South Vietnam, nor did it condemn such aggressive military activity on the part of the Viet Cong and their leaders in North Vietnam.

This is but one example of the consistently left wing attitude of NSA's resolutions. The Association is quick to condemn any apparent injustice in pro-Western countries (e.g., Spain and South Africa), but appears reluctant to do the same in regard to similar or even worse conditions in Communist states even through this injustice may manifest itself in aggressive military action against free nations. We suggest that the interested reader obtain a copy of the NSA's *Codification of Policy* and examine this strange double standard for himself.

NASA'S SERVICES TO MEMBERS SCHOOLS

One of NASA's principal selling points is its "service" to member schools. The Student Government Information Service (SGIS) is the "clearinghouse" through which the Association distributes information on various programs to individual student governments. However, much of the information which the SGIS has been able to supply in the past to interested student governments was entirely too theoretical to have any practical application. One of the fundamental deficiencies of NSA's program is its failure to provide member institutions with direct and continuing assistance. A college may be fortunate enough to receive a copy of an SGIS booklet which it requested, but that is generally the last time it hears from NSA. Although the Association employs a relatively large staff, its interest in political matters seem to take priority over its interest in matters relevant to the academic community. "In the past", says the October, 1965, issue of *Moderator* (page 29) "USNSA has barely kept up with its basic services".

For schools which are genuinely interested in solutions to student government problems, NSA is definitely not the answer. Such schools can find the assistance which they are seeking in state and regional organizations which have been established for the sole purpose of helping member schools in their campus programming and with a great deal less of a financial strain on the student government's budget. Political activity of the type conducted by NSA is best left to organizations specifically designed for that purpose. This is where campus groups of YAF, the Campus ADA, Young Republicans and Young Democrats should come in. It is through these groups that a student can freely choose the political programs and ideology or philosophy which best represents his views as an individual. For those who argue that students ought to be taking a greater interest in national and international affairs the answer is that NSA is not the proper place for shaping such interest.

The National Student Association claims to speak on behalf of the American student community on subjects which are beyond the constitutional realm of the organization. Moreover, the line that it takes is nearly always representative of the Leftist elite which controls the Association. *There is no real political consensus among American students* and any attempt to speak on behalf of the American student community in matters political should be suspect. It is reasonable to believe that the opinions of students tend to divide just as they do among the general public, according to geography, parental influence, religion, and social views.

Conservative student leaders recognize the need for confederations of student governments: confederations created for, and dedicated to, the promotion of better student government programming on the American college campus. NSA has ignored this purpose and failed in this goal. Other student confederations based on mutual interests already exist i.e., the Associated Student Governments of the United States of America (ASG), the Southern Universities Student Government Association; and other denominational or regional associations.

Where a college or university belongs to NSA, we believe that they should withdraw and align themselves instead with other schools on either a geographical, sectarian or enrollment basis. A realistic association of schools would take cognizance of the differences between them (e.g., size, location) and would attempt to reconcile these differences to the mutual benefit of all concerned.

NSA AND THE FRATERNITY SYSTEM

In keeping with its policy of general antipathy to traditional American values and institutions, NSA has taken a militantly anti-Greek stand. The Association's anti-Greek nature has not, however, escaped the attention of fraternity and sorority leaders throughout the United States, nor does it represent an innovation in NSA policy. Thus, the 1952–53 NSA President Richard J. Murphy was able to tell the delegates to the 1953 NSA Congress that the National Pan-Hellenic Council was one of the principal opponents of NSA. Murphy said: "For six years the Pan-Hellenic Council, i.e., the adult council, has not approved of the Association." He accused the Pan-Hellenic Council of circulating "poison pen letters" against the National Student Association. "This is the type of propaganda to which the Association and its officers have been subjected. Such attacks are insidious. Despite the Association's efforts to clear up the situation, no cooperation has been extended by the Council. I have become convinced that these people do not want to become enlightened." [43]

Eventually widespread criticism of the Association's anti-Greek policies forced NSA to candidly solicit the support of the Greeks. Typical of this subterfuge was a resolution adopted by the delegates to the 11th National Student Congress which consented to recognize "the contribution made by fraternal organizations to campus leadership" and urged a "closer relationship" between such groups and NSA.[44] However, NSA defined the type of fraternity it would like to promote on the college campus in its Basic Policy Declaration (BPD) on "Model Educational Practices Standards" under the section dealing with "Restrictive Clauses in Student Social Organizations". The resolution says:

"No incoming group shall be allowed on campus which contains in its constitution and/or by-laws discriminatory clauses with regard to race, color, religion, creed, political belief, or national origin. In the case of existing organizations which do discriminate, the institution and student body should make every reasonable effort to obtain the elimination of such discriminatory practices as rapidly as possible." [45]

In the summer of 1965, a resolution entitled "Discrimination in Membership Selection and Pledge Abuse in Campus Fraternal Organizations" was introduced at the 18th National Student Congress. Once again, the resolution recognized the contributions which the Greeks have made to the American student community, but the "FACT" section also said, ". . . instances of personal degradation by fraternal organizations across the United States continue to prove harmful to the university atmosphere." The Mandate section of the resolution directed the Association's National Affairs Vice President to conduct surveys of fraternal discrimination, methods utilized to investigate complaints of such practices, and "help given by college and university administrations to chapters of national fraternal organizations which become local organizations". The resolution also directed the NAVP to send copies of the surveys, in the form of a report, to NSA member schools to assist them in establishing "a review date" after which "recognition would be withdrawn from those chapters which are affiliated with national organizations which have discriminatory membership selection".[46] Fearing the reaction that such a directive would initiate among the Greeks, the Congress deleted the Mandate and passed the remainder of the resolution, but the resolution's sponsors then called for a reconsideration of the remaining portions of the proposition whereupon it was defeated. However, much of the resolution that was defeated in 1965 was already contained in a program Resolution (PR) which was adopted by the delegates to the 1964 NSA Congress entitled "Discrimination in Membership Selection in Campus Fraternal Organizations". The Mandate of the 1964 resolution made almost exactly the same provisions for "review dates", etc. as the aforementioned resolution and was passed by a substantial margin at the 17th NSA Congress.[47]

---

[42] *Minutes,* Sixth National Student Congress, August, 1953, pg. 100. The final sentence was later amended to read ". . . forwarded to the NSA Staff on the recommendation that this brief be brought to the attention of officials in Washington."

[43] *Minutes,* Sixth National Student Congress, August, 1953, pg. 24.

[44] *Codification of Policy, 1964–65,* by USNSA, Philadelphia, Pa., pg. 106.

[45] *Ibid,* pg. 42.

FEDERAL SUPERVISION OVER FRATERNITIES URGED

At the Eighteenth Congress in 1965 NSA urged the "Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and any other division of the Federal Government involved in the administering and granting of federal funds to write specific regulations implementing nondiscriminatory compliance and coverage under Title VI (Civil Rights Act of 1964) for the following:

1. Off-campus housing approved by any institution of higher learning.

2. Accommodations in houses and dormitories occupied by fraternal organizations.

3. Membership in any fraternal, social, professional, or business organization, club, association, group, committee, which is approved by a college or university."

Prior to and following such regulations by the Office of Education and other appropriate agencies, USNSA urged students to institute research groups into University operations and to serve as "monitors" for infractions of Federal law.

This shocking attempt to interfere into all private groups is strictly forbidden by the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Sec. 804. (a) "Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution, or over the selection of library resources by any educational institution.

(b) Nothing contained in this Act or any other Act shall be construed to authorize any Department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the membership practices or internal operations of any fraternal organization, fraternity, sorority, private club or religious organization at an institution of higher education (other than a service academy or the Coast Guard Academy) which is financed exclusively by funds derived from private sources and whose facilities are not owned by such institution."

WHAT GREEKS SAY ABOUT NSA

For many years fraternity and sorority leaders have patiently abstained from any overt hostility to NSA, hoping that with maturity NSA would return to the mainstream of American student consensus and abandon its anti-Greek policies. However, time has indicated conclusively that NSA is firm in its determination to destroy the American Fraternity System. Greek leaders have finally resolved to speak out; to point out to members of fraternal groups on the campuses the true nature of NSA and to urge them to work to disassociate their campuses from NSA.

"The Stop-NSA Committee is to be wholeheartedly commended for its constructive and aggressive activity in uncovering the insidious Un-American program of the National Student Association. The NSA is misrepresenting in a most unwholesome manner the true character and aspirations of the majority of America's young citizenry."—Mrs. C. M. Jansky, Past Grand President, Alpha Gamma Delta Fraternity.

"The use of front organizations purporting to espouse worthy and idealistic objectives is a technique often employed to further the sinister ends of atheistic communism. On the surface, NSA, to the unwary, might appear to be what its name implies, a voluntary association of college students, national in scope, conducted by its members and delegates in truly representative fashion. However, those who have looked behind its facade of respectability have found strange hands directing it under cover of darkness toward collectivist mastery of group action, sometimes to the exact opposite of expressed desires and plans of the collegians themselves. Without right or power, it pretends to represent those whom it degrades. It falsely denies to fraternities the freedom of association it so loudly proclaims for itself. NSA does not and cannot promote the cause of liberty, for actually it is an implement of slavery."—Sherwood Blue, Past National President, Theta Chi Fraternity.

"It is my firm belief that the principles and programs advocated by NSA are inimical to the best interests of the country and to the fraternity system, and should not be supported by fraternities and sororities."—Beatrice H. Wittenberg, NPC Delegate, Gamma Phi Beta.

"Where specific inquiries have been made from the Chapters, we have advised that they oppose membership in NSA by voting against either gaining or continuing membership in this organization."—Roy C. Clark, Executive Secretary, Acacia Fraternity.

"Once I had hopes that true representatives of the Fraternity System might be able to guide NSA into channels that would make it better represent the majority of the substantial number of students it contended it did represent. I urged fraternity men and women to do this but was disappointed. For many years I have not approved many NSA policies and procedures and see no reason now to change my mind."—Francis S. Van Derbur, Chairman, Interfraternity Research and Advisory Counsil, Past President, Kappa Sigma Fraternity.

"It is my observation that one of the aims of the NSA is to destroy the American fraternity system. I personally have derived great benefit from membership in my fraternity. To my personal knowledge, many, many others have similarly benefited. In token payment for the benefits derived, I shall continue to serve and fight for the American fraternity system against all its enemies, including NSA. I hope that the undergraduate members of my fraternity will join me in our fight for survival."—John E. Scott, President, Board of Trustees, Fraternity of Phi Gamma Delta.

"In very few specific instances, if any, have I found the aims and objectives of the National Student Association to coincide with those of the American College Greek Letter Fraternity system. After observing the NSA for a number of years I have no hope for a realignment of its activities to more closely coincide with the American College Greek Letter Fraternity system. In every instance wherein my opinion is requested I suggest that the NSA be removed from a campus, or in the instance of a vote for initial acceptance of NSA my counsel is for a negative vote."—Durward Owen, Executive Secretary, The Pi Kappa Phi Fraternity.

"I strongly object to not only the National Student Association but any other group or organization interfering with what I call the personal and civil rights of fraternities and sororities which are voluntary membership societies. We don't interfere with the manner which NSA selects or discriminates in connection with its membership, and the NSA should not interfere with the internal policies of fraternities and sororities."—Harold Jacobsen, Editor, The Emerald Sigma Pi, Sigma Pi Fraternity.

"I have read with interest the latest NSA statement regarding fraternities. It clearly is hostile to the best interests of the system. To subscribe to it would be to deny the basic character of the Greek system: the right voluntarily to choose one's associates. It would be impossible to meet the standard set down by NSA unless we were to allow NSA to choose our members for us. I can only conclude that NSA has abandoned any friendly stance it might once have adopted toward fraternities and has now consciously set out on an open course of opposition to the American Fraternity System. For this reason, I urge all members of my fraternity to oppose attempts to affiliate their school with NSA, and where their school is presently affiliated, to work for its withdrawal."—William S. Zerman, Executive Secretary, Fraternity of Phi Gamma Delta.

"During my 12 years of active national fraternity leadership, I watched closely the activities of NSA, and none of the faults of NSA which I recognized at the outset were corrected during that period.

"One of our young alumnae was among the students who organized NSA. She was amazed to learn recently from authentic reports of its current activities and how far afield it had gone from the purposes and needs which prompted its formation in 1947.

"In my opinion, NSA has by its adoption of policy statements on 'restrictive membership clauses in student social organizations' disregarded the privacy to which voluntary social associations are entitled by our Federal Constitution. The NSA statements seem to deny freedom of choice in membership selection by social groups on the one hand while professing belief in this freedom on the other. Further, it seems to me that NSA is not as interested in representing the ideas of its student membership as it is in trying to direct and control them.

"In view of the many resolutions passed by NSA which favor the extreme leftists elements of this country and the world, I am convinced that NSA is inimical to the existence of private voluntary groups such as fraternities. The freedom for such groups to exist is denied in Communistic, Socialistic, or Totalitarian societies. It is for this reason that I felt during my tenure of office that it was important to alert our membership, both collegiate and alumnae, to the nature of NSA. I have not changed my mind since that time.

"It has been very encouraging to learn of the increasing number of students bodies which have rejected affiliation with NSA."—Mrs. Robert W. Preston, Past President, Delta Gamma Fraternity.

"Nothing that I have read or heard about the United States National Student Association has suggested that it is a healthy, qualified, student organization. Rather, NSA appears constantly to agitate for interference in the affairs of other student organizations. This has been particularly true with regard to American fraternities and sororities, whose freedom of membership selection has been constantly under attack by NSA.

---

[46] *Policy Calendar,* 18th. National Student Congress, 1965, item 485/1–2.

[47] *Codification of Policy, 1964–65,* by USNSA, Philadelphia, Pa., pg. 99.

"NSA does not represent a majority of the students in the United States. Its wide range of resolutions, covering nearly all the controversial political questions of the day, brand it as a radical organization, clearly unrepresentative of thinking American students. NSA leaders could more profitably spend their time attending to their daily academic studies and leave the world's problems to those more qualified to solve them."—Julia Fuqua Ober, Past National President, Kappa Delta.

"We have long regarded NSA as an enemy of fraternities and have consistently advised our collegiate chapters to oppose NSA affiliation."—Richard R. Fletcher, Executive Secretary, Sigma Nu Fraternity.

"Any acceptance of NSA by the American college fraternity will have to be based upon their cessation of attacks upon the fraternity and its right to be selective in choosing its new members. I am positive that if I showed an attitude of "live and let live" in 1957, I underwent a considerable change after that date due to the repeated adoption of resolutions by the NSA Congress each year attacking or criticizing the American college fraternity."—Judge Frank H. Myers, District of Columbia Court of Appeals, Kappa Alpha Order.

"On the basis of careful consideration of the policies endorsed by the United States National Student Association over a period of years, I have become increasingly convinced that this organization does not represent the thinking of the majority of United States students. Judging by the number of schools whose students have voted to withdraw from or not to affiliate with NSA, it appears that students on many campuses share this view.

"In my opinion, NSA's recent statement regarding fraternities is indicative of an ambition to interfere with the right of voluntary association guaranteed to us by our Constitution and Bill of Rights, and that in striving to prevent NSA's entrance to a campus or to effect its withdrawal from a campus, fraternity members will be working to preserve not only the Fraternity system, but the whole concept of a free society."—Louise L. Moore, Past National President, Phi Mu Fraternity.

"Where student governments are affiliated with NSA, the college administrations seem unaware that they are arbitrarily billing all students for NSA dues and fees. Activity fees are charged on bills sent to students or to their parents along with tuition charges, etc. A portion of the activity fee goes to the student council and thence as dues to NSA. Administrations do not realize they are forcing students to pay union dues. (NSA describes itself as a union of students). It seems to me that those students who do not wish to be represented in or by NSA could request a refund from the college for amounts involuntarily paid for NSA."—Mrs. George G. Rudolph, NPC Delegate, Delta Delta Delta.

"The more we learn of NSA, the more we realize that it does not really represent the students of America, and that it is strongly influenced by people and organizations whose ideals run contrary to the American free enterprise system. I know of no national fraternity or sorority leaders who support NSA today."—Haldon C. Dick, Assistant Executive Secretary, Phi Kappa Psi Fraternity.

"It has been my observation and experience that NSA does not serve the best interests of fraternities and sororities, nor does it adequately or effectively represent the student body. I would urge strongly that you vote against affiliation with the NSA."—Stewart D. Daniels, Alpha Tau Omega Foundation.

"We believe the principles and programs advocated by NSA are inimical to the best interests of the country and to the fraternity system, and have urged our chapter members to vote against this referendum."—Beatrice Wittenberg, National Panhellenic Delegate, Gamma Phi Beta.

"I personally cannot see how it would be to the advantage of the great student body of the University of Texas to be affiliated with NSA. The cost is ridiculous and the individual student would receive no advantage from the affiliation. In the past, NSA has concerned itself with fraternity membership selection and other matters with which it has no authority to deal. A careful investigation of the operations of NSA in the past several years will show that many prominent campuses throughout the country have consistently declined to affiliate with it."—William Forester, Executive Secretary, Kappa Alpha.

"As a national fraternity we would like to ask that you encourage our members not to vote in favor of the referendum. We have found through past experience that the National Student Association does not function for the benefit of college students. All activities engaged in by the Association are and have been in the past for the benefit of certain select individuals. The American college student is merely being used as a front."—Elmer Blumenkamp, Executive Secretary, Theta Xi.

"The organization is controlled by a select group and is not representative of the membership in the organization, and the controlling group is more politically minded than is proper. The group which issues statements in behalf of the organization is self-perpetuating to a large degree and does not reflect the attitude and opinion of the general membership. There is, of course, question as to the democratic nature of the organization. I know that many schools have withdrawn from the organization recently for the above reasons. My recommendation to you would be to oppose the affiliation."—Jack L. Anson, National Secretary, Phi Kappa Tau.

"Most fraternity and sorority leaders oppose affiliation and with good reason. I think the motives of the organization and the quality and direction of its leadership is extremely suspect. I would urge you to give more careful consideration to this question. NSA has proved to be a most disruptive influence with very little to recommend it."—Mrs. Russell Strickland, National Panhellenic Delegate, Delta Gamma.

"We have been unable to learn of any benefit that would accrue to the members of fraternal organizations by virtue of the affiliation of the student body with NSA".—Harold Buchanan, Executive Secretary, Delta Chi.

"This organization is divisive and does not truly work for the best interests of the students in many cases. There is a new organization called the Associated Student Governments of the United States, and if they live up to their stated principles, I think this will have much more value to the student body than does NSA."—Bruce Melchert, Executive Secretary, Tau Kappa Epsilon.

"Alpha Phi believes that the National Student Association as presently constituted is antidemocratic in character and is unrepresentative of the majority of the students in the United States. We are opposed to this organization in its present form."—LaVerne Harvey, Executive Secretary, Alpha Phi.

YOU MUST DECIDE

The solution of the NSA question is up to you. The National Student Association has a number of paid staff people who work full time attempting to convince the American student community and the general public that NSA is, in fact, the legitimate representative of the American student. Thousands of students have recognized this deceit and have worked diligently on their individual campuses to obtain a decision to leave the ranks of NSA. The list of schools which have either ousted NSA or which have rejected membership in the Association has grown tremendously since 1961. Today, NSA "represents" less than fifteen per cent (15%) of the colleges, universities, and junior colleges in the United States which are, according to the NSA Constitution, eligible for membership in the Association. If your college or university is presently affiliated with NSA or if your school is presently considering affiliation with NSA, then it is up to you to act and expose NSA for what it really is—a fantastic fraud.

NASSER THREATENS THE UNITED STATES

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. **FARBSTEIN**. Mr. Speaker it is reported in the morning press that President Nasser has once again resorted to his habit of blackmail against the United States to keep his hands free for troublemaking in the Middle East.

The Egyptian President, according to this report, has said he contemplates defaulting on his debts to the United States. These debts, let me remind you, have been incurred not because this country is engaged in any profitmaking endeavors in Egypt but because we answered Nasser's pleas to help feed his starving countrymen. To some extent, the Egyptian people are starving because President Nasser diverts his agricultural resources to buy arms from the Communist bloc. Now he has the audacity to say he will not pay us what he owes us, though his is a solemn obligation incurred by one sovereign state to another. I wonder if President Nasser understands the obligation of sovereignty.

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to use aid as a lever to influence a country's domestic practices. Of this, we must be very careful; but it is another to use aid to influence a country's foreign policies in the direction of peace. That is a legitimate, in fact an essential, characteristic of our aid programs, in my mind. But that is precisely what President Nasser is complaining about.

I would not give Nasser another grain of wheat if he pursues the practice of disturbing Middle Eastern tranquillity. It is my view that we should tell him, in the face of the blackmail threat, to find some other way to feed his people. It is he, after all, not the United States, who is responsible to them in the first instance. I suggest we give President Nasser no further assistance until he learns we will not submit to his threats, his insults, his blackmail, until he learns to grow up and behave like a responsible leader.

THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the disclosure of CIA links to the National Student Association, to the American Newspaper Guild, to American business foundations, has caused an uproar in high Government circles and in the little precinct.

The President has called for an investigation, the Vice President is appalled, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is deeply concerned—and understandably enough—the president of the National Student Association, according to a Washington newspaper, "has gotten sick to his stomach."

This whole sad story is tragic indeed, especially to the reputation and worth of the Nation's largest student organization. But in an area where the right hand is never supposed to know what the left hand is doing, it is completely ludicrous to discover that the left hand did not even know what the left hand had been doing.

The Central Intelligence Agency is an arm of the executive branch, sitting on the National Security Council in an advisory role to the President. Yet he did not know of these connections which have existed since the early 1950's.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities must be chagrined that left-leaning students and labor leaders who have so aroused its ire are representatives of organizations financed and perhaps guided by a Government agency it previously considered an unimpeachable ally. It would be an amusing spectacle to see the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Central Intelligence Agency investigate each other. The CIA could use as a motive that everything in the universe belongs properly in its bailiwick; HUAC might forthrightly insist upon its mission to expose all truly un-American influence, covert and obvious, on the American way of life.

Last summer Members of the U.S. Senate solemnly refused to increase the membership of the CIA Oversight Committee. In the words of one Senator:

> The primary objective has always been to avoid leaks.

Declared another Senator in the same debate:

> Senators are not always good security risks. It seems to me that anybody who is involved on a Committee of this sort should be picked by those who are best at keeping secrets after they have had several years to observe him as one of those who keeps secrets best.

Well, they kept the secret all right. If the CIA would not tell the President, then the Oversight Committee in not informing him, itself, completely lived up to its name by committing the biggest oversight possible.

In intelligence operations I am informed that overclassification—that is, classifying information "top secret" when it should be treated merely as confidential, for instance—is considered a great bottleneck both to security and efficient operations. Not informing the President of the United States as to the full extent that the CIA's tentacles had wound their way into America's private life has to be one of the biggest overclassification blunders in which the Agency has ever partaken. Lord grant that there are no others.

In a month when the birthdays of Lincoln and Washington give occasion to prideful speeches about our Republic and the liberty and freedom that it has fostered, it is ironic that simultaneously another creation of this same Republic should be the object of indignant headlines which augur up the haunting image of "Big Brother."

What is this organization that deems it necessary to make secret connection with the educational, labor, and business communities of the United States? What is this CIA that it should be the arbiter of what is right and just?

The chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee has announced his intention for an inquiry into the CIA's links past and present with U.S. universities. I support him in this endeavor. Perhaps indeed it will be found that a law is needed requiring the registration of Government agencies trying to influence education just as we have laws requiring lobbyists who try to influence Congress to register.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL], has my sincere support for his resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 207, which would set up a joint congressional Committee on Central Intelligence. It is high time that this overclassification be ended and that this Congress know what is going on for the interests and security of the American people. In the words of the intelligence community, Mr. Speaker, this Congress has a "need to know."

Another sad commentary in this episode which has undeniably weakened citizen trust in government and further widened the so-called credibility gap is the obvious mistrust the leaders in this democratic society have had for democratic institutions.

If such governmental support was necessary to further international contact between students and labor leaders, it not only would have looked better had it been done openly, and it not only would have avoided the embarrassment which now faces us, but it would have made it possible for these private ambassadors to claim that this Republic is proud of its diversity in ideas and ambition; it would have made it possible for this Republic to proclaim that apologists and critics are equal as patriots.

My colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER], has suggested the establishment of an independent foundation supported by Government funds which would give assistance to private bodies, political, professional, and educational, in their endeavors to help represent their segment of American society to the world at large. This is a proposal which merits study and consideration.

At this point I include several outstanding editorials on the events of the last few days in the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 16, 1967]

KISS OF DEATH

The National Student Association is reportedly giving consideration to folding its whole organization because it has been fatally compromised by the disclosure that it has been the recipient of secret subsidies from the Central Intelligence Agency. The leaders of the student group will be wise to terminate its existence. It is not likely to recover enough credibility at home or abroad to make its activities at all worth while.

The covert, concealed, dishonest support of the Government is the kiss of death for any group holding itself out as a private, independent, non-governmental agency. Other organizations which have similarly accepted undisclosed governmental support will be well advised to quietly fold tents and give up the field. Even the open financial support by Government of nongovernmental academic and professional groups is sometimes compromising; but secret financial support is invariably so. The very resort to secrecy cries out against the integrity of the recipient. Every such subsidy indicts both giver and receiver. The Government agency, on its part, is tacitly acknowledging that disclosure would be fatal to its purposes. The whole transaction, from beginning to end, is touched with fraud and evasion. The very fact of secrecy transforms even what might be a legitimate cooperation into what obviously is an inadmissible conspiracy. And those who are caught in such a conspiracy cannot hope to regain credibility.

The Central Intelligence Agency, whatever good it has been doing, has been, at the same time, busily engaged in diminishing the credibility of all nongovernmental associations and organizations. This is a profound and serious national loss that it will be difficult to repair. We can only begin to repair it if the Government promptly and plainly puts an end to all such secret subventions and if private establishments join in binding themselves to a policy under which they are committed to refuse any secret Federal subsidies.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 20, 1967]

SUBVERSION BY CIA

The disastrous effects of the systematic penetration of American educational, cultural and labor organizations by the Central Intelligence Agency daily become more apparent. The strength of these organizations, both in the structure of American society and in their relations with their opposite numbers in other nations, always has been their freedom from government domination.

Now, through the deviousness of C.I.A. operations, thousands of scholars, students, unionists and professional leaders discover long after the fact that they have performed unwitting and undesired duty as secret agents.

The integrity of pro-American positions, honestly taken by groups and individuals in the worldwide battle of ideas, has been undermined. The independence of America's private foundations has been brought into question. In short, faith in American institutions has been besmirched in a way that would have eluded the reach of any foreign enemy.

It is no excuse to say that the C.I.A.'s decision to use a limitless range of philanthropic fronts to funnel its funds into youth groups, universities and other private institutions was designed to meet a very real problem of the cold war: the need for assuring that the Communists would not have an unchallenged field in the youth congresses and cultural conferences they were arranging—and subsidizing—on a global basis ten and fifteen years ago. That problem should have been met openly—by direct public subsidy.

It should have been clear long ago to the C.I.A.'s overseers in the White House that the end effect of clandestine subsidies to groups representative of the detachment and diversity of a free society must inevitably taint the genuineness of their detachment. This would be true even without the charges that have now developed of the assignment of C.I.A. operatives to influence the policy statements and choice of officers of the National Student Association—a practice that may have extended to other organizations as well.

The health of a democratic society depends on the certainty that its free institutions—its press, its educational and scientific bodies, its publishing houses and television networks, its unions and business organizations—are truly free. That does not mean government is barred from underwriting international exchanges or research study; it means that, where such support is appropriate, it must be given openly through its own public agencies.

The worst part of the current mess is that the very nature of the C.I.A., with its mandate for espionage and subversion all over the world, rules out any thoroughgoing public inquiry into its activities. That means some residue of suspicion is sure to remain—both in this country and abroad—no matter how conscientiously the Cabinet Committee appointed last week by President Johnson seeks to formulate policies that will prevent the C.I.A. or any other Federal bureau from imperiling the "integrity and independence" of educational institutions.

When a government finds it necessary to set up an agency to fight subversion with subversion everywhere, the tragic danger it opens up is that among the people it subverts are its own. The defense against such weakening of America's institutional fabric must rest with the President and Congress. Even with the recent broadening of Senator Russell's watchdog committee, Congress is not doing its part of that job.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 18, 1967]

The CIA: A Case of Addiction

Shortly after the CIA's fiasco at the Bay of Pigs, a leading figure in the Kennedy Administration who was asked to perform a dispassionate post-mortem observed that this country's foreign policy, over a dozen years of intense Cold War strain, had come to rely on what he called "two kinds of dope."

"When all the usual, conventional political remedies failed," he said, "the first impulse has usually been toward foreign aid—to try to buy our way out of trouble. The last resort has been to dump the mess on CIA."

The result, he concluded, was that the Intelligence organization, while manned by men of exceptional competence, was being asked to perform all manner of outlandish—and in some cases impossible—missions to recoup the mistakes of Cabinet Secretaries and Presidents. Cuba, for one example, was a terminal case when it was handed to CIA.

What we are witnessing—and may be witnessing on an ever-widening scale—are the ravages of this addiction laid bare. The case of the National Students Association doubtless began innocently enough in the grim Cold War atmosphere of the late 40s and early 50s, when communism and McCarthyism were both riding high. Communist groups were grabbing for control of international organizations of all sorts—students, professional, labor. Private American groups, affiliated to these international bodies, lacked the money and in many cases the know-how with which to fight back, and many were leftist-oriented, by American standards, which ruled out open United States Government support in the McCarthy age. Congress, moreover, would have wanted any Government-backed delegation to follow the Government's line with fine fidelity. (Ironically, those who are covertly subsidized and don't know it are more likely to be faithful to their true feelings.)

So the clandestine tack was almost irresistible, what with all those unvouchered CIA funds for which no public accounting need be made. For this same reason, long after the need for deception passed, it was tempting to continue along the covert route, rather than battle Congress for more money for the State Department's restricted budget.

Covert operations are seducive in this, and other ways. When they work, they can work remarkably well, as testified to by any number of unsung and unsingable successes, and some, such as the overthrow of Iran's recalcitrant, uncooperative Mossadegh, which have come to light long after the fact. But success has a spoiling effect, carrying with it a false sense of security. Complacency sets in. Ends begin to justify whatever means. Moral issues evaporate. So does simple prudence. Who bothered to check up on the U–2 flight plans (another stunning intelligence success) as the day drew near for the abortive Big Four summit meeting in May, 1960? Who is now asking whether the program of aerial reconnaissance over Cuba, and the contingency plans on hand in case of mishap, are still as valid now, given possible improvements in Soviet antiaircraft technology, as they were when the go-ahead was last reviewed.

If addiction is what's involved, the cure suggests itself. It lies not in banning all covert activity, any more than drug addiction argues for banning medically supervised use of barbiturates. The cure lies in tight control. The first move, long advocated by this newspaper, ought to be a clean break between CIA's intelligence-gathering and its "operations," or as they are better known, "dirty tricks." Intelligence data can too easily be bent into a compelling argument for this or that covert project when the two are conducted under one roof. Secondly, covert operations need the closest sort of case-by-case supervision by the White House and by men in the regular departments, whose main concern isn't dirty tricks, but the day-to-day, aboveboard conduct of foreign policy in a way which takes into account the Government's moral standing at home and abroad.

But even this is not enough; covert operations corrupt everybody involved in time. The eye becomes jaded, the sense of outrage dulled; what's been done before becomes the norm. Nor can the watchman's role be played by Congress, where pragmatism is rampant and morality too often expressed in terms of an Adam Clayton Powell or a Bobby Baker; where practical politics has a covert quality of its own.

What's really needed, beyond a fresh start to wipe away as much as possible the stigma past conduct has cast on almost every private institution in the land, is a new kind of control mechanism, capable of bringing to bear a chronically jaundiced eye. This probably means a panel whose personnel is constantly changed to refresh its innocence. The old establishmentarians won't do; too many of them were involved in the prescription which produced the addiction. Indeed, the search for unsullied individuals or even categories, in the present atmosphere, becomes nearly ludicrous. Would you believe a lighthouse keeper, an Arctic explorer, or perhaps a forest ranger or the headmistress of a young ladies finishing school?

One might begin by assembling a panel from the ranks of the unwitting and reconciled past members, over the years, of NSA.

Where the Administration cannot afford to begin—much less end in an age where credibility has become a household anxiety—is with the old, familiar palliatives of an inhouse review, or even the threadbare standby of a one-shot inquiry by distinguished private citizens. Shocking revelations call for shock treatment, however agonizing the wrench of withdrawal may turn out to be.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 22, 1967]

Washington: The CIA and the Unanswered Question

(By James Reston)

Washington, Feb. 21—After all the mysterious disclosures about the Central Intelligence Agency's secret operations among the students and foundations of America, one mystery remains: Why did all the intelligent people around the President not intervene to change the policy before it became a public scandal?

Almost all of them are now saying the policy was obsolete if not wrong. The President has stopped it. The Vice President has criticized it publicly. The Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, John Gardner, has condemned the C.I.A., directed by his friend, Richard Helms, for carrying it on. Bobby Kennedy, who presided over it when he was Attorney General, has sniped at it and at the President in private. The Under Secretary of State, Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Gardner, and Helms are now heading a Johnson committee to transform the whole system, and all this raises a fundamental question.

Why, if they all agree now it is wrong, did they not put that question to the President before? Why, if they condemn the press for "embarrassing" the President and his Administration now, did they not protect him earlier from a system they now concede should have been changed long ago?

THE FUTURE PROBLEM

So much has been written about this in the last week that everybody here is bored with it, and the Administration is so vulnerable to criticism that it is almost embarrassing to continue the controversy. But looking to the future, there is still a fundamental and unresolved problem. The machinery of the Government for reviewing policies which become obsolete with the passage of time is obviously defective. The officials now dealing with the controversy concede the point, and they are trying to deal with the limited question of the C.I.A. and the students, but they are still not really dealing with the larger question of policy-making that produced the C.I.A. controversy in the first place. That question is how can the Government keep policies up to date?

The interesting thing about this is that the Administration had various committees to perform precisely the function of answering these questions in relation to the C.I.A. Bobby Kennedy headed one to review the C.I.A.'s activities after the fiasco at the Bay of Pigs in 1961. The Secretary of State was given the task at that time of supervising the C.I.A.'s activities overseas. Senator Richard Russell of Georgia was assigned the job of watching the C.I.A. for the Congress. And the President's personal friend, Clark Clifford, was asked to preside over an outside committee to watch the intelligence activities of the Government.

Apparently none of these committees, however, either knew anything about what the C.I.A. was doing with its secret funds for students, labor unions, magazines, and radio stations such as Radio Free Europe, or they approved what President Johnson's own closest associates now criticize.

The Administration, under both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, had an interdepartmental committee to deal with the intelligence activities. Johnson, now U.S. Ambassador to Japan, and Cyrus Vance, Under Secretary of Defense, worked with Richard Helms, head of the C.I.A., on this problem.

Under President Johnson now, Walt Rostow of the White House staff, Vance of the Pentagon, Foy Kohler, former U.S. Ambassador in Moscow, and Helms still meet regularly to supervise intelligence problems, but none of these committees of extraordinarily able men apparently felt that the secret financing of students, labor unions, magazines, or radio stations was a major political issue.

SOMETHING IS WRONG

Even the Johnson intimates in the Government concede that something is wrong here. They are irritated with the press for exposing the facts. They concede the C.I.A. policy toward the students should be changed. But they have still not dealt with the major problem, which is that the Administration's machinery for reviewing policy is defective;

that the Cabinet and the National Security Council are not operating to check overall policy, and that the State Department still does not really know what the C.I.A. is doing.

This is the issue that is troubling Washington now. It is really the same issue that has been bothering the capital about Vietnam—a tendency to drift into unintended situations; a failure of the machinery of government to review old policies until it is too late.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 23, 1967]

INTELLIGENCE AND DIRTY TRICKS

(By Walter Lippmann)

The CIA problem is embarrassing and it is a disagreeable subject to talk about. But it is so important that we cannot sweep it under the rug and try to forget about it. For the good faith of the United States government has been compromised by the disclosures, and whether or not we like to think about it, we cannot conduct the affairs of the United States in a cloud of suspicion. We must dispel the suspicion and restore confidence in our good faith.

We may begin by noting that the cloud of suspicion is much wider than the actual operations of the CIA could possibly warrant. Anyone with experience in the outer world must realize that the CIA is almost automatically suspected of being implicated in or of being the prime mover in all manner of happenings abroad. It would be no exaggeration to say that outside the United States the CIA has become the universal scapegoat for any rightist activity which people on the left and in the center dislike. The CIA has acquired a legendary character and its activities are rather like the exploits of superman.

The CIA legend feeds on the fact that the agency has in fact done somewhere some of the things it is accused of doing everywhere all the time. It has overturned governments in Iran and Guatamala. It has organized an invasion of a foreign country in the Bay of Pigs. In the old days it interfered with money in elections in France and Italy. It has subsidized the foreign activities of students, scholars, journalists, churchmen, labor leaders; it has paid for radio stations and magazines abroad. Although these operations have been visible enough, they have been financed secretly. The secrecy has prevented reliable knowledge as to where the real CIA activities end and where the suspected and imaginary ones begin.

In this way the cloud of suspicion has been generated which envelops so large a part of American action in the rest of the world.

We may go on to note that the Americans are the only people who have not shared in this general suspicion.

There have, of course, been charges and exposures made by minorities on the Americans left and right. But until recently the great majority have taken for granted the purity of the government's motives and the innocence of its actions. The secrecy of the operation shielded it from suspicion in this country, and with very little questioning and argument the Congress has voted secret funds of unknown size for which there is no public accounting.

If we push deeper into the matter we find, I believe, that the root of the trouble is that the Central Intelligence Agency has been used for much more than genuine intelligence work. It has been used as a propaganda agency, as a superior diplomatic foreign service, as an agency for clandestine intervention in foreign countries. The breadth of the CIA's authorized activities has not only generated the cloud of suspicion over American action abroad but it has spoiled the CIA as an intelligence agency here at home.

The prime example of this was the fiasco of the Bay of Pigs. In that affair the CIA organized an invasion of Cuba. As an intelligence agency, however, it was supposed to advise the President about the prospects of the invasion and the probable reaction of the Cubans. Because the same CIA men who were running the invasion had also to advise the President on its prospects, their optimism got the better of their intelligence and the President received wholly wrong advice. Thus he was led into a disaster which very nearly wrecked the Kennedy Administration at the outset.

After the Bay of Pigs President Kennedy was urged to cut the CIA apart, separating sharply the business of intelligence from the business of propaganda and intervention. Unhappily, President Kennedy did not take this advice and, after a little tinkering with personnel and with the details, he left intact the secret conglomeration which is known as CIA.

There will be and there can be no solution to the problem, I believe, unless there is a surgical operation which separates true intelligence work from the whole clutter of other activities. An intelligence agency should deal with espionage, research and analysis. The other activities, propaganda, intervention and dirty tricks should not be in the intelligence agency. They should not be under the same roof, they should not be manned by the same men and they should not be under the same men and they should not be under the same cloak of secrecy.

There is little doubt that this will improve the integrity of the true intelligence work. What will it do to the other operations if they are divorced from the CIA as a secret intelligence agency? Secret propaganda would be abolished. This would make more credible open and avowed propaganda. By taking the business of intervening in foreign countries out of the CIA, the temptation to intervene will be diminished. This would in itself be a good thing, and in the rare cases where intervention was a vital necessity, it could be set up secretly enough in the Defense Department. As to the dirty tricks, like bribing a politician somewhere abroad, the American Republic will survive if such dirty tricks are not performed.

BURIAL FOR VETERANS

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I was very much annoyed to read the story in today's New York Times which attributed to "White House spokesmen" statements that tend to cast a slur on every person who ever served in the Armed Forces.

The story concerned the recently announced decision to expand certain national cemeteries, including the Beverly National Cemetery in New Jersey. The article stated that the decision had been reached "reluctantly" and had been made only because Vietnam war dead were being turned away.

Although there have been many instances of men killed in Vietnam being refused burial in certain of these national cemeteries, there have also been a much larger number of veterans of other wars turned away for the same reason—lack of space. We are naturally more cognizant of the sacrifices of our servicemen in Vietnam, but we should never forget the equally great sacrifices of those who fought in prior wars. A man who fought in World War I, World War II, or the Korean war should have no less weight in coming to a determination to reopen these cemeteries.

Ever since the Defense Department first announced the closing of Beverly I have been urging expansion. The final decision to follow this course is welcome, but long overdue.

I might also point out here that the Times story cited the figure of "half billion dollars" as the cost of expansion. The correct figure is $642,500 to acquire and develop a total of 32 acres.

I would hope that the decision to expand these cemeteries was made in recognition of the gift of sacrifice made to our country by the veterans of every war and every period in our history. The contributions our veterans have made in the past, and that are being made today, demand that we make the meager provision of a final resting place.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, when President Woodrow Wilson signed the first National Vocational Education Act on February 23, 1917, the act made possible the creation of practical vocational education programs which have proven to be of greater and greater service to the people of Connecticut and of the Nation.

Connecticut's programs over the past 50 years have been of distinguished service. The executive board of the Connecticut Vocational Association has drawn attention to the 50th anniversary date.

The role of vocational education in constructing a better future and providing more opportunities for all our people has been attracting increasing interest. The Congress has, in recent years, strengthened the abilities of our school systems to furnish skills for today's and tomorrow's jobs. It is fitting that we notice what has been done over the years as we meet the needs for what can be done.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago on February 23, 1917, President Woodrow Wilson signed into law the first National Vocational Education Act—the

Smith-Hughes Act. This landmark legislation as amended and supplemented has been the basis of the Federal effort in the field of vocational training.

The Smith-Hughes Act was prompted by a realization that it was a duty of the Federal Government to help prepare youth and adults for employment and to assist the employed workers in gaining advancement through additional training. Furthermore, the Smith-Hughes Act established one of the earliest programs of cooperative federalism, with the Federal Government providing funds and helping to promote, develop, and improve programs, but the States administering the program. This early experiment in joint cooperation has been a model the Congress has followed in establishing many programs. The foresight of our earlier colleagues in establishing this vocational training program is to be commended.

I am proud to have been a member of the Education and Labor Committee in the 87th Congress, and to have played a part in reevaluating the Federal role in these programs. Two important amendments were recommended by my committee at that time. Both became laws. The first established the manpower training and development program designed to retrain workers with obsolete skills for new jobs. The second amendment extended the title VIII program of the National Defense Education Act to promote training in scientific and technical fields.

In order to meet the demands of our growing economy, our workers must be qualified in skills that will be useful in the future. The Vocational Education Act assists them in this regard and helps us assure the continued prosperity of our Nation.

TO AMEND THE FLAMMABLE FABRICS ACT

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, one of the priorities cited by President Johnson in his state of the Union message was the need "to do more for the consumer." Definite proposals toward this objective were contained in the President's recent message to protect the American consumer. In the field of added protection for people against hazards in their homes, there was a specific recommendation to broaden and strengthen the Flammable Fabrics Act of 1953.

The original act was designed to remove from the market certain highly flammable articles of clothing, such as the famous "torch sweaters." In this purpose, the act succeeded. However, it did not affect the marketing of other clothing, still on the market today, some of which is extremely flammable. Furthermore, the original act did not attempt to deal with the broader problem of interior furnishings, which can also pose a threat to safety.

Accordingly, I have introduced a bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act of 1953, to make it more responsive to the problems of today. A quarter of a million people are burned each year in America from fires originating in highly flammable fabrics. That is the problem in sheer numbers. When we take a closer look, however, we find a disproportionate number of victims are the very young and the very old, those least able to protect themselves. There is another facet to stimulate all of us to action. As is well known, burns represent a very delicate medical problem, requiring a great deal of time, care, and expense in the treatment.

The amendments in the bill I have introduced would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to revise the existing standards for wearing apparel, to give people more protection. Standards could also be issued for interior furnishings such as draperies, rugs, blankets, upholstery, foam padding, if the Secretary determines that there is a need for flammability standards for these products. There would be a study of the causes of deaths, injuries, and property losses resulting from clothing and household material fires, conducted jointly by the Department of Commerce and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Finally, the amendments would authorize the conduct of laboratory research into the flammability of furnishings, fabrics, and materials.

I think these amendments are urgently needed. At the same time, I believe them to be reasonable, both in their scope and in the procedures outlined for administering the bill. The President pointed out that this gap in the existing legislation is so glaring that action should not be delayed.

I urge all Members to give this bill their thoughtful deliberation and support.

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT E. JONES, OF ALABAMA

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, last week my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Alabama, the Honorable ROBERT E. JONES, spoke to the Federal Bar Association and Bureau of National Affairs Briefing Conference on Electric and Gas Power. I think the contents of that speech should be considered by all the Members of this House. The speech follows:

SPEECH OF HONORABLE ROBERT E. JONES

I am happy to be here today to discuss with you the future of the electric industry. I will confine my remarks to the electric industry because I could not, in the time allotted to me today, adequately discuss both the electric industry and America's great gas industry.

You are familiar with the mushrooming growth of the electric industry and with the predictions of record growth ahead. In 1963, the Nation's electric power bill was about $14 billion. In 1980, the bill is expected to be about $42 billion, and rising.

It is obvious that an industry of such magnitude must have a tremendous impact on the fortunes of the American people and the economic destiny of our Nation. Electricity is an essential commodity for everyone. Everyone has a vital stake in its development.

The Federal Power Commission's Survey of 1964 charted the development of the electric industry. It laid out guidelines for a vast expansion of electric generation and transmission facilities to meet our country's needs in the next fifteen years. With such expansion, it forecast a 27 percent reduction in the average unit price to consumers of residential, commercial and industrial electricity.

It is expected that nuclear energy will contribute to the downturn in electricity costs in the next fifteen years. I understand that nuclear power was specified for 55 percent of the new generating capacity contracted for in the United States last year. Last year's orders for nuclear power plant equipment were four times larger than in 1965 and five times larger than all orders in the years before 1965. Orders being placed this year cannot be assured delivery until 1972 or 1973.

It is interesting to note that the Tennessee Valley Authority has contracted for two 1150 megawatt nuclear power plants. These two units will produce over 2,300,000 kilowatts of power. TVA estimates that the nuclear components will save more than $8 million a year.

The American consumer must receive the benefits without dilution, of the electric industry expansion program. The full benefits which flow from lower costs of generation and transmission must go to the consumer, not to the monopolistic electric utilities.

We come, now, to the question: How do we channel this flow of benefits to insure that it is in accordance with the public interest? The answer is founded on two words—*competition* and *regulation*.

The electric industry today comprises more than 3,600 separately operated systems. Of these about 480 are private utilities. These private utilities produce about 76 percent of the Nation's electric power and serve almost 80 percent of the Nation's consumers.

Public and cooperative agencies which obtain low cost power from Federal hydropower plants provide a form of competition for the private utilities, by establishing a yardstick for measuring the reasonableness of utility rates and services. The existence of this yardstick has prevented unrestrained monopoly pricing of electricity.

I grew up in the Tennessee Valley of North Alabama and now represent this area in the Congress. Public power at low rates, as provided through the Tennessee Valley Authority, has brought immeasurable benefits to my part of the country and has established the foundation for a healthy and expanding economic area.

Throughout the broad sweep of the Tennessee Valley, low cost public power has modernized the farms and brought new comforts to rural living. It has attracted hundreds of new industries to the Valley which have turned backwater hamlets and towns into vigorous and expanding economic entities.

I think it is alarming that the proportion of Federally generated power has been declining and thus warping the yardstick and rendering it less effective. This situation is particularly alarming when we look ahead and contemplate the predictions that the amount of electric power generated in this country will triple by 1980.

If the total amount of electric power generated in this country triples by 1980, as the National Power Survey predicted, the amount of Federally generated power should also triple.

And even more important, how could public power survive the establishment of the great regional power pooling combines if it does not keep pace with industry expansion? Already we have witnessed formation of power pooling blocs which exclude public power groups.

Either we maintain a reasonable balance as between public and private power groups, or the electric industry will be dominated and controlled by the large private utilities within the next fifteen years.

As you know, the large electric utility companies have been expanding. In 1964, there were 480 privately owned electric utility systems, most of which were created by the merger and consolidation of some 5,000 systems previously in existence.

It is essential that we make every effort in the years ahead to protect the ability of the smaller systems, especially the public power systems, to carry on in an efficient and productive manner. These small systems must be supported in their efforts—

To participate fully in pooling arrangements;

To construct and operate joint generation and transmission facilities;

To obtain electricity at reasonable rates from power suppliers;

To transmit the power to their customers at fair and reasonable cost.

If the smaller systems are supported in this manner, competition in the electric industry will be preserved and the yardstick will remain straight and true and effective.

I believe a majority of the Congress is sensitive to the vital need for competition in the electric industry and will move ahead in the immediate future to stimulate Federal development of new power sources. Public power systems must continue to grow. Otherwise they will, it is certain, be swallowed, digested and forgotten—and the big loser will be the American public.

The Congress must do what it can to preserve competitive conditions in the electric industry. It must also energetically examine governmental regulation of rates and services. I believe there is much room for improvement in this area, both by the state commissions and by the Federal Power Commission. Disuse has dulled the cutting edge of many of our regulatory tools.

The Federal Power Commission's program in the last few years for review and regulation of the wholesale rates of electricity transmitted or sold in interstate commerce is commendable and is a good beginning. This program should be strengthened and expanded.

You are familiar, of course, with the efforts made in 1965 by the private utilities to enact the Holland-Smathers bill to remove themselves from the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. The historic blackout of November 9, 1965, in the Northeast section of the country helped to scuttle this bill. This mass power failure graphically demonstrated the interstate character of the electric industry and revealed the need for more, rather than less, regulation to assure reliability of service.

The technological advances in generating and transmitting electric power will undoubtedly lead to increased pooling and coordination. We may expect to see proposals for new legislation which, in essence, would exempt private utilities from the anti-trust laws. Last year, hearings were held on a Senate bill which would provide such exemption if the Federal Power Commission found that a proposed coordination or pooling agreement would not adversely affect competition or restrain trade in the marketing of electricity. However, I am not convinced that the FPC should be the sole arbiter of this issue.

We must remember that the anti-trust laws, although often vague and sporadically enforced, have been a potent force in the attainment or protection of economic democracy. In any event, as long as the anti-trust laws apply they will serve as a powerful deterrent. The big fellow will think twice before clobbering the little fellow at the risk of inviting anti-trust action.

At the heart of the projections of decreasing electricity costs in the next decade, is the continued expansion of extra-high-voltage transmission facilities. I believe that the FPC should be authorized to require certificates of necessity for the construction and maintenance of such EHV facilities. These transmission facilities are a major key to the control of electricity—and profits.

The development of giant EHV transmission networks will be the core of the vast regional and interregional power systems of the future. They must be employed for the benefit of the entire public rather than for the profits of a few. Hence, I believe that the planning and establishment of these networks must be carefully scrutinized and monitored.

As a starter, the authority of the Federal Power Commission should be broadened to assure its supervision over the developing EHV transmission networks. At the same time, this highly important component of the electric industry should be kept under constant study by Congress.

We are seeing today an enormous spurt in efforts to attain the benefits of extra-high-voltage inter-regional interconnections and pooling. Already, the major lines of the eastern two-thirds of the United States and the major systems on the west coast are interconnected in some degree, and most of these interconnections extend beyond state boundaries. State regulation is not sufficient. Federal authority is needed.

Also, I believe that the Federal Government should participate actively in power planning on a national basis with the purpose of molding and giving direction and cohesion to the multiplying regional and inter-regional power systems. By promoting the coordination of the Nation's power systems it will promote efficiency and reliability of service and will set the stage for the ultimate establishment of a national, interconnected, power network.

Now, I come to a final point which I will put to you in the form of a question. What will this fantastic expansion of the electric industry in the next fifteen or twenty years do to our air, our water, our natural scenery?

Certainly, our air and water are in trouble already and government at all levels, and industry, are under steadily increasing pressure to do something about it. And encroachments upon the natural beauty of our community and our Nation are inspiring new protests daily. In fact, we now have a national beautification program to gloss over some of the blight and dowdiness which are products of our so-called modern civilization.

The vast expansion of the electric industry which lies ahead will be accompanied by a construction explosion—construction of electric generating plants, substations, transmission facilities and distribution lines. I believe that the American people will expect—and, in my opinion, they have a right to expect—that this new construction will not be an eyesore, will not mar the rural landscape or contribute to urban blight.

And the inevitable proliferation of transmission and distribution lines and poles will fire new public arguments and demands that the lines go underground for aesthetic reasons. The President has under consideration at this time a proposed $30 million research and development program to find satisfactory, low-cost methods of placing power transmission lines underground.

The electric industry is aware, of course, of these aesthetic problems ahead as well as the dangers involved in accelerating the pollution of our air and water.

In fact, it has been reported that in the last ten years the electric power industry alone has spent $750 million on air and water pollution control. However, this expenditure is just a drop in the bucket when we consider an estimate by the Howard Business Review that $275 billion will have to be spent over the next 33 years to provide us with good quality air and water.

One of the critical pollution problems which will loom ever larger for the industry in the years ahead will be how effectively and safely to dispose of radioactive wastes which are the by-product of nuclear power installations. The solution to this problem will be found simply because it must be found.

Many other important problems, as you know, will confront the industry as its expansion program is forced to adjust to requirements dictated by a growing public interest in and concern with environmental enhancement.

In closing, let me emphasize that it will require a vigorous, continuing effort by all of us to insure that the economies of large-scale generation and transmission—in the form of lower costs and better service—are passed on to the consumer.

We must strengthen our governmental tools to protect the consumer.

We must do this to render more effective governmental regulation of monopolistic utilities.

We must do this to preserve the yardstick for determination of fair prices for electric energy.

We must do this to stimulate the growth of the public and cooperative parts of the industry, and thus enable them to remain competitive and retain a fair share of America's energy business.

There are dangers and opportunities on the horizon for both sectors of the industry, public and private.

But I am confident that with a little imagination and foresight by industry and government the dangers can be averted and the opportunities exploited.

ONE NATION, ONE PEOPLE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, some 2½ years ago, it was my privilege to serve as chairman of the committee on resolutions and platform at the Democratic National Convention in Atlantic City. Our 1964 Democratic platform, "One Nation, One People," is truly a historic milestone in dealing plainly and straightforwardly with the complex domestic and international issues of the mid-1960's. As I said in my report at that time:

> This platform builds on the great pledges made four years ago (1960). It addresses itself to the hard problems and new challenges of our time. The oldest political party in the free world, in the pages of this platform, demonstrates its fresh and vigorous spirit in the service of peace and freedom.
>
> Our platform expresses the consensus of the Democratic Party. It reflects a program

on which this united, prosperous and free nation can continue to grow.

Mr. Speaker, the vast record of achievement of the historic 89th Congress during the past 2 years has made good on major commitments the Democratic Party made to the voters in the 1964 campaign. I am confident that during the 90th Congress, under the courageous leadership of President Lyndon B. Johnson and with the full cooperation of the Democratic leaders of the Congress, we will take before the voters next year an unequaled record of accomplishment, of progress, of stewardship, and dedication to our platform pledges. The American voters will know beyond any doubt that President Johnson, Vice President Humphrey, and we of the Democratic Party in the Congress have kept faith with them and because of this all Americans have benefited.

I include at this point the text of the 1964 Democratic platform, "One Nation, One People," so that Americans everywhere may judge for themselves the progress we have made thus far in carrying out its principles:

One Nation, One People

America is *One Nation, One People.*

The welfare, progress, security and survival of each of us reside in the common good—the sharing of responsibilities as well as benefits by all our people.

Democracy in America rests on the confidence that people can be trusted with freedom. It comes from the conviction that we will find in freedom a unity of purpose stronger than all our differences.

We have drawn upon that unity when the forces of ignorance, hate, and fear fired an assassin's bullet at the nation's heart, incited violence in our land, and attacked the outposts of freedom around the world.

Because of this unity, those who traffic in fear, hate, falsehood, and violence have failed to undermine our people's deep love of truth and quiet faith in freedom.

Our program for the future is to make the national purpose—the human purpose of us all—fulfill our individual needs.

Accordingly, we offer this platform as a covenant of unity.

We invite all to join us who believe that narrow partisanship takes too small account of the size of our task, the penalties for failure and the boundless rewards to all our people for success.

We offer as the goal of this covenant peace for all nations and freedom for all peoples.

PEACE

Peace should be the first concern of all governments as it is the prayer of all men.

At the start of the third decade of the nuclear age, the preservation of peace requires the strength to wage war and the wisdom to avoid it. The search for peace requires the utmost intelligence, the clearest vision, and a strong sense of reality.

Because for four years our nation has patiently demonstrated these qualities and persistently used them, the world is closer to peace today than it was in 1960.

In 1960, freedom was on the defensive. The Communists—doubting both our strength and our will to use it—pressed forward in Southeast Asia, Latin America, Central Africa and Berlin.

President Kennedy and Vice President Johnson set out to remove any question of our power or our will. In the Cuban crisis of 1962 the Communist offensive shattered on the rock of President Kennedy's determination—and our ability—to defend the peace.

Two years later, President Johnson responded to another Communist challenge, this time in the Gulf of Tonkin. Once again power exercised with restraint repulsed Communist aggression and strengthened the cause of freedom.

Responsible leadership, unafraid but refusing to take needless risk, has turned the tide in freedom's favor. No nation, old or new, has joined the Communist bloc since Cuba during the preceding Republican Administration. Battered by economic failures, challenged by recent American achievements in space, torn by the Chinese-Russian rift, and faced with American strength and courage—international Communism has lost its unity and momentum.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

By the end of 1960, military strategy was being shaped by the dictates of arbitrary budget ceilings instead of the real needs of national security. There were, for example, too few ground and air forces to fight limited war, although such wars were a means to continued Communist expansion.

Since then, and at the lowest possible cost, we have created a balanced, versatile, powerful defense establishment, capable of countering aggression across the entire spectrum of conflict, from nuclear confrontation to guerrilla subversion.

We have increased our intercontinental ballistic missiles and Polaris missiles from fewer than 100 to more than 1,000, more than four times the force of the Soviet Union. We have increased the number of combat ready divisions from 11 to 16.

Until such time as there can be an enforceable treaty providing for inspected and verified disarmament, we must, and we will maintain our military strength, as the sword and shield of freedom and the guarantor of peace.

Specifically, we must and we will:

Continue the overwhelming supremacy of our Strategic Nuclear Forces.

Strengthen further our forces for discouraging limited wars and fighting subversion.

Maintain the world's largest research and development effort, which has initiated more than 200 new programs since 1961, to ensure continued American leadership in weapons systems and equipment.

Continue the nationwide Civil Defense program as an important part of our national security.

Pursue our examination of the Selective Service program to make certain that it is continued only as long as it is necessary and that we meet our military manpower needs without social or economic injustice.

Attract to the military services the highest caliber of career men and women and make certain they are adequately paid and adequately housed.

Maintain our Cost Reduction Program, to ensure a dollar's worth of defense for every dollar spent, and minimize the disruptive effects of changes in defense spending.

BUILDING THE PEACE

As citizens of the United States, we are determined that it be the most powerful nation on earth.

As citizens of the world, we insist that this power be exercised with the utmost responsibility.

Control of the use of nuclear weapons must remain solely with the highest elected official in the country—the President of the United States.

Through our policy of never negotiating from fear but never fearing to negotiate, we are slowly but surely approaching the point where effective international agreements providing for inspection and control can begin to lift the crushing burden of armaments off the backs of the people of the world.

In the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, signed now by over 100 nations, we have written our commitment to limitations on the arms race, consistent with our security. Reduced production of nuclear materials for weapons purposes has been announced and nuclear weapons have been barred from outer space.

Already the air we and our children breathe is freer of nuclear contamination.

We are determined to continue all-out efforts through fully-enforcible measures to halt and reverse the arms race and bring to an end the era of nuclear terror.

We will maintain our solemn commitment to the United Nations, with its constituent agencies working to strengthen it as a more effective instrument for peace, for preventing or resolving international disputes, and for building free nations through economic, technical, and cultural development. We continue to oppose the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

We believe in increased partnership with our friends and associates in the community which spans the North Atlantic. In every possible way we will work to strengthen our ties and increase our cooperation, building always more firmly on the sure foundation of the NATO treaty.

We pledge unflagging devotion to our commitments to freedom from Berlin to South Vietnam.

We will:

Help the people of developing nations in Asia, Africa and Latin America raise their standards of living and create conditions in which freedom and independence can flourish.

Place increased priority on private enterprise and development loans as we continue to improve our mutual assistance programs.

Work for the attainment of peace in the Near East as an urgent goal, using our best efforts to prevent a military unbalance, to encourage arms reductions and the use of national resources for internal development and to encourage the resettlement of Arab refugees in lands where there is room and opportunity. The problems of political adjustment between Israel and the Arab countries can and must be peacefully resolved and the territorial integrity of every nation respected.

Support the partnership of free American Republics in the Alliance for Progress.

Move actively to carry out the Resolution of the Organization of American States to further isolate Castroism and speed the restoration of freedom and responsibility in Cuba.

Support our friends in and around the rim of the Pacific, and encourage a growing understanding among peoples, expansion of cultural exchanges, and strengthening of ties.

Oppose aggression and the use of force or the threat of force against any nation.

Encourage by all peaceful means the growing independence of the captive peoples living under Communism and hasten the day that Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania and the other captive nations will achieve full freedom and self-determination. We deplore Communist oppression of Jews and other minorities.

Encourage expansion of our economic ties with other nations of the world and eliminate unjustifiable tariff and non-tariff barriers, under authority of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Expand the Peace Corps.

Use even more of our Food for Peace.

THE CONQUEST OF SPACE

In four vigorous years we have moved to the forefront of space exploration. The United States must never again settle for second place in the race for tomorrow's frontiers.

We will continue the rapid development of space technology for peaceful uses.

We will encourage private industry to increase its efforts in space research.

We will continue to ensure that any race in space is won for freedom and for peace.

THE LEADERSHIP WE OFFER

The complications and dangers in our restless, constantly changing world require of us consummate understanding and experience. One rash act, one thoughtless decision, one unchecked reaction—and cities could become smouldering ruins and farms parched wasteland.

The leadership we offer has already been tested in the crucible of crisis and challenge. To this Nation and to all the world we reaffirm President Johnson's resolve to " . . . use every resource at the command of the Government . . . and the people . . . to find the road to peace."

We offer this platform as a guide for that journey.

FREEDOM AND WELL BEING

There can be full freedom only when all of our people have opportunity for education to the full extent of their ability to learn, followed by the opportunity to employ their learning in the creation of something of value to themselves and to the nation.

THE INDIVIDUAL

Our task is to make the national purposes serve the human purpose; that every person shall have the opportunity to become all that he or she is capable of becoming.

We believe that knowledge is essential to individual freedom and to the conduct of a free society. We believe that education is the surest and most profitable investment a nation can make.

Regardless of family financial status, therefore, education should be open to every boy or girl in America up to the highest level which he or she is able to master.

In an economy which will offer fewer and fewer places for the unskilled, there must be a wide variety of educational opportunities so that every young American on leaving school, will have acquired the training to take a useful and rewarding place in our society.

It is increasingly clear that more of our educational resources must be directed to pre-school training as well as to junior college, college and post-graduate study.

The demands on the already inadequate sources of state and local revenues place a serious limitation on education. New methods of financial aid must be explored, including the channeling of federally collected revenues to all levels of education, and, to the extent permitted by the Constitution, to all schools. Only in this way can our educational programs achieve excellence throughout the nation, a goal that must be achieved without interfering with local control and direction of education.

In order to insure that all students who can meet the requirements for college entrance can continue their education, we propose an expanded program of public scholarships, guaranteed loans, and work-study grants.

We shall develop the potential of the Armed Forces for training young men who might otherwise be rejected for military service because their work skills are underdeveloped.

The health of the people is important to the strength and purpose of our country and is a proper part of our common concern.

In a nation that lacks neither compassion nor resources, the needless suffering of people who cannot afford adequate medical care is intolerable:

We will continue to fight until we have succeeded in including hospital care for older Americans in the Social Security program, and have insured adequate assistance to those elderly people suffering from mental illness and mental retardation.

We will go forward with research into the causes and cures of disease, accidents, mental illness and mental retardation.

We will further expand our health facilities, especially medical schools, hospitals, and research laboratories.

America's veterans who served their Nation so well must, in turn, be served fairly by a grateful Nation. First-rate hospitals and medical care must be provided veterans with service-connected injuries and disabilities, and their compensation rates must insure an adequate standard of living. The National Service Life Insurance program should be reopened for those who have lost their insurance coverage, and an equitable and just pension system must help meet the need of those disabled veterans and their survivors who require financial assistance.

DEMOCRACY OF OPPORTUNITY

The variety of our people is the source of our strength and ought not to be a cause of disunity or discord. The rights of all our citizens must be protected and all the laws of our land obeyed if America is to be safe for democracy.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 deserves and requires full observance by every American and fair, effective enforcement if there is any default.

Resting upon a national consensus expressed by the overwhelming support of both parties, this new law impairs the rights of no American; it affirms the rights of all Americans. Its purpose is not to divide, but to end division; not to curtail the opportunities of any, but to increase opportunities for all; not to punish, but to promote further our commitment to freedom, the pursuit of justice, and a deeper respect for human dignity.

We reaffirm our belief that lawless disregard for the rights of others is wrong—whether used to deny equal rights or to obtain equal rights.

We cannot and will not tolerate lawlessness. We can and will seek to eliminate its economic and social causes.

True democracy of opportunity will not be served by establishing quotas based on the same false distinctions we seek to erase, nor can the effects of prejudice be neutralized by the expedient of preferential practices.

The immigration laws must be revised to permit families to be reunited, to welcome the persecuted and oppressed, and to eliminate the discriminatory provisions which base admission upon national origins.

We will support legislation to carry forward the progress already made toward full equality of opportunity for women as well as men.

We will strive to eliminate discrimination against older Americans, especially in their employment.

Ending discrimination based on race, age, sex, or national origin demands not only equal opportunity but the opportunity to be equal. We are concerned not only with people's right to be free, but also with their ability to use their freedom.

We will:

Carry the War on Poverty forward as a total war against the causes of human want.

Move forward with programs to restore those areas, such as Appalachia, which the Nation's progress has by-passed.

Help the physically handicapped and mentally disadvantaged develop to the full limit of their capabilities.

Enhance the security of older Americans by encouraging private retirement and welfare programs, offering opportunities like those provided for the young under the Economic Opportunities Act of 1964, and expanding decent housing which older citizens can afford.

Assist our Indian people to improve their standard of living and attain self-sufficiency, the privileges of equal citizenship, and full participation in American life.

The Social Security program, initiated and developed under the National leadership of the Democratic Party and in the face of ceaseless partisan opposition, contributes greatly to the strength of the Nation. We must insure that those who have contributed to the system shall share in the steady increase in our standard of living by adjusting benefit levels.

We hold firmly to the conviction, long embraced by Democratic Administrations, that the advancing years of life should bring not fear and loneliness, but security, meaning, and satisfaction.

We will encourage further support for the arts, giving people a better chance to use increased leisure and recognizing that the achievements of art are an index of the greatness of a civilization.

We will encourage the advance of science and technology—for its material rewards, and for its contribution to an understanding of the universe and ourselves.

THE ECONOMY

The American free enterprise system is one of the great achievements of the human mind and spirit. It has developed by a combination of the energetic efforts of working men and women, bold private initiative, the profit motive and wise public policy, until it is now the productive marvel of mankind.

In spite of this, at the outset of 1961, America was in the depths of the fourth postwar recession.

Since then, in 42 months of uninterrupted expansion under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, we have achieved the longest and strongest peacetime prosperity in modern history:

Almost four million jobs have been added to the economy—almost 1½ million since last December.

Workers' earnings and corporate profits are at the highest level in history.

Prices have been more stable than in any other industrial nation in the free world.

This did not just happen. It has come about because we have wisely and prudently used our increasing understanding of how the economy works.

It is the national purpose, and our commitment, to continue this expansion of the American economy toward its potential, without a recession, with continued stability, and with an extension of the benefits of this growth and prosperity to those who have not fully shared in them.

This will require continuation of flexible and innovative fiscal, monetary, and debt management policies, recognizing the importance of low interest rates.

We will seek further tax reduction—and in the process we need to remove inequities in our present tax laws. In particular we should carefully review all our excise taxes and eliminate those that are obsolete. Consideration should be given to the development of fiscal policies which would provide revenue sources to hard-pressed state and local governments to assist them with their responsibilities.

Every penny of Federal spending must be accounted for in terms of the strictest economy, efficiency and integrity. We pledge to continue a frugal government, getting a dollar's value for a dollar spent, and a government worthy of the citizen's confidence.

Our goal is a balanced budget in a balanced economy.

Our enviable record of price stability must be maintained—through sound fiscal and monetary policies and the encouragement of responsible private wage and price policies. Stability is essential to protect our citizens—particularly the retired and handicapped—from the ravages of inflation. It is also essential to maintain confidence in the American dollar; this confidence has been restored in the past four years through sound policies.

Radical changes in technology and automation contribute to increased productivity and a higher standard of living. They must not penalize the few while benefiting the many. We maintain that any man or woman displaced by a machine or by technological change should have the opportunity, without penalty, to another job. Our common responsibility is to see that this right is fulfilled.

Full employment is an end in itself and must be insisted upon as a priority objective.

It is the national purpose, and our commitment, that every man or woman who is willing and able to work is entitled to a job and to a fair wage for doing it.

The coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act must be extended to all workers employed in industries affecting interstate commerce, and the minimum wage level and coverage increased to assure those at the bottom of the economic scale a fairer share in the benefits of an ever-rising standard of American living.

Overtime payment requirements must be increased to assure maximum employment consistent with business efficiency. The matter of the length of work periods should be given continuing consideration.

The unemployment insurance program must be basically revised to meet the needs of the unemployed and of the economy, and to assure that this program meets the standards the nation's experience dictates.

Agricultural and migratory workers must be given legal protection and economic encouragement.

We must develop fully our most precious resource—our manpower. Training and retraining programs must be expanded. A broad-gauge manpower program must be developed which will not only satisfy the needs of the economy but will also give work its maximum meaning in the pattern of human life.

We will stimulate as well as protect small business, the seedbed of free enterprise and a major source of employment in our economy.

The antitrust laws must be vigorously enforced.

Our population, which is growing rapidly and becoming increasingly mobile, and our expanding economy are placing greater demands upon our transportation system than ever before. We must have fast, safe, and economic modes of transportation. Each mode should be encouraged to develop in accordance with its maximum utility, available at the lowest cost under the principles of fair competition. A strong and efficient American Flag merchant marine is essential to peacetime commerce and defense emergencies.

The industrial democracy of free, private collective bargaining and the security of American trade unions must be strengthened by repealing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. The present inequitable restrictions on the right to organize and to strike and picket peaceably must also be eliminated.

In order to protect the hard earned dollars of American consumers, as well as promote their basic consumer rights, we will make full use of existing authority, and continue to promote efforts on behalf of consumers by industry, voluntary organizations, and state and local governments. Where protection is essential, we will enact legislation to protect the safety of consumers and to provide them with essential information. We will continue to insist that our drugs and medicines are safe and effective, that our food and cosmetics are free from harm, that merchandise is labeled and packaged honestly and that the true cost of credit is disclosed.

It is the national purpose, and our commitment to increase the freedom and effectiveness of the essential private forces and processes in the economy.

RURAL AMERICA

The roots of our economy and our life as a people lie deep in the soil of America's farm land.

Our policies and programs must continue to recognize the significant role of agricultural and rural life.

To achieve the goals of higher incomes to the farm and ranch, particularly the family-sized farm, lower prices for the consumer, and lower costs to the government, we will continue to carry forward this three-dimensional program.

1. Commodity Programs to strengthen the farm income structure and reach the goal of parity of income in every aspect of American agriculture. We will continue to explore and develop new domestic and foreign markets for the products of our farms and ranches.

2. Consumer Programs including expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the school lunch and other surplus food programs, and acceleration of research into new industrial uses of farm products, in order to assure maximum use of and abundance of wholesome foods at fair prices here and abroad. We will also study new low-cost methods and techniques of food distribution for the benefit of our housewives to better feed their families.

3. Community Programs and agricultural cooperatives to assure rural America decent housing, economic security and full partnership in the building of the great society. We pledge our continued support of the rural telephone program and the Rural Electrification Administration, which are among the great contributions of the Democratic Party to the well-being and comfort of rural America.

THE NATION'S NATURAL RESOURCES

America's bountiful supply of natural resources has been one of the major factors in achieving our position of world leadership, in developing the greatest industrial machine in the world's history, and in providing a richer and more complete life for every American. But these resources are not inexhaustible. With our vastly expanding population—an estimated 325 million people by the end of the century—there is an ever-increasing responsibility to use and conserve our resources wisely and prudently if we are to fulfill our obligation to the trust we hold for future generations. Building on the unsurpassed conservation record of the past four years, we shall:

Continue the quickened pace of comprehensive development of river basins in every section of the country, employing multi-purpose projects such as flood control, irrigation and reclamation, power generation, navigation, municipal water supply, fish and wildlife enhancement and recreation, where appropriate to realize the fullest possible benefits.

Provide the people of this nation a balanced outdoor recreation program to add to their health and well-being, including the addition or improved management of national parks, forests, lake shores, seashores and recreation areas.

Preserve for us and our posterity through the means provided by the Wilderness Act of 1964 millions of acres of primitive and wilderness areas, including countless beautiful lakes and streams.

Increase our stock of wildlife and fish.

Continue and strengthen the dynamic program inaugurated to assure fair treatment for American fishermen and the preservation of fishing rights.

Continue to support balanced land and forest development through intensive forest management on a multiple-use and sustained yield basis, reforestation of burned land, providing public access roads, range improvement, watershed management, concern for small business operations and recreational uses.

Unlock the resources of the sea through a strong oceanography program.

Continue the attack we have launched on the polluted air that envelopes our cities and on eliminating the pollution of our rivers and streams.

Intensify our efforts to solve the critical water problems of many sections of this country by desalinization.

Sustain and promote strong, vigorous domestic minerals, metals, petroleum and fuels industries.

Increase the efficient use of electrical power through regional inter-ties and more extensive use of high voltage transmission.

Continue to promote the development of new and improved methods of generating electric power, such as the recent important gains in the field of atomic energy and the Passamaquoddy tidal power project.

Preserve the T.V.A., which has played such an instrumental role in the revitalization of the area it serves and which has been the inspiration for regional development programs throughout the world.

THE CITY

The vitality of our cities is essential to the healthy growth of American civilization. In the next 40 years urban populations will double, the area of city land will double and we will have to construct houses, highways and facilities equal to all those built since this country was first settled.

Now is the time to redouble our efforts, with full cooperation among local, state and federal governments, for these objectives:

The goal of our housing program must be a decent home for every American family.

Special effort must be made in our cities to provide wholesome living for our young people. We must press the fight against narcotics and, through the war against poverty, increase educational and employment opportunities, turning juvenile delinquents into good citizens and tax-users into tax payers.

We will continue to assist broad community and regional development, urban renewal, mass transit, open space and other programs for our metropolitan areas. We will offer such aid without impairing local Administration through unnecessary Federal interference.

Because our cities and suburbs are so important to the welfare of all our people, we believe a department devoted to urban affairs should be added to the President's cabinet.

THE GOVERNMENT

We, the people, are the government.

The Democratic Party believes, as Thomas Jefferson first stated that "the care of human life and happiness is the first and only legitimate object of good government."

The government's business is the people's business. Information about public affairs must continue to be freely available to the Congress and to the public.

Every person who participates in the government must be held to a standard of ethics which permits no compromise with the principles of absolute honesty and the maintenance of undivided loyalty to the public interest.

The Congress of the United States should revise its rules and procedures to assure majority rule after reasonable debate and to guarantee that major legislative proposals of the President can be brought to a vote after reasonable consideration in committee.

We support home rule for the District of Columbia. The seat of our government shall be a workshop for democracy, a pilot plant for freedom, and a place of incomparable beauty.

We also support a constitutional amendment giving the District voting representation in Congress and, pending such action, the enactment of legislation providing for a non-voting delegate from District of Columbia to the House of Representatives.

We support the right of the people of the Virgin Islands the fullest measure of self-government, including the right to elect their Governor.

The people of Puerto Rico and the people of the United States enjoy a unique relationship that has contributed greatly to the remarkable economic and political development of Puerto Rico. We look forward to the report on that relationship by a commission composed of members from Puerto Rico and the United States, and we are confident that it will contribute to the further enhancement of Puerto Rico and the benefit that flows from the principles of self-determination.

The Democratic Party holds to the belief that government in the United States—local, state and federal—was created in order to serve the people. Each level of government has appropriate powers and each has specific responsibilities. The first responsibility of government at every level is to protect the basic freedoms of the people. No government at any level can properly complain of violation of its power, if it fails to meet its responsibilities.

The federal government exists not to grow larger, but to enlarge the individual potential and achievement of the people.

The federal government exists not to subordinate the states, but to support them.

All of us are Americans. All of us are free men. Ultimately there can be no effective restraint on the powers of government at any level save as Americans exercising their duties as citizens insist upon and maintain free democratic processes of our constitutional system.

ONE NATION, ONE PEOPLE

On November 22, 1963, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was shot down in our land.

We honor his memory best—and as he would wish—by devoting yourselves anew to the larger purposes for which he lived.

Of first priority is our renewed commitments to the values and ideals of democracy.

We are firmly pledged to continue the Nation's march towards the goals of equal opportunity and equal treatment for all Americans regardless of race, creed, color or national origin.

We cannot tolerate violence anywhere in our land—north, south, east or west. Resort to lawlessness is anarchy and must be opposed by the Government and all thoughtful citizens.

We must expose, wherever it exists, the advocacy of hatred which creates the clear and present danger of violence.

We condemn extremism, whether from the Right or Left, including the extreme tactics of such organizations as the Communist Party, the Ku Klux Klan and the John Birch Society.

We know what violence and hate can do. We have seen the tragic consequences of misguided zeal and twisted logic.

The time has come now for all of us to understand and respect one another, and to seek the unity of spirit and purpose from which our future greatness will grow—for only as we work together with the object of liberty and justice for all will the peace and freedom of each of us be secured.

These are the principles which command our cause and strengthen our effort as we cross the new frontier and enter upon the great society.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BUSH, for 1 hour, on February 27; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. PETTIS), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. PETTIS), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER (at the request of Mr. PETTIS), for 10 minutes, on Monday, February 27, 1967; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER (at the request of Mr. PETTIS), for 10 minutes, on Tuesday, February 28, 1967; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER (at the request of Mr. PETTIS), for 10 minutes, on Wednesday, March 1, 1967; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER (at the request of Mr. PETTIS), for 10 minutes, on Thursday, March 2, 1967; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FARBSTEIN (at the request of Mr. ICHORD), for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. ICHORD), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend her remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia (at the request of Mr. PETTIS) for 10 minutes, February 28.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. DINGELL.
Mr. ST. ONGE.
Mr. PUCINSKI.
Mr. IRWIN.

Mr. FRASER to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter in his special order today.

Mr. PELLY to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter in his special order today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PETTIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MESKILL.
Mr. LAIRD.
Mr. ZWACH.
Mr. ROUDEBUSH.
Mr. PELLY.
Mrs. DWYER.
Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ICHORD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DENT.
Mr. PICKLE.
Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 13 minutes, p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 27, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

411. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to strengthen and expand food service programs for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

412. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, for July to December 1966, pursuant to the provisions of section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

413. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize (1) a transfer of credit between the Foreign Service retirement and disability system and the social security system and (2) social security minimum benefits for Foreign Service annuitants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

414. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reserve certain public lands and other lands for a nationwide system of scenic rivers, to provide for adding additional lands to the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

415. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report of activities under the Mobile Trade Fairs Act, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 87-839; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CELLER: Select Committee Pursuant to House Resolution 1, 90th Congress, first session. House Resolution. 1. Resolution relative to the seating of Adam Clayton Powell (Rept. No. 27). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 4573. An act to provide, for the period ending on June 30, 1967, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act (Rept. No. 28). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEVILL:

H.R. 6006. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for payments to educational institutions for reports made by them with respect to eligible veterans enrolled therein; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 6007. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 6008. A bill to incorporate Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 6009. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to establish in the Veterans' Administration a national veterans' cemetery system consisting of all cemeteries of the United States in which veterans of any war or conflict are or may be buried; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 6010. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 6011. A bill to grant civil service employees retirement after 30 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 6012. A bill to improve the safety of railroad transportation under the jurisdiction of the Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6013. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 6014. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide an increase in benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide benefits for additional categories of individuals, to provide health insurance to the disabled, to improve the public assistance program and programs relating to the welfare and health of children, to revise the income tax treatment of the aged, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 6015. A bill to strengthen State and local governments, to provide the States with additional financial resources to improve elementary and secondary education by returning a portion of the Federal revenue to the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 6016. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 6017. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1954, relating to office space in the districts of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 6018. A bill to provide assistance to students pursuing programs of higher education in the fields of law enforcement and of correctional treatment of law violators; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6019. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase the educational assistance allowances under the veterans' educational assistance program and to provide special educational assistance under that program to educationally disadvantaged veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6020. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide pension increases for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, for widows of such veterans, and for the children of such veterans who are deceased, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 6021. A bill to repeal the suspension of the investment credit and of the allowance of accelerated depreciation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 6022. A bill to authorize the Secretaries concerned to direct the initiation of allotments of the pay and allowances of certain members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of making deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 6023. A bill to make the provisions of section 232(b) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 inapplicable to propane gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 6024. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 6025. A bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act to increase the protection afforded consumers against injurious flammable fabrics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 6026. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to provide additional sources of financing for the rural electrification and rural telephone programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6027. A bill to require U.S. military establishments and installations to purchase wines and distilled spirits in compliance with and conformity to systems, procedures, and requirements established in the several States, and to limit the quantities of such beverages to be sold, distributed, or acquired within Federal enclaves; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 6028. A bill to amend title VII of the Housing Act of 1961 to authorize Federal grants under the open-space land program for the development and redevelopment of existing open-space land; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 6029. A bill to establish a Federal sabbatical program to improve the quality of teaching in the Nation's elementary or secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 6030. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 6031. A bill to oppose boycotts against friendly countries; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 6032. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited services of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 6033. A bill to provide that Flag Day shall be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 6034. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 6035. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of compensation of wage board employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 6036. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6037. A bill to permit wiretapping by an authorized Federal officer engaged in the investigation of illegal importation of narcotic drugs into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 6038. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 6039. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a portion of an individual's wages, salary, or other income shall be exempt from levy to enforce the payment of Federal taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 6040. A bill to provide appropriations for sharing of Federal taxes with States out of funds derived from a cutback in projected new expansion of grant-in-aid programs and as a substitute for portions of existing grant-in-aid expenditures and to amend the Interal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit individuals to claim a credit against Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 6041. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain additional losses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 6042. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to extend and enlarge the program of grants for educational television broadcasting facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6043. A bill for the general revision of the Patent Laws, title 35 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 6044. A bill to provide that judges of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals shall hold office during good behavior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 6045. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 6046. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 6047. A bill to authorize the Legislative Reference Service to make use of automatic data processing techniques and equipment in the performance of its functions; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 6048. A bill to repeal the suspension of the investment credit and of the allowance of accelerated depreciation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 6049. A bill to provide that Flag Day shall be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 6050. A bill to eliminate the requirement that veterans have served for 90 days or more to qualify for certain benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 6051. A bill to amend chapter 73, title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the obstruction of criminal investigations of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6052. A bill to provide the establishment of a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Crime in the Department of Justice to provide assistance in improving capabilities, techniques, and practices in the prevention and control of crime and juvenile delinquency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6053. A bill to permit the compelling of testimony with respect to certain crimes, and the granting of immunity in connection therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6054. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Organized Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 6055. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to make certain nonprofit organizations eligible for donations of surplus property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 6056. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide rules relating to the deduction for personal exemptions for children of parents who are divorced or separated; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 6057. A bill making an appropriation for the appointment of certain additional investigator personnel in the Bureau of Customs and the Bureau of Narcotics; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 6058. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for rounding the amount of State and local taxes for purposes of computing tax on cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 6059. A bill to amend section 6015 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change from January 31 to February 15 the last day for filing income tax returns for purposes of satisfying certain requirements with respect to the declaration of estimated tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 6060. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that, for benefit computation purposes, a man's insured status and average monthly wage will be figured on the basis of an age 62 cutoff (the same as is presently done in the case of women); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6061. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that workers who become disabled before attaining age 31 may qualify for disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze on the basis of a more appropriate test of substantial and recent employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6062. A bill to amend section 228 of the Social Security Act to eliminate the provisions which reduce the benefits otherwise payable thereunder to certain uninsured individuals by the amount of any governmental benefits they are now receiving; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6063. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment to a woman of wife's or mother's insurance benefits, based on having a child in her care, where such child is between the ages of 18 and 22 and attending school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6064. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide benefits for certain disabled widows without regard to their age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.R. 6065. A bill to revise eligibility requirements for burial in national cemeteries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 6066. A bill relating to the application of the effective date provisions of the act providing that certain forms of copper be admitted free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 6067. A bill prohibiting use in the commission or attempted commission of certain crimes of firearms transported in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.J. Res. 351. Joint resolution designating February of each year as American History Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.J. Res. 352. Joint resolution to create a joint congressional committee to study and report on problems relating to industrywide collective bargaining and industrywide strikes and lockouts; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 353. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.J. Res. 354. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a Commission on National Defense Policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.J. Res. 355. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.J. Res. 356. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. Con. Res. 231. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H. Con. Res. 232. Concurrent resolution to establish an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KYROS:

H. Con. Res. 233. Concurrent resolution to provide early appropriations for Federal educational programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MATHIAS of California:

H. Con. Res. 234. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the interest of peace in Vietnam the Government of the United States should only consider further expansions of trade, educational and cultural exchanges, and other related agreements with the Soviet Union and its East European satellites when there is demonstrable evidence that their actions and policies with regard to Vietnam have been redirected toward peace and an honorable settlement and when there is demonstrable evidence that they have abandoned their policy of support for so-called wars of national liberation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. QUIE:

H. Con. Res. 235. Concurrent resolution to establish an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H. Con. Res. 236. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the interest of peace in Vietnam the Government of the United States should only consider further expansions of trade, educational and cultural exchanges, and other related agreements with the Soviet Union and its East European satellites when there is demonstrable evidence that their actions and policies with regard to Vietnam have been redirected toward peace and an honorable settlement and when there is demonstrable evidence that they have abandoned their policy of support for so-called wars of national liberation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. Con. Res. 237. Concurrent resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. Res. 277. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 278. Resolution relative to the seating of Representative-elect Adam Clayton Powell; referred to the House Calendar.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

29. By Mr. KYROS: Memorial of the Maine State Legislature relative to including Maine in the study of high-speed ground transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

30. Also, memorial of the Maine State Legislature relative to extending the northern terminus of the Interstate and Defense Highway System in Maine from Houlton to Fort Kent; to the Committee on Public Works.

31. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands, relative to S. 450, amending certain provisions of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

32. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to the maintenance of the Federal aid highway program at its 1966 levels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 6068. A bill for the relief of Genowefa Libera Budzyna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.R. 6069. A bill for the relief of William L. Bowles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 6070. A bill for the relief of Rosario Furnari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6071. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Belmonte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6072. A bill for the relief of Calogero Governanti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 6073. A bill for the relief of Vito Barone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6074. A bill for the relief of Genaro Crescenzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6075. A bill for the relief of Armando, Rose, Antonella, and Ignazio Nicolosi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6076. A bill for the relief of Pietro Cacciatore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6077. A bill for the relief of John Markopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6078. A bill for the relief of Maria Aida Gambino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6079. A bill for the relief of Giorgios Markopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6080. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Fontana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6081. A bill for the relief of Antonino Como; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6082. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Florini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6083. A bill for the relief of Antonio Beninati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6084. A bill for the relief of Gerlando

Murena and Vincenza Murena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 6085. A bill for the relief of Clifton M. Chippewa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 6086. A bill for the relief of Bernardo Randazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 6087. A bill for the relief of Alvin A. Canha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 6088. A bill for the relief of Dr. Manuel Jose Coto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6089. A bill for the relief of Sabas Murillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 6090. A bill for the relief of Flaviano Sellaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 6091. A bill for the relief of Seppo R. Saikkonen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 6092. A bill for the relief of Maj. Warren E. Buhler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 6093. A bill for the relief of Nikandros Rondogiannis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 6094. A bill for the relief of Douglass Bros., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 6095. A bill for the relief of Hoo Sun Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES (by request):

H.R. 6096. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Inge Hemmersbach Hilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

36. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the State University of Iowa Young Democrats, Iowa City, Iowa, relative to the establishment of a permanent ethics committee, which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Paul A. Raushenbush, Dean of Unemployment Compensation, Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1967

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, Paul Raushenbush is known, nationwide, as the dean of unemployment compensation, to recognize both his seniority and his many contributions to the unemployment compensation program. He retired after 35 years of outstanding service as the director of the Wisconsin unemployment compensation program.

Paul helped to plan and to draft and to secure passage of Wisconsin's pioneer unemployment compensation law. He has helped to administer it, ever since.

Mr. Speaker, without the leadership and pioneering efforts in this field by Wisconsin, other States would not have progressed as rapidly or as well as they have. For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to give just a brief background of Paul Raushenbush and his career.

Mr. Speaker, Paul Raushenbush was born in Rochester, N.Y. He attended Amherst College, and then the University of Wisconsin. There he met and married Elizabeth Brandeis, who has shared his consuming interest in unemployment compensation. As students and colleagues of John R. Commons in the twenties, they absorbed his pioneering ideas on this subject.

In 1930–31, at the request of Philip La Follette, they worked with Harold Groves on planning and drafting a new unemployment compensation bill, based on those of the twenties but with significant improvements. Then they went on to build support for the new bill's enactment. The outcome was the 1932 Wisconsin unemployment compensation law, the first in this country and the only unemployment compensation law passed before 1935, when the Social Security Act provided powerful incentives for State action in this field. On that Federal act, too, Paul left his mark by helping to draft the unemployment "tax credit" device.

Over the years, under Paul's leadership, the industrial commission's unemployment compensation department has achieved a nationwide reputation for effective and economical administration. He has also worked, for three decades, with administrators from other States, to encourage better and stronger unemployment compensation programs.

He has always championed responsible State action, and Federal-State cooperation, with a minimum of Federal compulsion. Here at home, under his guidance, Wisconsin's Labor-Management Advisory Committee has played a major role in keeping the law in tune with changes in the State's economy and the needs of its citizens.

Mr. Speaker, Paul Raushenbush retired last month, after more than a third of a century of devoted and inspiring service to the program and to the State of Wisconsin.

Wendell L. Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1967

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, if he would have lived, Wendell L. Willkie would have been 75 years old this month.

It does not seem long ago when the chants, "We want Willkie, we want Willkie," drowned out all other at the Republican National Convention and Wendell Willkie carried our party colors.

Willkie, with his large crop of black hair hanging over his forehead, went home to the small central Indiana town of Elwood, Ind., to give his acceptance speech.

Thousands of Indiana residents listened to his remarks with tears in their eyes—because he was one of them. Willkie was a Hoosier.

He might have been flamboyant, he might have been unorthodox, but he was a great American.

He left his mark on our country for all time.

He was a humble man, an honest man, and a believer in American justice.

I am proud to take this time to honor a great Hoosier and a great American.

The Need for Firearms Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1967

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, everyone recognizes the fact that crime in our streets is rapidly increasing and has become a national disgrace. In an effort to bring a halt to this blight, the administration has requested, and many of my colleagues have introduced, firearms legislation designed to make traffic in guns more difficult for the criminal.

Mr. Speaker, in my estimation much of this proposed gun legislation makes it difficult for the law-abiding citizen to bear arms as guaranteed in the Constitution while it places very few actual restrictions on their use by criminals.

I believe the greatest deterrent to crime is the fear of punishment so I therefore wish to introduce the following legislation which would impose a mandatory sentence of 25 years in prison for anyone using a gun that has been transported in interstate commerce in the commission or attempted commission of any robbery, assault, murder, rape, burglary, kidnaping, or homicide.

The bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill prohibiting use in the commission and attempted commission of certain crimes of firearms transported in interstate commerce

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That whoever, during the commission or attempted commission of any robbery, assault, murder, rape, burglary, kidnaping, or homicide (other than involuntary manslaughter), uses or carries any firearm which has been transported across the boundary of a State, the

District of Columbia, or a territory or possession of the United States shall be imprisoned for twenty-five years.

Small Business Development Program Moving Along Well

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the small business development programs provided under the Economic Opportunity Act, which are now administered by the Small Business Administration, appear to be moving along quite well.

Small Business Administrator Bernard L. Boutin, in a letter dated February 20, 1967, reports:

> You will recall that I indicated last month that we would have a much more meaningful report on the new SBA Economic Opportunity Loan Program after our first full quarter of operation. I am delighted to provide you with the enclosed detailed summary of our operations since President Johnson signed the 1966 Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act early in November.
>
> There are two aspects of this compilation that are of particular interest: first, Economic Opportunity Loan applications are now being processed in every State; and second, the total volume of the anti-poverty Title IV loans from 1964 through October of 1966 was 2,476 loans, totaling $25,296,230. You will note that the new program has produced 478 loans totaling $5,249,912 in three months (November and December 1966, and January 1967). I am personally gratified at our initial success, and I pledge that our efforts to improve and expand the program will continue.

Mr. Speaker, the detailed summary to which Mr. Boutin referred is as follows:

	EOL I	EOL II	Total
Number of loans	227	251	478
Dollar volume	1,982,110	3,267,802	5,249,912

Items	EOL I[1]		EOL II[2]		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Type of business:						
Retail	86	37.9	103	41.0	189	39.5
Wholesale	8	3.5	11	4.4	19	4.0
Manufacturing	12	5.3	11	4.4	23	4.8
Service	110	48.5	100	39.8	210	43.9
Other	11	4.8	26	10.4	37	7.8
Race:						
Minority	99	43.6	77	30.7	176	36.8
White	128	56.4	174	69.3	302	63.2
Type of loan:						
Direct	205	90.3	199	79.3	404	84.5
Guarantee	15	6.6	29	11.5	44	9.2
Participation-bank	7	3.1	23	9.2	30	6.3
Businesses:						
New	75	33.0	89	35.5	164	34.3
Existing	152	67.0	162	64.5	314	65.7

[1] Business loans to individuals whose income does not provide basic needs.

[2] Business loans to individuals having experience, education, or training that indicates strong managerial ability who cannot meet the basic requirements for regular SBA loans.

I was the sponsor of the provision in the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1966 under which this program was switched from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the SBA. Under OEO, economic opportunity loans were available only in 44 selected communities throughout the country. I thought it was unfair that many small businessmen, both those in business and those who desired to start out on their own, who did not live in these communities, were excluded from the program. Additionally, it was my contention that SBA would be able to greatly reduce the administrative costs of the program, which, under OEO, were running about 20 cents for each dollar of loans.

I think that the SBA has done an outstanding job in rapidly implementing this expanded program. Economic opportunity loans are now available to eligible persons throughout the country, and the volume of loan applications and approvals is increasing. Thus, in only a little over 3 months, SBA has picked up this program and turned it into an effective antipoverty operation.

Meanwhile, I am also pleased to be informed by OEO that it has made a $115,850 grant under the small business development centers program to help finance, during the next 6 months, the operation of a SBDC operation in Detroit, Mich. The funds will be used by TAP—total action against poverty—to encourage and assist target area residents to enter into or to improve their businesses. I am sure that TAP will find SBA most willing to cooperate in its endeavor to assist worthy persons in this target area of 158,808 residents.

Andrew Jackson's Memory Deserves Park in Capital Named in His Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, for many years it has been an annual practice in the Congress to pay tribute to our great frontier President, Andrew Jackson, of Tennessee—a truly great American.

It has been traditional and customary in these discussions and tributes for my colleagues from North Carolina and South Carolina to debate the place of Andrew Jackson's birth, each State claiming him as a native son.

On such occasions it is always well to remember that Andrew Jackson was a Tennessean and won his name and fame as a Tennessean. The Hermitage, General Jackson's beautiful Tennessee estate near Nashville, is one of the historic landmarks and shrines of the Nation.

It is certainly fitting and appropriate that a suitable additional memorial be erected to this great American in the Nation's Capital. It has long been my belief that the Lafayette Park facing the White House should be designated as Jackson Park in memory of Andrew Jackson. We all know and recognize that the central monument or statue in a park sets the tone for the entire park—and the statue of Andrew Jackson is the outstanding monument in the center of this park. There are frequent references by the public to this park as Jackson Park as well as Lafayette Park. It should officially be designated as Jackson Park.

Estonian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the 24th of February, marks the 49th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Estonia. I would, therefore, take this opportunity to pay tribute to that small nation of one and a half million people.

Twenty-seven years ago, Estonia lost her freedom and independence. But this small nation possesses a devotion to liberty and a strong hope of eventual independence.

The world is much concerned with the issue of colonialism. The ugliest aspects of colonialism by force can be seen in the takeover of Estonia and the other captive nations of Eastern Europe. For 27 years Estonia has not known freedom but for those years, the Estonians have fought and prayed and hoped that the bright promise of 1918 might be realized once more.

As a nation opposed to all forms of enslavement, the United States has never recognized the Soviet Union's sovereignty over Estonia. It is our position today that the rightful government of Estonia must be established at the will of the Estonian people as manifested in a free and open election.

It is a tragedy that on this day, while the Americans of Estonian descent are free to celebrate the anniversary of their ancestors' declaration of independence, the citizens of Estonia must remain silent, for there can be no open commemoration within that brave nation.

To those Estonians held in bondage within their own country and to those Americans of Estonian nationality, let me say that we will not forget Estonia and her fight against oppression.

The 50th Anniversary of Vocational Education Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1967

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, 1917, President Woodrow Wilson signed into law the Smith-Hughes Act which was the first national vocational education legislation in the United States. Today marks the 50th anniversary of that event, and it is with a great deal of pleasure that I take official note of this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The first 50 years of the National Vocational Education Act have more than fulfilled the hopes of the original legislation, and it is with justifiable optimism that we anticipate a second half century of accomplishment. I believe that a brief summary of the important congressional action in support of vocational education will indicate the remarkable growth of this vital and dynamic program.

The original Smith-Hughes Act established an annual grant of $7.2 million to the various States; and apportioned $3 million for agricultural training, $3 million for trade and industrial and home economics education, $1 million for teacher training, and the remainder for the Federal costs of administering the act. Almost 30 years passed before Congress took further action, when in 1946 the George-Barden Act was passed. This authorized an annual appropriation of $28.5 million to be allotted to the same programs as the original act, but with the addition of education for distributive occupations.

In 1956 Public Law 84–1027 added the fishery trades and industries to the vocational categories of the George-Barden Act, and authorized an annual appropriation of $375,000 for vocational education in those fields and in the distributive occupations. The same year witnessed the passage of the Health Amendments Act, which established title II of the George-Barden Act, and included practical nurse training as an added provision of it.

The National Defense Education Act in 1958 added title III to the George-Barden Act and authorized $15 million a year to train highly skilled technicians. This title was initially established for 4 years, but now is a permanent part of the vocational education legislation. The Area Redevelopment Act—ARA—of 1961 provided a 4-year program to train and retrain unemployed or underemployed persons in redevelopment areas. This was followed the next year by the Manpower Development and Training Act, which offers training similar to that provided by the ARA, but broader in scale and not limited to redevelopment areas.

The increasing interest shown by the Congress in this field culminated in the Vocational Education Act of 1963, which authorizes substantial Federal grants to the States to assist in the development of new vocational education programs and to maintain, extend, and improve those already in existence. These programs, designed to meet present and future employment opportunities, are open to all persons who can benefit from training or retraining, whether enrolled in school or not. The act does not include provisions for training for professional occupations, or those requiring a higher degree.

On this 50th anniversary, I wish to especially praise the competent manner in which this program has been administered in the past, and to extend my appreciation to all those individuals who have worked so hard to make it an efficient and successful operation. Without this sincere devotion to the goals of vocational education the remarkable achievements of the past would not have been possible.

I particularly wish to congratulate the Connecticut Vocational Association, its executive board and all its members for the distinguished service rendered by this organization in the field of vocational education in Connecticut over the past half century. It helped make possible greater and better service to the people of Connecticut not only in the improvement of vocational education, but also in the development of research in this field, in bringing about a greater degree of skilled manpower, and in helping to keep unemployment at a minimum. For this they deserve our recognition and appreciation on this 50th anniversary of the first national Vocational Education Act.

New Peace Offers Reported

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1967

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it was heartening to read that Arthur J. Goldberg has cautioned against yielding to false despair in regard to peace talks. Speaking at a conference on world problems at New York University he said:

> The door is still open.

Meanwhile, a spokesman for Hanoi, Mai Vah Bo, North Vietnamese representative in Paris has reaffirmed his Government's willingness to enter into talks with the United States if American bombing attacks against North Vietnam were unconditionally and permanently halted.

Certainly if Ho Chi Minh will talk we will stop fighting.

All I can say is, What is Russia doing about this situation? Does she want this war stopped or not?

The blood, Mr. Speaker, is on her hands. She is in a position to arrange an armistice any time she wants, instead of supplying Hanoi with vast quantities of war material.

Fifty Years of Vocational Training—Milestones Through the Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1967

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, back in 1917—a half century ago—Woodrow Wilson and other men of vision saw the need for a program of assistance to vocational education.

In that year, the Smith-Hughes Act was passed which provided an annual grant of $7.2 million to the States: $3 million for agricultural training, $3 million for trade and industrial and home economics education, $1 million for teacher training, and the rest for Federal costs of administering the act.

In the ensuing years, it has become obvious that while Wilson and his associates had the vision to start a program of assistance to vocational education, their vision was not broad enough, flexible enough, or rich enough to meet the needs of today, much less the needs of tomorrow.

Thus, there have been further milestones in the struggle to meet these needs. In 1946, for example, the George-Barden Act came along and authorized annual appropriations of $28.5 million to be divided among the same categories as the Smith-Hughes Act, with the addition of education for distributive occupations.

Ten years later—in 1956—Public Law 84–1027 added the fishery trades and industries to the vocational categories in the George-Barden Act. It also authorized an annual appropriation of $375,000 for vocational education in those trades and industries and in the distributive occupations.

The Health Amendments Act of 1956 amended the George-Barden Act by adding title II, which specified practical nursing for inclusion under the act, with a $5 million appropriation annually. The title originally was for 5 years but in 1961 it was extended to June 30, 1965, and since has been made permanent.

Another milestone came in 1958 when the National Defense Education Act further amended the George-Barden Act by adding title III and authorizing $15 million annually to train highly skilled technicians. That title also has since been made permanent, although originally passed for 4 years.

Still a further milestone came with the passage in 1961 of the Area Redevelopment Act which provided for the training or retraining of unemployed or underemployed persons in redevelopment areas, authorizing $4.5 million a year until 1965 for training purposes.

In 1962, the Manpower Development and Training Act authorized a total of $951 million for a 4-year program of training similar to that under ARA, but broader and not limited to redevelopment areas.

Then the Vocational Education Act of 1963 came along and it cannot become obsolete because the machinery for keeping it flexible and up to date was built into it.

For the first time, all the new programs were meshed with the old, so that all became coordinate parts of the whole.

And at long last the emphasis was placed on the quality of education—with wise choices by the students, with the training of teachers, with the supply of materials and equipment, with research on problems and a search for solution.

Thus it is that vocational education has really come of age.

Thus it is that throughout the country new and expanded vocational education programs are underway, bringing job training for Americans into harmony with the industrial, economic, and social realities of the present day.

In my home State of Connecticut, vocational educators have rendered distinguished service back to the day the first program of assistance was enacted.

Today, a half century later, vocational educators in Connecticut remain alert to ways to provide still further improvement in instruction and the development of research to bring about still better ways of providing vocational education.

The 49th Anniversary of Estonian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1967

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, February is a particularly meaningful month for Americans—we celebrate the birthday of our Founding Father, George Washington, and the man who preserved our Union, Abraham Lincoln. It is also a historically important month for Estonians who celebrate the 49th anniversary of their independence today.

But unlike us, our Baltic neighbors must celebrate this national holiday with a heaviness of heart, for their homeland is once more under the domination of an oppressive foreign power. The Nazi occupation of World War II brought to a close the 21 years of independence enjoyed by Estonia and set the stage for an equally heavy domination by the Soviet Union which exists to this day.

During their all too brief taste of freedom, Estonians demonstrated their ability to govern themselves in the finest democratic tradition. Therefore, today, let us join in a solemn pledge to support their quest for self-determination by continuing in a strong refusal to recognize the incorporation of Estonia and the other Baltic States into the Soviet Union.

The CIA and the National Student Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1967

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, since the revelation last week of the CIA's association with the National Student Association, I have been shocked by the energy devoted by many to disclosing other, additional associations which the Agency has with various groups. At the outset, let me say that I do not want to believe for one minute that the CIA has subverted, distorted, or maligned either the students of this country or our academic and educational structure. The CIA's involvement with NSA was a small response to a direct propaganda challenge from the Communist bloc. The funds granted to the student association were not great when compared to the millions of dollars expended by the Communist bloc to directly utilize students and student organizations for subversive purposes. This does not necessarily justify our doing the same, but the cold realities of this age do.

What is happening now, however, is absolutely frightening. All news outlets have taken up the disclosure of last week and now appear to be engaging in enthusiastic competition to see who can expose the most about our intelligence service. The Washington Post of Saturday, February 18, 1967, is a good example. No fewer than three separate front-page articles appeared, associating the CIA in one way or another with national and international groups. One article amplified the NSA story. Another tied business leaders to the CIA's covert operations, and listed a number of foundations apparently used by the Agency to filter money into selected operations. Still another article boldly announced that the American Newspaper Guild has accepted nearly $1 million in CIA subsidies since 1961 for use in a broad international program.

Not to be outdone, The Evening Star of that date told of how a local Latin study group was controlled by the CIA. It also gave priority coverage to the student association story. Since then, each day has brought out new and detailed disclosures.

Mr. Speaker, I grant that the CIA makes good news copy. It is likewise obvious that it makes an ideal target, since it has a history of silence in response to attack and criticism.

There must, however, be some self-imposed limit on the extent to which the activities of this agency can be protected from public disclosure. The people are represented by the congressional committees that oversee the operations of the CIA. Surely, they need not be exposed for all—including those against whom they are directed—to see.

If some insist on categorically listing every group or association affiliated in some way with the CIA, why not then make it doubly simple and list the individuals involved, too. List the scores of Americans here and abroad who give selflessly, and without recognition, in this defense of their country. List also the hundreds of foreign associates who provide information and conduct operations, whether for profit or conviction, in the interest of the United States. Why not open the book up wide, and expose the soul of the organization established and maintained for the purpose of supplementing our national defense?

Mr. Speaker, one of the realities of the cold war—indeed, all war and peace—is the system of espionage developed by each nation for its own protection. The everyday life of our opposition is nearly clouded in secrecy. The intelligence activities of our opposition, therefore, are beyond our obvious gaze. Ours, on the other hand, operating in a free society, are quite naturally less free of discovery. But this does not give every curious entity or individual the unquestioned obligation to illustrate, for all to see, the mechanisms of our service. This information is dear to the national interest and should be accorded proper regard and handled with the utmost of delicacy. The CIA expends tremendous amounts of time and energy in penetrating the opposition's intelligence network, but the opposition can now do an effective job of penetrating ours for the price of a daily newspaper.

Mr. Speaker, the necessity for covert organizations in this world is a distressing reality. But, as I have repeated, it is a reality. The CIA is subject to a great deal of review and overview. The people and institutions of this country are amply protected with educated care and yet, we are not willing to afford the same degree of protection to an organization committed to our security. This is an irony that smacks of irresponsibility. I hope it may be resolved before the breach widens.

City-Suburb Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1967

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of Members of the House a very interesting example of cooperative action among local leaders in Kansas City, Mo., and the neighboring communities in the metropolitan area.

The Committee for Area Legislative Cooperation for the Counties of Cass, Platte, Clay, and Jackson has submitted to the Missouri General Assembly a seven-point proposed area legislative program, representing legislative needs of the highest priority.

The program was widely endorsed by officials of government, labor, business, professional, and community organizations throughout the four-county area. The proposals deal with a wide range of subjects including hospital and medical care for indigents, higher education and medical school branch, an expanded State highway plan, home rule for local government, increased aid to schools, law enforcement, and revaluation of real property. Substantial background information was presented for each of the recommendations in the 72-page report.

This example of concerted action reflects a collaborative spirit that can lead to other practical methods for areawide cooperation, such as those proposed by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, of which I am a member.

The example set by leaders in the four-county Kansas City area is particularly encouraging at this time when we are so much concerned with the resolution of differences between the central city and the suburbs in metropolitan areas. Much is now being said about strengthening local governments and strengthening the State's role in urban affairs, but one obstacle to effective State legislative action has been the failure of the central city, and the suburban areas to reach agreement on important issues before submitting proposals to the State legislature.

Hopefully, we shall see more instances of interlocal agreement on State legislative priorities. I am sure there are some good examples in other areas.

Joseph B. Grogan Retires as Chief of Police in Athens, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1967

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, perhaps one of the most difficult areas of public service today is that of a police officer. The hours are long, the pay poor, the risks encountered numerous. The rewards of having done a job well come with the knowledge that the people of the community recognize and appreciate the sacrifices of a policeman.

It is with this thought in mind that I ask the Members of Congress to join with me in honoring a man who has devoted half of his life to police work.

On January 21, Chief Joseph B. Grogan of the Athens, Ohio, Police Department retired after serving as chief for over 25 years. The story of J. B. Grogan's tenure as police chief is the history of the Athens Police Department. When Chief Grogan took the reigns of the department, it employed less than a half dozen officers with one old cruiser. Today the Athens Police Department has 16 uniformed officers, three cruisers, two motorcycles and radio communications with every on-duty patrolman, whether in car or on foot.

Joseph Grogan began his career as a policeman with the Ohio State Highway Patrol. During his 7 years' service, he rose to the rank of sergeant, and was commander of the Athens post of the patrol from 1936 to 1940. He is a member of the Ohio Chiefs of Police Association, the Fraternal Order of Police, Knights of Columbus, and Elks.

The problems of the department under Grogan have been unique. Athens is a city of 16,000 residents with a university population of 15,000 students. The untiring efforts of Chief Grogan have cemented a remarkable union between the "town and gown." Serious crime in Athens during the past quarter century has been practically nonexistent.

On Tuesday, February 28, 1967, the people of Athens will honor Chief Grogan for his years of service. That day has been proclaimed "Chief J. B. Grogan Day in Athens."

Honest, efficient police work has been the product of Chief Grogan's efforts.

Let us stand and be counted among those who salute him today.

Inner Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1967

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, a Texas State Highway Department core driller routinely bored a test hole in Williamson County, Tex., in 1963 and not-so-routinely discovered the newest and one of the most significant caverns in the Southwest.

The cavern—hidden until its discovery by the highway crew—is located in the Comanche Cretaceous formation from the Mesozoic Era. Estimated at about 100,000 years old, the limestone cave was hollowed out, according to geologists, by the actions of an ancient sea which once covered the southwest area of the United States.

The significance of such a discovery, in my opinion, should not be minimized.

Spelunkers and paleontologists who have entered the cavern have discovered the remains of prehistoric mastodons, camels, horses, glyptodons, and saber-tooth tigers.

And while these remains are estimated to be only 10,000 to 20,000 years old, the cavern itself has provided vital information to paleontologists and geologists about the climate and landscape of this area during the ice age.

There is no doubt that the cavern will yield more prehistoric evidence as more and more of the subsurface rooms are explored and charted.

Aside from the scholarly aspects of the discovery, the cave—Inner Space, which is operated by the Georgetown Corp.—has become one of Texas' prime new tourist attractions.

Sculptured by nature for uncounted thousands of years, the colorful world below ground is filled with exotic cones of incrustations.

Just how much time was required for nature to form the breathtaking shapes found within the colorful rooms below ground is anyone's good guess.

Nature's work, however, has produced a wondrous profusion of cave formation—not only stalactites, stalagmites, columns and flowerstones common to many caves—but also cave pearls, and a fantastic array of rare "soda straws" and hetictites, such as are found only in caves of exceptional beauty.

And while I do not claim to be an authentic spelunker, I have had the opportunity to visit firsthand these underground passages, and I found the experience to be fun and educational.

President Johnson, Secretaries Freeman and Weaver Call for Smalltown-Rural America Development and Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have been a longtime proponent and advocate of accelerated growth and development of our smalltown and rural areas, not only to create a better life for our people in these areas, but as a corollary to a direct approach to the solution of some of the problems that plague our major cities and metropolitan areas.

It is encouraging to me to note that President Johnson has advocated strenghened programs in our rural and smalltown areas to provide opportunities in these areas and thereby reduce the problems of our cities. It is also most encouraging to note that two of our major cabinet level departments have found a common ground and agree on the importance of smalltown and rural development.

In this connection, Hon. Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and Hon. Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, in separate speeches recently emphasized the necessity and importance of strengthened programs in our smalltown and rural areas.

I am gratified by these statements, believing we are moving in the right direction—and we should encourage this trend. Because of the great interest of our colleagues from all sections of America in these programs and because of the interest of the Nation generally in improvement of our cities, our towns and our countryside, under unanimous consent I include these speeches by Secretary Freeman and Secretary Weaver in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The speeches follow:

The Issue of Rural Development: Communities of Tomorrow

(Address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman at conference on rural poverty, sponsored by National Association for Community Development, Marriott Motor Inn, Twin Bridges, Arlington, Va., Jan 30, 1967)

We are now seven years into the seventh decade of the Twentieth Century, poised at a point in time when fundamental, widespread and irreversible change in the fabric of the United States is occurring daily.

Thirty-three years ahead of us lies the dawn of a new century. And if that date has the ring of the far-distant future, it might be well to recall just how short a period three decades really is.

We are equidistant in time today from the year 2000 and the year 1934, the second year of the New Deal. Rural America then, as now, was in crisis, but of a different order—a crisis highly visible, affecting almost the total rural population, and part of a larger economic crisis affecting the entire Nation.

The Nation responded to this crisis, creating agencies and programs to conserve the soil, to bring electricity to the countryside, to bring agricultural supply and demand in balance, and a host of other measures which fundamentally altered the condition of American life.

What we did then profoundly affected what we are today.

Now, 33 years later, we face crisis of another order—just as acute, just as widespread as the crisis in the thirties, but with this fundamental difference: Today's crisis in rural America is a hidden crisis, largely invisible, and largely overshadowed by other, more spectacular problems at home and abroad.

DIMENSIONS OF THE CRISIS

The dimensions of the crisis are well known to all of you who are deeply involved in rural development. They consist of too little of everything—jobs, income, education, and services—in rural America, and a continuing one-way flow of people from country to city, damaging to country and city alike.

The crisis is neither simple nor easy of solution. It is complex, multi-faceted, and feeds upon itself. Less economic opportunity in rural America means fewer jobs; underemployment means a lower tax base; a lower tax base means poorer community facilities and education; crippled education and facilities bring the problem full circle by discouraging industry from locating in rural areas.

The result has been a rural America with space to spare, but starved for opportunity—and paradoxically an urban America with opportunity for the many, but starved for space for her residents to move in, to enjoy, to breathe.

Rural residents have roughly half the number of doctors per 100,000 people as city people; a third of the number of dentists. The amount of underemployment in rural America is equivalent to 2.5 million unemployed. 6.8 million rural homes are in need of repairs and 30,000 rural communities need improved water and sewer systems. The educational achievement rate is some two years behind that of urban America and the dropout rate is 7 percent higher than in urban areas.

THE CITY TODAY

An unplanned policy of exporting rural problems to the city has drawn urban America into the rural crisis. For the affluent of the city, the unchecked migration means more crowding, higher taxes, more hours consumed in commuting as urban sprawl continues unabated. For migrants already in the teeming ghettos, further immigration means less opportunity and rising despair.

One urban observer put it this way: "Our cities expect too much from those who live in them. They are not only increasingly expensive places in which to live or work; more and more, the price of city living is being paid by a sacrifice of fundamental personal freedoms:" The author of these words is no agrarian fundamentalist; he is Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York City.

THE CITY TOMORROW

By the turn of the century, if present trends continue unchecked, Mayor Lindsay's New York will have become part of a super megalopolis stretching from present-day Boston south to Washington, D.C., and containing 56 million people. This strip city, and 4 other strips like it, will house 174 million Americans on urbanized land ranging in density from 660 to 2,600 people per square mile.

Residents of these 5 super strip cities and other urbanized areas will get up earlier, spend more time breathing their neighbors' car exhaust and return home later. Superhighways and mass transit systems will soak up increasing amounts of urban land in a frantic race to keep the city mobile. If past trends are an indication, crimes of violence will increase as urban life becomes increasingly more depersonalized and hopeless for the disadvantaged.

Nor can we count with any certainty on being rescued by technology from such a reckless concentration of people, vehicles and industry. The number of automobiles is increasing at a rate twice that of U.S. population. By the year 2000 we will have an estimated 200 million cars in the U.S.—nearly 3 times as many as today. With this many mobile pollution sources crowded into 9 percent of the land area, even the most stringent anti-pollution ordinances will do little more than preserve the status quo, if that. Pollutants produced by industry, sewage plants and land development, will increase apace.

This is the world we're building, simply by allowing present trends to continue to their logical conclusion—for powerful, yet unplanned, forces are tending in the direction of even further imbalance.

CENTRALIZATION FACTORS

1. One of these is tradition. The farm-to-city migration has been under way for a hundred years or more. Cities have traditionally offered better wages, education, community facilities, and cultural activities than rural areas. Both the city and the countryside have undergone tremendous change in recent years, and now many rural communities offer as much as the central city . . . and a great deal more that the urban complex cannot offer. Yet the tug of traditional thinking is strong, both on the average citizen and on those who make the plant-location decisions.

2. A second factor encouraging centralization can be summed up as, "them as has, gits." Those areas which already have industry attract more, and this in turn attracts even more. The sprawling electronics complex in Southern California is an example. Although overcrowding, increased taxation and snarled transportation in urban areas are making rural locations increasingly attractive, the lure of established commerce still is a powerful force.

3. A third factor is negative, but quite possibly more important than the other two combined: *We lack any accepted national goal in rural/urban balance.* We have never seriously asked—let alone answered—questions like these: "What is a desirable maximum size for any one metropolitan area?" "How much weight should be given to rural/urban balance in the location of government facilities and awarding of contracts?" "Are more Federal incentives desirable to encourage rural development? If so, how much?" "What are the social costs involved in this unplanned population shift?"

In the absence of a national policy in this matter, decisions in industrial location, government installations, contract awards, and government program expenditures all tend to favor urban areas.

A continued unplanned stacking up of more people in urban areas, at the expense of rural areas, is a national drift that bodes ill for the future. No one planned it this way; like Topsy, "It just grew." Nobody really wants an America of super strip cities, dotted with explosive and squalid ghettos. It is not too much to call such a drift "national idiocy," and it does no good to offer palliatives and pills to cure a disease which has literally assumed epidemic proportions.

THE NEW AWARENESS

Working against this centralizing drift, fortunately, is the flickering beginning of a national awareness of the relationship between urban and rural problems, and a growing commitment to meeting the problems in rural America, rather than exporting them.

Author J. P. Lyford, in his book on the New York slums, "The Airtight Cage," articulates this new awareness by asking: "Why, for instance, must huge concentrations of unemployed and untrained human beings continue to pile up in financially unstable cities that no longer have the jobs, the housing, the educational opportunities, or any of the other prerequisites for a healthy and productive life? Why do we treat the consequences and ignore the causes of massive and purposeless migration to the city? Why are we not developing new uses for those rural areas that are rapidly becoming depopulated? Why do we still instinctively deal with urban and rural America as if they were separate, conflicting interests when in fact neither interest can be served independently of the other?"

The President, speaking last September in Dallastown, Pennsylvania, said: "Not just sentiment demands that we do more to help our farms and rural communities. . . . The welfare of this Nation demands it . . . Must we export our youth to the cities faster than we export our crops and our livestock to market? I believe we can do something about this."

We can:

Urban America, according to its spokesmen, can easily absorb one trillion dollars to make existing cities liveable. Certainly we should bend every effort to make them liveable. But at the same time we should devote much more to building rural America than we have done in the past, to head off even more virulent attacks of urban decay occasioned by uncontrolled growth in the future. Doing this will cost less and get better results.

AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Basic to any discussion of this rural development is agriculture—because a healthy agricultural plant provides an underpinning to support the rural economy. This basic resource is in a very different position today than it was 5 years ago, or even 12 months ago:

1. Food surpluses have disappeared, and an end to surpluses in cotton and tobacco is within grasp. Our reliance now is on stored acres and improved technology to produce for need, rather than on stored commodities.

2. Farm income, both gross and net, has increased markedly. Last year gross income was the highest in history and net income was the second highest. In the 6 years since 1960, $31.8 billion more in gross income has been pumped into the rural economy, over and above what would have been earned had 1960 levels continued.

3. Demand for agricultural products is strong and will remain so for the foreseeable future. Exports during 1966 totaled some $6.9 billion and should surpass $7 billion this year.

4. The free market, much praised but little used during the fifties, is now freer of gov-

ernment control than it has been in decades.

5. Our commodities are moving in the world market at world prices, because of an aggressive public and private market development program and because of pricing policies designed to meet competition.

6. Of great significance is the accelerated graduation into "adequate size" class by family farms in recent years. One measure of "adequate size" is gross sales of $10,000 a year or more. Since 1959, nearly 200,000 farm families have moved into that class.

But let me be emphatically clear at this point: Despite steady progress the last 6 years, the farmer's income *still lags far behind that of other Americans.*

On a per capita basis, the farmer's income is $1,700. Other Americans average $2,610 per capita.

Farm prices, though up last year, have been down the last few months, and today are *less* than the 1947–49 average. At the same time, food costs are 35 percent *higher.* This the farmer bitterly resents—and properly so.

This discrepancy *must be corrected.* It must be corrected because it is unfair to the farmer and therefore wrong. It must be corrected because if farmers don't get a fair return commensurate with the other segments of society, we will lose our best farmers. If that happens the entire Nation, not just the farmer, will be hurt.

In addition, more financing and technical assistance, both public and private, should be extended to farmers presently in the "less-than-adequate" size, to allow those farmers to expand operations and to take advantage of modern technology. In other words, we should continue to keep the door open for those who wish to remain in commercial agriculture.

Yet there are many operators who do not wish to expand, or lack the capacity to, because of age, physical disability, grossly inadequate resources, or other limitations. It is critically important that there be a place for these farmers in rural America also—for urban America has no place for him.

Take the case of a man 45 years old whose farm has failed. The small town where he's done his modest shopping has no job for him, nor are there any within commuting range. And so, in a desperate search for work, he moves to the city.

He has no money, so he doesn't have much of a choice in housing . . . he settles in the decayed heart of the city. His limited education puts him out of the running for a job. His limited skills are useless in the city . . . for who needs a man to plow a straight furrow in an asphalt field?

He is one of thousands . . . all disenchanted, all strangers in a strange land. Families break asunder; children are infected with the virus of the ghetto and yet another generation is crippled. This is the human cost we're talking about.

It is true that our farm commodity programs have helped the less-than-adequate farmer—to an extent. From 1959 through 1965 the class of farmers with gross incomes below $10,000 yearly increased their per farm net income by some 19 percent. Their off-farm income, with greater job opportunities in recent years, increased some 30 percent. Yet their earnings are far from adequate, and it is unrealistic to expect the farmer with "40 acres and a mule" to enter the mainstream of commercial agriculture.

Commodity programs are not welfare programs; they do not provide the whole answer.

Certainly programs are necessary, and certainly they should be improved. Yet those who stake *all* their hopes on just one set of solutions for rural America perpetuate a cruel and dangerous illusion. Rural development must proceed on more than one track.

We *can* offer a place in the countryside to those who, for one reason or another, do not find a rewarding place in commercial farming, or who wish to farm part time and supplement their incomes with outside employment.

NEW TOOLS

The need for such a second track has called forth an array of Federal programs to help rural America. A partial list includes the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, the Rural Water Systems and Sanitation Act, the Housing and Urban Development Act, the Appalachian Regional Development Act, the Manpower Training and Development Act, Elementary and Secondary Education, and the Public Works and Economic Development Act. Local rural development committees, local Resource and Conservation Districts and local leadership give us an apparatus to use these tools.

So far, we have accomplished a great deal. USDA made more rural housing loans during the past 3 years than in all the prior years since the program began in 1949. In the first 6 months of 1966 alone, grants and loans for rural sewer systems totaled $13 million and helped 46 communities. Today, nearly 30,000 farmers are engaged in marketing recreation for profit. Since 1963, construction has begun on 256 small watershed projects—the largest number of any similar period in the 12-year history of the program.

Measured against what had gone before, accomplishment has been great. But measured against what *needs* to be done, it is apparent that we have only scratched the surface.

But we are making the attempt:

In my Department, the old county-by-county and agency-by-agency approach is giving way to State and county Technical Action Panels, made up of experts in many disciplines, and keyed to multi-county development. Where local leadership is aggressive and strong, the panels provide a ready source of technical aid; where it is lacking, Technical Action Panels seek to stimulate and involve local leaders in finding answers to local problems.

This new approach points up a basic change in Department thinking. Since its founding, and until very recently, the Department has been almost exclusively concerned with agriculture—keeping its records, researching its problems, conserving its soil, and educating its constituency in scientific farming. All of these functions are still necessary and are still being performed. But in the past 6 years the Department has begun to address itself to the problems of the *other* rural America—an America where poverty is ingrained, opportunity is lacking, and basic community growth facilities are sometimes nonexistent.

These problems, which are essentially human and economic, have been approached within the existing agency framework, and it has taken some basic reorientation on the part of all of us. In 1961, for instance, nearly all Farmers Home Administration loans went to farmers. During fiscal 1967, farmers will receive about 50 percent of the FHA loans, and nonfarm rural residents 50 percent. This doesn't mean farmers are being short-changed, since the total dollar amount loaned to farmers is higher this year than in 1961. It *does* mean more resources and a new priority for the problems of the small farm and nonfarm people in the countryside.

Another important ingredient in rural development is a re-evaluation of the administrative machinery we need to accomplish the job.

President Johnson pointed up the problem in his State of the Union address when he said: "(We) are making and breaking new ground. Some (of our programs) do not yet have the capacity to absorb well or wisely all the money that could be put into them. Administrative skills and trained manpower are just as vital to their success as dollars, and I believe these skills will come. But it will take time and patience and hard work. Success cannot be forced at a single stroke. So we must continue to strengthen the administration of every program if that success is to come—as we know it must . . . Every program will be thoroughly evaluated . . . where there have been mistakes, we will try very hard to correct them."

Such an evaluation is taking place today in the Department of Agriculture, in other Federal agencies, and in many of the States!

A RISING TIDE OF INTEREST

President Johnson has a deep and abiding interest in rural development. In recent Executive Orders, including Number 11307, issued last fall, the President made this interest unmistakably clear:

1. He directed Federal agencies to coordinate their boundaries for Federally-assisted planning and development districts with existing State planning boundaries, to eliminate confusion and overlap.

2. He directed the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Budget Bureau to review *all* existing programs with Cabinet and other Federal officials to insure that rural areas receive an equitable share of existing Federal progam benefits, and to submit proposals for administrative or legislative changes needed to obtain such equity.

3. And he gave the Secretary of Agriculture responsibility within the Federal establishment for identifying agricultural and rural development problems which require the cooperation of various Federal departments, so that these programs may be better coordinated, and duplication eliminated.

These are a few of the recent Federal actions that bear directly on the problems of rural America.

But this is a big, diverse country and Federal actions alone won't solve rural America's problems. This is a point which cannot be stated too strongly. Nobody in Washington can pre-package a cure for the ills of rural America, ship it out to the country, and expect it to work. The Federal Government has literally hundreds of programs which *can* work, but making them effective takes local initiative, local leadership and local planning.

We have learned that where this local leadership exists, a pipeline through which to channel our development efforts also exists. Without it, development efforts are ineffective.

We have also learned the lesson of planning on a multi-county basis. It is difficult for every single rural community to offer a full set of community services of the calibre needed for sustained growth.

But a group of counties, usually with a small or medium-sized city at its center within easy commuting range, *can* provide the framework needed to make Federal and State programs effective. When united for planning purposes, the people and governments of such a functional community can assess the area's needs and determine the combinations of internal and outside resources essential to spark growth.

The multi-county approach is being taken by a number of States, including Kentucky, Iowa and Georgia, among others. The Appalachian Regional Commission and other regional groups are exploring this approach. Its effectiveness is becoming increasingly apparent.

Achievement of our development objectives will take planning, dedication, hard work, and some basic re-thinking of long-cherished folkways.

Planning is paramount. Building bigger and more sprawling strip cities can proceed without real planning; but upgrading the communities we have now—and building new communities—demands it.

Finally, of course, we have learned that we need to know a great deal more about rural

America and its problems than we do now. To find answers to these questions, and to come up with effective solutions, President Johnson has established a Committee on Rural Poverty, which I am privileged to chair, and a National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, chaired by Governor Breathitt of Kentucky.

And while the Commission and Committee are seeking answers, the Department, in cooperation with other Federal Departments, the States, local government, and volunteer groups, will be pushing its own rural development programs at an ever-increasing tempo. In 1967, among other actions, we will:

1. Provide $33 million in Economic Opportunity loans to help 13,000 low-income families and some 390 cooperatives composed of low-income families.

2. Provide $435 million in rural housing loans for 48,000 families.

3. Help finance about 200 community recreation centers in rural areas.

4. Finance $304 million in loans and grants for construction or improvement of some 1,700 central water and waste disposal systems in rural areas.

5. Assist 10 additional local groups with Resource Conservation and Development projects.

6. Approve construction of another 63 multiple purpose small watershed projects with 45 reservoirs.

7. Help 8,500 additional rural land owners with income-producing recreational developments involving 150,000 acres of land.

8. Supervise harvest of another 12½ billion board feet of National Forest timber, providing 700,000 man years of employment, sharing $40 million of revenue with local governments for roads and schools.

9. Reforest 280,000 acres of timber lands, improve timber stands on another 440,000 acres, and build another 295 recreation sites in the National Forests.

THE MATTER OF CHOICE

What we in rural development are all fundamentally concerned with, it seems to me, is the matter of choice—of offering alternatives to ever-larger cities in the future. President Johnson put it this way:

"History records a long hard struggle to establish man's right to go where he pleases and live where he chooses. It took many centuries—and many bloody revolutions—to break the chains that bound him to a particular plot of land, or confined him within the walls of a particular community.

"We lost that freedom when our children are obliged to live someplace else . . . if they want a job or if they want a decent education.

"Not just sentiment demands that we do more to help our farms and rural communities . . . the welfare of this Nation demands it."

I believe that we *can* choose what kind of an America our children will inherit 33 years from now, for we are not the blind pawns of Fate, but rather the shapers of our own destiny.

I believe that we as a nation *should* grasp this chance to shape our destiny—grasp it here and now, without further delay—before the chance for choice eludes us.

Thank you.

Remarks by Robert C. Weaver, Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, to the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, Washington, D.C., February 17, 1967

The Department of Housing and Urban Development was created primarily and fundamentally to direct a new response to the need for revitalizing and rebuilding the cities and urban areas. Nevertheless, this Department is involved in the problems of towns and smaller population areas to a greater extent than is generally recognized. And some of our newest programs (Model Cities, Metropolitan Development, New Communities) can have a substantial impact on rural poverty. As great as the task is in our cities, their problems will never be truly solved unless we also solve the problems of the towns and smaller areas.

The living conditions of Americans living on farms and in rural areas remain among the major unmet challenges of the nation. It is by now well documented and widely understood that half of all the families whose incomes fall below the poverty level are living in rural areas. Too many rural families live in homes of such poor condition that they actually endanger health and safety. Too many live in homes that need major repair, or are without adequate sanitary or heating facilities.

Meeting the challenge to remedy these conditions is more than a question of housing. And it is more than a responsibility that falls upon any one Federal department or agency. Logically and legally, there is required here a cooperative effort that is parallel to the concentrated and cooperative effort that is being amassed to meet the nation's urban challenges.

The problems of poverty, both rural and urban, are more visible and urgent today in a society of affluence and high productivity than they have ever been before. Just over a year ago, the Department of Housing and Urban Development was created primarily and fundamentally to direct a new response to the need for revitalizing and *rebuilding the cities and towns* of this nation.

As part of this mission, this Department and its predecessors have been involved in the problems of towns and smaller population areas to a greater extent than is generally recognized.

This Administration recognizes that we need thriving, healthy rural areas just as we need thriving, healthy cities. And as great as the task is in our cities, their problems will never be truly solved unless we also solve the problems of the towns and smaller areas.

President Johnson, in a speech last September, observed that history records a long, hard struggle to establish man's right to go where he pleases and to live where he chooses.

"It took many centuries and many bloody revolutions," the President said, "to break the chains that bound him to a particular plot of land or confined him within the walls of a particular community. We lose that freedom when our children are obliged to live someplace else, that is, if they want a job or if they want a decent education."

In the United States today, we must examine poverty against a background that reveals relative affluence for most Americans. Within that affluence, however, there are revealed geographic differences that relate to poverty. For example, in 1964, the median income for suburban families was $7,770 while in central cities, it was $6,700, but in areas outside metropolitan centers, the median income was $5,210.

It is true that the most visible and pressing problems of the poor are in the central city slums and ghettos, but it is also true that large areas of poverty remain outside of the larger cities—and they are far less visible to the observer, and perhaps therefore less compelling as a national social problem.

The characteristics of poverty in both rural and urban areas tend to be similar, though not identical. In both, for example, the poor are often elderly, unemployed, under-employed, poorly educated, female heads of families, members of minority groups, poor in health or disabled.

One major difference, however, is that the rural poor, more often than the urban poor, live in areas whose economic or resource bases are defective as sources of earned income. This can be seen in such areas as Appalachia, or in some areas around the Great Lakes, where mines may have been worked out, or in other areas where timber stands have been exhausted, or in many parts of the nation—perhaps particularly in the South—where agriculture has been mechanized.

The point to be made in this discussion is that even where the personal handicaps of the rural poor can be overcome—say, by job-training—the poor themselves may still be left in areas where there are few opportunities for their new skills.

It has long been public policy that Federal and state assistance would concentrate a significant portion of its resources to serving the people where they are. Thus there have long been programs of aid to supplement diet, improve education and health services, provide training in home-making, farming and non-agricultural skills.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development, and its predecessors, have concentrated on improving community facilities including housing.

Federally aided low-rent public housing has been one of the most substantial efforts. For many years, rural counties and small towns have made substantial use of this program.

At the end of fiscal year 1966, four-fifths of the localities having public housing projects were, in fact, in the smaller cities and towns. Of the nearly 2,100 such small localities, there were 968 that were in places of less than 2,500 population. Of course, many of these public housing efforts in small population areas have contained a small number of family units when compared with public housing in cities. Still, even in terms of units, this smaller city program has been substantial.

To show the extent of this effort, a cumulative accounting of the decades of public housing showed that at the end of 1966, there were almost 200,000 units approved or built in smaller cities and towns.

It is worth noting that in low-rent public housing for rural communities, the questions of operating expense and management are often crucial. Projects too small, or dispersed over wide areas, may be unable to attract competent management or may show high costs of management per unit.

We have found it necessary, therefore, to require local authorities requesting very small programs to demonstrate that they can be managed economically. In many cases we encourage cooperative arrangements for centralized administration.

A typical characteristic of the older and smaller communities is the high proportion of elderly, low-income persons and families. Therefore, many of the public housing projects in rural areas have in fact been projects for the elderly. Another elderly program which applies here is the direct loan program of 100 percent loans made by HUD to nonprofit sponsors at a three percent maximum interest rate for 50 years. This housing is for older people with incomes too high for public housing, but too low for the private housing market. Another private housing program for persons in this income group, and which is applicable to rural areas, is the 221(d)(3) below market interest rate program. The relatively new rent supplement program, which provides a subsidy for the low-income family's rent, and which encourages private building of low-income housing, applies to rural areas as well as small cities and towns and in fact funds have been allocated for rurally-located projects.

The dimensions of the nation's housing inadequacies were documented in the 1960 census. It showed that one-fourth of all the rural, non-farm families were living in substandard housing, and in that same group, among those with incomes less than $4,000 a year, about half were in substandard housing.

Aside from housing, however, this Department has undertaken a variety of substantial efforts in helping the smaller communities—far more effort than is perhaps widely understood.

Many of our major programs, such as renewal, have been widely utilized in smaller communities, and other programs are, in fact, specifically and some almost exclusively directed to smaller communities.

In urban renewal, for example, more than 70 percent of the cities with projects have populations under 50,000.

Even more directly revelant are these other programs:

—In the dozen years of our planning assistance program, operating through state agencies, 87 percent of the local communities that were aided had fewer than 25,000 persons, and half of them were under 5,000 population. About 30 percent were under 2,500.

—The public facility loan program is directly related to smaller towns, 95 percent of those aided were communities of fewer than 10,000 persons. And in fact three-fourths of the loan approvals were in communities of under 2,500.

—The program of advances for public facilities planning gives first preference to communities with fewer than 5,000 persons and in fact almost half of the projects for which advances were made in 1965 were in such communities.

Special mention should be made of our relatively new program of grants for water and sewer facilities. As of last October, about three-fourths of the projects granted were in the smaller cities and towns. It should be noted here that we have an agreement with the Farmers Home Administration, Department of Agriculture, that it will serve towns below 5,500 in rurally-oriented areas while we serve towns of any size in either urban or urbanizing areas and our grants have gone, in fact, to many small towns down to 500 population.

It should be clear from these examples that this Department is making a significant contribution to small as well as large communities to help them develop comprehensive planning and development, public facilities and housing.

In the search for feasible techniques to raise the productivity of people in deprived areas, the Department is cooperating with other agencies in several experimental and demonstration projects.

One of these efforts is to help Indians. Together with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Deparment of Labor and the Office of Economic Opportunity, we have entered into self-help programs to provide better housing for Indians through procedures that permit job training and experience.

We are also participating in the Federal Development Committee for Appalachia and making our programs available to the fullest extent possible to assist inter-agency efforts to improve the economy of Appalachia.

In both Florida and New Jersey, we have cooperative demonstration programs under way to improve the housing and economic conditions of farm workers.

Major responsibility for the substantive programs in improving education, health, training and personal betterment lies with other departments and agencies. But the Department of Housing and Urban Development is assisting.

The Department is cooperating with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on a Task Force on Concerted Services. This task force is encouraging special efforts to make social services and education and training available to occupants of selected low-rent housing projects who have demonstrated particularly serious problems.

The concerted services approach is one technique that is considered useful in raising the capacity of low-income persons to cope with the problems of an urban environment.

Migration from rural to urban areas is one clear area of responsibility for this Department. In this connection, we feel that some of our newest programs can have substantial impact.

For example, the Model Cities Program will involve communities assessing their own problems and working out programs for solution which we can assist both by concentrating presently available urban aid funds and by drawing upon new funds that we can make available. These supplemental funds can be used for wholly new projects that might have been overlooked by the community before, or perhaps were not possible before. It is entirely conceivable and even likely that one of the problems of a given model city might well be to help its newly arrived residents with either or both physical and social improvement efforts.

We will also make certain that among the target neighborhoods selected for the concerted efforts possible under the Model Cities program there will be some of the smaller towns and communities in various geographic areas of the nation.

Other titles in the same legislation authorize two other new programs that might also have an impact on the problems of non-urban low-income families. These are the legislative sections dealing with metropolitan development and new communities.

It is the intent of the Metropolitan Development section to provide special incentives in the form of supplemental grants to metropolitan areas to carry out development activities in relation to comprehensive planning. The expectation therefore is that the coherence that can be brought to metropolitan development will enhance the living conditions of all those living within the area, whether rural or urban.

Finally, the legislation enables us to help in the private development of entirely new communities, as one means of adapting to the growing population. These new communities might rise from areas where there had been no community at all before, or perhaps where there had been small communities that were not economically viable. In either event, the prospect is for new communities that could offer new and significant facilities for the persons who had lived there before, or in the surrounding areas, both for places to live and places to find employment.

Each of these new programs offers important opportunities for localities to analyze their problems and to concentrate their resources for dealing with them.

We cannot, in candor, suggest that either the new or the continuing programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development are now dealing comprehensively with the problems of the rural poor any more than they are solving all the problems of the urban poor.

But we do feel that there has been a substantial amount of important work done and with the new programs being developed, there is the expectation that it will now be possible to undertake a great deal more than was possible before.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1967

(Legislative day of Thursday, February 23, 1967)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Rudolf Kiviranna, pastor, Estonian Evangelical Lutheran Church, Flushing, Long Island, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

On the occasion of the Independence Day of Estonia, let us pray.

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father: The destiny of our generation is to live in a troubled world. May we not be discouraged by the multitude of tasks and difficulties this Nation, our President, Congress, and the Armed Forces have to face.

Lord, make us strong and steadfast to protect the values of our Christian civilization mortally endangered by the atheistic communism all over the world.

Let Thy eternal truth in Christ guide us.

Help us, Lord, that the light of freedom and righteousness would burn brightly here in the United States of America that Estonians and other enslaved nations be strengthened in their resistance to communism.

May the love of Christ and the love of freedom inspire us to overcome all hardships and to bear all burdens.

Teach us to know Thy ways.

Father, Thy will be done on earth and in our lives as it is in heaven. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 23, 1967, was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS AND LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business and that statements therein be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. PROXMIRE, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC ROADS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Francis C. Turner, of Virginia, to be Director of Public Roads.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of receipts and expenditures, for the period July 1, 1966, through December 31, 1966, which, with the accompanying report, was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 1069. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chung Chick Nahm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1070. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the 12th World Jamboree of Boy Scouts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIBICOFF (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. PELL, Mr. PERCY, Mr. SMATHERS, and Mr. SYMINGTON):

S. 1071. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit States, under Federal-State agreements to provide for coverage for hospital insurance benefits for the aged for certain State and local employees whose services are not otherwise covered by the insurance system established by such title; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. RIBICOFF when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. HOLLINGS):

S. 1072. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks by Mr. MONRONEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 1073. A bill to remove arbitrary limitations upon attorneys' fees for services rendered in proceedings before administrative agencies of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 1074. A bill for the relief of Robert Dalby; and

S. 1075. A bill for the relief of Rivercliff Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 1076. A bill for the relief of Dr. Usha Kumar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1077. A bill to exempt a member of the Armed Forces from service in a combat zone when the father, mother, brother, or sister of such member has been killed in such combat zone; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1078. A bill to amend the act of October 4, 1961, relating to the acquisition of wetlands for conservation of migratory waterfowl, to extend for an additional 8 years the period during which funds may be appropriated under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. METCALF when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1079. A bill for the relief of Anastasios Athanasopoulos and his wife, Ourania Athanasopoulos; and

S. 1080. A bill for the relief of Parasram Manwani, Dewki Manwani, Ram Manwani, and Asha Manwani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1081. A bill to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, to remove restrictions on the careers of female officers in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. THURMOND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

MEDICARE FOR STATE AND LOCAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to allow States, under Federal-State agreements, to provide hospital coverage under medicare for certain State and local employees whose services are not otherwise covered by social security.

On July 1, 1966, hospitalization coverage under medicare began for nearly 20 million Americans age 65 or over. All Americans who reach age 65 before 1968 will be similarly covered, whether they are eligible for social security retirement benefits or not. But, after January 1, 1968, a person must be covered by the social security retirement system to be eligible for medicare hospitalization insurance. Although generally equitable, this creates a severe problem for employees of State and local governments.

Although most employees in the United States are now automatically covered by social security, this is not true with regard to employees of State and local governments. Social security coverage involves a tax on employers as well as on employees. In this case, however, the employer is a State or local government. The Congress, not wanting to be in the position of attempting to tax a State or local political unit, excluded their employees from compulsory participation in the social security system.

The law does allow, however, for voluntary agreements for the coverage of most State and local employees. Whether or not services to a State or local government are to be covered depends on the State, which must work out a coverage agreement with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Members of local retirement systems, however, must approve coverage by referendum.

As of January 1965, approximately 2.6 million positions in State and local employment were not covered by social security. Thus, the individuals in these positions will not be eligible for the hospitalization insurance provisions of medicare unless they have attained social security coverage in other employment. These are employees who are not covered by Federal-State agreements bringing them under social security. In most cases, they are covered by retirement systems of their own. These public employees, although members of State or local retirement systems, do not have programs similar to the hospital insurance program available to them. Many are willing to pay for such insurance, but under present law, are precluded from doing so unless the State brings them under the social security retirement system as well.

I am particularly concerned about this gap in medicare's hospital insurance coverage because among those excluded are over 689,000 public school teachers across the Nation. These are teachers who have devoted their lives to educating the children in a dozen States across the Nation—States which have excellent retirement systems—but they will be excluded from medicare's hospital insurance. My bill will allow them to elect to participate in the hospital insurance program as long as they are willing to pay their own way. Nothing could be fairer than that.

I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the States whose teachers are not covered by social security as a result of their employment as teachers.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Table—Instructional personnel

Area:	
California	181, 200
Colorado	24, 240
Connecticut	29, 750
Florida	58, 212
Illinois	95, 532
Kentucky	29, 500
Louisiana	36, 100
Maine	10, 380
Massachusetts	53, 200
Missouri	41, 798
Nevada	5, 030
Ohio	97, 000
Puerto Rico	19, 860
Rhode Island	7, 891
Total	689, 693

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, there is no reason why these employees should not be brought under the basic hospital insurance program without requiring them to participate in the social security retirement program. The basic hospital insurance program is financed by a payroll tax completely separate from the regular social security tax. Income from the hospital insurance payroll tax will go into a separate trust fund to pay the benefits and administrative expenses of the hospital insurance program. It is a completely separate insurance program. Allowing these public employees to participate in the hospital insurance program will actually improve that program by broadening the number of persons covered.

My bill will provide that those State and local employees not now included under an agreement providing social security coverage may be covered by hospital insurance only. The agreement provisions under which a State may make hospital insurance available in the referendum provisions to accomplish coverage are similar to those now in effect for social security retirement coverage of State and local employees. A majority of the employees in the coverage group in question must vote for coverage. The bill covers only those employee groups which may currently be subject to Federal-State agreements. Thus, there should be no unknown administrative problems connected with implementation.

The employees and their employers will pay for the coverage of hospital insurance according to the schedule now set out in the law. Currently this is 0.50 percent of salary up to $6,600 per employee and employer, rising to 0.80 percent in 1987. Thus, these employees will in no way be getting a free ride. They and their employers will pay their own way. The payments would go into the separately established hospital insurance trust fund, which is, of course, completely separate from the OASDI trust fund.

The enactment of this legislation will bring another large group of Americans under the protective provisions of the hospitalization insurance program. This is beneficial to the program as well as to these employees.

I ask unanimous consent that my bill and a table showing State and local government employment be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and table will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1071) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit States, under Federal-State agreements, to provide for coverage for hospital insurance benefits for the aged for certain State and local employees whose services are not otherwise covered by the insurance system established by such title, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1071

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title II of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS FOR COVERAGE OF STATE AND LOCAL EMPLOYEES FOR HOSPITAL INSURANCE BENEFITS

"SEC. 229. (a) (1) Any individual who—

"(A) has attained age 65,

"(B) has, after attainment of such age, filed application for monthly insurance benefits under section 202,

"(C) has, on the basis of such application, been determined not to be entitled to such benefits because he (or any other individual) fails to meet the requirements of section 214,

shall, solely for purposes of section 226, be deemed to be entitled to monthly insurance benefits under section 202 if, after application of paragraph (2), he (or such other individual) does meet the requirements of section 214.

"(2) (A) In determining (for purposes of paragraph (1)) whether any individual meets the requirements of section 214, there shall be included, as a quarter of coverage of such individual, each quarter which under subparagraph (B) is deemed to be a quarter of coverage of such individual.

"(B) Any quarter with respect to which—

"(i) any individual performs service which is covered under an agreement entered into pursuant to subsection (b),

"(ii) such individual would, if such service were covered under an agreement entered into pursuant to section 218, be credited with a quarter of coverage,

shall, for purposes of subparagraph (A), be deemed to constitute a quarter of coverage of such individual.

"(b) (1) The Secretary shall, at the request of any State, enter into an agreement with such State for the purpose of extending the insurance system established by this title (insofar as such system relates to hospital insurance benefits for the aged for which entitlement is established by section 226) to services performed by individuals as employees of such State or any political subdivision thereof, but only if such services are not covered by an agreement entered into pursuant to section 218.

"(2) No agreement under this subsection shall cover any employee or group of employees whose services are not permitted to be covered under an agreement entered into pursuant to section 218.

"(3) Any agreement under this subsection shall provide that the State will pay to the Secretary of the Treasury, at such time or times as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may by regulations prescribe, amounts equivalent to the sum of the taxes which would be imposed by sections 3101(b) and 3111(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 if the services of the employees covered by the agreement constituted employment as defined in section 3121 of such Code.

"(4) (A) Except as specifically otherwise provided in this subsection, the provisions required to be contained in an agreement under this subsection shall be those specified in regulations promulgated by the Secretary. Such regulations shall prescribe with respect to any such agreement requirements, conditions, limitations, sanctions, and other provisions patterned as closely after those prescribed in the case of agreements under section 218 as is appropriate for the carrying out of the purposes of this section.

"(B) Any authority conferred upon the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, upon the Secretary of the Treasury, or upon any other officer or instrumentality of the United States under section 218 shall, to the extent appropriate to the carrying out of this section, be deemed to apply to the carrying out of this section."

The table presented by Mr. RIBICOFF is as follows:

State and local government employment under OASDHI by State, January 1965

State	State and local government employment		
	All	Not under OASDHI	Under OASDHI
	Thousands	*Thousands*	*Thousands*
United States	7,479.2	6,252.9	4,826.3
Alabama	116.0	6.0	110.0
Alaska	11.3	1.9	9.4
Arizona	65.5	5.7	59.8
Arkansas	64.2	5.7	58.5
California	783.7	541.2	242.5
Colorado	96.9	74.3	22.6
Connecticut	97.0	51.7	45.3
Delaware	20.0	2.4	17.6
Florida	230.0	103.9	126.1
Georgia	150.6	37.0	113.6
Hawaii	26.6	5.3	21.3
Idaho	31.0	.1	30.9
Illinois	377.0	274.9	102.1
Indiana	190.6	31.6	159.0
Iowa	120.9	4.5	116.4
Kansas	107.1	9.2	97.9
Kentucky	102.8	37.9	64.9
Louisiana	141.2	94.6	46.6
Maine	41.3	30.9	10.4
Maryland	125.1	8.6	116.5
Massachusetts	204.0	203.1	.9
Michigan	330.9	52.8	278.1
Minnesota	155.3	99.0	56.3
Mississippi	89.7	10.5	79.2
Missouri	161.6	37.6	124.0
Montana	34.1	5.3	28.8
Nebraska	68.7	3.7	65.0
Nevada	19.2	18.2	1.0
New Hampshire	29.3	4.4	24.9
New Jersey	232.4	28.0	204.4
New Mexico	42.7	9.1	33.6
New York	769.3	69.0	700.3
North Carolina	164.9	5.6	159.3
North Dakota	41.5	15.6	25.9
Ohio	373.1	372.4	.7
Oklahoma	104.5	19.8	84.7
Oregon	90.1	7.7	82.4
Pennsylvania	373.9	52.7	321.2
Rhode Island	31.7	6.9	24.8
South Carolina	83.7	1.9	81.8
South Dakota	35.4	5.1	30.3
Tennessee	141.5	41.5	100.0
Texas	384.0	183.5	200.5
Utah	46.2	1.0	45.2
Vermont	16.6	5.7	10.9
Virginia	152.7	6.1	146.6
Washington	137.8	4.6	133.2
West Virginia	66.6	5.0	61.6
Wisconsin	180.1	49.2	130.9
Wyoming	18.9	.3	18.6

Source: State and local government employment under old-age survivors, disability and health insurance, 1956–65, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social Security Administration.

STATUS OF NATIONAL GUARD TECHNICIANS—AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, for myself and my distinguished colleagues, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. HOLLINGS, a bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes.

The purpose of this bill is to provide Federal employee status for technicians employed by the National Guard, thus making them eligible for the various Federal employee benefits such as civil service retirement and group life and health benefits insurance. The bill is identical to a legislative draft proposal prepared by the Department of Defense and concurred in by the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, and the President's Cabinet Committee on Federal Staff Retirement Systems.

At the present time there are approximately 40,000 technicians employed to care for materiel, armament, and equipment of the National Guard. These highly skilled employees, so crucially important in maintaining the Guards' present unparalleled level of combat readiness, must meet qualifications prescribed by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force. Their compensation is fixed by these Secretaries, who designate the persons to employ them. They are paid directly by Army and Air Force finance officers and entirely from Federal funds.

The legal status of these full-time civilian employees has long been unclear and has been the subject of considerable litigation in both State and Federal courts. They have been disclaimed as Federal employees by Federal authorities and as State employees by the majority of the States. Consequently, a large portion of them are now denied retirement and other fringe benefits which Federal and State employees generally enjoy.

The relationship of these employees to the National Guard program and the position of the National Guard as an integral part of the first line defense of the United States form a proper basis for establishing this group as Federal employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1072) to amend title 32, United States Code, to clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Monroney (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF PROGRAM OF LAND ACQUISITION FOR MIGRATORY WATERFOWL REFUGES

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, almost a year ago, I introduced a bill to extend to 15 years the 7-year program of land acquisition for migratory waterfowl refuges provided by Public Law 87–383.

For myself and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] I am reintroducing the proposed legislation today. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in full at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1078) to amend the act of October 4, 1961, relating to the acquisition of wetlands for conservation of migratory waterfowl, to extend for an additional 8 years the period during which funds may be appropriated under that act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Metcalf (for himself and Mr. Nelson), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1078

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes", approved October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 813; Public Law 87–383; 16 U.S.C. 715k–3), is amended by striking out "seven-year period" and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen-year period".

(b) Section 3 of such Act of October 4, 1961 (16 U.S.C. 715k–5), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. Funds appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be treated as an advance, without interest, to the migratory bird conservation fund. Such appropriated funds, beginning with fiscal year 1977, shall be repaid to the Treasury out of the migratory bird conservation fund, and such repayment shall be made in annual amounts comprising 75 per centum of the moneys accruing annually to such fund. In the event the full amount authorized by the first section of this Act is appropriated prior to the end of the aforesaid fifteen-year period, the repayment of such funds pursuant to this section shall begin with the next full fiscal year."

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, during the 1950's there were warnings that drought and drainage were threatening a great natural resource, migratory waterfowl. Following detailed studies and investigations, Congress acted in the public interest. We passed Public Law 87–383, enacted on October 14, 1961. It authorized the advance of up to $105 million in the 7 years beginning with fiscal 1962 and ending with fiscal 1968 for the acquisition of 2.5 million acres of waterfowl habitat. It was provided that this advance be repaid with 75 percent of the receipts from the sale of duck stamps beginning in fiscal year 1969.

At the rate of progress during the first 5 years of this program, it will end on June 30, 1968, with less than half the authorized advance appropriated and with the acquisition of less than half the land necessary to maintain this great natural resource.

In the first 5 years of this 7-year program, a total of $54 million was available for acquisition of waterfowl habitat. Of that amount, $32.5 million was appropriated as part of the advance and $21.5 million came from duck stamp receipts.

With these funds, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife acquired or obtained purchase contracts on 741,000 acres as of the end of this past fiscal year, June 30, 1966.

By the end of this fiscal year, on June 30, 1967, the total is estimated at 927,300 acres acquired at a cost of $65 million, $38.5 million of it appropriated as part of the advance and the other $26.5 million from duck stamp receipts. The program now is scheduled to end June 30, 1968, with a total of, roughly, 1,135,000 acres acquired. The program for the final year, if the $7½ million in the fiscal 1968 budget is approved will bring the total expenditure to $77.5 million, $46 million appropriated as part of the advance and $31.5 million from duck stamp receipts.

As can be seen, this program is now scheduled to end with the acquisition of 1,135,000 acres, or less than half the goal set when Congress enacted the program at the request of our sportsmen.

As a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, I therefore offer legislation to extend the original 7-year program to 15 years. This legislation, companion to a bill introduced in the other body by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dingell] would give the Congress the opportunity to appropriate the remaining $59 million of the $105 million advance authorized.

In addition, it is estimated that $40 million of duck stamp money would be available during the 8-year extension. The extension would provide for a program of $12.5 million a year, $7.5 million of it appropriated from the authorized advance and $5 million from duck stamp receipts. It is estimated that at the end of the extended program we would have acquired a total of 2,281,000 acres. This is still 219,000 acres less than the original program. But it will be a long step in the right direction.

One of the problems, of course, is the increase in land values, which the Department of Agriculture says is rising at an average rate of 5 percent a year.

Last year more than 1½ million Americans bought duck stamps. In numbers more than doubled in the 30 years since the duck stamp went on sale they went duck hunting, for recreation and food that is a delicacy. They also contributed substantially to our economy. The most recent survey revealed that duck hunters spent more than $87 million in 1965.

I am told that our waterfowl population is on the increase, following a sharp decline. In the mid-1950's, somewhere between 13 and 14 million waterfowl were bagged annually in the United States. In sharp contrast, the bag during the 1961 and 1962 seasons was less than half that number.

The difference was due to drought and drainage.

Beginning in 1959, the important mid-continent breeding area of the United States and the Canadian Prairie Provinces was plagued by drought. There were some 5 million small ponds in the southern portions of the Prairie Provinces in mid-1955. By 1962, there were only half a million. From these ponds come half the ducks that are shot in the United States. When these ponds are dry, the duck population drops, and bag and possession limits must be reduced to preserve the breeding stock.

Experts tell me that an increase in the number of potholes started in 1963 and in certain areas at least we are in a wet cycle.

But this does not mean that the problem is solved. During the drought, the duck population dropped by some 40 percent from the mid-1950 level. The decrease in some important species, such as mallards, was even greater. American and Canadian hunters shot more mallards in 1958 than there were in the fall flight in 1962. In the spring of 1958, the mallard breeding population was in the neighborhood of 13 million. In the spring of 1966 the population was estimated at 7½ million.

Drought is one thing which has made

the fate of waterfowl uncertain on this continent. Another is the permanent drought that is drainage. The needs of waterfowl, on which an important segment of our economy is based, are in ever-increasing competition with those of our increasing human population. The draining of marshes for farm improvement, for community growth and development, for airports and highways has brought problems that are difficult and expensive to solve.

For years, marshes and ponds have disappeared as agriculture has expanded. In the prairie pothole region of Minnesota and the Dakotas, agricultural drainage mopped up an average of more than 156,000 acres a year in the 1959–64 period. Although the number of acres drained in the next 2 years fell below that figure, it is continuing. The same thing is going on in Canada.

Similar drainage is taking place in many coastal sections which once were important wintering grounds. Many of the great natural marshes on the east coast and on the Gulf of Mexico have been ruined for waterfowl use by housing developments, by salt water intrusion, or by exploration for sulphur or oil. In the Pacific flyway, waterfowl face a crisis because the marshes, which once supported millions of ducks and geese wintering in California and northern Mexico, have become cotton and ricefields, orchards and suburban developments.

During the calendar years 1940–64, more than 45 million acres of U.S. wetland were drained. The average for calendar years 1959–64 was 1,403,385 acres a year. Prior to 1965, these drainage figures were kept on a calendar year basis. Beginning in 1965 they are reported on a fiscal year basis with a note that—

> These figures represent only the number of acres drained with 1965 ACP program funds. Other acreages drained in fiscal year 1965 are part of and inseparable from 1964 drainage figures.

I ask unanimous consent that a table of drainage statistics be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Drainage statistics,[1] total U.S. drainage

	Acres
Calendar year:	
1959	1,526,895
1960	1,574,404
1961	1,443,089
1962	1,394,107
1963	1,305,033
1964	1,176,618
Annual average (1959–64)	1,403,358
Cumulative total, 1940 to 1964, inclusive	45,628,618
Fiscal year:	
1965	[2] 134,980
1966	1,070,990

[1] As published in Annual Summaries of the Agricultural Conservation Program Service, USDA. Practices C–9 (permanent open drainage systems to dispose of excess water (in agricultural areas)) and C–10 (underground drainage systems to dispose of excess water) only for 1959–62, 1965, and 1966. In 1963 and 1964 drainage was not differentiated by practice.

[2] This figure represents only the number of acres drained with 1965 ACP program funds. Other acreages drained in fiscal year 1965 are part of and inseparable from 1964 drainage figures.

Drainage in prairie pothole States

	Minnesota	North Dakota	South Dakota	3-State total
Calendar year:	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Acres*
1959	138,855	22,467	1,560	176,768
1960	168,655	25,460	2,859	196,974
1961	129,543	13,683	2,188	145,414
1962	111,201	16,541	1,932	129,674
1963	137,421	14,138	1,541	153,100
1964	116,504	17,689	588	134,781
Annual 3-State average (1959–64)				156,118
Fiscal year:				
1965	[1] 326		[1] 130	[1] 456
1966	87,202	9,659	551	97,412

[1] These figures represent only the number of acres drained with 1965 ACP program funds. Other acreages drained in fiscal year 1965 are part of and inseparable from 1964 drainage figures.

Mr. METCALF. As the acres of wetlands have decreased, the number of hunters has increased. In fiscal year 1965, we sold 1,585,600 duck stamps compared with 635,000 in fiscal year 1935, the year they went on sale.

So, the uncertain future of waterfowl results from the decrease in the area in which they can nest, and rest, and the increase in the number of duck hunters.

Before long, the duck hunters of this country will depend for their game on land dedicated to the needs of waterfowl, land owned by our Federal Government, the States, or by private individuals or groups who have dedicated the land for that purpose.

Farsighted conservationists and sportsmen saw this situation developing more than 30 years ago. To conservationists, one of the important programs of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal was the acquisition and development of millions of acres of refuges for waterfowl, facing extinction in the early 1930's.

Led by that great conservationist, Ding Darling, a careful study of our waterfowl resource was made in 1934. Based on a careful estimate of future requirements, the study reported that this country must have at least 12.5 million acres of land managed primarily for waterfowl; that is, we must have it if we are to continue to hunt ducks.

The recommendation was that our Federal Government acquire and develop the major part of this acreage.

To bring this farsighted proposal nearer to completion is a challenge and an opportunity for us.

Mr. President, Daniel A. Poole, secretary of the Wildlife Management Institute, did an excellent job of putting the problem of "Waterfowl Versus Wetlands Shrinkage" into perspective in the October 1966 issue of the American Rifleman magazine. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATERFOWL VERSUS WETLANDS SHRINKAGE

(By Daniel A. Poole)

Waterfowl and waterfowling have come a long way from the halcyon days when a gunner could collect 25 or more greenheads with a minimum of effort, when hunters in sinkboxes piled up canvasbacks by the score, or when a man could support his young family by delivering wagon loads of ducks to railway stations for icing and shipment to distant cities.

Destructive spring shooting, baiting, trapping, and other outlawed practices that made deep inroads into the resources are not now practiced generally, but a few lawbreakers still make state and federal enforcement necessary.

In the place of the few men who used to bag a lot of ducks, there are now many men who individually bag far fewer ducks.

A major goal of waterfowl management is to blunt the impact of man's activities on ducks and geese. What has been done in the past, what is being done today, and what wildlife agencies hope to do in the future, and why, is what this article seeks to tell.

Admittedly, this will be a frank look at a complex situation. It has to be, because if waterfowl are to prosper, their difficulties have to be understood. Above all, sportsmen must understand because from them comes much of the money and the decisive support for new programs to assist waterfowl.

NEW PROGRAMS NECESSARY

But this is not a job for sportsmen alone. They lack the money and the political muscle, and it takes both. Most ducks are reared on private lands, and it never will be possible to place enough wetlands in public ownership to supply the birds' needs. New programs must be worked out so that landowners can be induced to preserve wetlands rather than being paid to destroy them as they now are.

And that great preponderance of the population that neither hunts nor goes into the field must be shown that waterfowlers seek not to decimate ducks and geese. Rather, they aid and support necessary research, management, and enforcement to the point that there always may be a waterfowl resource capable of providing recreation and enjoyment for every person who wishes to use that resource, whether in a duck blind, with binoculars or camera, or in any other way that is not destructive of the resource itself. But not all of these uses of waterfowl can persist, no matter how carefully tailored to remain within the biological capacity of the birds to sustain themselves, if the water-based habitat on which they depend is permitted to disappear.

Active concern about waterfowl began before the turn of the century as serious-minded sportsmen began to detect inroads being made by spring and fall shooting, long gunning seasons, and market hunting, which were common then. No agency—state or federal—had any feeling of primary responsibility for waterfowl, because the birds were here today and gone tomorrow. Those not taken in their state, hunters reasoned, would only be taken in the next. Mostly, they were right.

But there were men who had a deeper concern, who could see that the excess of shooting was harming the birds. The framework of today's waterfowl program is rooted in their concern. Its building blocks are international treaties, Congressional acts, and expanded and strengthened state and federal programs. The early advancements were argued at nearly every stage. There still is some debate today, but the principal points of dissension mostly have been resolved. The history of waterfowl legislation traces the fortunes of the birds.

CONGRESS ACTS

The first Congressional enactment to respond to the flagrant commercialization of waterfowl and migratory birds of many kinds, especially herons, ibises, egrets, and others whose plumage was sought for millinery, was the Lacey Act, approved in 1900. Among its several sections was one forbidding the shipment of game between states where it was taken contrary to state regulations. Thus, the illegal killing of game and its out-of-state shipment became a federal offense under exercise of the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution. Stimulated by the new law, the states adopted stronger regulations to protect game and song birds.

Yet the interstate trade in game and nongame animals went on. Profits were great, and thousands of ducks and geese were shipped regularly to cities from the great gunning marches, and quail and grouse moved to market in butter tubs and other camouflages.

Years of argument and agitation followed, and in 1913, Congress approved the Weeks-McLean Law, which declared "All wild geese, wild swans, brant, wild ducks, snipe, plover, woodcock, rail, wild pigeons, and all other migratory game and insectivorous birds which in their northern and southern migrations pass through or do not remain permanently the entire year within the borders of any state or territory, shall hereafter be deemed to be within the custody and protection of the Government of the United States, and shall not be destroyed or taken contrary to regulations hereinafter provided therefor."

Reaction to that declaration was not overwhelmingly sympathetic. Grave questions were raised about its constitutionality, and challenges were initiated in court. Cognizant of the legal vulnerability of the new law, Congress that same session approved a resolution calling upon the President to start negotiations with other North American countries to provide uniform protection for migratory birds.

A treaty, concluded with Great Britain (Canada) in 1916 became the bedrock for the sweeping Migratory Bird Treaty Act, approved by Congress in 1918, and the legal challenge to the earlier Weeks-McLean Act was abandoned. Two 1920 court actions, one by the U.S. Supreme Court and the other by the Prince Edward Island Supreme Court, upheld the validity of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Canadian Migratory Bird Convention Act.

From that point on, responsibility for migratory game, nongame, and insectivorous birds was vested firmly in the Federal Government, and the way was cleared for setting regulations and broadening law enforcement to halt harmful hunting practices. The needs of the birds were to be given priority consideration to the desires of those who sought to make use of them.

DUCK STAMP LEGISLATION

Next in the succession of specific Congressional enactments for waterfowl was the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of 1934. Purpose of the duck stamp, as it is popularly known, is to raise money for the purchase of waterfowl habitat. Price of the first duck stamp was $1, but this changed over the years to $2 and then to $3, and a bill now in Congress would authorize the Secretary of the Interior, as the administrator of the national waterfowl program, to increase the stamp fee to a maximum of $5. Every waterfowl hunter, 16 years of age and older, is required to have an unexpired duck stamp, validated by his signature in ink, in his possession while afield.

The number of duck stamps sold by years and the amount of revenue received are shown in Table 1. These funds, augmented by general appropriations prior to the Duck Stamp Act, plus the assignment of publicly-owned lands to the waterfowl program and the purchase of specific refuges under Acts of Congress, have placed more than 4 million acres of wetlands in waterfowl refuges and production areas.

TABLE 1.—*Duck stamp sales*

Hunting year	Number of stamps	Change from previous years	Income
	Cost of stamps, $1		
1934	635,001	([1])	$635,001
1935	448,204	−186,795	448,204
1936	603,623	+155,417	603,623
1937	783,039	+79,416	783,039
1938	1,002,715	+219,676	1,002,715
1939	1,111,561	+108,844	1,111,561
1940	1,260,810	+149,249	1,260,810
1941	1,439,967	+179,157	1,439,967
1942	1,383,629	−56,338	1,383,629
1943	1,169,352	−214,277	1,169,352
1944	1,487,029	+317,777	1,487,029
1945	1,725,505	+238,446	1,725,505
1946	2,016,841	+291,336	2,016,841
1947	1,722,677	−294,164	1,722,677
1948	2,127,603	+404,926	2,127,603
	Cost of stamp $2		
1949	1,954,734	−172,869	3,909,468
1950	1,903,644	−51,090	3,807,288
1951	2,167,767	+264,123	4,335,534
1952	2,296,628	+128,861	4,593,256
1953	2,268,446	−28,182	4,536,892
1954	2,184,550	−83,896	4,369,100
1955	2,369,940	+185,390	4,739,880
1956	2,332,014	−37,926	4,664,028
1957	2,355,353	+23,339	4,710,706
1958	2,165,562	−189,791	4,331,124
	Cost of stamp, $3		
1959	1,628,365	−537,197	4,885,095
1960	1,727,534	+99,169	5,182,602
1961	1,346,003	−381,531	4,038,009
1962	1,147,553	−198,450	3,442,659
1963	1,451,605	+304,052	4,354,815
1964	1,565,860	+114,255	4,697,580
1965	1,558,755	−7,105	4,676,265

[1] 1st year.

The land acquisition phases of the waterfowl program received further assistance in 1958 by Congressional refinement of the Duck Stamp Act. Prior to that time, the language of the Act gave the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, now the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, broad authority to spend the money for general refuge and migratory bird purposes, in addition to land acquisition. The weakness in this approach became evident in the mid-1950's, when it was disclosed that only $6.5 million of the $34.9 million collected from sportsmen up to June 30, 1954, had been invested in land. The remainder had been used for law enforcement, research, and refuge development, operations, and maintenance. Evidence was presented at Congressional hearings to show that plans called for more, not less, of the special duck stamp income to be used to finance the day-to-day operations of the wildlife refuge system. The money was being used legally, but contrary to the expectations of sportsmen, to finance regular operations that should have been supported from general funds.

The 1958 act requires that proceeds from the sale of duck stamps be used to buy wetlands. In addition to acreage for refuges, the act authorizes the purchase of smaller wetlands, called waterfowl production areas, in the breeding grounds. The only non-land expenses the proceeds may defray are the Post Office Department's charges for printing and distributing the duck stamps. Other expenses, such as refuge development, maintenance, operations, and enforcement of the migratory bird regulations, now are borne mostly from general appropriations.

Paralleling expansion of waterfowl programs in the first 6 decades of this century was the emergence of another force, the magnitude and the implications of which have not been realized until recently. That force is the increase in human population, with the attendant spread of cities and public works, and tremendous technological changes in agriculture.

Excessive and unregulated shooting of the early years no longer is a danger to the birds. But the towering wave of humanity is a deadly threat because it encroaches upon wetlands and renders them useless for waterfowl for all time. Less than 30 million acres of good quality wetlands remain of the 120 million acres of marsh and wetlands this country once contained.

Seeking to counteract the proliferation of public works such as dams, navigation channels, and irrigation projects to service the enlarging human population was the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1934 and its subsequent amendments. It requires, among several things, that water projects be studied by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in consultation with state wildlife agencies and that recommendations be made as necessary for modifications or the purchase of compensatory lands to prevent destruction of fish or wildlife. A number of new waterfowl refuges and management areas have resulted from this act, and some serious losses of wetlands habitat avoided, as well.

The drainage of marshes and potholes for farm improvement, for community growth and development, and for airports and highways, has brought problems that are difficult to resolve and costly to counteract.

In the prairie pothole region of Minnesota and the Dakotas, agricultural drainage removed more than 156,000 acres of wetlands yearly during the 1959–64 period. Coastal marshes, once forming the great wintering grounds, have been ruined for waterfowl by housing developments, salt-water intrusion, or exploration for sulphur and oil. Vast marshes in California and Mexico have become rice and cotton fields, orchards, and suburban developments.

More than 45 million acres of U.S. wetlands were drained during the period 1940–64, often with the technical advice and financial assistance of federal agencies. The average for the 1959–64 period was 1,403,358 acres a year. In 89 counties of the Dakotas and Minnesota, the most important duck-nesting counties in continental U.S., federal assistance was given for draining 72,000 individual potholes in the 8 years following 1953. More than 79,000 acres of waterfowl habitat were destroyed there alone. Drainage in the prairies provinces of Canada, once lagging behind the rate in the states, is also a matter of serious concern. Eighty percent or more of North American waterfowl are produced in the prairie provinces of central and western Canada. Tremendous northward expansion of agriculture, into the parklands north of the prairies, is causing the destruction of potholes there.

Congress took a number of steps to counteract the destruction of wetlands needed by waterfowl. First, in view of the relatively slow progress being made in acquiring lands with duck stamp revenues, Congress in 1961 authorized the advance appropriation of up to $105 million over a 7-year period for wetlands purchase. The advance, not bearing interest, is to be repaid from future duck stamp collections beginning at the end of the 7 years.

PROGRAM GOAL

The goal of the wetlands program is to place 12.5 million acres in public management for waterfowl purposes. The federal government already had about 3.5 million acres by 1961 and hoped to buy and lease 4.5 million more. The state wildlife agencies had 2 million acres under management for waterfowl purposes and assumed a goal of acquiring 2.5 million acres more, yielding a total of 12.5 million in state and federal ownership and management. Of the 2.5 million acres it hoped to put under active waterfowl management during the crash program, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife planned to buy 750,000 acres for waterfowl refuge purposes, and 600,000 acres for the waterfowl production areas, and lease 1,150,000 acres for the same purpose.

The emergency program ran headlong into difficulty before it could get moving. County governments in the north-central states were not pleased with the prospect of losing real estate taxes on private lands that would be moving into public ownership. Much of the waterfowl production areas acreage was slated for purchase there. A second Congressional act was required, this one sharing with the counties some of the money received yearly by the Bureau from the sale of hay, timber, grazing rights, and other natural products of the national wildlife refuge system. This plan was endorsed by the counties and their state governments, and the accelerated wetlands purchase got underway and is functioning well.

ANOTHER PROBLEM

Another problem has appeared. U.S. defense commitments have reduced appropriations for less essential activities, and funds are not being requested for the accelerated wetlands program at anywhere near the rate originally anticipated. In fact, advance appropriations so far total $38.5 million, slightly more than half of the $75 million expected by this time. The offshoot of this has been to delay wetlands acquisition and leasing. Congress has before it an Administration-supported bill that would extend the emergency program an additional 8 years, but without any increase in the $105 million authorization. Meanwhile, land prices continue to rise, and the amount of land that $105 million can buy over 15 years falls considerably short of what could have been done in the briefer span. Further, without this additional 8-year extension, the Bureau will end up with about one-half of the acreage it had hoped to reserve for waterfowl.

In another effort to slow drainage, at least to the point where wildlife inspections could be made of marshes and potholes on which federal drainage assistance is requested, Congress passed a law in 1962 aimed at the Dakotas and Minnesota. There, all drainage assistance requests must be referred by the U.S. Department of Agriculture to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. If, on inspection a pothole is determined to have a high waterfowl value, the Bureau or a state wildlife agency may offer to purchase or lease the area to save it from drainage. Any landowner refusing to lease or sell the pothole is not eligible for federal drainage assistance for 5 years. Some good wetlands have been preserved under this law, although others have been drained by the use of private funds or will be eligible for public assistance under federal agriculture programs in the future. Becoming more sensitive to the predicament of waterfowl, as well as the paradox of one federal agency spending funds to support drainage while another uses public funds to preserve wetlands, the agency under whose direction most cost-sharing payments are made has ordered its state offices to reduce this form of assistance by 50%.

The Canadian program, now getting underway, contemplates a number of important activities. This fall, for the first time, hunters of migratory birds in Canada are required to have a $2 federal permit. Purpose of the permit, unlike that of the U.S. duck stamp, is not to raise revenue for the migratory bird program. Rather, it will yield the names and addresses of hunters and will enable Canadian wildlife officials to learn, again for the first time, where and how many Canadians hunt waterfowl, the kinds and number of birds taken, and other information essential to the organization and conduct of an intelligent and responsive waterfowl management program. Additionally, pilot studies have been completed, and the Canadian Wildlife Service is ready to launch a wetlands leasing program aimed hopefully at preserving two-thirds of the 6 million small potholes in the prairie provinces from drainage and filling. Contemplated, too, are an expanded waterfowl research program and the outright purchase of larger nesting and over-wintering marshes.

Today's principal problem, and one that will go on for all time, is the preservation of sufficient habitat to enable the birds to persist in numbers so that hunting can be permitted. Under acts of Congress, waterfowl hunting is permissive rather than guaranteed. Law authorizes hunting only when, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, birds are plentiful.

Despite current state and federal efforts, it is evident that much more must be done to offset the large-scale destruction of wetlands in all sections of North America. The problem is most critical in the prairie breeding grounds, to be sure, because if waterfowl lack places to nest and rear their young, there can be no large annual replenishment to replace those birds lost to hunting and natural mortality. Lacking this annual replenishment waterfowl populations decline.

PROGRAM INADEQUATE

The federal accelerated wetlands purchase program, even if authorized to go on for 8 years past its original 7-year expiration date, will be inadequate to the task. Rapidly increasing land prices are reducing the amount of wetlands that can be bought with a fixed amount of money. Further, U.S. defense efforts have a priority claim on available funds and a program to preserve wetlands ranks far down on the list. Also, an emerging concept that the U.S. has a responsibility to feed the world, if it gains national favor, will mean that more wetlands may be drained and put to the plow.

One glimmer of hope for slowing this trend is the recent resolution of a major agricultural organization, the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, calling for creation of a water-bank program under which landowners would be paid to preserve, rather than to destroy, wetlands. Drainage also is receiving criticism because it appears to contribute to serious flooding in some areas. Rather than holding water on the land where it falls, drainage hastens surface flow into creeks and rivers, oftentimes greatly exceeding their channel capacity and floods result.

Much must be done, however, before the water-bank concept is translated into firm agricultural and land-use policy. Concentrating attention in this area could yield great dividends to waterfowl because it offers a positive and economically defensible approach toward preserving millions of acres of wetlands that are in private ownership.

A lesser problem that undoubtedly will persist arises from the philosophical differences in the federal and state approach to setting waterfowl shooting seasons and big limits. Sole responsibility rests with the Secretary of the Interior, and each year's regulations are issued after consultation wtih state wildlife agencies through their flyway councils, the national Waterfowl Advisory Committee, consisting of flyway representatives and conservation groups, and after analysis of census information collected over much of North America. State recommendations, for the most part, are inclined to be hunter-oriented, while those of the Federal Government respond more to the welfare of the total waterfowl resource.

This comment is not to imply that either the states or the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife are wrong, for in differing there always is the expectation that re-examination of information and refinement of information-gathering techniques and their analysis can only result in an improved level of waterfowl management. Through the Bureau, the U.S. is investing between $20 million and $25 million yearly in carrying out its international responsibilities for migratory waterfowl. The states spend only a fraction of this amount, but between them and the Bureau much field survey and research work is done to enlarge knowledge about waterfowl, for law enforcement, and to buy, develop, and maintain waterfowl habitat. State acquisitions are more for management areas where hunting is permitted; those of the Federal Government are for refuges and for waterfowl production areas.

Each year's shooting regulations are based largely on the comparison of waterfowl population and production information with that of previous years, with wetlands habitat conditions, the composition and nature of the hunter kill the previous season, and many other factors. The census information is compiled from massive aerial and ground surveys, involving more than 100 men and covering thousands of miles, during which the number of adult, or breeding, ducks in North America's major nesting grounds is determined each spring. Following this are production surveys, again in the nesting grounds, to get information about water conditions, hens with broods, and number of ducklings per brood. Analysis of this information results in the fall flight forecast, which forms most of the basis for determination of hunting regulations.

Later in the fall, after the gunning season, biologists gather to examine wings sent in by cooperating hunters. From these they can determine the various species of ducks bagged, whether adults or young of the year, and how well the hunting kill responded to the hunting regulations. That is, through varying regulations, the Bureau seeks to devote gun pressure on certain species of waterfowl and to lighten it on others.

SURVEYS YIELD INFORMATION

Repeated year after year, these surveys yield a string of information which contributes constantly to the improvement of waterfowl management. Statistical analyses play a fundamental role in the evaluations, and a large federal staff devotes thousands of hours to dissecting the information. Their work, without doubt, is the most intensive application of attention given any group of wildlife in the world.

Few challenge the adequacy of the Bureau's surveys. However, some question the conclusions the Bureau reaches and the recommendations that follow.

In 1966, for example, all signs point to a larger fall flight than in some previous years. Water conditions were good in the prairie nesting grounds, weather was not harsh, and the ducks responded with brood production well above the long-term average. But wildlife observers here and in Canada report that there were not enough breeding adult ducks to take advantage of all the water habitat that was available this spring. Had there been more adults, the outlook for this fall's flight would have been much better.

On this essential point, then, taking maximum advantage of habitat conditions in the breeding grounds in order to get the greatest production of ducklings, rests this year's duck debate. The Bureau is inclined to be somewhat restrictive in hopes that more ducks will survive the hunting season and return to the breeding grounds next year. Some states would be more liberal, returning fewer birds to the breeding grounds, but still above this year's level.

There are practical reasons for supporting each viewpoint. The Bureau suggests that by holding down the kill of adults in years when water returns to the prairies until such point that the maximum amount of wetlands habitat is occupied by breeding ducks, the overall population will increase greatly and more liberal hunting will be possible. The Bureau suggests, too, that as the drought cycle returns to the prairies, and as the number of waterfowl desiring to breed as adults exceeds available habitat, heavier hunting can be permitted to bring the birds into closer balance with their habitat. Habitat, in the Bureau's thinking, is the critical factor. It determines how many ducks may nest and its abundance or scarcity influences, in large degree, the outlook for each fall flight.

The state wildlife agencies that are most critical of the Bureau's viewpoint support, too, the concept of returning more breeding adults to the nesting grounds when habitat conditions are good. They question, however, the Bureau's recommendation that a maximum number be returned in any one year. They would return a lesser number, with hunters given an opportunity to take the difference by way of more liberal bag limits and shooting seasons.

Their chief arguments have a realistic ring. Restrictive hunting seasons decrease the number of persons buying licenses and duck stamps, with the effect that less money is available for essential waterfowl and other wildlife programs. In some primary wintering grounds, like in California, the southern terminus of most ducks of the Pacific Flyway, agriculture, subdivisions, and other developments are destroying wetlands at a rapid pace. Nearly 75% of California's wetlands are in private ownership and used as duck clubs. Reduction of hunting opportunity, the Californians warn, could discourage the clubs to the point that the lands may be sold, drained and developed. Provision of wetlands habitat for ducks, already critical in California, could become an unmanageable problem should this happen. There is some suggestion that the dense concentration of waterfowl in California is contributory to serious outbreaks of fowl cholera, such as occurred last winter, when an estimated 70,000 ducks and geese perished.

GUN PRESSURE THEORY

A prevailing theory in waterfowl management is to put gun pressure on those species of waterfowl that are in the numerical position to take it. An example of this is the blue-winged teal, which leaves the country well ahead of most waterfowl gunning seasons. An experimental season was held last year, in the Mississippi and Central Flyways, to determine if hunters could concentrate their fire on the blue wings without destroying other waterfowl. A second season will be held this year. Other recent examples of species management were the restrictions on canvasbacks and redheads in recent years, which sought to lessen gun mortality on 2 species that were in numerical difficulty because of the lack of water in their breeding grounds.

Species management, as it is known, is simply an exercise of selective shooting regulations. Hunters are informed, via the annual waterfowl regulations, that they may not shoot this or that species of waterfowl, and if so, how many and under what conditions. This approach was first used by Louisiana in 1904, when the season was closed on the wood duck. Restrictions and bag limitations have been imposed on a number of waterfowl since then. Canvasbacks and redheads were protected from 1960 through 1963. The opening day on white geese has been delayed until Oct. 5 in Saskatchewan to enable the bulk of the comparatively rare Ross' geese to migrate so that their kill will be reduced.

Species management can work in reverse. Shooters have been permitted to take more birds of certain species under regulated conditions. To control depredations on rice in the Pacific Flyway, for example, extra limits of pintails and baldpates were permitted from 1952 through 1958. Scaup have been subjected to more liberal gunning in the U.S. and in the eastern provinces of Canada because they are lightly shot.

IDENTIFICATION IS DIFFICULT

The severest test of the application of species management is the ability of hunters to identify ducks in the field, before they are shot. For some species, as in distinguishing between female scaup and ringnecks, identification of a bird in hand is tough enough. But add to this the fact that the birds are in flight, often under poor light, and the excitement of the hunt, and identification of even the more popular species becomes difficult at best. Moreover, the bulk of the time spent in the field by a duck hunter is during the gunning season, and that is not the best time for him to learn something about the identifying characteristics of the 48 species of ducks, geese, and swans that fly the face of North America. Not all the 48 are found in any one area, of course, but tests have shown that many hunters fail to recognize even the most common ducks of the areas they hunt. Few hunters can identify the birds in flight, and some tests have shown that fully one-third of the hunters misidentified the more common mallards, blue-winged teal, baldpates, and gadwall.

According to Walter F. Crissey, director of the Bureau's Migratory Bird Populations Station at Laurel, Md., ". . . We must conclude that the ability of most U.S. hunters to identify waterfowl with the birds in hand is not good at the present time and is very poor when the birds are viewed in flight. If species management is to work in many situations, the birds must be identified in the air before the gun is fired. It does little good to discover a mistake after the bird is already dead. The fact that hunters in some localities have developed the ability to identify the key species on the wing demonstrates that it is feasible."

The development of this skill as a contribution toward improved waterfowl management rests with the hunters themselves. An alternative to requiring hunters to be able to identify birds before they are shot would be to completely close to shooting concentration points of waterfowl known to be in numerical difficulty. This approach is not popular, however, because it would conflict with the philosophy of giving all hunters an equal opportunity to share in the waterfowl resource. Numerous recommendations have been made for accomplishing this, but the conclusion reached most frequently is that greater skill on the part of each hunter in identifying waterfowl would make the best contribution to the sport and to the future of the birds.

Crissey comments, that he can "visualize a situation where the right to participate in hunting waterfowl will depend on the ability of the individual to identify species and where there might be as much recreation provided by learning to properly identify the birds as there is in the actual shooting that follows".

In summary, it can be said that the continental outlook for some migratory birds, and particularly for ducks and geese, is not altogether encouraging. Tremendous loss of wetlands already has occurred, and much more is in sight. U.S. and Canadian efforts may fall short of habitat preservation goals. Federal agricultural programs give technical advice and financial help for drainage, while the sportsman's dollars seek to blunt this loss by acquiring, developing, and protecting wetlands. [Wildlife dollars are losing the race to agricultural dollars and something clearly must be done to offer landowners an economic incentive to retain wetlands.] Legislation and policy changes to achieve this positive approach sorely are needed.

And finally, a part of the future of waterfowling rests with the hunter. As more is learned about ducks and geese, it is apparent that the flyway concept is more administrative than biological. The birds do not move uniformly in the flyways. Some may be in one flyway this year and in a second the next.

Flyway populations contain many discrete groups of birds. Some meet little gunning pressure while others take a hammering. Gunning pressure must not exceed the biological capacity of the birds to sustain themselves, if these populations are to persist. Regulations fashioned to accomplish this likely will be more complicated. Zoning, species management, and other techniques may become more prevalent. And when these things come about the hunter must be better able to identify ducks in flight than he is at present.

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON CAREERS OF FEMALE OFFICERS IN THE ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to amend titles 10, 32, and 37 of the United States Code, to remove existing restrictions on the careers of female officers in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. I ask that this bill be appropriately referred.

Mr. President, this legislation is designed to remove the last remaining legislative restrictions against career opportunities for women in the armed services. This legislation is long overdue. Current provisions of the law impose severe limitations upon promotion opportunities for all women in the military service—nurses, medical service women, and the women serving in the WAC's, WAVES, Women Marines, and Women in the Air Force. It is regrettable that these restrictions ever existed, but they in fact do, and they apply to women serving on both active duty and in our Reserve forces. The restrictions effectively limit the career opportunities for women in the Armed Forces, and the Nation suffers from the loss of their services on many occasions when we should look to them for their maximum contribution. Now is such a time.

This proposed legislation provides no guarantees of promotion for women in the armed services. No guarantees are necessary. Women serving in the armed services are recognized as a responsible and valuable national asset. All this bill would do is to allow the consideration of these women for promotions in the same manner that male members of the armed services are now considered.

Women in the armed services serve all over the globe wherever American fighting men are stationed. They are today making their contribution in Vietnam. I am in hopes that this legislation will receive prompt and favorable consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1081) to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, U.S. Code, to remove restrictions on the careers of female officers in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. THURMOND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSION AND RENEWAL OF THE INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 101

Mr. ANDERSON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 35) consenting to an extension and renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 102

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, it is essential that every effort be made to reinforce the declared policy of our Government that the war in Vietnam should be brought to a peaceful conclusion by negotiation at the earliest possible date and that, as the Manila communique declared, we should withdraw our troops as soon as possible.

I am sure that is the sentiment of every Member of the Senate. In order to make that sentiment completely clear, Mr. President, I submit the following amendment to S. 665 to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missile, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes:

At the end of the bill add the following:

"TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

"Sec. 401. It is the sense of the Congress that these funds shall be used in pursuit of the Administration's aims for a peaceful settlement under effective guarantees in Vietnam, including (1) the right of the people of South Vietnam to choose their own government free of outside coercion, (2) the withdrawal of foreign troops and the dismantling of foreign installations after the termination of hostilities, as pledged in the Communique of the Manila Conference, October 25, 1966, (3) the achievement of peaceful reunification if desired by the free choice of all Vietnamese, as stated in the Manila Communique, and (4) the grant of substantial aid by the United States to the countries of the Mekong River Basin for the multipurpose development of that fertile but turbulent region, as pledged by the President in his address at Johns Hopkins University on April 7, 1965."

Mr. President, this proposed amendment expresses the sense of the Congress that it gives approval to the stated aims of the Communique of Manila and of the President's address at Johns Hopkins University. It makes clear that our aim in the granting of this authorization is not confined to the making of war, but that underneath we have a great and primary desire to see the realization of the peaceful goals we have enunciated. It is an encouragement to the administration to pursue those goals of peace with the utmost vigor, while it does not deny our boys under orders, as they engage in military action, the things they need with which to fight effectively. It does not change policy, but it places the emphasis where it belongs, on the pursuit of peace. There are some who would like to, and perhaps who will, vote against the appropriations. But this amendment offers an avenue to those, much more in number, who like myself find it necessary to vote for them—although with reluctance—while desiring to make completely clear the belief that peace, not violence, must be our aim.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the amendment being offered?

Mr. HARTKE. I offer the amendment, and ask that it be printed. It is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is being submitted for printing?

Mr. HARTKE. It is being submitted for printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh] as cosponsors of S. 188, a bill to create a Commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add the names of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Hansen] as a cosponsor of S. 199, a bill which has at one time passed the Senate and which I hope will soon pass again, to create a Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, about 10 days ago I introduced Senate bill 877, to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, with amendments, a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, and asked at that time that it remain at the desk for cosponsors until February 21. I am informed that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] understood that it was to remain there until today; and in his effort to have his name added as a cosponsor, he was told that it was closed the 21st.

I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 877, the name of the Senator from South Carolina be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION, AND RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors of the following bills, concurrent resolution, and resolution:

Authority of January 30, 1967:

S. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the need for members of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to be qualified to understand the problems of all groups of workers throughout our Nation: Mr. Allott.

Authority of February 7, 1967:

S. 877. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, with amendments, a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act: Mr. Allott, Mr. Morton, and Mr. Young of North Dakota.

S. 886. A bill to redesignate the Department of the Interior as the Department of Natural Resources and to transfer certain agencies to and from such Department: Mr. Brewster, Mr. Clark, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Lausche, Mr. McGee, and Mr. Metcalf.

Authority of February 16, 1967:

S. Res. 83. Resolution providing for study and reevaluation of U.S.-European relations: Mr. Allott, Mr. Baker, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Miller, and Mr. Percy.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 9, 1967, the names of Mr. Clark and Mr. Smathers were added as additional cosponsors of amendment No. 90, intended to be proposed by Mr. Dodd, to the bill (S. 1) to amend the Federal Firearms Act, submitted by Mr. Dodd on February 9, 1967.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Speech to Weirton chapter, West Virginia Society of Professional Engineers, on air and water pollution and Weirton Steel Co. statement on its facilities and projections for air and stream pollution control.

ROY ROBERTS, NEWSPAPERMAN

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, Missouri and America lost one of the great newspapermen of this century in the death last night of Roy A. Roberts in Kansas City at the age of 79. He had been in the hospital since last November 13, but never lost his interest in the affairs of his area, the Midwest, the Nation, and the world.

Born in Muscotah, Kans., on November 25, 1887, Mr. Roberts attended the University of Kansas from 1905 to 1908. He entered newspaper work with the Lawrence, Kans., World in 1905 and later became city editor of that paper. He joined the Kansas City Star in 1909, covered four sessions of the Missouri State Legislature at Jefferson City, was a Washington correspondent for the Star from 1915 to 1928, managing editor of the Star from 1928 to 1945. He became president and general manager in 1947. In 1963 he gave up his position as president, editor, and general manager of the Star, but continued in active consultation on daily policy as chairman of the board, retiring from that position on January 1, 1965, under a mandatory retirement plan which he himself had put into effect a short time before that date in order to assure that the Star, owned completely by its employees, would always have new and young leadership. He continued to have a personal office just off the big news and editorial room of the Star and was often consulted by those in active management.

Although Mr. Roberts had been active for many years in the Republican Party and was a leader in the nominations of Alfred M. Landon and Dwight D. Eisenhower, in 1964 he not only did not object, but also approved, when the editors of the Star supported the election of Lyndon B. Johnson, the first Democratic Presidential nominee it had supported since Grover Cleveland.

Even during the months of his illness and hospitalization, seldom a day went by on which he did not talk to his former associates on the Kansas City Star; and he made it a habit to talk at least once a week with members of the Washington Bureau of the Star. Only last Sunday he had a long conversation with Washington correspondent for the Star John Cauley.

Mr. Roberts covered the national presidential nominating conventions in 1912 and took pride in the fact that he had been at every convention of the two major parties from that time through 1960.

He had known personally every President since Woodrow Wilson, and although an avowed Republican and the guiding genius of a paper that became known as one of the editorial towers of strength for the Republican Party, he held the full respect of Democratic leaders.

Under his guiding spirit and personality the Kansas City Star, already a great regional newspaper, became one of the outstanding newspapers of America. There is no finer paper published in this land today. Mr. Roberts was given about every honor possible for a newspaper publisher or editor to receive, but he always counted himself first of all a newspaper reporter specializing in politics and economics, and in more recent years, world affairs.

Roy always liked to go to the source for his news stories. Accordingly, for many years he came to Washington and New York several times a year to talk to leaders and opinion makers. He would then report to the readers of the Star in a series of articles, passing on to the Midwest and other areas the thinking of the East. Those of us who have read the Star over the years valued the Roberts reports for their fairness, depth of reporting, and perceptive vision.

Much of the progress in the communities and States he and his paper served can be attributed to his leadership and inspiration. He made America a better land in which to live, primarily because, along with his skill and high character, he was a master of the profession he loved and served so well for 60 years.

All who knew him will miss him. To his gracious and lovely wife, Florence, to his fine daughters and grandchildren, my wife and I extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senators not be limited by the agreement with respect to morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, our Nation lost one of the greatest publishers and reporters of this century with the sad news last night that Roy Allison Roberts had passed away.

The memory of his dynamic spirit, his great leadership, his warm friendship will remain with us.

Roy Roberts is the man who made the Kansas City Star one of the Nation's top 10 daily papers. It still is today.

He began with the Star as a paper carrier in Lawrence, Kans., in 1889. At the University of Kansas he was the Star's correspondent, and editor of the student newspaper.

When he began as a full-time reporter in Kansas City, he vowed he would become the best reporter the Star ever had. He did.

From a $22.50 a week reporter he became correspondent for the Star, first in Jefferson City and then in Washington, D.C. He was known in Washington as one of the best reporters the city had ever seen.

In 1928 he became managing editor of the Star.

His efforts brought great strength and vitality to Kansas City. As managing editor, president, and general manager, Roy Roberts was respected throughout Missouri and Kansas for his strength and leadership.

We will greatly miss Roy Roberts in Missouri. He was one of the finest Kansas Citians of all time.

Roy was known all across the Nation. He knew every President of this century and was a friend to every one of them. I was always amazed when I was with him. He knew the doorman at the hotel and he knew everyone else on up to the President. His friendship, advice, and encouragement were of great value to all who knew him.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as has been stated by the distinguished Senator from Missouri, Roy Roberts was for 19 years managing editor of the Kansas City Star. He also became president and chairman of the board of that great newspaper.

Following his service in World War I, he became the Washington correspondent for the Kansas City Star and spent much time in the Press Gallery of the U.S. Senate, until 1928 when he returned to Kansas City.

Roy Roberts was a personal friend of mine during all the years of my public service. Our association was close and his sound advice and counsel throughout the years were invaluable.

He retired from active service with the Kansas City Star on January 1, 1965, after having worked for the Star for 56 years.

Roy was ranked among the foremost journalists of the Nation and many of our outstanding editors and newspaper men are indebted to him for guidance in the journalistic field.

Those of us who had an opportunity to know and work with Roy Roberts will always remember his kindness, his generosity, his unselfishness, and his sincerity.

He is survived by his wife, one daughter, five grandchildren, and a brother and sister.

Kansas and the Nation have lost a great citizen and I have lost a true friend.

(At this point, Mr. SYMINGTON assumed the chair.)

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the comments, remarks, and expressions of deep sympathy which have been made by the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], who now occupies the chair, and my very good friend and distinguished colleague from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] who, indeed, was one of the great friends, as was the Senator from Missouri, of Mr. Roy Roberts.

My association with him was in the first years of my public life, at a time when he was experiencing the last years of his life, and so it was to my great benefit as a relatively young man that I had the counsel, guidance, and opportunity to visit with a relatively old man at that time. I went to him in times of trouble and I went to him in good times for advice and counsel. Often I sat with him in the editorial room at his old desk, which was cluttered with papers, and talked with him for hours. I have visited with him in the rear of this august Chamber. Always he was the same—decent, kind, gentle, and civilized.

I knew his daughters well. My wife knew them well. We think of them now. We think also of the great contribution which he made to Kansas, to Kansas City, and to the public intelligence of the people throughout that area.

Today, with real sincerity, I join Senators in paying respects to Roy Roberts. Mrs. Pearson and I feel most privileged to have the opportunity at this time and place to express our feelings.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senators from Missouri and Kansas in the sentiments they voiced on the passing of a great newspaperman.

Roy Roberts and his very efficient, highly effective, and most observant Washington correspondent, John Cauley, visited with me in my office once or twice each year for the past decade or more. I found Mr. Roberts a man with an open mind, a man who considered all sides of any question, arriving at his decisions on the basis of his own judgment only after he had dissected, studied, and digested the facts involved.

He was a great newsman. He performed always in the best American tradition, and he produced much good for the welfare and well being, not only of the States his paper penetrated, but also of the Nation as a whole. As has been expressed so well by my three colleagues, Roy Roberts was very diligent, keenly observant, and deeply understanding in judging foreign policy matters—which came to be of such great importance in the affairs of this country.

He will be missed, but he will be remembered for the many contributions he has made. He will be remembered as one of the great newsmen of our time.

RAIL PASSENGER SERVICE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Interstate Commerce Commission is to conduct public hearings, due to begin on March 6, 1967, on a proposal of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co. to discontinue two passenger trains daily between Washington, D.C., and Cincinnati, with service to West Virginia.

We need passenger train service to attract new industries to West Virginia. Quite appropriately, the overall picture of declining passenger train service is a matter of concern to people in other parts of the country. One man who has voiced his concern for this problem is the Hon. William H. Tucker, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Chairman Tucker spoke of this problem last October and singled out the trouble in this manner:

> The technology for passenger movement by railroads has not merely lagged behind the pace of other modes. For all practical purposes, it has never really progressed beyond the depression of the thirties.
>
> That fact becomes even more compelling when you consider that more than 60 percent of rail passenger cars in operation today are more than 30 years old, and fewer than 4 percent are less than 7 years old.

Because the dangers inherent in the ever-declining passenger train service are greater than many people realize, I believe it is important to heed Mr. Tucker's warnings.

I ask unanimous consent to have his address to the New York Railroad Club on October 20, 1966, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF WILLIAM H. TUCKER, CHAIRMAN, INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION, AT THE NEW YORK RAILROAD CLUB, OCTOBER 20, 1966

In April last year, during the ICC hearing on the first of the New Haven Railroad's two major train discontinuance cases, the *New Yorker* magazine published a clever cartoon which perfectly reflected the dilemma of New York's commuters. The cartoon pictured a long horde of affluent-looking suburbanites marching along the New Haven Railroad's right of way toward their Manhattan offices. They had the familiar rails, ballast, and ties under foot, and the familiar electric power lines overhead—but the familiar trains were gone.

My guess was that this particular group of commuters was about two miles out of Stamford and that they had about 30 miles to walk to their offices. According to the caption, one commuter remarked to another: "I just never imagined they wouldn't come up with *some* form of government aid."

I assumed that *New Yorker* cartoonist Stevenson's thrust was at the New Haven Railroad, especially since I was then conducting hearings on the New Haven's proposal to discontinue 105 of its New York commuter trains—and also since there was lurking in the background of the case the threat of total collapse of the railroad and all of its passenger service.

One of the issues in the two New Haven train-off cases was the question whether there is any reasonable alternative to New Haven's commuter operations. The *New Yorker* cartoon's point was ultimately confirmed by our findings: There *is* no rational alternative.

I thought the cartoon was quite funny for itself, but I also got the suggestion from it that these early morning suburban marathoners were almost resigned to their fate, even if they were incredulous at it. That kind of attitude would be no laughing matter. I think it is unlikely that groups such as New Haven's 30,000 daily commuters would placidly accept abandonment of their passenger service where it is actually available and being relied upon, as in the case of the New Haven. As a public policy, the abandonment of such an urban mass transit facility would be a wholly unacceptable decision. But that fact, I believe, only reaches the threshold of the really relevant issues.

The real danger is that public policy will accept and try to live with a passenger service—both within and between our metropolitan areas—at a level of adequacy lower even than present requirements—and, even if patched up and pieced together from time to time, a service which consistently lags behind the now predictable, unavoidable needs of the near future.

This result must not be allowed to occur. The scope and quality of future railway passenger service represent at least as important a national domestic issue as any other this country will face in the next decade.

We have, for example, a too deeply rooted national tradition teaching that our intercity rail passenger service is moribund and must finally die. I think we must reexamine that tradition and do all that is necessary to reshape its course for the years ahead.

While airline and highway technology, capacities, and utilization have enjoyed phenomenal development and growth in the past 30 years, railroad passenger service as a whole has moved into nearly total eclipse. It was only 8 years ago last month that an ICC hearing officer, after conducting extensive hearings into the matter, made his famous and controversial findings in the well-known *Railroad Passenger Train Deficit* case:

"For more than a century the railroad passenger coach has occupied an interesting and useful place in American life, but at the present time the inescapable fact—and certainly to many people an unpleasant one—seems to be that in a decade or so this time-honored vehicle may take its place in the transportation museums along with the stagecoach and the steam locomotive."

Although the full ICC on its review of the case did not adopt this conclusion, it did summarize and publish a great deal of statistical data which, by itself, would tend to confirm the hearing examiner's fears. For one thing, the Commission showed national cumulative "passenger deficits" of more than a half-billion dollars in each of the preceding 10 years, and a nearly ¾ billion-dollar deficit for 1957 alone. Moreover, the report stated that, except for the World War II years, railroad passenger service had recorded annual deficits without fail since 1930.

Nevertheless, railway passenger service has not disappeared in the decade following the ICC's passenger service investigation. Today there is a new need and a new opportunity to give it life and purpose.

Senator Pell's recent book, *Megalopolis Unbound*, achieves a remarkable summary of the circumstances, the trends, and the possible alternatives which face the people of our rapidly urbanizing society.

Megalopolis, the urbanized corridor extending along the East Coast from southern New Hampshire to northern Virginia, houses 20 percent of the nation's population on about 1.4 percent of its land. It accounts for about 20 percent of the nation's employment and one-third of its wages and salaries. The scale of intercity travel within this area already is at a much higher level than any other region.

A recent study estimated 4,000 auto passengers travel daily on its highways between New York and Washington, 4,800 between New York and Boston, and 12,000 between New York and Philadelphia. To these totals should also be added an estimated 2,300 daily bus passengers between New York and Washington, 1,400 between New York and Boston, and 2,100 between New York and Philadelphia.

As to the airlines, statistics for 1962 show that 5 million people—nearly 14,000 a day—flew between points *within* the megalopolitan area, representing 35 percent of all airline operations in this zone. Comparable estimates for rail patronage showed a daily volume of 1,575 passengers between New York and Washington, 1,295 between New York and Boston, and 5,400 between New York and Philadelphia.

It is not difficult to foresee an enormous increase in this kind of movement within Megalopolis when you consider the population here will increase by about 30 percent in the next 20 years. A Bureau of Public Roads study a few years ago predicted that intercity travel generally could increase by 58 percent in 1970 and 133 percent in 1980 over 1961 levels.

Trends evident in the northeastern corridor make it clear that unless a dramatic change is effected our first Megalopolis, and others to follow its lead, will eventually strangle its necessary mobility in unending ribbons of concrete and dangerously overcrowded airline traffic.

In terms of safety, speed, and economic and social cost, the proliferation of superhighways along the 600-mile northeast urban zone is not an adequate answer for predictable increases in intercity passenger travel. The *economic* cost alone of widening existing superhighways is becoming prohibitive. Senator Pell points out that it will cost about $300 million to widen a 30-mile stretch of the New Jersey Turnpike near New York City. The cost will be about two-thirds the *total* cost of the entire 132-mile highway in 1952.

Air lanes and metropolitan airfields already are congested in the northeast corridor, which has a far more dense concentration of air traffic than any other part of the country. Rising use of commercial and private aircraft within Megalopolis, and tightening demands for peak-hour air space and landing rights, are beginning to tax the absolute physical limitations of present air technology. There are other severe limitations upon placing increased reliance upon air travel within Megalopolis. The incidence of bad weather still brings complete havoc to scheduled operations, even using the most advanced technology available. Incidental airport-to-city ground transportation continues to be inordinately time-consuming and inconvenient, and its improvement depends almost entirely upon feasible improvements in urban mass transit.

I think that the direction national public policy should follow is quite clear. As much as any other objective in the field of transportation, the nation needs a viable, modern, railway passenger service designed to satisfy the accelerating requirements of an increasingly urbanized society. By 1980 more than two-thirds of our population will live in about 25 compact urban zones around the country, located in a total of about 10 percent of the nation's land. Thus the travel limitations facing the northeastern Megalopolis will continually repeat themselves elsewhere, if they are not dealt with now.

Adequate railway passenger service for the future doubtless must include the provision of rapid commuter transit within individual metropolitan areas.

It must also, I am convinced, embrace both a vastly improved medium-range, high-speed intercity train service within the conglomerate megalopolitan zones, and a basic core of long-distance trains connecting the megalopolitan areas to each other in overnight service.

In many metropolitan areas substantial progress is evident in the planning, financing and building (or upgrading) of rail facilities for mass transit as part of comprehensive programs balancing highway and railway needs. Increasingly, local area governments have come to appreciate that they must contribute a reasonable level of support for this service, as the particular circumstances in each area may require.

To bring our intercity travel even to a minimal level of adequacy, however, will require a major new infusion of techniques, equipment, and imagination. As an essential element in this effort, I believe, each passenger-carrying railroad should undertake a thorough reexamination and replanning of the entire structure of its passenger operations. With the aid of all available contemporary market analysis capabilities, each railroad should ask itself fundamental questions:

What service is really needed?

What amount of pruning of unproductive and unneeded schedules would be justified?

What kind of investment would be needed to modernize the remaining operations?

To what extent would public support be necessary and justifiable to sustain and upgrade essential passenger operations?

Only such an effort, vigorously pursued, and, where necessary, performed in cooperation with affected governmental agencies, will lead to a sound rationalization of intercity passenger-service structure.

Whatever may be the ultimate merits of the proposal itself and of its negative implications with respect to long-distance service, the recently announced plan of the New York Central to reshape its passenger operations into a "no frill," intermediate-distance, "shuttle" operation represents the kind of comprehensive planning that should be stimulated. I am convinced that we will need, by the 1970's at least, a strong network of high-speed, medium-range, passenger trains—of the Tokaido Line genre—supplemented to some degree by a viable core or long-haul, overnight trains between the emerging megalopolitan communities and to and from primary sites of national historic interest. I would like soon to see my assumptions in this regard tested by objective and searching analyses of all the relevant facts.

Planning for improved railway service will have to be supplemented by improved technology. The enactment a year ago of President Johnson's High Speed Ground Transportation Bill, with its heavy emphasis on spurring research and development, represents a heartening breakthrough in a generations-old economic barrier to progress in railway passenger service. That legislation was a 3-year, $90 million commitment by the federal government to assist in financing a broad program of basic research, market analysis, and actual demonstration testing of rapid ground transportation methods. The commitment is not limited to rail service, and the total authorization obviously is not enough to solve all problems, but it does assure the needed start in the right direction.

The technology for passenger movement by railroads has not merely lagged behind the pace of other modes. For all practical purposes, it has never really progressed beyond the depression of the thirties. That fact becomes even more compelling when you consider that more than 60 percent of rail passenger cars in operation today are more than 30 years old, and fewer than 4 percent are less than 7 years old.

A study by the National Academy of Sciences several years ago revealed that railroads were spending only $7 on passenger research out of every $10,000 of their gross operating revenues. In contrast, as Senator Pell has pointed out, the national outlay for research and development activities in recent years has stood at about $15 billion. Approximately one-third of that total is performed for the aircraft and missile industry. Commercial airlines at present reinvest in their own operations more than 85 percent of all their earnings, and they expect to spend $14 billion on new equipment in the next 10 years.

What I believe has been established by the 1965 legislation is the means to begin to overcome the vast inertia retarding rail passenger service. A pilot program grant of $9.6 million for upgrading the New York-to-Washington operations of the Pennsylvania Railroad has been met by an investment of more than $36 million by the Pennsylvania Railroad itself. The result next year will be a vastly more attractive service between these vital centers at speeds up to 110 miles an hour. A complementary experimental program already has been authorized for trial on the lines of the New Haven on the northern side of the northeast megalopolitan corridor. In this program a $2.1 million commitment by the Federal government will be met with a $500,000 commitment by the State of Connecticut for a 1-year testing of the newly designed, lightweight gas turbine powered trains. The initial objective is to reduce the Boston-New York elapsed time by 1 hour, thus to a 3 hour and 15 minute schedule.

President Johnson, specifically recognizing that intercity passenger movements will double in volume in the next 15 years, has said that technological advances made in the northeast corridor experimental programs will be directly applicable to other regions. Under the High Speed Ground Transportation program in the past few months, the Commerce Department has awarded research and development contracts to a number of operating companies and research institutions around the country to study various technical factors essential to future high-speed railway operations, such as road beds, tracks, power catenary systems, electric motors, and the dynamic behavior of trains at high speeds.

The long decline in railway passenger service has revealed a virtual withdrawal by the railroad industry from any long-range commitment to performance of these operations. But there are current indications that, with enlightened federal assistance and a new public acceptance of appropriate responsibility to provide reasonable support for essential rail passenger service, the railroad industry may willingly join the ranks for a long-range reinvestment in, and reshaping of, a basic core of essential passenger service. For example, Stuart Saunders, Chairman of the Pennsylvania Railroad, has recently affirmed his company's commitment to modernizing railway passenger transportation, saying:

"That the Pennsylvania Railroad is definitely interested in preserving and improving passenger business. Our goal is to produce faster, more convenient, more comfortable and more efficient passenger service which is better suited to the needs of the public than it is today.

"We on the Pennsylvania are prepared to work with governmental agencies on local, state and federal levels to achieve this objective. We are convinced that the railroads can make a vital contribution to a new era of passenger service."

Just as there is a need for firmly redirecting our national attitudes concerning the utility and essentiality of rail passenger service for the next decade, the time has also come to reexamine certain primary regulatory devices affecting the shape and future of rail passenger service.

Eight years have elapsed since the enactment of Section 13a as part of the Transportation Act of 1958. In that period of time a total of 219 separate discontinuance proposals have been filed with the ICC, and the Commission has given its permission for the discontinuance of 960 interstate and intrastate passenger trains.

In 1958, the operations of Class I railroads recorded a total of 246 million passenger *train-miles* and a total of more than 23 billion *passenger-miles*. By 1965 the level of such passenger operations had declined to 178 million passenger *train-miles* and 16.8 billion *passenger-miles*, a decline of about 30 percent in each instance. The statistical passenger deficit declined from $723 million for 1957 to a reported $410 million for 1965.

The 1958 train discontinuance legislation was an authorization for emergency surgery, with limited objectives and procedures arising from the broader crises then affecting all railroad operations. We are nearing the end of a decade of use of the train-off statute, and I believe that the rail situation has changed sufficiently to warrant a reexamination of the procedures built into Section 13a.

I do not by any means suggest that the legislation has already been effective to remove all of the unproductive and unessential segments of rail passenger service. But I am convinced that, with the many railroad corporate unifications that have taken place, the operating innovations made effective, and the new marketing techniques employed in a steadily growing national economy, the railroad industry enjoys comparative economic health as well as strong prospects for continued growth. The "railroad emergency" of the 1950's has receded substantially, and, more important, the emergency train-off procedures do not any longer measure up to the present situation's developing needs.

The present statute with its limit of 4 months on the period in which the Commission may hold in abeyance a proposed interstate train discontinuance imposes severe restrictions upon the ICC's flexibility in processing the cases. As the proposals become more complex and the issues more important to the affected public, 4 months becomes less adequate to achieve a full hearing and evaluation of all the conflicting public interests involved.

Consider, for example, the proposal of the Boston and Maine Railroad in June 1964 to discontinue all interstate train service to and from Boston, to be effective in August of that year. That proposal, embraced in 3 simultaneous Section 13a(1) cases, involved a total of 40 trains. It was processed before the Commission contemporaneously with Boston and Maine's proposal to discontinue 229 intrastate trains under Section 13a(2). A joint hearing on these cases lasted 20 days in September and October. Division 3 of the ICC decided the interstate train case on December 31, 1964, issuing a brief summary order on that date and then a full report some 2 weeks later.

The New Haven's proposal to end all interstate passenger service, 273 trains' worth, in a single proceeding under Section 13a(1), also required hearing and decision within a 4-month period. Fortunately there, however, the carrier post-dated effectiveness of its proposal to give the Commission an extra 4 months to process the case. This case alone recorded 3,000 pages of hearing transcript over a period of 9 weeks. Had the New Haven sought to make its notice effective without post-dating, I doubt that an adequate hearing, deliberation, and decision would have been possible.

The reported intention of the New York Central to restructure its entire passenger service could conceivably be the subject of a single, massive Section 13a(1) proceeding, to the extent interstate trains are involved. While I do not, of course, here question whether such a proceeding would fit the jurisdiction of Section 13a. I seriously doubt that this type of major service restructuring was the kind of proceeding contemplated in 1958 when the statutory procedure for train-off cases was enacted.

While we know that hundreds of passenger trains have stopped running since 1958, and we can measure by total statistics the declining use of passenger service as a whole, there is no realistic method available to tell us exactly where we now stand in terms of realistic needs, prospects, and potential of intercity railway passenger service. Present Section 13a provisions seem to channel the railroads to a sporadic usage of its procedures. The tendency in the usual case is to remove particular trains whenever the cost and revenue data seem propitious, with no well-conceived plan to account for the consequences on such things as feeder revenues, remaining through connecting train operations, or the remaining market requirements in the area affected.

Section 13a procedure needs to be revised to provide more flexibility for both the carriers and the ICC to bring about whatever changes may be necessary to strengthen and coordinate the entire structure of a carrier's passenger service, balancing relevant factors such as the carrier's financial and operating condition, the needs of the public, and the willingness of the public to provide reasonable support for the rail service.

The formal evidence in the *New Haven* case convinced the ICC that the whole form and structure of that carrier's passenger operations should be reexamined and rationalized in a joint railroad-community planning effort to define and satisfy the real needs of the public. It was evident that the New Haven's problems could not be "solved" realistically within the narrow compass of a formal statutory investigating proceeding under Section 13a, and that any ICC decision in the case would only provide an interim solution.

However, in addition to providing the interim solution for New Haven's particular situation, the Commission stated policy guidelines which should prove helpful for comparable Section 13a train discontinuance problems. The Commission concluded that just as the railroad has an obligation to sustain and improve essential rail passenger service, the public has an obligation also to provide its support. The Commission stated:

"The reasonable level of public support should in fact be construed as that level of financial or other public assistance which will stimulate the carrier to initiate or, if already initiated, continue its own reasonable effort to sustain and improve essential and economically viable passenger services. This, we think, is the kind of creative cooperation which will most productively revitalize and invigorate the operation of America's privately-owned rail passenger operations."

Such a policy places appropriate responsibility upon both the public and private sectors. It also provides a definite basis for the Commission, in implementing future Section 13a train discontinuance proposals, to scrutinize carefully the good faith and efficacy of the cooperative efforts of all the parties.

One of the most impressive facts that comes to light from a survey of discontinuance proceedings under Section 13a is the railroads' glaring lack of precise data as to actual costs of particular schedules and as to relevant market factors. The relevant cost accounting practices vary widely among our nation's railroads. Only a comparative few maintain and analyze records which will pin down the actual costs in any reliable manner. In most instances railroads are content to rely upon statistical apportionment of their basic costs for their entire system, rather than to analyze performance records of particular trains, even if such records are maintained.

The remarkable fact is that too few railroads seem to know what it *really* costs to conduct particular train schedules or segments of passenger operations, as opposed to "average" costs, although exceedingly important management judgments are founded upon this kind of cost information.

I would think it increasingly desirable for the future for railroads to develop and observe modern cost accounting techniques that will tend to reflect to the extent possible actual profitability arising from particular passenger service operations. If such techniques will require coordination with the ICC's accounting regulations, I have no doubt that the attendant problems can be discussed and worked out.

As railroad judgments in the future regarding performance of passenger service will be more and more important to the public, use of more sophisticated cost information than is now possible would seem essential. Along with more sophisticated cost analyses must come, I am convinced, a more conscious and knowledgeable use of modern marketing techniques. It is astonishing to find, as we do all too often in passenger train-off cases, that the carrier has no clear idea of the patterns of passenger utilization of its service, except perhaps for an occasional short-term study undertaken with train discontinuance in mind. This situation must be reversed if future judgments regarding train service are to be soundly based.

The phrase "passenger deficit" has so many special emotional and technical meanings that it should be used sparingly, and only very carefully, by a regulator. I do not wish to participate in the philosophical arguments which have marked its existence, but I believe that circumstances have changed so materially in recent years that its reexamination would now be useful.

The first thing to make clear and to emphasize in any discussion of the passenger deficit is that it is not a measure of operating costs that would be eliminated upon elimination of passenger service itself. The deficit data and related statistics are used, however, as a measure of trends in the performance of railway passenger and freight operations and as a factor for consideration in rate determinations.

A basic assumption underlying the ICC's accounting rules, the so-called separation rules, by which costs are allocated between passenger service and freight service, is that each railroad performing both types of service is selling two equivalent products. The critical corollary is that both services must, therefore, jointly be assessed the entire costs of the railroad's operations in accordance with uniform units of measure such as ton miles and locomotive miles.

The separation rules by which the passenger deficit is calculated, have been in effect without essential revision since 1936. In the meantime enough of a change in the performance of railway operations has occurred to warrant a reexamination of the basic assumption underlying the rules themselves. In 1936 the total mileage of Class I railroads operated in passenger service represented 76 percent of the total mileage operated in freight service. By 1964 the passenger mileage operated had declined to about 38 percent of the freight mileage. In absolute terms, the miles of road used for passenger service have declined by about 55 percent since 1936, while freight road mileage has dropped less than 10 percent. At the present time passenger service operations earn about 10 percent of total railway operating revenues.

To some degree, at least, passenger service as performed by many railroads may have become a by-product of the freight service, rather than the "common" product assumed by the Commission's accounting rules for allocating common costs. An appropriate change in the rules may therefore be justified at this time.

Any changes, of course, in these rules regarding apportioning expenses between freight and passenger service would have important ramifications, particularly in the area of rate making, and that factor should be given ample consideration. But if assumptions basic to the present rules lack validity, then so, too, must the uses which are made of the statistics derived therefrom, both by management and the public.

The important consideration at this stage, I would emphasize, is not whether the rules or procedures have been correctly applied in the past, but whether they are reliable for the future decision-making. The public policy issues revolving about rail passenger service—including the fair and accurate determination of its costs—are too important to leave to guesswork.

The passenger cars of our railroads traditionally have been the "windows" through which the public has observed and judged the strength and competence of the whole railway system. That tradition will probably continue. Henceforth, it seems to me, these trains will also become windows to the vitality of our entire urban society. The coming years therefore present an unavoidably important challenge to the pride and initiative of our private ownership railroad industry, and to the inventiveness of our public policy. That challenge must be met.

ADVOCATES OF SENATE RATIFICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS WILL NOT SETTLE FOR THREE OUT OF FOUR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I rise today to continue my daily effort to win Senate ratification of the Human Rights Conventions on forced labor, genocide, political rights of women, and slavery.

After almost 2 months of daily speeches on behalf of Senate ratification of these conventions, I am encouraged. Final victory is attainable. Hundreds of citizens have expressed their support for ratification. Advocates of ratification establish one fact that must impress the Senate: The American people are interested and do care about the Human Rights Conventions.

The merits of U.S. ratification are presently the subject of hearings before a Foreign Relations Subcommittee. This is the first opportunity—during the 10 years I have been a Member of the Senate—that any American citizen has had to testify on any of these Human Rights Conventions. These are the first hearings held on any of the four conventions since 1950. I congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator FULBRIGHT, for authorizing this discussion on these profoundly significant conventions.

Mr. President, I want it made crystal clear that the advocates of Senate ratification will not settle for three out of four of these conventions: Forced labor, political rights of women, slavery, without the convention which has been languishing before this body for 18 long years—genocide. That might be a good batting average for a ball player, but here we will not settle for a partial victory. We will continue to work, to urge, and to persevere until the Senate ratifies all four of these conventions.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, when the First World War came to an end, there was wreckage everywhere in Europe. It was a disastrous human tragedy. But there was one bright aspect of that tragedy: many oppressed nationalities which were held down under autocratic regimes were set free. The Estonians were among these people, proclaiming their national independence 49 years ago, on February 24, 1918.

But these brave people were not to enjoy their freedom for long. Two decades after the establishment of the Estonian Republic, it was attacked and occupied by the Red army early in the last war, and then made part of the Soviet Union. Today the once independent and sovereign state of Estonia is a province of the Soviet Union, and the people there do not enjoy any of the freedoms which we consider as our birthright. On the 49th anniversary observance of their Independence Day we ardently hope that the Estonian people will again regain their freedom and national independence.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. Mr. President, every year Members of the Congress set aside their daily legislative tasks to pay tribute to the various countries of Eastern Europe who have been the victim of Communist aggression.

Today we pay tribute to Estonia, a nation small in geographic size and not numerous in population, but a nation that has made a remarkable historical record for itself as an independent nation.

During the interwar period Estonia had firmly established its independence. Here was a nation that was in every true sense, a "going concern." Economically, the people prospered. Culturally, the nation flourished. Socially, Estonians were far advanced. And politically, they had demonstrated the wherewithal to conduct their own affairs as an independent nation state.

We must remind ourselves of this simple fact when we contemplate the condition of Estonia today, a nation conquered by the Soviet Union and incorporated into the U.S.S.R. as a republic.

To all Estonians I raise my voice in prayerful hope that one day they may be able to enjoy the fruits of freedom that once was theirs not too many years ago. They are deserving of a better destiny than subjugation by communism.

Mr. **DODD**. Mr. President, today marks the 49th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Estonia.

Estonian independence was doomed, as was that of the other Baltic States of Latvia and Lithuania, to a short life of only 21 years. In June of 1940, following an ultimatum from the Soviet Union, Communist troops marched into and occupied Estonia.

A Soviet puppet government completely subservient to Russia was imposed on Estonia; a Soviet style, single, Communist-list election of a new parliament was held; the new one-party puppet chamber of deputies decided to rename Estonia a "Soviet Republic" and on August 6, 1940, Estonia was "admitted" to the Soviet Union as a Union Republic.

Midnight terror descended over the once free land of Estonia as the Soviets set out to purge all elements that could interfere with the complete sovietization of the country.

Mass arrests and executions were the order of the day. Prisoners were cruelly tortured and many of those arrested disappeared without any trace.

On the night of June 13, 1941, thousands of families were dragged from their beds, forced into trucks and sent in railway cattle cars to forced labor camps in remote parts of the Soviet Union.

It is interesting to note that the deportation order had been signed on October 11, 1939, only 13 days after the Soviet Union had signed the so-called mutual assistance pact with Estonia and had pledged not to violate Estonian integrity and independence.

Thus the Communists by overpowering military strength and the unrestrained use of terror and brutality crushed another free nation. This rule by force and fear had its beginnings, not in a revolt of the masses as the Soviets would have us believe, but by completely disregarding their pledge to honor a nation's right to chart its own course and to direct its own affairs.

Despite their best efforts, however, the Soviets have not been able to obliterate the spirit of freedom from the hearts of Estonians.

Although oppressed and exploited, Estonia has never been reconciled to the status of a Soviet colony. On this day when they celebrate their Independence Day with mingled emotions, I want them to know that we in the United States are aware of their predicament.

We are deeply committed to the principles of freedom and self-determination for all peoples, and we shall not rest until Estonia and other nations enslaved by the Communists have restored to them their God-given rights of freedom, independence, and self-determination.

NEED FOR ANOTHER HOOVER-TYPE COMMISSION WIDELY RECOGNIZED

Mr. **PEARSON**. Mr. President, on January 11, I introduced a bill S. 47, calling for the establishment of another Hoover-type commission to study and appraise the organization and operation of the executive branch of the Government for the purpose of recommending means by which the efficiency and effectiveness of the Federal bureaucracy can be improved. The response has been gratifying, with 38 of my colleagues joining as cosponsors.

In addition, Mr. President, it has recently come to my attention that the Comptroller General of the United States, the Honorable Elmer B. Staats, has reviewed S. 47 and has indicated that whereas the earlier Hoover Commissions contributed to the efficiency and economy in the operation of the Government, he sees no objection to the establishment of a similar commission at this time if the Congress feels that such action is presently desirable.

Mr. President, I believe that there is general agreement, not only in Congress, but within the executive branch itself, to the effect that there is a real need for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the administration of the vast array of existing Federal programs. The question then is not so much whether or not improvements can and should be made, but what should be the vehicle for bringing about these improvements.

I am fully aware that President Johnson has from time to time instructed the executive departments and agencies to review their programs and procedures with the view in mind of improving their administration. I am also confident that those responsible conscientiously make an effort to eliminate waste and to improve the efficiency of the bureaucracy.

On the other hand, I think it is quite clear that what we need at this stage is a thorough, overall review, rather than piecemeal review within each department. Moreover, this review to be most effective should be made by an independent group such as a Hoover-type commission.

Mr. President, within the past 2 weeks I have again been rather forcefully reminded of the need for eliminating redtape and inefficiency. Various spokesmen for educational institutions in Kansas have reported that the whole area of Federal aid to education has become so wrapped up in governmental redtape and paperwork that educational institutions, particularly elementary and secondary schools and smaller junior colleges, find it increasingly difficult to take full and effective advantage of the Federal aid programs which Congress has written into law.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that the Senate will act on this measure at the earliest possible date.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from Pennsylvania will state it.

Mr. **CLARK**. Is there further morning business?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there further morning business?

Mr. **CLARK**. If not, Mr. President, I suggest that morning business be closed.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Chair lays before the Senate the pending business, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 655) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **MONRONEY**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REDUCTION OF U.S. FORCES IN WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, according to this morning's press, there are diplomatic reports that the United States is planning to withdraw a single American division from Western Germany. The reports indicate that the decision is to be made because the West German Government is no longer able or willing, financially, to offset the dollar costs of deploying U.S. troops in Germany by arms purchases in the United States. Since this Nation has some financial problems of its own, according to the reports, it will be necessary for us to make a reduction in our forces in Western Europe.

These reports, Mr. President, are most disturbing. The present strength of U.S. forces in Western Europe is in excess of five divisions, on the basis of a commitment to NATO which was made many years ago. The full commitment has been rather rigidly maintained on the grounds that reductions would be detrimental to the defense of Europe and the North Atlantic region. Indeed, this Nation has been critical, and properly so, of European nations which for some years have been neither zealous nor nimble in meeting similar commitments of their own to NATO. Except for France, these nations have generally been prepared to acknowledge the vital necessity of our maintaining our full commitment, if we insist upon it, but they have not been prepared to meet the commitments of forces and resources which, along with us, they made some years ago.

According to the reports previously noted, this Nation has now found that five divisions-plus are no longer necessary and that it can do with one less U.S. division in Europe. Is this reduction possible because the overall situation has changed in Europe? Because the threat from the East is less? Because the military techniques, particularly in transport, have been improved? There is no indication in the reports that the reduction of one division will be made for any of these highly relevant reasons. Rather, the reduction is apparently going to be made because we are short of exchange dollars and the German Government says that it cannot go on making up the shortages by buying U.S. arms.

I would most respectfully suggest that that is the one consideration which ought not to govern in a situation which involves the vital defense needs of this Nation. If it is essential to the security of the United States to maintain the present troop deployment in Europe, we would be most derelict in cutting that level by even one division on the grounds that exchange dollars are tight; if exchange dollars are the problem, let them be found in nonvital areas of national activity. If we really need these forces in Europe, by all means, let us keep them there regardless of whether or not the Germans are prepared to cover the dollar costs.

But if the present U.S. military deployment in Europe is, in truth, swollen beyond present need, if it exceeds the requirements of the realities of Europe, then, by all means, let us reduce that deployment. Let us reduce it, whether dollars are scarce or plentiful, whether the Germans are willing or unwilling to underwrite the exchange costs. Let us reduce it, not by one division, but let us reduce it substantially and as soon as feasible.

These forces in Europe should be reduced—if I dare use the term—on the basis of principle rather than pennies. On many occasions in the past, I have made clear my own views on what I believe to be a "substantial" but reasonable redeployment of U.S. forces in Europe. As I see it, two U.S. divisions in Europe, 20 years after World War II, in a time of rapid thaw in the political climate of Europe, in the light of this Nation's unchanged and binding commitment under the North Atlantic Treaty, would be more than adequate. Although I shall reserve final judgment on this question until hearings on pertinent resolutions now pending in the Senate are completed, I am frank to say that the views of the distinguished first Supreme Commander of NATO, General Dwight D. Eisenhower, have weighed heavily with me in reaching the tentative conclusion that two divisions would be sufficient. He has used that same figure as representative of a desirable level. I am also reassured by the recent suggestion of General Gavin, who, out of a long military and diplomatic experience and his previous service with NATO, has arrived at the same figure.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, at a time when the United States cannot balance its budget, continues to pile up multibillion-dollar deficits year after year, suffers from severe annual balance-of-payments deficits, and is engaged in a $2 billion a month war in Vietnam, it becomes increasingly imperative that action be taken to reduce some of our unnecessary and nonessential spending abroad.

It has long been my view that one such area for possible corrective action is our vast foreign aid program. There is a great need for a reappraisal for foreign aid, and it is high time that we determine whether or not America can really afford to play policeman, banker, and Santa Claus for the entire free world. Judging from our worsening fiscal situation, it does not appear that we can keep it up very long at the present rate.

Also, there is mounting support, in the Senate as well as throughout the country, for reducing our troops commitments in Western Europe. United States support of our military forces in Western Europe, now comprising between five and six divisions, costs approximately $2½ billion a year, and about $1 billion of that winds up in a dollar deficit and eventually a further drain upon our gold reserves. I am cosponsoring the majority leader's resolution calling for a substantial reduction in our troops in Europe, a resolution which I hope will be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. President, the February 15 issue of Forbes magazine contains an excellent editorial which declares that "continuing to maintain 349,000 Americans in uniform in Europe is expensive foolishness." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOP TO IT

Continuing to maintain 349,000 Americans in uniform in Europe is expensive foolishness.

Three-and-a-half years ago on this page in an editorial entitled, "The Troops, the Gold, the Deficit" I wrote: "Is the presence of American forces in this huge number still necessary? . . . It is not the number of American forces present [in Europe] which is the prime deterrent. It is the American presence at the borders of the Iron Curtain, on the seas of the Mediterranean and our unadulterated commitment via NATO to meet and return any assault on the free nations of Western Europe. . . ."

Again from this page a year and a half ago: ". . . we can bring home our huge army, leaving only token forces as symbolic of our presence and intended return if the need arises."

Today we are engaged in a larger war than the Korean one and a war that's more expensive per annum than World War II. We not only don't *need* a mammoth army in Europe, but we cannot afford what the cost of maintaining it is doing to our trade imbalance.

If we and our dollar are not strong, all the nuances and niceties of relations with West Germany won't be worth a tinker's dam to the German government. Even Ike weeks ago declared that U.S. ground forces in Europe could be reduced two-thirds without harm to allied security.

Surely this is one matter in which the Johnson Administration could stop fiddling while the dollars fly. Come to think of it, detrooping Americans from Europe is one of those rare few cases where what makes sense would also make votes.

What more could a President want to spur an action long needed?

MILITARY PROCUREMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 665) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if I might have the attention of my friend from Georgia, I should like to address a few questions to him with respect to the committee report, and I first ask him to turn to page 5 of the report. I read from the first paragraph on that page:

> When the fiscal year 1967 Defense budget was presented to the Congress the Department of Defense assumed for planning purposes that the war in Vietnam would end by June 30, 1967. The record is clear that this assumption was not a prediction, but instead was a more or less arbitrary basis for determining the amount of the funding then to be sought, just as July 1 of one year through June 30 of the next are the more or less arbitrary limiting dates for determining the size of authorization and appropriation for any given year.

I assume—and I put it in the form of a question—that the Department of Defense has changed its mind about the war ending on June 30, 1967; and I wonder on what assumption the present request for authorization and for supplemental appropriations is based, with respect to the end of the war for planning purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if I understood the position of the Department last year, this target date or this date of June 30, 1967, was used because that is the end of the fiscal year, and was used for bookkeeping purposes rather than as a prediction that the war would end on that date.

It would be well to remember that as a result of making enormous open end appropriations during the Korean conflict, when that conflict ended, there were several billions of dollars of appropriations, which had been made on a supplemental basis, unspent; and when World War II came to a conclusion, even more billions of dollars had been appropriated for which there was no longer any rquirement. The war was over, but the unobligated appropriations were still in existence.

I am sure Secretary McNamara's desire to avoid an enormous carryover in the event the war should end had something to do with selecting this date. He was examined very closely about it, because some of us had been on the committee for a long time, and recalled that there had not been any similar assumptions for budgetary purposes in the case of Korea or World War II.

The pending bill and the 1968 authorization were formulated in an attempt to avoid the submission of another large supplemental next year. This requires projecting requirements through the length of time it takes to procure some of these weapons systems. For example, some aircraft, as I recall, require almost 2 years to be put in inventory after you have entered into the initial contract for their procurement. I do not know whether that answers the Senator's question or not.

Mr. CLARK. I suspect it answers it as well as it is possible to answer it. Of course, this is a very complicated matter, and the accounting is very difficult, indeed; but I would call the Senator's attention to the testimony of Secretary McNamara which appears on pages 10 and 11 of the hearings. I quote from the last full paragraph on page 10:

> In the case of aircraft, which have a production lead time of about 18 months, we have included sufficient funds in the FY 1967 Supplemental and the regular FY 1968 Budget to cover deliveries at rates sufficient to offset combat attrition in Southeast Asia to January 1, 1970. If it later appears that all of such aircraft will not be required to replace combat attrition, the production of some might be cancelled and some used to modernize the forces at a faster rate than presently planned.
>
> Similar provisions have been made in the FY 1967 Supplemental and the FY 1968 Budget for other categories of material which would be affected by the continuation of combat operations in Southeast Asia beyond June 1968. Accordingly, barring a significant change in the character or scope of the Southeast Asia conflict, or unforeseen contingencies elsewhere in the world, the FY 1967 Supplemental and FY 1968 Budget should be sufficient to cover our requirements until FY 1969 funds become available, even if the conflict continues beyond June 30, 1968.

This confuses me because of the use, in the first part of what I read, of the date January 1, 1970, and then later of the date June 30, 1968. I wonder if the Senator could help clarify that apparent ambiguity.

Mr. RUSSELL. In my opinion, the Secretary was trying to avoid the criticism that was heaped on him for making a budget assumption in the supplemental last year.

Mr. CLARK. But there must be some basis on which he asks for these huge sums of money, and I wonder what it is. I mean some time basis.

Mr. RUSSELL. The committee undertook to deal with that on page 5 of the report, under the subheading "Procurement." I direct the Senator's attention to that statement which says:

> The largest part of the authorization this bill would provide is for the procurement of aircraft and missiles.
>
> In presenting its procurement requests in this supplemental, and the fiscal year 1968 program—

That is, the regular authorization that will follow this one——

Mr. CLARK. We do not know how much that is yet, do we?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, we do not know what the committee will recommend. We know what the administration has requested.

Mr. CLARK. Can the Senator tell us what they have requested?

Mr. RUSSELL. About $75 billion as I recall.

Mr. CLARK. Of which how much, in the Senator's opinion, would be for the war in Vietnam?

Mr. RUSSELL. Around $23 to $24 billion.

Mr. CLARK. So that the costs will be continuing to run, for the foreseeable future, at about $2 billion a month?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. I hasten to add that that is merely a personal estimate I am making.

Mr. CLARK. I understand.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say to the Senator that the department has not submitted to us any official separation of the costs. But to carry on the war at the present tempo, or to increase it slightly—as there are some indications we may—will cost, in my opinion, in the neighborhood of $2 billion a month.

Mr. CLARK. It is my recollection, from having attended a White House briefing which I do not think was classified, that the Secretary of Defense indicated he thought the fiscal demands for the war were leveling off and were not apt to increase and the manpower requirements in terms of draft and recruitment might decrease. Is that the understanding of the Senator?

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not attend the conference to which the Senator refers. I do not believe I heard that particular statement on the part of the Secretary. However, it is my opinion that the expenditures are leveling off.

As I said yesterday, some of the large construction items will not appear in subsequent authorizations or appropriations unless there is some great expansion of the war from some source other than North Vietnam.

I am not quite as optimistic as the Secretary is about the Selective Service System requirements being greatly reduced. That will largely depend on the number of young men who voluntarily enlist in order to serve in the branch of service of their choice.

We have over 600,000 more men in uniform in the service today on active duty than we had when the buildup for the war in Vietnam started.

Mr. CLARK. Which is somewhat more than the round number stated presently in the newspapers to be engaging in the combat in Vietnam, which I understand is about 389,000. I believe that figure appears in the hearings.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe that the last figure I had was 414,000, in Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. Does that not include the Navy?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think so. The round figure, including the Navy and those in Thailand, is in the neighborhood of 500,000 men.

Mr. CLARK. Perhaps my figure was as of the end of the year, and it has gone up.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. Additional units have been introduced into Vietnam since the first of the year.

Mr. CLARK. If I were to say the war in Vietnam for the foreseeable future will cost about $2 billion a month, I take it I would find myself in accord with the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is my own estimate of the financial cost of this conflict. I regret the necessity for it.

Warfare with modern weapon systems has increased in cost tremendously, and the cost of killing one man in the Revolutionary War is practically insignificant when compared to the cost of killing one of our adversaries in the present conflict.

Mr. CLARK. I am aware of an estimate that it costs us $350,000 to kill each Vietcong.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have been unable to get a definite figure from the Secretary of Defense or the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs in answer to that question.

I had seen figures compiled from all of the other wars, showing how the cost had increased. I think it had increased to more than $50,000 in World War II. So, I would not dispute the figure of the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. I am not very good at what is now referred to as the new math, but I think if we were to take $2 billion a month as the cost of the war and added up the daily casualty list—the Department of Defense takes such joy in telling us how many Vietcong were killed every day and did a little long division, we would come out with a figure.

I will undertake to do that before the debate is over and see whether the figure of $350,000 is more or less correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would not challenge the figure. My own estimate, to pick a figure hastily, would be $300,000.

Mr. CLARK. I certainly would not quarrel over the extra $50,000.

If the Senator would look at the bottom of page 5 of the report, I wonder if there is not a typographical error there.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. The punctuation on the last line is erroneous. The commas should not be there.

Mr. CLARK. I was thinking of the figure $1 billion. As I add up the totals on page 6 for aircraft, the figure would be different.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator would eliminate the commas, the sentence would read:

> Almost $1 billion of the total procurement authorization is intended for additional aircraft spares and repair parts.

This does not refer to the purchase of aircraft itself, but to the spares and repair parts. The commas crept in through inadvertence and do not belong there.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator would agree then that the figures on page 6 under aircraft, Army, aircraft, Navy and Marine Corps, and aircraft, Air Force, for aircraft, aircraft spares and repair parts add up to $3.5 billion out of the total authorization.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. So that about three-fourths of the additional authorization is for aircraft and maintenance parts.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Can the Senator tell me how much of that would be utilized for the bombing of the north as opposed to supporting aviation in the south?

Mr. RUSSELL. I would be impossible for me to break it down to that degree. Frankly, I do not know just how many missions our forces fly. Some weeks the weather is so bad that they complete hardly any missions in the north. At other times, they intensify their attack.

I would think that very few of the Army aircraft would be used against the north because that is largely helicopters. But the Navy and Marine Corps and Air Force aircraft, where it is necessary, are used in both North and South Vietnam. Some missions would be in the south and some missions of the same planes would be in the north on the very next day.

Mr. CLARK. Generally speaking could the Senator estimate whether the expenditures for aircraft and spare parts for use in the north are heavier or lighter than the expenditures for use in the south?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is infinitely heavier in the north. We lose many more planes and pilots in the north.

The area around Hanoi and Haiphong is now one of the most heavily defended with conventional antiaircraft weapons that our Air Force and Navy pilots have ever encountered in any war.

Mr. CLARK. It is my understanding—and the Senator will correct me if I am wrong—that we are presently using artillery against North Vietnam. Is that statement correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I heard that report on the radio this morning. That is the only information I have about it. Our Navy has not fired from ship to shore in North Vietnam except in 1 or 2 instances where our ships have been fired upon by shore batteries.

We have fired a great many shells at sampans and barges that were undertaking to supply the forces in the south, but we have not directed fire from our ships against the shore, although I have urged this be done.

Mr. CLARK. How about the use of Army and Marine Corps artillery against North Vietnam?

Mr. RUSSELL. As I say, that is a new development. If it has happened at all, it has happened in the last 48 hours.

Mr. CLARK. It did not develop in the course of the hearings.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, it did not. The committee was not advised that this was planned.

It has been under consideration, but if any decision has been made to direct artillery fire against concentrations of North Vietnamese soldiers in North Vietnam, that determination has been made in the last few days.

I understand the news reports are that we are firing across the demilitarized zone.

Mr. RUSSELL. I heard that on the radio this morning.

Mr. CLARK. I note under the heading of "Missiles" that relatively small amounts are authorized for the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force—a total of approximately $100 million. I wonder whether the Senator can tell us if there are any plans for using missiles against North Vietnam.

Mr. RUSSELL. We are using some types of missiles now.

Mr. CLARK. Ground-to-ground?

Mr. RUSSELL. Air-to-ground.

Mr. CLARK. Air-to-ground?

Mr. RUSSELL. We have not used—and I know of no plans to use—any ground-to-ground missile; but we have used some of our smaller air-to-ground missiles in an effort to knock out bridges and targets of that kind, as well as radar sites.

We have used a great many air-to-ground missiles in an effort to blind the direction of the antiaircraft fire against our planes.

Mr. CLARK. Referring to page 6 and the subheading "Missiles," I see references, both with respect to the Marine Corps and to the Army, to Hawk missile systems. They are not air-to-ground missiles, are they?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. Hawk is a defensive missile system that is deployed in the event that the North Vietnamese Air Force decide to attack our installations in the south.

Mr. CLARK. In effect, it is something close to antiaircraft?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is a missile that is designed to knock down hostile aircraft. It is a defensive antiaircraft missile. Its purpose is similar to that of the so-called SAM missile that has been utilized against our planes in North Vietnam, except that we hope it will be much more effective, and I am convinced that it will be.

Mr. CLARK. Can the Senator assure me that no part of this authorization is to be used for atomic warheads?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes, indeed. I can with complete confidence assure the Senator that none of these funds will be used for the purchase of atomic warheads.

Mr. CLARK. So that when we are speaking of missiles, we are speaking of missiles with conventional warheads?

Mr. RUSSELL. With conventional explosives.

Mr. CLARK. I call the Senator's attention to page 7, to the heading "Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation." A relatively small amount of $135 million is to be authorized for research and development. I wonder why this was not funded in the regular 1967 proposal.

Mr. RUSSELL. Some of it was, but this is largely to accelerate development of weapons and devices that will enable us to meet the peculiar conditions of combat in Vietnam. Some of these matters are highly classified, and I would not go into the details. But we have considerable research to improve our ability to fight at night, to distinguish between our enemies and our friends, and we are undertaking to develop that type of equipment.

Mr. CLARK. Obviously, I do not suggest that the Senator should violate security; but I wonder if he can give me any assurance that no part of this research, development, test, and evaluation authorization is for poison gas.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not completely clear as to what is called poison gas. The ordinary tear gas that we have utilized in South Vietnam is called poison gas by some people.

Mr. CLARK. Even though it is used by many of our police forces.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not so define it. But we have not used any gas over there that is not available to the police forces of even the smallest communities in this country and that is not utilized by our city police forces on occasion.

While there was no testimony taken on this subject, I am quite confident that none of this money is for the development or use of poison gas. We know a great deal more about poison gas now than we have ever utilized. We made enormous research in that area before and during World War II, when both sides were waiting to see if the other was planning to release poison gas, and both sides decided that it would be much too disastrous for all concerned, and neither took the initiative. I hope that that will also be true with respect to the utilization of nuclear weapons.

Mr. CLARK. I would, too. I imagine, however, that the Senator would agree that what we used to call, in the old days, the Chemical Warfare Service has not been idle in pursuing research and development.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no. We still have chemical warfare work, and in my opinion it is efficient and effective. And we have new methods of utilizing chemicals in war, but none of them have been brought to bear against North Vietnam, except for the defoliation of trees, to enable us to discover infiltrators from the north.

Mr. CLARK. How about napalm?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is not a gas. That is more in the nature of a bomb. It is a very deadly and horrifying weapon.

I may say to the Senator that appropriations for the acquisition of napalm or bombs or ammunition is not required to be authorized specifically, and therefore such authorization would not be in this bill, although there probably is money for the purchase of some napalm in the appropriation that will follow this authorization.

Mr. CLARK. I share the hope of the Senator from Georgia that neither he nor I will live to see the day when atomic weapons are again used for other than peaceful purposes. My own view is that there is almost as great a danger of radiological, chemical, biological warfare as there is of nuclear warfare; and I do not believe that the American people have paid much attention to that threat.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is true. We have spent a great deal of money on research in this field and know of many methods that would produce almost unbelievable destruction and death if they were employed in the case of hostilities. I may say that the United States is not alone in that. I am confident that all the other military powers of the earth, including those of the Soviet Union, have not neglected research in the field of chemical and biological warfare, to wipe out plantlife of all kinds over vast areas, as well as human life.

Mr. CLARK. I am sure the Senator is correct. This is an area where the possibility of effective arms control or disarmament measures is hindered by the old inspection problem; because I imagine that it would be difficult, indeed, to detect the research, development, and manufacture of these weapons of war without on-site inspection.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is correct. And even on-site inspection would be very difficult, because some of these activities could be concealed.

Mr. CLARK. I ask the Senator to turn to page 8 of the report, which deals with military construction. He will note that the total requested for authorization is $624,500,000.

I would like to ask the Senator how much of this money is intended for permanent bases in South Vietnam.

Mr. RUSSELL. The declared policy of our Government has repeatedly expressed to the entire world that we are not seeking bases there and that we will surrender all of these installations upon the attainment of peace and any assurance of peace under which the people of South Vietnam will be permitted to select their own form of government.

If the Senator is talking about the nature of the bases themselves, many of the improvements are of a permanent type. At Cam Ranh Bay, where we have dredged out a harbor, even if the war ended tomorrow and our forces were brought home, we would not go back and fill in the harbor. The construction at that location is one of the more expensive projects we have had there.

Mr. CLARK. If we made that commitment the bases would not be overgrown with jungle, as in some parts of the country. With respect to the permanence and importance of these bases and the vast sums of money spent for them, it might be an occasion for some skepticism on the part of our enemies.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is undoubtedly true. I think Ho Chi Minh believes hardly anything we say.

Mr. CLARK. I would like to ask the Senator why the need for this military construction was not foreseen last year. Is this something that came upon us suddenly?

Mr. RUSSELL. A great deal of this authorization is to improve and enlarge installations that were established last year.

Mr. CLARK. Is any part of this requested money needed because the cost of these installations is higher than the original estimate?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. There was a large cost overrun of original estimates; around 23 percent, as I recall.

(At this point, Mr. BYRD of Virginia assumed the chair.)

Mr. CLARK. I see $138,900,000 in the authorization is to cover the cost of overruns in Vietnam, Thailand, and Taiwan, and that the South Vietnam overrun is about 23 percent.

I wonder whether the Senator can give us any idea of the profits that the contracting companies are making for doing this work. I noted yesterday afternoon that the Senator accepted the amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], which, as I recall, calls for competitive bidding.

Can the Senator enlighten us as to whether these military construction items resulted from competitive bidding and what profits were made, and whether the contracts are subject to renegotiation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no figures on the profits that have been made. I am quite sure that these contracts are subject to renegotiation. Unfortunately, some of the largest of them are on a cost-plus basis, which is always expensive.

Mr. CLARK. Is that a cost-plus-fixed-fee or percentage of cost?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it is cost-plus-fixed-fee. Procurement law prohibits the use of the cost-plus-a-percentage of cost type of contract.

Mr. CLARK. Has an audit of the cost of these bases been made, either by the General Accounting Office or the accounting agencies within the Department of Defense?

Mr. RUSSELL. The General Accounting Office has made some spot checks and reports, and they have a task force out there at the present time undertaking to delve into the situation.

Mr. CLARK. I understand the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], representing the Committee on Government Operations, recently received a good deal of money, through the Committee on Rules, and with the approval of the Senate, to investigate alleged misconduct on the part of contractors in Vietnam. I have been concerned that this was perhaps an overlap of jurisdiction on the Committee on Armed Services. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] assured me that that was not the case, and that it was appropriate for the Committee on Government Operations to move into that area, which I thought was subject to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Committee on Government Operations has broad jurisdiction. The Senator will recall that the famous TFX inquiry was conducted by the Committee on Government Operations. I never did challenge their right to do it. They had a larger staff than we in the Armed Services Committee and they had a number of investigators in the employ of the committee.

If the Armed Services Committee had undertaken to conduct that inquiry, we would have been compelled to employ many new employees.

If the Senator will indulge me, yesterday in a colloquy, the Senator requested information that I did not have available at that time. I have now undertaken to secure some statistics from the Department of Defense, and I offer them for the RECORD this morning.

The Senator asked with respect to the total number of deaths due to the combat action of hostile forces. I am informed that during the calendar year 1966 the total deaths sustained by our forces in Vietnam in battle was 5,008. The total of nonfatal wounds from hostile forces was 30,093. The number of deaths that were not the result of action by hostile forces was 1,045.

Information about the number of casualties as a result of bombing in North Vietnam is not now compiled exactly as the Senator from Pennsylvania requested.

Mr. CLARK. This has reference to our casualties in Vietnam.

Mr. RUSSELL. The statements I have just made relate to our casualties and include those on the ground and in the air.

During the period from January 1, 1961, to February 11, 1967, the number of deaths from aircraft accidents or incidents as a result of action by hostile forces totals 384 for our fixed-wing pilots and 387 for our helicopter pilots.

Mr. CLARK. I note that that is for 1961. I would be much more interested in what the casualties were in 1966. They probably constitute the greater part, although I may be wrong.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Department is undertaking to secure that information; they did not have it immediately available.

We have 363 members of our Armed Forces missing and 141 captured or interned. These figures cover actions in South Vietnam as well as in North Vietnam.

The number of U.S. aircraft lost in Vietnam in the calendar year 1966 from operational causes and as a result of hostile fire is 981. This total includes both fixed-wing and helicopter aircraft, and includes losses in both North Vietnam and South Vietnam. The figure is for the calendar year 1966.

The value of these aircraft is difficult to establish precisely. The value of the aircraft lost in fiscal year 1966 is estimated to be $900 million.

The estimated value of aircraft lost in fiscal year 1967, some of which, of course, lies ahead, is estimated to be $1,600 million.

Mr. CLARK. The cost is going up very fast, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, the cost of aircraft is going up rapidly.

For the calendar year 1966, it would not be too inaccurate to split the difference between those figures and to estimate the value of the 981 aircraft lost at $1,250 million. The latter figure is for the calendar year.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Georgia for furnishing that very helpful information.

(At this point, Mr. KENNEDY of New York assumed the chair.)

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I could not hear all the figures given by the Senator from Georgia. Do I correctly understand that American casualties for the calendar year 1966 are, in round figures, 5,000 killed and 30,000 wounded?

Mr. RUSSELL. There were 5,008 killed in action. The number of wounded in action was 30,093.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. The number of deaths

that were not as a result of action by hostile forces is 1,045. That 1,045, of course, is not included in the 5,008, but is in addition to that figure.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Then the total casualties would be 6,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. Including those totals, it would be.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Then it would be 6,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, but not lost in action; not all of them were killed by hostile fire.

Mr. CLARK. I have only two more questions to ask the Senator from Georgia on the report.

First, I note that under "Military construction," it is proposed to authorize $108,500,000 for Thailand, a part of which is for the Army and the larger part for the Air Force. Will the Senator give us some idea of the kind of military construction we are now conducting in Thailand? Is this largely for airbases?

Mr. RUSSELL. For some time we have been working on the development of ports. A small portion of this money will go into the dredging of breakwaters and other developments.

Mr. CLARK. That would be charged to the Army, would it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the Navy is the construction agent in charge of the work.

Mr. CLARK. There is nothing in the bill for the Navy, according to the table for Thailand, on page 8.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. The funding of the work in that area is to the Army and the Air Force.

Mr. CLARK. The Army Engineers?

Mr. RUSSELL. It appears as an Army item.

Mr. CLARK. A good deal of this military construction is for air bases, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes. It is for the development of some of the airfields now in use. We are building a rather expensive road network to connect these airfields.

Mr. CLARK. It has finally come into the public domain, has it not, and is no longer secret, that we are using airfields in Thailand to conduct operations against North Vietnam?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have read that in the newspapers. I am not in a position to confirm or deny it on the floor of the Senate from any officials of the Government.

Mr. CLARK. My final question to the Senator is whether he would agree, as I have been told, that the total amount authorized in military construction in southeast Asia through and including the Department of Defense requests for the 1968 fiscal year budget is approximately $2,600 million.

Mr. RUSSELL. That figure is approximately correct, because we have funded in southeast Asia through the fiscal year 1966 supplemental appropriation approximately $1,750 million; so the Senator's figures are approximately correct.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator would permit me, I would like to ask unanimous consent to have the table entitled "Scope of Southeast Asia Construction Program," which appears on page 149 of the hearings, printed in the RECORD.

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly have no objection. That is a part of a page from the committee hearings, I believe.

Mr. CLARK. Yes. That would show that the total for South Vietnam for fiscal years 1965 through 1968 would be $1,569 million out of a grand total of $2,666,700,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Scope of southeast Asia construction program

	Secretary of Defense worldwide contingency (fiscal year 1968)	Army	Navy	Air Force	Total
Fiscal year 1965 regular:					
South Vietnam		15.5	9.4	11.2	36.1
Outside South Vietnam			5.1	11.9	17.0
Subtotal		15.5	14.5	23.1	53.1
Fiscal year 1965 supplemental:					
South Vietnam		36.1	17.4	21.4	74.9
Outside South Vietnam		8.7	4.6	19.6	32.9
Subtotal		44.8	22.0	41.0	107.8
Fiscal year 1965 MAP transfer [1]		21.4	3.1	15.2	39.7
Fiscal year 1965 total		81.7	39.6	79.3	200.6
Fiscal year 1966 regular:					
South Vietnam		29.6	30.3	13.5	73.4
Outside South Vietnam			9.5		9.5
Subtotal		29.6	39.8	13.5	82.9
Fiscal year 1966 amendment:					
South Vietnam		35.9	32.9	39.2	108.0
Outside South Vietnam		28.7	10.3	18.7	57.7
Subtotal		64.6	43.2	57.9	165.7
Fiscal year 1966 supplemental:					
South Vietnam		358.5	177.6	148.4	684.5
Outside South Vietnam		203.2	83.4	171.0	457.6
Planning		29.8	14.9	15.9	60.6
Subtotal		591.5	275.9	335.3	1,202.7
Fiscal year 1966 MAP transfer [1]		46.6	7.5	11.9	66.0
Fiscal year 1966 total		732.3	366.4	418.6	1,517.3
Fiscal year 1967 budget:					
South Vietnam				6.0	6.0
Outside South Vietnam		.3		4.0	4.3
Subtotal		.3		10.0	10.3
Fiscal year 1967 supplemental:					
South Vietnam		217.6	76.2	103.5	397.3
Outside South Vietnam		70.9	59.8	86.9	217.6
Planning			4.0	5.6	9.6
Subtotal		288.5	140.0	196.0	624.5
Fiscal year 1967 total		288.8	140.0	206.0	634.8
Fiscal year 1968 regular:					
South Vietnam		39.2	13.7	24.2	77.1
Outside South Vietnam		1.7	24.2	9.8	35.7
Planning		.1	.1	1.0	1.2
Contingency fund	200				200.0
Fiscal year 1968 total	200	41.0	38.0	35.0	314.0
Total, fiscal years 1965–68:					
South Vietnam		800.4	368.1	394.5	1,563.0
Outside South Vietnam		313.5	196.9	321.9	832.3
Planning		29.9	19.0	22.5	71.4
Contingency	200				200.0
Grand total	200	1,143.8	584.0	738.9	2,666.7

[1] MAP transfer executed in calendar year 1966.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as I stated earlier, one can understand the skepticism of the Vietnamese—south as well as north—as to whether we are really going to get out of that part of the world when peace comes, in view of the enormous investment we are making in military construction in that area.

Mr. RUSSELL. It all depends on whom they prefer to believe. Many of our officials have said that if the war ends and the people of South Vietnam have the right to choose their own system of government, we will withdraw completely. I prefer to believe them. I must say, however, that there is nothing in the record from Korea and other places in the world to serve as an example. But these installations would have great economic value to the government of South Vietnam, or to a unified Vietnam should North Vietnam prevail in this war.

This construction is not limited to airbases. We are also building hospitals and barracks that can be used for living quarters that are much better than any the ordinary citizens in the rice paddies know.

Mr. CLARK. As I understand, the figures we are talking about are exclusive of anything that is done under the foreign aid program; is that not correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. So they must be added to those figures.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. It is also exclusive of anything that the Asian Development Bank may finance, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

This is purely an authorization for military appropriations.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator very much for his cooperation, and for his candid answers to my questions.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] wishes to make a speech at this point; accordingly, I yield the floor.

IT'S ONE WORLD

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I support the supplemental authorization. I warmly commend the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], for the fine way in which he has handled once again this year the authorization for supplemental funds for the Department of Defense in connection with our effort in Vietnam.

The hearings were thorough, and treated the subject in depth. All who participated in them were given the opportunity to examine thoroughly the department representatives. We were able to explore all aspects of the problem as carefully and thoughtfully as Senators had time to ask questions.

I congratulate the Senator from Georgia on the fair and objective way in which he always handles all matters in the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, sometimes I wonder whether the main battlefield in the Vietnamese war will prove to be the battlefield of public opinion here at home. Hanoi may be hoping to win a victory on the political front in this country, as it won in Paris in 1954. Certainly the hope that the war will become a bitterly divisive and partisan issue encourages them to hold on despite the heavy losses our forces are inflicting. We cannot be defeated militarily. That must be as clear to Hanoi as it is to us. The chance of failure now lies in the possibility that the American people will not understand the importance of pursuing this limited war for limited objectives to a successful conclusion, and will turn to one extreme or the other—to those who want to quit or to those who want to go to all-out bombing, and as they say, "get it over with."

We in Congress, with our special opportunities to inform ourselves, have a special obligation, I believe, to contribute to a popular understanding of the stakes in Vietnam in relation to our world policies.

One of the hard-learned lessons about foreign and defense policies is that everything is related to everything else. As Wendell Willkie said, we live in one world. What we do in Europe has its ramifications in Asia and Latin America and Africa. What we do in Vietnam cannot be understood in isolation from the problems of policy toward the Soviet Union, NATO, and Communist China. One of the disturbing features of the discussion of American policy in Vietnam, especially in circles that like to be thought sophisticated, is that so many of the participants do not see much beyond Vietnam.

But the Vietnam problem does not make sense except as we fit it into our conception of where we are and where we are going in the world. If the stakes in Vietnam were restricted to Vietnam, we would be concerned and unhappy at the fate of the Vietnamese people, but it is not likely that we would have taken a stand there. For if the struggle had no wider implications, we could not justify the cost of that stand in terms of a clear and present threat to our national interests.

But the stakes in Vietnam are critical to our foreign and defense policies as a whole. The United States is not, as some of its critics at home and abroad charge with easy assurance, a champion of the status quo. We have done more than anyone else to encourage and accelerate the processes of political, social, and economic change that are shaking the old order of things around the globe. What we do champion is peaceful change; what we strenuously oppose, with a long hard look at our own national interests, is the revision of the status quo by direct or indirect aggression.

This national interest comes into sharpest focus when any one power threatens to gain hegemony in Europe or the Far East. We have fought two World Wars on that account. This was the essential basis of the Marshall plan. It was the essential basis of NATO. It was the essential basis of the Korean war. It was the essential basis of SEATO. It is the essential basis of our stand in Vietnam.

When the Senate ratified the SEATO Treaty and the protocol thereto in 1954 it was thinking not merely of Vietnam but of the fate of the whole region of southeast Asia. This is reflected in the Senate debate and the national debate at the time. The intent of the SEATO Treaty was to try to create a balance of forces to prevent any one nation from dominating southeast Asia by external violence.

In Europe we and our allies have succeeded in creating a reliable balance of forces. The freedom and independence of Western Europe rests on this balance, which serves not only the national interests of the European states but also our own. In Asia we and our allies there are seeking, with far greater prospects of success than is recognized by those whose gaze is riveted on Vietnam, to create a reliable balance of forces, and, if we succeed, the benefits will accrue not only to the non-Communist countries of Asia but also to ourselves and to our European allies.

Any examination of American foreign and defense policies naturally begins with the Soviet Union. In 1967, as throughout the postwar period, the conflict of purposes and policies between the two super-powers is correctly seen as the problem that must be managed successfully if our children are to inherit a world whose peaceful possibilities have not been foreclosed.

There is a lively belief in some quarters that the problem of relations with the Soviet Union has taken a radical and reassuring turn. Some people contend that there is little danger of future Soviet aggression because of political and economic changes within the Soviet Union. The relative tempering of Soviet behavior since Stalin has led some people to believe that at long last the Soviet Union is ready to move toward the genuine settlement of basic East-West issues. Some people even see Communist China as the one disturbing power in the world and the Sino-Soviet rift as a doorway through which the Soviet Union is likely to step to rejoin Western civilization.

It would, of course, be extremely foolish to assert that the Soviet Union of 1967 is the Soviet Union of 1947. There have been changes, important changes. Perhaps internal political and economic developments have made the Soviet rulers more conservative, in the sense that they may be less inclined to run large risks for large gains. Kosygin and Brezhnev are not Khrushchev, and Khrushchev was not Stalin. But the Cuban missile crisis is not yet 5 years in the past, and warns against leaping too quickly to the conclusion that our troubles with the Soviet Union are over. The convulsive turn of events in China, together with Russia's ancient fears of simultaneous involvements in major difficulties in Europe and Asia, has probably dictated a more cautious approach for the time being to problems in the West.

But along with these changes there have been others. The Soviet Union has made giant strides in applying its rapidly advancing technology to military and nonmilitary purposes. Despite our best efforts it has kept its edge in the exploration of space. If present trends continue, in a few years it will have the largest and most modern merchant fleet on the seven seas. Its rate of economic growth is impressive, even if Soviet statisticians sometimes overstate it. It continues to allocate enormous resources to its military establishment. It has increased substantially its strategic offensive and defensive nuclear weapons systems, both quantitatively and qualitatively, in the last year or two. It has 700 to 800 MRBM's and IRBM's targeted on Western Europe. It claims to have developed an effective ABM system and has begun to deploy it. It has the largest and best equipped conventional force under national command in central Europe, with a backup of well-trained reserves. It has helped to provide the other Warsaw Pact forces with modern equipment.

What is the net of these changes? What are the implications for American policy? I would not wish to make any categorical assertions about Soviet policy when so many powerful forces are in motion everywhere, but if intentions are influenced by capabilities, there is little reason for complacency.

We might note that the Soviet Union must bear a heavy share of responsibility in Vietnam and has always stoutly supported Hanoi. As cochairman of the 1962 Geneva Conference to settle the Laos question, Soviet leaders failed to deliver on their responsibility under article 8 of the 1962 agreement, signed also by Hanoi, to see that Hanoi withdrew its military forces from Laos, refrained from reintroducing such forces, and refrained from using the territory of Laos for interference in the internal affairs of other countries. Due in large measure to this default by the Soviet leadership we and our friends and allies are making our great effort in Vietnam.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JACKSON. Briefly, yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator has pointed out that the 1962 agreement with respect to Laos was violated by Hanoi through its failure to pull out its troops. My question is, Is it not also a fact that the 1954 Geneva accords had provisions declaring that the north shall remove its men from the south and the south shall remove its men from the north, and that Hanoi violated the 1954 accords?

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct. They had convert forces in the south that had been there for a long, long time. Those forces remained there, and remained under Hanoi's control and direction.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not also a fact that Hanoi did withdraw some of its forces from the south, but did so to train them in guerrilla warfare, and then sent them back to participate in subversion, infiltration, terrorism, and especially the taking of the lives of the South Vietnam public officials?

Mr. JACKSON. That is my understanding.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is my understanding that North Vietnam not only violated the Laos accord of 1962, but also violated the 1954 Geneva accords.

Mr. JACKSON. I do not think there is any question about that.

Moreover, Moscow has trained and supported Ho Chi Minh for several decades. It is Hanoi's principal source of supply. Hanoi is the best or second-best defended city in the world, thanks to Soviet antiaircraft installations. Soviet mines are being laid in the waterways leading to Saigon. We may ask whether the Soviet Union is as anxious to bring the war to an end as it wishes to appear.

Furthermore, to the extent that Soviet policy toward the West has been marked in recent years by more moderation and circumspection, how much of the explanation lies in the strength, firmness, and unity of the Western countries? Although it may not be possible to truss up the Sino-Soviet rupture during China's present convulsions, will it never be possible to work out a modus vivendi which offers many mutual advantages? Never is a long time. And despite the extraordinarily difficult problem of devising and installing an effective ABM system, can we safely take it for granted that the task cannot be accomplished? If it were, could we prudently assume that such moderation and circumspection as we have seen would continue to characterize Soviet policy? If the Soviet rulers believe that they have an effective system and that we do not, might not this embolden them to take greater risks? If we and our allies believe that the Russians have an effective system and know that we do not, might not this inhibit our governments from standing firm in a crisis?

We need to learn the art of doing two things at once: to work with the Soviet Union where we can and to keep up our strength as a basis for working with them and for encouraging them to view us with a healthy respect. This is not easy to do, for it is an old tendency of ours to see things in black and white terms; but it is the task we face.

In general, we should be ready to do business with Moscow wherever our interests and theirs truly converge. There may therefore be advantages to each side in an expansion of the peaceful contacts growing out of trade and tourism and other exchanges.

At the same time we need to speak with the confidence that rests on strength. The Romans had a saying for it: "Who would desire peace should be prepared for war." A dialog between adversaries is helped, not hindered, by mutual respect for one another's strength.

It is for such reasons, Mr. President, that I shall support the Consular Convention and that I shall at the same time urge great caution with respect to any one-sided reduction of Western defenses. A Consular Convention will not dissolve our problems with the Soviet Union. It will not mean detente. It is what it is, and nothing more, an arrangement offering certain modest and reciprocal advantages with adequate safeguards, and should be judged on that basis. I wish more Americans could get a view of conditions in the Soviet Union, for I am not fearful of the comparisons they would draw, but I also want to give them more protection than they now have. The Consular Convention requires notification of our Government within 3 days when action is taken against an American citizen, and assures that our consular officials will have access within 4 days to a citizen who has been detained.

For similar reasons I wish more Soviet citizens could see the United States and measure what they have heard about us with what they could see of us with their own eyes. It would be a sobering experience for any who doubt the freedom of our society and its power. The additional Soviet consular officials would be few in number and would not overtax the ability of the FBI to cope with any threat to our security.

There have also been some hopeful signs of adjustment of East-West relations in Europe. We want to encourage more by standing ready to cooperate with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union when cooperation is possible and by standing quietly but firmly on the ready in case our will is once again put to the test in Berlin or elsewhere.

To the extent that the sense of crisis has diminished in Europe over these past 20 years, the credit goes in the main to the confidence that a reliable balance exists between East and West. Anything that would shake confidence in this balance and make it less reliable would place in risk the gains that have been won at great cost.

The relative quiet in Europe is in sharp contrast to the insecurity and dangers of the situation in the Far East. The difference is to be explained in part by the fact that it has not yet been possible to create a reliable balance of forces in Asia. But the clouds are lifting; the skies are a little brighter. Evidence is accumulating that our stand in Vietnam is strengthening hopeful tendencies in non-Communist Asia.

There is little doubt, for example, that the will of the present leaders of Indonesia—the sixth most populous country in the world—to oppose the attempted Communist coup was fortified by our stand in Vietnam. And if we had made no stand in Vietnam or had been thrown out, the prestige of Communist China and of Communist parties in general would certainly have given great status and encouragement to the PKI in Indonesia. The remarkable turn of events there may in time be seen as a watershed in Asia's postwar history.

It is a fact of international life that the small and the weak must rely for their security and independence on the benevolence of a powerful neighbor or on a balance of forces. There is no confidence in Red Chinese benevolence in Asia. If we hear few complaints, it is because it has not been prudent to question Peking's motives. But the doubts about these motives are rooted deep in history. In the case of Vietnam, the history of resistance to the Chinese dates back to the third century B.C.

Singapore's shrewd, tough-minded, and realistic Prime Minister, Lee Kuan Yew, has publicly, if cautiously, indicated his support of American policy in Vietnam. South Korea, Thailand, and the Philippines are backing their convictions with material support. So, too, are Australia and New Zealand. Leaders in other countries are moderating their public criticism of the United States and quietly communicating their private support for our efforts. To know Red China is to fear its ambitions.

There has been a remarkable shift of opinion in Japan as that country has watched the hard line followed by Peking in Vietnam and in international affairs generally. Japan at first was very critical of the American buildup in Vietnam. We know the good historical reasons why this should be so. But today there is open discussion in Japan, inconceivable 2 years ago, of the importance to Japan of keeping ready access to the markets of southeast Asia and not having an unfriendly power in control of the Straits of Malacca. It has not been lost on the Japanese that the United States has no territorial ambitions in North Vietnam or in Vietnam at all, that it is willing to permit the Communist government in the northern half of the country to continue and that it has hoped to bring about a degree of political stability in the south.

Clear-sighted Europeans also understand the place of Vietnam in America's world policy. A little over a year ago, for example, Manlio Brosio, Secretary General of NATO, spoke as follows to the NATO Parliamentarians:

> No state in the [North Atlantic] Alliance as it is today, and certainly no European state, is any longer in a position to conduct a world policy on its own and to act alone as a counter weight to the power of the Soviet Union—or, looking twenty years ahead, the power of China.
>
> In quite another direction, there are those who fear the expansion of the commitments and responsibilities of the United States in Asia, Latin America and elsewhere. These critics hope that the United States will not extend their commitments any further, but that they will, on the contrary, withdraw

> from their existing commitments as soon as possible, in order to conserve their strength for the vital Atlantic and European sectors.
>
> My answer to this is that it is true that the Atlantic sector should be for all of us, including the Americans, the decisive sector in the situation as it is today and is likely to be for some time to come. But it is also true that a setback for the United States in Asia, for example, in Vietnam, would also be a grave setback for the whole of the West. Not only this, but an American retreat or a humiliating compromise in Vietnam, far from ending United States commitments in Asia, would extend them on an even greater scale to all sorts of other areas, from Thailand to the Philippines.

If a balance of forces is to be created in Asia which will enable the non-Communist countries to live in independence and pursue their national programs of political and economic development on which their security ultimately depends, the task falls, for the time being, mainly on the United States. There is no one else with resources adequate to lead the effort.

We may leave to historians the question whether the United States was wise or unwise to make a stand in Vietnam. The fact is that we chose by an accumulation of decisions over a period of many years under four administrations to make the stand there. Today I am more confident than ever before that the limited victory we seek will be attained. We are succeeding.

Negotiation requires more than a willingness on our part to negotiate. The other fellow must be willing also. Even that is not enough, for, as things stand, neither side is willing to admit defeat. Hanoi must know by this time that it will not win at the conference table what its forces have been unable to win on the battlefields. It must know that we will not come to the conference table to yield what our fighting forces have won. In other words, Hanoi must know that there is no point in agreeing to negotiate unless it is prepared to accept its inability to accomplish its objectives in the south.

Even if Hanoi privately comes to the conclusion that the jig is up, it may not wish to admit it openly and may prefer the Greek solution to the Korean—to let the conflict peter out, calling its forces back to the north without any formal admission that it has abandoned its objectives.

The fact is that we do not know Hanoi's state of mind. The object in using force is persuasion—to convince the other side that the costs of continuing the struggle outweigh any possible gains. When Hanoi comes to that view, it will not be difficult for it to let us know. The costs to Hanoi are high and mounting; the possibility of achieving its objectives is dwindling. At the same time, however, the capacity of the Vietnamese people, north and south, to endure hardship and suffering is great; the north may be slower to accept defeat than rational calculations of advantage and disadvantage would suggest. Furthermore, we do not know just how Hanoi's problems are complicated by the Sino-Soviet rift and in particular by its fears of Chinese reactions to any peace moves it might make.

There are some reasons for thinking that the Soviet leaders would prefer a settlement. The bombing of the North, for example, is probably a source of embarrassment, for it demonstrates that the Soviet Union cannot prevent the United States from bombing a brother Communist state. One can surmise that the Russians are having to do a lot of explaining in other Communist capitals. For Moscow's situation in Vietnam puts in doubt what she could do to protect the interests of other Communist states if they sometime found themselves in similar jeopardy. In this sense, the bombing of North Vietnam has political significance—control over it is one of the few political assets and bargaining levers we have in encouraging the Russians to pressure Hanoi to deescalate militarily and to negotiate.

It must also be a source of some worry to the Soviet rulers that their aid to Vietnam, particularly in connection with their antiaircraft defense system, is steadily mounting.

At the same time, however, without Russian aid and support Hanoi would probably be unable to sustain its efforts, and the Russians are therefore partly responsible for the prolongation of the war. The Russians would not have had to furnish Hanoi with the mines used against American shipping on the waterways leading to Saigon, and in fact their willingness to supply such mines is a seriously provocative act, which does not easily square with their alleged desire for a peaceful solution. Again, however, we do not know just how the Sino-Soviet split affects Russian policies. The Russians may believe that for Russia the stakes of the Vietnam war lie in China rather than in Vietnam.

Currently, attention in this country is focused on the bombing. One thing we cannot do from the floor of the Senate or from our committee rooms is to direct the day-to-day conduct of military operations. A few obvious points may be made—so obvious that they are often overlooked in the public debate. There is no other example, I believe, in military history of bombing operations that have been conducted with equal restraint and precision. Of course some civilian casualties have been inflicted, and we regret that, for we have no wish to make war on the people of North Vietnam. The remarkable and generally ignored fact is how few civilian casualties there have been and how little civilian damage has been done. I might point out that our precision bombing—with its severe rules and regulations—has resulted in the loss of hundreds of American planes. Hanoi knows, if some Americans do not, that our efforts have been restrained, for they know what losses we could inflict were the signal to be given.

The bombing has been directed at Hanoi's ability to infiltrate men and supplies into the south. It has reduced the flow and complicated the problems of Hanoi in allocating resources to the war effort. Every bombing of tons of supplies in the north, every infiltrator taken out of the pipeline by our bombing in the north, directly lifts a weight from our fighting men, from the South Vietnamese, and from our other fighting allies. Every man diverted to repair roads and bridges, every man engaged in coastal defenses of North Vietnam, every man occupied in the air defense of North Vietnam, reduces the effort that can be made by the North Vietnamese in the south.

Contrary to the view expressed by some, I believe that the bombing of some carefully selected additional military targets in North Vietnam would further limit North Vietnamese infiltration capability. But the bombing is only one part, and not the major part, of our military operations. To talk about it as though it could be treated in isolation from the conduct of the war as a whole makes no sense whatever. If Hanoi wishes to bring the bombing to a halt, it can do so at any moment. It knows—and if it does not, it knows how to find out very quickly—that the bombing will halt the moment it halts the movement of men and supplies into the south.

I do not believe in searching for far-fetched explanations when an obvious explanation stares me in the face. Since Hanoi could stop the bombing if it wished to, I conclude that it does not yet wish to. The obvious explanation of its attitude is that Hanoi hopes to use the bombing as a form of psychological jujitsu in its continuing effort to achieve its objectives. Hanoi reads our newspapers and listens to our speeches. It would not be surprising for it to think that it may be able to score a psychological victory by exploiting American doubts about the bombing.

The President has successfully resisted the demands to halt the bombing, without a reciprocal downturn in military action, from those on one side who do not understand that a President must consider the cost in American lives such a decision would involve and its effect on our bargaining position in getting the main issues to the conference table. He has successfully resisted the demands for all-out bombing from those on the other side who have an unbounded faith in the ability of airpower to "get it over with."

There is no greater contribution that we in the Senate could make to the security and welfare of the Nation than to demonstrate our confidence in the President's direction of this dirty and not-so-little war on the outcome of which so very much depends.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. First, I wish to commend the Senator from Washington for a very knowledgeable statement. I believe he knows that many of us in the Senate hold him in high esteem because of his background and experience and insight into things military.

I am, however, a little troubled by one statement that the Senator made, when he said:

> It knows—

Referring to Hanoi—

> and if it does not, it knows how to find out very quickly—that the bombing will halt the moment it halts the movement of men and supplies into the South.

I had been under the impression that perhaps more than that was necessary, particularly the withdrawal of North Vietnamese in the south back to the north, where they came from.

I am wondering whether the Senator intended to limit the action by Hanoi as he did, or if he would also include the thought that Hanoi perhaps had better move its forces out of South Vietnam back home where they belong, before all bombing would cease.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank my colleague, the Senator from Iowa, for his fine remarks about me. I know I do not deserve them.

To respond to his question specifically, what I have said, of course, has been stated over and over again by the President and by the Secretary of State—that is, that if Hanoi will stop its aggression, the movement of supplies and troops into the south, we will stop our bombing. This does not end the war. As I understand our policy, these are conditions precedent to entering into negotiations with them. Obviously, they will have to move their forces out of South Vietnam, but that would be a matter to be dealt with at the negotiating table.

Now, what North Vietnam is insisting on—and the Soviets back them up, and the Chinese back them up further with additional points—is that we must agree in advance to a permanent unconditional cessation of bombing, no matter what happens at the bargaining table. In other words, they ask us to give up this important military lever without any quid pro quo.

As I pointed out in my speech, I think that the Soviets are embarrassed by the bombing that is taking place in the north, because they cannot stop it.

I believe that this is a bargaining lever on the Soviets to encourage them to get the Hanoi regime to the conference table; because here is the leader of the Communist world, the country armed with nuclear rockets and weapons, the country with a great submarine fleet, the country with enormous ground forces, and yet it cannot stop the American bombing of the north.

I believe that this is an important factor in inducing the Soviets to try to get Hanoi to the conference table.

Mr. MILLER. My understanding is—and this has been expressed by the President and the Secretary of State—that we have a threefold purpose in the bombing in the north: first, to bolster the morale of the South Vietnamese; second, to slow down or impede or put a limitation on the flow of troops and supplies from the north, and third, to cause Hanoi to pay some price for its continued aggression.

If Hanoi stops the flow of troops and supplies from the north to the south, that would achieve one of the three purposes of the bombing. But I suggest that if the purposes are valid, the other two have not succeeded; and that is why I am wondering whether this led to the conclusion that the Senator expressed that the bombing will halt the moment the flow of troops and supplies from the north to the south has taken place.

I do not recall any statement precisely like this having been made by the President or the Secretary of State. I have had the feeling that they have left that point somewhat open, as to whether or not Hanoi must pull back its forces from the south to the north, or at least start to do so, before the bombing is halted.

Mr. JACKSON. I have the strong impression that the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, has reiterated, over and over again, that there must be reciprocity. He has specified that such reciprocity should be related to the cessation of aggression on the part of North Vietnam, in the form of sending men and materiel into the south. That is my understanding of what he believes to be a condition precedent to entering into negotiations with the North Vietnamese. This is not to be confused with an ultimate settlement of the problem.

Mr. MILLER. Oh, no.

Mr. JACKSON. We are talking only about a cease-fire in the bombing of North Vietnam. In effect, that is what it amounts to. It would be a cease-fire in the form of our stopping bombing in the north, with a reciprocal stopping of aggression by North Vietnam into South Vietnam. I think that is a reasonable basis on which to proceed to have talks or discussions.

Mr. MILLER. I can understand that as a basis for having talks. I can also understand that as a basis for some kind of truce. However, if North Vietnam should stop the flow of troops and supplies from the north to the south, but at the same time refuse to stop the fighting and aggression that is going on within South Vietnam, I would hope that we would not forevermore call off all our bombing. We might call it off temporarily, since there was a "sign"; but if it were only a "sign," and aggression persisted in the south—and there can be aggression in the south by the North Vietnamese in the south, regardless of the fact that the flow of troops and supplies from the north may have been halted—I wonder whether we should stop our bombing, if the purposes of the bombing are valid.

Mr. JACKSON. If the moving of men and supplies into the south is stopped, the North Vietnamese and the main forces and elements of the Vietcong are not going to be able to sustain a substantial conflict over a long period of time.

I am talking about sustaining substantial military operations. Surely, guerrilla operations can be carried on for many years. But it seems to me that we will have taken a long step toward the ultimate solution of the problem in South Vietnam if we can achieve those two conditions, and make them stick. Obviously, if we entered into negotiations with the North Vietnamese, and they proceeded clandestinely to move forces into the south, we would retain the option to resume bombing.

But I should think that we would have laid the foundation for a reasonably good basis on which to proceed to negotiation. This does not mean the end of the conflict at all. I am sure one of the things they would probably try to do would be what happened in Korea. They would try to filibuster and protract the negotiations, in accordance with their theory of the protracted conflict.

I feel that this is a matter in which obviously we have to proceed with great caution. But I would certainly go along with the position taken by the Secretary of State, and my understanding of the position of the President, that we would sit down and start negotiations if they would stop the continuing intrusion of men and supplies into the south.

Mr. MILLER. I wish to offer this thought: If one of the three purposes is that Hanoi will pay some price for continued aggression, it seems to me we should not foreclose the possibility of a continuation of the bombing or a resumption of the bombing, even if Hanoi has stopped the flow of troops and supplies to the south. If we get into a long and protracted negotiation situation, the North Vietnamese troops in the south, pursuant to control exercised by Hanoi, in the meantime will chew up the lives of American and allied forces in the south.

Mr. JACKSON. No, let us not have a misunderstanding about this. What I referred to and what the Secretary of State and the President said would not prohibit us from continued military operations and bombing in the south.

Mr. MILLER. I am talking about bombing in the north.

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct. But we can continue to move on the adversary forces in the south from the standpoint of ground, air, and sea operations. Are we not in a much better position—if we have reached a preliminary agreement and can police it and determine whether it is being carried out—if we stop bombing in the north and they stop their infiltration of forces into the south?

We can proceed to grind them up if they are in the south, and nothing in such a preliminary agreement would prohibit that sort of operation.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator is correct in that respect. I know that the Senator from Washington is concerned about a protracted war. If the flow of troops and supplies from north to south is stopped, I am sure he recognizes that there could still be a protracted conflict and that Hanoi would be willing to pay the price for continued aggression. I hope the Senator would not foreclose that possibility.

Mr. JACKSON. There are two main problems in the south. One problem relates to the main-force elements of the Vietcong and the regular North Vietnamese Army units. They tend to fight classical ground-type operations. That is one side of the problem. The United States is carrying the main responsibility in that regard. Every time they move in conventional formation, they take a real clobbering, and they are being chewed up. We should be able to bring this phase of the war to a conclusion at some point not too far in the future.

But the second phase of the war, which is the guerrilla, the paramilitary type operation, the so-called war of national liberation that they preach, could go on in the countryside for many, many years. Under our policy and doctrine we are hopeful that this will become the main responsibility of the South Vietnamese.

At the present time we are carrying the major part of that phase, but our objective is to undertake to train and provide the support and assistance so that in due course the South Vietnamese Army, the ARVN, will be able to carry out that part of the assignment.

This is where we run into the doctrine of the protracted conflict. This is what we mean when we say that the war may be kept going for many, many years, which I think, of course, North Vietnam will endeavor to do. This second phase is a most difficult assignment because it involves two concurrent actions. One action concerns ferreting out the guerrillas and, for the first time, bringing government to the people in the countryside. It is called nation building. This is the revolutionary development building, of which the Senator is aware and had an opportunity to see when he was in South Vietnam.

This task is difficult, but it must, of necessity, be done by fellow Vietnamese. Americans cannot do it. This is a long drawn out effort, because never in our history have we been confronted with such a formidable task of trying to carry on a great social, political, and economic revolution, and at the same time conduct a war.

I must say, as I am sure the Senator from Iowa would say, that every American can be proud of the great professional skill of our officers, our noncommissioned officers, our enlisted men, and our civilians in South Vietnam. I think they are the best of Americans, and that what they are doing there would make every American proud if every American could understand and appreciate their work on a day-to-day basis.

Mr. MILLER. I do not wish to indulge in yielding any further, but I do wish to say that I share the views that have just been expressed about the quality of our people who are there. It is those people I am thinking about when I make this suggestion. I do not believe we should tie our hands by making a commitment to Hanoi or anybody else that just because they decide to stop sending troops from the north to the south, and decide to stop sending supplies from the north to the south, there shall therefore, be no more bombing of the north.

I say this with the understanding that there is a valid premise that one of the purposes of the bombing in the north is to cause Hanoi to pay a price for further aggression. But at least 40,000 North Vietnamese are in the south. If they are going to stay there and continue to fight—and they could continue to stay there and fight for some time, even if supplies are stopped in their flow from north to south—it seems to me that the control over them exercised by Hanoi should be pressured by continued heavy bombing on our part; and if bombing will do so, I do not think we ought to foreclose that possibility or give them an opportunity to go before world opinion and say, "Now, you see, we have stopped sending troops and supplies from the north to the south." Of course, they will not say that we stopped the control that is being exercised, because the control will continue. Then we shall be condemned if we continue the bombing.

Mr. JACKSON. It is a reasonable quid pro quo. It seems to me they are going to find it difficult to support their main force elements, the regular North Vietnamese army units in the south, if they are not reinforced with supplies.

The supply problem is a serious one. They cannot all live off the countryside. I may be wrong, but I think this is the judgment of most of our professional people. The sole question is, is there a reasonable quid pro quo for discussions and negotiations? That is what we are talking about.

Mr. MILLER. If we continue fighting for 6 months to a year more, there can be an awful lot of these fine people whom we have been talking about killed in the meantime. Therefore, if we can shorten that period by continued pressure on Hanoi through bombing—and I say, if we can—it seems to me that this is an option on our part which should not be foreclosed.

Mr. JACKSON. But remember that the North Vietnamese Army units face one great disadvantage; namely, they are trained to fight a classical war. They are not trained to fight as guerrillas. When they come out, they come out in classical formation. This is a great drawback. It really handicaps them.

We all recall Lin Piao's famous speech of September 5, 1965. Many people drew inferences from what he said but they left out one of the most significant comments Marshal Lin Piao made at that time. I do not know whether he is still Marshal Lin Piao, whether he is in charge of the Red Guard, or whether he is in charge of the billboard lobby in China; but, anyway, he made a sage observation. He accused General Giap, the Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces of North Vietnam, of falling prey to American tactics and strategy. He said it was a mistake for North Vietnam to fight Americans in the traditional type of warfare, that North Vietnam should send down guerrillas, that this was the way, in a protracted conflict, to destroy an advanced, scientific and technological adversary.

I would guess that the North Vietnamese would like to carry out the marshal's suggestions and advices, but the trouble is, so the experts say, it is most difficult to train guerrillas in the north and bring them into a countryside or an area where they are not familiar with the habits of the people and have to fight as guerrillas.

Thus Marshal Lin Piao gave this sage advice, but the North Vietnamese do not know how to implement it. The marshal did not give them a bill of particulars—or a T/O—how to carry it out, with all instructions.

Mr. MILLER. I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. JACKSON. I appreciate this dialog with my good friend from Iowa.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to my able friend from Missouri, who has been to Vietnam many times and has spent much time in the field, and who has taken not just a trip there but has made a day-to-day study of the terrible challenge we face in Asia.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I congratulate my able colleague, the junior Senator from Washington, for one of his typically thoughtful and constructive addresses to both the Senate and the people of this country on this serious and growing problem we now face in the Far East.

I was glad to note in this afternoon's newspaper that this talk of the Senator was on the front page. After all the "experts"—and apparently there are many—get through with their various analyses of how to win this war, or lose it—depending on how they feel about it—it is refreshing to note that someone like yourself who has studied the subject makes as thoughtful a presentation as these remarks this afternoon.

Among all our colleagues in the Senate, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson]—along with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], and the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. Smith]—is one of the true military authorities.

In the critical field of nuclear weaponry, it is my opinion that the Senator from Washington is the authority in the Congress. I have read these remarks carefully, again congratulate him and would ask several questions. First, why does he feel there is such a strong effort in this country to prevent the United States from using in this war its technological advantages as contained in airpower and seapower?

There has been much talk about airpower, but with the exception of the Senator from Georgia, not much about the use of seapower. Now that we have our young friends and neighbors out there fighting for freedom, many drafted who did not want to go, what reason can the Senator from Washington give the Senate today for this great effort to get this war on a "one-to-one" basis, in the jungles, on terrain the enemy understands fully, but which terrain is largely new to our own soldiers, sailors, and airmen?

Mr. JACKSON. First of all, I wish to thank my good friend from Missouri for his great generosity. He was too modest to include himself in the list of many Senators who are taking an active interest in this problem. I know of no one who takes a more thoughtful and helpful interest in this subject than the Senator from Missouri.

To answer the Senator, I have pointed out in my remarks that we are engaged in a limited war for limited objectives. Unfortunately, there are many people in this country who have come to the conclusion that if we bomb certain military targets, if we shell certain targets with our naval vessels, we will be escalating the war.

I do not agree with that position. I think that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] has rendered great service to his country in pointing out the obvious advantages which would accrue from the use of some of our naval combatant ships to bombard certain military installations in North Vietnam and South Vietnam.

I do not understand the reasoning by which some of these people have come to the conclusion that such action, somehow, will escalate into a general war because we are going to shell obvious military targets in North and South Vietnam.

I am convinced that we could save the lives of many pilots by doing so. At present, we are asking our pilots to engage in the most precise kind of bombing known to man. As I pointed out in my remarks, we have lost hundreds of airplanes—over 400—most of them due to precision bombing. Precious lives are being lost as a result. This is what disturbs me, because we have followed those particular tactics in carrying out our policy of a limited war with limited objectives.

I subscribe to the basic premise of a limited war with limited objectives, but I simply do not go along with the reasoning that these people indulge in, that if we go after certain additional military targets we will be escalating the war and will create a real danger of it blowing up into world war III.

I do not subscribe to that. I think it is wrong. I agree wholeheartedly with the comments of my good friend from Missouri on this issue.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator and would associate myself with his remarks.

Most of these people are completely sincere in their attempt to prevent utilization of the technological advantage of the United States in the war. Some, perhaps, are not quite as sincere.

Inasmuch as half a million Americans are in that part of the world at this time—and more as they rotate steadily—I am sure that they will have something to say about this matter when they come home.

Now, the other day, in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, at a hearing where, because of the CIA hearing, I could only listen to part of the original statement, a former Army general, for whom I have the greatest respect, but who has been out of Government for some time, gave some testimony which was disturbing. He is a brave and able military man with some experience in the diplomatic field. He, in effect, was "embraced," one might say, by several members of that committee.

Before asking the able Senator from Washington to comment on some of the general's testimony, I would present to the Senate that, in addition to his capacity in the military field, some of the most superb hearings ever held in this body were held by the Senator from Washington as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations functioning in part in the field of diplomacy. He has been a thorough student of the problems incident to communism and the so-called Communist conspiracy.

General Gavin said before the Foreign Relations Committee, on Tuesday, February 21:

> Technology is moving madly ahead, with the world shrinking rapidly, communications getting improved and so on, and we are at a point now where I think this country is in really fine shape technologically speaking. We have an abundant economy, doing very well, a high gross national product. Now, things are quite different than they were 25 years ago, and if we recognize this as a fundamental condition of affairs and now decide we are really going to be for ourselves and our revolution that has strived beyond anything dreamed about 175 years ago, we could do great things for our society and for the world.

I am reading this in detail because I do not want to be criticized for taking anything out of context.

Then General Gavin said this:

> Instead we are preoccupied with communism. Is it Russian communism, is it Titoism? Is it Ho Chi Minhism? Is it Chinese communism or what is it?
>
> If communism is from each according to his ability to contribute and to each according to his need, I think, perhaps, our own society, we are doing more this way than anybody else, as conceived in the industrial revolution. Communism, as near as I know, does not exist anywhere now. Time has outstripped all those things and we must realize it.

Then General Gavin continued:

> I think, Mr. Chairman, and I, of course, agree with you, if we could have a fundamental acceptance of this point of view, a lot of other things would fall into place.

I thought of that statement when I read this able paragraph from the address of the distinguished Senator from Washington this afternoon, which reads as follows:

> We need to learn the art of doing two things at once: to work with the Soviet Union where we can and to keep up our strength as a basis for working with them and for encouraging them to view us with a healthy respect. This is not easy to do, for it is an old tendency of ours to see things in black and white terms, but it is the task we face.

I ask my friend if he thinks that communism, as near as he knows, does not exist anywhere now?

Mr. JACKSON. First let me respond by saying that Gen. James Gavin is a personal friend of mine. I have the highest regard for him as a devoted, patriotic American citizen. General Gavin has been an outstanding professional soldier. He has served his country as a civilian, as Ambassador to France, with distinction and great credit. I have nothing but the highest personal respect for him.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would associate myself with those remarks.

Mr. JACKSON. I am sure my friend, the Senator from Missouri, would agree.

I just cannot agree with General Gavin's conclusion. First of all, he seems to get the impression that communism has been fractionated. Communism has never been monolithic. This is one of the great fallacies. Communism has never been a monolithic organization. It has always had to face the problems of nationalism and factionalism. Of course, our defense and foreign policies should be directed to taking advantage of the divisions and rifts of the Communist world. But for General Gavin to come to the conclusion that communism is no longer here is, I think, to miss the boat completely

I hear it said that we do not have the problems of the cold war any more; that the trouble with some of these "tired old liberals" is that they are still thinking in terms of 20 years ago. The "new left" comes along and says, "The Communist threat is gone. Russia has changed. Russia is no longer a problem."

Let us analyze two things. One is the cold war. The truth of the matter is that the cold war is going on with great vigor in many parts of the world. Indonesia, a country of 109 million, came within an eyelash of going behind the Communist curtain—not the Iron Curtain, the Bamboo Curtain; but still the Communist curtain. It was only because of our efforts in Vietnam, and other efforts that we made, that made it possible for the generals, one day in October in 1965, to make the decision they did in starting a countercoup. My colleague knows that in this town the question was being asked, over and over again, not whether Indonesia would go Communist, but when it would go Communist. Think of it; this sixth most populous country in the world almost went behind the Bamboo Curtain.

Then if one looks around the world, what are the Soviets doing in Europe, in the efforts to soften up the university groups and the intellectual groups? What did they do in the State of Kerala, India, just a week or so ago? A Province or a State of 20 or 25 million people went Communist.

In British Guiana it was only by an eyelash that we did not have another Castro regime.

The cold war in South America is going on unabated, as is true of the college campuses in South America. I think the problem we face in South America—for example, in Chile—is a classical one. There was a real, hard-fought election there. Chile is the only country in South America in this century that has elected, under democratic processes, a government through constitutional procedures. All others, at one time or another, have had coups or direct force. Yet in that country the cold war was being fought and carried out to the point where the President of Chile was unable to come to the United States due to the extreme left movement in that country.

Now let me come to the military side of the question. Who can say the Soviets have completely changed? Let us examine their capability. I think their capability gives some clues to their intentions. When we analyze what the Soviets can do in the strategic weapons field, I do not know how anybody could say that the Communist danger is over. When we consider the gains they have made, quantitatively and qualitatively, in the strategic missile field alone, when we consider what they have done, especially during the last 2 years, in the anti-ballistic-missile field, when we consider that they are about to have the world's largest merchant marine, that they have a tremendous fleet of submarines, more and more of them nuclear powered, when we look at the deployment of their forces in Eastern Europe—there is no room for complacency.

I do not think any man can honestly

say that when you analyze what the Soviets are actually doing on the military front, on the economic front, and on the political front, there is any room for complacency. I would say they are becoming more sophisticated; they are more astute in this business of achieving their objectives than ever before. I suppose that is why some of our friends become confused.

I say without reservation that there have been changes within the Communist world. But one must prudently ask the question, Why have there been changes?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator brought that latter point out well in his speech.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I submit that those changes stem in great part from the strength and unity of the United States and the Western World. The most tragic way to find out whether that is true would be to dismantle our efforts on the military, the political, the economic, and the other fronts that stand in the way of Soviet and Communist Chinese ambitions.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I agree. I did not intend until later to bring up my apprehension about the heavy and growing cost of this war. Much of that cost is unnecessary because of the successful efforts of those who believe the war should be fought as a great ground war on the mainland of Asia, without fully utilizing our air and sea technological advantage.

There are two more quotations from the testimony of General Gavin upon which I would ask the Senator to comment. First let me say I fully agree with the Senator from Washington about the courage, ability, and patriotism of General Gavin; but he has been away for a long time—over 10 years, I believe. When he comes down here, however, his testimony is accepted as that of a military expert. As the Senator knows, one has to follow these matters closely, or he is often talking behind the most recent developments.

Many professors have been called before the committee, and I have great respect for their opinions; but I do not believe the American people will give more weight to their opinion on military matters than they do to the unanimous opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. And General Gavin is in sharp disagreement with all the Joint Chiefs.

The first of the last two quotations from this testimony I would ask my friend about, in the context of his address, is as follows:

> Senator COOPER. Now, the Administration said that it is willing to, we understand, to stop the bombing of North Vietnam if there could be some sign—I think the President said almost any sign. So you will know I am not in opposition to this idea, I may say that I have said last year when the bombing pause was brought to a close, I thought the pause should be continued, and I think it should have been this year.
>
> General GAVIN. Yes, sir.
>
> Senator COOPER. But in what respect then do you differ from the statement of the Administration that it would halt the bombing if it could find some sign of reciprocity on the part of North Vietnam at present, almost any sign?
>
> General GAVIN. Senator Cooper, I do not think we should be bombing North Vietnam. In this respect I differ. We should not be bombing North Vietnam regardless.

I would ask the Senator to comment.

Mr. JACKSON. I simply do not agree with his conclusion that we should not be bombing North Vietnam. I have, in my remarks in chief and in my subsequent remarks in connection with the colloquy, pointed out that bombing of military targets in the north, contrary to the view of many people, is one way of slowing down the infiltration into the south.

I do think that it has, moreover, a significant diplomatic and political impact. The fact that it has an impact on North Vietnam is best attested to by the enormous worldwide effort that North Vietnam is making to halt the bombing. Why would they be engaged in a worldwide propaganda effort to stop the bombing, if it had no impact and no effect?

I am just a boy from a small town, but I think our people in the United States, understand that, even if a lot of people elsewhere do not understand it. But I am convinced that is one of the most telling points—the highly organized effort that they are making all over the world to stop our bombing, though it is said to be having no impact and no effect.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Now my final question with respect to General Gavin's testimony——

Mr. JACKSON. Of course, I hasten to add, as I have pointed out previously, that I think the bombing is indeed an embarrassment to the Russians, because it is a pressure, a lever on the Russians to get them to push Hanoi to the conference table. They cannot continue forever the explanation "We will send in more antiaircraft equipment, more of this, and more of that," while they still cannot stop the bombing in the north.

This is quite embarrassing, I would think, and would be pressure on them to get Hanoi to the conference table, if they are as powerful as they are alleged to be in the Communist camp.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The distinguished Senator stimulates me to ask another question.

Apparently there are some in this country who believe the way to obtain Hanoi representation at the conference table is through weakness, and another group who believe that history and logic dictate that the better way to get the enemy to the conference table, as long as we are very careful to do our best not to kill any civilians, is through strength; is that correct?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes, I think that is generally true. There may be some other views, but those are the main views, yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not mean to oversimplify it, but that is the way it has looked to me recently—as a matter of fact, for some time.

This question was asked of General Gavin by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]:

> My question is, Do you think that the Tonkin Bay incident had some effect in uniting the North Vietnamese in their determination to respond to what they considered to be aggressive policies on the part of the United States against North Vietnam?

Before reading the reply of General Gavin to that question, I again refer to the expertise the able Senator from Washington has with respect to developments incident to this war in the Far East. He and I have been together twice in the last 14 months, briefed in Hawaii—one of us going to, one coming from Vietnam. There is no one in the Senate whose opinion is based more on actual experience, knowledge of the truth out there, than the Senator from Washington.

The answer of General Gavin to that question follows:

> Well, Senator, I appreciate your detailing the Tonkin Bay incident. I had almost forgotten the details of it. I remember it and I remember the action that was taken at that time.
>
> I know, too, that the NLF was organized in the south and operated independent of the north for some time. What motivated the north to begin to send troops down, I do not know. But I can only answer in those terms if I were in their position and this incident had occurred, I would begin to look to my future survival in terms of reinforcing those people in the south who were opposing the government down there.

I ask my friend from Washington if the evidence is not crystal clear that the North Vietnamese had heavily infiltrated South Vietnam many years before the Tonkin incident.

Mr. JACKSON. I think it is quite clear. I agree completely with the Senator: The evidence is quite clear that the National Liberation Front, from the very beginning, worked in close concert with its No. 1 leader in Vietnam. That was Ho Chi Minh.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. They had certain autonomy apparently from time to time, but I am certain that there was very little deviation from the Ho Chi Minh line. They apparently had delegated, on occasion, sufficient authority to the National Liberation Front in Vietnam so that they could carry on on an autonomous basis, but to assume and to say that there are two separate, indigenous movements without any overall Communist direction and objective is, I think, the height of naivete. That is my own judgment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator, and hope that, as the cost to the American people of this great ground war in Asia, billions of dollars a month—and, what is more important thousands of casualties a month—the people of America will pay at least as much attention to the thoughtful remarks of the Senator from Washington as they do to those who recommend we do not use seapower or airpower in our effort to obtain peace at the conference table.

I again congratulate my colleague for his great speech.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate what my good friend, the Senator from Missouri, has had to say.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to my senior colleague.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I would say the Senator surely has been an expert on many things. He has been an expert in forecasting military strength throughout the world and in political matters and trends as they correlate.

The speech of the Senator is well reasoned. I ask if the Senator does not agree that, while they talk about the North Vietnamese coming into South Vietnam, there has been infiltration going on in that area for many years.

One of the stumbling blocks, I think, in some of the negotiations has been that it is obvious that the North Vietnamese want to leave some people in South Vietnam to maintain a political base. They do not want to bring those people back even if all action is stopped.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is absolutely correct. There is not any question that when the Viet Minh—which was the predecessor group that fought for France—were engaged in the war against France, Ho Chi Minh had left, at the conclusion of the hostilities in 1954, large numbers of his Communist forces in the south.

The Senator will also recall that it was during this period that thousands and thousands of Catholics left the north and were transported to the south by reason of the help given by the United States, but Ho Chi Minh left his forces in substantial numbers in the south to carry on the conflict at the appropriate time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. One of the most humiliating things to the leadership in North Vietnam is that if there were negotiations, they would lose a political base in South Vietnam.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct. And we have given them an out.

I have always said that while we keep talking about a negotiated settlement of the present hostilities in Vietnam, one should never rule out the possibility of this conflict simply petering out. This method might save face all the way around. In fact, of all the guerrilla wars that have been waged since World War II, none has been concluded as a result of negotiations.

In the conflict in Greece, there were no negotiations. In Malaya, there were no negotiations. In the Philippines, with the Magsaysayites and the Huks, there were no negotiations.

Ho Chi Minh can stop sending his forces down and let the conflict peter out. He can say to the loyal, dedicated Communists and to all of the ideologists, "We will continue the war for the next thousand years. We have not given up. This is a protracted conflict." He can make all sorts of rationalizations. This is a route that is definitely a possibility.

The President's course in this regard and the course of Secretary of State Rusk leaves that door open.

All Hanoi and its sponsors have to do is to cease and desist.

We do not have to have a formal conclusion of hostilities, a formal armistice or surrender. I do not think that is necessarily the course.

I believe what my distinguished senior colleague has had to say is most apropos and, I think, most pertinent to an understanding of our problem in Vietnam.

I thank and commend the Senator for his remarks.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I have listened carefully to the junior Senator from Washington. I found his address provocative, balanced, and well reasoned.

It was refreshing to have the Senator bring out so forcefully in his remarks and also in his dialog with the senior Senator from Missouri exactly what the Soviet Union is doing and what part it is playing in the current difficulties in southeast Asia.

We know that the Soviet Union is furnishing jet aircraft, antiaircraft weapons, radar, surface-to-air missiles, and a great deal of their oil.

The junior Senator from Washington has brought out another point today which I do not think has been emphasized very much in the public mind. That concerns the fact that Soviet mines are being laid in the waterways leading to Saigon.

I think that too frequently we have recently heard from responsible officials that the Soviet Union is seeking peace in North Vietnam. If the Soviet Union is seeking peace in North Vietnam, they can go a long way toward bringing about peace merely by ceasing to equip militarily the North Vietnamese.

The junior Senator from Washington brought out what I think is the very important point that the day-to-day conduct of military operations cannot be maintained from Washington. He specifically mentioned that they cannot be directed from the Senate committee room or from the floor of the Senate. I would expand that to say that they cannot be directed from Washington, because I do believe the time has come when our military commanders should be given authority to conduct our day-to-day military operations in Vietnam in such a way as to bring the war to its earliest possible conclusion with the least cost in American lives.

Earlier in the afternoon, before the junior Senator from Washington spoke, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] read into the RECORD the new casualty figures for the calendar year 1966. In round figures, there were 5,000 military deaths and 30,000 wounded in the Vietnamese operations for a total casualty list of 35,000 in that one year.

I feel that the junior Senator from Washington in the preparation of his address for today and in the debate that has taken place on the floor of the Senate as the result of the Senator's speech, has added immeasurably to the public understanding of the many great issues involved in the Vietnam operation.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the generous remarks of my good friend, the Senator from Virginia.

Those of us who serve on the Committee on Armed Services are proud to be associated with him. In the short time that he has been on the committee he has made many valuable contributions.

I am honored and pleased to be associated with him in the great work that he is doing for our country as well as for the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. President, I now yield to my able friend from Indiana.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank the Senator. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Washington some questions concerning the statement which he has made, a statement similar to those frequently made by members of the State Department. It is in conformity with the administration position.

Mr. JACKSON. I wish to say that I have expressed my own views in this matter. It is not unusual that one might agree with someone else. I think a number of Senators agree with my position.

Mr. HARTKE. I understand. I am not critical in that respect. In the main, it would seem to represent the same general approach that the administration has taken.

Mr. JACKSON. I think in general that is true, but these have been my views.

Mr. HARTKE. Let us say that the views of the Senator from Washington have been well accepted by the administration. Maybe that is it.

Mr. JACKSON. I believe that some points are made in my remarks which have not been made heretofore by the administration.

Mr. HARTKE. I correct my prior statement which implied that the remarks made by the Senator from Washington and those made by the administration are identical. There are some differences. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. JACKSON. I am proud to be able to support the President and Mr. Rusk in this matter. I admire the way they have handled this matter in general.

Mr. HARTKE. I think the title "One World" is an admirable one. As the Senator knows, the distinguished American who was the Republican candidate for President, Wendell Willkie, was a native of my State of Indiana. He expressed ideas and concepts which were considered at that time different from the then-current views and thinking of America.

However, since that time such views of the unity of the world have become pretty much established and accepted as fact. Wendell Willkie might twist a little in his grave, however, if he were to find that those ideas were being used for such a war topic. His thoughts were in the nature of a humanitarian approach, an expansion of the effort to live together with people in peace rather than maintaining the spirit of a war approach.

Mr. JACKSON. I assure my able friend and good Hoosier that I have not tried to retroactively associate my remarks with anything that Wendell Willkie might stand for in 1967 if he were here. That is the last thing I would do. I merely suggested his concept of One World is one which was not accepted by many people at that time. He certainly did dramatize the kind of world which we lived in then and do today. That is the extent of my involvement.

Mr. HARTKE. I thought that I might at some later date do a "One World" speech myself and see if I could bring back the approach of Willkie, since we have stolen the title—not stolen, but utilized the title—which was used by Wendell Willkie. If I should do so, I would undertake it with the idea that, instead of bringing about "One World" with guns, it must be brought about by bringing health to the people throughout the world, by feeding the starving people throughout the world, and developing purposes of that nature.

Mr. JACKSON. I hasten to advise my friend, as he knows so well, that America has given over $120 billion of its wealth and treasure to help the free world since the end of World War II. I do not think we have been niggardly.

Mr. HARTKE. I quite agree. I am not objecting to it. I pointed it out.

There are several statements here.

Page 4 of the Senator's remarks states, in part:

> Evidence is accumulating that our stand in Vietnam is strengthening hopeful tendencies in non-Communist Asia.

I think the Senator would agree basically that we would have to consider India to be a non-Communist state, is that not true?

Mr. JACKSON. It is true, although one of its states, Kerala, went Communist recently.

Mr. HARTKE. I was wondering whether our stand in that part of the world, which has now increased in its military aspects, has been one which, according to the Senator from Washington, "is strengthening hopeful tendencies in non-Communist Asia"? I wonder how the Senator would equate that with the statement he also made that Kerala for the second time in its history, through the democratic process, has now moved from a non-Communist situation and has accepted a Communist-type of government and will have Communists in office.

It strikes me, regarding our military actions over there, that possibly these people are also a part of the big, sprawling country of India; but, in fact, are turning away from societies which look toward freedom and democracy and are turning to Communist leadership in that part of the world.

Mr. JACKSON. Let me make two observations. First of all, of course, Communists have been elected to parliaments in various countries throughout the world. No Communist has taken over a sovereign national state in a free election. That question was put to the people of Chile. They decided that question decisively a year or so ago, when they elected President Frei.

What I am saying now is this: Every government in Asia supports our position in Vietnam either overtly or privately and tacitly except the Communist governments of North Korea, North Vietnam, and Red China.

Mr. HARTKE. I have not been privy to secret documents. I have not been privy to any secret cables which may have given those statements from heads of states to our Government. I do think, if there are such statements of support, that it is high time that they be brought to the attention of the people of the United States, because I believe that the people of this country do not believe we have support from every non-Communist country in Asia.

Mr. JACKSON. I am saying it right now. I suppose there are some things that a sovereign government cannot always state publicly.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator from Washington, though, comes to the floor of the Senate and makes such a statement. I think this is the kind of information the people of the United States would like to have.

Mr. JACKSON. I said it.

Mr. HARTKE. Where are our allies there? Where are the members of SEATO? They are not in this program. If they are with us, why does not someone come out and say so? Has Mrs. Gandhi endorsed our program?

Mr. JACKSON. I am standing on my statement. I know that it can be substantiated. Surely, the Senator does not believe for one moment that the people of India do not have some fear and concern about China?

Mr. HARTKE. I do not think there is any question that India is fearful of China. That is not what the Senator from Washington said. I am not talking about China. I am talking about Vietnam and our position in Vietnam. What are we doing in Vietnam? What is the position of India regarding our actions in Vietnam? It is not so much a question of China, but the fact that the people of India are more friendly to the Russians than they are to us.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not commonsense that the Indians would be deeply concerned if all of southeast Asia should come under the hegemony of Communist China?

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator from Washington has stated:

> Evidence is accumulating that our stand in Vietnam is strengthening hopeful tendencies in non-Communist Asia.

All I can say is, Where is the evidence? Where is that strong evidence?

Where is the strong evidence that our stand has a tendency to cut down on communism?

Evidently, something has happened.

Mr. JACKSON. I have stated some of the basic evidence in my speech. The Senator is ignoring the basic point of my statement.

Mr. HARTKE. I am not ignoring it. I am merely telling the Senator facts. One of those facts is that Kerala will be going Communist.

Mr. JACKSON. The Kerala situation is a special situation. There are Communist pockets all around the world and they have been Communist for years and years.

The Senator from Indiana is ignoring the fact that the sixth most populated country in the world is Indonesia. We know as a fact that Indonesia would, today, be behind the Chinese Bamboo Curtain if it were not for America's presence and strong stand in Vietnam. Is that not of importance?

Mr. HARTKE. What happened in Indonesia is very important. We had not one single American soldier over there. They had been locked out from receiving foreign aid. We were not extending one bit of economic aid to Indonesia when the attempted coup occurred. In Indonesia, when there was an attempted coup there, not one single dollar, and no material, had been sent there by us. What happened? They attempted to eliminate the military from control and have a Communist takeover.

We know that General Nasution's wife was shot and his daughter was killed. They also attempted to kill him. General Suharto was marked for extinction. There is no question of what happened there. There is no question that the Communists tried to kill those people. In their own self-interest, the military tried to save their lives and they had to take over the government. That is what happened. There is no denying that they were anti-Communist, but the whole thrust of this had nothing to do with Vietnam—nothing whatsoever.

Mr. JACKSON. Let us continue. The Senator says that there is no denying it. I deny it.

Mr. HARTKE. I am advising the Senator exactly what I said. They did what they thought was best for their own self-interest, and their own self-protection, to keep from getting shot.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator thinks that the presence of American forces in large numbers in South Vietnam had nothing to do with the decision? Is this what the Senator is telling the Senate today?

Mr. HARTKE. I know exactly the situation as it happened there, and not as someone imagined it might have happened. Nasution's wife and daughter were killed, and they were out to kill him, and he did what any person who was being threatened with death would do. He did the best he could to protect himself.

He took some people with him and Suharto was not where he was supposed to be. He was gone. So Nasution went ahead and organized resistance. Of course Mr. Malik will give us a different story, if the Senator had bothered to talk to him about it. We have talked to him about this.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator can have his opinion. I think he is dead wrong. Let me say to the Senator: Does he feel the same about the change in opinion of Mr. Lee in Singapore?

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. Lee has made some statements and it appears that they are playing to the question on both sides at the present time. They interpret it one day one way, and another way the next.

Let me ask the Senator, what about India? We left India. Let us return to India.

Mr. JACKSON. Let us take Singapore first. We are going to take it country by country. We will finish this dialog.

Mr. HARTKE. We started out with India, but we had to go to Indonesia, so let us return to India.

Mr. JACKSON. All right. But first, on Singapore, the Senator recalls Mr. Lee's statements a while back?

Mr. HARTKE. I recall his statements. Several.

Mr. JACKSON. Denouncing the United States——

Mr. HARTKE. That is right.

Mr. JACKSON. Does the Senator recall his more recent statements?

Mr. HARTKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, has there not been quite a change?

Mr. HARTKE. It is very hard to say. If we take all his remarks in total, it is difficult to say exactly where he is.

Mr. JACKSON. If the Senator wants to ignore the record, that is his privilege. Let us take the Philippines. Did the Senator have the privilege of listening to General Marcos?

Mr. HARTKE. I listened to him at the joint session and on the "Meet the Press" interview.

Mr. JACKSON. All right. What did he say about our presence in Vietnam as it affected Indonesia?

Mr. HARTKE. There is no question about what he said. He said he endorsed it and was 100 percent for it.

Mr. JACKSON. Is not this great country, the Philippines, a part of Asia?

Mr. HARTKE. The Philippines are not only a part of Asia, but a member of SEATO.

Mr. JACKSON. Let us turn to Burma——

Mr. HARTKE. Let us remain with the Philippines.

Mr. JACKSON. Very well.

Mr. HARTKE. How many Filipinos are fighting in Vietnam?

Mr. JACKSON. No Filipino is fighting there, but 2,000 Filipino engineers are in Vietnam.

Mr. HARTKE. If they believe that our struggle there is in the best interests of the Philippines, why have we not asked them to help us fight there?

Mr. JACKSON. We have carried on long negotiations with that Government. The Philippine Government is a free and independent Government. We are not a colonial power, as some people have alleged.

Mr. HARTKE. I have not alleged that it is.

Mr. JACKSON. I did not say the Senator from Indiana did. I would like to see combat units from the Philippines in Vietnam, but, unfortunately, we have not been able to get them. We are very proud, however, that we have about 50,000 Koreans out there.

Mr. HARTKE. I want to stay with the Philippines. Has the United States asked the Philippines to send fighting troops to Vietnam?

Mr. JACKSON. I do not want to comment on that. I know we have had extensive negotiations. I would not want to say publicly whether we have or not.

Mr. HARTKE. Let me modify that question.

Mr. JACKSON. It is clear that we have no combat troops there from the Philippines. I am not saying whether we have asked them or not.

Mr. HARTKE. Is it not true that President Marcos, on "Meet the Press," with many people in the United States listening, made the statement, "The United States has not asked us to send any fighting troops"?

Mr. JACKSON. I did not observe the "Meet the Press" broadcast.

Mr. HARTKE. President Marcos said he had not been asked for any.

The question then was put to him, "If you were asked, would you send fighting troops to Vietnam?" to which he said, "I would take that matter up with my people at home."

They asked him again. He said, "All I can say is that this matter involves such serious political considerations that I would have to take the matter up at home."

In order to get those 2,000 Philippine personnel in Vietnam, what commitments did we make, publicly? I am not asking for classified information.

Mr. JACKSON. We made certain commitments; we are supporting the Filipinos, as I recall, logistically in Vietnam. In addition, of course, we have certain problems in connection with our base facilities. We have obtained certain concessions from the Filipinos. I do not have the exact details.

Mr. HARTKE. They complain about the fact that we have not kept our commitments in that regard. Is that not true?

Mr. JACKSON. We have had some problems with the Philippines, but, on balance, our relations have been very good, and I am proud of that record.

Mr. HARTKE. I am not saying our relations have been bad. However, as the Senator had said, I am glad to note that this is strengthening hopeful tendencies in non-Communist Asia.

I am trying to pin down where it is. I am trying to see it. I am being honest when I say I do not think it is there.

Mr. JACKSON. I disagree with the Senator. The Senator brushes aside Indonesia, which is in southeast Asia. The Senator then says that what happened there had nothing to do with our presence in Vietnam. I disagree 100 percent.

Mr. HARTKE. I say the change was brought about by the non-Communist people there. The Communists tried to kill, and did kill, a number of the hierarchy of the military establishment. The military establishment, in its own defense, went into operation and its people successfully counterattacked. I think about 500,000 were killed in that operation. The present government is a military dictatorship.

Mr. JACKSON. President Marcos, who is right next door, disagrees 100 percent with the Senator from Indiana's point on Indonesia.

Mr. HARTKE. He also disagrees about the necessity of sending boys from his country to aid us in fighting in Vietnam, and Vietnam is a lot closer to him than it is to us.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator's statement is a non sequitur. It has nothing to do with the point I am making.

Mr. HARTKE. Maybe not, but I have seen no evidence to the effect that evidence is accumulating that our stand in Vietnam is strengthening hopeful tendencies in non-Communist Asia. I do not see it in that non-Communist Asian country.

Mr. JACKSON. Which country is the Senator talking about now?

Mr. HARTKE. The Philippines.

Mr. JACKSON. All right.

Mr. HARTKE. Is not the Republic of the Philippines a member of SEATO?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. HARTKE. Why did we have to give the Philippines special concessions for a so-called "balance of forces" for doing what they should have been doing in the first place many years ago?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is talking about the SEATO Treaty. It is not a self-executing document. It is up to each individual country to decide what assistance it is going to give. It is not like NATO, where the commitment is to resist an attack on one as an attack on all. It is a different situation.

Mr. HARTKE. There are only eight countries in the original SEATO agreement. Is that not correct? One of those countries was Britain. Britain is not involved there. Is that true?

Mr. JACKSON. Britain is not directly involved in South Vietnam, but it is heavily involved in that area. It has about 70,000 troops in the Singapore-Malay area.

Mr. HARTKE. That is a former colonial territory. Is it not?

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct.

Mr. HARTKE. Britain had many troops there and was heavily involved in what was a former colony, but it has not sent a single person to fight in Vietnam to help us. Has it?

Mr. JACKSON. That is true. None of our NATO allies have.

Mr. HARTKE. I am talking about SEATO troops; not NATO troops.

Mr. JACKSON. That is true. Britain has no fighting troops in Vietnam.

Mr. HARTKE. The second country in the SEATO group is France. Is that not true? There were eight countries in SEATO originally—the United States, Britain, France, Pakistan, the Philippines, New Zealand, Australia, and Thailand. Those were the other original countries involved in that agreement. Cambodia and free Vietnam and Laos came in by codicil later. That is the way those countries got it. They did not sign the original document.

France is a member of SEATO, and certainly the Senator cannot say that France is on our side in this fight.

Mr. JACKSON. Of course, France is not on our side on many issues in the world, except in the world of mischief.

Mr. HARTKE. We are in agreement on that statement. I am glad we are in agreement on something.

Mr. JACKSON. I am glad the Senator agrees that it is doing mischief around the world under General de Gaulle.

Mr. HARTKE. Where is Pakistan and where is there evidence that "our stand in Vietnam is strengthening hopeful tendencies in non-Communist Asia" so far as Pakistan is concerned? Pakistan is a member of SEATO.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator knows that there are special problems in Pakistan with relation to China, which grow out of the obvious problems with India. It is because of the conflict between India and Pakistan that Pakistan is not taking part in SEATO, because SEATO would in effect aid India. This is a special problem. But the SEATO Treaty leaves it up to each individual member to make the decision on aid and forces. There is no compulsion on any member that it go to the aid of the other. It is a moral obligation.

Mr. HARTKE. Among the other original SEATO members of France, Britain, and the Philippines, in addition to Pakistan, not one single fighting man is involved in the "balance of forces" operation to which the Senator has referred in his speech.

Mr. JACKSON. New Zealand and Australia have combat troops in South Vietnam.

Mr. HARTKE. Do these other countries have noncombatant troops in the Philippines?

Mr. JACKSON. Australia has a number in there which has been doubled, and the New Zealanders have a very small artillery unit.

Mr. HARTKE. For the sake of the record, they had 2,500 men there, and I think they have doubled that number.

Mr. JACKSON. My recollection is that New Zealand had a total of only 250 and they were assigned to artillery. The Australians had about 4,500 originally. That number is being doubled. That is my recollection.

Mr. HARTKE. We come back to the "hopeful signs." India is another Asian country, and India has not made any favorable impression. What about Japan?

Mr. JACKSON. I made the point about Japan in my speech. The Senator, of course, is trying to say that there are no hopeful signs because some states are not contributing troops. I am saying there has been a complete change of attitude in the Far East as a result of our presence and what we are doing in Vietnam. Changes have been taking place in Japan. It is a slow one, but the Japanese are fully cognizant of what happened in Indonesia and the importance to the survival of Japan in the long run. I have mentioned the Philippines. I have not mentioned, of course, Thailand, as one country that survived colonialism. We know the Burmese are seriously concerned about what occurs in southeast Asia.

Many of these countries cannot speak overtly about their positions, because they have peculiar political problems within their respective countries. But there has been a complete change of attitude, and I say without any reservation that our presence out there has made the difference.

Mr. HARTKE. Then there is Cambodia.

Mr. JACKSON. There is nothing more important than letting success breed success. I think we are winning in Asia.

Mr. HARKE. And in Cambodia; would the Senator care to comment on that?

Mr. JACKSON. Well, in Cambodia, Sihanouk is a supreme opportunist. He is waiting to see which way the wind blows; and he demonstrated that, as I recollect, a few years ago, when he sent two of his children to Paris to school, and two others to Red China, to school. So his feet are planted, as are those of so many opportunists in this troubled world of ours, in the most opportunistic fashion that he could find.

But I return to the fundamental premise here, that nothing succeeds like success. It has been slow for us, but I do think that the political complexion in Asia is changing as a result of our presence; and Indonesia is the outstanding example. Because we know—and President Marcos has repeated it—that if it had not been for our presence, those generals would not have made the move they did.

Mr. HARTKE. Those generals did what probably every person in this world do: If one is being shot at, he is going to do the best he can to protect himself.

I do not know what the Senator would do if somebody came shooting at him, and shot his 5-year-old daughter standing beside him, and shot his wife, as happened to General Nasution. I think he would probably be pretty mad, and do everything he could against those people who did the shooting.

That is what the army people did. They started scouring the countryside and killing the Communists, which is perfectly understandable. I would do the same thing.

Mr. JACKSON. Acting in defense of one's family is one thing; but they went far beyond that. This was a wholesale effort to restore Indonesia to the free world. The Senator completely ignores the basic human nature of the situation, if he thinks for one moment that our presence in Vietnam, and the British forces there, had nothing to do with the decisions made by the generals.

Mr. HARTKE. I think the generals——

Mr. JACKSON. The facts do not corroborate the Senator's position, I regret to inform him.

Mr. HARTKE. Have the generals made any statement endorsing our position? General Suharto, General Nasution, Foreign Minister Adam Malik—have those people indicated any support whatsoever?

Mr. JACKSON. I shall not comment on the floor of the Senate in a speech as to any indications they have made. I think it would be inappropriate. But it is quite obvious that we now have an entree in Indonesia, that we are restoring aid, and that they have rejoined the Western World when they were within an eyelash of being put behind the Chinese Communist Bamboo Curtain.

Here is a country rich in iron, tin, and rubber, which strategically controls those important straits that, had they fallen into Communist hands, would have meant that we would have to go around Australia with our naval forces, and the great resources upon which Japan is so dependent would have been denied to them. It is safe to speculate, I think, that it would not have been long before Japan would be fully neutralized, and soon moving toward the Chinese camp.

Mr. HARTKE. Does this imply that the so-called government and the group of people who are in control, including Sukarno, were going to be overthrown irrespective of the attempted Communist coup?

Mr. JACKSON. I am not so sure that Sukarno needed to be overthrown. I thought that he was pretty well enthroned in the Communist camp; it was just a question of when they were going to make it official, and liquidate the non-Communists in Indonesia.

Mr. HARTKE. Well, let us go to another part of the Senator's speech—possibly this is not the administration view, I do not know—on page 7, in the last paragraph, where the Senator from Washington states:

> Contrary to the view expressed by some, I believe the bombing of some carefully selected additional military targets in North Vietnam would further limit North Vietnamese infiltration capability.

I have not heard any administration official up to this time make such a statement, so I suppose that is the position of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, I am proud to support the administration, even if the Senator from Indiana is not very proud about the matter.

Mr. HARTKE. I am not talking about pride. I think it is a part of a U.S. Senator's obligation to do the best he can to try to determine positions; it is not a question of being proud or not proud.

Mr. JACKSON. I just said I am proud to support the administration on this general matter.

Mr. HARTKE. Is this a statement of the position of the administration?

Mr. JACKSON. I do not know whether it is or not. This is my speech. I have not talked to them about whether it is their position. I do not agree with the administration on every detail in connection with North Vietnam and the policy they may have been following. This is my speech.

Mr. HARTKE. What additional military targets in North Vietnam, in the opinion of the Senator from Washington, should be bombed?

Mr. JACKSON. I wish to say that we have hit only a small portion of the power facilities in North Vietnam. We have hit only a small portion of the petroleum facilities in North Vietnam, and we have hit only a small portion of the port facilities. I think our bombing activities should be continued and extended to selected targets in these categories closely related to the prosecution of the war. We have not touched the airfields from which their Mig fighters can launch an attack on American planes.

Mr. HARTKE. Then I take it that the Senator from Washington is not in agreement with the administration's position as stated by Secretary McNamara at the hearings which were held in closed session in January 1967, and subsequently released for public information, in which he said:

> I don't believe that the bombing, up to the present, has significantly reduced, nor any bombing that I could contemplate in the future would significantly reduce, the actual flow of men and materiel to the South.

Mr. JACKSON. I feel that it would reduce somewhat the amount of supplies and the number of men coming in. It would not shut them off. But I feel quite strongly that the effect of additional bombing in the areas we are already in, but where we have not completed the effort, would help to stem the flow. I am not saying that it would shut off the flow.

Mr. HARTKE. But the Senator is in

disagreement with the statement of Secretary McNamara, as set forth in that portion of his testimony?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. I do not agree with that.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator is in disagreement with Secretary McNamara on that point?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. HARTKE. With respect to Haiphong: Is it the Senator's opinion that we should bomb the port facilities—that is, the docks—of Haiphong?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. We made one attack, but it was not very effective. I think we should knock out the port facilities and thus make it more difficult for the North Vietnamese to move in supplies.

Mr. HARTKE. Is it the Senator's opinion that we should mine the harbor of Haiphong?

Mr. JACKSON. I am opposed to that.

Mr. HARTKE. Is it the Senator's opinion that we should bomb the dikes in North Vietnam?

Mr. JACKSON. I am opposed to that at this time.

Mr. HARTKE. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Washington that if further escalation of bombing is not successful, the dikes of North Vietnam should be put on the list of targets to be bombed?

Mr. JACKSON. I shall not engage in hypothetical or supposititious questions.

Mr. HARTKE. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Washington to say that he is opposed to the bombing of dikes in North Vietnam at this time?

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct.

Mr. HARTKE. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Washington that we should bomb the airfields in North Vietnam?

Mr. JACKSON. I think we should go after some of the airfields on a selective basis, but that would depend on the military situation.

Mr. HARTKE. Would the Senator have any reason why certain airfields should not be bombed?

Mr. JACKSON. I shall not get into those details on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HARTKE. Very well. I do not want the Senator in any way to compromise himself.

Mr. JACKSON. Do not worry; I will take care of myself.

Mr. HARTKE. Very well. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Washington that in the event planes came in from China, we should pursue those planes?

Mr. JACKSON. I think we have made it clear that if the Chinese enter the conflict with military operations from China, the doctrine of hot pursuit will apply.

Mr. HARTKE. In other words, there would be no area of sanctuary?

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct.

Mr. HARTKE. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Washington that the same basic doctrine applies to the extension or expansion of the war into Laos, Cambodia, or Thailand?

Mr. JACKSON. I do not know what the Senator is talking about.

Mr. HARTKE. I am talking about the alleged fact that some of the troops using the Ho Chi Minh Trail are coming through Laos.

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct.

Mr. HARTKE. Does not a part of the Ho Chi Minh Trail go through Laos?

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct.

Mr. HARTKE. Is it the contention of the Senator from Washington that those places in Laos should be bombed?

Mr. JACKSON. I shall not comment on that.

Mr. HARTKE. I merely asked if the Senator from Washington favored the bombing of the Ho Chi Minh Trail in Laos. Anyone who has listened to the radio or viewed television programs, or who has visited and seen that part of the world, knows that a part of the Ho Chi Minh Trail goes through Laos.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, as I said, I shall not comment.

Mr. HARTKE. I think the Senator from Washington is very astute, very capable, and very careful. He is doing a fine job.

Mr. President, is the Senator from Washington in favor of sealing off the demilitarized zone, the political demilitarized line between North and South Vietnam, as has been favorably discussed by Ambassador Lodge?

Mr. JACKSON. What does the Senator mean by sealing it?

Mr. HARTKE. To draw a line across with barbed wire and concrete.

Mr. JACKSON. Does the Senator mean a sort of Maginot Line? I do not know what the Senator is talking about.

Mr. HARTKE. Ambassador Lodge has discussed it at length.

Mr. JACKSON. Where?

Mr. HARTKE. A number of times here and in public, on the radio and television.

Mr. JACKSON. I do not know what kind of sealing the Senator is talking about. If the Senator could tell me what he is talking about, I could better answer the question.

Mr. HARTKE. Ambassador Lodge suggested that we could establish a line through the demilitarized zone and stretch it across Vietnam and go into Laos with it, and that this could prevent the seeping and movement of materiel and men from North Vietnam to South Vietnam.

Mr. JACKSON. Permit me to make the general observation that there have been indeed various proposals about stopping movement across the DMZ since the North Vietnamese made their first move across the line, I think, during last June or July.

I am not in a position to comment. I do not know enough about these proposals. I do know that there have been suggestions made that involve things all the way from fixed installations of various kinds to the use of troops to seal off the area which, of course, would involve in the latter case a lot of manpower.

Mr. HARTKE. Is it the recommendation of the Senator from Washington that there should be a blockade of North Vietnam?

Mr. JACKSON. I am opposed to that.

Mr. HARTKE. Is it the recommendation of the Senator from Washington that nuclear weapons, perhaps in tactical warfare, should be used in North or South Vietnam?

Mr. JACKSON. I am opposed to the use of nuclear weapons in the operation there. That goes without saying.

Mr. HARTKE. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Washington that we should use troops to invade North Vietnam as has been proposed by Marshal Ky?

Mr. JACKSON. I am opposed to that.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, without asking the Senator from Washington to take any position on the point, does not the Senator from Washington agree with the Senator from North Carolina that a very good case could be made for the proposition that we ought to turn the fighting of this war over to the admirals and generals on duty on the ground there and let them take charge of what ought to be done to win the war?

Mr. JACKSON. We should, of course, give to the officers in the field as much authority as can properly be given to them and still carry out the decisions made by the President, the Commander in Chief.

While there have been some misunderstandings and some differences of opinion, my impression is that General Westmoreland for the most part has been substantially satisfied with the authority granted to him.

Mr. ERVIN. Has not General Westmoreland been quoted as saying that he was in favor of continuing the bombing of North Vietnam and that although it has not stopped the infiltration of men and material from North to South Vietnam, it has certainly impeded such infiltration?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct. I do not know of a professional military man there, who has not come to the same conclusion, whether he be Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Washington for being so kind. I do want to submit an amendment. I have no further questions.

I think that the speech of the Senator from Washington has made a major contribution to clarifying what is going on in South Vietnam.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I assure the Senator that there is nothing personal in my remarks. There are problems particularly relating to military operations, that we unfortunately cannot discuss on the floor of the Senate.

I hope the Senator understands.

Mr. HARTKE. I am sure that the responses of the Senator from Washington have been of help. I think that we must be careful not to become too obsessed with the idea that the people are not entitled to know or that they cannot be trusted with the destiny of their own country.

This is an idea that seems to be creeping around in places.

The statement was made by Mr. Sylvester to Mr. Morley Safer and others to the effect that if one expected to get the truth about what was going on in South Vietnam he could not do so in this part of the world. He said, in fact, that the Government has the right to lie. I think that kind of statement creates a lot of suspicion.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator knows that I do not agree with that.

As the Senator knows, there are many things that we would like to be able to tell every American, but we cannot do so without giving aid and comfort to our adversary.

This is an inhibiting factor and there is no denying it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I have the honor of serving under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] on the Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations. In addition, he serves as a very well-informed member of the Committee on Armed Services.

I do not feel sufficiently qualified to comment on some of the suggestions made by the Senator and some of the answers he has given in regard to military policy in specific, as, for example, bombing of additional military targets, but I wish to join with him in general support of the course being followed by President Johnson in the conduct of the war in Vietnam, a hard but necessary middle course, requiring combined determination and restraint.

I also wish to join the distinguished Senator from Washington in his assessment of what our policy and position should be in regard to the Soviet Union. I believe that he has delineated this matter very well; and in this particular, as in others he has discussed today, he has made it again quite clear that while it may be easier, it is not quite so accurate to see things either in the black or in the white.

I commend the Senator for the thoughtful and useful speech he has made, which has resulted from his incisive mind and his excellent preparation. I believe the Senate and the country will benefit from the speech of the Senator and from his statements which followed.

Mr. JACKSON. I am grateful to my friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, for his remarks; and I certainly join with him, once again, in warmly supporting the President for what he has been doing in Vietnam. It has been a lonely fight at times, and it has been one that has not been easy to bear. I must say that the President deserves the support of all of us in what he is attempting to do—that is, to bring peace to this troubled part of the world.

I commend the able Senator from Oklahoma for his special help on our committee. His assistance in connection with our NATO hearings and study is absolutely invaluable; and the fact that he has taken such a keen interest in the defense policy, the national security considerations of that area, has been a great contribution to the Senate and to the security problems in that critical area of the world. I commend him most highly.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the Senator very much for his kind comments.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the colloquy that has taken place in the Senate this afternoon between the distinguished junior Senator from Washington and other Members of the Senate.

While I agree with some of the remarks made by the distinguished and congenial senior Senator from Indiana, particularly those which relate to the question of whether or not our friends in southeast Asia have been contributing enough support, or as much support as they should have, in view of the importance to those countries of the outcome of the war in South Vietnam, I must, in this instance, associate myself, on the whole, with the remarks that have been made by the distinguished Senator from Washington.

I serve on the Committee on Armed Services with the Senator from Washington; I serve with him on the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee; and I join with the able senior Senator from Missouri, who said earlier that no one in the Senate gives to this important subject more thought, more consideration, and more experience than is given by the Senator from Washington. He is a careful thinker; he has visited the area of South Vietnam many times; he expends much time and energy in studying the problems involved there, and he is truly one of this country's experts in this field.

I particularly agree with the position of the Senator from Washington when he says that we have a special obligation to contribute to a popular understanding of the stakes in Vietnam in relation to our world policies. I believe that the people of our country should carefully reflect upon the fact that South Vietnam is a part of southeast Asia. Southeast Asia is a vast territory of 200 million people. It is endowed with great natural resources. It dominates the gateway between the Pacific and the Indian Oceans. It is flanked on the one side by the subcontinent of India and on the other side by Australia, the Philippines, and New Zealand. It sits astride the airways and the sealanes that separate our own west coast from Asia and from Africa. It is strategically located. If South Vietnam should fall, I am afraid that other parts of southeast Asia would go. The Communists have already indicated that Thailand is the next country on their timetable, and I do not believe that this was idle talk on their part, by any means.

Moreover, I believe that we must take at face value the remarks made by Khrushchev in 1961 to the effect that the war in Vietnam is a "sacred war." Then, too, we must attribute to the remarks of Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap, the military commander of the North Vietnamese forces, the basic thinking that goes on in the Communist mind with regard to the war in South Vietnam, when he referred to that war as the "model of the national liberation movement of our time," and that if the United States can be defeated there, "it can be defeated everywhere in the world."

Then, too, in support of this thesis on the part of Giap and Khrushchev, the foremost Communist Chinese paper, the Peking People's Daily, has referred to the South Vietnam conflict as the "focal point of the international class struggle," and as the "acid test for all the political forces of the world."

So here we have, in the words of the Communists themselves, the statement that this is the "acid test."

I believe that regardless of whether the people in southeast Asia are willing to contribute to the common effort there, as they indeed should, it behooves us to recognize the fact that America is a world power.

We have a great interest in the Pacific and we simply cannot stand by and let the Communists overrun South Vietnam, Thailand, and the other countries in southeast Asia. I do not think there is any doubt that if this so-called war of national liberation should succeed in South Vietnam this might be repeated elsewhere in southeast Asia, Africa, and South America.

I believe if the United States were to be defeated, or if it were to withdraw—turn tail and run, as the President expressed it—this would be the green light to the Communists that we are not willing to take a stand, and I do not believe that we would buy peace by so doing. I feel that we would only buy a little time with which to "dig in" on a new line somewhere else.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I think the result would be to whet the appetite for more of the same.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator is correct. I feel the time is now. We should stand by the President of the United States and express our firm determination to support him as he is confronted with this very depressing and very great problem daily.

I do not support him in all matters. I have opposed some of his domestic policies in the past and undoubtedly will in the future. I cannot say that I agree with everything that has been done with respect to the war in South Vietnam. But he knows more than I do and he, more so than I, has access to information.

We have to stand behind our Commander in Chief—and it does not make any difference whether he is a Republican or a Democrat. We have fighting men in South Vietnam, and we must stand behind our men there and our Commander in Chief and hold up his hand and show the world that the people of the United States are indeed not disunited as the picture, repeatedly distorted, may have led other peoples of the world to believe.

I believe we must present a determined and a unified stand in this matter which is so vital to all of our people, to the peoples of the world, and to our posterity.

I join in believing, as the Senator from Washington has stated, that the main battlefield in the Vietnamese war may prove to be "the battlefield of public opinion here at home." The Senator from Washington is quite right in indicating that the battle of Dienbienphu was not won there or lost there. It was won and lost in Paris. France did not lose the war with the fall of Dienbienphu. That war was lost in Paris. It was lost at home. Not only were there disunity and lack of cooperation among the French generals in Vietnam, there was disunity at home. The French people did not throw their wholehearted support behind their fighting men, and France paid the price of defeat. The Communists have some reason to believe and hope that the American people will not have the stomach to see this thing through, and that some of the demonstrations and protests that have been made here at home—in some instances indubitably by well-meaning people who participated therein—will so undermine the war effort that the history of the failure of France will be repeated by an American failure.

We should take a lesson from the book of history and particularly should we view that history with the utmost seriousness as it was so painfully written in blood by France a little over a decade ago in the same part of the world where our fighting men are today shedding their precious blood. For upon those pages it is indelibly written that France showed the most complete indifference toward her army. Even in the face of incompetence of the French high command, but for the monstrous indifference of a nation, the outcome of the French effort in Indochina might have been victory rather than defeat. For at the bottom of everything was faith or the lack of faith, the will of a people, or its decline.

America must evince the will, the faith, and the spirit to persevere where others have weakened, to prevail where others have lost.

While some of us may feel that we should not have gotten involved so deeply in South Vietnam in the first place, nevertheless, we are there. It is too late now to engage in polemics as to whether or not we should have become engaged there. The fact is that we are there, and it is vital that our President have the support of his people. I intend to stand beside him, and I shall hold up his hand and the hands of our fighting men.

I congratulate the Senator from Washington. I think he has performed a signal service by bringing to the Senate today his thoughtful and valuable reflections and advice on this vital and most disturbing subject of our times.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I thank my good friend from West Virginia for the very kind remarks which he has made with regard to the junior Senator from Washington.

I wish to emphasize and be as emphatic as possible about my feelings regarding the need for our allies to participate more and give more in connection with the effort in South Vietnam.

I would not want the record to stand that they are doing all they can do. The fact is, however, that things have changed for the better as far as our allies in the Far East are concerned, and as far as the neutrals are concerned. There has been a tremendous change by reason of our determined presence in Vietnam.

I am grateful to the Senator for his contribution to the dialog and discussion on this all-important matter which is now before the Senate. It has been most helpful.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I would like to associate myself with the excellent, thought-provoking remarks made by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. I am particularly impressed by several points in this fine speech which he has brought out so well.

I agree with my colleague that too many people view the Vietnam situation without taking into account the whole picture in eastern Asia and throughout the world.

Vietnam cannot be viewed in a vacuum. It is not an isolated situation. If it were, we would probably be deeply concerned for the future of the Vietnamese people—but we would probably not commit our men and our resources to their defense.

Our commitment to Vietnam goes hand in hand with our commitment to the defense of freedom throughout the world and our goal of peaceful change in eastern Asia.

The problem today, as my distinguished colleague has pointed out so clearly, is that too many people do not see much beyond Vietnam.

Mr. President, the second point which my colleague makes so well is that, while we must be always ready and willing to promote the exchange of ideas and contacts with the Soviet Union, we must bear in mind that we must always deal from strength. We must never let down our guard or be lulled into a false sense of security.

I am convinced that the present relaxation of tensions between the Soviet Union and the United States derives from our increased strength—and not from any new-found benevolence on the part of the Soviets.

I also find myself in agreement with my colleague's view that our present stand in Vietnam has fortified the tendencies of other nations to resist the spread of communism.

Indonesia's wholesale rejection of communism in recent months, the spark of independence being shown by North Korea and the Chinese reversals in Africa might never have occurred if we had not demonstrated our commitment to the people of eastern Asia.

I am also in complete agreement with the necessity to continue maintaining pressure on North Vietnam through our aerial strikes on important military and logistical targets.

And I cannot understand why targets which are now open to aerial bombardment are presently denied to our naval units. This type of pressure can be of incalculable value to our present efforts in Vietnam and I am at a loss to understand why naval gunfire has not yet been authorized for targets in North Vietnam.

We must continue to increase the pressure on the Hanoi regime until it becomes sufficiently obvious that it can never hope to win this war. And I believe that airstrikes, combined with the accurate, constant pressure of naval bombardment, will bring the quickest results.

I have just returned from a trip to Vietnam. And my visit there has created substantial optimism about the present conduct of the war.

I share my collegue's confidence in the President's handling of this war and agree with the distinguished Senator from Washington that we can pay no greater service to our Nation than by demonstrating to our President that we support him in this dark and troubling dilemma.

THE RISING CRIME RATE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on other occasions this year I have addressed the Senate in regard to the grave public concern over the rising tide of crime in our country today. I have commented on the recent Supreme Court holding in *Miranda* v. *Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 (1966), and other Supreme Court decisions which have enhanced the rights and civil liberties of the criminal to the grave detriment of society.

That the public is cognizant of, and disturbed about, our soaring crime rate, and the inclination of the Supreme Court to free convicted self-confessed criminals is apparent from the results of a recent current events test and public opinion poll conducted by the Columbia Broadcasting System December 1966. When asked, "Do you think that the present restrictions on the police are correct and fair?" only 32 percent say yes. Asked, "Do you think that the police should again be allowed to be tougher with suspects than they can be now?" 56 percent say yes. Sixty-two percent of the respondents correctly answered the following fact question: "This year, in the Miranda case, the Supreme Court handed down a decision which affects a person's rights if he is picked up by the police. Which of the following did the Supreme Court say: First, that people taken into custody must be told of their rights to remain silent; second, that confessions can no longer be admitted as evidence in court; or, third, that police cannot question suspects before the trial?" Although No. 1 is the correct answer, it would not be going too far, as a practical matter, to say that there is a good deal of truth in answers 2 and 3.

If 62 percent does not seem to be a high percentage of correct answers on such an involved fact question, I should like to point out that only 28 percent of the respondents knew approximately how many servicemen the United States has stationed in Vietnam—the leading news topic for the past year. Perhaps one reason for the disparity of correct response to the two questions is that Vietnam is a distant country directly affecting a relatively small percentage of the American people at this time, while the deplorable prevailing crime rate in this country generally affects every American. Each individual is a potential victim of crime, and the odds are getting better each year that more and more of us will sooner or later become criminal statistics.

Two of the bills which I have introduced this session are designed to make a prompt and direct attack on the perilous crime condition existing in our country today. S. 674 provides for a sound and reasonable legislative approach regarding the admissibility of voluntary confessions, rather than the onerous exclusionary rules laid down in the Miranda decision. I should like to point out that at least seven members of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice believe that the "legitimate place of voluntary confessions in law enforcement must be reestablished and their use made dependent upon meeting due process standards of voluntariness."

S. 675 would outlaw all wiretapping except where permission is granted under restricted conditions by a court of competent jurisdiction to duly authorized law enforcement officers engaged in the investigation and prevention of specified categories of criminal offenses. A majority of the President's Crime Commission believes that "legislation should be enacted granting carefully circumscribed authority for electronic surveillance to law enforcement officers."

Although only a minority of the President's Crime Commission admit concern with the damaging effect the Miranda decision is having on law enforcement, there are other individuals who deny that the Miranda holding hampers law enforcement. That simply is not true.

Every day, in almost every newspaper that serves a metropolitan area, one will find at least one commentary on the lawlessness running rampant in our country. And it is now commonplace to read about self-confessed murderers, rapists, and robbers being set free by reluctant judges and prosecutors who are under compulsion to comply with the mandate handed down by the Supreme Court in the Miranda decision.

A recent case, reported in the New York Times and the World Journal Tribune, January 31, 1967, is typical. Justice Charles Marks of the New York Supreme Court was forced to dismiss charges against two self-confessed murderers because they had not been informed of their right to counsel before confessing to their crime. In dismissing the murder indictment the article quotes Justice Marks as stating:

> These defendants have records for robbery, assault and drugs, as well as other crimes. In the very near future I expect to see the defendants back again in this court. I hope it won't be for murder. As I see the smirks on their faces, I know they are getting away with murder.

Justice Marks was further quoted as saying it was the second time in 10 days he had been forced, because of the Miranda decision, to dismiss a murder charge against a defendant who had confessed.

Another, and more recent example of the impact of the Miranda decision on law enforcement is contained in the New York Times of February 21, 1967, as follows:

> A man who admitted slaying his wife and five small children walked out of a Brooklyn courtroom yesterday, free because the only available evidence against him was his own confession.
>
> The defendant, Jose Suarez, 22 years, a factory worker, was arrested on April 27, 1966. Questioned by the police, he signed a statement, acknowledging having killed his common-law wife, Maria Torres, 24; their children, Yvette, 4; Nancy, 3; and Jose, 11 months; and also Harry Santiago, 4; and Maria Antonio 2.
>
> Suarez said in the confession that after his wife had cut his leg with a knife during an argument, he seized the weapon and stabbed her and the children more than 100 times. That was on April 23 in their home at 301 Hooper Street.
>
> On June 13 the United States Supreme Court ruled in the landmark *Miranda* case that a defendant in custody must be informed of his rights. These include the right to remain silent if he wishes to do so, the right to consult a lawyer and the right to a warning that anything he says may be used against him at trial.
>
> Suarez was advised on none of these points, since New York State law at the time did not require it. However, the *Miranda* decision applied to him, inasmuch as it was made retroactive to cover all defendants who had not yet been tried. * * *
>
> For seven months the office of District Attorney Aaron A. Koota and the police sought, without success, to obtain evidence other than the confession against Suarez. A grand jury finally indicted him on Nov. 4. One week later, with a lawyer, Suarez retracted the confession and pleaded not guilty.
>
> "I daresay that if his questioning had conformed with the requirements of *Miranda*, this defendant would be in Sing Sing Prison serving several life sentences," Assistant District Attorney Nathan R. Schor told the court yesterday. "I am now constrained to ask for dismissal of the indictment."
>
> Suarez stood at the defense table, his head bowed. At no time did he speak or even look up. Frank Ortiz, his lawyer, was beside him.
>
> State Supreme Court Justice Michael Kern then spoke: "Unfortunately the general public doesn't understand the law. Even an animal such as this one, and I believe this is insulting the animal kingdom, must be protected with all the legal safeguards. This is a very sad thing. It is so repulsive it makes one's blood run cold and any decent human being's stomach turn to let a thing like this out on the street."
>
> Leaning forward, Justice Kern addressed the prosecutor: "Are you sure, I ask you most seriously, whether his (confession) is all you have in this case?"
>
> Mr. Schor replied: "I say reluctantly, with a heavy heart, that we simply have no alternative. There is no other evidence."
>
> Suarez was led away in handcuffs for routine processing before his release. An hour later he was a free man.
>
> Last night Mr. Koota issued the following statement: "The United States Supreme Court has weighted the scales of justice heavily in favor of the criminal suspect. I am not a prophet, but the hand-writing on the wall indicates a trend on the part of the Court to outlaw all confessions made to police. If and when that melancholy day comes, the death knell of effective criminal law enforcement will have been sounded."

Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, a leading philosopher of the Catholic Church, states that crime is increasing because of a widespread and "false compassion" for criminals. I listened to Bishop Sheen's discourse that evening and was tremendously impressed. I wish every American could have heard what he said about false compassion.

The U.S. News & World Report of January 23, 1967, quotes Bishop Sheen as saying: "A pity that is shown not to the mugged, but to the mugger, not to the family of the murdered, but to the murderer, not to the woman who was raped, but to the rapist," is a false compassion. An article in the Aurora Beacon News of January 20, 1967, commenting on Bishop Sheen's definition of "false compassion," asserts that this "clemency of a false kind" extends, in attitude, to the highest court of our land; that no longer does the U.S. Supreme Court heed the wise advice of Justice Cardozo, "Justice, though due to the accused, is due to the accuser also. The concept of fairness must not be strained until it is narrowed to a filament. We are to keep the balance true."

Mr. President, if the highest court of our land is so afflicted with such false compassion that their sympathies go out to the rapist, the murdered, the mugger, and the robber, rather than to their victims, then it is no wonder that people all over this country are clamoring against the police with a charge of police brutality.

The time has come, Mr. President, for those of us who have the responsibility in the Halls of Congress, for the executive branch of our Government, and the judiciary, to reexamine this issue and take appropriate action to bring the scales of justice back into balance to where society has some protection, to where there is the probability instead of the improbability that exists today that if a man commits a heinous crime he will not only be detected and arrested, but that he will be prosecuted, convicted, and punished, and not set free on society to again pursue his nefarious deeds.

Mr. President, today we do not have a true balance in the scales of justice between lawlessness and the rights of society. We must return to that true balance about which Justice Cardozo spoke.

In conclusion, I would like to say that I believe that many of the more than 200 recommendations made by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice will be invaluable in our long-range fight against crime.

I intend to support many of them and I hope that those that are most promising with respect to being effective, and which would serve as weapons or detriments against crime, can be enacted at this session.

I commend the President for recognizing the urgency for legislation in the field of law enforcement and crime prevention. But I am convinced we must go far beyond the recommendations of a majority of the Commissioners and of the President if we are to alleviate the injustices that recent Supreme Court decisions, such as Miranda have imposed on society. We simply cannot win this war on crime if we do not face up to these deplorable court decisions and do something about them.

Mr. President, I intend to speak on this subject often, and as often as necessary, to keep this issue ever before this body and before the people who are interested in combating crime, in winning the war against crime, and seeing that measures are taken to bring about better law enforcement, and more certainty in the apprehension and punishment of those who commit these violent crimes. I express the hope again that during this session of

Congress effective legislation in this field can be enacted.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the articles from which I have quoted and some additional articles and editorials relating to this topic as follows:

The Washington Evening Star, Tuesday, February 21, 1967, James J. Kilpatrick, "National Crime Report as a Whole Falls Short."

The Washington Evening Star, February 13, 1967, David Lawrence, "Severe Blow to Law Enforcement."

Philadelphia Inquirer, February 22, 1967, "200,000 Names Tied to Cosa Nostra in United States."

Philadelphia Inquirer, February 20, 1967, editorial, "A Landmark Report on Crime."

The Washington Evening Star, January 16, 1967, editorial, "Crippling His 'War on Crime.' "

The Washington Daily News, February 21, 1967, editorial, "The Case for Wiretapping."

The New York Times, February 21, 1967, "Confessed Slayer of Wife and Five Children Freed."

The Washington Evening Star, February 21, 1967, David Lawrence, "Crime Fight a Major 1968 Issue."

The Washington Evening Star, February 7, 1967, editorial, "The 'Plague' of Crime."

The U.S. News & World Report, January 23, 1967, "Compassion for 'Punks' Too Much, Says Bishop Sheen."

The Washington Evening Star, January 26, 1967, James J. Kilpatrick, "Fruits of Court Decisions Ripen."

World Journal Tribune, New York, January 31, 1967, "Her Husband Slain, Suspects Freed."

The New York Times, January 31, 1967, "Two Who Confessed Go Free in Slaying."

The Washington Evening Star, January 26, 1967, David Lawrence, "More Funds Needed To Fight Crime."

Arkansas Democrat, Little Rock, Ark., February 1, 1967, editorial, "For Better Justice."

Aurora (Ill.) Beacon News, January 30, 1967, "Crime Is Encouraged by Misplaced Mercy."

Chicago Daily News, January 31, 1967, David Lawrence, "Supreme Court Decisions Likely Issue in 1968."

The Philadelphia Inquirer, editorial, "In Unlimited War on Crime."

St. Louis Globe-Democrat, February 8, 1967, editorial, "Wiretap Bill Would Aid Mobsters."

World Journal Tribune, New York, February 22, 1967, editorial, "Criminals at Large."

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 21, 1967]

National Crime Report as a Whole Falls Short

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Sunday's report of the National Crime Commission contains so much that is good and wise and constructive that one gropes uncertainly to explain just why the report as a whole falls short. It is a matter of tone, of emphasis, of attitude. A feeling will not go away that the commission's staff talked with too many sociologists, and not with nearly enough cops.

The report emerges as a textbook. Indeed, it is set in the double-column design, complete with largely useless photographs, familiar in every classroom. The approach is pedantic, professiorial, antiseptic. The crime that is dissected in these statistical pages is a bloodless crime; all the passion has drained out; the outraged victims are embalmed in tabulated boxes.

Nowhere in the report—or almost nowhere—does the commission perceive any nexus between crime and punishment. The very word "punishment" seldom appears. Instead, the commission addresses itself chiefly to crime and "penalty," as if the consequence of crime somehow ranked with going down two, doubled, on a three-spade bid.

In only one brief portion of the 340-page report, if a fast first reading conveys an accurate impression, is there any strong suggestion that law-abiding people have rights that ought to be made secure. This is not even in the body of the report. It appears in a supplementary statement at the very end—and only seven of the 19 commissioners were willing to join in it.

As for the rest, the body of the report implies that law-abiding people are themselves largely to blame for the criminal sickness that afflicts society. They have failed "to motivate" the young hoodlum; they arouse temptation by leaving keys in unlocked cars; they suffer from petty thefts through their own carelessness in leaving their property lying around loose.

The report goes to some pains to belabor obvious truth, that "crime" covers a multitude of sins. It is obvious, and scarcely needed saying at any length, that tax evasion and rape at knife-point are quite different crimes, and require different procedures of law enforcement. The commission itself acknowledges that public concern is not directed at such offenses as bribery and violation of antitrust laws, but rather at crime in the streets. Yet the report's medical-school approach leaves us to contemplate the different fields of crime as no more than desiccated strains of staphylococci.

Doubtless there is something to be said for this laboratory view. Surely few persons would challenge some of the elementary correlations that are drawn in the commission's report. Slums breed crime, and crime breeds slums, and there is at least a reasonable hypothesis to be advanced that if we cure the slums, we cure the crime. But one wonders, all the same, if the commission's diagnosis is correctly drawn.

"Society insists that individuals are responsible for their actions," says the report, "and the criminal processes operates on that assumption. However, society has not devised ways for ensuring that all its members have the ability to assume responsibility. It has let too many of them grow up untaught, unmotivated, unwanted . . ."

But nowhere does the report suggest that the prospect of swift and certain punishment may also be a useful weapon in the war upon crime.

These reservations having been expressed, it is only fair to say that much of the report, and especially those sections dealing with improvements in police procedures and with judicial reform, ought to command the sober attention of civic groups and bar associations across the country. One quite minor recommendation—that police boxes be lighted, unlocked and designated as emergency telephones—makes great good sense. A National Criminal Research Foundation and a National Criminal Justice Statistics Center probably could contribute significantly to better law enforcement. The commission's concept of "Youth Service Bureaus," located chiefly in slum areas, may be idealistic and it may duplicate other community services, but there is much merit in the idea of working effectively with disadvantaged youngsters before they turn to serious crime.

The figures compiled by the commission on the incidence of crime are as familiar as they are appalling. They need no recapitulation. What matters to the average citizen is not so much the abstract of statistical problem, or even the sociologists' long-range solution. His concern goes to the mugger, the rapist, the dope-crazed thief, the arrogant young punks who infest his streets. What can be done about them now? One of the commission's answers is to provide textbooks for slum schools that are written in slum English. Okay, okay. But what can be done tomorrow, next week, next month, to lock up the hoods and thieves?

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 13, 1967]

Severe Blows to Law Enforcement

(By David Lawrence)

Although President Johnson sent to Congress a lengthy message last week proposing the expenditure of federal funds to deal with crime prevention and law enforcement in states and cities, no attention was given by the President to the harmful effects of court decisions which provide criminals with technicalities enabling them to go free.

The District of Columbia, for example—which is under direct supervision of the federal government—has today perhaps the worst crime record in the country. This has developed since the famous "Mallory" decision was rendered in 1957 by the Supreme Court of the United States, and after subsequent rulings.

Rep. John L. McMillan, Democrat of South Carolina, chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, replied recently to a letter from Washington bankers, written to the President and other government officials complaining about the crime problem. He says:

"Beginning in 1958, the trends in crime in the District of Columbia reversed. From that date to the present, the volume of crime has increased nearly 300 percent, a far greater increase than in any other comparable city in the nation."

McMillan refers to cases in which persons convicted in lower courts have been released, and adds that "the criminal mind is alert to court decisions which provide a means of escape from conviction."

He declares also that members of the House District Committee spent "thousands of hours" during the last six years in hearings, studies and conferences to draft effective legislation against crime in the District. The measure, known as the omnibus crime bill, passed the House by a two-to-one majority in three successive congresses. Last year the bill reached the point of conference between the House and Senate for the first time, and was passed by both houses in the closing days of the session, only to be vetoed by President Johnson after Congress had adjourned. Thus no opportunity was afforded to override the veto or revise the legislation.

McMillan says that while improvement in the police system and the provision of extra funds for law enforcement are decidedly helpful, all this will be of little avail unless the courts are cooperative in battling crime. He continues:

"Nationwide, it appears that we may have been concentrating on the wrong answers to crime for many years. Forty years ago, we had more poverty, more slums, poorer schools, lower educational achievement, but a crime rate which was significantly lower than today.

"In the meantime, we have tried to reduce crime through expenditures for education, housing programs and slum clearance, counselors and psychiatrists for our juveniles, indeterminate sentences, probation, parole, and rehabilitation for criminals, only to find a rapid acceleration in the crime rate.

"A recent national study indicated that 85 percent of those persons apprehended for crimes were repeat offenders."

Unfavorable sociological conditions alone are not to blame for the situation here, as McMillan points out that the operating expenses per pupil in schools in the District of Columbia are probably the highest of any comparable city. Welfare and public health expenditures have been doubled within recent years, while large sums have been spent for slum clearance and public housing. McMillan mentions also that this city has one of the lowest unemployment rates of any city in the nation and that the per capita income levels are high. He adds:

"Despite these facts, the crime rate has increased almost 300 percent in 10 years, about double the national average rate, and crime clearance here has dropped from 57 percent to 25 percent. During the same time the District of Columbia prison population at Lorton has dropped from approximately 2,200 to about 1,100. Such results are not primarily because of any basic defect in organization, inefficiency, or inadequacy of facilities of the Metropolitan Police Department."

For some undisclosed reason, the administration has ignored the severe blows to law enforcement that have come from the Supreme Court in recent years.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Enquirer, Feb. 22, 1967]

Two Hundred Thousand Names Tied to Cosa Nostra in the United States

The Justice Department disclosed it has assembled a file of more than 200,000 individuals and businesses thought to be associated with the Cosa Nostra crime syndicate in the United States.

The file contains the names of 3115 so-called principals—the most important crime figures and subjects of some kind of investigation—plus associated individuals and businesses that "number a couple of hundred thousand."

The file is the result of six years of work by government investigators since the Justice Department's organized crime drive got under way in 1961.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Enquirer, Feb. 20, 1967]

A Landmark Report on Crime

The report issued by the President's Crime Commission, interpreted by Mr. Johnson as a work of scholarship and an urgent call to action, seems thoroughly controversial in many of its details, so expensive in execution as to stagger the taxpayer, and so broad in scope as to be characterized, in fact, as a charter for a New America. All we have to do, apparently, is everything.

Yet it may stand as an enduring landmark by which the country can steer a saner and safer course in the future. The galloping increase in crimes of all kinds is no joke and won't go away for being ignored.

If, as the Commission indicates, the Nation must start by going hammer and tongs after the conditions that breed crime, it doesn't only mean the slums and ghettos, although they are of top priority; it also means a basic reorientation of American thinking about crime, for the Commission found that 90 percent or more of us admit to having done some act that could have resulted in a jail term. If we want an ordered and decent society we must start with Number One.

Any single one of the Commission's recommendations should result in some improvement of the crime situation: 50,000 more police, for instance, and all of them, in time, college graduates. Or a vastly better functioning judiciary. Or half-way houses for not-so-serious criminals.

But the dissents of seven members of former Attorney General Katzenbach's 19-member Commission are worthy of note, too. They ask legislation to reverse the trend of recent Supreme Court decisions widely held to hamper police in their work. We believe this aspect needs attention for the community's safety as well as police morale.

This massive report is something America needs—and must weigh carefully.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 16, 1967]

Crippling His "War on Crime"

The President has always talked in ringing terms of his determination to wage an all-out war on crime, to make certain that the law-abiding American people will be safe on the streets, in their homes and in their places of business. When the chips are down, however, he tends to back away from the fight.

This was demonstrated, we think, in his misguided veto of the District crime bill passed by the 89th Congress after long and careful study. The same tendency has cropped up again in his message to the 90th Congress on the state of the union. Two of his paragraphs illustrate the point.

In the section dealing with "improving the quality of life and enlarging the meaning of justice for all Americans," the President said: "We should protect what Justice Brandeis called the 'right most valued by civilized men'—the right to privacy. We should outlaw all wire-tapping—public and private—wherever and whenever it occurs, except when the security of the nation is at stake—and then only with the strictest safeguards. We should exercise the full reach of our constitutional powers [whatever that may mean] to outlaw electronic 'bugging' and 'snooping.' "

Six paragraphs later the President came to the 1967 version of his War on Crime in a section headed: "This nation must make an all-out effort to combat crime." Here are the key sentences: "Our country's laws must be respected. Order must be maintained. I will support—with all the constitutional powers I possess—our nation's law-enforcement officials in their attempt to control the crime and violence that tear the fabric of our communities."

We do not know who is responsible for the inherent contradictions in this rhetorical nonsense. But we do know that the laws are not being respected, that order is not being maintained, that the incidence of crime is constantly rising, and that neither lofty verbiage nor more federal money, which the President proposes, can reverse this trend.

What, we wonder, does the President think Justice Brandeis meant by the right to privacy—the "right most valued by civilized men"? Does this right of privacy apply to the criminal who kidnaps a child for ransom, and who will not hesitate to kill the child if it serves his purposes? Does it apply to those unconscionable characters at the top who enrich themselves from the sale of narcotics, even down to the level of our schools, and never mind the cost in ruined lives? Does it extend to organized crime, to the racketeers who survive by corrupting law-enforcement officials at the price of tearing apart "the fabric of our communities"?

There are two possible conclusions. One is that Mr. Johnson is insincere in his war on crime. We do not believe it. The other is that he doesn't really know what he is saying. This, we think, is likely.

Nothing is easier than to be against "snooping." Who isn't? But the fact remains that wiretaps and electronic devices are vitally important tools if the war on crime, especially organized crime, is to become anything more than a mouthful of words. To say as some do that these tools cannot be used without invading the privacy of the bedroom, whatever the emotional impact of this contention, is simply not true.

Our hope is that the President will take a second look at the phony advice which has been given him, that he will talk to people who know something about the facts of life in any meaningful war on crime, and that he will exercise all of the constitutional powers he possesses to seek authorization, subject to strict controls, of the use of wiretaps and electronic devices in the many instances in which they are essential to effective law enforcement. As a companion piece, he should seek legislation imposing a total ban on *unauthorized* "snooping." For this is the area in which the valid right to privacy is being destroyed.

[The Washington, D.C. Daily News, Feb. 21, 1967]

The Case for Wiretapping

Among its many thoughtful proposals for attacking crime, the President's Crime Commission strongly favors a law to legalize wiretapping by law officers — under strict supervision.

As it stands, the situation in this field now is "intolerable," the commission report asserts.

Under a series of laws and Supreme Court decisions, wiretap information is not admissible in Federal courts. But it is used in some state courts, although technically in violation of Federal law. President Johnson has banned any type of electronic snooping by Federal agents.

But the Crime Commission reported that the knowledgeable witnesses who helped it in its study of crime believe the use of "electronic surveillance" is substantial and increasing.

It is widely used by private eyes and others. And it is being done with no supervision at all.

The commission included in its report a detailed description of the difficulty of cracking organized crime because of the "layers of insulation" between the top criminals and their minions who might be caught. Then it quotes District Attorney Frank A. Hogan of New York who testified he could not have convicted some of the most infamous gangsters without wiretapping or bugging.

Wiretaps, Mr. Hogan said, are "the single most valuable weapon in law enforcement's fight against organized crime."

The great majority of law officers, the commission said, think these devices are "indispensable."

The commission conceded eavesdropping can be an invasion of privacy. So it made a sensible recommendation:

That Congress pass a law specifically dealing with this problem. That all private use of electronic snoops be outlawed—and we would add with severe penalties for violations. But that law enforcement officers be authorized to use these techniques on a "carefully circumscribed" basis—with advance court approval in each instance.

If crime is the enormous problem the Crime Commission describes—and it is—then the law is entitled to use this weapon in the people's defense.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 21, 1967]

Confessed Slayer of Wife and Five Children Freed—Judge in Brooklyn Conforms Reluctantly With High Court Protection of Defendants

(By F. David Anderson)

A man who admitted slaying his wife and five small children walked out of a Brooklyn courtroom yesterday, free, because the only available evidence against him was his own confession.

The defendant, Jose Suarez, 22 years, a factory worker, was arrested on April 27, 1966. Questioned by the police, he signed a statement, acknowledging having killed his common-law wife, Maria Torres, 24; their children, Yvette, 4; Nancy, 3; and Jose, 11 months, also Harry Santiago, 5, and Maria Antonio, 2.

Suarez said in the confession that after his wife had cut his leg with a knife during an argument, he seized the weapon and stabbed her and the children more than 100 times. That was on April 23 in their home at 301 Hooper Street.

On June 13 the United States Supreme Court ruled in the landmark Miranda case that a defendant in custody must be informed of his rights. These include the right to remain silent if he wishes to, the right to consult a lawyer and the right to a warning that anything he says may be used against him at trial.

Suarez was advised on none of these points, since New York State law at the time did not require it. However, the Miranda decision applied to him, inasmuch as it was made retroactive to cover all defendants who had not yet been tried.

Last month, three men were freed in murder trials here by State Supreme Court justices after rulings that they had not been informed of their right to counsel before they confessed.

On Jan. 20 Charles Wright of 554 West 150th Street won dismissal of homicide charges, but he was sentenced to 30 to 40 years in prison on a plea of guilty to first-degree rape.

Ten days later, Marvin Fitzgerald of 620 Lexington Avenue and Billy Bunche, no known address, were released in a similar case. Bunche was freed, but Fitzgerald was held on a charge of violating probation.

For seven months the office of District Attorney Aaron A. Koota and the police sought, without success, to obtain evidence other than the confession against Suarez. A grand jury finally indicted him on Nov. 4. One week later, with a lawyer, Suarez retracted the confession and pleaded not guilty.

"I daresay that if his questioning had conformed with the requirements of Miranda, this defendant would be in Sing Sing Prison serving several life sentences," Assistant District Attorney Nathan R. Schor told the court yesterday, "I am now constrained to ask for dismissal of the indictment."

Suarez stood at the defense table, his head bowed. At no time did he speak or even look up, Frank Ortiz, his lawyer, was beside him.

State Supreme Court Justice Michael Kern then spoke.

"Unfortunately the general public doesn't understand the law. Even an animal such as this one, and I believe this is insulting the animal kingdom, must be protected with all the legal safeguards.

"This is a very sad thing. It is so repulsive it makes one's blood run cold and any decent human being's stomach turn to let a thing like this out on the street."

Leaning forward, Justice Kern addressed the prosecutor. "Are you sure, I ask you most seriously, whether his [confession] is all you have in this case?"

Mr. Schor replied: "I say reluctantly, with a heavy heart, that we simply have no alternative. There is no other evidence."

Suarez was led away in handcuffs for routine processing before his release. An hour later he was a free man.

Mr. Ortiz spoke briefly outside the court. "He's absolutely not going to stay here," he said of his client. "Someone might kill him. His father is coming from Puerto Rico to take him home. This is terrible, I agree, but what can you do under the circumstances?"

Last night Mr. Koota issued the following statement:

"The United States Supreme Court has weighted the scales of justice heavily in favor of the criminal suspect. I am not a prophet, but the handwriting on the wall indicates a trend on the part of the Court to outlaw all confessions made to police. If and when the melancholy day comes, the death knell of effective criminal law enforcement will have been sounded.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, February 21, 1967]

CRIME FIGHT A MAJOR 1968 ISSUE

(By David Lawrence)

Perhaps the biggest political issue in the 1968 elections is going to be the failure of the Johnson administration to do an effective job in dealing with the crime wave that is sweeping America.

Plenty of presidential statements have been issued deploring crime conditions, and commissions have been appointed to study the problem.

But the urgency of the crime situation is apparently not being recognized, even though the damaging economic impact is estimated by the National Crime Commission as amounting to $20 billion a year.

While the commission has just supplied a comprehensive report on crime conditions, its recommendations largely concern future planning and further studies. The states are being encouraged to do more studying, too.

The main emphasis in the crime commission report seems to be on such factors as the elimination of "ghettos" and slums in big cities, the improvement of education, and further studies of rehabilitation techniques.

The assumption that the crime problem can be solved by sociological change means that communities will have to wait 10 to 20 years or longer for the causes of crime to be diminished.

Meanwhile, the pursuit of criminals is handicapped by a lack of personnel and of funds to take care of the larger and larger tasks that confront all the cities.

Law enforcement officials, moreover, throughout the country are complaining about court decisions that handicap them, particularly by the Supreme Court of the United States.

But no denunciation of these rulings has come from high officials here. Nor did a majority of the 19 members of the National Crime Commission accept the contention that the technicalities invoked by the courts have been responsible for the release of many prisoners who are plainly guilty of crimes.

Seven of the members of the commission, however—including three past presidents of the American Bar Association—forthrightly blamed much of the crime wave on Supreme Court rulings that have impaired the process by which police officers have questioned suspects and have used voluntary confessions as evidence in court.

This minority group of commission members urged that the American people should "take necessary action without delay" and adopt, if necessary, a constitutional amendment to safeguard "weapons of law enforcement."

But here in the Nation's Capital, which should be one of the show places of the country, the federal government—though possessing complete authority over and responsibility for the District of Columbia—has failed to deal effectively with crime. Meanwhile, community life has been immeasurably damaged.

Within the past three weeks, for instance, letters have been addressed to the President and other government officials by the District of Columbia Savings and Loan League, the Peoples Drug Stores and the Washington Clearing House Association, a banking group. All narrated the same familiar story—namely, the toll that crime is taking in Washington in both business and residential life.

The head of the Peoples Drug Stores—which operates a chain of stores in the area—said in his letter to the President that in the past 56 weeks these have been the scene of 31 armed robberies and 62 burglaries.

The Peoples Drug Stores suffered losses totaling more than $116,000 and employes of the stores have been kidnaped, pistol-whipped, beaten, bound and gagged by criminals robbing the stores of cash and drugs.

In one store, there were so many attacks that all of the employes resigned, and it had to be closed permanently.

If there's one thing that the states and cities need, it's money to build bigger and better police forces and detective bureaus.

The federal government, however, while still talking in terms of billions for education and antipoverty war, apparently thinks that the expenditure of a few millions will assure the safety of the citizen in his home, in his place of business and on the streets.

The protest against this point of view as voiced in the next election may furnish a real surprise.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 7, 1967]

THE PLAGUE OF CRIME

Lawlessness, President Johnson has told Congress, is "like a plague" in this country. No one can accuse him of exaggeration.

The recommendations which he put before the legislators are generally consistent with proposals which he previously made. And, in the main, they will be helpful, even essential, in any successful effort to combat the spread of crime.

Basically, his message was a call for millions of dollars to bolster law enforcement at the local level—to provide better salaries, better training, better equipment and the like. He also urged several innovations at the federal level which should be of substantial assistance. Finally, the President put appropriate stress on the need to alleviate conditions in the slums and elsewhere which nurture the roots of crime.

In two respects, however, one affirmative and one negative, the message was a disappointment.

Mr. Johnson again called for legislation within "the full reach of the constitutional powers of the federal government" to outlaw all wiretapping, public and private, wherever and whenever it occurs, as well as "all willful invasions" of privacy by electronic devices such as radio transmitters and concealed microphones. The only exception would be in matters of national security.

The President made this affirmative recommendation after receiving the report of his National Crime Commission, a report which will be made public later this month. It has been indicated, however, that a majority of the crime commission did not share the President's view, and that the report itself will spell out the majority belief that court-supervised eavesdropping by the police is essential to combat organized crime.

This, we believe, is the right view. And we hope that Congress, when and if it acts on this subject, will authorize the use of wiretaps and electronic devices in major cases by law-enforcement agencies, subject to strict supervision, and that all other taps and "bugs" will be outlawed and that any illegal use made subject to severe penalties.

On the negative side, Mr. Johnson had not a word to say about legislation to ease the heavy burden which court decisions have laid on law-enforcement officials. Some correction of this sort is also essential, however, if the "plague" of crime is to be abated, and we hope that Congress will follow Senator McClellan's lead and adopt remedial legislation in spite of the President's silence on the point.

President Johnson concluded his message

by saying: "Thus, it is the citizen who will be determining whether the streets will be safe to walk, whether homes will be secure, whether property rights will be respected, whether integrity and honest dealing will govern relationships between men."

No one doubts that the role of the citizen in any war on crime will be important. But the citizen, not to mention the police, will need more effective tools than the President seems willing to give them.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 26, 1967]

Fruits of Court Decisions Ripen

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

New York.—The conversation of cab drivers, shop clerks and old drinking companions offers an admittedly poor basis for drawing conclusions on the leading topic of conversation in New York these days. Yet it is curious, all the same, that here one subject crops up so constantly—crime. A visitor finds it at the very top of public concerns.

The concern goes to more than crime as such. New Yorkers have always known bloody crime. Out of random conversations, one gains an impression that many residents of the big town are experiencing a sort of crisis of confidence in their courts. It is a feeling not confined to New York alone. As the effects of several Supreme Court decisions become more evident, the fruits of Mallory, Escobedo and Miranda begin to ripen. New theories of criminal treatment, of which much more soon will be heard, suddenly are emerging in the public view. And the public is not amused.

This last Friday, there appeared before the bar of the State Supreme Court here in New York, a 23-year-old defendant by the name of Charles Wright. He had confessed to the brutal murder of two women whom he had stabbed to death. There was no question of the man's guilt. Yet inadvertently he had not been informed of his right to counsel before making his 41-page confession. Reported the New York Times:

"A distraught young assistant district attorney, who said he had taken the confession, moved to dismiss the charges to the dismay of court personnel and a courtroom filled with spectators."

"I cannot help but note," said the prosecutor, "that if it were not for assaults upon eight other women, many of whom were prepared to testify against the defendant, I would now by virtue of the Supreme Court decisions hailed and praised in many circles, be recommending that your honor return this admitted killer to a community that he ravaged for more than five months."

Presiding Justice Charles Marks, "with much reluctance," granted the motion to dismiss the two murder charges. As it happened, the defendant did not go free, even though he addressed the court eloquently on the subject of his "constitutional rights." He already had pleaded guilty to a separate and unrelated charge of first-degree rape. On this charge he was sentenced to 30 to 40 years in prison. Otherwise, the rule of Miranda would have set him free.

On the same day that the Times was reporting the abortive trial of Charles Wright, the World Journal Tribune was reviewing the tragic tale of a young architect, Edward Orman. He was shot and left paralyzed during the Christmas season by a mental patient, Theodore Neely, who was walking the streets of Manhattan on holiday parole from the Central Islip State Hospital. It appeared that Neely had an obsession against germs. He somehow got it into his head that Orman threatened him with contagious disease; so he shot him. Orman's young wife, the mother of two children, asked the anguished question, "Why did the hospital give this man parole?"

Under different circumstances, the two cases might be rationalized. Most persons would agree that coerced confessions, obtained by third-degree methods, ought not to be received in evidence. Everyone would agree that the very system of probation and parole, whether from mental or from penal institutions, entails an element of risk. Some degree of recidivism must be accepted. Yet here the evidence was that Wright had been abundantly advised of everything except his right to counsel before he launched into his detailed confession, there was nothing "coerced" about it. In the case of the obsessed Neely, the fact of the paralyzed young architect attests the hospital's error in judgment.

But the dismissal of the murder charges against Wright, and the granting of a holiday parole to Neely, are typical manifestations of the new school of thought in criminal jurisprudence. Within the next two or three weeks, the President's Commission on Crime will release its massive report. Enough has been leaked from inside sources to support a prediction that the commission's heart will bleed with solicitude for the criminals that infest American society.

Once more we will be told (as we were told in the recent report of a separate commission on crime in the District of Columbia) that punishment is not the answer. The answer, it will be said, lies in better housing, better jobs, better education, greater rehabilitation and strict observance of all the new constitutional rights.

As the D.C. commission's staff said of recidivists, "backsliding need not be taken as evidence of failure."

The New Yorkers one talks with are developing a slow burn against the coddling of criminals and lunatics. Their feeling, one surmises, is shared widely across the nation. It is a feeling the Supreme Court of the United States cannot wisely ignore. In the fruits of Miranda lie the seeds of a terrible loss of confidence in our courts. As surely as the high court sows this wind, a whirlwind will be reaped.

[From the New York World Journal Tribune, Jan. 31, 1967]

Her Husband Slain, Suspects Freed

(By Robert Samuels)

"I am so deep in grief," Mrs. Malvin Weiss said, almost sobbing. "I am not angry—I do not understand what happened. I am just worried, so worried about the future."

Yesterday, State Supreme Court Justice Charles Marks dropped homicide charges against two of her husband's three accused killers at the request of the Manhattan district attorney's office.

One of the men, Billy Bunch, 27, a drifter and an admitted drug addict with six previous convictions, walked out of court, a free man. The other, Marvin Fitzgerald, 35, of 620 Lenox Ave., also a drug addict with eight previous convictions, was held on a parole violation.

The murder charges were dropped because the defendants had not been advised of their right to counsel before being questioned. A third man, the convicted trigger man, Barnardo Gonzales, 19, of 15 Stanton St., pleaded guilty and will be sentenced March 1.

NO VENGEANCE

There was no vengeance in Mrs. Weiss' heart as she spoke—only confusion and fear for her and her daughters' futures.

"We only get the Social Security. It is $62 a month for each of us, but Aggie, my big girl, will be 18 this spring and then her's will stop. I don't know what our future is," she said.

After her husband, Moritz, 56, was slain in his Lower East Side second hand clothing store on Jan. 24, 1966, Mrs. Weiss moved with Aggie and her younger daughter, Gloria, 8, from the neighborhood into a friend's apartment at 1367 47th St., Borough Park, Bklyn.

"I couldn't stay in that neighborhood where we had been so happy. You understand," she explained.

NEEDS JOB

There had been no insurance money. Mrs. Weiss now supplements her income with baby sitting jobs that pay about $10 a week. She is desperately trying to find other work which will allow her to be home in time for Gloria's return from school each day at 4 p.m.

State. Sen. Paul P. E. Bookson, a Democrat who represents the district where Mr. Weiss had his store and the family used to live, said that the "community was shocked and outraged at the dismissal of the indictments."

Bookson felt that the case should have been prosecuted despite the historic Supreme Court ruling, which came four months following the arrests of the suspects, stating the right of a defendant to an attorney during questioning.

NO COMPENSATION

Bookson said that the widow and her family have not received any compensation from a law passed by the Legislature last year awarding money to victims of violent crimes. "No award can be made on crimes that occur before March 1, 1967," he pointed out.

"These defendants have records for robbery, assaults and drugs as well as other crimes," Marks said yesterday in dismissing the indictments. "In the very near future I expect to see the defendants back again in this court, I hope it won't be for murder. As I see the smirks on their faces, I know they are getting away with murder."

And in Brooklyn, Mrs. Weiss sits in her friend's apartment and worries about the future.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 31, 1967]

Two Who Confessed Go Free in Slaying

(By Jack Roth)

Two defendants with long criminal records won dismissal of murder charges yesterday in State Supreme Court here because they had not been informed of their right to counsel before they confessed.

One of the men walked from the Criminal Courts Building at 100 Centre Street a free man. The second was held on a charge of violating probation.

Justice Charles Marks said it was the second time in 10 days that he had been forced, because of a recent decision by The United States Supreme Court, to dismiss a murder charge against a defendant who had confessed. That ruling said a suspect must be told of his right to have a lawyer before he said anything either to the police or a district attorney.

Ten days ago Justice Marks dismissed a murder indictment against Charles Wright, 23 years old, who had confessed he stabbed two women to death. However, he was sentenced to 30 to 40 years after pleading guilty of rape.

The defendants yesterday were Marvin Fitzgerald, 35, of 620 Lenox Avenue, and Billy Bunche, 27, no address. Justice Marks, speaking with emotion, said as he looked at them:

"These defendants have records for robbery, assaults and drugs, as well as other crimes. In the very near future I expect to see the defendants back again in this court. I hope it won't be for murder. As I see the smirks on their faces, I know they are getting away with murder."

BACKGROUND RECALLED

Assistant District Attorney John F. Keenan had moved that the charges be dismissed. First he gave the background of the case.

Fitzgerald and Bunche, he said, had told a third man, Bernardo Gonzales, 20, of 15 Stanton Street, that they knew of an "easy mark" for a robbery, a clothing store at 48 Avenue C, owned by Moritz Weiss.

Mr. Keenan said that after their arrest on Jan. 26, 1966, Fitzgerald and Bunche told another assistant prosecutor, Robert Stein, that they had gone to the store on Jan. 24 with Gonzales; that they waited outside as lookouts, while Gonzales went into the store to commit the robbery, and that Gonzales then shot and killed Mr. Weiss.

The defendants were indicted on first-degree murder charges on Feb. 14, 1966. The following May their defense lawyers, led by Irving Mendelson entered a plea of not guilty. A month later the high court's decision was handed down.

The district attorney's office said that since then it has tried in vain to find witnesses to use against the defendants in court.

Fitzgerald and Bunche told Mr. Stein they were to have shared in the proceeds of the robbery, Mr. Keenan said. Gonzales pleaded guilty yesterday before Justice Marks to second-degree murder and is awaiting a mandatory sentence of at least 20 years to life.

PROSECUTOR EXPLAINS

A spokesman for the district attorney's office said that the prosecution had eyewitnesses prepared to testify against Gonzales. He explained that the defendant had been allowed to plead guilty to second-degree murder because it was considered that such a plea would satisfy the prosecution.

As far as Fitzgerald and Bunche are concerned Mr. Keenan said, "There are no witnesses to their participation in the murder, no witnesses who can identify them as being near the scene, and no other evidence to connect them to this brutal homicide other than their confessions."

Should witnesses turn up in the future, it would not be considered double jeopardy for a grand jury to return another indictment against the defendants, according to the District Attorney's office.

It explained that even if Gonzales was willing to testify against the other two, he could not be used as a witness because the District Attorney would then have only the uncorroborated testimony of an accomplice and that under the law this was not enough to obtain a conviction. Other evidence tending to connect them with the crime would be necessary, it was said.

Mr. Keenan added that the defendants had confessed although they had been told they had a right to remain silent. He said they were not informed of their right to counsel because at that time there was no such legal requirement. The high court's ruling requiring instruction about counsel was handed down on June 13, 1966.

Fitzgerald, who was held on the probation charge, has eight previous convictions and Bunche has six.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 26, 1967]

MORE FUNDS NEEDED TO FIGHT CRIME

(By David Lawrence)

With all the billions of dollars to be spent on the Great Society, it's amazing that virtually nothing is being provided to organize an effective war on crime throughout the country.

The rate of crime is growing every year, and in the nation's capital the rise in serious crime is three times the national average. But a bill dealing with the problem in the District of Columbia was recently vetoed by President Johnson because of its "possible" unconstitutionality.

It seems certain now that one of the biggest issues in the 1968 campaign will be crime—the inability of the citizen to walk the streets in safety.

Senator John L. McClellan, D-Ark., in a speech to the Senate yesterday, pointed out not only that the federal government has a responsibility to act, but that the Supreme Court by its decisions has made it easier for the criminal to escape punishment. The President has promised to recommend legislation to help. One problem, however, is how the states are going to get enough money to do the job.

Apart from the inadequacy of public funds for states and cities to multiply the number of their policemen and detectives, the biggest single obstacle today is the attitude of the Supreme Court of the United States, which has made it more difficult to convict persons who have committed a crime. Numerous technicalities have been interjected. so that criminals have more and more ways to evade the law.

McClellan said in his speech that federal legislation is urgently needed with respect to the admissibility of evidence obtained through voluntary confessions and other statements made by suspects after their arrest. The Arkansas senator said:

"Congress simply must rectify the mockery of justice and protect society from the dire consequences of a number of recent 5-to-4 Supreme Court decisions that allow self-confessed, vicious criminals to go free.

"Self-confessed criminals should be punished—not liberated. These enemies of law and order and decent society should be penalized—not freed on the basis of frivolous and dubious technicalities . . .

"A majority of the Supreme Court appears to be so obsessed in its quest of discovering new rights for the criminal and so enthusiastic in its efforts to magnify and articulate them that it has lost sight of law enforcement—an indispensable ingredient of our internal security."

The senator referred to what is known as the "Miranda" case, in which the Supreme Count declared that no confession—even if wholly voluntary—can be admitted in evidence in state or federal criminal proceedings unless, before any questioning by the police, the accused is given a lengthy warning about his rights. Just why policemen must give preference to the rights of the criminal, instead of to the rights of the public, is difficult to understand.

McClellan recited what has happened in a number of cases, including the following:

"Recently a self-confessed murderer was turned loose in Columbus, Ohio, because of the Miranda decision. He had voluntarily confessed and told where the murder weapon, a shotgun, could be found. It was found and tests proved it was the weapon used in the commission of the crime. Both confession and gun had to be excluded from the evidence. As a consequence, that murderer walks the streets today—free and unpunished for his terrible crime."

The American people are bewildered and dismayed by decisions of the high court and have been expecting President Johnson, as the leader of his party, to recommend to Congress a comprehensive program to halt the rise in crime. His apparent indifference to conditions in the District of Columbia has already resulted in much criticism.

It is evident now that, without waiting for the President to act, Congress itself will have to do something about the nationwide problem. Otherwise, in the 1968 campaign, the issue could bring about the defeat of many Democrats seeking re-election.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Jan. 23, 1967]

COMPASSION FOR "PUNKS" TOO MUCH, SAYS BISHOP SHEEN

Crime is increasing, says the Most Reverend Fulton J. Sheen, because of a widespread and "false compassion" for criminals.

Bishop Sheen, a leading philosopher of the Roman Catholic Church and the Bishop of Rochester, defines false compassion in these words—

"A pity that is shown, not to the mugged, but to the mugger; not to the family of the murdered, but to the murderer; not to the woman who was raped, but to the rapist."

This attitude, Bishop Sheen said in a telecast carried by a number of U.S. stations, is responsible to a large degree for the rising crime rate in the U.S. and the fact that 12 out of every 100 policemen were assaulted last year.

"Social slobberers" were deplored by the Bishop as those "who insist on compassion being shown to the junkies, to the dope fiends, the throat slashers, the beatniks, the prostitutes, the homosexuals and the punks. Today the decent man is practically on the reservation."

Bishop Sheen noted that crime is increasing because "clemency of a false kind is shown to criminals."

This is the picture he described—

"There is a robbery in the United States very 30 seconds. There is an auto stolen every minute. A rape is committed every three minutes. A murder is perpetrated in the United States every 60 minutes."

The Bishop declared that 43 per cent of those arrested for robbery and larceny have already received earlier clemency.

"In New York City alone," he said, "there are 60,000 narcotic addicts. Of all those that are arrested for dope-pushing, selling, taking narcotics, 37 per cent are released."

Bishop Sheen concluded that part of the blame for this crime picture "has to be laid at the door of all of those who have committed and shown false compassion."

[From the Aurora (Ill.) Beacon News, Jan. 30, 1967]

COMPASSION IS TWO-WAY STREET—CRIME IS ENCOURAGED BY MISPLACED MERCY

Compassion toward a fellow man can be a kindness, but it also can be a cruelty to all other men if it is false.

This is the provocative and accurate message the Most Rev. Fulton J. Sheen, a leading philosopher of the Catholic Church and the bishop of Rochester, uses to summarize the right attitude toward crime.

"A pity that is shown, not to the mugged, but to the mugger; not to the family of the murdered, but to the murderer; not to the woman who was raped, but to the rapist," is false compassion, the bishop says.

It is this kind of false compassion that is responsible, to a large degree, for the rising crime rate in the United States of America, including assaults on police officers.

Unfortunately the "clemency of a false kind" that is shown to criminals today in the United States is not confined to what the bishop calls "social slobberers" among the public. It extends, in attitude, to the highest court of our land.

No longer does the U.S. Supreme Court heed the wise advice of Justice Cardozo: "Justice, though due to the accused, is due the accuser also. The concept of fairness must not be strained until it is narrowed to a filament. We are to keep the balance true."

The effect of soft Supreme Court decisions in matters of interrogation, confessions, detaining of suspects, right of attorney and searching, has filtered to lower courts and has hamstrung police officers across the nation.

The anger of Federal Judge George L. Hart of Washington, D.C., as he faced James W. Killough on trial before him for murder, was understandable.

"On three separate occasions," said the judge, "this man voluntarily confessed foully killing his wife and throwing her body on a dump . . . he led police there. Yet the U.S. Court of Appeals has seen fit to throw the confessions out . . . tonight felons will sleep better."

"Social slobberers" have made it possible for many convicted criminals to escape punishment for their offenses against society. The urgent need for a new wave of moral responsibility was stressed by Gov. Ronald Reagan of California when he said in his inaugural speech:

"Californians should be able to walk our streets safely day or night. The law-abiding are entitled to as much protection as the lawbreakers."

Governor Reagan's words, although addressed to the citizens of California, apply equally well to every state in our union, including Illinois.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, Jan. 31, 1967]

Supreme Court Decisions Likely Issues in 1968

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—With all the billions of dollars to be spent on the Great Society, it's amazing that virtually nothing is being provided to organize effective war on crime throughout the country.

The rate of crime is growing every year, and in the nation's capital the rise in serious crime is three times the national average. But a bill dealing with the problem in the District of Columbia was recently vetoed by President Johnson because of its "possible" unconstitutionality.

It seems certain now that one of the biggest issues in the 1968 campaign will be crime—the inability of the citizen to walk the streets in safety.

Sen. John L. McClellan, Democrat of Arkansas, in a speech to the Senate last week, pointed out not only that the federal government has a responsibility to act, but that the Supreme Court by its decisions has made it easier for the criminal to escape punishment. The President has promised to recommend legislation to help combat crime.

Apart from the inadequacy of public funds for states and cities to multiply the number of their policemen and detectives, the biggest single obstacle today is the attitude of the Supreme Court, which has made it more difficult to convict persons who have committed a crime. Numerous technicalities have been interjected, so that criminals have more and more ways to evade the law.

McClellan said in his speech that federal legislation is urgently needed with respect to the admissibility of evidence obtained through voluntary confessions and other statements made by suspects after their arrest. The Arkansas senator added:

"Congress simply must rectify the mockery of justice and protect society from the dire consequences of a number of recent 5-to-4 Supreme Court decisions that allow self-confessed, vicious criminals to go free.

"Self-confessed criminals should be punished—not liberated. These enemies of law and order and decent society should be penalized—not freed on the basis of frivolous and dubious technicalities."

The American people are bewildered and dismayed by decisions of the high court and have been expecting President Johnson, as the leader of his party, to recommend to Congress a comprehensive program to halt the rise in crime.

His apparent indifference to conditions in the District of Columbia has already resulted in much criticism.

It is evident now that, without waiting for the President to act, Congress itself will have to do something about the nationwide problem. Otherwise, in the 1968 campaign, the issue could bring about the defeat of many Democrats seeking reelection.

[From the Arkansas Democrat, Little Rock, Ark., Feb. 1, 1967]

For Better Justice

As a means of providing greater justice in criminal cases, Sen. John L. McClellan suggests a law changing the manner in which voluntary confessions are considered. He suggests that voluntariness should be the only test for the court in determining admissibility, while the jury should be allowed to consider all the circumstances in weighing the credibility of such voluntary confessions or statements of the accused.

Factors involving voluntariness include circumstances surrounding the giving of the confession or the incriminating statement of the accused. Such circumstances include the length of time between the arrest and the arraignment; whether the defendant knew the nature of the offense with which he was charged or suspected; whether he was advised or knew that he was not required to make any statement and that such statement could be used against him; whether the defendant knew he had a right to the assistance of counsel, and whether he was without the assistance of counsel when questioned and when giving his confession.

In giving the trial judge such responsibilities, Sen. McClellan caustically asks if we cannot trust the trial judges of the nation. He also asks, "Is the Supreme Court the only one possessed of the wisdom and integrity to make such determinations."

This procedure for handling questions is an important one because recent decisions have found in favor of defendants on technical grounds in a way as to drastically restrict the work of peace officers in solving a crime and bringing a criminal to justice.

The senator's procedure apparently would provide a workable yardstick for the court, the jury, the accused, law-enforcement officers and the general public.

Current procedures in bringing criminals to trial and in presenting their case in court have reflected in a burgeoning crime rate.

Congress could do well to consider Sen. McClellan's proposals. They are reasonably intended to give society a better break while still maintaining the constitutional rights of persons arrested, questioned and put on trial for the commission of a crime.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer]

An Unlimited War on Crime

President Johnson's special message to Congress on crime includes a number of worthy proposals for strengthening the Nation's fight against criminal activity—but they only scratch the surface.

What this country urgently and desperately needs is an all-out war against crime—an unconditional war fought on every front of criminal depredation, with no privileged sanctuaries for lawbreakers and no appeasement of misguided mollycoddlers who compromise the public interest by exalting the rights of vicious hoodlums beyond the bounds of reason and justice.

The certainty of swift, stern punishment for the guilty, in a degree of severity commensurate with the nature of the crime, can serve as a powerful deterrent to crime as a persuasive force in the rehabilitation process, and as an ironclad protection of the public for as long as the miscreant is safely behind bars.

To apply such methods does not require huge Federal outlays for special studies, research programs and pilot projects. What is required are vigilant police departments unshackled by court-imposed rules and regulations giving unfair advantage to criminals.

The President's recommendations for controls on mail-order gun sales, for better-trained policemen, for streets that are more brightly lighted, for stronger measures to combat narcotics addiction and illicit drug traffic—all are desirable goals.

His call for protection of the people against invasions of privacy is timely. It should be remembered, though, that the most hazardous invasion of privacy confronting the public is the invasion of their homes by burglars, rapists and other criminal elements. Protection against them should be the first consideration in establishing safeguards of privacy.

In noting that the crime rate is highest among youths of 15 and 16, the President focused renewed attention on juvenile delinquency, which he will discuss in another message to Congress. Unwarranted leniency to young criminals may well be a major contributing factor toward encouraging, instead of discouraging, lifelong careers in crime as adults.

The war on crime will not be won by harassment of police and keeping them on the defensive, while criminals are favored and their victims are forgotten.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe Democrat, Feb. 8, 1967]

Wiretap Bill Would Aid Mobsters

In advocating a bill to curb crime and another measure to outlaw all wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping, except in cases involving national security, President Johnson is working at cross purposes.

The Justice Department and police would lose a major weapon in combatting organized crime, if all wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping were banned in cases involving national crime syndicates and other major felony.

Kidnapers and capital felons would breathe easier if they were assured police wouldn't be able to use electronic "bugs" and wiretaps against them.

Mr. Johnson apparently hasn't probed the feelings of most Americans who are sick and tired of rising crime. They don't fear police abuse of the privilege in using wiretaps and electronic devices.

But they do fear the hold that crime barons are getting over many large cities and the great increase in crimes of violence across the country.

President Johnson has called his anti-wiretap bill the Right to Privacy Act. He should realize that most Americans consider mounting crime a much greater threat to privacy than police use of listening devices.

The President's bill actually would give mobsters and perpetrators of major crimes an undeserved immunity.

It would further cripple law enforcement and should be defeated.

[From the New York World Journal Tribune, Feb. 22, 1967]

Criminals at Large

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration has unfurled a formidable blueprint for pushing back the tide of crime on every front and at every level.

Trouble is, it's hard to fight crime without fighting the criminal. And fighting the criminal is getting to be more and more a losing proposition.

Just this week a state court in Brooklyn was obliged to set loose a defendant who had confessed killing his wife and her five children.

His benefactor was a U.S. Supreme Court decision, in the landmark Miranda case, that a defendant in custody must be informed of his right to remain silent and to consult a lawyer. Although the Brooklyn man's confession preceded the Miranda ruling, it applied retroactively because he had not yet been brought to trial.

The incident, alas, is not remarkable. Three men were similarly freed of homicide charges here last month. The Miranda ruling is exploding cases all over the country. And it is aborting many more.

For instance, Brooklyn District Attorney Aaron Koota disclosed that in recent (post-Miranda) four-month period of 130 to 316 suspects—in homicides, robberies, rapes and felonious assaults—refused to talk when questioned by his office. They were let go.

Similarly, the Police Department noted that its crime-solving rate fell about 10 per cent last year. A spokesman explained: "The new court interpretations . . . have had a direct effect on prisoners talking."

For that matter, seven of the 19 members on the presidential commission took occasion to express concern that the Supreme Court had made crime-fighting a lot tougher.

This is not to suggest that the bad old days of "the third degree" be revised.

> But it is to suggest that the nation has fallen on sorry days when justice is a low-risk game of chance, when killers are turned loose and criminal suspects are virtually encouraged to clam up and go free.
>
> At this rate, it may be possible to get convictions only when criminals are caught in the act, incriminated by overwhelming evidence, or forced by penitent conscience to confess. Even at that, the slightest slip-up in protocol could demolish a seemingly airtight case.
>
> In dissenting from the majority, Justice Harlan foresaw the harm the Miranda ruling could do—and most certainly has done—in tilting the scales of justice unduly in favor of the criminal suspect and against society.
>
> The Supreme Court has come perilously close to ungluing altogether the concept of crime and punishment. Unless the court restores a reasonable balance between suspects' rights and the public's safety, we as a nation are in for a monstrous siege—not only of crime without punishment but without limit.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for his very able remarks. I do not know of anything that deserves higher priority in the Congress than to come up with some solutions to the problem of crime.

I served as prosecuting attorney in my home county. I believe that my good friend from Arkansas had a similar responsibility. I am convinced that the pendulum has swung too far in many of these areas and Congress does have a distinct responsibility of really giving this problem higher priority than it has been given heretofore. I commend the distinguished Senator most highly.

SOLDIERS' VIEW OF TRUCE—A LETTER FROM VIETNAM

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have received a letter from two North Carolina boys in South Vietnam which I wish to read into the Record without their signatures. I omit their signatures because the sentiments they express are not quite in harmony with all of the policies that have been pursued in the fighting of this war, particularly the policies on giving truces to the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese which they have used to bring weapons and munitions into South Vietnam to kill and maim American boys.

The letter is undated, and it is addressed to me. It states:

> Senator Ervin: We realize that this situation is probably out of your control. We feel that someone should know the soldiers view of the truces in Viet Nam.
>
> At present we are supposedly under cease fire for Tet (Viet Namese Lunar New Year). Last night and this morning we have witnessed three violations of the truce by the V.C. These violations resulted in casualties to U.S. personnel. We feel sure that these were only a few of many as these were just in our immediate area.
>
> Untrue to popular belief the truce does not help the individual soldier. It may look good in headlines but out here it doesn't help us any.
>
> This may be out of your area of responsibility but we felt our views on the matter may be appreciated. Thanks so much for your time.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> ——— ———.

PATRIOTISM AWARD WON BY LETTER OF DEAD SOLDIER

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, Butch Strickland, a boy from Graham, N.C., served a 1-year term in Korea and then volunteered for duty in Vietnam. He was killed just over 2 months after arriving in southeast Asia on November 25, 1965.

I read from an article published in the Daily Reflector, of Greenville, N.C., on February 22, 1967, which concludes as follows:

> His commanding officer, going through Butch's gear after his death, found this letter written by the young soldier and addressed to his family:
>
> "Dear folks: I'm writing this letter as my last one. You've probably already received word that I'm dead and that the government wishes to express its deepest regrets.
>
> "Believe me I didn't want to die, but I know it was part of my job. I want my country to live for billions and billions of years to come.
>
> "I want it to stand as a light to all people oppressed and guide them to the same freedom we know. If we can stand and fight for freedom, then I think we have done the job God sent down for us. It's up to every American to fight for the freedom we hold so dear. If we don't the smells of free air could become dark and damp as in a prison cell.
>
> "We won't be able to look at ourselves in a mirror, much less at our sons and daughters, because we know we have failed our God, country and future generations.
>
> "I can hold my head high because I fought, whether it be in heaven or hell. Besides the saying goes, 'One more GI from Vietnam, St. Peter. I've served my time in hell'.
>
> "I fought for Sandy, Nell, Gale (his sisters), Mom and Dad. But when the twins and Sandy's kids get old enough, they'll probably have to fight, too. Tell them to go proudly and without fear of death, because it is worth keeping the land free.
>
> "I remember a story from Mr. Williams' (Thomas Williams, a teacher) English classes when I was a freshman that said, 'The cowards die a thousand times; the braves die but once'.
>
> "Don't mourn me, Mother, for I'm happy I died fighting my country's enemies, and I will live forever in people's minds. I've done what I've always dreamed of. Don't mourn me, for I died a soldier of the United States of America.
>
> "God bless you all, and take care. I'll be seeing you in heaven.
>
> "Your loving son and brother,
>
> "Butch."

Mr. President, I want to make my position clear: I am going to support every authorization for appropriations which will give to the boys in southeast Asia every weapon they need, not only to defend themselves, but also to bring this war to a speedy and successful conclusion.

I was very much intrigued by the questions which the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke] put to the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], as to what should be done in southeast Asia in connection with our fighting the enemy there.

I am not going to say how that war should be fought, but I am going to say this: That when the politicians fail to such an extent that war comes, the politicians should take a back seat and let the generals and the admirals who command our fighting forces in the area of conflict decide how the war should be fought.

I am going to stand for every measure in Congress necessary to afford our boys every weapon they need to protect themselves and to bring the war to a speedy and successful conclusion.

Teddy Roosevelt said on one occasion:

> Never hit a man unless you have to, but when you hit him, don't hit him soft.

I think that that doctrine should be proclaimed throughout this country and put into practice in South Vietnam where our boys are now fighting for their lives and for the honor and glory of this country, as well as the security of the free world.

VULGAR AND OBSCENE ARTICLE IN RAMPARTS MAGAZINE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, last summer a friend brought to my attention an article entitled "Notes on a Native Son," written by Eldridge Cleaver, and published in the June 1966, issue of Ramparts magazine. Upon reading this article I was shocked that such patently vulgar and obscene material would be permitted to be transmitted through the U.S. postal service. I considered the article completely without any redeeming social value as its language described sexual perversion unimaginable to the average person. My amazement was compounded upon reading the introduction to this article which was written by Paul Jacobs, listed in the editorial staff of Ramparts as a consulting editor. Mr. Jacobs identified Mr. Cleaver as a resident of one of the Negro ghettos of Los Angeles who had spent "more time in jail than out of it" and who at that time was a prisoner in Soledad, Calif., serving a 1- to 14-year term for assault with intent to murder. Mr. Jacobs closes his amazing introduction with these words:

> Today, Cleaver is ready to be judged as a writer—not as a prison writer or a writer about prisons, but as a writer. He is an authentic voice, and a powerful one. We believe, too, that someday it will be heard all over the land.

Mr. President, this introduction is then followed by Mr. Cleaver's article entitled "Notes on a Native Son." This article is not fit to be reprinted here; it is not fit to be read by any normal person; and, in my opinion, it is not fit for transmission through the mail service of this country. This article is on file in my office and is available to any legitimate newspaperman who wishes to see it. Of course, it is a part of Ramparts' June 1966 issue and presumably is on file at various libraries or other public places. I ask unanimous consent that this introduction by Mr. Jacobs be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the introduction was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Notes on a Native Son

(By Eldridge Cleaver)

INTRODUCTION

> The first time Eldridge Cleaver was arrested, he was 12 years old. That was in 1947 and Cleaver lived in one of the Negro ghettos

of Los Angeles. Since then, Cleaver has spent more time inside jail than out of it. By far.

Today Cleaver, a tall, handsome man in his early thirties, is in prison at Soledad, California, serving 1 to 14 years for assault with intent to murder. He is no longer a criminal, but a writer, intent only on perfecting his craft.

His first prison sentence as an adult was 2½ years at Soledad, for possession of marijuana, and that was when he started writing. "Or rather I dabbled at it, chaotically," Cleaver explains, "and wrote some poetry, but I never was able really to put anything together." When he left Soledad, he enrolled at Los Angeles City College to study economics, "because I thought that was the thing."

Cleaver has already done eight years on the assault charge for which he's in prison now. Parole has repeatedly been denied him, partly because of his record, partly, he feels, for other reasons. At San Quentin he had been a leader in the Black Muslims, now considered by some prison authorities to have a "constructive" effect on certain inmates. His prison file card still bears a Star-and-Crescent stamp, although he has since repudiated the black nationalist organization. When Malcolm X broke away from the Muslims, 'there was a split in the prisons," Cleaver recalls, "and I went with the Malcolm faction. The prison officials regarded us with disfavor, to say the least, and I was the guy who took the most uncompromising position."

After San Quentin, where he obtained his high school diploma, Cleaver was transferred once again to Soledad. He works in the lithography shop. When he's not working he puts in long sessions at his typewriter and attends meetings of the African culture class.

"I'm the historian of the class and I do some lecturing," he says. "It helps me with my writing. There was a white prison official who used to sit in on the class, and who tried to introduce a course in Swahili. Since then he has been fired, I suppose for being too liberal. What I liked about him was the patience with which he would put up with the anti-white diatribe of the prisoners, and his genuine interest in the subject."

While he was in solitary, Cleaver learned that a man's soul can grow and expand, no matter how cramped his physical surroundings or how little he was understood by those who had the legal power to censor his letters, screen the books he wanted to read and confiscate the manuscript he was writing.

The prison system can easily crush a man, even a man of spirit. Cleaver has shown how it is possible to overcome the terrible pressures of our penal laws. Another man might have given up when the authorities took away his typewriter and put him in solitary for having "contraband" magazines and books, including works by Simone de Beauvoir and Tillie Olsen.

Today, Cleaver is ready to be judged as a writer—not as a prison writer or a writer about prisons, but just a writer. He is an authentic voice, and a powerful one. We believe his voice is worth hearing and we believe, too, that some day it will be heard all over the land.—*Paul Jacobs.*

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, The utter filth and meaningless depravity of this article resulted in my addressing to the Chief Postal Inspector of the U.S. Post Office Department a letter dated June 16, 1966, a copy of which I ask unanimous consent be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 16, 1966.

Mr. HENRY B. MONTAGUE,
Chief Postal Inspector,
Post Office Department,
Pennsylvania Avenue,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONTAGUE: Enclosed you will find the June, 1966, issue of Ramparts magazine, which has an application pending for second class postage rates in connection with the distribution of their publication.

The enclosed copy was sent me by a friend who has called to my attention an article in the magazine, beginning on page 51 and written by Mr. Eldridge Cleaver, which contains a number of words and sentences which are patently vulgar and obscene.

I bring this to your attention with the thought you will wish to judge this magazine in light of the latest Supreme Court decisions. My interpretation of these decisions would be that this article would be found to appeal only to prurient interests.

In my judgment the language contained in this article is completely without redeeming or social value.

I would urge that the Post Office Department reject the application for this publication to be transmitted through the mails. As it appears to me, the remarks contained in this article would be sufficient to place the publication in the pornography category, as no publisher with any standards at all would permit such filth to be made available to the public.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,
STROM THURMOND.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, shortly after communicating this to the Post Office Department I was visited by Chief Postal Inspector Henry B. Montague who subsequently answered my inquiry by letter dated July 29, 1966. I also ask unanimous consent the letter from Inspector Montague be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
CHIEF POSTAL INSPECTOR,
Washington, D.C., July 29, 1966.

Hon. STROM THURMOND,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in further reply to your letter of June 16, 1966, relative to the June 19, 1966, issue of "Ramparts" magazine, San Francisco, California. You call attention to the vulgar and obscene words in the article, "Notes on a Native Son" by Eldridge Cleaver, and you urge that the publishers' application for second-class entry be rejected.

Although the identification statement on page 4 includes the assertion, "Application to mail at second-class postage rates is pending at San Francisco, California, and additional mailing offices," the fact is that entry was granted to the publisher on March 30, 1966, at Menlo Park, California, and reentered on May 19, 1966, at San Francisco.

On June 21, 1966, I wrote to you stating that we were referring the matter to the General Counsel of the Post Office Department for consideration and opinion. That was done, and I subsequently discussed the subject with the General Counsel's Office on July 20, 1966. Then, in accordance with an appointment granted by you, I, during our discussion on the afternoon of July 26, 1966, outlined some of the technicalities involved in connection with decisions as to what constitutes obscenity.

We thoroughly understand your feelings in this matter and regret that anything which might be considered offensive is being sent through the mail. Questionable material, however, must be considered in the light of guiding decisions of the Federal Courts, as you mentioned in your letter of June 16. Therefore, the Post Office Department cannot arbitrarily refuse to accept questionable matter for mailing.

As you are aware, the standard for judging what is obscene is that handed down in 1957 by the United States Supreme Court in the so-called Roth case. That decision states that the standard for judging obscenity is whether to the average person, applying contemporary community standards, the dominant theme of the material taken as a whole appeals to the prurient interest. Other decisions have added the additional features that such material must be utterly without redeeming social importance, and that it must be patently offensive. The recent decision in the Ginzburg case did not change this standard, but added another element—that of pandering.

In enforcing the postal laws relating to obscenity, we proceed within the framework of the Roth decision and the subsequent ones bearing on it. These decisions, we believe, clearly leave determination as to what is obscene to local juries and courts which represent community standards, and not to the Post Office Department.

When we receive a complaint on obscenity, we decide, based on experience and knowledge of the law, whether the material falls within the guidelines of the Court decision. If it does, an investigation is made by a postal inspector and the evidence gathered is presented to the appropriate United States Attorney. If he determines that court action is warranted, the evidence is presented to a grand jury, and, if an indictment is returned, the defendant has a right to trial by jury and appeal if convicted. In cases involving joint interest with local authorities, such cases are handled through local district attorneys and courts. Grand jury and trial proceedings represent community standards in action.

In the light of the controlling decisions on obscenity, it is our opinion that the courts would hold that the June 1966 issue of "Ramparts" does not violate the Federal obscenity statute. Consequently, there is no legal basis upon which the Post Office Department could take any action. The copy which you referred to me with your letter of June 16 is returned herewith.

I was glad to have the opportunity to discuss this very vexing problem with you, and if you should desire any further information about it please let me know.

With kind regards.
Sincerely yours,
H. B. MONTAGUE,
Chief Inspector.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, at present we are witnessing in many segments of the press what I would term a glorification of Ramparts magazine. This has resulted from Ramparts' recent disclosure that funds from the Central Intelligence Agency had been supplied to the National Student Association for the purpose of gathering sensitive information abroad and influencing persons attending international meetings held in foreign countries.

The outstanding newspaper, the New York Times, on February 20, 1967, published on its front page a three-column article about Ramparts. This is typical of the nationwide publicity this magazine is reaping from its exposé.

Mr. President, one can usually judge with accuracy the character of a publication by the articles it publishes. I judged Ramparts magazine last year, and my judgment of it is unchanged.

ROOM ASSIGNMENTS IN HOSPITALS ON THE BASIS OF RACE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, during the last session of Congress, the Senate adopted as an amendment to an appropriation bill a provision which would prevent the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare from demanding that room assignments in hospitals be made on the basis of race. The Senate action in adopting this amendment was based on a number of factual situations which had come to the attention of many Members of this body. Unfortunately, the original Senate position did not prevail in the conference, because the members of the conference committee were assured by the Department that their policy did not require room assignments based strictly on race.

Although Congress has been assured that this is the case, there is considerable evidence to the contrary. Many hospitals in the South are being deprived of needed funds simply because they will not conform to the dictate of the bureaucracy in Washington and make room assignments in the hospitals which are dictated solely because of race. Many hospitals have been deprived of approval to receive medicare patients because they find it impossible to meet the demands of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The most tragic part of this set of circumstances is that those patients, both black and white, who are most in need are those who suffer the most.

The Beaufort Gazette, of Beaufort, S.C., carried an editorial entitled "Just One Word" in its edition of Thursday, February 16, 1967. This editorial was written by the editor while he was a patient at Beaufort Memorial Hospital and had a firsthand knowledge of the circumstances there. The editor discusses in some detail the extent of integration in the hospital among the staff and patients. And yet, Mr. President, this hospital has not been approved by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare because of the controversy over room assignments. I ask that this editorial be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as it makes an excellent case against the unconscionable demands being made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUST ONE WORD . . .

Much has been written and said, in recent months, about Beaufort Memorial Hospital.

The Board of Regents, governing body of the institution, has been blasted and also defended for its various decisions and policies. Law suits have been threatened and much needed monies have been withheld by our "old friends" HEW (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare) because the hospital officials have failed to give in to all of the dictatorial demands of the great do-gooders of the Great Society.

It isn't often that an editor gets to view first hand a situation that has caused so much comment. These words are being written in Room 110 of Beaufort Memorial Hospital and we hope will express the impressions that an average patient feels after four or five days of recuperation.

The hospital is without a doubt one of the finest available anywhere—large or small. The facilities are modern, the equipment is up-to-date and the up-keep leaves little to be desired.

The staff of doctors, nurses, technicians, practical nurses, aides and orderlies is top rate and it is very obvious that the hospital administrator has things well organized and well in hand. And yes, the food is good.

From the first day you have that feeling that you are in good hands and that your well-being is the uppermost thought in everyone's mind. There is that professional touch that exudes confidence and at the same time there is that friendly personal touch that means so much to a person who is incapacitated for one reason or another. It is a good feeling, particularly so, when you know you have put yourself in the hands of others.

As most of us know Beaufort Memorial Hospital has been denied federal funds by the bureaucratic hierarchy of HEW because they say there is not complete and total integration of the patients in the hospital. Having seen the situation first hand, we say this is a lot of bunk and hogwash. We have never been in any place that is more integrated than here in Beaufort Memorial Hospital.

The registered nurses on duty are both white and Negro. The practical nurses are both white and Negro. Negro patients have rooms next to white patients. The nursery has Negro and white babies in basinettes side by side. Negro patients receive the same professional care that white patients receive and from our point of view nothing more could be done to help either white or Negro than is being done.

To the best of our knowledge, the only mandate of HEW's that has not been adhered to by the hospital leaders is the dictate that the hospital must routinely assign Negro patients to rooms with white patients (forcible assignment of Negroes and whites to beds side by side). The fact that the hospital officials will assign Negro and white patients to the same room by mutual consent from the patients involved is not enough for HEW. Do it whether the sick patients want it or not or you don't get the money is HEW's answer.

If we still have a democracy, and the above is the only reason the hospital has not been approved by HEW, then something is bad wrong.

You can push people just so far and if we read between the lines correctly, the hospital leaders will stand pat and take no more pushing from HEW.

If the leaders of the group or groups who say they are going to sue the hospital would direct their energies and influences on their friends in Washington, we feel sure just one word in the affirmative and approval by HEW would be forthcoming almost overnight.

They know that with approval from HEW that the hospital would get monies for added improvements, more rooms, additional equipment. They know approval is needed for the hospital to participate in Medicare. They know that for Beaufort to continue to attract young, capable, dedicated doctors we must keep pace and keep the hospital on the upward swing.

They also know that the hospital leaders have bent over backwards to comply with HEW's demands and have complied with the spirit and the full intent of the law.

Yes, we have a good hospital in Beaufort and with the right word from the right group, we can have an even better one without a long legal wait that will help no one.

CONFERENCE OF RESERVE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, at this time the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States is meeting in Washington for its midwinter banquet and conference. I had the honor of serving as national president of that association in 1954–55. I just want to say that Members of Congress welcome the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States.

These patriotic men and women, who are serving their country in the Reserves, some on active duty, some on inactive duty, are meeting in our Capital City.

This organization stands for a policy of preparedness for the United States. This organization does not contain among its members beatniks and peaceniks who are opposing the war in Vietnam. This organization is not composed in its membership of people who go out and demonstrate against America's fighting men, who are now carrying the flag for freedom in Vietnam and other countries of the world.

The members of this organization are great patriots. Most of them have volunteered for service. They serve their country over weekends and at other times when other people are enjoying recreation, watching television, playing golf, swimming, and doing necessary chores. The Reserve officers, working with their units, and enlisted men and women, are trying to keep our country prepared in case of an emergency. They stand ready to serve. They do not want to evade service. They are eager to serve as individual members of the Reserves when called.

I regret that the Government has not helped to keep the Reserves prepared. I regret that the Government has not provided proper training. I regret that it has not provided proper equipment. There are many deficiencies in the Reserves, but this has not been because of any lack of spirit or desire to serve on the part of the reservists. It is not because of any lack of desire on their part to be the best trained soldiers in the world. They stand ready today to serve their country.

As a Reserve officer in the Army Reserve, I want to say it is a pleasure for Members of Congress and all of us in Washington to welcome these patriotic people here for their conference. I am glad they have come here.

Only on yesterday, dedicatory services were held for their new building here in Washington. The building of the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States will have as it address "No. 1 Constitution Avenue, Northeast." I am proud that this fine organization has been able to locate such a suitable site for the magnificent building which is to be erected.

I predict that many Members of Congress will in the future have the pleasure of visiting that building. That organization stands for what is best to keep our country prepared. This building will be a symbol of freedom. This building will represent men and women from every State of the Nation who have served, are serving, and will continue to serve their country in a fine and patriotic manner.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to commend the Senator from South Carolina for the remarks he has just made about the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States.

For many years I was a member of that organization. In fact, I have been a Reserve officer since 1921. I am on the retired list now; nevertheless, I am still a Reserve officer.

I shall always remember what the Reserve officers could mean to us in a great emergency. In fact, I know something of what they did mean to us in a time of emergency at the beginning of the Second World War. I was in the House of Representatives at that time and on the Military Affairs Committee. I remember some of the troubles that developed in some of those dark days that came upon us at that time.

Perhaps the brightest light of all was the fact that we had 125,000 Reserve officers in the Army of the United States. General Marshall, testifying before our committee, said, and I remember it clearly, that he did not know what we would have done had we not had those Reserve officers ready to be called up and to be used for training and to serve as cadres for the formation of new organizations within the Armed Forces; and I know that he was correct in that summarization.

The Reserve officers stand us in great good stead today. Of course, they are in much greater numbers than they were then; but necessary just the same, in order to give the backup that we need to our forces who are constantly under arms. I commend the Senator from South Carolina, and join him in the statement he has made.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the distinguished Senator for those remarks.

Mr. President, I had the pleasure of serving in the same Army unit here on Capitol Hill with the distinguished Senator from Alabama for several years. We derived a great deal of benefit from those unit gatherings. It kept the Members of Congress and their staffs posted on what was going on in the Defense Department, especially on the Army, and we felt the meetings were most helpful to our national defense.

For some strange unknown reason, the Secretary of Defense decided to abolish such units, and to my way of thinking it was a great mistake. I have not heard a single Member of Congress who was a member of the unit here, who has expressed himself on the subject, who did not feel it was a mistake.

We must keep this country prepared. Right today, if we had an emergency in some part of the world, who would we have to call upon quickly to respond, to protect our country, except the Reserves? We do not have sufficient forces otherwise to meet every emergency that could arise, and the Reserves stand like a guardian beacon protecting America.

I am proud of them. I am proud of the service they render. I am proud of their patriotism. I am proud of their love for their country, and I am proud of their respect and admiration for our flag. I am proud that they are a part of the armed services of the United States. They stand ready to protect this country and insure its survival.

SPARKMAN ANSWERS ROMNEY ON NATION'S VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, reviewing the day-by-day events of the bitter conflict in Vietnam, I find that the unrest over this struggle continues to flourish. It is a frustrating war. It is a costly war. And the President recently warned us it may be a long war.

Regardless of whether a person is a "hawk" or a "dove," or somewhere in between, it is agonizing to every American to know we are engaged in a conflict of this scale. For that reason, as it is surely obvious, the massive public debate that has erupted is nearly as fierce as the battle itself.

It is not my purpose today to contribute unnecessarily to this debate.

I believe I have made my own views on this conflict as clear as possible, on the basis of whatever knowledge and wisdom I may possess. These views are based on information gained from hearings and briefings as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and from other sources too numerous to mention. To summarize my views, I believe that the United States is sparing no effort in its endeavor to bring peace to Vietnam; that aggression must not be permitted to succeed because nothing feeds on aggression more than new aggression; and finally that the national interest of the United States requires perseverance in our present course, until peace is restored and our forces and those allied with us can return to the pursuits of peace.

Moreover, while I find myself disagreeing with some of this Nation's programs and policies, I support the stand we are taking in Vietnam. I think we have been acting with sincerity of purpose in our gravely responsible role as defenders of the rights of all men to be free. It is for this reason that I feel inclined today to defend our Nation's stand against those who would criticize our course in foreign affairs, and specifically Vietnam, for what seem to be purely political purposes.

War, it is said, is too important to leave to the generals and peace too important to leave to the diplomats. I would like to add that I think criticism of the conduct of foreign affairs for self-serving political motives is too important to leave unanswered.

Now, there are some areas in our Constitution which are unclear and left to the courts for interpretation. But there is nothing unclear about the Constitution on the matter of who is responsible for the day-to-day conduct of this Nation's foreign policy. That belongs to the President of the United States. And it disturbs me to see anyone jeopardize his country's welfare by fomenting unrest and uneasiness just to further his own political ambitions.

Chief among this category of critics is the Governor of Michigan, an apparent candidate for the Republican nomination for the presidency.

Let me make it clear that I do not question his right to criticize this Nation's foreign policy. What I do question are his credentials and motives as a critic and, indeed, the criticism itself.

First of all, what are his credentials as a foreign policy critic?

Virtually none, so far as I can determine. He has been in succession a Washington lobbyist, an automobile association executive, a corporate president, and the Governor of a Midwestern State. It was not until a few days ago that he even had the full-time services of a person qualified to advise him in foreign affairs.

Second, what are his motives?

I think it surely must be evident that he is seeking the Republican presidential nomination in 1968. So ambitious is he in his quest for this goal that even at the expense of his country's welfare, he has made a series of rather poorly researched statements on foreign affairs.

Lastly, what of the criticism itself?

Let us examine some of his most recent statements on foreign affairs. They were given originally at a Lincoln Club banquet February 11 in Louisville, Ky., but have been repeated on his trip through the West this week.

In the speech, the Governor said, for example:

> Our "stumbling" one-man decision for military escalation in South Viet Nam has left young and old inadequately informed and confused.

For him to say it has been a one-man decision to escalate is the truth solely in that the President as Commander in Chief gives the orders. Only a person totally ignorant of current events would state that the President stands alone on this country's commitment in Vietnam.

This hardly needs substantiation, but the Congressional Quarterly survey last October found that 313 Senators and Representatives, or 58.5 percent of the Congress, favor the basic course our Nation has taken in Vietnam. Another 141 Members favored even more decisive military action. Moreover, it cannot be argued that the election changed this situation. An Associated Press story in December stated:

> A cross-section check . . . showed that sentiment runs strongly among newly-elected members of the House for greater military efforts in Viet Nam if present policies fail to improve the war situation.

So, let us not permit the Governor of Michigan to create a "veracity gap" by confusing the public about who does and who does not support the President's decisions.

The Governor continued by saying:

> Furthermore, the global containment foreign policies of Truman and Dulles are no longer realistic or effective.

Fortunately, both President Truman and President Eisenhower are still with us and eloquently capable of making their own response to this charge. And I hope they will. But I agree with William S. White's comment on that statement when he said:

> The simple truth is that insofar as (Governor Romney's) foreign policy views can be guessed at, they would involve a repudiation not only of Eisenhower but of nine-

tenths of the Republican membership of Congress and of every Republican leader in both Houses.

The Governor's speech offered no real alternative to the Truman, Eisenhower, or Johnson policies in foreign affairs. Instead, he said:

> America must develop the underlying framework for a new generation of foreign policy. It must place primary emphasis on sharing our principles of material progress and universal concepts of brotherhood, rather than primarily on guns, gadgets, and things for being the world's policeman.

Let me suggest to the Governor that his proposal of a "framework for a new generation of foreign policy" is utterly lacking in originality. In fact, the Governor's words border on a plagiarism of President Johnson's words in his 1965 state of the Union message. The President said:

> . . . The unity we seek cannot realize its full promise in isolation. For today the state of the union depends, in large measure, upon the state of the world.
>
> Our concern and interest, compassion and vigilance, extend to every corner of a dwindling planet.
>
> Yet, it is not merely our concern but the concern of all free men. We will not, and we should not, assume that it is the task of Americans alone to settle all the conflicts of a torn and troubled world.

Were the statements Governor Romney made in Louisville and out West the exception rather than the rule, I would not bother to point them out. But this man, who once called President Eisenhower a "fuzzy thinker," has become the epitome of confusion, frustration, and inconsistency when he speaks of foreign affairs.

This is especially true of his statements on Vietnam.

Just when he became an "expert" on Vietnam I cannot say. However, I have seen headlines reporting his statements on the war dating back into 1965.

These headlines in themselves tell the story of the Governor's Vietnam views. With your indulgence I want to read a few of them:

March 6, 1965, in the Detroit News: "Romney Backs Viet Bombing. Opposes Peace Effort Now."

March 26, 1965, in the Detroit Free Press: "Romney Backs Use of Gas in Viet War."

July 29, 1965, in the Detroit News: "Romney Joins Front Rank of Johnson—Viet—Critics."

July 30, 1965, in the Detroit News: "Romney Backs Viet Policy."

August 8, 1965, in the Lansing State Journal: "Governor Criticizes U.S.—Viet—Policy."

November 17, 1965, in the Detroit News: "Romney Defends U.S. Viet Policies as 'Morally Right.'"

January 30, 1966, in the Lansing State Journal: "Governor Opposes Escalation."

June 13, 1966, in the New York Times: "Romney Favors Widening Bombing of North Vietnam."

I might say that I am not the only person who is concerned about these statements. Writing in the February issue of Harper's magazine, William V. Shannon says:

> As Romney now begins the crucial transition from the state to the national level of politics, he has assets and also some considerable weaknesses.
>
> The first weakness is what might called the "information gap." . . . (He) has read few books, and, like many successful men, has scarcely raised his eyes above the narrow confines of his daily work during the long climb to success. Quizzed last year on Africa, he made his now famous blooper about the "British blockade of Nigeria." Only after a staff man prompted a friendly reporter to ask whether he really meant Rhodesia was the Governor able to defend himself.
>
> A quick trip to Viet Nam two years ago did not suffice to clarify his views on the war. Appearing on the "Face the Nation" television program last June, he managed to take several different positions. He said it was "a mistake" for the United States to have become involved in a land war in Asia, but he also said, "I don't think we had any alternative but to keep our commitments in South Viet Nam." He opposed unilateral withdrawal, but he left himself the escape clause that withdrawal would be all right if a new government in Saigon were to ask the U.S. to leave. He next aligned himself with the hawks by urging the bombing of the port of Haiphong. A stalemate, he said, would not be good enough to bring the Communists to the negotiating table. They would have to be "confronted with the fact that they are going to lose if they don't come," and therefore, the U.S. should "take the military action necessary to win."
>
> Having taken this forthright hawk position, Romney turned around and added the dovelike thought, "Or we ought to concentrate on a negotiated settlement."
>
> At the Governors' Conference last July, he further deepened the confusion with this press conference exposition of his views:
>
> "Well, look . . . I . . . I think it should . . . oh . . . If, if this conflict really involves the question of our stopping Communism, the international Communist conspiracy, and stopping in South Viet Nam—if this conflict is really being supported by the Red Chinese and the Russians—if this really is naked Communism, international conspiracy, then I think we have to weigh the question of how far . . . how much we can escalate without their continuing to escalate if they . . . if they agree that's the real issue in South Viet Nam."

Not too many people were impressed with that statement. As a result, the Governor for a while last fall apparently decided to refrain from further statements on the war.

But, alas, he came to Washington in January for an off-the-record discussion with several members of the press. The views he expressed there later were made public. What he said was that saturation bombing failed to bring Germany to her knees in World War II because it could not overcome human adaptability, and that this adaptability is even greater in Vietnam.

It was quickly pointed out to Governor Romney that there has been little if any of the World War II type of saturation bombing in North Vietnam and there is no parallel in the two cases.

Romney further charged, according to press reports, that the President's policy of the carrot and the stick, of prosecuting the war and simultaneously seeking peace, may have prolonged the conflict.

His reasoning was that Hanoi may feel talk of a negotiated settlement is a sign of weakness.

Did it mean the Governor favors pulling out of Vietnam?

No one knows. The Detroit News, in an editorial entitled "He's Still Confused," made this comment about his position:

> If all this musing represents Romney's current state of mind, we suggest he compose his thoughts, do his homework, and then, if he really feels capable of it, come up with a positive position, not a melange of woolgathering dissertations that range from the thinking of Clausewitz to Saint Paul.

But the Governor did not take that advice. And I think that he might have reached the high point of irresponsible statements this week in Pocatello, Idaho.

According to the Washington Post, he became irritated when reporters covering his trip pressed him with questions about his stand in Vietnam. The Post said:

> The climax of the exchange came when he was asked to give a specific instance of the "political expediency" he had charged influenced Administration foreign policy.
>
> "No, I will not," he said.
>
> "Why not?"
>
> "I do not choose to."
>
> "You just make a charge and do not substantiate it?" the reporter asked.
>
> "At this point," was Romney's reply.

While he apparently feels no compassion for restraint in criticizing President Johnson on his conduct of the war, Governor Romney now says he can make no decisions on exactly what should be done until he has visited Vietnam again later this year. I feel inclined to agree with the news commentator, Edward P. Morgan, who called the Governor's decision "ridiculous."

Romney, according to press reports of the last few days, continues to deny he is a candidate for the presidential nomination. Yet, I see in other press reports that he has hired a full-time special assistant in foreign affairs. The people of Michigan must think that is a very unique post for the staff of their State chief executive. However, if this means that in the future Governor Romney may be speaking on foreign affairs with somewhat more responsibility and regard for his country, then I am sure they welcome the move as I most certainly do.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have read with interest the reports in newspapers on the initial hearings conducted by the Task Force on Environmental Health and Related Problems. This task force was appointed by Secretary John W. Gardner, of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the avowed purpose to "explore" the relationship between the Federal, State, and local agencies concerned with man's environment and with industrial activities which affect man's surroundings.

I compliment Secretary Gardner for his action in meeting the needs of these problems, and I am always available to assist him in finding solution.

I should like at this time to note that the principal interest displayed by the public at the hearings has been in regard to air pollution, the need to find a quick remedy to prevent this condition, and a cure for persons who believe they have a respiratory illness due to pollution in the air.

Fortunately for everyone, I believe, an outstanding start has been made in West Virginia in the matter of respiratory diseases. It has been a survey in my State of chest diseases which afflict coal miners—which have been found to be extensive—and medical research which is now underway at West Virginia University. I mention this survey in connection with the environmental health problems, because doctors believe there may be an association between the diseases due to coal dust and those due to other pollutants in the air.

I quote this paragraph from a news story appearing in the New York Times of January 8, 1966, concerning the "coal" study:

> The work here is already producing important clues to the way soft-coal dust apparently affects both lung and heart actions. If this can be understood, the research will have a great impact on the dozens of other "dusty industries" and perhaps on emphysema, lung cancer and air pollution work as well.

The research is now underway at the Appalachian Laboratory for Occupational Respiratory Diseases at West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va. I was pleased to initiate the survey and research with a $100,000 appropriation in fiscal year 1963.

Because of the importance of this work, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record news stories from the New York Times of January 8, 1966, and February 10 and 11, 1967.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Miners Aid Study That Traces Lung Cases to Blood Circulation

(By Evert Clark)

Beckley, W. Va., January 8.—Earl Stafford is a slender man with iron-gray, crew-cut hair and the unmistakable "miner's mascara" of soft-coal dust in the lashes around his hazel eyes.

He lay on a rolling stretcher recently in the Appalachian Regional Hospital, talking softly, as Dr. Donald L. Rasmussen inserted a small plastic tube into an artery of his left arm.

The white sheets and gowns made a stark contrast to the unbelievable blackness of the three-foot-high "low-coal" tunnels along which two other doctors had crawled deep in the earth the day before.

"I just got short-winded," Mr. Stafford explained. "I run a motor. There's not any straining work in it, but every trip of cars I pull up the hill I have to walk around them and I'd just run out of breath and have to sit down."

Mr. Stafford is a part of the so-called "coal study"—an ambitious attempt by the United States Public Health Service to explore and conquer miners' lung diseases.

AID IN LUNG DISEASES

The work here is already producing important clues to the way soft-coal dust apparently affects both lung and heart actions. If this can be understood, the research will have a great impact on the dozens of other "dusty industries" and perhaps on emphysema, lung cancer and air pollution work as well.

For 30 of his 47 years, Mr. Stafford has worked in the dusty caves far below the rugged beauty of the West Virginia mountain tops. Twenty-two of these years have been spent crouched low on an electric truck—"the motor"—hauling trains of 18-foot-long coal cars up a steep grade from four miles down in a drift mine in Red Jacket, W. Va.

In an eight-and-a-half-hour day, Mr. Stafford may make six rattling, jolting trips up the slanting tracks, pulling 50 to 60 cars at a time. Before the long runs begin, he must walk, bent over in half to clear the tunnel roof, around the entire train, checking the couplings between cars.

COMPLAINTS UNHEEDED

Sand must be sprayed on the tracks just ahead of the motor's wheels for traction. The slope is unusually steep.

"I'd just about have to stay on sand going out and coming back, both," Mr. Stafford said.

For years, some older miners in this soft-coal region have been complaining of shortness of breath. But chest X-rays and ordinary breathing tests showed none of the silicosis or other lung ailments common to hard-coal regions. Electrical traces of heart action were also normal.

State compensation laws deal only with silicosis, which ordinarily shows clearly on an X-ray plate. Sometimes, miners who complained repeatedly were put down as having "ATS"—anxiety tension state—or accused of simply having "compensationitis."

For years, some older miners in this soft-coal region have complained of shortness of breath. In hard-coal regions, where rock dust from quartz frequently causes a lung disease among miners called silicosis, this would have been expected.

However, silicosis—the only occupational lung ailment covered by state compensation laws—is not common in soft-coals areas. When X-rays and heart and breathing tests showed no evidence of damage, a complaining soft-coal miner was often diagnosed as having "ATS"—anxiety-tension-state—or accused of having "compensationitis.'

Only the motor operators, who ride a few inches above the excellent rock-crushing device that steel wheels make as they grind sand against the steel track, were likely to show traces of the dreaded silicosis.

However, a few medical men who saw case after case of breathlessness among miners with other types of jobs were curious. They found the miners rugged, quiet men, not given to complaining without reason.

Several years ago, Senator Robert C. Byrd, Democrat of West Virginia, got a $100,000 appropriation through Congress for what has grown into "the coal study"—an investigation of all facets of the types of pneumoconiosis, or dust-induced lung disease, found in this region.

The research has grown into a series of studies sponsored by or handled by the United States Public Health Service's Division of Occupational Health, with the cooperation of miners, unions and companies.

The work going on here has held perhaps the most surprises and created strong hope for important discoveries.

Until now, most studies of lung disease in this country have dealt with the body's breathing mechanism. Far less attention has been paid to the role of the circulatory system through which the blood gains vital oxygen from the lungs.

Mr. Stafford is a volunteer in this study. He sat bare-chested on a bicycle like exerciser the other day, pedaling steadily and breathing into a complex device of metal tubes and rubber bags.

Another plastic tube, delicately pushed up his right arm through the heart and into his right lung, told an expensive electronic recorder what went on internally.

The doctors here measure heart and lung actions while the miner is exercising, rather than at rest. With new and sophisticated methods, they are seeking significant changes in heart action that had escaped more ordinary diagnostic techniques.

Because of earlier tests on Mr. Stafford, the doctors had not expected to see all they found today. After the first six-minute ride he said that "the motor is a lot rougher ride than this."

After the second ride, he was exhausted. His heart had tripled the pressure required in a normal lung to circulate the blood in order to draw the needed oxygen.

"More and more this lends support to the belief that this is a vascular [circulatory] problem with these people," Dr. Rasmussen said. "It certainly implies there has been a tremendous vascular damage."

Dr. Hawley Wells Jr. thinks it may be a problem of "a pile of coal heaped on the small arteries of the lung." He and Dr. William C. Lane, both Public Health officers, and Dr. Werner Laqueur of the hospital here are pathologists. They study the slices of blackened lungs of dead coal miners.

Dr. Lawrence S. Cohen, another Public Health officer, is a cardiologist. The entire coal study is directed by Dr. George H. L. Dillard of the Public Health Office in Cincinnati.

Dr. Rasmussen is a civilian specialist in lung diseases, attached to the Public Health Service. Before the study began, he came to the hospital staff to follow pioneering work done by Dr. Albert D. Kistin, the hospital's chief of medicine; Dr. Robert E. Hyatt, now at the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minn., and Dr. Draper Warren of the Southern West Virginia Clinic here.

Mr. Stafford's problem is typical of those the team here believes must be solved. If his condition worsens, he must quit work. He has a wife and young son to support, and his $100-a-month United Mineworkers pension will not start until he is 55.

The couple also have a daughter, 25, as well as two older sons who are not miners by Mr. Stafford's choice.

"I took them away from the coal fields," he declared. "I got my back broken in 1944, so that kindly helped me a little to get them away."

[From the New York Times, Feb. 10, 1967]

U.S. Action Urged on Air Pollution—City Proposes Health Aides Work on Local Staffs

(By Peter Kihss)

The nation's Health, Education, and Welfare Department was urged yesterday to move out to the urban firing line by assigning experts to work on major cities' staffs for three years to improve air and other environments.

An activist role—rather than "one-day" study and "pontifical recommendations"—was proposed yesterday by Austin N. Heller, the city's Air Pollution Control Commissioner.

Mr. Heller appeared before an environmental health task force set up by Secretary John W. Gardner, which met at Rockefeller University. The group had already held sessions in Boston, Detroit, Los Angeles and San Francisco on its mission to consider not only air, water and radiological problems but also effects of noise, overcrowding, lack of green space and longer commuting hours.

Mr. Heller proposed that aides for such agencies as his—who would still be paid by the Federal Government—include engineers, data processors and long-range planners.

He told the task force he had been seeking similar aides from businesses. The Travelers Research Institute, set up by the Travelers Insurance Company, he said, agreed yesterday morning to have a data-processing specialist work with his staff for three months at the institute's cost.

One task force member, Dr. John J. Hanlon, Detroit's Director of Public Health, suggested the Public Health Service might recruit experts for New York, Chicago and other cities from various sources, as it now does for technical assistance abroad.

While Mr. Heller called the metropolitan area an "aerial sewer," he opposed a "regional superagency" with Federal appointment of members and primary control powers. Instead, he favored a regional agency with Federal, state and local representatives to carry on research, monitoring and setting of standards, leaving major enforcement to state and local agencies.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 11, 1967.]

UNITED STATES URGED TO ACT TO END POLLUTION—SCIENTIST TELLS TASK FORCE OF CRIPPLING EFFECTS

(By David Bird)

A leading scientist told a Federal task force yesterday that unless we do something quickly about air pollution we will run the risk of creating a civilization of "respiratory cripples."

The scientist, Dr. Rene J. Dubos of the Rockefeller University who pioneered an antibiotic drug research, said the situation could become a national disaster because of the number of persons who would become physically impaired unless corrective steps are taken.

He testified before an environmental health panel set up by John W. Gardner, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. The group met at Rockefeller University, 66th Street and York Avenue.

Dr. Dubos, who has concentrated recently on the ways in which early biological influences set the pattern for life, said he was especially concerned about how the poisons of pollution are affecting children during their formative years.

He said this factor was much more important than the bare statistics of excess deaths during a period of heavy pollution like the one that occurred here last Thanksgiving.

SULPHUR DIOXIDE QUESTIONED

A major problem of air pollution, Dr. Dubos said, is our "fantastic ignorance" about what is harmful. He cited the current concern over sulphur dioxide as a major source of pollution and said:

"I happen to think that sulphur dioxide may turn out to be the least of the problems." He added that as yet no one really knows and it is "sheer folly" to say you are going to control air pollution by removing sulphur dioxide."

Dr. Dubos said air pollution could be conquered if we devoted the effort to it that we have given to probing the atom.

The spur in that case was the development of nuclear weapons. We have to realize, he said, that biological research on the effects of air pollution can be just as important.

What we need, Dr. Dubos said, is a "Brookhaven applied to biology." He was referring to the Brookhaven National Laboratory on Long Island where Federal funds have long supported physicists in their search into the minutest particles of matter.

REGIONAL INSTITUTES URGED

He suggested that several regional institutes be set up to provide facilities for biological studies of air pollution. These could draw on scientists from many different universities to explore many theories and many ways of solving the problem.

He said that many theories today remain untested because of a lack of laboratory facilities and staff.

"You have to have the same kind of facilities you have for particle physics," Dr. Dubos said. "Scientists cannot do the necessary biological experiments today because they have to be their own animal keepers" and they do not have time to do that.

Mayor Lindsay also appeared before the panel and said solving environmental pollution would require massive help from the Federal Government.

As of now, he said, "I'm not persuaded the Federal Government is performing."

He said the aid required was not only money. Also needed, he said, are Federal standards and legislation.

It does no good for a city to pass tough legislation against pollution, the Mayor said, if the laws are weaker elsewhere. There is always the threat, he added, that industry will say: "To hell with you, we'll move to where the laws are not so rough."

CIA'S COVERT ACTION NO. 5

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, just before World War II, when I was an undergraduate student at Evansville College in Indiana, I first witnessed and then participated in a phenomenon of those times—a swift and growing awareness that American isolationism was a political and economic anachronism. With my fellow sophomores, juniors, and seniors, I shared in an awakening realization that events in the world around us were shaping our lives.

Place yourselves in the context of those years. We were emerging from the great depression, only to see the national economy mired in the recession of 1937. Our national preoccupation with our internal problems of employment contributed to an unawareness of the portent of political upheavals in Europe and in Asia. Had not Great Britain's Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain wrung an agreement from Hitler that there was indeed to be "peace in our time"? What business was it of ours that Japan announced a "Greater East Asia Coprosperity Sphere"? While newspaper caption writers referred to Hitler as "Handsome Adolph," there seemed to be a magical assurance that the great statesmen of those days would never allow the cold war of 1939 to burst out in worldwide conflagration.

Perhaps I was fortunate to be among young college men and women who were alert to the changing political climates of the earth, and of the fomenting unrest among nations. We expressed ourselves and our growing interest not in demonstrations—possibly because it did not occur to us—but in greater participation in student government. We studied the democratic process, its strengths and its weaknesses, in academic seminars and in just plain old "bull sessions." This was our outlet, this was our growing up. And it was then, in 1941, that I took my first step toward political life, running for and being elected to the presidency of the Evansville College student government.

What was happening at Evansville College was a microcosm of the fluidity of student thinking occurring at the major universities. In a very short time I, as were millions of Americans, was in uniform. The war and the devastation it wrought, and the world problems it created and left unsolved, seem like light years away. But those problems are still with us. Succeeding student generations have, in turn, become alive to the impact of world problems upon their private lives.

The U.S. National Student Association was organized in 1947, long after my undergraduate years, but I have long felt an empathy for the spirit of academic freedom identified with the NSA. Perhaps the outcry today is that of this country's distress and indignation that the U.S. Government has compromised professions and institutions on whose freedom the hopes of American freedom depends so greatly.

If it was necessary for the Central Intelligence Agency to subsidize the students and teachers visiting other nations, would it not have been more effective, and certainly more honest to openly support their tours so that they could openly argue the American free enterprise system vis-a-vis the collectivist philosophy of communism? The central indictment against the corrupting use of taxpayers funds by the CIA is that the student and teacher subsidies were secret; that we deliberately sought to deceive ourselves, our friends and our allies—while seeking to deceive the Communists.

That the National Student Association has revolted against being used either for espionage or for propaganda is a healthy sign that academic freedom is not dead, although badly wounded. I spent some valuable hours this week listening to, and asking questions of, a young student leader who has revealed to me some of the experiences of recruitment by the CIA's "Covert Action No. 5," a subdivision of the Central Intelligence Agency's Plans Division.

It became plain to me that the CIA–NSA relationship is more than merely subsidy.

His story is a grim reminder that we are "running scared," so to speak, in this latter-day cold war. That we are playing international gamesmanship by totalitarian rules.

What about "Cover Action No. 5"? How does it work? What are the duties of a student so involved? Some examples suffice:

Before and during the crisis in the Dominican Republic, American student leaders visited the Dominican Republic at CIA expense, ostensibly to confer with student leaders there on university modernization. Their orders were to provide names and dossiers of political evaluation of those student leaders. This information was passed to the CIA Plans Division and to local area specialists.

Everything that I am repeating now certainly comes from no classified information. It comes directly from the students involved.

After this incident, and others, some American student leaders sought to disassociate themselves from their CIA involvement.

How does one do this? I asked.

Withdrawal from CIA involvement, for an American student, can be as difficult as withdrawing from the Cosa Nostra, I learned in my personal interrogation.

One such student, now in a prominent law college, sought the services of a lawyer to determine whether he could offer citizen's testimony; that is, to state publicly his role in the CIA–NSA network without possible future recrimination. According to this young student leader, his lawyer was told by the CIA to drop his interest in the case. The student leader himself was told, through his lawyer and others, that the penalties were grave: If the student leader persisted in his efforts to reveal his CIA–NSA role, his CIA record would be documented with evidence of his psychiatric instability. The threat held out or implied to him was that he would be branded throughout his lifetime as unfit to hold a responsible position in government or in private industry.

As appalling as this appears, I am left

with no reason to doubt this evidence of the elaborate infiltration of American institutions by the CIA. As yet the Congress, as apart from the administration, has no avenues of meaningful investigation. We have been told, as a people, by a former Deputy Director of the Department of Defense, that to lie for one's government is in the public interest. But in this same frame of reference, it is evidently unlawful to expose details of the clandestine relationship between our top-secret espionage organization and the college students of this Nation.

As a onetime student government leader, long before the NSA was organized, I have reasons to believe Philip Werdell, an official of the National Student Association, who states:

> Officers of the NSA who had signed national security oaths have not violated their trust, yet they have been threatened with legal action, and this has only been a part of the harassment. The CIA has intimidated them with personal threats ranging from character assassination to placing pressure upon the "establishment" to reject them from responsible roles in American society.

As an American citizen who has had his fill of deliberate deception in government, I can only express my regrets. As a Senator, with the same motivation, I am hopeful that Congress will continue to investigate this matter. I realize that espionage is necessary in the interest of national security but certainly not to our young students.

HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a résumé, written by Carter Brooke Jones, of the book entitled "History of the American Legion," by Raymond Moley, Jr. This review appeared in Mr. Jones' column, "A Book for Today," published in the Washington Evening Star of February 21, 1967. Mr. Jones' brief résumé whets one's appetite to read this new book about the history of one of our outstanding veterans' organizations.

All Americans should be aware of the tremendous heritage of the American Legion, which, as an organization, has done so much to preserve the American way of life, for which its members fought so valiantly. All of us owe a great debt of gratitude to Legionnaires for "being on guard" for all America in the ever-continuing fight for the freedoms we all cherish and "for God and Country."

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BOOK FOR TODAY: HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

(By Carter Brooke Jones)

"The American Legion Story." By Raymond Moley Jr. Duell, Sloan & Pearce, affiliate of Meredith Press. 443 pages. $6.95.

The American Legion's solid achievements for the country its members have served so faithfully in the wars often have been overlooked in the heat of controversy over its aims and policies.

It was organized by World War I veterans in 1919. In its early decades its forthright stand for an adequate national defense, at a time when we were busy dismantling it, and its fight against subversive influences soon made it a prime target for the radicals who thrived in the '20s and '30s. Indeed, to this day some professional liberals equate the legion with such fanatical rightists as the John Birchers. It can only be pointed out that few persons are less liberal, in the original meaning of that word, than some who use it to describe their narrow philosophy. The legion never deserved such calumny.

"Legislative triumphs of the American Legion," Moley points out, "range from the field of rehabilitation to child welfare, from the establishment of the Veterans Bureau (later the Veterans Administration) to passage of the legion-sponsored GI bills of rights.

Moley, a lieutenant commander in the Naval Reserve, served overseas in World War II and in Korea. He is a lucid and often eloquent writer.

His book is the third history of the organization written for the general public in the nearly half century since a caucus in Paris reached out for a union that would bind together the men who had fought at Chateau-Thierry, on the Marne and in the Argonne. Marquis James, author of a highly regarded biography of Sam Houston and other biographies, published a history in 1923. A second history of the legion, written by Richard Seelye Jones, a journalist long a resident of Washington, appeared in 1946. But much has happened affecting the legion since, and Moley has ably brought its story up to date.

Moley is aware of the legion's enemies and scorners. "For nearly five decades," he writes, "Legion emphasis on security through adequate military forces, counter-subversion measures, the teaching of Communist and Fascist intentions and the promotion of patriotism has drawn intense fire from many quarters. At times, men and women deemed responsible have found it expedient or sophisticated to attack legion warnings and proposals. Segments of the press and the academic community have neglected, ignored and scorned legion positions for various reasons. And so, at times, many legionnaires, feeling slighted and frustrated, might have despaired, lamenting, 'Wisdom cries out in the street and no man regards.' Some struck back. Others chose to ignore this serious development, but most persevered. However, when unwelcome truths gain slight notice, when public figures mask malevolent facts, when men of learning indulge in wishful meditation on a present or potential adversary's intentions, when it is 'smart' to regard patriotism as an out-of-date virtue, the republic loses a measure of its strength. To counter these tendencies, the American Legion in recent years has more energetically exploited public relations. Consequently a larger public and a growing number of notable figures recognize the judicious record of the legion's resolutions on vital national issues."

The author even mentions criticism evoked by the overexuberance of legionnaires at national conventions, more especially the early ones, when most of them were young. He does not condone certain excesses, and yet he points out that legionnaires never were more ebullient than delegates to some other large fraternal conventions.

He portrays the personalities conspicuous in building the legion. It is interesting in this connection to recall that Harold Ross, afterward founder and editor of the New Yorker, attended the original Paris caucus, an army private detached to the Stars and Stripes. Ross was the first editor of the American Legion Weekly, afterward the American Legion Magazine, a monthly.

J. Edgar Hoover writes a foreword.

BUILDING OUR FISHING INDUSTRY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have spoken many times of the plight of the U.S. fishing industry and have often noted the faith of both industry and fisherman in the future of the industry, despite seemingly insurmountable obstacles at times.

It was extremely gratifying to me this week, therefore, to be advised by the president of the New England Fish Co., Mr. Sydney M. Rosenberg, of the demonstrated faith that that company is showing in the future of our commercial fisheries.

New England Fish Co. was founded in Boston, Mass., nearly 100 years ago and has weathered many crises during this period. As Mr. Rosenberg says:

> New England has faith in the people, including especially our legislators, who are charged with the responsibility of protecting our resources. We also have faith in the ability of American fishermen to harvest the resources so that they can be sold in the marketplace of the world.

The company is preparing to build the Nation's largest fish processing, storage, and office complex in Seattle at a cost of about $2 million. This is a positive demonstration of their faith in America's domestic fisheries and should serve to awaken the Congress to its responsibilities in assuring the protection and conservation of the world's fisheries resources.

I ask unanimous consent that the press release outlining the company's plans be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEATTLE.—New England Fish Company is building the nation's largest fish processing, storage and office complex on the shores of Elliott Bay here, Sydney M. Rosenberg, president, announced today.

Construction of the new facility, to cost approximately $2 million, will start this spring and is expected to be completed by the end of the year. The five-acre site is being purchased from Great Northern Railway Company.

New England's new building will complement its facilities in Alaska and will provide a pathway for the consolidation of seafoods gathered from all over the world for shipment to key markets. It will also complement the four other facilities of New England Fish Company and its divisions on Port of Seattle property on this city's waterfront.

Design of the building was accomplished by Ralf E. Decker, Architects, after he and two New England executives, Herman Feinberg and William Eardley, toured the United States and Canada studying facilities used by other fish companies, to improve present techniques. Many innovations for the processing, freezing and storage of fish will be contained in the new building.

New England Fish Company's complex will consist of two buildings: one to be used as general offices, and the other for processing and storage of all types of seafood.

The San Juan Fishing and Packing Company Division's operations will be included in the new complex.

The office building will be two stories high with provisions for adding a third story later. This structure will be 63'x100' and will house a modern lunchroom on the upper story. The first floor will be constructed of reinforced concrete and the building will be completely air conditioned.

The two buildings will be separated by a landscaped courtyard.

Rosenberg said that the processing-storage plant emphasizes the very latest techniques in sanitation. The plant will be 152' x 328' with a capacity for nearly 7 million pounds of fish and seafood. One portion of the plant will be used for the processing of fish and the other for storage. The latter will maintain a temperature of 25 degrees below zero.

There will be parking for 150 employees and visitors' cars. A pedestrian tunnel will be used under the plant for easy access of employees to their jobs. One side of the plant is designed for the delivery of frozen fish for speedy weighing, glazing and transportation to either the storage or packing facilities. The plant is ideally situated for either rail or truck delivery to points all over.

Rosenberg said that his company has so much faith in the future of the fishing industry that it has made provisions for expanding the facilities in the years ahead.

"We purposely selected a site that will allow for growth," Rosenberg said. "By expanding our facilities to the south, we could double the size of our plant and still provide pleasant, campus-like surroundings for our employees.

"Our complex will be built shortly before we complete the first 100 years since New England Fish Company was founded in Boston. During the first 100 years of our history, the company weathered many crises—some of which made today's problems trivial. The waters of the Pacific are teeming with food for the world. This is a food rich in protein.

"New England has faith in the people, including especially our legislators, who are charged with the responsibility of protecting our resources. We also have faith in the ability of American fishermen to harvest the resources of our waters so that they can be sold in the marketplaces of the world.

"Not only are we confident that we have an adequate provision of resources. We are also certain that there are untapped reservoirs of seafood that will make this a vital industry for many years."

Consultants to Ralf E. Decker, A.I.A., Architects are Charles E. Kichin, engineer; Valentine, Fisher & Tomlinson, mechanical and electrical; and Forest Sainsbury, refrigeration consultant.

Contract for the building has been awarded to Howard S. Wright Construction Company.

COMMENDATION FOR ESSA PROGRAMS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, one of the most terrifying manifestations of nature's fury is earthquakes. More than 650,000 persons have died in earthquakes in the 20th century. Last year the Environmental Science Services Administration's Coast and Geodetic Survey, of the U.S. Department of Commerce, received reports of 674 persons killed, 1,200 injured, and more than 100,000 made homeless by earthquakes around the world. More than 6,000 earthquake epicenters were located by the Survey, and approximately 2,050 of them were reported in the United States. Of these, 1,750 were located in Alaska. These figures indicate the importance of learning more about earthquakes.

President Johnson recently commended the Environmental Science Services Administration for its acomplishments in providing constantly improving environmental information. An outstanding example of this service is advanced in seismology. The report released by the President said that the establishment in ESSA of the National Earthquake Information Center will "make available quickly more precise information on location, time, size, and effects of earthquakes."

ESSA was formed in 1965, with a mandate to understand, describe, and predict the state of our environment. A major component of ESSA is the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which has long been active in the study of world earthquake belts.

Research programs on major facets of the earthquake problem are underway, not only in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, but in such other ESSA elements as the Institute for Earth Sciences, Institute for Telecommunication Sciences and Aeronomy, and Institute for Oceanography. ESSA is also studying the roles of various structural materials in earthquake damage and is preparing a national seismic risk map.

In seeking to make available as quickly as possible precise information on the location, time, size, and effects of seismic convulsions, ESSA uses communications facilities of the Weather Bureau and the global seismograph facilities of the survey to gather data for the National Earthquake Information Center.

Earthquakes of at least medium magnitude—6.5 or higher on the Richter scale—are reported by the center to news services and Government agencies with public safety responsibilities. Coast and Geodetic Survey observatories in Guam, Hawaii, Alaska, Arizona, Washington, and the Antarctic are involved in the early reporting system. In addition, many standard seismograph stations and cooperating observatories of other agencies are collaborating in this fine service.

The National Earthquake Information Center also is headquarters for the ESSA earthquake emergency plan, designed to provide immediate and longer range technical assistance to the American public during emergency periods after earthquakes and tsunamis—seismic sea waves.

The plan provides special land and ocean surveys and other field investigations on causes and geophysical effects of earthquakes, and on safety and reconstruction programs, from buildings, docks, and utilities to transport systems. Tidal, navigational, and charting skills, frequently required in the wake of major coastal quakes, are provided as needed.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey's Office of Seismology and Geomagnetism will have primary responsibility for the emergency plan, to be directed by a headquarters operations coordinator.

The National Earthquake Information Center will serve as a focal point for numerous other seismological services.

The Center will collect historically and scientifically valuable earthquake records which will become the nucleus for the Survey's instrumentation activity.

In addition to this valuable contribution to the public safety, ESSA now issues public bulletins announcing tsunami watches following earthquakes of intensity great enough to generate seismic sea waves. If it is established that a tsunami has been created, a tsunami warning will be issued to local public safety agencies to start appropriate evacuation and other emergency procedures.

Reviewing this and other ESSA programs, I have found that the Survey makes maximum use of multidisciplinary skills and techniques in a manner which exemplifies the purposes for which this organization was formed. I am happy to add my personal commendation to that of the President.

TAX REDUCTION PROPOSAL TO CONTROL AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, we are all vitally concerned with the growing problems of air and water pollution, which grow more acute every day. However, we have continually been deprived of one very effective weapon in our arsenal—that of tax incentives—by the opposition of the Treasury Department.

I want to point out today, however, the growing isolation of that Department by those who recognize the tremendous need to solve this problem. Secretary Udall, last year, spoke in favor of tax incentives. Yesterday, the Washington Daily News reported that Secretary Udall has been joined by Secretary John Gardner of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

My bill, S. 950, to provide a rapid writeoff for pollution control devices, has been cosponsored by 17 Senators. The proposal has the endorsement of many of the Senate's leading proponents of effective pollution control. It is my hope that the growing support for the concept will bring about effective action in this Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Industry Wants Tax Break," published in the Washington Daily News of February 23, 1967, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Billion Dollars To Fight Pollution—Industry Wants Tax Break

(By Robert Dietsch)

Pressed by Government and public concern, industry is paying more attention to air and water pollution.

Executives are putting more money into control equipment and research—perhaps as much as $1 billion this year—but at the same time they are demanding more guidance from the Government and a tax break on future anti-pollution spending.

There is a minimum of industry protest that Washington is intruding into a private area or local problem. This reflects not only a realization that pollution is rapidly assuming critical national proportions but that Government has a legitimate role to play in seeking solutions.

BIGGER OUTLAYS

Both the chemical and steel industries are sharply increasing anti-pollution outlays. The American Iron and Steel Institute estimates its members have invested more than $500 million in the last 15 years and "have authorized $144 million more" to clear the air and water." Dow Chemical will invest $3 million in pollution control this year, against $1 million in 1965 and $800,000 in 1960. Allied Chemical's 1967 investment is expected to total $4.5 million and the giant firm says by 1970 it will be spending at least $6 million annually. Du Pont's over-all pollution abatement spending is pegged at $114 million.

Chase Manhattan Bank estimates that by 1970, Government and business "efforts to preserve clean air and pure water are likely to double and amount to more than $10 billion. Much of this will be spent (by) industry. Half of the funds to provide water treatment now come from industry, and the proportion is rising to two-thirds. The big spenders are manufacturers in the primary metals, chemicals, paper and petroleum industries."

As is obvious from President Johnson's anti-pollution programs and statements by Federal officials, Washington still feels industry is lagging. Health, Education and Welfare Secretary John Gardner told a Senate committee recently that industry "has tended to minimize the problem."

Mr. Gardner's department likes the idea of giving industry a tax break for anti-pollution spending; but so far the Treasury remains cool, if not opposed.

Hew, along with the new Federal highway safety agency, is pressing auto producers to improve anti-pollution devices which must, by Federal ruling, be attached to all 1968 model autos. Those now installed on cars in California are proving less than satisfactory.

STANDARDS

Mr. Johnson's anti-pollution approach does include setting national standards for various industries—a move which could begin soon after Congressional approval of the Administration program. The present lack of such standards has left many corporations undecided on what equipment to install.

Industry's attitude was summarized by Samuel Lenher, a Du Pont vice president and a member of Mr. Gardner's anti-pollution advisory board.

"There are few guidelines that industry can follow in establishing pollution abatement policies and standards. Industry is often at a loss as to where to go and how far. In too many instances, we have had no clear direction from responsible agencies covering proper and acceptable standards of pollution abatement. We cannot afford to spend millions of dollars if we are not sure it will be acceptable to whatever authorities are in charge at the completion date.

WATER QUALITY STANDARDS ON INTERSTATE STREAMS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, one of the major features of the Water Quality Act of 1965 was the provision which requires States to establish water quality standards on interstate streams by June 30, 1967.

Typical of the interest which the establishment of these guidelines has aroused throughout the Nation is an editorial published in the January issue of American Forests magazine. In this editorial, James B. Craig, the editor, warns industry that it is time to stop delay tactics and to take constructive action now to abate industrial pollution. Mr. Craig also points out an intriguing proposal by the Battelle Memorial Institute of Columbus, Ohio, to develop a mathematical model of a typical river basin for possible use by industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Time To Fish or Cut Bait," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME TO FISH OR CUT BAIT

Hottest subject in conservation today is water—the use, re-use, management, pollution, and the future needs of water. The country seems filled with committees, work shops and organizations holding meetings to discuss this vitally important subject. Following a nationwide survey, the respected Louis Harris Poll stated, "a majority of Americans report that most of the rivers, streams and lakes where they live are polluted, and they are boiling mad about it." Nor are voters diverted when they are told what pollution cleanup is likely to cost. They know what it costs to wage modern war or send a rocket to the moon and both air and water pollution are much closer to them than either of those things. A pollution control referendum is yet to know defeat where state electorates have been given an opportunity to voice their views. Out of this swamp of discontent over the way Americans are fouling their own nests great reforms are almost certain to emerge. And the next six months are likely to prove crucial in terms of the direction the effort will take.

The force generating much of this activity is, of course, the Water Quality Act of 1965 which calls for the setting of standards on interstate waterways by June 30 of this year. All states will comply. Hearings are now being held. Conservationists can take the major credit for this legislative 11th Commandment based on the premise "Thou Shalt Not Pollute!" While pollution laws were enacted in 1948, 1956, and again in 1961, stressing the technical aspects of water pollution, professionals and decision makers largely failed to produce a program that met public demands. The National Water Pollution Congress of 1960 gave conservationists their opportunity to move into a yawning vacuum and they made the most of it. In giving the whole subject needed visibility, they took pollution to both the Congress and the public. They put their stamp on the Water Quality Act and anyone who thinks this is not so need only compare the Act and the more recent ground rules released by the Department of the Interior with the 1960 Pollution Congress address of Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson. The Act was a major conservation victory.

"What's the situation today?" AMERICAN FORESTS asked leading conservationists in Washington in December for a major strategy session. With all 50 states indicating they will come up with standards, the states, municipalities, citizens and particularly industry face a great challenge and opportunity, conservationists reply. Is industry meeting this challenge? While conservation still has hope, evidence of the old blocking tactics is now showing up at hearings. This is a pity, for industry with its vast technological capabilities can and should make a real contribution to the cleanup. In too many cases final word rests with "management people" and not with top level thinking executives and researchers, conservationists say. Consequently, conservationists are now watching state hearings for evidence of "real desire" as well as for know-how. Members of organizations like The American Forestry Association can be of real help in the formulation of state standards, conservationists add, not as experts but as sincere citizens interested in pollution cleanup. People of this caliber can strengthen the hands of state officials beset by special interests. (The booklet "A Citizen Guide to: Action For Clean Water" prepared by the Izaac Walton League and other conservation groups is recommended for all lay citizens. Copies can be obtained from AMERICAN FORESTS upon request.) What if the state standards don't measure up? While no one at this juncture wishes to see a federal crackdown—and this includes federal people as well as conservationists—leaders of the great national groups are convinced that neither Secretary Udall nor Congress will flinch from doing their duty. But fully cooperative action without resorting to the mailed fist could do the job much more economically. One way or another, the job is going to be done, conservationists say quietly. And they mean it. The presence of a two-fisted Pollution Boss at Interior in the person of Frank C. Di Luzio adds weight to conservation conviction.

What can industry do to show good faith—"real desire?" Admittedly, water management is an extremely complex problem. The aim should be to get the job done as economically as possible. Standards will be set—that is now the law of the land. What is most needed, it seems to us, is a fact base from which decision makers can work. The overall aim must be water quality improvement but objectives will vary in different regions of the country. Some streams should be returned to trout stream purity and kept that way. On others the facts of economic life will dictate that this is impossible and here the aim should be as much improvement as is consistent with the economic welfare of the inhabitants. Guidelines based on solid scientific fact therefore become a real necessity.

The highly-respected Battelle Memorial Institute at Columbus, Ohio, is one scientific fact-finding organization that believes technology can provide industry a way to go. Battelle has proposed to industry a research program whose objective is to develop a mathematical model of a typical river basin. Such a model would have within its framework the multitudinous variables that relate to the management of water. The variables include such things as the river chemistry, the biological considerations, the ability of the river to cleanse itself, the impact of standards on the economy of the region, its employment, the needs of the public for recreation, and many, many more. There could well be from two to three thousand interrelated mathematical equations in such a model. Once created, the model, which would be in the form of a computer program, would provide the ability to examine the trade-offs. The model will not be a decision maker in itself, but it will provide decision makers with a way to ask "What if" questions of almost limitless complexity. Accordingly, it offers a way to determine the best economic choices in the management of water. The model, which would simulate a river basin, would be applicable to any other river basin or even to a single reach of a river.

At a time when there is not the slightest doubt that industry as a user of water will soon face a day in court, the industry should not hesitate a second in making a most intensive effort to improve its public pollution image and place itself in a position where it will be able to intelligently defend its procedures in handling and returning water to a stream in front of many possible standard-setting bodies. And judgments presented should be based on the best possible scientific fact finding.

It should be evident to all by now that inertia and the old defensive tactics are not going to work in the case of both water and air pollution. The public is not at all dismayed by the possible costs of this cleanup. Senator Muskie, of Maine, believes that $100 billion will be required by the year 2000 just to clean up the waterways. The Harvard *Business Review* recently estimated that total expenditures of at least $275 billion will be required over the next 34 years to ensure the availability of clean air and water. This cost dismays the public not at all. Meanwhile, the possibility of establishing a Senate Select Committee on Water Pollution is being carefully considered.

Industry should get off the dime in this mounting groundswell of public action and place itself once and for all in a "for" position on the subject of pollution by initiating constructive and scientific action that will show the public it means business. The time has come to fish or cut bait. Leadership proposals such as those advanced by Battelle would be a good place to start. Five hundred industries in 50 states, or 10 companies a state, could make the Battelle project a reality by contributing the modest sum of $1,000 a year for three years. Nor should industry hesitate to move vigorously and affirmatively on similar projects in a concerted effort to improve its public image and assist those admirable companies that are carrying on the fight alone.

In view of the stakes, this cost does not seem excessive. Most important it would show "real desire" at a time when all users of water are under a very high-powered public microscope. (J. B. C.)

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION DISTINGUISHED CONSERVATION AWARD TO SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, several of us had the pleasure of attending the January 24, 1967, dinner of the National Wildlife Federation at which Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE was given the Federation's 1966 Distinguished Service Award for Legislative Achievement.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution the Senator from Maine has given forceful, effective leadership in the enactment of landmark bills to control water and air pollution. He authored the Water Quality Act of 1965 and the Clean Rivers Restoration Act of 1966, cosponsored the wild rivers bill in the 89th Congress, and introduced the Clear Air Act amendments of 1965.

Senator MUSKIE's contributions to conservation were aptly summarized by the National Wildlife Federation when he was introduced at the dinner:

> A distinguished member of the United States Senate, a former governor with an outstanding conservation record, here is a man who has compiled a truly outstanding record in Congressional leadership. A member of three standing Committees and Chairman of three Subcommittees, he is the author of three historic bills enacted by the 89th Congress in our Nation's all-out effort to control air and water pollution before it is too late. For his outstanding skill, perseverance, and dedication to the highest public service, for his statesmanship in representing not only the people of his native state but also the people of all America, for his distinguished service to conservation and the health and general welfare of this and future generations, we are privileged to introduce the Honorable Edmund S. Muskie, United States Senator from Maine.

With this description of our distinguished colleague I am sure there is widespread agreement.

A HISTORY OF THE GREAT LAKES REGION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, Dr. Harlan Hatcher, the president of the University of Michigan, is one of this continent's prominent authorities on the history of our Great Lakes. Dr. Hatcher recently gave an especially clear speech outlining the human and economic development of the Great Lakes region and the problems currently challenging it. It is good history; it is "must" reading for those concerned with our future. I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT LAKES AND THE INTERNATIONAL MEGALOPOLIS

I have enjoyed no part of my career more than that portion of it which I have devoted to the Great Lakes—the endlessly impressive heartland of the North American Continent. Among other things, I once did what is known in the motion picture trade as a "treatment"—a scenario-script under the title, "Border Without Bayonets." That project brought dramatically into light the extraordinary fact in human experience of two nations separated only by an imaginary border fence, living without hostilities for 150 years, whose only fortresses are museums for the pleasure of tourists and instruction for the youth concerning an era that is gone.

The task and opportunity for our era is not to refortify the border, but to bridge it more easily for the benefit of both countries.

"Something there is that doesn't love a wall . . . That sends the frozen ground swell under it and spills the upper boulders in the sun."

Perhaps Dr. Doxiadis's sweeping study of this area is such a ground swell, and we may yet see international airports, highways, and model new city developments around Windsor and Sarnia, as well as Port Huron, Mt. Clemens, and Detroit with linkages as natural and easy as the Windsor Tunnel, the Ambassador and Bluewater Bridges or the exchange of electric power and the joint use of the Great Lakes St. Lawrence waterway.

But those details are for Dr. Doxiadis and his professional staff to expound and to make recommendations about.

I turn to the incomparable region itself for a few observations that seem to me to be pertinent, and important to the understanding and perspective of our citizens as they come to understand their problems and make decisions.

The first is the fascinating drama of discovery, settlement, and development. The drama is still unfolding.

The exploration and development of this rich basin is, to my mind, one of the most stimulating chapters in the history of the continent. Foot by foot, mile by mile, year by year, the early explorers edged deeper into the wilderness, goaded by the glittering promise of a road to the Orient, and the sleek furs of millions of woodland animals. And once the land had been tamed and the value of its timber and ores had been realized, the Great Lakes area became the scene of such massive productive activity that it overwhelms the imagination.

To draw upon your imagination, and to increase your perspective and perception, incarnate yourself with the legendary Paul Bunyan.

It is the year 1534. You gaze east across some two-thousand miles of rivers and lakes and forest to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, where the ship of the French explorer, Jacques Cartier, is first arriving.

A year later, you see him making his way up the St. Lawrence River, driven by Indian legends of thundering waterfalls and inland seas of immense size. You watch his arrival at the site of the city of Montreal, and his climb to the top of Mount Royal. To the north are the Laurentian Mountains, to the south are the Adirondacks of New York State. To the west, sparkling in the sun, are the Lachine Rapids of the St. Lawrence River—the "China" Rapids. Cartier vows to return soon and push on to Cathay, but he is unable to do so.

Sixty-eight years later, you observe another intrepid Frenchman, Samuel de Champlain, at Montreal. In one of those decisions which alter the fate of a continent, he decides to extend the empire by moving due west, paddling and portaging up the difficult Ottawa River to Lake Nipissing and finally to Lake Huron.

Had he travelled southwest instead up the St. Lawrence, he might have established a pattern which could have kept the Great Lakes in French hands. Instead, he left the easier southern route along Lake Erie to the fierce Iroquois Indians, and, later on, to the British.

We watch Champlain as he struggles up the Ottawa to the site of the city which bears that name. He continues to Lake Nipissing and its outlet to Lake Huron, the French River. One day in late July of 1615 his canoes emerge from the mouth of the river and he glides out upon the first of the Great Lakes to be discovered. Lake Huron extends flat and blue to the south and west horizons.

He turns south, threads through the maze of islands of eastern Georgian Bay, then loops back across Huron Country to Montreal.

In 1634, we are excited by the approach of a full-fledged expedition. It is under the command of one of Champlain's gifted young lieutenants, Jean Nicollet, and he is off for China.

You watch his flotilla of canoes cross Georgian Bay, skirt the shores of Mackinac Island, and enter the Straits. He is the first white man to sail on a vast new sea, Lake Michigan. Thinking the Orient lies over the horizon, he readies the ornate yellow robes he has packed for his meeting with the Emperor of China. He paddles down Green Bay to be greeted in Wisconsin, not by Chinese, but by the Winnebago Indians. Then he, too, begins the long trek back home.

Another expedition appears on the horizon in 1660. Two amazing fur traders, Pierre Radisson and Medard Chouart, paddle through the Straits. They enter Green Bay and explore as far west as the Mississippi River; they roam around Lake Michigan; they come back through the Straits, turn north to the Sault, and traverse Lake Superior. When they return to Montreal, their 60 canoes are filled with furs valued at 200,000 pounds. The two-year odyssey has been eminently successful.

These furs, and the souls of the Indians who trapped them, cause these young Frenchmen to press further and further inland. Between the major expeditions are hundreds of lesser journeys by traders and Jesuit priests. An outpost is established at St. Ignace in 1670. A second post, also known as Michilimackinac, rises on the south side of the Straits in 1712. In 1781 the British move the post to Mackinac Island and raise fortifications.

To the Governor of Canada, the British captain in charge of the transfer wrote: "For God's sake be careful in the choice of an engineer and don't send one of your paper engineers fond of fine regular polygons." The Governor did not, and the handiwork of the English may still be seen.

The last gap in our map of the lakes—southern Lake Huron and Lake Erie—is filled in during the decade from 1669 to 1679. Louis Jolliet rescues an Indian prisoner from the stake at the Sault, and the grateful native leads him back to Montreal by way of Lake Huron, the St. Clair River and a portion of Lake Erie.

The largest ship until that time on the lakes, the 60-ton Griffon, is built by Rene La Salle near Niagara Falls in 1679. It makes but one tragic journey. La Salle sails her across Lake Erie, up Lake Huron, and stops at the St. Ignace outpost. From there he sails to Wisconsin, where he loads the ship with furs and sends it back home. The Griffon and its crew are never seen again, probably the victims of a lake storm.

Furs, then, were the first cash crop of the Great Lakes, and the canoes of the Indians and the bateaus of the French were the first commercial vessels. For 200 long years, furs were the cash crop for which men toiled and froze and starved and died. By 1800, fleets of 50 to 60 canoes were roaming the region, with six million pelts being taken annually. Jacob Astor's trading base was a beehive of activity throughout that exciting fur decade, the 1820's.

If the paddle and the moccasin of the fur trader were the pathfinders of the lakes, then the axe of the lumberman and the pick of the miner were the tools which opened up and cleared the wilderness. Within only two decades, busy Americans all but banished fur trading to the more remote regions.

In 1854, 61 lumber mills existed in the lakes region. In 1872, there were fifteen hundred mills. By 1881, the State of Michigan alone shipped enough lumber to fill a train twenty-five hundred miles long. Buffalo became one of the leading lumber ports of the world. The lakes were dotted with ships piled high with lumber.

Mining operations also began in the mid-1800's. From 1830 until 1840, only two copper mines were paying dividends. Following the opening of the Calumet and Hecla mines on Michigan's Keweenaw Peninsula, however, that state served as the country's only source of copper until the opening of mines in the West in 1880.

Iron ore was discovered in 1844. The first companies in Marquette County, Michigan, had to carry their ore down Indian trails to a wagon road for a 12-mile trip to water's edge. There the ore was laboriously loaded by wheelbarrows pushed up a plank. In 1852, the Marquette Iron Company shipped six barrels of ore to Cleveland in this way—the first Lake Superior ore to be received.

Wheelbarrows and planks and six-barrel cargoes—such were the primitive beginnings of today's rapid loading and unloading techniques and massive ore carriers.

The thread which runs through this report is one of vastness—the size of the lakes themselves and the lands they drain; the scope of Jacob Astor's fur trade; the broad belts of white pine and hardwood stripped from seven states and Canada; the millions of tons of iron ore scooped from five mountain ranges; the immensity of the grain elevators and ore docks; the cavernous ships to carry these cargoes. Giant Paul Bunyan was truly the symbol of the region.

There was another important cargo, too: people. A flood of Americans, lured by the promise of the West, poured through the Mohawk Valley to Buffalo, from where passenger ships carried them to Detroit, Chicago, Milwaukee. Ninety such ships docked at Detroit in May of 1838 alone. They were joined by Swedes, Finns, Norwegians, Germans, Irish, Poles—in all, 21 different nationalities. Their enclaves remain around the lakes to this day. Their united efforts, uncontaminated by national borders have developed the nation in peace.

As trade flourished and word of the land of opportunity spread around the world, the Great Lakes cities grew. Buffalo, Detroit, Cleveland, Chicago and Milwaukee were from 16th to 79th in size in the United States in 1840. By 1906, all were among the first twelve.

Blot out from the continent those cities which now rim the Great Lakes and you would be astonished at the loss to this country and Canada. Spread along their vital water fronts, these cities reach back deep into the land and symbolize the energy of the men and women who live in them.

They stand out as centers of industry, education, art, sociology, politics and religion. Each has an individual spirit and achievement of its own.

We have been prodigal, though not overtly wanton or malicious, in our use and waste of this magnificent heritage of natural resources and a potentially beautiful and supportive environment for living in our cities.

We are trying, with some success, to recover from the destruction and waste of our timber lands. We are making progress in recovering the waste of our iron mines, and reuse of abused lands.

We are just beginning to realize the crisis of our fresh water supply, of air and water pollution.

Let me take you back some 20 years. I was doing what might be called aerial research on a couple of books. One was titled *The Greak Lakes*, the other *Lake Erie*. We are in an airplane flying above Lake Erie near the south shore. Look down. We see these relatively short tentacles breaking the shoreline—rivers extending inland from the lake not very far, because the geological configuration permits only short rivers. These tentacles are yellow-stained—the color seeping out into the lake, beginning to edge the shore.

This is pollution. And this was more than two decades ago. Lake Erie now is so shamefully abused that a government official, in announcing recently plans for federal-state cooperation, said that if we can recover Lake Erie, we can save anything. Two point six million tons of filth, sewage, municipal waste and chemicals pour into the lake every year from the Detroit River alone. In a great central basin of the lake, covering more than one-fourth of its total area, the amount of dissolved oxygen in the water has been decreased by more than one-half. Some portions of Lake Erie are completely without oxygen at this time. There life can no longer exist, and there the lake is already dead.

How did we come so abruptly into such an unwelcome condition? It is a by-product of our virtues of manufacturing, of growing always bigger (if not better) and of our inadequate understanding of population growth, land utilization, urban development, and interdependence; and the sheer, overwhelming impact of an explosive population increase reverberating through every sector and configuration of modern society. It is man in quantity, piling up 40-story office buildings side by side, block by block in New York and Chicago; using his beautiful waterfronts strictly for utility, and discarding the waste product of his endeavors into a prime source of his wealth.

Our concern in this conference is the doleful condition of our expanding cities. They represent the relentless shift of people from the country to the town.

At the turn of the century Canada's population was 62.9 per cent rural and 37.1 per cent urban. In 1951, by coincidence, the percentage had been exactly reversed: 62.9 per cent urban, 37.1 per cent rural. The reversal has continued sharply into the sixth decade of the century and is now close to three-fourths–one-fourth. Combined with population growth from 5,731,300 to 18,238,200, the impact is very forceful.

On a larger scale the United States has followed the same pattern. It is both urban and suburban, with all the dislocation, relocation, and new development now so familiar in the cities of the world, especially in America. "Between 1951 and 1961, the metropolitan areas increased in population by 2,527,000," or 60 percent of the total population increase in Canada in that decade.

Many causes explain the development. The two basic ones have been:

1. The movement of manufacturing jobs from centers to suburbs since the war; and

2. The growing middle class seeking "space, privacy, and modern housing."

This has often created slum areas in the former residential districts in the centers, while stimulating building booms in the suburbs with all the resulting improvisation of expressways, utilities, shopping centers, schools, hospitals, churches, that begin to erase or engulf the space and privacy that lured people in the first place.

The cities are overburdened, and their utilities are apparently hopelessly obsolete. They have massive investments in these outmoded facilities. They seemed well designed to the booming 1880's and 90's, and the upsurge of the first quarter of this century when the basic commitments and investments were made: water, sewers, schools, street patterns, subways or surface transportation, et cetera. As population flooded in, through and over them, the basic systems have been extended, sometimes improved, but have now reached the crisis stage. The center is being transformed into a core area of financial, service, cultural districts requiring massive transportation to and from the suburbs with growing congestion, air pollution, water, sewage and waste disposal problems.

It is next to impossible either to improve the old sufficiently, or to begin anew. And it is especially ironical, or frustrating, since we now have the advanced knowledge and the brilliant new technology to build and equip cities adequate to our present needs, much more attractive to our spirit and able to support rather than intensify the effort to live in them.

But the city is not only here to stay. It is and will continue to be our inescapable environment. What we make of it is our own and solely our responsibility. What a challenge!

The experience of mankind over the centuries indicates that for whatever reasons he finds gregarious life among his own kind in urban environments supportive and more desirable than rural withdrawal in communion with nature.

Wordsworth, the greatest of nature lovers, wrote the best of London poems, standing at early morning on Westminister Bridge and declaring:

> "Earth has not anything to show more fair,
> This city now doth like a garment wear
> The beauty of the morning; silent, bare,
> Ships, towers, domes, theatres, and temples lie
> Open unto the fields, and to the sky;
> All bright and glittering in the smokeless air."

Boswell's Johnson abounds in praise for London. It is all summed up in the famous passage from the year 1777. Boswell is considering leaving the family seat in Scotland which seemed to him too narrow a sphere for the good life. He longed for London, "the great scene of ambition, instruction, and amusement . . . a heaven upon earth," yet he feared that if he resided there permanently "the exquisite zest" which he experienced on an occasional visit "might go off, and I might grow tired of it."

"Johnson: 'Why, Sir, you find no man, at all intellectual, who is willing to leave London. No, sir, when a man is tired of London, he is tired of life: for there is in London all that life can afford.' "

Canada must join with us, particularly in the Detroit-Windsor and Buffalo-Hamilton-Toronto area, in finding our way to better living conditions. One of Canada's distinguished men pointed out that: "The oldest and most tenacious tradition in our communal memory centers around our determination not to become Americans. This is also the one tradition in which English Canadians and French Canadians have been whole-heartedly united."

French Canadians know the "acid of assimilation" of the American melting pot. Ontario settled by Americans who rejected the Revolution to remain British subjects. All forces are against ultimate success of retaining artificial differences.

When the same set of conditions of life are created, the same set of reactions occur: industrialization, knowledge, education, economics, geography, history, technology all modify evolution, select adaptive traits, move us to more alikeness in the very areas where we try to preserve the differences. This is obviously happening dramatically in USSR. (I remember my startled introduction to Moscow at midnight in April of 1959. A great red neon sign, visible from Red Square, urged the Comrades to save their money at three per cent.)

We cannot survive on rejections alone.

Each city and each nation has its own problems. They are alike in kind. When the city of Cleveland dedicated a central area, once opulent and now a slum, to a new university campus, the dislocated people had nowhere to go except into an already tense and overcrowded Hough district. It exploded in violent frustration. It exposed the inadequacy of our present capacity to put into service our present knowledge and resulting plans for urban development. Hough lies under the shadow of the magnificent Erieview development, south of an improving Lake Shore, and on the edge of an institution of higher learning.

But we are making progress. The Seaway itself, the redeemed lake shore at Cleveland, Detroit, Milwaukee, Chicago, and, this ambitious and comprehensive study of a region whose development can still be directed and controlled. It is leading more and more decision-making groups to think in larger and more cooperative terms of the future into which the present decisions are taking us—on both sides of the border. We are far behind already, but we can still repent and be redeemed. We can be loyal and be happy in our own parish without walling it off from the diocese. Not only borders without bayonets, but an environment without borders is worthy of our effort.

RELIABILITY OF NATION'S ELECTRIC POWER SYSTEM

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the concern which President Johnson has expressed for the reliability and efficiency of our Nation's electric power system should be our concern as well. Too many Americans, perhaps, take for granted the availability of inexpensive, labor-saving electric service at the flick of a switch. For many of us, the massive power failure that struck the Northeastern States in November 1965, was a salutary warning that we must constantly guard our power grids against failure. We must improve the protective devices that regulate their operation. Even more important, we must proceed with the work of interconnection and coordination of our electric systems.

The Federal Power Commission has stated—and respected leaders of the electric industry have agreed—that interconnection and coordinated operation of electric systems is our best defense against power failures. It is also an important means of reducing costs and securing lower rates for the utility customer. A system operating in isolation must either provide itself with extensive standby generating facilities or face the possibility of long service interruptions. When electric systems interconnect, however, they can rely to a large extent on one another's generating capacity. This will reduce the amount of reserve capacity needed.

Strong interconnection of the type necessary for fully coordinated operation can pay other dividends as well. Small and medium-sized electric systems often cannot afford the large generators which, by their economies of scale, have helped make possible the low-cost power we enjoy today. If they are interconnected with larger neighboring systems, however, they can often purchase some or all of their power at a cost lower than that of energy generated on their own equipment. Where this is true, it means lower rates for the consumer.

The electric industry has made impressive progress, both economic and technological. Utilities in the United States have achieved an enviable record of reliability and efficiency. But we should not be satisfied with less than the best electric service that our technological leadership and vast resources can provide for us. It should be our concern in the 90th Congress to see that the best efforts of the electric industry and the Government are brought to bear on the complex problems of reliability. We must seek a still better, cheaper, and more dependable supply of electric power for the American consumer. This will be the goal of the Committee on Commerce, on which I am proud to serve.

DEATH OF BERNARD FALL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Bernard Fall is dead, killed by a Vietcong mine while on patrol with American marines. He died on "The Street Without Joy," the desolate stretch of sea coast after which he had named an admirable military history.

Bernard Fall has played a more important part in the war in Vietnam than any other writer. He not only wrote history but also participated in its making; he was a historian who looked to the future as well as the past.

In his recent book, "Vietnam Witness," Fall described the role of the independent scholar—a description that suited him so admirably—in the following words:

> He is—or should be, if he deserves the description of "independent scholar"—capable of recording the facts in a given situation as they actually are; and, unburdened by considerations of policy of futile allegiance to the views of a particular bureaucracy or service, he can make certain predictions of future developments.

Bernard Fall's predictions of future developments—predictions which in many cases forced him, as he described it, to "bear the burden of being the unwelcome bearer of ill tidings"—have proved to be accurate. He resisted the temptation he describes in an epilog to "Vietnam Witness":

> To succumb to the temptation of the easy way out, no matter how difficult the trail of the truth and how heavy the burden of the record.

The "trail of the truth" has now led this brilliant, perceptive, and courageous man to his death, a death that adds to "the weight of the dead souls" which rests so heavily on his native country—France; on the Vietnam he has known so well for the past 14 years; and on the United States, his adopted home since 1951.

When we think of those on the roll of honor who have sought to follow the "trail of the truth"—and have died for it—we will always remember the name of Bernard Fall.

EDITORIAL SUPPORT FOR FISHERIES TREATY WITH SOVIET UNION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Seattle Times recently published an editorial discussing the new compact between the United States and the Soviet Union on the important fisheries off our coast. It reflects some of the hopeful optimism toward the coming fishing seasons following the extreme and critical problems which we experienced, particularly off the States of Washington and Oregon, during 1966.

As the Seattle Times summarizes the situation:

> We hope the new agreement will be respected and augur an era of better cooperation toward the goal of wise utilization and conservation of ocean fisheries resources which must be achieved eventually.

I share this hope with the Seattle Times and ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE NEW UNITED STATES-SOVIET FISHERIES COMPACT

Under the new United States-Soviet fisheries compact, the Russians agree to respect the new American off-shore jurisdictional limit of 12 miles as it applies to certain coastal areas and, further, to discourage fishing practices that tangle fishing gear.

If terms of the agreement are carried out, there should be no repetition this year of the invasion by Russian fishing vessels of the fishing grounds inside the 12-mile limits on the Washington and Oregon coasts that occurred in 1966.

The Russian record of adhering to fisheries agreements is better than its reputation in international affairs generally. Its fisheries technicians apparently do not harbor the secret reservations of their counterparts in international diplomacy.

Hence, we hope the new agreement will be respected and augur an era of better cooperation toward the goal of wise utilization and conservation of ocean fisheries resources which must be achieved eventually.

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, President Johnson has proclaimed the week of February 19–24 as National Engineers Week. To observe this week the National Society of Professional Engineers conducts numerous programs in every State, including career conferences for high school students, guided tours through industrial and research facilities, scholarship awards, and talks before various civic groups.

This year Vernon G. MacKenzie, Assistant Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, has written an article on air pollution for National Engineers Week. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. MacKenzie's article, entitled "Air Pollution Challenges Engineers To Restore Quality of Atmosphere," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AIR POLLUTION CHALLENGES ENGINEERS TO RESTORE QUALITY OF ATMOSPHERE

(By V. G. MacKenzie)

Air pollution touches us all. Whether you live in a very small town or in a city of 50,000 or more, chances are that the air you breathe is polluted. Even some completely rural areas are subject to the hazards of air pollution.

Modern technology has poured into our atmosphere quantities of potentially harmful substances, and now we are challenged to restore the quality of the air we breathe before it is too late. Through engineering applications, for example, in breadth and depth, these pollutants can be brought down to controllable dimensions.

Anyone who knows the recent history of this country is aware that we have been perilously late in recognizing the need to halt the rising contamination of our environment. In the past few decades, we have been so intent on reaping the benefits of the American industrial revolution that we have failed to give enough attention to the by-product problems our successes have created.

The pollution of the very air we breathe, ironically enough, is an indirect result of our pursuit of an even higher standard of living.

Air pollution derives from the burning of fuel for heat and power, from the processing of materials, and from the disposal of wastes. Air pollution, in short, comes from those everyday activities which are so integral a part of a modern technologically advanced Nation.

SERIOUS EFFECTS

The effects of air pollution are serious now. Through injury to vegetation and livestock, corrosion and soiling of materials and structures, lowering of property values, and interference with transportation, air pollution costs this Nation billions of dollars each year.

Of greater significance are the effects of air pollution on health. Episodes of extreme pollution have resulted in immediate illness and death. Further, a growing body of scientific evidence indicates that long term exposure to ordinary levels of air pollution is associated with the occurrence and worsening of chronic respiratory disease and with premature death.

The problem of air pollution is steadily worsening. The forces of economic expansion, urban growth, and technological progress, and the increasing use of motor vehicles all contribute to the problem's growth. And in spite of the fact that we have available today the technological means of controlling most sources of air pollution, the problem continues to grow.

IMPROVED WEAPONS

The Clean Air Act of 1963 and its 1965 Amendments have given all levels of government improved weapons for fighting air pollution. Under this legislation several Federal interstate abatement actions have been initiated which will ultimately benefit millions of people. Federal standards have been published which will bring all new automobiles under control during the 1968 model year. Progress has been made toward the control of sulfur oxides, oxidants and other gaseous pollutants that were once clearly beyond our reach. Through the matching grants provision of the Clean Air Act, state and local control programs have been able to increase their budgets by roughly 65 percent nationally.

We are encouraged by this progress. But we are aware that we have only scratched the surface of a problem whose growth accelerates with each passing year.

The Federal government cannot alone arrest the problem of air pollution. State and local governments and the private sector must assume a greater share of the task than they have in the past.

ENGINEERS ACTIVE

It is encouraging, also, that the activities of the 1967 National Engineers' Week will focus on the need for applying our engineering skills to the restoration of the environment.

Engineers, who can be justifiably proud of their contribution to our technological progress, are now beginning to help solve the by-product problems progress has brought with it. Engineers know that the longer we delay in applying all the techniques of control in our possession, and the longer we wait to remedy the deficiencies in our technical knowledge, the higher the costs of control will be.

In dealing with air pollution, preventive measures cost far less than corrective ones. So the challenge to produce these preventive measures is being faced squarely by our country's engineers, who realize that human survival dictates that this challenge must and will be met.

GENERAL GAVIN'S REVIEW OF THE AMERICAN COMMITMENTS ABROAD

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, again this year, as he did last year, Gen. James Gavin presented the Committee on Foreign Relations and the country with a concise and provocative review of American commitments abroad. In order to share it with readers of the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that General Gavin's statement to the committee on February 21, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY LT. GEN. JAMES M. GAVIN, U.S. ARMY, RETIRED, AT THE HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE U.S. SENATE, FEBRUARY 21, 1967

Mr. Chairman, may I say at the outset that I consider an appearance before this Committee a public service, a service that I believe to be a privilege to perform. I have been asked to testify on the subject of "Conflicts Between United States Capabilities and Foreign Commitments." I am happy to do so.

I would like to talk briefly about Vietnam, then comment on our situation in Europe, and finally deal with the impact of our commitments on our domestic and global situations.

In discussing Vietnam, I would like to begin where I left off before this Committee last year. I urged then that we not expand our forces beyond those then committed, which were on the order of 275,000 troops, pointing out that we possessed powerful military enclaves; complexes of sea and air power from which we could conduct operations as necessary to pacify that country.

In the course of the hearing I was asked to state my views to the Committee in writing on bombing and I wrote, in part, the following:

"I believe that we must recognize that the nature of the fighting in Vietnam is quite different than, for example, that of World War II. Basic to the struggle in Vietnam is internal civil strife. Our military efforts, therefore, must be directed toward winning the good will of the people, and retaining that of those who are fighting with us. It follows that bombing attacks intended to achieve psychological impact through the killing of noncombatants is unquestionably wrong. Likewise the attack of targets near areas highly populated by civilians, where civilians are likely to be the casualties, is also militarily as well as morally wrong."

I would like to reaffirm those views today. The bombing of North Vietnam has caused considerable civilian casualties, has not stopped the flow of supplies to the South, and has aroused the ill will of people throughout the world.

In my testimony last year I referred to the changing nature of military power. It is my belief that the advent of nuclear weapons has brought about a fundamental change in the very nature of war itself. The Clausewitzian orthodoxy that war is a continuation of politics by other means, for example, no longer applies. The concept that if you destroy enough people and enough property you overcome an enemy's will to resist is equally fallacious. A corollary to this idea is that a nation should use as much force as is necessary to win since in war there is no substitute for victory. Actually, the nature of conflict being what it is and the danger of a nuclear holocaust being ever present, it is compelling that solutions less than total war be found. The indiscriminate use of power has been further complicated by modern communications media that now bring more and more detailed information about the conduct of war into every home. The inevitable, and needless, loss of civilian lives has become the subject of concern to more than just the contending military forces. Military victory in the terms we usually conceive of it is impossible today. We must realize that limited wars must be kept limited. This change in the nature of war is quite fundamental and it should be reflected in our foreign policy and the military operations that mirror such policy. Otherwise we shall expend our national wealth and manpower in never-ending conflicts all over the world. At the same time we will neglect doing the more positive things that must be done to develop our own society to its fullest potential, while instead we arouse the wrath and anger of people who are the victims of our policy, and of those who are in sympathy with the victims of our policy.

The one major critical event that has occurred in Asia since the hearings last year is the current revolution in China. This confronts us with a choice which we did not enjoy heretofore. We may now deal with Ho Chi Minh with some confidence that he is free of Chinese pressure and entanglement. I believe that we can negotiate with Hanoi and with the National Liberation Front confident that a free, neutral, and independent Vietnam can be established, with guarantees of stability from an international body. The latest information from Hanoi, attributed to the Prime Minister of the Hanoi Government, and reported recently by Mr. Wilfred Burchett, is that the Hanoi Government foresees the establishment of two different governments after hostilities have ceased. The intimacy of the relationship that will exist between these two governments, or whether in fact there would be two governments or ultimately one, is difficult to foresee. In any event, however, if the government established is one chosen by the people of Vietnam, it should be one acceptable to us.

The likelihood of Chinese intervention with major land forces in the Hanoi-Haiphong area has always been of over-riding military concern to our planners. This danger has now diminished considerably and the Chinese influence in the Hanoi government has likewise diminished. It will take strong will and determination to bring peace to Vietnam, and to get on with the establishment of a free government and the ultimate withdrawal of U.S. forces, but it is a task we should undertake. Undoubtedly, the terms that we will be confronted with will seem to us to be rather a stiff price to pay for peace, but the alternative is a protracted conflict for many years that will ultimately assume an Orwellian character; a war that will go on for years and will take many lives, Vietnamese and American, and a war in which ultimately the basic issues on which it began will have become forgotten by the participants.

This brings us to another choice. I am sure that there are many in this country who see the disintegration of the Chinese government as an opportunity to bring to an end the Vietnam war by the decisive use of massive power against the Ho Ci Minh government. Seizure and occupation of Haiphong and Hanoi without a major Chinese reaction becomes a military possibility. This, to me, would be a most dangerous course to follow. To begin with, we cannot foresee with any accuracy the reaction of the Chinese government, but I would be of the belief that this might provide the very basis for bringing order into the Chinese situation, with a prompt and militant response to the aid of Hanoi. To my mind, the risk of Chinese involvement is too high a price to pay for a solution to the Vietnamese situation that would ultimately entail a larger U.S. commitment to a major land war in Southeast Asia for an indefinite number of years. Of the two choices that now confront us, negotiations with Hanoi and the National Liberation Front to the end that we establish a free, neutral, independent Vietnam with international guarantees, or the escalation of power and the seizure of North Vietnam, clearly the first is the one that we should follow.

Our military forces in South Vietnam have conducted themselves well. The Vietcong cannot win a military victory as long as we are willing to maintain our present force commitments, and they must be aware of this. What is now needed is a political solution. Such a solution, promptly arrived at, will enable us to deal with affairs in other parts of the world, areas where our attention is sadly needed.

EUROPE AND NATO

I would like to talk briefly about the situation in Europe. I have spent quite a few years in Europe. Over three years of it were in combat in World War II, and this was followed by a short period as the senior American representative on the Kommandatura in Berlin in 1945. In 1951 I returned to Europe to be Chief of Staff of Allied Forces, Southern Europe, and after a year and a half I moved to Mid-Europe, where I commanded the U.S. VII Corps in Germany. During this time, I participated in numerous large-scale exercises and war games designed to test the NATO concept and our military capacity to react to a threat to NATO. After that I returned to Washington as Chief of Plans in the Department of the Army, where I was concerned with our European involvement. It is against this background that I would like to comment upon our situation in Europe today.

NATO was conceived and brought into being at a time when we believed that we were confronted with a worldwide Communist conspiracy. In 1948, in a drastic purge, a democratic Czechoslovakia was transformed into a Communist-run country and a Soviet satellite. At the same time, the Communists in Greece, supported by the nearby Communist states, were engaged in a civil war that would have, if successful, extended Soviet control beyond the frontiers seized by her armies in 1945. The Truman Doctrine brought an end to this. In 1950 we were attacked in Korea by forces almost entirely equipped with Soviet arms, tanks and equipment.

The danger to Western Europe appeared to be very real, particularly in view of the lack of any existing German military defensive units. To meet this threat, the North Atlantic Treaty was signed in Washington on April 4, 1949. This was followed by a build-up of U.S. Forces in Europe.

NATO has served us well and the importance of its role has been emphasized time and again to the American people, indeed to the extent that today to question NATO is to seem almost unpatriotic, yet the facts are that, today, conditions in Europe are entirely different from those when NATO came into being. To begin with, there is now a bloc of economic power in the form of the European Economic Community. In time it will consider political and military questions, as well as economic questions, and it already, in fact, is a potentially powerful military entity. We are no longer dealing with fifteen separate countries, we are dealing with the United States and Canada on this side of the Atlantic, and the European Economic Community and other states who are seeking to find some relationship with that Community on the other side of the Atlantic. NATO today must recognize this fact and set as one of its goals a reorganization that will reflect the changing components within NATO itself.

Furthermore, the United States' troop commitment to Europe is far in excess of today's needs. In fact, it could be argued that its very existence in Europe acts in a manner inimical to the long term military interests of Europe. I would like to explain this this way. The dollars spent by the U.S. troops in Europe are on the order of $700 million annually. These are spent for food, recreation, services, travel, etc. The Germans are not expected to pay these costs. They are, however, expected to make offset purchases in the United States. The most recent agreement signed by Mr. Erhard commits the present German government to make purchases in the foreseeable future on the order of five billion Deutsche marks.

Furthermore, these purchases, of necessity, must be for things that the Government can purchase such as aircraft, tanks, helicopters, etc. In the first place, it is almost impossible for Western Germany to meet this commitment and secondly if it were to do so, it would be buying weapons systems from the United States that it would much prefer to buy from, or develop with, its European allies. Weapons systems jointly developed by Western European nations for the defense of Europe would add to the over-all military strength of Europe. Their own industries would be developed, they would share to an increasing extent in the development and use of weapons systems of common characteristics and, all in all, the result of the integration would be to enhance their military prospects in defense.

The U.S., of course, is not the only country that demands offset purchases; Great Britain does likewise. I believe, therefore, that it is not only in the interest of the United States, but of Europe, that we reduce the present strength of United States' troop involvement in Europe. I realize that this is a very sensitive matter and it is one that the United States should not act upon unilaterally. Whatever reduction in troop strength is made should be made in the context of a multinational agreement that clearly spells out the intent of the United States to maintain forces of a specific character in Europe for the indefinite future. It is my belief that the present Seventh Army of five divisions and combat and service support forces could be reduced to a corps of two divisions, with combat and service support units on a much smaller scale than those now necessary to support an army.

The need for a North Atlantic Treaty Organization will continue to exist. Its plans for the future, however, should envision the growing strength of the European Common Market bloc of power and I refer to its potential economic, political and military power. The NATO organization should ultimately assume the character of a small planning group organized in a manner to hold together loosely the resources of Europe and North America. Ultimately, the European forces should have as much independence of action as those of the United States and be an equal independent partner.

For too long, too many of us in this country have looked upon NATO as our own instrument. While I know there will be those who will question this statement, I remember all too well the efforts of the French to interest NATO in infra-structure when Algeria was considered a part of Metropolitan France. We rejected this approach at the time on the grounds that what took place in Algeria was not of concern to NATO. Yet, during the past year, we have called to the attention of NATO the threat of China, endeavoring to elicit support for our involvement in Southeast Asia. The attitude of Europe was well expressed by the President of France in 1962 when he pointed out that NATO exists to keep the peace, not to serve specific members, and "notably not its biggest one." The future of NATO must be based upon a recognition of the growing strength of Western Europe, as well as an awareness of the strength of the U.S. It should be an organization that is prepared to recognize and encourage a relaxation of relations with the Eastern bloc. It should be an organization that exists to hold together, in loose form, the powerful economic, political and military blocs of the U.S. and of Europe. When it takes such form, it will be a much stronger NATO than that that exists today.

DOMESTIC NEEDS NEGLECTED

Finally, turning to our domestic situation, it seems to me to be of compelling importance that we deal with our domestic problems as a matter of highest priority. Before talking about specifics, I would like to say why I believe this to be of such importance. It seems to me that many Americans still think of international affairs in terms of almost a generation ago. They see the world as one in which there are two blocs of power, the Communists and the anti-Communists, a monolithic world in which a Communist conspiracy is out to conquer the world, and the anti-Communists are totally committed to preventing such a conquest. It is a world of bad guys and good guys with no place for the in-betweens.

Actually, the world is no longer like that for the Communist conspiracy is shattered beyond possibility of recovery. But fundamental in our lives, to our way of thinking, is the basis on which this country was established: the American Revolution. As a concept, it has served the interests of free men everywhere and it still thrives as a concept to which free men can confidently adhere. Our intellectual, physical, and economic resources should be applied as a matter of first priority to the problems of our American society. It must be a society that uses its tremendous technology and physical resources, and its national wealth, to rid the country of poverty, to raise the standard of living of its citizens, to provide a healthful environment, to provide educational opportunities for all of our people, and opportunities to achieve high standards of excellence in competitive amateur sports, and finally, domestic security for its citizens. These are impressive goals, but they must be our goals if this country is to continue to grow, and to prosper, and to exert an influence for the good in the World Councils.

I emphasize these national needs, at this time, because I believe that they are being grossly neglected while we continue to escalate our spending in Vietnam. A small part of what we have spent in Vietnam in the last ten years if applied to our own problems would have improved tremendously the conditions in our own country while, at the same time, we would today be in a much better condition to help others. For we cannot live in an enclave of affluence in a world in which a third of its population is very poor, with a per capita gross national product of less than $100, and another third not much better off, with a per capita gross national product of from $100 to $249. We delude ourselves if we think that we can turn backs on our fellow men while we continue to add to our own prosperity.

These disturbing economic facts are creating worldwide discontent, in part because the world has shrunk rapidly in recent years. Today satellite communications makes it possible to communicate from any one point on the globe to another in a very brief span of time. Instead of many separate nations we now are closer to one family than we have ever been in the earth's history. In my opinion we must face up to the kind of a world that this is going to be and realize that a "Great Society" at home will have little greatness about it if it does not have in addition to its material affluence a sense of responsibility and a sense of morality about its relations with others with whom we are now thrown into such intimate association worldwide.

For some years we have had a foreign aid program that has accomplished much. I have supported our foreign aid program and I have served on committees that have reviewed it in Washington. I believe now that it should be expanded. However, I also believe that the time has come to take a very close look at what we have accomplished and what our goals are, on a country by country basis. This searching, investigatory approach should be made in each country where the investments of our resources have been made, not by another high level committee review in Washintgon. We need a foreign aid program and we very likely need a larger one than we now have. There is sufficient reason for uneasiness, however, on the part of many of us who have observed it in operation to suggest the need for a grass roots look at what has been accomplished, and what our goals are.

In summary, I recommend that we bring hostilities in Vietnam to an end as quickly and reasonably as we can, that we devote those vast expenditures of our national resources to dealing with our domestic problems; that we make a massive attack on the problems of education, housing, economic opportunity, lawlessness, and environmental pollution; that we increase the support of all peaceful measures with our neighbors; that this include a thorough evaluation of our aid program; that we seek peaceful relations and closer economic ties with the Eastern bloc of nations. To accomplish this, I believe, for example, that the ratification of the Consular Convention should be accomplished and that the President's program for East-West trade should be encouraged and supported. With an improving society at home and an outgoing approach to dealing with the problems abroad, we shall have no fear whatsoever for our own place in history, for there is a quality of greatness in the American Revolution that is yet to be realized and it is a quality that is exportable.

PROPOSED UNITED STATES-SOVIET RUSSIA CONSULAR CONVENTION

Mr. MUNDT. Yesterday afternoon there occurred on the floor of the Senate a most interesting and informative series of colloquies led by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] on the pros and cons of the proposed United States-Soviet Russia Consular Treaty.

While there were present in the Chamber well over the average number of Senators for a preliminary debate of this nature, I think all Senators would like to read what transpired if they were not among those present, so I invite attention to pages 4280 through 4288 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 23—Thursday's RECORD. Included among those speaking were Senators HRUSKA, MILLER, CLARK, LAUSCHE, CURTIS, ERVIN, DOMINICK, and MUNDT. Before casting their votes on this unprecedented treaty with its announced associated programs, I feel certain that all Senators will want to read this preliminary debate as well as to study carefully the statements of all witnesses—pro and con—as their testimony appears in the printed hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is for that purpose that I have identified in Thursday's RECORD the pages reporting this spirited and informative discussion.

I also take this opportunity, Mr. President, to read into the RECORD at this point a letter which reached my desk just this morning from a South Dakota constituent, Mr. Don D. Duncan, of Rapid City, S. Dak. The letter speaks for itself, but it comes from a serviceman in Vietnam for whom the theories and philosophical discussions about treaties, emerging detentes, expanding trade with the Russian sources supplying all the sophisticated weaponry being used against our troops by North Vietnam, and the recommendations of armchair strategists on how to bring peace and victory to our military efforts in that far-off war are the stark realities of life and death instead of the forensic exercises engaged in by civilians far removed from the areas of danger and death.

RAPID CITY, S. DAK.,
February 20, 1967.

Senator KARL MUNDT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: I quote below a paragraph from a letter written by a friend in Viet Nam.

"Don, we will never win the war since it is being run from Washington, Johnson and his advisors. I have seen Air Force pilots nearly cry when they tell about targets they can't shoot at due to White House orders such as large bridges in Laos on the Ho Chi Minh trail and also large convoys in certain areas. It seems the click in Washington always sends them into areas with very few targets but a lot of antiaircraft and SAM missiles which is why so many of our planes are being shot down."

I cry with them when I read President Johnson wants to expand trade with the very butchers who furnish missiles and planes to shoot down these same pilots.

I cry with them every time I see our President on his knees begging for negotiations and offering bribery to bring them to the conference table.

"Victory then Peace" should be the cry of every concerned American today, replacing this talk of fighting over there for fifteen or more years.

Sincerely,

DON D. DUNCAN.

I for one feel that such testimony coming from one whose very life depends upon wise and prudent decisions in Washington and on the Senate floor has fully as much significance and meaning as the sophisticated presentations of diplomats or the pious pleadings of politicians who apparently forget at times that our first business should be to end this 5-year-old war without defeat and to get on with the task of building a world safe for freedom and free from conflict.

Mr. President, I offer this firsthand, on-the-ground testimony in part because one of the Senators speaking yesterday said:

> I do not believe that a man in Vietnam knows anything about the Consular Convention or cares about it.

Incidentally, I have had numerous letters from servicemen written from the war theater in Vietnam and addressed to me personally expressing the concern which I share, along with many other Senators, that the net result of expanding our exports to Russia while she is serving as a supply source for the very weapons Hanoi needs in order to prolong this war and to expand our list of American casualties will do much to delay the day of peace we all desire. Since none of them has authorized me to read them into the RECORD, however, I have refrained from doing so; but the letter from Don Duncan involves no such inhibitions and demonstrates that at least one man in Vietnam is considerably embittered by the President's program of urging ratification of this Consular Convention and an expanding East-West trade with Hanoi's Russian ally. Since both the President and the Secretary of State forthrightly have linked the two goals together I feel Senator HRUSKA's argument yesterday that no Senator can logically consider them as separate issues is irrefutable.

Morale among our fighting men and among our allies and widespread support for our war effort among our fellow citizens here at home are indispensable ingredients if this bloody and brutal war in Vietnam is not to end in disaster for the United States and for the cause of peace and freedom. It is not good, for example, when men write from Vietnam in such terms as the paragraph in the letter sent me by Don Duncan which says:

> I cry with them when I read President Johnson wants to expand trade with the very butchers who furnish missiles and planes to shoot down these same pilots.

Who among us, Mr. President, can criticize men on the fighting front for expressing such distress when they see their comrades shot down, crippled, or killed daily, by Russian weapons fired by their North Vietnam Communist associates?

For those who face death in the Vietnam war, trading with the enemy must indeed appear as an incomprehensible and calloused neglect of their own safety and security.

I sincerely hope that this administration will give full consideration to all the ramifications of its ill-advised and ill-timed efforts to secure ratification of the Consular Convention and stepped-up trade with Communist nations and cease pressuring Senators to support this program against their better judgments until such time, at least, as the fighting ends in Vietnam or until Russia ceases to provide in steadily increasing numbers the weapons which already have done so much to expand our casualties to over 50,000 in this far-off war on foreign soil.

Surely it would appear from the debates in Congress, the unrest on our college campuses, the groups of clergymen who visit Washington, the caustic criticisms of some columnists and commentators, and from the correspondence files of every Senator that there is already far too much dissension among our citizens over the conduct and the purposes of this cruel war. Why should this administration now put its waning prestige on the line to force through ill-advised programs and policies which at best can only serve to divide even more deeply those who support the war and those who would now accept defeat and pull out of the conflict at almost any price?

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 27, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 24 (legislative day of February 23), 1967:

Civil Service Commission

Robert E. Hampton, of Maryland, to be a Civil Service Commissioner for the term of 6 years expiring March 1, 1973. (Reappointment.)

In the Navy

Vice Adm. Andrew McB. Jackson, Jr., U.S. Navy, for appointment as a senior member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 711.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231. Vice Adm. John S. McCain, Jr., U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 24 (legislative day of February 23), 1967:

Director of Public Roads

Francis C. Turner, of Virginia, to be Director of Public Roads.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Weirton Chapter Establishes West Virginia Professional Engineers Society Record in Observance of National Engineers Week—Theme Is Engineering for the Human Environment—Senator Randolph Speaks on Air and Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 24, 1967

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the best attended meeting of the West Virginia Society of Professional Engineers or any of its chapters was sponsored February 21, 1967, by the Weirton chapter in the Millsop Community Center. The dinner meeting, with 360 persons present in observance of National Engineers Week, emphasized the theme of the February 19–25 period, "Engineering for the Human Environment."

The Weirton chapter is comprised of members from 10 industries in the area. They were joined for the event by engineers and officials of 20 additional industries in the Ohio Valley, plus representatives of the cities of Weirton, Wellsburg, Wheeling, Follansbee, and New Cumberland, W. Va., and Toronto and Steubenville, Ohio, as well as the West Virginia Air Pollution Commission, and the West Virginia-Ohio Industry Committee for Air Pollution Abatement.

William M. Smith, president of the Weirton chapter and pollution control engineer for Weirton Steel, was the toastmaster. Among the distinguished guests and participants were George A. Stinson, president of National Steel Corp., of which the Weirton Steel Co. is a major division; John G. Redline, executive vice president of Weirton Steel; J. Hayden Harris, a Weirton Steel vice president; Fred M. Tucker, manager of pollution control services, National Steel Corp.; Mayor Frank Rybka, of Weirton; and Jay E. Henry, of Charleston, president of the West Virginia Society of Professional Engineers.

Special guests were State Agriculture Commissioner Gus Douglas, of Charleston, and Samuel Kusic, of Weirton, members of the West Virginia Air Pollution Control Commission, and Carl Beard, executive of that commission.

Jack Galbraith, plant manager of the Signode Corp. of Weirton, was the chapter's general chairman of its National Engineers Week observances and of the committee for the banquet. A member of the committee was James D. O'Roark, Weirton Steel's manager of engineering service and maintenance, the chapter's "Engineer of the Year" last year. He was succeeded to that title by Edwin J. Smith, director of research and development, National Steel Corp., and a highlight of the meeting was the designation of Mr. Smith, who made an appropriate response when presented. Rev. G. Ousley Brown, D.D., of the Cove United Presbyterian Church, spoke the invocation and the benediction.

It was my privilege and responsibility to discuss national and local problems of air and water pollution and national legislation for their control. Mr. Stinson, president of National Steel Corp., and a cherished friend, introduced me, and also made penetrating remarks on the efforts of his organization to abate pollution with large sums of private investor funds committed to this purpose. Prior to the formal gathering I counseled with Thomas C. Millsop, long a leader in this industry and in community progress, who was unable to attend. I also regret that C. G. Tournay was not able to be present.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record with these remarks the text of my speech, and to insert at an appropriate place in my address a statement by the president of Weirton Steel Co. on its air and stream pollution control facilities since 1951 and its projected facilities.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speech by U.S. Senator Jennings Randolph, Democrat of West Virginia, to Banquet-Meeting of Weirton Chapter, West Virginia Society of Professional Engineers, Weirton, W. Va., February 21, 1967

It is particularly appropriate that your chapter has Weirton as the site of this meeting to discuss problems of air and water pollution. For this area not only offers the kind of topographical, industrial and meteorological conditions that accentuate the problems of environment pollution; it also presents an example of the kind of modern and enlightened industrial management which will be required to solve the problems of air and water pollution.

Thus, while President Johnson singled out Weirton as one of the critical areas of air pollution, in his recent message on the "Air Quality Act of 1967," it should also have been noted that the Weirton Steel Company has been one of the leaders in the installation of modern pollution abatement facilities for both air and water.

I commend a recent statement by Weirton Steel's President C. G. Tournay in which he said that the company is "aware of the accelerated interest by the public in air and stream pollution control and we are not only continuing but are accelerating our efforts to completely resolve a problem that is of concern to us all." Weirton Steel, he explained, has expended more than $15 million for air and water pollution control devices since 1951 and plans considerable additional capital expenditures to effect total pollution control. I will make available at the conclusion of my remarks, the text of the Weirton Steel statement which I commend.

Those persons who assisted President Johnson in the preparation of his message to Congress on air pollution and influenced his inclusion of the comment concerning Weirton should have consulted Doctor Robert M. White, the administrator of the Environmental Science Services Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, which includes the Weather Bureau. They and the President would have received pertinent facts from Dr. White. We of the Senate Public Works Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution heard Dr. White testify on February 8 concerning "air lids, otherwise known as air inversion" and concerning "reduced atmospheric ventilation."

We learned from Dr. White that government investigation and records prove that the Appalachian valleys of Pennsylvania and West Virginia—including, of course, the Ohio River Valley—are among the country's worst areas of poor atmospheric ventilation and pollution dilution. Trouble areas, in which the President included Weirton—but did not relate any part of Weirton's problem to atmospheric conditions—usually have peculiar weather difficulties.

Dr. White told us:

"First, the horizontal wind speed is reduced much below its average level and air pollutants are not moved away from their source as quickly as usual. In such light wind conditions the pollutants seldom travel away in a straight line, but often double back on their sources, gradually filling up the area with more and more pollution.

"Second, within these high pressure areas a large mass of air gradually descends, warming as it descends and creating a temperature lid. This lid, or invasion, as we call it technically, is a layer in which the temperature increases with height instead of decreasing, as normal.

"In addition to these large-scale meteorological effects there are local situations, usually created by major topographic features such as mountains, that can reduce the average ventilation or dilution of an area. The best known of these is probably southern California. The San Joaquin Valley in California and the Appalachian Valleys of Pennsylvania and West Virginia are other examples.

"Through studies of the winds, inversion frequency, and the movement of high-pressure centers, a general picture of the atmospheric ventilation potential of the United States is beginning to emerge. Qualitatively, the zones of reduced atmospheric ventilation are in the eastern part of the country during the fall, and the reduction in the western part occurs in the winter. Areas of the greatest persistency of these conditions are southern California and Appalachia."

So, our air pollution problems in this areas and almost all of the Ohio Valley, as well as those of the Kanawha Valley, are vastly complicated by atmospheric conditions. Our pollution control and abatement efforts are more difficult and more costly in the valleys of Appalachia than many of us realized.

The Ohio Valley mirrors the challenge which we face in the Nation at large—the same forces which have brought our Nation to its present unparalleled economic and industrial strength now threaten the quality of life which this strength has made possible.

This fact was dramatically pointed up in recent hearings before our Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution by Dr. Ivan L. Bennett, Deputy Director of the Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President, when he stated that "The existence of man and of all the biological universe, the so-called biosphere, which sustains his life and makes it pleasant by bringing delight to his mind and his senses, is threatened as never before in history."

Because of the great bounty of this land of ours, we have been slow in realizing that our natural resources are not unlimited. It was not until the settlement of the free lands of the West that we began as a Nation to think seriously about the conservation of our land resources under the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt.

Similarly, with the great industrialization and urban expansion of World War II and the decade following, we began to realize that our rivers and streams were limited in their capacity to carry the wastes of our civilization. Now, after some two decades during which the signs have been ever more evident, we have come to realize that even the air around us has passed the limit of its capacity to cleanse itself of the byproducts of urban-industrial civilization. Thus, air itself, the most essential of our natural resources, must be utilized with efficiency and conserved with prudence.

Tonight, I shall discuss some of the conclusions which the Congress has reached with regard to the problems of air and water pollution and some of the areas of further inquiry in which we are now engaged.

WATER POLLUTION

The Water Quality Act of 1965—adopted after two and a half years of Congressional effort—represented one of the major steps in a national effort to face the challenge of limited water resources.

Prior to enactment of this legislation, our primary concern was with the reparation of past damage and deterring the advance of pollution. In 1965, however, we turned the corner—to face tomorrow's needs as well as today's crises.

That Act was not the final answer to the problem. But it did provide us with two important instruments for the establishment and implementation of a national water policy: first, it created the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration directly responsible to a Cabinet level Secretary—now the Secretary of the Interior—and armed the new agency with the mandate to consider all aspects of water pollution control and abatement; secondly, the Act of 1965 provided for the establishment of water quality standards, designed to stimulate cooperative Federal-State and local water resource planning, and directed at the improvement as well as the repair of water quality.

I emphasize that the Congress did *not* authorize a *national* standard of water quality. It authorized a national *policy* of water quality enhancement, based on local and regional water uses, with the provision that the States be given the opportunity to develop standards based on the application of scientifically established criteria.

In order to strengthen Federal participation in the pollution abatement effort and to stimulate our States and cities, the Congress last year enacted legislation which will greatly expand the Federal financial commitment to water pollution control.

The Water Quality Amendments of 1966, which were enacted unanimously by both bodies of the Congress, authorize $3.4 billion in Federal funds over the next four years for the assistance of municipalities in the construction of sewage treatment facilities. It represents a major advance in the field of water pollution control.

In addition, the legislation last year authorized $50 million for a demonstration program of 50 percent Federal grants for the construction of joint municipal-industrial treatment facilities. It is our hope that this demonstration program will provide some guidelines for Federal assistance to industry in this field.

This brings me to one of the areas of continuing concern of the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, chaired by the able Senator from Maine (Mr. Muskie). I refer to the question of financial incentives and their relationship to effective and efficient investment in plant and equipment. This is a complex area, because it involves the relationship of the technology of in-process treatment, the relative merits of enforcement versus effluent fees or other "dis-incentives," and the amount and type of public contributions considered appropriate for private enterprise.

There is, I believe, some difference of opinion on this question between officials of the Administration and many of us in the Congress. Our committee report last year strongly urged that attention be given to the issue of investment incentives for both air and water pollution abatement facilities. I am a cosponsor this year of three bills in the Senate which would provide several alternatives of accelerated depreciation or tax credits. There are task forces in both the Department of HEW and the Department of the Interior studying the problem, and I have urged that the Administration come up with recommendations this year.

AIR POLLUTION

Air pollution, in many respects, presents a more complex and more critical problem than does water pollution. For we have the same relationship to air that a fish has to water. Though we can avoid the pollution of a stream, a fish cannot. By the same token—unless we wear gas masks—we cannot avoid the pollution of the air around us. And there is no known or foreseen method which is technically and economically feasible to wash or cleanse the ambient air once it has become polluted. Obviously, we must control air pollution by controlling it at the source of emissions.

We gain some measure of the scope of the problem when it is noted, according to a recent report of the National Academy of Sciences that the emission of principal pollutants to the atmosphere over the United States totals approximately 125 million tons annually. But this figure offers no indication of the complexities created by local variations, the technological problems of controlling certain types of emissions, or the difficulties created by established patterns of activity in transportation, industry and energy production that involve huge amounts of capital and important segments of our economy.

The possibilities of disruptions in industry and dislocations of the economy must not be taken lightly. And despite the severity of the problem, we know that action on the scale required will not be accomplished unless incentives are made available and sanctions are used wisely.

To date, our goals have been limited. We have concentrated on individual pollutants, their weights, their amounts, and their observable effect. There have been developed specific emission standards to control individual sources of contamination. Ordinances have been passed to reduce smoke. Abatement action has been taken against specific pollutors. These were necessary steps, but they are not sufficient even to keep pace with pollution, much less to improve the quality of our air. We must direct our attention to the concept of air quality.

We must also refine our concept of acceptable health standards to eliminate not only those conditions which are reflected in the dramatic increase of hospital admissions during pollution emergencies. We must look also at the gradual erosion of health due to the daily exposure to pollutants at less-than-critical levels. Although we will never have the kind of certainty of knowledge developed in the controlled conditions of the laboratory, we now have sufficient knowledge as a basis for the establishment of public policy and guidelines for action.

The proposed Air Quality Act of 1967, now pending before the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, would authorize the establishment of emission control levels for those industries which are nationally significant sources of air pollution. Such standards must, of course, be applied with an understanding of the technological and economic problems involved. But national emission standards are, I believe, essential, not only to insure the desired ambient air quality, but also to insure equal competition among plants within the same industry and to prevent States from soliciting new industries by inadequate or non-existent State pollution abatement standards.

The Air Quality Act of 1967 also recommends the establishment of Regional Air Quality Commissions for pollution abatement in interstate regions. There are some 70 large interstate metropolitan areas where such problems exist.

In this connection, it is factual to comment that on December 20, 1966—more than a month prior to the President's air pollution message to the Congress—significant meetings were held in Parkersburg, West Virginia, and Steubenville, Ohio, under the auspices of the Ohio-West Virginia Industry Committee on Air Pollution Abatement.

The group includes representatives of 34 major industries with plants on both sides of the Ohio River from East Liverpool, Ohio, to Huntington, West Virginia. It was announced at the December 20 meetings that the group would propose to the Ohio and West Virginia Legislatures measures authorizing the creation of an Ohio-West Virginia Air Pollution Abatement Compact—an interstate agreement. The chairman, your own Fred E. Tucker of Weirton, said the compact was drafted in accordance with the intent of Congress and the provisions of the Federal Clean Air Act. The legislation has been introduced in the Legislatures both at Charleston and in Columbus and is pending there.

In a telegram to Chairman Tucker on December 18, 1966, I commended the committee, its actions, and its proposals for interstate Compact legislation. I noted, however, that the legislature must be free to work its will on such Compact measure, both as to form and content. And I said that I will be among sponsors in Congress for legisation to sanction such an interstate compact if the legislatures of Ohio and West Virginia agree on it. I do not share the pessimistic views of some of my colleagues on the value of compacts between the states.

I hope that the legislatures of West Virginia and Ohio will ratify an effective compact. But if they do so this year, it will be only the second interstate air pollution compact to come to the Congress since the Clean Air Act of 1963. In conjunction with our hearings on the Air Quality Act of 1967, our committee will therefore, explore not only the concept of the regional air quality commission, but other institutional devices which might offer prospects for more effective control of interstate problems.

Monumental as the task is of achieving improved air quality, we have the actual or potential technological and economic resources to do the job. We are, I believe, at the point of several significant and exciting technological breakthroughs, and I am confident that many others lie just beyond the horizon if we mobilize our resources for this purpose.

I have in mind, for example, pilot programs which are now going forward on the liquefaction of high-sulfur coal, in which a fuel oil is produced with no sulfur content, a coal char with seven-tenths of one percent sulfur content, and the sulfur is recaptured for commercial purposes. Though experts differ at the present time concerning the economic feasibility of the process, it seems likely that it is only a matter of time before such questions are resolved.

In the field of auto exhaust pollution, Secretary of HEW Gardner, recently promulgated standards for the control of evaporative hydro-carbons only a few weeks after a feasible device was demonstrated by a major oil research firm.

More recently, during our subcommittee's field hearings last week in Los Angeles, we were given a demonstration of what appears to be the first feasible device for the control of nitrous oxides. Such advances will, I believe, be forthcoming with increasing frequency as we gain momentum in the field of pollution abatement.

This is, of course, a field in which your society and professional engineering in general have a place of preeminent importance. The challenge of improving the quality of our urban-industrial environment is one of the truly important tasks of our time. It should enlist our best resources of intellect and imagination, for the quality of life on this planet is at least as important as determining what lies on the far side of the moon.

Scientists and engineers, more than any other professions, are responsible for the great strides in technological development that we have experienced in recent decades. It now rests primarily with your professions to help augment the state of the art to improve the quality of our environment—and thus the quality of life which will give meaning to the advancement of technology.

Statement Released Saturday, February 11, 1967, by Weirton Steel Co., Division of National Steel Corp., Weirton, W. Va., Concerning Its Air and Stream Pollution Control Facilities Since 1951 and Its Projections

Weirton Steel Division of the National Steel Corporation has spent approximately $15 million on air and stream pollution control facilities since 1951, it was announced today by C. G. Tournay, President. He added that "considerable additional expenditures will be made in order to effect total pollution control."

"Even prior to 1951," he said, "Weirton Steel Division had begun a systematic step-by-step program of pollution control, and since that time the program has advanced as rapidly as technological development of control equipment would permit."

The latest control facilities to be installed at Weirton are on the "Mill of the Future" which is scheduled for start-up later this year and will combine basic oxygen furnaces, vacuum degassing and continuous casting.

Effluent from the basic oxygen furnaces will be removed in a wet scrubber, resulting in a clean stack on the operation which will meet all existing control requirements. Over 50 million gallons of water per day will be required to operate this mill. Ninety percent of the water will be recirculated through a complex filtering and clarifying system. As a result, water returned to the Ohio River will meet the most stringent requirements for water quality.

Another important step in the Weirton Steel program was taken nearly two years ago when the huge electrostatic precipitator was placed in operation on the No. 13 and No. 14 open hearth furnaces. The unit removes effluent from discharges of the furnaces by means of electrically charged plates, cleaning 7,500 tons of air per day.

The precipitator was first activated on April 30, 1965 by U.S. Senator Jennings Randolph of West Virginia who, on the occasion, stated: "If all industrial management officials were as progressive and as civic minded as are those of the Weirton Steel, and if all state and local officials were as conscious of their responsibilities in the field of pollution control as are those now serving in West Virginia, the Congress would perhaps not need to act on Federal standards for air and water quality.

"As legislators," Senator Randolph continued, "we must recognize that these large expenditures for cleaning our air and water and for the beautification of America do not result in any financial return to industry. On the contrary, they result in substantial costs."

The combination of the precipitator in the open hearth and the wet scrubber on the basic oxygen furnaces in the "Mill of the Future" will eliminate by the end of this year in Weirton the plumes of brown smoke referred to in President Johnson's air pollution message on January 30.

Mr. Tournay commented that "installation of the massive, non-productive pollution control facilities has been done on a voluntary basis in cooperation with local and state governments."

He added that "air and stream pollution control is not limited just to the operations that produce brown plumes of smoke, but touches virtually all operations in the steelmaking process."

In the coke plant, he said, phenol discharges are controlled by the most advanced phenol recovery plant in the industry. The phenols, if permitted to enter the Ohio River, would be a potential cause of a medicinal taste in drinking water. Also in the coke plant, all 294 coke ovens have been equipped with knife-edge self-sealing doors to reduce black smoke.

At the blast furnace department, all four furnaces have been equipped with a complex system of dust control including dust catchers, gas washers, precipitators and Venturi scrubbers. Water from these installations is transferred to two large clarifiers where the solids are removed before the water is discharged to the Ohio River.

The company has installed rotoclones, cyclones and a chemically-treated wet water system in the sinter plant to reduce dust emissions.

At the Strip Steel Department, all continuous pickling lines have been equipped with wet scrubbers to completely eliminate acid mist. The waste acid produced by these lines is collected and hauled to lagoons where it is neutralized and contained. This installation alone has an operating cost of more than $1,500 per day.

In the Strip Steel tandem mills, construction has been completed on a highly complex oil recovery and water purification system in which waste oil, after repeated use on the mills, is pumped to a new oil recovery plant where oil is reclaimed and reused in company operations.

Similar controls for acid mist elimination, oil recovery, and the recirculation and containment of chemical waste are also in operation in the Sheet Mill and Tin Mill departments.

In addition to these in-plant controls, facilities have also been provided for stream pollution control at the coal preparation plant. Here water is constantly recirculated and cleaned for reuse at the plant and no discharge of "black water" is permitted from the operation.

Mr. Tournay said these facilities are only a portion of the total equipment installed by Weirton Steel to control air and stream pollution.

"Pollution control," Mr. Tourney added, "is not a new problem at Weirton Steel. The company has realistically faced the problem for more than 20 years and has made steady progress with its step-by-step program.

"We are aware of the accelerated interest by the public in the problems of air and stream pollution control, and we are not only continuing but are accelerating our efforts to completely resolve a problem that is of concern to us all."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Juhan Suurkivi, St. Mark's Temple Lutheran Church, Clifton Heights, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who hast made us for fellowship that reaches around the earth, we thank Thee for every gift which becomes richer as we share it, and more secure as we guard it for one another.

Unite us in the cause of righteousness, love, and peace. Set us firmly against tyranny, oppression, and discrimination at home and abroad. Let us never grow indifferent to the agonizing cries of enslaved people in Estonia and in all nations under Communist rule.

Look with mercy upon those who must serve in places of great danger. Strengthen the President and all who are burdened by the responsibility of finding the way to a true and lasting peace, which shall bring glory to Thy name and blessings to people everywhere. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 23, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4573) entitled "An act to provide, for the period ending on June 30, 1967, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act."

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 301, 78th Congress, appointed Mr. INOUYE to be a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 207, 81st Congress, appointed Mr. RIBICOFF to be a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 1028, 84th Congress, appointed Mr. HRUSKA to be a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy in lieu of Mr. CASE, resigned.

ROY A. ROBERTS OF THE KANSAS CITY STAR

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, at about this hour in Kansas City, memorial services are being conducted for the late Roy A. Roberts, of the Kansas City Star. His passing will be mourned by countless thousands. He will be remembered as the head of a paper that has been the recipient of five Pulitzer prizes and acclaimed repeatedly over the years by honorable mention as one of the 10 great newspapers of America.

My dear friend, the late Judge Eugene I. "Buck" Purcell of the Jackson County, Missouri, court best described Mr. Roberts as the kind of a man if he had to write something critical about a person would let him know far enough in advance to prepare his side of the issue and not be taken by surprise.

As a delegate to the 1956 convention, it was my privilege to visit with him in Chicago which he attended as a correspondent for his paper. He told me he had to be careful what he said about any of the candidates for President while the convention was going on because of its possible influence on our State's delegates. He added he thought a reporter should print the facts and he should not commingle news and editorial opinion in the same column. To me, this proved his unbiased above-board determination to give fair treatment to those he wrote about.

As a reporter he was seldom equaled. Heads of state, Government leaders, and captains of industry would confide in him because they knew he would honor their confidence. He could convey the meaning of complex situations in a language anyone could understand. He said he hoped he could make his columns sound as if he was talking to his readers, rather than writing for them. He made many predictions and most of them came true with uncanny accuracy.

It was his belief that it was important to dig out the facts because he believed only an informed people could make democracy work. He required all of his people at the Star to follow a policy of fairness. Roy Roberts was not only a good newspaperman but a great human being. He took a strong and fearless stand on every important issue, national and local, but then as a warm humanitarian would turn to the role of benefactor and befriender of those whom he felt needed his help. He will long be remembered for his contributions to American journalism.

SALMON IS AN ANADROMOUS FISH—NOT A DISEASE

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, an increase in the disease sometimes called Salmonella causes some concern to the fishing industry lest some people think the term refers to fish. Unfortunately, it is not widely known that the genus of bacteria causing this disease was first identified by a scientist whose name was Salmon. As a consequence, the disease carries his name.

Obviously, there is inherent danger of public confusion and that some people will get the idea that the source of the disease is related to the nutritious and wholesome anadromous fish called salmon. Any such impression of course has an adverse effect on many fishermen and the salmon industry.

To invite the coining any common use of some other scientific term, and to clear up confusion, Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress that terms "Salmonella" and "salmonellosis" should not be used in reference to any genus of bacteria or bacterially caused disease. I am hopeful there will be ever widening recognition that not only are salmon a delicious delicacy, but likewise being rich in protein, are unsurpassed as an energy food and should be on every household diet regularly for pleasure in good eating and likewise for health and good living. Passage by Congress of my resolution, I am hopeful, will encourage medical journals and doctors to use some other term that will not do violence to one of the great living resources of the sea.

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI DEFENDS AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the disclosure that some cadets from the Air Force Academy have left school due to violation of the honor code has produced expected Monday-morning quarterbacking of the Academy by some Members of Congress. This instinctive urge to question the honor code at the Academy parallels in a very interesting fashion the current hue and cry against the CIA.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Air Force, Naval, and Military Academies are all being excellently administered and are meeting their responsibilities in a very effective fashion. They are producing young men of extremely high caliber who are filling their expected role as the backbone of our career military officer category.

All three Academies are emphasizing not only very practical educational programs, but have set and are maintaining extremely high standards of proficiency as well as the code of honor among the students.

Whenever there is a disclosure of this nature there are immediate cries against the necessary discipline and the unique esprit de corps of the Academies.

We must keep in mind that these are not universities. They are not a haven for beatniks, superintellectuals, or socialites, but are special educational-military schools devoted to turning out career military officers who are the finest in the world.

One of the great virtues of our Military Establishment is that its career officials have been continually drawn from civilian backgrounds and provided with the excellent training which has been demonstrated in superior leadership in time of war and sound preparedness in peacetime.

We should properly emphasize the overall soundness of our military academies and their great records of accomplishment, rather than to blindly criticize their administration or attempt to interfere with the necessary discipline and code of honor.

PAUL G. ROGERS, OF FLORIDA, PRAISES COMMISSIONING OF ATLANTIC UNDERSEA TEST AND EVALUATION CENTER

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I take pride in bringing to the attention of the House the commissioning of the Atlantic Undersea Test and Evaluation Center in West Palm Beach, Fla.

I would make note of the importance given this occasion by the presence of the Vice President and the major address he delivered at the dedication ceremonies. I will place this outstanding speech in the RECORD within the next day or two.

The Vice President's leadership and active interest in the field of oceanography has led the enthusiasm which government and private industry are exhibiting in this new and exciting field.

The development of the Nation's undersea defense system gives this country added muscle, and the people of the Nation will realize added benefits from the exploration, research, and development of the seas.

Through the efforts made by the Atlantic Undersea Test and Evaluation Center, the Nation will be able to make more effective use of the seas.

Mr. Speaker, we see here just one more step in our program to fully utilize the vast resources that lie beneath the oceans.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1967—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 60)

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1967.

This plan would transfer from the Secretary of Commerce to the Secretary of Transportation authority to approve the surrender of certain ship documents. These documents include certificates of ownership, declarations of citizenship, and related ship papers issued for commercial vessels covered by preferred mortgages or owned by the United States.

Under the act establishing the Department of Transportation, the Secretary of Transportation, acting through the Coast Guard, will have responsibility for recording bills of sale, transfers, and mortgages of ships; for issuing new marine documents; and for retaining custody of preferred mortgages on vessels.

The Secretary of Transportation will not, however, have the authority to approve the surrender of documents for vessels covered by preferred mortgages. That authority still resides with the Secretary of Commerce.

As a result, shipowners will have to deal with two separate departments of the Federal Government every time a ship's name is changed, its structure is modified, or it is sold or transferred.

In each of these and other cases, the shipowner must first seek the approval of the Secretary of Commerce to surrender the ship's documents and then request the Secretary of Transportation to issue new documents.

The reorganization plan is designed to eliminate this duplication of effort, and to save time and expense for shipowners.

This is not a major reorganization plan. But it is important. It is part of our larger effort to streamline the Government, to make its operations as efficient as possible, and to enable it to provide better service to the citizens and businessmen of this country.

This plan has been prepared in accordance with chapter 9 of title V of the United States Code. I have found, after investigation, that the reorganization is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 901(a) of that title.

I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 27, 1967.*

THE NATION'S CAPITAL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 61)

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Our goal for the Nation's Capital is a city of which all Americans can be proud.

As I said 2 years ago, this city and its government must be, for its residents and the entire world, "A living expression of the highest ideals of democratic government." It should be a city of beauty and inspiration, of equal justice and opportunity. It should be a model for every American city, large and small. It should be a city in which our citizens and our friends from abroad can live and work, visit our great national monuments, and enjoy our parks and walk our streets without fear.

The District of Columbia is the Nation's ninth largest city. It is the center of the fastest growing metropolitan area in the country, with a population today of 2.5 million. As such, its citizens have all the problems—and are entitled to all the rights—of the citizens of any large city in this country.

The District of Columbia is also the Capital of our Nation, and the seat of every major agency of the Federal Government. As such, there is a significant Federal interest in the affairs of this city.

Since I have been President, I have addressed myself to the difficult problem of balancing the interest of the residents of the District as citizens of a large city with that of the National Government as representative of the people of the entire country.

The actions of the 89th Congress demonstrate that it shares my concern that both these interests be fairly served. While the 89th Congress did not move forward in every field as many of us would have preferred, its accomplishments do illustrate our mutual interest in making the District of Columbia a place in which we can all take pride:

A new 4-year college and a technical institute were authorized to bring better education and training to our young.

A mass transit system was authorized to serve the city and its suburbs and an interstate agency was created to plan and build the system.

A comprehensive minimum wage law was enacted.

Urban renewal was started for the commercial area in the heart of the city.

Two new museums, the Hirshhorn and the Air and Space, were authorized.

A commission to plan a visitors' center was established.

These actions are an important, and a very historic, beginning.

The District's programs for housing, education, health, welfare, and recreation must be expanded and improved. Its war against crime must be sharply stepped up.

The 1968 budget for the District calls for increased efforts in each of these areas. The budget would finance long-delayed school construction projects. It would provide the personnel and equipment needed to enhance the quality of education. It would provide resources vitally needed by the police and it would enable us to combat crime at its source with improved housing, education, training, health, and rehabilitation services.

But prompt action on the 1968 budget alone is not enough.

The citizens of the District are entitled to:

Elect the government which serves them.

Efficient and effective government machinery.

Representation in the Congress of the United States.

Streets and homes that are free from crime and the fear of crime.

The citizens of our Nation as well as those of the District, are entitled to a Capital that is:

Inspiring, dignified, and beautiful.

A place where the great scholars of the Nation and the world can come to work, study, and learn.

A hospitable location for the scores of foreign governments which are represented here.

Accessible by transportation convenient to all who visit here.

I. A BETTER GOVERNMENT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The District of Columbia, as a major American city and the center of a large metropolitan area, faces all the problems of explosive urbanization—a rising crime rate, traffic congestion and parking shortages, decaying buildings and homes, and inadequate health and education services. To meet these needs, the District must have the most responsive and efficient government we are capable of providing.

I recommend a three-point program to bring new vitality and strength to the District's government: Home rule; reorganization and strengthening of the District government; representation in the Congress.

HOME RULE

To provide a system of government appropriate for the people who live here and worthy of our heritage, the residents of the District of Columbia must be given a voice in the selection of their local officials.

The citizens of the District today have no voice in the government of their city. Despite the principle so long cherished in this country, they are taxed without representation. The are asked to assume the responsibilities of citizenship and at the same time denied one of its most fundamental rights.

This continuing denial of democracy is an affront to our traditions and to the citizens who make the District their home.

The need for home rule stems from practical considerations as well. Management of any large metropolitan center, in this era of rapid technological and social change, must be promptly responsive to new demands and new conditions. The Congress, preoccupied as it should be with the problems of this great Nation, cannot be expected to provide the day-to-day management that should be provided by locally elected officials. The 535 Members of Congress should not be expected to serve as city councilmen for the city of Washington.

The bill to provide self-government for the District, which I transmitted to the 89th Congress, was designed to afford local citizens a full voice in their affairs and at the same time provide adequate safeguards for the legitimate interest of the Federal Government in our Nation's Capital. The Senate passed that bill. While the House of Representatives did not pass the bill I submitted, a majority of its Members clearly went on record in support of the principle of home rule.

I again endorse the home rule bill.

As I said in my message on the District of Columbia budget:

> I believe that the last Congress should have granted home rule to the citizens of the District, and I urge the present Congress to give them home rule.

REORGANIZATION OF THE DISTRICT GOVERNMENT

Improvements in District government need not await the passage of home rule legislation. Interim action under the Reorganization Act can bring urgently needed improvements to make the present unwieldly structure into an efficient and effective instrument of municipal government.

I will shortly transmit to the Congress a reorganization proposal to strengthen and modernize the government of the District of Columbia.

The present District government organization was established almost a century ago. The District was then a community of 150,000 people. Less than 500 persons were employed by its government.

Today the District has 800,000 residents. Its government employs some 30,000 people. Its 1968 budget is more than half a billion dollars. This major metropolis cannot be properly governed with the cumbersome machinery of an archaic and obsolete structure.

The District is entitled to have the best and most efficient municipal government we can provide. The Nation's Capital should lead the country in applying the techniques of modern management to the organization and administration of its programs.

The reorganization plan I propose would create a mayor-council form of government—the form which has been found most successful in the Nation's 27 largest cities.

Under the reorganization plan, the President, subject to Senate confirmation, would appoint from among District residents a single Commissioner as chief executive and a Council of nine members.

The single Commissioner would serve at the pleasure of the President. Council members would serve 2-year terms, five to be appointed one year and four the next. The staggered terms would insure continuity of experience on the Council.

The powers and responsibilities which the three-man Board of Commissioners presently have would be apportioned between the single Commissioner and the Council. The Commissioner would be assigned the executive functions now vested in the Board of Commissioners. Like most mayors, he would be given responsibility and authority to organize and manage the District government, to administer its programs, and to prepare its budget of revenues and expenses.

The Council would be responsible primarily for making local rules and regulations—the District's city ordinances. This would include the quasi-legislative functions which are now performed by the Board of Commissioners, such as licensing rules, the issuance of police regulations, and the establishment of rates for property taxation. It would also review and approve the Commissioner's budget for submission to the President.

This reorganization would unify executive and administrative authority in a single Commissioner. While the District has been fortunate in the caliber and dedication of men who have become Commissioners, divided executive authority cannot provide effective management for the municipal affairs of a city of almost 1 million people.

The Capital City of this Nation can no longer afford Government by three heads—each wearing several hats. To achieve their maximum potential, District programs—and federally assisted programs in the District—require clear-cut executive authority and flexible government machinery at the local level—not divided authority which too often produces prolonged negotiations and inaction. A single executive can bring effective management, direction, and control to the task of meeting increasingly complex needs.

But reorganization alone will not assure the Nation's Capital the best municipal government. The District must also be able to attract and hold topmen in the widely varying fields required for effective city government.

I recommend legislation to give the District government an ample quota of its own top executive level positions—supergrades and levels IV and V. The District government must be able to offer attractive salaries and opportunities for career advancement if it is to draw the caliber of person which the government of the Nation's Capital deserves.

As these fundamental changes are made, it will be possible to effect further improvements, both in the structure of the District government and in its relationships to other agencies serving the Nation's Capital.

These proposals in no way substitute for home rule. The single Commissioner and the nine-man Council will give the District a better organized and more efficient government, but they will have no functions beyond those the three Commissioners now possess. The new structure will make the transition to self-government easier, but only home rule will provide the District with a democratic government—of, by, and for its citizens.

REPRESENTATION IN THE CONGRESS

A proper complement to locally elected District officials is locally elected voting representation in the Congress.

I recommend that the Constitution be amended to authorize one Representative for the District of Columbia in the House and such additional representation in the House and the Senate as the Congress may from time to time provide.

Upon ratification, this would give the District of Columbia at least one sure voice—the minimum possible voting representation—in the Congress. At the same time, it would provide, through the Congress, the ability to adjust the representation for the District as population increases and as other changes make such adjustments appropriate and fair.

Ratification by the States and enactment of the necessary implementing legislation will take some time. But District citizens should not be left completely without a voice in the Congress during this vital interim period. They are entitled to some representation in the Congress now.

I recommend legislation to permit the citizens of the District to elect a nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives. Such a delegate would be comparable to the delegates who formerly represented Hawaii and Alaska and to the present Resident Commissioner for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

A delegate from the District in the House of Representatives would be of benefit to both the Congress and the District in providing a more adequate line of communication on District matters. A collateral benefit would be the opportunity for District citizens, through the experience of biennial elections, to develop additional local leadership and more effective political organizations responsive to the citizens who live here.

II. THE WAR ON CRIME

In my message to the Congress on Crime in America, I said:

> Lawlessness is like a plague. Its costs, whether economic, physical or psychological, are spread through every alley and every street in every neighborhood. It creates a climate in which people make choices, not out of confidence, but out of fear.

That plague has struck our Nation's Capital. But, as I said in that same message:

> We can control crime if we will. We must act boldly, now, to treat ancient evils and to insure the public safety.

In my 1965 message on the District of Columbia, I announced the establishment of the Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia and asked for additional policemen, special incentives to attract and hold first-rate policemen, improvements in our courts to handle the growing criminal caseload, new correctional techniques to break the cycle of crime, prison, release, and crime.

The Congress responded and in the past 2 years there have been significant advances. Working together, we have increased police salaries, authorized overtime compensation for police officers, provided additional judgeships in the court of general sessions, established a work-release program for misdemeanor offenders, and created the District of Columbia Bail Agency.

Through the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, the Department of Justice has provided funds to support development of a model police radio communications system, a police planning bureau, an in-service police training program for all staff levels, a computerized law enforcement information system for the metropolitan area, additional mobile units.

The District of Columbia Commissioners have issued orders reorganizing the Police Department and the Department of Corrections to increase their efficiency and effectiveness.

These are significant steps forward. But more—much more—remains to be done.

In December 1966, the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia submitted a comprehensive report on the nature and extent of the District's crime problem and on the quality of the District's response to it. The report assembled facts, carefully explored alternatives, and presented a broad and practical program for action.

The Crime Commission reported that since 1960:

The rate of homicides and housebreakings in the District has doubled.

The rate of robberies and auto thefts has almost tripled.

The rate of grand larcenies has increased by more than 50 percent.

The Commission's report emphasizes that any meaningful attack on crime involves comprehensive and persistent action over a period of several years. The report makes the priorities clear. We must:

Develop new programs to deal with juvenile delinquency.

Develop and use the most effective law enforcement machinery available.

Strengthen our courts and prosecutors so that persons charged with crime can be tried quickly and fairly.

Guarantee that our rehabilitative efforts reflect the wisest experience in the field of corrections, so that we can break the vicious cycle of crime, prison, and more crime.

Develop an information and evaluation system which permits rapid appraisal of our efforts to control crime.

Measured against the demands of these goals, piecemeal efforts will not suffice. Crime will not be controlled by strengthening just one or two agencies in the field. All parts of the government with law enforcement and criminal justice responsibilities must be strengthened. Private citizens must participate at every level—from support for the police and promptly reporting crimes, to testifying in court and employing good risk offenders.

THE COMMITMENT

Crime in the sixties and seventies can no more be fought with inadequate budgets and obsolete tools than with words of public indignation. The District of Columbia needs financial resources to provide the manpower, training, new facilities, and equipment and information systems—to prevent crime before it occurs, to process offenders swiftly, and to develop programs which prevent repetition of crime by offenders and return them to useful lives.

Equally important, the police and government officials of the District need the personal support of every citizen who lives here and of the Congress. So long as I am President, I will take every step necessary to control crime in the District and to make it a community of safe streets and homes, free from crime and the fear of crime.

My message on the District's budget described some of the efforts we must make:

A further increase in police salaries.

Additional funds to improve police planning, communications, and transportation.

More police officers, particularly sergeants to improve supervision.

Additional funds for our efforts to curb juvenile delinquency.

Expanded assistance for the planning, construction, and modernization of our courts and correctional facilities.

To support these efforts, I am requesting $11.6 million—a 20-percent increase—in the fiscal 1968 appropriations for the District police, courts, and correctional activities. I urge the Congress to act promptly on this vital request.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Action on the District's budget alone is not enough. Our laws—and the weapons of those who enforce our laws—must be strengthened. I propose a 10-point program to achieve this objective.

1. GUN CONTROL

Pistols are relatively easy to purchase in the District of Columbia. As the Crime Commission found, "almost anyone who is willing to fill out a form and wait for 48 hours can buy a handgun." The only persons who may not purchase handguns are minors, the mentally ill, drug addicts, and convicted felons. It makes no difference whether the individual has any need to purchase a pistol. Pistols may also be purchased by mail without restriction.

Any person who is not a felon or drug addict may possess a pistol in the District. It makes no difference whether he is mentally ill, a minor, or a chronic alcoholic, whether the weapon was obtained legally or illegally or whether there is any need for possession of the weapon.

Between July 1, 1965, and June 30, 1966, 1,850 major crimes were committed in the District of Columbia with pistols; 73 homicides, 640 assaults, 1,137 robberies and attempted robberies.

No civilized community in the 20th century should permit a situation such as this to exist. Experience in cities that regulate the purchase and possession of handguns and the studies of the Crime Commission clearly show that strict controls can strengthen our efforts to reduce violent crimes. Such controls cannot eliminate the danger of violence in our society. But they can help keep lethal weapons out of dangerous and irresponsible hands.

As the District Crime Commission emphasized, New York City, with the most stringent pistol control law in the country, has many crimes committed with handguns, but the relative number of such crimes is significantly less than in the District.

The District had a hand gun murder rate of 9.1 per 100,000 of population in fiscal 1966, New York City had a rate of only 1.7. The handgun assault rate was 79.8 in the District, but only 20.0 in New York. The handgun robbery rate was 141.7 in the District, but only 45.4 in New York.

I recommend legislation to:

Prohibit possession of firearms by minors, chronic alcoholics, and the mentally ill, as well as felons and drug addicts who are covered by existing law.

Prohibit purchase of firearms by chronic alcoholics, as well as minors, the mentally ill, felons, and drug addicts who are now covered.

Require that any person desiring to purchase, possess, or carry a pistol in public obtain a license which will be granted only if he can show that he needs the weapon to protect his person or property.

Prohibit anyone from carrying rifles and shotguns in public, unless unloaded and properly encased.

Authorize the courts to impose increased penalties where a firearm is used in the commission of a robbery.

2. POWER TO ARREST WITHOUT A WARRANT

At present District police officers are authorized to arrest without a warrant only when they have reason to believe that the person has committed an armed robbery, murder, or some other felony, or one of a limited number of misdemeanors, such as possession of narcotics or carrying a concealed weapon. The police today may not arrest a person whom they believe has committed other serious offenses, such as an assault or unlawful entry, without first obtaining a warrant for his arrest.

I recommend legislation to extend the authority of police to arrest without a warrant to additional serious offenses, such as assault, unlawful entry, and attempted housebreaking. This will allow the police to respond more quickly and effectively to criminal acts threatening serious harm to our citizens.

3. WITNESSES

Of vital importance to crime control and any criminal prosecution is the availability of witnesses and their freedom from threats and intimidation.

Existing laws provide ample protections against intimidation of witnesses—but only after charges have been filed. It is not a crime to bribe or threaten persons with vital information before charges have been filed.

I recommend that the obstruction of justice statute be extended to cover interference with criminal investigations before charges have been filed.

In addition, the power of police to take custody of material witnesses at the scene of a crime must be clarified.

I recommend that the police of the District of Columbia be given authority to take custody of a material witness whenever there is reason to believe that he will not be available to testify in court. After the witness has been taken into custody, he would be promptly brought before a judicial officer who could either set conditions upon his release to insure reappearance or make arrangements for taking his deposition prior to release.

4. CITATIONS BEFORE AND AFTER ARREST FOR CERTAIN OFFENSES

District police today spend enormous amounts of time guarding and transporting persons arrested for minor offenses. Even where the offense is minor and identity of the offender clear, the police must in each case arrest the offender and take him to the stationhouse before he can be released with orders to reappear for trial or a hearing to determine whether a trial should be held. This must be done even if the offense involves nothing more than annoying a neighbor or refusing to move on when asked by some local official. This results in an inexcusable waste of police time and energy and often prevents the police from fulfilling more important duties.

New York, California, and several other States have resolved this problem by authorizing the police to issue citations to persons they consider reliable to require a subsequent appearance in court or at the police station.

I recommend legislation to give the police discretion to issue citations for certain minor offenses requiring subsequent appearance by the suspect.

Under this proposal, the Court of General Sessions would determine the types of offenses which would fall within this procedure. The proposal would enable the police to release reliable persons at the place of arrest or the stationhouse, thus conserving valuable police time for more important crime detection and protection duties.

5. BAIL SUPERVISION

Much can—and should—be done to improve our bail practices.

We are now making every effort to speed up the judicial process, to shorten the periods between arrest and trial and between conviction and appeal. This would limit the period during which the suspect is at large pending trial or appeal.

In addition, we must minimize the risk to society created by releasing persons before their trial.

I recommend legislation to permit the Department of Corrections to supervise persons released pending trial. This legislation would make possible more careful supervision of persons released on bail and would help the released person obtain needed counseling and assistance.

6. PROCEDURES UPON PLEA OF INSANITY

Existing procedures governing the defense of insanity contribute neither to judicial efficiency nor to protection of the rights of criminal defendants. A criminal defendant need not notify the prosecution or the court that he intends to raise the defense of insanity. He can wait until the prosecution has completed the presentation of its case and then submit this complex defense.

As a result the prosecutor must either make extensive and costly preparations which may not be necessary or enter the trial unprepared to deal with the issue. If the prosecution is not prepared and insanity is raised, a delay in the trial is unavoidable. But even where the trial is delayed, the government may not have sufficient time to prepare its case properly.

I recommend that counsel for a defendant who proposes to plead insanity be required to give advance notice to the prosecution.

This would protect the public against needless expense, where insanity is not in issue. It would protect the courts, the prosecution, and the defendant against needless delay, where insanity is unexpectedly raised.

7. CIVIL COMMITMENT FOR NARCOTICS OFFENSES

Last year I proposed the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act to permit civil commitment of certain narcotic addicts. As I said at that time:

> Our continued insistence on treating drug addicts, once apprehended, as criminals is neither humane nor effective. It has neither curtailed nor prevented crime.

I now recommend legislation to broaden the act's applicability in the District of Columbia.

Full criminal sanctions must be retained against the pushers who peddle narcotics—those who corrupt our children and destroy the lives of the young on whom they prey. But we must begin to provide treatment for those who are addicted to drugs. We must attempt "to eliminate the hunger for drugs that leads so many into lives of crime and degradation."

8. ALCOHOLIC OFFENSES

In fiscal 1965 there were 44,000 arrests for intoxication in the District of Columbia. This represents 50 percent of all nontraffic arrests. A few of these arrests were accompanied by assaults or other serious offenses. Most, however, involved nothing more than intoxication—and often just the intoxication of a chronic alcoholic.

This represents a tremendous waste of resources—police, courts, and prisons. Alcoholism, as both the National and District Crime Commissions pointed out, is not a criminal problem. It is a health problem. Alcoholics should not be arrested. They should be treated.

I recommend that the laws of the District be clarified so that police and Health Department personnel can take intoxicated persons not to a jail, but to a medical facility where they can receive proper treatment. Intoxication would be a criminal offense only when accompanied by conduct which endangers other persons or property.

9. CRIMINAL LAW AND PROCEDURE

The Criminal Code of the District needs complete modernization and revision. It was last codified three-quarters of a century ago. The District Crime Commission cites many examples of vague, confusing, archaic, and conflicting provisions of substance and procedure. The District should have a coherent and consistent framework for the arrest and punishment of offenders and the control of crime.

I recommend the establishment of a Commission on Reform of Criminal Laws of the District of Columbia to review, modernize, and clarify the District's Criminal Code. The 11-man Commission would be composed of representatives from the House and Senate, from the courts of the District and from the public at large.

10. CRIMINAL STATISTICS

The District must have a reliable means of discovering the effectiveness of its efforts to control crime. The report of the Crime Commission points out substantial gaps in the criminal information system. Police, courts, and correctional and juvenile institutions maintain separate and uncoordinated records, often creating conflicts in statistics and leaving the community without a comprehensive view of its criminal process. More significant, the policymakers in the District and the senior police officials lack the information essential to evaluate new and lasting crime control programs.

I have asked the District Commissioners to create a Bureau of Criminal Statistics. The Bureau would supply crime control agencies in the District with accurate data essential to their planning and evaluation functions and would end duplication of effort in data collection.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The District must be given the total resources necessary to mount an effective attack on crime. Its laws—and law enforcement officers—must be strengthened. But we must also improve our techniques for crime prevention, for processing offenders and for rehabilitating the convicted.

We must make additional efforts to stop crime where it most frequently begins—with the young offender:

In the 16 years from 1950 to 1965, nearly one-third of the persons arrested in the District for serious crimes were under 18.

In 1965 arrests of youth offenders under 18 for serious crimes increased by 53 percent over 1960; adult arrests decreased 11 percent during this same period.

In 1965, children 15 years and younger accounted for 36 percent of all housebreaking arrests and 27 percent of all robbery and auto theft arrests.

In January 1967, there were more youth offenders referred to the juvenile court than in any prior month.

The Crime Commission's report stresses the need for improving our efforts to rehabilitate our young offenders and restore them to useful and productive lives. But as the Commission stated:

> The most productive approach for both the potential offender and the community is to prevent delinquency before it begins.

It will be neither simple nor cheap to halt the growth of juvenile crime. But we must commit the necessary resources. I have recommended in the budget urgently needed funds to strengthen and improve a variety of District programs—education, recreation, health and welfare, and the juvenile court.

I have requested funds for a major summer program which will provide recreation, training, and employment for disadvantaged youth.

I have also asked for funds to expand

the roving leader program which has had such marked success in dealing with gangs and delinquency-prone youth. These funds will permit the expansion of programs removing the causes of delinquency as well as the improvement of the various rehabilitative services afforded the youth in trouble.

Consistency in these efforts, coordination of present youth programs, public and private, and development of new prevention techniques are essential. The Crime Commission proposed that a Youth Services Office be established to carry out these responsibilities.

I recommend legislation to establish a District Youth Services Office to plan and direct all the services needed to combat juvenile delinquency.

This Office, recommended by the District Crime Commission, would encourage maximum efforts by public and private agencies, as well as by private individuals. It would make available through one source all the specialized services—counseling, remedial education, vocational training, employment assistance, and health and recreational services—needed by the young, their parents, school personnel, and other persons working with the youth of the District. It would test new ways to prevent and control delinquency and to restore the troubled youth to a satisfying and productive life.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

We must make improvements in the administration of justice in the District of Columbia.

The report of the Crime Commission's study of the District courts is particularly disturbing. The Commission points out that offenders are released and not tried—not from any deliberate policy of leniency or softness, but rather from the pressure of sheer numbers and impossible caseloads.

In fiscal 1966, the number of felony prosecutions was substantially less than it was 15 years ago—in the face of a substantial increase in the amount of crime and the number of arrests.

In fiscal 1965, only 15 percent of the adult felony charges filed by the police resulted in felony prosecutions in the District court. An efficient police department is not enough. We must have a judicial system fully capable of dealing swiftly and fairly with persons arrested by the police.

The courts and the bar are already engaged in serious efforts to find solutions. The District court and the court of general sessions have made significant strides in improving their procedures for handling criminal cases.

The Judicial Council of the District of Columbia Circuit is preparing recommendations on ways to handle the staggering—and increasing—caseload of the court of general sessions, and to improve the processing of criminal cases in all of our courts. One promising method being explored is a program for round-the-clock processing of arrested persons and night sessions of court.

The Judicial Council is also at work on another recommendation of the Crime Commission—the proposal for a family court which would assume the responsibilities of the juvenile court, the domestic relations branch of the court of general sessions, and the Mental Health Commission.

The need to find solutions remains urgent. I pledge the continuing cooperation and assistance of the executive branch to these efforts. I have asked the District Commissioners and the Acting Attorney General to review promptly any recommendations for improving the administration of justice in the District of Columbia made by the courts or the Judicial Council and to take appropriate action to implement them.

CORRECTIONS

We must make improvements in the rehabilitation of the convicted offender. The report of the Crime Commission makes clear that the problem which the District faces is not too much probation and parole.

The Crime Commission's report revealed that two-thirds of those convicted of felonies in the District have already served at least one prison term. In addition, the Commission found that more than one-half of the felony offenders were unemployed when they committed their most recent crime.

No matter how long the sentences, most prisoners will eventually be returned to the community. The quality of the help they receive in prison and after release in building new lives for themselves makes the critical difference.

The District's correctional system is in need of modern facilities, more specialized personnel to provide counseling and vocational training, "halfway" houses to provide support during the critical release period, and community support to provide employment for persons with criminal records.

The budget I have recommended to the Congress will permit the District to begin to overcome these deficiencies and to plan to meet the needs of the future. It will:

Permit planning of a modern detention, diagnostic, and treatment facility to replace the District Jail and the District Receiving Home.

Allow closer supervision and improved counseling, training, and employment services for prisoners before and after release.

Provide greater services for youth offenders and an expanded work-training program to assist in the transition from jail to meaningful employment.

I strongly urge prompt and favorable action on these recommendations.

I also recommend that the Federal Prison Industries be authorized to manage and operate the industrial program of the District's correctional institutions. This agency, which has an enviable record of success in Federal prisons, will provide valuable assistance to the District in improving prison vocational training and employment opportunities.

This is the immediate battle plan in a total campaign to assure law and order for the District. Some parts require legislation. Some require funds. Some require improvements in procedures that courts, agencies, and administrators can themselves put into effect. A failure on any front in this war weakens the efforts on all the others. Every course must be pursued. We must not fail.

I pledge myself—and I urge the Congress—to take every step which is necessary to ultimate success in our drive against crime. We must pursue every avenue and use every weapon which holds promise of advancing this effort. We will need the total commitment and cooperation of every man and woman in the District, if we are to have a city where civic order and social justice prevail.

As I said in my message on crime in America, "Public order is the first business of government."

III. THE DISTRICT AS THE CAPITAL

The District, as the Nation's Capital, must be able to serve the national purpose for which it was founded. Its great avenues must be preserved as a tribute to the past and an inspiration for the future. It should afford unparalleled opportunities for the great scholars of the country and the world. It must make every effort to meet the needs of emissaries from abroad. It must continually explore new ways to improve its overloaded transportation facilities.

PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE COMMISSION

Pennsylvania Avenue, the District's most important thoroughfare, is the symbolic link between the White House and the Capitol. Throughout our history it has been the scene of ceremonies celebrating our triumphs and our tragedies.

Yet it has been allowed to wear down and become unworthy of its role. A temporary Commission created by Executive order is now engaged in bringing to the avenue the dignity and grandeur which it should have.

I recommend that the Congress support these efforts by prompt approval of the bill establishing a statutory Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue.

WOODROW WILSON CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

The Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission, created by the Congress in 1961, recently recommended the establishment of a Center for Scholars at Market Square as a living memorial to that great President.

The proposal of the Woodrow Wilson Commission has much to commend it. Because of its broad educational aspects, I am appointing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Temporary Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue. I am asking him, in consultation with the Commission, to conduct a study to develop a detailed proposal for the Center. When that study is completed, I will make further recommendations to the Congress.

It is my hope that the Center will serve as a place for bringing together scholars and students from other countries to increase understanding among peoples of the world, as well as an important educational institution.

INTERNATIONAL CENTER

For the District to serve its purpose as the Nation's Capital, it must provide for the representatives of foreign governments and international organizations. Increasingly, the unavailability of space for the legitimate needs of foreign governments is becoming a matter of concern.

Many new countries require but have been unable to secure adequate space for their chanceries. Many older countries which are seeking larger quarters are having similar difficulties. The problem has become an unnecessary irritant in our international relationships.

I recommend legislation which, consistent with the legitimate interests of District citizens, would specify an area northwest of Washington Circle to be available for foreign chanceries and the offices of international organizations. The bill would authorize the Federal Government to acquire land in this area for appropriate disposition, as the Secretary of State may determine, to foreign governments and international organizations.

TRANSPORTATION CENTER

Last year, important decisions by the Congress and by local government agencies cleared the way for the development of highway and mass transit systems required to handle the growing transportation needs of the National Capital region. Meanwhile, the National Capital Planning Commission is recommending that a major transportation center be developed in the vicinity of the Union Station, where railroads, mass transit, and highways will come together.

I am asking the Planning Commission to take the lead, in cooperation with other agencies, to conduct a detailed study of this recommendation and to determine how such a center might be designed and brought into being. This study will be closely coordinated with the planning for the Visitors Center which the Congress has already authorized.

CONCLUSION

It will not be easy to achieve our goal for the Nation's Capital—a city in which all Americans can take pride. The problems to which this message is primarily directed—better government and crime—will not be solved overnight. Dedicated and persistent efforts by private citizens, private organizations, private businesses, and by the District and Federal Governments will be required.

The task is difficult and success will take time. We must—and we will—succeed.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 27, 1967*.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, some years ago a great thinker wrote that there is nothing so irresistible in history as an idea whose time has come. Today we have heard an eloquent and persuasive message of the President on the future of the Nation's Capital. It seems to me that the idea of a new Washington has arrived and it is irresistible.

The President's comprehensive plan suggests that we might do many things for Washington. Some will take time. Others could go into effect immediately. Whatever the time sequence, his recommendations are logical, rational, and right, and we ought to act on them.

We should get on with the business of granting the District home rule. This is so basic to municipal government that one wonders why we have hesitated so long. But time has a way of being persuasive. There are few here today who doubt that a body of people 800,000 strong should not have the right to elect its own government and manage its own affairs. Let us, then, finish the good work we began in the 89th Congress and grant Washingtonians a government of their own choosing.

Next, we ought to permit the District to discard its present outmoded commission form of government for a strong executive-council type which gets things done and clearly delineates responsibility.

Let us also consider granting the District temporary representation now in Congress with the intention of permanent representation when constitutional ratification is assured.

But the job is only half done when new laws or administrative orders are approved. Washington cannot face the future as a workable and progressive city until it has the funds, the personnel, and the programs to move itself forward into the 20th century.

The schools, job opportunities, housing, and law enforcement agencies of the District need our increased assistance and support. We have too long turned our eyes away from the dilapidated and deteriorated housing, the overcrowded and inadequate schools, the lack of job and career opportunity for its residents.

We have the chance to make up for past neglect with present achievement. Let us approve the needed laws. Let us reform the District's government. Let us allocate the funds needed to make this not just the first city of the Nation but the best city of the Nation. I urge all members to support the President's proposals for the District of Columbia.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the series of proposals the President has made in his message on the Nation's Capital are as persuasive as they are eloquent, as broad as they are specific. He has charged us to do what is, simply, our duty. For the Congress has a special responsibility toward the Nation's Capital and toward the people who live in it. And we must fulfill that responsibility by supporting the series of programs outlined to us today.

First, and foremost, we must complete our work on home rule for Washington, for this is a basic power without which a modern city cannot function effectively. We must give District citizens the right to elect and select those who will manage their government and plan their public future. Without that right, whatever else we may do seems partial.

Second, we must permit the District to reorganize its government along logical and efficient lines. The commissions form must give way to a strong executive-council form, because this is what works in today's America.

Third, we must vote the new laws requested for crime prevention and control, so that Washington will be a city where the lives and property of all its citizens are equally protected.

Fourth, we must establish a mechanism whereby the District will enjoy a voice and voting power in the Congress itself—for which there are many historic precedents.

Fifth, we must appropriate the funds which the President requested in his budget so that Washington can have the economic leverage needed to lift itself up and fulfill the rising expectations of its citizens and visitors. The health, housing, education, and job opportunities of the District's residents reflect well or badly on the health, housing, education, and job opportunities of the American Nation as a whole.

Sixth, we must maintain the reputation of Washington as a world capital—if not the world capital. This city is looked upon by those beyond our seas as a symbol of what is right with America and what is wrong. Let us make certain that we have done everything proposed in this message—and more—to make ours a model city in a model country.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, like other large cities, the District of Columbia is constantly faced with the most critical and urgent problems—crime in the streets, health, slum removal, economic and cultural opportunities, the administration of justice and the like.

The District not only has these problems; but also they are severely aggravated when the citizens of the District are denied the power possessed by citizens in other cities to govern their own affairs.

The President has carefully set forth his recommendations to the Congress as to how the goals of local self-government can finally and effectively be attained in the District.

The President's proposals are these: First, home rule; second, legislation to provide a nonvoting representation in the House of Representatives; and third, a proposed constitutional amendment which would provide the District full representation in the Congress.

These proposals are indeed worthy of support by the members. They will provide the citizens of the District of Columbia control over their local government and representation in our national government.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in his message on the National Capital, the President has asked us to set our goals for a capital city of which all Americans can be proud. And we should do nothing less than that. Yet, today, Washington is also a city of which the world must be proud, because it has become the capital of the world.

As we, in Congress, debate the overriding questions of war and peace, and as we seek new tools for the physical and human transformation of our cities and our institutions, we often forget that the District of Columbia demands our special attention because it is a symbol both of American Government and the American Nation. Unfortunately, and in spite of all the conscientious efforts of the Congress and of the District government itself, the face of the Capital has been a shabby one, and traditional and new problems of an exploding metropolis have submerged our city in what seems to be a sea of hopelessness. And this is our city, no matter where we come from.

The President's message is a call to transform the District. It is a call to turn back the tide of hopelessness for too many of its citizens. It is a call to the Congress to release the potential energies of more than three-fourths million people who have been held back from the future by the dead hand of the past. It is a call to protect the lives and property of 2.5 million inhabitants of the Greater Washington area.

The President has now proposed a full battle plan, and I urge each of my colleagues to view it carefully with compassion, and to enlist himself as a soldier in the right war in the right place at the right time.

The President has asked us again to get on with the unfinished business of granting Washington home rule. This is so fundamental, so basic in a democratic nation that one wonders why the delay and hesitation. One hundred years ago home rule might not have been a necessity. We still accepted the philosophy of benevolent government paternalism. But, today, in the midst of triumphant self-government all around the world, how can we look down from this Hill and permit more than 800,000 people not to have their own freely elected representatives?

How can we permit our Capital not to reorganize its commission form of government—now almost a hundred years old—and replace it with a modern strong executive-type government which can act rapidly and intelligently in carrying out the people's business?

How can we not grant the President the funds which he has already asked in his budget for the improvement of health, welfare, job opportunity, housing, crime control and prevention, judicial reform, general administration, and beautification after we have read—and seen—the overwhelming crime rate, the congestion and deterioration, the lack of human opportunities which the District faces?

And how can we not be deeply sympathetic to the very clear and urgent request—which only we can grant—to approve voting representation, on a temporary or permanent basis, for the District in this very Congress of the United States?

And finally, beyond Washington as a mere city; beyond it as the seat of American Government; we are faced with Washington and its relationships to the world.

The President wants to enhance Washington's status as a world capital by facilitating the location of foreign chanceries; by establishing a center for scholars from our own land as well as from abroad.

The Congress of the United States has always had a very special and historic relationship to this city which symbolizes America to our own citizens and to citizens all over the world. Let us come together and support the President's program for a new Washington, seeking not conformity of opinion, but unity of purpose for a finer, better, more peaceful, healthful, and more beautiful first city of this first Nation of the world.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the message from the President on the District of Columbia, which we received today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF SUCH COMMITTEE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 203 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 203

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1967, the Committee on Public Works, or any subcommittee thereof designated by the chairman, may make investigations into the following matters within its jurisdiction: In the United States, Commonwealths, territories, and possessions thereof, and Canada, public works projects either authorized or proposed to be authorized relating to flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors, waterpower, navigation, water pollution control, public buildings and grounds, as well as roads and highways.

For the purpose of making such investigations the committee or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places in the United States, Commonwealths, territories, and possessions thereof, and Canada, whether the House has recessed or adjourned, and to hold such hearings and require by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee may attend conferences and meetings on matters within its jurisdiction wherever held within the United States, Commonwealths, territories, and possessions thereof, and Canada.

The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject matter which is being investigated by any other standing committee of the House.

Funds authorized for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States, Commonwealths, territories, and possessions thereof, and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the Committee on Public Works for expenses of its members or other Members or employees traveling abroad.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 19, after the word "authorized", insert the word "are".

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] and to myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 203 is the regular legislation on investigative powers that is necessary for the normal operation of the Committee on Public Works. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has made one change which should be called to the attention of the House.

On page 2, line 19, after the word "authorized," the word "are" was inserted in order to explicitly explain the meaning of the paragraph pertaining to travel authorization of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 203 in order that the Committee on Public Works will have authority to conduct investigations and studies of matters under their jurisdiction, and that funds for this purpose will be available to them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 203 was reported unanimously out of the Committee on Rules. I concur in the explanation that has just been made by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I would yield at this time 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the remarks I am about to make are not necessarily directed to the Committee on Public Works, or to any other one committee of the Congress, but I am very much disturbed by the lack of information concerning the spending of money as set forth in the publications authorized by law.

Mr. Speaker, I have in hand one such publication for the period of January 1 to June 30, 1966, the latest available to me, which is titled "Detailed Statement of Disbursements."

To put this in the proper perspective, section 60 of the Revised Statutes, 2 United States Code 102, provides in part as follows:

> The Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall prepare and submit to the two Houses, respectively, at the commencement of each session of Congress, the following statements in writing . . . A detailed statement, by items, of the manner in which the contingent fund for each House has been expended during the preceding year. This statement must give the names of every person to whom any portion of the fund has been paid; and if for anything furnished, the quantity and price; and if for any services rendered, the nature of such service, and the time employed, and the particular occasion or cause, in brief, that rendered such service necessary, and the amount of all former appropriations in each case on hand, either in the Treasury or in the hands of any disbursing officer or agent.
>
> Reports of the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives under this section shall be printed as Senate and House documents, respectively.

Reading from this document of alleged detailed statements of disbursements:

Eastern Airlines Inc., official travel for members of staff of Committee on Education and Labor, March 1 through March 24, 1966, $1,214.23.

Again we find:

Eastern Airlines, official travel for members of staff of Committee on Education and Labor, March 8 through March 24, 1966, $3,704.26.

Mr. Speaker, does the listing of these expenditures conform to the statute and, if not, why has the law not been adhered to?

If we had the detailed information on these two items alone, we might well have some of the answers two committees of the Congress apparently failed to get.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is high time chairmen of the various committees give to the Congress the information the statute provides, not the abbreviated accounting such as is to be found in all too many instances in the statements of disbursements from the contingency fund of the House of Representatives.

I was also attracted to another item in this particular statement of disbursements which shows the purchase of lapel pins and charm bracelets—November 22 to November 30, 1965.

Who in the world is getting lapel pins and charm bracelets?

I noted in the paper the other day a news story that Members of the other body apparently have voted themselves chipped diamond lapel pins. Can this be the bill for Members of the other body? Who gets the charm bracelets? Are Members of the other body or are Members of the House wearing charm bracelets these days?

Mr. Speaker, the expenditures as provided by law ought to be listed in the book in detail as the law requires.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and the amendment thereto.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment to the resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO MAKE STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 168) authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make studies and investigations within its jurisdiction.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 168

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1967, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may make investigations and studies into matters within its jurisdiction including the following:

(1) Policies with respect to competition among the various modes of transportation, whether rail, air, motor, water, or pipeline; measures for increased safety; adequacy of the national transportation system for defense and the needs of an expanding economy; and the administration by the Interstate Commerce Commission of the statutes which it administers.

(2) Policies with respect to the promotion of the development of civil aviation; measures for increased safety; restrictions which impede the free flow of air commerce; promotion of travel and tourism; routes, rates, accounts, and subsidy payments; airport construction, hazards of adjacency to airports, and condemnation of airspace, aircraft, and airline liability; aircraft research and development, and market for American aircraft; air navigational aids and traffic control; and the administration by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency of the statutes which they administer.

(3) Allocation of radio spectrum; pay television; ownership, control, and operations of communications and related facilities; policies with respect to competition among various modes of communication, including voice and record communications and data processing; policies with respect to governmental communications systems; coordination of communication policies both domestic and foreign; impact of foreign operations, international agreements, and international organizations on domestic and foreign communications; technical developments in the communications field; and the administration by the Federal Communications Commission and the Director of Telecommunications Management of statutes which they administer.

(4) Adequacy of the protection to investors afforded by the disclosure and regulatory provisions of the various securities Acts; and the administration by the Securities and Exchange Commission of the statutes which it administers.

(5) Adequacy of petroleum, natural gas, and electric energy resources for defense and the needs of an expanding economy; adequacy, promotion, regulation, and safety of the facilities for extraction or generation, transmission, and distribution of such resources; development of synthetic liquid fuel processes; regulation of security issues of and control of natural gas pipeline companies; and the administration by the Federal Power Commission of the statutes which it administers.

(6) Advertising, fair competition, and labeling; and the administration by the Federal Trade Commission of the statutes which it administers.

(7) Research in weather, including air pollution and smog, and artificially induced weather; and the operations of the Weather Bureau.

(8) Effects of inflation upon benefits provided under railroad retirement and railroad unemployment programs; and inequities in provisions of statutes relating thereto, with comparison of benefits under the social security system; and the operations of the Railroad Retirement Board, the National Mediation Board, and the National Railroad Adjustment Board.

(9) Adequacy of medical facilities, medical personnel, and medical teaching and training facilities; research into human diseases; provisions for medical care; efficient and effective quarantine; protection to users against incorrectly labeled and deleterious foods, drugs, cosmetics, and devises; and other matters relating to public health; and the operations of the Public Health Service and the Food and Drug Administration.

(10) Disposition of funds arising from the operation of the Trading With the Enemy Act; and the operations of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

(11) Current and prospective consumption of newsprint and other papers used in the printing of newspapers, magazines, or such other publications as are admitted to second-class mailing privileges; current and prospective production and supply of such papers, factors affecting such supply, and possibilities of additional production through the use of alternative source materials.

(12) Traffic accidents on the streets and highways of the United States; factors responsible for such accidents, the resulting deaths, personal injuries, and economic losses; and measures for increased traffic and motor vehicle safety.

For the purposes of such investigations and studies the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House has recessed or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee may report to the House at any time during the present Congress the results of any investigation or study made under authority of this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate. Any such report shall be filed with the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 4, after line 21, add the following paragraph:

"*Provided,* That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House."

On page 5, after line 14, add the following paragraphs:

"Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190d of title 2, United States Code: *Provided,* That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502 (b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88–633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

"Each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the cost of such transportation, and the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON], and myself such time as I shall consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 168 is the regular legislation on investigative powers that is necessary for the normal operation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has made two changes which should be called to the attention of the House.

The first amendment simply adds the following language:

> *Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

This is the same provision which already appears in most of the resolutions of this type and the Committee on Rules is trying to be fair to all committees alike in this provision to eliminate duplicate investigations.

The second amendment adds three additional paragraphs concerning the use of counterpart funds and the reporting of the costs of such overseas travel as is necessary. These additional paragraphs which were added to this resolution are contained in other similar types of resolutions which authorize the use of counterpart funds.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 168 in order that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will have authority to conduct investigations and studies of matters under their jurisdiction, and that funds for this purpose will be available to them.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of Members on this side of the aisle, I would state that this is the standard investigative resolution. It was reported unanimously out of the Committee on Rules, and I join the able gentleman from Florida in urging the House to adopt House Resolution 168.

I have no further requests for time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and the amendments thereto.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendments to the resolution.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRST THINGS FIRST IN SPENDING

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, a little over 3 months ago, the administration announced an immediate cutback in construction funds for the Federal-aid highway program. Congress was told that the cutback would amount to $700 million, or 17½ percent of the proposed construction commencing during fiscal year 1967. The excuse given was that the program represented nonessential, nondefense spending at a time when economic pressure was great because of the war in Vietnam. To say I was amazed at this pronouncement coming from the Johnson administration is to put it mildly.

It has always been my understanding that the primary reason for the passage of the 1956 act which authorized the 41,000-mile Interstate System was because it would provide the means to move great quantities of military and defense equipment from point A to point B overland in the shortest amount of time; whether that material and equipment should traverse the Nation from north to south or east to west. Congress even saw fit to title this impressive system of roadways the "National System of Defense and Interstate Highways." Let me repeat that word "defense."

Apparently, the administration has either forgotten or ignored both the intent of Congress in titling the act and its subsequent mandate that the system should be completed by 1972. By its recent action, the administration has turned away from the congressional declaration that the system's primary importance is for the national defense and that prompt and early completion of the highway network is essential to the best interests of this Nation.

The statement made that this important program must be cut back due to the exigencies of Vietnam would seem to have been directed, not at the Congress, but at those who would believe such a charge. Members of Congress cannot accept this statement as fact. Not for one minute can it be reasonably contended the Interstate System should be subordinated to such projects as demonstration cities or wasteful and ineffective poverty programs and, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] so aptly said, "the planting of posies along the highways." It would seem to me that our great Nation must have priorities in spending somewhere. For example, who among us would question the importance of the Interstate System as opposed to the Highway Beautification Act? If our priorities are in such a state of disarray, then we ought to act to straighten them out. I say let us stop politics in spending and continue with the work that must be done.

Mr. Speaker, the Interstate System is a little over half complete. It is not likely that it will be completed on schedule by 1972 or even 1975. No one can say, however, that the Congress, the States, and the roadbuilding industry have not tried to accomplish this objective on time. Time after time, since 1956, the Congress has passed laws to speed up this work. The several States have met the Federal Government more than half way in planning and meeting obligations to insure that the work would move along on schedule. The roadbuilding industry has geared itself to the almost herculean task and is prepared to see it through to fruition. The initial problems that seemed so large in the beginning have been overcome. But now it appears—if the President will have his way—the Congress will have been misled, the States will lose the trust they have gained through the Federal partnership, and the roadbuilding industry will have to face the hard reality of completing contracts which already have been committed and, in all probability, lay off skilled workers who were initially hired to do the work that had to be done.

What is surprising is that the decision to cut back should come from the President, who has often stated his desire to see the system completed on time. He was instrumental, as majority leader of the Senate, in guiding the legislation through that body in 1956. What is even more surprising is that somehow, for some reason yet unknown, the President has changed his mind. Surely the President is cognizant of the fact that to delay this program is to add an additional financial burden to it. The simplest economic principles manifest this truth.

Mr. Speaker, because of increasing values placed on most real estate, rights-of-way acquisition are becoming more financially cumbersome. As the program rapidly moves toward property close to urban areas, property values increase. The program is now at the point where it will be necessary to obtain rights-of-way in and around a number of large metropolitan areas in the near future to insure the system's planned completion. Construction costs are on the rise. Since 1963, they have increased an average of 2½ percent annually, except for the unusual peak increase of 8 percent last year. It is probable that these costs will level off at an approximate 3-percent annual increase, though this is conjecture. Because of the increases in construction costs and the increasing cost of obtaining rights-of-way as the program approaches metropolitan areas, I am convinced that in order to complete the job we started out to do in 1956 at a minimum amount of cost, we ought to go ahead as planned.

It has been estimated that upon the completion of the system America would be spared a large part of the tragic loss of 8,000 lives each year. Even the President has acknowledged this. Let me quote from a statement he made upon the occasion of signing into public law the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1964. At that time, the President had this to say:

> In every respect it (the Interstate System) has met our hopes. It is already saving 3,000 lives a year and, by 1972, it will be saving 8,000 a year.

What this all boils down to then is: Do we set priorities so that we can eventually save 8,000 American lives each year, or do we plant "posies"? Do we go along with the administration in funding other less significant programs that should be deferred at this time, or do we go along with the clear intent of Congress in building a system of defense highways second to none in the world? I do not think there is any question but that we have a choice and we ought to get on with this work that needs to be done.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee of this body, I am well aware that the money for this program does not come out of the general fund of the Treasury. This network of roads is being paid for in full by the people who use them—the American public who travel over the Nation's secondary and primary highways. It is being paid for by a trust fund which was organized to finance the system and which is kept solvent from taxes placed on highway users. I believe this is one of the most sensible ways to finance this type program. The trust fund should remain a trust as its name implies and the Federal Government should not transfer money from the fund to other projects.

I am concerned because of what this and other proposed cutbacks in highway funding will mean for the State of New Hampshire. At this point I would like to have inserted into the body of the RECORD two letters I have received in response to my request for additional information regarding the seriousness of the cutbacks as it affects New Hampshire. The first letter is from the commissioner of the Department of Public Works and Highways of the State of New Hampshire, Mr. John O. Morton. Mr. Morton's letter clearly outlines the adverse effects the imposed cutback will have on my State. Along with the letter, I would include in the RECORD a copy of a telegram sent to the commissioner from the American Association of State Highway Officials and his reply which states his response to the questionnaire contained in the body of the telegram. The second letter is from Mr. Joseph Foster, chairman of the New Hampshire Highway Users Conference:

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND HIGHWAYS,
Concord, N.H., January 25, 1967.

Hon. LOUIS C. WYMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LOUIS: Enclosed herewith is a copy of a questionnaire developed by the American Association of State Highway Officials for the purpose of assessing, on a nationwide basis, the effects of the recent cutback in Federal funds earmarked for the Federal highway construction program. Attached to the questionnaire is the response that I have developed. My response is intended to document the seriousness of the situation we are currently confronted with in New Hampshire.

I have some appreciation of the fact that when cuts are made in Federally supported programs it usually attracts an array of protests; however, I would be derelict in my duty if I did not express to you my views as they relate to the seriousness of this situation.

The highway construction program in any state is one that substantially contributes to the welfare of the people. It is a program that involves a wide variety of activities, many of which are of great complexity. Such a program cannot be turned on or off at a moment's notice without creating huge economic losses at both the State and Federal level. The present highway construction program is not providing the facilities that our expanding population and our greatly increased volumes of traffic require.

New Interstate expressways, modern feeder roads, and highway construction in urban areas are making valuable contributions in the field of highway safety. With the public of this nation now aroused to the seriousness of highway accidents, it is most inconsistent that the program should now be curtailed.

Highway contractors are representative of most small business enterprises. They have, in the past few years, geared themselves to handle a high level of construction activity. They have made extensive commitments predicated on a continued level of construction activity. They will require work to retain their equipment and maintain a sound financial position. Failure to obtain work will, without question, cause a series of failures in the construction industry. These failures will produce widespread hardships in many of the industries that are allied to highway construction.

I anticipate that in the next month or two, highway officials from all parts of the nation will gather in Washington for the purpose of appearing before the appropriate committees of Congress to present testimony as to the seriousness of the present cutback.

I hope that the information I am supplying you with at this time will prove to be meaningful and helpful. If I can be of additional assistance, please feel free to call on me for it.

With my kindest regards,
Sincerely,

JOHN O. MORTON,
Commissioner.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *January 19, 1967.*

JOHN O. MORTON,
Commissioner, Department of Public Works and Highways, Concord, N.H.:

Please furnish in concise summary form listed under appropriate captions your answers to the following questions that will be used during AASHO's appearance before the Public Works Committee.

(1) How much of your 1967 fiscal year planned program, expressed both in money value and percentage, did the cutback of November 23, 1966, reduce scheduled lettings for the 1967 fiscal year?

(2) How is the November 23 cutback affecting your department personnel and work schedule?

(3) Are you able to reassign affected personnel to other tasks or is there any possibility that you will have to release personnel if the cutback continues past July 1, 1967?

(4) Do you have sufficient competent personnel to carry on the full amount of the highway program without diversely affecting the quality of the finished product? Statements have been made in Washington that the slowdown is beneficial to some degree because the highway departments have a shortage in certain professional and engineering personnel and have problems in retaining sufficient personnel to do the job, also that the slowdown will give an opportunity for needed additional planning in urban areas.

(5) Will the November 23 slowdown result in a benefit to your State by allowing any needed urban transportation planning to proceed?

(6) What adjustments have you made in your department operations and program, because of the November 23 cutback:

(A) Are you proceeding with engineering work or are you slowing down this activity?

(B) Are you using State funds that would have been used for matching Federal-aid to finance State construction?

(C) Are you reducing interstate work in favor of ABC projects?

(D) Other effects.

(7) As a result of the November 23 cutback, what is the money value of contracts that you can award during the remaining part of the 1967 fiscal year?

(8) In your opinion, is the highway cutback adversely affecting the economy of your State? If so, in what regard and to what degree?

(9) In case an additional 400 million dollar highway cutback for the 1967 fiscal year is ordered (presumably this would all be deducted from the last and remaining fiscal year quarterly allotment)

(A) What would be the total dollar value of highway lettings that could be awarded during the remaining part of the 1967 fiscal year?

(B) What would be the affect on your personnel of this additional cutback?

(C) Any additional observations or pertinent remarks.

A. E. JOHNSON,
Executive Director, American Association of State Highway Officials.

COMMISSIONER MORTON'S RESPONSE TO THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS

The following material is supplied in response to the questions that were posed in your telegram dated January 19, 1967. The answers that have been supplied clearly indicate that it is impossible to turn the Highway Program off and on at a moment's notice. The operation of a Highway Department is one of large proportions and considerable complexity. The Highway Department organization is created over a period of time in which a large number of people have been specially trained to function as a unit. I would hope that this point would be strongly emphasized to the appropriate members of Congres.

1. $11,017,000 36%.

2. Cutback not affecting personnel at this time. During winter months there is very little active construction, and field personnel are on their regular winter office assignments. Regular work schedule proceeding except that completed plans will be held until funds are available.

3. No reassignment yet. Will not release personnel. Past experience dictates that it is almost impossible and extremely costly to replace trained personnel when they are needed.

4. We have sufficient trained personnel to carry on the full program. At the time of the cutback we were on schedule. Our Federal-aid Urban funds are so small that we do not need additional time for urban area planning.

5. No.

6. (A) Proceeding with engineering work, no slowdown.

(B) Under the terms established by our State Legislature we are unable to transfer the Federal-aid matching funds to any other purpose.

(C) No. We are making every effort to retain a balanced program.

(D) The contracting and allied industries will be seriously affected.

7. $14,666,000.

8. Yes. There will be a substantial reduction in contractors' payrolls, in the purchase of equipment and materials, in trucking and other forms of transportation, and in the many services that are associated with construction activity. As the effects of these reductions spread to other areas, the total effect on the State's economy might be as much as 5%.

9. (A) $10,602,000

(B) There could be some reassignment of duties and a substantial reduction in, or the complete elimination of the temporary summer employment of college engineering students and high school graduates.

(C) We have received critical comments from the press, from legislators, and from local officials in areas where construction has to be delayed. In New Hampshire the Federal-aid construction program represents 95% of our entire construction program. In view of this situation, the consequences of the cutback are extremely serious.

It is impossible to materially reduce a highway construction program without greatly increasing the administrative and organizational costs of a highway department. Large sums of money have been expended by a state to improve the skills of highway management, and to equip, through a variety of special training programs, personnel engaged in engineering, right of way, traffic, safety, and highway beautification programs. Once these people are eliminated from a Highway Department organization it is a lengthy and costly process to replace them.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely,

JOHN O. MORTON,
Commissioner.

NEW HAMPSHIRE HIGHWAY
USERS CONFERENCE,
Concord, N.H., December 23, 1966.

Hon. LOUIS C. WYMAN,
Manchester, N.H.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN-ELECT WYMAN: By action of the membership of the New Hampshire Highway Users Conference, at its annual meeting on December 9, I am writing to members of our State Congressional Delegation to protest the recent drastic cutback ordered by the Federal Government in Federal "aid" highway funds previously apportioned to the states for the current fiscal year. We ask that you do all you can to have these funds restored.

In the case of New Hampshire, this cutback will mean the loss of $3,236,245 to be held back from the $18,657,245 originally apportioned.

In the discussion preceding adoption of the motion to appeal to the New Hampshire Congressional Delegation, the following points were brought out:

(1) The validity of the reason given in messages sent by the Bureau of Public Roads to Federal regional and division engineers is subject to challenge, i.e., "in recognition of the need for reducing non-military Federal expenditures as contribution to the Vietnam effort and the resultant program to reduce inflationary pressures."

(2) The resultant slow-down of the road program will not only defer the completion date of the Interstate System, but will also result in economic loss and hardship to New Hampshire road-building contractors and the loss of jobs to some of their employees.

(3) Accrual of revenues to the Federal Highway Trust Fund from continued collection of the present highway user taxes could result in a substantial excess of such revenues and offer great temptation to divert this money to other governmental purposes.

In connection with point 3, a good deal of apprehension was expressed by several members that continuation of the cutback over any considerable period of time would almost certainly lead to proposals for "borrowing" from the Highway Trust Fund, or outright diversion, for purposes having no relationship to highway construction. Accordingly, the Conference went on record as reiterating its strong policy against the use of any part of the Highway Trust Fund for any purpose except highways.

We hope that you will assist in every way possible toward the early restoration of these funds.

Most respectfully,

JOSEPH FOSTER,
Chairman.

I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that in light of the many problems which will be created around the Nation by the application of this and other proposed cutbacks in this very essential program, the President will reconsider his decision. I believe we must put first things first in spending and that the Federal-aid highway program and its Interstate System ought to be numbered among those at the top of the list.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ALCOHOLISM CONTROL BILL

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to remedy some of the serious problems in the Nation's Capital brought about by the Federal court decision in the case of Easter against the District of Columbia.

As a result of that decision, an administrative condition of near chaos exists in the District with regard to treatment of chronic alcoholics. It is apparent that neither law enforcement nor public health authorities in Washington, D.C., were prepared for the impact of a court ruling that chronic alcoholics, as victims of a medically recognized disease, cannot be dealt with under the criminal code.

Thus, because of a shortage of medical facilities and the inadequacy of programs to deal with alcoholism, the spirit, if not in fact the judicial letter, of the Easter case is being violated daily.

Nearly a year has passed since the Easter decision, but confusion still reigns as to what that ruling means.

It does not mean that alcoholism is a legal defense for the violation of National, State, or local laws.

It does not mean unlawful use of alcoholic beverages, public drunkenness, or disorderly conduct are excusable or to be excused under our law.

What it does mean is that a person found upon medical determination to be a chronic alcoholic—that is, someone who is habitually and obsessively drunk and, who for all practical purposes, cannot control his conduct and therefore needs specialized medical assistance—that person is properly the responsibility of community public health rather than law enforcement agencies.

Experience has taught us that dealing with public inebriates as criminals is expensive to the community, burdensome to our law enforcement agencies, and futile in the administration of justice.

Yet, while police and law enforcement officials are expending time and resources on this noncriminal problem—one that in most of the countries of the world is dealt with by public health, not law enforcement agencies—our District crime rate increases.

Unfortunately, as we have seen, the Easter decision cannot be properly implemented under present conditions here. Washington, D.C., officials were and are insufficiently prepared for the transition in treatment of chronic alcoholics which the Easter decision requires.

I say this not as a blanket criticism of the Washington, D.C., police force and court system, already overburdened, overextended, and, in my opinion, overcriticized in many areas.

Nor is it surprising that District of Columbia public health officials were and are unprepared to meet the greatly enlarged responsibilities that the decision places upon them.

No, the fact is that the near-chaotic conditions which now exist, reflect a total community shortsightedness with regard to the problem of alcoholism. Worse yet, it reflects a national attitude. I am certain that the vast majority of communities throughout the country would fall short, as has the National Capital, in responding to the need for change placed upon it by the Easter decision.

What can be done? We cannot ignore the problem any longer, unless Washington, D.C., the community where the Nation's laws are made, is in effect to operate in contempt of court for inability to conform to the new legal interpretation regarding chronic alcoholics.

Clearly, the District of Columbia needs a comprehensive new program to meet its community responsibility under the Easter ruling—a crash program, considering the present state of affairs.

As a member of the District of Columbia Committee, I have been especially concerned with the impact of the Easter decision on the National Capital community, and have therefore followed this situation with intense interest. The legislation which I introduce here today will, I believe, go far toward alleviating the current crisis. It is my hope that it will also serve to make the Nation's Capital a pilot example for other American communities which will soon be faced with this same problem.

Briefly, the Hagan alcoholism care and control bill establishes a Bureau of Alcoholism Control within the District of Columbia Department of Public Health, with a qualified program director in charge of community services for inebriates and chronic alcoholics.

The bill provides for one or more detoxification centers located in the District, with a capacity of at least 200 beds. As we know, District authorities, because of a shortage of such facilities within the District, are currently using facilities many miles away, in Virginia.

The bill also provides for inpatient extended care facilities for study, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics, and for outpatient aftercare facilities, including not only clinics, but social centers, rehabilitation services, and half-way houses, with a capacity of at least 2,000 beds.

And the bill also sets up adequate safeguards for protection of individual constitutional rights of those persons who fall within the purview of its provisions.

The Nation's Capital needs legislation of this order, and needs it quickly. The existing situation with regard to treatment of alcoholics is so serious as to require congressional attention, and with the agreement of District of Columbia Committee Chairman McMILLAN, I intend to call for early hearings at which officials of District law enforcement and public health agencies will be heard on this subject. An on-the-spot investigation of existing facilities is also planned.

We are witnessing in the Nation's Capital a court-ordered reformation in community treatment of alcoholics—a reformation which will soon be extended to cover communities throughout the country. For, make no mistake, the Easter case, and the ruling of the Fourth Federal Circuit Court in the case of Driver against Hinnant, are forerunners to similar decisions which will soon affect every American community.

As I have said, what we do here in the Nation's Capital can be a notable pilot case—or a horrible pilot example—for these other communities. In the aftermath of the Easter case, Congress therefore has no alternative. We must enact legislation to deal with the problems of the disease of alcoholism—and the chronic alcoholic, the victim of that disease—and we must act quickly and effectively in the interests of the National Capital community and the country as a whole.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE OHIO RIVER CANAL STORY

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, later this year the Congress will be asked to consider many appropriations bills. One of the most important is the public works appropriations bill which will contain funds for the Corps of Engineers' civil works projects.

In the rush of trying to adjourn last fall we passed the public works appropriation bill for 1967, I believe, without proper and full debate. The result was that we included in that bill a $500,000 appropriation for advance planning and design of the infamous Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal without being able to bring that item to a record vote.

Considering the controversy which has surrounded this "billion dollar boondoggle," it is odd that the proponents of the bill were afraid to put into the record their votes in support of it. It is possible they do not want their constituents back home to know they voted for this "pork barrel"?

Today I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House two recent developments in this continuing Ohio River Canal story which should be investigated.

On Thursday, February 16—just 1 week ago—the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' district office in Pittsburgh opened bids for the first phase of the planning and design of the canal. These bids were for drilling test holes along the route of the canal. The Engineers, in their laudatory, expansive, and glowing report in favor of the canal last year estimated that these test borings between Warren and Ashtabula, Ohio, would cost a mere $65,770.

Imagine their surprise when they discovered the low bid submitted by the Pennsylvania Drilling Co., of McKees Rocks, Pa., was $74,934. It is simple mathematics to figure out that the Corps of Engineers had underestimated costs by a whopping 7 percent.

I ask my colleagues in the House: if the Corps of Engineers can underestimate this small phase of the canal boondoggle by 7 percent, why could not their entire estimate on the canal be off by 7 percent—or even more? The Corps of Engineers has optimistically said the canal will cost only $1,025 million. Do you realize that a mere 7 percent underestimation in the overall cost would add $71 million to the total bill for this "pie-in-the-sky."

I would now like to go on to another facet of the canal controversy. We all know that the organization which has spent more time and more money to lobby for the canal is called Interconnecting Waterways, Inc., located in Columbus, Ohio. In the past few weeks they have been caught acting in what has been termed "improper and possibly illegal" activities in behalf of the canal. What they have done is approach local jurisdictions along the route of the proposed canal and request these local governments to provide easements and rights-of-way to the Federal Government without cost.

The Corps of Engineers here in Washington was informed by me of this activity and they admitted that Interconnecting Waterways, Inc., had no jurisdiction to request these easements. The Engineers explained that several years from now, when the planning for the canal is completed, the corps will appoint some State or local agency as the sponsoring agency. Only at this time will this empowered agent be able to request easements and rights-of-way.

No agency at this time has this authority and the Engineers point out that the actions of this lobbying group are premature and improper.

The question to ask is why is Interconnecting Waterways, Inc., undertaking this improper lobbying now when it has no permission or right to do so. I will tell you—it is because local opposition to the canal is fast crystalizing, and if the backers of the canal do not obtain easements now, they may never be able to.

Already local jurisdictions are beginning to realize that the canal will not be all perfume and roses. It will result in heavy costs to them, on the State, county, township and city level. They will have to pay millions of dollars for highway and railroad bridge maintenance and replacement. They will have to repay the State for money allocated or expenses incurred on the local government's behalf, and they will have to share the cost of bridge alterations.

And just as important, this canal, tearing through the centers of many towns along the Beaver and Mahoning Rivers, will take off the local tax rolls many thousands of acres of prime industrial, business, and personal real estate.

We have positive proof that the proponents of the canal are worried. They see opposition banding together in greater numbers each day. They have obviously changed their tune. A year ago they were all confidence. Now they are running scared. Our distinguished colleague from Youngstown, Ohio, who has long led the fight for the canal, admitted in public on February 14 that if local jurisdictions along the canal route fail to support the canal, its future is uncertain.

All those of us who oppose this canal as an unmoded, outdated, overexpensive and useless project must now work harder than ever before. Our cause is just; our foes admit they are scared. We must ask the Corps of Engineers pointblank why their initial estimates are way off. We must explain to local governmental bodies the true facts of what this project will cost them. We must explain to each and every interested citizen how this canal will hurt, not help them and their industries and jobs.

The time to act is now.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT OF 1967

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, a letter dated February 20, 1967, addressed to the Speaker from the Under Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with a summary of Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act of 1967, is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
February 20, 1967.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed for your consideration is a draft bill, the "Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act of 1967".

This draft bill would carry out the recommendations with respect to the juvenile delinquency contained in the President's Message to the Congress on Welfare of Children.

We should appreciate it if you would refer the enclosed draft bill to the appropriate committee for consideration.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accordance with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

WILBUR J. COHEN,
Under Secretary.

SUMMARY OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT OF 1967

PLANNING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS (TITLE I, PART A)

a. Grants would be authorized to State or community public agencies to meet up to 90 percent of the cost of preparing or revising comprehensive State-wide or community-wide plans. The Secretary could make such planning a condition to receipt of any other aid under this title in the State or community.

. b. Also authorized would be grants to State agencies to meet up to 90 per cent of the cost of provision of technical assistance in youth services to local agencies.

c. Grants to up to 90 per cent of the cost of planning for programs or projects eligible for aid under the bill would also be authorized.

REHABILITATIVE SERVICES (TITLE I, PART B)

a. Grants by the Secretary of HEW, with the concurrence of the Attorney General, would be authorized to any public agency for projects or programs for diagnosing, treating, and rehabilitating delinquent youths.[1]

b. To secure a grant a public agency would file an application which assures that—

1. the agency will coordinate its activities with those of other agencies providing health, education, welfare and other basic services in the community, will make reasonable efforts to secure any of these needed services which are not otherwise available, but with maximum use of other Federal, State, or local resources;

2. there will be consultation with local service agencies in formulating the project or program, as well as agencies involved in the correction process.

The application must also contain a description of the youth services available in the community, a statement of the method or methods of linking the service agencies, and a showing that the project or program is consistent with any plans developed under the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967.

c. In passing upon applications, consideration would be given to, among other relevant local factors,

1. relative costs and effectiveness of projects and programs;
2. incidence of youth offenses and juvenile delinquency;
3. school drop-out rates;
4. adequacy of facilities and services;
5. extent of local comprehensive planning.

d. Grant funds could be used for paying up to 60 per cent of the cost of securing or providing otherwise unavailable essential services prescribed by the Secretary, and for up to 50 percent of the cost of construction of unusual, and special purpose or innovative, facilities which the Secretary finds necessary for the program. The usual prevailing wage requirements would be applicable to construction aided under the bill.

PREVENTIVE SERVICES (TITLE I, PART C)

a. Grants would be authorized to local public or nonprofit agencies or organizations for projects or programs for securing or provision (where not otherwise available) of special diagnostic, treatment, or rehabilitative services for delinquents or youths in danger of becoming delinquent who need them to prevent or control juvenile delinquency.

b. To secure a grant, a local community public or nonprofit agency or organization would file an application which assures, in addition generally to the assurances and information required under part B, that—

1. the agency or organization will assume responsibility for seeing to it that at least those health, education, welfare, and basic services which the Secretary specifies as necessary will be provided in the community for youths who are delinquent or in danger of becoming so;

2. special efforts to make services available to youths with serious behavioral problems;

3. appropriate youth participation in formulation and operation of the program.

c. In passing on applications, consideration would be given to various relevant factors, including those which apply in the case of part B.

d. Grant funds could be used to meet up to 75% of the cost of needed diagnostic, treatment, or rehabilitative services which are otherwise unavailable in the community, but only to the extent and for the period reasonably necessary for the community to provide them from other sources.

RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TITLE II)

a. Grants to or contracts with State, local, or other public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, and institutions would be authorized for research and demonstration projects which have promise of making a substantial contribution to improvement in preventive, treatment, and rehabilitative services for delinquents or potential delinquents. Such contracts could also be made with other private groups and with individuals. Direct conduct of such activities by the Secretary would also be authorized.

b. The Secretary would be authorized to conduct research and to cooperate with and provide technical assistance to public and private agencies, organizations, and institutions, with respect to preventive, treatment, or rehabilitative services for delinquents or potential delinquents, and to provide short-term technical training.

c. The Secretary would also be authorized to collect, evaluate, publish and disseminate information and materials relating to research and other matters relating to delinquency and potential delinquency.

GENERAL (TITLE III)

a. Appointment of committees would be authorized to advise on general policy and on coordination of activities under the bill and related activities.

b. The appropriation of $25,000,000 for fiscal year 1968 and necessary sums for next 4 fiscal years would be authorized.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT OF 1967—SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS

Planning and technical assistance grants (title I, part A)

Authorizes grants to meet up to 90 percent of the cost:

1. To State or community public agencies for comprehensive planning;
2. To State agencies for provision of technical assistance in youth services to local agencies;
3. For planning for programs or projects eligible for aid under the bill.

Rehabilitative services (title I, part B)

Authorizes grants to meet up to 60 percent of the cost of unavailable essential services and 50 percent of the cost of construction of unusual and special purpose or innovative facilities to any public agency for projects or programs for diagnosing, treating, and rehabilitating delinquent youth, provided that the agency assures it will coordinate with and make maximum use of other relevant agency activities and will consult with local service and correctional agencies in formulating its activities.

Preventive services (title I, part C)

Authorizes grants to meet up to 75 percent of the cost to local public or nonprofit agencies for projects or programs for securing or providing special diagnostic, treatment, or rehabilitative services for delinquents or youths in danger of becoming delinquent who need them to prevent or control juvenile delinquency. The grantee must assure, in addition to assurances required under title I, part B, that it will assume responsibility to see that necessary services are provided for such youth in the community; that special efforts are made on behalf of youth with serious behavioral problems; and that there is provision for youth participation in formulation and operation of the program.

Research and technical assistance (title II)

Authorizes grants to or contracts with State, local, or other public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, or institutions for research and demonstration projects which have promise of making a substantial contribution to improvement in preventive, treatment, or rehabilitative services for delinquents or potential delinquents. Authorizes Secretary to conduct research and to cooperate with and provide technical assistance to public and private groups with respect to such services, and to provide short-term technical training. Authorizes Secretary to collect, evaluate, publish and disseminate information and materials relating to research and other matters pertaining to actual or potential delinquency.

General (title III)

The appropriation of $25,000,000 for fiscal year 1968 and necessary sums for the next four fiscal years would be authorized.

GAYLORD P. GODWIN

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that Gaylord P. Godwin is retiring from United Press International which he has served with distinction for 40 years.

Mr. Godwin is a native of my State and an alumnus of my alma mater, the University of Missouri, where we both were graduated from the school of journalism.

We also share a deep interest in agriculture, as evidenced by my long service on the House Committee on Agriculture and his coverage of the Department of Agriculture for UPI since 1955.

He began his career as a wire service reporter at Kansas City in 1927, immediately after his graduation. He was transferred successively to United Press offices at Oklahoma City, Chicago, Madison, Wis., Omaha, Nebr., and Washington.

He was still a cub reporter when he covered the impeachment and removal from office of Oklahoma's Gov. Henry S. Johnston in 1929. The following years brought other important political assignments—a "beat," the reporter's constant goal, when Wendell Willkie withdrew as a candidate for the Republican presidential nomination in 1944; continuing coverage of Nebraska's 1948 presidential preferential primary election in which all candidates, announced or merely possible, were entered with or without their consent.

Like all wire service reporters, he was not limited to a single subject. He covered, with equal competence, executions and spelling bees, football games and track meets, blizzards, and floods.

He was respected by the men and women whose activities he covered—as well as by those with whom he worked—as a blunt-spoken, no-nonsense reporter. He did not take kindly to interference.

His friends remember with delight his response to a Post Office Department official of some years ago who protested that a Godwin story about that Department had not been secured through proper channels.

---

[1] Parts B and C, taken together, would provide services to youths who are delinquent or in danger of becoming delinquent, whatever their legal status. The services provided under part B and part C may be similar, but the auspices are different. Part B is addressed to law enforcement agencies, courts, and other correctional institutions and the youths with whom they deal. Part C is addressed to community agencies and the youths with whom they deal. The two parts are so designed as to promote more interaction between these two kinds of agencies, more use by correctional agencies of community services, and a tendency, whenever appropriate, to render services to youths without identifying them as delinquent or placing them in custody.

The reporter said:

> Don't you tell me how to get a story, and I won't tell you how to lick a stamp.

Mr. and Mrs. Godwin will leave next month for their new home at Manteo, N.C. With them go our best wishes. They will be missed.

HOW MANY RED SPIES PER YEAR?

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, why does not the State Department tell us who the 18,000 American travelers in Russia are, in whose interest they travel in Russia, and who is paying their expenses?

As a father-taxpayer, one of 190 million Americans, I am given to understand that the Soviet Consular Treaty is to offer some security to 18,000 Americans who travel annually behind the Communist Iron Curtain. This apparently is the State Department's chief selling point on public opinion. Yet, we 190 million are being asked to place our country, our lives, and our property in additional jeopardy for the benefit of 18,000 people, only 20 of whom were arrested according to State Department records. Certainly, we people are entitled to a full disclosure of all the facts.

Pending before Congress and our Nation is this most crucial decision of whether or not the Soviet Consular Convention, or Treaty, should be ratified. I continue to receive a heavy flow of mail from my constituents and from citizens all over the country who fear for the safety and defense of our America and the risk of any treaty involvement with the Communists. They raise questions that I am unable to answer and that I have not heard discussed nor adequately presented to the public from any of the administration sources.

In the interest of public opinion and academic freedom regarding this Communist treaty convention, I have a study prepared by Mr. W. B. Hicks, Jr., executive secretary of Liberty Lobby and which, I am told, was delivered before the appropriate committee. The benefit of his remarks and study was given very little exposure to the American people and certainly we, in Congress, do not want to hide any of the facts or arguments so vital to national defense and our individual survival.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert Mr. Hicks' complete statement into the RECORD for the reading and study of my colleagues:

Statement of W. B. Hicks, Jr., Executive Secretary, Liberty Lobby, Before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Hearings on Soviet Consular Convention, February 17, 1967

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, I am W. B. Hicks, Jr., Executive Secretary of Liberty Lobby. I appear today to oppose the Soviet Consular Convention in the name of the 170,000 subscribers to the *Liberty Letter*, our monthly legislative report. I have been authorized to take this position by our Board of Policy which, at the moment, is made up of some 10,000 of our subscribers who have joined our Board of Policy in order to take a more active role in the Liberty Lobby. Our Board of Policy has voted overwhelmingly to support a pro-American foreign policy and it is our belief that this treaty with the Soviet Union fails to meet that standard.

We will restrict our testimony on the treaty to a summary of the arguments and counter-arguments for and against the treaty, as they are curerntly being presented by the State Department, the press, in letters from Senators to their constituents, and by those actively opposing the treaty.

First, the arguments put forward in support of the treaty, each followed by the counter-argument of the opposition.

1. *Argument:* If ratified, the Convention would bring important and immediate benefits to the 18,000 or more American citizens who travel to the U.S.S.R. each year.

Counter-argument: The only benefit to the ordinary American traveler in the Soviet Union would be access to American consular offices in the limited number of cities in the U.S.S.R. where consulates may be established. According to the State Department, only one such location (Leningrad) is now contemplated. Travelers in any other cities would not be aided unless they happened to be arrested. Since June of 1964, when the treaty was signed, only 20 Americans have been arrested by the Soviet Union. The benefits of this treaty would apply to these 20 but not to the 18,000 per year claimed by the State Department.

2. *Argument:* The treaty will protect Americans arrested by the Soviet Union.

Counter-argument: The protection offered by the treaty consists solely of visiting rights by consular officials. There are no concessions by the Soviets to American standards of justice. There is no provision for jury trial. There is no provision against self-incrimination. There is no provision for facing one's accuser. There is no provision against cruel or unusual punishment. Contrary to the statement on the Senate floor of one supporter of the treaty, *there is no provision for release of a prisoner.*

3. *Argument:* The treaty offers an unusual (for the Soviet Union) right of access to American prisoners by consular officials.

Counter-argument: The right of notification and access to arrested Americans within four days of their confinement is unusual only in the Soviet Union. This right of access has always been granted by the United States and most other civilized nations. In fact, at the time the United States recognized the Soviet Union over thirty years ago, the Soviet Government promised the immediate implementation of this right of access. This promise was never carried out.

4. *Argument:* If this right of access had been in effect, Newcomb Mott (the American who died while imprisoned in the U.S.S.R. last year), might still be alive.

Counter-argument: This argument is based on the assumption that Newcomb Mott committed suicide in a fit of despair. There is just as much reason to believe that he was murdered by fellow prisoners on his prison train. Further, it assumed that Mott's despair resulted from lack of contact with Americans rather than the circumstances of his trial and prospective "punishment."

In a more recent case, that of Mr. Kazan, no protection at all would have been forthcoming under the proposed treaty because the Soviets turned him over to a Czechoslovakian court for trial. Nothing in the treaty would prevent the Soviets from adopting this procedure as a standard practice to avoid the access provisions of the treaty if it is ratified.

5. *Argument:* American personnel who serve as officers and employees in any consulates we may establish in the U.S.S.R. must have the protection of diplomatic immunity offered by this treaty.

Counter-argument: This argument assumes that the *necessity* for American consulates and personnel is taken for granted. Therefore, its validity depends entirely on first proving the necessity for additional U.S. diplomatic offices in the Soviet Union.

6. *Argument:* American consulates in the Soviet Union will offer valuable "windows" on the "closed society" of the U.S.S.R.

Counter-argument: Diplomatic officials who have served in the Soviet Union have complained of the extensive restrictions placed upon their movement and activities by the Soviet Government. The very fact that the Soviet Union *is* a "closed society" necessarily means that useful observations are more difficult to obtain for our personnel there than for Soviet personnel stationed in the United States. It follows that we would obtain little useful information in comparison to what the Soviets would gain by having offices in cities in this Nation where they are presently not allowed to operate.

In addition, the difficulties of maintaining security in an American consulate in the U.S.S.R. (against "bugging" and other electronic devices) might in fact make our consulate more of a "window" on *our* diplomatic operations, for the Soviets.

7. *Argument:* The convention does not provide for the opening of consulates, either in the United States or in the U.S.S.R. It provides for *no* new Soviet personnel in this country.

Counter-argument: This argument is pure sophistry, beneath the dignity of even the State Department. Immediately following Article 1 of the treaty, which contains a definition of terms, follows the title of the next five articles: "Opening of consular establishments, appointment of consular officers and employees," and the content of Articles 2 through 6 is devoted to the provisions under which the State Department and the Soviet Union are to establish consulates and appoint consular personnel. The treaty does *not* in fact actually open any new consulates, but if ratified by the Senate, it gives the State Department a "blank check" to open an unlimited number of consulates with no further consultation of the Senate.

8. *Argument:* Consulates could be opened whether or not the present Convention is ratified.

Counter-argument: The obvious reply to this argument is: Why then, the need for including consulates in this treaty? Obviously, there is something contained in this treaty that cannot otherwise be obtained. That "something" is certainly not the right of "notification and access" because this right is provided to an even greater degree by the provisions of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations signed on April 24, 1963 by the United States, and which has now been signed by a total of 52 nations. The Vienna Convention needs only one more ratification to become effective but has never been sent to the Senate by our State Department to be ratified.

Opponents of the treaty believe that the necessity for this treaty from the State Department point of view is simply the desire of the State Department to exempt Soviet Consular personnel from the laws of the United States, which could *not* be done without Senate ratification of a treaty.

9. *Argument:* The number of Soviet consular personnel would be limited to 12 or 15 per consulate and would not greatly increase the total number of Soviet personnel enjoying diplomatic immunity.

Counter-argument: First, there is no numerical limitation contained in the treaty itself. Thus, what the State Department foresees as the number of personnel involved may well prove inaccurate in actual practice. Again, this treaty is a "blank check" to the State Department and once ratified, the Senate will have no further control over its implementation.

Further, there is the factor of the "most favored nation" clauses that exist in consular conventions currently in force with *other* nations, including some Communist nations. These clauses will go into effect if this treaty is ratified, entitling hundreds of consular personnel already here to full diplomatic immunity. In his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Secretary Rusk stated: "If all of them exercise that option, our estimate is that approximately 400 officers and employees could be involved."

10. *Argument:* We will be protected against the activities of Soviet personnel because of the power to "expel" Soviet consular officials.

Counter-argument: The power to send a Soviet official home if he commits a crime such as bribery, extortion, blackmail, kidnapping or murder, is hardly a protection.

11. *Argument:* We will gain just as much from "diplomatic immunity" as the Soviets.

Counter-argument: This argument assumes that our personnel in the Soviet Union will have identical purposes and functions with those of Soviet personnel in the United States. J. Edgar Hoover has testified that "involving the great bulk of their official personnel in intelligence activity in one way or another, the Soviets utilize to the fullest extent possible any and all official means . . . as transmission belts to carry additional intelligence personnel into this country."

If this is the purpose and function of our diplomatic personnel in the Soviet Union, then this treaty should be properly referred to as a "spy exchange program."

We should also consider the fact that while the Soviets will be given access to tens of thousands of refugees from Communism, many of whom have relatives behind the Iron Curtain, and who are subject to extortion and blackmail . . . *there is no such body of refugees from the West inside the Soviet Union on whom our officials would practice extortion and blackmail.* Hence, there will be no reciprocity on this point.

12. *Argument:* J. Edgar Hoover has agreed that the advantages which would accrue to the United States by entering into such a treaty outweigh any disadvantages.

Counter-argument: In a letter to Senator Karl Mundt of January 23, 1967 Hoover stated, "The FBI is not a policy-making agency and we do not express opinions. Since 1924, when I became its Director, the FBI has refrained from injecting itself into the area of legislation. The Consular Convention between the Soviet Union and the United States which is now before the United States Senate, is no exception to this long-standing rule."

13. *Argument:* In a letter to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, J. Edgar Hoover withdrew his opposition to the treaty.

Counter-argument: As is clear from the above quotation, J. Edgar Hoover never "opposed" the treaty in the first place. He merely reported the facts as he knew them before the House Appropriations Subcommittee.

At that time he stated that "a cherished goal of the Soviet intelligence services was realized when the United States signed an agreement with the Soviet Union on June 1, 1964, providing for the reciprocal establishment of consulates in our respective countries. One Soviet intelligence officer in commenting on the agreement spoke of the wonderful opportunity this presented his service and that it would enable the Soviets to enhance their intelligence operations."

In the letter to Senator Mundt referred to above, Mr. Hoover stated, "You specifically inquired whether I had changed my views or whether any evidence has developed to make me change my mind about my testimony of March 4, 1965. The answer is an unequivocal no."

14. *Argument:* The FBI can cope with any increase espionage arising from the establishment of Soviet consulates.

Counter-argument: The FBI and the other counter-intelligence agencies have *never* been 100% effective in the control of espionage. The history of the Cold War is replete with examples of Soviet espionage activities that have succeeded in yielding some of our most important secrets to the U.S.S.R.

One of the most important of these cases was the theft of the secrets of the Atomic bomb, which gave the Soviet Union the weapon without which there could be no Cold War. The Oppenheimer Hearings of the Atomic Energy Commission revealed that the command post of the Berkeley-based spy ring that delivered the A-Bomb to the Soviets was located *in the Consulate of the Soviet Union in San Francisco.*

In addition, it should be noted that *this* Soviet Consulate was able to function as a spy-center *without* the special benefits of consular inviolability and immunity contained in this treaty.

In fact, considering the provisions of this treaty against any inspection of Soviet equipment and baggage brought into the United States, for shipment to consulates, it is obvious that there is no way, short of violating the treaty laws of the United States, for the FBI to detect the importation of anything, from narcotics to A-Bombs, so long as it is marked "Diplomatic Pouch." Furthermore, should a shipment of narcotics be detected, there is no way to prevent its delivery short of abrogating Article 18 (2) of the treaty.

15. *Argument:* Ratification of this treaty will lead to reduced tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Counter-argument: There are numerous ways in which the establishment of consulates in both countries could lead to an *increase,* rather than a decrease of tension between the two nations. Any serious incident involving a violation of our consular establishment or the immunity of our consular personnel, whether by accident or design, could lead to outraged demands by the American people that the treaty be nullified.

On the other hand, any act of a Soviet official, accidental or otherwise, which might inflame American public opinion could have the same result. In addition, acts of revenge or agitation by refugee groups in this country against Soviet consulates (such as the recent bombing of the Yugoslav consulates) could add to the "tensions" between our countries.

15. *Argument:* An important part of the whole exercise of diplomacy these days is to isolate the Vietnam war, to maintain as good relations as possible between the United States and the Soviet Union during a tense period.

Counter-argument: The "isolation" of the Vietnam war would seem to require of the Soviet bloc that they cease to supply the enemy there. Yet, Poland alone has ten cargo vessels carrying Soviet-bloc weapons to North Vietnam of a full-time basis, and Soviet leaders have proclaimed their full support of the Hanoi efforts to subjugate South Vietnam.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE TREATY

The principle arguments against the ratification of this treaty are:

1. *Argument:* 350,000 Americans *per day* are involuntarily risking arbitrary loss of blood, limb and life by Soviet weapons in Vietnam, in comparison to the 12 or 18 thousand *per year* who are *voluntarily* risking arbitrary arrest in the Soviet Union.

Beside this comparison, all other arguments for and against this treaty pale in signficance in the minds of the American people.

Counter-argument: This is all the more reason why we must "Build Bridges" to the Soviet Union at this time.

2. *Argument:* The Soviet Union cannot be trusted to adhere to any agreement, unless it offers them more than it offers the other party. It should be noted that this Soviet Consular Convention was signed for the Soviets by Andrei Gromyko, the same man who was accused by President Kennedy of deliberately lying to him about the missiles sent to Cuba in 1962.

Counter-argument: If the Soviets violate this treaty, it can be considered void, and in any case, can be canceled with six months notice.

3. *Argument:* One of the results of this treaty will be to increase trade with the enemy in Vietnam, by way of the Soviet Union.

Counter-argument: Those who make this objection apparently base it on the fact that the Convention states that consular officers of the two countries will be entitled "to further the development of commercial, economic, cultural and scientific relations . . . between the two countries." This is the kind of phrase which is found in all consular conventions and agreements which the United States has signed with other countries in the 20th Century. It does not mean that there will be any change in the nature of our trade with the Soviet Union in so-called strategic items.

4. *Argument:* It is clearly established that Soviet diplomatic officials are secret policemen or intelligence agents first, and diplomats second. Besides the Hoover testimony on this point, there is the statement of Oleg Penkovskiy, who was the second-ranking agent of the GRU itself, who said: "In a Soviet consulate, almost 100 per cent of the personnel are KGB, with one or two GRU officers included." (*Penkovskiy Papers*)

Counter-argument: This treaty offers advantages to us that are worth the risks of additional Soviet intelligence agents being stationed in the consulates.

5. *Argument:* Soviet KGB agents are not simply ordinary spies who gather information, they are also trained assassins, equipped with special weapons and poisons to make their victims appear to have died naturally, or by suicide. In addition, they have used their consular positions in the past to extort information from refugees, blackmail security risks and even to kidnap those whom they consider dangerous to them, such as the case of Oksana Kasenkina, and, perhaps, Povl Bang-Jensen.

Counter-argument: There have been no recent cases of this nature, and again, this treaty offers advantages to us that are worth the risks.

6. *Argument:* We have a moral obligation to all those who have sought and received asylum from Communism by coming to America, *not* to allow the establishment of privileged Communist sanctuaries here, from which they can be terrorized anew by their former enemies.

Counter-argument: When they come to this country, it is up to them to accept the rules and regulations of America and not spend their time agitating hate against the countries from which they came. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 31, 1967, p. 2011.)

7. *Argument:* The provisions for "diplomatic immunity" contained in this treaty are unique for a consular convention. We have such conventions with more than 30 other nations, and none of them provide immunity for felonies. Why should we provide something special for the Soviets?

Counter-argument: This point was not in our original draft because it is not a part of our general practice. But when the matter was raised by the Soviets we gave it close examination. We felt that in view of the special circumstances of the character of the two societies that it would be advantageous to us to go ahead on this basis.

Mr. Chairman, I will close this statement with a reiteration of the argument against this treaty for which there is no satisfactory counter-argument.

The Soviet Union is supplying its ally in North Vietnam with the only weapon that can shoot down the aircraft being flown by American pilots who represent the cream of our air forces. These Soviet anti-aircraft missiles are maintained—probably even manned—by the Soviet "technicians" to whom the Soviet press has referred as "fighting shoulder to shoulder with the Vietnamese people."

It might be well for the Senate to give some consideration in the case of this treaty, to the remarks of your colleagues in the other House of Congress, where in recent weeks there have been expressions of grave concern on the general subject of our relations with the Soviet Union as well as the specific subject of this Consular Convention. One Congressman who represents a city where it is proposed to locate a Soviet consulate has expressed his fear that the reaction of his constituents who have lost dear ones to Soviet Russian terrorism might be so violent as to create a dangerous situation for the cause of international peace. Another, highly respected member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee has decried the fact that this consular treaty is proposed while Soviet ammunition, fired from almost all types of Russian-made guns, is killing and maiming Americans in Vietnam.

And in closing, I refer you to the remark of a member of Congress who arose to inform the House just days ago that his own son, a Lieutenant in Vietnam, had just become the victim of a Soviet weapon. Mr. Chairman, the House of Representatives, as a cross-section of the American people, may be taken as a reliable gauge of the current attitude of the people toward the Soviet Union. There are arguments and answers to all the reasons for and against this treaty, except in the case of this argument. What answer can a Senator give to the bereaved parent or wife of an American who has been deprived of his right to life by the acts of the criminal government to whom this treaty seeks to build a "bridge"?

Thank you.

ENLIGHTENING EDITORIAL ON SALISBURY'S HANOI REPORTING

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I recently called the attention of the House to the disservice to his country which Mr. Harrison Salisbury had rendered through his so-called factual reporting of civilian bombing in Hanoi. At the time I brought this matter to the attention of the House, I referred to previous dispatches filed by Mr. Salisbury when he was a correspondent in Moscow for the highly respected New York Times. I directed your attention to the variance of the contents of his copy when filed in Russia and his subsequent articles after he had returned to the United States.

I also directed your attention to the statements made in his dispatch from Hanoi which did not indicate that his figures were spoon-fed him by North Vietnam officials. He subsequently described his oversight as a journalistic error. I termed it a colossal error and very bad reporting by spewing the Communist line.

After I had brought this matter to the attention of the House, my attention was called to the editorial which had appeared in the Picayune Item, of Mississippi, on the same subject. Now, undoubtedly, many other comments have been made editorially on Mr. Salisbury's sloppy reporting which served the Communist Party line, but I doubt if there has been or can be written an editorial which demands more attention than this editorial to which I direct your attention.

This editorial from the Picayune Item is perhaps the most important observation to be made on the subject because of the identity of the author.

Charles Nutter is one of the best newspapermen I have ever known, and I have known many of them.

He is armed with impressive credentials to make his opinion of Harrison Salisbury most important and most acceptable.

My observations recently were based entirely on the documented background of Mr. Salisbury and the documentation of his most recent exploits. Mr. Nutter's observation is based on personal observance of other Times correspondents and their modus operandi in Communist-flavored atmospheres.

Mr. Nutter, when I first met him, was chief of the Associated Press bureau in New Orleans.

His assignments with the Associated Press included service in Russia when I am informed that Walter Duranty, a Times correspondent, openly boasted for some 20 years that he wrote to please the Communist government because he wanted to stay there and not be thrown out.

Mr. Nutter also served in Spain during the civil war when Herbert Matthews was openly boasting that he wanted the Communist government to win the war and wrote accordingly. In case it has slipped your memory, this is the same Matthews who went to Cuba in 1957 and glorified Fidel Castro to the point that the State Department began undermining the legitimate government, and Batista fled and Castro took over.

It becomes apparent that the practice of reporters of the New York Times in Communist countries or countries where the Communists are attempting to gain control is no novelty.

But Mr. Nutter's credentials as an outstanding newspaperman and reporter go beyond his service in the areas which I have mentioned. He was selected by the Associated Press to direct its South American activities before he was the choice of the famed International House in New Orleans to become its director.

There is no doubt that Mr. Nutter knows whereof he writes, and it is refreshing to know he has returned to the newspaper field and is using his talents to cry out, admittedly perhaps in a wilderness, against those actions which tend to undermine America and its traditional institutions.

I share the opinion with many that Harrison Salisbury's articles on Hanoi did more damage to the United States than sending 100,000 soldiers there could have done.

Here is the editorial, written almost immediately after the Salisbury articles, which I commend to your attention and study.

[From the Picayune (Miss.) Item]

A Questionable Newspaper Stunt

We doubt that the New York Times is going to pick up any honors for Harrison Salisbury's coverage from Hanoi in Vietnam where it appears he has been mousetrapped by the North Vietnam government and the Viet Cong, and finds himself and his paper peddling the propaganda of a government which is killing and injuring several hundred Americans weekly in war.

The paper and Salisbury are beginning to feel the backlash of this journalistic stunt whereby he was admitted alone of American newspapermen to Hanoi by that government, evidently because Ho Chi Minh felt he could depend on this great American paper to disseminate Communist propaganda. It now comes out that Salisburg is being briefed by Australian and British communists in Hanoi, and his dispatches reflect their line of anti-Americanism.

The Associated Press and scores of other American newspapers have tried for years to station correspondents in Hanoi to cover that side of the conflict. But they all have been turned down by the North Vietnamese, and still are not allowed to enter. The action therefore of admitting Salisbury, an assistant managing editor of the New York Times who had spent nearly twenty years in Moscow, is questionable.

The Communists there apparently felt that he could be depended upon to write the kind of news reports which they felt would help their cause and further divide the American people. And so far Salisbury has accommodated Hanoi by sending back dispatches critical of American bombing raids, and other dispatches of dubious truth.

Salisbury is a competent, highly honored newspaperman whose dispatches from the Soviet Union won him much acclaim, but never displeased the Soviets because they always closely followed the Soviet line as indeed dispatches to the New York Times from the Soviet Union have for the past forty years.

Every American correspondent in Russia in the last 50 years has spread the government line and its propaganda to a certain extent, because it is impossible always to ferret out the truth where news sources are closed and where there is heavy censorship. For example to this day no outsider has ever seen the Russian space bases or seen a space launching or recovery; correspondents have to accept the bulletins issued by the government, true or false.

Such coverage can be excused from nonbelligerent nations which we are not fighting in a hot war. But this becomes inacceptable and inexcusable when it comes from a nation against which we have 350,000 men fighting and dying, and in which we are engaged in a bitter war to the death.

Salisbury's interviews with government leaders become sheer propaganda, and his reports about our bombings are hearsay on his part. He saw none such and saw no civilians killed. Indeed American pilots have been quick to challenge the accuracy of the propaganda fed him by briefing communist officers. They know far more about the situation than the correspondent, handpicked for entry, and who arrived weeks or months after the bombings.

It is a tragedy that the highly respected Times is being used by the Hanoi Communists to mislead, misinform and divide the

American people. But that is what is happening. Hanoi's only mistake was that it failed to recognize what a valuable ally it might have had for its propaganda a year or two or three ago.

If Hanoi was honest in wanting the truth known it would open its doors to all legitimate American correspondents and would let them file news freely from Hanoi. But this would not serve the propaganda purpose because some correspondents would dig deeper than others and might expose the truth.

The New York Times still is held responsible in government and newspaper circles for its action in praising and promoting Fidel Castro and undermining Batista in Cuba to the point the rebel Communist was able to overthrow the legitimate Cuban government and turn that country over to the Communists. A member of the Times editorial board, still employed there, was responsible for this tragic event.

The best thing that could happen would be for this newspaper to stop its use by the communists to mislead the people in this country, quickly and effectively. Withdrawal of Salisbury until Vietnam admitted all legitimate correspondents would be the proper action but it will not be taken by this newspaper, whose purposes are as questionable in Hanoi as they were in Havana nearly a decade ago.

WEST VIRGINIA'S BOOMING OHIO VALLEY

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on February 23 I had the honor to introduce Mr. C. C. Baldwin, Jr., vice president and general manager, Specialty Chemical Division, Stauffer Chemical Co., who was the principal speaker at the 22d annual dinner of the Point Pleasant-Mason County Chamber of Commerce. This excellent meeting was held in Point Pleasant, W. Va., and revealed the great progress and exciting future plans for economic development in this great and booming Ohio Valley of West Virginia.

Because Vice President Baldwin brings out some little-known facts concerning the contribution which Mason County and West Virginia are making to the economic development of the Nation, under unanimous consent I include this fine address with my remarks:

Mr. Chairman, Congressman Hechler, ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor and a personal pleasure for me to be invited to speak before you this evening. I want to thank Ken Hechler for that most complimentary introduction.

I have become aware that in past years, the meetings of your chamber of commerce have brought to Point Pleasant some extremely interesting speakers . . . men like a distinguished professor, Dr. Moffat, who spoke on presidents' wives, and an unusual celebrity, Colonel Chuck Yeager whose speech in 1966 almost made you feel as if you were aboard his soaring jet when it first broke the sound barrier.

Tonight I have no inside glimpses of White House families to expound upon nor am I likely to take you up into the deep blue on a flight into history. I *do* have a message, however, that is bound to *interest* you . . . primarily because it is *about you* and about *Mason County, West Virginia.*

MASON COUNTY'S CONTRIBUTION

I would wager that few of you really *know* the *full* story of what you and your county today contribute to our Nation and the world. Inasmuch as I have been in the chemical industry all of my adult life, I would naturally *tend* to, and *will*, focus upon *that* aspect of your local area's productivity. So in that vein, then, let me tell you some of the *exciting* facts that make Mason County's *industrial* role a most *significant* one. It has all been accomplished in just *the past ten years.*

Of the numerous chemical products manufactured today in your local area, many beneficially affect the daily lives of most everyone of you—probably without your realizing *how*. You, therefore, may be interested in some *statistics* and *information* which, by the way, may also prove useful to your local Chamber of Commerce in its *promotional* programs.

CAPACITY FOR POLYESTER RESINS

Today Mason County possesses about 1/12 of the total U. S. *production capacity* for *polyester resins.* Maybe this doesn't *sound very large* to you but actually out of the total national output, Mason County accounts for a healthy 75 million pounds of polyester resins which are locally produced by your neighbors, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company. Polyester resins have many uses. Goodyear's is used primarily in the manufacture of tire cord.

You have all heard of *dacron*. Dupont sells their polyester fiber under that trade name. Polyester resin is also used to produce most of the magnetic recording tapes in the United States. So this particular chemical product from Mason County finds its way into many areas of activity throughout our land and, for that matter, the world.

VINYL PLASTIC PRODUCTION

Let us take *another* product polyvinyl chloride—one of the largest volume plastics produced today in the United States—and more commonly known to most of you as "vinyl plastic." It is used for so many things, such as, for example, the shower curtains in your bathroom, the upholstery covering in your car, the protective cover for your outdoor furniture, plastic pipe for drainage ditches, insulation on electrical wiring, the vinyl floor tile in your kitchen. Mason County proudly includes among its major industries the Pantasote Company. Its new plant produces a generous *4%* of the total U.S. output of polyvinyl chloride resins. This share is a *significant* one since, out of total U.S. productive capacity, Mason County *alone* accounts for over 100 million pounds. I would not be loyal to Stauffer if, at this point, I did not mention that we also are an important producer of polyvinyl chloride resins—with plants in California, and Delaware.

Included in the major product groups produced by Stauffer chemical at *its* plant here are *phosphate esters.* Our continuous production unit for phosphate esters is the *largest* of its kind in the world. Stauffer's combined production for all phosphate esters represents 30% of the U.S. capacity for this type of product.

Phosphate esters have a wide variety of uses and applications. Although you may not realize it, you all come in contact with them regularly.

GASOLINE ADDITIVE

The *gasoline* you buy may contain an additive called TCP (tricresyl phosphate) which was first made famous worldwide by Shell Oil. Other oil companies, under license from Shell, also use TCP in their gasoline. Stauffer's Mason County plant is one of the *major* producers of this gasoline additive.

Another important use for phosphate esters is to make a wide variety of products *fire resistant*. Examples would include fireproofing such things as the *plastic foam cushions* used in your home, mattresses in hospitals and hotels, the seats of automobiles, vinyl drapes for schools and public buildings.

Phosphate esters are also used as hydraulic fluids in steel mills, power plants, and chemical plants throughout the world where there is a need to protect against fire in case of a hydraulic system leak.

In addition, phosphate esters are used as *transmission oil additives* to prevent system leakage in cars and trucks.

HALF OF JET LUBRICANT PRODUCTION IN MASON COUNTY

Now I want to tell you of another new chemical that is Mason County produced. Your local Stauffer chemical plant turns out a new synthetic lubricant which now supplies 50% of the U.S. Air Force and Navy's requirements for synthetic jet engine lubricants in use throughout the world. Many of our NATO allies also purchase this synthetic lubricant from Stauffer for their jet air force needs.

Very soon Stauffer will be supplying several commercial air lines—flying in the United States and abroad—with synthetic jet engine lubricants—all to be produced here in Mason County. Our first important airline customer was one you are familiar with—Piedmont Airlines. All of their jet turbine powered aircraft now use a synthetic jet engine lubricant made right here in Mason County.

OTHER STAUFFER PRODUCTS

A number of other products produced by Stauffer Chemical here in Mason County are not made anywhere else in the world. One is a special additive which helps to improve the resistance of nylon carpets to heat and light.

I've tossed a lot of facts and figures at you in a pretty big hurry here. What I'm trying to say in summary is that your county has become an important center in the vast chemical complex that extends along the Ohio and Kanawha River Valleys. Mason County is definitely a major factor in the production of polyester resins, polyvinyl chloride plastics, gasoline additives, fire resistant plasticizers, fire retardants for plastic foam, synthetic fire resistant hydraulic fluids, and jet engine lubricants.

A large share of the credit for the development and growth of Mason County's chemical industry must go to you, the local members of the chamber of commerce. You have done an excellent job in presenting your story. I am sure that your area leaders have also aided this cause, such as Congressman Hechler.

WHY INDUSTRY LOCATES IN MASON COUNTY

There are several *good* reasons why industry should be *interested* in locating or expanding in Mason County. You have a lot of things *going* for you. Some of them are God-given: such as the Ohio and Kanawha Rivers, providing *inexpensive* transportation and an *abundance of water*, which is so *vitally important* to most chemical operations. And there is *land* available—*Lots* of it.

You also have dependable rail service to other areas of the country. West Virginia's highway system is good, and hopefully will be improved upon substantially with such projects as the proposed new highway between here and Huntington.

Mason County also has readily available the three major sources of energy (coal, natural gas, and electricity), which are basic needs of chemical industries. In abundant supply, these are also available at the right price.

IMPORTANCE OF THE AIRPORT

Recently, I was pleased to hear about another important asset you are adding to Mason County—the new airport to be constructed this year. I can't impress upon you how important this airport will be to strengthen the future development of Mason County as an industrial center.

Today, Stauffer Chemical and most other companies, when examining new plant sites, consider nearby airport facilities as one of the important factors. In today's world and at the pace we keep, time is critical. Measured in hours and minutes, rather than days, it is important to be able to move engineers, chemists, marketing people, production people, customers, and management people back and forth as quickly as possible. Therefore, modern timesaving airport facilities are important if one is to run an efficient and profitable business. Your new airport will play a vital role in developing further the economy of Mason County.

Probably the most important factor today in selecting a new plant site is people. Industry needs to have readily available increased numbers of intelligent, trained people who want to work. We may have a population "explosion" problem in today's world, but in the United States our need for competent employees is a constant one, with the high rate of employment we have today throughout the Nation.

The people of Mason County, therefore, are really your major asset. We and our industrial neighbors here are going to need you.

HOW TO ATTRACT MORE INDUSTRY

Some words of counsel on what your organization should do to attract qualified people to work and live in Mason County.

First, improve your schools. Second, expand your homebuilding programs. Also, continue improving and modernizing your fine stores which I have seen in downtown Point Pleasant. This will help make your area a more attractive place to live. We at Stauffer Chemical are doing our part to recruit scientists and engineers to come here for interviews from all over the U.S.A. We can and will cooperate with the chamber of commerce to convince these skilled personnel that Mason County is a great place to work and live.

Confidence and faith in Mason County have already been strongly demonstrated by our neighbors—Goodyear and Pantasote with their recent investments of substantial sums of money to expand their plants here.

MILLION DOLLAR EXPANSION PROGRAM

I am pleased to tell you tonight that Stauffer feels the same way. Our company is planning to spend over a *million dollars* during 1967 to construct new facilities and expand existing installations at our Point Pleasant plant. Furthermore, we are developing plans for even larger projects to be considered for future years.

You all know that well-known expression, "a picture is worth ten-thousand words". I don't think I have used ten-thousand words tonight. Also we haven't used any picture slides or visual aids. However, I did bring along some 3-dimensional evidence which should symbolize my message that the chemicals and plastics produced here come back to you in the form of familiar products.

As you leave our dinner meeting tonight, I would like to invite you to take a souvenir. A souvenir that is symbolic of Mason County's industrial strength. For the men, please accept a courtesy can of Firestone transmission fluid for your auto. This product is made from the phosphate ester which Stauffer Chemical makes right here in Point Pleasant, West Virginia. There are actually about 25 or 26 different brands on the market, but all are similarly based on phosphate esters produced by Stauffer here in West Virginia. We ship out tank car supplies to many manufacturers who then package the product in cans, shipping it out through distribution channels to local gasoline stations, service centers, and auto stores.

For the ladies, we have available some plastic table cloths made of vinyl plastic. The raw material for this product is PVC resin produced by Pantasote here at Point Pleasant, West Virginia. For safety, the table cloth also contains a fire-resistant plasticizer produced by Stauffer Chemical at Point Pleasant. Pantasote and Stauffer's products are shipped from here to fabricating plants in other parts of the country. There they are combined with dyes and fillers. Processed and calandered as sheets, printed, stitched—the finished product eventually finds its way right back to Mason County for your shopping selection.

I certainly enjoyed talking to you. I hope I have been able to broaden your knowledge and realization of what you, yourselves, contribute to the world in the form of chemicals and plastics produced in Mason County.

RELEASE OF FUNDS BY THE ADMINISTRATION THAT WERE RECENTLY CUT FROM THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see in this morning's paper that the administration plans to release today a large part of the funds that were cut from the Federal highway construction program recently.

The point had already been made in the House that there were no legal grounds for the cutback. I previously pointed out that it had violated congressional intent as well.

Checking over the debate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when the Highway Act of 1956, setting up the highway trust fund, was passed, I find that this congressional intent as far as the use of money going into the trust fund was concerned was spelled out quite clearly indeed.

I wrote the Director of the Bureau of the Budget last week, citing two of the most significant remarks made in 1956. By law and congressional intent, this money belongs to the States, and any other use of it, or any withholding of it, is tantamount to misappropriation of Government funds.

The text of the letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES L. SCHULTZE,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: The recent cutback in highway construction funds not only has no basis in written statute, but in addition it violates long-standing and near-unanimous Congressional intent. Careful reading of the 1956 debate, when the highway trust fund was established, shows plainly that the will and desire of the Congress was to guarantee this construction money to the States without interruption.

HR 10660, which became PL 84–627, the Highway Act of 1956, passed the House by a vote of 399 to 19, in itself evidence of the overwhelming support for the concepts of this legislation. The following statements made at the time by members of both parties are indicative of a sentiment which has not changed:

Mr. Reid of New York, then ranking Republican member of the Committee on Ways and Means: ". . . it is important to emphasize that the bill provides for the establishment of a highway trust fund. . . . The existence of this fund will insure that these receipts will not be diverted to other purposes."

Mr. Boggs of Louisiana, now second-ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Ways and Means as well as House Majority Whip: ". . . This bill . . . establishes the highway trust fund which dedicates most of these funds to highway construction and for that purpose only. . . . Thus, for the first time, the American motorist will pay these taxes with the assurance that he will be the direct beneficiary of every penny which he pays and he will pay with the knowledge that every cent derived from these taxes will be devoted exclusively to his personal convenience and safety."

The Administration has forced the States to beg for money that is rightfully theirs by law and Congressional intent. This is legally and morally wrong. It savors of misappropriation of Government funds, an action that cannot be condoned and must be stopped. I urge the cutback order be revoked and the funds be made available to the States, as the law provides, and as the Congress desires.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM G. BRAY,
Member of Congress.

A KNOCK ON THE DOOR

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Northumberland Echo of Heathsville, Va., had a recent editorial, entitled "A Knock on the Door," relating to an investigation of the Northumberland County public school system by the FBI at the request of the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department.

According to the editorial, without disclosing their purpose two agents spent 3 days carefully going over school records for the past several years. Supposedly they were investigating a complaint made against the school system by a local citizen.

There seems to be something inherently wrong about a Federal agency going into a county and reviewing records without advising local officials as to the reason.

I wish to bring this to the attention of the House, in the hope that it is an isolated case, and will not happen again in Heathsville or elsewhere.

I have written the Acting Attorney General, Ramsey Clark, for a report on the situation.

A KNOCK ON THE DOOR

And it did happen here. Two FBI agents spent three days recently carefully going over every phrase of the school system in Northumberland County. What were their credentials? A request from the Department of Justice signed by John Doar, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, that the investigation be made. Why was it issued? Because of a complaint of a violation under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 made by a local school patron.

The FBI men, evidently in the dark along with the school board office as to the discrimination involved, settled down to a meticulous study of school records for the past several years. These men were experts, not a stone was left unturned. But what was the charge? Who made it? Superintendent Brann and the school board do not know.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1963 under Article 17, Violations to be Reported, includes the following: "Anyone with a complaint to report should first bring it to the attention of the State or local school officials, unless he feels it would not be helpful to do so." That the complainant did not do this would indicate that the violation was a serious one.

So let's get down to brass tacks. If this complaint was grave enough to merit two highly trained men spending three whole days investigating Northumberland's school system, then the citizens of the county have the right to know the reason that prompted its being made—to see that the situation is rectified.

But if the complaint was trivial, one that could have been easily settled by a conference with school officials, then we hold that the Office of Education is culpable of furthering tale-bearing.

Last November at a Virginia Teachers Association conference in Richmond, H. N. Taylor, a teacher at Fairfields Elementary School, complained that Negroes in this county are "not satisfied with things as they are going" in public school desegregation. He said, "We feel there is a need for more pressure on them." We take it by "them" Mr. Taylor also included his own race.

The Civil Rights Act discourages members of the school board from interrogating Mr. Taylor about his dissatisfaction with the status quo. At the same time it seems to condone a system if irresponsible accusation which could become vicious if allowed full rein.

In spite of the sixth amendment of our Constitution taking a dim view of withholding the "nature and cause of the accusation" could this nation ever become another Hungary where a knock on the door may have ominous significance?

GEORGIA STATE SENATE REPEAL OF RESOLUTION 21 RELATIVE TO THE ATLANTIC UNION DELEGATION

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, 1967, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] read into the RECORD the text of the Georgia State Senate Resolution 21 passed on February 13, 1967, by the Georgia State Senate, but apparently was unaware the Georgia State Senate revoked and repealed this resolution February 17, 1967, making the resolution null and void.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert Georgia State Senate Resolution 40 into the RECORD which revokes Resolution 21 mentioned before.

As a further word, Mr. Speaker, in the Georgia State Senate there is a procedure for passing what are called privileged resolutions. These resolutions require no committee action, do not have the three readings of other resolutions and bills, and most often are the work of only one senator. By custom in the Georgia State Senate the privileged resolution is used for the purpose of commending individuals and organizations. It is not to be used for stating the position of the Georgia State Senate without full debate.

I have received in the past few days numerous letters from my former colleagues in the Georgia State Senate who have stated due to the nature of Resolution 21, they were unaware of its passage and when it became known to them that the resolution stated the position of the Georgia State Senate on a matter of great substance, it was revoked, rescinded, and repealed by Resolution 40.

As additional comment, a number of Georgia senators advised me that to the best of their knowledge Resolution 21 had the support of only one senator:

GEORGIA STATE SENATE RESOLUTION

A resolution relative to Senate Resolution 21; and for other purposes

Be it resolved by the Senate, That Senate Resolution No. 21, relative to the Atlantic Union Delegation, is hereby repealed and rescinded.

Be it further resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to furnish appropriate copies of this Resolution to the United States Senators and the members of the United States House of Representatives from the State of Georgia.

Senate Resolution No. 40.

By Senators Gardner of the 1st, Bateman of the 27th and Adams of the 26th.

Adopted in Senate February 17, 1967.

GEO. L. SMITH,
President of the Senate.
HAMILTON MCWHORTER, Jr.,
Secretary of the Senate.

THE SEATTLE POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the war on poverty in Seattle—as in most cities—has suffered rude jolts in recent weeks as the result of cutbacks necessitated under last year's antipoverty legislation. Seattle's outstanding program has been forced to sustain cutbacks totaling $1 million in highly effective, locally developed projects which have brought hope and opportunity to the poor of Seattle and King County.

Mr. Speaker, a forceful and informative article by Lane Smith, entitled "Poor Persons Give Eloquent Praise to Poverty Programs," appeared in the Seattle Times on January 13. Mr. Smith describes a public meeting called by Mayor Braman to discuss the cuts in the community action programs of the Seattle-King County OEO. As Mr. Smith tells it:

> The poor spoke eloquently and movingly today about their participation in the war on poverty.

Mrs. Dora Miller, a poverty neighborhood resident employed as a "day-care mother" by the Neighborhood House Service Center, described what being involved in the war on poverty means to her:

> I can be independent. It means I have my own income. Before, I was on welfare and I even thought my children belonged to the State.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Miller speaks for thousands of disadvantaged citizens in Seattle and King County. With our support, they will be able to continue winning their own wars on poverty. I am extremely grateful to Lane Smith for his fine article, and with permission include it at this point in the RECORD:

POOR PERSONS GIVE ELOQUENT PRAISE TO POVERTY PROGRAM

(By Lane Smith)

The poor spoke eloquently and movingly today about their participation in the war on poverty.

They made much stronger impressions than men long skilled in public speaking at a meeting called by Mayor Braman to build up community pressure against federal fund cutbacks in community-action programs of the Seattle-King County Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mrs. Dora Miller, a "day-care mother" employed by the Neighborhood House Service Centers, said employment given her under the war on poverty program means:

"I can be independent. It means I have my own income. Before, I was on welfare and I even thought my children belonged to the state."

Neighborhood House, under a federal grant, employs mothers such as Mrs. Miller as day-care mothers for the children of other working mothers.

Another day-care mother, Mrs. Ozeal Wrice, a resident of the Rainier Vista Housing project, said:

"It bothered me to be on welfare. My children seemed to be ashamed of it.

"Even if the cuts means that I won't be able to work as a day-care mother, I am licensed and I will be able to take care of myself. I won't have to go back on welfare. It feels good."

Both professional staff members and persons employed in or aided by poverty programs confirmed what the projected $1 million in fund cutbacks will mean to local community programs.

Renton Mayor Donald Custer, outgoing chairman of the Seattle-King County O.E.O. board, said community-action programs have made a highly successful start, "but not much more."

Braman urged a "community expression of support for retention" of the federal grants. He said:

"Many community-action programs have not been given time to prove their worth, but they have lasted long enough to inspire hope and purpose, which should not be crushed.

"To reduce or possibly eliminate federal support could be devastating, to the extent that the poor sink back into hopelessness, on the one hand, or surge into seething anger on the other—having been built up only to be let down."

Presentations were made by Caritas, a program specializing in volunteer tutoring by university and college students; the Central Area Motivation Program, the largest community poverty program, which faces severe cuts in its study-center programs; the Council on Aging's extended-services project; the Justice Court probation program, The Travelers Aid Newcomer Program, and the new Careers Program, which has not been funded.

Representatives of the Head Start program, which would not be affected by local cutbacks, and the Seattle Opportunities Industrialization Center, a training program also apparently unaffected, made strong pleas for the community-action projects.

Custer explained that the national poverty programs are not affected by the local cutbacks. He said many of these programs whose funds are dictated by the federal government are receiving more money than they ask.

Walter Hubbard, executive director of CARITAS, said the free tutoring contributed by students amounts to a donation of about $100,000. Several parents whose children are tutored at St. Peter Claver Center by CARITAS volunteers told how their children's grades had benefited.

Mrs. Eva Lee, mother of five, said the CAMP program had provided baby-sitting and housekeeping services while she was confined to bed after delivery of twins last year.

"I often pray that we can keep this program," Mrs. Lee said.

The Rev. Mineo Katagiri, new chairman of the local O.E.O. board, said the office had been directed to hire a staff member to seek money from private organizations.

IS THE YUGOSLAVIA COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR VIETNAM A CONDUIT FOR YUGOSLAV GOVERNMENT AID TO NORTH VIETNAM?

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the President should have the Central Intelligence Agency determine whether the Yugoslavia Coordinating Committee for Vietnam is actually a conduit through which the Yugoslav Government aids North Vietnam.

I made the proposal in the following letter I sent yesterday to the White House:

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Despite the intended effect of the Findley Amendment to last year's Appropriation Act for Agriculture, as interpreted by the Comptroller General of the United States, the Departments of State and Agriculture are in the process of completing a transaction under Public Law 480, in which Yugoslavia will get subsidized credit worth about $2 million in connection with the purchase of about $9 million in vegetable oil.

The decision to go ahead apparently was based on a memorandum supplied to the Department of State by the Department of Justice on November 18, 1966 which held that the Findley Amendment—aimed at shutting off aid to nations that make shipments to North Vietnam—applied only to government shipments, not those of a private character.

At issue were shipments of medical supplies, which according to the memorandum were sponsored by organizations in Yugoslavia which were allegedly non-governmental and privately financed. Those named were: The Socialist Alliance, The Trade Union Federation, The Association of Veterans Federations, The Youth Federation, The Yugoslavian Red Cross, The Student Union, The Conference of Social Activities for Women, and the Yugoslavian League for Peace and Independence and Equality of Peoples.

In reaching the conclusion that the vegetable oil shipment should not be made, pending legislative clarification, the Comptroller General in his opinion to the Secretary of Agriculture dated February 2, 1967 came to the view that the proviso applied to private as well as government shipments. Although I agree with the Comptroller General's view, it appears that the Executive Branch has decided on a contrary opinion.

That being the case, would it not be wise to determine the true character of the so-called private organizations in Yugoslavia?

In recent days the American people, myself included, have learned with astonishment that many prominent U.S. organizations believed to be unconnected with the government have actually been secretly subsidized for years by the Central Intelligence Agency. These have included labor union, student organizations and foundations of various sorts.

If this can happen in what we proudly acclaim as our open society, it occurs to me that the conclusions apparently reached by the State Department as to the strictly private character of the Yugoslav organizations may also be questioned.

Therefore I request that the deal with Yugoslavia be halted until our government has explored the very real possibility that the organizations enumerated in the third paragraph of this letter have close links with the Tito regime, perhaps even including financial aid.

The agency that logically comes to mind to undertake this fact finding chore is the Central Intelligence Agency. It has international contacts and certainly has a staff well experienced in techniques employed to keep secret government payments to private organizations.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

STATE DEPARTMENT CLARIFICATION OF LITVINOFF MEMORANDUM

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, 1967, I wrote the Secretary of State asking for a clarification of the Litvinoff memorandum of November 16, 1933. This memorandum dealt with the question of detention of American nationals while in the Soviet Union and consular access to them. In my letter I requested information whether the memorandum was still in effect today.

I have received a reply from the Department of State and ask that the full text of the letter be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The text of the letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 13, 1967.

Hon. PAUL FINDLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FINDLEY: The Secretary has asked me to respond to your letter of February 2, 1967, in which you comment favorably on the Consular Convention with the Soviet Union now pending before the Senate and ask for clarification on certain points relating to the declaration made to President Roosevelt by Soviet Foreign Minister Litvinoff on November 16, 1933. For convenience of reference I am enclosing the full text of the Litvinoff letter.

As you indicate in your letter, a prime purpose of the pending Convention is to obtain assured rights of consular notification and access in the case of Americans arrested in the Soviet Union. The Litvinoff declaration, while addressed to the same subject, proved to be wholly inadequate to assure these rights. Its legal deficiencies were among the reasons that persuaded the Department to negotiate and sign the pending Consular Convention, containing as it does clear and unequivocal provisions on the point.

Mr. Litvinoff's letter to President Roosevelt declared that American nationals would receive rights of consular protection no less favorable than those enjoyed by nationals of the nation most favored in this respect. The letter also referred to a Soviet-German Agreement of 1925, which provided for notification within three to seven days and for access "without delay", as the then-current standard of most-favored-nation treatment. This Soviet-German Agreement, however, did not survive World War II; and up until the signing of the U.S.-U.S.S.R. Convention in 1964, the Soviet Union did not conclude any other treaties with specific provisions for consular notification or access. At the time of Professor Barghoorn's arrest in 1963, accordingly, there were no treaties in force between the Soviet Union and other countries from whose provisions the United States could claim the most-favored-nation treatment pledged by Mr. Litvinoff.

Even while the Soviet-German Agreement of 1925 was in force, its application was in practice entirely unsatisfactory to the United States. Several cases occurred in which American citizens were arrested and no consular notification or access was given until long after the arrest. In these cases we protested strenuously to the Soviet Union, asserting that under the Soviet-German Agreement notification was due within three to seven days, and that we were entitled to access "without delay", *after the arrest*. The Soviets took the position, however, that notification and access rights did not become operative until *after the investigation*. This was in fact the interpretation they were following in the case of German nationals. Thus although the United States was receiving most-favored-nation treatment, that treatment was wholly inadequate from our viewpoint.

The issues of notification and access are unmistakably resolved in the 1964 Consular Convention and its Protocol, which make clear that notification and access must be accorded within four days "from the time of arrest or detention." As you note in your letter, the Secretary has testified that the U.S.S.R. has never before given so specific a guarantee on access.

Ratification of the Consular Convention would bring into force the legal instrument contemplated by the Litvinoff letter as the definitive means for assuring consular protection to American nationals in the Soviet Union. Such rights, Mr. Litvinoff stated, were to be included in a consular convention "to be negotiated immediately following the establishment of relations." No consular convention was concluded, however, until the two countries signed the 1964 Convention now pending before the Senate. We agree with you that its provisions, particularly those dealing with consular notification and access, are very much in our national interest.

If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

Enclosure: Litvinoff letter of November 16, 1933.

WASHINGTON,
November 16, 1933.

MR. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States of America,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Following our conversations I have the honor to inform you that the Soviet Government is prepared to include in a consular convention to be negotiated immediately following the establishment of relations between our two countries provisions in which nationals of the United States shall be granted rights with reference to legal protection which shall not be less favorable than those enjoyed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by nationals of the nation most favored in this respect. Furthermore, I desire to state that such rights will be granted to American nationals immediately upon the establishment of relations between our two countries.

In this connection I have the honor to call to your attention Article 11 and the Protocol to Article 11, of the Agreement Concerning Conditions of Residence and Business and Legal Protection in General concluded between Germany and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on October 12, 1925.

"ARTICLE 11.

"Each of the Contracting Parties undertakes to adopt the necessary measures to inform the consul of the other Party as soon as possible whenever a national of the country which he represents is arrested in his district.

"The same procedure shall apply if a prisoner is transferred from one place of detention to another.

"FINAL PROTOCOL

"Ad Article 11

"1. The Consul shall be notified either by a communication from the person arrested or by the authorities themselves direct. Such communications shall be made within a period not exceeding seven times twenty-four hours, and in large towns, including capitals of districts, within a period not exceeding three times twenty-four hours.

"2. In places of detention of all kinds, requests made by consular representatives to visit nationals of their country under arrest, or to have them visited by their representatives, shall be granted without delay. The consular representative shall not be entitled to require officials of the courts or prisons to withdraw during his interview with the person under arrest."

I am, my dear Mr. President,
Very sincerely yours,
MAXIM LITVINOFF,
People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs,
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

REPRESENTATIVE FORM OF GOVERNMENT FOR VIETNAM

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most encouraging aspects of the struggle in Vietnam is the movement toward a representative and democratic government for the Republic of Vietnam. We have learned through bitter experience that a government which is strongly anti-Communist without itself being representative is hardly an adequate deterrent to Communist subversion.

The strongest defense against Communist subversion is a constitutionally based government which offers political opportunities for all its people.

The progress of South Vietnam toward constitutional government has not always been as certain or as determined as it now is. The most dramatic evidence of the growth of democracy was the recent constituent assembly election. This election, held in a country during a state of war, resulted in 80.8 percent of the registered voters casting their ballots for 532 candidates competing for 117 seats in the Constituent Assembly. This election was in itself dramatic refutation to the claim of the National Liberation Front that it represents a majority of the Vietnamese, because an estimated 56 percent of all Vietnamese of voting age cast ballots at the risk of Vietcong reprisal, demonstrating their determination to develop their own independent political institutions. Despite the large-scale attempts at intimidation, three-fourths of the voting-age population were registered to vote, and four out of every five of those registered voted. This success destroys the NLF's claim that they control two-thirds of the population and are the "sole genuine representatives" of the Vietnamese people.

The attempts of the Vietnamese to build their own political system must necessarily start with a constitution. I have today introduced a concurrent resolution which expresses the full support of Congress for the efforts of the Constituent Assembly now in session to provide for the right of self-determination through a representative form of government for the state of Vietnam.

H. CON. RES. ——

Whereas the South Vietnam Constituent Assembly has been formed as a result of recent elections; and

Whereas this Constituent Assembly is preparing a new constitution to provide a basis of freedom for the people of South Vietnam; and

Whereas this Constituent Assembly proposes that all people of the Republic of South Vietnam be permitted to vote for the officials who will govern them; and

Whereas the United States, in the conduct of its foreign affairs, is dedicated to the principle that people everywhere have the right to determine their own destiny through free participation in the choosing of their government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses its full support of the South Vietnam Constitutent Assembly in its efforts to assure all the people of South Vietnam the right of self-determination and the right to choose a representative form of government.

WASHINGTON POST EDITORIAL ON CIA

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House, including myself, have expressed alarm with the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency in assisting financially the activites of various "nongovernmental" organizations including the National Student Association.

The Washington Post on Tuesday, February 21, 1967, had an excellent editorial discussing this subject and pointing out the dangers in this type of activity. Too often we in this country tend to forget that a policy of anticommunism is not enough. Our purpose must be to advance democracy and freedom. Merely containing communism does not mean we have succeeded in establishing democratic governments and preserving freedom. Certainly these two principles cannot exist where there is communism, but neither does the absence of communism guarantee their presence. We must guard carefully against using state tactics to defeat a police state. In defending ourselves and others against our enemies we must be vigilant lest we be swept into adopting the very strategy and tactical devices of our opponents.

The editorial follows:

PREVENTING SUBVERSION

The first object of the President's task force on the Central Intelligence Agency's operations ought to be to devise a system that will make the country's non-governmental professional associations secure against secret, covert and conspiratorial subversion by the Government.

Its first purpose ought to be the preservation of the integrity and independence of the private institutions and agencies whose separate existence distinguishes a free from a totalitarian society. No doubt some of these associations, as the result of CIA financing, have, in the past, made a contribution toward the conduct of American policy abroad. But it is a contribution that they cannot make without diminishing, if not destroying, their larger role in the formation of opinion and the ventilation of criticism of government here at home. For government, in a free society, is not a thing apart from the society it serves—it is a product of society. And its views emerge from the clash of opinion and the storm of controversy. To tamper with the spontaneity of that clash and controversy is to pollute the mainsprings of policy at the source. The various professions, crafts, trades and academic institutions alone can perform this function. Other agencies can be used, by other means, to further national interests at stake in direct competition with our cold war opponents.

The competition for the control of various international professional groups is a political struggle common to our time. Perhaps we cannot escape it. Our opponents in this struggle have no existence, no policy, no purpose other than that of their governments. They come to this battlefield better financed, better indoctrinated, better coordinated than do our representatives. And so, in the short run, they may win some contests that we would not wish to lose. But few of these battles are of such serious consequence that we can afford to win them by means that imperil the very freedoms we struggle to preserve. And where they are of that importance, and no other alternative is available, open, avowed, admitted and on-the-record governmental support surely would be the best way to accomplish our purposes. It is, in any case, the way that does not hazard the survival of our domestic society in order to win a point in the struggle for the control of international groups.

The full dimensions of the CIA operation are not yet known. What is known indicates that the CIA has been used to channel Federal funds into private groups for the good purpose of contending for the control of many international bodies. That has had a catastrophic effect on the creditability of some of these groups. But so far, no one has suggested a worse misuse of Federal funds that such secrecy might make possible in the future. This power and authority raises a specter of corruption that has alarmed every free people since the Walpole government in Great Britain used its secret funds to corrupt the Parliament itself. It is not alleged that this has happened here—but the almost unrestricted discretion of the CIA to spend what and where it will could be perverted. It ought to appall Americans to know that an agency of their Government (for a good purpose) has prejudiced the independence of private groups important in their intellectual life. Unless appropriate steps are taken, it may appall them even more, at some future time, to discover that such an agency has prejudiced the integrity of private organizations for a bad purpose. Some of the groups already involved have great power in this country. Their favor or opposition, in some cases, is sufficient to determine the death or survival of associated institutions. They could be as useful in fixing the fate of political parties or factions inside the country as they have been useful abroad. And unless the misuse of this kind of concealed subsidy, secret conspiracy and financial corruption is made impossible, this is the kind of rot that will some day appear in this Nation. Now is the time to prevent it by unequivocal, explicit and unmistakable provisions in the law itself that will put these operations under more stringent and more intensive and more continuous review, fixing the responsibility so clearly that no future Congress, no future Administration and no future supervisory board can say that they did not know what was going on.

LETTER TO SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, I sent a letter to the Secretary of Commerce regarding the reestablishment of the weather station at Burlington, Iowa. I include the letter in full at this point in the Record:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., February 22, 1967.

Hon. John T. Connor,
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: Having learned of the tornado which tragically took one person's life and caused injury to many others in Fort Madison, Iowa, I feel it necessary to urge the re-establishment of the weather bureau at Burlington, Iowa. The death, injury, and damage resulting from the tornado could have been prevented if the Burlington weather station had been in operation and, therefore, able to warn citizens of the storm's approach.

Although I represent the 20th District of Illinois, this Iowa weather station was important to my District as it provided weather information, forecasts, and storm warnings for eight west-central Illinois counties. Located as we are, jutting into northeastern Missouri, the weather forecast for western Illinois has often passed us before we've heard about it. We need the pinpointing attention we formerly enjoyed from the Burlington weather bureau for the safety of those threatened by storm and flood, for its value to industry and business, and for personal convenience and general satisfaction.

This part of the Mississippi Valley can generate sudden and erratic switches in the weather that seem independent of the major systems dominating the national picture. This particular area, therefore, needs a special watch. It was promised that the area would be served from Des Moines but last week's tornado demonstrated the inadequacy of that arrangement.

I, therefore, request that you take whatever action may be necessary to re-establish the weather station at Burlington, Iowa. Among the many reasons are:

1. The large area served has been left relatively unprotected.
2. The fact that the station was here, and facilities are still available at the Burlington airport, make it more economical to reactivate the service here, rather than instituting a substitute elsewhere.
3. The forecast record of its 23 years here was one of the best in the country.
4. Forecasting of river stages makes the Burlington site ideal for the area.
5. The IAAP, a major reason for moving the station here in 1941, is operating now at the highest level since World War II.

Thank you so much for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Paul Findley,
Representative in Congress.

PERIL OF DISARMAMENT

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the noted columnist and dean of war correspondents, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, recently accorded richly deserved praise to Congressman Craig Hosmer, and at the same time ably summarized the case against the nuclear weapon treaty in the following column:

Disarmament Would Free Reds To Expand Further

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Which is more important to you: uninspected disarmament agreements with the Soviet Union leading to "general and total disarmament" (maybe) or a halt to further communist expansion?

As an American and a voter you should make up your mind quickly for the chances are you cannot have both.

Uninspection disarmament agreements with Moscow, such as those now accepted or desired by the U.S. administration, can save money for antipoverty efforts, more social security, more subsidies apparently required by the Great Society. Yet, contrary to what government spokesmen are saying, they will not diminish the danger of major nuclear war.

In fact, according to Congressman Craig Hosmer, ranking Republican Representative on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, they are largely a hoax. Hosmer knows war first-hand having had active naval service from 1940 to 1946 (unlike so many of our young disarmers who have never heard a shot fired in anger). Moreover, he spent a year in Los Alamos with the Atomic Energy Commission.

Halting further Soviet expansion will cost money—more and more of it, in all likelihood. For we cannot afford to allow the Soviet Union and Red China, separate or together, to surpass us in any vital weapon, as the former has already done in large nuclear warheads and threatens to do with anti-missile missiles.

RACE COSTLY TO REDS

The resulting armament race makes nuclear war so horrendous as to be unlikely. And because of the vastly superior wealth of the United States, the race puts a greater strain on the U.S.S.R. Yet while that country has already surrounded Moscow with anti-missile missiles, the United States has so far done nothing of the kind.

The greater the degree of disarmament reached by both countries, the more the Soviet Union and lesser Red countries will be free to spread the Red blight by all means short of nuclear war, from unlimited propaganda and systematic subversion to more "little wars of liberation," as in Viet Nam.

The American champions of relaxing tensions know this as well as the partisans of military preponderance over the Soviet Union. But the former believe that the danger of the armament race is greater than that of "trusting the Russians."

Therefore after saying for years that it would not, the Administration now seeks, according to Congressman Hosmer, "not only a disarmament treaty . . . but a nonproliferation treaty, a treaty to halt production of fissionable materials for nuclear weapons, a treaty to stop us from building nuclear delivery systems including anti-missile defenses, a treaty to remove fissionable material from existing warheads." In addition it is asking the Senate to ratify the Treaty on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space now—with no built-in possibility of inspection to prevent the Soviet Union "from orbiting nuclear monsters."

PEACE AT A PRICE

The nonproliferation treaty, which is still waiting for Soviet acceptance, would not, according to Hosmer, make for peace. But it would have another and, to my mind, disastrous result. It would divide the world permanently into two nuclear giants, several nuclear pigmies and a mass of totally impotent countries. Acting together, the United States and the Soviet Union could impose anything they wanted upon the rest of the world, including our real friends at least, until the world accepted "general and total disarmament."

Any such dyarchy would be particularly intolerable to one-time great powers like Britain, Germany, France and Japan.

Moreover, so long as the Soviet Union practices party tyranny and terror at home and promotes aggression abroad, it will remain capable of treachery toward the United States. Nor can I believe that those dwindling Americans who still believe human freedom to be the highest good, will be willing to share world rule with double-talking Bolsheviks.

For these reasons I disapprove of any form of disarmament even with inspection that is not accompanied by political changes in communist countries. What freedom needs is not a loosening of our alliances but their consolidation into an overwhelming bloc impervious to Moscow's divisive actions and deceptive talk of "peaceful coexistence."

REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON REORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW HOOVER COMMISSION

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, now, without further delay, an in-depth study of the Federal Government's bureaucratic sprawl must be undertaken. The House Republican policy committee urges the immediate consideration and enactment of legislation sponsored and introduced by Republican Members that would establish a Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

There is today an administrative crisis within the executive branch of the Federal Government. Hastily enacted and often times competing programs have been stacked one upon another until it is impossible for State and local governments to know what is available for what purpose or even where to go for specific information. For example, five agencies of the Federal Government are presently involved in administering Federal programs for community water supply, sewers, and sewage treatment facilities. There are more than 260 Federal programs bearing on poverty problems that are administered by 16 separate departments and agencies.

Since 1960, as reflected by the following chart, the number of Federal employees has increased by 18 percent and the Federal payroll by almost 50 percent:

Federal civilian employment

Year	Total civilian employment	Payroll (billions)
1960	2,386,345	$12.637
1961	2,372,445	13.648
1962	2,443,808	14.296
1963	2,493,374	15.347
1964	2,488,365	16.205
1965	2,479,489	17.239
1966	2,818,015	18.706

The runaway nature of the increase in Federal civilian employment was starkly dramatized by the actual results of a recent Presidential cutback order. In December 1965, President Johnson ordered a 1-percent cut—25,000 employees—to be achieved by June 30, 1966. However, as of June 30, 1966, the number of employees had risen by 192,000 instead of being reduced by 25,000.

In 1947, the Republican 80th Congress established the first Hoover Commission. In 1953, the Republican 83d Congress established the second Hoover Commission. These Commissions contributed markedly to the ability of the Congress and the agencies themselves to improve efficiency and to eliminate duplication of executive functions. Unfortunately, since the second Hoover Commission completed its work in 1955, there has been no overall study of the mushrooming agencies and departments of the Federal Government.

In recent years there has been a flood of poorly coordinated and ofttimes conflicting statements and directives of authority have, in certain instances, from the various executive departments and agencies. The lack of communication and the absence of clear-cut lines led to embarrassing confusion, damaging contradictions and an apparent paralysis at the policymaking level of government. A new Commission could survey this problem and suggest ways to restore order, improve communications and coordinate decisions.

We believe that a major revision and reform of the executive branch is absolutely essential. Old departments and agencies that were created and organized to meet the problems of the first half of the 20th century should be carefully studied. It may be that certain agencies and departments should be phased out or combined in order to achieve maximum efficiency at a minimum cost. However, changes of this type must be made on the basis of careful and thorough studies that are conducted well above partisan politics and interagency power fights. A sporadic or a piecemeal reorganization could mean more rather than fewer problems.

A Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government could provide the thoughtful and careful reorganization that is so desperately needed. If the Commission had been in operation during the 89th Congress pursuant to the recommendations of the policy committee and the Republican Members of the House of Representatives, the establishment of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Transportation could have been an integral part of a general executive branch reorganization rather than just two isolated regroupings. Moreover the Johnson-Humphrey administration's proposed merger of the Commerce and Labor Departments could now be considered within the framework of an overall study and broad recommendations rather than on the basis of quickly garnered facts and surface appraisals.

FINO INTRODUCES BILL TO IMPROVE VIETNAM MAIL SERVICE

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to first, extend free mailing privileges to all service personnel in service overseas or hospitalized as a result of injury incurred while on active duty; second, limit cost of airmailing parcels to servicemen to surface mail rates; and third, extend the airlift category of mail so that all servicemen overseas can get newspapers and such mail by plane, rather than only those in a combat zone.

I believe that we owe our boys in the field full-fledged and fast mail service. Certainly the expense of providing this service will be much less than the cost of a single jet bomber.

Given our troop deployment in Asia, a lot of men are stationed in out-of-the way places which are not combat areas. Presently only the troops in combat areas are on the receiving end of mailing privileges. This should be changed.

Perhaps even more important is the question of airmail rates for parcels. Unless a parcel is sent airmail, it will take forever to get to Vietnam, but the cost is prohibitive. My bill would let parcels sent to servicemen overseas go by airmail but at surface rates. This would make airmail costs to Vietnam reasonable.

If there is any question about how we can pay for these benefits in a deficit budget year, I have an easy answer—cut the poverty program and cut foreign aid.

This same bill has already been introduced by Post Office Committee Chairman DULSKI and other committee members.

THE AMERICAN INTEREST IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, since becoming interested in the Rhodesian affair and the resolution imposing compulsory sanctions upon that country, I have discovered a great lack of understanding on the part of our own people about the possible results of our action in siding with England in connection with the imposition of the sanctions.

Recently Mr. John Davenport of New York, who is a journalist and an author, delivered an address entitled, "The American Interest in Southern Africa," which shows rather clearly the situation which exists in southern Africa, and why the majority rule cannot be imposed on either Rhodesia or the Republic of South Africa at this time.

Mr. Davenport's address follows:

THE AMERICAN INTEREST IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

(A critique of U.S. and U.N. policy toward a third of a continent, delivered before certain students of political economy in February 1967, by John Davenport[1])

Gentlemen, I am very honored to be asked to speak in a purely personal capacity, and not as the representative of any organization or publication, to this distinguished group. I do so with some reluctance because what I shall have to say will not be pleasant, and I am cognizant of the old adage that fools rush in where angels fear to tread. I believe that my country, our country, is on dangerous collision course with what I shall be calling southern Africa and that our policies are currently misguided and misdirected. It is time that we recognized this and tried in our individual capacities to rectify matters before incalculable harm is done.

As you all know, southern Africa, where it was my privilege to travel last summer, is an enormous and complex region. It includes the Republic of South Africa, its legal dependency, South West Africa, the newly declared independent state of Rhodesia, and finally the Portuguese possessions of Angola and Mozambique, to which I can refer only in passing. It is an area of many races, cultures, and languages. It also includes many natural wonders—rolling veldt, high mountains, rivers and waterfalls, and abundant game parks where lions, tigers, elephants, and other wild animals roam at will.

---

[1] Mr. Davenport is a New York journalist and author of the book, *The U.S. Economy*. Opinions herein contained are strictly personal and can be attributed to no organization or publication.

But as you have perhaps already gathered, it is not these animals of which I wish to speak. My concern is rather with certain big game hunters who have taken it upon themselves to wage an unremitting ideological war against this southern third of the continent, where it is charged that the white man continues to exploit, and indeed to enslave, the black man through such condemned practices as apartheid, discrimination, denial of majority rule, and other so-called crimes against humanity.

I propose to deal with some of these charges in the context of actual fact, but let me make one point abundantly plain in the beginning. Even *if* conditions in this part of the world were as bad as they are so often painted—and it is a big if—this would not in my opinion justify present U.N. and U.S. actions. United States foreign policy cannot, in my judgment, be based on vague ideological abstractions such as majority rule, one man one vote, and other cliches, good or bad. Foreign policy, which implies in the last analysis willingness to fight, must be based on hard-headed assessment of this country's fundamental national interest.

THE POWERHOUSE OF SOUTH AFRICA

I believe this holds particularly true in the case of the Republic of South Africa, where, at first glance anyway, the U.S. national interest would seem to dictate a policy of accommodation, understanding, and respect for international decorum. This is partly because the U.S. generally honors economic progress, and certainly South Africa can display plenty of that. We Americans are justly proud of the fact that, with only about 6% of the world's population, we produce about 33% of the world's goods and services. Well, the Republic of South Africa can in a way match this record. With just about 6% of the population of the African continent, and with only 4% of its land area, it produces no less than 25% of the entire continent's product, and some 40% of its industrial output!

That is, indeed, a stunning statistic, but it is not all that binds or should bind South Africa and the West together. U.S. business firms have now invested well over $600 million in South Africa's mines and factories, and Britain has invested four times that amount. In 1965 South African imports ran to no less than $2.5 billion—one quarter of the imports of the entire African continent, and its commercial exports ran to about $1.5 billion. It is a major producer of uranium and the world's largest producer of chrome, manganese, and diamonds. More important still, it supplies no less than 70% of the gold production of the West, which balances its accounts with the outside world and which also serves as the vital buttress of our international monetary system. Finally, let me remind you that South Africa, by its very geographic position, has certain strategic advantages. Its tracking station is used in almost every space shot which the U.S. makes. It has harbors which command the vital Atlantic approaches to the Indian Ocean.

Now given all that, and given the fact that South Africa leads all other African states in per capita income, one might suppose that our relations with this republic would be of the closest. This is not the case. At recent Congressional hearings various pressure groups advocated that U.S. business should cut all connections with South Africa, and the United Nations has passed no less than 100 resolutions condemning South Africa and its policies. What policies? You all know the answer. The dread word here is *apartheid,* meaning specifically the separation of the races, and it is on that rock that all efforts to maintain friendly relations with South Africa and its dependency, South West Africa, have foundered.

TWO FACES OF APARTHEID

So I feel today in duty bound to comment on this business of apartheid, laying down some broad distinctions or guidelines in the beginning which are all too often overlooked. In the first place, separation of the races is not necessarily the same thing as *exploitation* of one race by another, and I believe that rising income levels for all in South Africa, and increasing education for all, tend to make good this distinction. In the second place, apartheid is not the same thing as the problem of majority rule, though linked with it. In the third place, I must say that I find nothing abhorrent in the separation of the races so long as such separation is *voluntarily* chosen by those concerned. *De facto* and voluntary separation of the races has always existed and probably always will exist to greater or less extent. It is because South Africa has made *de facto* separation a *de jure* separation, because the state has intervened to make separation stick, that its policies prick the conscience of the West and of many of us in this room.

Yet I also believe it is necessary to understand how these policies evolved and what exactly they entail if we are to pass rational judgment in this matter. And here the whole history of South Africa differs from the American experience. When the Cavalier and the Puritan—your ancestors and mine—first came to American shores, they found it already inhabited by a fairly large population of native Indian tribes, which they proceeded, I am sorry to say, to exploit and indeed nearly to exterminate. That was *our* solution of the only real colonial problem we have ever faced. South African experience is quite different. When in the 17th century Dutch and then English settlers landed at Cape Town, they found a few scattered tribes such as the Hottentots, but otherwise the great area which today comprises the Republic lay bare and empty. It was only later, when the white man pushed into the interior, that he encountered large numbers of black, or Bantus, pushing at the same time down from central Africa, that a real racial problem arose.

And this problem, it is important to note, has grown to its present proportions precisely because the whites did *not* kill off these alien races as we Americans did. On the contrary, they allowed them to wax and multiply and to increase their numbers through further immigration. Even today it is extraordinary that thousands of blacks from northern Africa continue to enter the Republic which reputedly enslaves them. As the saying goes, they continue to "vote with their feet" for South Africa precisely because they find higher living standards and economic advance.

The second point I would emphasize is that, due to this multiplication and immigration, the racial mix in South Africa today is a highly complicated one. The descendants of the early Dutch and British pioneers, who largely built the country and who, unlike the European in other parts of Africa, have no Western homeland to return to, now number about 3,500,000. Early mingling of whites and Hottentots has produced the so-called Coloreds, now numbering nearly 2,000,000. Indentured servants coming from India in the 19th century have built up their own Indian society numbering about 500,000. Finally, and this is the real problem, there are now some 12,500,000 blacks or Bantus, belonging to many different tribes and speaking no less than seven different languages and many more dialects, who in part live in South African cities and on its farms and in part live on native reservations initially set aside for them to prevent their exploitation.

Now it is the considered policy of the South African government, which is today controlled by the white minority, that no good can come of trying to jumble and mix this great diversity of racial groups into a single centralized nation state along European democratic lines. Believing so, apartheid has taken two different forms, one negative and one positive. Where whites and blacks live in close contact with each other in city and on farm, they can work together by day but they must occupy separate living quarters. To make this separation stick involves minute rules as to where and how people shall live. It also involves minute rules, applying especially to the Bantu, as to when and how he can enter urban areas and how he can shift jobs. His "passbook", as the saying goes, is his vital passport so far as his movement within the country is concerned.

Now I cannot say that as an old-fashioned liberal I like this system. It involves a high concentration of government power and often discretionary power. It cuts all too often against the grain of the free market, which, as our good friend Professor Hutt as well as Dr. von Mises have again and again pointed out, works best where men and women can work where they choose, for what they can get and for what they are worth. Yet I am also bound to say that I see no way by which the system could be suddenly reformed or abolished without unbearable racial tension, and I must also point out that under it very considerable social progress has been made. In the early days South Africa tried the experiment of just letting the Bantu immigrate to the city at his own free will. This bred some of the worst slums in the world. Today that is getting to be a thing of the past. While controlling the influx of Bantus into the cities, the government has largely rehoused all that are there. Today new homes for non-whites are going up at the rate of sixty per day. There have also been enormous steps forward in education. Over 80% of all Bantu children of school age are now in school. The educational record is far better than in most of the other states of Africa.

Finally, I would point out that South Africa has not stopped short at just keeping the races separate where they exist today. It is planning for the future in what can be called a positive way. As noted, a large segment of the Bantu population—indeed, 40% of it—still lives on native reserves of homelands scattered around the country. The government is making a very considerable effort to develop these homelands into going economic concerns and to give their inhabitants a kind of home rule. In theory, at least, every Bantu, no matter where he works, will be a citizen of a so-called Bantustan. He will vote for his parliament there just as white South Africans now vote for their central parliament in Cape Town. Progress along this line has been made in an area called the Transkei. It has also been given a boost by the fact that the former British protectorate of Basutoland has now become the independent state of Lesotho, and that the protectorate of Swaziland will presently achieve this condition. These areas are completely surrounded by South Africa, which is now forging with them the closest political and economic ties. I suppose that I should offend many modern Liberals if I called what is going on an experiment in "creative federalism." I will say that the principle of federalism as applied to different races and, indeed, different nationalities holds out great hope for South Africa and for all of southern Africa.

In any case, you will see that the domestic and also the foreign policy of South Africa is far more constructive than you are apt to gather from your newspapers. Admittedly, much remains to be done. For while the theory of separate development as enunciated by the late Hendrik Verwoerd may indeed be a way to harmonize the interests of the European and the Bantu, it leaves unresolved what will happen to other groups—notably the status of the Coloreds, who are tied in closely with the white community but who are today denied political privileges. Yet there is a strong pressure within South Africa itself to resolve this particular problem, and that is precisely where the pressure should be coming from. What solves nothing is the constant pounding of outside critics who prefer to talk in the stale language of coming "blood baths" rather than to face realities. What is being done merits better than epithets and scorn. It deserves, if not blank-check approval, at least the civilized give and take of opinion in what Clarence Randall has called "constructive dialogue." That too is my hope for U.S. relations with South Africa.

THE CASE OF SOUTH WEST AFRICA

Unfortunately, those relations are now being disturbed and brought to the boiling point, not just by often ill-informed opinion about South Africa, but by overt attack in the United Nations and elsewhere on its policies in South West Africa and by the situation that has developed in Rhodesia. I should like to deal with South West Africa first because it is probably least familiar to you. It is an enormous and largely arid territory twice the size of California and very sparsely populated (less than two inhabitants per square mile—that's right, per square mile!), which stretches down along the Atlantic between Angola to the north and South Africa. Despite its rugged terrain and sparse population, it is an area of great strategic value precisely because it commands the southern approaches to the Republic and because it likewise commands shipping trade down the long African Atlantic coastline.

As you will recall, this strange territory, now populated by some 75,000 whites and 450,000 blacks, has had a weird political history. In the 19th century the Germans under Kaiser Wilhelm made an abortive attempt to colonize it. In World War I the territory was captured by British and South African troops, and at that time, and indeed later, South Africa could easily have annexed it. Instead it accepted a Class C League of Nations mandate over the territory under a "sacred trust" agreement to care for the "material and moral" well-being of its inhabitants. From that day in 1919 forward, South Africa has, as was its right to do under the old mandate, administered South West Africa as an integral part of its own territory. Economically the two are linked by interconnecting railroad lines and roads and by a common currency system, without controls or tariff barriers of any kind. Politically they are linked through an arrangement whereby a provincial parliament, for which, it should be noted, only whites vote, is given certain local autonomy, with power over defense and internal security resting with the South African government.

Now it is not surprising that the other and newly independent African states should view this persistence of what they refer to as "colonialism" in their midst with concern, if not with deep hatred. What is surprising and sad is the amount of venom that has been put into the attack to detach South West Africa entirely from South Africa. That attack has taken several different lines. It is contended that South Africa has no rights whatever in the territory since her mandate lapsed with the death of the old League of Nations after World War II. It is contended that the United Nations as the legal successor to the League of Nations now has full supervisory rights over this immense area. And finally, it is contended that, given these supervisory rights, the U.N. must now become the launching pad for propelling South West Africa into complete independence with the initiation of full majority rule, one man one vote, and all the rest of it.

I shall not try to comment at length here on all the twisted legalities involved in this dispute. *I would suggest that on the evidence South Africa may have as much right to the control of South West Africa as the U.S. had in the case of Texas; and I would deny strenuously that the United Nations is in any meaningful sense the successor to the old League.* I would also emphasize that most of the charges brought against South Africa rule—exploitation, enslavement, etc., etc.—are simply untrue and were so proved in the recent World Court case brought by Ethiopia and Nigeria. But what concerns me most is the whole atmosphere of unreality which broods over recent U.N. debates.

In this matter our U.N. representatives are constantly referring to the rights and the aspirations of the "people" of South West Africa. I would respectfully ask them what "people" they are referring to, for as in the case of South Africa we are dealing, not with one people, but several. There are first of all the Europeans, who over the years have been chiefly responsible for developing the territory's agriculture, fisheries, and industries. As noted, there are also some 450,000 non-Europeans who work partly on South West Africa's farms and in its factories but who also remain in very large numbers in its native reserves as in South Africa itself. By far the largest of these native homelands is a place which, I daresay, you have never heard of. It is called Ovamboland, lying far to the north along the Cuayne River at the Angola border and comprising land which is largely cultivateable given sufficient water. The Ovambos, who incidentally lived here long before the white man arrived, now comprise no less than 45% of the black population of the territory.

Now that is another stunning statistic and one which puts the whole matter of apartheid and majority rule into new perspective. For if self-determination and majority rule were granted tomorrow, it would be the Ovambos who would hold the majority, leaving other tribes to the south as discontented, hostile, and explosive minorities. I do not believe that the Ovambos want such power or could possibly exercise it if it were granted to them. It would seem far wiser to develop at least this area of South West Africa as a separate entity within the larger whole, and that is precisely what is being done. Large irrigation projects are now being installed in the north. Very considerable local autonomy is being given to Ovambo chiefs and to their own peculiar institutions of government, and this is likewise taking place in other reserves—the counterparts of the Bantustans in South Africa itself. Within a generation, and given further educational effort, might not this effort at home rule and this kind of federalism serve the divergent peoples of South West Africa far better than current U.N. proposals to create one more completely independent, centralized, and no doubt strife-torn democracy?

At any rate, this is the way that South African policy and administration are heading, and on the evidence this is contributing to the well-being of the territory. Between 1940 and 1965, South West's per capita income jumped from a bare $42 to $380—a faster advance than in most of Africa. This was partly the result of government subsidy, but it is also the result of creating the conditions of stability and confidence where private enterprise can take hold in cattle raising, sheep raising, and in the exploitation of mineral resources—chiefly copper and diamonds. If South African administration ends, who will step into the vacuum left behind? The United Nations is hard put to it today to pay its own administrative bills, let alone finance an area of this kind. Perhaps the United States will step in, but does the U.S. taxpayer really want to assume this load and this responsibility even if we could fulfill it? Once again my counsel is to go slow, to maintain our critical faculties, but to abstain from and if necessary to veto those ringing declarations in the U.N. which embitter our relations in all of southern Africa and which, if ever taken seriously, could lead on to war. For make no mistake about it, if the U.N. ever actively tried to intervene in South West Africa with force, South Africa would oppose force with force.

AND NOW RHODESIA

And this leads me, gentlemen, to that third area of southern Africa—namely, Rhodesia—where again, unhappily, discord and even threats of force are in the air. In Rhodesia, to perhaps an even greater extent than in South West Africa, the U.S. has been led to a wholly tragic and dangerous confrontation which, however resolved, again demonstrates that the road to perdition in statecraft is, indeed, paved with good intentions. The blunt fact is that as I write the U.S., a nation of 190 million people, is waging an open and declared economic war against a small country of 4 million people which has never harmed American life or limb and which is one of the few countries that I know which accept an American passport without visa! How in the name of common sense, let alone justice, did we ever get ourselves into this appalling situation?

The story is a sad one, and once again some background is necessary. As you all know, Rhodesia, lying just to the north of South Africa, was conquered by Cecil Rhodes in the 19th century and for some time was developed by a private chartered company. In 1923 it became a part of the British Empire under special arrangements which gave it virtual home rule and a strong promise of independence. Such independence might in fact have come years ago had not Rhodesia, at British urging, joined in the creation of a federation which included the former colonies of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland. In 1963 that federation came to an end when first Nyasaland (now Milawi) and then Northern Rhodesia (now Zambia) packed their bags and walked out of the Commonwealth.

In view of their breakaway, the Rhodesian government confidently expected that Rhodesia would also be untied from Britain's apron strings—the more so because in 1961 a constitution had been adopted under British sponsorship which guaranteed the franchise to all Rhodesians, black and white, who met certain qualifications in terms of income, property, and/or education. It was not to be. Throughout 1964 the British government, with one eye fixed on those areas of Africa which have always looked on Rhodesia with suspicion, kept stiffening the terms on which independence could be granted. Indeed, at one point it wanted a definite timetable as to when Rhodesia's 4 million blacks would be accorded full majority rule whatever their qualifications. In the upshot the white minority of 220,000 rallied behind the government of Ian Smith and in November, 1964, Smith made his fateful declaration of independence.

Now I am not here to defend the prudence of that declaration, for as events turned out Ian Smith, a former RAF pilot, by the way, was taking some fearful risks. I am here to question the wisdom of my country's joining with Britain in a policy of economic sanctions against Rhodesia, and to question the reasoning which led us to that step. In the beginning voluntary sanctions voted by the United Nations were backed by our State Department on the argument that we must support and follow the lead of our old and trusted ally Britain. I yield to none in my admiration of the Britain of 1940 when she stood alone under Winston Churchill. I am less than enchanted with the Britain of Harold Wilson. But my main point is that the argument that the U.S. was bound to follow the British "lead" in the matter of sanctions was and always has been hokum. For one thing we Americans once had a little argument with Britain in the matter of independence, and I do not recall that Washington or Jefferson ever fell for the doctrine of the King, right or wrong. But more practically I would suggest to you that in the twentieth century, with most of Britain's Empire gone with the winds of change, we are simply deluding ourselves in talking about the British "lead." The blunt fact is that it would be quite impossible for Britain to maintain sanctions against Rhodesia for a moment without U.S. collaboration and connivance. No British cruiser could or would stop a tanker of an American oil company from delivering oil to Rhodesia. What stopped the flow of oil, or attempted to stop it, was the pressure of our own President and Administration on major U.S. oil companies to prevent delivery. I have constitutional doubts as to whether the President acted legally. In any case, make no mistake about it, this was *our* blockade.

As you know, initial efforts to bring down the Smith regime by voluntary sanctions proved a miserable failure. Oil flowed in from South Africa, and during 1965 the Rhodesian economy survived fairly well. So nothing would do but for Britain to go to the U.N. Security Council and get a vote for *mandatory* sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter, and these are now in force. Whether Rhodesia can withstand this second onslaught remains to be seen, but I for one trust that she does, the more so because I find the further arguments made for mandatory sanctions by the U.S. and the United Nations wholly unconvincing.

These arguments are two in number. The first is that the Smith government is denying majority rule in Rhodesia and that in doing so it is violating the purposes of the United Nations which is to promote "respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion." Well, I sometimes wonder whether those who put forward this argument have ever read the present Rhodesian Constitution whose principles were laid down in 1961 and reaffirmed in 1965. The most remarkable fact of that Constitution is that so far as the franchise in Rhodesia is concerned, there *is* no mention of race, creed, or color.

As I have indicated, all Rhodesian citizens can vote—some on the A. roll where qualifications are higher, some on the B. roll where they are lower—who can show a certain level of income, property or education. It is true that these qualifications especially for the A. roll are relatively high and it is true that in fact white Rhodesians do still control its Parliament. But blacks are also represented there and as education proceeds, as it is now proceeding, at a very rapid pace, more and more black Rhodesians will in fact be given the vote and will find representation. How sad then that the U.S. and the U.N. should pick on this particular country to vent their wrath or their prejudices when there might be so many others to choose from. Does majority rule *now* obtain in Soviet Russia? Does it obtain in Eastern Europe? Does it obtain in large portions of South America or in Africa itself? You all know the answer. If the U.S. is to follow this kind of logic to its bitter end, we must declare war against two-thirds of the civilized and uncivilized world.

The second argument for the application of sanctions is even more fantastic. It is that Rhodesia, with a population of only 4,000,000, is a "threat to the peace" and so falls within the ambit of Chapter VII of the charter which deals with such threats. But it is obvious to anyone reading that chapter that threats to the peace means armed aggression across state borders, and who is making those threats? Certainly not Rhodesia. We are here involved in a cloud-cuckoo-land of legal hair splitting which I am glad to say that such a fine international lawyer as Dean Acheson has fully exposed. In plain English, the present logic of the U.N. comes down to this. If I as a private citizen do something which annoys my neighbor, and if that neighbor starts out to threaten and bully me, then I, not he, am threatening the peace and can be held accountable. Such argument would not stand up for a moment in a U.S. court of law, and I for one find it ridiculous when applied to the law of nations. The truth is that present U.N. action is probably illegal in terms of the Charter itself. It is certainly not benefiting the people of Rhodesia, and it is fundamentally against the U.S. interest itself. I conclude that sanctions should never have been imposed in the first place and that they should be lifted forthwith—in concert with other nations if possible, if not, unilaterally by this country.

FREEDOM AND ORDER

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I end my specific survey of these three great trouble centers in southern Africa and my specific assessment of U.S. policy toward the same. It should be clear to you now why my concern is not with the lions and tigers of this region but rather with the ideological game hunters who have chosen to mount a costly safari into southern Africa which in the end is not worth the price. I would say to these gentlemen—be they politicians or statesmen or just plain troublemakers—"Put up your guns." In the phrase of Charles Burton Marshall of Johns Hopkins University, "Simmer down!"

That is sound advice for many members of the United Nations, who have turned that organization away from its initial objective of promoting peaceful progress. It is also sound advice for U.S. policymakers both in and out of the U.N. If our objective is to promote stability in Africa, then we must avoid pulling down the whole structure of going societies, leaving nothing but disorder and turmoil in their place. More fundamentally, I submit that the problems of Africa cannot be solved simply by trying to export from the West certain glittering generalities which we take all too much for granted at home. In the United States and in Britain we have come to assume that because majority rule "works" in certain highly advanced countries it will work everywhere and will resolve all difficulties. We forget that even Winston Churchill was once led to remark: "Democracy is the worst form of government—until other forms are considered."

In any case, we must realize that current efforts to transplant Western political ideas into alien soils without a long period of preparation has proved something less than a brilliant success. It is remarkable in this connection how the so-called "show-pieces" of the African continent have changed before our very eyes. Yesterday the show-piece was Ghana, until, of course, it turned into a dictatorship. Then came Nigeria, which is now riven into contending factions. Today it is Kenya, where all the fierceness of Kenyatta and the Mau Mau has apparently been forgotten, and all is for the best in the best of all possible worlds. Perhaps so. Yet the central fact to grasp about all these situations is that in no part of Africa are majorities really effective. In all countries relatively small minorities actually rule. I am not presuming to say whether they rule well or ill. I am saying that even in the north progress toward true constitutional two-party republican government is slow and halting.

Does this mean, then, that in the end we shall have to choose between minority rule of the blacks or minority rule of the whites? Is it really that bad? There are those in South Africa and elsewhere who talk that way, but I, for one, hope they are wrong, and I believe that there is some evidence to show that they are wrong. If my analysis of apartheid is correct, then it holds out the promise that in time both black men and white men in South Africa and South West Africa will enjoy very large political privileges. If the Rhodesian Constitution means what it says, then over time—and provided sanctions do not destroy the economy—more and more blacks will in fact join the voting roll in the formation of a true multiracial society. Finally, I would point out that in Portuguese Angola and Mozambique still a third approach to the race problem is being tried—namely, completely free social intercourse and indeed intermarriage between whites and blacks at levels where they are culturally equal. I rejoice that in southern Africa there are not one but many approaches toward allowing the races to live in harmony together. The one thread that runs through all of these approaches is that certain human standards of decency, of education, and of civilization exist and that these standards cannot be lightly thrown away. On this point I honor Ian Smith when he says he is fighting, not for white against black, but for the enduring values of civilization itself.

It is these values that we fortunate Americans should seek to protect and to promote, however the chips may fall. I have said that the first business of foreign policy is to protect and further the national interest. That interest is a broad one. It should involve cultivating good relations with those nations on which we are dependent for raw materials and trade, and in avoiding threats and commitments which can only lead to war—economic or otherwise. It should also involve encouraging where we can a world of individual liberty under law, with the emphasis on the *individual*, not pressure groups, and a full realization that law implies not revolution but evolution, not chaos but *order*. In southern Africa we may yet have a chance to further those ideals if we finally come to realize that political arrangements are only means to higher ends, and that in the end it is the ends that count. Our mistakes in policy, in my judgment, derive to no small degree from reversing that equation. We have been so busy preaching the virtues of democracy that we have forgotten that the purpose of democracy is, in the last analysis, human betterment. Perhaps this is why we have lost friends and influence in the lower third of a great continent. It is time we regained them.

I HOPE MY MESSAGE REACHES THE HEARTS OF AMERICANS

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I have received a copy of a letter from a soldier in Vietnam who simply cannot understand how we can justify expanding trade with the Soviet Union and the Soviet-bloc nations when these nations are supplying assistance to North Vietnam, our treacherous enemy in the Vietnam war. Possibly, he has no background in political science; perhaps he never served in the diplomatic corps. Nevertheless, his credentials are impressive;

he is serving in Vietnam and knows the brutality of the enemy. Unlike some political scientists and diplomats he is, of necessity, in very, very close touch with reality. He asks:

> How can we trade with a country which aids the soldier who tries to kill me?

If I favored this trade with the enemy, I would be hard pressed to answer him. He raises other questions that some officials may someday be embarrassed to answer. His letter reads:

> DEAR SIR: Morale of our troops is certainly not being helped by the U.S. expanding its foreign trade with Communists, e.g., Soviet-Bloc nations. I'm presently serving in the U.S. Army in Viet Nam, and find the thought of trading materials with even pro-Communist countries disheartening, distasteful and two-faced.
>
> How can we trade with a country which aids the soldier who tries to kill me?
>
> Don't the people back home realize that men are dying here because of aid furnished the V.C.? I'm sure they do; then how can they in their hearts indirectly and with premeditation support such a two-faced foreign policy?
>
> I personally find such Americans (who can help another country to help the V.C.) sickening to all that I have ever been taught by sound American principles. People like that shouldn't be American citizens. Let them come fight this nasty war sponsored by Communists. Let them justify to the children of a dead U.S. soldier, their eagerness to trade with supporters of the V.C.
>
> What is happening to the morals of the U.S. people? How can they turn on the men who are dying for their freedom and the freedom of a nation which appears so far from America's shore. Would Premier Ky trade with the V.C. or Communist-Bloc nations? Hell NO! He has *that much* loyalty to his own troops.
>
> Is it too much to expect civilians to assist in their ways of helping us with this war? I pray not. I pray that God will protect us all and guide our leaders towards righteousness. May He guide L.B.J. and the Congress towards the basic American principles as founded in 1776.
>
> Please excuse a hand-written letter as typewriters are not always easy to come by. I hope my message reaches the hearts of Americans so we may unify ourselves in the defense of freedom which our fathers sacrificed to give us. Let us not throw it away and compromise our integrity towards our loyal and dying servicemen.

Just in case some may have doubts concerning the assistance which is being rendered by the Soviet Union, for example, to North Vietnam, the U.S. News & World Report of January 30, 1967, should provide some enlightenment. In the subheading of the article entitled "Russia: The Enemy in Vietnam?" the magazine states:

> More and more, there's a "made in Moscow" mark on the weapons used to kill Americans in Vietnam. Facts now emerging make it clear that it wouldn't be so much of a war for the U.S. if it weren't for the Russians.

The article goes on to demonstrate how necessary is Soviet aid if the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong are to continue to send young American soldiers to their graves.

It is unfortunately true that American citizens sometimes forget that they are the final judge of our foreign policy and not the officials in Washington. I hope that our experience in the downfall of Nationalist China to the Communists in 1949 is not repeated in Vietnam. I agree with the statement made by Hon. John F. Kennedy in 1949:

> This is the tragic story of China whose freedom we once fought to preserve. What our young men had saved, our diplomats and our President frittered away.

Again our young men are fighting to preserve freedom in a far-off land. May we hear their plea as presented in the above letter by one from their ranks:

> I hope my message reaches the hearts of Americans so we may unify ourselves in the defense of freedom which our fathers sacrificed to give us. Let us not throw it away and compromise our integrity towards our loyal and dying servicemen.

I insert the article, "Russia: The Enemy in Vietnam?" in the RECORD at this point:

[From U.S. News & World Report, Jan. 30, 1967]

RUSSIA: THE ENEMY IN VIETNAM?

SAIGON.—Soviet Russia, not Red China, is turning out to be the major enemy of the U.S. in Vietnam. A steadily expanding Russian involvement is causing this war to be the second most costly in dollars in American history.

The American people have not previously been told of this situation that is regarded by military commanders with increasing concern.

Instead, high officials in Washington have pictured the Russians as anxious for peace.

The U.S. policy has been to portray Communist China as responsible for prolonging war and to try to buy Russian friendship by American concessions in many fields.

Sinews of war. The facts, just beginning to emerge, tell a different story.

The Red Chinese, torn by troubles at home, still are supplying light weapons, ammunition and rice to the North Vietnamese. Their aid is helpful to guerrilla forces when it reaches the South. It is the Russians, however, who are furnishing the real sinews for major and prolonged war.

Extent of Soviet participation is great and expanding. The Russians now are investing close to 1 billion dollars a year in the war. With this billion—and no real loss of life—they are helping to force the U.S. to wage a war that now is taking thousands of American lives and costing directly about 30 billion dollars a year.

On January 19, U.S. headquarters reported that U.S. forces in Vietnam suffered in the second week of January their heaviest casualties of the war—1,188 men killed or wounded in action.

The U.S., because it is bogged down in Vietnam and burdened with over-all defense spending that is to reach 73 billion dollars or more in the year ahead, is hampered in trying to keep Russia from forging ahead in the nuclear-arms race.

The Russians, with the U.S. tied down, have made a major "breakthrough" in antimissile defense and are pushing ahead with that decisively important defense while the U.S. talks and delays because of money problems.

The Russian investment in the Vietnam war today is impressive. The chart on pages 28 and 29 spells out that investment not only in terms of dollars, but also in terms of specific armament and vital technical assistance.

The big question. Says a top U.S. officer: "There no longer is any question about it—the Russians are at war with us in Vietnam in a very real sense. They are more important than most people realize in the operation of the war. Most of the trucks that move the needed supplies from North to South Vietnam, for example, come from Russia or her satellites. Many of the automatic weapons that we capture from North Vietnamese troops are of Russian manufacture. Most of our plane losses have resulted from the use of Soviet Russia's antiaircraft guns, missiles or MIG jet fighters."

From another officer: "If Russia were to pull out of the war, so would Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia and other suppliers of vitally needed equipment. Red China alone couldn't start to carry the supply burden alone. Ho Chi Minh in Hanoi would have a tough time continuing his infiltration. It would have a noticeable effect on the war, maybe a decisive one."

Soviet aid to North Vietnam trickled along at an average yearly rate of 35 million dollars until early in 1965, when, even before U.S. began bombing in the North, the Russians started moving in a big way—with SAM antiaircraft missiles, jet fighters, military vehicles, oil, other paraphernalia of war.

The Russian rockets and guns are directly responsible for mounting U.S. losses over the North. Almost 1,000 SAM's have been fired at U.S. planes. These Soviet missiles, launched by Russian-trained crews, have themselves destroyed 30 U.S. planes and contributed in a large measure to an over-all loss in the North of more than 460 U.S. planes.

Cost to the Russians in spent missiles: about 25 million dollars. Cost to the U.S. in planes alone: more than 1 billion dollars.

The North Vietnamese landscape is also studded with conventional antiaircraft positions, about 6,000 in all. The original antiaircraft system was installed by the Chinese. Now bigger guns are coming in. They are Russian.

The North Vietnamese Air Force now consists of 75 to 100 fighter planes and a handful of light bombers supplied by the Soviet Union. About one fifth of the force are the most up-to-date MIG–21s; the remainder, MIG–15s and MIG–17s. The MIG's are replaced by the Russians as they are lost in the fighting.

Russian technicians, too. Intelligence sources estimate there are upward of 2,000 Russian technicians working at air bases and at SAM sites. North Vietnamese pilots are trained in Russia and supervised by Soviet fliers when they return to Hanoi.

Within the past few months, the Russians have taught North Vietnamese to man approximately 350 SAM missiles and an estimated 3,000 antiaircraft guns. Other Soviet advisers help operate North Vietnam's industry, its coal mines and the port of Haiphong, and are helping in the building or rebuilding of hydroelectric plants, other major works.

For the first time, Soviet helicopters are being spotted in North Vietnam. Russian cargo aircraft are also making an appearance.

The North Vietnamese war machine runs almost entirely on Russian oil. In the past 18 months, the Russians shipped in 300,000 metric tons. The Chinese provided almost none. Last month alone, the Soviets shipped nearly 25,000 metric tons of gasoline and oil into Haiphong.

The Russians use ships to transport 80 per cent of their aid to North Vietnam, the balance going by rail or by plane across Red China despite severe restrictions set up by Peking. All told, the Russians are said to be delivering 80,000 tons of goods a month to Hanoi.

Intelligence sources in Saigon report that the Soviet ships going to Haiphong carry not only civilian goods, as the Reds insist, but jet aircraft, SAM's radar gear and antiaircraft guns.

During 1966, an average of one ship a day reached Haiphong. Six Soviet ships docked there during the past 2 weeks.

Tonnage by sea from all sources—Russia, China, East Europe and non-Communist countries—was estimated at 2 million tons in 1966. Of that, the Russian share was estimated at half the total, Red China's about one fourth.

The point is stressed that the number of Chinese ships entering Haiphong went down in 1966, the Russians total up.

China's role. Chinese propagandists, pushing their fight for world Communist leadership, maintain that Peking still is the main supplier to the Communists of Vietnam. "What the Chinese are bragging about," says one Western expert, "is volume. Tonnage from Red China may run higher, but the dollar-per-ton value and the strategic value of Russian aid is much greater."

In the words of another expert: "The vital suppliers are the Soviets. If the flow of supplies from Red China were cut off, the Soviets would be able to handle the whole job. The Chinese could not if the situation were reversed."

The Russians, when possible, avoid shipping vital items across Red China. One reason, according to intelligence sources: The Chinese insist on opening all shipments crossing their territory, often stamp, "From China With Love", over the Russian characters.

Reports are heard, also, that the Chinese have delayed shipments of SAM's and late-model MIG's while their technicians removed them from the crates to make copies for themselves.

Soviet prudence? It is agreed here in Saigon that the Russians have not gone as far as they could in arming North Vietnam. "In fact," says one U.S. official, "the Russians have been extremely prudent in some ways. We think it very likely that Hanoi has asked for such items as battlefield missiles for use in the South, perhaps even for submarines to use against the Seventh Fleet in the Tonkin Gulf."

Another senior officer adds:

"It is clear what the Russians are up to. They want to keep us tied up in knots out here. So far they have refused Hanoi the weapons to wage a bloody campaign against U.S. forces in the South, but is that to be permanent? The Soviets want Hanoi to win, and they are playing a very clever and cagey game."

Top analysts insist that Russia's basic strategy for conquest in the world has not changed; to weaken the U.S. position wherever it can in the world, while the Soviets seek to strengthen their own.

Russia is viewed as supporting a "war of national liberation" in Vietnam in precisely the way foretold by their top strategists.

Despite an impression fostered in Washington that the Russians really want peace in Vietnam, analysts here find the evidence in the other direction. "The Soviet Union," reports one official, "has done nothing publicly or privately to help start negotiations. We don't buy the Moscow line that they have no influence in Hanoi."

In view of the Russian record in Vietnam, fighting men here are puzzled at what seems to be efforts by U.S. to make one accommodation after another with the Soviets—space treaties, airline pacts, efforts to set up more consulates in both countries, attempts to expand East-West trade while war goes on.

In Washington, Senator Karl E. Mundt (Rep.), of South Dakota, said on January 18 he was appalled at the number of key U.S. items already being traded behind the Iron Curtain. He said: "We're doing this in the face of the fact that every sophisticated weapon being used to kill our boys in Vietnam is furnished by Russia. The deaths of many of them could be marked: 'Made in Moscow.'"

Soviet military aid to north Vietnam

	Millions
1955–64 (Soviet figures)	$35
1965 (Soviet figures)	550
1966 (estimated)	700
1967 (Soviet promise)	800

VITAL WAR SUPPLIES—EVERYTHING FROM OIL TO MODERN JETS

Supplied by Russia in past 18 months

SAM surface-to-air missiles, antiaircraft batteries, 75 to 100 MIG warplanes, coastal ships, IL–28 light bombers, field-artillery pieces, helicopters, advanced radar defense system, heavy-construction equipment, bridge-building materials, military trucks, rolled-steel products, fertilizer, pyrites, drugs, surgical instruments, 300,000 metric tons of oil, cargo transports, heavy infantry weapons.

In addition, Soviets are training hundreds of North Vietnamese pilots in Soviet Union, have sent about 2,000 Russian technicians into North Vietnam to train and help SAM missile crews. Soviet experts help run North Vietnam's mining, power, engineering and technical industries, serve at the port of Haiphong, at Hanoi factories, supervise construction of new plants.

AMERICA'S CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the March 1967 edition of Reader's Digest carries a provocative and sobering interview with Nathan F. Twining the retired Air Force general who served as chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff from 1957 to 1960. Asked about the present state of U.S. defenses, General Twining stated:

> During the past few years our ability to deter an enemy attack has been severely eroded. I am convinced that if the present trend is not reversed, and fast, the United States will soon find itself in very serious danger.

It will be remembered that the United States and the U.S.S.R. agreed to a moratorium on nuclear testing in 1958, at which time it was stated that little progress was to be expected by further development of nuclear explosives and that the field of missile defense was designated as particularly barren. In 1961 the Soviets broke the moratorium and conducted high-yield tests which placed them well beyond us in the area of very-high-yield technology. Not too long thereafter the United States signed the test ban treaty which substantially froze our technology in the very-high-yield area.

In the field of missile defense, the situation is equally alarming. Attempts were made in 1963 to allot money for initial planning on an antiballistic missile defense system. Such attempts were defeated and to this day we are still debating the advisability of proceeding with the program. Meanwhile, it is now common knowledge that the Soviets are ahead of us in this area and have such a system, although to a limited degree.

After getting burnt on the 1958 moratorium, the United States signed the test ban treaty, thereby freezing the very-high-yield technological gap in favor of the Soviets. Now, with the Soviets ahead in the antiballistic missile defense area, we are talking of signing another pact with Russia to limit the antiballistic missile defenses. The words of General Twining are worth remembering in this respect:

> If we keep trying to appease the Soviets with foolish offers and concessions, and keep reducing our military capabilities toward their level, and also keep tying our military technology into unrealistic cost-effectiveness straitjackets, I believe we can look forward to a major crisis.

It is ironic that those who favor making concessions of various types to the Soviets' claim to be insuring peace and lessening tensions, when just the opposite is true. The more we place ourselves at a disadvantage by our agreements with the Soviets, the more we increase the chances of war. For it must be remembered that the same forces that shed blood in Budapest, Hungary in 1956, in Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania and in other European nations, is the same enemy that we are dickering with today.

There is one major difference: It will not be quite so simple from now on to just shake our heads when another nation is smothered by the Soviets; it will not be so easy to let the passage of time wipe out the injustice done to free and innocent peoples. For destructive Soviet ICBM's have a U.S.S.R.-to-United States itinerary and the people of the United States are now directly involved. Advice such as that of the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Earle Wheeler, should be heeded now. An antiballistic missile system must be started now and in dead earnest. The objection of some—Secretary of Defense McNamara is a prime example—that concentration on an ABM system would touch off an expensive arms race is similar to the case of D. Jerome Wiesner and the military parity argument which General Twining mentions in the following article. Some Alice-in-Wonderland argument is concocted, U.S. leadership buys it, the Soviet Union continues on its merry military way, and the people of the United States are left holding the bag. It is high time the American people realize that holding a high office in Government does not guarantee infallibility—the mistakes of high officials in the past easily prove that. The hard-nosed commonsense, always a characteristic of our citizens in the past, must be applied to high-level decisions, just as it is used in the average American home.

With permission, I place the article, "America's Clear and Present Danger," from the Reader's Digest of March 1967, in the RECORD at this point:

AMERICA'S CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER

(An interview with Nathan F. Twining, General, U.S. Air Force (retired))

(NOTE.—*In his current book, "Neither Liberty Nor Safety,"* Gen. Nathan F. Twining, who served as chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff from 1957 to 1960, discusses the alternative courses of cold-war strategy open to the United States: (1) to disarm the nation gradually in the hope that communist countries will follow suit; (2) to maintain overwhelming military superiority as a de-*

---

*Published by Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

terrent to aggression. In an interview with editors of The Reader's Digest, General Twining explains why he considers the former course—the one the United States is now pursuing—a blueprint for national suicide.)

Q. General Twining, in your book you express serious misgivings about the present state of U.S. defenses. What has you so worried?

A. During the past few years our ability to deter an enemy attack has been severely eroded. I am convinced that if the present trend is not reversed, and fast, the United States will soon find itself in very serious danger.

Q. Do you mean actual military danger?

A. I do. We have technologically competent enemies who are determined to destroy us. They have been working hard and steadily to advance their military technologies; we have not. The Soviet Union presents the most immediate danger, and clearly is aiming at across-the-board nuclear supremacy. But Red China, too, is rapidly developing an important nuclear capacity.

Q. Won't our ICBM's, our missile-firing submarines and our strategic bombers continue to be an effective deterrent?

A. The force that we have today has done exactly what it was meant to do: it has provided the United States with overwhelming military supremacy through the mid-1960's. But military supremacy is not a permanent fact of life. To keep it, you must keep working at it. If you don't, sooner or later an ambitious enemy is bound to achieve technological breakthroughs which will shift the balance of power in his favor. This, I'm afraid, is what has been happening.

All the major weapons systems now in our combat inventory were started in the 1950's. Since then, we have added nothing significant. We have thrown away more than half a decade of irretrievable lead time in the development of the advanced weapons systems we will need to present a convincing deterrent through the mid-1970's and beyond.

At the same time, we have been discarding existing strength. For example, soon after the 1962 agreement by the U.S.S.R. to withdraw its medium-range ballistic missiles from Cuba, to the amazement of our military professionals and our allies we suddenly announced that all our ballistic missiles in Europe were outmoded and ineffective, and took them out—from Turkey, Italy, and the United Kingdom. The truth is that these weapons were still effective, and by removing them we greatly simplified both the offensive and the defensive problems for the Soviets.

Then we canceled plans to produce a mobile medium-range ballistic missile for NATO Europe, whose vital centers are now within range of hundreds of Soviet medium-range ballistic missiles. We made major reductions in the production of materials for nuclear weapons. We are now engaged in a rapid phase-out of our strategic bombardment force.

Q. What have the Russians been doing in the meantime?

A. Evidence mounts that the Soviets have been pursuing a vigorous weapons program. They have developed a high-yield nuclear-weapons technology, and it seems likely that they can produce warheads of 100 megatons and more. In addition, reliable evidence indicates that they are rapidly deploying an operational anti-ballistic missile system for the defense of vital target areas. There have also been reports that they are increasing substantially the size of their ICBM force.

Q. Do you think that if they achieve breakthroughs in their military technology they will attack?

A. We certainly could look forward to some interesting nuclear blackmail. I think they might attack if they were convinced that they had achieved a clear strategic ascendancy and could strike with acceptable losses to themselves.

Q. Why have we not been developing our own military technology?

A. Two forces have been at work. One is an anti-nuclear clique of moralists, pacifists and academic dreamers associated at influential levels with the State and Defense departments and the White House. These people may be sincere, concerned and patriotic, but they have never been able to acclimate themselves to the nuclear age. They don't believe that the Soviets mean it when they tell us that someday they will destroy us. They insist that our military supremacy has been "provocative" and largely responsible for the tensions of the past two decades. They theorize that if we scale down our strategic capability to the point where it is equal to or even a little inferior to Russia's, the Soviets will stop competing, the arms race will end and peace will reign.

To my mind, such views are indicative of an inability, or a refusal, to cope with reality. But the anti-nuclear clique is vociferous. It has been a major force in the retardation of our weapons technology and in the weakening of our deterrent.

Q. Who are these anti-nuclear people?

A. The leaders are, mainly, scientists who have been active politically for many years. They advised President Truman not to develop the hydrogen bomb. In fact, there might not have been an American H-bomb if Dr. Edward Teller, a scientist who *is* in touch with reality, had not presented convincing evidence that we could develop it, and that for national security we *must* build it. As it turned out, the Soviets tested their first H-bomb within a few months of ours; so it was obvious that they were not guided by any considerations of what the United States might or might not do, but had developed the H-bomb as fast as they could. There is no telling whether this country would still exist if Truman had not decided to proceed with development of this weapon.

Q. Then, in 1958, we joined the Soviets in a moratorium on nuclear testing?

A. That's right. At first we had insisted on a foolproof inspection system—we didn't mind stopping if we knew that no one else was testing and developing. But the Soviets didn't want any sort of inspection. They wanted us to stop our nuclear-weapons program, and to take their word for it that they had stopped theirs. Communist propaganda went to work, and our own antinuclear clique picked up the cry, giving assurances that we were so far ahead in nuclear technology that we would lose little even if the Soviets *did* test clandestinely.

Every responsible American military leader and our more responsible nuclear scientists, again led by Dr. Teller, opposed a no-inspection moratorium. They insisted that it was a trap, and would end in a double cross. But they were overruled. Of course, the Soviets continued secretly, and in 1961 they ended the "gentlemen's agreement" with a series of tests of great sophistication, technological depth and military significance. We gave them three free years, and they made the most of them.

Q. Did we then re-establish the development capabilities we had when we stopped testing?

A. No. We should have, but we didn't. Gen. Curtis LeMay, then chief of staff of the Air Force, organized a committee of nuclear and military professionals to study the military implications of the Soviet tests. When we finished our study, we went to the White House to recommend urgently that the United States get cracking in exploring the high-yield nuclear-weapons field. But Dr. Jerome Wiesner, who was chief science adviser to President Kennedy, and others did not agree. We were turned down. The underlying conviction of those who opposed us, it seemed to me, was that the American posture of nuclear supremacy had to be cut back so that "military parity" with the Soviet Union might be achieved.

Even after we learned that the Soviets had made sensational progress with their nuclear-weapons programs, Dr. Hans Bethe, another influential scientist, said he thought that this contributed to stability and reduced Soviet fears of an attack by the United States. I believe most Americans must find such reasoning as upside down as I do.

A year after the Soviets completed their tests, knowing that they had advanced well beyond us with their very-high-yield technology, our government signed a formal nuclear test-ban treaty with them which substantially froze our technology where it stood. Our proposals for on-site inspections were turned down.

Q. Why is it so important to test a high-yield device?

A. Because the Russians have this big weapon, and we do not know what effect it might have on our missile systems. We cannot afford this information gap.

Q. Don't we have an underground testing program?

A. Yes, but you can't measure underground the exact phenomena which might develop from a detonation in the atmosphere or in space.

Q. Has the United States remained ready to resume atmospheric testing immediately, if it should become necessary?

A. It would take a long time—possibly too long—to re-establish a comprehensive testing and development program. It is impossible to keep together, against a day which may or may not come, the kind of scientific talent such a program requires. People disperse. It is unrealistic to think you can stop such a program and then start it up again immediately.

Q. Is the anti-nuclear clique still active in government?

A. Dr. Wiesner recently headed a committee for President Johnson which suggested a total ban on nuclear testing, plus a new concept of flexibility on the matter of mutual inspection, and a total halt in the production of nuclear materials for weapons purposes. In other words, the committee seems to me to say that the United States should quit the nuclear-weapons business altogether and take it on faith that the Soviets will do the same. The plan strikes me as a blueprint for suicide.

But I would not dare predict that we won't implement portions of it. In fact, Ambassador Arthur Goldberg has proposed in the United Nations that the United States would retire vast amounts of nuclear-weapons materials if the Soviet Union would retire about two thirds as much—leaving the Soviets to do with the remaining third whatever they wished. This is an incredible proposal.

Q. Does our Arms Control and Disarmament Agency do a sensible job of planning and negotiating?

A. Many in Congress feel that the 1961 Act which established the agency exceeded the original intent of Congress, which was to provide an arms-control research service for the President. As passed, however, the Act charges the agency with preparing for and managing American participation in international *negotiations*—even though it is not answerable to Defense or State, and has no overall responsibilty for national security. Of course, those who staff this agency want to succeed at what they conceive to be their primary mission—disarmament. Thus, the agency is bound to use its influence on such matters as nuclear testing and development of new weapons—and to lean toward the concept of "no inspection" or "minimum inspection" for the sake of reaching some form of agreement with the communist powers.

The military assigns knowledgeable officers as advisers to the agency, to try to make sure that the family jewels are not given away. Even so, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency should be abolished and its functions returned to the departments of Defense and State.

Q. You said that two forces have combined to retard the development of our military capability. One is the anti-nuclear clique. What is the other?

A. The rigid application of Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara's cost-effectiveness theory to defense planning. Cost-effectiveness is simply a way of measuring the most economical way to accomplish a military mission. I don't quarrel with the theory. But it becomes self-defeating when it is made the dominant factor in defense planning, almost to the exclusion of other vital elements of judgment. Most military professionals believe that this poses a grave danger to the future security of the nation because it stifles research and development. It is usually impossible to produce in advance, from the thresholds of new technologies, conclusive proof that a proposed weapons system will accomplish a mission more effectively and more economically than it could otherwise be done. You must move off the thresholds, conduct serious explorations in promising fields, give some leeway to disciplined imagination. If McNamara's policies had been in effect during the 1950's we would not have the ballistic-missile force we have today.

Q. Don't the senior military officers speak freely to Congress on such matters?

A. No. The Defense Department monitors everything they say, and the officer who talks out of turn may expect some kind of reprisal. I believe strongly in civilian control of the military. But I don't believe that the military posture of the United States is the private business of an autocratic civilian authority, such as the Defense Department has become. When the elected representatives of the people seek professional military judgments, I believe that they are entitled to straightforward answers, and that such answers should be given without fear of reprisal. As the situation now stands, the civilian managers of Defense have effectively silenced the military, and are tightly managing the news that reaches the people.

Q. For a country that isn't doing much to advance its military technology, isn't our defense budget inordinately high?

A. Yes—but primarily because of the war in Vietnam. Any war is extremely expensive—which is another excellent reason for staying militarily strong enough to keep wars from happening.

Q. What must we do? How should we assign priorities?

A. The Defense Department is making our strategic posture a Maginot Line of missiles. If we fail to reverse this trend quickly, the President in some future crisis is going to find himself in a dangerous, inflexible military position. An all-missile strategic force will not give him much choice in the response we can make, since missiles cannot be used for anything short of general nuclear war.

To ensure operational flexibility, we need a mixed force. We need a new manned bomber, one with great range and speed, and the ability to penetrate existing and projected air defenses. Such a bomber, called AMSA (Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft), has already been through the preliminary design stages. It can be built.

Q. What has been holding it up?

A. The Defense Department argues that the need for AMSA is not clear. The military and Congress disagree. Congress keeps appropriating funds and authorizing the Defense Department to proceed. But Defense keeps saying year after year that it is "studying the matter." Millions for study, nothing for hardware.

Q. What else should we be doing?

A. I am deeply concerned at the lack of attention the United States has paid to the really awesome military potential of space. We have done no significant work in developing offensive and defensive space-weapons systems. Yet the Soviets are on record as recognizing and planning for the military utilization of space; in fact, in the past year they have paraded a weapon that they call an orbital bomb. We have been governed in our approach to space by the same absurd and dangerous logic that thwarted development of our nuclear technology. Now, a treaty banning weapons of mass destruction from outer space has been worked up, and high officials of our government are hailing it as a great step toward peace. I'm sure that the Soviets will respect this treaty just as they respect all the agreements they enter into—until it suits their purposes to break it.

Q. In the past, it has taken war or the threat of war to snap America out of peacetime weapons development lethargy. Do you think it will happen this way again?

A. If we keep trying to appease the Soviets with foolish offers and concessions, and keep reducing our military capabilities toward their level, and also keep tying our military technology into unrealistic cost-effectiveness straitjackets, I believe we can look forward to a major crisis. Such a crisis will be far more serious than any we have been through before—certainly more serious than the Cuban missile crisis. Next time, an enemy who no longer can see such a clear strategic superiority on our side may not be inclined to back off so quickly. There would be grave danger of miscalculation. There could be war. I believe that such a crisis is coming. I also believe that such a crisis need not come. But if we are to prevent it, we have no time to lose. The hour is late, and the enemy is watching the clock.

TAX INCENTIVE WOULD HELP MINNESOTA FIGHT AIR, WATER POLLUTION

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is little question that air and water pollution problems are mounting in Minnesota as well as in other States. The Governor's Committee on Air Resources, reporting on Minnesota air pollution in 1966, labeled air pollution "a problem of statewide concern." The committee reported that at least 356 towns and cities in Minnesota, not including Minneapolis or St. Paul, had one or more sources of air pollution. The committee warned—

> The State can expect to encounter more air pollution as it continues to grow in population, productivity and urbanization.

With respect to water pollution, in spite of encouraging efforts, sewage and industrial wastes continue to contaminate the State's waterways. As an example, of a total 849 municipalities in the State on January 1, 1967, some 366 were without sewer systems and another 32 were without any treatment plant, according to the Minnesota Department of Health. Some 64 additional municipalities have been found by the Minnesota Water Pollution Control Commission to have inadequate treatment plants.

And it should be pointed out that these figures do not indicate the extent of damage to plant and animal life through air and water pollutants associated with industrial plants.

Damage from all kinds of pollution is considerable. While figures on Minnesota exclusively are difficult to come by, it has been estimated that the economic loss to the average individual as a consequence of air pollution alone amounts to at least $65 per capita per year, or a total of over $12 billion per year in the United States. The Governor's Committee study in our State last year pointed out—

> If the per capita loss in Minnesota were only one-third the national average, or $22, the annual cost in the State could come to something like $82.5 million.

Nor should it be assumed that such damage is confined largely to industrial areas. The 1962 National Conference on Air Pollution, for example, estimated that the national agricultural losses resulting from presently recognized air pollutants already amount to hundreds of millions of dollars a year. In a State such as Minnesota, concentrations toxic for certain crops may be found as far away as 100 miles from the sources of pollution, according to the Governor's committee.

The problems of air and water pollution, while mounting, are being increasingly recognized by an informed public. A recent Minnesota poll, conducted by the Minneapolis Tribune, reported February 12:

> More than three out of four Minnesotans (76 per cent) think pollution of the state's rivers and lakes is a serious problem.

I request inclusion of the entire poll report at this point in my remarks.

SEVENTY-SIX PERCENT: WATER POLLUTION IS SERIOUS PROBLEM

More than three out of four Minnesotans (76 per cent) think pollution of the state's rivers and lakes is a serious problem, according to a statewide survey by the Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota Poll.

"Water pollution is caused primarily by manufacturers who dump waste materials into the rivers and lakes," said a St. Paul sales manager.

Fifty-three per cent of the state residents interviewed said that business and industry is mainly responsible for the water pollution problem.

President Johnson has asked Congress to appropriate $306 million to fight water pollution, including nearly $4 million for projects in Minnesota.

Six hundred adults from all parts of the state were asked:

"Do you think pollution of Minnesota's rivers and lakes is or is not a serious problem?"

The replies:

	Percent
All adults:	
Is serious problem	76
Is not	15
Other and no opinion	9
Men:	
Is serious problem	76
Is not	16
Other and no opinion	8

Women:	
Is serious problem	77
Is not	14
Other and no opinion	9
Grade school:	
Is serious problem	62
Is not	22
Other and no opinion	16
High school:	
Is serious problem	79
Is not	15
Other and no opinion	6
College:	
Is serious problem	85
Is not	10
Other and no opinion	5

About one out of four people (23 per cent) agree with the Rochester housewife who said, "The carelessness of the public is responsible for pollution—refuse is strewn along the beaches and banks of lakes and rivers."

"Too many communities simply do not have adequate purification systems."

That comment from a St. Louis Park engineer is typical of the responses received from 16 per cent of the public who blame pollution on cities and towns.

"People living along lakes and rivers completely disregard sanitation by dumping untreated waste materials into the water," said a 39-year-old St. Paul man.

The question asked was:

"Who or what do you think is mainly responsible for water pollution."

The explanation of all respondents:

	Percent
Manufacturers, factories, industry	53
The public, tourists, sportsmen	23
Cities, towns	16
Sewage, drainage from ditches	14
Farmers, fertilizers, insecticides	4
Motorboats, ships	4
Detergents, soaps	3
Other causes	6
No opinion	16
Total	139

The above table totals more than 100 per cent because some people supplied more than one reason for pollution.

Interviews were conducted with a balanced cross-section of adults in early January.

D. C. Townsend, editor and publisher of the Belle Plaine Herald in the Second Congressional District, is among many editors in my congressional district who have expressed themselves on the subject of increased pollution. I ask that a recent editorial by Mr. Townsend be made a part of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

In the increasing discussion on water pollution, particularly of the rivers in or near the Twin Cities—The Mississippi, Minnesota and St. Croix—special mention has been made of the condition of the lower Minnesota river. During the past six to ten years, practically every town in the lower Minnesota from Mankato to the mouth of the river financed disposal plants, and that should have greatly reduced the pollution factor. However, the more than twenty miles from Shakopee to the mouth of the river, serving the extensive industrial area on the south, and the vast residential area of Bloomington on the north, creates the charge of bad pollution in the lower Minnesota river. The afflicted areas know it, but are reluctant to spend their own money in correcting the situation as did the towns and industrial plants on our portion of the river.

From such evidence, Mr. Speaker, it is apparent Congress should leave no stones unturned in doing what is sound, reasonable, and in the public interest in controlling pollution.

I am therefore today introducing legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code to liberalize the tax treatment accorded facilities for water and air pollution abatement. Initially sponsored by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and a great many other Republicans in the House, it would encourage industry to act promptly in building antipollution facilities by giving a 20-percent tax credit for such investments. The facilities could be expensed as they are built or over a period up to 5 years. Certifying agency for the tax benefit facility would be local authority in compliance with Federal regulation.

This tax incentive would apply to all costs of pollution abatement work, including buildings, improvements, machinery, equipment, and land costs. The project would require approval from the appropriate State authorities, however, in order to qualify.

Mr. Speaker, from the research I have done, it appears at least 148 Minnesota businesses could have been stirred to faster antipollution efforts in the last 2 years alone if liberalized tax treatment had been available as an incentive. My estimate is based on a report issued earlier this year by the Minnesota Water Pollution Control Commission, which indicated at least 148 businesses and corporations had initiated some action to check pollution.

Such businesses would be stimulated to more rapid development of waste control projects if they were assured that such sizable investments undertaken not for profit, but to protect the public interest, could be partially written off through a tax credit.

For such important reasons, I hope the tax incentive legislation so many of us have introduced will receive early and favorable consideration.

BILL INTRODUCED TO ALLOW MINT MARKS

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would repeal the prohibition of mint marks on U.S. coinage.

Since the establishment of our coinage system, these marks have been an important part of it, identifying the mint from which our coins were issued. Thus an important part of our historic heritage is preserved in the "CC" mint marks on coinage from the old Carson City, Nev., Mint; it is long since closed, but the "CC" mark remains as a collector's item and a reminder of the prosperous and thriving mint which once existed as our Nation's borders pushed westward.

Mint marks were deleted from our coinage with the enactment of the Coinage Act of 1965. This was an emergency measure, attributed to the critical shortage of coins in circulation at that time. It was felt that coins with no mint marks would be less valuable to collectors, and especially speculators, and would be more likely to stay in circulation where they were desperately needed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Treasury Department and Bureau of the Mint officials acknowledge that the coin shortages of 1964 and 1965 have ended; that sufficient coinage is now in circulation to satisfy our Nation's commercial needs. With the end of this shortage, I feel the historically significant mint marks should be restored to our coinage.

Late in the second session of the 89th Congress, a bill was introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] to do this. It had the support of literally millions of numismatists, who, incidentally, comprise one of the fastest-growing hobby groups in the Nation. Neither the Bureau of the Mint nor the Treasury Department expressed any opposition to the bill. But, unfortunately, it was lost in the rush for adjournment, as business more vital to the Nation's welfare had to be considered.

Now, as we start a new Congress, I hope this bill will be given thoughtful consideration and eventual passage. Its adoption would end emergency regulations where it has clearly been shown the emergency no longer exists.

NATIONAL SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL WEEK

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of this session, I introduced House Joint Resolution 39 which would provide for the designation of the second week of each May as "National School Safety Patrol Week."

I introduced a similar measure last year.

The sight of a young man or young woman with his arms outstretched and a safety patrol belt on is a familiar sight to all the Members of this body, I am certain. They should be. There are over 900,000 patrol members in the United States. They serve 40,000 schools in 15,000 communities.

In addition there are some 156,000 patrol members serving in 20 foreign countries.

More than 16 million have served on safety patrols since their establishment in 1922.

When one considers these schoolchildren, who must be from the upper elementary or junior high school grades, protect some 19 million schoolchildren, it is easy to see the tremendous job they are doing.

Some may ask, "What good are these patrols?" The answer can best be given by citing the fact that since 1922, the year the patrols were first instituted, the traffic death rate school-age children has dropped nearly one-half, while the death rate of all other age groups has doubled.

Each year, the American Automobile Association joins with the schools and police in sponsoring the National School Safety Patrol Parade here in Washton, D.C. More than 22,000 boys and girls from 20 or more States annually participate in this colorful event.

I am happy that this year there will be a contingent of 12 youngsters from Omaha, Nebr., participating in the parade down Constitution Avenue on May 13. William S. Mitchell will be in charge of the group, which is being sponsored by the Cornhusker Motor Club in Omaha.

In connection with the parade, the American Automobile Association each year presents Gold Lifesaver Medals to those young patrol heroes who have actually saved the life of a schoolmate in traffic danger. Among those who have made the presentations in the past are: Presidents Johnson, Kennedy, Eisenhower, and Truman; Vice Presidents HUMPHREY and Nixon; and Attorney General ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

I would like to take this opportunity to invite my colleagues to join with me in sponsoring this legislation, which will call national attention to the wonderful work being done by these youngsters, and I include in my remarks some remarks from the "School Safety Patrol Member's Handbook":

> A good school safety patrolman is always on the job. Make your school and schoolmates proud of the way you appear and the way you act on the street.
>
> Dress neatly and cleanly. Keep your patrol belt washed. Wear it correctly.
>
> Be polite. You are a leader. Others will try to act like you.
>
> A good patrol does not stand in the street. Correct patrol position is to stand on the sidewalk, one step back from the curb.
>
> If parked cars block your view, step into the street only far enough to see approaching cars—never more than three steps.
>
> This is what a good patrol member should do:
>
> Stand one step back from the curb, facing the street.
>
> Give the arm-stretched signal for schoolmates to wait back of you on the sidewalk.
>
> Watch for a safe gap in traffic.
>
> Then, step aside, watch for turning cars, motion schoolmates to cross the street and return to your arms-stretched position facing the street.

THE NATIONAL MEDICAL DEVICES STANDARDS COMMISSION ACT

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. REINECKE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, the advances made in medical technology these past few years remind us once again that we are living in a new age of miracles—miracles of science and medical research. The practice of the medical art has developed to such an extent that the new language and vocabulary sounds like that of the space exploration programs. Words like "automation," "microwave technology," "computerization," "laser rays," "telemetry," and "radiology" are becoming as common to medical doctors as are the "old" words like penicillin, and thermometer, and vitamin.

This is the new language for new events in the new age of better and longer life for our people.

With the explorations of space have come great advances in the science of supporting life in hostile environments. Our astronauts who have walked in space have carried with them an "extravehicular life-support system."

Last year the Nation was awed to learn of Mrs. Esperanza del Valle Vasquez, of Mexico City, who walked out of the Houston Methodist Hospital 2 weeks after an artificial booster device had been linked to her heart by a surgical team under the leadership of Dr. Michael DeBakey.

Artificial limbs, contact lenses, artificial kidneys, surgical implants, nylon arteries, and now artificial hearts—are all becoming an integral part of medical technology and medical practice today.

It is important that as we advance in medical technology and in the development of new medical devices and instrumentation, that there be established some responsible minimum standards for the safety and efficacy of the instruments, devices, and equipment used by today's physician.

Research in these areas of new instruments, medical devices, and artificial limbs and organs is being conducted by private pharmaceutical manufacturers, by private research laboratories, by university medical centers, and by industrial research centers. Much of this work is conducted under Government contract, and under research grants from Federal agencies. The Department of Defense, the Veterans' Administration, the Food and Drug Administration, the National Institutes of Health, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration are now all involved in encouraging this kind of research.

The varieties of devices and surgical instruments, the specializations of medical technology involved is almost beyond imagination. The amount of knowledge yet to be discovered is staggering. In many cases our understanding of medical technology involved is so limited that we cannot yet set any minimum standards of safety and efficacy.

It is important, nevertheless, that we begin to explore this worthwhile area which so vitally affects the health and welfare of the American people.

It is with these thoughts in mind, Mr. Speaker, that I am today introducing into the House of Representatives legislation to establish the National Medical Devices Standards Commission.

This national commission will be composed of 20 members equally representing five groups of interested parties: First, the private pharmaceutical industry; second, the research laboratories and university medical centers; third, the private practice of medicine; fourth, the public agencies involved in public health, and medical research; and, fifth, the Congress, as custodians of the public interest.

The Commission will study quality controls and manufacturing procedures of medical devices, surgical instruments, artificial organs and limbs, therapeutic instruments and devices, and other medical and hospital equipment. They will determine the need for and the extent of Federal regulation of such medical devices. They will advise on such specific manufacturing practices and minimum performance standards as may be recommended to it by the President, the Surgeon General of the United States, the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, or competent private medical authorities. They will establish methods for determining constructive minimum performance standards for the research and design, and the manufacture of such medical devices and instruments. The Commission will also establish methods for determining the medical value of devices manufactured and the therapeutic consequences thereof. And, finally, the Commission will recommend to the President and to the Congress feasible methods for Federal regulation of medical devices.

Mr. Speaker, there is so much yet to be learned about this area of medical technology. It is so complex. The specializations of devices are so varied that it would be impossible at this time to set down exacting minimum standards for Federal regulation. What one doctor in a Government agency, or even a panel of doctors in an agency, would determine as a standard of performance could seriously limit and hinder advanced research somewhere in the country.

For the Government to try to keep abreast of all the advances being made in medical instrumentation would require a task force equal to, if not exceeding, the manpower of all the research laboratories, the medical centers, and pharmaceutical manufacturers who are already involved in this area. The bureaucracy thus created would be totally inefficient and unwieldly. It is not necessary to get the job done.

May I quote, Mr. Speaker, from a very fine address given last July 27, 1966, by the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Dr. James L. Goddard, before the convention of the Association for the Advancement of Medical Instrumentation, in Boston. Dr. Goddard said:

> I believe that protective legislation in the medical device and instrumentation field is probably necessary. I believe many of you here this evening would agree with that. And I would, therefore, ask that you not wait for us to put together what has to be ultimately presented before the Congress, but rather that you actively participate in this process. I would have you evaluate some of the problems and anticipate some helpful solutions. This is the way our kind of Government works at its best, with ideas

coming from concerned citizens and framed into law by public servants who listen to and respect the voice of knowledgeable people.

Mr. Speaker, my bill to create the National Medical Devices Standards Commission will carry out Dr. Goddard's invitation. It will bring together the leadership of concerned citizens in this area. It will call forth the voice of knowledgeable people. It will provide the opportunity for the knowledgeable, the concerned, to "actively participate in the process" to putting together the necessary protective legislation in the medical device and instrumentation field.

Mr. Speaker, I urge speedy action by the House on this important legislation affecting the health and welfare of the American people.

VALUES IN COLLEGE FOOTBALL

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, one of the sports world's top honor events each year is the annual banquet of the National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame. At its ninth annual banquet on December 6, 1966, the foundation presented its Gold Medal Award to Col. Earl "Red" Blaik, famous Army and Dartmouth Hall of Fame coach and present chairman of the executive committee of AVCO Corp. The honors dinner reunited Colonel Blaik with one of his great proteges, "lonely end" Bill Carpenter, who recently distinguished himself in battle in Vietnam. In a day when many colleges and universities tend to ignore or play down the values to be derived from good, clean, hard college football competition, I think it worthwhile to call attention to those values as underscored by Colonel Blaik in his Gold Medal acceptance speech at the Hall of Fame banquet. With the unanimous consent of the House, I offer Colonel Blaik's speech for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Colonel Blaik's speech follows:

President LaRoche, Reverend Clergy, members and friends of the Football Foundation:

We are all inspired by the presence of so many legendary football heroes, and as a former coach, I can think of no greater satisfaction than to participate in the honoring of one of my former players. Tonight I have watched with great pride Captain Carpenter, who did the usual both on the playing field and on the battlefield. Bill, your old coach is awed by your distinguished record and I am proud of your example of dedication to the service of our country.

It would be a gross understatement for me to say I am anything less that overwhelmed by the honor the Foundation accords me tonight. I have no illusion that my credentials qualify me to be included with my predecessors. Perhaps I may stand on the statement, though, that during thirty two years of coaching and eight years of reflection the respect I hold for the American game of football has never wavered.

One wonders what type of game it is that challenged such distinguished and not forgotten men as Stagg, Yost, Zuppke, Daly, Rockne, Warner, Cavanaugh, Dobie, the Jonses—Tad and Howard, McGugin, Alexander, Neyland, Sutherland, Harlow, Caldwell—all of whom I knew well.

THE GAME

It is a game played in some form by over a million young Americans, a game uninhibited by social barriers.

It is a game that in early season requires exhaustive hard work, often to the point of drudgery.

It is a game of violent body contact that demands a personal discipline seldom found in our modern life.

It is a game of team action wherein the individual's reward is that total satisfaction returned by being part of successful team play.

It is a game that is 100% fun when you win, and exacts 100% resolution when you lose.

And if it is the game most like war, it is also the game most like life, for it teaches young men that work, sacrifice, selflessness, competitive drive, perseverance, and respect for authority are the price one pays to achieve goals worthwhile.

It is also a contentious game that has detractors in academic and other circles who enjoy nothing more than the violent verbal impact they bring to a discussion of the sport. I shall, only contest the detractors by observing that, imperfect as it may be, college football during the past decades has been deemphasized to the point where it is now, I believe, quite properly emphasized. Today a solid education is the paramount objective of most college players. For my part, just so long as the college does not shortchange the player on his education I do not become overly concerned about either athletic scholarships or recruiting.

In essence, then, based on long observation, it is my conviction the modern approach to the game as compared to that in the years gone by is more forthright, more sensible, and clean. And I suggest we should not now attempt to over-refine the product.

As a coach I gave our squads ten axioms to go by—If you don't mind I shall repeat several of them and relate each to an intimate coaching experience.

RELAXED PLAYER EXCELS

Axiom—*A relaxed player performs best and a sense of humor and good fun keeps one relaxed.* The squads at Dartmouth and West Point had a lot of fun with their trainer, Rollie Bevan, who was a shrewd judge of young players. Bevan was well attuned to any player who courted the attention of the stands. In a hard-hitting Penn State game a young back went down for the count and was stretched out seemingly seriously injured. A hush came over the crowd and there was a great anxiety in the stands. Now, much to my annoyance, Bevan showed a callous disregard of the injured back and it took considerable prodding on my part before Rollie went onto the field.

This is the scene—Bevan sauntered out to the injured player, but instead of giving the back a whiff of ammonia, Rollie jabbed his toe into the players' side and with each jab, said "Get up, get up, Joe. Get going—the crowd has spotted your number and know it's you. You're their hero and they'll give you a rousing cheer when you jog around."

At that, Joe jumped up and sure enough the relieved crowd gave him a tremendous cheer. By this time our players were convulsed with laughter. Their trainer had demonstrated he was a "Miracle Healer." Suddenly, it dawned on Joe he had been royally taken. He was infuriated — he steamed over to Bevan and stammered—"D-d-damn you Bevan—you made an ass of me."

SAME DIFFERENCE

Coaches, too, supply humor. I enjoy the story on Francis Schmidt, who was the coach of Ohio State in the '30s . . . Ohio State was having great trouble with Michigan and Schmidt, a wild man on the bench who really needed a keeper on Saturday afternoons, couldn't stand the Michigan parade through his tackles. After a long gainer Schmidt bellowed, "Look out there, look at Jim, just look at our All America tackle. There he is—knocked flat on his tail." With that, Jim, at the other end of the bench, protested, "No, no coach, I'm not out there, here's old Jim right here on the bench."

With that, Schmidt cocked an eye, measured old Jim and then said, "Now, what's the difference anyway—if you were out there you'd be on your tail." There is much good fun in football and certainly a sense of humor.

GAME OF INCHES

Axiom—*Inches make the champion and the champion makes his own luck.* In the '46 Army-Navy game, the farewell of Blanchard, Davis and Tucker to Army football, the first half looked like an Army route of Navy. For the rest of the game, this cadet team, undefeated in three years, fought the fiercest rear guard action I have ever seen on a football field. Finally, with the score 21–18, the Cadets stopped the Middies twice on the 3 yard line and once on the 4 as the game ended in a scene of pandemonium. Picture this if you will: A half crazed crowd had come out of the stands and pressed against the sidelines obliterating my last minute view of the playing field. I was more isolated than the Lonely End as my frantic calls to the spotters—Gustafson and Hickman—went unanswered. I later learned that Andy presented a ghostly belligerent stare toward the playing field while Herman, bless his soul, buried his head and pleaded, "Please, God, don't let them do it—don't let them do it." By all odds this was the most starkly anxious moment of my coaching career. But the Blanchard-Davis Army team prevailed—Inches made them champions and they made their own luck.

PRICELESS LEADER

Axiom—*Good fellows are a dime a dozen, but an aggressive leader is priceless.* The 1955 season was most trying for me as we had a lean squad and no quarterback. A coach has never known trouble unless he has the senseless temerity to change an All American End into a "T" quarterback in one season. There was hardly an officer or cadet at West Point who didn't believe this switch was a colossal error. Even my friends of the Press called the move "Blaik's Folly."

Sunday afternoon after the Michigan defeat the Superintendent, my former football teammate, came to my office and inquired as to whether I was aware of the local sentiment about our quarterback. I told him that the team was aware, the staff was aware, and I was aware, but far more important they all believed as I did that our only chance to defeat the Navy was with Holleder at quarterback.

A few minutes after the Superintendent left Holleder came to see me. As he entered the office I got up, placed my hand on his shoulder, and said, "Holly, you played a good game yesterday and I am proud of you. You're making fine progress as our quarterback." With moisture in his eyes, Holly replied, "I know what the cadets are saying, I have heard the officers talk, and I came fully prepared to get my old number back, but I want you to know I prayed all the way here that you would not give up on me."

THE LONG WALK

Now, it is many weeks later. It is the night before the Navy game. As was usual, I took the squad for a bedtime walk on the golf course which ended with a few words about the big game. I recall saying: "Three times this season I took the long walk across muddy fields to congratulate first Benny Oosterbaan, then Ben Schwartzwalder, and then Jordan Olivar. It has been a trying season and I am a bit weary from those walks. Tomorrow before 100,000 spectators and fifty million television viewers I want you men to know it would be the longest walk of my coaching career if I cross the field to congratulate the Navy coach."

There was silence for a moment—then a voice spoke out with resolution. It was Holleder. "Colonel, you're not taking that walk tomorrow."

The Cadets won an upset victory over the Navy. The Press stated it was Holly's vindication. It wasn't—It wasn't at all. It was an unforgettable demonstration that an aggressive leader is priceless.

VALUES OF FOOTBALL

From these remarks you may have sensed I have fixed opinions on the value of the American game of football. I have, and in summary, simply stated, they are three:

One: Football should be secondary to the purpose for which the player is in college.

Two: Championship football and good scholarship are entirely compatible. We salute our scholar athletes tonight as splendid examples of this fact.

Lastly: The purpose of the game of football is to win and to dilute the will to win is to destroy the purpose of the game.

This, then, gentlemen, has been my football creed and I dare say with the active support and influence of this great Foundation college football will not be devalued by the passing of time.

May I repeat, it is an overwhelming honor to have received the Gold Medal Award from the National Football Foundation. I am grateful to the Foundation and to you friends of Football, but more especially I am grateful to my former Dartmouth and Army players and to my old coaching associates, many of whom have come far to be with us tonight.

It is to each one of you then, I give my hearty thanks, my warm thanks, for this inspiring and memorable evening.

Thank you.

TO GUARANTEE FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the civil rights proposals which the President has submitted to Congress are essentially familiar ones. In its broad outlines and many of its specific provisions, this year's administration bill is very similar to that which was debated, modified, and ultimately passed by the House last year.

There is, however, one significant exception. The administration, unfortunately, did not see fit to include in this year's draft legislation any form of preventive relief to preclude interference with freedom of speech, assembly, or petition in relation to civil rights. I am today introducing a bill fill this gap.

The bill which I am offering today is identical to title III of H.R. 14765, the civil rights bill of 1966, as reported on June 30, 1966, by the House Judiciary Committee. This title would provide an avenue of injunctive relief, through civil action, in two types of instances:

First. Where there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage or continue to engage in any act or practice which would deprive another of any right, privilege, or immunity granted, secured, or protected by the Constitution or laws on account of such person's race, color, religion, or national origin; and

Second. Where there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage or continue to engage in any act or practice which would deny or hinder another in the exercise of his lawful right to speak, assemble, petition, or otherwise express himself for the purpose of securing recognition of or protection for equal enjoyment of guaranteed and protected rights free from discrimination.

In such instances, the bill would authorize a person, or the Attorney General for or in the name of the United States, to institute a civil action or other proceeding in the U.S. district courts for temporary or permanent preventive relief, including restraining orders or injunctions.

Mr. Speaker, this measure is in accord with a line of legislative proposals which have been discussed on both sides of the Capitol for a full decade. As part III, this approach was offered during the Eisenhower administration and was passed by the House in 1957. As title III, it was debated during our consideration of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As the Lindsay amendment, it was offered during floor debate on the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Again as title III, this proposal was introduced early last year by approximately 20 Members of the House, accepted by Judiciary Committee as an addition to H.R. 14765, and passed by the House as an important part of that omnibus bill.

In advancing this proposal, the committee and the House have recognized its importance as a complement to the Federal criminal laws which punish violations of civil rights. Title III would give every American the assurance that he has a course of action to prevent such violations, and to guarantee that he may exercise his first amendment rights in advocating equal rights free from violence, intimidation, interference, or the threat of interference. This bill would also give our law enforcement officers a new tool with which to prevent violence, protect American citizens, and maintain civil order.

I trust that the House Judiciary Committee, in considering the administration's civil rights package of 1967, will continue the precedent set in 1966 and will again seek to improve our legislative guarantees of equal rights by reporting title III.

FATE OF POWELL TO BE DECIDED BY HOUSE ON WEDNESDAY

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ruppe] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday we will be called upon to decide the fate of Adam Clayton Powell. There is no question but what Powell misused public funds and has acted in a grossly irresponsible manner. The facts of the Powell case have been carefully developed by a special House committee, and that committee has recommended severe punishment.

The American press has thrust the Powell case into the forefront of America's attention. Before Powell came the strange case of Bobby Baker, and the allegations and investigation of U.S. Senator Thomas Dodd. All of this has culminated in a deep suspicion by the American people of their elected representatives.

I firmly believe that the great majority of Congressmen and Senators are honest and of the highest integrity. But the fact remains that the actions of a few have cast doubt on the entire legislative branch of our Government. If we punish Adam Clayton Powell—and go no further—we have done little to repair the sagging reputation of Congress. It is my sincere hope that the Powell investigation will culminate in the establishment of a Standing Committee on Standards and Conduct. This committee must have the power to investigate charges of official misconduct against any Member of the House of Representatives, and must have the authority to recommend corrective measures to the House concerning that Member. Only through such a committee can we begin to repair the reputation of the House of Representatives.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS AND CONDUCT

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Lukens] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, the new Members who are proposing that a select committee be established on standards and conduct in the House of Representatives are not attempting to be presumptuous, nor are they suggesting that the Members who came here before them have been guilty of low standards and bad conduct. We know that, with a few possible exceptions, the integrity and honor of the Members of this body are beyond question.

But we are concerned with the public attitude toward the Congress generally. Because of a few highly publicized departures from a standard the American people feel is required of their Representatives in Congress, a belief seems to have grown up that most Members of this honorable body indulge in practices of misconduct of one sort or another. It is at this belief that our resolution is aimed.

Our resolution is not complicated. It would ask for the establishment of a select committee of 12 members—six from each political party—to be named by the Speaker and empowered to investigate any violation of the law by any Member of this body. It would call upon Members to, first, make a full disclosure of the assets, liabilities, honorariums, and so forth, held by them, their spouses, or any staff members making more than $15,000 annually; second, make a full disclosure of any interest, either financially or through kinship, with any firm practicing before any Federal agency; third, make a full disclosure of any interest, regardless of amount, in any business whose right to operate is regulated by the Federal Government; and fourth, make a full disclosure of any relatives—immediate family—carried on their congressional payrolls.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that this kind of "gesture of honorability" is desperately required at this time in our history.

The "credibility gap"—with regard to the conduct of Congressmen, has not grown to such incredible size that it is more than a political issue—it is a menace to this Nation. Our people are confused, utterly, by conflicting statements from Government officials about the war in Vietnam, the need for a missile defense, the subsidizing of leftwing organizations by the CIA, the doubts cast on the Warren Commission's findings, the direction of the economy, the cause of inflation, the increase in crime in the streets—to name just a few examples.

I am convinced that this Congress has a great responsibility to resolve many of these doubts and I am confident that it will. But on the question of its own honor and integrity, we cannot wait. We must show the American people as quickly as possible that, in this time of widespread disregard for law and order, we intend to keep the U.S. House as far above suspicion as possible. In effect, our own right to act for the American people is at stake in this question of ethics. We must establish it beyond all question and quickly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

REVISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Poff] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, as Government grows, the identity and majesty of the individual citizen shrinks.

This terrible truth, and the urge to temper it, was at the root of the Administrative Procedure Act adopted by the Congress in 1946.

In the two decades which have elapsed since then, Government has grown in size and power more than ever before in a similar period. The time has come to make adjustments, take up the slack and elevate the citizen's posture to defend his rights in conflicts with Government. It is time to modernize the Administrative Procedure Act. This is the purpose of the bill I have introduced today.

There are many reasons for the dramatic increase in citizen-Government conflicts. Growth in the private sector has complicated life and compounded frictions; in the last 20 years the gross national product has tripled. Scientific and technological changes have brought a new sophistication to old disputes. In 1946, atomic energy, television and electronics were in their infancy. The communications and transportation industries were on a threshold no one fully appreciated. Space exploration was only dreamed of.

Those who wrote the original law in 1946 hardly anticipated demographic developments this generation of Americans has witnessed. Better fuel, food, clothing, shelter, and medicine have prolonged the life-expectancy, and with the help of greater immigration, America's population has increased by 45 million. Population is not only greater but it has become increasingly concentrated in urban pockets. These developments have created new problems, new needs, new attitudes which in turn have created new programs, laws, licenses, regulations, and controls.

As a consequence of these changes and developments, the likelihood of a citizen confrontation with some arm of the many arms of Government is infinitely greater today than it was 20 years ago. Moreover, the substance of the conflict is more complicated and, in terms of both property and personal liberty, the results of the conflict are more consequential. In such circumstances, the citizen's only protection is in stronger procedural safeguards. To quote Mr. Justice Frankfurter:

> The history of liberty has largely been the history of procedural safeguards.

Under our Constitution, the people of the United States are regarded as citizens rather than subjects. As such, they are entitled to deal with the agencies of Government on a parity. The purpose of my bill is to restore a proper citizen-Government balance by insuring that agency procedures governing the settlement of disputes are not weighted against the citizen.

In pursuance of that purpose, my bill will guarantee that interested citizens who may be affected by agency rules and regulations will have an effective voice in the formulation of those rules and regulations.

These rules, including those which govern practice before the agency, and subsequent modifications or interpretations of these rules should be fully publicized.

For the sake of the citizen, rules concerning investigations, hearings, evidence, and decisions should be clear and constant and should guarantee every element of due process.

The practice of depositions and discovery and the prehearing conference procedure which have been used so successfully in the Federal district courts to narrow the issues and expedite the trial, must be adapted to adversary proceedings before administrative and regulatory agencies so far as practicable.

The citizen should have the unrestricted right to use subpenas and to demand declaratory orders.

In the field of administrative appeals, the citizen's rights should be broadened and a new system of interlocutory appeals should be inaugurated to reduce the number of final appeals that otherwise would have to be made to the agency level.

In the field of court appeals, the citizen should be guaranteed recourse to the Federal district courts except where there is specific statutory provision for appeal to another Federal court. Venue in such appeals should be patterned after that fixed in title 28 United States Code 1391 enacted in 1962 so that the citizen will not be required to come to Washington but rather will be allowed to file his complaint in the Federal district court where he resides or has his principal place of business, or where the agency proceeding took place, or where any real property involved in the proceeding is situated.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wish to commend the gentleman for his introduction of legislation to update the Administrative Procedure Act. I know of the gentleman's interest in this field. It is an interest of many years' duration. In 1962, the gentleman was the author of the venue statute to which he has just referred. He fought hard and successfully to allow citizens having causes of actions against Government agencies to sue the Government at home, in their own districts. He proposes now to extend that principle to administrative appeals.

The gentleman's observation about the increasing complexity of the Government and the decreasing status of the individual citizen in it certainly is well put and well taken.

The gentleman from Virginia is one of those individuals who does not merely decry the increasing complexity and power of government; he is a Member of Congress who proposes to do something about it.

The bill the gentleman is introducing today is evidence of the fact that the gentleman from Virginia is a "doer" rather than a talker. I commend the gentleman.

Mr. POFF. I most sincerely appreciate the generosity of the gentleman's remarks. So long as he continues in the same vein I shall be glad to yield to him the remainder of the time which has been made available to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is only a broad-brush picture of the provisions and purposes of the legislation I introduced today. Similar legislation passed the other body in the last Congress. It is my hope that the House will take the lead this year and register its urgent concern for citizen protection in this vital area.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS—PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT AND SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 6098

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight on Monday next to file a report and supplemental views to accompany H.R. 6098, the interest equalization tax bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENNETT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], which I believe is for 10 minutes and which was to follow mine, precede my special order of today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

NONPROLIFERATION TREATY—A NUCLEAR YALTA?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in negotiating the nonproliferation treaty the Johnson administration trustfully looks ahead to a rosy era in which promises are kept, nuclear spread is stopped, U.S. security is enhanced and so on ad infinitum or nauseam, as the case may be. Humbug. Why the apparent Soviet shift from negative to positive on this treaty? I say "apparent" because they have wanted it all along, craftily figured the way to get it was seemingly to be forced, and are now laughing up their sleeves. The long negotiations gave them a forum to spew out venomous propaganda against the United States, West Germany, and others. It gave their atomic scientists several years to turn into lethal hardware knowledge gained before the test ban, in 1962, for 40 tests in and above the atmosphere. They multiplied their ICBM's and deployed a nuclear-tipped ABM system. The same years were those of ever intensifying U.S. involvement in Vietnam. As the administration's peace image tarnished, with wily contumacy the Soviets fanned in it an almost hysterical yen to consummate tarnish-removing treaties. The Soviets watched as they might watch a dog drool for a bone. By a negotiating striptease—peeling off small concessions and hints—they sharpened the Johnson administration's treaty desires while they themselves moved closer to the bone. Why? What, in addition to that already related, does the view of this treaty from the Kremlin offer them that we do not see? The answer is several sided.

A prime Soviet objective since NATO was formed in the late 1940's has been to weaken it and then dispose of it and all other free world alliances. Unquestionably the course of negotiations has reinforced European misgivings over whether, when the chips are down, the United States itself will come to NATO's nuclear defense. At the same time it sees the United States gasping for a treaty which simultaneously will ban Europe from developing atomic defenses on its own and bar the United States from selling nuclear weapons to it for Europe's independent self-defense against Soviet aggression. Is this a nuclear Yalta? Actions speak louder than words and despite Johnson-Rusk-McNamara reassurances Europeans increasingly weigh the advantages of turning from Washington and making their own accommodation with Moscow's desire for world dominance. The seeming "togetherness" of the United States with the U.S.S.R. on this treaty can almost, by them, be taken as precedent. Recently in London Premier Kosygin told newsmen that "whether the Federal Republic of Germany likes it or not, the document must be signed." Almost contemporaneously—to gain West German adherence—headshrinking treatments were given to Foreign Minister Willy Brandt by President Johnson in Washington and to Chancellor Kurt Kiesinger by Soviet Ambassador Semyon Tsarapkin in Bonn.

Another prime Soviet objective is to get rid of the U.S. strategic deterrent. The Soviets deployed a damage-limiting ABM system while we negotiated. This affects the credibility of our deterrent when considered in parallel with McNamara's unwillingness to go for a U.S. ABM system and his refusal to replace the aging SAC bomber fleet. Of greater significance from the Soviet viewpoint, however, is what they may consider a "technology and treaty" approach to ending the deterrent. They may believe, and induce others to believe, that the delays and limitations of underground testing, together with their extensive 1962 test effort, compared with our modest effort, have given them a substantial lead in nuclear technology. Their ABM deployment and the absence of ours could be an argument to this point. They also see, perhaps have participated in, the buildup of pressures for a treaty banning even underground tests which could allow the United States to catch up. The Johnson administration shows every willingness to negotiate it either as a condition of the nonproliferation treaty or a quick follow-on to it. If, indeed, the Soviets have gained nuclear superiority, and before admitting it can maneuver an underground ban to freeze their superiority into permanent being, the U.S. deterrent will vanish. The ball game will be over.

SPECIAL ETHICS COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUSH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this special order, I would like to ask unanimous consent for all Members to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on this subject for a period of 5 legislative days.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time today so that a number of our new Republican Members of the 90th Congress can address ourselves to the tremendously important subject of ethical behavior in the House of Representatives.

First, I want to make very clear that all of us support the active leadership role taken in this important area by our distinguished minority leader and by the Policy Committee. Both have made forceful appeals for a special ethics committee. I hope what we do here will enforce and back up the forthright position that they have taken on this important subject.

Today I have introduced a House resolution (H. Res. 279) creating a select ethics committee and establishing rigid requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities; disclosure of relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists; and also establishing full disclosure of certain nepotic relationships.

Many of my colleagues are joining today in introducing similar or identical resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, the question we must ask ourselves is really a very basic and simple one: Does a Congressman have the right to behave as he pleases—or does he have an obligation to the Congress and to the country to observe certain standards of conduct?

Well, the Republican answer to that is very clear. We feel we most definitely do have an obligation. Like Caesar's wife, every Member of this House must be above suspicion. And if that means a self-imposed code of conduct, so be it.

A problem exists; we must face up to it. We have a responsibility; we must live up to it.

This is not a matter of exposing our weaknesses; rather we should look on this as an opportunity to demonstrate our strengths.

James Reston wrote in the New York Times yesterday, February 26, in a column devoted to corruption in America, that—

> The habit of honesty in the U.S.—in its people and in its institutions—is still too strong to be overwhelmed.

That is why it is so important that we take the initiative. We must make the moves that will lead to a practical code of conduct, because if we do not, if we keep putting it off, we shall be answerable for any misconduct to an aroused and angry America with that "habit of honesty that is too strong to be overwhelmed."

It is important that we now use our energies to find ways of preventing misconduct, not waste our energies figuring out ways to punish it. We are being watched. And if anyone doubts it, he will find out soon enough if the House tries to pretend that the issue of congressional ethics is not a matter of real concern to every American. We cannot put this matter aside again. This time we must do something. It is too late to do nothing.

My resolution calls for the creation of a special Ethics Committee. It goes further. It would make all Members disclose their principal assets and liabilities, their sources of income, their relationships with businesses which are beholden to the Federal Government for their right to do business. In addition it calls for a full disclosure of relatives on the payroll, and it requires the spelling out of any relationship financial or personal, with any lobbyist.

I know that some will feel this is an invasion of privacy or that by inference it suggests that many Members of the House have something to hide. This criticism misses the point.

No one is anxious to lay out for public scrutiny his personal financial affairs, but regrettably it must be done. For rightly or wrongly, until we act and act with force, the country is going to hold us in suspicion. I would add right here that these disclosure provisions should also apply to candidates for the Congress as well as Members. This must be covered by legislation which we should promptly enact.

Some people say, "Oh, this disclosure stuff is old hat." I say that it is not old—it has never been tried.

I have been impressed by the seriousness of purpose of the Republican leadership in this broad area. It is the purpose today of the new Members to add our voices to the battle. True, we lack experience in the House, but we bring to this problem a fresh look. We feel totally uninhibited by tradition in this one sensitive area, because we think we heard the unmistakable clear voice of the people saying on November 8, "Go there and do something to restore respect for the House."

We like the concept of a special Ethics Committee and many of us like the idea of doing more. We must demonstrate to the American people that we have nothing to hide. To so demonstrate we must bend over backward as far as our own personal disclosures go; but if these disclosures remove the doubt that is troubling many Americans about their Congress, then it will have been worthwhile.

Mr. Speaker, I urgently call on the leadership of this House to give us some action in this important area.

I know I speak for many of my colleagues when I say we do not come to this floor today leveling any charges at any Member or group. We come here having taken a fresh look at the problem; we come here feeling we do know the will of the people on this important issue; we come here with a constructive spirit and with open minds; we come here restless with the status quo and eager to try.

We come here determined to be a part of the first Congress in history that has actually been willing to come to grips—forcefully and specifically—with this very touchy and difficult subject. This time we must do something—it is too late to do nothing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to yield to any of my colleagues who desire to participate in this colloquy.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding to me at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Texas for the stand which he has taken today on the commencement of this particular action. However, I would like to add these few words:

This is a statement which has been signed so far by 43 Members of the new freshman Republican group:

> We newly elected Republican Congressmen feel certain that the Congress of the United States—possibly with a few rare exceptions—is composed of men and women who are honest, dedicated and prepared both to preach and to practice adherence to a code of high personal morality and conduct.
>
> We feel strongly that no duly elected individual member of Congress should be singled out from our midst to be judged against any special standard against which we are not all ready and willing to be judged.
>
> In an effort to cause these feelings to take solid form, a number of us have earlier in this session introduced, or are today introducing or supporting, bills and resolutions looking to these goals.
>
> In order to demonstrate to the people of the United States in a clear and convincing manner the fact that these feelings are not ours alone but are also the feelings of the entire Congress, we urge the entire Congress, and particularly the Members thereof sitting in positions of leadership in this Congress as Members of the majority Democratic party, to insist upon immediate study of and action upon proposed changes in House Rules and in statutes that will incorporate these feelings as part of such rules and statutes. We intend to push as hard as we are able toward the earliest possible attainment of these goals.
>
> Done this 27th day of February, 1967 in Washington, D.C. by:
>
> Sherman P. Lloyd, John Paul Hammerschmidt, Guy Vander Jagt, Charles E. Wiggins, Daniel E. Button, William V. Roth, William O. Cowger, George Bush, Thomas S. Kleppe, Dan Kuykendall, James C. Gardner.
>
> Margaret M. Heckler, Donald W. Riegle, Jr., Clarence E. Miller, Henry C. Schadeberg, John M. Zwach, Louis C. Wyman, M. G. Snyder, Howard W. Pollock, Sam Steiger, William C. Wampler, Charles W. Sandman.
>
> John Dellenback, Garry Brown, J. Herbert Burke, Thomas J. Meskill, Chalmers P. Wylie, Wiley Mayne, Charles W. Whalen, Jr., William A. Steiger, Fletcher Thompson, John E. Hunt, Gilbert Gude.
>
> Larry Winn, Jr., Roger H. Zion, Edwin D. Eshleman, James A. McClure, James V. Smith, Edward G. Biester, Donald E. Lukens, Robert D. Price, William L. Scott, Robert V. Denney, Philip E. Ruppe, Tom Railsback.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Oregon and I commend the gentleman for his forthright approach to this subject.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, as distasteful as it may be, it is an irrefutable fact of life that the elected official is regarded by those who elect him as capable of the most flagrant dishonor. Having most recently joined the ranks of this distinguished body, we of the freshman class are possibly even more cognizant of this fact than our more senior colleagues. It is my intention, and I am certain the will of my fellow freshmen, that the code of ethics herein proposed makes it patently clear that defections of honor are totally rejected as a way of congressional life. I urge the adoption of this code, as well as an Election Reform Act which I am today introducing, not as an admission that wholesale chicanery will run rampant without it, but that our behavior will not be modified by its implementation. That the practices spelled out in the code are in keeping with our present conduct.

There will always be those among us, on both sides of the aisle, who will succumb to avarice; the code will not prevent this. The code will make the apprehension of the guilty more accessible; it will, most important of all, make the innocence of the vast majority of the membership of this body abundantly discernible.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I also rise to commend the gentleman from Texas on his presentation of this much-discussed subject. At this point in the proceedings, I want to go on record as being in favor of part I, which covers the establishment of a Select Committee of the House on Standards and Conduct. This is in accordance with the Republican policy committee recommendation, and I agree with it. We presently have a code of ethics in the House which was passed on July 11, 1958, and which sets forth 10 points to which any person in Government service should adhere. I would suggest to the select committee so recommended by this resolution to carefully review these 10 points and to consider proper ways and means of enforcing them.

Mr. Speaker, I insert these 10 points at this point in the RECORD. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

The 10 points referred to are as follows:

I. Put loyalty to the highest moral principles and to country above loyalty to persons, party, or Government department.

II. Uphold the Constitution, laws, and legal regulations of the United States and of all governments therein and never be a party to their evasion.

III. Give a full day's labor for a full day's pay; giving to the performance of his duties his earnest effort and best thought.

IV. Seek to find and employ more efficient and economical ways of getting tasks accomplished.

V. Never discriminate unfairly by the dispensing of special favors or privileges to anyone, whether for remuneration or not; and never accept, for himself or his family, favors or benefits under circumstances which might be construed by reasonable persons as influencing the performance of his governmental duties.

VI. Make no private promises of any kind binding upon the duties of office, since a Government employee has no private word which can be binding on public duty.

VII. Engage in no business with the Government, either directly or indirectly, which is inconsistent with the conscientious performance of his governmental duties.

VIII. Never use any information coming to him confidentially in the performance of governmental duties as a means for making private profit.

IX. Expose corruption wherever discovered.

X. Uphold these principles, ever conscious that public office is a public trust.

Mr. BUSH. I yield now to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KUYKENDALL].

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the gentleman from Texas in urging support for the ethics and disclosure bill and to reiterate its importance to the House and to the Nation. We are all cognizant of the fact that each and every Member of Congress is presently governed by a written code of ethics which was adopted on July 11, 1958. Although I sincerely feel that even this code is really unnecessary to establish a standard of conduct for the vast majority of our Members, I am proud that we have one. At any rate, under the existing code of conduct, the Members of Congress are governed mostly by their own conscience since there is no permanent organization or structure to investigate complaints or recommend disciplinary action by the Congress.

Instances where it was necessary for congressional action to discipline a Member for unethical conduct have indeed been rare. Yet we know that these possibilities are real and I can think of no better way to provide for these possibilities than the ethics and disclosure bill which establishes a Select Committee of the House on Standards and Conduct. This committee will operate strictly on a nonpartisan basis and its work will be geared to enhance and strengthen the standards of conduct of the Members of the House.

We all know that the general public's opinion of the ethics of Members of Congress is not too high compared to the other professions, and their opinion is particularly low right now. This resolution is an excellent opportunity for us to demonstrate and proclaim to the public that we are opposed to unethical practices in any shape or form, and we are prepared to do something to guard against violations of our standards of conduct by establishing a committee for this purpose. We should be willing to judge our own Members and ready and able to deal with violations of our code with measures as harsh as necessary. The other provisions of the resolution providing for full disclosure strengthen our position that we are operating above board with nothing to hide and this is the way it should be.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee for those pertinent comments.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MESKILL].

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as one who has been a Member of this House for so short a time, I would ordinarily be reticent about urging reforms in the procedures of the House. The rules, traditions, and operations of the House have been evolved over the years. Generations of able minds have developed them in response to particular situations and in the quest for orderly, truly representative government. One does not lightly propose changes in a system which has brought just government to more free citizens than any other in history.

But what is proposed today by my colleagues and myself also follows years of tradition—bad tradition. From the beginning, scandals involving various Members of Congress have marred the public image of the legislative branch. Their cumulative effect has been to undermine public trust in our democratic institutions. Recent allegations of misdeeds by Members and employees have shocked the Nation. Three of the major cases are very much with us today. One of them, arising in this body, is moving to a partial solution, at least, by the House on Wednesday. Another, involving an employee of the other body, has resulted in court convictions which are now on appeal. The third involves a Member of the other body from my own State.

In addition, we can read almost daily in the press vague references to other misdeeds. The public demands and is entitled to reform. My bill, House Resolution 166, and the others of my colleagues, are designed to provide not only a strict, fair code of ethics for the Congress but also the machinery for enforcing it. Until this is done, a cloud of moral suspicion will continue to hang corrosively over this Capitol. Let us act now to drive it away.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for his comments.

I would like to add, though, that I am sure all of us as new Members feel the concern that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MESKILL] expressed in his opening comments, but I would also add that perhaps we can take a new and fresh look at this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for his forthright statement.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. HECKLER].

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on the day Congress convened in January, my first day as a Member of the National House, I favored adoption of a code of ethics for Members of Congress. I believed strongly then, and believe strongly now, that such a code should be adopted.

A law setting forth a code of ethics has been enacted for members of the Massachusetts Legislature and are laws in the books in other States. In my judgment, there certainly should be an effective code of ethics for Members of Congress, the highest lawmaking body in the Nation. Congress not only should do this but we have a duty and responsibility to do it.

The fortune—or misfortune—of one Member of Congress is but a shadow of the problem. Its substance, and the larger issue, is the conduct—or misconduct—of Congress itself.

A resolution of the hard problem posed by the gentleman from New York will be worse than meaningless if it is not accompanied by reforms of wider application.

To seat, to censure, and to fine a duly elected Representative for abuse of his public trust without imposing equal demands and expectations on his colleagues, would lend credence to the charge of hypocrisy which the censured Member has already flung at these Chambers.

How can the House content itself with chastising one Member for violation of an ethical code yet to be explicitly defined for all Members?

How can the House, in conscience, settle the accounts of one Member without settling the accountability of all Members?

How can the House slap one Member's wrist without holding out all Members' hands for inspection?

If the Congress does not ask itself these questions, the people will ask them.

Only the rapid development of a congressional code of ethics and its continuing enforcement by a standing committee from both Houses, will deny the gentleman from New York the martyr's robes. And, more importantly, only such a code and such a committee will insure the continued confidence in the Congress of our citizenry.

The country waits for Congress. Let us not keep them waiting.

For these reasons I maintain that the Congress must enact a strict, effective, and fair code of ethics now.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter and certain material in tabular form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues, particularly the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Bush], in introducing and discussing a subject that deeply concerns the people of this country and this Congress—ethics and standards.

We discuss today the ethics in this and the other Chamber and in our election process. This is a subject that deserves more discussion and attention. It is a subject that we must concern ourselves with if we are to continue to have a workable relationship as Members of Congress with those who have elected us.

The strength of our Government, of our federal system as we know it today, depends on the strength of our American system of elections as well as the faith the governed hold in those who govern. Our activity, in the past, in the future and now, will dictate our constituents' faith in our ability to serve.

It is primarily, Mr. Speaker, through the exercise of the franchise to vote that American citizens participate in self-government. It is, therefore, vitally important that we, as their duly elected representatives in this Congress, keep our constituents informed of our actions and purposes and that we leave no doubt in their minds as to the purpose of any actions.

I have joined today with a number of my colleagues in introducing legislation designed to establish the procedure for Members of Congress, their spouses, and their assistants to disclose publicly their income and financial assets and liabilities. Both the resolution and the bill I have introduced will accomplish this important task. In keeping with the intent of this legislation, I have today placed on public file with the Clerk of the House a statement of my financial holdings.

The bill establishing the Election Reform Act of 1967 which I have introduced today will also take an important step toward filling another glaring weakness in our present system. The Election Reform Act of 1967 will close the holes in our present law, the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925. It will make sweeping changes in the reporting by candidates of expenditures for their campaign and the contributions they receive. In effect, it will create a reporting system where now we have none.

Mr. Speaker, the American Legion magazine, in August of 1966, did an excellent job of outlining some of the problems now in existence with regard to the Corrupt Practices Act. The magazine said in part:

> The costs of campaigning in the United States have skyrocketed in recent years, and no end is in sight. In 1912, the Democrats reported spending $1,134,848 to elect Woodrow Wilson President, but in 1964 it cost the Republicans 17 times as much—$19,314,796—to run Barry Goldwater's unsuccessful campaign for the Presidency. In 1948, the total reported national-level expenditures of the political parties was $8,771,879. In 1964, the total had soared to $47,762,890.
>
> It's been estimated that the real, total national bill for political campaigns in 1964, from the Presidency down to town government, was in the neighborhood of $200 million—up from $140 million in 1952. In 1962, when the Presidency wasn't even at stake, about $100 million—or about $2 for each of the 53 million Americans who went to the polls—was spent on races for Congress, state and local government.

Mr. Speaker, it has become the procedure, unhappily, for both political parties to raise the substantial amounts needed for political campaigns from large contributors. My bill is designed to severely restrict this practice and encourage small contributions of up to $100.

A November 18, 1966, editorial of the Sheboygan Press in Sheboygan, Wis., provides a good discussion of the difficult situation surrounding the soaring cost of political activities. I include that editorial at this point as part of my remarks:

Political Expenses

> Three members of the Senate bowed out when the 89th Congress adjourned. Senators Neuberger of Oregon, Saltonstall of Massachusetts and Simpson of Wyoming were not seeking re-election.
>
> Saltonstall and Simpson may deliver themselves of some reflections, in due course, on their experiences in Washington. Mrs. Neuberger already has uttered some sharp words that merits some attention. She went out with a penetrating and disturbing comment on her impressions of being a senator, specifically on the expense of maintaining membership in that august body.
>
> "Everything comes back to money," she said. "It's the one with the most money who will win. It is a thwarting of what we call the great democracy." It seems so, indeed, when measured against what is spent on many a Senate election. She said her 1960 campaign cost $80,000 and termed it "cheap" compared to the $2 million required in an Illinois senatorial election. Expenses in the larger states of New York and California reportedly are even higher.
>
> These observations by a retiring Senator are rather thought provoking. Mrs. Neuberger stands little to gain by making them, and perhaps could generate a touch of enmity with her former colleagues. The Congress in its recent session passed an imperfect bill granting the principal political parties certain funds contributed by willing taxpayers. The Neuberger remarks indicate that once a workable formula is achieved for presidential elections, as the new legislation provides, efforts should be made to extend the system to lesser offices.

In order to help overcome part of this problem, Mr. Speaker, the last Congress passed a $1-per-person tax checkoff plan. I think the law is a poor one and include as part of my remarks two excellent editorials from newspapers in the Sixth District of Wisconsin, regarding this matter:

[From the Fond du Lac Commonwealth Reporter]

Dangers Are Apparent

> Last year the Congress passed a $1-per-person tax checkoff plan for presidential campaign contributions. The foolish decision of Congress represents an extremely dangerous grant of power the heads of the national political parties.
>
> It is estimated that each party will receive approximately $30 million.
>
> Offhand—it is possible to ask why the Internal Revenue Service should serve as a collection agency for partisan politics.
>
> President Johnson signed the "Christmas Tree" bill with a statement saying "presidential candidates will no longer have to rely on special interest groups to meet the heavy financial burden of a campaign." Most everyone still has Bobby Baker in mind.
>
> It is difficult to understand why partisan presidential campaigns should be sponsored by the public. There is nothing wrong if an individual wants to send a dollar to the Democrats or the Republicans, but it certainly should not be deducted from his income tax payments, and, the overburdened Internal Revenue Service should not be saddled with the task of making the deductions.
>
> The trouble with the whole idea is that it places too much money without any restraints in the hands of political organizations.
>
> Robert F. Kennedy, New York Democratic Senator, sort of hit the proverbial nail on the head when he said:
>
> "Say you were my friend here in the City of New York and I was head of the Democratic Party. I'd say to you, Here's $500,000, I hope you can work for the candidate in 1968. . . . And if you have a struggle for the nomination you know that the money is going to go to the national committee. . . . He can easily indicate to various parts of the country that they will receive large amounts of money if they vote in a way that meets his wishes."
>
> There is extremely serious danger when Congress attempts to intertwine tax collections and methods with partisan and sometimes corrupt politics.

[From the Appleton Post-Crescent]

How Not To Finance Campaigns

> There has been a growing concern among many politicians and thoughtful voters that the ever-rising costs of campaigning make political office unattainable for some and unpalatable for others. But one way not to remedy the situation is the tax credit amendment hurriedly tacked on to the tax bill passed by the United States Senate in its closing moments Saturday.
>
> The provision, put into the bill by Senator Long, aims at helping to finance presidential campaigns. A box on individual income tax returns may be checked by taxpayers beginning in 1968 if they wish to contribute $1 to a presidential campaign fund and have $1 deducted from their tax. Couples filing joint returns may contribute and deduct $2. The major political parties, every four years, would then split the money subject to limitations on the number of votes cast in the preceding presidential election. A minor party could get a share only by polling five million votes in the preceding election. According to the formula, the Democratic and Republican parties would each get $35 million for 1968.
>
> The overwhelming victories of Democratic

candidates have alarmed even some non-Republicans that our two party system itself is in peril. The tax credit would aim somewhat at reducing this danger. As far as a valid deductible expense for every taxpayer interested in maintaining the two party system, the credit is probably sound.

But it overlooks every taxpayer's right to support the party of his choice. In order to get a tax credit—and a very minor one—he must financially support both parties. And somehow it does not seem likely that either presidential candidate of the two major parties is in such dire need. The money is needed far more down the line where neither $1,000 President's Clubs nor massive union and fat cat support generally lie. And while there is always some danger of too much power in elections being in the hands of minor parties such as may be once more happening in the New York gubernatorial race this fall, a tax credit going only to the major parties in the form of a $35 million windfall puts an added handicap upon the development of a third party when it may some day be advantageous for our political system. There is certainly the possibility, as Senator Gore insisted, that such a provision is not giving equal protection of the laws.

If there is merit in the idea that political contributions should be tax deductible, a much better way would be to permit each taxpayer to deduct his contributions up to a certain amount regardless of party or candidate.

Mr. Speaker, in order for us to more thoroughly understand the problem that exists insofar as our present election laws are concerned, I would like to include at this point the history of the development of the Federal election laws as outlined on pages 3, 4, and 5 of the "Regulation of Political Finance," published in 1966 by the Institute of Governmental Studies at the University of California, Berkeley, and the Citizen's Research Foundation at Princeton, N.J.:

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

Federal legislation relating to money in politics first took the form of protection against political assessment of federal employees in 1867. This provision was later extended and broadened in the Civil Service Reform Act of 1883 which forbade the solicitation of campaign funds from any federal officer or employee by a fellow officer or employee, or by an other persons on federal premises. A 1907 law prohibited political contributions by national banks and corporations in election of federal officials. A 1910 Act of Congress, providing for publicity of election campaign receipts and expenditures, was amended in 1911 to require similar preelection statements and to limit the amounts that could be spent by candidates for the House and Senate. These provisions extended to primary elections and conventions, but provision for this coverage was struck down by the Supreme Court in the Newberry decision in 1921. Subsequent court cases, mainly U.S. vs Classic, would permit such coverage today, yet Congress has not fully reasserted its power over the nominating phase of the electoral process, and publicity provisions still reflect the Newberry decision.

Relevant federal legislation was codified and revised, but not substantially changed, in the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, which still remains the basic law although amendments were made to some of its provision in 1944, 1947, and 1948. This act regulates the reporting of receipts and expenditures of political committees that are active in two or more states.

The Hatch Act, enacted in 1939 and amended in 1940, established a $5,000 limitation, backed by criminal sanctions, on the size of individual contributions made during a calendar year in connection with a campaign for federal office; the act also put a $3,000,000 limitation on the amount that can be spent by an interstate political committee, to influence or attempt to influence the election of a candidate for federal office.

The prohibition against corporate contributions has been complemented by similar ones against contributions by labor unions in both the Smith-Connally Act of 1944 and the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947. Thus it is unlawful either for unions or corporations to make direct contributions or expenditures in any federal election, primary election, political convention, or caucus.

State legislation has followed much the same pattern as the federal. The financial activities of candidates for the United States Senate and House are regulated concurrently by the federal and state governments, or by the states alone: campaign finance for all state and local candidates, parties, and committees is regulated by the states alone. Only certain committees operating in two or more states or for the election of federal officers are beyond the control of the states.

With this background, we should review the procedures of the State governments and compare that with present procedures at the Federal level.

Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 found on pages 59 through 67 of the "Regulation of Political Finance" provide this information and I would like to include those tables as part of my remarks at this point:

TABLE 1.—*Contribution and expenditure statements*

[Key: Cand.—Candidate(s); Com.—Committee(s); R—Receipts; D—Disbursements; P—Primary election; G—General election]

State	Statements required from	Statements must contain	Forms provided by State or prescribed by statute	Campaign affected	Time of filing	Failure to file reported to prosecutor	Statement inspected by official	Excessive or illegal expenditures reported to prosecutor
Alaska	Com.[1]	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	15 days after P; 30 days after G			
Alabama								
Arizona	Cand., com. & others [2]	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	10 days after P; 30 days after G			
Arkansas	Cand	D.		P.	30 days after			
California	Cand. & com	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	35 days after each			
Colorado	Cand. & com	R. & D.[3]	Yes	P. & G.	(4)			
Connecticut	Cand. & com	R. & D.[3]	Yes	P. & G.	30 days after each	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Delaware								
Florida	Cand., com. & depositories [5]	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	(6)	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Georgia								
Hawaii	Cand., agents & com	D.		P. & G.	20 days after each			
Idaho	Cand	R. & D.		P.	20 days after			
Illinois								
Indiana	Cand., agents & com	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	(7)	Yes		
Iowa	Cand. & com	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	30 days after each [8]			
Kansas	Cand. & com	R. & D.[3]		P. & G.	(9)			
Kentucky	Cand. & com	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	15 days before each; 30 days after each			
Louisiana								
Maine	Cand. & com	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	10-15 days before G; 30 days after P. & G.	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Maryland	Cand. & com	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	20 days after each	Yes		
Massachusetts	Cand., treas. of com. & depositories	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	14 days after P; between 3d & 2nd Tues. before G; & 14 days after G.	Yes	Yes	
Michigan	Cand. & com	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	10 days after P; 20 days after G	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Minnesota	Cand. & com	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	8 days before each; 10 days after each	Yes		
Mississippi	Cand	R. & D.	Yes	P.	(10)			
Missouri	Cand. & com	R. & D.[3]		P. & G.	30 days after each	Yes	Yes	
Montana	Cand., com. & others	R. & D.[3]	Yes	P. & G.	Cand.: 15 days after each; com. & others—10 days after each.	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Nebraska	Cand. & com	R. & D.[3]	Yes	P. & G.	Before & after [11]			
Nevada								
New Hampshire	Cand., com. & others [12]	R. & D.		P. & G	Before & after [13]	Yes	Yes	Yes.
New Jersey	Cand., com. & depositories	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	Before & after [14]			
New Mexico	Cand., & com	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	Before & after [15]			
New York	Cand., com. & others	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	10 days before each; 20 days after each.	Yes [16]		
North Carolina	Cand. & com	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	10 days before; 20 days after [17]	Yes	Yes	Yes.
North Dakota	Cand	R. & D.		P. & G.	15 days after each			
Ohio	Cand., com. & others	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	45 days after each	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Oklahoma	Cand., com. & others	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	Cands. 10 days after P only; coms. 10 days after all elections.		Yes	Yes.
Oregon	Cand., com. & others [18]	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	15 days after each	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Pennsylvania	Cand. & com	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	30 days after each		Yes [19]	Yes.[4]
Rhode Island								
South Carolina	Cand	D.		P. & G.	Before and after each			
South Dakota	Cand., com. & others [20]	R. & D.[3]		P. & G.	30 days after each		Yes	Yes.

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Contribution and expenditure statements*—Continued

[Key: Cand.—Candidate(s); Com.—Committee(s); R—Receipts; D—Disbursements; P—Primary election; G—General election]

State	Statements required from	Statements must contain	Forms provided by State or prescribed by statute	Campaign affected	Time of filing	Failure to file reported to prosecutor	Statement inspected by official	Excessive or illegal expenditures reported to prosecutor
Tennessee	Cand. & campaign mgr.	D.		P. & G.	5-10 days before, cand.; 30 days after, campaign mgr. (or cand. if no mgr.) [28]			
Texas	Cand. & others [21]	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	7-10 days before each; & 10 days after each.	Yes [22]		
Utah	Cand. & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	Before & after [23]	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Vermont	Cand	D.		P.	10 days after			
Virginia	Cand	D.		P. & G.	30 days after each			
Washington	Cand	D.		P.	10 days after			
West Virginia	Cand. & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	7-15 days before each; 30 days after each.	Yes		
Wisconsin	Cand., com. & others [24]	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	Tuesday before & Tuesday after each.			
Wyoming	Cand., com. & others	R. & D.[25]		P. & G.	20 days after each	Yes	Yes	Yes.
United States	Cand., com. & others [26]	R. & D.		G.	(27)			

---

[1] Candidate must file affidavit supporting committee statement.

[2] Statements required from each campaign committee which manages a candidate's campaign before a primary election, or manages the campaign for a political party, and every person who engages in political propaganda, and collects or expends any money or valuable thing in connection therewith.

[3] Committee statements include receipts and disbursements; candidate statements include only disbursements.

[4] Candidates must file statements within 10 days after primary and 30 days after general election. Committees must file within 30 days after general election only.

[5] Candidate must designate campaign treasurer and bank depository. Statements required from banks acting as campaign fund depositories, as well as from candidates and committees.

[6] Candidates and committees submit statements as follows:

a. In the case of candidates for Governor and U.S. Senator: Before the election—on the Monday of each week during the campaign. After the election—15 days after the election.

b. All other offices: Before the election—on the first Monday of each month during the campaign. After the election—15 days after the election.

c. Depositories to file statements within 15 days after the election.

[7] Candidates must file report of receipts and expenditures within 30 days after primary or general election. The treasurer of a political committee or a political agent must file a report within 20 days.

[8] Candidates must file after both primary and general elections. Political party central committees must file only after general elections.

[9] Candidates must file statements within 30 days after both primary and general elections. Annual statements to be filed on December 31 are required of all political committees and other organizations engaged in promoting the success or defeat of candidates, parties, or constitutional amendments.

[10] Contribution statements required 1st and 15th day of each month of the primary campaign and the last Saturday before the primary. Expenditures statements required 30 days after the primary.

[11] Candidates to file only statements of disbursements within 10 days after each election. Committees, however, must file statements of contributions 15 days before each election, listing the names of persons contributing more than $25. In addition, each day that an individual contribution exceeding $25 is made, the committee must file a statement of it. Committee statements of contributions and disbursements must be made within 20 days after each election. A further requirement that individuals contributing more than $250 to any campaign fund should themselves submit statements was repealed in 1953.

[12] Statements required from candidates, fiscal agents designated by the nominators of candidates in presidential preference primary, and state and other political committees.

[13] Statements to be filed as follows:

a. The state committee of every political party shall file, not later than the Wednesday preceding the election, with the Secretary of State, an itemized statement, signed and sworn to by its chairman and treasurer. A second statement must be similarly filed not later than the second Friday after the election. Enough additional copies of the statement shall be filed to provide a copy for the state committee of every party on the ballot; the Secretary of State furnishes these to the committees upon request.

b. Major candidates and the fiscal agent designated by the nominators of any candidate in the presidential preference primary shall similarly file sworn statements. However, the candidate need not report expenditures by the political committee of his party in elections other than primaries. Other candidates need file only by the second Friday after the election.

c. Other political committees shall similarly file sworn statements before and after the election.

[14] Candidates and committees must report receipts and disbursements on the Friday or Saturday before an election and disbursements only within 20 days after an election. Bank depositories of campaign funds must report receipts and disbursements 20 days after an election.

[15] Candidate must file a statement of expenditures 10 days after the primary and general elections. The committees must file statements of receipts and expenditures within 30 days after each election.

[16] Appropriate court may require filing upon complaint of any candidate or 5 qualified voters.

[17] Candidates file statements before and after primaries only. Political committees file statements before and after primaries and general elections.

[18] Persons expending or contributing more than $50 must file statement within 10 days after election.

[19] Five voters may petition appropriate court for audit of expenditures.

[20] Any person not a member of such committee who collects or disburses over $5 must file a statement.

[21] Any person making one or more contributions or loans aggregating more than $100 to a candidate must report these contributions if the candidate does not report them.

[22] Voters can institute *quo warranto* proceedings.

[23] Candidate's personal committees and state committees must file statements on the second Saturday after such candidate or committee has first made a disbursement or incurred any obligation, and thereafter on the second Saturday of each month until all disbursements have been accounted for. They shall also file a final statement on the Saturday preceding the election to contain all transactions not theretofore accounted for. All other political committees must file statements 30 days after any election.

[24] Any corporation, association, organization, committee, club or group which advocates, endorses, or opposes any political party, faction or group or any candidate for office, or any constitutional amendment or measures to be voted on by people must file statements.

[25] Candidates must file statements of expenditures; committees must file statements of both receipts and expenditures. Any other person receiving or expending $50 on behalf of the campaign must also file statement.

[26] Statements required from others who spend more than $50 per annum for purposes of influencing in 2 or more states the election of candidates.

[27] Candidates must file statements 10 to 15 days before and 30 days after a general election. Committees must file statements on Jan. 1, the 1st and 10th of March, June and September; and between the 10th and 15th day and on the 5th day preceding the date of the general election.

[28] Requirements for candidates and managers apply to both primary and general elections. In the primary elections statements are filed with the chairman of the executive committee of the party, and in the general elections statements are filed with the Secretary of State.

TABLE 2.—*Campaign expenditure limitations and enumeration requirements*

[Key: AS—Annual salary; P—Primary election; G—General election; Cand.—Candidate(s); Com.—Committee(s)]

State	Governor	U.S. Senator	U.S. Representative	Campaign affected	Limit applies to expenditures by—	Certain expenditures exempted from limitations	Legitimate expenses enumerated
Alabama	$50,000	$10,000	$10,000	P and G combined [1]	Cand. only	Yes	Yes.
Alaska							
Arizona	$2,500	$3,500	$2,500	P	Cand., agent, and coms.	Yes	
Arkansas	$5,000	100 percent AS [2]	100 percent AS [2]	(3)	Cand. only		
California							Yes.
Colorado	(No limits imposed by new election laws of 1963.)						
Connecticut	(4)	¼ AS [2]	(4)	P and G separate [5]	Cand. [6]	Yes	Yes.
Delaware							
Florida				P and G separate [5]			Yes.
Georgia	(Most regulations repealed in 1962.)						
Hawaii							Yes.
Idaho	$2,000	$5,000	$2,500	P	Cand. only		Yes.
Illinois							
Indiana	$25,000	$25,000	$10,000	P and G combined [1]	Cand. and agents [7]	Yes	Yes.
Iowa	50 percent AS [2]	50 percent AS [2]	50 percent AS [2]	P and G separate [5]	Cand. only		
Kansas	10 percent AS [2]	10 percent AS [2]	10 percent AS [2]	P and G separate [5]	Cand. only		
Kentucky	$10,000			P and G separate [5]	Cand. [8]		Yes.

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 2.—*Campaign expenditure limitations and enumeration requirements*—Continued

[Key: AS—Annual salary; P—Primary election; G—General election; Cand.—Candidate(s); Com.—Committee(s)]

State	Governor	U.S. Senator	U.S. Representative	Campaign affected	Limit applies to expenditures by—	Certain expenditures exempted from limitations	Legitimate expenses enumerated
Louisiana							
Maine							
Maryland	$10,000	$10,000	$10,000	P and G combined [1]	Cand., agent, treasurer	Yes	Yes.
Massachusetts	(Limits repealed by amendments in St. 1962, c. 444, sec. 2.)						
Michigan	(8)	(8)	(8)	P and G separate [5]	Cand.[6]		Yes.
Minnesota	(9)			P and G combined [1]	Cand. and com.	Yes	Yes.
Mississippi	$25,000	$25,000	$3,500	1st and 2d P separate	Cand. only [10]	Yes	
Missouri	(11)	(11)	(11)	P and G separate [5]	Cand. and com.	Yes	
Montana	P: 15 percent AS [2] G: 10 percent AS [2]	P: 15 percent AS [2] G: 10 percent AS [2]	P: 15 percent AS [2] G: 10 percent AS [2]	P and G separate [5]	Cand.[6]	Yes	Yes.
Nebraska							
Nevada							
New Hampshire	$25,000	$25,000	$12,500	P and G separate [5]	Cand.[6]	Yes	Yes.
New Jersey	$100,000	$100,000	$15,000	P and G separate [5]	Cand., com., and others	Yes	Yes.
New Mexico	P: $2,500 G: 10 percent AS [2]	P: $3,500 G: 10 percent AS [2]	P: $2,500 G: 10 percent AS [2]	P and G separate [5]	Cand.[12]	Yes	Yes.
New York	$20,000	$12,000	$8,000	P and G combined [1]	Cand., com., and others		Yes.
North Carolina							
North Dakota	15 percent AS [2]	15 percent AS [2]	15 percent AS [2]	P and G separate [5]	Cand.[6]	Yes	Yes.
Ohio	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000 [13]	P and G separate [5]	Cand. only	Yes	Yes.
Oklahoma	$60,000	$60,000	$25,000	P	Cand.[6]		Yes.
Oregon	P: 15 percent AS [2] G: 10 percent AS [2]	P: 15 percent AS [2] G: 10 percent AS [2]	P: 15 percent AS [2] G: 10 percent AS [2]	P and G separate [5]	Cand.[6]	Yes	
Pennsylvania							Yes.
Rhode Island							
South Carolina							
South Dakota	50 percent AS [2]	50 percent AS [2]	50 percent AS [2]	P and G combined [1]	Cand.[6]	Yes	Yes.
Tennessee	$25,000	$25,000	$12,500	P and G separate [1]	Cand.[6]		Yes.
Texas				P and G	Cand. and com.		Yes.
Utah	(Limitations repealed by Laws 1961, ch. 42. sec. 1.)						Yes.
Vermont	$7,500			P	Cand.[6]		Yes.
Virginia	(14)	(14)	(14)	P	Cand.[6]	Yes	Yes.
Washington							
West Virginia	($75 for each county in State or district)					Yes	Yes.
Wisconsin	$10,000	$10,000	$2,500	P and G combined [1]	Cand.[6]	Yes	Yes.
Wyoming	50 percent AS [2]	50 percent AS [2]	50 percent AS [2]	P and G separate [5]	Cand.[6]	Yes	Yes.
United States		(15)	(15)	G	Cand. and coms.[16]		

---

[1] P and G combined: Combined aggregate total of expenditures in both primary and general election cannot exceed the limitation.

[2] AS: Limitation based on the annual salary of the office sought.

[3] The $5,000 limitation on expenditures by gubernatorial candidates applies to primary campaigns only. The annual salary limitation on congressional candidates includes the aggregate of all expenses in both the primary and general election campaigns.

[4] The amount may not exceed in:

a. Primary campaigns—$10 for each 1,000 voters, or major portion thereof, who voted at the last preceding election for the candidate of the same political party and same office as the candidate who seeks nomination;

b. General election campaigns—$15 for each 1,000 electors, or major portion thereof, qualified to vote for office in question at last preceding election.

[5] P and G separate: Expenditures up to the limit may be made in both the primary and general election campaigns respectively.

[6] Limit applies to expenditures by and on behalf of the candidate with his knowledge and consent.

[7] Limitation applies to the total of all expenditures by the candidate and his agents. Candidates personally may expend additional amounts for letters, postage, printing, advertising, etc.

[8] Limit is $40 for each 1,000 votes cast for Governor in last preceding presidential year in State or political subdivision in which candidate is running; but no candidate shall be restricted to less than 25 percent of 1 year's compensation or $100.

[9] Limit is $7,000 plus 5 cents for each of the total number of persons voting in State at last general election.

[10] Contributions by corporations to candidates for certain high judicial offices prohibited.

[11] Limit is $8 for each 100 votes cast for all candidates for president in the State, county, district, or municipality, at the last preceding presidential election.

[12] State law prohibits expenditures of any money by a political party on behalf of a primary candidate.

[13] A candidate for office of Representative in Congress is limited to 3 cents for each voter in his district voting for a candidate for presidential elector at the last prior presidential election or $4,000, whichever is greater.

[14] Limit is 50 cents for every vote cast for the candidate of his party receiving the largest vote at the last preceding gubernatorial election.

[15] Unless the laws of the State prescribe a lesser amount, a candidate may expend up to:

a. $10,000 if a candidate for Senator, or $2,500 if a candidate for Representative;

b. An amount equal to the amount obtained by multiplying 3 cents by the total number of votes cast at the last general election for all candidates for the office which the candidate seeks, but in no event exceeding $25,000 if a candidate for Senator or $5,000 if a candidate for Representative.

[16] Political committees each limited to $3,000,000 per annum.

TABLE 3.—*Regulation of campaign contributions*

State	Corporate contributions prohibited	Labor union contributions prohibited	Individual contributions limited to—	Solicitation from State employees prohibited [1]	Solicitation from candidates illegal	Contributions under fictitious names illegal
Alabama	Yes			Yes	Yes	
Alaska						
Arizona	Yes					
Arkansas				(2)		
California				Yes		
Colorado						
Connecticut	Yes				Yes	Yes.
Delaware						
Florida	Yes [3]		$1,000 [3]		Yes	
Georgia	Yes					
Hawaii	Yes					
Idaho						
Illinois				(4)		
Indiana	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes.
Iowa	Yes			Yes		
Kansas	Yes [5]					
Kentucky	Yes			Yes		
Louisiana	Yes			Yes		
Maine						Yes.
Maryland			$2,500			Yes.
Massachusetts	Yes		(6)	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Michigan	Yes				Yes	Yes.
Minnesota	Yes				Yes	
Mississippi					Yes	
Missouri	Yes				Yes	
Montana	Yes		Yes [7]	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Nebraska	Yes		$1,000 [8]			
Nevada						
New Hampshire	Yes	Yes	$5,000	(9)	Yes	
New Jersey	Yes			Yes	Yes	Yes.
New Mexico						

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 3.—*Regulation of campaign contributions*—Continued

State	Corporate contributions prohibited	Labor union contributions prohibited	Individual contributions limited to—	Solicitation from State employees prohibited [1]	Solicitation from candidates illegal	Contributions under fictitious names illegal
New York	Yes			Yes	Yes	
North Carolina	Yes					
North Dakota	Yes				Yes	Yes.
Ohio	Yes			Yes [10]	Yes	
Oklahoma	Yes					
Oregon	Yes [11]			Yes	Yes	Yes.
Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes		(12)		Yes.
Rhode Island						
South Carolina						
South Dakota	Yes					
Tennessee	Yes					
Texas	Yes	Yes		Yes		
Utah	Yes				Yes	
Vermont						
Virginia						
Washington						
West Virginia	Yes		$5,000	Yes	Yes	
Wisconsin	Yes			Yes	Yes	
Wyoming	Yes			Yes		
United States	Yes	Yes	$5,000 [13]	Yes [14]		

---

[1] Generally refers to employees under a civil service or merit system.

[2] It is unlawful for any person whomsoever to assess any State employee for any political purpose whatever, or to coerce by threats or otherwise any such employee into making a subscription or contribution for any such purpose.

[3] The following persons also are prohibited from making campaign contributions directly or indirectly: (a) Holders of horse or dog racing permits; (b) holders of licenses for the sale of intoxicating beverages; and (c) operators of public utilities, except nonprofit cooperatives.

[4] State employees whose tenure is subject to merit principles are forbidden to engage in certain specified prohibited political activities during working hours, and the prohibited activities include soliciting money for political purposes and making contributions of money in behalf of candidates or in support of public or political issues. The prohibition does not apply to soliciting and making contributions after working hours.

[5] Contributions by such corporations as banks, trusts, railroads, and utilities are forbidden.

[6] Individual contributions during year are limited to $3,000 to 1 candidate, $3,000 to 1 party, and $3,000 to nonelected political committees not organized on behalf of any candidate.

[7] Any person expending more than $50 in a campaign must file an itemized statement and give a duplicate to the candidate or treasurer of the political organization whose success or defeat he has sought to promote.

[8] No treasurer of a political committee shall receive or accept more than $1,000 from any 1 person to be spent in any one campaign.

[9] Employees under civil service are not allowed to contribute money for the promotion of candidates or political issues.

[10] Solicitation from civil servants prohibited and receipt of contributions from mine inspectors prohibited.

[11] Contributions prohibited from banks, utility corporations, or a majority of their stockholders.

[12] Contributions may not be solicited from civil service employees and those employed by the commission and the board of parole.

[13] $5,000 limitation applies only to contributions to a national committee during any calendar year, or in connection with any campaign for an elective Federal office. Hatch Act specifically excludes contributions to State or local committees from this limitation.

[14] Applies to Federal employees or to persons receiving salary or compensation for services from money derived from the U.S. Treasury.

TABLE 4.—*Penalties and provisions for enforcement*

State	Penalty for failure to file	Penalty for excessive or illegal expenditures	Enforcement of penalties
Alabama	Misdemeanor; fine from $100 to $500	Misdemeanor; fined up to $500 and may be jailed or sentenced to hard labor up to 6 months. Candidate disqualified from office.	
Alaska			
Arizona	After primary—no certificate of nomination; unsuccessful candidate or other persons guilty of misdemeanor fined $25 to $500. After general election—guilty of misdemeanor.	Fine of $100 to $2,000 and jail 6 months to 2 years. Barred from holding office in the State.	
Arkansas	For most candidates, fine up to $1,000 and/or jail up to 1 year; ineligible to hold office. U.S. Congressmen and U.S. Senators—fine $50 to $1,000.	Forfeit nomination for any office. Misdemeanor; fine $500 to $1,000 and/or jail up to 1 year.	
California	Misdemeanor; no certificate of nomination or election to be issued.	Misdemeanor; same as for failure to file	
Colorado	Misdemeanor; fine up to $1,000 and/or imprisonment up to 1 year.	Misdemeanor; same as for failure to file. (For illegal expenditures such as bribery.)	Any person may file affidavit with district attorney or State attorney general stating name of person who has violated any provisions of act and stating facts which constitute alleged offense. District attorney or State attorney general shall then prosecute.
Connecticut	Fine $25 per day while in default	Fined up to $1,000 and/or imprisonment up to 2 years.	Prosecuting officer shall be notified and shall proceed to prosecute.
Delaware			
Florida	Misdemeanor; fine up to $1,000 or jail up to 6 months. Knowing violation voids nomination or election.	Same as for failure to file	Electors may file petition with circuit court, attorney general must act as counsel for State.
Georgia			
Hawaii	Misdemeanor; fine up to $500 and/or jail 6 months.	Fine $100 to $1,000 and/or 2 years jail or hard labor. Must vacate office. Disqualified from voting and from being elected to, holding or occupying any office, elective or appointive.	
Idaho	Misdemeanor; fine $100 to $500 and/or 1 to 6 months jail. Ineligible to run for office; no name on ballot.	Disqualified from nomination or office; misdemeanor; jail up to 6 months and/or fine $300.[1]	
Illinois			
Indiana	Can't get commission or certificate of election, or take office until statement filed. Misdemeanor; fine $1 to $500. Jail 30 days to 1 year, or both, and disenfranchised up to 5 years.	Ineligible for public office for 4 years. Misdemeanor; same as for failure to file.	Prosecutor notified for appropriate action. Defeated candidate or any 10 electors may petition to prevent a candidate alleged to have violated Corrupt Practices Act from taking office.
Iowa	Misdemeanor; jail up to 1 year and/or fine up to $500.	Misdemeanor; same as for failure to file	Officials in place where crime was committed shall prosecute.
Kansas	Misdemeanor; fine up to $1,000 [2]	Misdemeanor; fine up to $1,000. Candidate must vacate office; disqualified from holding public office for 2 years.	
Kentucky	No name on ballot; no certification of nomination or election. Candidates fined not more than $500. If committees or managers fail to file, fine $100 to $5,000 and/or jail 1 month to 1 year.	Fine $100 to $1,000. Nomination or election voided.	Candidate receiving certain percentage of votes may contest election. Grand jury may investigate alleged violations.
Louisiana			
Maine	Daily assessment of fine. If assessment not paid, person becomes disqualified and his name may not appear on official ballot used for any election during same calendar year.		Campaign statements reviewed by campaign reports committee composed of 2 members from the senate and 3 from the house of representatives of State legislature. Attorney general acts as committee counsel and must prosecute offenders.

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 4.—*Penalties and provisions for enforcement*—Continued

State	Penalty for failure to file	Penalty for excessive or illegal expenditures	Enforcement of penalties
Maryland	Can't be considered elected, assume duties, or receive salary until report is filed; fine of $1,000 and/or 1 year imprisonment.	Fine of $1,000 and/or imprisonment for 1 year, and for some illegal expenditures shall be ineligible for any public office or for any public employment for period of 4 years from and after time of commission of such offense.	Within 30 days after election, citizens may petition court that successful candidate was guilty of corrupt practices. Court will submit findings (if high State office) to secretary of state who will then refer them to appropriate person or legislative body or to Governor to declare election void. Duty of State's attorneys to prosecute whenever they feel they have good reason to believe corrupt practices involved.[1]
Massachusetts	Imprisonment for not more than 6 months or fine of not more than $500.		Officer in charge of receiving statements notifies attorney general who, if satisfied there is cause, shall institute civil proceedings or refer case to district attorney for action in criminal courts. Courts may compel filing of statement on application of attorney general or district attorney or petition of any candidate voted for, or any 5 persons qualified to vote at election on account of which expenditures were made.
Michigan	Person can't take office, collect salaries, or receive certificate of nomination or election until he has filed account. Fine up to $1,000 and/or imprisonment up to 2 years.	Fine of up to $1,000 and/or imprisonment up to 2 years.	Alleged violations reported to prosecuting attorney or attorney general who shall institute civil or criminal proceedings.
Minnesota	No name on ballot. Candidate disqualified from holding public office. Gross misdemeanor.	Same as for failure to file	County attorney shall inquire into and prosecute cases which come to his notice.
Mississippi	Willful and deliberate violations shall be punishable by fine not more than $500 and/or imprisonment for not more than 1 year. Forfeit nomination or general election.	do	Petition for judicial review of election may be made.
Missouri	Fined not more than $1,000. Can't take office until statement is filed.[3]	Forfeiture of election	Person receiving next highest vote may petition attorney general for action against successful candidate upon posting $1,000 bond. If attorney general does not prosecute in 10 days, applicant may prosecute at his own expense (for excessive or illegal expenditures).
Montana	$25 per day while in default. Name won't be printed on ballot and no certificate of election.	Deprivation of nomination or office. Fine up to $5,000 and/or up to 1 year in jail.	Electors may file petition contesting election with court, must post bond up to $2,000, on basis of illegal or excessive expenditures. Official receiving statements shall notify prosecutor.
Nebraska	Candidate: Fine up to $1,000. No certification of nomination or election; can't take office. Treasurer: Fine $50 to $500; further failure after notice to comply—jail 2 to 6 months.[4]	Fine up to $50 and/or jail 6 months	Voters may file complaint with State attorney general to have him prosecute. In cases involving members of the State legislature, a voter may file complaint with the legislature, which shall hear and determine cases of contested election of its members and for all officers of the executive department of the State.
Nevada			
New Hampshire	Willful violations of rules relating to primary may disqualify candidate from ensuing election. Not entitled to nomination or election until filing. Fine $100 to $1,000 and/or 30 days to 6 months in jail.	Same as penalty for failure to file except no refusal of certification.	Any person voted for at an election for any office, or any voter, may make a complaint in writing to attorney general of any violation. Any person may bring proceeding in equity against primary candidate who violates law to disqualify him from ensuing election.
New Jersey	Office forfeited by nonfiling of statement or filing of false statement. Court may also disenfranchise voter and disqualify him from holding office in State for period of time. Candidate at primary election with next highest number of votes shall be put on ballot.	Office forfeited. Same as for failure to file. Persons making unauthorized expenditures are guilty of a misdemeanor.	Voters may contest election on ground of illegal or excessive expenditures. If candidate has taken office, attorney general shall institute appropriate proceedings for vacation of such office; or shall notify appropriate legislative body to which candidate was elected.
New Mexico	Primary election: No certificate of nomination; no name on ballot; fine of $25 to $500. General election: Can't take office; no certificate of election; fine up to $500.[5]	Primary election: Fine of $100 to $2,000 and imprisonment for 6 months to 2 years. General election: Same as for failure to file.	
New York	Guilty of misdemeanor; imprisonment up to 1 year and/or fine of $100 to $500.	Same as for failure to file	Court, in proceeding instituted by candidate or 5 qualified voters, may compel persons or committees to file statement, to make statement conform to law, or to comply with any other provisions of section. Court may require bond and sureties from petitioner.
North Carolina	Misdemeanor; fine and/or imprisonment. Court may remove from office and declare ineligible to hold office for 2 years.	Same as for failure to file	Duty of secretary of state and superior court clerks to call for required statements and report violations to attorney general, who should initiate prosecution.
North Dakota	Fine of $25 per day while in default; name can't go on ballot until report is filed.	Deprivation of nomination for office	Offender deprived of office by contest proceedings.
Ohio	No certificate of nomination or election until report is filed. Failure to file within time limit shall disqualify said person from becoming candidate in any future election for period of 5 years; candidates for an elected office having a 6-year term shall be disqualified from becoming a candidate in any future election for a period of 7 years. Failure to file at any time: Fine $25 to $500 and/or jail 10 days to 6 months.	Forfeiture of nomination or election; same as for failure to file. Fine $100 to $500 and/or jail up to 6 months.	Secretary of state notifies attorney general of violation and he must prosecute. Citizens may present petition to court of common pleas or any judge thereof, with security, but election law does not specifically provide for any special procedure for citizens' prosecutions in this area.
Oklahoma	Candidate: Misdemeanor; fine of $25 to $500 and imprisonment 5 to 30 days. No certification of nomination.[6]	Guilty of misdemeanor; fined $100 to $2,000 and jail for 6 months to 2 years; candidate to be barred from holding office in State.	Prosecution by county attorneys.
Oregon	Candidate: Fine $25 per day while in default; no name on ballot and no certification of election.	Deprivation of nomination or office. Can't hold any office during term for which he was nominated or elected. Jail up to 1 year and/or fine up to $5,000.	District attorney required to prosecute alleged violations which come to his attention from election officials or from complaints and notices by citizens under penalty of forfeiture of office.
Pennsylvania	Can't take oath of office, take office, or receive salary until all statements filed. Misdemeanor; fine up to $1,000 and/or 1 month to 2 years in jail.	Ousted from office or from nomination. Misdemeanor; fine up to $1,000 and/or jail 1 month to 2 years. Willful violation by candidate disqualifies him forever from holding public office in State; willful violation by any person requires disenfranchisement for 4 years.	Any 5 electors may petition court for an audit; district attorney must institute criminal proceedings. If it appears that candidate has violated these sections, attorney general shall institute quo warranto proceedings against such candidate for ouster from nomination or from office.
Rhode Island			

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 4.—*Penalties and provisions for enforcement*—Continued

State	Penalty for failure to file	Penalty for excessive or illegal expenditures	Enforcement of penalties
South Carolina	Election null and void. Misdemeanor; fine $100 to $500 or imprisonment at hard labor 1 to 6 months, or both at the discretion of the court.	Misdemeanor; fine $100 to $500 or imprisonment at hard labor 1 to 6 months, or both at the discretion of the court.	
South Dakota	Forfeiture of office; fine up to $1,000 and/or jail up to 6 months.	Same as for failure to file	Attorney general investigates and prosecutes.
Tennessee	No certificate of nomination or election. Fine $100 to $5,000 and/or jail 30 days to 12 months.		
Texas	Fine $100 to $5,000 and/or jail 1 to 5 years. Forfeit right to place name on ballot at any subsequent primary, special, or general election. If he fails to report any receipt or expenditure, liable for double the amount or value to each opposing candidate and also for reasonable attorneys' fees.	Candidate and campaign managers civilly liable to each opposing candidate for double the amount or value of such unlawful campaign expenditures and reasonable attorney fees for collecting the same. Also, fine of $100 to $5,000 and/or jail 1 to 5 years.	Quo warranto proceedings may be instituted in district courts.
Utah	Name won't be printed on ballot for ensuing election; disqualified from holding office until statement is filed.[1]	Election voided; person ousted and excluded from office; misdemeanor.[1]	Filing officer inspects statements and reports violations to county attorney who must institute proceedings if evidence is sufficient; candidates or voters may complain to filing officer of violations or may petition district judge, Attorney general, or Governor to investigate alleged violation.
Vermont	Fine up to $500 and/or jail up to 6 months	Fine up to $500 or jail up to 90 days	
Virginia	No certification of election: can't take office; misdemeanor; fine up to $1,000 and/or jail up to 1 year	Election declared null and void	
Washington			
West Virginia	Misdemeanor; fine not less than $50, and/or jail not more than 1 year. No name on ballot; no certification of election.	Disqualified from holding any public office or employment during period of 5 years subsequent to date of conviction. Vacate office.	Prosecutor notified for appropriate action.
Wisconsin	No name on ballot; no certification. Failure to file on part of treasurer or political committee is punishable by 2 to 6 months in jail.	Voiding of election and ousting and excluding candidate from office.[1]	Any elector may petition for permission to bring charges against candidate or committee for alleged violation.
Wyoming	No name on ballot; no certification of election. Misdemeanor; fine up to $1,000 and/or jail up to 1 year.	Misdemeanor. Fine up to $1,000 and/or jail up to 1 year.	Upon notice by filing officer or petition by voter, county or prosecuting attorney must prosecute alleged violation.

[1] Findings are certified to presiding officer of appropriate legislative body in case of a violation by any of its members.

[2] Filing officer must notify delinquent of his failure to file and, if the latter has not expended more than allowed, and files within 10 days of receipt of this notice, he will not be assessed the penalties provided.

[3] Failure to file on part of treasurer of political committee subject to fine of $50 to $500; if treasurer receives notice from 5 resident freeholders and still fails to file, jail for 2 to 6 months.

[4] Failure to file on part of committee treasurer subject to fine of $50 to $500; failure to file after notice, jail for 2 to 6 months.

[5] For treasurers of political committees, fine is $50 to $500 and/or 6 months in jail.

[6] Penalty for violation by committee is a fine of $25 to $500 and imprisonment for 3 to 12 months.

[7] Penalty for committee treasurers is 2 to 6 months in jail.

Mr. Speaker, with this background, we can compare the election laws of the various States with the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 which governs the spending of campaign funds by Federal candidates. On June 10, 1966, Life magazine discussed the act in an editorial. That editorial said in part:

> The Corrupt Practices Act of 1925—the law that still regulates campaign spending—was aptly named. If ever a law was designed to promote corrupt practices, this is it. For instance, it provides that a congressman can spend only $5,000 in a bid for election and a senator $25,000. But it sets no limit on the number of outside committees that can help by spending an equal amount. Thus, a senatorial candidate has to maintain the fiction that the dozen or more committees set up to accept donations for his cause do so without his "knowledge or consent."
>
> The extent of this and other shenanigans can be gauged by the fact that all parties reported total expenses across the country in the '64 election as $47.8 million. A reliable estimate of the amount actually spent, starting with the primaries, puts it at $200 million.
>
> Much of the other $150 million did not have to be reported to the Clerk of the House of Representatives or the Secretary of the Senate. And even the transactions that should have been reported—but weren't—will never be investigated. Justice Department policy is "not to institute investigations . . . in the absence of a request from the Clerk of the House of Representatives or Secretary of the Senate." Since both of those men are elected by the houses they serve, it is not surprising that neither has ever asked for an investigation of any member's election.

The problem this Congress faces is threefold. It is first of all important that Members of Congress include as part of the public record their assets, liabilities, and sources of income. We must also move to establish standards of conduct for Members of the House.

Secondly, we must insure in this country the highest possible degree of honesty in elections by instituting full disclosure of campaign funds. We must also make available a means for many more people to financially aid in the election of his favorite candidate or party.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, we must establish a method of enforcing these procedures. We must take out of the hands of the employees of the House and Senate and place in a National Commission and a Joint Ethics Committee the power to punish violators of the election code and judge the conduct of Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the bill of the resolution I have introduced today would accomplish these important tasks. These are important steps in the long road toward strengthening the legislative branch of Government and insuring the continued viability of our republican form of government. As the Madison, Wis., Capital Times said on Monday, February 20, 1967:

> The issue of ethics in government continues to haunt politicians and public. There is a disposition on the part of both to ignore it. But it keeps popping up. The politicians try to give the impression that the issue doesn't exist but they also devoutly wish it would go away. The public doesn't like to be reminded of unpleasant things—such as the waywardness of the men they elect to public office. But if these things are not called to public attention and discussed, it would be a question of time before free government would collapse from the unbearable burden of corruption it would have to support.

I trust the Congress will consider this matter in the very near future and will act favorable on these proposals.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin and I would like to emphasize the importance of his comments on these provisions so far as the election law goes. Certainly, it is only fair that a candidate be required to report and be subject to the same requirements imposed upon him as any Member of this body.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas and the entire freshman group of Republican Members of the 90th Congress for his and their leadership in suggesting this code of ethics.

As one who entered the House during the 89th Congress, but just now, with you, approaches a first full term, I am in full agreement that the ethical standards of the House and the Congress should be high and equally applicable to all Members. Appropriate action must and will be taken to assure this, and your proposal is a very good first step.

I came here from the New York City Council last year. We there had a very stringent code of ethics for a legislative body, and it was a salutary thing. The Congress can well take heed in this area of New York City's example.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the gentleman from New York.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BIESTER].

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I am

proud to join a large number of freshmen Congressmen in offering resolutions to establish an Ethics Committee for the House and also to change the rules of this House to provide for the disclosure of assets and the disclosure of nepotism.

Last week, we received the report of the President's Crime Commission. The cost and extent of criminal behavior prevalent in our country must be a matter of great concern to all of us. Not many Americans escape the sweep of its indictment, either as participants or indifferent bystanders.

This past weekend we learned of cheating scandals in one of our service academies.

On Wednesday of this week we will consider a report concerning the conduct of a Congressman-elect .

Mr. Speaker, I believe that most Americans are sick of feeling soiled by the times in which they live. If this is indeed a sickness, the people expect the Congress to be a physician, not one of the patients.

We have all heard the old bromide that you cannot legislate morality. That does not mean we may not exemplify morality. That does not mean that we cannot make the practice of immorality more difficult.

If this House cannot bestir itself to clean its own affairs, how, Mr. Speaker, can we expect to clean our streams, clean our air, and reduce crime on a national scale? If we cannot take this small step now, we jeopardize for a long time to come our reputation and the confidence Americans want so desperately to feel in their Congress. This resolution cannot be opposed on the basis of too great an expense, nor should it be opposed on grounds of partisanship. The Good Book says there is a time and a season for the events of life and history. This is the season and now is the time to set our house in order.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. LLOYD].

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I am pleased to join him in his essential objective.

Mr. Speaker, as a general rule for better Government operation I prefer better and more effective use of existing committees rather than the addition of new ones. Those who are critical of the proliferation of committees perform an important public service.

The Adam Clayton Powell case now confronts us with the question of whether existing facilities, specifically the House Administration Committee, is the appropriate vehicle to respond to the present overriding demand of the American people, and our own deep desires, that rules of standards and conduct of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives be more clearly defined, be raised to a higher plateau, and be more effectively enforced. I should like to commend the members of the House Administration Committee on their efficient examination of facts in the Powell case and for the high quality of their service. It is now my belief that this House must establish stronger and more tangible rules than have been previously considered necessary, and stronger enforcement and investigatory procedure than has previously sufficed. The matter of standards and conduct of Members has become, in my opinion, a subject for an exclusive responsibility of the select committee which this resolution creates.

The creation of the select committee is another acknowledgment that conduct and standards of members of the U.S. House of Representatives are expected to be far superior to those expected of others.

The addition of a rule requiring comprehensive disclosure of assets, liabilities, special interests, substantial income, gifts, and reimbursements to Members and those employees and officers of the House who are compensated at a rate in excess of $15,000 annually is likewise subject to the general suspicion that such disclosure requirements may serve to mislead, to hide and protect the cleverly unethical, rather than to actually disclose the personal gains and benefits derived from political influence. But here again, it is my belief in view of the heavy responsibilities which we bear as Members of this House, that we cannot surrender to a fatalistic attitude that no improvement is possible, and that it is now our opportunity and bounden responsibility to forge a meaningful upgrading in the rules which govern standards and conduct of Members of the House of Representatives.

I join in the introduction of the resolution.

Mr. BUSH. I commend the gentleman from Utah for that statement.

Before yielding further, I would like to note for the RECORD our pleasure at having the gentleman from Florida in the Speaker's chair. He has, perhaps, done more in this body than any other Member to fight for a strong code of ethics. I believe it is altogether appropriate that we be speaking here while he is presiding. I believe further it is altogether appropriate that he is here when we new Republican Members are speaking out for many of the things for which he has been fighting for many years.

At this point I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. McCLURE].

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, I wish, first, to congratulate the gentleman from Texas for his effort in bringing this matter to the floor and for the efforts he has extended so far in coordinating the efforts of those of us who are appearing in support of this legislation today.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we in the House of Representatives must put aside consideration of such pressing problems as the Vietnamese conflict to discuss the personal conduct of Members of Congress. But the fact remains that before we can expect the people to respect the laws we make, there must be respect for the lawmakers themselves.

There are those who will question the propriety of freshman Congressmen taking the floor to propose ethical standards for all Members, most of whom are many years our senior. As for myself, I can only reply that it was not necessary for me to be elected to Congress to be endowed with the capacity to tell right from wrong.

Furthermore, I feel certain that the big turnover in the congressional elections last fall was in no small measure due to a lack of public confidence in governmental officials on all levels. The reasons were not hard to find: a Senate employee who had used his position for personal gain, talk of a credibility gap, the personal conduct of certain Members of Congress themselves. If those of us who were suddenly thrust into positions of leadership do not seek to restore confidence in public officials, then the American people have merely traded tweedledee for tweedledum. I, of course, do not refer to those Members who have been returned.

It is most gratifying to me to find so many of the new Congressmen responding to this challenge with proposals for putting our house in order. The diverse approaches in our bills illustrate the many paths available to us. None of those participating in the discussion today are being so presumptuous as to say we have all the answers. On the contrary, each of us has been encouraged to suggest varying methods for establishing ethical standards in order that the Congress may choose the best from each.

It is in this spirit that I have today introduced a resolution on ethics and disclosure. My bill differs from the basic measure being offered by the gentlemen from Texas and others in several significant respects.

For one thing, I suggest a revolving membership for the proposed Committee on Standards and Conduct. No Member should be permitted to sit in judgment of other Members for a prolonged period of time.

My resolution authorizes the proposed committee to issue advisory opinions, upon request, when a Member is uncertain as to whether or not some course of action open to him is ethical.

I have also proposed penalties, and I suggest that where there is a finding of willful violation of the House rules, the recommendation must be expulsion. And if the House agrees to the recommendation, the Member expelled may never again serve in a Government position, elective or otherwise, except for the military.

I have not attempted to define a code of ethics, but the committee is required under my bill to issue its first recommendations by August 31 of this year. I would expect that report to contain a code of ethics at that time.

The Select Committee on Standards and Conduct is expected, of course, to devise a code of ethics. In this connection, I would expect the committee to consider such matters as disclosure of confidential information acquired during official duties for personal gain; the acceptance of gifts; pressuring employees to make contributions to political and charitable organizations; use of the franking privilege and abuse of the accounts available to us for running a congressional office; or, for that matter, slush funds and the use of campaign contributions for personal purposes. Likewise, the committee should formulate rules by which communications between a Member and an agency with respect to any adjudicatory matter or rulemaking would be made a part of the public record of that proceeding. I would suggest to the committee that where it is difficult to translate ethical standards into legislative form, the oath be rewritten to include those provisions.

I hope it never becomes necessary for the proposed committee to investigate a Member. But if it does, there will be no doubt that the House of Representatives is prepared to discipline its own. Creating the committee will, at the very least, remove from partisan politics such unpleasant matters as the one we must face on Wednesday.

Most of the bills being introduced today require each Member to file annually a public statement of his personal holdings. My bill will extend most of these requirements to candidates for the House of Representatives. This requirement should cause no embarrassment to anyone who is truly above suspicion, for we are indeed public servants.

If, when history judges the record of the 90th Congress, it can be said that this was the time when the faith in the Congress was restored to the American people, then it can also be written that this was the time when the principle of representative government was reaffirmed and freedom did indeed flourish.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RIEGLE. I should like to take this opportunity to applaud the fine statement just made by the gentleman from Idaho and to draw particular attention to one point he made; that is, our discussion today and the bills and resolutions we offer are presented with the complete and wholehearted support of the party leaders. I believe it is important to point out for the country that we discussed our intention with our party leaders and received full encouragement from them to proceed in this manner. This is important to recognize. I would underscore that statement.

Mr. BUSH. I commend the gentleman from Michigan, and I agree totally. I am glad the gentleman brought out that additional information.

Mr. McCLURE. I thank the gentleman for his comment. This is one thing I wish to underscore; the fact that we are not talking behind the backs of our elders. We have their support. This is important.

I commend the gentleman for making this addition to my comments.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, every body of men engaged in a common task, seeking a common objective, and working together to achieve a common end should, as a matter of course, have the benefit of a common set of rules to guide them in their personal conduct as a member of that body.

I speak of the advisability of having a code of ethics governing the conduct and standards of Members of Congress. After all, we are here only for one purpose, and that purpose is to serve our constituency and our country in an able and honorable way. But, considering the relative values we all possess, it does seem presumptuous to expect every Member of this large body to hold identical sets of values where their conduct in relation to this body is concerned.

It seems to me, therefore, that if we had an established set of rules, which were unquestionably enforced, they would help each of us to serve our constituency and country in the able and honorable way expected of us. This would materially benefit this Congress by allowing it to proceed with its important work, secure in the knowledge that each Member is aware of his obligations, and will abide by them once he is so apprised.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I urge the prompt consideration of this resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct and establishing clear-cut requirements for Members of this House of Representatives.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the gentleman for his timely comments.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I share with my colleagues a deep concern over recent acts that have cast dark shadows of doubt over the entire Congress in the minds of the people of the United States.

Today, I have introduced a separate resolution that, like others introduced here today, would create a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct.

However, on the matter of disclosure of financial interests, my resolution differs from others. The difference is in the method of disclosure and in the teeth put into the requirement for accurate disclosure.

This resolution would require Members and certain employees to file annually with the Comptroller General of the United States a copy of their financial statement and a copy of their income tax return. The latter, of course, would require further implementing legislation. Under my resolution, the Comptroller General of the United States and the select committee would be authorized to examine these financial reports and, should they find anything wrong, would be empowered to conduct such investigations as they deemed necessary. Reports of wrongdoings would be filed by the Comptroller General with the Justice Department and with the House for appropriate action.

As a new Member of this body, and as the single Representative from the State of Delaware to this body, I urge the passage of this bill to establish in the House an effective body to investigate and act on allegations of misconduct of Members and of staff members so that the American people will not continue to have reservations regarding the integrity of this body and reservations regarding its willingness to condone the actions of Members and staff members guilty of misconduct.

Justice for Members and staff members who might be accused, as well as, public demand for the highest standards of conduct by Members and their staffs, makes imperative the immediate establishment of this Select Committee on Standards and Conduct—and certain amendments to House rules that will provide the means to quickly ferret out any who might be guilty of misconduct.

Under the resolution that I have introduced, a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct would be established, having a membership composed of 12 members divided evenly between the majority and minority parties. It would be empowered to recommend rules and regulations it deems necessary to insure proper standards of conduct by Members and by staff members of the House. It would have authority to investigate alleged breaches of conduct, recommend appropriate action and report violations of law to the proper Federal and State authorities.

Further, the resolution I offer would amend the rules of the House to require that Members and their employees who are paid more than $10,000 annually file with the Comptroller General of the United States a financial statement and a copy of their income tax return. This closely parallels a proposal made in the other body by the senior member of the congressional delegation from Delaware.

This section of my resolution differs from others in that the others require only the filing of a financial statement.

The difference is in the amount of teeth we want to put in legislation requiring disclosure of financial interests. A financial statement can reflect as much or as little as the preparer wishes it to reflect. Most of us would report assets and liabilities to the letter and intent of the law. However, it is not the actions of most of us that have caused us concern, and that recently have caused a decline in the respect of the House by the American people.

On the other hand, an individual could if he so desired, simply file an incomplete financial statement—there seems to be no punishment for that—or could conceal his assets in the names of other parties.

By the requirement to have Members and certain staff members file a copy of their annual income tax return along with their financial statement, we would give teeth to the requirement for accurate disclosure of financial interests. While there may be no penalties for filing an incomplete financial statement, there are severe penalties for filing a false income tax return. And the proper filing of the latter with the Comptroller General of the United States would prompt complete and accurate disclosure of the former.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. COWGER].

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Texas, and the other new Members of Congress for their sincere interest in establishing rules of conduct for the Congress. It is quite obvious that public opinion dictates a firm and clear statement of principles from all of us—new and old, important and the new and the mighty, rich and poor, Republican and Democrat.

I am in complete favor with this bill and urge its adoption. We must have a strong measure—if not this one—then, at least another that will be equally as demanding. For my part, I intend to immediately comply with the spirit of this bill, by furnishing to the Clerk of the Congress, a complete statement of my assets, my interests, and my income. It is hoped that all our other colleagues will join us in this endeavor.

Thank you.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Kentucky, the distinguished president of the new Republican Members of this Congress, and thank him for those comments.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT].

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, today, I join with many of my colleagues in calling for the establishment of a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and for the establishment of requirements calling for disclosure of assets and liabilities, and certain business, lobby, and nepotic relationships.

As we all know, Congress adopted a "code of ethics" in July 1958, that was intended to apply to all individuals in Government service. Regretfully, the wording of the code is, of necessity, general, and therefore lacking in strength. It has no muscle.

Our effort today is an attempt to add strength to the "code of ethics" that now exists. In my mind, it is good that this is being attempted in a positive light and not in a negative—do not do—manner.

President Calvin Coolidge said:

> Little progress can be made by merely attempting to repress what is evil; our hope lies in developing what is good.

Today, the 90th Congress is being challenged to develop what is good.

The resolution that I introduce today calls for the public recording of those relationships and situations which, in some cases, are considered questionable. The resolution does not say that the hiring of relatives is all bad. It does not say the business connections are all bad. It does not say that communications with lobbyists are bad. What it does say is that these relationships should be recorded in such a way that the public can observe them and determine when "conflicts of interest" exist.

John C. Calhoun observed that—

> The very essence of a free government consists in considering offices a public trust.

Hopefully, the resolution here offered will make it possible for the public to evaluate the manner in which these officeholders honor this trust.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for this time.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for those comments.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUSH] and many of my other colleagues in introducing this ethics and disclosure resolution. Since my election last November, I have heard from many of my constituents who seem to be losing their confidence in many of our public officials.

I would like to quote from one letter which expresses a rather harsh and unjustified opinion of Congress:

> I, like millions of other Americans, have come to realize that Congress has degenerated to a mere shadow of its once great image. The conduct of many representatives and senators has been highly reprehensible. Now, one member is trying to blackmail Congress because he knows that a large number of members are guilty of criminal misconduct and political immorality.

Although I have been in Congress only a short time, Mr. Speaker, it appears that the conduct of one or two Members may have tarnished the good reputation of this great body. There is no doubt in my mind that the great majority of the Members of Congress are of the highest caliber and their integrity is above reproach. I believe this impression must be corrected and that public confidence in Congress must be restored.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I urgently hope this or similar legislation will be adopted. It will go a long way toward maintaining the faith of the American people in their Government.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PRICE], my fellow colleague, and I believe I speak for all when I say that many Members of this Congress have received this type of letter, and many of us know that the people are waiting for the Congress to act in this important field.

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Texas for his remarks and the initiative he has taken in bringing this issue before the House.

As a newly elected Congressman, I feel certain that there are very few Members on either side of the aisle who do not practice adherence to a high code of personal morality and conduct.

Because of this, there is an almost unanimous concern for the good name of this body on the part of the membership.

In an effort to give these feelings positive form, I have earlier in this session introduced a bill which would bring about changes in the House rules making it impossible for any individual Member of this great body, regardless of race or political status, to corrupt his high office or bring shame on the Congress of the United States.

I feel strongly that no duly elected individual Member of Congress should be singled out from our midst to be judged against any special standard against which we are not all ready and willing to be judged.

In order to demonstrate to the people of the entire world in a clear and convincing manner that we are men and women who are as true to duty as the needle to the pole, who do not fear to call sin by its true name, men and women who will stand for right though the heavens fall, I urge the entire Congress, and particularly the Members who sit in positions of leadership on both sides of the aisle, to insist upon the immediate study of, and action upon, proposed changes in House rules that will renew public confidence in the integrity and honesty of this bastion of representative government.

Mr. BUSH. I thank my distinguished colleague from California.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, and the other participating Members of the 90th Club. I am most anxious that we take this decisive step to put our house in order—by boldly introducing legislation to formulate a strong code of ethics.

The present conduct of Members of Congress is of vital concern to every American—it should be of utmost, of paramount, concern to the Members of Congress to meet this issue head on and to do something constructive and meaningful to resolve the problem which confronts us. We are and must ever be servants of the people who choose us to represent them in the U.S. Congress—and we not only must serve with dignity and integrity, but there should be no doubt or cloud in the understanding of the American people. Confidence in all Members of Congress in all their endeavors should never again be shaken.

It is surprising that such a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct has not been established long before now. Let us not let another session of Congress become history without enactment of appropriate legislation to establish clearly recognized standards of conduct and ethics.

Today I join in introduction and support of an appropriate resolution to establish a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct. There are a number of good approaches to the problem. Let us put our heads together and come out with a good workable solution we can all live with—one that will remove the public cynicism which unfortunately exists today.

I fear no standards which can gauge and measure my personal conduct as a Member of the U.S. Congress. Let us get on with the job which confronts us.

Mr. BUSH. I thank my distinguished colleague from Alaska [Mr. POLLOCK].

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE].

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today as one of the cosponsors of this resolution because I deeply believe that it is essential for Congress to act promptly and decisively to preserve what is left of our integrity and respect in the eyes of the American people. Today there is doubt in too many minds across the country about the personal conduct of Members of this body.

In 2 days, we will act on the case of a man who, as a Congressman, used his position in Government for his own personal gain. The other body of Congress is today conducting a similar investigation into the conduct of one of its Members.

Unfortunately it takes only one corrupt Congressman to seed the false idea that all Members of Congress are guilty of similar indiscretions. Today, much of the growing public cynicism is due to our own ponderous inability to come to grips with the problem of implementing some tough, but fair, standards of personal conduct. It is not enough to just take strong action against the occasional publically identified offender, but we—to a man—must establish and live by the very highest objective public standards of personal conduct. Let us get moving and demonstrate to the American people beyond any doubt that we are deeply honored to serve in our capacity of public trust and wish to act, in every instance, only in the public interest.

Let us establish an objective code of conduct which will apply to all Members of this body by which the activities of each and every Member can be measured. Only with such an overall objective standard of conduct can we eliminate the public doubt that arises when—in the absence of an overall objective standard—one man is singled out and punished for improper conduct.

This resolution is not offered as a cure-all but rather as a long overdue beginning. Certainly it will take good faith and earnest concern of us all if we are to develop and implement a meaningful code of personal conduct. As a freshman Member of this body, I look to my senior colleagues for advice and counsel in this matter, so that we who are new to the House can make full use of the knowledge and experience you represent. But let us get moving—let us quit spinning our wheels. Let us get something done. Let us answer mounting public concern about the integrity of Congress with a hard-hitting, straightforward code of conduct that does the job.

As one Member of this body, I stand ready to work on this issue with any interested Member, on either side of the aisle, for as long as it takes to get this job done. And I suspect it will take determined and unrelenting effort of this kind to finally overcome the inertia and bring about this long overdue reform.

Until such time, however, as an objective code of conduct is operational, I will, as a matter of personal conviction, voluntarily file with the Clerk four annual statements for insertion into the public record.

The first voluntary statement will be full disclosure annually of my earnings and assets and I will shortly supply this statement. And I hasten to add that this is not a new idea with me. During my recent campaign for election, I voluntarily made such a complete public disclosure.

The second annual statement will certify that I have not had any relatives on my congressional payroll or working in any other capacity, with or for, any governmental agency.

The third statement will certify that I have held no interest, personally or beneficially, in any firm that is a major supplier to Government, or in any firm that operates under direct Government charter or supervision, such as TV stations, airlines, and so forth.

The fourth statement will list all congressional travel expenses incurred by me and reimbursed by the Government.

I will make these statements available for public review because I wish to have my personal conduct in these areas above suspicion—above any lowest denominator of conduct possibly occasioned by some Member who may misuse his position of trust for his own gain.

Mr. BUSH. I would like to commend the forthright statement of the gentleman from Michigan. No Member of our group has helped more and no one has contributed more to this discussion and to the background work that went into it.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, and other newly elected Republican Members of the House in urging, as strongly as we can, the appointment of a Select Committee on Ethics and Conduct and proper standards to govern this House.

This committee should recommend rules and regulations necessary or desirable to insure such proper standards of conduct—and not only by Members of the House but also by officers or employees of the House. In my judgment, such rules and regulations should include a provision prohibiting any Member of this House from employing any member of his family on his staff.

I do not think that mere disclosure of such employment is sufficient in view of the mood of this House and the recognition by many Members of the pressing need for meaningful action. I think it is also imperative in view of the mood of the country.

The committee should also be given power to make investigations of the conduct of Members, officers, and employees of the House and in my judgment should be empowered to recommend censure, suspension, or expulsion of any such Member or officer or employee after an investigation—and I wish to emphasize—after a fair and complete hearing.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the House Republican policy committee, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas and the other newly elected Members of the Congress from the Republican Party for doing what you have done here today. I think you have done a magnificent job of pointing out the existence of a very important problem. The solution that you offer appears to me to be reasonable, honorable, and just. I think the services that you have rendered will stand the entire House of Representatives in good stead when this very important matter comes before it for deliberation and the formation or creation of a select committee.

Mr. BUSH. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Arizona, who is the leader of the Republican policy committee which has already issued, as most of us recognize here today, a forthright statement calling for the selection and establishment of a special Ethics Committee.

It is a great honor to have the gentleman from Arizona commend the new Members for the work they are doing.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would once again urge with respect to this very important matter that the House not say it cannot be done, or this is old hat, or that it has been tried.

I urge that we take a new and fresh look at the problem, and I urge the leadership on both sides of the aisle and the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle to work diligently and provide not only for the creation of an Ethics Committee, but for the adoption of a meaningful code of ethics which will show the country that we are determined to do something about this ethical cloud that hangs over this illustrious body.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, a basic tenet of American democratic philosophy is the proscription that our Nation is to be a government of laws, not men. In order that Congress achieve the ultimate moral strength in its role as the crucible of American laws it must indeed also govern itself under a code of ethics which measures every Member as an equal. No American can feel secure in moral righteousness and punishment vented against any man, unless every man is governed in all respects with the same laws.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I have said repeatedly that there can be no compromise with integrity, and that includes the integrity of every Member of Congress as well as anyone else. We have all been honored by our people at home who have charged us with the awesome responsibility of representing them in the Congress of the United States. They expect us to work diligently and honestly in their behalf.

We must never reach a point where we feel that Members of Congress need not adhere to the same high standard of conduct and integrity that is expected of every man and woman in this Nation. In contrast, we should try to be a model for them.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that a number of incidents in recent years have made the people suspicious of government. But a good share of the problem does indeed lie with the leaders of government. It is their responsibility to lead the crusade to prove to the people that the Congress and the Government of the United States will insist on absolutely honest and upright conduct by those in public service.

It is necessary for the continuance of representative government in any country, that the citizens who agree to be governed by a system of manmade laws, have continual evidence of the practice of the highest degree of ethics. Faith in our form of government must never be taken for granted. There must be assurances and protections for U.S. citizens.

One way to help do this, Mr. Speaker, is to establish a code of ethics in Congress which will apply to every man and woman who is commissioned by the people to work here. It should be a code that will make explicit the requirements and responsibilities of the Members.

I have been honored to serve in representative government for 33 years. I hope to continue working to restore the confidence of our citizens in their Legislature. To help achieve that goal, I am proud to join with my colleagues, the newly elected Members of Congress, in this very worthy goal.

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce a resolution here in the House of Representatives, similar though not identical to that of my colleagues, to establish a House Committee on Ethics and to provide for full disclosure of financial holdings. The events of past weeks have reflected poorly on all Members of the House of Representatives, and, in fact, all Members of Congress. If the legislative branch is to maintain its role as a vital part of our democracy, then it must have the confidence of the American people, and we can hardly ask for or expect to receive that confidence until we are prepared to operate in the light of public disclosure.

My resolution, in addition to establishing an Ethics Committee and requiring full public disclosure of assets and indebtedness, prohibits Members of the House of Representatives from appointing or recommending for appointment any members of their family for positions on the House payroll. I feel that the recent disclosures indicating that a number of Members of Congress had relatives on their payrolls did grievous damage to the image of Congress in the eyes of the American public. Although in most instances expenditures for family members can be quite legitimate, the opportunity for misuse of public funds remains.

In recent months the concept of credibility has been challenged in the executive branch of government. Respect for the Congress has reached new lows with the disclosure of questionable practices by some of its Members. It falls, then, to the Members of this body to demonstrate to the people of the Nation that we will govern ourselves by rule of law.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, over the years a great national concern has grown about the conduct and practices of Members of Congress. Events of recent months have highlighted this concern, and, if any good can ever come from such circumstances, it will hopefully take the form of greater and continuing efforts at policing ourselves to the degree that assuming the public trust will mean exactly that. For unless we begin to police ourselves effectively, a credibility gap, at least in terms of ethics and conduct, will exist here in the legislative branch, as well as in the executive.

While I join in the introduction of a resolution calling for the establishment of a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, I am convinced that our efforts in this area must attain a high degree of permanency and stability. Perhaps the establishment of a standing committee would best serve this end and develop the type of continuity necessary to treat all Members equally rather than dealing with individual controversies once they have reached the crisis stage.

Our prime goal must be public confidence. The people must not have doubts as to whether Members of this House are expected to live up to high ethical standards. The people have every right to expect their lawmakers not to be lawbreakers.

The action of a few can and will reflect on the reputation of the total. Our task must be then, to set standards for all Members so that this body, individually and collectively, will be above suspect.

It is fitting that new Members of the House are speaking out, for our mandate clearly reflects a public concern. May it not fall on closed ears. The immediate public interest and the long-range interests of Congress so demand.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, certainly the public opinion of the U.S. House of Representatives is at a low ebb. In order to counteract this fact, I believe it is necessary for us to take measures to improve the image of the House of Representatives prior to the enactment of legislation determining the future of our fellow citizens. People are entitled to know the financial interests and dealings of their elected officials, and whether any of their relatives are on the Government payroll.

Today I am introducing a resolution establishing a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct. This committee, consisting of six Members from each side of the aisle, would have the power to investigate alleged misconduct of Members, officers, and employees of the House. The resolution would also require full disclosure of assets, liabilities, gifts, and so forth, by Members of Congress, their spouses and members of their staffs. It further provides for disclosure of interests on any business dealings with or regulated by the Government, and requires a listing of relatives on the Government payroll. To enforce these disclosures the committee would design appropriate forms to be filled out by the Members, officers, and employees of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that my colleagues in the 90th Congress show to the American people that we are for integrity in Government by early passage of this resolution.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the resolutions which have been introduced to establish a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct in the House.

As we are all aware, a short-lived version of an ethics committee was established in the waning hours of the 89th Congress. Its powers, however, were severely limited by amendment. In its report to the House, issued last December, it urged that a permanent Select Committee on Standards and Conduct be created by the House in the 90th Congress. The final report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, issued last July, also recommended the creation of such a select committee in the House. In the other Chamber a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct has been in existence since 1964. The House has been derelict in its failure to follow suit.

At the beginning of this Congress the House refused to seat, pending investigation, a Member of long standing because of apparent—one is compelled to say transparent—abuse of his perquisites and privileges as a Member of the House of Representatives and chairman of an important committee. Allegations of misbehavior on the part of this Member had long been blazoned in the press, yet no investigation of his conduct was forthcoming in the House until the courts in his home State charged him with criminal contempt. This is a sad commentary on the moral conscience of one of the four most powerful governmental institutions in this country. If there had been in existence an ethics committee, empowered to investigate alleged misbehavior by Members of the House, it is certain that this unfortunate oversight would not have occurred.

Public confidence in the Congress has slipped precipitously in the last few years. To restore that confidence it is imperative that we now create a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct and that we give it the power necessary to insure prompt and effective action when Members of the House abuse their office. The integrity of this body and its Members must not be permitted to be compromised by the deeds of the few. An independent ethics committee is the best guarantor of this.

Mr. Speaker, opinions have been expressed that a Member once brought before such a committee would stand convicted in the public's eye even should the committee exonerate him of all allegation of misbehavior. This contention will not survive scrutiny. This Nation still believes in the innocence of the accused until guilt is groven beyond a reasonable doubt. I see no reason why this high principle of justice will be voided because a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct might investigate a Congressman's behavior. Indeed, a "clean bill of health" from the committee should dispel the doubts and concern which might obtain about a Member's actions. To doubt this indicts the public's sense of fair play, decency, and justice. Let us remember, furthermore, that the purpose of the committee would be not to act as an inquisitor but rather as an investigator. Its purpose would be to ascertain the facts in any case, report these to the House, and recommend a course of action. We are most emphatically not creating a star chamber here.

Mr. Speaker, the entire question of ethical conduct by a Congressman is a thorny thicket. I cannot believe that any significant number of Congressmen deliberately engage in criminal, or even questionable, conduct. Nevertheless, predicaments face us at every turn. One of the most troublesome of these is the difficult and complex matter of conflict of interest. If a Member is a lawyer, for example, he may be uncertain as to which clients he, or especially the law firm with which he may be associated, may represent in suits involved with the Government. He may own stock and find himself in a perplexing dilemma because a bill on which he should vote for the interest of his constituency also affects his own vested interests.

Then there is the matter of ex parte communications with agencies of the Government on behalf of constituents. What line may he not trespass in this regard as he attempts to hasten action. Then there is that biennial headache of campaign funds.

These are only three problems encountered by virtually every Congressman for which no adequate guides exist. The Code of Ethics passed in 1958, while a step in the right direction, simply fails to provide assistance to a Congressman in these important areas—and others. A real service would be performed by a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct if it were authorized to recommend a more explicit Code of Ethics for Members of the House with regard to these matters. I, for one, would welcome recommendations of this nature from the committee.

Mr. Speaker, the force of circumstances and logic clearly support the creation of a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct. Temerity and not timidity is the order of the day.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined a number of my colleagues in the introduction of the ethics and disclosure bill. Passage of this legislation will provide a uniform standard by which all Members of Congress can be judged by the American people. It is our position that no duly elected individual Member of Congress should be judged against any special standard against which all Members are not ready and willing to be judged.

The bill is well conceived, Mr. Speaker, and it stands as a genuine contribution to the establishment of a uniform standard of conduct for the Members of this House. I strongly urge immediate study of and consideration on this important legislation.

This bill is identical to Mr. BUSH's.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I join today with my colleagues in support of a bill to create a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct. The creation of this committee is vital to restore the confidence of the American people in this Congress and to insure that the present and future Congresses will warrant such confidence and respect.

The American public is entitled to expect from their elected Representatives and the officers and employees of this House, superior standards of conduct. We, as public servants, are entrusted with the responsibility of providing fair and representative government for the welfare of this great Nation. In order to do this, our behavior and conduct must be of the highest quality.

This select committee, which is similar to the one established in the 89th Congress, is desirable for the guidance and protection of Members and House employees. It has become apparent that in order for Members and employees of this House to give proper and adequate service to the public, standards and a supervisory body must be established.

I believe that this committee, along with the standards it will establish, will provide a suitable deterrent to those who might be tempted to put personal ambition ahead of service to their country. This committee will serve as a guarantee that the Members of the House of Representatives and its employees will meet their sworn obligation to serve God and country.

Tomorrow I will introduce a resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, similar to the resolutions introduced by my colleagues. In addition to creating a Select Committee, this bill will amend the Rules of the House of Representatives by adding rule XLIII. The new rule requires that each Member, officer, and employee of the House of Representatives will file the following information with the Clerk of the House:

First, the name and address of any business which is Government controlled or licensed in which the individual has a financial interest, second, the name and address of any professional firm which engages in practice before any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States in which the individual has a financial interest, and third, the name of each person employed by the U.S. Government who is a member of the family or other relative of a Member of the House of Representatives.

The responsibility is upon each of us as Members of the House of Representatives to provide such measures which will insure that all Members, officers and employees of this House will fulfill their sworn duty.

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, the new Members who are proposing that a select committee be established on standards and conduct in the House of Representatives are not attempting to be presumptuous, nor are they suggesting that the Members who came here before them have been guilty of low standards and bad conduct. We know that, with a few possible exceptions, the integrity and honor of the Members of this body are beyond question.

But we are concerned with the public attitude toward the Congress generally. Because of a few highly publicized departures from a standard the American people feel is required of their Representatives in Congress, a belief seems to have grown up that most Members of this honorable body indulge in practices of misconduct of one sort or another. It is at this belief that our resolution is aimed.

Our resolution is not complicated. It would ask for the establishment of a select committee of 12 members—six from each political party—to be named by the Speaker and empowered to investigate any violation of the law by any Member of this body. It would call upon Members to: first, make a full disclosure of the assets, liabilities, honorariums, and so forth, held by them, their spouses or any staff members making more than $15,000 annually; second, make a full disclosure of any interest, either financially or through kinship, with any firm practicing before any Federal agency; third, make a full disclosure of any interest, regardless of amount, in any business whose right to operate is regulated by the Federal Government, and fourth, make a full disclosure of any relatives—immediate family—carried on their congressional payrolls.

Mr. President, I am convinced that this kind of gesture of honorability is desperately required at this time in our history.

The credibility gap—not only with regard to the conduct of Congressmen—has now grown to such incredible size that it is more than a political issue, it is a menace to this Nation. Our people are confused, utterly, by conflicting statements from Government officials about the war in Vietnam, the need for a missile defense, the subsidizing of left-wing organizations by the CIA, the doubts cast on the Warren Commission's findings, the direction of the economy, the cause of inflation, the increase in crime on the streets, to name just a few examples.

I am convinced that this Congress has a great responsibility to resolve many of these doubts and I am confident that it will. But on the question of its own honor and integrity, we cannot wait. We must show the American people as quickly as possible that, in this time of widespread disregard for law and order, we intend to keep the U.S. House as far above suspicion as possible. In effect, our own right to act for the American people is at stake in this question of ethics. We must establish it beyond all question and quickly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, perhaps at no time in this century has the Congress been more sharply studied by the public gaze than the present. Perhaps at no time in recent memory has the reputation of Congress with its collective membership been subject to such popular criticism and censure as today. The tragic and thoughtless behavior of a tiny element of this House has reaped publicity of an adverse nature far in excess of the quantity of the issue. Unfortunately, all Congress is now suspect. Honest, decent, and ethical men have been forced to stand in the baleful light of mistrust that has radiated from the machinations of the few.

Our linen is now on the line. And, as long as it is there, it would be timely to apply some new detergents to the wash and give the American people a whiter and brighter deal. I am pleased to join many of my colleagues today in introducing my own package of soap in the form of an ethics and disclosure bill. Such legislation, like soap, must be more than chosen or passed upon. Ethics do not become a permanent state of affairs from the adoption of such a bill any more than laundry becomes perpetually radiant through one pass in the washer. It takes constant dedication and application to accomplish both jobs.

The bills introduced by myself and my colleagues are only a beginning. The real enforceability of congressional ethics lies in the inner person of the individual Member. The workability of any such system lies with each of us. As with a religious creed, acceptance must be essentially voluntary in nature.

But today we may choose to begin. Today we must answer a trust, one arising from the biennial mandate of a people that have the right to expect the best from their elected representatives. We can give them no less.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, along with many of my colleagues, I am introducing legislation today designed to strengthen public confidence in congressional ethics.

The current public image of Congress demands that we address ourselves to the need for tighter standards of conduct for the legislative branch of Government. Some 60 percent of those answering a recent Gallop poll said they believe the misuse of Government funds by Congressmen is fairly common. Of course, we know that such abuses are, in fact, not common, but there have been a number of such polls showing a distressing lack of public faith in the integrity of public officials. The number of identical and similar measures being introduced today demonstrates to the Nation a great desire, particularly on the part of those of us who are newly elected, for some positive steps in this important area.

I am aware that Congress does now have a code of ethics to which any person in Government service should adhere. Unfortunately, the best of codes will not provide a guarantee against occasional misbehavior by Members. Therefore, there is a need for a vehicle in the House to achieve and maintain the highest possible standards by statute with provisions for enforcement thereof. To fill this need, I am introducing legislation to amend the rules of the House in such a manner as to encourage compliance with regard to ethical conduct by compelling public disclosure of financial assets, potential conflicts of interests, and other areas in which Members or their staffs might find themselves—and, thereby, the Congress as an institution—open to public criticism.

I recognize that disclosure is a thorny problem to many of my colleagues, because public officials are also citizens with personal assets and aspirations and who quite naturally feel these matters are private in nature. However, I believe disclosure can be one more effective way to protect the integrity of elective office. As a Michigan State senator, I voted in favor of such a disclosure bill last year. Since its passage, I have found the statute not only helps insure that the public interest will be safeguarded but it can serve as a protective device for legislators against unwarranted charges leveled against them.

Personally, I do not believe it is possible to legislate morality. But it has never been more important than it is today—when we are engaged in a life and death struggle with tyranny—to maintain confidence in our governmental institutions and to strengthen the moral fiber of our Nation. Over the past few years, there have been several highly publicized stories of alleged misconduct by a few Members of Congress and a few employees. These escapades have hurt the collective reputation of the Congress and of its Members. Wrongdoing must be punished and public faith in the legislative branch must be restored. I believe this legislation will go a long way toward accomplishing these objectives. We can do no less for our constituents and our country.

When an organization finds its reputation tarnished, action must be taken. I sincerely believe, Mr. Speaker, that corrective action in the form I have suggested, while not a guarantee against "bad apples in the barrel," will at least give the public its rightful opportunity to identify those apples which are less than thoroughly wholesome.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with the other Members of the 90th Congress in support of a resolution to establish a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct.

Events of the past few months have made it crystal clear that such a committee is needed and that the procedures and committees as presently constituted in the House are inadequate to survey the standards and conduct of the Members.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see the active interest and genuine concern expressed here today by the freshman Republican Members of the 90th Congress, in this united effort to demonstrate that they are concerned about the failing image of Congress, and want to take positive, remedial action.

The Congress has demanded high standards of conduct from other Government officials, particularly members of the Cabinet. It is time that those Members who are concerned, those Members who make up the vast majority of honest and hard-working Congressmen, those Members who are striving to serve their constituents in an effective and meaningful way—it is time that these Members not only ask but demand that this House be put in order.

Mr. Speaker, that demand is being made today. It is being made not only on the floor of this House, but wherever people gather to discuss the affairs of their Nation. The concern expressed here by the new Members of Congress is reflective of a greater public feeling that the time has come to put this House in order.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, everybody's talking about crime and pointing a finger at the youth of our land as the guilty party. The phrase "juvenile delinquency" has become a frequent part of our conversation.

It is said that 20 percent of our population is 18 or below, and that 50 percent of the crime is committed by young people in this category. However, less than 5 percent of the teenagers commit the crimes. But teenagers—all of them, are labeled with this stigma.

We have something akin to this in the Congress of the United States. One Member has flaunted his disregard for the honesty and dignity of Congress, and so a cloud is cast over the whole. People do not say, one man or a few men are guilty. No, they say, "Congress—Congress is like a barrel of rotten apples, each contaminating the others."

I ask, What kind of an example is that for the youth of our land? I say, let us clean our own house before pointing to youth and the misdemeanors and crimes of youth. We, ourselves, are on trial. Let us purge ourselves.

For this reason, I have this day introduced a bill known as the ethics and disclosure bill.

The general purpose of this bill involves five items:

First. Establish a select committee of the House called the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct.

Second. Provide a full disclosure of assets, liabilities, honorariums, and so forth, by Members, their spouses, and staff members, whose salaries exceed $15,000 gross annually.

Third. Provide a full disclosure of interest, either through financial connection or kinship, with any firm practicing before any agency of the United States.

Fourth. Provide a full disclosure of interest, regardless of amount, in television and radio stations, banks, savings and loan institutions, airlines, and any other business whose right to conduct business is regulated by the Federal Government. Percentage of ownership and fair market value of interest are required for disclosure—exemption here for listed securities in this type of enterprise.

Fifth. Provide disclosure of relatives on the Government payroll, including wives, husbands, sons or daughters, grandsons or granddaughters, mothers and fathers of the Members, or his spouse.

Sixth. Require a complete disclosure form to be designed to include the second, third, fourth, and fifth items above. Also require change in clerk-hire form to require clerks to reveal relationship, if any, to Member.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, one thing that has been overlooked by the public and by Members of the House somewhat in this discussion on ethics in Government, is that one of the needs for such a committee is to improve the image of Congress. Most of us know that most Members of Congress are above reproach. As a part of discussing what would be done to eliminate violations of standards in the few instances when it may arise, it would be worth while to discuss for a minute or two, the fact that the bringing about of this committee would really establish a bill of rights for Members because the legislative history of the bringing about of this committee shows clearly the following rights would be established:

First, that, as I said in the first hearing of the Committee on Standards and Conduct, October 20, 1966:

> I do not think a man's private life is detrimental to the House. No one is perfect, and if he privately has weaknesses, it should not be something that should come before this committee, as it would not reflect upon the House.

Second, that a Member is entitled to his own political views and such would not be the subject of inquiry by this committee, and no such power would be given to the committee under the proposed statute.

Third, that no trivial or frivolous matter would come before the committee, and this would be protected by the requirement that any complaint would have to be under oath and in writing, and backed up by competent evidence, and be presented to the committee by a Member of the House, and even then, the committee would have discretion to fail to investigate it if it so decided.

Fourth, that no ex post facto hearings would be held, that is, a person could not be charged for doing something that occurred before the Congress had set up the standard by action of the full House.

Fifth, that the committee could help to make definite, realistic guides for conduct by not only helping to prohibit the bad but also by making definite what is proper, thus evading "throwing out the baby with the bathwater."

Finally, I would like to say that in my opinion, it is just as important to protect Members of Congress from being hurt by unfounded accusations as it is to root out the few isolated cases of misbehavior.

ETHICS OF CONGRESS

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is deeply encouraging to me to see the determination of our remarkable group of first-term minority Members to make a contribution toward the resolution of one of the thorniest problems facing the Congress, the question of the proper means of insuring the ethical conduct of the Members of this body. I congratulate them.

In deciding, as a group, to address themselves to this issue, our colleagues have displayed an alert sensitivity both to the moral responsibility of the House to take effective action in this field and to the proper opinion of the people we represent.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that more senior Members of this body should view with more than ordinary significance this action of our junior colleagues. Our newer Members are in a position to see this institution with somewhat greater detachment and objectivity, perhaps, than those who have served here much longer. Having been constituents themselves only a few short weeks ago, they may speak with greater authority about the attitudes of the people we represent toward Congress' long-standing reluctance to insist on the highest standards of ethical conduct.

They know, Mr. Speaker, that the people are troubled about their Congress. They recognize that when doubt and suspicion beset this representative institution, we cannot do our jobs properly. They understand that the responsibility is upon all of us—junior and senior alike—to remedy this unfortunate situation. I welcome, therefore, their sound judgment and their mature determination to act.

To elaborate somewhat on my own view of the need we face and of the actions I believe we should take without further delay, I include as part of my remarks the text of the first of my biweekly radio reports in the 90th Congress, which I recorded on Wednesday, February 8:

> Since this is my first broadcast of the new 90th Congress, and since we are still in the organizational stages of the new session, I was inclined to devote these remarks to a review of some of the major issues we will be facing here. There are plenty—taxes, government reorganization, air and water pollution are obvious examples. And always at issue will be the amount of money we can afford to spend for the multitude of objectives—some essential, some questionable—which earlier Congresses have authorized.
>
> But on reflection, as a believer in priorities, I've decided that first things really should come first.
>
> First among the first, in my judgment, is the matter of integrity, Congressional integrity. It is the foundation of representative government. It colors everything Congress does. It determines the confidence which people may have in their Government, the respect they may hold for the laws, the effectiveness with which the Government can function.
>
> No one can disagree with the principle that all public officials must act with unwavering integrity, absolute impartiality, and complete devotion to the public interest. Moreover, this principle must be followed not only in reality but also in appearance. For Congress, this principle is especially important. Congressmen are the direct representatives of the people. And Congress is the source of the money and the authority on which the National Government depends.
>
> Yet, there is an uncomfortable gap between principle and practice. Congress does not possess the unquestioned confidence or the high reputation for integrity it needs to have. People have doubts and suspicions. And much of the fault lies with Congress itself. For Congress has failed to police itself effectively. It has failed to establish clear-cut standards of conduct and to enforce these standards.
>
> Two examples are very much in the news and they illustrate very well the problem we face. Congressman Adam Clayton Powell was denied his seat in the House on the first day of the new session, and the charges against him are now being investigated. I supported this move, but I must ask now, in common with many people, whether Congress will be content simply to dispose of the Powell case or whether it will establish the standards and machinery to assure that all its members are above reproach.
>
> The other example is the Bobby Baker case. Mr. Baker has just been convicted on charges amounting to a violation of his trust as a former top employee of the Senate. The very evidence, however, which convicted Baker also implicated at least one former Senator in a situation involving the payment of nearly 100,000 dollars for the purpose of influencing legislation. Nothing, apparently, is being done about this.
>
> People have a right to be bothered by unanswered questions like these. It's their government. And Congress has an obligation to the people, and to itself, to restore the people's confidence in this the highest institution of self government in our land.
>
> Throughout my years in the House, I have repeatedly urged Congress to take the necessary action. Together with many of my colleagues, I have voted, introduced legislation, made speeches and testified before committees in efforts to bring about reform. The results, to date, have been meager, indeed. It's not because Congress doesn't know what it ought to do; rather, it has lacked the will to do it. Now, however, in the face of renewed scandal, we have the best opportunity so far to remedy the situation.
>
> For the past several weeks, I have been researching this matter carefully—reviewing what has been proposed, studying the conflict-of-interest regulations of the Executive Branch, and preparing legislation which will meet the problem squarely.
>
> I believe we need to do the following things: require the disclosure of all assets and liabilities, gifts, and business interests of Members of Congress and their top staff assistants; place on the public record all communications between Congressmen and government agencies on behalf of private interests; write a Code of Ethics which will provide specific and meaningful standards of conduct; and establish a permanent committee in the House with the power to investigate allegations of improper conduct and the power to punish offenders.
>
> This is what my legislation will provide. If Congress enacts these laws, most of our battle will be won. And for those who persist in violating ethical standards, we will have the means of dealing with him effectively.

THE WAR ON POVERTY IN MY HOMETOWN—A STUDY IN SCHIZOPHRENIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENNETT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the schizoid activities of the Johnson administration in approaching the problems of poverty make the story of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde relatively unimaginative. The mimeograph mills of the Great Society are constantly grinding out big slogan words like "massive attack," "bold and imaginative planning," which create the impression that poverty and the other evils which confront mankind are being rolled back before the forces of Federal law and Federal money. But when the time comes for some constructive action, I have learned from bitter experience that the Great Society frequently puts on a new face and looks the other way.

In Mexico there is a saying, "Mucho ruido, pocas nueces." Literally, it means "Much noise and few nuts." Figuratively, it means "Much talk and little accomplishment."

A rather exotic Yankee philosopher, Yogi Berra, recently stated:

> You can observe quite a lot just by looking.

Well, I have been looking at all the Federal Government has done about poverty in my own hometown and I have observed quite a lot and, in my opinion, it can be best expressed with the Mexican phrase, "Mucho ruido, pocas nueces."

I take this time, Mr. Speaker, to give you a concrete example, documented in fact, of the schizoid actions of the Johnson administration in the last few days in my congressional district.

To set the stage, let us first take a look at my hometown of Gilroy, Calif. We are primarily an agricultural community in an area which is almost in a different economic world than the rest of Santa Clara County. Because the fast-growing electronic and industrial complex of northern Santa Clara County has not yet come to the Gilroy area, we will probably be required to depend upon agriculture and food processing as our economic base for a few years to come.

This dependence creates serious unemployment problems since agricultural employment is highly seasonal. Furthermore, because it is a pleasant place to live, many migratory workers who travel across the State during the summer spend their winters in Gilroy. These people are underskilled and have not been fortunate enough to have received the training which would enable them to break their migratory pattern. Their lot admittedly is not the most pleasant. There is need to help them develop skills which are in demand and at the same time to develop jobs which they can fill.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has designated Gilroy as a "pocket of poverty." Two years ago a nationally televised report by the Columbia Broadcasting System held it up as an example of poverty in the midst of affluence.

According to figures taken from the Santa Clara County Special Census of April 1966, 41.7 percent of Gilroy families have an annual income of less than $6,000, 23.5 percent get less than $4,000, and 8.4 percent get less than $2,000.

The Santa Clara County Welfare Department estimated early in January that more than 1,000 families are currently on the welfare rolls in the greater Gilroy area.

The State department of employment estimates that the level of employment fluctuates wildly throughout the year, with a low employment of 1,721 to a high of 7,926.

The Federal Government sends a parade of VISTA volunteers to Gilroy to assist migratory workers. The Gilroy Area Service Center of the Economic Opportunity Commission receives comparatively heavy financing in its efforts under the poverty program.

Though I wish I could claim differently, these facts show that we do have a problem in Gilroy. Constructive Federal help would be useful and welcome in meeting our peculiar economic problem.

As the remainder of my story will show, we took the constructive steps advocated by the deluge of paper and press releases which come from the mimeograph mills of Washington. We found a means of doing something constructive. We courted one branch of Government, we were encouraged, and then we were jilted.

At the same time, another branch of the Great Society continues to pipe its tune which leads people down a road of false hope, frustration, and continued poverty.

Last fall, Swift & Co. expressed an interest in establishing a meatpacking plant near Gilroy. I talked personally with Mr. J. A. Copeland, vice president of Swift & Co., who confirmed this interest.

The meatpacking plant would immediately employ 350 unskilled laborers who would be furnished year-round employment at good wages. Here was an opportunity in one fell swoop to break the migratory and poverty pattern of 350 human beings for all time. And the anticipated growth of Swift & Co. would undoubtedly more than double their initial employee requirements.

But Swift & Co. had to be assured that adequate utilities could be furnished, the most crucial being a sewage treatment and disposal system to handle the large discharges that come from a meatpacking plant.

This situation appeared made to order for the grant and loan program authorized by Congress and administered by the Economic Development Administration. Gilroy was encouraged to submit its application and did so. I had numerous contacts with the Seattle Regional Office of the Economic Development Administration in an effort to expedite processing of this application and received courteous and efficient replies from Mr. V. W. Cameron, the area director. At one time, Mr. Cameron wrote, and I quote:

> Since the Swift and Company project involves approximately 900 new jobs, its location may have considerable impact in our evaluation of this Gilroy application.

In the meantime, Swift & Co., anxious to make its decision and proceed with the construction of its new west coast facility, patiently marked time. The Seattle office of the Economic Development Administration acted expeditiously and I was finally informed that the application had been sent forward to Washington.

At this point, the old Washington runaround started to operate and political gobbledygook and doubletalk began. Twice I was informed by Washington Economic Development Administration officials that the application was still in Seattle. Upon checking there, I found on both occasions that the information from the Economic Development Administration in Washington was false. On one occasion, I was even told the name of the lady in Washington who had the application on her desk.

I pressed further and submitted a letter written to the city manager of Gilroy by Mr. John W. Nordstrom of Swift & Co., which said in part:

> We cannot definitely state that if Gilroy is given the money for this sewage disposal plant that Swift and Company would build there, but we can say that Gilroy would not be considered for this plant if a sewage disposal facility is not available.

On February 6, I wrote a letter to Mr. Ross D. Davis, Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director of Economic Development, enclosing a copy of Mr. Nordstrom's letter, in which I said:

> Perhaps it is too much to expect the Federal Government to make an advance commitment conditioned upon Swift's action in this case. This being true, we are then faced with the situation of which comes first, the chicken or the egg?
>
> It is my considered opinion that a conditional commitment on the part of the Federal Government should be made and the condition should be that the grant will be approved if and when an industry is attracted to Gilroy because of the grant which would provide permanent employment to those who are presently unemployed. This would break the impasse and would certainly serve the intent, purpose, and spirit of the law.

I received various oral indications from representatives of the Economic Development Administration which strongly suggested that funds were unavailable and that though Gilroy was a pocket of poverty, the overall unemployment figures of Santa Clara County were not sufficiently high to warrant a grant. I countered with the figures from the State department of employment, the Santa Clara County Welfare Department, and the special census taken in 1966, and heard nothing further regarding the overall unemployment figures of Santa Clara County.

Finally, I received a copy of a letter from Mr. Lambert S. O'Malley, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Operations, Department of Commerce, addressed to the Honorable Kenneth L. Petersen, mayor of Gilroy. It said:

> Since the amount of money requested is far in excess of the funds available . . ., we have no choice but to limit our assistance to those projects which will do most to further the purpose of the Public Works and Economic Development Act.
>
> Although the construction of the facilities you plan would be an asset to your community, we do not see in this project any economic justification since, at this time, the Swift and Company has not made a decision with regard to locating in your area.

It is noteworthy that the denial was based upon the allegation that Swift & Co. had not made a definite decision. My suggestion for an approval conditioned upon Swift's decision was totally ignored. It is my understanding that the Economic Development Act is for the purpose of attracting industries and jobs, and not for the purpose of helping industries which would locate in an area with or without Federal assistance in building a sewage plant.

I strongly suspect that the Economic Development Administration is under wraps from the administration and is required to hold back construction of sewage facilities and similar public works projects in order to keep the economy from overheating with inflation. This explains why the administration played Alphonse and Gaston with my request and batted it back and forth between Seattle and Washington as long as it could. It explains why it proferred weak excuses which I met with facts and figures. It explains why it was finally forced to come out and say no, for a very poor reason.

We could look the world over and not find a situation which more clearly falls within the spirit and intent of the Economic Development Act. What could have provided 350 immediate jobs for the unskilled in a pocket of poverty, and eventually 900, will be lost simply because of an administrative decision.

Disappointing as the unfavorable decision might be, it would have been received much more gracefully had not information come to my desk on the same day that another branch of government was cranking up its mimeograph to announce the release of $109,000 for the California Center for Community Development for the purpose of continuing the training of a group of people who had "graduated" from the California Self-Help Service Corps and were now out in the field working with the poor.

Last December 30 I visited the California Self-Help Service Corps. It was located 12 miles north of Gilroy and was funded with Federal money in an amount of $246,836. Since April of last year it has graduated 34 persons with an average third-grade education who are now working with the poor in outlying areas. These students are receiving $400 per month and 9 cents a mile for use of their own automobiles. The director of the school is a former employee of the American Friends Service Committee. The executive research director was formerly an economist from Washington and an organizer with CORE in the Watts area. The third member of the permanent executive staff was an editor of a labor newspaper, the Valley Labor Citizen, for 11 years. Field supervisors were and are still employed to supervise the trainees in their field work with the poor. One is a teamster from Los Angeles. Another is the cousin of Cesar Chavez and still another is Fred Hirsch of San Jose, Calif., long identified with leftwing activity and a controversial individual at best.

The school was conducted in an old abandoned grammar school which had been condemned. I would not attempt to judge the quality of instruction, which included lectures from persons like the daughter of Jack London on the history of farm labor organization, officials of SNCC—Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee—who spoke on SNCC's experience in the South with racial matters, and representatives of the sheriff's department and the industrial welfare department.

Though it may not be an indication of what was taught, I was rather interested to note the extensive use of wall posters and sayings which emanated from SNCC and CORE. Above the director's desk was a poster which said:

> Justice is a two-edged sword—but it is always sharper on one side than the other

Another said:

> Lord, if you would make me in your image, you must be an agnostic.

And another said:

> We're going to tear this country up, then we're going to build it back, brick by brick, until it is a fit place for human beings.

Still another said:

> If the courts don't kill a man after he is convicted of committing a crime, what right does a cop have to kill him on suspicion?

For no explained reason, a picture of Red Chinese Defense Minister Lin Pao, cut from the cover of a magazine, was prominently displayed on the bulletin board. Another poster put out by the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee showed a picture of a stern-faced Mississippi highway patrolman above the caption: "Is he protecting us?"

Some area citizens have called this school an agitation academy and, judging from what little I saw, it is possible they are correct.

One fact is certain—it has cost about $7,260 for each of the original 34 community service representatives who graduated.

As I have said previously, on the same day that the Economic Development Administration denied a loan for a sewage treatment plant to Gilroy, which would have eventually provided employment for 900 individuals, the Office of Economic Opportunity released an additional $109,000 to continue the work of the self-help service corps so that 30 of its graduates may continue their work in the field.

And what type of work are they doing? According to the gentleman who talked to me when I visited the self-help service corps center, they are participating in self-help housing programs—violently opposed in some quarters by the building and construction trades unions. They are conducting citizenship education and in Modesto they are helping to organize welfare recipients and equip them to be better able to secure all their rights.

Thus, at the end of the current grant, which is to be spent on 30 of the original 34 graduates, we will have approximately another $3,633 invested in each of the trainees. Each of the 30 now represents a taxpayers' investment of more than $11,000.

Mr. Speaker, the war on poverty continues to flounder. The Headstart program and the Neighborhood Youth Corps program have achieved a degree of success, but the former properly belongs under the direction and administration of the U.S. Office of Education and local school systems. The latter should be under the administration of the Department of Labor, administered through State departments of employment. The Office of Economic Opportunity is hiding behind the skirts of a successful Headstart and Neighborhood Youth Corps program and continuing to throw money around in improperly planned, proliferated efforts which lack coordination and commonsense. I believe that with the above exceptions it is achieving nothing except to excite false hopes and create frustrations in the poor. Furthermore, as I have repeatedly stated in the past, I believe the program is being utilized as a base of political operations for those ultraliberal persuasion.

Mr. Speaker, the series of events I have related, though they affect only a small locality within this Nation, could be typical of what is going on everywhere. They raise a very serious question as to the sincerity of the Johnson administration. Does the administration really want to get at the causes of poverty and give people the dignity and pride of holding a steady job, or do they only want to build bureaus and political bases of power, hire topheavy bureaucracies, and train people to agitate rather than work?

I suppose I am being provincial, but, frankly, I feel sorry for the migrant workers of my hometown who lost their chance for a better life last Thursday, while the poverty program continues to train more paid agitators to tell them how bad is their lot.

Mr. Speaker, this does not make sense and the American people know it. This Congress should do something about attacking the real root of poverty. Let us train people to want jobs—to hold them—and let us do things which will create jobs.

THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL CREDIT SYSTEM REVIEW

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the overstress on monetary policy, as opposed to fiscal action, which caused such grief in our Nation's economic system last year, has made us all more aware of the credit functions of both public and private bodies. The possibility that our present credit system is simply not structured to handle this type of stress has been raised in an excellent and concise statement of the problem by Milford A. Vieser, chairman of the finance committee for the Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co.

In his comments on January 23, 1967, to the Newark chapter of the Finance Executive Institute, Mr. Vieser noted that a multiplicity of Federal Government credit operations has sprung up beyond the control of the Federal Reserve. Far more important, as Mr. Vieser points out, is the impact of increased Government spending, coupled with borrowing and lack of fiscal restraint, which has created an unfavorable interaction between the price structure and the credit structure.

Mr. Vieser brings out the fact that our budget is not only increasing in amount, but number of outlays each year. He calls for a more straightforward method of Federal budgeting, an all-inclusive method of coordinated Federal appropriating procedures, and a simplification of the Federal administrative structure through a new Hoover Commission-type study. The latter has been recommended by many Members of Congress, including myself, in legislation this year.

Of primary importance, he notes the need to set priorities. The questions he raises are worth asking and repeating. Do we have to get to the moon in 1968 or could we better use some of the billions in meeting the challenge of slums and urban problems? Does the supersonic airplane have priority over moving millions on the ground through mass transportation? We must find a means to rationally answer these questions.

In addition, Mr. Vieser poses areas of investigation and study dealing with the supply of private credit and the institutions so far created for this task. All in all, I have found Mr. Vieser's remarks to be a unique contribution to a necessary dialog on the credit problem, and I commend them to my colleagues for their serious consideration.

The statement of Mr. Vieser follows:

THE AMERICAN CREDIT SYSTEM—ORDER OR DISORDER

(Statement by Milford A. Vieser, chairman of the finance committee, the Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co., before the Newark Chapter of the Finance Executives Institute, Newark, N.J., January 23, 1967)

The year 1966 will be memorable in financial history as the year in which our credit structure was subjected to greater strain than it had known since the late 1920s.

While the strain will probably be less in the present year, the strain of last year will, I fear, be transmitted into sectors of the economy other than simply those comprising financial institutions. While I am not forecasting a deep recession, I believe that the time is at hand when we must make a thoroughgoing review of our credit structure in all its complex ramifications—government and private—to make sure that we avoid even the possibility of such a disaster.

The reason for the severe strain we experienced last year, the reason we shall not be without some this year, and the reason that we must remove the sources of excess strain is that the structure of our credit system is not designed to cope with the stresses imposed upon it. These stresses have been created not only by the growth and variety of private credit demands, but by a dramatic expansion of governmental activity that involves both the demand for credit for its own purposes and the extension of credit to meet the needs of a variety of private claimants.

Let us reflect on the background of the situation in which we find ourselves. The last major revision of our federal banking laws was in 1935. This was a revision made in the midst of catastrophe. It was made in haste to meet and finally to overcome a disaster. Consequently, it was a backward rather than a forward-looking revision, designed to restore confidence, and to get the financial machinery of the nation functioning as rapidly as possible. It did not anticipate the vast changes in credit demands that the nation has experienced since that time. In fact, it did not look beyond the needs of the moment. It was like reinforcing a levee in the midst of a flood rather than controlling the flow at the headwaters where the flood had started.

Prior to the great depression, the involvement of the federal government in the credit structure was extremely limited. It chartered and supervised national banks; it had established the Federal Reserve System in 1914, and the Federal Land Bank System a short time after, and that was about it. The federal government was not itself a direct source of credit for the purposes of either individuals or local governments. Following the collapse of the early 1930s, however, came a sudden multiplication of new agencies which affected the flow of credit and, for the most part, acted independently of the banking system and the controls of the Federal Reserve.

Among these new credit instrumentalities were the RFC, HOLC, FDIC, FHA, FNMA and many others. All of these used federal funds or pledged the credit of the federal government. Their establishment resulted from no set policy and from no objective other than to get this or that sector of the economy into working order. Little account was taken of their effect upon the nation's financial structure as a whole.

A few of these agencies have been terminated; but many have survived, undergoing in the course of time revisions designed to meet new emergencies, and new agencies have been created to serve new needs. And so we have the CCC, SBA, the Export-Import Bank, and many others, the total adding to around 75 wholly separate federal government operations dispensing loans for a great variety of purposes, to a great variety of borrowers, including interest rates determined by a great variety of criteria, usually with the idea of circumventing the forces of the financial markets. The amount committed by these operations is expected to exceed $36 billion in the 1966–67 fiscal year. The total of these activities obviously becomes in itself a force in the financial market.

Although the federal government's credit operations bear heavily upon general credit conditions, they are beyond the control of the Federal Reserve. Therefore, monetary policy, unable to control these extra-market credit operations, must adapt itself to absorb their impact.

These although troublesome, comprise the smaller part of the impact which the operations of the federal government have on money and credit conditions. The major source of our credit difficulties comes from the mounting cost of government itself. This finds its expression not only in pressures directly on the credit structure as the result of deficit financing, but also in the strain it has created on the nation's resources of materials and labor and, through that, on the price structure. The price inflation of 1965 and 1966, as well as that still threatened, has been mainly caused by this pressure. One evidence is that the gains in the gross national product throughout 1966 were steadily larger for government purchases of goods and services and steadily less for private spending.

As a nation we have been trying to do more than it is feasible to do in such a hurry. The enormous expansion of federal participation in welfare and educational activities, the rising cost of our ventures into outer space, the emergence of new forms of subsidy for urban development and transportation—all at a time in which we are engaged in what can no longer be called a little war—have produced strains that are clearly reflected in an unfavorable interaction between the price structure and the credit structure.

This has resulted from two basic factors. First, the federal government's rising demand for funds has required it to go to the market in 1966 for $9 billion net new Treasury obligations and about $1 billion in FNMA participations which are merely a delusive way of raising funds for government purposes. This has put pressure directly on a market crowded by a record expansion in private plant and equipment financing and in local government borrowing. Second, because of the absence of fiscal restraint by the federal government, it has been necessary for the monetary authorities to combat the inflationary trend by constricting the money supply and restraining bank credit.

Out of this combination have come the closest thing to a financial crisis since 1932, the highest interest rates in more than forty years, a disruption in the competitive relationships of institutional investors, and a sharply and unequally curtailed availability of credit. which was especially—though not exclusively—adverse to the market for home mortgages. And so, in this troubled year, we have a flood of demands and suggestions for improving the flow of funds from existing channels and for tapping new sources of funds.

While some of these suggestions may have merit, they do not go to the root of the distortions that cause this ferment. If we concentrate on the usual and expedient proposals that arise from this ferment we shall at best do another patch-up job, and more likely create further distortions rather than eliminate those we already have.

The root of our present distortions is in the framework and the policy, or lack of policy, in the federal government's fiscal and monetary operations. To get to the root, however, it is necessary to face up to these facts.

The federal budget is out of control.

The federal budget is out of control because each year federal outlays both rise in amount and increase in variety. This is not necessarily by design, but results from a mass of conflicting claims and a host of authorizations for lending activities, many of which are carried on outside the regular appropriations procedures. This situation exists irrespective of the Vietnam conflict, although it is greatly complicated by it.

Because the budget is out of control, the task of determining and of implementing an appropriate tax policy becomes difficult, and consequently, the burden of economic adjustment falls too heavily upon monetary policy.

Our means and methods of exercising monetary policy in themselves may be antiquated.

What is the answer? The noted architect, Louis Sullivan, worked on the principle that the solution of a problem is inherent in its statement. In our case, if the problem is that the budget is out of control, the solution plainly is to get it under control. By this we do not mean turning out the lights in the White House or otherwise trimming around the edges of the problem. New methods of compiling and reviewing the budget must be developed, and some means be devised for coordinating appropriations procedures and for assuring that all types of federal outlays be subject to them. In short, the budget must be an all-revealing budget. Backdoor spending must be ended, the granting of long-range obligational authority should be curtailed wherever possible, and unused outstanding authorizations should certainly be subject to annual review.

Equally important with these needs is that for simplification of function. If ever an organization could use the services of a management expert, it is the federal government. The Hoover Commission of 1948 to 1955 undertook the task of reviewing the federal structure, but only part of its many excellent recommendations were acted upon. Since then the cross-jurisdictions and general confusion have become much greater. The War on Poverty, notwithstanding its excellent intentions, appears to be an administrative nightmare. Matters related to urban renewal as recent hearings have disclosed, are spread over 70 agencies and involve over 200 separate programs. Transportation, in spite of the creation of a new cabinet post, is still under at least half a dozen jurisdictions. As a result, we have reached the point where another Hoover-type study is urgently called for and this time its recommendations would be neglected only at the risk of fiscal chaos beyond that which we now have, if that is possible.

Both better budgeting methods and greater simplicity are vital to getting the budget under control. But they do not go fully to the most vital questions of all: Is a given activity a necessary one for the federal government? If so, how does it stand in the range of priorities?

Questions like these must be kept constantly in mind by every private business and every family. Neither business man nor householder can ignore them except at the peril of insolvency. Only the most reckless and improvident assume they can have everything they want without delay, and the wise ones know there are some things they may never have at all. Government can no more avoid the consequences of failure to sort out needs in relation to present and prospective resources and to set a scale of importance and a schedule of timing for them than can you or I. What happened last year has demonstrated this, and we shall be lucky if the years ahead do not carry the demonstration painfully further.

The strongest and mightest nation in the world cannot meet all goals at once. A responsible government must therefore begin to think in terms of priority. It must take seriously such questions as: Can we ignore the drain of war on our resources when we plan for needed improvements in the social and physical aspects of our country? Can we launch a multi-billion-dollar anti-missile program concurrently with a multi-billion-dollar expansion of medicare? Do we have to get to the moon in 1968 or could we better use some of the billions to eliminate the still festering slums of our cities? Do we have to spend billions in order to beat some rival nation to the production of a supersonic airplane, when billions are urgently needed to improve mass transportation in our cities? These questions must be asked, and we must find the means for answering them wisely if we are ever to approach rationality and prudence in our fiscal policy. While we are reviewing federal institutions and fiscal policies, we should also take a fresh look at our private credit institutions. Our credit system has grown infinitely more complex than it was in 1908 when Senator Aldrich of Rhode Island began the inquiry that six years later led to the formation of the Federal Reserve System.

Since that time, a whole system of institutions for dispensing agricultural credit has been created. Savings and loan associations, from a small group mainly of neighborhood self-help organizations, have become a major medium for savings and a major force in the financial market. Credit unions have now begun to follow a similar course. Mutual savings banks, originally motivated by philanthropy, have become important sources of investment funds. Life insurance companies are vastly more influential in the direction that economic expansion will take than they were 60 years ago. And the commercial banks themselves, which virtually were the financial system when the Federal Reserve was first contemplated, have multiplied the ways in which they affect the flow of credit beyond anything that Senator Aldrich could have imagined.

All this growth and multiplication have happened in response to recognition of special credit needs and to the ingenuity of individuals and government in meeting them. In many respects, they have served their purposes well; and, merely because their functioning has been disrupted by unusual conditions, we need not conclude that their ability to continue to serve these purposes has beeen forever impaired.

Nevertheless, we need to take a longer view and to measure our institutional savings structure against the enormous demands for credit that will face us in the years ahead. Does our present structure in fact measure up? Should we differentiate more clearly between the commercial banking function and the function of savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks? Or should we be moving toward a system of all-purpose institutions, for at present we certainly can see a tendency toward a blending of function. Should we not review the present system of branches for our commercial banking and savings institutions to permit greater service to our people in places of substantial population growth? Some states confine banking to municipal boundaries. Others confine their financial institutions to county boundaries which no longer represent a commuting or economic area. What should be the criteria for mergers of financial institutions?

The answers to such questions will be found only through such an exhaustive inquiry as that instituted by Senator Aldrich and finally completed under the guidance of Carter Glass. This time we should avoid emergency answers and waste no time in getting down to root issues.

This is a large order. You may think that it is too big an order, including as it does a straightforward method of federal budgeting; an all-inclusive method of coordinating federal appropriating procedures; a simplification of the federal administrative structure; a method of evaluating federal activities and establishing priorities among them; and a thoroughgoing review of our credit system and of the institutions of which it is composed.

Large as the order is, it is not too large to attempt or too large to achieve. The American people have demonstrated their ingenuity and ability to fulfill larger orders than this.

But this large order will not be solved unless action is taken, and action will not be taken until people like you and me throughout the country fully realize the nature of the problem and the need for its solution and impress upon our nation and our representatives the necessity for action. We must take a long, deep look, jointly by government and the private financial sector of the economy itself.

Trite though it may sound, the objective of such action must be a sound fiscal and credit policy. In spite of all the recent scorning of the "Puritan ethic" of caution and discretion as applied to government, government can no more escape the penalties of improvidence than can private companies and individuals.

We may take warning that, throughout history, strong nations and civilizations have collapsed because they failed in reaching that objective. In the light of this warning and with the readiness we have always shown in meeting a challenge once it is recognized, we may have confidence that the questions that confront us now, numerous and puzzling though they be, can and will be answered.

GOOD AIR USE MANAGEMENT NEEDED

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, reduction in air pollution is a subject which is occupying the attention of deeply concerned people in every part of the country. One who has long been studying this problem is James L. Dallas, of Beverly, Mass., sanitary engineer in charge of the air use management program of the bureau of environmental sanitation of the Massachusetts Department of Public Health.

Contending that good air use management programs, not just air pollution control programs, are needed in the United States, Mr. Dallas ably discussed this subject during a panel session of the Engineering Societies of New England on February 21, 1967, at the Sheraton Plaza Hotel in Boston. Because of the broad interest I believe his message contains, I wish to submit the text of his remarks, as follows:

On Air Use Management

(By James L. Dallas)

I would like to discuss briefly a few observations relative to air use and air quality control.

In so-called "air pollution control programs," government should strive to keep in balance its efforts to reduce air contamination and its sufference of reasonable use of its air (as a resource) to receive (and transport away) certain wastes resulting from man's individual and collective activities. Such use, however, must be in a manner compatible with but to an extent no greater than the capability of the ambient (outdoor) air to tolerate such use without undue detriment to man and his environment of concern. Expensive air pollution control measures for the preservation of pristine purity of air, for preservation reasons alone, and where lack of such would produce no significant hazard to man or to those elements in the environment for which man has a real concern, is *per se* a waste of a valuable resource—contradictory as it may seem, air manifests itself as a resource through use—it cannot be hoarded. A drop of water, which falls as rain on land, runs downhill into a river and back unused, to the ocean, is lost for use as nature's fresh water until it returns as an entirely new drop of rain in nature's cycle. So also is air wasted if not used. Air exists as a resource partly through its capability to receive a limited amount of dirt and by means of natural phenomena, cleanse itself. The phenomena of self-purification and constituent rejuvenation *is* the resource; prudent utilization of these phenomena while maintaining an air quality satisfactory to a democratic society, is desirable. Good air use management programs, not just air pollution control programs, are indicated.

To properly manage air use, we must be custodian of the ambient air, we must monitor its quality and inventory its corruption, we must constantly evaluate its air contamination absorption potential (which is weather dependent), and we must apply the art of air pollution control when and where indicated for the benefit of man.

As a public health official I am, of course, primarily concerned with the problem of protecting the health of the citizens. I am aware, however, that a good air use management program must address itself also to the commonweal and economic well-being of its citizens. The attainment and maintenance of economic well-being requires the husbandry of industry, but as such must not be at the expense of "mal air" (i.e., air of unacceptable quality). The ambient air over a state represents a resource capability which varies from place to place, in its volume, climate, meteorological patterns, geographical location, and place or places of origin. These variations determine the relative worth to a state of its "ambient air heritage" and the uses to which its air can be put under a balanced air use management program. The ambient air over a state is therefore a resource which varies in value from state to state (and from place to place within a state) just as do mineral, land, water, climatological, or other resources. It is a resource which a state has a right to zealously guard, protect, and use competitively with other states to its advantage as it does with its other resources. A state should have a right to receive air from adjacent states in reasonably good quality and likewise should have a responsibility to discharge air across its borders to sister states in equally reasonably good quality. Standards for this "reasonably good quality" for interstate air have not yet been established but to be fair such standards must provide a reserve capacity for potential air use by the receiving state so that, after a degree of reasonable use, the quality of the air would still meet the ambient air quality criteria of that (the receiving) state. However, a state's particular geographic location, (e.g. adjacent to an ocean or large body of water such as in the case of Hawaii) may afford it apparent advantages and great latitudes in its air use management program and in the indicated requisite quality of its effluent air.

The ideas and concepts that I have been discussing are some that should affect legislation and the manner of implementation of air use management programs. They should influence the design and oversight of such programs at local, regional, state, inter-state, and federal levels.

STATE PROGRAMS

We know how to legislate for, regulate, and institute state air pollution control programs; such are simple exercises in well established governmental and public health administrative practices and procedures. Massachusetts already has excellent enabling legislation, and its programs and potential programs are recognized as among the best in spite of budget and staffing problems. We have municipal, multi-municipal regional, and state wide programs operational under the aegis and direct supervision of the Department of Public Health.

A major and continuing problem to air use management officials, however, is and will be that of determining the appropriate kind of and amount of use to which air resources may be put. The difficulty arises in determining the proper balance between control and reasonable use. A clue to the solution to the problem may, however, be found in the name: *"Commonwealth* of Massachusetts. The world "commonwealth" means "general welfare" and also it means "the body of people constituting a politically organized community." These in turn suggest that perhaps the point of balance should be determined for the maximum benefit of society with due regard for the public health, comfort, and convenience, and the rights of individual and group interests.

To accomplish this, the public must be educated in the why and ways as well as the costs, direct and indirect, of air pollution and of its control. The hazards to health and other deleterious effects of air pollution must be determined and made known to the people. The courts must be educated in air pollution matters so that they can make just decisions in cases involving the reasonableness of enforcement measures. Pollutors of the environment must act responsibly and be held responsible for their actions. Legislators must act as statesmen and not political opportunists and control officials must be provided with a "crystal ball" to guard them against attempting "too little too late or too much too soon".

As you may see, State Air Pollution Control Programs have developed into sophisticated and complex programs of "Air Use Management" in which no single area of concern can be totally satisfied at the expense of any or all others. Control officials, industry, the general public, the news media, and elected officials have a responsibility to become acquainted with the state of the art of air pollution control, the real significance of air contamination, and the benefits *vs* the risks of air pollution controlled or uncontrolled before making potentially unreasonable demands, one upon another.

INTERSTATE APC

As for interstate air pollution control, I believe this problem should be handled by the Federal Government through an *air quality assurance program*. In such a program reasonable acceptable minimum air quality standards for air passing from one state to another should be established and guarantees of such quality provided by the Federal Government. These standards must be determined *first*, on the basis of health requirements and *second*, on the basis of reasonable use by the discharging state with due regard for potential air borne waste dispersal needs of the receiving state. For some long lived pollutants, the standard would therefore be a fractional portion of its acceptable ambient air quality criteria concentration.

Further, it should be recognized that the size of a state, its geographic location, weather patterns, and proximity to an ocean (whereby the effluent air may at times discharge to the ocean instead of an adjacent state) are vagaries of fortune which, like other resources, may occasion certain benefits to some states. Such states should not be denied the beneficial use of such circumstances.

FEDERAL

Under the clean air act, a state can request the federal government to provide relief for a condition of air pollution resulting in its state but caused by a source in a sister state. The responsibility of a state to maintain its effluent air of suitable quality should be recognized. The federal government, in assuring interstate air quality, should address its abatement order to the offending state which should then take appropriate action. Federal intervention should come only upon failure of the offending state to act.

The federal government should not be allowed to arbitrarily impose its whims upon a group of states through the formation of "Air Shed" regions as suggested recently by the President. Such federalism usually results in bureaucratic uniformity of regulation, *and* administration with ease of implementation thereof as the guide for action. I give you, for example, nationwide automobile exhaust control to be required by federal law on all 1968 models' to be sold in the United States regardless of demonstrated need in the state where sold, e.g. Alaska.

The federal government can best, and most appropriately should, encourage research in *both* control measures and control program techniques, help standardize evaluation procedures, assure satisfactory interstate air quality, provide technical assistance to the states, disseminate accurate information on the status of air pollution and administer federal financial assistance programs. Resources necessary *and* available to the federal government should be used by the U.S. Public Health Service to establish and keep up to date ambient air quality criteria and information on the significance of such criteria.

INTERSTATE COMPACT PROGRAMS

Interstate-Compact Air Pollution Control Programs would then be indicated only in those instances where a mutual desire for either a *higher* or *lower* degree of ambient air quality than that assured by the federal government existed. Such a program should be entered into voluntarily by the states concerned and not arbitrarily imposed upon them by the federal government. By special consent a state which does not need a specific air pollution absorption capability in the air it receives, could grant special privileges to its neighbor state.

These then, I believe, are a few important ideas which should be weighed and considered by all people involved in the air pollution problem. The people involved are: the lay public and the control officials, industry and the man on the street, the consultant and his client, the individual and organizations such as service clubs and the Air Pollution Control Association, and, yes, even elected officials including the President.

ASHBROOK CALLED TURN IN 1963

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Schadeberg] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I was on the floor of this House on March 2, 1963, when my colleague, John Ashbrook, of Ohio, spoke before this body to discuss the irregularities of Adam Powell in reporting official expenses of the committee the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell] served as chairman and on which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] served as a member. I include in the body of today's Record an article by Jack Steele in the Columbus Citizen-Journal, on Monday, February 27, 1967:

Powell Case: Ashbrook Called Turn in 1963

(By Jack Steele)

Washington.—If the House had paid attention to Rep. John M. Ashbrook (R-O.) back in 1963, it might have avoided the present hassle over seating Adam Clayton Powell.

Ashbrook, in a House speech on March 12, 1963, accused Powell of falsifying an official expense report he had filed with the House on a 1962 junket to Europe.

This was Powell's notorious six-week jaunt to London, Paris, Venice, Rome, Athens, Delhi and other watering places with two women members of his staff, beauty-queen Corrine Huff and Mrs. Tamara J. Wall.

The three had luxuriated at London theaters, Paris nightclubs and at a beachhouse in Greece.

Ashbrook charged that Powell had drawn far more in foreign currencies from the State Department to finance the junket than he had reported spending to the House.

Powell ignored his charges.

The State Department refused to divulge how much it had turned over to Powell and his companions in foreign currencies—most of it counterpart funds generated by the foreign aid program.

The House Administration Committee, which now aspires to serve as the guardian of congressmen's ethics, disclaimed any responsibility for checking up on Powell's travel expenses.

The House collectively yawned.

Now—nearly four years later—the special House committee which investigated Powell's fitness to be seated finally has confirmed that Ashbrook's charges were correct.

The committee's report disclosed that Powell and his two fellow travelers collected $10,607 in foreign currencies from the State Department for their 1962 European junket.

But they reported to the House that they had spent less than half this on the trip—$4938. The report does not say what happened to the rest of the money.

The committee dug into Powell's foreign trips because one of its members, Rep. Vernon W. Thomson (R-Wis.) remembered Ashbrook's charges and demanded that State Department records be subpenaed, if necessary, to check on them.

The records show that in the years 1961 through 1964 Powell drew $13,614 in foreign currencies for his own trips abroad and listed only $6902 in expenses in his reports to the House.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—XXIV: THE NEGRO AND THE DRAFT

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Kastenmeier] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, at the House Armed Services Committee hearings last June, our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Pike], asked General Hershey if the percentage of qualified Negroes drafted was higher than that of qualified non-Negroes. The Director of the Selective Service responded:

> No; I don't think so, because in the first place the population is somewhere around 11 or 12 percent, so that leaves in all other groups about 88 percent and I doubt very seriously that the 88 percent isn't furnishing a higher percentage, relatively, than the 12 percent.

The results of a study of the draft figures for 1965, however, dispute General Hershey's thoughts on this matter: 1,037,788 whites were given preinduction examinations; 630,592 were found acceptable—60.7 percent of those examined; 194,696 were drafted—30.8 percent of those found acceptable; 163,425 nonwhites were given preinduction examinations; 47,792 were found acceptable—29.2 percent of those examined; 29,608 were drafted—61.9 percent of those found acceptable.

While it is convenient to cite the fact that the percentage of nonwhites who are conscripted, and this essentially means the Negro, at times may approximate the percentage of Negroes in our population, the significant fact is that a smaller proportion of Negroes meet the physical and mental standards for induction, and of these, a larger proportion are drafted.

Statistically, then, the Negro qualified for induction stands twice as great a chance of being drafted as does the white who is qualified for military service.

SOUTH AFRICA MUST RE-EXAMINE ITS RACIAL POLICIES

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the strict segregation of the races that is attempted by the Government of South Africa is bringing it more problems every day.

The Christian Science Monitor for February 17 points out that South Africa must "find the will and the means to bring all of its inhabitants, regardless of color, into a fuller participation in all aspects of national life."

I commend this editorial to the attention of other Members of the House.

New Dilemma in South Africa

A dispatch to this newspaper from Cape Town recently revealed another of the serious difficulties facing the Republic of South Africa. In its efforts to increase the white percentage of the population, the government has been encouraging European immigration. Now, however, there is a rising demand from within the Afrikaans-speaking community that such immigration be halted. And the reason? Because most of the newcomers were found to be joining the English-speaking sector, arousing fear among the Afrikaners that their present firm grip on the government might some day be swept away.

Thus the government finds itself in a cleft stick. On the one hand the white population (both Afrikaans- and English-speaking) came to less than one in every five South Africans in the 1960 census. Furthermore, the nonwhite majority (black Africans, Cape Coloureds, and Indians) has a far higher birthrate than the whites. Therefore, if there is no immigration, the whites will become a smaller and smaller minority year by year.

On the other hand, the Nationalist government has clearly found it impossible to find adequate sources of immigration (the most likely being German and Dutch Protestants) who can be expected to meld with the Afrikaner portion of the white population. Thus any other kind of white inflow raises its own threat to Nationalist sway—that of seeing English-speaking whitedom take over the running of the country.

This dilemma is but one of the forces which will inevitably force the Republic of South Africa into a thoroughgoing reexamination of its basic racial policies. It becomes increasingly apparent that the fundamental need is for that land to find the will and the means to bring all of its inhabitants, regardless of color, into a fuller participation in all aspects of national life. This is an inescapable obligation, as the increasing contradictions of any other course of action show.

THE ROLE OF THE CIA

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the recent disclosure of the secret relationship between the CIA and several private organizations and of certain USIA activities has prompted considerable public discussion as to the proper role of these two groups.

Edward P. Morgan, news commentator for ABC, has expressed some penetrating observations on the dangers he sees in allowing these types of activities to continue.

I have unanimous consent to have these comments printed in the Record, as follows:

February 14, 1967.

According to the late George Orwell, the brilliant and iconoclastic British writer, Big Brother was not supposed to take over until 1984. But thanks to the assiduous stupidity of the Central Intelligence Agency and the well- if covertly-budgeted activities of other do-gooder bureaucracies within the U.S. government, the realization of that happy day of total domination of a citizen's life by higher authority may be hastened by a full 10 years if, indeed, it is not already upon us. This may come as a surprise to the Kremlin which had been under the impression that it was unchallenged in totalitarian pursuits. The jarring realization that the Americans are not only in the running but could conceivably claim the laurels is almost enough to blight the 50th anniversary celebration of the Bolshevik revolution which the Russians are now preparing for October. But after all, that's the risk the Marxists run in trying to compete with a free society which has a budget so big that it can afford to produce, not only color television sets but campus scholarships, in effect, for training in the arts of subversion and espionage, without really knowing what it is doing.

Ah, there's the rub—without really knowing what it is doing. No master demon is actually sitting in Washington conspiring to brainwash the American people and rob them of their rights. Nevertheless, this insidious operation is underway before our very eyes and we hardly know it is happening. It is not too late to understand what is going on and reverse it. But this involves a realization of what well-intentioned officials can do, are doing and have done, with budgets that have become bigger than the average mind can comprehend, and with the unquestioned purpose of furthering the national interest. But who defines the national interest these days?

The Defense Department has asked for 73 billion dollars to protect it. Inevitably, in spending that much money the Pentagon puts its own interpretation on the national interest, which bidders for defense contracts are not likely to challenge too sharply. The CIA's budget is chicken feed by comparison. It is secret but the New York Times in a revealing series on the agency last year estimated it as upward of half a billion. Even at current prices, that will feed a lot of chickens.

The trouble is now another CIA turkey has come home to roost. Eclipsing its expose last spring of how a Michigan State University project for training Vietnamese police had become a front for the agency, an irreverent monthly magazine called Ramparts now reveals this: The CIA for about 15 years has been subsidizing the international staff of the biggest, most moderate and most "respectable" campus organization in the country, NSA, the National Student Association. How patriotic, how appropriate, how economical! Teach red-blooded young Americans how to spot a revolutionary at a World Youth Congress, then let these budding James Bonds come back and report. There is, in fact, great merit in briefing youth on the sinister facts—and they can be sinister—of international political life. But the place for this is not in some secret school for Junior G-men but openly, in public and private education.

The ghastly trouble now is that the public doesn't really know whether some university training project is being secretly financed. Just as the Michigan State-CIA liaison was being revealed, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, with reluctance and embarrassment, publicly severed its ties with the agency which had helped establish, with a $300,000 grant, MIT's Center of International Studies in 1951. With six million dollars to spend, the U.S. Army hired a special task force from American University in Washington to conduct a secret study of revolutionary situations in Latin America in 1965. Fortunately it was exposed and blew up before it did much diplomatic damage. Even earlier educators were debating the dubious merits of disguised federal support for special "education" projects. How can you fertilize academic freedom if the administration is not free to say why or whence the cash is coming?

The New York Times revealed two Sundays ago that ROTC cadets in seven western states have been given "confidential instruction that association with certain political organizations could endanger their being granted a commission." An interesting military invasion of a civilian province which the Defense Department confirms. The U.S. Information Agency in the past has secretly contracted with authors to write books, whose federal sponsorship was not known. The USIA has lamely complained that only a "few" such instances were involved.

Why don't the master minds in the CIA, the Pentagon, the USIA and elsewhere in government stop to think sometimes what their pretty plans are likely to do to the very free institutions they are supposed to be helping protect? The CIA found the virginal Peace Corps almost irresistible but President Kennedy extracted Director Allen Dulles' solemn pledge its honor would not be violated with spies. Presumably it remains pure as the driven snow but the CIA seduction of the NSA now unfairly raises insidious doubts.

In George Orwell's book "1984" Big Brother's one-party system has three slogans: "War is Peace," "Freedom is Slavery," and "Ignorance is Strength." They'd sound pretty good, wouldn't they, under government subsidy?

This is Edward P. Morgan saying good night from Washington.

THE TRICK IS PEOPLE

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a pene-

trating analysis of the process necessary for modernizing society in the developing nations was presented last weekend by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse].

His emphasis on the strategy and techniques for involving people in running their own affairs deserves careful reading by all Members as a basis for shaping foreign aid legislation for fiscal 1968.

The remarks follow:

The Trick Is People

(Remarks of Congressman F. Bradford Morse, Republican, of Massachusetts, before the conference on "Societal Change in Developing Countries: Alternatives to Revolution" Institute of International Relations, Stanford University, February 24–26, 1967)

It is most impolite for a guest to criticize the topic of his host's conference. Nevertheless, I feel I must take issues with the "Alternatives to Revolution" portion of the conference theme, for I am convinced that there is no alternative to revolution. The problem for the developed and the developing society alike is to encourage that revolution to be a quantitative increase in political effectiveness rather than a cycle of violence, coup and instability.

The deficit in our thinking about development has been that we have concerned ourselves principally with but one aspect; economics. Increasingly we are discovering that this is inadequate. It is not enough merely to provide more economic resources. This must be done, of course, but more money, more dams, more transportation networks will not in themselves bring about the broad-gauge development that is necessary to put the developing societies into the 20th century as effective nations.

We must give equal attention to the development of human resources, in short, with political development. Because as John Plank of the Brookings Institution has put it, "political development in the last analysis is something that occurs in individuals."

It is time to stand some of the traditional theories about development on their heads. One need look only at Germany of the 1930's and South Africa today to demonstrate that economic progress does not necessarily lead to political enlightenment. Fortunately, there is evidence, of which this conference is a leading example, of a new interest and attention to the political dimension of development.

Another evidence is the enactment of a new Title IX in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966. The text of Title IX is short and simple. It provides that "emphasis shall be placed on assuring maximum participation through the encouragement of private voluntary organizations and strengthened local government institutions." Both elements are virtually unknown in much of the developing world.

The co-author of Title IX, Congressman Donald Fraser of Minnesota, has stated the thrust of the legislation this way: "The Problem of the developing nation requires attention to the social and political structures. These must be changed to release the energies—where they exist—of individual men and women who want to improve their lot. This will lead to economic progress." I would argue that we can even go beyond this to help create energies for development. We can help instill the idea in individual men and women that their action, especially when combined with that of their neighbors, can bring change for the better.

I want to make it clear that by turning our attention to political development, we should in no way insist upon any particular political system, nor attempt to impose any particular political institutions. The encouragement of involvement, of popular participation, is the key. Nor do I suggest that we fight the cold war between free and communist societies in the developing world. To be sure, this is still a significant concern as the famous country/city conflict formulation of Lin Piao demonstrates. It has always been a problem for Americans to understand why, despite generous outpourings of money and material goods, the developing nations are not more stable, their people not more committed to the "democratic way of life", and the appeal of communism is still so great.

Part of the problem is inherent in the moderation and pluralism of the democratic approach. Part lies in the relative stages of historical development. C. E. Black has put the contrast well:

"The societies that modernized relatively early were able to adopt a pragmatic approach to their problems and did not bother to think in general terms about what they were doing. When it comes to presenting a succinct statement of their experience and its relevance to other societies, they are at something of a disadvantage as compared with a communist leadership that has gone to great trouble to conceptualize and rationalize its program. In many instances where rapid modernization is taking place with the methods and assistance of the advanced societies, the indigenous political and intellectual leaders are lacking in ideological goals and incentives."

What is the framework in which we will be operating in any effort to contribute to the political maturity of developing nations? Many of our historians and political analysts have listed the characteristics of the modernizing society. They include: consolidation of local authorities, creation of a relatively large and effective bureaucracy, increase in citizen participation in government, increased use of a common language, heightened nationalism, urbanization, levelling of income, education and social differences, growth of mass media, mechanization of agricultural and industrial activities, higher standards of health, disintegration of traditional family and tribal units, increased application of violence, and atomization of the individual from his traditional sources of security.

These characteristics are found in varying degrees and in varying combinations, but to a large extent they reflect the pattern of development of the western societies more nearly than the patterns we have seen so far in the developing world. The nations of Latin America, Africa and Asia have experienced more of the negative than the positive factors of development thus far. The disintegrative factors have outpaced the integrative ones. And the job of achieving broad economic and social progress is proving far more difficult than imagination and expectation are prepared to accept. This makes political development all the more necessary and urgent. As one scholar has said, "it is the past and prospective inadequacy of economic and socal progress that argues strongly for more direct action to develop political systems than can enable developing societies to contain and manage the explosive tensions being generated by continuing and inevitable economic and social frustrations."

Without the existence of political leverage through democratic institutions, frustrations will mount; the people will become more susceptible to demagogic appeals; and violent efforts to smash the machinery of society can be the logical result. The government must then be preoccupied with security rather than development and the vicious cycle of constitutional instability and lack of growth continues.

STRATEGY

The key to the strategies we adopt to help achieve political development must be the determination of what kind of nation and society is to be the product. The strategies will vary according to the traditions and needs of the country involved, but I think it is possible to formulate some possible goals at three levels: at the level of value, at the level of the structure needed to implement those values, and at the level of the performance of the institutions in the structure.

At the value level, political development involves:

1. A sense of community. This includes the integration into the nation-building process of disparate language, tribal, ethnic and geographic groups.
2. Honest, efficient administration. A government riddled with corruption and inefficiency cannot hope to command the support of its citizens.
3. Democracy. By this I do not mean the institutions of federalism and separation of powers as we know them, but rather rights for all individuals, and the correlative obligations of citizenship, including participation in the political process, respect for law, and the tolerance of dissent.
4. The opportunity for civic participation. This involves the freedom for voluntary associations to exist and flourish. De Tocqueville recognized the importance of such associations in our own development when he wrote:

"As soon as several of the inhabitants of the United States have taken up an opinion or a feeling which they wish to promote in the world, they lock out for mutual assistance; and as soon as they have found one another out, they combine. From that moment they are no longer isolated men, but a power seen from afar, whose actions serve for an example and whose language is listened to."

At another level, it has been argued that certain structural features are necessary. One such listing includes:

1. An effective executive, including a responsible bureaucracy with an imaginative planning capacity.
2. Enforceable limitations on government to guarantee civil liberties.
3. The mechanism for the participation of the adult citizenry in the decision-making process. In practical terms this would involve an elected representative body, especially at the municipal level.
4. The existence of general rules that apply to all citizens, in all regions, at all levels of economic and social achievement.
5. An independent judiciary.
6. Effective decentralization of governmental authority and performance.
7. Political parties and other voluntary groups.

It would be a mistake to insist that each and every one of these institutions be included in our political development model. It is possible to foresee a variety of combinations, suited to the circumstances of the particular nation involved. And we must always resist the temptation to talk about government, politics, or development as a product rather than a process. It is one thing to create a democratic constitutional structure. It is quite another, as our Latin American neighbors have found out, to make it work.

And now we are brought right down to the level of the individual again. In this connection, I would insist very strongly on the existence and support for free voluntary private associations at all levels of government. As we know from our own experience, such organizations are channels for individual expression, teachers of cooperation, and vehicles for economic, social and political change.

The mere existence of such organizations will not ensure liberty, however. They must be democratically run, responsive to the needs of their members, and recognize that opposition to one government may mean responsibility for the next.

This is particularly true of political parties. In many countries, parties have not served as vehicles of change, but as vehicles for personal gain. A responsible political party must recognize its role as an agency of civic education, as a training ground for future leaders, and as the potential resource of responsible government.

To this end, it has an obligation to provide accurate and honest information to its members and the public at large, to build for consensus not division, and to define the issues fairly so that the voters have a meaningful choice between relevant alternatives.

TECHNIQUES

As a politician, I am realistic enough to admit that it is one thing to state the goals of a politically developed society. It is quite another to achieve them. As members of a society that is sometimes deficient at one or another, or all of these levels of values, structure and performance, what do we have to offer the developing world? What are the techniques of political development?

It is here that we are most sadly lacking in information, not only about what techniques will be successful, but about what is already being done. I have been amazed by the number of programs and organizations that have come to light since public encouragement was provided by the enactment of Title IX. One of the other amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act last year called for greater use of the private sector to achieve development goals. These two commands of the law should be closely coordinated.

Whatever our deficiencies as a nation, I am convinced that we have a great deal to offer, perhaps primarily at the private level. I do not think that it is only traditional Republican policy that persuades me of the crucial role that private enterprise, the free trade union movement, universities, women's groups, and trade associations have played in our own development. There is much that these groups can do to help in Latin America and elsewhere. Many of them are already engaged in exciting programs; we need the organizational capacity to collect the results of their efforts, and share their conclusions with others.

In 1966, we tried to institutionalize this process by requiring AID to: "establish an effective system for obtaining adequate information with respect to the activities of, and opportunities for, nongovernmental participation in the development process, and for utilizing such information in the planning, direction, and execution of programs carried out under this Act, and in the coordination of such programs with the ever-increasing developmental activities of nongovernmental United States institutions;"

I feel sure that the Congress will inquire carefully into the results that have been achieved thus far when the 1967 bill is before us.

But while I am the first to agree that we need far more research, I would be the last to admit that we cannot act until that research is accomplished. And I think that there are ongoing programs that bear me out.

Some of the most important programs involve the training of leadership. In Latin America there are a number of outstanding statesmen, but lacking are the leaders at the middle and lower levels with the capacity to mobilize public energies and establish the institutions needed to permit effective realization of economic and social goals. Sensitive Americans are engaged in a variety of efforts, using local instructors and specially prepared materials, to help train the community development workers who will go out into the rural areas and attempt to integrate those elements in the national economic and political life.

But, training is only one aspect of the political development process. The structure must be able to provide an outlet for the leader's desire to change and improve the lot of his followers. Expectations inevitably aroused must have a realistic hope of fulfillment. One of the key questions raised in the recent hearings of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Organizations on the role of communications in the foreign policy process was, motivation for what? As Congressman Fraser pointed out, the motivation of a farmer to grow more may have a destructive impact when his increase ends up in the hands of a corrupt tax collector.

As a consequence political development techniques must operate at a number of levels. On a visit to Chile in 1965 I was much impressed with the efforts of a Dutch agronomist and his wife to instill self-help attitudes through the establishment of an agricultural cooperative for the farming of vegetables. As I pointed out in my report upon my return, "they have had grave difficulties in obtaining a truck to help market the produce—an item that could spell the difference between success and failure of the project, and between hope and despair for the people of the area." I was disturbed that our aid program did not seem to be able to meet this minimal, but important need. Economic significance rather than potential political implication has seemed to govern the attitudes of our AID missions.

Ways must be found to incorporate the political development component into our planning and programming of economic and social development. I have seen, for example, an excellent attempt to do this for Brazil through the development of a grid indicating the program goals in the country, the specific output targets in terms of numbers of teachers, quantity of investment, etc. and the items of self-help input that will work with the necessary aid from external sources to achieve the desired goals. Popular participation is included at every level. This is the kind of thinking that must move beyond the staff level to the highest levels in AID.

One of the most ambitious efforts at political development has been the East Pakistan experience with the creation of local governmental institutions. The traditional highly centralized governmental structure was replaced with an integrated township-country-regional system. Wide latitude for decision making was permitted at local level with provisions for regional networks and systems to avoid duplication and uncoordinated effort. The results, as described in the forthcoming book "The Strategy of Democratic Development" by Edger L. Owens, have been remarkable, both in terms of citizen participation and in terms of economic performance.

As these examples demonstrate the task of political development involves education, the improvement of public administration, and the increase of political leverage for change at all levels. It involves the participation of far more people and resources than is now contemplated by our foreign aid program. It means the resources of U.S. private groups, public programs, and the efforts of our friends in the other developed countries as well. It requires the commitment and resources of the developing countries themselves.

Having set ourselves such an enormous task, what progress are we making? I am both encouraged and discouraged by the degree of attention that is being given to the implementation of Title IX by the Administration.

Vice President Humphrey clearly understands the nature of the challenge. In a speech at the Pan American Union last fall he said:

"Economic and social development can help significantly to provide the basis for civic advancement, but it will not guarantee it. The past and prospective inadequacy of economic and social progress argues strongly for more conscious action to develop political systems that can enable rapidly changing societies to contain and manage explosive tensions within them."

Yet there was no reference to Title IX or to the concepts of political development in the President's Message to the Congress on foreign aid. Political development may be an idea whose time has come only to Congress. To some extent the time lag is one of personnel. Some of my friends have argued that you have to be a politician to understand and implement Title IX. Others point to the large number of economists, some of whom date back to the Marshall Plan, in policy-making roles in our aid program. Others note once again how little we really know about the developmental process.

All of these obstacles can be understood, but they do not persuade me that a start, however limited, cannot be made *now* toward the achievement of democratic development goals. We need more research; in particular we need case studies of successful political development efforts. Perhaps most of all we need more people with political skills directing the development effort.

As a layman in the field, I have not attempted to provide definite answers to the riddles of economic, social and political progress. Nor have I been precise in defining my terms. What I have attempted to do in these brief remarks is to draw upon the analysis of some of the most thoughtful individuals I have encountered to stimulate your thinking and your discussion.

Our success has not been so great, nor is our time span so long that we can afford to close our minds to new concepts and new techniques.

PROHIBITION ON MILITARY INSIGNIA

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing a bill to amend section 704 of title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the manufacture, sale, wear, or reproduction of military insignia by unauthorized persons. During the 89th Congress hearings were held on my bill, H.R. 15571, but no further action was taken. The bill I am introducing today is almost identical to H.R. 15571, with only a few technical changes.

I first became aware of the need for such legislation after reading in the Baltimore Sun of a bank holdup executed by a bandit wearing an imitation of a green beret. The green beret, with appropriate insignia, is worn by members of the Army Special Forces, who undergo rigorous training to win it. So proud are these fighting men of their headgear that a visiting general was recently turned down on his request to borrow one. Yet, upon investigation, I discovered that an imitation green beret could be purchased in the local five and dime by anyone with $1.10.

When I asked the FBI to investigate the selling of the berets with the facsimile of the Army insignia, the special agents assigned to the case were informed by the U.S. District Attorney in Baltimore, Mr. Thomas J. Kenney, that there was some doubt as to whether or not military insignia were covered by either section 701 or 704 of title 18, although existing law clearly prohibits the wearing of military apparel. My bill amends section 704 to prohibit explicitly manufacturing, selling, wearing, or reproducing military insignia. Furthermore, it clarifies the meaning of insignia, stating that military insignia include medals, decorations, badges, cap devices, ribbons, buttons, rosettes, emblems, patches, flags, seals, coats of arms, shoulder, lapel, and sleeve insignia, and any devices used to indicate grade, rating, branch, service, or duty assignment. Thus, unauthorized use of such military insignia as the Special Forces green beret would be subject to prosecution and punishment under the amended code.

As the result of the FBI inquiry which I initiated, a nationwide retail chain returned all 12,000 unsold green berets to the manufacturer, who has in turn stopped making the imitation berets. However, under the present law neither the retailer nor the manufacturer could have been forced to desist, and there is no way of preventing their quiet resumption of both production and sale.

When I first introduced H.R. 15571, certain organizations whose members wear green berets feared that my bill would prohibit their wearing of traditional headgear. I should like to make it clear that my legislation is intended only to prevent the use of imitation military insignia and thus does not in any way affect organizations such as the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts. In addition, my bill clearly provides for authorization by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of a military department with approval of the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary of the Treasury of special uses of military insignia. The major purpose of my bill is to prevent unauthorized use of military insignia that could degrade the meaning of the symbol or defame the character of those authorized to wear it.

Public reaction to my bill has been enthusiastic. I received a letter from the mother of a son on his way to Vietnam, commending me for taking steps to end the degradation of such an honorable and coveted award. Her son had written:

> I talked to the rest of the men in my unit about the Green Berets. They think just about the same way that I do. I feel that the Green Berets are something you work for and can be proud of. I myself don't think they should sell them any place.

The mother felt that the men who wear the green beret are "special men with special training—they have worked and sacrificed for the honor of wearing the green beret, and the badge of courage."

I have received wholehearted support of my bill from several veterans' organizations. The national commander of the AMVETS, Ralph E. Hall, wrote:

> We are grateful that you have initiated action to correct over-the-counter sale of military type clothing. The Green Berets, worn by Special Forces, are a badge of honor and should not be sold to or worn by civilians.

Claude L. Callegary, the national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, sent a telegram from the National Convention in New York endorsing H.R. 15571.

Mr. Speaker, I shall press for prompt and favorable action on my bill, which will close the loopholes in the present statute and prevent the degradation, through unauthorized use, of U.S. military insignia.

AMEND THE FLAMMABLE FABRICS ACT

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, is there anyone among us who has not come face-to-face, either through personal experience or through the experience of a friend or neighbor, with the pain, the suffering, the tragedy of burns caused by clothing fires? I think the answer would most probably be "No." Every year, more than one-quarter million people suffer burns from clothing fires. More than 2,000 people die from these burns. This is not a rare problem. It is not a peculiar problem. It is a problem that has touched many families across the Nation. Unfortunately, the typical victim is either a very young person or a very old person; people least capable of protecting themselves.

In the city of Detroit, I am advised that during 1966 there were almost 1,700 fires directly involving clothing, bedding, upholstered furniture, and so forth. In addition to the very substantial monetary damage involved in these fires, it is estimated that 50 persons lost their lives. Detroit Fire Department officials tell me that there were about 80 incidents of clothing fires, in which seven children lost their lives. Out of 159 hotel fires in 1966, there were 99 bedding fires in which 35 persons were killed. As to dwelling fires, I am told that there were approximately 1,500 which involved burning furnishings—sofas, overstuffed chairs, bedding, and so forth, and which resulted in seven deaths. These dwelling fires were generally caused by the careless discarding of smoking materials, largely cigarettes.

In places of public assembly, Detroit fire officials tell me that interior furnishing fires are not a great problem, because such establishments are required to submit their furnishings for inspection. Unless these furnishings meet rather stringent flammability standards, they cannot be installed.

It seems apparent to me that, since experience shows that stringent flammability standards successfully reduce fire dangers in such places as restaurants, bars, theaters, and so forth, we should apply similar standards to all clothing and interior furnishings. And that is precisely what my bill would do.

Some of the Members may recall that in 1953 a Flammable Fabrics Act was passed by the Congress and signed into law by the President. That act was specifically designed to remove from the market certain well-publicized items of clothing, including the famous "torch sweaters." The act did, in fact, accomplish this objective. However, it left untouched many other items which are still on the market, and which continue to pose a threat to the safety of men, women, and children today.

President Johnson, in his message, "To Protect the American Consumer," referred to this continuing problem as "one gap in existing legislation which is so glaring that action should not be delayed."

I agree with this assessment, and, accordingly, I have introduced a bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act of 1953, to broaden and strengthen the protection afforded by this law.

The bill I have introduced would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to: First, revise the existing standards for flammability of wearing apparel to make them more effective; second, issue standards for flammability of interior furnishings, such as draperies, bedding, rugs, upholstery, and foam padding, if it is determined through due process that such standards are needed; third, conduct a study, together with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on the causes of human and material losses resulting from furnishings and fabric fires; and fourth, perform laboratory research into the flammability of furnishings, fabrics, and materials.

It is desirable to treat the safety issue caused by this type of fire as a special case. This is because burns present a most difficult medical problem. The amount of care, time, and expense required during the recovery period is much greater than for most other types of injuries.

I commend this bill to the thoughtful deliberation of all Members, and I urge your support for enactment of these progressive and modernizing amendments.

ACCIDENTS IN THE HOME

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the expression "safe at home" becomes a hollow mockery when we come face to face with the hard statistics that several thousand people die each year and more than 20 million are injured because of accidents that occur in and around the home. Perhaps accidents are an element of human nature that we can never hope to eliminate completely. But we can certainly do a lot more than is presently being done to alleviate the threat to life and limb from some of the household products of modern technology.

These products I am referring to are not experimental devices. They are not untried and untested products. They are items found in millions of homes throughout the country. They include furnaces, stoves, incinerators, hot water heaters, sun lamps, power tools, glass doors, lawnmowers, and a host of electrical appliances. These products should not be outlawed. They are useful, necessary, functional, labor-saving, pleasure-giving products which we all want to use and enjoy. But we want to use and enjoy them with the highest degree of assurance of safety that is possible for well-intentioned men to provide.

In President Johnson's state of the Union message, he gave a high priority to steps to safeguard the home against hazardous household products. In the President's message, "To Protect the American Consumer," he recommended the enactment of legislation to establish a National Commission on Product Safety. Because of my strong feeling that we must take effective action based on a foundation of knowledge, I have introduced a bill to establish a National Commission on Product Safety.

The proposed Commission would conduct a factfinding study of the protection consumers now have against injuries caused by hazardous household products, and would report back to the President and the Congress with its recommendations within 18 months. The study would include: First, identification of those products which are determined to present unreasonable hazards; second, the extent to which self-regulation by industry is effective; third, protection given by common law in the States; and fourth, a review of Federal, State, and local laws aimed at dealing with this problem. Those products which have come under recent congressional scrutiny would be excluded from the Commission's study.

Users of household products would have a new sense of security in their enjoyment of these products. Manufacturers would have a single, national pattern to deal with in regard to their liability for possible injuries.

I believe that this proposal is clearly in the public interest, and I urge all Members to give it their most earnest consideration and support.

THE TIME IS NOW FOR CHANGE IN OUR DRAFT LAWS

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Brown] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with other Members of Congress in introducing legislation calling for the establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on American Manpower and National Security. The purpose of the committee will be to thoroughly explore and evaluate the complex problem of compulsory manpower procurement for our military needs and the effect of this compulsory system on the civilian sector of our economy, and on the traditions of freedom and human liberty that form such an integral part of our American way of life.

We are all aware of the injustices and inequities existing in the present draft laws and in the system of administering the laws. We discuss and debate these defects each time the draft is due to expire. We acknowledge that a major overhaul of the system is needed, but we take no legislative steps to accomplish this goal. Instead, we vote another automatic extension of the law as it stands.

The time could not be more appropriate for a thorough congressional review of the entire draft structure. We are faced with practically an unlimited supply of draft-age young men as the "baby boom" of 20 years ago comes of age. The increase in draft calls demanded by our tragic involvement in Vietnam has barely tapped this manpower supply. Despite these facts, however, as the draftable manpower pool grows, the percentage of young men in the 19-through-25 age bracket called on to serve steadily diminishes. The unprecedented number of registrants has led to highly selective procedures being followed by the Armed Forces and the Selective Service System. Increasingly we hear the charges that the draft is unfair and discriminatory in many of its aspects.

I am convinced, and I am sure many of my colleagues share this conviction, that public dissatisfaction with the draft is constantly growing. Various reforms have been suggested to modernize the admittedly antiquated draft laws and the system's administrative machinery. Various alternatives to the draft have been proposed—ranging from a lottery system to a military force composed entirely of volunteers. Yet we have undertaken no comprehensive congressional review of the defects inherent in the present system. We have not utilized the congressional committee process to study the relationship of our military manpower procurement policies to our civilian resources and needs. We have failed to investigate the feasibility of initiating another method of procuring men for military service. And, most importantly of all, Congress has given no serious consideration to the basic question of whether we intend to make the draft a permanent institution in our national life, which we have done informally by our automatic renewal of its statutory life.

There are some who will no doubt question the need for a congressional committee study of these problems. I am sure it will be pointed out that numerous commissions and special committees, appointed by and operating under authority of the executive branch, have studied and made recommendations in the area of military manpower needs and procurement. In fact, we are presently waiting for the report on the draft by the latest of these special study groups, the President's National Commission on Selective Service. This particular report was due in January 1967. We can seriously ask if the timing of its presentation will allow us time enough to thoroughly review and digest its contents before we consider legislation to further extend the draft.

I do not believe Congress can sidestep its clearcut responsibility to investigate and offer constructive legislation that would basically improve, or hopefully abolish, the present system of military conscription. A joint congressional committee, composed of members of the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Education and Labor would be an ideal forum for conducting the type of investigation that is so urgently needed. The composition of the committee, representing as it would members from committees already concerned with the broad areas of manpower policies, would provide ample assurance that the viewpoint of the Department of Defense is not the only opinion that will be assimilated by the committee. Open, public hearings, where the testimony of experts in military and civilian manpower needs can be subjected to cross-examination and questioning, and their arguments carefully weighed, offer the best method available for a complete and impartial review of the draft laws now in effect. I believe we owe it to the American people to make such an investigation, and I earnestly implore my colleagues to join me in supporting the legislation designed to accomplish this task.

ELECTRICALLY POWERED VEHICLES

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Brown] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation for a Government-supported program to accelerate the research, development, and demonstration of electrically powered vehicles as a means of seeking alternatives to the internal combustion engine for purposes of reducing the Nation's air pollution problems.

In a recent message to Congress, President Johnson cited the motor vehicle as a major source of air pollution. He said this:

> Many sources of air pollution cannot be economically or effectively controlled by our present technology. The sheer number of motor vehicles, may, within a decade or two, defy the best pollution control methods we can develop.
>
> If this proves true surely we cannot continue to use the type of internal combustion engine now in service. New types of internal combustion engines—or indeed new propulsion systems—may be required.

I think it is quite evident that present technology is capable of finding alternative means of propelling vehicles that would help solve a wide range of problems associated with urban congestion, mass transportation, air and noise pollution, and personal travel inconveniences.

It is ironic that although the United States may be first in space, we are bogged down on earth with enormous and frustrating problems that affect the well-being of our people. They grow more complex and more severe and yet we seem unwilling or unable to reassess our national priorities so that we can begin to develop meaningful solutions.

It has been demonstrated by a recent Gallup poll that millions of Americans would be interested in purchasing an inexpensive electrically powered vehicle, mainly for use as a second car.

Those who were polled were asked if they would buy an electric vehicle—chiefly for use for shopping and other limited purposes—that would have a maximum speed of 40 miles per hour and a range of about 150 miles between battery recharges. As projected, the vehicle would be small and easy to park.

Gallup reported that the results of the poll demonstrated that 36 million adults would be interested in acquiring such a vehicle. On the basis of this finding, it is apparent that an electrically powered passenger vehicle would find a large market.

At present, a limited amount of research relating to the development of batteries and electrical components is being performed by several agencies of the Federal Government. The legislation which I have introduced today would coordinate and centralize this research and set up a new program of total research.

Reports from overseas indicate that other countries are moving more rapidly toward the development of electrically powered vehicles. Electric buses and cars are being tested in Japan; battery operated trucks are being utilized in England; and, a battery-powered train is being developed in Germany.

Senator MAGNUSON, who has provided such imaginative leadership in Congress in this field, has pointed out that the electric battery-powered vehicle affords an opportunity "to make a fresh start with new and more efficient concepts and materials." I agree.

WRIGHT PATMAN SOUNDS THE ALARM AGAINST THE HIGH INTEREST RATE

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, no one in Congress has been more alert or more persistent in pointing out the dangers of high interest rates to the American economy than my widely respected colleague, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN.

The distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee last week again sounded the alarm against the high interest rate, tight money policies in a speech before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in San Francisco, Calif. This meeting, the annual gathering of rural electric cooperatives from 46 States, attracted more than 9,000 delegates.

As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] told these rural electric leaders, the toll of high interest rates is taking huge sums out of the Federal Treasury at a time when programs such as rural electrification, the war on poverty, education, and urban renewal are hard pressed for the necessary funds. I join the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] in his call for an immediate rollback of interest rates to levels existing before the December 6, 1965, increase imposed by the Federal Reserve Board.

The speech of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] before the NRECA meeting should be must reading for anyone interested in the Nation's monetary affairs. I commend it to my colleagues:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE WRIGHT PATMAN, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, TO THE 25TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 21, 1967, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Thank you—fellow fighters against high interest rates—for inviting me to San Francisco.

The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and its member systems, have always been dependable and effective allies in the battle for sound monetary policy and low interest rates. Through the years, your individual systems, your state associations, and your great national organization have been in the frontlines of the fight. Your resolutions, your words of encouragement, and your active support are deeply appreciated by every member of Congress who is seeking to bring some semblance of sense and responsibility to our monetary system.

Many of you in this room I recognize from past battles for lower and lower interest rates. Certainly none of us identified with the cause for low interest rates could forget the tremendous work of Clyde Ellis. I have known Clyde for many years, both as a colleague in the House of Representatives and as Washington's most able spokesman for Rural America.

Through the years, Capitol Hill—and this includes some of his most ardent enemies—has come to know Clyde Ellis as a tough battler who steadfastly refuses to compromise away any of the hard-won rights of the rural electric systems.

NRECA—under the leadership of Clyde Ellis—has moved to the forefront as a powerful force for all rural America. Today, NRECA is an organization that no one in Washington can afford to ignore.

That is why I am so happy to have allies like NRECA and Clyde Ellis on my side in this fight against high interest rates. I was impressed by the fine turnout at your conference on the "Tight Money Crisis" in Washington last month. This was a worthwhile effort and one which I am sure will continue to pay dividends in our campaign for lower interest rates.

Your battle against high interest rates is *not* separate from your fight for a strong rural electrification program and for a strong rural America. This battle is tied up with your day to day fight for existence. It cannot be separated.

As you learned during the bitter Eisenhower-Ezra Taft Benson days, high interest rates place a tremendous pressure on your 2% financing. When the Federal Reserve sends interest rates up, the power companies and your other enemies jump in and renew their hue and cry for higher interest rates on REA loans. High interest rates give your opponents a great weapon against you.

And now the highest interest rates in more than forty years are making it difficult, if not impossible, for you to develop a supplemental financing program. As soon as you announced plans to develop an REA bank, the Federal Reserve started jacking up interest rates. Today, high interest rates are placing a tremendous roadblock in the way of your efforts to develop a financing program that all of your systems can live with. The 37½% increase in interest rates imposed by the Federal Reserve on December 6, 1965 was a devastating blow to your systems and to your plans for the future.

So, my friends in the rural electrification program, let me warn you that high interest rates are endangering both 2% money and any type of supplemental financing program. In other words, interest rates must be brought down drastically if the rural electric program is to survive in this country. You are faced with a crisis of gigantic proportions. Nothing means more to the continued success—or more correctly the continued survival—of your program than the campaign to loosen credit and to bring an end to extortionate interest rates.

Let me say to you that this is not Wright Patman's crusade. I am not here to give you my theories and thoughts on monetary policy and the Federal Reserve. But I am here to talk to you as a friend and to tell you that this monetary crisis is a crisis for the rural electric program in every state.

This year, you will be coming to Congress for less than $400 million in loan funds. As you know, there is much talk on Capitol Hill about budget cuts and about the need to slow down needed economic and social programs. And I do not have to tell you that some of these budget slashers are thinking about the REA program.

It is too bad that some of our Republican friends, who talk so much about budget cuts, have so little to say about high interest rates. This year, $14.2 billion of your money—the taxpayers' money—will go down the drain for interest charges on the national debt. This is second only to the budget for national defense. This is $7,000,000,000 more than it would be under reasonable rates. Billions of dollars of taxpayers' money were wasted when the Federal Reserve raised interest rates in December, 1965. This is no guess—no figure pulled out of the sky.

Let me quote from the testimony of Charles L. Schultze, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, before the Ways and Means Committee last month:

"We estimate that the increasing shortage of credit funds and rising interest rates experienced last year are adding approximately $3 billion to the Federal budget for fiscal year 1967 as a whole . . ."

So, by the admission of the Bureau of the Budget—which I understand is not given to inflammatory statements—the Federal Reserve imposed $3 billion in extra costs on the Federal Government this year. This is at a time when your systems were struggling to get $350 million in appropriations from the Congress for loans. You had to fight all the way for this appropriation, while the Congress looked the other way and let the banks and a handful of others walk off with that $3 billion. And at the same time your opponents were yelling "waste" concerning your supplemental financing proposals.

Yes, your opponents are zeroing in against your efforts to set up some type of financing to supplement the basic REA 2% program. I am in sympathy with your efforts to establish some type of REA bank or other lending agency which would provide these funds. There have been many successful Federal banks, particularly in the area of farm credit, and I see no reason why the rural electric systems should be blocked off from this avenue of financing. However, I want to emphasize that this bank should be designed so that it provides credit, on reasonable terms, and without "strings" which would hamper your program.

The rural electrification program has gained the confidence of the American people through the years. Your record refutes the charges of "waste" which are made by some against Federal credit programs. The rural electrification program has been a productive, self-propelling program that has repaid and repaid the American people many times over. Rural electrification has enriched the resources of this country.

But, high interest payments are unnecessary and are indeed wasteful. They do not enrich our country.

It takes no mathematical genius to realize that the current level of interest payments by the Federal Government—$14.2 billion—is putting tremendous pressure on the entire budget, including the allocations for REA. Many opponents of our great economic and social programs—such as REA—are quite happy to see this situation developing. They are happy that interest rates are soaring and that interest charges in the Federal Budget are choking off funds from other parts of the Budget. High interest rates are another means for this group to fight REA, Social Security, the War on Poverty, and other similar programs.

You people from the rural communities of this country know, however, that the bite of high interest rates goes much deeper than just the Federal Budget. High interest rates traditionally have been a means of redistributing the wealth of this country from the poor and middle-income groups to the rich. High interest rates are a tax on the poor and a bonanza for the rich.

High interest rates and the restrictive loan policies of the big banks are the single biggest factor in creating poverty in this country. Today, nearly one-half of the poverty of this nation is in the rural areas and in the small towns. And these are areas that the big banks have traditionally refused to serve. These are the areas that are cut off first when the Federal Reserve tightens money and raises interest rates.

Yes, the big banks of this country stand indicted as the number one enemies of rural development. They have never cooperated with rural people or rural communities in development projects. They have instead sought out the easy, the safe, and the most profitable loans. As many of you in this audience know, farmers have always been treated as second-class citizens at the loan windows. Rural home owners have been forced to meet almost impossible loan requirements in the financing of the most modest houses.

The record of discrimination against rural communities and farmers by the nation's big banks is one of the sad chapters of the financial history of this country. Many once-fine rural communities, now ghost towns, can trace their sad plight directly to the refusal of credit by our banking institutions. In the First Congressional District of Texas, which I have represented since 1929, I have often seen the results of this discriminatory policy.

Your systems came into being because of the failure of the power companies to serve the rural areas. REA was born out of necessity and it continues today out of necessity. It is the same with the Federal credit programs. They came into being and are continued today because the banks said "no" to our rural people and our small businessmen.

The banks today are intensifying this trend. More and more they are discriminating against customers and against whole areas of the country. They are not meeting their assigned purposes in the economy.

The banks are refusing to cooperate with many of these Federal credit programs. In some areas they seem to be doing everything they can to wreck the projects. Recently in the hard-pressed Appalachian region, the Economic Development Administration—the successor to ARA—was willing to lend a new company $1 million. The agreement for the EDA loan came after a bank had promised to loan the company $400,000. But the bank pulled out and refused to make its loan, thereby killing the project which would have meant many new jobs for Appalachia.

The Small Business Administration has had similar difficulty in nearly every section of the country. The refusal of the banks to participate in good loans to good credit risks has stopped the development of small business enterprises. This has meant loss of jobs, loss of payrolls, and the loss of a chance to redevelop many small communities. This has been a sad spectacle and a disheartening situation for many struggling areas.

I am not in favor of nationalization of the banks. However, the banks' refusal to serve all the people and all the areas is creating a situation which may eventually call for drastic reforms. If the banks continue to thumb their noses at the public and serve only their corporate allies, the day may come when the country will demand a change in the system. If banking is ever nationalized in this country, it will be the bankers themselves who brought it about by ignoring the public interest.

Today, the customer has no recourse against discriminatory loan practices of a bank. The bank does not have to tell the customer why he is turned down. He can be turned down for any reason and that's the end of it The customer has no appeal. And when the customer is turned down at one bank, it is traditional policy for other banks in that area to accept that action and also refuse to make the loan.

Such a policy, of course, has extremely serious implications. It allows the banks to discriminate in favor of one business against another. It allows the banks to aid and abet the concentration of economic power in a few hands in a given area. It allows banks to penalize political enemies—and reward political friends. In short, the banks, through these discriminatory policies, can maintain a life and death power over all activity in a community. And again, there is absolutely no appeal to any type of tribunal. There is no process at the present time to prevent rank discrimination.

This policy is not in the public interest. In fact, it strikes at the heart of our competitive, free-enterprise system. The banks, more than any other institution, have the power to kill off competition, which is the lifeblood of the American economic system.

This situation should be corrected. At a minimum, there should be legislation which would make it possible for a customer to appeal a loan refusal directly to a Federal court. Here, the bank would be required to show cause for its action. It would have to have substantial and reasonable grounds for refusing credit.

This approach should give a public service character to the banking business. The banks, as many of you know, are in a virtual monopoly position in our economy. For instance, they are the only institutions that can legally provide checking account services. They have a monopoly in this area. They enjoy all types of protective and special advantages granted to them by the Federal and state governments. And, of course, the banks have tremendous tax advantages and subsidies.

Under our fractional reserve system, they create money on the Government's credit. Actually, for every dollar in reserves, the banking system is able to create about $14 for loan or investment purposes. Now, this is a huge advantage for the banks—a tremendous windfall. Yet, in return for these advantages—advantages that no other segment of our economy enjoys—the banks provide virtually nothing in the way of public service. Banks are quasi-utilities, but they take on no responsibility of utility services.

Your systems are required to hook up anybody in your service area. You cannot reject anyone and, of course, you would not think about doing so. But the banks, while enjoying monopoly positions, refuse service to the public and are free to discriminate in favor of the privileged few.

The growing dominance of the banking community over the American economy is going unnoticed in much of the press. But this is one of the greatest dangers existing to our competitive economic system. Banks are gobbling up small business enterprises at a fantastic rate. They are engaged in the insurance business, credit cards, automobile rentals, accounting, and a variety of other non-banking enterprises. All of this adds to the concentration of power in the hands of a few.

Back in December, our Banking and Currency Committee released a study into "Bank Ownership and Control". This study, as you may have noted in the press, revealed a startling amount of interlocking between banks, insurance companies and mutual savings banks. In many areas, it was discovered that banks were actually holding stock in other banks with which they were supposedly competing. The study indicates that the banking industry in many parts of the country is just one big, happy, interlocked family—with the public locked out.

The study revealed that the trust departments of the banks—which hold more than $215 billion—are providing the means by which the banks control the stock of other banks and a variety of corporations. In effect, this study destroyed the myth of competition and once again illustrated that the banking community is a prime instrument for concentration of power throughout our economy.

The interlocking relationship of the banks with the rest of the big business community is fantastically far-reaching. The pattern is widespread. For example, power company executives invariably find themselves on the boards of the big banks. Needless to say, such a situation would hardly lead the banking community to take a friendly attitude towards rural electrification.

The growing concentration of power in the hands of the banks and their growing role as the czars of the economy are developments which strike right at the heart of programs like REA and small enterprises everywhere.

This growing power of the banks results directly from the willful neglect by the so-called bank supervisory agencies of the Federal Government. This includes the Federal Reserve Board, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. These agencies, instead of protecting the public, have served as vehicles for the promotion of the interests of the banks and, for the most part, the interests of the big banks.

This fact of life is one of the major reasons why we have high interest rates today. In 1965, the big banks, primarily those located in Chicago and New York, demanded an increase in interest rates so that they could hold on to about $16 billion in time deposits. The Federal Reserve, so used to being a lackey for these banks, gave in almost within hours and granted the 37½% increase in interest rates.

Since that time, we have had skyrocketing interest rates which have created unnecessary and heavy burdens on the consumer, on the Federal Government, and on state and local governments. The Federal Reserve System has either been unwilling, or unable, to stop the trend. It has either been unwilling or unable to say "no" to the big bankers.

The reasons are obvious. The entire Federal Reserve System is set up and operated in a manner designed to give the commercial banking industry the maximum control of basic monetary decisions. Eighty-four of the 108 directors of the twelve Federal Reserve banks either are now, or have been, officers, directors, or stockholders of commercial banks and their opinions and their actions reflect this background.

When the Federal Reserve's Open Market Committee meets in Washington in secret, the twelve presidents of the Federal Reserve Banks—all elected by commercial banking interests—are there participating in the monetary decisions. These bankers—the people who are going to profit from high interest rates—make the decisions. Under such a system it is not surprising that the public interest is consistently trampled in these secret sessions of the Federal Reserve.

Of course, this setup would be just like having the major power company presidents sitting in on the loan decisions at REA, or participating in the actions of the Federal Power Commission. It is just like having the railroad presidents sitting on the Interstate Commerce Commission, or the television broadcasters sitting on the Federal Communications Commission. The country would not allow this to happen, but it happens all the time in the field of monetary policy.

This banker-oriented domination is heightened by the fact that the Federal Reserve has seized its independence and is unaccountable to the President or the Congress. The Federal Reserve does not come to Congress for appropriations and its books are not audited as are other government agencies. Its Board members serve for 14-year terms and the terms are staggered in such a manner as to prevent a President from appointing a majority until his last year in office. In short, the Board and the entire Federal Reserve System has been shaped through the years to bring it closer to the banking industry and to move it farther and farther away from the public interest.

Actually, what we have in this country is a money dictatorship. The Federal Reserve System doesn't resemble anything else in our democratic government. Nothing else comes close to equalling the absolute, autocratic powers of the Federal Reserve.

When you take a long hard look at the structure, you come to realize that the Federal Reserve System has been shaped along the lines of agencies that are usually found in totalitarian states.

Now, I am not by any stretch of the imagination accusing the Federal Reserve, any of its members, or any banker of being Communistic. I want to make that point crystal clear.

However, the parallel between the set-up for the Communist Party in Russia and the Federal Reserve System in the United States is startling.

In the Soviet Union, a tightly-knit clique of the Communist Party runs everything, operating in total secrecy and with total disregard for the wishes of the people and the Russian Constitution.

In the United States, the monetary affairs are run by a tightly-knit clique of bankers, within the Federal Reserve System, operating in total secrecy and with total disregard for the people and for the Constitution of the United States. In both countries, a small group of people have knowledge of, and benefit from, the decisions of these tightly-knit cliques.

In the United States, monetary policy is basically controlled by the seven members of the Federal Reserve Board, the twelve presidents and the 108 directors of the twelve Federal Reserve banks. These 127 people, operating in a secretive manner, have absolute power over monetary decisions.

In the Soviet Union, there are 133 members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. This is the group that runs everything in Russia.

Both the Federal Reserve System and the Communist Party in Russia also have a more elite group—a small super-committee.

In the Federal Reserve System, this group is known as the Federal Open Market Committee, and is composed of the seven members of the Federal Reserve Board and five of the twelve presidents of the Federal Reserve Banks—twelve in all—with the other seven presidents participating.

In the Soviet Union, this is a small committee within the Central Committee known as the Politburo. This has eleven members compared with the Federal Open Market Committee's twelve.

When the Federal Open Market Committee meets every three weeks in Washington, it goes behind locked doors. The shades are drawn, and the Gestapo is put out in the hall to guard against any possible intrusion by outsiders. We never know what goes on in these meetings—until six years later—after the statute of limitations has run on any crime that might have been committed. It is in these sessions that the monetary decisions, interest rates, and the supply of money are decided. Not even the President of the United States can attend these secret sessions, nor can any member of the Congress.

In the Soviet Union, the Politburo meets several times a month in Moscow in totally secret sessions. No one is allowed past the armed guards. Like the Federal Open Market Committee, the decisions of the Politburo are kept secret until the Party decides to release the information.

In both the Soviet Union and in the Federal Reserve System, favors are dispensed to a select few.

The decisions of the Federal Open Market Committee on monetary affairs are made known to a handful of bankers and big business allies—perhaps as many as 2,000 to 3,000 people. They are the only ones who get this favored information and, of course, they are the ones who are in a position to profit from this knowledge.

In the Soviet Union, the Central Committee and the Politburo dispense favors to select members of the Communist Party. They get the advantages, the good housing, the cars, other special privileges and favored treatment.

The Communist Party takes care of its friends in Russia, and in the United States, the Federal Reserve takes care of its banker friends.

In both countries, the people are shut out. The people do not take part in the decisions and they do not benefit from them. Only an elite few get the benefit.

Now in the Soviet Union, we might expect this situation. It is a totalitarian state and it is not surprising that these decisions benefit the few and not the many. But in the United States, it is strange—and I believe tragic—that we have a Federal Reserve System that operates in the same manner as the Communist Party. It is out of step with our other democratic institutions. It is the rotten apple in our barrel of democracy.

Again, I want to say that I am not accusing anyone of being a Communist. But I am saying that both systems operate as dictatorships against the will of the people.

The reform of the Federal Reserve System is the key to lower interest rates. It is the key to a stable economy and to a stable monetary system which would allow programs like REA to go forward. Only under such stable monetary conditions can the rural electrification program expect to develop long-range financing programs to meet the future needs of its members.

It is true that in recent weeks there have been minor changes in the money market and there have been minor downward shifts in a few prime interest rates. But the basic situation has not changed. We are still in a very high interest rate economy. The bankers are convinced that they can hold onto most of the high interest rates which were ratcheted in by the December, 1965 action of the Federal Reserve. They do not plan to give this up unless they are forced to do so by public demand.

If the bankers do succeed in keeping high interest and forcing a tax increase on the people, then we may see a recession in 1967 and possibly in 1968. This country cannot stand high taxes and high interest rates at the same time. Already the economy shows soft spots in many areas, but the Federal Reserve still refuses to budge. In my opinion, we do not need a tax increase. What the economy does need is an immediate roll back of interest rates to the level existing before the December 6, 1965 increase of the Federal Reserve.

This roll back should be accomplished immediately if we are to head off a downward trend in more areas of the economy. This roll back is needed to put the housing industry back on its feet and to prevent a further slide in the automobile industry. And other areas of the economy will soon be demanding this same roll back of high interest rates. For the rural electrification program, let me say again that I do not believe your systems can survive in an atmosphere of high interest rates. If the economy continues with the same high level of interest rates, your systems as well as other small enterprises across the country will be in deep trouble.

I am proud of what the rural electric program has done in my home state of Texas and in the First Congressional District. I want to see this program continue. I want to see this program prosper. And I want to see the rural areas of the nation revitalized. I want to see the rural people move forward with the urban areas.

And this is one of the major reasons why I want to see an immediate roll back of high interest rates.

Thank you.

MEAT INSPECTION

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have been introducing and promoting bills since 1961 which would extend protection to consumers from being the unsuspecting purchasers of unwholesome or adulterated meat. The existing law has not been amended or updated for 60 years. Jurisdiction under the existing law is based solely upon whether the slaughterhouse sells its meat to purchasers in another State. Since very few States have adequate inspection laws, this situation has encouraged some large packinghouses to carefully avoid selling to purchasers in another State so that they can slaughter sick or diseased animals which would probably be condemned at a federally inspected plant. They can buy this livestock much cheaper and the customer that buys the meat from it in the retail store has no way of knowing what kind of an animal it came from. While most customers assume that surely such a basic food product as meat would be inspected before it could be sold, the fact is that 20 percent of the meat sold in the United States avoids Federal inspection or an adequate inspection of any kind.

My bills from the beginning have proposed to extend the jurisdiction of the Federal Meat Inspection Act to cover all plants that are large enough to be subject to the provisions of the Taft-Hartley labor law. That law and other Federal laws base Federal jurisdiction upon the size of the plant and its effect upon commerce rather than merely whether it sells to a purchaser in another State.

Other serious problems relating to the

health and welfare of the American people involve contaminated meat or meat from sick animals originally intended for dog and cat food ending up in hamburger. The existing law does not adequately protect against the product sold by rendering works being purchased by someone who is willing to sell it to a processor of sausages or an unsuspecting retailer as if it were proper meat to sell for human consumption.

Another problem involves the importation of meat capable of being used as human food which has not been slaughtered, labeled, branded, or handled in a manner substantially equivalent to that required of domestically slaughtered meat from a Federal inspection plant. The bill introduced today requires equivalent handling of any meat imported.

The administration has now proposed some amendments to the Meat Inspection Act. While its proposal does not extend jurisdiction to cover some of these large plants that sell meat from diseased animals, it does provide a considerable improvement in the protection against adulterated and unwholesome or misbranded meat coming into the market either from importing sources or rendering works. While I think we should still consider the matter of jurisdiction further, I do agree with the other provisions of the new bill offered by the administration and in fact think that it improves on some of the language that was in my former bill and I have introduced that bill.

Even under the bill I have been sponsoring, about 5 percent of the slaughterhouses would not be federally inspected. These are small operators and have a local market where most of the customers know what kind of sanitary standards the operator employs. However, I think consumers should have protection under local health laws as far as the product from these locker plants and slaughterhouses is concerned. My previous bills and the new administration bill both propose a framework for extensive cooperation between the Federal Government and the States to encourage the development of an adequate local meat inspection service. Under the bill, a State which establishes a meat inspection service consistent with the sanitation and other requirements of the Federal law could request from the Federal Government needed advisory assistance, technical and lab assistance, help and training personnel, and matching funds to pay for the administration up to 50 percent.

These bills also provide some additional protection against deceptive labeling under which consumers have at times purchased bologna which they assumed to be meat but which was in fact more than one-third flour and byproducts. In other instances they have purchased ham with up to 30-percent water content. Under these circumstances the prices per pound without an explanatory label very greatly deceived the consumers.

Mr. Speaker, the date has long passed when we should provide some additional protection for the consumers of meat. The whole meat industry is playing Russian roulette when it permits this situation to exist, because abuses of a few in the slaughter and sale of cancer-eyed cows and the sale of adulterated meat for human consumption in products ranging from sausage to frozen dinners could easily cause consumers to react against buying meat products. I have attended livestock sales where some sick-looking animals were purchased by slaughterers and I noticed that the purchasers were always a Federal uninspected plant. I think that having no protection against those animals going into human food is not only bad for the public but is also unfair competition for the processor of wholesome health meat products.

I am glad to see that the administration is taking a very active interest in this field this year and I hope that hearings will be held and a satisfactory bill passed.

THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the 89th Congress amended the Economic Opportunity Act, and in so doing transferred full responsibility for the economic opportunity loan program to the Small Business Administration. SBA Administrator Bernard L. Boutin has kept the Congress abreast of the progress of this program since it became his responsibility. It seems appropriate now, after some 3 months of operation under SBA, to report on the program for the RECORD.

I would like to speak today about one of the least heralded of our many economic opportunity programs, but one which is having a growing impact on the problems of poverty and lack of opportunity in our cities and rural areas alike.

I am referring to the small business loan program authorized under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act.

The economic opportunity loan program got off to a shaky start and frankly many of us wondered whether it would fill the role we foresaw when we enacted the Economic Opportunity Act in 1964.

However, I am pleased to report today that recent changes make it clear that the economic opportunity loan program will fulfill its potential in alleviating the lack of business opportunity which is prevalent in depressed areas and other parts of our great country.

I am also pleased to report that largely as an outgrowth of this program, the Small Business Administration is carrying all of its programs out to small businessmen in the rural areas, the towns and the cities—wherever they work and live.

The Small Business Administration is demonstrating that it is oriented to the needs of the small business community and that this administration is responsive to those needs.

During its first 2 years, the economic opportunity loan program was operated on a limited basis. Long-term loans of up to $25,000 were available to qualified low-income businessmen and prospective businessmen who resided in target poverty areas.

Throughout this period the program was limited to fewer than 50 communities served by local small business development centers—SBDC's. All loan applications came to SBA through these centers. No matter how great his need, a small businessman could not obtain an economic opportunity loan unless he lived in a community served by an SBDC.

This created an impossible situation.

Chicago was served well by the program, but the small businessman who lived just over the city line in Cicero, Ill., was ineligible for a loan.

Loans were made in Dallas, but not in San Antonio.

One Indian reservation in North Dakota was eligible, but the other three were not.

Paducah, Ky., was one of the first communities served, but Louisville never did get the program.

The 1966 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act transferred sole authority for the lending program to SBA and in early November, just a few days after the President signed these amendments into law, SBA Administrator Bernard L. Boutin expanded and broadened the scope of the economic opportunity loan program.

Under the revised program, loans were available in every single community directly through SBA's field offices. Eligibility requirements were broadened so that loans could be made to both low-income persons and to others who lacked the opportunity to compete in business on equal terms.

The results to date have been gratifying. Economic opportunity loans have been made in nearly every State. During the first 3 months of the new program, SBA made an estimated 700 loans for approximately $7.5 million. These include 280 loans made to low-income small businessmen under the old program and 420 loans made under the revised program guidelines.

About half of the loans made under the revised program went to persons in poverty and the other half were to individuals with higher incomes who nonetheless lacked opportunity.

But the story of the economic opportunity loan program can best be told by the types of loans SBA is making.

In a southwestern city, a determined Mexican-American youth came to SBA for help. His record shop had been burglarized of $585 and he needed a loan for that amount to stay in business. The banks could not help him.

SBA learned that the youth suffered from cerebral palsy. As a teenager he had quit school to help support his mother but he later completed high school at night. Because of his physical condition he was unable to find full-time work, so he supported himself doing odd jobs. In 1966 he took his life savings of $1,300, borrowed another $300 from a finance company and opened a record shop. He lived in the hallway behind the store.

SBA was able to make the youth an economic opportunity loan for $1,200, repayable over 6 years. A volunteer counselor recruited from the business community is assisting, too. The loan and counseling should enable the borrower to upgrade his business.

In Oklahoma, a disabled railroad worker was supporting his family on the meager earnings of a small shoestore and a pension. When the disability pension was discontinued he was no longer able to make ends meet and his creditors threatened to put him out of business. An economic opportunity loan is paying off the creditors and increasing the store's profitability so that it should throw off enough earnings to support the owner's family and repay SBA.

In Paducah, Ky., a Negro taxi owner with a third-grade education received management assistance and a $15,000 economic opportunity loan. When he came to SBA he operated out of his home in a 1961 taxi without a radio. Today, he has three new taxis with radio communications and an office. The business supports the owner, his family, and three employees and their dependents. During the first 2 months following the loan the business cleared more than $1,000.

A $3,000-a-year Paducah truckdriver with a wife and two children received a $15,000 economic opportunity loan to purchase a truck and become a self-employed contract driver with an interstate moving company. During his first 4 months in his new position he earned as much as he had the entire previous year.

None of these stories would be possible without the economic opportunity loan program, and now that loans are being made nationwide, we will be hearing more and more of these success stories.

But there is another side to this program which is not yet reflected in SBA's loan statistics. It is the Agency's outreach program, and it is the reason why I can say SBA is bringing this program into every community.

At the same time that Mr. Boutin announced the new economic opportunity loan program, he told the staffs of the 73 SBA regional and branch offices to get out from behind their desks and spend more time in the field. Some SBA offices had effective circuit riding programs, but most did not. Mr. Boutin instructed his field staff to develop close working relationships with community action agencies and other organizations representative of the individuals being assisted under the economic opportunity loan program.

The results are impressive.

During the past 3 months, SBA personnel have met with the directors and staffs of hundreds of community action agencies to explain the revised economic opportunity loan program and to recruit local volunteers to support it. SBA loan officers will be interviewing prospective loan applicants in community action centers throughout the country.

In Oklahoma, the SBA regional director met with all 51 community action directors and has embarked on a circuit riding and referral system which will enable him to serve every county on a monthly basis. A loan officer will interview applicants from a cluster of five counties at a community action center convenient to all five counties. The circuit riding schedule will be adjusted to local demand.

In Texas, under the old system an applicant from Fort Worth came to Dallas to obtain information on the program. Now, SBA has a circuit rider in a Fort Worth neighborhood center weekly, and during the first four visits he interviewed 68 persons. Dallas is also sending circuit riders into Waco, Sulphur Springs, Paris, Brownswood, and Wichita Falls, and other parts of Texas will be covered by other regional offices.

In Connecticut, SBA's regional director spoke with every community action director and in Illinois, the regional director is successfully recruiting leading businessmen in dozens of communities—including board members of community action agencies—to form small business advisory councils. These councils will help identify economic opportunity loan applicants and will provide management assistance to loan recipients.

The New York City regional office for the first time has established regular circuit rider service to Albany, Kingston, Poughkeepsie, Ellenville, Newburgh, and other communities. Previously applicants from these areas came to the SBA office in Manhattan.

The extensive outreach program is essential to the success of the economic opportunity loan program because SBA and other Federal agencies have learned that the only effective way to reach low-income groups is to go into their communities. The middle-class businessman in need of SBA assistance usually will seek out that assistance. But this is not true of the marginal businessman who until recently has had no source of financial aid.

Nonetheless, Mr. Boutin reports that the economic opportunity loan outreach program is resulting in inquiries and applications for all types of SBA loans.

In Dallas, the regional office was averaging about 275 interviews a month for all SBA programs through late 1966. In January 1967 Dallas loan specialists conducted 534 interviews.

In Oklahoma, there were 213 interviews conducted and 23 applications issued for all types of SBA loans in December 1966. The following month there were 582 interviews and 93 applications issued.

SBA has proven that there is a pent-up demand for the economic opportunity loan program in all parts of the country. The same can probably be said for many Federal programs, and the only way to meet this demand is to get out of the Federal offices and carry the programs to the people—the way SBA is doing it.

SBA is providing a perfect example of what President Johnson means when he talks about "creative federalism." I know SBA is reflecting the President's and the Congress' interests and concerns when it develops new techniques to bring its program to the people and make it responsive to their needs.

SALUTE TO A GALLANT MARINE

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my honor to be present today at the Marine Barracks for the ceremony at which Capt. Harvey Curtiss Barnum, Jr., of Cheshire, Conn., was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. I know of no other occasion that could arouse such a feeling of pride in a fellow American as the one which I have just witnessed. I am reminded of President Truman's remark at a similar presentation in October 1945, when he said:

> I would rather have that medal, the Congressional Medal of Honor, than be President of the United States.

President Truman's words accurately state the great esteem in which Americans hold the Congressional Medal of Honor as a symbol of soldierly qualities displayed to a supreme degree by those who have won it. The Nation knows that it is presented only to those men who have displayed the highest degree of bravery and intrepidity. Capt. Harvey Barnum is such a man and is a splendid example of the fine young men who serve in our Armed Forces today.

While on active duty in Vietnam in December 1965, then First Lieutenant Barnum assumed command of a rifle company whose commander had just been killed by enemy fire. While commanding the heavily hit rifle company, Lieutenant Barnum displayed the greatest courage, and disregard for his personal safety, in directing the defense of the company's position, and in leading the eventual successful counterattack against the enemy forces. The bravery, calmness, and leadership displayed by Lieutenant Barnum while under intense enemy fire, provided an exceptional example for the men serving under him; and an inspiration for the citizens of the United States and of the Republic of Vietnam.

As Representative of Connecticut's Fifth Congressional District, where Captain Barnum has his home, I am privileged to express the pride which my constituents feel in the achievements of our distinguished fellow citizen and the gratitude which we feel for the sacrifice which he and his fellow fighting men are making to guarantee our security and safeguard the peace of the world.

Mr. Speaker, following is a biography of Captain Barnum, and the official citation which describes his heroic actions.

CAPT. HARVEY C. BARNUM, JR., U.S. MARINE CORPS

Harvey Curtiss Barnum, Jr., was born July 21, 1940 in Waterbury, Connecticut. He was President of his Senior Class at Cheshire High School, Cheshire, Connecticut, where he also played football and baseball. In high school, he was a member of the Boy Scouts of America, the "C" Club, and the Gym Leaders Club.

After high school graduation, he entered St. Anselm's College in Manchester, New Hampshire graduating with a B.A. Degree in Economics in June, 1962.

He joined the Marine Corps' Platoon Leaders Class program in November, 1958 and attended two summer training sessions, one in 1959 and the other in 1961. Upon graduation from St. Anselms, he was commissioned a Marine Reserve second lieutenant.

Upon commissioning, he was ordered to Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia where he attended The Basic School until December, 1962 when he began the Artillery Officers Orientation Course, graduating in February, 1963. He was then ordered overseas and joined Battery "A", 1st Battalion, 12th Marines, 3d Marine Division (Rein), FMF, in Okinawa. He served first as a forward observer and then as the Battery's liaison officer. In July, 1964, he accepted appointment in the regular Marine Corps. Prior to completing his Okinawa tour, he also served as the battalion liaison officer. He was promoted to first lieutenant in December, 1964.

Transferred to the 2d Marine Aircraft Wing in April, 1964, Lieutenant Barnum was assigned as the Wing's Career Advisory and Personal Affairs Officer. During Exercise Steel Pike, a landing exercise in Spain, he served as the Wing's Security Officer. Upon returning to the United States from Spain, he was assigned as Officer in Charge, 2d Marine Aircraft Wing Classified Files.

Detached in March, 1965, he began his current assignment as Guard Officer, Marine Barracks, U.S. Naval Base, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii.

From December, 1965 until February, 1966, Lieutenant Barnum served on temporary duty in Vietnam. As an artillery forward observer with Company "H", 2d Battalion, 9th Marines, 3d Marine Division (Rein), FMF, Lieutenant Barnum's actions on December 18, 1965 earned him the Nation's highest award for valor, the Medal of Honor. He was promoted to Captain in June, 1966, after his return to Hawaii.

Captain Barnum's medals and decorations include the Medal of Honor, the National Defense Service Medal, and the Vietnam Service Medal.

His parents are Mr. and Mrs. Harvey C. Barnum of 5 Glenbrook Drive, Cheshire, Connecticut. He has one brother, Henry C. Barnum of 250 Steuben Street, Painted Post, New York.

CITATION

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Medal of Honor to First Lieutenant Harvey C. Barnum, Jr., United States Marine Corps, for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty as Forward Observer for Artillery, while attached to Company H, Second Battalion, Ninth Marines, Third Marine Division (Reinforced), in action against communist forces at Ky Phu in Quang Tin Province, Republic of Vietnam, on 18 December 1965. When the company was suddenly pinned down by a hail of extremely accurate enemy fire and was quickly separated from the remainder of the battalion by over five hundred meters of open and fire-swept ground, and casualties mounted rapidly, Lieutenant Barnum quickly made a hazardous reconnaissance of the area seeking targets for his artillery. Finding the rifle company commander mortally wounded and the radio operator killed, he, with complete disregard for his own safety, gave aid to the dying commander, then removed the radio from the dead operator and strapped it to himself. He immediately assumed command of the rifle company, and moving at once into the midst of the heavy fire, rallying and giving encouragement to all units, reorganized them to replace the loss of key personnel and led their attack on enemy positions from which deadly fire continued to come. His sound and swift decisions and his obvious calm served to stabilize the badly decimated units and his gallant example as he stood exposed repeatedly to point out targets served as an inspiration to all. Provided with two armed helicopters, he moved fearlessly through enemy fire to contol the air attack against the firmly entrenched enemy while skillfully directing one platoon in a successful counterattack on the key enemy positions. Having thus cleared a small area, he requested and directed the landing of two transport helicopters for the evacuation of the dead and wounded. He then assisted in the mopping up and final seizure of the battalion's objective. His gallant initiative and heroic conduct reflected great credit upon himself and were in keeping with the highest traditions of the Marine Corps and the United States Naval Service."

American fighting men traditionally have performed with bravery and determination under the most trying circumstances. I am honored that that medal which is awarded by the United States for the highest degree of gallantry is known as the Congressional Medal of Honor, and that I have the privilege of representing one of those extraordinary men to whom the award has been presented. I know that the Members of this House join me in saluting Captain Barnum for his outstanding fearlessness and bravery.

His actions reflect the greatest credit upon himself, his family, the U.S. Marine Corps, and the United States. With men of Captain Barnum's stature serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, this Nation will achieve its goal of world security under justice.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post has hailed the President's recent message on children and youth as "the most closely fitted to the immediate capability of the Government."

In a thought-provoking editorial, the Post points out the value of the President's message and of its call to insure that not only the average American child, but "even the least fortunate of children will be included in the general advance" that our Nation is making in the areas of education and health. The editorial goes on to support the President's proposals which will bridge the disparity between the top two-thirds and the bottom third of this Nation and prevent a fatal fragmentation in the next generation.

The editors of the New York Times echo the Post's enthusiastic acceptance of the President's message. They call Mr. Johnson's message "wide ranging" and go on to say:

> Virtually nothing seems to have been left out in offering new answers to the challenges of an ever-younger population, or in building on the more successful of already established programs.

I feel that my colleagues will find both articles informative and enlightening and I include them in the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 9, 1967]

AND FOR YOUTH

Almost every problem concerning children and youth is touched on in large or small degree in the President's wide-ranging special message to Congress yesterday.

Virtually nothing seems to have been left out in offering new answers to the challenges of an ever-younger population, or in building on the more successful of already established programs.

There is a hint of urgency in the plans for the coming summer. Dramatically, the President is establishing a "Cabinet-level" council, headed by the Vice President, to promote summer youth opportunities. These would include asking families to share their summers with less advantaged children, a search for volunteers to teach and guide, and camping facilities to be built for another hundred thousand youngsters by next year.

But it is in year-round programs that the greatest strides are suggested. Many of the plans are based on successful experimentation in such urban centers as New York and some on the outstanding programs operated in New Haven by Mitchell Sviridoff before he became Human Resources Administrator here.

Head Start, the most universally accepted of Mr. Johnson's sociological projects, is to be extended from a summer program to the full twelve months and also down to three-year-olds, with day care for even younger children.

Perhaps the biggest change in conventional welfare patterns will result from the President's proposal for neighborhood child and parent centers. Obviously, anything as costly as this must be paid for by public funds, which probably means that present private agencies in many instances will turn to demonstration projects and more flexible phases of guidance and assistance.

As a preface to announcement of new juvenile delinquency legislation, the President speaks of present Federal educational and financial incentives and job training opportunities. Some of these, notably the Job Corps, have been less than successful. A major challenge to all these programs is the problem of actually getting young people into the job stream.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 9, 1967]

THE CHILDREN'S CHARTER

The strongest force for social reform in American history is the country's concern for its children. The bitter debate over relief and public responsibility for private distress is muted when it comes to children. We are an optimistic people, and one mark of it is the increasingly strong and comprehensive system of laws that we are building to guarantee our aspirations for these children.

President Johnson returns to this purpose in his Message on America's Children and Youth. As a practical matter, all of Mr. Johnson's legislation, the bill that will bring the greatest benefits to the largest numbers of children is the Education Act of 1965. In the present Message he is chiefly talking about the children whose birth and circumstances disqualify them from drawing much good from the public schools. He is talking about the children to whom the usual medical services are not available. He is talking about the children who have got themselves into trouble with the police. Some Americans will always be much better off than others. But there is an imperative Federal interest in seeing to it that the disparity between the top two-thirds and the bottom third never becomes so wide that the Nation splits, in Disraeli's phrase, into two nations. The President's proposals are intended to insure against that fatal fragmentation in the next generation.

The Head Start preschools will not get much bigger, but they will reach down for still younger children. This shift of emphasis is precisely the way that the experimental programs of the war on poverty ought to operate. Under the influence of Head Start, and with the help of other Federal funds, school systems all over the country are now establishing and improving kindergartens. As the local schools begin to provide systematically for the 5-year-olds, the resources of Head Start are freed to begin working more widely with children of 3 and perhaps even younger. If, as some scientists believe, a child's verbal aptitudes are largely formed by his third birthday, it may be necessary to reach some children much earlier, perhaps in their own homes, to break the pattern of hereditary illiteracy.

The President spoke last month, in the State of the Union Message, of the difficulties arising from the shortage of skilled personnel in the new health and welfare programs. Now he points out that the United States has an excessively high infant mortality rate, and he proposes new centers for child health in the slums. But there are only 12,000 pediatricians, and 13,000 obstetricians, in the country. "New types of health workers must be trained to help our doctors do more," the President concludes. The emerging Federal emphasis on semiprofessional skills, in clinics, schools and welfare agencies, is essential to the expansion of benefits that the President envisions.

In the current spate of ambitious presidential messages, it is fair to ask whether Mr. Johnson is not raising expectations too high. But of all his recent messages on domestic policy, this Message on Children is the most closely fitted to the immediate capability of the Government. The advances proposed here lie entirely within the established tradition; they are not radical departures, but rather the continuation and perfection of work begun long since. The reforms in public relief, for example, would only extend to the remaining States a set of rules already adopted by many of them. The noxious man-in-the-house rule, forcing indigent fathers to desert their families, would at last be prohibited; a majority of the Senate has voted to retain that rule in the city of Washington, but they will not vote to uphold it in their own States.

Federal and local governments are working effectively to improve the education and health of the average American child. In this Message, the President seeks to ensure that even the least fortunate of children will be included in the general advance.

H.R. 6118—TO EXTEND FOR 2 YEARS CERTAIN EDUCATION ACTS

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 6118, a bill to extend for 2 additional years the provisions of certain education acts which would otherwise expire.

This bill does not make any substantive changes in existing legislation, nor does it expand any existing authorities. It only extends through fiscal year 1969 several authorizations which are now scheduled to run out on June 30 of this year. The legislation affected is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Facilities Act, and the so-called federally impacted areas programs.

The provisions of these programs which would be extended are as follows:

First. Additional aid to impacted areas for the construction and continued operation of schools damaged by natural disasters. This provision was originally added to the impacted areas programs by Public Law 89-313, enacted in 1965. I am pleased to note that I had the honor of introducing and managing that legislation during my freshman term in this body.

Second. Assistance to public institutions of higher education for the restoration and equipping of facilities damaged by natural disasters.

Third. Construction assistance to impacted areas on behalf of "B category" children; namely, those whose parents either live on or work on Federal property, but not both.

Fourth. Payments under titles I, II, and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act on behalf of Indian children in schools operated by the Department of the Interior. Title I provides general assistance for the education of educationally deprived children; title II provides assistance for library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials; and title III provides assistance for supplementary educational centers and services.

Fifth. Payments under titles II and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act on behalf of children in overseas schools operated by the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing controversial in this bill. These provisions have all been thoroughly studied and reviewed by this body. Public Law 89-769, which authorized disaster assistance to institutions of higher education, was passed by voice vote. Public Law 89-313, which authorized disaster assistance to impacted areas, and Public Law 89-750, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966, which authorized the remaining provisions to be extended by H.R. 6118, were both passed by overwhelming majorities.

The programs extended by H.R. 6118, effectively meet serious, and long-neglected needs in several sectors of American public education. These programs deserve our continued support. Mr. Speaker, I urge the early consideration and passage of this legislation.

SPEECH OF ROBERT JEROME, WINNER OF VFW'S VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. McFALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to insert at this point in the RECORD the speech by Robert Jerome, of Turlock, Calif., which won for him the California competition in the Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy contest this year.

Turlock is one of the principal cities in my congressional district and I know how proud the residents of his community and our entire State are of Robert.

Robert will be in Washington next week to participate in the national competition and I wish him every success in the presentation of his speech, which is an excellent one. It follows:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Robert Jerome)

Franklin Delano Roosevelt on the eve of World War II made a fervent request to the American people during one of his famed fireside chats. "We must be the arsenal of democracy!" he pleaded. He felt that during a time of world turmoil, America had to remain the light in the darkness, the stronghold of freedom.

America remained the arsenal of democracy throughout World War II as a beacon light of hope to millions throughout the world. American democracy survived the Second World War as it had the first and countless wars before that. But, now, a new and different force works for the destruction of our arsenal of democracy. This enemy carries no weapons, no bombs, nor does he sinisterly creep through the underworld plotting the overthrow of the government. This person may look harmless enough, but in reality he is more detrimental to society that the largest atomic bomb. This adversary who poses the severest threat to American democracy is, surprisingly enough, Mr. John Smith, the average American. Despite his meek exterior, Mr. Smith is a keg of dynamite with a slow-burning fuse placed under our arsenal of democracy. For you see, Mr. Smith no longer cares about his country. He is too caught up in himself and protecting American democracy just isn't in his schedule.

"Mr. Smith, what does democracy mean to you?"

"Well, that's a hard question. As a democratic American, I'd say democracy means that I can take advantage of all the freedoms guaranteed to me by the Constitution."

Yes, Mr. Smith, you certainly are, as you say, a democratic American. You most assuredly do take advantage of freedom. In fact, you take and take and take, but the only thing is, you never give. To me, democracy means more than merely grabbing all the freedom you can lay your hands on, it means protecting the destiny of America so that freedom will be left for the future. Democracy means more than merely reaping the autumn harvest of liberty, it means nurturing the crop through blight, disease, drought. It means not merely caring for yourself, but for your country. As the old saying goes, "You can't get something for nothing." There is a price that accompanies freedom and that price is the daily battle of guarding American democracy.

"Mr. Smith, would you say there is anything wrong with America today?"

"Well, I guess I'd say the crime problem is getting a little out of hand."

"Are you doing anything about the situation, Mr. Smith?"

"Me! These crimes don't affect me! I'm an honest citizen!"

Yes, Mr. Smith, you are indeed an honest citizen, a democratic American as you call yourself. Crime is running wild, and you know it. Yet you will do nothing to remedy the situation. You will sit back in your own self-centered little world and go right on, as you say, taking advantage of all those freedoms guaranteed you by the Constitution, while your country may be crumbling beneath your feet. And, Mr. Smith, you call yourself a democratic American.

"Mr. Smith, how do you feel about the civil rights problem?"

"Oh, I really feel the Negroes should be given equal rights."

"How would you feel if a Negro family moved nextdoor to you?"

"What! And downgrade the value of my property!"

Mr. Smith, you are certainly a democratic American. On the outside, you are all brotherhood and love, but deep in your heart lies the cold, hard belief that you are better; that the white man was born to rule supreme above the black. Mr. Smith, you will be right up there at the head of the receiving line when freedom is being ladled out, but you'll also be elbowing out all those you consider "inferior" to yourself. And, Mr. Smith, you call yourself a democratic American.

Mr. Smith, democracy is not one-sided. It is a give and take situation. You must give to your country before you can take its freedoms. You must protect your country before it can protect you. You must pump the well of democracy before you can drink the water of freedom.

As Roosevelt said, "We must be the arsenal of democracy!" He was right. We must be the country that all others can look to for hope. But our arsenal cannot be strong until Americans know the true meaning of democracy. We must give to our country before we can take from its arsenal. Mr. Smith will have to stop calling himself a democratic American and become one.

THE HAWAII LEGAL AID SOCIETY

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. Mink] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the president of the Hawaii Legal Aid Society, Mr. Dwight M. Rush, has forwarded to me a report on the first 6 months of the society's operation, and I wish to include it in the Record at this point as a very definite indicator of the need in my State for this service. Mr. Rush quite rightly points out that statistical tabulations for such a short period can only be tentative, but I am in total agreement with his conviction that the caseload handled during these months clearly illustrates the value of this program and the necessity for our continuing support:

> Six months have passed since the OEO Legal Aid Project was funded in June of 1966. As most of you know, at that time we employed a staff of two attorneys and two secretaries., With OEO funding, we have expanded our staff to five staff attorneys and a chief counsel, aided by three attorneys hired as investigator-law clerks. During the month of June 15th to July 15th, the new staff underwent an extensive training program. In August, eleven neighborhood centers were opened on the island of Oahu, at Waianae, Nanakuli, Pearl City, Halawa, Kalihi, Palama, Papakolea, Palolo and Waimanalo. These neighborhood offices are served half a day twice per week or half a day once per week, or on an appointment basis, depending upon the case load.
>
> Statistics over the early months of our operation are expressed below. These statistics relate for the most part to August through November. Our outside island offices did not open in Kona and Hilo until September, 1966 and we did not open offices on Molokai and Kauai until November of 1966. The Wailuku office is not yet in operation because there has been some difficulty in arranging office space on the Island of Maui. Two of the attorneys on our staff were not hired until October and one attorney was hired in September.
>
> The statistics below are expressed in cases. Under these statistics a client who comes to the office for an interview is a case. Likewise, one who comes to the office and for whom a case is tried for a period of three weeks with extended appeals to the Supreme Court is also a case. The concept does not lend itself to accurate calculations but these are the only statistics that we presently have.
>
> We have experienced a rise in demand through the neighborhood offices. In the months of August, September, October and November, we received 191 cases from the first nine of Oahu's neighborhood centers. This averages at approximately 21 cases per neighborhood center, or approximately 5 cases per month from each neighborhood office. In September, we opened an office at Hauula and through November have picked up five cases. The Kahaluu office began operations in November and received eight clients during that month.
>
> We opened a neighborhood center in Kona, on the Island of Hawaii, and have received a total of 33 cases during the months of September, October and November. In Hilo we have received 42 cases during the same months. Our neighborhood center at Kanakakai, Molokai, opened in November and the Society found 13 cases waiting. Although we had no neighborhood center on Lihue, Kauai, until November, we received 6 cases there during the month of November and 6 cases in December.
>
> In May of 1966, prior to the OEO program, we received 141 new cases. Since the beginning of the OEO expanded program, the number of new cases per month received has risen from 168% to 186% above the May level to a figure of 392 new cases in October and 379 in November. Cases completed during this period total 1,803. Cases completed per month stood at 370 in August, 356 in October, but fell to 295 in November, an increase in monthly cases completed over May 1966 of from 109% to 162%.
>
> Meanwhile, our backlog in cases has increased from a level of 359 cases in May, 1966 to a level of 722 in November, 1966, an increase of 100%.
>
> The bulk of cases handled by the Society fall into the field of family law including non-support cases, adoptions, guardianships and divorces.
>
> These figures do not include the many calls for aid that we received from other community action programs. At the request of the OEO the staff attorneys and Chief Counsel have rendered substantial aid and service in the administration of an educational program, including TV appearances, lectures, formal and informal group discussions, and drafting informational leaflets. This educational program has been directed toward preventive law. In addition, the staff has incorporated at least ten community action projects to implement OEO programs.
>
> It is always dangerous to generalize from statistics arising out of as short a period of operation as the few months period that the Society has operated under the expanded program. Nevertheless, I believe that we can conclude from the above figures that there is a definite need for the services which the Society is rendering and that the demand will become much greater as the availability of our services becomes better known.
>
> The individual who is entitled to the greatest credit for the smooth transition from our former practice into the OEO Legal Aid project is our Chief Counsel, Ronald Y. C. Yee.
>
> Dated: Honolulu, Hawaii, January 16, 1967.
>
> Dwight M. Rush,
> *President.*

ACCELERATED ACTIVITIES OF SOVIET POWER IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in two statements to the House in the last session of the Congress—"Caribbean Triangle; Panama Canal, Guantanamo, and Puerto Rico—Objectives of Subversive Attack," on September 20, 1966; and "Panama Canal: U.S. Sovereignty or Communist Control?" on September 29—I commented at length on the Communist revolutionary program for conquest of the Caribbean and quoted the resolutions adopted in January 1966 at Havana by the Tricontinental Conference of African, Asian, and Latin American Peoples. What was stated on those occasions applies with even greater force today, for Cuba is still serving as a beachhead for spreading revolutionary violence and terror in the most strategic area of the Western Hemisphere.

Among the activist organizations that grew out of the 1966 Havana Conference is the Latin American Continental Students Organization—OCLAE—which has formed student groups in seven Latin American countries, including the Student Federation in Panama. Its purpose is to serve as the vanguard of revolution and to place revolutionary governments in power with student uprisings.

Mr. Speaker, at this very moment, the executive branch of our Government is engaged in diplomatic negotiations with the Republic of Panama as regards the future status of the Panama Canal and has publicly stated its aim to surrender our treaty-based sovereignty over the Canal Zone to the Republic of Panama. This country, if the truth must be told, is a land of endless revolution and inherent political instability and infiltrated with Red revolutionaries from Cuba.

In a series of addresses in the Congress over a period of years, I have discussed at length why such action by our Government should not be permitted. Some of my more important addresses and statements on various angles of the canal problem have been published in one volume as House Document No. 474, 89th Congress, under the title of "Isthmian Canal Policy Questions," and distributed to all Members of the Congress, our principal educational institutions, and libraries.

As to the gravity of the proposed surrender, I can think of no action by our Government that is fraught with graver peril. It was, therefore, with keen interest that I read in a recent issue of National Review a most illuminating article by Paul D. Bethel, executive secretary of the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba, an organization of distinguished leadership. In this article, its author gives much new information on the dangers to the south of us in the form of expanded Vietnam type of guerrilla jungle wars, how Cuba has become an overt military threat, and why the time has come to transfer the problem of hemispheric security from the Department of State to the Pentagon. If the Vietcong in South Vietnam can tie up the United States in southeast Asia for more than 5 years, what is to prevent the same situation occurring in the jungles of Latin America under Soviet leadership?

Back in 1965 when the President of the United States announced the status of the treaty negotiations with the Republic of Panama, I issued a press release predicting accelerated activity among Communist revolutionary elements all over Latin America and stressing that there should be only one flag over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal—the flag of the United States. The response to that release from all parts of the country and abroad was one of universal acclaim, especially from informed persons who have lived or served on the isthmus and know its problems from direct observation and experience, including members of our Armed Forces on the isthmus.

As has been stated by me on numerous occasions in regard to the Caribbean, the Panama Canal has been, and still is, a prime objective of the world revolutionary movement in its drive for domination over vast strategic areas and key water routes. Proposals to share control of this artery of interoceanic transport with any other country or organization are not solutions for the realistic problems involved but abdications of our responsibilities and violations of our own commitments to Great Britain and Colombia, recognized long ago by the maritime nations of the free world. Moreover, the Canal Zone is American soil, forming a part of the coastline of the United States.

Despite all the amazing developments of communistic revolutionary power and purpose in the Latin American nations, the State Department, as far as I am able to learn, never issues a press release or other type of information relative to such dangerous movements in these neighbor countries. The Soviets are constantly receiving more generous favors and concessions from our Nation yet, with effective malignancy, arms the Vietcong and prolongs the slaughter of American soldiers, Vietnam civilians and soldiers, with resultant monumental expenditures by our taxpayers and a war exceeding the length of either World War I or II; and also, despite the fact that the Soviets, by ceasing to supply the Vietcong, could bring the war to an immediate close with a peace agreement guaranteeing the freedom of South Vietnam.

All this illustrates the naive dominance in the conduct of our foreign affairs, which is unparalleled in the entire history of our country.

The indicated article and press release which follow are commended for reading by all Members of the Congress and by responsible officials in the executive agencies, particularly those dealing with Canal and Latin American problems:

[From National Review, Feb. 7, 1967]

CAN CASTRO START A NEW VIETNAM?

(He's trying to. And he may pull it off if the State Department doesn't wake up to what's going on. The time to stop it, says Mr. Bethel, is now.)

(By Paul D. Bethel)

Bureaucracy often has about it a frozen character that renders it unresponsive to change and incapable of meeting new challenges. Nowhere is this more evident than in the State Department's attitude toward Cuba and the rest of Latin America. When a Washington reporter asks about U.S. policy in this area, he is given a speech delivered back in April 1964 by then Under Secretary of State George W. Ball, a speech dusted off and issued in pamphlet form. Ball's discourse, done up in a bright red, 22-page package, *U.S. Policy Toward Cuba*, does not of course deal with developments in Cuba and the balance of Latin America over the past two-and-one-half years, nor has any attempt been made to update it. Yet, it stands as the definitive word on U.S. policy.

The existence of a Soviet base in Cuba is not, in the judgment of the State Department, a military threat to the United States. More surprising still, the State Department insists that Cuba is not a direct military threat to the other countries of Latin America. As the Ball pamphlet states: "Cuba does not possess air- and sealift sufficient to permit it to take offensive action against its neighbors." In almost ho-hum fashion, the paper adds: "In any event, we maintain overwhelming military forces in the area to prevent Cuba from attacking other American Republics."

Other passages in the pamphlet reveal the philosophy behind U.S. policy toward Cuba and Latin America. Admitting that Cuba does present a problem of subversion, the pamphlet reads: "Vulnerability is greatest where social injustice is widely prevalent, where anachronistic societies remain dominated by small elites—tight little oligarchies that control the bulk of the productive wealth." The enemy, to the State Department, it would seem, is not a predatory Cuba, but Latin American governments which fail to provide for their own people.

The social worker mentality now directing our policies in Latin America is further revealed by other passages in the State Department document: "In the long run, Latin America will be rendered immune to Communist infection only by an amelioration of conditions—political, economic, and social, in which subversion flourishes . . . until such a transformation is accomplished, Latin America will remain a fertile seedbed for Communist subversion."

The shocking truth is that U.S. policy is based on a propostion that is not believed by sophisticated Marxists anywhere in the world—namely that poor economic conditions are a precondition to Communist advances. One would have thought that this idea had been laid to rest when, on July 26th, 1966, no less an authority than Fidel Castro, in recalling Cuba's excellent economic conditions at the time he came to power, said: "Well, if this concept [poor economic conditions] had been applied to this nation, a revolution never would have taken place. Never!"

TRICONTINENTAL SUBVERSION

However that may be, there is not much question that Russian-Cuban subversion is proceeding to a jet-propelled pace. The Tricontinental Conference, held in Havana last January under Russian sponsorship, brought together some 600 Communist delegates and observers from 82 countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. When the delegates decamped after two solid weeks of propaganda and planning, they left in their wake an efficient organization to expand Vietnam-type wars into a global war of subversion.

Of the several organizations to come out of the Tricontinental Conference, the most vigorous is the Latin American Solidarity Organization (LASO). This is not surprising, since Fidel Castro and his Russian masters have been at the business of subverting Latin America for years. Thus, when the Communist delegates convened in Havana last January, Cuba was able to show them a well-developed apparatus of subversion, backed by 43 guerrilla training camps, already active and successful. That apparatus has since been refined and fashioned into a deadly instrument by which terrorism and subversion have advanced in this hemisphere at a terrifying rate.

One of the latest additions to LASO is the Latin American Continental Students Organization (OCLAE). To date the Cubans have been able to corral student groups in seven Latin American countries—the Federation of University Centers in Venezuela, the Dominican Students Federation, the General Association of Students of Guadalupe, the Panamanian Students Federation, the Pro-Independence Student Federation of Puerto Rico, the University Students Federation of Uruguay, and the National University Federation of Colombia. All receive money, arms, and direction through LASO in Havana. Cuba also trains student militants at its Revolutionary Education School in San Francisco de Paula, near Havana.

The role of the OCLAE was outlined in Havana last July. There, Cuban Minister of Education José Llanusa told his Communist charges that Latin American students would be in the vanguard of the revolution, adding that they would "smash the showrooms of Latin America and put revolutionary governments in power." Success in Latin America most assuredly will be followed by similar student uprisings in Asia and Africa, and even in the United States.

Today LASO, and its student arm, OCLAE, is so effective as to constitute the most potent weapon in the Communist arsenal. It has rocked governments from Buenos Aires to Bogotá through blackmail, agitation and assault. The Dominican Students Federation demonstrated its power by forcing the expulsion of 150 professors, taking control of the faculty, and turning the University of Santo Domingo into an armed Communist camp. Relatively quiet since Joaquin Balaguer swamped Juan Bosch in the elections for President last June 1, the Dominican Republic is again threatened by civil war. President Balaguer said on December 6 that Communist propaganda is pouring into the country, "some from Russia and other countries behind the Iron Curtain." He added that "Communists and extreme leftists have been visiting the 'constitutionalists' [those who headed the revolt in April 1965], asking them to take over their old posts in the city" for a renewal of urban violence to force Balaguer out of office. The tense situation is further exacerbated by broadcasts from Havana urging the Communists and "constitutionalists" again to join forces and "defeat the servants of imperialism."

In Colombia, urban terrorism and guerrilla assaults in the rural areas have forced President Carlos Lleras Restrepo to make three impassioned addresses to the nation since taking office in August. Pointing out that terrorism is "planned precisely to cause trouble and maintain an atmosphere of uneasiness throughout the country," President Lleras revealed that "the stepping up of guerrilla warfare is called for openly through the microphones of Castroite radio stations." Referring to Cuba and indirectly addressing himself to Washington, he said: "It is a fact that a foreign country is intervening in Colombia's internal affairs, touching off guerrilla wars." He added: "Agitators are promoting student strikes—professional agitators—turning those strikes into pretexts and tools of violence . . . they attempt to pass off kidnappings, the stoning of shops, the burning of cars, as mere innocent acts of students which they claim cannot be classified as crimes." They *are* crimes, in the opinion of the President of Colombia, and he sketched their dimensions: "During the first two days of the Antioquia University strike, the damage amounted to 500,000 pesos."

Last October, President Lleras and John D. Rockefeller were set upon by trained student agitators as they entered the University of Bogotá to inaugurate the Veterinary Science Laboratory. (Much of the funds which made the construction of the laboratory possible came from the Rockefeller Foundation.) Other acts of violence involving student militants caused Colombia's President to cry out to the nation: "Are we to permit rebellion to be openly advocated; are we to permit troops to be killed in ambush?" He spoke of Communist assaults against interior towns and villages in these terms: "I visited a military hospital where fourteen dead and wounded peasants, serving their compulsory military service, were taken, following ambush. They were even younger than university students who, by reason of attending the university, are exempt from military service."

President Lleras reminded his listeners that the Communist terrorists can destroy faster than a free society can build. He said: "The country wants order, work, and progress, the constructive implementation of the national transformation programs . . . we need foreign investments . . . but it is precisely because of this that extremists, directed from abroad, are bent on destruction." Cuban-exported terrorism has caused a precipitate flight of capital from Colombia, forcing the government to apply restrictions against the transfer of money out of the country.

In the very midst of President Lleras's denunciations of Cuban subversion, U.S. Ambassador to Colombia Reynold E. Carlson permitted himself a political observation which is quite in keeping with stated U.S. policy regarding Cuba. An interview published in the newspaper *El Espectador* quoted him as saying that present relations between Cuba and the United States "are now based on the interchange of weather reports on hurricanes." He added, however, that "those relations can improve. It is a matter of patience." The newspaper *El Siglo* quoted Ambassador Carlson on Cuba as follows: "To consider Cuba as 'a danger to democracy' is now 'slightly archaic.' The position of the two countries is now changing little by little."

Guatemala has raised warning flags over that guerrilla-infested country. When liberal Cesar Mendez Montenegro was installed as President last July, he immediately declared an amnesty for Guatemalan guerrillas. By November, however, he was forced to declare martial law for a thirty-day period and obliged to extend it another thirty days when the guerrillas struck at mountain villages and in Guatemala City in mounting waves of terrorism. The climate of "unrest and uneasiness" which the Colombian President says the guerrillas are trying to create in *his* country has already been achieved in Guatemala, according to Guatemala's Vice President. Vice President Clemente Marroquin wrote in his newspaper, *Le Hora,* on November 2: "It looks as though Guatemala will be the next American nation to fall to Marxism. At the rate things are going," he continued, "everything points to this eventuality. . . . Day after day the Communists advance on two fronts: victorious armed attacks by the guerrillas, and greatly increased harangues by agitators. But over and above these two alarming facts there is even a more serious situation, and that is the panic which is taking hold of the people."

Vice President Marroquin wrote his article of warning as 21 clashes erupted between the police and army units and guerrilla bands. Student militants were involved in all but three. In the innocent guise of students, Communist youths have been particularly successful in gaining entrance to government offices and public buildings. A four-man group seized control of the *Nuevo Mundo* radio station in Guatemala City long enough to broadcast messages on behalf of the Castroite Armed Rebel Force (FAR), headed by guerrilla chieftain Cesar Montes. Marroquin wrote of such activities: "The guerrillas can act night or day without the slightest fear of persecution. . . . The fall of Guatemala could take place in a few hours or even minutes. Once the capital is in a state of panic, everything will inevitably deteriorate into a government composed of 'students, peasants, and laborers.' . . . We have the guerrillas under the same roof, in our own house, at the same table, and it is only necessary for them to say, Now! and chaos will ensue."

Another Central American country, Costa Rica, is clearly alarmed at the increasing threat to Latin America posed by a Russian-propelled Cuba, and is disposed to do something about it. Calling the Russian-sponsored Tricontinental Conference in Havana "an act of war against the democratic institutions, the traditions, and the security and liberty of our peoples," on November 1, the Costa Rican legislature unanimously passed a resolution which reads, in part: "*One:* To denounce the so-called First Tricontinental Conference as an act of war; *Two:* To express our total solidarity with the Cuban people in their revolutionary struggle against the Communist dictatorship and recognize their right, within the island and in exile to fight freely for the restoration of their self-determination and their democracy; *Three:* To communicate this resolution to the Honorable President of the Republic for the official action which in his opinion is needed tc carry out points One and Two; *Four:* To call upon the legislatures of the Free World, and especially those in Latin America, to pass resolutions similar to this and to adopt means which will preserve and develop the democratic systems of government."

According to reliable sources in Costa Rica, the U.S. Embassy tried to stop the resolution from being passed. Having failed, those same sources state, the Embassy now is bringing pressures to bear against President José Joaquín Trejos to discourage him from responding to the resolution—by, for example, providing military bases from which Cuban exiles could operate against Castro. Should Trejos resist U.S. pressures, these informants say, U.S. aid to that country would be drastically reduced.

Venezuela, one of the countries that has been attempting to modernize its military forces, has been under almost constant guerrilla assault from Cuba for a period of more than five years. Venezuelan guerrilla leaders Elias Manuit Camero, Alirio Chirinos, Alberto Pérez, and Gaspar Rojo, manage to travel to Havana and sneak back into Venezuela undetected with the ease of commuters. On November 5, Camero broadcast over Radio Havana what amounted to a declaration of guerrilla war against his own country. Three army patrols were ambushed in one night by guerrilla forces, and reports from the countryside told of momentary guerrilla control of eight interior towns and villages. One group of thirty guerrillas, dressed in the khaki uniforms and the green-and-red berets of the Castro-directed Armed Forces of National Liberation, seized the town of Sabana Grande, robbed its stores of food and clothing and made off safely. At Campo Alegre, guerrillas forced the owner of a large ranch to flee for his life to a nearby city. His flight followed a skirmish between army units and large guerrilla forces in which the latter, led by *Cuban officers,* bested the Venezuelan regulars.

In a low-key announcement, Army headquarters in Caracas revealed that heavy fighting was in progress in many of the states. Army planes and helicopters were thrown into a major antiguerrilla campaign in mountainous Lara State. Similar campaigns are being carried out in varying degrees of intensity, at enormous expense to the government, in the states of Falcon, Mérida, Trujillo, Portuguesa, Monagas, Anzoategui, and Barinas. The tactics now being used by the government—use of helicopters, bombing and strafing—are almost direct copies of those employed by the United States in Vietnam. This is so because the structure and tactics of the Latin American guerrilla forces trained in Cuba are copied from the Vietcong and indeed taught by Vietcong instructors who staff many of Cuba's guerrilla training camps.

Favorite targets of the Venezuelan guerrillas are pipelines through which Venezuelan oil flows to market, and American-owned factories and stores which contribute to Venezuela's high living standard. At the end of November, urban terrorists in Caracas turned that capital city into a shambles. Six attacks were launched within a period of 24 hours, leaving destruction in their wake. A Sears Roebuck store was hit by fire bombs that destroyed most of its merchandise, and burned through its three stories. A United States Commerce Department trade fair was machine-gunned, and a U.S.-owned supermarket suffered two attacks by terrorists within a week's time. An elementary school for American children was also machine-gunned by terrorists.

Venezuelan President Raúl Leoni and his ruling Democratic Action Party are under fire because of the worsening situation. The President and his cabinet ministers have consistently sought to play down the seriousness of Venezuela's internal disorders, it is thought, so as not to add to the already considerable flight of foreign capital out of Venezuela into Swiss and other foreign banks. However, Defense Minister General Ramon Florencio Gómez was candid enough to blame the fresh outbreak on an amnesty recently extended to 31 guerrilla gangsters by President Leoni. The amazing strength shown by urban and rural guerrilla bands has raised doubts about the civilian government's ability to deal with the Communists, and rumors of a military coup are making the rounds in Caracas.

ARSENAL UNCOVERED

On December 13, Leoni was forced to declare a state of martial law. He made his decision as the result of the assassination of Army Major Francisco Astudillo Suárez and the wounding of General Roberto Morean Soto by Communist terrorists on the streets of Caracas. Believing that the Cuban-supported OCLAE was behind the asssassination attempts, President Leoni sent troops into the University of Caracas where, on December 14, they uncovered an arsenal of weapons, including nineteen light machine guns, vast amounts of hand grenades, and an unspecified amount of small arms and ammunition. As a result of Cuban-exported terrorism, the administration of President Leoni has called on the Organization of American States to do something about the "subversive machinery installed in Cuba, well-financed by outside powers," and demanded "a sincere and honest examination of the policy followed by the OAS in the Cuban case . . . ." Venezuelan Interior Minister Reinaldo Leandro Mora was more specific. He said: "We have specific evidence that the acts of subversion spring directly from the Tricontinental Solidarity

Conference held the beginning of this year in Havana."

LATIN REACTION

Impatience among Latin American countries with our State Department has risen to unusual heights over the past year. They are unhappy over statements which purport to see nothing of consequence in the Havana-based Tricontinental organization other than those expressed in such phrases as, "It has had the positive results of awakening Latin America to the dangers of internal subversion." As one Latin American diplomat coldly observed: "We have been alert to the danger far beyond the State Department's willingness to cope with it."

What particularly alarms Latin American governments is the conscious and conspicuous Russian leadership in the subversion of the hemisphere assumed at the Tricontinental Conference. They are disturbed that the United States did not then challenge open Soviet military intrusion in Latin America.

Latin American apprehensions have found little echo in the United States press, and the American public has been left largely uninformed of the meaning of the Tricontinental organization in Havana and of the devastation it has been wreaking in Latin America over the past year. The liberal press in this country finds in the Havana Conference little of significance beyond the confident (and unrealized) predictions that it will merely widen the Sino-Soviet split in the quest for Communist leadership in Latin America. The fact is, however, that Red China and Russia are seated cheek-by-jowl on the Conference's central strategy and policy committee in Havana—the Committee of Assistance and Aid for Peoples Fighting for their Liberation.

Newspaper editorials in Latin America express a widespread belief that the United States is playing fast and loose with the security of Latin America in exchange for an ephemeral accommodation with Russia. There is considerably more to this belief than mere conjecture. The State Department has kept mum on the subject of Russian intervention, even in the face of the OAS study which bluntly states that "the action of Russo-Chinese Communism at Havana shows the imminence of one of the most serious dangers for the hemisphere." The Russian ambassador to Havana, Alexander Alekseyev, impudently asserted that the Russians would continue to support liberation movements. Soviet Russia, he said, believes in the "firm solidarity of all the revolutionary liberation forces of the world. . . ." In broadcasts in the Quechua dialect (the native tongue of millions of Indians in Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador), Radio Moscow continues to call for uprisings. Latin Americans are fully aware of the facts of the Russian intrusion into the hemisphere. For, in another Quechua Indian broadcast that preceded the Havana Tricontinental Conference, Radio Moscow boasted that 10,000 "students" from Asia, Africa, and Latin America were attending classes in revolutionary tactics at Moscow's Lumumba University. The broadcast said that the number of Latin Americans at Lumumba University is being greatly increased, since "the dawn of freedom in Latin America is now in its initial stages." Radio Moscow also said of those students that "they will fight alongside the peasants and humble people to ensure that their countries have genuine freedom."

U.S. PRESS DELINQUENT

Blasts recently issued in the United Nations by Ambassadors José Sette Camara of Brazil, Victor Andres Belaunde of Peru, and Evaristo Sourdis of Colombia, against Russia and members of the Soviet bloc for their aggressions in the Western Hemisphere, received little attention in the American press. Nor was there the open and vigorous support from the United States which these denunciations obviously merit. A bill of particulars submitted by Sourdis, and by Ambassador Hector Escobar Serrano of El Salvador, blistered Russian-Cuban subversion, named names, and called on the UN to do something about it. But their warnings also went largely unnoticed.

The frozen attitude of the Department of State, and the failure of the American press adequately to report on the alarming situation in Latin America, was dramatically brought to light recently. In November, Panama's Dr. Eduardo Ritter, unanimously elected chairman of the Council of the Organization of American States, inaugurated his one-year tenure with a speech in which he criticized the U.S. press and U.S. policymakers in unusually blunt language. He said that not only is the OAS the target of "the constant aggression of its enemies," but "of strong and dangerous aggression of silence by those who should be its best allies." Dr. Ritter continued: "The objectives of American action should be the cessation of the purges and forced labor in Cuba, the gagging and persecution, the abuse and insult." He blistered the U.S. press, saying that the activities of Latin American countries in seeking collective action against Russian-Cuban subversion "barely achieve an occasional line among the inconsequential news items."

Official Washington must share considerable blame for Dr. Ritter's charges against the American press. The State Department has done nothing to arouse press interest in the deteriorating situation in Latin America brought about by Russian-Cuban subversion. For example, when Dr. Ritter finished his blunt address, the U.S. Ambassador to the OAS, Col Linowitz, rose and delivered his own maiden speech. Its most notable passages contained an echo of Senator Robert Kennedy's outburst against the sale of arms to Latin America. In what must rank as the most colossal irrelevancy in the history of the OAS, Linowitz complained about "unnecessary" military expenditures. The State Department, it would seem, is still riveted to its social worker course. That is why, it may be surmised, the State Department has remained silent on the subject of massive subversion of our neighbors while at the same time furiously denouncing the non-predatory governments of South Africa and Rhodesia for their racial policies.

The lines have been clearly drawn. Either we must take measures adequate to the task of eradicating the Soviet base in the Caribbean, or we must face another Vietnam, in the towering Andes and the jungle heartland of Latin America, one that will make the present conflict in Asia seem insignificant by comparison. In an interview published in the January 5 issue of Castro's *Granma* newspaper, Nguyen Van Duc, head of the Vietcong mission in Havana, addressed the burgeoning "wars of national liberation" in these terms: "Within a short period of time, there will not be just one Vietnam, but many Vietnams, and the Yankees will not be able to handle so many attacks at the same time." The Ecuador newspaper, *El Universo,* scored the Cuban policy of the Johnson Administration as the consequence of an unworkable détente with Russia, saying: "While the Russians continue to seek agreements with the United States, they are not disposed to pay the price for these agreements."

It was left to Colombia's Ambassador to the UN to put the issue squarely. On December 8, Ambassador Sourdis told the UN: "If we do not arrive right now at a means to put a stop to undercutting our sovereignty and self-determination, in the near future the world will be faced with a devastating conflagration." Some indication of what Ambassador Sourdis is talking about is evident right now in Havana, where a preparatory committee of the Latin American Solidarity Organization is in session, preparing an agenda for the meeting of LASO in July. One purpose of the preparatory meeting, as outlined in Castro's newspaper, *Granma,* is to prepare for "common action against the ideological, political, and economic penetration of imperialism in Latin America"—a Communist program of systematic destruction. The other purpose is "to receive all information from delegates, make plans on the basis of the needs of each country, and make recommendations to the Central Committee"—in short, to study the successes and failures of last year's enormously eventful guerrilla campaigns and make adjustments which will make them even more potent in the future. Thus, when July 1967 arrives, hundreds of Communist delegates from Latin America will again make their way to Havana, under the very nose of the U.S., there to plot the next phase of the Vietnam wars in this hemisphere.

On September 13, 1962, the late President Kennedy stated: "If Cuba should ever attempt to export its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force against any nation in this hemisphere, or become an offensive military base of significant capacity for the Soviet Union, then this country will do whatever must be done to protect its own security and that of its allies." There can be little question that that time has come. A new Communist International, headed by Russia and Red China, has been spawned right off the cost of Florida; and it is waging war against the United States. The global implications of this simple fact are enormous, and require considerably more than the words, only now being uttered by U.S. representatives to the United Nations, to deal with the threat. And why the United States backed the move in the OAS which placed the issue of Cuban subversion before the United Nations where, in any showdown in the Security Council it would be subject to the Russian veto, awaits a satisfactory explanation. The evidence suggests that the matter is much too serious to be resolved by our diplomats in Foggy Bottom. It should be placed in the hands of our very best military planners.

PRESS RELEASE, SEPTEMBER 27, 1965

Congressman Daniel J. Flood (D-Pa), concerning the proposed treaties with the Republic of Panama, released the following statement today from his Washington office:

"The President's announcement on September 24, 1965, about the status of current treaty negotiations with the Republic of Panama, fully justify my fears for the security of our position on the Isthmus and confirm my predictions on this subject.

"It means a complete and abject surrender to Panama of our indispensable sovereignty and authority with respect to the Panama Canal in favor of a so-called dual governmental and managerial setup for it in an area of endless bloody revolution and political instability. This can only lead to unending conflicts and recriminations that always accompany extra-territorial jurisdictions where two masters are involved.

"The Canal Zone is a territorial possession of the United States with sovereignty granted by treaty in perpetuity and ownership of all land in the Zone obtained by private purchase at a total cost of some $144,000,000. Our investment in the Canal enterprise and defense installations is in billions of dollars furnished by the American taxpayers but in the indicated agreements not a dollar is to be repaid to us.

"Under existing treaty, the United States is obligated to Panama for the perpetual operation and maintenance of the Canal. The issues involved in the agreements under negotiations are so grave that candor is required. Panama gets everything it desires and the United States nothing but losses and ignominy.

"The Panamanian negotiators have written out what they demanded and our negotiators, figuratively speaking, have merely signed on the dotted line. We certainly should not have agreed to Panamanian sovereignty but, on the other hand, should have demanded the extension of the Canal Zone to include the watershed of the Chagres River.

"The grant of complete jurisdiction of Panama over the Canal Zone, means that all laws made by the U.S. Congress for the Government of the Zone and the operation and maintenance of the Canal may be scrapped at any time by Panama, and superseded by Panamanian law. Also, all civil activities in the Zone—Courts, Police and Fire Departments, Schools, Roads and Public Utilities—will be taken over by Panama.

"All this means, sooner or later, the elimination of United States citizen employees in the Canal enterprise with substitutions by Panamanians. It will be inevitable that all these positions will become political plums eagerly sought by Panamanian politicians with gross confusion and embarrassment. Yet, our negotiators were unable or unwilling to deal with the situation realistically and have agreed to leave our Government with responsibility without any adequate authority. Think what this means in time of war or other grave emergency? Even as to the matter of land in the Zone, which may be required for Canal purposes, we should have to buy back at exorbitant prices areas we already own by actual purchases from the owners. What a ridiculous situation!

"Panama, having secured such outstanding results in its claims, will, inevitably, demand all control over the Canal enterprise with withdrawal by the United States. If such abandonment occurs, Panama and all of Latin America will go down the communist drain.

"For our officials to proclaim that Panama, which since 1955 has not been able to collect its own garbage from the streets of Panama City and Colon, as a partner of this great interoceanic public utility, is, to say the least, unrealistic and really astounding; and it will evoke serious reactions from maritime countries as regards the fixing of tolls.

"The President's announcement, indeed, marks a sad day for the United States, although it may bring rejoicing at Peking and Moscow. He has completely yielded to the counsel of his advisers, sappers and appeasers, who must be made to bear basic responsibility for what has occurred. Moreover, I predict that the expressed willingness to surrender control over the Panama Canal will be taken as a signal for accelerated activity among communistic revolutionary elements all over Latin America and the Caribbean.

"There should be only one flag flown over the Panama Canal and Zone—the flag of the United States—and the proposed treaties should be defeated."

OPEN COVENANTS OPENLY ARRIVED AT FOR PANAMA TREATY PROPOSALS

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, during the aftermath of World War I, the people of our country heard much about President Woodrow Wilson's call for "open covenants openly arrived at" as the antidote for secret diplomacy which had preceded that fratricidal conflict. This potent slogan applies with equal force today, especially as regards the proposed new treaties with Panama now being negotiated under conditions of the tightest secrecy.

In a recent issue of the Washington Observer Newsletter, a semimonthly periodical published in the Nation's Capital City, there are statements of unusual interest in regard to the current United States-Panama diplomatic negotiations. The assertions made therein accord with published statements to the effect that the President of the United States will shortly announce at the approaching meeting of Latin American Presidents, which it says he will attend, that a new treaty or treaties will be made with Panama to abrogate the treaty of 1903, with surrender by the United States of its authority over the Canal Zone and with what would amount to a joint United States-Panamanian management of the Panama Canal. It is obvious to informed observers that an attempt is being made through the treaty process to bring about surrenders to Panama that could never be obtained by acts of the Congress.

The article further confirms the published story that the President and his treaty advisers have pursued a policy of silence, and suppression of news concerning the proposed new treaties. The strategy behind this is to secure an immediate ratification of them by a Senate unacquainted with the complicated issues involved. This, Mr. Speaker, would not be the first time such tactics have been used in the Senate.

The importance of the Panama treaty proposals cannot be overemphasized. The future, not only of the United States but also of other countries of the Western Hemisphere, may depend on the action taken by the Senate on them. They most certainly should be dealt with by the Senate only after ample study, debate, and consideration. They should not be handled as was the suddenly sprung 1955 Eisenhower-Remon Treaty with Panama when not a single Senator was well enough versed on the subject to elucidate the facts involved and to debate with the necessary effectiveness. The consequence was that this giveaway treaty was ratified by default notwithstanding that it contained provisions highly prejudicial to the efficient control and management of the canal.

Since that time the Congress has become far bettter informed on interoceanic canal problems, which are now well documented as regards their most significant phases in many discussions in the Congress. Special attention is invited to a collection of addresses, which was published as House Document No. 474, 89th Congress, in 1966 under the title of "Isthmian Canal Policy Questions." This volume contains a wealth of carefully researched material and was distributed to all Members of the Congress. Any attempt to stampede the Senate by a surprise submission of the treaty proposals accompanied by plausible pleas of emergency will, in essence, constitute a kind of guerrilla warfare characteristic of the jungles of Vietnam, which should not prevail in the Halls of the Congress.

The taxpayers of the United States have provided billions of dollars to construct, maintain, operate, sanitate, and protect the Canal and the Canal Zone. Certainly they should be fully apprised of the effects of the proposed surrender at Panama before any votes in the Senate are taken on the treaty proposals. Anything less than such a course of action would be a base betrayal of the treaty making processes provided by the Constitution.

While the House of Representatives is granted no constitutional authority as regards treaty ratification it has nevertheless the solemn duty and obligation to be concerned with treaties negotiated by the Executive and to do what seems necessary to protect the best interests of our people. Moreover, the House has a direct responsibility with any treaty that requires appropriations by the Congress to implement it or which may affect the citizens or the taxpayers of the Nation. Hence, what is now said is in the nature of a warning to all concerned and is not inconsistent with customs involved in these connections.

The indicated article follows:

SECRET TREATY

One of the best kept White House secrets is the new Panama Canal treaty that has already been agreed upon by President Johnson and President Marco A. Robles of Panama. Chief architect of the treaty is Walt W. Rostow, Presidential policy planner for Latin America.

LBJ, who prides himself on his skillful timing of his legislative thrusts, realizes he must stampede the unpalatable treaty through the Senate with a minimum of debate before public sentiment against it is generated.

Mr. Johnson shrewdly calculates that the proper time and setting to unveil his Panama treaty would be for him to make a spectacular announcement before the upcoming conference of Latin American Presidents; he is prodding the Latin nations to set an early date for the meeting in order to insure the election of the Robles coalition in early 1968. The President has sweetened the pie for the other Latin nations by cajoling the ruling Panamanian oligarchy into conceding preferential lower canal tolls for Latin countries and at the same time hike the tolls for European countries. And, of course, minimal tolls for Panama, thus encouraging more foreign ships to fly the Panamanian flag. LBJ will receive an ovation when he announces that he has wangled special concessions from Panama for their benefit.

Under the 1903 Panama Canal Treaty negotiated by President Theodore Roosevelt Panama receives an annuity of $1.93 million annually. Under the new treaty the tiny Republic of Panama will receive upward of $80 million a year. Panama's gross national product is only $595 million.

The handful of wealthy Panamanian families that constitute the ruling oligarchy will be practically tax free under the "Panama Master Plan" and the little nation may become a tax haven for wealthy foreigners.

CUTBACK IN FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY APPORTIONMENT

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BLANTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of my district and the State of Tennessee are keenly concerned with the prospects of another cutback in Federal aid highway apportionment, this one to amount to $400 million.

Tennessee has 526.8 miles of interstate highways open to traffic, with 178.7 miles under construction and a total of 346.1 miles which are to be built but have not been started. The initial cutback last November, which forced a reduction by 17 percent in our interstate program in Tennessee, did not have a disastrous effect on our highway building program. However, if the now proposed cutback of $400 million goes into effect, it will cause serious economic repercussions in all segments of Tennessee's economy.

There are hundreds of people who will be thrown into unemployment if the present cutback is carried out. Many small contractors invested heavily from the profits they have made in the interstate projects in the past few years, into modern equipment. They expanded their businesses in order to meet the demands of the projects. They assumed that the projects would be carried out on schedule as planned by both State and Federal Government agencies.

The cutback drastically changes the schedule and scientific programing of the interstate project in our State. The Tennessee Highways Department coordinates its plans with those of many State departments; for example, revenue, industrial development.

Furthermore, the Governor's office has reported that all elements of the State's economy will be affected, and especially the 38 Tennessee counties designated by the Economic Development Administration as economically depressed areas.

Good roads mean employment opportunities in industrial areas of our State. The mountainous terrain of our State makes many rural roads hazardous. The Interstate System, which is designed to crisscross the 503-mile length of Tennessee, makes it easier for people in rural poverty areas to reach industrial employment opportunities in urban areas.

Furthermore, many industries have indicated a willingness to settle in some of these rural areas of the State under the presumption that the Interstate Highway System will reach that area in the near future, which would enable them to maintain the adequate transportation system industries demand.

We are fully aware that the cutbacks will merely delay the Interstate Highway System, rather than to end it completely. But I submit that these delays will effect thousands of Tennesseans adversely because our State and our citizens have anticipated no further cutbacks, and the strain of our economy will be a profound one.

I have mentioned the economic burdens this cutback will cause our citizens, but there is another important issue involved. It is one of highway safety. The National Safety Council has reported that interstate highway deaths number more than one-third less than automobile accidents on other highways. Tennessee, in 1966, ranked 13th in the United States in number of traffic fatalities. Indications are that the rate of fatalities in our State are continuing on this unprecedented high course. The slowdown in the interstate building in Tennessee, promulgated by the cutbacks in appropriations, will affect the safety of all the motoring public, and is of great concern to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that there are numerous other programs which involve State and Federal matching funds, which will be in danger in the States, because of the cutbacks in this program. Having served in the State legislature, I know there will be those using this cutback as an excuse to vote against appropriations for other matching fund programs. They will say, "Why appropriate moneys when the overall program we are voting for might be curtailed or even stopped?"

I believe it would be unwise to have any further cutback in the interstate program appropriations at this time. I believe there are many other programs where we can carve unnecessary fat from, thus leaving this program as it now stands.

REGENTS' JOB NOT TO BARGAIN AWAY STANDARDS

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to my colleagues in the House an editorial which appeared in the Sacramento Bee of February 20, 1967, entitled "Regents' Job Is Not To Bargain Away Standards."

The leadership of the University of California in the academic world has long been a source of pride for all Californians. I have serious concern, however, whether or not the high academic excellence of this institution will be undermined by the budgetary and tuition policies promulgated by the current Republican administration in California.

The editorial follows:

Regents' Job Is Not To Bargain Away Standards

University of California regents rejected—and rightly—the proposal by Gov. Ronald Reagan that they impose a tuition this fall but they compromised their own standards—they should not have—in bargaining with the governor on the budget.

The rejection of the tuition means no tuition can be imposed before the spring of 1968, thus leaving the issue in debate. The scaling down of the UC budget request to $255 million, this while voting to use $19 million from its special fund toward the university's operation to help ease the emergency, will force the university to turn away some 3,500 students it otherwise would have accepted.

So for the first time in almost a century of operation, the university must recant on its stated goal to provide "every qualified student" with an educational opportunity. No longer can California say it offers that maximum opportunity——and this is the state which boasts it has greater blessings in resources, in wealth and in adventurous people than any state in the Union.

Assembly Speaker Jesse Unruh, a member of the Board of Regents by virtue of his legislative office, came the closest to speaking for the concerned when he cautioned the board, to paraphrase—

That it is the board's responsibility to declare needs, not to bargain away standards.

That the issue of money is a political problem and therefore the problem of the governor and of the legislature.

That the board should indicate how much it needs to run the university and stick to it, and that anything short of this fails the university and the regents' responsibility.

Unruh thus emphasized the real areas of authority and duty.

It is as he suggested—the responsibility of the regents is to speak for the university needs and not to bargain away standards or educational opportunity.

If in the end there just is not the money to finance such opportunity—this becomes an issue for public decision through the legislature.

Surely the turning away of 3,500 students, otherwise qualified, does not represent faithful stewardship.

Surely the bargaining away of so basic a university standard as open-door opportunity makes a mockery of the state's master plan for higher education—which has as its first predication the determination to furnish a seat for all who can qualify.

SPY HYSTERIA

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Byrne] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia Inquirer has put the Central Intelligence Agency-National Student Association affair into perspective in a recent editorial.

The actions of the CIA and the NSA appear to the writer and, I may add, to myself—as patriotic, not reprehensible.

These organizations were combating the effort by international communism to subvert student groups all over the world.

We were forced to fight fire with fire—and we did so successfully.

The Inquirer states the case in terms for Philadelphia—and the rest of the country—with this observation:

> We happen to live in a jungle world, not in some Utopia where a country's intelligence service can operate in full view of the public at Broad and Chestnut Streets.

I include this fine editorial as a permanent part of the Record, as follows:

False Hysteria

The outcry following disclosure that the Central Intelligence Agency had helped finance the National Student Association has been almost hysterically out of all proportion to the actual situation.

All kinds of sinister motives have been read into the CIA's connection with the student organization, with the implication that young people have been corrupted by Government subsidy and used as spies or in some other outlandish capacity.

Not surprisingly, critics of President Johnson, whether those opposed to him politically or those who take the left-wing line in any matter having to do with foreign policy, have seized upon the CIA-Student

Association affair to make the President the target of new attack.

At the same time, America's Intelligence Service has been made to appear as though it were engaged in some nefarious conspiracy, with students as their tools.

On the part of those who support international Communism and who oppose U.S. foreign policy at all times, such tactics are understandable. But there is no sensible reason for others to join in this uproar. We happen to live in a jungle world, not in some Utopia where a country's intelligence service can operate in full view of the public at Broad and Chestnut streets.

A calm appraisal of the oversensationalized disclosure of the National Student Association subsidies will make the hullabaloo of the past week seem ridiculous.

After questioning CIA Director Richard Helms, a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee issued a statement saying that the CIA aid was given, at the student's request, to counter Communist attempts to take over foreign student organizations, by making it possible for American students holding independent views to participate in international meetings.

"It is no secret," the statement continued, "that since the end of the Second World War, the Communists concentrated on student organizations throughout the free world and by 1950 were successful to the point that they had little opposition. Patriotic and worried students in the U.S. were quick to recognize the situation. Leaders of their organization sought appropriate help. It was forthcoming, and has now served its purpose. Espionage was not involved: the survival of freedom was."

The intent of the CIA aid was patriotic; to help resist the inroads made by international Communism. What is the intent of those who are trying to defame and to belittle the CIA, and to embarrass the Government of the U.S. with their outcries over the student subsidy incident? Certainly they are giving aid and comfort only to our enemies.

CONGRESSMAN CLAUDE PEPPER INTRODUCES A BILL TO CHANGE THE OCCUPATIONAL DEFINITION FOR OLDER WORKERS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill which will help answer a question which has plagued us and our offices for years. It is probably the question most frequently asked about the social security disability program. The question is:

> I have suffered a disabling injury which makes it impossible for me to continue to work. Why am I not entitled to disability benefits?

In answer to such a letter we have pointed out that the law requires that you must be disabled for any substantial gainful activity and that just because you cannot work at your previous occupation does not, as such, qualify you for benefits. We point out that the law is stricter than most staff retirement systems, such as civil service, which require that you only suffer a disability which prevents you from doing the work you previously did. Last year's Committee on Ways and Means report stated:

> In line with the original views expressed by your committee and since reaffirmed, to be eligible an individual must demonstrate that he is not only unable, by reason of a physical or mental impairment, to perform the type of work he previously did, but that he is also unable, taking into account his age, education, and experience, to perform any other type of substantial gainful work, regardless of whether or not such work is available to him in the locality in which he lives.

I find it particularly difficult to explain this test to older workers. For most of them inability to work at their old jobs means inability to work at all. Vocational rehabilitation for them is much more difficult than for younger workers. Moreover, it seems to me a trifle harsh to impose a test that requires them to leave their homes of a lifetime to seek "theoretical" employment in other parts of the country.

I think the Congress recognized the harshness of this provision last year when it adopted, in the conference committee, a provision that individuals aged 55 or over who are "blind"—as defined in the law—may qualify for cash benefits on the basis of their inability to engage in their past occupation or occupations.

The bill I introduce would merely extend this test to all persons age 55 or over, whether blind or not, so as to entitle them to benefits if their disability is such as to prevent them from engaging in substantial gainful activity requiring skills or abilities comparable to those of any gainful activity in which he has previously engaged with some regularity and over a substantial period of time.

The adoption of this "occupational" definition for our older workers will bring more realism and justice to the social security disability program. I urge the Committee on Ways and Means to study this legislation and present it to the Congress in the near future.

UNDERPAYMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill which will remove a technicality in the social security law which is causing considerable hardship to a good many people. The Social Security Administration acknowledges that there has been an underpayment of benefits in some 67,000 cases but maintains that it cannot pay out this money to those who should rightfully receive it because of the provisions of existing law. In 1 week alone—January 7 to January 13 of last year—over 3,400 complaints were received by the Social Security Administration as to this provision. About 100 of them were from my State of Florida.

The situation in brief is this. The Social Security Administration in the past had been authorizing payments to surviving beneficiaries of the unpaid benefits of a deceased beneficiary. To do this they had been interpreting broadly the phrase in section 204(a) in the law which authorized such payments "whenever an error has been made." In the face of a number of court decisions, they concluded they could no longer make such payments to the eligible survivors—usually the widow—and that such payments had to be paid to a legal representative. The cost of obtaining underpayments through a legal representative in many jurisdictions exceeded the amount of the underpayments. More than half of the underpayments are under $100 and about 35 percent of the cases involve amounts of $50 or less.

No particular problem is involved where an estate is one that must be probated, but in case of small estates, in States with no small estate statutes, the complicated and costly procedure is not worth the meager receipts.

In view of this situation the administration presented remedial legislation to the Committee on Finance during its consideration of the social security amendments last year. The amendment, which was adopted by the committee, would have allowed disposition of the underpayment according to regulations of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare "in such order of priority as he determines will best carry out the purposes of this title." Presumably the conference committee found this delegation of authority a little too broad and modified it in two ways: First, by limiting its applicability to cases where the amount does not exceed a month's benefit of the deceased beneficiary; and second, by providing that payment would go to the surviving spouse living with the beneficiary, but if there was no spouse, then to the legal representative. This brings us up to the present situation where approximately 67,000 cases—mostly children but some widows—are not getting these payments because they cannot meet these rigid requirements of the law which make the appointment of a legal representative a sine qua non.

The bill I introduce today meets the objections of the conference committee. It is similar to the bill of Senators Mondale and Harris (S. 3681). My bill will provide that in the case of amounts less than $1,000 the money due will be distributed according to a list of priority spelled out in the law, not in HEW regulation. This meets the objection to the original Administration proposal that it was too broad a delegation of probate power. Under my bill payments would be first made to the surviving spouse. If there is no spouse, then payment would be made to the surviving children in equal parts. Finally, if there were no spouse or children, payment would go to the legal representative but, if none had been appointed after a 3-month period, then it would go to the persons who would take under the laws of the State for intestate succession in such amounts as prescribed by such laws. If the amount involved is over $1,000 the amount would have to go to the legal representative. This, in my view, provides a workable and equitable solution in a context which preserves the basic probate prerogatives of the States.

Mr. Speaker, social security is unique among the Government social insurance systems in requiring such payments to the legal representatives. Amounts of underpayments of deceased beneficiaries under civil service, military retirement, and veterans' programs are distributed according to priorities set forth in statutes. The Railroad Retirement Board pays such amounts first to the surviving spouse, and then on the basis of equitable entitlement to persons paying the decedent's burial expenses. I urge early consideration of this important amendment.

MEDICARE FOR THE DISABLED

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, last year brought about the establishment of the first national health insurance program in the United States when the medicare bill for the aged went into effect on July 1, as a result of the Social Security Amendments of 1965. I found a great deal of satisfaction out of the experience of going to Independence, Mo., to be with Presidents Harry S. Truman and Lyndon B. Johnson for the signing of this historic legislation. For it was my privilege, 20 years ago, to be selected as one of Mr. Truman's chief advocates of the health insurance principle as a means of increasing the economic security of Americans. I stated then my belief that "the national health-insurance principle is a wise, sound, and thoroughly American principle to apply to the health needs of the people."—Congressional Record, 80th Congress, first session, May 7, page 4679. I have always been particularly proud of the fact that, in his health message to Congress in 1945, President Truman referred specifically to the findings of my Subcommittee on Education on Wartime Health and Education of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor with respect to the health needs of the American people in calling for his national health insurance program.

Because of some of the bitter charges which were made against such legislation in those early days, I may say I also take particular pride in the fact that few legislative proposals have been enacted with so clear a mandate from the American people themselves—for medicare was a key issue in the 1964 campaign. President Johnson repeatedly described it as being on the top of the list of his must legislation. And the people spoke. We have, then, achieved a health insurance program in this country for those of our people 65 and over who, for this reason, have less opportunity—as years of experience have shown—to purchase the kind of health insurance they need through private means.

I rise today, however, on behalf of another group of Americans who, I am convinced, should also have been given the right to the kind of medical care we are now committed to provide for people 65 and over. I refer to those people who are drawing social security benefits today because they have been retired from the labor force by a crippling total disability.

I am not alone in this conviction. The report of the Advisory Council on Social Security, which appeared on January 1, 1965, following over a year's deliberations recommended that hospital benefits be provided for the disabled as well as for the aged. In their words:

> Hospital expenses are a serious problem for the totally disabled, too. Like the aged, they, too, are hospitalized frequently and in many cases their hospital stays are long. According to a survey of workers (50 and over) found disabled under the social security disability provisions (conducted by the Social Security Administration in 1960), about one out of five disability beneficiaries under social security received care in short-stay hospitals in the survey year; and, excluding hospitalizations in long-term institutions, half of those hospitalized were in the hospital for 3 weeks or more.

Pointing to the fact that health care has become so expensive that only the relatively well-off person at the height of his earning power can afford to pay the cost of a major, prolonged illness without effective insurance, the Council added this pertinent sentence:

> And the great majority of the aged and the disabled are neither well off nor have adequate health insurance.

I would point out that the members of this Advisory Council were broadly representative of American business, labor, and economic and social conscience. To illustrate this point I want, at this time, to name and identify the 13 members of the Council—a group appointed in line with legislation enacted by the Congress to provide a periodic review not only of the financing of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program but also all other aspects of the program, including extensions of coverage and the adequacy of benefits:

Robert M. Ball, Commissioner of Social Security, Chairman.

J. Douglas Brown, dean of the faculty, Princeton University.

Kenneth W. Clement, M.D., practicing physician and immediate past president, National Medical Association.

Nelson H. Cruikshank, director, department of social security, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

James P. Dixon, M.D., president, Antioch College.

Loula F. Dunn, director, American Public Welfare Association, 1949–64.

Marion B. Folsom, director and former treasurer, Eastman Kodak Co.

Gordon M. Freeman, president, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

Reinhard A. Hohaus, director, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., and fellow, Society of Actuaries.

Arthur Larson, director, Rule of Law Research Center, Duke University.

Herman M. Somers, professor of politics and public affairs, Princeton University.

John C. Virden, chairman of the board, Eaton Manufacturing Co.

Leonard Woodcock, vice president, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America.

Mr. Speaker, this is a modest proposal for the extension of medicare coverage involving relatively few people, all of whom have already experienced the misfortune of having a crippling illness or injury and, for this reason, are unable to continue in their job. Of the 20.7 million people now receiving social security benefits they total only some 930,000 people, less than 5 percent of all beneficiaries.

For some reason I cannot really understand why we have, throughout the history of social security, been tardy in recognizing the particular problem of this group—perhaps because they are small in number. Back in 1947, the bill I sponsored would have paid benefits to severely disabled in the same way benefits were then being paid to people retired from the labor force because of age. But not until almost a decade later, in the Social Security Amendments of 1956, did they become eligible for the cash benefits, and then only if they were aged 50 and over. We have since provided them with benefits, regardless of their age, and made their dependents also eligible for benefits—but this rounding out of the program took another 4 years.

I hope that this Congress will see the wisdom of extending the benefits of the medicare program to this group within the next few months, so that they may be qualified for these important benefits along with the aged when the programs went into effect this July. To this end, I am again introducing a bill to this effect. I remind you that no new administrative machinery will be required since the social security people are already charged with the responsibility for making the determination as to whether or not they are so severely disabled as to be entitled to cash benefits. Under my legislation, once that determination has been made, they would be eligible for the benefits already established for people 65 and over. I urge every Member of Congress to consult his conscience in this matter, for I am convinced that such consideration would produce wide support for my proposal.

THE ELECTRIC CAR IDEA

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to report a situation in which one of our outstanding power companies is making a great contribution toward the development of the car of the future.

The West Penn Power Co., serving my

district, is one of the leaders in this field of research and progress.

The electric car has always intrigued many of us and with the great anxiety about air pollution, its development has become not only a necessity, but in reality, an emergency.

The articles that follow should be read by every Member of Congress:

[From Electric World, Dec. 12, 1966]

Electric Car Idea Is Out Front Again

On a road in western Pennsylvania, a couple of weeks ago, passersby were startled to see a snappy, fire-engine-red, strange-looking car scooting past them. What amazed them mainly, however, was that it was quiet, and it emitted no fumes clouding up the country air.

At the wheel was *Electrical World's* Pittsburgh Correspondent Lou Gomolak, who commented when he ended his run, "it's a quiet dream to drive and I wouldn't mind getting one."

When such a car can be purchased is pure speculation at this point, for the car Gomolak was driving was West Penn Power Co.'s prototype model of an electric car—the Allectric.

West Penn is not going into the electric car production business. Spearheaded by Vice President W. E. Sturm, its only aim is to prove that a satisfactory electric car can and should be produced.

In recent months these other developments also indicated a revival of interest in the electric car:

Fourteen electric utilities have kicked in additional dollars to the Edison Electric Institute-General Atomic research on a high-energy-density, zinc-air battery;

Government, state, and city officials concerned over the increasing problem of air pollution, have called for a substitute for the gasoline-powered automobile;

Ford Motor Co. next spring will test prototypes of an electric car and is developing a lightweight, sodium-sulfur battery;

General Motors and Chrysler reported they were also looking at the electric car's potential, but expressed doubts about producing a practical one in the near future;

Great Britain, which already has about 40,000 electric vehicles in service; is running various tests on electric cars;

A Japanese utility is developing an electric car in cooperation with a battery manufacturer.

Most of previous attempts in recent years to market a practical electric car were little more than conversions of existing gasoline-powered vehicles. This usually resulted in a car that was overweight, structurally weak, and had very limited speed and range.

West Penn Power, part of the Allegheny Systems, has designed its car around available battery supplies but used techniques that other experimenters did not have or did not apply.

For instance, West Penn designed its own speed-control system using solid-state materials. It is also planning to use regenerative braking, which will restore some of the charge of the batteries by coasting downhill. Top speed of the Allectric is 50 mph and it has a range of 50 mi between recharges.

For the time being, West Penn is keeping design of its electronic control and recharging circuitry secret. Transistors and silicon-controlled rectifiers are used and efficiency is "20% higher than any system we know of," said Earl deChambeau, manager of the utility's Connellsville meter department, where the car was designed and built.

Power-saving scr's are used in circuitry. The battery charging device is a pulsed-scr type with a peak rating of 25 amp.

The basic car used by the utility was a Volkswagen. The control equipment is predicated on designs used on industrial trucks and golf carts. The silicon-controlled-rectifier is basically the variable-pulse-width, variable-pulse-frequency type controlling a 7.1-hp, power-traction motor at 72-v, 88-amp, and a top rpm of 3,055. Road speed is infinitely variable to 2,444 rpm when full power is automatically applied.

The drive system is from the motor through the gear box and differential to the rear wheels.

The prototype cost $2,000, including $460 for its six, 12-v, lead-acid, medium-duty truck batteries. Curb weight is 2,160 lb, including 945 lb of batteries. Sturm believes, however, that design refinements will cut the weight and price "far below" present levels.

Capacity of the batteries is 205 amp-hr, with a 20-hr discharge rate, plus an auxiliary battery to operate such parts as the lights and windshield wipers.

The batteries can be recharged through a wall plug. However, West Penn has also modified a conventional parking meter by adding an ordinary two-pronged, 110/117v ac, wall socket.

A 100% recharge takes eight hr. However, Sturm believes the market for the Allectric would be as a second car. For example, a housewife could drive 12 mi to a shopping center, using 25% of charge, and plug into the nearest parking meter. If she returned two hr later the batteries would be completely recharged.

A factor going for the Allectric is its low cost per kwhr. It needs only 25 kwhr to fully recharge. At 1¢ per kwhr, operating cost is less than ½¢ per mi so far under actual road conditions.

Sturm is also high on the electric car because he believes it could help eliminate air pollution, irritating noise, weather troubles, and danger of explosion in case of a crash.

He reiterated that West Penn is not in the car manufacturing business. "We sell power, and this type of car will sell more of it. All we want to do is prove where the truth lies among the smoke clouding electric cars."

ELECTRIC CAR HAS NEW LOAD POTENTIAL

Other utilities should take note of the tremendous load potential in the electric car.

The Allectric takes 25 kwhr to fully recharge its batteries. Ford estimates a Falcon-size vehicle, equipped with a 500-lb, sodium-sulfur battery, will use about 75 kwhr in recharging. And, Japan's Chubu Electric Power Co, which is also developing an electric car, estimates that each one would consume $140 of electric power per year.

One of the main reasons for resurgence of interest in the electric car is because of the potential contribution toward solution of the air pollution problem.

During recent discussions on pollution, John W. Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, remarked that projected increases in the number of conventional cars would eventually wipe out any improvements to be expected from his department's new program against auto exhaust pollution.

Sen. Warren G. Magnuson (D.-Wash.) feels that if every gasoline-powered vehicle could be converted to electric battery power, about half of the total air pollution problem could vanish overnight.

To speed this, Magnuson recently introduced a bill in Congress to help promote rapid development of electric vehicles.

He proposed a three-fold thrust:

1. Build prototype vehicles to demonstrate their ability to perform tasks presently done by combusion-type vehicles;
2. Develop lightweight, powerful batteries and fuel cells;
3. Develop a vehicle specifically designed for propulsion by these sources.

Several groups are now doing something about the electric car's potential in defeating air pollution.

The main emphasis in these efforts revolves around developing a satisfactory battery for the new electrics.

In May 1964, Edison Electric Institute, with General Atomic Division of General Dynamics Corp., entered joint sponsorship of a research and development program on a high-energy-density, zinc-air storage battery. EEI believes vehicles using the zinc-air battery would have a long, useful life and would operate quietly, thus contributing to a reduction of air pollution, as well as lowering urban noise levels.

The objective of the EEI-General Atomic program is to develop a high-capacity storage battery with substantially less weight per kwhr than is available in industrial storage batteries.

Under study is a zinc-air battery with an energy storage density four to five times greater than now available.

The zinc-air concept offers many potential advantages for several types of vehicles now powered by internal combustion engines. The concept also has advantages over present types of battery-powered vehicles which have limited range because of the heavy weight of their electrical storage system.

Fourteen utilities, which originally underwrote the research program, recently contributed another $150,000.

And Ford Motor Co has intensified a four-year-old program of battery research because of the mounting needs to solve the problems of air pollution.

Ford claims its battery makes feasible adequate motive power for electric cars for the first time in 30 years.

The heart of the new battery system is the electrolyte—a crystalline ceramic that selectively passes ions while containing all other liquids, including the sodium and sulfur reactants.

Ford claims the battery can store up to 15 times the energy of present batteries and deliver about three times more discharge rate. This capacity, it said, could increase the potential range of small electric vehicles five-to-ten times that available with present batteries.

* * * * *

[From Electric World, Jan. 9, 1967]

Electric Cars Utilities Must Be in Driver's Seat

There has been a great deal of publicity of late about the possible return of the electric car. However, what has been lacking in most of the stories in national media is any mention whatsoever of the role electric utilities will play in this effort to develop a practical, workable electric car that the public will accept.

Are electric utilities going to sit back and wait to pull in what could be an attractive load? Or are they going to get in the front seat and help spur this development?

We believe they must join in and that they have a two-fold responsibility. First there is this need to push development. Secondly, and just as important, there is the responsibility to see that the electric car model which the industry finally stamps as practical is a quality product, one that is better than the public's present means of transportation for specified uses. The industry cannot afford to be associated with an electric car that is an overnight success but a failure in the long run.

Of all the groups which should be interested in seeing the electric car back on the road, utilities stand to gain the most. There would be the increased load, the bulk of it off-peak, while the cars are being recharged overnight. Then there would be the beneficial effect of cutting down air pollution. With the mounting furor over increasing pollution, utilities are being called on to show they are lessening the problem, not contributing to them. A concerted drive by utilities to help develop the electric car would show the industry wants to help eliminate pollution.

Our report on the electric car [EW, Dec. 12, 1966, p 73] showed some utilities are actively working now on the problems which previously plagued electric car development.

One is West Penn Power Co which has developed an electric car prototype which has now been road tested and licensed. Not only does the car work, but it has achieved speeds of 50 mph and can go 50 miles between recharges.

Fourteen other utilities are also doing something concrete about electric car development. These utilities recently contributed more than $150,000 to accelerate the zinc-air battery research program co-sponsored by Edison Electric Institute and the General Atomic Division of General Dynamics Corp.

Before Congress adjourned last year, four bills had been introduced in Congress calling for Government sponsorship of electric vehicle research. The American Public Power Assn, through its Electric Vehicle Committee, is pushing for early enactment of this legislation.

Beyond these actions there are several things all electric utilities can do to speed the development of a practical electric car. Among them are:

Contribute knowledge and dollars to the research programs;

Point out to civic groups and local governments how electric cars could help lessen urban noise and air pollution;

Test, promote, and buy practical electric cars as they are developed.

Recently, various other groups have announced they are looking at the electric car. While help from all quarters is welcome, we feel the onus falls heavily on the shoulders of electric utilities. They stand to gain the most. They should be in the driver's seat.

IN SEARCH OF A POSITION

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I hope all our colleagues—on both sides of the aisle—had an opportunity to read and reflect on Mr. David Broder's article in the Washington Post of last Wednesday, February 22, describing Governor Romney's confrontation with the press last week in Idaho. This occurred during the noncandidate's noncampaign swing through five western States.

For those who may have missed Mr. Broder's article, I include an excerpt from it as part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD. The excerpt follows:

> The climax of the exchange came when he was asked to give a specific instance of the "political expediency" he had charged influenced Administration foreign policy.
>
> "No, I will not," he said.
>
> "Why not?"
>
> "I do not choose to."
>
> "You just make a charge and do not substantiate it?" the reporter asked.
>
> "At this point," was Romney's reply.

I tried to think of something to say about that exchange, Mr. Speaker, but I have decided the Governor's words speak for themselves. I think they tell us a great deal.

Governor Romney's forthright and fearless statements on our foreign policy have prompted editorial comment in a number of newspapers in recent weeks. One of the better editorials I have read on this subject appeared in the Washington Evening Star last Thursday.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Star's editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD:

> [From the Evening Star, Feb. 23, 1967]
>
> ROMNEY'S OPTIONS
>
> George Romney, the non-candidate in search of a presidential nomination, has at long last broken his silence and spoken out on the subject of Vietnam. He didn't say much, to be sure, but the very fact that he has seen fit to address himself, however vaguely, to that knotty problem can only be considered a step in the right direction.
>
> The substance of the governor's remarks on Vietnam seems to boil down to a slashing attack on President Johnson for having made up his mind about certain courses of action. This decision-making process is referred to by Romney as option closing, which, it seems, is a bad thing. For example:
>
> "Once we had the option of getting involved in a large-scale land war in Southeast Asia. Now we don't.
>
> "Once we had the option to bomb or not to bomb. Now we don't.
>
> "Johnson's peace options are being frittered away . . ."
>
> It is, admittedly, difficult to determine from the foregoing whether Romney is distressed over the nation's failure to get involved in a large-scale land war in Asia (which seems hard to believe) or if he believes that the United States is already in a "large-scale land war." Equally obscure are the reasons why he believes that the administration is irrevocably committed to continue the bombing. And exactly what "peace options" are and just how they have been "frittered away" is anybody's guess.
>
> Still and all, the fact that Romney has stuck a tentative toe into the murky waters of Vietnam policy gives promise for the future. Perhaps, with the passage of time, he will see fit to close a few options of his own, thereby giving some clue as to where he stands on this major issue.
>
> And when he does, the Republican party will be in a better position to exercise some of its important options. Like deciding who should run for president in 1968.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Estonia is a small country in northeastern Europe, one of the three Baltic countries on the eastern shore of the Baltic Sea. With an area of about 18,000 square miles, and a population just under 2 million, it has always been among the smallest of European countries, and the Estonian people have figured as one of the smallest of nationality groups in all Europe. But to these gallant, hardy, and stalwart souls, whose past history is full of great and glorious deeds, their numerical inferiority has not been a serious handicap. This they have amply proved in the course of their long and turbulent history in their cold but beautiful homeland. They have been sturdy defenders of their centuries-old traditions and ideals, and have faced their far more powerful foes, invariably many times more numerous, with courage, and determination, firmly convinced that theirs was a righteous and sacred cause. In the course of their history, when it became impossible for them to maintain their national independence and had to admit defeat, they refused to bend their knees to their conquerors and overlords, thus proving their greatness even in defeat.

In the early 18th century Estonia became part of the czarist Russian empire, and the Estonians proved the most irreconcilable subjects of the czars. For this reason they were subjected to harsh treatment in the hands of callous Russian officials. They were cruelly persecuted for some of the beliefs they held and advocated, and they were held down under the oppressive regime. But these dauntless fighters for their freedom and liberty could not be silenced and subdued. With uncommon tenacity they clung to their ideals until the time came for their liberation. In 1917 when the czarist regime in Russia was overthrown by the Bolsheviks, the Estonians saw their chance, seized upon it and proclaimed their national independence on February 24, 1918. That was 49 years ago.

During the interwar years the Estonians enjoyed real freedom in their homeland under their own democratic government. They worked hard and succeeded in making their reborn state one of the most advanced, industrialized, and progressive countries in all eastern Europe. They leaped forward on every front, especially in educational, social, and economic fields, and for a while many highly educated Estonians became dedicated international civil servants, working in the League of Nations. Of course they also guarded their newly won freedom against their actual and potential foes as best they could. They were fully aware of the difficult predicament which was their lot, and had no choice but hope for the favorable turn of international events. Then came the world cataclysm in 1939, and the ensuing war proved most disastrous to the Estonian people.

Very early in the war the Soviet Government used veiled tactics to overawe and then actually to bring the Estonian Government to submit to Soviet overlordship of the country. By mid-1940 the country was overrun and occupied by the Red army, putting an end to the independent Estonian state and making it part of the Soviet Union. Thus after enjoying freedom for only two decades, these freedom-loving and absolutely innocent people were once more robbed of their freedom and found themselves under the unrelenting regime of Communist tyranny.

During the course of the war the Estonians for a while exchanged their Communist masters for Nazi overlords, but that did not change their unhappy lot; they suffered under both tyrannies. Toward the end of the war Communists returned with added force and fury, and to this day they remain there. For more than two decades, since 1945, they have turned once independent and free Estonia into a large prison camp where all Estonians live, work, and perforce endure the abominable yoke of Communist totalitarianism. For a long time they were effectively cut off from the free world, and at times their movements were restricted even within their own country. Fortunately, this situation has changed somewhat for the better. Today Estonia is at least partly open to tourists from the West, and a relatively few Estonians are allowed to make short visits abroad. Their means of livelihood have improved, and they do not suffer as much under the minions of the Kremlin. The gradual thawing of the cold war, and the relative improvement of East-West international relations have thus brought some windfall to the people of Estonia. But they are still far from free, and of course cherish their national independence with undiminished fervor. On the occasion of their 49th independence day I hope and pray that soon they attain their national goal and live in peace in their homeland.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE TO CONGRESS ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Hanley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week President Johnson issued to this Nation a most perceptive message on our Nation's youth. Giving the importance of youth to our future as a nation, this message certainly deserves our most careful attention.

I most strongly favor the President's decision to establish a Cabinet-level Council, headed by the Vice President, to promote summer programs for young Americans. The President outlined his plans for making the long summer a time for constructive activity for our young people by providing them with access to recreation and to summer jobs. In such a context, our older youngsters can work with young children during the summer, teaching, supervising, and caring for them in various activities.

Last summer, Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees, between age 16 and 21, made an invaluable contribution to the President's youth opportunity campaign. They worked with children in recreational facilities, in libraries, and at camps and parks. Indeed, the NYC youth were helping enrich the lives of younger children at the same time they were earning money for return to school in the fall. Such programs need and deserve our continued support.

The President also asked the Congress to support a wide range of services for these child and parent centers in areas of acute poverty, including health, nutrition, and counseling in household management, accident prevention, and infant care.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps, with its young men and women enrollees, could be an important source of manpower for these centers. NYC enrollees serve as health aids, day-care center aids, and as counseling and recreation aids. This type of service is not new to the young men and women who make up the Neighborhood Youth Corps. In programs in every part of the Nation, they have proven their ability to work with younger children in Headstart programs and in the President's youth opportunity campaign. NYC enrollees have served as recreational, health, teachers' and nurses' aids. They have worked in rehabilitation centers and in centers for the handicapped. By these outstanding efforts the Neighborhood Youth Corps has been able to contribute its services for the betterment of our children who tomorrow must wear the mantle of leadership.

This NYC program, as well as the other Labor Department work-training programs, constitutes a vital weapon in our fight against poverty and is a great asset in improving the quality of our society.

UNWAVERING COMMITMENT

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Burton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, Lyndon Johnson has earned the title of "Civil Rights President."

He has done more than any other President in this century to make equality a living principle of this country. The remarkable civil rights legislation and its encouraging effect are a tribute to his belief and his perseverance.

If any doubts as to his personal commitment still linger, as the Washington Post states in a fine editorial, the message on civil rights ought to dispel them.

As the newspaper says, Mr. Johnson has renewed the national commitment in a way that leaves no room for doubt.

I enter this editorial in the Record:

[From the Washington Post, Feb, 17, 1967]

Civil Rights Commitment

The President's Civil Rights message ought to extinguish the last lingering remnant of skepticism about his unwavering commitment to the principle of equality and the practical proposals available to achieve it.

It is a long message. And it contains a lot of homely truths that it should not be necessary to repeat at this stage of the Nation's history. But the experience of the last session showed clearly enough that the Congress had either forgotten or did not ever know some of the facts of life that the President recited. And it revealed plainly enough that repetition of first principles still is necessary.

The proposals themselves are perfecting and improving devices for existing programs, for the most part. It is difficult to see how Congress could seriously object to most of them. The President has used great skill and persuasive talent to try to bring around those who opposed the fair housing proposal last session. Whether his three-stage plan is more palatable than his one-jump plan remains to be seen, but it shows his desire to be conciliatory and his old urge to find a consensus.

The country still has far to go to achieve its goals and purposes. The progress which the President detailed is impressive, but it counsels no diminishing of our exertions.

Important as his legislative proposals are, it is quite clear that it is equally important to have the President of the United States, year after year, reaffirm the broad principles on which the country stands. President Johnson has succeeded in getting Congress to approve more civil rights measures than any other Administration in our history. He still is at work on that legislative program. But perhaps, even more significant, is the fact that he has renewed the national commitment in a way that leaves no room for doubt.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF ESTONIA

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Friedel] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as liberty-loving Americans who are dedicated to the cause of freedom and democracy, it is but right and proper that we pause during our legislative duties to take note of a brave people's fight for independence.

Forty-nine years ago, a group of patriots across the seas declared the independence of their country and established, against great odds, the Republic of Estonia. Their ancestors have lived along the Baltic Sea for thousands of years and have always been considered as a distinct, hardworking, religious, and energetic people. Their independence, however, was of short duration.

On June 17, 1940, Soviet troops invaded Estonia and the Communists stamped out that unfortunate country's freedom. With utter disregard for human life and human values, the Reds cruelly deported about 120,000 Estonians from their ancient homeland and replaced them with hostile people from other parts of the Soviet Union. There are indications that as many as 60,000 Estonians were killed during the first Soviet occupation of the Baltic States in 1940–41.

It is quite well known that the Russians employed a very vicious policy to eliminate the distinctive nationality of the Baltic people by scattering them to the four winds. The present sad fate of Estonia represents one of the great tragedies of modern times—the complete enslavement of formerly free people by the neocolonialistic imperialism of the U.S.S.R.

The reality of the Iron Curtain as a barrier remains. For over 15 years, U.S. foreign correspondents were almost completely excluded from Estonia and other Baltic countries. It signifies a failure on the part of the Soviet system to reach its goals and to provide a successful competition with the free world for the minds and loyalties of the captives behind that barrier.

It should also be remembered that the Soviet Government has signed treaties of nonaggression with Estonia and other Baltic nations—and then systematically invaded the countries whose integrity it had solemnly promised to respect. The U.S.S.R. then physically annexed these nations and forcibly incorporated them into the cluster of its "Socialist Republics." So far as the Communists are concerned, Estonia has ceased to exist as a separate country entitled to her own national identity and independence.

I wish to invite to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress that to this day, the United States fully accords diplomatic recognition to the representatives of this great Baltic State. Here, I submit, is positive proof of our dedication to the cause of freedom and of our belief in the right of self-determination of separate and independent nations, even though they might presently be subjugated.

By noting this day, we give notice to the entire world that we trust in the not too distant future, Estonia will again take its rightful place among the community of free and independent sovereign nations.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Patman, for 60 minutes, on March 6, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Patman, for 60 minutes, on March 7; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Hechler of West Virginia, for 60 minutes, on February 28, 1967; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Riegle, for 60 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Gross, for 20 minutes, on Tuesday, February 28, 1967.

Mr. Gubser (at the request of Mr. Gude), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Gude), for 10 minutes, on February 28; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Cunningham (at the request of Mr. Gude), for 30 minutes, on March 1; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Rumsfeld.

Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Rarick in two instances.

Mr. Poage and to include an address by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Gude) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Railsback.

Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Kazen) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Fraser.

Mr. Scheuer.

Mr. Casey.

Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Hanley.

Mr. Zablocki.

Mr. Hanna in two instances.

Mr. Howard.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 28, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

416. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify and otherwise amend the Meat Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State meat inspection programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

417. A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting a report of all expenditures during the period July 1 to December 31, 1966, from moneys appropriated to the Architect of the Capitol, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88–454; to the Committee on Appropriations.

418. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1967 for use by the Secretary of Defense for acquisition of properties pursuant to section 1013 of Public Law 89–754, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

419. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the financing of the operations of the Bureau of the Mint, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

420. A letter from the junior past national president, Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc., Medford, Oreg., transmitting the minutes of the annual national convention of the Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc., pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 86–654; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

421. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act of 1967; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

422. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of potential savings in the procurement of spare aircraft parts for outfitting aircraft carriers, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

423. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of potential savings through constructing rather than leasing housing at Brewerville, Liberia, for U.S. Information Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

424. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of savings available through expanded use of regional contracts for the repair and maintenance of selected office machines, General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

425. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of potential savings available in manpower costs of railway post offices, Post Office Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

426. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a copy of the annual report of the Board covering fiscal year 1966, pursuant to the provisions of section 205 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

427. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a recommendation against "recapture" of the Empire District Electric Co.'s Ozark Beach hydroelectric project, located on the White River in Taney County, Mo., pursuant to the provisions of section 14, 16 U.S.C. 807; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

428. A letter from the Acting Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting the 32d annual report of the Board, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

429. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report of claims paid during the year ending December 31, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of title 28, section 2672, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

430. A letter from the president, Boys' Clubs of America, transmitting an audited financial statement of the Boys' Clubs of America, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 84–988; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

431. A letter from the Director, Congressional Liaison, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a report of claims settled by the Agency during the period January 1–December 31, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of section 3(e) of the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

432. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a highway safety and beauty trust fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

433. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned, long-lines communication facilities in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of February 23, 1967, the following bill was reported on February 24, 1967:

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 4515. A bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 29). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted February 27, 1967*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 273. Joint resolution to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments (Rept. No. 30). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 6097. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of certain casualty losses attributable to major disasters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 6098. A bill to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 6099. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,500 to $3,000 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6100. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 6101. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H.R. 6102. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6103. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6104. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6105. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from the gross income for contributions to local, State, and National candidates for public office or to political parties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 6106. A bill to provide for the participation of the Department of the Interior in the construction and operation of a large prototype desalting plant, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 6107. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exclude from minimum wage and overtime coverage employees of public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 6108. A bill to establish the Channel Islands National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 6109. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the rates of pension payable to certain veterans and their widows, to provide additional readjustment assistance for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 6110. A bill to repeal the prohibition against mint marks on coins of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 6111. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Judicial Center; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 6112. A bill to prohibit political influence with respect to appointments, promotions, assignments, transfers, and designations in the postal field service, to revise the laws governing the appointment of postmasters and rural carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 6113. A bill to establish a Federal Motor Vehicle Insurance Guaranty Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6114. A bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act to increase the protection afforded consumers against injurious flammable fabrics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 6115. A bill to provide for the establishment of a drug stamp program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6116. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 6117. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for certain members of the United States Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 6118. A bill to extend for 2 additional years the provisions of certain education acts which would otherwise expire; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 6119. A bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland:

H.R. 6120. A bill to guarantee freedom of speech, assembly and petition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 6121. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 6122. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 6123. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 6124. A bill to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 6125. A bill to provide for reimbursement of U.S. cities for a portion of expenses incurred in connection with the entertainment of foreign officials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 6126. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 6127. A bill to amend section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 6128. A bill to amend section 521 of title 38, United States Code, to exclude from consideration as income, for the purpose of determining eligibility for pension, all payments of any kind or from any source, including salary, retirement or annuity payments, endowments or similar income, which a veteran receives or is entitled to receive after attaining age 70; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6129. A bill to amend section 48 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the suspension period for the investment credit shall end on June 30, 1967, in the case of railroad rolling stock; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 6130. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 6131. A bill providing for the designation of the gravesite and the ancestral home of Jane Addams in Cedarville, Ill., as national historical landmarks; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 6132. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Grand Canyon National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 6133. A bill to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program, to expand the program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 6134. A bill to amend section 6 of the Internal Security Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 6135. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 6136. A bill to authorize a program of research, development, and demonstration projects for electrically powered vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 6137. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the use in commission of certain crimes of firearms transported in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 6138. A bill to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States; to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 6139. A bill to prohibit nepotism in Government employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 6140. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 6141. A bill to control unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products and associations of such producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 6142. A bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act so as to clarify certain provisions of that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 6143. A bill to provide a comprehensive program for the control of drunkenness and the prevention and treatment of alcoholism in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 6144. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 6145. A bill to establish a National Institute of Criminal Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 6146. A bill relating to the rate of duty on fresh and frozen strawberries which are imported from Mexico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 6147. A bill to amend section 8(b) (4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, with respect to strike at the sites of construction projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6148. A bill to require health insurance policies sold in interstate commerce to provide payment for health services performed by dentists and optometrists if the same services, if performed by doctors, are covered under the terms of the policies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 6149. A bill to increase the amount of real and personal property which may be held by the American Academy in Rome; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LLOYD:

H.R. 6150. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $250,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed Golden Circle National Scenic Parkway complex connecting the national parks, monuments, and recreation areas in the southern part of Utah with the national parks, monuments, and recreation areas situated in northern Arizona, northwestern New Mexico, and southwestern Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6151. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture jointly with the Secretary of Commerce to make a preliminary survey of the proposed Skyline Drive Recreation Way in the Manti-LaSal and Fishlake National Forests in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MATHIAS of California:

H.R. 6152. A bill to establish a program of mutual and self-help housing in the Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6153. A bill to establish a National Spelling Commission to reform the spelling of English words, to publish the United States Official Dictionary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 6154. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 6155. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modernize the loan, investment, dividend, and reserve provisions; to require the establishment of an education committee; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6156. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to permit Federal credit unions to make long-term loans secured by real estate; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6157. A bill to permit Federal employees to purchase shares of Federal- or State-chartered credit unions through voluntary payroll allotment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6158. A bill to provide full and fair disclosure of the nature of interests in real estate subdivisions sold through the mails and instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce, and to prevent frauds in the sale thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 6159. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more realistic definition of disability, based on previous occupational experience, for purposes of disability insurance benefits in the case of individuals who have attained age 55; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6160. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to revise and improve the provisions thereof relating to the adjustment of overpayments and underpayments of benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6161. A bill to provide that disabled individuals entitled to monthly cash benefits under section 223 of the Social Security Act, and individuals retired for disability under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, shall be eligible for health insurance benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act without regard to their age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 6162. A bill to provide Federal assistance to courts, correctional systems, and community agencies to increase their capability to prevent, treat, and control juvenile delinquency; to assist research efforts in the prevention, treatment, and control of juvenile delinquency; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 6163. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 6164. A bill to prohibit nepotism in employment under the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 6165. A bill to create a national commission to study quality controls and manufacturing procedures of medical devices, surgical instruments, artificial organs and limbs, therapeutic instruments and devices, and other medical and hospital equipment; to determine the need for and the extent of Federal regulation of such medical devices; to recommend to the President and to the Congress methods for determining constructive minimum performance standards, and feasible methods for Federal regulation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 6166. A bill to reserve certain public lands and other lands for a nationwide system of scenic rivers, to provide a procedure for adding additional lands to the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 6167. A bill to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 6168. A bill to clarify and otherwise amend the Meat Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State meat inspection programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 6169. A bill to amend section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 6170. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to enable certain permanently and totally disabled veterans to receive the full rate of disability compensation payable for service-connected disabilities, and also a proportionate amount of disability pension under a specified formula; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6171. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to provide for the payment of additional pension to the widows of veterans who die while suffering from a service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 6172. A bill to control unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products and associations of such producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6173. A bill to establish the Sandy Hook National Seashore in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6174. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior in cooperation with the States to preserve, protect, develop, restore, and make accessible estuarine areas of the Nation which are valuable for sport and commercial fishing, wildlife conservation, recreation, and scenic beauty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 6175. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide career incentives for certain professionally trained officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6176. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6177. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing job training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.R. 6178. A bill to amend section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on griculture.

By Mr. WATKINS:

H.R. 6179. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 6180. A bill to provide time off duty for Government employees to comply with religious obligations prescribed by religious denominations of which such employees are bona fide members; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUSH:

H.R. 6181. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COWGER:

H.R. 6182. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 6183. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 6184. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 6185. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ZION:

H.R. 6186. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.J. Res. 357. Joint resolution to establish a National Commission on Product Safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.J. Res. 358. Joint resolution to change the name of San Angelo Reservoir project, Texas, to Culbertson Deal Reservoir project, Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.J. Res. 359. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.J. Res. 360. Joint resolution to designate Monday, October 2, 1967 (and each succeeding first Monday in October) as Free Enterprise Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 361. Joint resolution concerning designation of National Poetry Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. Con. Res. 238. Concurrent resolution reaffirming the support of the Congress for United Nations peacekeeping and peacemaking operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H. Con. Res. 239. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Federal-aid highway program should continue without interruption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H. Con. Res. 240. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the interest of peace in Vietnam the Government of the United States should only consider further expansions of trade, educational and cultural exchanges, and other related agreements with the Soviet Union and its East European satellites when there is demonstrable evidence that their actions and policies with regard to Vietnam have been redirected toward peace and an honorable settlement and when there is demonstrable evidence that they have abandoned their policy of support for so-called wars of national liberation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 241. Concurrent resolution to provide for an investigation and study of the administration of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. Con. Res. 242. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the use of the terms salmonella and salmonellosis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H. Con. Res. 243. Concurrent resolution to provide early appropriations for Federal educational programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H. Con. Res. 244. Concurrent resolution expressing the support of Congress for the South Vietnam Constituent Assembly; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. Con. Res. 245. Concurrent resolution expressing the support of Congress for the South Vietnam Constituent Assembly; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 246. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the interest of peace in Vietnam the Government of the United States should only consider further expansions of trade, educational and cultural exchanges, and other related agreements with the Soivet Union and its East European satellites when there is demonstrable evidence that their actions and policies with regard to Vietnam have been redirected toward peace and an honorable settlement and when there is demonstrable evidence that they have abandoned their policy of support for so-called wars of national liberation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H. Con. Res. 247. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain proposed regulations of the Food and Drug Administration relating to the labeling and content of diet foods and diet supplements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUSH:

H. Res. 279. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan:

H. Res. 280. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H. Res. 281. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COWGER:

H. Res. 282. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DENNEY:

H. Res. 283. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ESCH:

H. Res. 284. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H. Res. 285. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GUDE:

H. Res. 286. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HUNT:

H. Res. 287. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H. Res. 288. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LLOYD:

H. Res. 289. Resolution creating a select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LUKENS:

H. Res. 290. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H. Res. 291. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H. Res. 292. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H. Res. 293. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H. Res. 294. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H. Res. 295. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma:

H. Res. 296. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 297. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H. Res. 298. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 299. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H. Res. 300. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 301. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ZION:

H. Res. 302. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H. Res. 303. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BIESTER:

H. Res. 304. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H. Res. 305. Resolution establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H. Res. 306. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H. Res. 307. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships, and for certain other purposes regarding the conduct of a Member of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MAYNE:

H. Res. 308. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROTH:

H. Res. 309. Resolution to create a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct and to amend the rules of the House to require disclosure of certain information; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WINN:

H. Res. 310. Resolution creating a standing Committee on Standards and Conduct of the House of Representatives, establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, of Members, officers, and employees of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H. Res. 311. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the effects of military operations in South Vietnam on the civilian population of South Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. Res. 312. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Science and Astronautics to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to aeronautical and other scientific research and development and outer space; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 313. Resolution providing for additional copies of the report entitled "Food for Progress in Latin America"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H. Res. 314. Resolution to extend the congratulations of the House of Representatives to the people of Puerto Rico on their 50th anniversary of U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. Res. 315. Resolution to extend the congratulations of the House of Representatives to the people of Puerto Rico on their 50th anniversary of U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Res. 316. Resolution to extend the congratulations of the House of Representatives to the people of Puerto Rico on their 50th anniversary of U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. Res. 317. Resolution to extend the congratulations of the House of Representatives to the people of Puerto Rico on their 50th anniversary of U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. Res. 318. Resolution to extend the congratulations of the House of Representatives to the people of Puerto Rico on their 50th anniversary of U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. de la GARZA:

H. Res. 319. Resolution to extend the congratulations of the House of Representatives to the people of Puerto Rico on their 50th anniversary of U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

33. By the SPEAKER. A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, relative to ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and the Vice Presidency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

34. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to Presidential succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

35. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to citizenship for the membership of the Colville Reservation, Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

36. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to the conduct of hearings on the subject of percentage distribution of national forest receipts for schools and roads; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 6187. A bill for the relief of Antonina Randazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 6188. A bill for the relief of Hi Sook Kwon Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 6189. A bill for the relief of Fred W. Kold, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6190. A bill for the relief of the O'Brien Dieselectric Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 6191. A bill for the relief of Angela Canepa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6192. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe D'Angelo, his wife, Rose D'Angelo, and Onofrio D'Angelo and his wife, Francesca D'Angelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6193. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Taormina, his wife, Vincenza Taormina (nee Bozzetta), and their minor child, Matteo Taormina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 6194. A bill for the relief of Miss Melody P. de Guzman, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6195. A bill for the relief of Peter Balinas and Lee Balinas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 6196. A bill for the relief of Caterina Testa Genareo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H.R. 6197. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gracia Trias Digal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 6198. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Laila Atchoo Parker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 6199. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fair J. Bryant, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 6200. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Crisanzio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 6201. A bill for the relief of Rosario Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 6202. A bill for the relief of Dr. Takashi Wakamori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6203. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Iuliano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6204. A bill for the relief of Mari Versienti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 6205. A bill for the relief of Marge Eastlyn Savery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 6206. A bill for the relief of Yoshio Okada, Masako Okada, and Keikichi Okada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6207. A bill for the relief of certain Philippine nurses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6208. A bill for the relief of Erlinda A.

Camacho, Maria Zoraida Tan, and Arsenia V. Tolentino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN (by request):

H.R. 6209. A bill for the relief of Wesley Crump; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6210. A bill for the relief of Ethel McLeod; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 6211. A bill for the relief of Rosette Sorge Savorgnan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS of California:

H.R. 6212. A bill for the relief of Antonio S. Martins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6213. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria da Conceicao Rodrigues; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland:

H.R. 6214. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chung Sook Paik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 6215. A bill for the relief of Chang Ghoone Yi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 6216. A bill for the relief of Paulina Crisci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 6217. A bill for the relief of Mohammed Ali Moallem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 6218. A bill for the relief of William E. Neu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 6219. A bill for the relief of Alexander Aliferis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6220. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Grimbilas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6221. A bill for the relief of Vasiliki Angelopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6222. A bill for the relief of Antonia Grimbila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 6223. A bill for the relief of Luigi Viekoslav Pirjavec, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN (by request):

H.R. 6224. A bill for the relief of Mario Cianciulli and his wife, Candida Cianciulli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 6225. A bill for the relief of Errol George Minto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6226. A bill for the relief of Muriel C. Greaves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 6227. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Rebecca Riley Black; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

H.R. 6228. A bill for the relief of Lloyd T. Eastburn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 6229. A bill for the relief of William Wallace Division, Wallace-Murray Corp. (formerly William Wallace Co.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 320. Resolution providing for sending the bill H.R. 6190, for the relief of the O'Brien Dieselectric Corp., to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

37. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Oreg., relative to Federal income tax returns, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-living God, as we bow in this quiet moment dedicated to the unseen and the eternal, make vivid our abiding faith, we beseech Thee, in those deep and holy foundations which our fathers laid, lest in foolish futility in this desperate and dangerous day we attempt to build on sand instead of rock.

Enable Thy servants in this place of governance, in the discharge of great responsibilities of public trust, to be calm, confident, wise, and just, their hope in Thee as an anchor sure and steadfast.

Make us honest and honorable enough to bear the vision of the truth, wherever it may lead; to cast aside all pretense; and expediency which warp the soul.

Give us, O God, the strength to build
The city that hath stood
Too long a dream, whose laws are love,
Whose ways are brotherhood:
And where the sun that shineth is God's
grace for human good.

We ask it in the name of HIM who is the light and the truth. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 24, 1967, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1967—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 60)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States transmitting reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1967. Without objection, the message will be printed in the RECORD, without being read, and appropriately referred.

The message from the President was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1967.

This plan would transfer from the Secretary of Commerce to the Secretary of Transportation authority to approve the surrender of certain ship documents. These documents include certificates of ownership, declarations of citizenship, and related ship papers issued for commercial vessels covered by preferred mortgages or owned by the United States.

Under the act establishing the Department of Transportation, the Secretary of Transportation, acting through the Coast Guard, will have responsibility for recording bills of sale, transfers, and mortgages of ships; for issuing new marine documents; and for retaining custody of preferred mortgages on vessels.

The Secretary of Transportation will not, however, have the authority to approve the surrender of documents for vessels covered by preferred mortgages. That authority still resides with the Secretary of Commerce.

As a result, shipowners will have to deal with two separate departments of the Federal Government every time a ship's name is changed, its structure is modified, or it is sold or transferred.

In each of these and other cases, the shipowner must first seek the approval of the Secretary of Commerce to surrender the ship's documents and then request the Secretary of Transportation to issue new documents.

The reorganization plan is designed to eliminate this duplication of effort, and to save time and expense for shipowners.

This is not a major reorganization plan. But it is important. It is part of our larger effort to streamline the Government, to make its operations as efficient as possible, and to enable it to provide better service to the citizens and businessmen of this country.

This plan has been prepared in accordance with chapter 9 of title V of the United States Code. I have found, after investigation, that the reorganization is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 901(a) of that title.

I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 27, 1967.*

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 61)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States relating to the District of Columbia. Without objection, the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD, without being read, and will be appropriately referred.

The message from the President was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Our goal for the Nation's Capital is a city of which all Americans can be proud.

As I said 2 years ago, this city and its government must be, for its residents and the entire world, "a living expression of the highest ideals of democratic government." It should be a city of beauty and inspiration, of equal justice and opportunity. It should be a model for every American city, large and small. It should be a city in which our citizens and our friends from abroad can live and work, visit our great national monuments, and enjoy our parks and walk our streets without fear.

The District of Columbia is the Nation's ninth largest city. It is the center of the fastest growing metropolitan area in the country, with a population today of 2.5 million. As such, its citizens have all the problems—and are entitled to all the rights—of the citizens of any large city in this country.

The District of Columbia is also the Capital of our Nation, and the seat of every major agency of the Federal Government. As such, there is a significant Federal interest in the affairs of this city.

Since I have been President, I have addressed myself to the difficult problem of balancing the interest of the residents of the District as citizens of a large city with that of the National Government as representative of the people of the entire country.

The actions of the 89th Congress demonstrate that it shares my concern that both these interests be fairly served. While the 89th Congress did not move forward in every field as many of us would have preferred, its accomplishments do illustrate our mutual interest in making the District of Columbia a place in which we can all take pride:

A new 4-year college and a technical institute were authorized to bring better education and training to our young.

A mass transit system was authorized to serve the city and its suburbs and an interstate agency was created to plan and build the system.

A comprehensive minimum wage law was enacted.

Urban renewal was started for the commercial area in the heart of the city.

Two new museums, the Hirshhorn and the Air and Space, were authorized.

A Commission to plan a Visitor's Center was established. These actions are an important, and a very historic beginning. The District's programs for housing, education, health, welfare, and recreation must be expanded and improved. Its war against crime must be sharply stepped up.

The 1968 budget for the District calls for increased efforts in each of these areas. The budget would finance long-delayed school construction projects. It would provide the personnel and equipment needed to enhance the quality of education. It would provide resources vitally needed by the police and it would enable us to combat crime at its source with improved housing, education, training, health and rehabilitation services.

But prompt action on the 1968 budget alone is not enough.

The citizens of the District are entitled to:

Elect the government which serves them.

Efficient and effective government machinery.

Representation in the Congress of the United States.

Streets and homes that are free from crime and the fear of crime.

The citizens of our Nation, as well as those of the District, are entitled to a Capital that is—

Inspiring, dignified and beautiful.

A place where the great scholars of the Nation and the world can come to work, study, and learn.

A hospitable location for the scores of foreign governments which are represented here.

Accessible by transportation convenient to all who visit here.

I. A BETTER GOVERNMENT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The District of Columbia, as a major American city and the center of a large metropolitan area, faces all the problems of explosive urbanization—a rising crime rate, traffic congestion and parking shortages, decaying buildings and homes and inadequate health and education services. To meet these needs, the District must have the most responsive and efficient government we are capable of providing.

I recommend a three-point program to bring new vitality and strength to the District's government: Home rule, reorganization and strengthening of the District government, representation in the Congress.

HOME RULE

To provide a system of government appropriate for the people who live here and worthy of our heritage, the residents of the District of Columbia must be given a voice in the selection of their local officials.

The citizens of the District today have no voice in the government of their city. Despite the principle so long cherished in this country, they are taxed without representation. They are asked to assume the responsibilities of citizenship and at the same time denied one of its most fundamental rights.

This continuing denial of democracy is an affront to our traditions and to the citizens who make the District their home.

The need for home rule stems from practical considerations as well. Management of any large metropolitan center, in this era of rapid technological and social change, must be promptly responsive to new demands and new conditions. The Congress, preoccupied as it should be with the problems of this great Nation, cannot be expected to provide the day-to-day management that should be provided by locally elected officials. The 535 Members of Congress should not be expected to serve as city councilmen for the city of Washington.

The bill to provide self-government for the District, which I transmitted to the 89th Congress, was designed to afford local citizens a full voice in their affairs and at the same time provide adequate safeguards for the legitimate interests of the Federal Government in our Nation's Capital. The Senate passed that bill. While the House of Representatives did not pass the bill I submitted, a majority of its Members clearly went on record in support of the principle of home rule.

I again endorse the home rule bill.

As I said in my message on the District of Columbia budget:

> I believe that the last Congress should have granted home rule to the citizens of the District, and I urge the present Congress to give them home rule.

REORGANIZATION OF THE DISTRICT GOVERNMENT

Improvements in District government need not await the passage of home rule legislation. Interim action under the Reorganization Act can bring urgently needed improvements to make the present unwieldy structure into an efficient and effective instrument of municipal government.

I will shortly transmit to the Congress a reoganization proposal to strengthen and modernize the government of the District of Columbia.

The present District government organization was established almost a century ago. The District was then a community of 150,000 people. Less than 500 persons were employed by its government.

Today the District has 800,000 residents. Its government employs some 30,000 people. Its 1968 budget is more than half a billion dollars. This major metropolis cannot be properly governed with the cumbersome machinery of an archaic and obsolete structure.

The District is entitled to have the best and most efficient municipal government we can provide. The Nation's Capital should lead the country in applying the techniques of modern management to the organization and administration of its programs.

The reorganization plan I propose would create a mayor-council form of government—the form which has been found most successful in the Nation's 27 largest cities.

Under the reorganization plan, the President, subject to Senate confirmation, would appoint from among District residents a single Commissioner as chief executive and a Council of nine members.

The single Commissioner would serve at the pleasure of the President. Council members would serve 2-year terms, five to be appointed one year and four the next. The staggered terms would insure continuity of experience on the Council.

The powers and responsibilities which the three-man Board of Commissioners presently have would be apportioned between the single Commissioner and the Council. The Commissioner would be assigned the executive functions now vested in the Board of Commissioners. Like most mayors, he would be given responsibility and authority to organize and manage the District government, to administer its programs, and to prepare its budget of revenues and expenses.

The Council would be responsible primarily for making local rules and regulations—the District's city ordinances. This would include the quasi-legislative functions which are now performed by the Board of Commissioners, such as licensing rules, the issuance of police regulations, and the establishment of rates for property taxation. It would also review and approve the Commissioner's budget for submission to the President.

This reorganization would unify executive and administrative authority in a single Commissioner. While the District has been fortunate in the caliber and dedication of men who have become Commissioners, divided executive authority cannot provide effective management for the municipal affairs of a city of almost 1 million people.

The Capital City of this Nation can no longer afford government by three heads—each wearing several hats. To achieve their maximum potential, District programs—and federally assisted programs in the District—require clear-cut executive authority and flexible government machinery at the local level—not divided authority which too often produces prolonged negotiations and inaction. A single executive can bring effective management, direction, and control to the task of meeting increasingly complex needs.

But reorganization alone will not assure the Nation's Capital the best municipal government. The District must also be able to attract and hold top men in the widely varying fields required for effective city government.

I recommend legislation to give the District government an ample quota of its own top executive-level positions—supergrades and levels IV and V. The District government must be able to offer attractive salaries and opportunities for career advancement if it is to draw the caliber of person which the government of the Nation's Capital deserves.

As these fundamental changes are made, it will be possible to effect further improvements, both in the structure of the District government and in its relationships to other agencies serving the Nation's Capital.

These proposals in no way substitute for home rule. The single Commissioner and the nine-man Council will give the District a better organized and more efficient government, but they will have no functions beyond those the three Commissioners now possess. The new structure will make the transition to self-government easier, but only home rule will provide the District with a democratic government—of, by, and for its citizens.

REPRESENTATION IN THE CONGRESS

A proper complement to locally elected District officials is locally elected voting representation in the Congress.

I recommend that the Constitution be amended to authorize one Representative for the District of Columbia in the House and such additional representation in the House and the Senate as the Congress may from time to time provide.

Upon ratification, this would give the District of Columbia at least one sure voice—the minimum possible voting representation—in the Congress. At the same time, it would provide, through the Congress, the ability to adjust the representation for the District as population increases and as other changes make such adjustments appropriate and fair.

Ratification by the States and enactment by the necessary implementing legislation will take some time. But District citizens should not be left completely without a voice in the Congress during this vital interim period. They are entitled to some representation in the Congress now.

I recommend legislation to permit the citizens of the District to elect a nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives. Such a delegate would be comparable to the delegates who formerly represented Hawaii and Alaska and to the present Resident Commissioner for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

A delegate from the District in the House of Representatives would be of benefit to both the Congress and the District in providing a more adequate line of communication on District matters. A collateral benefit would be the opportunity for District citizens, through the experience of biennial elections, to develop additional local leadership and more effective political organizations responsive to the citizens who live here.

II. THE WAR ON CRIME

In my message to the Congress on crime in America, I said:

> Lawlessness is like a plague. Its costs, whether economic, physical or psychological, are spread through every alley and every street in every neighborhood. It creates a climate in which people make choices, not out of confidence, but out of fear.

That plague has struck our Nation's Capital. But, as I said in that same message:

> We can control crime if we will. We must act boldly, now, to treat ancient evils and to insure the public safety.

In my 1965 message on the District of Columbia, I announced the establishment of the Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia and asked for additional policemen, special incentives to attract and hold first-rate policemen, improvements in our courts to handle the growing criminal caseload, new correctional techniques to break the cycle of crime, prison, release, and crime.

The Congress responded, and in the past 2 years there have been significant advances. Working together, we have increased police salaries, authorized overtime compensation for police officers, provided additional judgeships in the court of general sessions, established a work release program for misdemeanor offenders, and created a District of Columbia Bail Agency.

Through the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, the Department of Justice has provided funds to support development of a model police radio communications system, a police planning bureau, an in-service police training program for all staff levels, a computerized law enforcement information system for the metropolitan area, additional mobile units.

The District of Columbia Commissioners have issued orders reorganizing the Police Department and the Department of Corrections to increase their efficiency and effectiveness.

These are significant steps forward. But more—much more—remains to be done.

In December 1966, the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia submitted a comprehensive report on the nature and extent of the District's crime problem and on the quality of the District's response to it. The report assembled facts, carefully explored alternatives and presented a broad and practical program for action.

The Crime Commission reported that since 1960 the rate of homicides and housebreakings in the District has doubled, the rate of robberies and auto thefts has almost tripled, the rate of grand larcenies has increased by more than 50 percent.

The Commission's report emphasizes that any meaningful attack on crime involves comprehensive and persistent action over a period of several years. The report makes the priorities clear. We must develop new programs to deal with juvenile delinquency, develop and use the most effective law enforcement machinery available, strengthen our courts and prosecutors so that persons charged with crime can be tried quickly and fairly, guarantee that our rehabilitative efforts reflect the wisest experience in the field of corrections, so that we can break the vicious cycle of crime, prison, and more crime, develop an information and evaluation system which permits rapid appraisal of our efforts to control crime.

Measured against the demands of these goals, piecemeal efforts will not suffice. Crime will not be controlled by strengthening just one or two agencies in the field. All parts of the government with law enforcement and criminal justice responsibilities must be strengthened. Private citizens must participate at every level—from support for the police and promptly reporting crimes, to testifying in court and employing good risk offenders.

THE COMMITMENT

Crime in the sixties and seventies can no more be fought with inadequate budgets and obsolete tools than with words of public indignation. The District of Columbia needs financial resources to provide the manpower, training, new facilities, and equipment and information systems—to prevent crime before it occurs, to process offenders swiftly and to develop programs which prevent repetition of crime by offenders and return them to useful lives.

Equally important, the police and government officials of the District need the personal support of every citizen who lives here and of the Congress. So long as I am President, I will take every step necessary to control crime in the District and to make it a community of safe streets and homes, free from crime and the fear of crime.

My message on the District's budget described some of the efforts we must make: A further increase in police salaries, additional funds to improve police planning, communications, and transportation, more police officers, particularly sergeants to improve supervision, additional funds for our efforts to curb juvenile delinquency, expanded assistance for the planning, construction, and modernization of courts and correctional facilities.

To support these efforts, I am requesting $11.6 million—a 20-percent increase—in the fiscal 1968 appropriations for the District police, courts, and correctional activities. I urge the Congress to act promptly on this vital request.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Action on the District's budget alone is not enough. Our laws—and the weapons of those who enforce our laws—must be strengthened. I propose a 10-point program to achieve this objective.

1. GUN CONTROL

Pistols are relatively easy to purchase in the District of Columbia. As the Crime Commission found, "almost anyone who is willing to fill out a form and wait for 48 hours can buy a handgun." The only persons who may not purchase handguns are minors, the mentally ill, drug addicts, and convicted felons. It makes no difference whether the individual has any need to purchase a pistol. Pistols may also be purchased by mail without restriction.

Any person who is not a felon or drug addict may possess a pistol in the District. It makes no difference whether he is mentally ill, a minor, or a chronic alcoholic, whether the weapon was obtained legally or illegally or whether there is any need for possession of the weapon.

Between July 1, 1965, and June 30, 1966, 1,850 major crimes were committed in the District of Columbia with pistols: 73 homicides, 640 assaults, 1,137 robberies and attempted robberies.

No civilized community in the 20th century should permit a situation such as this to exist. Experience in cities that regulate the purchase and possession of handguns and the studies of the Crime Commission clearly show that strict controls can strengthen our efforts to reduce violent crimes. Such controls cannot eliminate the danger of violence in our society. But they can help keep lethal weapons out of dangerous and irresponsible hands.

As the District Crime Commission emphasized, New York City, with the most stringent pistol control law in the country, has many crimes committed with handguns, but the relative number of such crimes is significantly less than in the District.

The District had a handgun murder rate of 9.1 per 100,000 of population in fiscal 1966, New York City had a rate of only 1.7. The handgun assault rate was 79.8 in the District, but only 20 in New York. The handgun robbery rate was 141.7 in the District, but only 45.4 in New York.

I recommend legislation to:

Prohibit possession of firearms by minors, chronic alcoholics, and the mentally ill, as well as felons and drug addicts who are covered by existing law.

Prohibit purchase of firearms by chronic alcoholics, as well as minors, the mentally ill, felons, and drug addicts who are now covered.

Require that any person desiring to purchase, possess, or carry a pistol in public obtain a license which will be granted only if he can show that he needs the weapon to protect his person or property.

Prohibit anyone from carrying rifles and shotguns in public, unless unloaded and properly encased.

Authorize the courts to impose increased penalties where a firearm is used in the commission of a robbery.

2. POWER TO ARREST WITHOUT A WARRANT

At present District police officers are authorized to arrest without a warrant only when they have reason to believe that the person has committed an armed robbery, murder, or some other felony, or one of a limited number of misdemeanors, such as possession of narcotics or carrying a concealed weapon. The police today may not arrest a person whom they believe has committed other serious offenses, such as an assault or unlawful entry, without first obtaining a warrant for his arrest.

I recommend legislation to extend the authority of police to arrest without a warrant to additional serious offenses, such as assault, unlawful entry, and attempted housebreaking. This will allow the police to respond more quickly and effectively to criminal acts threatening serious harm to our citizens.

3. WITNESSES

Of vital importance to crime control and any criminal prosecution is the availability of witnesses and their freedom from threats and intimidation.

Existing laws provide ample protections against intimidation of witnesses—but only after charges have been filed. It is not a crime to bribe or threaten persons with vital information before charges have been filed.

I recommend that the obstruction of justice statute be extended to cover interference with criminal investigations before charges have been filed.

In addition, the power of police to take custody of material witnesses at the scene of a crime must be clarified.

I recommend that the police of the District of Columbia be given authority to take custody of a material witness whenever there is reason to believe that he will not be available to testify in court. After the witness has been taken into custody, he would be promptly brought before a judicial officer who could either set conditions upon his release to insure reappearance or make arrangements for taking his deposition prior to release.

4. CITATIONS BEFORE AND AFTER ARREST FOR CERTAIN OFFENSES

District police today spend enormous amounts of time guarding and transporting persons arrested for minor offenses. Even where the offense is minor and identity of the offender clear, the police must in each case arrest the offender and take him to the stationhouse before he can be released with orders to reappear for trial or a hearing to determine whether a trial should be held. This must be done even if the offense involves nothing more than annoying a neighbor or refusing to move on when asked by some local official. This results in an inexcusable waste of police time and energy and often prevents the police from fulfilling more important duties.

New York, California, and several other States have resolved this problem by authorizing the police to issue citations to persons they consider reliable to require a subsequent appearance in court or at the police station.

I recommend legislation to give the police discretion to issue citations for certain minor offenses requiring subsequent appearance by the suspect.

Under this proposal, the court of general sessions would determine the types of offenses which would fall within this procedure. The proposal would enable the police to release reliable persons at the place of arrest or the stationhouse, thus conserving valuable police time for more important crime detection and protection duties.

5. BAIL SUPERVISION

Much can—and should—be done to improve our bail practices.

We are now making every effort to speed up the judicial process, to shorten the periods between arrest and trial and between conviction and appeal. This would limit the period during which the suspect is at large pending trial or appeal.

In addition, we must minimize the risk to society created by releasing persons before their trial.

I recommend legislation to permit the Department of Corrections to supervise persons released pending trial. This legislation would make possible more careful supervision of persons released on bail and would help the released person obtain needed counseling and assistance.

6. PROCEDURES UPON PLEA OF INSANITY

Existing procedures governing the defense of insanity contribute neither to judicial efficiency nor to protection of the rights of criminal defendants. A criminal defendant need not notify the prosecution or the court that he intends to raise the defense of insanity. He can wait until the prosecution has completed the presentation of its case and then submit this complex defense.

As a result the prosecutor must either make extensive and costly preparations which may not be necessary or enter the trial unprepared to deal with the issue. If the prosecution is not prepared and insanity is raised, a delay in the trial is unavoidable. But even where the trial is delayed, the government may not have sufficient time to prepare its case properly.

I recommend that counsel for a defendant who proposes to plead insanity be required to give advance notice to the prosecution.

This would protect the public against needless expense, where insanity is not in issue. It would protect the courts, the prosecution, and the defendant against needless delay, where insanity is unexpectedly raised.

7. CIVIL COMMITMENT FOR NARCOTICS OFFENSES

Last year I proposed the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act to permit civil commitment of certain narcotic addicts. As I said at that time:

> Our continued insistence on treating drug addicts, once apprehended, as criminals is neither humane nor effective. It has neither curtailed nor prevented crime.

I now recommend legislation to broaden the act's applicability in the District of Columbia.

Full criminal sanctions must be retained against the pushers who peddle narcotics—those who corrupt our children and destroy the lives of the young on whom they prey. But we must begin to provide treatment for those who are addicted to drugs. We must attempt "to eliminate the hunger for drugs that leads so many into lives of crime and degradation."

8. ALCOHOLIC OFFENSES

In fiscal 1965 there were 44,000 arrests for intoxication in the District of Columbia. This represents 50 percent of all nontraffic arrests. A few of these arrests were accompanied by assaults or other serious offenses. Most, however, involved nothing more than intoxication—and often just the intoxication of a chronic alcoholic.

This represents a tremendous waste of resources—police, courts, and prisons. Alcoholism, as both the National and District Crime Commissions pointed out, is not a criminal problem. It is a health problem. Alcoholics should not be arrested. They should be treated.

I recommend that the laws of the District be clarified so that police and Health Department personnel can take intoxicated persons not to a jail, but to a medical facility where they can receive proper treatment. Intoxication would be a criminal offense only when accompanied by conduct which endangers other persons or property.

9. CRIMINAL LAW AND PROCEDURE

The criminal code of the District needs complete modernization and revision. It was last codified three quarters of a century ago. The District Crime Commission cites many examples of vague, confusing, archaic, and conflicting provisions of substance and procedure. The District should have a coherent and consistent framework for the arrest and punishment of offenders and the control of crime.

I recommend the establishment of a Commission on Reform of Criminal Laws of the District of Columbia to review, modernize, and clarify the District's Criminal Code. The 11-man Commission would be composed of representatives from the House and Senate, from the courts of the District and from the public at large.

10. CRIMINAL STATISTICS

The District must have a reliable means of discovering the effectiveness of its efforts to control crime. The report of the Crime Commission points out substantial gaps in the criminal information system. Police, courts, and correctional and juvenile institutions maintain separate and uncoordinated records, often creating conflicts in statistics and leaving the community without a comprehensive view of its criminal process. More significant, the policymakers in the District and the senior police officials lack the information essential to evaluate new and lasting crime control programs.

I have asked the District Commissioners to create a Bureau of Criminal Statistics. The Bureau would supply crime control agencies in the District with accurate data essential to their planning and evaluation functions and would end duplication of effort in data collection.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The District must be given the total resources necessary to mount an effective attack on crime. Its laws—and law-enforcement officers—must be strengthened. But we must also improve our techniques for crime prevention, for processing offenders, and for rehabilitating the convicted.

We must make additional efforts to stop crime where it most frequently begins—with the young offender:

In the 16 years from 1950 to 1965, nearly one-third of the persons arrested in the District for serious crimes were under 18.

In 1965 arrests of youth offenders under 18 for serious crimes increased by 53 percent over 1960; adult arrests decreased 11 percent during this same period.

In 1965, children 15 years and younger accounted for 36 percent of all housebreaking arrests and 27 percent of all robbery and auto theft arrests.

In January 1967, there were more youth offenders referred to the Juvenile Court than in any prior month.

The Crime Commission's report stresses the need for improving our efforts to rehabilitate our young offenders and restore them to useful and productive lives. But as the Commission stated:

> The most productive approach for both the potential offender and the community is to prevent delinquency before it begins.

It will be neither simple nor cheap to halt the growth of juvenile crime. But we must commit the necessary resources. I have recommended in the budget urgently needed funds to strengthen and improve a variety of District programs—education, recreation, health and welfare, and the Juvenile Court.

I have requested funds for a major summer program which will provide recreation, training, and employment for disadvantaged youth.

I have also asked for funds to expand the Roving Leader program which has had such marked success in dealing with gangs and delinquency-prone youth. These funds will permit the expansion of programs removing the causes of delinquency as well as the improvement of the various rehabilitative services afforded the youth in trouble.

Consistency in these efforts, coordination of present youth programs, public and private, and development of new prevention techniques are essential. The Crime Commission proposed that a Youth Services Office be established to carry out these responsibilities.

I recommend legislation to establish a District Youth Services Office to plan and direct all the services needed to combat juvenile delinquency.

This Office, recommended by the District Crime Commission, would encourage maximum efforts by public and private agencies, as well as by private individuals. It would make available through one source all the specialized services—counseling, remedial education, vocational training, employment assistance, and health and recreational services—needed by the young, their parents, school personnel, and other persons working with the youth of the District. It would test new ways to prevent and control delinquency and to restore the troubled youth to a satisfying and productive life.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

We must make improvements in the administration of justice in the District of Columbia.

The report of the Crime Commission's study of the District courts is particularly disturbing. The Commission points out that offenders are released and not tried—not from any deliberate policy of leniency or softness, but rather from the pressures of sheer numbers and impossible caseloads.

In fiscal 1966, the number of felony prosecutions was substantially less than it was 15 years ago—in the face of a substantial increase in the amount of crime and the number of arrests.

In fiscal 1965, only 15 percent of the adult felony charges filed by the police resulted in felony prosecutions in the District court.

An efficient police department is not enough. We must have a judicial system fully capable of dealing swiftly and fairly with persons arrested by the police.

The courts and the bar are already engaged in serious efforts to find solutions. The District court and the court of general sessions have made significant strides in improving their procedures for handling criminal cases.

The judicial council of the District of Columbia Circuit is preparing recommendations on ways to handle the staggering—and increasing—caseload of the court of general sessions, and to improve the processing of criminal cases in all of our courts. One promising method being explored is a program for round-the-clock processing of arrested persons and night sessions of court.

The judicial council is also at work on another recommendation of the Crime Commission—the proposal for a family court which would assume the responsibilities of the juvenile court, the domestic relations branch of the court of general sessions, and the Mental Health Commission.

The need to find solutions remains urgent. I pledge the continuing cooperation and assistance of the executive branch to these efforts. I have asked the District Commissioners and the Acting Attorney General to review promptly any recommendations for improving the administration of justice in the District of Columbia made by the courts or the judicial council and to take appropriate action to implement them.

CORRECTIONS

We must make improvements in the rehabilitation of the convicted offender. The report of the Crime Commission makes clear that the problem which the District faces is not too much probation and parole.

The Crime Commission's report revealed that two-thirds of those convicted of felonies in the District have already served at least one prison term. In addition, the Commission found that more than one-half of the felony offenders were unemployed when they committed their most recent crime.

No matter how long the sentences, most prisoners will eventually be returned to the community. The quality of the help they receive in prison and after release in building new lives for themselves makes the critical difference.

The District's correctional system is in need of modern facilities, more specialized personnel to provide counseling and vocational training, "halfway" houses to provide support during the critical release period and community support to provide employment for persons with criminal records.

The budget I have recommended to the Congress will permit the District to begin to overcome these deficiencies and to plan to meet the needs of the future. It will:

Permit planning of a modern detention, diagnostic, and treatment facility to replace the District jail and the District Receiving Home.

Allow closer supervision and improved counseling, training, and employment services for prisoners before and after release.

Provide greater services for youth offenders and an expanded work-training program to assist in the transition from jail to meaningful employment.

I strongly urge prompt and favorable action on these recommendations.

I also recommend that the Federal Prison Industries be authorized to manage and operate the industrial program of the District's correctional institutions. This agency, which has an enviable record of success in Federal prisons, will provide valuable assistance to the District in improving prison vocational training and employment opportunities.

This is the immediate battle plan in a total campaign to assure law and order for the District. Some parts require legislation. Some require funds. Some require improvements in procedures that courts, agencies, and administrators can themselves put into effect. A failure on any front in this war weakens the efforts on all the others. Every course must be pursued. We must not fail.

I pledge myself—and I urge the Congress—to take every step which is necessary to ultimate success in our drive against crime. We must pursue every avenue and use every weapon which holds promise of advancing this effort. We will need the total commitment and cooperation of every man and woman in the District, if we are to have a city where civic order and social justice prevail.

As I said in my message on crime in America:

> Public order is the first business of government.

III. THE DISTRICT AS THE CAPITAL

The District, as the Nation's Capital, must be able to serve the national purpose for which it was founded. Its great avenues must be preserved as a tribute to the past and an inspiration for the future. It should afford unparalleled opportunities for the great scholars of the country and the world. It must make every effort to meet the needs of emissaries from abroad. It must continually explore new ways to improve its overloaded transportation facilities.

PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE COMMISSION

Pennsylvania Avenue, the District's most important thoroughfare, is the symbolic link between the White House and the Capitol. Throughout our history it has been the scene of ceremonies celebrating our triumphs and our tragedies.

Yet it has been allowed to wear down and become unworthy of its role. A temporary Commission created by Executive order is now engaged in bringing to the avenue the dignity and grandeur which it should have.

I recommend that the Congress support these efforts by prompt approval of the bill establishing a statutory Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue.

WOODROW WILSON CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

The Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission, created by the Congress in 1961, recently recommended the establishment of a Center for Scholars at Market Square as a living memorial to that great President.

The proposal of the Woodrow Wilson Commission has much to commend it. Because of its broad educational aspects, I am appointing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Temporary Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue. I am asking him, in consultation with the Commission, to conduct a study to develop a detailed proposal for the Center. When that study is completed, I will make further recommendations to the Congress.

It is my hope that the Center will serve as a place for bringing together scholars and students from other countries to increase understanding among peoples of the world, as well as an important educational institution.

INTERNATIONAL CENTER

For the District to serve its purpose as the Nation's Capital, it must provide for the representatives of foreign governments and international organizations. Increasingly, the unavailability of space for the legitimate needs of foreign governments is becoming a matter of concern.

Many new countries require but have been unable to secure adequate space for their chanceries. Many older countries which are seeking larger quarters are having similar difficulties. The problem has become an unnecessary irritant in our international relationships.

I recommend legislation which, consistent with the legitimate interests of District citizens, would specify an area northwest of Washington Circle to be available for foreign chanceries and the offices of international organizations.

The bill would authorize the Federal Government to acquire land in this area for appropriate disposition, as the Secretary of State may determine, to foreign governments and international organizations.

TRANSPORTATION CENTER

Last year, important decisions by the Congress and by local government agencies cleared the way for the development of highway and mass transit systems required to handle the growing transportation needs of the National Capital region. Meanwhile, the National Capital Planning Commission is recommending that a major transportation center be developed in the vicinity of the Union Station, where railroads, mass transit, and highways will come together.

I am asking the Planning Commission to take the lead, in cooperation with other agencies, to conduct a detailed study of this recommendation and to determine how such a center might be designed and brought into being. This study will be closely coordinated with the planning for the Visitors Center which the Congress has already authorized.

CONCLUSION

It will not be easy to achieve our goal for the Nation's Capital—a city in which all Americans can take pride. The problems to which this message is primarily directed—better government and crime—will not be solved overnight. Dedicated and persistent efforts by private citizens, private organizations, private businesses, and by the District and Federal Government will be required.

The task is difficult and success will take time. We must—and we will—succeed.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 27, 1967.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar, under rule VIII, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On the request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On the request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance in the Senate tomorrow, Tuesday, February 28, 1967, in order that I may accompany the Vice President on a trip which he is making to North Carolina.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM TOMORROW UNTIL 11 A.M. ON WEDNESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tomorrow, Tuesday, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock Wednesday morning, March 1.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PASTORE AND OTHER SENATORS ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, at the conclusion of the 3 hours pertaining to germaneness under the Pastore rule, the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and other Senators may be recognized for a series of round-robin speeches on a subject in which they are interested.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I am wondering how these unanimous-consent requests tie in with the desire of the majority leader with respect to the disposition of the pending military authorization bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like, as soon as possible, to reach a vote on the sense of the Congress amendments that the Senate has been notified will be offered, some of which are at the desk at the present time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it has been my intention to call up my proposals tomorrow. I have a rather lengthy speech to make today. I do not know how many other Senators wish to speak, but I am informed that other Senators wish to do so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator like to have the Senate convene earlier tomorrow?

Mr. CLARK. We have a very important committee meeting tomorrow morning.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senate will convene at 12 o'clock tomorrow. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania be prepared to offer his amendments tomorrow?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the Senator in a position to acquaint us now with the proposals that he expects to offer?

Mr. CLARK. They are at the desk. I explained them at some length last week. Generally speaking, they would carry out the sense of the Senate with respect to bombing in Vietnam; the number of troops we would have in Vietnam without a declaration of war; and the sense of the Senate that we would encourage an opening of negotiations to conclude hostilities at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As I understand, in addition to the proposals to be offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, another proposal will be offered by the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE].

Mr. CLARK. That is my understanding.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Can the Senator from Pennsylvania advise us about his amendment to rule XXII?

Mr. CLARK. As soon as the Senate returns to the consideration of the reorganization bill, I shall be prepared to call up, under limited time, if that is acceptable, the five remaining amendments which have not yet been disposed of. When that will be, I do not know.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania has been most cooperative. Had the opportunity offered itself last week, he would have offered his amendments at that time. But because of the circumstances, he graciously agreed to postpone calling them up until the Senate could dispose of the military authorization bill.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Montana.

REPORT OF ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of all expenditures, during the 6-month period ended December 31, 1966; which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF MONTANA LEGISLATURE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid befor the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

H.J. RES. 28

A joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, to request the Department of Defense to establish an adequate and permanent national cemetery system available with burial spaces in national cemeteries for all U.S. military service men and women who are entitled to the same and wish to be interred there

Whereas, figures, compiled by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1966, show that of the 4,873 servicemen who lost their lives in the fight for freedom in Vietnam during the period, 873 or 20.4 percent were buried in national cemeteries. Although one in five were actually interred in national cemeteries, many more would probably have also been buried in a national cemetery had there been available space near the home of next of kin, and

Whereas, over the past three years there has been a determined effort on the part of some federal agencies to sharply curtail or do away altogether with any further provision for national cemeteries. The Bureau of the Budget has stated unequivocably, "We continue to believe that expansion of the national cemetery is undesirable. The Administration firmly believes that funeral benefits now paid by the Veterans Administration and under Social Security are far preferable to the furnishing of interment facilities by the Government. Legislation to this end would not be in accord with the program of the President," and

Whereas, present-day burial expenses are sufficiently high without placing on the veteran's and serviceman's dependent the added cost of purchasing a burial plot, and

Whereas, the burial allowances of the Veterans Administration and that provided under Social Security are far too meager to provide for the last rites of most veterans and servicemen, and

Whereas, the Department of the Army has advised Congress that, "The Administration has determined that it is opposed to any further expansion of the present national cemetery system with the exception of Arlington National Cemetery," and

Whereas, it is perfectly evident that the present Administration is determined to end the national cemetery system just as soon as present facilities are exhausted. This procedure is a departure from the long-time precedent that veterans who have served their nation in time of war are entitled to burial sites provided by the United States Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, That we strongly urge the Congress of the United States to take such action as necessary to forestall the present plans of the Bureau of the Budget and the Administration, and to oppose the position of the Department of Defense which supports the Administration's policy of no further expansion of the national cemetery system, with the exception of the Arlington National Cemetery, as many national cemeteries have already exhausted available space and several others are scheduled for closing this year, and be it further

Resolved, That the Department of Defense be requested to establish an adequate and permanent national cemetery system to make national cemeteries available with burial spaces for all U.S. military service men and women who are entitled to the same, and wish to be interred there, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of the United States Senate, and Chief Clerk of the United States House of Representatives and to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States: the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense; the Honorable Charles L. Schultz, Director, Bureau of the Budget; the Honorable Mike J. Mansfield, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.; the Honorable Lee Metcalf, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.; the Honorable James F. Battin, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.; and the Honorable Arnold H. Olsen, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

I hereby certify that the within Joint Resolution originated in the House.

EDNA J. HINMAN,
Chief clerk.
JAMES R. FELT,
Speaker of the House.
TED JAMES,
President of the Senate.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], I send to the desk a concurrent resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina. This concurrent resolution memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to prohibit the use of the mails to advertise, sell and deliver master keys and master key sets which may be used by unauthorized persons to commit larceny, burglary, and other crimes.

I ask that this resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the close of my remarks and that it be appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

S. 191

(Adopted February 22, 1967)

A concurrent resolution to memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to prohibit the use of the mails to advertise, sell and deliver master keys and master key sets which may be used by unauthorized persons to commit larceny, burglary and other crimes

Whereas, the General Assembly of South Carolina has become aware recently that the United States mails are being used to advertise, sell and deliver master keys and master key sets which unlock large groups of door locks, vehicle switches and other locking devices; and

Whereas, the receipt by persons within the State of originals of Exhibit "A" bears witness to this practice of using the mails; and

Whereas, the General Assembly believes that the continued commerce through the mails of advertisement for and delivery of these master keys and key sets represents a threat to the security of property throughout the Nation, and an unnecessary temptation toward crime, especially for young people. Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate, the House of Representatives concurring:

That the Congress of the United States is requested to enact legislation to prohibit the use of the mails to advertise, sell and deliver master keys and key sets without restriction, regulation and control.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States and to each member of the United States Senate and United States House of Representatives from South Carolina.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

William Matson Roth, of California, to be special representative for trade negotiations, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary;

William S. Gaud, of Connecticut, to be United States Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank;

Maurine B. Neuberger, of Oregon, to be a member of the General Advisory Committee of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; and

William B. Macomber, Jr., of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of treaties were submitted:

By Mr. LAUSCHE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive H, 89th Congress, second session, Exploration of the Sea Convention (Ex. Rept. No. 1);

Executive T, 89th Congress, second session, Notes Amending the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries (Ex. Rept. No. 1);

Executive U, 89th Congress, second session, International Convention for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (Ex. Rept. No. 1);

Executive Q, 89th Congress, second session, Convention of Mar del Plata on Facilitation of International Waterborne Transportation (Ex. Rept. No. 2);

Executive R, 89th Congress, second session, Convention on Facilitation of International Maritime Traffic (Ex. Rept. No. 2);

Executive K, 89th Congress, second session, Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Professional Equipment (Ex. Rept. No. 3);

Executive L, 89th Congress, second session, Customs Convention on the ATA Carnet for the Temporary Admission of Goods (Ex. Rept. No. 3);

Executive M, 89th Congress, second session, Customs Convention Regarding ECS Carnets for Commercial Samples (Ex. Rept. No. 3);

Executive J, 89th Congress, second session, Customs Convention on Containers (Ex. Rept. No. 3); and

Executive N, 89th Congress, second session, Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods Under Cover of TIR Carnets (Ex. Rept. No. 3).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1082. A bill to require that medicine cabinets used in federally assisted housing be equipped with latches designed to prevent young children from gaining access to the contents of such cabinets; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (by request):

S. 1083. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to permit Federal credit unions to make long-term loans secured by real estate;

S. 1084. A bill to permit Federal employees to purchase shares of Federal- or State-chartered credit unions through voluntary payroll allotment; and

S. 1085. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modernize the loan, investment, dividend and reserve provisions; to require the establishment of an education committee; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1086. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture jointly with the Secretary of Commerce to make a preliminary survey of the proposed Skyline Drive Recreation Way in the Manti-LaSal and Fishlake National Forests in the State of Utah; and

S. 1087. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $250,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed Golden Circle national scenic parkway complex connecting the national parks, monuments, and recreation areas in the southern part of Utah with the national parks, monuments, and recreation areas situated in northern Arizona, northwestern New Mexico, and southwestern Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 1088. A bill relating to the appointment of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1089. A bill for the relief of the H & H Manufacturing Co., Inc.; and

S. 1090. A bill for the relief of the O'Brien Dieselectric Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1091. A bill for the relief of Hyun Ok Shin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1092. A bill to reserve certain public lands and other lands for a Nationwide System of Scenic Rivers, to provide a procedure for adding additional lands to the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. JACKSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S.J. Res. 46. Joint resolution to establish a National Advisory Commission on Fire Prevention and Control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

CONGRATULATIONS OF THE CONGRESS TO PUERTO RICO ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF U.S. CITIZENSHIP

Mr. JACKSON (for himself, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. MONTOYA) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 86) to extend the congratulations of the Congress to the people of Puerto Rico on their 50th anniversary of U.S. citizenship, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JACKSON, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF RULES OF THE SENATE RELATIVE TO REPORTING OF PERSONAL ASSETS AND LIABILITIES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 87); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 87

Resolved, That the Standing Rules of the Senate are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new rule:

"RULE —

"Reporting of personal assets and liabilities

"1. Each individual who is a Member of the Senate and each officer or employee of the Senate compensated at a gross rate in excess of $10,000 per annum on April 15 of any year shall file with the Comptroller General on or before such date—

"(a) a financial statement listing both assets and liabilities (exclusive of items of tangible personal property having a fair market value of not more than $5,000) held by him or his spouse, or by him and his spouse jointly, as of January 1 of such year; and

"(b) a copy of any income tax return filed by him with respect to the taxes imposed by subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code for the most recent taxable year ending prior to such date.

"2. Both the Comptroller General and the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct of the U.S. Senate are authorized to examine the reports and copies of income tax returns required to be filed with them under this Section, and in any case in which such examination discloses evidence of any impropriety relating to the discharge of the official function or duties of the Member, officer, or employee filing the report or copy of return or of a violation by such Member, officer, or employee of any law of the United States, the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct or the Comptroller General shall make such further investigation with respect to such impropriety or violation as it or he deems necessary to establish the facts with respect thereto.

"3. If after such further investigation either the Comptroller General or the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct is of the opinion that such impropriety or violation has occurred, it or he shall make a report thereon to the Senate and, if in its opinion or in his opinion such violation of law has occurred, to the Attorney General.

"4. As used in this Section, the term 'officer or employee of the Senate' means—

"(a) Members of the Senate;

"(b) an elected officer of the Senate who is not a Member of the Senate;

"(c) an employee of the Senate, or of any committee or subcommittee of the Senate;

"(d) the legislative counsel of the Senate or any employee of that office;

"(e) an Official Reporter of Debates of the Senate and any person employed by the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate in connection with the performance of their official duties;

"(f) a member of the Capitol Police force whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate;

"(g) an employee of the Vice President if such employee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate;

"(h) an employee of a joint committee of the Congress whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate; and

"(i) an employee of any Member of the Senate whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate."

REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 1089 TO THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS FOR A REPORT THEREON

Mr. SCOTT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 88); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 88

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1089) entitled "A bill for the relief of the H & H Manufacturing Co., Inc.", now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims; and the chief commissioner shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended by the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 958), and report thereon to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States or a gratuity and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 1090 TO THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS FOR A REPORT THEREON

Mr. SCOTT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 89); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 89

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1090) entitled "A Bill for the relief of The O'Brien Dieselectric Corporation", now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims; and the chief commissioner shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended by the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 958), and report thereon to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States or a gratuity and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

EQUIPMENT OF LATCHES FOR MEDICINE CABINETS TO PREVENT CHILDREN FROM GAINING ACCESS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to require that medicine cabinets used in federally assisted housing be equipped with latches designed to prevent young children from gaining access to the contents of such cabinets.

This is the same bill I introduced last year, when crowded committee schedules did not permit consideration of it. I strongly urge consideration of the bill early in this Congress because the lives of literally hundreds of children may depend upon it.

In the summer of 1959 the Accident Prevention Committee of the American Public Health Association stated that accidental poisoning of children could be drastically reduced if homes were equipped with safety storage cabinets for medicines.

The committee, working with the U.S. Public Health Service, sought adoption of a plan to provide for inclusion of these cabinets during construction or remodeling of every home.

Unfortunately, the plan foundered on the rocks of bureaucracy and the number of reported cases of accidental poisonings among children has continued to grow year by year since then.

In 1965, the most recent year for which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has figures, there were about 148,000 reported cases of accidental poisonings among children under 5 years of age in this country. An estimated 400 of these cases resulted in death.

And not all of the cases of accidental poisonings are reported.

The New Jersey Pharmaceutical Association recently observed that there may have been 500,000 such cases in the Nation in 1966, and about 50,000 in my State of New Jersey alone.

In the year in which the American Public Health Association began its activity in this area, more children were victims of accidental poisoning than of diphtheria, scarlet fever, hepatitis, and polio combined.

The president of the New Jersey Pharmaceutical Association has been quoted as saying:

> Some drug poisoning is a result of mistaken over-dosing. But a great deal of it is like any other household poisoning—the child simply swallows something he has found.

I understand that manufacturers of medicines voluntarily have agreed to bottle their products in containers with safety caps which are difficult for children to remove. This, indeed, is a commendable step.

But pharmacists recommend that we take the further step of providing a means of keeping all medicines in a locked closet out of children's reach. Most homes do not have such cabinets, although at least five companies manufacture them under a Government-owned patent which is available to all who want to use it.

There are two types of devices currently available—one for a sliding door cabinet and one for a swing door cabinet. Both were developed from a prototype invented by Dr. Elbert L. Chapman, a retired chief of the Public Health Service's Division of Accident Control, who turned the patent over to the Government.

For the swing door cabinet, there is a three-button device with the buttons spaced far enough apart so they can be controlled only by an adult hand. For the sliding door cabinet, there is a knob device with finger tabs on either side which must be squeezed together while the knob is pushed in and revolved.

The legislation I am introducing amends eight different laws and applies the same standard to family housing constructed by the Department of Defense. The agencies which administer these programs already have adopted various standards which must be met, but none of them deal with safety latches on medicine cabinets.

In order to obtain a uniform standard for all of the programs, I felt this legislation should be submitted to Congress in the form of legislation because Congress has a broader responsibility than any individual agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1082) to require that medicine cabinets used in federally assisted housing be equipped with latches designed to prevent young children from gaining access to the contents of such cabinets, introduced by Mr. CASE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SCENIC RIVERS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], an administration bill to establish a nationwide system of scenic rivers.

This bill is similar in several respects to one which I cosponsored with Senator CHURCH in the 89th Congress, S. 1446, to establish a nationwide system of wild rivers—and which passed the Senate last year, 71 to 1. That bill has been reintroduced as S. 119.

The new bill introduced today is patterned after the Wilderness Act of September 3, 1964, which established the national wilderness preservation system. It sets out a statement of policy to the effect that our national policy of constructing dams and other works on certain sections of rivers, needs to be complemented with a policy of preserving other sections of free-flowing rivers and related adjacent lands that possess outstanding scenic, fish, wildlife, and other outdoor recreation values.

The nationwide system would include "national scenic river areas" to be designated by Congress, and State and local scenic river areas designated by the Secretary of the Interior.

Nine rivers or their segments would make up the initial system. These would include segments of the Salmon and Clearwater in Idaho, the Rogue in Oregon, the Rio Grande in New Mexico, the Eleven Point in Missouri and Arkansas, the Cacapon and Shenandoah in West Virginia, the St. Croix in Wisconsin and Minnesota, and the Wolf in Wisconsin. Thirty-five other rivers would be studied for possible future inclusion.

The national scenic river areas listed in the bill do not include the Missouri in Montana or the Buffalo in Arkansas because these areas are now under consideration for administration in connection with the National Park System. They might, for example, be authorized as national scenic riverways comparable to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of the letter transmitting the bill, plus an analysis of the bill as provided by the Department of the Interior, appear in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee will conduct an open hearing on S. 119, the wild rivers bill, and on the national scenic rivers bill which I have just introduced, Thursday and Friday, April 13 and 14.

The hearings will start at 10 a.m., and will be conducted in room 3110 of the New Senate Office Building.

Those organizations and individuals interested in presenting their views on this important legislation should notify the committee, preferably by letter, and indicate upon which of the two dates they wish to be heard.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1092) to reserve certain public lands and other lands for a Nationwide System of Scenic Rivers, to provide a procedure for adding additional lands to the system, and for other purpurposes, introduced by Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. NELSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter and analysis presented by Mr. JACKSON are as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., February 18, 1967.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The President, in his January 30, 1967, message to the Congress on protecting our natural heritage renewed his recommendation for legislation to establish a Nationwide System of Scenic Rivers similar to legislation the Department submitted to the 89th Congress. The need to act in order to preserve portions of our free-flowing rivers for the benefit of the American people is urgent. Unless we act promptly, growth and development will soon make the beauty of the unspoiled stretches of our scenic waterways merely a memory.

While river flows have been harnessed to aid navigation, control floods, increase farm productivity and hydroelectric power, too little attention has been given to the importance of protecting the very water we drink and the values of fish and wildlife, scenic and outdoor recreation resources. These values, although often measureless in commercial terms, should be preserved by a program that will guarrantee America her heritage of unspoiled, unpolluted free-flowing rivers. Our belief is shared by a wide range of public and private authorities, and the time to act is now, before it is too late.

In 1962, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission endorsed efforts to preserve certain rivers because of unique natural values they provide. Also in 1962, the President upon recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Army, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, approved for application by them and by the Bureau of the Budget, a policy statement concerning the use and development of water and related land resources. This policy statement provides, among other things, that in particular instances wild areas of rivers should be maintained and used for recreational purposes.

In 1963, this Department and the Department of Agriculture initiated a coordinated, broad-scale study of the need to preserve a nationwide system of scenic or wild rivers. This study revealed that of a total of approximately 100,000 miles of rivers and tributaries in the United States averaging a flow of at least 550 cubic feet per second, only a few of the rivers could still be classified as relatively unspoiled. In a strict sense, a pristine river is a rare thing today in the United States. There are, however, many free-flowing rivers, or segments thereof, which still retain enough of their original character to provide the distinctive type of enjoyment and inspiration that increasing numbers of people are seeking. The sheer natural beauty of such river areas is a source of physical and spiritual refreshment.

The enclosed bill, which would establish a Nationwide System of Scenic Rivers, is similar to the proposal which the Department submitted to the 89th Congress. We urge that it receive early consideration. A detailed analysis of its provisions is set forth in an enclosure to this report.

Pertinent data with respect to the initial nine areas included by this bill in the System is enclosed.

The proposed legislation has been prepared in collaboration with the Secretary of Agriculture and has his approval.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that this proposed legislation is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,
HARRY R. ANDERSON,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

ANALYSIS OF BILL

The bill is patterned after the Wilderness Act of September 3, 1964, (78 Stat. 890), which established the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Section 1 provides for the Act to be cited as the "Scenic Rivers Act".

Section 2 sets out a statement of policy to the effect that our national policy of constructing dams and other works on certain sections of rivers needs to be complemented with a policy of preserving other sections of free-flowing rivers and related adjacent lands that possess outstanding scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values. The section declares a congressional policy to preserve, reclaim, and appropriately develop such sections of our free-flowing rivers, and establishes a Nationwide System of Scenic Rivers composed of (1) areas designated by Congress in this Act or subsequent Acts as "national scenic river areas", and (2) State and local scenic river areas designated by the Secretary of the Interior as part of the System.

Section 3 defines the term "national scenic river area" to denote those segments of streams, tributaries, or rivers that possess outstanding scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values and are essentially free-flowing and unpolluted, and that should be preserved in such condition, or restored thereto, for public use and enjoyment. The definition of "national scenic river area" is not limited to relatively unspoiled or wilderness types of rivers because there are only a few such rivers remaining in the United States. There are, however, many free-flowing rivers, or segments thereof, which still retain enough of their original character to provide the distinctive type of enjoyment and inspiration that increasing numbers of people are seeking.

Section 4(a) designates as the initial national scenic river areas nine rivers or segments thereof, some of which are already mostly in Federal ownership. Each of these rivers has been carefully studied by this Department and the Department of Agriculture, and is considered to be an outstanding example of the values a Nationwide System of Scenic Rivers seeks to preserve. The segments of the Salmon (Idaho), Clearwater (Idaho), Rogue (Oregon), Rio Grande (New Mexico), Eleven Point (Missouri and Arkansas), Cacapon (West Virginia), and Shenandoah (West Virginia) Rivers mentioned in this section were included in the bill that passed the Senate in the 89th Congress (S. 1446). The segment of the Eleven Point River, however, has been extended downstream to its confluence with the Black River—a distance of approximately 50 miles. This has been made possible by a recent decision of the Secretary of the Army to recommend deauthorization of the Water Valley Dam project on the lower portion of the Eleven Point River.

The segments of the Saint Croix (Wisconsin and Minnesota) and Wolf (Wisconsin) Rivers described in this section have also been proposed for preservation as free-flowing rivers in previous bills introduced in the 89th Congress. The Saint Croix River is widely acclaimed as one of the most scenic and relatively unpolluted large rivers in the United States. The Wolf River has long been the subject of intensive efforts to protect its recreational qualities. On January 4, 1967, the Secretary of the Interior announced that a grant had been made to the State of Wisconsin out of funds appropriated from the Land and Water Conservation Fund for the State to acquire and develop the portion of the Wolf River in Langlade County for scenic river purposes. The Secretary of the Interior also announced that he planned to recommend the downstream portion of the Wolf River in Menominee County for national scenic river status.

The nine rivers designated as the initial national scenic river areas are scattered across the face of America. Three of them—the Clearwater, Salmon, and Rogue—are in the far West. Four others—the Rio Grande, Eleven Point, Saint Croix, and Wolf—are in the middle section of the country. The remaining two, the Cacapon and Shenandoah, are located in the East. These rivers contain an intriguing variety of recreational opportunity. There are whitewater rivers such as sections of the Salmon and Rogue, and more leisurely, forested rivers such as the Saint Croix and Eleven Point. All of them afford outstanding opportunities for a wide variety of outdoor recreation experiences. Each is regarded as one of the finest examples of the remaining free-flowing rivers in this country.

The national scenic river areas listed in this section do not include the Missouri in Montana or the Buffalo in Arkansas because these areas are now under consideration for administration in connection with the National Park System. They might, for example, be authorized as National Scenic Riverways comparable to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The upper reaches of the Hudson River in New York and the Connecticut River in Vermont and New Hampshire also are not included at this time because of studies now underway.

Section 4(b) provides for the administration of the Rio Grande, Saint Croix, and Wolf National Scenic River Areas by the Secretary of the Interior, and for the administration of the Clearwater and Eleven Point National Scenic River Areas by the Secretary of Agriculture. The Salmon, Rogue, Cacapon, and Shenandoah National Scenic River Areas are to be administered in a manner agreed upon by the two Secretaries, or as directed by the President. The rivers to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture are closely associated with national forests.

Section 4(b) also requires that detailed boundaries for each national scenic river area be established as soon as practicable after the enactment of the bill, and provides that such boundaries may not include on both sides of the river a total of more than 320 acres per mile. This provision will enable the amount of land included in a national scenic river area to vary in width at different points along the river segment. Some portions of a national scenic river area will extend only a short distance beyond the riverbanks. Other portions will include a wider strip of land along the river that will vary in width depending upon such factors as the terrain, vegetative cover, existing developments, and the need for public use facilities and administrative sites. This provision envisions that the boundaries of a national scenic river area generally will not extend to a width of more than 1,320 feet from either side of the river.

Sections 4(c) and (d) set forth the general authority of each Secretary to acquire property within the boundaries of national scenic river areas, but restrict each Secretary's authority to acquire a fee title on both sides of the river to a total of not more than 100 acres per mile. This envisions the fee acquisition of a strip of land generally not more than 400 feet from either side of the river. This limitation does not apply, however, where additional lands need to be acquired in fee to provide public use facilities and public access, and to avoid the payment of severance costs. The bill contemplates that the acquisition of scenic easements or other interests in land will be adequate to protect the remaining lands included in the boundaries of a national scenic river area.

Sections 4(c), (e), and (f) provide that the appropriate Secretary may not acquire (1) lands owned by a State without its consent; (2) lands owned by an Indian tribe without the consent of the tribal governing body; (3) lands within an incorporated city, village, or borough by condemnation proceedings as long as satisfactory zoning ordinances are in effect with respect to such lands; and (4) county-owned lands by any method, without the consent of the county, as long as it is following a satisfactory management plan for such lands.

Section 5(a) sets forth the purposes for which the national scenic river areas are to be administered. It directs the two Secretaries to give primary management emphasis to protecting the aesthetic and scenic features of such areas. This section recognizes that management plans for national scenic river areas may vary, depending upon the special attributes of each such area. The intention of this section is to maintain the status quo with respect to the character of the river and related adjacent lands at the time of its designation as a national scenic river area. It is recognized, however, that additional highways may unavoidably be routed across national scenic river areas.

Section 5(b) provides that the States will be encouraged to cooperate in the administration of a national scenic river area where it includes State-owned or county-owned lands. This section also authorizes the transfer of any Federal land located within a national scenic river area, with the consent of the agency having jurisdiction thereof, to the appropriate Secretary for administration as part of the national scenic river area.

Section 6(a) restricts the authority of the Federal Power Commission to license the building of any new dam or any project work unrelated to an existing project within a segment of a river designated as a national scenic river area. It provides that the Federal Power Commission may not issue such licenses unless the Congress enacts legislation approving their issuance. The purposes of designating an area as a national scenic river area are to maintain the free-flowing character of the stream and the natural character of the related adjacent lands. The building of dams or other structures would destroy these conditions.

Section 6(b) expressly continues the applicability of the United States mining and mineral leasing laws to the areas designated as national scenic river areas. All mining operations, however, will be subject to regulations needed to safeguard the national scenic river values. In addition, after the effective date of this Act, a mining claim perfected within a national scenic river area will give the mining claimant title only to the mineral deposits in the claim, together with the right to make any use of the land surface of such a claim as is reasonably required for his mining operations.

We believe that mineral activity within a national scenic river area should not be precluded, but that it should be subject to sufficient controls to prevent mining from defeating the purposes of this bill. This section provides such controls.

Sections 6 (c) and (d) provide that when a portion of a national scenic river area is also located within the National Wilderness Preservation System, the National Park System, or the National Wildlife Refuge System, the provisions of this bill and the Act or Acts governing the respective system will apply to such area, and if there should be a conflict the more restrictive provisions will apply.

The provisions of the Wilderness Act governing mining in the national forest areas designated by that Act as wilderness areas are, for example, more restrictive than the comparable provisions of this bill. When a portion of a scenic river area, therefore, is also within a portion of a national forest designated by the Wilderness Act as a wilderness area, it would be withdrawn on January 1, 1984, from further appropriation under the mining laws and from further disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral leasing.

Section 6(e) requires the Federal or State agency which has responsibility for a national scenic river area to cooperate with the Secretary of the Interior and with appropriate State water pollution control agencies for the purpose of controlling the pollution of waters in such area.

The maintenance of a high-quality water yield in a scenic river area is affected by upstream developments. This section requires the appropriate Federal and State officials to take action to control upstream pollution under their existing authority.

Section 6(f) preserves the status quo with respect to the law of water rights, and makes clear that the designation of a stream or portion thereof as a national scenic river area is not to be considered a reservation of waters for purposes other than those specified in the bill, or in quantities greater than necessary to accomplish these purposes.

Section 6(g) preserves the jurisdiction which the States have over fish and wildlife.

Section 7 establishes the procedures for other areas to be designated as national scenic river areas by subsequent legislation. As a basis for subsequent legislation, this section provides for studies and the development of detailed information and for the submission of reports and recommendations to the Congress on potential national scenic river areas in three ways:

(1) It directs the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture where national forest lands are involved, to consult with other Federal agencies and with the States in which the 35 rivers named in the section are located for joint Federal-State plans to preserve them, and to submit recommendations to the President, who in turn will submit recommendations to the Congress with respect to their designation as national scenic river areas. The section requires that one-half of the 35 rivers be studied within five years after enactment of the bill, and the balance within ten years. The 35 rivers have been the subject of preliminary investigation and have been identified as prime candidates for national scenic river status.

(2) It requires all river basin and project planning reports submitted to the Congress to discuss the alternative use of a river or portion thereof as a national scenic river area, and to reconsider specifically for this purpose any river segment designated by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture.

(3) It requires the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture where national forest lands are involved, to submit from time to time to the President, and for the President to submit to the Congress, recommendations for additional national scenic river areas.

Section 8 provides that a national scenic river area added to the System by subsequent legislation will be administered by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, depending on the location of the area and its relation to the other programs of the two departments.

Section 9 directs the Secretary of the Interior to encourage the States to consider needs and opportunities for establishing State and local scenic river areas in the comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plans and project proposals submitted to the Secretary under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897). Upon the approval by the Secretary of the Interior of scenic river area projects proposed by the States for financial assistance under the Fund Act, funds would be available for the acquisition and development of such scenic river areas from the monies allocated to the States out of the Fund. This section also directs the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, under the authorities vested in them, to assist, advise, and cooperate with States, local agencies, and private interests in the establishment of such scenic river areas. The Secretary of the Interior may designate a State or local scenic river area as part of the Nationwide System of Scenic Rivers if the State or local agency administering the area agrees to manage and protect it in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary.

Section 10 authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the bill.

Cost data for the nine areas designated as national scenic river areas in this bill are presently being developed. Precise cost estimates for land acquisition and development will not be available until surveys are made on the ground to establish the detailed boundaries of the proposed areas. At the present time we estimate that approximately $3.5 million will be needed per year over a ten-year period for acquisition of property for the nine areas initially designated as national scenic river areas in this bill.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to establish a National Advisory Commission on Fire Prevention and Control.

The time has come to study our increasing fire problem on a nationwide basis. There can be no doubt that something should and must be done about it.

The recent terrible fire with such tragic loss of life in Montgomery of my own State of Alabama reaffirms the urgency of this need. That sad occasion followed in relatively close succession to the burning of the McCormick Place in Chicago which is said to be the most devastating fire since the 1906 San Francisco fire.

In spite of our great progress as a Nation in most all lines of human endeavor, we still have unwarranted and excessive losses of lives and property by fire. As the President pointed out in his message to Congress on February 16, 1967, our loss in lives, which in the year 1965 was 12,000, is about four times greater on a per capita basis than that of the United Kingdom, and is over six times as great as that of Japan. Needless to say, our property loss each year amounts to billions of dollars. Immediate steps should be taken to see just how and why the United States is so sadly lacking in this regard.

In the field of housing and urban development, it is my belief that a wholesome and productive reexamination of construction, in both design and materials, can be made. Better attention could be given in urban development to the crucial place which fire prevention and control should have in the balanced and proper development of a community. In the field of urban development alone, I am mindful of the fact that at this very moment there are thousands of slum or blighted homes and buildings throughout the Nation boarded up and lying vacant as fire hazards. Due consideration may or may not have been given in these various projects to the extra burdens these vacancies place on the local fire and police departments and also to the time involved and the manner in which this vacant and fire hazardous period endangers the surrounding areas. This is but one of many examples that could be given of the need for a coordinated study of the fire problem, not only from the standpoint of the adequacy of local fire departments, but from the standpoint of Federal and State Governments, as well. This is indeed a national problem.

Experiences and outstanding advances in one part of the country should be made known to other parts of the country. Additional training facilities and improved techniques are needed throughout the country. Every effort should be made not only to provide our fireman with the means to put out fires, but also to diminish the grave risks to his life and limb. Definite and sound attention should be given to safety principles in construction and to the due inspection and rehabilitation of existing structures with fire safety standards in mind.

It seems logical that an appropriate way to approach this comprehensive subject is by a national Commission which shall make a thorough and unbiased study and report to the Congress and to the President.

Accordingly, my resolution would provide for such a Commission of 20 competent and outstanding members to be appointed by the President and empowered to go into the question fully and in depth.

There must be a starting place for something this comprehensive, and I believe that the large programs which are underway in the fields of housing, community facilities, city planning, land development, rehabilitation, urban renewal, and demonstration or model cities afford a logical starting basis. Accordingly, the resolution empowers the Commission to analyze these programs and consider ways of strengthening them by legislation or otherwise to help meet the national fire problem.

The Commission, however, would have broader powers that would extend into other fields and there are several committees in Congress other than Banking and Currency that would have an interest in these. The Commission should study technological advances and how best to make them available to prevent and combat fire. It should study municipal problems of recruiting and training firemen, and of the ways in which a better level of public education and enlightment on this subject can best be achieved.

The time is appropriate for a thorough assessment of local, State, and Federal responsibilities in the development of practicable and effective solutions for reducing our extensive and unnecessary losses by fire.

While the kind of comprehensive study which this Commission would be authorized to undertake by my bill is long overdue, the Commission's study must not be used as a basis for deterring immediate action in those areas where we are prepared and ready to move ahead. In the event the committee finds that we are ready to move now I feel sure that the appropriate authority will be recommended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 46) to establish a National Advisory Commission on Fire Prevention and Control, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CONGRATULATIONS OF THE CONGRESS TO PUERTO RICO ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF U.S. CITIZENSHIP

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on next Thursday, March 2, the people of Puerto Rico will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the grant of American citizenship to them by the 64th Congress in 1917. It is highly appropriate that this 90th Congress should give formal recognition to this historic occasion, and accordingly, on behalf of myself, and Senators KUCHEL, BURDICK, JAVITS, and MONTOYA, I send to the desk a resolution for that purpose.

Mr. President, every American everywhere can be proud of the truly great progress and attainments that have been made in Puerto Rico during the past half century of American citizenship. It will be recalled that Puerto Rico came under the American flag as a result of our war with Spain. American troops had landed in force on the island as a part of our military action in the Caribbean. Puerto Rico—then known as "Porto Rico"—was formally ceded to the United States by the Treaty of Paris, the second paragraph of article IX of which provided that the Congress should determine—quote—"the civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants" of the areas ceded.

The act of March 2, 1917, known as the Jones Act, was a cornerstone in the fulfillment of that obligation by the Congress.

It not only granted full American citizenship to all of the inhabitants of Puerto Rico who wished it, but it also provided a bill of rights and established a civil government with very substantial powers of local self-government.

Still another legislative milestone was passed in 1948 with the enactment of the elective governor bill, and then in 1950 the 81st Congress approved Public Law 600 which was the foundation of the present Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. It will be recalled that the constitution of the Commonwealth was approved on July 3, 1952, by the 82d Congress.

Mr. President, the history of the relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico and the present state of economic and political attainment of the people of Puerto Rico bear eloquent witness to the wisdom and statesmanship of the Members of the 64th Congress in enacting the Jones Act extending American citizenship to Puerto Rico. I urge this Congress promptly to give formal recognition to the 50th anniversary of that occasion by adopting my resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 86) was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, under the rule, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. RES. 86

Whereas the Jones Act of March 2, 1917, granted United States citizenship to the people of Puerto Rico; and

Whereas March 2, 1967 marks the fiftieth anniversary of this historic event; and

Whereas the bond of common citizenship has played a major role in the development of close and mutually beneficial economic, cultural, political and legal relationships between the United States and Puerto Rico: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the Congress hereby extends to the people of Puerto Rico its congratulations on their fiftieth anniversary of United States citizenship.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 889, to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California, the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors of the following bills and concurrent resolution:

Authority of February 7, 1967:

S. 876. A bill relating to Federal support of education of Indian students in sectarian institutions of higher education: Mr. Burdick, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Morse, Mr. Moss, Mr. Proxmire, Mrs. Smith, and Mr. Tydings.

Authority of February 8, 1967:

S. 928. A bill to protect the right of privacy by prohibiting wire interception and eavesdropping, and for other purposes; Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Fong, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Pell, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Scott, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of Ohio.

S. 929. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the tariff classification of braided rugs composed of tubular braids with a core: Mr. Ervin, Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, and Mr. Talmadge.

Authority of February 15, 1967:

S. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution to restore Federal aid to highways: Mr. Allott, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Brooke, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Church, Mr. Cotton; Mr. Dodd, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Harris, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Holland, Mr. Hollings, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. McClellan, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Miller, Mr. Morse, Mr. Moss, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Pell, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Scott, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Thurmond, and Mr. Young of Ohio.

Authority of February 16, 1967:

S. 990. A bill to establish a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to prepare for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as International Human Rights Year, and for other purposes: Mr. Inouye, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Pell, and Mr. Yarborough.

S. 1006. A bill to provide for the control and prevention of erosion damages to the roadbeds and rights-of-way of existing State, county, and other rural roads and highways, and for other purposes: Mr. Long of Missouri.

ANTIPOVERTY WHITEWASH

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a column entitled "Antipoverty Whitewash," written by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak in their column entitled "Inside Report," published in the Washington Post of recent date.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 24, 1967]

Antipoverty Whitewash

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

For all of Majority Leader Mike Mansfield's bold talk about congressional scrutiny of Great Society programs, the Senate's prospective investigation of the antipoverty program is taking on unmistakable signs of whitewash.

The Senate is expected soon to appropriate $165,000 for a Senate Labor Committee study of President Johnson's war against poverty, an amount wholly inadequate for serious investigation. More important, a secret bipartisan agreement provides that only one-third of that money may be used to hire outside consultants.

Thus, the investigating will be almost entirely in the hands of the Labor Committee's Democratic-controlled staff, with help from individual consultants only on a piecemeal basis. And since this staff can scarcely be wholly objective about the most politically vulnerable program of a Democratic Administration, suspicions of whitewash are justified.

The story is another sign of congressional impotence. But it also reveals just how sensitive the Johnson Administration really is about any hard-nosed probe of the war on poverty.

As recently as last December, a non-nonsense investigation by the Senate Labor Subcommittee handling poverty matters seemed possible. During the congressional recess, the Subcommittee Chairman, Sen. Joseph Clark of Pennsylvania, and staffers traveled to New York City for private conferences with Ford Foundation officials to discuss outside consultants for the study.

The result was a proposed $252,000 budget, adequate but scarcely bountiful. Preliminary plans called for 12 separate studies of poverty programs to be conducted by outside experts—some from management consultant firms, some from Space Age industries, some from the academic community.

These plans immediately aroused deep concern inside the Administration—and particularly in Sargent Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO). After all, if tough-minded management consultants were called in, they might undermine the poverty crusade's main philosophical pillar: participation of the poor in fighting poverty.

These were the very risks foreseen by Senate Democrats. It soon became clear that the need for outside management consultants was felt by only one Democrat, Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island, on the Clark Subcommittee. The three Republicans—Jacob Javits of New York, Winston Prouty of Vermont and George Murphy of California—dissented from this majority Democratic position.

The partisan split widened late in January when the Labor Committee's Democrats held a secret caucus. Alabama's Sen. Lister Hill, Chairman of the full Committee, asserted that outside consultants might badly hurt the poverty program. Sen. Edward M. (Ted) Kennedy of Massachusetts agreed. The overwhelming majority of Democrats agreed that their own hired hands should run the study contending management consultants would not appreciate the political and social subtleties.

Thus, when the full Labor Committee met soon thereafter, the Democrats slashed the original $250,000 budget to $190,000.

Chairman Clark later worked out a private compromise with the Republicans allocating one-third of the total funds to hiring outside consultants. But that total soon dwindled to insignificant proportions. The Senate Rules Committee, which passes on fund requests of all other committees, further sliced the $190,000 to $165,000. None of the Labor Committee Democrats complained very loudly.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON MANPOWER, EMPLOYMENT, AND POVERTY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I announce today that the Senate Labor Committee's examination of the war on poverty will begin with 4 days of hearings in Washington on March 13, 15, 16, and 17. The Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, which I chair, will follow these hearings with extensive hearings in each of the seven geographical regions through which antipoverty program activities are administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In its March Washington hearings the subcommittee will hear testimony from representatives of State and local government agencies, from a panel of local community action agency directors, from a panel of representatives of the poor, and from business, labor, and academic leaders, who are familiar with the Federal Government's antipoverty program.

While the exact schedule and locations of the subcommittee's field hearings have not yet been determined, hearings will be held during the months of April and May in each of the seven economic opportunity regions, thus covering all areas of the country.

I would also like to answer charges recently made in a syndicated column that my subcommittee's investigation of the war on poverty will be a "whitewash."

Based, as it is, upon misstatements of fact and misrepresentations of the views of both Democratic and Republican members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the charge of a prospective "whitewash" is totally unfounded. Lest the aims and purposes of my proposed inquiry be misconstrued by newspaper readers, I would like to take this opportunity to set the record straight.

As I have stated on numerous occasions in the past, publicly, as well as privately to my colleagues in the Congress and to persons in the Johnson administration including Mr. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, I approach this investigation with a completely open mind. Neither I nor the other members of the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty of either party have any preconceived notions about the future directions of the war on poverty, the future role of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the successes or failures of Federal antipoverty programs, or the findings, recommendations, and conclusions that will result from the inquiry.

This inquiry will not be an attempt to sweep problems under the rug. Nor is it designed as a partisan exposé that some would like to see.

This investigation will be an objective, thorough, and bipartisan analysis of both the successes and shortcomings of the war on poverty and the administration of Economic Opportunity Act programs at the Federal, State, and local levels.

Our task is to examine and evaluate, and that evaluation will culminate in constructive criticism of past performance and constructive recommendations for future action.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KENNEDY OF NEW YORK, BEFORE AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a splendid address made in Philadephia last Friday by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] on the subject "Youth," and a news account of the meeting, which was a most successful one.

There being no objection, the speech and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY, DINNER, AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION, PHILADELPHIA, PA., FEBRUARY 24, 1967

John Adams found the meaning of America in the scope it gave for the opportunity to excel—which, he said, "next to self-preservation, is ever the great spring of human action". Americans for Democratic Action is a young organization, on the scale of history. But in its passion for excellence, it is as old as the impulse which gave this nation birth. Therefore to be invited to speak before you is an invitation to share that passion, to discuss excellence in our day, to measure ourselves against the highest standards of truth and idealism.

Those standards are found in the thought and action of men through thousands of years in nations all over the globe. But here in America today, perhaps the clearest mirror of our performance, the truest measure of whether we live up to our ideals, is our youth. And therefore I would speak to you tonight about the rising generation in America; about the brightest, best-educated, most highly-motivated generation of young people we have had since the founding of the Republic—when the 32-year-old Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence, Henry Knox built an artillery corps at 26, Alexander Hamilton joined the independence fight at 19, and Rutledge and Lynch signed the Declaration for South Carolina at 27. In the Peace Corps, in the Northern Student Movement, in Appalachia and Oakland, on dusty roads in Mississippi and narrow trails of the Andes, this generation of young people have shown an idealism and a devotion to country matched in few nations—and excelled in none.

And we have shown our admiration for them in the sincere flattery of imitation, in ways large and small. Cafe society and country clubbers follow their fashions in hairstyles and skirt lengths, listen to their music and dance their dances. The great automobile industry of Detroit styles its cars and designs their engines on the model of those built by teen-age "hot-rodders" of a few years ago. The sit-in movement which energized the Negro of the South, and resulted in the Civil Rights Act of 1964, began with a few college students. And it was a small group of Northern students, in the Mississippi Summer Project, who taught thousands of adults how to make personal witness for civil rights in conditions of difficulty and danger.

Yet for all the inspiration, all the freshness and imagination our young people have given us in the last few years, we are now profoundly troubled by them; and so we should be. For the gap between generations, always present in the past, is suddenly widening; the old bridges which span it are falling; we see all around us a terrible alienation of the best and bravest of our young; and the very shape of a generation seems turned on its head overnight. Bob Moses is gone, Stokely Carmichael stands in his place—and beyond him are others more militant, offering dark visions of an apocalyptic future. Peace Corps recruiting is not so easy as it was; and we read less of tutoring programs in the ghetto than of trips, festivals, and drugs with strange new names. There are riots on the Los Angeles "strip", and in dozens of colleges; hundreds of young men dodge the draft in Canada, and unknown numbers effectively do the same in years of graduate study; the suicide rate among young people is rising—and so is the rate of juvenile delinquency. The troubador of their generation, who three years ago sang of the changes that were "Blowin' in the Wind", now dismisses our pronouncements as "propaganda, all is phony".

Clearly, these are different phenomena, different youth. But taken together, they mean that more and more of our children are estranged, alienated in the literal sense, almost unreachable by the familiar premises and arguments of our adult world. And the task of leadership, the first task of concerned people, is not to condemn or castigate or deplore—it is to search out the reason for disillusionment and alienation, the rationale of protest and dissent—perhaps, indeed, to learn from it. And we will learn most, I think, from the minority who most sharply articulate their criticism of our ways. And we may find that we learn most of all from those political and social dissenters whose differences with us are most grave; for among the young as among adults, the sharpest criticism often goes hand in hand with the deepest idealism and love of country.

What, then, estranges these young people, our children; what are they dissenting from—and what do they tell us about ourselves?

They begin, of course, with the war in Viet Nam. At the outset, let me emphasize again that we are not talking about all our young people; after all, Viet Nam is a young man's war. The men who fight and die there, with bravery and endurance equal to any in our history, are young. There are others, as I have seen on many campuses, who are in favor of escalation—though many who favor escalation also favor continuation of the student deferment, their seeming slogan "Escalation without Participation," or at any rate "Without Me." But when a hundred student body Presidents and editors of college newspapers; hundreds of former Peace Corps Volunteers; dozens of present Rhodes scholars—when these, the flower of our youth, question the basic premises of the war, they should not and cannot be ignored. Among these protestors, most will serve, if called upon, with courage and responsibility equal to any. But their basic loyalty and devotion does not and cannot obscure the fact of dissent.

These students oppose the war for the same reason that many of you feel anguish: for the brutality and the horror of all wars, and for the particular terror of this one. But for our young people, I suspect, Viet Nam is a shock as it cannot be to us. They did not know World War II, or even Korea. And this is a war surrounded by rhetoric they do not understand or accept; these are the children not of the Cold War, but of the Thaw. Their memories of Communism are not of Stalin's purges and death camps, not even the terrible revelations of the Twentieth Party Congress, or the streets of Hungary. They see the world as one in which Communist states can be each others' deadliest enemies or even friends of the West, in which Communism is certainly no better, but perhaps no worse, than many other evil and repressive dictatorships all around the world—with which we conclude alliances when that is felt to be in our interest.

And even as the declared foreign policy of our government is to "build bridges" to this new Communist world, they see us, in the name of anti-communism, devastating the land of those we call our friends. However the war may seem to us, they see it as one in which the largest and most powerful nation on earth is killing children (they do not care if accidentally) in a remote and insignificant land. We speak of past commitments, of the burden of past mistakes; and they ask why they should now atone for mistakes made before many of them were born, before almost any could vote. They see us spend billions on armaments while poverty and ignorance continue at home; they see us willing to fight a war for freedom in Viet Nam, but unwilling to fight with one-hundredth the money or force or effort to secure freedom in Mississippi or Alabama or the ghettos of the North. And they see, perhaps most disturbing of all, that they are remote from the decisions of policy; that they themselves frequently do not, by the nature of our political system, share in the power of choice on great questions which shape their lives.

These, at any rate, are some of the sources of their dissent from the war. It is not difficult to understand them.

It would be tempting—but it would be wrong and self-deluding—to trace to the war all the problems of our disaffecting youth. Nor can this problem be traced to any individual, or to any Administration, or to a political party; the challenge is deeper and broader.

Consider for example our economy: the wondrous production machine which has made us richer, as we count, than any people in history, within which we all find sustenance and support. It is a business economy—which is to say, that most Americans are engaged in some form of business—indeed, that Coolidge was accurate, if not particularly edifying, when he said that "the business of America is business". Yet we know that in a survey last year, only 12 percent of all graduating college seniors hoped for a career in business, or thought such a career would be worthwhile and satisfying.

Why? Part of the answer, surely, is that the great corporations which are so large a part of American life, play so small a role in the solution of its vital problems. Civil rights, poverty, unemployment, health, education—these are but a few of the deep crises in which business participation, with a few important exceptions, has been far less than might be expected from such an important part of the society. We can recognize, and applaud, the work of the NAM in job training, or the work of Foundations like Ford and Rockefeller, or the efforts of individuals like Paul Hoffman or Thomas Watson, or corporations like Smith, Kline & French. But certainly business as a whole has not sought out the challenge of the nation's frontier. Of course, it may well be argued that the business of business is to make a profit, that to attempt more is to do less than its stockholders deserve. But does such an argument have relevance, ask the young, when a single company, like General Motors or IT&T, has annual profits greater than the gross national product of any one of seventy nations in the world?

Nor—painful as it may be for liberals to acknowledge—are these young people enchanted with liberal institutions. Most of us at this dinner, when we think of labor unions, have as a frame of reference the long struggle to establish labor's basic rights—to make the workingman something more than an industrial serf. Labor has been in the forefront of many a great battle; it has always been a major part of this organization. But youth looks with other eyes, and their view is very different: They think of labor as grown sleek and bureaucratic with power, sometimes frankly discriminatory, occasionally even corrupt and exploitative; a force not for change but for the status quo, unwilling or unable to organize new groups of members, indifferent to the men who once worked the coal mines of Appalachia, a latecomer to the struggles of the grape pickers of California or the farm laborers of the Mississippi Delta. This is a one-sided picture, without the dimenisons of fifty years struggle, and the undramatic yet vital work of labor in many parts of the nation today. But there is too much truth in it for us not to understand our children's view—or to ignore the need for change.

And we here are friends of education, all, especially of universities; our friends and allies teach there, they are a major force in the liberal community. But listen:

"Education (is) by its very nature an individual matter . . . not geared to mass production. It does not produce people who instinctively go the same way . . . (Yet) our millions learn the same lessons and spend hours before television sets looking at exactly the same thing at exactly the same time. For one reason and another we are more and more ignoring differences, if not trying to obliterate them. We seem headed toward a standardization of the mind, what Goethe called 'The deadly commonplace that fetters us all.'" That might well have been, but it was not, a speaker at a Berkeley rally; it was Edith Hamilton, one of our greatest classicists. And now listen to a student representative, speaking to a meeting of the Board of Regents of the University of California:

"We have asked to be heard, you have refused. We have asked for justice. You have called it anarchy. We have asked for freedom. You have called it license. Rather than face the fear and hopelessness you have created, you have called it communistic. You have accused us of failing to use legitimate channels. But you have closed those channels to us. You, and not us, have built a university based on distrust and dishonesty."

It is impossible to mistake the anguish of that voice. There may be many things in that cry, but one of them is surely a protest of individuality—against the university as corporate bureaucracy, against the dull sameness Miss Hamilton saw also—for in bureaucracy and sameness is the denial of individuality, and the denial that human beings matter; if all are the same, why listen to what anyone says? And if we are not prepared to listen, then men cannot be recognized as more than numbers in statistical collections, a part of the gross national product like so many coffee cups or carpet sweepers.

The non-recognition of individuality—the sense that no one is listening—is even more pronounced in our politics. Television, newspapers, magazines, are a cascade of words, official statements, policies, explanations, and declarations; all flow from the height of government, down to the passive citizen; the young must feel, in their efforts to speak back, like solitary salmon trying to breast Grand Coulee dam. The words which submerge us, all too often, speak the language of a day irrelevant to our young. And the language of politics is too often insincerity—which we have perhaps too easily accepted, but to the young is particularly offensive. George Orwell wrote a generation ago that "In our time, political speech and writing are largely the defense of the indefensible. Things like the continuation of British rule in India, the Russian purges and deportations, the dropping of the atom bombs on Japan, can indeed be defended, but only by arguments which are too brutal for most people to face, and which do not square with the professed aims of political parties. Thus political language has to consist largely of euphemism, question-begging and sheer cloudy vagueness."

There is too much truth for comfort in that statement today. And if we add to the insincerity, and the absence of dialogue, the absurdity of a politics in which a Byron de la Beckwith can declare as a candidate for Lieutenant Governor of Mississippi, we can understand why so many of our young people have turned from engagement to disengagement, from politics to passivity, from hope to nihilism, from SDS to LSD.

But it is not enough to understand, or to see clearly. Whatever their differences with us, whatever the depth of their dissent, it is vital—for us as much as for them—that our young feel that change is possible; that they will be heard; that the cruelties and follies and injustices of the world will yield, however grudgingly, to the sweat and sacrifice they are so ready to give. If we cannot help open to them this sense of possibility, we will have only ourselves to blame for the disillusionment that will surely come. And more than disillusionment, danger; for we rely on these young people more than we know: not just in the Peace Corps, though the Peace Corps has done more for our position around the world than all our armed forces and foreign aid; not just in Civil Rights, though our youth have done more toward a solution of that problem than all the power and panoply of government; we rely on our youth for all our hopes of a better future—and thus, in a real and direct sense, for the very meaning of our own lives. If we would look back with pride at the lives we lead, we know above all that we will judge ourselves by the hope and direction we have left behind.

And to help achieve the vital sense of possibility, to take up the challenge our young pose to us, there is no group more suited than the ADA—than those who are here tonight.

For you have also been capable of scathing and turbulent dissent. You remind us that idealism and morality in politics is not only a thing of the future—and need not be a thing of the past. You remind us of how much we owe to the generation of idealist dissenters before us—and how difficult it must be for the young dissenters of today, to have before them for example only the beat and silent generation of the 1950's.

This group, if any, can reach across the gap—can reach out to the young of the '60's. And this group must. We may find some of their ideas impractical, some of their views overdrawn. But there is no question of their energy, of their ability, above all of their honest commitment to a better and more decent world for all of us. They have struggled and sacrificed alone too long. It is for us now to make the effort—to take their causes as our causes, and to enlist them in our own; to lend to their vision and daring the insight and wisdom of our experience; and to recapture for ourselves the sense of open possibility which they gave a nation for a few brief years. And if, when we reach out to them, we are tempted to dismiss their vision as impossible, or their indignation as naive, let us remember, as the poet says, that

"None can usurp the height
But those to whom the miseries of the world
Are misery, and will not let them rest."

The ADA has scaled the height before. I believe it can and will again.

UNITED STATES MUST NOT IGNORE YOUTH, ROBERT KENNEDY TELLS ADA

(By Joseph F. Lowry)

U.S. Sen. Robert F. Kennedy said here last night that America's youth see the Vietnam war as one in which "the largest and most powerful nation on earth is killing children—they do not care if accidentally—in a remote and insignificant land."

The New York senator addressed the 20th annual Roosevelt Day dinner of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Chapter of Americans for Democratic Action in the Bellevue-Stratford. He said the United States cannot afford to ignore youth's questioning of the war, adding:

"Even as the declared foreign policy of our government is to build bridges to this new Communist world, they (American youth) see us, in the name of anti-Communism, devastating the land of those we call our friends.

SPEAKS FOR YOUTH

"We speak of past commitments, of the burden of past mistakes; and they ask why they should now atone for mistakes made before many of them were even born, before almost any could vote.

"They see us spend billions on armaments while poverty and ignorance continue at home. They see us willing to fight a war for freedom in Vietnam but unwilling to fight with one-hundredth the money or force or effort to secure freedom in Mississippi or Alabama or the ghettoes of the North.

"And they see, perhaps most disturbing of all, that they are remote from the decision of the policy; that they themselves frequently do not, by the nature of our political system, share in the power of choice on great questions which shape their lives."

Kennedy said it is not difficult to understand their dissent from the war.

"These students," he continued, "oppose the war for the same reason that many of you feel anguish for the brutality and the horror of all wars and for the particular terror of this one.

"But for our young people, I suspect, Vietnam is a shock it cannot be to us. They did not know World War II or even Korea. And this is a war surrounded by rhetoric they do not understand or accept. These are the children, not of the cold war, but of the thaw.

"Their memories of communism are not of Stalin's purges and death camps, not even the terrible revelations of the twentieth party congress or the streets of Hungary.

"They see the world as one in which Communist states can be each other's deadliest enemies or even friends of the West in which communism is certainly no better, but perhaps no worse, than many other evil and repressive dictatorships all around the world with which we conclude alliances when that is felt to be in our interest."

Kennedy said American business, labor, education and liberals play too small a role in the solution of youths' problems. Then, he criticised U.S. polices, saying:

"The non-recognition of individuality—the sense that no one is listening—is even more pronounced in our politics.

"Television, newspapers, magazines are a cascade of words, official statements, policies, explanations and declarations. All flow from the height of government, down to the passive citizen.

"The young must feel in their efforts to speak back like solitary salmon trying to breast Grand Coulee dam. The words which submerge us all too often speak the language of a day irrelevant to our young. And the language of politics is too often insincerity, which we have perhaps too easily accepted, but to the young is particularly offensive."

AUDIENCE OF 1,800

The senator was applauded by the audience of 1,800 when he said:

"If we add to the insincerity and the absence of dialogue the absurdity of a politics in which a Byron de la Beckwith can declare as a candidate for lieutenant governor of Mississippi, we can understand why so many of our young people have turned from engagement to disengagement, from politics to passivity, from hope to nihilism, from SDS (Students for a Democratic Society) to LSD."

He said the Peace Corps has done more for the American position around the world than all our armed forces and foreign aid. He credited the nation's young for this.

He also praised youth for "doing more for civil rights than all the power and panoply of government."

Kennedy congratulated ADA for its achievements, then called on the organization "to take up the challenge our young pose for us." He said there is no group more suited for this than the ADA.

EVENT RECALLED

The senator spoke from the same podium in the same ballroom where his brother, the late President John F. Kennedy, addressed the ADA in 1959.

This was recalled among other events in the history of ADA here during a 20-minute showing of slides on a screen on the stage. The commentary was by Mrs. Emily Sunstein, chairman of the organization.

Philadelphia's U.S. Sen. Joseph S. Clark introduced Kennedy but, before he did, he charged the U.S. has placed itself in a position in Viet Nam it cannot justify morally.

He called for the end of the bombing of North Viet Nam and a limit of 500,000 on our servicemen there unless Congress declares war.

Kennedy later kidded Clark, calling him "the conscience of the Senate."

Directing his remarks to U.S. Rep. William J. Green, 3d, of this city, Kennedy said:

"I'm wondering how your father (the late congressman and former Democratic city chairman) would feel if he knew you were here." Then, Kennedy drew a laugh by adding quickly: "And I'm wondering how my father would feel if he knew I was here."

CHIDES HUMPHREY

Kennedy, who is not a member of ADA and admits he doesn't agree with all they advocate, said (with a wink) he was talking to Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey before going to the dinner and that Humphrey said his speaking before the ADA was like putting a chicken in a fox house.

Henry W. Sawyer, 3d, former ADA chairman, joined the kidding. He assured the audience ADA was not benefiting from CIA subsidies. He also congratulated Mayor Tate for "attending your second annual ADA dinner," then said Tate was going to give every man in the room a pension.

BLUEPRINT FOR PEACE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled " 'Blueprint for Peace'—Scholar-Diplomat Proposes Policy for United States," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of Sunday, February 5, 1967. The article was written by Richard N. Gardner, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Institutions. This is a splendid article, and I highly commend it to Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Feb. 5, 1967]

TEN-POINT PROGRAM: "BLUEPRINT FOR PEACE"—SCHOLAR-DIPLOMAT PROPOSES POLICY FOR UNITED STATES

(By Richard N. Gardner)

To seek the best thinking of the American people on how to pursue world peace, the President of the United States, as part of this country's participation in International Cooperation Year (1965), called a White House Conference on International Cooperation Nov. 29 through Dec. 1, 1965. Nothing quite like it had ever happened before. Some 5000 people representing all aspects of American society attended. Thirty committees, including leading authorities in many fields, made more than 400 recommendations on subjects ranging from arms control to youth activities. And 220 private organizations presented statements on their activities in the field of international cooperation. The conference was, in President Johnson's words, "a town meeting of the leaders of this Nation."

What has been done to carry out the conference's recommendations? What can be done, in view of the escalating conflict in Vietnam?

The State Department recently prepared an inventory of the status of the conference committees' more than 400 recommendations for government action. It revealed:

33 recommendations already implemented.

143 recommendations "in the process of implementation."

24 recommendations "scheduled to be implemented."

209 recommendations "under study."

26 recommendations "considered impractical at this time and perhaps at any time."

This "box score," of course, hardly provides an adequate measure of the impact of the reports on government policy. The Government might have done many of these things anyway. Some of the recommendations made by the committees were undoubtedly stimulated by government officials.

Yet even in such cases the committees served a useful function. The expression of public support for controversial proposals that had not yet achieved the status of government policy may have helped, in some cases, to move the Government forward.

NEED FOR STIMULUS

If the conference had a stimulating effect on government policy, that is all to the good. But the momentum needs to be maintained.

What of the 209 recommendations "under study" and the 26 that are considered "impractical"? Some of these recommendations undoubtedly should not be acted upon. But without further stimulus, some meritorious proposals may not receive the attention that they deserve. Therefore the question arises: How should the conference be followed up?

Fortunately, the President has appointed a Special White House Committee to study fully each recommendation that has not yet been put into effect. The President's budget and legislative proposals for this year in areas covered by the conference will be formulated on the basis of the committee's review and evaluation. The composition of the committee is impressive: Budget Director Charles Schultze, Special Assistant to the President Walt W. Rostow and Joseph A. Califano, Jr., and Raymond D. Nasher, who served as executive director of the conference. Nasher will serve as the contact for conference participants who may wish to express views to the White House Committee on any aspect of its work.

The White House Conference created, or at least strengthened, new and interested constituencies in 30 different fields of activity. Many of the individuals involved gained a new insight and a new sense of commitment as a result of sustained analysis of the subject matter in cooperation with their government counterparts. There is reason to hope that this new expertise and enthusiasm will not be dissipated.

AGENDA OUTLINED

What are the main areas of cooperation that deserve attention from the White House Committee? Here is an outline of my own agenda for cooperation, in some respects differing from on going beyond the proposals presented to the White House Conference:

Curbing the Arms Race. Five nations now have the capacity to explode nuclear weapons. At least 10 more have the technical capability to develop nuclear weapons in the next few years. It is in the common interest of the nuclear powers—and in the long-term interest of all mankind—to prevent the further spread of these weapons.

The obstacles to a treaty on nonproliferation are not insoluble. The U.S. treaty draft prohibits giving ownership, possession, or control of nuclear weapons within the NATO alliance.

TEST BAN

The Soviet Union appears to have dropped its insistence that a nonproliferation treaty must prohibit consultation on nuclear matters. In return, the United States should be willing to accept provisions foreclosing sharing in ownership or control of nuclear weapons by the Germans or other nonnuclear powers through some kind of multilateral forces. And it should also be possible to devise adequate security guarantees to nonnuclear powers, perhaps through parallel declarations by nuclear powers confirmed in a U.N. resolution.

Further efforts should be made to conclude a comprehensive ban on nuclear testing. The art of seismic detection does not yet permit distinguishing underground nuclear explosions from earthquakes without on-site inspection. The Soviet Union does not accept this proposition, and rejects the idea of on-site inspections. But a solution may lie in an international effort to agree on present possibilities of detection and to develop improved methods.

Work must also go forward on general and complete disarmament. Even with some measures of arms control, the maintenance of huge nuclear stockpiles and the modern methods of delivering them mean a substantial risk of nuclear war for our generation.

Obviously, progress toward general and complete disarmament and toward many measures of arms control requires the cooperation of Communist China. Its involvement in disarmament talks, whether bilaterally or at the existing Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference or at a World Disarmament Conference, should be actively encouraged.

KEEPING PEACE

Keeping the Peace. International cooperation to strengthen the United Nations is essential for general and complete disarmament. It is also essential to reduce the risks of violence while we live in the shadow of the arms race.

The United Nations needs an effective standby military capacity to deal with peacekeeping emergencies. This can be developed within the present constitutional structure.

Every effort must be made to enable the Security Council to discharge its primary responsibility in the peacekeeping field. But past experience with the Soviet Union and the prospect of Communist China's membership in the Council suggest the need to retain the General Assembly's power to authorize peacekeeping operations — operations in which forces are contributed on a voluntary basis and deployed to the territory of countries with their consent.

If certain members will not pay assessments for these operations, other methods of financing such as non-mandatory apportionment will have to be found to assure a fair sharing of the cost. And the U.N.'s military capability should be augmented through the earmarking and training of national contingents on a broad geographical basis.

The United States could use military assistance funds to help less developed countries prepare units for U.N. service. Together with other countries, we also might make military bases available to the U.N. both for training and for actual use in peacekeeping emergencies.

Concern with the U.N.'s peacekeeping capacity has recently been accompanied by increasing interest in the problems of peaceful settlement and peaceful change. This is as it should be.

More needs to be done to anticipate and resolve situations which could lead to armed conflict. More needs to be done to attack the root causes of conflicts temporarily arrested by the interposition of peacekeeping forces.

TRADE EXPANSION

Expanding World Trade. The Expansion Act gave U.S. negotiators new authority to remove trade barriers, but it came when the Common Market was preoccupied with its internal problems; 10 years earlier it might have produced dramatic results. Nevertheless, every effort must be made to salvage a meaningful settlement from the Kennedy

Round and to prevent backsliding from liberal trade policies on both sides of the Atlantic.

The United States will have to revise some nontariff barriers, such as the American selling-price method of valuation on chemical imports, and be prepared to subject domestic farm programs to international negotiation.

And after the Kennedy Round ends, we should put ourselves in a position to move even more boldly—proposing a treaty for gradual but complete elimination of tariffs within 25 years.

The United States has fallen behind other free world countries in expanding trade with Eastern Europe. The legislation which President Johnson sent to the Congress last spring would at least enable American negotiators to offer most-favored-nation tariff treatment to countries such as the Soviet Union, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia in exchange for concessions of equivalent significance to us. It deserves to be enacted, and followed up with further measures to expand trade on a basis of mutual advantage.

DEVELOPMENT AID

Aiding Economic Development. The rate of increase of gross national product in the less developed countries slipped from 5 percent in 1950–54 to 4 percent in 1960–64.

With population growth averaging at least 2 or 3 percent in most of these countries, per capita income for the group is rising only about 1 percent a year. If these trends continue, their average per capita income, now about $120, will be only about $170 in the year 2000—while the present $3000 per capita income of the United States will grow to some $5000 or $6000.

Unfortunately, financial assistance to the developing countries has begun to level off, and the burden of debt service increasingly offsets the transfer of new resources.

Congress has been reluctant to increase bilateral assistance, to reduce or eliminate interest rates on development loans, or to provide assurance of continuity through multiyear authorizations of appropriations. But a bold proposal to transfer additional resources through international agencies such as the International Development Association might meet with a better Congressional response.

At the very least, American policy should aim at increasing to $1 billion a year the "soft" lending of the International Development Association and raising to $300 million a year the pre-investment outlays of the U.N. Development Program. A U.S. offer to put up 40 percent of these sums on a matching basis could demonstrate the U.S. commitment to development and restore forward movement now lacking in multilateral aid efforts.

WORLD FINANCE

Organizing World Finance. For the past eight years, the United States has run substantial deficits in its balance of payments. These deficits have been partly financed by increased foreign dollar holdings, but they have also been paid for by large reductions in our gold stocks.

The United States cannot go on losing gold indefinitely. Yet elimination of the deficit may leave the world short of the liquidity needed for the continued expansion of world trade. And measures taken to reduce the deficit may have unfortunate consequences.

Generalizations in this complex field are dangerous. It would appear, however, that the world's gold supply is growing too slowly to finance the growing volume of world trade and that the United States can no longer take the principal responsibility for supplementing it.

Other nations therefore must bear a growing share of responsibility for increasing world liquidity, by increasing the credit facilities in the International Monetary Fund, by creating a new form of "owned" reserves, or by some combination of the two.

If a new reserve unit is created, the national currencies paid by the developed countries in exchange for it could be used for long-term lending in the less developed world.

POPULATION GROWTH

Curbing Population Growth. There is a growing realization that significantly higher living standards in the less developed countries will never be achieved if the population goes on doubling every 20 or 30 years, and there is increasing awareness that if we do not make voluntary family planning possible in this generation, we may make compulsory family planning inevitable in some countries in the future.

The U.S. Government is now providing direct support for family planning efforts through technical, financial, and commodity aid. The big question is no longer whether the United States will help but whether the countries concerned will move fast enough to train and deploy the necessary administrators, doctors, and health workers.

The United Nations, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Children's Fund, the U.N. Regional Economic Commissions and their demographic centers—all should be encouraged to work together to assist in effective national programs of family planning.

WORLD CONSERVATION

Conserving the World's Resources. In the headlong thrust toward industrialization and urbanization, man risks undermining the very basis of his civilization—the resources of his planet.

Both the industrial countries and the countries seeking rapid industrialization need to do a better job of conserving precious minerals, preserving wildlife and natural areas, avoiding air and water pollution, developing additional water resources through desalting sea water, and controlling the toxic consequences of drugs and pesticides. The time has surely come for more effective international cooperation in the central task of preserving the balance of nature.

The report of the White House Conference Committee on the Conservation of Resources offers significant proposals for action. It urges an International Trust for the World Heritage to identify, establish, develop and help manage natural areas and archaeological sites of unique value to the world community.

It calls for better regulation of the world's fishing practices to prevent depletion of the marine harvest. It asks cooperative efforts to deal with the contamination of man's environment by pesticides, oil pollution of the high seas, and the disposal of nuclear wastes. It proposes an international authority to exploit metal deposit on the ocean floor which may soon be extractable in large quantities.

OUTER SPACE

Exploring Outer Space. The United States and the Soviet Union have agreed to a treaty designed to keep nuclear weapons out of space and prohibiting the use of the moon and other celestial bodies from use as military bases. It is the first treaty governing space exploration.

Joint ventures in the launching of astronauts have been considered impractical because neither the Soviet Union nor the United States would permit the other nation to gain access to military information. But astronauts launched separately by the two countries can meet in outer space and work on joint projects.

We should explore the possibility of lunar or orbital laboratories jointly operated by the two countries in the name of the United Nations. At first these laboratories might consist only of equipment; later they might be manned by astronauts of various countries.

These joint laboratories could gather information about the solar system as well as about our own planet. Eventually they might be the basis of a U.N. inspection service capable of patrolling borders and monitoring arms control agreements.

Expanding the Exchange of Ideas. Modern technology and culture are breaking down many official barriers. The United States can assist in this process by seeking the bolder programs of exchange of teachers and students, newspapers and books, motion pictures and cultural presentations. For example, the United States could offer Soviet leaders the opportunity to address Americans regularly on television, in return for the same privilege to us in the Soviet Union. We could propose to exchange time on the Voice of America for the same amount of time on Radio Moscow.

More can be done to encourage private groups around the world to strengthen the United Nations' role in this field, including the capacity of the U.N.'s Department of Public Information to bring the story of U.N. activities to the peoples of the world. The United States should encourage the use of communication satellites by the U.N. for this purpose, at special rates or without charge.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Protecting Human Rights. The United Nations has designated 1968, the 20th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as Human Rights Year.

The United States has taken important action to promote human rights at home, but it must go further in making the promotion of human rights a central element in its foreign policy. One step long overdue is the ratification of the human rights treaties now before the U.S. Senate—the conventions on Slavery, Forced Labor, and the Political Rights of Women. Ratification of the Genocide Convention, another treaty pending in the Senate, would also be desirable.

The United States should work for adoption of a proposal now before the U.N. to create a High Commissioner for Human Rights. Such a Commissioner could present a professional and comprehensive report each year on the progress of member governments in implementing the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. He could deal with specific complaints and assist members in organizing domestic institutions for the protection of human rights.

It is to be hoped that the President's Special Committee will support bold measures of the kind outlined in this agenda and that the improved dialogue between U.S. citizens and their Government resulting from the White House Conference will yield more and better ideas.

BOLD CONCEPT

But a dialogue between American citizens or Americans and their Government is no substitute for a dialogue with the other peoples and governments of the world. If we really want to implement the bold concept of International Cooperation Year, then let us propose to the Soviet Union that our best qualified citizens meet with theirs to explore each of the 30 subjects discussed at the White House Conference, or other subjects of their choice.

These meetings could be of the same character as the famous "Pugwash" conferences—scientists, scholars and professional men of both countries would participate in their individual capacities without commiting their respective governments.

If a series of meetings of this kind were held, it could not fail to have a salutary effect on Soviet-American relations. Perhaps these conferences could even be broadened to include citizens from other Communist countries. Through such a program we could supplement a policy of containment with a policy of engagement—engagement of all parts of our societies on all relevant subjects in a cooperative quest for peace.

President Kennedy, in his American University speech, conveyed the essential spirit with which we should approach such a new effort of peaceful cooperation. "Peace," he declared, "need not be impracticable, and war need not be inevitable. By defining our goal more clearly, by making it seem more manageable and less remote, we can help all peoples to see it, to draw hope from it, and to move irresistibly toward it."

"Our problems are manmade," President Kennedy said, "therefore they can be solved by man. And man can be as big as he wants."

Speaking as a Private Citizen

Richard N. Gardner is currently professor of Law and International Relations at Columbia University and senior adviser to the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. He has been actively involved in fashioning the foreign policy of the United States since 1961, when he left the Columbia faculty to become deputy assistant secretary of state for International Organization Affairs. He left the State Department in 1965.

The article on this page is excerpted from Gardner's latest book, "Blueprint for Peace," published recently by McGraw-Hill, and, he says, is his private view. In addition to Gardner's proposals, the book contains 30 reports submitted to the White House Conference on International Cooperation in at the end of 1965, of which Gardner was chairman. He has published two other books, "Sterling Dollar Diplomacy," a history of U.S. foreign economic policy from the Atlantic Charter to the Marshall Plan, and "In Pursuit of World Order," an analysis of American policy in international organizations.

Gardner was born in New York in 1927, served in the Second World War, was graduated from Harvard College in 1948 and from Yale Law School in 1951. He went to Oxford University as a Rhodes Scholar, and he was awarded a doctoral degree in 1961. After three years with a New York law firm, he joined the faculty of Columbia.

During his service at the State Department, Gardner was directly involved with the international organizational aspects of such problems as outer space, trade and aid. He has been a member of a number of U.S. delegations to international conferences and was a member of the U.S. delegation to the U.N. at the last six sessions of the General Assembly.

ARMS CONTROL

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Charade On Arms Control Pact," written by Joseph Kraft, and published in the Washington Post of recent date. The article should be of interest to all who are hoping that we will secure a nonproliferation treaty in the near future.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Charade on Arms Control Pact

(By Joseph Kraft)

Important gains in two fields of arms control are in prospect for later this year.

But to understand what is happening it is first necessary to penetrate elaborate charades now being played out in exquisite detail with a view toward disarming nationalistic and military critics of arms control in West Germany, the United States and the Soviet Union.

One of these charades, which I will make the subject of this column, centers on the non-proliferation treaty currently under negotiation before the United Nations Disarmament Committee in Geneva. The other, which I will discuss in a subsequent column, centers on the anti-ballistic missile, or ABM.

The non-proliferation treaty obliges signatory nations not to give or receive nuclear weapons. For the non-nuclear states, the treaty would set up in Article III a safeguard system subjecting their programs for peaceful uses of nuclear energy to international inspection.

Many groups in many countries have doubts about the treaty. But the truly critical opposition lies with the nationalist wing of West German opinion ranging from the extreme right towards Finance Minister Franz Josef Strauss.

For Strauss and his followers could use the denial of nuclear status to Germany as a pretext for whipping up deep currents of nationalistic opinion. They might, in that case, blow up the shaky coalition government led by Chancellor Kurt Kiesinger and Foreign Minister Willy Brandt, or at least cause it to turn against the treaty.

If that happened, if the Germans balked, the treaty would be dead. For the minimal Soviet need is a visible muzzling of the Germans in a way that can be used to build up the standing of the present Russian leadership in their own country and Communist Europe.

The purpose of the charade is to neutralize Strauss. It got under way three weeks ago when Foreign Minister Brandt came to Washington for talks with Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

Apparently they decided to give special attention to one of the many obscure reservations dimly voiced about the treaty by Strauss and his followers.

Brandt, looking very grave, alluded to the issue at a briefing on Feb. 8. Rusk took it up in his news conference on Feb. 9. The issue they chose to highlight was the issue of whether the treaty would deny Germany the fruits of industrial research in the nuclear field.

With Brandt and Rusk seemingly concerned about the industrial fruits, Strauss and his followers went wild on the matter. In a storm of wrathful statements, they made the industrial issue the centerpiece of their opposition to the treaty.

They charged that the treaty was a means of keeping Germany down forever—"a diabolical instrument of Morganthauism," as former Chancellor Konrad Adenauer said in an allusion to the plan for dividing Germany advanced by the late American Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morganthau, in 1945.

The outburst of German opposition had an immediate impact on the treaty talks. When they resumed in Geneva last week, uncertainty about Article III made it impossible for the United States and Russia to publish an agreed draft of the treaty. And at that point alarmists took fright.

But the rest of the script is already visible. For the German nationalists have now been exposed as the major obstacles to agreement.

SUPPORT FOR SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, the President has asked Congress to turn its attention as soon as possible to enacting legislation designed to expand and improve the social security system in order to make it possible for older Americans to live their retirement years in dignity and self-respect, not in poverty and despair.

Incredible new discoveries in medical knowledge coupled with a steady improvement in nutrition have given Americans the precious gift of longer life. The statisticians tell us that a person retiring at age 65 has another 13 years of life. Those remaining years should be years spent with some measure of independence. All too often, however, they are years spent in an all-absorbing struggle to maintain a marginal standard of living on an inadequte income.

In my mail the other day was a heartbreaking letter from a 73-year-old woman alone in the world and living on a $74 social security pension. In part she wrote:

> I went to the store down the street with my last money left till I get my next check from the government. I got me a dozen eggs and a loaf of bread and some dry milk. Came time to pay and I didn't have enough cash. So I put out my hand with all my change and told the lady to take all I have and give me what I can buy. So she gave me the bread and dry milk and not but four eggs. Senator, can't the government raise our check a few dollars?

Everything we can do to increase social security benefits, consistent with the administration of the Social Security trust fund on a sound financial basis, we must do. We must give first priority to human considerations, while at the same time giving due weight to actuarial considerations.

The President's proposal calls for an increase in the earnings base covered by social security. In 1938 the $3,000 earnings base represented the total earnings of 97 percent of all workers covered by social security. While the earnings base has been increased from time to time, it has not kept step with increases in wages. As a consequence, while the number of workers having earnings above the established base grows larger the proportion of their earnings replaced in benefits grows smaller. By proposing to increase the earnings base the President has eliminated a significant flaw in the social security program.

As the cost of living has risen, the funds available to retired people have not kept pace. It is incumbent on us all to give full support to the President's social security program which will help to lift the burden of want from the shoulders of the aged.

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 15 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

A CALL FOR REALISM

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have pondered at length with respect to President Johnson's message on crime in America. Many Senators have commended the administration's concern over crime and its wide-reaching ramifications. I, too, applaud the President for his vigorous and unswerving desire to bring about a reversal of the trend toward utter chaos on our streets.

In many respects, I am in accord with what the President has said. It may be noted that I am a cosponsor of S. 917, which seeks to implement some of the recommendations contained in the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act proposed by the President.

There is something left out of the President's message, however, which I believe to be a grievous omission. I felt it when I first read the message, and my uneasiness has been crystallized into real concern now that the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice has issued its report entitled "The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society."

I am referring to the complete absence in the President's message of any consideration of the profoundly adverse effects of recent Supreme Court decisions upon the ability of local law enforcement officers to carry out their responsibilities.

In his message, the President quotes Abraham Lincoln as having said:

> Let reverence for the laws . . . become the political religion of the nation.

I believe, however, an expansion of this quotation by Abraham Lincoln is in order. He said:

> Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap; let it be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges; let it be written in primers, spelling-books, and in almanacs; let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice. And, in short, let it become the political religion of the nation; and let the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the grave and the gay of all sexes and tongues and colors and conditions sacrifice unceasingly upon its altars.

I should like to emphasize a portion of this wise admonition; that is, let reverence for the laws be "enforced in courts of justice."

I submit that the honorable and progressive police of this Nation, who make up the great majority of the profession, are sacrificing unceasingly upon the altars of justice. They know, however, that it is fundamental that the law must be given full force in order that the rights and liberties of the people of our society may be protected. They are witnessing, day by day, growing restrictions upon their ability to provide the protection which they are charged with giving to the citizens they serve.

President Johnson pointed out in his message that crime—and the fear of crime—has become a public malady. He revealed that a survey made in high crime areas of two of our largest cities found that 43 percent of the people interviewed stayed off the streets at night; 35 percent did not speak to strangers; 21 percent used only cabs and cars at night; 20 percent would like to move to another neighborhood—all because of their fear of crime. I know that these citizens and millions more like them would prefer to see the menace of the depraved criminal removed from our streets.

More and more, because of unrealistic Supreme Court decisions, America is becoming not the land of the free, but the land of the freed criminal. It is, in many cities, becoming the lawbreaker's domain where he reigns supreme because the law-abiding citizen is intimidated, the police are rendered nearly impotent, and the criminal is encouraged as he sees his fellow hoodlums escape justice through loopholes created by technicalities. In 1926, Supreme Court Justice Cardozo asked this question: "A criminal must go free because the constable has blundered?" I believe this is what alarms the police, and not only the police but also the general public: that a vicious criminal is allowed to go free because law enforcement officers, through alleged overzealousness, possible errors in judgment, or because of lack of familiarity with the complex restrictions placed upon them, sometime err in dealing with the prisoner and with evidence. As has been pointed out by a police executive, there is no question that police on occasion make errors—if we functioned in a utopian world in which all policemen were infallible, there would be little, if any, need for the higher courts.

It is my firm contention that the majority of those on the Supreme Court have lost touch with reality. Apparently, they are too greatly insulated from the harsh realities of crime. I am not going to reel off the available plethora of horrifying statistics today concerning crime. I believe that those responsible for the dismaying decisions of late are too removed from reality by their more rarified surroundings, that they are so far away from the "madding crowd's ignoble strife" that they cannot see from their Mount Olympian chambers that these statistics represent flesh-and-blood, suffering victims of the most despicable of violations against innocent children, women, and men.

The sanctity which characterizes the atmosphere in the U.S. Supreme Court Building is entirely proper. But, it is far removed from the subhuman jungle of crime on the streets. Crime is no ethereal threat. Crime is stark reality, and judgment and punishment must be just as starkly realistic.

Compassion is a worthy trait of man. But, compassion cannot be reserved for the criminal alone. It must also be extended to the law-abiding citizen who lives in growing fear for the safety of his family and himself. The majority of the Supreme Court Justices, in cloaking themselves in their judicial robes, seem to have forgotten this. It is time for them to realize that, as someone once said, "A halo does not have to fall very far to become a noose." And the Supreme Court's halo is rapidly helping to fashion a noose about the throat of our law-abiding citizens.

The purpose of this Nation as set forth in the preamble to the Constitution is to "establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

When our forefathers thought of establishing justice, I am sure they meant justice for all and not a tenuous justice for the habitual transgressor. In the early days of our country, those who did not abide by the law were punished and punished severely. The Constitution was a document of realism, and I am sure the framers would be appalled to see it used today as a shield for lawbreakers.

We all know, consideration is being given to proposing an amendment to the Constitution to override and clarify certain Supreme Court decisions. I think it is shameful that the legislative branch must consider taking such a drastic step merely because our Supreme Court will not listen to the prevailing public sentiment.

My feelings, I believe, are vindicated by the report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice in the chapter on "The Police." The Commission comments that—

> Standard police procedures that are more intrusive have, during the last 30 years, been increasingly circumscribed by court rulings. Personal and property searches and the seizure of the evidence they yield, the use of informants, the arrest of demonstrators, and stationhouse detention and questioning of suspects have been more and more rigorously measured by the courts against the constitutional standards of due process, right to counsel, probable cause, privilege against self-incrimination, prompt presentment in court, and the rights of free speech and peaceable assembly. . . . It is evident that every restriction that is placed on police procedures by the courts—or anyone else—makes deterring or solving crimes more difficult. However, it is also evident that police procedures must be controlled somehow. . . . Nevertheless many police officers and citizens believe that recent judicial interpretations of the Constitution and various statutes have unduly and inappropriately inhibited the work of the police and so have made it harder for police to protect the public. Part of this feeling stems, no doubt, from the sharp contrast between the tense, fast-moving situations in which policemen are called upon to make split-second decisions, and the calm that prevails in the appellate courts while lawyers and judges argue the merits of those decisions, after having searched lawbooks for apposite precedents. Another part of it results from the fact that many of those court decisions were made without the needs of law enforcement, and the police policies that are designed to meet those needs, being effectively presented to the court. If judges are to balance accurately law enforcement needs against human rights, the former must be articulated. They seldom are. Few legislatures and police administrators have defined in detail how and under what conditions certain police practices are to be used. As a result, the courts often must rely exclusively on intuition and common sense in judging what kinds of police action are reasonable or necessary, even though their decisions about the actions of one police officer can restrict police activity in the entire Nation.

The Commission also makes reference to the case of Miranda against Arizona, which prohibited by a 5-to-4 decision, the questioning of a suspect in custody unless counsel is present or the subject expressly waives his rights to counsel. The Commission reported that it believed it is too early to assess the effect of the Miranda decision on law enforcement's ability to secure confessions and to solve crimes.

> But—

The Commission added—

> This and other decisions do represent a trend toward findings by the judiciary that previously permitted police practices are unconstitutionally offensive to the dignity and integrity of private citizens. The need for legislative and administrative policies to guide police through the changing world of permissible activity is pressing. . . . If the present trend continues, it is quite likely that some current investigative practices and procedures thought by police to be proper and effective will be held to be unconstitutional or subjected to restrictive rules.

I think it is vital to note also that four distinguished members of the Commission felt compelled to add a supplemental statement to the Commission's report which was concurred in by three other equally distinguished Commission members. In this addendum, the Commission members said:

> There is a serious question, now being increasingly posed by jurists and scholars whether some of these (constitutional) rights have been interpreted and enlarged by (Supreme) Court decision to the point where they now seriously affect the delicate balance between the rights of the individual and those of society. Or, putting the question differently, whether the scales have tilted in favor of the accused and against law enforcement and the public further than the best interest of the country permits. . . . Whatever the reason, the trend of decisions strikingly has been towards strengthening the rights of accused persons and limiting the powers of law enforcement. It is a trend which has accelerated rapidly at a time when the nation is deeply concerned with its apparent inability to deal successfully with the problem of crime. We think the results must be taken into account in any mobilization of society's resources to confront this problem. . . . We are passing through a phase in our history of understandable, yet unprecedented, concern with the rights of accused persons. This has been welcomed as long overdue in many areas. But the time has come for a like concern for the rights of citizens to be free from criminal molestation of their persons and property. In many respects, the victims of crime have been the forgotten men of our society—inadequately protected, generally uncompensated, and the object of relatively little attention by the public at large. Mr. Justice White has said: "The most basic function of any government is to provide for the security of the individual and of his property." Unless this function is adequately discharged, society itself may well become so disordered that all rights and liberties will be endangered.

These members of the Commission call for the achievement of three essential ends: First, an adequate opportunity must be provided the police for interrogation at the scene of the crime, during investigations and at the stationhouse, with appropriate safeguards to prevent abuse; second, the legitimate place of voluntary confessions in law enforcement must be reestablished and their use made dependent upon meeting due process standards of voluntariness; and, third, provision must be made for comment on the failure of an accused to take the stand, and also for reciprocal discovery in criminal cases.

Pointing out that the Constitution contemplates amendment and that no part of it should be so sacred that it remains beyond review, the Commission concludes:

> If, as now appears likely, a constitutional amendment is required to strengthen law enforcement in these respects, the American people should face up to the need and undertake necessary action without delay.

To which I say amen.

These are not the thoughts of individuals unfamiliar with the laws of our land nor of people inexperienced in dealing with the criminal element. They are some of the most distinguished people of our time, and I ask unanimous consent to have their identities and backgrounds printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the philosophy expressed by these authorities was advanced some time ago by former Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach who, on December 3, 1964, said:

> It is not necessary to dismiss anyone who believes in the rights of the individual as a coddler of criminals. Nor is it necessary to dismiss one who believes in strict law enforcement as a cop-lover or a sadist. The aims of each side should be aims of both. . . . One thing I can say is that we have no right to continue to leave the issue as murky, no matter how passionately murky, as it is. To do so is to pass the buck, and the place the buck stops is with the policeman. While we, on the plateau, may argue, it is the policeman, on the spot, who must try to sort out all that philosophy. It is he who must, in the heat of the moment, make a decision to which devoted judges may later devote days of deliberation—and even then divide, 5 to 4.

It is the responsibility of the U.S. Supreme Court to interpret the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. According to the dictionary, interpret means first, to explain or tell the meaning of; translate; elucidate; and, second, to construe in the light of individual belief, judgment, or interest.

No right-thinking American would wish that the meaning of the Constitution be distorted to give aid immorally to a certain segment of society. At the same time, no right-thinking American can afford to tolerate for long a series of judicial interpretations which jeopardize the law-abiding citizens of our society. There is no question but that the Supreme Court's decisions have been influenced by the tenor of the times in years gone by. It would seem, however, that its decisions today are completely out of consonance with the Constitution's promises of domestic tranquillity, general welfare, and the blessings of liberty.

Our Government was built upon the foundation of separation of powers—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. While this separation is essential to the durability of our Republic, I feel it is time that the executive and the judiciary interpret for the Supreme Court the full meaning of the fear that pervades our civilization today as it becomes more infiltrated by hordes of criminals.

I believe that the President should recognize and publicly identify appellate and Supreme Court decisions as major contributing factors to the increase in lawlessness.

His Commission has clearly set forth the impact of these decisions upon the attitudes of criminals and the ability of the police to carry out their duties. And in ignoring these admonitions, I believe he has committed an oversight of great magnitude.

I believe that my colleagues in this body should make every effort to gage the desires of their constituents and then legislate accordingly.

It is well known that I am a supporter of effective law enforcement, and I believe our police agencies can take heart in the proposals made by President Johnson and echoed in the Senate and the House to provide the wherewithal in order that they might function to the highest degree of efficiency. While the furnishing of material benefits should certainly provide our police with a stimulus, I do think that we would accomplish even more by showing the individual police officer that his Nation is behind him in his efforts to curb lawlessness. While we may give him the most sophisticated devices of detection, communication and transportation, he still cannot do his job unless spiritual support extends throughout all echelons of government.

In yet another portion of the President's message, I detect a paradox. His Commission and his message call for better trained and better educated law enforcement officers with constantly higher educational requirements being made for recruits.

At the same time, the President asks for uniformed "community service officers" who would maintain close relations with people in their areas and be alert to potentially dangerous areas that should be brought to the attention of other city agencies for prompt action. These officers, according to the President's recommendation, might not meet conventional educational requirements; they might even have had minor encounters with the law as teenagers. In my conversations with police authorities, I find little agreement with this approach. Already, the police are saddled with too many sociological responsibilities which should be handled by welfare agencies. This is no time to start diluting the growing professionalism of police work by hiring officers who are below standard in character and education. This activity, I feel, should rightfully repose in welfare agencies and our police should be left the job of enforcing the law and preventing crime. In closing, I should like to dispel a fear which seems to be the rallying cry in the ultraliberal camp. And that is the fear that the police have become too powerful. I do not believe that this is so, and I believe they can never be when one considers the various safeguards which characterize our modern-day society. Even so, I believe that the individual police officer today is a better man than he ever was before.

The police of this country have a Law Enforcement Code of Ethics. Its first paragraph states:

> As a Law Enforcement Officer, my fundamental duty is to serve mankind; to safeguard lives and property; to protect the innocent against deception, the weak against oppression or intimidation, and the peaceful against violence or disorder; and to respect the Constitutional rights of all men to liberty, equality and justice.

I believe that the police as a group are no better or no worse than men in any other field of honest endeavor. But, I believe the majority of them adhere to this code, and I believe that, in a Republic such as ours, those who do not shall quickly be brought to light.

I believe that, with the proper support, the police can and will do their job; but that, if this support flags, if through unrealistic treatment of the police we terrorize the officer rather than instill respect for law in the lawbreaker, a chaos—of which we have already seen the beginnings right here in the Nation's Capital—will engulf us all.

Exhibit 1

Authors of Supplemental Statement to the Commission Report

Leon Jaworksi—Houston, Tex.; attorney, senior partner, Fulbright, Crooker, Freeman, Bates & Jaworski; U.S. Army, Colonel, Chief, War Crimes Trial Section, European Theater, Legion of Merit, 1942–46; President, Houston Bar Association, 1949; President, Texas Civil Judicial Council, 1951–52; President, American College of Trial Lawyers, 1961–62; President, Texas Bar Association, 1962–63; Special Assistant U.S. Attorney General, 1962–65; Special Counsel, Attorney General of Texas, 1963–65; Executive Committee, Southwestern Legal Foundation; Trustee, Houston Legal Foundation; Fellow, American Bar Foundation; U.S. Member, Permanent (International) Court of Arbitration; Member, National Science Commission; Chairman, Governor's Committee on Public School Education, State of Texas.

Ross L. Malone—Roswell, N. Mex.; attorney, partner, Atwood & Malone; U.S. Navy, Lieutenant Commander, 1942–46; Deputy Attorney General of the United States, 1952–53; President, American Bar Association, 1958–59; President, American Bar Foundation; Trustee, Southwestern Legal Foundation; Council, American Law Institute; Board of Regents, American College of Trial Lawyers; Board of Trustees, Southern Methodist University.

Lewis Franklin Powell, Jr.—Richmond, Va.; attorney, partner, Hunton, Williams, Gay, Powell & Gibson; U.S. Army Air Force, Colonel awarded Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, Croix de Guerre With Palms, 1942–46; Member, Virginia State Board of Education, 1961– ; President, American Bar Association, 1964–65; Trustee, Washington and Lee University and Hollis College; Board of Regents, American College of Trial Lawyers; Vice President, American Bar Foundation; Trustee and General Counsel, Colonial Williamsburg, Inc.

Robert Gerald Storey—Dallas, Tex.; attorney, partner, Storey, Armstrong & Steger; Phi Beta Kappa, Order fo Coif; U.S. Army, 1st Lieutenant, 1918–19, Colonel, Bronze Star, Legion of Merit, 1941–45; Assistant Attorney General, State of Texas, 1921–23; Executive Trial Counsel for the United States, trial of major Axis war criminals, Nuremberg, Legion of Honor (France), 1945–46; Dean, Southern Methodist University Law School, 1947–59; President, Texas Bar Association, 1948–49; President, American Bar Association, 1952–53; Member, Hoover Commission, 1953–55; President, Inter-American Bar Association, 1954–1956; American Bar Association Gold Medal, 1956; Vice Chairman, U.S. Civil Rights Commission, 1957–63; President, Southwestern Legal Foundation.

CONCURRING COMMISSION MEMBERS

Garrett H. Byrne—Boston, Mass.; attorney, District Attorney, Suffolk County, Mass.; Member, Massachusetts House of Representatives, 1924–28; President, National District Attorneys Association, 1963–64; President, Massachusetts District Attorneys Association, 1963–64; President, National District Attorneys Foundation.

Thomas J. Cahill—San Francisco, Calif.; Chief of Police, San Francisco; entered San Francisco Police Department as patrolman, 1942; Big Brother of the Year Award, 1964; Liberty Bell Award, San Francisco Bar Association, 1965; Vice President, International Association of Chiefs of Police, 1963– ; Chairman, Advisory Committee to the Governor on the Law Enforcement Section of the Disaster Office of the State of California; Chairman, Advisory Committee to the School of Criminology, City College, San Francisco; Member, National Advisory Committee, National Center on Police-Community Relations, Michigan State University.

Thomas C. Lynch—San Francisco, Calif.; Attorney General, State of California; Assistant U.S. Attorney, 1933–42; Chief Assistant U.S. Attorney, 1943–51; District Attorney, San Francisco, Calif., 1951–64; Fellow, American College of Trial Lawyers; Advisory Committee on Prearraignment Code, American Law Institute.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT ENACT 6 PERCENT SURTAX—SHOULD RESTORE INVESTMENT CREDIT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the evidence that the Congress should not enact the 6 percent surtax and should restore promptly the investment credit grows daily.

Consider this morning's Wall Street Journal. I refer to the first four items in the column under the heading "Business and Finance." Let me quote from those items, because they call our attention to the state of the Nation's economy.

The first item reads:

> Rail-equipment makers report incoming orders for freight cars and locomotives have practically halted, largely as a result of last year's suspension of the 7% tax credit for new equipment purchases. Recent surveys indicate the industry's backlog has fallen by $1,250,000,000, or 80%, from a year earlier. Although equipment companies are still running at full tilt, the months ahead spell sagging operations unless the carriers resume buying. Railroads and their suppliers are banding together in the hope of winning, at the earliest possible date, reinstatement of the tax credit, currently slated for restoration next Jan. 1.

The second item reads:

> Machine tool orders last month fell 23% from December and 37% from January 1966. Order cancellations rose 43% from December and were three times the year-earlier rate. Incoming business has shown no improvement this month, tool builders said. Some industry sources called for prompt restoration of the 7% investment tax credit to stem the downtrend in tool buying.

The third item reads:

> Steel buying for April delivery is lagging behind the month-ago rate of orders for shipment in March. The slowdown reverses the traditional trend. Because of seasonal demand, the second quarter usually shapes up as the strongest of the year for the steel industry. Most mills blame slow business from auto makers for the less-than-expected advance bookings.

The fourth item reads:

> The auto sales slump is deepening, executives of the industry's top companies concede. Assembling in Chicago for the annual midwinter auto show, these officials revised downward their sales forecasts; most blamed severe winter weather for depressing retail deliveries recently to the lowest rate in five years. Many predicted sales in the 1967 model year could skid to 8.3 million, including imports, down nearly 9% from 1966-model volume.

Under these circumstances, Mr. President, it is clear that the continuation of the suspension of the investment credit will hurt American business, slow down the growth of our economy, and very possibly increase unemployment.

There never was any price stabilization argument for suspending the investment credit. Inflation was never serious in the industries affected by investment in plant and equipment, and the slowdown in the growth of this sector of the economy so vital to our growth has been very great, indeed.

Finally, Mr. President, whatever case there had been for a tax increase is disappearing like snow in a hot oven on a July day in Washington as returns come in, showing the status of American business.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Wall Street Journal of today to which I have referred be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Business and Finance

Rail-equipment makers report incoming orders for freight cars and locomotives have practically halted, largely as a result of last year's suspension of the 7% tax credit for new equipment purchases. Recent surveys indicate the industry's backlog has fallen by $1,250,000,000, or 80%, from a year earlier. Although equipment companies are still running at full tilt, the months ahead spell sagging operations unless the carriers resume buying. Railroads and their suppliers are banding together in the hope of winning, at the earliest possible date, reinstatement of the tax credit, currently slated for restoration next Jan. 1.

Machine tool orders last month fell 23% from December and 37% from January 1966. Order cancellations rose 43% from December and were three times the year-earlier rate. Incoming business has shown no improvement this month, tool builders said. Some industry sources called for prompt restoration of the 7% investment tax credit to stem the downtrend in tool buying.

Steel buying for April delivery is lagging behind the month-ago rate of orders for shipment in March. The slowdown reverses the traditional trend. Because of seasonal demand, the second quarter usually shapes up as the strongest of the year for the steel industry. Most mills blame slow business from auto makers for the less-than-expected advance bookings.

The auto sales slump is deepening, executives of the industry's top companies concede. Assembling in Chicago for the annual midwinter auto show, these officials revised downward their sales forecasts; most blamed severe winter weather for depressing retail deliveries recently to the lowest rate in five years. Many predicted sales in the 1967 model year could skid to 8.3 million, including imports, down nearly 9% from 1966-model volume.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE TO STUDY IMPACT OF VIETNAM WAR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the New York Times reports this morning an exceedingly interesting policy of the Defense Department in scheduling production and inventory in military supply to ease the economy's transition to peace when it comes in Vietnam.

Whatever can be said for this policy from a military standpoint, and I leave that to the military experts in the Senate, it can be a significant and helpful economic policy.

It would mean that the kind of jolt the economy suffered after Korea would not be felt this time.

But it stresses once again, Mr. President, the great desirability of a congressional investigation of the full impact of the Vietnam war on our economy and what we can do in a myriad of ways to adjust to its escalation or deescalation in terms of manpower, tax adjustments, Federal programs, and so forth.

I hope that the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am chairman, may be able to undertake this kind of a study in the near future. The results could be useful to the Congress in adjusting to what is becoming one of the biggest and most significant economic facts of life—the Vietnam war.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from this morning's New York Times be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. GEARS OUTPUT TO THE WAR'S END—DEFENSE DEPARTMENT SEEKS TO AVOID PRODUCTION SLUMP AFTER CONFLICT IN VIETNAM—1953–54 RECESSION CITED—KOREAN AFTERMATH RECALLED—MILITARY ORDERS LINKED TO INVENTORY POSITIONS

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, Feb. 26.—The Defense Department is scheduling production and inventory of military items in a manner designed to prevent a sharp drop in production when the war in Vietnam ends.

The policy was disclosed recently by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara.

If it works as planned, there will not be a repetition of the Korean experience, when a precipitous decline in defense orders and production as the war ended helped bring on the 1953–54 recession.

POLICY EXPLAINED

However, the policy also means that defense expenditures will continue high, though they probably will drift gently downward, for many quarters after hostilities cease.

Thus, there will not be immediate availability of vast sums for domestic or tax cuts.

The new policy is based on the principle that inventories can be safely allowed to run down for items that are now in assembly-line production—ranging from bombs to airplanes.

Then, when peace comes, production can continue for the rebuilding of inventory.

Mr. McNamara described the policy in the following terms at a recent news conference:

"As you might expect, when the production lines are moving, we are able to meet our worldwide requirements with a lower inventory level than is required in peacetime, when many of the production lines are down.

"We had the option open to us of building our wartime inventories to the level required for peacetime—a high inventory—or holding them at the lower levels consistent with the moving production lines of the present. We have decided to hold them down."

PEAKS AND VALLEYS

The purpose, he said, is "to avoid large peaks and subsequent valleys."

As an example, he cited air ordnance, such as bombs.

The peacetime inventory requirement is one million tons. Current inventories however, have been run down to 600,000 tons.

Production is at a level that meets or exceeds current wartime consumption, rather than being built up to its maximum capability.

Then, when the war ends, in Mr. McNamara's words, "we can taper off our air ordnance production, instead of precipitously calling it to a halt."

He cited other areas in which the same policy is being followed, such as aircraft, helicopters and ground ordnance.

The aim is both to reduce pressure on the economy, where the danger until recently was overheating, and to avoid "precipitous declines" when peace comes.

SENATE RATIFICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS WILL ENABLE UNITED STATES TO CELEBRATE 1968 AS INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS YEAR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the General Assembly of the United Nations has designated 1968 as International Human Rights Year. Nineteen hundred and sixty-eight was selected because it marks the 20th anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948.

Twenty-two years ago in San Francisco President Truman forcefully expressed this Nation's deep commitment to the fledgling United Nations efforts toward establishing universal human rights, when he said:

> Under this document (the Charter) we have good reason to expect the framing of an international Bill of Rights, acceptably to all the nations involved. That Bill of Rights will be as much a part of international life as our own Bill of Rights is a part of our Constitution. The Charter is dedicated to the achievement and observance of human rights and freedoms, and unless we can attain these objectives for all men and women everywhere—without regard to race, language, or religion—we cannot have permanent peace and security.

As was so frequently the case during his Presidency, Harry Truman, by these words at San Francisco, demonstrated himself to be a sage prophet.

President Truman, a full 22 years ago, recognized that elementary truth about international relations: Unless mankind is able to establish and guarantee universal human rights for all men, mankind will be unable to establish and guarantee permanent peace among all men.

Since 1948, the United States has made remarkable domestic progress in the guaranteeing of basic human rights to all our citizens. It is a record of progress in which all of us can take real pride and justifiable satisfaction.

Unfortunately, this Nation's record internationally in the field of human rights has been as bad as our domestic accomplishments have been good. Of the four Human Rights Conventions—forced labor, genocide, political rights of women, and slavery—all drafted with U.S. assistance and adopted by U.S. persistence—the Senate has failed to ratify a single one.

Why? I am at a loss to understand the Senate's indifference or to explain the Senate's inaction. This same chamber which saw the enactment of two memorable human rights bills in 1964 and 1965 has recorded only deafening silence on the equally important question of universal human rights.

As of today, only nine nations, Bolivia, Maldives, Paraguay, Spain, Togo, Union of South Africa, Uruguay, Yemen, and the United States have failed to ratify a single one of these four conventions. This is an exclusive group in which I for one, do not covet American membership.

International Human Rights Year is only 9 months away. The Senate, and the Senate alone, can enable the United States to observe fittingly International Human Rights Year. This Nation and people everywhere will be able to celebrate when the Senate ratifies the Human Rights Conventions on forced labor, genocide, political rights of women, and slavery.

STREETS OF MILWAUKEE STILL THE SAFEST IN UNITED STATES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in this day when so many brickbats are thrown at our cities, and especially at the police departments of our cities, it is good to have something favorable and constructive to report.

I am proud to announce that recently Milwaukee, Wis., was found by the National Safety Council to have the safest streets in the Nation for both drivers and pedestrians. This was the third straight year Milwaukee has won this honor.

In spite of the growth in population, the immense increase in auto travel, the great increase in speed, and the tragic acceleration of death from traffic accidents, Milwaukee kept her fatalities in 1966 at the same low level as in 1965.

As the senior Senator from Wisconsin, I am very proud of this excellent Milwaukee record, and I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from an article in the Milwaukee Journal reporting this great Milwaukee achievement.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STREETS OF MILWAUKEE STILL THE SAFEST IN UNITED STATES

Pedestrians and drivers were safer in Milwaukee in 1966 than in any other United States city of comparable size, the National Safety Council reported Thursday. It was the third consecutive year that the city has ranked first.

There were 64 traffic deaths in Milwaukee last year, the same number as in 1965. The death rate in 1966 was 2.1 persons for every 10,000 registered vehicles.

The safety council based its death rate computation on 62 deaths in 1966, a figure which did not include two more deaths early in 1967 from injuries received in 1966 accidents, according to the Milwaukee safety commission.

Second in the 750,000 to 1,000,000 population class was San Francisco, with a rate of 2.7 and 87 deaths. St. Louis was third with 3.1 and 93, followed, in order, by Washington, Dallas, Baltimore and Cleveland.

Traffic deaths nationally set a record with 52,500 killed, a 7% increase over 1965.

TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on February 17 the Woman's Wear Daily published two articles on the truth in lending bill. One article reported that several retail department store executives felt that they could live with the present version of the truth in lending bill. Mr. Frank G. Gillett, chairman of the board of Bullock's Department Store in Los Angeles, was quoted as saying in regard to the truth-in-lending bill, "I don't think it will make much difference to us."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RETAILERS WAIT AND SEE ON CONSUMER PACKAGE

Initial top retail reaction in Washington to the President's consumer message generally is unenthusiastic. That puts it mildly.

The proposed truth-in-lending law is a "misnomer," an official of Julius Garfinckel & Co. said. "I don't think any of us object to truth-in-lending, but the Douglas bill would have been impossible to operate under. The public is entitled to full credit disclosure . . . we have no reason for not wanting that known . . . but the bills have been unworkable."

In agreement was a Woodward & Lothrop executive, who said: "I don't think anyone objects to this type of legislation provided it can be handled in an intelligent way . . . if not confusing. This has been the stumbling block so far. The way it has been proposed up to this point, it would have caused too much confusion."

James Michaux, Washington representative for Federated Department Stores, noted President Johnson this year first called for clear and honest expression of credit costs in his State of the Union message.

"We agree with President Johnson in principle," Mr. Michaux said.

Retailers in Los Angeles reacted cautiously to the President's proposed legislation, generally begging off on commenting until they had time to study the salient points.

However, on the one familiar point, truth in lending, there seems to be an acceptance that some sort of credit disclosure bill eventually will be accepted and they must learn to live with it.

"I don't think it will make much difference to us," observed Bullock's chairman Frank G. Gillett. He felt consumers wouldn't react much differently if credit costs were spelled out in dollars rather than in monthly percentages, as they are now commonly done in California.

In New York, Melvin Dawley, president, Lord & Taylor, said, "I haven't had an opportunity to read the President's proposals yet, but I don't think any legitimate retailer will be adversely affected by them, since they have been using truth-in-lending for many years, and their customers know what they are being charged in interest. I am also sure that we are not selling any products that are harmful or dangerous, and we would not sell them even if there were not laws prohibiting such sales."

The President's truth package isn't aimed at legitimate retailers and will not add to their woes, is the opinion of top Philadelphia store officials. They declined to be quoted by name.

It was called "an attempt to weed out chiselers" that will affect the reputable store only "in the gigantic task of additional work that represents an unneeded welfare program for another segment of the population."

Leading Chicago retail officials deferred comment on the proposals to Congress.

Spokesmen for both Sears, Roebuck and Montgomery Ward indicated their companies would have no official comment.

THE PROPOSED BIG THICKET NATIONAL PARK—A BOTANICAL HAVEN

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on February 12 attention was once again focused on the unique biological area of east Texas called the Big Thicket. In an article which appeared in the Austin American-Statesman, Miss Hazel Green reminded her readers that 400,000 acres are all that remain of a natural estate once encompassing millions of acres and still containing countless examples of wildlife and vegetation that once flourished in abundance in this part of the world. She states that the Big Thicket is the home of hundreds of varieties of animals, birds, and reptiles; fungi that are unknown, unnamed, and unclassified; and 2,000 classified shrubs, plants, and trees, including holly trees that grow taller and more perfect than anywhere else in the world, reaching up to 13 feet in diameter. It is almost unbelievable to note that four out of the five carnivorous plants known in the world call the Big Thicket their native home.

As in all the correspondence I have received regarding the Big Thicket, this article repeats the notes of urgency which prompted me to introduce a bill to preserve the treasures of the Big Thicket in the form of a national park—S. 4. I share the concern of many conservation groups and individuals who want the Big Thicket of east Texas preserved for this generation and those which follow, and I reecho the hope of these same people that curfew will not ring for this living symbol of a bygone era which nature so painstakingly joined together and which man with his quest for progress is so mercilessly attempting to destroy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Miss Hazel Green on the Big Thicket published in the Austin American-Statesman of February 12, 1967, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATURE TRAILS

(By the Travis Audubon Society)

Our great big beautiful State of Texas, about 170 million diversified acres, can boast of only less than a million acres devoted to park land (only about 60,000 acres of which are state park lands). We are on the verge of having two magnificent national parks in two unique areas: The Guadalupe Mountains area, which has already passed the Congress and been signed by the President, with $12½ million appropriated for development, but which now must pass the Texas Legislature; and the Big Thicket area, covered by Bill S. 4 introduced by Sen. Yarborough Jan. 11.

When he introduced this bill covering 75,000 acres, Sen. Yarborough said: "The top item on my conservation agenda for Texas now becomes the conservation and preservation of a portion of the Big Thicket, a unique area. . . . In the Texas Gulf coastal plain. . . ."

At one time the Big Thicket covered millions of acres in 12 counties, which in prehistoric times were covered by an arm of the Gulf of Mexico, and washed at times by flood waters of the Mississippi River. This ultimately created an area of rich alluvial soils which receives an annual rainfall of from 45 to 50 inches. Now it is a mere remnant of its original vast pristine glory—about 400,000 acres in five counties—Liberty, Polk, Tyler, San Jacinto and Hardin. Those who know about these things and the rapid destruction and despoliation going on day by day, say there won't be any Big Thicket 10 years from now.

A forest jungle of approximately 2,000 square miles, the home of more than 2,000 classified trees, plants, shrubs; hundreds of animals, hundreds of varieties of birds and snakes; many alligators, turtles, frogs, moths, butterflies and dragon flies of spectacular beauty; lichens of infinite and striking variety; fungi that are unknown, unnamed and unclassified, and around 300 varieties of mosses—that is the Big Thicket. Of the five carnivorous plants known in the world, four are native here. There are even beech trees; and holly trees that grow taller and more perfect than anywhere else in the world, and up to 13 feet in diameter.

The only Indian reservation in Texas is located on the northern edge—about 4,009 acres now reserved for the Alabama-Coushatta Indians.

Here is another unique paradise of America and Texas that will be lost to the world forever if we don't all lend our support to saving more of what's left. Many biologically, geologically and historically significant areas of the Big Thicket are already lost.

We should write Sen. Yarborough, Secretary Stewart Udall, and our U.S. Congressmen that we endorse this bill. The Texas House of Representatives has endorsed the bill by a vote of 139 to 0.

—HAZEL C. GREEN.

BUILDING AMERICA UNDER PRESIDENT JOHNSON: AFL–CIO RECOUNTS FABULOUS PROGRESS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in an age of rapid change and rising human expectations, the Nation and its representatives often forget the accomplishments of yesterday as they debate the promise of tomorrow.

We in the 90th Congress should never forget that the programs we debate and approve will be built on the foundations of one of the greatest social and economic records ever proposed by an administration and enacted by any Congress of the United States.

I am pleased, therefore, to present a statement by the executive council of the highly respected American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations on the social progress achieved by our country under the farseeing leadership of President Johnson, adopted February 22, 1967.

The statement reads as follows:

America is now beginning to reap the harvest of the great social legislation advanced by the Johnson administration and adopted by the 89th Congress.

It is a record unsurpassed in any period of democratic government. We are proud of the role played by the AFL–CIO, which initiated the fight for many of these programs and which actively supported them in the Congress.

On the first of February, the new minimum wage bill—the most effective antipoverty legislation yet—became law. With that new bill, nine million more Americans gained the protection and benefits of that law. One billion dollars a year of new purchasing power was pumped into the economy.

The record of social progress during the Johnson Administration extends into many other broad areas of constructive action, for the welfare of all Americans:

1. Three million older Americans have received hospital care and 5½ million have received physicians' services under medicare just through January 31.

2. More than 19 million older Americans are protected under the hospital insurance part of medicare, and 17½ million have also signed up for supplementary medical insurance.

3. An additional million persons are receiving Social Security benefits today, as a result of the 1965 and 1966 amendments, who would otherwise not be receiving any benefits.

4. All 23 million Social Security beneficiaries are receiving monthly case benefits at least seven percent higher as a result of the 1965 amendments.

5. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act is helping more than 8 million disadvantaged children through special programs in over 17,000 communities.

6. Library books, text books and other educational materials have been provided for 49 million school children and two million teachers under the Elementary and Secondary Education act.

7. More than 135,000 needy college students are being helped to continue their education through the new program of educational opportunity grants initiated last fall, and 190,000 students who could not otherwise afford to go to college are being aided through part-time jobs under the college work-study program.

8. Measles vaccine for 4½ million children has been made available to state and local health agencies under the 1965 amendments to the Vaccination Assistance act.

9. During the last four years there has been a $9.3 billion, 72% expansion in Federal programs which directly combat poverty and assist the poor. More than 1,000 local communities have been mobilized for the war on poverty.

10. More than one million needy children have been helped by Head Start, Neighborhood Youth Corps and other programs.

11. More than one million persons are currently receiving training and new avenues of opportunity under manpower training and development programs.

Satisfying as this record is, much more remains to be done before America can afford to pause on its march forward in the social welfare field.

We are confident the President shares that view. He has already asked the Congress for broader programs and additional legislation in this area. For ourselves, we want to make this clear: the AFL–CIO will be working day in and day out to achieve the kind of society we seek—one in which insecurity, poverty and injustice no longer exist in our land.

Nothing less is worthy of America.

That is a fine record, Mr. President. As the AFL–CIO says, in part, the Johnson-congressional record is "unsurpassed in any period of democratic government." That is a true statement of fact. We all know it is true because we were the indispensable partners in the progress achieved in the last 2 years—progress of which every man should be proud, whatever party he represents.

The Nation's largest labor organization has rightfully called our attention to the gigantic strides made in giving greater economic protection to the workingman; the increased numbers of poor children now getting a better education; the older citizens whose lives will be freer from insecurity and doubt under medicare and expanded social security programs; the libraries, and taxtbooks which will enlighten and shape the minds of almost 50 million additional schoolchildren; the needy college student now advancing up the great ladder of learning because this Congress wanted it so; the many health, welfare, and job training programs which have been expanded.

These, the AFL–CIO executive council has cited. They could have cited many more. We who were here during those thrilling days know that we proudly joined our President in writing into law measures to dignify the full hopes and dreams of a democratic society.

But our work is not done. The AFL–CIO rightly suggests the record is not complete. No record for the people in a democracy is ever complete. The Nation, the Presidency, the Congress, our society are living things constantly growing. And so as we debate new programs and laws, and as we read of criticism at home and abroad, let us remember that we are building today's America on the solid foundations of the accomplishments of the Johnson administration and the dynamic 89th Congress—the Congress in which many of us had the honor to serve. It is a record which speaks for itself—a record in which we take deep pride as legislators.

CAN ATLAS SHRUG?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on February 16, I had the pleasant privilege of speaking before the American affairs meeting of the Los Angeles, Calif., chapter of Hadassah. I ask unanimous consent that a partial text of my comments on that occasion be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN ATLAS SHRUG?

Today, the interests and the responsibilities of our nation are ubiquitous. Often it seems that America, like Atlas, is holding up all the world. We know the figure of the man whose tired arms continually support the earth, and whose load no one else will share, even for a brief respite. I wonder if Atlas would have seen the humor in the Wordsworth phrase "The world is too much with us; . . ." or, if he would have taken it, as too many people do today, as an ironic jab at the tragedy of our era.

Many Americans today have the same sort of "trapped" feeling that Atlas must have had. I am not referring to the young housewife or the middle-aged professional man, but to every American who asks the questions: Where does it end? How far do we go? What is our share in maintaining peace and decent human order?

At the end of World War II, when what remained of the whole human race was horrified by the ravages of global conflict, like a Phoenix from the ashes, there arose a bright new confidence in a system of collective security, of sharing risks, and of jointly confronting common dangers to world peace. In the first instance, this hope gave rise to the San Francisco Charter of the United Nations. It was followed by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, as a military defensive system against potential Soviet aggression. Other agreements were later made in almost every other region. These arrangements were not only military in character; they sought to find a basis for first-step disarmament and for arms control agreements, and to advance the cause of peace through economic development, in an over-all hoped for solution of the age-old ills of man: pestilence, famine, and the despair of forlorn poverty.

This was a bipartisan effort. As a Republican, I recall with great pride one of my illustrious predecessors, Arthur Vandenberg, Senator from Michigan, who spoke out two decades ago to bring to our country a clear understanding that there must be an interdependence among free peoples, that the United States could not—can not—"go it alone." It was Vandenberg and the men of the 81st Congress from both parties who slammed the door on America's outgrown policy of isolation. But the great hopes for world security, so bright in the aftermath of World War II under men like Vandenberg, Winston Churchill, Dwight Eisenhower, and John F. Kennedy, seem now to have been shattered, and broken beyond repair. France's De Gaulle, Egypt's Nasser, Rhodesia's Ian Smith, all refuse to accept the principle that one people's freedom is in pawn to another's safety.

In this nuclear age no one nation can stand alone against all comers. Foreign policy for our republic assumes a transcendent importance for the whole human race.

Once we lived in the secure protection of two oceans and a large navy. Today, any city on earth can be largely obliterated within moments by the flick of a finger. The order may come from either a reasoning or unreasoning mind.

Militarily, the United States is more powerful today than at any time in her history, but she has less security than ever before. That is the strange paradox of the nuclear age. The discoveries of science, and the streaking speeds of transportation and communication with 12,000 miles per hour intercontinental ballistic missiles have effectively and permanently eliminated the idea of living alone. Isolation is all gone. Whether we like it or not, we are all, Russians and Americans, Chinese and French, Israeli and Arab, Germans and Japanese—ultimately in hock to the reasoning process of a relatively small number of people who control the levers of power in the nuclear bastions of the so-called "Great Powers."

There are those who defend freedom, those who oppose, and those, hypnotized by dated ideologies, who have never been given a chance to know the difference. I believe those who believe in freedom vastly outnumber all the others.

All nations who value their independence have a common interest in and a responsibility for the defense of the free world. But, today our system of collective security, so hopefully unveiled, is in a sad state of disrepair.

As a consequence, enormous burdens have been heaped on the shoulders of the American people by the events of the last few years. Some 400,000 troops have been committed to the defense of South Vietnam. The United States and her allies in Asia carry on this costly conflict without any substantial help from our allies in Europe, who nevertheless, continue to benefit from the protection of the American nuclear defense forces—to say nothing of their economic resuscitation by our economy at the close of the Second World War.

There is a major threat to world peace from the madness now sweeping through Communist China, which approaches a giant internal convulsion. And this occurs while they continue to make strides towards an intercontinental nuclear force of their own.

The Soviet Union, which has at times shown some signs of coming to reason, continues, alas, to withhold her support from the peacekeeping efforts of the United Nations. This single fact, more than any other, has prevented us from taking further steps in establishing a sound international peacekeeping arrangement in that body.

Effective peacekeeping machinery cannot be built without help from all major powers, something which we do not have. Fundamental to any stabilization among the great powers is an understanding that no one nation may—or can—hope to benefit from initiating a nuclear conflict. In this situation, nothing is more vital than maintenance of a mutually acceptable halt to the 20-year old nuclear arms race.

On November 11, 1966, the Secretary of Defense gave the first confirmation by our government that the Soviet Union has begun to build a new defense system around one or more of its major cities, composed at least in part of Anti-Ballistic Missiles. We do not know everything about the capabilities of Soviet weapons. But we have grave apprehensions about this development, and about its implications for the continuity of the human race.

The Soviet action, taken in secrecy, gravely prejudices the possibility of resolving our differences by rational and peaceful means. In the closing months of his Administration, President Eisenhower said: "In an age of rapidly developing technology, secrecy is not only an anachronism, it is downright dangerous. To seek to maintain a society in which a military move can be made in complete secrecy, while professing a desire to reduce the risk of war through arms control, is a contradiction." This contradiction which Eisenhower saw in the Soviet system remains. It lies at the heart of the Soviet Union's inability to contribute, as that nation should, to meaningful peacekeeping endeavors.

There is a severe limit to how long we can tolerate Soviet action without a military response of our own. We and the Russians both possess vast nuclear retaliatory capability. Ours is superior and considerably larger. There is nothing America can do to keep the Soviet Union from building and maintaining such a force, awesome as it may be, unless, by reason and by diplomacy, she were to urge terminating this excursion into needless nuclear escalation. We cannot permit the USSR to gain strategic military superiority over the United States.

Last December 7, I wired the President, respectfully calling on him to employ the most expeditious diplomatic channels to convey to the Soviet leaders, at the highest level, a concern of the American people on the issue of a renewed nuclear arms race. The President, in his State of the Union Message, disclosed that our government is seeking an agreement in this area. Every American devoutly hopes that we may succeed in this undertaking. In a very real sense, we deal here with the future of this planet.

In 1960, President Eisenhower's doctrine, as expressed to the United Nations General Assembly, was:

"Ours is a world of growing danger. There is a danger of surprise attack prepared in secret. There is the danger of nuclear attack from outer space. There is the menace of constantly mounting stockpiles of nuclear weapons and of large armies. There is the peril of spreading capability for the production of modern weapons to greater numbers of nations. There is the hazard of war by accident or miscalculation. We hold these dangers must be dealt with now."

That was nearly seven years ago. How far have the advances of weaponry progressed and, by contrast, how little has been done to resolve and keep them in control of rational men?

Because its activities are cloaked in mystic secrecy, we know very little about the political apparatus of the Soviet Union. But we can guess that there are Soviet "hawks" and Soviet "doves." Diplomacy is still the art of international communication and persuasion; a very important part of it is the dissipating of the hard issues of world affairs with the solvent of reason. Soviet military leaders may be unaware of the risks they take in seeking to occupy, or to pre-empt, the next rung of the nuclear ladder. It will be the task of Free World diplomacy to strengthen the hands of those in the Soviet Union who find the risks involved unacceptable, and who recognize that, whatever their ideological differences with the United States, there is nothing to be gained by courting the destruction of the planet upon which we dwell.

In other areas we find depreciating security. In no region is the peace more fragile than in the Middle East. Here again, we have particular doubts about the effects of Soviet policy.

The Tripartite Agreement of 1950 was the last attempt, by three Western powers, Britain, France and the United States, to provide security for the Middle East. Today a precarious balance exists between Israel and those Arab states who recognize the futility of arms struggle on the one hand, and a relentless irredentism on the other.

Some fatuously contend there is an identity of views between ourselves and the Soviet Union, that both nations would act to prevent a major war in the Middle East. Yet, the leaders of Syria, who can find competition in irrationalism of their policies only from the Red Chinese, must be counted as minions of the Communist world.

In any major clash of interests, the world's peacekeeping arrangements would be closely limited. The U.N. has for nearly two decades maintained truce supervisory activities along the border of Israel and of her neighboring countries. A small U.N. security force remains in the Gaza Strip. With substantial American assistance a U.N. relief and work agency (UNRWA) continues to feed thousands of refugees whom the Arab nations have not absorbed. Like the refugee problems, many of the issues remain unsolved or insoluble. The U.N.-sponsored Armistice Commissions were not able to convene on the critical problems of the Syria-Israel border for a period of eight years.

The weakness of the United Nations is a reflection of the disunity among the world leaders. Without a firm Soviet commitment to peace in the Middle East, no taming of Syrian, or Egyptian, recalcitrance seems possible. Without good will on both sides, no peacekeeping organization can succeed.

We have witnessed in the raids of the renegade Palestine Liberation Organization what can only be called an attempt by one group of countries to egg another to attack a third. I refer to Syrian and Egyptian support of the Palestine Liberation Organization's attempt to bring Jordan into war with Israel. Such a parlay should be soundly condemned under the title of "Third Country Aggression." No nation on earth is safe as long as its neighbors may be used by a more distant adversary as a means of making war without suffering any consequences of its own.

This kind of attempt to embroil one nation against another is not new. We saw it when North Korea was encouraged by the Soviet Union to attack South Korea in 1950. We saw it in Cuba with the arrival of Soviet missiles and their supporting ground crews. We see it today in Africa where Tanzanian territory has been used to train "volunteers" to attack Mozambique. It ocurred in Ghana, before the fall of Nkrumah, where Soviet and Chinese instructors taught guerrilla tactics to those who would subvert free nations in Africa.

Any nation which values its independence, regardless of its ideology, must see that such behavior is symptomatic of international anarchy.

"Third Country Aggression" is an ugly practice, which ought decisively to be condemned. I am sure that if a roll call were taken among the independent nations of this earth there would be no doubt of the result. Such strategy would be condemned.

Even our own government has indirectly been providing aid and assistance to the Palestine Liberation Organization through the feeding of Palestine refugees by the United Nations Relief and Work Agency. Sixty percent of the support of this body comes from the United States.

Last August, I asked the Secretary of State to determine whether United States aid funds were being disbursed in a manner that would benefit members of the Palestine Liberation Organization who were registered on the refugee roles. The Secretary answered—not as satisfactorily as I'd want. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 was later amended to make clear the intent of the Congress that American tax revenues would not support those being trained to attack Israel, or any other peaceful country. I recognize the great complication of reducing food rations to hundreds of thousands of people, who have yet to find a livelihood after a war concluded nearly 20 years ago. But the arrangement made by which American funds were segregated still leaves the U.N. contributing to refugees who are members of the PLO. I simply say that if the United Nations is to have any authority on earth it must take firm steps to insure that it is not itself contributing to aggression.

We must take decisive steps in the United Nations to see that no further assistance is given to the Palestine Liberation Organization and that nations which indulge in egging one neighbor to attack another should be condemned out of hand.

In the absence of an effective international system for the maintenance of peace, the world is left to cope with its problem as best it can. We seek a rule of law in the world, but more exists. Force and physical power remain supreme. The burden falls unequally on the strong and on the willing. History has taught us some sober lessons. In the absence of a sound collective security system the first answer to territorial expansionism must be a determined defense. Today in Southeast Asia, with the aid of the large majority of nations free of Communist domination, the United States has once again committed itself to the principle that aggression must not be allowed to pay.

Robert Sherod, the well-known journalist and foreign correspondent, recently summed up a pessimistic article on Vietnam with the following thought:

"We have committed our national honor to defend our policy and our allies. The key question is the one asked so often by (President) Lyndon Johnson, 'What would *you* do?' At this point it makes no sense to say 'Give up,' or to ask 'Why did *you* do what you did?'" The United States and her allies have the ability to see the problem through. I believe that through sound programs of political and economic development, the people of Vietnam may be able to determine freely and for themselves what their destiny will be. The achievement of this right to choose is our goal.

The people of South Vietnam went to the polls last fall to elect a Constituent Assembly. That election was a clear example of the use of the techniques of democracy in a war which involves men's minds more than their geography. The vote which the people of Vietnam cast, despite the intensified campaign of terror carried on by the Communist Viet Cong, displayed yet again the tremendous wager on the system of self-government which the Vietnamese have undertaken.

The Vietnamese Constituent Assembly is now completing its labors. By the spring of this year a Constitution will be promulgated. The villages and the hamlets are again scheduled to test the democratic process in the election of local chieftains. In the village the tradition of elections runs deep into Vietnamese history. By the end of the year national elections are planned to elect a President and possibly a new Assembly. These would be major gains. But no such progress would be possible without resolute opposition to Communist terror and aggression.

The political growth in Vietnam is a hopeful aspect of a costly and ugly war. This conflict has plagued the hearts of our allies with doubts, has permitted the Cassandras of Europe to sow disaffection in the NATO Alliance.

Twice in our lifetime America has been called by its allies beyond the seas to fight for the freedom of Europe. More recently, we have been called to the aid of our allies in Asia. We live in an interdependent world. The United States cannot play the role of Atlas. We cannot be the world's policemen. If independent nations are to remain free, they must recognize the facts of interdependence and adhere to the principles of collective security.

Last year, a spokesman for the French Government said "International crises no longer center in Europe, but in Asia, and the majority of NATO countries are not involved in Asia." And thus he argued that Western Europe should be unconcerned with our exertions in Indochina.

One of the problems of Atlas was the pathos of being alone. Many in Europe seem to be fascinated with the painful ordeal our nation is going through. Yet the consequences of the United States laying down her burden are as great for the people of Europe as for the people of Vietnam.

Europeans must know full well that a nation's acquiescence points to her own destruction. The concept of collective security is founded on the idea that aggression, by whatever name, must not be tolerated in the community of nation states. Where it is resisted, hope remains.

I do not hold with those who feel there is something morally wrong with the United States because she has accepted the challenges of the Communists' misnamed "Wars of National Liberation." Those who entertain such doubts would have Atlas cast off his burden and let the earth come crashing to the ground. That is not a realistic choice for free men.

Rather the course lies for us to persevere and recruit new members to the cause of collective security, to make full use of the channels of diplomacy to use America's great creative powers in seeking new instrumentalities for preserving the security of this earth—to let no one doubt that time is on the side of rational men and women, however great their burden may be.

THE BATTLE FOR CLEAN AIR

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the "Battle for Clean Air" has become a matter of concern for the entire Nation. Our very existence is dependent on the environment that surrounds our world, an environment slowly being poisoned by pollution. For too long we have tolerated filth in the air. For too long we have ignored the dangers of contamination. Our complacency was born from ignorance and from the hope that the dangers could be somehow controlled by a brisk wind. But no wind has been strong enough to remove the tremendous amounts of pollution deposits that a modern, industrial society has itself placed in the air. And these uncontrolled hydrocarbons, oxides, and noxious odors will continue to multiply until this same society can mobilize its every resource against the threat it has created.

This mobilization is in progress today but only to a limited extent. As the author of the first proposal to provide grants-in-aid for research and technical assistance in the air pollution area, I have followed with great interest the developing efforts of local, State and Federal governments in attempting to control environmental contamination. But the hazards continue to increase; hazards which demand greater and intensified action by Government, by industry; indeed, by every citizen. I believe the Nation can and will respond to the menacing challenge of air pollution, much as it has responded to similar challenges in transportation, communication, national defense, and space exploration.

Legislation has been introduced in the Congress to provide for greater research, additional assistance, and added tax incentives. Only recently, the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Committee on Public Works held hearings in Los Angeles to study the effectiveness of auto emission devices. I was pleased at that time to present a statement before the subcommittee on the need for effective Government-industry cooperation in the battle for clean air.

Of particular interest and satisfaction to me are the recent efforts in my own State of California to control pollution. Our distinguished Gov. Ronald Reagan, has submitted a waste management program to the State legislature which is aimed at controlling pollution not only of the air, but of water and land. The proposal establishes single State governmental units in each of these fields, recommends tough antipollution standards, and calls for the creation of an environmental quality board to provide a unified approach to solving the problems of pollution control. Perhaps Governor Reagan's own words best summarize the need for greater national concern and action in the battle for clean air:

> If the air cannot be breathed, if the water is unfit for drinking, if the land is despoiled by our own refuse, we will have nothing. If we permit the befouling of our air, our water, our land, we shortly will be unable to live in this great state.

These views are in line with my own. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement made by Governor Reagan in sending to the California Legislature his proposal for a California waste management program be placed in the RECORD at this point. I further ask unanimous consent that the statement which I made before the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution also be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF GOVERNOR REAGAN ON THE CALIFORNIA WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

To the Senate and Assembly of the Legislature of California:

I am today submitting a proposal for a California Waste Management Program designed to end the pollution of our air, water and land. Such pollution is a major threat to public health, economic growth and the quality of our California environment.

Specific legislation will be introduced within the next few weeks which will make California the first state in the nation to adopt a comprehensive three-fold approach to the very critical problems of pollution.

As you are aware, there are serious gaps in state policy and a piecemeal fragmentation of governmental units which now characterize the waste management field. There is an absence of state policy goals aimed at improving the quality of our environment. And there is little ability now to control the major sources of pollution.

We must adopt a systematic program of action in this field. To meet this need, we are proposing a policy that would:

1. Reorganize and consolidate the existing fragmented government systems by establishing single state governmental units in the fields of air resources, water resources and solid waste disposal. I cannot emphasize too strongly, however, that this consolidation must preserve local responsibilities.

2. Establish tough anti-pollution standards, especially in the field of air pollution.

3. Recognize that the related problems of air pollution, water pollution and solid waste disposal are part of the general problem of protecting the quality of California's environment.

I am, therefore, recommending legislation establishing a single Air Resources Board. This Board would have jurisdiction not only in the field of motor vehicle emissions now covered by law, but also over air pollution from stationary sources such as open burning, burning dumps and industrial-commercial operations.

This legislation would authorize the Air Resources Board to adopt standards governing the composition of diesel and other motor fuels and would establish a statewide air monitoring system. Educational efforts on the very serious problems of air pollution would be stepped up.

In addition, a major requirement in the field of air pollution should be a provision that vehicle emission devices be designed to meet 1970 standards. This would give the automotive industry and others a three-year period in which to develop and improve emission devices that would meet a definite and minimum goal set for 1970.

Until now, limited responsibilities for air pollution control have been vested at all levels of government. The result has been an inability to develop a program that considers the total air pollution burden on the air resources throughout a region.

I am further recommending that legislation be enacted to establish a single unit of state government for liquid waste management. Responsibility for water quality control, according to a report by the "Little Hoover Commission," is diffused among the State Water Quality Control Board, nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards, the Department of Water Resources, the Department of Public Health, the Department of Fish and Game and waste discharges under self-monitoring arrangements.

The Assembly Water Committee, headed by Assemblyman Carley Porter, has recommended merging the State Water Rights and Water Quality Control Boards and I look with approval on this measure.

Finally, legislation should be enacted which would designate responsibility within the Department of Public Health for developing solid waste management policies and standards and for undertaking research and development. In this field of refuse and sanitation, no state agency now has the statutory responsibility for planning and development of standards.

I would also suggest that legislation creating a California Waste Management Act of 1967 be enacted, establishing an Environmental Quality Board to provide a unified approach to solving the problems of pollution control and improving the quality of our environment.

Such a Board would resolve policy conflicts between air, water and solid waste disposal agencies and would make recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature to prevent pollution. Representatives on the Board might include those from the agencies in the water, air and solid waste fields. Other members could be representatives of the League of Cities, County Supervisors Assn., State Planning Office, the Legislature and the state Chamber of Commerce.

Such a Board, involving all segments of the population, would allow the needed flexibility nécessary to implement pollution controls on the local and regional levels.

What I have outlined today will have a very limited immediate cost but will result in significantly improved programs for making our environment livable. As state responsibility broadens, and this unique approach results in a cleaner and better California, costs will increase. But federal grants can be expected in the future to finance this tremendously improved and vitally important program.

This "Waste Management Program" provides California with the opportunity to pioneer among all the states of this nation in the waste management field.

California cannot afford to lose its three most valuable resources. If the air cannot be breathed, if the water is unfit for drinking, if the land is despoiled by our own refuse, we will have nothing. If we permit the befouling of our air, our water, our land, we shortly will be unable to live in this great state.

I am thoroughly convinced that we must act—and act now. At best, our current efforts are barely keeping even with the problem. Much greater effort must be put forth. Enactment of this program is the first step toward a brighter future.

INDUSTRY'S ROLE IN THE BATTLE FOR CLEAN AIR

(Statement by U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, before the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Committee on Public Works, February 13, 1967)

In the 1930's, the people of Los Angeles County, numbering in those days a little over two million, became aware that their matchless climate was blemished somewhat by a periodic haze. No one had heard of hydrocarbons or smog. No one spoke of sulphur oxides, oxidants, particulates, and oxides of nitrogen. Many blamed the newly constructed oil refineries for the noxious odors in the air. In the valleys, after a night of low temperatures and heavy smudge pot burning, a pall of soot which literally blacked out the sun enveloped the small country towns. Complaints were often heard but little action was taken. The oil industry, at one point, felt obliged to employ a technical inspector who was charged with the duty of keeping a 24-hour surveillance of the refineries and had the authority to enter the refinery premises and halt any operation producing an odor nuisance. In general, however, people in those days largely were tolerant of pollution in the air. They were ignorant of the hidden dangers and hopeful that at worst the haze would last no more than a day or two.

The County of Los Angeles, the State of California, indeed, the entire Nation, have come a long way since the days of aggravating haze and technical inspectors. Today, the problem of air pollution is referred to interms of a national crisis. Science has deduced that the pollutants in the air strike at virtually everything that exists. In economic losses alone, air pollution costs the country billions of dollars a year through injury to vegetation and livestock, corrosion and soiling of materials and structures, depression of property values, and interference with ground and air transportation. Of even greater significance are the adverse effects on human health. Pollution has been related to a growing number of ailments—asthma, bronchitis, lung cancer and emphysema. The Surgeon General's office has indicated that:

"In the not-too-distant future, if present rates of national growth are sustained, air pollution will reach truly critical proportions."

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare states:

"What is already known about the relationship of air pollution to illness, disability, and premature death, together with considerations of prudence in the protection of public health, leave no doubt that the contemporary air pollution problem is a threat to the lives and health of millions of people in all parts of the country."

Local, State and Federal governments have been trying desperately to wage the battle for clean air. The efforts of Los Angeles County alone have been cited by the United States Public Health Service as a model for the Nation. The County Air Pollution District has initiated a number of attacks against open burning, industrial contamination, as well as automobile emissions.

The State of California was one of the first to grant local jurisdictions the authority to regulate factories and other sources of atmospheric contamination through the establishment of air pollution control districts. In 1959, the State legislature directed the State Department of Public Health to establish standards for the air and created a Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Board to test and, if necessary, require control devices; devices which in fact are today required on all cars sold in California.

On the Federal level, an identifiable program in air pollution was not established until 1955, when Public Law 159 was passed by the 84th Congress. As a member of the Public Works Committee at that time, I was the author of this proposal to provide the first grants-in-aid for research and technical assistance in this area. The adoption of the Clean Air Act in December of 1963 and the amendments that have been adopted since that date, have given the Federal Government a mandate to provide leadership and assistance in the national effort to control pollution.

But despite the public and private efforts in this area, despite the volumes of research and the thousands of dollars of assistance, despite the controls that have been established, and the standards that have been developed, air pollution continues to grow and to threaten the environment of our Nation. The recent clouds of pollution that settled on New York are but one example. Recent reports from the County of Los Angeles raise serious questions regarding the effectiveness of control devices on automobiles. Statistics on the damaging effects of smog on health and property continue to multiply.

As the hazards increase, the Nation gropes for any answer, any solution, but the same are offered again and again—more legislation, more controls, more research and more assistance. The Administration has recommended greater Federal controls. This recommendation, of course, should be studied. My own view is that if police power is to be invoked in the area of air pollution, it ought primarily to rest with the individual states of the Union. I should not wish to invoke Federal police power until it indisputably is shown that there is no other alternative. That constitutes one of the basic responsibilities of this Subcommittee.

Legislation also has been introduced in the Congress again to provide for greater research, additional assistance to local programs, and added tax incentives for industries building pollution abatement facilities. Though all of these proposals certainly will have some effect on the air pollution problem, I am afraid that the same old answers will reap only the same results; results which have fallen seriously short of success; results which have offered only a slow, prodding, fragmented approach to a rapidly exploding environmental problem.

What is needed to meet this challenge to human environment is an attack equal to the threat. What is needed is not more controls but better technology, not the power of compulsion, but the power of industry, not more piece-meal research, but a well planned academic and industrial effort, not just additional tax incentives but real financial and competitive inducements.

The time has arrived for an enlightened overview of the problems of the human environment and of measures and plans for solution of these problems, both immediate and long range. And the primary key lies in the vast, unexploited resources of American industry and free enterprise. The ill effects of environmental hazards can be controlled effectively only through the development and application of technology. And it is only private industry that can undertake the kind of research and development which will lead to the technical hardware that can control, eliminate or modify environmental hazards.

In the battle for clean air, government must induce the participation of industries with the greatest research and development capability. The solution of present and future environmental problems will have to be generated out of a collaboration between government and industry the equal of which may be unprecedented, but the pattern for which is neither new nor controversial.

The Federal Government has often successfully brought American industry into a partnership for the exploitation of new opportunities and the solution of problems. More than a century ago, the Federal Government and industry joined forces in an effort to forge the greatest network of railroads in the world. By somewhat different means, but with a parallel objective, the Federal Government has nurtured the resources of industry to develop air and highway transportation, electronic communications, publishing, and, of course, the industries heavily engaged in national defense and space exploration.

Behind each of these joint endeavors has been an acceptance of the premise that neither industry nor government alone has the capability of grasping an opportunity for vast economic development or for meeting a challenge to the national security or welfare. Furthermore, such collaborative efforts have always been predicated on the basic assumption—which can hardly be disputed—that the end product or goal, whether it be an efficient transportation system, colonization of the moon, or eradication of poliomyelitis, would help to preserve or strengthen society, or avert a crisis.

The Nation now faces a situation which more than any other in our history requires that we apply the technique of joint government-industry collaboration to preserve and protect society in order to avert a crisis of unimaginable proportions.

Environmental hazards to health are intimately linked to the growth of our industrial, technological society. This factor alone would seem to indicate that American industry must play a major part in solving environmental problems. But the resources of industry will have to be brought to bear on environmental problems for another, and perhaps more compelling, reason: without the application of the vast research and development capability of American industry, without its unequalled skill at identification and resolution of technological problems, the efforts of government to deal with present and future health hazards in the environment of man will continue to be substantially unsuccessful.

I believe it is fair to say that when this is pointed out to industrial leaders, they accept it. It is also fair to say that, given the proper incentives, industrial leaders are willing to apply the resources at their disposal to the solution of environmental problems. But they want to make this effort within the context of their place in the free enterprise system. In other words, industrial cooperation in the control of environmental pollution and in the design and maintenance of environments free of hazards to health and welfare will have to be consistent with the economic goals of our industrial system. This, in effect, means that government cannot expect to encourage great expansion in industrial research and development if industry will be effectively blocked from realizing a profit from its efforts.

The experience of the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in drawing on the resources of private industry for research and development hardly needs to be discussed here, other than to point out that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has very similar needs but has yet to develop similar means of satisfying them. The Department has no Rand Corporation, no North American Aviation, nor any other private industry partner which recognizes a community of interest with the Departmental program. As a consequence, the Department has no effective means of drawing on the resources of the private industrial community for basic research on environmental problems, for design of systems capable of meeting these problems, nor for development of hardware, where hardware is called for. It lacks the funds to support such an undertaking, but more importantly, it lacks the administrative structure and legislative authority to make such an undertaking possible.

I believe American industry is poised for a fundamentally new and immeasurably greater attack on problems of the human environment than has heretofore occurred. For the present, this industrial capability is largely untapped. It has been goaded to a limited extent by the expediency of regulatory control, but this means of Federal inducement has accomplished but a small fraction of the results that might be achieved through a more imaginative and resourceful Federal effort.

The problems faced by the government in meeting the growing challenge of air pollution are easy to describe. Conditions needing correction are easy to identify. A generalization on solutions is simple to state. These I have done. The difficult task is to identify all the barriers to effective cooperation between government and industry and to determine how these barriers can be breached. I am hopeful that this Subcommittee will give urgent consideration to this challenge. This is, in fact, the first order of business to which both industry and government must address themselves if industry is to have a role in the battle for clean air and, indeed, if the battle itself is ever to be won.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am glad to report that sundry newspapers in California have editorially commented on the position which Governor Reagan has taken in California and the position which I have taken here in Washington on the same subject. I ask unanimous consent that editorials from several California newspapers on the subject be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Berkeley (Calif.) Daily Gazette, Feb. 21, 1967]

SMOG CAN BE BEATEN, AND KUCHEL HAS ONE OF THE KEYS

In the fight against smog, the Bay Area Air Pollution Control District and private industry have cooperated in cleaning up the urban environment.

After extensive public hearings, the BAAPCD in recent years has promulgated regulations to control emissions of air pollutants from industrial sources. For its part, industry has invested considerable sums in equipment and technical research to meet those regulations.

In a statement to the Senate's subcommittee on air and water pollution, Senator Thomas H. Kuchel of California has called for effective nationwide government-industry cooperation in meeting the menacing challenge of air pollution.

The assistant minority leader told the subcommittee at a field meeting in Los Angeles:

"Without the application of the vast research and development capability of American industry, without its unequalled skill at identification and resolution of technological problems, the efforts of government to deal with present and future health hazards in the environment of man will continue to be substantially unsuccessful."

The subcommittee—and the nation—would do well to heed Senator Kuchel's remarks.

For the senator's home state has demonstrated how government can cooperate with private industry in the fight against a major health menace.

[From the San Jose (Calif.) Mercury Feb. 20, 1967]

POLLUTION WAR AIMS

Californians on the state and federal levels sought last week to mobilize the resources of society against the rising tide of pollution—of air, water and land.

In Washington, Sen. Thomas H. Kuchel (R-Calif.), assistant GOP leader of the Senate, called for greater industry-government cooperation in controlling air pollution. Kuchel was concerned primarily with the basic research and technology that must underpin any successful fight against smog.

In Sacramento, Gov. Ronald Reagan called for a coordinated attack on dirty air, polluted waters and waste-strewn land. Essentially, the governor sought to strengthen enforcement of existing regulations and to draft new and more effective controls as well.

In a sense, this approach represents an excellent division of labor between state and federal governments; it carries forward the basic philosophy developed more than a decade ago when Congress first began to appropriate money for research into the causes of smog.

It was agreed at that time that the federal government could make its greatest contribution in the field of research, leaving enforcement to local authorities.

The words of Sen. Kuchel and Gov. Reagan echo this philosophy.

The Senator said in part:

"The federal government has nurtured the resources of industry to develop air and highway transportation, electronic communications, publishing, and, of course, the industries heavily engaged in national defense and space exploration. The solution of present and future environmental problems will have to be generated out of a collaboration between government and industry the equal of which may be unprecedented, but the pattern for which is neither new nor controversial. . . .

"Without the application of the vast research and development capability of American industry, without its unequalled skill at identification and resolution of technological problems, the efforts of government to deal with present and future health hazards in the environment of man will continue to be substantially unsuccessful."

To which Gov. Reagan added, in a lengthy anti-pollution message to the California Legislature:

"If the air cannot be breathed, if the water is unfit for drinking, if the land is despoiled by our own refuse, we will have nothing. If we permit the befouling of our air, our water, our land, we will shortly be unable to live in this great state. . . ."

The point is well taken. If existing regulations against pollution go unenforced; if exemptions are granted willy-nilly; if research is allowed to lag, no amount of administrative reorganization will improve the environment one iota.

This must not be allowed to happen. The indications in Sacramento and in Washington are that it will not be allowed to happen.

MEDAL OF HONOR AWARD TO CAPT. HARVEY C. BARNUM, JR., U.S. MARINE CORPS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it was my pleasure to be present this morning at the Marine Barracks when the Congressional Medal of Honor was presented to Capt. Harvey C. Barnum, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, of Cheshire, Conn.

It was a most touching and moving ceremony. Captain Barnum's mother, father, and brother attended along with many other relatives and friends. Abbot Gerald of St. Anslem's College, Manchester, N.H., came to Washington to proudly witness his former student receive this great honor.

Captain Barnum now belongs to the ranks of the few who have qualified for the highest this Nation bestows on its fighting men.

We respect and admire the courage and strength of character a person must possess to perform the deeds necessary to be considered for the Medal of Honor.

I share with Captain Barnum's family and friends the great pride they feel in his accomplishments. I also congratulate him, on behalf of all our citizens, for his brave actions which earned him this high honor.

I believe that Captain Barnum is far more representative of our young people than whose misdeeds we read about daily in our newspapers.

As Captain Barnum's actions in battle in Vietnam speak more eloquently than any words of mine, I ask permission to have the text of the citation awarding him the Medal of Honor inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Medal of Honor to First Lieutenant Harvey C. Barnum, Jr., United States Marine Corps, for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty as Forward Observer for Artillery, while attached to Company H, Second Battalion, Ninth Marines, Third Marine Division (Reinforced), in action against communist forces at Ky Phu in Quang Tin Province, Republic of Vietnam, on 18 December 1965. When the company was suddenly pinned down by a hail of extremely accurate enemy fire and was quickly separated from the remainder of the battalion by over five hundred meters of open and fire-swept ground, and casualties mounted rapidly, Lieutenant Barnum quickly made a hazardous reconnaissance of the area seeking targets for his artillery. Finding the rifle company commander mortally wounded and the radio operator killed, he, with complete disregard for his own safety, gave aid to the dying commander, then removed the radio from the dead operator and strapped it to himself. He immediately assumed command of the rifle company, and moving at once into the midst of the heavy fire, rallying and giving encouragement to all units, reorganized them to replace the loss of key personnel and led their attack on enemy positions from which deadly fire continued to come. His sound and swift decisions and his obvious calm served to stabilize the badly decimated unit and his gallant example as he stood exposed repeatedly to point out targets served as an inspiration to all. Provided with two armed helicopters, he moved fearlessly through enemy fire to control the air attack against the firmly entrenched enemy while skillfully directing one platoon in a successful counter attack on the key enemy positions. Having thus cleared a small area, he requested and directed the landing of two transport helicopters for the evacuation of the dead and wounded. He then assisted in the mopping up and final seizure of the battalion's objective. His gallant initiative and heroic conduct reflected great credit upon himself and were in keeping with the highest traditions of the Marine Corps and the United States Naval Services."

MICHIGAN'S GOVERNOR ROMNEY

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, the Michigan ship of state has been captained well during the last 4 years by our exceedingly able and popular Governor, George Romney. On November 8, 1966, the people of Michigan resoundingly reaffirmed their approval of Governor Romney's leadership when they reelected him to a full 4-year term by the overwhelming margin of nearly 530,000 votes.

Not only has Governor Romney uprighted a ship that was listing badly, but he has also brought new meaning to the concept of self-government and citizenship responsibility.

In two recent inaugural addresses delivered in Michigan, one at Lansing on January 2 and another at Marquette on February 4, Governor Romney eloquently set before the people of Michigan the record of his administration as well as an outline of its future goals.

Because I know that his inaugural addresses will be of general interest, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Inaugural Address, "A New Generation of Progress," Gov. George Romney, Lansing, Mich., January 2, 1967

Reverend clergy, fellow oath takers, friends and citizens:

These are our goals.

We have sworn to uphold the laws and constitutions, and pledged to grapple boldly with the future with all the vigor and wisdom we possess.

We seek a Michigan where every individual is free to develop to his full capacity; where barriers of poverty, social injustice and discrimination, including those erected in the minds and hearts of men, have been torn down; where vocational training and higher education are within the reach of every child, and each is equally free to choose his path; where the skills and contributions of the people meet their economic needs; where quality housing, productive employment and equal opportunity are available to all.

We seek a Michigan in which all our people share in a good life—a better life than most of us have today—based on qualities of heart and mind and spirit, as well as on material well-being.

We seek thriving, well-planned cities with efficient, integrated governments; an end to urban blight and ugliness; a new transportation network, unmarred by congestion, frustration and delay; green parks and open spaces accenting and enlivening our communities; an unequalled abundance of fresh clean water for all its many uses, and pure air.

We seek a Michigan where heightened citizen respect for law strengthens the framework of stability and order within which opportunity and freedom flourish.

We seek a Michigan where citizens throughout our state can walk or ride the streets, by day or night, without fear of physical assault, property loss, or traffic tragedy.

We seek government directed by those who put the public trust above all personal considerations, and set a high example both of public morality and private conduct; and politics adhering to standards that make public service an honored and preferred pursuit.

We seek more enlightened activity by private enterprise and voluntary associations, and a rebirth of cooperation not only among all governmental levels but between government and private effort, to achieve the goals which none can reach alone.

We seek a Michigan where those who strive to overcome handicaps or misfortune will receive personalized assistance in their area of need, whether mental, physical, material, social, cultural, or spiritual—assistance which is already within our available skill, time, and means to provide. Of course, Washington would have to let us use more efficiently more of our own means.

We seek the use of our expanded leisure time as an opportunity not merely for greater self-gratification, but for self-fulfillment through faith, knowledge, work, citizenship, brotherhood and service.

And most of all, we seek a renewal of the vitality and strength of family life and personal conduct, on which all else depends. For the strength of society is rooted in the strength, responsibility, and character of individual lives.

Michigan's accomplishments of the past 4 years have laid a stronger foundation for the achievement of these goals.

Together we have fought to strengthen the people's control of state and local self-government.

Together we have secured a modern constitution. The executive branch is more effective, the judicial branch stronger, and the legislative branch more representative.

Our actions have reflected the determination to treat every citizen with justice, impartiality, and equality before the law.

We have given equitable treatment to both workers and employers, and restored Michigan's reputation as a responsible and responsive state—a dynamic state—a good state in which to live, invest, work and play.

We have overcome past deficiencies and achieved new heights in education, health care, recreation, and other fields of public service.

We have worked closely with leaders and citizens in other states to strengthen the forces of self-government controlled by the people and responsive to their needs and aspirations.

And we have encouraged the active participation of self-reliant individuals, families, private institutions, economic organizations, and voluntary associations in solving their own problems and meeting pressing needs—independent of governmental subsidy, regulation, and control.

Together we have passed through a period of preparation. The people have a new attitude about their state—a new involvement in its affairs—a new optimism for its future.

And I am confident that the people of Michigan—responsible individuals devoted to the common good—are able and ready to supply the sweat, sacrifice, and service required to reach our goals.

For the people have spoken, and this is what they said:

"We, the people—we are individuals. Treat us as individuals. Don't try to lump us into faceless special-interest categories.

"We refuse to be neatly packed and labeled into economic, religious, racial, or ethnic blocs to be used by political brokers. We will not be deceived by promises of group favoritism and special privilege. We're not for sale.

"Give us a government that serves us, not one that makes us dependent and stifles us—a government we can control, not one that manages our lives."

That's what the people said.

The people are awake. They see the futility of trying to meet tomorrow's complex human problems with yesterday's over-simplified governmental answers.

The people feel the stifling consequences of over-centralization, conformity, manipulated consensus, and arbitrary unchecked power, whether public or private.

The people recognize the limitations of efforts to improve the lives of men and their society by material means alone.

The people sense there is a better way to meet their needs and still preserve the expression and integrity of individual personality.

The way has been prepared. The foundation has been laid.

The time has come for Michigan to move ahead into a new generation of progress.

And a new generation of people is prepared to provide much of the driving faith, imagination, intelligence, and resolve that this new generation of progress will require.

More than half the people of Michigan are not yet 30 years of age. We have no greater resource—no more precious asset—than their energy and idealism.

Young people in increasing numbers are finding an unequalled creative channel for their idealism in voluntary service to their fellow men. We have ample evidence in their enthusiastic response to the Peace Corps and to our own student volunteer movement here in Michigan.

And politically, young voters are in the vanguard of the resurgence of public confidence in the capacity of state and local governments to do a job for the people and do it close to home, where the people can scrutinize more closely the conduct of officials and get involved themselves in shaping public programs and performing public tasks.

The faltering of over-centralization, the solid accomplishments of state governments in recent years, the expressed approval of the voters, and the confidence of youth will give self-government at the state and local level a second chance to prove its worth.

As a state, the most important question Michigan can ask is, "Are we ready to take full advantage of our second chance?"

For if we fail to use it, the people will have no choice but to turn back to distant federal power for the services that state, local, private, and voluntary effort can most effectively perform.

If that should happen, our lofty vision of tomorrow could crumble into dust. Our hopes for a new generation of progress would be crushed.

For a sound political, social, and economic structure cannot be built from the top down. It must be raised from the bottom up.

It must be founded on the rock of individual effort and responsibility. It must be shaped by the foundation of family life. It must rest on the sturdy joists, beams, and framework of state, local, and independent institutions.

On this Inauguration Day, I pledge unceasing effort to justify your confidence not only in your chosen leaders but in state government itself.

I pledge to offer additional specific proposals in the weeks and months ahead to advance us further toward our goals.

I pledge that we will not drift down the easy paths of least resistance.

I pledge to confront you and your representatives with the hard choices necessary if Michigan's bright promise is to be fulfilled.

I pledge to call upon the people of this state to heed the wise advice of Emerson: "What would you have? . . . Pay for it and take it . . . it is impossible to get anything without its price."

The price of personal joy and freedom through self-government and personal responsibility is always high; but I believe the people of Michigan will respond.

For the people's leaders can be the architects, but the people themselves must be the builders of Michigan's new generation of progress.

Its hallmarks: Recognition of the sanctity of each individual personality; wide-open doors for individual opportunity and self-fulfillment; respect for God, parents, home, and law; receptivity to the idealistic fervor of the young; readiness to sweat, sacrifice, and serve; and resolution to use not government alone, but all the tools at our command to build a better Michigan.

This is the path which will lead, with God's help, to the fulfillment of our goals.

In the words of Winston Churchill: "Come, then, let us go forward together with our united strength."

SECOND INAUGURAL ADDRESS, GOV. GEORGE ROMNEY, MARQUETTE, FEBRUARY 4, 1967

It's great to be here in Marquette today, so we can get away from all that snow in Lansing!

This is the third time that the people of the Upper Peninsula have honored us with a second inauguration ceremony. Lenore, Helen, Bill, and I appreciate it deeply. And we're particularly delighted that something new has been added this year—your great Senator and Congressman, BOB GRIFFIN and PHIL RUPPE.

The Upper Peninsula inaugural is a happy new tradition. It has real significance. Its purpose is not to get the Upper Peninsula apart from the rest of Michigan, but to reassert the fundamental unity of our state and of its people.

We have taken the same oaths—to uphold the laws and constitutions and to serve the people—that we took five weeks ago in Lansing. And my inaugural message, whether in Lansing or Marquette, is fundamentally the same.

For as I said two years ago, at Iron Mountain-Kingsford, "By these ceremonies . . . all of us here are reaffirming the fact that Michigan is indivisible."

These are our goals for all of Michigan—for the people of both our great peninsulas.

We seek a Michigan where every individual is free to develop to his full capacity; where barriers of poverty, social injustice and discrimination, including those erected in the minds and hearts of men, have been torn down; where vocational training and higher education are within the reach of every child, and each is equally free to choose his path; where the skills and contributions of the people meet their economic needs; where quality housing, productive employment and equal opportunity are available to all.

We seek a Michigan in which all our people share a better life, based on qualities of heart and mind and spirit, as well as on material well-being.

We seek thriving, well-planned communities with efficient, integrated governments; an end to urban blight and ugliness: a new transportation network; green parks and open spaces; an unequalled abundance of fresh clean water for all its many uses, and pure air.

We seek a Michigan that is united physically and economically, free from artificial barriers between our two peninsulas. The present stifling tolls on the Mackinac Bridge must be removed.

We seek a Michigan where heightened citizen respect for law strengthens the framework of stability and order within which opportunity and freedom flourish.

We seek a Michigan where citizens can walk or ride the streets, by day or night, without fear of physical assault, property loss, or traffic tragedy.

We seek a Michigan where each individual who strives to overcome handicaps or misfortune will receive personalized assistance in his area of need, whether mental, physical, material, social, cultural, or spiritual.

We seek government directed by those who put the public trust above all personal considerations—officials whose personal example makes public service an honored and preferred pursuit.

We seek more enlightened activity by private enterprise and voluntary associations, and a rebirth of cooperation among all governmental levels and between government and private effort, to achieve the goals which none can reach alone.

And most of all, we seek a renewal of the vitality and strength of family life and personal conduct, on which all else depends. For the strength of society is rooted in the strength, responsibility, and character of individual lives.

Michigan's accomplishments of the past four years have laid a stronger foundation for the achievement of these goals.

And the people of the Upper Peninsula have shared in both the effort and the benefits.

The Upper Peninsula is one of America's last great physical frontiers. Its promising potential is becoming more and more a bright reality.

In four years, employment in the U.P. has increased seven per cent, while unemployment has declined 39 per cent. Utilities, businesses, and industries are expanding at record rates. Associations for voluntary action to lick local problems are gaining strength. And for two years in a row, the Upper Peninsula has been the home of the "Michigan Product of the Year."

In three years, state aid to Upper Peninsula schools increased 25 times faster than pupil enrollment.

Operating appropriations for your two fine state universities have more than doubled in four years.

The two community colleges in the Upper Peninsula, like those in the lower peninsula, are receiving about 50 per cent more state aid per pupil than four years ago.

Services for the mentally ill and retarded, including new community services programs, have been substantially increased.

Expanded conservation, highway, and tourist programs are developing the Upper Peninsula's natural resource and recreational potential.

And we have made progress toward removing the tolls on the Big Mac Bridge. Two years ago, I proposed the issuance of new bonds to refinance the Bridge at lower interest rates, thus permitting elimination of the tolls. Unfortunately, interest rates went up before the legislature acted. But we did secure stand-by legislation which can lead to reduction or elimination of the tolls when interest rates go down again.

Today, interest rates have begun to decline. As a result, the prospects for refinancing the Bridge are brighter now than at any time since the enabling legislation was passed.

Meanwhile, we are actively pursuing the possibility of removing the Bridge tolls through action by the newly-established Upper Great Lakes Economic Development Commission. This is a joint body representing Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, and the federal government. Its objective is to foster the economic growth of the Upper Great Lakes Area—and in my opinion, no single governmental step would contribute more to the economic resurgence of the Upper Peninsula and the entire area than removal of the Mackinac Bridge tolls.

Yes, these last four years have been years of accomplishment for all of Michigan.

Together we have fought to strengthen the people's control of state and local self-government.

Together we have secured a modern constitution.

Our actions have reflected the determination to treat every citizen with justice, impartiality, and equality before the law.

We have given equitable treatment to both workers and employers, and restored Michigan's reputation as a responsible and responsive state—a dynamic state—a good state in which to live, invest, work and play.

We have overcome past deficiencies and achieved new heights in education, health care, recreation, and other fields of public service.

We have worked closely with leaders and citizens in other states to strengthen the forces of self-government controlled by the people and responsive to their needs and aspirations.

And we have encouraged the active participation of self-reliant individuals, families, private institutions, economic organizations, and voluntary associations in solving their own problems and meeting pressing needs—independent of governmental subsidy, regulation, and control.

Together we have passed through a period of preparation. The people have a new attitude about their state—a new involvement in its affairs—a new optimism for its future.

And I am confident that the people of Michigan—responsible individuals devoted to the common good—are able and ready to supply the sweat, sacrifice, and service required to reach our goals.

The people are awake. They see the futility of trying to meet tomorrow's complex human problems with yesterday's over-simplified governmental answers.

The people feel the stifling consequences of over-centralization, conformity, manipulated consensus, and arbitrary unchecked power, whether public or private.

The people sense there is a better way to meet their needs and still preserve the expression and integrity of individual personality.

The way has been prepared. The foundation has been laid.

The time has come for Michigan to move ahead into a new generation of progress.

And a new generation of people is prepared to provide much of the driving faith, imagination, intelligence, and resolve that this new generation of progress will require.

More than half the people of Michigan are not yet 30 years of age. We have no greater resource—no more precious asset—than their energy and idealism.

Young people in increasing numbers are finding an unequalled creative channel for their idealism in voluntary service to their fellow men.

And politically, young voters are in the vanguard of the resurgence of public confidence in the capacity of state and local governments to do a job for the people.

The faltering of over-centralization, the solid accomplishments of state governments in recent years, the expressed approval of the voters, and the confidence of youth will give self-government at the state and local level a second chance to prove its worth.

As a state, the most important question Michigan can ask is, "Are we ready to take full advantage of our second chance?"

On this Inauguration Day, I pledge to do everything in my power so that Michigan will be prepared to use this second chance fully and wisely.

I pledge unceasing effort to justify your confidence not only in your chosen leaders but in state government itself.

I pledge to confront you and your representatives with the hard choices necessary if Michigan's bright promise is to be fulfilled.

Our greatest single governmental challenge in the months ahead is to secure the financial future of state and local government in Michigan.

The job will be tough. But the need is inescapable.

Michigan must have tax reform, and tax action in this legislative session must come before spending action.

I have said before, and I say again: We will not spend more next year than we are willing to pay for in taxes.

The price of responsive and responsible state and local government is not cheap. Yet it is one of the greatest bargains ever offered, contrasted to the ultimate price of weak and ineffective government.

For if we fail—if we muff our second chance—the people will have no choice but to turn back to distant federal power for the services that state, local, private, and voluntary effort can most effectively perform.

If that should happen, our lofty vision of tomorrow could crumble into dust. Our hopes for a new generation of progress would be crushed.

For as I have said so many times before, a sound political, social, and economic structure cannot be built from the top down. It must be raised from the bottom up.

It must be founded on the rock of individual effort and responsibility. It must be shaped by the foundation of family life. It must rest on the sturdy joints, beams, and framework of state, local, and independent institutions.

The price of personal joy and freedom through self-government and personal responsibility is always high. But I believe the people of Michigan will respond.

For the people's leaders can be the architects, but the people themselves must be the builders of Michigan's new generation of progress.

In the words of Winston Churchill: "Come, then, let us go forward together with our united strength."

With our united strength we can together, with the help of God, build a new generation of progress.

DR. WOODLIEF THOMAS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I regret to advise the Senate that for personal reasons, Dr. Woodlief Thomas has decided to leave the committee staff, and February 28 will mark the close of Dr. Thomas' services to the Banking and Currency Committee as chief economist.

Dr. Thomas came with the committee in January 1965, after a very distinguished career with the Federal Reserve System, which began in 1920 and included service as Director of the Board's Division of Research and Statistics, Economist to the Federal Open Market Committee, and Adviser to the Board. Following this, Dr. Thomas spent 2 years in Chile conducting a study of Chile's capital market situation for the World Bank. One of the most noteworthy services performed by Dr. Thomas for the Banking and Currency Committee was the study of the balance-of-payments situation conducted in 1965 in the Subcommittee on International Finance under the chairmanship of the Senator from Maine [Senator MUSKIE]. Dr. Thomas' great knowledge of the subject and his familiarity with possible witnesses representing all points of view made it possible for him to set up outstanding hearings.

The Banking and Currency Committee has been privileged to have had the benefit of the knowledge, experience, and sound judgment of Dr. Thomas. We shall miss Dr. Thomas and we wish him and Mrs. Thomas well.

THE 50TH MILESTONE IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, in 1917, while a headline-catching conflict raged, President Woodrow Wilson quietly put his signature on the first bill providing for assistance to vocational education.

The Smith-Hughes Act was enacted, providing an annual grant of $7.2 million to the States: $3 million for agricultural training, $3 million for trade, industrial, and home economics education, $1 million for teacher training, and the rest for Federal costs of administering the act.

This was but a beginning, and the scope of this aid to vocational education has evolved with our economy, our changing work force, and a technology that is constantly emerging and growing in complexity.

So milestone after milestone has been added as our land has risen to the challenge. In 1946, the George-Barden Act authorized $28.5 million to be divided among the same categories as provided for in the original act, with addition of education for distributive occupations.

In 1956, fishery trades and occupations were added to vocational categories of the George-Barden Act, while authorizing an annual appropriation of $375,000 for vocational education in those trades and industries and in distributive occupations.

Also in 1956, the Health Amendments Act added title II, which specified practical nursing for inclusion under the act, with a $5 million annual appropriation.

In 1958 the National Defense Education Act further amended the George-Barden Act by authorizing $15 million annually to train highly skilled technicians.

In 1961, the Area Redevelopment Act provided for training or retraining of unemployed or underemployed persons in redevelopment areas.

In 1962, the Manpower Development and Training Act authorized a total of $951 million for a 4-year program of training similar to that under ARA, but broader and not limited to redevelopment areas.

The Vocational Education Assistance Act of 1963 has been tailored so that it will continue to meet growing needs through its flexibility. All parts of this program now mesh well together.

So it seems vocational education has come of age. All these years it has quietly and with few headlines performed a vital function, training uncounted numbers of essential technicians who make our society run on a day-to-day basis.

Where would we be without their services? It is only now that we are coming to realize that not all of our students can attain or even desire a college education. But many of these students want a technical education, which will enable them to be earners of fine livings and taxpaying contributors to the welfare of their individual communities.

Mr. President, I am a devoted believer in the cause of vocational education, and am doing all that I can in my home State of New Mexico to aid our forward-looking educators in this field in making available to the youth of our State the finest in vocational education.

The potential dropout, dropout, underemployed, and person whose skills have been dated by advancing technology can all find hope in technical and vocational education.

It is not a flashy program. It does not start picket lines in progress. It functions quietly, almost anonymously. But it does more real good for more people than many other lavishly funded programs have done.

It creates taxpayers rather than destroys them.

DENTAL CARE FOR CHILDREN

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, among the 12 proposals constituting the President's 1967 message on America's children and youth, there appears one of especial interest on dental care for children. One of the President's specific recommendations is legislation to authorize a pilot program of dental care for children in areas of acute poverty.

Dental care is one of the most ignored areas in the field of child health today. I have heard dentists refer to it, with some justification, as the "stepchild" of this area.

The dental profession, to my knowledge, has long worked to remedy this situation. Its most recent action, taken by the American Dental Association in November of last year, was to adopt a dental health program for children that would pledge the appropriate private and public resources to a cooperative effort to solve this longstanding deficiency in our national life.

As far back as last April, President Johnson spoke publicly of his personal concern. His proposal in the message delivered on February 8 gives substance to his intentions. The continuing cooperation of the dental profession can, I know, be counted on. Indeed, the president of the American Dental Association, Dr. William A. Garrett of my home State of Georgia, has already issued a statement commending the President's action and pledging the profession to further consultation and cooperation.

In the near future, the President will be sending us the specifics of his proposal. I await them, as I know do all my colleagues, with great interest. I, too, am eager to work in common purpose to extend to poor children the scope and quality of dental care they need and deserve to have.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement by Dr. William A. Garrett, of Atlanta, president of the American Dental Association, on the message to Congress on children and youth.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF DR. WILLIAM A. GARRETT, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION, ON DENTAL CARE PROPOSAL MADE BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON IN HIS FEBRUARY 8 MESSAGE TO CONGRESS ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

The American Dental Association is pleased indeed at this expression of the President's intent to join with the dental profession in its efforts to do something substantial about the appalling rate of dental disease among needy children.

It is a problem that the dental profession has long recognized and fought to remedy. Our most recent action, taken in November of 1966, was to adopt a Dental Health Program for Children, which brings together, in a unified, cooperative effort, the resources of both the private and public sectors of the nation and provides a framework for constructive action now and in the future.

The section on dental health that appears in the President's Message on America's Children and Youth is not sufficiently detailed for me to be able to judge how closely the thinking of the Administration is to that of the profession. I am confident, however, that consultation will show large areas of agreement and the Association stands ready to participate in such discussions at the earliest possible moment.

HIGHWAY FUNDING

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am pleased that Transportation Secretary Alan S. Boyd has announced a slight thaw in the freeze of Federal highway construction money. But for Pennsylvania this will mean very little relief in our hard-pressed highway program.

I am informed by Pennsylvania Highway Secretary Robert Bartlett that the Commonwealth had planned to defer $37.4 million in Federal interstate highway projects—principally in the Philadelphia and Pittsburgh areas—as a result of the previously announced freeze. This was work scheduled through the first 6 months of 1967.

Fortunately, however, the administrations of Governors Scranton and Shafer did not allow highway building in Pennsylvania to come to a complete halt. Seizing the initiative, the Commonwealth pledged to use its own funds to finance entirely ABC primary, urban, and secondary construction—work for which Federal assistance would normally have been available on an even 50–50 basis. A total of $42 million in State money now has been committed for ABC work for which Federal funding would otherwise have been obtainable.

This move, in turn, made it possible for Pennsylvania to realize the greatest return on its reduced Federal dollars by allocating this assistance to interstate highway construction exclusively. As a result, the Commonwealth had $70 million for interstate highway projects—a figure far greater than it would have been if Pennsylvania had taken no action other than to wait for a Federal "handout."

Some relief is now in sight with the announcement that Secretary Boyd is releasing $175 million of the deferred funds. When you carve that up among 50 States, however, it leaves little enough for Pennsylvania. Our $37.4 million deficit will largely remain.

Money from the Federal highway trust fund can be spent for no other purpose. Thus, in my opinion, the withholding of such funds is budget gimmickry designed to give a false impression that the Federal Government is fighting inflation. I look forward to a further acceleration of vital Federal highway programs.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I have read the President's message on the District of Columbia with great interest. It depicts with clarity and precision the problems faced by our Nation's Capital City and provides a hard, reasoned program for overcoming them.

I was particularly encouraged to see that the President remains undaunted by the setbacks of the 89th Congress in achieving home rule. To my mind, District home rule, along with District representation, is fundamental to an effective attack on the problems outlined in the message. I do not know how any community can marshal its civic resources with any real effectiveness except behind a responsible political leadership of its own choosing. By civic resources I mean much more than mere money. I mean a sense of civic identity, a pride of place that makes a man speak of "my city" in the same way that he speaks of "my home, my castle."

How helpless the citizen of Washington must feel in the face of his city's problems. What recourse does he have against ineffective civic leadership?

However, even if we are not moved by this American anomaly of 800,000 politically voteless citizens in the midst of the center of the democratic world, simple considerations of government efficiency and economy must dictate support for the President's recommendations. The appointed commission form of municipal government is simply not designed for big city management in this day and age. Government by committee is too cumbersome to permit the flexible use of municipal resources required to meet the shifting conditions and problems of the modern city. Efforts to react quickly to civic crises are doubly doomed in Washington, for the committee governing it is, in turn, governed by two other committees. Whatever the conscientiousness and dedication of the Members of the House and Senate, they are occupied by many other problems of the Nation and the world and cannot give adequate attention to the affairs of the District. And whatever the leadership quality of the men who hold the thankless job of District Commissioners, they are hedged at every turn by the network of Federal statutes under which they must operate.

There can be no question of the need for home rule, whether on grounds of morality or management. The reorganization plan announced by the President is a step in the right direction, but it is only a step; it will be useful as an interim device to prepare the way for home rule, but it is no substitute for it. Home rule must come to Washington, and it will come.

HOSPITAL SUPPLIES FOR RIO GRANDE DO SUL, BRAZIL

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I have on other occasions called attention to the relationship which has developed between the Indiana Partners of the Alliance and Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil, working cooperatively with the Alliance for Progress. Last year, a number of Indiana hospitals agreed to donate more than $100,000 worth of hospital supplies and equipment through the Indiana Partners of the Alliance to hospitals in Rio Grande do Sul.

Under the able leadership of Mr. James E. Nicholas, general manager of the Indiana Motor Truck Association, more than 11 tons of equipment were collected and transported, first to a central depot at Bakalar Air Force Base, then to New York City for shipment to Brazil. A number of trucking companies joined together in providing this transportation free of charge, delivering two large trailer loads of material to the eastern seaboard.

An article in the January 1967 issue of the Fifth Wheel, which is the official publication of the Indiana Motor Truck Association, Inc., described the coordinated efforts which went into this operation. As a tribute to the unselfish service rendered by the Indiana Motor Truck Association and its member firms to the successful completion of this important project, I ask unanimous consent that this brief account be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. As the author, Robert Loy, pointed out, the "people of Rio Grande do Sul will have improved treatment in their hospitals, thanks in great part to the generosity of Indiana trucking people." In addition, I wish to commend those public-spirited hospitals in Indiana which so generously contributed this equipment and supplies for our good neighbors to the south.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fifth Wheel, January 1967]

TRUCKERS GIVE "FREE RIDE" TO HOSPITAL SUPPLIES FOR SOUTH AMERICA

(By Robert Loy)

Indiana truckers again have demonstrated their public spirit by giving a free ride to much-needed hospital supplies for the people of South America.

This was a program begun half a year ago, interrupted by the Viet Nam war and finally concluded in early January.

Last June, several Indiana hospitals affiliated with the Indiana Hospital Association donated more than 11 tons of surplus equipment and supplies valued at over $100,000 to hospitals in Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil.

The program was sponsored by the Indiana Partners of the Alliance, a private organization working in cooperation with the Alliance For Progress to aid the people of South America.

Rio Grande do Sul, one of the Brazilian states, is Indiana's "sister" state in this endeavor. Hospitals there are in great need of modern equipment.

When the equipment collection was made in June, the Indiana Motor Truck Association coordinated the transportation of it from several cities in Indiana to Bakalar Air Force Base near Columbus.

Trucking companies which provided free transportation included A. & H. Truck line, Clemans Truck Line, Commercial Motor Freight, Inc. of Indiana, Courier-Newsom Express, Crutcher Brothers, Renner's Express and McLean Trucking Co.

These companies, their personnel and equipment performed magnificently and delivered the equipment to Bakalar on schedule.

The Partners of the Alliance working with the U.S. Department of State arranged for transportation by ship for the equipment from New York.

This meant transportation would have to be provided from Bakalar to New York.

Again the Indiana Motor Truck Association stepped into the picture and four of its member companies volunteered to haul the equipment at no charge.

Eastern Express, Inc. and Spector Motor Freight System each made a trailer available at Indianapolis and these trailers were pulled to Bakalar to be loaded, and returned by Courier-Newsom power units.

In the meantime, Lovelace Truck Service brought a load of dental equipment to Indianapolis which had been stored in Terre Haute.

During the last week of December Eastern and Spector pulled their loaded trailers to New York from where the equipment was to leave by ocean freighter early in January.

There were 89 crates, cartons and pallets of the hospital materials weighing 23,292 pounds and occupying 2,020 cubic feet of space.

Included were such items as an iron lung, sterilizers, surgical instruments, surgical tables, beds, special treatment devices and an incubator.

Thus, the people of Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil will have improved treatment facilities in their hospitals thanks in great part to the generosity of Indiana trucking people.

Even premature babies, who otherwise would not be able to make it, will be given a chance to live by the acquisition of that incubator.

By coincidence, the governor-elect of Rio Grande do Sul, Walter Peracchi Barcellos, who took office in January, was visiting in Indianapolis when the hospital equipment was being made ready for shipment to New York.

James E. Nicholas, general manager of the IMTA, arranged for the two loaded trailers to be brought to the new IMTA Building the day before Christmas and Sr. Barcellos was able to have a first-hand look at the equipment before it was shipped to his country.

A television crew from station WFBM, Indianapolis, which is making a documentary on the Partners of the Alliance program, shot some films while Sr. Barcellos was at the IMTA headquarters. Some of this film coverage was shown on a news broadcast the same night.

Sr. Barcellos, speaking through a translator, expressed his thanks to all concerned in making the gift of hospital supplies available to his people.

ANTICRIME LEGISLATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on February 16, Senator EDWARD KENNEDY introduced three bills to help control crime and delinquency in this Nation.

S. 991 would establish Federal help in providing street lighting to prevent crime in local areas.

S. 992 would create a National Institute of Criminal Justice in the Justice Department to provide new research and new methods for the control and prevention of crime and delinquency.

And, S. 993 would create six regional Academies of Criminal Justice connected with institutions of higher learning for the study of crime control and the rehabilitation of offenders and for the development of professionally trained personnel in the correctional field.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, I am fully aware of the value of these proposals.

As a member of our subcommittee, Senator KENNEDY is equally aware of the need for both specific and comprehensive measures to improve the administration of justice in this Nation and to get at the roots of the problem of criminal behavior.

The three bills he has introduced are well thought out proposals for effective action to improve our crime control methods and to improve the treatment and rehabilitation of offenders.

I commend Senator KENNEDY for introducing these bills.

I ask that these proposals be given prompt consideration by this entire body.

And I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor to each of these measures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR RANDOLPH SUPPORTS HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—COMMENDS PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S MESSAGE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in his message on the District, President Johnson has urged the Congress to give District citizens a voice in the selection of their local officials.

I support the President's proposal.

We who live and work in our Nation's capital know that the problems of this metropolitan area reflect many of the difficulties that face other major cities across the country.

We are battling a rising crime rate, terrible traffic congestion, overcrowded schools, inadequate housing in poor neighborhoods, and the other acute problems we encounter as we try to cope with urban life in the 1960's.

An obstacle, of course, is that the residents of the District of Columbia must face these problems without redress from elected officials pledged to fulfill their obligations to the community.

I believe that the problems facing the District can be overcome, in part, when the people can elect officials directly responsive to the voter. This is the most basic proposition of our democratic life: that representative government expresses the aspirations of the electorate it represents.

The 89th Congress passed bills which voiced this principle, but there was no agreement by which to implement it. We in the 90th Congress should reach such an agreement.

The House and Senate Committees on the District of Columbia, and the District Commissioners have been performing commendably in trying to bring progress to the District.

But we know that the District Committee is one assignment that most members do avoid. I served for 7 years as the chairman of the District of Columbia Committee during 14 years of effort in the House of Representatives.

Congress is coping with the vast and complex problems of the Nation, and the District of Columbia does not receive the attention that it deserves.

The District Commissioners are able and dedicated administrators, but there is no substitute for elected officials whose tenure depends on their records, as judged by the citizens.

The President has urged us to reach agreement on home rule. I believe that justice and the cause of democratic government itself are inherent in the request.

I urge my colleagues to favorably consider the cause of home rule, and bring the tens of thousands of Americans who reside in the District of Columbia into the mainstream of our national life.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the pending business, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 655) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

EXPANSION OF U.S. MILITARY OFFENSIVE IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in connection with the pending supplemental authorization bill, when the votes are taken later in the week, I intend to bear in mind that some 600,000 of the finest young men in the United States are in southeast Asia. Unfortunately, they are fighting what has come to be an American war, in the worst place in the entire world where American soldiers could fight, and in a little area of no strategic importance whatever to the defense of the United States.

Yet, I cannot in good conscience ignore the fact that these fine young men—incidentally, the best trained, the best equipped, and the most intelligent fighting men that any nation ever put on a field of combat at any time in the history of the world—are not there of their own choosing. They are there because they have been called on by their Commander in Chief to serve overseas. Of course, we want them equipped with the best of everything that can be provided.

During the time that I was in southeast Asia—in Thailand and South Vietnam—for a period of about 3 weeks, from September 28 to October 19, 1965, I visited every air base in South Vietnam and every area of South Vietnam. During that time I spoke with many officers and enlisted men. I ate at messes with them, sometimes at noon, sometimes at night. I took down the names and addresses of more than 200 Ohio GI's serving in that stinking, filthy, dangerous area of the world.

When I spoke with our GI's from Ohio, I always asked, "Have you any problems? Have you any shortages?" They had few, if any, problems. The morale was exceptionally high.

Let no one say that the activities of some demonstrators, beatniks, publicity seekers, or draft card burners affect those men at all. One after another said, "Oh, we don't pay any attention to those fellows." Truly, those fighting men are the cream of the crop. If the war continues to expand, as apparently it is expanding, certainly the next 200,000 or the next 400,000 youngsters sent there cannot be superior to the boys already there. I hope they will be as good. They are all entitled to be cared for in the best possible manner while they are over there, because—and I want to make it crystal clear—they had no choice. They are in the Armed Forces. We are faced with the fact that our boys are there, and we must take care of them.

Mr. President, without a doubt, President Johnson is expanding the U.S. military offensive in South Vietnam and in what is called North Vietnam. Of course, historically, there are no such places as North Vietnam and South Vietnam. There never have been. The Geneva accords of 1954 specifically stated that the 17th parallel was to be a temporary demarcation line to separate the two areas into what were to be temporarily termed North Vietnam and South Vietnam. The delegates at the Geneva Convention agreed to establish a demilitarized, or neutral, zone 6 miles in width along the temporary demarcation line. This was supposed to be a neutral zone under the control of the International Control Commission, consisting of representatives from Poland, India, and Canada.

In the present expansion of the war, our heavy artillery is now being fired for the first time across the demilitarized, or neutral, zone.

In addition, as an important part of the offensive in North Vietnam, we Americans are now dropping mines in the rivers of North Vietnam, not to destroy large freighters from West Germany, Canada, Russia, Poland, Greece, and other nations that are trading with North Vietnam but to destroy, to blow up, sampans and small craft, regardless of whether such small boats are carrying munitions and military supplies or are loaded with children going to school or with Vietnamese families traveling on a family mission. In addition, our offensive in recent days has been accelerated by heavy firing from our warships off the coast of North Vietnam.

However, during recent months we have read nothing of any offensive by the ARVN forces. We have read of the acceleration of our offensive, but what has become, a neutral leader could ask, of the so-called friendly forces of South Vietnam? In other words, for weeks and weeks no mention has been made in any newspaper in the world, to my knowledge, of any offensive being carried on by the so-called South Vietnamese Army. Approximately 118,000 soldiers of the army of South Vietnam—I mean soldiers of the army of the Saigon junta of 10 generals who overthrew the civil government of Saigon in June 1965—deserted from the so-called South Vietnamese Army during 1966. Now the leaders of the Saigon junta apparently make no pretense that they are fighting the Vietcong.

This has become, it is sad to relate, an American land war. Apparently the aim of our offensive is to make North Vietnam uninhabitable by men, women, children, and even by the water buffalo, which are so essential to enable farm families to exist.

In the south, American attack-and-destroy missions in the provinces to the north and west of Saigon, have been laying waste to the countryside. Wave after wave of B–52's have destroyed some 28 square miles no farther than 30 miles from Saigon. This destruction with magnesium bombs and with our artillery has been so tremendous that an American military spokesman said triumphantly that our attack looked like a Fourth of July celebration.

What it looked like to the people of four little villages within 30 miles of Saigon is something else. As one peasant woman said:

> I was very poor in my village, but I did not mind that. I wanted to stay. First, the planes passed over our fields. My husband didn't know what to do. He stood up. They killed him. I wish I had stayed and been killed, too.

She and 6,000 other natives of those four villages so close to Saigon were evacuated by the American forces. Those who survived are now in refugee camps operated not by South Vietnamese armed forces or South Vietnamese officials, but by Americans.

One of the four villages, Ben Suc, was typical of the others. It is now a ghost town with graves. The gardens are unattended. Every hut in that little village has been destroyed.

This is an American offensive that will be bitterly remembered and spoken of in Asia 100 years from now.

RELEASE OF THREE AMERICAN CIVILIANS FROM SAIGON PRISON

Mr. President, I now advert to a very sad and distressing situation. Three American civilians were released from prison in Saigon last week, after the men had alleged that they and other Americans, who are still jailed had been sentenced by a corrupt Saigon court and had lived in terror of being murdered by bribe-hungry wardens. The three Americans who were released under what was purported to be a delayed lunar New Year amnesty, had each been sentenced to serve 5 years on charges of currency manipulation. Two of those released, and four Americans still in jail, stated in writing that they were imprisoned on technicalities and primarily for extortion purposes by the South Vietnamese. One of those still in prison, Merle V. Brown, is a resident of Worthington, Ohio.

Mr. President, I can understand something about this matter because I recall distinctly when I was in Saigon along with Senator Cannon of the Committee on Armed Services, I remember one morning we both interviewed the flamboyant Prime Minister Ky. Prime Minister Ky, although he is Prime Minister of South Vietnam, was born and reared in what is termed North Vietnam. He was serving in the French Colonial Army which was fighting the Vietnamese forces; in other words, he was fighting the forces of liberation back in 1954 when the French were trying to hold on to their lush Indochinese empire and were compelled to do so by force and violence. In the end, of course, they failed. Prime Minister Ky was in the French forces as an air force pilot in training.

In June of 1965, he was appointed Prime Minister of the Saigon government by 10 generals who overthrew the civilian government. Who are those 10 generals? Nine of the 10 generals were from North Vietnam and served in the French Colonial Army trying to suppress the forces of the National Liberation Front in the war of liberation. The civilian government of Saigon was overthrown by these 10 generals, nine of whom we Americans, during our Revolution, would have termed "Tories" because they were fighting on the side of the colonial oppressors.

Mr. President, to return to our interview with Prime Minister Ky, he is a very flamboyant, overdressed, young man. He has been in power in Saigon since June of 1965. I assert that without the support of the American forces and without the support of our CIA, which helped put him in power at the outset, he could not remain in power in Saigon for more than 1 or 2 weeks.

Mr. President, the interview to which I refer took place on a Wednesday morning. In the course of our discussion, Prime Minister Ky said, "We arrested a merchant." He told us the man's name. Ky said he was a millionaire Chinese merchant and a leading businessman in Saigon.

On this particular Wednesday morning he said his police had arrested that man for black marketing and that he himself was going to try him on the charge of black marketing the next day, Thursday; and that they were going to shoot him the following Tuesday. It was all cut and dried. That is the kind of democratic prime minister we are supporting in South Vietnam.

Recently, these American prisoners smuggled out of prison a letter to the U.S. Ambassador, and to Prime Minister Ky.

It was subsequently learned that on February 8, U.S. mission employees went to the prison and warned the Americans not to "get involved in trying to expose corruption in the government"—referring to the Saigon government—"because it would do you no good."

Those already released from jail in Saigon are Louis J. Fraser from Massachusetts, Coy G. Bond from Colorado, and Leroy F. Freeden from California. Fraser had been in prison since late 1965; Freeden, since July 4, 1966; and Bond, since July 27, 1966. But in the prison in Saigon there is still being held a gentleman by the name of Merle V. Brown of Worthington, Ohio; Bernard Elmont of New York City, P. Leo Bennett of Florida, and W. K. Char of Honolulu.

Mr. President, I do not know the facts pertaining to these other men who were arrested other than they were civilians. I do know, however, about Merle Brown of Worthington, Ohio.

His wife stated last Sunday that at the time of the trial of her husband, two aids of the Saigon court—two civilian officials of the Ky government—told her an acquittal would cost $10,000. She said she had only $5,000 and offered to pay that but had not turned it over to the court aids because she knew she could not raise the additional $5,000. Mr. President, a lawyer friend of mine in Columbus has obtained a statement from Mrs. Brown which I have not yet seen. It may be that after receiving it, I shall read it in the Chamber later this week.

Mr. President, all of those men except Mr. Char from Honolulu, who is awaiting trial, were sentenced to minimum prison terms of 5 years, and were also assessed heavy fines by the special court set up allegedly to fight corruption—to fight corruption, yet court officials offered to free Merle Brown if his unfortunate wife could raise $10,000.

The smuggled letter to the Ambassador from the seven Americans held in prison along with 3,000 Vietcong prisoners states that they had been on a hunger strike for almost a month because they had "nothing to lose," and that they were existing on coffee and sugar water. That letter was dated last January 30.

The letter also stated—

> We are positively convinced that we have been imprisoned primarily for extortive purposes by corrupt South Vietnamese . . . not for crimes committed against the state. We have been arrested for either minor offenses, technicalities, and in some cases only by implication, but almost all of us have been asked to pay large bribes in order to obtain acquittal at trial or amnesty after conviction.

The letter further stated that—

> The director of the Saigon prison of Prime Minister Ky reminded us that there are over 3,000 anti-American (Viet Cong) prisoners here who would murder us at the first opportunity. Due to the fact that we must leave our cells during the day, the director's threat to our lives is more than obvious.

That is just one indication of the kind of justice meted out by the Saigon government, which has United States wholehearted support.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. President, with the acceleration of the war in Vietnam, particularly the bombing of installations in North Vietnam, together with the fact that we have approximately 600,000 of the finest fighting men who have ever worn the uniform of our country in Vietnam, we hear statements regarding a declaration of war.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, as Representative at Large from Ohio, it was my duty to vote for a declaration of war against Germany and the Axis Powers and also a declaration of war against the Japanese Empire. I am not ashamed of those votes. I cast my vote to declare war on the Imperial Japanese Empire directly after the attack on us at Pearl Harbor, and I did not hesitate one moment to cast that vote. Of course, it is a sad thing to look back on it and have to remember that during my service in Congress I voted on more than one occasion to declare war.

The vote, then, was unanimous with one exception in the House of Representatives. It was unanimous in the Senate. It would not be unanimous in the Senate today were the Senate to be asked by our President to declare war on North Vietnam. In my humble opinion, it is unlikely that such a request will come to the Senate, but if it does, I know that the junior Senator from Ohio would cast his vote against a declaration of war.

Then, following such a declaration, because undoubtedly a very large majority of the Senate would vote in favor of it, the junior Senator from Ohio would vote to supply our officers and men with all the equipment and support which they would require—and I would do that gladly.

I do not know what reason would be given for requesting a declaration of war, but I do know that when I first went to South Vietnam I had previously swallowed entirely the statements from the Pentagon and the propaganda that we read in our papers. Before I went there, I believed that all of the Vietcong were Communists; that they were infiltrators from the north.

In one of the first conversations I had with General Westmoreland—whom I admire as a great Army officer—he stated to me that the bulk of the VC fighting in the Mekong Delta, south and west of Saigon, were born and reared in the Mekong Delta. In other words, they were from South Vietnam.

The second officer in command, Gen. Richard Stilwell, told me very emphatically that 80 percent of the VC fighting us in the Mekong Delta were born and reared in that very territory. Yet this civil war has become an American war.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wonder if the Senator obtained any information as to approximately what percentage of Vietcong are Communists, what percentage can read and write, what percentage have studied Karl Marx, whether or not it is actually the case that all of the Vietcong who are killed there are Communists. We constantly read and hear that so many Communists were killed yesterday, for example. Did the Senator get any information in that respect?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I am glad to try to answer that question. I shall not name him, because I do not want him to be rebuked by some armchair general in the Pentagon, but a very high-ranking general in our Armed Forces in Vietnam, when I asked him that question, told me that very few officers and men, fighting us in Vietnam had ever heard of Karl Marx or knew who he was. That is answering one part of the question.

Obviously, North Vietnam is a Communist country. However, there is every indication that it may well be a nationalist Communist country.

Well, Tito's Yugoslavia is a nationalist Communist country, but it is a well recognized fact that it is not a satellite of the Soviet Union.

It has been said that if all of Vietnam could be neutralized, until there was a reunification which restored Vietnam to its correct historical status as one country, North Vietnam could remain a nationalist Communist country and South Vietnam could—it is hoped—be what it is not today—governed by those selected by democratic processes.

The other day, in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, General Gavin said we are confronted with a new situation. Instead of Red China being a nation that should be feared by the free nations of the world, it is itself involved in insurrection and is in deep internal turmoil and unrest because of factions fighting for control. Therefore, Ho Chi Minh today is in an excellent position to withstand pressure from the Chinese Communist regime. He is independent. After all, he was imprisoned, toward the end of World War II, in a Chinese dungeon for a year. Very definitely, he is not part and parcel of Chinese communism. The fact is that the boys and girls and men and women who are fighting in the VC forces are illiterate, ignorant people. They would not know what the communism of Karl Marx is. They have never heard of it. They know as much about Karl Marx as Prime Minister Ky knows about democracy.

On another subject, we hear much about the aggression from the North from supposedly knowledgeable men on our General Staff and from the Defense Department, including Secretary of Defense McNamara. I have heard estimates that 45,000 hard-core Communist soldiers from North Vietnam have infiltrated into South Vietnam and are fighting there.

The number of infiltrators has leveled off recently and there are fewer now. The fact is that our country, too, has brought into South Vietnam more than 53,000 men to add to the forces of the United States and of South Vietnam, if they have any armed forces in being there now.

Of these 53,000, approximately 48,000 are fine combat soldiers from the Republic of Korea. There are 2,000 noncombat engineers from the Philippine Republic. There are a few hundred soldiers from New Zealand, and a very few thousand from Australia.

To return to the approximately 50,000 soldiers from the Republic of Korea, they are fine fighting men. Their training has resulted from the outpouring of many millions of dollars of American taxpayers' money. I spent time in the Republic of Korea. I reviewed, together with Senator CANNON and others, the Tiger Division, just before it left for Vietnam on American ships.

During the American Revolution, Mr. President, Lord North, for King George III, made an arrangement with the Duke of Hesse-Cassel in Germany to furnish thousands of Hessian soldiers, and the British Government paid thousands of pounds to the Duke of Hesse-Cassel for those soldiers, and sent them over to the American Colonies to fight on the side of the British soldiers. We contemptuously termed those Hessian soldiers "mercenaries."

Today, the Pentagon says, "Oh, no, these Koreans are not mercenaries." However, it is true that our President has added $150 million to the treasury of the Republic of South Korea. It is true that when President Marcos of the Philippines was in our country, we increased the allowance of aid to the Philippine Republic by $50 million at one time and $100 million another, and following that event, the Philippines sent over the noncombat engineers. But it would be horrifying to the generals in the Pentagon were we to term them "mercenaries."

The distinguished Senator from Tennessee asked about the percentage of Vietcong who are Communists. Throughout their history the Vietnamese people had, over the centuries, repelled Chinese aggression time and time again. During World War II, Vietnam was taken over by the Japanese. Immediately after the war the Japanese withdrew. Almost immediately the forces of liberation and freedom erupted in Vietnam. The French tried to restore their colonial empire in Indochina. They failed. Only 12,000 Frenchmen surrendered at Dienbienphu, but France had been bled white, one might say, by the fighting. So, following the Geneva agreement—which we approved but which we did not sign—240,000 French soldiers were withdrawn from that lush Indo-Chinese empire, consisting of what are now termed Cambodia, Laos, and North and South Vietnam.

Following Dienbienphu, a Nationalist government was formed in North Vietnam under the leadership of Ho Chi Minh. They had no elections. Ninety percent of the population were illiterate peasants. They had been waging guerrilla warfare for a long time. So, Ho Chi Minh took over.

In the Geneva agreement, it was specifically provided that there would be an election in 1956—an election throughout both North and South Vietnam. General Eisenhower, in his reminiscences has stated that it was well understood that if such an election were held, Ho Chi Minh would have received 80 percent of the votes of the people of Vietnam, both north and south of the 17th parallel.

So, at our insistence the election was called off. Then the CIA brought Diem who was then living in this country and he was installed as President. He was not elected President, but he became President of the Saigon government, and ruled until 1963 when he was overthrown by a coup in which I am afraid the truth is—and it will come out in time—our military and our CIA participated.

Mr. President, yesterday on the television program "Meet the Press," I listened to Gen. Earle Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

It was somewhat terrifying to me, as an American who in his earlier days, during World War II served for most of 37 months in the combat zones in north Africa and Italy—having been one of the most terrified soldiers in the Fifth Army at the Anzio beachhead—to hear the Chief of Staff of our Armed Forces discussing the foreign policy of our country and not military matters.

The Chief of Staff was asked: "Do you favor an extension of the test ban treaty?"

We entered into a limited nuclear test ban treaty with Great Britain, the Soviet Union and other nations. That treaty was patiently sought for by three American Presidents, President Truman, President Eisenhower, and President Kennedy. The treaty was finally achieved during the administration of the late great President John F. Kennedy, due to his efforts and those of his Ambassador at Large, Averell Harriman. An extension of the limited nuclear test ban treaty is now being considered.

Mr. President, our military leaders should adhere to military matters and not try to shape the foreign policy of the United States.

I think that President Eisenhower in one of the final statements he made before leaving the Presidency was correct when he warned the Nation against the military and industrial complex endangering our liberty and our Constitution.

Mr. President, these are not being imperiled by a rag-tag group of perhaps as many as 8,000 despicable Communists in this country. Far more dangerous than that is the militarist-industrial complex against which President Eisenhower warned.

General Wheeler was asked: "Do you favor an extension of this limited nuclear ban treaty?" He replied: "No."

This, during a period of time in which our people in the State Department and other high administration officials are patiently trying to work out an extension of the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

Knowledgeable people know—of course, the militarists know, but do not seem to care—that in this grim period of international anarchy the time is at hand when the United States and the Soviet Union—the two most powerful nations on earth with the nuclear capacity to practically destroy each other—must realize that we are facing an era in which we should strive for coexistence. If we do not achieve coexistence, we will be confronted with coannihilation.

I take a dim view of a high-ranking general, such as General Wheeler, making the statements he made on "Meet the Press." The general was asked whether we could withdraw a sizable number of our Armed Forces from Western Europe where we have nearly 1 million men and their dependents, most of them in Germany.

Everyone knows that times have changed very considerably from the days of Stalin and Khrushchev. Every knowledgeable person in the world knows today that the Soviet Union is no longer a have-not nation. We know that the Soviet Union is a have nation and that its leaders are striving to improve the standard of living of their people. Western Europe is no longer seriously threatened with aggression from the Soviet Union.

It is obvious that the outflow of gold would be stopped and turned the other way if we were to bring some of our forces home or send them to southeast Asia, where they will be really needed if we are to continue to expand the war in Vietnam. Furthermore, our Operation Airlift has proven that we can transport and land in Europe within 36 hours and place in the field combat-ready divisions, fully equipped and ready to fight.

General Wheeler said he would have to explore the terms of the agreement to determine what would be necessary for the security of the United States.

That is a matter for the Congress of the United States to consider. It is a matter for the President and for officials of the State Department. It is not a matter for the high moguls in our Army of determine. It involves the foreign policy of our country.

General Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, then stated:

> I do not trust the Russians.

He then added:

> If history is a test, we should not trust the Russians.

If General Wheeler is the intelligent man that I know he is, he knows that the Soviet Union has lived up in every particular to its obligations under the limited nuclear test ban treaty. We have entered into a treaty with the Soviet Union for the entire Antarctica region and our scientists are working in cooperation with those of the Soviet Union at the present time. Very definitely, General Wheeler was out of line in making those statements.

Mr. President, things have gone from bad to worse in North Vietnam since we have accelerated our bombing of that area. It is to be regretted that our Commander in Chief did not even wait until Premier Kosygin left London before ordering the resumption of the bombing.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1967

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 355) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate resume the consideration of S. 665, the military procurement authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 665) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

EXPANSION OF U.S. MILITARY OFFENSIVE IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it has seemed to me that it was exceedingly ill timed not to afford an opportunity for Kosygin at least to return to his homeland and make a complete report before we resumed our bombing of North Vietnam. It has seemed to me, as a humble Member of the Senate, that it was in bad taste and was offensive to Pope Paul VI, who is striving so hard to bring all parties concerned to a conference table. It was offensive, it seemed to me, to Security General U Thant, of the United Nations, who has been striving to have us abstain from the bombing of North Vietnam and thereby to provide further time for him to try to bring about negotiations.

In addition, we should have considered the turmoil and insurrection afflicting the huge Chinese Communist state, whose population of 750 million comprises one-fourth of the people of the entire world. With Communist China in chaotic condition, with turbulence, with fighting and killing going on there, it seems to me that now, as never before, would be the time for us to do everything possible to bring about a conference to see if a cease-fire or an armistice could not be established in Vietnam.

Unfortunately, it seems to me, some of the President's advisers manifest a lack of wisdom. I should like Secretary of State Rusk to answer without evasion one simple question. He has evaded it every time it has been asked. The question is: "Are you willing to agree that representatives of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam—in other words, the independent representatives of the Vietcong—may sit as independent delegates at a peace conference?" I do not want Secretary Rusk's evasive answer that they could be represented by delegates of the Hanoi Government, or that some arrangements could be made. Obviously there can be no peace or no cease-fire in South Vietnam unless the forces of the National Liberation Front are represented by independent delegates. It seems to me that in view of the unsettled conditions in Communist China, in view of the fact that Communist China and the Soviet Union have a common border of some 6,500 miles; that invectives are being hurled by the leaders in Peking at the leaders in Moscow; that the Chinese are moving their forces along the border; and that relations between Peking and Moscow are strained as never before; that now is the time for us to renew our efforts to bring about a conference that could possibly result in an armistice or a cease-fire.

By the way, what has our intensive bombing of North Vietnam accomplished? Many civilians—men, women, and children—have been killed or horribly burned or otherwise maimed. No doubt great damage has been inflicted upon North Vietnam, because more than half of our tremendous airpower is involved and committed there, despite our tremendous losses. Unfortunately, the Pentagon generals, in telling of the losses, were less than honest with Members of Congress when, in stating the numbers of planes that had been destroyed in combat, they did not include planes on the ground that were destroyed by ground fire. Despite the strong assaults by our tremendous airpower, one is reminded of the Luftwaffe's daily bombing of London and other parts of England day after day, night after night, in an attempt to destroy England. Instead of accomplishing what Hitler thought he would accomplish—terrifying the English people so that they would sue for peace—the bombing not only did nothing of the sort, but strengthened the will of the English people and their government to resist. I am fearful that our intensive bombing has strengthened the will of the North Vietnamese to resist, thus making them appear heroic to a large segment of world opinion.

It should not surprise us that at present the rulers of Japan seem to be hostile to us. The Japanese people have been rioting against us in the streets. The people of India, who have been kept alive by our huge sums of money and grain, are hostile to us. We have few friends in Asia; and our European allies—certainly De Gaulle—are exceedingly unfriendly to us and are becoming more so.

Let us hope that the President will try again to halt the bombing of North Vietnam, if only for a week or 2 weeks, or until some definite date in the expectation that during that time a further effort will be made to restore peace, so that the Armed Forces of America can eventually be withdrawn from South Vietnam.

South Vietnam is a little area, probably less than half the size of the State of Nevada, a little larger than the State of Georgia, and one and one-half times the size of my State of Ohio; a little area 9,000 to 10,000 miles distance from our shores. It is not now, never was, and never will be of any strategic importance to the United States. Certainly, Saigon is not an outpost for the defense of Seattle.

The time is long past due when we should take a further look at the situation and, disregarding for the time being our militarists, give the greatest possible consideration to some 600,000 of the finest youth of America who are now in this jungle area. It is said that some 2,000 of our troops there have been afflicted with forms of bubonic plague and other plagues, some 800 or more every month are afflicted with malaria and other jungle diseases. In addition, hundreds of these fine boys are being killed every month and thousands are being wounded.

Mr. President, let us hope that there will be a pause in the bombing of North Vietnam, and that during that pause we will give renewed consideration to the welfare and the future of those fine young men who are over there. They are not over there of their own free will.

Mr. President, I expect to vote in support of the Clark amendment which is being considered to the supplemental authorization bill. I shall carefully consider all amendments. I hope that perhaps soon we can devote the billions of dollars now being spent on the Vietnam war to the betterment of life in America, rather than to fire $2.4 billion up in smoke every month for no useful purpose whatever.

I want to support the supplemental authorization bill. In addition, I want, along with other Members of the Congress, to leave a better country to our children and our grandchildren who, within a comparatively few years—I will not be here, then—will be the custodians and keepers of our country. I hope that we may have a pause in this bombing of North Vietnam so that we may give more serious consideration and concentration to the problem of trying to leave to those who come after us a nation that is solvent and mighty, with unlimited resources, and in a peaceful world; a nation where only minor attention will be paid to those militarists who are preaching blood and the destruction of a land 10,000 miles distant, which is of no importance whatever, to the economic future or to the strategic defense of the United States.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Montoya in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGESTION IN THE PORT OF SAIGON

Mr. **McINTYRE**. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of the Senate a letter to the editor of the Baltimore Sun from William S. Gaud, Administrator of the Agency for International Development. In his letter Mr. Gaud presents the most complete explanation I have seen to date of both the dimensions of the problems of congestion in the port of Saigon and the steps that have been taken to deal with it.

As Mr. Gaud points out, the port of Saigon was designed to handle about 1.5 million tons of cargo a year. But it is, in fact, today handling cargo at an annual rate of about 5 million tons. The fact that its capacity has more than tripled speaks for the improvements that have been made. Obviously, still more needs to be done. In his letter Mr. Gaud specifies the measures that have been taken and the progress made. I commend it to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter to the editor was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Feb. 12, 1967]

A Letter to the Editor: Port of Saigon: AID Statement

Sir: I have read Mrs. Helen Bentley's recent articles on the port of Saigon with a great interest and concern. Mrs. Bentley has vividly described the congestion and some of the problems which one encounters in the Saigon port area and in the staging area downstream.

I am disturbed, however, that the focus and emphasis of these articles will leave your readers with the quite erroneous impression that such conditions were not anticipated by the United States Government, and that nothing effective has been done, or is being done, to correct this situation.

In making the decision to make large commodity shipments to Vietnam, the United States Government fully recognized that serious congestion would inevitably occur in the port of Saigon. But what was the alternative? Heavy demands for a wide variety of commodities existed in Vietnam. Shore supplies were pushing prices upward. Serious inflation threatened Vietnam's sensitive economy.

The United States and Vietnamese governments determined that inflation was the greater threat—a decision which, in retrospect, was correct. This choice, coming on top of continuing heavy shipments of military supplies, meant that we would strain the capacity of the port of Saigon to the utmost.

However, knowing that we must strain the Saigon port facilities, we also set out to help Vietnam improve those facilities as fast as might be possible in the midst of a war. This effort has already produced significant results and is continuing.

The port of Saigon was designed to handle about 1.5 million tons of cargo a year. Prior to the beginning of the military and economic build-up in the summer of 1965, these facilities were adequate for Vietnam's needs. Today, however, the port is handling cargo at an annual rate of about 5 million tons. It is obvious, therefore, that something dramatic has happened to the port of Saigon in the relatively short period of a year and a half.

On November 26, 1965, there was a backlog of 122 vessels unloading or waiting to unload. On January 31, 1967, there were 69 vessels unloading or waiting. During November, 1965, 218,000 tons of cargo were discharged. During November, 1966, 415,000 tons were discharged. By November, 1967, the monthly discharge capacity of the port is expected to reach about 630,000 tons. Between mid-1965 and January, 1967, there has been a 50 per cent increase in the number of vessels which could be discharged simultaneously.

During the past year and a half, great improvements have been made in physical facilities, port management, cargo documentation and port security. While there are still many problems in all these areas, much has already been done, many thing are being done now and many additional things are in the planning stage.

It takes time and trained manpower to design physical facilities, negotiate contracts and get work underway, even under "crash conditions." It takes time and trained manpower to design and install new management procedures and to improve port security. These things have been happening about as fast as possible under the conditions prevailing in Vietnam.

They have been happening fast enough to change the capacity of the port from 1.5 million tons to 5 million tons per year within a year and a half. As a result, the commodity import program has been effective as a key instrument in containing what would otherwise have been rampant inflation. Over 150,000 different commodities have been procured, shipped and distributed.

Some of the specific physical improvements to benefit the port of Saigon follow:

a. Fourteen additional deep-draft buoy sites have been prepared and a floating dock for roll-on-roll-off loading has been put into operation.

b. "New Port," an entire new section of the Saigon port, is partially constructed and in use by the United States military. It is scheduled for completion in the spring of 1967.

c. Expansion of barge unloading facilities on both the Kinh Te and Kinh Doi canals in Saigon will be completed within the near future.

d. A new deep water berth, the "Fish Market pier," south of the main port area, is now in operation.

e. A fresh-water facility for ships in port has been finished.

f. AID is building the largest warehouse complex in Vietnam, 676,000 square feet of new civil warehouse space at Thu Duc, close to Saigon. It is partially in use now and is expected to be fully operational by April, 1967. This facility possesses double the capacity of existing port transit warehouses for civil cargo.

g. Other Saigon area warehouse facilities have been expanded to expedite port clearance.

h. AID has procured or contracted for 552 trucks, 156 barges, 13 tugs and 213 pieces of handling equipment (*e.g.*, cranes and fork lifts) to facilitate port operations. More is being procured—all additional to the port equipment furnished by the United States military.

i. Ten coastal vessels and a 3,000 ton per month junk fleet have been chartered to help move cargo from Saigon to other ports.

j. The load on the port of Saigon has been reduced by the expansion of facilities at a number of other Vietnamese ports including Quang Ngai, Qui Nhon, Nha Trang, Danang and Cam Ranh Bay. The capacity of these ports has been increased more than threefold, from 125,000 metric tons per month in August, 1965, to more than 400,000 metric tons at present.

Increased physical facilities must be supplemented by improved management in processing materiel through the port area. In this field, we have supplied many United States advisory services. Typical examples are:

(1) Since March 1966, a United States Customs Bureau team detailed to AID has been increased from one to ten and will be expanded to twenty. . . . This team is working closely with the Vietnamese Customs Bureau in its actual operations and improving its procedures and systems.

(2) A four-man United States Census Bureau team, serving with AID since August 1966, is assisting the Vietnamese Customs Bureau and the Ministry of Finance in developing automated data processing systems to provide rapid and accurate financial and logistical information.

(3) United States civilian and military port advisers are assisting the port authorities of Vietnam in improving reporting and inventory control systems and port operations.

(4) An eight-member team from the International Longshoremen's Union worked with the Saigon stevedoring companies during most of 1966 to advise on techniques for increasing cargo handling capability.

(5) In September 1966, the United States Army's 125th Terminal Command arrived in Vietnam to supplement the services of the AID technical advisers to the director of the port of Saigon and his staff. All of its 187 officers and enlisted men are assigned to the commercial area and working in scheduling of ships, unloading and warehousing procedures, importer notification, etc. The unit has also set up a documentation system for commercial cargo parallel to the combined coverage of the four separate and distinct Vietnamese systems maintained by the Saigon port director, the ship's agent, the stevedore and the Customs Bureau.

Also, as Mrs. Bentley's articles have noted, there has been a need to tighten security precautions in order to protect the incoming cargoes. A few of the measures already undertaken are:

a. The Vietnamese Customs Bureau has 1,700 employees, 1,300 working in the Saigon port. Their enforcement operations include the use of several large launches and 12 smaller boats provided by AID in September, 1966.

b. The Vietnamese harbor police has increased to 600 men engaged in physical security of the port area. It has checkpoints at a number of strategic port locations and regular water patrols covering 96 kilometers of waterways containing up to 1,400 barges, junks, lighters, and other miscellaneous small boats, many of which double as homes for one or more families.

c. The harbor police director also controls the activities of a 167-man police field force unit recently assigned to the An Khanh area directly across the Saigon River from the main piers.

d. Society de Surveillance (Geneve) S.A., a private Swiss international shipping inspector, experienced in Vietnam, is under contract to the AID mission to inspect deliveries of several types of AID-financed and Food for Peace commodities, as well as to check rice shipments arriving in the ports of Qui Nhon and Nha Trang.

e. American MP's board each vessel arriving at Cap St. Jacques and remain aboard during waiting, river transit and unloading. These heightened security efforts are reflected in the fact that port area arrests for improper documentation, trespassing, theft and other offenses rose from a rate of 150 per month in early 1966 to 500 a month by the end of 1966, while reports of major crimes dropped. . . .

I will not undertake to respond in detail to the several unwarranted allegations in Mrs. Bentley's articles, but two major ones do warrant specific comment.

The allegation is made that AID is forcing into the country commercial imports which are not wanted by the Vietnamese merchants. This ignores some basic facts:

With few exceptions, of which fertilizer is one, all imports respond to requirements registered by importers who guarantee payment with their own funds.

One of the major objectives of these commercial imports, that of controlling inflation, has been largely realized.

We are not sure of the exact nature of the Saigon Chamber of Commerce remarks or the motives in contributing to the allegations, but it may well stem from resentment on the part of some in the commercial community at our strong measures to reform the commercial import program in order to broaden competition, eliminate a number of abuses that had developed earlier, and substantially reduce the opportunities for speculation and unduly large profit margins.

Regarding the allegation that large unneeded quantities of fertilizer were offered, the difficulty in 1966 arose from the Vietnamese Government's devaluation in June (an essential step recommended by the International Monetary Fund) which suddenly doubled the landed cost to importers. However, the Vietnamese Government did not properly adjust the ceiling price at which importers could resell it. Vietnamese delays in resolving this problem, over which AID had no direct control, caused most of the commercial dealers to refuse to accept some fertilizer shipments. The temporary pile-up of fertilizer ships was resolved by AID's making other arrangements for its distribution. The fertilizer was transferred to the account of the National Agricultural Credit Office, which has country-wide branches and which is now charged with ordering, storage, and sale to commercial distributors or direct sale to farmers.

In closing I cite the judgment of Mr. Austin J. Tobin, executive director, the Port of New York Authority, who has just recently visited Saigon. He states: "The port of Saigon is handling more than we have a right to expect considering all of the difficulties and circumstances, and the overriding necessity of meeting requirements for large amounts of military and civil cargo."

WILLIAM S. GAUD,
Administrator, Agency for International Development.
WASHINGTON.

REORGANIZATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, there is one very important matter on which I was pleased to hear the President dwell in depth in his message on the District of Columbia. That is his plan for a complete reorganization of the present cumbersome form of District government, and its replacement with a structure more efficient and responsive to the urban problems which Washington faces in a century of rapid growth and intensive development.

I am strongly in favor of home rule for the District of Columbia—I think it is one of the keys to the District's future. But I share the President's feeling that we must act now to effect some improvement in the structure of District government—with or without home rule. There is absolutely no reason why the Congress must continue to accept an old form of government that was developed to meet old problems which have now passed into history.

In 1874, when "Boss" Shepherd had forced the District deeply into debt by promoting his overly ambitious plans for public improvement, it might have been historically necessary to set up a Commission government so that one person could not dictate the sole course of District affairs. It might also have been necessary, then, to assign an officer of the Army Corps of Engineers to complete the multitudinous public works commenced by Shepherd.

But now, almost 100 years later, local government has certainly graduated beyond the era of civic bossism. Yet, we are still confronted by a commission form of municipal government; a form of government which has proved so ineffective throughout the country that it has been abandoned by most cities which once adopted it.

Whatever the high qualifications of the officers assigned to serve on the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, and the good works they have accomplished, the time has come to create a new form of government with a new division of responsibilities and—if you will—a new vision of what local government in the Nation's Capital could be and ought to be.

It appears to me that the action contemplated by President Johnson is absolutely right, necessary, and long overdue. As I understand his message, the Board of Commissioners of the District will be replaced by a single Commissioner who becomes chief administrator of District government. A nine-member council, roughly comparable to a city council, will translate congressional mandates into rules and regulations and be implemented by the Commissioner. The council also approves the Commissioner's budget for submission to the President and Congress.

Even at first glance, this seems to me to be a much more businesslike arrangement for managing municipal affairs than our present system.

We in Congress often complain a good deal about the way the District is managed. Yet, our complaints are less than valid until we ourselves provide more logical and more modern tools by which the District can manage its own affairs. District government reorganization is one of those tools.

I look forward to the submission of the President's reorganization plan for the District, and I shall give it my firm support.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED CRIME BILL

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, at this time, I would like to say that I have read with great interest the President's proposed crime bill for the District of Columbia. The scope of these proposals is broadly based, as I believe any effective legislation in the criminal area must be, and it is my belief that these proposals will go a long way toward stopping and finally turning the tide of criminal activity here in the District.

The proposal dealing with street citations is particularly interesting and important. I feel it will put more authority in the hands of the police at the crucial moment where a police officer must determine whether or not to arrest an individual or let him go. I believe that this type of proposal gives the police officer another alternative rather than simply allowing him to decide whether or not the individual should be arrested and jailed, or turned free. It also works benefits for persons accused of crimes in that the citation gives that individual greater flexibility in preparing for defense as opposed to an arrest which would require that he be taken to the police station.

It is this kind of creative legislation that is necessary if we are to effectively combat crime while at the same time protecting individual liberties.

I strongly favor the provisions of the President's proposal that I have mentioned and also support this type of legislation in general. The need for action in combating crime in the District of Columbia is immediate, and I hope my fellow Congressmen agree with me in this regard and move with speed toward enactment of this legislation.

VIETNAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, last Friday, February 24, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] made a most interesting speech on the floor of the Senate with reference to U.S. foreign policy in general and our posture in Vietnam in particular.

Because much of that speech deals with the same subject matter as the pending supplemental authorization bill, I want to comment about it at this point.

The speech is entitled "It's One World." There is no doubt, of course, that Wendell Willkie was right when he coined that phrase a good many years ago and wrote a book about it.

It is one world. It is a smaller world every day. It is a more complex world every day.

But, because it is one world, it does not necessarily follow that our present foreign policy posture, both in Vietnam and elsewhere, is correct.

The concept of a small and shrinking world and the heavy responsibilities the United States has in connection with that world have recently been brought to the attention of the country through Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings, at which skilled historians, diplomats, and soldiers referred to America's responsibilities as a world power.

Later this afternoon, I will discuss the testimony of these very able gentlemen, including former Ambassador to the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, George Kennan; former Ambassador to Japan, Professor Reischauer, now back again teaching at Harvard; the dean of American historians, now teaching at Amherst, Henry Steele Commager; and Gen. James Gavin, a former distinguished soldier and Chief of Plans in the Pentagon, an Army man, former Ambassador to France, and presently chairman of the board of the widely known Arthur D. Little & Co., of Boston, manager-consultants for many of the great corporations of America.

It is significant that the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] started his speech with the suggestion that perhaps the main Vietnam battlefield was not above and below the 17th parallel in Southeast Asia, but was right here in the United States of America, where the battle for public opinion is being fought. I agree with this, as I agree with many of the statements of the distinguished Senator from Washington in the speech to which I have reference.

He then stated that we cannot be defeated militarily in South Vietnam, and with this I would agree, too; but the main question is no longer, can we be defeated on the battlefield? That question was answered in the negative when President Johnson, without a declaration of war, undertook to send, first 100,000, then 200,000, then 300,000, and now 400,000 American boys to fight in South Vietnam and to bomb North Vietnam in order to prevent a military defeat.

That military action by our Commander in Chief—I say again without a declaration of war—did stem the tide.

Before that action was taken, our South Vietnamese allies were well on their way to losing the war; and the best military advice the President could get was that, if we did not have this massive intervention by American troops, military victory would go to the Vietcong and their allies of the Hanoi government.

But the tide has been turned, and I agree with Senator JACKSON that we are very unlikely to lose the military war in South Vietnam. That, however, to my mind, does not answer the two major questions.

First, can we win a military victory at a cost acceptable to the American people, and at a cost which does not include the destruction of most of South Vietnam and most of the logistical facilities and urban facilities of North Vietnam, leaving behind us utter devastation and hate for the white man on both sides of the 17th parallel?

The second question is whether this kind of war—a guerrilla war, a civil war—which yellow men are fighting for their independence against a white country—can ever be won in the hearts and minds of men, not only in Vietnam but across the one world of which we have been talking?

I must recall again, as I have many times before, the statement made by President John F. Kennedy within 2 months of the date of his assassination, when he said—and I paraphrase and do not quote—this is their war, referring to the South Vietnamese; we can help them with technical assistance, money, advice, but they have got to win it; and, in effect, we do not intend to try to win it for them.

That was over 3 years ago. Senators will recall in the 1964 presidential campaign, President Johnson said time after time, rebutting Senator Goldwater's belligerent position, that he did not want to see American boys doing the fighting Asian boys should do.

His clear and pertinent point was that the liberty and freedom of all Vietnam was the problem and the task and the obligation of the Vietnamese, and not of the Americans.

That is not so today. I think it reasonably clear that most of the fighting is being done by American forces. Many weeks, and some months, the major amount of dying is being done by American boys fighting, ostensibly, for the freedom of the South Vietnamese.

I do not charge that the South Vietnamese Army has become militarily ineffective. Occasionally we see evidence of fine military action on their part. But undoubtedly the burden of the war has been transferred from South Vietnamese shoulders to American shoulders.

The frequently stated American obligation is search and destroy the enemy, whereas enemy pacification—clearing and holding—has been turned over to the South Vietnamese. I suggest much more holding than clearing is being done by the South Vietnamese; thus, most of the fighting, and the major burden of the dying, is being transferred from the South Vietnamese to the Americans.

For many years, the South Vietnamese made no serious effort to clear out the Mekong Delta, the rice bowl of South Vietnam often leaving it largely under Vietcong control.

Therefore, the rice-exporting country of South Vietnam has now become a rice-importing country. Who pays for the rice? Of course. The Americans.

Thus, it has been decided to move the American Army into the Mekong Delta to search and destroy the enemy and allow the South Vietnamese to clear up the wreckage and pacify the villagers. This, of course, betokens heavier American than South Vietnamese casualties.

So I find it not particularly edifying when my good friend from Washington suggests we cannot be defeated militarily, and that we must not turn from one extreme to another. The first extreme the Senator mentioned is total withdrawal from Vietnam, and the second extreme is total, all-out warfare against North Vietnam, and perhaps China and Russia, to win an overwhelming military victory.

I agree with the Senator from Washington in that comment. I know of nobody in the Senate who has seriously proposed the United States unilaterally withdraw from Vietnam.

Let me make my position quite clear. I believe I speak for other Members of the Senate as well in saying we should stop this search-and-destroy operation which is costing so much life. We should turn back to the South Vietnamese the burden of offensive action against their fellow countrymen, the Vietcong, and against the troops from the North who are, in a very real degree, their fellow countrymen also. Remember the present dictator of South Vietnam, Air Marshal Ky, is himself from the north, as are many of his Cabinet members.

I would leave the Mekong Delta to the South Vietnamese Army. I would accept the views of Ambassador Kennan, General Ridgway, and General Gavin, and make it very clear indeed that nobody is going to throw us out of South Vietnam, that we neither propose nor choose to get out until we establish freedom of the Vietnamese to choose the kind of government under which they want to live, whether there be one Vietnam or two. I do not like to use the word "enclave" because that has become subject to some scorn. I would prefer to propose we fight a defensive war.

Many successful defensive wars have been fought through history. Perhaps the most famous one was fought by Fabius, the ancient Roman, when he finally destroyed Hannibal, who had crossed the Straits of Gibraltar and the Alps with his elephants, and spent 2 unprofitable years in Italy, trying to defeat the Roman Army.

The situations are, of course, essentially different. I do not believe even the leaders in Hanoi think they can beat the American Army in pitched battle. Nevertheless, Fabian's tactic finally saved Italy for Rome. I would suggest that, at an infinitely smaller cost in deaths, in wounded, in materiel and equipment, and in money, we could assure that Hanoi—and Peking and Moscow, if you will, shall not work their will in South Vietnam and kick the Americans out.

They cannot throw us out, and I do not advocate that we should get out, and neither does any other Senator. So much for that strawman.

I throughly agree with the Senator from Washington when he opposes escalating this war to a far greater extent than it has been escalated already, with the imminent danger of bringing both China and Russia into the contest, possibly loosing atomic bombs. A few misguided individuals—I suspect some in the Pentagon, maybe even one or two in the State Department and in the entourage of the President in the White House, but certainly not the President himself and certainly not the Secretary of State, nor the Secretary of Defense—advocate that kind of all-out war. But so far, that theory seems to be largely confined to defeated candidates for the Presidency of the United States; and I hope that it will stay just there, and operate no further.

So this idea of all-out war is a kind of strawman also—not a realistic alternative for men of common sense, charged with the heavy responsibility of finding out how we can get out of Vietnam with honor. We shall never be able to get out of Vietnam with honor by destroying the country and inducing the inception of World War III.

So I say again that I agree with Senator JACKSON in deploring both those extremes. But I suggest what we should do, and are not doing, is to shift our emphasis from military action to a more aggressive diplomacy and try to get to the conference table, where in the end this war will be settled, just as most wars in our history have been settled.

My concern is that so many of my fellow Senators apparently lack a keen desire to bring the war to negotiations but rather seem content to continue the war, with its ever-mounting list of American casualties.

Our clear-and-hold policy and our pacification policy have been complete failures.

I wish to read into the RECORD in that connection a colloquy appearing on page 48 of the hearings on the pending bill. The colloquy was between Senator YOUNG of North Dakota, a member of the Armed Services Committee, and Secretary of Defense McNamara. It reads:

> Senator YOUNG of North Daktota. Last year, Mr. Secretary, you stated with respect to the population of South Vietnam and Ky government controlled 53 percent, the Vietcong, 23, and 23 percent in disputed areas. With respect to the land areas you said your own estimate was that the Vietcong controls 60 percent of the land area. Has this situation changed in the last year?
>
> Secretary McNAMARA. I do not think so, Senator Young. I noticed some figures yesterday or the day before that showed that the Vietnamese Government controlled, I think they said, 54 to 56 percent of the population.

Apparently the figures are up 1 percent or, at the most, 3 percent over 12 months earlier.

I continue to read from the statement made by Secretary McNamara:

> I do not put too much weight on those figures, because of the way in which they are compiled. But I think the figures I gave you last year are fairly representative of the situation today.

So we have not gained anything in terms of population of the land controlled as the result of the most aggressive military operations conducted certainly since the height of the Korean campaign.

We then come to an interesting colloquy, one which I find disturbing to Senator YOUNG. It reads:

> Senator YOUNG of North Daktota. Will we greatly expand our operations in the delta area this year? I understood a few months ago that this was not scheduled for calendar year 1967, but we are moving in there now.

That is my information, too. It has been published in the newspapers all over the country. We are not only moving into the delta, but we have moved into the delta, and the various units which have come into there have been active. Accounts have been given of one or two of the battles of the search-and-destroy operations which they have conducted.

All that Senator YOUNG asked was:

> Will we be expanding our operations in the delta this year?

Listen to what was done with the answer to that question. The transcript reads:

> Secretary McNAMARA. [Deleted.]
>
> General WHEELER. [Deleted.]
>
> General Westmoreland—

Said General Wheeler—

> is going to put a brigade of the Ninth Infantry Division at a location in the vicinity of My Tho, which is south of Saigon in the Delta [deleted].

The rest of his statement was deleted.

Senator YOUNG either asked another question or made a comment and that was deleted.

Secretary McNamara then said something and that was deleted.

With that kind of censorship, it is a little hard for the average Senator who does not serve on the Armed Services Committee to have much idea of what our intentions are in the delta. So all I can do is accept what the newspaper reports said, and it was on the basis of the newspaper reports that I made my comments a short time ago on our activities in the delta.

I should like to read also into the RECORD a colloquy which appears at page 101 of the hearings between the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], whom I see in the Chamber, and Secretary of Defense McNamara.

Senator MANSFIELD said:

> Mr. McNamara, on page 6 of your testimony yesterday, you indicated the basic tasks which flow from this war:
>
> "2. To interdict the flow of men and supplies from North Vietnam to South Vietnam.
>
> "3. To exert pressure on the Government of North Vietnam to cease its direction and support of insurrection in South Vietnam."
>
> Am I to understand that this is a war directed not only against aggression from the North, but also is a civil war directed against insurrectionaries within South Vietnam?

Secretary McNamara then replied:

> I think the answer is No, Senator Mansfield. That is not what this statement was meant to say, nor is it my view of the war. Without arguing the point of the origin of the conflict, our analysis indicated to us that it would not have started, it certainly wouldn't have reached the present scale without active direction of the action in the south by the north.
>
> Captured documents, [deleted] and other sources of intelligence appear to support that conclusion. Now having said that, I want to emphasize also that the direction from the north could not possibly have succeeded in activating the support it has had in the south, unless there had been what I will call indigenous support desiring to modify by revolutionary action, the economic and political institutions of the south.

I congratulate the Secretary of Defense on his mastery of the English language. Listen to that again: "indigenous support desiring to modify by revolutionary action, the economic and political institutions of the south."

If that is not civil war in two words, I do not know what civil war is.

Senator MANSFIELD then said:

> Mr. Secretary, I understand your point of view. I don't agree with it, because, according to the Webster Dictionary, an insurrection is "a rising up against civil or political authority."

I agree with the Senator from Montana.

I continue to read from the statement made by the Senator from Montana:

> It is my belief that in its beginning this was a civil war that has been added to by the infiltration of Hanoi.

I agree with that statement and I yield to the Senator from Montana because of his understanding and personal experience as a result of several trips he has made to South Vietnam.

Senators will recall the very able, if pessimistic report he made to the President and to the Senate a year or so ago when he predicted exactly what has happened: the continuing escalation with a resultant threat of the onset of world war III through the intervention of China and/or Russia in the event our military activities came to threaten the capabilities as a combat force of the army of North Vietnam.

Continuing with what Senator MANSFIELD said:

> It is my belief that in its beginning this was a civil war that has been added to by the infiltration of Hanoi. That cadres in very, very small extent did not start coming down until the latter part of 1964—

That is, from the north—

> according to information which was received from the Department of Defense and checked and rechecked and not denied. So, to me, it is a combination of a civil war in the south and an attack by Hanoi from the north, perhaps to direct the war effort, certainly to assist and to cooperate with the Vietcong. It appears to me that on the basis of newspaper reports recently, that we are considering stepped-up activities in the Mekong Delta. In that respect, I assume that you are aware, certainly far more than I am—I am no military expert—that when you go into the Mekong Delta, you are going into the most difficult part of all Vietnam, far tougher than the central highlands and far tougher than the area along the demilitarized zone, and if I may be permitted, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments about the Mekong which can be refuted or confirmed.
>
> It is my understanding that down there in the delta, there are 25,000 miles of waterways and canals. The people number 7 million, clustered along the estuaries of the Mekong. That the enemy is harder to identify in the delta than anywhere else in Vietnam.

I interpolate that the enemy is pretty hard to identify everywhere in Vietnam, as many an American, who thought he was dealing with a friend, who turned out to be a foe, has found. This, of course, is one of the great disadvantages confronting a white army attempting to suppress guerrilla warfare in a country where everybody looks alike; where many of those little men—many of them brave, indeed—have chosen sides, just as was done in the American Civil War, or the War Between the States, as some of my friends prefer to call it. But the men fighting guerrilla warfare in Vietnam wear no uniform at all. So it is indeed difficult, as Senator MANSFIELD said, to identify friends and foes in Vietnam, particularly so in the delta. I continue to quote from Senator MANSFIELD's statement:

> That the Vietcong has an extensive delta organization and continues to feed large quantities of men, supplies, and money to Vietcong units further north.
>
> That, to repeat, the delta is a far worse area to fight in than the rest of Vietnam, and I think perhaps that might be given some degree of proof by the recent amphibious operation, which accomplished very little in a 10-day period, if my memory is correct.
>
> Furthermore, that to many people in the delta the Vietcong is a nationalist and a village hero and not a Communist.

I interpolate again that most of them would not care whether he was a Communist or not, because what those people are interested in are at least one square meal a day, a roof that does not leak over their head, and an opportunity to carry on a normal, peaceful life of birth, death, and the raising of families. That is what this cruel and dirty war is denying them. They denied it to themselves at first through civil war, and now the Americans have undertaken to come in from many thousands of miles across the sea to deny it to them in their own country, in the interest of preserving there freedom and training them in the ways of democracy.

I return to Senator MANSFIELD's statement: "that years of war have taught the Vietcong every aspect of guerrilla warfare in the Mekong area. That no North Vietnamese regulars have been found in the delta south of the Saigon area. That the delta Vietcong are masters at camouflage, know all the ins and outs of the waterways in the countryside, and at present number approximately——."

In comes our old friend "deleted." Senator MANSFIELD, I feel reasonably certain—he will deny it, if I am wrong—picked that figure out of a newspaper report somewhere, but now it is deleted in the text of the hearings.

> Well-trained battalions.
>
> In addition, there is a large guerrilla force bringing the enemy's delta force to [deleted] armed men.
>
> One more statement. It is my impression, too, that many Vietcong battalions recruited in the delta are now fighting in the northern areas and they could be moved back. Is that a correct summary in brief of the situation there?
>
> Secretary MCNAMARA. Senator Mansfield, you made a number of statements, not all of which I was able to note as I listened to you, and I will comment on some of them, and those I do not comment on, I do not necessarily support. It's simply that my memory——
>
> Senator MANSFIELD. Shall I ask them one by one?
>
> Secretary MCNAMARA. You may not want to take time. Let me comment on them. I simply want to point out that my failure to rebut or comment on a particular statement doesn't mean I endorse it.

Then Secretary McNamara went on to state that Senator MANSFIELD's description of the delta was quite correct. He agreed that the Vietcong are very strong in the delta, as Senator MANSFIELD said. He agreed that:

> They are not only strong there, but they use that area as a base of supply of food and weapons for their forces in the central and northern parts of South Vietnam, and, of course, that is why it is important to begin to weaken their hold on the delta.

What Secretary McNamara said in reponse to Senator MANSFIELD's third point is deleted. He said, however:

> I think it is quite clear that the backbone of their strength is represented by men infiltrated from the North to serve as cadremen and leaders, and on his point I would take exception with what I understood you to say somewhat earlier—that it was not until 1964 that cadres, small in number, came down from the North.

Let me point out again, however, that

many thousands of members of the South Vietnamese Army are also infiltrators from the north. General Ky said only a few days ago—and I am sure he would not have made this kind of statement if he were not convinced it was correct—that there are only about 10,000 Communists who form the leadership of the Vietcong. We have been told that the Vietcong army forces—regulars, irregulars, and the North Vietnamese troops associated with them—total 275,000 men. That includes some 45,000 North Vietnamese regulars. So if those figures are correct—and I believe they are official figures; if not, they came from a reputable newspaperman who has been there—that means that of approximately 230,000 Vietcong, only 10,000 are Communists. That does not surprise me very much, because I would hazard the guess that not many guerrillas fighting with the Vietcong could tell you what the difference is between a Communist and a capitalist. They do not know, and they do not care. They just want to be let alone. They want the Americans to go home and let them alone to work out their own problems in their country.

Another interesting comment appears on page 103 of the hearings. It bears out a colloquy I had with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] on the same point last year. At that time I did not have available to me the hearings and the colloquy between Senator MANSFIELD and Secretary McNamara.

Senator MANSFIELD said, as quoted on page 103:

> Senator MANSFIELD. One brief question. Does it cost about $400,000 to kill a Vietcong or a North Vietnamese?
>
> Secretary MCNAMARA. I wouldn't like to try to give you a figure. It costs a great deal indeed. The reason I can't give you a figure is that it is almost impossible to develop a meaningful estimate of the incremental cost of our operations in Vietnam, but it costs a lot, let's put it that way.

I wonder what Mr. McNamara meant by "incremental cost." That is stylish English.

> Senator MANSFIELD. Hundreds of thousands of dollars?
>
> Secretary MCNAMARA. Well, certainly a large amount. I have seen figures of $100,000, $200,000. I haven't seen any figure reported as large as $400,000, but it certainly costs a very large amount. I would certainly agree with that.

Mr. President, last Thursday I suggested to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who was unwilling to place a precise figure on how much it cost to kill a Vietcong or a Hanoi regular, that he might take the amount being spent each month on the war in Vietnam, which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] agreed was approximately $2 billion a month, and divide that figure by our claims of how many Vietcong we were currently killing. To make the figure a little more accurate, it might be placed on the 12-month basis.

The Department of Defense has furnished us with figures with respect to Vietcong and North Vietnamese killed in action. For the year 1966 the figure is 55,000. So, if we compute the necessary mathematics on the basis of $2 billion a month, the figure comes out to $436,000 for every Vietcong killed. I suggest that Senator MANSFIELD was, if anything, underestimating the cost of this war in terms of what the Department of Defense, much to my chagrin, seems to think is the daily figure that the United States is interested in: How many Vietcong did you kill yesterday; how many will you kill tomorrow; how many are you going to kill today?

To me a constantly recurring statistic does as much as any one thing to brutalize this war and brutalize the American people unless they are as shocked by it as I have been, which I hope.

I was going to read more from Senator MANSFIELD's colloquy with Secretary McNamara, but I note that it is so full of deletions that it seems hardly worthwhile taking the time to do so.

About this time last year, when we were considering a supplemental defense authorization, Secretary McNamara was before the Committee on Armed Services and had this colloquy with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

The Senator said as quoted on page 341:

> Well, in the course of the conversation I had with General Stilwell, he stated that 80 percent of the VC fighting in the Mekong Delta were born and reared in the Mekong Delta. Have you any comment on that?
>
> Secretary McNamara. Again, I cannot reply specifically where they were born and raised, but I think it is fair to say that a high percentage, if not 80 percent, were recruited from the South.

Again, we should keep in mind the basic fact that most of the Vietcong are South Vietnamese. Hardly 45,000 out of 275,000 fighting men opposed to ours come from Hanoi. Most of the rest are civil war participants fighting for what they think—and I disagree with them strongly—is a cause which is in the best interests of their country.

I return to the speech of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. He makes the point that we cannot justify the cost of our Vietnamese stand in terms of Vietnam alone; and again, that we must see beyond Vietnam, for what is going on there has its impact in Europe and all over Asia. With this I also agree. I agree that the stakes in Vietnam are related to our foreign and defense policies as a whole because they are destroying a chance for a just and lasting peace elsewhere in the world.

And yet, in another way, they are not so vital for us, for if we were not there, the chance of peace would right now, in my judgment, be substantially improved. In other words, I suggest that many of us have misread the stakes in this war.

I feel the most important stake is how to come to an accommodation with Russia over serious problems that divide us in Southeast Asia, Europe, the Middle East, and elsewhere. Every day the bombing of North Vietnam continues places us 1 day further from those essential negotiations which I still hope can lead to a just and lasting peace, coupled with arms control and disarmament measures, which lie ready for the negotiating table once the shooting stops and the bombing stops in Vietnam.

Senator JACKSON says we must oppose the revision of the status quo, and I assume he means everywhere, by aggression. I suggest there are places where our vital interests are affected and a change in governmental status quo does require us to intervene to prevent it. We thought that was the case in the Dominican Republic when we intervened, successfully only in the end, as a universal policeman moving into the domestic concern of any country where he believed freedom and democracy were threatened.

I deplored our activity before in the Dominican Republic and I shall one day return to a calm and historical analysis of that venture.

I must admit it appears to have been successful. A freely elected government runs the Dominican Republic, supported and sustained almost entirely by American dollars.

But we did not do that in Cuba. We got our fingers burned in the Bay of Pigs. We did not move in with our Armed Forces at the time of the missile crisis.

I wonder why we found it wise—and I personally think it was wise—not to intervene in a military way in the Cuban situation.

Nonetheless, we thought it so important, several years later, to deploy over 400,000 men, and goodness knows how many airplanes and naval vessels, in an effort to—as we say—prevent aggression, and—as they say—to remove a dictatorial and Fascist dictatorship in the interest of what they consider the peace and freedom of their own country.

Thus, I must differ with my good friend from Washington on the implications in his statement. It is not explicit, it is implicit that we are, in effect, the world's policeman.

I suggest that we would be well advised to take a good, hard look at a map of the world and determine where our vital national interests would be affected by a change in the status quo and the coming into power of a government which we did not like.

I wonder, if we would do that, how we could justify not going into Cuba, which is only 90 miles from our shores and, yet, going in which such a massive force in South Vietnam?

I suggest that U.S. diplomacy since the days of the Eisenhower administration has been heavyhanded. Perhaps great power has come to us too quickly. But, we have blundered, and blundered badly, in practically every instance where we have used naked, military power to support or to change a particular governmental status quo.

I suggest that this is true because of two things:

First, we are not sophisticated enough to understand the limitations of power and its wise use. Perhaps, even more, because we have forgotten the famous dictum of Lord Acton, when he said:

> Power tends to corrupt; absolute power corrupts absolutely.

Perhaps Senators have read the article written by James Reston in last Sunday's New York Times, on its editorial page, on corruption and ethics. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objections, the article

was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Washington: How Corrupt Is America?

(By James Reston)

Washington, Feb. 25.—How Corrupt is America? This is not a popular question. Moral speculation is "out" in New York and Washington, but even the sophisticates of the great commercial, artistic and political capitals of the United States cannot avoid the question.

They have been through too much in the last few years to avoid even if they scoff at the question of corruption. The assassination of a President, the violence of the racial struggle, the civil disorders in the cities, the war in Vietnam, the conflict in the universities, the Oswald case, the Powell case, the Ruby case, the Senator Dodd case, the Bobby Baker case, the C.I.A. case, the wiretapping cases, the argument over who is telling the truth in the White House; in the Manchester-Kennedy book controversy; in the J. Edgar Hoover-Kennedy argument about wiretapping—all this has produced too many boat-rocking facts to be dismissed as the silly moralizing of cranky world-bettering reformers.

THE BIG QUESTION

In fact, this question about the corruption of personal and institutional standards in America is the one thing that troubles most of the leaders on all sides of all the current controversies. Rich and poor, black and white, Republican and Democrat, hawks and doves, are all worrying about it. Of course they are all complaining about the corruption of somebody else, but at least they are united on one proposition—that something is wrong, that there is now no common code of conduct in the United States that unites the nation and guides its people about what is right and what is wrong.

Washington consistently tries to avoid facing this fact. The leaders of both parties in the Congress know that the Central Intelligence Agency's activities need to be investigated, but they have decided this week not to investigate it. The President knows that he is responsible for what the C.I.A. has been doing to use university students for intelligence purposes, but he is passing the buck to Nick Katzenbach at the State Department, John Gardner at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Richard Helms at the C.I.A.

Nevertheless, these political maneuvers will not work in the end. The Congressional leaders may try to smother the C.I.A. controversy, but some members of the Congress will insist on talking about it in the House and Senate. The President may try to correct the system quietly—and the evidence is that he is trying to correct it fairly—but members of his Administration will insist on talking honestly and openly about the facts, and this is the main point of the question of corruption.

The habit of honesty in the United States, in its people and institutions, is still too strong to be overwhelmed. Whatever else can be said about the press, it will print the facts about the C.I.A. ties to the American Newspaper Guild or to prominent newspaper publishers. Whatever the Congressional leaders decide to do about not investigating the C.I.A., members of Congress will discuss the problem.

TRADITION AND CONSCIENCE

Some student leaders may take money from the C.I.A. and be quiet about it, but others, troubled by tradition or conscience, will express what they really think. Some politicians will defend the Administration regardless of what it does, but others will tell the truth, even if it hurts their own party. Some newspapers will not risk the dangers of defying political power, commercial power and labor union power, but a few will, and when they do, their disclosures will be widely reported by the news agencies and the radio and television networks to the rest of the nation.

In this sense the institutions of America are not corrupted. They are under pressure of various kinds but something in the tradition of the country keeps them doing what they were intended to do under the Constitution.

A good case, therefore, can be made for the proposition that while there is plenty of corruption in America, the corruption is somehow exposed, and condemned by the nation when it is exposed. Bobby Baker, Adam Clayton Powell, Senator Dodd, all had their day but they were caught. The legal system trapped Baker, and the Congress has brought both Powell and Dodd to the bar of the Congress. The C.I.A. tried to conceal its arrangements with students, radio stations, magazines, and student organizations, but the facts came out.

Fortunately, the Johnson Administration now understands this fundamental point. It has stopped its secret funds to the students. It is finally reviewing all its activities with universities, labor unions and other private organizations. It is looking for ways to finance legitimate student programs by open and private means, and the Congress is now more sympathetic to this procedure.

INFLUENCE OF THE PUBLIC

The mail coming into the White House and the Congress is a major factor in all this—much more than the letterwriters realize. These letters are expressing the moral conscience of the nation. They are arguing for equality of the races. They are calling for moderation in the war, and protesting violently against the past activities of Powell, Baker, Dodd, and others who have been accused of misusing political power.

Public opinion in America in this way still exercises great influence. It affects the decisions of the Executive and the legislature. It is for equality, peace, and freedom. It is more powerful than the lobbyists for special interests. And it is a much greater force for moderation in the White House and in the Congress than is generally realized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I fear that the whole problem of misuse of military power has not been given adequate consideration either in the White House, the Pentagon, or "Foggy Bottom."

As the Senator from Washington stated, of course we champion peaceful change. That is easy. The big question is, advocates of peaceful change and resisters of aggression though we may be, have we read the facts right when we justify sending 400,000 young Americans into the jungles in southeast Asia to intervene in what is essentially a dirty little civil war?

I suspect that we blundered because we overreached ourselves, not understanding the wise use of that enormous power which we possess today.

The Senator from Washington suggests that we should be governed by the old-fashioned balance-of-power theory.

That balance of power did succeed for almost 100 years, from the Treaty of Vienna in 1815 up until the outbreak of World War I in 1914 in, generally speaking, keeping the peace. But those were the days before nuclear war. Those were the days before radiological, biological, and chemical warfare. Those were the days when Europe was the main consideration. Latin America, Africa, and practically all of Asia were not particularly affected by the balance of power because there was no great Asian power, as China has since become, and as Japan was once—and will be again—which could act as a countervailing balance of power against the white colonials in that part of the world.

The Senator from Washington refers to SEATO as a treaty commitment on our part requiring us—perhaps he did not say, "requiring," but I suggest it is implied—requiring us to move into Vietnam. This comment has been made on several occasions by Secretary of State Rusk, but only after he had made practically every other argument that could be thought of to justify our intervention in the civil war, which he denies is a civil war. As I understand it, he still contends that this is nothing more than aggression from the North with the Vietcong the tools of the Hanoi government.

This is a contention which, incidentally, I think is becoming weaker and weaker and less credible as time goes on—particularly in light of the statistics which I quoted a little earlier.

With respect to the SEATO Treaty, let me quote a statement made by Lt. Gen. Jesus Vargas, Secretary General of SEATO, at the opening of the 11th Council meeting in Canberra, Australia, on June 27, 1966:

> "Viet-Nam, therefore, rather than being held up as a symbol of SEATO's alleged inaction, should be looked upon for what it actually is—a symbol of spontaneity, the determination and the singleness of purpose with which many free countries from different parts of the world have come to the aid of an embattled friend and ally. In relation to SEATO in particular, Viet-Nam is incontrovertible proof of the wide latitude of freedom open to individual members of the alliance to choose the manner and degree of assistance to be rendered, or even for any one member to withhold assistance or keep the matter under consideration for as long as it pleases.
>
> "As we all know, assistance under the Manila Pact may be either collective or individual. This permits member nations to undertake, along with nonmember countries holding common values and persuasions, and on their own individual choice, actions necessary to preserve peace and freedom in our part of the world."

How could it be more abundantly clear that the Secretary of State is wrong when he relies on an obligation in the SEATO treaty to justify our massive interjection of forces in Vietnam in support of one of the parties in a civil war?

We hear much about the atrocities and terrorism of the Vietcong; and I do not doubt that what we hear is true. I deplore it. I hold no brief for those terrorists. But it is equally true that similar acts of terrorism have been committed by our allies, the South Vietnamese, from the beginning.

If one has to choose between a Fascist dictator who so admires Hitler and a Communist dictator—if we can ever find out who he is—perhaps Ho Chi Minh in Hanoi; we do not seem to know exactly who the civilian or even the military leaders of the National Liberation Front are—I suppose we would have to conclude that there is not so much to choose from, as so many seem to think there is, between fascism and communism.

Having said that, I wanted to make it clear that I am significantly encouraged by the efforts being made by the South Vietnamese, without much encouragement from the present dictator, Ky, to create a constituent assembly which would, in turn, draft a democratic and free constitution.

I applaud that effort. I hope it will be successful. I hope it will result in a freely elected government in South Vietnam. But this will require the military to keep their hands off that constitution. They have retained the right to reject any part of it they do not like. I suspect there should be an obligation on the part of the military also to see that there is a free election, and that the candidates for the legislative branch of the South Vietnamese Government and, indeed, the new President, will be chosen without fear, favor, ballot-stuffing, or the other notorious tricks of the trade to prevent a free election.

So I suggest that the balance of power is a dangerous doctrine in the nuclear age. This is a subject on which my very good friend from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and I have disagreed for a number of years. I should like to state very briefly the nature of that disagreement. The Senator from Washington not only doubts the feasibility or practicality of arms control and disarmament; he does not place much faith in the United Nations. He feels we are still in a primitive condition with respect to the government of the world; that we must rely primarily on our national strength, and not turn to international institutions for the solution of these very difficult problems.

I agree with the Senator from Washington in part. It would be folly to negotiate for lasting peace from anything except a position of strength; as long as the Russians and Chinese are armed, we, too, must stay armed. But there are indications that the Russians, who have come under far greater stresses and strains than we have, are ready for a detente, which would include not only a treaty in terms of arms control, but, afterwards, even substantial reductions, if we only could get out of Vietnam and stop the shooting.

I would like to see far greater emphasis placed on the establishment of international institutions; on the moving of the 18-nation Geneva Conference for arms control along the line of ironing out the differences in the proposal for complete arms control and disarmament, which was tabled on the one hand by the Soviet Union, and on the other hand by the United States, some time ago. I hope to see further progress made in that direction, and I hope it will be made at Geneva this year in terms of creating a nonproliferation nuclear treaty and a comprehensive test ban treaty, including underground as well as overhead tests.

I would hope to see the prevention of an insane race for the deployment of antiballistic missiles and a moving forward with international cooperation as opposed to international conflict.

I want to be fair to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who is not here to defend himself; but I am sure in his heart he approves of the same objectives. However, I am afraid he does not think it a feasible or pragmatic method of solving our problems in the world in which we live today. Therefore, he puts his reliance on weapons of destruction, and I put my reliance on the diplomatic weapons of peaceful negotiations.

This seems to be, in a very real sense, the major difference between those who feel we should be working harder for peace in Vietnam and a detente with the Soviet Union than we are and those who in their hearts still believe that the Soviet Union is the same implacable enemy, bent on world conquest, the destruction of capitalism and freedom all over the world, and that we must continue that same fight against communism, which, in my opinion, has now largely become obsolete, although again I say that it certainly has not been entirely done away with. But the opportunity exists now for us to move toward a detente and away from conflict. I would hope we could see it that way in terms of the war in Vietnam as well as in our relations all over this constantly shrinking one world.

In this regard, I should like to quote a comment by former Ambassador Kennan in the testimony he gave before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, under the general heading of "The Communist World in 1967," a subject with respect to which I think we all agree he is one of the greatest living authorities. He said, as shown beginning on page 56 of these hearings:

> Well, it is true that I think we have worried about a great many more things than we needed seriously to worry about in recent years or at least that we have felt it necessary to take action in more situations than we needed to take action in. I think that we must realize that this world is not going to be without violence—not in our time, not in any time that we can conceive of. There is going to be a great deal in the way of internal violence within various countries. There is going to be violence between them. There is no slogan that I think is more false than the one that the Soviet Foreign Minister Litvinov used to peddle about in the 1930s that peace is indivisible. Peace is obviously not indivisible.
>
> We have seen numbers of wars that have been isolated, numbers of armed conflicts that have not led to the use of arms.
>
> It seems to me our first concern here should be to prevent any war with weapons of mass destruction that we conceivably can prevent. This is our first duty, it is a duty to our children first and then to ourselves. But it is a duty that everybody should care about.
>
> Beyond that I think we should strive for world stability, and try to reduce violence to a minimum, but be extremely careful about trying to distinguish morally between the two sides in the various conflicts that we see beyond our borders.

I interject at that point to say that I believe one of the serious errors that can be made in connection with the conflict in Vietnam is making a determination as between the "goodies" and the "baddies"; that the South Vietnamese are the "goodies," and the Vietcong are the "baddies," supported by the "big baddie," Ho Chi Minh, and Hanoi.

To me, this is a superficial and immature approach to the whole problem which exists in that country.

I return to quote Ambassador Kennan:

> As a rule the issues of these conflicts are not identifiable with our own ideals anyway. And it is a great mistake to think that the devils are all on one side or the angels on the other. We have had a tendency to exaggerate the enmity of our enemies, and to exaggerate the friendliness of our friends. In international affairs there is always, as I said in my initial statement, a degree of complication in relations between people.

I interpolate there again to stress that in my judgment, my good friend from Washington, who generally is supporting the State Department and Defense Department line, has fallen into the error of oversimplifying the conflict in Vietnam, and considering it clearly an issue of black and white or right and wrong. It is much more complex and more complicated than that, as I have been endeavoring to show today and on several occasions in the past.

I return to former Ambassador Kennan's statement:

> Let's adjust to this, and then concentrate more than we have on our internal problems which, as I see it, are really in a very serious state. Let's be a little more willing to let things happen without our intervention in other parts of the world wherever it does not seem as though world peace would be threatened thereby.
>
> I think the main thing is to try to bring about, as I have said, stability, to restrict violence, not to put ourselves in a position where we have to interfere every time the guns begin speaking anywhere.
>
> We have done something—I say "we" meaning the international community—which is extremely dangerous in one way, and that is we have authorized the establishment of literally dozens of new states, composed of peoples without experience in the sense of a national identity, in many instances with a scarcely sufficient educated class to mount a government.
>
> Now, we mustn't expect that this is not going to have many adverse effects, or that all that results is going to be stable. These countries are simply not going to become mature and established and peaceful members of the international community like some of the older small nations of Europe within our time. We have to allow for that.
>
> I think we should try to help them avoid armed conflicts. We should try to help them with their problems of developing within limits.
>
> But we have to be careful about shouldering their entire burdens in any of these things, and about espousing their causes.

I interject that our failure to heed that sound advice is the principal reason we are in so much trouble today in South Vietnam. We have shouldered, or attempted to shoulder, practically the entire burden of the Government of South Vietnam. We have espoused their cause without giving any very careful consideration to whether or not it is a just cause. I suggest that we have deceived ourselves by identifying the war as one of aggression from the north on the south, whereas in point of fact the civil war began as long ago as 1958, and the intervention from the north did not occur until 1964; so that for 6 years it was a civil war, fought by South Vietnamese against South Vietnamese, with, of course, on both sides many Vietnamese from the north—because we must never forget that Vietnam is really all one country. The 17th parallel is an artificial division, created by the Geneva Conference for temporary purposes, and was not intended to last for more than the 2 years between 1954 and 1956.

I continue to read from Ambassador Kennan. Having referred to our shouldering their entire burden, he says, in concluding the particular colloquy:

> I can't repeat too often one thing that I cited last year when I spoke before this committee, a sentence from John Quincy Adams, where he said even where other peoples' causes masquerade under the banner of freedom we had better not be tempted to take part in them. It is apt to prove that it just isn't just quite that way.

We should have learned the lesson when Diem betrayed democracy, but we did not. Now we shall have to learn it all over again when General Ky betrays democracy.

I turn now to page 61 of the same hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee, at which Ambassador Kennan was testifying, and the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy] was engaged in colloquy with him.

The Senator said:

> Mr. Kennan, in the years that you were involved in policy planning—

I interpolate that Ambassador Kennan was at one point the very brilliant director of the State Department's Policy Planning Staff.

> Senator McCarthy. Mr. Kennan, in the years that you were involved in policy planning, the years when you observed the development of plans with reference to the Far East, was there any time, when it was accepted that putting troops in southeast Asia was a part—was within the defense perimeter of the United States.
>
> Mr. Kennan. Not to my knowledge.
>
> Senator McCarthy (continuing). When that concept was current, within or on the perimeter?
>
> Mr. Kennan. My recollection is that this was in earlier years never accepted at all as a principle of American policy. I don't believe from my talks with General MacArthur that he ever envisaged a situation in which we would want to put troops on the mainland, outside of Korea, and I can assure you that in such planning as I was connected with in the immediate posthostility period running down to 1950—again excepting Korea which was a responsibility we had through the surrender of Japan and which occupied a special place—outside of that, I don't think anyone ever thought that any national interest that we had in the mainland of Asia was such that we might put troops there.
>
> Senator McCarthy. What about the point of view of those who were concerned with the containment of China by the United States? Did any of them contemplate that the containment of China depended upon our maintaining strength in this area of Southeast Asia?
>
> Mr. Kennan. No, they did not. I think the general view at this time was that we had a vital interest in seeing to it that the Japanese and Philippine archipelagos remained in reasonably friendly and reliable hands. We also had an interest of a negative sort in Formosa and in Okinawa.
>
> Senator McCarthy. So that the arguments that both the defense of the United States and the containment of China are somehow closely related to what we do in Southeast Asia are relatively new arguments?
>
> Mr. Kennan. Yes.
>
> Senator McCarthy. They are not in the longtime plans or projections?
>
> Mr. Kennan. I think that is correct.
>
> Senator McCarthy. Mr. Kennan, do you know of anyone—back at the time when we first committed advisers in Vietnam—who actually said that this might develop into the kind of commitment that we now have?
>
> Mr. Kennan. No, although I am sure that there were people who viewed what we did at that time with a certain amount of apprehension. I can remember that on one occasion, when one of my colleagues came to me at the time of the crisis in Greece, when the Greeks were faced with a guerrilla movement, and suggested that we ought to put troops in, I had to reply to him that the experience of our intervention in Russia in 1918 and 1919 would suggest we should never put troops into such a situation unless we could see in advance how and when we were going to get them out again.

I interpolate that at the time President John F. Kennedy made his statement to which I referred earlier this afternoon, to the effect that it was the South Vietnamese people's war to win or, indeed, to lose, we had only 12,000 combat troops in South Vietnam.

We now have upward of 400,000, and very little of anything more to show for it except a rising list of American casualties and the other disadvantages of the war in South Vietnam to which I intend to refer after I offer my amendment tomorrow in a speech which I shall entitle "What Price Glory."

I read again from the statement of Ambassador Kennan:

> Well, I wasn't the only person who held such views. I am sure there were many people who had misgivings about seeing us commit soldiers to combat in a confused situation of this nature before we could see at what point we were going to be able to extract them again.
>
> Senator McCarthy. Do you know of anyone who had that apprehension who said nonetheless we ought to put them in?
>
> I am trying to find somebody who said, "If we put them in this is the way we ought to be doing it, and I am in favor of it."
>
> We find lots of them saying, "I didn't think it would go this way and if I thought it were going to go this way I wouldn't be in favor of it."
>
> Mr. Kennan. It seems to me most people in a responsible position three or four years ago were saying we never should have put them in there. It is very difficult to understand how we got to where we got.
>
> Senator McCarthy. Wouldn't it be better to find someone who said, "I knew it was going to go this way and I was for it," than to find somebody who said, "I didn't think it would go this way or I wouldn't be for it."
>
> But there is evidently nobody who conceived that it might go this way and who said, "We have got to do it anyway."
>
> Mr. Kennan. I can't think of anyone.

Mr. President, that takes me back to a concept which I have long accepted as our wise military and diplomatic posture with respect to Asia. I believe it is a posture which would be agreed upon by most thoughtful interpreters of our history in the wise use of our power.

Let us remember that when the Japanese struck at Pearl Harbor in December of 1941, there was nobody in the United States who thought that the Pacific was an American sea. We had only outposts at Wake Island and Guam and the Marianas, and they had relatively minor fortifications and very few troops to defend them.

Honolulu and the Hawaiian Islands were our outposts in the Pacific—one-third of the way across that vast ocean.

There suddenly came Pearl Harbor and World War II, and we found ourselves pledged to the defeat of Japan, a Pacific power.

The French went back into southeast Asia. The Dutch went back into Malaysia, and the British went back into Malaysia and Hong Kong.

It has always been my view, then and now, that that was the problem of the colonial powers of Western Europe, and if they were able to maintain their positions as colonial powers, that was not our affair. If the natives decided to throw them out and become independent, that was none of our affair either.

It was my view that the outmost edge of the wise American policy was to draw a periphery down the island chain, starting with Japan—and I would not have included Korea—and running around Okinawa, Taiwan, the Philippines, the Indonesian archipelago, Malaysia—being then a British hegemony—with Australia and New Zealand to back them, and that we would then be able to deploy in support of our diplomacy the military power in which we excel: naval and air power.

We would be under no temptation to put American ground troops to fight on Asian land. I think that was a serious mistake, and I hope in due course that, having settled the Vietnam conflict on a basis honorable to ourselves and fair to our allies in South Vietnam, we will withdraw and never go back to the mainland of Asia.

I completely agree with Ambassador Kennan and most regretfully, in opposition to the thesis advanced by the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson].

In that connection, I reiterate that, in my judgment, the balance of power is a dangerous doctrine in a nuclear age and should not be injected by us in South Vietnam where, in many ways, particularly since the current chaos in China and the apparent willingness of the Soviet Union to see peace terms sought after and negotiations commenced, there is no long-term threat to whatever balance of power there may be in southeast Asia which could not be adequately handled by our diplomacy supported by our air and naval power based on the island chain, to which I have just referred.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] then discussed with considerable force and clarity the importance of our relations with the Soviet Union. I agree with the Senator from Washington that those relations are important. Perhaps they are more important than even the Senator from Washington thinks.

I agree with the Senator from Washington that the U.S.S.R. has great capabilities, economic and military.

The Senator from Washington speaks of the Soviet Union having broken its word in Laos. The Senators can recall that in the Vienna meeting, not too long after his inauguration, President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev purported to make a deal with respect to Laos but were unable to make a deal with respect to Vietnam, and that the Pathet Lao, supported from Hanoi, broke that agreement to which it was never a party.

The Soviet Union has been charged—and I will not say without justice—with having broken its commitment.

My own suggestion is that is was perhaps a commitment that they did not have the power to keep and that therefore they should never have made it.

I suspect that Mr. Khrushchev thought he had a great deal more influence with Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh than it turned out he had.

I would not myself accept the fact that that arrangement between Kennedy and Khrushchev was broken on the Communist side as uncontrovertible evidence of bad faith on the part of the Russians. I think it is evidence of the fact that their reach exceeded their grasp and that they made a commitment which they were unable to fulfill on the ground.

The Senator asked:

> Is the Soviet anxious to bring the war in Vietnam to an end?

When I was in the Soviet Union last November and had a long talk with First Deputy Foreign Minister Kuznetsov, a man who incidentally speaks excellent English and who was educated at the Carnegie School of Engineering in my own State, in the city of Pittsburgh, he was tough.

He indicated that the Soviet Union would not in any way intervene to help bring hostilities in Vietnam to a close. He reiterated the famous four points of the Hanoi government.

He referred to that government as "our Socialist allies whom we must protect and defend."

I left Moscow quite discouraged, believing that the Soviet Union was not interested in peace in Vietnam; that perhaps, like the Chinese Communists, they would like to have the war continue until the death of the last American, without any commitment of troops on the part of either China or Russia, although, of course, there were massive commitments of equipment and materiel.

If I have correctly read the newspapers in the last few weeks, the whole situation has changed. I was particularly interested that that change in situation has been perceptively noted by an able reporter who hitherto has been one of the great hawks of all time, a belligerent hawk, who appears to obtain from the Pentagon information that nobody else can get, and who has written so often in the past of the need for total military victory in Vietnam. I refer, of course, to the well-known columnist Joseph Alsop, who wrote several columns in recent days or weeks, indicating that he has changed his mind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the column entitled "The Big Blink in London," written by Joseph Alsop, and published in this morning's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BIG BLINK IN LONDON

(By Joseph Alsop)

What happened in London ten days ago, between the British and Soviet Prime Ministers, was very much more important than anyone has as yet admitted in public. Facts have been published, but in a manner three quarters shorn of meaning.

Briefly, Prime Minister Alexei Kosygin went to London with a lingering hope that this country might still be induced to "stop the bombing to get talks" about Vietnam.

More specifically, he hoped to persuade the British to change their stand, and to join in the pressure that the Soviets had been so persistently applying since September.

Kosygin's aim had been foreseen in Washington. Chester Cooper, one of the ablest members of Governor Averell Harriman's "peace task-force," was therefore sent over very inconspicuously, just before the Kosygin visit, to give Prime Minister Harold Wilson the very latest details of the situation as seen here in Washington.

In the outcome, the Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary George Brown refused to be budged from their position that the President was quite reasonable to refuse a bombing halt without some sort of reciprocal action by Hanoi. Whereupon—and here is the vital meaningful development—the Soviet Premier took the wholly new tack of trying to budge Hanoi.

For this purpose, the Soviet government, at Kosygin's request, officially urged the Hanoi government to take quite important reciprocal action, in order to secure the desired bombing halt and the opening of negotiations. After long delays (during which Harold Wilson has confessed that he thought peace was "within grasp") the Hanoi leaders refused to heed Moscow's urgings.

But Hanoi's obstinacy was really less significant than Moscow's new flexibility. When one partner is deeply and painfully engaged, and another partner is merely giving aid and comfort, the engaged partner is always bound to meet the first suggestion that he cut his losses with an initial show of obstinacy. The thing to note, in fact, is that Moscow has begun to give this kind of advice.

This means, first, that Hanoi's partners in Moscow now judge that the war is going very badly for Hanoi. It means, second, that Moscow seriously wants the war ended as soon as possible. Without such compelling reasons, Kosygin would never, indeed could never have done what he did.

One informed judge has remarked that "the Soviets were formerly trying to find a way out that would save America's face. Now they are trying to find a way out that will save Hanoi's face." Maybe that is putting it a bit high; but the fact remains that in Dean Rusk's terminology, there was a big blink in London, though a blink at second hand, to be sure.

The Wilson-Kosygin conversations had some other vividly interesting aspects. Quite spontaneously, for instance, and to all appearances quite disinterestedly, Premier Kosygin strongly advised Prime Minister Wilson to remain solidly faithful to his American Alliance, whatever Gen. de Gaulle might say about it. The United States, Kosygin implied, mattered immeasurably more than France.

Again, Premier Kosygin had the frankness to admit, at one point, that no less than 100,000 North Vietnamese are now at the front in South Vietnam. This figure means that just about one half of the Vietcong—indeed, rather more than half, according to the enemy documents newly captured in the "Cedar Falls" operation—are now invaders from the North.

The figure is far higher than any the U.S. Intelligence has ever used. It points to serious deterioration of the Vietcong's structure and popular support in the South; for such an enormous Northern presence can only reflect an urgent need. It fits, in short, with what Kosygin did in London.

One may be quite certain, moreover, that what Kosygin did in London was only a beginning. Such new departures are always beginnings, never ends. It is a ten-to-one bet, therefore, that new approaches to peace in Vietnam are now being jointly explored, in some back room or other, by Soviet and American representatives.

This does not mean that an end is already in sight—although it just could be. It is also a situation demanding maximum American self-possession. To budge Hanoi at last, maximum pressure must be maintained at the front; yet in outlining possible settlement terms, the most generous moderation must also be shown. It will be criminal if the first "smell of victory," as Walter Lippmann has put it, is allowed to cause intoxication-from-success.

That fact remains that if we are both resolute and generous, an end may yet be in sight before most people have dared to imagine.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, to lapse briefly into Latin: Mirabile dictu—the hawk has lost his claws.

Mr. Alsop starts his column by saying that what happened 10 days ago in London between Kosygin and Wilson was very important, indeed. Kosygin went to London, hoping that the United States could be induced to "stop bombing to get talks" about Vietnam. When he found that could not be done, much to Mr. Alsop's surprise—and perhaps this is true; who knows?—the Soviets promptly took a whole new tack and tried to budge Hanoi, to get them to the negotiating table.

I do not say that Mr. Alsop is the law of the Medes and the Persians; I do not even identify him with the Code of Hammurabi or with the Constitution of the United States. I am lost for further analogies. But I think it is interesting when this hawkiest of the hawks writes:

> It is a 10-to-1 bet, therefore, that new approaches to peace in Vietnam are now being jointly explored, in some back room or other, by Soviet and American representatives.
>
> This does not mean that an end is already in sight—although it just could be. It is also a situation demanding maximum American self-possession.

With that, I thoroughly agree.

> To budge Hanoi at last, maximum pressure must be maintained at the front.

With that I disagree.

> Yet in outlining possible settlement terms, the most generous moderation must also be shown.

I should like to see some generous moderation as opposed to the further escalation. I note from the newspapers this morning that we have again moved to escalating the war by dropping mines from aircraft into the rivers of North Vietnam, and are further escalating by moving in artillery to shell North Vietnam across the demilitarized zone. We are also moving our warships in to shell North Vietnam targets in a new blow at the supply trail to the south. These are actions which the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, told me on Thursday he did not know were even contemplated.

So we see, as Ambassador Goldberg goes to the Far East on a mission to explore possibilities for peace, that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have moved in, as they have moved so often before, with a further escalation of military action. Senators will remember that it has now been revealed that back on the 12th and 13th of last December, Hanoi was ready to say that if the United States called off its bombing, Hanoi would go to the negotiating table. Before the words could come out of their mouths, we bombed Hanoi and killed a number of civilians right in the middle of the city. Oh, surely, it was said to be an accident. Oh, surely, we did not mean to kill civilians. We were after some military target, the nature of which I do not remember at the moment.

So now, when possibly again, according to one of the great hawks in our country, peace may be just around the corner, we choose to escalate the war for another time.

I am concerned as to what the administration is up to. The President talks a fine game of peace; and frankly, I believe him. I think he wants peace as much as anyone else in the United States today. But just as there seems to be a pretty good chance of getting peace, just as he receives a signal—almost any signal—that Hanoi is ready to talk, our military takes over and escalates the war, and if for no other reason than because of a loss of face—a vice not confined to the Oriental mind; many Americans, I think, also practice that vice—and the chance for peace has gone out the window.

I wonder who is doing all this. I wonder why it is that the military do not seem to be under that control of our civilian government which is the basis of our whole democracy. I will say again, as I have said many times before, that, in my judgment, the military ought to be kept on tap, not on top. But they wriggle out of the tap time after time and seem to get on top just at the time when their activities strike a serious blow against peace.

I was startled on Saturday morning of last week, when I was back in my hometown of Philadelphia, Pa., to see a four-column spread on the front page of the Philadelphia Inquirer, our great morning newspaper. The headline was:

> U.S. Calls Peace Effort a Failure, Says War is Only Vietnam Course.

Who told the Philadelphia Inquirer that? I do not know. Let me read a little further:

> From Our Wire Services. Washington, February 24—U.S. officials said Friday that peace efforts made this month have collapsed and—barring a change of position by Hanoi—a military solution is the only way of ending the Vietnam War.

What U.S. officials? Faceless men, again; a reiteration of that wicked maxim—I use the word advisedly—by which anonymous little men, usually at intermediate positions in either the State Department, the Defense Department, or the Armed Services, leak stories to anonymous reporters from our wire services.

A scare four-column headline appears in a great metropolitan daily to lead the American people to believe that the chances of peace are gone.

> U.S. officials said the response from Hanoi to the meeting in London of Prime Minister Harold Wilson and Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin in effect was, "Go to hell."

What U.S. officials were using that somewhat vulgar language is not disclosed in the article. Certainly, Mr. Alsop does not appear to believe that. I wonder who was responsible.

> U.S. officials said that North Vietnam had concentrated major forces in and about the demilitarized zone at the 17th parallel.
>
> There were no assurances given by Hanoi that these forces would not be sent across the demilitarized zone into South Vietnam if the United States halted the bombing of the North.

(At this point, Mr. SPONG took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, here we have a war scare created anonymously by faceless men. I deplore this and I intend to ask the Department of Defense and the Department of State to see if they can find out who these anonymous men are. The Philadelphia Inquirer, of course, will protect its sources. That is proper newspaper procedure. But this sort of thing is vicious and there should be a way to stop it, particularly when it comes at a time when many persons, in addition to Mr. Alsop, think if we behave with that wise maturity which Ambassador Kennan counseled us to follow, we may be much closer to peace now in this area than we have been for a long time, and perhaps close to it.

Mr. President, that is why it is a wise thing to have a far-ranging debate on the pending business. I hope tomorrow and the next day that many Senators will rise and express their views on what I have said, what the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has said, what the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] has said today, what the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] said last week, and what the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] said on Friday.

Mr. President, I think it is high time that we brought these problems into the open and that we had a wide-ranging debate. Perhaps the amendments which I and Senator HARTKE filed—and he played his part in the debate on Friday, also—will provide the vehicle for such a debate.

Mr. President, I say, in answer to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], in my judgment and the judgment of Mr. Alsop—an unusual ally for my point of view—the Soviet Union is anxious to bring the war in Vietnam to an end. I believe the consensus is that Soviet policy has changed since I was in Moscow in the middle of last November—for which I am glad, if it is true—and we should explore to determine if it is true.

I am gratified by the fact that Ambassador Thompson, that wise diplomat, has returned to Moscow. I have no doubt that he is even now exploring the possibilities of peace which might develop from a Soviet change of mind.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] refers to the antiballistic missiles and their alleged deployment by the Soviet Union. He indicates his grave concern that we might let down our guard and not follow suit, even though following suit would cost us in the neighborhood of $40 billion, and without civil defense shelters which would have to be constructed and made available to our people in the relatively small number of cities where $40 billion would provide some kind of inadequate antiballistic missile defense.

The Senator puts his emphasis on a strong defense. I cannot disagree with him, for I, too, think that within limits we should have a strong defense until, negotiating from strength, we are able to arrive at a detente, which is so clearly in the interest of both the Soviet Union and the United States.

The Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which has as its chairman the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and on which I have the honor to serve, is presently conducting hearings on the antiballistic-missile problem. Of course, much of that testimony is classified. I am not at liberty to reveal it, but from what I have heard I do not have the slightest doubt that newspaper stories, which I have read to the effect that there is no such thing nor will there be in the foreseeable future a foolproof antiballistic missile system, are correct. Nothing we have, the Nike X or the Nike-Zeus, could prevent any one of our cities from being destroyed by a massive attack. The information I have received is that this is true of the Soviet Union's antiballistic missile defense.

I hope that wise and enlightened diplomacy will succeed. I know that our diplomats are trying hard to persuade the Soviet Union to call off this expenditure for a system which will not work and the future tax of the economy would perhaps bring it close to the breaking point.

The Senator says that we need to remember the art of doing two things at once. I agree with that. Possibly Theodore Roosevelt was right when he said: Speak softly and carry a big stick. We are going to carry that stick a while longer. Let us speak softly. Let us appreciate that there is a good chance, indeed, that the posture of the Soviet Union has changed; that they are now as anxious to move toward a détente as we are if we can only get the shooting stopped in Vietnam.

I commend the Senator from Washington for his support of the consular treaty with Russia. I think he showed wise statemanship, particularly when one remembers his inherent suspicions of the intentions of the Soviet Union and the speculation on the wide range of intentions of that country. I think he showed wisdom and maturity by stating he believed that the consular treaty should be ratified as the first step toward what could turn into a wide ranging détente.

I would hope that the Senator from Washington—and I have not abandoned hope—would join some of the rest of us in urging reciprocal reduction of military power by the Soviet Union and ourselves. That action is needed and it is needed before we break into open conflict because, as with children playing with tin soldiers and little guns in the sand, we have to commit those toys to use to see if they work. We are fortunate indeed, that that has not yet happened.

The Senator from Washington notes that there have been some hopeful signs in connection with East-West relations in Europe. Having recently returned from that part of the world I believe we should capitalize on them in terms of the splendid speech which was made on October 7, 1966, by President Johnson, when he indicated his desire to build bridges between the nations of Eastern Europe, Western Europe, and ourselves.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] said:

> We want to encourage more by standing ready to cooperate with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union when cooperation is possible and by standing quietly but firmly on the ready in case our will is once again put to the test in Berlin or elsewhere.

With that I thoroughly agree.

In the third part of the Senator's speech, he attributes the anti-Communist revolution in Indonesia to the strong military stand we took in South Vietnam. This must be a matter of judgment. My judgment is not in accord with that of the Senator from Washington. I believe that the revolution in Indonesia would have occurred because of the peculiar situation in that country, whether we had a single American soldier on the land mass of Asia in Vietnam. But, I cannot prove it, and he cannot prove it. This must be a question of judgment which I think, to some extent, reflects our varying points of view in the appropriate use of military power.

I quote from an article written by Seymour Topping and published in the New York Times, provided to me by the Library of Congress. On August 25 he writes:

> Although some military men feel that United States action in Vietnam helped to shield Indonesia from Communist infiltration, the Jakarta government officials and public generally are opposed to the Vietnam policy of the Johnson Administration. Malik—

That is the Indonesian Foreign Minister—

> believes that Asian security problems should be solved by the Asians themselves on the basis of regional cooperation.

Malik is one of the triumvirate which is presently governing Indonesia. He, Malik, says that Indonesia will join in developing Southeast Asia regional organizations, but he feels that in their early stages such groups should exercise economic rather than military action.

Mr. President, Mr. Malik came to Washington on September 27, 1966, and he treaded carefully on the Vietnam issue. In an obvious effort to avoid complicating current aid for Indonesia negotiations, he took a guarded stand in favor of a cessation of U.S. bombing in North Vietnam at a news conference reported in the Washington Post on September 28, 1966.

Thus, I suggest that the consensus of available information would be that the Indonesians, after their anti-Communist revolution—and for that matter, before it—did not believe that our intervention in South Vietnam was of any particular assistance to their cause.

Let me point out that Indonesia is one of three countries which got rid of its Communists without the aid of a single American soldier. The other two countries were Burma and the Philippines.

Perhaps we would do better if we utilized our diplomacy, and perhaps the Peace Corps, to aid the economic advancement of these countries through our aid program rather than landing soldiers on their shores to kill the natives in an effort to give them the freedom which they know little, if anything, about.

The Senator said that "to know Red China is to fear its ambitions."

Perhaps Red China has bellicose intentions toward the other nations of Southeast Asia. They have had them for thousands of years and they have never been able to take over yet. But, I wonder, under current conditions, whether Red China has the capability of moving any soldiers very far south of its own borders.

I am certainly no military expert, but everything I have been able to read and to hear is to the effect that certainly since the recent chaos overtook Communist China—and probably before then—they had great defensive capability; one would be unwise to attempt to invade Red China; but their offensive capability was slight, indeed. Their adventures into Tibet and on the borders of India are not evidence to the contrary.

The Senator also refers to opinion in Japan. He says in effect:

> There has been a remarkable shift of opinion in Japan as that country has watched the hard line followed by Peking in Vietnam and in international affairs generally.

I interpolate to say that Japan has watched the hard line which we have taken in South Vietnam since we put massive American forces and firepower in there to the tune of hundreds of thousands of men in the spring and summer of 1965.

> Japan—

Continues the Senator from Washington—

> was at first very critical of the American buildup in Vietnam. We know the good historical reasons why this should be so. But today there is open discussion in Japan, inconceivable two years ago, of the importance to Japan of keeping ready access to the markets of Southeast Asia and not having an unfriendly power in control of the Straits of Malacca. It has not been lost to the Japanese that the United States has no territorial ambitions in North Vietnam or in Vietnam at all, that it is willing to permit the Communist government in the northern half of the country to continue and that it has hoped to bring about a degree of political stability in the south.

This may well be true, but let me quote from the testimony of our very able former Ambassador to Japan, Mr. Reischauer, given a couple of weeks ago before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—actually it was January 31 of this year—on the subject of Asia, the Pacific, and the United States.

Note this carefully:

> Mr. REISCHAUER. The Japanese public is very much afraid that America may be following the unhappy course Japan took in the 1930s and 1940s in its relationships with China, and that is one of the reasons for the strong public reaction to our Vietnam policies in Japan, because they see us following an essentially military course that might get us further and further involved with these great masses of people on the Asian continent, and they learned themselves that they cannot be controlled by military means.
>
> I do not think we are doing that—

Says Ambassador Reischauer, and I interject there to say that I think we are doing just that.

Ambassador Reischauer continues:

> I do not think we are doing that, but this is what the Japanese think we may be getting into.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. I have been told the Japanese approve of what we are doing down there. Would you elaborate a bit on that?
>
> * * * * *
>
> Mr. REISCHAUER. This is a very complicated thing to talk about, because, after all, there are 100 million Japanese with different points of view.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The Government which, of course, has close contacts with us, and has had a dialog with us all along, I think understands our position fairly well and has tended to say that it understood. That is the strongest phrase they used in giving us their support there. They have never quite dared to say that they support us because there is a great deal of opposition to our policies on the part of the general public in Japan.
>
> I think the average Japanese would be worried if we were to pull out.

So would I, without a sensible and honorable peace.

Continuing to read from Mr. Reischauer's testimony:

> They would see this as leading to great disruption in the whole of southeast Asia, and they have much greater interests there than we do, so they do not want to see that happen.

And neither do I, but I want to see us stay and withdraw gradually, after a just peace and some contribution on our part to reviving the economy which we have played so large a part in wrecking.

> On the other hand—

Says the Ambassador—

> they have an instinctive revulsion at seeing what is essentially a Caucasian nation with superior weapons fighting Asian people without those weapons, and they identify themselves naturally with the people being bombed, and this is not surprising, because we bombed Japan ourselves 21 years ago, and so they think of themselves more in terms of bombees rather than bombers.

So I, with great reluctance, cannot agree with my friend from Washington in his analysis of Japanese opinion.

The Senator from Washington says we seek a limited victory; and I agree with that, too. He says it is obtainable. I believe it is obtainable, but not by military means. We need political action, and not a military solution, to bring this war to an honorable end.

The word must go through diplomacy, and not by force of arms. Are we succeeding?

. I have tried to make a record with respect to that earlier this afternoon. I suggest that while it may be that our military efforts are beginning to become more successful than they were in the past, all the indications of military strength suggest we are not any closer to the subjugation of the Vietcong and the pacification of South Vietnam than we were at the time the infiltration started and the guerrilla warfare commenced. All the massive strength of the

United States of America, deployed in that country, now for more than 18 months, has had very little impact.

I cannot help remembering so well that General Harkins and General Taylor, and even Secretary of Defense McNamara, have said it is almost over, that we are winning, that the war is coming to an end. The Secretary once promised even to bring the boys home by Christmas 1965. General Taylor once indicated that in 3 or 4 months, from the time he spoke, the war would be won.

We all know the story of the little boy who ran into the village and cried "wolf." This is the reverse of the situation in Vietnam. The story goes that each time the little boy cried "wolf," the village men ran out with their sticks and other weapons, and the little boy roared with laughter, because there was no wolf. Are we going to continue to accept the military's word when they predict victory? We started doing it many years ago and here it is the winter of 1967. So I suggest we remember that, when we hear that recent military operations have taken a turn for the better and that Hanoi is about to give up and the Vietcong about to return to their destroyed villages. As one Senator, I will believe it when I see it. I hope I am wrong. I hope the military is right. But I must admit that past experience does not give one much confidence in its predictions.

I want to say a word about the bombing. The Senator from Washington appears to believe that the bombing of the north has had at least a perceptible, if not a significant, effect in curtailing infiltration from the south; and perhaps he has evidence to sustain that position, but, from what I have been able to learn from the hearings held before the Armed Services Committee, there is no such contention on the part of the military.

At page 73 of the hearings, Secretary McNamara is quoted as having said:

> I believe that the campaign against the north has been successful, and I say that for two reasons. First, because the objectives were just exactly what you say has been accomplished, to increase the morale of the south.

At what cost do we increase the morale of General Ky and his military and air force cohorts?

I resume reading what Secretary McNamara said:

> Everybody will agree to that. Second, to increase the cost to the north of infiltration to the south.

Note carefully, not to stop it, but to increase its cost. He then continues:

> Roughly 200,000 to 300,000 people in the north have been diverted from other activities to, in effect, repairing the damage to the lines of communication caused by our bombing. So the cost to infiltrate these limited quantities of men and equipment to the south has increased dramatically.
>
> Third, to raise the political price paid by the north to continue the campaign in the south, and as you pointed out, that has definitely been done. So I would say those were the stated objectives we had in mind and we have accomplished them.
>
> The second reason I say it's a success is that there isn't anything they would like to get rid of more at the moment, that I can tell, than the bombing [deleted]. So for both of those reasons I think it has been a success.

Now note this:

> But I never believed in the past, and I don't believe today, that air bombardment on any acceptable scale will stop or significantly reduce the movement of such small numbers of men and such small quantities of material as are being sent from the north to the south.

Are they, then, so small? We have been told various figures at different times: 3,500 a month; 7,500 a month; a total, according to our last count, of 45,000 last year, plus possibly 26,000 more who have not been actually identified.

I charge that North Vietnam can send just exactly as many people into South Vietnam as it wants to, and if it has not sent any more, it is not because the bombing has stopped or even slowed them, but because it did not want to send any more. We all know Ho Chi Minh has a large, well trained army, which he has not committed to the south at all. Any time he wants to, in my opinion, he can.

I am not in a position to reveal the source of that statement, but I am convinced that it is correct.

So I would say that our diplomacy should be a little more skillful, and not so blundering; that we should have taken and should take all initiative and every opportunity to get negotiations started. If we have to stop the bombing again, to see if it will work, let us stop the bombing. If it does not work, we can always start the bombing again. But let us remember that the bombing does not do us much good. Even Secretary McNamara's statements, if we analyze them carefully, do not differ along those lines.

Let me read from another statement by the Secretary. It appears on page 57 of the hearings:

> Undoubtedly the bombings do limit the capability of the North Vietnamese to infiltrate men and equipment into the south. I think just a priori one could arrive at that conclusion. But it is not clear that the limit that results is below the level that the North Vietnamese planned on, and in any event, it is not below the level necessary to support the force in the south at the present time.

Apparently Secretary McNamara there is saying that it is just the intentions of Hanoi, and not the bombing, that is curtailing infiltration into the south. They just do not want to send any more down there at the present time; and perhaps they are wise.

So I would suggest that a little more skillful diplomacy could be conducted, in the hope of getting together over the negotiating table, without threatening in any way the lives of "our boys in the jungles and the elephant grass," as so many of my fellow Senators love poetically to say from time to time, when they feel they do not want the bombing stopped.

I do not believe a single additional American boy's life would be in jeopardy if we stopped the bombing. I could be wrong. I do not know. This must be just an individual judgment. I know that former Senator Goldwater said recently that during the truce, the trucks were bumper to bumper from North Vietnam to South Vietnam, carrying additional ammunition and materiel to kill our boys. I do not know whether anybody verified that comment, and I would be interested to see to what extent, if at all, during the truce, significant additional supplies or men were infiltrated from the north to the south. Again I say I might be wrong, and I shall await with interest a reply to that inquiry.

The complaint is made that Russian mines and antiaircraft are being used against our shipping and our airplanes. But is this anything more than the opposite number of our bombing and our naval activity, and now our mining of the rivers of North Vietnam? What we have to get into our heads is that Soviet Russia is a natural ally of the Socialists in North Vietnam, to the same extent as we have become, to my way of thinking, a rather unnatural ally of the Ky government in South Vietnam; and to the extent that the two powers are engaged, of course, we are going to protect our friends. That has been the history of alliances and warfare since the beginning of time.

The Senator says that Hanoi could stop the bombing by stopping the infiltration. I wonder what the record of infiltration has been since the first of this year. I wait with interest some figures on that. It was not too long ago that the columnist, Joseph Alsop, averred that our bombing had pretty well dried up the infiltration of South Vietnam from the north. Yet, I repeat, highly responsible intelligence sources say that that is not so, and if the infiltration has leveled off, as perhaps it has—and I should like to know—I would suggest it is not because of the bombing, but because Ho Chi Minh decided he did not wish to commit any more regular troops to the south.

Mr. President, let me say in conclusion that I welcome the speech of the Senator from Washington. It is a temperate speech. It does not wrap the flag around anyone. If one makes the basic assumptions of the Senator from Washington, it is a persuasive speech. I agree with much of it. But I suggest it ignores the larger picture which the witnesses before the Committee on Foreign Relations made plain in their testimony a few weeks ago. So I now turn to a brief discussion of that testimony. I believe I have already read into the RECORD most of what needs to be pointed out with respect to the testimony of Ambassador Kennan; but I did not mention what he had to say about the bombing.

I quote from page 59 of his testimony at the hearing before the Foreign Relations Committee on January 30. Senator COOPER asked him—and I shall skip the first part of the Senator's comment, because it is irrelevant:

> Do you think cessation of bombing is worth the risk of our taking it?
>
> Mr. KENNAN. Yes.
>
> Senator COOPER. Moving toward the possibility of negotiations?
>
> Mr. KENNAN. Senator Cooper, I don't feel that I am in a position to see all the factors that are involved in this situation. There are no doubt some that I can't judge from the information available to me. Also, in contrast, apparently, with a great many people who criticize violently what we are doing in Vietnam, I have a very high degree of

> faith in the good will and the seriousness of the people who are guiding our policy.
>
> I feel that their problems have not been easy ones. I don't share the feeling that they are idiots to have done what we have done. I think this has been a very, very difficult problem. They have given their explanations for the continuation of the bombing. I have not been fully persuaded by those explanations. Perhaps I am wrong; perhaps they are. But it has seemed to me that this is a very extravagant undertaking from the standpoint of the relationship between cause and effect, fantastically expensive for a relatively small result. It has certainly had adverse effects on world opinion. And it has required us repeatedly to decline to follow the very solemn urgings given us by such people as U Thant and Pope Paul.
>
> These are not light considerations, you see.
>
> But in addition to this, it has divided our own opinion here at home in a very grievous manner.
>
> And finally you have the fact that, as the administration admits, any operation of this sort is bound to bring a certain amount of loss of innocent civilian life. Now, this is something we, all of us, in the light of our own ideals and national ideals and personal feelings can only regret profoundly.

I interject that it is not only the cause of substantial loss of life among civilians; it is the cause of significant loss of life to American boys who are flying the planes and being shot down and killed or burned to death, or taken prisoner and perhaps tortured. So the cost is even greater, in my book, than Ambassador Kennan's statement indicates.

The Ambassador continues:

> So for all these reasons, it seems to me that the burden of proof is on those who say that this operation must continue.
>
> I would not like to risk the statement that if we were to stop doing it there would immediately be some reciprocal action either by Ho or by the Russians. I don't know whether there would or wouldn't.

Neither do I.

He continued:

> I personally would feel more comfortable about our position, whether there was or whether there wasn't.

Then Senator COOPER said, to paraphrase his statement, "I do not know the answer to these imponderables, either," and continued:

> But even knowing all, these questions cannot be answered, yet the hope of negotiations could make it worthwhile to make the effort.
>
> Mr. KENNAN. Yes; the answer is affirmative.

I turn now to the testimony of Ambassador Reischauer, who testified on January 31. For the record, this is Ambassador Edwin O. Reischauer, who served in Japan with such distinction for many years, and is now back in this country as a professor at Harvard University.

Senator CASE asked him, as quoted on page 56, a question which referred to escalation and the dangers in it and the dangers of the bombing. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] expressed his personal concern about the bombing.

The Ambassador replied:

> My observation is that the dangers of escalation are the ones that press upon us for the moment, but the other one might be very, very serious, and I was really arguing against these two possibilities.
>
> I do not have any good solution to the present war in Vietnam, as no one else has. We do not really know. I would tend to agree with your view that our hope of bringing about negotiations and forcing the other person to the table by hitting him harder, by search and kill, which has not been too successful, particularly by bombing in the north, that these hopes have been proved to be wrong.

With that, I thoroughly agree.

I continue to read from the statement by the Ambassador:

> Psychologically, I think, they go against fundamental feelings. Remember the chip on the shoulder that any Asian has against us. The harder we push the more he wants to resist. This is not the way to get him to the table. I think we have much more hope of getting a negotiated settlement by getting hold of the population in the south through a clear and hold type of policy, particularly in the delta areas, and putting our greatest effort into trying to bring peace, stability, and eventually a buildup in those areas.

I state my disagreement with the commitment of American troops into the delta. I have already stated earlier this afternoon why I do not agree with Ambassador Reischauer in that regard.

The statement of Ambassador Reischauer continues:

> Actually, one reason for not bombing the north or for trying to find a way to deescalate that bombing, aside from the very high political costs we have paid around the world for this particular policy, is a psychological one. I think it would be easier for the other side to try to find a negotiated settlement when we are no longer doing that to them, and in that sense it would be a step toward negotiation.

With that, I thoroughly agree.

Ambassador Reischauer undertook to state the propositions on which to base our Pacific policy. I find myself in complete agreement with them, and since they have pertinence to the pending measure and to the amendments which I propose to offer tomorrow, I should like to read them into the RECORD. They appear at page 8 of Ambassador Reischauer's testimony. The title is: "Propositions on Which To Base Our Pacific Policy."

It reads:

> Returning to the other Asian lands, I should like to put forward, on the basis of the broad concepts discussed above, a few general propositions, as indicative of the fundamental directions in which we should be trying to move over the years ahead. I cannot in the format of this brief presentation explore these propositions fully, but I believe they are concepts which should be studied carefully. Stated bluntly and with a minimum of justification or explanation, these propositions are:
>
> 1. We should seek to minimize our military involvement and military commitments in Asia, because our vital interests are not likely to be threatened in most of Asia, because our type of military strength is not very effective in meeting subversion and guerrilla warfare, which are the chief threats to the stability of most Asian countries, and because our military presence is likely to stir up anti-American reactions and have other influences adverse to our long-range interests.

It was heartening to me, who, in my really quite humble way, have been trying to think through these problems for several years now, to find Ambassador Reischauer saying so much better than I could have said it exactly what I had come to believe.

His second point is:

> We should not try to induce most Asian countries to aline themselves formally with us, since such alinements do not add to our security and are not likely to be as effective in giving them security as their own unfettered nationalism and, possibly, regional groupings of like-minded countries. Far more useful, both to the security of most Asian nations and to our own, are multilateral involvements of these states with one another and with all the developed nations.

We tried to do that in the SEATO Treaty and we failed. It was not an effective instrument for Asia then and it is not now. We may be a long way from being able to create that kind of détente or line between south Asian countries. However, I suggest that the initiative should come from them and not from us, and perhaps that was the trouble with the SEATO Treaty, that we tried to jam it down their throats and it did not work.

I see China as a stirring and effective nationalism along with a number of Asian countries: Malaysia, Indonesia, Thailand, and the Philippines. They seem now to be coming together in an arrangement among themselves which perhaps—but only perhaps—we should be prepared to support by air and naval power from the island chain I referred to earlier this afternoon and perhaps—but only perhaps—by very substantial economic aid.

I have a fear that our very useful foreign aid program—and I have been one of the relatively few Senators who have been strongly in support of it—is being distorted by the enormous emphasis placed on economic aid to Vietnam in contradistinction to aid to other countries which, in my opinion, need it far more and where, were it dispersed, the national security of the United States would be much better protected. I refer to the countries of Latin America where the Alliance for Progress seems to be faltering to some extent, and necessarily to India and Pakistan, Turkey to a lesser extent, Greece, Taiwan, and perhaps Korea, speaking in economic but not in military terms.

Ambassador Reischauer's third point is:

> We should not sponsor political, social, or economic change in Asian countries, though we should be responsive to requests from them for aid in carrying out such changes whenever we judge that these changes would help in the healthy development of these countries and that our aid could usefully contribute to this end. We run serious and unwarranted dangers when we take the initiative in sponsoring important internal changes in Asian lands or when our influence becomes so preponderant that we assume responsibility for the existence or nature of a regime. Such situations are all too likely to produce serious friction between our well-meaning efforts and their nationalism.

If I could put that eloquent statement in blunter terms, I would say that we should mind our own business. We should not offer our particular brand of idealism to those who do not ask for it. However, if we are asked and the request is sensible and in the best interest of ourselves and the asking country, we should then show that compassion and good Samaritanism which is so large a part of the American attitude toward the world during the history of our Republic.

The Ambassador's fourth point is:

> We should not seek to play the role of leader in Asia, rallying allies to our policies, but should attempt to withdraw to the role of a friendly outside supporter of individual or collective Asian initiatives. In such a role, we are more likely to be able to give effective aid to Asian countries than when we assume the leadership ourselves.

I quote from page 9:

> However, unless we have guiding propositions of this type clearly in mind, we cannot take steps in the right direction when opportunity does offer, and we run the risk of wandering even further afield from them.

I now turn to the testimony of Henry Steele Commager before the Committee on Foreign Relations on the subject "Changing American Attitudes Toward Foreign Policy." Mr. Commager testified on Monday, February 20, of this year. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] asked this question:

> I would like to have your analysis of the proposal recently made that, as I understand it that, the United States would stop bombing of the north, of North Vietnam, if North Vietnam would cease supplying her soldiers and sending reinforcements and supplies to her soldiers, her armies, in South Vietnam.

Mr. Commager replied in terms of a letter he had written a few days earlier to the New York Times, expressing his views on the bombing. I ask unanimous consent that the text of that letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 19, 1967]

BOMB PAUSE ARGUMENT CHALLENGED

TO THE EDITOR:

In his authoritative statement (Feb. 9) of the United States position on halting the bombing in North Vietnam, Secretary Rusk emphasized what has now become the central thesis of the American position: no bombing pause unless there is a reciprocal pause in North Vietnamese "infiltration." The Administration is by now so bemused with this argument that it advances it as if it were an axiom that cannot be challenged. But the two activities—bombing of North Vietnam and the movement of troops into South Vietnam, are neither reciprocal nor comparable.

During the past three years or so the United States has "infiltrated" something over four hundred thousand troops into South Vietnam; North Vietnam has "infiltrated" perhaps one-third or one-fourth this number. On top of our troop build-up, which more than matches the combined forces of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese, we have embarked upon a program of bombing, and now rain down upon Vietnam more bombs than we dropped on Germany or Japan during any year of the great war.

COMPARABLE ACTION

The equivalent of a halt to the bombing is not a halt to North Vietnamese "infiltration." Such a halt would be logically matched by a comparable halt to the build-up and supply of U.S. forces in Vietnam. Secretary Rusk complained that North Vietnam took advantage of our two previous bombing pauses to continue its "infiltration." But surely so did we. Indeed, all the evidence which we have suggests that during these pauses our own build-up went on at a faster rate than the North Vietnamese's.

The idea, so assiduously propagated, that if we halted the bombing we would somehow be left naked to the enemy, is unworthy of the spokesman of the most powerful nation on earth. The joint United States-South Vietnamese forces outnumber the joint Vietcong-North Vietnamese forces by something like three to one; their superiority in arms and equipment and all material of war is incomparably greater.

To halt the bombing would not put American soldiers at the mercy of the enemy, but might restore, for a moment, a faint semblance of parity between these contending forces. If, as seems clear, this is the price of peace negotiations, it is a price we can well afford to pay. [Editorial Feb. 14]

HENRY STEELE COMMAGER.

AMHERST, MASS., *February 9, 1967.*

(*The writer is Winthrop H. Smith, Professor of American History at Amherst College.*)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, Mr. Commager continued:

> I do not, in fact, think that the equivalent of a cessation of bombing is a cessation of infiltration from the North. The fact is that we continue our infiltration and have done so from the beginning.

Let us remember that we are a foreign power in Vietnam, and that North Vietnam at least has the excuse that they are coming to the aid of their countrymen, however we may deplore the way their countrymen are acting.

Mr. Commager continued:

> The fact is that we continue our infiltration and have done so from the beginning: that although we do not use this word, it is a loaded word, we have, in effect, infiltrated something like 450,000 soldiers to Vietnam to, perhaps 100,000 I suspect less, from North Vietnam into the south.

Mr. Commager's suspicions are correct, according to the best figures that the Department of Defense has been able to furnish me. Infiltration into the south was 48,000 last year—with the possibility of 26,000 more—and 26,000 for 1965.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table entitled "Statistics of Troop Strength, Infiltration, and Numbers Killed in Action," compiled by the Committee on Foreign Relations from data furnished by the Department of Defense.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Statistics on troop strength, infiltration, and numbers killed in action, 1960–65, compiled from Department of Defense data

[Some figures have been rounded off]

	End of year—						
	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966
1. U.S. forces	800	3,000	11,000	16,000	23,000	184,000	[1] 454,000
U.S. forces killed in action (267 total, 1961 through 1964)						1,369	5,008
2. South Vietnam's forces (national military forces)[2]	248,000	306,000	395,000	397,000	514,000	571,000	620,000
3. South Vietnamese forces killed in action	2,223	4,004	4,457	5,665	7,457	11,243	9,469
4. Other friendly forces						22,400	52,600
5. Vietcong and North Vietnamese forces	36,000	63,000	79,000	92,000	126,000	[3] 250,000	[4] 275,000
6. Vietcong and North Vietnamese killed in action	5,669	12,133	21,158	20,575	16,785	35,436	55,000
7. Infiltrations from the north	4,600	6,300	12,900	8,000	12,400	26,000	[5] 48,000

[1] Includes 35,000 U.S. forces in Thailand and 36,000 in naval forces operating in Vietnam area.

[2] Does not include paramilitary/security forces.

[3] 26,000 North Vietnamese regulars.

[4] 45,000 North Vietnamese regulars.

[5] Total for "confirmed" and "probable." An additional 26,000 are listed as "possible."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, Mr. Commager continues:

> We have have built up our supplies, our materiel, all of these things, throughout the last three years at our various bombing pauses. We continue our build-up, we continue our infiltration of soldiers.
>
> It seems to me most unfair to ask the other side to stop what they are doing while we continue that. The quid pro quo for cessation of infiltration is a cessation of our own build-up. The bombing is an extra, as it were. We launched it rather late in the day. It now seems to have gone on forever, but it did not go on up until 1965.
>
> We launched it rather late in the day, and the proper relationship, a proper basis, I think, for a discussion, preliminary discussion, which might lead to a negotiated settlement is that we stop bombing and then that both sides, if possible, stop infiltrating, fighting, any kind of build-up.
>
> If the North insists on continuing its build-up, we would continue our build-up as we now have a three-to-one majority in soldiers against the other side, and probably a ten-to-one superiority in arms and armaments of all kinds, and the comparable build-up would not be a serious drawback for the United States.
>
> As I said earlier, the notion that we would somewhat be left naked to our enemies if we stopped bombing the North is an absurdity.
>
> So that I do not see there any serious danger. I think it is clear, and it grows increasingly clear, with every statement that comes from us.
>
> There was a letter in the Post today from Canada on this matter. It grows increasingly clear that there was some kind of signal from the North if we would, in fact, stop bombing for awhile, perhaps steps could be taken for discussions. This is a matter, of course, about which no layman has any accurate knowledge.

Mr. President, I wish I could do adequate justice to the testimony given by Mr. Commager. It was brilliant and, to me, absolutely persuasive. His statement is a long one—too long, I believe, to place in the RECORD. The colloquy with various members of the Committee on Foreign Relations was even longer. But the point of view expressed by Mr.

Commager with great eloquence is substantially the point of view I have advanced on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. I concur in his comments, and I urge Senators to get copies of his statement from the Committee on Foreign Relations. I would urge them, if they feel so inclined, to read the colloquy also, because to me the Commager statement is a brilliant rebuttal of the policy this administration is following both with respect to Vietnam and China and, indeed, with respect to all of Southeast Asia—I will go even further and say: the policy we are following with respect to this constantly shrinking one world, concerning which the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] addressed himself in his speech last week.

The title of Professor Commager's testimony is "Changing American Attitudes Toward Foreign Policy." I think he rendered a great educational service to the Committee on Foreign Relations, I hope to the Senate, and I hope to the country, because his primary concept was that the cold war can be ended; that international cooperation can be substituted for international conflict; that Vietnam is merely a symptom of the need to turn toward a détente with the Soviet Union and to offer the hand of friendship to Communist China, even though we know that that hand will not, for the foreseeable future, be accepted; to build those bridges between East and West, about which President Johnson spoke so eloquently in his October 7 address; and at least to give the Communists a chance to satisfy us that they know that their future as well as our future depends on peace, not war; that war in the modern world settles nothing, but exacerbates hate that can last for generations.

I had an opportunity, around the 18th or 19th of November last, to go to Poland. The Poles have a wonderful sense of humor. They are a brilliant people. They have been devastated and ravaged through the centuries by the Germans, the Austrians, and the Russians. Their independence and freedom have been taken away from them. They have come back, they have bounced back strongly, to become an independent nation again.

They still have a sense of humor. There is a story going around Warsaw to the effect that Adenauer, Gromyko, and Khrushchev all died and, believe it or not, they went to heaven. That is the unbelievable part of the story. When they got there, St. Peter greeted them cordially. This, I think, is also somewhat unlikely. He said to them, "Gentlemen, I give each of you one wish. What you want will be granted." He then asked Adenauer to state his wish.

Adenauer said, "I want to kill all the Russians." Khrushchev said, "I want to kill all the Germans." St. Peter said to Gromyko, "What do you want?" Well, said Gromyko, "Are you really going to grant these desires of my colleagues? This is not a very Christian thing to do."

St. Peter said, "That is true. They are harsh requests, but I have given my word and, therefore, I will, at the request of Chancellor Adenauer, kill all the Russians. I will, at the request of Premier Khrushchev, kill all Germans. What do you want, Mr. Gromyko?" Gromyko said, "Under those circumstances, I would like to have a cup of coffee."

This story gives an idea of the hatred which still infests Europe. We are building up hatreds of our own in Asia today. It is a remarkable thing that the hatred between ourselves and the Japanese ended so quickly, and that the hatred between ourselves and the Germans ended so quickly. There never really was much hatred between us and the Italians. To me it is almost impossible to hate an Italian. I do not know how one can do it.

We have substituted hatred for communism and it has become nationalistic. So many hate the Russians and the Chinese, and they are not going to go away. St. Peter is not going to act on that basis when President Johnson goes to heaven, as I am sure he will. We better learn to get along with it and substitute, if we can, those lines I have recited so many times, "International cooperation for international conflict."

I wish to refer to four other extraordinarily fine witnesses who appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations, the first of which was Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin:

> In discussing Vietnam, I would like to begin where I left off before this Committee last year. I urged then that we not expand our forces beyond those then committed, which were on the order of 275,000 troops, pointing out that we possessed powerful military enclaves; complexes of sea and air power from which we could conduct operations as necessary to pacify that country.
>
> In the course of the hearing I was asked to state my views to the Committee in writing on bombing and I wrote, in part, the following:
>
> "I believe that we must recognize that the nature of the fighting in Vietnam is quite different than, for example, that of World War II. Basic to the struggle in Vietnam is internal civil strife. Our military efforts, therefore, must be directed toward winning the good will of the people, and retaining that of those who are fighting with us. It follows that bombing attacks intended to achieve psychological impact through the killing of noncombatants is unquestionably wrong. Likewise the attack of targets near areas highly populated by civilians, where civilians are likely to be the casualties, is also militarily as well as morally wrong."
>
> I would like to reaffirm those views today. In my opinion, the bombings of North Vietnam have caused considerable civilian casualties, have not stopped the flow of supplies to the South, and have aroused the ill will of people throughout the world.

Mr. President, I was quoting from pages 3 and 4 of the typewritten transcript of the comments of General Gavin. He reiterated on pages 45, 46, and 47 his objections to the bombing and his reasons for believing it should cease.

On page 50 he said:

> One gets uneasy, if you read carefully what has been said about bombing, for example, in the midst of the Lunar truce. We said that they had shipped 35,000 tons of supplies down south, and therefore they violated the truce. Now it seems to me to a thoughtful person this means, "We are giving you a warning now; we are not going to go beyond the pre-truce," and I say this because they could not possibly know what was 35 or 350,000 tons of troop-supplies and this suggests that we stopped all movement to the theater in the mid-Pacific and every place else of supplies and troops and stopped all movement to the border of our own troops, you see, wherever the confrontation occurred, which of course was not so, and besides in the preceding truce we flew reconnaissance missions that the Vietnamese could not tell from a bomber I am sure or an airplane carrying weapons, so that this announcement in itself was a suggestion to me of more—of there being more behind the statement than the statement itself said.
>
> I do not—I find it difficult to believe all the things that are being said about bombing.

So, Mr. President, we have the testimony of Reischauer, Commager, Kennan, and Gavin that the bombing is counterproductive and that it is a deterrent to efforts to get to the negotiating table.

From a military point of view it is ineffective and, therefore, in my opinion it should be stopped, at least long enough for us to determine whether it is possible to come to the negotiating table if we hold our hand for at least a reasonable period of time.

Mr. President, I wish to read the last paragraph of General Gavin's statement. It appears on pages 16 and 17 of the typewritten transcript. It is the most eloquent statement that any of the witnesses made for the need for a different foreign policy. General Gavin spoke on the conflicts between U.S. capability and foreign commitment. He said at the end:

> Now, Mr. Chairman, in summary, I recommend that we bring hostilities in Vietnam to an end as quickly and reasonably as we can, that we devote those vast expenditures of our national resources to dealing with our domestic problems; that we make a massive attack on the problems of education, housing, economic opportunity, lawlessness, and environmental pollution; that we increase the support of all peaceful measures with our neighbors; that this include a thorough evaluation of our aid program; that we seek peaceful relations and closer economic ties with the Eastern bloc of nations. To accomplish this, I believe, for example, that the ratification of the Consular Convention should be accomplished and that the President's program for East-West trade should be encouraged and supported. With an improving society at home and an outgoing approach to dealing with the problems abroad, we shall have no fear whatsoever for our own place in history, for there is a quality of greatness in the American Revolution that is yet to be realized, and, in my opinion, it is a quality that is exportable.

Mr. President, that completes the material which I wish to place in the RECORD today preliminary to calling up my amendments tomorrow, unless others wish to speak before the amendments are called up.

At that time I expect to speak again, although more briefly, on the assets and liabilities of our policy in Vietnam, what the war is costing us, not only in dollars and lives and the balance of payments, but also the postponement or abandonment of domestic programs, which in my opinion should have a higher priority. I have entitled this speech, "What Price Glory."

What are we paying for the elusive hope of a military victory in Vietnam which might conceivably result in one more "Hurrah"?

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 28, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 27, 1967:

In the Marine Corps

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Abene, Charles F.
Abrams, David P.
Abrams, Joseph C.
Ackerson, George T.
Ackley, Gordon E., Jr.
Acosta, Louis
Acosta, Raymond, Jr.
Adams, Joe E.
Adams, John W.
Adams, Norbert H.
Adams, Richard W.
Adams, Robert L.
Adams, William T.
Adkins, Jimmie L.
Adler, Sidney S., Jr.
Aggers, Dean R.
Aguayo, Ernest M.
Ahlers, Richard M.
Ah Sue, Frank L.
Ainsworth, James J.
Albert, Bruce M.
Albright, Thomas E.
Albright, Walter L.
Alexander, Richard E.
Allen, Carl, Jr.
Allen, James M.
Allen, James P.
Allen, Kenneth E.
Allen, Lloyd, Jr.
Allen, Raymond K.
Allen, Thomas V.
Allum, Phillip D.
Althoff, Otto T. H., III
Alvarez, George L.
Alvarez, Juan C.
Amberson, William D.
Ambort, Ernest G.
Ambrose, Ronald S.
Amick, Dewey E.
Amos, Henry D., Jr.
Andelin, Marvin R.
Anderson, Byron A.
Anderson, Carl W.
Anderson, Charles F.
Anderson, Douglas E.
Anderson, Jack H.
Anderson, John H.
Anderson, Joseph C.
Anderson, Lawrence R.
Anderson, Melvin L.
Anderson, "O" "V."
Anderson, Perry B.
Anderson, Robert C., Jr.
Anderson, Terrence E.
Anderson, Thomas M.
Anderson, Wilbur L.
Anderson, William A.
Annis, James E.
Anselmo, Salvatore
Anthony, William J.
Anti, Raymond L.
Antle, Gayle
Appleby. William L.
Aragon, Gerald P.
Arango, Gerardo
Ardolino, Gavin C.
Arendale, John L.
Armitage, George L.
Arnold, Billy T.
Arnold, Everett C.
Arnold, Richard E.
Arocha, Julius
Arthur, Robert J.
Ascher, Charles J.
Ash, George J.
Asher, James P.
Ashley, Calvin H.
Astle, John C.
Atiles, Louis C., Jr.
Atkins, Darrell R.
Atkinson, William T., Jr.
Atwood, Robert E., Sr.
Avellino, Michael J.
Awalt, Marshall L.
Axline, Robert L.
Ayers, Rodney F.
Aylward, George F.
Azarian, Harry K.
Babers, Henry D.
Babineau, Raymond O., Jr.
Bache, Terrance W.
Bachstein, Robert L.
Backus, William E., Jr.
Bacon, Gerald C.
Baer, Robert A.
Baeza, Bernard J.
Bagby, Richard A.
Baggett, Liston D.
Bagley, David L.
Bailey, Barry H.
Bailey, George H.
Bailey, Ralph J.
Bailey, Robert E.
Bailey, Willard E.
Baird, Jerry K.
Baker, Clyde L.
Baker, George W.
Baker, Michael L.
Baker, Paul R.
Baker, Robert C.
Baker, Vance
Balderree, Theodore G.
Balfanz, Duane A.
Balius, Ronald A.
Ball, Richard A.
Ballance, Orval C.
Ballance, Samuel M.
Balske, Ronald E.
Banaszek, Edward A.
Bancroft, Paul F.
Bangs, William L.
Banks, Charles D.
Banks, Don
Bantleon, Ervin R., Jr.
Barber, Harold J., Jr.
Barber, John S., Jr.
Bare, Boyd B.
Barfield, Ernest
Bargerstock, Glenn C.
Barkhouse, Walter E.
Barkley, Roy T.
Barksdale, Dennis
Barnes, Glen E.
Barnes, James M.
Barnes, Robert J.
Barnes, William P.
Barnett, James W.
Barnett, Windle W.
Barnett, Robert K.
Baronet, Lee N.
Barrer, Harold B.
Barriteau, Bradley E.
Barrow, Bonie P.
Barry, James M.
Barry, Lawrence E.
Bartell, Harold E.
Bartlett, Donice R.
Bartlett, Francis E., Jr.
Bartlett, James N.
Bartley, James H.
Bartley, Charles M.
Bartolomeo, Clarence C.
Barton, Charles R.
Barton, Richard L.
Baschnagel, Walter T.
Bash, Robert C.
Basham, Benjamin E.
Bass, Charles M.
Bass, Henry S.
Bass, Louis M.
Bassett, James V.
Bassett, Irving A., Jr.
Bastyr, Michael J.
Bates, Joseph F.
Bates, John L.
Bates, Ralph S.
Batha, Frank M., Jr.
Bau, William P.
Bauer, John W.
Baughman, William O.
Baum, Arthur R., Jr.
Baumbach, Richard R.
Baumgardner, Janna R.
Baurle, Robert E.
Bausemer, Francis J.
Baxley, Eugene L.
Bayse, Daniel L.
Beadle, Conrad M.
Beal, Rodney A.
Bean, Theodore T.
Beasley, Robert E.
Beasock, Kenneth U.
Beatty, Robert E.
Bechtel, Marvin H.
Beck, Benjamin W.
Beck, Bobby L.
Beck, William O.
Becker, Edgar L.
Beebe, Daniel L.
Beggs, Bernard F.
Begor, George L.
Beier, John C.
Beiling, Francis J., Jr.
Belanger, Durham J.
Belcher, Travis E.
Beligotti, Augustus D.
Belkonen, Thomas C.
Bell, Charles H.
Bell, Eugene O.
Bell, Timothy C.
Bell, Walter H.
Bellis, Richard T.
Belville, Arthur J., Jr.
Beman, Charles G.
Bemish, Richard O.
Benedict, Fieldon C.
Benfatti, Raymond C
Benjamin, Eugene R.
Benjamin, Gilbert T.
Bennett, George J.
Bennett, Robert W.
Bennett, Donald E.
Bennett, Donald R.
Benoit, Ronald R.
Benoy, Robert F.
Benson, Robert C.
Benson, Thomas G.
Bentley, Harry L.
Benton, William C.
Bentson, Roy B.
Benz, Anthony B.
Bequette, Bobby F.
Berdine, Virgil M.
Beresford, Eugene H.
Berger, Donald J.
Berger, Paul A.
Berger, Roger J.
Bergerson, John F.
Berglund, Alfred C.
Berkey, Kenneth W.
Berkheiser, Stephen R.
Berrey, Charles H.
Berry, Thomas A.
Berryman, Cecil B.
Bersano, Bernard L.
Bershinsky, George V.
Bertagnolli, William R.
Berton, Calvin J.
Bethune, Donald E.
Beukema, Donald R., III
Bever, Homer E.
Beveridge, Albert J., Jr.
Bevilacqua, Allan C.
Bewley, Theodore A.
Bible, Hubert D.
Bickford, Thomas E.
Biggers, William A.
Bigler, David P.
Bihler, Spencer G.
Bille, George A.
Billick, Robert M.
Billings, Charles E.
Billipp, Norman K.
Binder, John A.
Bingham, Thomas F.
Bishoff, Franklin R.
Bishop, Francis A.
Bishop, John W.
Bjornaas, Forrest R.
Black, Jerry C.
Black, William E.
Blair, Howard M., Jr.
Blake, James T.
Blake, Mason G.
Blanchette, Robert O.
Bland, Robert W.
Bland, Thomas M.
Blank, Joseph J., Jr.
Blanton, Jerry M.
Blaylock, Philip W.
Bledsoe, John D.
Bledsoe, Otis W.
Blessing, LeRoy E.
Blevins, "L" "D"
Blocker, Billy R.
Blott, William
Blount, Earl C., Jr.
Blount, John L., Jr.
Bloxom, Ray L.
Bly, Oscar E.
Blyzes, Orville N.
Boatwright, Dave E.
Bobb, John T.
Bobbio, Leonard J.
Bodkin, Lee D.
Bodree, Eugene A.
Bodziak, Henry M.
Boehm, Robert W.
Boeker, Arden G.
Boerner, Robert E.
Boeyen, William C.
Bofenkamp, Brent S.
Boggs, Okey L.
Boise, Lee A.
Bokholt, William M.
Bolen, Glenn E.
Bolson, James M.
Bolton, Richard W.
Bondurant, Richard D.
Bonifay, Robert L.
Bonin, Francis G.
Bonini, Juan B.
Bonneau, James M.
Bonsignore, Joseph
Bontell, William J.
Booze, Delmar G.
Borek, Max J.
Borgman, William C.
Borowicki, Albert A.
Borowy, Alfred J.
Bos, Richard E.
Botelho, Ernest
Bottorff, Norman L.
Bouldin, John F.
Boutin, Leo C.
Bovee, William B.
Bowen, Clifton E.
Bowen, Eugene A.
Bowen, Henry E., Jr.
Bowers, Earl T., Jr.
Bowers, Ralph C.
Bowman, John W., Jr.
Bowman, Leonard L.
Bowman, Marion V.
Bowyer, Bernard G.
Bowyer, Lindy E.
Box, Robert C.
Boyd, Richard R.
Boyle, Edward B.
Boyser, Everett J., Jr.
Bracken, Wallace D.
Braden, Norman D.
Bradford, Ellis J.
Bradley, Robert G.
Bradley, Joseph G. A.
Brady, Donald
Brady, Earnest W.
Brady, John A.
Brage, Jack A.
Bragg, Kenneth G.
Braley, Charles A., III
Brandenburg, William C., III
Brandenburg, Leo A.
Brandl, Donald R.
Brantd, Dale R.
Brandt, George "H", Jr.
Branson, Bobbie V.
Branson, Sylvan K.
Brassington, Richard C.
Bray, Sheila R., Jr.
Brayfield, Nelson E.
Bream, Philip A.
Breeze, Eugene
Brehm, Arthur R.
Brennan, Edward J.
Brennan, Joseph J.
Breshears, "R" "B"
Brey, Patrick M.
Bridges, Lionel H.
Bridges, Robert, Jr.
Bright, Edward E.
Bright, Raymond J.
Bringham, Gary L.
Brock, George A.
Broderick, Ernest J., Jr.
Brodeur, Henry
Brookman, Donald P.
Brooks, Garold N.
Brooks, James W.
Brooks, Robert D.
Brooks, Ronald D.
Brooks, Theo I.
Broska, Arthur C., Jr.
Brouillette, George H.
Broussard, Nelson J.
Brown, Charles O.
Brown, Charles W.
Brown, Constantinos T.
Brown, Donald A.
Brown, Donald E.
Brown, Donald J.
Brown, Edward H., Jr.
Brown, Edwin J.
Brown, Gerald V.
Brown, George F.
Brown, Harry A., Jr.
Brown, Herbert D.
Brown, James C.
Brown, James E.
Brown, Jerrell M.
Brown, John P.
Brown, John W.
Brown, Kermit E.
Brown, Norman
Brown, Palmer
Brown, Richard M.
Brown, Robert A.
Brown, Robert L.
Brown, Thomas L.
Brown, Umphis L.
Brown, Walter A., Jr.
Brown, William A.
Brown, William A.
Brown,William N.
Brownfield, Arthur, III
Brownlee, Joseph L., Jr.
Bruch, John N.
Brumagen, Arthur
Brundage, Warren R., Jr.
Brunell, Randolph D.
Bryant, Clarence C.
Bryant, George M.
Buck, William L., III
Buckingham, John E.
Buckley, Leonard
Buelow, Frederick A.
Bugbee, Duane M.
Buhl, William J.
Buice, Richard E.
Bullock, Jeat
Bumgarner, Olin L.
Bunn, Marcus L.
Bunnell, Vernon B.
Bunting, Jerry E.
Burch, Verle E.
Burgess, Bernard E.
Burgett, Ernest A.
Burie, James R.
Burk, Roger R.
Burke, John R.
Burkhard, Robert G.
Burley, Harold G., Jr.
Burlingame, William R.
Burnett, Earl V.
Burns, Elkanah J., Jr.
Burns, James M.
Burns, Kenneth R.
Burns, Kenneth R.
Burns, Robert J.
Burr, Charles A., Jr.
Burris, Kenneth F.
Burton, Earl L.
Burton, Harry E.
Burton, Ronald R.
Burtscher, Johnnie D.
Bury, Leonard M.
Buschbom, Ronald L.
Bushey, Charles J.
Bushnell, Louis G.
Bussell, Brice L.
Butchko, Stephen W., Jr.
Butler, Erston
Butler, William B., Jr.
Butts, Bonnie O.
Byelick, Joseph M.
Byrnes, Ronald F.
Bytof, Clarence
Cady, Raymond J.
Cahill, William J., Jr.
Caldwell, Jackie D.
Caldwell, William
Call, Fred J.
Callahan, Howard L.
Cameron, Charles A.
Cameron, Donald R.
Camp, Walter J.
Campaigne, Markham B.
Campbell, Charley M.
Campbell, Donald E.
Campbell, Donald J.
Campbell, James E.
Campbell, Joseph J.
Campbell, Thomas E.
Campbell, William J.
Camper, Donald "A"
Camper, Ronald "B"
Candelario, Emilio, Jr.
Canning, Robert H.

Cannon, Charles E.
Cannon, James R.
Canonico, Joseph A.
Cantrell, Bryan K.
Cantrell, Harold E., Jr.
Capdepon, Henry P., Jr.
Capeci, Robert L.
Capelle, Paul W.
Capistran, Joseph A.
Cappock, Robert J.
Capps, Darl G.
Caputo, Anthony F.
Cardell, Robert A.
Cardoza, Edward
Carey, Richard L.
Carlisle, Rayon H., Jr.
Carlton, Eugene E.
Carman, James D.
Carmen, Nathaniel W.
Carmody, Edward E.
Carnako, George
Carnicle, Gary L.
Caroll, Robert F.
Carpenter, "H" "C"
Carpenter, James E.
Carpenter, Robert M.
Carr, Thomas L.
Carr, William D., Jr.
Carrington, John H.
Carroll, Patrick G.
Carroll, Robert J.
Carroll, Thomas L.
Carson, Milton E.
Carter, John E.
Carter, Joseph M.
Carter, William L., Jr.
Cartmill, Lloyd J.
Carver, David B.
Carver, Roger E.
Casen, Grover C.
Casey, Andy
Casey, Howard L.
Casey, James J.
Cash, Paul E.
Cash, Robert
Casti, James E.
Castonguay, James J.
Caswell, Charles R.
Catanzaro, Leonard J.
Cates, Ernest H.
Cathcart, James A.
Cato, Dale G.
Caudill, Oscar L.
Caulfield, Thomas J., Jr.
Caussin, John J.
Caylao, Alex H., Jr.
Cedoz, Russell C.
Centers, Norman B.
Chamberlain, Douglas W.
Chamberlain, Richard
Chambers, Cleo M.
Chambers, Justice M., Jr.
Champion, George W.
Chance, Charles L.
Chapman, Arthur J.
Chapman, James F.
Chapman, James L.
Chapman, Laurel E.
Chapman, Walton F.
Charles, Maurice A.
Charrier, James E.
Chase, Jerome M.
Chatelle, Louis A., Jr.
Chavers, Wayland D.
Chaves, Emilio J.
Chaves, Jackson B.
Chavez, Pedro
Chen, Robert L.
Chervenak, Michael P.
Chesnut, Bobby G.
Chickneas, James
Childs, William J.
Chilton, Jack E.
Chin, Earl F. M.
Ching, George M.
Chipman, Edward E.
Chmiel, Larry V.
Choate, Julian R., Jr.
Choate, Larry D.
Chopiak, Russell C.
Christ, William E.
Christenson, Howard J.
Christian, Ward E.
Chun, James K. M.
Chupik, Stephen E.
Church, Earl V.
Chytka, Lawrence J.
Cialone, Joseph A., II
Cipolla, Henry J.
Cipperly, William J.
Cipriani, Robert P.
Cirka, Richard G.
Cismar, Frank P., Jr.
Cisneros, Philip C.
Clancy, William J., Jr.
Clapp, Harold G.
Clapp, Robert D.
Clark, Charles V.
Clark, Donald J.
Clark, Duchesne P., Jr.
Clark, Elmo A.
Clark, Kenneth R.
Clark, Roy L.
Clark, Stephen P.
Clark, Thomas J.
Clarke, Thomas J., Jr.
Clark, Vernon L.
Clausen, Raymond C.
Clem, Kenneth W.
Clemens, Duane T.
Clemons, Edgar L.
Cleveland, David C.
Cleveland, Harold "K"
Clevenger, Aubrey L.
Clickner, David M.
Clifford, Gerald R.
Clifford, Wilfred J.
Cline, Charles M.
Cline, Charles S.
Clontz, Paul B.
Coble, Rex G.
Cochran, Ralph E.
Cockrell, Ernest
Coconis, Peter P.
Coffey, Allin L.
Cohenour, Keith E.
Colbert, Jarrett, Jr.
Cole, Bobby D.
Cole, Robert E.
Coleman, Harold J.
Coleman, Clinton R.
Coll, William P.
Colleton, Charles F., Jr.
Collier, Donald E.
Collins, Daniel J.
Collins, Joan M.
Collins, Joe R., II
Collins, John L.
Collins, Howard J.
Collura, Joseph
Colly, Joseph P., Jr.
Colney, Earl W.
Colton, William J.
Combs, Edgar G.
Combs, William D.
Comer, Charles G.
Compo, Edward E.
Condroski, Anthony R.
Connell, William R.
Connin, Larry A.
Connly, Robert A., Jr.
Connolly, John L., Jr.
Conover, Jerry L.
Conrardy, William C.
Consolvo, John W., Jr.
Constantine, Stephan L.
Contreras, Solomon O.
Conyers, John M.
Cook, Charles E.
Cook, Dannie L.
Cook, Darrell H.
Cook, Freddy V.
Cook, James A.
Cook, Marvin, Jr.
Cook, Paul M., II
Cook, Rodney
Cooke, Curtis V.
Cooksey, Charles D.
Cooper, Bertrand W., Jr.
Cooper, Charles L.
Cooper, Eldon L.
Cooper, Joseph R., Jr.
Cooper, Warren E.
Copeland, George D.
Copes, William E.
Corcoran, Joseph N.
Corcoran, Kermit C.
Cordes, Alfred G.
Cormier, Gerard A.
Cornelius, Franklin L.
Cornell, Robert A.
Cornett, Hubert C.
Corral, Robert A.
Corsey, Nolan L.
Cortez, Jose F.
Cosby, Donald R.
Cottle, Stanley E.
Coulter, Allen R.
Coulter, Robert J.
Coulter, Ronald K.
Courtney, Robert A.
Cowan, Harry E., Jr.
Cowan, William V., III
Coward, Allen M.
Cox, Billy J.
Cox, Charles K.
Cox, Frank A., Jr.
Cox, Francis L.
Cox, Robert D.
Coyle, Edwin J.
Crabb, Kenneth L.
Craig, Rodger L.
Craiglow, John F.
Cramer, Donald L.
Crandall, Robert J.
Crane, Gordon N.
Craner, Franklin D.
Cravens, Larry G.
Crawford, Duane E.
Craynon, Charles R.
Creamer, Charles E.
Crew, Thomas W., II
Crews, Ellis L.
Cribbs, Winford R.
Crippen, Jack E.
Crist, Larry D.
Critzer, Roger A.
Crockett, Daniel E.
Crockford, Ronald K.
Croghan, Edward J., III
Crone, John
Cronin, Richard A.
Crosby, Robert
Crosier, Allen D.
Cross, Charles F.
Crossman, Chester H., Jr.
Crostic, Roy E.
Crouch, Jerry L.
Crowe, John T.
Crowe, William J.
Croy, Louis M., Jr.
Croy, Norvin A., II
Cruickshank, Eugene J.
Cruit, Kenneth A.
Crum, Ralph W.
Culbertson, Louis A.
Culp, Leo "V"
Culp, William L.
Culver, John M.
Cummings, Fledge E., Jr.
Cummings, John D.
Cummins, Philip T.
Curran, John F.
Currey, Arol E.
Curt, William E.
Curtis, Charles E.
Curtis, Harry F.
Curtis, Otis F., IV
Curtis, Terry M.
Cushman, Richard M.
Cusick, Richard D.
Cutshall, James J.
Cutten, Lewyn F., Jr.
Cuyno, Vincent H.
Czapor, Karl W.
Czarnecki, Ronald L.
Czubachowski, Raymond F.
Dailey, Edwin L., Jr.
Dalbey, Rolland M.
Daley, James T.
Daley, Raymond C.
Dalton, Robert J.
Dalzell, Richard
Daniel, Alonzo N.
Daniel, William R.
Daniels, Robert L.
Darby, Jackie T.
Darcy, Joseph P.
Dargan, James J.
Darling, Eugene R.
Darnell, James M.
Darnell, William M.
Darner, Trever E.
Darou, Ronald B.
Darracott, John F.
Darroch, Robert G.
Darst, Glenn L., Jr.
Daubenspeck, Frederick E.
Daugherty, Gerald B.
Daugherty, James T. Jr.
Davidson, Kenneth M.
Davidson, Larry R.
Davidson, William L.
Davies, Kenneth W.
Davies, Ralph D.
Davis, Albert E.
Davis, Arthur T.
Davis, Carroll C.
Davis, David A.
Davis, Daniel
Davis, Delmont I., Jr.
Davis, Ernest M.
Davis, George K.
Davis, James H.
Davis, James S.
Davis, John W., Jr.
Davis, Muriel
Davis, Raymond A.
Davis, Robert L.
Davis, Samuel D.
Davis, Thomas E.
Davis, Vaughn C.
Dawkins, Edward D.
Dawson, Charles L.
Dawson, Edward L.
Dawson, Samuel L.
Dean, Larry A.
Dean, Paul A.
Deane, Ottie B.
Deaton, Marvin D.
Deaver, Ralph W.
Decherd, David W.
Decker, William J.
Dederick, Darwin E.
Deffes, Romain J., Jr.
Defrank, James W.
De Grenier, Paul L.
De Gryse, Richard V.
De Hart, Lawrence A.
Deibert, Harold J. E.
Deitrich, James N.
De Jaynes, Hubert D.
Delabarre, Ronald K.
Delacqua, Raymond J.
De La Garza, Luis A.
De Lancey, Joe M.
Delk, Vaughan E.
De Luca, Robert J.
Demers, Russell L.
Denison, Charles F., Jr.
Dennison, Marshall "C"
De Pietro, James D.
Desjarlais, Roland A.
Desourdy, Robert A.
Devereaux, Jewel L.
Devinny, Bernard M.
Devitt, John R.
De Wert, William F.
Dewey, Charles H.
Dexter, Harold E.
Diana, Kenneth R.
Dianish, John A.
Dias, Kenneth W.
Di Bernardo, James V.
Dickerson, Charles R.
Dickey, Thomas C.
Diederich, Don E.
Dierker, Henry A.
Dietz, Robert G.
Di Leva, Robert F.
Dill, Henry E.
Dilley, George W.
Dillinger, John W., Jr.
Dillon, James G.
Dillon, Walter R.
Di Maio, Edward
Di Muzio, Camillo A.
Dittman, Richard H.
Ditto, Donald S., Jr.
Divis, James H.
Dixon, Robert D.
Doak, Henry L., Jr.
Dobbs, Jeff A.
Dobon, Peter, Jr.
Dobson, Leroy
Dockery, Billy W.
Dodd, Julian E., Jr.
Dodd, Robert D.
Dodge, Ronald L.
Doherty, John W.
Dohse, Gunther
Dolman, Robert J.
Donlan, James T.
Donley, Paul J.
Donnell, Billy D.
Donovan, James R.
Dooley, Dennis D.
Doorack, Robert J.
Doran, Bernard R.
Doran, Frederick L.
Dorn, Daniel B.
Dornbach, Albert A.
Doss, Thomas L.
Douglas, Daniel C.
Douglas, Kenneth M.
Dow, Arnold H.
Dowden, Frank H.
Dowling, Charles H.
Downey, Jesse
Downie, Robert M.
Downs, David B.
Doyle, Bryant E.
Doyle, Duane R.
Doyle, James A., Jr.
Doyle, John
Doyle, Paul H.
Doyle, Robert D.
Doyle, Teddy J.
Drake, Charles B.
Drew, Charles L.
Drew, Stuart H.
Drivick, John F., III
Drnec, Paul F.
Drucker, Jerome
Drummond, Thomas W.
Duer, Arthur M.
Du Fore, Floyd L.
Du Friend, James M., Jr.
Dugas, Hubert
Duggan, Michael J., Jr.
Duke, William E.
Dunagan, Donald R.
Duncan, Emmett D.
Dundes, George E., Jr.
Dunn, Harvey
Dunn, James A.
Dunn, John F.
Dunn, Ralph W., Jr.
Dupre, Howard J.
Duran, Gregory
Durazo, Carlos C.
Durham, Kenneth G.
Durham, Sidney E.
Dusek, Bobby E.
Dustman, George H., Jr.
Dutiel, Robert O.
Dyberg, Richard H.
Dye, Nellis C.
Dykes, "H" "L"
Dykstra, Lowell G.
Dzialo, Robert E.
Dzik, Arthur J.
Eagle, Monte W., Jr.
Early, Archie L.
Eaton, Jackie L.
Ebert, Robert W.
Eckersen, Frederick
Eckert, Robert L.
Eckley, Rex T.
Eckman, Charles D.
Eckman, George M.
Edelen, Kenneth D.
Edwards, Charles E.
Edwards, Robert I.
Egan, John B.
Eggers, Lee K.
Eicher, Charles D.
Elcess, Weldon L.
Elder, Harold T.
Eldon, Ralph T.
Eley, Richard J.
Ell, Melvin L.
Eller, Henry R.
Eller, Johnnie L.
Ellerbee, Morris C.
Elliott, Vernon R.
Elliott, Thomas M.
Ellis, Billie R.
Ellis, Bruce L.
Ellis, Bruce W.
Ellis, John P.
Ellis, Thurlow D.
Ellis, William F., Jr.
Elmore, Ernest M.
Elms, Robert W.
Eloe, Edwin E.
Emanus, Calvin D.
Emeney, John B.
Emmett, John P., Jr.
England, Phillip L.
England, Joe H.
English, Fred C.
Ennis, John E.
Ennis, Patrick E.
Enos, Leroy N.
Entwisle, Thomas J.
Ereth, Thomas M.
Erickson, Donald A.
Ericsson, Bruce T.
Eriksson, Dale L.
Erly, John W.
Ervin, Morris L.
Eschenfelder, George J., III
Esler, Richard G.
Esmond, Donald V.
Esmond, Roy D.
Espinoza, Carlos D.
Estela, Manuel
Estep, Vernon C.
Eubank, Leroy E.
Eubank, William E.
Evans, David P.
Evans, Michael J.
Evans, Thomas E.
Evans, William R.
Eveland, William L.
Everett, Zane L.
Fabricius, Gerald D.
Fagen, Clifford L.
Fager, Wendel P.
Fain, Robert L.
Fairbrother, Myrl G., Jr.
Fairchild, Guy R.
Fairchild, Lon C.

Fairley, James A., Jr.
Falgout, Roy F.
Falkenstein, Stanley M.
Fallon, Lewis J., Jr.
Fanning, John T.
Faries, Victor H.
Farlee, Richard E.
Farr, Roland C.
Farra, Elwood D.
Farrington, Richard A.
Farrow, William T.
Fasnacht, Jon H.
Fasulo, John
Fattig, Charles W.
Faulkner, Wayne E.
Favaron, John T.
Favreau, Robert D.
Faylor, Dwight G.
Feaselman, Charles M.
Featherstone, Joseph F., Jr.
Fecke, Ralph L.
Feifs, Helmuts A.
Feiring, David E.
Felderman, Keith L.
Feldhaus, James C.
Fellinger, Barry E. C.
Fenn, Ronald S.
Fenner, Edward G.
Fenwick, George W.
Ferguson, Mitchell M.
Ferguson, Raymond E., Jr.
Fermino, Francis R.
Fernandez, Walter J., III
Ferral, William J.
Ferrari, Joseph G.
Ferree, Douglas R.
Ferree, Harry R.
Ferris, Richard L.
Fetchko, John B.
Fields, James E.
Fifer, Billy J.
Filicko, James W.
Finlayson, Andrew R.
Finnie, Richard F.
Firth, Thomas G.
Fischer, Harold R.
Fischer, George A.
Fischer, Robert C.
Fischer, John L., Jr.
Fisette, Robert H.
Fisher, Joseph V., Jr.
Fisher, Ronald F.
Fitts, William A.
Fitzgerald, Stephen A.
Fitzgerald, Stuart W.
Fitzpatrick, Jimmy D
Fitzsimmons, Joseph C., Jr.
Fladd, Robert J.
Flaherty, Paul S.
Flanagan, Philip E.
Flanigan, John N.
Flanigan, Wesley E.
Fleck, Wolfgang H.
Fleming, James P.
Fleming, William E.
Fleming, Ronald D.
Flery, Joseph J., Jr.
Fleskes, William G.
Fletcher, Ernest E.
Fletcher, Freddie E.
Fletcher, Fredric L.
Fletcher, Jack L.
Fletcher, Morris O.
Flick, Gerald L.
Flinn, John D.
Floe, Jerry D.
Flom, William F.
Flood, Henry D.
Floyd, Henry A., Jr.
Flynn, Edward H.
Flynn, George R.
Fogg, Donald L.
Foley, Jeremiah R.
Foley, Nicholas A.
Folsom, Clyde W.
Fontenot, Robert H.
Foo, Robert C. K.
Ford, David L.
Ford, Norman R.
Ford, Robert
Ford, Wayne H., Jr.
Ford, William G.
Forester, Donald R.
Forrest, William E., Jr.
Fortin, James E.
Fortson, Marvin P.
Forvendel, Henry A., Jr.
Foss, Philip L.
Foster, Frank C.
Foster, Robert P.
Foster, Ronald L.
Foster, Sterling J., III
Fountain, Billy V.
Fox, Charles W.
Fox, Guy G.
Fox, Wesley L.
Fraiser, Martin S.
Fraker, Adrian X.
Frakes, Lee W.
Frame, Robert C.
Franklin, Thomas L.
Franks, William D.
Frantz, Robert L.
Frazier, Jack E.
Frazier, Harold W., Jr.
Freburger, Hamilton P., Jr.
Frederickson, Robert R.
Freed, Joseph E.
Freem, Mitchell C., Jr.
Freeman, James H.
Freeman, Peter E.
Freeman, Billy R.
Freeman, Bobby S.
Freidenberger, George H.
Freitas, John P.
French, Alvin E.
French, John K.
French, Richard E.
French, Stanley L.
Frickie, Frank J., III
Fritz, Donald H.
Frost, Donald E.
Fry, William R.
Fugera, Franklin J.
Fulford, Carlton W., Jr.
Fuller, David D.
Fulmer, James D.
Fulton, Daine L.
Funk, Howard E., Jr.
Furbee, Richard D.
Furber, Buddy R.
Furtney, Arthur J., Jr.
Futch, Amos W., Jr.
Fyles, William A.
Gabriel, Billy K.
Gabrys, Erich E.
Gage, Cecil O.
Gaines, Charles J.
Gajewski, Francis J.
Galang, Richard S., Jr.
Galasky, Michael P.
Galbreath, Bobby F.
Gallan, Craig D.
Gallo, Joseph C.
Galvin, Eugene A.
Gamble, Frank R., Jr.
Gambrell, Jerry C.
Gangwer, John L.
Gant, Frederick D., Jr.
Garavaglia, Joseph E.
Garber, Charles P.
Garbrick, James H.
Garcia, Alfredo S.
Garcia, Arthur
Garcia, Clarence D.
Garcia, Johnny
Garcia, Louis
Garcia, Robert H.
Gardner, Ralph G.
Gardner, Lawrence R.
Gardner, Kenneth M.
Gardner, Richard G.
Garibay, Antonio F.
Garland, Ronald G.
Garner, Bertram A., Jr.
Garner, James "D"
Garon, John T.
Garoutte, Robert L.
Garr, Edward
Garrett, Carl
Garrett, Leroy A.
Garrett, Charles D.
Garris, Rhyne E.
Garrow, Robert T.
Garvey, William F., Jr.
Gates, Phillip E.
Gatton, Donald T.
Gaubert, Raoul J.
Gay, Logan T., Jr.
Gaylord, Ivan E.
Gazaway, Harold S.
Gearhart, Carl O.
Geddis, Robert B.
Gehrdes, Robert P.
Gehring, Paul, Jr.
Geiske, John, Jr.
Gellenbeck, Oscar A.
Gentemann, James L., Jr.
George, Leonard E.
George, Marvin J.
George, Robert J.
Geries, Theodore R.
Gerlach, Howard L.
German, Terry G.
Gessner, Frederick C.
Getchey, Charles D.
Ghia, Frank J., Jr.
Gibbard, Patrick F.
Gibbs, Gene R.
Gibbs, Haywood P.
Gibney, William A.
Gibson, Ernest L., Jr.
Gibson, Robert L. J.
Gibson, Roy
Gibson, William C., Jr.
Gibson, William J., Jr.
Giedzinski, Henry P.
Gilbert, William E.
Gildea, Michael J.
Giles, Earl E.
Gill, Sam A.
Gillespie, George E.
Gillespie, Robert W., II
Gillis, John P.
Gilmore, Jimmy G.
Gilmour, Daniel C.
Gilstrap, Lester
Gipson, Carroll S.
Girardot, Charles E.
Giroux, George A.
Giusto, Donald S.
Glasgow, Robert T.
Glasgow, John P., Jr.
Glass, Robert T.
Glassmire, John R.
Glausier, Robert E., Jr.
Glenn, Dearl A.
Glidden, Marvin S.
Gloady, Richard C., Jr.
Glover, John D.
Goble, Billie J.
Goble, Woodruff C.
Godfrey, Robert C.
Godin, Alfred M.
Godsil, Richard L.
Godsil, Stanley W.
Goedeke, Walter H.
Goewey, Virgil L.
Goff, Charles N.
Goguen, Albert A. J.
Gogulski, John B.
Golab, Alfred J.
Golden, Tom A.
Golowski, Stanley A.
Gomeau, Edward J.
Gonsalves, Manuel
Gonzalez, Gilberto
Gonzalez, Heriberto
Gonzalez, Victor B.
Gooch, Brannon N.
Good, Loyal W.
Goodall, Elbert R.
Goodine, James E.
Goodman, Monroe A.
Goodwin, Robert Y.
Gordon, Robert D.
Gordon, Samuel M.
Gordon, William H.
Gore, William M.
Gorman, George W.
Gornic, George J.
Gosch, Thomas C.
Gould, Keith R.
Gould, Ronald W.
Goulet, Joseph A.
Gour, Oliver F., Jr.
Gover, Dan S.
Govier, Thomas E.
Goyette, Gerald L.
Grabenbauer, Wayne E.
Grabus, Edward J.
Gracida, Joaquin C.
Graham, David P.
Graham, John D.
Graham, William L.
Grant, Charles E.
Grant, Robert A.
Grassilli, Leo J., Jr.
Graves, Perry H., III
Gray, Ainslie A., Jr.
Gray, Hayward W.
Gray, Wayne K.
Green, Billy D.
Green, James R.
Green, Jack C.
Green, Ray H.
Greenawalt, Harvey E.
Greenburg, Lawrence K.
Greene, Russell E.
Greenfield, John W.
Greenlaw, Donald B.
Greenleese, William E.
Gregorius, Eugene W.
Gregory, Abie R.
Gregory, Donald W.
Greisen, Bruce R.
Griesmer, Bruce E.
Griffin, Samuel E.
Griffin, Kevin J.
Griffin, Charles L.
Griffin, Charles R., Jr.
Griffin, Joseph A.
Griffiths, Raleigh R.
Griffith, Bryan O.
Griffith, James H.
Griffith, John A., III
Grigg, Davis I.
Griggs, Bobby J.
Grimes, Jessie
Grimmer, James R.
Grinager, Vernon L.
Grivner, Richard L.
Grose, Lester R.
Gross, Francis E.
Groulx, James W.
Grove, Ralph M., Jr.
Grunwald, Richard H. W.
Guelich, James H., Jr.
Guerin, James D., Sr.
Gueterman, Frank J.
Guffey, David L.
Guice, Doyal R.
Guile, Frederick A.
Gulley, Robert G.
Gulley, Robert M.
Gunkel, Alfred N.
Gustafson, Richard J.
Gustin, Walter W.
Guth, Roger A.
Guthrie, Clarence L., Jr.
Guy, William D.
Gwaltney, Robert E.
Gwaltney, William J.
Gwinn, Robert P.
Gypin, Fred, Jr.
Haack, Richard O.
Haaland, John D.
Hack, Virgil D.
Hackett, David S.
Hagan, Howard P.
Hagener, Lillian
Hager, Thomas J.
Haggerty, Jerald J.
Haglage, Andrew M.
Haines, Edward R.
Haines, Robert L.
Hajduk, James C.
Hakim, James J.
Hale, Edmund D.
Hale, Jim B., Jr.
Haliscak, George
Hall, Ernest L.
Hall, Jesse B., Jr.
Hall, Morton L.
Halloran, Bernard
Halterman, William R.
Hamel, Roland L.
Hamelback, Walter D.
Hamic, Thomas E.
Hamilton, Carl D.
Hamilton, John L.
Hamilton, Robert E.
Hamlin, William H.
Hamm, Troy B.
Hammond, Glenn R.
Hampton, Walter R.
Hancock, John C., Jr.
Hancock, Troy W.
Hand, Jesse A.
Handelsman, Martin H.
Handley, Clarence I.
Hanevik, Robert H.
Haney, Emmett L.
Hanger, Darrel W.
Hankins, Thomas J.
Hankinson, Robert C.
Hanle, Arlen J.
Hann, Thomas E.
Hansen, Guy R.
Hansen, James F.
Hanus, Clois L.
Hapgood, William R.
Happy, Robert E.
Hardie, Richard A.
Hardin, Bobby L.
Harding, Alan L.
Hardman, Eugene R.
Hardt, Arthur L.
Hardy, James W.
Hardy, Ronald E.
Hargrove, Billy E.
Harmon, Kenneth D.
Harmon, Tommy A.
Harrell, James S.
Harrell, Charles D., Jr.
Harrell, Arnold C.
Harrelle, Roosevelt
Harrer, William J.
Harrington, Billy D.
Harris, Billy M.
Harris, Don T.
Harris, James R.
Harris, Robert E.
Harris, Robert L.
Harris, Richard L.
Harris, Ralph
Harris, William H.
Harris, Willie L., Jr.
Harrison, Leonard J.
Harrison, Robert D.
Harrison, Ronald C.
Harrison, Russell J.
Harry, Lawrence E., Jr.
Hart, Berne C.
Hart, Robert H.
Hart, Roger M.
Hartkopf, Albert I.
Hartman, Donald E.
Hartnett, Ronald J.
Hartzler, Earl W.
Harward, Joseph R., Jr
Harwood, Gerald R., Jr
Hase, Herbert G.
Haselton, Gerald M.
Hasse, Ronald E.
Hassen, Lyle C.
Hastie, Orville L.
Hatadis, Robert E.
Hatch, Emmett L.
Hatch, William M.
Hatchel, Joe H.
Haugen, James H.
Haught, Harry A.
Haught, William G.
Haugley, Lorell J.
Haukaas, Everette W.
Hauptfuhrer, Harold B.
Hauser, Albert W., Jr.
Hawkes, Lawrence D.
Hawkins, Robert D.
Hawkinson, Jerrald J.
Hayes, Jerome D.
Hayes, William R., Jr.
Haynes, John L.
Haynes, Paul C.
Hayward, Thomas E.
Hazlett, Donald L.
Head, Joe M.
Heaivilin, Gale E.
Heap, Virgil I.
Heard, Jewel M.
Heard, Nathan E.
Heatley, George
Hebert, Allen J.
Hebert, Kenneth J.
Hedgecock, Norman C.
Hedrick, Charles T.
Hehner, Walter K., Jr.
Heidbreder, Henry, Jr.
Heiden, Charles S.
Heim, Donald E.
Heishman, Gordon E.
Heitz, Bruce A.
Heitzman, Larry G.
Helber, Lawrence N.
Heldreth, Claude E.
Hellbusch, Ronald A.
Heller, Frederick P.
Hellinger, Solomon S.
Helton, William C.
Hemlepp, William M.
Hemming, Michael J. T.
Henderson, Alfred B.
Henderson, Charles H.
Henderson, Delbert D.
Henderson, Jack R.
Henderson, James J., III
Henderson, James M.
Hendricks, Phillip G.
Hendrickson, Kenneth J.
Hendrix, William L.
Henninger, Edgar W.
Hennon, Franklin R.
Henry, Carl J., Jr.
Henry, Elton O.
Henry, Herman C.
Hensel, Frank E.
Herak, James S.
Herd, Douglas R.
Herman, Harley W.
Hern, Charles R.
Hernandez, Miguel A.
Herold, Andrew G., Jr.
Heroy, Dewey W.
Hertz, James O.
Herzog, John M.
Hesser, Peter M.
Hester, Robert J.
Heusner, Robert A.
Heyse, Rudolph B.
Hiatt, George A.
Hiatt, Virgil D.
Hickerson, Robert
Hickey, Myles T.
Hickey, William C.
Hickman, John L.
Hicks, Edward Q.
Hicks, Leroy

Hiester, Wellington A., Jr.
Higgs, William W.
High, Roger D.
Highhouse, Frederick F.
Hildebrand, Arthur T., Jr.
Hill, Albert H.
Hill James E.
Hill, Peter
Hill, Thomas A.
Hill, William P.
Hill, William R., Jr.
Hillard, Gerald W.
Hiller, Dale R.
Hilliard, Albert E.
Hilliard, Roy L., Jr.
Hillman, James E.
Hilton, Richard G.
Hinds, Munn E., Jr.
Hines, Howard R.
Hines, Lonnie R.
Hinkle, Edmond R.
Hinman, Rex L.
Hintz, James D.
Hirschmann, Harold
Hisler, Norman R.
Hix, Clifton L.
Hobart, Ellis R.
Hobbs, Comer E.
Hockensmith, Donald L.
Hodge, Arthur D.
Hodge, Joel A., Jr.
Hodges, Jerry L.
Hodgins, Edward F., Jr.
Hodgson, Donald W.
Hodory, Richard W.
Hoedl, Leo J.
Hoelzle, Jack
Hoffman, Danny R.
Hoffman, George J.
Hoffmann, Ronald G.
Hofstra, Jack
Holdeman, Robert E.
Holderness, John
Holdridge, Billy B.
Holiman, Ralph L.
Holiwski, Frank D.
Holk, James N.
Holland, Kenneth B.
Hollis, James F.
Holloway, Clomer J.
Holmberg, Eugene S.
Holmes, James D.
Holmes, Stanley M., Jr
Holmgreen, John C., Jr
Holschen, Henry J., Jr
Holt, Paul L., Jr.
Holt, Robert A.
Holt, William A.
Holter, Vernon P.
Honbarrier, Harold L., Jr.
Honza, Billy J.
Hoogendoorn, Raymond J.
Hooper, Jerald D.
Hooper, Theodore D., Jr.
Hoover, Ronald E.
Horadan, Lloyd R.
Horsfall, Walter S.
Horton, John W.
Hosek, Louis O., Jr.
Hoskins, Rowland R.
Hoskot, Nathaniel R., Jr.
Hotard, Darrel R., Jr.
Houck, Harvey D., Jr.
Houggard, Byron L.
House, Donald C.
Housh, Richard H.
Howard, Donald L.
Howard, Thomas E.
Howell, John C.
Howell, Paul A.
Hoy, Jack R.
Hradsky, Robert A.
Hrebik, Richard K.
Huddleson, Carl L.
Hudson, Clarence
Hudson, Richard A.
Huels, Walter D.
Huff, James L.
Huffman, James W., Jr.
Hughes, Edward M.
Hughes, Jacob W., Jr.
Hughes, Ralph C.
Hughes, William J.
Huie, Robert D., Jr.
Hulcy, Zane C.
Hull, Denford J.
Hulsey, James G., Jr.
Humm, Edmond R.
Humphrey, Doyle E.
Hundley, Thomas Y.
Hunt, William R., Jr.
Hurst, Charles E.
Hurt, Roosevelt
Huskey, Donald R.
Huslander, Richard E.
Husted, Thomas H., Jr.
Huston, Wayne B.
Hutchinson, Arnold A.
Hutchinson, Homer G., III
Huth, Gary T.
Hutsler, William C.
Hutson, Larry W.
Hutton, John W.
Hyde, John S.
Hyland, Edward C.
Illes, Steve J.
Imes, Donald E.
Imhauser, Robert W.
Ingersoll, Alvah E., Jr.
Ingraham, Charles H., Jr.
Ingram, Walter E.
Innerarity, Vernon E.
Irons, John L.
Irvine, Floyd D.
Irvine, Joseph W.
Irvine, Thomas R.
Israel, Larry N.
Iversen, Rolf R.
Jabs, Walter L.
Jackson, Marvin L.
Jackson, Kaye E.
Jackson, Dennis D. W.
Jackson, Jerald W.
Jackson, Richard B.
Jackson, Buddy K.
Jacobs, Charles E., Jr.
Jacobs, George T.
Jacobsen, Arthur R., Jr.
Jacobsen, Randall N.
Jacobson, Theodore R.
Jacome, Robert A.
James, Danny D.
Jameson, Christopher P.
Janis, Joseph J.
Janke, Jimmie E.
Jarrell, Roland
Jarvin, Donald C.
Jasmuno, Robert F.
Jealous, Bradford
Jeffery, Harry D.
Jeffries, John M.
Jenkins, Ralph H.
Jenkins, Walter R.
Jenkins, Clifton S., Jr.
Jennings, Earl M.
Jennings, James
Jeremiah, John B.
Jernee, Huston R.
Jessee, Franklin E.
Jewell, Jack D.
Jiminez, Francis
Johann, Joseph A.
Johanson, David D.
John, Noel A.
Johnson, Albert E.
Johnson, Arney M., Jr.
Johnson, Carl O.
Johnson, Carl R.
Johnson, Dale L.
Johnson, Dan C.
Johnson, Dan E.
Johnson, David F.
Johnson, Dennis W.
Johnson, Donald D.
Johnson, Donald R.
Johnson, Elsie M.
Johnson, George O.
Johnson, Harold B.
Johnson, Kenneth E.
Johnson, Laverne E.
Johnson, Paul C.
Johnson, Richard, Jr.
Johnson, Richard S., Jr.
Johnson, Richard W.
Johnson, Robert J.
Johnson, Stanley P.
Johnson, Vernon J.
Johnson, Weldon W.
Johnson, Wesley D.
Johnson, William D.
Johnson, William F.
Johnston, Bobby M.
Johnston, Darrell G.
Joiner, James E.
Joles, Kenneth D.
Jolly, Charles M.
Jolly, Charles S., Jr.
Jones, Allen L.
Jones, Bruce R.
Jones, Charles T.
Jones, Clarence H.
Jones, Daniel T., Jr.
Jones, Earnest J.
Jones, Edward T., Jr.
Jones, Floyd S.
Jones, Harold L., Jr.
Jones, Henderson B.
Jones, James D.
Jones, James W.
Jones, John L.
Jones, Kenneth W.
Jones, Morris, Jr.
Jones, Paul D., Jr.
Jones, Philmon E.
Jones, Reginald L.
Jones, Richard D.
Jones, Richard W.
Jones, Robert J.
Jones, Thomas H.
Jones, Walter K.
Jones, William A.
Jones, William T.
Jordan, Joe T.
Jordan, William F.
Journey, John E.
Joyce, Robert E.
Jozwiakowski, Richard P.
Juarez, Luis A.
Julich, Paul, Jr.
Justice, William N., Jr.
Kaczinski, Marcellus J.
Kadlecik, John, Jr.
Kahl, Herbert S.
Kahl, Martin F.
Kahl, Thomas A.
Kammeier, Cyril L.
Kane, Gerald T.
Kane ,William J., Jr.
Kanocz, Michael, Jr.
Kappel, Jacob, Jr.
Karasek, Robert G.
Karch, Lawrence G.
Karr, James T.
Karrer, Joseph J.
Kasson, George P.
Kasten, William
Katz, Robert E.
Kaus, Eugene J.
Kavanaugh, John W., III
Kearley, Arthur M.
Kearney, Thomas F.
Keatley, Roger L.
Kee, Gary S.
Keeler, Clyde E., Jr.
Keeler, Doris M.
Keene, David R.
Keglovits, Edward J.
Keim, John R.
Keker, John W.
Keller, Harry L.
Keller, Richard S.
Keller, William E., Jr.
Kelley, Jessie W.
Kellison, Charles R.
Kelly, George W.
Kelly, James R.
Kelly, John M.
Kelly, Michael S.
Kelly, Ralph E.
Kelly, Richard M.
Kelly, Samuel C., III
Kelly, Thomas P.
Kelly, William D.
Kelly, William E.
Kemerley, Richard K.
Kemick, Gerald T.
Kemmis, Edward D.
Kemper, George R., Jr.
Kemple, William G.
Kendall, James E.
Kendall, Ronald R.
Kendig, Dennis R.
Kendrick, Edgar T.
Kennedy, Laurance J.
Kennedy, Delbert E.
Kennedy, William G.
Kenner, George F.
Kenner, William W., Jr.
Kenniston, George P.
Kent, Arthur L., Jr.
Kent, James M.
Kentner, Raymond L.
Kepford, Carl B.
Kerchner, Henry A.
Kerr, Howard E.
Kerr, Richard A.
Kerr, Samuel L.
Kersey, Ronald R.
Kettler, Jack
Keyes, Roy C.
Kicklighter, Rodney C.
Kiehl, Richard M.
Kiemel, Raymond E.
Kight, James
Kiker, Meek C., Jr.
Killian, Bobby P.
Kim, Joseph W., III
Kimball, Thomas R.
Kimball, Lynn J.
Kimble, Ralph R.
Kindler, Gary L.
King, Ben W.
King, Claude E.
King, Claude E.
King, James F.
King, John C.
King, Thomas G.
King, Wayne W.
Kinnear, John H.
Kinslow, George C.
Kipick, Mike
Kirchgessner, Gerald P.
Kirchmeier, Robert T.
Kirin, Michael J.
Kirk, Harvey O.
Kirk, Paul C.
Kirk, Robert W.
Kirkland, Golden C.
Kirkman, Timothy R.
Kirkpatrick, William S.
Kirkpatrick, Loren K.
Klansky, Gerald J.
Klesyk, Francis, Jr.
Kline, Roy C.
Kling, Harry A.
Klingensmith, Harold A.
Klingensmith, Harry G.
Klocek, Joseph J.
Kloch, Robert L.
Klunk, Harold P.
Knack, John M.
Knapp, John R.
Knight, William A.
Knipper, William J.
Kniska, Nicholas E.
Knocke, James J.
Knowles, Coleman R.,
Knowles, Robert E.
Knox, Richard D.
Kobel, Alan D.
Kobel, William L.
Koble, Ned A.
Koelln, Kenneth A.
Kohler, William C.
Koliha, Joe J.
Kollar, Joseph J.
Komo, Raymond S.
Kondo, Herbert S.
Kopacz, John R.
Kraft, Leo W.
Krajewski, Joseph S.
Kramer, William L.
Kramp, Kay E.
Krantz, Everett W.
Krauer, John J.
Kreiling, William
Kresty, Edward J.
Krieger, Edward T., Jr.
Kroelinger, William L.
Krohn, Orville E.
Kromis, Emanuel J.
Krone, Melvin P.
Krueger, Ronald L.
Kucinski, Julius W.
Kuhlman, Robert J., Jr.
Kuhlman, Norman K.
Kuhn, Coleman D., Jr.
Kuykendall, Billy H.
Kuzmenko, Tom A.
Labby, Charles E., Jr.
Laboissiere, David J.
La Bounty, Norman F.
Lacey, Don C.
Lacoursiere, Robert P.
Lacy, Horace W.
Lacy, John J.
Ladd, Lawrence "K"
Ladner, Claudie J.
Laing, Ivan A.
Lake, Donald E.
Lake, Donald L.
Lake, James E.
Lamb, Michael R.
Lambert, Leon
Lambert, Frank A.
Lambert, Glynn P.
Lamberth, Scott M.
Lambiasi, Louis C.
Lambka, Harvey L.
Lamczyk, Everett E.
La Montagne, Henry J.
La Montagne, Robert N.
La Motte, Francis W., Jr.
Lamson, John C.
Landrum, Dale F.
Lane, Benny W.
Lane, Billy B.
Lane, Bobby
Lane, James V.
Lane, John S.
Lane, Warren R.
Lang, Bruce A.
Lang, Elbridge W.
Lange, Robert K.
Langin, Charles E.
Langley, Robert C.
Lanis, Howard G.
Lanthier, Richard G.
Larkin, Edward J.
Larkin, Joseph V.
Larson, Duane D.
Larson, Richard M.
Larsson, Thomas R.
La Rue, Billy B.
Lasher, Jerry V.
Lastovica, Jerry L.
Latham, Irving C.
Latham, Julian S.
Laton, Roger L.
Laughlin, Ronald J.
Laughner, Donald E.
Lauland, Thomas H., Jr.
Lauretta, Antonio
Laverty, Chester N.
Laverty, Robert C.
Lawler, Eugene D.
Lawrence, Charles A. L.
Lawrence, Edmond H.
Lawrence, Thomas J.
Layton, Lewis W., Jr.
Lea, Franklin S.
Leach, Harold W.
Leach, William H.
Leahy, John J.
Leal, Jimmie V.
Leathers, James P.
Le Doux, Roger "O"
Lee, Earl C.
Lee, John A.
Lee, John J.
Lee, Lendith
Lee, Richard R.
Lee, William E.
Leedle, James M.
Legere, Alfred H.
Legg, William E.
Lemmond, Walter V., III
Lemoine, Stanley P.
Lenhart, George E.
Lenhart, Richard A.
Lenn, Donald S.
Leonski, Joseph A.
Le Page, Lawrence J.
Lepore, William P., Jr.
Lesh, Thomas "J"
Levengood, Joseph C.
Lewallen, James W.
Lewandowski, Eugene S.
Lewis, Kennith D.
Lewis, Robert C.
Lewis, Samuel P.
Lewis, Willard R.
Lichty, Randall W.
Lidback, George S., Jr.
Liebert, Karl F.
Light, Bobby R.
Lilja, Ralph B.
Lilley, John M.
Lilly, Junior
Lind, Paul A.
Lindholm, Hans W.
Lindsay, Samuel E., Jr.
Lindsey, Joel F.
Lindsey, Steven P.
Lisenbe, Bobby M.
Lisenby, William E.
Listwan, Albert J.
Little, Allan G.
Little, Herman I., Jr.
Little, John R.
Little, Roy F.
Littlefield, Arthur L, Jr.
Littler, James L. M., III.
Littrell, Roy L.
Llewellyn, William D.
Lloyd, Burdell L., Jr.
Lloyd, Robert A.
Lockwood, Charles E.
Lockyer, Arron K.
Loeffler, Charles H.
Loeffler, Robert L.
Loehr, Curtis J.
Lofton, William A.
Loftus, Edward P.
Logan, Bernard W.
Logar, Michael F.
Lohr, John L.
Lonetti, Richard P.
Long, Boyzy C.
Long, Carl E.

Long, Charles E.
Long, Charles J.
Long, Lowell D.
Loof, Charles J., Jr.
Lord, Robert L.
Lorelli, Jerry N.
Lorentsen, Frederick A.
Losey, Charles E.
Loughren, Frederick R.
Loustaunau, Charles, Jr.
Love, Ronald L.
Lovelace, Richard J.
Lovell, John T.
Lovitt, Willis J., Jr.
Lowe, John W.
Lowe, William N.
Lowell, Joel K.
Lowery, John S., Jr.
Loy, David W.
Lubbe, Walter W., Jr.
Lucas, David J., Jr.
Lucas, Harry A.
Lucas, Troy A.
Lucenius, Arne B.
Lucero, David A.
Lucht, Dean C.
Lucy, Jimmie L.
Luedtke, Dale C.
Luisa, Edward M., Jr.
Lukawecz, Theodore
Luke, David A.
Lum, Allen J. A.
Lumpkins, Sellards L.
Lund, Robert E.
Lundberg, Helmer G., Jr.
Lunn, Carl K.
Lunt, George L., Jr.
Lusignan, John H.
Lutz, Fred, Jr.
Lutz, Kenneth O.
Luxemburger, Maxwell C.
Lykens, William F., Jr.
Lynch, John F.
Lynch, Peter
Lynch, Robert L.
Lytle, John T.
Mac Cormack, Dana F.
Mac Donald, Hazen E.
Mac Farlane, Larry S.
Mac Farlane, Robert W.
Mac Geary, Fred E.
Machado, Enrique L.
Machovec, Richard A.
Mac Iver, Colin R.
Mac Kenzie, Robert B.
Mackey, David G.
Mackins, Jeff G.
Macklin, Herman E.
Macky, Gerald
Mac Pherson, Ray D.
Macy, Ronald T.
Madsen, Alfred L.
Magers, Donald P.
Maguire, Paul B.
Maiden, John E.
Main, Stanley W.
Majewski, Norbert L.
Mallard, Ira T.
Mallette, Gerald O.
Mallon, Thomas W.
Malnicof, Harry B.
Malone, Loren J.
Maloney, John C.
Maloney, John M.
Maloney, John T.
Maloy, Thomas D., Jr.
Manbeck, Lewis D.
Manifold, Dale W.
Manion, Jimmy L.
Manley, James D.
Mann, Daniel I.
Mann, Marion R.
Mann, Thomas J.
Manning, Earl J.
Manning, John A.
Manning, Joseph R.
Manry, Tommy E.
Mansdorf, Bruce D.
Manz, Joseph C.
Marchette, Donald C.
Marcum, George L.
Marek, Gaylord J.
Mariz, Robert J.
Markowski, Frank G.
Marland, Daniel, Jr.
Marlow, Donald R.
Marnon, John J.
Marois, Armand
Marrone, Samuel R.
Marshall, Alvin F., Jr.
Marshall, John J.
Marshall, Russell H.
Martello, Herbert P., Jr.
Martin, Bobby O.
Martin, Donald J.
Martin, David O.
Martin, Francis L.
Martin, James J.
Martin, Joseph L.
Martin, Joseph M., Jr.
Martin, Louie G.
Martin, Nelson R.
Martin, Paul S.
Martin, Ronald A.
Martinez, Carlos
Maruhn, Richard L.
Marvin, Horace W.
Marzioli, Joseph
Mashburn, Lester E.
Maslyk, Edward G.
Mason, Michael R.
Mason, Wayne B.
Masone, Vincent J.
Massey, Allen W.
Mastroberti, Michael P.
Matchett, John W.
Mathis, Don E.
Mathys, Dale A.
Matkowski, Joseph R.
Matras, Lawrence W.
Matte, Joseph C.
Matte, Leland J.
Matteson, Richard J.
Matthews, Gordon B.
Matthews, John T., Jr.
Matthews, Millard F., Jr.
Matthews, Peter J.
Matthews, Robert J.
Mattox, Leon
Matzko, Dean H.
Mauricio, Roberto P.
Maxon, Don K.
Maxwell, Daniel M.
Maxwell, John
Maxwell, Donald M.
May, Kenneth N.
Mayer, Robert, Jr.
Mayes, Ronald J.
Mayfield, Sanford F.
Maynard, Kenneth L.
Maynard, Fredrick
Maynes, Robert L.
Mayo, Harold D., Jr.
Mayo, Philip S.
Mayo, William H., Jr.
Mazzei, Edmund J.
McAfee, Marvin K.
McAlister, John T.
McAuley, William T., II
McAvoy, Paul O., Jr.
McBride, William G., Jr.
McCabe, James J.
McCain, Daniel N.
McCall, William D., Jr.
McCallion, Frank E.
McCallum, John E. B.
McCarter, William D.
McCarthy, Frank H.
McCarthy, John E., Jr.
McCarthy, Richard C.
McCartney, Joseph R.
McCauley, Benjamin D.
McClain, "R" "L"
McClellan, Ramon V.
McClure, Raymond B.
McCombs, Francis
McConnell, Richard S.
McCord, Richard G.
McCormack, James S.
McCormick, Donald W
McCourt, Edward F., Jr.
McCourt, Thomas
McCranie, Cleo H.
McCue, John W., III
McCulloch, Billy R.
McDaniel, Joe E.
McDeavitt, Richard L.
McDonald Denis H.
McElroy, Joseph A.
McElvain,Ronald R.
McEwen, Robert G.
McFadden, Bernard W.
McFarlane, Andrew B.
McGann, Joseph
McGee, Henry W.
McGinniss, Milburn
McGrath, Alvin L.
McGraw, John J.
McGraw, Reginald K.
McGuire, John P.
McIlnay, Bernard L.
McInerney, James P.
McInnes, John M.
McIntosh, Roger A.
McIntyre, Max
McIver, Wallace L.
McKay, Frederick R.
McKay, John E.
McKee, Dennis T.
McKee, Larry E.
McKenna, Joseph C.
McKinney, Harry T., Jr.
McKinnon, Joseph R.
McKnight, Matthew O.
McKnight, Thomas A.
McLaughlin, John E.
McLaughlin, Robert J.
McLaughlin, William J
McLean, Albenious P.
McLemore, Kenneth N.
McMakin, John F., Jr.
McManus, Raymond J.
McMenamin, Harry D.
McMenany, Edward L. Jr.
McMillan, Milburn H.
McMullin, Jack H.
McMullin, Thomas B.
McNamara, William
McNulty, Jerry W.
McPartland, Paul D.
McPeak, Melvin E.
McPherson, Warren R.
McQueary, Daniel H.
McSpadden, Bert L.
McVey, Lavoy D.
McWaters, Fred H.
McWhorter, Robert J.
Means, Charles E.
Means, John R.
Medearis, Eldon G., Jr.
Medina, Joseph M., Jr.
Mednis, Alfons J.
Meece, Ralph D.
Meech, Robert A.
Meech, Wayne A.
Meegan, George B.
Meehleder, James M.
Meek, Phillip E.
Meeker, Charles C.
Meeks, Joseph R.
Meier, Fred J., Jr.
Meisner, Donald E.
Mello, Edmund M.
Mellon, Bruce
Mendoza, Raymond A.
Mentzer, John H., II
Mercer, Edward F.
Merlino, John A.
Merna, Gerald F.
Merrell, Robert G.
Merritt, Jimmy M.
Messier, Alfred L.
Messinger, Gene V.
Metcalfe, Edwin A.
Meyer, Edward H., Jr.
Meyer, William O., Jr.
Meyers, Bradford B.
Meyers, Donald J.
Meyers, Gary G.
Meyers, John L.
Meyers, Richard B.
Michael, Edward L.
Migliacci, Joseph A.
Mikulsky, John J.
Milavic, Anthony F.
Milburn, Carroll R.
Miles, John J.
Miles, William R.
Millard, James C.
Millard, Arthur F.
Miller, Andrew P.
Miller, Ashby R.
Miller, Burleigh W.
Miller, Charles R.
Miller, Don P., Jr.
Miller, Jacques L.
Miller, James E.
Miller, Jerry J.
Miller, Lester V.
Miller, Miles T.
Miller, Norman A.
Miller, Phillip M.
Miller, Robert L.
Miller, Robert S.
Miller, Richard E.
Miller, Ralph H.
Miller, Raymond R., Jr.
Miller, Thomas C.
Miller, Thomas J.
Miller, William A.
Miller, William R.
Miller, Walter N.
Millichap, Peter B.
Milliman, Glenn P.
Milliron, Robert E.
Millis, Dorne A.
Mills, Donald E.
Mills, Jimmie L.
Mills, Thomas C.
Milne, James E.
Milton, Ralph A.
Mino, Michael J.
Mitchell, Earl W.
Mitchell, Floyd G.
Mitchell, Mack E.
Mitchels, William L.
Mix, Tom A.
Mobley, Perry A.
Moe, Harold J.
Moffitt, Kermit
Mollendor, James J. C.
Moller, Harry R.
Moneypenny, Guy E.
Montana, Douglas W.
Montgomery, Orrie G.
Moody, Johnney W.
Moog, David C.
Mook, David
Mooney, John F.
Moore, Bill Z.
Moore, Bruce K.
Moore, Edward L., II
Moore, Fred A., Jr.
Moore, Frank O., Jr.
Moore, Henry
Moore, Kenneth W.
Moore, Theodore C.
Moore, Theodore M.
Moore, William A.
Moore, William J.
Moore, William T., Jr.
Moorhead, Robert D.
Moos, Walter H. I.
Mora, Aurelio
Moran, Richard C.
Moran, Richard G.
Morgan, Francis T., Jr.
Morgan, Franklin M.
Morgan, Grover K.
Morgan, Robert Y.
Morgan, Roger G.
Morgan, William A.
Morilla, Robert G.
Morin, Richard G.
Moring, Joe D.
Morocco, Pasquale J.
Morrill, Alan L.
Morris, Charles A.
Morris, Herbert R., Jr.
Morris, John R.
Morris, Kenneth A.
Morris, Richard L.
Morris, Stanley S., Jr.
Morrison, Allen W.
Morrison, Arthur E., Jr.
Morrison, Jerald J.
Morrison, John R.
Morrissey, John T., Jr.
Morrow, Charles L.
Morrow, Edward
Morrow, Joseph M.
Mort, James H.
Morton, Merrill T.
Morts, Harold D.
Mosley, Don E.
Moss, Lawrence W.
Mossey, Donald J.
Mossler, Alfred H.
Mott, Dean V.
Mottard, Dean L.
Moulton, Bruce L.
Moungelis, Stavros S.
Mounter, Paul H.
Moxley, William H.
Moyer, Samuel L.
Mucci, Anthony
Mueller, Richard A.
Mulford, Randolph M.
Mull, Robert L.
Mullaney, Garrell S.
Muller, Richard J.
Mullins, Peter F.
Mulvey, William R.
Mumford, John V.
Munday, Ted L.
Mundy, Marion E.
Munn, Warren E.
Murphy, David B.
Murphy, James P.
Murphy, Michael W.
Murphy, Timothy J.
Murray, Gilbert W.
Murray, Grover
Murray, John E.
Murray, Peter J.
Murry, Joseph A.
Musser, Richard E.
Myers, Clair D.
Myers, Earl G., Jr.
Myers, Edward M.
Myers, Glenn N.
Myers, Hugh G., Jr.
Myers, Larrie J.
Myers, Lonnie M.
Myers, Paul A., Jr.
Myers, Richard D.
Nadeau, Arthur G.
Nagai, Hideo
Nagelin, Thomas F., Sr.
Nail, Gary L.
Nailor, Richard A.
Naperalski, Gerald R.
Nash, Gail L.
Nason, Gilbert L.
Natt, Frank, Jr.
Nazarchuk, Daniel A.
Neely, Gerard T.
Neff, Thompson D.
Nelson, Albert C.
Nelson, Delbert L.
Nelson, Edward A.
Nelson, George, Jr.
Nelson, Monte V.
Nelson, William H., Jr.
Nemeth, John W.
Netherly, Cecil
Nettleingham, Allen D
Neubauer, Ronald S.
Neveu, Alfred C.
New, Walter
Newell, Charles A.
Newkirk, Gary L.
Newman, Ronald D.
Newton, Richard B.
Neyt, Ronald J.
Nicholas, Billy D.
Nichols, James D.
Nichols, Robert J.
Nickell, Scott G.
Nicklin, Richard F.
Nicolai, Peter W.
Nicolopoulos, John S.
Nicosia, Donald D.
Nida, Carl E.
Nienstedt, James F.
Nigro, Anthony
Nimmow, Donald D.
Nix, Joseph R.
Nixon, Joe A.
Nixon, William F.
Nobriga, Leabert F.
Noel, John F., Jr.
Noonan, William, Jr.
Noonkester, Henry E.
Norman Geoffrey W.
Norton, Frank J.
Norton, Phillip C.
Norton, Patrick T.
Norton, Robert L.
Norton, William D.
Norwood, Thomas H.
Norwood, Richard H.
Nothhaft, Henry R.
Novak, John P.
Nowicki, Norbert J.
Nozar, John J.
Nyenbrink, Henry W.
Oakley, Howard C.
Oatis, Peter W.
O'Brien, Thomas M.
O'Cchipinti, Charles W.
Ockuly, Eugene J.
O'Connor, Patrick R.
O'Connor, George R.
O'Connor, Charles F.
Odegard, Ralph P.
O'Dell, Frank E.
Oehlers, Roy M.
Oetting, Robert H.
Offutt, Charles W.
O'Hara, William J.
O'Leary, Patrick J.
Olmstead, Howard W.
Olsen, Almart H.
Olsen, James G.
Olsen, John O.
Olson, Leland M.
Olson, Roy C.
Olson, Robert D.
Olson, Thomas A.
Ondrak, Daryle M.
O'Neil, Donn L.
O'Neill, Peter J.
O'Neill, Stephen J.
Oppenhuizen, John P.
Ordway, Ruel E.
Orlando, Louis D.
Orona, Louis, Jr.
O'Rourke, James M., Jr.
Orr, James C.
Osborne, Hansel E.
Osenkoski, Stanley M.
Osgood, Carl G., Jr.
O'Shields, Robert C.
O'Shields, Tommy S.
Osterberg, Richard R.
O'Sullivan, Thomas T.
Oswald, Donald H.
Ota, Yoneo
O'Toole, Thomas F., Jr.

Oubre, Melvin J.
Outrakis, Nicholas J.
Owen, Albert A.
Owen, James R.
Owen, Joseph C., Jr.
Owens, Billy W.
Owens, Charlie C.
Owsley, Gerald E.
Owsley, Robert E.
Oxford, Lynn D.
Pachucki, Robert J.
Page, Herbert M., Jr.
Pahl, Gerald S.
Paige, Joseph J.
Painter, Billy G.
Pallang, Rodney L.
Pallo, Mathew, Jr.
Palmer, Doil C.
Palmer, Leonard E., Jr
Pancoast, Harry L., Jr.
Panicali, Louis V.
Panknin, James D.
Papciak, George J.
Paquette, Paul
Parker, Allen D.
Parker, Charles D.
Parker, George R., Jr.
Parker, Hubert L.
Parker, Joseph A., Jr.
Parretti, Lawrence
Parrish, Bobby J.
Parrish, Julian W.
Parrott, Howard G.
Parry, Fred R.
Partain, Warren B., Jr.
Parton, Donald J.
Partridge, Gerald B.
Paschen, Charles W.
Pascual, Ronald J.
Paskevich, Theodore
Patridge, James O.
Pattat, Albert W.
Patterson, Hobart D., Jr.
Patton, Doyle M.
Patton, Robert F.
Paulk, James S.
Paurazas, Edward J.
Pavlik, Alfred J.
Paxton, Jack T.
Payne, Courtney B.
Payne, Walter A.
Pearce, Arthur R.
Pearce, Bruce W.
Pearce, Patrick A.
Pearson, Charles R.
Pease, Delbert A.
Peck, Joseph E.
Pedersen, Charles L.
Pedlar, Dean C.
Peeples, Walter A.
Pelczarski, Paul R.
Pelletier, Conrad R.
Pelletier, George A.
Pelletier, Perly A.
Pelli, James A., Jr.
Pelto, William M.
Peltzer, Benson, Jr.
Pendarvis, Robert H.
Pendergast, Paul
Pendleton, Martin H.
Penman, Donald E.
Penman, David T.
Pennington, Earl
Pentony, Thomas J.
Pepe, Francis A.
Peregoy, Edmund T.
Perkins, William N.
Perkins, Huette D.
Perrin, Jack N.
Perry, Jimmy R.
Perry, Joseph
Perry, Richard P.
Perry, Ronald L.
Pete, Guy A., Jr.
Peters, Maxwell R.
Peters, Sterling R.
Peters, William C.
Peterson, Clarence F.
Peterson, Dennis A.
Peterson, George L., Jr.
Peterson, Gordon F.
Peterson, John E.
Peterson, John W.
Peterson, Robert A.
Petronzio, John A.
Petry, Rudge
Pettit, Kenneth E.
Petty, Robert H.
Petzel, Ronald J.
Peyer, Otto W., Jr.
Phelan, James M.
Phelps, Douglas R.
Phillippi, Lewis M., Jr.
Phillips, Bruce M.
Phillips, Charles L.
Phillips, Clarence W., Jr.
Phillips, Donald F.
Phillips, Ennis T., Jr.
Phillips, Kent W.
Phillips, Weller A., III
Piconke, Ronald J.
Pier, Robert P.
Pieratt, John J.
Pierce, Arthur A.
Pierce, John F.
Pierse, Donald E.
Pihl, Donald E.
Pike, John E.
Pike, Ralph H.
Pinguet, Jean
Pinnell, Murry C.
Pinola, Tony R.
Piontek, Edward
Pippin, James R.
Pitcher, Kenneth E.
Pitts, Edward F.
Pitts, James E.
Pitts, Michael G.
Pitts, Robert D.
Plank, Adolph L., Jr.
Plant, Bernard M.
Plante, Leo G.
Platt, Charles L.
Plots, Robert F.
Polasek, Edward J., Jr.
Pollmiller, Lawrence A.
Pollock, William W.
Ponder, Carl N.
Pontillas, Robert G.
Pool, Glaston
Pope, Joe A.
Pope, John R.
Pope, Paul E., Jr.
Pope, Robert E.
Porter, Bebe B.
Porter, Richard L.
Post, Raymond, Jr.
Postalwait, Ronzel E.
Posthuma, Henry
Pothier, Gerald T.
Potter, Donald D.
Poulin, Edward G.
Powell, Clayton A.
Powell, Frank D.
Powell, William B., Jr.
Powell, William H.
Prato, Sam J.
Pratt, Donald L.
Prelgovisk, John A.
Prendergast, Thomas J.
Preston, Ralph A., Jr.
Pretsch, Donald C.
Price, Dwight L.
Price, Fred R.
Price, Jimmie
Price, Robert F.
Price, Thomas L.
Price, William S., Jr.
Priddy, Sanford J.
Prokopchuk, Nicholas
Pruett, Bobby R.
Puricelli, Russell A.
Purnell, George W.
Purvis, Charles F.
Quan, Raymond J.
Quest, Herman W.
Quigley, William J.
Quigley, Alvin J.
Quill, Lewis R.
Quinn, James E.
Quinn, John E.
Raber, William E.
Rabun, Jack N.
Rachal, James E.
Radcliffe, Darrel R.
Radford, Garland L.
Raffel, Richard R.
Rafferty, Cleon H.
Rafferty, Michael E.
Raines, Arvel H.
Rainwater, Gerald K.
Raley, Jerry A.
Ralph, John "C"
Ralph, Nelson P.
Ramaker, James K.
Ramey, Perry A.
Ramirez, Joe P., Jr.
Ramirez, Roy G.
Ramsay, Jerrold A.
Ramseur, Joe D.
Ramsey, Bobby J.
Ramsey, Emma G.
Randall, David R.
Randall, David S., Jr.
Randlett, Frederick A.
Ransom, Morris E.
Rasile, Robert
Ratcliffe, Donald
Rau, Harvey L.
Ravan, George "A"
Rawlins, Malcolm S.
Ray, Glen C.
Ray, James F.
Ray, Philip H.
Ray, Robert E.
Ray, Thomas W.
Ray, Walter J.
Raymer, Erwin O.
Raymond, Dale
Raymond, Joseph C.
Raymond, Ernest A.
Reale, Frank A.
Redford, Raymond E.
Redic, Bobby D.
Redican, Thomas E.
Redifer, John L.
Redlinger, Robert E.
Reed, Chris D.
Reed, Doyle R.
Reed, Jack M.
Reed, Ralph W.
Reed, Thomas F.
Reeves, Ross N., III
Reeves, Walter A.
Rehmann, Lawrence M.
Reid, Dewitt R., Jr.
Reid, Gawn W.
Reifsnider, Lawrence C.
Reigle, Robert E.
Reigle, William A.
Reitmeister, William A.
Rembish, Stanley J., Jr.
Rempel, Robert H.
Reneau, Calix L.
Renegar, Edwin J.
Renfroe, Luther L., Jr
Renn, Earle L.
Renno, Robert "E."
Rentz, Homer A.
Rexroade, John D.
Reyer, Alfred J., Jr.
Reynaud, Junior G.
Reynolds, Albert A.
Reynolds, Charles D.
Reynolds, Donna M.
Reynolds, Oren C.
Rhode, Richard W.
Rhodes, Davey L.
Rhodes, John L.
Rhodes, Larry E.
Rhyder, Frederick V.
Rice, Edwin A.
Rice, Lewis E.
Rice, Luther E., Jr.
Rich, Robert E.
Richards, Clarence E., Jr.
Richards, Donald R.
Richards, Larry D.
Richardson, Donald F.
Richardson, Harold L.
Richardson, Herbert C., Jr.
Richmond, Arthur D.
Richmond, William A.
Richter, Robert E.
Richter, Robert L.
Ricker, Clarence J.
Rickman, Lester, Jr.
Ricks, Melvin R.
Ricks, Peter J., Jr.
Riddle, William N.
Ridenour, Robert L
Riggs, Charles
Rigney, Michael A.
Riley, Carroll J.
Riley, Charles N.
Riley, Harold J.
Riley, Patrick A.
Riley, William E.
Rindt, Brian A.
Ring, Paul E.
Ringler, Dean R.
Ringler, Jerry H.
Ripa, Sebastiano F.
Ripp, Robert W.
Risko, William
Ritter, Harold L.
Rivers, Robert R.
Robbins, John R.
Roberson, James J.
Roberson, Thomas F.
Roberts, Leo W., Jr.
Roberts, Lewis C.
Roberts, Thomas E.
Roberts, Thomas G.
Roberts, Linton R.
Roberts, Frank H., Jr.
Robertson, Emmett L., Jr.
Robertson, John T.
Robertson, Roland G.
Robinson, Clarence A., Jr.
Robinson, Clifford R.
Robinson, George N.
Robinson, Neil H.
Robinson, Robert B.
Robinson, Robert L.
Robinson, Ronald L.
Robinson, William R.
Robison, David B.
Robitaille, Edmund A.
Rodgers, Carl L.
Rodgers, John J., Jr.
Roe, Jerry D.
Roettger, Raymond J.
Rogers, Cecil W.
Rogers, Lionel D.
Rogers, William S.
Rogers, Walter A.
Roland, Alex F.
Rolita, Edward J., Jr.
Rollins, Thomas E.
Romano, Robert J.
Romeo, Joseph F.
Romine, Donnie L.
Ronalds, Hugh A.
Rooks, Warren H.
Roos, Philip G.
Root, James P.
Roper, Clyde A.
Rosbe, William L.
Rose, Robert L.
Rose, William C.
Rosenthal, James H.
Roser, George R.
Ross, Leonard
Ross, Leonard H., Jr.
Rotchford, Edward P.
Rote, Richard E.
Roth, John W.
Roth, Mark C.
Roth, Thomas H.
Rothrock, Jack C.
Rotramel, Joseph R., Jr.
Rounseville, Peter R.
Rouse, Albert C.
Roush, Donald G.
Rousseau, Donald F.
Roux, Roger P.
Rowe, Carlton A.
Rowe, Guy F.
Rowe, Hugh T., Jr.
Rowe, Robert D.
Ruckel, William W.
Ruder, Eugene J.
Rummel, Thomas R.
Rundle, Randolph K.
Runer, Jimmy T.
Runkle, Roger L.
Rushlau, Gerald A.
Russ, Alfred B.
Russell, James C.
Russell, Hayden B., Jr.
Russell, Edward M., Jr.
Russell, Leonard D.
Russell, Charles E.
Russell, Richard S., II
Russell, William C., Jr.
Russell, Billy E.
Russell, Robert M.
Ryan, James A.
Ryan, John J., Jr.
Sabattus, Donald J.
Sable, Ivan R.
Sabourin, Fernand H.
Sadler, Woodson A., Jr.
Sager, Hugh F.
Sakert, January T., Jr.
Salazar, Daniel M.
Salazar, Gerard
Salmons, Lloyd Y.
Salum, George D.
Sampson, Gerald H.
Sanborn, Richard S.
Sanchez, Milton
Sanders, James W.
Sanders, Richard K.
Sanders, Billy C., Jr.
Sanders, Stanley F.
Sanderson, Stephen H.
Sandoval, John, Jr.
Sands, Charles L.
Sanford, Eugene D.
Sangialosi, Samuel
Sansom, Howard D.
Santiago, George
Sarin, Mathew J.
Sarver, Edmond S.
Satterfield, Marion G.
Sauger, Peter P.
Saulnier, John L.
Saunders, Carleton F., Jr.
Savage, Charles W.
Savant, Richard L.
Savoy, Daniel R.
Sawyer, Harry E., Jr.
Sawyer, William F.
Saxton, Samuel F.
Sayre, Orville L.
Scalzo, Salvatore J.
Scarborough, Neil H.
Scarboro, Jimmy M.
Schauer, Theodore W.
Scheller, Leroy A., Jr.
Schiraldi, Anthony P.
Schlack, Carl J.
Schlapfer, Robert E.
Schleusner, Clifford G.
Schlitz, Leonard L.
Schlondrop, William C.
Schmehl, Lyle F.
Schmid, Adolph
Schmidt, Paul T.
Schmidt, Raymond H.
Schmidt, Charles W.
Schmidt, Michael E.
Schmidt, Milford D.
Schmitt, Robert G.
Schneider, Louie F., Jr.
Schneider, Roger J.
Schomisch, Erwin W.
Schooler, Bill M.
Schoonover, Adrian E.
Schoppaul, Elwyn K.
Schrader, Robert E.
Schriber, Edward C.
Schultz, Donald C.
Schultz, Frank W.
Schumacher, Herbert J.
Schuring, Clifford S.
Schuster, Harold R.
Schwanke, Donald W.
Schwartz, Henry J.
Schwartz, John P.
Schwarz, William O.
Schwarz, Frank H., Jr.
Schwarzer, Bob
Schwelm, John H.
Scoggin, Phillip C.
Scott, Billy H.
Scott, David L.
Scott, Eldon
Scott, Harmon, Jr.
Scott, James L.
Scott, Jerome C.
Scott, Jesse M.
Scott, Keith A.
Scott, Norvel M.
Scroggin, Ronald L.
Seage, Frederick H., Jr.
Seaman, Arthur J.
Search, George B.
Sebens, Mervin L.
Seder, Elmer C.
Seipel, Harry H., Jr.
Seitz, James E.
Selby, Martin A.
Seliga, John V.
Sellars, James A.
Selleck, Albert L., Jr.
Seman, Stephen G.
Sepulveda, Benny R.
Sergeant, Louis E., Jr.
Sexton, Gleason A.
Sexton, William H.
Seybold, Gerald C.
Shafer, Ronald L.
Shaffer, James A.
Shampoe, Clayton L., Jr.
Shamrell, Richard A.
Shank, Paul S.
Sharrow, Edward S.
Shaughnessy, John G.
Shaughnessy, Joseph B.
Shaw, Donald R.
Shea, James J., II
Shea, Robert E.
Sheckler, Herman D.
Sheehan, John F.
Sheldon, William G., III
Shelkey, Lloyd E.
Shell, Isham G., Jr.
Shelton, James H.
Shelton, Jerry M.
Shelton, Jesse E.
Shepard, Dean S.
Shepherd, Thomas C.
Sheppard, John L.
Sheppard, Victor L.
Sheridan, Robert L.
Sheridan, Thomas J.
Sheridan, William A., Jr.
Sherrow, Bobby L.
Sherry, Homer G.
Shick, Warren I.
Shifflette, Leonard R.
Shiver, Clements W.
Shiver, Henry D.
Shivers, Robert L.
Shoaf, Richard A.
Shoemaker, William E.
Shoffner, Mann, Jr.
Shook, Eddie H.
Shoop, Ronald H.
Shore, Richard G.

Shough, John G., II
Shoultys, John J., Jr.
Shove, Louis D.
Shroyer, Russell E.
Shubin, Derek A.
Shulgay, Peter
Shultis, Dean G.
Shumate, Kenneth C.
Shupe, Franklin D.
Sickels, George, Jr.
Siemasko, Paul R.
Siemion, Daniel L.
Sigmon, Billy R.
Siler, Jerry E.
Silk, Thomas E.
Simkins, Joseph R.
Simmons, Harry A.
Simmons, Warren A.
Simolin, Roy E.
Simon, Edward J.
Simond, Roger C.
Simpkins, "J" "V"
Simpson, Harvey H.
Sims, Jack
Sinclair, Harry L.
Skalski, Stanley A.
Skinner, Marion R., Jr.
Skrobialowski, Stanley C.
Slane, Thomas J.
Slate, James C.
Slavens, Charles R.
Sloan, Bobby B.
Sloan, Joe D.
Slocum, John J.
Smallwood, Gene G.
Smethurst, Robert J. L.
Smiley, Perry
Smith, Alexander G.
Smith, Blakeslee A.
Smith, Cameron M., Jr.
Smith, Carroll J.
Smith, Charles W., Jr.
Smith, Curry L.
Smith, David M.
Smith, Darrell M.
Smith, Don "L"
Smith, Donald F.
Smith, Donald J.
Smith, Donald W.
Smith, Earl F.
Smith, Frank E.
Smith, George M., Jr.
Smith, George W.
Smith, Glen D.
Smith, Guanie D.
Smith, Harold, Jr.
Smith, Harold W., Jr.
Smith, Herbert S.
Smith, James C.
Smith, James G., Jr.
Smith, James J.
Smith, James L.
Smith, Jessie E. Jr.
Smith, Joe F.
Smith, John R.
Smith, John R.
Smith, John R.
Smith, Kenneth F.
Smith, Lawrence W.
Smith, Lloyd M.
Smith, Marschall I.
Smith, Melvin L.
Smith, Ralph A.
Smith, Ronald L.
Smith, Ronald R.
Smith, Robert E.
Smith, Robert E.
Smith, William C.
Smith, William E.
Smyth, Edward A.
Snead, John J.
Snearly, Paul L.
Snedeker, Charles W.
Snell, Leland N.
Snellings, Sidney L., Jr.
Snodgrass, Nathaniel I.
Snooks, Donald J.
Snow, Richard W.
Sobkowiak, Aloysius N.
Sojourner, Fletcher B., Jr.
Soldner, Charles R.
Soltes, Anthony J.
Sommerhauser, James E.
Sordello, Vincent A.
Sorensen, Martin
Sorenson, Neil R.
Sosa, Martin D., Jr.
Sousa, Ronald L.
Southall, James B.
Spacek, Lawrence L.
Spaeth, Leo M.
Spahr, Edward J.
Spainhour, Harold L.
Spalsbury, James A.
Sparkes, Peter A.
Sparks, Alan J.
Sparks, Billy R.
Sparks, John H., Jr.
Spear, Winfield A.
Spears, Leo E.
Speeg, Roger V.
Speliopoulos, Philip P.
Spellins, William R.
Spencer, Ralph D.
Spiczka, Robert A.
Spiker, Robert E.
Spikerman, Jack L.
Spillane, Raymond J.
Spinks, James A., III
Spitze, Robert R.
Spooner, Robert L.
Springer, Dennis E.
Springer, Larry J.
Staffieri, John P.
Stafford, Donald E.
Stalcup, Gerald G.
Stamper, Thomas B.
Stanford, "T" "J"
Stanley, Jackie W.
Starbuck, James W.
Stashi, Donald I.
Statham, Dorrance E.
Staump, Frank A., Jr.
Stavros, Peter N.
St. Clair, Edward M.
Stebbins, Jack L.
Steele, Lloyd M.
Steele, Richard A.
Steeves, William D., Jr.
Steffan, William J.
Steger, Lester H.
Steger, Robert A. J.
Stein, Timothy E. S.
Steinken, William T., Jr.
Stephenson, Jack E.
Stephenson, Jack W., Jr.
Sterling, Earl W.
Sterling, William G.
Sternberg, John C., Jr.
Stetster, Raymond D., Jr.
Stevens, Danny H.
Stevens, Darrell T.
Stevens, Herbert W.
Stevens, Irvin J.
Steward, Ralph E.
Stewart, "J" "D" E., Jr.
Stewart, James N.
Stickler, Melvin A.
Still, Cornelius F.
Still, Myles C.
Stinson, Idus E.
Stirling, Gordon P., Jr.
Stitcher, Frederick M.
Stitt, Charles D.
Stockman, John A.
Stoffel, Donald F.
Stokes, Donald
Stokes, James C., Jr.
Stolz, Floyd L.
Stone, Joe W., Jr.
Stone, Larry G.
Stone, Richard C.
Stone, Thomas
Stoner, Raymon E.
Stoops, James M.
Stote, Samuel E.
Stouffer, Thomas "D"
Stout, Arthur R.
Stout, Raymond H.
Stout, Robert R.
Stowell, James H.
Strassenberg, Donald E.
Strayhorn, Kenneth E.
Street, Douglas D.
Striano, John F.
Strickley, Benjamin J.
Striker, Frederick H.
Strom, Rawlin D.
Strong, Charlie, Jr.
Strong, Richard H.
Stroup, Guy S.
Struble, Richard H.
Strunk, Harry H.
Struwe, Lawrence T.
Stuckey, William H.
Stull, Willard E.
Sturm, Donald R.
Storsa, Raymond P.
Suarez, Charlie F.
Suhy, John M.
Sullivan, Charles A.
Sullivan, John J.
Sumrall, Tommy L.
Surles, Charles T.
Suthard, Richard C.
Sutherland, Frank R.
Sutherland, Frank S., Jr.
Sutler, Lawrence L.
Sutton, Gerald F. L.
Svitak, James D.
Swan, Allan G.
Swanagin, Cecil E.
Swaney, David O.
Swanson, Donald G.
Swanstrom, Carl R.
Sweeney, Richard F.
Sweeney, Allen M.
Swindell, Harold W.
Swink, Richard M.
Swinson, James D., Jr.
Swisher, Charles E.
Switzer, Walter E.
Sylvers, Donald
Sylvester, Ira L.
Symolon, William P.
Synnes, Dale C.
Syska, Herbert P., Jr.
Tackett, Charles R.
Tafaoa, Togialuga
Taft, Norman F.
Taker, Lionel D.
Tallmage, George E.
Tandle, Thomas J.
Tarry, William E.
Tatum, James R.
Taussig, Joseph K., III
Tawney, William H.
Taylor, Aubrey M.
Taylor, Charles C.
Taylor, Charles R.
Taylor, David E.
Taylor, Floyd E.
Taylor, Gilbert J.
Taylor, Howard E., Jr.
Taylor, Kenneth E.
Taylor, Robert T.
Taylor, Raymond E.
Taylor, Steve F.
Taylor, Thomas F.
Tebrich, Charles D.
Templeton, Bobby A.
Templeton, Ralph D.
Templin, Charles J.
Tennant, Delbert M.
Ter Horst, Kenneth C.
Terrell, Thomas J.
Terrell, William K.
Tetu, Gerard P.
Thacher, Robert M.
Thacker, Darrell L.
Thacker, John L.
Thayer, Dilver, Jr.
Theriot, Jimmy R.
Thibault, Paul V.
Thomas, Benjamin G.
Thomas, Edgar D.
Thomas, Elmer L.
Thomas, Frank D.
Thomas, Jerrold A.
Thomas, Neil S.
Thomas, Stanley B.
Thomas, Velpeau C.
Thomas, William N.
Thomason, James W.
Thome, Richard A.
Thompson, Chester R.
Thompson, Gary R.
Thompson, George P.
Thompson, James B.
Thompson, James G.
Thompson, John C.
Thompson, John L.
Thompson, Lacy, Jr.
Thompson, Leon R.
Thompson, Melvin L.
Thompson, Thomas L.
Thompson, William F.
Thornton, Arvin L.
Thornton, Cecil R.
Thornton, James C.
Thornton, Joseph O.
Thrailkill, Allen B.
Tice, Martin A.
Tidwell, Edwin D.
Tieking, Harold L.
Tillie, Robert F.
Timmons, Robert W.
Tims, Franklin L.
Tims, Kenneth W.
Tinney, John G.
Tobin, Harry J.
Toepfer, Richard E.
Tofft, Charles N.
Toholsky, Ralph E.
Tolles, Oliver K.
Tomlinson, Jerry L.
Tomlinson, William G.
Toney, Edgar A.
Toombs, William E.
Torres, Fredinand J., Jr.
Torrey, Robert W.
Toso, Chester L.
Toth, Albert A., Jr.
Toth, Francis A.
Toval, Ferdinand A.
Toy, John B., Jr.
Tracey, Robert L.
Trader, Harold C.
Trainor, Kevin F.
Treadwell, William E.
Treece, Wayne L.
Trott, Winfield R., Jr.
Trudell, Edward P.
True, Charles G.
Trujillo, Luis L.
Tucci, Thomas J.
Tucker, Fred, Jr.
Tucker, Jacques E.
Tucker, Robert B.
Tucker, Willie R. M.
Tuleya, Robert W.
Tully, Fred, Jr.
Turl, Donald R.
Turnbull, Walter N.
Turner, Frank L.
Turner, Thomas W.
Turney, Milas E.
Turse, Ellsworth J., Jr.
Twiddy, Curtis A., Jr.
Twiford, Richard D.
Tygart, Leonard D.
Tyler, Charles B.
Tyler, James E.
Tyler, James E.
Tyson, Francis D.
Underwood, Paul
Underwood, Robert J.
Unger, James J.
Urquhart, Larry J.
Usher, Lloyd J.
Vaart, Andres
Valdez, Michael F.
Valentino, John, II
Van, Arthur V.
Van Amberg, David E.
Van Antwerp, Lloyd H.
Vance, Allen L.
Vance, Ivan L.
Vance, Kenneth R.
Vance, Marshall C.
Van Cott, Richard C.
Vandenberg, Wallace E.
Van Der Does, Nicholas C.
Vanderhoof, Rex F.
Vandermark, Joseph D.
Van Druff, Roscoe W., Jr.
Van Hoose, Donald L.
Van Kirk, Theodore R.
Van Landingham, Thomas C.
Van Orden, William L.
Varnadore, William E.
Vaserberg, Morton
Vchulek, Joseph A.
Veater, Jimmie
Veigel, Robert E.
Venanzi, Vincent J.
Venuto, Chauncey D.
Verbanic, Francis E.
Vernon, David D.
Vestal, Lavon H.
Vickers, Robert E.
Vido, Ronald E.
Vignere, Samuel E.
Villarreal, Michael D.
Villeneuve, Joseph L. P.
Vincelette, Alan J.
Vincent, Richard L.
Visser, Eric P.
Vollmer, Dorothy L.
Voltz, Richard A.
Volz, Edward G.
Voronin, Bernard B.
Voss, Curtis M.
Waddell, Howard L., Jr
Wade, Gordon R., Jr.
Wager, Charles P.
Waggoner, William C.
Wagner, Charles I.
Wagner, James P.
Wagstaff, Jack L.
Wahl, Edward P., Jr.
Waite, Carold R.
Waitt, Maurice G.
Walaconis, Donald B.
Walden, Robert A.
Waldenville, Alan W.
Waldron, John N.
Waldvogel, Irwin F.
Walker, Charles L.
Walker, Houston E.
Walker, James E.
Walker, Jerry E.
Walker, Loren E.
Walker, Laurence A.
Walker, Lowell A.
Walker, Mungo R.
Walker, Norman J.
Walker, Pierre L.
Walker, Robert G.
Walker, Willard C.
Wall, Thomas U.
Wallace, Bernie J.
Wallace, Richard H.
Wallace, William J., Jr.
Wallace, Virgil E.
Wallace, Robert H.
Wallace, Robert T.
Walls, George O.
Walls, William B.
Walsh, Donald F.
Walsh, Edmund E., Jr.
Walsh, Walter R., Jr.
Walter, Lowell W.
Walters, Clyde T.
Walters, Bud R.
Waltman, Robert, Jr.
Waltzer, Robert A.
Wamble, Bobby L.
Wapp, Glen E.
Ward, George B.
Ward, Joseph E.
Ward, Ronald E.
Ward, Thomas R.
Ward, William B.
Warnack, Arthur
Warne, Richard E.
Warner, Charles W. F.
Warner, Tholow A.
Warner, Virgle C.
Warren, Theodore B., Jr.
Waters, Calvin R.
Watkins, Price I.
Watson, Carl D., Jr.
Watson, Eric P., Jr.
Watson, Henry L., Jr.
Watts, Avron J.
Watts, Carl V.
Watts, Gerald A.
Watts, John C.
Watts, John R.
Weare, Everett A.
Weatherford, Delano C.
Weatherford, Louis E.
Weatherly, Richard E.
Weathersby, John M.
Weaver, Billie F.
Weaver, Billy J.
Weaver, John F., III
Weaver, James P.
Webb, Patrick J.
Webb, Richard D.
Weber, David C.
Weber, James E.
Weber, Thomas H.
Weckerly, William M.
Weeks, Robert J.
Weeks, Robert W.
Weeks, Sammy N.
Wegl, John
Wehrly, Frank E., Jr.
Weigman, Charles J., Jr.
Weikel, Darvin A.
Weilant, George J.
Weins, Charles J.
Weisenburger, James L.
Welborn, David E.
Welch, Alexander D.
Welch, Jerry H.
Welch, William H., Jr.
Weldon, Arthur J.
Weldon, Nolan W.
Welker, Daniel L.
Wellman, Daniel T., Jr.
Wells, Claire V.
Wells, Herbert D.
Wells, Howard R., Jr.
Wells, James W.
Welsh, Ronald R.
Wengeler, Lloyd J.
Wenger, William L.
Wenglare, William R.
Wenrich, John L., Jr.
Wentworth, Lloyd M.
Werbinski, Kenneth L.
Wesner, Howard F., Jr.
West, Carl J., III
Westbrook, Jack S.
Westbrook, Raleigh B.
Westerfield, Frank B.
Wheatley, James M.
Wheeler, Paul K.
Wheeler, Charles D.
Wheeler, John W.
Whelchel, Leonard A.
Whisnant, Donald L.
White, Billy D.
White, Billy K.

White, Henry G.
White, Jacky I.
White, Kenneth T.
White, Louis L.
White, Robert L.
White, Robert M.
White, Thomas A.
White, Thomas L.
White, Vance E.
Whiteaker, Jackie D.
Whited, Robert L.
Whitehurst, Charles B.
Whitehurst, Willis L.
Whiteside, Donald A.
Whiting, William A.
Whitten, Dale J.
Whitten, Marvin A.
Whitten, Jesse J. M.
Whitworth, Jack R.
Wholley, Michael C.
Wickens, Alan E.
Widel, James O.
Widger, Richard O.
Wiggs, Robert N.
Wilbur, William J.
Wilcox, Neal D.
Wilcoxen, Edward E.
Wilder, Jack A.
Wiles, Earl K.
Wiley, Buford B., Jr.
Wilhelm, Murray R.
Wilhide, Henry E.
Wilkerson, Kenneth J.
Wilkinson, James V.
Willard, Digby H.
Willer, Joe H.
Williaford, Cecil R.
Williams, Charles R., Jr.
Williams, George J., Jr.
Williams, Irving D.
Williams, James R.
Williamson, Leon
Williamson, Thomas W.
Williams, Robert F.
Williams, Samuel G., Jr.
Williams, Saville L.
Williams, Ted E.
Williams, Wilbur C.
Willingham, Donald
Willis, John
Willner, Hugh L.
Willson, Russell O.
Wilmes, Richard G.
Wilson, Arthur G., Jr.
Wilson, Carl E.
Wilson, Donald T.
Wilson, David C.
Wilson, John C.
Wilson, John P.
Wilson, Jimmie J.
Wilson, Jerry T.
Wilson, Kenneth L.
Wilson, Robert L.
Wilson, William H.
Wincentsen, Bruce M.
Wingard, Marquis M.
Winkleman, Guy H.
Winkler, Fred M.
Winters, Harry L.
Wire, Sydney M.
Wise, Donald L.
Wise, Richard D.
Witham, Merton T.
Witsell, Michael J.
Witt, William J.
Witten, Harry
Witthoeft, George H.
Woidyla, Wilfred P.
Wojciechowski, Pasquale A.
Wold, Howard A.
Wolfe, Howard C.
Wolfe, James F., Jr.
Wolfe, William C. E.
Wolfe, William M.
Wolford, Kirk S.
Wolverton, Charles F.
Wong, Nathan A. K.
Wonson, Myles P., Jr.
Woo, Fang Y.
Wood, Albert F.
Wood, Charles M., Jr.
Wood, Charles R.
Wood, Dana J.
Wood, David D.
Wood, Samuel J.
Wood, William H. Jr.
Woodland, Edmund W.
Woodland, Elmo R.
Woodman, William E.
Woodral, Albert L.
Woods, Clyde E.
Woods, Gary L.
Woods, Henry C.
Woods, John L.
Woods, Robert J.
Woodworth, Evan K.
Woog, Peter A.
Wooley, Neil "R"
Wooliever, James E.
Worcester, Floyd B.
Worley, Bascom C. S.
Wozar, Richard M.
Wright, Billy J.
Wright, Burl M.
Wright, Claude C., Jr.
Wright, Clyde V.
Wright, Eddie B.
Wright, James D.
Wright, James E.
Wright, James L.
Wright, James N.
Wright, Robert C.
Wright, Richard M.
Wright, William C.
Wright, William F.
Wulfeck, Floyd C.
Wunsch, Michael C.
Wyatt, James R., Jr.
Wylde, Clark H.
Yoder, Robert H.
Yon, Veo S.
York, James M., Jr.
Young, Arthur C.
Young, Austin Z., Jr.
Young, Earnest
Young, John L., Jr.
Young, Robert W.
Young, Virgil L., Jr.
Youngstrom, Nels C., Jr.
Zakian, John F.
Zalipski, John M.
Zeferjohn, David A.
Zell, Richard M.
Zellers, Jon L.
Zenns, Larry P.
Zettler, George A.
Ziegler, Delphinus "N"
Zimmer, John R.
Zimmer, Jerry A.
Zimmerman, James H.
Zoerb, Dennis R.
Zorens, Roger D.
Zumstein, Charles E.
Zumwalt, Donald L.
Zwiener, Robert C.
Abbs, William E.
Acker, Bruce J.
Admire, John H.
Ailstock, Jack W.
Akers, Ervin E.
Alberts, Alfred B.
Albizo, David G., Jr.
Alexander, Arthur I.
Alexander, Frank A. F.
Alexander, James F.
Allegree, Patricia A.
Allen, Homer L.
Allen, Paul W.
Allen, Robert L.
Allen, Roosevelt, Jr.
Allen, Tim
Allison, Robert C.
Allman, Bonnie J.
Alnutt, Ronald H.
Ammons, Gene F.
Amos, Robert D., Jr.
Anaya, John J.
Anderson, Robert J.
Anderson, William E.
Andes, James A.
Andrews, George E.
Andrus, Donald F.
Arbisi, Anthony R.
Arnold, Charles L.
Asselin, Raymond F.
Atherton, Robert O.
Ayotte, James A.
Baca, Francisco P.
Bady, James R., Jr.
Bailey, Charlie E.
Bailey, Tase E., Jr.
Bajkowski, Walter F.
Barkovich, Andrew R.
Baldwin, Donald G.
Baldwin, Grant H.
Balignasay, Ernest N.
Baltes, John F.
Banaszek, Henry F.
Bare, Curtis J.
Barfield, Jimmy C.
Baribeau, Robert A.
Barineau, Richard L.
Barker, Charles P.
Barker, Robert L.
Barlow, Gerald L.
Barotti, James W.
Barrientes, Hector
Barrier, Wade H.
Bass, William E.
Battista, Salvatore A.
Beard, Lewis C.
Beck, Arthur R.
Belflower, Herman E.
Belken, Douglas C.
Bena, David J.
Bender, Lawrence J., II
Bertram, Lois J.
Bickel, Raymond R., III
Biesinger, Frederick S.
Bigness, David D.
Bines, Walter G., Jr.
Bird, Theodore A.
Bishop, Richard J.
Blair, Donald W.
Blair, Gary A.
Blakely, George M., III
Blankenship, Dennis R.
Blass, Kenneth L.
Blivin, William C.
Bock, Robert A.
Boggess, Gary M.
Boggs, William R.
Bogniard, Robert A.
Boley, Jackson D. T., Jr.
Bond, George P.
Bornemann, Michael J.
Boston, Leslie W., Jr.
Botsford, Donald R.
Bower, John H.
Bowers, Daniel C.
Bowling, Ralph M.
Boyer, Paul L.
Bozelli, Richard
Brewster, Jerry R.
Briggs, Jerry J.
Branch, Billy T.
Brier, Franklin D.
Brookfield, Charles E.
Brooks, "J" "B"
Brooks, John V.
Brooks, Ronald D.
Brophy, Daniel R.
Brown, David T.
Brown, Elton R., III
Brown, Fred A.
Brown, George R.
Brown, Thomas E., Jr.
Broyer, Fred D.
Brozena, Thomas J.
Bruce, Gale E.
Buchholz, James H.
Buell, Edwin L.
Bullock, Delbert A.
Bunch, Robert F.
Bunner, Robert D.
Burcham, Richard G.
Burford, George I.
Burkholder, Robert P.
Burlingame, Victor R., Jr.
Burnett, Robert D.
Burrell, Jack H.
Buser, Harry E., Jr.
Byrd, Thomas A.
Caldwell, Ronald L.
Cameron, Marion G.
Campbell, David M.
Canada, Ray G.
Candlen, Thomas P.
Capers, James, Jr.
Carlson, Carl J.
Carlson, Floyd A., Jr.
Carney, Robert A.
Carswell, Robert W.
Carter, Tommy A.
Casey, Jackie V.
Cass, Bert
Caudill, Robert E.
Cawthorn, Harvey W.
Cefail, Norman C.
Chandler, Herbert, Jr.
Chapa, Richard E.
Chase, Daniel D., Jr.
Chase, Jerry D.
Chase, Marshall C.
Chastang, Percy L.
Clark, Curtis R.
Clark, Leonard T.
Clark, Robert N., Jr.
Clelland, John P., Jr.
Cline, Rollin W.
Cobb, Oliver P., Jr.
Cofty, Huey C.
Cole, James W., Jr.
Collins, Charles B.
Collins, Charles G. T.
Collins, Donald C.
Collins, Geoffrey M.
Conti, Frank J.
Cotterell, Anthony J.
Cotton, David G.
Crangle, Chandler C.
Creech, Keith D.
Crews, Billy D.
Cronin, Daniel J.
Crull, Willard D.
Cumber, Harry W.
Curry, Carl R.
Curtis, Albert
Cusack, John T.
Cutlip, Homer S.
Dale, Lewis I.
Dale, Wayne R.
Damon, Carl B.
Daniel, Johnny L.
Daniel, Walden L.
Darity, Martin H., Jr.
Darlington, Earl G.
Daskam, Walter C.
Daugherty, Richard C.
Davidson, William E. A., Jr.
Davis, Lawrence
Davis, Leon J.
Davis, Louis L.
Davis, Robert D.
Davis, Rodney F.
Dawdy, Lester L.
De Gennano, Anthony A.
Deichl, Richard J.
Delafleur, Christopher F.
Dennis, Richard E.
Detrich, Homer D.
Dey, Charles J.
Dial, Herman W.
Dickerson, Donald L.
Dillar, Curtis, Jr.
Dirks, David C.
Dixon, Isaac G., II
Dixon, Wallace W.
Dobies, Robert A.
Dockendorff, Gary D.
Dolan, Harry C.
Dollison, Dan P.
Dolphin, John J.
Domke, Walter
Donahue, Mary E.
Donnelly, Gustavus L.
Doody, James W., IV
Dotson, Weldon L.
Doughty, William D., III
Doyle, Thomas J.
Drigg, John F., Jr.
Dube, Serge R.
Du Chaine, Lonnie F.
Dugger, James W.
Duncan, Gerald S.
Dunham, William E., Jr.
Dunlap, James V.
Dunning, Richard L.
Duran, Roy G.
Duree, Charles D.
Durham, Jerry W.
Dziedzic, Darryl F.
Eads, William C.
Econom, Samuel N.
Egan, Brian P.
Eichholz, William A.
Elder, Victor B., II
Ellis, Roger J.
Ervic, Sherman R.
Eshelman, Allen H.
Eskridge, William W.
Esposito, Michael J.
Ette, Robert J., Jr.
Eure, James L.
Everett, John R.
Fagersten, Gerald C.
Falcon, Alfredo
Farrand, Robert C.
Farris, Paul T.
Fayak, Bernard A.
Felner, Theodore K.
Feryan, James E.
Fey, Marvin H.
Fichtner, Thomas R.
Fields, Bobby J.
Filak, John J.
Fish, Charles W.
Fisher, Jeffrey M.
Fisher, Norman, Jr.
Fitzgerald, Charles J.
Fitzgerald, Victor K.
Fitzpatrick, John J., Jr.
Flores, Arturo
Floyd, Johnny M.
Flynn, Walter H., Jr.
Folgate, Henry R.
Forbell, Ronald J.
Ford, Douglas O.
Ford, Edwin C., Jr.
Foss, Donald L.
Foust, William N.
Fowler, Glen V.
Fox, Gerald E.
Franzia, Joseph S.
Fraser, John H.
Frech, Roland A.
Friedl, Richard T.
Furer, Robert W.
Gagnon, Leo P.
Gainor, Richard H.
Gallagher, Cornelius J.
Gardner, Bernard E.
Gardner, Thomas R.
Gariboldi, Philip J.
Garoutte, Jimmy L.
Garrett, Joe D.
Gaskill, Robert
Gates, Lauren W.
Gaul, Ray H., Jr.
Gearhart, Van F.
Georges, Robert J.
Gibbs, Walter M.
Gierczynski, Michael
Giles, Horance M.
Gillen, Catherine
Gilmore, Clayton S.
Gingras, Ronald "F"
Glass, Johnny M.
Goad, Daniel N., Jr.
Goewey, Virgil L.
Gorman, William M.
Gorney, Jerry E.
Gorton, Glen L.
Gortz, William M.
Goshey, Frank
Gorzynski, Joseph A.
Grabner, George J., Jr.
Graham, Alan N.
Graham, Terry P.
Greathouse, Earl L.
Green, Frank N.
Gretton, Robert K.
Griffin, Roy L.
Grimsley, Richard A.
Grot, Robert E.
Grzanich, Philip A.
Guldi, Frederick X.
Habermacher, David I., Jr.
Hagans, Patrick C.
Hagen, Gunnar K.
Hamilton, William M.
Hammett, James R., III
Hamlin, Edwin A.
Hancharick, Joseph, Jr.
Hand, Kenneth R.
Hanrahan, Thomas J.
Hansen, Charles T., Jr.
Hansen, Richard C.
Hansford, George F.
Harden, Richard M.
Harlan, Herman
Harlow, Roger H., Jr.
Harris, Lee F.
Harrison, Wilbur H.
Hart, John T.
Hart, Robert S.
Hartman, Donald N.
Harwell, Patrick C.
Haskell, Richard P.
Hastey, Robert L.
Hastings, Sidney T.
Hawkins, Dale D.
Hawkins, Dicky E.
Hawkins, Emerson W.
Hayek, Thomas J.
Hayes, Gary P.
Headrick, Harold D., Jr.
Heald, Richard D.
Heaton, Billy L.
Helm, Joel K.
Helmick, James E.
Henderson, Richard W.
Hendricks, Charles M.
Hensel, Richard E.
Hepner, Stephen T.
Herak, James S.
Hughes, Richard O.
Hinds, Steven M.
Higbee, Larry T.
Hitte, Robert C., III
Hobaugh, George F.
Hobson, Robert M.
Hodge, George E.
Hodges, John A.
Hoffman, Charles R.
Hogan, Richard J.
Holley, Aubrey R.
Hollis, Harold D.
Holman, Arthur F., Jr
Holmes, Billy R.
Holt, George A., Jr.
Hornak, John J.
Horne, David L.
Horrobin, William P.
Horsfall, William D.
Hostrander, Howard L.
Houle, George A., Jr.
Howell, Gatlin J.
Howey, William C.
Hudson, Jimmy "R"
Hunsberger, Robert S.
Hunt, Larry D.
Huntoon, Gerald D.
Hyland, Michael J.
Iacovacci, Michael A.
Innis, Donald A.
Isa, Ronald Y.
Ivey, James W.
Ivy, James E.
Jackson, Charles H.
Jackson, James W.
Jackson, William L.

Janssen, Richard C.
Jarrell, Roland, Jr.
Jernigan, Charles R.
Jewett, Joseph M.
Johnson, James A.
Johnson, Martin B.
Johnson, Richard O.
Johnson, Richard M.
Johnston, Bobbie J.
Joiner, George L., Jr.
Jones, Jimmy C.
Jones, John A.
Jones, John L.
Jones, Linza J.
Jones, Lynn F.
Jones, Robert A.
Jones, Sidney A., III
Juck, Leonard P.
Julian, John E.
Kammerer, Roger E.
Kane, Robert F.
Kane, Robert J.
Kasparian, John P.
Kearney, Brantley E.
Keating, Joseph R.
Keiter, Eugene L.
Keller, Clinton O.
Keller, William H., III
Kelly, Daniel W.
Kelly, Joseph J.
Kelly, Thomas E.
Kemmerer, Janet M.
Kemp, Bruce A.
Kendall, Peter C., III
Kenyon, William O.
Kerch, Richard J.
Kichi, Edward P.
Kidd, Arthur J.
Kilbourn, Frank D.
Kiley, John J., Jr.
Kilpatrick, John F.
Kimberl, John D.
King, Kenneth M.
Klein, Charles
Klein, Harold D.
Knagge, Joseph G.
Knox, Earl L.
Koelln, Kenneth A.
Kociolek, John S.
Kolb, Theodore R.
Kolek, David L.
Koran, John G., Jr.
Korn, Ambrose E., Jr.
Kozma, Joseph M.
Krawiec, Edward P., Jr.
Krell, Frederick W.
Kuykendall, Paul G.
Labarge, Roland L.
Labash, Robert D.
Lada, Samuel G.
Laferte, Robert W.
Lainhart, Michael S.
Lama, Ivars
Lambdin, Robert B.
Lamey, Carl E.
Lane, Gerald S.
Larkin, Robert L.
Larrabee, Allen W.
Larson, John H.
Latour, Leonard W.
Latshaw, Clarence C., Jr.
Leaverton, Shirley E.
Leblanc, Carl J.
Ledger, Ralph
Lee, Thomas W.
Leininger, Jack L.
Lepak, Theodore W.
Lephart, Larry G.
Lewis, Ralph
Lidyard, John A.
Lightsey, Regenald F.
Lile, Brian K.
Lincoln, John C.
Linn, Robert F. K.
Little, Fosterior, Jr.
Littlejohn, Jun D
Lonetti, Frank J.
Longhouser, Garland A., Jr.
Lovelace, William J.
Lowery, Paul J.
Lukasiewicz, Frank W.
Luna, Albert
Lynn, Joel J.
Lyons, Donald E.
Lyons, Joseph E.
Machovec, Richard A.
Madden, Jimmie E.
Maloy, Raymond L.
Mahoney, Joseph F., Jr.
Mallon, George O., Jr.
Manning, John E.
Mannion, James P., Jr.
Marr, Joseph L.
Martin, Kenneth W.
Martin, William E.
Marvin, Earl A.
Mason, Frank R.
Matherly, Junior L.
Maxfield, Charles L.
Mayfield, Herman P.
Mays, Arthur, Jr.
McCall, Alonzo B.
McCall, Jimmy E.
McClinchie, Alexander, III
McConnell, George J.
McDonough, Donald H.
McDonough, Francis M.
McGinnis, Harold S., Jr.
McGlumphy, Mack L.
McGrory, Patrick A.
McKee, Jack, Jr.
McLellan, Robert S., IV
McLelland, James W.
McLennan, Donna R.
McReynolds, Jack L.
McWhorter, Donald G.
Mears, Donald E.
Meier, Bobby L.
Melson, David H., Jr.
Meston, Ward B.
Micucci, Charles P.
Mielnicki, Walter M.
Miller, August O.
Miller, Sherwood M.
Minch, Harry E.
Minnis, Hubert T.
Miskin, Edward T.
Mitchell, James G.
Mitchell, John A.
Moen, Dale A.
Montgomery, Michael T.
Montoya, Cecilio
Moody, Rex B.
Moore, Clarence G.
Morgan, Jimmy B.
Morris, Allan R.
Morrison, Irwin D.
Morrison, John R.
Morrissette, Joseph R.
Morrissey, Paul H.
Morow, Melvyn T.
Moss, John C.
Moss, Michael J.
Mosser, William A.
Mott, Robert J.
Moulder, John G.
Mouton, Joseph
Mowatt, Donald L.
Mowry, George T.
Mullen, Richard H.
Murdoch, Arthur R.
Nauth, Paul G.
Nee Dels, Charles F., Jr.
Needham, Richard L.
Nelson, David E.
Newman, Billy R.
Norris, Gerald E.
Norris, Richard C., Jr.
O'Brien, James E.
O'Connor, Brian R.
Odell, George W. T.
Odom, James E.
Ogg, Robert C.
O'Neil, Edward P. B.
Oquendo, Juan S.
O'Roark, Alfred W.
Osborne, Bobby L.
Osborne, Phyllis S.
Ott, Clair E.
Overcash, "W" "P"
Overton, Harold B.
Page, Frederick H.
Painter, William R.
Paris, Robert T.
Parson, Charles A.
Pasieka, Stanley J., Jr.
Pate, Eugene L.
Patterson, James H.
Patterson, Robert E.
Patterson, Wilbert L.
Payne, Jimmy A.
Peabody, Charles P.
Pearson, Ronald K.
Pendas, Gerard G., Jr.
Peter, James E.
Peters, William J.
Peterson, Carl E.
Peterson, Clark A.
Petruna, Michael N., Jr.
Pfeiffer, Frank L.
Pfrimmer, Francis L.
Philipp, James L.
Phillips, Lloyd G.
Pierce, Darvin D.
Pierson, Abel D.
Pigeon, Troy J.
Plaskett, Alrid E.
Poe, Willard D.
Poling, Lawrence D.
Pomichter, Stanley D.
Poole, Henry J.
Poole, William S.
Pouliot, Armand R.
Powers, John A.
Price, Ronnie K.
Pyne, Horatio E.
Quaglia, Joseph J., Jr.
Quebodeaux, Anthony P.
Ream, Edward P.
Rector, James S.
Register, Charlton L.
Reichler, James R.
Renau, Thomas T.
Reynolds, Trace J.
Rhine, John R.
Rice, Arnold A.
Richards, Edward T.
Richardson, Kilburn E.
Richey, Ollen R.
Rijfkogel, Herman
Rine, John H., Jr.
Riser, Jerome E.
Ritenour, Donald F.
Roberts, Harry F.
Roche, James J.
Roepke, Lyonel K.
Rohleder, William P.
Rooney, Phillip B.
Rothrock, Richard L.
Rudd, Claude T.
Ruddick, Morris E., Jr.
Russell, Vincent B., Jr.
Rusthoven, Bernard R.
Ruth, John R.
Rynne, Edward M.
Sachse, Richard D.
Saldivar, John G.
Samples, John B.
Sandmeyer, Robert F.
Schaffer, Robert K.
Scheetz, Paul V., Jr.
Schenck, Kenneth W.
Scherer, Melvin A.
Scheurich, John A.
Schlott, Robert L.
Schmidt, Gary M.
Schmidt, Ralph C.
Schneider, Charles J., Jr.
Schott, Michael L.
Schuette, Charles E.
Schutz, Peter G.
Scott, James H.
Scott, Janice C.
Scott, John W.
Scott, Wayne J.
Scuras, James B.
Seiple, William C.
Sellers, Walter S.
Shahan, Billy J.
Shandor, Joseph P., Jr.
Sharratt, James R.
Shaw, Oscar E.
Shearer, Robert A.
Sheckler, Herman D.
Shine, Thomas R.
Silen, Tony
Sim, Craig S.
Simmons, Clyde B.
Singer, William R.
Slater, Robert M. S.
Smith, Aaron A.
Smith, Harry R.
Smith, Lidge W.
Smith, Ronald L.
Snodgrass, Russell A.
Sobotor, Francis E.
Sorrell, Jerry E.
Souza, Richard E.
Spalding, Vincent A.
Spencer, Charles W.
Spicer, William R.
Stagnaro, Charles J.
Stambaugh, Harold W.
Stanko, Stephen J.
Stankosky, Michael A.
Stant, James E., Jr.
Stanton, Lloyd E., Jr.
Steed, Billy C.
Steed, James A.
Stelman, Bobby
Stevermer, Brian M.
Stewart, Robert E.
St. Denis, Harold J., Jr.
Stilson, Frederick C.
Stimpson, Robert E.
Stock, Frederick J.
Stockdale, James A.
Stoltzfus, David S.
Stone, Gerald A.
Strickland, Ralph
Sullivan, David S.
Sullivan, Francis H.
Sullivan, Jeremiah J.
Sumner, Donald W.
Sutton, Terry D.
Sweet, Cyrus C.
Swidonovich, Eugene
Swindell, Thomas E.
Swinea, Larry C.
Sylvester, Gerald W.
Sylvia, Joseph R.
Tackitt, Loyce M.
Talley, Lee D.
Tanzer, Lowell E.
Tanzey, Theodore E.
Tauber, Gerald L.
Taylor, Thomas W.
Terrell, Jack T.
Thobois, Paul, Jr.
Thomas, Dewey A.
Thomas, John H.
Thomas, Paul R.
Thompson, Dallas E.
Thompson, Don O.
Thompson, Jerry C.
Thornton, William A., Jr.
Thrasher, David R.
Thrasher, Moris D.
Tickle, Randall K.
Tidwell, John
Tipton, Richard J.
Toland, Owen J.
Toma, Masao
Tonack, Leland B.
Tracy, Brandon L.
Tracy, Normand C.
Treon, William W.
Trippleton, Eugene M
Tucci, Alan J.
Tunmire, David C.
Turner, Frank L.
Turner, Joseph G., Jr.
Tyndall, William F.
Tyynismaa, Robert R.
Uritescu, Jerry
Valent, Stephan
Vaughan, Isaac R.
Vaughn, David B.
Vaughn, James O.
Verceles, Federico T.
Vigil, Leroy
Visnick, Donald D.
Wahlers, Larry F.
Walker, Marvin D.
Walkup, William D.
Walrath, Ernest H.
Walsh, Charles E.
Ward, Anthony L.
Wasson, Jesse R.
Webber, Ralph L.
Welch, John H., III
Welch, Stanley R.
Wells, Darrell A.
Whipple, William L.
White, Herman
Whitlatch, Thomas H.
Wiener, Thaddeus D.
Wiggins, William C.
Wiktorek, William A.
Wilding, James L.
Wileman, Charles R.
Williams, Albert
Williams, Marvin L.
Wills, James E.
Wilson, Eugene S.
Wilson, Leroy L., Jr.
Wisdom, Hershel E.
Wood, Larry A.
Wood, Lloyd C.
Wood, Millard W.
Wood, Myron C.
Woods, James M.
Woodward, Robert L.
Wooldridge, Debney E., III
Wright, Howell F.
Wuest, Karl E.
Wyant, Richard N.
Yadon, Thomas L.
Yost, Jere W.
Young, Donald C.
Young, Louis L., Jr.
Youngblood, Theodore A.
Zeitvogel, Joseph A.
Zerbe, Edward M.
Ziegler, Earl K.
Bromley, Austin W.
Carr, William R.
Deaver, Richard
Hagan, Stephen H.
Harris, Russell G.
Misemer, Frank G.
Pase, Robert R.
Teasley, Jack G.
Volack, Robert G.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Anniversary of Estonian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1967

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, February 24 marked the 49th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Estonia. On this day in 1918, the people of this historic land proclaimed a free democratic republic, and during the First World War successfully defended themselves against both German and Soviet offensives, which resulted in the renouncement of all claims to the territory of Estonia. The nation then set to the task of expanding her agriculture and industry and promoting trade with other nations. In the atmosphere of freedom, the people of Estonia made great progress.

Then came World War II, and in violation of existing treaties the overwhelming military might of the Soviet Union and of Germany alternated in occupying this land and depriving its citizens of their freedoms, culminating in the forced incorporation of the country into the U.S.S.R. The United States and other Western countries have refused to recognize this annexation.

Although the people of Estonia have been silenced and cannot openly commemorate this memorable day in the history of their country, we know that they continue to hope and work for liberation. And we who cherish the principles of freedom and justice must continue to share these hopes to restore the independence of these people and the neighboring Baltic nations that have fallen behind the Iron Curtain.

Soviet Armed Forces Day in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I cried last night, in memory of fellow Americans who gave their lives in the cause of liberty and for our country. I prayed, "What will ever become of these United States?"

The revolting spectacle of our top military generals and admirals engaged in hospitality with Communist soldiers and agents here in Washington constitutes a mockery to every uniformed fighting man. And some of these same command officers had, just weeks ago, forbid their battle-weary troops to socialize in South Africa because of segregation.

The gala occasion was for the Communist Russian Armed Forces Day celebration at the Russian Embassy right here in the National Capital. A great victory for the image of world communism, and not a shot fired. But what about the image of our national leaders to the folks at home?

Noted dining and honoring the Communist military apparatus were Gen. Jack Thomas of the Air Force, General Johnson, Chief of Staff, General Taylor, Adm. David McDonald, Admiral Rittenhouse, and Vice Adm. Lot Ensey, and a host of lesser lights. In fact, according to the local society page coverage, some 700 were in attendance. Are we to believe they merely compared their campaign medals and toasted the revolution?

I do not impugn the integrity of these military leaders as I realize they were probably in attendance under orders. But have they considered the damaging effect upon the men under their command caused by their presence and the purpose they lauded? With our people already suspicious about the war's progress, they will now be more divided than ever. By their indiscretion these men of high rank have wreaked more havoc on the "peace through victory" effort than all of the preacherniks and peace marchers combined. Just ask mom and dad, "Do you want to give your son to the command and at the mercy of leaders who cavort with Communists and praise the great record of the Red army?" And what do you think would be the retort from Johnny Doughboy somewhere on the frontline in Vietnam? Some might even wonder if all this Communist socializing by our high command in Washington, which is now come to light, could have any explanation as to why our boys are not permitted to win in Vietnam.

I do not know your feelings, but as for me, these generals and admirals have disgraced our flag and trampled under foot the faith and confidence of the people of our land. By association, their uniforms are now stained with the innocent blood of the millions of victims who have fallen under the aggression of the Red army.

The damage has now been done. These admirals and generals must be given no out. They must either resign for the good of America or be removed from command as unfit. An investigation must be immediately instituted into the Pentagon leadership and the State Department so that our people are clearly advised as to who set up this program and who is calling these devastating signals. It may resolve that the next political election will be Americans versus Communists, if it is not then too late. It is all up to you, mom and dad—Mr. Citizen on the Street—you are now the frontline strength of America.

Estonian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1967

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, February 24, marked the day, exactly 49 years ago, when more than a million Estonians established an independent, peace-loving nation dedicated to the betterment of their children's lives and fulfillment of their fathers' dreams.

History records for us the tremendous progress the small nation accomplished despite the years of depression that hit Europe and despite the constant threats of her greedy neighbors. Estonia's economy grew steadily between 1920 and 1939 and considerable achievement was made in the arts as well as in the growing field of industrialization.

In a short period of time the Estonian nation had shown that it could reach great heights through democratic self-government and had rightfully earned its place in the community of nations.

However, secret pacts between Nazi Germany and Communist Russia, the so-called nonaggression pacts between the two mightiest aggressors of modern Europe, soon led to a Soviet sphere of influence in the Baltic States. Military arrests and mass persecutions followed and Estonia was overrun. During the first year of Soviet occupation, there was a manpower loss of over 60,000 men of all ages and classes. Ten thousand of these were removed in a single night as a part of the well-synchronized Communist plot. Another 60,000 Estonians who resisted Soviet collectivism and fought in the underground for reestablishment of their beloved homeland were deported between 1944–49. By that time the Communists had added another reluctant member to its growing empire.

But despite 27 years of displacement, the mighty spirit of the fighting Estonians remains unbroken. I was deeply moved by the volume of mail I received from Estonian-Americans from every part of our Nation when I joined my colleagues in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 416 in the 89th Congress.

There is much to be learned from the tragic events of 1940 and it is important for all Americans to focus upon the painful lessons of the past as we reaffirm our commitments to the democratic nations of the world today. The free world cannot remain quiet while men are denied their liberties, while families are massacred and cultures destroyed—all this to create more monuments to the living death that is communism.

Let us hope and pray that the Estonian people will one day soon see the recreation of a free state and once again enjoy the freedom which is democracy's lifeblood.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1967

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today our hearts are heavy as we recall the poignant memory of the lost independence of Estonia. The brave Estonian people awaited through dark centuries of foreign subjugation the opportunity to regain their individual and national freedom. That opportunity was finally afforded them by Russian preoccupation with its internal struggles at the time of World War I. On February 24, 1918, the Estonians declared their independence.

By the fall of that year they were again under siege by the Russian invading forces. With the aid of a few allies, this small nation valiantly fought to preserve its independence, resulting in the withdrawal of Russian troops. The peace treaty signed between Russia and Estonia on February 2, 1920, insured Estonian sovereignty and territorial integrity. The treaty did not represent the true intentions of the Soviet Union vis-a-vis Estonia as evidenced by a statement by Lenin at the time:

> We do not want to shed the blood of workers and Red Army soldiers for the sake of a piece of land, especially since this concession is not forever.

The Soviet concession was, indeed, not forever. Russian Communists continued throughout the 21 years of Estonian independence to try to undermine the government through espionage and underground activities. The advent of World War II enabled the Soviet Union to reoccupy Estonia, terminating its brief historical respite from foreign subjugation.

In order to solidify its control over Estonia the Soviet Union has resorted to mass deportations and terrorist techniques.

Our hearts go out today to the Estonian people who have withstood such cruel suffering and who have retained an indomitable spirit. We add our prayers to theirs for their liberation from Soviet enslavement.

Address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1967

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman to the annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Civic Auditorium, San Francisco, Calif., February 22, 1967.

The address follows:

My remarks today will be three-fold. First, a report on the new era in agriculture which the Nation is entering in this seventh decade of the 20th Century; second, a brief analysis of some of the largely-unrecognized forces that are causing urban-rural imbalance in our Nation; and, finally, a request that NRECA, which has done so much for America in the past, lead a sweeping rural renaissance to shape its future.

I last attended an NRECA convention in 1963 . . . four years ago. Four years is a short time, scarcely a pause in one man's lifetime. Yet the world is a very different place. Great men have passed from the national scene; others have taken their places; great issues have been decided; new ones are fast upon us. And nowhere is this dizzying pace of change more evident than in agriculture.

1. A NEW ERA IN AGRICULTURE

Agriculture is a very different industry today from what it was in 1963, or even a year ago. Witness with me the changed dimensions of this industry as it enters a new era in 1967:

1. Food surpluses have disappeared, and an end to surpluses in cotton and tobacco is within our grasp. At long last we are able to produce for use, rather than for storage. Surpluses, other than temporary oversupplies caused by weather variation, can become a thing of the past as we rely increasingly on reverse acreage and improved technology instead of top-heavy stocks.

2. Farm income, both gross and net, has increased markedly. Last year gross farm income was the highest in history and national net farm income was the second highest. Net income per farm, also at the highest level in history, topped $5,000 last year, up 70 percent from 1960.

3. Demand for agricultural products in the United States and the world is strong and will remain so for the foreseeable future. Exports during 1966 totaled some $6.9 billion and will surpass $7 billion this year.

4. The free market, much praised but little utilized during the fifties, is now freer of government controls than it has been in decades. The government, for all practical purposes, is out of the market.

5. The "graduation rate" of smaller farms into the "adequate-sized" category has accelerated in recent years. Since 1959, nearly 200,000 family farms graduated into the $10,000-a-year or larger gross income class. The living standards of these farm families have risen accordingly.

All of these items represent striking progress, of course. But having acknowledged the advances, let me also emphatically express my dissatisfaction with the fact that, despite the steady progress of the past six years, *the farmer's income still lags behind that of other Americans.*

On a per capita basis, the farmer's income is $1,700. Other Americans average $2,610 per capita.

Farm prices, though up last year, have been down the last few months, and today are *less* than the 1947–49 average. At the same time, food costs are 35 percent *higher.*

This the farmer bitterly resents—and properly so.

This discrepancy *must be corrected.* It must be corrected because it is unfair to the farmer and therefore wrong. It must be corrected because if farmers don't get a fair return commensurate with the other segments of society, we will lose our best farmers. If that happens, the entire Nation, not just the farmer, will be hurt.

This Monday, some 400 farm, commodity and other leaders, representing more than 50 organizations, conferred with me in Washington on the ways and means to correct this discrepancy, to bring commercial agriculture further into the mainstream of American economic prosperity.

President Johnson, describing himself whimsically as an "unsuccessful part-time rancher," met with these farm representatives at a White House luncheon, where he expressed once again his determination that this Nation should accomplish parity of income for its farmers.

Just before I left Washington late yesterday to fly to San Francisco, President Johnson telephoned to say he was so pleased with his meeting with farm leaders and so impressed by the Farm Policy Conference itself that he wants me to make it an annual event.

The President called the Conference "successful and constructive" and said he was impressed with the sincerity of the recommendations made by farm leaders who participated. He said he looks forward—and certainly I look forward, as well—to continuing the dialogue with farm and commodity leaders at this highest level.

The Presidential directive is in keeping with statements President Johnson made to farmers and ranchers attending the Conference. He told them: "I want to appeal to the farm industry in advance to give us your suggestions, your ideas, your counsel, and your patience."

His instructions to hold annual farm policy conferences will mean that all segments of farming and ranching and all commodity groups will be heard directly at the White House. At the same time, they will receive direct and up-to-date reports on what the Government is doing to carry out farm programs.

The Conference discussions were open. The comments and suggestions had the sound and the meaning and sincerity of the "grass roots." The President recognized this.

The Department of Agriculture already has begun a careful study of the recommendations and proposals offered by farmers, livestock producers, and commodity groups at the Feb. 20 meeting.

I need not tell this audience that the President is also deeply interested in the supplemental financing program for rural electric and telephone cooperatives. Again this year this Administration is strongly supporting legislation to accomplish this purpose. We should not underestimate the difficulties of passing this legislation, given the present composition of the Congress and the powerful opposition to its enactment. But passage is vital if we are to continue the same wide-ranging, progressive rural electrification program that has meant so much to the development of this Nation in the past.

I shall not belabor this point, since it has been covered in such detail by previous speakers. Suffice it to say that rural electric cooperatives are being called upon to serve some 150,000 additional consumers each year. Rural power requirements will triple in another two decades. These needs, plus those of rural telephone cooperatives, will require an estimated $11 billion in new capital during the next 15 years. This is more than double the amount provided in Congressional appropriations over the past 15 years. I speak from hard-earned personal experience when I say that supplemental financing is the *only* way to obtain the bulk of this additional required capital. There is little or no likelihood that Congress will appropriate such vast sums for rural power.

2. THE FACE OF THE FUTURE

So far, I have reported to you only on the status of agriculture, still the mainstay of economic life in rural America, still the most important single industry in our national life. I know that agriculture is a subject of prime interest to everyone in this hall, and the source of livelihood for many of you.

But I know also that members of NRECA, and for the most part, other residents of country and small-town America also are deeply concerned with the urgent need for accelerated rural development. You have proved this by past actions, in what Clyde Ellis calls "a continuing crusade for a better America."

Since 1961, rural electric and telephone systems have sponsored nearly 2,100 projects which created some 180,000 new jobs in rural America. To this extent, you have already shaped the future—for if you had not acted to obtain these jobs in rural areas, there is little doubt that many, if not most of them, would have been gone to already-booming metropolitan areas, where most of the new jobs in the past decade have already landed.

Let's take a closer look at this matter of new job locations in the United States, because doing so points up a fact that is too often overlooked.

Over the past 15 years, 13.6 million new jobs were created in the national economy. But during this same period, the population and the number of people holding jobs in rural America remained about the same. Now, obviously, new jobs were added to rural America—you helped add many of them. But out the back door, rural America lost about an equal amount of jobs, so that the *total* number of jobs in areas classified "rural" remained almost the same.

And so, as a practical matter, those 13.6 million new jobs went to areas classed "urban" in the census.

The foregoing is merely one indicator of a deep-seated, chronic, and increasingly serious problem facing the entire Nation. It can be described as a rural America starved for opportunity; an urban America increasingly starved for open space. We have lost our urban-rural balance.

Let me give you another indicator. We all know that the country-to-city population shift has been going on for a long time. But few of us are aware just how far it has progressed. As of today, 70 percent of our population—roughly 140 million out of 200 million Americans—live on that *1 percent* of the continental land mass classified as "urban." The other 60 million of us rattle around in the other 99 percent of the land classed as "rural."

And as the old saying goes, "we ain't seen nothing yet." Mark the second hand on your watch . . . now. Keep looking at it and mark again when 12 seconds have passed. Sometime in those 12 seconds another person was added to U.S. population.

The U.S. Census Bureau can predict with some accuracy future U.S. population trends. It has prepared four estimates, each dependent on different variables, ranging from a high estimate of 356 million Americans to a low of 280 million in the year 2000, just 33 years from now.

In previous talks on Agriculture/2000, a series of exploring the future of rural America, we have relied on one of the more conservative estimates, 300 million—which is 100 million more Americans than we have with us today.

To gain an insight of what this means, I hope you'll try a little experiment while you're in San Francisco. Go up to the Top of the Mark Hopkins, or the Fairmont, and look out over the city. You'll be gazing down on the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area encompassing San Francisco, Oakland, and adjacent communities. You won't see all of it, but you'll see most, if the weather cooperates.

Multiply what you see by 33 times. Enough more Americans to populate 33 cities of this size will be with us in the Year 2000.

And then, if you will, think this one over. According to present estimates, about 4 out of 5 of these new Americans will be settling in areas like the one you're looking at—and other heavily urbanized areas—and only 1 out of 5 will settle in predominantly rural areas.

By the turn of the century, if present trends continue unchecked, San Francisco will have become part of a super megalopolis stretching from here to the Mexican border, 500 miles to the south, and containing 40 million people. This strip city—there will be 4 other strips like it—will house 174 million Americans on urbanized land ranging in density from 660 to 2,600 people per square mile.

These five super-strip cities and other urbanized areas will be located on less than 9 percent of our land area. Residents will get up earlier, spend more time breathing their neighbors' car exhaust, and return home later. Superhighways and mass transit systems will soak up increasing amounts of urban land in a frantic race to keep the city mobile. If past trends are an indication, crimes of violence will increase as urban life becomes increasingly more depersonalized and hopeless for the disadvantaged.

Nor can we count with any certainty on being rescued by technology from such a reckless concentration of people, vehicles, and industry. The number of automobiles is increasing at a rate twice that of U.S. population. By the year 2000 we shall have an estimated 200 million cars in the U.S.—nearly 3 times as many as today. With this many mobile pollution sources crowded into 9 percent of the land area, even the most stringent anti-pollution ordinances will do litle more than preserve the status quo, if that. Pollutants produced by industry, sewage plants, and land development will increase apace.

This is one face of the future. It is a prediction, of course, and a prediction isn't necessarily a blueprint. But if this is the kind of America we *want*, then nothing additional needs to be done. This is the kind of America we'll *have*, given a continuation of present trends.

But the future is not immutable, not in America, not if you share the belief of that perceptive visitor to our shores, Alexis de Tocqueville, who observed, more than a century ago:

". . . in the (American's) eyes, what is not yet done is only what he has not yet attempted to do."

We can have another kind of an America, if we care enough:

We can have an America of 300 million people living in less congestion than 200 million live in today, with new industry dotting rural America, providing the jobs where the people want to live.

We can have an America with parity of opportunity—in agriculture, in education, in community facilities and in jobs—an accomplished fact.

This is the kind of America/2000 *I* believe in, and it's the kind you believe in, too. You have proved this by your actions in the past.

But if we want this, if we really want our population and the jobs to support them more widely dispersed over the land, then a decided and determined effort to modify the future *is* needed. This latter course of action is the one that the Secretary, and the Department of Agriculture have been pursuing for six years now.

I shall not recite the accomplishments of this six years of effort. We started from zero in this whole field of building a viable rural economy, and suffice is to say, we have made some progress. Of prime importance, I think, is not so much what we have *done*, but what we have *learned*. Let me outline a few of the salient ideas I think are important in rural development.

Local involvement

The first is local involvement, as trite and as self-evident as that sounds. With it, all things are possible. Without it, all of the Federal and State programs in the world can't help much. A community that doesn't want to be helped can't be helped. This is basic, and this local involvement is what our Rural Area Development committees and Technical Action Panels have been attempting, with varying degrees of success, to stimulate. I urge much more of such effort on your part. Local electric and telephone cooperatives are particularly well-equipped to provide the local leadership which is the key to building a new rural America.

The larger community

We could call the second basic thing we've discovered a "concept of the larger community." We've found that the formal political subdivisions of county, township and municipality are being replaced by functional boundaries determined in practice by the commuting distance to jobs, the availability of services within driving range and other factors relating to present-day transportation and communication. No one has decreed these larger boundaries. The people in rural areas have set them themselves by everyday use.

In practice, this concept reminds us that development efforts limited to the resources of one county, or one town, which do not take into account the larger functional community, fail to realize their full potential. Conversely, if the larger functional community *is* considered, exciting and meaningful development can be accomplished.

By combining resources, multi-county areas *can* compete with large metropolitan areas. They *can* hire the trained technical and planning people needed to combine their own resources with Federal and regional development programs to get quick but meaningful results.

Facilities

Third, we've learned the value of community facilities. The REA, the NRECA and local cooperatives electrified the countryside. We knew, even back in the thirties, that electricity was a prerequisite for rural development. We've learned in the past few years that a safe, central source of water is just as important—that community facilities, including cultural and recreation facilities, help get plants and jobs to rural areas, and that industry looks long and hard at local education and health facilities when they're making plant location decisions. And so the Department is doing its best to help provide the water and sewer systems and recreation facilities for rural areas, just as we continue with you the fight to get adequate power. At the same time, other Federal agencies are involved in helping local communities upgrade rural education.

The final thing we've learned, and the subject on which I shall devote the remainder of my time today, is this:

We have learned that the primary reason rural areas are lagging behind urban areas; the primary reason that we face the threat of an America/2000 of congested, clogged strip cities, *is that we lack any widely-accepted national policy on rural-urban balance.*

Without such a policy, the issue of whether we want widespread dispersal of our people over available land or continuing enlargement and impaction of presently urbanized areas simply does not enter into the decision-making process of Federal, State, and local governments, or private industry.

Here's what lack of such a national policy means in cold, hard reality, and this is just one example:

A Department of Argiculture study undertaken several years ago showed that out of $28 *billion* expended in prime military contracts, 23 percent went to one State alone, California. It is estimated that this public expenditure created some 1.2 million jobs in the State. During the following fiscal year, California received 60 percent of the $6.3 billion Defense research and development funds. All this to one State alone, and within that State, the contracts went primarily to urban areas. During the same year the total amount of public monies expended for job creation in rural areas under the old Area Redevelopment Act was $267 million—or less than 1 percent of the amount expended on prime defense contracts that year.

This disparity, surprisingly, caused practically no public comment at the time, and has caused little comment since. It still exists.

This is not to say that the only consideration in awarding contracts should be development of rural areas. But I do think it is legitimate to ask whether this kind of expenditure, while serving the national defense need, which is primary, might also be tooled up to serve the larger national interest at the same time. Consideration should be given to this.

Stating the problem, of course, is easier than solving it. But efforts are being made now to hammer out a national policy on urban-rural balance, and questions like these are being asked more and more frequently:

"What is a desirable maximum size for any one metropolitan area?

What are the real social costs, ultimately borne by the taxpayers, of a continuing depopulation of rural areas and an increasing impaction of urban areas?

What can the private and public sectors do, working together, to answer the needs of a rural America starved for jobs, and an urban America starved for space?"

Questions like these are being asked not only by those traditionally concerned with rural development. They're being asked by urban observers, too. One such observer is author J. P. Lyford who, in his monumental study of the New York City slums, "The Airtight Cage," had this to say:

"Why, for instance, must huge concentrations of unemployed and untrained human beings continue to pile up in financially unstable cities that no longer have the jobs, the housing, the educational opportunities, or any of the other prerequisites for a healthy and productive life? Why do we treat the consequences and ignore the causes of massive and purposeless migration to the city? Why are we not developing new uses for those rural areas that are rapidly becoming depopulated? Why do we still instinctively deal with urban and rural America as if they were separate, conflicting interests when in fact neither interest can be served independently of the other?"

As of today, these are questions without effective answers. As of today, no nationally-recognized, responsible and articulate organization or spokesman in the private sector of our national life is bringing these deep and fundamental issues before the public.

The Nation badly needs such a spokesman. It needs more: It needs a strong, resourceful, and effective national organization to support the passage and funding of programs in the U.S. Congress which will make a more rational balance of our population possible.

The NRECA *is* such an organization.

I know at this very hour you are engaged in a great and vital struggle to decide the future course of rural electrification.

I know that your resources, great as they are, are already deeply committed in the course of this struggle.

But I urge you to commit yourselves even further—to take on this additional assignment and to make the additional effort necessary to win.

You have the capacity, the leadership, and the know-how to do it.

You will find in rural America vast reservoirs of yet-untapped support for this new effort.

In tapping this support, you will win new allies for the battle in which you are presently engaged.

You *should* do it. You *can* do it.

You have electrified the countryside—both literally and figuratively—in the past.

I hope, and in the larger sense I know, that you will do no less in the future.

Thank you.

International DeMolay Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House that the week of March 12 to March 19, 1967, is DeMolay Week. During the period we join in saluting the young men of the Order of DeMolay and in expressing our grateful appreciation of the fine examples set by these young leaders in contributing to the welfare and character of other young men in the city, thus aiding in the development and leadership of tomorrow.

The Order of DeMolay is a character building organization composed of young men 14 to 21 years of age, who are seeking to prepare themselves as better leaders and citizens for tomorrow by developing these traits and strengths of character of all good men.

The organization was founded by Frank S. Land during the year 1919, at Kansas City, Mo., and now has more than 2,500 chapters located all over the free world.

All the DeMolay members of La Mirada Chapter, sponsored by La Mirada Lodge No. 778 F. & A.M., will observe the period of March 12–19 as DeMolay Week in celebration of their 48th anniversary, so as to exemplify to all citizens here and elsewhere their many activities, and in some small way show recognition to their many senior DeMolays.

"Moline Achievement"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1967

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to insert in the RECORD today an editorial from the Moline Daily Dispatch which congratulates my hometown of Moline, Ill., for winning a National Distingushed Achievement Award for its recent cleanup, paintup, fixup campaign. I would like to add my congratulations to the residents of Moline for their community spirit and efforts and take this opportunity to tell you briefly about our city.

Moline, a leading farm implement manufacturing center, is located on the Mississippi River where it is linked by several bridges to Rock Island, East Moline, and cross-river Davenport, Iowa. Comprising an extensive metropolitan area known as the Quad Cities, these four communities are separately incorporated and maintain their own business districts, but there is a strong rapprochement between them stemming from both proximity and history.

This was the land of the Sauk and Fox Indians, who were virtually exterminated in the Black Hawk war. This, too, was the area where an inconspicuous Negro servant spent 2 years with his master. In later years he was to sue for his freedom, taking his case to the U.S. Supreme Court. The result was the famous Dred Scott decision, the implications of which hastened the country into the Civil War.

Moline was laid out in 1843, 4 years before John Deere decided to locate his plow factory there. The town was on the Mississippi, with steel readily available by boat from Pittsburgh and St. Louis, and waterpower for Deere's mills. When Moline incorporated as a city in 1872, much of its 4,000 population had come there because of the expanding Deere plants.

Implement making is the chief concern of the city today, although it possesses an underpinning of some 90 other industrial concerns.

Moline received this Achievement Award because of the excellent participation of civic groups and citizens during the cleanup campaign last spring, as is noted in the Dispatch editorial:

MOLINE ACHIEVEMENT

> The Dispatch congratulates all those responsible for the "distinguished achievement award" that was presented to the City of Moline for its 1966 clean-up, paint-up, fix-up campaign.
>
> This campaign, under the leadership of the Chamber of Commerce and the chairmanship of Vern Kester, was rated as one of the 24 best carried out in the nation last year.
>
> This was no small achievement, considering the scope of the contest, with hundreds of cities entered. And the numerous civic groups, school pupils and other individuals participating in the program share in the credit.
>
> * * * * *
>
> We are confident that the sponsors of this annual campaign will not rest on their laurels, and will press on with vigorous programs in the future. "Clean-up, paint-up and fix-up" is a good goal for every community.

We read about and review a great many Federal, State, and local beautification and urban renewal programs. In every case, however, key to the success of these programs is civic pride, enthusiasm, and participation. These elements were exhibited in the Moline campaign. To this initiative and community response, my hat is off.

Estonian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1967

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, Estonians in the United States and elsewhere in the world celebrated the 49th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Estonia.

In Estonia itself, however, the event was not commemorated. For Estonia is no longer a free and independent nation. Rather it is a constituent state of the Soviet Union.

Freed from czarist control in World War I, Estonia lost its independence at the inception of World War II as a result of the Ribbentrop-Molotov Agreement of August 1939.

Together with the peoples of the other Baltic Republics, Latvia and Lithuania, Estonia was forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Communist empire.

The event is one which will live in infamy for the rest of recorded time. The brutal denial of popular right to self-determination which the Soviets imposed on Estonia has never been surpassed in history.

It is a fitting tribute to the courage and determination of the Estonian people that they have never ceased to hope for a better and free tomorrow. They—in their hearts—celebrate Estonian independence daily.

Estonia—and its fate—should be constant reminders to us that some nations prowl the world as predators, seeking to devour whole peoples. These nations must be stopped, as the United States is stopping the aggression from the North in Vietnam.

Estonia also serves as a reminder of the kind of world we are attempting to build: A world in which small, weak nations can exist in security and independence even if they exist in geographical contiguity to large and powerful countries.

Mr. Speaker, on this 49th anniversary of Estonian independence it gives me great pleasure to join with our Estonian-Americans and Estonians everywhere in paying tribute to the independence of their homeland and the glorious history of their people.

Needed: Good Jobs—Not Promises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1967

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report to my constituents:

NEEDED: GOOD JOBS—NOT PROMISES

South and East Los Angeles are literal islands of poverty and deprivation that have grown more depressed over the past five years . . . the quality of housing deteriorated sharply while rental costs rose . . . purchasing power of the average family dropped nearly $400 . . . a fifth of the men were neither in school nor in the labor force . . . unemployment rate over 10% . . . welfare cases have increased since August 1965 . . . Such are the actual conditions.

But look at these random news bits which attempt to tell us how prosperous we are: Unemployment in Los Angeles County down to 4.5% . . . Industrialist H. C. McClellan (in charge of State Jobs for Minorities program) expresses satisfaction over progress in Watts . . . Over 18,000 curfew area Negroes have been hired, he says . . . Unemployment cut nearly 50% since 1965 riots . . . Governor Reagan promises jobs in private industry . . .

In calling attention to the potential for danger that lies in the real conditions, and in demanding action instead of vague promises to correct them, thereby removing the causes of violence and disorders, I have been accused by some of "rabble-rousing" and "encouraging people to riot."

The truth of the matter is I have merely quoted U.S. Department of Labor and the U.S. Census reports, and on the basis of these facts demanded what we should do before frustration turns into anger and this erupts into another summer of disorders. No responsible citizen living in the area, as I do, and an elected public official, could honestly do otherwise.

Disorders can be prevented but not by making false claims as to the actual numbers who are being given jobs, as Governor Reagan is doing, and destroying anti-poverty programs, sabotaging equal employment, and cutting off spending on vital programs to educate, train, and employ people.

Those who accuse me of stirring up trouble by telling the truth are generally the same people who oppose essential government spending and fair housing; they are the people who vote against school bonds to educate our youngsters and then complain when teenagers get into trouble. They are the hypocrites who talk about "law and order" but look the other way at the economic and political exploitation, the poverty and hopelessness that prevail in our low-income communities. They are the demagogues who say "people want jobs, not relief" and then support cuts in welfare budgets without providing jobs.

Governor Reagan and his jobs chief McClellan are not telling the truth when they sneakily imply I am opposed to jobs in private industry. I have personally encouraged private enterprise to provide jobs and to make them full time at decent wages. Apparently, however, it is unable or unwilling to provide enough such jobs for the hard core unemployed without some governmental cooperation. And I am not willing to remove our government, which we have elected, from the responsibility of protecting us whenever it becomes necessary from starvation, exploitation, deceitful advertising, monopolies, discrimination, and exorbitant prices. Good jobs *is* the answer to most of our problems, not relief. But not to provide either is criminal.

A massive attack on the basic causes of poverty and insecurity is long overdue. We have made a beginning in such programs as Head Start, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Fair Employment and Housing laws, tuition-free community colleges, on-the-job training programs, Teen Posts, Neighborhood Youth Corps, adult education classes, and the Neighborhood Adult Participation program. We now need to strengthen, expand, and coordinate these and many other services. And above all we need to locate Neighborhood Service Centers in every neighborhood where people can get in one place all the information they need about the various programs as well as help, from some sympathetic person, in obtaining the benefits and services they need.

Poverty is the overriding factor that underlies Negro life. While 80% of the poor are white, over half of all Negroes live in poverty or deprivation. Any program to reduce poverty, therefore, has vital and direct bearing on Negro life in general.

The best attack on poverty is not to ignore or alleviate, but to prevent it. Such an approach involves full time employment at decent wages for all who are willing and able to work, plus assurance of an income (through social security and other programs) for those who because of physical disability, old age, etc., do not work on jobs at decent wages. This approach recognizes the essential dignity of individuals to earn a living, to live in a decent environment, and to achieve their full potential in life.

This approach supports the belief that it is the concern of government not only to use its taxing, monetary, lending, and other powers in behalf of big corporations, but also to help human beings, including the most disadvantaged among us, to live better.

If to support this approach and to advocate these beliefs is "rabble-rousing" or injurious to the public welfare, then it is time for us to reexamine our national goals, and to determine if in a growing economy that spends $2 billion monthly on "saving" a country in southeast Asia we can afford to ignore 30 million persons living in poverty and 8 million on public assistance here at home.

National Beauty Salon Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, during the month of February we observed National Beauty Salon Week. During that period we recognized the unselfish and public-spirited activities of beauty salon operators and employees.

The hairdressers organization recently celebrated its 17th birthday. It is proper and appropriate that we pause at this time to give official recognition to the time and help that these individuals have accorded the unfortunate. They have done much to raise the spirits of the unfortunates by visiting homes and hospitals to generously render their services.

The work of the Orange County, Calif., hairdressers and cosmetologists during recent years is particularly noteworthy. They have rendered over 300 free services to women and girls in various institutions, including homes for the aged, hospitals, penal institutions, and special homes. It is, indeed, fitting that they receive this special recognition.

Tax Incentives for Home Improvements Will Create Work, Boom the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1967

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, every level of government has long been concerned over the disgrace of urban blight spreading across our land.

We have spent billions fighting the end result, without attacking the cause. This Congress can strike a crippling blow at the cause of urban blight by giving the people a tax incentive to repair their home and rent property.

I have long advocated that Congress adopt this approach, and reintroduced in the 90th Congress a bill, H.R. 358, outlining what I consider would be an effective program. Let me explain briefly the provisions of my bill. It would permit a taxpayer to deduct a maximum of $750 during a taxable year for expenditures made to repair or improve property used as his principal residence.

In addition, H.R. 358 would permit the owner of rental property to amortize over 60 months the expenditures made for repairs, replacements, or improvements intended to increase the livability, utility, safety, or value of property. Those improvements or additions which would increase the total amount of floorspace used for dwelling purposes would not be deductible.

There will be, no doubt, profound arguments against such a tax incentive on the basis that it will cost the Federal Government heavily in revenue. This, I would like to discuss later. But first, let us examine a few statistics that point vividly to the need for sound and constructive approach to the prevention of blight, rather than spend heavily on slum clearance programs after the fact has occurred.

In the last survey of housing in this country, made in 1960, we had a total of 58.2 million units of housing.

The shocking fact was discovered that 10,952,000 housing units were classed as substandard, as defined by the Public Housing Administration. These units were either classed as dilapidated, or lacked hot piped witer, flush toilet, or both, inside the structure for the exclusive use of the occupants.

It was further noted in this census that 826,259 owner-occupied units were classed as dilapidated, and that 501,352 units classed as dilapidated were standing vacant.

The need for action in this field is evident. To me, it is our greatest tragedy that in this day and age, millions of our people must live in substandard housing.

But there is more involved here than deep sympathy for those who dwell without the creature comforts you and I take for granted.

We are faced with an economy showing the danger signs of stagnation. Production is down in many major industries, layoffs are occurring, and the consumer, hard pressed for his dollar, is passing up purchases he would have made a year ago. This Congress, not long ago, was faced with a similar situation. It passed the investment tax credit program, which boomed the economy. It also took note of the plight of the self-employed, and passed tax incentive legislation to assist them to provide their own pension program. Why not now give some thought to the harried homeowner, the perennial forgotten man? He carries on his shoulders the heaviest tax burden, for he must finance his schools, his city government, county government, special district agencies, his State, and last but not least, the operation of his Federal Government.

This Congress and the respective States spend millions each year in unemployment benefits. We have enacted and funded vast programs of job training, retraining, and placement to help some of our people find productive niches in our land.

And yet, we are reluctant to enact legislation that will create more jobs, boom the economy, and give a modest form of tax relief to the one individual who deserves it most and, at the same time, strike a major blow at the cause of urban blight.

To those who would argue that the cost of such a tax incentive would be prohibitive in terms of Federal revenue, I ask merely that they consider the following:

In 1960, $13.1 billion was spent for residential additions, alterations, maintenance, repair and replacement for both owner-occupied and rent property. It has dropped drastically in the ensuing years: 1961, $13.8 billion, of which $6.1 billion was for maintenance and repairs; 1962, $11.3 billion, of which $5 billion was for maintenance and repairs; 1963, $11.7 billion, of which $5.1 billion was for maintenance and repairs; 1964, no figures available; and 1965, $11.4 billion, of which $5 billion was for maintenance and repairs.

We have witnessed almost a $2 billion drop in this market in 5 years. In my judgment, enactment of H.R. 358 would send this market soaring to an all-time high, and the additional tax revenue generated would more than offset the cost of the tax deduction granted to the homeowner.

Let us examine where the money goes, so you can see the potential growth in new job opportunities, the demand for products and services.

In 1963, of the $11.7 billion total—56 percent of the expenditure—was for additions, alterations, and replacements. The remainder, 44 percent, was for maintenance and repairs, broken down as follows: 3 percent, heating and air conditioning; 6 percent, plumbing; 3 percent, roofing; 2 percent, flooring; 19 percent, painting; and 11 percent, all others.

In addition to what this legislation would do to benefit these industries, let us also consider the impact on the local government.

We spend billions in various forms of aid each year, to help local governments solve problems and initiate and complete local projects, ostensibly on the basis that the local government can no longer afford to solve such problems. Nearly every major city and every State is seeking sources of additional tax revenue. It stands to reason that, once dilapidated and substandard housing is upgraded through repairs, it will be assessed at a higher valuation for local tax purposes. It stands to reason that those areas having local sales taxes will benefit heavily from increased sales of merchandise, such as wood, paint, air conditioning and plumbing supplies, roofing materials, and so forth. Building permits where necessary will bring additional revenue.

These are factors that should and must be considered in any discussion of the "loss" of Federal revenue such a tax deduction would generate. I repeat again, in my judgment, the tremendous growth in jobs, the boom in our economy generated by enactment of this bill, the shot in the arm it would give to local and State government tax revenues, would more than offset any initial loss to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, there is growing support in favor of this legislation across the country. It comes not only from the property owners directly involved, but from those men farsighted enough to see the beneficial effect such legislation will have in opening vast new markets, in creating new jobs, new opportunities, and last but not least, in beautifying our Nation through the prevention of urban blight and the creation of slums.

I strongly urge my colleagues to look closely at this legislation, and to join with me in an effort to bring out of this 90th Congress a constructive and wholesome program of giving our home and rent-property owners a tax incentive for repair of their property.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1967

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, this month we celebrate the 49th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. As we have in past years, so also do we in 1967 commemorate the bravery and dedication of these oppressed peoples.

The Lithuanians are a proud nation with a rich history. It has been their misfortune, however, to have suffered at the hands of many foreign aggressors.

The future looked bright for Lithuania in 1918. They had finally thrown off the yoke of 123 years of czarist Russian rule, and in consonance with President Wilson's call for self-determination for all nations, they declared their independence. The labors of internation deceit, however, caught up with them once again, and their ancient oppressors soon took advantage of Lithuania's military weakness. In 1940, they fell prey to the aggressive appetite of the Red tyrants in Moscow, and they have endured hardship, privation, and enforced enslavement until the present.

Mr. Speaker, we who enjoy the fruits of liberty cannot afford to forget the plight of our brothers in Lithuania, for in their land we see a frightening reflection of the true nature of Communist designs.

I commend the Lithuanians and offer my deepest prayers for their freedom.

Statement of Congressman James H. Scheuer on the Need for a National Institute for Criminal Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1967

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is spending more today on fighting tooth decay than it is spending on the fight to lower the Nation's crime rate. The Federal Government is spending more for research into the uses of coal in fiscal 1967 than it is spending on research into the spiraling increase in crimes against society in this country. Our national crime rate is a matter of great concern to all Americans. In 76 percent of all crimes in this country no apprehension of the criminal is made. In many cities in the United States, both large and small, people are afraid to go out of their houses at night. Millions of Americans have in a very real sense lost not only their valued right of freedom of movement, but have also come to fear the very environment in which they live.

I have introduced in this Congress a bill to create a National Institute for Criminal Justice and Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY has introduced an identical bill in the Senate. The purpose of this Institute would be to provide for the Justice Department a research arm comparable to the National Institutes of Health. This Institute would have as its primary task the job of assisting State and local law enforcement agencies, courts and correctional institutions in the prevention and control of crime. This assistance would be given in the form of support and coordination of research activities in the area of crime prevention and control.

The National Institute for Criminal Justice would be authorized to spend $100 million over the next 3 years to coordinate research of four types. The first type of research would involve the selection of police personnel. What type of man makes a good police officer? The second type of research concerns discovery of better methods for training police and correctional personnel. The third type of research would be to encourage the development of police equipment in tune with our 20th century technological capabilities. Finally, the Institute would conduct basic behavioral research on the more effective involvement of the public at large in public safety programs.

The research budget of the National Institutes of Health is over $1.3 billion this year, while the budget of the Justice Department for crime research is only $7.2 million. This means that the Federal Government is spending over 180 times as much on research in the health area as it is spending for crime research. Unfortunately, the sad comparison does not end with health research. The research budget of the Department of Agriculture this year is approximately $139,468,000, 19 times greater than the amount spent on crime research and the Department of Interior research budget of $129,707,000 is 18 times greater than the Federal budget for crime prevention and control.

We must reverse this trend and revise our list of priorities. We must bring the fight against crime into the 20th century. Our law enforcement personnel are still largely dependent on 19th century weapons and procedures to fight the sophisticated techniques of the 20th century criminal. The possible application of space-age science and communications technology to police work is boundless. Yet the practical application of this advanced science and technology to police work is undoubtedly one of the most neglected aspects of current public safety programs.

Two recent incidents in my South Bronx constituency are indicative of the need I am citing here today. In one incident an innocent bystander was wounded in an exchange between police and a holdup man. In another incident a 12-year-old boy was shot by a policeman while trying to escape from a stolen car. In both of these very unfortunate incidents the patrolman was only doing his duty, but the result in each case was a very serious physical injury, as well as a potential riot-producing situation. It is unlikely that either of these serious injuries would have occurred if the New York police had had at their disposal a gun that would stun or temporarily disable, but not kill.

The saddest part of these two incidents is that neither is unique nor isolated. Innocent bystanders and youthful offenders are all too frequently the unfortunate victims of a deadly weapon used in the pursuit of the public safety. We owe it to our patrolmen on the beat and to the citizens who walk our streets to provide our police with the best possible equipment with which to do their job. It is inconceivable that a nation which is about to land a man on the moon at the cost of untold billions of Federal tax dollars cannot provide its law enforcement personnel with more efficient weapons than they use today.

The application of space-age technology is by no means limited to law enforcement personnel alone. Over a recent weekend New York City was victimized by a series of taxicab holdups, a common event in many American cities. It is well within our current technological capabilities to provide taxicabs with an instant emergency detection service. We also have within our current capacities the ability to provide law enforcement agencies with instantaneous identification of fingerprints and with immediate data on stolen automobiles via closed circuit television. These are only a few small examples of the potential applications of current technological advances to police problems.

But the problem of crime in this country requires more than the development of better weapons and better police methodology, as important as these are. The National Crime Institute would also carry out an extensive program of behavioral research into the causes of crime, into the effectiveness of various means of preventing crime, and into cost-benefit techniques for reducing recidivism among those released from correctional institutions.

Every survey I have made of my own congressional district in the south Bronx has shown that neighborhood security is the most critical concern of the residents in this area. This anxiety is not unique. People in our major cities across the country as well as in rural areas live in fear of becoming the targets of unrestrained criminal activity.

Police chiefs throughout the country, in response to my recent inquiry, have stated that the lack of adequate research funds is a universal deficiency. Most of our State and local governments have virtually no funds to devote to research activities and where funds do exist the lack of coordination is virtually universal. Criminologists, sociologists, and jurists have likewise pointed up the lack of adequate funds for the large-scale research and demonstration projects that are needed to provide us with better information into the causes of crime as well as for testing existing theories of how to prevent criminal activity.

I am gratified that the President's Crime Commission has so convincingly documented the need for research in the crime prevention area. Their report is certainly a major advance in our understanding of the current problems in crime prevention and control. I am also gratified to see that the President has presented us with the blueprint for a major attack on crime in the streets in his recent crime message to Congress. Congress has already taken an important step in this area with the passage of the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, which was definitely a step in the right direction.

Grant-in-aid programs to local police departments, however, will not solve the problem of inadequate research into weapons technology and criminal behavior. No one would ever have expected State and local grant-in-aid programs to produce a Manhattan project, a supersonic transport, or a Telestar satellite. Why then should we place the enormous burden of the types of research that I have discussed today on our State and local governments?

The National Institute of Criminal Justice would provide the basic research tools, the funds, and the expertise to improve the work of those involved in reducing crime. Communities across the Nation are desperately looking to the Federal Government to attack this problem which can only be solved with the commitment of substantial Federal funds and strong Federal leadership.

Congressman Poff States the Case for Small Tax Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, several Members on the Republican side of the aisle have introduced legislation to protect the interests of the average American taxpayer through the means of a small tax court.

Congressman RICHARD POFF, of Virginia, has very effectively stated the case for this proposal in his newsletter to his constituents of February 20, 1967.

His statement deserves the attention of all of us, and I include it here:

SMALL TAX COURT

Well, it's time for the tax man again. The old deadline draws near and all of us have been struggling manfully and womanfully with the Form 1040, the W-2's and the scratch pads. What the verdict will be remains to be seen for each of us. Some of us will find that we owe additional taxes. Others, more fortunate, will find that they are entitled to a refund. But for some of us a dispute will arise with the Internal Revenue Service and when that happens we're in trouble. We're not so much in danger of punishment in the physical sense but we are in danger of penalty in the economic sense. More importantly we are in danger of becoming involved almost interminably in the cement-mixer processes of the present system of tax appeals. The present system, it seems to me, has been geared primarily to controversies in which the big taxpayer is involved. The big taxpayer who finds himself in a dispute with the Internal Revenue Service has a problem, but in nature and consequence it is not the same as that of the small taxpayer. The big taxpayer can afford the expense of attorneys and court costs and all the other expense incidental to litigation. He can afford to take the IRS to court. An eyeball-to-eyeball confrontation holds few terrors for him.

On the other hand, the little taxpayer often is confronted with an impossible dilemma. His claim for a refund or the deficiency assessment the tax collector has made against him is sometimes too small to justify the cost of litigation. But it may, particularly if it is a claim for a refund, be too big to ignore. So, the little taxpayer is put to the decision whether to dig down in his pocket and bear these expenses and run the risk of losing his case, or simply to forget about it and mark it all up to experience. I have introduced a bill which I hope will spare the little taxpayer this harsh dilemma. It will establish for the first time since the income tax law was written a Small Tax Division in the Tax Court to which the small taxpayer can repair and where he can obtain prompt, definitive and final disposition of the claim which he makes or have the deficiency judgment pending against him settled once and for all.

I am constrained to believe that this legislation would promote better personal relations between the taxpayer and the tax collector. The Internal Revenue Service agent, through no fault of his own, wears several hats. He is the tax collector. He is the tax assessor. He is the accuser. If the taxpayer has made some error, he initially decides whether it was accidental or fraudulent. It is not fair to the taxpayer that so many potentially conflicting functions should be combined in one person. Neither is it fair to the tax collector.

I earnestly hope that the Congress can be persuaded to give sympathetic consideration to this proposal this year.

Lest We Forget—Estonia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, February 24 marked the 49th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Estonia. Free Estonians in the United States and about the world commemorate this event—not with joy and happy exuberance as one might expect, but rather in sadness and heartache in lonely exile.

Their flicker of hope, their destiny, their last chance rests with America.

We of the United States can well benefit from the trials and tribulations of these gallant people in our national policies of appeasement and coexistence with the Communist Party of Russia.

Estonia stretched forth the hand of friendship and reconciliation in many treaties and agreements with Soviet Russia: A treaty of peace in 1920, the Kellogg Briand pact in 1928, a Nonaggression and Peaceful Settlement of Disputes Treaty in 1932, and a treaty that defined aggression in 1933.

Mr. Speaker, the Communist Party that pilots Russia repudiated every agreement. Estonia—by trying, by trust and faith—was the loser for having attempted to negotiate differences. The treaties and agreements by Communists, then as now, are but mere scraps of paper, used for their gain but never representing their bond.

When Estonia declared herself a democratic republic in February of 1918 she was recognized as a nation by all Allied Powers, as well as other countries. And, in November of that same year she was, without great protest, invaded by the brutal forces of Communist Russia in complete violation of all treaties and international law, violating Russia's previous declaration whereby Estonia was recognized as a free state.

Fourteen months later Estonia succeeded in gaining a written treaty of peace whereby "Russia unreservedly recognizes voluntarily and forever all rights of sovereignty held by Russia over the people and territory of Estonia."

Unprecedented terror, brutality, and mad fear was turned upon the citizens by the Communists to force submission, silence, and compliance. Arrests and murders of untold numbers became a daily occurrence. Prisons were so jammed with political prisoners that new torture chambers had to be hastily built. The overwhelming number of those arrested were never heard from again, disappearing without a trial, a hearing, or an explanation.

Many Estonians recall the horror of the nights of June 13 and 14, 1941. Thousands upon thousands of innocent men, women, and children were dragged from their beds, carried away at gunpoint to railway cattle cars to be delivered to slave labor camps in the most secluded areas of the Soviet Union. Mothers and dads were separated from their children and delivered to "special camps" never to regain contact with one another.

The order for this family purge was signed by Gen. Ivan Serou, top-ranking Communist of the NKVD and GPU of the Soviet security police, only 13 days after the Soviet Union had signed the so-called mutual assistance pact with Estonia—which was then not occupied—and had pledged not to violate Estonian national integrity and independence.

During World War II, Estonia established that 7,926 persons had been arrested in 1 year of Communist occupation. Of those taken into custody by the Communists, only 1,950 were ever accounted for. These occupy mass graves scattered about Estonia. Included were the bodies of 206 women. All had been murdered by Communist security police using nape shots, hands bound behind their backs. The unaccounted 5,900 arrested were sent to forced labor camps in the Soviet Union, or were murdered in the Soviet Union, never to be heard from again.

By June 1941, those deported into the Soviet Union totaled 10,205. More than 1,100 were unaccounted for and missing.

The Nazi occupation ended in the fall of 1944, when Communist troops reentered Estonia. Arrests, murders, and deportations resumed. To escape Communist terror 75,000 Estonians fled their country in advance of the Red army occupation.

Another large kidnaping of Estonians was effected by the Russians on March 22 to 25, 1959. Thousands of peasants were seized and carted off to Siberia as an effort to frighten those remaining into agricultural collectives. All told, the known Communist brutality consumed 10 percent of the populace of Estonia.

By savage brutality, Estonia as well as Latvia and Lithuania were converted to Communist puppet fronts for the Soviet.

Today, her government does not speak for her people. The enslavement of formerly free peoples, the destruction of constitutional governments by the ruthless dictatorship of the communistic international conspiracy under its blueprint for world domination continues as one of the great tragedies of our time.

This wanton destruction of freedom—hideous and terrifying—must never be forgotten nor these facts silenced.

We salute these proud people who continue the struggle in heart and mind for individual liberty and the restoration of the national identity that is rightfully theirs. We, as free Americans, must recommit ourselves to a firm conviction that the struggle of the free Estonians is ours. For we acknowledge that so long as any peoples are denied their God-given right to individual liberty and self-determination no free people can be truly safe in any land.

ESSA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1967

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most significant scientific development since World War II has been the data explosion. The collection, quality control, communication, analysis, processing, storage or retrieval of information is underway today on a scale that numbs the imagination. The volume of technical information is doubling every decade.

The effective use of data in understanding the environment is one of the aims of an important new scientific agency known as the Environmental Science Services Administration—ESSA—of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Within the past few days, President Johnson has publicly congratulated ESSA on its achievements during its period of development. He stated, as he had earlier in announcing Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1965, "that the reorganization would permit us to provide better environmental information to vital segments of the Nation's economy. ESSA's accomplishments are bearing out these predictions." Improved environmental information is available because of the establishment of ESSA's Environmental Data Service—EDS.

This service provides an integrated attack upon the problems of collection and dissemination of climatological, geodetic, seismological aeronomy and space data. In EDS, ESSA has fashioned from many data centers previously scattered among several organizations one service which permits the application of modern technology to the processing, storage, recall and summarization of all forms of environmental data. It is making possible the previously unattainable goal of one-stop service to the multitude of interests needing many kinds of environmental data.

Although it is not generally realized, archived scientific data grows in value with the passage of time. The institution of the data bank is one whose service seldom stirs the popular imagination, yet serves our Nation exceedingly well.

In ESSA, the Environmental Data Service has three major centers: the National Weather Records Center and the National Geophysical Data Center at Asheville, N.C., and the Aeronomy and Space Data Center in Boulder, Colo.

A number of international data centers are now gathered in the Environmental Data Center, a significant testimony to this institution's scope and capabilities.

ESSA, through this service, assists practically every area of the national economy—and the private citizen. It is the kind of service which typifies the best in government—accurate, complete, and quickly available. Its importance to our national life can hardly be overestimated. It is gratifying to me, as I am sure it was to the President, to know that the Environmental Science Services Administration, which has accomplished so much for our Nation in such a short period of time, has among its components this outstanding and vital service.

Scouting and Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a recent survey leaves no doubt that the Boy Scouts of America has had a pronounced impact on the Members of Congress. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is to be commended for the thoroughness with which he conducted this survey in observance of the 51st anniversary of the Boy Scouts.

Of the 523 male Members of Congress, 328—77 percent—have been influenced by membership in or service to Scouting. This total includes 177 who have been Scouts only, 60 who have been leaders only and 91 who have been both. Twenty-six, including Congressman BLATNIK, of Minnesota's Eighth District, have been Eagle Scouts. Two have won the Silver Buffalo Award, nine the Silver Beaver and two the Silver Antelope.

Four of the 10 Members of Minnesota's Congressional delegation have been involved in scouting. For several years during the 1930's, I was a member of a troop in southeast Minneapolis.

Scouting's influence on Congress is not limited to male members. Of the 12 women Members, one has been named an honorary Boy Scout and another has served as a Cub Scout den mother.

Following is the State-by-State list of Senators and Representatives who have, at some point in their lives, been active in some phase of Scouting:

Scout denoted by (S); Leader denoted by (L); Scout and Leader denoted by (S & L).

ALABAMA

Senator John Sparkman (D), S & L.
George Andrews (D), S.
John H. Buchanan, Jr. (R), L.
William L. Dickinson (R), S.
Robert E. Jones (D), L.
Armistead I. Selden, Jr. (D), S.

ALASKA

Senator E. L. Bartlett (D), S.
Howard W. Pollock (R), S.

ARIZONA

Senator Paul J. Fannin (R), S.
Senator Carl Hayden (D), L.
John J. Rhodes (R), S.
Morris K. Udall (D), S & L.

ARKANSAS

E. C. Gathings (D), S & L.
Wilbur D. Mills (D), S & L.
John Paul Hammerschmidt (R), S.
David Pryor (D), S.

CALIFORNIA

Senator Thomas Kuchel (R), S & L.
Senator George Murphy (R), L.
Alphonzo Bell (R), S.
George E. Brown, Jr. (D), L.
Del Clawson (R), S & L.
Jeffrey Cohelan (D), S.
James C. Corman (D), S.
Don Edwards (D), S.
Richard T. Hanna (D), S & L.
Craig Hosmer (R), S.
Harold T. Johnson (D), L.
Robert L. Leggett (D), S & L.
Glenard P. Lipscomb (R), S.
John F. McFall (D), L.
William S. Mailliard (R), S.
Bob Mathias (R), S.
John E. Moss (D), S.
Ed Reinecke (R), S & L.
Edward R. Roybal (D), S.
H. Allen Smith (R), S & L.
Burt L. Talcott (R), S & L.
Charles M. Teague (R), S.
John V. Tunney (D), L.
James B. Utt (R), S.
Lionel Van Deerlin (D), S.
Jerome Waldie (D), S.
Bob Wilson (R), S.
J. Arthur Younger (R), L.

COLORADO

Wayne N. Aspinall (D), S.
Frank E. Evans (D), S & L.
Byron G. Rogers (D), S.
Donald G. Brotzman (R), S.

CONNECTICUT

Senator Thomas J. Dodd (D), S.
Senator Abraham A. Ribicoff (D), S.
Robert N. Giaimo (D), S.
William L. St. Onge (D), S. & L.

DELAWARE

Senator J. Caleb Boggs (R), S & L.
William V. Roth, Jr. (R), L.

FLORIDA

Senator Spessard L. Holland (D), S.
Charles E. Bennett (D), S.
Dante B. Fascell (D), S.
Sam M. Gibbons (D), S.
James A. Haley (D), L.
Edward J. Gurney (R), S.
A. Sydney Herlong, Jr. (D), S.
Claude Pepper (D), S & L.
Paul G. Rogers (D), S.
Robert L. F. Sikes (D), S.
J. Herbert Burke (R), S.

GEORGIA

Jack Brinkley (D), L.
John J. Flynt, Jr. (D), S & L.
G. Elliott Hagan (D), L.
Phil M. Landrum (D), S.
Maston O'Neal (D), S & L.
Robert G. Stephens, Jr. (D), S & L.
Fletcher Thompson (R), L.
W. S. (Bill) Stuckey, Jr. (D), S & L.
Benjamin Blackburn (R), S & L.

HAWAII

Senator Hiram Fong (R), S & L.
Spark Matsunaga (D), S.

IDAHO

Senator Frank Church (D), S.
George V. Hansen (R), S.
James A. McClure (R), S.

ILLINOIS

Frank Annunzio (D), L.
Leslie S. Arends (R), S.
Harold R. Collier (R), S.
Edward J. Derwinski (R), S.
John N. Erlenborn (R), L.
Robert McClory (R), L.
Roman C. Pucinski (D), S.
Thomas Railsback (R). S & L.
Dan Rostenkowski (D), S & L.
Donald Rumsfeld (R), S
William L. Springer (R), S.
Sidney R. Yates (D), S.
Senator Charles Percy (R), S & L.

INDIANA

E. Ross Adair (R), S.
John Brademas (D), S & L.
William G. Bray (R), S.
Lee H. Hamilton (D), S.
Andrew Jacobs, Jr. (D), S.
Richard L. Roudebush (R), S & L.
Roger H. Zion (R), S & L.

IOWA

Senator Jack Miller (R), S.
John C. Culver (D), S.
John Kyl (R), L.
Fred Schwengel (R), L.
Wiley Mayne (R), S.
Neal Smith (D), L.

KANSAS

Senator Frank Carlson (R), L.
Senator James B. Pearson (R), S.
Bob Dole (R), S.
Chester L. Mize (R), S.
Garner E. Shriver (R), S & L.
Joe Skubitz (R), L.
Larry Winn, Jr. (R), S & L.

KENTUCKY

Senator John Sherman Cooper (R), S.
William H. Natcher (D), S.
William Cowger (R), S.
Frank A. Stubblefield (D), S.
John C. Watts (D), S.
Gene Snyder (R), S.

LOUISIANA

Hale Boggs (D), S.
Speedy O. Long (D), S.
Otto E. Passman (D), S.
Joe D. Waggonner (D), S.
Edwin E. Willis (D), S.

MAINE

Senator Edmund S. Muskie (D), S.
William D. Hathaway (D), S.
Peter N. Kyros (D), S.

MARYLAND

Senator Joseph D. Tydings (D), S.
Samuel N. Friedel (D), S.
Hervey G. Machen (D), S&L.
Charles McM. Mathias, Jr. (R), S.
Rogers C. B. Morton (R), S.
Clarence D. Long (D), S.
Gilbert Gude (R), S&L.

MASSACHUSETTS

Senator Edward Brooke (R), S.
William H. Bates (R), S.
Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. (D), L.

MICHIGAN

Senator Robert P. Griffin (R), S&L.
Garry Brown (R), S.
Elford A. Cederberg (R), S.
John D. Dingell (D), S&L.
Gerald R. Ford (R), S&L.
William D. Ford (D), S.
Edward Hutchinson (R), S.

Lucien N. Nedzi (D), L.
Philip E. Ruppe (R), S.
William S. Broomfield (R), S&L.

MINNESOTA

Senator Walter F. Mondale (D), S.
John A. Blatnik (D), S.
Donald M. Fraser (D), S.
Joseph E. Karth (D), S&L.

MISSISSIPPI

Thomas G. Abernethy (D), S&L.
G. V. Montgomery (D), S.

MISSOURI

Senator Edward V. Long (D), L.
Thomas B. Curtis (R), S&L.
Durward G. Hall (R), S&L.
W. R. Hull, Jr. (D), L.
William L. Hungate (D), S.
Paul C. Jones (R), S&L.
Frank M. Karsten (D), S.
William J. Randall (D), S.

MONTANA

Senator Lee Metcalf (D), S&L.
James F. Battin (R), S.
Arnold Olsen (D), L.

NEBRASKA

Glenn Cunningham (R), S&L.
Dave Martin (R), S&L.
Robert V. Denney (R), L.

NEVADA

Senator Howard W. Cannon (D), S.
Walter S. Baring (D), S.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Senator Norris Cotton (R), S.
Senator Thomas J. McIntyre (D), L.
Louis C. Wyman (R), S.

NEW JERSEY

Senator Clifford P. Case (R), S.
Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr. (D), L.
Cornelius E. Gallagher (D), S.
John E. Hunt (R), S & L.
Joseph G. Minish (D), S.
James J. Howard, (D), S.
Charles Sandman (R), S.
William B. Widnall (R), S & L.

NEW MEXICO

Senator Clinton P. Anderson (D), L.
Thomas G. Morris (D), S.
E. S. Johnny Walker (D), S & L.

NEW YORK

Senator Robert F. Kennedy (D), S.
Hugh L. Carey (D), L.
Barber E. Conable, Jr. (R), S & L.
John G. Dow (D), S & L.
Thaddeus J. Dulski (D), S & L.
James R. Grover, Jr. (R), S.
Seymour Halpern (R), S & L.
Frank Horton (R), S & L.
Carleton J. King (R), L.
Richard D. McCarthy (D), S.
Robert C. McEwen (R), S.
Abraham J. Multer (D), L.
Richard L. Ottinger (D), S
Otis G. Pike (D), S & L.
Odgen R. Reid (R), S.
Joseph Y. Resnick (D), S & L.
Howard W. Robison (R), S & L.
John J. Rooney (D), S.
Henry P. Smith III (R), S & L.
Samuel S. Stratton (D), S & L.
Herbert Tenzer (D), L.
John W. Wydler (R), S.
Theodore R. Kupferman (R), L.

NORTH CAROLINA

Senator B. Everett Jordan (D), L.
James T. Broyhill (R), S.
L. H. Fountain (D), S.
Nick Galifianakis (D), S.
David N. Henderson (D), S.
Walter B. Jones (D), S.
Charles R. Jonas (R), S.
Horace R. Kornegay (D), S & L
Alton Lennon (D), S & L.
Roy A. Taylor (D), S & L.
Basil Whitener (D), S.
James C. Gardner (R), S.

NORTH DAKOTA

Mark Andrews (R), S.
Thomas S. Kleppe (R), S.

OHIO

John M. Ashbrook (R), L.
Jackson E. Betts (R), S & L.
Clarence J. Brown, Jr. (R), S & L.
Samuel L. Devine (R), S.
William H. Harsha (R), S.
Wayne L. Hays (D), S & L.
Delbert L. Latta (R), S.
D. E. "Buz" Lukens (R), S&L.
Clarence E. Miller (R) S.
William E. Minshall (R), S.
Charles A. Mosher (R), L.
J. William Stanton (R), S.
Chalmers P. Wylie (R), S & L.
Robert Taft, Jr. (R), S.

OKLAHOMA

Senator Fred R. Harris (D), S.
Senator A. S. Mike Monroney (D), S.
Carl Albert (D), S & L.
Page Belcher (R), L.
Ed Edmondson (D), S.
John Jarman (D), L.
Tom Steed (D), S & L.

OREGON

Al Ullman (D), L.
John R. Dellenback (R), S.
Senator Mark Hatfield (R), S & L.

PENNSYLVANIA

Senator Hugh Scott (R), S.
William A. Barrett (D), S.
Edward Biester (R), S.
Frank M. Clark (D), S & L.
Robert J. Corbett (R), S.
Daniel J. Flood (D), S.
James G. Fulton (R), S.
Albert W. Johnson (R), L.
Joseph M. McDade (R), S.
Thomas E. Morgan (D), S.
Fred B. Rooney (D), S.
John P. Saylor (R), S & L.
Herman T. Schneebeli (R), S.
Richard S. Schweiker (R), S & L.
J. Irvin Whalley (R), L.
L. G. Williams, (R), S.
Joshua Eilberg (D), S & L.

RHODE ISLAND

Senator Claiborne Pell (D), S.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Senator Strom Thurmond (R), S & L.
John L. McMillan (D), L.
L. Mendel Rivers (D), S & L.
Albert W. Watson (R), S.
Senator Ernest Hollings (D), S.

SOHTH DAKOTA

E. Y. Berry (R), L.
Senator Karl E. Mundt (R), S.
Ben Reifel (R), L.

TENNESSEE

William R. Anderson (D), S.
William E. Brock III (R), S.
John J. Duncan (R), S & L.
Richard H. Fulton (D), S & L.
Ray Blanton (D), S & L.
Dan Kuykendall (R), L.

TEXAS

Senator Ralph Yarborough (D); L.
Omar Burleson (D), S.
Earle Cabell (D), L.
Bob Casey (D), S & L.
John Dowdy (D), S & L.
O. C. Fisher (D), L.
Eligio de la Garza (D), S & L.
Henry B. Gonzalez (D), S & L.
Wright Patman (D), L.
J. J. (Jake) Pickle (D), S.
W. R. Poage (D), L.
Graham Purcell (D), L.
Ray Roberts (D), S & L.
Olin E. Teague (D), S.
Richard C. White (D), S & L.
James C. Wright, Jr. (D), S & L.
Abraham B. Kazen, Jr. (D), S.
Robert D. Price (R), L.
Joe R. Pool (D), S.

UTAH

Senator Wallace F. Bennett (R), S.
Senator Frank E. Moss (D), S.
Laurence J. Burton (R), S & L.
Sherman P. Lloyd (R), S & L.

VERMONT

Robert T. Stafford (R), S.

VIRGINIA

Thomas N. Downing (D), S & L.
Porter Hardy, Jr. (D), S & L.
John O. Marsh, Jr. (D), S & L.
David E. Satterfield III (D), S.
William C. Wampler (R), S.
William L. Scott (R), L.
Senator William B. Spong, Jr. (D), S & L.

WASHINGTON

Senator Henry M. Jackson (D), S.
Brock Adams (D), S.
Thomas S. Foley (D), S.
Lloyd Meeds (D), S & L.
Thomas M. Pelly (R), S.

WEST VIRGINIA

Senator Robert C. Byrd (D), S.
Senator Jennings Randolph (D), S.
Ken Hechler (D), S.
James Kee (D), S.
Arch A. Moore, Jr. (R), L.
John M. Slack, Jr. (D), S.
Harley O. Staggers (D), L.

WISCONSIN

Senator William Proxmire (D), S.
Robert W. Kastenmeier, (D), S.
Glenn R. Davis (R), L.
Melvin R. Laird (R), S.
Henry S. Reuss (D), S & L.
Vernon W. Thomson (R), S.
William A. Steiger (R), S.

WYOMING

Senator Gale W. McGee (D), S.

SENATE

Tuesday, February 28, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. Frank J. Lausche, a Senator from the State of Ohio.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, at whose word man goeth forth unto his work and to his labor until evening, we come to these spiritual springs asking that we may be given strength to match the tasks we face.

O Thou who didst guide our fathers of this Republic, and dost surround us with a cloud of witnesses, watching from heroic yesterdays, still by Thy pillar of cloud, and of fire, lead us on through disturbed days that test the souls of all men.

As work and hopes deferred take their constant toll of our human strength, grant us as laborers together with Thee a sense of spiritual resources, and restore our souls with the joyous strength of Thy salvation.

Search us, O God, and know our hearts; try us, and know our thoughts, and see if there be any wicked or perverse way in us; for we would come to this high and holy hill with pure hearts and clean hands.

Gird our hearts to seek peace and pursue it, that the sundered family of mankind at last may be bound by golden cords of understanding fellowship around the feet of the one God.

In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., February 28, 1967.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. FRANK J. LAUSCHE, a Senator from the State of Ohio, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. **LAUSCHE** thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 27, 1967, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

HEALTH AND EDUCATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. 68)

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States on health and education. Without objection, the message will be printed in the RECORD, without reading, and appropriately referred.

The message from the President was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

In Edmonds, Wash., three new evening classes today are helping 150 high school dropouts finish school and gain new job skills.

In Detroit, a month ago, 52,000 children were immunized against measles, during a campaign assisted by Federal funds.

In 25 States, Federal funds are helping improve medical care for 6.4 million citizens who get public assistance.

Over 8 million poor children are now getting a better education because of funds provided under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Nineteen million older citizens enjoy the protection of medicare.

Three years ago, not one of these programs existed.

Today, they are flourishing—because a concerned people and the creative 89th Congress acted. They are the result of 24 new health laws and 18 new education laws.

But even the best new programs are not enough.

Today, we face major challenges of organization and evaluation. If our new projects are to be effective, we must have the people to run them and the facilities to support them. We must encourage States and localities to plan more effectively and comprehensively for their growing needs and to measure their progress toward meeting those needs.

Above all, each community, each State, must generate a spirit of creative change—a willingness to experiment.

In this, my fourth message to Congress on health and education, I do not recommend more of the same, but more that is better—to solve old problems, to create new institutions, to fulfill the potential of each individual in our land.

Nothing is more fundamental to all we seek than our programs in health and education.

Education—because it not only overcomes ignorance, but arms the citizen against the other evils which afflict him.

Health—because disease is the cruelest enemy of individual promise and because medical progress makes less and less tolerable that illness still should blight so many lives.

I. EDUCATION

I believe that future historians, when they point to the extraordinary changes which have marked the 1960's, will identify a major movement forward in American education.

This movement, spurred by the laws of the last 3 years, seeks to provide equality of educational opportunity to all Americans—to give every child education of the highest quality, no matter how poor his family, how great his handicap, what color his skin, or where he lives.

We cannot yet fully measure the results of this great movement in American education. Our progress can be traced partially by listing some of the extraordinary bills I have signed into law:

The Higher Education Act of 1965.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1964.

The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963.

The scale of our efforts can be partially measured by the fact that today appropriations for the Office of Education are nearly seven times greater than 4 years ago. Today we can point to at least 1 million college students who might not be in college except for Government loans, grants, and work-study programs, and to more than 17,500 school districts helping disadvantaged children under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

This breakthrough is not the work of Washington alone. The ideas for these programs come from educational leaders all over the country. Many different communities must supply the energy to make these programs work. Yet they are national programs, shaped by national needs. Congress has played a vital role in reviewing these needs and setting these priorities.

The new Federal role in education is, in reality, a new alliance with America's States and local communities. In this alliance, the Federal Government continues to be a junior partner:

Local school districts will submit, and State governments will approve, the plans for spending more than $1 billion this year to improve the education of poor children.

Federal funds for vocational education are administered through State plans controlled by State, not Federal, officials.

The recommendations of the States have been sought and followed in more than 95 percent of the projects for centers and services which are funded by the U.S. Office of Education.

The education programs I recommend this year have three major aims:

To strengthen the foundations we have laid in recent years, by revising, improving, and consolidating existing programs.

To provide special help to those groups in our society with special needs: the poor, the handicapped, victims of discrimination or neglect.

To build for the future by exploiting the new opportunities presented by science, technology and the world beyond our borders.

The budget proposals I am making for 1968 will carry forward our efforts at a new level. The total Federal dollar expenditures for educational purposes, including health training, which I have proposed for fiscal 1968 will amount to $11 billion—an increase of $1 billion or 10 percent over 1967 and $7 billion, or 175 percent, over 1963.

STRENGTHENING EDUCATION PROGRAMS

State and community education leaders have shouldered heavy new burdens as a result of recent increases in Federal programs. If these officials are to develop wise and long-range plans for education, they must have more help.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act has provided funds to strengthen State departments of education. But additional funds are needed—money to improve community, State, and regional educational planning. Nothing can do more to insure the effective use of Federal dollars.

I recommend legislation authorizing $15 million to help State and local governments evaluate their education programs and plan for the future.

A BETTER EDUCATION TIMETABLE

One condition which severely hampers educational planning is the congressional schedule for authorizations and appropriations. When Congress enacts and funds programs near the end of a session, the Nation's schools and colleges must plan their programs without knowing what Federal resources will be available to them to meet their needs. As so many Governors have said, the Federal legislative calendar often proves incompatible with the academic calendar.

I urge that the Congress enact education appropriations early enough to allow the Nation's schools and colleges to plan effectively. I have directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to work with the Congress toward this end.

Another way to ease this problem is to seek the earliest practical renewal of authorization for major educational measures.

I recommend that Congress this year extend three major education measures now scheduled to expire in June 1968:

The National Defense Education Act of 1958.

The Higher Education Act of 1965.

The National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965.

IMPROVING PROGRAM EVALUATION

Most of our education programs have been operating too short a time to provide conclusive judgments about their effectiveness. But we should be heartened by the evaluations so far.

Recently, the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children reported:

> The morale of teachers and administrators in schools with many poor children—their will to succeed and their belief in the possibility of succeeding—is perceptibly on the rise in many of the schools visited. More teachers than ever are involved in an active search for paths to success. The paths are not all clearly visible as yet, but decidedly the search has taken on a new vigor.

The council did identify problems and weaknesses in the school districts. Our efforts to identify shortcomings and to assess our progress can never be fully effective until we provide sufficient resources for program evaluation.

I have requested $2.5 million to assure careful analysis of new programs so that we can provide a full accounting to the Congress and the American people of our successes and shortcomings.

THE EDUCATION PROFESSIONS ACT OF 1967

Our work to enrich education finds its focus in a single person: the classroom teacher, who inspires each student to achieve his best.

Next year, more than 170,000 new teachers will be needed to replace uncertified teachers, to fill vacancies, and to meet rising student enrollments. Moreover:

There are severe shortages of English, mathematics, science, and elementary school teachers.

More teachers are needed for our colleges and junior colleges.

Well-trained administrators at all levels are critically needed.

New kinds of school personnel—such as teacher aids—are needed to help in the schools.

By 1975, the Nation's schools will need nearly 2 million more new teachers.

To help meet this growing demand, the Federal Government has sponsored a number of programs to train and improve teachers.

These programs, though they have been effective, have been too fragmented to achieve their full potential and too limited to reach many essential sectors of the teaching profession. Teacher aids and school administrators have not been eligible to participate.

We must develop a broader approach to training for the education professions. At the State and local level, education authorities must have greater flexibility to plan for their educational manpower needs.

I recommend the Education Professions Act of 1967 to:

Combine and expand many of the scattered statutory authorities for teacher training assistance.

Provide new authority for the training of school administrators, teacher aids, and other education workers for schools and colleges.

IMPROVING STUDENT LOAN PROGRAMS

In the Higher Education Act of 1965, Congress authorized a program to support State guarantees for student loans made by banks and other lending institutions. For students of modest means, the Federal Government also subsidizes the interest cost.

The program has become an example of creative cooperation between the Federal Government, the States, private financial institutions, and the academic community.

Though it began in a time of tight credit, the program is off to a promising start. This year, it is expected that loans totaling $400 million will be made to nearly 480,000 students. By 1972, outstanding loans are expected to total $6.5 billion.

I have asked all of the Government officials concerned with the program—the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Budget, and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers—to review its operations in consultation with State and private organizations concerned.

If administrative changes in the program are necessary, we will make them. If any amendments to the legislation are in order, we will submit appropriate recommendations to the Congress.

SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR SPECIAL NEEDS

EDUCATING POOR CHILDREN

Over the past 2 years, we have invested more than $2.6 billion in improving educational opportunities for more than 10 million poor children. This has been an ambitious venture, for no textbook offers precise methods for dealing with the disadvantaged. It has also been rewarding: we have generated new energy, gained new workers and developed new skills in our effort to help the least fortunate.

Dollars alone cannot do the job—but the job cannot be done without dollars.

So let us continue the programs we have begun under Headstart and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Let us begin new efforts—like the Headstart followthrough program which we can carry forward into the early grades the gains made under Headstart.

THE TEACHER CORPS

Young as it is, the Teacher Corps has become a symbol of new hope for America's poor children and their parents—and for hard-pressed school administrators.

More than 1,200 interns and veteran teachers have volunteered for demanding assignments in city and rural slums. Teacher Corps volunteers are at work in 275 schools throughout the country—helping children in 20 of our 25 largest cities, in Appalachia, in the Ozarks, in Spanish-speaking communities.

The impact of these specialists goes far beyond their number. For they represent an important idea—that the schools in our Nation's slums deserve a fair share of our Nation's best teachers.

Mayors and school officials across the country cite the competence, the energy, and the devotion which Teacher Corps members are bringing to these tasks.

Perhaps the best measure of the vitality of the Teacher Corps is the demand by school districts for volunteers and the number of young Americans who want to join. Requests from local schools exceed by far the number of volunteers we can now train. Ten times as many young Americans as we can presently accept—among them, some of our brightest college graduates—have applied for Teacher Corps service.

The Teacher Corps, which I recommended and which the 89th Congress established, deserves the strong support of the 90th Congress.

I recommend that the Teacher Corps be expanded to a total of 5,500 volunteers by the school year beginning in September 1968.

I propose amendments to enhance the role of the States in training and assigning Teacher Corps members.

Finally, to finance next summer's training program, I strongly recommend early action on a supplemental appropriation request of $12.5 million for the Teacher Corps in fiscal year 1967.

EDUCATING THE HANDICAPPED

One child in 10 in our country is afflicted with a handicap which, if left untreated, severely cripples his chance to become a productive adult.

In my message on children and youth, I proposed measures to bring better health care to these children—the mentally retarded, the crippled, the chronically ill.

We must also give attention to their special educational needs. We must more precisely identify the techniques that will be effective in helping handicapped children to learn.

We need many more teachers who have the training essential to help these children. There are now only 70,000 specially trained teachers of the handicapped—a small fraction of the number the Nation requires. In the next decade, five times that number must be trained and put to work.

I recommend legislation to:

Establish regional resource centers to identify the educational needs of handicapped children and help their parents and teachers meet those needs.

Recruit more men and women for careers in educating the handicapped.

Extend the service providing captioned films and other instructional materials for the deaf to all handicapped people.

ENDING DISCRIMINATION

Giving every American an equal chance for education requires that we put an end once and for all to racial segregation in our schools.

In the Civil Rights Act of 1964, this Nation committed itself to eliminating segregation. Yet patterns of discrimination are still entrenched in many communities, North and South, East and West.

If equal opportunity is to be more than a slogan in our society, every State and community must be encouraged to face up to this legal and moral responsibility.

I have requested $30 million—nearly a fourfold increase over this year's appropriation—to provide the needed resources under title IV of the Civil Rights Act to help States and communities face the problems of school desegregation.

EDUCATION FOR THE WORLD OF WORK

Three out of 10 students in America drop out before completing high school. Only two out of 10 of our Nation's young men and women receive college degrees.

Too few of these young people get the training and guidance they need to find good jobs.

I recommend legislation to aid secondary schools and colleges to develop new programs in vocational education, to make work part of the learning experience and to provide career-counseling for their students.

A number of our colleges have highly successful programs of cooperative education which permit students to vary periods of study with periods of employment. This is an important educational innovation that has demonstrated its effectiveness. It should be applied more widely in our schools and universities.

I recommend an amendment of the college work-study program which will for the first time permit us to support cooperative education projects.

I am also requesting the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Secretary of Labor to use Neighborhood Youth Corps funds at the high school level for this purpose.

COMBATING ADULT ILLITERACY

At least 3 million adults in America cannot read or write. Another 13 million have less than an eighth-grade education. Many of these citizens lack the basic learning to cope with the routine business of daily life.

This is a national tragedy and an economic loss for which each one of us must pay.

The Adult Education Act, enacted last year, is our pledge to help eliminate this needless loss of human talent.

This year, I am requesting $44 million—an increase of nearly 50 percent—for adult basic education programs.

These funds will help new projects, sponsored by both public agencies and nonprofit private groups, to train volunteers for work in adult literacy programs and to establish neighborhood education programs reaching beyond the formal classroom.

BUILDING FOR TOMORROW

PUBLIC TELEVISION

In 1951, the Federal Communications Commission set aside the first 242 television channels for noncommercial broadcasting, declaring:

> The public interest will be clearly served if these stations contribute significantly to the educational process of the Nation.

The first educational television station went on the air in May 1953. Today, there are 178 noncommercial television stations on the air or under construction. Since 1963 the Federal Government has provided $32 million under the Educational Television Facilities Act to help build towers, transmitters, and other facilities. These funds have helped stations with an estimated potential audience of close to 150 million citizens.

Yet we have only begun to grasp the great promise of this medium, which, in the words of one critic, has the power to "arouse our dreams, satisfy our hunger for beauty, take us on journeys, enable us to participate in events, present great drama and music, explore the sea and the sky and the winds and the hills."

Noncommercial television can bring its audience the excitement of excellence in every field. I am convinced that a vital and self-sufficient noncommercial television system will not only instruct, but inspire and uplift our people.

Practically all noncommercial stations have serious shortages of the facilities, equipment, money, and staff they need to present programs of high quality. There are not enough stations. Interconnections between stations are inadequate and seldom permit the timely scheduling of current programs.

Noncommercial television today is reaching only a fraction of its potential audience—and achieving only a fraction of its potential worth.

Clearly, the time has come to build on the experience of the past 14 years, the important studies that have been made, and the beginnings we have made.

I recommend that Congress enact the Public Television Act of 1967 to:

Increase Federal funds for television and radio facility construction to $10.5 million in fiscal 1968, more than three times this year's appropriations.

Create a Corporation for Public Television authorized to provide support to noncommercial television and radio.

Provide $9 million in fiscal 1968 as initial funding for the Corporation.

Next year, after careful review, I will make further proposals for the Corporation's long-term financing.

Noncommercial television and radio in America, even though supported by Federal funds, must be absolutely free from any Federal Government interference over programing. As I said in the state of the Union message:

> We should insist that the public interest be fully served through the public's airwaves.

The board of directors of the Corporation for Public Television should include American leaders in education, communications, and the creative arts. I recommend that the board be comprised of 15 members, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

The Corporation would provide support to establish production centers and to help local stations improve their proficiency. It would be authorized to accept funds from other sources, public and private.

The strength of public television should lie in its diversity. Every region and every community should be challenged to contribute its best.

Other opportunities for the Corporation exist to support vocational training for young people who desire careers in public television, to foster research and development, and to explore new ways to serve the viewing public.

One of the Corporation's first tasks should be to study the practicality and the economic advantages of using communication satellites to establish an educational television and radio network. To assist the Corporation, I am directing the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct experiments on the requirements for such a system, and for instructional television, in cooperation with other interested agencies of the Government and the private sector.

Formulation of long-range policies concerning the future of satellite communications requires the most detailed and comprehensive study by the executive branch and the Congress. I anticipate that the appropriate committees of Congress will hold hearings to consider these complex issues of public policy. The executive branch will carefully study these hearings as we shape our recommendations.

INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION

I recommend legislation to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to launch a major study of the values and the promise of instructional television which is being used more and more widely in our classrooms, but whose potential has not been fully developed.

COMPUTERS IN EDUCATION

In my 1968 budget, I propose that the National Science Foundation be given new resources to advance man's knowledge and serve the Nation. Its endeavors will help our scholars better to understand the atmosphere, exploit the ocean's riches, probe the behavior and the nature of man.

The Foundation will also step up its pioneer work to develop new teaching materials for our schools and colleges. The new math and the new science are only the first fruits of this innovative work.

One educational resource holds exciting promise for America's classrooms: the electronic computer. Computers are already at work in educational institutions, primarily to assist the most advanced research. The computer can serve other educational purposes—if we find ways to employ it effectively and economically and if we develop practical courses to teach students how to use it.

I have directed the National Science Foundation working with the U.S. Office of Education to establish an experimental program for developing the potential of computers in education.

ENRICHING THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

Our progress will not be limited to scientific advances. The National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, established in 1965, has already begun to bring new cultural and scholarly spirit to our schools and communities. State arts councils, museums, theaters, and orchestras have received not only new funds but new energy and enthusiasm through the National Endowment for the Arts.

The National Endowment for the Humanities has made grants to support new historical studies of our Nation's heritage, to encourage creative teaching in our colleges, to offer outstanding young scholars opportunities for advancement.

I recommend that Congress appropriate for the National Foundation on the

Arts and Humanities $16 million—an increase of nearly one-third.

HIGHER EDUCATION FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

For many years, America's colleges and universities have prepared men and women for careers involving travel, trade, and service abroad. Today, when our world responsibilities are greater than ever before, our domestic institutions of higher learning need more support for their programs of international studies.

The 89th Congress, in its closing days, passed the International Education Act—an historic measure recognizing this Nation's enduring belief that learning must transcend geographic boundaries. Through a program of grants under the act, America's schools, colleges, and universities can add a world dimension to their students' learning experience.

I urge the Congress to approve promptly my forthcoming request for a supplemental appropriation of $350,000 for the International Education Act, to permit necessary planning for next year's program, as well as an appropriation of $20 million for fiscal 1968.

II. HEALTH

No great age of discovery in history can match our own time. Today, our wealth, our knowledge, our scientific genius give us the power to prolong man's life—and to prevent the erosion of life by illness.

In 1900, an American could expect to live only 49 years. Today, his life expectancy has been increased to 70 years.

These advances are the result of spectacular progress in research, in public health, in the medical arts. We have developed:

Sufficient knowledge to end nearly all of the hazards of childbirth and pregnancy.

Modern nutrition to wipe out such ailments as rickets, goiter, and pellagra.

Vaccines, antibiotics and modern drugs to control many of the killers and cripplers of yesterday: polio, diphtheria, pneumonia.

New medical and surgical techniques to combat cancer and cardiovascular disease.

Lifesaving devices: plastic heart valves, and artificial artery transplants.

In 1967, to pursue this vital work, the Federal Government is investing more than $440 million in the construction of health facilities, $620 million for health manpower education and training, $1.3 billion in biomedical research, $7.8 billion to provide medical care.

But each gain, each victory, should focus our attention more sharply on the unfinished business facing this Nation in the field of health:

Infant mortality is far higher than it need be.

Handicaps afflicting many children are discovered too late or left untreated.

Grave deficiencies remain in health care for the poor, the handicapped and the chronically ill.

American men between the ages of 45 and 54—which should be the most productive years of their lives—have a death rate twice that of men of the same age in a number of advanced countries.

We still search in vain for ways to prevent and treat many forms of cancer. Many types of mental illness, retardation, arthritis and heart disease are still largely beyond our control.

Our national resources for health have grown, but our national aspirations have grown faster. Today we expect what yesterday we could not have envisioned—adequate medical care for every citizen.

My health proposals to the 90th Congress have four basic aims:

To expand our knowledge of disease and our research and development of better ways to deliver health care to every American;

To build our health resources, by stepped-up training of health workers and by improved planning of health facilities;

To remove barriers to good medical care for those who most need care;

To strengthen our partnership for health by encouraging regional, State, and local efforts—public and private—to develop comprehensive programs serving all our citizens.

HEALTH RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT: THE FOUNDATION OF OUR EFFORTS

SUPPORTING BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH

Our progress in health grows out of a research effort unparalleled anywhere in the world. The scientists of the National Institutes of Health have shaped an alliance throughout the Nation to find the causes and the cures of disease.

We must build on the strong base of past research achievements, exchange ideas with scholars and students from all parts of the world, and apply our knowledge more swiftly and effectively.

We must take advantage of our progress in targeted research as we have done in our vaccine development program, in the heart drug study, in artificial kidney and kidney transplant research, and in the treatment of specific types of cancer.

In the 1968 budget, I am recommending an increase of $65 million—to an annual total of almost $1.5 billion—to support biomedical research.

I am seeking funds to establish an International Center for Advanced Study in the Health Sciences and to provide scholarships and fellowships in the Center.

I am directing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to appoint immediately a lung cancer task force, to supplement the continuing work of existing task forces on leukemia, cancer chemotherapy, uterine cancer, solid tumor, and breast cancer.

HEALTH SERVICES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

America's annual spending for health and medical care is more than $43 billion. But despite this investment, our system of providing health services is not operating as efficiently and effectively as it should.

In some U.S. counties infant mortality rates, one yardstick of health care, are 300 percent higher than the national average.

Seventy percent of automobile accident deaths occur in communities of less than 2,500 people, where medical facilities are often poorest.

Even though we have good techniques for detecting and curing cervical cancer, 8,000 women die each year for lack of proper care.

Emergency rooms in U.S. hospitals are seriously overcrowded, not with actual emergency cases, but with people who cannot find normal outpatient care anywhere else.

Research and development could help eliminate these conditions by pointing the way to better delivery of health care. Yet the Government-wide total investment in health service research amounts to less than one-tenth of 1 percent of our total annual investment in health care.

We have done very little to mobilize American universities, industry, private practitioners, and research institutions to seek new ways of providing medical services.

There have been few experiments in applying advanced methods—systems analysis and automation, for example—to problems of health care.

Our superior research techniques have brought us new knowledge in health and medicine. These same techniques must now be put to work in the effort to bring low cost, quality health care to our citizens.

We must marshal the Nation's best minds to:

Design hospitals, nursing homes and group practice facilities which provide effective care with the most efficient use of funds and manpower;

Develop new ways of assisting doctors to reach more people with good health services;

Devise new patterns of health services.

To begin this effort, I have directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish a National Center for Health Services Research and Development.

I recommend legislation to expand health services research and make possible the fullest use of Federal hospitals as research centers to improve health care.

I also recommend an appropriation of $20 million to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1968, for research and development in health services—nearly twice as much as in 1967.

DEVELOPING MANPOWER AND FACILITIES FOR HEALTH

HEALTH MANPOWER

The United States is facing a serious shortage of health manpower. Within the next decade this Nation will need 1 million more health workers. If we are to meet this need, we must develop new skills and new types of health workers. We need short-term training programs for medical aids and other health workers; we need programs to develop physicians' assistants, and speed the training of health professions. We also need to make effective use of the thousands of medical corpsmen trained in the Armed Forces who return to civilian life each year.

Last May, I appointed a National Advisory Commission on Health Manpower to recommend how we can:

Speed the education of doctors and other health personnel without sacrificing the quality of training;

Improve the use of health manpower both in and outside the Government.

Meanwhile, I directed members of my Cabinet to intensify their efforts to relieve health manpower shortages through Federal programs. This week they reported to me that federally supported programs in 1967 will train 224,000 health workers—an increase of nearly 100,000 over 1966. Thirty thousand previously inactive nurses and technicians will be given refresher training this year.

Through the teamwork of Federal and State agencies, professional organizations, and educational institutions, we have launched a major effort to provide facilities and teachers for this immense training mission.

To maintain this stepped-up training already started in fiscal year 1967, I am recommending expenditures of $763 million—a 22-percent increase for fiscal year 1968—to expand our health manpower resources.

PLANNING FOR FUTURE HEALTH FACILITIES

Over the past two decades, the Hill-Burton program has assisted more than 3,400 communities to build hospitals, nursing homes and other health care centers. Hill-Burton funds have helped to provide 350,000 hospital and nursing home beds, and to bring modern medical services to millions of Americans. The authorization for this program expires on June 30, 1969. The contribution of the Federal Government in financing construction of health facilities has changed, especially with the beginning of medicare, medicaid, and other new programs. It is timely, therefore, that we take a fresh look at this area.

I am appointing a National Advisory Commission on Health Facilities to study our needs for the total system of health facilities—hospitals, extended care facilities, nursing homes, long-term care institutions, and clinics. In addition to considering the future of the Hill-Burton program, the Commission will make recommendations for financing the construction and modernization of health facilities.

ELIMINATING BARRIERS TO HEALTH CARE

In previous messages to Congress this year, I have made recommendations to:

Extend medicare to 1.5 million seriously disabled Americans under age 65.

Establish new health services through broader maternal and child health programs; a strengthened crippled children's program, and new projects in child health and dental care.

Improve medical services for the needy under medicaid.

Combat mental retardation by supporting construction of university and community centers for the mentally retarded, and for the first time, helping to staff the community centers.

Guarantee the safety of medical devices and laboratory tests by requiring Food and Drug Administration preclearance of devices, and by requiring licensing of clinical laboratories in interstate commerce.

We must act in other ways to overcome barriers to health care.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has developed a program of Neighborhood Health Centers which not only bring modern medical care to the poor but also train citizens for jobs in the health field.

Last year, Congress endorsed this new approach and authorized funds for 24 such centers. More are needed.

I am requesting the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to encourage communities to establish additional centers. Our goal will be to double the number of centers in fiscal 1968.

In the past 4 years, we have launched a new program to attack mental illness through community mental health centers. This program is now well underway. More centers are needed, and we must strengthen and expand existing services.

I recommend legislation to extend and improve the Community Mental Health Centers Act.

Among the most tragically neglected of our citizens are those who are both deaf and blind. More than 3,000 Americans today face life unable to see and hear.

To help reach the deaf-blind with the best programs our experts can devise, I recommend legislation to establish a National Center for the Deaf and Blind.

ENDING HOSPITAL DISCRIMINATION

With the launching of the medicare program last July, the Nation took a major step toward ending racial segregation in hospitals.

More than 95 percent of the Nation's hospitals have already complied with the antidiscrimination requirements of the medicare legislation. They are guaranteeing that there will be no "second-class patients" in our health-care institutions; that all citizens can enter the same door, enjoy the same facilities and the same quality of treatment.

We will continue to work for progress in this field—until equality of treatment is the rule not in some, but in all of our hospitals and other health facilities.

RISING MEDICAL COSTS

In 1950, the average cost per patient per day in a hospital was $14.40. In 1965, this cost more than tripled to over $45. Other health costs have also risen sharply in recent years.

Last August, I asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to initiate a study of medical costs. This study, now completed, indicates that medical costs will almost certainly continue to rise. It emphasizes the absolute necessity of using medical resources more efficiently if we are to moderate this increase in the cost of health care.

This is a job for everyone who plays a part in providing or financing medical care—the medical profession, the hospital industry, insurance carriers, State and local governments and many other private and public groups. Federal programs must also play a role in promoting cost consciousness in medical care.

The new National Center for Health Services Research and Development will develop ways to make our medical systems more efficient. The Center's first assignment will be to develop new ways to improve the use of professional and auxiliary health workers—a key factor in reducing hospital costs.

We can take other steps.

I am directing Secretary John Gardner to convene, at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a National Conference on Medical Costs.

This Conference will bring together leaders of the medical community and members of the public to discuss how we can lower the costs of medical services without impairing the quality.

In the weeks and months ahead, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will consult with representatives of the medical profession, universities, business, and labor to:

Find practical incentives for the effective operation of hospitals and other health facilities.

Reduce the costs of construction and speed the modernization of hospitals, nursing homes, and extended care facilities.

Support those innovations in medical education which will lead to better training programs and promote the efficient practice of medicine.

OUR PARTNERSHIP FOR HEALTH

The partnership for health legislation, enacted by the 89th Congress, is designed to strengthen State and local programs and to encourage broad-gage planning in health. It gives the States new flexibility to use Federal funds by freeing them from tightly compartmentalized grant programs. It also allows the States to attack special health problems which have special regional or local impact.

I recommend that Congress extend the partnership for health legislation for 4 years; provide supplemental appropriations for planning in fiscal 1967 and total appropriations of $161 million—an increase of $41 million—in fiscal 1968.

Our regional medical programs for heart disease, cancer, and stroke depend on a second partnership, involving doctors, medical schools, hospitals, and State and local health departments. These programs will bring to every citizen the fruits of our Nation's research into the killer diseases. They will also promote the continuing education of the Nation's doctors, nurses, and other health workers.

To sustain these nationwide programs, I recommend an appropriation of $64 million for fiscal 1968—an increase of $19 million over 1967.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

Occupational health and safety is another area in which we need to strengthen our partnership with labor, industry, medicine, and government.

In 1965, more than 14,000 job-connected deaths and 2 million disabling work injuries caused untold misery and privation to workers, 230 million lost man-days of production, and billions of dollars in lost income.

We must learn more about the nature of job-connected injuries, so we can set effective safety standards and develop better protective measures.

I am recommending in the 1968 budget an appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of $8.1 million—a 25-percent increase over this year—to expand research and training programs in occupational health, and to strengthen State and local public health programs in this field.

I am directing the Secretary of Labor to improve and strengthen health protection and safety standards for workers through cooperative Federal-State programs.

III. TO FULFILL THE INDIVIDUAL

As a people, we have wanted many things, achieved many things. We have become the richest, the mightiest, the most productive nation in the world.

Yet a nation may accumulate dollars, grow in power, pile stone on stone—and still fall short of greatness. The measure of a people is not how much they achieve—but what they achieve.

Which of our pursuits is most worthy of our devotion? If we were required to choose, I believe we would place one item at the top of the list: fulfillment of the individual.

If that is what we seek, mere wealth and power cannot help us. We must also act—in definable and practical ways—to liberate each individual from conditions which stunt his growth, assault his dignity, diminish his spirit. Those enemies we know: ignorance, illness, want, squalor, tyranny, injustice.

To fulfill the individual—this is the purpose of my proposals. They present an opportunity—and an obligation—to the 90th Congress.

I hope and believe this Congress will live up to the high expectations of a progressive and humanitarian America.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 28, 1967*.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Subcommittee on Securities of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The Subcommittee on Government Research of the Committee on Government Operations.

On request of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Public Works was permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Ramsey Clark, of Texas, to be Attorney General, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maurine B. Neuberger, of Oregon, to be a member of the General Advisory Committee of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William S. Gaud, of Connecticut, to be U.S. Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I believe we are extremely fortunate in having as an Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. William B. Macomber, Jr., of New York. In years past he served in that same capacity in the Eisenhower administration. His devotion to public service has been outstanding. I am confident that he will perform his duties as he always has performed—capably, diligently, and with broad understanding of the problems involved. I recall his great assistance in informing and serving the Members of this body and those of the House. I welcome his appointment. I only add that I deeply regret the departure of Douglas MacArthur II. I understand, however, he will be named Ambassador to a most important country, a position in which he will serve with great distinction.

Further, I wish to express my delight that our former colleague, Maurine Neuberger, has just been confirmed by the Senate as a member of the General Advisory Committee of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Her service there, I am sure, will equal her outstanding service here in the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

Trade and Other Transactions Involving Southern Rhodesia

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, Executive Order No. 11322, relating to trade and other transactions involving Southern Rhodesia (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report on Agricultural Conservation Program

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the agricultural conservation program, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Wholesome Meat Act

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify and otherwise amend the Meat Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State meat inspection programs, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Alaska Communications Disposal Act

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned long-lines communication facilities in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Financing of Operations of the Bureau of the Mint

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the financing of the operations of the Bureau of the Mint, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Appropriations for Acquisition of Certain Properties by Secretary of Defense

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1967 for use by the Secretary of Defense for acquisition of properties pursuant to section 1013 of Public Law 89–754, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report of Civil Aeronautics Board

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Recommendation Against Recapture of the Empire District Electric Co.'s Ozark Beach Hydroelectric Project

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting its recommendation against recapture of the Empire District Electric Co.'s Ozark Beach hydroelectric project (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Proposed Legislation Relating to the District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of July 11, 1947, to authorize members of the District of Columbia Fire Department, the U.S. Park Police force, and the

White House Police force to participate in the Metropolitan Police Department Band, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that the Commissioners may accept or permit the acceptance of the performance by volunteers of services for and on behalf of the muncipal government of the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5 of the act of February 11, 1929, to remove the dollar limit on the authority of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims of the District of Columbia in escheat cases (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 5 of the United States Code with respect to pay received by public school teachers of the District of Columbia for employment during the summer vacation period (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to transfer from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia court of general sessions the authority to waive certain provisions relating to the issuance of a marriage license in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Establishment of Highway Safety and Beauty Trust Fund

A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a highway safety and beauty trust fund (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

Extension of Authorization To Make Appropriations for Allocations and Grants for Collection and Publication of Certain Documentary Sources

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 503(f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend for a period of 10 years the authorization to make appropriations for allocations and grants for the collection and publication of documentary sources significant to the history of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Reports of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on savings available through expanded use of regional contracts for the repair and maintenance of selected office machines, General Services Administration, dated February 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on potential savings available in manpower costs of railway post offices, Post Office Department, dated February 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on potential savings in the procurement of spare aircraft parts for outfitting aircraft carriers, Department of the Navy, dated February 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on potential savings through constructing rather than leasing housing at Brewerville, Liberia, U.S. Information Agency, dated February 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Appropriations for Saline Water Conversion Program

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program, to expand the program, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Tort Claims Paid by Department of Labor

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, during the calendar year 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Claims Paid by the Agency for International Development Under Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964

A letter from the Director, Congressional Liaison, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on claims paid by that Agency, during the calendar year 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Proposed Relief Bills

A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting two drafts of proposed legislation, as follows: For the relief of Dino J. Caterini and for the relief of Robert M. Gilkey, Jr. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Admission Into the United States of Certain Defector Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of National Mediation Board

A letter from the Acting Chairman, National Mediation Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1966 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Cost Ascertainment Report, Post Office Department

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, the cost ascertainment report of the Post Office Department, for the fiscal year 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Proceedings of Annual Meeting of Board of Regents, Smithsonian Institution

A letter from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, the proceedings of the meeting of the Board of Regents of that Institution, held on January 25, 1967 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Appropriations to Atomic Energy Commission

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Disposition of Executive Papers

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Finance:

"H. Con. Res. —

A concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact a bill introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives by Edward J. Gurney, to liberalize pension rules for veterans and their widows

"Whereas, Edward J. Gurney, R-Florida, introduced a bill to liberalize pension rules for veterans and their widows; and

"Whereas, the bill calls for a ten percent increase in veterans' widows pensions; and

"Whereas, both types of pensions are now reduced when there is income from other sources and this measure would permit higher levels of other income; and

"Whereas, the allowable income from other sources for veterans and their widows without dependents is now limited to six hundred dollars, and would be increased by this bill to one thousand dollars; and where it is now limited to twelve hundred dollars, it would be increased by this bill to seventeen hundred dollars; and where it is now limited to eighteen hundred dollars, it would be increased by this bill to twenty-six hundred dollars; and

"Whereas, when there are dependents the corresponding changes would be one thousand dollars to sixteen hundred dollars; two thousand dollars to twenty-seven hundred dollars; and three thousand dollars to thirty-eight hundred dollars; and

"Whereas, the General Assembly believes this to be suitable and necessary legislation for the welfare of the veterans and their widows: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring,* That Congress be memorialized to enact, without delay, the bill introduced by Edward J. Gurney, R-Florida, to liberalize pension rules for veterans and their widows; be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each United States Senator from

South Carolina, each member of the House of Representatives of Congress from South Carolina, the Clerk of the Senate of the United States and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"State of South Carolina, in the House of Representatives, Columbia, S.C., January 26, 1967.

"I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a Resolution adopted by the South Carolina House of Representatives and concurred in by the Senate.

"[SEAL] "Inez Watson,
"Clerk of the House."

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for an orderly and mandatory expansion of the national cemetery system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond], I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record two resolutions recently adopted by both houses of the South Carolina General Assembly requesting the Secretary of Agriculture to provide for more loose leaf tobacco sales on South Carolina markets in 1967.

The concurrent resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

A Concurrent Resolution Requesting the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture To Provide for the Sale of Loose Leaf Tobacco in South Carolina

Whereas, the offices of the Governor of South Carolina and the Commissioner of Agriculture for South Carolina have recently conducted a farm to farm survey among the tobacco producers in South Carolina to ascertain the wishes of the growers as to the marketing of loose leaf sales for the 1967 flue-cured tobacco crop; and

Whereas, the questionnaire or survey sheets returned represent growers of 71,428.47 acres, out of a total allotment of 77,000 acres of tobacco planted in South Carolina for the farm year 1966; and

Whereas, the recent survey figures reveal ninety per cent of the South Carolina tobacco growers favor a full season of loose leaf sales, nine per cent favor a split season of loose leaf and tied tobacco, four-tenths of one per cent favor a full season of all tied tobacco and six-tenths of one per cent expressed no preference, and

Whereas, the South Carolina tobacco growers and others deem it unwise to force loose leaf stocks on export markets until such markets have had time to arrange for storage facilities and equipment for handling loose leaf stocks. Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate, the House of Representatives concurring:

That the Honorable Orville Freeman, United States Secretary of Agriculture, is requested that loose leaf sales of tobacco in South Carolina be permitted for the 1967 flue-cured tobacco crop and that sales be slowed down to the point where congestion would not develop.

Be it further resolved that a combination of loose leaf and tied tobacco sales be permitted and that the price support be provided on all grades of tobacco.

Be it further resolved, that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Orville Freeman, to the Chairman of the Public Hearing scheduled to be held in Marion, South Carolina, on Monday, February 20, 1967, to the Governor of South Carolina, to the Commissioner of Agriculture for South Carolina and to members of the United States Senate and members of Congress from South Carolina.

A Concurrent Resolution Requesting the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture To Provide for the Sale of Loose Leaf Tobacco in South Carolina

Whereas, the offices of the Governor of South Carolina and the Commissioner of Agriculture for South Carolina have recently conducted a farm to farm survey among the tobacco producers in South Carolina to ascertain the wishes of the growers as to the marketing of loose leaf sales for the 1967 flue-cured tobacco crop; and

Whereas, the questionnaire or survey sheets returned represent growers of 71,428.47 acres, out of a total allotment of 77,000 acres of tobacco planted in South Carolina for the farm year 1966; and

Whereas, the recent survey figures reveal ninety per cent of the South Carolina tobacco growers favor a full season of loose leaf sales, nine per cent favor a split season of loose leaf and tied tobacco, four-tenths of one per cent favor a full season of all tied tobacco and six-tenths of one per cent expressed no preference; and

Whereas, the South Carolina tobacco growers and others deem it unwise to force loose leaf stocks on export markets until such markets have had time to arrange for storage facilities and equipment for handling loose leaf stocks: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, That the Honorable Orville Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, is requested that loose leaf sales of tobacco in South Carolina be permitted for the 1967 flue-cured tobacco crop and that sales be slowed down to the point where congestion would not develop; be it further

Resolved, that a combination of loose leaf and tied tobacco sales be permitted and that the price support be provided on all grades of tobacco; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Orville Freeman, to the Chairman of the Public Hearing scheduled to be held in Marion, S.C., on Monday, February 20, 1967, to the Governor of South Carolina, to the Commissioner of Agriculture for South Carolina and to members of the United States Senate and members of Congress from South Carolina.

State of South Carolina in the House of Representatives, Columbia, S.C., February 22, 1967.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a Resolution adopted by the South Carolina House of Representatives and concurred in by the Senate.

[SEAL]

Inez Watson,
Clerk of the House.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mrs. SMITH:

S. 1093. A bill to authorize the use of the vessel *Annie B.* in the coastwise trade; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LAUSCHE (for himself, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, and Mr. Williams of Delaware):

S. 1094. A bill to make it a Federal offense to incite or participate in a riot which impairs interstate or foreign commerce or to interfere with a fireman or law enforcement officer who is performing official duties incident to and during such a riot, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Lausche when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 1095. A bill to provide for the establishment of the William Howard Taft National Historic Site; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. Lausche when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1096. A bill for the relief of David Chin (Hing Yuey Chin or Leung Hing Yuey); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 1097. A bill for the relief of Arley L. Been, aviation electrician's mate chief, U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1098. A bill to amend the act of September 26, 1950, authorizing the Sacramento Valley irrigation canals, Central Valley project, California, in order to increase the capacity of certain project features for future irrigation of additional lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kuchel when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1099. A bill to amend the public health laws relating to mental retardation to extend, expand, and improve them, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. McINTYRE:

S. 1100. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, so as to give a five point preference on civil service examinations to veterans who served in the Armed Forces after July 1, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. McIntyre when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1101. A bill to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program, to expand the program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Jackson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 1102. A bill for the relief of Leonard J. O'Keefe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1103. A bill to provide additional protection for the rights of participants in employee pension and profit-sharing-retirement plans, to establish minimum standards for pension and profit-sharing-retirement plan vesting and funding, to establish a pension plan reinsurance program, to provide for portability of pension credits, to provide for regulation of the administration of pension and other employee benefit plans, to establish a U.S. Pension and Employee Benefit Plan Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE (for himself, Mr. Clark, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Kuchel, and Mr. Tydings):

S. 1104. A bill to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive branch; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1105. A bill for the relief of Dr. G. F. Valdes-Fauli;

S. 1106. A bill for the relief of Dr. David Castaneda;

S. 1107. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pedro A. Ruiz;

S. 1108. A bill for the relief of Dr. Felix C. Caballol and wife, Lucia J. Caballol;

S. 1109. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ramon E. Oyarzun; and

S. 1110. A bill for the relief of Dr. Manuel Alpendre Seisdedos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 1111. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the San Felipe division, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CANNON (for himself and Mr. BIBLE):

S. 1112. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the occupational tax on coin-operated gaming devices for similar taxes presently imposed by a State where the operation of such devices is legal; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CANNON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1113. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Dinosaur Trail National Monument in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1114. A bill for the relief of Peter Soon Sang Rhee and his wife, Ruth I. Rhee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1115. A bill for the relief of Nina B. Whitney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELL:

S. 1116. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act so as to extend and improve the Federal-State program of child-welfare services; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. PELL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1117. A bill to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1118. A bill for the relief of Clyde M. Russell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 1119. A bill to grant minerals, including oil and gas, on certain lands in the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., to certain Indians, and for other purposes; and

S. 1120. A bill to grant minerals, including oil, gas, and other natural deposits, on certain lands in the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, Mont., to certain Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1121. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to classify as wilderness the national forest lands known as the Lincoln Back Country, and parts of the Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests, in Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS (by request):

S. 1122. A bill for the relief of Comdr. Edward White Rawlins, U.S. Navy (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. TYDINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1123. A bill relating to the status under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 of the Local 738, I.B.T.—National Tea Company Employees' Retirement Fund; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. COTTON):

S. 1124. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a fire research and safety program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 1122 TO COURT OF CLAIMS FOR A REPORT THEREON

Mr. TYDINGS, by request, submitted a resolution (S. Res. 90) to refer the bill (S. 1122) entitled "A bill for the relief of Comdr. Edward White Rawlins, U.S. Navy (retired)" to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims for a report thereon, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. TYDINGS, which appears under a separate heading.)

TO PROHIBIT THE SLAUGHTERING OF ELK IN YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK

Mr. HANSEN submitted a resolution (S. Res. 91) prohibiting the slaughtering of elk in Yellowstone National Park, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. HANSEN, which appears under a separate heading.)

FEDERAL OFFENSE TO INCITE OR PARTICIPATE IN CERTAIN RIOTS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The bill contemplates making it a Federal offense for persons promoting or participating in a riot which in any manner interferes with the free flow of interstate commerce. It also provides that if there is any interference with firemen in the performance of their duties in extinguishing fires, as an incident of an interference with interstate commerce, such action shall likewise constitute criminal misconduct in violation of Federal law.

My bill has its origin in thought in the instances where interstate commerce has been blocked by rioters and incidentally interfering with firemen attempting to extinguish fires caused by the riot.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1094) to make it a Federal offense to incite or participate in a riot which impairs interstate or foreign commerce or to interfere with a fireman or law enforcement officer who is performing official duties incident to and during such a riot, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LAUSCHE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, if the Senator from Ohio has no objection, that my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes; I am glad to have the Senator as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name also be added as a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. With the consent of the Senate, I would also like to have the Senator from Delaware become a cosponsor of the bill, as he has indicated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1095) to provide for the establishment of the William Howard Taft National Historic Site, introduced by Mr. LAUSCHE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to have the birthplace of William Howard Taft declared to be a national historic site. This distinguished Ohioan occupied the office of the Presidency and was also a Chief Justice of the United States.

There is no adequate memorial in honor of former President William Howard Taft. The Taft family has now acquired control of the Alphonso Taft house, where William Howard Taft was born in 1857. The father of William Howard Taft, Alphonso Taft, was a distinguished American. He was a leading judge in Ohio. He was Secretary of War and Attorney General under President Grant and also Minister to Austria and Russia.

The family, through a nonprofit corporation, the William Howard Taft Memorial Association, has, with its own finances, restored a part of the old house, but has encountered insurmountable barriers. It is for that reason that I have introduced the bill.

TEHAMA-COLUSA CANAL ENLARGEMENT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to enlarge positions of the Tehama-Colusa Canal to allow it to serve adequately the Central Valley project as presently planned. The Central Valley project, in my State of California, was designed to bring water to the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys. The Tehama-Colusa Canal, when completed, will run from Red Bluff in Tehama County to a point near the boundaries of Colusa and Yolo Counties, a distance of some 126 miles.

As presently proposed, the canal will be adequate only to serve the area originally planned. However, the proposed West Sacramento Valley project, when authorized and built, will provide service to the counties of Yolo and Solano, which lie south of the present area served. The water for this new worthwhile project will travel the same route as the Tehama-Colusa Canal. It will travel in the Tehama-Colusa if that conduit is enlarged, in accordance with the legislation introduced today, to be able to handle the added capacity. If it is not enlarged, an entirely new canal will have to be constructed parallel to the Tehama-Colusa Canal. The folly of this approach is apparent.

My bill will allow the Secretary of the Interior to enlarge the capacity and adjust the elevation of the Tehama-Colusa Canal to provide service to the additional areas to be served by the West Sacramento Valley project when completed. This approach will have construction costs, as well as reducing the amount of land which would be taken off the local tax rolls by virtue of constructing a parallel canal. In this way the local area will be doubly served.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record as requested by the Senator from California.

The bill (S. 1098) to amend the act of September 26, 1950, authorizing the Sacramento Valley irrigation canals, Central Valley project, California, in order to increase the capacity of certain project features for future irrigation of additional lands, introduced by Mr. Kuchel, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1098

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize Sacramento Valley irrigation canals, Central Valley project California," approved September 26, 1950 (64 Stat. 1036), is amended by adding to the first paragraph of that section the following: "Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to provide sufficient extra capacity and elevation in the Tehama-Colusa Canal to enable future water service to Yolo, Solano, Lake, and Napa Counties for irrigation and other purposes, and to treat the cost of providing such extra capacity as a deferred obligation. The deferred obligation is to be paid under arrangements to be made at such time as the works to serve the additional areas may be authorized as an extension of the Central Valley project. In the event such works are not authorized, the deferred obligation is to be paid from other revenues of the Central Valley project."

FIVE-POINT PREFERENCE ON CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATIONS TO CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide meaningful and statutory five-point veterans preference for those veterans who were supposedly given this preference already by the Veterans Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966.

The background and need for this bill can be simply explained. In the last Congress we enacted the Veterans Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966, which purported to give those cold war veterans who had served for 180 or more consecutive days after July 1, 1955, preference on civil service examinations under the Veterans Preference Act of 1944, as amended.

The 1966 act did provide preference for cold war veterans. It did not specify how this preference was to be granted.

On March 2, 1966, after the bill had been sent to the President for his signature, but before it was signed, the Civil Service Commission issued its Federal Personnel Manual Letter 211-3, which dealt with the problem posed by the new legislation. The Commission ruled that the newly covered veterans would receive, by regulation, as opposed to legislation, the same five-point preference which was already given by statute to other preference eligibles.

What the bill that I am introducing today does is to grant by statute what is presently being granted by regulation.

I believe that the veterans of the cold war, including those now fighting in Southeast Asia, deserve the same treatment which was extended to their predecessors on the battlefields of Korea, and World War I and II.

I believe that our veterans laws will be more consistent and logical if we extend this five-point preference by statute, as we have done for all previous veterans, and not have some benefits conferred by statute and others by regulation. Finally, I believe that our cold war veterans will feel more secure in their rights if they need not rely upon a simple regulation of a Government agency, but are able to rest assured that their rights are spelled out in the law of the land.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1100) to amend title 5, United States Code, so as to give a five-point preference on civil service examinations to veterans who served in the Armed Forces after July 1, 1955, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McIntyre, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE SALINE CONVERSION PROGRAM

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, by request I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize appropriations and expand the program for saline water conversion.

The program which was authorized under the act of July 3, 1952, dealt primarily with basic research. The basic research must continue, but the success of the program indicates we must now move ahead with testing and practical application.

To do this, we must expand the existing program its authorization for the fiscal years 1968 through 1970.

Fifteen years ago it cost an estimated $5 per thousand gallons to convert salt water into fresh water. Today, this can be done for 40 cents per thousand in moderately large plants. In larger, dual-purpose plants such as the proposed Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, this could be accomplished for 25 cents per thousand.

Mr. President, this is an area of great promise in the solution of our water shortage problem. I request that the letter from the Secretary of Interior requesting this legislation, and the text of the proposed bill, appear in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1101) to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program, to expand the program, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Jackson, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1101

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of July 3, 1952 (66 Stat. 328), as amended (42 U.S.C. 1961 et seq.), is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) In section 8 substitute "$188,082,000, plus such additional sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize and appropriate but not to exceed $86,918,000," in lieu of $90,000,000, plus such additional sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize and appropriate but not to exceed $185,000,000,".

(b) In subsection 2(b) add the words "test bed," after the word "laboratory,".

(c) At the end of subsection 2(b) add the following:

"the five demonstration plants authorized by the joint resolution of September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1706), as amended (42 U.S.C. 1958 (d)), shall hereafter be regarded as test beds subject to the provisions of this Act. The provisions of sections 3 and 6 of such joint resolution, and those provisions of section 4 relating to the method of disposal and disposition of the proceeds of sale shall also continue to be applicable to them;".

(d) In subsection 2(c) insert the word "prototype" and delete the world "demonstration".

(e) By adding a new section 9 to read as follows:

"This Act may be cited as the 'Saline Water Conversion Act'."

The letter presented by Mr. Jackson is as follows:

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., February 27, 1967.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "To authorize appropriations for the Saline Water Conversion Program, to expand the program, and for other purposes." We recommend that the enclosed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

The program for the development of saline water conversion processes is making significant progress in its efforts to develop economic methods for producing fresh water from saline and brackish waters. It has supplied incentives for the development of desalting technology and has encouraged the growth of an increasingly valuable and significant scientific program.

The program authorized under the Act of July 3, 1952, was focused primarily upon basic research. While basic research efforts must continue, the program is now at the stage where it must place growing emphasis on the testing and practical application of the earlier research effort. To achieve this purpose, it is necessary to expand the existing saline water conversion program authorization in order to cover the proposed program for Fiscal Years 1968 through 1970. The enclosed bill has been drafted to accomplish these needs.

The Act of July 3, 1952 (Public Law 82-448), as amended, authorizes "to be appropriated such sums, to remain available until expended, as may be necessary, but not more than $90,000,000, plus such additional sums as the Congress may hereafter *authorize and appropriate,* but not to exceed $185,000,000" (emphasis supplied). Through Fiscal Year 1967, $82,500,000 has been appropriated. The remaining amount, $7,500,000, plus $15,782,000, is required to meet the total program Fiscal Year 1968 appropriation request of $23,282,000. Based on current estimates the appropriations required for Fiscal Years 1969 and 1970 are $39.3 and $43.0 million respectively. Thus, the draft bill authorizes the current authorization to be increased from $90,000,000 to $188,082,000, and reduces the $185,000,000 figure included in the current bill to $86,918,000 to reflect the increased authorization requested for these years.

With the authorization for Fiscal Year 1968, we will be able to meet the program goals of the following four major activities:

1. Operating expenses for research and development, $18,532,000;

2. Design, construction, modification, operation and maintenance of saline water conversion test beds and test facilities, $4,298,000;

3. Design construction, acquisition, modification, operation and maintenance of saline water conversion modules, $2,190,000;

4. Administration and coordination, $1,762,000.

The above listed amounts require some explanation. First, the four activities total $26,782,000, which is the sum of "total obligations for "Salaries and Expenses" and "Operation and Maintenance" shown in the Fiscal Year 1968 budget. Secondly, the total is $3,500,000 more than the appropriation requested for Fiscal Year 1968 in order to reflect the funds appropriated for Fiscal Year 1967 but not now planned to be obligated.

The four program activities are defined as follows:

1. *Operating expenses for research and development*. This includes all programs authorized under the Act of July 3, 1952, as amended, except those identified with other program activities.

2. *Saline water conversion test beds and test facilities*. Test beds are intermediate-size plants used as experimental tools. They are designed to facilitate the introduction of experimental hardware into the conversion process, for performance testing. Proposed for inclusion under this heading are the five demonstration plants authorized by the joint resolution of September 2, 1958 (Public Law 85-883). It is proposed in the draft bill to transfer the modification, operation, and maintenance of these plants to the authority of the amended 1952 Act. The plants have adequately demonstrated the concepts for which they were originally designed and now better serve the function of test beds. Test facilities are sites including building, utilities, and other services used for the purpose of conducting research and engineering and development projects which provide module, test bed, pilot plant, and component test operations.

3. *Saline water conversion modules*. These are sections of prototype plants which simulate the operation of a complete plant and confirm essential design features.

4. *Administration and coordination*. This includes planning, supervisory, technical and administrative activities within the Office of Saline Water related to its research and development contract and grant program, program analysis, feasibility studies, water economics investigations, and associated administrative support activities.

For Fiscal Years 1969 and 1970 detailed discussions of program status and planned activities will be prescribed to the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs well in advance of appropriation hearings.

In administering the saline water conversion program, it is the Department's goal to maintain every degree of control necessary to insure that the obligated amounts set forth above will not be exceeded for any of the four major program activities. Nevertheless, because of the very nature of a research and development program it is recognized that program requirements may occasionally change during the fiscal year. For the most part, these program changes will be minor. However, in the event of unanticipated changes that necessitate a significant increase in any of the activities, the Department will keep both Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs fully informed of the need for reprograming. Further, no reprograming action will be taken to increase the amount specified for administration and coordination or to provide funds for the construction, acquisition, or modification of a prototype plant.

In addition to authorizing appropriations for the program for Fiscal Years 1968 through 1970, the bill makes a series of amendments to the Act of July 3, 1952, as amended. One of the amendments is to insert, following the word "laboratory" in subsection 2(b), the words "test bed". As indicated, "test beds" include the demonstration plants as well as any future intermediate-size plants needed to develop various desalting processes. The demonstration plants are no longer being used as such. They can be of great value to the program when used as test beds, and it is proposed that they be made subject to the basic saline water Act. They will, however, remain subject to section 3 (Financial Assistance from Public Agencies), section 6 (Contracts for Materials and Supplies), and part of section 4 (which recognizes State equities). The portion of section 4 which requires the plants to be disposed of at the end of twelve years (1970) will no longer apply; the plants may be retained as long as they are needed for the program, which is presently authorized through Fiscal Year 1972.

Subsection 2(c) of the 1952 Act is amended to substitute the word "prototype" for the word "demonstration". This revision is in accord with the terminology currently in use within the program when referring * * * a new section 9 is added to the 1952 Act which provides that the Act may be cited as the "Saline Water Conversion Act".

The enclosed bill will permit a new step forward in the development of processes for the economical conversion of saline waters for beneficial consumptive use. We urge its immediate consideration and approval.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that this proposed legislation is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK C. DI LUZIO,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

PENSION AND EMPLOYEE BENEFIT ACT OF 1967

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill entitled "The Pension and Employee Benefit Act of 1967." This bill, in my judgment, is the first truly comprehensive legislative proposal to deal with the major problems and defects in our private pension plan system.

As the ranking minority member of the committee having principal charge of such matters, I have introduced the bill as a matter of duty.

The principal provisions of the bill are a creation and development of the thinking of the minority counsel of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Frank Cummings, a member of the bars of New York and the District of Columbia, who is about to leave that service—as of today, as a matter of fact—to go with a New York law firm. In my judgment, I think the whole Nation owes him a debt of gratitude for the work he has done on a very comprehensive plan to deal with problems of pension and welfare funds.

This bill, which, as I have said, deals with the major problems and defects in our private pension plan system, would accomplish the following:

First, the bill would establish minimum vesting standards for pension plans, thereby giving assurance that no pension plan could set its eligibility standards so high as to deny pension eligibility to all but a few employees.

Second, the bill would establish minimum funding standards, thereby giving assurance that pension funds will be operated on a sound and solvent basis, enabling the fund to deliver the benefits which have been promised.

Third, the bill would establish a program of pension plan reinsurance so that plans meeting the vesting and funding standards of the bill would be insured against termination, and retirees would be insured against loss of benefits when an employer goes out of business before the plan has been fully funded.

Fourth, the bill would provide for the establishment of a special central portability fund, participation in which would be on a voluntary basis, enabling pension plans to have a central clearinghouse of pension credits for persons transferring from one employer to another.

Fifth, the bill would establish certain minimum standards of conduct, restrictions on conflicts of interest, and other ethical criteria which are to be followed in the administration of pension plans and other plans providing benefits for employees.

Sixth, the bill would establish a U.S. Pension and Employee Benefit Plan Commission to administer the requirements of this bill. The Commission would be given sufficient enforcement powers to insure compliance, but the bill also provides for judicial review, insuring to the maximum feasible extent against arbitrary exercise of the Commission's powers.

And seventh, the bill consolidates in the Commission most existing Federal regulatory standards relating to pension and welfare plans, thereby relieving employers, unions, insurance companies and banks of the necessity of dealing with multiple Federal agencies—such as the Labor Department under the Disclosure Act or the Treasury Department under the pension provisions of the tax code. Under this bill, a qualification certificate from the Pension Commission will be sufficient to satisfy most, if not all, Federal regulatory statutes governing employee benefit plans.

I. BACKGROUND

Mr. President, there are now almost $100 billion in private pension plans, yet there is almost no Federal regulation of the conduct of these plans' affairs, no minimum standards governing their establishment or operation, and, far too often, no practical means by which a beneficiary can secure his rights.

Mr. President, I am committed to preserving, fostering, and improving the private pension plan system. I join those who also want to improve social security, but I have no illusions that social security will ever, or ought ever, to replace private pension plans. For private plans serve a dual purpose of supplementing the very limited benefits payable under social security while at the same time providing very substantial funds for investment, thereby fostering the growth of this Nation's economy.

Two years ago, the President's Committee on Corporate Pension Funds issued a report, which has become the "bible" in this field, in which it was recommended that every pension plan be required to "provide some reasonable measure of vesting for the protection of employees"; that minimum funding standards be established because "inadequate funding of private pension plans under present standards places an unwarranted financial risk on employees during their retirement years"; that "the possibility of developing an institution arrangement for transferring and accumulating private pension credits deserves serious study"; and that, although funding provides some measure of protection for retirees, it "may not protect plan participants from losing at least some of their equity in the event of a plan's termination," and, to meet the latter problem, the idea of reinsurance "is worthy of serious study."

That was 2 years ago, but as far as I know, no comprehensive plan for implementation of the recommendations of the President's Committee has been forthcoming until this bill which I introduce today.

I hasten to add that it was not forthcoming last week when the President called for enactment of additional protection for welfare and pension plan beneficiaries. For the bill he endorsed last week, which has been introduced in the Senate as S. 1024, is strictly a conflict-of-interest and ethical-standards bill. It includes basic standards of good faith for plan trustees, but it sets no standards for the plans themselves.

The President's bill, moreover, ignores almost all the recommendations of the President's own Committee on Corporate Pension Funds—particularly those concerning vesting and funding.

It ignores the need for reinsurance.

It does nothing for portability.

It continues to rely, moreover, in large part, on the now well-nigh discredited technique of requiring more disclosure—on the theory, I suppose, that if you can only get the plan administrator to disclose enough, the beneficiaries will figure out what is wrong. I doubt that they will. It is hard enough for lawyers and actuaries to read annual reports, balance sheets, and other financial statements. I doubt that we can expect the average pensioner to absorb, let alone to have the expertise to see all the implications of, a complex pension plan.

The President's bill, while it has some worthwhile features—almost all of which are included in essence in titles IV and V of my bill—would require audits of pension books by accountants, which is fine as far as it goes, but the key men in this field are the actuaries who can tell you, not just how much cash you have, but how much you will need 10 years from now to meet the benefits which will accrue in the meantime. My bill requires actuarial certifications at periodic intervals, not just accountants' audits.

The President's bill gives all power to the Secretary of Labor. With all due respect to my good friend, the Secretary of Labor, pension plans, in my judgment, are highly technical financial arrangements, every bit as complex as stocks and bonds, and what we need here is an independent commission—like the SEC—to administer this highly complex field. My bill would establish a U.S. Pension Commission—patterned on the SEC—to do just that.

So I suggest that the President's bill has barely scratched the surface. The Congress, however, has begun to look further.

The Fiscal Policy Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am also a member, held several hearings growing out of many complaints received from all parts of the country protesting that people who had worked long years for a pension were denied benefits on various grounds which seemed unfair or that the funds set aside to provide the benefits they had been promised proved far from sufficient. Other hearings looked into the feasibility of a pension reinsurance program, and the possibility of amending the Taft-Hartley provision dealing with labor-management trust funds. And, of course, the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, of which I am a member, held several very revealing investigations of the affairs of certain plans, and unearthed shocking misapplication of plan assets—some $4 million in one case—all without violation of any State or Federal law.

In short, we have been nibbling at this problem, circling around the edges, but we have never met the issues head on.

II. THE BASIS FOR THIS BILL

This subject is so complex, so technical, that, in the absence of a specific proposal, the details of which are spelled out in a bill, the pension dialog tends to become abstract and diffuse. We are all against sin and in favor of virtue, but the specifics are much harder to pin down.

I introduce this bill, therefore, as a basis for discussion—a way of bringing the pension dialog down to earth. I do not, however, claim that this bill is necessarily the right way to deal with every problem in the pension field. But it is my earnest hope that this bill, and subsequent discussion of it, hearings on it, and amendments to it, will help us find out what properly can and ought to be done in this field to improve our private pension system.

The bill is drafted on the hypothesis that if it is desirable to deal with all the pension problems which have come to the surface in recent years, there is a way, a comprehensive way, to do it.

This bill, in my judgment, presents the first concrete comprehensive scheme for establishing basic minimum pension standards and dealing with the problems which have come to light in recent years.

Whether, in solving those problems, the bill creates a host of new ones, is something we have to find out, and I call upon those with specialized knowledge or significant experience in the field to give us their expert assistance so that this measure can be pragmatically evaluated and improved or modified.

III. THE NEED FOR A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH

I believe that all of these problems are so interrelated that they cannot be solved without a comprehensive legislative program dealing not only with malfeasance of administrators, and not only with the consequences of plant shutdowns and plan terminations, but also with the broad spectrum of questions such as adequacy of funding, reasonable minimum standards of vesting, transferability of credits under some circumstances, and, in short, the establishment of certain general minimum standards to which all private pension plans must conform.

That is by no means to say that we should create a legislative straitjacket which would destroy the flexibility and inventiveness which have been one of the foundations of the enormous growth of pension plans in recent years. But I do think there ought to be some minimum standards in this field. And, in my judgment, those minimum standards will no more force all pension plans to be the same than the minimum wage law forces all employees' wages to be the same. The minimum is merely the basic level which decency and order require.

A. FUNDING AND VESTING

When we speak of adequate "funding," we mean setting aside sufficient funds to pay the benefits provided in the plan. When we speak of "vesting," on the other hand, we ordinarily mean the establishment of a participant's interest in a fund which he will retain even if he loses his job.

It is easy enough to "fund" a plan with no vesting—as there are no vested liabilities, there is no need for funds to pay those liabilities. Thus, for example, if a fund promises to pay "such benefits as the trustees may decide from time to time to pay," the plan can never be "unfunded" because the trustees can always decide to cut benefits.

Conversely, a "vested interest" in an unfunded plan may be worth very little, because no matter how "vested" a pension right may be, it is worthless if the trust fund is depleted.

Either way—a vested interest in an unfunded plan, or a funded plan with no vested interests—an employee may learn after years of faithful service that his expected pension was a cruel hoax.

There is no easy solution, however. Industry needs vary widely; vesting after 20 years may work well in an industry with a stable work force, while in certain high-labor-turnover trades such 20-year vesting may set the standards so high as to make pension almost unattainable for most employees.

I refuse to believe, however, that the problem is insoluble.

This bill sets the standards at a point which is, in my judgment, a bare minimum: as to vesting, the bill requires that an employee after 15 years of service and reaching the age of 45 must receive a nonforfeitable right to a full pension, or, in the alternative, a 50-percent right after 10 years and full entitlement after 20. That is not a high standard; it is minimal. A man who has devoted 15 years of his life to working under a plan in the expectation of pension has earned something, he has paid for it, and he ought not to be told in his later years, after devoting much of his working life to service with one company, that his rights have been forfeited because of the "small print" in the pension contract.

As to funding, again this bill is minimal, for it gives existing plans 40 years to amortize their unfunded liabilities, and 30 years for new plans. That is a long time, but it is considered a reasonable amortization period by most pension planners.

Nevertheless, it has been suggested that this bill, without further qualifications, could have a damaging effect on pension plans in certain low-wage industries. In some of those industries, it is argued, payment of even minimal pensions depends upon marginal funding and eligibility standards so high that most employees do in fact forfeit their rights before retirement. That is an unhappy situation, but if it is true that the choice in those industries is between such a plan or no pension plan at all, then we need to find out the facts—the precise details—and I call upon the pension planners and administrators, the Government agencies and others with specific knowledge and experience in the field to come forward with what information they have so that we can be sure that whatever law we enact will help and not hinder the development, solvency, and fairness of private pension plans.

Conversely, it may also turn out, in some multiemployer plans, that, because of the added opportunity for continued employment under these plans even after involuntary separation from a particular job, vesting standards may not need to be as high as elsewhere and can still assure eligibility of a reasonable proportion of the participants. Once again, we need the facts, the precise details of as many varied types of pension plans as we can find, to be sure that this legislation is refined and tailored to fit the needs of the private pension industry. But the only way, in my judgment, to find those facts is to focus on a particular bill, a precise legislative proposal, and see exactly how it will work.

B. PORTABILITY

The problem of portability is intimately related to funding and vesting. As long as plans have no minimum standards, it will be difficult, indeed, to devise any effective portability scheme—for how can an employee with a vested interest in an inadequately funded plan convert that interest into an "equivalent" participation in another plan which has lots of money but no vested interests? At first the employee had an enforceable interest in nothing; and now he wants to exchange that for an unenforceable interest in something.

On the other hand, I want to make it very clear—and the bill specifically provides—that the portability clearinghouse feature of this bill is completely voluntary. It is a convenience to those funds which already have, or will have, benefit and funding structures similar enough to permit transferability. It is my hope that this portability service will be attractive enough to induce many plans to participate, but it will be up to them.

There is, however, another feature in this bill which is, in effect, a kind of de facto portability. The bill permits special funding standards for multiemployer plans, allowing them to fund over a longer period of time on a less stringent basis, under certain specified conditions. The theory of this less stringent funding for multiemployer plans is that, while employers come and go, many industries, as such, go on "forever," and therefore there is much less risk that a plan will be terminated before its unfunded liabilities are amortized. As a result, multiemployer plans are made comparatively more attractive by this bill, and, of course, a multiemployer plan gives to each participant a kind of "portability" of his pension credits, as long as he works for any employer under the plan.

Finally, the mere existence of minimum vesting standards creates, if not a de factor portability, at least a substitute for it. An employee with a vested pension right may not be able to take it with him when he moves to another job, but at least he can come back and get the pension when he reaches retirement age. The result may be that he will get two small pension checks instead of one larger one later on, but the total will often be the same.

Thus, voluntary portability under the bill, plus incentives for multiemployer plans, plus minimum standards for vesting, all aim in the same direction—giving the employee the right to some protection from forfeiture when circumstances require that he change jobs.

C. REINSURANCE

Reinsurance, like portability, sounds fine all by itself, but it is part and parcel of the vesting-funding package. If we are to insure employees that their pensions will be paid even if the employer's business terminates, then we must regulate the pension fund itself, at least to a limited extent. Surely we would not ask the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to reinsure bank deposits without some control of the bank's affairs. Yet, if we regulate the fund itself, it seems inevitable that we require some minimum standard of vesting, or else we may be insuring that the money will be there, without insuring that anyone will have a right to receive it when he retires.

This bill reinsures against only one contingency: termination of the employer's business before the unfunded liabilities of the pension plan are funded. The premium is geared to the amount of such unfunded liabilities, and cannot exceed 1 percent of that amount.

This is not the maximum type of pension reinsurance which could be devised. It is not as expansive as a bill introduced last year and subjected to hearings in the Finance Committee. But it meets the major problem: it would, if it had been on the books 5 years ago, have protected against the tragedy in the Studebaker shutdown in South Bend, when one employee who was 59 years old and had worked for Studebaker for 43 years, starting at the age of 16, forfeited 85 percent of his pension rights. And he was not alone, for there were 20 other Studebaker employees each with more than 40 years of service who were in the same boat. Studebaker's plan was a good one. It would have met the vesting and funding standards of this bill, and it could have been reinsured, and those employees could have been 100 percent protected.

I am not prepared to ask for compulsory reinsurance of pension plans without some minimum standards for all. It is easy enough to set up an actuarily unsound plan which is bound to go broke, and then make the solvent plans pay higher premiums to cover the unsound ones. But I do think we can devise a scheme which will let each plan bear a minimal cost of reinsurance, each knowing that every other participant in the reinsurance program is held to the same minimum standards of solvency. That is what this bill would do.

D. ETHICAL STANDARDS OF ADMINISTRATION

Title IV of this bill establishes certain basic standards for the administration of all employee benefit funds—not just pension funds. Conflicts of interest, kickbacks, payroll-padding, and so forth are prohibited. This title of the bill is specifically designed to outlaw the practices disclosed last year in hearings before the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee.

But beyond such standards, the bill provides for jurisdiction in the Federal courts and a wide battery of remedies to insure not only that benefit plans are administered without conflicts of interest, but also in accordance with the contract or trust agreement, as well as pursuant to the fiduciary standards which we have developed over the years in our courts of equity.

E. REMEDIES

Title V of the bill gives the Commission the right to sue in Federal court to require compliance with the vesting-funding-reinsurance provisions of the bill, and it gives the Federal district courts equivalent jurisdiction to entertain a suit by a plan administrator to test any action of the Commission. This title also gives the Commission authority to sue to enforce the ethical standards established by title IV of the bill. And it also permits private parties to sue for rights guaranteed by the bill, as well as for breach of any contract or trust guaranteeing them any rights.

The alternative remedies are important; too often a beneficiary who has wrongfully been denied his rights will not bring suit because his costs in maintaining a legal action will exceed the small amount of his pension. It is in cases like these in which a pensioner—or a group of pensioners—with a meritorious case can request the Commission to bring suit in their behalf.

The district courts, in turn, are authorized to issue injunctions or other orders to compel compliance with the law, and, if necessary, to put a fund into receivership until its affairs are put in order.

The bill does not attempt to spell out all the fiduciary standards to which every trustee must adhere. It does specifically prohibit certain conflicts of interest, but, beyond that, the bill leaves the matter of trustee standards to the courts—as has been done with great success for hundreds of years under our Anglo-American legal tradition. The law the courts will apply under this bill in such cases will vary—if the trust agreement specifies the law of a particular State, that State's law will apply—otherwise it will be Federal common law, as developed by the Federal courts. In my judgment, that is the best way to develop fiduciary standards—and it is the way most consistent with our legal traditions.

F. SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF PROFIT-SHARING RETIREMENT PLANS

Profit-sharing plans, which I have long sought to encourage as a valuable inducement to labor-management cooperation in the interest of stability and higher productivity, present many significant differences from pension plans, even when profit sharing involves payment of benefits on retirement. This was clearly brought out last year in hearings on private pension plans held by the Joint Economic Committee. These differences in operation necessitate differences in treatment, although in both cases the goal should be to insure fulfillment of the legitimate expectations of the participants.

The bill I am introducing today seeks to reflect these important differences. It defines profit-sharing retirement plans separately from ordinary pension plans, and reflects the fact, for example, that true profit-sharing retirement plans are automatically fully funded because benefits are entirely dependent upon the employer's profits.

IV. THE PENSION COMMISSION—A SINGLE AUTHORITY TO REPLACE MULTIPLE AGENCIES

The concept of a single authority to regulate the creation and operation of pension plans is one which should be beneficial to the labor organizations, employers, and participants as well as those who sell and service pension plans, such as the banks, insurance companies, and pension consultants. Presently various aspects of some pension plans are unregulated while other aspects are regulated by State agencies, by the Treasury Department, Labor Department, Securities and Exchange Commission, among others. The need for coordination of these efforts together with any new regulation is obvious. Accordingly, this bill would make the qualification procedures now administered by the Treasury a part of the operations of the proposed Pension Commission. It may be that the entire scope of Treasury operations affecting pension plans should be transferred to the Commission. And yet, such determinations as the manner of integrating pension benefits with social security benefits and the determination of reasonable levels of compensation obviously have an important impact on Federal revenue considerations. Similarly, the extent to which regulations of pension plan investments is now performed by the Securities and Exchange Commission warrants careful consideration as to what functions, if any, should be transferred to the proposed Commission.

The point to be made here is that a great deal of thought will be required to develop a rational and coordinated system for the regulation of pension and other employee benefit systems without adversely affecting the traditional role of existing agencies now concerned with some aspect of these plans. But the goal is an important one, and worthy of the effort that will be required. For, after much thought on this subject, I am convinced that a single agency is required. It will be a very difficult task to regulate the operation of employee benefit plans sufficiently to assure the legitimate expectations of employee participants while at the same time avoiding undue or unnecessary interference with the operation of these plans. Overregulation or unnecessary regulation would be worse than none, for it would deter the installation and improvement of these much needed programs. It is a tortuous course to be steered between the problems of frustrated expectations for pension plan members growing out of no regulation and the equally damaging frustrations growing out of an irrational regulatory scheme which deters the employer from instituting a pension plan for the employees. It seems clear to me that this course could best be steered by an agency which has the general responsibility for encouraging the growth of the private pension system including the implementation of needed rules to protect pension participants.

Mr. President, as I have said, the complexities in this field are awesome. The bill I introduce today is not perfect, but it represents several years work by myself and my staff, in consultation with representatives of the business community, organized labor, and the banking and insurance industries. I hasten to add that none of those groups endorse all of the bill, though each, I suspect, has much to gain from certain features of it. But the bill now needs the wider scrutiny that comes with introduction, publication, hearings, and the rest of the legislative process.

I ask, therefore, Mr. President, that the text of this bill be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with an accompanying analytical explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and the accompanying explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1103) to provide additional protection for the rights of participants in employee pension and profit-sharing-retirement plans, to establish minimum standards for pension and profit-sharing-retirement plan vesting and funding, to establish a pension plan reinsurance program, to provide for portability of pension credits, to provide for regulation of the administration of pension and other employee benefit plans, to establish a U.S. Pension and Employee Benefit Plan Commission, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1103

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Pension and Employee Benefit Act of 1967".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "Commission" means the United States Pension and Employee Benefit Plan Commission established under section 3.

(2) The term "employee" means an individual who performs service for a continuous period of not less than six months in one or more States for an employer, and includes an officer or director of a corporation or of an unincorporated organization and an agent acting for his principal on a substantially full-time basis.

(3) The term "employees' benefit plan" means any plan providing for the payment of any of the benefits specified in section 2(4).

(4) The term "employees' benefit fund" means any fund, whether established pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement or unilaterally by an employer or by a labor organization, which is available for the payment either from principal or income, or both, to persons who are employed in an industry affecting commerce or who are members of a labor organization representing employees in an industry affecting commerce, or to members of the families, dependents, or beneficiaries of such persons, of one or more of the following benefits: Medical or hospital care, pension on retirement or death of employees, benefits under a profit-sharing-retirement plan, compensation for injuries or illness resulting from occupational activity or insurance to provide any of the foregoing, or unemployment benefits or life insurance, disability and sickness benefits, or accident benefits, or pooled vacation, holiday, severance or similar benefits, or defraying the costs of apprenticeship training programs, or, in the case of a fund subject to the restrictions of section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, providing any other benefit which may be permitted by subsections 302(c)(5) or 302(c)(6) of that Act: *Provided,* That any fund to which contributions are made solely to provide workmen's compensation benefits, disability benefits, or other benefits required by State or local law to be provided to employees shall not be deemed to be an employees' benefit fund. To the extent that benefits under an employees' benefit plan are provided through the medium of an insurance contract under which benefits are guaranteed by the insurance company to the extent that insurance premiums are paid, and under which neither the employer nor any labor organization retains the power to instruct the insurance carrier with respect to entitlement to receipt of benefits, disposition of assets or any other matter relating to the moneys received by the insurance carrier

pursuant to the plan, such plan shall not be deemed to involve an employees' benefit fund subject to the provisions of title IV.

(5) The term "employer" means any person acting directly as an employer or indirectly in the interest of an employer in relation to a pension plan or employee's benefit fund, and includes a group or association of employers acting for an employer in such capacity.

(6) The term "person" means an individual, partnership, corporation, mutual company, joint stock company, trust, unincorporated organization, association, or employee organization.

(7) The term "State" means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, Wake Island, the Canal Zone, and Outer Continental Shelf Lands defined in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

(8) The term "commerce" means trade, commerce, transportation, or communication, among the several States, or between any foreign country and any State, or between any State and any place outside thereof.

(9) The term "industry affecting commerce" means any activity, business, or industry in commerce or in which a labor dispute would hinder or obstruct commerce or the free flow of commerce and includes any activity or industry "affecting commerce" within the meaning of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, or the Railway Labor Act, as amended.

(10) The term "life annuity" means an annuity that continues for the duration of the life of the annuitant, whether or not it is thereafter continued to some other person.

(11) The term "deferred life annuity" means a life annuity that commences at retirement age under a pension plan, but in no event later than age seventy.

(12) The term "pension benefit" means the aggregate annual, monthly, or other amounts to which an employee will become entitled upon retirement or to which any other persons is entitled by virtue of such employee's death.

(13) The term "pension plan" means a pension fund or plan, other than a profit-sharing-retirement plan, organized and administered to provide pension benefits for employees or their beneficiaries, and includes, without limiting the generality of the foregoing:

(A) a unit benefit plan under which pension benefits are determined with reference to remuneration of an employee for each year of service, or for a selected number of years of service.

(B) a money purchase plan under which pension benefits are determined at the retirement of an employee with reference to the accumulated amount of the aggregate contributions paid by or for the credit of the employee, and

(C) a flat benefit plan under which the pension benefits are expressed either as a fixed amount in respect of each year of employment or as a fixed periodic amount.

(14) The terms "registered pension plan" and "registered profit-sharing-retirement plan" mean, respectively, a pension plan or profit-sharing-retirement plan registered with and certified by the Commission as a plan organized and administered in accordance with title I.

(15) The term "reinsured pension plan" means a registered pension plan which has been reinsured under title II and which has been in operation for at least five years and, for each of such years, has met the registration requirements of title I: *Provided*, That any addition to or amendment of a reinsured pension plan shall, if such addition or amendment involves a significant increase, as determined by the Commission, in the initial unfunded liability of such pension plan, be regarded as a new and distinct pension plan which may become a "reinsured pension plan" only after meeting the five-year operation requirements of this paragraph and section 202(c) and the registration requirements of title I.

(16) The term "supplemental pension plan" includes a pension plan established for employees whose membership in another pension plan is a condition precedent to membership in the supplemental pension plan.

(17) The term "voluntary additional contribution" means an additional contribution by an employee to or under a pension or profit-sharing-retirement plan except a contribution the payment of which, under the terms of the plan, imposes upon the employer an obligation to make concurrent additional contribution to or under the plan.

(18) The term "experience deficiency" with respect to a pension plan means any actuarial deficit, determined at the time of a review of the plan, that is attributable to factors other than (i) the existence of an initial unfunded liability, or (ii) the failure of the employer to make any payment as required by the terms of the plan or by the provisions of title I, other than as required by section 108(b)(3).

(19) The term "fully funded" with respect to any pension plan means that such plan at any particular time has assets actuarily determined by a person authorized under section 108(e) to be sufficient to provide for the payment of all pension and other benefits to all employees and former employees then entitled to an immediate or deferred benefit under the terms of the plan.

(20) The term "provisionally funded" with respect to any pension plan means that such plan at any particular time has insufficient assets to make it fully funded, but has made provision pursuant to section 108 for special payments sufficient to liquidate all initial unfunded liabilities or experience deficiencies.

(21) The term "initial unfunded liability" means the amount, on the first day of January, 1968, or the effective date of a pension plan or any amendment thereto, whichever is later, by which the assets are required to be augmented to insure that the plan is fully funded.

(22) The term "special payment" means a payment made to or under a pension plan for the purpose of liquidating an initial unfunded liability or experience deficiency.

(23) The term "fund" shall mean a trust fund, but shall also include a contractual right pursuant to an agreement with an insurance company.

(24) The term "funding" shall mean payment or transfer of assets into a fund, but shall also include payment to an insurance company to secure a contractual right from such company.

(25) The term "profit-sharing-retirement plan" means a plan established and maintained by an employer to provide for the participation in his profits by his employees in accordance with a definite predetermined formula for allocating the contributions made to the plan among the participants and for distributing the funds accumulated under the plan upon retirement or death. Such plan may include provisions permitting the withdrawal or distribution of the funds accumulated upon contingencies other than, and in addition to, retirement and death.

(26) The term "interest in a profit-sharing-retirement plan" means the amount allocated to the account of a participant in a profit-sharing-retirement plan.

(27) The term "service for a continuous period" means service for a period of time without regard to periods of temporary suspension of employment.

(28) The term "administrator" means the person or persons designated by the terms of a pension plan, collective bargaining agreement, trust agreement, or other document establishing or relating to a pension plan or employees' benefit fund as having responsibility for the effective control, disposition or management of the money or other assets contributed to or received by a pension plan or employees' benefit fund; or, in the absence of such designation, the person or persons actually responsible for the control, disposition, or management of such money or other assets, irrespective of whether such control, disposition, or management is exercised directly or through an agent or trustee designated by such person or persons.

ESTABLISHMENT OF PENSION AND EMPLOYEE BENEFIT PLAN COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the "United States Pension and Employee Benefit Plan Commission". The Commission shall be composed of five members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Members of the Commission shall serve for terms of six years, except that (i) of the members first appointed, two shall be appointed for a term of two years, two shall be appointed for a term of four years, and one shall be appointed for a term of six years, and (ii) members appointed to fill vacancies occurring by reason of death or resignation shall be appointed for the unexpired terms of their predecessors. Not more than three members of the Commission shall be members of the same political party, and in making appointments members of different political parties shall be appointed alternately as nearly as may be practicable. No member of the Commission shall engage in any business, vocation, or employment other than that as serving as a member, nor shall any member participate, directly or indirectly (except as a beneficiary) in the management of any plan or fund subject to regulation under this Act. One of the members shall be designated by the President as Chairman of the Commission. Three members shall constitute a quorum of the Commission.

(b) (1) Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code (which lists positions in level III of the Executive Schedule) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(46) Chairman, United States Pension Commission."

(2) Section 5315 of such title (which lists positions in level IV of the Executive Schedule) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(78) Members, United States Pension Commission."

(c) The Commission is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, and to incur such expenses, as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission—

(1) to promote the establishment, extension, and improvement of pension, profit-sharing-retirement and other employee benefit plans;

(2) to accept for registration all pension and profit-sharing-retirement plans required and qualified to be registered with the Commission under title I, and to reject any pension or profit-sharing-retirement plan that does not qualify for registration;

(3) to cancel certificates of registration of pension and profit-sharing-retirement plans registered under such title which cease to be qualified for such registration;

(4) to direct and administer the pension reinsurance program established by title II;

(5) to direct and administer the pension portability program established by title III;

(6) to enforce the provisions of title IV; and

(7) to perform such other functions as may be necessary to administer the provisions of this Act.

(b) The Commission or its duly authorized representatives shall have power, at any reasonable time—

(1) to inspect the books, files, documents, and other records respecting pension and profit-sharing-retirement plans kept by an administrator, employer, insurer, trustee, or other person in relation to such plans: *Provided,* That the Commission may delegate its powers under this subsection (b) to the Comptroller of the Currency, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in cases involving books, files, documents, or other records held by a bank or trust company, subject to their respective supervisory power, and

(2) to require any such administrator, employer, insurer, trustee, or other person to furnish, in a form acceptable to the Commission, such information as the Commission deems necessary for the purpose of ascertaining whether this Act and regulations of the Commission hereunder have been or are being complied with.

(c) The Commission is authorized by regulation to prescribe minimum standards and qualifications for persons performing services required by the provisions of this Act to be performed by actuaries and, upon application of any person, to determine whether such person meets the standards and qualifications so prescribed. The Commission shall issue certificates of qualification to applicants determined by the Commission after such examination, investigation, or other procedure as it may deem necessary, to meet such standards and qualifications.

(d) The Commission is authorized by regulation to prescribe reasonable fees for the registration of pension and profit-sharing-retirement plans and other services to be performed by it in connection with such plans under this Act, and to make and enforce such other regulations as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions and duties under this Act. All fees collected by the Commission shall be paid into the general fund of the Treasury.

(e) The Commission shall transmit to the Congress annually a report of its activities under this Act during the preceding fiscal year.

(f) All regulations issued by the Commission under authority of this Act shall be promulgated pursuant to the procedures prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its functions and duties.

ADMINISTRATION OF WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS DISCLOSURE ACT

SEC. 6. (a) The functions of the Secretary of Labor and the Department of Labor under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, as amended, are hereby transferred to and shall be administered by the Commission.

(b) All personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, which the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines are used or intended for use by the Secretary of Labor or the Department of Labor primarily in the administration of functions transferred under the provision of this section, are transferred to the Commission.

(c) In addition to the filing requirements of the Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act, it shall be a condition of compliance with section 7 of such Act that each annual report hereinafter filed under that section shall be accompanied by a certificate or certificates in the name of and on behalf of the plan, the administrator, and any employer or labor organization participating in the establishment of the plan, designating the Commission as agent for service of process on the persons and entities executing such certificate or certificates in any action arising under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act or this Act.

TITLE I—BENEFIT STANDARDS

PLANS TO WHICH TITLE APPLIES

SEC. 101. (a) Except as provided by subsection (b), this title applies to any pension plan and, to the extent hereinafter provided, to any profit-sharing-retirement plan, established by an employer engaged in commerce or in any industry or activity affecting commerce or by any employee organization or organizations representing employees engaged in commerce or in an industry or activity affecting commerce or by both.

(b) This title shall not apply to a pension or profit-sharing-retirement plan if—

(1) such plan is administered by the Federal Government or the government of a State or subdivision thereof, or by an agency or instrumentality thereof;

(2) such plan is administered by an organization which is exempt from taxation under the provisions of section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and is administered as a corollary to membership in a fraternal benefit society described in section 501(c)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 or by an organization described in section 501(c) (3) or (4) of such Code: *Provided,* That the provisions of this paragraph shall not exempt any plan administered by a fraternal benefit society or organization which represents its members for purposes of collective bargaining;

(3) such plan is established by a self-employed individual for his own benefit or for the benefit of his survivors or established by one or more owner-employers exclusively for his or their benefit or for the benefit of his or their survivors;

(4) such plan covers not more than twenty-five participants;

(5) such plan is established and maintained outside the United States by an employer primarily for the benefit of employees who are not citizens of the United States; or

(6) such plan is unfunded and is established by an employer primarily for the purpose of providing deferred compensation for a select group of management employees and is declared by the employer as not intended to meet the requirements of section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

REGISTRATION OF PLANS

SEC. 102. (a) Every administrator of a pension or profit-sharing-retirement plan to which this title applies shall file with the Commission an application for registration of such plan. Such application shall be in such form as shall be prescribed by regulation of the Commission, and shall be accompanied by a copy of the plan, a copy of the trust deed, insurance contract, by law, or other document under which the plan is constituted. Therefore, while such plan is in force, the administrator shall maintain its qualification for registration under this title.

(b) In the case of plans established on or after January 1, 1968, the filing required by subsection (a) shall be made within six months after such plan is established. In the case of plans established prior to January 1, 1968, such filing shall be made on such date or on such later date as may be specified by the Commission.

(c) If after examination of a pension or profit-sharing-retirement plan filed under this section, the Commission is satisfied that such plan is qualified for registration under this title the Commission shall issue a certificate of registration with respect to such plan. If the Commission is not so satisfied it shall notify the administrator.

(d) If at any time subsequent to the issuance of a certificate under subsection (c) with respect to any plan, the Commission determines that such plan is no longer qualified for registration under this title, it shall notify the administrator.

(e) A notification under subsection (c) or (d) shall set forth the deficiency or deficiencies in the plan or in its administration by reason of which the notification is given, and shall give the administrator, the employer of the employees covered by the plan, and the labor organization, if any, representing such employees a reasonable time within which to remove such deficiency or deficiencies. If the Commission thereafter determines that the deficiency or deficiencies have been removed it shall issue or continue in effect the certificate, as the case may be. If it determines that the deficiency or deficiencies have not been removed it shall enter an order denying or canceling the certificate of registration.

ANNUAL REPORTS ON REGISTERED PLANS

SEC. 103. The Commission may, by regulations promulgated pursuant to the Administrative Procedures Act, provide for the filing of single reports satisfying the reporting requirements of this Act and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

AMENDMENTS OF REGISTERED PLANS

SEC. 104. Where a pension or profit-sharing retirement plan filed for registration under this title is amended subsequent to such filing, the administrator shall within six months after the effective date or the date of adoption of such amendment, whichever is later, within sixty days after the effective date of such amendment file with the Commission a copy of the amendment and such additional information and reports as the Commission by regulation requires to determine the amount of any initial unfunded liability created by the amendment and the special payments required to liquidate such liability.

QUALIFICATION OF PLAN FOR REGISTRATION

SEC. 105. A pension or profit-sharing retirement plan shall be deemed to be qualified for registration under section 102 if it conforms to, and is administered in accordance with, the standards and requirements set forth in section 102 and sections 106 to 110 inclusive.

GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 106. (a) Every pension plan and, to the extent required by regulations issued by the Commission, every profit-sharing-retirement plan shall define the benefits provided by such plan, the method of determination and payment of benefits, conditions for qualification for membership in the plan and financial arrangements made to insure provisional or full funding of benefits under the plan. Each such plan shall provide for the furnishing of a written explanation to each member of the plan of the terms and conditions of the plan and amendments thereto applicable to him, together with an explanation of the rights and duties of the employee with reference to the benefits available to him under the terms of the plan and such other information as may be required by regulations of the Commission. The Commission may also by regulation require each plan to furnish a participant, upon termination of service with a vested right to a deferred life annuity, pension, or other vested interest, with a certificate setting forth the benefits to which he is entitled.

(b) A pension or profit-sharing-retirement plan filed for registration under this title, and any trust forming a part of such plan, shall meet all requirements set forth in section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as determined by the Commission, except to the extent such requirements are inconsistent with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section or of sections 107 to 110, inclusive.

VESTING OF BENEFITS

SEC. 107. (a) A pension or profit-sharing-retirement plan filed for registration under this title shall provide, under the terms of the plan in respect of service on or after January 1, 1968, or by amendment to the terms of the plan or by the creation of a new plan on or after such date in respect of service on or after the effective date of such amendment or new plan, that—

(1) a member of the plan who has been in the service of the employer, or has been a member of the plan,

(A) for a continuous period of fifteen years, and who has attained the age of forty-five years, is entitled upon termination of his employment or membership in the plan prior to attaining retirement age (i) in the case of a pension plan to a deferred life annuity commencing at his normal retirement age equal to the full pension benefits as provided by the plan in respect of such service, and (ii) in the case of a profit-sharing-retirement plan to a nonforfeitable right to his interest in such plan, or

(B) for a continuous period of ten years, and who has attained the age of forty-five years, is entitled upon termination of his employment or membership in the plan prior to attaining retirement age (i) in the case of a pension plan to a deferred life annuity commencing at his normal retirement age, and (ii) in the case of a profit-sharing-retirement plan to a nonforfeitable right to his interest in such plan, equal to 50 per centum of full pension benefits as provided by the plan in respect of such service or of such interest, respectively, and such entitlement shall increase by at least 5 per centum per year of continuous service thereafter until the completion of twenty years of continuous service, after which such member shall be entitled upon termination of employment or membership in the plan prior to attaining retirement age to a deferred life annuity commencing at his normal retirement age equal to the full pension benefits as provided by the plan in respect of such service, or to the full amount of such interest in the profit-sharing-retirement plan, respectively;

(2) the pension benefits provided under the terms of a pension plan, the deferred life annuity referred to in paragraph (1), and an interest in a profit-sharing retirement plan referred to in paragraph (1) shall not be capable of assignment or alienation and shall not confer upon any employee, personal representative or dependent, or any other person, any right or interest in such pension benefits, deferred life annuity, or profit-sharing retirement plan, capable of being assigned or otherwise alienated: *Provided*, That the Commission may by regulation provide for the final disposition of plan assets when beneficiaries cannot be located or ascertained within a reasonable time.

(b) Anything in subsection (a) to the contrary notwithstanding, a pension or profit-sharing-retirement plan may provide for—

(1) vesting at an earlier age than forty-five years or upon service or membership in the plan for a lesser period than is provided in such subsection or both; and

(2) in the case of a pension plan, payment to an employee of an amount equal to the commuted value of the deferred life annuity or pension benefit to which such employee is entitled.

(c) Anything in subsection (a) to the contrary notwithstanding, when a plan so provides, an employee may receive in discharge of his rights thereunder upon termination of employment prior to attaining normal retirement age as defined in the plan, or upon attaining such retirement age, a lump-sum amount equal to the commuted value of the annuity prescribed by the plan, or, in the case of a profit-sharing retirement plan, the value of his interest in such plan.

(d) If a pension plan so provides, a person who is entitled to a deferred life annuity under subsection (a) may, before the commencement of payment of such life annuity, elect to receive, partly or wholly in lieu of the deferred life annuity described by subsection (a)—

(1) a deferred life annuity the amount of which is reduced or increased by reason of early or deferred retirement, by provision for the payment of an optional annuity to a survivor or to the estate of the employee, or by variation of the terms of payment of such annuity to any person after the employee's death, and

(2) a payment or series of payments by reason of a mental or physical disability as prescribed by regulations of the Commission.

(e) For the purposes of subsections (b) (2) and (c), the commuted value of a deferred life annuity shall be computed on the basis of such interest rate and mortality tables and in such manner as may be approved by the Commission.

FUNDING OF PLANS

SEC. 108. (a) A pension plan filed for registration under this title shall provide for funding, in accordance with the tests for solvency prescribed by this title, that is adequate to provide for payment of all pension benefits, deferred life annuities and other benefits required to be paid under the terms of the plan. A pension plan shall be deemed to be solvent for the purposes of this title if it is fully funded or provisionally funded.

(b) Provisions for funding shall set forth the obligation of the employer to contribute both in respect of the current service cost of the plan and in respect of any initial unfunded liability and experience deficiency. The contribution of the employer, including any contributions made by employees, shall consist of the payment currently into the plan or fund of—

(1) all current service costs;

(2) where the plan has an initial unfunded liability, special payments consisting of equal annual amounts sufficient to liquidate such initial unfunded liability over a term not exceeding,

(A) in the case of an initial unfunded liability existing on January 1, 1968, in any plan established before that date, forty years from that date, and

(B) in the case of an initial unfunded liability resulting from an amendment to a pension plan made on or after January 1, 1968, or resulting from the establishment of a pension plan on or after January 1, 1968, thirty years from the date of such amendment or establishment; and

(3) where the plan has an experience deficiency, special payments consisting of equal annual amounts sufficient to liquidate such experience deficiency over a term not exceeding five years from the date on which the experience deficiency was determined: *Provided*, That the Commission may suspend the special payments requirements or extend the five-year period provided in this subparagraph (3) in cases involving business necessity or substantial risk to the continuation of the employing enterprise.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this subsection, (i) the liquidation of initial unfunded liabilities or experience deficiencies may be accelerated at any time, and (i) where an insured pension plan established before January 1, 1968, is funded by level annual premiums to retirement age for each individual member and benefits are guaranteed by the insurance company to the extent that premiums have been paid, it shall be deemed to meet the requirements of paragraph (2)(A) of this subsection.

(c) On or before January 1, 1969, in the case of pension plans registered on or before that date, or within six months after the date of establishment of the plan in other cases, the Administrator shall submit a report of the person authorized by subsection (e) certifying—

(1) the estimated cost of benefits in respect of service in the first year during which such plan is required to register and the rule for computing such cost in subsequent years up to the date of the next report;

(2) the initial unfunded liability, if any, for benefits under the pension plan as of the date on which the plan is required to be registered; and

(3) the special payments required to liquidate such initial unfunded liability in accordance with subsection (b).

Where an insured pension plan is funded by level annual premiums extending not beyond the retirement age for each individual member and benefits are guaranteed by the insurance company to the extent that premiums have been paid, the report required by this subsection may certify the adequacy of the premiums to provide for the payment of all benefits under the plan in lieu of the matters required to be certified under clauses (1), (2), and (3).

(d) The administrator in respect of a registered pension plan shall cause the plan to be reviewed by a person authorized by subsection (e) not more than three years after registration and at intervals of not more than three years thereafter and the person reviewing the plan shall prepare a report certifying—

(1) the estimated cost of benefits in respect of service in the next succeeding year and the rule for computing such cost in subsequent years up to the date of the next report;

(2) the surplus or the experience deficiency in the pension plan after making allowance for the present value of all special payments required to be made in the future by the employer as determined by previous reports; and

(3) the special payments which will liquidate any such experience deficiency over a term not exceeding five years.

If any such report discloses a surplus in a pension plan, the amount of any future payments required to be made to the fund or plan may be reduced by the amount of such surplus. A report under this subsection shall be filed with the Commission by the administrator upon its receipt.

(e) The reports and certificates referred to in subsections (c) and (d) shall be made by an actuary certified by the Commission under section 4(c): *Provided*, That the Commission may exempt any plan, in whole or in part, from the requirement that such reports and certificates be filed where the Commission finds such filing to be unnecessary.

(f) Anything in this section 108 to the contrary notwithstanding, if evidence satisfactory to the Commission shall be filed on behalf of a pension plan in connection with an application for registration under this title demonstrating that (i) such pension plan is a multiemployer plan in which at least 25 per centum of the employees in the industry covered by the plan, either nationally or in a particular region in which a substantial number of employees in such industry is employed, participate, and (ii) no single employer employs more than 20 per centum of the employees covered by the plan, and (iii) the history and present business condition of the industry make it improbable that there will be a substantial decrease in employment in the industry within the foreseeable future—

(I) the Commission may register such plan without regard to the funding requirements of section 108 if such plan meets the following alternative funding requirements:

(1) annual payment into the fund of all current service costs;

(2) annual payment into the fund of an amount equal to the interest, at such rate of interest as the Commission shall prescribe, but not more than 6 per centum per annum, on the unfunded liability of such fund at the date each such payment is made;

(3) annual payment into the fund of an amount equal to the insurance premium for such year required to be paid on behalf of such fund by section 203 of title II of this Act; and

(4) In computing unfunded liability under this subsection (f), the Commission may per-

mit a multiemployer plan to compute such liability solely on the basis of information obtained from participants pursuant to a requirement of the plan under which each such participant, upon reaching the age of forty and completing ten years of continuous service, is required to file with the Administrator of the plan notification of his status under the plan.

(II) the Commission may by regulation approve alternative requirements for payments into the fund other than those specified in subparagraph I of this subsection (f), when, in the opinion of the Commission, such standards will provide reasonable assurance of sufficient assets in the fund of the multiemployer plan to provide for payment of anticipated benefits.

(g) Each pension plan shall, as a condition of registration under this title, apply for reinsurance and pay the reinsurance premiums provided in title II.

(h) For the purpose of this section, a profit-sharing-retirement plan, within the meaning of section 2(26) of this Act, which meets the requirements of title I insofar as they are made specifically applicable to such a plan by section 105 shall be deemed fully funded.

DISCONTINUANCE OF PLANS

SEC. 109. (a) Upon complete termination, or substantial termination as determined by the Commission, of a pension plan—

(1) All contributions by an employer, a labor organization, an employee or other person made after January 1, 1968, in respect of the deferred life annuity prescribed in section 107(a) shall be applied under the terms of the plan—

(A) first, in the case of persons who have already retired and begun to draw benefits under the plan, or who, on the date of such termination, had the right to retire and begin to draw such benefits immediately, to provide the life annuities to which such persons were entitled at the date of termination of their employment;

(B) second, in the case of persons who have vested rights under the plan but have not reached retirement age and begun to draw benefits, to provide the deferred life annuities to which they were entitled at the date of such termination of the plan; and

(C) third, in the case of any other participants in the plan, to provide deferred life annuities to which they are entitled under the plan pursuant to the requirements of section 401(a)(7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended; and

(D) in any case, the Commission may approve payment of survivor benefits with priorities equal to those of the employees or former employees on whose service such benefits are based.

(2) The employer, and the employees if the plan so provides, shall be liable to pay all amounts that would otherwise have been required to be paid to meet the tests of solvency prescribed by section 108, up to the date of such termination, to the insurer, trustee, or administrator of the plan.

(3) No part of the assets of the plan shall revert to the employer until provision has been made for all pensions and other benefits vested or otherwise payable under section 109 according to the plan in respect of age and service up to the date of the discontinuance to members of the plan and for all benefits to pensioners and their pension beneficiaries in accordance with the terms of the plan.

(b) Upon complete termination, or substantial termination as determined by the Commission, of a profit-sharing-retirement plan, the interests of all participants in such plan shall fully vest.

PAYMENTS TO SURVIVORS

SEC. 110. (a) Where in accordance with the terms of a pension or profit-sharing-retirement plan an employee or former employee has designated a person or persons to receive a benefit payable under the plan in the event of the employee's death—

(1) the employer's liability to provide the benefit shall be discharged upon payment to such person or persons of the amount of the benefit; and

(2) such person or persons may upon death of the employee or former employee enforce payment of the benefit, but the employer shall be entitled to set up any defense that he could have set up against the employee or former employee. As used in this subsection, the term "employer" includes a trustee or insurer under a pension or profit-sharing-retirement plan.

(b) An employee or former employee may from time to time alter or revoke a designation made under a pension or profit-sharing-retirement plan, but any such alteration or revocation may be made only in the manner set forth in the plan.

AMENDMENT TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

SEC. 111. (a) Section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to qualified pension, etc. plans) is amended by redesignating subsection (j) as (k) and by inserting after subsection (i) the following new subsection:

"(j) PENSION AND PROFIT-SHARING-RETIREMENT PLANS TO WHICH THE PENSION AND WELFARE BENEFITS ACT OF 1967 APPLIES.—For purposes of this part, any pension or profit-sharing-retirement plan to which title I of the Pension and Welfare Benefits Act of 1967 applies, and any trust forming a part of such plan—

"(1) shall be treated as meeting the requirements of this section during any period for which a certificate of registration with respect to such plan issued by the United States Pension Commission under such title is in effect or an application therefor is pending before the Commission, and

"(2) shall be treated as not meeting the requirements of this section during any period for which such application has not been timely filed or such certificate has been denied or cancelled by such Commission."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to periods after December 31, 1967, except that with respect to any pension plan established before January 1, 1968, such amendment shall not apply to any period before the date specified by the Commission under section 102(b).

MINIMUM WAGE QUALIFICATION

SEC. 112. Contributions by an employer to a registered pension or profit-sharing-retirement plan shall not be deemed to be part of or to affect the "regular rate" as that term is used in section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

TITLE II—PENSION REINSURANCE

ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM

SEC. 201. There is hereby established a program to be known as the Federal pension reinsurance program (hereinafter referred to as the "program"). The program shall be administered by, or under the direction and control of, the Commission.

CONTINGENCY INSURED AGAINST UNDER PROGRAM

SEC. 202. (a) The program shall insure (to the extent provided in subsection (b)) beneficiaries of a reinsured pension plan against loss of benefits to which they are entitled under such pension plan arising from substantial cessation of one or more of the operations carried on by the contributing employer in one or more facilities of such employer before funding of the unfunded liabilities of the fund.

(b) The rights of beneficiaries of a reinsured pension plan shall be insured under the program only to the extent that such rights do not exceed—

(1) in the case of a right to a monthly retirement or disability benefit for the employee himself, the lesser of 50 per centum of the average monthly wage he received from the contributing employer in the five-year period after the registration date of the plan for which his earnings were the greatest, or $500 per month;

(2) in the case of a right on the part of one or more dependents, or members of the family, of the employee, or in the case of a right to a lump sum survivor benefit on account of the death of an employee, an amount found by the Commission to be reasonably related to the amount determined under subparagraph (1).

In the case of a periodic benefit which is paid on other than a monthly basis, the monthly equivalent of such benefit shall be regarded as the amount of the monthly benefit for purposes of clauses (1) and (2) of the preceding sentence.

(c) If a registered pension plan has not been registered under title I for each of at least the five years preceding the time when there occurs the contingency insured against, the rights of beneficiaries shall not be insured: *Provided*, That the Commission may, in its discretion, credit against the five year requirement of section 202(c) one or more years prior to the effective date of this Act for any pension plan which, during such prior years, would have satisfied the registration requirements of title I had this Act been in effect.

PREMIUM FOR PARTICIPATION IN PROGRAM

SEC. 203. (a) Each registered pension plan shall pay an annual premium for reinsurance under the program upon payment of such annual premium as may be established by the Commission. Premium rates established under this section shall be uniform for all pension funds insured by the program and shall be applied to the amount of the unfunded liability to each insured pension fund. The premium rates may be changed from year to year by the Commission, when the Commission determines changes to be necessary or desirable to give effect to the purposes of this title; but in no event shall the premium rate exceed 1 per centum for each dollar of unfunded liability. Premiums under this title shall be payable as of January 1, 1968, or, for plans adopted after that date, as of the effective date of such plans.

(b) If the Commission determines that, because of the limitation on rate of premium established under subsection (a) or for other reasons, it is not feasible to insure against loss of rights of all beneficiaries of reinsured pension plans, then the Commission shall insure the rights of beneficiaries in accordance with the following order of priorities—

First: individuals who, at the time when there occurs the contingency insured against, are receiving benefits under the pension plan, and individuals who have attained normal retirement age or if no normal retirement age is fixed have reached the age when an unreduced old-age benefit is payable under title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, and who are eligible, upon retirement, for retirement benefits under the pension plan;

Second: individuals who, at such time, have attained the age for early retirement and who are entitled, upon early retirement, to early retirement benefits under the pension plan; or, if the pension plan does not provide for early retirement, individuals who, at such time, have attained age sixty and who, under such pension plan, are eligible for benefits upon retirement;

Third: in addition to individuals described in the above priorities, such other individuals as the Commission shall prescribe.

(c) Participation in the program by a pension plan shall be terminated by the Commission upon failure, after such reasonable period as the Commission shall prescribe, of such pension fund to make payment of premiums due for participation in the program.

REVOLVING FUND

SEC. 204. (a) In carrying out its duties under this title, the Commission shall establish a revolving fund into which all amounts paid into the program as premiums shall be deposited and from which all liabilities incurred under the program shall be paid.

(b) The Commission is authorized to borrow from the Treasury such amounts as may be necessary, for deposit into the revolving fund, to meet the liabilities of the program. Moneys borrowed from the Treasury shall bear a rate of interest determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be equal to the average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the period such moneys are borrowed. Such moneys shall be repaid by the Commission from premiums paid into the revolving fund.

(c) Moneys in the revolving fund not required for current operations shall be invested in obligations of, or guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States.

TITLE III—PENSION PORTABILITY PROGRAM

ACCEPTANCE OF DEPOSITS

SEC. 301. (a) It is declared to be the policy of the Congress that a system of pension portability should be established by the Federal Government to facilitate the voluntary transfer of credits between registered pension or profit-sharing-retirement plans having similar benefit features and actuarial assumptions. Nothing in this title nor in the regulations issued by the Commission hereunder shall be construed to require participation in such portability system by a plan as a condition of registration under this Act.

(b) The Commission is authorized and directed, in accordance with regulations prescribed by it, to receive amounts which are transferred to it from a registered pension or profit-sharing retirement plan and which are in settlement of an individual's rights under the plan when such individual is separated from employment covered by the plan before the time prescribed for payments under the plan to such individual or to his beneficiaries.

SPECIAL FUND

SEC. 302. Amounts received by the Commission pursuant to section 301 shall be deposited in a special fund which shall be established by it for the purposes of this title. The amounts in the fund which are not needed to meet current withdrawals shall be invested as provided under regulations prescribed by the Commission.

INDIVIDUAL ACCOUNTS

SEC. 303. There shall be established and maintained in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commission, an account for each individual with respect to whom the Commission receives amounts under this title. The amount credited to each such account shall be adjusted at the times and in the manner provided by such regulations to reflect earnings of the special fund and transfers from the special fund for costs of administration.

PAYMENTS FROM INDIVIDUAL ACCOUNTS

SEC. 304. Amounts credited to the account of any individual under this title may, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commission, be paid by the Commission—

(1) to a registered plan, if such individual becomes an employee covered by such plan and if such plan has benefit features and actuarial assumptions similar to those of the plan from which such amount was originally transferred, or

(2) to such individual or his beneficiaries, if he dies or reaches the age of sixty-five.

Payments under this section shall be made at such times, in such manner, and in such amounts in a lump sum or otherwise as may be determined under such regulations. The amount of any periodic payments shall be determined on an actuarial basis.

COST OF ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 305. There are authorized to be made available out of the special fund established pursuant to section 302 such amounts as the Congress may deem appropriate to pay the costs of administration of this title.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 306. No amount may be transferred to the Commission pursuant to section 301 of this title before the first day of the twelfth month following the month in which this Act is enacted.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 307. The Commission and the Secretary of Labor are authorized to provide technical assistance to employers, trade unions, and administrators of pension and profit-sharing-retirement plans in their efforts to provide greater retirement protection for individuals who are separated from employment covered under such plans. Such assistance may include, but is not limited to (1) the development of reciprocity arrangements between plans in the same industry or area, and (2) the development of special arrangements for portability of credits within a particular industry or area.

TITLE IV—ADMINISTRATION OF EMPLOYEES' BENEFIT FUNDS

SEC. 401. Every employees' benefit fund established to provide for the payment of benefits under an employees' benefit plan shall be established pursuant to a duly executed trust agreement which shall set forth the purpose or purposes for which such fund is established and the detailed basis on which payments are to be made into and out of such fund.

SEC. 402. Moneys in an employees' benefit fund shall be available for expenditure only for the sole and exclusive purpose of paying to employees or their families, dependents, or beneficiaries the benefits for which it was established, and for defraying the reasonable costs of administration of such fund. None of the assets of an employees' benefit fund shall be held, deposited, or invested outside the United States unless the indicia of ownership remain within the jurisdiction of a United States district court. Any such assets remaining upon dissolution or termination of the fund shall, after complete satisfaction of the rights of all beneficiaries to benefits accrued to the date of dissolution or termination, be distributed ratably to the beneficiaries thereof or, if the trust agreement so provides, to the contributors thereto: *Provided,* That in the case of a registered pension or profit-sharing retirement plan, such distribution shall be subject to the requirements of the previous titles of this Act.

SEC. 403. The person or persons responsible for the administration of an employees' benefit fund shall cause an independent audit to be made of the fund annually, and shall make the results thereof available for inspection by interested persons at the principal office of the fund and at such other places as may be designated in the agreement or instrument pursuant to which the fund is established.

SEC. 404. No person who is an officer or employee of an employer or association of employers or a labor organization, which is a party to any agreement establishing or relating to an employee's benefit fund, shall receive or accept, directly or indirectly, whether through a corporation or other entity owned or controlled in any substantial degree by such person or otherwise, any payment, loan, pledge, hypothecation, assignment, or other transfer out of the assets of such fund (other than benefits to which such person is entitled as an employee), except that if such person is an officer or employee of such fund, reasonable fees or expenses of attending meetings in connection with the business thereof may be paid from the fund to any officer or employee attending such meetings in an official capacity. Nothing herein contained shall prohibit the purchase by a profit-sharing retirement plan or other profit sharing plan, in the ordinary course of business, of the securities or indebtedness of any corporation or other business entity employing directly or through a subsidiary or parent entity a substantial number of the beneficiaries of such fund.

SEC. 405. All investments and deposits of the funds of an employees' benefit fund and all loans made out of any such fund shall be made in the name of the fund or its nominee, and no officer or employee of the fund, no trustee or administrator or officer or employee thereof, no employer or officer or employee thereof, and no labor organization, or officer or employee thereof shall either directly or indirectly accept or be the beneficiary of any fee, brokerage, commission, gift, or other consideration for or on account of any loan, deposit, purchase, sale payment or exchange made by or on behalf of the fund.

SEC. 406. The provisions of this title shall not be applicable to a bank, trust company, or insurance company which is subject to examination and regulation by the Federal Government or a State government, nor to the employees or representatives, acting in an authorized capacity, of such a bank, trust company, or insurance company, nor to the assets owned or held by such a bank, trust company, or insurance company: *Provided,* That this section shall not exempt from the coverage of this title any person other than such a bank, trust company, insurance company, or their employees or representatives, acting in an authorized capacity, issuing instructions or otherwise dealing with such a bank, trust company, or insurance company in connection with an employees' benefit fund.

TITLE V—ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 501. Whenever the Commission—

(1) determines, in the case of a pension or profit-sharing-retirement plan required to be registered under title I, that no application for registration has been filed in accordance with section 102(a), or

(2) issues an order under section 102(e) denying or canceling the certificate of registration of a pension or profit-sharing-retirement plan,

the Commission may petition any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties, or the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, for an order requiring the employer or other person responsible for the administration of such plan to comply with such requirements of title I as will qualify such plan for registration under title I.

SEC. 502. Whenever the Commission has reasonable cause to believe that an employees' benefit fund is being or has been administered in violation of the requirements of title IV, the Commission may petition any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties or the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for an order (1) requiring return to such fund of assets transferred from such fund in violation of the requirements of such title (2) requiring payment of benefits denied to any beneficiary in violation of the requirements of such title, and (3) restraining conduct in violation of the requirements of such title by any person performing duties in connection with the administration of such fund.

SEC. 503. Upon the filing of any petition pursuant to section 501 or 502, the district court may, in its discretion, appoint a receiver to take possession of the assets of the plan or fund which is the subject of the petition and to administer them until such time as the violations of law alleged in such petition no longer exist.

SEC. 504. Suits by persons entitled, or who may become entitled, to benefits from employees' benefit funds or plans may be brought in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties, or in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia without respect to the amount in controversy and without regard to the citizenship of the parties (1) against any such fund or plan to recover benefits required to be paid from an employees' benefit fund or plan pursuant to the terms of the agreement pursuant to which such fund or plan is established or other constituent instrument; or (2) on behalf of and in the name of an employees' benefit fund against any person who shall have transferred or received any of the assets of such fund in violation of any such agreement or of the requirements of title IV.

Sec. 505. The provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes", approved March 23, 1932 (29 U.S.C. 101–115) shall not be applicable with respect to suits brought under this title.

Sec. 506. Suits by an administrator of a pension plan, a profit-sharing-retirement plan, or an employees' benefit fund, to review any final order of the Commission, to restrain the Commission from taking any action contrary to the provisions of this Act, or to compel action required under this Act, may be brought in the name of the plan or fund in the district court of the United States for the district where the fund has its principal office, or in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

Sec. 507. In any case in which a trust agreement relating to a fund subject to this Act contains a provision stating that it shall be construed under the law of a particular State, such provision shall be controlling in any suit arising under this Act for breach of any agreement or trust relating to an employees' benefit fund.

Sec. 508. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to nullify any provision of any State or Federal law not in direct conflict with a provision of this Act. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected.

The statement, ordered to be printed in the Record, is as follows:

Explanatory Notes Concerning Principal Provisions of the Pension and Employee Benefit Act

DEFINITIONS

The definitions, as well as title I of the bill, follow the general format, after extensive revision, of the Pension Benefits Act, 1965, of the Province of Ontario, Canada. While the language of that Act obviously required substantial re-working to fit within the special framework of United States law and the different pattern of United States pension plans, nevertheless the general outlines of the Ontario Act may be useful, as a statute *in pari materia*, in interpreting this bill. The full text of the Ontario Act, as well as its interpretative regulations and an explanatory statement by the Prime Minister of Ontario, are set forth in *Private Pension Plans, Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy of the Joint Economic Committee* 89th Cong., 2d Sess. 6–21 (1966).

The term "Commission" (section 2(2)) refers to a new agency, the United States Pension and Employee Benefit Plan Commission, which would be established under section 3 and would be given enforcement jurisdiction over all provisions of this Act, as well as over other existing laws dealing with employee benefit plans which are now administered by other agencies.

The terms "employee benefit plan" and "employee benefit fund" are used only in title IV and the enforcement provisions of title V. Title IV does not regulate employee benefit plans which do not provide for benefits through the medium of an employee benefit fund. Only one section of the Act in any way affects an employee benefit plan without a fund, and that is section 504, which permits suits by private parties for breach of an agreement relating to an employee benefit plan.

The "commerce" language (section 2(9)) is intended to reach the outer limits of the Constitutional power to regulate interstate commerce, subject to the specific exemptions and exclusions set forth in the bill.

The term "pension plan" (section 2(13)) does not include a plan meeting the definition of a "profit-sharing-retirement plan" (section 2(25)). Profit-sharing-retirement plans are dealt with separately in the bill. To the extent that a deferred profit sharing plan does not meet the terms of the definition set forth in section 2(25), however, it could nevertheless be considered a pension plan subject to the requirements of the bill applicable to such plans. A regular profit-sharing plan, however, as distinguished from a profit-sharing-retirement plan, ordinarily would not fall within either definition and would not be covered by title I, because no retirement benefits would be provided.

The term "reinsured pension plan" (section 2(14)), which is used in title II, is, strictly speaking, a misnomer, as the program provided under title II is really an insurance, rather than a "reinsurance", program, except in cases involving plans funded originally through the medium of an insurance contract. Note also that, while plans are required to pay premiums from the first day of coverage under the Act, they do not become effectively "reinsured" until 5 years have expired. Note further that an amendment to a plan resulting in a substantial increase in unfunded liability may be deemed a new "plan" for reinsurance purposes.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

The Commission established by section 3 would be an independent agency organized on the SEC pattern. The language of section 3(a) is similar to the language establishing the SEC. The general intent of the bill is to centralize all federal regulation relating to employee benefit plans in a single agency, thereby to the maximum feasible extent relieving plan administrators of the burden of multiple-agency regulation and avoiding the necessity of multiple applications, multiple inspections, and overlapping jurisdictions. It is understood, however, that not all aspects of this field can be so consolidated. The SEC will continue to have responsibility to enforce the securities laws, and the Federal Reserve and other agencies will continue to regulate banks. Section 4(b)(1) recognizes this fact and attempts to avoid duplication by allowing the Commission to delegate its functions in certain cases to other agencies which would be inspecting banks in any event.

Section 4(c) would authorize the Commission to license persons performing actuarial services and certifications under the bill. Despite the rather extended series of definitions in section 2 and rather technical statement of funding and vesting requirements in title I, a great deal will inevitably depend on the accuracy of actuarial determinations. It would be impossible to regulate actuarial assumptions such as life expectancy and rate of labor turnover by setting forth requirements in statutory form. The only viable approach, therefore, is to regulate to some extent the persons competent to make certifications based on such assumptions. The long-term accuracy of actuarial assumptions and certifications, however, is subject to a check under section 108(b)(3), which requires that an actuarial error resulting in an experience deficiency would need to be corrected and funded over a much shorter period of time than any other unfunded liability.

Section 6(a) transfers to the Commission the administration of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act. Ideally, that Act should be consolidated with and made a part of the provisions of this bill, and no doubt such would be the case in the long run. As an interim matter, however, Section 103 does permit the Commission to consolidate the reporting requirements of the two Acts into a single report form.

Section 6(c) should be read together with the enforcement provisions of title V. While title V permits institution of legal proceedings in any of the United States District Courts, there are often problems of obtaining service of process upon all the necessary parties. The Administration bill (S. 1024) would permit an action in any United States District Court and then allow the court's process to reach beyond the confines of its district—indeed, nationwide. The result would be that anyone could be made to respond anywhere, subject to a later motion to transfer the case to a more convenient forum. Section 6(c) of my bill would permit an action to be brought against a plan or person in only one district outside his home district, and that would be the District of Columbia, as service of process could always be made upon the necessary parties merely by serving the Commission as statutory agent.

FUNDING AND VESTING

As indicated above, this title uses the Ontario Pension Benefits Act as a general model (see comments on definitions, above). It should be noted that the enforcement provisions relating to title I do not, however, appear in this title but rather are placed in title V, along with all other enforcement provisions under the Act. Enforcement of title I is not based on the typical device of an administrative hearing followed by review in the Court of Appeals, where the Commission's findings would be final and binding. Rather, the Commission would be required in any case in which, for example, registration is denied, to bring an action in a District Court to compel compliance with the registration requirements of the Act, and the Commission would have to prove its case *de novo*. In addition, any person aggrieved by an action of the Commission, as, for example, in a case in which registration is denied, would not be required to wait for the Commission to seek enforcement but could bring an action in a District Court immediately to review the Commission's action. Thus, maximal judicial review is provided.

The notice requirements of section 106(a) require not only that each participant receive an explanation of his rights under a plan, but also that an employee leaving his job with a vested interest in a pension must receive a certificate telling him what kind of a right he has, so that, years later when he reaches retirement age, he will know precisely what he can expect.

The vesting provisions of section 107 require *either* full vesting of a non-forfeitable pension right after 15 years of service, *or* 50% vesting after 10 years and full vesting after 20 years, in each case subject to attaining the age of 45. It should be noted that this provision does apply retroactively to service performed prior to the effective date of the Act, as the initial sentence of section 107(a) makes its requirements applicable only "in respect of service on or after January 1, 1968." Indeed, even if a plan increases its benefits, the required vesting would only apply to service *after* the effective date of the increase, though the plan would be permitted, of course, to vest the increase retroactively. It should also be noted that the "full pension benefits" which must be vested in the stipulated time are those based upon service up to the vesting date; additional benefits could then be added in respect of further service after the vesting date.

The funding provisions of section 108 are basically 40 year funding for old plans, and 30 year funding for new plans or new amendments. Thus, a plan starting out anew with an initial unfunded liability based upon past credited service occurring prior to the effective date of the plan would be required to pay into the plan sufficient money to cover current service costs plus sufficient additional moneys to amortize the initial unfunded liability over 30 years. But in any case in which the estimate of the sums necessary to achieve such 30-year funding is in error and an "experience deficiency" develops, the deficiency must be made up in 5 years, subject to the hardship proviso set forth in section 108(b)(3).

In the case of multiemployer plans meeting the requirements of section 108(f), alternative funding requirements are provided, in recognition of the fact that such plans tend to be more stable and less susceptible to termination. Section 108(f) is designed to meet some of the problems of such industries as the apparel and clothing industries, where, because the plans' continuance does not depend on the continuance of any particular employer, full funding need not be achieved as rapidly. Even so, it has been suggested that an additional alternative funding arrangement in such industries may be warranted, requiring that in such plans, for example:

(A) The projected income throughout the ensuing 10-year period, based on expected contributions at contribution rates stipulated in existing collective bargaining agreements, plus expected interest, shall be at least as great as the projected expenses of the plan, provided that such plan (i) has been in existence and has paid benefits for at least 10 years prior to the registration of the plan, and (ii) has retired at least 5 per centum of the employees covered by the plan at the time of registration and thereafter; and

(B) The calculation of the projections under paragraph (A) above shall be based on the following numbers of employees: (1) employees who may be anticipated to receive retirement payments during the succeeding 10 years, including those already on the retirement rolls; and (2) employees who within one year prior to acquiring vested rights hereunder notify the plan administrator in writing of their expectation to acquire such rights under the plan during the following year.

The viability and soundness of such additional alternatives, along with such others as may be proposed, are certainly worthy of serious consideration.

Sections 111 and 112 would have the effect of consolidating within the Commission jurisdiction over the principal existing regulatory laws concerning pension plans—tax and minimum wage qualification. It is understood that jurisdiction over section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code has been jealously guarded by the Treasury. Nevertheless, section 111 recognizes that the Treasury may have conflicting policy considerations: on the one hand, it seeks to implement the policy of encouraging pension plans, which is inherent in section 401 of the Code, yet on the other hand the Treasury is legitimately concerned with maximization of revenue. The transfer of section 401's enforcement to the Commission would ensure that that section will be interpreted in a manner most sympathetic to the growth and soundness of private pension plans.

REINSURANCE

This feature of the bill is based in part on a measure sponsored by Senator Hartke in the 89th Congress. The two major differences between this title and that bill is that this bill does *not* insure against loss of plan assets through bad investments, and it does undertake to insure pension plans without regulating them. Instead, this title insures against one contingency only—termination of the employing enterprise before full funding—and insurance applies only to plans meeting the vesting and funding standards of title I, and then only after 5 years, compliance. The bill sponsored by Senator Hartke last year made reinsurance a condition of tax qualification, while this bill makes reinsurance a mandatory requirement, under section 203(a), as well as a condition of registration under section 108(g).

PORTABILITY

The portability program under title III is completely voluntary, and section 301(a) sets forth a specific declaration of policy prohibiting the Commission from making participation in the portability program a condition of registration under title I. The existence of a portability clearing house, however, may be a useful service to those organizations which have already begun to seek ways of developing reciprocal credit systems. Certain labor organizations, particularly in the building trades, have pension plans in various regions of the country with similar benefit and funding features, and have sought to establish reciprocity systems between such regional plans. The existence of a central pension credit clearing house may be a useful accommodation and catalyst for such reciprocity arrangements.

ADMINISTRATION OF EMPLOYEES' BENEFIT FUNDS

Title IV deals with many of the same problems as are dealt with in the Administration bill introduced by Senator Yarborough, S. 1024, and Mr. Perkins, H.R. 5741. There are a number of significant differences, however.

Section 401 requires that if there is a fund, it must be established pursuant to a duly executed trust agreement, thus, in effect, producing substantially the same effect as is accomplished by the Administration's bill, which clothes the administrators of such funds with the responsibilities of "fiduciaries."

The basic difference here is that establishes the familiar standard of "a man of ordinary prudence" and then turns the interpretation of that term over to the Federal courts exclusively. (Sections 14(a) and 9). The result of those provisions of the Administration bill would seem to be to wipe out the vast body of State case law on the subject of trusts and fiduciary responsibility, except to the extent that it is incorporated into the development of federal case law on the subject. Such a development of a federal case law of trusts, however, will only occur after many years, as the cases arise one by one in the federal courts. In the meantime, there will be considerable uncertainty among trustees as to what the law really is. Such uncertainty for an extended period may well be too high a price to pay for the establishment of federal fiduciary standards.

Titles IV and V of this bill, on the other hand, take a more moderate approach. Insofar as trust agreements contain "choice of law" provisions designating the trust law of a particular state as applicable, such provisions are required to be honored, pursuant to section 507. If no such "choice of law" provisions is included in the trust agreement, then the federal courts would apply federal law. Under this system, certainty would be preserved for those trustees who require it—typically banks and trust companies—while the development of federal trust law would proceed in those cases where no specific State law is spelled out.

Along the same lines, the Administration bill again attaches no importance to the historical development of trust law, in that it provides, in section 14(k), that no "exculpatory provision" shall relieve any fiduciary from any of his responsibilities. Of course, the law of trusts, as it has developed in the cases down through the centuries, has developed various standards for enforcing or nullifying such "exculpatory clauses," depending on the circumstances. For example, in many pension trusts, responsibility is divided between the trustee (often a bank or trust company) and a labor-management "Committee," which typically is given power to "instruct" the trustee as to certain matters. Typically, a trust company or bank simply will not accept appointment as a trustee under these circumstances unless the trust agreement provides that the Bank shall not be held responsible for any action taken in reliance on instructions from the "Committee" as provided in the agreement. Is this an illegal "exculpatory clause" under the Administration bill? It seems likely. Nor can all such problems be spelled out in the statute. The answer, once again, is to leave such matters to development through the case law, and to preserve what certainly we already have by allowing existing case law to continue in existence where it is specifically made applicable under the terms of the trust agreement.

The "conflict of interest" provisions of this bill and the Administration bill are quite similar. As indicated above, title IV applies only to funds, not to plans without funds—i.e., those whose benefits are payable solely out of the general assets of the employer. A principal difference between the provisions of this bill and the administration bill concerns the prohibition against being on two payrolls at once. The administration bill, like this bill, prohibits fiduciaries from receiving any assets out of the fund, except as regular benefits. The administration bill attempts to accomplish this first, by stating that the moneys in the fund shall be used "for the sole and exclusive purpose" of providing benefits and defraying "reasonable costs of administering the plan." (Section 14(c)). The Administration bill also prohibits the making of loans from the fund to any fiduciary (Section 14(f)), and prohibits a fiduciary from dealing with the fund in his own account (section 14(e)(3)). These provisions will *probably* cover most conflict of interest situation, unless a dishonest person is quite clever. The trouble is that recent hearings have shown the development of the most ingenious schemes for siphoning off pension funds, and a bill such as this ought to be drafted with such ingenious schemes in mind.

The administration concentrates on the possible misdeeds of the fiduciary—the trustee himself, while my bill concentrates on the representatives of the employer or the union. My bill controls the actions of the truly independent trustee only by application of the law of trusts, without attempting to spell out every detail of that law as it exists in the cases, but my bill *does* specifically prohibit the representatives of the *employer or the union* from siphoning off fund assets to their own use, and this is done in much more comprehensive language than that used in the administration bill (section 404).

One other major difference between the two bills relates to payroll padding. Last year's Investigations Subcommittee hearings disclosed that one of the most effective ways of depleting a fund was to permit an officer of the employer or the union to draw a salary from both the fund and the employer or union, as the case may be. The theory of my bill is that if a union officer is serving as a trustee and still drawing his salary from the union, he may not also draw a salary from the fund itself—though he may receive expense money and a reasonable fee for attending fund meetings, and the same prohibition is applied to management officers. (Section 404). The Administration bill allows such officers to be on both payrolls at once, but instead limits fiduciaries to "reasonable compensation". Such a provision may well get the Labor Department into the business of passing on the reasonableness of every fee paid to every trustee in the Nation, which seems to me to be neither necessary nor wise. I would rather focus on those salaries which are paid in the true conflict of interest situation, and, when it comes to the hiring of the truly independent trustee in a truly arms-length business situation, rely on the ordinary law of trusts.

ENFORCEMENT

Title V contains enforcement provisions covering the whole bill. These provisions should be read in connection with the notes under section 6 (service of process) and Title I (judicial review of Commission determinations with respect to funding and vesting). Basically, section 501 permits the Commission to sue to enforce title I, and section 502 permits the Commission to sue to enforce title IV. Section 503 authorizes the Court to appoint a receiver, where necessary, in either case. Section 504 provides a private remedy in case of violation of title IV or in case of violation of any provision of a plan. The law applicable in any such case based upon a breach of contract or breach of trust, however, would be State law in any case in which the agreement designates the law of a State as applicable, and in all other cases, federal common law would apply, although, of course, the federal courts would be expected to draw upon the State common law as a source for the development of a federal common law in this area. Of particular importance are the provisions of sections 502 and 504 which permit suit to be brought by the Commission or a participant *either* against the fund to compel payment of benefits, *or* "in the name of the fund" against any other person to compel return of misappropriated assets—a remedy comparable to the familiar "stockholders derivative suit" under the law of corporations.

Mr. JAVITS. I also ask unanimous consent that this bill, which has its primary emphasis in the labor field, be referred first to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and that if it should be reported from that committee and, as reported, it should contain any provisions affecting the tax laws, it will then be referred to the Finance Committee for consideration of those provisions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SAN FELIPE DIVISION, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the San Felipe division, central valley project, in California. My able colleague and longtime friend in the House of Representatives, CHARLES S. GUBSER, has previously introduced this legislation in the House.

This project will eventually provide 273,000 acre-feet of water annually for 448,000 acres of land in the counties of Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz, and Monterey on the west slope of the coast range. Wells in that area are becoming dry, or polluted from boron infiltration, and in the coastal areas, sea water intrusion has become a major problem. Rapid urbanization of the area has also resulted in serious pressures on the existing water supply.

The project water supply will be obtained from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta through the operation of existing facilities of the central valley project, and will then be transported through facilities of the State water project from the delta to the San Luis Reservoir. A low level tunnel will carry the water through Pacheco Pass in the Diablo Range to a 104-mile canal and pipeline distribution system.

Other features of the project will include one large and several smaller pumping plants, power transmission facilities, three small regulatory reservoirs, and distribution facilities.

The total Federal investment will be $89.8 million. Inlet works and the first 2-mile section of the Pacheco Tunnel are nearing completion under a 1964 contract awarded as an economy measure to permit construction before the site was covered with water by the filling of the San Luis Reservoir.

In October 1966, the Department of the Interior approved and submitted to Congress a Bureau of Reclamation feasibility report recommending authorization of the $89.8 million project. The report stated that the project was economically feasible and financially justified, the cost-benefit analysis showing a very favorable 1: 3.27 ratio.

Local agencies are cooperating with Federal authorities in planning this project. The tricounty water authority has shared the cost of investigation to date, and other local interests are organizing an agency qualified to contract with the United States under reclamation law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1111) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the San Felipe division, central valley project, California, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1111

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of providing irrigation and municipal and industrial water supplies, area redevelopment, conserving and developing fish and wildlife resources, enhancing outdoor recreation opportunities and other related purposes, the Secretary of the Interior, acting pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain, as an addition to, and an integral part of, the Central Valley project, California, the San Felipe division. The principal works of the unit shall consist of the Pacheco tunnel, pumping plants, power transmission facilities, canals, pipelines, regulating reservoirs, and distribution facilities.

SEC. 2. Subject to the provisions of this Act, the operation of the San Felipe division, shall be integrated and coordinated, from both a financial and an operational standpoint, with the operation of other features of the Central Valley project in such manner as will effectuate the fullest, most beneficial, and most economic utilization of the water resources hereby made available.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary is authorized in connection with the San Felipe division to construct, operate, and maintain or otherwise provide for basic public outdoor recreation facilities, to acquire or otherwise to include within the division area such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for present or future public recreation use, to allocate water and reservoir capacity to recreation, and to provide for the public use and enjoyment of division lands, facilities, and water areas in a manner coordinated with the other division purposes. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with Federal agencies or State or local public bodies for the operation, maintenance, and additional development of division lands or facilities, or to dispose of division lands or facilities to Federal agencies or State or local public bodies by lease, transfer, conveyance or exchange, upon such terms and conditions as will best promote the development and operation of such lands or facilities in the public interest for recreation purposes.

(b) Federal operation and maintenance costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement in excess of the foregoing limit under one or a combination of the following methods, as may be determined appropriate by the Secretary: (1) provision by non-Federal interests of land or interests therein or facilities required for the division; (2) payment or repayment, with interest at a rate comparable to that for other division functions, pursuant to agreement with one or more non-Federal public bodies; (3) reallocation to other project functions in the same proportion as joint costs are allocated among such functions.

(c) Costs of means and measures to prevent loss of and damage to fish and wildlife shall be treated as division costs and allocated to the other division purposes. Nothing herein shall limit the authority of the Secretary granted by existing provisions of law relating to recreational development of water resource projects or disposition of public lands for recreational purposes.

SEC. 4. In locating and designing the works and facilities authorized for construction by this Act, and in acquiring or withdrawing any lands as authorized by this Act, the Secretary shall give due consideration to reports prepared by the State of California on the California water plan, and shall consult with local interests who may be affected by the construction and operation of said works and facilities or by the acquisition or withdrawal of lands, through public hearings or in such manner as in his discretion may be found best suited to a maximum expression of the views of such local interests.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, recently in the Nevada Legislature a proposal was introduced, now being studied by the Nevada Assembly Committee on Taxation, which seeks to impose an additional tax on coin operated devices through a tax credit formula.

I ask that the assembly measures be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The bill which I now introduce renews a proposal I made, along with my colleague [Mr. BIBLE], in 1965 which recognizes that since Federal legislation in this field is designed for purposes of regulation rather than for the raising of revenue, a more realistic formula be instituted.

Our proposal stipulates that 80 percent of the occupational taxes collected on these devices be credited for similar taxes imposed by a State where the operation of such devices are legal. It is an amendment which would be consistent, in our opinion, with the action taken by the Congress in 1965 in the case of the New Hampshire lottery.

Nevada, like New Hampshire, is in need of these locally raised revenues to meet its growing costs of government, not the least of which is support of schools.

I ask that the text of the bill be inserted in the RECORD following the Nevada Assembly bill No. 174 and Nevada Assembly Joint Resolution No. 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the measures of the Nevada Legislature and the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The measures of the Nevada Assembly, presented by Mr. CANNON, are as follows:

ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 174—COMMITTEE ON TAXATION—FEBRUARY 6, 1967

An act to amend chapter 463 of NRS, relating to the licensing and control of gambling, by adding a new section imposing an additional tax upon slot machines contingent upon the allowance of an offsetting Federal tax credit; and providing other matters properly relating thereto

The People of the State of Nevada, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Chapter 463 of NRS is hereby amended by adding thereto a new section which shall read as follows:

1. In addition to any other license fees and taxes imposed by this chapter, there is hereby imposed upon each slot machine operated in this state a tax equal to the amount of any credit which may be allowed against the tax imposed on slot machines by 26 U.S.C. § 4461 for the payment of a state tax. If no such credit is allowed, no tax is payable under this subsection.

2. The commission shall:

(a) Collect the tax annually in advance, prior to January 10, as a condition precedent to the issuance of a state gaming license to operate any slot machine.

(b) Include the proceeds of the tax in its reports of state gaming taxes collected.

3. The commission shall pay over the tax as collected to the state treasurer to be deposited to the credit of the state distributive school fund.

SEC. 2. If the Congress of the United States enacts legislation after January 10 of any calendar year by virtue of which a credit against the tax on slot machines by 26 U.S.C. § 4461 is allowable for a state tax paid during such calendar year, the Nevada gaming commission shall charge and collect, within 30 days after the effective date of such legislation, a tax on each slot machine licensed in this state equal to the amount of such credit allowable.

SEC. 3. This act shall become effective upon passage and approval.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 8—COMMITTEE ON TAXATION—FEBRUARY 6, 1967

Assembly joint resolution — Memorializing the Congress of the United States to allow a credit against the federal tax for slot machine taxes imposed by the states.

WHEREAS, The State of Nevada, like all areas of rapidly expanding population, is faced with a continuing crisis in the field of education as it strives with limited resources to meet ever-growing needs; and

WHEREAS, The Federal Government has recognized the crucial importance of education in developing a citizenry informed and prepared to meet the challenge of our complex society; and

WHEREAS, Federal law now imposes a tax of $250 per year on each slot machine, and certain controls upon the use of such machines; and

WHEREAS, Various proposals have been made in the Congress for the return of certain federally collected revenues to the states; and

WHEREAS, The process of collection and return is cumbersome, costly and time-consuming; and

WHEREAS, The State of Nevada stands ready to collect such a tax directly and to take all necessary measures to insure its payment for each machine; and

WHEREAS, Legislation is now pending in this state to impose such a tax to the extent that the corresponding federal tax is diminished, and to devote its proceeds to the support of the public schools; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada, jointly, That this legislature on behalf of the people of the State of Nevada respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing a credit of 80 percent against the tax imposed by 26 U.S.C. § 4461 upon slot machines for the amount of any tax paid upon such machines to a state; and be it further

Resolved, That this legislature urgently requests each member of the Nevada congressional delegation to work for the enactment of such legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the legislative counsel to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and each member of the Nevada congressional delegation.

The bill (S. 1112) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the occupational tax on coin-operated gaming devices for similar taxes presently imposed by a State where the operation of such devices is legal, introduced by Mr. CANNON (for himself and Mr. BIBLE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1112

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subchapter B of chapter 36 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to occupational tax on coin-operated devices) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 4464. CREDIT FOR STATE-IMPOSED TAXES.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by section 4461 with respect to any coin-operated gaming device for any year an amount equal to the amount of State tax paid for such year with respect to such device by the person liable for the tax imposed by section 4461, if such State tax (1) is paid under a law of the State in which the place or premises on which such device is maintained or used is located, and (2) is similar to the tax imposed by section 4461 (including a tax, other than a general personal property tax, imposed on such device).

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) DEVICES MUST BE LEGAL UNDER STATE LAW.—Credit shall be allowed under subsection (a) for a tax imposed by a State only if the maintenance of the coin-operated gaming device by the person liable for the tax imposed by section 4461 on the place or premises occupied by him does not violate any law of such State.

"(2) CREDIT NOT TO EXCEED 80 PER CENTUM OF TAX.—The credit under subsection (a) with respect to any coin-operated gaming device shall not exceed 80 per centum of the tax imposed by section 4461 with respect to such device.

"(3) CREDIT NOT TO APPLY TO NEW TAXES.—Credit shall be allowed under subsection (a) for a tax imposed by a State only if such State imposed such tax or a substantially similar tax (whether or not conditionally) on the date of the enactment of this section.

"(c) SPECIAL PROVISION FOR PAYMENT OF TAX.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, a person who believes he will be entitled to a credit under subsection (a) with respect to any coin-operated gaming device for any year shall, for purposes of this subtitle and subtitle F, satisfy his liability for the tax imposed by section 4461 with respect to such device for such year if—

"(1) on or before the date prescribed by law for payment of the tax imposed by section 4461 with respect to such device for such year, he has paid the amount of such tax reduced by the amount of the credit which he estimates will be allowable under subsection (a) with respect to such device for such year, and

"(2) on or before the last day of such year, pays the amount (if any) by which the credit for such year is less than the credit estimated under paragraph (1)."

(b) The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 36 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"SEC. 4464. CREDIT FOR STATE-IMPOSED TAXES."

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply on and after July 1, 1967.

THE DINOSAUR TRAIL NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish the Dinosaur Trail National Monument near Glen Rose, Tex.

This bill would authorize a national monument to preserve the site of perhaps the most numerous and best preserved dinosaur tracks in the world. The footprints of the vanished dinosaurs can be seen preserved in the natural rock that forms the bed of the beautiful little Paluxy River. The tracks, in part forming a trail, are said to be 135 million years old.

My colleagues, Representatives BOB POAGE, of Waco, and JIM WRIGHT, of Fort Worth, earlier this year sponsored House bills to create this national monument. I am honored to introduce this companion Senate bill today. It is noteworthy that united community spirit in Glen Rose and Somervell County favors the preservation of these tracks in a national monument.

About 30 dinosaur tracks are said to be visible today, left by dinosaurs in mud which has hardened into limestone. More tracks are likely to be uncovered. This legislation is made necessary by the fact that people pry up the dinosaur tracks out of the rock and carry them away.

Previously, some of the tracks were quarried, and are on display at the American Museum of Natural History in New York and the Texas Memorial Museum in Austin. All of these tracks might be subject to removal were a national monument not created to preserve the tracks as they were originally created by the feet of the dinosaurs.

I have personally walked this creek bed and have seen the tracks, originally in mud, now turned to stone, where these giant, extinct creatures of a vanished time cycle walked up the creekbed with vast strides longer than that of any living creature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The

bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1113) to authorize the establishment of the Dinosaur Trail National Monument in the State of Texas, introduced by Mr. Yarborough, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE FEDERAL-STATE PROGRAM OF CHILD WELFARE SERVICES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act so as to extend and improve the Federal-State program of child welfare services.

This proposed legislation was introduced in the 89th Congress in the House of Representatives by the late Congressman John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, and could be called the greatest unfinished program left by Mr. Fogarty's untimely death. The legislation calls for Federal participation in the cost of State child welfare services based on the State's per capita income. The proposal has the support of practically all of those individuals most concerned with child welfare. Specifically, the bill would authorize:

1. SEVENTY-FIVE PERCENT MATCHING FOR SALARIES AND TRAINING

The Federal Government would pay 75 percent of the total of each State's salary and training costs for child welfare personnel employed or preparing for employment.

2. FIFTY TO EIGHTY-THREE PERCENT FOR ALL OTHER CHILD WELFARE COSTS

Each State would receive funds to pay for a percentage of the cost of all child welfare services for every child who is the responsibility of the State or local public welfare agencies. Such funds would include coverage for purchase of care from voluntary agencies and for administrative costs other than salaries.

Payments would be made on a matching basis, depending on a State's per capita income. The Federal share of each State's expenditures—for other than salaries and training—would be at least 50 percent and no more than 83 percent, with those States having the lowest per capita income receiving the largest Federal share.

3. STATES MUST SPEND NO LESS THAN BEFORE

To make sure that the additional Federal money made available by the bill would be spent to strengthen and expand child welfare programs, rather than used to replace State dollars, the legislation requires that State and local expenditures for child welfare services may not be less than such expenditures were for the year ending June 30, 1966.

4. SERVICES TO CHILDREN THROUGHOUT THE STATE

To be eligible for funds, a State must have a plan for a comprehensive child-welfare program—a program that would include services to help children remain in their own homes as well as foster-care services. The plan must meet Federal requirements that are essentially the same as those already established—by the 1962 amendments of the Social Security Act, part IV. They include the important proviso that the program must extend throughout all political subdivisions of the State. That is, services must be provided for children in all counties of the State.

5. GRANTS FOR EXPERIMENTATION

Federal project grants would be available to States for developing and maintaining new or experimental forms of child-welfare services, including services for children with special needs. Such grants would give States a specific incentive to develop new projects and to try them out within a limited local area, thus encouraging experimentation with programs that have not been sufficiently tested to justify their application on a statewide basis.

Mr. President, we should remember that in half the counties of the Nation there are presently no child-welfare services. We should also not lose sight of the fact that there are thousands of homes in our land where the abilities of parents to cope with the problems of their children are extremely limited, either by reasons of health, income or inability. This legislation would give parents a modicum of help presently unavailable which would aid them in meeting their needs as parents.

The expenditures under this measure could be called a capital investment in the future. For better child-welfare services today would mean a healthier citizenry, both physically and mentally, in the future.

Mr. President, I hope that this proposal will meet with early and approving consideration by the Senate, for there can be no more fitting memorial to John E. Fogarty than its enactment. I ask that the full text of the proposed legislation be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1116) to amend title V of the Social Security Act so as to extend and improve the Federal-State program of child-welfare services introduced by Mr. Pell, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committeee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1116

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 521 through 525 of the Social Security Act are amended to read as follows:

"APPROPRIATION

"Sec. 521. For the purpose of enabling each State to extend and improve public child-welfare services, there are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and each of the succeeding fiscal years, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this part. The sums made available under this section shall be used for making payment to States which have State plans for child-welfare services developed jointly by the State public-welfare agency and the Secretary.

"STATE PLANS FOR CHILD-WELFARE SERVICES

"Sec. 522. (a) A State plan for child-welfare services developed for purposes of this part must—

"(1) provide for coordination between the care and services provided under such plan and the care and services provided for dependent children under the State plan approved under title IV, and with care and services provided for children under other State or local programs, with a view to provision of such services as will best promote the welfare of such children and their families;

"(2) provide that it shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State, and, if administered by them, be mandatory upon them, and that child-welfare services under the plan shall be provided by the staff (which to the extent feasible shall be composed of trained child-welfare personnel) of the State public-welfare agency or the local agency participating in the administration of the plan in the political subdivision;

"(3) provide for financial participation by the State;

"(4) provide for administration, or supervision of administration, of the State plan by the State public-welfare agency;

"(5) provide such methods of administration (including methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Secretary shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods) as are found by the Secretary to be necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the State plan;

"(6) provide that the State public-welfare agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may from time to time require, and will comply with such provisions as the Secretary may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

"(7) provide safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning children receiving child-welfare services to purposes directly connected with the administration of the State plan;

"(8) provide that the amount of non-Federal funds determined by the Secretary to have been expended in the State under the State plan developed for any fiscal year will not be less than the amount of non-Federal funds determined by the Secretary to have been expended under the State plan developed under this part for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; and

"(9) provide, with respect to day care services (including the provision of such care) provided under the plan—

"(A) for cooperative arrangements with the State health authority and the State agency primarily responsible for State supervision of public schools to assure maximum utilization of such agencies in the provision of necessary health services and education for children receiving day care,

"(B) for the advisory committee, to advise the State public-welfare agency on the general policy involved in the provision of day care services under the State plan, which shall include among its members representatives of other State agencies concerned with day care or services related thereto and persons representative of professional or civic or other public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, or groups concerned with the provision of day care,

"(C) for such safeguards as may be necessary to assure provision of day care under the plan only in cases in which it is in the best interest of the child and the mother and only in cases in which it is determined, under criteria established by the State, that a need for such care exists; and, in cases in which the family is able to pay part or all of the costs of such care, for payment of such fees as may be reasonable in the light of such ability,

"(D) for giving priority, in determining the existence of need for such day care, to members of low-income or other groups in the population and to geographical areas which have the greatest relative need for extension of such day care, and

"(E) that day care provided under the plan will be provided only in facilities (including private homes) which are licensed by the State, or approved (as meeting the standards established for such licensing) by the State agency responsible for licensing facilities of this type; and

"(10) provide, with respect to foster care (including the provision of such care) provided under the plan—

"(A) for payment of the reasonable cost for adequate care of each child receiving such foster care under the plan (as determined in accordance with standards established by the State public-welfare agency and approved by the Secretary), including care purchased from nonprofit private agencies, group homes, and child-care institutions,

"(B) in cases in which the child's family is able to pay part or all of the cost of foster care of the child under the plan, for payment of such amount of such cost as may be reasonable in the light of such ability,

"(C) such safeguards as may be necessary to assure provision of such care under the plan (i) only in cases in which it is determined, under criteria established by the State public-welfare agency, that a need for such care exists and that the type of care and services provided are in the best interest of the child, and (ii) except in situations in which emergency care is required, only in cases in which the State public-welfare agency (or the local agency administering the plan in the political subdivision) has responsibility for the child as a result of a written agreement with the child's parent or guardian or as a result of commitment by a court of competent jurisdiction,

"(D) for maximum utilization of health care and services available under State plans approved under part 1, 2, or 4 of this title or under title XIX, and

"(E) that such care will be provided only in facilities (including foster family homes) which (i) are licensed by the State, or approved (as meeting the standards established for such licensing) by the State agency responsible for licensing facilities of this type, and (ii) meet the standards of reasonable cost for adequate care included in the plan pursuant to clause (A) of this paragraph.

"(b) No plan developed for purposes of this part may impose any residence requirement as a condition of eligibility for services under the plan.

"PAYMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 523. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary shall pay to each State which has a plan developed as provided under this part, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1967—

"(1) an amount equal to 75 per centum of so much of the sums expended during such quarter (as found necessary by the Secretary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan) as are attributable to compensation or training of personnel employed, or preparing for employment by the State public-welfare agency (or by the local agency administering the plan in the political subdivision), for the purpose of providing child-welfare services; plus

"(2) an amount equal to the Federal child-welfare percentage of the remainder of the amounts expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, and of the amounts expended for other child-welfare services under the plan.

"(b)(1) Prior to the beginning of each quarter, the Secretary shall estimate the amount to which a State will be entitled under subsection (a) for such quarter, such estimate to be based on (A) a report filed by the State containing its estimate of the total sum to be expended in such quarter in accordance with the provisions of such subsection, and stating the amount appropriated or made available by the State and its political subdivisions for such expenditures in such quarter, and if such amount is less than the State's proportionate share of the total sum of such estimated expenditures, the source or sources from which the difference is expected to be derived, and (B) such other investigation as the Secretary may find necessary.

"(2) The Secretary shall then pay, in such installments as he may determine, to the State the amount so estimated, reduced or increased to the extent of any overpayment or underpayment which the Secretary determines was made under this section to such State for any prior quarter and with respect to which adjustment has not already been made under this subsection.

"(3) The pro rata share to which the United States is equitably entitled, as determined by the Secretary, of the net amount recovered, during any quarter, by the State or political subdivision thereof with respect to child-welfare services, shall be considered an overpayment under this subsection.

"(4) Upon the making of any estimate by the Secretary under this subsection, any appropriations available for the payments under this section shall be deemed obligated.

"(c)(1) The Federal child-welfare percentage for any State shall be 100 per centum less the State percentage; and the State percentage shall be that percentage which bears the same ratio to 45 per centum as the square of the per capita income of such State bears to the square of the per capita income of the United States and shall in no case be less than 50 per centum nor more than 83 per centum. The Federal child-welfare percentage shall be 83 per centum for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

"(2) The Federal child-welfare percentage for each State shall be promulgated by the Secretary between July 1 and August 31 of each even-numbered year, on the basis of the average per capita income of each State and of the United States for the three most recent calendar years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in the period beginning July 1 next succeeding such promulgation; except that the Secretary shall promulgate such percentage as soon as possible after the enactment of this part, which promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the quarters in the period beginning October 1, 1967, and ending with the close of June 30, 1969.

"(3) The 'United States', for purposes of this subsection only, means the fifty States and the District of Columbia.

"OPERATION OF STATE PLANS

"SEC. 524. If the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State public-welfare agency administering or supervising the administration of the State plan developed as provided in this part, finds that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision, the Secretary shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made to the State (or, in his discretion, that payments will be limited to categories under or parts of the State plan not affected by such failure), until the Secretary is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied he shall make no further payments to such State (or shall limit payments to categories under or parts of the State plan not affected by such failure).

"PROJECTS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND SPECIAL TYPES OF CHILD-WELFARE SERVICES

"SEC. 525. (a) For the purpose of encouraging experimental and special types of child-welfare services, there are authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for each succeeding fiscal year.

"(b) From the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized to make grants to the State public-welfare agency administering the plan and (with the consent of such agency) to the local agency of any political subdivision of the State supervised by the State agency, for all or part of the cost, as determined by the Secretary, of developing and maintaining projects for experimental types of family or group care and services and for types of care and services that have been proved effective in special situations, including care and services for children with special needs. No project shall be eligible for a grant under this section unless there is submitted to the Secretary an application providing (1) a description of the services available to, and the method of selection of, the children included in the project, (2) a description of the geographic area to be served by the project, and (3) reasonable assurance that there will be coordination of the care and services provided under the project with other State programs providing services for children.

"(c) Payment of grants for special projects under this section may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments, as the Secretary may determine; and shall be made on such conditions as the Secretary finds necessary to carry out the purposes of the grants."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 528 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out the heading and inserting in lieu thereof "DEFINITIONS";

(2) by striking out so much thereof as precedes " 'child-welfare services' means" and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 528. For purposes of this part—

"(a) The term"; and

(4) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(b) The term 'child' means a child who is under the age of 21.

"(c) The term 'foster family home' means a family home which cares for any child or children who are unrelated, or not closely related, to the family and which is licensed by the State in which it is situated or has been approved, by the agency of such State responsible for licensing homes of this type, as meeting the standards established for such licensing.

"(d) The term 'group home' means a small, public or nonprofit private, residential home which cares for children and (1) is administered by a public or nonprofit private agency concerned with child welfare services, and (2) is licensed by the State in which it is situated or has been approved, by the agency of such State responsible for licensing homes of this type, as meeting the standards established for such licensing.

"(e) The term 'child-care institution' means an institution operated primarily for the care of dependent or neglected children which (1) is a public institution operated by the State agency, or which has policies and methods of operations which have been approved by the State agency or (2) is a nonprofit private institution which is licensed by the State in which it is situated or approved, by the agency of such State responsible for licensing or approval of institutions of this type, as meeting the standards established for such licensing."

SEC. 3. As used in the provisions of the Social Security Act amended by this Act, the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

COMDR. EDWARD WHITE RAWLINS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in 1949, during the 81st Congress, a bill was first introduced in the Senate to promote Comdr. Edward White Rawlins to the rank of captain in the U.S. Navy. A subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee held hearings on the bill. The basic justification of that bill was that the Wartime Promotion Panels considering Rawlins' promotion acted hastily and without consideration of all relevant documentation. Moreover, the one apparently unfavorable item in Rawlins' record at the time he was being considered for promotion—an unenthusiastic fitness report from an immediate superior—was later withdrawn by the superior.

The Navy Department stated, at the 1949 hearings, that it agreed Commander Rawlins' record has no blemish. The Armed Services subcommittee concluded that there was considerable merit to the claim that an injustice had been done to Commander Rawlins by his promotion denial—Senate Report No. 562, 81st Congress, first session.

A House Committee considering this matter in 1950 found that:

> There is ample evidence in the record that Commander Rawlins may have suffered due to an administrative error. It appears that a letter was missing from his file which would have refuted a detrimental statement concerning him (H. Rep. No. 3012, 81st Cong., 2nd Sess.).

Commander Rawlins' claim for promotion has been supported by an impressive number of Navy flag officers, including Adm. Robert B. Carney, and Adm. Louis Denfeld, both former Chiefs of Naval Operations.

The Rawlins' promotion bill was not passed by the Congress during the 81st Congress, though the Senate passed a bill which would have required the Navy to reopen his case, among others. In the 83d Congress, the Senate passed a bill promoting Commander Rawlins to captain, but the House refused to accept it. In 1955, during the 84th Congress, hearings were again held on this issue, and at that time a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee concluded that whatever injustice may have been caused Commander Rawlins by his promotion denial was no greater than the possible injustice to other officers denied promotion by the Wartime Promotion Panels. Specifically, this subcommittee found that whatever documents were absent from Rawlins' file when his promotion was being considered would have had no material impact on his promotion request. The Senate took no action on Rawlins' relief bill.

This matter did not end here. In 1961, another private bill was introduced on Rawlins' behalf, and the Navy then agreed to set up a special board to reconsider Rawlins' claim. That board refused to give Rawlins the rank of captain. Rawlins claims, however, that this board failed to take into account that his early unenthusiastic fitness report had been retracted by the reporting officer and that the board did not have available other evidence of Rawlins' fitness for promotion. Moreover, Rawlins was not permitted to appear before the board, with or without representation by counsel.

It should be noted that if the Navy had not convened a special panel to consider Rawlins' claim, but rather permitted his claim to go before the board for correction of Navy records—as it has done in cases similar to Rawlins—then Rawlins would have had the right to testify in person, to be accompanied by counsel, to introduce witnesses, and to present all available new evidence in his behalf.

Mr. President, this case has a long history. It seems to me desirable that Rawlins should be given a "day in court" so that the conflicting factual allegations and conflicting views of the equities of the situation can be sorted out. During the 89th Congress, the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judiciay Machinery, of which I am chairman, of the Senate Judiciary Committee did considerable work on a bill to provide for reference of private bills to the commissioners of the court of claims.

My subcommittee believed that Congress could benefit greatly by receiving the impartial judgment of these commissioners regarding private bills to remedy apparent inequities, particularly where conflicting factual allegations are involved. I am pleased that the Congress enacted this legislation. I believe the machinery set up by that legislation for reference of private bills is most appropriate for the bill I introduced today, on behalf of Commander Rawlins.

Accordingly, I am also submitting a Senate resolution, referring the Rawlins bill to the chief commissioner of the court of claims, for findings regarding the equities of that bill and a report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1122) for the relief of Comdr. Edward White Rawlins, U.S. Navy (retired), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The resolution (S. Res. 90) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. RES. 90

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1122) entitled "A bill for the relief of Commander Edward White Rawlins, United States Navy (retired)", now pending in the Senate, together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to chief commissioner of the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and the court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and shall report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, its findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress (a) of the nature and character of his demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, (b) whether Commander Rawlins suffered nonpromotion to the grade of captain as a probable consequence of any arbitrary, capricious, inadvertent, improper, inequitable, or wrongful act or action or combinations thereof by or within the Department of the Navy, and (c) in such event, the amount legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant, notwithstanding the lapse of time and any statute of limitations or laches.

FIRE RESEARCH AND SAFETY ACT OF 1967

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, the proposed Fire Research and Safety Act of 1967.

One of the earliest and one of the most important discoveries of mankind was the use of fire. Yet throughout history, fire has also posed a threat to man, when it is an uncontrolled and unwanted fire. Some fires have gone down in history—the great fire of London in the 13th century, for example. Other fires receive scant attention in the daily newspapers. Yet to the victims of fire, the results are equally tragic.

It is ironic that here in the United States, with all of our vast technical know-how, the per capita death rate from fire is four times as high as the rate in the United Kingdom and more than six times as great as the rate in Japan.

President Johnson, in his message, "To Protect the American Consumer" said: "We can do better, and we must."

These are my sentiments, exactly. I have therefore introduced a bill, the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1967, which is designed to help cut down the toll of 12,000 lives and $1¾ billion in property losses that the Nation suffers each year as a result of fires.

There is not a Member of this body who has not come into contact, directly or indirectly, with the human tragedy behind the grim statistics. Earlier this month, in the Lake Stevens area of Snohomish County in my home State of Washington, a fire in the middle of the night took the lives of an entire family—mother, father, and three little children. The children never even had a chance to get out of their beds. And this is not an exceptional case. A casual glance at newspapers around the country would reveal many similar stories of tragedy and loss.

There are a number of public and private institutions that are active in the field of fire safety. Without their efforts, the situation today would no doubt be much worse than it is. However, there is still much more that needs to be done. We are making no headway at the present time in reducing the per capita death rate from fires. Moreover, the number of fires per capita and the property damage per capita have increased during the past 5 years. Obviously, something must be done to correct this deteriorating situation.

The bill I have introduced would amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a comprehensive fire research and safety program. This objective would be accomplished through support and expansion of existing public and private programs, wherever possible.

Specifically, the proposed program would include: First, investigation of the incidence of fires, and research on the causes of fires; second, education of the public on fire hazards and safety techniques; education of firemen on fire-fighting methods including the development of fire safety courses; third, reference and data services to provide information on all aspects of fire safety; fourth, support for demonstration projects on improved methods for the prevention and control of fires, and for projects designed to improve fire services; and fifth, grants to State and local governments, and to other public and nonprofit institutions for the purpose of achieving the objectives outlined in the bill.

I believe that the proposed program is a well thought out approach to a difficult and complex problem. It may be that some fires cannot be avoided, as, for example, those started by lightning and other natural causes. Nevertheless, most of the causes of fires are related to human carelessness in the highly technological and potentially hazardous environment we have created for ourselves in the 20th century.

In my opinion, the problem of fire safety is a perfect example of a problem which can best be resolved through the cooperative efforts of public and private organizations, and through a working partnership of government at all levels, Federal, State, and local. The bill I have proposed takes just such an approach. I urge all Members to study the proposals carefully, and I believe the public interest will be well served through swift enactment of this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at the close of my remarks, together with a statement of purpose and need and a brief summary of the proposed national fire safety program.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, statement of purpose, and a summary of the proposed national fire safety program, will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1124) to amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a fire research and safety program, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Magnuson (for himself and Mr. Cotton), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1124

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act be cited as the "Fire Research and Safety Act of 1967."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Sec. 2. Congress finds that a comprehensive fire research and safety program is needed in this country to provide more effective measures of protection against the hazards of death, injury and damage to property. The Congress finds that it is desirable and necessary for the Federal Government, in carrying out the provisions of this Act, to cooperate with and assist public and private agencies. The Congress declares that the purpose of this Act is to amend the Act of March 3, 1901, as amended, to provide a national fire research and safety program including the gathering of comprehensive fire data; a comprehensive fire research program; fire safety education and training programs; demonstrations of new approaches and improvements in fire prevention, control and reduction of death, personal injury and property damage. Additionally, it is the sense of Congress that the Secretary should establish a fire research and safety center for administering this Act and carrying out its purposes, including appropriate fire safety liaison and coordination.

FIRE RESEARCH AND SAFETY AMENDMENTS

Sec. 3. The Act entitled "An Act to establish the National Bureau of Standards" approved March 3, 1901, as amended (15 U.S.C. 271–278e) is further amended by adding the following sections:

"Sec. 16. The Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) is authorized to—

"(a) Conduct directly or through contracts or grants—

"(1) Investigations of fires to determine their causes, frequency of occurrence, severity and other pertinent factors;

"(2) Research into the causes and nature of fires, and the development of improved methods and techniques for fire prevention, fire control and reduction of death, personal injury and property damage;

"(3) Educational programs to—

"(A) Inform the public of fire hazards and fire safety techniques, and

"(B) Encourage avoidance of such hazards and use of such techniques;

"(4) Fire information reference services, including the collection, analysis and dissemination of data, research results and other information, derived from this program or from other sources and related to fire protection, fire control and reduction of death, personal injury and property damage.

"(5) Educational and training programs to improve, among other things—

"(A) The efficiency, operation and organization of fire services; and

"(B) The capability of controlling unusual fire-related hazards and fire disasters; and

"(6) Projects demonstrating—

"(A) Improved or experimental programs of fire prevention, fire control and reduction of death, personal injury and property damage;

"(B) Application of fire safety principles in construction; or

"(C) Improvement of the efficiency, operation or organization of the fire services.

"(b) Support by contracts or grants the development, for use by educational and other nonprofit institutions, of—

"(1) Fire safety and fire protection engineering or science curriculums; and

"(2) Fire safety courses, seminars or other instructional materials and aids for the above curriculums or other appropriate curriculums or courses of instruction.

"Sec. 17. With respect to the functions authorized by section 16 of this Act—

"(a) Grants may be made only to States and local governments, other non-Federal public agencies and nonprofit institutions. Such grants may be up to 100 per centum of the total cost of each project for which such grant is made. The Secretary shall require, whenever feasible, as a condition of approval of a grant, that the recipient contribute money, facilities, or services to carry out the purpose for which the grant is sought. For the purposes of this section, 'State' means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Canal Zone, American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; and 'public agencies' includes combinations or groups of States or local governments.

"(b) The Secretary may arrange with and reimburse the heads of other Federal departments and agencies for the performance of any such functions, and, as necessary or appropriate, delegate any of his powers under this section or section 16 of this Act with respect to any part thereof, and authorize the redelegation of such powers.

"(c) The Secretary may perform such functions without regard to Revised Statutes section 3648 (31 U.S.C. 529).

"(d) The Secretary is authorized to request any Federal department or agency to supply such statistics, data, program reports and other materials as he deems necessary to carry out such functions. Each such department or agency is authorized to cooperate with the Secretary and, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such materials to the Secretary. The Secretary and the heads of other departments and agencies engaged in administering programs related to fire safety shall, to the maximum extent practicable, cooperate and consult in order to insure fully coordinated efforts.

"(e) The Secretary is authorized to establish such policies, standards, criteria and procedures and to prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or appropriate to the administration of such functions or this section, including rules and regulations which—

"(1) Provide that a grantee will from time to time, but not less often than annually, submit a report evaluating accomplishments of activities funded under section 16, and

"(2) Provide for fiscal control, sound accounting procedures and periodic reports to the Secretary regarding the application of funds paid under section 16."

EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS

Sec. 4. Nothing contained in this Act shall be deemed to repeal, supersede, or diminish existing authority or responsibility of any agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this Act, $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the following four fiscal years, and such appropriations are authorized to be made without fiscal year limitations.

The statement of purpose and need, and the national fire safety program presented by Mr. Magnuson are as follows:

Statement of Purpose and Need

This proposed "Fire Research and Safety Act of 1967" would amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a comprehensive fire research and safety program to gather comprehensive fire data, conduct intensive fire research, educate and train in fire protection and safety and support demonstrations of improved and experimental fire protection and safety.

The best estimates available indicate that in 1965, fire in the United States caused 12,100 deaths and property damage amounting to $1,741,300,000 or ($8.98 for every man, woman, and child). Our per capita fire death rate is twice Canada's rate, four times the rate for the United Kingdom, and six and one-half times the rate for Japan. While our much higher per capita death rate may reflect the hazards that accompany our higher standard of living, this merely indicates that we must put forth greater fire safety efforts as our living standards rise, if we are to eliminate excessive loss of life to fire.

Over the past five years, the best privately estimated per capita fire death rate from all causes has remained relatively constant (although U.S. Public Health Service figures for non-transportation fires have increased nine percent). Over the same period the estimated per capita number of fires in the United States has increased nine percent and the estimated per capita property damage has increased four percent. Our 1965 estimated per capita property damage contrasts with $6.85 for Canada, the next highest per capita loss among major countries. Japan, with a population of about one-half that of the United States, has a per capita loss of only $1.32 and its total number of fires in 1965 is about one-fortieth of the number that occurred in the United States.

The ravages of uncontrolled fires have dotted the pages of history from its beginning. Great fires that are well known go back at least to Nero's Rome in the middle of the first century. King John promulgated building ordinances to prevent the spread of fire between buildings after the London fire of 1212—three years before the Magna Charta. Research and testing of building constructions for fire resistance in this country started early in the last century but remained at a very low level until the great fires in Chicago, Baltimore and San Francisco, the last two in the first decade of this century. The resulting impetus to fire studies has lead to a more systematic approach and to the present collection of standard test methods.

At about the same time that fire testing and research was beginning to grow, the gathering of fire information and attempts at public education on fire safety took on a new stature. The National Fire Protection Association, founded in 1896, is the chief source for educational materials and consolidated fire information.

ROLE OF FIRE IN PUBLIC SAFETY

Fire strikes at man both physically and economically. There is no place or time when he may safely relax his guard. His homes, places of amusement, cities, transportation, and national resources are all vulnerable to fire. Fires start from natural causes such as lightning, but most causes are related to man's carelessness among the hazardous surroundings he has made for himself.

Fires in homes and apartments take many lives every year. Tragedies strike in places of public assembly despite laws and recommendations on construction, decoration, occupancy, and means of egress. Large losses of life have occurred in just the past few years as a result of fires in schools, hospitals, hotels, and restaurants. The recent tragedy in a penthouse restaurant in Montgomery, Alabama, took 25 lives.

Without the significant efforts of private and public organizations in the field of fire safety, the record would be much worse. However, this record can and should be improved. Greater support of fire safety programs will be needed, if such improvement is to be achieved. The Federal Government should provide needed support through a national fire safety program, including direct financial support of activities of private nonprofit and public organizations, and increased Federal activities to provide technical support for their programs. The national program should encourage local initiative by supporting improved methods and techniques for preventing and controlling fires, reducing personal injury and property damage, or improving the efficiency, operation or organization of the fire services.

Comprehensive and detailed information on fire causes and effects is essential to the best use of available resources to minimize the harm from fires. These resources must be directed to the most significant areas of the overall problem, which are only partially identified at present. For example, present fire cause data are not detailed enough to permit analysis to determine where research and other activities will be most beneficial. Similarly, education in fire safety and protection is hindered by a lack of detailed information on the nature and scope of the problem.

INFORMATION

Our present national efforts to gather information on fire causes and effects are carried on by private organizations. These organizations depend on voluntary cooperation of their members and others who are interested enough to provide reports. The National Fire Protection Association is generally recognized as having the best compilation of data on fire causes and losses of life and property. Despite diligent effort on the Association's part, however, it receives statewide loss data from only about half of the States, and data on causes from about one-third of the States. The present NFPA budget, derived from members' dues plus the sale of publications cannot support staff operations in the field to gather directly the data which is not supplied to the Association. Nor can the Association appeal to any incentive for cooperation in the data gathering other than a common interest in fire safety.

Another group gathering data is the insurance industry. However, their primary interest is in the area of establishing insurance rates, and their data, and analyses thereof, are of appropriately limited scope.

We need more fire information than voluntary efforts have been able to gather. The proposed legislation would authorize Federal support that could be used to increase that level of effort significantly. Voluntary and uniform reporting of fire information could be achieved by grants to local organizations. The information gathering program would utilize a standardized reporting system, and one or more teams of experts to investigate selected fires in depth and evaluate and improve the reporting system. There would also be a clearinghouse service for fire information, which would maintain a comprehensive library, provide materials and an abstract service, publish bibliographies and maintain roosters of those having highly specialized expertise.

The information gathered under this program would aid in planning, research, and in providing fire safety education. The clearinghouse service would furnish useful fire information to the fire service and others interested in fire safety throughout the country.

RESEARCH

The present research effort is carried on by fire equipment and building materials industries, trade associations, universities, nonprofit organizations, commercial laboratories, and Government agencies. The industry and trade association research, for the most part, is of an applied, product-oriented nature. Individual companies conduct little basic research. Industry has made use of trade associations as a mechanism for industry-wide support of research on common problems. But this work also is predominantly applied research. Industry tends to look to those who are not profit motivated for the basic research information.

The Federal Government's funding for fire research program is about six million dollars, concentrated mainly in the Forest Service and Department of Defense, the latter including the Office of Civil Defense. Smaller amounts go to the National Bureau of Standards, National Science Foundation, Bureau of Mines, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The research of the Government agencies is largely mission-oriented, and not applicable to many common fire safety problems.

The primary deficiency of these research programs is that inadequate attention is given to establishing an understanding of the basic nature and behavior of fire upon which could be based a theory and more efficient practice of fire prevention and control. Instead, great reliance is placed on the less efficient method of empirical fire testing, to determine the fire resistance of various materials. The number of samples of building materials and assemblies that can be fire tested is limited because of cost, thus restricting technological innovations in the building industry.

A major research gap is in the area of fire department operations. The need for research here is becoming critical. Increasing costs of operating community services, the trend to great agglomeration of communities into metropolitan regions, and the rapid social and technological change are imposing demands on fire services for greater efficiency. In rural areas, the longer distances and uncertain water supplies, plus the hazard of large quantities of stored combustible agricultural products on many farms, place great demands on local fire services.

The legislation will authorize additional research nearly equal to the present Federal level immediately, much of which will be used, through contracts, to support fundamental studies in the universities and other non-Federal facilities. There would also be development of improved methods and techniques for preventing and controlling fires, and for rehabilitating injured persons and damaged property.

EDUCATION

The National Fire Protection Association, the International Association of Fire Chiefs, and the National Safety Council each has a national program in fire prevention education. Of these, NFPA's is the largest and includes Spring Clean-Up Week and Fire Prevention Week in October. Government and local public education programs are generally related to the national programs and make use of their educational literature.

Despite these efforts at public education, many members of the public are complacent and do not take the precautions needed to reduce the occurrences of fires caused by carelessness. Inadequate financial resources now preclude existing programs from fully effective use of mass communication media and of other public educational activities. The legislation would authorize grants to state and local fire service groups and support to national fire education groups for public fire safety education. It will also authorize Federal technical support of such educational activities.

Insufficient attention is given to fire prevention education in our institutions of higher learning. Engineering, architecture, city planning and comparable curricula should include fire problems and design approaches that will minimize fire occurrence and spread. Such design should become an integral part of the overall practice of those professions. Specialized training in the scientific and engineering aspects of fire protection are also needed. Only two universities offer four-year curricula leading to degrees in fire protection engineering. The proposed legislation would authorize grants for the development of curricula and course material to facilitate the establishment of fire protection curricula in additional colleges or universities, and facilitate the introduction of fire protection courses in other curricula.

Most professional fire personnel lack sufficient training in command and control of disaster operations and in the control of special hazards. Education and training is essential to attainment of the highest levels of competence for the fire services. Many states have fire service schools offering short courses. However, the content and amount of training varies from state to state, and even within states since individual participation in some cases is dependent on the availability of local funds. The proposed legislation would authorize grants and support of the development of and participation in professional extension courses for fire service personnel and officers. We believe the objective should be the establishment of a program of periodic professional training for all fire services personnel, and for the staff of State Fire Marshals Offices or other offices whose responsibilities have significant relationship to fire. Such increased education should enhance professional stature and encourage career and executive development in the fire services, thereby attracting greater numbers of highly qualified individuals to this important area of public service.

DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

Many interested firemen and other public spirited individuals have applied themselves to problems of public education, fire safety, and fire department operations. Frequently, these individuals have not been able to support, or find support for, practical demonstrations of the feasibility of improved training aids, operational procedures, public education programs, or other fire safety methods and techniques. Ideas for useful demonstration will also result from Federal fire safety activities. The proposed legislation would authorize Federal support of appropriate demonstrations, and thus would encourage local and individual initiative in the solution of fire safety problems.

NATIONAL FIRE RESEARCH AND SAFETY CENTER

This proposed legislation would state the sense of Congress that the Secretary should establish a fire research and safety center. While much of the research under this program will be performed outside the Federal Government or in other Federal facilities, neither private nor Government facilities in this country are equipped for certain kinds of research, such as growth and spread of fires within full-scale multistory buildings or the interactions among structural elements under fire conditions. The results of these and similar studies could lead to advanced design practices reducing the likelihood and spread of fires. Consequently an advanced research center is needed for performance of such fundamental studies.

Additionally, the center would provide a central focus for management of the national fire safety program under this proposed legislation. By establishing close contact with research personnel, the center would facilitate development of necessary staff competence for both technical support of non-Federal activities and scientific management of contracts and grants.

Finally, the program also would utilize fully existing competence and facilities of other Federal agencies, and would be coordinated carefully with related existing Federal programs.

NATIONAL FIRE SAFETY PROGRAM

Comprehensive program is needed to provide better protection against deaths, injuries, and property damage caused by fire. This objective should be accomplished through support and expansion of *existing* public and private programs, wherever possible.

New program would include:

1. *Investigation and Research:*

Investigation of causes, frequency, severity, and other important data.

Research on causes of fires; development of better methods for fire prevention, control, and rehabilitation of affected people and property.

2. *Education* of the *public* on hazards, safety techniques, etc.; of *firemen* on techniques, etc.; and developing fire safety curricula and courses.

3. *Information:*

Reference and data services on all aspects of fire safety.

4. *Support* for Demonstration Projects on improved methods for prevention, control, rehabilitation and improving fire services.

5. *Grants* to State and local governments, other public and non-profit institutions.

THE SLAUGHTER OF ELK IN YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, again this year the National Park Service has taken its riflemen and skinning crews to Yellowstone National Park for the purpose of slaughtering the magnificent elk which range there.

Yesterday, the Service announced, through gunfire that echoed south from the park, that the so-called direct reduction program—that is to say, killing—of Yellowstone elk was again underway after a brief pause called either to cool the rifles from earlier killing or to evaluate the strenuous objections elicited by the slaughter.

To date, some 15,000 elk have been "directly reduced" by the National Park Service since that expedient was first begun three decades ago.

I am compelled to comment on the killing of the magnificent Yellowstone elk, to ask that an editorial from the Wyoming State Tribune be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my comments, and to submit for consideration by the Senate a resolution which seeks alternatives to direct reduction.

Mr. President, the recent brief pause in the killing to which I referred was ostensibly for the purpose of studying other remedies to the park's elk-versus-food problem.

After a short study by a Dr. Cowan, Mr. Starker Leopold, and Mr. Tom Kimball, two of whom were members of a similar blue ribbon study commission appointed 4 or 5 years ago, the Park Service has come to the judgment that it must resume killing. Six hundred elk are slated for slaughter.

Some 10 days ago, I had announced my hope that this study group would find better ways to bring about elk reduction without the necessity of slaughter. Now the study group has simply confirmed the long-established and undeviating position taken by the National Park Service.

I think it is extremely regrettable that the Park Service has not called upon the expertise and talents of other interested parties in this controversy. I speak of our Wyoming Game and Fish Commission—one of the best State agencies in this country—and of our commission's sister agency in the State of Montana.

I speak also of the invaluable advice that could be given by local citizens intimately involved with the management of our wildlife resources. These groups have made a number of excellent suggestions, all worthy, I believe, of attention by the National Park Service.

Among these suggestions is the possibility of improving the live trap program by placing traps, portable or otherwise, in areas of the park where they are not presently available. Part and parcel of this approach would be the use of hay to further bait animals toward these traps and the driving of animals from inaccessible areas by helicopter.

Another suggestion with great merit would question the inflexible and arbitrary control program presently advocated by the Park Service. To establish a maximum elk population at 5,000 head without regard to changing range conditions, snow conditions and hunter harvests defies both good management principles and commonsense. The Park Service claims that the present elk slaughter does not constitute an emergency, but if this is not an emergency, I do not know what is. Further, the Park Service will find itself confronted with recurring emergencies of just this sort if it persists in sticking by a magical limit of 5,000 head.

I would respectfully suggest that the Park Service should consider the advisability of maintaining the northern Yellowstone—Upper Lamar elk herd between approximate maximum and minimum limitations. This would then allow the Federal officials flexibility in management. The conditions in the mountains and plateaus of Yellowstone Park today recommend this approach.

The Park Service has admitted that the elk are now wintering in scattered bands on high and inaccessible windblown ridges. It is certain that if the elk are truly scattered then a minimum amount of damage will be done to the winter range this year. If, next year or the year after, a heavy early snowfall serves to drive the elk to lower altitudes in concentrated bands, then the Park Service could pursue an intensive live trapping program that would cut back the excess numbers allowed on the range this winter.

These four things, then, I believe could be offered as a direct answer to the elk slaughter situation with which the Park Service finds itself confronted:

First. Revision of management policy to allow for a more flexible range of elk numbers.

Second. Greater cooperation between the National Park Service and Wyoming and Montana citizens and game agencies.

Third. Intensification of a more effective live trap method.

Fourth. More effective hunter harvest outside of Yellowstone Park.

Mr. President, I submit a resolution which I hope will express the concensus of the Senate that methods other than direct reduction are deserving of further exploration by the National Park Service in its effort to limit the size of the Yellowstone elk herds.

The essence of this resolution is that the National Park Service ought to meet in a dispassionate and constructive atmosphere with the States contiguous to Yellowstone National Park to work out alternatives to direct reduction, that the Service ought to apprise the States and the appropriate committees of Congress of precisely what it is costing the taxpayers to slaughter the elk and what it might cost them to employ other methods to achieve the same end, and that, for the present at least, the killing ought to be stopped.

As I have stated, I will do everything in my power to assist the Park Service in securing funds for any control program which envisions alternatives to direct reduction and my office stands ready ever to promote cooperation between the "Yellowstone States" and the Federal Government.

It is time now to substitute reason for rifles in Yellowstone National Park.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution and editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 91) was rereferred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

S. Res. 91

Whereas the people of the United States, and particularly the Rocky Mountain States, are appalled that in this age of sophisticated management techniques, the alternative of slaughter is the principal means whereby the National Park Service has been able to keep within manageable limits the number of elk in Yellowstone National Park;

Whereas in the past three decades fifteen thousand elk have been killed in Yellowstone Park, reducing greatly the magnificance of the wildlife herds in that area;

Whereas the National Park Service has refused to justify the present practice of slaughtering elk by a cost analysis and a logical and comprehensive management plan and has failed to sufficiently consider alternative management techniques such as increased live trapping, and a concerted effort to encourage the migration of elk out of Yellowstone Park during the fall of each year;

Whereas the National Park Service has demonstrated its disinclination to discuss alternatives to the satisfaction of the Game and Fish agencies of the several States contiguous to Yellowstone Park;

Resolved, That the National Park Service be prohibited in 1967 from further implementation of its herd management program for Yellowstone Park through the expedient of what is known as direct reduction; that the National Park Service submit to the appropriate Committees of Congress and to the Governors of States contiguous to Yellowstone Park, in writing, cost analyses comparing the several alternatives to direct reduction, together with a logical and comprehensive long-range management plan; that the appropriate officials of the National Park Service or its parent agency, the Department of the Interior, meet in an atmosphere of cooperation to discuss to the satisfaction of all parties the several alternatives to direct reduction; that the Congress will be on record as opposing the elk herd management expedient known as direct reduction, unless the Interior Department and the Governors of the States involved shall agree that it is the most efficacious, economical and desirable alternative available for such control.

The editorial presented by Mr. Hansen is as follows:

The Peace That Didn't Last

It is to be hoped that the U.S. will secure a more lasting peace in Vietnam than the Great Elk war of Wyoming.

We thought this conflict had been settled four years ago, and so noted in an editorial on Jan. 11, 1963, the day following an announcement by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall in Washington that the National Park Service had capitulated to the People's Army of Wyoming, captained by Sen. Milward L. Simpson and Gov. Cliff Hansen.

For those who are not up to date on this contest, which has covered almost as long a period as the Punic Wars, the Great Elk war had raged for years over a policy by the National Park Service and carried out exclusively, insofar as we have been able to determine, in Yellowstone National Park, of having park service rangers de-populate the Yellowstone elk herds by shooting the excess animals.

This shooting program has involved numbers ranging from several hundred to several thousand per year; and it gradually evolved from a cold war into a hot one with the passage of time, until in the winter of 1961–62 and 1962–63 things got pretty sticky.

It now appears the only mistake we made was not in bombing their principal cities and throwing a naval blockade around Mammoth Hot Springs.

As a private citizen, Milward Simpson in December, 1961, tried but failed to obtain a federal court injunction against the Yellowstone park superintendent in an effort to halt the shooting; but in the following year he was elected to the United States Senate, and being on a little higher ground and with the considerable assistance of Cliff Hansen, who had been elected governor at the same time, the Park Service saw it was losing the battle.

On Jan. 30, 1963, the Park Service, according to our somewhat inadequate files, called for a Panmunjom type conference in the governor's conference chamber here to discuss the value of the National Park Service to the state of Wyoming. While this parley was in the process of discussing some of the finer points of the law, Secretary Udall in Washington issued a surprise announcement saying the Park Service was giving up the elk killing.

This news was greeted by all sorts of joyous reactions. Simpson and Hansen issued statements saying how pleased they were, and editorialists (including this one) praised the Great Day saying it hadn't been expected but since it had arrived, why welcome, and all that.

Four years later, almost exactly, plus a week or so, we are sadly disillusioned. The Park Service says it will resume shooting elk because there are too many, they are destroying the natural habitat, and the only way to get rid of them is by slaughter.

We should like to point out the trouble with India is that there are too many Indians, too, but nobody has suggested shooting them; instead President Johnson is sending them 2,000,000 tons of wheat. Maybe we ought to send the elk some wheat, too; that way they won't browse so vigorously and destroy the rangeland in Yellowstone; the wheat farmers will be happy, the Park Service people and the anti-elk killers will be satisfied, and no doubt the elk will be, too. Nobody has asked them their choice in the matter but it is to be assumed they'd rather dine on a sack of wheat shorts, than be confronted with a rifletoting ranger out for their hides (and tallow, too).

No, doubt, our advice will not be accepted in this respect; so we must sadly assume that judging from yesterday's press accounts, the great fracas will be re-played with a slight change in the cast of characters.

The Park Service's theater commander, Yellowstone Superintendent Lemuel Garrison, has gone on to other fields, to be replaced by a new man. Mr. Simpson is no longer in the Senate, but it might be observed that he is even closer to the firing line than he was in Washington, and he already has gotten off one salvo from Litchfield Park, Ariz., where he is getting a bit of the Arizona sun.

While the fires of battle are stirring Milward, his second-in-command in the Battle of 1961–63, Cliff Hansen, holds Simpson's old job in Washington, and the latter has been succeeded by a worthy contender in his own right, Stan the Man.

Therefore, it appears we're headed back to the war, and if somebody doesn't do something quick—like getting Senator Fulbright or Walter Lippmann out here—things are apt to get mighty bad.

Before it is over, we should like to predict, there will be other bodies dragged off the field of battle than those of elk.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from consideration of the bill, S. 1032, to provide for the disregarding, for purposes of determining need under programs established pursuant to the public assistance titles of the Social Security Act, of certain income of aged persons employed under programs receiving assistance under the Older Americans Act of 1965, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 428) to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in establishing bilingual American education programs, and to provide certain other assistance to promote such programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 646) to provide for the compensation of persons injured by certain criminal acts, at the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON MISCELLANEOUS BANKING AND CREDIT UNION BILLS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions of the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold hearings on March 14 on three bills:

S. 714 consists of two sections. The first deals with loans to executive officers by member banks of the Federal Reserve System; it passed the Senate in 1965 as S. 1558, but did not become law. The second section amends the Federal Credit Union Act to modify loan provisions relating to directors and members of the supervisory and credit committees of Federal credit unions;

S. 965 would authorize Federal Reserve banks to invest in certain obligations of foreign governments. It passed the Senate in 1965 as S. 1557 but did not become law;

S. 966 is known as the eligible paper bill. It passed the Senate in 1965 as S. 1559 but also did not become law.

The hearings on these three bills will begin at 10 a.m. in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

Persons desiring to testify or to submit written statements in connection with these bills should notify Mr. Matthew Hale, Chief Counsel, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510, telephone 225-3921.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF RAMSEY CLARK, OF TEXAS, TO BE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, March 2, 1967, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, before the Committee on the Judiciary, upon the nomination of Ramsey Clark, of Texas, to be Attorney General.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Telegram of congratulations by him to Dr. James Madison Nabrit, Jr., president of Howard University, Washington, D.C., dated February 27, 1967.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have discussed with the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services [Mr. Russell], and my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois, the minority leader [Mr. Dirksen], the possibility of a time limitation on the amendments which will be offered to the military procurement bill, the pending business in the Senate.

With their full agreement, I ask unanimous consent that, beginning at the conclusion of morning business tomorrow, debate be limited to 1 hour on each amendment, the time to be equally divided, and that 4 hours of debate be allowed on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would add one reservation to that request. I have not had an opportunity to confer with the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke]; and if he enters any objection insofar as the agreement applies to his amendment or amendments, I will move that the order be vacated with respect to his amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is that in the form of an amendment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; that is in the form of a qualifying statement of intent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Montana advise the Chair if he wants the unanimous-consent agreement in the regular form?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Unanimous-Consent Agreement

Ordered, That, effective on March 1, 1967, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 665) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

CIA CONTROVERSY MANY FACETED

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the current controversy over the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency has many facets. One aspect of the matter was covered in the Carl T. Rowan column, "In Defense of the CIA's Undercover Links," in the February 26 issue of the Washington, D.C., Sunday Star, with the emphasis placed on the possibility that in pursuit of openness of action and undisciplined speech we may be exceeding prudence.

Another aspect of the matter, the manner in which allied nations handle similar intelligence operations, was reviewed on the same date in the Washington, D.C., Post under the heading, "Other Democracies Do Their Spying in Different Ways."

I believe these areas of the current CIA furor deserve wider public attention, and I am providing these items for insertion in the Record.

I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Feb. 26, 1967]

In Defense of the CIA's Undercover "Links"

(By Carl T. Rowan)

When the stream of criticism and contempt for the Central Intelligence Agency rolls so forcefully and resolutely, one risks all manner of accusations if he moves against the tide.

But move against it I must, for there are some tragic aspects of the furor over the CIA's financing student, labor and other private groups that have not been given adequate attention.

Surely I break no vows of secrecy made in my government days if I say now that this string of "exposés" of CIA associations can go on and on. There are dozens of yet unnamed groups that cooperated with CIA—simply because they believed it to be in their children's and the nation's interest.

I admire one of them—the Hobby Foundation of Houston, Texas—for publicly expressing pride in having cooperated.

The disciplines of self-acclaimed intellectualism, or liberalism, or idealism compel some people to deplore these private involvements in the dirty business of waging a cold war. They say the health of the nation requires that our press, universities, students et al. remain "free of government manipulation."

I cannot understand the schizophrenia that has caused these purists to exempt the Federal Bureau of Investigation from criticism for so long. The FBI has its hand, and agents, in far more domestic organizations than the CIA. But somehow the press and the public have accepted that as necessary to trap those frightful spies and saboteurs.

It must be reckoned one of the great public relations failures of American history that the CIA has not won acceptance for its clandestine activities on the valid ground that it is fighting the same deadly struggle as the FBI.

As the tedious string of "revelations" unwinds, I conclude that American opinion-molders have become almost as psychotic about "the CIA" as those foreigners who talk as though the agency is capable of overthrowing their governments on five minutes' notice.

The harsh truth is that these exposures have destroyed the CIA as an effective instrument in many arenas of the cold war that is still being waged furiously, despite the recent talk about "detente." So what the Communists spent billions—unsuccessfully—to do, we Americans, out of our idealism, have delivered to them as a gift.

It disturbs me that this rush to bare CIA "links" has tainted "Crossroads Africa," the "American Society for African Culture" and other groups that have worked honestly and intelligently to keep alive in millions of Africans a faith and hope in democracy.

Sanctimonious, theoretically, correct arguments that "private business and industry" should have provided the funds demolish themselves against one hard fact: Business and industry had neither the interest, the attitudes nor the inclination to support these efforts properly.

It bothers me that these "revelations" have compromised, perhaps fatally in some cases, hundreds of young men and women who might have become leaders of the developing nations.

The wounds inflicted upon the Alliance for Progress are grave.

Many a U.S. Peace Corps worker or diplomat, and numerous foreign scholars and labor leaders who have struggled bravely in the cause of freedom, will have their integrity impugned and their futures jeopardized before this great exposé fiizzles out.

Sure, one can say the CIA built this colossal tragedy by wrongly involving all these peoples and groups in the first place.

I say nonsense. Several presidents, several cabinets, dozens of congressmen and the leaders of all the groups involved went into this business with their eyes wide open. And it wasn't because of an ugly assumption that the ends justify the means, as some idealists argue. They made a practical recognition of the fact that the adversary had already set the dirty rules of battle, so either we played by his rules or got our brains beaten out.

I can't find it in my journalistic heart to say the press is wrong to dredge up all it has about CIA "covers." Yet, I have an uneasy feeling that in pursuit of a hallowed bit of journalistic dogma, we are slaying some dragons that will come back to haunt our progeny.

I keep remembering President Kennedy saying to the American Newspaper Publishers Association in 1961:

"This nation's foes have openly boasted of acquiring through our newspapers information they would otherwise hire agents to acquire through theft, bribery or espionage . . .

"Today no war has been declared—and however fierce the struggle, it may never be declared in traditional fashion . . .

"If the press is awaiting a declaration of war before it imposes the self-discipline of combat conditions, then I can only say that no war ever posed a greater threat to our security."

Is it heresy for me to ask whether the benefits to "freedom" accruing from these exposés of the CIA are great enough to balance out the damage done to our security?

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 26, 1967]

Other Democracies Do Their Spying in Different Ways

IN BRITAIN, THEY KEEP QUIET

(By Karl E. Meyer)

London.—A fundamental difference between British and American intelligence organizations was proclaimed last week on thousands of newsstands throughout Britain.

On the cover of the international edition of Time magazine was a portrait of Richard Helms, the director of the Central Intelligence Agency. No British magazine or newspaper could be expected to carry a similar picture of Helms' counterpart here. This name of the chief of MI–6, Britain's CIA, is never published, and indeed is not even known by the vast majority of the populace. Even Members of Parliament and ambassadors profess ignorance of his identity. He is simply "X" or, as every movie goer knows, "M."

The paucity of information about MI–6 makes it extremely difficult to offer any objective comparison between its efficacy and that of CIA. One observation can be safely made. Whether MI–6 is better or worse than the CIA, it is surely different. And so are the countries they serve.

Compared to America, Britain is a homogeneous society accustomed to rule by a traditional elite. It is more like a cozy club than a railway terminal. The club's inner circle is accustomed to work in discreet intimacy, arranging with a hint what in America requires an act of Congress.

It can be assumed that over the years covert assistance has been given to private organizations engaged in cold war hostilities. But it can also be assumed that most of this aid will not become publicly known for decades.

The D-notice

Secrecy is enforced not only through tradition. The government can use an official secrets act to close blurting lips. Only the other day, Britions were reminded of another silencing weapon the government possesses—the system known as the D-notice.

Under this system, begun in 1912, newspapers have voluntarily agreed not to publish information that officials deem contrary to security. Twice last week, Prime Minister Wilson attacked the Daily Express for allegedly violating a D-notice in reporting that security agents were still reading telegrams sent overseas.

But even if silencing devices were removed, it is doubtful that the public would discover the kind of prodigious secret aid practiced by the CIA. A shrewd observer put in this way:

"Americans think they need hundreds of thousands of dollars to get anywhere—the whole paraphernalia of letterheads, carpeted suites, secretaries, first-class plane tickets. Here a few thousand pounds (a pound is $2.80) is enough. A musty office, a scruffy bright young man and a single mimeograph machine is enough."

Moreover, there exist organizations that can provide overt assistance, most notably the British Council. Founded in 1934, this agency gives broad support to overseas cultural programs with state money. Its budget for 1966–67 was $30 million.

BRITISH PRATFALLS

British intelligence has endured its pratfalls. There are still bitter memories in the Middle East about a "black" radio station beamed from Cyprus with covert British help during the Suez crisis. Moreover, there is a lively controversy under way over exaggerated claims some feel were made for British wartime subversion in France.

But here discretion and frugality are the rule. One qualified observer said:

"A persistent problem with CIA operations is that not enough thought is given to what might happen when they are exposed. This was true of the Bay of Pigs, of the U–2 flight and the large subsidies to student organizations. In each case, American prestige was vested in debatable risks—Cuban exiles, a hired pilot and youngsters still in college.

"No doubt these efforts often produce results. But when they backfire, the noise can be heard clear around the world."

In Britain, it might be said, any backfire is usually muffled in a clubby smoking-room. The MI–6 is not a government, but for the most part it is truly invisible.

In France, They Pay Openly

(By Waverley Root)

Paris.—The French reaction to the subsidy given by the CIA to the National Students Association is: "It couldn't happen here."

This is not because French secret services would necessarily be above such tactics, but because somebody else is already taking care of such subsidies—more or less openly.

During the Algerian revolution, the National Union of French Students was openly receiving a subsidy from the French government through the Ministry of Education.

When the UNEF began to espouse the cause of Algerian independence, the subsidy was canceled and government support was then given to a rival student organization, oriented politically to the right.

But the government tactics backfired. The new recipient of government largesse also took up the cudgel for the Algerian cause.

Today, the UNEF is again the principal student organization and once again is enjoying government support. The past is forgiven.

A normal action

This is the difference between French and American uses of the subsidy. In France, helping your political supporters is considered a normal action which need not be carried on in secret.

Undercover activities in connection with organizations receiving subsidies would occur either through bona fide members who would consent to inform secret services, or by secret services planting members in any organization they wanted to watch.

But there is not as much open government subsidizing of organizations as there used to be in France.

Before the war, the Ministry of the Interior had a secret account for subsidizing publications. The original idea was to reward newspapers which gave the government a break—but getting a share of the gravy came to be regarded as a right.

Secrecy distrusted

Such subsidies no longer exist. In addition, if the French spread any money about abroad, they do it through overt channels. Their secret organizations don't get it to spend. The French have had a good deal of experience with them, and don't trust them with any more power than necessary.

France's closest parallel to the CIA is the counterespionage organization which came under fire in the Ben Barka kidnaping—the SDECE.

The light the Ben Barka case turned on the SDECE revealed certain details of its modus operandi including secret agents at airports to watch the comings and goings of people in whom it was interested and bugging public rooms. But this was not much of a surprise to the French, for whom the tapping of telephones has long been commonplace.

The trial resulting from the kidnaping of Ben Barka, the Moroccan opposition leader, has not been completed—so it is not known whether the SDECE as a whole was involved in the case or only one of its agents, but the case reminded the French of the need to keep watch over their watchdogs.

"You Americans make the mistake of leaving the heads of your secret organizations in their jobs too long," I was once told by a highly placed French politician who had held such a job.

L.B.J., A GREAT PRESIDENT WITH A GREAT MESSAGE ON HEALTH AND EDUCATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the President of the United States has just sent to this body his message on education and health in America.

This is a message that should make every Member of the Congress proud.

Mr. President, with all the brickbats many of us aim at the White House, it seems to me time that we take off our hats and salute President Johnson as the President who has done more for the health and more for the education of Americans than any President in the history of this country.

After all, what is more important than education and health for our country's strength, our country's future, and the happiness of 200 million Americans?

Mr. President, this is not a matter of rhetoric cr partisanship. This is a matter of fact. Within the past 2 years this Congress, led by President Johnson has done more for the health of Americans than ever before in history.

In the past 2 years Congress has provided a greater impetus to education than all other Congresses combined in the history of this Nation.

A great President has sent the Congress a great message today charting an even better future. I say this as one who has consistently fought for a reduction in spending and who will continue to do so.

But in the Nation's health and the Nation's education, parsimonious penny-pinching would be very foolish. It would mean the Nation was failing to make the sound investment in its future which will bring returns many times over.

I honor the President for asking for additional funds in these areas. Every dollar we invest in additional training opportunities will come back in full in a very few years in welfare costs. It will come back again in higher taxes paid. And most importantly it will come back in a stronger, better, freer, happier America.

TRIBUTE TO HENRY R. LUCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is my sad duty to call to the attention of the Senate the death, earlier this morning, of Henry R. Luce, the former editor in chief of Time magazine, and well known throughout the world as the head of the Time-Life-Fortune publishing empire.

Mr. Luce, as is well known, was born in China of American missionary parents. He was a graduate of Yale University and was very prominent in its activities. In 1923, he founded, with Briton Hadden, the Time magazine; in 1930, he founded Fortune magazine; and in 1936, he founded Life magazine. Together, they represent probably the single most important publishing force that we know. He was very active, as everyone knows, in the United China Relief which he organized in 1940. He was a stalwart advocate of freedom of the press, and was well known as having initiated the Committee on Freedom of Press in 1944.

Mr. President, when a man passes away in the fullness of his years, in the vigor of his talents, we always seek to praise him. Harry, as he was known to his friends—and I have the honor to number myself among them—and to his associates in his great publishing empire, made history.

He and his associates inaugurated a new epoch of journalism especially for the complete man; we might use the expression, "the compleat man." He was ahead of his time when he began and time has hardly begun to catch up with him now that he is gone. To those who had the privilege of knowing him, his dominant characteristic was liveliness, and our memory of him, and that of the world, will be the brighter for it.

I know of no more beautiful epitaph for a vigorous man, who died in the fullness of his activities, than a comment from one of his associates, who told me a few minutes ago:

> Harry would have wanted to die this way—when he went he was barreling along with a full head of steam on the many problems which absorbed his heart and mind.

Henry R. Luce lived a life of excitement. He and his associates inaugurated a new approach to journalism: the summation of news after research in depth, and placing it in context by showing its relationship to other news. His aim was the compleat man in information, culture, education, sports, finance, and living. He made one of the truly historic contributions in communications, and to this ideal he devoted his life.

I know my colleagues will wish to join me in expressing our deepest sympathy and condolences to Clare Booth Luce, a personal friend of mine, who served the State of Connecticut in the other body. She is a very gifted, and a very exciting woman herself, for whom this is a very sad hour.

We can only hope that the expressions of friendship and sympathy which will be heard on the floor of the Senate today will be of some comfort to her in her sad bereavement.

Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. DODD addressed the Chair.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield first to the distinguished majority leader, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] to express regret at the passing of Henry Luce. He founded Time in the twenties, during a most difficult period; he set a new standard for a news magazine which has since been emulated very often.

Henry Luce was a man of controversy and one could always take issue with some of the articles published under his direction. I believe that that was a part of the attraction which Time held for so many people. This man was born in China of missionary parents and his life reflected his great interest in that part of the world. He has made a contribution which cannot be fully measured by those of us who are here today. Perhaps his greater contribution will come when his magazine, Time, will be looked back upon as a document which can be considered as the source of material for historic research.

To me his passing was totally unexpected. He will be missed, his contribution to journalism will be missed but that contribution will also serve as a monument in history.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the majority leader for his comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator. I wish to join him and the majority leader in paying tribute to Henry R. Luce.

Mr. Luce and his wife were for many years residents of the State of Connecticut. Mrs. Luce represented her district in the House of Representatives with great ability and grace, and she made a great contribution in her time in the House of Representatives for the betterment of the country.

I have been privileged to know Henry Luce for 22 years. I considered him one of the outstanding journalists of this country, a great publisher and, more than that, a truly great American citizen.

I believe that his contribution in the field of journalism will be a monument to the improvement of factual reporting in this country for many, many generations to come.

I believe, Mr. President, that the country has suffered a great loss.

I did not know that he was seriously ill. It will be a personal loss to a vast number of people who enjoyed the warmth of his friendship, and who also enjoyed his publications.

I join my colleagues in extending sympathy to Mrs. Luce and his relatives on this sad occasion.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I join the Senator from New York and the Senator from Connecticut in tribute to the late Henry Robinson Luce.

Mr. Luce was a controversial man with whom, I suppose, at one time or another, everyone in the Senate disagreed and disagreed violently. But, at the same time, he was a man who made a great contribution to American journalism, in that at the age of 23, fresh out of Yale University, he founded Time magazine.

As the Senator from New York has pointed out, he founded many other publications, but Time magazine held the Nation's attention with its provocative, readable, exciting style and format, which made everyone sit up and pay attention to current events in a way which had not been done before. Since then, Time magazine has had some imitators, but I am sure that one reason why Americans are as well informed today as they are is due to the formula of Luce and Hadden.

The smashing success that Time magazine has achieved, of course, brought Mr. Luce great wealth and power; but far more important, he made a vast contribution to public understanding and public literacy, enabling the American people to follow what was going on in the world in an intelligent manner.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin very much for his remarks.

Mr. President, I should like to reserve an opportunity for other Senators to have a similar opportunity to speak on Mr. Luce, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that such statements may be included in the RECORD as a part of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to Henry Luce.

I did not have the opportunity of knowing him as well as the Senator from New York or the Senator from Wisconsin but I did have the opportunity to meet him on several occasions and I found him to be a delightful and talented man.

Having read Time magazine from week to week, I know, too, that his presence will be sorely missed in the field of journalism.

I extend to Mrs. Luce my heartfelt sympathy at this sorrowful moment in her life.

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I proudly and enthusiastically support the President's message on education which keeps us on the successful course begun by the 89th Congress. I applaud that part of the message that calls for an increase in Federal funds for constructing new educational television facilities in this country and for the establishment now of a Public Television Corporation. I am hopeful that when this legislation is introduced it will be referred to the Senate Commerce Committee and assigned to my Subcommittee on Communications with my assurance to the Congress and to the administration that hearings will proceed with all possible expedition.

Television, over the past decade, has become an integral part of quality education, and far from detracting from individual attention provided to the student in the classroom, it has enhanced personal attention by freeing teachers from formal lecturing for more individual tutoring assignments. Also it has enhanced classroom visual arts instruction—so necessary to help students thoroughly understand difficult and complex subjects. Educational TV also permits even the smallest college to have access to some of the great scholars in the world.

Yet no one is contending that educational television has fully lived up to its promises or expectations. It will never, for example, replace the most vital element in the classroom: the skills and talents of the individual teacher.

Nor is it intended to do so. Rather, educational television and the support by the Federal Government of numerous ETV stations across the country have acted significantly to supplement educational needs.

I agree with the President's proposal that a thorough study must be made of the feasibility of satellite communications in building an educational network to encourage the widest and the most effective use of educational broadcasting facilities and to study the impact of educational TV and its relationship to instructional TV.

As recently as August of 1966 during my subcommittee's hearings on the so-called Ford Foundation proposal, I made it abundantly clear and I reiterate now that satellite communications will play a vital role from a national standpoint in the development of a nationwide educational television system and how this is to be done requires a national policy which should be developed with care and I am happy to see that the President is cognizant of this and has called upon the executive, the Congress, and private sectors to cooperate together in developing this national policy.

Again I applaud the message of the President on education in all of its aspects.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS FAILURE ON HUMAN RIGHTS SHOWS WHY U.N. MUST NOT FAIL HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, sincere persons have asked, "Why is it necessary for the community of nations to outlaw genocide? Surely it is obvious that civilized man will not condone such a monstrously heinous crime."

We can all hope that the civilized world will not condone another act of genocide, but barbaric genocide has been perpetrated within the lifetime of most of us.

Who among us can deny that the League of Nations' impotence in protecting German citizens from their own government contributed significantly to the impunity with which the Third Reich waged its subsequent campaigns of domestic persecution and foreign aggression? How could these uncivilized acts of terror against German citizens have been allowed? Simply because the Third Reich asserted its absolute sovereignty over its citizens and denied the League of Nations any right of inspection.

The League's failure to enact meaningful international agreements on protecting human rights enabled any government so disposed to organize and execute a program of terror against its own people.

In 1939 when anouncing his intention to destroy the Polish race, the diabolically canny Hitler recognized both the failure of civilized nations to intervene and the willingness of civilized nations to forget past atrocities when he asked: "Who still talks nowadays of the extermination of the Armenians?"

Well, I am sure that the American people do remember the Armenians, do remember the Jews, do remember the Poles, the Slavs, the Hungarians, and the Rumanians who have faced the executioner—not because of any criminal charge, but simply because they were born Armenians, Poles, Jews, or Slavs.

Every American certainly can recall vividly that 291,557 American men and boys made the ultimate sacrifice in World War II to stop Hitlerism.

The United Nations has not made the same mistake which the League did. The United Nations has proposed and enacted universal covenants on human rights. The Convention on Genocide, unanimously adopted by the General Assembly in 1948, was signed by the United States in 1949. Tragically mindful of past inaction, civilized man wanted to be sure that the world would never again be afflicted with genocide.

But has the Senate forgotten? The United States has historically been a behemoth in battle.

Will the Senate continue to restrict the United States to being a dwarf in pursuit of international human rights?

The Senate should shake off its lethargy of indifference and move with all dispatch toward recognizing the universality of human rights—by immediately ratifying the Convention on Genocide.

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL CITES ATOMIC MILESTONE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues to an editorial published in the Milwaukee Journal, Sunday, February 19. It observes that last year, for the first time since it was founded 20 years ago, the Atomic Energy Commission's spending for peaceful projects matched that for weapons.

I think it now can be said that, 22 years after the first atomic blast at Alamogordo, N. Mex., the dream that this immense energy could be harnessed for the enrichment of mankind is bearing significant fruit.

All mankind hopes that atomic power will never again be used for war, but that, instead, there will be ever-expanding uses for this energy in peaceful projects that will mean a better and richer life for all men everywhere.

It is in this 22d year of the atomic age that the United States and Russia—the two outstanding nuclear powers—are discussing a treaty on nuclear arms control. We should give our leaders every encouragement so that 1967 may signal the coming of age of atomic power.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BENEFICIAL ATOM

President Truman called it "the most important branch of government to be created in 100 years." He was referring to the atomic energy commission, which 20 years ago took over the nation's atomic energy program. The commission has presided over the orderly transfer of control of atomic energy from military to civilian hands and the development of peaceful uses for nuclear energy.

When the commission was created the destructive potential of the atom was fresh in memory, but the constructive potential was less clear. During the AEC's early years military goals continued to occupy most of the new agency's energies. America's early lead in weapons production has not been overcome by any other nation.

An historic shift was signaled in 1953 when President Eisenhower proposed an "atoms for peace" program in a speech before the United Nations. A law passed the following year cleared the way for the pacification and internationalization of atomic energy. Secrecy was lifted, permitting distribution to the world's scientists of much of America's nuclear knowledge. The AEC's monopoly on atomic reactors was ended. Agreements were signed with other nations for the exchange of information on peaceful uses of the atom.

The AEC encouraged private electric companies to invest in nuclear generating plants. The agency's prototype reactor at Shippingport, Pa., began producing electricity in 1957. Within six years, 16 more electric power reactors were operating or under construction. Last year, utilities announced plans for a record 27 new generating plants. The AEC estimates that nuclear reactors will supply 25% of the nation's electricity by 1980 and half by 2000.

Materials and devices developed as a result of nuclear experimentation have found scores of peaceful applications in medicine and industry. Other applications are under development, including processes to remove salt from sea water and to preserve foods. Some projects have been given up for the time as impractical—the nuclear airplane, for example. Now atomic scientists are planning nuclear powered rockets to carry man to the moon and beyond.

A significant milestone was reached last year when, for the first time, AEC spending for peaceful projects matched that for weapons. If the United States and Russia could agree on a nuclear arms control treaty now under discussion, both would be able to turn vastly greater resources to harnessing atomic energy for the benefit of man.

DR. WOODLIEF THOMAS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Dr. Woodlief Thomas is one of the handful of those who received a Ph. D. from the old Brookings Graduate School. Robert Brookings founded the institution which has, of course, long since ceased to grant graduate degrees with the ideal of improving the quality of personnel charged with research, analysis, and policymaking in the Government. I am sure that if Mr. Brookings were alive today he would have had many occasions to feel proud not only of the institution which he began, but of the professional output and influence which its graduates and fellows have had—and probably in no case would this be more so than that of Woody Thomas.

It is rather hard for us today to realize that somebody, sometime in the past, working against frustrations, had to conceive, nurture, and refine such a thing as the industrial production index, which we take for granted. No matter how critical some of us are at times of the Federal Reserve System and its policies, we all appreciate the privilege it has been to have known and had the opportunity to be advised by one who was a part of the Federal Reserve thinking in its early days as it felt its way through the 1920's and 1930's from a passive attitude to a more active attitude toward the money market.

We are certainly still learning by the month and by the year about the uses and misuses of monetary policy as a stabilization tool. How much more must one have learned who has had such an intimate part in the evolution of our central bank for 40 or 50 years through the time when it was evolving from a system of regional banks through the early stages of a true central bank when open market operations first took the form of coordinated bond purchasing activities.

I need not mention the changes that took place in the 1930's, especially the Banking Act of 1935, but I do want to say that we have recognized and greatly benefited by the presence with us of a man who knows how things got the way they are.

Since he left active work with the Federal Reserve System, Dr. Thomas has been an adviser to the Government of Chile in establishing their central bank and, more recently, he has been a staff member with the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. He is leaving that role as of today and this is the occasion prompting me to these remarks.

I will certainly miss the opportunities to consult with Woody and I think I speak the feelings of all of the other members of the Banking and Currency Committee when I say that we deeply appreciate the help and advice he has been giving us and we will greatly miss his presence. Perhaps I should add that we are not going to give him up entirely but if the occasion arises when some need to understand the developing system better comes up, I am certainly going to write and ask for his advice and counsel.

THE PROPOSED UNITED STATES-SOVIET CONSULAR TREATY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I intend to introduce what I consider to be a rather important bill. Before I do that, I call the attention of the Senate to the action of a group of Republican Members in the other body who have joined together to endorse the Consular Treaty, which the Senate will be considering shortly. I ask unanimous consent that the text of their statement and the list of those signing it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement and list of names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Statement on Consular Treaty

The proposed consular treaty and protocol with the Soviet Union is important in the national interest and we strongly urge its ratification.

At a critical time in international affairs the ratification of the treaty can serve two clear objectives of U.S. foreign policy.

First, it can insure that some 18,000 American tourists will be afforded basic protections in the Soviet Union and that our officers in any consulate would enjoy diplomatic immunity. This treaty, which provides reciprocal rights, inures significantly to our benefit.

Second, while the consular treaty is a modest step, its ratification may encourage greater flexibility in Soviet policy and facilitate improved U.S.-Soviet relations. It can serve as a clear demonstration that the world's two most powerful nations are determined to move from a position of mistrustful polarization toward more positive efforts for the achievement of peace and stability.

Rejection of the treaty could have serious implications for U.S.-Soviet relations. Our two governments, together and separately, are exploring a number of vitally important subjects: an honorable settlement of the Vietnamese conflict; a non-proliferation treaty; the expansion of non-strategic East-West trade; an avoidance of a major new arms race of a much higher order of magnitude involving a new generation of ICBM's and ABM systems.

Agreement in any of these areas could have a profound impact on the stability of international affairs. Rejection of the consular treaty might create a psychological atmosphere in which serious negotiations with the Soviet Union on any of these subjects would be infinitely more difficult—if not precluded.

Assurances given to the President from the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation that the Bureau could deal effectively and efficiently with any problems which might arise under the treaty would seem to remove any significant reason for opposition to ratification.

As Republicans, we take pride in the fact that the treaty is the culmination of an idea first proposed by a Republican Administration eight years ago. We hope that it will have continued Republican support.

From the offices of Congressmen:
Ogden R. Reid, New York.
Alphonzo Bell, California.
Daniel E. Button, New York.
Silvio O. Conte, Massachusetts.
John R. Dellenback, Oregon.
Marvin L. Esch, Michigan.
Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, New Jersey.
Gilbert Gude, Maryland.
Seymour Halpern, New York.
Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., Maryland.
Joseph M. McDade, Pennsylvania.
F. Bradford Morse, Massachusetts.
Philip E. Ruppe, Michigan.
Richard S. Schweiker, Pennsylvania.
Robert T. Stafford, Vermont.

THE CRIME COMMISSION AND ALCOHOLISM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, like the recent report on crime in the District of Columbia, reflects the growing national concern with our Nation's fourth largest health problem, alcoholism.

Recent court decisions—Easter against District of Columbia, and Driver against Hinnant—have established the principle that intoxication cases must be handled medically and socially. The Crime Commission report deals with the problem of public and chronic alcoholism on this basis. Other nations in the Western World have long recognized this principle and now, it would appear, the United States is following suit.

The Crime Commission has recommended the establishment of detoxification units as part of comprehensive treatment programs, aftercare for alcoholics and expanded research into alcoholism, the problems of alcoholics, and methods of treatment. Together with the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], I am preparing comprehensive legislation along these lines to be introduced by us and cosponsoring Senators from both parties in the near future. This measure will be the successor to the bills we introduced in the last Congress.

The chapter of the Crime Commission's report dealing with alcoholism and drunkenness offenses merits study by every American. I ask unanimous consent that it be included as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Drunkenness Offenses

Two million arrests in 1965—one of every three arrests in America—were for the offense of public drunkenness. The great volume of these arrests places an extremely heavy load on the operations of the criminal justice system. It burdens police, clogs lower criminal courts and crowds penal institutions throughout the United States.

Because of the sheer size of the problem and because of doubts that have recently been raised about the efficacy of handling drunkenness within the system of criminal justice, the Commission sought to reexamine present methods of treating drunkenness offenders and to explore promising alternatives. It was not in a position to undertake a comprehensive study of the complex medical, social, and public health problems of drunkenness.

THE EXISTING SYSTEM

Drunkenness laws

Drunkenness is punishable under a variety of laws, generally describing the offense as being "drunk in a public place," often without providing a precise definition of drunkenness itself. Some laws include as a condition that the offender is "unable to care for his own safety."

In some jurisdictions there are no laws prohibiting drunkenness, but any drunkenness that causes a breach of the peace is punishable. In Georgia and Alabama, for example, drunkenness that is manifested by boisterous or indecent conduct, or loud and profane discourse, is a crime. Other jurisdictions apply disorderly conduct statutes to those who are drunk in public. In Chicago, for example, the police, having no drunkenness law to enforce, use a disorderly conduct statute to arrest nondisorderly inebriates. Some jurisdictions permit police to make public drunkenness arrests under both State laws and local ordinances.

The laws provide maximum jail sentences ranging from 5 days to 6 months; the most common maximum sentence is 30 days. In some States an offender convicted of "habitual drunkenness" may be punished by a 2-year sentence of imprisonment.

The offenders

The two million arrests for drunkenness each year involve both sporadic and regular drinkers. Among the number are a wide variety of offenders—the rowdy college boy; the weekend inebriate; the homeless, often unemployed single man. How many offenders fall into these and other categories is not known. Neither is it known how many of the offenders are alcoholics in the medical sense of being dependent on alcohol. There is strong evidence, however, that a large number of those who are arrested have a lengthy history of prior drunkenness arrests, and that a disproportionate number involve poor persons who live in slums. In 1964 in the city of Los Angeles about one-fifth of all persons arrested for drunkenness accounted for two-thirds of the total number of arrests for that offense. Some of the repeaters were arrested as many as 18 times in that year.

A review of chronic offender cases reveals that a large number of persons have, in short installments, spent many years of their lives in jail. In 1957 the Committee on Prisons, Probation and Parole in the District of Columbia studied six chronic offenders and found that they had been arrested for drunkenness a total of 1,409 times and had served a total of 125 years in penal institutions. A recent article in a Syracuse, N.Y., newspaper illustrates the point even more succinctly:

"H---- F----, 69, appeared in Police Court for the 277th time on a public intoxication charge. F----, who has served 16 years in the Jamesville Penitentiary in short terms on the charge, was returned there for a 6-month sentence."

The great majority of repeaters live on "skid row"—a dilapidated area found in most large and medium-size cities in the United States. On skid row substandard hotels and roominghouses are intermingled with numerous taverns, pawn shops, cheap cafeterias, employment agencies that specialize in jobs for the unskilled, and religious missions that provide free meals after a service. Many of the residents—including the chronic drunkenness offenders—are homeless, penniless, and beset with acute personal problems.

The arrest of the drunkenness offender

The police do not arrest everyone who is under the influence of alcohol. Sometimes they will help an inebriate home. It is when he appears to have no home or family ties that he is most likely to be arrested and taken to the local jail.

One policeman assigned to a skid row precinct in a large eastern city recently described how he decided whom to arrest:

"I see a guy who's been hanging around; a guy who's been picked up before or been making trouble. I stop him. Sometimes he can convince me he's got a job today or got something to do. He'll show me a slip showing he's supposed to go to the blood bank, or to work. I let him go. But if it seems to me that he's got nothing to do but drink, then I bring him in."

Drunkenness arrest practices vary from place to place. Some police departments strictly enforce drunkenness statutes, while other departments are known to be more tolerant. In fact, the number of arrests in a city may be related less to the amount of public drunkenness than to police policy. Some of the wide variations in police practices can be seen in the table below that compares drunkenness arrests by two police departments known to be guided by policies of strict enforcement (Atlanta, Ga., and Washington, D.C.) to arrests by a department that is considered more tolerant (St. Louis, Mo.).

In some large and medium-size cities, police departments have "bum squads" that cruise skid rows and border areas to apprehend inebriates who appear unable to care for their own safety, or who are likely to annoy others. Such wholesale arrests sometimes include homeless people who are not intoxicated.

Operation of the criminal system after arrest

Following arrest, the drunk is usually placed in a barren cell called a "tank," where he is detained for at least a few hours. The tanks in some cities can hold as many as 200 people, while others hold only 1 or 2. One report described the conditions found in a tank in this way:

"Although he may have been picked up for his own protection, the offender is placed in a cell, which may frequently hold as many as 40–50 men where there is no room to sit or lie down, where sanitary facilities and ventilation are inadequate and a stench of vomit and urine is prevalent."

"The drunken behavior of some of the inmates is an added hazard. It is questionable whether greater safety is achieved for the individual who is arrested for his safe keeping."

The chronic alcoholic offender generally suffers from a variety of ailments and is often in danger of serious medical complications, but medical care is rarely provided in the tank; and it is difficult to detect or to diagnose serious illness since it often resembles intoxication. Occasionally, chronic offenders become ill during pretrial detention and die without having received adequate medical attention.

If the offender can afford bail, he usually obtains release after he sobers up. In many jurisdictions an offender is permitted to forfeit bail routinely by not appearing in court. Thus, if the arrested person has the few dollars required, he can avoid prosecution; if he has no money, as is usually the case, he must appear in court.

Drunkenness offenders are generally brought before a judge the morning after their arrest, sometimes appearing in groups of 15 or 20. Rarely are the normal procedural or due process safeguards applied to these cases. Usually defendants are processed through the court system with haste and either released or sentenced to several days or weeks in jail. In some cities only those offenders who request it are jailed. In others, chronic offenders, who are likely to be alcoholics, are generally sent to jail.

When a defendant serves a short sentence, he is fed, sheltered, and given access to available recreational facilities. In most institutions there is such a lack of facilities and financial resources that it is not possible to do more. Austin MacCormick, a former New York City Commissioner of Corrections, noted recently:

*"The appallingly poor quality of most of the county jails in the United States is so well known that it is probably not necessary to discuss this point at any great length. The fact that the majority of all convicted alcoholics go to these institutions, however, makes it imperative that the public, and particularly those thoughtful citizens who are interested in the treatment of alcoholics, never be allowed to forget that our county jails are a disgrace to the country * * * and that they have a destructive rather than a beneficial effect not only on alcoholics who are committed to them but also on those others who are convicted of the most petty offenses."*

Comparison of drunkenness arrests in 3 cities

	Population (1965 estimates)	Number of arrests (1965)			Percentage of all arrests accounted for by—	
		Drunkenness arrests	Disorderly conduct and vagrancy arrests	All arrests	Drunk arrests	Drunk, disorderly, and vagrancy arrests
Washington, D.C.	802,000	44,792	21,338	86,464	51.8	76.5
St. Louis, Mo.	699,000	2,445	5,994	44,701	5.5	18.9
Atlanta, Ga.	522,000	48,835	22,379	92,965	52.5	76.6

After serving a brief sentence, the chronic offender is released, more likely than not to return to his former haunts on skid row, with no money, no job and no plans. Often he is rearrested within a matter of days or hours.

In a memorandum of law submitted in a recent case of a homeless alcoholic, defense counsel noted that his client had been arrested 31 times in a period of 4 months and 6 days. Counsel maintained that "it is fair to conclude [in view of three commitments during that period of time] that he must have been arrested once out of every two days that he appeared on the public streets of the District of Columbia."

EVALUATION OF THE EXISTING SYSTEM

Effect on the offender

The criminal justice system appears ineffective to deter drunkenness or to meet the problems of the chronic alcoholic offender. What the system usually does accomplish is to remove the drunk from public view, detoxify him, and provide him with food, shelter, emergency medical service, and a brief period of forced sobriety. As presently constituted, the system is not in a position to meet his underlying medical and social problems.

Effect on the system of criminal justice

Including drunkenness within the system of criminal justice seriously burdens and distorts its operations. Because the police often do not arrest the intoxicated person who has a home, there is in arrest practices an inherent discrimination against the homeless and the poor. Due process safeguards are often considered unnecessary or futile. The defendant may not be warned of his rights or permitted to make a telephone call. And although coordination, breath, or blood tests to determine intoxication are common practice in "driving-while-intoxicated" cases, they are virtually nonexistent in common drunk cases. Yet, without the use of such chemical tests, it is often difficult to determine whether the individual is intoxicated or suffering from a serious illness that has symptoms similar to intoxication.

The handling of drunkenness cases in court hardly reflects the standards of fairness that are the basis of our system of criminal justice. One major reason is that counsel is rarely present. Drunkenness cases often involve complex factual and medical issues. Cross-examination could be conducted on "observations" of a police officer such as "bloodshot" and "glassy" eyes, "staggering gait," "odor" of alcohol on defendant's breath. The testimony of an expert medical witness on behalf of the defendant could be elicited.

The extent of police time allotted to handling drunkenness offenders varies from city to city and from precinct to precinct. In most cities a great deal of time is spent. The inebriate must be taken into custody, transported to jail, booked, detained, clothed, fed, sheltered, and transported to court. In some jurisdictions, police officers must wait, often for hours, to testify in court.

There is a commensurate burden on the urban courts. Notwithstanding the fact that an overwhelming caseload often leads judges to dispose of scores of drunkenness cases in minutes, they represent a significant drain on court time which is needed for felony and serious misdemeanor cases. More subtly, drunkenness cases impair the dignity of the criminal process in lower courts, which are forced to handle defendants so casually and to apply criminal sanctions with so little apparent effect.

In correctional systems, too, resources are diverted from serious offenders. After court appearance, some offenders are sent to short-term penal institutions, many of which are already overcrowded. Correctional authorities estimate that one-half the entire misdemeanant population is comprised of drunkenness offenders. In one city it was reported that 95 percent of short-term prisoners were drunkenness offenders.

LINES FOR ACTION

The sheer size of the drunkenness problem in relation to the very limited knowledge about causes and treatment makes it impossible to speak in terms of "solutions."

There are, however, some important and promising lines that the Commission believes should be explored.

Treating drunkenness as noncriminal

The Commission seriously doubts that drunkenness alone (as distinguished from disorderly conduct) should continue to be treated as a crime. Most of the experts with whom the Commission discussed this matter, including many in law enforcement, thought that it should not be a crime. The application of disorderly conduct statutes would be sufficient to protect the public against criminal behavior stemming from intoxication. This was the view of the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia, which recommended that the District of Columbia drunkenness law "be amended to require specific kinds of offensive conduct in addition to drunkenness."

Perhaps the strongest barrier to making such a change is that there presently are no clear alternatives for taking into custody and treating those who are now arrested as drunks. The Commission believes that current efforts to find such alternatives to treatment within the criminal system should be expanded. For example, if adequate public health facilities for detoxification are developed, civil legislation could be enacted authorizing the police to pick up those drunks who refuse to or are unable to cooperate—if, indeed, such specific authorization is necessary. Such legislation could expressly sanction a period of detention and allow the individual to be released from a public health facility only when he is sober.

The Commission recommends: Drunkenness should not in itself be a criminal offense. Disorderly and other criminal conduct accompanied by drunkenness should remain punishable as separate crimes. The implementation of this recommendation requires the development of adequate civil detoxification procedures.

Among those seeking alternatives to processing drunkenness cases through the criminal system are the Vera Institute of Justice in New York City and the South End Center for Alcoholics and Unattached Persons in Boston. The Vera Institute has recently undertaken a project to explore the feasibility of using personnel other than the police to pick up drunks. Included in the study is an attempt to determine what percentage of drunks will come to a treatment facility voluntarily. The Vera program would circumvent the criminal process by establishing a system within a public health framework to care for the immediate and long-range needs of the skid row inebriate.

The Boston program, which has received funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity, provides an alternative to the police-correctional handling of the homeless alcoholic. Staff personnel of the Boston South End Center have approached homeless inebriates in skid row and offered them assistance. An official of the program estimates that 80 percent of the people approached in this way responded willingly. The center screens and evaluates the cases and refers homeless alcoholics to appropriate community facilities. In the past year it has handled the cases of over 900 homeless alcoholics.

The importance of developing an alternative to treating drunkenness within the criminal system is underlined by court decisions in two Federal circuits holding that alcoholics cannot be convicted for drunkenness. *Easter* v. *District of Columbia,* 361 F.21 50 (D.C. Cir. 1966); *Driver* v. *Hinnant,* 356 F.2d 761 (4th Cir. 1966). Pursuant to the *Easter* decision, alcoholics are no longer being convicted of public drunkenness in Washington, D.C.

Detoxification centers

An alternate approach to present methods of handling drunkenness offenders after arrest and a prerequisite to taking drunkenness out of the criminal system is the establishment of civil detoxification centers. The detoxification center would replace the police station as an initial detention unit for inebriates. Under the authority of civil legislation, the inebriate would be brought to this public health facility by the police and detained there until sober. Thereafter, the decision to continue treatment should be left to the individual. Experience in New York and Boston indicates that some alcoholics may be willing to accept treatment beyond the initial "sobering up" period. The center should include such medical services as physical examinations, an emergency-care unit for the treatment of acutely intoxicated persons, and transportation to a hospital, if advanced medical care seems necessary.

The Commission recommends: Communities should establish detoxification units as part of comprehensive treatment programs.

The Department of Justice has recently provided funds to establish detoxification centers as demonstration projects in St. Louis and Washington, D.C. The St. Louis center is already in full operation; plans for the Washington center are under way. Both units have sufficient facilities to house for a period of a few days those who are in need of "drying out." They also have "inpatient programs," in which patients are given high protein meals with vitamin and mineral supplements and appropriate medication to alleviate alcohol withdrawal symptoms. Bath and laundry facilities are available, as are basic clothing and limited recreational facilities. Regularly scheduled Alcoholics Anonymous meetings, film showings, work projects, group therapy, and lectures are part of the program. During their stay patients are counseled by social workers and other staff members.

The police might also bring to such a center intoxicated persons charged with a variety of petty offenses apart from drunkenness, with violations of administrative codes, and with such felony offenses as driving while intoxicated, assault, and larceny. If the police planned to prosecute the case, a summons could be left with the offender to appear in court at a later date. If an intoxicated defendant was charged with committing a felony, the police could make an individual determination as to the most appropriate detention facility. If he seemed likely to appear in court he might be taken to the detoxification facility. Otherwise, he would presumably be taken to the local jail, unless there were adequate detention facilities on the premises of the detoxification center.

Aftercare programs

There is little reason to believe that the chronic offender will change a life pattern of drinking after a few days of sobriety and care at a public health unit. The detoxification unit should therefore be supplemented by a network of coordinated "aftercare" facilities. Such a program might well begin with the mobilization of existing community resources. Alcoholics Anonymous programs, locally based missions, hospitals, mental health agencies, outpatient centers, employment counseling, and other social service programs should be coordinated and used by the staff of the detoxification center for referral purposes. It is well recognized among authorities that homeless alcoholics cannot be treated without supportive residential housing, which can be used as a base from which to reintegrate them into society. Therefore, the network of aftercare facilities should be expanded to include halfway houses, community shelters, and other forms of public housing.

The Commission recommends: Communities should coordinate and extend aftercare resources, including supportive residential housing.

The success of aftercare facilities will depend upon the ability of the detoxification unit to diagnose problems adequately and to make appropriate referrals. A diagnostic unit attached to, or used by, the detoxification unit could formulate treatment plans by conducting a thorough medical and social evaluation of every patient. Diagnostic work should include assistance to the patient and his family in obtaining counseling for economic, marital, or employment problems. Subsequent referrals to appropriate agencies will be crucial to the success of the overall treatment plan. The diagnostic unit, through referral to a job and housing service, might also assist the patient in moving out of the deteriorating environment of skid row. Philadelphia has already established a diagnostic and relocation center, which offers diagnostic, recreational, therapeutic, vocational counseling, and housing relocation services, including training in social and occupational skills.

Research

With over five million alcoholics in the country, alcoholism is the Nation's fourth largest health problem. Research aimed at developing new methods and facilities for treating alcoholics should be given the priority called for by the scope of the need.

The Commission recommends: Research by private and governmental agencies into alcoholism, the problems of alcoholics, and methods of treatment, should be expanded.

The application of funds for research purposes appears to be an appropriate supplement to the proposed detoxification and treatment units. Consideration should be given to providing further legislation on the Federal level for the promotion of the necessary coordinated treatment program. Only through such a joint commitment will the burdens of the present system, which fall on both the criminal system and the drunkenness offender, be alleviated.

THE UNITED STATES AND LATIN AMERICA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on Tuesday, February 21, 1967, it was my privilege to speak before the World Affairs Council of Northern California, at the Fairmont Hotel in San Francisco.

I ask unanimous consent that a partial text of my comments, entitled "The United States and Latin America," be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE UNITED STATES AND LATIN AMERICA

(Partial text of remarks by U.S. Senator Thomas H. Kuchel, before World Affairs Council of Northern California, San Francisco, Calif., Feb. 21, 1967)

From George Washington's injunction in his Farewell Address, about steering clear of entangling alliances, until now, America's relations with her neighbors in the Western Hemisphere have been on a different basis than our ties with the rest of the world.

Our direct participation in the affairs of Latin America dates back to the 1820's, when the great Simon Bolivar pushed the idea of a conference of independent American countries to be held in Panama in 1826. Mexico and Colombia invited the United States to attend, and the matter was subjected to vigorous and heated Congressional debate which lasted for four months. The invitation was finally accepted, but our participation in the affairs of the conference left much to be desired. One of our delegates died en route to Panama, while the other started his trip so belatedly that he subsequently gave up the idea of attending at all.

In the ensuing years, we did participate actively in inter-American conferences, and, as the Twentieth Century neared, began to take initiative in strengthening diplomatic and economic ties among the nations in this Hemisphere. In 1889, the first Pan American Conference met in Washington, all independent nations attended, and, in addition to problems of trade and commerce, attention was also turned to common legal and political questions.

Thus, while isolation continued to be our basic doctrine, we had begun to show a neighbor's interest in those who lived near us.

The First World War brought a change, bringing us, almost against our will, into the drama of the globe. In the 1930's Franklin D. Roosevelt's "Good Neighbor" policy was inaugurated. As the gathering clouds of the Second World War began to take shape, hemispheric ties came to assume a far greater importance than ever before.

When that conflict erupted in Europe, the nations of this Hemisphere saw an increasing need for mutual security. Agreements were reached on an early course of action if any American nation were attacked. Most Latin American countries saw the threat to freedom as we did and joined in the fight against the Nazis.

This experience and its aftermath brought a new spirit of unity to our Hemisphere. By the Rio Treaty of 1947, the republics of Latin America and the United States agreed on the principle of a collective defense "in accordance with the principle of continental solidarity." In 1948, the Organization of American States was established as a capstone of decades of effort to create a permanent regional agency to work continually toward our common goals.

Today, isolation—going it alone—is at last gone, except in the minds of a few who wish the calendar would turn back to the 1800's. It won't come back because it can't, and they ought to know it. In this ever-shrinking world neighborhood where we live, the successes and the failures of neighbors are all of the utmost import to the people of the United States. A decent respect for our brethren suggests it. Self-preservation requires it. Thus, today we play a fuller role in the problems of this Hemisphere, and of the world.

What is it we have in common with our neighbors to the South? The fact that we live on the same piece of God's earth gives American nations somewhat the same view of the rest of the world, no matter how different the interpretations.

A few million of our fellow citizens trace their ancestry to lands south of the border. Particularly in the West, we observe a wide Latin American contribution to art, music, food and language—a contribution to an all-American culture which merits our pride.

The ringing phrases written into our Declaration of Independence, the guarantees of liberty in our Constitution, have been reechoed by free men south of us.

In the corridors of our common history, Washington and Lincoln walk hand in hand with Bolivar, San Martin, and Benito Juarez.

Our all-American goal was simply stated by the late President Kennedy in Mexico City:

"We are dedicated to the ideal of a peaceful and free hemisphere, of free and equal nations. 'Democracy,' said Benito Juarez, 'is the destiny of humanity; freedom its indestructible arm.' "

The achievement of these goals has become a bipartisan effort in the United States, and is a matter equally beyond dispute in the rest of the Hemisphere from Canada to Chile.

In the days following the Second World War, Communism began to probe for weak spots. While America was busily engaged in binding up the wounds in Europe and Asia, Communism sought to penetrate the Americas, and to divide and destroy the solidarity which had been achieved after so many decades.

Dwight Eisenhower clearly saw the danger and the responsibility In the idea of equality of opportunity through democratic social change, he saw the means of making the Hemisphere proof against the Marxist threat. This concept led to the creation of the Inter-American Development Bank in 1959 and the Act of Bogota of 1960. His aims were:

"1. To help Latin America develop institutional and human resources.

"2. To strengthen the framework of freedom and

"3. To gain a better life for those who are underprivileged, underemployed and undereducated."

Prior to the signing of the Bogota Agreement for economic cooperation, the Eisenhower Administration sought and received Congressional approval of a contribution of $600,000,000 toward the achievement of these goals.

The outgrowth of the 1960 action was the formulation in 1961 by the new President John F. Kennedy of the Alliance for Progress which was incorporated in the Charter of Punta del Este. Partisan politics were not dominant in the Pan American decision of either Eisenhower or Kennedy. They still have no place in the administration of the Alliance.

We all look hopefully at these programs, and, indeed, there has been some achievement. In general, the nations of Latin America have begun to make economic progress in the past five years. A limited growth per capita income has been achieved. Capital flows have improved. Steps, although small, have been made toward economic integration. Doctors have found health standards on the rise.

In all this, the role of the United States has been substantial. Total U.S. assistance to the Alliance for 1966 exceeded one billion dollars. Only about one-third of our aid is in grant form. By far the greater portion is in repayable loans, which over the years will result in a net gain for the U.S. Balance of Payments.

Private investment, too, has continued to grow. For 1966 the Department of Commerce reports a substantial rise in American capital investment in Latin America, well above the record rate of $171,000,000, reached in the previous year.

But the rate of growth in most of Latin America has been plagued by rising population and insufficient food output. In 1966, total agricultural production declined below levels achieved in 1965. Latin America is today a net importer of food. Over the past ten years agricultural total output increased twenty-seven percent, but per capita output has declined.

The population of Latin America will reach 600,000,000 people by the end of this century at present rates of growth. At the present rates, the population will double every 26 years. In Brazil, with a population of 85,000,000, it will double in about 22 years.

The updraft in population is matched by a shift in rural population to the cities resulting in critical shortages in housing, and other vital facilities. In Latin America 45 million people live in urban slums. They live without water or sewage in impossibly overcrowded conditions. Three to four persons live together in one room. The situation is little better for an equal number of people living in rural areas.

Meanwhile, there is an alarming emigration of the scientists, engineers, physicians and other trained people who are vitally needed for economic development. The flow of doctors from Latin America to the United States over the past ten years was equal to the production of about four of our medical schools. Over the past five years the cost to Latin America of the emigration of university-educated people to the United States has been estimated at nearly $80,000,000.

Professor John Paddock of Stanford has written an account of the disappearance of the "Cloud People of Mount Alban", the ancient people of the Valley of Oaxaca in Southern Mexico, whose civilization came to a sudden end about 900 A.D. He gives as the probable cause for the failure of this once glorious culture the inability of the society to deal successfully with the losing race between population and food supplies. Despite the grandeur of their culture, the Cloud People could not survive unless they solved this fundamental problem. In the collapse at Oaxaca, their nation all but disappeared.

Like each of you, I have a profound respect for those great, mystical Indian civilizations of distant antiquity in the Americas whose progress and whose struggles relate a remarkable story by any human standard. We are only now beginning to understand the significance of these ancient cultures. It is against this proud background of accomplishment that we see a virtual renaissance in modern Mexico.

The Mexican Republic—with its momentous revolution against tyranny and its successful fight for liberty and independence—has marked many milestones of progress. There is much that all America can learn from the Mexican achievement of self-sustaining growth. The National Product over the past fifteen years has grown at rates far surpassing the goals of Punta del Este. Its agriculture is in surplus.

I was particularly pleased when President Diaz Ordaz last September set a national objective to insure that two-thirds of all investment come from the private sector. The Republic of Mexico has begun her own program of aid to Central America, including 6 million dollars to the Central American Bank for Economic Integration. She has also signed technical assistance agreements with Honduras, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica. Mexico has become a leading contributor to the achievement of the goals of which our great democratic leaders have dreamed.

We are all looking with hope to the upcoming Summit Conference of Latin American heads of state to provide new departures in our search for their goals. Next April's meeting will require a thorough and objective appraisal of all of the issues of the Hemisphere.

Vexing problems remain unsolved between the United States and a number of our Latin American neighbors. I regret exceedingly that jurisdiction over the open oceans 200 miles seaward of their borders has been claimed by some of our neighbors.

No nation should be allowed to harm the vital interests of her neighbors, but I regret to say that in at least one instance, we have in our Hemisphere a very real problem involving the vital interests of all American states. The traditional, historic concept of freedom of the seas has been summarily abrogated by some of our southern neighbors who are asserting a seaward jurisdiction as much as 200 miles from their coast line. That is hardly a good neighbor policy on their part. Such claims are unreasonable and arbitrary. The skirmishes which have occurred because of those claims have bemore more frequent and are making a bad situation infinitely worse. In 1965 I succeeded in amending the Foreign Assistance Act to provide that aid can be withdrawn from nations that interfere with American fishing vessels on what, by any reasonable determination, should be called the high seas. I continue to believe, however, that the good people in the countries involved should—no, must—come into an agreement on a reasonable basis, as has been the case in the settlement of other inter-American disputes in recent years. I have sponsored legislation designed to achieve a reasonable settlement on a basis other than our simply refusing to ally ourselves with the progress of the countries involved.

We come then to the agenda. What is to be done to improve our Hemispheric neighborhood?

If Latin America is to use its resources for progress, it should be freed of the burden of excessive armament costs. The proposed creation of a Latin American Nuclear Free Zone made up of the nations south of the United States should permit our neighbors to continue their progress without paying the astronomical costs of competing in a nuclear arms race. A Nuclear Free Zone will have its problems. Cuba will not participate. But the unanimity-minus-one of states who will join this cause leaves no doubt that the overwhelming interest of the peoples of the Hemisphere is to seek peace with justice in the nuclear age.

The might of the United States must stand ready now, as always, to defend the Americas against nuclear attack. This position is implicit in the solidarity agreements of the Rio Treaty. It should be made clear by a further strengthening of Charters of the Organization of American States. No nation should have any doubt about the readiness of the United States to resist aggression and subversion in the Hemisphere, in whatever form or time.

In my opinion, the consultative arrangements of the OAS should be amended to take account of the need for rapid response to any nuclear attack on this Hemisphere. There is little to be gained by consulting after the fact of any nuclear exchange. Rather, in the first instance, let the nations of the world be on notice. The Americas will be resolutely defended.

There are those who might cynically view this as traditional imperialism. Let them be assured the direct opposite is the case. Citizens of the United States, like all decent people everywhere, are peace loving, and as a matter of mutual interest are willing to come to the aid of their neighbors who want to live as they do. This is an interdependent world; all reasonable men recognize that fact.

The larger issue, however, rests with the question of social and economic development, particularly of organizing the resources of the Americas for progress exceeding the rate of population growth.

In the past 5 years there has been an emphasis on economic integration through the Latin American Free Trade Association, the Central American Common Market, the Inter-American Bank, and the Alliance itself. The United States must look with favor on the formation of a Common Market in the South.

Our southern neighbors do not now seek United States membership, for many reasons, which I believe are valid. Our membership in a Common Market would distort the efficient flow of goods among the developing nations, whose economic units must come to reinforce each other and eliminate pointless competition. The United States can continue to help capital resources, especially from the private sector, and to assist, where we can, in the expansion of markets.

The success of international banking institutions, such as the Inter-American Bank, its new counterpart, the Asian Development Bank, and the World Bank, itself, suggests that the use of multilateral assistance should be broadened, as a means of mobilizing capital. I think this kind of repayable, interest-bearing bank loan is particularly important in Latin America where direct aid from the United States has in the past taken on political overtones, unrelated to the objectives of rational economic progress. In my view, our program of aid ought to be essentially one of repayable loans. The banking function helps to assure sound business practices and a uniform system of procedures in accounts and at law. Bank investment also helps to expand the scope of the market for free competitive enterprise.

Latin American nations must also concentrate increasingly on multi-national projects in public works, in power transmission in tele-communications and in the exploitation of Latin America's vast river systems. We should also recognize fully the need for a Second Atlantic-Pacific Canal as a means of increasing the flexibility of our trade patterns with one another.

In all of this, free competitive enterprise should be given an ever larger role. Today United States investment in Latin America employs 1,500,000 persons, it supplies one-tenth of total production, pays one-fifth of all taxes, and accounts for one-third of all export earnings. The local participation arrangements which Kaiser Industries have made in Brazil and Argentina are a clear example of the evident interest of American business in the development of Latin America.

The Administration would do well to consider agreements to eliminate double taxation on American firms. As a further incentive, profits on American investments in Latin America should be given tax credits by our government if they are re-invested in a reasonable period of time.

In this development effort much greater emphasis must be placed on education of all kinds. The people of Latin America must come to realize the dangers of their rapid population growth. The experience in India has suggested that as people move from the farm into town, it is easier to explain to them the possibilities of family planning. The development of urban educational centers could play a major role in this vital problem.

The "brain drain," which poses a serious threat to the formation of the necessary pool of skills, is a problem that must be dealt with imaginatively. The creation of regional institutions at the graduate level on a regional basis would give an opportunity for intellectual and technical advancement and eliminate much of the appeal of emigration. The need to expand intellectual horizons is critical for those who would advance in technical fields. This need is probably a major cause of the Latin brain drain.

Finally, all of us must have a common understanding of our history, both to know each other better and to have a clearer view of the path we are treading together.

At present rates of population growth, our Hemisphere will be the home of more than a billion people, not long after the turn of the century. There will be a lot of people living in our neighborhood. Of all the areas of the world, those closest to us require the most consideration. Let me emphasize that this Hemisphere should have the number one priority in American policy in our efforts toward the positive achievement of the peace, security, independence and freedom which we all cherish. This is not merely a case of mutual defense or preserving democracy. The survival of our own way of life depends on what the Americas do with their Hemisphere; so we must heed the cry for action.

THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH MESSAGE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the 3-minute limitation on speeches, I be permitted to continue for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the White House message on education and health in America has been received by Congress today. In it, we are told that an appropriation of $8.1 million—a 25-percent increase over this year—has been requested in fiscal year 1968 to expand research and training programs in occupational health and to strengthen State and local public health programs in this field.

As a member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee which votes funds for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, I have had ample opportunity to watch the interest of the Federal Government in occupational health programs for the last several years. It is unfortunate that this interest has not been as great as the need.

I personally led the campaign to conduct a survey by the U.S. Public Health Service on the chest diseases which afflict coal miners. This program was begun in 1962 on a small scale and, while it has been continued through the years, it still is not on the same scale as that conducted in other countries.

I am told that similar needs exist for the occupational hazards of noise, stress, and tension—to mention just a few.

The 1965 special report to the Surgeon General on occupational health said that the first year cost of mounting a national program would be approximately $15 million.

The request contained in today's message is about one-half of that amount. Moreover, I am informed that nearly 40 percent of the $8.1 million to be appropriated in fiscal year 1968 is required for administration, with another 33 percent to be allocated for research grants. The remaining funds are not sufficient to delve into new programs for other occupational hazards.

The $15 million recommended in the special report to the Surgeon General included some $5 million to be spent for Federal specialists to work with the individual States for on-the-site studies of occupational hazards facing men and women at their jobs. The $18.1 million to be appropriated in fiscal year 1968 would apparently eliminate this activity or, to say the least, allow it only on a minor scale.

I know from firsthand experience that the problems which face America's working people take a tremendous toll in human suffering and can be an economic and social burden on the well-being of whole communities. I have seen many of my friends in West Virginia fall ill, have to stop work, and ultimately die because of the work they did. I have seen their families go hungry because the father was too incapacitated to do any kind of work. I have sponsored appropriations for research to find out why soft coal workers develop chest diseases and what can be done to eliminate, control, and cure these diseases. I have also supported the development of a national center for research on occupational respiratory diseases so that the knowledge developed from the research on coal miners' chest diseases can be used to benefit other workers.

I also know that workers face health hazards other than chest diseases—that four out of five workers are unprotected on the job. The problems of a celery picker in Michigan, a garage mechanic in California, a machine shop worker in Pennsylvania, a textile plant employee in North Carolina, just to name a few, are different from those of my West Virginia miners—but they are problems nonetheless, and it should weigh heavily on the conscience of the Nation that so little has been done about them.

Research, by itself, is not the answer. If a worker in a chemical plant in New York becomes ill from exposure to toxic fumes, there is no way of assuring that the knowledge of the hazard and the necessary precautionary measures reach the chemical companies in other parts of the country. This is why improved reporting of occupational diseases is so important.

Twice within the last year the President has expressed his concern about the health of the American working public, and yet the 1967 plans and budget proposals for occupational health were not responsive to the President's concern. It was left to my subcommittee on appropriations to add funds to assure that the research on occupational respiratory diseases would move forward at a reasonable pace. Now, it appears that it will be up to Congress again to appropriate the moneys necessary to enable the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to move forward in this area.

I think it is fair to say that the concern of the Federal Government about the health of workers has not matched that of labor and big business, nor that of Congress for that matter. Leadership from the very highest level of government is needed to strengthen the national occupational health effort to hasten the day when every worker can go to his job with the assurance that his health is protected.

RECREATION IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, recently the Pittsburgh Press carried an article that merits the widest possible circulation, particularly in the East. Written by Gilbert Love, "Worth an Ogle" is a brief but comprehensive description of the wonders of Oglebay Park, a magnificent recreational facility that is attracting visitors from an ever-lengthening radius to the Wheeling area.

I shall ask that the article be placed in the RECORD. My colleagues, particularly those who drive beyond the Ohio River from the Nation's Capital, ought to take note of it. For that matter, Oglebay Park is less than 6 hours from Washington by automobile—not an unreasonable distance for a family looking for the unusual over a long weekend.

West Virginia is also ready to take care of those with only a day or two to spare, for no area of the State is without unique and refreshing points of diversion for individuals and families seeking rest and play. While our parks in the eastern part of the State are becoming more popular by the year, new facilities are now under construction to offer expanded vacation sites for both West Virginians and out-of-State guests.

West Virginia's mountains have always been a mecca for those seeking the solitude of nature unspoiled. Now, as those who reside in metropolitan areas look for new avenues of escape from monotony and tension, the hospitable river valley sections of West Virginia will also increase in popularity. The State's potential as a recreation area is almost without limitation, and there is no question but that there will be progressively sharp increases in the number of vacationists who will come to enjoy West Virginia's beauty as the Nation's population continues to grow.

The capacity of Atlantic seaboard resorts is already being overtaxed. For the city dweller who takes his family to the beach for a weekend, the ride home over congested highways and bridges tends to negate whatever advantages a swim in the ocean may have had. Within 6 weeks or so, as the first indications of spring come to soften winter skies, access to the shore on a Friday night will become increasingly difficult. By mid-June, travelers will ask themselves whether the trip was necessary or desirable.

As beach traffic continues to pick up, the mountains of West Virginia will reach out and persuade more and more families to behold the majestic beauty and incomparable tranquillity that God has built into the wide regions of my State. As new facilities are developed and present facilities expanded, West Virginians are also broadening the range of hotels, motels, and dining facilities to assist in providing every service for guests who will visit our State this year and in the future.

So, I say to my colleagues and other Americans, come to West Virginia. We have the parks, the revitalizing scenery, and the kind of warm hospitality to convince one and all that life begins not necessarily "at 40" but, indeed, it begins when one has spent a weekend or a holiday season in the West Virginia hills.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORTH AN OGLE

(By Gilbert Love)

[*This is another article in a series about wandering in a winter wonderland.*]

OGLEBAY PARK, W. VA.—The chances seem good that you know this park in summer. It's less than 60 miles from Pittsburgh and is one of the best-equipped in the East, offering golf, swimming, boating, fishing, riding, picnicking, dancing, outdoor theater, nature walks and all sorts of special events.

It doesn't have as long a recreational menu in winter, but it still is a lively place and worth an afternoon's visit or a weekend stay.

Unlike most rural parks it has people at this season. Even on week days popular Wilson Lodge has many guests. On week ends its guest rooms are likely to be sold out and its big dining room filled with people who have come out from Wheeling, or from nearby cities like Pittsburgh and Cleveland, to ski or enjoy other park facilities.

The big Mansion Museum is open 9:30 to 5 every week day and 1:30 to 5 on Sundays. It has one of the nation's best glass collections, rooms done in period furniture and, currently, a special exhibit titled "How to Look at a Painting."

The museum has become so popular that it is able to command an admission price of $1 for adults. Children under 12 are not charged.

The Garden Center, including a palm house, specialized gift shop and library, is open Tuesdays through Saturdays and Sunday afternoons. The park's greenhouses are open daily, 7:30 to 4.

The ski area, with poma lifts and rope tows, operates daily from 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. when there's snow or enough cold weather to make it artificially. When there isn't, there's golf.

There's also riding, out of the park's stables, over 12 miles of bridle paths. And hiking, of course.

Schenk Lake is heavily stocked with rainbow trout, bass and channel catfish and fishing is permitted whenever the lake has no ice cover. No West Virginia license is required, but persons over 12 are charged $1.50 and everyone pays by the inch for any fish he catches and wishes to keep.

(A trout over 18 inches long would be $4 . . . and worth it).

In winter the park also offers a full schedule of lectures, films and classes. Next Sunday afternoon Roger Latham, Outdoor Editor of The Press, will be a winter lecture series speaker.

Quite a place, Oglebay. It's a former country estate, in the West Virginia Panhandle, that was given to the City of Wheeling and has been intensively developed by its Park Commission.

Pittsburghers can drive to it in about an hour by taking U.S. Route 19 south to Washington, Pa., then Interstate 70 and some remaining sections of U.S. 40 to an intersection with State 88 in suburban Wheeling. You can contact Wilson Lodge by mail or phone through Wheeling.

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators CLARK, HART, HATFIELD, KUCHEL, and TYDINGS, I introduce a bill to require the public disclosure of the financial interests of Members of Congress and top legislative staff, as well as top officials in the executive branch.

Our bill would require Members of Congress—and candidates for Congress—and top legislative staff, as well as top officials in the executive branch, to make annual reports covering all their income and the sources thereof, gifts received of more than nominal value, liabilities and assets, and all transactions in commodities, real and personal property. These reports would be filed with the Comptroller General and would be freely accessible to the press and public.

I am more convinced than ever that such a measure offers the most effective way to protect the integrity of governmental processes, both legislative and administrative.

So far as the Congress is concerned, the last few years have provided ample demonstration of the futility of expecting Congress to discipline itself. For years the Senate, for example, has squirmed uneasily in the face of recurrent "exposés" or allegation of misconduct by Members or staff. But we have yet to come to grips with the problem.

For example, in 1958, Congress adopted a code of ethics covering all persons in Government service, Congress included. Printed in red, blue, and gold, it is available to hang on any Member's wall. It does add a decorative note, but I rather doubt that it serves any other purpose, since it consists of pious homilies, unexceptional in themselves but too general in nature to provide real standards, much less any means of enforcement.

In any case, only a few years later the Bobby Baker case broke, and we had the on-again-off-again Rules Committee inquiry. Ineffective though it was, the inquiry could not avoid the conclusion that the former secretary to the majority was "guilty of many gross improprieties" and "used the influence of his public office to feather his own nest and hence acted unethically"—a statement to which the committee appended the puzzling comment "even though the subject matter did not touch the 'public' interest."

The committee reported several recommendations, including a limited disclosure requirement. They were, however, not acted upon by the Senate since consideration of them terminated abruptly when the Senate adopted a resolution to establish a new Select Committee on Standards and Conduct.

Understandably, there was no rush to volunteer for service on the select committee, and it was many months before the committee was organized. Shortly thereafter, it was confronted with allegations involving a colleague, and its inquiry into this matter has been proceeding ever since.

The inquiry had hardly begun when a Supreme Court decision made clear the unique position in which legislatures find themselves in matters of ethical standards and conflicts of interest problems. In a case involving a Member of the House of Representatives, the Court pointed to article I, section 6, of the Constitution, which provides that "for any speech or debate in either House, they (Senators and Representatives) shall not be questioned in any other place." This provision, the Court concluded, "generally forecloses from executive and judicial inquiry" the motivation behind a Congressman's conduct. As the Court explained:

> The legislative privilege, protecting against possible prosecution by an unfriendly executive and conviction by a hostile judiciary, is one manifestation of the "practical security" for ensuring the independence of the legislature.

I fully agree. It does indicate, however, why the conflict of interest approach has been so ineffective when applied to legislatures. It has been largely left to legislatures to police themselves. But history shows that legislatures do not police themselves. Apart from election frauds, only twice in the last 100 years has the U.S. Senate acted even to censure one of its own Members for any cause.

Our public disclosure proposal has several advantages.

First. It would be preventive rather than punitive. The knowledge that one's financial activities and interests would become known would serve as a "stop and think" signal. At the very least, it would tend to sharpen awareness of possible confusion of public and private interests.

Second. It would be nearly automatic in operation. The reports would put the facts on the table, and the press and the public could make their own judgment.

So far as the executive branch is concerned, it would correct a vital omission in the Executive order issued in 1965 by the President. His order requires Federal employees to submit financial reports to their superiors, or in some cases to the Civil Service Commission. But these reports are not available to the public and availability to the press and public, as provided in our bill, is vital to the effectiveness of the disclosure principle.

Third, disclosure would protect the right of the people to elect whomever they wished, while enhancing their right to full knowledge of the economic interests and financial activities of those who represent them or who present themselves as candidates for public office.

A second section of our bill would apply the disclosure principle to another important area of governmental activity. Exercising great powers over particular segments of our economic structure, the administrative agencies are natural targets for those who look to "influence" to press their cases. Rumors of backdoor approaches, influence peddling, and the like are constantly circulating, and sometimes, as we know, not without cause.

Our bill would deal with the problem by putting all—and I emphasize "all"—approaches to administrative agencies with regard to particular cases on the record. For example, all communications, routine or otherwise, written or oral, formal or informal, from Members of Congress or any other persons outside the agency itself in behalf, say, of a particular application for a broadcasting license from the FCC would be made part of the public record of the case.

Here again, disclosure would be both preventive and protective—with regard to the public and also those who serve in appointive office.

As far back as 1951, a Senate subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator Paul Douglas reported to the Senate:

> Disclosure is like an antibiotic which can deal with ethical sicknesses in the field of public affairs. There was perhaps more general agreement upon this principle of disclosing full information to the public and upon its general effectiveness than upon any other proposal. It is hardly a sanction and certainly not a penalty. It avoids difficult decisions as to what may be right or wrong. In that sense it is not even diagnostic; yet there is confidence that it will be helpful in dealing with many questionable or improper practices. It would sharpen men's own judgments of right and wrong since they would be less likely to do wrong things if they knew these acts would be challenged.

The statement is as true today as it was then. Indeed, over the intervening years public and administrative recognition of the usefulness of the disclosure approach has grown steadily.

In 1966, the President of the United States proposed that Members of Congress disclose annually income received for personal services and gifts of $100 or more in cash or kind. While his recommendation did not go nearly far enough, it was welcome recognition of the effectiveness of the disclosure approach.

Congress lags far behind. It is time we ourselves recognized, and acted on the recognition, that public disclosure is far and away the most practicable and least painful way of maintaining the public confidence in the integrity of its Government.

PRESIDENT'S CRIME COMMISSION ENDORSES VICTIM COMPENSATION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in recent weeks public interest has been aroused by the illuminating and comprehensive report of President Johnson's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Never before in our history have we had such a competent public assessment of our crime problems. The American people welcome this report and the resolute action which it promises.

The Crime Commission's report takes on added significance in that it emphasizes that our crime problems are interwoven. The report offers persuasive evidence for the argument that the solution of our crime problems requires a broad, all inclusive assault on a vast array of problems. Piecemeal solutions may slow the crime growth problem, but only a comprehensive plan can solve it.

I am especially pleased by the fact that the President's Crime Commission, a distinguished group of experts, has endorsed the principle of victim compensation for which I reintroduced a bill, S. 646, on January 25, 1967. The Commission has also done an admirable job of reporting the growth of widespread support for victim compensation. I quote from this report a passage which is particularly encouraging for the supporters of victim compensation:

> The Commission has been impressed by the consensus among legislators and law enforcement officials that some kind of State compensation for victims of violent crime is desirable. Recent public opinion polls indicate that a considerable majority of the public is in favor of victim compensation. The Commission believes that the general principle of victim compensation, especially to persons who suffer injury in violent crime, is sound and that the experiments now being conducted with different types of compensation programs are valuable.

New Zealand was the first English-speaking jurisdiction to enact such a law, in 1963, followed by England, in 1964. This matter had been debated in the House of Lords, in England, for many years.

In 1965, I introduced the first bill of this kind in Congress. Thereafter, California adopted a rather limited plan. Governor Rockefeller requested and obtained a copy of our bill and our reports, and the State of New York has adopted a comprehensive plan for the compensation of the innocent victims of crime.

A bill is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary, and we are hopeful that hearings will be held this year. The committee recognizes the importance of hearings being held with respect to these bills, so that the matter may be properly debated and information may be obtained.

The bill that I have introduced would compensate innocent victims of violent crime to the person in the District of Columbia and other areas of Federal jurisdiction. It would not impinge upon the State's treatment of these victims in areas where the State has jurisdiction.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an excerpt, entitled "Compensation to Victims of Crime," from page 41 of the Commission's report, "The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society."

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPENSATION TO VICTIMS OF CRIME

Programs granting public compensation to victims for physical injuries from violent crimes have aroused increased interest in recent years. The community has evidenced concern for the plight of victims of muggings, stabbings, and other violence. In the absence of such programs victims generally suffer losses that are not compensated in any way. Their civil remedies are most likely to be unsuccessful because of the poor financial condition and prospects of most offenders. And the criminal law generally makes no effort to use its sanctions to insure restitution to the victim. Indeed it often aggravates the victim's problem by incarcerating the offender, thus preventing him from earning money to make restitution.

Two philosophies underlie the recent movements for victim compensation. The first argues that the government is responsible for preventing crime and therefore should be made responsible for compensating the victims of the crimes it fails to prevent. The second approach, an extension of welfare doctrines, rests on the belief that people in need, especially those in need because they have been victimized by events they could not avoid, are entitled to public aid.

The first modern victim-compensation programs were established in New Zealand and Great Britain in 1964. California's program, which became effective in the beginning of 1966, was the first in the United States. Only victims with limited financial resources qualify for compensation under this program. New York's victim-compensation bill, enacted in 1966, also provides compensation only for those who would suffer "serious financial hardship" as a result of the crime. Various Federal victim-compensation bills, now before the Congress, have yet to receive public hearings. The Commission believes that such hearings would provide a national forum for a much needed debate over the philosophy, assumptions, and potential advantages and disadvantages of such programs generally, and the relative merits and design of a program on the Federal level in particular.

The Commission has been impressed by the consensus among legislators and law enforcement officials that some kind of State compensation for victims of violent crime is desirable. Recent public opinion polls indicate that a considerable majority of the public is in favor of victim compensation. The Commission believes that the general principle of victim compensation, especially to persons who suffer injury in violent crime, is sound and that the experiments now being conducted with different types of compensation programs are valuable.

ADULT BASIC EDUCATION TEACHERS IN CROCKETT INDEPENDENT SCHOOL, HOUSTON COUNTY, TEX., VOLUNTEER TO TEACH WITHOUT PAY RATHER THAN CLOSE DOWN THEIR PROGRAM.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, an example of the devotion to the adult basic education program felt by people all over the country is the decision of the teachers in the Crockett Independent School District, Crockett, Houston County, Tex., to continue to serve without pay rather than see their program ended because no more money was available.

The current program began in September 1966. When the district applied to the Texas Education Agency for funds for the second session they were informed that Federal money had run out and no more money, either Federal or State, was available. It was then that a majority of the teachers volunteered to serve without pay.

This strong belief in the program is symptomatic of the way people feel about the program all over the country. Congress answer to this nationwide enthusiasm should be to provide an additional $10 million in supplemental funds to keep the adult basic education program operating the rest of fiscal year 1967. Congress should not say to the teachers of the country: "either work without pay or terminate your programs."

I congratulate the teachers in the Crockett adult basic education program for their selfless dedication.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Houston County Courier of February 16 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADULT BASIC EDUCATION TEACHERS VOLUNTEER SERVICES WITHOUT PAY

A majority of the teachers in the Adult Basic Education program have assured that there will be no lapse in the classes by offering to continue to teach without pay.

The current Adult Basic Education Program will complete the first session on Feb. 23. An application has been sent to the Texas Education Agency for continuing funds, but notification has been received that the federal funds are exhausted and no additional funds are available to finance an additional term.

The adult classes will continue, however, due to the unselfishness and community spirit of the teachers. A majority of the teachers, when informed that their salaries for these services would end Feb. 23, decided to continue their classes on a voluntary basis for the remainder of this year.

Beginning July 1, there will be additional funds to carry on the program for next year.

All of the people of Houston County can feel justly proud of these teachers for devoting their time and efforts, and sometimes money out of their own pockets, to the continuation of the adult classes.

Most persons felt that the teachers were teaching primarily for the salary, but now that they will be teaching without pay, everyone should realize that a teacher is in the teaching profession for more than just the salary.

Listed are the teachers of the Adult Basic Education classes, and the ones marked with an asterisk have been teaching without pay since Sept. 6, 1966:

*Vivian Lovelady, *Evola Dorn, *Delta Shepherd, *Mrs. Billie B. Lamb, *Lula Dailey, *Alma Mathis, *Sabra D. Berry, *Octavia S. Williams.

Mary Murphy, Mittie Mae Wiley, Annie B. Steed, Vernon Grant, Eugene Dix, Beatrice Murphy, T. J. Shepherd, Addie M. Ware.

Lucille M. King, Pauline Davis, Connie Jones, John Davis, Nellie Williams, Jerry Bill Woolbright, Helen Jackson, Glenn Cross.

Robbie D. Cotton, Kathryn Sanders, Virginia Garner, Norma Dell Monk, Annie Mae Sapp, Ruthie Mae Jackson, Rosena H. Murphy.

H. D. Glaspie, Lucy M. Houston, John Pruitt, Mabel Ledgrum, Emma Pearl Todd, Archie Mae Garrett, Jo Ella Scott.

FOOD OUTPUT PER PERSON DID NOT INCREASE IN UNDERDEVELOPED NATIONS DURING 1966—UNITED STATES SHOULD MAKE MAXIMUM EFFORT TO AID THESE NATIONS IN SOLVING THEIR POPULATION PROBLEMS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the January 1967 issue of Agricultural Situation, published by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, reports that 1966 saw the world's developed areas make further gains in agricultural production per person while the less developed regions had to settle for no better than the year before.

> Agricultural output during the past decade has actually gone up faster in the less developed areas than in the rest of the world—

The report says—

> but the benefits have been canceled out by a corresponding rapid growth in population.

In the face of this continuing situation, it is to be hoped by all who are concerned about the desperate race being run in the underdeveloped nations between population growth and food supply, that the U.S. State Department and the U.S. Department of Agriculture will devote maximum effort to aiding these lands in dealing with this enormous problem.

Congress last year was most definite in its intent that these agencies step up their activity. New, explicit authority to render assistance, at a country's request, was given in both the foreign aid bill and the food-for-peace bill.

The information contained in this Agriculture Department report reminds us again of the seriousness of the problem and of the massive effort which must be made in order to deal with it effectively.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the January 1967 issue of Agricultural Situation be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As in recent past years, 1966 saw the world's developed areas make further gains in agricultural production per person while the less developed regions had to settle for no better than the year before.

A per capita production gain to 110 (1957–59=100) from 106 for the year before for the developed areas contrasted with a level of 101 for the second straight year for the less developed areas due to their faster rising populations.

Agricultural output during the past decade has actually gone up faster in the less developed areas than in the rest of the world. But the benefits have been canceled out by a corresponding rapid growth in population.

OPEN AID FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDENT ACTIVITY ADVOCATED BY MAX LERNER

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on February 15, 1967, I introduced S. 981, a bill to authorize the Secretary of HEW to make grants to individuals broadly representative of American students for the purpose of attending international youth conferences. Rather than some secret grant, as in the case of the CIA, we would publicly make grants.

Last week Max Lerner wrote a very thoughtful column in which he argued that the right way to make it possible for American students to attend these conferences is "to get or appropriate money for these international students activities quite openly." I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lerner's article as published in the Wednesday, February 22 Washington Evening Star be published at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Feb. 22, 1967]

INTERNATIONAL STUDENT ACTIVITY DUE OPEN AID

(By Max Lerner)

There has been a lot of stupidity on the part of the Washington people, under Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson, in getting the student movement tied in with the Central Intelligence Agency, and a lot of hypocrisy on the part of some of the more bitter critics who gain cheap and easy victories flaying the CIA and the students equally.

The government people saw a problem but settled for a terribly wrong solution of it. Some of the critics, both within Congress and outside, offer no solution, and perhaps see no problem.

The problem is there, and it has been there sharply since the beginning of the 1950s, when the Communist camp made its shift of strategy in the political war. While maintaining their old litany about factory workers and peasants as the true revolutionary material, the Communist leaders began to put their real reliance on the intellectuals as their fulcrum of revolution. They saw that in such a struggle the weapons tipped with flame are the ideas, and so they put their energies into training, persuading, seducing, converting the carriers of ideas.

For the Communists it made sense. They were veterans of the ideological wars, and had been attending international conferences for generations. They knew all the dodges, they had a powerful mystique that attracted the young—and they had the machinery of complete secrecy.

What America had was two groups of activist students. Both had generosity and idealism as they looked at the world. But they had different angles of vision. There were those who identified romantically with revolutions and—without themselves wanting to be Communists—felt that the future lay with the revolutionary left. But there were also those who identified strongly with democracy, but who felt frustrated because they could not find in it an adequate armory of weapons with which to meet the Communists on their chosen ground of political warfare.

That, however you might cut it, was the sharp edge of the problem. But the question for America was: How do you send knowledgeable students to all the youth conferences and youth congresses that the Soviet camp knew so well to mount? How do you pay their way without leaving them open to the charge of being stooges of the government that subsidized them?

The problem was real. The solution found, of subsidizing student organizations secretly by the CIA, was an idiot one.

I have heard two lines of defense of it. One is pragmatic: "It worked, didn't it?" (the Allen Dulles defense, presumably). The other is one of bruised innocence: "We were sure we could count on everyone's patriotism and sense of responsibility not to reveal it."

The answer to the bruised ones is that the notions of what is patriotic and responsible will differ. At some point someone is bound to be in on the secret who gets religion and is driven to confess all. The wondrous thing is not that the secret was broken but that it took so long to break. As for the pragmatic line about its "working," my answer is that it worked for a while, yes, but only a narrow vision would believe that the manipulation paid off. When the lid blew off, it blew disastrously, and neither the government nor the student movements—which will be so vulnerable abroad now—will be able to make up for the damage in prestige for some time.

It "worked"? Only if you say that, given the end, the quality of the means makes little importance. But one of the things that a democracy prides itself on is that it does care about means. And covert means in this case were wrong means. And did it "work" for the young men who must now be counted as its victims, because they were forced into a corroding secrecy and must now face the judgment of a hostile world? Did it finally "work" for all the young people who were not in the secret at all, who now find that unwittingly they were along used all the time?

I don't intend this against the CIA as such. Intelligence agencies are normal and necessary in an absurd world, and the United States may be the only major country in the world that keeps lambasting its intelligence services constantly. All I am saying is that the CIA should stick to its knitting, which doesn't include subterranean support or manipulation of student movements, not even under the spur of the competitive warfare of ideas. We have tried the wrong way. Why not try a right way for a change?

And the right way? It is to get or appropriate money for these international students activities quite openly. The money itself may be government money (Why not? We spend it for far less important things) or else mixed government and foundation money. America has a powerful weapon, in the foundation, which no other nation has to the same extent. Why not use it? But however the money gets furnished, it should be administered non-governmentally and openly. It will make things harder for the students, at least for a while, but not nearly as hard as they have been made by the blunders of covert manipulation.

EDUCATION AND HEALTH

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Senate today has received a message on education and health from the President of the United States.

I wish to commend this message to my colleagues as a document that is compassionate and imaginative, reasonable and responsive in meeting our obligations to the health and welfare of the American people.

President Johnson has rightly noted that these programs are fundamental to our most coveted aspirations for individual fulfillment, and represent an investment in our most previous natural resource: our people.

No American President has accomplished more to advance the quality of education and health services available to our people than has President Johnson. The 89th Congress can be truly called "the Education Congress" for the amount of historic legislation it passed in this field.

And yet, our vibrant, growing Nation demands that still more be done to provide adequate resources and services in our schools, hospitals, research institutes, and health centers.

The President's proposals are based on careful study and sound research. In education, the President requests programs to help State and local agencies evaluate their own educational programs; he asks for an expansion of our National Teacher Corps programs; and recommends bold initiatives in the neglected fields of vocational training, educational television, adult education, and in the development of computers in education.

These programs are responsive to definite needs in our educational establishment. They will help us to continue the progress we have achieved in recent years. All of these programs, in my judgment, will have long-range benefits that may well determine the vitality and capacity of American education for years to come.

In the field of health, the President is asking that we continue to build on the accomplishments of the past several years. He recommends expanded support for cancer and biomedical research and for our health manpower resources. He requests improvement of the community mental health program and studies to improve and strengthen health protection for our industrial workforce. He recommends that we initiate a new program to help the deaf and blind; that we expand our neighborhood health centers for the poor; and that we extend medicare coverage to seriously disabled Americans under 65.

These, and other of the President's health proposals, are fundamental to the security and welfare we seek for the American people.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I have aided in the support of all educational and public health legislation of this Nation in the past 9 years, beginning with the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which I had the privilege of cosponsoring.

I believe that President Johnson has forwarded to us a reasonable blueprint for progress in these vital fields that we can well afford. In addition I feel sure that many of my colleagues have sound health and education proposals which should receive favorable consideration by Congress.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to support progress recommended in this message and help us to continue the progress that will make America in the 1960's the most enlightened and humane society the world has ever known.

POSTAL AUTOMATION AND MODERNIZATION

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the distinguished Assistant Postmaster General for Research and Engineering, Dr. Leo S. Packer, recently addressed the Oklahoma Advertising Club on the vitally important topic of postal automation and modernization.

Dr. Packer has brought new skill and leadership to the Post Office Department and I am very hopeful that the Department's program for modernization will progress rapidly to improve our national mail service.

I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point two articles from the Oklahoma Journal and the Oklahoma City Times concerning Dr.

Packer's address and the subject which he discussed.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oklahoma City Times, Feb. 1, 1967]

RESEARCH CHIEF LOOKS TO FUTURE MAIL PROBLEMS—SORRY, AUNT MINNIE, BUT POST OFFICE TRIES

If Aunt Minnie's latest letter arrived six days late at the wrong address, Dr. Leo S. Packer is sorry about that.

An assistant U. S. postmaster general heading the new Bureau of Research and Engineering, he knows it's important to solve day by day breakdowns in the massive postal system.

But he is more concerned with bigger problems looming in later years if the postal department doesn't develop "a management and control structure as progressive and adaptable to change as any modern industry."

Dr. Packer was in Oklahoma City Wednesday to speak at an Advertising Club "Direct Mail Day" luncheon.

In an interview, he described his hopes for building a postal operation meeting 20th century needs.

The enthusiastic engineering PhD said realization of "the need to look ahead" is just dawning.

"We have been much too preoccupied with the problems of today, serious as they are," he said.

"We must look ahead and anticipate technical developments, so that we won't continue to just be in a passive and defensive position of trying to meet problems as they come up."

Dr. Packer is pioneering, as the first presidential appointee to take the special assistantship when the old office of research was beefed up to bureau status last August.

He brings industrial know-how from Bausch & Lomb, where he was with the space and defense division, and from Xerox Corp., where he was responsible for specialized government research and development contracts.

Dr. Packer said the first task is assembling a trained corps to tackle postal updating from all directions.

Key areas haven't had staff specialists in the past, including human-factors engineering, communications engineering, researchers on mechanical systems reliability, and operations research.

"We have to start from scratch in these important areas," he said. He predicted impact of the new studies won't be felt for five to 10 years.

"You can't just say, 'Lo and behold, here is our brand new postal system'. It will take time, and effort, and money from congress," he said.

Dr. Packer is optimistic about the bureau's budget fate when congress takes a look at it next month. He hopes to gain almost a 50 percent increase in research and development funds.

That would provide a number of new positions for a staff now numbering more than 500.

He is sure the road to better, faster, cheaper mail service methods is open, but he doesn't claim traveling the road will be a one-man job.

"We're a long way from industrial standards, and I don't expect to do it by myself," he said. "I'll just need to needle the right people and put money into the right contracts."

[From the Oklahoma Journal, Feb. 2, 1967]

"SEXIEST"—IF NOT FASTEST: POSTAL DEPARTMENT UPSET WITH IMAGE

Dr. Leo S. Packer, assistant postmaster general, Bureau of Research and Engineering, Wednesday told an Oklahoma City audience that "the postal department is quite concerned with changing its image."

"The present image isn't a very flattering one," he said. "Most individuals think of the system as operating on a non-professional basis. They equate it with lack of change."

In an address to Oklahoma City's Advertising Club, Dr. Packer explained, "But by getting the kind of people who have drive, skills, ambition and communications ability, we're going to make the postal department one of the sexiest government agencies in Washington."

Dr. Packer indicated that lack of funds for research and engineering in the past has hamstrung postal system development. Creation of the new bureau, he said, is a step toward rectifying the situation.

"We're involved in all sorts of things," he asserted. "Everything from the design of functional and pleasant post offices to the development of efficient optical scanners to consideration of the special needs of postal vehicles to the conception of new types of conveyor mechanisms.

"All sorts of new engineering specialties are being called upon. The design of post offices must, for the first time, meet the requirements of the buildings' intent. No longer do we construct a building and then place the equipment as best we can. Now we're designing the building to meet the needs of the equipment and of the people who will operate it."

The ZIP code and other mechanization techniques, said Dr. Packer, "have enabled us to forestall rate increases and have kept the size of such increases to a minimum when they did become necessary."

Rate increases recently proposed would allow the system to operate $82 million in the black by 1968, contrasted with a $597 million deficit which will result if they are not enacted, Dr. Packer said.

"From now on we're going to be exploring all of the possibilities. We'll be scrutinizing all of the latest developments, and adapting them to our use.

"This is a big country with a huge mail volume. So there can be no denying that the task which lies before us is a challenging one. But I believe we can meet the challenge," Dr. Packer concluded.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NAVAL BOMBARDMENT OF VIETNAM

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] plans to introduce in the Senate a resolution calling for cessation of bombing attacks on North Vietnam. It is in that context, therefore, that I wish to make the following remarks.

Mr. President, during the past weekend, the U.S. Government announced that it had implemented its strategic bombing of North Vietnam to include deployment of naval gunfire against strategic targets north of the 17th parallel. During my recent trip to Vietnam, I found that field commanders were anxious to secure this additional gunfire for their operations against the Hanoi regime. I believe that naval bombardment is an essential and reasonable implementation of our efforts to convince North Vietnam that it can never hope to win this war.

My trip convinced me that only by steadily increasing the pressure against the North Vietnamese can we hope to shorten the duration of this war.

I, therefore, fully support the President's decision to utilize naval bombardment against North Vietnam and sincerely hope that this strategy will be continued and perhaps increased if North Vietnam continues to refuse to join us at the conference table.

Mr. President, naval gunfire has long been considered by many of us to be an absolutely necessary element of our strategic bombing against North Vietnam; and it is reassuring that the Pentagon has finally seen fit to authorize this important increase in our operations. Naval gunfire offers many advantages over air bombardment. Naval gunfire has greater accuracy; it is less vulnerable to enemy attack; it is more effective in hitting hardened targets not easily destroyed by air attack; it provides an all-weather capability; and, most important, it will not only destroy enemy targets, but will also provide round-the-clock interdiction of repair efforts.

Aircraft attacks come and go. The time lag between primary attacks and return sorties to interdict repair efforts may be as long as 2 or 3 days because of uncertain weather conditions over the north. This often gives North Vietnamese crews just the time they need to make repairs and continue their infiltration into the south. Naval attacks would be continuous, causing serious problems to repair crews and infiltration of men and supplies into the south.

Today, North Vietnam has a three-pronged defense against air attack—antiaircraft guns, Mig-21 jet fighters, and Russian-built missiles. This, and the uncertainties of weather conditions over the north, have hampered bombing sorties and have caused high attrition in aircraft and manpower. Naval gunfire can effectively counter the North Vietnamese air defense network and cut down dramatically on aircraft and manpower attrition, all at a much lower cost.

Mr. President, because there is a possibility that we may be in Vietnam for a long duration, I would also like to suggest the possibility that the United States give most serious consideration to reactivating two heavy battleships which are now in the Reserve Fleet. It would take approximately 1 year to reactivate these heavy battleships and the cost of reactivating these battleships would be between $16 and $27.5 million. However, I feel that the cost is worth it if we can cut down on huge losses of aircraft. I feel that the length of time it takes to reactivate each battleship is worthwhile if, in the end, we can shorten the war by bringing this substantially increased pressure against the North Vietnamese.

I sometimes wonder why we ever deactivated our heavy battleships. As an economy move alone, this would have been a mistake, because I believe that there is a role for the heavy battleship in our strategic requirements. If these battleships had not been deactivated, they could be put to immediate use in the Vietnam theater of operations.

During World War II and the Korean war, our Nation developed an expertise in the use of naval shore bombardment. A high degree of coordination with shore-based troops and air attacks greatly facilitated the attainment of our strategic objectives and contributed significantly to the safety of our own troops.

In spite of the fact that Vietnam has hundreds of miles of coastline, the techniques learned in World War II and the Korean war have not been put to good use in the present conflict. Battleships have innumerable advantages over any other naval weapons we now possess—greater gun range, greater security against attack from any source, greater endurance and staying power, capability of exerting a greater psychological effect against an enemy, and greater accuracy against enemy targets—all at a considerably reduced cost.

Naval bombardment from destroyers, cruisers, and heavy battleships is a necessary ingredient of our success in Vietnam; and I am in complete accord with any proposal to extend the scope of this activity to more targets and strategic objectives in the north.

The Hanoi regime's reaction to our decision to deploy naval bombardment against targets north of the 17th parallel was typically vocal. The Hanoi regime is loud in its denunciation of this increased pressure. Whether the Hanoi regime finds this increased pressure intolerable or not, I do not know. But I do know that we find Hanoi's continued intransigence both unacceptable and intolerable and will continue to mount steadily increasing pressure until Hanoi finally chooses the course of least resistance—the conference table.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McINTYRE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from New Hampshire on the fine remarks he has just made.

He is an alert, active, and conscientious member of the Committee on Armed Services. He has recently completed a visit to South Vietnam. I am sure that the committee and the Senate will benefit from his advice and certainly from the observations he made during his visit to South Vietnam.

I associate myself with the Senator when he recommends that our Government bring increasing military pressure to bear upon North Vietnam.

In my judgment, this will be the best way to bring the North Vietnamese to the conference table and, thereby, hasten the end of the military conflict.

I also join the Senator in his expressions of support for naval bombardment. I support his position that an expansion of naval bombardment against additional targets is in order and very much needed.

I also associate myself with the Senator's remarks regarding reactivation of battleships.

I congratulate the Senator once again and thank him for yielding to me.

Mr. McINTYRE. I thank the Senator from West Virginia, a senior member on the Armed Services Committee.

I am particularly gratified to find that he feels the same way I do, that continued military pressure on Hanoi is, in the last analysis, the best way to bring the not so little war in Vietnam to an honorable conclusion.

NOMINATION OF RAMSEY CLARK TO BE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I commend President Johnson for his excellent choice in nominating Ramsey Clark to be Attorney General of the United States. The President has sent to the Senate many outstanding nominations, but this is one of the best. Of course, it was not entirely unexpected that Ramsey Clark would be the President's choice, but it is good to have the nomination official.

Ramsey for some time, now, has served as Acting Attorney General as well as Deputy Attorney General, and he has proven himself well qualified to carry the heavy responsibility of this office.

He is a man dedicated to justice and the preservation of the rights of man. I have been particularly impressed by his actions in the area of wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping. He is the first Attorney General actually to come to grasp with the total privacy problem as it is affected by wiretapping and electronic snooping. Too often in the past, Attorneys General have followed the course of least resistance and have failed to provide the leadership necessary to strengthen privacy.

In addition to his many other qualifications, Ramsey Clark is also a good administrator, as is shown by his record as Assistant Attorney General and Deputy Attorney General.

Mr. President, I know the Senate will give this nomination early consideration and that Ramsey Clark will soon be confirmed as the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, President Johnson has just announced his intention to appoint Ramsey Clark as Attorney General of the United States. Most of us in the Senate have had a chance to get to know Mr. Clark, and I think we can all agree that his appointment will be one of the finest any President has ever made.

President Kennedy appointed Ramsey Clark as Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Lands Division of the Justice Department almost exactly 6 years ago. Mr. Clark did an outstanding job in this position, and in February of 1965 became Deputy Attorney General. He was instrumental in assisting the President and Attorney General Katzenbach in securing passage of such landmark legislation as the Voting Rights Act and the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, and he had the opportunity to observe at firsthand the difficult days of the Selma to Montgomery march and the awesome aftermath of the Watts conflagration. Since last October 3, Mr. Clark has been Acting Attorney General, and we have seen the mark of his work in the President's crime and civil rights programs and in yesterday's fine message on the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, this route to the Attorney Generalship—from Assistant Attorney General, to Deputy Attorney General, to Acting Attorney General—is the route which gave us Mr. Clark's predecessor, Nicholas Katzenbach, who did such an excellent job. It means we have a man with experience in the Department and with good relations on Capitol Hill. I look forward to Mr. Clark's quick confirmation, and to many more years of imaginative leadership in the Justice Department.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, word has just reached me that President Johnson has nominated Acting Attorney General Ramsey Clark to become Attorney General. I hasten to congratulate the President on his choice and Mr. Clark on his nomination.

He brings to this Cabinet position a considerable amount of experience—over 10 years in the private practice of law; 6 years as an Assistant Attorney General, Deputy Attorney General, and Acting Attorney General.

Mr. President, I know my colleagues join me in wishing Mr. Clark well. He has demonstrated his devotion to the law. I am confident he possesses the leadership and the ability to meet the challenging responsibilities of the office.

THE CIA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the Central Intelligence Agency is criticized much too freely and at the slightest, flimsiest provocation, by all too many of our leading "opinion makers" in both public and private life.

The sputtering indignation of the past week over the fact that the CIA has been doing what it should do, would be amusing were it not illustrative of an appalling lack of understanding of the proper functions of an intelligence agency in a cold war situation.

For the CIA to help finance these various activities is not indicative of a diseased society.

It is rather a sign that a healthy society is taking the pragmatic action that is necessary to preserve itself in a difficult, demanding, and often tumultuous world.

I do not intend to speak at any length today, in defense of the CIA.

Rather, my purpose in making these brief comments is to introduce into the RECORD an article by Carl T. Rowan, entitled "In Defense of the CIA's Undercover 'Links'."

Mr. Rowan has had a distinguished career in Government and as a newspaperman. On the basis of his experience, he is better qualified than most to make a judgment on the Agency's assistance in the financing of student, labor, and other private groups.

Mr. Rowan writes:

> It must be reckoned one of the great public relations failures of American history that the CIA has not won acceptance for its clandestine activities on the valid ground that it is fighting the same deadly struggle as the FBI.

I agree fully with this accurate and tragic statement.

The feeling that the CIA can do no right is all too prevalent in our country today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this realistic and able article reprinted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN DEFENSE OF THE CIA'S UNDERCOVER "LINKS"

(By Carl T. Rowan)

When the stream of criticism and contempt for the Central Intelligence Agency rolls so forcefully and resolutely, one risks all manner of accusations if he moves against the tide.

But move against it I must, for there are some tragic aspects of the furor over the CIA's financing student, labor and other private groups that have not been given adequate attention.

Surely I break no vows of secrecy made in my government days if I say now that this string of "exposés" of CIA associations can go on and on. There are dozens of yet unnamed groups that cooperated with CIA—simply because they believed it to be in their children's and the nation's interest.

I admire one of them—the Hobby Foundation of Houston, Texas—for publicly expressing pride in having cooperated.

The disciplines of self-acclaimed intellectualism, or liberalism, or idealism compel some people to deplore these private involvements in the dirty business of waging a cold war. They say the health of the nation requires that our press, universities, students et al. remain "free of government manipulation."

I cannot understand the schizophrenia that has caused these purists to exempt the Federal Bureau of Investigation from criticism for so long. The FBI has its hand, and agents, in far more domestic organizations than the CIA. But somehow the press and the public have accepted that as necessary to trap those frightful spies and saboteurs.

It must be reckoned one of the great public relations failures of American history that the CIA has not won acceptance for its clandestine activities on the valid ground that it is fighting the same deadly struggle as the FBI.

As the tedious string of "revelations" unwinds, I conclude that American opinion-molders have become almost as psychotic about "the CIA" as those foreigners who talk as though the agency is capable of overthrowing their governments on five minutes' notice.

The harsh truth is that these exposures have destroyed the CIA as an effective instrument in many arenas of the cold war that is still being waged furiously, despite the recent talk about "detente." So what the Communists spent billions—unsuccessfully—to do, we Americans, out of our idealism, have delivered to them as a gift.

It disturbs me that this rush to bare CIA "links" has tainted "Crossroads Africa," the "American Society for African Culture" and other groups that have worked honestly and intelligently to keep alive in millions of Africans a faith and hope in democracy.

Sanctimonious, theoretically correct arguments that "private business and industry" should have provided the funds demolish themselves against one hard fact: Business and industry had neither the interest, the attitudes nor the inclination to support these efforts properly.

It bothers me that these "revelations" have compromised, perhaps fatally in some cases, hundreds of young men and women who might have become leaders of the developing nations.

The wounds inflicted upon the Alliance for Progress are grave.

Many a U.S. Peace Corps worker or diplomat, and numerous foreign scholars and labor leaders who have struggled bravely in the cause of freedom, will have their integrity impugned and their futures jeopardized before this great exposé fizzles out.

Sure, one can say the CIA built this colossal tragedy by wrongly involving all these peoples and groups in the first place.

I say nonsense. Several presidents, several cabinets, dozens of congressmen and the leaders of all the groups involved went into this business with their eyes wide open. And it wasn't because of an ugly assumption that the ends justify the means, as some idealists argue. They made a practical recognition of the fact that the adversary had already set the dirty rules of battle, so either we played by his rules or got our brains beaten out.

I can't find it in my journalistic heart to say the press is wrong to dredge up all it has about CIA "covers." Yet, I have an uneasy feeling that in pursuit of a hallowed bit of journalistic dogma, we are slaying some dragons that will come back to haunt our progeny.

I keep remembering President Kennedy saying to the American Newspaper Publishers Association in 1961:

"This nation's foes have openly boasted of acquiring through our newspapers information they would otherwise hire agents to acquire through theft, bribery or espionage . . .

"Today no war has been declared—and however fierce the struggle, it may never be declared in traditional fashion . . .

"If the press is awaiting a declaration of war before it imposes the self-discipline of combat conditions, then I can only say that no war ever posed a greater threat to our security."

Is it heresy for me to ask whether the benefits to "freedom" accruing from these exposés of the CIA are great enough to balance out the damage done to our security?

GREENLAND HALIBUT IS NOT NORTH PACIFIC HALIBUT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a situation that is unfair to the American consuming public and the cause of great damage to one of the Nation's important commercial fisheries is occurring today in the marketplace.

A product labeled as "Greenland" halibut is masquerading as true halibut in the fresh and frozen food cases of the Nation's food stores, despite the fact that the so-called Greenland halibut is not only inferior in taste and texture, but fails to an even greater degree in the nutritive values which have helped build a strong and stable market for the North Pacific-produced species. I have had considerable comment from the consuming public, who feel that they are being misled and cheated; and the method of merchandising the imported product is such that our own fishermen and industry are bearing the brunt of much of this assault.

I have in my possession numerous newspaper advertisements promoting this inferior imported product. Some of them, it is true, use the term "Greenland," but in almost every case it is subjugated and nearly hidden, and a large number of others refer only to halibut. A survey of actual market showcases throughout the country by the American industry indicates that only the word "halibut" is being used, and the public is purchasing this inferior product, confident that they are receiving the high-quality and nutritious product to which they have long been accustomed. The situation must be halted by the Government agencies concerned.

For some 5 years now, the Halibut Association of North America has spent considerable sums of money and untold effort in building a market for the highly prized North Pacific halibut. Not only is the inferior imported product profiting from that effort, but they are doing untold damage, for the housewife will now be wary in her future fishery purchases.

As the result of heavy imports of "Greenland" halibut, the markets for our own Pacific Northwest product have been falling off to a point where holdings are now at a high and dangerous level. It is estimated that the value of the 1967 halibut catch from the North Pacific Ocean may be from $6 to $10 million dollars less than that of the 1966 catch.

There is no problem for the scientist to distinguish between these two species. The Greenland variety is called "Reinhardtius hippoglossoides." The true halibut—the one the housewife thinks she is buying—is called "Hippoglossus Stenolepis."

Mr. President, scientifically, these are different species, they are of different texture, taste, and quality, and the respective agencies of Government must act quickly not only for the protection of the consumer, but for the welfare of one of the west coast's oldest fisheries.

The International Pacific Halibut Commission, which exists under treaty between the United States and Canada, is one of the world's respected conservation agencies, and its record in maintaining these stocks at high level and the industry in a healthy economic climate, has come about only through decades of sacrifice by both fisherman and processor. To allow this great industry to face economic collapse and at the same time continue to mislead the American consumer is not only unthinkable, but must receive immediate attention and action by the U.S. Government.

ARE YOU HOLDING UP THE U.S. MAIL?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, all citizens desire speedy, efficient postal service at a reasonable cost. They are entitled to that. The Post Office Department is perhaps one of the most criticized of all Government Departments and for the reason that it affects the daily lives of all Americans.

We sometimes lose sight of the fact that officials of the Post Office Department are doing their utmost to improve the operation of their Department and to provide Americans with swift postal service. On February 16, 1967, the Wellston, Ohio, Telegram, published an excellent editorial entitled "Are You Holding Up the U.S. Mail?" urging readers of that newspaper to cooperate in ZIP coding their mail. In doing so, this newspaper performed a fine public service. I hope that other newspapers throughout the country will follow this example.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE YOU HOLDING UP THE U.S. MAIL?

The time has come for the public to be aware that Zip Coding in the U.S. mails is vitally important. The mails are swelling each year to the point that service rendered under the old system is slowing up deliveries.

Postmaster General, Lawrence F. O'Brien stated, "You can help your Post Office provide the finest and most efficient mail service in the world by joining in the Zip Code Campaign. Your support is vital to the success of this program. We are counting on your help."

Only about half of the letters mailed by individuals are now Zip Coded. Part of this is due to the fact that some people are not aware of its tremendous importance in the efficient handling of mail. Surely everyone has heard of Zip Code by this time. Some folks think of it as just a favor to the post office—something to do if they happen to think of it.

But the Zip Code is much, much more than that.

Zip helps our postal worker move mail the modern way. With Zip they can sort it faster and deliver it by more direct routes. With Zip they will use modern electronic machines that "read" Zip numbers and sort mail fifteen times faster than was possible before.

People who don't use Zip Code hold up the mail for themselves and for everyone else.

As long as the "Zip gap" exists, the Post Office must operate on both the old and the new systems, simultaneously. This cancels out many of the advantages inherent in Zip code.

When you plunk down a nickel for a stamp, you "should" get the world's most efficient postal service in return.

But—if you haven't added the Zip Code to the mailing address, you may not get all you are paying for. A single unzipped letter can slow up the mail at six post offices.

At Christmas-time, the post offices, including ours here in Wellston, issued cards asking the public to fill in the names and addresses of their correspondents and bring them back and they would supply the zip codes. How many did this? The response was not too great. Henceforth, things are in the "gap" stage here in Wellston.

So remember: Always add Zip Code to every address you write. If you do not know the number, call your post office or look it up in their Zip Code Directory.

Also remember to add your Zip Code to your return address too. That makes it easier for others to Zip their mail to you.

We're always growling about the postal service—but possibly we are to blame. Let's get the Zip Codes on our mail.

Mail moves the country—Zip Code moves the mail.

THE UNREST IN CHINA

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the current unrest and chaos that are dominating Red China's political, social, and cultural life have been the focus of attention and interest of many Americans, especially our "China watchers."

China's size and population make her an important and decisive factor in our study of and dealings in international affairs. What happens in China as a result of the current "cultural revolution" could be of great importance to the United States. It could conceivably alter our policy toward Red China a great deal.

Recently Dr. Stephen Pan, director of the East Asian Research Institute, wrote a very informative letter to the Christian Science Monitor revealing and explaining some of the important though lesser known reasons for the cultural purge. He aptly explains why Mao and Lin Piao are unable to utilize the Communist Party, the Young Communist League, or the Government to deal with the "revisionists."

I highly recommend this short but perceptive article to my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Dr. Pan's letter to the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the letter to the editor was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED GUARDS

NEW YORK.

To the Christian Science Monitor:

Elizabeth Pond's recent article on "What's afoot in Red China?" is rather concise, but still comprehensive on the Chinese Communist Party and the Red Guards. Since she relies primarily on non-Chinese sources, her article is as good as could be expected. I should like to suggest some more up-to-date information and add further light to the subject matter.

Miss Pond offers various explanations of the Red Guard movement, enumerating the power struggle, ideology, pragmatic opposition and business as usual. It is not a single factor which has made it possible, but all these factors together with others having caused it to come into existence. There are other even more important factors which have induced Mao and Lin to use the youngsters (between 14 and 18) as an instrument to purge their opponents. These may be briefly mentioned as follows:

(1) Many intellectual leaders including educators and writers have turned against Mao and Maoism. To cope with this trend, Mao and Lin launched their "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution."

(2) The Mao-Lin group uses the Red Guards as a tool to liquidate the bourgeois elements and the party-government "authorities." Yet Mao and Lin do not and cannot invoke the name of the party or the government to punish the opposition.

(3) The party newspaper, the People's Daily, for some time secretly opposed Mao's infallibility. But Lin Piao's own paper, the Liberation Daily, attacked revisionism, suggested the "Cultural Revolution" and instigated the Red Guards, whose main mouthpiece it now is.

(4) All the activities of the Young Chinese Communist League have been halted. All universities and colleges have been suspended for six months and it is unlikely that they will be reopened in the next semester. The Red Guards provide a substitute.

(5) If the Red Guards fail to acomplish their objectives, Mao and Lin and the others could say that they are not responsible.

In other words, since Mao and Lin are unable to use the Communist Party, the Young Communist League or the government to cope with the situation, they have to utilize the Red Guards to launch an unprecedented scale of purges to liquidate their opposition. The "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" aims at uprooting all the traditional Chinese cultural heritages by using the Red Guards. Lin Piao, heir apparent of Mao, made an unusually strong speech in September, 1965, denouncing "American Imperialism" and "Soviet Revisionism." Thus, after Mao, it is most unlikely that the Chinese Communists under Lin, will adopt a more conciliatory policy toward the United States and the Soviet Union.

STEPHEN C. Y. PAN, Ph. D.,
Director, East Asian Research Institute.

POLICE CHIEF LIU OF HONOLULU BACKS FIREARMS CONTROL BILL

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, during extensive hearings conducted last year on firearms control legislation by the Judiciary Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, of which I am a member, law-enforcement officers from across the Nation testified that the need for Federal legislation on this matter was an urgent necessity.

These local officials noted that present State laws and local ordinances have been unable to cope with the increasing number of crimes in which firearms are used.

Without dissent, they agreed that one of the chief causes of this problem is the relative ease with which any person can acquire firearms, especially rifles and shotguns.

A detailed report recently sent to me by the chief of police of the city and county of Honolulu, Mr. Dan Liu—a nationally recognized authority on law enforcement, past president of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, and life member of that organization's executive committee—corroborates all of this testimony and renders it directly applicable to Honolulu.

The data furnished to me by Chief Liu has been requested by the subcommittee.

They reveal that during 1965 on the island of Oahu, 193 handguns, 46 rifles, and 7 shotguns were used in 246 of the total of 773 cases in which crimes were committed—including murder, robbery, aggravated assault, suicides, and illegal possession of firearms.

During a 9-month period in 1966, from January 1 to September 30, a total of 126 handguns, 47 rifles, and 1 shotgun were used in 174 out of 644 cases.

These statistics, according to Chief Liu, graphically illustrate "the seriousness of the problem of the use of firearms."

To illustrate his point, he cited the following occurrences in Honolulu during the past 2 years:

First. A police officer killed while patroling his beat by an ex-convict with a sawed-off carbine.

Second. A sniper who placed himself at a vantage point on a hillside and used a rifle to shoot at a group of tourists sightseeing on a bus and at two police officers investigating the incident.

Third. A supermarket employee killed with a carbine during a holdup.

Fourth. A service station attendant killed after a holdup of the service station.

Fifth. Many cases in which criminals were armed with handguns and rifles in their possession when arrested.

Chief Liu pointed out that while State laws in Hawaii regulate and control the acquisition, use, and ownership of firearms, control over rifles and shotguns was deleted from the law in 1955. He indicated that an attempt will be made in the current session of the State legislature to reinstate control over rifles and shotguns.

The problem of firearms control in Hawaii is aggravated, said Chief Liu, because, he explained:

> Ex-servicemen have brought home and will continue to bring home firearms from the war front, especially carbines which are the made-to-order type of weapon for criminal use in their activities, and the easy importation of surplus military weapons.
>
> With no requirement to register rifles, the need of revealing their possession is eliminated, and anyone in possession of government property is not subject to questioning.

Furthermore, Chief Liu pointed out that the lack of requirement to register affords an easy and free barter of rifles and shotguns between individuals, even to criminals and mentally incompetent persons.

Because State laws are effective in maintaining control of firearms within a State only, Chief Liu urged Congress to adopt a stringent firearms law—a law which would provide "adequate and positive Federal control over interstate commerce in firearms, to make it possible for States to impose more effective controls over firearms."

The chief pointed out that firearms are obtained through mail order or common carrier delivery, and may be purchased by any person from an out-of-State licensed dealer and brought into the purchaser's resident State without conforming with the registration requirements of the resident State.

No matter how strict a particular State's firearms control law may be, then, that law may easily be circumvented by simply going to another State with less strict laws to buy a firearm.

This is possible, Chief Liu explained, because a search is "unauthorized, illegal, and cannot be conducted of each and every package, baggage, and person that comes into a State."

As a result, Honolulu police were unable to determine the source of 44 handguns, seven rifles, and two shotguns in 1965, and 34 handguns and four rifles in 1966.

Moreover, the breakdown of the firearms used in the crimes of murder, robbery, and aggravated assault into their sources of origin which Chief Liu furnished indicates that the majority were illegally acquired.

Chief Liu concluded that—

> The primary source of availability (of firearms to criminals) is through interstate traffic of firearms, and state laws are inadequate to stop or cope with this aspect of the problem.
>
> Thus, a strong Federal firearms control act is very necessary.

Mr. President, if crimes committed with the use of firearms are to be minimized or reduced, their easy and immediate availability to persons convicted of crimes of violence and narcotics violations, persons mentally incompetent or unstable, and others who might misuse them, should be tightly controlled.

The data submitted by Honolulu's chief of police represent the most persuasive kind of arguments for a very strict Federal firearms control law.

I believe that Senate bill 1, which I have cosponsored, can be such a law. And I feel strongly that its enactment is long overdue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the data submitted by Chief Liu, entitled "Information on Sources of Firearms Used in the Commission of Crimes," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Information on sources of firearms used in the commission of crimes, 1965

Crime categories	Total actual cases	Number of cases firearms used
Murder	18	7
Robbery	130	36
Aggravated assault	52	16
Suicides and attempted suicides	332	14
Offensively armed	156	88
Carrying concealed weapon	85	85
Illegal possession of weapon		
Illegal transfer of weapon		
Discharging firearm		
Total	773	246

Sources of firearms	Type of firearms		
	Handguns	Rifles	Shotguns
Firearms legally purchased	28	28	3
Firearms illegally purchased	45	2	0
Firearms found	5	1	0
Firearms stolen	12	3	0
Firearms legally borrowed	7	2	0
Firearms illegally borrowed	18	2	1
Firearms brought into State	34	1	1
Firearms of unknown source	44	7	2
Total	193	46	7
Grand total		246	

Breakdown of 1965 firearms cases

MURDER

Rifle, legally purchased from local dealer	2
Shotgun, legally purchased from local dealer	1
Handgun, legally purchased from unknown local person	1
Handgun, illegally purchased from local underworld source	3
Total cases	7

ROBBERY

Handgun, purchased illegally from local acquaintance	1
Handgun, purchased illegally from local unknown person	2
Rifle, found locally	1
Handgun, stolen locally	2
Handgun, stolen out of State	1
Handgun, borrowed illegally from local acquaintance	1
Handgun, borrowed illegally from local unknown person	2
Rifle, borrowed illegally from local unknown person	1
Rifle, accused unknown, origin of rifle unknown	2
Shotgun, accused unknown, origin of shotgun unknown	2
Handgun, accused unknown, origin of handgun unknown	21
Total cases	36

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT

Breakdown of 1965 firearms cases—Continued

Handgun, legally purchased from local dealer	2
Handgun, illegally purchased from local acquaintance	1
Handgun, illegally purchased from local unknown person	1
Handgun, illegally purchased and believed to be from local underworld	2
Rifle, stolen locally	1
Handgun, brought into State, firearm legally acquired in another State when residence changed	3
Handgun, accused and origin of handgun unknown	6
Total cases	16

SUICIDE

Handgun, legally purchased from local dealer	3
Rifle, legally purchased from local dealer	4
Handgun, illegally purchased from unknown local person	1
Handgun, stolen locally	1
Handgun, borrowed legally from local acquaintance	1
Rifle, borrowed legally from local acquaintance	2
Handgun, brought into State, firearm legally acquired from another State when residence changed	2
Total cases	14

OFFENSIVELY ARMED

Handgun, legally purchased from local dealer	10
Rifle, legally purchased from local dealer	15
Shotgun, legally purchased from local dealer	2
Handgun, legally purchased from local acquaintance	3
Rifle, legally purchased from local acquaintance	3
Rifle, legally purchased from local unknown person	1
Handgun, illegally purchased from local acquaintance	4
Handgun, illegally purchased from local unknown person	7
Rifle, illegally purchased from local unknown person	1
Handgun, illegally purchased from local underworld source	2
Handgun, found locally	2
Handgun, stolen locally	4
Rifle, stolen locally	1
Handgun, borrowed locally from acquaintance, legally	3
Handgun, borrowed illegally from local acquaintance	5
Shotgun, borrowed illegally from local acquaintance	1
Handgun, borrowed illegally from local unknown person	3
Handgun, borrowed illegally from out of State acquaintance	1
Handgun, brought into State, firearm acquired legally in another State when residence changed	13
Handgun, accused and origin of gun unknown	5
Rifle, accused and origin of gun unknown	2
Total cases	88

CONCEALED WEAPONS, AND SO FORTH

Handgun, purchased legally from local dealer	4
Rifle, purchased legally from local dealer	2
Handgun, purchased legally from local acquaintance	3
Handgun, purchased legally from local unknown person	1
Rifle, purchased legally from local unknown person	1
Handgun, purchased legally from out-of-State dealer, mail order	1

Breakdown of 1965 firearms cases—Continued

Handgun, purchased illegally from local acquaintance	13
Handgun, purchased illegally from out-of-State acquaintance	2
Handgun, purchased illegally from local unknown person	6
Rifle, purchased illegally from out-of-State unknown person	1
Handgun, found locally	3
Handgun, stolen locally	4
Rifle, stolen out of State	1
Handgun, borrowed legally from local acquaintance	3
Handgun, borrowed illegally from local acquaintance	4
Rifle, borrowed illegally from local acquaintance	1
Handgun, borrowed illegally from local unknown person	1
Handgun, borrowed illegally from out-of-State acquaintance	1
Handgun, brought into State legally acquired from another State when residence changed	16
Rifle, brought into State legally acquired from another State when residence changed	1
Shotgun, brought into State legally acquired from another State when residence changed	1
Handgun, accused and origin of gun unknown	12
Rifle, accused and origin of rifle unknown	3
Total cases	85

Information on sources of firearms used in the commission of crimes, Jan. 1–Sept. 30, 1966

Crime categories	Total actual cases	Number of cases firearms used
Murder	14	4
Robbery	110	36
Aggravated assault	38	11
Suicides and attempted suicides	264	5
Offensively armed	156	51
Carrying concealed weapon Illegal possession Illegal transfer Discharging firearm	67	67
Total	644	174

Sources of firearms	Type of firearms		
	Handguns	Rifles	Shotguns
Firearms legally purchased	25	32	1
Firearms illegally purchased	21	2	0
Firearms found	1	1	0
Firearms stolen	12	2	0
Firearms borrowed legally	1	2	0
Firearms borrowed illegally	10	4	0
Firearms brought into State	22	0	0
Firearms of unknown source	34	4	0
Total	126	47	1
Grand total		174	

Breakdown of 1966 firearms cases

MURDER

Handgun, purchased illegally from local underworld source	1
Handgun, stolen locally	2
Handgun, suspect known, origin of gun unknown (noncommittal)	1
Total cases	4

ROBBERY

Rifle, purchased legally from unknown local person	3
Handgun, stolen locally	4
Handgun, brought into State, firearm legally acquired in another State when residence changed	1
Handgun, accused and origin of firearm unknown	22
Rifle, accused and origin of firearm unknown	1
Handgun, claimed by accused to be toy handgun	5
Total cases	36

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT

Rifle, purchased legally from local dealer	1
Handgun, purchased legally from local acquaintance	1
Rifle, purchased legally from local unknown person	1
Handgun, purchased illegally from local unknown person	1
Rifle, purchased illegally from local unknown person	1
Handgun, purchased illegally from local underworld source	1
Rifle, stolen locally	1
Handgun, brought into State, firearm legally acquired in another State when residence changed	2
Handgun, accused and origin of gun unknown	2
Total cases	11

SUICIDE

Handgun, purchased legally from local dealer	2
Rifle, purchased legally from local dealer	2
Handgun, brought into State, firearm legally acquired in another State when residence changed	1
Total cases	5

OFFENSIVELY ARMED

Handgun, purchased legally from local dealer	7
Rifle, purchased legally from local dealer	14
Handgun, purchased legally from local acquaintance	1
Shotgun, purchased legally from local unknown person	1
Handgun, purchased illegally from local acquaintance	3
Handgun, purchased illegally from local unknown person	5
Handgun, purchased illegally from unknown person, out of State	1
Handgun, stolen locally	3
Rifle, borrowed legally from local acquaintance	2
Handgun, borrowed illegally from local acquaintance	2
Rifle, borrowed illegally from local acquaintance	2
Handgun, brought into State, firearm legally acquired in another State when residence changed	6
Handgun, accused and origin of firearm unknown	4
Total cases	51

CONCEALED WEAPONS, AND SO FORTH

Handgun, purchased legally from local dealer	5
Rifle, purchased legally from local dealer	10
Handgun, purchased legally from local acquaintance	6
Rifle, purchased legally from local acquaintance	1
Handgun, purchased legally from local unknown person	1
Handgun, purchased legally from out-of-State dealer, mail order	2
Handgun, purchased illegally from local acquaintance	2

Breakdown of 1966 firearms cases—Continued

Handgun, purchased illegally from local unknown person	5
Rifle, purchased illegally from local unknown person	1
Handgun, purchased illegally from unknown person, out of State	2
Handgun, found locally	1
Rifle, found locally	1
Handgun, stolen locally	2
Rifle, stolen locally	1
Handgun, stolen out of State	1
Handgun, borrowed legally from local acquaintance	1
Handgun, borrowed illegally from local acquaintance	8
Rifle, borrowed illegally from local acquaintance	2
Handgun, brought into State, firearm legally acquired in another State when residence changed	12
Rifle, accused and origin of rifle unknown	3
Total cases	67

THE CIA AND THE NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I believe my colleagues in the Congress will be interested in seeing the full text of the explanation by 12 former presidents of the National Student Association on the relationship of the NSA to the CIA.

I ask unanimous consent that their responsible and considered statement of February 25, 1967, be printed at this point in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 25, 1967.

As former presidents of the National Student Association we feel that a responsible and thoughtful explanation of the relationship of the NSA to the CIA is desirable. Each of us speaks for the year he served as president.

The international world of the 1950's and early 1960's was largely a bipolar world and that fact was important in shaping NSA's decisions. NSA recognized the vital importance of American student participation in international student affairs which otherwise would have been dominated by the well trained and well informed representatives of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. But our's was no reflex Cold War action. Indeed it was precisely out of NSA's dissent from many aspects of American post war foreign policy which often seemed to us intransigent and inflexible that many of the Association's international programs were born.

NSA believed that there was a critical need for the American student movement to be an active participant in world affairs in order to create a more sensible international atmosphere. Students were one important voice among many American voices abroad in a complex world which required that many American viewpoints in addition to the governmental viewpoint be heard.

Three aspects of NSA's international policies should be emphasized:

. . . NSA consistently supported and sought to strengthen democratic student organizations in those countries where they existed and encouraged their formation where they did not exist. The political and social importance of students and student organizations was not then widely recognized, but it was evident to us that students were a significant and influential elite in their countries.

NSA's international policy early recognized the crucial importance which nationalist movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America would have in shaping our world. NSA's attitude was consistently but not uncritically sympathic to nationalist aspirations. Others were equally aware of those aspirations, but at that time much U.S. foreign policy was still focused upon Europe and the Soviet Union. There were few institutions through which individuals who felt the urgency of American cooperation with nationalist groups could act. NSA was one such institution.

While we were quite aware of the expansionist ambitions and ideological goals of the Soviet Union, NSA chose to deal with the Soviets and Eastern Europeans not as ideological pariahs but as political adversaries in a changing world. We felt that the politics of confrontation would not only hinder Soviet domination of international student life, but would also enable young Soviets and Eastern Europeans to come into contact with the ideas and convictions of young Americans, and vice versa.

Without substantial funds, NSA's international program would have been immobilized. Yet each of us concluded that, without question, we would have chosen immobilization if the only funds available were conditioned on impairment of the independence of any of NSA's principles or programs.

And so the question became whether CIA funds entailed any such conditions. We state categorically that they did not. Each of us after being elected to office was fully informed about the CIA relationship. Allegations that we were "trapped" or "duped" are arrant nonsense. While we constantly searched for alternative sources of funds, this relationship was the only realistic and responsible alternative available to us at that time. Each of us authorized its continuation subject to the controls and safeguards which we each deemed necessary to ensure the complete independence and integrity of NSA. One such safeguard was to insist that senior elected officers in succeeding years be informed of the relationship so that no possibility could exist of by-passing the duly elected leadership of the Association, which could reappraise the relationship annually. Each of us maintained the utmost vigilance and independence of judgment during his term of office. Attempts at control would not have been tolerated. Any such attempts would have resulted in an immediate termination of the relationship.

The absence of controls should be absolutely clear to anyone who is either familiar with NSA or willing to take the time to review the record. Each NSA policy and program was adopted by the governing bodies of the Association, the National Student Congresses. For nearly twenty years NSA has remained constant to the principles it established in the late 1940's long before any financial discussion with the government took place. These policies and programs have been consistently independent of and often in conflict with the positions of the government. NSA friends and foes alike have verified this fact throughout NSA's history.

Political contexts change. The national and international situation in which NSA creates its present policies is no longer the one in which we made our decisions. We have always recognized the responsibility of each group of current leaders of NSA to lead the organization in the direction which seems to them appropriate during their term of office, subject to the decisions of the governing bodies of the Association.

In retrospect we feel that in the world in which we worked the relationship helped make it possible for the American student movement to make important contributions toward the development of democratic student organizations. We affirm our sense of pride in the free and independent accomplishments of NSA during those years. We reaffirm our conviction that all those individuals who shared in carrying out NSA's international activities did so with honor in the best traditions of American voluntary service.

William T. Dentzer, Jr., 1952.
James M. Edwards, 1954.
Harry H. Lunn, Jr., 1955.
Stanford L. Glass, 1956.
Harald C. Bakken, 1957.
K. Ray Farabee, 1958.
Robert R. Kiley, 1959.
Donald A. Hoffman, 1960.
Richard A. Rettig, 1961.
Edward R. Garvey, 1962.
W. Dennis Shaul, 1963.
Gregory M. Gallo, 1964.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the proposed new legislation calling for a national program in occupational health could not be more timely or more needed. New processes and new sources of energy are presenting health hazards of unprecedented complexity. A new and potentially toxic chemical is introduced into industry approximately every 20 minutes.

Some of the needed corrective measures are very simple, if they are applied. A well engineered and correctly placed ventilating fan will do wonders in protecting the health of a worker or workers. On the other hand, there are other problems that can be solved only through intensive, long-term basic and experimental research.

Asbestos-caused health problems present a case in point. A recent report indicates that exposure to high levels of asbestos dust occurring 20 to 30 years ago is probably responsible for a 21-percent increase in the death rate among certain workers. Such association, however, is not controlled enough to give the answers that are needed in order to protect industrial workers. We do not know, for example, whether the asbestos mineral fibers are vehicles or carriers of carcinogenic chemicals or if they are active themselves. Nor do we know that it might not be the degree of hydration in the asbestos silicates or the physical properties of its fibrous structure that caused problems.

A similar problem exists in the case of the soft coal worker's chest disease. We do know that 10 percent of the active miners and 20 percent of the former miners in the soft coal regions of Appalachia have a serious, disabling chest disease. We do not know, however, whether the coal dust itself is to blame or whether some of its constituents, such as aluminum, copper, titanium, or boron, are causing our serious occupational health problems.

Several months ago, another health problem arose which has caused several known deaths and a serious degree of discovered illness. I say "discovered" because only recently have some physicians learned that certain persons who use metal solder containing cadmium are exposing themselves to highly toxic fumes. Vague warnings on packages of cadmium-containing solder are insufficient. In industries where there is heavy use of this material, no warnings at all are provided to the user.

Further complicating the picture in these and other occupational disease problems is the long time that it takes for these diseases to occur even with exposure to low levels of toxic materials. The disease seen today among asbestos workers and coal miners, for example, is associated with exposure to high levels of dust 20 to 30 years ago. Dust levels today are generally much lower, so the problems of the future may again be different.

The only way we are going to get the answers to complicated questions involving industrial health is through expanded research. The answers cannot wait 20 to 30 years, because it will be too late to protect today's workers then. That is why there must be greater emphasis on experimental research. We must be armed with better scientific information upon which we can base preventive measures.

Asbestos and soft coal and cadmium are very important to our Nation's economy. They cannot be cast aside merely because of associated health problems. These natural materials can be used without extreme hazard if we apply existing knowledge and, at the same time, press forward with an expanded research program which will develop a broader approach to our total industrial health problem.

The legislation proposed today will help accomplish these objectives.

BURIALS AT ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the February 25 issue of the Journal of the Armed Forces contains an article by Editor Louis Stockstill which fairly well sums up my views on the new rules for burials at Arlington National Cemetery recently announced by the Department of the Army.

Mr. Stockstill suggests that the Congress must devise suitable solutions for the mounting problem posed by the shortage of burial space for servicemen, veterans and their dependents in our national cemeteries.

If there are no objections, I ask that Mr. Stockstill's article be printed in the RECORD in its entirety.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BURIALS AT ARLINGTON

(By Louis Stockstill)

The new Army rules for burials at Arlington National Cemetery no doubt constitute an honest effort to solve a difficult problem. Yet the solution is far from satisfactory.

The main argument for limiting future burials to active and retired members of the Armed Forces, Medal of Honor winners, and Government VIP veterans (The Journal, 18 Feb.), is that at the current burial rate all of the space at Arlington will rapidly disappear.

Plans are underway to expand the cemetery, but this expansion, even when coupled with the new rules, will not prevent all of the space from ultimately becoming exhausted. And it's likely that all of those now on active duty or on the retired rolls will have to be buried elsewhere if they are still living 20 years from now.

So, as far as we are concerned, there is little merit in simply postponing the inevitable by closing the gates to "Selected" veterans.

Present or former Presidents, Vice Presidents, Cabinet officers, Supreme Court Justices, Congressmen, Senators, and a flock of

Presidential appointees still would be eligible for Arlington burial, provided they are qualified veterans.

Frankly, we see no reason to permit some obscure, one-term Congressman or short-term sub-Cabinet official—who spent a minimum amount of time in uniform—to be buried in Arlington, when many, more distinguished veterans would be barred.

The new rules, as they apply to veterans, can only be an all-or-nothing proposition. The weakness of the Army plan is underlined by the creation of an "excepted" group —a move which could easily be interpreted as an effort to make the plan more palatable to those who would be in a favored position to otherwise oppose it.

Although our military readers consist almost entirely of active and retired personnel, we cannot in all conscience (nor do we believe they would want us to) ignore the fact that they have no more legal right to burial at Arlington than any other veteran.

The Cemeteries initially were authorized as burial grounds for men killed in combat or dying of battle wounds during the Civil War. They were not established for all active duty personnel, or for retirees, or for veterans, or for high Government officials.

Veterans first were authorized to be buried in the Cemeteries 10 years after the Civil War (The Journal, 22 March 1873). Their rights, therefore, are as firmly established in both statute and tradition as those of the combat dead. Over the years, eligibility for burial in the Cemeteries has been consistently broadened.

If the rules must now be revised, then Congress—not the Army—should assume the responsibility for making such revisions as are necessary and justified. Congress represents the people. And, the people should have some voice in deciding the fate of our National Cemeteries, which, after all, were erected and are maintained and supported by the tax dollars of the entire population.

As we see it, three different problems must be solved.

If it is considered desirable to have a national burying ground for State Funerals of former, present and future top Government officials, it is time we developed a new cemetery solely for this purpose.

And, if Arlington, the most famous and historic military cemetery in the Nation, is to be permanently closed during this century, as the Army intimates, then neither is it too early to start planning and developing another Arlington—perhaps one specifically set aside for our combat dead, for our military heroes, for those in uniform who lay down their lives for their country in whatever endeavor.

And, too, our other veterans cannot be ignored. Congress must devise some suitable solution for them.

We think the most appropriate commentary on the entire problem might be one that was made several years ago in a related context by the former Chairman Carl Vinson of the House Armed Services Committee.

When the Army, in an economy move, sought to eliminate the traditional funeral horses at Arlington, Chairman Vinson protested. His argument, simply stated, and equally valid today, was this:

"If we can afford state dinners and the expenses always associated with the visits of foreign dignitaries, we can afford to retain some small semblance of the respect this Nation still possesses for the few military personnel who are carried to their last resting place on a caisson.

DR. WOODLIEF THOMAS, CHIEF ECONOMIST, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I was sorry to learn yesterday that Dr. Woodlief Thomas, who has been serving as the chief economist on the staff of the Committee on Banking and Currency has found it necessary for personal reasons to terminate his services to the committee.

Yesterday, in announcing this fact to the Senate, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] chairman of the committee, briefly outlined the highlights of Dr. Thomas' impressive career. I feel that it is especially noteworthy that Dr. Thomas has served this country for 47 years. This record, equaled by only a very few, has covered a period in which we have experienced war and depression as well as relative peace and unexcelled prosperity. Perhaps even more impressive to me than the period which he has served is that this service has not been as a partisan but as a public servant in the best sense of that term.

Dr. Thomas' long experience and educational background provided a storehouse of knowledge and technical ability from which the members of the Banking and Currency Committee have been able to draw on a moment's notice. This has proved especially helpful in the areas of monetary policy and international finance.

Even more important, however, from my point of view is the fact that Dr. Thomas has served all members of the committee with equal diligence.

I have appreciated my association with him and the frankness and candor of his comments when I have asked him for his assistance and opinions.

I can only wish him well and assure him that he can leave satisfied that his services have been appreciated by those with whom he has served, and that he has made an important contribution to the committee and his country. This, indeed, is success.

CONTRIBUTIONS MADE TO ORGANIZATIONS BY CIA

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, practically every newspaper and magazine has recently published articles and many editorials dealing with the CIA. One of the best editorials I have read during the recent controversy concerning the contributions the CIA has made to various organizations was one published in the Grand Forks Herald, Grand Forks, N. Dak.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SPY STORY

There's something embarrassing to most Americans about the idea that we have spies and a sophisticated espionage set-up. When we think about it, of course, we recognize the need for intelligence. But we'd rather not think about the details and, if we do, we'd just as soon imagine a dashing young adventurer in a trench coat who outwits brutal enemy agents. Spies are all right in a thriller or on television, but not in our conscience.

Thus the super-spy agency of the United States, the Central Intelligence Agency, gets it coming and going. If we are taken by surprise by rockets in Cuba or underground activity in southeast Asia, we blame the CIA for not doing its job. If the CIA uses American citizens who have logical reasons for being abroad as part of their intelligence network, we react in horror. They've bungled again.

There are two sides to the most recent CIA sensation.

On the one hand, it appears that the CIA has tainted the National Student Association by contributing money to its overseas program.

On the other hand, it can be said that the United States was losing in the international student forums because the Soviet Union was organizing and propagandizing the world student movement. Through CIA financial contributions it became possible to have the American viewpoint presented at international gatherings, supporters of the intelligence agency say. And what's so wrong with that?

Whichever side is right—if either is entirely—it's likely that the CIA will continue to be the United States' eyes and ears around the world. And will continue, from time to time, to be the center of news sensations which shock some Americans.

After all, we're like that. We like everybody to wear white hats.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, President Johnson's message on the District of Columbia is a call for action which should appeal to the conscience and better judgment of each member of the 90th Congress. The President has asked us to do something which should have been done long ago; namely, to authorize self-government for the residents of the District of Columbia.

I sincerely endorse the President's proposal and hope that the 90th Congress will reach agreement quickly on home rule legislation for the District. The President has warned that time is running out; the District faces serious problems that must be solved by the people themselves acting through their own elected leaders. Without self-government there can be no real progress or leadership for this community, and the people will remain submerged in a morass of conflicting authority and commitment. Without self-government redress of grievances by the citizens of this Federal city will be difficult to achieve.

There is no longer any rational excuse for delaying adoption of this vitally important proposal. Agreement on home rule for the District must be accomplished during this session of Congress. The President is right: time is running out in the affairs of the District. Congress should respond now to the just demands of American citizens who have never known representative government in the Capital of the greatest representative government on earth.

THE VOICE OF AMERICA

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, Friday, February 24, 1967, marked the 25th anniversary of the Voice of America, the broadcast arm of the U.S. Information Agency. On Thursday, February 23, Mr. Leonard H. Marks, Director of the U.S. Information Agency, addressed the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., on "International Communication: A National Imperative." In his speech Mr.

Marks dramatically reviewed geographic, political, and communication revolutions which have taken place during the past quarter century and the tasks now facing the U.S. Information Agency.

As Mr. Marks points out, the role of USIA in the field of "public diplomacy" is a vital one. I commend these thoughtful remarks to the consideration of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the Record. It is fitting that we join in saluting the Voice of America, its Director, John W. Chancellor, and the Director of its parent organization, the U.S. Information Agency, on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of this vital branch of the U.S. Government.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

International Communication: A National Imperative

(An address by Leonard H. Marks, Director, U.S. Information Agency, National Press Club, Washington, D.C., February 23, 1967)

Mr. LeRoy, members of the National Press Club, fellow guests:

Tomorrow the Voice of America, the radio arm of the U.S. Information Agency, celebrates its twenty-fifth anniversary. Such an occasion is by tradition a moment for stocktaking. Today I ask you to join me in reflecting on some of the dramatic changes that have taken place in international communication within the last quarter century—a period that I suspect does not seem very long to most of us in this room—and to consider some of the implications of these changes for the United States.

When I came to Washington in 1942, there were 698 radio stations in the United States. Television was in its experimental stage and satellites existed only in the minds of some daring fiction writers. The chief means of international communication were telephone and telegraph—dependent on uncertain equipment and the vagaries of the weather, to say nothing of the temperament of Morse Code operators.

To cite only the most obvious changes, today in the United States alone there are over 6,000 radio stations and more than 700 television channels. International broadcasting has become such a common business that the International Telecommunications Union faces a crisis for want of enough frequencies to meet the burgeoning demand. Two weeks ago in London, Chairman Kosygin held the first press conference to be telecast simultaneously via satellite on both sides of the Atlantic. Just in the past week we have been seeing, on the evening television news, events of the same day in Vietnam.

In only a few years, our whole pattern of communication has been transformed.

This transformation is part of a broader picture of profound changes that have marked the past twenty-five years—changes so sweeping that they merit being called revolutions. They have been so much a part of our lives that we sometimes take them for granted. Thus I hope you will not think I am belaboring the obvious when I recall three that are fundamental to what we are discussing today.

The first I shall call the *geographic revolution*. By this I mean the remarkable expansion of the geographic boundaries of our national concerns. Before Pearl Harbor, America was deeply divided over whether her own safety would be menaced by a Hitlerian Europe. Today through our commitment to the NATO nations, we have declared that an attack upon them would be considered an attack upon ourselves. Few parts of the globe are now remote to us; there are few whose peoples' hopes and fears, triumphs and setbacks, do not in some way affect the United States.

Take the specters of famine and overpopulation. These twin menaces do not threaten the people of the United States directly, yet we know that if they threaten others, however many thousands of miles away, our own security and well-being are ultimately involved.

Americans have traditionally shown concern for their neighbors. The geographic revolution means that our neighbors today live in India, Brazil, Nigeria, and Turkey . . . in fact, around the globe. And Americans are there, working with them.

Second is a *political revolution*, marked by the increasing power of public opinion on governments throughout the world. While the citizen is most powerful in a democracy, even authoritarian governments must concern themselves with the minds and hearts of their people. Think for a moment of the fervor with which the leaders of the Cultural Revolution in China are impressing the thought of Mao upon the Chinese masses through wall posters, pamphlets, books, newspaper, radio and television.

In most of the world today the masses of people wield more power, have higher aspirations, and are more aware of events outside their immediate surroundings, than ever before.

What the citizen thinks is of consequence not only to his own government but to other governments as well. Chairman Kosygin, I am sure, valued the international audience he was able to reach through his recent London press conference. Today all the great powers, and many smaller ones too, seek to put their case before the court of world opinion. To be sure, the jury may not always be able to enforce the verdict, but its opinions are important. In the long run, they may be decisive.

Third comes the *communication revolution*, to which I have already referred. Let me add just a few more facts. Five years ago, 64 nations had television; today the number is 104. In the same period, the number of sets around the world rose from 101 million to 182 million. Radio receivers, thanks to the low-cost transistor, have increased from 356 million to 543 million. International broadcasting has jumped from 16 thousand to 24 thousand hours weekly.

For this audience I need not elaborate the point that news today is both international and instantaneous. Statesmen can no longer with impunity make one statement for the "domestic" and another for the "international" audience. You newsmen have made that next to impossible. And as most Americans who travel abroad have observed, reports of a race riot in a northern U.S. city or the use of police dogs in a southern town will be heard over transistor radios and seen in banner headlines and radiophotos around the world. In an open society, domestic problems cannot be solved in family privacy. For better or for worse they are shared with the world.

These three revolutions—in geography, in politics and in communication—are quite evidently inter-related. And the three in concert present the United States with new problems, opportunities and responsibilities.

First the responsibilities. The United States' role of leadership today—in context of the three revolutions that I have described—makes direct communication with other peoples an imperative. We need to be understood and respected, able to state our case cogently and to persuade, not just in chanceries around the globe, but also in the court of public opinion.

We must be able to communicate effectively with other peoples on the many issues on which our mutual welfare and security depend in a tense and potentially explosive world.

Thus direct communication, or "public diplomacy," has become an essential element in the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States.

This is the task of the U.S. Information Agency.

It is a necessary task and a natural one for a nation which, in its Declaration of Independence, proclaimed the need for a "decent respect to the opinions of mankind."

USIA of course does not and should not have sole responsibility for such communication. Private channels form by far the greatest part of the international dialogue. The news agencies, Hollywood films, the businessman, tourist, and GI all participate. It is the role of USIA to complement the myriad private channels where the interests of the United States so dictate: to supply significant facts that are not known, to put into perspective and balance those that are, to fill significant gaps.

Thus USIA first asks, "What needs to be done, in the interests of the United States, that is not being done in other ways?"

The needs and opportunities are very great.

Thanks to the excellence of American engineering, the Voice of America can be heard in the deserts of Africa, the steppes of Russia, the villages of the Andes. Fifteen million watts of power beam our message over more than 100 transmitters. With construction planned and underway, our signals will reach all parts of the globe with even greater strength and clarity. The expansion of television, radio and motion picture channels in the developing nations offers us new and wider outlets.

Hunger for knowledge about the rest of the world, which characterizes so much of youth everywhere today, is still another asset. Young people want to hear what we, as well as others, have to say.

At the same time, the problems are manifold. Simply because communication is technically more feasible than ever before does not mean that it is easier. Intercultural communication is a difficult and delicate process. The possibilities of misunderstanding and misinterpretation are rife. Words that mean one thing to us may mean something very different to others. Some of our research studies, for example, show that a phrase like "capitalism" has a negative connotation to leaders in many countries. Yet, when our economic system is explained to these same persons as a combination of private initiative and government regulation, many wholeheartedly approve it. They discover that we have what they seek.

So we must choose our words with care.

Or take another example of the difficulties. With the more highly educated and sophisticated audiences—particularly with leadership elements who have the greatest influence in shaping public opinion—the very din of voices and multiplicity of communication may create problems. Competition for attention is keen. Audiences become more selective and more critical in their judgment. The challenge to skill in presentation is proportionate.

That the United States makes news in so many different ways is still another factor. It is often the sensational, the brutal, the unusual that claim the headlines. People around the world know more about the United States today than they did a generation ago. But they often do not know the most significant—how the ordinary family lives, what the ordinary worker does, what the ordinary law-abiding citizen thinks—because these daily happenings do not make the headlines. Nor are they facts which Moscow, Peking or others who disagree with us, will tell.

I can touch today only on some of the highlights of how USIA goes about meeting these challenges. Because we are honoring the Voice of America on its anniversary, I shall illustrate chiefly in terms of VOA. I ask you to keep in mind, however, that USIA programs encompass the various media of communication—films, television, press, publications, books, libraries, exhibits, personal contact—and that our overseas offices, known as USIS, also administer the cultural exchange programs of the Department of State.

First I would point out that one fundamental principle guides our operations: USIA aims to tell the truth with professional skill. In the inaugural broadcast of the Voice of America twenty-five years ago, in the dark days of early 1942, the announcer said: "Daily at this time we shall speak to you about America and the war. The news may be good or bad. We shall tell you the truth."

That maxim still guides USIA today. It has stood us in good stead.

Sometimes—I shall speak frankly—I get queries from members of Congress and other influential Americans about some episode in the United States of which we are not particularly proud; they ask whether we reported this on the Voice of America. If it was significant news, we did. I submit that any other policy, in an open society, would be self-defeating. I also submit that the total impact of what we report—the reality about America and its policies—brings us not only credibility but also respect. In the end, the United States is judged by this reality, not by a rosy-hued interpretation of it. USIA's task is to present the facts fairly, accurately and persuasively, so that our world-wide audiences can make an informed judgment.

One distinguished member of your fraternity, James Reston of the *New York Times,* last August wrote a column after vacationing in Canada, where he had listened regularly to our broadcasts. VOA, he wrote, ". . . is not peddling political propaganda. It is telling not only what the President and his associates says, but what the opposition says. It is carrying the critical comments of the American press, and the protest of the American Negroes out of Chicago, and the accounts of crime in the cities, as well as the stories of American universities, novelists and poets. . . .

"What comes out of all this is not that the United States is failing so often, but that it is attempting so much; not that it has failed to eliminate poverty or create a Great Society, but that it is aiming at these high ideals. . . ."

Let me give you one recent example of how we reported some unpalatable news. When King Faisal was the guest of the United States, an unhappy incident, as you may recall, resulted in cancellation of a dinner planned for him by the city of New York. The news broke a few minutes before our scheduled Arabic newscast to the Middle East. The Voice of America was the first to carry it to Saudi Arabia. Unpalatable and embarrassing, yes. But USIA gained credibility and confidence.

You might be interested to know that a Director of the news agency TASS recently complained to the Congress of Soviet Journalists that the Soviet Union did not follow such a policy. Referring to a plane crash at the Moscow airport, he claimed it would have been far better for Russians to learn the bad news from Radio Moscow than from the Voice of America.

The U.S. space program is open for all to observe. We mourn the death of the three brave astronauts—we do not hide it. While we report America's setbacks, we also proclaim with pride its successes. We tell of how President Johnson has fought for civil rights legislation which Congress has approved—and strives for more. We tell of how American workers receive social security benefits, protection for old age, medical insurance; of how America is trying to rebuild cities, eradicate slums, beautify the land.

America is not a perfect society, but it strives for perfection. This we proudly tell.

I should like to speak for a moment of USIA's role as official spokesman for the United States with foreign audiences. Here we have a grave responsibility to make certain that U.S. policy is clearly understood.

Let me first state that USIA does not *make* policy, foreign or domestic. We seek to explain it. The Agency also has, within the Executive Branch, the responsibility of advising on the implications of foreign opinion for the conduct of our foreign relations. Obviously foreign opinion is only one factor that must be taken into account as policy is formulated, and it cannot often be the determining one. It is our task, however, to see that it is considered.

Throughout the world people see evidence of our prowess in space; they should also know of our determination to use it in the interests of peace. They hear and read much about U.S. military might; we seek to make them understand that it serves as a deterrent against possible aggressors and atomic holocaust. They know full well that the United States is fighting in Vietnam—over 400 representatives of the world press, radio and television make this the most fully-covered war in history—but they also should know that the United States is there to support the principle of self-determination.

We hope, of course, that a clear explanation of the motivations of U.S. actions will bring conviction as well as understanding. We believe that U.S. policies will, in the long run, stand on their intrinsic worth, once they are adequately explained. We recognize that others will not always agree with us. But we seek to make our policies crystal clear, if possible to win support, and at the least to prevent a misunderstanding of U.S. intentions that could prove disastrous.

No great power today can afford to do less.

At a time when misunderstanding can result in a nuclear catastrophe, we must never relax our efforts to inform the world of where we stand and the principles which we support. The Voice of America is one of our strongest instruments for doing so.

In 1942 it proclaimed, "We shall tell you the truth." Its message today is the same—may it always be.

I have spoken chiefly of how we report the news and how we explain U. S. policies. These are perhaps the most dramatic parts of our work, but no more significant than the quiet, continuing task that we perform day by day in 220 USIS posts around the world: building understanding of the United States as a nation—its aims and ideals, its institutions, society and culture. The judgments that other peoples have of the United States as a world leader and partner stem from their judgment of the kind of nation we are. Their view of what we have achieved and are seeking to achieve for ourselves inevitably colors their interpretation of U. S. actions and intentions throughout the world.

I firmly believe that as other peoples understand the spirit of America, they will understand far better the policies than flow from it. And I believe they will have confidence in us.

We seek to convey this spirit through features on our radio programs; through magazines such as *America* for the Soviet Union and Poland, *Topic* for Africa, and *Al-Hayat* for the Arabic speaking nations; through television programs and films that not only give an honest picture of the kind of nation we are, but also help to build a sympathetic bond between the American people and our overseas audiences.

Here none of the USIA media contributes more than our USIS libraries and reading rooms—227 of them in 84 countries. They are miniature storehouses of knowledge about the United States, with representative works of our literature, history, science and other facets of our society. They stand as symbols of the cultural heritage of the United States and of our desire to share that heritage with others.

I have sketched for you briefly what USIA seeks to accomplish through direct communication with other peoples.

Are we succeeding?

I am convinced that we are.

First, we know that we are getting through. Since communication requires a dialogue, our ears are tuned to what our audiences have to say. Each day between 500 and 1,000 letters and post-cards arrive at the Voice of America mail room. They come from all parts of the world including communist countries. They tell us what programs our listeners prefer, what they like best and least.

Those of you who are now experiencing the feeling that follows a full lunch may sympathize with the Filipino who asked that we change the time of our broadcast in Special English, which he heard after midnight. He wrote, and I quote: ". . . we have to force ourselves not to fall asleep because the program is so educational and enlightening that ignoring it and falling asleep becomes equally painful."

You may have noticed an article in the *New York Times Magazine* two weeks ago by the distinguished British historian, H. R. Trevor-Roper. Reporting on his trip to Communist China in 1965, he told how he learned of the failure of the attempted communist coup in Indonesia over the Voice of America, audible through the jamming.

We do not, of course, know as much about our listening audience as we would like. We have studies under way to learn more. We do know that our listeners are predominantly young, alert, curious about the world and on the move. We know that they include distinguished statesmen, scientists and men of letters as well as university students who are rock-and-rollers. Among them are both staunch admirers of the United States, and those who distrust and oppose us. (As examples I cite a Central American President who regularly sends his country's native coffee to the announcer of VOA's Breakfast Show—and Communist China's Foreign Minister Chen Yi who last September told a group of Japanese Parliamentarians that he listens daily to VOA.)

I am glad that we reach both, for USIA should seek to reinforce its friends as well as to influence its critics.

Almost daily I hear some new evidence of the strength of the ties that USIA is forging through its world-wide network of communication.

Recently a U.S. Ambassador, just returned from his post in Africa, told us of an official call he made on the Chief of State. The gentleman suddenly looked at his watch and interrupted their conversation, saying, "Excuse me—it is 3:30, time to hear the news on the Voice of America."

An American in Moscow a few months ago took part in a discussion with three Soviet writers. A question of fact arose which was quickly settled when one of the Russians exclaimed, "But I heard it last night on the Voice of America!" The other two accepted the point without further question.

We know that our ability to communicate with the young generation in the Soviet Union causes considerable worry to their political leaders. This year a new Soviet weekly was launched, *RT* (Radio and Television). It is devoted in part to attacking the "nefarious pursuits" of the U.S. Information Agency. So is a recently-published book entitled "Operation P.W.: The Psychological Warfare of the American Imperialists."

I can only interpret such attention to mean that we are indeed having an effect.

In these few minutes I have shared some thoughts with you about three great revolutions—in geography, politics and communication—that have over the past twenty-five years transformed our world.

If we accept these premises—and I venture to say the facts are not easily contested—then we must accept the conclusion that international communication has become an imperative for the United States.

We must also accept the resulting responsibilities.

By communicating clearly and cogently with peoples of the world, I believe the U.S. Information Agency is helping to meet the challenge.

THE 25 MILLIONTH VOTE

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, this week the United States is honoring an important event in labor-management relations. In little more than 31 years since the enactment of the Wagner Act, 25 million votes have been cast in National Labor Relations Board elections.

In a speech delivered in Indianapolis last Thursday, February 23, Mr. Sam Zagoria, a member of the NLRB, reviewed the history of the election procedures authorized by Congress in 1935 for determining union representation and collective bargaining purposes. As Mr. Zagoria pointed out, the first secret ballot election under the jurisdiction of the NLRB was held in Indiana in December shortly after the adoption of the Wagner Act. During the succeeding years nearly 4,000 similar elections have been held in the State of Indiana alone.

From a small beginning NLRB elections have become both widespread and frequent. Over a half million workers, with a participation rate of some 90 percent, cast votes in approximately 8,000 such elections each year. There can be no doubt that this democratic determination of the will of workers through the ballot box has contributed much to improved labor-management relations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Zagoria's address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 25 MILLIONTH VOTE—A MILESTONE IN INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

(Remarks of Sam Zagoria, member, National Labor Relations Board, at the Indiana Labor-Management Relations Luncheon, Indianapolis, Ind., Feb. 23, 1967)

We are gathered here to celebrate a milestone in industrial democracy—the casting of the 25 millionth vote in a National Labor Relations Board election.

Next week in Washington labor and management will join together in a unique demonstration of cooperation in honoring the 25 millionth voter as a symbol of the 200,000 secret ballot elections run by the Board. A young machinist from New Jersey who cast a ballot in the decision to have United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO, represent his plant in collective bargaining with the Reynolds Metals Company will come to Washington with his family to meet leaders of labor, management and government gathered to mark the occasion.

For many, secret ballot elections are thought to have had their beginnings in the founding of our own democracy, but, actually, this ingenious technique for measuring individual decisions has much deeper roots in world history.

Way back in the fifth century B.C., in Athens certain secret ballot decisions were made by the electorate by casting white or black balls of stone. This may be where the term black ball originated. Many other elections were determined by show of hands in public meetings, but in the second century B.C., in Rome laws were passed providing for a secret ballot in order to offset the influence which patricians exercised over the plebeians. I assume similar considerations were involved in the Congressional decision to make NLRB elections secret ballot ones, but I leave to you which were the patricians—the employers or the union leaders, or both?

In the United States, from its earliest days elections were decided by voice, hand or division. Another system was devised in colonial days, borrowing from the Indians, and used corn for "aye" and beans for "nay." This does seem like a more practical method than black or white stones, for here the ballots could be safely digested after the election. Challenged ballots mildewing in the drawer awaiting a decision might create some smelly problems, though.

The secret ballot as such was developed in Australia in 1856 to safeguard the integrity of individual choices. However, more than 50 years later, Will Rogers observed that "more men have been elected between sundown and sunrise than ever were elected between sunrise and sundown."

There was evidence to support the Oklahoman's comment. In Philadelphia, for example, a politician, annoyed by jibes that his ward was a "low down" one, reminded his audience that it was originally the Independence Hall ward. "The fathers of American liberty voted down here once," he said with a grin, "and they vote here yet."

In St. Louis, history records the words of St. Louis leader who walked out of a polling place and called across the cordon of police to a group of men standing at the curb, "Are there any more repeaters out here who want to vote again?"

But there was a certain ethic even about election rigging. In New York state, in Chatham, a politico said he voted the dead only as they would have voted if alive. In a Tammany Hall election, Richard Croker once was accused of voting for a candidate for constable 14 times in one election. The constable indignantly came to his defense with the actual facts, "Richard Croker voted for me 17 times in one day."

Lest anyone here from Philadelphia, St. Louis or New York state take offense, let me emphasize that these things happened a long time ago, and for you native Hoosiers, of course they never could have happened in Indiana at any time.

The reason for this happy occasion is to mark an important moment in industrial history and to recognize the tremendous progress which has been made in achieving peaceful labor-management relations. It was not always thus.

In pre-NLRB days the history of America's industrial relations sometimes resembled a casualty list in a war. The names of the Haymarket riot in Chicago, the Homestead, Pa., steel conflict, the Pullman strike, the McNamara dynamiting in Los Angeles, the sitdown strikes in the auto industry, are splattered in labor history by the blood of workers, employers, soldiers and police.

But then in 1935, Senator Robert F. Wagner of New York proposed enactment of the National Labor Relations Act to guarantee the right of employees to organize or join unions of their own choosing and to bargain collectively with their employers. The legislation was passed by Congress and signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The Act created the National Labor Relations Board and charged it with holding secret ballot elections to decide which union, if any, the employees wanted to represent them for bargaining purposes.

The Act did not convert the industrial battlefield to an afternoon tea party overnight. In 1937, while the NLRB was still getting underway, the Memorial Day Massacre occurred in the Little Steel strike with a toll of 10 marchers killed, 30 wounded. But then, "one by one the companies agreed to abide by the results of NLRB elections. In September 1941, the four Little Steel companies sat down to bargain."

Some may ask why recall the bloody days now that they are behind us, but it seems to me that it is necessary in order to adequately appreciate the progress we have made. Neither today's labor nor management would want to return to those days of jungle warfare.

The first Board directed election was run by the regional office here in Indianapolis on December 12, 1935. It was held in Fort Wayne for the 960 workers of the Wayne Knitting Mills. A total of 933 turned out, with 516 voting for the American Federation of Hosiery Workers, Branch #2, AFL, and 401 for the Association of Employees for Representation of Employees Only of the Wayne Knitting Mills. Six months later a contract was signed and through the ensuing 31 years, the Hosiery Workers, I am told, has continued to hold contracts with the company for several of its plants in this part of the country.

In Indiana, the Indianapolis regional office has held almost 4000 elections during the past 20 years giving almost half a million workers a chance to make a free choice on whether to be represented by a union or not, and if so, which one. Incidentally, the average rate of participation in these secret ballot elections, in Indiana has been almost 90 percent—a figure which compares most favorably with the turnout in political elections here.

Today, throughout the country, NLRB elections are becoming commonplace, hardly noted in contemporary journals. The ballot box has replaced the bomb and the billyclub. In 1937 there were 2,728 strikes for organizing purposes; in 1964 there were only 35. The election process has been broadly accepted by labor and management—currently, 4 out of 5 elections are conducted by agreement of the company and the union. In all, 25 million working men and women have exercised freedom of choice in collective bargaining elections. This number, I might point out, equals the total population of the states of Indiana, Illinois and Ohio, and approaches a third of the entire civilian work force of the nation.

In exercising their right to choose a union or not, working men and women are protected against retaliation, discrimination, or other unfair conduct, whether by employers or unions. Elections have grown in number and voter participation. In its first year, 1935, the Board held 31 elections for 7,734 voters with an average 80 percent participation rate. This year, the Board is holding about 8,000 elections for more than a half million voters with an average 90 percent participation rate. (As a measure of comparison, in the last presidential election, only 62 percent of the eligibles voted.)

This Board election record doesn't just happen. Board employees through the 31 years of setting up and running elections have gone to great lengths to make voting easy and simple in the 50 States, Puerto Rico, and Guam. Notices of election, for example, have been translated into almost every language on the linguistic spectrum, ranging from Spanish, Italian, Polish, and German through Yugoslavian, Russian, Chinese, and Tagalog. The polling place is brought to the worker—voting booths and boxes have been set up in factories, warehouses, mills, and also aboard ship, in railroad boxcars, stadiums, movie studios, and, when necessary, in a rented circus tent.

The report of the Board agents running the salmon cannery elections in the Aleutians in 1945 is instructive on how far our people go, literally, in bringing the precious right to vote to each worker—and how difficult it sometimes is. The agents left Seattle in July aboard the Baranoff, the first commercial transportation after the war was technically ended. Things were still uncertain so the vessel proceeded with no radio or other communication, total blackouts at night and nightly boat drills.

Arriving at the False Pass cannery, three men fanned out to various polling places some 200 miles up the coast toward Kodiak. There was no commercial transportation so the trio had to thumb its way on fishing boats out and back. There were some compensations, the report shows; an agent, assisted by an Aleut fisherman, caught a chicken halibut by handline, fried it in butter and consumed it enthusiastically with salt crackers and strong black coffee. The next day, however, he arose in the midst of a blizzard, but somehow managed to make it back after holding his election.

Other agents on the cannery voting task force had to make their way in a single-engine pontoon plane, which had to try five times before lifting off the two-foot high waves. One man was sent to Taku and was due back the same evening, but failed to arrive until three days later for he was fogged in. Another was sent to Hidden Inlet, but on the way down the moss-covered plane ramp he slipped, fell and disappeared into the sea. He was fished out, reequipped and sent forth. He returned five hours later, mission completed, but still wet to the skin. Ah, these government men do lead an easy life!

Naturally, the Board is proud of its three-decade election history. While its 2300 employees make it one of the smallest Federal agencies, our people, whether in the Indianapolis region or any one of the other 30 regions, have striven hard to accord each working man and woman his precious right to vote. They are our "E" men, e for election—and excellence.

A labor historian, reviewing the span of elections, has observed:

"Many elections through the years were conducted in large units, as in a textile plant of 12,000 employees in a southern mill town, for many of whom this must have been their first experience of casting a vote in a publicly conducted election, or in a steel corporation's mills where more than 116,000 voters were eligible in plants throughout the country, voting for a national union after a long company-union history; or in steamship companies where it took months before all the ships returning from far seas could be counted when they touched American ports . . .

"Many smaller elections involved their special difficulties and their own elements of drama, as when lumberjacks voted in the woods, or Negro workers in a cotton-seed-oil mill dared community opposition to come out and vote for a union . . . overall, the elections conducted by the Board were an experience with the democratic process, meeting some of its difficulties as well as giving the lift of spirit that often comes to the participant in such undertakings."

The Board's election process has drawn praise from both labor and management. It has become the peaceful, logical way to resolve questions of representation. If the union wins an election, there is a duty to bargain in good faith. If the union loses the election, there can be no further election for at least a year in the same unit.

The Board is constantly striving to improve its administration of the election process. Last year, concerned about the difficulties involved in assuring worker voters of the opportunity to hear both sides of arguments on choosing or rejecting union representation, it adopted a rule requiring furnishing of lists of workers and their addresses so they could receive information before the election from interested parties. Last month, the Board announced a three-point program to better inform workers of their right to vote and to warn unions and managements against conduct impeding fair and free elections.

Representation elections have led to the give and take of the bargaining table and hundreds of thousands of contracts have been agreed upon by both parties.

In the words of Archibald Cox, former Solicitor General of the United States, "Participation in debate often produces changes in a seemingly fixed position either because new facts are brought to light or because the strengths and weaknesses of the several arguments become apparent. Sometimes the parties hit upon some novel compromise of an issue which has been thrashed over and over. Much is gained even by giving each side a better picture of the strength of the other's convictions."

Industrial democracy has cleared the way for unprecedented industrial growth and has brought the workers improved pay, safer working conditions, and job security. Industrial peace has made possible bold and imaginative contract provisions for pensions, life insurance, apprenticeship programs, and adjustment to an accelerated technology. Multiemployer contracts, multiunion bargaining, pension clearinghouses, worker sabbaticals, and other tools for human relations have emerged from the mutual efforts in the bargaining room.

The father of the National Labor Relations Act, Senator Wagner, described his bill as based on the principle "that democracy cannot work unless it is honored in the factory as well as the polling booth; and that men cannot be truly free in body and in spirit unless their freedom extends into the places where they earn their daily bread."

A principal author of the 1947 amendments, Senator Robert A. Taft, described them as "based on the theory that the solution of the labor problem in the United States is free collective bargaining—a contract between one employer and all of his men acting as one man . . . No employer can beat down a union; no employer can discriminate; no employer can refuse to deal with the union which is duly certified to him."

Our gathering here indicates that man is not inevitably committed to hostility and disagreement. We accept the view that we have hands to shake hands with—as well as to tighten into fists; that we have ears to hear each other's pleas—as well as each other's insults; that we have eyes to look at each other and recognize sincerity and understanding. These things are possible when men of good will sit down together, reason with each other and search out areas of agreement.

They are the basis of man's greatest invention—not the technological ones which pour out an endless stream of material goods—but rather the development of the council table where differences are openly displayed and discussion moves to understanding and agreement. For above all, we have to constantly find ways to live together in peace and harmony.

These principles hold as true in the volatile field of labor-management relationships as in the relationships between nations or between states. The secret ballot election process, I submit, has been a useful first step along this route to discussion and understanding.

One of democracy's greatest exponents summed it up simply:

"At the bottom of all tributes paid to democracy is the little man, walking into the little booth, with a little pencil, making a little cross on a little bit of paper—no amount of rhetoric or voluminous discussion can possibly diminish the overwhelming importance of that point."—Winston Churchill.

And now I am at the end of my 25 millionth voter birthday greeting and I feel much as H. L. Mencken, the Baltimore writer, felt on completion of a new volume. "I feel like the mother of the Dionne quintuplets—that is to say, I am happy, but hollow."

APPROPRIATIONS FOR MAJOR SCIENTIFIC PROGRAMS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, at 11 o'clock this morning President Johnson sent to Congress a request for appropriations for three major scientific programs. In his statement, the President concluded:

> These projects are not theoretical adventures. They are the practical results of basic scientific research, and their fruits will prove of the highest value to a nation seeking new and peaceful keys to unlock the powers of man and the universe.

At a time when Congress and the executive branch are closely concerned about the level of Federal spending, I believe the President's comment is significant. He asks for these funds—and I support his request wholeheartedly—as an investment in the extension of man's knowledge and the application of that knowledge to human progress.

The request for funds covers these projects: nuclear rocket propulsion; a medium-energy physics facility; and a specialized facility for advanced research on controlled thermonuclear fusion as a potential source of electricity.

All of these projects involve the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, in New Mexico. The facilities for medium energy physics research—the so-called meson factory—and the controlled thermonuclear fusion installation will be established at Los Alamos. I know there is always the thought that a Member of Congress works to secure programs for the benefit of his own State. This activity has been criticized as the "scientific pork barrel." But while the nuclear-rocket project has much of its research base in New Mexico, and while the meson factory and the controlled thermonuclear facility would be sited at Los Alamos, the entire Nation is the beneficiary. These are not provincial projects.

This morning, in hearings, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy heard testimony from some of the scientists chiefly responsible for the meson facility and controlled thermonuclear progress.

Dr. Louis Rosen, a guiding spirit in the medium energy physics program, pointed out that the meson facility will be available at least 50 percent of the time to researchers from outside the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory. They will come from across the Nation, and, indeed, the facility will be the "focus of worldwide activity in medium energy physics," Dr. Rosen said. The device will be used for studying the basic structure of the atomic nucleus and the forces that govern that nucleus.

Moreover, the meson facility holds the promise of being a valuable instrument for the treatment of certain forms of cancer. I hesitate to put the wrong emphasis on this possibility; I do not want to label this instrument the means for curing cancer. But Dr. Rosen pointed out to the Joint Committee a few hours ago that in the last year or two the possibilities of the meson facility offered a method for attacking deep-seated, inoperable malignancies.

Mr. President, I have long been enthusiastic about the application of nuclear propulsion to space travel. The nuclear rocket offers far greater efficiency than chemical propulsion, and that means cost savings.

Quite clearly, the exploration of space is in its early and formative years. We shall continue this bold journey, and the atom will be absolutely essential to success. That is why I strongly endorse the President's decision to move toward the development of a nuclear rocket engine for actual space flight.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement I made earlier today regarding the President's announcement be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> The President's decision on the three nuclear projects is of tremendous impact. While I am, of course, proud of the involvement of the Los Alamos scientific laboratory, the significance goes far beyond New Mexico.
>
> First, the decision to begin development of a nuclear rocket engine for flight brings closer to reality the use of atomic energy for space travel with far more efficient engines for long space voyages. The nerva engine that is to be developed could be used in a nuclear rocket stage to replace the chemical third stage of the Saturn V vehicle. This would increase the payload capability of that vehicle by 65 to 85 percent for lunar exploration and lunar base operations, and by about 100 percent for unmanned deep space scientific missions to the planets or close in to the sun. Such use of nerva to increase the payloads of Saturn V could be particularly important if the Soviet Union demonstrated a payload capability larger than that of Saturn V. In addition, that same nerva engine, when installed in a suitable space rocket system, would permit manned exploration of the planets with space craft that were millions of pounds lighter in earth orbit than with chemical propulsion.
>
> Although the estimate of additional cost for development of the nerva engine is a total of about $1 billion over a ten year period, I am told this total cost could be paid off in only a few space missions because of the high performance achievable with nuclear propulsion, as compared with any conceivable alternate chemical system. Any nation which is seriously planning for eventual leadership in space must plan on using nuclear power.
>
> Second, the decision to begin construction of the linear proton accelerator for the production of mesons at Los Alamos is of most immediate impact to the laboratory. Establishment of this facility assures the long-term usefulness of the laboratory and its staff. It tells the people of Los Alamos that their community is going to continue to be a viable one. The total cost of this project—$55 million—is a sound investment in scientific research. Not only will the meson facility be important to national security, but there may be considerable promise that it will play a major role in improving the health of our people, particularly in the treatment of cancer.
>
> The meson facility will be available to researchers not only in the Rocky Mountain region, but for scientists from far beyond as well.
>
> Third, I want to mention scyllac. This is the Los Alamos project which looks towards the harnessing of thermonuclear fusion to produce electric power.
>
> AEC-sponsored scientists have made excellent progress in controlled thermonuclear research. Intensive review has led to the conclusion that the time is now ripe for expanded effort in this field. There is broad support in the scientific community for expanding the effort at Los Alamos. Quite obviously, the payoff is down the road, but there is a strong conviction that there will be rewards in terms of assuring mankind vast amounts of very low cost energy.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, in asking today for additional appropriations for nuclear rocket engine development, President Johnson has taken a historic step that will truly join the nuclear age with the space age. As one who has championed our Nation's efforts in this field, I wish to commend the President for his far-sighted judgment and his initiative.

This request for an additional $91 million for the Rover program, as it is called, also awards eminent recognition of the great advances that have been scored in nuclear rocket engine experiments under the joint efforts of the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Space and Aeronautics Administration. Certainly congratulations should go out to the dedicated men who have worked so long and so well in this undertaking.

To underscore these achievements and to point to the potential of the nuclear rocket engine, I would like to direct specific attention to that portion of the President's message which discusses these factors:

> This engine will substantially increase our nation's space capabilities, and will give our larger rockets and spacecraft immensely increased power and versatility.
>
> In the nuclear rocket program which has been moving forward during the last decade, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Atomic Energy Commission have successfully tested reactors and engines with 55,000 pounds of thrust.
>
> Government scientists and engineers have now concluded that a much more powerful nuclear engine would have distinct advantages over rockets now in use. I am recommending that the United States Government move ahead with the development of a nuclear engine having a potential of 200,000 to 250,000 pounds of thrust.
>
> Such an engine could be used for a new and much more powerful third stage for our Saturn V launch vehicle. Because of its very high efficiency, it could:
>
> Permit us almost to double the weight of the present payload of the Saturn V vehicle;
>
> Increase our ability to maneuver spacecraft; and,
>
> Be used in future manned landings and explorations of far distant planets.

The President goes on to say that present plans call for delivery of the first test engine by 1971. But if the men of AEC and NASA continue the pace of success they have established, we may advance that target date by a year or more.

Mr. President, my major purpose in speaking now is to call for full congressional support of this important project that looks beyond the moon and beyond the rapid advances of orthodox rocketry. For it will, I am convinced, vault the United States far into the lead in space exploration and research.

I wrote the President in support of this project acceleration February 9, stressing that I believed it imperative to provide additional moneys to guarantee success.

I am proud that the Atomic Energy Commission's test site in Nevada has become the proving grounds for this rocket engine of the future, and I am doubly proud that much of the acceleration proposed by the President will be concentrated at the nuclear rocket development station there—some $22.5 million for expansion of engine systems work and testing facilities construction alone.

This will indeed make the Nevada test site the launching pad for America's nuclear race into space.

ADDITIONAL AEC AND NASA FUNDS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I am extremely pleased that the administration has made a decision to press forward with its highly successful nuclear rocket engine development program.

The President noted in his 1968 fiscal budget that excellent progress had been made in experimentation with regard to our national commitment to develop this unique and most essential method of space travel.

Last week another test was conducted in this continuing program in Nevada and the results were again highly encouraging. They indicate that we can go forward from the development of a 50,000-pound thrust engine to a 250,000-pound thrust engine. This means that instead of conducting a barebones level system of testing, our scientists will be able to proceed with the logical new steps indicated by their experience.

Following the budget message of the administration, I wrote to the President urging that he take this step. I told him then that the successes of 1966 "gave hope that the atomic rocket engine will, indeed, give America unquestioned space leadership in the future."

I further related to the President that—

> We are faced with the prospect wherein if we do not move ahead we will have to phase out existing capabilities and waste much of the enormous investment which thus far has been made to bring us to the so encouraging point in the nuclear rocket engine program as we are today. It is clear that the additional capability of the nuclear engine, including its importance in upgrading Saturn V, makes release of the funds critical to our overall posture in space.

Mr. President, $100 million is involved in the recommendation which the Senate will be studying. I submit that this is a modest cost for the benefits which are to be created for our space program. I am, of course, very proud of the role which Nevada will continue to play in this program. Approximately $22.5 million will be spent in my State on the design and construction of two enormous test stands which will permit adequate testing for the development of these new high thrust atomic engines. It will be a welcome addition to Nevada's rapidly growing capability in this futuristic field which has become an integral part of the economy of my State.

It is reassuring to know that this proposal will receive the thorough review which it will unquestionably be given by the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, on which I also serve.

THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise at this time to commend to my colleagues attention to that specific portion of the President's message on education which dealt with the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. As the chief Senate sponsor of the enabling legislation which created the Foundation, I am pleased that the President has seen fit to recommend funding for this new agency in the amount of $16,370,000 for the coming fiscal year.

While this amount is less than the authorized ceilings for Federal support of the Foundation's activities, it represents an important step forward from the sums appropriated for the present fiscal year. I am most hopeful that the Congress will approve the full amount recommended by the President.

In terms of the broad mandate we have given to the new Foundation to advance the quality of our Nation's life, this relatively modest investment is, I believe, of high consequence. The program which is involved should be encouraged in every possible way. It is central to the goals we seek now and for the future. The potentials of this program, which clearly recognizes the fundamental values of our cultural well-being are immense. These values are basic to our growth as a mature nation. Throughout history leading nations have placed great emphasis on the development of the arts and humanities, or the creative talents of the individual, and on the contributions great artists and scholars make to society. At this critical time in our history, these values are of paramount importance.

As President Johnson said when he transmitted the administration bill to create a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, for consideration by the 89th Congress:

> This Congress will consider many programs which will leave an enduring mark on American life. But it may well be that passage of this legislation, modest as it is, will help secure for this Congress a sure and honored place in the story of the advance of our civilization.

I believe that this prophecy and promise is being well fulfilled. Guided by their two councils of outstanding private citizen artists and scholars, and under the leadership of their two distinguished chairmen, Roger L. Stevens and Barnaby C. Keeney, the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities are working in close partnership, in accord with the spirit and purpose of the authorizing legislation.

National endowment for the arts programs are supporting the development and growth of the arts at both a National and State level. To date more than 90 projects have been initiated at a national level and close to 300 other worthwhile projects by the States themselves. Initial programs developed by the National Council on the Arts have been designed to:

Stimulate enjoyment and appreciation of the arts by creating the widest possible audience for arts activities of substantial artistic and cultural significance.

Encourage and assist individual performing, creative, and visual artists to achieve standards of professional excellence.

Develop and expand the capacity of independent arts institutions and organizations for imaginative and substantive programs.

Explore the problems of the arts in America in order to develop new programs and institutions to meet existing and future needs.

Encourage imaginative arts programs in the field of education.

Support international arts events which relate to the advancement of the arts in the United States.

The National Endowment for the Arts, through the provisions in the law which require funding on a matching basis, has encouraged arts organizations to assume their share of the responsibility for cultural progress. It has developed a program in which Federal, State, and local governments are cooperating to broaden opportunities for artists and audiences. It is stimulating new sources of funds and services for the arts. It is fostering an appreciation of the individual creative artist in America today, and it has made comprehensive plans for the future.

Several National Endowment for the Arts programs with national implications are:

ACADEMY OF AMERICAN POETS

The National Endowment for the Arts provided matching funds totaling $79,750 to support the Academy of the American Poets' pilot projects in Detroit, Pittsburgh, and New York. The first phase of the project, "Dialogues on the Art of Poetry," is intended to stimulate teacher interest and improve teaching methods by enabling high school instructors to hear poetry readings by outstanding established American poets. The second phase, "Poetry Readings in the Classrooms," brings younger, lesser known poets into high school classrooms to read and discuss their own poetry with the students, a unique and rewarding experience for the poets as well as the children.

In New York, hundreds of teachers attended readings by distinguished American poets, and many thousands of students responded enthusiastically to hearing and talking with young poets, an unprecedented experience for most of them.

LABORATORY THEATER PROJECT

In cooperation with the U.S. Office of Education and State and local school boards, the National Council on the Arts committed funds to initiate an experimental "laboratory theater" project to provide two American cities with professional theater companies which will present outstanding theater performances at no charge to secondary school children during weekday afternoons and to adult audiences during weekend performances. This program is designed to develop new audiences of all ages, and to improve the quality of secondary school instruction in dramatic literature by making live professional theater productions of outstanding quality an integral part of high school curriculum. For example: More than 40,000 secondary school students from every part of my own state of Rhode Island are having the opportunity to attend up to five free performances of Providence's Trinity Square Repertory Company, and more than 50,000 secondary school students from New Orleans and surrounding areas are being shown, at no cost to themselves, the productions of the newly created Repertory Theater, New Orleans.

RURAL ARTS PROGRAM

The National Council on the Arts launched a pilot program to develop artists and audiences in five small rural communities through support of the University of Wisconsin College of Agriculture's Wisconsin Idea Theater.

The rural arts program is exposing small towns to a variety of creative, performing, and visual arts programs which involve locating and supporting local artists and craftsmen, and inviting professional artists to participate in activities, performances, and exhibits. Community reaction is constantly being evaluated by the university and the towns compared to two similar communities which are not participating in the program, so that better plans for expanding the benefits of the arts to small communities can be made at a national and State level.

MARTHA GRAHAM NATIONAL TOUR

The National Endowment for the Arts made $142,250 available on a matching basis to enable the Martha Graham Dance Company to make its first national tour in 15 years. Although Miss Graham has been internationally acclaimed as the founder and leading exponent of modern dance, millions of Americans had never had the opportunity to view performances by her outstanding company which has been financially unable to tour the United States.

During the 8-week tour in the fall of 1966, audiences and critics in 32 cities applauded the company's excellence.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTURE, PLANNING, AND DESIGN

The National Council on the Arts is studying the organization, structure, and functions of a proposed National Institute of Architecture, Planning, and Design.

The institute is envisioned as an independent facility which will serve citizens, cities, and States in their search for higher quality in the physical environment. It is anticipated that the institute will involve leading architects, planners, and designers, as well as mayors, planning commissioners, Governors, industrialists, educators, public officials, and private citizens, in programs to enhance all pertinent aspects of the arts of architecture, planning, landscape architecture, and design as they relate to the environment.

AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE

The National Council on the Arts is developing a plan to establish an American Film Institute comparable to organizations presently operating in other nations. This plan involves the creation of an entirely new national arts institution capable of enhancing the art of film making throughout the United States. President Johnson endorsed this concept at the signing ceremonies of the National

Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 when he said:

> We will create an American Film Institute, bringing together leading artists of the film industry, outstanding educators, and young men and women who wish to pursue the Twentieth Century art form as their life's work.

PROJECT FOR YOUNG MUSICIANS

The National Council on the Arts is developing a program which will give young musicians the opportunity to participate as soloists in national tours. A program is under way to develop a unique American Lyric Theatre workshop, combining a variety of the arts, and under the experienced leadership of one of our country's most talented artists, Jerome Robbins, who has generously agreed to devote his time and energies to the project without personal compensation.

The National Endowment for the Humanities entered the present fiscal year with the dual tasks of developing its program and making its first major series of awards. Before discussing these efforts, I should like to make some general comments about why it is important that the endowment succeed in its efforts.

In its annual report, the endowment said:

> A striking point of the last decade of American life has been the growing frustration in public life as realization developed that our wealth, our superb technical and material skills, our undifferentiated desire for the superlative across the gamut of our national existence, created as many, perhaps more, problems than they solved. As though to mock our material progress, darkening problems of urbanization, of lacerating political and social division, and of aimless discontent grow with our progress. It is perhaps not too much of an exaggeration to say that the country is passing through a crisis of confidence in its achievements and its aspirations—indeed, itself.

Barnaby C. Keeney, former president of Brown University, now the chairman of the endowment, has said:

> It is in response to this climate of anxiety that the Endowment faces its most challenging opportunity—to increase the interest in and use of the humanities by our citizens, and to improve their access to them. Other things can make us wealthy and powerful; the humanities are to make us wise, and they lead us to apply our wisdom in ways which can heal both private and public life. It is urgently in the national interest to make available to the broad public as well as the scholarly community the attitudes of mind, the methods of assessing value, the self-knowledge and civic knowledge which are the ultimate contributions of the humanities to public and private life. If a broad public can be encouraged to appreciate and understand the humanities, they may habitually use this knowledge in making their public and private decisions. It is impossible to calculate the beneficial national effect of "being scientific;" but few would question that such an outlook has been of fundamental importance in achieving our present material good fortune at home and our leadership abroad. We are persuaded that "being humanistic," both in our schools and colleges and outside them, is equally necessary for solutions to our national anguishes, to maintain our leadership abroad, and to represent to the world what the quality of human life can be. No less than this is the ultimate objective of the Endowment, and we believe that it was an expression of such hopes and convictions that the President and Congress established the Endowment. The need, as the President put it, is "not only in enriching scholarship but in enriching life for all people."

To meet this national need, the Humanities Endowment is operating fellowship programs to develop the capacities of individual scholars and teachers in the humanities, research grant programs to support the discovery of new knowledge and insight in those fields which contribute so much to an understanding of what it is to be a human being, and educational and public grant programs to improve the teaching of the humanities in schools, colleges and universities, and among the public at large.

Two of the fellowship programs are directed toward the young scholar and teacher, who is not yet in a position to compete with senior scholars of established reputation, yet whose need is particularly great because he is at a critical stage of his development as a scholar and teacher; the third fellowship program is aimed at the senior scholar who needs time off from his other duties in order to make a contribution of major significance to his field.

In the present year, fellowships were awarded to scholars from just under 200 educational institutions located in 44 States and the District of Columbia, and including scholars unaffiliated with academic centers. The endowment awarded 100 6- to 8-month fellowships to young scholars, 130 summer fellowships for young scholars, and 57 senior fellowships.

The distribution of the fellowships among numerous States and institutions is especially noteworthy, since so many Federal and private fellowship programs in all fields tend to concentrate at a relatively small number of prestigious institutions.

The programs in support of research in the humanities have provided funds for over 80 projects in the present fiscal year. Many of these projects have an immediate usefulness in enabling Americans—whether scholars, teachers, students, or the general public—to better understand the American experience and tradition, but as a whole they offer the promise of contributing to our knowledge of ourselves as well as of our past. As Mr. Keeney has put it:

> In order to develop a broad national policy of support for the humanities, we must enable humanists to provide knowledge and understanding of what is past, or abstract, or aesthetic. By gaining perspective on the past, thoughtful men may be inspired to a vision of future achievement, and if they are given the means to develop their wisdom they will come to understand and to master themselves in their environment.

The Humanities Endowment's educational and public programs have aimed in the present year at encouraging joint cooperative efforts by institutions which traditionally operate at different levels and with different conceptions of their scope and purpose. Schools and colleges have received grants to improve the teaching of the humanities therein; museums and universities have received grants which encourage them to make their strengths available to one another; colleges and universities have received grants to permit them to take better mutual advantage of their respective facilities; and additional grants which cut across the traditional perimeters of separate activities in the humanities have been made to provide support for educational television, talking books, training of journalistic critics, and the personnel of the Nation's 3,500 State and local historical societies.

One particular grant of the Humanities Endowment illustrates the way in which all of its grants have reinforced one another to strengthen the Nation's resources in the humanities. By a grant of $300,000 to the Modern Language Association of America to support a center for the editing and publishing of accurate editions of major American authors such as Twain, Melville, and Hawthorne, scholars in the field of literature will have a valuable addition to their understanding of what these authors in fact intended to say, while teachers and students, as well as the general public, will have more satisfactory texts of the works of these American giants. In announcing the grant, Mr. Keeney said:

> It is extraordinary that the works of many American writers since the mid-19th century exist only in inaccurate and incomplete editions. Some texts of their works which are in wide distribution are thoroughly inaccurate and misleading, and result very frequently in misinterpretations of the intentions of the writers, not only by students and the lay public but by scholars as well.

The Modern Language Association Award is intended to remedy this situation. The Humanities Endowment is also negotiating to insure that the standard texts which will result will be published in inexpensive and widely available editions, as well as in its "talking books" grant.

All of these efforts for the humanities have been made upon a budget in the present fiscal year of $4,500,000. Commenting upon the awards made by the endowment with so small a sum, the Washington Star said:

> That relatively small amount already makes the Endowment the prime source of financing for achievement in the humanities. This stark fact, in contrast to the vast amounts of Federal money being spent on the sciences, is ample proof of the need for the Endowment.

This is a sentiment which I share, and a situation which I hope Congress will see fit to improve in future actions. Support for the humanities and the arts at higher levels of funding is worthy of our closest consideration.

DO NOT CUT EDUCATION FUNDS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I have said repeatedly that it would be tragic for the Nation to cut back on its vital domestic programs because of the added financial burden of Vietnam. I continually receive similar pleas from knowledgeable Michigan residents. One recent example concerning the need for maintaining full funding for education and education research programs comes to me from John E. Ivey, Jr., dean of the College of Education of Michigan State University. Because he states the need so well, I ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Michigan State University,
East Lansing, Mich., January 6, 1967.
Senator Philip A. Hart,
East Bluff,
Mackinac Island, Mich.

Dear Senator Hart: Those concerned with education throughout the State of Michigan have benefited greatly from the past efforts of the Congress of the United States. As a result of efforts within the past two years, school children are receiving instruction in exciting new programs; neglected segments of our society are now finding educational opportunities long denied them; additional, top-quality, young persons are being encouraged to enter the educational profession; experienced teachers are receiving encouragement to continue programs of self improvement; new and sorely needed facilities are rising on the campuses of the nation's colleges and universities; and, for the first time, large funds have been made available for research on the vexing and perplexing problems involved in educative processes.

If the rate at which a society progresses is greatly influenced by its capacity to educate, then this moment in history is crucial to society. The Congress must not now turn its back upon the need to carry forward the research and fellowship programs now underway. These programs must be carried forward without diminution if gains are to be consolidated.

As a member of the 90th Congress, you will soon be called upon to pass judgment on the unfinished work of the 89th Congress. That judgment, in part, will be to approve or deny appropriations designed to fund the authorizations previously approved and will have great consequence on the future of public education at all levels.

I recognize many of the pressures you will face as the appropriation processes are undertaken. Nevertheless, my professional colleagues and I urgently solicit your support in retaining and expanding those programs through which the Congress extends financial support to educational and educational research programs.

Sincerely yours,
John E. Ivey, Jr., *Dean.*

Mr. HART. Mr. President, a second letter is from Dr. Ira Polley, the Michigan Superintendent of Public Instruction. Dr. Polley argues persuasively the case for increased appropriations to implement the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Polley's letter also be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Michigan Department of Education,
Lansing, Mich., February 20, 1967.
Hon. Philip A. Hart,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Hart: President Johnson's budget contains modest increases for Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs. We would like to emphasize that they do not meet either the present demand for service or the authorized ceiling which the Congress established in 1966.

Federal aid to education has been a vigorous spur to action here in Michigan. Under the impetus of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the State has launched a major program for constructing area technical-vocational schools. The State has received programs from local districts for $15 million for supplemental educational services under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Over 3,000 youths were enabled last year to stay in school, because of the work and subsistence provisions of the 1965 Vocational Education Act.

The State of Michigan has, in the past two years, responded to this federal effort. It established a $4 million fund for aid to educationally deprived children; it included adult high school completion expenses in the basic State aid formula; it raised the level of support for special education; it provided 75 percent State aid for remedial reading; and it increased the level of state support of local schools to about 50 percent of operational costs.

The combination of these state and federal programs has generated an important thrust in our elementary and secondary schools. School districts have been encouraged to find useful new ways and means of serving the children of the poor, the distressed, and the deprived. They have been encouraged to find better ways to educate the average child.

I hope that you will find it possible to continue the momentum of these programs, and that you will be able to support elementary and secondary education appropriations equal to the 1966 authorizations. The price of these programs will be returned several times over in the future careers of the children who are helped now.

If you desire elaboration on any of the programs I have mentioned, please ask. I will be happy to provide further detail regarding the extent of the impact federal aid has had in any Michigan education area.

Sincerely yours,
Ira Polley.

AMENDMENT OF EXECUTIVE T—CONVENTION ON GREAT LAKES FISHERIES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I wish to add my voice in support of amending the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries to increase the representation of the United States and Canada by one member each to the Great Lakes Commission, thus providing four Commissioners from each country instead of three.

Over the past few years the Commission has concentrated its efforts on controlling the sea lamprey problem principally in the western Great Lakes—Superior, Michigan, and Huron—where the devastation to the lake trout was most acute. For this reason it has been appropriate for the two public members of the U.S. section on the Commission to come from this area of the Great Lakes.

The Commission's efforts have met with outstanding success. Where only a few years ago the trout fisheries in Lake Superior had been reduced to practically zero, trout are now well on their way back. In addition, we are witnessing a rapid growth in trout in Lake Michigan and look forward to their abundance in the years ahead.

As the sea lamprey control efforts move across to the eastern Great Lakes, I can fully appreciate the desire of the eastern lake States to have representation on the Commission. Since the stated purpose of increasing the membership on the Great Lakes Fisheries Commission is to provide just such representation, I am happy to endorse this aim and support ratification of the amendment to Executive T.

THE REIMBURSEMENT FORMULA FOR MEDICARE

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, recently the American Protestant Hospital Association at its annual meeting adopted a resolution urging that certain changes be made in the current reimbursement formula for hospital patients eligible for medicare. It is the position of the APHA that the present allowance of only 2 percent of hospital basic costs for refurbishing, modernization, and expansion is inequitable and that other procedures need to be revised.

The president of APHA, Mr. Jack A. L. Hahn, who is also the executive director of the Methodist Hospital of Indianapolis, Ind., has pointed out that under the present formula "self-supporting hospital patients are paying more than their share of hospital expenses." If this be true, and there apparently is substantial evidence to support it, serious questions of policy are raised by the operation of the schedule approved by the Social Security Administration.

In order that all Members of Congress will have the opportunity to examine the objections and the recommendations made by the American Protestant Hospital Association, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by its house of delegates and board of trustees be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution re Medicare by the American Protestant Hospital Association, Chicago, Ill.

1. Whereas the American Protestant Hospital Association recognizes that Medicare is the Law of the land; and

2. Whereas the A.P.H.A. acknowledges the responsibility for hospitals contributing to successful implementation of Medicare; and

3. Whereas it is the intent of public law 89–97 to pay for full costs of providing hospital service to Medicare patients; and

4. Whereas the Social Security Administration has developed a reimbursement formula for Medicare which does not cover the full economic cost of providing hospital service; and

5. Whereas it is discriminatory to other patients to carry the financial burden for costs not covered by Medicare which must be incurred to provide service to all patients; and

6. Whereas the church and the community have invested millions of dollars in the typical community voluntary hospital, to provide it with the capability of serving; this investment merits a return, but requires at minimum a reimbursement from purchases of service sufficient to preserve it against inflation and obsolescence; and

7. Whereas it is an economic truism that operating capital and plant capital must be expanded proportionately to expanded functions; and

8. Whereas patients covered by Medicare are absorbing facilities needed by all segments of the community at a steadily increasing amount for communities to expand hospital facilities; and

9. Whereas Medicare will cost the Voluntary Hospital System millions of dollars because of the premature and inadequate application of the R.C.C. (ratio of charges to cost) method without allowing hospitals a reasonable period of time to convert to a cost related charge system, and which will incur a loss in capital which hospitals cannot afford; and

10. Whereas Medicare has added to the cost of operation of hospitals by requiring multi-part forms instead of simplified reports which are technically acceptable, and in developing the most complicated accounting and reimbursement formulae ever de-

vised by a purchaser of hospital care (with particular emphasis on Part B benefits); and

11. Whereas the continuance of high quality and efficient care is threatened and the very existence of the Voluntary Hospital System is in jeopardy; and

12. Whereas the A.P.H.A. recognizes the diligence of the American Hospital Association and the difficulties they have encountered in attempting to obtain changes in the Medicare reimbursement formula: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That:

1. The A.P.H.A. protests the costly and cumbersome methods imposed on hospitals in submitting bills for service; and

2. The A.P.H.A. expresses opposition to the complicated and untenable formula of reimbursement for Part B services; and

3. The A.P.H.A. protests the unfairness of the Medicare reimbursement formula with particular reference to the 2% allowance for costs not included in reimbursable expenses, and expresses alarm because of the economic deterioration it is causing to hospitals all over the United States; and

4. The A.P.H.A. protests the apparent unwillingness of the Social Security Administration to give serious consideration to the deficiencies in the Medicare formula or to the consequences of these deficiencies as they pertain to:

a. Replacement value depreciation,

b. Obsolescence losses,

c. The community-wide load of charity and bad debts,

d. The encumbered income required to maintain necessary levels of operating cash, inventories, and accounts receivable,

e. Principal payments on loans for facilities expansion,

f. Principal payments on loans for modernization or extensive rehabilitation,

g. Principal payments on cost reducing investments which can be paid for from reductions in expense,

h. Principal payments on loans for providing operating capital,

i. Principal payment on indebtedness as noted previously, whether it involves existing or future capital obligations.

Until effective methods can be agreed upon to measure the full costs of providing hospital care, the A.P.H.A. maintains that increasing the present 2% allowance to 7% would provide a modest and minimally acceptable substitute.

5. A.P.H.A. recognizes the obligation of voluntary hospitals to all age groups, and firmly believes that hospitals cannot continue indefinitely with a contractual agreement for reimbursement at less than full economic cost for Medicare patients; and

6. The A.P.H.A. observes that the Voluntary Hospital System and the Private Practice of Medicine have jointly contributed to an outstanding and generally excellent health system, maintains that the system can improve along with medical and technological progress, and can expand to meet many unfulfilled needs in accordance with local and regional hospital plans providing that under-financing is eliminated as a barrier; and

7. The A.P.H.A. will publicize its position on the rejection of the present Medicare reimbursement formula, and will do everything within its power to seek adequate and equitable payment, and will actively seek the support of others to attain this objective.

Adopted by the House of Delegates January 23, 1967.

Approved by the Board of Trustees January 24, 1967.

COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am very pleased that President Johnson has called for an extension of the Community Mental Health Centers Act, in his message today on education and health.

Our communities needed Federal help in 1963, when the law was first enacted, and they need it now. Under this act, we will have assisted States and communities in providing mental health services to 44 million Americans by the end of 1967.

If the act is extended—and I hope the Congress will grant President Johnson's request—we can expect 135 million people to benefit in the coming 5 years.

The people in our States and local communities have been willing to put their money and manpower into combating and treating mental illness. The Federal funds provided under this act have brought rich returns in cooperation at all levels of government.

In Maryland, Federal grants totaling $758,000 to local communities are aiding construction of mental health facilities at Prince Georges General Hospital in Cheverly, and Holy Cross Hospital in Silver Spring; and providing staffing funds for the inner-city community mental health center in Baltimore. The Maryland Department of Mental Health received $99,600 in fiscal 1967 for staffing, in order to develop such services as alcoholism outpatient clinics and local mental health day centers to enable those who need treatment to get it while living at home with their families. Federal funds have also supplemented in-service training programs at all Maryland State hospitals and aided many State hospitals in improvement programs. And federally financed mental health research projects are developing new knowledge in subjects such as group therapy and psychopharmacology at Johns Hopkins University, and at the University of Maryland.

For the patients themselves—whether they are emotionally disturbed children or elderly persons suffering the mental diseases of old age—our efforts to develop services in the communities mean an end to isolation in a distant hospital, removed from family and familiar surroundings.

It is reassuring that President Johnson has recognized the accomplishments of this program and the need to continue such a promising beginning.

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Federal Government has supported the development of educational television for almost 5 years. We have made substantial progress in increasing the number of operating stations. The time has now come, however, as the President has made abundantly clear in his education message, for us to move dramatically in the direction of not only more educational television facilities, but also higher quality educational television programing and services.

The President has proposed a magnificent plan which is aimed at strengthening every facet of educational television. The added funds for the construction of facilities and purchase of equipment will bring us measurably closer to our goal of a high-power color signal for 90 percent of our population.

The proposal to establish a public corporation is imaginative and, in time, will lead to a remarkable upgrading of educational television programing. The concept of the public corporation has the added advantages of enabling the Federal Government to promote quality while simultaneously leaving the decisions for program content in the hands of local stations, where they rightfully belong.

Not only will the proposed public corporation stimulate the production of high quality programs, it will also encourage the training of highly qualified persons to work in educational television. If educational television is to compete successfully with the programs produced by commercial stations, it will require greater numbers of creative and skilled personnel. The President's proposal will take a large step toward recruiting and training such people.

In addition to the advantages for the improvement of educational television programing and the stimulation and upgrading of recruitment and training, the President's proposal for a public television corporation will attract the attention and support of a wide range of philanthropic individuals and corporations and, thus, will enable educational television at last to acquire the depth and breadth of financial aid it has needed for so long.

Though not calling for a large outlay of funds, I think it is, nevertheless, important to emphasize that the President's proposal also asks for an extensive study of television as it is used in instructional settings. If we are to meet adequately the pressing problems of both the pupil population explosion and the knowledge explosion, it may well be that instructional television is our answer. Thus, it is vitally important that we take the time and money today and invest it in planning for the optimum use of instructional television for tomorrow.

Finally, I would like to call your attention to the fact that the President's proposal will enable educational radio at last to come in for its share of support and encouragement. The events of the television era, as remarkable as they are, have amply demonstrated that radio yet can play a vital function. It is time we planned to use it well, and to capitalize upon its unique benefits.

Television and radio are remarkable examples of modern technology at its best. The time has come, however, when we must begin to adapt the benefits of this technology to education. I strongly believe that the President's proposals will be a dramatic step in this direction.

DELIVERY OF HEALTH CARE

I also commend the President for his recommendation for a new center to study and improve our methods for the delivery of medical care.

All of us, I know, have been heartened and delighted by the tremendous accomplishments of our medical scientists. We have read with excitement about their new discoveries—new surgical operations, new diagnostic methods, new drugs to cure infections, new vitamins and hormones, new agents to control mental disease.

It is true, our physicians tell us, that today we possess the knowledge which can prevent or cure a host of age-old diseases. It is true that we possess the knowledge which can bring better health and added years of productivity to most Americans.

But it is also true—as we have seen too often with our own eyes—that this lifesaving knowledge is not reaching millions of our people.

Too many children, this year, are being crippled by forms of heart disease which we know how to prevent.

Too many women, this year, are dying from forms of cancer which we know how to detect and how to control.

Too many people, this year, are suffering from infectious diseases which we know how to cure.

It is tragic when any child or any adult suffers or dies from a disease against which our physicians are helpless. But it is infinitely more tragic, and, totally unpardonable, when any individual suffers from an ailment when an effective treatment is known but not applied.

We can no longer allow our limited supply of skilled health professionals—doctors and dentists and nurses—waste their precious time doing routine jobs which less skilled assistants can do equally well.

We can no longer squander the time of our health workers by having them perform tasks which can be handled as well or even better by electronic devices.

We can no longer dissipate our support for health facilities in building new hospitals and new nursing homes and new clinics according to the styles that might have been good enough for the 1920's and the 1930's, but which are not good enough to meet the needs of the 1970's and the 1980's.

We can no longer let outmoded methods of health financing block patients from getting the care, the high quality care, they need, where they need it, and when they need it.

Unless we can develop the improved methods to provide the requisite application of our available knowledge, we will have wasted the tremendous investment we have already made in dollars and in the dedicated efforts of our scientists.

We cannot waste this investment. We cannot let this opportunity escape. We cannot avoid this responsibility.

I urge my fellow members to join with me in supporting the creation of a National Center for Health Services Research to improve the health of all Americans.

FISHERIES, MARITIME FACILITATION AND CUSTOMS TREATIES

Mr. LAUCHE. Mr. President, there are on the Executive Calendar of the Senate the following treaties:

Executive H, 89th Congress, second session, Exploration of the Sea Convention.

Executive T, 89th Congress, second session, Notes amending the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries.

Executive U, 89th Congress, second session, International Convention for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas.

Executive Q, 89th Congress, second session, Convention of Mar del Plata on Facilitation of International Waterborne Transportation.

Executive R, 89th Congress, second session, Convention on Facilitation of International Maritime Traffic.

Executive K, 89th Congress, second session, Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Professional Equipment.

Executive L, 89th Congress, second session, Customs Convention on the ATA Carnet for the Temporary Admission of Goods.

Executive M, 89th Congress second session, Customs Convention Regarding ECS Carnets for Commercial Samples.

Executive J, 89th Congress, second session, Customs Convention on Containers.

Executive N, 89th Congress, second session, Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods Under Cover of TIR Carnets.

Since the majority leader plans to call up these treaties for a vote tomorrow, I thought it might be helpful for the Senate to have explanatory statements available before they are considered.

FISHERIES TREATIES

The first group of treaties before the Senate includes the three fishery items Nos. 1, 2, and 3 on the calendar: The Convention for the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (Ex. H., 89th Cong., 2d sess.); the notes amending the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries (Ex. T., 89th Cong., 2d sess.); and the Atlantic Tuna Convention (Ex. U., 89th Cong., 2d sess.).

They all have the same basic aim of conserving the living resources of the seas. This is accomplished through the establishment of commissions which study these resources and on the basis of these studies recommended conservation measures to the participating countries.

The International Council for the Exploration of the Sea is concerned with fishery resources in the Atlantic with particular emphasis on the Northeastern Atlantic. It was established in 1902 and the United States was briefly a member of it before World War I. It is now getting its first formal constitution and the administration thinks it is desirable to have the United States be a party to it again because of its broadening scope, the important and growing fisheries and oceanographic programs of our country and the fact that this Council works closely with other organizations of which we are a member.

The Great Lakes Fisheries Commission obviously is concerned with the Great Lakes. A rather minor amendment to the original convention approved in 1955 is before the Committee, enlarging the Commission from six to eight members, with three instead of four appointed from each the United States and Canada. The enlargement is to give representation to the Eastern Great Lakes States, since the Commission until recently had been mostly concerned with the sea lamprey problem in the Western Great Lakes and representation on the Commission was drawn from the States bordering those lakes.

The Atlantic Tuna Convention concerns tuna and tunalike fish in the whole Atlantic. Is is very closely patterned on the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention of 1949 which deals with cod, haddock, flounder, and the like. Like it, it provides for a commission to study the tuna and formulate conservation measures to be recommended to the participating countries. None of these recommendations will be binding on the United States if we disapprove of them. The exploitation of tuna in the Atlantic has been on a rapid increase and in the eyes of United States and other fishery experts the time is at hand to prepare conservation measures.

My subcommittee held hearings on these fishery matters on February 7 and, so far as is known, there is absolutely no opposition to these treaties. In fact, on the Tuna Convention we had two specific endorsements from the Tuna Research Foundation and the American Tunaboat Association.

Conservation is certainly in the highest U.S. tradition and for that reason, the Committee on Foreign Relations recommends that the Senate advise and consent to ratification of these treaties.

MARITIME FACILITATION CONVENTIONS

The two conventions in the next group—Nos. 4 and 5 on the Executive Calendar—the Inter-American Convention on Facilitation of International Waterborne Transportation—Executive Q, 89th Congress, second session—and the Convention on Facilitation of International Maritime Traffic—Executive R, 89th Congress, second session—deal with paperwork for ships on international voyages. Their common aim is to reduce and standardize the number of papers, the entries on these papers, and the number of copies, that ships have to leave with authorities at ports upon entering and leaving.

The two conventions follow the pattern established by the International Civil Aviation Organization—ICAO—for airplanes in international flights, which makes possible their rapid processing through international airports. These treaties are expected to speed up ships on international voyages and thereby reduce the costs to shipowners, travelers, and the shippers of goods.

The conventions themselves pledge the parties to adopt all appropriate measures to facilitate and expedite international maritime traffic and to cooperate in securing the highest practicable degree of uniformity in formalities, documentary requirements, and procedures in relation to the entry and clearance of vessels. The annexes to the conventions list the eight basic papers which may be required by port-of-entry officials; namely, general declaration, cargo manifest, ship's stores declaration, crew's effects declaration, crew list, passenger list, the Universal Postal Convention mail document, and the maritime declaration of health. The type of information and number of entries for each of these pieces of papers is further spelled out in detail.

I might add that the annexes of the conventions are not subject to ratification. To the extent that presently there exist differences between the standards and recommended practices contained in them and U.S. laws and regulations, these differences will be passed on to the administering authorities of the conventions, and will continue to exist until such time as our administration decides to eliminate them by asking Congress to enact appropriate legislation, if such is necessary.

The hearing, by my subcommittee, on February 7 brought out only favorable testimony by executive branch officials. To their knowledge, there is no opposition to these conventions. The subcommittee itself received letters urging approval from the Pacific American Steamship Association, the Labor-Management Maritime Committee, the American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., and the Propeller Club of the United States.

At the hearing I wondered why we need two separate conventions which are so very much alike. It appears that the Organization of American States—OAS—became active in this field first and drafted the Inter-American Convention. Then the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization—IMCO—became interested and drafted the international one. The State Department recommends approval of both, so that the simplified standards will have the widest possible application.

Mr. President, I recommend that the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of these treaties.

CUSTOMS CONVENTIONS

This last group of treaties before the Senate—Calendars Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10—are also designed to assist our international commerce. As the President states in his letter of transmittal, our accession to them "will aid the American export drive."

Briefly, they deal with or are related to the temporary importation of certain equipment and the papers, or so-called carnets, which cover these importations. The first treaty in this group—the Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Professional Equipment—Executive K, 89th Congress, second session—provides for temporary—about 6 months—duty-free entry of all kinds of professional equipment, TV cameras, and so forth. An instance where this would be useful is the case of an American broadcasting company sending a crew to Europe to cover an important event. The second treaty—the Customs Convention on the ATA Carnet for the Temporary Admission of Goods—Executive L, 89th Congress, second session—provides for the issuance of a document, which the U.S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce has agreed to do, to cover this temporary importation so that bonds do not have to be posted for this equipment.

The third treaty—Customs Convention Regarding ECS Carnets for Commercial Samples—Executive M, 89th Congress, second session—does the same for commercial samples covered by the International Convention To Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Material which we approved in 1956. Again, the U.S. Council of the International Chamber will issue the carnet to make posting of bonds unnecessary.

Under both of these conventions the U.S. Council will be responsible for paying the duty that would otherwise be due, if the items covered do not leave the country within the proper temporary period.

The fourth convention—the Customs Convention on Containers—Executive J, 89th Congress, second session—provides for duty-free temporary entry of those big containers, like lift vans and movable tanks, which are being used increasingly in international trade. They must be of permanent construction, so they can be used repeatedly and must meet other standards.

The last convention—Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods under the cover of TIR carnets—Executive N, 89th Congress, second only session—concerns the contents of these containers when they are moved by road and spells out a system of documentation that will provide for inspection and payment of duties only at the final point of destination and not at each border crossing. In an area like Europe, the advantages of this carnet system are obvious.

The common aim of all these treaties is to make it easier for our citizens to do business abroad and vice versa. The fact that the American business community has a deep interest in these treaties is attested by the large volume of favorable mail that the committee has received on them. As a matter of fact the Committee on Commerce, of which I am also a member, has urged approval in particular of the container convention. I know of no opposition to these treaties.

Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations recommends that the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification of these treaties.

YOUTH AND THE CHALLENGE OF OUR CITIES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on February 14, the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Percy] delivered the Senior Week address at Villanova University, one of the great universities of my Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Senator Percy's theme was "Youth and the Challenge of Our Cities," and his remarks were aimed at inspiring today's young people to involve themselves in urban problems, as career urban administrators and managers, as volunteers, and as the future shapers of the urban policies of our two political parties.

I am pleased that the Senator from Illinois had the opportunity to visit two of Philadelphia's outstanding efforts to improve life for urban people: The Reverend Leon Sullivan's Opportunities Industrialization Center and the Lambert Street Home Ownership project sponsored by the Interfaith Interracial Council of the Clergy, both of which he commends in his speech.

I commend Senator Percy's remarks, especially to young people, upon whom will fall the task of putting into practice so many of the plans conceived today for imroving our cities and creating better lives for their people. I ask unanimous consent that Senator Percy's Villanova address be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

YOUTH AND THE CHALLENGE OF OUR CITIES

(Senior Week address by U.S. Senator Charles H. Percy, Republican of Illinois, at Villanova University, Villanova, Pa., Feb. 14, 1967)

Professor Charles Abrams, perhaps the dean of America's urban scholars, has said:

"In our own era, the world's cities are witnessing their greatest surge in man's history. Everywhere, hordes of people are leaving the hinterlands in quest of the city's opportunities . . . Our civilization is becoming urban, and the advance into cities is one of the most spectacular social phenomena of our time. The city has become the frontier."

Yes, today the city is the frontier. It is, to be sure, a far different kind of frontier that William Penn found here in Delaware County nearly 300 years ago. But like the great American frontier of the 18th and 19th Centuries, today's urban frontier is fraught with challenge and risk—and opportunity.

Daniel Boone and Jim Bridger had an advantage over the urban pioneer of 1967. At least they pushed ahead into unspoiled wilderness, where streams ran clear and cold, and the plow turned the rich black dirt three and four feet thick across the prairies.

By contrast, the urban pioneer confronts a depressing scene.

Traffic clogs our streets.

The smoke and soot and smells of our industrial society pollute the air we breathe.

Our lakes and rivers have become sludgy cesspools of raw sewage and industrial waste.

Our urban green space has given way to the axe and grader, leaving only treeless concrete prairies for the playgrounds of our children.

Once stately and respectable buildings decay, first slowly, then rapidly, into wretched slums.

And compounded with these physical problems of the declining central city are the far more tragic and baffling problems of wasted human beings—poverty, unemployment, juvenile delinquency, vice, disease, violence, and, perhaps most distressing of all because it is the hardest to combat, the feeling of alienation and despair that inhibit the slum dweller from striving to improve himself and his environment.

The key question of our day is this: how can we make our cities truly a place for man—not just a *location* at which he exists, but a psychologically and emotionally satisfying habitat in which he may grow to his full potential?

Some answers to that question are beginning to emerge from the recent but growing dialogue of concern over the crisis of our cities and their people. I want to discuss a few of them this evening. But first I would impress upon you that even if *my* generation begins to discern a valid approach to revitalizing urban life in America, it is your generation upon whom will largely fall the responsibility for putting plans into full practice.

What shape the American city will take depends on your response; on your readiness to meet challenges more complex and intractable—and certainly more subtle—than the challenge of landing a man on the moon.

The problems of the slum—both physical and psychological—are not the only problems of urban America today. But I wish to address myself to those problems—and to the part you can play even now in overcoming them—because of the pressing need to salvage the millions of today's slumsdwellers from continued lives of squalor, dejection, and despair.

First, ironically, the problems of the slum have been aggravated by the well-intentioned efforts of government itself.

Thus urban renewal, aimed at replacing slums with decent housing and taxpaying commercial buildings, has had the concomitant effect of uprooting the poor, destroying established neighborhoods, and producing new slums, even as modern middle-income apartments and shopping centers took the place of the old.

Public housing, once so enthusiastically advocated as the answer to the low-income housing problem by the professors and planners, has fallen far short of their expectations. Though the great public housing highrises which line South State Street in Chicago are structurally sound, and though they have fewer rats than the slums they replaced, human dignity and decency in them is commonly far lower than in the older slum neighborhoods that they replaced.

This preoccupation with the idea that government action was *the* answer was accompanied by a disinterest in the potential contributions that private enterprise and the independent, non-profit sector could make to improving our declining central city areas. But today the revitalization of the slums requires that these enormous resources be brought to bear on their many-faceted problems.

Mere lip service to private enterprise is not enough. Our national policy must be reoriented to generate the maximum involvement of the private sector—business, labor, the professions, the universities, the non-profit associations—in creating new opportunities for today's slums and slum people. The role of government should begin to emphasize reinforcement and guarantee, rather than execution and control.

Second, through the myriad Federal-aid programs for central city housing runs the unhappy theme of dependence.

The public housing dweller is at the mercy of the housing authority.

The below-market mortgage insurance program is available only for rental projects, not ownership projects.

The new mortgage insurance program enacted last year to promote urban home ownership has been deliberately blocked by administrative action in Washington.

The rent subsidy plan, heralded last year as such an advance, makes the city dweller doubly dependent—once upon the landlord, and once upon the government.

The plain fact of the matter is that home ownership in much of urban America is today rapidly becoming the preserve of the well-to-do—or at least the well-to-do who haven't fled to the more congenial suburbs.

To those who might profit by it most—the low-income families confined to public housing and slum tenements—it is not available.

For more than anyone else, the poor man yearns for and needs the roots, the security, the identity that are so much more common among his more affluent fellows.

For a man who owns his own home acquires with it a new sense of dignity and self-esteem. The ancient adage that "a man's home is his castle" reflects the venerated values of home ownership.

The home owner begins to take pride in what is his own, and pride in conserving and improving it for his children. He becomes a more steadfast and concerned citizen of his community. The act of becoming a home owner, of realizing its implications and opportunities, transforms him. It gives him roots, a sense of belonging, a true stake in his community and its well-being.

The overriding imperative in the Nation's war against slums is devising a way of making the values of ownership—particularly home ownership—available to families who presently cannot share them.

I do not pretend this will be easy. But I *do* maintain that it is time we got to work at it.

A third characteristic of the slum problem is the historic separation of the people responsible for housing and the people responsible for education, training, social services, and welfare.

On one hand are the housers. They think in terms of bricks and mortar, contracts and balance sheets, bulldozers and credit ratings.

On the other hand are the welfarists. They think in terms of warm clothing, job finding, day care, case work, and child tutoring—the human problems of low-income neighborhoods.

Both of these groups have the improvement of slum life at heart. But each view is obviously incomplete. And, unfortunately, the bridge between them has been fragile and precarious at best. Thus, housing development programs all too frequently ignore human values, and the anti-poverty, education and welfare programs all too often fail to combat the depressing effect of the urban environment.

No program for helping slum people and rebuilding urban slums can succeed if it focuses exclusively on housing, or on jobs; or on training, or on education, or on welfare, or on any one other single problem. They are all woven together and will have to be overcome together.

A fourth aspect of the slum problem is the widespread attitude that poor people should not be allowed to get into the act except as recipients—props and not actors on the stage of life.

That attitude is widely held by a whole array of skeptics. Many reasons can be advanced in support of it. The simple—and to me compelling—reply is this: that unless slum dwellers can be encouraged to involve themselves in self-help programs that prove to them that *what they do can make a difference,* the chances for getting them out of perpetual dependence and moving up the ladder to economic security, self-reliance and dignity are small indeed.

This, too, may be a heartbreaking task; for there is a maddening inertia among the downtrodden poor that resists the most concerted efforts to generate their involvement and action. But the fact that it is difficult is a poor excuse for not trying.

Now around those four principles—private sector involvement, home ownership for lower-income families, a coordinated effort to grapple with the whole range of slum problems, and a new emphasis on self help and personal involvement of the poor—I believe a progressive program for revitalizing our cities can be based.

On these principles I have tried to devise a concrete plan. It is ambitious in its scope and pioneering in some of its particulars. I do not pretend that it is the last word on anything. But it is a beginning.

I would charter a new, private, non-profit National Home Ownership Foundation to serve three of the essential functions of rebuilding present declining areas.

The Foundation would have a Loan Fund, financed by the sale of tax-exempt, government-guaranteed bonds to private investors or to government. From it loans would be made to local non-profit associations conducting housing rehabilitation programs. With the proceeds of the Foundation loan, the local group would buy up sound but rundown buildings, contract for their rehabilitation, and sell them to neighborhood residents who have demonstrated their readiness to accept the responsibilities of home ownership.

The Foundation would also aid the local association in arranging supporting programs to help potential home owners secure basic education and job training, find a job, move up on that job, learn to handle the responsibilities of home ownership—credit buying and money management in particular—and generally begin to take part in activities that help to build a genuine community—out of what was formerly an aggregation of isolated individuals.

To ensure that the loan money was used wisely and well—and as a prerequisite for it—the National Foundation would provide the local group with the necessary technical assistance in program planning and management. Here, if any one provision can be so labelled, is the key provision of my home ownership plan.

For the crucial element in making a local community development project work—especially if the rehabilitation of housing and the making of real estate transactions are involved—is the competent administrator. There are few commodities in such scarce supply.

The project administrator cannot just be a specialist in housing finance.

He cannot just be knowledgeable about construction techniques.

He cannot just have a rapport with low-income slum families.

He cannot just have contacts with religious, business, union, and civic leaders and local, state and Federal government agencies.

He must be *all* those things and more.

A staggering task? Yes, but an exciting task too.

A task fit for pioneers.

A task fit for young people like you.

For this task demands as well as ordinary competence the qualities so characteristic of youth—idealism, dedication, driving energy, motivation to achieve.

No pioneer marching westward toward Cumberland Gap ever confronted such a baffling challenge. And none of you tonight are likely to have such a sparkling opportunity to grow and build and achieve—and learn to overcome reverses along the way.

There are several ways in which you can begin.

You can explore a career in the urban development field. In the last few years a growing number of universities have created departments or centers of urban studies. The Federal Government has available a limited number of Fellowships for City Planning and Urban Development. That number should be increased, and I will propose a doubled appropriation to one million dollars annually for that purpose.

Under the same Act the Department of Housing and Urban Development is authorized to make matching grants to states for programs in cooperation with universities to train technical and professional people for employment with governmental urban affairs agencies at the local level. Senator Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut has already introduced legislation to expand this authority to permit the training of young people and slum residents for work in local neighborhood development projects. I support such broadening legislation, and I will urge the immediate funding of this program, which to date has never been funded by Congress.

But the great majority of you will most likely not choose to make a career of urban development. Does that mean you cannot have a hand in shaping the future of today's slum neighborhoods, and creating new opportunities for people who yearn for the same opportunities most of us so lightly take for granted.

Far from it.

For today, as never before, young people are getting involved on a purely volunteer basis in projects and enterprises to help others help themselves.

In Washington, D.C., hundreds of housewives are tutoring slum children.

In Lansing, Michigan, hundreds of Michigan State students are doing the same thing.

In Indianapolis, over a thousand people have joined the Voluntary Advisory Corps, sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce, to help unemployed workers get and keep new jobs.

In Hartford, some 500 college graduates and professional people contributed to helping potential high school dropouts stay in school and then go on to college and careers.

And I could never overlook the time and effort of the many volunteers who have operated the Call For Action program—through which slum residents can get help with housing code enforcement—sponsored by my own New Illinois Committee in Chicago.

Right here in Philadelphia Reverend Leon Sullivan has started a quiet revolution which has already spread to some 65 American cities—the Opportunities Industrialization Center. Through it Philadelphians of every race, color, or creed who have insufficient skills to move up to jobs now open are given the basic education and training they need to start up the ladder that leads to security and success. Rev. Sullivan and OIC need the assistance of people like you. You will find OIC's number in the phone book.

Just one mile away from OIC on Lambert Street the Interfaith Interracial Council of the Clergy is making poor people the owners of beautiful four-room homes with oak flooring, mahogany paneling, wrought iron railings, and tile bath and all new gas kitchens for an incredibily low $53 a month! How do they do it? You can find out how—and give your invaluable assistance too—by calling Father Finley at Our Most Precious Blood parish.

Now there are two ways you can personally do battle against the slums. You can make it a career, or you can volunteer to help an organization already active in the field. And there is as yet a third way. It is to begin to shape the policies of the two great political parties to make them more responsive to the needs of urban America.

For the fact is unmistakably clear: with the great majority of American voters living in urban areas, the party which most effectively appeals to them with responsible programs for dealing with urban problems, will be the majority party of America.

And I want to say to you right now, that I firmly believe that the Republican Party, over the next few years, is going to become the Nation's majority party again *precisely* because it is going to do a more creative and effective job of coming to grips with the problems of urban America.

I hold that belief for a number of reasons.

First, America's cities are in trouble. Since they are in trouble, their people are in the market for change. And receptivity to change is the first great prerequisite for any significant shift in party loyalties.

Second, the party long in power—and for most practical purposes the Democratic Party has been in power since 1933—is at a serious disadvantage when it comes to generating new ideas.

When Franklin Roosevelt took office in 1933, and again when John F. Kennedy took office in 1961, there was a great flood of new ideas and new directions for national policy. The obvious symbol of that New Frontier spirit of 1961 was the Peace Corps—loaded with bright young men and women who worked enthusiastically day and night to create something new and important.

Perhaps equally symbolic, however, is President Johnson turning off the lights of the White House. There is no doubt but what the President is sincerely trying to grapple with the new problems of our age. But the ideas and exuberance that accompanied his predecessor's rise to the Presidency are now difficult to find. Instead, one sees on every side in Washington orthodoxy, bureaucracy, ossification, a sort of hardening of the arteries of goverment.

Third, by contrast, the Republican Party that emerged so revitalized from the 1966 elections is eager and aggressive, full of zest and sass and vinegar. It is generating new ideas and attracting bright new people.

Perhaps some of you saw the Meet the Press program of last month featuring the five new Republican Senators. I won't speak for myself, but I believe the American people were deeply impressed with my articulate and forceful freshmen colleagues—Mark Hatfield of Oregon, Cliff Hansen of Wyoming, Ed Brooke of Massachusetts, and Howard Baker, Jr. of Tennessee. The same applies to many new Republican House members and Governors.

And I would hardly come here to the Quaker State and not mention your bright new face in Harrisburg, Governor Ray Shafer, and the great Republican Senator from Pennsylvania, who after two productive decades in Congress has never shown a sign of intellectual fatigue—Senator Hugh Scott.

The Republican Party today has got the action. The Republican Party, and not the Democratic Party, has become the party of ideas. Those with youth and talent and bright ideas to contribute, those who in 1961 flocked to join President Kennedy's New Frontier, are today increasingly looking to the Republican Party for a home.

Fourth, the character of the Democratic organizations in most of America's big cities is just not attractive to the public spirited young American whose ideas are so vitally important to the future of the cities.

The stale cigar smoke of backroom city politics holds no enchantment for the young people whose ideas and talents our cities must have. But that is all the Democratic Party, in city after city across the country, can offer today.

For those reasons, then, I believe that the Republican Party has the golden opportunity to win the allegiance of urban America, and especially of its bright young people.

The Republican Party is now making a strong new effort to attract young people—through what our National Chairman Ray C. Bliss calls "Opportunities Unlimited". We must prepare a home for young Americans in the Republican Community, a base from which their ideas can be usefully channeled into the official party policy-making machinery. To fail to do so would be to forego a potential asset of inestimable value.

Once when Henry Clay was Speaker of the House, a notoriously long-winded Congressman was delivering a ponderous oration on the House floor. "I speak for posterity," the Congressman thundered. "Yes," said Speaker Clay, "and the gentleman seems resolved to hold the floor until the arrival of his audience."

So I have spoken my piece to you tonight. It has been a great privilege to come to Villanova and be with you. Thank you so much for your invitation.

PROPOSALS FOR PRESIDENT'S COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING IN EDUCATION COMMENDED BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, among the legislative recommendations that President Johnson has presented to Congress is one in particular to which I invite the attention of my colleagues. Especially meritorious is the proposal to amend title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to authorize grants to the States to assist them in establishing programs of educational planning and evaluation.

Education continues to be one of the vital concerns of the Nation. Last year our total expenditures for school training were more than $50 billion. Approximately half of the people in the United States are directly served by an educational institution or program of one type or another. The future strength and vitality of our country depends on the quality and direction of the educational opportunities made available to more and more of our citizens.

In almost every other sector of our society, a large portion of the expenditure of funds and of effort is invested in planning and evaluation. But in education the time, effort, and money invested for planning are minimal in comparison to the overall expenditure.

The educational needs of the Nation cannot be met unless the States are able to fully share the responsibility and to acquire competency for rational long-range planning. This cannot be achieved without financial assistance. If we want the States and the local school boards to provide effective leadership in education, they must be capable of accurately evaluating their educational needs, and finding ways to plan and to meet these requirements.

I believe the amendments proposed to title V are essential to the improvements we seek in the field of education. In the final analysis, Mr. President, the quality of our schools depends on the wisdom and resourcefulness of our local communities and their leaders. And it is here—in the local school district itself—that the President hopes to see achieved the kind of improvement in the quality of American education that will be worthy of our most precious resource—our children.

I urge prompt enactment of this proposal, and, as a member of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittee on Education, I will support the principle of our administration's recommended title V amendments.

SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH AND REPRESENTATIVE GEORGE FALLON, CHAIRMEN OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER THE HIGHWAY DEFERMENT ORDER, REPORT PROGRESS SUFFICIENT TO RECESS HEARINGS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, at the close of the joint hearing today of the Committees on Public Works of the House, and the Senate, Representative FALLON and I made the following statement:

> Mr. Schultze, with the assurances that you have given us, coupled with the testimony of Secretary Boyd yesterday; and President Johnson's press conference; and based on our desire to support the administration in its fight against inflationary pressures that still prevail to a reduced degree; and our belief that the administration is committed to a meaningful highway program, we feel that there is no further need for continued hearings at this time. We would hope that as conditions change, as indicated in the testimony received from you today, Mr. Schultze, you will consult with us on any future efforts in which the highway program is involved in an implementation of Federal fiscal policy.
>
> Our concern in these hearings was based on our deep and abiding interest in the Federal aid program. We realize the serious impact this deferment of funds has had on all segments of the highway industry. We would not have shared our responsibilities as Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate had we not held these hearings. The information you have presented to us and to the public makes for better understanding.
>
> Too often necessary actions are misinterpreted because of a failure of communication.

We commend your concern for achieving maximum utilization of the highway construction dollars contributed by millions of highway users throughout the United States.

We reiterate that continued consultation beween the executive and legislative branches on these problems of national concern will obviate certain misunderstanding and will contribute to our joint efforts to meet the problems of our Nation and our citizens.

The testimony of the administration witnesses during the past two days has answered our most pressing questions. Therefore the chairmen of the joint committee have agreed to recess these hearings at the call of the chairmen.

The record will remain open until March 10 for all witness statements and supplementary material.

THE IOU OVERCHARGE

Mr. **METCALF**. Mr. President, a principal inflationary cost in millions of family budgets is the overcharge in the electric bill.

This extra consumer cost is not generally recognized, for several reasons.

First, there is a lack of understanding of monopoly pricing. The IOU's—investor-owned utilities—rates are not established in the marketplace. To determine whether a utility charge is excessive you compare the "allowed" rate of return established by a State regulatory commission with the actual rate of return earned by a utility. Few utilities earn only the "allowed" rate. Utility overcharges in many cases are increasing even though the rates are decreasing, because of the sharply decreasing costs of producing and distributing electricity, thanks to interconnections, nuclear generation, larger plants, technological developments and because of the failure of State regulatory commissions to regulate.

In 1946 the return on invested capital of the investor-owned utilities was 5.6 percent. The IOU's averaged 6.2 percent return on invested capital during the 1959-63 period, according to Edison Electric Institute, the IOU trade association. The 35 principal electric utilities, which account for about two-thirds of the industry's profits, averaged an 11.4-percent return on invested capital in 1965, according to Fortune. The electric utility rate of overcharge is increasing more than the bank rate of interest is increasing.

A second reason for the lack of general understanding of utility overcharges is the misleading advertising and public relations program of the investor-owned utilities. The utility promoters have done as much for the managers—if not the customers—of the IOU's as Samuel Insull did when he invented State regulation of electric utilities and had his people help write the laws which make regulation ineffective.

Because of this misleading advertising, financed with customers' money:

First. The growing overcharge in electricity bills is believed to be the biggest bargain in the family budget;

Second. The Nation's largest, safest monopoly—which enjoys 110 percent of parity or more in good times or bad—is considered a prime example of risky, competitive free enterprise;

Third. The electric utilities, through keeping more taxes than they pay, are gratefully cited as the Nation's largest taxpayers, and

Fourth. Customer-owned, locally managed power systems are considered socialistic, while absentee-owned, proxy-managed utilities are equated with junior's lemonade stand and the local mom-and-pop corner grocery.

This remarkable inversion of real life by incessant utility advertising is the biggest hoax since Phineas T. Barnum hoodwinked the public into paying to see his "Feejee Mermaid," contrived of monkey and fish. And it is pertinent to point out that the creator of utility advertising techniques, Samuel Insull, "may be called the link between P. T. Barnum and Madison Avenue," according to the recent biography of Insull which received friendly reviews in the industry press. Forrest McDonald, "Insull," Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1962.

The third reason for the lack of understanding of utility overcharges is the one which I want to discuss in some detail today. It is the mercenary misrepresentation of basic utility matters by men who know better.

I regret having to make a charge which reflects upon a former high Government official. It is, however, in my considered opinion, essential to sound government to put aside the myths that surround the utility business and begin a discussion based on realities.

It is bad enough when utility propagandists misrepresent facts. It is worse when men who have held positions of trust and respect in the National Government become a party to an instrument of deception.

Mr. President, I was appalled and saddened to read in a recent issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—February 16, pages 3610-3611—a letter written by a former White House assistant, during the Kennedy administration, who formerly served on a regulatory commission.

The letter was written by Myer Feldman to Robert H. Fite, president of Florida Power & Light. Mr. Fite had asked Mr. Feldman, now a Washington attorney, to review legislation introduced in the 89th Congress dealing with exemption of certain utilities from jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. Mr. Feldman prepared for Mr. Fite proposed legislation to exclude the utility from FPC legislation. In his accompanying letter, Mr. Feldman wrote Mr. Fite, as follows:

> No public purpose would be served by transferring jurisdiction (of Florida Power & Light) to the Federal Power Commission. On the contrary, the public would have to pay for unnecessary duplicate surveillance, electric bills would go up instead of down, expenses would increase substantially, and the Company, its customers, and its investors would be prejudiced.
>
> This is clear from the history of the Company. Over the past decade there have been nine rate reductions, almost one every year. If the original rates, prior to the reductions, had been in effect last year, consumers would be paying over $100 million more for their electricity. This is a tribute to both the Florida commission and the company. Federal jurisdiction would reverse this trend, for the company would, by its estimates, have to pay between $500,000 and $600,000 a year more to meet the accounting requirements of the Federal Government. This cost would necessarily be passed to the consumer.

Mr. President, in the first place, no serious student of regulation can say that Florida electric utilities, especially Florida Power & Light, have been subject to meaningful regulation, except perhaps in very recent times, in circumstances which I shall describe. The chairman of the Florida Public Service Commission testified in 1965, in response to a question by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], during hearings on S. 218, that "the best regulation is little or no regulation." An experienced reporter for the Miami Herald, Mrs. Juanita Green, attempted without success in 1964 to find out from the Florida commission the rate base of Florida Power & Light. She was told, by the director of the commission's finance department, that "where it is, if it still exists, I don't know." Utilities, unlike free enterprise business, receive a percentage of their rate base or investment. So that sorry state of affairs in Florida is comparable to a situation where a county assessor could not show an ordinary taxpayer his assessment.

Second. It is pure poppycock to assert, as Mr. Feldman did, that Federal jurisdiction would cause electric bills to increase. The cost of producing and distributing electricity is steadily decreasing. Monopoly pricing is essentially different from pricing of competitive products or services. Despite slight rate reductions the excess profits of the IOU's are growing ever larger, because of the cost reductions made possible by regional and now national power grids, nuclear power generation, larger and more efficient plants, and because the savings are not being shared equitably with utility customers.

The return on invested capital of Florida Power & Light was 12.3 percent in 1964. The company's rate of return was one of the most exorbitant in the Nation—8.72 percent, as compared with 7.74 percent in 1961. Had the Florida Public Service Commission kept profits down at the 6.98 percent "allowed" rate which it set for the company some years ago, many millions of dollars in overcharges would have remained with the company's customers.

The principal rate reduction granted Florida Power & Light's customers results neither from the initiative of the company nor the initiative of the commission. It stems rather from the fact that the city of Miami, tiring of overcharges, hired an aggressive utility consultant, and the fact that the Miami Herald decided to cover the utility beat and report on the real world of electric utilities.

Mr. President, Mr. Feldman's reference to accounting requirements also deserves comment. Florida Power & Light is one of the many examples of IOU's which presently disregard the reasonable accounting requirements of the Federal Power Commission. Not long ago the FPC requested Florida Power & Light to itemize more than $400,000 in contributions and other expenses during 1963 which the utility had accounted, contrary to regulations, as a lump sum, and also, incorrectly, as an operating expense to be borne by the customers. In response to the FPC request, the company still did not itemize more than $125,000 in "public relations," "educational" and "donation" expenditures. Interestingly enough, the company did, when pressed for details, report spending more than $1,000 that year on subscriptions to Public Service magazine, a publication which, as the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] pointed out years ago in "The Public Pays," has been part of the IOU's propaganda transmission system for decades.

Public Service magazine is a conglomeration of speeches and articles by leaders of the IOU's and of the extremist organizations which the utilities endow, with your and my money. Among the organizations which receive these special favors from the IOU's and Public Service magazine are the Southern States Industrial Council—which claims that UNICEF is "completely Communist dominated" and that civil rights legislation is Communist inspired, Industrial News Review—the editoral service which distributes to 11,000 editors each week two editorials which praise the investor-owned utilities, Harding College—which in cooperation with the John Birch Society produces and distributes films and pseudoeducational material to schools and civic organizations, the Foundation for Economic Education—whose recommended literature is for the most part also found on the recommended reading lists of the John Birsch Society, and the American Economic Foundation—which is the organization of Fred Clark, who has been fronting for the utilities ever since the fight over the Public Utilities Holding Company Act in the thirties.

Let me cite another example of the accounting practices of Florida Power & Light. In 1963 it cosigned with three other Florida IOU's—Florida Power Corp., Gulf Power, and Tampa Electric—an advertisement which put a Communist connotation on the Federal Power Commission's requirement that power companies account for political ads as a nonoperating expense, to be borne by stockholders rather than customers. According to this ad:

> A "Berlin Wall" (is) being built in America . . . constructed of subtle and gradual curtailments of traditional American freedoms.

And the FPC "laid the first brick" by its accounting regulations. When queried concerning this ad, Florida Power & Light told the FPC:

> The ad was neither reviewed or approved by the chief executive officers of this company. In fact, our name was included by mistake and consequently this company will not participate in the cost of the ad.

That was a new twist. The customers of other power companies would pay for the smear ad that bore Florida Power & Light's signature.

Mr. President, the performance of Florida Power & Light does no credit to the electric power industry, the Nation's largest. Mr. Feldman's performance is certainly no credit to his background.

State commissions have been saddled with impossible jobs and inadequate laws and staffs. We talk of the regulatory lag, but it is the regulatory lapse which should concern State and Federal officials. The supposedly regulated industries account for more than one-fifth of all business in this country, and men with knowledge and responsibilities need to examine and update the regulatory process.

SIGNING OF THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES BILL

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, nearly a year and half ago, it was my privilege to be present at a unique White House ceremony, the signing of the arts and humanities bill. That was a historic occasion, for it marked the first time in our history that the Federal Government had committed itself to the active support of artists and writers in our society.

I recall very well the moving and eloquent words that President Johnson spoke at that ceremony:

> In the long history of man, countless empires and nations have come and gone. Those which created no lasting works of art are reduced today to short footnotes in history's catalogue. Art is a nation's most precious heritage. For it is in our works of art that we reveal to ourselves, and to others, the inner vision which guides us as a nation. And where there is no vision the people perish.

Last week, Mr. President, the distinguished Director of the National Gallery of Art, Mr. John Walker, delivered a most learned and enlightened address on this very subject at the college of William and Mary at Williamsburg, Va. In it, he paid high tribute to President Johnson's historic contributions to the arts and humanities.

He said:

> Mr. Johnson has intuitively felt than in art people hope to find antidote for man's spiritual poverty.

I share Mr. Walker's point of view, and I ask permission to insert the full text of his speech in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Two Presidential Attitudes: Jefferson and Johnson on the Fine Arts

Ladies and Gentlemen: It is a great honor to be here today. As a graduate of Harvard I have always taken pride in the belief that my Alma Mater was the first college established in North America. It was therefore disconcerting to find that only an Indian massacre prevented Virginia from having a college some eighteen years before Massachusetts. Between 1618 and 1622 at Henrico near Richmond money and land for a university were allocated by the Virginia Company of London. But in that fatal year, 1622, the ferocity of the Indians annihilated alike parents and future students; whereas in New England the aborigines were milder and the Puritans flourished. Thus Harvard survived; while Virginia had to wait more than half a century for William and Mary to become the second college in our country.

Being only second it tried harder. Inspired by Thomas Jefferson, William and Mary took American leadership in a number of fields, among them the use of the elective system of study and the establishment of the first Chair of Law and of Modern Languages. But more important for our ceremony today is another priority. At William and Mary in 1779 the Fine Arts became a part of the curriculum. This is almost a century before Fine Arts were taught at Harvard or at any other American university. In that year, 1779, the Reverend Robert Andrews was made the "Professor of Moral Philosophy, the Law of Nature and of Nations, and of the Fine Arts," a combination curious to us but not to the 18th century. It is appropriate that this new Fine Arts wing of Phi Beta Kappa Memorial Hall bear his name.

How I wish there were preserved a syllabus of his course or courses, his notes, any scrap of evidence which would enlighten us about this earliest of American experiments in granting to the history of art an academic status. Probably two texts used were Edmund Burke's *On the Sublime and Beautiful* and Lord Kame's *Elements of Criticism*, since we have a record that in the late 18th century these two works on aesthetics were on sale in the College bookshop, which was then located in the Virginia Gazette Office.

The writings of Burke and Kames were also well known to Thomas Jefferson; and it was the third President of the United States to whom William and Mary owed its early pre-eminence not only in the Fine Arts but in other academic disciplines. For as you know it was under the influence of Mr. Jefferson, then Governor of Virginia and a member of the Board of Visitors, that William and Mary became a university—at that time probably the most distinguished to be found in the New World. As we have no evidence which will reveal Robert Andrew's approach to the Fine Arts, we may assume that he was inspired by his far-greater contemporary, the Governor of Virginia and future President of the United States. Under the circumstances I thought it might be suitable to reflect on what the arts seem to have meant to Mr. Jefferson; and then, since we are meeting almost two centuries later, to speculate on what they mean today to another President, to Mr. Johnson.

Two centuries have brought about an immense change. The enjoyment of the Fine Arts has become more democratic than even Thomas Jefferson, the great Democrat, would have believed possible. Our museums have now an attendance larger than our baseball parks; school children in the millions are taken to view public collection of paintings and sculpture; each week sees the establishment of a new museum or art center.

It was different in the 18th century. In the summer of 1786 Mr. Jefferson in the company of two of his closest friends, John Trumbull and Maria Cosway, visited great collections in and around Paris. He concluded that paintings and statuary were "Too expensive for the state of wealth among us."

His conclusion was probably right. We had to wait for the age of the Wideners, the Mellons, the Kresses, to draw on the resources necessary for the great American collections. However, Thomas Jefferson would have felt as little sympathy for the gentlemen I have mentioned as they would have felt for him. Mr. Jefferson was a versatile genius—unequalled in the history of the United States—but he would have been a wretched museum director! He believed the collecting of art was "to give a pleasing and innocent direction to accumulations of wealth which would otherwise be employed in the nourishing of *coarse and vicious habits*." "Coarse and vicious habits," indeed! Can you imagine a museum director pointing out to a potential donor that but for his art collecting he would be busy nourishing his coarse and vicious habits? With Thomas Jefferson as Director that vast, marble structure on Constitution Avenue, which is our National Gallery of Art, would still be as empty as the day it was finished.

I mentioned John Trumbull and Maria Cosway. The lives of these two painters were closely entwined with Mr. Jefferson's. Trumbull introduced him to Mrs. Cosway, the wife of the miniaturist, and herself an able artist. Mr. Jefferson fell in love. Trumbull acted as go-between. Mr. Jefferson was Minister in Paris, the most romantic of cities, and he had as his companion a lady of such fascination that two hundred years later I find myself equally in love with her. Judging by their correspondence, which remained unpublished until fairly recently, their affair was short-lived. Only death, however, ended their affection for each other. The letters they exchanged over many years are extraordinarily touching.

Maria Cosway was a lady who attracted men. In London society she was the subject of scandalous gossip. Many love affairs were attributed to her. Horace Walpole doubted the paternity of her child. She was supposed to have gone off to Italy with an opera singer. But in the end her redemption was complete. She ended a career of the gayest immorality as the Headmistress of a girls' school. Her experience must have enabled her to set her pupils on the correct worldly path.

She was less successful in setting Mr. Jefferson on the right artistic path. His taste in painting remained erratic. He wrote Maria Cosway from Germany, "At Dusseldorf I wished for you much. I surely never saw so precious a collection of paintings. Above all things those of Van der Werff affected me the most. His picture of *Sarah Delivering Agar to Abraham* is delicious. I would have agreed to have been Abraham though the consequence could have been that I should have been dead five or six thousand years. Carlo Dolci became also a violent favorite. I am so little of a connoisseur that I preferred the works of these two authors to the old, faded red things of Rubens. I am but a son of nature, loving what I see and feel, without being able to give a reason, nor caring much whether there be one. At Heidelberg I wished for you too. In fact, I led you by the hand thro' the whole garden."

To prefer Van der Werff and Carlo Dolci to Rubens shows the courage of one's convictions, but not the benefit of a discerning eye.

Mr. Jefferson in this letter indicates that he is more interested in the subject matter of art than in its presentation. This was to be expected. He was living in Paris at a time when the Neo-classicists valued content above form. As he wrote, "I do not feel an interest in any pencil but that of David." His concept of the role of painting and sculpture was the same as David's. Both believed the arts should inculcate virtue, orient the mind toward republican heroes, and foster patriotism. Both believed in an art filled with social content.

The avant garde today would find President Jefferson's aesthetic theories totally unacceptable. As far as art is concerned, to use their language, he was "out of it"! On the other hand, President Johnson is "with it" when he says, art "flourishes most abundantly when it is really free—when the artist can speak as he wishes and describe the world as he sees it without any official direction."

Mr. Jefferson, however, was himself an artist. His belief in the importance of painting, sculpture, and above all architecture, profoundly affected the new republic. "His enthusiasm for the arts, he wrote Madison in 1785, was one 'of which I am not ashamed, as its object is to improve the taste of my countrymen, to increase their reputation, to reconcile to them the respect of the world and procure them its praise.'"

Almost two hundred years were to pass before we find again among the speeches and writings of our Presidents so positive an affirmation. This enthusiasm for the arts reappears in the address delivered by President Kennedy in 1963 at Amherst. He said:

"I look forward to an America which will steadily raise the standards of artistic accomplishment and which will steadily enlarge cultural opportunities for all of our citizens.

"And I look forward to an America which commands respect throughout the world not only for its strength but for its civilization as well."

President Johnson has brought to realization many of President Kennedy's hopes. It has not been easy. Americans have always been basically utilitarian. It is true, as Mr. Johnson has said, "We in America have not always been kind to the artists and the scholars who are the creators and the keepers of our vision. Somehow, the scientists always seem to get the penthouse, while the arts and the humanities get the basement."

In this I believe Mr. Jefferson was not unlike other Americans. There is reason to think that he too would have put his scientific tenants in the penthouse and his artistic tenants in the basement. But this is understandable. America in his day was young and had to be practical. As John Adams wrote, "I must study politics and war that my sons may have liberty to study mathematics and philosophy . . . . in order to give their children a right to study painting, poetry, music, architecture, statuary, tapestry and porcelain."

We have now reached this last generation. Winds of change have blown across our country. These have swept the arts into new directions. The third President and the thirty-sixth President have different views on the Fine Arts. That Mr. Jefferson was a great architect and a diligent student of the humanities, while Mr. Johnson is neither, is not the explanation. Instead the change is the product of time and environment. In America in the 18th century painting and sculpture were related to the rural culture of the young Republic; a culture resembling that of Rome in the days of Horace, one of Mr. Jefferson's favorite poets. Our third President looked on works of art when privately owned as the amenities of a balanced, harmonious existence such as he enjoyed at Monticello; or when publicly owned as a means of instructing his fellow citizens in the history and virtues of their country.

The visual arts today have a greater complexity of purpose. They are related to an urban culture: a culture which at its best is gay, frivolous, sophisticated; at its worst filled with tension and anxiety, with loneliness and despair. The arts are called upon to stimulate and amuse or to heal and give hope.

As Mr. Johnson has said in a recent speech, "Science can give us goods—and goods we need. But the humanities—art and literature, poetry and history, law and philosophy—must give us our goals. We have the material power to conquer economic want. Now we need the will to attack the poverty of man's spirit."

Mr. Johnson has intuitively felt that in art people hope to find an antedote to man's spiritual poverty. Contemporary life has its dreary and monotonous aspects. Existence is more standardized than ever before.

Art, on the other hand, is not standardized. It is the free expression of the spirit. It sometimes points out the humor, the charm, the significance underlying our environment. If one Campbell soup can resembles another, then Andy Warhol paints them row upon row with a gloriously mocking, comical effect. If our super-highways and clover-leafs are monotonous d'Arcangelo and Indiana show that they also contain a hidden beauty. If our cities are stark and lonely, Hopper humanizes them with a girl, her clothes blown against her body. And if we feel alienated, our identity lost, a sculptor like Segal, gives our trivial, meaningless gestures significance, makes us feel a part of humanity, no longer isolated or alone.

Thus art offers a remedy, makes life more bearable in "our age of clatter and buzz, of gape and gloat," to use Winston Churchill's description. Ours is an age when art alone keeps us from living lives not of quiet but of noisy desperation.

In Mr. Jefferson's time less of a burden was placed on art. Painters and sculptors were asked only to be good decorators or useful propagandists. They were not explorers of the unconscious, investigators of the nature of vision, searchers for beauty in the ugliness of our environment. Society depended on them less than it does today. In our contemporary culture artists have been called upon to perform new and complex functions.

Yet the economics of our time make it difficult for them to carry out these functions. There are, of course, artists who have become fashionable. They present no problem. But there are also painters and sculptors who work alone, who see nature not with the eyes of a movement, who create with their own special sensitivity. These are the artists to be pitied. Too often the shows are closed to them, too often their canvases or statues remain unseen, their work unrecognized. But this does not destroy their inner conviction, often right, that the future will welcome their achievement when they are no longer alive.

For such artists some form of subsidy has become necessary. Mr. Johnson is aware of this. Consequently we have the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities—in my opinion a noble experiment which will play a great role in your future.

Doubtless many of those who will study in the building we are dedicating today will sometime or another be affected by this new agency of our Government. Each year the National Endowment for the Arts will distribute millions of dollars in grants to painters, sculptors, musicians, dancers, museums, art centers, theatres, etc. Mr. Jefferson would have been astounded at this governmental generosity. Our third President was not ashamed of this enthusiasm for the arts, but he saw no necessity for their subvention. He believed in patronage not subsidy. Today the situation has changed; and though there are more consumers of art, yet in relation to the number of artists, there are fewer discerning patrons.

The intellectual climate has also changed. In the 18th century art was taken for granted; it required no justification. With time we have grown more self-conscious; we are always reminding ourselves of the importance of the Fine Arts. In this regard President Johnson has spoken with great eloquence. "In the long history of man, countless empires and nations have come and gone. Those which created no lasting works of art are reduced today to short footnotes in history's catalogue. Art is a nation's most precious heritage. For it is in our works of art that we reveal to ourselves, and to others, the inner vision which guides us as a nation. And where there is no vision the people perish."

These are noble words. The building we are dedicating today is proof that the Commonwealth of Virginia believes them to be true words. The State has erected this superb edifice with studios for sculpture, painting, the graphic arts, architecture, and photography. There will also be lecture rooms and seminar rooms for the teaching of the history of art, and space for an audio-visual library containing thousands of photographs and slides.

The College of William and Mary for 188 years has placed its stamp of approval on the teaching of the Fine Arts, and this new building shows that the leadership established in the 18th century in this discipline has not been lost. This is a clear affirmation that in the second oldest college in the United States the Board of Visitors, the President, and the Faculty, believe that a knowledge of art will strengthen men's faith in humane values, and also that such knowledge will give some of you assembled here this morning the power to convey your inner vision in visible form.

Thank you.

THE CONSULAR CONVENTION AND THE EAST-WEST TRADE BILL—DANGEROUS BRIDGES

Mr. **HRUSKA**. Mr. President, last week I suggested to the Senate that any decision on the consular convention with Russia be deferred until an opportunity had been had to consider all the other aspects of the President's program to "build bridges" to the Communist countries.

It was and is my contention that this consular convention and the East-West trade bill, the treaty on the peaceful uses of outer space, and perhaps other measures which may be proposed are parts of a single large package which should all be studied together. Possibly they will stand or fall together as a unit; at least, they should all be studied as a unit, so that we may clearly understand to what further steps we may be led if we now approve some one of these proposals.

One of the favorite themes of this administration has been that the expansion of our trade relations with the Communist countries of Eastern Europe can be a force in easing world tensions, breaking up the control of Communist Russia over its smaller neighbors, and leading all those countries to reject the dogmas of Communist economics.

It is an appealing, attractive, in fact seductive idea. It is pleasant to believe that we can somehow reform our enemies—peacefully—and at the same time make some money for ourselves. It would be nice if it were possible.

Unfortunately, there is never any easy way out of a hard problem. A recent article entitled "Dangerous Bridges," published in Barron's weekly, should bring us back to earth. In this article it is shown that the administration's bridgebuilding program is a construction of tissue paper, based on faulty premises and flimsy logic.

Spokesmen for the administration speak of trade, but what they mean is aid. As the article well points out, the nub of the issue is U.S. credits, not U.S. aid. Increase of our normal trade cannot help the Communist bloc much, since there is little they produce that we need. The real meat of the coconut is in the tendency toward longer and longer trade credits.

The article points out that the Communists have already built up a trade debt to foreign creditors, chiefly Western Europe, of $2 billion. Our own Export-Import Bank will give credit guarantees of as much as 5 years in some cases, certainly much too long a period to be considered normal short-term trade credit in any sense; and the pressure is now on from our foreign competitors to push these credits to 10, 12, or 15 years. Credits of such a duration cannot be called trade financing; rather, they are a form of subsidy.

Furthermore, this foreign aid—no other term is appropriate—instead of weaning those countries away from Communist economics, has rather permitted their ruling regimes to avoid the necessity for change. The failure of Communist centralized economic control has been apparent throughout the bloc, or would have been without the financial strength borrowed from the West. They have used our money to strengthen their control over their own people, and to fight off the demands for reform from within.

All these facts are demonstrated with convincing reasoning and a wealth of detail in the article which I ask to have printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Barron's, Jan. 16, 1967]

Dangerous Bridges—Proposals for Expanded East-West Trade Rest on Shaky Ground

(Note.—In last week's State of the Union Message, President Johnson urged new measures to expand U.S. trade with the Soviet bloc. In the accompanying article, Brutus Coste and Hal Lehrman, authorities on Communism in Europe, make a convincing case against such proposals.)

Among the articles of faith in Washington, none is more hotly professed than the doctrine of "Bridges to the East." It holds that American trade can seduce the countries of the Soviet bloc away from Socialist rigidities toward a capitalist-style economy, with East-West amity and possibly even political freedom at the end of the line. This belief began growing earnestly in 1964, when signs of "independence" from Moscow became visible in State Department telescopes aimed at puppet Red Rumania.

"So naive that it borders on the grotesque," said the official Slovak Communist newspaper "Pravada," in a typical comment on the notion that the carrot of American machinery and technology might convert the Marxist donkey. But such Communist candor failed to daunt U.S. policymakers, perhaps because the scoffing was restricted to local consumption in local languages, while Red broadcasts aboard, declarations by bloc leaders and informal talks with foreign diplomats, reporters, and stray businessmen hinted of native nationalism, economic liberalism, evolution toward freedom and other hopeful developments.

President Johnson pointed his first "bridge of friendship" eastward in the summer of 1964, when thousands of American commodities were delicensed for export to Rumania, which also was promised delivery of whole industrial plants with Export-Import Bank financing. Last October the President held out the prospect of a whole network of bridges to the Red countries, including the Soviet Union: "Our task is to achieve a reconciliation with the East—a shift from coexistence to peaceful engagement. We seek healthy economic and cultural relations with the Communist states." Specifically, he announced: 1) clearance for the Export-Import Bank to guarantee commercial credits for Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland and Bulgaria; 2) the Bank's readiness to finance export of American equipment to a large Soviet auto plant which Italian Fiat will build; 3) imminent decontrol of certain commodities for sale to East Europe.

Six days later some 400 items previously barred from export to the Soviet bloc without special license—including metal manufactures, machinery and chemical products—were expunged from the Commerce Department's Commodity Control List. Since then Congress has confirmed Mr. Johnson's authority to produce Export-Import Bank guarantees of credit for "any Communist country . . . when the President determines such guarantees in the national interest." The U.S. has raised to embassy rank its legations in Bulgaria and Hungary (the latter is still the refuge of Roman Catholic Primate, Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, hiding there from the Russians since the Red Army shelled the 1956 Budapest uprising into rubble. Under Secretary of State Eugene M. Rostow has urged a joint effort by the free world's industrial powers and the U.S. for "peaceful economic engagement" with East Europe. Awaiting the 90th Congress are two Administration "bridge" bills, one a Convention allowing the Soviets to establish a series of consulates here, the other an East-West Trade Relations Act extending most favored nation treatment to those European Communist states not yet so favored (Yugoslavia and Poland already are).

Disquiet has been expressed by an occasional Senator or Representative, an editorial or column, and a few economists and businessmen. By and large, however, industry has shared the enthusiasm for increasing East-West trade. When the U.S. Government set up recent business missions to Rumania, Poland, Bulgaria and Hungary, the Commerce Department crowed that "we had no lack of candidates anxious to participate." A high-speed October tour of East Europe sponsored by "Time" had a roster reading like a Who's Mostly Who in U.S. Business and Finance.

Formidable academic support for "peaceful engagement" has come from Zbigniew Brzezinski, a ranking specialist on East Europe and inventor of the term. Brezezinski, now on loan from Columbia University to the State Department's Policy Planning Council, is credited with having furnished the main intellectual inspiration for the idea of prodding satellite and Soviet "evolution" through wide economic and other stimuli. Roost concepts in his "Alternative to Partition" (Council on Foreign Relations, 1965) were borrowed by the Johnson and Rostow speeches cited above.

Despite the near-unanimity, however, American parents, taxpayers and entrepreneurs have cogent reasons for withholding their hurrahs. One is that Moscow began pushing bridges long before Washington. Premier Nikolai Bulganin said in 1955: "Everything new being created by world science and technology must be studied, technical information improved, relations with research establishments and scientists of foreign countries expanded." Party boss Nikita Khrushchev in 1956: "The task is to pursue a vigorous policy of improving relations with the U.S., developing trade and expanding contacts." Premier Aleksei Kosygin in September 1965: "We must make wider use of foreign technology." No bones were made about the purpose, in Bulganin's words: "The struggle for technical progress is the struggle for the building of a Communist society."

A second good reason not to be over-awed by a proposition just because most policymakers and experts agree on it is that recent history bulges with consensus that went wrong. To cite a few exploded axioms: we can trust Joseph Stalin's wartime pledges on free elections in East Europe; let's let the Red Army get to Berlin first; the Chinese Reds are agrarian reformers; Fidel Castro is a patriotic anti-Communist; Arab unity and Egypt's Nasser are irresistible forces which the U.S. should appease and support.

One way to test the bridges proposition would be to examine some of the economic "facts" on which its widespread acceptance rests: 1) satellite defiance (especially Rumania's) has thwarted a Soviet drive for bloc integration; 2) satellite economic reforms are trending toward a Western structure; 3) another mark of the satellites' growing emancipation is their increased trade with the West; and 4) satellites have actually begun exploiting the USSR, reversing their previous condition of servitude.

Upon examination, these assumptions look more like fiction than fact. The evidence suggests instead that Moscow is the chief beneficiary of bloc non-integration; that satellite reforms have failed to shake the basic centralism of Communist management, leaving the concept, of a market-oriented economy as remote as ever; that the Soviets have upped their trade with the satellites as fast as the West; and that the USSR is getting more economic mileage, not less, out of East Europe since the dawn of so-called Red nationalism.

The data indicate further that increase of normal U.S. trade can't help the bloc much. East Europe exports little that we need or could accept in payment. The nub of the issue is U.S. credits, not U.S. trade. And U.S. credits given freely, without a Communist quid pro quo, will defeat our purpose.

The Reds' war-emphasis allocation of investment, and their adoration of an inflexible god called The Plan, have hobbled their economic development with producer muddle and consumer crisis. Their only way out is via genuine reform. They must face up to decentralization, higher rewards for labor, greater initiatives for management, real adaptation of Western market techniques (not merely of U.S. technology) and a shift from armaments to better-quality exports. But this they will not do unless compelled, because such reforms would reduce the Party's totalitarian power.

Yet only this, and nothing else, can build a sturdy bridge. There is a chance if we use the bargaining power of our credits which the bloc so desperately needs. There is a second chance if we abstain, and the bloc is forced to adjust by its own internal stresses and (in satellite territory at least) by the necessities of population discontent. There is no chance whatever, if we subsidize the regimes as they stand.

LOOK AT THE EVIDENCE

To justify these conclusions it will be useful to look hard at the evidence behind them. Consider, first, the theory that plucky Rumania prevented the Soviets from integrating the bloc's economies. A typical statement of the theory—with an air of absolute verity—is J. W. Fulbright's passing reference in a Senate speech that the Rumanians had "defied the Russians in refusing to subordinate their economy to a Soviet-sponsored program for joint economic development of the Soviet bloc . . . (and in) undertaking to strengthen (Rumania's) economic independence by broadening their industrial base."

The bridge-building chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee was saying that the Soviets had tried to impose a so-called "socialist division of labor" on Comecon—the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, East Europe's answer to the Marshall Plan. Each Comecon member was to specialize in what was best for the bloc rather than for itself; all the satellites obeyed—except Rumania, a "defiance" which wrecked the Soviet design.

But the truth is that Comecon integration was wrecked by the region's built-in economic confusions, which made a "socialist division of labor" simply impossible. Moreover, Rumania was only one of several members which insisted on "broadening their industrial base" instead of serving as sources of raw materials. Foremost and decisive among such recalcitrant members was the USSR.

West Europe could achieve an operating Common Market because the area possessed systems of adjustable internal tariffs, convertible currencies, an infra-structure of independent economic units competing under fairly equal terms and a reasonably free play of market forces. East Europe could not integrate because it traded inside itself by barter instead of money; had no independent economic units, no solid currencies and no internal tariffs to adjust; and was entirely innocent of competition.

Integration might still have been possible if Comecon could figure out objectively which member might produce what item at what cost for equal quality, and make assignment of tasks accordingly. But this was unattainable in the area's accounting nightmare of artificial money rates and non-economic State-manipulated "costs" beyond the reach of rational audit.

ANGRY DEBATE

Soviet economic journals have been angrily debating for three years just how production cost should be defined. Rumanian money is a normal example of the bloc's currency chaos: the lei's official rate for foreign trade is six to the dollar; for individual remittances abroad it is 12; for foreign tourists 18; for Rumanian tourists 30; official Rumanians abroad have to pay back 60 lei for every unaccounted dollar; the lei's real purchasing power, meanwhile, is 25 to 1.

Out of the horse's mouth ("Hospodarske Noviny," economic review of the Czechoslovak Communist Party's Central Committee, July 22, 1966) has come the revelation that Comecon's only worthwhile "multilateral coordination" has been a mere "exchange of information," and this only to "pinpoint the main problems" in any planning to be done "after 1970"! The review goes on to lament that "Comecon members still face one another as closed economic units."

Can believers in bridges glean more comfort from a second canon in their credo, the one which professes that Western aid has inspired, and will continue to inspire, a gradual fading-away of Communism through economic reform in the Western image?

Washington considers Rumania the likeliest candidate for such liberalization. So it is curious that Rumania stands last in line among the satellites on even minimal change. A full year after U.S. commitment to the Rumanian bridge, Communist chief Nicolai Ceausescu (in July 1965) informed his Party Congress that no reform would occur; he stipulated that decentralization of State controls—the key to meaningful change—"is not Rumania's way of doing things."

CURIOUSER AND CURIOUSER

It is curious that the "rebellious" idea of modifying the totalitarian economic structure also was invented by Soviet Russians. Nikita Khrushchev was the first, gingerly, to attempt decentralization, in 1957. In the early 'Sixties, Kharkov University Professor Y. Liberman began his daring advocacy of market-economy concepts like profitability and managerial initiative. Liberman is the basic text for the debate flourishing ever since in Soviet and satellite (except Rumanian) economic circles.

Khrushchev tried for geographical decontrol by replacing 10 central and 15 republic industrial ministries with 104 regional economic councils (Sovnarkhozy). His announced purpose was to spur local economic flexibility, but the real aim was to strengthen Khrushchev's provincial Party henchman against his opponents in the Moscow bureaucracy. Weakened in the Cuban-missile confrontation, Khrushchev was compelled by his critics in 1963 to accept a Supreme Sovnarkhoz, which brought the reins back to Moscow. After his downfall, the regional councils were suppressed.

Some modification of the Command Economy (though far short of effective) was allowed in 1965. Managers got the right to discharge unproductive workers, but no say in distribution of plant production. A bigger chunk of "profits" was left to the individual enterprise, but no curb was placed on the arbitrary pricing system which operates independently of supply, demand or true cost and makes profit meaningless. The slow-grinding three-tier administrative structure—State Planning Commission (Gosplan) over Industrial Ministries over Individual Enterprise—remained. As noted in the U.S. Information Agency's bimonthly "Problems of Communism," the "reform measures do not even begin to eliminate the fundamental deficiencies of Soviet economic management."

Similar defects are rampant among the satellites. Despite much talk and some patchwork nowhere (except Yugoslavia) has any dent been made on the two major obstructions: know-nothing control of economic decision by the Red political apparatus, and management according to Marxist prejudice, rather than according to the marketplace.

GLUTTING THE WAREHOUSES

Thus it was possible, at the Zabrze-Zakrzow Metal Works (as reported by the Polish press), for an unusually alert plant director to notice that demand for large refrigerators was dropping and a shortage in small ones rising; for him and his workers' council to recommend that next year's plan should increase output of smaller models 70% at the expense of big models; for the far-away central planners to reject this and order more big models than the preceding year, on grounds that small units would require extra labor and some overtime pay, thereby upsetting the indices for jobs and wages already concocted by the Ministry. So the big units were inexorably manufactured—to join some 60,000 unsold units already glutting the local warehouses.

This characteristic satellite example in Poland dates not from 1950 but from 1965-66. It suggests that, after years of ballyhoo and change, things remain very much the same. On decentralization, the much-advertised reforms have tended to restrict the top echelon of the Command Economy to long-range strategy, leaving tactical decisions to a lower level: "Trusts" in Czechoslovakia, "Industrial Associations" in Poland, "Associations of People's Enterprises" in East Germany, and so forth.

The exiled Polish economist Michael Gamarnikow, a brilliant student of satellite economics, has analyzed the aberrations of these agencies in the magazine "East Europe" (July 1966). They are a cross between cartel, combine and holding company, controlling the finances and administration of component enterprises, their targets and production. Being smaller than the old bureaucratic units, their deluge of directives is less torrential, but they merely interpose still another institution into the superstructure. Appointable and fireable by the Minister, the Trust Director reports to him, preserving the old political "transmission belt." Top Trust positions are mainly filled by people from the old apparatus. As one satellite journalist has put it, "Only the name of the institutions on the door has changed. The persons inside, their habits and attitudes, remain the same."

CLING TO THEIR POWER

Some variations of a limited free-price system are being introduced requiring enterprises to pay some attention to what the market, i.e. the consumer, wants. But there is small sign that the central planners are ready to make these valid by yielding or reducing their arbitrary rule over production costs and profit. They cling to their power to fix prices of raw materials, semifinished products, fuel and power, the size of total payroll and individual wages, the wholesale and retail prices of finished goods.

For authentic profitability, price increases would be inescapable in the Communist systems. Production costs would have to rise if only because interest would have to be paid on capital for the first time and subsidies reduced or ended. Nevertheless, not one of the published East European economic blueprints contemplates any real compensation in higher personal earnings. Underpaid labor and exploited peasants (subject to arbitrary low prices for their produce) would remain the chief sufferers. So long as the State dominates all the other production costs, managers trying for a better profit performance would have little room to maneuver except by discharging superfluous workers. (Experimenting cautiously with higher wages and reduced work-force in a few plants, the Soviets were amazed to discover that labor productivity soared by 31% when 7% of the workers were dismissed.)

ARE THEY UNLIKELY?

Why are such forms unlikely? Mobility of labor, for one thing, raises the specter of political contamination. Consumed-goods production, for another, takes capital away from rockets, moon probes, heavy industry, guns. Surrender of production and investment controls deprives the Party faithful of jobs and strips the Party of influence. So would the necessary closing of profitless enterprises, many of them huge status symbols built during the Stalin era and maintained only by State coverage of their deficits. Nationwide services like housing—now provided at nominal rents—would have to be charged at cost plus. All this would bring social—and potentially political—disturbance.

Confronted by such menace, the Red regimes are marking time with half-measures—and peering westward for rescue without risk or obligation. Even where, as in Czechoslovakia, 1,300 inefficient enterprises were shut down in 1964–65 and the abolition of another 1,400 is projected for 1966–70, the net result is considered virtually nil by local observers ("Procrastination as a Planning Principle," in "Prague Reporter," July 16, 1966). "It will be impossible," says the Polish weekly "Polytyka" (August 8, 1966) "to lead our economy into clear water without correcting the price and wage structure or, to put it bluntly, without introducing such a structure, because there has been no such thing in our economy. . . ."

Another pillar beneath the bridges policy is that the rise of satellite trade with the West reflects East Europe's gradual emancipation from the Soviet Union. Ergo, Washington argues, still larger trade means still larger emancipation.

GOT THERE FIRST

Once more it must be reported that the Russians got there first with the idea. In June 1958 the Soviet government formally proposed increased trade to the U.S., offering substantial orders for American equipment (if we would arrange the credits) to advance a multibillion-dollar expansion of the Soviet chemical industry. The following January, Anastas Mikoyan, as Soviet Deputy Premier, journeyed to Washington specially to request removal of trade restrictions and grant of large long-term credits. He got a short answer then, but his arguments and his shopping bag have been dusted off by present U.S. advocates of business deals with Communism.

It must also be noted that satellite trade with the free world has been developing at no faster rate than Soviet trade with the free world—or satellite trade with the Soviets. Rumania's non-Communist trade went up from 27% of its entire foreign trade in 1960 to 35% in 1965, a rise of eight percentage points. In approximately the same period the USSR's trade with non-Communists went up seven points, from 29% in 1960 to 36% in 1964. From whom was the USSR emancipating itself?

During the same time, Poland, whose emancipation we have long been overtly fostering by trade concessions and economic aid, actually cut down its business with the West from 43% to 39%. Meanwhile, satellite trade with the USSR, which East Europe was supposed to be rejecting in its turn westward, rose from 37% in 1960 to 40% in 1964, the latest year available for full comparative data. Rumania stood third-highest among the six satellites in her level of exchanges with the USSR. This hardly sustains the thesis that Rumania is spearheading a Western orientation.

In some cases the West's increase in a satellite's trade does amount to more than the West's increase in trade with the USSR. Invariably the difference represents the value of Western credits. In other words, the West pays for such increases. Western Europe and Japan have been easier on credits to the satellites than they have to the Soviets. The titillating thing is that Moscow has not resented such discrimination. Recently released figures on 1965 Rumanian trade with Western Europe may tell why.

Thanks to credits, Rumania's unfavorable balance of trade with the six Common Market and the Outer Seven countries reached 490 million lei ($82 million at the foreign-trade exchange rate). By eloquent coincidence, this was almost the identical figure (495 million lei) for Rumania's favorable balance with the Red bloc. It represented a credit from Rumania to her Comecon partners in their barter economy. Thus, indirectly, but effectively, Western credits had been transferred by Rumania to the other Communist states, with the USSR getting the usual lion's share. Moreover, because the Soviets were continuing their notorious practice of charging more than world prices for Russian exports to Rumania and of paying less for imports from Rumania, Western credits were also fattening Rumania for further exploitation by the USSR.

Despite such pillage, the notion lately has grown current that the Soviet Union now is being exploited by East Europe, rather than the other way around. The satellites, it appears, get world-market prices from Russia for their inferior machinery, while paying "below cost" prices for Soviet food and raw materials. This view, very satisfying to members of the satellite-emancipation cult, derives its inspiration from Russian economic journals.

OVERCHARGES SATELLITES

Actually, as distilled by exiled Estonian economist Aleksander Kutt from the official Soviet annual survey of USSR foreign trade, Russia collected an extra $12.7 billion from the satellites in a single decade by overcharging and under-paying between 1955 and 1964. Instead of diminishing, this loss to East Europe has been on a mounting scale, from $503 million in 1955 to $2,251 million in 1964, the latest year officially recorded in full.

For 1965, Soviet figures specifically available on crude oil exports show the satellites still being charged more than the USSR's West European customers: Czechoslovakia had to pay 18.06 rubles ($20.07) per metric ton; Poland 17.11 rubles, East Germany 15.32—while Austria got the same ton for 10.98 rubles and Italy for 7.93 rubles. The 1965 price to the Czechs was 127% higher than to the Italians.

The myth that the satellites suddenly have begun exploiting the USSR is more than a Soviet effort to cover up chronic extortion. It provides a smokescreen of indignation for a new Russian drive to exact still higher prices from the captive nations for Soviet raw materials. These prices are to be based on production cost plus. Though above world level, the exorbitant charges previously levied on the satellites still do not make Soviet exports profitable. But this is due to the inefficient and uneconomic Soviet procedures which swell production costs.

FORCED LOANS

In June 1966 the authoritative "Voprosi Ekonomiki" summoned the industrialized satellites to invest in Soviet extractive industries if they wanted to continue getting raw materials. Czechoslovakia, Hungary and East Germany promptly agreed to give the USSR such loans. Soviet domination of East Europe's economy will only be strengthened if Western financing speeds industrialization in underdeveloped Rumania and Bulgaria. The more these require Soviet raw materials, the greater the Soviet bargaining power over them will be.

Thus four major economic props beneath the emancipation bridges have the solidarity of jello. There is also reason to suspect that even the traffic over the proposed bridges is radically not as described by White House, State, Commerce and other promotional U.S. agencies.

The Administration has specifically ruled out anything strategically useful: "In no case," according to the State Department, "does our policy permit trade with Communist countries in war materials and other strategic items." True, no U.S. bombs, missiles, tanks or other military goods have been sold direct to the Reds. But what about the so-called "gray area" items."

These are commodities or know-how which can be bellicose or pacific in application, depending on the good faith of the recipient. The Administration must consider Red good faith to be impeccable. Gray items get licensed for export when a "determination" is made they will be used for "peaceful purposes." Government spokesmen—among them, Assistant Secretary of Commerce Alexander B. Trowbridge, in a speech to the National Foreign Trade Council Convention on November 2 publicly congratulate themselves that more and more such goods are being approved whenever "demonstrated to us that the order is reasonable and necessary for the civilian economy." This has been going on "for some years" with Poland, Trowbridge rejoiced; "since 1964" with Rumania; and "more recently with other countries of Eastern Europe and the USSR." He added that the U.S. was also now okaying "some types of commodities and technology which we were not approving to any of them a few years ago."

Among gray shipments, listed by Congressman Glenard R. Lipscomb (R., Calif.) in a speech to the House on October 17, are: know-how to build a Soviet plant for glycerol, used in explosives; metal-cutting machinery to Bulgaria for ball bearings; piston-making equipment for Rumania; an aluminum-tubing mill for Czechoslovakia; steel mills and rotary combustion engines for East Germany; a chemical factory for Poland; radiation instruments and airplane navigational equipment for Hungary.

RANDOM SAMPLING

This is a random sampling from hundreds of war-useful items licensed: a list just for part of 1966 covers two full columns of small type in the Congressional Record. All are undoubtedly employable in peace, but easily convertible to war. One must conclude that Washington believes either that a Communist promise is as good as gold or that the risk of our troops somewhere getting hurt by a gray item turned black is justified by the boost which that item might have given a Communist economy.

Communist pledges never to detour strategic goods from "civilian" purposes would be dubious enough if the Red bloc were currently on its best behavior. But right now all its members are flagrantly helping the Vietcong war effort. Just in the past 12 months, Soviet ships have unloaded at least 50 cargoes at the North Vietnam port of Haiphong. Moscow Radio boasts (in its domestic service) about Haiphong wharves crammed with crates of equipment "from Soviet and Czechoslovak factories." After a personal inspection trip to Vietnam, Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield (who nevertheless still advocates bridges) officially reported the Vietcong was getting "full and firm support" especially from the Soviet Union, Poland and Rumania—the two satellites still regarded by Mr. Trowbridge as notably trustworthy. East German, Bulgarian and other satellite chiefs regularly reaffirm their direct aid to "the Vietnamese people's heroic defense against American imperialist aggression."

DEADLY WALLOP

An item need not even be "gray" in the strategic sense to pack a deadly wallop. The Vietcong transport for its guerrillas, weapons and supplies is donated largely by the Red block. Rumanian and Czechoslovak trade agreements with North Vietnam include vehicles; said Prague Radio (again only for internal broadcast): "We shall deliver . . . machines and equipment, means of transportation."

Yet, with Congressional approval, U.S. taxpayer money is being funneled through the Export-Import Bank to finance American equipment comprising 75% of the installations in the Soviets' Fiat-planned, $887 million auto plant, expected to produce 600,000 cars annually. As these roll off the line, it will be child's play to metamorphose them out of their "civilian" innocence.

Petroleum is another peace-loving commodity with a mortal kickback. Soviet oil dumping on non-Communist markets, to acquire foreign exchange for the USSR's industrial build-up, has been noted. This drive, also aimed at making under-developed African and Asian countries dependent on the Soviet by displacing Western oil suppliers, became so clearly perilous that the State Department two years ago issued an alert about it. A National Petroleum Council report (sponsored by the U.S. Interior Department) said that Soviet-bloc oil exports "furthers Communist political objectives, (with) penetration especially marked in Western Europe"; the Council warned that "Western equipment and technology would enhance the Soviet's ability to produce, refine and export oil." Yet one of the first moves in the Administration gambit for Rumania's "independence" was a 1964 license to help set up an oil refinery installation there with capacity of one million tons annually. Since then there has been a steady stream of approvals for petroleum drilling and oil and gas production equipment.

The real Red dilemma is how to pay for U.S. skills and equipment. They can pay only by borrowing. Not short-term credits, which lower the boom quickly, but long-term. Ultimately the logic of the bridge policy must compel such credits in bulk. Critics of the Administration see this as the most pernicious aspect of the program.

The Communists already have accumulated a cozy $2 billion commercial debt, largely in West Europe. Industrial sales approved or executed for Rumania are backed by five-year credit guarantees to U.S. business from the Export-Import Bank. The President now has Congressional authority, at his discretion in "the national interest," to command the Bank's support for more of the same with the entire bloc. His Special Committee on East-West trade deliberately advised him that "trade with Communist countries should not be subsidized." But this is what we are ready to do.

FORM OF SUBSIDY

A long-term credit to a Communist country is a form of subsidy, especially in the political sense. Five years is not "normal" short or medium term. Ninety days is normal when Western countries trade with each other, or six months, or possibly a year. The five-year term was originally a limit: the 1934 Berne Agreement pledged export credit institutions not to guarantee commercial credit for a longer period. But the U.S. has come to accept five years not as a limit but as normal.

So far, the U.S. has admittedly been urging other suppliers to restrict their bloc credits to five years, correctly contending that anything more is not trade but aid. But, in the context of the Administration's overall thinking, this clearsightedness is sure to dim. Meanwhile Japan and her West European competitors, in their race for Communist orders, have escalated to 7, 12 and even 15 years. The justification given is that a credit's duration should match normal amortization for complete factories and other major equipment like ocean-going vessels.

Ironically, though these interminable credits are called good business, and the Communists good risks because they have not defaulted to date, in no case will the Western businessman stir without a government guarantee of his risk.

THREE ALTERNATIVES

Opponents of the bridges policy see three alternatives on long-term U.S. credits: to grant the credits unconditionally; to withhold them absolutely; to pay them out gradually, each one in exchange for a specific concession leading gradually toward a genuinely favorable change in East-West relationships.

The Administration seems intent on the first choice. The critics find merit in the second; recommend the third; and consider the first potentially ruinous to the economic and political interests of the captive peoples and of the free world.

Credits without quid pro quo would enable the Red systems to continue operating as they are, slowing reform, freezing or scrapping it. This appraisal is not guesswork. Once assured of substantial U.S. credits in 1964, Rumania became the only satellite where even discussion of possible reforms was taboo. As soon as large-scale American aid for Poland was nailed down in 1958, the Communist Party there rejected a radical reform plan drawn by the Polish Economic Council the previous year. As long as American help was pouring in, Yugoslavia did nothing about liberal programs formulated in the mid-'Fifties; since the help dried up two years ago, the Yugoslavs have been racing to introduce economic incentives, managerial initiatives and other "capitalist" concepts.

Unconditional long-term credits simply would eliminate or relieve the bloc's acute pressures. Why bother to remedy the foreign-exchange pinch by narrowing the quality gap between Eastern and Western competitive products instead of concentrating on space exploration and armaments—if the U.S. obligingly waives the need for foreign exchange? Why decentralize management and reduce the Party's control, or decollectivize and allow the peasants to till their own land or form genuine cooperatives—if the U.S. supplies industrial machinery and technical guidance, chemicals and agrarian know-how which will enable the totalitarian economy to get by without drastic overhaul? Why scratch for efficiency, lower costs and profitability in a liberalized economy so as to earn investment capital for rational expansion—if the Americans will do the investing and ship the expansion? Why raise wages and give other rewards for greater effort by labor—if American techniques and equipment will increase productivity without such costly incentives?

MAKING A BUCK

Suppose the second alternative is adopted and Washington suppresses entirely its impulse for long-term financing of bloc economies. The exact positive of the negatives listed above will not accrue, if only because other countries may continue their present zeal for "making a buck" out of Red trade.

But to the large extent that their resources cannot fill the void created by our abstention, the stresses inside bloc economies will have their chance to perform constructively.

After all, the wave of reform clamor by Red economists was not provoked by us but by the inherent defects of the existing system. The first satellite to pick up the reformist theses of the Liberman school in the USSR and make the biggest noise about them was Czechoslovakia—which had been the most industrialized prior to the Communist grab and therefore the first to bog down under Communist mismanagement.

If we refrain from solving its dilemmas, the bloc may yet be constrained for economic survival to do something about them. The USSR has the largest problems, because, on a much smaller economic basis, it supports armament and space programs comparable to the American. And all the Conecon members must increase their agricultural investments, keep other investments at a level adequate for a minimum 4 percent growth in gross national product, and somehow lure the cooperation of farm and factory workers.

Till now the leadership has been resisting basic changes which could create counterforces against the Party's hegemony. But necessity may yet compel the acceptance of political risks: incentives to end foot-dragging by peasants and workers; less planning and more productivity; more butter and less moonshots; the accumulation of foreign exchange by outselling competitors abroad rather than by outdumping them, and so on.

There remains a final, supreme consideration for any American businessman who may still hanker after elusive profit from selling to the Communists. He must decide in his own private conscience whether the profit is worth the personal risk that some day, soon or late, on some near or distant battlefield, his neighbor's son or his own may be struck down by a weapon which his zeal for trade put into an enemy's hand.

ARMIES AND INNER LEADERSHIP

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the January 1967 issue of Military Review, which is the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College magazine, contains a valuable article entitled "Armies and Inner Leadership." This article was written by a man extremely well versed in military matters, Mr. Anthony Harrigan. Mr. Harrigan is associate editor of the Charleston, S.C. News and Courier, and also is a member of the Institute for Strategic Studies, of London, England. Mr. Harrigan brings to this subject a wealth of background information on military affairs, having served in the U.S. Marine Corps during World War II, presently acting as military consultant for the National Strategy Committee of the National Security Council, and having studied and written extensively on all phases of military activities.

Mr. Harrigan places in proper prospective the role of the military in the life and society of the United States, and this article places to rest some of the old shibboleths which are constantly used to downgrade military service. To quote one paragraph, Mr. Harrigan says:

> Insofar as the United States is concerned, the question of the place of the military services in society is really synthetic and stirred up. In the United States, there has been a traditional unity of civil and military purposes. Indeed, the critics of the military component of our society have yet to prove that there is a "military mind" in the United

States as distinct from the thought patterns of the responsible civilian community.

Mr. President, this article is an excellent treatise and would be of invaluable assistance to anyone concerned with the proper role of the military in the American way of life. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Congressional Record following these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Armies and Inner Leadership

(By Anthony Harrigan)

(Note.—Anthony Harrigan is the author of "Combat in Cities" which appeared in the May 1966 issue of the Military Review. He is Associate Editor of The News and Courier, Charleston, South Carolina, and a member of the Institute for Strategic Studies (London). Mr. Harrigan served in the U.S. Marine Corps during World War II, is a military consultant to the National Strategy Committee of the American Security Council, and is U.S. correspondent for the Canadian Military Journal.)

The role that armed forces play in human society is the subject of considerable debate in the public arena. Soldiers are not only defending themselves on the battlefield, but also are having to defend their concepts of professionalism against a wide variety of sharpshooting critics of the military life.

One author, who has written extensively on the ideals of military service, has cited the "caricature of the trigger-happy, slaughter-minded, war-mongering officer." This caricature crops up frequently. For example, one contemporary critic of the armed forces has spoken of a struggle between a "huge warmaking organism and the apparatus of democracy." Fortunately, the caricature does not always prevail. President John F. Kennedy, in a salute to the Nation's military services, once said that "Armies cannot only defend their countries—they can help build them."

The question being debated in some academic circles in the United States is whether armies represent a socially constructive or destructive element in the life of a nation and a civilization. This is not exclusively a U.S. question. The place of the army in the national life has been an issue in France during much of the 19th and 20th centuries. In the Soviet Union, professional military cadres long have been viewed as suspect by the Communist Party. Whether armies are instruments of order or disorder is a bone of contention among students of the Latin-American countries.

PLACE IN U.S. SOCIETY

Insofar as the United States is concerned, the question of the place of the military services in society is really synthetic and stirred up. In the United States, there has been a traditional unity of civil and military purposes. Indeed, the critics of the military component of our society have yet to prove that there is a "military mind" in the United States as distinct from the thought patterns of the responsible civilian community.

Military service and service to the civilian community have been regarded as being of the same character throughout U.S. history. No contradiction or separation of purpose was considered involved as in some countries where the armed forces have been an island apart. The history of the United States is rich in examples of professional officers serving in high posts in the civilian Government after retirement from active duty.

Whether for this or other reasons, little attention has been focused on the contribution that armed forces have made to the human order down through the ages. In the United States, military men in the past have not had to develop a rationale for their existence. It is only in recent years that there have been national and even global campaigns aimed at condemning the U.S. use of force to protect national interests. However, today the military professional increasingly is in the position of the policeman who in the past had only to use his authority to maintain order, and who now is compelled to justify his exercise of police authority.

DEVELOP PUBLIC PHILOSOPHY

The military professional, living within his service, knows that he and his associates are not trigger-happy and not slaughter-minded. He knows the restraint with which weapons are used. He understands and respects civilian authority over the Defense Establishment. He is familiar with the sense of responsibility and social obligation which characterizes his profession in this era. But the individual soldier's knowledge of his reliability as a citizen is not in itself an adequate defense against those who regard everyone in uniform as a militarist and downgrade the role of armies as human institutions.

It is necessary, therefore, that the modern soldier develop a public philosophy for his profession so that the nation as a whole may better understand the contribution made by the uniformed element in the national life.

In developing such a philosophy, it is useful to search out the lessons of history that shed light on the functions of armed forces. In this connection, there is much merit in examining the writings of Indian authors. India is a country in which theories of nonviolence and nonresistance have had enormous acceptance. The Gandhian doctrines took root among both the masses and intellectual elite of India. As a result, the Indian military services suffered a loss of status in the years following India's independence. Not until 1962, when Communist China invaded India and shattered concepts of peaceful coexistence in Asia, was there a reversal of the Indian philosophy with respect to military service.

HISTORICAL ROLES

One of the Indian writers who has taken a fresh look at the role of the armed forces is Professor Muhammad Mujeeb, Vice Chancellor of Jamia Millia Islamia in New Delhi. He recently analyzed the role of armies in history and quoted Werner Sombart, the German economist, who said: "In the beginning was the army." Professor Mujeeb observed that "no historian could disagree with him," pointing out that armies have been the principal means of change in "the process of grafting of peoples, cultures, techniques, ideas on to each other to which we owe most of the progress we have made."

Asserting that armed conflict "can be a means of placing social and political systems on trial, and of infusing vitality in those that have become petrified," Professor Mujeeb suggested that it is possible to distinguish between wars that are in the nature of surgical operations on societies unable to fulfill the conditions of survival and wars that are purely destructive. He stated:

"Alexander the Great's imperialist ambitions influenced world history by making the peoples of West Asia and Egypt heirs to Greek culture; the military exploits of Timur are a record of merciless destruction without any purpose."

This analysis has value for the military professional, for it is important that he not accept the stereotype of armies in action as destructive forces. In World War II, the US Armed Forces not only protected the freedom and physical integrity of the United States, but carried out extraordinary measures of pacification and national rehabilitation.

US occupation administrations in Japan and Germany must be credited with enormous achievements in rebuilding two advanced nations along constructive lines. While civilians played a part in both administrations, the accomplishments were overwhelmingly those of men in the uniformed service of their country. It is, perhaps, too early to compare these feats with events in classical times, but one cannot overlook the parallels with ancient nation-building feats performed by Greek and Roman soldiers.

BACKWARD STATES

Truly phenomenal is the influence a military presence has had on some of the backwaters of the world. For example, the South Pacific region—an ocean area comparable in size to the greatest of continents—has changed more in the last quarter century as a result of World War II than in the preceding hundreds of years.

Across the world in Turkey, the army has been the key social instrument in the rise of that country from the backwardness and ignorance of the Ottoman era. The Turkish Army serves as a school for the nation, absorbing illiterate recruits and training them for useful lives in the civilian community. Turkish Army units in the countryside even adopt villages as part of a broad program of civic action.

An army—it should be borne in mind—is a specialized form of human order. In advanced nations such as the United States, it has specialized and limited functions because society has a complex civil order that meets public needs. In less developed or truly backward states, an army often is the only available form of order. In such a situation, the army is a society in miniature—an organism capable of getting things done, productive of both plans and end results, and cemented by loyalty and obedience. It is a command structure essential in weak or threatened nations.

Those who say that the trouble with much of Latin America lies with the armed forces have not considered the effect of a lack of an alternative civil order in many countries in that region. If the structure of the civil government is not strong, disorder reigns and is exploited by those seeking the overthrow of a nation.

COMMUNIST POWER

Communist Parties, wherever these exist, are another form of order. They represent an armed doctrine, an action organism, a state within a state. In the absence of an army capable of maintaining the national integrity from attack within, the civil structure of a weak state is likely to fall before insurgent assault by the Communist power structure. Thus, it is the height of folly to call for the breakup of professional armies in small, weak nations.

In the advanced states, armed forces have a wholly different role. They are clearly subordinate to the civil authority, but even in these countries, armed forces may have specified civil action responsibilities such as flood control and harbor management. They do not, however, direct the societies of which they are a part except as individual officers assigned responsibility in government by the executive authority.

Nevertheless, the armed forces in advanced states have heavy responsibilities. One of these responsibilities concerns the readiness of deployment of military power to fulfill the national security objectives established by the civilian leadership. In short, armies have places to guard and battles to win.

Less understood is another part of the responsibility of armed forces in highly developed states. This responsibility has to do with that intangible but important element in armies—the quality of the human beings who have dedicated their lives to service in the military profession.

Although there certainly is not a military mind in the United States in the sense of a

Prussian-type militarism, there is a professional awareness of the imperatives of duty. Military training is supposed to leave a special imprint of responsibility on the citizen in uniform. The concepts of duty, honor, and country are especially important to a democracy in an age when almost all moralists and social commentators are agreed that values have been gravely eroded under the pressure of change.

The fundamental differences between the military professional and his fellow citizen in civilian life is that the former does not live in a permissive environment. This is an important difference. Many social commentators have warned that permissiveness has had an unfortunate effect on US life. With the dilution of stern attitudes of an earlier period, a number of destructive and impulsive tendencies have been noted. Increased crime, social irresponsibility, and civil disobedience have become serious problems. Among the social ills are disordered family life, a higher rate of bankruptcy, a lack of confidence between generations, and more draft dodging.

VALUE OF DISCIPLINE

Conversely, the military life—which is definitely not permissive—builds into citizens an understanding of the value of the disciplined life. Uniformed personnel know that the greatest freedom is in service to the ideals of one's country. This is not surprising, for the lessons of the battlefield are the lessons of sacrifice, comradeship, personal responsibility, and accountability. Military life is life according to a code in which intelligence and training are related to fundamental social goals.

More thought should be given to the fact that the military profession in the United States has lived with nuclear arms for almost a generation. Those who have handled the most powerful weapons ever known to mankind have demonstrated the intellectual capacity to prepare for war with these devices while, at the same time, demonstrating the moral strength it takes to live with and keep leashed these engines of destruction.

The very last person who could emerge from the military profession in the United States is the mad bomber of pacifist tracts. It is not just a matter of needing more than one officer to turn a key, or other procedural safeguards; it is also a matter of training men with the moral stamina to bear the heaviest of national responsibilities.

Holmes Alexander, who has had wide experience in observing the military profession, hash written in this connection:

"To the etxent that the choosing and training of young military men—the top officers of the near future—are successfully conducted, the more we alter our society for the better. . . . The reporter who travels for a while among modern warriors soon finds an accumulation of admirable traits and honorable codes which are far less prevalent—certainly less stressed—in the civilian segment. The military today is the opposite of anti-social. It is pro-social in a big way. It is neither trigger-happy nor trigger-shy."

SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS

This assessment of the values enhanced by the military life emphasizes the importance of the Armed Forces as social institutions in US society. It is to be hoped that such assessments will lead to an appreciation of the worthwhile character of military service for as many young men as possible. The mistaken idea exists in some quarters that military service represents "time out" of a young man's life. It seems clear, however, that the period of military service is an increasingly vital part of a US citizen's education for life in a world wherein disorder is rampant.

Professor Hugh Seton-Watson, the British historian, recently warned that dictatorships could emerge from the "uprooted, classless, faceless hordes" of the large European and American cities. Many of the young turn to generational strife and civil disobedience because the education they have received has been inadequate. They have had the intellect trained, but their values are not rooted in a code of life. Military service, especially the small-unit warfare of today's struggle in the Far East, provides a classical form of education in the duties of manhood; it ends the alienation that many modern youths experience.

Looking back on Roman times, we discover how the legionnaires were not only fighters, but civilization builders. The camps of the legions became towns and cities. They provided the peace that made orderly life possible among barbarians, and laid the foundation for a higher stage of life.

The legions were the instruments that Rome used to overcome barbarism on the Empire's strategic frontiers. First came the sword and then the ploughshare. A similar pattern existed in the settlement of the US West. The Army made the peace and provided the framework for civil order and then the life of the territories was developed.

The modern era has created a new set of problems. Barbarism is not only something beyond the pale—a force on the outside. Barbarism is a force within a state. It is not only the guerrilla who must be reckoned with by the military forces, but the nihilist who erodes the life of the homefront behind the men on the battlefront.

The breakdown of internal values can be seen in many areas. We discerned it in the moral collapse of Germany when that country fell from within to the inner barbarians—the Nazis. The increasing lawlessness of US cities is a grave problem, suggesting a major breakdown of morale and social cohesiveness. It may be that the armed services, by the training in discipline that they give those who put on their country's uniform, will be able to deal effectively with the threat of inner barbarism.

The Federal Republic of German Army, established in the 1950's on new foundations, did remarkable work in this field through its emphasis on inner leadership. The people of West Germany wanted a new army that embodied the professionalism of the old army and the social faith of the new Germany.

The shapers of the *Bundeswehr* shared the belief of Raymond Aron, the distinguished French writer on military institutions, that "decisive is a man's inward attitude." Inner leadership is not indoctrination; it is not the teaching of specific programs. It is the moral strengthening of the soldier-citizen. Emphasis on inner leadership is not only intended to produce a better soldier and a better citizen, but is aimed at promoting the social cohesion that a country must have to survive and to achieve great things.

One of the dangers of our time is the loss of this social cohesion. In the United States and elsewhere in the West, there has been a disturbing emergence of the anarchist spirit and philosophy which suggests to some that individuals and small groups have no obligations to the larger community. However this anarchism is revealed, it threatens disintegration of the unity that is a nation. When this attitude is limited to a few individuals, it is not a menace to public order. But if this anarchist spirit becomes contagious, then it opens the way for foreign conquerors.

Without a code of behavior and a prevailing sentiment, a country falls apart; it is without a center. A nation that is a collection of anarchic adventurers is no nation at all. To be sure, preserving the cohesion of the nation is partly the task of home, church and school. But military service also is a vital part of schooling in citizenship and national values. It is, perhaps, the toughest and most valuable of educational experiences in a democracy, for it demands that intelligence be combined with courage and loyalty to ideals—often at the risk of death.

In a real sense, therefore, the armed forces are the capstone of the educational system whereby citizens are embued with the qualities essential to a free society. If this is understood by the public, then the constructive role of armed forces also is comprehended.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT TITLE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 665.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Assistant Legislative Clerk. S. 665, to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to its consideration.

RECESS UNTIL 2 O'CLOCK P.M.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 2 o'clock p.m. this afternoon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the Senate took a recess until 2 o'clock p.m. the same day.

At 2 o'clock p.m., on the expiration of the recess, the Senate reconvened, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. Hollings in the chair).

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1967

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 355) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, S. 355, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate continue its consideration of S. 665, the military procurement bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 665) to authorize authorizations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call for the quorum be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is Senate bill 665.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Are there any amendments pending to the measure before us?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no amendment pending at the present time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry, and I should like, if I could, to have the attention of the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. It is my understanding that when I was necessarily away from the Chamber——

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator was absent on official business.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator. As a courtesy to me the majority leader recessed the Senate until 2 o'clock p.m., and a unanimous-consent agreement was entered into which, as I understand it, provides that starting tomorrow there shall be 1 hour allowed on each amendment, and in all likelihood my amendments will be first, there will be 4 hours on the bill, and that as a result there will be no votes on amendments today. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Whether or not there will be any votes, I cannot say. I do not anticipate any, but somebody could call up an amendment and there could be a vote on it, but it is an unlikely possibility. If I may make one correction, the time limitation begins at the conclusion of morning business tomorrow; we come in at 11 o'clock; have a brief morning hour; the business runs 3 hours under the Pastore rule on germaneness; and then, under the previous unanimous-consent order, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and others interested in the question of textiles, will undertake a roundrobin debate on that most important subject.

Mr. CLARK. So that in effect we will have 3 hours tomorrow on the pending business, including amendments, under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend from Montana.

I should like to address a question to the Senator from New York. Does the Senator desire to be heard today?

Mr. JAVITS. I have been heard already. I may wish to speak a little later on, after listening to what has been going on.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, for the benefit of my colleagues, let me state what my present intentions are, so that they may make their plans and act accordingly.

I am committed to the Senate to call up my first amendment today. It is my present intention to do so toward the end of afternoon business. In the meantime, as I understand it, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who will be here shortly, as well as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who also will be here shortly, desire to be heard.

Since they are not presently in the Chamber, I will begin my speech now and ask unanimous consent that when either of them comes into the Chamber, to yield to them in order that I may meet their convenience.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator include me in that unanimous-consent request? I may wish to be heard.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to do so. I encourage the Senator from New York to lend his silver-tongued voice to the progress of this debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

"WHAT PRICE GLORY?"

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the title of my speech is: "What Price Glory?" I intend to develop the balance sheet of the Vietnam war as I see it.

First, the alleged assets in terms of our national honor and national security by which the war is said to be justified; and, then, my own view of the liabilities which the war is imposing on the American Nation.

The reason for my title is that I conclude we are paying a very heavy price, indeed, for whatever glory there may be for our country in the Vietnamese conflict, a price which, in my opinion, is far too high.

Yet I must assert this caveat, that I am not one who would withdraw unilaterally from Vietnam despite the fact that I do not believe we should ever have gone in there; but I am one who would assert that our primary objective should be to get this dirty little war—from which we gain so little and lose so much—over with just as soon as we can, with reasonable honor.

By reasonable honor, I do not mean glory, military victories, bands, and a lot of parades. I mean a sober and mature determination as to how much of our objectives in Vietnam we can, at this point, reasonably expect to achieve without an undue cost in lives and fortune, and heavy cost indeed to the economy of this country.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

UNITED STATES HOPES FOR DETENTE WITH RUSSIA

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a very interesting article containing a very good analysis was published in the Baltimore Sun, on January 19, 1967, written by Mr. Philip Potter of the Washington Bureau of the Sun.

Mr. Potter is a man who knows the Far East. He knows Asia, and he gives what I believe to be an objective writeup concerning many of the conditions in the Far East and southeast Asia.

I believe that the article is worth commending to my fellow colleagues in the Senate to read, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RISE OF "PRAGMATIC" RULERS STIRS U.S. HOPES FOR DETENTE

(By Philip Potter)

WASHINGTON, Jan. 18.—When the Johnson Administration casts its eyes abroad it sees beyond the Vietnam conflict to what it considers hopeful vistas—even in China.

Concededly the present situation in Vietnam remains "dour and difficult," although the President and his principal foreign policy advisers believe there is some light at the end of that tunnel.

Elsewhere, the Administration sees heartening signs.

PRAGMATISTS COMING IN

In Latin America, Africa and in the rest of Asia, it is contended, there is "a tremendous amount of slow turning in the right direction"—toward economic and political stability.

Administration foreign policy, in fact, is increasingly predicated on a belief that the world is in "transition" from an era in which "romantic revolutionaries" have held sway to one in which "pragmatists" are coming into power.

The inference is that pragmatists will be easier to deal with.

Placed in the category of "romantic revolutionaries" who have faded or are fading from the scene are such leaders as Red China's Mao Tse-tung, President Sukarno of Indonesia, Ghana's Ex-President Kwame Nkrumah, Algeria's former Premier Ahmed ben Bella; The United Arab Republic's President Gamal Abdel Nasser and former Premier Nikita Khrushchev of the Soviet Union.

While the cautious reading here is that Mao is not yet to be classed among the "faded," the belief seems to be that the trend in Communist China, as elsewhere, is in the direction of a "pragmatic regime."

Ironically, in respect to Red China, neither the United States nor the Soviet Union is entirely confident about what a pragmatic turn there would involve.

The Russians have some apprehensions that it could mean a "deal" between Peking and the United States, while there are some here who think it would mean a healing of the breach between Russia and Red China, again confronting the West with combined Communist power.

On the whole, however, the Russians seem to be doing the most worrying. One of their chief fears is that the current strife in China could destroy the Communist party there and bring rule by a military "Nasserist" who conceivably would cast covetous eyes on once-

Chinese territories now embraced in the Soviet empire, just as Nasser would like to rule or at least dominate a United Arab world.

It should not be lost sight of however, that another area on which Peking casts covetous eye's is Formosa (Taiwan), now included in our sphere of protection. A Peking "Nasserist" could look that way, too.

In any event, the turmoil in Red China is of momentous import in the world. It could affect, for instance, the course of the Vietnam war, since so much of Hanoi's supplies come from Red China.

DEPENDENT ON 800,000 TONS OF RICE

Harrison Salisburg, in a series of articles about his visit to North Vietnam, said it was believed that Hanoi may be dependent on China for as much as 600,000 or 800,000 tons of rice in 1967–1968 because of the short-fall in North Vietnam's crop due to bad weather and lack of manpower. That is almost as much grain tonnage as the United States sent to India last year (largely wheat and sorghum).

Red China has no food surplus of its own, and has been purchasing about 6,000,000 tons of wheat a year from Canada, Australia and Argentina.

Obviously if the turmoil continues to spread, China's industrial output will go down and so will the foreign exchange earnings which permit it to buy foreign grain. Hanoi could soon feel the squeeze.

RAIL TRANSPORT DISRUPTED

Actual shipment of supplies from Red China to Hanoi also could be affected. Reports reaching here are that the rail line between Shanghai and Peking, for instance, has been idle since the third week in December, because of strikes and strife.

Whether or not there is gain for America in Vietnam as a result of developments in Red China, the Administration wishes its foreign policy critics would focus not only on the conflict there but on what is happening in Asia and in other parts of the world.

The President, in his State-of-the-Union message, dealt with Vietnam only in the last three pages because he wanted to focus attention on other things domestic and foreign.

REGIONAL SOLUTIONS

One thing pointed to with pride is a growing trend toward regional solutions to problems among the many small states (and some large ones) in Latin America, Africa and Asia.

Mr. Johnson and his foreign policy advisers see such regionalism as a healthy alternative to excessive nationalism. Regional combines produce a sense of status and dignity, it was said, and make it easier for smaller states to deal with big ones on a basis of parity.

For the United States, it means possibilities of sharing burdens it has been carrying alone, or almost alone. Mr. Johnson notes, for instance, that the United States was called upon to put up only 20 per cent of the capital in the new Asian Development Bank, an amount matched by Japan.

THROUGH "FILLING VACUUMS"

That is a trend he would like to cultivate in all our undertakings abroad.

As one source put it, America has passed from the time of "filling vacuums"—as in Greece, Korea and Vietnam—to a time when it can hope to pull some of the "saved" countries into regional combines in a way that will spare national sensibilities and save the United States money.

In short, the Administration believes its foreign policy has been formulated with more wisdom than it has been credited with.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 665) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to engage the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in colloquy for the purpose of clarifying my views and my thoughts about the situation in Vietnam, for which this authorization and appropriation is intended.

Much has been said about Vietnam. I have tried to make clear my own position as to the general nature of that conflict.

However, there are some aspects of our involvement which I believe should be discussed further in view of the nature of the bill before us. I do not wish to prolong this discussion, but I hope that the Senator from Georgia would be willing to respond to some questions.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am somewhat apprehensive when I see how well-armed the Senator from Arkansas is. I am defenseless except for what little smattering of knowledge I have with me in my head and not on paper; but I would be happy to undertake to make any responses of which I am capable.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Georgia is quite capable. He is the best authority in this body, if not in the entire Government, on the subject of our Armed Forces. It is out of my high respect for him, and the country's respect for his knowledge, that I wish to address these questions to him.

I wonder if the Senator from Georgia could tell us how many American men are now serving in, or are involved directly in, fighting the war in Vietnam.

Mr. RUSSELL. The last figures that were made available to the committee indicated there are 414,000 men in South Vietnam; 35,000 in Thailand; and about 40,000 in the Navy, in the waters adjacent thereto.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In that regard, can the Senator tell us how many—I do not believe the figures are classified——

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope it is not classified information.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think it is.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am of the opinion that the figures that were given at the time of the hearing were left in the record and some troops have been sent there subsequently, and that information has appeared in the press and has been broadcast over the air and, I think, on some television films.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In the last day or two there have been some interesting discussions about our troop commitments to NATO. As the Senator knows, the majority leader has proposed a resolution concerning that subject. I have been approached by administration officials on this subject. While the issue does not bear directly on the pending question, it is related to our overall commitments, whether in Vietnam or Europe.

Would the Senator agree that, in terms of U.S. forces involved, the war in Vietnam is now larger than the Korean conflict

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; it is slightly larger. The number of American forces engaged in Vietnam is larger than the number that was engaged at any one time in Korea. We never had more than 330,000 in Korea at any one time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So it is substantially larger now.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has often discussed on this floor the Constitution of our Nation. He knows I have been very much in agreement with his views with regard to the applicability of the Constitution to domestic issues. The Senator is a great student of the history of the Constitution. Does he recall the discussion in the Constitutional Convention over the question of the wording of the Constitution—whether the Congress should have the power to "make" or "declare" war?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I recall something about that in Madison's papers wherein he reported what took place in the Constitutional Convention. The original draft empowered Congress to make war, and the members of the Convention decided Congress was not so constituted that it could make war, so they changed the language to "declare" war, leaving the power to direct the armies in the President as Commander in Chief. I am confident I am correct about that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it not also true that the reasoning which prompted the change from the original draft, to which the Senator referred, was that the President should be left with the power to repel sudden attacks?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. In the event of a sudden attack, Congress would not have time to prepare to make war, and the Commander in Chief should have that power.

Of course, the Senator is more familiar with the long debates that have surrounded this whole issue. They began back on the NATO Treaty, and went through all the Korean conflict, as to just how much power the President had to order American troops into foreign lands without a declaration of war by the Congress. It is a constitutional question that is very intriguing.

I remember the President, on more than 125 occasions, has exercised his power as Commander in Chief to order the Armed Forces of the United States into foreign lands.

I have had some interesting thoughts about that provision of the Constitution. I often wondered what would happen if the President vetoed a declaration of war, and just where we would be left in that event.

What is the opinion of the Senator from Arkansas in that respect?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would imagine, if we found ourselves in that situation, that the President would be in peril of impeachment.

Mr. RUSSELL. It takes only a majority to declare war, but it takes two-thirds to impeach.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I cannot imagine the circumstances under which a veto of a declaration of war might take place, although it could.

The Senator will agree, will he not, that there has not been anything "sudden" about the war in Vietnam? It was not a sudden attack.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I would not consider it a sudden attack on the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. At the time of the adoption of the southeast Asia resolution in 1964 there were only about 16,000 American servicemen in Vietnam. As the Senator has already stated, we now have some 414,000 there.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is about 500,000 in the southeast Asia area.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Arkansas knows, from past experience, that the Senator from Georgia has been greatly concerned about the increase in the powers of the executive branch of the Government, particularly so with regard to certain domestic issues. He has expressed those views eloquently on the floor of the Senate on many occasions.

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly have undertaken to express myself clearly to the effect that I had great concern about the status of our system of checks and balances and division of powers, and that Congress was being subordinated to both the executive and the judiciary.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. From recent discussions, I know that the Senator has great respect for Prof. Henry Steele Commager, regarded as the dean of American historians, and a distinguished gentleman who recently appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I have a high regard for him as a historian. I have read some of his works. I am not familiar with his statement in his appearance before the Foreign Relations Committee, although a member of the committee, knowing of my interest in this subject, sent me a copy of his speech. It is on my desk. I have not had the opportunity to read it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think his testimony is pertinent to the issue now before us. If the Senator will permit me, I will read from pages 41 and 42 of the hearings of February 20 before the Foreign Relations Committee. Professor Commager was asked about the constitutional provisions relating to a declaration of war in the light of the situation in Vietnam. This is what he said:

> I think what is necessary is a full-scale discussion in the Congress and outside Congress over this extraordinarily important question of how far the Executive power must obtain to meet emergencies and to act where the interests and security of the nation are involved, and how the Congress of the United States keeps control on such decisions as are made.
>
> We have, to my mind, drifted into a situation which is fraught with danger, one where the shift has gone all the way, and where, by a series of unforeseen, unexpected and, perhaps unforeseeable processes, declaring war has all but evaporated, and making war has taken its place and where, therefore, the center of gravity has shifted almost imperceptibly but now quite decidedly to the Executive Branch.

Would the Senator agree that we have "drifted into a situation which is fraught with danger" because of our growing involvement there without a declaration of war?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is one element of danger to our system. I do not think it is the most dangerous threat that is posed to our constitutional system. Personally, I think some of the recent decisions of the Supreme Court are a greater threat to our constitutional system than the situation outlined by the Senator from Arkansas; but this, too, is an element of danger to the position of the legislative branch of the Government.

I am sure the Senator will recall that when the so-called Tonkin Gulf joint resolution was pending before the Senate, I offered an amendment, in order to protect the prerogatives of Congress, that was included in the joint resolution as passed. That amendment permits Congress by a concurrent resolution, which does not require the approval of the President, to terminate all the powers and all the approval that were given by the Tonkin Gulf joint resolution. A majority of Congress can annul that joint resolution today, if they wish to do so, without the President's being able to intervene with a veto.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct; and that is only further evidence of the concern he has had in the past about the confusion of powers.

Mr. RUSSELL. I still have the concern; it increases with time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am glad to hear the Senator say that. One of the pending amendments on which the Senate will have to vote tomorrow, involves the question of a declaration of war, I was trying to lay a basis for proper consideration of this amendment. I wish to read the paragraph from Professor Commager's testimony which follows those I have just read:

> It seems to me that the responsibility for that is, and I should not say this to you distinguished gentlemen—

Mr. Commager was speaking to the members of the committee—

> is as much on the Senate as it is on the Executive Branch of the Government, and that what we have witnessed not just now but in the past as well on numerous occasions, is something very close to an abdication of the Congressional authority in this realm in the face of what appear to be national emergencies, and I think all we can fairly say here, we cannot say that the President must be shorn of his power to meet emergencies, that would be too dangerous a situation, we cannot say that the Congressional, particularly the Senatorial authority can now be safely ignored. That way, too, is a very dangerous one.
>
> What we can say, and I think must say, is that there must be a reconsideration of the relationship of the Executive and the Legislative branches, particularly the Executive and the Senate in the conduct of foreign relations, clarification, and that both branches of the Government should, I think, search their souls, search the law, search history, and develop the resources of joint programs and joint policies, rather than the situation which now confronts us.

That is Mr. Commager's comment on this issue.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think there is a great deal of merit in that statement. I think its application is not limited, however, to the situation in Vietnam. I think the exercise of the powers of the executive, the legislative, and the judiciary might well be reviewed generally, in an effort to take this country back to the proper separation of powers and the proper weighing of our system of checks and balances, which have enabled us to achieve our present greatness.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator on that point.

If I may digress a bit, a proposal which appeals to me—though I do not wish to commit myself on the issue this soon—is the movement for sharing of revenues with the States, not because I particularly like the procedure, but because I do not know of a better way to reestablish the powers of the States, powers which they lost because of financial difficulties they have encountered.

Mr. RUSSELL. In times of war, we have restricted many of the States sources of revenue because of the war emergency, and after the war, we seldom give it back to them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. The Senator from Pennsylvania has an amendment pending which deals with the subject of congressional consideration of a declaration of war.

I feel very strongly the criticism which Mr. Commager has laid at the door of the Senate, that we are responsible, having abdicated to a great degree our authority under the Constitution. I wish to say that I take full responsibility for my part, because at the time of the Senate's consideration of the southeast Asia resolution, I was unaware of the actual significance of the measure. I wish to make it clear for the record that I did not originate the resolution, although a number of newspaper writers have written as if it was my idea. It was sent up here by the administration.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will bear witness to that. We had a meeting in the office of the majority leader and discussed it, before it was proposed by the executive branch, and that is when I suggested language permitting termination by concurrent resolution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct. I regret that I was not more aware then of the significance of the proposal. I remind the Senator that we were in the midst of initiating a political campaign and there was great public interest in the positions of the two candidates. I confess that I was somewhat partisan in my views at that time, so I was inclined to accept the views of the President without too much criticism.

I accepted the resolution and defended it on the floor, much to my regret. Not that the resolution could have been stopped. But it could have been debated on the basis that I think the Senate should debate this matter now: Are our policies wise and proper?

We have precedents for such debate. I voted, as the Senator will remember, against the Middle East resolution somewhat on the same grounds—that Congress should not delegate, in advance, powers which the President did not need, in my opinion, but where the effect of the action would be to preclude criticism because Congress took a position in advance.

This question was also raised at the time of the Formosa resolution, again in President Eisenhower's administration.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct; and it was debated at some length.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. At considerable length.

Mr. RUSSELL. Senators will remember that when it was raised, the question of congressional approval of sending the five divisions to bolster the NATO forces was debated on the floor of the Senate for 2 or 3 weeks.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was coming to that point. The Senator played a part in that debate, and I think Congress certainly discharged its duties much better then than it did in its consideration of this resolution.

I suppose it might properly be said that it is a little late for me to bring up the question of the Tonkin Gulf resolution now. All I can say is that it is better late than never. That is why I raise these questions at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. It may be belated, but——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have learned a number of things in the last few months that I did not know then.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is never out of order, or out of season, or an improper time to discuss the question of the constitutionality of any action, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think I would agree with the Senator on that.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question. I have not completed my interrogatories to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SCOTT. I understand. I am merely seeking clarification; that is the reason I rise while the colloquy is going on.

Is the Senator advocating a declaration of war, or not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am raising the constitutional question regarding the present war, and laying the basis for taking a position on the amendment which has been submitted that the number of troops in Vietnam should not be increased above 500,000 without a declaration of war.

At some point, it seems to me, we should either recognize the congressional responsibility, or acknowledge that the constitutional requirement is no longer of any effect. I do not know what that point is. But the troop strength in Vietnam has risen above 400,000. As the Senator from Georgia has stated, it is no longer a sudden action; it no longer qualifies as a sudden emergency, which we all admit the President has the power to respond to. He has, of course, done on numerous occasions in the past.

I simply seek to raise questions now that I feel I should have raised before, for discussion with the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator might run into one of the old maxims of equity, which says that he who would not when he could cannot when he would. However, I would not think that would apply here; we all should have the opportunity to come in later.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And confess our sins.

Mr. SCOTT. That is correct. I am merely in the colloquy for the purpose of clarifying the matter.

I wonder if the Senator would not agree that his view has been for some time—and I agree with him—that this is a deplorable war. However, his further view, as I understand it, is that it ought to be ended as soon as a way can be found to end it.

If that is the case, would not a declaration of war make it much more difficult to end this war and aggression, bearing in mind that if we do not have a declaration of war, the conclusion of this war may be that it ends not with a bang, but with a whimper and that the aggressor fades away into the bush, and suddenly there is nobody to fight with anybody else?

That is one way that it can be ended. If we formalize it with a declaration of war and let it go through all of the stages, including an armistice or a treaty with years passing between the armistice and the final peace treaty, would we not run into the argument that once we declare a war and there is an unconditional surrender, we are moving into a morass which we can avoid by the very vagueness of the existing situation in which, as I understand our policy, we are asked to repel aggression in response to certain national commitments.

I am not trying to argue with the Senator. I am just trying to clarify the matter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The last statement is a very strong statement, and I do not accept it.

We are there because we made a terrible mistake in judgment in the past. I would like to see the Nation confess its mistakes in judgment like I am willing to confess mine.

This is not a declaration of war, but it is a warning that if the escalation is continued, consideration should be given to a declaration of war. If we have any regard at all for the Constitution, this should be done. This war is not the repelling of a "sudden attack," as the Founding Fathers had in mind when they debated this provision of the Constitution.

The Constitution says that we should declare war if we are involved in a conflict that amounts to a war.

I am familiar with the theory that the war may just dwindle away. Our present Ambassador to Vietnam advanced the same theory before the committee some 2 or 3 years ago. Others have made the same predictions but it has not worked that way, and the war has grown steadily larger.

We have had many other prophesies from other administration officials.

I could argue just as well that if Congress adopted this amendment and the administration were confronted with the necessity of asking for a declaration of war or maintaining military strength at 500,000, and they did hold at that level, that this would be a move toward deescalation, or at least a halt in the escalation.

The amendment promotes a settlement short of a military victory.

The Senator knows—and I have no objection to this matter with him after I complete my statement—that I have advocated a negotiated settlement in contrast to what I believe to be the administration's policy of trying to achieve a military victory. I think a negotiated settlement is in the best interests of this country, and is more likely to create conditions for a durable peace.

I, therefore, think a policy of seeking a negotiated end to the war is wiser. So, I have advocated that we seek a negotiated settlement, in the nature of a compromise, rather than a military victory.

Mr. SCOTT. Would not a declaration of war get in the way of a negotiated settlement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Pennsylvania does not say that we should declare war either. It says that we should not increase our forces in Vietnam above 500,000 and, if we do, there should be a declaration of war.

Mr. SCOTT. Which is really the same thing.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is not the same thing.

Mr. SCOTT. Do we not all recognize that there will be escalation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not recognize the necessity for it. I recognize that we are moving that way because of an unwise policy, as I have been trying to make clear on a number of occasions.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not want to keep the Senator standing on his feet.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am enjoying the discussion as long as I am not compelled to participate in it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania then, perhaps ask the Senator a few more questions, if the Senator feels that way about it. I did not know whether he was enjoying the discussion or not.

Mr. CLARK. I say to my colleague that I think he knows perfectly well the thrust of my amendment. It is an effort to exercise the power of the purse to force the administration to fish or cut bait.

I believe, if we are going to escalate the war, that the honorable as well as the constitutional thing to do is to ask Congress for a declaration.

I am far from sure, if the President were to ask for that declaration, that I would vote for it, but I think there is essentially hypocrisy in our present system which I deplore.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am not entirely enlightened, but reasonably so. I do thank the Senator very much.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator. These questions are really for the record because the answers from the Senator from Georiga have special importance.

Does the Senator from Georgia believe that within our constitutional framework the President, as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, has unlimited power to commit this Nation to war

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that is a difficult question to answer categorically.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is for me, too.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think it was contemplated by the Founding Fathers that the President would commit the Nation to unlimited war except that which might arise from resisting aggression.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Aggression against us or another country?

Mr. RUSSELL. To defend the United States or its vital interests or our citizens.

We do have the Tonkin Gulf resolution. The Senator from Arkansas may be unhappy about the fact that the Tonkin Gulf joint resolution was ever passed, but it was passed and he was its manager on the floor at the time it passed.

I think if Congress wishes to assert its authority, the proper way to do it is to introduce a concurrent resolution to annul the Tonkin Gulf joint resolution.

I must say that I think one of the pending amendments is about as awkward an approach to the matter as could possibly be conceived. In other words, if we should commit more men than 500,000, even to defend those who are already there or to enable them to be withdrawn in case the war should be vastly increased by attack from some other forces in that area, the Congress would be on record against such action without a declaration of war. We are involved in a war now. It was started. It does no good to recite the history and ignite recriminations, but in the administration of Dwight D. Eisenhower we sent military personnel to South Vietnam for the first time. When it was apparent that the training cadres were not sufficient, it was decided to provide American advisers with the South Vietnamese forces.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That was not with any approval of Congress. That was done as an Executive act.

Mr. RUSSELL. That was all Executive action, but Congress did not undertake to exercise its powers to cause the Executive to cease and desist, and in that we were all culpable.

No one was more strongly opposed than I to ever becoming involved on the mainland of Asia. After our experience in Korea, it seemed to me that if we became involved there it would be very difficult to get out. Even if there were later agreement on some kind of settlement, it seemed clear that it would be difficult to extricate ourselves and to bring all our forces home. I was opposed to it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But did the Senator bring that up on the floor of the Senate at the time?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. I think the Senator from Arkansas was at the conference we had at the State Department. At that time we were led to believe that the administration had dropped the idea of intervening in anyway in Vietnam. Mr. Dulles and Admiral Radford were there. The President was not there. As I recall, he was ill at that time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not believe I was there. I remember a session when they were talking about putting 35,000 men into Laos, and the Senator from Georgia and I think every Member of Congress who was there said "Don't do it."

Mr. RUSSELL. That was some time later.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Georgia remembers that.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, I recall. The conference to which the Senator refers was at the White House.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was a junior member of Foreign Relations at the time of the meeting to which he refers.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has always been a leader in foreign relations. He came into fame as a very junior Member of the other body through the Fulbright resolution, one of the historic documents that Congress has produced in this generation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish we would return to the spirit of that resolution rather than pursue the course we are following in Vietnam, since the Senator from Georgia has mentioned it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Now that we have condoned and supported these operations to the present extent, I certainly do not favor any sense-of-the-Senate resolution that should cut back on the military action there by shutting off the bombing, or that would suggest we should not bombard the routes of invasion into South Vietnam, or that would disapprove any other tactic short of landing men in North Vietnam.

I am strongly opposed to any invasion of North Vietnam.

I am opposed to a declaration of war at this stage of the proceedings because I do not know what treaties may exist with some of the powerful nations of that area, some of the large Communist states, such as the Soviet Union and China. There may be a provision in a treaty under which a formal declaration of war would trigger an escalation much greater than anything that the United States is even remotely contemplating there. I see no reason, at this late date, to tempt the fates by declaring war. The results could be very damaging.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not want the Senator to leave the impression that I am proposing a declaration of war. This proposal is really an indirect way of saying, "Do not increase the number of people." I believe the Senator said—I do not wish to misquote him—that if there should be a vast increase in our forces in Vietnam, he would not want this declaration of war.

In effect, in answer to my question, if the number there grows far beyond what it is now, if it becomes a million men, then the Seinator still would not want a declaration of war.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I would not. I do not want to send a million men there. But I do not see that this Nation or our people would have one thing to gain by a declaration of war, and I can see a great many things we might lose.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it not fair to say that the Senator has accepted the principle that the power of Congress to declare war, as written in the Constitution, is obsolete?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I do not think so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why is that not a fair statement?

Mr. RUSSELL. When I followed the Senator on the Tonkin Gulf joint resolution, I think I absolved myself of declaring it completely obsolete. I shall read the resolution:

> VIETNAM
>
> Whereas naval units of the Communist regime in Vietnam, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law, have deliberately and repeatedly attacked United States naval vessels lawfully present in international waters, and have thereby created a serious threat to international peace;
>
> Whereas these attacks are part of a deliberate and systematic campaign of aggression that the Communist regime in North Vietnam has been waging against its neighbors and the nations joined with them in the collective defense of their freedom;
>
> Whereas the United States is assisting the peoples of southeast Asia to protect their freedom and has no territorial, military or political ambitions in that area but desires only that they should be left in peace to work out their own destinies in their own way; now therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.
>
> SEC. 2. The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia—

It was difficult for me to accept that particular sentence, but I did. I was persuaded—

> consonant with the Constitution and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any protocol or member state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.
>
> This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, and shall so report to the Congress, except that it may be terminated earlier by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses.

Now, that is almost a declaration of limited war in itself, for the purposes of that resolution.

I doubt not that there have been times when Senators have regretted voting for legislative proposals. I know that I have. There are a number of votes that I would change, if I could go back and if I had the benefit of hindsight to compensate for the lack of foresight.

But we are in this conflict now, and I fail to see where it can possibly benefit this country in the slightest degree for Congress to vote a formal declaration of war. On the other side of the coin, I can see a great deal of harm that could flow from such action.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to point out again that I am not proposing a declaration of war. What the amendment really proposes is to develop some congressional restraints on escalation. In my opinion, the effect of its adoption would be a restraint upon escalation, not a declaration of war.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would be a reduction of American effort, because it would immediately stop the bombing of North Vietnam.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There are two resolutions.

Mr. RUSSELL. No.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is in the same one, but I am talking about the declaration of war portion.

Mr. RUSSELL. If we continue operations over North Vietnam or if we assign more than 500,000 persons to South Vietnam, the amendment would express the sense of the Senate that there should be a declaration of war. We have sent those men out there. They did not go out there on a holiday tour. If most of them had their "druthers," they would not be there.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If I had mine, they would not be there either.

Mr. RUSSELL. They are there by authority of this Government, and I do not propose to vote for anything that cuts back operations there by any degree.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask that certain portions of the debate in the Senate on August 6 and 7, 1964, on the southeast Asia resolution be inserted in the Record, as they bear upon my understanding of the intent of that resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Brewster. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. Fulbright. I yield.

Mr. Brewster. I had the opportunity to see warfare not so very far from this area, and it was very mean. I would look with great dismay on a situation involving the landing of large land armies on the continent of Asia. So my question is whether there is anything in the resolution which would authorize or recommend or approve the landing of large American armies in Vietnam or in China.

Mr. Fulbright. There is nothing in the resolution, as I read it that contemplates it. I agree with the Senator that that is the last thing we would want to do. However, the language of the resolution would not prevent it. It would authorize whatever the Commander in Chief feels is necessary. It does not restrain the Executive from doing it. Whether or not that should ever be done is a matter of wisdom under the circumstances that exist at the particular time it is contemplated. This kind of question should more properly be addressed to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee. Speaking for my own committee, everyone I have heard has said that the last thing we want to do is to become involved in a land war in Asia; that our power is sea and air and that this is what we hope will deter the Chinese Communists and the North Vietnamese from spreading the war. That is what is contemplated. The resolution does not prohibit that or any other kind of activity.

Mr. Brewster. I thank the distinguished chairman.

Mr. Morton. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. Fulbright. I yield.

Mr. Morton. Mr. President, first I say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that I approve the action that has been taken, and I approve this resolution. On the matter which was the subject of the colloquy between the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, can we not associate our presence in the Gulf of Tonkin to a degree with our own interpretation of our obligations under the SEATO Treaty?

Mr. Fulbright. Yes. I made mention of it. That is a further responsibility that we undertook in alining ourselves with other countries in trying to bring peace and stability into this area. That was another obligation which we undertook. It fortifies our right or responsibility for being in the Gulf of Tonkin.

Mr. Morton. I believe the action taken by the President helps to avoid any miscalculation on the part of either the North Vietnamese or the Chinese Communists. I believe the joint resolution gives that policy further strength. In my opinion, the three major wars in which we have been involved in this century have come about by miscalculation on the part of the aggressor.

I believe Congress should speak loud and clear and make it plain to any would-be aggressor that we intend to stand here. If we make that clear, we will avoid war, and not have to land vast land armies on the shores of Asia. In that connection I share the apprehension of my friend the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster].

Mr. Fulbright. The Senator has put it very clearly. I interpret the joint resolution in the same way. This action is limited, but very sharp. It is the best action that I can think of to deter an escalation or enlargement of the war. If we did not take such action, it might spread further. If we went further and ruthlessly bombed Hanoi and other places, we would be guilty of bad judgment, both on humanitarian grounds and on policy grounds, because then we would certainly inspire further retaliation.

This situation has been handled in the best way possible under the circumstances so as to calm the situation, and not escalate it into a major war.

* * * * *

Mr. Nelson. I could not hear all the colloquy between the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller]. I heard a part of it.

As I understand the mission of the United States in South Vietnam for the past 10 years, stating it in the negative, has not been to take over the Government of South Vietnam, and has not been to provide military forces to do battle in place of South Vietnamese forces. To state it in the positive sense, our mission has been to supply a military cadre for training personnel, and advisory military personnel as well as equipment and materiel—our objective being to help in the establishment of an independent stable regime. And, if my memory is right, we had about 1,000 troops there the first 5 or 6 years, up to 1960. There are now approximately 16,000 troops there. In addition, it is now proposed that this number be expanded to, I believe, 21,000.

Looking at sentences of the resolution, I understood it to be the position of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] that Congress is saying to the President that we would approve the use of any might necessary in order to prevent further aggression. Am I to understand that it is the sense of Congress that we are saying to the executive branch: "If it becomes necessary to prevent further aggression, we agree now, in advance that you may land as many divisions as deemed necessary, and engage in a direct military assault on North Vietnam if it becomes the judgment of the Executive, the Commander in Chief, that this is the only way to prevent further aggression"?

Mr. Fulbright. As I stated, section 1 is intended to deal primarily with aggression against our forces. "That the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression."

This means to me that it is with regard to our own forces. I believe section 2 deals with the SEATO area, which we are committed to protect under our treaties, particularly when they ask for our assistance.

If the situation should deteriorate to such an extent that the only way to save it from going completely under to the Communists would be action such as the Senator suggests, then that would be a grave decision on the part of our country as to whether we should confine our activities to very limited personnel on land and the extensive use of naval and air power, or whether we should go further and use more manpower.

I personally feel it would be very unwise under any circumstances to put a large land army on the Asian Continent.

It has been a sort of article of faith ever since I have been in the Senate, that we should never be bogged down. We particularly stated that after Korea. We are mobile, we are powerful on the land and on the sea. But when we try to confine ourselves and say that this resolution either prohibits or authorizes such action by the Commander in Chief in defense of this country, I believe that is carrying it a little further than I would care to go.

I do not know what the limits are. I do not think this resolution can be determinative of that fact. I think it would indicate that he would take reasonable means first to prevent any further aggression, or repeal further aggression against our own forces, and that he will live up to our obligations under the SEATO Treaty and with regard to the protocol states.

I do not know how to answer the Senator's question and give him an absolute assurance that large numbers of troops would not be put ashore. I would deplore it. And I hope the conditions do not justify it now.

Mr. Nelson. We may very well not be able to nor attempt to control the discretion that is vested in the Commander in Chief. But the joint resolution is before the Senate, sent to us, I assume, at the request of the executive branch.

Mr. Fulbright. The Senator is correct.

Mr. Nelson. It was sent to the Congress, in order to ascertain the sense of the Congress on the question. I intend to support the joint resolution. I do not think, however, that Congress should leave the impression that it consents to a radical change in our mission or objective in South Vietnam. That mission there for 10 years, as I have understood it, has been to aid in the establishment of a viable, independent regime which can manage its own affairs, so that ultimately we can withdraw from South Vietnam.

Mr. President, we have been at the task for 10 years. I am not critizing the original decision to go into South Vietnam. I do not know how long that commitment should be kept in the event we are unable to accomplish our mission. And I would not wish to make a judgment on that question now. But I would be most concerned if the Congress should say that we intend by the joint resolution to authorize a complete change in the mission which we have had in South Vietnam for the past 10 year, and which we have repeatedly stated was not a commitment to engage in a direct land confrontation with our Army as a substitute for the South Vietnam Army or as a substantially reinforced U.S. Army to be joined with the South Vietnam Army in a war against North Vietnam and possibly China.

Mr. Fulbright. Mr. President, it seems to me that the joint resolution would be consistent with what we have been doing. We have been assisting the countries in southeast Asia in pursuance of the treaty. But in all frankness I cannot say to the Senator that I think the joint resolution would in any way be a deterrent, a prohibition, a limitation, or an expansion of the President's power to use the Armed Forces in a different way or more extensively than he is now using them. In a broad sense, the joint resolution states that we approve of the action taken with regard to the attack on our own ships, and that we also approve of our country's effort to maintain the independence of South Vietnam.

The Senator from Wisconsin prompts me to make a remark which perhaps I should not make. He has said that we might be mistaken in our action. If any mistake has been made—and I do not assert that it has been the only questionable area is whether or not we should ever have become involved. That question goes back to the beginning of action in this area, and I do not believe it is particularly pertinent or proper to the debate, because in fact we have become involved. However, the Senator has mentioned it. As an academic matter, the question might be raised. But having gone as far as we have in 10 years, it seems to me that the question now is, How are we to control the situation in the best interest of our own security and that of our allies? I believe that what we did was appropriate. The joint resolution is appropriate, because it would fortify the strength of the Executive and the Government. It would put the Congress on record—and we are the most representative body that we have under our system—as supporting the action. If anything will deter aggression on the part of the North Vietnamese and the Chinese, I believe it would be the action taken together with the joint resolution supporting the action. That is the best I can do about justification of the resolution. In frankness, I do not believe the joint resolution would substantially alter the President's power to use whatever means seemed appropriate under the circumstances. Our recourse in Congress would be that if the action were too inappropriate, we could terminate the joint resolution by a concurrent resolution, and that would precipitate a great controversy between the Executive and the Congress. As a practical question, that could be done.

Mr. Nelson. I have a couple of additional questions. But first I wish to say that I did not suggest that by the use of hindsight I would now conclude that the intervention in 1954 was wrong. I do not know. I understand the necessity for the United States, since it is the leader of the free world, to do all it can in furtherance of the protection of the idea of freedom and independence, and that, to do so, we must take gambles. We shall lose some; we shall win some. I believe the public is slow to recognize that we have vast responsibilities, and they expect us to win every gamble that we take. I do not expect that. And I do not now rise here to criticize the original decision.

But I am concerned about the Congress appearing to tell the executive branch and the public that we would endorse a complete change in our mission. That would concern me.

Mr. Fulbright. I do not interpret the joint resolution in that way at all. It strikes me, as I understand it, that the joint resolution is quite consistent with our existing mission and our understanding of what we have been doing in South Vietnam for the last 10 years.

Mr. Nelson. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Arkansas to say a while ago that the language of the resolution is aimed at the problem of further aggression against our ships and our naval facilities?

Mr. Fulbright. I think that is the logical way to interpret the language. It makes reference to the armed attack against the forces of the United States which has just taken place, and to prevention of further aggression against our forces. Then the joint resolution passes on to our obligations under the treaty, which involves other countries.

I believe also that it is implicit, if not explicit, in the next section that the intent is to prevent the continuing aggression that now exists against South Vietnam.

* * * * *

Mr. Fulbright. This provision is intended to give clearance to the President to use his discretion. We all hope and believe that the President will not use this discretion arbitrarily or irresponsibly. We know that he is accustomed to consulting with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and with congressional leaders. But he does not have to do that.

Mr. Cooper. I understand, and believe that the President will use this vast power with judgment.

Mr. Fulbright. He intends to do it, and he has done it.

Mr. Cooper. I do not wish to take more time now, because the distinguished Senator from Georgia wishes to speak, and I want to hear him.

Mr. Fulbright. I have no doubt that the President will consult with Congress in case a major change in present policy becomes necessary.

* * * * *

Mr. McGovern. What I am getting at is, suppose the Government of South Vietnam, for whatever reason, should decide to launch a major military attack on North Vietnam, would we be obligated in any kind of arrangement we have with South Vietnam?

Mr. Fulbright. No. We have no obligation to follow through with a situation which we believe to be unwise, stupid, or silly. We could disavow it and withdraw and have nothing to do with it. We have no treaty agreement or any other agreement that I know of that binds us to follow through with that.

* * * * *

Mr. Javits. Mr. President, I note the presence in the Chamber of the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. Fulbright. We almost exhausted him yesterday in keeping him on the floor to answer questions.

I believe that a very important question is raised by Mr. Reston's article in the New York Times of this morning in respect to our relationship with the South Vietnamese Premier, General Khanh. Mr. Reston writes of the pattern which we followed in respect to the Formosa resolution in 1954. I know the inhibitions of secrecy and the effects upon national policy in all these respects. We may assume that our Government is taking the necessary precautions so that the broad support—to use a juridical term—which we would give to the President in respect to the extended operations of a military character in this area of the world, is not an action by which our freedom of control may be taken away by actions to which the Khanh regime may commit us for practical purposes. But we would have a right to assume in voting the joint resolution that our Government is taking the necessary precautions to see that whatever commitment we undertake is our own, and that we shall not be forced into a position of broadening that commitment against our will because the country in whose interest we are working so hard will commit us beyond what we wish to be committed to as a practical matter.

In short, to be very practical, suppose we are faced with a situation in which the South Vietnamese position should be jeopardized by its own extension of the struggle beyond its own capacity to wage a successful war in North Vietnam. Then what would happen in terms of our commitment and the commitment which our President is empowered to undertake anyhow, but which we would support in the joint resolution?

Mr. Fulbright. As a practical question, there is the closest cooperation between the Government of South Vietnam and our representatives, particularly our Ambassador, General Taylor. I do not believe there is any probability, or even a possibility, that they can commit us beyond what our own people believe to be in the interest of our common effort.

There is some distinction between the present situation and the declared policy of Chiang Kai-shek during the time of the Formosa resolution. As the Senator well knows, it was—and perhaps it still is—his declared intention to retake the mainland of China. That was a question of considerable concern. That government had quite a large army of its own, and perhaps had greater capabilities than presently exist in South Vietnam.

I do not believe there is any substance to the fear that the Vietnamese could involve us beyond the point where we ourselves wish to be involved. I do not think a full scale or a substantial invasion or extension of the war without our approval and assistance could be mounted. No such invasion has been mounted. I do not know that there is any prospect of it. That is a question which I believe is in the field of tactics, on which I am not competent to comment at the moment. But on the political aspect of the question, I do not think there is any substance to the fear that the South Vietnamese may lead us down a road that we do not wish to travel. It is a question of judgment as to what is the wise road to follow, of course.

The question will remain one of great difficulty until it can be settled. I do not believe there is any reason for such a fear at the present time.

I share with the Senator, as we all do, nervousness over these resolutions. I think it is caused by nervousness about war in general. It is not because of the specific individual involved. We are all nervous about the expansion of the war. I know the President is.

The Presiding Officer. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. Javits. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield 2 additional minutes to me, so that I might finish my colloquy with the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. Dirksen. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The Presiding Officer. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. Fulbright. I am sure the President shares our concern. Great concern and apprehension are always created by the breaking out of violence in these areas.

Mr. Javits. I should like to ask the Senator whether we have a right to feel satisfied that our Government has taken or will take the necessary precautions to see that we shall not be committed beyond the extent to which we wish to be committed by the local Government of South Vietnam itself.

Mr. Fulbright. I believe we have, both in the past and presently. I do not believe that there is any probability of their going off and involving us where we do not wish to be involved. I believe we can maintain complete control over our own commitments.

* * * * *

Mr. Nelson. Mr. President, I have read the Record. There was some colloquy on the floor yesterday. I noticed that every Senator who spoke had his own personal interpretation of what the joint resolution means.

Our Senator yesterday stated for the Record that he understands the resolution to mean that there will be no more privileged sanctuaries.

Another Senator interprets the resolution to mean that it would authorize the Chief executive to eliminate any aggression, future and present. Some Senators interpret this language to mean aggression against South Vietnam; others interpret it to mean aggression directly against our military forces.

Another Senator interpreted the joint resolution to mean that it is the sense of Congress that no change is suggested by Congress in the present mission in South Vietnam—the mission that has been ours for 10 years, which is to supply advisers, technical advice, and material, for the purpose of attempting to encourage the establishment of an independent, viable regime, so that we can withdraw our forces; and that it has not been our mission in the past 10 years to substitute our military forces for the South Vietnamese forces, nor to join with them in a land war, nor to fight their battle for them, nor to substitute our Government for theirs.

This 10-year-old limited mission can be legitimately defended as a responsibility of ours to assist free and independent nations; and it can be legitimately questioned too, because of the gregraphic location of that mission.

In any event, I am most disturbed to see that there is no agreement in the Senate on what the joint resolution means. I would like to see it clarified.

If we are telling the public by this resolution that it is our responsibility to use our forces to win a war in southeast Asia——

The Presiding Officer. The 5 minutes of the Senator from Wisconsin have expired.

Mr. Nelson. I ask the Senator from Oregon to yield me some time.

Mr. Morse. Mr. President, I am willing to make a deal with the Senator from Arkansas. If I yield the Senator 4 minutes, will the Senator from Arkansas yield him some time?

Mr. Fulbright. We have only 7 minutes.

Mr. Dirksen. All the time for the quorum calls came out of our time.

Mr. Morse. I did not ask that it come out of the time on the other side. I did not ask for any quorum call. I am willing to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement that the time taken for the quorum calls be not counted.

Mr. Dirksen. Perhaps we should find out how the timekeeper can change the record.

Mr. Morse. I specifically said I would reserve time to yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. Dirksen. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The Presiding Officer. The Senator will state it.

Mr. Dirksen. Is it the understanding of the Chair that the last hour was to be equally divided between the two leaders for disposition as they saw fit; and is it also correct that the time for the quorum calls was taken out of our time?

The Presiding Officer. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, 1 hour was to be divided between the leadership. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, at the request of the Senator from Montana, the time used during the quorum calls was taken out of that 1 hour.

Mr. Morse. I say most respectfully that quorums calls were asked for by the proponents of the bill.

Mr. Dirksen. What happened to my half hour?

Mr. Morse. The proponents did not have any speakers for the resolution. That is why they suggested the absence of a quorum. Let us be frank about it. We have speakers against the resolution. I shall not deny my colleague from Alaska an opportunity to close the debate on the resolution. It is now 20 minutes to 1. Do Senators still wish to vote at 1 o'clock? How much time have I remaining?

The Presiding Officer. The Senator from Oregon has 15 minutes remaining. Very briefly let the Chair state that 1 hour was allotted to the majority leader and the minority leader. It was not understood that the time was to be divided between them.

Mr. Morse. I will reserve 10 minutes of my time for the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening]. The Senators from Arkansas and Illinois may have the rest of the time and use it as they see fit.

Mr. Dirksen. Out of whose time is that to come?

Mr. Morse. I have 15 minutes. I am reserving 10 minutes for the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. Fulbright. We have 7 minutes.

Mr. Morse. I will give the Senator 5 minutes of my time.

Mr. Nelson. I wonder if the Senator would accept an amendment.

Mr. Morse. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin, with the understanding that the time that I have reserved for the Senator from Alaska will be protected.

The Presiding Officer. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. Nelson. In view of the differing interpretations which have been put upon the joint resolution with respect to what the sense of Congress is, I should like to have this point clarified. I have great confidence in the President. However, my concern is that we in Congress could give the impression to the public that we are prepared at this time to change our mission and substantially expand our commitment. If that is what the sense of Congress is, I am opposed to the resolution. I therefore ask the distinguished Senator from Arkanas if he would consent to accept an amendment, a copy of which I have supplied him. I shall read it into the Record:

On page 3, line 3, after the word "That" insert "(a)".

On page 2, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

"(b) The Congress also approves and supports the efforts of the President to bring the problem of peace in southeast Asia to the Security Council of the United Nations, and the President's declaration that the United States, seeking no extension of the present military conflict, will respond to provocation in a manner that is 'limited fitting.' Our continuing policy is to limit our role to the provision of aid, training assistance, and military advice, and it is the sense of Congress that, except when provoked to a greater response, we should continue to attempt to avoid a direct military invlovement in the southeast Asian conflict."

This amendment is not an interference with the exercise of the President's constitutional rights. It is merely an expression of the sense of Congress. Would the Senator accept the amendment?

Mr. Fulbright. It states fairly accurately what the President has said would be our policy, and what I stated my understanding was as to our policy; also what other Senators have stated. In other words, it states that our response should be appropriate and limited to the provocation, which the Senator states as "respond to provocation in a manner that is limited and fitting," and so forth. We do not wish any political or military bases there. We are not seeking to gain a colony. We seek to insure the capacity of these people to develop along the lines of their own desires, independent of domination by communism.

The Senator has put into his amendment a statement of policy that is unobjectionable. However, I cannot accept the amendment under the circumstances. I do not believe it is contrary to the joint resolution, but it is an enlargement. I am informed that the House is now voting on this resolution. The House joint resolution is about to be presented to us. I cannot accept the amendment and go to conference with it, and thus take responsibility for delaying matters.

I do not object to it as a statement of policy. I believe it is an accurate reflection of what I believe is the President's policy, judging from his own statements. That does not mean that as a practical matter I can accept the amendment. It would delay matters to do so. It would cause confusion and require a conference, and present us with all the other difficulties that are involved in this kind of legislative action. I regret that I cannot do it, even though I do not at all disagree with the amendment as a general statement of policy.

Mr. Nelson. Judging by the Record of yesterday, many Senators do not interpret the resolution in the same way.

Mr. Fulbright. Senators are entitled to have different views. However, most members of the committee, with one or two exceptions, interpret it the same way.

The Presiding Officer. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. Fulbright. Differences of interpretation are necessarily always present. I think the Senator's statement is a fair statement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For example, I quote from my remarks on August 7, 1964:

> I believe the joint resolution is calculated to prevent the spread of the war rather than to spread it, as has been alleged by some critics of the resolution.

This is, of course, what I was interpreting to the Senate as having been told by the administration.

> But essentially the joint resolution is an exhibition of solidarity in regard to the will and determination of this country as a whole, as represented in Congress, to support the broad policies that have been well announced and well described in the words of the President, both recently and in past months. We are exhibiting a desire to support those policies. That will have a strong psychological effect upon our adversaries, wherever they may be.

The Senator will recall that the President at that time, in contrast to the Republican candidate, was taking the position that he was opposed to escalation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Absolutely.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And that is what I thought we were supporting. And I was supporting the President's policies, and I was very much opposed to the Republican candidate's policies.

Mr. RUSSELL. There was nothing dovelike in the resolution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. The Senator recalls the circumstances at that time. It was the beginning of the campaign in 1964.

But does the Senator believe that in adopting this resolution the Senate had any intention of giving advance approval for the President to involve the Nation in a conflict of this magnitude?

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot speak for the Senate. Personally, at that time I did not contemplate anything of this magnitude. I want to be perfectly honest with the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Neither did I.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was first told by my distinguished colleague from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], who at that time was an Assistant Secretary of State, about the proposal to send some 200 or 400 men to Vietnam in the capacity of trainers. President Eisenhower was kind enough to advise me of his intention because of the strong position I had taken in opposition to it. I was apprised of it after the fact, but there was nothing I could have done if I had known of it before. Congress was out of session.

Senator Morton came to Georgia and told me the technicians had been sent to Vietnam. I said that there was nothing I could do about it but that I regretted to hear it. I said, "I think you are opening up a trail today that will be costly in blood and treasure to this country, and that where there are 200 or 300 in Vietnam today there will be thousands there tomorrow."

But I am frank to say that I did not expect the war to assume this magnitude at the time we passed the resolution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator will, I think, admit that the common understanding at the time has a bearing on the present issue. Does the Senator believe that this resolution can stand constitutionally as a substitute for a congressional declaration of war?

Mr. RUSSELL. What resolution?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Gulf of Tonkin resolution that we have been discussing.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is a nice constitutional question that I would have to consider. I think it amounts to a congressional approval of a state of war, if it is not a formal declaration of war.

The Senator knows we have been engaged in a number of other very bloody and substantial wars without any formal declaration of war. The Korean war was the last one. The bloodiest war ever fought between citizens of the United States was fought without any formal declaration.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator mean the Civil War?

Mr. RUSSELL. I mean the Civil War. There were those in Congress at that time who wished to have a formal declaration made against the Southern States, and there were those in the Confederate Congress who wished to have a formal declaration made against the Union. For one reason or another they never did do it. I do not know why. I know that matter was discussed in both Congresses, in the Southern States and in the Union, but no formal declaration of war was made, and for 4 years that was the bloodiest war we ever had.

I do not see how it can benefit this country by one iota to pass a formal declaration of war at this time. I would like to have one reason given as to how we would be benefited.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is not the effect of this amendment.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I interpret what the Senator said to mean that he believes the southeast Asia resolution is a constitutional substitute for a declaration of war. Is that a fair statement or not?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I don't think it is, but it is a legislative approval of the state of war that is there.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How can the Senator say that logically when he said the present war was not in his mind. And he is the man most concerned with the military in the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations. If this present situation was not in his mind and not imagined or foreseen, how can it have been approved in advance?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator asked me a straightforward question: Did I contemplate at the time this resolution was passed that this war would ever assume the magnitude that it has today?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I gave him an honest answer, and I told him I did not.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. What bearing that has on this amendment I fail to see.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Maybe I can develop that later. I am trying to lay some groundwork.

Mr. RUSSELL. Perhaps the Senator is laying a trap.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No, I could not begin to lay a trap, even if I wanted to. The Senator is much more alert on Senatorial procedure than I will ever be. I am trying to ask straightforward questions on constitutionality. The Senator is a great student of the Constitution.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am trying to develop what the situation is on this constitutional issue. I hope he does not consider the questions to be unfair. This issue bothers a lot of people.

Mr. RUSSELL. It causes all of us concern.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Constitution is still important in this country.

Mr. RUSSELL. It causes me concern. The Korean war caused me concern whether we should pass a formal declaration of war. But I see nothing whatever to be gained by a declaration at this late date, and, therefore, I am opposed to it very strongly. I can see much more harm than good.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would like to ask the Senator another question.

A State Department legal memorandum, dated March 4, 1966, on the legality of our involvement in Vietnam states:

> It may be suggested that a declaration of war is the only available constitutional process by which Congressional support can be made effective for the use of United States armed forces in combat abroad. But the Constitution does not insist on any rigid formalism. It gives Congress a choice of ways in which to exercise its powers. In the case of Viet Nam the Congress has supported the determination of the President by the Senate's approval of the SEATO Treaty, the adoption of the Joint Resolution of August 10, 1964, and the enactment of the necessary authorizations and appropriations.

Does the Senator believe that any of these measures, singly or collectively, constitute a declaration of war against North Vietnam?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I do not think they constitute a declaration of war by the Congress. But the Senator knows as well as I that when treaties are approved by Congress they have all the force of the Constitution itself. When we give our approval to the President carrying out our obligations under a treaty, if such an obligation actually exists, I think this is a method of making war other than by formal declaration.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In the case of the Korean war we did have the formal treaty commitment of the United Nations Charter. That war was carried out under the auspices or authorization of the United Nations. Therefore, it meets the Senator's criteria. That is not the case with the Vietnam war.

The war is not being carried out or sanctioned by the United Nations. There has not even been any formal collective action under the SEATO Treaty. The Senator will note that the quotation from the State Department memorandum does not allege that there has been formal SEATO action.

Mr. RUSSELL. This was not lost on me, and I had not read the memorandum. The first time I heard it was when the Senator read it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I assure the Senator that that is the correct quotation.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not challenge the Senator on that at all.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator agree that there is much public uncertainty and frustration about this war?

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree there is much uncertainty and frustration about any war. War is not a pleasant state of affairs. There is great frustration attendant on any war, even those smaller than this war.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would the Senator say the same thing about World War II; that there was uncertainty about our role; the same kind of division we have today?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think there was greater frustration in World War II than today.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Really?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I do.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not recall that there were protests, at least not any similar to those we have today—in and out of Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. That was before the day when students exert such a tremendous influence on our Government. Back in those days, demonstrators would have been very unpopular. The police department would have immediately locked them up and would have done so roughly. The police would have piled them into the paddy wagons and dragged them off to jail. Today, however, it is a different story, with cries of "police brutality," and such, now that we have become such a sophisticated people.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did we not have demonstrations in World War II?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, there were demonstrations in World War II.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There was a formal declaration of war, which everyone accepted, was there not? I do not recall any substantial opposition to the war other than from a number of pacifists and conscientious objectors. There was no substantial criticism of the declaration of war, was there?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not recall much.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not recall any.

Mr. RUSSELL. There was some, of course.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is always some.

Mr. RUSSELL. There were some 56 or 57 Members of Congress, I believe, who voted against a declaration of war in World War I—a considerable number of them, at any rate. There were very few who voted against a declaration of war in World War II. I believe Mrs. Jeanette Rankin voted against it.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for a brief observation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am glad to yield for a very brief statement. I should like to finish this colloquy.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator.

On that point, there was the IWW that called for a cessation, but they switched back and forth. But I remember that there were many demonstrations held by them, but they did not get the communications attention that such demonstrations get today because we did not have any television then, or so vast a communications media as today's press and radio. So that whether it was to a greater or a lesser degree than it is today, would be very hard to say.

From my personal experience, I can say that today many of the demonstrations which take place are overexpanded in the communications media. Sometimes we read that there were 2,000 protestors when actually there might have been only 200. I speak from experience at the recent visit of the Vice President, Mr. HUMPHREY, to Stanford University. There were some 6,000 persons present, I am told, and yet out of that number, only 200 were the troublemakers.

Thus, it gets back to how big was the noise, which is hard to ascertain.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There were a lot of draft-dodger cases.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; many of them. They were men trying to escape the Selective Service draft, just as we have today. They are going to Canada today. In World War I and World War II, many of them went to Mexico. They went down there in large numbers. There were two young men, members of my high school class, who went down to Mexico to avoid service. I know that this ruined the lives of two very nice boys.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to complete my colloquy, but I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will be brief. Of course, in World War I, there were all kinds of demonstrations and marches based upon the fact: Why were we going overseas to fight this war for democracy in Europe? There were parades up and down Fifth Avenue and every other place in the country. In proportion, there was almost as much unrest, but a little like the Senator from California has just pointed out, not much was said about it, the coverage was not the same as it is today.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for a 10-second observation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In that connection, let me ask, did this take place before or after the declaration of war?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Both.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator will recall that Woodrow Wilson's campaign was run on the basis of opposition to the war and keeping America out of the war. Shortly thereafter we got into it and that caused an outcry. I, therefore, wonder whether the Senator is clear in his mind that after a declaration of war there was still great opposition to our participation in it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I can look it up in the record——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not really remember the facts, frankly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I happened to be reading an article recently. I will get it. I was not old enough to get into World War I. I tried to do so, but I could not make it.

I remember seeing a newsreel in a small theater about these marches and it was after the declaration of war, because our troops were going overseas to fight a war that some people did not like for us to get involved in. It certainly was after the declaration.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the Senator from Arkansas yield for one more observation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. I was in World War I for 3 days. But, in my industry, the motion picture industry, we were asked to do whatever we could to make it possible for this country to enter World War II.

As I entered the Chamber today I was commenting to one of my colleagues about a scene that we had been asked to insert into a picture we were making, in order to prove to the American people that the scene, which had to do with Maxim Litvinov and his visit to this country which was occurring at that time, should be publicized, in order to help friendship between the United States and Russia, which at that time it was hoped could be brought about. It was on this impulse that we tried to make it palatable to the American people. I do not think that anyone wants to go to war now, any more than he did before.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not wish to prolong this colloquy, but it is history that the territory of the United States was directly and very violently attacked by the Japanese at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. That beginning was quite different from the origin of this war.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Surely.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think we will all admit that.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question about that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Well, the Senator will recall the long debate in the Senate in 1951—he referred to it a moment ago—on the question of sending U.S. troops to Europe. I am sure that he will recall the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees held lengthy joint hearings on the matter. In the light of the development concerning our involvement in Vietnam, I should like to have the Senator's comment on this portion of the joint committees' report which I believe had much to do with the President's consulting with the appropriate congressional committees before ground troops were sent to NATO.

The joint committee believes—

The Senator from Georgia, I believe, was chairman of this joint committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not recall that. I do not believe I was, because as a rule I always yielded that distinction, to, I believe, the former Senator from Texas, Mr. Connally.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was thinking the Senator was——

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Texas, Mr. Connally.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I quote from the report:

> The joint committee believes that, in such important matters which involve the security of the United States and world peace, the Congress should be kept informed of developments and should be in a position to participate in the formulation of major policy steps. In this way the unity of purpose and action on the part of the Executive and the Congress so necessary to public understanding and the full cooperation of the American people will be assured.

Does the Senator consider that to be a proper request to make of the executive branch?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think there is nothing unreasonable in that request. I think that any President of the United States understands he has to live with Congress and that he would do well to keep Congress as well informed as he can, consistent with the limitation of the safety and security of the country.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator think that there is now general public understanding of the Vietnamese war, the degree of understanding which was the object of this language in the joint committee's report?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know what the degree of public understanding is throughout the country. The Senator has correctly stated that many people are opposed to this war. I think that Congress has been very well advised. The Senator certainly was of that opinion because he read from the debate.

I wish to place in the RECORD the exchange between the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], in which the Senator from Kentucky asked:

> Then, looking ahead, if the President decided that it was necessary to use such force as could lead into war, we will give that authority by this resolution?
>
> Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the way I would interpret it. If a situation later developed in which we though the approval should be withdrawn, it could be withdrawn by concurrent resolution.

That situation still exists. Any Senator is at liberty to offer a concurrent resolution to withdraw any authority in the Tonkin Gulf resolution that he may think has been abused by the Chief Executive.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator correctly reads that, and I do not know that I can say any more with regard to my own misguided actions—misguided because I did not understand the situation properly. I misinterpreted the views of the President, and the significance of the resolution. I have said that on numerous occasions in public.

What I have been trying to do—alone as well as collectively with other Members of the Senate—is to influence the policy of the administration toward a negotiated settlement of the conflict in Vietnam, as contrasted to a military victory. That is really all I propose. And it is really what the Senator from Pennsylvania proposes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am trying to influence the policy of the Government. Admitting that I have been mistaken in the past; admitting that this administration and previous administrations—as the Senator has said, to his own knowledge—were mistaken in their initial——

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not above saying I have been mistaken. I have been mistaken.

Mr. FULBRIGHT The question now is, What is the wise course? There is plenty of fault to go around.

The Senator from Georgia and I would both like the war to be brought to an end. The only difference between the Senator from Georgia and myself is over what is best calculated to bring it to an end, which policy will lead to a permanent disengagement. Some people seem to think it is not wise for us to disengage;

that it is our duty to stay in Vietnam as a counterbalance to China.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Will the Senator define "disengage"?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; to remove our physical presence from Vietnam and Thailand, and that we return to what I thought was our policy, relying on naval and air power to maintain whatever influence is required in that area, rather than to establish and maintain permanent land bases.

We used to have a policy, supported by such military authorities as General MacArthur and others, that was firmly opposed to getting this Nation involved in a land war in Asia.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Suppose it involved our air and sea power against North Vietnam?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If there was proper provocation for it, I think we should use our air and sea power in whatever way was necessary, but not in such a manner as to establish a colony or a permanent base there.

Both the Senator from Georgia and I have the same objective; the only difference between us is over which is the best policy calculated to bring about disengagement, the removal of our military presence in the long run. I do not say immediately because I think working out the arrangements is going to be a complicated matter.

This amendment is an attempt to try to influence discussion, and possibly bring about a reconsideration of policy by the administration. It obviously has a free hand to do pretty much as it pleases, but we can at least give advice.

Mr. RUSSELL. We can adopt a concurrent resolution terminating the authority in the previous resolution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it would be impractical to do that. If the Senator from Georgia could be persuaded to share my views, and so state them, this in itself could well bring about a change in the policy of this administration. His long prestige as the senior Member in this body in the field of armed services over a long period of years gives him great influence. If I could bring the Senator to share my views, that would cause the President to wonder whether he was following the right policy.

Mr. RUSSELL. May I say that the Senator has certainly rewarded me for the long time I have been on my feet by that laudatory statement. It is appreciated much more than it is deserved.

I, of course, share the fervent hope, and even the prayer, for an honorable conclusion of hostilities at the earliest possible date. I do not think we are going to arrive at that happy state of affairs through a policy of deescalating the war. That is where I differ with the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think we will hasten the day of peace by stopping the bombing in North Vietnam or by deescalating the war. In my opinion, the only way we will arrive at a termination of hostilities will be through the same course of action we followed in Korea, and that is by keeping the pressure on North Vietnam until Ho Chi Minh concludes that he cannot possibly win and that it would serve his national interest to bring the war to a conclusion.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. In just a moment. As I recall, within 3 or 4 days of the meeting at Panmunjom the Chinese were issuing avowals every day that under no conditions would they talk about a cessation of hostilities as long as we had a military presence in Korea. But they did. They eventually came to talk about a cessation of hostilities, and we finally brought about a peace of a sort there in Korea. When we are able to arrive at negotiations in Vietnam, I hope we will do a better job than we did in Korea, because what we did there was more in the nature of an armistice than it was a permanent peace.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I was wondering if the Senator believes we can win a military victory there.

Mr. RUSSELL. I know we can if we want to apply the power there that we have.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator advocate our doing that?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. I have urged certain steps. I have urged naval bombardment. I am delighted that the administration has ordered it. I favor extension of the air attacks until all their power facilities and whatever potential they have for making war are destroyed. But I am opposed to landing one American soldier on the shores of North Vietnam. I think the surest way to create a long period of hostilities of great magnitude in that area would be to undertake to do what is being proposed here in some of these amendments. That is why I oppose them.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator think further escalation and bombing of the north and further deployment of American troops in the south, with continuation of the costly search-and-destroy mission, is going to bring the war to an end more quickly than if we do not pursue those aggressive tactics?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, I think it will, and I think it will be done at a much lesser cost in American life than by an absolute prohibition on the number that can be engaged and by telling the enemy that—

> This number we are going to permit over there; you can bring down as many as you want—bring a million, if you want to, from the North. We have put a limit at 500,000. That is all we will have. If you can kill them all, you can achieve your end; and we are not going to bomb you; just keep on the roads and on the seas and bring in the army and all the forces you can, because we are not going to bring more than 500,000 troops into Vietnam.

To me that does not make sense.

We have been very slow in changing our policy. I have been critical of some policies of the administration. I think if they decide they are going to wage war, they should wage war.

I must say I do not go along with the enclave theory that has been supported by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator will, of course——

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it will just mean more American boys killed, that is all.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator will, of course, permit me to disagree with him.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes, of course. I knew the Senator would disagree. I just stated I disagreed with him.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will yield briefly to the Senator. I am almost ready to conclude; I merely wish to say a few more words.

Mr. SYMINGTON. One point that worries me. We talk about disengagement. The enclave theory, to the best of my knowledge, is opposed by every leading military man on active duty, without exception—Army, Navy, or Air.

As the Senator defines disengagement, he does not agree does he, that we should retreat to a few centers in South Vietnam, so as to let the enemy mass their attacks at will against remaining American troops.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. General Gavin has discussed this theory twice. The Senator says "no one on active duty." I am glad that he used the word "active." Generals Ridgway and Gavin, who made the study for President Eisenhower back in 1954 of possible American intervention in southeast Asia recommended against our entering the war at that time, I believe. As the Senator knows, General Gavin came and testified before the Foreign Relations Committee only last week. Given the objective which I tried to state a moment ago, his theory makes more sense to me than unlimited escalation of the war.

I foresee the possibility—and I do not like to run the risk—of inducing the Chinese to enter this war. Once that happens, as it did in Korea, it will become a very different kind of conflict, one which would be extremely difficult to end on any honorable basis except through an all-out, very costly war.

I do not think our vital interests are involved there. As I said a while ago there are all kinds of complications to the situation in Vietnam. Yesterday very important people from the administration called upon me to talk about NATO. They urged me not to go along with the resolution of the majority leader, which I had already publicly stated I favored. This war brings on all sorts of complications. This incident ties in with General Gavin's testimony.

Last year, as the Senator from Missouri remembers, General Gavin made a major point of the overcommitment of our military forces. The Senator from Missouri, too, has taken that line, from a somewhat different angle.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think this is a part of that picture.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I said so as far back as last April. I think this country is overcommitted around the world.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If there were only

Vietnam in the commitment picture, if that were the only responsibility we had—if we did not have the NATO commitment, for example—and had very little prospect of other engagements, I might favor a different approach. After putting all of the pieces together, it seems to me the interests of this country are not served by the great cost of this war in lives, and money, and by the risk we are taking of becoming involved in an unlimited war with China.

I do not believe that North Vietnam wishes to be a satellite, or in any way controlled by China. But I think we are gradually forcing her into the position of having to make a choice between us and the Chinese. Reluctantly she would probably take the Chinese, and ask them to come in.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. After personally investigating through all the windows we have to China, from Japan to Hong Kong on down, I found no one who felt that any amount of bombing, even the bombing of civilian housing which nobody wishes to do, would bring in the Chinese—no member of the State Department, no member of the CIA, and no member of the military.

On the other hand, about half felt that landing ground troops in southern North Vietnam would bring in the Chinese; and everybody, in all three of those departments, felt that any ground troop landing around Hanoi or Haiphong would bring in the Chinese.

What worries me greatly is this constant steady attack on any qualitative utilization of air power and sea power. About this I completely agree with the Senator from Georgia—through airpower and seapower there is a greater chance of bringing the North Vietnamese to the conference table than if we continue this fight on the ground. That is why it is so disturbing to have people I respect, like the Senator from Pennsylvania, constantly criticizing any bombing, but apparently would support the idea—to me a guarantee of heavy additional loss of American lives, with no possibility of any success—of the enclave theory.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator in a moment, but the Senator from Arkansas has the floor.

If we are anxious to achieve success at minimum cost in money and lives, why favor the ground war, as exemplified by the enclave theory? Why is there so much effort on the part of many people, not to use the qualitative advantages we have in the air and on the sea?

Why do we have unnecessary sacrifices in order to play their game, instead, if we should fight at all, working on a basis that is more advantageous to us?

If the President decides to get out of Vietnam now, I am ready to get out. But I am not ready to agree to leave those young men, whom I have seen over there three times in the last 15 months, operate under rules and regulations which would make it impossible for them, as I see it, to achieve any success.

There has never been anything in history that will justify the concept of bringing the North Vietnamese to the conference table through a display of weakness as against a display of strength. Let me emphasize again that I am not talking about any bombing of civilians, only military targets. I just do not understand why some people wish to see us continue to fight on the ground over there, and not use our qualitative advantages.

I have asked this of the Senator. I say this with great respect and in no sense of criticism.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Ever since General Gavin first came before the committee I have been greatly concerned about the psychology of this war. In correspondence with me, General Ridgway endorsed General Gavin's position.

The Senator from Missouri says it involves success. It involves the question of what is necessary. This particular point, I think, involves a judgment of human nature. The Senator has had much experience with that in connection with his own constituents or he would not be elected. Every Member of this body must have some feeling about the reactions and attitudes of his constituents. I think there is some difference between the views of the Senator from Missouri and myself about the people in Vietnam. This is why it is not inappropriate to discuss the origin of the war.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator mean North Vietnam or South Vietnam?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Both. It involves people who are opposed to us, whether they are in North or South Vietnam. It is not inappropriate or irrelevant to consider how the war started or how the people feel about it. Many people say that that has nothing to do with it. It does have something to do with it in connection with making a correct judgment about the attitudes of the people who are fighting.

Bernard Fall and Jean Lacoutre, who have been engaged in long study of Vietnam, have different views from the administration about what is likely to make North Vietnam come to the conference table. Are they likely to do so under the pressure we exert? They may be inclined to, although, coming from the Ozark hills as I do, and seeing how some of those mountain people resent being pushed around, I am inclined to doubt whether they would.

When I first ran for the Senate one of the most nervous men in one county was a banker. He had many trucks on the road. He did not want the Governor, my opponent, on his back. He liked me, but he could not support me. But across the street was a poor fellow who was not concerned about the Governor because he did not have anything to lose. He did not mind letting people know where he stood. My point is that I am not at all sure that the United States scares those poor little people in Vietnam as we think we are scaring them. They do not have much to lose like rich people or rich nations do. I wish they would give up. We have the power to kill them wholesale, but I certainly would not like to do it because I think that approach misjudges the psychology of these people.

I am not at all sure that the so-called Rostow theory of surgical bombing is sound psychologically. It would be much more sound if it were applied to Paris, for example. Paris is a great city. Threatened with disaster, the government there might consider giving up in order to save Paris. But what do the people of North Vietnam have to lose? This is an integral part of the judgment as to what is likely to succeed in this war.

First, our national interests are not in any way so substantially involved—I think the Senator from Georgia confirmed that in his original reaction to our first sending in 200 people.

The Senator from Georgia did not object at that time. He did not think our national interest was involved in Vietnam. He did not want any part of it. But now he finds himself inextricably involved in a tragedy, and he thinks that the best way to bring the war to a close is to continue increasing the military pressure.

We must think of our national interests and our commitments in other parts of the world, particularly in Europe, where, as one of the leading authorities said yesterday, "You know, the big league is still Europe, not Asia."

We must make a choice and use our best judgment to determine what the other side is like, and how they view the war. And it does make a difference how they view it. Rightly or wrongly, I do not think they believe they are the aggressor and that they have sought to invade that country without provocation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator does not associate the matter of bombing military airfields, on which there are planes preparing to fight against American pilots, with attacking Paris?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I only use that as an illustration to show the difference between the reactions of poor people, who have nothing to lose—their determination and their independence of official threats—and rich people do not have that degree of freedom.

The Senator knows very well that rich people are the nervous ones. If one has a lot to lose, he tends to be nervous. That is a well-known characteristic.

A rich person is a nervous man because he has a lot to lose. That is only natural.

If I were rich, I would be the same way, but coming from the Ozarks, I do not have a lot to lose.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Perhaps the position of the Senator and myself on some of these points are closer than he thinks. The difference is, if we are to stay there, the Senator wants to stay on a different basis than I would. I would stay on the basis of maximum accomplishment with minimum expenditures and, more important, minimum casualties.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has mentioned Korea. I do not like that settlement because we still have 55,000 men there. However, that situation, bad as it is, is better than the war we are waging in Vietnam. We have to keep many men there and it costs a lot of money. We have spent a great deal of money in Korea, and I used to complain about it during consideration of the foreign-aid bill. However, that was peanuts compared with the bill for the Vietnam war.

What I am trying to do is to develop the idea that the administration could possibly be wrong in their calculations of the ultimate wisdom of the policy they are following.

I know it is their decision to make. All I can do is give them the best judgment that I have, based upon our hearings, what I have read and heard, and my discussions with knowledgeable people who know a great deal more about this situation than I do.

Mr. Fall, who was tragically killed in Vietnam the other day, knew much about the history and background of these people. He had specialized in that field for 15 years.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will yield in a moment, but I am about ready to yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK. I do not intend to ask for the floor. I would appreciate it if the Senator would keep the floor very briefly. I should like to make the point that my friend, the Senator from Missouri, I am sure quite inadvertently, has misrepresented my position about the bombing, and I know he did not mean to do so.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I did not mean to misrepresent anything, and would be very glad to be clarified if I have made a mistake.

Mr. CLARK. I appreciate the point of view of the Senator.

My position has been and is that I would stop the bombing for the third time in order to explore the clear signals, and I think they are clear signals, which have come in the last several months from North Vietnam, to the effect that if we stop our bombing, they would be willing to talk. I would take the calculated risk of stopping the bombings. However, I must say that I get a little tired of having my position represented as though I wanted to subject American boys in South Vietnam to an extra hazard.

The moment that Ho Chi Minh started to step up the rate of infiltration, I would resume the bombing. I would certainly use the bombing to defend the enclaves and close support. If the North Vietnamese air force were foolish enough to come down with offensive measures against the South Vietnamese, I would take out their airfields.

Therefore, I think that what is being done is to erect a sort of strawman with respect to the position which it is alleged that those of us who would like to stop the aggressive action and move on the defensive are advocating.

All we are saying is that we want to defend our boys in South Vietnam with everything we have got. We want to get to the negotiating table as soon as we can.

We think that the search and destroy policy is unduly costly of American life. We think that the pacification program is not working and will not work.

We do believe there is an excellent chance if we stop the bombing in North Vietnam that we will find ourselves within the reasonably near future with an armistice and negotiations.

If that position turns out to be wrong, I would still take a defensive position, but I would resume the bombing of North Vietnam for the purpose of preventing that very infiltration from the north which gives the Senator from Missouri so much concern.

I make the point made by the great hawk, Joseph Alsop, a short time ago—it was made at the hearings which I guess were executive, but it has been made abundantly clear and it comes from a number of sources—that North Vietnam can send just as many men and supplies in support of the Vietcong right now under bombing as they want to.

It is a good deal more expensive than if we were not bombing, but they can send as many of Ho Chi Minh's boys down to kill American boys as they want, regardless of the bombing.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator believe that? He has quoted a newspaperman. Does the Senator believe it is true that if we attack such military targets, military airfields, and knock out military aircraft and power stations and petroleum dumps, they can still send just as many North Vietnamese down as they desire?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is an indictment of the military effort of the United States, and I do not believe it.

Mr. CLARK. Who has the floor?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have the floor. I yielded to the Senator for a colloquy. I will yield to the other Senator also.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I will be glad to listen.

Mr. CLARK. I conclude very briefly by saying that I do not think the bombing is stopping the infiltration of the south by the north, and I believe that I have put that in the RECORD already from the hearings on the bill.

I know that I have been told in executive session, in a situation which I cannot repeat here, that what I say is true. They can send as many people down as they wish. It will cost them a little more.

I am happy to yield, and I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is Secretary McNamara's statement about this subject. I quote from page 73 of the hearing on the supplemental military procurement bill.

> But I never believed in the past, and I don't believe today, that air bombardment on any acceptable scale will stop or significantly reduce the movement of such small numbers of men and such small quantities of material as are being sent from the north to the south.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I was present when the Secretary made that statement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is good authority.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would also make a point this afternoon that has to do with the testimony of General Gavin.

No one has greater respect for General Gavin than I, having known him for many years. He was an outstanding Army officer.

At the time of Dienbienphu, when others of the military were on one side of that picture and he and General Ridgway on the other, I fully supported his position. I believe, however, that there is a marked difference between the position of today and the position at the time of Dienbienphu.

All people occasionally make mistakes. There was a time when over 90 percent of the Army budget was for missiles at a time when our troops in Berlin were carrying 20-pound radios, with children in the streets of Little Rock and St. Louis with a better radio that weighed 3 pounds.

The atomic cannon also comes to mind. I am sure all Senators will agree that did not prove to be one of the best weapons of the time.

I was in Vietnam during the last bombing pause, over a year ago. What did it get our forces? As to whether we should have another bombing pause, that is a matter of opinion.

The President of the United States is in a right good position to know these matters. He says that at this time there is no light leading to negotiation; therefore he does not wish to stop the bombing.

For some reason, when Senators—including some who have a basic apprehension about all military men—find a military man who conforms to their thinking, all of a sudden he leaves the military pack and becomes a prophet overnight.

General Gavin completely disagrees with the theory just expressed by the Senator from Pennsylvania, because he said at the recent hearing that we should not have any more bombing of North Vietnam regardless, under no conditions. He would stop it and keep it stopped, no matter what, and then protect a few ground forts like Cam Ranh Bay.

I believe that is the type and character of defeatism which is dangerous to the security of the United States as apparently he believes the thinking of all the current Joint Chiefs of Staff and the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia is detrimental to that security.

Those men out there represent us. They are doing their best, fighting; many are dying, many more are being wounded. I say give them all qualitative advantages possible to in turn give them the best chance.

I have no more respect for General Gavin, who is in private business and has been out of the Pentagon for over 10 years, than I have for the present Joint Chiefs of Staff. Nor do I have any more respect for his opinion as I have for the opinions of the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Georgia, who listen day after day, to these problems.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have to take issue with the way the Senator has characterized what I believe to be General Gavin's intention in his statement. I believe that the Senator has overstated it.

I have the greatest respect for the judgment of General Gavin, and the fact that he has had civilian experience and experience as an ambassador adds to his credibility. He has had a successful military role, a second role as a high ranking diplomat, and now he has experience in private industry. He is a young man, relatively speaking, an extremely intelligent man, with this rather unique background of having three careers.

As to my choosing him to rely on as a military authority, I will have to say that the Senator does the same thing with political people. He approves of some and he disapproves of others. There is nothing peculiar about that.

I thank the Senator from Georgia for his patience in answering these questions. I hope that the discussion has shed some light as to our respective positions. The Senator has been most patient and fair in his responses, as he always is, and I appreciate his taking the time to respond.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. I am always happy to discuss any matter with the Senator from Arkansas. He is always fair in his statements.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the following occurred during the course of the hearings when General Gavin appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations:

> Senator Cooper. Now, the Administration said that it is willing to, we understand, to stop the bombing of North Vietnam if there could be some sign—I think the President said almost any sign. So you will know I am not in opposition to this idea, I may say that I have said last year when the bombing pause was brought to a close, I thought the pause should be continued, and I think it should have been this year.
>
> General Gavin. Yes, sir.
>
> Senator Cooper. But in what respect then do you differ from the statement of the Administration that it would halt the bombing if it could find some sign of reciprocity on the part of North Vietnam at present, almost any sign?
>
> General Gavin. Senator Cooper, I do not think we should be bombing North Vietnam. In this respect I differ. We should not be bombing North Vietnam regardless.

General Gavin was never much of a friend of the Air Force. That is his right. But I think his present position is but further denigration of airpower, naval airpower as well as Air Force airpower; and I believe such denigration is not in the best interest of the United States.

This position of the General is stronger than the position the Senator from Arkansas has taken with respect to the bombing of North Vietnam, and stronger than the position taken by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RUSSELL. The amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania is different from the explanation he has made, because the amendment says that none of the funds authorized by this act or any other act should be used to carry out military operations in or over North Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. That means our forces absolutely cannot drop one bomb on North Vietnam, under any circumstances.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator has stopped short of the period at the end of the sentence—unless there is a declaration of war.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, unless there is a declaration of war.

Mr. CLARK. And if, after we stop the bombing, the Ho Chi Minh army comes down in massive force to the south, then I would vote for a declaration.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing in the amendment about the forces coming down.

Mr. CLARK. All the amendment says is that we are now in a situation where, in my judgment, if we are going to continue to escalate this war, we ought to have a declaration of war. I would stop the bombing, to see if we can get to the negotiating table. If that fails, and we find Ho Chi Minh's divisions coming down the trail and reenforcing the Vietcong to a massive extent, I would vote for a declaration of war; but I would still think we ought to have a declaration of war.

I point out to the Senator that the best figures the Department of Defense has given us is that there are presently 275,000 men in combat against us in South Vietnam, and 230,000 of those men are Vietcong, and only 45,000 are North Vietnamese regulars, and, in effect, the Vietcong are estimated to have only 10,000 Communists among their 230,000 troops. Other than the one for the number of Communists, these are figures which have been obtained from the Defense Department. I did not dream them up.

Mr. RUSSELL. If that is so, I had not understood that. I understood that only 46,000 organized North Vietnamese in units had been moved into the south, but that there were hard cadres there that had been engaged in training the Vietcong for a long time. This business of north and south is very difficult to follow, because it is more a matter of the philosophy of the individual than where he lives. You have men from the south in the north, and men from the north were in the south even before this fighting broke out.

The Senator will recall that immediately after the Geneva accords were signed, we furnished a great deal of transportation to enable a large number of people who lived in the north to move to the south.

A very large proportion of the Catholic population of the north did move south, and we transported them. We sent out a large number of LST's to move them down.

I want to refer further to the fact that the bombing is not a consonant thing. Secretary McNamara has never been very enthusiastic about the bombing. I think that he feels about it almost as the Senator from Arkansas does. General Wheeler, who has been to Vietnam often and is in close contact with the men, testified on page 137 of the hearings that the bombings had probably not reduced the infiltration of manpower, but had reduced supplies to the point where the North Vietnamese cannot take care of any additional manpower in the south.

General Wheeler is quoted as saying:

> I do believe, as I said yesterday, that our bombing in North Vietnam and against the infiltration routes [deleted] has reduced the level of materiel supplies which are moved from North Vietnam into South Vietnam.
>
> I cannot give you any figures on this. I also have the feeling that the reason we don't have the [deleted] combat battalions in South Vietnam that were anticipated [deleted] last year, the reason that we don't see a larger buildup of North Vietnamese troops in South Vietnam, is a measure of the effectiveness of our bombing campaign to date.

He testified to that effect two or three times in the hearings.

I agree that the Secretary of Defense was less convinced of the value of the bombings.

I believe in full and free debate and I want every Member of the Senate, whatever his views, to express them, and I shall defend to the death his right to express them on the floor of the Senate. But I believe that when amendments are urged here that would have the effect of absolutely terminating any bombing in the north, that this, in itself, will stir the dying embers of hope in the breasts of Ho Chi Minh and his associates. Every time they hear that leading Members of this body are supporting proposals that would forbid the use of the air arm against North Vietnam, and I think the air attacks hurt them as badly as anything does, that postpones the date of the settlement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. One of the things that it is hard for us to accept in this case is the great disparity between Vietnam and the United States. Most of our wars—I should not say most of our wars because the Spanish-American War, and particularly the action in the Philippines, was most one sided when it pitted the great United States against a few natives led by Aguinaldo—but at least in World War I and World War II the United States was fighting powers comparable to itself. This causes to arise in our consciences certain views about our national honor, and what we could do, and so forth. I never felt that in fighting this war the honor of this country was involved.

I felt we got into it more or less casually by mistake and that we should say, not necessarily in these words, that we made a mistake and "let us settle this matter."

We do not want to wipe off the face of the earth a small, weak, underdeveloped country. That is an element in this situation which would not be the case were we fighting countries comparable to our own, such as Russia or China.

It always embarrasses me a bit to feel that the United States, the greatest power in the world, with all of its economic wealth, its intelligent, skilled people, its great technology—all of that pitted against this poor little country of peasants who were not really threatening anybody, least of all the United States. It bothers me to realize what the United States is doing to these very backward, poor people who never thought of coming over to bother us.

The argument that we must fight them there or we will have to fight them in San Francisco is utter nonsense. The administration says that we are not going to fight China. This is the ambiguous situation that confuses people. On the one hand, the Secretary of State leads us to believe that this war is justified to contain China. On the other hand, statements are made—like those made here today—that we would do almost anything to keep China from becoming involved. We do not think they will intervene.

The Senator from Missouri said that all of these military experts have said that they do not think that China will come in. Then we are not containing China.

This is an example of the confusion that this war causes. But the Senator from Arkansas—being a simple Ozark hillbilly—would like to see this war stopped on an honorable basis. It might require at least tacit admission that we could have made some wrong decisions over the past 15 or 20 years, along the lines that the Senator from Georgia mentioned. When we put 200 U.S. soldiers there in 1955, for example. He is not adverse to saying we made a mistake. By implication he was mistaken just as I made a mistake in not examining more closely some of the steps taken in the past.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article by Chalmers M. Roberts, in which he said in part:

> As to the guerrillas, Ky said that the number of dedicated Communists who form the leadership of these forces numbers no more than 10,000. Some American officials have put that figure at about 8,000 or 9,000.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Ky Says "Too Soon" To Stop Bombing; Saigon Opposes Early Negotiations

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

Saigon, Feb. 3.—There are diverging views on the current talk about peace negotiations between the government here and that in Washington.

Today Premier Nguyen Cao Ky publicly paralleled President Johnson's press conference remarks, although he had not then seen them, only to the extent of calling for "some concrete suggestions" from Hanoi rather than just hints that talks "could" take place if the United States stopped bombing North Vietnam.

But there was nothing similar in what Ky said to Mr. Johnson's Thursday plea for "just almost any step" by Hanoi as a reason for halting the bombing.

Furthermore, it is now known that the Saigon government believes it is too soon for negotiations because it feels the next six months will vastly improve its own and the Allied position here and thus provide a far better bargaining position in what it considers will be extremely tough discussions with the Communists.

TALKS TO NEWSMEN

Ky made his remarks at a breakfast with a dozen newsmen in his modest Tansonnhut Airport home. He added that he feels "it is too soon to stop the bombing." He again spoke with reporters after helicoptering to the Mekong Delta just outside Cantho where he attended the solemn opening of a war cemetery by the Hoa Hao sect.

Ky said that "if their (Hanoi's) proposition is concrete, reasonable and provides South Vietnam with full independence and integrity I see no objections. Don't let them have a chance to destroy all the good things we have done in the past ten years."

The Premier added that the Communists "are more afraid of a civilian elected government here than of the military because it means a regime which is stable and stronger."

These last remarks are key to his thinking, observers said. He told newsmen that he now thinks that the election of a President can take place as early as the end of July with the legislative election in August or September. Earlier it had been assumed the presidential voting would not come before September.

It is the time to get a civilian government elected that Ky is now playing for and that means no halt in the military pressure, including bombing of the North, before that milestone is passed, according to observers.

CLEAN ELECTIONS

Ky added that "we must have very clean and honest elections to give the Presidency real prestige" and he added that he would invite 1000 newsmen to come and observe the voting. About 600 were here for last September's election of the Constituent Assembly which is now drafting the constitution which creates the Presidency.

Ky was publicly silent on his own plans but few here doubt he is a highly likely presidential candidate.

He was optimistic in his assessment of the war.

As to the guerrillas, Ky said that the number of dedicated Communists who form the leadership of these forces numbers no more than 10,000. Some American officials have put that figure at about 8000 or 9000.

Ky said that the Communists will have "to stop their aggression, stop infiltration, stop everything so the South and the North can live in peace for the next 20 or 25 years."

TOUGH TALKS

The Saigon government's belief that tough negotiations lie ahead, when they do take place, includes a clear realization that the Communists may very well try for a coalition regime in South Vietnam, observers said.

This will be stoutly resisted, the informed observers said, except that it is not beyond possibility that a former member or two of the National Liberation Front, the political arm of the Vietcong, could become cabinet members. But this could only occur, they added, if Saigon was certain he was either truly repentent or had been an NLF member simply because of Nationalist feelings.

It is realized that to accept such a possibility could be a means of helping the Communists save face on a settlement. But this all depends, it is felt, on the strength of a new civilian government and the state of the war. As to latter, Ky said today that he felt two American divisions should be sent into the Delta. So far a U.S. brigade of 4000 to 5000 men has been committed to the IV Corps area there, not all yet in place.

Hence Saigon is in no rush, as it sometimes thinks President Johnson seems to be, to get to the negotiating table.

Mr. COOPER and Mr. THURMOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Mondale in the chair). The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, as I came into the Chamber I heard my friend, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], allude to a question I had asked General Gavin when he testified before the Committee on Foreign Relations, and General Gavin's response. As it also stated my position, I should like to elaborate on it for a moment.

When the Tonkin Bay resolution came before the Senate in August 1964, it was managed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright]. In speaking on the resolution—a resolution for which I voted—I asked certain questions which went to the point of whether, under the resolution which was being considered by the Senate, and later supported by the Senate with the exception of two votes, we were giving approval, in advance, to the President of the United States to take action, not only to resist any attack made upon the forces of the United States—which he would have the authority to take no matter what the Congress did—but whether we were also approving, in advance, action against North Vietnam, including the bombing of North Vietnam.

In the debate, I stated that I thought section II of the resolution did provide to the President of the United States some character of approval in advance to action, even bombing of North Vietnam.

As I remember the answers of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, he agreed in effect with my statement. I then stated that because I was concerned about the implication of section II, I thought it was very necessary that the President take immedate steps toward negotiations to end the war, or refer it to the Geneva Convention or to the United Nations.

Since then, I visited Vietnam a year and 1 month ago, at the time of the bombing pause. When I returned, I talked to the President of the United States and stated that, in my view, the bombing pause should be continued to see whether there would be any response to the President's worldwide appeal for negotiation and peace.

That did not occur.

Then, with the recent bombing pause, I again stated that I thought it would be wise to continue the pause, to see whether any response could be made to the President's efforts, and to determine if there was a possibility of negotiations, as was suggested from many quarters.

I should like to say now that considering the great losses both to our men and to our resources—but particularly to our men if the war is continued for a long time—that I would prefer to risk another bombing cessation to determine if there is any willingness on the part of North Vietnam to negotiate. I cannot state the length of such a cessation because I do not believe that a government could ever say that it would not and could not take steps to defend its troops if necessary. But I would support another bombing pause to see whether there was any possibility of negotiations.

These are the views I have held, but in addressing myself to the amendment, I do not believe that it would have any effective value, other than expressing the views of those who favor it.

I make my statement for these reasons: Whatever our views may be, a war is in process and the President of the United States is acting as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. The Congress could cut off all funds to support our troops and effectively remove the power of the Commander in Chief to carry on the war—but the Congress will not do this, and I could not vote to withdraw support from those who fight there.

I do not believe that Congress can constitutionally limit the authority of the Commander in Chief to take such steps as he believes to be necessary in the discharge of his duties as Commander in Chief as this amendment proposes. I do not believe that the amendment has any value except to state the opinions of Members of the Senate who support it.

I do not believe the Congress could direct and command our forces. As I understand it, the President of the United States is trying to find an avenue for negotiations. We can give our views, our advice, marshal opinion, and my opinion is that although we disagree with the President, it is his function and his heavy responsibility to choose the best ways to enter negotiations.

For the reasons I have stated, I cannot support the amendment.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wholeheartedly support the supplemental military procurement and construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1967. This bill provides additional authorization for defense appropriations which are absolutely necessary if we are to back up our boys fighting in Vietnam.

I want to congratulate the able chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the other members of the committee for the careful work they have done in analyzing this measure.

I think it should be pointed out that this bill covers only a part of the funding authority which the Department of Defense is currently seeking. It is not concerned with personnel, operations, or maintenance of the armed services' operations in the Far East. It is primarily a backup bill to support the sacrifice our men are making in the combat zone. It seeks to provide a continuous supply of the aircraft and missiles which our forces need for their daily missions. It seeks to provide the research, development, testing, and evalution which our forces need to meet the special problems of combat and terrain which are encountered in a guerrilla-type war. It authorizes construction moneys for crash building programs necessary to supply support activity for Southeast Asia.

Thus, it will be seen that this particular bill is not authorizing any escalation or broadening of the war in Vietnam. It is simply backing up the GI's in Southeast Asia who are risking their lives fighting to preserve our freedom. Our country has put these men out there. We have a moral obligation to provide them with the equipment and facilities they need to do the job they are doing.

Unfortunately, some of the distinguished members of this body have chosen to treat this legislation as though it were a new policy declaration. They are using this occasion to ventilate at length their familiar objections against the Vietnam war or the manner in which we are fighting it. They have chosen to transform routine consideration of necessary military support legislation into an excuse for a full-scale debate on the propriety of national policy in Vietnam.

This is not a time to discuss policy. The time to discuss policy was during the debate on the Bay of Tonkin resolution. I respect the disagreements of certain of my colleagues in this body, but this is not the moment to pursue a negative course. Every hour spent in debate here is holding up the procurement of equipment that our men in the field currently need. Every hour spent here means a delay in the support activity which our men need now, for the actions in which they are currently engaged. Policy questions should be discussed at leisure, with reasoned analysis; they should not be discussed in the heat of urgent need.

Nevertheless, since some Senators have chosen to question our current policy, it may be appropriate to review the situation in Vietnam, which presently calls for such urgent support. Just as some critics have occasioned the delay of this appropriations bill by questioning policy at an inappropriate time, so too, some of our policies themselves have delayed the swift and successful conclusion of the war.

It is not my purpose here either to question or defend the decisions which led to the U.S. commitment in Vietnam. Since the United States is there, however, it is my view as a Senator concerned with Armed Forces preparedness to see that we should take every step possible to bring the war to a successful conclusion as quickly as possible. A successful conclusion may mean either an all-out victory on the battlefield, which calls for an unconditional surrender of the insurgent forces in the South—or an honorable, negotiated peace settlement, based upon the cessation of guerrilla warfare by the Vietcong and their supporters from the North, which guarantees the security and the sovereignty of the people of South Vietnam from foreign domination or from domination by a foreign ideology forced upon them. In my opinion, victory is necessary to insure permanent peace.

It is true that we are fighting a limited war in Vietnam. It is limited in the sense that we are not seeking any territorial aggrandizement for the United States, and in the sense that we are not attempting to impose our way of life or our system of government upon anyone in that area of the world. There should be no limitations placed, however, on our total commitment to the cause of freedom in Southeast Asia to the extent that our basic reason for being there or our will to persevere on freedom's behalf is open to question or limitations. It would be a mistake to allow self-imposed limitations to so hedge our commitment to the cause of freedom for the people of South Vietnam, that we accept the terms of warfare laid down by our enemy and allow ourselves to become bogged down in a land war of attrition.

Many years ago, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, whose knowledge of this area of the world and of the rules of warfare is not open to question, warned against U.S. involvement in a major land war in Asia. This advice is as well taken today as it was then. That is why the United States must take full advantage of its sea and air superiority and wage this war on terms most favorable to us, and not allow the Communist aggressors to coax us into playing by the ground rules established by them. Nothing would be more acceptable to the Communist forces in Southeast Asia than for the United States and its allies to rely solely upon its ground forces in the conduct of the war in Vietnam. The Communists are prepared to carry on a virtually endless guerrilla-type action, which has its slack seasons and its hot seasons, but which they feel would spell eventual success for their cause. The Vietcong and their mentors in Hanoi are convinced that they won the war against the French in Paris, rather than in Vietnam, and they are further convinced that reliance upon the same tactics now would mean eventual victory in Washington.

There are certain steps which the United States can, and I feel must, take in the prosecution of the war.

First, we must bomb all the strategic and military targets which exist throughout North Vietnam. It is true that, prior to the truce, we were bombing in North Vietnam virtually every day; and it is true that in recent days we have initiated shelling and mining operations on a minor basis. Nevertheless, the use of airpower above the DMZ—demilitarized zone—is of little consequence if it is not calculated to eliminate the warmaking potential in the north. The question is not one of merely increasing either the scale or the frequency of the bombing attacks. Rather, it is one of making a more selective choice of targets and concentrating the attacks where they are calculated to do the most damage to our foes. I honestly do not know whether this could be called escalation or not, since it could be done with little or no increase in the intensity of the air raids.

It is unjustifiable to me, and to the men directly involved, that we can ask them to risk their lives to damage one span of a relatively innocuous bridge, while more important targets are left untouched, and many times untouchable. Our bombings should be aimed at all obvious military targets such as airfields, troop concentrations, and military convoys, as well as certain basic industries which are essential to a war effort. These would include petroleum storage dumps, steel mills, cement factories, and power-generating facilities, among others.

The second essential step which I feel should be taken is to close all the ports in North Vietnam. The most notorious of these is, of course, Haiphong. By all means, this port should be closed. However, there are others through which supplies and military materiel are received which should be closed as well.

There are three ways in which the ports can be closed: bombing, embargoing, or mining. The weight of military opinion leans toward mining the ports as the most efficient and quickest method available.

We have just begun mining the rivers in the north, but this operation is aimed principally at light native river traffic. It will not have any effect upon the major sources of supply reaching the country. It only affects the distribution of the material, once it has arrived. According to recent figures published in the press, the Soviets are sending 80,000 tons of goods a month to North Vietnam. Some 80 percent of this comes in by ship. It is reported that an average of one Soviet ship a day docks at Haiphong. In one recent month alone, the Soviets sent 25,000 metric tons of gasoline and oil through Haiphong. Moscow and

Hanoi should be put on notice that the ports are to be mined, and that further supply ships enter the harbors at their own risk.

These two steps—more selective bombing and closing the ports of North Vietnam—would, in my judugment, hasten the conclusion of the war in Vietnam. Some military people feel that at its present rate of prosecution, the war could last as long as 10 years. Such a protracted conflict is not necessary if the full impact of the war is brought home to Hanoi. The enemy must be taught that when waging a war like this—a so-called war of national liberation—they are going to be punished. Then, and only then, will there be any incentive for them to sue for peace or abandon their attempts at conquest.

The United States has unquestionably shown the enemy, if it ever needed to, that we have the power to win the war in Vietnam; and yet, the enemy persists. Obviously the enemy is not convinced that the United States has the will to use that power in the manner necessary to bring the war to a successful conclusion. We must convince them that not only do we possess the requisite power, but that we also possess the necessary will. A display of the will is as necessary as a display of the power.

That is why it is important that this supplemental appropriations bill be passed without further delay. This bill simply supports policies which have already been initiated. Much as I would like to see even more positive efforts made to bring us to victory in Vietnam, it is far more crucial that we avoid hesitation in providing the back-up support necessary for our present level of operations. I trust that the Members of this body will respond to the commitment this Nation has already undertaken, and promptly pass this legislation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have agreed to make a statement tonight, prior to the offer of the amendment, of which I am a cosponsor, by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] later this evening.

After listening to this debate today, I should say that if the Clark-Morse amendment had accomplished no other purpose than to produce the dialog of the day, it would have been very much worthwhile. But the amendment has a much greater purpose. This amendment is being offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Oregon for pasage, not merely for the education of Senators. Perhaps it will not pass, because I do not think we have reached that stage yet, in the dialog on the pros and the cons of the war in Vietnam, where a majority of Senators are yet ready to face up to the realities of both the war itself and the effect that it will have on the future of American history.

I think it will take some time longer before the elective representatives of this free people in Congress will face up to the fact that we must necessarily completely change our foreign policy in Asia. As I listened to the dialog this afternoon, I thought of the French Parliament, for there is a direct relationship between the debate here on the floor of the Senate today and the debates which occurred in the French Parliament for a long time preceding the ultimate decision of the French Government to withdraw from Indochina. Those French debates contained statement after statement by French parliamentarians that France had made a great mistake in getting involved in that war. In fact, the beloved Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] might just as well have been a Member of the French Parliament prior to the French withdrawal from Vietnam, because statements were made by French parliamentarians almost identical to the statements made by the Senator from Georgia about this war.

On many occasions, the Senator from Georgia has stated, both on and off the floor of the Senate, that we made a mistake in going into the war, and he was opposed to our going in. Then, of course, he falls back on the rationalization that we are in, that is an accomplished fact, and therefore, on the basis of what he says, I can reach no other conclusion than that he thinks we ought to stay in until we have a victory.

What a price that victory will cost us.

Mr. President, I say again tonight that I do not think we can just, all of a sudden, pull out. I have come to the conclusion—and this is the first time that I have stated it in the course of this debate—that I do not think we can justify staying in on the basis of our present policy. I think there is a policy that could justify our staying in, and I shall outline it, in broad outline, tonight.

However, if the choice is to stay in on the basis of what I interpret to be the terms that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would have us stay in, it would be a great disservice to American history. I do not think—and I say this most respectfully—that there is full comprehension on the part of many in Congress of what is happening within the body politic of this Republic. Members of Congress today are pretty much in the same situation that Members of the French Parliament were when, at one stage of the development of the French policy, the French flag, too, was vigorously waved on the floor of its Parliament. The only solution, said those Frenchmen, was victory. The only solution was the surrender of the enemy.

We have many in this Congress going on television and radio and before the people, following a similar course of what they consider to be patriotic appeal, urging support for the notion that the only solution is victory.

Victory for what? We can have victory in a military sense; but we shall never have victory in the sense of winning the minds of the people of the world to our cause. For the people of the world, in my judgment, by an overwhelming majority, know that our cause is not a noble cause; that our cause is not a justifiable cause; that our cause is not a cause consistent with international morality. Most of the people of the world know that the United States cause is a cause of military dictation in an area of the world in which we did not have the slightest right to intervene in the first place; and I have come to the conclusion that we ought to face up to the realization that we do not have the right to stay in southeast Asia on our terms.

There are terms, on the basis of which we have a justification to stay and should stay for some years to come; but it is not on terms of the military power of destruction that we can exercise—and there are those who would have us exercise it—that will force a surrender by the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong.

As I have said so many times, that is not going to produce peace. That is going to produce only a truce out of which no peace will ever come.

I think we make a mistake if we think we are admired. I think we make a mistake if we think that in the underdeveloped areas of the world the people of the United States are now looked up to as good Samaritans. To the contrary, we are a feared people because of the result of the shocking, immoral foreign policy that we have foisted upon a part of Asia. After we force the surrender, Asians by the millions are going to recognize that what we are doing here we will have the power to do elsewhere unless they stop us.

If one reads any history, he cannot escape the conclusion that any nation that starts on a course of military determination in the settlement of disputes in which it is not even a party is a nation that in the due course of time will find the opinion of the world organized against it, and that it cannot successfully challenge that opinion of the world over the course of many years.

I listened with great interest to the comments of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. I could not disagree with him more in his interpretation of constitutionalism in this country.

Why, of course, Congress has the power to stop the President. We have it, unless we just waive all of our checking power under the Constitution, and we have been waiving so much of it now for so many years that a Senator from Kentucky can stand on the floor of the Senate and say, as he said a few minutes ago, that in his opinion under the Constitution we could not stop the President of the United States from following his course of action even if we wanted to. He qualified it slightly by saying that unless we denied him all of the funds we could not do so.

May I say to the Senator from Kentucky, that if it is necessary in order to correct the historic mistakes that we have made in involving the American people in this war, we had better start denying him the funds. We certainly have that constitutional right under the check of the purse strings. That is exactly what the Constitution was written to provide—that armies could be raised by Congress only for 2 years at a time, and it is why the Constitution provides that funds may be withdrawn from the Treasury only in pursuit of appropriation made by law. This is where the checking is given to us. If we merely shrink from using it, that is not to say we do not possess it.

The Clark-Morse amendment seeks to make a start toward the denying of some funds as a means of seeking to force a change of policy.

It reads:

> It is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress—
>
> (1) that none of the funds authorized by this Act or any other Act should be used to carry out military operations in or over North Vietnam or to increase the number of United States military personnel in South Vietnam above five hundred thousand, unless there shall have been a declaration of war against North Vietnam by the Congress in accordance with article 1, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States; and
>
> (2) that the Congress support those efforts being made by men of good will throughout the world to prevent an expansion of the war in Vietnam and to bring that conflict to an end through a negotiated settlement which will preserve the honor of the United States, protect the vital interests of this country, and allow the people of South Vietnam to determine the affairs of that nation in their own way.

I say to the Senator from Kentucky that the amendment is but an expression of the sense of Congress. The amendment does not in itself deny the funds, but the amendment does state that it is the sense of the Congress that that is the course of action that should be followed unless the President of the United States changes his policy.

Agreement to the amendment with that expression of opinion as the sense of the Congress provides time for the President of the United States to decide whether he wants to follow the advice of the amendment. The Senator from Kentucky seems to overlook completely in his argument the fact that the amendment is in the form of advising the President of the United States under the advice and consent clause.

I am sure the Senator from Kentucky would not argue that constitutionally, an undeclared warmaking places a limit in any way upon the right and the duty of Congress to advise the President of the United States.

This amendment is an advisory amendment. If this President decides to ignore it, then Congress should take the next step of denying him the funds to prosecute the war at the level that he is prosecuting it.

That is the purpose of the amendment, and I hope that Congress will agree to it now, although, as I said, I surmise that the amendment will not be agreed to and that we may be engaging only in an educational process on foreign policy at this stage of the dialog.

But, if the Members who think the contention being made here to the effect that those of us who will vote against the supplemental authorization bill are letting down the boys in South Vietnam is going to be convincing to a large body of Americans, then I want to say respectfully that my colleagues could not be more wrong.

There is growing in this country an attitude within American public opinion on a parallel with what happened in France when some of the parliamentarians in the French Parliament made the same speeches that were made on the floor of the Senate this afternoon by those in opposition to the pending amendment, speeches in which the appeal was made to the French people that they could not let down their boys in Indochina, they were in the war, and they had to see it through.

However, as the French people took an accounting of the blood loss, took note that they were losing more French officers than were trained each year in the French military academy, and came to recognize that France, in fact, did not have any vital national interest in all of Indochina, they made it clear to their politicians: "You either change French policy in Indochina, or we will change the government."

There arose in France a great statesman-leader named Mendes France. He correctly read the facts concerning a divided France. He went before the French people on the pledge that if he were placed at the head of the French Government, he would proceed to take France out of the war. He was elected. Mendes France kept his pledge. I recommend that policy to the present administration of this Government. Mendes France kept his pledge, and the Geneva Conference followed. As the result of the Geneva Conference, France got out of the war.

Senators know that for 3 or more years I have invited attention repeatedly to the fact that the United States was opposed to the Geneva agreement. We were opposed to the treaty because Secretary of State Dulles had wanted to keep France in the war. That is why I have said that when this sorry, sad chapter of American history is written, John Foster Dulles will not come out of it an American hero, but will have to have placed upon his record much of the responsibility for the great mistake the United States has made in becoming involved on a unilateral basis in the bloodletting in Vietnam.

There seems to be a great deal of agreement, even within Congress, and within the Senate on the evils of our initial involvement. I can give testimony to the number of Senators who have told me, not once, but many times, in the last 3½ years, of the great mistake it was for the United States to become involved. They share the point of view of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. But we have reached a point of view, at least in the cloak rooms and in increasing numbers of statements on the floor of the Senate, that our historic record is not a good one; but that having made a whole series of historic mistakes, there is nothing that can be done about it now. We made them, and we are in a trap; we have got to see it through.

I am always at a loss to understand what is meant by that argument that we have to see it through. See it through to what? I come to the general conclusion that what is meant is that we have to force a surrender; we have to kill and kill; we have to defoliate and defoliate; we have to burn and burn; we have to massacre, with our napalm bombing, increasing hundreds of innocent civilian victims—men, women, and children—in South Vietnam, and now in North Vietnam, as well, because it justifies total victory; it justifies our insistence on a surrender. Mr. President, it does not.

When it is said, "We are in, and there is nothing we can do about it," my answer is that there are many things we can do about it. The Clark-Morse amendment sets forth some implications as to what we would start doing about it. We could at least decide whether or not we want to make our warmaking legal.

All the rationalizing and sophistry of those who justify this war on the ground that, the shooting having started, we do not need a declaration of war, are not being bought by millions of Americans; objection to it is growing at a rapid rate throughout this country.

I have been on 22 university campuses since November 8, 1966, and I have not been on one at which young men have not come to me and expressed their feeling that the Government of the United States has no right to insist that they serve in the Armed Forces, in the absence of a declaration of war. They contend—and I argue with them—that they have a right to refuse to conform to the draft law.

Last night, at Brown University, in the open forum discussion that was conducted, one of the students stood up and asked a question and pressed this point. Later, in the reception period that followed, at a more informal discussion, he was joined by other students who made clear that they were seriously considering defying the Government of the United States, in seeking to send them into a war without a declaration of war.

I presented the point of view I always present: There cannot be any justification for defying the law and then expecting to be in any way exempted from the circumstances of its enforcement. I do not like many phases of the draft law, and that is why I voted against it the last two times, and undoubtedly will vote against it again, unless it is completely revised so that there can be a fair rather than a discriminatory piece of legislation.

I argued with these students that their responsibility is to conform to the law and to seek to change the law, but not to advocate anarchy, or to disobey the law. When they say, "This war violates our conscience," I reply that they do not meet the legal requirements giving them exemption because of conscientious objections based upon religious grounds, and they have no right to expect that their violation of the law will be condoned.

I believe that is a sound legal argument in reply to them; but it does not change the fact that this point of view exists, and it is increasing. It does not change the fact that increasing numbers of Americans, who no longer can be considered an insignificant minority, are resentful of the President of the United States sending young men to their slaughter in South Vietnam, without his sending to this body a statement setting forth the reasons why he believes that we should make war, by way of a legal declaration of war under article I, section 8.

Mr. President, this war without a declaration of war is resulting in such an antipathy toward the President and this administration that as a Democratic Senator, once again I plead again with my President to change this course of action. If he does not change it he is going to be confronted, and he should be confronted, with a nation so disunited by November 6, 1968, that even if he wins the election he will not win a victory that will be worth having.

Therefore, I have come to the conclusion that we should change our status drastically in South Vietnam. In changing that status, we should make very clear to the nations of the world that unless there is a change of attitude on their part we will get out of Vietnam after the passage of a period of time, to which I shall allude in this statement.

Mr. President, we cannot justify staying in Vietnam indefinitely in order to effectuate the policy which is now the basis of our warmaking.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. It has been my understanding in the past that the Senator has been of the view that we should not unilaterally withdraw from Vietnam but that we should press for meaningful negotiation, be prepared to come to some kind of arrangement neutralizing Vietnam, and eventually get out.

Do I understand the Senator correctly that he has never advocated immediate unilateral withdrawal without negotiation?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct; and I am not this afternoon. I advocated withdrawing before we had built up our huge military establishment there, but not since 1964. But I am warning that if this policy is carried out with its present inhumanity, and we are able with our great military might to force a surrender and thereby set up, not a peace table, but a truce table, we are making a great mistake. Rather than follow that course of action on a unilateral basis I would have us get out before we implement that course of action.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator, but I think that the Senator will agree with me that the alternative which I stated a brief moment ago is a perfectly feasible alternative, and we do not need to go to either extreme.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. However, I am saying that we are going to go to an extreme in this matter by the dictates of the American people in the not too distant future if we continue to follow our present course of action.

I say to Members of Congress: "You will be greatly mistaken if you think that in the 1968 campaign you, as Senators and Congressmen, and the President, as the President of the United States, are going to get the approval of the American people. He may lose the majority; but even if he does not, there will be such a strong minority against him that in my judgment any effectiveness we may have in the councils of the world in trying to lead other nations to peaceful settlement will be greatly damaged."

Mr. CLARK. I have stated privately, and I am now prepared to state publicly, that in my opinion if we are still fighting the kind of war in Vietnam by July 1, 1968, that we are now fighting, the Democratic Party will lose the Presidency and many of us who might otherwise be reelected, or those who may be elected on the ticket of the Democratic Party will be defeated.

Mr. MORSE. I have stated many times, as the Senator will recall, that if we are fighting this war on the basis that we are now by the date that the Senator from Pennsylvania mentioned, July 1, 1968—I shall not support the President for the Democratic nomination, and I am a candidate myself in 1968. I will not support him because I will not support anyone who makes the historic record he is making, causing the slaughter of increasing numbers of American boys in an undeclared war, not to mention tens of thousands of South Vietnamese civilians.

BASIS FOR U.S. ACTION SHOULD BE CHANGED

Mr. President, I have some suggestions I wish to make in this speech as to what I think should constitute some of the changes in American foreign policy.

There are two critical factors which underlie the U.S. dilemma in Vietnam.

First, Hanoi, and for that matter most other nations, do not believe that the United States will withdraw from Vietnam as President Johnson has promised. They cite the permanence of such installations as Cham Ranh and Sattahip in Thailand.

They cite the present building and projected building of great American military bases in the Philippines, around the circumference of the Indian Ocean, and elsewhere in Asia.

We do not like to hear it, but the fact is that throughout the world the credibility gap of this administration is so broad that no bridge of truth can span it. The fact is that the Johnson administration in many areas of the world is not believed and should not be, for it taxes all comprehension to hear this administration saying that we seek no bases, that we have no desire to maintain a foothold elsewhere, and then we proceed to spend not millions but billions of dollars to build the bases.

Our actions speak so much louder than the President's words. We have got to take a long hard look at the existence of the credibility gap. We are not going to change world opinion in regard to its view toward our unreliability measured by the differences between our words and our acts by further professings that we seek no foothold elsewhere in the world.

Second, the increasing commitment of U.S. men and materiel in southeast Asia tends to make the struggle there an American war. Nations in the area are not compelled to use their own troops and develop their own indigenous capacity to resist external aggression or internal subversion.

American policy should make it clear that the United States will withdraw from Vietnam at a time certain. U.S. policy should be designed to pressure such states as Japan and India, which in combination with Indonesia and other independent states in the area have more men and industry than China to erect their own barriers to potential Chinese aggression.

American policy now, however, has just the opposite effect. U.S. military construction and economic expenditures tell Asians that the United States is there to stay, no matter what the President says.

No matter what our President says, these acts also encourage Asian states to leave the job to the United States. The Vietnamese want U.S. forces in the delta, and they are getting them by increasing thousands. We have taken over the war. American soldiers who have been sent into the delta—and they should never have been sent in there—are dying and being wounded without any justification because the Johnson administration is creating this situation. The human sacrifice of American boys is being made to support corrupt, mandarin-type tyrants which constitute the American puppet government in Saigon.

Oh, the immorality of this situation is not being lost on millions of Americans. It is no longer being lost on the men in the pulpits of America. In almost every community in this broad land, there are clergymen who have come to recognize that the prolonged silence which has characterized too many of the pulpits in this country must come to an end.

Thus, in community after community, an increasing number of clergymen are making the point that the Johnson administration's war policy in Vietnam is immoral. By every measure, standard, and criterion by which it can be evaluated, it is immoral. By all the religious criteria of which we measure morality, increasing numbers not only of church men but also of religious people within our population have come, at long last, to recognize as they sit home, safe and comfortable in their affluence, that the killing of American boys in support of our present policy cannot be justified.

That is why my colleagues in the Senate are greatly concerned when they come and talk to me about the position which the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and I took as we began this debate, saying that they have come to be greatly concerned because they are recognizing that in their home States they are faced, as Senators, with disunity. That disunity will intensify, not lessen. I cite the parallel of France, not only the debates in the French Parliament before the ultimate decision was made in France, which is analogous to the debates now going on in this body, but also the millions of Frenchmen finally made it clear to their politicians what they thought, as I think millions of Americans will make clear to their politicians before November 1968, exclaiming:

> We have had enough. We expect you to bring these boys home and stop murdering them.

As I have stated once before, and got castigated for it, but I repeat, the killing of a single American boy in the undeclared war in Vietnam constitutes, in my judgment, murder.

Let its administration come up with a declaration of war and see if they can pass it, and try to make those deaths legal.

Senators are going to hear with increasing intensity in the months ahead of the growing resentment of a large part of the people of this country who are in opposition to our failure to act by way of placing checks upon the President, who should have been checked long ago.

These suggestions I am making this afternoon bear upon what I consider to be sound recommendations for checking our policy.

U.S. policy assumes that U.S. interests demand resistance to aggression wherever it occurs and that it is necessary if we are to contain China.

But it can also be argued that U.S. interests require that there not be a long-term, heavy deployment of American military power on the land mass of Asia and that threatened areas in Asia must themselves coordinate their defenses to counter any threat China may pose.

PROPOSAL

This is what I would have my President say—I would have him say it first to the Security Council of the United Nations, and if he gets vetoed, then to the General Assembly:

First. The United States is receiving no major support from other nations in Vietnam.

What other support we have from a few countries—not great powers, not a single one—is token support of practically no significance.

Second. The United States has stated that it has no territorial designs and does not intend to maintain U.S. forces on the land mass of Asia.

Third. Americans are now persuaded that the United States should not continue to carry alone the main burden in manpower and costs to repelling this aggression. Other important states on or near the borders of China do not view the danger as does the United States. Neither China's neighbors nor free world states are taking steps to assist in the defense of South Vietnam.

Fourth. The President is, therefore, planning to take steps to prepare for the orderly withdrawal of U.S. forces to designated areas sufficiently large to accommodate refugees should they wish protection.

To digress, I was interested in the argument made by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] this afternoon, in the colloquy with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], as to why there is no military authority now administering American military power that supports the recommendation of a Gavin. Of course, there is not. That does not mean we ought not follow the advice of a Gavin, a Ridgway, a Kennan, or others, or, by the way, of a General Shoup, who, before his retirement not so long ago, was the Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps. Why, his statement before the junior college group in Los Angeles on May 14, 1966, makes a conservative out of me in all my proposals about the war in Vietnam.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] put that statement in the RECORD the other day.

I paraphrase that quotation. He pointed out what the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and I have been saying for three and a half years—that the whole area in which American soldiers are fighting in South Vietnam is not worth the life of one of them. He is right. The Senator from Missouri can place his case all he wants to on the Wheelers and the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Westmorelands. As long as one puts his case on that group of military leaders conducting this war, he is going to continue to permit the unjustifiable killing of increasing hundreds of American boys. What Americans have to do, and what we hope they will do through their elected representatives in Congress, is to make clear to the military that they want this military approach and American foreign policy stopped.

Therefore, I want to say to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], I am proud to stand on the recommendations of a General Ridgway, and a General Gavin, and a great diplomat, George Kennan. I am proud to stand on the recommendations of a General Eisenhower, a General Marshall, a General MacArthur, a General Collins—that whole list of great generals who have warned us in recent years that we should not bog down American land forces in Asia.

That the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], by implication, compared the present Joint Chiefs of Staff and General Westmoreland with these great military advisers of this country is, in my judgment, itself incredible.

What we have here is a basic issue as to whether or not the Congress will make clear to the military that it is not going to run American foreign policy. This war is what is putting American foreign policy in disrepute around the world.

So, I would hope, as I have said, that my President would announce to the world that we are prepared for the orderly withdrawal of U.S. forces to designated areas sufficiently large to accommodate refugees, should they wish protection.

I do not care how it is described. I am for an enclave approach, or whatever else one may wish to call it. I think General Gavin has yet to be successfully rebutted by any military analyst in regard to the soundness of his approach.

I have read what Maxwell Taylor has presented as administration rebuttal to the Gavin recommendation. Read the testimony of General Gavin given the other day. He took the Maxwell Taylor book and on this point, in my judgment, demolished it—which is not difficult to do with almost any recommendation Maxwell Taylor makes. It is too bad that the administration has followed his ill advice for so long.

To continue with my statement, I would urge the President to cease search-and-destroy operations.

That means I would have my President announce an end of that escalation.

To cease further air attacks on enemy targets unless they threaten the areas still occupied by U.S. forces.

Fifth. I would have my President announce that the United States will maintain its military presence in these areas for a period of not to exceed 2 years and will then withdraw them completely unless other nations of the world come in to cooperate with us in enforcing the peace and developing an economic pacification program.

Sixth. I would have my President point out that the United States would be prepared to reconsider this decision only if requested to do so by a majority of the governments of SEATO, plus the Governments of Japan, India, and Indonesia; or if requested to do so by a majority vote of the General Assembly of the United Nations; or if requested to do so by a majority of the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

What I am saying in this speech this afternoon is that I think the historic hour has come when the President owes it to the people of the United States and the people of the world to announce a major change in the objective of the United States in southeast Asia.

He should make it very clear that we stand ready and willing to cooperate with other nations in a pacification program, and a program to prevent a blood bath.

I say again, as I have continued to say so often in the last 3 years, that a blood bath would result from a sudden, overnight withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam, that leaves only a vacuum behind us. It is bound to happen because of the situation we have created, for which we are primarily responsible. To walk out now from South Vietnam would probably result in a blood bath, so we could not justify precipitate withdrawal on moral grounds either.

The time has come when the President should announce to the world that the policy of unilateral American action in this war is going to be changed; that we are willing to cooperate with other nations in peacekeeping; that we are willing to hold the line for the time being, until they can reach the necessary understandings, adopt procedures, consummate agreements, and effectuate an implementation which would result in the nations of the world as a whole, so to speak, taking over this threat to the peace of the world. But, he should say, we are not going to be the lone policeman to the world. Either we mean that, or we do not.

I know what the opposition will say: That it is a surrender; it is appeasement; it is a withdrawal. Mr. President, I will tell you what it is. It is a changing of our course of action from jungle law to adherence to the rule of law. It is in keeping with what I think is our clear legal and moral obligation to the world.

CLARK-MORSE AMENDMENT AND THE WAR POWER

In the debate this afternoon, great concern was expressed by some Senators with respect to the proposal of the Clark-Morse amendment that it is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of the amendment should flow in the absence of a declaration of war. Of course, that is the purpose of this amendment. I heard nothing in the debate this afternoon, including the observations of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], to justify, as a matter of law, our making war without a declaration of war. Certainly at some point the national commitment becomes so great as to require a declaration of war in any international dispute. What is that point? I think the point always exists immediately following the development of the emergency, following the immediate response of the President in the self-defense of the Nation, during the period that it takes him to prepare his war message and present it to a joint session of Congress. Then let Congress work its will upon the President's recommendation. That is the constitutional procedure set forth by the constitutional fathers. It is what they made perfectly clear in their debate in the Constitutional Convention as to why they wrote article I, section 8, with its declaration of war provision, into the Constitution in the first place.

Mr. President, you can research all you want the history books, the Constitutional Convention, the record of past Presidents, and you cannot come up with a denial of what I say; namely, that if the country is to be taken into war, it must be taken into the war by a declaration of war.

The Clark-Morse resolution seeks to make that clear once again. But in this colloquy this afternoon, as in other colloquies on the floor of the Senate, the hypothetical question has been raised, "At what point must there be a declaration of war?"

When? Can we wait until 2,500 men have been sent on to the battlefield? 1,000? 500,000? 1 million? 2 million?

My answer is, except for the men who must be used for that brief period of time to meet the self-defense response, we cannot proceed to send men to their deaths on a battlefield without a declaration of war. Read the message of Franklin Roosevelt following Pearl Harbor. President Roosevelt responded, as was his constitutional right and duty, to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor with such military forces as we were able to draw together after that great catastrophe, to respond in the self-defense of the Nation. But he did not prolong the Executive response to the Japanese. He sat down and prepared a war message. He delivered it to Congress the next day. He asked for a declaration of war. He made it perfectly clear that that was his Presidential duty; and, as I have said so many times in the last 3½ years, it has likewise been the Presidential duty of President Johnson. History will not write a favorable account of his failure to live up to his responsibilities under article I, section 8, of the Constitution.

Then the question is raised, "How can we explain to the young men of this country who are protesting the course of action we are following that they should be drafted and sent to war on the basis of Presidential warmaking, but not on the basis of a congressional declaration?" Students are well versed also, by and large, in the constitutional history of the Republic. I do not like the illegal actions that have characterized some of the student reactions in this country; but I always look for possible provocations to try to find some explanation.

Although it is not a justification for a wrong course of action, I am always inclined to look for provocations which may have produced the action.

I happen to think that until there is a declaration of war, or the issue is faced by Congress, draft card burnings will continue, draft violations will continue, charges of treason will be made, castigation and abuse of people on both sides of the issue will continue; the rich will get richer—in fact, to paraphrase General Shoup in his speech to that junior college group in Los Angeles, if we would only keep our crooked business fingers out of the economic aspects of this war, we might not find ourselves involved.

Why, Mr. President, the slightest suggestion that the war ought to be paid for by a corporate tax increase brings down on the heads of Members of Congress the lobbying activities of shockingly selfish economic groups who are perfectly willing to collect the blood money profits out of this war, and think they should be allowed to pocket them without having imposed upon them a tax increase to help pay for the war. If we could get a war profits tax adopted, Mr. President, we would see a remarkable change in the public attitude of the affluent of this country, who sit in their economic comfort and protection and collect the dollars out of the profits of bloodletting.

Mr. President, more and more people are becoming aware of the part that economic selfishness is playing in the urging that we must continue an all-out war until we force a surrender. I am somewhat at a loss to understand the arguments of those who do not think we ought to face up to whether or not we should make a declaration of war. I wonder what they would say if some of us should introduce a joint resolution—which we cannot in good faith do, because we would be violently opposed to it—proposing an amendment to the Constitution giving the President of the United States the sole power to make and declare war. Can you not hear that debate? Can you not hear the repercussions across the land?

That would be called the destruction of our system of limited power. It would be denounced as meaning the destruction of Congress as an effective party in the National Government.

But Members of Congress are quite willing to accept de facto such a proposal.

By inaction in this situation, that is what we have done. We have given to the President the power in fact to declare war. Does it take much argument to point out that if Congress allows the President to exercise such a war power, that would be a power ranking with the tax power?

What do Senators think would happen if it were proposed that we pass a constitutional amendment to give the President exclusive power to tax? What a hullabaloo that would stir. Yet, we sit by here as elected officials of the people in Congress and we try to alibi for, excuse, and rationalize this shocking exercise of executive power by the President of the United States.

I shall always be proud of the fact that I did not vote for that resolution of August 1964, which is cited as some condonation of the President's war making.

If we continue to acquiesce in it, we will go down the last step to total executive power in this country. If we do that, then the need for Congress ceases to exist in fact, and we will have really moved into a Government by executive power.

So the Clark-Morse sense-of-the-Senate amendment which will soon be pending before the Senate seeks at least for educational reasons to educate and display a few warning flags concerning the road that we are headed down.

I thought that today was a good day to start a discussion that I shall continue from time to time advocating a change now, a great change, in the direction of our policy, a change in which we start to announce to the world: "We are not going to stay there indefinitely." It will be a change in which we announce to the world:

> We are not going to assume this responsibility, whatever it is, to maintain order in that part of the world on a unilateral American basis at the expense of the lives and the bloodshed of the American boys that we send over there, in respect to which they really have no real choice of serving because they are patriotic Americans.

There is a lot of talk about the patriotism of these soldiers and their bravery and their courage and their dedication to the cause of their country. I yield to no one in joining in that praise, but there is one great difference between my position and the position of many who talk in terms of the great heroic record that these troops are making. That difference is that I raise the questions:

> By what right do we have them there? What is the justification for the Congress of the United States permitting a President to continue a presidential war-making power that has resulted in the killing of those boys?

That is why in this debate on the supplemental appropriation authorization as I said yesterday and say again now, I do not intend to vote a single dollar to kill them because voting the money to send them there, to keep them there, and kill them is letting them down.

If we really want to support those boys, we can stop their killing by denying the President the money with which to kill them by exercising our constitutional duty under the Constitution to pull the purse strings on the President and deny him the money. For the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] to say he does not think Congress will withhold the money is no justification for voting for the appropriation. At what point, may I ask, does a Senator become party to a policy after he votes, year in and year out, for the money to carry it out?

I think we are going to find millions of Americans asking us Senators: "Why did you do it?"

There is another phase of this subject that I want to comment on because at least some of us who are opposed to the supplemental authorization are opposing it because it is an installment appropriation. It is going to be followed with a $12 billion-plus appropriation, and that is going to be followed, when we come to next year's budget, with a defense appropriation, of $75 billion-plus out of a total budget of $144 billion. So, I think that before we vote on this $4 billion-plus supplemental bill and the $12 billion-plus and eventually $75 billion-plus for the building up of the military power of this country, we should realize that if it is not stopped, it is going to make the military or cause the military to continue to be the most dominant force in the determination of American foreign policy. It is now.

American foreign policy is now cut to the cloth of the military, and that is what the military, in my judgment, needs: To have its programs not only in Vietnam but also its fiscal programs here at home deescalated.

We need to cut billions and billions and billions of dollars from the American military budget, because only by cutting out those billions, in my judgment, are we going to stop the American military from controlling American foreign policy and building this American military lifeline around the world to supplant the broken and destroyed British Empire's lifeline. If we do not stop it our fate will be the same as the fate of the British Empire—not in my lifetime, not in the lifetime of the younger generation of the country, but within the next century and maybe within the next half a century. For the other nations of the world are not going to countenance the resulting military domination of the United States in many parts of the world that a $75 billion defense budget will put this military in the position of being able to thrust upon the world.

The American taxpayers will get wise long before the military gets strong enough to force such a program upon us. But let me say to the American taxpayers: "I don't think you have much time." We had better take a look at what the military posture of the American military, augmented by the power that they are developing through the world in Vietnam, means to our domestic economy; because in my judgment we are so weakening our domestic economy that if we do not stop it we will contribute to the ultimate downfall of the Republic.

WAR AND GREAT SOCIETY

I suppose the remarks that I am about to make can best be summarized by a paragraph from Senator FULBRIGHT's notable book, "The Arrogance of Power":

> Vigorously executed and adequately funded, the legislation adopted by the 89th Congress can open the way to an era of abundance and opportunity for all Americans, but for the present, at least, the inspiration and commitment of the Great Society have disappeared. They have disappeared in the face of our deepening involvement in Vietnam, and although it may be contended that the United States has the material resources to rebuild its society at home while waging war abroad, it is already being demonstrated that we do not have the mental and spiritual resources for such a double effort.

Another popular book about current government affairs, "Lyndon B. Johnson—The Exercise of Power," recounts the President's displeasure upon reading a comment of mine made on the Senate floor last summer, that the Great Society is dead. That does not change the fact that it is dead—dead as a dodo. And I see no indication that Lyndon Baines Johnson is going to resurrect it, either.

The Great Society programs, most of them, are on the books, although the failure of the fair housing bill last year marks the evidence that the loss of attention and leadership at the top of our Government and the top of our society has stalemated the drive to equality for colored Americans. But where the programs are on the books, they are grieviously underfunded, and, more important, they are not attracting the imagination and interest of those whose imagination and interest are vital to their success.

The pinch in funds comes from necessity in a budget where $10 to $12 billion was provided for the war in the current year budget, only to fall short by half of the actual cost for the fiscal year 1967. The $12.5 billion supplemental now on its journey through Congress marks an approximate doubling of what was budgeted for the war. Knowledgeable estimates suggested that more is being spent for war activities than even these figures show, and that the actual annual cost of the war is running from $25 to $30 billion a year.

It is self-evident that something must give, in the face of an added cost of that magnitude. The "giving" has taken place in the impact of a war economy upon the private sector, and in the impact of the war budget upon the rest of the Federal budget.

Few Americans are as yet aware of the demands our rising population is placing upon housing. Most of us forget that we, too, are experiencing an exploding population, and that accommodating it is more expensive to a highly industrialized country than to an undeveloped country.

Estimates of housing officials indicate that we need 2.5 million new housing starts each year in order to keep pace with population needs. A million and a half are needed each year just to keep pace with new families and to replace dilapidated and razed buildings. But the impact of a war economy hit mortgage funds and interest rates so hard that no more than 1.1 million new starts were achieved last year.

So that even while the need rises, the number of new homes actually built last year dropped from the levels of previous years. Nineteen hundred and sixty-seven is expected to show some improvement, but it will still fall far short of national needs.

A second area of underfunding is in the highway program. Of an estimated $5.2 billion of Federal funds that would normally have been available for highway construction, about $3.3 billion was actually made available. According to estimates of the Senate Public Works Committee, another $1½ to $2 billion was "deferred," in the language of the Bureau of Public Roads.

I know there is not a State that did not feel this pinch severely, although funds were withheld in the same percentage as they are disbursed, and hence some lost a greater percentage of funds than others.

When I sought an explanation of the deferral from the Bureau, I received the reply which I am sure went to all Senators. Mr. Rex Whitton, who was then the Director, wrote me:

> As you know, the current limitation on the federal-aid highway program is being applied in recognition of the need for reducing federal expenditures as a contribution to the Vietnam effort and the resultant effort to reduce inflationary pressures.

Mr. Whitton advised that the funds not obligated will be carried forward and remain available for obligation in the later fiscal years. Meantime, the revenues accruing in the highway trust fund are being invested in Federal bonds, to the credit of the trust fund.

This deferral in highway spending is simply a cutback in a domestic program to save the economy that much of the stress of public spending in a war-tight economy. The impact on State highway programs has not been good, and the announcement yesterday that $175 million will be released involved engineering and acquisition only, not construction.

In an economy in which interest rates rather than taxes have been counted on to offset the economic pressure of the war spending, great stimulus has been given to price escalation. One factor that went into the decision to freeze these highway funds was the contention on the part of the Bureau of Public Roads that construction companies were raising their bids rapidly and uniformly, and that a hiatus in the progress of construction would help bring prices down.

Reduction in the domestic programs more specifically identified as the Great Society has been more direct. In the case of the war on poverty, it is difficult to say how much the program was cut, because it is still authorized on an annual basis, and the authorization itself was reduced in 1966 far below what the needs of the program called for. In the Senate Labor Committee, for example, many Senators felt that between $2.5 and $2.7 billion was the sum that the poverty program needed to keep it on the track originally planned for it.

But Congress saw fit to authorize only $1.75 billion, and then to appropriate only $1.6 billion. A budget request in the fiscal 1968 budget calls for only $1.86 billion for the antipoverty program, although it has fallen behind schedule by more than a third in the funds it could usefully be devoting to this purpose had it not been a victim of a war economy.

The budget for the war on poverty for fiscal year 1968 will not mark any escalation in that war, but only a stalemate. In 1966, only about 30 percent of the 2½ million poor children in the 3-to-5 age group were reached by Headstart. That percentage will not change noticeably in the budgeted program. About 30,000 dropouts from society were enrolled in Job Corps centers last year; about 38,000 are planned for enrollment this year.

These are figures anticipated by the administration budget. In a Congress where normal opposition to these programs exists anyway, the $25 to $30 billion cost of the Vietnam war will be sufficient excuse to cut back deeply on such a political hot potato as the war on poverty.

Education programs, which are of great personal interest to me in my capacity as chairman of the education subcommittee, are also hard hit in the budget. The Library Services and Construction Act, for example, which authorizes $50 million in 1968 in grants for construction of public libraries, is being funded by little over half that figure—$27 million. The library services section carries an authorization of $45 million, for which $35 million is requested.

Under title I of the Higher Education Act, $50 million is authorized for community service and continuing education, for which $16½ million is requested. College library resources are funded only by half—$25 million of the $50 million authorized.

Probably of greatest interest is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Under title I, $2.4 billion is authorized for 1968 for educationally deprived children, of which half—$1.2 billion—is requested.

These cutbacks are needed so we can escalate the war, even though it exposes the American people in the possibility of a third world war. The library resources title for elementary and secondary schools, for which $154 million is authorized, is to receive $105 million in the administration budget. Title III, for supplementary educational centers and services, authorizes $515 million for the fiscal year; $240 million is requested.

Education of handicapped children, for which $154 million is authorized, would be funded only by $15 million in the budget.

In the area of community college construction, the Higher Education Facilities Act authorizes $167 million for this purpose in 1968; $89 million is requested.

An authorization is the estimate of the legislative committee of how much can be used effectively in a given program. The Appropriations Committees do not always provide the full sum authorized. But when the Appropriations Committees start with a budget request that is already half the authorized amount, it is evident that many of these programs are going to receive little more than token funds in 1968 which will keep them alive but will not enable them to accomplish much.

In rural areas, too, the budget cuts are going to hurt. I have already indicated the blow struck at the housing industry by high interest rates, a blow that falls harder on rural areas than most people realize. For example, census figures show that nearly half of all substandard housing in the country is in rural areas where less than one-third of the population resides. Between 1961 and 1966, rehabilitation of rural housing had advanced remarkably, with Farmers Home Administration loans rising from $180 million in the previous 6 years to $850 million in the 1961–66 years.

Last year, Congress increased the operating loan authorization of the Farmers Home Administration to $350 million. But the Bureau of the Budget has cut this back to $275 million. Rather than cutting it back, circumstances warrant that operating loan funds for the FHA should actually be in the neighborhood of $700 million—and this would represent only 5 percent of the total operation credit farmers will need in 1967.

Needless to say, the interest rate squeeze that has driven mortgage rates up to 7 percent in some areas of the country has fallen hardest upon low and middle priced homes, driving homeowners in this class almost out of the market. Nor are these rates expected to come down much. Any revival in home construction that takes place will occur largely in the higher priced homes at high interest rates, but money to lend will again be available, whereas last year it simply was not.

The impact of this home construction pattern will be very hard on rural housing. We can only expect from it that the rate of dilapidation in rural areas will rise and not decline.

Budgetary curtailment in other rural programs is also a result of the war. Services provided by the Rural Electrification Administration, the Soil Conservation Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Forest Service, to mention those most prominent in my own State, will not sustain any revitalizing of rural life. As with the effort to eradicate urban poverty, the budget figures mark holding operations.

In a Congress where support for most of these programs was severely undercut in the November election, they face harder going than in the Budget Bureau. The thrust, the enthusiasm for rebuilding America has been lost. Some of the institutional momentum, which dictates that once business and industry have come to count on a particular source of spending or service it will continue, will maintain programs already begun. But a President and a cabinet whose time and attention these days is devoted to picking targets in North Vietnam, and weighing endless diplomatic details which might lead to peace talks, are not on hand to provide the leadership and sense of purpose that it takes to arouse and interest the American people to the needs of their own country.

Today, the administration talks of creating a Great Society in Asia, although the one we started out to build in Latin America 6 years ago has fallen by the wayside, and enthusiasm for the one we hoped to build here has dissipated.

Today, the administration spends its time going over details of pacification of South Vietnam, a pacification that the French undertook several times, the Eisenhower administration undertook several times, and the Kennedy administration undertook several times. The pacification of Watts, and Harlem, and the Hough area of Cleveland, the West Side of Chicago, is left to subordinate officials in the Department of HUD and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

This order of priority, which puts the needs of South Vietnam ahead of the needs of the United States, cannot help but result in a freeze in the rehabilitation of the United States in preparation for our own population explosion.

In Vietnam, we defoliate thousands of square miles of forest, lay waste to thousands of acres of food-producing areas, burn up villages with flamethrowers and plow them under with bulldozers. The people are herded out of the villages in which they and their ancestors have always lived, to set up life in temporary communal tents, lacking now a past, as well as a present and a future.

For all the official publications about the number of wells being dug, the number of schools built, the handful of doctors serving in South Vietnam, not much is said about how much more we have destroyed there than we have created. Most tragic are the lives we have taken with our military power, lives estimated at 1,000 South Vietnamese civilians a month. These casualties make a mockery of our claim that we are saving the people of Vietnam from Vietcong terrorists, who take the lives of some 700 civilians a year, according to our own statistics.

Their terrorism is shocking, inexcusable, and morally wrong; but so is the terrorism of the South Vietnamese. Little is ever said by this administration about the brutalities, the inhumanity to man, the shocking wrongs committed upon the bodies of captured Vietcong soldiers.

The fact is that we cannot justify the propaganda this administration has been putting out, seeking to justify this illegal, immoral, unjustifiable war. That is why I am taking the time this late in the afternoon to make my record once again, with this new development, in regard to my position that the time has now come for the President to serve notice on the world that the United States will not stay in Vietnam indefinitely, and that we will not continue to stay there on the basis of our present policy of escalating a war in an attempt to force a surrender that will never produce a peace.

One of the most knowledgeable of American historians, Prof. Henry Steele Commager of Amherst, recognized by most historians as the dean of American historians, touched on some of the fallacies of power in his recent appearance before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He said:

> The word "power" is an awkward and even a dangerous one, for it is used in two ways and it is almost fatally easy to confuse the two uses. It is clear that the United States has immense power anywhere on the globe it decides to use it. But it is by no means clear that the United States is, therefore, a world Power, with a capital P. If you have the strength, and do not care overmuch about consequences, it is easy enough to exercise power, but to be a Power is a very different thing, and it is a very difficult thing. I do not think the United States is prepared to be a Power everywhere—in the Western Hemisphere, in Europe, in Asia, nor do I think we should wish to exercise power everywhere. . . .
>
> Although we used something like total power in the Second World War, once victory had been achieved, we contented ourselves with trying to put the broken fragments of the war-torn world together again. We used aid, we used influence, we used military power, but we did not use the ultimate power of the nuclear weapon, nor did we in fact attempt to order the affairs of Asia. It has remained for the statesmen of this decade to insist that we are an Asian power, and have the same kind of responsibility for Asia that we have for Western Europe.
>
> It is my feeling that we do not have the resources—material, intellectual, or moral, to be at once an American power, a European power, and an Asian power. . . .
>
> Perhaps one fifth of our population lives in poverty; we do not have the resources to wipe it out. Our cities are decaying, we

do not have the resources to restore them. Our educational enterprise is desperately inadequate; we do not have the resources to bring it up to the standards which we ourselves set. Our rivers and streams are polluted and the very air we breathe is poisonous but we lack the resources to cleanse these. Racial discrimination and injustice flaunts itself in every section of the nation, but we lack the resources to eradicate them from our society or economy. Crime flaunts itself in the streets of our cities, but we lack the resources to control it. Would it not be wise if we used our immense power and resources to wipe out poverty and injustice and waste at home before launching ourselves upon crusades to wipe out these things in distant continents?

[At this point Mr. HOLLINGS assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the dean of the American history professors, in the excerpt from his testimony which I have just read, gives us cause to ponder, and also gives the President of the United States and his advisers in Congress ample cause to ponder.

This is the crux of our situation today. All evidence suggests that the American commitment to Asia today exceeds our commitment to ourselves. It remains to be seen how long our burgeoning population can tolerate this deplorable order of priority.

Mr. President, I have discussed the cause-and-effect relationships between these supplemental authorizations and appropriations for war and our domestic needs so that my colleagues in the Senate and the people of the United States can see the cause to effect relationship between military expenditures, and denying to the American people the money necessary to prevent the economy from falling into decay and public opinion to fall into disruption.

We must avoid going the way of other governments that fail to give heed to the needs of their own people. We must recognize before it is too late that the prosecution of this undeclared, illegal, immoral, and unjustifiable war in Asia cannot be justified by the President, or by Congress, from the standpoint they accept the protection to which they are entitled.

The time has come for Congress to check the President and make clear to him that it wants escalation of this war stopped, to make clear to him that it wants to change the policy and make an announcement to the world, as I have suggested in my speech this afternoon, that if other nations do not proceed to work out a cooperative program to maintain the peace in Asia, we will withdraw, because we cannot justify continuing the slaughter of American boys which has already reached the neighborhood of 9,000, and the wounding has reached more than 40,000. We cannot justify continuing the slaughter on the basis of our unilateral action or on the basis, as Professor Commager points out, that we may think we have some right to exercise that kind of world military power.

The time to support our boys in Vietnam has arrived. In order to support them in my judgment, we have the duty, as my sights see it, to vote against the supplemental appropriation bill, to vote against the next one, and to vote to cut drastically the defense budget of some $75 billion which will be submitted to the Senate before it adjourns.

AMERICAN CITIES ARE BECOMING GHETTOS FOR OUR COLORED AMERICANS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the current issue of the University of Oregon alumni bulletin publishes an article that should be of interest to everyone who is concerned with the problems of American cities and the extent to which they have become ghettos for colored Americans.

I can remember a time when the word "ghetto" brought to our minds a revulsion against the narrowmindedness and backwardness of the society of Europe that forced people of the Jewish faith into confined urban quarters. What a sad day has come to America, when the word "ghetto" is now a part of our own vocabulary and worse, part of American society.

A distinguished alumnus of the University of Oregon is a leading businessman in the area of Watts in southern California. Although he is perhaps best known for his athletic accomplishments at the university, and later with the Los Angeles Rams in professional football, Mr. Woodley Lewis is one of the people who are coming to grips with the reality of the ghetto, and trying to do something meaningful about it.

The article, "Quiet Man in an Unquiet City" in the February issue of Old Oregon speaks for itself, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUIET MAN IN AN UNQUIET CITY

(By Lucile Vaughan Payne)

On the wall of a certain office in Compton, California, is a map of Los Angeles County marked off with clusters of colored pins. The pins are there to show the areas where the black population outnumbers the white. Some of the clusters are small and scattered, each covering no more than a half-dozen or so city blocks. South and east of the city of Los Angeles, however, is a huge, ragged strip of land so thickly encrusted with pins that it stands out from the surface like some giant spreading malignant growth.

Here are dozens upon dozens of city blocks occupied almost exclusively by Negroes. Here is Watts, with the history of the country's worst race riot written in its burned buildings and devastated streets. And here, next to Watts, indistinguishable from it as you drive along the main thoroughfare that joins them, is Compton.

On the map the two towns are separated by a thin line, but you do not see the line as the flat, monotonous panorama of Los Angeles' poorest and ugliest commercial geography unrolls outside the windows of a moving car. One municipality simply merges with the other in an unending succession of drab storefronts, filling stations, repair shops, flop houses, used-car lots, cheap bars. Cross a crowded street, and you are out of Watts, in Compton.

Compton is the home of Woodley Lewis.

The name may have a familiar sound. Certainly it will have for football fans. For Woodley Lewis was once a star player for the Los Angeles Rams. And back in 1949 he was a halfback on the famous U.O. team that went to the Cotton Bowl—a team that included another halfback named Johnny McKay (now head football coach at the University of Southern California) and a quarterback named Norm Van Brocklin. Woodley Lewis won the award as Oregon's most valuable player that year—he was tops in kickoff returns in the nation—and went on from U.O. to pro football.

After six years with the Rams, five with the St. Louis Cardinals, Lewis left pro football to go into business in Compton. Dick Daugherty, another U.O. alumnus and ex-Ram player, joined him as a "silent partner." In 1961 they built the Woodley Lewis Sportsman Bowl, a huge (32-alley) bowling and recreation center, which Lewis manages. It it one of the few recreational facilities available to the 80,000 people who live in the municipality.

The Sportsman Bowl is in the heart of the high-unemployment and school-dropout area. Although Negroes and Caucasians mingle casually in its bar and restaurant and around the polished, gleaming alleys with their constant cannonade of rolling balls, few of them have much money to spend. And their number has decreased since the Watts riot. "Businesses are touch-and-go propositions in this area," says Lewis. "Especially now."

Lewis' experience as a businessman and, in an oblique way, his experience as a pro football player, have given him some special insights into the problems that beset the huge, troubled area where most of Los Angeles' Negro population lives. They are insights all the more interesting because they come from a Negro whose own life had been only lightly touched by racial problems, who came late to any genuine realization of them. Lewis seems to have been, always, oddly immune to prejudice, almost unaware of it.

Perhaps the simplest explanation for this immunity was his own personality: everybody always liked Woodley Lewis. He was one of those lucky people born, apparently, with the kind of inner strength and pride, the natural warmth and humor that made him at home in the world everywhere, in any company, and made nonsense of racial barriers. Everybody liked young Woodley Lewis. Everybody respected him. He hardly knew the meaning of a term like "racial problems."

How intensely concerned with racial problems Woodley Lewis is today, however, can be seen in a number of ways. One of the most vivid is just inside the door of his office in the Sportsman Bowl. There on the wall is the map with the colored pins.

"I lived here as a kid," says Lewis, touching a cluster of pins near the northern end of the long, ragged area that includes Watts and Compton. "It was just a small Negro neighborhood then, a little island of Negro homes and businesses. Since then, it has spread out, joined with other islands. Now you have all this." His hand brushes the sweep of thickly clustered pins, the miles of city streets. "As soon as a Negro family moves next door, you see, or across the street, or even a block away, the white people start moving out. Pretty soon it's all Negro." His voice contains no anger; he looks thoughtful, detached, restless, a little puzzled, as though it still surprises him to look at the map, as though he is trying to think of some practical way to solve the staggering problems it represents.

"Most of the people who live in this area don't work in it," he says. "They have to commute to other areas to get to their jobs—92 percent of them commute. There just aren't any jobs for them here. That's our biggest problem. That and the fact that a lot of people simply don't have jobs of any kind, anywhere. And can't get them. If you want a simple explanation of the Watts riot, that's it."

If Woodley Lewis is angry about the conditions he sees around him, it does not show; his face is not much different from that of the 1949 football player who raced for a 92-yard touchdown in the last few seconds of the last game of the season against O.S.U., the face of the kid that everybody liked;

faintly reserved but friendly, confident, with a look of shrewd good humor around the eyes. He still has the light, swift step of the track runner (he was one of "Bowerman's boys," a two-year letterman in track as well as football), the look of a man who knows who he is and where he is going.

In football that meant running faster and playing harder than anybody playing against him, quickly and coolly sizing up a problem and moving quickly to solve it. In business it has meant much the same thing; he works, as a matter of course, a 14 or 15-hour day and still manages to spend a great deal of time on community problems; he is a member of the board of directors of the Compton Chamber of Commerce and the Southern Area Boys' Club, is area council representative to Boy Scouts of America, and serves on the Citizens Advisory Staff for the Los Angeles County district attorney. He believes the only way to solve the problems of the ghetto, including his own problems as a businessman, is through community action; he is too busy trying to solve the problem to take time to be angry.

He was lucky, of course. He had a childhood he remembers without bitterness; his father had a job (he was a waiter on the Union Pacific Railroad), he had a home, family, many friends. And he had the physical and mental confidence of the born athlete. Sports led him to college, through a football scholarship, first to Los Angeles City College, then as a sophomore to Oregon, where he majored in political science.

Why political science? "I guess I had some idea then that I wanted to go to South America," says Lewis. "But basically I was just a liberal arts student trying to decide where to land." He grins ruefully. "Too bad I didn't land in business. I took one of those business short courses before buying the Bowl. Three weeks of training. I should have had five years. I had to learn everything about the food and liquor business the hard way, and it was rough going around here at first."

It's still far from easy. But the Bowl is now relatively well established in Compton, with 50 employees (which makes it an enterprise of considerable importance in the community) and a share-the-profit incentive program in which Lewis takes a good deal of pride. From the pretty girl who works at the counter above the booming alleys to the men who polish the wood, you get the sense of shared enterprise, of personal involvement—and of affection for Lewis. He is still, quite obviously, the boy that everybody likes and respects.

He is no stranger to hard work. As a student at Oregon he earned $71.20 monthly on a work detail for the Athletic Department. Room, board, and insurance came to $80. "Ends," he says with his quick, ironic smile, "didn't quite meet." So he worked weekends—when he wasn't making touchdowns—chopping weeds, cleaning floors, washing windows. He managed, simultaneously, to maintain above-average grades and a happy social life. He remembers his years at U.O. with warmth and affection. "I made lots of friends up there," he says. He also met a girl named Mitzi Nagasaka '51, a major in general social science. A year after he joined the Rams, they were married. They have two children, a boy and girl, Craig, 13, and Page, 11.

Oddly enough, it was Lewis' experience with the Rams that finally brought him into real contact with social problems. For a couple of years he "loafed and lived it up" during the football off-season. "Then I began to realize that I'd better get a job and live on it, or I'd wind up a bum, an ex-football player without a dime and no place to go."

He discovered that it wasn't too easy for a Negro to get a job—even a Negro who was a nationally known football player. He was turned down, for example, when he applied for work as a parking attendant at the racetrack. Apparently that was a trifle too grandiose a job for a man with a black skin to hope for, back in 1952. Fortunately, Lewis heard that the juvenile court was looking for athletes to serve as probation officers. He applied and got a job.

For nine years thereafter he worked during the football off-season as a counselor at a detention home for some of the toughest youngsters the streets of Los Angeles ever spawned. They included boys of every race and of every level of criminal development—some were first offenders, some were hardened young veterans. Too young for jail, too tough for their parents to handle, they had won their stripes for car thefts, strong-arm robbery, knifings, shoot-outs, arson, even attempted murder.

Lewis won their respect immediately; to these boys, the only law-abiding adult worth respect was an athlete. He played ball with them, talked to them, relieved them of contraband knives and cigarettes, broke up their fights, and listened to them. He came away from that experience with some very firm convictions about the causes of juvenile—and adult—delinquency.

Most of the boys had known nothing but poverty, and most came from broken homes. "It all starts in the home," says Lewis. "And one of the big reasons it starts is that the image of the father has been lost. The father's no longer the strong guy. When he used to say 'jump,' the kids jumped. Now when he says it, *he* jumps—and everybody laughs at him."

Lewis points to the Watts area around him, with its low income and high desertion rate. Because society has made it difficult for a Negro man to support his family, the man loses his self-respect, allows the woman to take over the entire responsibility for the family. "How can you expect a kid to grow into a man, if he has no man around to model himself on? What can he know about the meaning or value of work when he's spent his life watching this mother wait for the welfare check to come every month?

"I believe that classes should be developed for people on public assistance," says Lewis. "And they should be *required* to attend. They need to earn that money, even if it's just for going to class. People have to have something to do, they've got to feel they're worth something, that they've got something to live for. That's what brought on the Watts riot—too many people with nothing at all to do. If we can't provide jobs for them, we can at least provide classes and require them to go. People on public assistance just rot away because their lives have no meaning or purpose; they're just being kept alive, and they know it."

Although stores near Lewis' business were looted and a grocery store only four blocks from the Sportsman Bowl was burned to the ground the night of the Watts riot, the Bowl was not attacked. "Maybe I was spared because I've worked hard for this community, and people know it," says Lewis. "A lot of people were doing everything they could to help me protect myself. Certainly the majority of the people were against the riots."

He believes that the people are tired now, that violence is not likely to flare up again if the people feel that an honest attempt is being made to help them solve the unemployment problem. But the only real hope for an area like Watts, he says, is to rebuild and redevelop it. He hopes for urban redevelopment on a broad scale. "The only way to eliminate slums is to build new areas and relocate people. An old area will always have problems. It's like an old car. You can repair it, and repair it, and then finally you've got to have a new car, the old one just won't run. Communities are like that."

Sooner or later, he believes, the problems that grip the whole grim complex of streets and neighborhoods that make up Los Angeles' Negro ghetto will be solved. "We've got good people here. All they need is a chance." Optimistically, he speaks of developing, eventually, an entire shopping center for the area.

"Some day," he says. "Some day." He stops beside the map on his office wall and stares at the colored pins clustered so thickly around Watts and Compton. "I believe the area can be redeveloped," he says. "I really do."

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE TO ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the President of the United States has today submitted to Congress his recommendations for legislation in the elementary and secondary as well as the higher education areas. Since the draft bills submitted in mimeograph form run to 42 and 68 mimeographed pages, respectively, I cannot in all candor say that I have reviewed each and every comma of the proposals as thoroughly as I could have wished. However, the Office of Education did provide, with each of the draft bills, a fact sheet setting forth the principal provisions.

The President, further, in his message has provided us with much helpful material interpreting his approach to the legislation. In view of these facts and in view of the respect which is due the office of the Presidency and the recommendations which the President sends to the Congress, it is my belief that the legislation should be introduced at this time so that all Senators may have an opportunity to weigh and to analyze the proposals which have been put forward.

There is no question in my mind that widespread agreement in the Senate can be obtained for the extension of programs which have proven their merit over time. A quick review of the justifications prepared by the Office of Education would indicate there is much merit in many of the new proposals put forward. Some of these may meet with questioning but the proper forum for the resolution of any difficulties that may arise are the committee sessions on the legislation following an analysis of the testimony presented at full and open hearings.

Mr. President, in order that Senators may have full information on the President's proposals, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bills, the fact sheets pertaining thereto and that portion of the President's message relating to the educational proposals be printed at this point in my remarks.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the two measures to which I have alluded and ask unanimous consent that they be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the RECORD, together with the fact sheets pertaining thereto, and the pertinent portion of the President's message.

The bills, introduced by Mr. MORSE, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Labor and

Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1125

A bill to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education by extending authority for allocation of funds to be used for education of Indian children and children in overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense, by extending and amending the National Teacher Corps program, by providing assistance for comprehensive educational planning, and by improving programs of education for the handicapped; to improve programs of vocational education; to improve authority for assistance to schools in federally impacted areas and areas suffering a major disaster; and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967".

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, AND RELATED AMENDMENTS

PART A—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE I OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

SUBPART 1—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE II OF PUBLIC LAW 81–874

Extending for one year provisions relating to schools for Indian children

SEC. 101. The third sentence of section 203(a)(1)(A) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1967," and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1968,".

Raising the dollar limitation for State administrative expenses under title II of Public Law 874

SEC. 102. Effective for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1967, section 207(b)(2) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress) is amended by striking out "$75,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$150,000".

Technical corrections with respect to payments on account of neglected or delinquent children and payments for children of migratory agricultural workers

SEC. 103. (a) The first sentence of section 203(a)(2) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress) is amended by inserting "(other than such institutions operated by the United States)" immediately after "living in institutions for neglected or delinquent children", and by striking out "paragraph (5)" and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph (7)".

(b) Section 205(c)(1)(C) of such Act is amended by striking out "(8)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(10)".

(c) Section 206(a)(3) and section 207(b) of such Act are each amended by striking out "section 205(a)(5)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 205(a)(6)".

Redesignating section numbers in title II of Public Law 874

SEC. 104. For the purpose of avoiding confusion between references to section numbers of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and references to section numbers of title II of Public Law 81–874 (which latter title is also generally cited as title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965), sections 201 through 214 of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended by the preceding sections of this Act, are redesignated as sections 101 through 114, respectively, and all references to any such section in that or any other law, or in any rule, regulation, order, or agreement of the United States are amended so as to refer to such section as so redesignated.

SUBPART 2—TEACHER CORPS

Teacher Corps program transferred and reconstituted as part B of title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

SEC. 111. (a) Part B of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (with its references therein to title II of Public Law 81–874 redesignated as provided by section 104 of this Act) is deleted from that Act (but without repeal thereof) and is inserted (as captioned) as part B in title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 immediately after the last section of such title; and the sections so transferred (which are numbered 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, and 517), and internal cross-references therein to any such section, are redesignated and are hereinafter in this title referred to as sections 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, and 157, respectively, of such title I, so as to make such part B read as follows:

"PART B—NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 151. (a) The purpose of this part is to strengthen the educational opportunities available to children in areas having concentrations of low income families and to encourage colleges and universities to broaden their programs of teacher preparation by—

"(1) attracting and training qualified teachers who will be made available to local educational agencies for teaching in such areas; and

"(2) attracting and training inexperienced teacher interns who will be made available for teaching and inservice training to local educational agencies in such areas in teams led by an experienced teacher.

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out this part, there are authorized to be appropriated $36,100,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $64,715,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

"SEC. 152. In order to carry out the purposes of this part, there is hereby established in the Office of Education a National Teacher Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "Teacher Corps"). The Teacher Corps shall be headed by a Director who shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for grade 17 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, and a Deputy Director who shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for grade 16 of such General Schedule. The Director and the Deputy Director shall perform such duties as are delegated to them by the Commissioner.

"TEACHER CORPS PROGRAM

"SEC. 153. (a) For the purpose of carrying out this part, the Commissioner is authorized to—

"(1) recruit, select, and enroll experienced teachers, and inexperienced teacher-interns who have a bachelor's degree or its equivalent, in the Teacher Corps for periods of up to two years;

"(2) enter into arrangements, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education or State or local educational agencies to provide members of the Teacher Corps with such training as the Commissioner may deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of this part, including not more than three months of training for members before they undertake their teaching duties under this part;

"(3) enter into arrangements (including the payment of the cost of such arrangements) with local educational agencies, after consultation in appropriate cases with State educational agencies and institutions of higher education, to furnish to local educational agencies, for service during regular or summer sessions, or both, in the schools of such agencies in areas having concentrations of children from low-income families, either or both (A) experienced teachers, or (B) teaching teams, each of which shall consist of an experienced teacher and a number of teacher-interns who, in addition to teaching duties, shall be afforded time by the local educational agency for a teacher-intern training program developed according to criteria established by the Commissioner and carried out under the guidance of the experienced teacher in cooperation with an institution of higher education; and

"(4) pay to local educational agencies the amount of the compensation which such agencies pay to or on behalf of members of the Teacher Corps assigned to them pursuant to arrangements made pursuant to the preceding clause.

"(b) Arrangements with institutions of higher education to provide training for teacher-interns while teaching in schools for local educational agencies under the provisions of this part shall provide, wherever possible, for training leading to a graduate degree.

"(c)(1) Whenever the Commissioner determines that the demand for the services of experienced teachers or of teaching teams furnished pursuant to clause (3) of subsection (a) exceeds the number of experienced teachers or teaching teams available from the Teacher Corps, the Commissioner shall, to the extent practicable, allocate experienced teachers or teaching teams, as the case may be, from the Teacher Corps among the States in accordance with paragraph (2).

"(2) Not to exceed 2 per centum of such teachers or teams, as the case may be, shall be allocated to Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs. The remainder of such teams or teachers, as the case may be, shall be allocated among the other States in proportion to the number of children counted in each State for the purpose of determining the amount of basic grants made under section 103 of title II of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, for the fiscal year for which the allocation is made.

"(d) A local educational agency may utilize members of the Teacher Corps assigned to it in providing, in the manner described in section 105(a)(2) of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, educational services in which children enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools can participate.

"COMPENSATION

"SEC. 154. (a) An arrangement made with a local educational agency pursuant to paragraph (3) of section 153(a) shall provide for compensation by such agency of Teacher Corps members during the period of their assignment to it at the following rates:

"(1) an experienced teacher who is not leading a teaching team shall be compensated at a rate which is equal to the rate paid by such agency for a teacher with similar training and experience who has been assigned similar teaching duties;

"(2) an experienced teacher who is leading a teaching team shall be compensated at a rate agreed to by such agency and the Commissioner; and

"(3) a teacher-intern shall be compensated at a rate which is equal to the lowest rate paid by such agency for teaching full time in the school system and grade to which the intern is assigned.

"(b) For any period of training under this part the Commissioner shall pay to members of the Teacher Corps such stipends (including allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such members and their dependents) as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported training programs.

"(c) The Commissioner shall pay the necessary travel expenses of members of the Teacher Corps and their dependents and necessary expenses for the transportation of the household goods and personal effects of such members and their dependents, and such other necessary expenses of members as are directly related to their service in the Corps, including readjustment allowances proportionate to service.

"(d) The Commissioner is authorized to make such arrangements as may be possible, including the payment of any costs incident thereto, to protect the tenure, retirement rights, participation in a medical insurance program, and such other similar employee benefits as the Commissioner deems appropriate, of a member of the Teacher Corps who participates in any program under this part and who indicates his intention to return to the local educational agency or institution of higher education by which he was employed immediately prior to his service under this part.

"APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LAW

"Sec. 155. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this section, a member of the Teacher Corps shall be deemed not to be a Federal employee and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

"(b)(1) Such members shall, for the purposes of the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (5 U.S.C. 751 et seq.), be deemed to be civil employees of the United States within the meaning of the term 'employee' as defined in section 40 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 790) and the provisions thereof shall apply except as hereinafter provided.

"(2) For purposes of this subsection:

"(A) the term 'performance of duty' in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall not include any act of a member of the Teacher Corps—

"(i) while on authorized leave; or

"(ii) while absent from his assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity authorized by or under the direction or supervision of the Commissioner; and

"(D) in computing compensation benefits for disability or death under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the monthly pay of a member of the Teacher Corps shall be deemed to be his actual pay or that received under the entrance salary for grade 6 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, whichever is greater.

"(c) Such members shall be deemed to be employees of the Government for the purposes of the Federal tort claims provisions of title 28, United Statets Code.

"LOCAL CONTROL PRESERVED

"Sec. 156. Members of the Teacher Corps shall be under the direct supervision of the appropriate officials of the local educational agencies to which they are assigned. Except as otherwise provided in clause (3) of section 153(a), such agencies shall retain the authority to—

"(1) assign such members within their systems;

"(2) make transfers within their systems;

"(3) determine the subject matter to be taught;

"(4) determine the terms and continuance of the assignment of such members within their systems.

"MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT

"Sec. 157. No member of the Teacher Corps shall be furnished to any local educational agency under the provisions of this part if such agency will use such member to replace any teacher who is or would otherwise be employed by such agency."

(b) The heading of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "FINANCIAL" and by striking out "TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES", and the following new heading is inserted immediately below such heading:

"PART A—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES FOR EDUCATION OF CHILDREN IN AREAS HAVING CONCENTRATIONS OF CHILDREN FROM LOW-INCOME FAMILIES".

(c) Wherever in any law, rule, regulation, order, or agreement of the United States reference is made, however styled, to part B of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965, or to any section thereof, such reference is amended so as to make comparable reference to part B of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, or to such section of that part as redesignated herein, respectively.

(d) Subject to the provisions of subsections (a) and (c), any order, rule, regulation, right, agreement, or application in effect under part B of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 immediately prior to the enactment of this Act, shall continue in effect to the same extent as if this section had not been enacted.

(e) Appropriations made for carrying out the part B of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 which is transferred by this section to and reconstituted as part B of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 shall be deemed made for carrying out such part B of such title I.

(f) The section of title II of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, redesignated as section 114 of such title by section 104 of this Act is amended by inserting "Part A of" immediately before "Title I".

Extending Teacher Corps program

Sec. 112. Subsection (b) of the section redesignated by this Act as section 151 of such part B of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "and" after "June 30, 1966," and by inserting the following immediately before the period at the end of such subsection: ", $36,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, and June 30, 1970, respectively; and there are further authorized to be appropriated such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, as may be necessary to enable any teacher-intern who has not completed his program of practical and academic training to continue such program for a period of not more than one additional year."

Requiring approval of State educational agency

Sec. 113. The section redesignated by this Act as section 153(a) of part B (National Teacher Corps) of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended as follows:

(a) Paragraph (2) is amended by striking out "with institutions of higher education or State or local educational agencies" and inserting in lieu thereof "with institutions of higher education or local educational agencies (upon approval in either case by the appropriate State educational agency) or with State educational agencies".

(b) Paragraph (3) is amended by striking out "after consultation in appropriate cases with State educational agencies and institutions of higher education," and inserting in lieu thereof "upon approval by the appropriate State educational agency and after consultation, in appropriate cases, with institutions of higher education,".

Limiting compensation for teacher-interns

Sec. 114. (a) The section redesignated by this Act as section 154(a)(3) of such part B is amended by inserting ", or $75 per week plus $15 per week for each dependent, whichever is less" immediately after "to which the intern is assigned".

(b) The amendment made by this section shall not apply to any person enrolled in the Teacher Corps before the date of enactment of this Act.

Clarifying authority of local educational agency to refuse to accept particular members assigned to such agency

Sec. 115. The second sentence of the section redesignated by this Act as section 156 of such part B is amended by inserting "no such member shall be assigned to any local educational agency unless such agency finds each member acceptable, and immediately before "such agencies shall retain the authority".

Authorizing acceptance of gifts on behalf of Teacher Corps

Sec. 116. The section redesignated by this Act as section 153(a) of such part B, as amended by this Act, is further amended by—

(a) striking out "and" at the end of clause (3);

(b) striking out the period at the end of clause (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(c) inserting the following new clause at the end thereof:

"(5) accept and employ in the furtherance of the purposes of this part (A) voluntary and uncompensated services notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679(b) of the Revised Statutes, as amended (section 665(b) of title 31, United States Code), and (B) any money or property (real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible) received by gift, devise, bequest, or otherwise."

Authorizing assignment of Teacher Corps members to schools for Indian children operated by Department of the Interior

Sec. 117. The first sentence of the section redesignated as section 153(c)(2) of such part 2 is amended by striking out "2 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "3 per centum", and by striking out "Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands" and inserting in lieu thereof "Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and elementary and secondary schools operated for Indian children by the Department of the Interior,".

Authorizing assignment of Teacher Corps members to special programs for children of migratory agricultural workers

Sec. 118. Such part B as amended by the preceding sections of this Act is further amended by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"Teaching in special programs or projects for children of migratory agricultural workers

"Sec. 158. For purposes of this part the term 'local educational agency' includes any State educational agency or other public or private nonprofit agency which provides a program or project designed to meet the special educational needs of migratory children of migratory agricultural workers, and any reference in this part to teaching in the schools of a local educational agency includes teaching in any such program or project."

Conforming amendment

Sec. 119. Subsection (c)(2) of the section redesignated by this Act as section 153 of part B of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "basic".

PART B—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE II OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Extending for one year provisions relating to schools for Indian children and Defense Department overseas dependents schools

Sec. 121. (a) Section 202(a)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "June 30, 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1968".

PART C—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Extending for one year provisions of title III of Public Law 89–10 relating to schools for Indian children and Defense Department overseas schools

SEC. 131. Section 302(a)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "June 30, 1967," and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1968,".

PART D—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE V OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT of 1965; SUBPART 1—AMENDMENTS RELATING TO GRANTS TO STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES; INCLUSION OF TRUST TERRITORY OF PACIFIC ISLANDS

SEC. 141. (a) The first and third sentences of paragraph (1) of section 502(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, relating to apportionment of appropriations, are each amended by striking out "and" after "Samoa," and by inserting ", and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands" after "Virgin Islands".

(b)(1) Paragraph (j) of section 701 of such Act, defining the term "State", is amended by striking out "and for purposes of title II and title III, such term includes the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands" and inserting in lieu thereof ", and for purposes of titles II, III, and V such term also includes the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands".

(2) Such section 701 is further amended by inserting ", except when otherwise specified" immediately after "As used in titles II, III, and V of this Act".

Revision of apportionment formula

SEC. 142. The second sentence of paragraph (1) of section 502(a) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "The remainder of such 85 percent shall be apportioned by the Commissioner as follows:

"(A) He shall apportion 40 percent of such remainder among the States in equal amounts.

"(B) He shall apportion to each State an amount that bears the same ratio to 60 percent of such remainder as the number of public school pupils in the State bears to the number of public school pupils in all the States, as determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

SUBPART 2—ADDITION OF NEW PART RELATING TO PLANNING GRANTS FOR COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

SEC. 145. (a) Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by adding "AND FOR STATEWIDE EDUCATIONAL PLANNING" to its heading and by inserting the following immediately below its heading:

"PART A—GRANTS FOR STRENGTHENING LEADERSHIP RESOURCES OF STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES"

(b) Title V of such Act is further amended by striking out the words "this title" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "this part", and by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART B—GRANTS FOR COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND EVALUATION

"Authorization

"SEC. 521. To the end of enhancing the capability of the several States to make effective progress, through comprehensive and continuing planning, toward the achievement of opportunities for high quality education for all segments of the population throughout the State, the Commissioner is authorized to make, in accordance with the provisions of this part, comprehensive planning and evaluation grants to States that have submitted, and had approved by the Commissioner, an application pursuant to section 523, and special project grants, related to the purposes of this part, pursuant to section 524. For the purpose of making such grants, there are authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and such sums as may be necessary for the next four fiscal years.

"Apportionment Among the States

"SEC. 522. (a)(1) From the sums appropriated for carrying out this part for each fiscal year, 25 percent shall be reserved for the purposes of section 524 and the remaining 75 percent shall be available for grants to States under section 523.

"(2) The Commissioner shall apportion not in excess of 2 percent of the amount available for grants under section 523 among the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, according to their respective needs for carrying out the purposes of this part. The remainder of such amount shall be apportioned by the Commissioner as follows:

"(A) He shall apportion 40 percent of such remainder among the States in equal amounts.

"(B) He shall apportion to each State an amount that bears the same ratio to 60 percent of such remainder as the population of the State bears to the population of all the States, as determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term 'State' does not include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(b) The amount apportioned under this section to any State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, shall be available for obligation for grants pursuant to applications approved during that year and the succeeding fiscal year.

"(c) The amount of any State's apportionment for any fiscal year under paragraph (2) of subsection (a) which the Commissioner determines will not be required for grants to that State under section 523 during the period for which such apportionment is available may from time to time be reapportioned by the Commissioner to other States, according to their respective needs, as the Commissioner may determine. Any amount so reapportioned to a State from funds appropriated for any fiscal year shall be deemed to be a part of the amount apportioned to it under subsection (a) for that year.

"Comprehensive planning grants

"SEC. 523. (a)(1) Any State desiring to receive a grant or grants under this section from its apportionment under section 522 for any fiscal year shall designate or establish a single State agency or office (hereafter in this part referred to as the State educational planning agency) as the sole agency for carrying out or supervising the carrying out of a comprehensive Statewide program of systematic planning and evaluation relating to education at all levels (including remedial education and retraining of adults), except that—

"(A) the field of higher education shall be included only if the State so elects and so provides in an application (or amended or supplemental application) under this section, and

"(B) in the event of such election the State may designate or establish a separate State agency (hereafter in this part referred to as the State higher education planning agency) for carrying out or supervising the carrying out of such planning and evaluation program with respect to higher education.

"(2) A grant to a State may be made under this section only upon approval of an application submitted to the Commissioner through the State educational planning agency, except that, with respect to States electing to include the field of higher education as provided in clause (A) of paragraph (1) of this subsection and designating or establishing a State higher education planning agency as provided in clause (B) of paragraph (1), the Commissioner, by or pursuant to regulation—

"(A) shall authorize the submission of a combined application which includes higher education (or an amended or supplemental application filed upon the making of such election) jointly through both of the State's planning agencies involved, or the submission of a separate application (or supplement) through the State's higher educational planning agency as to so much of the State's program as relates to planning and evaluation in the field of higher education, and

"(B) may provide for allocating, between the State's two planning agencies, the amount of any grant or grants under this section from the State's apportionment.

"(3) An application (or amendment or supplement thereto) under this section shall set forth, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, the Statewide program referred to in paragraph (1) (or, in the case of a separate application or amendment or supplement with respect to the field of higher education, so much of the Statewide program as relates to that field), which shall include provision for—

"(A) setting Statewide educational goals and establishing priorities among these goals;

"(B) developing through analyses alternative means of achieving these goals, taking into account the resources available and the educational effectiveness of each of the alternatives (including, in the case of higher education, the resources and plans of private institutions in the State bearing upon the State's goals and plans for public higher education);

"(C) planning new programs and improvements in existing programs based on the results of these analyses;

"(D) developing and strengthening the capabilities of the State to conduct, on a continuous basis, objective evaluations of the effectiveness of educational programs; and

"(E) developing and maintaining a permanent system for obtaining and collating significant information necessary to the assessment of progress toward the State's educational goals.

"(b) Applications (including amendments and supplements thereto) for grants under this section may be approved by the Commissioner only if the application—

"(1) has been submitted to the chief executive of the State for review and recommendations;

"(2) sets forth if the State has elected to include the field of higher education and has designated or established a separate State higher education planning agency, such arrangements for coordination, between the State's educational planning program in that field and the remaining educational planning program submitted by the State, as will in the Commissioner's judgment be effective;

"(3) contains satisfactory assurance—

"(A) that the assistance provided under this section, together with other available resources, will be so used for the several purposes specified in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of this section as to result in the maximum possible effective progress toward the achievement of a high level of competence with respect to each of them, and

"(B) that assistance under this part will, by the State planning agency involved, be used primarily in strengthening the capabilities of its own planning and evaluation staff or, to the extent that the program is to be carried out under the supervision of that agency by other agencies, the planning and evaluation staffs of such other agencies; but consistently with this objective part of the funds received under a grant under this section may be used, in appropriate circumstances, to employ consultants, or to enter into contracts for special projects with public or private agencies, institutions, or organizations having special competence in the areas of planning or evaluation;

"(4) makes adequate provision (consistent with such criteria as the Commissioner may prescribe) for using funds granted to the applicant under this section, other than funds granted for planning and evaluation in the field of higher education, (A) to make program planning and evaluation services available to local educational agencies, and (B) in the case of such agencies in areas (particularly metropolitan areas) with school populations sufficiently large to warrant their own planning or evaluation staffs, to assist such agencies (financially or through technical assistance or both) to strengthen their planning and evaluation capabilities and to promote coordinated areawide planning for such areas;

"(5) provides for such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the program;

"(6) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid under this part to the State (including any such funds paid by the State to agencies, institutions, or organizations referred to in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (3)); and

"(7) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may reasonably require (copies of which shall also be sent to the chief executive of the State), and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(c) A grant made pursuant to an approval of an application under this section may be used to pay all or part of the cost of activities covered by the approved application and included in such grant, but excluding so much, if any, of such cost as is paid for from grants under part A.

"Special projects

"SEC. 524. (a) The sums reserved pursuant to section 522(a)(1) for the purposes of this section shall be used for grants for special projects in accordance with subsection (b) of this section.

"(b) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to public or private nonprofit agencies, institutions, or organizations, or to make contracts with public or private agencies, institutions, or organizations, for special projects related to the purposes of this part, to be conducted on an interstate, regional, or metropolitan area basis, including projects for such purposes as—

(1) metropolitan planning in education in areas covering more than one State;

(2) improvement and expansion in the educational planning of large cities within a State with due regard to the complexities of adequate metropolitan planning in such places;

(3) comparative and cooperative studies agreed upon between States or metropolitan areas;

(4) conferences to promote the purposes of this part and involving different States;

(5) publications of general use to the planning of more effective and efficient educational services, and other activities for dissemination of information related to the purposes of this part.

"Payments

"SEC. 525. Payments under this part may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments, as the Commissioner may determine."

PART E—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, AND RELATED AMENDMENTS

Regional resource centers

SEC. 151. Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by—

(1) inserting immediately below the heading of such title

"PART A—ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN";

(2) inserting immediately below section 607

"PART D—GENERAL PROVISIONS";

(3) redesignating sections 608, 609, and 610 as sections 610, 611, and 612, respectively,

(4) striking out the words "this title" wherever they occur in sections 601 through 607, and inserting in lieu thereof "this part"; and

(5) inserting immediately after section 607 the following;

"PART B—REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTERS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

"Regional resource centers

"SEC. 608. (a) For the purpose of aiding in the establishment and operation of regional centers which will develop and apply the best methods of appraising the special educational needs of handicapped children referred to them and will provide other services to assist in meeting such needs, there are authorized to be appropriated $7,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the four succeeding fiscal years.

"(b) Appropriations under this section shall be available to the Commissioner for grants to or contracts with institutions of higher education, State educational agencies, or combinations of such agencies or institutions, within particular regions of the United States, to pay all or part of the cost of establishment (including construction) or operation of regional resource centers for the improvement of education of the handicapped in such regions. Centers established or operated under this section shall (1) provide testing and educational evaluation to determine the special educational needs of handicapped children referred to such centers, (2) develop educational programs to meet those needs, and (3) assist schools and other appropriate agencies, organizations, and institutions in providing such educational programs through services such as consultation (including, in appropriate cases, consultation with parents or teachers of handicapped children at such regional centers), periodic re-examination and reevaluation of special educational programs, and other technical services.

"(c) In determining whether to approve an application for a project under this section, the Commissioner shall consider the need for such a center in the region to be served by the applicant and the capability of the applicant to develop and apply, with the assistance of funds under this section, new methods, techniques, devices, or facilities relating to educational evaluation or education of handicapped children.

"(d) Payment pursuant to grants or contracts under this section may be made (after necessary adjustments on account of previously made underpayments or overpayments) in advance or by reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions as the Commissioner may determine."

Improvement of recruitment of educational personnel and information on educational opportunities for the handicapped

SEC. 152. Such title VI is further amended by inserting immediately after part B, as added by the preceding section, the following new part:

"PART C—RECRUITMENT OF PERSONNEL—INFORMATION ON EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED

"Grants or contracts to improve recruiting of educational personnel, and to improve dissemination of information concerning educational opportunities for the handicapped

"SEC. 609. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, or institutions, or to enter into contracts with public or private agencies, organizations, or institutions for projects for—

"(1) encouraging students and professional personnel to work in various fields of education of handicapped children and youth through, among other ways, developing and distributing imaginative or innovative materials to assist in recruiting personnel for such careers, or publicizing existing forms of financial aid which might enable students to pursue such careers, or

"(2) disseminating information about the programs, services, and resources for the education of handicapped children, or providing referral services, to parents, teachers, and other persons especially interested in the handicapped.

"(b) To carry out the purposes of this section, there are authorized to be appropriated $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the four succeeding fiscal years."

Transfer of definition and other technical amendments

SEC. 153. (a) Section 602 of such title VI is redesignated as section 613 and transferred to the end of such title.

(b) Section 601 of such title is amended by—

(1) striking out the section heading and inserting in lieu thereof the heading

"Grants to States for education of handicapped children";

(2) striking out "(a)" in subsection (a);

(3) redesignating section 601(b) as section 602 by striking out "(b)" in subsection (b) and inserting "SEC. 602." in lieu thereof; and

(4) inserting above section 602 as so redesignated the section heading

"Appropriations authorized".

(c)(1) The portion of section 701 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (containing definitions) which precedes subsection (a), as amended by section 141(a) of this Act, is further amended by striking out "As used in titles II, III, and V" and inserting in lieu thereof "As used in titles II, III, V, and VI".

(2) Paragraph (j) of such section 701, as amended by section 141(b) of this Act, is further amended by striking out "and V" and inserting in lieu thereof "V, and VI".

SHORT TITLE OF TITLE VI OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

SEC. 154. Title VI of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Short title

"SEC. 614. This title may be cited as the 'Education of the Handicapped Act'."

Including schools for Indian children operated by the Department of the Interior and Defense Department overseas dependents schools in Title VI

SEC. 155. So much of paragraph (1) of section 603(a)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 as follows the first sentence is amended to read as follows: "The Commissioner shall allot the amount appropriated pursuant to this paragraph among—

"(A) Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective needs, and

"(B) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, (i) the Secretary of the Interior according to the need for such assistance for the education of handicapped children in elementary and secondary schools operated for Indian children by the Department of the Interior, and (ii) the Secretary of Defense according to the need for such assistance for the education of handicapped children in the overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense. The terms upon which payments for such purpose shall be made to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Defense shall be determined pursuant to such criteria as the Commissioner determines will best carry out the purposes of this title."

Expansion of instructional media programs to include all handicapped children

Sec. 156. Subsection (b) of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a loan service of captioned films for the deaf" (42 U.S.C. 2491 et seq.) is amended to read as follows in order to conform its statement of objectives to amendments made to such Act by Public Law 89–258:

"(b) to promote the educational advancement of handicapped persons by (1) carrying on research in the use of educational media for the handicapped, (2) producing and distributing educational media for the use of handicapped persons, their parents, their actual or potential employers, and other persons directly involved in work for the advancement of the handicapped, and (3) training persons in the use of educational media for the instruction of the handicapped."

Sec. 157. Section 2 of such Act is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"(4) The term 'handicapped' means deaf, mentally retarded, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, or other health impaired persons."

Sec. 158. Section 3 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "deaf" and inserting in lieu thereof "handicapped" each time it occurs therein.

Sec. 159. Section 4 of such Act is amended by striking out "$5,000,000" and inserting "$6,000,000" in lieu thereof, and by striking out "$7,000,000" and inserting "$8,000,000" in lieu thereof.

Authorizing contracts, as well as grants, for research in education of the handicapped

Sec. 160. (a) The first sentence of section 302(a) of Public Law 88–164 is amended by inserting ", and to make contracts with States, State or local educational agencies, public and private institutions of higher learning, and other public or private educational research agencies and organizations," immediately before "for research or demonstration projects".

(b) The second sentence of such section 302(a) is amended by striking out "Such grants shall be made" and inserting in lieu thereof "Payments pursuant to grants or contracts under this section may be made".

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963

Part A—Exemplary and Innovative Programs or Projects in Vocational Education

Special programs or projects

Sec. 201. Section 4 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (Public Law 88–210, 20 U.S.C. 35c) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) (1) There are authorized to be appropriated $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and such sums as may be necessary for the four succeeding fiscal years, to be used by the Commissioner for making grants to or contracts with State boards or local educational agencies for the purpose of stimulating and assisting, through programs or projects referred to in paragraph (3), the development, establishment, and operation of exemplary and innovative occupational education programs or projects designed to serve as models for use in vocational education programs. The Commissioner also may make grants to other public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, or institutions, or contracts with public or private agencies, organizations, or institutions, when such grants or contracts will make an especially significant contribution to attaining the objectives of this subsection.

"(2) (A) From the sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine and shall apportion such amount among Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this subsection.

"(B) From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall apportion $150,000 to each State, and he shall in addition apportion to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to any residue of such remainder as the population aged 15 to 19, both inclusive, in the State bears to the population of such ages in all the States.

"(C) Any amount apportioned to a State under this subsection for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for grants for programs or projects in that State during the period for which such apportionment is available shall be available for reapportionment by him from time to time to other States in accordance with their respective needs.

"(D) For the purposes of paragraph (2) (A) and (B) of this subsection, the term 'State' does not include Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(E) The population of particular age groups of a State or of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the latest available estimates furnished by the Department of Commerce.

"(F) The amount apportioned under this section to any State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, shall be available for obligation for grants pursuant to applications approved during that year and the succeeding fiscal year.

"(3) Grants or contracts pursuant to this subsection may be made by the Commissioner, upon such terms and conditions consistent with the provisions of this section as he determines will most effectively carry out the purposes of paragraph (1), to pay part of the cost of—

"(A) planning and developing exemplary and innovative programs or projects such as those described in subparagraph (B), or

"(B) establishing, operating, or evaluating exemplary and innovative vocational education programs or projects designed to broaden occupational aspirations and opportunities for youths, with special emphasis given to youths who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps, which programs or projects may, among others, include—

"(i) those designed to familiarize post-elementary school students with the broad range of occupations for which special skills are required and the requisites for careers in such occupations;

"(ii) programs or projects for students providing educational experiences through work;

"(iii) programs or projects for intensive occupational guidance and counseling during the last years of school and for initial job placement; or

"(iv) programs or projects designed to broaden or improve vocational education curricula.

"(4) (A) Programs or projects referred to in clause (ii) of paragraph (3) (B) may include cooperative work-study arrangements, other educationally related public or private employment, or volunteer work. Preference in compensated work under such programs or projects shall be given to students from low-income families.

"(B) No grant or contract shall be made by the Commissioner under this subsection with respect to any such program or project unless—

"(i) such program or project will not involve the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

"(ii) such program or project will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services.

"(C) Funds appropriated under this subsection shall not be available to pay any part of the compensation of a student involved in a program or project referred to in clause (ii) of paragraph (3) (B) if the work is performed for any employer other than a public or private nonprofit agency, organization, or institution.

"(5) (A) In determining the cost of a program or project under this subsection, the Commissioner may include the reasonable value (as determined by him) of any goods or services provided from non-Federal sources.

"(B) Financial assistance may not be given under this subsection to any program or project for a period exceeding three years.

"(6) In administering the provisions of this subsection, the Commissioner shall consult with other Federal departments and agencies administering programs which may be effectively coordinated with the program carried out pursuant to this subsection, and to the extent practicable shall—

"(i) coordinate such program on the Federal level with the programs being administered by such other departments and agencies; and

"(ii) require that effective procedures be adopted by grantees and contractors to coordinate the development and operation of programs and projects carried out under grants or contracts pursuant to this subsection with other public and private programs having the same or similar purposes."

Conforming amendments

Sec. 202(a)(1). Section 4(a) of such Act (describing permitted uses of Federal funds under approved State plans) is amended by changing the period at the end of paragraph (6) to a semicolon and inserting immediately after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

"(7) The planning, establishment, operation, and evaluation of programs or projects of the kind described in subsection (d), whether or not previously assisted by a grant or contract under such subsection."

(2) Section 5(a) (2) and section 6(b) of such Act are each amended by striking out "and (6)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(6), and (7)."

(b) The second sentence of paragraph (1) of section 8 of such Act (defining the term "vocational education") is amended by inserting "(individually or through group instruction)" immediately after "counseling", and by inserting "or for the purpose of facilitating occupational choices" immediately after the word "training" the first time such word appears in that sentence.

(c) The first sentence of section 5(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "this part" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 3".

(d) The heading of section (6) of such Act is amended to read "PAYMENT", and the following sentence is added at the end of subsection (d) of such section: "Other payments pursuant to this Act may be made in installments, in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments."

PART B—AMENDING SECTION 4(c) TO ALLOW CONTRACTING AND DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION

SEC. 211. Section 4(c) of such Act is amended by inserting ", or to make contracts with private agencies, organizations, or institutions for, (1)" immediately after "cost of"; by striking out "and of" immediately preceding "experimental" and inserting in lieu thereof ", (2)"; and by inserting immediately prior to the period the following: ", or (3) for the dissemination of information derived from the foregoing programs or from research and demonstrations in the field of vocational education".

PART C—INCLUDING THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS UNDER THE ACT

SEC. 221. Paragraph (6) of section 8 of such Act is amended by striking out "and American Samoa" and by inserting in lieu thereof "American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands".

SEC. 222. Paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 3(d) of such Act are amended by striking out the words "and the Virgin Islands" each time they occur and by inserting in lieu thereof "the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands".

TITLE III—FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

PART A—ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION AND CURRENT EXPENDITURES IN IMPACTED AREAS

Clarifying definitions of "Federal property"

SEC. 301. Section 15(1) of the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress) and section 303(1) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress) are each amended by—

(a) striking out the second sentence thereof;

(b) striking out "also" in the penultimate sentence thereof; and

(c) inserting immediately before the last sentence thereof the following new sentence: "Such term also includes any interest in Federal property (as defined in the foregoing provisions of this paragraph) under an easement, lease, license, permit, or other arrangement, as well as any improvements of any nature (other than pipe lines or utility lines) on such property even though such interests or improvements are subject to taxation by a State or political subdivision of a State or by the District of Columbia."

PART B—ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION AND CURRENT EXPENDITURES IN MAJOR DISASTER AREAS

Assistance to disasters occurring after July 1, 1967

SEC. 311. (a) Section 16(a)(1)(A) of the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress), as added by Public Law 89-313, is amended by striking out "July 1, 1967," and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1972,".

(b) Section 7(a)(1)(A) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress), as added by Public Law 89-313, is amended by striking out "July 1, 1967," and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1972.".

Authorizing, in cases in which the disaster has not destroyed or damaged public schools, assistance for construction of public school facilities needed because of destruction of private facilities which will not be replaced

SEC. 312. (a) Section 16(a)(2) of the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress), is amended to read as follows:

"(2) as a result of this major disaster, (A) public elementary or secondary school facilities of such agency have been destroyed or seriously damaged, or (B) private elementary or secondary school facilities serving children who reside in the area served by such agency have been destroyed and will not be replaced, thereby increasing the need of such agency for school facilities;".

(b) Section 16(a)(4) of such Act is amended by inserting "(A)" after "needed", inserting "of such agency" after "the school facilities", and inserting the following before the semicolon after the word "damaged": "or (B) to serve, in facilities of such agency, children who but for the destruction of the private facilities referred to in clause (2)(B) would be served by such private facilities".

Modifying conditions of eligibility with respect to local effort and minimum damage required

SEC. 313. (a) Section 16(a)(3) of the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) such agency is utilizing or will utilize all State and other financial assistance available for the replacement or restoration of such school facilities;".

(b) Section 16(a)(4) of such Act is amended by inserting "and requires an amount of additional assistance equal to at least $1,000 or one-half of one percent of such agency's current operating expenditures during the fiscal year preceding the one in which such disaster occurred, whichever is less," immediately before "to provide the minimum school facilities needed".

(c) Section 7(a)(2) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) such agency is utilizing or will utilize all State and other financial assistance available to it for the purpose of meeting the cost of providing free public education for the children attending the schools of such agency, but as a result of such major disaster it is unable to obtain sufficient funds for such purpose and requires an amount of additional assistance equal to at least $1,000 or one-half of one percent of such agency's current operating expenditures during the fiscal year preceding the one in which such disaster occurred, whichever is less, and".

Determining level of education to be restored according to level at time of disaster instead of level during a base year

SEC. 314. The penultimate sentence of section 7(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress) is amended by striking out "during the last full fiscal year".

Authorizing disaster relief assistance for technical, vocational, and other special schools

SEC. 315. (a) Section 16(a) of the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress) and section 7(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress) are each amended (1) by inserting "(or any other public agency which operates schools providing technical, vocational, or other special education to children of elementary or secondary school age)" immediately after "If the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning determines with respect to any local educational agency", and (2) by striking out "if the Commissioner determines with respect to such local educational agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "if the Commissioner determines with respect to such agency".

(b) Clause (2) of section 16(a), as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting "(or, in the case of a public agency other than a local educational agency, school facilities providing technical, vocational, or other special education to children of elementary or secondary school age)" after "public elementary or secondary school facilities".

Clarifying authority to provide funds for minor repairs under Public Law 874

SEC. 316. Section 7(b) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress) is amended by inserting "to make minor repairs," immediately after "destroyed or seriously damaged as a result of such major disaster,".

S. 1126

A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, and the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act, with the following table of contents, may be cited as the "Higher Education Amendments of 1967".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE I OF HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 (COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS)

Sec. 101. Extension of grant program.
Sec. 102. Extension of 75 percent Federal share through fiscal year 1969.
Sec. 103. Authorization of experimental or pilot projects.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE II OF HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 (COLLEGE LIBRARIES, ETC.)

PART A—COLLEGE LIBRARY RESOURCES

Sec. 201. Extension of program.
Sec. 202. Revision of maintenance-of-effort requirement for special purpose grants.

PART B—LIBRARY TRAINING AND RESEARCH, AND LIBRARY SCHOOL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Sec. 221. Extension of program.
Sec. 222. Authorizing planning and development grants for library schools.
Sec. 223. Clarifying authority of institutions to use training institutes.

PART C—STRENGTHENING COLLEGE AND RESEARCH LIBRARY RESOURCES THROUGH LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Sec. 231. Extension of program.
Sec. 232. Clarifying authority to purchase copies; increasing authority to prepare catalog and bibliographic materials; authorizing librarians to act as acquisitions agent.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III OF HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 (STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS)

Sec. 301. Extension of program.

TITLE IV—STUDENT ASSISTANCE

PART A—AMENDMENTS TO EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANT PROGRAM

Sec. 401. Extension of program.
Sec. 402. Counting work-study assistance to student in computing maximum allowable educational opportunity grant.
Sec. 403. Authorizing grants (as well as contracts) for talent search.

PART B—AMENDMENTS TO PROVISIONS ON STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE PROGRAMS

Sec. 421. Authorizing deferment of repayment of State or privately insured loan during attendance of student borrower at institution of higher education, or during military, Peace Corps, or VISTA service; requiring deferral of such repayment of federally insured loan under National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act during VISTA service; and authorizing Federal payment of all interest accruing during any such attendance or service.
Sec. 422. Coordination between non-Federal and Federal programs with respect to maximum amounts of individual loans insured and minimum amounts of repayment installments on such loans.

Sec. 423. Extension of Federal loan insurance program.
Sec. 424. Technical corrections.

Part C—Amendments to College Work-Study Program

Sec. 431. Extension of program.
Sec. 432. 80 percent Federal matching.
Sec. 433. Authorizing work-study employment of 40 hours a week for students enrolled in classes during vacation periods.
Sec. 434. Revising maintenance-of-effort requirement to take into account additional forms of institutional student aid.
Sec. 435. Authorizing proprietary institutions to conduct work-study programs for off-campus work of their students for public or private nonprofit organizations.
Sec. 436. Providing for institutional expenses of administration of cooperative-education demonstration programs.
Sec. 437. Work-study program reconstituted as Part C of Title IV, Higher Education Act of 1965.

Part D—Amendments to National Defense Student Loan Program

Sec. 451. Extension of program.
Sec. 452. Making ten percent loan cancellation applicable to teacher service for certain special programs conducted by nonprofit institutions.
Sec. 453. Encouraging availability of non-Federal capital for National Defense Student Loans by establishing a revolving fund from which institutions may obtain loans to capitalize student loan funds, and providing for allotment of Federal capital contributions to such funds.

Part E—Amendments to National Defense Fellowship Program

Sec. 471. Extension of program.
Sec. 472. Increasing maximum length of fellowship from three to four years in special circumstances, and requiring institutional effort to encourage recipients to enter or continue teaching.
Sec. 473. Requiring stipends to be set in an amount consistent with those awarded for comparable fellowships.

Part F—Advisory Council on Student Aid

Sec. 481. Establishment of advisory council on all financial aid to students; absorption of advisory councils on insured loans.

TITLE V—EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT (AMENDMENTS TO TITLE V OF HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965)

Sec. 501. Statement of purpose.
Sec. 502. Amendments to part A (General Provisions) of title V of Higher Education Act of 1965.
Sec. 503. Extending teacher fellowship program to include graduate education for preschool and adult and vocational education personnel.
Sec. 504. New parts added to title V of Higher Education Act of 1965.
Sec. 505. Limitation.
Sec. 506. Short title of title V of Higher Education Act of 1965.
Sec. 507. Effective date.

TITLE VI—INSTRUCTIONAL EQUIPMENT AND MATERIALS

Part A—Equipment and Materials for Higher Education (Amendments to Higher Education Act of 1965)

Sec. 601. Extension of program.
Sec. 602. Elimination of subject limitations; extension of assistance to graduate instruction.

Part B—Equipment and Material for Elementary and Secondary Education (Amendments to Title III of National Defense Education Act)

Sec. 621. Extension of program.
Sec. 622. Elimination of subject limitations; and merger with Section 12 of National Foundation on Arts and Humanities Act.
Sec. 623. Provision for within-State equalization in State-imposed requirements for financial participation of project applicants.
Sec. 624. Payment of State administrative expenses out of project funds in lieu of separate funding.
Sec. 625. Private Schools: Authorizing less than maximum set-aside for loans; repealing loan allotment formula; and authorizing loans to American-sponsored schools serving American children abroad.

TITLE VII—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, AND TESTING (AMENDMENTS TO PART A OF TITLE V OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958)

Sec. 701. Extension of program.

TITLE VIII—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT (AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958)

Sec. 801. Extension of program.

TITLE IX—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VIII (GENERAL PROVISIONS) OF HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 AND TO TITLE X (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Sec. 901. Establishment of Advisory Council on Graduate Education; abolition of Higher Education Facilities Act Advisory Committee.
Sec. 902. Conforming definition of institution of higher education in Higher Education Act to other definitions used in the Act and National Defense Education Act.
Sec. 903. Provision in National Defense Education Act for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, for schools of Department of Interior for Indian children, and for overseas dependents schools of Department of Defense.

TITLE X—AMENDMENTS TO HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

Sec. 1001. Adjustment of interest rate on loans.
Sec. 1002. Extending authorization for Higher Education Facilities construction assistance in major disaster areas.

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE I OF HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 (COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS)

EXTENSION OF GRANT PROGRAM

Sec. 101. Section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended (1) by striking out "and" before "$50,000,000", (2) by inserting after "succeeding fiscal year" the following: ", and such sums as may be necessary for the next five fiscal years", and (3) by striking out the last sentence of such section.

EXTENSION OF 75 PERCENT FEDERAL SHARE THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 1969

Sec. 102. (a) Section 106(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "75 per centum of such costs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and 50 per centum of such costs for each of the three succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, and 50 per centum of such costs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall be effective with respect to grants awarded after the enactment of this Act.

AUTHORIZATION OF EXPERIMENTAL OR PILOT PROJECTS

Sec. 103. (a) Sections 107, 108, 109, 110, and 111 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and references thereto, are redesignated as sections 108, 109, 110, 111, and 112, respectively, and there is inserted after 106 a new section as follows:

"EXPERIMENTAL PROJECTS

"Sec. 107. From the sums reserved therefor pursuant to paragraph (2) of section 103 for any fiscal year, the Commissioner is authorized to make grants to or contracts with institutions of higher education to pay all or part of the cost of experimental or pilot projects in the fields of community service or continuing education, with emphasis on innovative approaches and on the promotion of comprehensiveness and coordination in these fields. The Commissioner may also, from such sums, make grants to other public or private nonprofit agencies or organizations, or contracts with public or private organizations, including grants to or contracts with professional or scholarly associations, when such grants or contracts will make an especially significant contribution to attaining the objectives of this section."

(b)(1) Subsection (a) of section 103 of such Act is amended by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(a)", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) Not to exceed ten per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 101 shall be reserved by the Commissioner for grants and contracts pursuant to section 107."

(2) Subsection (a) of section 103 of such Act is further amended by inserting after "each fiscal year," the following: "reduced by the sums reserved pursuant to paragraph (2)," and by inserting after "remainder of such sums" the following: "(as reduced by the sums reserved pursuant to paragraph (2))".

(3) The heading of such section 103 is amended by adding at the end thereof "—SET-ASIDE FOR SPECIAL PROJECTS".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall be effective with respect to appropriations pursuant to section 101 of such Act for fiscal years ending after June 30, 1967, except so much of any such appropriation as has been allotted prior to the enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE II OF HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 (COLLEGE LIBRARIES, ETC.)

Part A—College Library Resources

EXTENSION OF PROGRAM

Sec. 201. (a) Section 201 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "$50,000,000 each for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1966, 1967, and 1968, respectively, and such sums as may be necessary for the next five fiscal years".

(b) Such section 201 is further amended by striking out the last sentence of such section.

REVISION OF MAINTENANCE-OF-EFFORT REQUIREMENT FOR SPECIAL PURPOSE GRANTS

Sec. 202. (a) Clause (2) of section 204(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by inserting after "June 30, 1965" the following: ", or during the two fiscal years preceding the fiscal year for which the grant is requested, whichever is less".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective with respect to applications for grants payable on or after the effective date of the enactment of this Act.

Part B—Library Training and Research, and Library School Program Development

EXTENSION OF PROGRAM

SEC. 221. Section 221 of such Act is amended by striking out the second sentence thereof and by inserting "and such sums as may be necessary for each of the next five years," after "$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years,".

AUTHORIZING PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT GRANTS FOR LIBRARY SCHOOLS

SEC. 222. (a)(1) Subsection (a) of section 224 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended (1) by inserting "(1)" after "organizations,"; (2) by inserting after "such activities;" the following: "and, (2) for the planning or development of programs for the opening of library or information science schools, or of programs intended to lead to the accreditation of such existing schools;" and (3) by striking out "no such grant" and by inserting in lieu thereof "no grant under this section".

(2) The heading of such section is amended by adding ", AND GRANTS FOR LIBERTY SCHOOL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT" at the end thereof.

(b) The amendments made by paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section shall be effective with respect to grants payable from appropriations for fiscal years ending after June 30, 1967.

CLARIFYING AUTHORITY OF INSTITUTIONS TO USE TRAINING INSTITUTES

SEC. 223. Subsection (a) of section 223 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by inserting after "the cost of courses of training or study" the following: "(including short-term or regular session institutes)".

Part C—Strengthening College and Research Library Resources Through Library of Congress

EXTENSION OF PROGRAM

SEC. 231. (a) Section 231 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "and" before "$7,770,000", and by inserting after "June 30, 1968," the following: "and such sums as may be necessary for the next two fiscal years,".

(b) Such section is further amended by striking out the last sentence.

CLARIFYING AUTHORITY TO PURCHASE COPIES; INCREASING AUTHORITY TO PREPARE CATALOG AND BIBLIOGRAPHIC MATERIALS; AUTHORIZING LIBRARIAN TO ACT AS ACQUISITIONS AGENT

SEC. 232. Section 231 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended by section 231 of this Act, is further amended:

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting "copies of" before "all";

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking out "providing catalog information for these materials promptly after receipt, and distributing bibliographic information by" and inserting in lieu thereof "providing catalog information promptly and distributing this and other bibliographic information about library materials by"; and

(3) by adding after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) enabling the Librarian of Congress to pay administrative costs of cooperative arrangements for acquiring library materials published outside of the United States, its territories, and its possessions, and not readily obtainable outside of the country of origin, for institutions of higher education or combinations thereof for library purposes, or for other public or private nonprofit research libraries."

TITLE III—STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS

EXTENSION OF PROGRAM

SEC. 301. Paragraph (1) of section 301(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "and the sum of $55,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968" and inserting in lieu thereof "the sum of $55,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and such sums as may be necessary for the next five fiscal years".

TITLE IV—STUDENT ASSISTANCE

Part A—Amendments to Educational Opportunity Grant Program

EXTENSION OF PROGRAM

SEC. 401. (a) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 401 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by inserting after "two succeeding fiscal year," the following: "and such sums as may be necessary for the next five fiscal years,".

(b)(1) Such subsection (b) is further amended by striking out the second sentence thereof.

(2) Section 405(b), 406(b), and 407(b)(2) of such Act are each amended by striking out "third sentence" and inserting in lieu thereof "second sentence".

COUNTING WORK-STUDY ASSISTANCE TO STUDENT IN COMPUTING MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANT

SEC. 402. (a) Section 402(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out ", but excluding assistance from work-study programs".

(b) The amendments to such Act made by the preceding subsection shall be effective with respect to educational opportunity grants awarded by an institution on or after September 1, 1967, or the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever date is later.

AUTHORIZING GRANTS (AS WELL AS CONTRACTS) FOR TALENT SEARCH

SEC. 403. Section 408 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out ", to enter into contracts, not to exceed $100,000 per year, with State and local educational agencies and other public or nonprofit organizations and institutions" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "to make grants to State or local educational agencies or other public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, or organizations, or make contracts with public or private agencies, institutions, or organizations, not to exceed (in the case of any contract or grant) $100,000 per year,".

Part B—Amendments to Provisions on Student Loan Insurance Programs

AUTHORIZING DEFERMENT OF REPAYMENT OF STATE OR PRIVATELY INSURED LOAN DURING ATTENDANCE OF STUDENT BORROWER AT INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION, OR DURING MILITARY, PEACE CORPS, OR VISTA SERVICE; REQUIRING DEFERRAL OF SUCH REPAYMENT OF FEDERALLY INSURED LOAN UNDER NATIONAL VOCATIONAL STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE ACT DURING VISTA SERVICE; AND AUTHORIZING FEDERAL PAYMENT OF ALL INTEREST ACCRUING DURING ANY SUCH ATTENDANCE OR SERVICE

SEC. 421. (a)(1) Section 428 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and section 9 of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 are amended by adding at the end of each such section the following new subsection:

"(c) The Commissioner shall encourage the inclusion, in any State student loan program or any State or non-profit private student loan insurance program meeting the requirements of subsection (a)(1) (B) or (C), of provisions authorizing or requiring that in the case of student loans covered by such program periodic installments of principal need not be paid, but interest shall accrue and be paid, during any period (i) during which the borrower is pursuing a full-time course of study at an institution of higher education (or at a comparable institution outside the States approved for this purpose by the Commissioner), (ii) not in excess of three years during which the borrower is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, (iii) not in excess of three years during which the borrower is in service as a volunteer under the Peace Corps Act, or (iv) not in excess of three years during which the borrower is in service as a volunteer under title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. In the case of any such State or non-profit private program containing such a provision, any such period shall be excluded in determining the period specified in clause (ii) of subparagraph (C), or the maximum period for repayment specified in subparagraph (D), of subsection (b)(1) of this section."

(2)(A) Subparagraph (C)(ii) of paragraph (1) of section 428(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and subparagraph (C)(ii) of paragraph (1) of section 9(b) of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 are each amended by inserting after "(ii)" the following: "except as provided in subsection (c) of this section,".

(B) Subparagraph (D) of each such paragraph is amended by inserting after "subject to subparagraph (C)" the following: "of this paragraph and except as provided by subsection (c) of this section".

(b) Subparagraph (C) of section 8(a)(2) of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 is amended (1) by striking out "or" before "(iii)", and (2) by inserting after "Peace Corps Act," the following: "or (iv) not in excess of three years during which the borrower is in service as a volunteer under title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964,".

(c) The first sentence of paragraph (2) of section 428(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and the first sentence of paragraph (2) of section 9(a) of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, are each amended by inserting after "repayment period of the loan," the following: "or which accrues during a period in which principal need not be paid (whether or not such principal is in fact paid) by reason of a provision described in subsection (c) of this section or in subsection (a)(2)(C) of the preceding section,".

(d) Deferment of repayment of principal, as provided in the amendments made by subsection (a) of this section, may be authorized (but not required) with respect to loans meeting the requirements of subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 428(a)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, or of subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 9(a)(1) of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, which are outstanding on the date of enactment of this Act, but only with with respect to periods of attendance or service occurring on or after such date, or after June 30, 1967, whichever is later. The amendments made by subsection (b) shall be effective with respect to loans made by the Commissioner and, with the consent of the lender, loans insured by the Commissioner, which are outstanding on such date of enactment, but only with respect to periods of attendance or service occurring on or after such date or after June 30, 1967, whichever is later. The amendments made by subsection (c) shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act or on July 1, 1967, whichever is later.

COORDINATION BETWEEN NON-FEDERAL AND FEDERAL PROGRAMS WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM AMOUNTS OF INDIVIDUAL LOANS INSURED AND MINIMUM AMOUNTS OF REPAYMENT INSTALLMENTS ON SUCH LOANS

Annual maximum of $1,500, aggregate maximum of $7,500 for higher education

SEC. 422. (a)(1) Subparagraph (A) of section 428(b)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by inserting the following before the semicolon at the end of such subparagraph: ", which limit shall not be deemed exceeded by a line of credit under which actual payments by the lender to the borrower will not be made in any such year in excess of such annual limit; and provides that the aggregate insured unpaid principal amount of all such insured loans made to any student shall not at any time exceed $7,500;".

(2) Paragraph (1) of section 425(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended (1) by striking out "in the case of a graduate or professional student (as defined in regulations of the Commissioner), or $1,000 in the case of any other student" in the first sentence, and (2) by striking out "in the case of any graduate or professional student (as defined in regulations of the Commissioner, and including any such insured loans made to such person before he became a graduate or professional student), or $5,000 in the case of any other student" in the second sentence.

Annual maximum of $1,500, aggregate maximum of $1,500, for vocational education

(b)(1) Subparagraph (A) of section 9(b)(1) of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows:

"(A) provides that the program will insure loans made to any individual student in any academic year or its equivalent (as determined under regulations of the Commissioner) of up to but not in excess of $1,500, which limit shall not be deemed exceeded by a line of credit under which actual payments by the lender to the borrower will not be made in any such year in excess of such annual limit; and provides that the aggregate insured unpaid principal amount of all insured loans under the program made to any student shall not at any time exceed $3,000;".

(2) Subsection (a) of section 6 of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 is amended (1) by striking out "$1,000" in the first sentence and inserting "$1,500" in lieu thereof, and (2) by striking out "$2,000" in the second sentence and inserting "$3,000" in lieu thereof.

Minimum annual repayments for higher and vocational education

(c) Paragraph (1) of section 428(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and paragraph (1) of section 9(b) of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 are each amended (1) by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (J) and inserting a semicolon in lieu thereof, and (2) by adding at the end of subparagraph (J) the following:

"(K) provides that the total of the payments by a borrower during any year of any repayment period with respect to the aggregate amount of all loans to that borrower which are insured under the program shall not be less than $360 or the balance of all such loans (together with interest thereon), whichever amount is less."

(d)(1) The amendments made by this section shall apply to loans made on or after the 60th day after the date of enactment of this Act. In computing the maximum amounts which may be borrowed by a student, and the minimum amounts of repayment allowable with respect to sums borrowed by a student, after such 60th day there shall be included all loans, whenever made, insured pursuant to the insurance program under which the computation is made.

(2) Paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not apply so as to require violation of any commitment for insurance made to an eligible lender, or of any line of credit granted to a student prior to such 60th day or, except with the consent of the State or nonprofit private agency concerned, impair the obligation of any agreement made pursuant to section 428(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 or section 9(b) of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965.

EXTENSION OF FEDERAL LOAN INSURANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 423. (a) Subsection (a) of section 424 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended (1) in the first sentence by striking out "and $1,400,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968" and inserting in lieu thereof "and such limitation in the six succeeding fiscal years as may be specified in appropriations Acts except that in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, such amount shall not exceed the lesser of any such limitation specified for that year and $1,400,000,000"; and (2) in the second sentence by striking out "1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "1977".

(b) Subsection (a) of section 5 of the National Vocation Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 is amended (1) in the first sentence by striking out "and in each of the two succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "and such limitations as may be specified in appropriations Acts for each of the seven succeeding fiscal years, except that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, such amount shall not exceed the lesser of such limitation and $75,000,000"; and (2) in the second sentence by striking out "1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "1977".

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

SEC. 424. (a)(1) Section 2(a) of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 is amended by striking "9(a)(1)(A)" and inserting in lieu thereof "9(a)(1)(C)".

(2) Section 5 of such Act is amended (A) by inserting "FEDERAL" before "LOAN INSURANCE" in the caption, and (B) by inserting, in subsection (a), "Federal" before "insurance" in the first sentence and "Federal" before "insurance pursuant to this part" in the second sentence.

(3) Section 6 of such Act is amended (A) by inserting "UNDER FEDERAL INSURANCE PROGRAM" in the caption after "LIMITATIONS", (B) by inserting "Federal" before "insurance" in the first sentence of subsection (a), and (C) by inserting "federally" before "insured" in the first sentence of subsection (b).

(4) Section 8 of such Act is amended (A) by inserting "UNDER FEDERAL INSURANCE PROGRAM" after "LOANS" in the caption, and (B) by inserting "by the Commissioner" after "insurable" in the introductory phrase of subsection (a).

(5) Clause (A) of the first sentence of section 9(a)(1) of such Act is amended by inserting "by the Commissioner" after the word "insured".

(b) The second sentence of 435(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended by the International Education Act of 1966 to make students in comparable institutions abroad eligible under the reduced-interest loan insurance program, is further amended by inserting ", with respect to students who are nationals of the United States," after "Such term includes".

PART C—AMENDMENTS TO COLLEGE WORK-STUDY PROGRAM

EXTENSION OF PROGRAM

SEC. 431. The first sentence of section 442 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended (1) by striking out "and" before "$200,000,000", and (2) by inserting after "June 30, 1968," the following: "and such sums as may be necessary for the next five fiscal years,".

EIGHTY PERCENT FEDERAL MATCHING

SEC. 432. (a) Paragraph (f) of section 124 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "75 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "80 per centum."

(b) The amendment made by the preceding subsection shall be effective with respect to work performed by a student on or after August 21, 1967, or on or after the date of enactment of this Act, whichever date is later.

AUTHORIZING WORK-STUDY EMPLOYMENT OF 40 HOURS A WEEK FOR STUDENTS ENROLLED IN CLASSES DURING VACATION PERIODS

SEC. 433. (a) Paragraph (d) of section 124 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"(d) provide that no student shall be employed under such work-study program for more than 15 hours in any week in which classes in which he is enrolled are in session, except that, to the extent and in accordance with criteria established by or pursuant to regulations of the Commissioner, such maximum work week shall be 40 hours with respect to classes conducted in vacation or comparable periods of additional or nonregular enrollment (as respects the particular student);".

(b) The amendment made by the preceding subsection shall be effective with respect to work performed on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

REVISING MAINTENANCE-OF-EFFORT REQUIREMENT TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT ADDITIONAL FORMS OF INSTITUTIONAL STUDENT AID

SEC. 434. (a) Paragraph (e) of section 124 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"(e) provide assurance that in each fiscal year during which the agreement remains in effect the institution will expend in its own programs of student assistance (including student assistance through employment of its students, whether or not in employment eligible for assistance under this part), exclusive of any component of such expenditures representing payment to the institution of Federal financial assistance as determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, an amount that is not less than its average annual expenditure for such purposes during the three fiscal years preceding the fiscal year in which the agreement is entered into;".

(b) The amendment made by the preceding subsection shall be effective with respect to grants made under any agreement on or after the effective date of the enactment of this Act, or after June 30, 1968, whichever is later.

AUTHORIZING PROPRIETARY INSTITUTIONS TO CONDUCT WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS FOR OFF-CAMPUS WORK OF THEIR STUDENTS FOR PUBLIC OR PRIVATE NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 435. (a) Paragraph (a) of section 124 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by inserting after "work for the institution itself" the following: "but only in the case of a public or other nonprofit institution,".

(b) Paragraph (1) of section 123(b) of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "(D) is a public or other nonprofit institution," in the first sentence thereof; (2) by striking out "(D)." in the second sentence of such paragraph; and (3) by striking out "(E)" wherever it appears in such paragraph and inserting "(D)" in lieu thereof.

(c) Paragraph (1) of section 122(b) is amended by striking out all of that paragraph following the words "full-time basis" the first time these words occur, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "in public or other nonprofit institutions of higher education in such State bears to the total number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in such institutions in all the States,".

(d) The amendments made by this section shall be effective only with respect to work performed on or after the date of enactment of this Act, or after June 30, 1967, whichever is later.

PROVIDING FOR INSTITITUTIONAL EXPENSES OF ADMINISTRATION OF COOPERATIVE-EDUCATION DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 436. (a) Sections 125 and 126 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 are redesignated as sections 126 and 127, respectively, and the following new section is inserted immediately following section 124:

"USE OF WORK-STUDY FUNDS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF COOPERATIVE-EDUCATION PROGRAMS

"SEC. 125. (a) An agreement entered into pursuant to section 124 may also include provisions authorizing the institution, to the extent and under terms and conditions prescribed by the Commissioner by or pursuant to regulation, to use, out of the sums granted to it under section 123, a portion for its administrative expenses (which for this purpose may, among other expenses, include expenses of counseling and guidance, placement, and consulting services) in developing or carrying out a program, described in such agreement, to demonstrate or explore the feasibility or value of methods of cooperative education involving alternate periods of full-time academic study at the institution and periods of full-time public or private employment (whether or not afforded by an organization described in section 124(a)) approved or arranged for by the institution under such program. The Commissioner may, if in his judgment it would promote efficiency and economy to do so, prescribe regulations applicable both to administrative expenses for which an institution may use work-study funds under this section and to administrative expenses for which it may use such funds under section 124(b) and to the determination of the amounts allowable for such expenses from such funds, and such regulations shall, to the extent (if any) provided therein, supersede with respect to administrative expenses referred to in section 124(b) the limitations specified therein.

"(b) The question of the authority of the institution to use funds obtained under section 123 to pay for particular work performed by a student under a cooperative-education program covered under this section by an agreement with the Commissioner shall be determined solely by reference to the provisions included in the agreement pursuant to section 124."

(b) Section 124(b) of such Act is amended by inserting "except as otherwise provided under section 125," before "provide".

WORK-STUDY PROGRAM RECONSTITUTED AS PART C OF TITLE IV, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

SEC. 437. (a) The purpose of this section is to reconstitute part C of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (as amended by the foregoing sections of this Act) as part C of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, without substantive change.

(b)(1) So much of part C of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (including the heading of such part) as precedes section 442 thereof is deleted (but without thereby affecting the amendments heretofore made by that part to parts C and D of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964); (2) such section 442 (as amended by this Act) and references thereto, are redesignated as section 448; (3) part C of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (as amended by the foregoing sections of this Act) is deleted from that Act (but without repeal thereof) and is inserted (as captioned) as part C in title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 immediately before the section of such title redesignated as section 448; and (4) the sections so transferred (which are numbered 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, and 127), and internal cross-references therein to any such section, are redesignated as sections 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, and 447, respectively.

(c) Wherever in any law, rule, regulation, order, or agreement of the United States (including the first sentence of the section redesignated by paragraph (1) as section 448 of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965), reference is made, however, styled, to part C of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, or to any section thereof, such reference is amended so as to make comparable reference to part C of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, or to such section of that part as redesignated herein, respectively.

(d) Subject to the provisions of subsection (c), any order, rule, regulation, right, agreement, or application in effect under part C of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 immediately prior to the enactment of this Act, shall continue in effect to the same extent as if this section had not been enacted.

(e)(1) The section of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 redesignated by this section as section 448 of that title, as amended by this Act, is further amended by deleting all that follows the first sentence of that section but without thereby affecting the effect of such deleted matter.

(2) Appropriations made for carrying out the part C of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 which is reconstituted by this section as part C of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 shall be deemed made for carrying out such part C of such title IV.

Part D—Amendments to National Defense Student Loan Program

EXTENSION OF PROGRAM

SEC. 451. (a) Section 201 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended (1) by striking out "and" before "$225,000,000", (2) by inserting after "June 30, 1968," the following: "and such sums as may be necessary for each of the five succeeding fiscal years;" and (3) by striking out "and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "and there are further authorized to be appropriated such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974".

(b) Section 202 of such Act is amended by striking out "1968" in subsections (a) and (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "1973".

(c) Section 206 of such Act is amended by striking out "1972" each time it appears in subsections (a), (b), and (c) of such section, and inserting in lieu thereof "1977".

MAKING 10 PER CENTUM LOAN CANCELLATION APPLICABLE TO TEACHER SERVICE FOR CERTAIN SPECIAL PROGRAMS CONDUCTED BY NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 452. (a) So much of paragraph (3) of section 205(b) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 as precedes clause (A) thereof is amended by inserting the following immediately before "at the rate of 10 per centum": "or for comparable service as a full-time teacher in a program of special (including preschool) education or training designed to combat disadvantage, poverty, or unemployment which is conducted by such a school or institution or by another public or nonprofit agency, institution, or organization in a State,".

(b) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to teaching service performed during academic years beginning on or after the date of enactment of this Act, whether the loan was made on, before, or after such date.

ENCOURAGING AVAILABILITY OF NON-FEDERAL CAPITAL FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE STUDENT LOANS BY ESTABLISHING A REVOLVING FUND FROM WHICH INSTITUTIONS MAY OBTAIN LOANS TO CAPITALIZE STUDENT LOAN FUNDS, AND PROVIDING FOR ALLOTMENT OF FEDERAL CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO SUCH FUNDS

SEC. 453. (a)(1) Section 207 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (relating to loans to institutions to help finance their student loan funds) is amended to read as follows:

"LOANS TO INSTITUTIONS; REVOLVING FUND

"Loans to institutions

"SEC. 207. (a)(1) During the period of six fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the Commissioner may make loans, from the National Defense Education Loan Fund established by subsection (d), to institutions of higher education to provide all or part of the capital needed by them for making loans to students (other than capital needed to finance the institutional contribution to a student loan fund established with the aid of Federal capital contributions pursuant to an agreement under section 204). Loans to students from such borrowed sums shall be subject to the terms, conditions, and limitations set forth in section 205. The requirement in section 204 (2)(B) with respect to institutional contributions to student loan funds established under that section shall not apply to loans made to institutions under this section.

"(2) Loans to institutions under this section may be upon such terms and conditions, consistent with applicable provisions of section 204, as the Commissioner deems appropriate, including a requirement that the proceeds of such loan be deposited by the institution in a separate student loan fund established and maintained, in accordance with regulations, solely for operations in connection therewith (or, in accordance with such regulations, in a segregated account so established and maintained within a student loan fund established pursuant to an agreement under section 204, in which event such account shall be treated as a separate fund for the purposes of this title). If the Commissioner deems it to be necessary to assure that the purposes of this section will be achieved, these terms and conditions may also include provisions making the institution's obligation to the Commissioner on such a loan payable solely from such revenues or other assets or security (including collections on loans to students) as the Commissioner may approve. Such a loan shall bear interest at a rate which the Commissioner determines to be adequate to cover (A) the cost of the funds to the Treasury as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to the maturities of loans made by the Commissioner under this section, (B) the estimated cost of administering this section, and (C) probable losses.

"Payments to Institutions To Cover Certain Costs Incurred In Making Student Loans From Borrowed Funds

"(b) If an institution of higher education borrows from the Commissioner from the National Defense Education Loan Fund established under subsection (d), the Commissioner shall agree to pay to the institution (1) an amount equal to 90 per centum of the loss to the institution from defaults on student loans made from the student loan fund (or account) established pursuant to paragraph (2) of subsection (e), (2) the amount by which the interest payable by the institution on the Commissioner's loan exceeds the interest received by it on student loans made from such student loan fund (or account), (3) an amount equal to so much of the expenses of the institution arising out of its operation of such student loan fund (or account) as would be allowable under paragraphs (3) (C) and (D) of section 204 if such fund (or account) were established under that section, and (4) the amount of principal which is canceled pursuant to section 205(b)(3) with respect to student loans made from such student loan fund (or account). There are authorized to be appropriated without fiscal-year limitation such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

"Limitation on Loans From Revolving Fund

"(c) The total of the loans made in any fiscal year from the National Defense Education Loan Fund established by subsection (d) shall not exceed such limitations as may be specified for such year in appropriation Acts.

"Revolving fund

"(d) (1) There is hereby created within the Treasury a National Defense Education Loan Fund (hereafter in this section called 'the fund') which shall be available to the Commissioner without fiscal-year limitation as a revolving fund for the purposes of this section. A business-type budget for the fund shall be prepared, transmitted to the Congress, considered and enacted in the manner prescribed by law (sections 102, 103, and 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, 31 U.S.C. 847–849) for wholly owned Government corporations.

"(2) The fund shall consist of appropriations paid into the fund pursuant to section 201, all amounts received by the Commissioner as interest payments or repayments of principal on loans, and any other moneys, property, or assets derived by him from his operations in connection with this section (other than subsection (b)), including any moneys derived directly or indirectly from the sale of assets, or beneficial interests or participations in assets, of the fund.

"(3) All loans, expenses (other than normal administrative expenses), and payments pursuant to operations of the Commissioner under this section (other than subsection (b)) shall be paid from the fund, including (but not limited to) expenses and payments of the Commissioner in connection with the sale, under section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, of participations in obligations acquired under this section. From time to time, and at least at the close of each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall pay from the fund into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts interest on the cumulative amount of appropriations paid into the fund as capital for loans under this section less the average undisbursed cash balance in the fund during the year. The rate of such interest shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield during the month preceding each fiscal year on outstanding Treasury obligations of maturity comparable to the average maturity of loans made from the fund. Interest payments may be deferred with approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, but any interest payments so deferred shall themselves bear interest. The Commissioner shall also from time to time (not less often than annually) transfer from the fund, to the credit of the appropriation (current at the time of such transfer) for salaries and expenses of the Office of Education, an amount that in his judgment constitutes a reasonable estimate of the normal administrative expenses of the Office incurred, or to be incurred, in connection with operations of the Commissioner under this section during the period covered by the transfer. If at any time the Commissioner determines that moneys in the fund exceed the present and any reasonably prospective future requirements of the fund, such excess may be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury."

(2) Section 201 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out the last sentence and substituting therefor the following: "Sums appropriated under this section shall be available (1) in accordance with agreements between the Commissioner and institutions of higher education, for payment of Federal capital contributions which, together with contributions from the institutions, shall be used for establishment and maintenance of student loan funds in accordance with agreements pursuant to section 204, and (2) to the extent determined by the Commissioner not to be required for the foregoing purpose, for payments into the loan fund established by section 207(d)."

(3) Section 208 of such Act is amended by substituting "title" for "subsection" in the parenthetical phrase.

(b) (1) Section 202 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (relating to allotments of appropriations among States), as amended by section 451 of this Act, is further amended by inserting "(for payment as Federal capital contributions or as loans to institutions under section 207)" after "the Commissioner shall allot to each State" in the first sentence of subsection (a), and by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c) and inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) Funds available in any fiscal year for payment to institutions under this title (whether as Federal capital contributions or as loans to institutions under section 207) which are in excess of the amount appropriated pursuant to section 201 for that year shall be allotted among the States in such manner as the Commissioner determines will best carry out the purpose of this Act."

(2) Section 203 of such Act (relating to the payment of Federal capital contributions to institutions), including the heading thereof, is amended to read as follows:

"DISTRIBUTION AMONG INSTITUTIONS OF FEDERAL CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS AND INSTITUTIONAL LOANS

"SEC. 203. (a) The Commissioner shall from time to time set dates by which institutions of higher education in a State must file applications for Federal capital contributions, and for loans pursuant to section 207, from the allotment of such State under section 202(a). In the event the total requested in such applications (which meet the requirements established in regulations of the Commissioner) exceeds the amount of such allotment of such State available for such purpose, the total of the Federal capital contributions and loans from such allotment to each such institution shall bear the same ratio to the amount requested in its application as the amount of such allotment available for such purpose bears to the total requested in all such applications. In the event the total requested in such applications which are made by institutions in a State is less than the amount of the allotment of such State available for such purpose, the Commissioner may reallot the remaining amount from time to time, on such date or dates as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under section 202 for such year.

"(b) Sums allotted among States pursuant to section 202(b) shall be allocated among institutions within States in such manner as the Commissioner determines will best carry out the purposes of this Act.

"(c) The Federal capital contribution to an institution shall be paid to it from time to time in such installments as the Commissioner determines will not result in unnecessary accumulations in the student loan fund established under its agreement under section 204 of this title."

(c) (1) So much of section 206(a) of such Act as precedes paragraph (1) is amended by striking out "this title" and inserting in lieu thereof "an agreement pursuant to section 204".

(2) Paragraph (1) of such section 206(a) is amended by striking out "the balance" and inserting in lieu thereof "such balance";

(3) Such section 206 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(d) Subsections (a) and (c) shall not apply to a separate student loan fund or account established by an institution pursuant to section 207(a)(2) of such Act with the proceeds of a loan to the institution from the National Defense Education Loan Fund, and subsection (b) shall not apply to amounts of principal or interest on student loans made from such separate student loan fund or account."

(d) (1) The amendments made by this section shall be effective in the case of payments to student loan funds made on or after June 30, 1967, or on or after the date of enactment of this Act, whichever date is later, except that such amendments shall not be effective with respect to payments pursuant to commitments (made prior to enactment of this Act) to make loans under section 207 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 as in effect prior to the enactment of this Act.

(2) The Commissioner of Education is authorized, at the request of any institution, to take such steps as are necessary to convert a Federal capital contribution to a student loan fund of such institution, made pursuant to title II of the National Defense Education Act from funds appropriated pursuant to section 201 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, to a loan under section 207 as amended by this Act.

PART E—AMENDMENTS TO NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

EXTENSION OF PROGRAM

SEC. 471. (a) Section 402(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "two succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "seven succeeding fiscal years".

(b) Section 403(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "three succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "eight succeeding fiscal years".

INCREASING MAXIMUM LENGTH OF FELLOWSHIP FROM 3 TO 4 YEARS IN SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, AND REQUIRING INSTITUTIONAL EFFORT TO ENCOURAGE RECIPIENTS TO ENTER OR CONTINUE TEACHING

SEC. 472. (a) Subsection (a) of section 402 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting "(1)" after "except" in the second sentence thereof, and by inserting immediately before the period at the end of such sentence the following: ", and (2) that the Commissioner may provide by regulation for the granting of such fellowships for a period of study not to exceed one academic year (or one calendar year in the case of fellowships to which clause (1) applies) in addition to the maximum period otherwise applicable, under special circumstances in which the purposes of this title would most effectively be served thereby".

(b) The Commissioner may in his discretion increase, in accordance with the amendment made by subsection (a), the maximum periods of fellowships awarded prior to the enactment of this Act.

(c) The second sentence of section 403(a) is amended by striking out the period at the end of clause (2) of such sentence and inserting ", and" in lieu thereof; and by adding the following new clause:

"(3) that the application contains satisfactory assurance that the institution will make reasonable continuing efforts to encourage recipients of fellowships under this title, enrolled in such program, to teach or continue to teach in institutions of higher education."

(d) The amendment made by subsection (c) of this section shall be effective with respect to fellowships awarded on or after June 30, 1967, or on or after the date of enactment of this Act, whichever date is later.

REQUIRING STIPENDS TO BE SET IN AN AMOUNT CONSISTENT WITH THOSE AWARDED FOR COMPARABLE FELLOWSHIPS

SEC. 473. (a) Section 404(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 404. (a) The Commissioner shall pay to persons awarded fellowships under this title such stipends (including such allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such persons and their dependents) as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs."

(b) The amount of any stipend payable with respect to a fellowship awarded prior to the date of enactment of this Act shall not, during the period for which such fellowship was awarded, be less with respect to any year of study than the amount that would in the absence of the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section be payable with respect to such year.

PART F—ADVISORY COUNCIL ON STUDENT AID

ESTABLISHMENT OF ADVISORY COUNCIL ON ALL FINANCIAL AID TO STUDENTS; ABSORPTION OF ADVISORY COUNCILS ON INSURED LOANS

Sec. 481. (a) Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by adding after Part D the following new Part:

"PART E—ADVISORY COUNCIL ON FINANCIAL AID TO STUDENTS

"Sec. 481. (a) There is established in the Office of Education an Advisory Council on Financial Aid to Students (hereinafter in this section referred to as the Council), consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, and of members appointed by the Commissioner without regard to the civil service or classification laws. Such appointed members shall include leading authorities in the field of education, persons representing State and private nonprofit loan insurance programs, financial and credit institutions, and institutions of higher education and other eligible institutions as those terms may be variously defined in this Act, in the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, or in the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

"(b) The Council shall advise the Commissioner on matters of general policy arising in the administration by the Commissioner of programs relating to financial assistance to students and on evaluation of the effectiveness of these programs.

"(c) Members of the Council who are not in the regular full-time employ of the United States shall, while attending meetings or conferences of the Council or otherwise engaged in the business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem (or, if higher, the rate specified at the time of such service for grade GS–18 in 5 U.S.C., section 5332), including travel time, and while so serving on the business of the Council away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by 5 U.S.C., section 5703, for persons employed intermittently in the Government service.

"(d) The Commissioner is authorized to furnish to the Council such technical assistance, and to make available to it such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data available to him, as the Council may require to carry out its functions."

(b) (1) Section 433 of such Act, providing for establishment of an Advisory Council on Insured Loans to Students is repealed, and sections 434 and 435 are redesignated as sections 433 and 434, respectively.

(2) Section 15 of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, providing for establishment of an Advisory Council on Insured Loans to Vocational Students is repealed, and sections 16 and 17 of such Act are redesignated as sections 15 and 16, respectively.

TITLE V—EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT (AMENDMENTS TO TITLE V OF HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965)

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Sec. 501. It is the purpose of this title to coordinate, broaden, and strengthen programs for the training and improvement of the qualifications of teachers and other educational personnel for all levels of the American educational system so as to provide a better foundation for meeting the critical needs of the Nation for personnel in these areas.

AMENDMENTS TO PART A (GENERAL PROVISIONS) OF TITLE V OF HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.

Sec. 502. Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by—

(a) striking out "TEACHER PROGRAMS" in the heading of such title and inserting in lieu thereof "EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT";

(b) redesignating section 502 as section 508; and

(c) striking out section 501 and inserting in lieu thereof the following sections:

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"Sec. 501. The purpose of this title is to improve the quality of teaching and to help meet critical shortages of adequately trained educational personnel by (1) developing information on the actual needs for educational personnel, both present and long-range, (2) providing a broad range of high quality training and retraining opportunities, responsive to changing manpower needs; (3) attracting a greater number of qualified persons into the teaching profession; (4) attracting persons who can stimulate creativity in the arts and other skills to undertake short-term or long-term assignments in education, and (5) helping to make educational personnel training programs more responsive to the needs of the schools and colleges.

"NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT

"Sec. 502. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'Council'), consisting of members appointed by the President without regard to the civil service and classification laws and, in addition, the Commissioner and one representative each from the National Science Foundation and the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. The appointed members, one of whom shall be designated by the President as Chairman, shall include persons broadly representative of the fields of education, the arts, the sciences, and the humanities, and of the general public, and a majority of them shall be engaged in teaching or in the education of teachers.

"(b) The Council shall, in addition to performing the functions set forth in subsection (c), advise the Secretary and the Commissioner with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this title and any other matters, relating to the purposes of this title, on which their advice may be requested.

"(c) The Council shall from time to time review the operation of this title and of all other Federal programs for the training and development of educational personnel and shall evaluate their effectiveness in meeting needs for additional educational personnel, and in achieving improved quality in training programs as evidenced in the competency of the persons receiving such training when entering positions in the field of education. The Council shall make annual reports of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in this title and other Federal laws relating to educational personnel training) to the Secretary for transmittal to the President, who shall transmit such reports to the Congress together with his comments and recommendations.

"(d) Members of the Council who are not in the regular full-time employ of the United States shall, while serving on the business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day (or, if higher, the rate specified at the time of such service for grade GS–18 in 5 U.S.C., § 5332), including travel time, and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by 5 U.S.C., § 5703, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(e) The Secretary shall make available to the Council such technical, secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as it may require to carry out its functions. The Secretary may also assist the Council by utilizing for that purpose the services and facilities of any other agency of the Federal Government, in accordance with agreements (on a reimbursable basis or otherwise) between him and the head of such agency.

"APPRAISING EDUCATION PERSONNEL NEEDS

"Sec. 503. (a) The Commissioner shall from time to time appraise the Nation's existing and future personnel needs in the field of education, including preschool programs, elementary and secondary education, vocational and technical education, adult education, and higher education, and the adequacy of the Nation's efforts to meet these needs. In developing information relating to educational personnel needs, the Commissioner shall consult with the Department of Labor, the National Science Foundation, the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, and other appropriate public and private agencies.

"(b) The Commissioner shall prepare and publish annually a report on the education professions, in which he shall present in detail his views on the state of the education professions and the trends which he discerns with respect to the future complexion of programs of education throughout the Nation and the needs for well-educated personnel to staff such programs. The report shall indicate the Commissioner's plans concerning the allocation of Federal assistance under this title in relation to the plans and programs of other Federal agencies.

"ATTRACTING QUALIFIED PERSONS TO THE FIELD OF EDUCATION

"Sec. 504. The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to, or contracts with, State or local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, or other public or nonprofit agencies, organizations, or institutions, or to enter into contracts with public or private agencies, institutions, or organizations, for the purpose of—

"(a) identifying capable youth in secondary schools who may be interested in careers in education and encouraging them to pursue post-secondary education in preparation for such careers;

"(b) publicizing available opportunities for careers in the field of education;

"(c) encouraging qualified persons to enter or reenter the field of education; or

"(d) encouraging artists, craftsmen, artisans, scientists, and persons from other professions and vocations, and homemakers to undertake teaching or related assignments on a part-time basis or for temporary periods.

"CONSULTATION

"Sec. 505. In the development and review of grant and contract programs under this title the Commissioner shall consult with the National Science Foundation and the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote coordinated planning of programs to train educational personnel.

"TRANSFER OF FUNDS

"Sec. 506. In addition to the authority for utilization of other agencies conferred by section 803(b) of this Act, funds available to the Commissioner for grants or contracts under this title shall, with the approval of the Secretary, be available for transfer to any other Federal agency for use (in accordance with an interagency agreement) by such agency (alone or in combination with funds of that agency) for purposes for which such transferred funds could be otherwise expended by the Commissioner under the provisions of this title, and the Commissioner is likewise authorized to accept and expend funds of any other Federal agency for use under this title.

"EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS

"SEC. 507. The Commissioner may employ experts and consultants, as authorized by 5 U.S.C., § 3109, to advise him with respect to the making of grants and contracts and the approving of programs under this title. Experts and consultants employed pursuant to this section may be compensated while so employed at rates not in excess of $100 per day (or, if higher, the rate specified at the time of such service for grade GS-18 in 5 U.S.C., § 5332), including travel time, and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of substance, as authorized by 5 U.S.C., § 5703, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently."

EXTENDING TEACHER FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM TO INCLUDE GRADUATE EDUCATION FOR PRESCHOOL AND ADULT AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL

SEC. 503. (a) The heading of part C of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by inserting "AND RELATED EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL" after "FELLOWSHIPS FOR TEACHERS".

(b) (1) The first sentence of section 521 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended (A) by striking out "elementary and secondary schools" and inserting in lieu thereof "schools", and (B) by inserting "or postsecondary vocational education" after "career in elementary or secondary education".

(2) The second sentence of such section is amended by striking out "teacher education programs" and inserting in lieu thereof "programs for the education of teachers and related educational personnel".

(3) (A) So much of the third sentence of such section as precedes the first comma therein is amended to read as follows: "For the purposes of this part the term 'elementary and secondary education' includes preschool and adult and vocational education, and the term 'career in elementary and secondary education or postsecondary vocational education' means a career of teaching in elementary or secondary schools (including teaching in preschool and adult and vocational education programs) or in postsecondary vocational schools"; (B) the words "elementary or secondary schools", the second time these words occur in such third sentence, are changed to read "such schools"; and (C) the following is inserted in such sentence before the comma after "educational media": "(including educational and instructional television and radio), child development".

(c) Section 522 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"FELLOWSHIPS AUTHORIZED

"SEC. 522. The Commissioner is authorized to award fellowships in accordance with the provisions of this part for graduate study leading to an advanced degree for persons who are pursuing or plan to pursue a career in elementary and secondary education or postsecondary vocational education."

(d) (1) Paragraph (1) of section 523 of such Act is amended by striking out "Advisory Council on Quality Teacher Preparation" and inserting in lieu thereof "National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development".

(2) Paragraph (2) of such section is amended by inserting "or postsecondary vocational schools" after "elementary or secondary schools"; inserting "or postsecondary vocational education" after "elementary or secondary education"; and amending the term "career in elementary and secondary education", each time such term occurs, to read "career in elementary and secondary education or postsecondary vocational education".

(e) Section 524 of such Act is amended by striking out "; GRANTS" in the heading thereof, by striking out the subsection designation "(a)", and by repealing subsections (b) and (c). (For substantially equivalent provisions, see sections 531(b) and 507, respectively, of such Act as inserted therein by sections 504 and 502 of this Act.)

(f) Subsection (b) of section 525 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Unless in the judgment of the Commissioner a program development grant under section 531 of this title adequately covers the institution's cost of education for persons awarded fellowships in a graduate program approved under section 524, the Commissioner shall (in addition to the stipends paid to persons under subsection (a)) pay to the institution of higher education at which such person is pursuing his course of study such amount as the Commissioner may determine to be appropriate, not to exceed the equivalent of $2,500 per academic year, but any amount charged such person for tuition and nonrefundable fees and deposits shall be deducted from the amount payable to the institution of higher education under this subsection."

(g) Section 528 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

"SEC. 528. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this part for each fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1973."

NEW PARTS ADDED TO TITLE V OF HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

SEC. 504. Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is further amended by adding the following new parts at the end thereof:

"PART D—IMPROVING TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONNEL SERVING IN PROGRAMS OF EDUCATION OTHER THAN HIGHER EDUCATION

"PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

"SEC. 531. (a) The Commissioner is authorized, in accordance with the provisions of this section, to make grants to, or contracts with, institutions of higher education to pay all or part of the cost of projects for developing or strengthening undergraduate or graduate programs (or other programs of advanced study) which the Commissioner finds will afford substantially improved training opportunities for persons who are pursuing or plan to pursue a career in elementary and secondary education or postsecondary vocational education (as defined in section 521).

"(b) Projects for developing or strengthening graduate programs may be approved by the Commissioner under this section, either individually or in conjunction with graduate programs approved for purposes of awarding fellowships under part C of this title, for such purposes as—

"(1) encouraging imaginative and innovative approaches to teacher education, including new patterns of education and new curricula;

"(2) obtaining an appropriate geographical distribution of high quality graduate programs which meet or, as a result of assistance received under this section, will be enabled to meet the requirements for approved fellowship programs under part C of this title;

"(3) establishing and supporting for a reasonable period of time projects for the development of new or expanded graduate programs which provide opportunities to prepare persons to serve in school systems in nonteaching professional fields; or

"(4) meeting other critical needs for advanced study in the area of educational personnel training.

"(c) Projects for developing or strengthening undergraduate programs may be approved by the Commissioner under this section for such purposes as improving the curricula designed to prepare persons for teaching and related fields, and establishing or expanding programs for the training of teacher aides and other nonprofessional educational personnel.

"PRESERVICE AND INSERVICE TRAINING

"SEC. 532. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to, or contracts with, institutions of higher education, State or local educational agencies, or other public or nonprofit agencies, institutions, or organizations, and to enter into contracts with public or private agencies, institutions, or organizations, (including in either case professional or scholarly associations), for carrying out programs or projects to improve the qualifications of persons who are serving or preparing to serve in education programs in elementary and secondary schools (including preschool and adult and vocational education programs) or postsecondary vocational schools or in educational or other related agencies, or in the fields of educational or instructional television or radio, or to supervise or train persons so serving.

"(b) Programs or projects under this section may include, among others—

"(1) programs or projects to train or retrain teachers, or supervisors or trainers of teachers, in any subject generally taught in the schools, including such subjects as history, geography, economics, civics, industrial schools, including such subjects as English, reading, history, geography, economics, civics, science, mathematics, industrial arts, modern foreign languages, health, physical education, international affairs, and the arts and the humanities;

"(2) programs or projects to train or retrain other educational personnel in such fields as guidance and counseling (including occupational counseling), school social work, child psychology, remedial speech and reading, child development, and educational media (including educational or instructional television or radio);

"(3) programs or projects to train teacher aides and other nonprofessional educational personnel;

"(4) programs or projects to provide training and preparation for persons participating in educational programs for children of preschool age;

"(5) programs or projects to prepare teachers and other educational personnel to meet the special needs of the socially, culturally, and economically disadvantaged;

"(6) programs or projects to train or retrain persons engaging in programs of special education for the handicapped;

"(7) programs or projects to provide inservice and other training and preparation for school administrators, school board members, State educational agency personnel, and persons responsible for or involved in planning or administering educational programs; and

"(8) programs or projects to prepare artists, craftsmen, scientists, or persons from other professions or vocations to teach or otherwise assist in programs or projects of education on a long-term, short-term, or part-time basis.

"(c) Grants or contracts under this section may provide for use of funds received thereunder to pay the cost of—

"(1) short-term or regular-session institutes or refresher courses;

"(2) seminars, symposia, workshops, or conferences; or

"(3) other preservice and inservice training programs or projects designed to improve the qualifications of persons entering or reentering the field of elementary and secondary education or postsecondary vocational education.

"(d) The Commissioner may include in the terms of any grant or contract under this section provisions authorizing the payment, to persons participating in training programs supported under this section, of such stipends (including allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such persons and their dependents) as he may determine, which shall be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs.

"APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

"Sec. 533. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this part for each fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1973.

"Part E—Training and Development Programs for Higher Education Personnel

"PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS

"Sec. 541. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to, or contracts with, institutions of higher education to pay all or part of the cost of projects for developing or improving programs which the Commissioner finds will substantially improve educational opportunities for persons who have, or are preparing to undertake, teaching, administrative, or other educational specialist responsibilities in institutions of higher education, or in educational or other related agences, including—

"(1) projects to establish new, or improve existing, programs of advanced education for prospective college teachers, with emphasis upon developing the capabilities of such persons for teaching;

"(2) projects for planning changes in the curriculums of advanced-degree programs in order to meet the specific needs of particular subject-matter areas for increased numbers of qualified teachers;

"(3) projects to develop or establish programs or courses designed to improve the administration of institutions of higher education; or

"(4) preservice or inservice programs, including arrangements for short-term or regular session institutes, refresher courses, seminars, symposia, workshops, or conferences.

"(b) The Commissioner is authorized to make arrangements with institutions of higher education for providing fellowships, traineeships, or internships to persons undergoing advanced education in a program assisted under this section.

"STIPENDS

"Sec. 542. The Commissioner may include in the terms of any arrangement with an institution of higher education under this part provisions authorizing the payment, to persons participating in training programs supported under this part, of such stipends (including allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such persons and their dependents) as he may determine, which shall be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs.

"APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

"Sec. 543. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this part for each fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1973."

LIMITATION

Sec. 505. The Higher Education Act of 1965 is further amended by inserting before the period at the end of section 508 (as redesignated by section 502(b) of this Act) the following words: "or training for a religious vocation or to teach theological subjects".

SHORT TITLE OF TITLE V OF HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Sec. 506. Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end of part A thereof the following new section:

"SHORT TITLE

"Sec. 509. This title may be cited as the 'Education Professions Development Act.'"

EFFECTIVE DATES

Sec. 507. (a) The amendments to title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 made by the foregoing sections of this title shall be effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1968, except that the following amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act:

(1) The redesignation of section numbers made by section 502 of this Act.

(2) The repeal (by section 502(c) of this Act) of section 501 of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (which provides for an Advisory Council on Quality Teacher Preparation) and the enactment, in lieu thereof, of section 501 (Statement of Purpose) and section 502 (National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development) of such title; and the conforming amendment to section 523(1) of such title V made by section 503(d)(1) of this Act.

(3) The enactment (by section 502(c) of this Act) of section 507 of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (relating to experts and consultants), and the concomitant repeal (by section 503(e) of this Act) of subsection (c) of section 524 of such title V.

(4) The amendments made by sections 505 and 506 of this Act.

(b) Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude advance planning and dissemination of information by the Commissioner of Education with respect to amendments the effective date of which is deferred by this section.

TITLE VI—INSTRUCTIONAL EQUIPMENT AND MATERIALS

Part A—Equipment and Materials for Higher Education (Amendments to Higher Education Act of 1965)

EXTENSION OF PROGRAM

Sec. 601. (a) Subsection (b) of section 601 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended (1) by striking out "and" before "$60,000,000", and (2) by inserting after "June 30, 1968," the following: "and such sums as may be necessary for each of the five succeeding fiscal years,".

(b) Subsection (c) of section 601 of such Act is amended by inserting after "the succeeding fiscal year," the following: "and such sums as may be necessary for the next five fiscal years,".

(c) Section 601 of such Act is further amended by striking out subsection (d).

ELIMINATION OF SUBJECT LIMITATIONS; EXTENSION OF ASSISTANCE TO GRADUATE INSTRUCTION

Sec. 602. (a) Subsection (a) of section 601 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "in selected subject areas".

(b)(1) Clause (A) of paragraph (2) of the second sentence of section 603 is amended by striking out "other than" before "supplies consumed in use" and inserting in lieu thereof "except (i) laboratory or other special equipment for education in the natural or physical sciences at the graduate level; (ii) athletic or recreational equipment; and (iii)"; and such clause is further amended by striking out "in science, mathematics, foreign languages, history, geography, government, English, other humanities, the arts, or education at the undergraduate level".

(2) Subclause (i) of clause (B) of such paragraph (2) is amended by striking out "in such fields".

(c) The caption of title VI of such Act is amended by striking out "UNDERGRADUATE".

Part B—Equipment and Material for Elementary and Secondary Education (Amendments to Title III of National Defense Education Act)

EXTENSION OF PROGRAM

Sec. 621. Section 301 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "and" before "$110,000,000" and by inserting after "June 30, 1968," the following: "and such sums as may be necessary for the next five fiscal years,".

ELIMINATION OF SUBJECT LIMITATIONS; AND MERGER WITH SECTION 12 OF NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON ARTS AND HUMANITIES ACT

Sec. 622. (a)(1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 303 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended (A) by striking out "in science, mathematics, history, civics, geography, economics, industrial arts, modern foreign languages, English, or reading"; (B) by inserting before "supplies consumed in use" the following: "(i) athletic or recreational equipment, and (ii)", and (C) by striking out "and such equipment may, if there exists a critical need therefor in the judgment of local school authorities, be used when available and suitable in providing education in other subject matter,".

(2) Paragraph (5) of such subsection is amended by striking out "in the fields of science, mathematics, history, civics, geography, economics, industrial arts, modern foreign languages, English, and reading" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the subject-matter areas for which equipment and materials acquired under the State plan are used";

(3) The heading of title III of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to real: "FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING INSTRUCTION IN ACADEMIC SUBJECTS".

(4) There is added at the end of title III of such Act the following new section:

"LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS UNDER THIS TITLE

"Sec. 306. No grant or loan may be made under this title for equipment or materials to be used for sectarian instruction or religious worship."

(b) Section 12 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 is repealed, and sections 13 and 14 of such Act are redesignated as sections 12 and 13, respectively.

(c) The amendments made by this section shall be applicable with respect to appropriations for fiscal years ending after June 30, 1967.

PROVISION FOR WITHIN-SENATE EQUALIZATION IN STATE-IMPOSED REQUIREMENTS FOR FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION OF PROJECT APPLICANTS

Sec. 623. Subsection (a) of section 303 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is further amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and "; and by inserting at the end of such subsection the following new paragraph:

"(6) sets forth any requirements imposed upon applicants for financial participation in projects assisted under this title, including any provision for taking into account, in such requirements, the resources available to any applicant for such participation relative to the resources for participation available to all other applicants;"

PAYMENT OF STATE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OUT OF PROJECT FUNDS IN LIEU OF SEPARATE FUNDING

Sec. 624. Effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1968, title III of such Act is further amended as follows:

(a) Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 303 (as amended by section 622 of this Act) is further amended by striking out "and" before "(B)" and by inserting the following before the semicolon at the end thereof:", and (C) administration of the State plan, except that the amount used for administration of the State plan for any year shall not exceed an amount equal to 3 percent of the amount paid to the State under this title for that year, or $50,000, whichever is greater".

(b) (1) Paragraph (5) of such section 303(a), the second sentence of section 301, subsection (b) of section 302, and subsection (b) of section 304 are repealed.

(2) Section 302 is amended by striking out "the first sentence of" in subsection (a) (1); striking out "or (b)" in the first sentence of subsection (c); striking out "subsections (a) and (b)" in the same sentence of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (a)"; striking out "or (b)" in the second sentence of such subsection; and redesignating such subsection (c) as subsection (b), and references elsewhere to such subsection (c) are redesignated accordingly.

(3) Subsection (a) of section 304, and references thereto, are redesignated as section 304; and there is deleted from section 304 the obsolete phrase "as provided in paragraph (4) of section 302(a) of this title".

(4) Section 304 is further amended (A) by striking out "for projects for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling referred to in paragraph (1) of section 303(a) which are carried out", and (B) by inserting the following after "except that": "(1) such payments with respect to expenditures for administration of the State plan shall not exceed the limitation established by paragraph (1)(C) of section 303, and (2)".

(5) Paragraph (6) of section 303(a), as added by section 623 of this Act, is redesignated as paragraph (5).

PRIVATE SCHOOLS: AUTHORIZING LESS THAN MAXIMUM SET-ASIDE FOR LOANS; REPEALING LOAN ALLOTMENT FORMULA; AND AUTHORIZING LOANS TO AMERICAN-SPONSORED SCHOOLS SERVING AMERICAN CHILDREN ABROAD

SEC. 625. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 302(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting "not in excess of" before "12 per centum".

(b) (1) Section 305 of such Act of 1958 is amended (1) by striking out subsection (a) (including the section designation preceding it), (2) by striking out so much of subsection (b) (including the subsection designation) as precedes clause (1) of the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 305. From the sums reserved for each fiscal year for the purposes of this section under the provisions of section 302(a), the Commissioner is authorized to make loans to private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools in any State, and to private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools outside of the United States that the Commissioner determines to be founded or sponsored by citizens of the United States and serving primarily children of American citizens. Any such loan shall be made only for the purposes for which payments to State educational agencies are authorized under the first sentence of section 301, and—".

(2) Clause (3) of such second sentence is amended by striking out "the current average yield on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States" and inserting in lieu thereof "the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with redemption periods to maturity comparable to the average maturities of such loans".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall be effective with respect to fiscal years ending after June 30, 1967.

TITLE VII—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, AND TESTING (AMENDMENTS TO PART A OF TITLE V OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958)

EXTENSION OF PROGRAM

SEC. 701. (a) Section 501 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "and" before "$30,000,000" and by inserting after "two succeeding fiscal years," the following: "and such sums as may be necessary for the next five fiscal years,".

(b) (1) Subsection (a) of section 504 of such Act is amended by striking out "eight succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "thirteen succeeding fiscal years".

(2) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking out "nine succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "fourteen succeeding fiscal years".

TITLE VIII—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT (AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958)

EXTENSION OF PROGRAM

SEC. 801. (a) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 601 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 are each amended by striking out "1968" and inserting in lieu thereof "1969".

(b) Section 603 of such Act is amended by striking out "and" before "$18,000,000" and by inserting after "1968," the following: "and such sums as may be necessary for the next succeeding fiscal year".

TITLE IX—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VIII (GENERAL PROVISIONS) OF HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 AND TO TITLE X (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

ESTABLISHMENT OF ADVISORY COUNCIL ON GRADUATE EDUCATION; ABOLITION OF HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 901. (a) The Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by adding after section 804 the following new section:

"ADVISORY COUNCIL ON GRADUATE EDUCATION

"SEC. 805. (a) There is hereby established in the Office of Education an Advisory Council on Graduate Education (hereinafter in this section referred to as the Council), consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, of one representative each from the Office of Science and Technology in the Executive Office of the President, the National Science Foundation, and the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, and of members appointed by the Commissioner without regard to the civil service or classification laws. Such appointed members shall be selected from among leading authorities in the field of education.

"(b) The Council shall advise the Commissioner on matters of general policy arising in the administration by the Commissioner of programs relating to graduate education.

"(c) Members of the Council who are not in the regular full-time employ of the United States shall, while attending meetings or conferences of the Council or otherwise engaged in the business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem (or, if higher, the rate specified at the time of such service for grade GS-18 in 5 U.S.C., § 5332), including travel time, and while so serving on the business of the Council away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by 5 U.S.C., § 5703, for persons employed intermittently in the Government service.

"(d) The Commissioner is authorized to furnish to the Council such technical assistance, and to make available to it such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data available to him, as the Council may require to carry out its functions."

(b) (1) Section 203 of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is repealed.

(2) Paragraph (1) of section 202(c) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The Commissioner shall not approve any application for a grant under this title until he has obtained the advice and recommendations of a panel of specialists who are not employees of the Federal Government and who are competent to evaluate such applications."

(c) This section shall become effective on July 1, 1968.

CONFORMING DEFINITION OF INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION ACT TO OTHER DEFINITIONS USED IN THE ACT AND NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

SEC. 902. (a) Paragraph (a) of section 801 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by inserting after "if not so accredited," the following: (A) is an institution with respect to which the Commissioner has determined that there is satisfactory assurance, considering the resources available to the institution, the period of time, if any, during which it has operated, the effort it is making to meet accreditation standards, and the purpose for which this determination is being made, that the institution will meet the accreditation standards of such an agency or association within a reasonable time, or (B)".

(b) The second sentence of such paragraph (a) is amended by striking out "Such term also includes any business school or technical institution" and inserting in lieu thereof "Such term also includes any school which provides not less than a 1-year program of training to prepare students for gainful employment in a recognized occupation and".

PROVISION IN NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT FOR THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLAND, FOR SCHOOLS OF DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR FOR INDIAN CHILDREN, AND FOR OVERSEAS DEPENDENTS SCHOOLS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

SEC. 903. (a) Section 1008 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1008. The amounts reserved by the Commissioner under sections 302 and 502 shall be allotted among—

"(A) Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective needs for the type of assistance furnished under the part or title in which the section appears, and

"(B) (i) the Secretary of the Interior according to the need for such assistance in order to effectuate the purposes of such part or title in schools operated for Indian children by the Department of the Interior, and (ii) the Secretary of Defense according to the need for such assistance in order to effectuate the purposes of such part or title in the overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense. The terms upon which payments for such purpose shall be made to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Defense shall be determined pursuant to such criteria as the Commissioner determines will best carry out the purposes of this title."

(b) Sections 302(a)(1), 302(b), and 502(a) are amended by striking out "2 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "3 per centum".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall be effective with respect to fiscal years ending after June 30, 1967.

TITLE X—AMENDMENTS TO HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

ADJUSTMENT OF INTEREST RATE ON LOANS

SEC. 1001. (a) Subsection (b) of section 303 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) A loan pursuant to this title shall be secured in such manner, and shall be repaid within such period not exceeding 50 years, as may be determined by the Commissioner; and shall bear interest at a per annum rate that is not less than (1) a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with redemption periods to maturity comparable to the average maturities of such loans, adjusted to the nearest ⅛ of 1 percent, less (2) not to exceed a rate of 1 percent per annum as determined by the Commissioner.

(b) This section shall apply to all loans approved, or for which a commitment is made, on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

EXTENDING AUTHORIZATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE IN MAJOR DISASTER AREAS

SEC. 1002. Subsection (a) of section 408 of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, as added by section 7 of the Disaster Relief Act of 1966, is amended by striking out "July 1, 1967," and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1972,".

The fact sheets presented by Mr. MORSE are as follows:

[From the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare]

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1967

I. FACT SHEET: NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

Background and need

The National Teacher Corps offers new hope for blighted schools, both in urban slums and in remote rural areas. It offers hope of increased educational opportunities for America's 8 million impoverished children, by training new manpower in the education of the disadvantaged. It offers new ways to tap idealism and motivation for public service, as a major factor in the national commitment to the elimination of educational deprivation through the partnership of governmental and voluntary action.

Studies have shown that many of the economically deprived are also educationally deprived. Their schools are more likely to be understaffed and overcrowded. Their teachers are more apt to be poorly qualified for the difficult tasks they face. Curricular materials are less likely to be available and up to date. The children themselves face other limitations: impoverished family background and environment, lack of books and reading materials at home, absence of cultural experiences common to middle-class homes, low self-esteem.

The problem must not be underestimated.

Only one in four nonwhite children outside metropolitan areas is enrolled in school at age 5, compared with half the white children in the same parts of the country. In metropolitan areas, about three-fourths of all children, both white and nonwhite, are in school at age 5.

Nearly a million Spanish-speaking children in Southwestern States are unlikely ever to get beyond the eighth grade. Many are only vaguely familiar with English and, since they attend schools where classes are taught in English and speaking Spanish frequently forbidden, they fall behind in the first grade and progressively further behind thereafter.

In the metropolitan Northeast, the average Negro student is about 1.6 years behind the average white student in scholastic achievement in the sixth grade, 2.4 years behind in the ninth grade, and 3.3 years behind in the twelfth grade. In the South, both white and Negro students score below their northern counterparts.

Severe teacher shortages have plagued school districts across the Nation. A recent survey of 39 States showed that last September, 20 had substantial shortages of applicants for teaching positions; elementary school teachers were most in demand. Shortages affected communities of every size: 37 States lacked teachers for rural areas; 33 lacked teachers for small cities, 22 for large central cities, and 19 for suburbs.

Within a single system, however, the greatest demand for teachers occurs in impoverished schools; in these areas, school officials experienced great difficulty in recruiting both beginning and experienced teachers. In Philadelphia, for example, the overall teaching staff vacancy rate was nearly 11 percent at the beginning of this school year; in elementary schools in poverty areas of the city, the vacancy rate was almost 20 percent. On opening day, New York City had to mobilize a 500-man substitute teacher force for full-time duty.

The *National Teacher Corps* will help to meet these needs. It has, at present, 262 veteran teachers and 965 college graduate interns who are working to build professional careers in teaching disadvantaged children. They serve in 275 schools in 111 school systems, with the cooperation of 50 university training centers in 29 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. There are Teacher Corps teams in 20 of the Nation's 25 largest cities, among them: New York, Chicago, Detroit, Houston, Cleveland, San Diego, Buffalo, and Memphis. There are Teacher Corps teams in Appalachian towns and in the Ozarks, in Spanish-speaking communities in New York, Florida, California, and the Southwest.

Teacher Corps members serve at the request of the local schools in a program worked out by the State department of education, the school system, and a local university. They work in teams, with a veteran teacher serving as team leader for 3–10 interns.

Part of a Corps member's time is spent in and about the schools in which he teaches, and part in study at a nearby university. At the end of 2 years, the interns will have earned a master's degree and will be qualified as specialists in the education of the disadvantaged.

The Corps has had no problem with recruitment of persons to teach in slum schools and rural areas. On the contrary, 13,000 persons applied for membership in 1965. Those selected were all college graduates; they were chosen on the basis of teaching experience (in the case of team leaders) and of academic achievement (in the case of interns). They are paid at the salary rates in effect in the school district in which they teach. Since 70 percent of the projects deal with elementary school children, the National Teacher Corps should have substantial impact on a critical areas of need—education of children of poverty in the early grades.

Proposal

The National Teacher Corps program would become a special part of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and would be extended for three years, through fiscal year 1970, plus authority to enable a teacher-intern to continue his program of practical and academic training for a period of not more than one year, for those who begin such training during fiscal year 1970.

Teacher-interns would be compensated at the lowest rate for teaching full-time in the school system in which they teach, as they are under existing law, or at the rate of $75 per week plus $15 per dependent, whichever is less.

State educational agency approval of the local educational agency's request for Corps members and of the training program offered by an institution or university would be required.

Teacher Corps members would be permitted to be assigned to a migrant group not in a regular school, who are taught by a public or other nonprofit agency, if the number of migrant children makes such an assignment feasible.

The Commissioner of Education would be authorized to accept gifts on behalf of the Teacher Corps, in the same way as the Peace Corps is authorized to accept gifts.

Teacher Corps members would be permitted to be assigned to schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The "Local Control" section would be amended to make it clear that no Teacher Corps member may be assigned to a local educational agency unless the agency finds the member acceptable.

II. FACT SHEET: COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

Background and Need

Rational planning at all levels is essential if the Nation's educational needs are to be met. Reliable information concerning the effectiveness of existing education programs must be obtained and objectively evaluated in order to better coordinate and improve present programs and to develop new programs to fill unmet needs.

Local educational agencies receive funds from three primary sources—the local, State, and Federal Governments. Each school district must plan the use of those funds to meet local needs. However, almost all Federal funds and some State funds are earmarked for special purposes. The number of education programs designed to meet special needs has increased to the point that some districts have hired special coordinators to work the various programs together into a comprehensive plan adapted to local needs. However, neither the local schools nor the States have the resources to extend this local coordination and short-range planning to a long-range project of regional or Statewide planning and coordination.

During the 1965–66 school year, $27 billion was spent on education by local education agencies. With expenditures of that magnitude, a program of systematic Statewide planning and evaluation must be established if duplication is to be avoided and maximum efficiency is to be attained.

If the evaluation and planning of education programs is to be effective, it must be carried out close to the people to be served by those programs. The American system of education is founded on the principle of State and local control. The responsibility for educational planning, therefore, rests at the State and local levels. State educational agencies now set standards for our schools and qualifications for our teachers. Local schools are directly responsible to local school boards. The best planning—that which will be most responsive to the needs of the persons to be served—must be carried out at the State and local levels.

If State and local educational agencies are to continue to carry out their present role in educational planning and if the administration of Federal educational programs is to reflect the intent of Congress, the Federal Government must share some of the burden placed on those agencies. This can be done by assisting them in developing comprehensive systems of planning and evaluation which will aid them in meeting educational goals at all levels of education, from preschool programs through postgraduate education.

Proposal

Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act would be amended to establish a 5-year program of grants to States by the Commissioner of Education for programs of comprehensive, systematic, and continuous planning, and for evaluation of education at all levels, except that the inclusion of the field of higher education would be optional with the State. Any State desiring to receive a grant would designate or establish a State agency to be responsible for carrying out, or supervising the carrying out, of the comprehensive planning, except that, if the State so decided, the planning for higher education could be carried out by a separate agency, provided that there was assurance of effective coordination between the two. To be eligible for a grant, the programs set forth in the State's application would include: setting educational goals; developing through analysis alternate means of achieving these goals; planning new and improved programs on the basis of these analyses; developing and strengthening the competencies of the States for conducting objective evaluations of educational programs; and collecting, compiling, and analyzing significant data concerning education in the State. State applications would be submitted to the Governors for their review and recommendations.

Seventy-five percent of the funds appropriated would be apportioned among the States, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas for grants according to State plans. The remainder of the appropriation would be reserved for grants to public and private nonprofit agencies, institutions, or organizations for special projects related to educational planning and evaluation on an interstate, regional, or metropolitan area basis.

$15 million would be authorized for comprehensive planning for fiscal year 1968.

III. FACT SHEET: INNOVATION IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Background and Need

The changing character of the American economy and the resulting change in manpower needs require that our schools anticipate the demands which will be made of their students in the future. In the next few years, employment opportunities in the professional, semi-professional, and technical fields will increase more than 40 percent, while job opportunities for unskilled workers and agricultural workers will actually decline. Opportunities in public service, in business, and in the professional and personal service fields are expected to increase at a much faster rate than in other areas. These shifts in the structure of the American labor market impose ever-increasing demands upon high school students. They must make decisions about schools which affect their entire lives, when they know very little about opportunities which will be available to them.

The job of our Nation's schools is particularly critical in view of the large number of workers under 25 years of age who will be continuing to enter the labor force. From 1965 to 1970, the number of persons 20 to 24 years old in the job market will be increasing by close to 500,000 or 4.8 percent per year—2½ times the rate for the labor force as a whole. By 1970 there may be close to 12 million of these young adult workers, representing about 14 percent of the total labor force, compared with 10 percent in 1960. Overall, the total number of teenage and young adult workers (aged 14 to 24) is expected to increase by almost 700,000 a year, constituting about 45 percent of the increase in the labor force between now and 1970.

More than one million students drop out of school each year. Of the students now in the fifth grade, approximately 80 percent will not complete college. A large number of these students will not receive the education or training which will prepare them to adapt to the jobs available ten or twenty years from now. If they are to develop to their greatest potential as wage earners and as citizens, school programs must be designed to keep them in school, and these programs must prepare them to function in an increasingly complex society.

Failure to meet the needs of students in high schools results in lessened employment opportunities. The unemployment rate for high school age youth is more than three times that of the public at large. The unemployment rate among those who fail to finish high school is 50 percent greater than among those who complete high school—in spite of an expanding economy.

The secondary school system of the United States must be strengthened to enable it to be more responsive to the needs, interests, abilities, and problems of all students and to the current and long-term demands of the world of work. This is especially true in the case of disadvantaged students. High school may be their last opportunity for formal education unless they are stimulated to continue on to college, and unless they receive training for employment they may be doomed to a life of unemployment. For students who do not plan to go to college, high school may be the last opportunity to prepare for, or receive training for, a job.

Proposal

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 would be amended to establish a 5-year program of grants to State vocational boards, local educational agencies, and public and private agencies, organizations, and institutions to support the planning, development, and operation of innovative occupational education programs which may serve as models for vocational education programs. Examples of the types of projects which might be supported are:

Exploratory occupational education programs to provide practical and educational experiences essential to understanding the demands and complexities of our modern society and opportunities in the constantly-changing world of work. These programs would be designed to familiarize students with the broad range of occupations available to them and requisites for careers in the various occupations.

Programs or projects to provide to students educational experience through part-time work to assist in their maximum development and to help in linking school and employment. Such programs would assist needy students to continue their education; promote a sense of achievement in school-related work experiences; enlarge educational opportunities; develop recognition of the value of work; and establish communication channels between education and the world of work which are not now in existence.

Guidance and counseling to assure that all students' interests and capabilities are developed in relation to their career objectives and to ease in the transition from school to work by assisting them in initial job placement.

Improvement of curricula to stimulate broad-scale innovative changes to provide more realistic vocational education programs for youth and adults at all skill levels. The curriculum changes would involve new instructional media; improved curriculum guides; and innovative techniques and services designed to meet the needs of youth and adults for entry into the world of work or for continuing education at the post-secondary level.

The funds appropriated would be apportioned among the States and outlying areas as follows: $150,000 would be apportioned to each State and outlying area, and the remainder would be apportioned according to population aged 14 through 19.

$30 million would be authorized for fiscal year 1968.

IV. Fact Sheet: Expanded Educational Opportunities for Handicapped Children

Background and Need

During the past decade, the foundation has been laid for a comprehensive program of support for educational programs and services for mentally retarded, hearing and speech impaired, deaf, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, and other health impaired children. Beginning with the Cooperative Research Act in 1954, Congress has enacted legislation to provide assistance for research and demonstration projects and for personnel training programs in the education of handicapped children. Over 32,000 fellowships and training grants have been awarded in all areas of education for the handicapped. Last year 8,300 grants were awarded in the area of teaching programs for handicapped children. The Captioned Films for the Deaf program, twice amended since 1958, now includes research, training, production and dissemination activities which are reaching an annual audience of 1.5 million.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 offers direct educational benefits to handicapped children. In addition, it was amended to include State-operated or -supported schools which provide free public education to handicapped children. Also enacted in 1965 was the National Technical Institute for the Deaf Act. This Institute will supplement the post-secondary educational opportunities for the deaf provided only by Gallaudet College. In the summer of 1966, an HEW Task Force on Handicapped Children and Child Development reviewed the Department's programs for the handicapped and suggested priorities of effort and means for improved coordination of programs.

In the last days of the 89th Congress, two important pieces of legislation for handicapped children were enacted. One authorized the Model Secondary School for the Deaf at Gallaudet College. The other added Title VI—Education of Handicapped Children—to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This title authorized earmarked funds for projects to develop education programs for the handicapped, and directed the Office of Education to establish a Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped. The establishment of the new Bureau was announced by the Office of Education on January 12, 1967.

Although these enactments provide an impressive foundation for research, professional training, and development of special education programs for handicapped children, we must continue to expand their educational opportunities.

Of the estimated 5 million children, or 10 percent of the school-age population, appreciably limited by one or more handicapping conditions, only about 40 percent are receiving the benefits of special education programs. Half of the public school systems in the United States report that they do not provide educational services for even one type of handicapping condition.

Little beyond verbal acknowledgment has been provided for the education of hundreds of multiple handicapped children. Some handicapped children must remain on residential school waiting lists 5 or 6 years before being accepted into an education program; this almost destroys a child's chance to prepare for his future and to prepare to contribute to our Nation's future.

Early diagnosis and identification of a handicapping condition is essential and basic to formulating an education program for a handicapped child. There should be a focal point at which such diagnosis can be provided to help decide how best to allocate available resources to meet the needs of all handicapped children.

The great obstacle to developing and providing educational programs for handicapped children is the critical shortage of trained personnel—teachers, teachers of teachers, supportive personnel. Of the estimated 300,000 teachers and other personnel necessary to provide educational opportunities to all handicapped children within this decade, there are now only about 70,000. And at this time, there are only about 300 institutions of higher education capable of offering training for the preparation of professional personnel, often only in one area. If the 300,000 goal is to be attained, a nationwide personnel recruitment program, utilizing comprehensive and innovative information-dissemination methods, must be immediately initiated.

Proposal

The proposed amendments for improvement of the education of the hadicapped would provide a variety of expanded educational opportunities for all handicapped children. The proposed *Regional Resource Centers*, which would be authorized by a separate part of title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, would provide testing and evaluation services to determine the special educational needs of a handicapped child, would develop education programs to meet these special needs, and would assist schools and other agencies in their respective regions in providing these educational programs for the handicapped child. $7.5 million would be authorized for the Centers for fiscal year 1968.

The proposal for *Recruitment of Personnel and Dissemination of Information on Education of the Handicapped* would provide grants to or contracts with public or private agencies or institutions to expand and encourage intensive nationwide recruitment programs and information dissemination programs aimed at encouraging students, professional and supportive personnel to work in the field of education of handicapped children. $1 million would be authorized to implement this program in fiscal year 1968.

Schools for Indian children operated by the Department of the Interior and overseas dependents schools operated by the Department of Defense would be made eligible for assistance under title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The proposal for *Expansion of Instructional Media Programs to Include All Handicapped Children* would insure that all handicapped children would receive the demonstrated benefits of the instructional media materials program established and successfully carried out under the Captioned Films for the Deaf program and would greatly help in shortening the time lag between new educational media discoveries and their actual applications. $1 million would be authorized in fiscal year 1968 for this expanded program.

Existing authority to make grants for research in the education of the handicapped would be made more flexible by authorizing the Government to obtain such research through contracts with public or private educational research agencies and organizations.

V. FACT SHEET: MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS TO THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT AND THE FEDERALLY IMPACTED AREAS PROGRAM

Indian children in BIA schools and children in DOD overseas dependents schools

Background and Need

Last year, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was amended to include two groups of children—Indian children in schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior and children in overseas dependents schools operated by the Department of Defense—who had not been afforded the educational benefits offered other children under the Act. Indian children in BIA schools were made eligible to participate in programs conducted under Titles I, II, and III of the Act; Department of Defense schools were included in the provisions of Titles II and III.

The benefits to the two groups of children have been substantial. It is estimated that 37,000 Indian children will be reached by special programs for the educationally deprived under Title I of ESEA, at a total cost of more than $5 million. More than $125,000 will be spent in providing these children with textbooks, library books, and other instructional materials during this fiscal year, and nearly $205,000 will be expended on supplementary educational centers and services under Title III. Overseas schools will also reap the benefits of change during this fiscal year: more than $404,000 for books and instructional materials under Title II, and $527,000 for supplementary educational centers and services under Title III.

Proposal

Provisions for participation of Indian children enrolled in BIA schools and of children in overseas dependents schools would be extended one year, through fiscal year 1968. These provisions would otherwise expire at the end of fiscal year 1967. Extension would make them uniform with the rest of the Act, which continues through fiscal year 1968. A study of the provisions and further recommendations will be submitted to the Congress later this year.

Amendment to Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

In order to provide for a more equitable distribution of Title V funds the allotment formula would be amended. Forty percent of the amount available for apportionment among the States would be allotted to the States in equal amounts and the remaining 60 percent would be allotted to the States on the basis of school age population.

Amendments to Disaster Authority in Public Laws 874 and 815

Background and Need

Public Law 81–815 and Title I of Public Law 81–874 were amended by P.L. 89–313, approved November 1, 1965, to give the Commissioner of Education authority, until June 30, 1967, to provide assistance to repair or replace school facilities damaged or destroyed by natural disasters, to provide temporary facilities while damaged facilities were being repaired or rebuilt, and to provide operating assistance as might be needed in any area declared by the President to be a major disaster area.

Prior to these amendments, such disaster assistance was provided by the Office of Emergency Planning. Although this was a new program for the Office of Education, it has worked well in meeting the most urgent needs in disaster areas. There were 11 disasters during fiscal year 1966 and two disasters thus far in fiscal year 1967 for which applications for aid have been received. The total cost of the disaster program for applications received, as of February 1967, exclusive of Hurricane Betsy, is estimated to be $375,000.

Proposal

Authority to provide disaster assistance under Public Laws 815 and 874 would be extended to five years, through fiscal year 1972. Coverage would be extended to a few special public schools that now provide elementary and secondary education, but are not covered by the Act because they are operated by a State rather than a local educational agency.

The burden and effort test now required before emergency assistance can be authorized would be eliminated. This change is necessary because most school districts do not have in their yearly budget funds to meet emergency disaster needs, and they cannot get such funds until a new budget is approved for the following year. At present, the Office of Education cannot give assurance of Federal assistance when the disaster occurs and emergency repairs must be made; the change would permit authorizing emergency aid when needed.

A minimum amount of $1,000 or one-half of one percent of the agency's operating budget for the year will be established for any disaster claim. This would avoid handling requests for very small amounts of money.

The Commissioner of Education would be authorized to grant funds to a public agency in sufficient amount to house students who were in a private school which was destroyed by a disaster, if the private school is not to be rebuilt. Under present wording, this can be done only if there also is destruction of or damage to public schools; the amendment would permit granting such assistance to a public agency when a private school is destroyed and not to be rebuilt, although no public school has been destroyed or damaged.

Amendment to Public Law 874

The only amendment proposed to P.L. 874 is a technical change in the definition of Federal property. This amendment is made necessary in order to remove any question as to the deductibility of other Federal payments from the gross entitlement of school districts in those cases where the other Federal payment is made because of taxes on private improvements on land held in trust for individual Indians or Indian tribes. Two recent court cases have ruled against making deductions in these cases. The amendment would prevent duplicate payments to some districts.

[From the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare]

HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1967

I. FACT SHEET: EXTENSION OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Background and need

Passage of the Higher Education Act in the closing days of the first session of the 89th Congress marked the culmination of an unprecedented legislative commitment to the goal of educational opportunity for all Americans. As President Johnson noted in signing the Act into law on November 8, 1965, no less than two dozen education measures were enacted by Congres during 1965. This Act, one of the keystones of the 89th Congress, was characterized by the President as the key which unlocks a new door for the young people of America: "the most important door that will ever open—the door to education."

The past year and a half have proved the truth of this statement. Programs supported by the Higher Education Act have touched the students and colleges—and, indeed, citizens and their communities—in every State in this country. This is an age when we are calling on all the resources of this Nation to help develop the Nation. Only through total commitment and total involvement can we assure equal educational opportunity. The Higher Education Act forms one of the bases for this commitment.

Title I—This Title provides funds to institutions of higher education to support extension and continuing education programs designed to solve community problems and to meet the continuing educational needs of citizens whose formal education has been terminated or interrupted. Fifty years ago, when most Americans were engaged in rural occupations, Congress responded to the challenge by enacting the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, which made instruction, research, and extension services widely available through land-grant colleges. Today, when 70 percent of our population live in urban areas, Title I takes up the challenge of meeting the physical and educational needs of a growing, shifting population. During fiscal year 1966, $9.2 million was allocated to the States in support of community service programs. Over $3 million is being used for programs concerned with problems of government; over $1 million for programs concerned with problems of poverty; and over $1 million for programs concerned with problems of health. Of the 539 programs being conducted by 301 institutions of higher education, 85 percent are directed toward the solution of urban and suburban problems ranging from recreation to housing to employment to transportation. In fiscal year 1967, $10 million was appropriated for university-sponsored community service programs.

Title II—This program is designed to strengthen the heart of our Nation's colleges and universities—the library. Part A of Title II provided nearly $9 million in fiscal year 1966 to 1,830 institutions in every State. This money, in the form of basic grants to institutions of up to $5,000, was used for the purchase of books and periodicals, documents, tapes, recordings, audiovisual and other library materials. It is estimated that the increase in library resources will reach 1.5 million volumes. Part B of the Title supported 139 fellowships in library and information science in 24 colleges and universities during fiscal year 1966. Of the fellowships awarded, at a cost of $900,000, 52 were doctoral fellowships and 87 were predoctoral. Part C transferred $300,000 to the Librarian of Congress, for the acquisition of library materials from all over the world and for their cataloging. In fiscal year 1967, a total of $31.75 million was appropriated for these activities.

Title III—This unique program seeks to help those institutions of higher education that are isolated from the main currents of academic life. In fiscal year 1966, $5 million was appropriated; 310 proposals submitted by 252 institutions in 46 States requested a total of $32 million. Projects supported provided for a wide variety of approaches to aid developing institutions; $4.3 million supported cooperative arrangements between strong and weaker colleges, including national teaching fellowships; $0.7 million was in the form of national teaching fellowships for which colleges applied individually. In fiscal year 1967, Title III received an appropriation of $30 million. Proposals for funding, seeking in excess of $52 million, received from 382 four-year institutions and 147 two-year institutions, are presently being considered.

Title IV—This Title has helped to provide students attending colleges and universities with a well-rounded package of student financial assistance opportunities. Educational opportunity grants, combined with low-interest insured loans and college work-study programs, have had a major impact in alleviating the financial burden of attending college. During fiscal year 1966, $58 million was appropriated for educational opportunity grants for low-income youth. Grants were made to about 134,000 students in 1,420 institutions; the average grant amounted to $432. In fiscal year 1967, the $112 million appropriated is expected to aid 225,000 students in 1,700 institutions. During fiscal year 1966, 133 proposals were received and 42 contracts were concluded under Part A of Title IV to carry out the educational talent search program; in fiscal year 1967, 13 contracts have already been concluded. Part B of the Title authorized low-interest insured loans. During fiscal year 1966 interim agreements were signed with 12 State guarantee agencies; 8 state agencies commenced operations under permanent agreements; and the United Student Aid Fund had begun to participate in the program under permanent agreement in 18 States. From the passage of the Act in November 1965 through the end of October 1966, the volume of loans exceeded $223 million, and the estimated number of borrowers exceeded 174,000. Part C of the Title transferred the college work study program from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education. During fiscal year 1966, $99 million was appropriated, allowing over 190,000 students to receive work-study earnings at over 1,500 institutions. A total of $291.6 million was appropriated for these student assistance programs in fiscal year 1967.

Title V—This Title provided for a variety of teacher training and preparation programs. For fiscal year 1966, $9.5 million was appropriated for the National Teacher Corps, which allows corpsmen to study for a master's degree at the same time they serve as teacher-trainee under the supervision of experienced teachers, in impoverished school districts across the country. An additional $15 million was appropriated for fellowships for experienced and prospective teachers. A total of 1,530 prospective teacher fellowships were awarded to 169 institutions throughout the United States; another 1,004 fellowships were granted to experienced teachers seeking to improve and update their skills. Institutional assistance grants, designed to strengthen curricula in teacher education, were awarded to 123 institutions in 46 States and Puerto Rico. In fiscal year 1967, $7.5 million was appropriated for Teacher Corps, $25 million for experienced and prospective teacher fellowships, and $5 million for strengthening programs in teacher education.

Title VI—Title VI is directed toward improvement of undergraduate instruction. Fifteen million dollars was appropriated for fiscal year 1966, of which $1.5 million was available for the acquisition of television equipment and for minor remodeling of college facilities. A total of 1,125 applications for assistance in the purchase of instructional equipment were received by State commissions, and grant agreements were executed for 896 projects. In fiscal year 1967, $17 million was appropriated for acquisition of equipment and for media institutes.

Most titles of the Higher Education Act expire at the end of fiscal year 1968. However, in the past our Nation's schools and colleges have often been handicaped in their program planning by the Federal Government's timetable for both authorization and appropriations measures. Early extension of the Act would allow schools and colleges more ample lead-time for educational, fiscal, and manpower planning.

Proposal

Title I would be extended five years through fiscal year 1973. Matching at the rate of 75 percent Federal and 25 percent non-Federal share would be continued through fiscal year 1969. Not to exceed ten percent of sums appropriated would be set aside for support of experimental or pilot projects. For fiscal year 1968, $16.5 million is being requested to be appropriated.

Parts A and B of title II would be extended five years through fiscal year 1973; Part C would be extended one year through fiscal year 1969. Part A, library resources, would be amended to liberalize the matching provision for special purpose grants. Planning and development grants to encourage the opening of new library and information science schools would be authorized under Part B. For fiscal year 1968, $37.25 million is being requested to be appropriated.

Title III would be extended five years through fiscal year 1973. For fiscal year 1968, $30 million is being requested to be appropriated.

Title IV would be extended five years through fiscal year 1973. Work-study assistance would be counted as institutional contributions in satisfying matching requirements for educational opportunity grants. Repayment of insured loans would be authorized to be deferred under State or nonprofit private student loan insurance programs while a student is attending an institution of higher education or is in military, Peace Corps, or VISTA service. This deferment is already provided under the Federal program. Under either program the Federal Government would pay all interest during this period of deferment. The maximum annual authorized loan, both under the Federally insured program and the State or privately insured programs would be set at $1500. A student would be permitted to enroll in summer classes if employed full time under the work-study program. Maintenance of effort provisions in the work-study program would be liberalized, and proprietary institutions would be eligible to participate. The Federal matching share in the work-study program, which is scheduled to drop from 90 to 75 percent, would be held at 80 percent. To stimulate and encourage college-level programs of cooperative education—alternate periods of work and study—administrative expenses incurred in the operation of such programs would be eligible for payment from work-study funds. For fiscal year 1968, $339.5 million is being requested to be appropriated.

Title V's teacher fellowship programs would be incorporated into Title V of the Higher Education Amendments of 1967—Education Professions Development.

Title VI would be extended five years through fiscal year 1973. Subject matter limitations would be eliminated, and the program would be extended to graduate instruction. For fiscal year 1968, $17 million is being requested to be appropriated.

The Higher Education Facilities Act would be amended by extending the provisions for assistance in case of a major disaster and by fixing interest rates for loans at the current average market yield of comparable United States obligations less a reduction of not more than one percentage point to be set by the Comissioner of Education.

II. FACT SHEET: EXTENSION OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

Background and need

When the National Defense Education Act was enacted in 1958, President Johnson, then one of its authors in the Senate, commented that "History may well record that we saved liberty and saved freedom when we undertook a crash program in the field of education." In the last 8 years, programs conducted under the NDEA have gone far to bear out this prophecy.

The National Defense Education Act was signed into law September 2, 1958, during the period of national uneasiness that followed launching of the Soviet Sputnik. The legislation had the immediate aim of augmenting the supply of highly trained manpower in fields relating to security—science, mathematics, and foreign languages.

In succeeding years the Act has had increasing impact on the quality and availability of American education. It has been amended from time to time—most recently by the Higher Education Amendments of 1966—to extend its coverage to virtually all areas of education. Students at all levels of education benefit from its provisions.

Enacted originally for a 4 year period, the NDEA was extended in 1962 for two years. In 1964, the Congress provided a further extension, through fiscal year 1968. Since the Act's enactment, Congress has appropriated nearly $2.4 billion for NDEA activities; the appropriation for fiscal year 1967 is $446,357,000.

Title II—This program of financial assistance to students in the form of loans is probably the best known portion of the Act. As originally enacted, loans were to be made to full-time students in institutions of higher education, with preference to those majoring in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages. Forgiveness of a percentage of the loan amount and interest was afforded to teachers in public elementary and secondary schools. This title has been substantially broadened in the ensuing years. Part-time students are now eligible to borrow; forgiveness has been extended to teachers in nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools and in institutions of higher education and to teachers of handicapped children; preference is now given to students with superior records in any field. It is estimated that more than $1 billion has been advanced to student borrowers, with the average loan amounting to a little more than $600. For fiscal year 1967, $190 million was appropriated for contributions to student loan funds, $2 million for loans to educational institutions, and $1.15 million for cancellation of student loans.

Title III—Title III is designed to strengthen instruction in critical subjects: science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, history, civics, geography, economics, English, reading, and (as added in 1966 amendments) industrial arts. Grants are available for public elementary and secondary schools, and loans are made to nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools. The appropriation for these purposes for fiscal year 1967 totaled $80.7 million, with an additional $7.5 million for grants to States for supervision and administration of the program. State and local matching of Federal funds on a 50–50 basis assures a greater expenditure for critically needed equipment; in fiscal year 1966 a total of $159 million was spent by the States under title III for acquisition of equipment and concomitant minor remodeling. A random sample of approved projects showed that approximately 58 percent of the funds were used for equipment and 42 percent for instructional materials. Audiovisual equipment and materials accounted for 38 percent of the acquisition projects. In fiscal year 1967, $79.2 million was appropriated for grants.

For each of the last two fiscal years the appropriation for loans has been $1.5 million. The availability of funds for loans has taken on increased importance during the past year because of the unavailability of commercial credit. In fiscal year 1966, 37 loans were made to 35 schools in 20 States, serving nearly 18,000 students.

Title IV—The Graduate Fellowship Program, administered under title IV, has a dual purpose: to increase the number of well-qualified college and university teachers and to develop and expand the capacity of doctoral study facilities throughout the country. The need for college and university teachers is acute. Enrollments in institutions of higher education are expected to expand from 5 million in 1964 to 9 million in 1975. It is estimated that approximately 610,000 new full-time-equivalent professional staff members will be needed to meet these demands, but projections indicate that only 230,000 doctorates will be produced by 1975, and no more than half of these can be expected to go into college teaching. As originally enacted, title IV authorized 1,000 graduate fellowships. Amendments passed in 1964 authorized a 100 percent increase in the number of fellowships for fiscal year 1965, a 400 percent increase for fiscal year 1966, and a 500 percent increase for fiscal year 1967. Beginning with the 1967–68 academic year, more than 90 percent (193) of all institutions authorized to award the doctorate will have active title IV fellowship programs. Approximately $82 million will be obligated during fiscal year 1967 to cover the cost of 6,000 new graduate fellowships plus some 9,000 awards continuing from previous years.

Title V—Part A of title V supports programs in guidance, counseling, and testing and identification and encouragement of able students. Its purpose is to assist in establishing and maintaining programs of guidance, counseling, and testing in elementary and secondary schools and junior colleges and technical institutes. Appropriations for this activity have risen from $7.4 million in fiscal year 1959 to $24.5 million in fiscal year 1967. During the past year the 54 States and territories participating in the program gave more than 9 million aptitude and achievement tests to public school students and 370,000 to students in nonpublic schools. Under Office of Education contracts, testing agencies administered 210,300 tests to more than 179,500 nonpublic school students in 37 States, the District of Columbia, and Guam. In addition, the number of full-time counselors for secondary school students in public schools was increased to 1 counselor to every 460 students, a striking improvement over the 1 to 960 ratio for fiscal year 1959.

Part B of title V authorizes institutes for persons who are working or planning to work in counseling and guidance. Forty colleges and universities will conduct 42 institutes during the summer of 1967 and the 1967–68 school year for approximately 1,200 persons, 850 of whom will be elementary and high school counselors. Since 1959, more than 21,000 counselors have participated in guidance and counseling institutes. For fiscal year 1967, $31.750 million was appropriated for activities under Title V.

Title VI—A critical need for specialists in foreign languages and countries existed in 1959, when the first fellowships were awarded under Title VI of NDEA. Eight years and 7,000 fellowships later, the need still exists. Next summer and during the 1967–68 school year, 1,600 additional graduate students will receive intensive training in 92 foreign languages and related studies such as geography, history, and anthropology. The training will be provided by 52 colleges and universities in 27 States and the District of Columbia. About $6 million will be expended to finance these studies. An additional $550,000 will be allocated to 19 universities for undergraduate modern foreign language stipends, as authorized by Title VI. Approximately 550 stipends will be awarded to qualified undergraduate students, who will be enrolled in 22 NDEA-supported Language and Area Studies programs during the summer of 1967.

In fiscal year 1966, 98 Language and Area Centers were established at 61 institutions under Title VI. These Centers focused on 79 different modern foreign languages rarely taught in the United States. Over $5 million was obligated in support of these Centers. For fiscal year 1967, $15.8 million was appropriated.

Title VII—The research program authorized by Title VII provides the means for adapting such communication media as television, motion pictures, radio, and programmed self-instruction to the improvement of education in our schools. Since fiscal year 1959, over $33 million has been obligated for research and dissemination activities. Part A of Title VII provides support for research and experimentation and evaluation of projects involving television, motion pictures, radio, printed and published materials, and related communication media for educational purposes. Since 1959, approximately 375 projects have received support in institutions throughout most of the 50 States and the District of Columbia. Some 215 of these have been completed. Title VII also provides, through Part B, support for project activities involving the dissemination of information about new educational media and their utilization. Such activities may take the form of studies and surveys, demonstrations, and publications or reports. Since 1959, 253 projects have been initiated under Part B; 195 have been completed. For fiscal year 1967, $4.4 million was appropriated.

Title VIII—This title authorizes area vocational educational programs; it was enacted as title III of the George-Barden Act of 1946. The technical education program was made a permanent program by the Vocational Education Act of 1963, with an authorization of $15 million a year for the training of highly skilled technicians for occupations requiring scientific knowledge—electronics, drafting and design, instrumentation, industrial chemistry, and other technical occupations.

Title IX—Title IX establishes a Science Information Service to coordinate and improve methods of disseminating information in the sciences. This activity is carried out by the National Science Foundation.

Title X—NDEA provides grants to State Education agencies to improve the adequacy and reliability of educational statistics and the methods for collecting, processing, and disseminating such data. For fiscal year 1967, $2.25 million was appropriated for these purposes.

Title XI—A new title, Training Institutes, was established by the 1964 amendments. As enacted, it authorized institutes in modern foreign languages and English taught as a second language, but also expanded the program to include a selected range of vital fields—English, reading, history, geography, disadvantaged youth, and educational media specialists. Amendments contained in the Higher Education Act of 1965 added economics, civics, and industrial arts to the areas of specialization. By amendment in the International Education Act of 1966 institutes were authorized in the field of international affairs. For fiscal year 1967, $30 million was appropriated for the institute program.

Proposal

The National Defense Education Act does not expire until the end of fiscal year 1968. However, in the past our Nation's schools and colleges have often been handicapped in their program planning by the Federal Government's timetable for both authorization and appropriation measures. Early extension of the Act would allow schools and colleges more ample leadtime for educational, fiscal, and manpower planning.

Title II would be extended five years through fiscal year 1973. The loan cancellation benefits would be extended to teachers in programs of special education or training designed to combat disadvantage, poverty, or unemployment. In addition, non-Federal capital for National Defense Student Loans would be encouraged by establishing a revolving fund from which institutions may obtain loans to capitalize fully additional student loan funds. This would make more funds available to students to finance their undergraduate and graduate educations. An appropriation of $195.4 million is being requested for fiscal year 1968.

Title III would be extended 5 years through fiscal year 1973. Subject limitations would be eliminated, and Section 12 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act would be merged with title III. In instances where States impose requirements for financial participation of project applicants, within-State equalization would be encouraged. State administrative expenses would be paid out of project funds. The loan allotment formula for private schools would be repealed, and loans would be authorized to American-sponsored schools serving American children abroad. An appropriation of $50 million is being requested for fiscal year 1968.

Title IV would be extended 5 years through fiscal year 1973. The maximum length of fellowship would be extended from 3 to 4 years in special circumstances, and stipends would be set in amounts consistent with those awarded for comparable fellowships. An appropriation of $96.6 million is being requested for fiscal year 1968.

Title V-A would be extended 5 years through fiscal year 1973. Title V-B expires at the end of fiscal year 1968. Its extension is not being requested as it would be incorporated in title V of the Higher Education Amendments of 1967—Education Professions Development. An appropriation of $31.75 million is being requested for fiscal year 1968.

Title VI would be extended one year through fiscal year 1969.

Title VII expires at the end of fiscal year 1968. Its extension is not being requested since activities can be funded under the Cooperative Research.

Title VIII is incorporated into the Vocational Education Act of 1963. No amendments are proposed.

Title IX is the responsibility of the National Science Foundation. No amendments are proposed.

Title X (Improvement of Statistical Services of State Educational Agencies) expires at the end of fiscal year 1968. Its extension is not being requested, as its function has been superseded by title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Provision is made in NDEA for the participation of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, for schools of the Department of the Interior for Indian children, and for overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense.

Title XI expires at the end of fiscal year

1968. Its extension is not being requested, as it will be incorporated into title V of the Higher Education Amendments of 1967—Education Professions Development. An appropriation of $35.5 million is being requested for fiscal year 1968.

III. FACT SHEET: EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT

Background and need

Education, our Nation's second-largest enterprise, has acute staffing problems. In the fall of 1965, more than 200,000 teachers were hired, filling vacancies left by turnover, replacing uncertified teachers, and meeting needs caused by increased student enrollment. Yet the critical need for teachers continues and, according to a nationwide study, is more acute this school year than it was a year ago.

Total enrollments in public elementary and secondary schools reached a new peak of 43 million last fall. To meet the demand for teachers, to reduce class size, to replace teachers leaving their positions, and to eliminate the number of teachers not having adequate training, 169,000 additional teachers are currently needed. Today, more than 5 percent of our schools' teaching force—approximately 90,500 full-time teachers—do not meet their State's certification standards. Properly qualified teachers must be employed if our country's children are to achieve their full educational development.

Many Federal programs currently are directed toward attracting promising personnel into the field of education and toward updating the skills of those already in the classroom.

Last year, nearly 300 different programs supporting 2,534 fellowships were awarded grants under the Teacher Fellowship Program authorized by Title V-C of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

This year, 18,000 teachers will be trained in 493 institutes in 272 colleges under Title XI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Currently, 10,350 NDEA fellows are studying for their doctorates on American campuses, prior to entering the field of college teaching.

This year, approximately 1,200 persons who are working or planning to work in counseling and guidance will attend 42 institutes conducted by 40 colleges under Title V-B of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Yet current Federal programs are handicapped by gaps in legislative authority and by the lack of flexibility which inhibits the development of a variety of programs needed to meet the changing manpower requirements of our schools and colleges.

The Office of Education can support:

Training of certain school-related personnel but not others, for example, subprofessionals, school business managers, school board members;

Institutes in certain subject areas but not in others, for example, psychology, anthropology, sociology, business education, physical education;

Fellowships for certain professionals but not others, for example, junior college teachers, university administrators.

Proposal

Effective July 1, 1969, the Education Professions Development Act, as a part of the proposed Higher Education Amendments of 1967, would bring greater order out of the present patchwork of educational training legislation through flexible authority allowing the coordination, broadening, and strengthening of programs for the training of teachers and other education personnel for all levels of education.

The Commissioner of Education would be required to appraise the Nation's existing and future personnel needs in education and the adequacy of the Nation's efforts to meet these needs, from preschool to university, and to publish an annual report on the state of the education professions. In developing this information, he would consult with the Department of Labor, the National Science Foundation, and the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

Grants would be made to State and local educational agencies and to institutions of higher education, to enable them to identify and encourage qualified persons to enter or reenter the field of education. Fellowships under Title V–C of the Higher Education Act of 1965 would be expanded to include preschool and adult and vocational education personnel.

In the field of training for careers in elementary, secondary, and post-secondary education, program development grants to institutions of higher education would be offered to strengthen graduate and undergraduate programs, including those for nonteaching personnel. Grants would also be made to institutions of higher education and to State and local educational agencies for preservice and inservice training, including institutes, seminars, and workshops for personnel in all subject matter areas.

In the field of training for careers in higher education, a special program of grants would support programs or projects designed for persons planning to teach or undertake other educational responsibilities in institutions of higher education.

A National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development would be established upon enactment of the Act, to review this title and all other Federal programs for the training and development of educational personnel. The Council would make annual reports of its findings and recommendations.

IV. FACT SHEET: EXTENSION OF THE NATIONAL VOCATIONAL STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE ACT OF 1965

Background and need

The National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 is designed to make it possible for students to borrow money for education and training in schools of business, trade, technology, and other vocational fields. The Act provides the means for students to obtain insured loans from private commercial and other eligible lenders, with the Federal Government paying a part of the interest on behalf of qualified students.

For a student to obtain a vocational student loan, he must attend or be accepted for enrollment in an eligible school. There are no age limitations. The student need not be a high school graduate, or even an elementary school graduate, but he must be considered able to benefit from the program in which he is enrolled.

Eligible vocational schools must meet several criteria:

They must admit only those students who have the ability to benefit from the training;

They must be legally authorized to provide a program of post-secondary education which trains for useful employment in recognized occupations;

They must have been in existence for at least two years; and

They must have been accredited by an accrediting agency recognized by the Commissioner of Education or have been specially approved by the Commissioner.

Banks, savings and loan associations, credit unions, insurance companies, and similar institutions subject to supervision by the State or Federal Government are eligible to become lenders. Eligible vocational schools may also qualify to become lenders.

Programs vary from State to State, depending on the regulations of the insurance agency. For a student whose adjusted family income is less than $15,000 per year, the Federal Government will pay interest up to 6 percent a year on the unpaid principal balance of his loan while the student is in school, and 3 percent interest on the unpaid principal balance during the repayment period.

The National Vocational Student Loan Program is unprecedented in the field of vocational and trade school education. The response has been outstanding. Although the program is quite new, 14 States already have operative loan programs, conducted either by State agencies or by private nonprofit insuring agencies. Approximately 3,500 vocational schools have been approved as "eligible schools." It is estimated that, by the end of 1968, approximately 173,000 students will have received vocational student loans, totalling $872 million.

Proposal

The present Act provides that, after fiscal year 1968, the Federal Government can insure loans only for students who have received prior insured loans under the Act. The amendment will provide insurance for loans made to new borrowers until June 30, 1973, and for additional loans made to borrowers prior to that date to continue their education until June 30, 1977.

Section 6 of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act will be amended so that, under the Federal loan insurance program, the maximum loan amount per academic year shall be $1,500 and the aggregate loans to any student shall not exceed $3,000. Section 9(b) of the Act will be amended to provide that, in the case of State and private programs, loans shall be insured up to a maximum of $1,500 for any academic year or its equivalent and up to an aggregate of $3,000 of loans outstanding to any student. At present, insurance agencies are free to establish any maximum amounts over $1,000 they desire. The amendments will make the Federal and non-Federal programs coordinate.

These amendments will make uniform the maximum amounts a student can borrow under the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act, whether guaranteed by a State or private agency or insured by the Federal Government.

The total of the payments by a borrower during any year of any repayment period, with respect to the aggregate amount of all loans to that borrower which are insured under this Act, shall not be less than $360 or the balance of such loans plus interest, whichever is less. At present, the Act indicates no minimum payment under State or private nonprofit guarantee agencies; under the Federal insured loan program, repayments must be made as specified in the amendment. The amendment will require a borrower under a State or private guarantee agency program to make the same minimum payment as in the Federal program.

Repayment of insured loans would be authorized to be deferred under State or private loan insurance programs while a student is attending an institution of higher education or is in military, Peace Corps, or VISTA service. This deferment is already provided under the Federal program. Under either program the Federal Government would pay all of the interest during this period of deferment.

The excerpts from the President's message, presented by Mr. MORSE, are as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON EDUCATION AND HEALTH IN AMERICA

In Edmonds, Washington, three new evening classes today are helping 150 high school dropouts finish school and gain new job skills.

In Detroit, a month ago, 52,000 children were immunized against measles, during a campaign assisted by Federal funds.

In 25 States, Federal funds are helping improve medical care for 6.4 million citizens who get public assistance.

Over 8 million poor children are now getting a better education because of funds provided under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Nineteen million older citizens enjoy the protection of Medicare.

Three years ago, not one of these programs existed.

Today, they are flourishing—because a concerned people and the creative 89th Congress acted. They are the result of twenty-four new health laws and eighteen new education laws.

But even the best new programs are not enough.

Today, we face major challenges of organization and evaluation. If our new projects are to be effective, we must have the people to run them, and the facilities to support them. We must encourage states and localities to plan more effectively and comprehensively for their growing needs and to measure their progress towards meeting those needs.

Above all, each community, each state, must generate a spirit of creative change: a willingness to experiment.

In this, my fourth message to Congress on Health and Education, I do not recommend more of the same—but more that is better: to solve old problems, to create new institutions, to fulfill the potential of each individual in our land.

Nothing is more fundamental to all we seek than our programs in health and education:

Education—because it not only overcomes ignorance, but arms the citizen against the other evils which afflict him.

Health—because disease is the cruelest enemy of individual promise and because medical progress makes less and less tolerable that illness still should blight so many lives.

I. EDUCATION

I believe that future historians, when they point to the extraordinary changes which have marked the 1960's, will identify a major movement forward in American education.

This movement, spurred by the laws of the last three years, seeks to provide equality of educational opportunity to all Americans—to give every child education of the highest quality, no matter how poor his family, how great his handicap, what color his skin, or where he lives.

We cannot yet fully measure the results of this great movement in American education. Our progress can be traced partially by listing some of the extraordinary bills I have signed into law:

The Higher Education Act of 1965.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1964.

The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963.

The scale of our efforts can be partially measured by the fact that today appropriations for the Office of Education are nearly seven times greater than four years ago. Today we can point to at least one million college students who might not be in college except for government loans, grants and work-study programs, and to more than 17,500 school districts helping disadvantaged children under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

This breakthrough is not the work of Washington alone. The ideas for these programs come from educational leaders all over the country. Many different communities must supply the energy to make these programs work. Yet they are national programs, shaped by national needs. Congress has played a vital role in reviewing these needs and setting these priorities.

The new Federal role in education is, in reality, a new alliance with America's states and local communities. In this alliance, the Federal Government continues to be a junior partner:

Local school districts will submit, and state governments will approve, the plans for spending more than one billion dollars this year to improve the education of poor children.

Federal funds for vocational education are administered through state plans controlled by state, not Federal, officials.

The recommendations of the states have been sought and followed in more than 95 percent of the projects for centers and services which are funded by the U.S. Office of Education.

The education programs I recommend this year have three major aims:

To strengthen the foundations we have laid in recent years, by revising, improving, and consolidating existing programs.

To provide special help to those groups in our society with special needs; the poor, the handicapped, victims of discrimination or neglect.

To build for the future by exploiting the new opportunities presented by science, technology and the world beyond our borders.

The budget proposals I am making for 1968 will carry forward our efforts at a new level. The total Federal dollar expenditures for educational purposes, including health training, which I have proposed for Fiscal 1968 will amount to $11 billion—an increase of $1 billion, or 10 percent, over 1967 and $7 billion, or 175 percent, over 1963.

Strengthening education programs

State and community education leaders have shouldered heavy new burdens as a result of recent increases in Federal programs. If these officials are to develop wise and long-range plans for education, they must have more help.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act has provided funds to strengthen state departments of education. But additional funds are needed—money to improve community, state, and regional educational planning. Nothing can do more to ensure the effective use of Federal dollars.

I recommend legislation authorizing $15 million to help state and local governments evaluate their education programs and plan for the future.

A better education timetable

One condition which severely hampers educational planning is the Congressional schedule for authorizations and appropriations. When Congress enacts and funds programs near the end of a session, the Nation's schools and colleges must plan their programs without knowing what Federal resources will be available to them to meet their needs. As so many Governors have said, the Federal legislative calendar often proves incompatible with the academic calendar.

I urge that the Congress enact education appropriations early enough to allow the Nation's schools and colleges to plan effectively. I have directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to work with the Congress toward this end.

Another way to ease this problem is to seek the earliest practical renewal of authorization for major education measures.

I recommend that Congress this year extend three major education measures now scheduled to expire in June 1968:

The National Defense Education Act of 1958.

The Higher Education Act of 1965.

The National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965.

Improving Program Evaluation

Most of our education programs have been operating too short a time to provide conclusive judgments about their effectiveness. But we should be heartened by the evaluations so far.

Recently, the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children reported:

"The morale of teachers and administrators in schools with many poor children—their will to succeed and their belief in the possibility of succeeding—is perceptibly on the rise in many of the schools visited. More teachers than ever are involved in an active search for paths to success. The paths are not all clearly visible as yet, but decidedly the search has taken on a new vigor."

The council did identify problems and weaknesses in the school districts. Our efforts to identify shortcomings and to assess our progress can never be fully effective until we provide sufficient resources for program evaluation.

I have requested $2.5 million to assure careful analysis of new programs so that we can provide a full accounting to the Congress and the American people of our successes and shortcomings.

The Education Professions Act of 1967

Our work to enrich education finds its focus in a single person: the classroom teacher, who inspires each student to achieve his best.

Next year, more than 170,000 new teachers will be needed to replace uncertified teachers, to fill vacancies and to meet rising student enrollments. Moreover:

There are severe shortages of English, Mathematics, Science and elementary school teachers.

More teachers are needed for our colleges and junior colleges.

Well trained administrators at all levels are critically needed.

New kinds of school personnel—such as teachers aides—are needed to help in the schools.

By 1975, the nation's schools will need nearly two million more new teachers.

To help meet this growing demand, the Federal government has sponsored a number of programs to train and improve teachers.

These programs, though they have been effective, have been too fragmented to achieve their full potential and too limited to reach many essential sectors of the teaching profession. Teacher aides and school administrators have not been eligible to participate.

We must develop a broader approach to training for the education professions. At the state and local level, education authorities must have greater flexibility to plan for their educational manpower needs.

I recommend the Education Professions Act of 1967 to:

Combine and expand many of the scattered statutory authorities for teacher training assistance.

Provide new authority for the training of school administrators, teacher aides, and other education workers for schools and colleges.

Improving Student Loan Programs

In the Higher Education Act of 1965, Congress authorized a program to support state guarantees for student loans made by banks and other lending institutions. For students of modest means, the Federal Government also subsidizes the interest cost.

The program has become an example of creative cooperation between the Federal Government, the states, private financial institutions and the academic community.

Though it began in a time of tight credit, the program is off to a promising start. This year, it is expected that loans totaling $400 million will be made to nearly 480,000 students. By 1972, outstanding loans are expected to total $6.5 billion.

I have asked all of the government officials concerned with the program—the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Budget, and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers—to review its operations in consultation with state and private organizations concerned.

If administrative changes in the program are necessary, we will make them. If any amendments to the legislation are in order, we will submit appropriate recommendations to the Congress.

Special programs for special needs

Educating Poor Children

Over the past two years, we have invested more than $2.6 billion in improving educational opportunities for more than ten million poor children. This has been an ambitious venture, for no textbook offers precise methods for dealing with the disadvantaged. It has also been rewarding: we have generated new energy, gained new workers and developed new skills in our effort to help the least fortunate.

Dollars alone cannot do the job—but the job cannot be done without dollars.

So let us continue the programs we have begun under Head Start and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Let us begin new efforts—like the Head Start Follow Through program which can carry forward into the early grades the gains made under Head Start.

The Teacher Corps

Young as it is, the Teacher Corps has become a symbol of new hope for America's poor children and their parents—and for hard pressed school administrators.

More than 1200 interns and veteran teachers have volunteered for demanding assignments in city and rural slums. Teacher Corps volunteers are at work in 275 schools throughout the country: helping children in 20 of our 25 largest cities, in Appalachia, in the Ozarks, in Spanish-speaking communities.

The impact of these specialists goes far beyond their number. For they represent an important idea: that the schools in our Nation's slums deserve a fair share of our Nation's best teachers.

Mayors and school officials across the country cite the competence, the energy, and the devotion which Teacher Corps members are bringing to these tasks.

Perhaps the best measure of the vitality of the Teacher Corps is the demand by school districts for volunteers and the number of young Americans who want to join. Requests from local schools exceed by far the number of volunteers we can now train. Ten times as many young Americans as we can presently accept—among them, some of our brightest college graduates—have applied for Teacher Corps service.

The Teacher Corps, which I recommended and which the 89th Congress established, deserves the strong support of the 90th Congress.

I recommend that the Teacher Corps be expanded to a total of 5,500 volunteers by the school year beginning in September 1968.

I propose amendments to enhance the role of the states in training and assigning Teacher Corps members.

Finally, to finance next summer's training program, I strongly recommend early action on a supplemental appropriation request of $12.5 million for the Teacher Corps in fiscal year 1967.

Educating the Handicapped

One child in ten in our country is afflicted with a handicap which, if left untreated, severely cripples his chance to become a productive adult.

In my Message on Children and Youth, I proposed measures to bring better health care to these children—the mentally retarded, the crippled, the chronically ill.

We must also give attention to their special educational needs. We must more precisely identify the techniques that will be effective in helping handicapped children to learn.

We need many more teachers who have the training essential to help these children. There are now only 70,000 specially trained teachers of the handicapped—a small fraction of the number the Nation requires. In the next decade, five times that number must be trained and put to work.

I recommend legisation to:

Establish regional resource centers to identify the educational needs of handicapped children and help their parents and teachers meet those needs.

Recruit more men and women for careers in educating the handicapped.

Extend the service providing captioned films and other instructional materials for the deaf to all handicapped people.

Ending Discrimination

Giving every American an equal chance for education requires that we put an end once and for all to racial segregation in our schools.

In the Civil Rights Act of 1964, this Nation committed itself to eliminating segregation. Yet patterns of discrimination are still entrenched in many communities, North and South, East and West.

If equal opportunity is to be more than a slogan in our society, every state and community must be encouraged to face up to this legal and moral responsibility.

I have requested $30 million—nearly a four-fold increase over this year's appropriation—to provide the needed resources under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act to help states and communities face the problems of school desegregation.

Education for the World of Work

Three out of ten students in America drop out before completing high school. Only two out of ten of our Nation's young men and women receive college degrees.

Too few of these young people get the training and guidance they need to find good jobs.

I recommend legislation to aid secondary schools and colleges to develop new programs in vocational education, to make work part of the learning experience and to provide career-counseling for their students.

A number of our colleges have highly successful programs of cooperative education which permit students to vary periods of study with periods of employment. This is an important educational innovation that has demonstrated its effectiveness. It should be applied more widely in our schools and universities.

I recommend an amendment of the College Work-Study Program which will for the first time permit us to support cooperative education projects.

I am also requesting the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Secretary of Labor to use Neighborhood Youth Corps funds at the high school level for this purpose.

Combating Adult Illiteracy

At least three million adults in America cannot read or write. Another 13 million have less than an eighth grade education. Many of these citizens lack the basic learning to cope with the routine business of daily life.

This is a national tragedy and an economic loss for which each one of us must pay.

The Adult Education Act, enacted last year, is our pledge to help eliminate this needless loss of human talent.

This year, I am requesting $44 million—an increase of nearly fifty percent—for adult basic education programs.

These funds will help new projects, sponsored by both public agencies and nonprofit private groups, to train volunteers for work in adult literacy programs and to establish neighborhood education programs reaching beyond the formal classroom.

* * * * *

Instructional television

I recommend legislation to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to launch a major study of the value and the promise of instructional television which is being used more and more widely in our classrooms, but whose potential has not been fully developed.

Computers in education

In my 1968 Budget, I propose that the National Science Foundation be given new resources to advance man's knowledge and serve the nation. Its endeavors will help our scholars better to understand the atmosphere, exploit the ocean's riches, probe the behavior and the nature of man.

The Foundation will also step up its pioneer work to develop new teaching materials for our schools and colleges. The "new math" and the "new science" are only the first fruits of this innovative work.

One educational resource holds exciting promise for America's classrooms: the electronic computer. Computers are already at work in educational institutions, primarily to assist the most advanced research. The computer can serve other educational purposes—if we find ways to employ it effectively and economically and if we develop practical courses to teach students how to use it.

I have directed the National Science Foundation working with the U.S. Office of Education to establish an experimental program for developing the potential of computers in education.

Enriching the arts and the humanities

Our progress will not be limited to scientific advances. The National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, established in 1965, has already begun to bring new cultural and scholarly spirit to our schools and communities. State arts councils, museums, theaters, and orchestras have received not only new funds but new energy and enthusiasm through the National Endowment for the Arts.

The National Endowment for the Humanities has made grants to support new historical studies of our Nation's heritage, to encourage creative teaching in our colleges, to offer outstanding young scholars opportunities for advancement.

I recommend that Congress appropriate for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities $16 million—an increase of nearly one-third.

Higher education for international understanding

For many years, America's colleges and universities have prepared men and women for careers involving travel, trade and service abroad. Today, when our world responsibilities are greater than ever before, our domestic institutions of higher learning need more support for their programs of international studies.

The 89th Congress, in its closing days, passed the International Education Act—an historic measure recognizing this Nation's enduring belief that learning must transcend geographic boundaries. Through a program of grants under the Act, America's schools, colleges, and universities can add a world dimension to their students' learning experience.

I urge the Congress to approve promptly my forthcoming request for a supplemental appropriation of $350,000 for the International Education Act, to permit necessary planning for next year's program, as well as an appropriation of $20 million for fiscal 1968.

* * * * *

III. TO FULFILL THE INDIVIDUAL

As a people, we have wanted many things, achieved many things. We have become the richest, the mightiest, the most productive nation in the world.

Yet a nation may accumulate dollars, grow in power, pile stone on stone—and still fall short of greatness. The measure of a people is not how much they achieve—but what they achieve.

Which of our pursuits is most worthy of our devotion? If we were required to choose, I believe we would place one item at the top of the list: fulfillment of the individual.

If that is what we seek, mere wealth and power cannot help us. We must also act—in definable and practical ways—to liberate each individual from conditions which stunt his growth, assault his dignity, diminish his spirit. Those enemies we know: ignorance, illness, want, squalor, tyranny, injustice.

To fulfill the individual—this is the purpose of my proposals. They present an opportunity—and an obligation—to the Ninetieth Congress.

I hope and believe this Congress will live up to the high expectations of a progressive and humanitarian America.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 28, 1967*.

TEACHER CORPS SUCCESS IN MILWAUKEE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senate will soon be asked to consider the supplemental budget request for the National Teacher Corps. President Johnson has also recommended that the Teacher Corps be tripled in size during the coming fiscal year.

During its first year of operation the Teacher Corps has been tremendously successful. The enthusiasm and dedication of the Teacher Corps interns has had a pronounced impact on the children in the inner city and poor rural school districts.

A team of teacher corpsmen serving in Rufus King High School in Milwaukee has worked extensively with students who have been multiple failures, failing three or more of their academic subjects. After only a few months of work with these children on a 1-to-1 basis, over 50 percent of the students showed academic improvement, and attendance and disciplinary problems dropped.

A committee headed by Dr. Harvey Goldman, director of the Wisconsin Teacher Corps, and Mr. John Powers, principal of Rufus King High School, has submitted a report on the work of this team of corpsmen which will show Senators what the Teacher Corps can accomplish.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STUDY OF MULTIPLE FAILURES: A REPORT OF A SOCIAL WELFARE FIELD PROJECT CONDUCTED BY THE NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS TEAM AT RUFUS KING HIGH SCHOOL, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

(Submitted by Dr. Harvey Goldman, director, National Teacher Corps at Milwaukee; Mr. John A. Powers, principal; Mr. Jerald A. Hauser, intern; Mr. Donald Sorauf, team leader; Mr. William Ware, intern; Miss Patricia Wiser, intern)

I. THE PRELIMINARY SURVEY OF MULTIPLE FAILURES WITHIN THE RUFUS KING HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

During the Pre-Service (summer) session of the National Teacher Corps the team leader and interns at Rufus King High School sought to study those students classified as multiple failures during the previous year. A multiple failure, as defined here, is one who failed at least three academic subjects the previous semester, who appeared to be a potential dropout, and who had manifested disciplinary patterns which were not in keeping with that which was expected from them. The team members were hopeful that such a study would enable them to derive numerous insights into the nature of students' attitudes toward school, into the home situations which apparently fostered such attitudes, and into the relationships which existed between such students and the various school authorities.

A study of the school records of the ninety-two multiple failures mentioned above indicated the following: (1) approximately 62% were born and raised in Milwaukee; (2) the families of such multiple failures were relatively large, averaging 5.4 children per family; (3) multiple failures within the school had not previously received aid which might enable them to compensate for their academic inadequacies; (4) multiple failures rarely participated in any type of extracurricular activities; (5) there was, in the past, a consistent pattern of failure on the part of these students, and the fact that they would become multiple failures and potential dropouts could have been predicted at a considerably earlier point in their educational careers; (6) these students were generally cooperative (perhaps even docile) in a one-to-one relationship with school authorities, but were highly reticent and refused to initiate or volunteer information of any kind to anyone who in any way represented an authority figure.

During the summer program interns undertook and completed the necessary steps prior to beginning work with the students in preparation for the fall semester. To this end, they met a number of times with each of the students, visited their homes and introduced themselves to the parents, explained to the students and parents their desire to help the students succeed within the school situation, and undertook an intensive study of the school records relating to these children. This study of available records included the development of an acquaintance with both the sociological and psychological backgrounds of the students involved. It was anticipated that, beginning with the fall semester, an attempt would be made to raise considerably the educational, motivational, and inspirational levels of the students.

II. FOLLOW-UP WITH MULTIPLE FAILURES AT RUFUS KING HIGH SCHOOL DURING THE FALL SEMESTER, 1966

At the beginning of the fall semester there were three interns and a team leader comprising the National Teacher Corps team at Rufus King High School. It was agreed that each of the interns would work with approximately eleven of the multiple failures who were investigated during the pre-service project. Two of the interns worked with twelve such multiple failures. As mentioned earlier, each of these students had failed three or more academic subjects during the previous regular school semester (Spring, 1966).

As a group, the interns were concerned with two specific behavioral areas of the students as follows: (1) pupils' attendance records—to this end, they obtained copies of previous attendance records for the students under consideration for the express purpose of comparing them with the attendance records maintained by the same students during the semester in which they received help from the Corpsmembers; (2) pupils' academic progress—here, as was true with regard to the attendance records, the specific intent was to compare academic progress of the students under consideration after one semester of academic tutoring and of general help, including counseling, which was to be provided by the interns.

At the end of the semester, it was obvious that the work undertaken by the Corpsmembers had had a significant impact upon the attendance records of the students with whom they dealt. During the previous semester the multiple failures with whom the NTC members worked averaged 18.3 days of absence for the term. For the semester during which they worked with the Corpsmembers, the average number of days absent was 10.2, noticeably lower than the average of the previous semester. In addition, it should be noted that the number of days absent for any given individual during the semester prior to working with the National Teacher Corps varied from three to sixty-two days of absence. However, while working with the Corpsmembers, the number of days absence for any given student ranged from zero to forty-one days, again noticeably less than was true prior to their having been involved with the Corpsmembers. Many factors contributed to the fact that the students maintained considerably better attendance records during the semester in which they worked with the Corpsmembers. For one thing, the Corpsmembers maintained a daily attendance card for each of the students with whom they worked.

TABLE 1.—*Attendance records of multiple failures prior to and during the semester in which they worked with National Teacher Corps interns*

Semester	Number of absences	Average number of days absent
Spring 1966 (prior)	Varied from 3 to 63	18.3
Fall 1967 (during)	Varied from 0 to 41	10.2

Each student, upon going to school on a given day, was given one of these cards and it was expected that he would have it signed by each of his class teachers during that day. This created a situation in which it was quite difficult for students to intentionally cut class without its being quite obvious to those with whom he was working. Also, whenever a student with whom the Corpsmembers were working was absent, immediate follow-up was made by the intern. In some cases this involved a telephone call, but in most cases it involved a home visit on the part of the intern. Obviously, such close supervision would result in better attendance.

With regard to academic success, it is quite noticeable by the figures that will be presented that considerable help was provided to a number of the multiple failures by the interns operating at Rufus King High School. As mentioned earlier, the thirty-five students with whom they worked had all failed at least three or more academic subjects during the previous semester. As the interns worked with the students in tutoring sessions, it should be made clear that they did not deal only with basic skills such as reading except as such skills applied to the subject being taught. Therefore, such reading skills as syllabication and deriving meaning from context were undertaken when it was necessary as a part of the mathematics, social studies, English, or science tutoring session. Also, approximately half of each tutoring session was spent in general conversation with the student. Such discussions covered topics related to school, home, personal problems, dating, general community problems, and any others that the student felt like talking about at the time. As a result of these sessions, the students received a considerable amount of help directed toward mediating immediate problems and conflicts with which they were faced. It also had a considerable impact upon their self-image since they felt that, at last, here was an adult willing to listen to their problems, willing to discuss them with him, and willing to help him seek solutions which he was unable to find independently.

TABLE 2.—*Number of subjects failed by multiple failures after having worked with National Teacher Corps interns*

Number of subject failures	Number of students	Percent
0	6	17
1	7	20
2	5	14½
3	6	17
4	6	17
5	5	14½
Total	35	100

The work undertaken with students in the area of counseling enabled the interns to help students develop new plans for the future and new strategies for attacking problems with which they were presently faced. Early in the semester, it became quite obvious that this type of help was needed by the students if they were to succeed within any contemporary social setting. The team found that the number of times it was necessary to see each student varied depending on the kinds of problems which the students faced, and also depending on the degree to which such problems were creating internal conflict for the student.

With regard to the results, it was found that six of the students with whom the interns worked passed every subject taken. Thus, 17 per cent of the students with whom the interns worked passed all of their subjects; quite remarkable in light of the fact that each of those students had failed at least three academic subjects the previous semester. Seven of the students with whom the interns worked failed only one subject during that semester, and one of those students failed only gym, so that it might be said that seven students passed all of their academic subjects and only six failed one subject. The seven students who officially failed one subject represented 20 per cent of the group with whom the interns chose to work. Another five students failed two subjects, and they represented 14.5 per cent of the initial group with whom the interns worked. Thus, it can be pointed out that 18 students, representing 51.5 per cent of the group with whom the interns worked, improved in terms of their academic achievement pattern during the semester in which they worked with NTC interns. The assumption can be made that the time and effort expended by the interns on behalf of these students was the factor which brought about the change in their academic pattern since to the best of our knowledge, no other factors within those students' life patterns were modified in any way.

It was noticed by the interns in almost every case with which they dealt that the attention paid the students became an initial link in a chain reaction which took on a circular effect; that is, at the outset they paid attention to the student by offering him individual tutoring and counseling as well as sympathy and other kinds of attention. The students reacted to the attention which they received by working harder in an attempt to please the person who gave them the initial attention. Because they expended more effort on their academic work, the quality of the school work undertaken by the students improved considerably and this led to their passing tests within classrooms, a phenomenon which had not occurred previously. Because they were successful in their school work, they received more attention from the interns, from their parents, and from other representatives of the school. This, in turn, initiated another such circle in which the students, as a result of the attention received, worked harder, experienced success, and therefore received more attention which led them to work harder, achieve more success, which resulted in their receiving more attention, etc., etc., etc. Simultaneously, the interns noticed that the self-concept of the students improved considerably. That is, the way in which they viewed themselves led them to attribute higher levels of esteem to their own worth. It was also noticed that, as their self-concept improved, the general disciplinary problems which many of these children presented the previous semester tended to diminish since it was no longer necessary to obtain attention through undesirable and anti-social behavior.

In conclusion, it is quite obvious that the National Teacher Corps team, working in cooperation with school authorities, effected a considerable amount of change with regard to those students with whom they worked and who were termed multiple failures. As repeated statements by the school principal have indicated, these students would never have received such help had it not been for the presence of the Teacher Corpsmembers within the school who were willing to give their time and energy in hopes that success with such students would set them on the right track in the future. There does not appear to be any doubt that in many cases they were successful. A number of the students with whom they worked and who were previously considering dropping out of school are now considering completing high school and attending post-graduate work, either in a university or in a technical school of some type.

Of considerable importance is the fact that each intern derived considerable personal benefit out of the study with which he was involved. In particular, they derived a number of insights into the nature of poverty and of failure, and also into the means through which such characteristics can be ameliorated. Each has commented a number of times and in many different ways regarding the impact which such a project would have on them as they became teachers in their own right. A number of factors were mentioned as being particularly important. Among them are the following:

1. Home Visitations—It was found by the interns that home visitations provide a tremendous amount of data about the student, his family, and his attitudes which are valuable to the classroom teacher and which such teachers do not usually receive as a result of their classroom contacts. In many cases such knowledge enables them to deal considerably more effectively with the students within the classroom situations;

2. School Authority Cooperation—Every intern remarked on the fact that when all the teachers with whom the child deals cooperate with one another to provide the most effective learning situation for that student, that there is a considerably better chance of their being successful within the school situation;

3. Administrator-Teacher Relationships—Each of the interns found that, as a result of their close contact with the principal of the school and the cooperation provided by his office, that teachers and administrators can effectively work together to provide the best possible learning situation for every student within the school. This includes the purchasing of materials and the determination of what strategies are most effective when dealing with any given student. The insights which the principal was able to provide the interns on the basis of his past teaching and administrative experience were found to be invaluable as the interns sought to deal with the students within the context of the school situation.

In summary, it can be emphatically stated that the project described above and undertaken by the National Teacher Corps Interns at Rufus King High School in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, was a tremendous success. This can be measured both in terms of the improvement noted within the students at the end of the semester and also through discussions with the interns and students as one finds that the knowledge which they have obtained will most assuredly contribute to their becoming the best possible teachers of disadvantaged students.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 665) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has heard me apologize before; I apologize again. I am sorry I took longer than I estimated to him I would take, and yet the unanimous-consent agreement for tomorrow would make it impossible for me to make this record tomorrow. I feel it is important that the evidence that I put in the RECORD be made a part of the record, and that the attention of the Senate be drawn to what is happening in this country in regard to our critical domestic needs because of the policy we are following in Vietnam.

I want to change that policy, for many reasons, but one of them is so we can meet the needs of the Great Society program and try to resurrect it ourselves, because the administration is not going to try to. The President can send all the messages to Congress that he wants to. He can send a poverty message. He can send a message on the District of Columbia. He can send a message on civil rights. He can send a message on labor. All the messages he has been sending to Congress make good campaign material, but, let us face it, unless the President makes a fight for these programs, they are simply interesting preparations for getting ready for the 1968 campaigns. He did not make a fight for them last year. Messages came to the Congress, and, with little help from the White House, we battled here for critically needed domestic programs.

As far as I am concerned, I am not interested in messages or promises; I am interested in delivery. I want to see the Senate proceed to deliver in meeting the needs of the American people in regard to the domestic issues that I raised in my speech this afternoon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Oregon need not apologize. It was a pleasure to sit here and listen to his logical analysis of the situation in Vietnam and administration policies with respect thereto.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, it has been said that—

> War is too important to be left to the Generals.

Having listened to the recommendations for the war in Vietnam for the past few days in this Chamber, I am constrained to observe that perhaps war is too important to be left to Senators. Certainly this great Nation would have never survived, we would never have won in combat, with the commands being given here.

"Withdraw," says one Senator. Another says: "We only blundered in, and we should admit this mistake and get out." "Stop the bombing," say a dozen more "Talk to them," plead others. "Give blood to the Vietcong," advises one. Even the distinguished chairman of our Foreign Relations Committee writes of our "Arrogance of Power." The din of criticism mounts so that even the Commander in Chief has become gunshy.

The President, in his state of the Union address, did not hesitate to reaffirm our declaration of war on poverty and proudly said:

> We shall not rest until this war is won.

But to the war in Vietnam he announced only that we would "stand firm."

He sounded almost apologetic. Perhaps the President felt that words of determination and victory would serve only to set the doves aflutter; that other than financial support, no other support was needed from the Congress—or expected; and that his best bet was to avoid stirring up a bad situation by emphasizing Vietnam; that it would be better to try for domestic accomplishment with an eye on the 1968 elections. I submit that the people will not look for domestic accomplishment in 1968; it will not be a New Frontier they seek; it will be an old frontier—an age-old precept of nations—eloquently expressed by Winston Churchill when he said:

> Victory at all costs, victory in spite of all terror, victory however long and hard the road may be; for without victory there is no survival.

Our people will be looking for the return of their sons and daughters. And rather than dignity from poverty for themselves, they will demand international dignity for the United States of America.

The President does indeed need more than financial support for Vietnam. He needs moral support for our commitment to defeat the enemy. We must let that enemy know that this is not the administration's war, or Johnson's war, or McNamara's war, or the Hawks' war—but this is the Nation's war. Ho Chi Minh must know that we are united in our determination to win. Then and only then will he stop his aggression.

Let me comment on the debilitating and divisive. I do so as no expert, but Vietnam—like the subject "women"—has no expert. Most damaging to our stance is the constant revelation by self-styled Vietnam experts in the Senate that we have no right to be there—that we really did not mean to be there—that somehow we just blundered in. Each of these authorities are quick to point out that Vietnam has been at war for 20 years, and just as quickly avoid the fact that the United States has been committed to fight in Vietnam for 12 years. In April 1954, President Eisenhower pleaded with Winston Churchill for a "coalition composed of nations which have a vital concern in the checking of Communist expansion in the area"; and this coalition "must be willing to join the fight." Under Eisenhower, join the fight we did—a course which was reaffirmed by President Kennedy in 1961 and President Johnson in 1964. To those who continue to lament, "Who asked us to help South Vietnam?" my answer is "Our conscience."

Since the decisions of three Presidents are necessary to the one decision of entry, there is some support for the feeling that we blundered in. But, a war of national liberation does not begin as did World War II. The war of national liberation countenances no sudden attack on Pearl Harbor. On the contrary, true to the three stages of war of Mao Tse Tung, the infiltration is gradual, the terrorism and guerrilla phase intermittent, and the actual attack so obscured as to appear liberation. It would have been clean and clear had each of the three Presidents been afforded a joint session of Congress for formal declaration of war. But such was not their response—nor should it have been. Much soul searching and many days of deliberation, guided each of our three Presidents in their decision to fight in Vietnam. I repeat—their decisions were deliberate. Their decisions were patterned after the threat. To me, their decisions were right. But right or wrong, this body should know we did not blunder into Vietnam.

Well, the Vietnam "experts" of the Senate immediately counter, it is a blunder to stay. Ten thousand miles away, infested with disease, the country is not worth fighting for. The South Vietnamese will not fight for themselves. At a cost of $2 billion a month—and already with 7,400 deaths and 45,000 casualties—they will bleed us dry.

"Besides," conclude the experts, "we can't afford, and shouldn't try to be world policemen."

I only wish we had a choice in the matter. One battleship alone still flies the flag of the United States. With 46 Governors a few years ago, I visited this ship. She has a crew of 1,100 men—none braver, none more dedicated. Unfortunately, the *Arizona*, and her crew, lie 62 feet underwater at Pearl Harbor. The infamous attack that placed her there was quick, dramatic, and deadly. The United States stood alone that December day 25 years ago as the policeman of the world. We did not ask for this role—I do not believe any of us really want it—but it is irrevocably ours if freedom is to survive at this time and place in history. Again and again, this role of policeman has been thrust upon us—at Berlin, Korea, Guatemala, Suez, Greece, Lebanon, Cuba, the Congo, and the Dominican Republic, and now in South Vietnam. That we assumed this role must be credited with the relative stability that the world enjoys today. Providing this balance wheel of freedom, the United States should never be charged with overplaying its hand. The nations we have conquered—the nations we have freed—they all enjoy self-government without interference from the United States. The aggression in South Vietnam was not as quick nor as dramatic as was Pearl Harbor, but certainly it has been as deadly. Over 50,000 South Vietnamese have been killed. Their leadership systematically snuffed out, their teachers murdered, their women terrorized, their children maimed. Yet South Vietnam refuses to sue for peace. Instead, her resistance stiffens. She has held a free election, checked inflation, and is about to adopt a constitution. A land of wealth—one only has to visit to understand why the French fought so hard to keep her.

Billy Graham has said South Vietnam could feed the 500 million people in India and the 800 million in Red China. This was a prime target of the Japanese in World War II, and China sees why today. The domino theory is not theory to Mao Tse Tung. He has indicated clearly that his intention is to take South Vietnam, Thailand, Singapore, Indonesia, the Philippines, Australia, the Far East and the world. Foot dragging by the Soviet on this goal of world conquest is China's difference with the Soviet today. Our European allies may pout and palaver, but those in the Far East directly affected by the war in Vietnam see the danger and are fighting and dying with us. We continue to mount support daily. The bombing in the north has slowed Ho Chi Minh. Other than guerrilla skirmishes by the Vietcong, the North Vietnamese have not attacked since June 1966. We are winning politically and militarily in Vietnam today. Ho Chi Minh sees for the first time he can lose, and he moves cleverly and quickly with his one remaining strategy. He has no air force. He has no navy. He has no artillery. He has only one weapon left—psychological and political warfare. For this he has many allies. Whether it be France or Britain, U Thant or a Senator, the cry for peace, to an aggressor, means encouragement. The strategy of the aggressor is clear. Necessary to this strategy is the doubt, anxiety, and confusion of the American people. Let us not, in the Senate, lead the way. Let us not unconsciously give aid and comfort to the enemy. Let us not isolate a portion of our military strategy, the bombing, and ignore the murder, maiming, terrorism of North Vietnam. Let us acknowledge that the United States has meticulously avoided bombing civilian populations; that the cities of North Vietnam are intact. Let us acknowledge that the bombing has aided in slowing the aggression; has saved many American lives, and is hurting North Vietnam in its aggression. Let us not blind ourselves to the truth that North Vietnam is the aggressor. Let us agree that we have been willing to talk peace; that actually we have cried peace so readily and so often as to sound weak and indecisive.

Rather than building new bridges to the East, let us first cross our bridge of commitment to Vietnam. Let us applaud General Westmoreland and his men for their skill, their patience, their courage, and their dedication; and, for a change, here in Congress, let us tell the world we mean business in Vietnam.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CONSIDERATION OF CONVENTIONS TOMORROW—MODIFIED UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the unanimous-consent request I am about to make has been cleared on both sides.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon the completion of morning business tomorrow, the Senate go into executive session to consider the treaties on the Executive Calendar; and that at that time and without further debate of the treaties, the Senate act on them, as follows:

First. The first three treaties on the calendar, Calendar Nos. 1 through 3, inclusive, be considered and voted on en bloc.

Second. That the fourth and fifth treaties on the calendar, Calendar Nos. 4 and 5, be considered and voted on en bloc.

Third. That the next five treaties on the calendar, Calendar Nos. 6 through 10, inclusive, be considered and voted on en bloc.

I further ask that the action on the treaties be entered separately in the Executive Journal and the Congressional Record and that before the action on each treaty is recorded in the Record that the explanation thereof that will be given today on the Senate floor be repeated in the Record as if given at that time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the several requests of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the previous unanimous-consent agreement limiting debate on the military procurement bill be modified to read "after the vote on the treaties."

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection?

There being no objection, the modified unanimous-consent agreement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Ordered, That, effective on March 1, 1967, after the vote on the treaties, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 665), to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 665) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the pending military authorization bill is the first war measure to come before the Senate in this new 90th Congress. I realize that the manager of the bill, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], will take the position that this is not a policy bill, but that it is only a measure to insure that our fighting forces receive the tools needed to implement policy.

I cannot agree. This is a policy bill. No matter what may be said to the contrary, this bill will be added to the long list of measures which officials of the administration readily cite as proof of congressional participation in the making, and the support, of its war policies.

Members of the Foreign Relations Committee were quite surprised to learn from Secretary Rusk last year that by approving aid for Vietnam each year they had been supporting what he apparently considers as an open-ended military commitment to South Vietnam. A year ago, following a vote of 92 to 5 to table, the amendment of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] to the supplemental military autborization bill, which would have repealed the southeast Asia resolution, many Senators were somewhat puzzled to learn that the Deputy Under Secretary of State, speaking to a foreign audience, made it appear that the resolution was thus reaffirmed by this margin. Senators should not be surprised to learn that their votes are used. And it is because of this that we must look at this bill as much more than a nuts-and-bolts measure. It should be seen as a vehicle for reasserting the Senate's constitutional role in grave questions of war and peace.

Supplemental authorization by supplemental appropriation, this Nation has been inched into a war which has poisoned our political dialog, obsessed the energies and thoughts of men in public life, starved public needs, baffled and frustrated the public, and seriously impaired the conduct of foreign policy.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 99 and ask that it be read.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Hollings in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—STATEMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL POLICY

Sec. 401. It is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress—

(1) that none of the funds authorized by this Act or any other Act should be used to carry out military operations in or over North Vietnam or to increase the number of United States military personnel in South Vietnam above five hundred thousand, unless there shall have been a declaration of war against North Vietnam by the Congress in accordance with article 1, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States; and

(2) that the Congress support those efforts being made by men of good will throughout the world to prevent an expansion of the war in Vietnam and to bring that conflict to an end through a negotiated settlement which will preserve the honor of the United States, protect the vital interests of this country, and allow the people of South Vietnam to determine the affairs of that nation in their own way.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in support of this amendment, let me remind Senators of some of the economic, social, and political costs of the bleeding wound which is Vietnam. Let us look first at the assets, and then at the liabilities, of our present policies in southeast Asia. In short: What price glory?

First, as to the assets: It has been said that our efforts in Vietnam are essential to the security of the United States; that the non-Communist nations of Asia will fall like dominoes if the Vietcong and their North Vietnamese allies should succeed; that we must fight in Vietnam, because to do otherwise would be to reward aggression and encourage new so-called wars of national liberation; and finally, that we must do what we are doing to contain the aggressive thrust of Communist China.

Even if one concedes the truth of all these assertions—and I certainly do not—one is still required to ask: What are the costs of our efforts?

Let me touch briefly on the alleged assets. I do not believe, and I do not believe it is possible to demonstrate, that Vietnam is essential to the security of the United States. Neither do I believe, despite the able argument to the contrary just made by the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Hollings], that the non-Communist nations of Asia would fall like a row of dominoes if the Vietcong and their North Vietnamese allies should succeed. This, of course, must be a question of judgment, on which men of good will will differ.

But I would suggest that the enlightened consensus of informed opinion, not only in this country but throughout the world, has treated the domino theory as completely discredited by events which have occurred in Southeast Asia during the last 5, 10, or perhaps 15 years.

The argument that we must fight in Vietnam because to do otherwise would be to reward aggression cannot stand up in the face of what is obviously a civil war, in which two factions within South Vienam, one of them supported by Hanoi, the other supported by the United States of America, are endeavoring to subjugate that country by a dictatorship, alleged, on the one hand, to be Communist, and clearly, on the other hand, pretty close to being Nazi, since its leader has indicated on many occasions that Adolf Hitler is his hero. I refer, of course, to General Ky.

Finally, that we must do what we are doing is said to be an asset so that we can contain the aggressive thrust of Communist China. Yet, Mr. President, Communist China is presently faced with chaos. If they ever had any offensive capabilities to send vast masses south of their border, that capability is pretty well lost in the situation that now exists in which army is fighting army and in which we have almost a recreation of the situation which existed toward the end and shortly after World War II.

So, I conclude that the alleged assets with respect to our Vietnam policy are indeed paper assets which have no market value.

Let us turn now to the liabilities of our Vietnamese policy in determining what price we are paying for an alleged glory of old-fashioned, 19th-century patriotism.

First. It so absorbs the time and attention of the Nation's leaders—both in the Congress and in the executive branch—that they have little time for anything else. The war is a consuming passion on which no man in public life can be neutral. I know of no issue since I have been in public life which has so preoccupied the hearts and minds of our leaders. Although public affairs go on, the thought, energies, and spirit so necessary to solve the critical problems of our society are focused not on the problems of Harlem or Watts—but on a jungleland halfway around the world. The sores of our society grow and fester, without adequate attention or aid.

Second. Every Member of this body is familiar with what this war is costing in terms of cutbacks in programs of importance to his State, from highways to hospitals. According to the figures in the President's budget message there would be a $16 billion surplus this fiscal year if we were not fighting the Vietnam war. Think of what we could do to improve our society and make a better world by putting these vast amounts to constructive, instead of destructive, uses.

Third. There is little likelihood that major agreements with the Soviet Union toward a less-menacing world can be reached until this war is settled. An insignificant Consular Treaty is in deep trouble in the Senate, and the East-West trade bill is a dead issue this session. The spring of hope for real détente has been poisoned by Vietnam.

Fourth. All efforts to bring Communist China into the company of civilized nations at the U.N. and elsewhere are bogged down by the war, while she gloats over our deepening involvement in the morass of southeast Asia.

Fifth. Forward movement toward true collective security within the structure of the United Nations has come to a halt.

Sixth. There has been a deterioration in both the Senate and the House in the will to act as a cooperating partner of the Executive in the search for a just and lasting peace. Suspicion and distrust have replaced cooperation and confidence.

Seventh. The public image of the United States all around the world has been changed from a benevolent Uncle Sam seeking to do more than his share in curing the ills of the world, to a power-hungry empire, bent on establishing by force of arms a Pax Americana without regard for the views of others, whether adversaries or allies. There is something drastically wrong with a society that spends $24 billion in a war which does not involve its vital—or even major—interests and only $2 billion to help the two-thirds of this world who are poor or hungry.

Eighth. Our efforts to balance our international payments and to achieve the commonsense objective of providing for the adequate financing of international trade and the gradual abandonment of the gold exchange standard have been crippled, if not killed. The dollar drain of Vietnam is enormous, with millions ending in Swiss bank accounts of local Vietnamese profiteers.

Mr. President, I am seriously concerned at our international monetary situation. I am concerned because of the constant drain on our gold, a drain in large part occasioned because we are a deficit and not a surplus country, a drain which will continue as long as the combined expenditures for military forces maintained in Europe and in Vietnam exceed the excess of our exports over our imports. And it may well be, unless we can remedy the situation by bringing home a major part of our troops from Europe and bringing home our boys from Vietnam, that we will find a run on American gold coming, perhaps in the most embarrassing time it could for the Johnson administration, in the middle of next summer with the 1968 election going full swing. So I raise this flag of warning.

The balance of payments is not a technical problem which we can ignore. It is an important international issue which affects the life and well-being of every American citizen. Unless we can bring our balance of payments into surplus or at least into balance within the next 12 months, I do not hesitate to predict a financial situation in the international community as serious as that of the London Economic Conference which failed in 1933, resulting in our going off the gold standard and bringing international trade almost to a halt.

Ninth. 5,008 American boys were killed in combat last year, more than three times the total killed prior to 1966. There are few communities in our country which have not had at least one military funeral this year. The buildup of U.S. forces continues and the casualty lists grow in length as Americans take over the primary fighting job from the South Vietnamese, and as our forces move into the treacherous Mekong Delta—accordingly, having American boys doing the fighting which Asian boys should be doing to preserve whatever freedom they may desire.

Tenth. We are destroying the nation of South Vietnam and its people. Civilian casualties of the war obviously number in the thousands each month, although official statistics are not made available, apparently because they are too embarrassing. Martha Gellhorn wrote in the January Ladies Home Journal that the estimated increase in Vietnam orphans is 2,000 each month. Our massive military presence drove the Saigon price index up 40 percent last year and about the same the year before. The retail price of rice went up 30 percent in Saigon last month alone.

Before the Americans intervened in South Vietnam, that country was a rice surplus country. It was exporting rice for valuable foreign exchange. It was available to export rice to North Vietnam, a deficit country, if some sort of peace could be arranged. But today the Americans are sending hundreds if not thousands of tons of rice to feed these people, who are no longer able to harvest their crops, in large part because of the depredations of the Vietcong, but also in significant part because of the operations of the American Army in South Vietnam—the napalm, the fires, the machineguns, the killing, the deaths, the terror which drives the peasants from the fields.

Eleventh. Our political dialog has been distorted and warped as it has not been since the McCarthy era. I am referring to Senator Joseph McCarthy. The very fabric of our political life has been torn asunder.

Liberal-conservative lines are meaningless on the Vietnam issue. There is a sense of public frustration and distrust of their government and its leaders which, if unheeded, could result in massive loss of confidence in the basic institutions of our democratic society. The credibility gap is no joke. It is an actuality which should frighten us who believe in democracy far more than it has done so far. If the people lose confidence in their government, democracy is indeed in jeopardy.

Twelfth. But perhaps the greatest cost of all of this war, as of most wars which have preceded it, is the brutalization of human nature and the turning aside of our aspirations for man through the revival of the primitive instinct for combat which glories in the daily statistics of the number of Vietcong and North Vietnamese troops killed in the last 24 hours and pushes under the carpet the weekly figures of South Vietnamese and American casualties.

Surely, a nation engaged in the spectator sport of watching people kill each other on television is not the kind of nation in which we can expect the compassion and the sense of international cooperation which is essential to bring a just and lasting peace to the world.

If the war proves anything, it attests to the validity of Alexander Pope's phrase, "The greatest enemy of mankind is man."

Mr. President, some point has been made of the application of the Tonkin Bay resolution as authorizing everything that has been done since it was passed, in terms of military authorizations and appropriations. Yet, I suggest that the simple answer to that argument can be found in the Senate debate on the Southeast Asia Resolution.

When we passed that resolution, some 16,000 U.S. soldiers were in Vietnam; their purpose was to advise and train Vietnamese troops—not to fight a war. The debate in the Senate, and subsequent statements by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, who handled the resolution, clearly prove that the resolution was not meant to be taken as a blank check for involving the Nation in war.

I introduce this amendment and call it up as a means of stimulating Congress to have the courage to meet its constitutional duties on issues involving war and peace. All Members of this body have at one time expressed concern about the erosion of congressional power and the growing domination of Congress by the executive branch. The issue my amendment poses illustrates quite well why this trend continues—because Congress simply has not had the guts to fulfill its constitutional responsibilities. It is much easier to let the President take the heat than to assume the burden of decision for formally declaring war, or, in the alternative, for exercising that power over the purse string which has been the historical prerogative of legislators in free societies all over the world.

I wonder how many of my colleagues would have voted for the southeast Asia resolution if they knew on August 7, 1964, what they know today; or how our constituents would have reacted if they had known that their representatives, in voting for the resolution, were going to be told by the Secretary of State and to some extent by the President, himself, that they were giving the Commander in Chief a blank check.

We have bypassed the people and we have bypassed Congress in the decision-making process on this war. The representatives of the people, in Congress, have failed to tackle the Vietnam problem, taking the easy way out by deferring to the executive branch. The President and his advisers have neither a monopoly on brains nor on virtue nor on constitutional power. As representatives of the people of this land, who pay in lives and dollars for this war, it is past time for Congress to decide whether our vital interests are truly at stake in this conflict. If they are not, we should set a price on what we will pay to protect interests that may be only desirable and not essential. Are these interests so vital that we should continue to funnel the lives of thousands of our finest young men and tens of billions down a bottomless Asian rat hole? This is the question Congress should decide. This amendment gives the Senate an opportunity to do so.

Congress has passed the buck too long and too often. The Constitution says that the buck for putting this Nation at war stops here, not in the executive branch. I hope the Senate will have the courage to do its constitutional duty.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, and ask that it be read.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair). The amendment, in the nature of a substitute, will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, as follows:

> In lieu of the language of the amendment No. 99 insert the following:
>
> "TITLE IV. STATEMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL POLICY
>
> "SEC. 401. The Congress hereby declares—
>
> "(1) its firm intentions to provide all necessary support for members of the Armed Forces of the United States fighting in Vietnam;
>
> "(2) its support of efforts being made by the President of the United States and other men of good will throughout the world to prevent an expansion of the war in Vietnam and to bring that conflict to an end through a negotiated settlement which will preserve the honor of the United States, protect the vital interests of this country, and allow the people of South Vietnam to determine the affairs of that nation in their own way; and
>
> "(3) its support of the Geneva accords of 1954 and urges the convening of that Conference or any other meeting of nations similarly involved and interested as soon as possible for the purpose of formulating plans for bringing the conflict to an honorable conclusion in accordance with the principles of those accords."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate——

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have read hastily the amendment which the Senator from Montana has offered as a substitute.

In order that the RECORD may be complete this evening and so that Senators may see where we are when they read the RECORD in the morning, I wish to read into the RECORD at this point my amendment No. 100 which I had announced I intended to bring up in the event my amendment No. 99 were voted down.

Amendment No. 100 reads as follows:

> SEC. 401. The Congress hereby declares—
>
> (1) its firm intentions to provide all necessary support for members of the Armed Forces of the United States fighting in Vietnam;

I point out that that part of my second amendment is identical with the first paragraph of the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. My second paragraph reads as follows:

> (2) its support of efforts being made by men of good will throughout the world to prevent an expansion of the war in Vietnam and to bring that conflict to an end through a negotiated settlement which will preserve the honor of the United States, protect the vital interests of this country, and allow the people of South Vietnam to determine the affairs of that nation in their own way; and

I ask my friend from Montana whether that paragraph No. 2 is not substantially identical to his paragraph 2.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Substantially, but not definitely, because I included the President in paragraph 2, as well as other men of good will. I believe that is the only difference I can note at the moment.

Mr. CLARK. I would certainly have no objection to that change.

Paragraph (3) of my amendment states:

> (3) its support of the Geneva Conference Agreement of 1954 and the final declaration of that Conference as a basis for a settlement of the Vietnam war, and to that end urges that the Conference be reconvened as soon as practicable for the purpose of formulating plans to effectively implement that agreement.

I ask my friend from Montana whether that paragraph (3) of my amendment is not substantially in accord with paragraph (3) of his amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Substantially but not definitely, because in addition to the Geneva accords we say, "or any other meeting of nations similarly involved," which would, for example, include the Percy proposal for an all-Asian meeting, or the proposal that the matter be referred to the United Nations or other proposals of a similar nature.

I would say, in general, the language I suggest is similar but differs in that important respect—it not only includes parties to the Geneva conference, but any other interested parties that have been considered.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to say to my good friend from Montana that despite the fact that the amendments are not identical, they are so completely similar that I would be glad to support the amendment of the Senator from Montana and give him all due credit for having proposed it.

I do have the somewhat difficult parliamentary problem of attempting to get a vote on my somewhat more rigorous amendment. I shall think overnight how to do that and perhaps we can end up with the same result which I intended to achieve before the Senator offered his amendment.

I congratulate the Senator for going at least halfway down the road that I would like to follow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I wish him well in his overnight study. I hope the amendment offered in the nature of a substitute would be considered on its merits, and apart from the original resolution in the form of an amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the amendment of the Senator from Montana in the nature of a substitute were to be approved by the Senate, would it then be in order for me to offer, as an additional amendment, my amendment No. 99?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment would be in order at another place, but not as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. CLARK. If the Presiding Officer will permit me, may I suggest that I believe we are talking at cross-purposes. My understanding is that if the amendment of the Senator from Montana is agreed to, the bill would then be open to further amendment. Is that correct?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Yes, but the question would then be on the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania, as amended.

Mr. CLARK. By way of further amendment, would it be in order for me to offer at that point my amendment No. 99, which would not have the effect of amending the amendment of the Senator from Montana?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be in order.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Financial Statement of Boys' Clubs of America

A letter from the president, Boys' Clubs of America, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audited financial statement of that organization, for the year 1966 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children

A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Council, for the year 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Resolution No. 13

"A resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President of the United States Senate, the honorable Hubert Humphrey; to the Honorable John McCormack, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives; to the Honorable Mike Mansfield, United States Senator from Montana; the Honorable Lee Metcalf, United States Senator from Montana; the Honorable James Battin, United States Representative from Montana; the Honorable Arnold Olsen, United States Representative from Montana; requesting that the Congress of the United States conduct hearings on the subject of percentage distribution of national forest receipts for schools and roads, and to adjust the method of computation to restore a proportionate relation to local governmental costs

"Whereas, under act of Congress (act May 23, 1908, 35 Stat. 260, amended act Sep. 24, 1944, 58 Stat. 737, 16 U.S.C. 500) twenty-five percent of National Forest receipts are distributed to the states and under state legislation to the several counties concerned for schools and roads therein;

"Whereas, in application certain items of receipt are administratively excluded or deducted in the computation of this percentage; and

Whereas, exclusions and deductions so made have resulted in a declining level of payments at a time when costs of schools and roads and the burdens of local taxation are increasing.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana:

"That the Congress of the United States is requested to schedule and conduct public hearings in those states and localities where National Forest areas predominate to determine the extent to which revision of the method of percentage computation for distribution of National Forest receipts may be justified in fairness to the localities affected and to take such remedial action as the hearings warrant.

"Be it further resolved, that the secretary of state be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the Honorable Mike Mansfield and Lee Metcalf, Senators from the state of Montana, and the Honorable James Battin and Arnold Olsen, Congressmen from the state of Montana."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Resolution No. 20

"A joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana requesting and urging that the Congress of the United States take effective action to restore to the State of Montana the full amount of the funds which were apportioned to the State under the provisions of the Federal Highway Acts of 1964 and 1966

"Whereas, a presidential order of November, 1966 reduced the amount of federal money available for highway construction purposes in the state of Montana; and

"Whereas, that order has resulted in a reduction of available federal money to the extent of about eight million dollars ($8,000,000.00) for fiscal year 1967; and

"Whereas, further reductions in federal monies may be authorized; and

"Whereas, this reduction seriously curtails the highway construction program in the state of Montana, as well as in the nation, thereby seriously affecting employment and the production and sale of supplies, materials and equipment used for highway construction purposes; and

"Whereas, any reduction in federal highway construction funds will result in an equivalent reduction of the current Highway Safety Program for eliminating unsafe and hazardous sections of highway, thereby contributing to accidents involving serious injury, loss of life and property damage; and

"Whereas, the state of Montana has developed long-range highway construction programs based on utilization of the full apportionment of federal funds to the states; and

"Whereas, a reduction in federal funds for highway improvement has a serious effect on the morale of present engineering employees who are in short supply and further detracts from the recruitment program for obtaining new engineering employees; and

"Whereas, a reduction in federal funds for interstate highway construction has an especially serious effect on the state of Montana since this state is faced with a major construction program to complete all interstate highways to four-lane standards.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana:

"That the congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested and urged to take effective action to restore to the state of Montana for expenditure the full amount of federal funds authorized by congress in the Federal Aid Highway Acts of 1964 and 1966.

"Be it further resolved, that the secretary of state forward a duly certified copy of this resolution to the secretary of the United States Senate and the speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each United States senator and to each member of congress from the state of Montana."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Resolution No. 7

"A joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to Presidential succession.

"Whereas, the eighty-ninth Congress of the United States of America, at its first session, in both houses, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, has made the following proposition to amend the constitution of the United States of America by adding an article in the following words:

"Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several states within seven years from the due date of its submission by the Congress:

" 'Article —

" 'Section 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

" 'Sec. 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

" 'Sec. 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

" 'Sec. 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may be law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

" 'Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.'

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, that the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby ratified; and

"Be it further resolved, that certified copies of this resolution shall be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the administrator of general services, Washington, D.C., to the President of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Senate Joint Resolution No. 5

"A resolution of the Legislature of Montana relating to the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp for Phoebe Apperson Hearst

"Whereas, Phoebe Apperson Hearst was a great American woman humanitarian and philanthropist who is noted as the co-founder of the Parent Teachers Association and the organizer of the Travelers Aid Society and as being instrumental in restoring of Mount Vernon; and

"Whereas, By her generosity and consciousness of the tremendous requirements of education today, Mrs. Hearst gave millions of dollars to education and has properly become known as 'one of the greatest benefactors' of libraries throughout Montana and donated a complete building and library facilities to the City of Anaconda, Montana; and

"Whereas, It is only fitting and proper that recognition in the form of a commemorative postage stamp be given to Phoebe Apperson Hearst for her multitudinous projects and activities.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Montana:

"That the Legislature of the State of Montana memorializes the Postmaster General of the United States to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp honoring Phoebe Apperson Hearst; and

"Be it further resolved, that the secretary of state be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Postmaster General of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from Montana in the Congress of the United States.

"I hereby certify that the within Resolution originated in the Senate.

"James J. Pasma,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"Ted James,
"President of the Senate.
"John H. Leuthold,
"Speaker of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2—Relative to Discriminatory Trade Barriers Against California Wines.

"Whereas, Grapes and wine constitute one of the major agricultural industries of the State of California, and California produces approximately 85 percent of all wine produced in the United States; and

"Whereas, The grape and wine and allied industries also enhance the economic welfare of the state by the employment of many thousands of people; and

"Whereas, The Constitution of the United States sets forth basic principles which seek to make the United States a single union and to set up a single national economy and to assure the products of every lawful industry access to the markets of all states; and

"Whereas, The United States has also declared a foreign policy to foster the elimination of trade barriers by reducing tariffs in cooperation with the European Common Market countries and other; and

"Whereas, The states of the United States cannot constitutionally erect discriminatory barriers against the free movement of products of other states in interstate commerce, except in the case of wines and alcoholic beverages; and

"Whereas, Many states have by legislation and regulation erected discriminatory barriers against California wines which include the levying of higher taxes on California wines than are placed upon local wines, and the imposition of restrictions on distribution and marketing of California wines which are not imposed upon local wines, so that the entrance of California wine into their markets and the distribution thereof are severely restricted; and

"Whereas, Congressional discussions clearly indicate that by the adoption of the 21st Amendment it was intended not to permit discriminatory treatment by one state of the products of another state, but only to protect the integrity of each state in the matter of regulating the importation and sale of alcoholic beverages by such states; and

"Whereas, The United States is founded on the principle of free commerce among the states, and citizens of each state should be free to select the products they desire to purchase, at fair prices and under reasonable conditions, without undue favoritism for local products; and

"Whereas, Unless relief is given from the present and ever increasing trade barriers being erected by several of the states, the grape and wine industry of California and the economy of the State of California will suffer great and irreparable harm; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to take cognizance of these discriminatory practices by the several states and proceed in such a manner as it may deem appropriate to cause the elimination of trade barriers by the several states of the Union against California wines; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Resolution No. 66—Relating to Vocational Education. Resolution Read Second Time

"Whereas, February 23, 1967, marks the fiftieth anniversary of the signing of the Smith-Hughes Act, which laid the groundwork for important subsequent vocational education legislation; and

"Whereas, With the passage of this act a successful cooperative effort was established between the Federal Government and the states for the further development of vocational education through the facilities of public education; and provided a basis for federal and state relationships in subsequent federal aid to public education; and

"Whereas, The major purpose of this act is to prepare youth and adults for employment and to assist employed workers to gain advancement in their chosen field of endeavor; and

"Whereas, Public vocational education and technical education is designed to educate youth and adults of our country to become useful citizens and productive skilled workers in business, industry, agriculture, homemaking, health services, and technical occupations; and

"Whereas, Youth groups, such as Future Farmers, Future Homemakers, and Future Leaders in Marketing and Distribution, have been developed as the result of the Smith-Hughes and other vocational education acts; and

"Whereas, Vocational Education has made a major contribution to the economic and general well-being of the individual as well as to the economic development of our state and nation; and

"Whereas, Vocational Education has contributed substantially to meeting the needs for trained manpower in California; and

"Whereas, Vocational education under this act has operated for fifty years in California with full cooperation and support of agriculture, business, industry, and labor; and

"Whereas, Enrollment in vocational education programs in California now exceeds one million students, which makes California the leader of all other states in this area of education; and

"Whereas, Local school districts in California have matched federal funds in the various federal vocational educational acts at a ratio of more than five local dollars to each federal dollar; and

"Whereas, Vocational education will continue to provide trained manpower to meet the needs of our changing technology; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the Legislature, on the anniversary of the Smith-Hughes Act, reaffirms its concurrence in and support of the objectives and provisions of this act and the above mentioned subsequent vocational education acts; and be it further

"Resolved, That February 23, 1967, be declared Vocational Education Day in recognition of the importance of the fiftieth anniversary of the Smith-Hughes Act; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Congress of the United States, and suitably prepared copies to Dr. Max Rafferty, Superintendent of Public Instruction and Director of Education, to Mr. Wesley P. Smith, State Director of Vocational Education, and to the members of the California Congressional Delegation."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Memorial No. 6—Memorializing the President and Vice President of the United States and the New Mexico Delegation to the U.S. Congress To Protect and Replace Waterfowl and Game Habitat in the Middle Rio Grande Valley in New Mexico

"Whereas, the middle Rio Grande valley between the Cochiti diversion dam and Socorro, New Mexico, has suffered an extremely significant loss of waterfowl and wildlife habitat which exceeds eight thousand acres and which loss is due in major part to federal water development projects in the one hundred mile area;

"Whereas, the area was a wintering area of great significance to waterfowl, and the losses of habitat therein, as an important section of the central flyway, influence the welfare of waterfowl nationality;

"Whereas, the state of New Mexico has taken all possible measures, under the circumstances, to mitigate the losses to the welfare of waterfowl nationally;

"Whereas, there exists an immediate necessity to further mitigate the losses;

"Whereas, implementation of such mitigation would be of significant economic benefit to the people of this state, as well as to the national welfare as is indicated by a special report on fish and wildlife resources of the Rio Grande valley by the United States bureau of sport fisheries and wildlife and the New Mexico department of game and fish;

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the State of New Mexico that the president and vice president of the United States and the New Mexico delegation to the United States congress are petitioned to instigate the immediate, necessary action to cause the congress of the United States to enact legislation appropriating four hundred twenty-seven thousand, three hundred fifty dollars ($427,350) to the proper state or federal agency to be applied to the mitigation of the loss of waterfowl and wildlife habitat in the middle Rio Grande valley between the Cochiti diversion dam and Socorro, New Mexico, in accord with the recommendations of the United States bureau of sport fisheries and wildlife and the New Mexico department of game and fish;

"Be it further resolved that copies of this memorial be sent to the president and vice president of the United States and the New Mexico delegation to the United States congress.

"Signed and Sealed at The Capitol, in the City of Santa Fe.

"R. C. (IKE) MORGAN,
"President Pro Tempore, Senate.

[SEAL] "JUANITA PINO,
"Chief Clerk, Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Public Works:

"JOINT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO EXTEND THE NORTHERN TERMINUS OF THE INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAY SYSTEM IN MAINE FROM HOULTON TO FORT KENT

"We, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the One Hundred and Third Legislative Session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your Honorable Body as follows:

"Whereas, it has been recognized that the nation's economy and the nation's security require the construction of a national system of interstate and defense highways; and

"Whereas, the primary responsibility for construction of such a system rests in the Federal Government; and

"Whereas, the objective is to complete the presently designated national system by 1972; and

"Whereas, the people of Maine through appropriate action have deemed it essential that the highways of this State be integrated into the interstate and defense system; and

"Whereas, the coinciding completion dates of U.S. Interstate 95 to the border east of Houlton and the entire Trans Canada Highway system will result in a great amount of potential traffic by-passing central and northern Aroostook County; and

"Whereas, a high-standard, key artery highway through Aroostook County will better serve present industry, attract new industry and provide tourists and travelers with access to the many recreational possibilities of central and northern Aroostook County; and

"Whereas, the Department of Defense of the U.S. Government has extensive defense installations in northern Aroostook County, namely Loring Air Force Base located in Limestone, Maine and supplemental installations to this base also located in the general area of northern Aroostook County in the State of Maine; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved: That we, your Memorialists, recommend and urge to the Congress of the United States, in order to more adequately serve the more heavily populated areas of central and northern Aroostook County and provide additional highway facilities for defense installations in northern Aroostook County, that appropriate action be taken to require the Department of Commerce, through the Bureau of Public Roads, to relocate the northern terminus of the Interstate and Defense Highway System in Maine from Houlton to Fort Kent; and be it further

"Resolved: That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be immediately transmitted by the Secretary of State to the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress and to the members of the said Senate and House of Representatives from this State.

"In Senate chamber: Read and adopted, sent down for concurrence, January 24, 1967.

"JERROLD B. SPEERS,
Secretary.

House of Representatives: Read and adopted in concurrence, January 25, 1967.

"BERTHA W. JOHNSON,
Clerk".

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"SENATE MEMORIAL NO. 1—A MEMORIAL REQUESTING THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO RECOGNIZE THE REPUBLIC OF RHODESIA AS AN INDEPENDENT NATION

"To the President and the Congress of the United States of America:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Whereas, the United States of America came into being by declaring independence from the British Empire, of which it had been a colony for over a century and a half; and

"Whereas, Rhodesia has declared its independence as a Nation from Great Britain; and

"Whereas, the United States of America, in spite of speedy recognition of the independence of the many emerging African Nations over recent years, with the exception of Katanga, has refused to recognize the independence of Rhodesia as a Nation; and

"Whereas, the State Department of the United States of America and our Ambassador to the United Nations did quickly announce that our Country would join and support Great Britain in applying severe economic sanctions and moral pressures against Rhodesia; and

"Whereas, Great Britain has grievously failed to apply a single sanction desired by the United States of America against Cuba or Viet Nam, our deadly communist enemies; and

"Whereas, the Government of Rhodesia has neither needed nor requested a penny of our foreign aid and proffers us not debts but friendship; and

"Whereas, according to Article 1, Section 8, of the Constitution of the United States, only Congress has the power to regulate commerce with foreign Nations.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the President and the Congress of the United States take immediate steps to rescind all sanctions against the Republic of Rhodesia.

"2. That the President and the Congress of the United States effect immediate recognition of the sovereignty and independence of the Republic of Rhodesia.

"3. That the Secretary of State of Arizona send copies of this Memorial to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of Arizona's Congressional delegation.

"Passed the Senate on February 17, 1967 by the following vote: 18 Ayes, 10 Nays, 2 Not Voting.

"Approved by the Governor—February 17, 1967.

"Filed in the Office of the Secretary of State—February 17, 1967."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 1967–20

"Whereas, The State of Washington is singularly honored in that the Indian peoples constituting the membership of the great Colville Indian Reservation wish to find an equitable means of terminating federal supervision over the property and affairs of the Colville Indian Reservation and to become full-fledged citizens both of this nation and of the state; and

"Whereas, This desire on the part of the membership has been evidenced by the action of the members of its Tribal Council; and

"Whereas, Senator Henry M. Jackson introduced legislation in the Eighty-Eighth Congress providing for an end to the Colville Reservation and restoration to full rights as citizens to the membership and Representative Thomas S. Foley introduced like legislation for the Eighty-Ninth Congress;

"Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the Senate, That this petition be most respectfully submitted to the House of Representatives and to the Senate of the United States and to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, urging immediate action to fulfill the desires of the membership of the Colville Reservation to become citizens enjoying equal rights, privileges and responsibilities as other citizens of this state and of this nation; and

"Be it further resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate submit copies of this resolution to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, and to each member of Congress from the State of Washington.

"WARD BOWDEN,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 1007

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to take no action limiting the power of the States to tax

"Whereas, H.R. 11798 was introduced into the eighty-ninth Congress by the Honorable Edwin E. Willis of Louisiana, and said bill was later superseded by the introduction of H.R. 16491 and an interstate taxation bill, H.R. 2158, was recently introduced in the Ninetieth Congress by Representative Willis.

"Whereas, Under the terms of these three bills the federal government will invade the field of state and local taxation, including state and local corporation income taxes, and sales and use taxes, traditionally left to the states, prescribing the jurisdiction to tax and the method of determining the portion of net income of multi-state corporations which may be taxed by a state.

"Whereas, The said bills are an unwarranted, unnecessary, and undesirable intrusion into the tax and fiscal jurisdiction of the State of Colorado and our local governments, and would be destructive of the principles of federalism enunciated by our founding fathers.

"Be It Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Forty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the Senate concurring herein:

"That the members of the Congress of the United States be memorialized to discontinue further consideration of the interstate taxation bill, H.R. 2158, introduced in Congress by Representative Willis of Louisiana.

"Be It Further Resolved, That copies of this Memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Members of Congress from the State of Colorado, and the members of the Judiciary Committee of the United States House of Representatives.

"JOHN D. VANDERHOOF,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"HENRY C. KIMBROUGH,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

"MARK A. HOGAN,
"President of the Senate.

"COMFORT W. SHAW,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"A RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE PRESIDENT, THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS AND SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TO MAINTAIN THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM AT ITS 1966 LEVELS

"Whereas, the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Transportation in late November of 1966 advised all states of a cut in their authority to obligate Federal Aid Highway Funds for fiscal 1967 as well as a retroactive prohibition on obligating any funds not yet obligated from previous apportionments as of June 30, 1966; and

"Whereas, the State of Minnesota had $23,100,000 authorized, but not released for obligation as of June 30, 1966, and an additional appropriation of $102,300,000 was made in October 1966, making a total of $125,400,000 of which only $76,400,000 is now available for obligation during this fiscal year, a reduction of $49,000,000; and

"Whereas, improvements in Minnesota's highway program are essential to the economic growth and development of Minnesota, and vital to our national defense program, curtailment of less essential programs should be considered; and

"Whereas, the State of Minnesota has geared its highway planning and steadily increasing construction in reliance on the promises, announced policies, budgets, statutes and urgings of the federal government; and

"Whereas, the private construction industry has increased its employment and capital investments to meet anticipated highway department programs; and

"Whereas, the Federal-Aid cut will create employment difficulties in both state government and private industries as well as losses in capital investments; and

"Whereas, the Federal-Aid cut will severely curtail this state's efforts to achieve an adequate state highway transportation system to fulfill its obligations to complete its portion of the interstate highway system; now therefore,

"Be it resolved, that the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota do respectfully urge that the Congress of the United States do at the earliest possible time devise and approve legislation which will restore all Federal-Aid Highway Funds to the levels in effect and contemplated in November 1966, prior to the cut back.

"Be it further resolved, that the Secretary of State of the State of Minnesota transmit copies of this memorial resolution to the President of the United States, to the Senators and Representatives from the State of Minnesota, to the Vice President, to the Chairmen of the Committees on Finance and on Commerce of the Senate, to the Speaker and the Chairmen of the Ways and Means and Public Works Committees of the House of Representatives and to the Secretary of the Department of Transportation."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 4—A JOINT MEMORIAL TO THE HONORABLE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED

"Be It Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Idaho:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas, the lack of an adequate transportation system is the greatest deterrent to the full use of the natural resources in the national forests in the State of Idaho; and

"Whereas, under the present rate of road construction, it will take 100 years to complete an adequate national forest conservation road transportation system;

"Whereas, under the present rate of road construction on the forest highway system it will take 100 years to complete an adequate forest highway system in conjunction with the state highway system in the State of Idaho.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Thirty-ninth Session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho now in session, the Senate and House of Representatives concurring, that we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America to proceed at the earliest possible date to enact the necessary legislation to appropriate full authorization of $170 million for financing of primary National Forest Conservation roads from the general funds of the United States Treasury and to provide an appropriation commensurate with the urgency of the demonstrated need.

"Now, therefore, be it further resolved by the Thirty-ninth Session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho now in session, the Senate and House of Representatives concurring, that we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America to proceed at the earliest possible date to enact the necessary legislation to authorize full authorization of $66 million for financing of the forest highway system in the United States from the general funds of the United States Treasury and to provide an appropriation commensurate with the urgency of the demonstrated need.

"Be it further resolved that the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this state in Congress of the United States."

The petition of Miss M. Hazeltine Fewsmith, of Bala-Cynwyd, Pa., favoring the cessation of bombing in Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

The petition of Mrs. L. B. Magnuson, of Chesterton, Ind., relating to the Government's policy in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Mission Indian Federation, Inc., of Perris, Calif., signed by Dan Pico, president, relating to a redress of grievance by that federation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The petition of Richard H. Davis, of New York, N.Y., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Ohio Bell, of Chicago, Ill., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1125. A bill to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education by extending authority for allocation of funds to be used for education of Indian children and children in overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense, by extending and amending the National Teacher Corps program, by providing assistance for comprehensive educational planning, and by improving programs of education for the handicapped; to improve programs of vocational education; to improve authority for assistance to schools in federally impacted areas and areas suffering a major disaster; and for other purposes; and

S. 1126. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, and the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock a.m., tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 1, 1967, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 28, 1967:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Ramsey Clark, of Texas, to be Attorney General.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 28, 1967:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

William B. Macomber, Jr., of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

William Matson Roth, of California, to be special representative for trade negotiations, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Maurine B. Neuberger, of Oregon, to be member of the General Advisory Committee of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

William S. Gaud, of Connecticut, to be U.S. Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 5 years and until his successor has been appointed.

◆

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Eslie R. Phillips, West End Baptist Church, Petersburg, Va., offered the following prayer:

Proverbs 14: 34: *Righteousness exalteth a nation: but sin is a reproach to any people.*

Eternal God, our Father, of whom the whole family of heaven and earth is named, in whom we live, and move, and have our being, and without whom we have no hope for time or eternity, we look now to Thee for Thy counsel and direction.

Bless, we pray Thee, our President and his aids, the Speaker and all the Members of the Congress, and may they be imbued with infinite and infallible wisdom to direct the affairs of our great Republic. May the goal of all their striving be that judgment run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream. Give them a compassionate concern for the general welfare of all peoples of our world and for every citizen of our own land.

May all the deliberation and action of this day be motivated by the purity of unselfish service. Grant that a sense of unworthiness may be replaced by a faith which leads to conviction, and may the courage of conviction become the touchstone by which the morality of the Nation is tested.

Help us to understand that if the mighty potential of our country's men and materials is to be realized that we must heed the prophetic injunction: Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord of hosts.

To these purposes, O God, we now dedicate ourselves in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

REASONS WHY MARTIN AND SHEPARDSON SHOULD NOT BE REAPPOINTED TO THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD WILL BE DOCUMENTED NEXT WEEK

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the next few weeks, President Johnson will have a great opportunity to reshape the Federal Reserve Board.

I will discuss this vital matter on the floor of the House early next week—either Monday or Tuesday, depending on the legislative schedule.

In this speech, I will document in detail the reasons why William McChesney Martin should not be reappointed as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. I will document the many instances in which Mr. Martin has betrayed the public trust and has seriously damaged the people and the economy of this country.

My remarks will also outline the compelling reasons why Federal Reserve Gov. Charles N. Shepardson should leave the Board when he reaches the mandatory civil service retirement age next month. Mr. Shepardson must leave the Board unless the President grants him a special exception to the civil service regulation. Mr. Shepardson, like Mr. Martin, has a consistent record of representing the interests of a few large banks and of failing to protect the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, in discussing these matters, I will not deal in generalities. I shall cite specific instances that, I believe, will show beyond any doubt that the records of William McChesney Martin and Charles N. Shepardson have been against the public interest. My charges will be specific and concrete, and I will welcome debate from anyone who believes that these charges can be refuted or that it can be shown that the actions of these Federal Reserve Board members have in any way been beneficial to the American people in recent years.

PROPOSED PAUL G. BLAZER LOCKS AND DAM

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing, for reference to the Committee on Public Works, a bill which would change the name of the "Greenup Locks and Dam" on the Ohio River to the "Paul G. Blazer Locks and Dam."

This proposed change in designation of the locks and dam, which are in Ohio and Kentucky, would pay appropriate tribute to the memory of a man who did more than any one person in this era to make the Ohio River and its tributaries an important factor in the economic life or an important sector of our country.

The late Paul G. Blazer was a successful industrialist in the city of Ashland, Ky., the main driving force behind the achievements of the Ashland Oil Co. In addition to his business activity, Paul Blazer was the man to whom everyone turned who wanted something accomplished for his city, his State, and the area surrounding his home community.

While he needs no other memorial than the memory of what he accomplished during his lifetime, it would be only fitting to place Paul G. Blazer's name on the locks and dam at Greenup.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE III OF BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to stimulate and accelerate economic development in rural America and create new outdoor recreation opportunities for all Americans.

We all know of the critical need for more outdoor recreation areas. Because we have more leisure time, more spendable income, and improved roads and highways, our rapidly expanding population is seeking more and better opportunities to enjoy the out-of-doors. We are finding this quest increasingly difficult. And prospects are it will get even more difficult, for outdoor recreation demands are growing at a much faster rate than our population is increasing.

To meet this demand we must turn to our rural areas where land is available.

We must enact legislation that would encourge the people in rural America to plan and develop recreation facilities in the most efficient and expedient manner.

The legislation I propose would permit this. It would give the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to furnish financial help to public bodies in planning and constructing recreation developments in resource conservation and development project areas.

It would give him the same authority he now has under Public Law 566, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, that is greatly benefiting watershed project sponsors from coast to coast.

Resource conservation and development projects are one of the most promising new approaches to natural resource development. These projects, initiated and sponsored by local people, are already contributing to the economic growth and job opportunities in many areas.

There are presently 26 projects in the operations and planning stages covering more than 59 million acres in 27 States. Project measures vary from area to area. But in most areas the greatest opportunity for increasing rural employment and income is through the development of the recreation potentials.

Since resource conservation and development funds cannot presently be used for cost sharing on recreation and fish and wildlife developments, local sponsors have been stymied.

More than 350 recreation developments presently planned by resource conservation and development sponsors cannot be completed without some public financial help. Although project sponsors are encouraged to make use of any available public program that will meet their needs, funds just are not available in many project areas.

State plans for outdoor recreation under which land and water conservation fund grants are made usually do not include resource conservation and development recreation project measures or assigns low priority to them.

The legislation I propose would fill the gap for aid in recreation development left by other program authorities. It would not overlap any existing programs.

Instances where this new legislation is needed are numerous. For example, in the Tradewater resource conservation and development project in western Kentucky sponsors, as part of their total program, desire to develop three impoundments for flood control, industrial development, municipal use, and recreation.

The recreation developments alone would have a tremendously favorable impact on this area that lags economically behind the rest of the Nation. They would offer full-time and off-farm employment to many of the rural residents. They would create the need for new businesses to service tourists, vacationers, and sportsmen. And they would make the area more attractive to industry and for residential development.

The 1.7-million-acre Tradewater resource conservation and development project, covering six counties, can well be one of the milestones in the development of western Kentucky. Recreation is an integral part of it. It should be planned and carried out along with the other proposed measures.

This same situation exists in most of the 26 resource conservation and development projects presently underway.

My amendment to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act would correct this.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to join me in sponsoring this important bill.

CONGRESSMAN STRATTON TO OFFER A STRENGTHENING AMENDMENT TO THE POWELL SEATING RESOLUTION

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that during tomorrow's debate on the Powell resolution I will seek to offer an amendment which would make the seating of the Harlem Democrat contingent on his first having purged himself of contempt of New York State courts. The remainder of the committee-backed resolution would be largely unchanged.

Under the parliamentary situation likely to prevail during the House's consideration of the Celler committee's recommendations, it will first be necessary, of course, to get a majority to vote down the previous question.

I find in talking around that there are a lot of Members who feel as I do, that the committee made a mistake in recommending that Mr. POWELL be seated without any regard for the continued defiance of the New York State courts which led to his difficulties in this House in the first place. So far, however, these Members have not been organized, and have been looking for someone to carry the ball in tomorrow's debate. Having already made my position clear that I will oppose the committee's recommendation, I believe I have an obligation to try to crystallize this opposition sentiment around a reasonable and constructive alternative.

In recommending that Mr. POWELL be seated, the committee has taken the position that the only constitutional grounds on which he can be excluded are age, citizenship, and inhabitancy. But they did not look into the inhabitancy question very far. It is clear that Mr. POWELL's conduct in connection with the New York State contempt of court citations has wiped out his inhabitancy in New York State, and has thus made him ineligible to be seated under even the narrow constitutional grounds espoused by the committee.

The sworn testimony before the committee makes it clear that Mr. POWELL, well before November 8, 1966, had moved out of New York State to escape compliance with the orders of the New York State courts. He testified that he had not voted in person in New York on November 8, but by absentee ballot. And he could not clearly recall the last time he had been back in the State.

This is not just the same residency problem faced by most other Congressmen, of having to live in two different places at once, in Washington and in one's own home district. It was a deliberate, conscious, and intentional action of a person removing himself physically from the State for the express purpose of not carrying out certain obligations and responsibilities imposed upon him by the courts of the State.

This very point has already been fully examined by the House in a previous case, and a meaningful definition of inhabitancy has been set forth in the precedents. Surprisingly enough it is even quoted in full on page 24 of the committee's own report. It completely supports the position which I am just describing, and clearly refutes the committee's position.

In connection with an election challenge against James M. Beck, of Pennsylvania, in the 70th Congress in 1928, the committee which examined the Beck case reported as follows:

> We think that a fair interpretation of the letter and the spirit of this paragraph with respect to the word "inhabitant" is that the framers intended that for a person to bring himself within the scope of its meaning he must have and occupy a place of abode within the particular State in which he claims inhabitancy, *and that he must have openly and avowedly by act and by word subjected himself to the duties and responsibilities of a member of the body politic of that particular State.*

In the Powell case we obviously have a situation where he had removed himself "openly and avowedly by act and word" from "the duties and responsibilities of a member of the body politic of that particular State," since compliance with the orders of the courts of that State is one such duty and responsibility.

We are told that we must not look into this matter of inhabitancy, since otherwise we might find ourselves involved in lengthy litigation in the Supreme Court. But this is an issue of one of the constitutional qualifications for membership in the House, and the Constitution provides that in determining questions relating to such qualifications the House itself "shall be the judge." It is up to us to make the determination here, not for nine men across the street to do it, nor even the courts in New York State.

We are also told that the House cannot refuse to seat the gentleman from New York because then he could just get reelected and we would have the same problem all over again. But the fact is he is not now an inhabitant of New York State, and cannot become one until he returns to the State, purges himself of contempt of its courts, and complies with its orders and decrees. Were he to run again anyway, we would still have under the Constitution the same final and ultimate right that we have today to "judge" whether one who intentionally remains outside his State and district rather than comply with the orders of the courts of that State is an "inhabitant" of his State.

So there is only one clear and simple way for the gentleman from New York to remove the grave cloud that hangs over his inhabitancy qualification, and that is for him to return to New York State and purge himself of contempt of court.

The amendment I shall offer—if the previous question is voted down so that it can be offered and considered—would require that this action must first be taken by the gentleman from New York before we will seat him in this House.

HOUSE DELEGATION TO THE SPRING CONFERENCE OF THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the bylaws of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union, the following Members of the House are designated to serve as members of the U.S. delegation to the spring conference of the Interparliamentary Union to be held in Palma de Mallorca, Spain, March 27, to April 2, 1967:

W. ROBERT POAGE, Democrat, of Texas;

PAUL C. JONES, Democrat, of Missouri;

E. ROSS ADAIR, Republican of Indiana;

ALEXANDER PIRNIE, Republican, of New York;

EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, Democrat, of Connecticut;

EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Republican, of Illinois;

CATHARINE MAY, Republican, of Washington;

JOHN S. MONAGAN, Democrat, of Connecticut; and

ROBERT MCCLORY, Republican, of Illinois.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON SUBMITS BILL TO STRENGTHEN BAR ON U.S. PARTICIPATION IN ARAB BOYCOTT OF ISRAEL

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with some sense of regret that I am submitting today a bill to toughen an amendment to the Export Control Act which we enacted in the last Congress. I am referring to the present provision of law which calls on American businessmen to refuse to cooperate with boycotts sponsored by other nations against countries friendly to the United States.

This law refers, of course, to the continuing Arab effort to force participation by American and other Western firms in the Arab economic boycott of the State of Israel. While the legislation has stiffened the resistance of some large U.S. firms to the Arab tactics, it has spawned virtually no effort in the administration to attempt to enforce or encourage the fulfillment of congressional intent.

Only last December, a reliable source on events relevant to American-Israel relations, Near East Report, disclosed that an American corporation was communicating Arab boycott regulations to its suppliers and subcontractors, in outright contradiction of the legislative intent. Near East Report noted that no action has been taken by the Commerce Department to either discourage or even investigate this practice.

It is this failure of the administration to act upon this legislation of the 89th Congress, and the failure of some companies to follow its direction which I regret. The only alternative Congress has is to make this provision of law mandatory—and thus more effective. Apparently, we cannot leave it to the administration to carry out a flexible provision on this subject; we must leave no room for putting aside or questioning the congressional intent which is manifest in the present provision.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I am joining my colleagues who have introduced amendments to the Export Control Act, containing a mandatory prohibition on "the taking of any action by domestic concerns which would have the effect of furthering or supporting the restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any foreign country against another country friendly to the United States."

It is unfortunate that Congress must assert its role in U.S. foreign policy by enacting mandatory provisions of law. It is apparent in this instance, however, that the administration takes less than seriously congressional guidance on foreign affairs which is expressed in less stringent terms. I am confident that my colleagues will look closely at the events surrounding the operation of the present provision, and that they will soon vote the mandatory provision I have introduced.

KENNEDY CULTURAL CENTER, PLAYGROUND FOR WASHINGTON'S NET SET, WILL BE UNLOADED ON THE NATION'S TAXPAYERS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, each time the jerry-built legislation of the National Cultural Center, since named the Kennedy Center, has come before this House I have cautioned that we were being deluded. We have repeatedly been conned into approving a monstrous project, designed to serve a privileged minority in Washington, that will become an ever-increasing burden on the American taxpayers.

The latest in the series of sorry developments surrounding the troubled Kennedy Center occurred last week when officials admitted that their gigantic structure has already been underestimated by at least $5 million—$5 million they do not have.

Does this $5 million deficit make these cultural officials pause and take stock? Far from it. Two days after announcing this serious capital deficit, they calmly announced the are going right ahead and ordering $7,200,000 worth of steel.

There are two time bombs aimed straight at American taxpayers and the U.S. Treasury hidden in this pair of announcements. First, it is clear that the Kennedy Center officials are committed to a reckless course of starting construction without having enough money in hand to finish the job. If allowed to continue, they will expect Congress and our taxpaying constituents to bail them out. Since this misguided project is a Presidential memorial, its sponsors will rely on that in an attempt to force the hand of Congress when the time is ripe. This is the technique they flagrantly used in 1963 when the death of the President gave them the means of salvaging an admitted private failure with public funds that Congress had been assured would never be used.

The second cause for immediate alarm is the $7.2 million order for steel. Competent architects say that a steel order of that magnitude should represent a total structure with a value of about $75 million, rather than the $51 million representing the inflated estimate now acknowledged by the Center officials. So, unless the Kennedy Center is about to apply new and wonderful methods to the art of construction, it is apparent that the $30 million colossus of 1962 that became a $46 million memorial in 1963 and that had a cost last Thursday of $51 million is really going to cost $75 million or more. And that means that Congress is going to be faced with deficit capital financing of $30 million or more, to say nothing of the eventual operating costs.

A further indication of the mountainous final costs of the Kennedy Center is the price tag of almost $50 million on New York's new Metropolitan Opera House, a single theater. The Washington center calls for five theaters and a parking garage, hardly likely to be delivered for the price of one opera house in New York.

A comparison could also be made with the Rayburn House Office Building which we were promised would cost $50 million and has already cost $130 million. The Kennedy Center is being built under an open-end, cost-plus arrangement. The sky is the limit, and it is onward and upward with "culture" in the Great Society.

It is the more astonishing that this extravagant $7,200,000 order for steel comes at a time when the White House has clamped down on nonessential public construction involving steel in order to curb inflation. The President even canceled improvements to the White House itself for this reason, and mentioned something about giving up some luxuries at home while American boys are dying in Vietnam.

Inflation and the war in Asia are of little concern to the Kennedy Center Chairman, Roger L. Stevens. He told the Washington Star:

> It will prove to have been worth the time and money. Patrons of the arts can expect to enjoy the best in culture.

Now I realize that patrons of the arts have a right to enjoy culture, and that Mr. Stevens likes to hobnob with the patronesses when they show up at cultural parties, such as those thrown at the Smithsonian Institution, wearing snappy minks, and chic fishnet dresses. Yes, let patrons of the arts have all this and more, including a cultural center as a playground if that is what they want, but let them pay for it themselves. Do not bring in the taxpayers and the U.S. Treasury.

Meanwhile, I call on the Kennedy Center trustees—including the ex officio Members of Congress—not to rubber-stamp the improvident actions of their officers. The trustees, especially the members of the Kennedy family, owe it to themselves and to the Nation to halt all construction activity until they have seen reliable and complete estimates and until they are sure that all of the necessary money is in hand.

This folly must be stopped before it irrevocably disgraces the memory of the name it proposes to honor.

MENTAL HEALTH AND MENTAL RETARDATION

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has forcefully indicated his support for a needed, promising, and successful health program—the Community Mental Health Centers Act.

The President has asked for extension of legislation to construct and staff these centers, and has coupled his request with generous support for training qualified mental health personnel to man these centers.

This program is of particular value in the State of West Virginia.

We are making startling progress in the treatment of mental illness. We are also learning how to deal with mental retardation. It serves the young and the old and all types of mental problems. It is community based, serving people locally where they live, and stops the archaic practice of ripping a person from friends and family to be sent to a distant custodial institution. It also brings together all the types of services an individual needs when he needs it, from emergency services around the clock, to full-time hospitalization.

The community support of this program bears witness to its impressive and early success. State and local governments—in fact 44 States and over 150 communities—have already provided not only matching funds, but citizen interest involvement and enthusiasm. The current legislative authorization will provide for some 270 centers serving some

40 million people. We cannot stop until we have made these programs available in every community in the Nation.

DENYING MR. POWELL HIS SEAT

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the report of Mr. Celler's select committee to investigate Adam Clayton Powell does not satisfy me as being sufficiently strong, and tomorrow I shall propose an amendment to House Resolution 278 which would deny Mr. Powell his seat. My reasons for doing so are sixfold, and I should like to enumerate them at this time.

First, the fine to be imposed on Mr. Powell is an insufficient deterrent because it deals with only part of the sums involved in the charges of misconduct. Even if it did cover the entire sum, mere restitution of funds provides no deterrent to persons contemplating future misuse of funds.

Second, the $40,000 fine, to be imposed in monthly installments of $1,000, is based on the assumption that Mr. Powell will be reelected in 1968. I do not think that such an assumption is either safe or warranted.

Third, there is a possibility that Mr. Powell will appeal to the courts on the ground that a fine cannot be imposed for any reason other than absenteeism, and the courts could declare the fine unconstitutional.

Fourth, the seriousness of Mr. Powell's offenses raises the possibility that he may yet go to prison on criminal charges. The sentencing of a Member of Congress to prison would reflect on the integrity and honor of every other Member, just as the behavior of Mr. Powell has aroused indiscriminate public indignation against all of his colleagues.

Fifth, the argument that Mr. Powell's constituents will return him to Congress is not persuasive. Now that the committee has found him guilty, his constituents might decide they want a higher level of representation. In the event he were returned, the moral responsibility would be on his constituents, not on Congress. Furthermore, there is a possibility that the State of New York will determine that Mr. Powell does not qualify as an inhabitant of New York, and thus does not fulfill residency requirements for election to Congress and is ineligible to run for reelection.

Last, Mr. Powell has demonstrated himself totally unworthy of membership in the Congress of the United States, and I am opposed to our seating him.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of my amendment to House Resolution 278 at this point in the Record. I shall present both parts of the amendment at once, as the elimination of paragraph one of the whereas clause is necessary to the sense of my amendment to deny Mr. Powell his seat.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That Adam Clayton Powell, Representative-elect from the State of New York, ought not to have or hold a seat in the House of Representatives, and the seat to which he was elected is hereby declared vacant."

Change the whereas clause as follows: beginning with "whereas" on page one, strike out all down through "now, therefore be it." and insert the following:

"Whereas the Select Committee appointed Pursuant to H. Res. 1 (90th Congress) has reached the following conclusions:

"First, Adam Clayton Powell has repeatedly ignored the processes and authority of the courts in the State of New York in legal proceedings pending therein to which he is a party, and his contumacious conduct towards the court of that State has caused him on several occasions to be adjudicated in contempt thereof, thereby reflecting discredit upon and bringing into disrepute the House of Representatives and its Members.

"Second, as a Member of this House, Adam Clayton Powell improperly maintained on his clerk-hire payroll Y. Marjorie Flores (Mrs. Adam C. Powell) from August 14, 1964 to December 31, 1966, during which period either she performed no official duties whatever or such duties were not performed in Washington, D.C. or the State of New York as required by law.

"Third, as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, Adam Clayton Powell permitted and participated in improper use expenditures of government funds for private purposes.

"Fourth, the refusal of Adam Clayton Powell to cooperate with the Select Committee and the Special Subcommittee on Contracts of the House Administration Committee in their lawful inquiries authorized by the House of Representatives was contemptuous and was conduct unworthy of a Member; Now, therefore, be it".

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order. This is Tuesday, and we have another of the multitudinous messages from the President. I believe that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 19]

Adair
Annunzio
Ashley
Bevill
Bow
Cahill
Celler
Clausen, Don H.
Conyers
Corbett
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Diggs
Donohue
Dorn
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Foley
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gettys
Giaimo
Green, Oreg.
Holifield
Holland
Irwin
King, Calif.
Kleppe
Long, La.
McDonald, Mich.
Macdonald, Mass.
Marsh
Morse, Mass.
Murphy, Ill.
Myers
Nichols
Nix
Philbin
Poage
Pucinski
Resnick
Ronan
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Smith, Calif.
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Vigorito
Willis
Wright

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 376 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF SUSAN B. ANTHONY—GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, through an error, no notice was given to the Members of the House that I have asked for 60 minutes today to speak on Susan B. Anthony's birthday and to pay tribute to Jeanette Rankin. I hope that any Members who would like to say a word will do so.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES—PERMISSION TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by request, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, rule XI of the House provides that all committees of the House of Representatives other than the Committee on Appropriations shall have regular meeting days during the sessions of the Congress.

The same rule also provides that the committees of the House may adopt additional rules not inconsistent with the rules of the House.

In conformity with and carrying out the provisions of rule XI, the Committee on Rules today unanimously adopted the following rules of procedure for the Committee on Rules:

RULES FOR THE COMMITTEE ON RULES, ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY FEBRUARY 28, 1967

RULE 1. MEETINGS

The Committee on Rules shall meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday of each week while the Congress is in session. Meetings shall be called to order and presided over by the Chairman or, in the absence of the Chairman, by the ranking Majority Member of the Committee present as acting chairman.

Meetings and hearings of the Committee shall be open to the public except when a majority of the Committee determine that testimony received may bear upon matters affecting the national security. Executive sessions of the Committee shall be closed.

For the purpose of hearing testimony, a

majority of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

A printed transcript of any hearing or public meeting of the Committee may be had if the Chairman decides it is necessary, or if a majority of the Members request it.

A Tuesday meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with where, in the judgment of the Chairman, there is no need therefor, and additional meetings may be called by the Chairman or by written request of a majority of the Committee duly filed with the counsel of the Committee.

RULE 2. VOTING

No measure or recommendation shall be reported or tabled by the Committee unless a majority of the Committee is actually present.

A roll call vote of the Members of the Committee may be had upon the request of any Member.

RULE 3. REPORTING

Whenever the Committee authorizes the favorable reporting of a bill or resolution from the Committee, the Chairman or acting Chairman shall report the same or designate some Member of the Committee to report the same to the House, as provided in the Rules of the House.

RULE 4. COMMITTEE STAFFING

The professional and clerical staffs of the Committee shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of the members of the staffs and delegate such authority as the Chairman deems appropriate, with the exception of the Minority staff, who shall be selected by and under the general supervision and direction of the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

RULE 5. MISCELLANEOUS

The Committee shall prepare, maintain, and publish for the Members of the Committee, so far as practicable, a calendar listing all matters formally before it. Information on the Calendar shall include the numbers of the bills or resolutions, a brief description of a bill's contents, including the legislative committee reporting it and the name of the principal sponsoring Member. For purposes of this rule, matters formally before the Committee include: bills or resolutions over which the Committee has original jurisdiction, and bills or resolutions from other committees concerning which the chairman or designated member of such committee has requested a hearing in writing and forwarded to the Committee on Rules a copy of such bill or resolution as reported, together with the final printed committee report.

Upon adoption of the rules and procedures of the Committee at the opening of each Congress, the Chairman may have these rules and procedures printed in an early issue of The Congressional Record.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON SPACE NUCLEAR PROPULSION

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the letter request sent by the President to the Speaker amending his fiscal year 1968 budget to make specific provision for moving ahead with the development of a new nuclear rocket engine, known as Nerva II, as well as with certain other atomic energy projects.

At this time our attention has been focused on the tragic accident in the Apollo program which claimed the lives of three of our brave astronauts. I believe that I can fairly state that the reaction of the Congress and the country has been that we must get to the bottom in finding out the causes of the fire and take all the corrective actions necessary, but that we should not be deterred by this accident from pressing forward with the Apollo program and with our long-term goals in space.

In his budget message in January, the President laid before the Congress and the Nation the post-Apollo space program he and his advisers consider it is essential for the Nation to pursue, and the budget includes the funds needed in fiscal year 1968 for the program to proceed without a gap which would delay progress and force a dismantling of the skilled scientific, technical, and production teams that have been built up. These new programs include an Apollo applications program which will provide a long duration orbital workshop and laboratory for scientific, medical, and technological experiments and for further exploration of the moon; the Voyager program for unmanned exploration of the planets; and several other programs which will carry forward our aeronautical and space advances in the early 1970's.

In his message today, the President has recognized that in aeronautics and space it is not enough to plan only 5 years or so ahead, but that the Nation must also take the steps necessary to preserve our position in the late 1970's and beyond. This is the real significance of his recommendation today amending his fiscal year 1968 budget for both NASA and AEC to provide for a start of the Nerva II nuclear rocket engine.

For many years one of the most difficult but most successful programs for advancing space technology has been the joint effort of NASA and AEC in the development of nuclear rocket technology. There have been times when success was in doubt. But during the past 2 years the skilled and dedicated scientists and engineers in this program have proven without doubt the feasibility of space nuclear propulsion and have successfully tested engines with 55,000 pounds of thrust on the ground at the Nevada test site. Only last week the new Phoebus reactor was successfully tested at 1,500 megawatts.

The President's recommendation is that in fiscal year 1968 we build on the foundation of this successful preliminary work and undertake the development of a 200,000- to 250,000-pound-thrust engine which would be suitable for actual use in flight. As his letter states, this nuclear engine can be used to propel a new and more powerful third stage for the Saturn V launch vehicle we will be using in the Apollo program. The nuclear powered stage can about double the present payload of the Saturn V for many missions. In this way, the greater efficiency of nuclear propulsion can make a major increase in our space capabilities without an entirely new launch vehicle system to replace the Saturn V.

Nerva II will be a major development and it will take a long time. The important, and to me reassuring, thing is that the President's recommendation provides us a clear basis for assuring that in our concentration on today's problems in the Apollo program and on the important tasks to be done in the immediate post-Apollo period, we have not lost sight of the Nation's long-term interests in space and have not foreclosed, through failure to take necessary steps when they have to be taken, opportunities and options that may be vitally important to us 10 years and more from now.

The President's recommendations are that a total of $91 million—$41 million for AEC and $50 million for NASA—be authorized and appropriated for the Nerva II program in fiscal year 1968. These amounts do not increase the total budget. In the January total they were included in the allowance for contingencies and the President is now making his formal recommendation that they be added to the amounts previously recommended for NASA and AEC.

NUCLEAR ROCKET PROGRAM

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to call the attention of the House to the importance of the letter the President sent to the Speaker today amending the President's fiscal year 1968 budget to make a specific and strong recommendation that the country proceed to develop the Nerva II nuclear rocket engine.

The Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology, which I have the honor to chair, has long been in the forefront of the effort to speed the development of nuclear rocket engines. My colleagues have been concerned that we not neglect the advances in technology which are absolutely necessary if we are not to fall behind once again in the future.

We all remember that the one field in which the launching of Sputnik in 1957 caught us the furthest behind was propulsion. Since that time what we have been able to do in space, in Mercury, in Gemini, and in our scientific satellites and space probes, has been largely limited by the propulsion capabilities we have had. With the development of the Saturn I–B and the Saturn V, we are gaining the propulsion capability we need for the programs we now have planned, but we would be repeating a tragic mistake if we do not also take in advance the steps that are necessary to avoid finding ourselves in the same position again. Personally, I feel we should also push forward with the development of the 260-inch solid rocket motor which NASA wants to put on the shelf.

In recommending that we proceed now with the development of the Nerva II

200,000- to 250,000-pound nuclear rocket engine, the President is urging a step that we can and must take to insure the success of our space program in the future.

I believe that nuclear propulsion and also solid rocket propulsion are not only technologically advanced forms of space propulsion but also the most efficient for most types of large space operations—the kinds of operations that we must be able to undertake in the late 1970's. If we do not start development of the nuclear rocket engine and the solid rocket engine now, we will not be able to make these choices. Inaction now will predetermine what we can and cannot do 10 years and more from now.

I believe that the Congress should carefully consider and give strong support to the NASA and AEC budget amendments for space nuclear propulsion the President has now recommended. I also feel that support should be given to the development of the 260-inch program. Together with the recommendations in the January budget for carrying forward our current programs and those we need to start in fiscal year 1968, the amendments give us a sound and balanced program for meeting the current, future and long-term needs of the Nation in aeronautics and space.

EDUCATION AND HEALTH IN AMERICA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 68)

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In Edmonds, Wash., three new evening classes today are helping 150 high school dropouts finish school and gain new job skills.

In Detroit, a month ago, 52,000 children were immunized against measles, during a campaign assisted by Federal funds.

In 25 States, Federal funds are helping improve medical care for 6.4 million citizens who get public assistance.

Over 8 million poor children are now getting a better education because of funds provided under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Nineteen million older citizens enjoy the protection of medicare.

Three years ago, not one of these programs existed.

Today, they are flourishing—because a concerned people and the creative 89th Congress acted. They are the result of 24 new health laws and 18 new education laws.

But even the best new programs are not enough.

Today, we face major challenges of organization and evaluation. If our new projects are to be effective, we must have the people to run them, and the facilities to support them. We must encourage States and localities to plan more effectively and comprehensively for their growing needs and to measure their progress toward meeting those needs.

Above all, each community, each State, must generate a spirit of creative change; a willingness to experiment.

In this, my fourth message to Congress on health and education, I do not recommend more of the same—but more that is better: to solve old problems, to create new institutions, to fulfill the potential of each individual in our land.

Nothing is more fundamental to all we seek than our programs in health and education:

Education—because it not only overcomes ignorance, but arms the citizen against the other evils which afflict him.

Health—because disease is the cruelest enemy of individual promise and because medical progress makes less and less tolerable that illness still should blight so many lives.

I. EDUCATION

I believe that future historians, when they point to the extraordinary changes which have marked the 1960's, will identify a major movement forward in American education.

This movement, spurred by the laws of the last 3 years, seeks to provide equality of educational opportunity to all Americans—to give every child education of the highest quality, no matter how poor his family, how great his handicap, what color his skin, or where he lives.

We cannot yet fully measure the results of this great movement in American education. Our progress can be traced partially by listing some of the extraordinary bills I have signed into law:

The Higher Education Act of 1965.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1964.

The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963.

The scale of our efforts can be partially measured by the fact that today appropriations for the Office of Education are nearly seven times greater than 4 years ago. Today we can point to at least 1 million college students who might not be in college except for Government loans, grants and work-study programs, and to more than 17,500 school districts helping disadvantaged children under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

This breakthrough is not the work of Washington alone. The ideas for these programs come from educational leaders all over the country. Many different communities must supply the energy to make these programs work. Yet they are national programs, shaped by national needs. Congress has played a vital role in reviewing these needs and setting these priorities.

The new Federal role in education is, in reality, a new alliance with America's States and local communities. In this alliance, the Federal Government continues to be a junior partner:

Local school districts will submit, and State governments will approve, the plans for spending more than $1 billion this year to improve the education of poor children.

Federal funds for vocational education are administered through State plans controlled by State, not Federal, officials.

The recommendations of the States have been sought and followed in more than 95 percent of the projects for centers and services which are funded by the U.S. Office of Education.

The education programs I recommend this year have three major aims:

To strengthen the foundations we have laid in recent years, by revising, improving, and consolidating existing programs.

To provide special help to those groups in our society with special needs: the poor, the handicapped, victims of discrimination or neglect.

To build for the future by exploiting the new opportunities presented by science, technology and the world beyond our borders.

The budget proposals I am making for 1968 will carry forward our efforts at a new level. The total Federal dollar expenditures for educational purposes, including health training, which I have proposed for fiscal 1968 will amount to $11 billion—an increase of $1 billion, or 10 percent, over 1967 and $7 billion, or 175 percent, over 1963.

STRENGTHENING EDUCATION PROGRAMS

State and community education leaders have shouldered heavy new burdens as a result of recent increases in Federal programs. If these officials are to develop wise and long-range plans for education, they must have more help.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act has provided funds to strengthen State departments of education. But additional funds are needed—money to improve community, State, and regional educational planning. Nothing can do more to ensure the effective use of Federal dollars.

I recommend legislation authorizing $15 million to help State and local governments evaluate their education programs and plan for the future.

A BETTER EDUCATION TIMETABLE

One condition which severely hampers educational planning is the congressional schedule for authorizations and appropriations. When Congress enacts and funds programs near the end of a session, the Nation's schools and colleges must plan their programs without knowing what Federal resources will be available to them to meet their needs. As so many Governors have said, the Federal legislative calendar often proves incompatible with the academic calendar.

I urge that the Congress enact education appropriations early enough to allow the Nation's schools and colleges to plan effectively. I have directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to work with the Congress toward this end.

Another way to ease this problem is to seek the earliest practical renewal of authorization for major education measures.

I recommend that Congress this year extend three major education measures now scheduled to expire in June 1968:

The National Defense Education Act of 1958.

The Higher Education Act of 1965.

The National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965.

IMPROVING PROGRAM EVALUATION

Most of our education programs have been operating too short a time to provide conclusive judgments about their effectiveness. But we should be heartened by the evaluations so far.

Recently, the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children reported:

> The morale of teachers and administrators in schools with many poor children—their will to succeed and their belief in the possibility of succeeding—is perceptibly on the rise in many of the schools visited. More teachers than ever are involved in an active search for paths to success. The paths are not all clearly visible as yet, but decidedly the search has taken on a new vigor.

The Council did identify problems and weaknesses in the school districts. Our efforts to identify shortcomings and to assess our progress can never be fully effective until we provide sufficient resources for program evaluation.

I have requested $2.5 million to assure careful analysis of new programs so that we can provide a full accounting to the Congress and the American people of our successes and shortcomings.

THE EDUCATION PROFESSIONS ACT OF 1967

Our work to enrich education finds its focus in a single person: the classroom teacher, who inspires each student to achieve his best.

Next year, more than 170,000 new teachers will be needed to replace uncertified teachers, to fill vacancies and to meet rising student enrollments. Moreover:

There are severe shortages of English, Mathematics, Science and elementary school teachers.

More teachers are needed for our colleges and junior colleges.

Well-trained administrators at all levels are critically needed.

New kinds of school personnel—such as teachers aids—are needed to help in the schools.

By 1975, the Nation's schools will need nearly 2 million more new teachers.

To help meet this growing demand, the Federal Government has sponsored a number of programs to train and improve teachers.

These programs, though they have been effective, have been too fragmented to achieve their full potential and too limited to reach many essential sectors of the teaching profession. Teacher aids and school administrators have not been eligible to participate.

We must develop a broader approach to training for the education professions. At the State and local level, education authorities must have greater flexibility to plan for their educational manpower needs.

I recommend the Education Professions Act of 1967 to:

Combine and expand many of the scattered statutory authorities for teacher training assistance.

Provide new authority for the training of school administrators, teacher aids, and other education workers for schools and colleges.

IMPROVING STUDENT LOAN PROGRAMS

In the Higher Education Act of 1965, Congress authorized a program to support State guarantees for student loans made by banks and other lending institutions. For students of modest means, the Federal Government also subsidizes the interest cost.

The program has become an example of creative cooperation between the Federal Government, the States, private financial institutions, and the academic community.

Though it began in a time of tight credit, the program is off to a promising start. This year, it is expected that loans totaling $400 million will be made to nearly 480,000 students. By 1972, outstanding loans are expected to total $6.5 billion.

I have asked all of the Government officials concerned with the program—the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Budget, and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers—to review its operations in consultation with State and private organizations concerned.

If administrative changes in the program are necessary, we will make them. If any amendments to the legislation are in order, we will submit appropriate recommendations to the Congress.

SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR SPECIAL NEEDS

EDUCATING POOR CHILDREN

Over the past 2 years, we have invested more than $2.6 billion in improving educational opportunities for more than 10 million poor children. This has been an ambitious venture, for no textbook offers precise methods for dealing with the disadvantaged. It has also been rewarding: we have generated new energy, gained new workers, and developed new skills in our effort to help the least fortunate.

Dollars alone cannot do the job—but the job cannot be done without dollars.

So let us continue the programs we have begun under Headstart and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Let us begin new efforts—like the Headstart followthrough program which can carry forward into the early grades the gains made under Headstart.

THE TEACHER CORPS

Young as it is, the Teacher Corps has become a symbol of new hope for America's poor children and their parents—and for hard-pressed school administrators.

More than 1,200 interns and veteran teachers have volunteered for demanding assignments in city and rural slums. Teacher Corps volunteers are at work in 275 schools throughout the country: helping children in 20 of our 25 largest cities, in Appalachia, in the Ozarks, in Spanish-speaking communities.

The impact of these specialists goes far beyond their number. For they represent an important idea: that the schools in our Nation's slums deserve a fair share of our Nation's best teachers.

Mayors and school officials across the country cite the competence, the energy, and the devotion which Teacher Corps members are bringing to these tasks.

Perhaps the best measure of the vitality of the Teacher Corps is the demand by school districts for volunteers and the number of young Americans who want to join. Requests from local schools exceed by far the number of volunteers we can now train. Ten times as many young Americans as we can presently accept—among them, some of our brightest college graduates—have applied for Teacher Corps service.

The Teacher Corps, which I recommended and which the 89th Congress established, deserves the strong support of the 90th Congress.

I recommend that the Teacher Corps be expanded to a total of 5,500 volunteers by the school year beginning in September 1968.

I propose amendments to enhance the role of the States in training and assigning Teacher Corps members.

Finally, to finance next summer's training program, I strongly recommend early action on a supplemental appropriation request of $12.5 million for the Teacher Corps in fiscal year 1967.

EDUCATING THE HANDICAPPED

One child in 10 in our country is afflicted with a handicap which, if left untreated, severely cripples his chance to become a productive adult.

In my message on children and youth, I proposed measures to bring better health care to these children—the mentally retarded, the crippled, the chronically ill.

We must also give attention to their special educational needs. We must more precisely identify the techniques that will be effective in helping handicapped children to learn.

We need many more teachers who have the training essential to help these children. There are now only 70,000 specially trained teachers of the handicapped—a small fraction of the number the Nation requires. In the next decade, five times that number must be trained and put to work.

I recommend legislation to:

Establish regional resource centers to identify the educational needs of handicapped children and help their parents and teachers meet those needs.

Recruit more men and women for careers in educating the handicapped.

Extend the service providing captioned films and other instructional materials for the deaf to all handicapped people.

ENDING DISCRIMINATION

Giving every American an equal chance for education requires that we put an end once and for all to racial segregation in our schools.

In the Civil Rights Act of 1964, this Nation committed itself to eliminating segregation. Yet patterns of discrimination are still entrenched in many communities, North and South, East and West.

If equal opportunity is to be more than a slogan in our society, every State and community must be encouraged to face up to this legal and moral responsibility.

I have requested $30 million—nearly a fourfold increase over this year's appropriation—to provide the needed resources under title IV of the Civil Rights Act to help States and communities face the problems of school desegregation.

EDUCATION FOR THE WORLD OF WORK

Three out of 10 students in America drop out before completing high school.

Only two out of 10 of our Nation's young men and women receive college degrees.

Too few of these young people get the training and guidance they need to find good jobs.

I recommend legislation to aid secondary schools and colleges to develop new programs in vocational education, to make work part of the learning experience and to provide career counseling for their students.

A number of our colleges have highly successful programs of cooperative education which permit students to vary periods of study with periods of employment. This is an important educational innovation that has demonstrated its effectiveness. It should be applied more widely in our schools and universities.

I recommend an amendment of the college work-study program which will for the first time permit us to support cooperative education projects.

I am also requesting the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Secretary of Labor to use Neighborhood Youth Corps funds at the high school level for this purpose.

COMBATING ADULT ILLITERACY

At least 3 million adults in America cannot read or write. Another 13 million have less than an eighth-grade education. Many of these citizens lack the basic learning to cope with the routine business of daily life.

This is a national tragedy and an economic loss for which each one of us must pay.

The Adult Education Act, enacted last year, is our pledge to help eliminate this needless loss of human talent.

This year, I am requesting $44 million—an increase of nearly 50 percent—for adult basic education programs.

These funds will help new projects, sponsored by both public agencies and nonprofit private groups, to train volunteers for work in adult literacy programs and to establish neighborhood education programs reaching beyond the formal classroom.

BUILDING FOR TOMORROW

PUBLIC TELEVISION

In 1951, the Federal Communications Commission set aside the first 242 television channels for noncommercial broadcasting, declaring:

> The public interest will be clearly served if these stations contribute significantly to the educational process of the Nation.

The first educational television station went on the air in May 1953. Today, there are 178 noncommercial television stations on the air or under construction. Since 1963 the Federal Government has provided $32 million under the Educational Television Facilities Act to help build towers, transmitters, and other facilities. These funds have helped stations with an estimated potential audience of close to 150 million citizens.

Yet we have only begun to grasp the great promise of this medium, which, in the words of one critic, has the power to "arouse our dreams, satisfy our hunger for beauty, take us on journeys, enable us to participate in events, present great drama and music, explore the sea and the sky and the winds and the hills."

Noncommercial television can bring its audience the excitement of excellence in every field. I am convinced that a vital and self-sufficient noncommercial television system will not only instruct, but inspire and uplift our people.

Practically all noncommercial stations have serious shortages of the facilities, equipment, money, and staff they need to present programs of high quality. There are not enough stations. Interconnections between stations are inadequate and seldom permit the timely scheduling of current programs.

Noncommercial television today is reaching only a fraction of its potential audience—and achieving only a fraction of its potential worth.

Clearly, the time has come to build on the experience of the past 14 years, the important studies that have been made, and the beginnings we have made.

I recommend that Congress enact the Public Television Act of 1967 to:

Increase Federal funds for television and radio facility construction to $10.5 million in fiscal 1968, more than three times this year's appropriations.

Create a Corporation for Public Television authorized to provide support to noncommercial television and radio.

Provide $9 million in fiscal 1968 as initial funding for the Corporation.

Next year, after careful review, I will make further proposals for the Corporation's long-term financing.

Noncommercial television and radio in America, even though supported by Federal funds, must be absolutely free from any Federal Government interference over programing. As I said in the state of the Union message, "we should insist that the public interest be fully served through the public's airwaves."

The Board of Directors of the Corporation for public television should include American leaders in education, communications, and the creative arts. I recommend that the Board be comprised of 15 members, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

The Corporation would provide support to establish production centers and to help local stations improve their proficiency. It would be authorized to accept funds from other sources, public and private.

The strength of public television should lie in its diversity. Every region and every community should be challenged to contribute its best.

Other opportunities for the Corporation exist to support vocational training for young people who desire careers in public television, to foster research and development, and to explore new ways to serve the viewing public.

One of the Corporation's first tasks should be to study the practicality and the economic advantages of using communication satellites to establish an educational television and radio network. To assist the Corporation, I am directing the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct experiments on the requirements for such a system, and for instructional television, in cooperation with other interested agencies of the Government and the private sector.

Formulation of long-range policies concerning the future of satellite communications requires the most detailed and comprehensive study by the executive branch and the Congress. I anticipate that the appropriate committees of Congress will hold hearings to consider these complex issues of public policy. The executive branch will carefully study these hearings as we shape our recommendations.

INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION

I recommend legislation to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to launch a major study of the value and the promise of instructional television which is being used more and more widely in our classrooms, but whose potential has not been fully developed.

COMPUTERS IN EDUCATION

In my 1968 budget, I propose that the National Science Foundation be given new resources to advance man's knowledge and serve the Nation. Its endeavors will help our scholars better to understand the atmosphere, exploit the ocean's riches, probe the behavior and the nature of man.

The Foundation will also step up its pioneer work to develop new teaching materials for our schools and colleges. The "new math" and the "new science" are only the first fruits of this innovative work.

One educational resource holds exciting promise for America's classrooms: the electronic computer. Computers are already at work in educational institutions, primarily to assist the most advanced research. The computer can serve other educational purposes—if we find ways to employ it effectively and economically and if we develop practical courses to teach students how to use it.

I have directed the National Science Foundation working with the U.S. Office of Education to establish an experimental program for developing the potential of computers in education.

ENRICHING THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

Our progress will not be limited to scientific advances. The National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, established in 1965, has already begun to bring new cultural and scholarly spirit to our schools and communities. State arts councils, museums, theaters, and orchestras have received not only new funds but new energy and enthusiasm through the National Endowment for the Arts.

The National Endowment for the Humanities has made grants to support new historical studies of our Nation's heritage, to encourage creative teaching in our colleges, to offer outstanding young scholars opportunities for advancement.

I recommend that Congress appropriate for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities $16 million—an increase of nearly one-third.

HIGHER EDUCATION FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

For many years, American's colleges and universities have prepared men and women for careers involving travel, trade, and service abroad. Today, when our world responsibilities are greater than ever before, our domestic institutions of higher learning need more support for their programs of international studies.

The 89th Congress, in its closing days, passed the International Education

Act—an historic measure recognizing this Nation's enduring belief that learning must transcend geographic boundaries. Through a program of grants under the act, America's schools, colleges, and universities can add a world dimension to their students' learning experience.

I urge the Congress to approve promptly my forthcoming request for a supplemental appropriation of $350,000 for the International Education Act, to permit necessary planning for next year's program, as well as an appropriation of $20 million for fiscal 1968.

II. HEALTH

No great age of discovery in history can match our own time. Today, our wealth, our knowledge, our scientific genius give us the power to prolong man's life—and to prevent the erosion of life by illness.

In 1900, an American could expect to live only 49 years. Today, his life expectancy has been increased to 70 years.

These advances are the result of spectacular progress in research, in public health, in the medical arts. We have developed:

Sufficient knowledge to end nearly all of the hazards of childbirth and pregnancy.

Modern nutrition to wipe out such ailments as rickets, goiter, and pellagra.

Vaccines, antibiotics, and modern drugs to control many of the killers and cripplers of yesterday: polio, diphtheria, pneumonia.

New medical and surgical techniques to combat cancer and cardiovascular disease.

Lifesaving devices: plastic heart valves, and artificial artery transplants.

In 1967, to pursue this vital work, the Federal Government is investing more than $440 million in the construction of health facilities, $620 million for health manpower education and training, $1.3 billion in biomedical research, $7.8 billion to provide medical care.

But each gain, each victory, should focus our attention more sharply on the unfinished business facing this Nation in the field of health:

Infant mortality is far higher than it need be.

Handicaps afflicting many children are discovered too late or left untreated.

Grave deficiencies remain in health care for the poor, the handicapped, and the chronically ill.

American men between the ages of 45 and 54—which should be the most productive years of their lives—have a death rate twice that of men of the same age in a number of advanced countries.

We still search in vain for ways to prevent and treat many forms of cancer.

Many types of mental illness, retardation, arthritis, and heart disease are still largely beyond our control.

Our national resources for health have grown, but our national aspirations have grown faster. Today we expect what yesterday we could not have envisioned—adequate medical care for every citizen.

My health proposals to the 90th Congress have four basic aims:

To expand our knowledge of disease and our research and development of better ways to deliver health care to every American;

To build our health resources, by stepped up training of health workers and by improved planning of health facilities;

To remove barriers to good medical care for those who most need care;

To strengthen our partnership for health by encouraging regional, State, and local efforts—public and private—to develop comprehensive programs serving all our citizens.

HEALTH RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT: THE FOUNDATION OF OUR EFFORTS

SUPPORTING BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH

Our progress in health grows out of a research effort unparalleled anywhere in the world. The scientists of the National Institutes of Health have shaped an alliance throughout the Nation to find the causes and the cures of disease.

We must build on the strong base of past research achievements, exchange ideas with scholars and students from all parts of the world, and apply our knowledge more swiftly and effectively.

We must take advantage of our progress in targeted research as we have done in our vaccine development program, in the heart drug study, in artificial kidney and kidney transplant research, and in the treatment of specific types of cancer.

In the 1968 budget, I am recommending an increase of $65 million—to an annual total of almost $1.5 billion—to support biomedical research.

I am seeking funds to establish an International Center for Advanced Study in the Health Sciences and to provide scholarships and fellowships in the Center.

I am directing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to appoint immediately a lung cancer task force, to supplement the continuing work of existing task forces on leukemia, cancer chemotherapy, uterine cancer, solid tumor, and breast cancer.

HEALTH SERVICES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

America's annual spending for health and medical care is more than $43 billion. But despite this investment, our system of providing health services is not operating as efficiently and effectively as it should.

In some U.S. counties infant mortality rates, one yardstick of health care, are 300 percent higher than the national average.

Seventy percent of automobile accident deaths occur in communities of less than 2,500 people, where medical facilities are often poorest.

Even though we have good techniques for detecting and curing cervical cancer, 8,000 women die each year for lack of proper care.

Emergency rooms in U.S. hospitals are seriously overcrowded, not with actual emergency cases, but with people who cannot find normal outpatient care anywhere else.

Research and development could help eliminate these conditions by pointing the way to better delivery of health care. Yet the Government-wide total investment in health service research amounts to less than one-tenth of 1 percent of our total annual investment in health care.

We have done very little to mobilize American universities, industry, private practitioners, and research institutions to seek new ways of providing medical services.

There have been few experiments in applying advanced methods—systems analysis and automation, for example—to problems of health care.

Our superior research techniques have brought us new knowledge in health and medicine. These same techniques must now be put to work in the effort to bring low-cost, quality health care to our citizens.

We must marshal the Nation's best minds to:

Design hospitals, nursing homes, and group practice facilities which provide effective care with the most efficient use of funds and manpower;

Develop new ways of assisting doctors to reach more people with good health services;

Devise new patterns of health services.

To begin this effort, I have directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish a National Center for Health Services Research and Development.

I recommend legislation to expand health services research and make possible the fullest use of Federal hospitals as research centers to improve health care.

I also recommend an appropriation of $20 million to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1968, for research and development in health services—nearly twice as much as in 1967.

DEVELOPING MANPOWER AND FACILITIES FOR HEALTH

HEALTH MANPOWER

The United States is facing a serious shortage of health manpower. Within the next decade this Nation will need 1 million more health workers. If we are to meet this need, we must develop new skills and new types of health workers. We need short-term training programs for medical aids and other health workers; we need programs to develop physicians' assistants, and speed the training of health professions. We also need to make effective use of the thousands of medical corpsmen trained in the Armed Forces who return to civilian life each year.

Last May, I appointed a National Advisory Commission on Health Manpower to recommend how we can:

Speed the education of doctors and other health personnel without sacrificing the quality of training;

Improve the use of health manpower both in and outside the Government.

Meanwhile, I directed members of my Cabinet to intensify their efforts to relieve health manpower shortages through Federal programs. This week they reported to me that federally supported programs in 1967 will train 224,000 health workers—an increase of nearly 100,000 over 1966. Thirty thousand previously inactive nurses and technicians will be given refresher training this year.

Through the teamwork of Federal and State agencies, professional organizations, and educational institutions, we have launched a major effort to provide facilities and teachers for this immense training mission.

To maintain this stepped-up training already started in fiscal year 1967, I am recommending expenditures of $763 million—a 22-percent increase for fiscal year 1968—to expand our health manpower resources.

PLANNING FOR FUTURE HEALTH FACILITIES

Over the past two decades, the Hill-Burton program has assisted more than 3,400 communities to build hospitals, nursing homes, and other health care centers. Hill-Burton funds have helped to provide 350,000 hospital and nursing home beds, and to bring modern medical services to millions of Americans. The authorization for this program expires on June 30, 1969. The contribution of the Federal Government in financing construction of health facilities has changed, especially with the beginning of medicare, medicaid, and other new programs. It is timely, therefore, that we take a fresh look at this area.

I am appointing a National Advisory Commission on Health Facilities to study our needs for the total system of health facilities—hospitals, extended care facilities, nursing homes, long-term care institutions, and clinics. In addition to considering the future of the Hill-Burton program, the Commission will make recommendations for financing the construction and modernization of health facilities.

ELIMINATING BARRIERS TO HEALTH CARE

In previous messages to Congress this year, I have made recommendations to:

Extend medicare to 1.5 million seriously disabled Americans under age 65.

Establish new health services through broader maternal and child health programs; a strengthened crippled children's program, and new projects in child health and dental care.

Improve medical services for the needy under medicaid.

Combat mental retardation by supporting construction of university and community centers for the mentally retarded, and for the first time, helping to staff the community centers.

Guarantee the safety of medical devices and laboratory tests by requiring Food and Drug Administration preclearance of devices, and by requiring licensing of clinical laboratories in interstate commerce.

We must act in other ways to overcome barriers to health care.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has developed a program of neighborhood health centers which not only bring modern medical care to the poor but also train citizens for jobs in the health field.

Last year, Congress endorsed this new approach and authorized funds for 24 such centers. More are needed.

I am requesting the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to encourage communities to establish additional centers. Our goal will be to double the number of centers in fiscal 1968.

In the past 4 years, we have launched a new program to attack mental illness through community mental health centers. This program is now well underway. More centers are needed, and we must strengthen and expand existing services.

I recommend legislation to extend and improve the Community Mental Health Centers Act.

Among the most tragically neglected of our citizens are those who are both deaf and blind. More than 3,000 Americans today face life unable to see and hear.

To help reach the deaf-blind with the best programs our experts can devise, I recommend legislation to establish a National Center for the Deaf and Blind.

ENDING HOSPITAL DISCRIMINATION

With the launching of the medicare program last July, the Nation took a major step toward ending racial segregation in hospitals.

More than 95 percent of the Nation's hospitals have already complied with the antidiscrimination requirements of the medicare legislation. They are guaranteeing that there will be no "second-class patients" in our health-care institutions; that all citizens can enter the same door, enjoy the same facilities, and the same quality of treatment.

We will continue to work for progress in this field—until equality of treatment is the rule not in some, but in all of our hospitals and other health facilities.

RISING MEDICAL COSTS

In 1950, the average cost per patient per day in a hospital was $14.40. In 1965, this cost more than tripled to over $45. Other health costs have also risen sharply in recent years.

Last August, I asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to initiate a study of medical costs. This study, now completed, indicates that medical costs will almost certainly continue to rise. It emphasizes the absolute necessity of using medical resources more efficiently if we are to moderate this increase in the cost of health care.

This is a job for everyone who plays a part in providing or financing medical care—the medical profession, the hospital industry, insurance carriers, State and local governments, and many other private and public groups. Federal programs must also play a role in promoting cost consciousness in medical care.

The new National Center for Health Services Research and Development will develop ways to make our medical systems more efficient. The Center's first assignment will be to develop new ways to improve the use of professional and auxiliary health workers—a key factor in reducing hospital costs.

We can take other steps.

I am directing Secretary John Gardner to convene at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a National Conference on Medical Costs.

This Conference will bring together leaders of the medical community and members of the public to discuss how we can lower the costs of medical services without impairing the quality.

In the weeks and months ahead, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will consult with representatives of the medical profession, universities, business, and labor to:

Find practical incentives for the effective operation of hospitals and other health facilities.

Reduce the costs of construction and speed the modernization of hospitals, nursing homes, and extended care facilities.

Support those innovations in medical education which will lead to better training programs and promote the efficient practice of medicine.

OUR PARTNERSHIP FOR HEALTH

The partnership for health legislation, enacted by the 89th Congress, is designed to strengthen State and local programs and to encourage broad gage planning in health. It gives the States new flexibility to use Federal funds by freeing them from tightly compartmentalized grant programs. It also allows the States to attack special health problems which have special regional or local impact.

I recommend that Congress extend the partnership for health legislation for 4 years; provide supplemental appropriations for planning in fiscal 1967 and total appropriations of $161 million—an increase of $41 million—in fiscal 1968.

Our regional medical programs for heart disease, cancer, and stroke depend on a second partnership, involving doctors, medical schools, hospitals, and State and local health departments. These programs will bring to every citizen the fruits of our Nation's research into the killer diseases. They will also promote the continuing education of the Nation's doctors, nurses, and other health workers.

To sustain these nationwide programs, I recommend an appropriation of $64 million for fiscal 1968—an increase of $19 million over 1967.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

Occupational health and safety is another area in which we need to strengthen our partnership with labor, industry, medicine, and government.

In 1965, more than 14,000 job-connected deaths and 2 million disabling work injuries caused untold misery and privation to workers, 230 million lost man-days of production, and billions of dollars in lost income.

We must learn more about the nature of job-connected injuries, so we can get effective safety standards and develop better protective measures.

I am recommending in the 1968 budget an appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of $8.1 million—a 25-percent increase over this year—to expand research and training programs in occupational health, and to strengthen State and local public health programs in this field.

I am directing the Secretary of Labor to improve and strengthen health protection and safety standards for workers through cooperative Federal-State programs.

III. TO FULFILL THE INDIVIDUAL

As a people, we have wanted many things, achieved many things. We have become the richest, the mightiest, the most productive nation in the world.

Yet a nation may accumulate dollars, grow in power, pile stone on stone—and still fall short of greatness. The measure of a people is not how much they achieve—but what they achieve.

Which of our pursuits is most worthy of our devotion? If we were required to choose, I believe we would place one item at the top of the list: fulfillment of the individual.

If that is what we seek, mere wealth and power cannot help us. We must also act—in definable and practical ways—to liberate each individual from conditions which stunt his growth, assault his dignity, diminish his spirit. Those enemies we know: ignorance, illness, want, squalor, tyranny, injustice.

To fulfill the individual—this is the purpose of my proposals. They present an opportunity—and an obligation—to the 90th Congress.

I hope and believe this Congress will live up to the high expectations of a progressive and humanitarian America.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 28, 1967.*

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON EDUCATION AND HEALTH

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I commend President Johnson for his message on education and health.

The President's proposals go to the heart of our Nation's health and education needs by strengthening those programs which have proven to be successful, and by bold, new initiatives designed to insure continuing progress in the years ahead.

These proposals are among the most vitally important to the American people that we will be considering during this session of Congress. Inherent in them are two of the most fundamental propositions of democratic life; namely, the right of each and every American to receive an adequate education that will prepare him for responsible citizenship; and the right of all our people to have the best health and medical services a rich and progressive nation can provide.

In his message, the President speaks of the "fulfillment of the individual" as being most worthy of our devotion as a great nation and a great people. This fulfillment, the President notes, requires the skill and courage necessary to curb the conditions that thwart free human expression and creativity—ignorance, illness, want, tyranny, and injustice.

These are old nemeses—as old as mankind itself. But we now possess the means—for the first time in history—to convert unprecedented human knowledge into the progress of all mankind.

We are investing much of our national wealth to help train and educate our youth. Under the leadership of President Johnson, we have begun a wide range of educational programs that will insure the quality of our schools and institutions for generations to come.

We have also broadened the coverage, upgraded the quality, and sought new breakthroughs in all areas of health care and research available to the public.

But we know too that our work has only begun. There can be no respite from our responsibilities to create the best possible educational system and health programs available anywhere in the world.

President Johnson is now asking us to move responsibly in three broad areas of educational need: help for local and State agencies to evaluate their education programs; a stepped-up program for the National Teacher Corps; and new efforts to improve vocational training and adult education programs.

In the field of health, he is asking that we continue to build on the accomplishments of the 89th Congress and expand support for cancer and biomedical research. We must also consider new programs to improve health protection for our industrial workers—a reform that is long overdue, in my opinion.

We are also being asked to extend medicare coverage to seriously disabled persons under 65; open up new neighborhood health centers for those in poverty; and undertake new initiatives to help the deaf and the blind.

In short, this Congress has been asked to complete some of the most important unfinished business of the Nation.

I have every reason to believe that we in Congress will support President Johnson as he leads us in our effort to equate the American birthright with full opportunity for health and knowledge.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend President Johnson for initiating the most meaningful and appropriate memorial to our late and beloved colleague, Representative John Fogarty.

In his message on health, the President has proposed the creation of the John E. Fogarty Center for Advanced Study in International Health Sciences. This Center would operate in conjunction with a scholarship and fellowship program.

No memorial to John Fogarty could be more fitting than this. For 26 years, this great legislator was in the vanguard of action to improve the quality and quantity of health care and research for the American people. He was the articulate spokesman for most of the pioneering health legislation that has been passed in recent years. This legacy is embodied in much of the President's health message. It is safe to say that the Fogarty legacy will be felt by generations of Americans far into the future.

I know that I speak for all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle when I say that we shall miss this man of integrity, courage, and tenacity. We shall miss him as a leader of noble causes—and we shall miss him as a noble friend.

I think I can speak for us all when I say that the John E. Fogarty Center would be the kind of memorial worthy of the man himself.

I commend the President for proposing such a fitting memorial tribute. And I believe that this proposal will receive the prompt and positive action that it deserves.

ADMINISTRATION PROPOSALS ON EDUCATION

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a detailed explanation of the bill H.R. 6230.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have been pleased today to introduce H.R. 6230, the administration's proposed legislation in the field of elementary and secondary education. At the same time, I would like to announce to the membership that the House Education and Labor Committee will proceed to an early consideration of the legislation, and in this connection, hearings will begin on Thursday of this week at 9:30 a.m. with testimony from the U.S. Office of Education.

The fact that certain portions of existing authorizations are due to expire on June 30 of this year require our attention to these proposals. For example, the temporary provisions of Public Law 815 dealing with impacted areas school construction expires on June 30. Provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 strengthening educational opportunities in the Bureau of Indian Affairs schools for the benefit of Indian children are due to expire this June 30. Provisions to strengthen the educational resources of our overseas schools for dependent children of military personnel under titles II and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 also expire at that time.

It will be noted from the accompanying fact sheets that I shall place in the RECORD following my remarks that H.R. 6230 also proposes additions and changes to this important act.

I am extremely hopeful that the committee can give favorable consideration to a longer period of authorization for the entire Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Such a move would enable a much better planning and use of Federal funds in these important educational programs and at the same time assure school systems with the funding of projects at appropriate times prior to the beginning of academic years.

I am extremely hopeful that the committee may present to the House legislative recommendations on the President's proposals in a very short time so that school administrators and school personnel may have adequate lead time to assure that the benefits of the act will redound in improved instruction and new and better opportunities for our young schoolchildren.

Fact sheets and other data concerning the legislation follow:

I. EXTENSION OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

BACKGROUND AND NEED

Passage of the Higher Education Act in the closing days of the first session of the 89th Congress marked the culmination of an unprecedented legislative commitment to the goal of educational opportunity for all Americans. As President Johnson noted in signing the Act into law on November 8, 1965, no less than two dozen education measures were enacted by Congress during 1965. This Act, one of the keystones of the 89th Congress, was characterized by the President as the key which unlocks a new door for the young people of America: "the most important door that will ever open—the door to education."

The past year and a half have proved the truth of this statement. Programs supported by the Higher Education Act have touched the students and colleges—and, indeed, citizens and their communities—in every State in this country. This is an age when we are calling on all the resources of this Nation to help develop the Nation. Only through total commitment and total involvement can we assure equal educational opportunity. The Higher Education Act forms one of the bases for this commitment.

Title I—This Title provides funds to institutions of higher education to support extension and continuing education programs designed to solve community problems and to meet the continuing educational needs of citizens whose formal education has been terminated or interrupted. Fifty years ago, when most Americans were engaged in rural occupations, Congress responded to the challenge by enacting the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, which made instruction, research, and extension services widely available through land-grant colleges. Today, when 70 percent of our population live in urban areas, Title I takes up the challenge of meeting the physical and educational needs of a growing, shifting population. During fiscal year 1966, $9.2 million was allocated to the States in support of community service programs. Over $3 million is being used for programs concerned with problems of government; over $1 million for programs concerned with problems of poverty; and over $1 million for programs concerned with problems of health. Of the 539 programs being conducted by 301 institutions of higher education, 85 percent are directed toward the solution of urban and suburban problems ranging from recreation to housing to employment to transportation. In fiscal year 1967, $10 million was appropriated for university-sponsored community service programs.

Title II—This program is designed to strengthen the heart of our Nation's colleges and universities—the library. Part A of Title II provided nearly $9 million in fiscal year 1966 to 1,830 institutions in every State. This money, in the form of basic grants to institutions of up to $5,000, was used for the purchase of books and periodicals, documents, tapes, recordings, audiovisual and other library materials. It is estimated that the increase in library resources will reach 1.5 million volumes. Part B of the Title supported 139 fellowships in library and information science in 24 colleges and universities during fiscal year 1966. Of the fellowships awarded, at a cost of $900,000, 52 were doctoral fellowships and 87 were predoctoral. Part C transferred $300,000 to the Librarian of Congress, for the acquisition of library materials from all over the world and for their cataloging. In fiscal year 1967, a total of $31.75 million was appropriated for these activities.

Title III—This unique program seeks to help those institutions of higher education that are isolated from the main currents of academic life. In fiscal year 1966, $5 million was appropriated; 310 proposals submitted by 252 institutions in 46 States requested a total of $32 million. Projects supported provided for a wide variety of approaches to aid developing institutions; $4.3 million supported cooperative arrangements between strong and weaker colleges, including national teaching fellowships; $0.7 million was in the form of national teaching fellowships for which colleges applied individually. In fiscal year 1967, Title III received an appropriation of $30 million. Proposals for funding, seeking in excess of $52 million, received from 382 four-year institutions and 147 two-year institutions, are presently being considered.

Title IV—This Title has helped to provide students attending colleges and universities with a well-rounded package of student financial assistance opportunities. Educational opportunity grants combined with low-interest insured loans and college work-study programs, have had a major impact in alleviating the financial burden of attending college. During fiscal year 1966, $58 million was appropriated for educational opportunity grants for low-income youth. Grants were made to about 134,000 students in 1,420 institutions; the average grant amounted to $432. In fiscal year 1967, the $112 million appropriated is expected to aid 225,000 students in 1,700 institutions. During fiscal year 1966, 133 proposals were received and 42 contracts were concluded under Part A of Title IV to carry out the educational talent search program; in fiscal year 1967, 13 contracts have already been concluded. Part B of the Title authorized low-interest insured loans. During fiscal year 1966 interim agreements were signed with 12 State guarantee agencies; 8 state agencies commenced operations under permanent agreements; and the United States Aid Fund had begun to participate in the program under permanent agreement in 18 States. From the passage of the Act in November 1965 through the end of October 1966, the volume of loans exceeded $223 million, and the estimated number of borrowers exceeded 174,000. Part C of the Title transferred the college work study program from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education. During fiscal year 1966, $99 million was appropriated, allowing over 190,000 students to receive work-study earnings at over 1,500 institutions. A total of $291.6 million was appropriated for these student assistance programs in fiscal year 1967.

Title V—This Title provided for a variety of teacher training and preparation programs. For fiscal year 1966, $9.5 million was appropriated for the National Teacher Corps, which allows corpsmen to study for a master's degree as the same time they serve as teacher-trainees under the supervision of experienced teachers, in impoverished school districts across the country. An additional $15 million was appropriated for fellowships for experienced and prospective teachers. A total of 1,530 prospective teacher fellowships were awarded to 169 institutions throughout the United States; another 1,004 fellowships were granted to experienced teachers seeking to improve and update their skills. Institutional assistance grants, designed to strengthen curricula in teacher education, were awarded to 123 institutions in 46 States and Puerto Rico. In fiscal year 1967, $7.5 million was appropriated for Teacher Corps, $25 million for experienced and prospective teacher fellowships, and $5 million for strengthening programs in teacher education.

Title VI—Title VI is directed toward improvement of undergraduate instruction. Fifteen million dollars was appropriated for fiscal year 1966, of which $1.5 million was available for the acquisition of television equipment and for minor remodeling of college facilities. A total of 1,125 applications for assistance in the purchase of instructional equipment were received by State commissions, and grant agreements were executed for 896 projects. In fiscal year 1967, $17 million was appropriated for acquisition of equipment and for media institutes.

Most titles of the Higher Education Act expire at the end of fiscal year 1968. However, in the past our Nation's schools and colleges have often been handicapped in their program planning by the Federal Government's timetable for both authorization and appropriations measures. Early extension of the Act would allow schools and colleges more ample lead-time for educational, fiscal, and manpower planning.

PROPOSALS

Title I would be extended five years through fiscal year 1973. Matching at the rate of 75 percent Federal and 25 percent non-Federal share would be continued through fiscal year 1969. Not to exceed ten percent of sums appropriated would be set aside for support of experimental or pilot projects. For fiscal year 1968, $16.5 million is being requested to be appropriated.

Parts A and B of title II would be extended five years through fiscal year 1973; Part C would be extended one year through fiscal year 1969. Part A, library resources, would be amended to liberalize the matching provision for special purpose grants. Planning and development grants to encourage the opening of new library and information science schools would be authorized under Part B. For fiscal year 1968, $37.25 million is being requested to be appropriated.

Title III would be extended five years through fiscal year 1973. For fiscal year 1968, $30 million is being requested to be appropriated.

Title IV would be extended five years through fiscal year 1973. Work-study assistance would be counted as institutional contributions in satisfying matching requirements for educational opportunity grants. Repayment of insured loans would be authorized to be deferred under State or nonprofit private student loan insurance programs while a student is attending an institution of higher education or is in military, Peace Corps, or VISTA service. This deferment is already provided under the Federal program. Under either program the Federal Government would pay all interest during this period of deferment. The maximum annual authorized loan, both under the Federally insured program and the State or privately insured programs would be set at $1,500. A student would be permitted to enroll in summer classes if employed full time under the work-study program. Maintenance of effort provisions in the work-study program would be liberalized, and proprietary institutions would be eligible to participate. The Federal matching share in the work-study program, which is scheduled to drop from 90 to 75 percent, would be held at 80 percent. To stimulate and encourage college-level programs of cooperative education—alternate periods of work and study—administrative expenses incurred in the operation of such programs would be eligible for payment from work-study funds. For fiscal year 1968, $339.5 million is being requested to be appropriated.

Title V's teacher fellowship programs would be incorporated into Title V of the Higher Education Amendments of 1967—Education Professions Development.

Title VI would be extended five years through fiscal year 1973. Subject matter limitations would be eliminated, and the program would be extended to graduate instruction. For fiscal year 1968, $17 million is being requested to be appropriated.

The Higher Education Facilities Act would be amended by extending the provisions for assistance in case of a major disaster and by fixing interest rates for loans at the current average market yield of comparable United States obligations less a reduction of not more than one percentage point to be set by the Commissioner of Education.

II. EXTENSION OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

BACKGROUND AND NEED

When the National Defense Education Act was enacted in 1958, President Johnson, then one of its authors in the Senate, commented that "History may well record that we saved liberty and saved freedom when we undertook a crash program in the field of education." In the last 8 years, programs conducted under the NDEA have gone far to bear out this prophecy.

The National Defense Education Act was signed into law September 2, 1958, during the period of national uneasiness that followed launching of the Soviet Sputnik. The legislation had the immediate aim of augmenting the supply of highly trained manpower in fields relating to security—science, mathematics, and foreign languages.

In succeeding years the Act has had increasing impact on the quality and availability of American education. It has been amended from time to time—most recently by the Higher Education Amendments of 1966—to extend its coverage to virtually all areas of education. Students at all levels of education benefit from its provisions.

Enacted originally for a 4 year period, the NDEA was extended in 1962 for two years. In 1964, the Congress provided a further extension, through fiscal year 1968. Since the Act's enactment, Congress has appropriated nearly $2.4 billion for NDEA activities; the appropriation of fiscal year 1967 is $446,357,000.

Title II—This program of financial assistance to students in the form of loans is probably the best known portion of the Act. As originally enacted, loans were to be made to full-time students in institutions of higher education, with preference to those majoring in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages. Forgiveness of a percentage of the loan amount and interest was afforded to teachers in public elementary and secondary schools. This title has been substantially broadened in the ensuing years. Part-time students are now eligible to borrow; forgiveness has been extended to teachers in nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools and in institutions of higher education and to teachers of handicapped children; preference is now given to students with superior records in any field. It is estimated that more than $1 billion has been advanced to student borrowers, with the average loan amounting to a little more than $600. For fiscal year 1967, $190 million was appropriated for contributions to student loan funds, $2 million for loans to educational institutions, and $1.15 million for cancellation of student loans.

Title III—Title III is designed to strengthen instruction in critical subjects: science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, history, civics, geography, economics, English, reading, and (as added in 1966 amendments) industrial arts. Grants are available for public elementary and secondary schools, and loans are made to nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools. The appropriation for these purposes for fiscal year 1967 totaled $80.7 million, with an additional $7.5 million for grants to States for supervision and administration of the program. State and local matching of Federal funds on a 50–50 basis assures a greater expenditure for critically needed equipment; in fiscal year 1966 a total of $159 million was spent by the States under title III for acquisition of equipment and concomitant minor remodeling. A random sample of approved projects showed that approximately 58 percent of the funds were used for equipment and 42 percent for instructional materials. Audiovisual equipment and materials accounted for 38 percent of the acquisition projects. In fiscal year 1967, $79.2 million was appropriated for grants.

For each of the last two fiscal years the appropriation for loans has been $1.5 million. The availability of funds for loans has taken on increased importance during the past year because of the unavailability of commercial credit. In fiscal year 1966, 37 loans were made to 35 schools in 20 States, serving nearly 18,000 students.

Title IV—The Graduate Fellowship Program, administered under title IV, has a dual purpose: to increase the number of well-qualified college and university teachers and to develop and expand the capacity of doctoral study facilities throughout the country. The need for college and university teachers is acute. Enrollments in institutions of higher education are expected to expand from 5 million in 1964 to 9 million in 1975. It is estimated that approximately 610,000 new full-time-equivalent professional staff members will be needed to meet these demands, but projections indicate that only 230,000 doctorates will be produced by 1975, and no more than half of these can be expected to go into college teaching. As originally enacted, title IV authorized 1,000 graduate fellowships. Amendments passed in 1964 authorized a 100 percent increase in the number of fellowships for fiscal year 1965, a 400 percent increase for fiscal year 1966, and a 500 percent increase for fiscal year 1967. Beginning with the 1967–68 academic year, more than 90 percent (193) of all institutions authorized to award the doctorate will have active title IV fellowship programs. Approximately $82 million will be obligated during fiscal year 1967 to cover the cost of 6,000 new graduate fellowships plus some 9,000 awards continuing from previous years.

Title V—Part A of title V supports programs in guidance, counseling, and testing and identification and encouragement of able students. Its purpose is to assist in establishing and maintaining programs of guidance, counseling, and testing in elementary and secondary schools and junior colleges and technical institutes. Appropriations for this activity have risen from $7.4 million in fiscal year 1959 to $24.5 million in fiscal year 1967. During the past year the 54 States and territories participating in the program gave more than 9 million aptitude and achievement tests to public school students and 370,000 to students in nonpublic schools. Under Office of Education contracts, testing agencies administered 210,300 tests to more than 179,500 nonpublic school students in 37 States, the District of Columbia, and Guam. In addition, the number of full-time counselors for secondary school students in public schools was increased to 1 counselor to every 460 students, a striking improvement over the 1 to 960 ratio for fiscal year 1959.

Part B of title V authorizes institutes for persons who are working or planning to work in counseling and guidance. Forty colleges and universities will conduct 42 institutes during the summer of 1967 and the 1967–68 school year for approximately 1,200 persons, 850 of whom will be elementary and high school counselors. Since 1959, more than 21,000 counselors have participated in guidance and counseling institutes. For fiscal year 1967, $31.750 million was appropriated for activities under Title V.

Title VI—A critical need for specialists in foreign languages and countries existed in 1959, when the first fellowships were awarded under Title VI of NDEA. Eight years and 7,000 fellowships later, the need still exists. Next summer and during the 1967–68 school year, 1,600 additional graduate students will receive intensive training in 92 foreign languages and related studies such as geography, history, and anthropology. The training will be provided by 52 colleges and universities in 27 States and the District of Columbia. About $6 million will be expended to finance these studies. An additional $550,000 will be allocated to 19 universities for undergraduate modern foreign language stipends, as authorized by Title VI. Approximately 550 stipends will be awarded to qualified undergraduate students, who will be enrolled in 22 NDEA-supported Language and Area Studies programs during the summer of 1967.

In fiscal year 1966, 98 Language and Area Centers were established at 61 institutions under Title VI. These Centers focused on 79 different modern foreign languages rarely taught in the United States. Over $5 million was obligated in support of these Centers. For fiscal year 1967, $15.8 million was appropriated.

Title VII—The research program authorized by Title VII provides the means for adapting such communication media as television, motion pictures, radio, and programmed self-instruction to the improvement of education in our schools. Since fiscal year 1959, over $33 million has been obligated for research and dissemination activities. Part A of Title VII provides support for research and experimentation and evaluation of projects involving television, motion pictures, radio, printed and published materials, and related communication media for educational purposes. Since 1959, approximately 375 projects have received support in institutions throughout most of the 50 States and the District of Columbia. Some 215 of these have been completed. Title VII also provides, through Part B, support for project activities involving the dissemination of information about new educational media and their utilization. Such activities may take the form of studies and surveys, demonstrations, and publications or reports. Since 1959, 253 projects have been initiated under Part B; 195 have been completed. For fiscal year 1967, $4.4 million was appropriated.

Title VIII—This title authorizes area vocational educational programs; it was enacted as title III of the George-Barden Act of 1946. The technical education program was made a permanent program by the Vocational Education Act of 1963, with an authorization of $15 million a year for the training of highly skilled technicians for occupations requiring scientific knowledge—electronics, drafting and design, instrumentation, industrial chemistry, and other technical occupations.

Title IX—Title IX establishes a Science Information Service to coordinate and improve methods of disseminating information in the sciences. This activity is carried out by the National Science Foundation.

Title X—NDEA provides grants to State Education agencies to improve the adequacy and reliability of educational statistics and the methods for collecting, processing, and disseminating such data. For fiscal year 1967, $2.25 million was appropriated for these purposes.

Title XI.—A new title, Training Institutes, was established by the 1964 amendments. As enacted, it authorized institutes in modern foreign languages and English taught as a second language, but also expanded the program to include a selected range of vital fields—English, reading, history, geography, disadvantaged youth, and educational media specialists. Amendments contained in the Higher Education Act of 1965 added economics, civics, and industrial arts to the areas of specialization. By amendment in the International Education Act of 1966 institutes were authorized in the field of international affairs. For fiscal year 1967, $30 million was appropriated for the institute program.

PROPOSAL

The National Defense Education Act does not expire until the end of fiscal year 1968. However, in the past our Nation's schools and colleges have often been handicapped in their program planning by the Federal Government's timetable for both authorization and appropriation measures. Early extension of the Act would allow schools and colleges more ample leadtime for educational, fiscal, and manpower planning.

Title II would be extended five years through fiscal year 1973. The loan cancellation benefits would be extended to teachers in programs of special education or training designed to combat disadvantage, poverty, or unemployment. In addition, non-Federal capital for National Defense Student Loans would be encouraged by establishing a revolving fund from which institutions may obtain loans to capitalize fully additional student loan funds. This would make more funds available to students to finance their undergraduate and graduate educations. An appropriation of $195.4 million is being requested for fiscal year 1968.

Title III would be extended 5 years through fiscal year 1973. Subject limitations would be eliminated, and Section 12 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act would be merged with title III. In instances where States impose requirements for financial participation of project applicants, within-State equalization would be encouraged. State administrative expenses would be paid out of project funds. The loan allotment formula for private schools would be repealed, and loans would be authorized to American-sponsored schools serving American children abroad. An appropriation of $50 million is being requested for fiscal year 1968.

Title IV would be extended 5 years through fiscal year 1973. The maximum length of fellowship would be extended from 3 to 4 years in special circumstances, and stipends would be set in amounts consistent with those awarded for comparable fellowships. An appropriation of $96.6 million is being requested for fiscal year 1968.

Title V-A would be extended 5 years through fiscal year 1973. Title V-B expires at the end of fiscal year 1968. Its extenstion is not being requested as it would be incorporated in title V of the Higher Education Amendments of 1967—Education Professions Development. An appropriation of $31.75 million is being requested for fiscal year 1968.

Title VI would be extended one year through fiscal year 1969.

Title VII expires at the end of fiscal year 1968. Its extension is not being requested since activities can be funded under the Cooperative Research.

Title VIII is incorporated into the Vocational Education Act of 1963. No amendments are proposed.

Title IX is the responsibility of the National Science Foundation. No amendments are proposed.

Title X (Improvement of Statistical Services of State Educational Agencies) expires at the end of fiscal year 1968. Its extension is not being requested, as its function has been superseded by title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Provision is made in NDEA for the participation of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, for schools of the Department of the Interior for Indian children, and for overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense.

Title XI expires at the end of fiscal year 1968. Its extension is not being requested, as it will be incorporated into title V of the Higher Education Amendments of 1967—Education Professions Development. An appropriation of $35.5 million is being requested for fiscal year 1968.

III. EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT

BACKGROUND AND NEED

Education, our Nation's second-largest enterprise, has acute staffing problems. In the fall of 1965, more than 200,000 teachers were hired, filling vacancies left by turnover, replacing uncertified teachers, and meeting needs caused by increased student enrollment. Yet the critical need for teachers continues and, according to a nationwide study, is more acute this school year than it was a year ago.

Total enrollments in public elementary and secondary schools reached a new peak of 43 million last fall. To meet the demand for teachers, to reduce class size, to replace teachers leaving their positions, and to eliminate the number of teachers not having adequate training, 169,000 additional teachers are currently needed. Today, more than 5 percent of our schools' teaching force—approximately 90,500 full-time teachers—do not meet their State's certification standards. Properly qualified teachers must be employed if our country's children are to achieve their full educational development.

Many Federal programs currently are directed toward attracting promising personnel into the field of education and toward updating the skills of those already in the classroom.

Last year, nearly 300 different programs supporting 2,534 fellowships were awarded grants under the Teacher Fellowship Program authorized by Title V–C of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

This year, 18,000 teachers will be trained in 493 institutes in 272 colleges under Title XI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Currently, 10,350 NDEA fellows are studying for their doctorates on American campuses, prior to entering the field of college teaching.

This year, approximately 1,200 persons who are working or planning to work in counseling and guidance will attend 42 institutes conducted by 40 colleges under Title V–B of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Yet current Federal programs are handicapped by gaps in legislative authority and by the lack of flexibility which inhibits the development of a variety of programs needed to meet the changing manpower requirements of our schools and colleges.

The Office of Education can support:

Training of certain school-related personnel but not others, for example, subprofessionals, school business managers, school board members;

Institutes in certain subject areas but not in others, for example, psychology, anthropology, sociology, business education, physical education;

Fellowships for certain professionals but not others, for example, junior college teachers, university administrators.

PROPOSAL

Effective July 1, 1969, the Education Professions Development Act, as a part of the proposed Higher Education Amendments of 1967, would bring greater order out of the present patchwork of educational training legislation through flexible authority allowing the coordination, broadening, and strengthening of programs for the training of teachers and other education personnel for all levels of education.

The Commissioner of Education would be required to appraise the Nation's existing and future personnel needs in education and the adequacy of the Nation's efforts to meet these needs, from preschool to university, and to publish an annual report on the state of education professions. In developing this information, he would consult with the Department of Labor, the National Science Foundation, and the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

Grants would be made to State and local educational agencies and to institutions of higher education, to enable them to identify and encourage qualified persons to enter or reenter the field of education. Fellowships under Title V–C of the Higher Education Act of 1965 would be expanded to include preschool and adult and vocational education personnel.

In the field of training for careers in elementary, secondary, and post-secondary education, program development grants to institutions of higher education would be offered to strengthen graduate and undergraduate programs, including those for nonteaching personnel. Grants would also be made to institutions of higher education and to State and local educational agencies for preservice and inservice training, including institutes, seminars, and workshops for personnel in all subject matter areas.

In the field of training for careers in higher education, a special program of grants would support programs or projects designed for persons planning to teach or undertake other educational responsibilities in institutions of higher education.

A National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development would be established upon enactment of the Act, to review this title and all other Federal programs for the training and development of educational personnel. The Council would make annual reports of its findings and recommendations.

IV. EXTENSION OF THE NATIONAL VOCATIONAL STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE ACT OF 1965

BACKGROUND AND NEED

The National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 is designed to make it possible for students to borrow money for education and training in schools of business, trade, technology, and other vocational fields. The Act provides the means for students to obtain insured loans from private commercial and other eligible lenders, with the Federal Government paying a part of the interest on behalf of qualified students.

For a student to obtain a vocational student loan, he must attend or be accepted for enrollment in an eligible school. There are no age limitations. The student need not be a high school graduate, or even an elementary school graduate, but he must be considered able to benefit from the program in which he is enrolled.

Eligible vocational schools must meet several criteria:

They must admit only those students who have the ability to benefit from the training;

They must be legally authorized to provide a program of post-secondary education which trains for useful employment in recognized occupations;

They must have been in existence for at least two years; and

They must have been accredited by an accrediting agency recognized by the Commissioner of Education or have been specially approved by the Commissioner.

Banks, savings and loan associations, credit unions, insurance companies, and similar institutions subject to supervision by the State or Federal Government are eligible to become lenders. Eligible vocational schools may also qualify to become lenders.

Programs vary from State to State, depending on the regulations of the insurance agency. For a student whose adjusted family income is less than $15,000 per year, the Federal Government will pay interest up to 6 percent a year on the unpaid principal balance of his loan while the student is in school, and 3 percent interest on the unpaid principal balance during the repayment period.

The National Vocational Student Loan Program is unprecedented in the field of vocational and trade school education. The response has been outstanding. Although the program is quite new, 14 States already have operative loan programs, conducted either by State agencies or by private nonprofit insuring agencies. Approximately 3,500 vocational schools have been approved as "eligible schools." It is estimated that, by the end of 1968, approximately 173,000 students will have received vocational student loans, totalling $872 million.

PROPOSAL

The present Act provides that, after fiscal year 1968, the Federal Government can insure loans only for students who have received prior insured loans under the Act. The amendment will provide insurance for loans made to new borrowers until June 30, 1973, and for additional loans made to borrowers prior to that date to continue their education until June 30, 1977.

Section 6 of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act will be amended so that, under the Federal loan insurance program, the maximum loan amount per academic year shall be $1,500 and the aggregate loans to any student shall not exceed $3,000. Section 9(b) of the Act will be amended to provide that, in the case of State and private programs, loans shall be insured up to a maximum of $1,500 for any academic year or its equivalent and up to an aggregate of $3,000 of loans outstanding to any student. At present, insurance agencies are free to establish any maximum amounts over $1,000 they desire. The amendments will make the Federal and non-Federal programs coordinate.

These amendments will make uniform the maximum amounts a student can borrow under the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act, whether guaranteed by a State or private agency or insured by the Federal Government.

The total of the payments by a borrower during any year of any repayment period, with respect to the aggregate amount of all loans to that borrower which are insured under this Act, shall not be less than $360 or the balance of such loans plus interest, whichever is less. At present, the Act indicates no minimum payment under State or private nonprofit guarantee agencies; under the Federal insured loan program, repayments must be made as specified in the amendment. The amendment will require a borrower under a State or private guarantee agency program to make the same minimum payment as in the Federal program.

Repayment of insured loans would be authorized to be deferred under State or private loan insurance programs while a student is attending an institution of higher education or is in military, Peace Corps, or VISTA service. This deferment is already provided under the Federal program. Under either program the Federal Government would pay all of the interest during this period of deferment.

I. NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

BACKGROUND AND NEED

The National Teacher Corps offers new hope for blighted schools, both in urban slums and in remote rural areas. It offers hope of increased educational opportunities for America's 8 million impoverished children, by training new manpower in the education of the disadvantaged. It offers new ways to tap idealism and motivation for public service, as a major factor in the national commitment to the elimination of educational deprivation through the partnership of governmental and voluntary action.

Studies have shown that many of the economically deprived are also educationally deprived. Their schools are more likely to be understaffed and overcrowded. Their teachers are more apt to be poorly qualified for the difficult tasks they face. Curricular materials are less likely to be available and up to date. The children themselves face other limitations: impoverished family background and environment, lack of books and reading materials at home, absence of cultural experiences common to middle-class homes, low self-esteem.

The problem must not be underestimated.

Only one in four nonwhite children outside metropolitan areas is enrolled in school at age 5, compared with half the white children in the same parts of the country. In metropolitan areas, about three-fourths of all children, both white and nonwhite, are in school at age 5.

Nearly a million Spanish-speaking children in Southwestern States are unlikely ever to get beyond the eighth grade. Many are only vaguely familiar with English and, since they attend schools where classes are taught in English and speaking Spanish is frequently forbidden, they fall behind in the first grade and progressively further behind thereafter.

In the metropolitan Northeast, the average Negro student is about 1.6 years behind the average white student in scholastic achievement in the sixth grade, 2.4 years behind in the ninth grade, and 3.3 years behind in the twelfth grade. In the South, both white and Negro students score below their northern counterparts.

Severe teacher shortages have plagued school districts across the Nation. A recent survey of 39 States showed that last September, 20 had substantial shortages of applicants for teaching positions; elementary school teachers were most in demand. Shortages affected communities of every size: 37 States lacked teachers for rural areas; 33 lacked teachers for small cities, 22 for large central cities, and 19 for suburbs.

Within a single system, however, the greatest demand for teachers occurs in impoverished schools; in these areas, school officials experience great difficulty in recruiting both beginning and experienced teachers. In Philadelphia, for example, the overall teaching staff vacancy rate was nearly 11 percent at the beginning of this school year; in elementary schools in poverty areas of the city, the vacancy rate was almost 20 percent. On opening day, New York City had to mobilize a 500-man substitute teacher force for full-time duty.

The *National Teacher Corps* will help to meet these needs. It has, at present, 262 veteran teachers and 965 college graduate interns who are working to build professional careers in teaching disadvantaged children. They serve in 275 schools in 111 school systems, with the cooperation of 50 university training centers in 29 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. There are Teacher Corps teams in 20 of the Nation's 25 largest cities; among them: New York, Chicago, Detroit, Houston, Cleveland, San Diego, Buffalo, and Memphis. There are Teacher Corps teams in Appalachian towns and in the Ozarks, in Spanish-speaking communities in New York, Florida, California, and the Southwest.

Teacher Corps members serve at the request of the local schools in a program worked out by the State department of education, the school system, and a local university. They work in teams, with a veteran teacher serving as team leader for 3–10 interns.

Part of a Corps member's time is spent in and about the schools in which he teaches, and part in study at a nearby university. At the end of 2 years, the interns will have earned a master's degree and will be qualified as specialists in the education of the disadvantaged.

The Corps has had no problem with recruitment of persons to teach in slum schools and rural areas. On the contrary, 13,000 persons applied for membership in 1965. Those selected were all college graduates; they were chosen on the basis of teaching experience (in the case of team leaders) and of academic achievement (in the case of interns). They are paid at the salary rates in effect in the school district in which they teach. Since 70 percent of the projects deal with elementary school children, the National Teacher Corps should have substantial impact on a critical area of need—education of children of poverty in the early grades.

PROPOSAL

The National Teacher Corps program would become a special part of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and would be extended for three years, through fiscal year 1970, plus authority to enable a teacher-intern to continue his program of practical and academic training for a period of not more than one year, for those who begin such training during fiscal year 1970.

Teacher-interns would be compensated at the lowest rate for teaching full-time in the school system in which they teach, as they are under existing law, or at the rate of $75 per week plus $15 per dependent, whichever is less.

State educational agency approval of the local educational agency's request for Corps members and of the training program offered by an institution or university would be required.

Teacher Corps members would be permitted to be assigned to a migrant group not in a regular school, who are taught by a public or other nonprofit agency, if the number of migrant children makes such an assignment feasible.

The Commissioner of Education would be authorized to accept gifts on behalf of the Teacher Corps, in the same way as the Peace Corps is authorized to accept gifts.

Teacher Corps members would be permitted to be assigned to schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The "Local Control" section would be amended to make it clear that no Teacher Corps member may be assigned to a local educational agency unless the agency finds the member acceptable.

II. COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

BACKGROUND AND NEED

Rational planning at all levels is essential if the Nation's educational needs are to be met. Reliable information concerning the effectiveness of existing education programs must be obtained and objectively evaluated in order to better coordinate and improve present programs and to develop new programs to fill unmet needs.

Local educational agencies receive funds from three primary sources—the local, State, and Federal Governments. Each school district must plan the use of those funds to meet local needs. However, almost all Federal funds and some State funds are earmarked for special purposes. The number of education programs designed to meet special needs has increased to the point that some districts have hired special coordinators to work the various programs together into a comprehensive plan adapted to local needs. However, neither the local schools nor the States have the resources to extend this local coordination and short-range planning to a long-range project of regional or Statewide planning and coordination.

During the 1965–66 school year, $27 billion was spent on education by local education agencies. With expenditures of that magnitude, a program of systematic Statewide planning and evaluation must be established if duplication is to be avoided and maximum efficiency is to be attained.

If the evaluation and planning of education programs is to be effective, it must be carried out close to the people to be served by those programs. The American system of education is founded on the principle of State and local control. The responsibility for educational planning, therefore, rests at the State and local levels. State educational agencies now set standards for our schools and qualifications for our teachers. Local schools are directly responsible to local school boards. The best planning—that which will be most responsive to the needs of the persons to be served—must be carried out at the State and local levels.

If State and local educational agencies are to continue to carry out their present role in educational planning and if the administration of Federal educational programs is to reflect the intent of Congress, the Federal Government must share some of the burden placed on those agencies. This can be done by assisting them in developing comprehensive systems of planning and evaluation which will aid them in meeting educational goals at all levels of education, from preschool programs through postgraduate education.

PROPOSAL

Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act would be amended to establish a 5-year program of grants to States by the Commissioner of Education for programs of comprehensive, systematic, and continuous planning, and for evaluation of education at all levels, except that the inclusion of the field of higher education would be optional with the State. Any State desiring to receive a grant would designate or establish a State agency to be responsible for carrying out, or supervising the carrying out, of the comprehensive planning, except that, if the State so decided, the planning for higher education could be carried out by a separate agency, provided that there was assurance of effective coordination between the two. To be eligible for a grant, the programs set forth in the State's application would include: setting educational goals; developing through analysis alternate means of achieving these goals; planning new and improved programs on the basis of these analyses; developing and strengthening the competencies of the States for conducting objective evaluations of educational programs; and collecting, compiling, and analyzing significant data concerning education in the State. State applications would be submitted to the Governors for their review and recommendations.

Seventy-five percent of the funds appropriated would be apportioned among the States, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas for grants according to State plans. The remainder of the appropriation would be reserved for grants to public and private nonprofit agencies, institutions, or organizations for special projects related to educational planning and evaluation on an interstate, regional, or metropolitan area basis.

—$15 million would be authorized for comprehensive planning for fiscal year 1968.

III. INNOVATION IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

BACKGROUND AND NEED

The changing character of the American economy and the resulting change in manpower needs require that our schools anticipate the demands which will be made of their students in the future. In the next few years, employment opportunities in the professional, semi-professional, and technical fields will increase more than 40 percent, while job opportunities for unskilled workers and agricultural workers will actually decline. Opportunities in public service, in business, and in the professional and personal service fields are expected to increase at a much faster rate than in other areas. These shifts in the structure of the American labor market impose ever-increasing demands upon high school students. They must make decisions about schools which affect their entire lives, when they know very little about opportunities which will be available to them.

The job of our Nation's schools is particularly critical in view of the large number of workers under 25 years of age who will be continuing to enter the labor force. From 1965 to 1970, the number of persons 20 to 24 years old in the job market will be increasing by close to 500,000 or 4.8 percent per year—2½ times the rate for the labor force as a whole. By 1970, there may be close to 12 million of these young adult workers, representing about 14 percent of the total labor force, compared with 10 percent in 1960. Overall, the total number of teenage and young adult workers (aged 14 to 24) is expected to increase by almost 700,000 a year, constituting about 45 percent of the increase in the labor force between now and 1970.

More than one million students drop out of school each year. Of the students now in the fifth grade, approximately 80 percent will not complete college. A large number of these students will not receive the education or training which will prepare them to adapt to the jobs available ten or twenty years from now. If they are to develop to their greatest potential as wage earners and as citizens, school programs must be designed to keep them in school, and these programs must prepare them to function in an increasingly complex society.

Failure to meet the needs of students in high schools results in lessened employment opportunities. The unemployment rate for high school age youth is more than three times that of the public at large. The unemployment rate among those who fail to finish high school is 50 percent greater than among those who complete high school—in spite of an expanding economy.

The secondary school system of the United States must be strengthened to enable it to be more responsive to the needs, interests, abilities, and problems of all students and to the current and long-term demands of the world of work. This is especially true in the case of disadvantaged students. High school may be their last opportunity for formal education unless they are stimulated to continue on to college, and unless they receive training for employment they may be doomed to a life of unemployment. For students who do not plan to go to college, high school may be the last opportunity to prepare for, or receive training for, a job.

PROPOSAL

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 would be amended to establish a 5-year program of grants to State vocational boards, local educational agencies, and public and private agencies, organizations, and institutions to support the planning, development, and operation of innovative occupational education programs which may serve as models for vocational education programs. Examples of the types of projects which might be supported are:

Exploratory occupational education programs to provide practical and educational experiences essential to understanding the demands and complexities of our modern society and opportunities in the constantly-changing world of work. These programs would be designed to familiarize students with the broad range of occupations available to them and requisites for careers in the various occupations.

Programs or projects to provide to students educational experience through part-time work to assist in their maximum development and to help in linking school and employment. Such programs would assist needy students to continue their education; promote a sense of achievement in school-related work experiences; enlarge educational opportunities: develop recognition of the value of work; and establish communication channels between education and the world of work which are not now in existence.

Guidance and counseling to assure that all students' interests and capabilities are developed in relation to their career objectives and to ease in the transition from school to work by assisting them in initial job placement.

Improvement of curricula to stimulate broad-scale innovative changes to provide more realistic vocational education programs for youth and adults at all skill levels. The curriculum changes would involve new instructional media; improved curriculum guides; and innovative techniques and services designed to meet the needs of youth and adults for entry into the world of work or for continuing education at the post-secondary level.

The funds appropriated would be apportioned among the States and outlying areas as follows: $150,000 would be apportioned to each State and outlying area, and the remainder would be apportioned according to population aged 14 through 19. $30 million would be authorized for fiscal year 1968.

IV. EXPANDED EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

BACKGROUND AND NEED

During the past decade, the foundation has been laid for a comprehensive program of support for educational programs and services for mentally retarded, hearing and speech impaired, deaf, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, and other health impaired children. Beginning with the Cooperative Research Act in 1954, Congress has enacted legislation to provide assistance for research and demonstration projects and for personnel training programs in the education of handicapped children. Over 32,000 fellowships and training grants have been awarded in all areas of education for the handicapped. Last year 8,300 grants were awarded in the area of teaching programs for handicapped children. The Captioned Films for the Deaf program, twice amended since 1958, now includes research, training, production and dissemination activities which are reaching an annual audience of 1.5 million.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 offers direct educational benefits to handicapped children. In addition, it was amended to include State-operated or-supported schools which provide free public education to handicapped children. Also enacted in 1965 was the National Technical Institute for the Deaf Act. This Institute will supplement the post-secondary educational opportunities for the deaf provided only by Gallaudet College. In the summer of 1966, an HEW Task Force on Handicapped Children and Child Development reviewed the Department's programs for the handicapped and suggested priorities of effort and means for improved coordination of programs.

In the last days of the 89th Congress, two important pieces of legislation for handicapped children were enacted. One authorized the Model Secondary School for the Deaf at Gallaudet College. The other added Title VI—Education of Handicapped Children—to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This title authorized earmarked funds for projects to develop education programs for the handicapped, and directed the Office of Education to establish a Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped. The establishment of the new Bureau was announced by the Office of Education on January 12, 1967.

Although these enactments provide an impressive foundation for research, professional training, and development of special education programs for handicapped children, we must continue to expand their educational opportunities.

Of the estimated 5 million children, or 10 percent of the school-age population, appreciably limited by one or more handicapping conditions, only about 40 percent are receiving the benefits of special education programs. Half of the public school systems in the United States report that they do not provide educational services for even one type of handicapping condition.

Little beyond verbal acknowledgement has been provided for the education of hundreds of multiply handicapped children. Some handicapped children must remain on residential school waitinglists for 5 or 6 years before being accepted into an education program; this almost destroys a child's chance to prepare for his future and to prepare to contribute to our Nation's future.

Early diagnosis and identification of a handicapping condition is essential and basic to formulating an education program for a handicapped child. There should be a focal point at which such diagnosis can be provided to help decide how best to allocate available resources to meet the needs of all handicapped children.

The great obstacle to developing and providing educational programs for handicapped children is the critical shortage of trained personnel—teachers, teachers of teachers, supportive personnel. Of the estimated 300,000 teachers and other personnel necessary to provide educational opportunities to all handicapped children within this decade, there are now only about 70,000. And at this time, there are only about 300 institutions of higher education capable of offering training for the preparation of professional personnel, often only in one area. If the 300,000 goal is to be attained, a nationwide personnel recruitment program, utilizing comprehensive and innovative information-dissemination methods, must be immediately initiated.

PROPOSAL

The proposed amendments for improvement of the education of the handicapped would provide a variety of expanded educational opportunities for all handicapped children. The proposed *Regional Resource Centers,* which would be authorized by a separate part of title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, would provide testing and evaluation services to determine the special educational needs of a handicapped child, would develop education programs to meet these special needs, and would assist schools and other agencies in their respective regions in providing these educational programs for the handicapped child. $7.5 million would be authorized for the Centers for fiscal year 1968.

The proposal for *Recruitment of Personnel and Dissemination of Information on Education of the Handicapped* would provide grants to or contracts with public or private agencies or institutions to expand and encourage intensive nationwide recruitment programs and information dissemination programs aimed at encouraging students, professional and supportive personnel to work in the field of education of handicapped children. $1 million would be authorized to implement this program in fiscal year 1968.

Schools for Indian children operated by the Department of the Interior and overseas dependents schools operated by the Department of Defense would be made eligible for assistance under title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The proposal for *Expansion of Instructional Media Programs to Include All Handicapped Children* would insure that all handicapped children would receive the demonstrated benefits of the instructional media materials program established and successfully carried out under the Captioned Films for the Deaf program and would greatly help in shortening the time lag between new educational media discoveries and their actual applications. $1 million would be authorized in fiscal year 1968 for this expanded program.

Existing authority to make grants for research in the education of the handicapped would be made more flexible by authorizing the Government to obtain such research through contracts with public or private educational research agencies and organizations.

V. MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS TO THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT AND THE FEDERALLY IMPACTED AREAS PROGRAM

INDIAN CHILDREN IN BIA SCHOOLS AND CHILDREN IN DOD OVERSEAS DEPENDENTS SCHOOLS

Background and need

Last year, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was amended to include two groups of children—Indian children in schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior and children in overseas dependents schools operated by the Department of Defense—who had not been afforded the educational benefits offered other children under the Act. Indian children in BIA schools were made eligible to participate in programs conducted under Titles I, II, and III of the Act; Department of Defense schools were included in the provisions of Titles II and III.

The benefits to the two groups of children have been substantial. It is estimated that 37,000 Indian children will be reached by special programs for the educationally deprived under Title I of ESEA, at a total cost of more than $5 million. More than $125,000 will be spent in providing these children with textbooks, library books, and other instructional materials during this fiscal year, and nearly $205,000 will be expended on supplementary educational centers and services under Title III. Overseas schools will also reap the benefits of change during this fiscal year: more than $404,000 for books and instructional materials under Title II, and $527,000 for supplementary educational centers and services under Title III.

Proposal

Provisions for participation of Indian children enrolled in BIA schools and of children in overseas dependents schools would be extended one year, through fiscal year 1968. These provisions would otherwise expire at the end of fiscal year 1967. Extension would make them uniform with the rest of the Act, which continues through fiscal year 1968. A study of the provisions and further recommendations will be submitted to the Congress later this year.

AMENDMENT TO TITLE V OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

In order to provide for a more equitable distribution of Title V funds the allotment formula would be amended. Forty percent of the amount available for apportionment among the States would be allotted to the States in equal amounts and the remaining 60 percent would be allotted to the States on the basis of school age population.

AMENDMENTS TO DISASTER AUTHORITY IN PUBLIC LAWS 874 AND 815

Background and need

Public Law 81-815 and Title I of Public Law 81-874 were amended by P.L. 89-313, approved November 1, 1965, to give the Commissioner of Education authority, until June 30, 1967, to provide assistance to repair or replace school facilities damaged or destroyed by natural disasters, to provide temporary facilities while damaged facilities were being repaired or rebuilt, and to provide operating assistance as might be needed in any area declared by the President to be a major disaster area.

Prior to these amendments, such disaster assistance was provided by the Office of Emergency Planning. Although this was a new program for the Office of Education, it has worked well in meeting the most urgent needs in disaster areas. There were 11 disasters during fiscal year 1966 and two disasters thus far in fiscal year 1967 for which applications for aid have been received. The total cost of the disaster program for applications received as of February 1967, exclusive of Hurricane Betsy, is estimated to be $375,000.

PROPOSAL

Authority to provide disaster assistance under Public Laws 815 and 874 would be extended five years, through fiscal year 1972. Coverage would be extended to a few special public schools that now provide elementary and secondary education, but are not covered by the Act because they are operated by a State rather than a local educational agency.

The burden and effort test now required before emergency assistance can be authorized would be eliminated. This change is necessary because most school districts do not have in their yearly budget funds to meet emergency disaster needs, and they cannot get such funds until a new budget is approved for the following year. At present, the Office of Education cannot give assurance of Federal assistance when the disaster occurs and emergency repairs must be made; the change would permit authorizing emergency aid when needed.

A minimum amount of $1,000 or one-half of one percent of the agency's operating budget for the year will be established for any disaster claim. This would avoid handling requests for very small amounts of money.

The Commissioner of Education would be authorized to grant funds to a public agency in sufficient amount to house students who were in a private school which was destroyed by a disaster, if the private school is not to be rebuilt. Under present wording, this can be done only if there also is destruction of or damage to public schools; the amendment would permit granting such assistance to a public agency when a private school is destroyed and not to be rebuilt, although no public school has been destroyed or damaged.

AMENDMENT TO PUBLIC LAW 874

The only amendment proposed to P.L. 874 is a technical change in the definition of Federal property. This amendment is made necessary in order to remove any question as to the deductibility of other Federal payments from the gross entitlement of school districts in those cases where the other Federal payment is made because of taxes on private improvements on land held in trust for individual Indians or Indian tribes. Two recent court cases have ruled against making deductions in these cases. The amendment would prevent duplicate payments to some districts.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. Speaker, I voice my support for the amendments to the Vocational Education Act as proposed by the President.

The administration proposal will make Federal assistance available to support a broad range of new and imaginative programs specifically designed for students who prefer to enter the labor market rather than go to college.

I am sure all of us would like to see every young person in America continue his education after high school graduation. However, we know that thousands of high school graduates, by reason of necessity or preference, enter the world of work rather than continue the life of a student. Less than half of our high school graduates receive bachelor's degrees. The majority have already chosen their careers by the time they are 21.

Our present Federal education programs support a wide variety of academic activities. We have vocational education programs, elementary and secondary education programs, student assistance and institutional support in the higher education—but none are responsive to the needs of those students who are not in vocational programs and who do not go to college. The President's proposal now fills this gap.

Another of my concerns has been that our highly competitive and technological society has forced early career decisions upon our high school students. Youngsters today are pondering not only whether or not to go to college, but also their choice of a profession—well before high school graduation. Many of these decisions are made by students who do not have adequate information upon which they can base a wise decision. The President's proposal will support programs designed to help and provide them with this very necessary information.

Under the proposed amendments, our schools would be able to establish new programs in occupational education designed to aid young people by explaining career choices available, educational requirements necessary to various pursuits, to inspire them to raise their aspirations, and to make information available which will assist them in making decisions that will prepare them for the future.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the Honorable Carl Perkins, of Kentucky, in introducing for the consideration of the committee, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967, a measure which has been proposed by the administration.

I want to speak very briefly about the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments and most particularly of the success to date of the National Teacher Corps, amendments to which program are contained in the legislation I am introducing.

Mr. Speaker, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is a landmark in American education history. It represents the first commitment at the national level of support for our hard-pressed elementary and secondary schools. In particular, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has made clear and concrete this country's firm commitment to providing all Americans an opportunity for a decent education. Title I of the act alone, which concentrates funds in school districts with large numbers of disadvantaged children, is reaching approximately 8.3 million schoolchildren in more than 17,000 school districts throughout the Nation.

Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act title II program, which provides support for school library resources, books and materials have been placed in school libraries which serve some 49 million children and almost 2 million teachers.

A third portion of the act, the title III program for the development of supplementary educational services and centers, is providing innovative educational services—advanced mathematics and sciences, cultural enrichment, special foreign language assistance, to name a few—to some 10 million children, parents, and teachers.

Under title IV almost $60 million in research funds are helping bring to American education the same kinds of talented, imaginative minds that have so successfully helped America win world leadership in science, technology, and business.

Under its fifth title, the act is strengthening State departments of education to help them meet their expanding responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, the administration has proposed several amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, among which are new authorizations for the National Teacher Corps, assistance to State education agencies for comprehensive educational planning, and continuation of the authority which enables children in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools and Department of Defense overseas schools to participate in specified Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs.

Chairman Perkins has supplied for the Record valuable summaries of these and other amendments contained in the proposed legislation and I shall not repeat them. I would, however, like to say a few words about the success to date of the National Teacher Corps, of which Senators Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts and Gaylord Nelson were sponsors in the Senate and I in the House.

Mr. Speaker, the Teacher Corps has received the warm endorsement of educational leaders all over the country. Such diverse people and groups as the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, Mayor John Lindsay, of New York, and the outstanding Pittsburgh school superintendent, S. P. Marland, have heartily endorsed the Teacher Corps. I insert texts of their letters in the Record at this point:

National Congress of
Parents and Teachers,
Chicago, Ill., February 2, 1967.

To: State Chairman of Legislation, National Board of Managers.

From: Mrs. Edward F. Ryan, National Chairman of Legislation.

CALL FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION

The National Teacher Corps

It is generally agreed that educational opportunity remains the best means of breaking the poverty cycle for millions of children now growing up in slums. One of the chief obstacles in present efforts, however, is the lack of enough qualified teachers who are able and willing to work in what is essentially a different culture and another language, to give the badly needed individual attention.

The National Teacher Corps has proven to be one good instrument to provide educational opportunity to disadvantaged children. The Corps is made up of teams of experienced and interne teachers, working under the regular school staff in a two-year graduate program with a nearby university. In each team the experienced teacher acts as team leader, and the internes are graduate students teaching, or assisting teachers, while working toward a master's degree in education. A local program is initiated when teams are requested by the local school district, and the training program in the university is developed cooperatively. Approval of the project by the state department is required. Federal funds pay 90 percent of the cost.

Because the Corps members are selected from those who had not previously prepared for teaching, they represent an addition to the number of highly qualified teachers. At the same time, their academic programs are developed specifically for teaching disadvantaged children, and have proven to be an important means in improving teacher education.

The first Corps members went in training in June 1966. There are now about 1,200 Corpsmembers working in 300 schools in 110 school districts in 28 states. Fifty universities are cooperating in the program.

Originally Congress *authorized* funds for 2,500 Corpsmen, but *appropriated* funds for only 1,600, for a year's training. The Administration is requesting *supplemental* funds of $12,000,000 to complete the second year for the present group of 1,200 and start next summer's training for a new group of 2,500.

In addition, new *authorization* and *appropriation* will be requested for $36,000,000 to complete training for the first group, carry forward training for the second group, and begin a third.

There is much evidence that the Teacher Corps program is serving to develop successful teaching methods for working with disadvantaged children, both urban and rural, beyond those previously available in teacher education. As we well know, the methods helpful with disadvantaged children are good for all children. At the same time the program is adding to the available supply of highly qualified teachers badly needed in this field.

The National PTA therefore proposes to support this program as outlined above, with provisions for channeling funds as well as program approval through the state departments of education.

Your own prompt action in support is needed right now, however, if the Corps is to remain in business. Lack of interest in Congress has jeopardized even the completion of the first training cycle. Would you please, therefore, write or call your own congressmen and senators as quickly as possible to request their support for the full appropriation of authorized funds for the National Teacher Corps, and for new funds of $36,000,000 to prepare the second group of interne teachers and begin a third?

The City of New York,
Office of the Mayor,
New York, N.Y., January 23, 1967.

Hon. John W. Gardner,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: In looking ahead to a year which promises to bring a review of many federal programs which intimately affect the cities, I would like to express my personal admiration and the strong support of my entire Administration for the work of the National Teacher Corps in New York City. Since the idea of the Teacher Corps was first introduced while I was in Congress, I have watched with interest its growth and development in its first year in New York.

Far too often, imaginative innovation is at a premium in government. Yet few qualities are more seriously needed at all levels of government. The National Teacher Corps represents the kind of innovation which is imperative to urban public education if it is to respond to the immense challenges facing our schools today.

The 93 teacher corpsmen who are now working in 16 of our public schools in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens, and Manhattan have brought a great spirit of open-minded change to a system which sometimes seems to have built-in rigidities. I have become familiar with the constructive role played by the city's teacher corpsmen through reading reports of their activities. Members of my own staff and the Human Resources Administration have also been greatly impressed with the corpsmen with whom they have had the opportunity to discuss the work of the National Teacher Corps. At New York University, Hofstra, Hunter, and Queens College, working in neighborhood storefronts, voter registration drives, clean-up campaigns, after-school music classes, and extra language training. The interns have refused to accept the bounds of a textbook definition of teaching. They have helped their students by helping the community, and they have brought new hope to children who too often give up in school because they believe the school has given up on them.

The Teacher Corps has brought a much-needed infusion of genuine commitment and imaginative talent to the schools of New York City. I would count it a serious setback to the cause of quality education for every American if the Teacher Corps were not to be allowed to continue and expand its work in New York and across the country. We need more such young men and women who believe in the right of every child in every American school to broaden their world beyond the invisible prisons of poverty.

With best regards,

John V. Lindsay,
Mayor.

Pittsburgh Public Schools,
Pittsburgh, Pa., January 26, 1967.

Mrs. Donald A. Levenson,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

Dear Anne: Responding to your letter of January 18, I am pleased to enclose a statement which you are free to use in any way you wish in support of the National Teacher Corps. A year or two before the Teacher

Corps emerged in national legislation we in Pittsburgh were heavily concerned with what we at that time called "the Urban Teacher." We had constructed a design for the early identification, intensive training, and internship experience for young men and women to confront the deep needs of inner-city schools. At the time the National Teacher Corps became a fact we found it so similar to our prior planning that we immediately seized the opportunity to identify warmly with NTC and to set aside what we called "The Urban Teacher Program." This is merely by way of explaining to you our strong commitment to the concept.

I would further add that in my judgment there is emerging in our society a new breed of young person coming through our colleges and universities with a deep and self-sacrificing commitment to social justice. This commitment is not necessarily related to the profession of teaching in the conventional sense, and it is therefore quite possible that thousands of these young people in realizing the relevance of urban teaching to their own conscientious drives miss the whole point of the new vocation that we are defining, for indeed the urban teacher is in many ways a new vocation.

Therefore, at this time in history, the relevance of the NTC is one of the most significant moves that our society can make in bringing about a compatible relationship between the drives of young people and the needs of our civilization.

Sincerely,

S. P. MARLAND, Jr.

(NOTE.—Mrs. Levenson is chairman of the Pittsburgh Committee for the Teacher Corps.)

ATTACHMENT TO MARLAND LETTER RE NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

Thirty-two members of the National Teacher Corps are functioning members of the Pittsburgh Public School faculty. They are teaching in eight schools in four disadvantaged neighborhoods of our city. Teamed with experienced teachers of the regular staff the corpsmen are gaining insights into the teaching of boys and girls with low socio-economic backgrounds. Many of the N.T.C. members are finding ways and means of creating interest in learning, of strengthening the desire to learn, and of giving remedial help for the low achiever. Fully integrated into the school faculty the corpsmen plan, and practice with the regular teams, taking on more and more responsibility with teaching groups. They teach solo, large and small groups, or team teach.

In addition to the classroom experience the interns have the complementing activity of working with the home and school visitor, the school medical department and the school counselor. The principal plans for community agency contacts as they relate to the school needs. The classroom activities, the school service activities and the community agencies serve to give the intern a comprehensive experience in total teaching.

The N.T.C. training is directed not only to the development of teaching skills, but, probably more important, to the development of a commitment to teaching and, particularly, a commitment to teaching in deprived neighborhoods.

The N.T.C., therefore, is bringing into the teaching profession in Pittsburgh a group of college graduates who are trained in our classroom laboratories for teaching in the depressed neighborhoods. The concurrent course work at the University of Pittsburgh enhances their professional growth. These young interns will then be better equipped to cope with the problems of teaching in the inner-city—we hope in Pittsburgh.

More than 1,200 men and women—262 veteran teachers and 965 college graduates—are now serving in the Teacher Corps at the request and under the control of local school officials. Seventy percent of these teachers are focusing on elementary education, where the need is so great and the impact of a dedicated teacher so crucial.

The dedicated members of the Teacher Corps serve in school districts throughout the Nation which are most in need of more and better trained teachers—the slum schools of our cities and in areas of rural poverty. Teacher Corps teams serve in 20 of the 25 largest cities in the country—New York, San Diego, Houston, and Memphis among them. But they also serve in Appalachia and the Ozarks, in Spanish-speaking communities from Florida to California, in towns with populations of less than 1,000. Teacher Corps members, Mr. Speaker, are available for service in schools all over the country in which more than 50 percent of the pupils come from low-income families, precisely the schools which need them the most.

The proposal presented to us today would make the Teacher Corps a special part of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and emphasize its special relevance to the needs of the educationally disadvantaged. The Corps would be extended for 3 years and increased in size. In addition, the existing practice of local control of the Teacher Corps would be reaffirmed in the statute by making it clear—as is already the case—that no Teacher Corps member may be assigned to a local educational agency unless that agency wants him.

Mr. Speaker, other changes proposed today will lead to even more effective operation of the Corps. They will strengthen the relation of the Teacher Corps to State departments of education, increase the capacity of the Teacher Corps to train all of its members, and reduce its cost.

Mr. Speaker, I want to stress one point particularly, that the Teacher Corps represents and embodies local control of education, not Federal dictation.

The Teacher Corps provides assistance for schools that want help, not for those who do not.

The Teacher Corps is actively cooperating with State educational agencies, not bypassing them.

The Teacher Corps is far cheaper than neglect of the problems of disadvantaged children, not more expensive.

The Teacher Corps is a uniquely useful program. It attracts both experienced and prospective teachers and combines them in a program under which the experience and maturity of one strengthens the enthusiasm and new approaches of the other.

The Teacher Corps brings people not only into teaching, but into teaching of the disadvantaged and into the school districts which have the most difficulty in attracting enough, well-trained faculty. Training, service, focus on our most pressing needs, expansion of the supply of teachers—all are part of the Teacher Corps. One superintendent of schools from California recently summed up the situation with precision:

> There is no aspect of our society that needs more serious attention than that of education. There is no aspect of education that needs more serious attention than teacher training. There is no aspect of teacher training that needs more attention than the encouragement of young people to enter the teaching profession. The National Teacher Corps is an exciting new attempt to provide the encouragement needed for young people to enter teaching.

Mr. Speaker, such sentiments have been echoed repeatedly over the first year of operation of the Teacher Corps, in spite of the difficult conditions under which the corps began. I urge my colleagues—indeed, all who are interested in improving the quality of American education—to lend full support to the Teacher Corps.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967, as proposed today by Chairman PERKINS and me:

H.R. 6230

A bill to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education by extending authority for allocation of funds to be used for education of Indian children and children in overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense, by extending and amending the National Teacher Corps program, by providing assistance for comprehensive educational planning, and by improving programs of education for the handicapped; to improve programs of vocational education; to improve authority for assistance to schools in federally impacted areas and areas suffering a major disaster; and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967".

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, AND RELATED AMENDMENTS

PART A—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE I OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

SUBPART 1—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE II OF PUBLIC LAW 81–874

Extending for one year, provisions relating to schools for Indian children

SEC. 101. The third sentence of section 203 (a) (1) (A) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1967," and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1968,".

Raising the dollar limitation for State administrative expenses under title II of Public Law 874

SEC. 102. Effective for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1967, section 207(b) (2) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress) is amended by striking out "$75,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$150,000".

Technical corrections with respect to payments on account of neglected or delinquent children and payments for children of migratory agricultural workers

SEC. 103. (a) The first sentence of section 203(a) (2) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress) is amended by inserting "(other than such institutions operated by the United States)" immediately after "living in institutions for neglected or delinquent children", and by striking out "paragraph (5)" and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph (7)".

(b) Section 205(c) (1) (C) of such Act is amended by striking out "(8)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(10)".

(c) Section 206(a)(3) and section 207(b) of such Act are each amended by striking out "section 205(a)(5)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 205(a)(6)".

Redesignating section numbers in title II of Public Law 874

SEC. 104. For the purpose of avoiding confusion between references to section numbers of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and references to section numbers of title II of Public Law 81-874 (which latter title is also generally cited as title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965), sections 201 through 214 of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended by the preceding sections of this Act, are redesignated as sections 101 through 114, respectively, and all references to any such section in that or any other law, or in any rule, regulation, order, or agreement of the United States are amended so as to refer to such section as so designated.

SUBPART 2—TEACHER CORPS

Teacher Corps program transferred and reconstituted as part B of title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

SEC. 111. (a) Part B of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (with its references therein to title II of Public Law 81-874 redesignated as provided by section 104 of this Act) is deleted from that Act (but without repeal thereof) and is inserted (as captioned) as part B in title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 immediately after the last section of such title; and the sections so transferred (which are numbered 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, and 517), and internal cross-references therein to any such section, are redesignated and are hereinafter in this title referred to as sections 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, and 157, respectively, of such title I, so as to make such part B read as follows:

"PART B—NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 151. (a) The purpose of this part is to strengthen the educational opportunities available to children in areas having concentrations of low income families and to encourage colleges and universities to broaden their programs of teacher preparation by—

"(1) attracting and training qualified teachers who will be made available to local educational agencies for teaching in such areas; and

"(2) attracting and training inexperienced teacher-interns who will be made available for teaching and inservice training to local educational agencies in such areas in teams led by an experienced teacher.

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out this part, there are authorized to be appropriated $36,100,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $64,715,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

"SEC. 152. In order to carry out the purposes of this part, there is hereby established in the Office of Education a National Teacher Corps (hereinafter referred to as the 'Teacher Corps'). The Teacher Corps shall be headed by a Director who shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for grade 17 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, and a Deputy Director who shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for grade 16 of such General Schedule. The Director and the Deputy Director shall perform such duties as are delegated to them by the Commissioner.

"TEACHER CORPS PROGRAM

"SEC. 153. (a) For the purpose of carrying out this part, the Commissioner is authorized to—

"(1) recruit, select, and enroll experienced teachers, and inexperienced teacher-interns who have a bachelor's degree or its equivalent, in the Teacher Corps for periods of up to two years;

"(2) enter into arrangements, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education or State or local educational agencies to provide members of the Teacher Corps with such training as the Commissioner may deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of this part, including not more than three months of training for members before they undertake their teaching duties under this part;

"(3) enter into arrangements (including the payment of the cost of such arrangements) with local educational agencies, after consultation in appropriate cases with State educational agencies and institutions of higher education, to furnish to local educational agencies, for service during regular or summer sessions, or both, in the schools of such agencies in areas having concentrations of children from low-income families, either or both (A) experienced teachers, or (B) teaching teams, each of which shall consist of an experienced teacher and a number of teacher-interns who, in addition to teaching duties, shall be afforded time by the local educational agency for a teacher-intern training program developed according to criteria established by the Commissioner and carried out under the guidance of the experienced teacher in cooperation with an institution of higher education; and

"(4) pay to local educational agencies the amount of the compensation which such agencies pay to or on behalf of members of the Teacher Corps assigned to them pursuant to arrangements made pursuant to the preceding clause.

"(b) Arrangements with institutions of higher education to provide training for teacher-interns while teaching in schools for local educational agencies under the provisions of this part shall provide, wherever possible, for training leading to a graduate degree.

"(c)(1) Whenever the Commissioner determines that the demand for the services of experienced teachers or of teaching teams furnished pursuant to clause (3) of subsection (a) exceeds the number of experienced teachers or teaching teams available from the Teacher Corps, the Commissioner shall, to the extent practicable, allocate experienced teachers or teaching teams, as the case may be, from the Teacher Corps among the States in accordance with paragraph (2).

"(2) Not to exceed 2 per centum of such teachers or teams, as the case may be, shall be allocated to Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs. The remainder of such teams or teachers, as the case may be, shall be allocated among the other States in proportion to the number of children counted in each State for the purpose of determining the amount of basic grants made under section 103 of title II of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, for the fiscal year for which the allocation is made.

"(d) A local educational agency may utilize members of the Teacher Corps assigned to it in providing, in the manner described in section 105(a)(2) of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, educational services in which children enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools can participate.

"COMPENSATION

"SEC. 154. (a) An arrangement made with a local educational agency pursuant to paragraph (3) of section 153(a) shall provide for compensation by such agency of Teacher Corps members during the period of their assignment to it at the following rates:

"(1) an experienced teacher who is not leading a teaching team shall be compensated at a rate which is equal to the rate paid by such agency for a teacher with similar training and experience who has been assigned similar teaching duties;

"(2) an experienced teacher who is leading a teaching team shall be compensated at a rate agreed to by such agency and the Commissioner; and

"(3) a teacher-intern shall be compensated at a rate which is equal to the lowest rate paid by such agency for teaching full time in the school system and grade to which the intern is assigned.

"(b) For any period of training under this part the Commissioner shall pay to members of the Teacher Corps such stipends (including allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such members and their dependents) as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported training programs.

"(c) The Commissioner shall pay the necessary travel expenses of members of the Teacher Corps and their dependents and necessary expenses for the transportation of the household goods and personal effects of such members and their dependents, and such other necessary expenses of members as are directly related to their service in the Corps, including readjustment allowances proportionate to service.

"(d) The Commissioner is authorized to make such arrangements as may be possible, including the payment of any costs incident thereto, to protect the tenure, retirement rights, participation in a medical insurance program, and such other similar employee benefits as the Commissioner deems appropriate, of a member of the Teacher Corps who participates in any program under this part and who indicates his intention to return to the local educational agency or institution of higher education by which he was employed immediately prior to his service under this part.

"APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LAW

"SEC. 155. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this section, a member of the Teacher Corps shall be deemed not to be a Federal employee and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

"(b)(1) Such members shall, for the purposes of the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (5 U.S.C. 751 et seq.), be deemed to be civil employees of the United States within the meaning of the term "employee" as defined in section 40 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 790) and the provisions thereof shall apply except as hereinafter provided.

"(2) For purposes of this subsection:

"(A) the term "performance of duty" in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall not include any act of a member of the Teacher Corps—

"(i) while on authorized leave; or

"(ii) while absent from his assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity authorized by or under the direction or supervision of the Commissioner; and

"(B) in computing compensation benefits for disability or death under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the monthly pay of a member of the Teacher Corps shall be deemed to be his actual pay or that received under the entrance salary for grade 6 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, whichever is greater.

"(c) Such members shall be deemed to be employees of the Government for the purposes of the Federal tort claims provisions of title 28, United States Code.

"LOCAL CONTROL PRESERVED

"SEC. 156. Members of the Teacher Corps shall be under the direct supervision of the appropriate officials of the local educational agencies to which they are assigned. Except as otherwise provided in clause (3) of section 153(a), such agencies shall retain the authority to—

"(1) assign such members within their systems;

"(2) make transfers within their systems;

"(3) determine the subject matter to be taught;

"(4) determine the terms and continuance of the assignment of such members within their systems.

"MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT

"SEC. 157. No member of the Teacher Corps shall be furnished to any local educational agency under the provisions of this part if such agency will use such member to replace any teacher who is or would otherwise be employed by such agency."

(b) The heading of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "FINANCIAL" and by striking out "TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES", and the following new heading is inserted immediately below such heading:

"PART A—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES FOR EDUCATION OF CHILDREN IN AREAS HAVING CONCENTRATIONS OF CHILDREN FROM LOW-INCOME FAMILIES".

(c) Wherever in any law, rule, regulation, order, or agreement of the United States reference is made, however styled, to part B of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965, or to any section thereof, such reference is amended so as to make comparable reference to part B of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, or to such section of that part as redesignated herein, respectively.

(d) Subject to the provisions of subsections (a) and (c), any order, rule, regulation, right, agreement, or application in effect under part B of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 immediately prior to the enactment of this Act, shall continue in effect to the same extent as if this section had not been enacted.

(e) Appropriations made for carrying out the part B of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 which is transferred by this section to and reconstituted as part B of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 shall be deemed made for carrying out such part B of such title I.

(f) The section of title II of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, redesignated as section 114 of such title by section 104 of this Act is amended by inserting "Part A of" immediately before "Title I".

Extending Teacher Corps program

SEC. 112. Subsection (b) of the section redesignated by this Act as section 151 of such part B of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "and" after "June 30, 1966," and by inserting the following immediately before the period at the end of such subsection: ", $36,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, and June 30, 1970, respectively; and there are further authorized to be appropriated such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, as may be necessary to enable any teacher-intern who has not completed his program of practical and academic training to continue such program for a period of not more than one additional year."

Requiring approval of State educational agency

SEC. 113. The section redesignated by this Act as section 153(a) of part B (National Teacher Corps) of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended as follows:

(a) Paragraph (2) is amended by striking out "with institutions of higher education or State or local educational agencies" and inserting in lieu thereof "with institutions of higher education or local educational agencies (upon approval in either case by the appropriate State educational agency) or with State educational agencies".

(b) Paragraph (3) is amended by striking out "after consultation in appropriate cases with State educational agencies and institutions of higher education," and inserting in lieu thereof "upon approval by the appropriate State educational agency and after consultation, in appropriate cases, with institutions of higher education,".

Limiting compensation for teacher-interns

SEC. 114. (a) The section redesignated by this Act as section 154(a)(3) of such part B is amended by inserting ", or $75 per week plus $15 per week for each dependent, whichever is less" immediately after "to which the intern is assigned".

(b) The amendment made by this section shall not apply to any person enrolled in the Teacher Corps before the date of enactment of this Act.

Clarifying authority of local educational agency to refuse to accept particular members assigned to such agency

SEC. 115. The second sentence of the section redesignated by this Act as section 156 of such part B is amended by inserting "no such member shall be assigned to any local educational agency unless such agency finds such member acceptable, and" immediately before "such agencies shall retain the authority".

Authorizing acceptance of gifts on behalf of Teacher Corps

SEC. 116. The section redesignated by this Act as section 153(a) of such part B, as amended by this Act, is further amended by—

(a) striking out "and" at the end of clause (3);

(b) striking out the period at the end of clause (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(c) inserting the following new clause at the end thereof:

"(5) accept and employ in the furtherance of the purposes of this part (A) voluntary and uncompensated services notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679(b) of the Revised Statutes, as amended (section 665(b) of title 31, United States Code), and (B) any money or property (real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible) received by gift, devise, bequest, or otherwise."

Authorizing assignment of Teacher Corps members to schools for Indian children operated by Department of the Interior

SEC. 117. The first sentence of the section redesignated as section 153(c)(2) of such part B is amended by striking out "2 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "3 per centum", and by striking out "Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands" and inserting in lieu thereof "Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and elementary and secondary schools operated for Indian children by the Department of the Interior,".

Authorizing assignment of Teacher Corps members to special programs for children of migratory agricultural workers

SEC. 118. Such part B as amended by the preceding sections of this Act is further amended by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"Teaching in special programs or projects for children of migratory agricultural workers

"SEC. 158. For purposes of this part the term 'local educational agency' includes any State educational agency or other public or private nonprofit agency which provides a program or project designed to meet the special educational needs of migratory children of migratory agricultural workers, and any reference in this part to teaching in the schools of a local educational agency includes teaching in any such program or project."

Conforming amendment

SEC. 119. Subsection (c)(2) of the section redesignated by this Act as section 153 of part B of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "basic".

PART B—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE II OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Extending for one year provisions relating to schools for Indian children and Defense Department overseas dependents schools

SEC. 121. (a) Section 202(a)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "June 30, 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1968".

PART C—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Extending for one year provisions of title III of Public Law 89–10 relating to schools for Indian children and Defense Department overseas schools

SEC. 131. Section 302(a)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "June 30, 1967," and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1968,".

PART D—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE V OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

SUBPART 1—AMENDMENTS RELATING TO GRANTS TO STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

Inclusion of Trust Territory of Pacific Islands

SEC. 141. (a) The first and third sentences of paragraph (1) of section 502(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, relating to apportionment of appropriations, are each amended by striking out "and" after "Samoa," and by inserting ", and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands" after "Virgin Islands".

(b)(1) Paragraph (j) of section 701 of such Act, defining the term "State", is amended by striking out "and for purposes of title II and title III, such term includes the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands" and inserting in lieu thereof ", and for purposes of titles II, III, and V such term also includes the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands".

(2) Such section 701 is further amended by inserting ", except when otherwise specified" immediately after "As used in titles II, III, and V of this Act".

Revision of apportionment formula

SEC. 142. The second sentence of paragraph (1) of section 502(a) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "The remainder of such 85 per centum shall be apportioned by the Commissioner as follows:

"(A) He shall apportion 40 per centum of such remainder among the States in equal amounts.

"(B) He shall apportion to each State an amount that bears the same ratio to 60 per centum of such remainder as the number of public school pupils in the State bears to the number of public school pupils in all the States, as determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him."

SUBPART 2—ADDITION OF NEW PART RELATING TO PLANNING GRANTS

Comprehensive educational planning

SEC. 145. (a) Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by adding "AND FOR STATEWIDE EDUCATIONAL PLANNING" to its heading and by inserting the following immediately below its heading:

"PART A—GRANTS FOR STRENGTHENING LEADERSHIP RESOURCES OF STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES"

(b) Title V of such Act is further amended by striking out the words "this title" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "this part," and by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART B—GRANTS FOR COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND EVALUATION

"*Authorization*

"SEC. 521. To the end of enhancing the capability of the several States to make effective progress, through comprehensive and continuing planning, toward the achievement of opportunities for high quality education for all segments of the population throughout the State, the Commissioner is authorized to make, in accordance with the provisions of this part, comprehensive planning and evaluation grants to States that have submitted, and had approved by the Commissioner, an application pursuant to section 523, and special project grants, related to the purposes of this part, pursuant to section 524. For the purpose of making such grants, there are authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and such sums as may be necessary for the next four fiscal years.

"*Apportionment among the States*

"SEC. 522. (a) (1) From the sums appropriated for carrying out this part for each fiscal year, 25 percent shall be reserved for the purposes of section 524 and the remaining 75 percent shall be available for grants to States under section 523.

"(2) The Commissioner shall apportion not in excess of 2 percent of the amount available for grants under section 523 among the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, according to their respective needs for carrying out the purposes of this part. The remainder of such amount shall be apportioned by the Commissioner as follows:

"(A) He shall apportion 40 percent of such remainder among the States in equal amounts.

"(B) He shall apportion to each State an amount that bears the same ratio to 60 percent of such remainder as the population of the State bears to the population of all the States, as determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term 'State' does not include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(b) The amount apportioned under this section to any State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, shall be available for obligation for grants pursuant to applications approved during that year and the succeeding fiscal year.

"(c) The amount of any State's apportionment for any fiscal year under paragraph (2) of subsection (a) which the Commissioner determines will not be required for grants to that State under section 523 during the period for which such apportionment is available may from time to time be reapportioned by the Commissioner to other States, according to their respective needs, as the Commissioner may determine. Any amount so reapportioned to a State from funds appropriated for any fiscal year shall be deemed to be a part of the amount apportioned to it under subsection (a) for that year.

"*Comprehensive planning grants*

"SEC. 523. (a) (1) Any State desiring to receive a grant or grants under this section from its apportionment under section 522 for any fiscal year shall designate or establish a single State agency or office (hereafter in this part referred to as the State educational planning agency) as the sole agency for carrying out or supervising the carrying out of a comprehensive Statewide program of systematic planning and evaluation relating to education at all levels (including remedial education and retraining of adults), except that—

"(A) the field of higher education shall be included only if the State so elects and so provides in an application (or amended or supplemental application) under this section, and

"(B) in the event of such election the State may designate or establish a separate State agency (hereafter in this part referred to as the State higher education planning agency) for carrying out or supervising the carrying out of such planning and evaluation program with respect to higher education.

"(2) A grant to a State may be made under this section only upon approval of an application submitted to the Commissioner through the State educational planning agency, except that, with respect to States electing to include the field of higher education as provided in clause (A) of paragraph (1) of this subsection and designating or establishing a State higher education planning agency as provided in clause (B) of paragraph (1), the Commissioner, by or pursuant to regulation—

"(A) shall authorize the submission of a combined application which includes higher education (or an amended or supplemental application filed upon the making of such election) jointly through both of the State's planning agencies involved, or the submission of a separate application (or supplement) through the State's higher educational planning agency as to so much of the State's program as relates to planning and evaluation in the field of higher education, and

"(B) may provide for allocating, between the State's two planning agencies, the amount of any grant or grants under this section from the State's apportionment.

"(3) An application (or amendment or supplement thereto) under this section shall set forth, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, the Statewide program referred to in paragraph (1) (or, in the case of a separate application or amendment or supplement with respect to the field of higher education, so much of the statewide program as relates to that field), which shall include provision for—

"(A) setting Statewide educational goals and establishing priorities among these goals;

"(B) developing through analyses alternative means of achieving these goals, taking into account the resources available and the educational effectiveness of each of the alternatives (including, in the case of higher education, the resources and plans of private institutions in the State bearing upon the State's goals and plans for public higher education);

"(C) planning new programs and improvements in existing programs based on the results of these analyses;

"(D) developing and strengthening the capabilities of the State to conduct, on a continuous basis, objective evaluations of the effectiveness of educational programs; and

"(E) developing and maintaining a permanent system for obtaining and collating significant information necessary to the assessment of progress toward the State's educational goals.

"(b) Applications (including amendments and supplements thereto) for grants under this section may be approved by the Commissioner only if the application—

"(1) has been submitted to the chief executive of the State for review and recommendations;

"(2) sets forth, if the State has elected to include the field of higher education and has designated or established a separate State higher education planning agency, such arrangements for coordination, between the State's educational planning program in that field and the remaining educational planning program submitted by the State, as will in the Commissioner's judgment be effective;

"(3) contains satisfactory assurance—

"(A) that the assistance provided under this section, together with other available resources, will be so used for the several purposes specified in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of this section as to result in the maximum possible effective progress toward the achievement of a high level of competence with respect to each of them, and

"(B) that assistance under this part will, by the State planning agency involved, be used primarily in strengthening the capabilities of its own planning and evaluation staff or, to the extent that the program is to be carried out under the supervision of that agency by other agencies, the planning and evaluation staffs of such other agencies; but consistently with this objective part of the funds received under a grant under this section may be used, in appropriate circumstances, to employ consultants, or to enter into contracts for special projects with public or private agencies, institutions, or organizations having special competence in the areas of planning or evaluation;

"(4) makes adequate provision (consistent with such criteria as the Commissioner may prescribe) for using funds granted to the applicant under this section, other than funds granted for planning and evaluation in the field of higher education, (A) to make program planning and evaluation services available to local educational agencies, and (B) in the case of such agencies in areas (particularly metropolitan areas) with school populations sufficiently large to warrant their own planning or evaluation staffs, to assist such agencies (financially or through technical assistance or both) to strengthen their planning and evaluation capabilities and to promote coordinated areawide planning for such areas;

"(5) provides for such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the program;

"(6) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid under this part to the State (including any such funds paid by the State to agencies, institutions, or organizations referred to in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (3)); and

"(7) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may reasonably require (copies of which shall also be sent to the chief executive of the State), and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(c) A grant made pursuant to an approval of an application under this section may be used to pay all or part of the cost of activities covered by the approved application and included in such grant, but excluding so much, if any, of such cost as is paid for from grants under part A.

"*Special projects*

"SEC. 524. (a) The sums reserved pursuant to section 522(a) (1) for the purposes of this section shall be used for grants for special projects in accordance with subsection (b) of this section.

"(b) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to public or private nonprofit agencies, institutions, or organizations, or to make contracts with public or private agencies, institutions, or organizations, for special projects related to the purposes of this part, to be conducted on an interstate, regional, or metropolitan area basis, including projects for such purposes as—

"(1) metropolitan planning in education in areas covering more than one State;

"(2) improvement and expansion in the educational planning of large cities within a State with due regard to the complexities of adequate metropolitan planning in such places;

"(3) comparative and cooperative studies agreed upon between States or metropolitan areas;

"(4) conferences to promote the purposes of this part and involving different States;

"(5) publications of general use to the planning of more effective and efficient educational services, and other activities for dissemination of information related to the purposes of this part.

"Payments

"SEC. 525. Payments under this part may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments, as the Commissioner may determine."

PART E—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, AND RELATED AMENDMENTS

Regional resource centers

SEC. 151. Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by—

(1) inserting immediately below the heading of such title

"PART A—ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN";

(2) inserting immediately below section 607

"PART D—GENERAL PROVISIONS";

(3) redesignating sections 608, 609, and 610 as sections 610, 611, and 612, respectively,

(4) striking out the words "this title" wherever they occur in sections 601 through 607, and inserting in lieu thereof "this part"; and

(5) inserting immediately after section 607 the following:

"PART B—REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTERS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

"Regional resource centers

"SEC. 608. (a) For the purpose of aiding in the establishment and operation of regional centers which will develop and apply the best methods of appraising the special educational needs of handicapped children referred to them and will provide other services to assist in meeting such needs, there are authorized to be appropriated $7,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the four succeeding fiscal years.

"(b) Appropriations under this section shall be available to the Commissioner for grants to or contracts with institutions of higher education, State educational agencies, or combinations of such agencies or institutions, within particular regions of the United States, to pay all or part of the cost of establishment (including construction) or operation of regional resource centers for the improvement of education of the handicapped in such regions. Centers established or operated under this section shall (1) provide testing and educational evaluation to determine the special educational needs of handicapped children referred to such centers, (2) develop educational programs to meet those needs, and (3) assist schools and other appropriate agencies, organizations, and institutions in providing such educational programs through services such as consultation (including, in appropriate cases, consultation with parents or teachers of handicapped children at such regional centers), periodic re-examination and re-evaluation of special educational programs, and other technical services.

"(c) In determining whether to approve an application for a project under this section, the Commissioner shall consider the need for such a center in the region to be served by the applicant and the capability of the applicant to develop and apply, with the assistance of funds under this section, new methods, techniques, devices, or facilities relating to educational evaluation or education of handicapped children.

"(d) Payment pursuant to grants or contracts under this section may be made (after necessary adjustments on account of previously made underpayments or overpayments) in advance or by reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions as the Commissioner may determine."

Improvement of recruitment of educational personnel and information on educational opportunities for the handicapped

SEC. 152. Such title VI is further amended by inserting immediately after part B, as added by the preceding section, the following new part:

"PART C—RECRUITMENT OF PERSONNEL—INFORMATION ON EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED

"Grants or contracts to improve recruiting of educational personnel, and to improve dissemination of information concerning educational opportunities for the handicapped

"SEC. 609. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, or institutions, or to enter into contracts with public or private agencies, organizations, or institutions for projects for—

"(1) encouraging students and professional personnel to work in various fields of education of handicapped children and youth through, among other ways, developing and distributing imaginative or innovative materials to assist in recruiting personnel for such careers, or publicizing existing forms of financial aid which might enable students to pursue such careers, or

"(2) disseminating information about the programs, services, and resources for the education of handicapped children, or providing referral services, to parents, teachers, and other persons especially interested in the handicapped.

"(b) To carry out the purposes of this section, there are authorized to be appropriated $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the four succeeding fiscal years."

Transfer of definition and other technical amendments

SEC. 153. (a) Section 602 of such title VI is redesignated as section 613 and transferred to the end of such title.

(b) Section 601 of such title is amended by—

(1) striking out the section heading and inserting in lieu thereof the heading

"Grants to states for education of handicapped children";

(2) striking out "(a)" in subsection (a);

(3) redesignating section 601(b) as section 602 by striking out "(b)" in subsection (b) and inserting "SEC. 602." in lieu thereof; and

(4) inserting above section 602 as so redesignated the section heading

"Appropriations authorized".

(c)(1) The portion of section 701 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (containing definitions) which precedes subsection (a), as amended by section 141(a) of this Act, is further amended by striking out "As used in titles II, III, and V" and inserting in lieu thereof "As used in titles II, III, V, and VI".

(2) Paragraph (j) of such section 701, as amended by section 141(b) of this Act, is further amended by striking out "and V" and inserting in lieu thereof "V, and VI".

Short title of title VI of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

SEC. 154. Title VI of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Short title

"SEC. 614. This title may be cited as the 'Education of the Handicapped Act'."

Including schools for Indian children operated by the Department of the Interior and Defense Department overseas dependents schools in title VI

SEC. 155. So much of paragraph (1) of section 603(a)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 as follows the first sentence is amended to read as follows: "The Commissioner shall allot the amount appropriated pursuant to this paragraph among—

"(A) Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective needs, and

"(B) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, (i) the Secretary of the Interior according to the need for such assistance for the education of handicapped children in elementary and secondary schools operated for Indian children by the Department of the Interior, and (ii) the Secretary of Defense according to the need for such assistance for the education of handicapped children in the overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense. The terms upon which payments for such purpose shall be made to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Defense shall be determined pursuant to such criteria as the Commissioner determines will best carry out the purposes of this title."

Expansion of instructional media programs to include all handicapped children

SEC. 156. Subsection (b) of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a loan service of captioned films for the deaf" (42 U.S.C. 2491 et seq.) is amended to read as follows in order to conform its statement of objectives to amendments made to such Act by Public Law 89–258:

"(b) to promote the educational advancement of handicapped persons by (1) carrying on research in the use of educational media for the handicapped, (2) producing and distributing educational media for the use of handicapped persons, their parents, their actual or potential employers, and other persons directly involved in work for the advancement of the handicapped, and (3) training persons in the use of educational media for the instruction of the handicapped."

SEC. 157. Section 2 of such Act is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"(4) The term 'handicapped' means deaf, mentally retarded, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, or other health impaired persons."

SEC. 158. Section 3 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "deaf" and inserting in lieu thereof "handicapped" each time it occurs therein.

SEC. 159. Section 4 of such Act is amended by striking out "$5,000,000" and inserting "$6,000,000" in lieu thereof, and by striking out "$7,000,000" and inserting "$8,000,000" in lieu thereof.

Authorizing contracts, as well as grants, for research in education of the handicapped

SEC. 160. (a) The first sentence of section 302(a) of Public Law 88–164 is amended by inserting ", and to make contracts with States, State or local educational agencies, public and private institutions of higher learning, and other public or private educational research agencies and organizations," immediately before "for research or demonstration projects".

(b) The second sentence of such section 302(a) is amended by striking out "Such grants shall be made" and inserting in lieu thereof "Payments pursuant to grants or contracts under this section may be made".

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963

PART A—EXEMPLARY AND INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS OR PROJECTS IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

SPECIAL PROGRAMS OR PROJECTS

SEC. 201. Section 4 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-210, 20 U.S.C. 35c) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) (1) There are authorized to be appropriated $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and such sums as may be necessary for the four succeeding fiscal years, to be used by the Commissioner for making grants to or contracts with State boards or local educational agencies for the purpose of stimulating and assisting, through programs or projects referred to in paragraph (3), the development, establishment, and operation of exemplary and innovative occupational education programs or projects designed to serve as models for use in vocational education programs. The Commissioner also may make grants to other public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, or institutions, or contracts with public or private agencies, organizations, or institutions, when such grants or contracts will make an especially significant contribution to attaining the objectives of this subsection.

"(2) (A) From the sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine and shall apportion such amount among Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this subsection.

"(B) From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall apportion $150,000 to each State, and he shall in addition apportion to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to any residue of such remainder as the population aged 15 to 19, both inclusive, in the State bears to the population of such ages in all the States.

"(C) Any amount apportioned to a State under this subsection for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for grants for programs or projects in that State during the period for which such apportionment is available shall be available for reapportionment by him from time to time to other States in accordance with their respective needs.

"(D) For the purposes of paragraph (2) (A) and (B) of this subsection, the term 'State' does not include Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(E) The population of particular age groups of a State or of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the latest available estimates furnished by the Department of Commerce.

"(F) The amount apportioned under this section to any State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, shall be available for obligation for grants pursuant to applications approved during that year and the succeeding fiscal year.

"(3) Grants or contracts pursuant to this subsection may be made by the Commissioner, upon such terms and conditions consistent with the provisions of this section as he determines will most effectively carry out the purposes of paragraph (1), to pay part of the cost of—

"(A) planning and developing exemplary and innovative programs or projects such as those described in subparagraph (B), or

"(B) establishing, operating, or evaluating exemplary and innovative vocational education programs or projects designed to broaden occupational aspirations and opportunities for youths, with special emphasis given to youths who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps, which programs or projects may, among others, include—

"(i) those designed to familiarize post-elementary school students with the broad range of occupations for which special skills are required and the requisites for careers in such occupations;

"(ii) programs or projects for students providing educational experiences through work;

"(iii) programs or projects for intensive occupational guidance and counseling during the last years of school and for initial job placement; or

"(iv) programs or projects designed to broaden or improve vocational education curricula.

"(4) (A) Programs or projects referred to in clause (ii) of paragraph (3) (B) may include cooperative work-study arrangements, other educationally related public or private employment, or volunteer work. Preference in compensated work under such programs or projects shall be given to students from low-income families.

"(B) No grant or contract shall be made by the Commissioner under this subsection with respect to any such program or project unless—

"(i) such program or project will not involve the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

"(ii) such program or project will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services.

"(C) Funds appropriated under this subsection shall not be available to pay any part of the compensation of a student involved in a program or project referred to in clause (ii) of paragraph (3) (B) if the work is performed for any employer other than a public private nonprofit agency, organization, or institution.

"(5) (A) In determining the cost of a program or project under this subsection, the Commissioner may include the reasonable value (as determined by him) of any goods or services provided from non-Federal sources.

"(B) Financial assistance may not be given under this subsection to any program or project for a period exceeding three years.

"(6) In administering the provisions of this subsection, the Commissioner shall consult with other Federal departments and agencies administering programs which may be effectively coordinated with the program carried out pursuant to this subsection, and to the extent practicable shall—

"(i) coordinate such program on the Federal level with the programs being administered by such other departments and agencies; and

"(ii) require that effective procedures be adopted by grantees and contractors to coordinate the development and operation of programs and projects carried out under grants or contracts pursuant to this subsection with other public and private programs having the same or similar purposes."

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 202(a) (1). Section 4(a) of such Act (describing permitted uses of Federal funds under approved State plans) is amended by changing the period at the end of paragraph (6) to a semicolon and inserting immediately after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

"(7) The planning, establishment, operation, and evaluation of programs or projects of the kind described in subsection (d), whether or not previously assisted by a grant or contract under such subsection."

(2) Section 5(a) (2) and section 6(b) of such Act are each amended by striking out "and (6)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(6), and (7)".

(b) The second sentence of paragraph (1) of section 8 of such Act (defining the term "vocational education") is amended by inserting "(individually or through group instruction)" immediately after "counseling", and by inserting "or for the purpose of facilitating occupational choices" immediately after the word "training" the first time such word appears in that sentence.

(c) The first sentence of section 5(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "this part" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 3".

(d) The heading of section (6) of such Act is amended to read "PAYMENTS", and the following sentence is added at the end of subsection (d) of such section: "Other payments pursuant to this Act may be made in installments, in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments."

PART B—AMENDING SECTION 4(c) TO ALLOW CONTRACTING AND DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION

SEC. 211. Section 4(c) of such Act is amended by inserting ", or to make contracts with private agencies, organizations, or institutions for, (1)" immediately after "cost of"; by striking out "and of" immediately preceding "experimental" and inserting in lieu thereof ", (2)"; and by inserting immediately prior to the period the following: ", or (3) for the dissemination of information derived from the foregoing programs or from research and demonstrations in the field of vocational education".

PART C—INCLUDING THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS UNDER THE ACT

SEC. 221. Paragraph (6) of section 8 of such Act is amended by striking out "and American Samoa" and by inserting in lieu thereof "American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands".

SEC. 222. Paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 3(d) of such Act are amended by striking out the words "and the Virgin Islands" each time they occur and by inserting in lieu thereof "the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands".

TITLE III—FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

PART A—ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION AND CURRENT EXPENDITURES IN IMPACTED AREAS

CLARIFYING DEFINITIONS OF "FEDERAL PROPERTY"

SEC. 301. Section 15(1) of the Act of September 23, 1950, (Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress) and section 303(1) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress) are each amended by—

(a) striking out the second sentence thereof;

(b) striking out "also" in the penultimate sentence thereof; and

(c) inserting immediately before the last sentence thereof the following new sentence: "Such term also includes any interest in Federal property (as defined in the foregoing provisions of this paragraph) under an easement, lease, license, permit, or other arrangement, as well as any improvements of any nature (other than pipe lines or utility lines) on such property even though such interests or improvements are subject to taxation by a State or political subdivision of a State or by the District of Columbia."

PART B—ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION AND CURRENT EXPENDITURES IN MAJOR DISASTER AREAS

ASSISTANCE TO DISASTERS OCCURRING AFTER JULY 1, 1967

SEC. 311. (a) Section 16(a) (1) (A) of the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress), as added by Public Law 89-313, is amended by striking out "July 1, 1967," and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1972,".

(b) Section 7(a) (1) (A) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress), as added by Public Law 89-313, is amended by striking out "July 1, 1967," and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1972,".

AUTHORIZING, IN CASES IN WHICH THE DISASTER HAS NOT DESTROYED OR DAMAGED PUBLIC SCHOOLS, ASSISTANCE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES NEEDED BECAUSE OF DESTRUCTION OF PRIVATE FACILITIES WHICH WILL NOT BE REPLACED

SEC. 312. (a) Section 16(a)(2) of the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress), is amended to read as follows:

"(2) as a result of this major disaster, (A) public elementary or secondary school facilities of such agency have been destroyed or seriously damaged, or (B) private elementary or secondary school facilities serving children who reside in the area served by such agency have been destroyed and will not be replaced, thereby increasing the need of such agency for school facilities;".

(b) Section 16(a)(4) of such Act is amended by inserting "(A)" after "needed", inserting "of such agency" after "the school facilities", and inserting the following before the semicolon after the word "damaged": "or (B) to serve, in facilities of such agency, children who but for the destruction of the private facilities referred to in clause (2)(B) would be served by such private facilities".

MODIFYING CONDITIONS OF ELIGIBILITY WITH RESPECT TO LOCAL EFFORT AND MINIMUM DAMAGE REQUIRED

SEC. 313. (a) Section 16(a)(3) of the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) such agency is utilizing or will utilize all State and other financial assistance available for the replacement or restoration of such school facilities;".

(b) Section 16(a)(4) of such Act is amended by inserting "and requires an amount of additional assistance equal to at least $1,000 or one-half of one per cent of such agency's current operating expenditures during the fiscal year preceding the one in which such disaster occurred, whichever is less," immediately before "to provide the minimum school facilities needed".

(c) Section 7(a)(2) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) such agency is utilizing or will utilize all State and other financial assistance available to it for the purpose of meeting the cost of providing free public education for the children attending the schools of such agency, but as a result of such major disaster it is unable to obtain sufficient funds for such purpose and requires an amount of additional assistance equal to at least $1,000 or one half of one per cent of such agency's current operating expenditures during the fiscal year preceding the one in which such disaster occurred, whichever is less, and".

DETERMINING LEVEL OF EDUCATION TO BE RESTORED ACCORDING TO LEVEL AT TIME OF DISASTER INSTEAD OF LEVEL DURING A BASE YEAR

SEC. 314. The penultimate sentence of section 7(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress) is amended by striking out "during the last full fiscal year".

AUTHORIZING DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE FOR TECHNICAL, VOCATIONAL, AND OTHER SPECIAL SCHOOLS

SEC. 315. (a) Section 16(a) of the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress) and section 7(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress) are each amended (1) by inserting "(or any other public agency which operates schools providing technical, vocational, or other special education to children of elementary or secondary school age)" immediately after "If the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning determines with respect to any local educational agency", and (2) by striking out "if the Commissioner determines with respect to such local educational agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "if the Commissioner determines with respect to such agency".

(b) Clause (2) of section 16(a), as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting "(or, in the case of a public agency other than a local educational agency, school facilities providing technical, vocational, or other special education to children of elementary or secondary school age)" after "public elementary of secondary school facilities".

CLARIFYING AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR MINOR REPAIRS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 874

SEC. 316. Section 7(b) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress) is amended by inserting "to make minor repairs," immediately after "destroyed or seriously damaged as a result of such major disaster,".

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to indicate my hearty support for the special message on health and education presented before this body today by President Johnson. In this message, the President has recognized the importance of special attention which now must be paid to a coordinated approach to the health and education problems of the people of our country.

There are two particular areas in the message which are of special interest to me. The first relates to the critical shortages which now exist in health manpower; the second relates to the National Defense Education Act and the Higher Education Act.

During my work on the House Ways and Means Committee in connection with the Medicare Act of 1965, it became evident from testimony presented to our committee that a critical shortage was indeed imminent in the field of health occupational training. With this in mind, I sponsored a lengthy seminar on this subject in Cleveland in 1965, the first such conference to be held in the United States. As a result of this conference, a project for training over 1,300 people in health occupations was begun in my city of Cleveland.

While the program has gotten off to a very slow start, a start has indeed been made. As hospital and nursing home utilization have increased as a result of medicare, there has been a marked increase in the shortage of personnel. It becomes quite clear that an approach like the one recommended by President Johnson is vital if we are to keep abreast of our health manpower needs.

Problems which we have experienced in Cleveland in the area of health occupational training are, undoubtedly, being experienced elsewhere in the country. A coordinated approach to this area of training must and can be undertaken under the provisions suggested in the section of the President's health and education message.

I wish to commend the President and add my support to assure the development of a soundly organized approach to health occupational training in this country. I wish also to express my support for the President's recommendation that the National Defense Education Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965 be extended.

From studies I have conducted of the utilization of these important programs in my district and in the city of Cleveland, the importancy of these programs is clearly evident. The fact that National Defense Education Act student loans have been available has meant that many thousands of students otherwise unable to meet the increased financial burdens of a college education are assured the means to do so. This system of financing college educations has become particularly important since conventional loan funds have been more difficult to obtain for this purpose because of high interest rates and the unwillingness of some banks to participate in alternative student loan programs. I have also seen the fullest use in my city of the other sections of the National Defense Education Act relating to libraries and educational curricula programs and new and more useful educational equipment; increased support of services in the field of guidance counseling has been strengthened because of this vital program. Nationally, over 10,300 National Defense Education Act fellows have received assistance in our colleges and universities. Small colleges sorely in need of financial assistance have been able to benefit from this program. Three hundred thousand college students have been assisted through the development of part-time employment. Over 835,000 students have received National Defense Education Act loans.

This vital legislation deserves the support of this Congress because of its demonstrated success.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased that the President's health message has called for an expanded national program in occupational health. As President Johnson said almost a year ago:

> The time has come to do something about the effects of a working man's job on his health. This problem has been neglected too long.

I could not agree more. Our Government today supports medical and health services for many groups of American citizens—mothers and children, senior citizens, people with heart disease, strokes, cancer, and mental problems, the poor and the unemployed. Yet, we have done little to protect the health of the largest group of our citizens—our workers who keep our Nation strong and productive. The proposed legislation is the first step in correcting the gross oversight.

The health hazards our 80 million workers face are real and they are serious, ranging from vexing skin diseases to deadly lung cancer. One out of every 10 soft coal miners in the Appalachia area has a disabling chest disease caused by his work. Four million workers in the manufacturing, construction, and automotive repair industries work under conditions either immediately dangerous to their health or hazardous enough to require continual inspection. Anywhere from 6 to 16 million workers—and the true figure is not known—are on jobs where noise conditions are potentially damaging to their hearing.

These problems do more than affect the individual worker, although that in itself is enough to merit correction.

They also affect the health and strength of our Nation. In some areas of the country machinists, whose skills are vital to our defense effort, are in short supply—their factories on double shifts. If they miss work, production—and the national security—suffers. If a national occupational program of the type proposed by the President can keep them healthy and productive, our troops abroad can be assured of a steady flow of supplies.

Our workers need, and the new program will help provide, legislation to protect them against known and predictable health hazards. For example, one chemical dye, which is known to produce cancer of the bladder among workers and has been outlawed in one State, is still being produced and moved in interstate commerce. There are no national labeling requirements to cover this and hundreds of other toxic industrial substances. Nor is there at the present time any effective mechanism for testing new products and processes so that precautions can be taken before health hazards occur. Reports of occupational diseases occurring in one plant or industry are not available to prevent broadscale repetition elsewhere.

Because the health hazards facing our workers are varied and complicated, the solutions are not going to be easy. Just as the mine safety, clean air, and clean water acts had to be changed on the basis of practical experience, I am sure that the proposed legislation is not going to be the final answer. But a first step has to be taken, and I am pleased that the 90th Congress is going to have a chance to take it.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has appealed to the conscience of the Nation to do more for our handicapped youth. There are tens of thousands of such youngsters—the mentally retarded, the deaf, the blind, the emotionally disturbed, the crippled, and others who have known a childhood of anguish and despair. A number of important legislative proposals by the administration already has been enacted into law. These new programs insure quality education for handicapped children, but constitute only a beginning for a comprehensive education program to help handicapped children.

It is estimated that 5 million school-age children are handicapped in some fashion and require special education and training. Yet thousands of these children do not have access to the special educational services they require. We need literally thousands of more professional and supportive personnel to help handicapped children.

President Johnson's recommendations provide assurance that more of our resources will be efficiently and effectively invested in programs to assure that the special educational needs of handicapped children are adequately met.

I urge you to support the programs proposed by the President. The regional resource centers for improving the education of the handicapped will provide testing and educational evaluation of handicapped children, in cooperation and coordination with all agencies concerned with providing educational services to these children. The centers will undertake demonstration projects of the latest, and most improved methods and techniques for educating special types of handicapped young people.

An expanded professional personnel recruitment program will help to meet the already crucial need for teachers, supervisors, teacher aides, and others trained to work with these unfortunate youngsters.

A comprehensive and expanded system of information dissemination will distribute up-to-date facts about programs, services, and resources available to parents, educators, and others concerned with the educational opportunities of handicapped children.

And the expansion of the instructional materials research, demonstration, production, and distribution will provide the benefits of the remarkably successful captioned films for the deaf program to many other categories of handicapped children.

Many of President Johnson's recommendations will build upon existing programs which past legislation began. My hope is that this Congress will continue the progress begun so promisingly only a few years ago.

The President's proposal raises a fundamental question: Can the richest and most powerful nation on earth be also the most humane and enlightened?

I believe we shall vote "yes" to this proposition.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to offer my support for the President's request in his health and education message for funds to expand the program of assistance to school districts in solving the problems of desegregation.

Public school systems undergoing desegregation under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 will enter the third year of their desegregation program during the coming fiscal year.

An essential part of the programs in hundreds of these school systems has been the assistance made available under title IV of that act. This section provides invaluable technical assistance as well as grants to help school boards cope with problems arising out of desegregation. Although funds have been limited, the success of the program has been remarkable in terms of preventing disorders and strife that inevitably would have arisen without the kind of help provided under title IV.

As he said in his message, the President has requested $30 million to carry on title IV of the Civil Rights Act. This is nearly four times the amount appropriated by the Congress to carry on this program during each of the 3 preceding years.

The funds he has asked for are based on the amount of money requested by communities during the last 3 years. Obviously, the need is there; and there is no question that the money will be put to good use. These most sensitive human relations problems affect every section of the country. Much of the money granted under title IV has gone to the South. But, a great deal also has gone to the North and West where we all know similar problems exist.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the President's request.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the President and the administration, recognizing the importance of the Nation's 80 million workers, are calling for an increase in occupational health activities designed to keep these workers healthy, on the job, and productive. My colleagues have spoken about the long neglect of this vital aspect of our public health efforts and have indicated the types of research needed to solve workers' health problems. Just as important, is the necessity for seeing that something is done about the problems. It is with respect to occupational health, I feel, that the Partnership for Health concept can be best expressed.

The 89th Congress found that Federal assistance must be directed to support the marshaling of all health resources—National, State, and local—to assure comprehensive health services of high quality for every person; that it was desirable to strengthen the leadership of State health agencies. And yet, it is precisely in the field of occupational health that the State resources show the greatest lack.

Current staffs of State health agencies are totally inadequate to cope with a fast growing industrial labor force. Eight States have no occupational health program at all. These States cannot offer even token partnership with the Federal Government directed toward worker health. The average number of nonagricultural employees per occupational health staff member ranges from a low of 23,400 in Vermont to a high of 724,000 in Illinois. The average number of workers for which each State occupational health expert must provide services is 108,200. This is an impossibly large number, and has led to the untenable situation of a first-rate Nation having fourth-rate health services for its workers.

The delivery of health services to the ultimate beneficiary, the worker, can be best accomplished at the State and local level. I would strongly urge that the concept of the Comprehensive Health Planning Act of 1966—that of partnership—be applied to occupational health and that in the new legislation there be a vigorous program of strengthening State and local health agencies for this purpose.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the President's message on education.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ETHICS AND DISCLOSURE BILL

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McDonald] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I join with many of my new

Republican colleagues in introducing an ethics and disclosure bill. I believe that the finding of the recent select committee hearings dramatically emphasize the importance of enacting this type of legislation.

The proposed measures will provide an effective means for the House to survey the outside activities of its Members and to protect the public from possible abuses by its elected representatives. I am hopeful that this proposal which I have introduced today will receive prompt and favorable consideration.

U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY VERSUS FRIENDLY RELATIONS WITH THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the issue of whether we should sell to the Soviet Union a small two-man research submarine requires no great diplomatic talent to resolve. To state the case briefly, the United States last July called for international cooperation with all the maritime nations of the world in the peaceful exploration of the science of oceanography. To the Soviet Union in particular the United States extended "our earnest wish that you may join with us in this great endeavor." The Soviets later approached the General Dynamics Corp., the manufacturer, to purchase one of the subs. The proposition was put in the lap of the Federal Government, and according to the New York Times of February 26, 1967, the State Department was wavering in favor of the sale while the Navy Department opposed it.

Involved in the manufacture of the submarine is a secret welding process which was developed at General Dynamics which we refuse to divulge even to our ally, Great Britain. Now our arch enemy in Vietnam and throughout the world, the Soviet Union, wishes to acquire the sub along with all the plans, specifications and repair information, and the State Department is reported to be considering it.

If the newspaper account of this issue is essentially true, then we have been handed another illustration of how an unrealistic and dangerous foreign policy can imperil the security of the Nation.

I include the article, "Submarine Sale to Soviet Studied," from the New York Times of February 26, 1967, in the RECORD at this point:

SUBMARINE SALE TO SOVIET STUDIED—BID FOR RESEARCH OFFSET BY FEAR OF LOSING SECRETS

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, February 25.—A Soviet bid to purchase a miniature United States submarine has the Administration in a quandary as a political desire to cooperate with the Russians conflicts with a technical interest in protecting the secrets of atomic submarines.

The Navy was reported by Pentagon sources to be opposed to the sale of the two-man research submarine, the State Department was reported to be wavering in favor of the sale, and the ultimate decision, it was conceded by officials, probably will have to be made by the White House.

For the White House, however, the decision will be a difficult one, because a Presidential bid for Soviet cooperation in the peaceful exploration of the oceans is involved. In a policy speech last July setting out the Administration's objectives on oceanographic research, President Johnson called for international cooperation since, as he put it, "truly great accomplishments in oceanography will require the cooperation of all the maritime nations of the world."

To the Soviet Union in particular, the President extended "our earnest wish that you may join with us in this great endeavor."

This presidential offer was cited by the Soviet Academy of Sciences in a letter to the General Dynamics Corporation last month in which it asked to purchase one of the company's research submarines, known as the Star III.

Soviet scientists had seen a wooden model of the submarine at the Frankfurt Oceanographic Equipment Show in West Germany in November and decided they could use it in their underwater exploration of the Black Sea.

The sale might have been a straightforward matter if the submarine had not been built by the Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics, one of the principal builders of atomic submarines for the Navy.

The Star III, a 10-ton craft capable of diving to depths of 2,000 feet, is an unclassified research vehicle under military security regulations. It has no nuclear power plant nor does it carry any secret military equipment or instruments used in nuclear submarines. But the concern of the Navy is that some of the valuable technology developed by General Dynamics for fabrication of nuclear submarines might be disclosed.

HIGH ALLOY STEEL

The research submarine, for example, uses HY–100 steel, a high alloy steel comparable to that used in atomic submarines. The technology of the steel is commonly known, but what is not well known is the technique for welding the steel so it can resist the extreme pressures encountered by a deep-diving submarine.

The welding technique was one of the most difficult problems encountered in the original development of atomic submarines. The technique is still regarded as so secret that it has not been divulged to Britain, although the United States has provided Britain with plans for a reactor for an atomic submarine.

One major problem encountered by Britain in building its first atomic submarine, the Dreadnaught, reportedly was in welding the steel plates in the submarine hull.

While the Soviet Union has developed atomic submarines, the presumption of United States submarine experts is that Russia does not have as sophisticated a welding technique as the United States and, therefore, cannot build atomic submarines that will go as deep as those of the United States.

The diving depth of United States submarines is still a tightly held secret, but they are believed to approach the 2,000-foot capabilities of the Star III.

The Navy, therefore, is concerned that if the Soviet Union obtains a Star III submarine, along with all the plans, specifications and repair information, Russian engineers will acquire valuable information on how atomic submarine hulls are fabricated by the United States.

In its letter, the Academy of Sciences explained that the submarine, which has mechanical hands to pick up ocean-bottom samples, was wanted to explore the marine life and geological features of Black Sea canyons. But the suspicion of some Navy officials is that if the submarine is shipped to the Soviet Union it will never go to sea but be taken apart to see how it is fabricated.

Officials of the Electric Boat Company in Groton, Conn., said the submarines were built as a "private venture" by engineers in its research and development division who are not directly involved in the day-by-day construction of atomic submarines. But they acknowledge that some of the technology involved in constructing atomic submarine hulls "probably had rubbed off" onto the research submarine. For example, they said, the welding techniques "probably are similar."

The immediate decision on whether to sell the submarine rests with the State Department's Office of Munitions Control, which must determine whether under its regulations the research craft is "an article considered to be an arm or implement of war or incorporating technology related thereto."

If the State Department decides the submarine does not fall under its munitions control, the decision will shift to the Commerce Department to determine whether the craft falls under its export controls over shipments to Communist nations.

THE TRANSITION FROM STATE TO NATIONAL ISSUES

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a column recently by the nationally known author and syndicated columnist, Victor Lasky, who writes for the North American Newspaper Alliance, points up the fact that the transition from State to National areas can have its pitfalls. Foreign policy issues, for instance, very rarely constitute major issues on the State level. Yet, as in the case of Vietnam, there are of unequaled importance. The following views by Mr. Lasky in his column, "Say It Straight," dated for release the weekend of February 25, 26, 1967, illustrates the issue clearly, and for that reason I include it in the RECORD at this point:

ROMNEY HURTS HIS OWN CAUSE BY INEPT CAMPAIGN STRATEGY

(By Victor Lasky)

NEW YORK, February 25.—Gov. George Romney does his presidential aspirations a decided disservice when he gets testy with newsmen interested in ascertaining his views on such questions as Vietnam. The Michigan Republican appears to be congenitally incapable of spelling out his thoughts succinctly and responsively. And he gets irate when pressed to do so by newshawks who, after all, are just doing their job.

The tragedy is that this good man may well prove to be his own worst enemy. Veteran political reporters, who followed Romney on his recent western trip, are beginning to wonder whether the Governor has the expertise so necessary for a man who wants to be President of the United States. And their copy reflects their concern.

In Pocatello, Idaho, the Governor swung out at the Johnson administration with a charge that by resorting to "political expediency" it had gotten the Nation into serious difficulties both at home and abroad.

"Can you give us an example of what you mean?" a reporter asked.

"No, I will not," the Governor replied.

"Why?" asked the reporter.

"Because I choose not to."

A few more of such inept performances and Gov. Romney might as well return to Lansing and forget all about the Presidency. No amount of money—and he certainly is not hurting for cash—can change a growing conviction that Romney, despite his statesmanlike looks and excellent record as Governor, would not be able to handle the toughest job in the world.

And what does Romney mean when he states that the Republican Party is not "locked in" on Vietnam and, thus, has "not exhausted its options and is free to take a fresh approach?" Is his "fresh approach" to give in to Hanoi? The Governor doesn't say yes and he doesn't say no. He just keeps mumbling along.

Like most Americans, Romney finds Vietnam a complex situation that defies easy solution. But, unlike most Americans, Romney wants to be President, and must come up with answers that make sense.

Romney has had several months since the election to bone up on the issues and prepare himself for the tough questioning of the top correspondents who inevitably trail a seeming front-runner.

Nevertheless, he did have one success the other day. Alfred M. Landon, the 1936 GOP presidential candidate, came out for Romney in 1968.

HOW TO FIGHT CRIME

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, the noted and respected columnist, Roscoe Drummond, makes a good point in his column, "How To Fight Crime," appearing in the Christian Science Monitor on February 27, about the responsibility of the individual citizen in the battle to reduce the crime rate. Under leave to extend my remarks, I want to call special attention to his observations. I personally feel that the success or failure of any meaningful effort will rest with you and me, and the millions like us, and unless we do our parts individually, no amount of money, preachments or tongue clucking will get the job done.

Mr. Drummond's column follows:

How To Fight Crime

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Public concern about crime in the United States is growing all the time. It should.

Crime is growing all the time and the rate of increase is greater than the rate of population increase.

The wide publicity given the recent report of the National Crime Commission is all to the good. It forces us to face the facts and the facts are that we will be in for more trouble until we do the things needed to deal with crime and criminals more effectively and more wisely.

But public concern is not automatically a national asset in dealing with this problem. It is not an asset if most people hold to their present view that the effort to reduce crime is somebody else's responsibility, not their own.

PUBLIC FEARFUL

The need is for alertness without alarm and for a sense of personal involvement. This is why the answer which commission chairman Nicholas Katzenbach gave Look magazine is valuable. The question was: Is the public too fearful of crime? The answer:

"Yes, and no. There are, of course, rational reasons for fear. The crimes that get the most attention are those most likely to induce fear—armed holdups, beatings, rape, murder—and I think the common idea is that, therefore, we should fear the stranger. Actually, most crimes of violence are committed by friends, associates, and relatives—not by strangers. Most crime is committed by people who live in slums against people who also live in slums, not by people coming out of slums and attacking people in the suburbs. Most crime is not interracial, although when it is, it gets a lot more attention. Negroes in slums fear crime more—and with more reasons—than any group."

PARENTAL NEGLECT

The report of the Crime Commission shows vividly how much the individual can do to reduce crime by his own actions and until the individual says, "I am going to do my part now," he has no excuse for blaming someone else.

The crimes which are increasing the most rapidly are those which the individual citizen can do most about: put a better lock on the door, don't leave milk bottles and newspapers out front while away, remove the ignition key from your car and lock the doors; don't carry large sums of cash and don't leave things lying around in your car or home. These are ways to reduce the opportunities for crime—and will reduce the amount of crime.

There are two other ways the individual can act and thus make himself a personal and powerful force for reform.

Young people commit a higher proportion of crime than any other age group. Youths 15 and 16 years old are only 5.4 percent of the population but they account for 12.8 percent of all arrests. Most criminal careers are begun in youth and therefore are either fostered or not prevented in the home. This means that parents are neglecting their children, are not providing either proper teaching in the home or proper examples and are relying on community institutions, usually the school and the church, to exert on influence on children which will never be adequate unless matched in the home.

SPECIAL OPPORTUNITY

There will, of course, have to be important actions taken by local, state, and national government to improve the police, improve the courts, improve the systems of correction. Here, too, the individual can do much. The commission urges that every city and state designate an agency of one or more officials to take responsibility for such improvements. Every citizen can focus his influence on this one thing, interest his friends and his civic organizations to take action to support it.

The individual is not helpless. He can act all by himself.

And the fact that The Christian Science Monitor has given so much constructive attention to the crime problem and to the commission report suggests that those who understand the operation of spiritual and moral law in human affairs have a special opportunity to help.

WESTERN ELECTRIC SETS PACE IN SEWAGE TREATMENT

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, when I spoke in support of the Clean Rivers Restoration Act last September, I stated:

> Although this bill does not go as far as I would like to see in respect to incentives for industrial construction of sewage treatment plants, it does provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior looking toward appropriate future legislation. We will not have truly "clean rivers" until treatment of industrial sewage not tied into municipal sewer systems is also assured.
>
> Toward that end I have submitted a bill to give industries income tax credit for the expenses of installing their own treatment plants. I hope some such legislation will be enacted to help provide the missing segment of the clean rivers restoration program.

In furtherance of hopefully attaining that objective, I have introduced similar legislation—H.R. 209—in this Congress, although it seems unlikely that there will be any congressional action on this subject until the Secretary of the Interior has made his study report, due by January 30, 1968.

It is heartening, however, to see that some industries are not waiting for Government action but are moving ahead on their own. One of the most outstanding examples is the Western Electric Co., which has just announced plans for constructing a $1.5 million sewage treatment plant at its Merrimack Valley Works, North Andover, Mass., in my congressional district. This is the largest such plant undertaken by any industry in Massachusetts, and it is indeed a challenge to other industries throughout the United States to take affirmative steps toward elimination of river pollution by wastes from their plants.

In that regard, I think many other people will appreciate the remarks of Harry N. Snook, general manager of Western Electric's Merrimack Valley Works, in announcing his company's decision to make its major contribution toward pollution control in the Merrimack River. Mr. Snook stated:

> Each person present today is acutely aware, as a concerned citizen, that immediate action must be taken to restore and preserve our natural resources. We are constantly reminded that two of our most precious birthrights, our air and our water, have gradually become less and less wholesome. We are also cognizant of the fact that the restoration of these birthrights is a task that must be jointly shouldered by private industry and the Federal, state and local governments. No lasting solution to these problems will result unless government and industry work hand in hand.
>
> As a concerned corporate citizen, Western Electric is proud to take this voluntary, initial step in pollution abatement that is so vital to communities in the central Merrimack Valley. We feel confident that our friends in business and industry who work along the Merrimack River, as well as those who have plants and businesses adjacent to other rivers and streams in this area, will certainly cooperate in this vital program. As you know, the Associated Industries of Massachusetts is and has been working diligently to supply leadership for members of our Commonwealth's industrial community in this important field.
>
> Certainly it would be remiss of me to neglect mentioning the leadership which members of the local, state and federal government are providing. It is easy to find out-

standing examples of interested involvement and participative cooperation on the part. Hardly a day goes by when we are not reminded by our friends in the press, radio and television communities of the many bills, programs and studies that our representatives at all levels of government have initiated.

PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT

Each representative of government present today, as well as those who could not join us, should take legitimate pride in his involvement in pollution abatement. I have no doubt that this personal involvement has brought us to our present state of attack on this problem and will result in additional breakthroughs in its solution in the future.

In brief, since water pollution may be termed as a problem of the highest priority to society, no significant step toward its prevention, control or abatement can be made unless there is an effective joining of the community's total resources—all levels of government, industry, scientists and most important of all—the individual citizen.

Consequently, in recognizing our responsibility in this area and willingly responding to the challenge it imposes, the facility we propose to begin building this fall will incorporate advanced concepts in waste treatment. As a result of the utilization of these new concepts, we can predict that our treated waste water will continue to be such that no pollution of the Merrimack River from this works will result. This facility, while an advancement over our present system, will enable us to meet all future standards that are being considered to conserve this valuable water supply.

WAR ON POLLUTION

Our sole purpose in this venture is to do our part to wage war on the stream pollution problem in Massachusetts. We sincerely hope by doing so that the major natural waterways of this beautiful Merrimack Valley area will benefit. Most importantly, we hope that this action will illustrate that we are concerned in establishing and maintaining a degree of water quality in Massachusetts that will not only comply with established requirements, but which will, in addition, protect the health and welfare of our neighbors. In doing so, a reasonable enjoyment of this river and a continued vigorous industrial development of this area will result.

CUTBACKS IN FEDERAL HIGHWAY FUNDS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the distinguished Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, John A. Volpe, appeared before a special hearing conducted jointly by the Public Works Committees of the House and Senate to outline his position on recent cutbacks in Federal highway funds.

The Governor spoke not only for Massachusetts, but in his capacity as vice chairman of the Federal-State Relations Committee of the National Governors' Conference. His statement is a trenchant analysis of the impact of the reduction in highway funds and I wish to call it to the attention of all of my colleagues by including it in the RECORD:

GOV. JOHN A. VOLPE'S REMARKS BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I am well aware that your committee had nothing to do with the cutback of $1.1 billion dollars in federal-aid highway funds. I am also aware of the administration proposals made this morning which will partially alleviate the situation which resulted from the cutback. I appreciate this action but it will not solve the total problem.

I appear before you today as the representative of the National Governors' Conference—well aware that each of you represent great states that have been adversely affected by this action. As Vice-chairman of the Federal-State Relations Committee; and, at the suggestion of Governor William Guy of North Dakota, the Chairman of the National Governors' Conference, and as Governor of The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I have every confidence that your Committee will recognize the folly of tampering with highway monies. I have every confidence that the evidence presented to you will lead to a reversal of this misuse of gas tax monies paid by the citizens of our nation to the Federal highway trust fund.

I take this opportunity to work with you, Mr. Chairman, and with members of your Committee to deal with this great crisis. That challenge, plainly stated, is whether the population and motor vehicle explosions which we face can be met with the total development of a modern highway system to service America. We are destined to face this challenge because mobility has been, and will continue to be, a vital and meaningful part of our society. Mobility has an implicit priority in economic planning and has always been an integral factor to the military needs of a society.

With this in mind, let us explore developments since November 23, 1966, which have had a definite impact on every person whose livelihood depends on the nationwide transportation effort.

I am specifically referring to the impact that has, and will continue to be caused from any cutback of funds from federally financed road-building programs.

Since the passage of the Interstate Highway Act, a full decade ago, thousands of miles of highway have been constructed and opened to traffic. These modern superhighways have already begun to stimulate the economies of our great cities and states. These highways have become a vital part of the national economy; and, with the decline and obsolescence of mass transit systems across the nation. The national highway network has become the prime mover of people and goods—the prime mover in our mobile society. Very soon population densities and high land costs will set a limit on new highway construction in urban areas.

The last nation-wide report, issued by the Federal Bureau of Public Roads, listed as open 21,590 of its 41 thousand mile interstate system—which is about 53%. At the present time, we have over 90 million motor vehicles registered nationally and a total of 3.6 million miles of local streets and public ways available for their use. The national primary and secondary total road mileage is 227 thousand.

The over 90 million vehicles will travel a total of 880 billion miles this year; and, by 1975, we can expect to have a total of 120 million vehicles traveling almost 1.2 trillion miles. These are astronomical statistics and they pose a most serious challenge to those of us charged with providing roads adequate to carry ever-increasing traffic loads.

Unquestionably, highway builders have done a magnificent job in the past. They have given the United States the finest highway transportation network—one that is the envy of the rest of the world. However, the interstate system of 41 thousand miles of controlled access highways, when completed, will represent only slightly more than 1% of the nation's 3.6 million miles of roads and streets. The network will, however, carry 20% of all motor traffic safely, swiftly and efficiently. But 80% of all travel will take place on other roads and streets.

This means that even after the interstate network is completed, our nation will need additional highway capacity to cope with the travel demands of the next decade.

To keep our economy in high gear, we must complete, on schedule, the projects we now have underway. Future construction must not be hampered and plagued by Federal limitations. No major highway plan can be abandoned without causing serious damage to our industrial growth upon which the economic welfare of all our people hinges.

Let me emphasize that, as a representative of the chief executives of the various states, I strongly urge that completion of the interstate highway program be given the highest priority.

What hurt most was the inequity caused by the freezing of all unobligated funds as of July 1, 1966. In many instances, this precluded the states from following an orderly and phased advertising schedule of projects on which the design had been or was nearing completion. The holdback of these funds will not permit completion of the interstate system in each state at the same time as originally envisioned by the Congress. I believe that, if pursued, any freeze of road funds will be harmful to all fifty states, to the citizens of today and to the generations of tomorrow.

Gentlemen, I ask you to consider these four points:

First, the economic impact the administration's policy will have on future road construction.

Second, the adverse affect on highway safety programs called for by the Congress.

Third, the basic intent of the cutback.

Fourth, the intent of the Congress in establishing the self-supporting highway trust fund to build highways.

The economic impact of the policy, since the passage of the Interstate Highway Act a full decade ago, the various states, as I have pointed out, have been engaged in accelerated highway programs which have led to the construction of thousands of miles of freeways. Thousands of miles of modern, safe highways promise greater mobility, greater safety and a great economy. With this dream approaching ultimate realization, any action of the administration to limit or restrict the use of highway funds rightfully due to the states, will bring this great effort and national need to an unacceptable slowdown.

The White House fund freezing has already delayed this program to the point where the majority of states will be unable to complete their programs before 1975. This will not only cost time, it will cost money, it will cost lives.

The Congress called for completion of the interstate and defense system of highways in 1972. Administration policy has pushed that date back to at least 1975. Any restriction will push completion further away because of engineering, design and administrative problems it poses. Also, we will not be able to construct the same miles for the same dollars in the years to come.

For example, ten years ago, we could build one mile of interstate highway for $673 thousand. Today it costs about $1.25 million a mile. This figure will increase in the years ahead.

At the start of the program, as you gentlemen well know, the estimated cost of the national interstate program was $28 billion. This was later raised to $41 billion; and, today, the forecast is $51 billion. Our costs have doubled since 1955. Obviously, fiscal prudence dictates that we finish the job . . . now! And, it is not only the costs of steel, concrete and asphalt that are increasing. Also on the rise, is loss of life and limb on the nation's highways.

The impact on highway safety, as to number two of the points I have raised, during recent months, the administration and the Congress have moved courageously to improve highway safety. The result has been the passage of far-reaching and progressive legislation aimed at making the motor vehicle a safer instrument of public use than it has ever been.

The administration's limitation of highway funds will be harmful to the total highway safety effort.

The basic intent of cutback, on point number three, I ask you to consider the announced explanation of the cutback. I would call your attention to the remarks of Senator Birch Bayh of Indiana contained in the Congressional Record of February 15, 1967. He was supporting his resolution in opposition to the highway funds cutback. He said, and I quote:

"Has Congress revised its estimate of the urgency of the highway traffic problem? Is the interstate system no longer an essential weapon in the war against traffic deaths? I think not.

"Mr. President, it should now be apparent that we will not meet the 1972 target date. In fact, as a result of the present policy, the earliest estimate for the completion of the remaining 20 thousand miles of the interstate system has been pushed back to 1974.

"Mr. President, I must confess that I simply do not see the logic of this deferment as a contribution to the war in Vietnam. The deferment of highway funds, contrary to popular opinion, does not free money for use in Vietnam.

"Trust fund money is earmarked and cannot be spent for any purpose other than highway construction. Of course, under Section 209 of the Highway Act, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to invest that portion of the highway fund that is not required to meet current needs.

"This deferment, therefore, is misdirected, both as a remedy for current economic needs and as a means of providing more funds for the war in Vietnam."

Use of highway trust funds—On my final point, Number 4, I want to elaborate upon the question of tampering with highway monies.

The highway trust fund program, as you know, was established by Congress to finance a pay-as-you-go highway program. In its wisdom, the Congress asked highway users to finance a program from which they would benefit. Much has been achieved.

Then came the administration cutback order of November 23, 1966, an order that took highway users by surprise and seriously delayed one of the most progressive government programs of our generation.

I cannot accept the administration's logic that led to this action. It is, I believe, a direct violation of the intent of the Congressional action that established the highway trust program.

For the administration to use gasoline monies for non-highway purposes is as illogical and improper as it would be to use social security funds for purposes other than caring for our aged.

I strongly urge that the cutback order be rescinded in its entirety and I ask this Committee to work with the Governors of the various states for the restoration of the highway funds. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE TAFT ADDRESSES MIDDLESEX CLUB

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on February 17 the Middlesex Club, a distinguished Massachusetts Republican organization, celebrated its 100th anniversary with its annual Lincoln Day dinner. Speaker for the occasion was our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. The occasion marked the third generation of Taft statesmen to address the club. Former President William Howard Taft and Senator Robert A. Taft had previously addressed the group.

The Middlesex Club is now under the outstanding leadership of my good friend Charles Morin, long one of the club's most energetic members. The 100th anniversary dinner was a successful occasion in every way and Congressman TAFT's remarks were very much in the tradition of eloquence and energy for which his family is justly known. Under unanimous consent I include the text of Mr. TAFT's remarks in the RECORD:

I am honored to be the speaker at this 100th Anniversary of the Middlesex Club. The earlier appearances of my grandfather and my father make it an exceptional honor for me. The pleasure is added to by the presence of your new and able Congresswoman Peggy Heckler, and my long friendships with your Congressmen Bill Bates, Silvio Conte, Hastings Keith, and Brad Morse.

When this club was formed 100 years ago, the Republican Party had taken the leadership of the nation. It had done so because of its bold position on three problems of national concern. These were the questions of:

1. Restoring the Union and national security;
2. The abolishment of slavery;
3. Recognition that the people themselves should be the dominant voice in government.

These goals had risen from the confusions of vacuums of position of the nation in 1859 just before the Civil War. Their resolution had established the dominance of the Party for three decades or more.

Today, the Republican Party has a similar challenge and a like opportunity.

In our International relations there is division and confusion within the Democratic leaders as to our role, not only in Vietnam, but also in Europe and the entire world.

In national security matters the inequities of the draft and the uncertainties of our military preparedness in new weapons and in training go unexplained and uncorrected. The inevitable result is further lack of confidence and frustration of national purpose.

In problems of discrimination and equality of opportunity, the Democratic Party likewise remains deeply split. We see the rosy pledges of progress on the national scene belied by miserable performance and execution, not to mention the racism of the Wallaces and the Maddoxes at the State level.

Finally the desire and dedication of Americans for responsive and responsible government continues to be thwarted by the ever-increasing centralization of power in Washington and the dominance there of the executive bureaucracy.

In each of these areas Republicans have an opportunity to move into the vacuums of leadership. They could do so far more easily than Lincoln did in 1859 and 1860. While there is disagreement on our Vietnam policy, a great preponderance of Americans stands ready to back our commitment to halt any threat to freedom in its tracks. We need only leadership with courage to call for patriotism, unity and priority in doing so. This could do much to promote peace through negotiation by ending the lack of credibility in Hanoi as to our commitment and purpose.

In pursuing equality of opportunity, Republicans have the chance to take the lead in training programs and in new job openings and advancement through partnership of government at all levels with the private sector.

In building responsive and responsible government, Republican proposals for local and state government reform and for distributing income tax revenues can and should make possible the handling of many problems by the people through solutions of their own choosing. Our genius of diversity of solutions need not be lost. Our community participation and responsibility must be strengthened not weakened.

If we Republicans can but recognize the shortcomings of the national leadership today and, united, offer our answers to them in 1967 and 1968, the party of Lincoln can and will be called upon for national leadership in the Congress and in the White House. I would like to review with you for just a few minutes tonight the nature of the problems faced by Lincoln and the nature of our problems today.

Elected without a mandate with 60% of the voters supporting one of his three opponents, Lincoln faced hitherto unknown perils for the American system of government, perils which have not been matched since. To a Union which had been rent asunder, Lincoln brought genius of leadership which resulted in the American people being reunited and launched once more on a march to greatness.

It is frightening even to consider what state of affairs might exist today had there been no Lincoln. Unthinkable as it might seem, there might be armed troops patrolling the banks of the Ohio River trying to enforce sanctions against the South similar to those being enforced against Rhodesia. Well can we ask whether we as a nation would have been able to stand up against Hitler, Stalin and the Japanese. Our high standards of living might never have been approached and most importantly, millions of our citizens might still be living in restraint or even in slavery here in the last half of the Twentieth Century.

We are fortunate that such matters are merely subject of speculation and yet any of these things might have been had Lincoln lacked fortitude. Nor was it solely Lincoln. We owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to the Republican Party of 1859, the year in which the Party was contemplating who would be chosen for the Presidency and it appeared that the country might be on the verge of a changing political power.

Tonight we find ourselves in a comparable position. Fortunately, the threat of American civil war no longer casts its shadow across the land, but there are definite parallels between factors dominating the pre-Lincoln electoral scene and those which are dominant today. Our responses may be no less important to the future. A distressing similarity between 1859 and 1967 is that once again the Democratic Party is split down the middle on the issue of whether America is willing to pay the price of freedom. In the time of Buchanan, Democrats divided over giving freedom to Negro slaves; tonight the Democratic Party cannot decide whether we should permit enslavement through abandoning our commitment to freedom for the people of Vietnam. As in the time of Buchanan, tonight a Democrat President cannot hold his party together either on this key issue or on the direction of domestic policy. Because of this, Democrats are forfeiting the right to lead. Almost daily, Democrat Senators and Congressmen undercut the President's policies. The unfortunate fact is that this undercutting is giving material comfort to the Communists and serving to prolong the conflict. In fact a Senator whose brother first authorized Americans to carry out combat roles in Vietnam appears to be undercutting the President's position. His own position with the Left Wing of the Democratic Party is thus solidified. This should be a matter of grave concern. In foreign policy, we Americans are used to pleas for bi-partisanship. Today there is a need of the President to unite his own party behind his objectives. A paramount issue in 1968 will be whether the Democrats of 1967 like the Democrats of 1859 forfeited their right to leadership by failing to unite the cause of freedom. No incident has called more to question the ability of the Democrats to lead us through these troubled times than the strange unfolding of the Kennedy peace feeler just last week. According to Newsweek magazine and other press reports, the Senator received a peace feeler while visiting in France. In content and detail it was said to go beyond anything the U.S. had received from any other source. When questioned by the press, the Senator refused to comment until he had a chance to talk with the President and such a response only heightened speculation that peace talks were imminent. Upon Mr. Kennedy's return to the United States there was no immediate presidential meeting. A hassle apparently developed as to whether the Senator was requesting to see the President or whether the President was requesting to see the Senator.

When the meeting finally took place, Senator Kennedy emerged and said there had been no contact such as reported by the Press. This announcement dashed the hopes of many for peace and spread the credibility gap even further. We can only speculate as to the justification for the turn of events.

The Republican party had the answer to the problem of the lack of Democratic leadership in 1859. Tonight we must strengthen ourselves, choose our best leadership, and throw the party of division out of office. We can once again provide the vigorous and unified leadership required to make America's position in the Vietnam conflict clear at home and abroad.

A second striking similarity exists between the opportunities of Republicans in 1859 and the opportunity of Republicans today. This relates to the attitudes toward and the position of the Negro in America. Though the Republican Party was born in opposition to slavery, there were those who in 1859 felt the commitment to the Negro should be soft pedaled in order to win votes. Abraham Lincoln sounded the clarion call in my own home town of Cincinnati on September 15, 1859 when he said "I think slavery is wrong morally and politically". Ever since, Republicans have viewed our racial problems as moral problems and recognize law as the proper method of reflecting that morality. This was behind the Public Accommodations Act of the Reconstruction. It is behind the Civil Rights legislation of today. Admittedly at times the Republican Party and its leadership have failed in their commitment to the Negro in America just as the opposition has failed. But I think we must admit once more that where this has occurred, we have been wrong. As Lincoln said, "If slavery is not wrong, nothing is wrong". In today's world this means if discrimination is not wrong, nothing is wrong, and equality means nothing without meaningful equality of opportunity.

There are still legislative goals to be accomplished in the area of Civil Rights and they should be approached promptly and without demogoguery. The advisibility of packaged bills which may drag down easily attainable goals with the more difficult ones is certainly subject to question and the sincerity of purpose. But while we should keep our attentions on these goals, perhaps the primary emphasis should shift from the legalistic and impersonal approach to the moral and highly personal one. We must turn our attention to encouraging and working with the private sector of our society to open up, in a way that government can never do, new opportunities for employment and advancement. In the Congress, we have junked the claimed coalition with the South for once and for all. The Wallaces and the Maddoxes make clearer daily the wisdom of such a decision. We must not sell equal civil rights down the river with deals with the hardcore southerners or even the unconcern of the Fulbrights. At the statewide and local level, we find your Governor, John Volpe, and our Ohio Governor, Jim Rhodes, meeting the issue headon with programs for jobs. Equally important it is that at the local level of political activity, we strive not only to make our party freely accessible to all who wish to join but that we go out into the wards and precincts and actively encourage Negro membership, responsibility and candidacy in the Republican party. We must do more than merely extend the right to serve in the ranks. Here in Massachusetts to your everlasting credit, you have elected Edward Brooke to the Senate. The importance of this decision is impossible to overestimate. It is true not only from the point of view of race relations but also because I know that he will be one of the greatest senators to come from this State and there have been some truly great ones, especially Ed Brooke's predecessor, your beloved Leverett Saltonstall. As Republicans we must recognize that our political strength lies in reaffirming the principles of equality and fair play forged in the days of Lincoln. Following in his footsteps, we could meet the challenges of equality on moral as well as political terms.

Finally, tonight, I would like to touch on another situation which has parallels with the days of emerging Lincolnian Republicanism in the distortion of the Federal system. Lincoln had to cope with a distortion of Federalism which grew from the mistaken notion of the Southern States as to the extent of their Sovereignty and the doctrine of interposition. At that time, Republicans responded by demanding and acting to restore the proper balance between the states and the Federal Government. Today it seems that the pendulum has swung too far to the other side. We see the States now on the verge of losing all political vitality through the pre-emption of the Federal Government of many of their proper functions. As in the 1850's, the Democrats have demonstrated again that they do not understand or have a true commitment to the Federal System as a safeguard of freedom. The opponents to our Lincolnian Republicans could even tolerate and support slavery in the name of States rights. While today the Democratic Party remains still the home of the Red necked states-righter, over the last 34 years, it has also become a mechanism for increasing Federal control and domination over many facets of American life. This control is followed with each succeeding preemption by the Federal Government of functions either taken from the private sector or formerly exercised by State and local government. While some of this pre-emption has resulted from the states failing to meet responsibilities as in the case of the Southern states on civil rights, in the long run a much more important factor has been the denial to the states of the financial ability to handle new problems because of the pre-emption of graduated income tax revenue by the Federal Government. The practical limitations upon rate and volume of property and sales taxes have handcuffed our political subdivisions. Today state and local governments are in desperate need of funds to carry out necessary programs of education, of crime protection, of water and air pollution control, of health and of training. Financial response of the Democratic leadership to this has been through grants and aid programs. These have expanded many times until today we have almost 150 programs with expenditures nearing $15 billions of dollars annually. But with the grant in aid has come the imposition of federal controls and federal direction.

This solution has only accelerated the shift in control to Washington. It can stifle the state and local attempts to solve problems that might better be handled at levels of government closer to the people. It has also stifled the diverse approaches to many of our problems that have led to their solution in the past. What Louis Brandeis referred to as our social laboratory is thus being closed down. As in Lincoln's day, Republicans are developing and proposing a solution to the problems of Federalism. While we recognize that it is by no means unique, we believe that sharing directly with state and local government some of the proceed to the graduated Federal Income Tax must and should be a national program. Many formulas have been proposed and note has been taken of the war-time demands upon Federal revenues that may postpone any implementation of the principle at the present time. However, this does not mean that it should not be studied and enacted as a principle to be put into effect at the earliest date possible. As an approach it can give to state and local political entities some financial resources to meet problems at the local level and assure to them a part in the national growth. The more direct reflection of that growth through the Federal Income Tax has been automatically building into our governmental structure a growth of national at the expense of regional and local response.

These are a few of the similarities of problem and of opportunity that existed and exist in 1859 and in 1967. As we meet here this evening, let us acknowledge that our prospects of political victory in 1968 are as good as those of the Republican party of Lincoln in 1859. Let us note that the Republicans of that day met their challenges with courage and perseverance. If we meet our responsibilities in the same spirit and with the same determination, and if we choose great leadership to carry our banner, we can be confident too that we may earn the tributes of history.

PROHIBIT DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT, JOB PLACEMENT, AND MEMBERSHIP IN A LABOR ORGANIZATION ON THE BASIS OF AGE

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am, today, introducing legislation to prohibit discrimination in employment, job placement, and membership in a labor organization on the basis of age.

This bill will, in my judgment, eliminate a glaring gap in the present structure of our labor laws. At the present time, it is estimated that about 27 percent of the unemployed in this country are 45 years of age or older. I cannot believe that there are not positions that these men and women can fill in our society. They should not be prevented from doing so due to an arbitrary insistence on age limitations.

This bill would make it a violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act for any employer with 50 or more employees to "refuse to hire, discharge, or otherwise discriminate against any person 45 years of age or older with respect to the terms, conditions or privileges of employment due to age, when age is not a bona fide occupational qualification reasonably necessary to the normal operation of the business or enterprise." It would also outlaw the use by an employer of an employment agency which discriminated on a similar basis of age. And, finally, it would prevent labor organizations with 50 or more members from refusing membership, or creating classifications of membership that could hinder employment, for men and women 45 years of age or older.

At the present time there are a number of States which have such laws on the books. They are not always enforced adequately, and many States have no such laws at all.

The standardization of such an age discrimination ban is as important to enlightened labor-management relations as standards of wages and working conditions. I hope that the Congress will act promptly to correct this situation.

AN ANALYSIS ON HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION CUTBACKS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, one of the most authoritative publications in the Southeast on construction, particularly highway construction, is the Dixie Contractor magazine, published in Decatur, Ga., in the district of my colleague from Georgia [Mr. BLACKBURN].

As we continue to debate the various and far-reaching aspects of the administration's cutback in the spending of Federal highway funds, Dixie Contractor has published a revealing analysis on what it calls the cutbacklog detailing the real impact on the Southeast of the administration's action. Since this analysis covers highway apportionments in five Southeastern States, including my own, I shall include this article in full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. However, some salient points in the article bear repeating now because they point up what many Members of this House have been saying all along—that the American public has not been told the truth about the full impact of the cutback.

As the magazine points out, the confusion started from the top when the administration announced there would be a cutback of $700 million in fiscal 1967 plus a freeze of the backlogs. The effect was appraised at a precise 17.5 percent for all States. However, this percentage underestimated the situation because it did not include the backlogs, which amounted to $1.1 billion.

Thus, as the article concludes:

> The total effect . . . is going to be closer to $1.4 billion than $700 million.

In addition, the cutback reduced the original apportionment for fiscal 1967 for Alabama, Georgia, Florida, South Carolina, and Tennessee from $386.6 to $289 million, "a loss of $97.6 million or 25 percent—not the oft-touted 17.5 percent."

One other point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the administration has not given the American public the what I believe to be the true reason for withholding these highway funds, which really belong to the American motorist. Ostensibly, this cutback was to have an immediate impact on inflation. Careful examination reveals this is not true because the highway projects under construction are now already funded. However, no new bid lettings will be made and the full impact on the economy is thus delayed by approximately 12 months. The full impact will hit at a time when the economy will probably need a boost to prevent a recession which has been forecast.

The true reason for the administration's impounding of the highway trust fund appears to be an effort to cause a $1½ billion accumulation which may then be taken advantage of by use of sales participation certificates and use of the money thus obtained without any congressional control for financing its pet projects. This would be impossible if the administration did not allow the trust fund to accumulate.

The American motorist, American industry, and those dependent upon highway transportation are being victimized by the budget gimmickry being practiced by the administration with their highway trust funds, which by law are to be used only for highway purposes.

To date, the administration has not caused any sales participation certificates to be issued on these funds, however, we may expect this action to occur within several months.

The administration simply has not been truthful when it said it was going to reduce spending by $3 billion. The public took this to mean a reduction in Foreign and Domestic programs, not trust fund programs. No matter how long expenditure of these trust funds is withheld, they cannot be spent for anything other than highways. And yet, while these funds are being withheld we face the anachronistic situation of being asked to increase domestic programs in other areas.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think the motoring public will stand for such a lack of credibility much longer. I expect the joint hearings of the Public Works Committees of the House and the other body to reveal just how incredible the American public considers the administration's action for the many reasons already pointed out by many of my colleagues.

The text of the magazine article follows:

A LOOK AT THE CUTBACK LOG AND ITS REAL IMPACT ON THE SOUTHEAST

(By Peter Byrne Baxter)

The day before last Thanksgiving Federal Highway Administrator Rex M. Whitton announced via telegrams to the fifty state highway departments in the nation that there was going to be an adjustment in fiscal 1967 highway spending.

Since that day there has been an avalanche of statements, press releases and a cavalcade of figures and percentages to comment on this reduction in federal aid to highways. A considerable portion of the commentary has served to confuse the contractor, and most of it has been unnecessary.

For one thing, the same figure never seemed to pop up twice, particularly in the case of individual states. Various highway departments throughout the country would release estimates of the effect on their own programs, and then proceeded to revise them, often using an entirely different approach or base for their data.

CONFUSION AT THE TOP

The confusion started from the top—the federal government's announcement that there would be a cutback of $700 million in fiscal '67 plus a freeze of the backlogs. The effect was appraised at a precise 17.5% "across the board" for all states. This percentage underestimated the situation because it did not include the backlogs, which amounted to $1.1 billion. Not all of the backlogs could have been spent by the states, freeze or no freeze, but their elimination magnified the real impact of the overall reduction.

Then there was the matter of the companion reductions in state matching funds which no federal official bothered to compute for the public. This, added to the cutback, added to the backlog freeze, started to turn the government's economy molehill into a mountain of great proportions. The total effect of the Thanksgiving eve reduction in the estimation of *Dixie*, is going to be closer to $1.4 billion than $700 million and this is based on the assumption of just partial commitments of the backlog funds.

Effect of cutback and freeze on 5 Southeastern States [1]

	Before cut	After cut	Net effect
Carryover from fiscal 1966	122.9		−122.9
Fiscal 1967 Federal apportionment	386.6	289.0	−97.6
Fiscal 1967 State matching funds	191.3	132.5	−58.8
Spendable 1967 funds	700.8	421.5	−279.3
Federal and State funds used, July to December 1966	282.2	282.2	
Federal and State funds available, January to June 1967	418.6	139.3	−279.3

[1] Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, Tennessee.

WHAT IS THE REAL IMPACT?

A good case in point exists in the five southeastern states covered by this magazine. During the past month Dixie contacted the state highway departments within its coverage area in order to assemble some data that would be both meaningful in itself and consistent with the same data for all other states. The objective was to determine the real, full impact of the federal reductions and at the same time use the same base, the same periods, the same categories, etc. for all five states.

The original apportionment, for example, from the federal government for fiscal '67 was $386.6 million. The cutback reduced that to $289.0 million, a loss of $97.6 million or 25%—not the oft-touted 17.5%.

Next take the backlog which existed in all states except South Carolina. This amounted to $122.9 million. Again, not all of it would have been used in fiscal '67, but a good portion of it would have been.

Then there is the matter of state matching funds, which, for all five states, was set for $191.3 million. This was trimmed, as a result of the cutback and backlog freeze, to $132.5 million, representing a reduction of $58.8 million or 31%.

ADD THEM ALL TOGETHER

When you add all of the elements together something the federal government has been reluctant to do—and publicize, you have the maximum spendable fiscal '67 funds that could have been spent by the five states (i.e., before the cutback, freeze etc.). This amounted to $700.8 million. After the damages done by the various reductions, this figure was modified to $421.5 million, a loss of $279.3 million or 40%.

The above figure applies to the maximum amounts the states could spend before and after the cutbacks. It presumes a 100% realization of the backlogs. Another measurement exists, however, although, it includes the backlog figure also.

During the first half of fiscal '67 $282.2 million was spent by all five states. Before the cutback changed things, a total of $418.6 was available to be spent by the states during the second half of the year. After the cutback, this was reduced to $139.3 million, a loss of the same $279.3, but in this case it represents a decrease of 66% since the cutback applies in theory to all of fiscal '67, but in practice is applied to the second half.

Again, it should be noted that much of the backlog was unused during the first half and, most probably, the same rate of non-use would have continued during the second half.

Analysis of Federal cutback and freeze on 5 Southeastern States

[In millions of dollars]

	Carryover funds from fiscal 1966	Fiscal 1967 Federal apportionments	Fiscal 1967 State matching funds	Maximum spendable 1967 funds	Federal and State funds used July–December 1966	Federal and State funds available January through June 1967
Original (before cutback):						
Alabama	69.5	91.9	36.6	198.0	50.2	147.8
Florida	17.5	95.5	52.0	165.0	99.4	65.6
Georgia	31.8	71.3	51.6	154.7	54.6	100.1
South Carolina	----------	34.6	23.0	57.6	22.6	35.0
Tennessee	4.1	93.3	28.1	125.5	55.4	70.1
Southeast	122.9	386.6	191.3	700.8	282.2	418.6
Present (after the cutback):						
Alabama	----------	68.7	21.0	89.7	50.2	39.5
Florida	----------	71.4	52.0	123.4	99.4	24.0
Georgia	----------	53.3	17.2	70.5	54.6	15.9
South Carolina	----------	25.7	16.9	42.6	22.6	20.0
Tennessee	----------	69.9	25.4	95.3	55.4	39.9
Southeast	----------	289.0	132.5	421.5	282.2	139.3

Looking individually at the five southeastern states the impact of the reductions becomes even more vivid. Starting with the backlogs, Alabama had the most to be frozen with a backlog of $69.5 million. Georgia was second with $31.8 million, followed by Florida ($17.5) and Tennessee (4.1). South Carolina had no backlog.

The '67 cutback itself was felt almost equally by Florida ($24.1), Tennessee ($23.4) and Alabama ($23.2). Georgia was next with $18.0 million, followed by South Carolina with a $8.9 million loss.

The reduction in state matching funds shows Georgia the loss leader with a cut of $34.4 million, followed by Alabama ($15.6) and South Carolina ($6.1). Interestingly, Tennessee will suffer a minor reduction ($2.7 million). Florida has none.

The decision on maintaining or cutting state matching funds, of course, was entirely up to the states involved.

Including the backlogs again to determine the individual state's loss in maximum spendable '67 funds Alabama was trimmed by $108.3 million, due largely to its sizeable backlog. Georgia was second with a $84.2 loss, followed by Florida ($41.6), Tennessee ($30.2) and South Carolina ($15.0).

Before the cutback a maximum of $418.6 million was the maximum amount that could be spent by the five states between January and June of 1967. The current maximum, after all reductions is only $139.3 million—a reduction of 66%. Florida and Georgia, for example, can spend less than $40.0 million between them during the next six months (see chart). Tennessee ($39.9) and Alabama ($39.5) can spend the most. South Carolina has $20.0 million left.

WHAT CAN BE DONE

After studying these real decreases in the current road programs in the southeast you turn to the prospects of what can be done about it and what lies ahead for fiscal '68. The answer to the first question is more predictable than the answer to the second.

What can be influenced by the states is fiscal '68 construction activity, and the time to plan for it is now. Three states, Alabama, Georgia and Florida, are exploring the feasibility of bond issues for highway construction and maintenance programs. Georgia, however, may have hers scrapped. Former Gov. Carl Sanders proposed a $135 million bond issue several weeks before leaving office, but Gov. Lester Maddox has served notice that he plans to kill it. The interest and principal costs over the next two years would be over $14 million.

Bond issues or not, the states can still plan ahead for '68 now. From the hind-sight of the activity of the last two months, plus the apparent fact that things are still not coming up roses with regard to a bounty of federal highway aid in the immediate future, it is imperative that the individual states get to work on '68 programs thereafter at once. Although the thought is a distressing one, the situation regarding federal aid in the light of the President's State of the Union Message and the current state of the economy, is such that things could get measurably worse before they get better (see AED story, p. 20). All of which prompts more federal corrective action.

TAX RELIEF SHOULD BE GIVEN RETARDED AND HANDICAPPED

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two bills which would provide tax relief for those taxpayers who support mentally retarded dependents and those who have been handicapped by the loss of normal speech through a laryngectomy.

Present tax laws take into consideration the elderly and the blind. There are also those whose living costs are severely affected by the mental and physical handicaps which would be covered by the legislation which I am sponsoring.

There are, for example, 125,000 children born each year who will be considered mentally retarded part or all of their lifetime. The families of these children face a financial burden for special education, medical, and custodial care which usually continues through the lifetime of the child.

I am fully aware that Federal, State, and local programs provide assistance to mentally retarded persons; but they do not alleviate the financial strain borne by the family of the retardate.

The second bill which I am introducing would provide an additional $600 exemption for the taxpayer of the spouse of the taxpayer who has had a laryngectomy.

A laryngectomy is a surgical operation which removes all or part of the larynx, the voice box, so that the normal voice airway of the individual is diverted to the surface of the neck. Normal and natural sounding speech is entirely lost and must be replaced with a mechanical device or by training the individual to use esophageal speech.

Needless to say, individuals who have had this operation must often find new employment; and major adjustments are required by those who hold employment where speech is a prerequisite.

There are many citizens throughout the Nation who have made successful adjustments following the laryngectomy. Last year there were some 60 members of the New Voice Club which had its headquarters in Wichita, Kans.

However, this removal operation of the larynx, the need for artificial or mechanical devices to make speech possible, and speech training, as well as other readjustments, have convinced me that an additional income tax exemption should be granted in such cases.

Mr. Speaker, through such tax relief we can help many Americans help themselves toward rehabilitation and useful lives.

UTILIZE OUR NATION'S TRADE POLICY TO END VIETNAM WAR

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, today I join the distinguished gentleman from

Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] and other colleagues in introducing a resolution urging that our Nation's trade policies be utilized to bring the Vietnam war to an honorable and successful conclusion.

The resolution I am introducing would declare it the sense of Congress that:

> The Government of the United States should only consider further expansions of trade, educational and cultural exchanges, and other related agreements with the Soviet Union and its East European satellites when there is demonstrable evidence that their actions and policies with regard to Vietnam have been redirected toward peace and an honorable settlement and when there is demonstrable evidence that they have abandoned their policy of support for so-called wars of national liberation.

It is clear that the Soviet Union holds the key to peace in Vietnam, especially since it and its East European satellites now provide more than 80 percent of all strategic war materials furnished to North Vietnam.

This in turn leads to two basic conclusions.

First, in addition to our strictly military efforts in Vietnam such as bombing escalation, it is clear we should also utilize trade with supplying countries as a weapon of war; and by withholding this trade, possibly hasten the war's conclusion.

Secondly, while American soldiers are being killed and wounded in Vietnam by some of the very materials being supplied by Eastern European satellite countries, it makes little sense for us to trade with, or to encourage trade with those same countries.

The administration has urged us to bridge the gap between East and West. This is an admirable sentiment. But I feel we should worry about bridging this gap only after or as a condition of a meaningful end to the Vietnam war, when we have tangible indications from the Soviet Union that it genuinely desires to live in a spirit of peace and cooperation.

Until then, I oppose an expansion of East-West trade and urge support for my resolution, which embodies this sentiment.

TWIN CITIES OIC PROJECT DRAWS PRAISE

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, at 8 p.m., February 16, I was privileged to attend a dedication ceremony in Minneapolis for the Twin Cities Opportunities Industrialization Center, and I must say, it was a most thrilling experience.

This center's program is patterned after the great work of Rev. Leon Sullivan, of Philadelphia, who serves a colored Baptist congregation in that city. Reverend Sullivan has come up with a strong, progressive philosophy of self-help for the Negro race. Through his efforts, local funds have been collected and a job training and motivating program has been started. Young men and women are being encouraged to develop their skills. Training centers are being provided with the necessary equipment to do the job—this, of course, within the limitations of money locally subscribed in the local community.

The Minneapolis center following this pattern is now established, and the dedication ceremony was one that I shall long remember. The Sabathani Baptist Church Choir, under the direction of the Reverend Stanley King, gave an outstanding performance.

Reverend King and Reverend Sullivan gave interesting and inspiring talks, and also on hand was one longtime friend, Mr. Cecil Newman, publisher of the Minneapolis Spokesman, and who is chairman of the board of TCOIC.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the Reader's Digest reprint of the Reverend Sullivan's story, titled "We Help Ourselves."

Further, Mr. Speaker, now that we have taken congressional action to establish a Federal City College and Technical School here in the District, we will need a similar program here to provide the motivation and stimulated desire of many who could hold jobs with proper training facilities available. This could be a giant step toward reducing problems of crime, delinquency, welfare, and so forth.

[From Reader's Digest; condensed from the Christian Science Monitor]

WE HELP OURSELVES

(By Paul Friggens)

(NOTE.—*Inspired by a dynamic Negro preacher, Philadelphia's unique program for training Negroes offers a far-reaching example to the nation.*)

Just ten minutes' ride from the prideful new glass-and-steel skyscrapers of downtown Philadelphia lies a nightmarish Negro world: six city wards of squalid streets and rotting red-brick tenements, packed with 270,000 people and faced with appalling want and social decay. This area, which Mayor James H. J. Tate declared had "the most crime, tuberculosis, venereal disease, unemployment and poverty in all of Philadelphia," is in fact one of the worst slums in the United States. Yet here, in an abandoned police station rented from the city for one dollar a year, a militant Negro minister, Leon Howard Sullivan, has launched one of the most exciting and hopeful programs in America.

"We help ourselves!" is the program's motto and philosophy. Its "Opportunities Industrialization Center" (OIC), the first enterprise of its kind in the nation, is designed not only to give Negroes new job skills, but also to inspire them with hope, confidence, and a new way of looking at themselves and at life. It is this emphasis on attitude which distinguishes OIC from almost all other current job-training efforts, and which in just 19 months has made this bold venture, in the words of Mayor Tate, "a model for the rest of the country." Consider some of its significant accomplishments:

Of OIC's first 500 "graduates," who took eight-week to one-year courses in everything from power sewing and restaurant practices to electronics and sheet metal work, a phenomenal 80 percent were almost immediately placed in good jobs.

Probably one third of the OIC trainees now taking jobs are shifting from the relief rolls—good news indeed for Philadelphia, where Negro welfare costs have soared to over 100 million dollars a year.

In a notable innovation, OIC is giving special "pre-job" training to some 1,000 Negroes at a time, helping them to brush up on their reading, writing, arithmetic, and to improve their speech and even personal grooming.

Originally aiming to train some 2,500 individuals a year, but swamped with over 6,000 applicants on its opening day, OIC is already expanding with two branches. To house the first, a Philadelphia philanthropist turned over a six-story office building. This new branch offers training in department-store selling, merchandising, and small-business operation. A second, recently opened, gives training in laundry, dry-cleaning and building-trade skills, among other courses.

Already, OIC has won the enthusiastic support of the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce and the "white power structure." "Businessmen have come to understand that the position of the Negro involves more than a moral principle; the future of our community is at stake," W. Thacher Longstreth, executive vice president of the Philadelphia Chamber, told me. "Either we give the Negro tools to compete, or we resign ourselves to perpetual handouts and unconscionable welfare problems." And, typifying the new spirit, Sullivan declares: "The Negro has learned to demonstrate and to protest, but in Philadelphia now we recognize that he must also *prepare himself and produce.*"

TABLE D'HÔTE AND A LA CARTE

One morning recently, I drove out to the North Philadelphia slums to see this inspiring project in action. At OIC, I was greeted by its creator, the Rev. Leon Howard Sullivan.

Six-foot-five and an athletic 235 pounds, the ebullient Baptist preacher showed me around the transformed police station. Using $50,000 from an anonymous donor, and dime-to-dollar contributions from Negro parishioners and other well-wishers, Sullivan, with the help of carpenters, plumbers and painters, had completely renovated a rat-infested former jail.

Where once police had booked drunks, dope addicts and muggers, I entered a spick-and-span restaurant, cheerful with canary-yellow walls, colorful curtains and modern furnishings. "We painted everything bright: the Negro needs a lift," Sullivan explained. A class in restaurant practices was in progress, with a group of young Negro girls seated around their teacher. "We're learning table settings, and the difference between table d'hôte and a la carte," their instructor told me.

But she was teaching infinitely more, I discovered: poise, positive attitudes of courtesy, and the importance of food service as an ever-growing industry. Later I learned that a graduate of OIC had become night manager for a downtown branch of a food chain—motivation, indeed, for the trainees.

In another room, young Negroes sat before a battery of chattering machines learning how to become teletypewriter operators. The talk was all about two OIC graduates: a girl who had just got her first job after only six weeks' instruction; and a young man who was back for advanced training. "As soon as I finish another eight weeks, I'm promised a transfer to a branch office where I'll be the main operator," he said proudly.

I followed Sullivan upstairs. "We didn't have even a screwdriver to start," he told me. "Now look at this—a quarter-million dollars of the finest equipment, all donated by Philadelphia industry: Philco, General Electric, Budd and Bell Telephone, among others. We're in business!"

Down the hall, in a huge sunny room, Negro housewives, many of them on relief, were learning power sewing in a nine weeks' course. "We make actual garments for charity," a young mother said, holding up a dress. "Man, you should see me put in a zipper!" Sullivan led the way to the basement: what had once been a dank, dark hole with ankledeep water was now a sheetmetal and machine-tool shop complete with whirring lathes and eager trainees.

YOU ARE SOMEBODY

I talked to several OIC graduates: the young woman now holding her first good job in a garment factory; the paper cutter who realized his 15-year ambition to get into electronics; and Bob Fisher, a 30-year-old man with a wife and seven children. He had been "reorganized" out of his steel mill job and forced onto welfare. Fisher took nine months' training in machine-tool operation at OIC, and today earns three dollars an hour as a turret-lathe operator. "We're paying the bills now," he told me, with emotion. "It's like a year of storms, and then all of a sudden the sun starts shining."

How has OIC succeeded where other schools have failed?

"I think the difference," Sullivan explained, "is that people come in here without fear of being ridiculed or turned away, and they see a job at the end." The typical school program is apt to be too academic; OIC tries to reach people *where they are*. It isn't the diploma or report card that counts, but a job!

"Here, they show you what other Negroes have done," a shy but ambitious student told me. Said another, "For the first time, they make you realize that you are *somebody*."

REACHING THE UNREACHED

With this fresh, uplifting approach, Sullivan's self-help program immediately paid dividends. But it also uncovered serious problems; thousands of these disadvantaged—people from broken homes or on welfare, unwed mothers, some illiterates—needed preliminary training even to enter OIC.

To overcome this deficiency, and also to give some training and incentive to the 6000 hopefuls on the waiting lists, Sullivan pioneered his unique "pre-job" program. He obtained another abandoned building, this time a synagogue, where 1000 Negro men and women hurried to enroll in a three months' special course. The dingy, abandoned temple was partitioned into tiny, noisy cubicles scarcely conducive to teaching of any kind.

Yet here, under such inspiring banners as "GET READY FOR OPPORTUNITY!" I listened to some memorable classes. Frequently, Philadelphia businessmen were scheduled to talk about jobs and how to get them. Such Negro idols as Jackie Robinson have spoken to the trainees. "You have to face the same obstacles I had to face," Jackie told the pre-job school. "But with faith and confidence, you will win!"

As often as he finds the time, the tireless Sullivan visits the classes to preach *attitude*. "Sit up straight, young man," he frequently admonishes slouching students. "Stick it out," he urges the frustrated and floundering. "You don't have to spend the rest of your lives on handouts and welfare. You are part of a historic demonstration, and upon your performance will depend the futures of 20 million persons in our big cities who have been brain-washed into thinking they are inferior. But I tell you the Negro is *not* inferior, and genius is color-blind!"

Thus with Negro telling Negro, Philadelphia is embarked on one of the most far-reaching and significant programs not only for Negro race, but for our entire complex industrial society. "Reaching the unreached!" Sullivan calls it.

Recently, the old synagogue was swept by a disastrous fire, but with the temporary use of a National Guard Armory offered by Gov. William Scranton, the resolute Sullivan and his devoted staff carried on with the vital pre-job program.

BLUEPRINT FOR THE FUTURE

Leon Sullivan, himself a product of Charleston, W. Va., slums, grew up in a broken home "on a dirt alley"—his mother was a $13-a-week elevator operator, his father a janitor. After being ordained, he promptly took his ministry to the streets. He organized an outstanding youth-employment program in Philadelphia, for which he won the Freedom Foundation Award. But not long ago, Sullivan's name was a fighting word in Philadelphia business circles.

In an attempt to win more jobs for Negroes, he had spearheaded an aggressive consumer boycott against 29 top Philadelphia companies. But the important thing was that jobs began to open, and Negro leaders realized that unless something was done fast, there wouldn't be enough qualified Negroes around to fill them. So Sullivan conceived the idea of training through OIC.

Fortunately for Philadelphia, the business community and the Negro leaders shared the same fundamental concerns; even before Sullivan's boycott, the Chamber of Commerce was hard at work on the general problem. "We had thousands of jobs going begging while we had more than 100,000 unemployed," Keeton Arnett, then chairman of the Economic Leader Group and now consultant to both the Philadelphia Chamber and to OIC, told me. "Our only resource," says Arnett, "was the unemployed labor force, largely unskilled and largely Negro."

When Sullivan's idea of Negroes training Negroes to help themselves came up, the Chamber of Commerce promptly threw in its resources and support. Recognizing a venture that might well be a model for the nation, the U.S. Department of Labor stepped in with a $458,000 grant for the pre-job school—probably the first program of its kind in the world. The Negroes raised $100,000 in a city-wide drive; business and industry contributed, and during this past summer, OIC's program was granted $1,756,163 by the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

Yet for all of its success, the Philadelphia venture is still a pilot project, with problems. "For one thing, the level of educational achievement of most students is so low that it has taken much longer than we had anticipated to teach basic skills," says Sullivan.

Naturally, with its initial success, OIC is attracting a flock of visitors to study the program. "Will the blueprint succeed elsewhere?" they want to know. Philadelphia leaders with whom I talked are convinced it will, but with some important qualifications:

Negro and white leaders must sit down together; accept their mutual economic dependence; and recognize that this is a problem not only for the Negro, but for everybody. The chances for success will be vastly greater if both sides are able to develop the tolerance, understanding and constructive leadership represented in Philadelphia. Whenever communities are able to achieve this spirit, we can mark another milestone in race relations and opportunity in the United States.

TO EDITORIALIZE OR NOT

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 23, I had the privilege of making the Washington's Birthday address at a luncheon meeting of the International Radio and Television Society, Inc., of which I am a member, at the Grand Ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City.

The IRTS, as it is familiarly known, has some 1,300 members who work in broadcasting or related pursuits and has its office at 444 Madison Avenue in my district. A number of years back I served as the chairman of the legal committee of this organization. At the time, it was known as the Radio Television Executive Society.

My subject for the meeting was "To Editorialize or Not," and because this is a matter of current interest to both broadcasters and those in public service, I bring it to the attention of my colleagues:

TO EDITORIALIZE OR NOT

(By Hon. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN, Congressman, 17th District, New York) *

To editorialize or not is a current policy question for company strategists in the broadcasting field.

It is a decision to be made not only on its own merits within the ambit of a business fraught not only with the public interest,[1] but with both the rights and responsibilities of a public opinion medium.

Despite the clearly evident free speech[2] aspect of the problem for this means of communication, businessmen who must come to the Executive Branch of Government and seek to retain licenses from the Federal Communications Commission, subject to laws made by the United States Congress, are wary of venturing in this area.

Frank Stanton, President of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., has stated that while the "broadcaster cannot be an advocate", "the right of broadcast licensees to editorialize is rooted in the First Amendment of the Constitution."[3]

Yet only recently, Congressman Emanuel Celler (Dem., N.Y.), Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, has stated that he takes a dim view of such editorializing, and Congressman Harley O. Staggers (Dem., W. Va.), Chairman of the House Interstate & Foreign Commerce Committee, has announced that he will investigate the practice of endorsing political candidates by radio and television stations.

Mr. Staggers stated: "The power and influence of radio and television stations in the field of endorsing candidates when they are operating under a license worth countless millions of dollars, and granted by the Government, has caused considerable concern among Members of Congress in both parties."[4]

The struggle for the freedom of the press was first primarily against the power of the licensor. John Milton directed his assault against that power by his "Appeal for the Liberty of Unlicensed Printing." Liberty of the press initially meant to publish without a license what formerly could be published only with one.[5]

---

*The 17th District of New York covers the home offices of all the networks and the offices of all major New York City stations.

[1] 47 U.S.C. Sec. 307.

[2] United States v. Paramount Pictures, 334 U.S. 131, 166 (1948) where it is stated: "We have no doubt that moving pictures, like newspapers and radio, are included in the press whose freedom is guaranteed by the First Amendment."

[3] CBS Policy Notes from the President, Frank Stanton, Nov. 2, 1966.

[4] The Pittsburgh Press, October 24, 1966; New York Times October 23, page 71, col. 2.

[5] Lovell v. Griffin, 303 U.S. 444, 451 (1938).

John Peter Zenger[6] had a similar problem. With his livelihood as a printer at stake, he insisted on giving his opinion of the then Governor of the Colony of New York, and when brought to trial, he established for us, with the help of a Philadelphia lawyer and an intelligent jury, freedom of the press.

Why can't a broadcaster act the same way? Why can't a broadcaster endorse a candidate?

What makes a broadcaster different? The fact that he gets a monopoly from the people through their government by selective licensing because of the limited facilities, is given as justification.[7]

But newspapers today have a near monopoly by virtue of physical and economic factors which make competition prohibitive.

They have not hesitated to use their monopoly power.[8]

In the great City of New York there are only four major daily newspapers today, but there are at least seven times as many radio and television stations.

Would it not provide for more freedom of expression, with consequent benefit to the public, to have more editorial thought and opinion?

The F.C.C. determined to diversify radio programming by requiring, as of January 1, 1967, that in cities of more than 100,000 AM and FM programming would not duplicate more than 50% of the programs on both bands simultaneously.[9]

If this ruling was sound, it is just as important that editorial opinion be diversified for *all* media of public communication.

While it might not be economic in the smaller cities and towns to have a separation of AM and FM programming, the opportunity for differing views in editorials by broadcasters is even more important where the newspaper may have a monopoly. It is in the smallest cities and towns that the monopoly problem really exists.

Newspapers are not necessarily as restrained or as fair as broadcasters have been. It is sometimes hard to distinguish news from opinion in a newspaper.

On the other hand, broadcasters label their editorials and even provide time for rebuttal arguments. I myself have had the opportunity to rebut editorials on New York City's WCBS and WINS. I can say that it is a lot easier then getting a letter to the editor published.

Shall you shake the shackles and bring broadcasting to full partnership as a medium of communication and free speech or shall you remain as the Courts have considered the recording, just a mechanical purveyor and not an intellectual conception?[10]

John Peter Zenger risked his liberty to print the truth, but a jury of his peers acquitted him and made new law for a future America. Broadcasters may risk property, but those interested in the future of a responsible democracy will defend their right to express opinions.

Broadcasters must attain full partnership with newspapers as a medium of communication.

THE VIETNAM CONFLICT

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. Reid] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there are many serious problems of major concern to Americans throughout our beloved land—but perhaps uppermost in the hearts and minds of all of us is the conflict in South Vietnam and a desire to see an end to the fighting which has brought such sorrow, heartache, suffering, sacrifice, and death to all too many.

We are saddened every time we read or hear of death or injury inflicted upon our brave Americans fighting so valiantly to help the South Vietnamese preserve their independence and right to determine their own future without outside interference. Our prayers are with these men and their families as well as with the allied forces of South Vietnam, South Korea, Australia, and so forth, who are continuing to fight right alongside of our own troops. All of us deplore the fact that the Communist aggressors continue to reject all of our efforts to bring an honorable and lasting end to the fighting as they proceed to try to take over this small country by force and enslave her freedom-loving people. Apparently, they are still convinced that the United States will eventually tire and withdraw—as evidenced by an article in the February 20 issue of the New York Times which reported that North Vietnam regarded the demonstrations in the United States against American policy in Vietnam as proof that the Communists would win the war.

Another tragedy of the war which we all regret and which holds a prominent place in news reports and discussions is the accidental injury of or death to civilians occasionally and inadvertently resulting from our bombing of military targets in North Vietnam and our military activities in South Vietnam despite all precautions taken by our troops to prevent such civilian casualties. In this regard, I thought you would be interested in the following comments made by Gen. Earl G. Wheeler, Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, in an interview appearing in the February 27, 1967, issue of U.S. News & World Report:

> I'm bothered by people who make allegations to the effect that we have been deliberately attacking in such a way as to inflict casualties on the civilian population, because it doesn't happen to be true. I'm not in the least surprised that there have been a certain number of civilians killed in our air attacks. I would say that even the allegations of the North Vietnamese as to civilian casualties would bear out the restraint of our air attacks, the training, the bravery and the precision with which our pilots deliver their weapons. If you read some of these Communist casualty figures—and I don't say they are accurate; they are probably exaggerated—at Nam Dinh, for example, there were 89 civilian casualties, according to Hanoi, in a heavily populated area. It's very heavily defended. They have something like 500 antiaircraft weapons within firing radius of the city. The fact that our pilots were able to bomb these weapons with such a small number of civilian casualties refutes the allegation rather than supporting it . . . in planning operations he (General Westmoreland) always takes the civilian population into account. If possible—and on many occasions they do this—they warn people with leaflets or with bullhorns—speaking in Vietnamese from an airborne loudspeaker—that the troops are going to move in, and to either get out of the way, get away from the Viet Cong, or take cover. . . . Our fire discipline is very tight. In fact, before any fire is delivered in certain areas, it has to be cleared by the Vietnamese Province or District chief. In other words, he has to be consulted in order to ascertain the control of the people or the attitude of the people in the area, so that, above all, we will avoid going in and injuring people who are supporting the Vietnamese Government.

There is still a third facet to the war, however, which seems to receive little notice in the news reports—and that is the terrible tragedy caused by the deliberate terroristic attacks and atrocities committed by the Vietcong against South Vietnamese civilians as well as United States and allied personnel in South Vietnam. Perhaps one of the reasons why more publicity has not been given to these acts of terror is that it does not make pleasant reading. On the other hand, however, I feel that the American people have the right to know as much as possible about all facets of the war so that they can better be able to judge for themselves the true aims of the enemy as well as the merits of our cause in behalf of the overwhelming majority of South Vietnamese who wish to remain free of Communist domination. I, therefore, feel it is my duty to share with you the information which I have received from the Department of State. The figures on terrorist acts are far from complete but will give you a general idea of the disregard for human life and human welfare which has been shown by the Vietcong—under directions from North Vietnam and with supplies furnished by North Vietnam and other Communist-bloc nations. First, I am setting forth just a few salient facts and statistics appearing in a blooklet published by the U.S. mission in Vietnam in May of 1966, entitled "A Study: Vietcong Use of Terror":

> In the Spring of 1959, the Communist leaders in North Vietnam were growing increasingly impatient. . . For five years their fellow communists—using the argument that the south was so divided, its government so weak that soon the whole structure would collapse of its own weight—had dissuaded them from taking direct action to bring all of Vietnam under the red banner. But finally the waiting game could no longer be endured. Worse, the south steadily was gathering strength and daily its government was becoming more viable. Time was running against the men in Hanoi. And so on March 13, 1959, the Central Committee of the Lao Dong Party, meeting in Hanoi, declared that the time had come to begin the task of "liberating the south . . . to struggle heroically and perseveringly to smash the southern regime."
>
> *To smash the southern regime*—that was the stated objective. The method was to eliminate by force the southern governmental apparatus, the country's official and natural leaders and establish in each village an *apparat* tied to Hanoi. The assault began in the villages and was to work its way up through the district and then provincial governmental levels until at last there would be a direct attack on the central

---

[6] "The Trial of Peter Zenger" by Vincent Buranelli, New York University Press, 1957.

[7] Radio Commission v. Nelson Bros. Co., 289 U.S. 266 (1933), Communications Commission v. N.B.C., 319 U.S. 239 (1943).

[8] Associated Press v. United States, 326 U.S. 1 (1945); Lorain Journal v. United States, 342 U.S. 143 (1951); Times-Picayune Pub. Co. v. United States, 345 U.S. 594 (1953).

[9] See Newsweek, November 28, 1966 at page 107.

[10] White-Smith Music Publishing Co. v. Apollo Company, 209 U.S. 1 (1907).

government itself. Along the way, the enemy's instruments of power—his police and his armed forces—would be won over by proselyting means or nullified by force. . . Terror was an integral part of the planned campaign to achieve the single political objective: unification of Vietnam under the communist banner. This is a study of the specific uses which the Viet Cong have made of terror during the past six years. . . .

Harry Eckstein in the book *Internal War* defines terror (in internal war) as "a symbolic act designed to influence political behavior by extranormal means, entailing the use or threat of violence." This definition is employed here. It is a broad one. It includes, for example, both agitational terror designed to disrupt the existing order and achieve power, as well as enforcement terror, activity by an encumbent who wishes to suppress the challenge to its authority. And it includes activities far beyond the stereotype view of terror, the dynamiting of buildings or the mass execution of a village's Council of Notables. As used here it involves (1) terror acts which are part of military or paramilitary assaults either offensively against defended hamlets or GVN and allied military installations or units, or defensively in the field against GVN and Allied military operations; (2) terror acts which are part of the ambush, so common and distinct to the Vietnam war as to be *sui generis;* an ambush may be directed at military units, or at civilians traveling along roads or through canals; (3) harassing villagers for coercive or intimidation purposes with or without the taking of life; (4) sabotage and subversive acts which involve direct use of violence; (5) acts directed against specific individuals, such as kidnappings, assassinations and executions.

An effort has been made here to assemble data to describe the five terror categories listed above. Statistics of the sort that could yield precise listings of Viet Cong acts of violence are not now and never have been available in Vietnam. The figures quoted here are estimates based on a careful study of partial data from GVN and U.S. sources. The error, if there is one, is on the side of conservatism. It is quite likely that Viet Cong terror exceeded these figures in every category.

The total number of Viet Cong incidents, which include all five of the above categories:

Incidents

Date:	
1957	[1] 500
1958	500
1959	1, 500
1960	3, 000
1961	5, 000
1962	19, 000
1963	19, 500
1964	25, 500
1965	25, 500
1966	[2] 7, 000

[1] Under 500.

[2] 2 months.

This booklet from which I am quoting also contains a statistical chart giving a breakdown according to the following categories: Terror acts, assassinations, kidnapings, and attacks. Before giving you this breakdown, I feel it best to explain what is meant by the figures given under each category. As reported in footnotes to the statistical chart which follows: Terror acts include "sabotage, harassments, harassing fire, armed agitprop team visits to villages, but not the acts of terror listed in subsequent columns." Assassinations include "officials only and not random killings. Records were kept only on officials and even these are incomplete. Based on a 1964 study it probably is safe to conclude that for every official Vietnamese assassinated four natural leaders were killed." Kidnapings include "officials only and not natural leaders and other village residents. Based on 1964 study the ratio between kidnapings of officials and nonofficials was one to two. The GVN has estimated the total number of kidnapings at 1962, 10,000; 1963, 7,200; 1964, 10,450; and 1965, 11,500." Attacks include "Military attacks on villages; ambushes, and so forth." NA stands for not available.

"Year	Terror acts	Assassinations	Kidnapings	Attacks
1957-1960	NA	[1] 1, 700	[1] 2, 000	(2)
1961	NA	[1] 1, 300	1, 318	NA
1962	[1] 20, 000	1, 118	1, 118	5, 484
1963	25, 280	827	1, 596	3, 735
1964	21, 733	516	1, 525	15, 500
1965	18, 300	305	1, 730	15, 200
1966 (3 months)	4, 000	35	NA	NA"

[1] Estimate.

[2] Negligible.

Still another chart in this same booklet gives the Vietcong's own statistics on its violence program which were assembled from Radio Liberation and Radio Hanoi output during the years. This chart shows that the Vietcong themselves claim to have destroyed 3,900 hamlets in 1963 and 3,659 hamlets in 1964—and in still a separate claim which is not a total of earlier years, the Vietcong claim to have destroyed 7,559 hamlets from January of 1961 to January of 1965.

The figures given above are shocking by themselves without any further elaboration, but even so it is still difficult for one to realize just what is involved without witnessing the terror activities firsthand or without having specific examples. Therefore, I am now setting forth a sample list of Vietcong terrorist activity during the past 6 years. This sample list contains incidents which have been verified and obtained from the same report of the U.S. mission in Vietnam which is quoted above and from an additional list of incidents supplied by the State Department:

A SAMPLE LIST OF VIET CONG TERRORIST ACTIVITY

1. February 2, 1960—The Viet Cong sack and burn the Buddhist temple in Phuoc Trach village, Go Dau Ha district, Tay Ninh province. They stab to death 17-year old Phan Van Ngoc who tries to stop them.

2. April 22, 1960—Some 30 armed Viet Cong raid Thoi Long hamlet, Thoi Binh village, Thoi Binh district, An Xuyen province. They attempt to take away villager Cao Van Hanh, 45. Villagers protest en masse. Farmer Pham Van Bai, 56, is particularly vehement. The Viet Cong, angered, seize him. This arouses the villagers who swarm toward the Viet Cong and their prisoner. The Viet Cong fire into the crowd. A 16-year old boy is shot dead.

3. August 23, 1960—Two school teachers, Nguyen Koha Ngon and Miss Nguyen Thi Thiet, are preparing lessons at home when Viet Cong arrive and force them at gun point to go to their school, Rau Ran, in Phong Dinh province. There they find two men tied to the school veranda. The Viet Cong read the death order of the two men, named Canh and Van. They are executed. The Viet Cong stage the execution presumably to intimidate the school teachers.

4. September 24, 1960—A band of armed Viet Cong sack a school in An Lac village, Tri Tan district, An Giang province. They pile seats and desks together and set fire to them and the school. All that remain are four bare walls.

5. September 28, 1960—Father Hoang Ngoc Minh, much loved priest of Kontum parish is riding from Tan Canh to Kondela. A Viet Cong roadblock halts his car. A bullet smashes into him. The guerrillas drive bamboo spears into Father Minh's body. A Viet Cong fires his sub-machine gun point blank, killing him. The driver Huynh Huu, his nephew, is seriously wounded.

6. September 30, 1960—A band of ten armed Viet Cong kidnap farmer Truong Van Dang, 67, from Long An hamlet, Long Tri village, Binh Phuoc district, Long An province. They take him before what they call a "people's tribunal." He is condemned to death for purchasing two hectares of rice land and ignoring Viet Cong orders to turn the land over to another farmer. After the "trial" he is shot dead in his rice field.

7. December 6, 1960—The Viet Cong dynamite the kitchen at the Saigon Golf Club, killing a Vietnamese kitchen helper and injuring two Vietnamese cooks.

8. December 1960—The GVN reports to the ICC that during the year the Viet Cong had destroyed or damaged 284 bridges, burned 60 medical aid stations and, through destruction of schools, deprived some 25,000 children of schooling.

9. March 22, 1961—A truck carrying 20 girls is dynamited on the Saigon-Vung Tau road. The girls are returning from Saigon where they have taken part in a Trung Sisters Day celebration. After the explosion the Viet Cong open fire on the passengers. Two of the girls were killed and ten wounded. The girls are unarmed and traveling without escort.

10. May 15, 1961—Twelve Catholic nuns from La Providence order, are traveling on Highway One toward Saigon. Their bus is stopped by Viet Cong who ransack their luggage. Sister Theophile protests and is shot dead on the spot. The vehicle is sprayed with bullets seriously wounding Sister Phan Thi No. The ambush takes place at Tram Van hamlet, Thanh Phuoc village, Go Dau Ha district, Tay Ninh province.

11. July 26, 1961—Two Vietnamese National Assemblymen, Rmah Pok and Yut Nic Bounrit, both Montagnards, are shot and killed by Viet Cong near Dalat. A school teacher traveling with them on their visit to a Montagnard resettlement village, is also killed.

12. September 20, 1961—One thousand main force Viet Cong soldiers storm the capital of Phuoc Thanh province, sack and burn the government buildings, behead virtually the entire administrative staff. They hold the capital for 24 hours before withdrawing.

13. October 1961—A U.S. State Department study estimates that the Viet Cong are killing Vietnamese at the rate of 1500 per month.

14. December 13, 1961—Father Bonnet, a French parish priest from Konkala, Kontum is killed by Viet Cong while he was visiting parishioners at Ngok Rongel.

15. December 20, 1961—S. Fukai, a Japanese engineer working on the Da Nhim dam, a Japanese government war reparations project to supply electric power to Vietnam, is

kidnapped after being stopped at a Viet Cong road block. His fate is never learned.

16. January 1, 1962—A Vietnamese labor leader, Le Van Thieu, 63, is hacked to death by Viet Cong wielding machetes near Bien Hoa, in the rubber plantation on which he works.

17. January 2, 1962—Two Vietnamese technicians working in the government's anti-malaria program, Pham Van Hai and Nguyen Van Thach, are killed by Viet Cong with machetes, twelve miles south of Saigon.

18. February 20, 1962—Viet Cong throw four hand grenades into a crowded village theater near Can Tho, killing 24 women and children. A total of 108 persons are killed or injured.

19. April 8, 1962—The Viet Cong execute two wounded American prisoners of war near the village of An Chau in Central Vietnam. Each with hands tied, is shot in the face. They cannot keep up with their retreating Viet Cong captors.

20. April 25, 1962—Two French civilians are shot and killed by Viet Cong while boating on the Saigon River just outside the city.

21. May 19, 1962—A Viet Cong grenade is hurled into the Aterbea restaurant in Saigon wounding a Berlin circus manager and the cultural attaché from the German embassy.

22. May 20, 1962—A bomb explodes in front of the Hung Dao Hotel, Saigon, a billet for American servicemen, injuring eight Vietnamese and three Americans who are in the street at the time.

23. June 12, 1962—The Viet Cong ambush a civilian passenger bus near Le Tri hamlet in An Giang province, killing all the passengers, the driver and the driver's helper, a total of five men and women.

24. October 20, 1962—A teen-age Viet Cong hurls a grenade into a holiday crowd in downtown Saigon killing six persons, including two children, and injuring 38 persons.

25. November 4, 1962—A Viet Cong hurls a grenade into an alley in Can Tho killing one American serviceman and two Vietnamese children. A third Vietnamese child is seriously injured.

26. January 25, 1963—Viet Cong dynamite a passenger-freight train near Qui Nhon killing eight passengers and injuring 15 others. The train is carrying only rice as freight.

27. March 4, 1963—Two Protestant missionaries—Elwood Forreston. an American and Gaspart Makil, a Filipino—are shot at a road block between Saigon and Dalat. The Makil twin babies are shot and wounded.

28. March 16, 1963—Viet Cong terrorists hurl a grenade into a home where an American family is having dinner, killing a French businessman and wounding four other persons, one of them a woman.

29. April 3, 1963—Viet Cong terrorists throw two grenades into a private school near Long Xuyen, An Giang province, killing a teacher and two other adults. Students are performing their annual variety show at the time.

30. April 4, 1963—Viet Cong terrorists throw grenades into an audience attending an outdoor motion picture showing in Cao Lanh village in the Mekong Delta, killing four persons and wounding 11.

31. May 23, 1963—Viet Cong mine the main northern rail line killing five civilian passengers. Twelve other passengers and crew are injured.

32. May 31, 1963—Two powerful explosions set off by terrorists on bicycles kill two Vietnamese and wound ten others in Saigon. Police believe the explosive accidentally detonated prematurely.

33. September 12, 1963—Miss Vo Thi Lo, 26, a school teacher in An Phuoc village, Kien Hoa province is found near the village with her throat cut. She had been kidnapped by the Viet Cong three days earlier.

34. October 16, 1963—Viet Cong terrorists exploded mines under two civilian buses in Kien Hoa and Quang Tin provinces, killing 18 Vietnamese and wounding 23.

35. October 26, 1963—The French Embassy in Saigon reports that four French planters were kidnapped and two others wounded in machine gun attacks on French rubber plantations East of Saigon.

36. November 9, 1963—Three grenades are thrown in Saigon injuring a total of 16 persons including four children; the first is thrown in a main street; the second along the waterfront and the third in the Chinese residential area.

37. February 9, 1964—A bomb exploded in the Playboy Bar in Saigon killing four Vietnamese and injuring 35 Vietnamese and four Americans.

38. February 9, 1964—Two Americans are killed and 41 wounded including four women, five children when a Viet Cong bomb is set off in a sports stadium during a softball game. A second portion of the bomb fails to explode. Officials estimate that had it detonated fifty persons would have died.

39. February 16, 1964—Three Americans are killed and 32 injured, most of them U.S. dependents, when the Viet Cong bomb the Kinh Do movie theater in Saigon.

40. February 21, 1964—The Saigon-Da Nang train is derailed, with 11 persons killed and 18 seriously injured.

41. July 14, 1964—Pham Thao, chairman of the Catholic Action Committee in Quang Ngai is executed by Viet Cong when he returned to his native village of Pho Loi in Quang Ngai.

42. October 1964—U.S. officials in Saigon report that from January to October of 1964 the Viet Cong killed 429 local Vietnamese officials and kidnapped 482 others.

43. December 24, 1964—A Christmas eve Viet Cong bomb explosion at the Brink officer billet kills two Americans and injures 50 Americans and 13 Vietnamese.

44. February 6, 1965—Radio Liberation announces that the Viet Cong have shot two American prisoners of war as reprisals against the Vietnamese government which had sentenced two Viet Cong terrorists to death.

45. February 10, 1965—Viet Cong terrorists blow up an enlisted men's barracks in Qui Nhon killing 23 Americans.

46. February 10, 1965—Viet Cong mined a bus in Pleiku province, killing one civilian and wounding six others.

47. March 1, 1965—Viet Cong entered Hoa Hoi hamlet in Binh Dinh province and burned 185 houses and destroyed all personal belongings of the inhabitants.

48. March 12, 1965—Viet Cong mined a bus in Long An province, killing 13 Vietnamese civilians and wounding two others.

49. March 21, 1965—Viet Cong entered a hamlet in Binh Dinh province and forced 100 laborers to leave with them. Twenty-five other laborers who refused to go with the Viet Cong were executed by the Communists.

50. March 30, 1965—A Viet Cong bomb explodes outside the American Embassy in Saigon killing 2 Americans, 18 Vietnamese and injuring 100 Vietnamese and 45 Americans.

51. Early June 1965—Viet Cong ambushed a Vietnamese Red Cross vehicle belonging to the provincial health service in Kien Tuong province, wounding two health workers and a small boy.

52. June 24, 1965—Radio Liberation announces the execution of an American prisoner as a reprisal.

53. June 25, 1965—Terrorists dynamite the My Canh restaurant in Saigon killing: 27 Vietnamese, 12 Americans, two Filipinos, one Frenchman, one German; more than 80 persons are injured.

54. June 1965—Vietnamese officials report that Viet Cong assassinations and kidnapping of rural officials doubled in June over May and April. A total of 224 officials were either killed or kidnapped.

55. July 1965—Viet Cong ransacked a village pagoda in Kien Hoa province and kidnapped the chief monk. He was murdered six days later.

56. July 11, 1965—Viet Cong entered An Loi and Van Quai hamlets in Thua Thien province, kidnapped three farmers and buried two of them alive some three kilometers from their homes.

57. July 18, 1965—Viet Cong forced the population of a hamlet in Le Trung district, Pleiku province to assemble for a propaganda lecture. When the people were assembled, the Viet Cong threw hand grenades into the crowd, killing 11 persons and wounding many others.

58. August 1965—Viet Cong attacked a refugee resettlement center in Binh Dinh province and killed or wounded 60 old people and children.

59. August 5, 1965—Viet Cong exploded a time-bomb near the Gia Huynh market in Trang Bang district town, Hau Nghia province, killing five Vietnamese and wounding five others.

60. August 18, 1965—A Viet Cong bomb at the Saigon Police Directorate office in Saigon kills six and wounds 15 Vietnamese.

61. September 4, 1965—Seven Vietnamese civilians were killed and twenty others were wounded when Viet Cong terrorists blew up a coach on the road at Truc Giang, near Loc Thuan village.

62. September 26, 1965—Viet Cong blew up a crowded bus in Phu Yen province, killing 21 passengers, including four children.

63. October 1965—Viet Cong murdered a village chief near Phuong Dinh in Quang Ngai province and stuck his severed head on a pole in the village center.

64. October 4, 1965—One of two Viet Cong planted bombs explodes at the Cong Hoa National Sports Stadium killing eleven Vietnamese, including four children and wounding 42 other persons.

65. October 5, 1965—A Viet Cong bomb goes off, apparently prematurely, in a taxi on a main street in downtown Saigon killing two Vietnamese and wounding ten others most of them Vietnamese.

66. November 1965—A GVN military unit found the bodies of seven peasants who had been buried alive in Quang Ngai province. The hands of the peasants had been tied behind their backs.

67. December 4, 1965—A Viet Cong terrorist bomb kills eight persons when it explodes in front of a Saigon hotel converted to quarters of U.S. enlisted men, 157 are injured, including 72 Americans, three New Zealanders and 62 Vietnamese.

68. December 12, 1965—Two Viet Cong terrorist platoons kill 23 unarmed Vietnamese canal construction workers asleep in a Buddhist Pagoda in Tan Huong village, Dinh Tuong province, and wound seven others.

69. December 17, 1965—Viet Cong lobbed grenades into a crowd watching an open-air film show in Vinh Long province, killing six persons and wounding 28 others.

70. January 3, 1966—Two unknown persons fired into a group of people in the Cholon area of Saigon killing one Vietnamese soldier and wounding one Vietnamese child.

71. January 3, 1966—Six Viet Cong entered Hoa Hung hamlet, six miles southeast of Bien Hoa and assassinated the hamlet chief.

72. January 3, 1966—An unknown person threw a grenade into a group of U.S. soldiers near a refreshment stand in Saigon killing one U.S. soldier and one Vietnamese child and wounding five U.S. soldiers.

73. January 7, 1966—A Claymore mine explodes at Tan Son Nhut gate killing two persons and injuring 12.

74. January 17, 1966—Viet Cong in Kien Tuong detonate a mine under a highway bus, killing 26 Vietnamese civilians, seven of them children. Eight other persons are injured and three listed as missing.

75. January 18, 1966—Viet Cong mined a commercial bus in Kien Tuong province, killing 26 civilians and wounding eight others.

76. January 29, 1966—Viet Cong terrorists kill a Catholic priest, Father Phan Khac Dau, 74, while he was praying at the altar of his

church at Thanh Tri, Kien Tuong province. Five other civilians, including a church officer are also killed. The marauders desecrate the church and destroy its statuary and religious artifacts.

77. February 2, 1966—A Viet Cong squad ambush a jeep load of Vietnamese information personnel, killing six and wounding one in Hau Nghia province.

78. February 14, 1966—Two Viet Cong mines explode under a bus and a three-wheeled taxi on a road near Tuy Hoa killing 48 farm laborers and injuring seven others.

79. April 1966—A Viet Cong terror squad assassinated a regional head of the Cao Dai Church in My Tho. The Communists broke into his home, and beat him and his seven-year-old daughter to death. His wife was also wounded but was expected to recover.

80. April 1966—25 prisoners of the Viet Cong, mostly civilians and women in chains and padlocks, were shot by the Communists at Phu Ham in Vinh Long province.

81. May 21, 1966—Viet Cong terrorists machine-gunned a group of workers in their sleep. The workers were employed in digging a canal near Vinh Hanh village in An Giang province. Twenty-three civilians including a woman and five children were killed and twelve others were wounded. The Viet Cong reportedly shot the civilians to teach them a lesson.

82. August 16, 1966—A platoon of Viet Cong entered Trung Tin and Phu Hoa Hamlets in Quang Ngai and burned the homes of 138 families.

83. August 17, 1966—About a platoon of Viet Cong entered Pho An Hamlet in Quang Ngai Province burning some of the houses in the hamlet and attacking a naval junk base.

84. August 17, 1966—A Viet Cong terror group set off an explosive device at the municipal fair in Hue City. Twenty-six were killed and 150 injured from the explosion and the flight to leave the fair.

85. September 1966—Viet Cong burned 90 houses and killed four civilians in a refugee camp in Quang Tin Province.

86. September 1966—Viet Cong attacked the home of the Deputy Police Chief in Kien Phong Province and a check point in the same province killing five civilians.

87. September 1966—A Viet Cong squad disguised as government soldiers captured a village office and killed the Finance Commissioner and a Deputy Hamlet Chief.

88. September 11, 1966—Election Day, the Viet Cong launched 42 incidents while the polls were open to disrupt the polling and a total of 166 incidents the day before and during the elections to keep voters away from the polls. While the polls were open, 19 persons were killed and 120 wounded from such incidents as the mortaring of four province towns, the mining of vehicles and assassination of those participating in the election. Despite their efforts, 4,275,406 Vietnamese voted, or 80% of the registered voters.

89. September 20, 1966—The Vietnamese Army reported finding civilians killed by the Viet Cong in two caves in the Mekong Delta about 60 miles southwest of Saigon. Nearby a seriously wounded civilian was found who claimed that 12 of his companions were killed and thrown into a canal by the Viet Cong after being taken prisoner.

90. October 1966—A Viet Cong terrorist platoon butchered the 18-year-old son of a deputy hamlet chief in Quang Tin province.

91. October 3, 1966—The Manager of the Chinese-owned Hau Li fish net factory was assassinated. He was the seventh prominent Chinese to be attacked since late 1965.

92. October 18, 1966—A terrorist threw a Russian-made grenade at a bus stop in Saigon wounding five American soldiers.

93. October 18, 1966—Viet Cong exploded a mine at a bus stop in Saigon killing two and injuring nine including eight American soldiers.

94. On October 18, 1966—Viet Cong threw a grenade into a rural movie theater 410 miles north of Saigon killing six Vietnamese and wounding 45.

95. November 1, 1966—Two waves of mortar shells struck Saigon in a Viet Cong effort to disrupt the government's National Day ceremony. Shells hit a Roman Catholic Cathedral and high school, and a hospital and market. There were at least 27 casualties.

96. November 6, 1966—Viet Cong forces entered a village in Vinh Binh Province and kidnapped the entire population of over 100 persons.

97. November 8, 1966—Two Viet Cong platoons infiltrated Cao Doi Hamlet in Vinh Binh Province kidnapping 30 families. Twelve women suspected of being government agents who were wives of government soldiers had not been released by December 1.

98. November 24, 1966—Viet Cong entered Din Cu Hamlet in Vinh Binh Province abducted 109 civilians and burned 15 houses. This was the third mass kidnapping of a hamlet during November.

99. November 29, 1966—Three wounded Vietnamese civilians were found six miles from Sadec City after escaping from a Viet Cong prison camp. Seventeen prisoners were held in the prison camp. Before departing the Viet Cong killed two men and two women and wounded several others. Survivors said they were chained by the wrists during the day and, in addition, put in leg irons at night. One prisoner was found shot with his hands bound behind his back and mutilated by hatchet blows.

100. December 7, 1966—A leader of the Southern Bloc of the Constituent Assembly, Tran Van Van, was murdered while driving his car to the Assembly. A Viet Cong terror cadre has confessed to participating in the assassination.

101. December 27, 1966—An explosive device went off in the car of the influential Gia Dinh Constituent Assembly Deputy, Dr. Phan Quang Dan, killing two pedestrians and giving superficial injuries to Dr. Dan.

102. December 29, 1966—Five Viet Cong dressed as government soldiers entered a hamlet in An Xuyen Province and killed two local soldiers.

103. December 30, 1966—Two terrorists threw a grenade in Than Vinh district, four miles south of Saigon. There were no casualties.

Those of you who will study the above sample list—and I want to reiterate that this list includes only a few examples of terrorist activities committed by the Vietcong—will know why I said at the beginning of my discussion that this is not pleasant reading. I once again wish to stress how much I deplore the fact that we even have to think about such things. However, I cannot emphasize too strongly that these are facts. This is what is actually happening and I am afraid that it is only too true that ignoring these atrocities committed by the Vietcong will not make them go away.

I, myself, visited South Vietnam in the fall of 1965 and personally witnessed some of the results of these terrorist acts committed by the Vietcong as well as the injuries inflicted upon troops on the battlefield. When I returned from that visit, I issued a report to the news media in my congressional district—concluding such report with these remarks:

> Of course, to me the most important and most heartwarming part of my mission was meeting and shaking hands and talking with our brave and valiant young men in Vietnam. I was so impressed with their wonderful morale in the face of so many hardships, dangers and adversities—being so far away from home, adjusting to the hot, heavy, humid climate, to the rain and the mud, and to the war itself. All of the men with whom I talked—and I talked with many—seemed to know why they were there—not only to preserve freedom from Communist slavery for the South Vietnamese but really to preserve freedom for each and every one of us—and they all seemed to feel it was their duty to be there and to make the sacrifice for us. Even the wounded with whom I talked in the hospitals said they wanted to return to duty when they were able to do so. Of course, they admitted they didn't like it. Who could? But they were making the best of it. . . . They certainly deserve the support and complete backing from all of us at home. Above all, we must make certain that their sacrifices will not be in vain.

POLITICS AND THE PRESS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on January 24, Eric Sevareid, CBS News national correspondent, delivered an address before the joint session of the Massachusetts State Legislature on the subject of "Politics and the Press." There is much in this address of interest to all Congressmen and all individuals running for political office. His address follows:

POLITICS AND THE PRESS

(An address by Eric Sevareid, CBS News national correspondent, delivered before a joint session of the Massachusetts State Legislature, Boston, Mass., Jan. 24, 1967)

I cannot imagine an occasion in my life of greater satisfaction and moment than this one. I had never thought that I would one day be welcomed before this ancient body, that I would climb this hill in this Commonwealth, which become landmarks on the indelible map of the inner mind when the schoolboy first opens the book of the great American story. Here, more than anywhere else, I should think, began the process of welding the Athenians' art of democracy with the Romans' science of government.

I was a schoolboy on the Dakota prairies where all was new and raw and wanted building. At times, as my understanding increased, I envied those of my generation who were born in places like this, the old and established places, and had, I thought, only to open their minds and arms and inherit it all, ready made. But I am grateful, now, for my origins. At each stage of the westering impulse America re-made itself socially and physically from the beginnings, from the log house and the loneliness, the hand axe and the terrible labors. Something of what your forebears, very long ago, experienced on these shores of rock my forebears, not very long ago, experienced on those plains of snow and dust. I understood the Pilgrims and what it meant for them far sooner than I understood Harvard and its meaning.

But there was a precious thing we did not have to build, which we took from you. It came through the few books in the library off Main Street; it came through the speeches of the occasional Chautauqua lecturer who appeared in the Opera House above the general store; it came through the talk of my father at the dinner table. New England, Massachusetts, Boston—the great men, their electrifying, illuminating words, as stirring to us then out there as they must have been to your ancestors when they were spoken and written here. They formed the invisible environment in which we lived, the most lasting environment of all. By this mysterious alchemy the miracle of Americanism, of national union was performed, quietly, in secret at it were, across thousands of miles, the invisible cords stretching into every valley and clearing, guiding us, binding us all in the face of the worst that the world and our own worst nature could bring against us.

So it is good to be here, where all seems familiar and reassuring, nothing strange; a place I have, in a sense, inhabited all my life.

POLITICS AND THE PRESS

I am to talk to you about politics and the press, and their relationship, the high art of governing men and the profession or the calling, at least, of informing and explaining to men.

I represent what is called electronic journalism, to use a phrase I once coined in one of my less graceful moments. It was, with radio, the function of informing and explaining through the ear; and now with television, through both ear and eye. And it has become the most immediate, dramatic, in some ways the most powerful form of journalism. Certainly, the most personal, as the affectionate letters from strangers and the denunciatory telegrams arriving at offices like mine attest every day.

The politician, local or national, the journalist, in print or by broadcast, have more than a little in common, beyond the fact that we make our mistakes in public and have no hiding place. About eighty years ago James Russell Lowell wrote: "In a world of daily—nay, almost hourly, journalism, every clever man, every man who thinks himself clever or whom anybody else thinks clever, is called upon to deliver his judgment point blank and at the word of command on every conceivable subject of human thought."

About a *hundred* and eighty years ago, John Adams wrote, sardonically, of the Congress: "every man in it is a great man, an orator, a critic, a statesman; and therefore every man, upon every question, must show his oratory, his criticism and his political abilities."

Not quite on every subject or question anymore, for the journalist or the politician. Among both, the specialists have developed. But on a frightfully large number of subjects and questions. It will always be this way; it has to be this way. You require no explaining why a world of specialists only would be a jungle, the world of our final floundering. Serious statesmanship and serious communication with others cannot exist without the generalist, the man of the broad and liberal experience and teaching, the philosopher, homespun or literary, of the human condition.

The general politician and the general journalist—we are jacks of all trades and masters of none save the trade of being jack of all, a trade by no means easily mastered. We must always know enough of what is old to recognize what is new, enough of what has been good for man to sense what is going to harm him. People like you work the cutting edge of history; people like me along with you, live at the growing points of society. And we live together, in a frequently miserable marriage of necessity as restlessly close as any two elements society knows. You make a bit of history every day; we write the first rough draft of history every day. Together we compose the invisible environment of the American mind, make the community weather, sound the tones of the day. And frequently, we detest each other, because as in any marriage, we happen to have certain conflicts of interest. These can be ameliorated but never solved. They would be solved only in the event that one side or the other abandon its responsibilities, in which case, I fear, this free society would be free no longer.

THE "CREDIBILITY GAP"

The relationship is a daily improvisation as are most of the creative tensions in American political life, including those I would suppose, between executive and legislative and judiciary.

In the national capital, where I live and work, the relationship is severely exacerbated at the present time. The phrase "credibility gap" has become a tiresome cliché already, but the very fact of its existence suggests that the condition is unusual. It is unusual only in degree, but I must say that in a quarter century of reporting Washington I have never seen it in such a high degree as this. The press—print and broadcast—is in part responsible because it has not always understood what the administration was saying and has, on these occasions, translated caution to mean dissembling. But the press is not very different from what it was in the capital five, ten or twenty years ago. It is the governing personnel that has changed the most. And the President is the key to this. It is not only that he is unusually sensitive to criticism by nature, not much given to a humorous recognition of his mistakes and bred in the manipulative techniques of the corridors of Capitol Hill—it is also that he is the kind of master personality to whom other personalities, other egos, exist chiefly as tool and extensions of his own. He therefore has created a certain claustrophobic feeling in the Administration, a certain spirit of intimidation which encourages his lieutenants and assistants to release what news is favorable and to withhold what is unfavorable, in order both to protect the President and to protect themselves from the President.

SOURCES OF MUTUAL MISTRUST

We had some of this under President Kennedy who could also be quick of temper and sharp of tongue and who also tended to divide the journalists into friends and enemies; we had some of it under Eisenhower, not much under Truman, and, unless my memories of those days are faulty, very little under Roosevelt in whose administration powerful personalities—like Ickes, Hull, Hopkins, Wallace—were not only permitted to exist but who spoke out powerfully, often against one another, sometimes even against their chief.

A credibility gap, a lack of trust between the federal government and the press and people—this is a most serious thing, one not easily put right. But I have the feeling it is magnified because of the context in which it exists. This President is at the low point of what may be only another political cycle of a familiar kind. He has rapidly escalated the military effort abroad and it seems caught in a log jam; he has rapidly escalated his domestic welfare projects at home and they seem caught in a log jam. For the time, at any rate, the people have small sense of affairs moving, here or overseas. If and when they begin to move, we will all feel that in our spirits; the press generally will forget its present pique, will give credit when it is due, and then, I think, we may all forget that phrase, "credibility gap."

But I remain a journalist and instinctively I side with the press in the ultimate squaring of this particular account. So I shall defer any full flowering of sympathy with officials who feel badly treated by the press until that marvelous day, when I wake to see public officials complain that this newspaper or that commentator has bestowed greater praise upon them than they deserve, which, indeed, happens frequently. That will be a day to remember!

A HISTORIC CONDITION

Bad blood between those who govern the people and those who monitor the governors and report to the people is nothing new in the American story. It is a condition we have never lived without. George Washington sickened of the treatment he received from much of the early American press. Thomas Jefferson, who said once that he would choose newspapers over government if he could have but one or the other, left the White House as a reader of only one paper, the Richmond Enquirer, and that chiefly for the advertisements because, he said, they contained the only truths to be relied on in a newspaper.

I think news reporting of government has greatly changed since then. So, I fear, have the advertisements.

But that there has been a substantial growth in the quality of American journalism is as clear to me as that there has been a substantial growth in the quality of our legislatures, state and federal. You would have to search hard for a Jefferson or a John Adams in the Federal Congress of today, but you must search hard, also, to find much corruption by money, to find sluggards, drunks, the boors and the ignorant. The pace is too fast, the load too heavy, our public affairs far too complicated to afford such men, anymore.

I believe the American press to be better educated, more responsible and alert than it has ever been. I am aware of certain recent strictures, including the remark of Professor Arthur Schlesinger, late of these parts, who said that after working in the White House he could never again take seriously the testimony of journalism on important government decisions. Its relation to reality, he said, "is often less than the shadows in Plato's cave."

The professor's charge was answered years before it was made, by Mr. Walter Lippmann who said, "The theory of a free press is that the truth will *emerge* from free reporting and free discussion, not that it will be presented perfectly and instantly in any one account."

The ultimate burden must fall upon the individual citizens. If he wishes to be well informed he must read *widely* in the press and listen *widely* to the broadcasts. No one example of either can serve him more than very partially.

The press is indeed powerful. And is therefore dangerous indeed. Power in any form carries danger within it somewhere; and, as John Adams tried to warn his countrymen long ago, "power always thinks it has a great soul." But if there is an imbalance of power in our country today, I beg you to consider whether it is the power of the press that has been doing the growing at the expense of the others, or the power of government, specifically the federal government and more specifically the Presidency, which acts more on its own in direct ratio to the fatefulness of the decisions to be taken, the Cuban missile decision, and the decision to make a major war out of the Vietnamese guerrilla war, very much included.

POWER AND ITS HAZARDS

Power is required if we are to do anything, good as well as evil. But we had better, you and I as well as Presidents, be frightened of the power we have; the real danger begins at the point where we are no longer frightened. If it is true, as a Frenchman recently said, that in this life men must choose between anxiety and boredom, all those of us who hold a fragment of power had better be anxious. This is an anxiety of an evangelical nature, our saving grace. We cannot have it both ways; we cannot ask authority over the minds and lives of others, rather direct in your case, indirect in mine, and also ask to sleep easy in our beds.

No doubt we would all sleep, if not well, a little bit easier if we could use our instruments, law and communications, better than we do. I am a more credible authority on the failings in my field than on those in yours, so let me glance around my own house which has a fair proportion of glass in its walls. I began broadcasting news and impressions about the news twenty-seven years ago when the great war was starting and at the scene of it. I might have remained with the printed press and its established comforting traditions. But something exciting was happening, the beginnings of the first new form of journalism in a very long time. We all then found it nerve-wracking, difficult. We were an odd lot—some of us, like me, better reporters than speakers, others the reverse. But we were, I think, essentially responsible, under the intuitive caution and common sense of the leaders, like the late Ed Murrow, who set the tone and the guidelines for the new profession. We had to create a tradition, as it were.

The obstacles were, and are, enormous. One is the basic nature of the broadcasting industry. In this country, many newspapers were founded by men with something particular to say and who wished to say it. A lot of them became simple business properties as they were handed down through the generations, but a meaning, a mystique had been established. Radio and then television stations were started simply and purely as business. Their owners then found themselves, often to their surprise and confusion, custodians of free expression, regents and guardians, along with publishers, of the First Amendment, but with their role and rights still somewhat obscure by reason of their existence through specific government license, not true in the case of the papers.

Then, too, by the nature of the structure, the news functions of networks and stations constitute only a department in a great entertainment industry. The news people live in constant competition with the entertainment people for budgeted funds. Even more acutely, they must compete for time, for minutes and hours, and in a more decisive way than a managing editor competes with the advertising department for a newspaper's space.

BROADCASTING AND PRINT

I am sure that broadcasting and the printed press are much more complementary than competitive to one another. Most comparisons between their output are rather meaningless. Their opportunities and limitations are wholly different. A newspaper's space can be expanded, but there are only so many hours in the day. A newspaper's space can be contracted, when there is little news to give, but broadcasting must live with the fifteen minute quarter-hour and the thirty minute half-hour.

A newspaper can use its space concurrently, broadcasting must use time consecutively. Page one, that is, can show you simultaneously a variety of news items, some played prominently, some obscurely, and the reader's eye can skip about to take its choice. Broadcasting must deliver one news item at a time, so that the story of a bus accident at Fourth and Main receives essentially the same prominence as the story of a great revolution in China. A newspaper can offer details including many statistics because reader can go over it all again if need be; the broadcaster cannot because the listener cannot.

Daily newspapers have radically declined in numbers; broadcasting stations—radio especially—have radically increased. There are probably now too few of the first, too many of the second. In any case this double phenomenon obliges a negative answer to those who contend that stations, because they use public airways under government license, have no right to editorialize, on the news, while newspapers do.[1] Most do it badly, timidly, but that, too, many change with time. If they have this right, as common sense says they do, then they have the right in full and may properly endorse political candidates, a matter now much in contention.

It is not proper that the more numerous and pervasive medium should have fewer liberties than the less numerous and pervasive, but it is not proper, either, that it should handle its liberties in careless manner. Radio is a case in point where news is concerned. There are now so many radio stations, they have sprung up so quickly that professionalism with the news has taken hold only here and there. News is thrown on the market as quickly and cheaply as recorded jazz or used cars or deodorants. These hourly little swatches of news, delivered in the self-conscious baritone of youngsters just out of their high school or college speech class—these I would call the "non-news programs." People tune into them, I think, not to know what has happened, but what has *not* happened. To make sure that the atomic bomb has not fallen, that bubonic plague is *not* sweeping the nation. It would be as useful just to ring a bell every hour on the hour and have someone cry, "All's well." It would also provide time for an extra detergent commercial.

I am not at all sure that radio news is getting better. Television news by the networks and the larger stations I think *is* getting steadily better. The original trouble with it was that its managers fell in love with the pictures and some of its practitioners fell in love with their own image on the screen. What didn't move, wasn't news. An idea wasn't news, because you couldn't put a camera on it. A number of broadcasters thought—and some still do—that they had to perform the news. So we have seen too many character actors and too few minds of character in action. This is changing, steadily for the better. We are learning that a few thoughtful words can often be more revealing than ten thousand pictures and that the people welcome them.

BUILT-IN PROBLEMS

We have some built-in problems, the answers to which we haven't yet come upon. One is the problem of dealing with a complex news story with the simplicity demanded in a hard news program. The printed press has the same problem. Long ago it invented the so-called "all purpose" news story technique which puts the most dramatic single fact in the lead, following it with the less dramatic but often essential facts so that any editor can cut off the story where he wishes. Editing from the bottom up. That is the way the news agencies in particular do it. As James Reston of The New York Times points out, this practice sharpens and inflates the news. It encourages, he remarked, not a balanced but a startling presentation of the news. Time after time, with a complicated story, the result is distortion.

The same is true of the picture medium. I was extremely conscious of this last spring in Vietnam. Buddhists staged some riots in Saigon and Da Nang. The TV cameras wheeled up. They focus, of course, on whatever is most dramatically in motion. They act like a flashlight beam in the darkness. Everything else around, however vital to the full story, is lost in the darkness and ceases to exist. The pictures could not show you that a block away from the Saigon riots the populace was shopping, chatting, sitting in restaurants in total normalcy. The riots involved a tiny proportion of the people in either city; yet the effect of the pictures in this country, including in the Congress, was explosive. People here thought Vietnam was tearing itself apart, that civil war was raging. Nothing of the sort was happening.

Our problem is to find the techniques that will balance the spot news and the spot picture and put them in proportion, and without letting hours or days go by until we can do a special report or a long documentary to explain it all as it really is. This is one reason television news is going back to the daily commentator or "analyst" as they are now called. The men who were used heavily and quite well in the hey-day of radio.

I could talk at great length about these practical challenges and responses, but perhaps to no great purpose. The true challenge, the deep and abiding problem is something of a very different order. It is to see the world not only steadily and whole, but *as it is*, not as our minds have been conditioned to believe it is. To think closely about this is, very often, to feel one's heart sink.

Why has this been called the "age of the journalist"? Why are most of the really enthralling, best-selling books no longer novels of fiction but accounts of real events and real persons? It is because history is moving in geometric progression, because public events more and more dominate private lives, because the most vivid imagination can scarcely compete with the daily realities. Whatever men can think of doing, science and technology now permit them to do, and they do it.

As journalists we are not keeping pace with the realities; we report them but we do not truly understand them, so we do not really explain. I have read much and listened much but I do not understand what will really happen, to what end, when we have men on the moon; I thought I knew something about China but I am at a loss to perceive the inner meaning of the present convulsion in the world's biggest country. I have closely followed the civil rights story but if you asked me now to explain what lies in the deepest recesses of the heart of a Negro boy in an American ghetto, I could not tell you. I am sure they will build the supersonic jet passenger plane but I cannot tell you whether it will improve human life or make it just a bit worse. I am told by experts that a given business, or for that matter, the federal government, can grow to any size at all and under the modern methods of management, operate just as efficiently as when they were small, but I don't know why and I don't quite believe it. I have read much and seen much of the country called Vietnam but I have never dared to try to explain, for want of conviction, why the South Vietnamese fight with poor spirits and the Northerners with determination.

THE REAL "CREDIBILITY GAP"

Here lies a credibility gap that is really worth talking about. Constantly, our measurements of things fall short of the realities the people see. It is not that we hide or alter the truth; it is that we often cannot penetrate the truth. It is deep in our American faith to believe that progress, human and material, must inevitably spread here among ourselves and in the distant improverished lands. It may be quite as likely that catastrophe is approaching, not the millenium. But, poor creatures that we are, we cannot say even this for sure.

My immediate fear is that the gap lies not only between the journalists and the truth but between our national leadership and the truth. I fear the intellectual lag; I fear that yesterday's truths have become today's dogma. Is Mao Tse-Tung's China really to be compared with Hitler's Germany? Is Vietnam really today's Czechoslovakia? Does communism always and everywhere require physical containment or does it not have within itself its own built-in braking mechanism, its own containment? Is it true today, as the administration believes, and as seemed very true in the thirties and forties, that peace and freedom are indivisible? Or is it the real truth that peace and freedom will continue to coexist with war and tyranny as they have coexisted through most human history?

Up to what point is it the responsibility of the United States to try to renovate the economies, the institutions, the ways of life of distant and alien societies, and can this, in fact, be really done? Is democracy an exportable item at all? It is the basic faith of our foreign policy that peace, democracy and material progress are not, each of them, merely good in themselves, but interdependent. I try to find evidence from history that this is so, but I find very little.

---

[1] Stations should editorialize, as stations, and more and more do.

Could it be that we are making a gigantic mistake, that we fail to perceive what Archimedes perceived? The Greek mathematician, with his levers and pulleys and screws, said that he could move the world—if he had a place to stand. He knew he did not. He knew his feet had no separate foundation, that he was in and of the world. As a country, we often seem to think that we stand in a separate place. Perhaps this is why we talk about "conquering nature" or "conquering space." But we are of nature, we are in space. We talk of renovating, uplifting almost all the world, of creating what Secretary Rusk calls a "world order" to govern relations between the nations. But we are in and of the world, with our due share of ignorance, sloth, fears, dangers, prejudice. So much so that we have not been able to renovate our own society, the fearful problems of which pile higher and higher.

THE FATAL MISTAKES

Again and again we must remind ourselves of that truth which John Adams perceived as he walked this hill, long ago: "Power always thinks it has a great soul." In that thought lies the secret of the terrible, sometimes fatal mistakes made by every great national power in the past. If our country is indeed the last, best hope of man, it is imperative that somehow, some way, America prove to be the exception, in the long litany of power misused.

We are involved in all this together, you of government, we of the press. We think of ourselves as practical men and we see with much the same eye. We have read our economics, our political science, our sociology. The federal government, like the American press, habitually sends men of that training and cast of mind to foreign places and they habitually measure affairs and prospect in those places with these instruments, the only ones they know. And time after time their diagnoses and remedies prove to be wrong. Today's Africa is the best example of this I know. The preparatory work, helped along by many Americans as well as Europeans, the planning for political institutions and economic processes was done with dedication, yet in one place after another it was all blown to pieces when independence came.

For the critical forces there had little to do with institutions, with politics or economics; they had to do with ancient traditions, profound emotions. The local witch doctor often proved a better judge of his people and their needs than the traveling expert from M.I.T. Among foreigners there it was the anthropologists who were closer to the truth with their predictions, and the psychologists, the philosophers and the poets.

I believe the American State Department must think hard about this. I know the American press, broadcasting included, must think hard. It must develop the new generation of journalists in a different way, with our training but much more besides, including the most exotic languages of Asian peoples, much history, philosophy, comparative religions, psychology and world literatures. For America is now everywhere in the world, touching everything and we shall not understand what we are doing in this new and revolutionary world unless we find fresh eyes and ears.

It was of this that Dr. Charles Malik, the statesman of Lebanon, was speaking, some years ago before a gathering of journalists in New York. He perceived then what I have been able to perceive with clarity only recently and after much renewed travel abroad.

It so happens, he said, that precisely at the moment when they are most desperately needed, the liberal arts are in a state of crisis. "Do you think," he asked, "that the coincidence of these two crises—the special crisis of the liberal arts and the general crisis of the world—is purely accidental?

"If you aim," he said to us, "at the real truth in your mediation, not the obvious truth, not the superficial truth, but the deep, hidden tragic truth; if you always faithfully bring out what is ultimately at stake today, namely that there is a rebellion of the elements against all that you have held true and holy and sacred for thousands of years—then," he said, "I believe you will put the entire world in your debt."

That, I am afraid is the real dimension of the task that faces the man of the press today, especially in this earth-shaking nation of the United States. In considerable measure, it is also the task of the American man of politics.

I am not sure that either you or I have chosen the most completely satisfying work in which we spend our days—though I suspect neither of us would want it different. I can only suggest that neither one of us is likely to die of boredom.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we are celebrating a good many things all at once. In the first place, we have the birthday of Susan B. Anthony on February 15. Susan B. Anthony was quite a wonderful person, and one to whom the women of this country owe a great deal.

We are also celebrating the 50 years since Jeannette Rankin took her seat in the House—the first woman to do so. Congressman JAMES F. BATTIN says:

> She was a valiant gentlewoman from Montana. Everyone should be proud of the noble tradition she sparked 50 years ago in these halls, for it was she who first opened the doors of Congress to the gentler sex. Serving with the women of Congress today assures me of the wisdom of Montana voters who in 1917 decided to set a national precedent and send Miss Rankin to Washington. Elected as a Republican to the 65th Congress, Miss Rankin was the first woman to be elected to the National House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I have requested this special order today for the purpose of allowing the Members of the House of Representatives to join me in observing the 140th birthday of Susan B. Anthony, which occurred a few days ago, and in commemoration of the coming of women to the Congress 50 years ago.

Susan B. Anthony was born on February 15, 1820, in Adams, Mass. A few years later her Quaker family moved to Rochester, N.Y., where the family home is now known as the Susan B. Anthony house.

Susan was a gifted child. At the age of 3 she learned to write. For a girl of her times, she received a good education, and she was also skilled in cooking, sewing, and furniture making.

Over the years many people felt she should marry and settle down at home, but Susan saw no reason why she should not use her head as well as her hands. When misfortune struck her father's business, Susan began teaching to augment the family income. In those days, as you know, teaching was about the only paid occupation available to women.

Susan was appalled to learn that while she was paid $2.50 a week—a week—the man she replaced had received $10 a week for the same work. A woman could own no property, and legally she was under the control of either her father or her husband.

Miss Anthony breached the barrier by daring to speak at a New York teachers' convention. She was the first woman to ask to be heard, and by a very slim majority the men voted to let her speak. Thereafter she became bolder and spoke often, although not without opposition and insult.

She advocated equal rights for women—especially the right to vote—abolition of slavery, temperance, and better quality of education.

Her travel to speaking engagements took her far and wide. For many years she appeared before Congress in pursuit of legal rights for women. She was a guest at the White House, and was honored abroad.

Many women joined her efforts. Near the end of her life her ideals were no longer scorned. Her own determination never wavered. Fourteen years after her death the 19th amendment, guaranteeing women the right to vote, was adopted. By then 12 Republican States had already given women full suffrage in their State elections.

Today in the crypt under the Capitol dome stands a monument honoring Miss Anthony and two other early champions of women's rights. It is the only monument in any capitol of the world dedicated to women, sculpted by a woman, and presented by women. Without Miss Anthony's vigorous and sacrificial efforts, much of the protective legislation women enjoy today would have been postponed.

Her efforts paved the way for other feminine pioneers. In 1913 the Women's National Party was founded as a temporary organization to sponsor legislation. In 1920 it was reorganized to function permanently. Its only objective is to secure complete equality for women and it promotes no other issues.

Nineteen hundred and seventeen brought the first woman, a Republican, to the Congress. Jeanette Rankin came from Montana, with a university education and experience as a social worker in Seattle, Wash. For several years she had been engaged in advancing the cause of woman suffrage in several Western States. She served in the House of Representatives from March 4, 1917, to March 3, 1919. In 1918 she became a candidate for the Republican nomination for Senator but was unsuccessful. She then tried for the Senate on an independent ticket and lost again. In 1941 she returned to the House of Representatives and served a second term. At the end of the 77th Congress she did not seek renomination, but returned to lecturing and ranching in Montana.

Since her first term in Washington, many other women have been elected to the Congress. This year there are 11 women in the House and one in the Senate. The drive to seek full legal rights for women continues. It is interesting to note that many visitors in this country from the nations that have come into being within the past 10 years have been astonished to learn that women in the United States of America do not have the full legal rights which are guaranteed in these new nations.

Mr. Speaker, I have a number of telegrams here and a selection of some of the editorials that have been written and I ask unanimous consent that these may be inserted in the RECORD with my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEGGETT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the telegrams referred to are as follows:

WARREN, MICH.,
February 28, 1967.

MRS. FRANCES BOLTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your efforts in calling attention to the 50th year of women's representation. I sincerely hope that the speeches today will encourage passage of the equal right amendment.

BEULAH MAGRUDER.

NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY,
Washington, D.C., February 27, 1967.

HON. FRANCES BOLTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your ceremony tomorrow celebrating fiftieth anniversary of opening of doors of Congress to women. We are glad that the women who are in Congress are making this tribute to Jeannette Rankin in recognition of what she did for women when she took her seat in Congress March 4, 1917.

ALICE PAUL,
Honorary Chairman.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 27, 1967.

HON. FRANCES BOLTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Best wishes for your ceremony tomorrow commemorating opening of Congress to women exactly fifty years ago this week. We are happy to see this honor paid to Jeannette Rankin, the distinguished pioneer who opened the gates of Congress to women.

EMMA GUFFEY MILLER,
Dean of Democratic Committeewomen and President, National Womans Party.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I should like to read the telegram from Jeannette Rankin, sent to me personally:

WATKINSVILLE, GA.,
February 27, 1967.

HON. FRANCES BOLTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Greetings and congratulations on the progress women in Congress have made and gratitude to Susan B. Anthony for her pioneer spirit. Women are a majority of the people in the United States. They have education privileges, opportunities greater than the women in any other land. The great challenge today is to protect the youth. This is the deepest rachial responsibility. Let us face the problem and go forward without fear and with mother love for all humanity, hoping for a happier world. Special greetings to you Frances Bolton and to Alice Paul for her untiring work for humanity.

JEANNETTE RANKIN.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to yield to some of my colleagues who would like to speak on this subject, but before doing so I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the anniversary of Susan B. Anthony and Hon. Jeannette Rankin, the first woman Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I gladly yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of the 19th amendment is one of the historic events in the history of our country. Even prior to the adoption of the 19th amendment when two children were born, one a boy and one a girl, they both were citizens of our country—both were equal so far as citizenship was concerned but one, because of being born a girl, was denied the fullness of citizenship, as the years went by, and she arrived at the voting age established by the laws of the several States.

It is well that we pause on this occasion to reflect on the importance of what took place 50 years ago when the first lady Member was sworn in as a Member of the House of Representatives.

It is also well that we pause on the birthday anniversary of one of the greatest fighters for a great cause that history records, Susan B. Anthony.

I can remember, throwing my mind back, as a youngster in the part of Boston in which I was born and brought up, where people always take their politics seriously, even now as well as then—that I would attend meetings as a youngster of 12 or 13 years of age, and the purpose of the meetings would be to oppose women's suffrage.

I would sit there and I would listen to the intensely emotional arguments, but, even in my mind as a youngster, illogical and unsound arguments which made no impression upon me Notwithstanding, as a youngster long before I had the right to vote, I made up my mind on the issue. The main reason that I made up my mind was to me a profound reason. It involved direct thinking and action on my part.

I would attend these meetings and these rallies. At that time we did not know "outer space" as we do now, but how the old "outer space" would be reverberating with electricity and all of the emotions that "Woman's place was in the home," and so forth and so on—as if she is not there now, loyal to her dedicated duties and responsibilities.

Then I would go home. I would take one look at that dear mother of mine and I would ask myself a question. She never knew I asked the question, but I looked at her and I would ask myself the question, after listening to all these arguments as to why women, who, though they were citizens then as they are now, should not have the right to vote, I would ask myself the question, "Who dares tell me that my dear mother could not vote better than most men I knew in the community?" That was the main reason that settled the question in my mind as a youngster.

The beneficial results of this amendment giving to the women of our country the fullness—and the fullness of citizenship in the right to vote is what was involved—has been of inestimable value to our country, strengthening our institutions and giving a recognition that was fundamental and based upon justice and equity.

So I am very happy to join with my dear friend, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], and the other Members, in pausing on this day that, 50 years ago, was a very historic one, and out of which great event has flown tremendous beneficial results in the best interests of our country, and to pay tribute to Susan B. Anthony, and to place in the RECORD the manner in which I decided the issue. One look at my dear mother inspired the question: "Who would dare tell me that my dear mother could not vote better than most men I knew?"

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I yield to our distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join with my colleague from Ohio and others in paying tribute to Susan B. Anthony, who was the leader in the women's suffrage movement 50 years ago or more, and to pay tribute to Jeannette Rankin, the first woman who served in the Congress of the United States.

I cannot match the story that was just told by the distinguished Speaker, but I certainly agree with him that my mother and all our mothers were certainly as well qualified to cast a vote on local, State or national matters, as any one of us.

I believe the House of Representatives and the Senate are better off today because we do have the women of this country having the right to cast their ballots for each of us or against each of us.

I believe also that the House, where we now have 11 women Members, is better off because we are associating with each of you every day. We are getting the benefit of your wisdom and counsel. We do have an opportunity to get the viewpoint of those that Jeannette Rankin carried the torch for prior to the approval of the 19th amendment.

I say again, as I conclude, that this is a very memorable day, when we can combine and pay tribute to these two gallant women in the history of America.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the minority leader.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today we commemmorate two important events in the history of progress for women's rights in the United States. The first is the birthday of Susan B. Anthony, leader in the effort to gain political equality for women which culminated in the ratification of the 19th amendment. The second is the 50th anniversary of the seating of the first woman in Congress. On March 4, 1917, Jeannette Rankin, of Montana, became the first women to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives. It is with great respect that we honor these two women today. Through their courage and the courage of others of their era, the long slow march toward full equality for women was begun.

In the past 50 years we have seen substantial progress toward equal treatment of women in the United States. But recently the pace of change has suddenly, and most excitingly, accelerated.

I would like to say briefly that that change has come from this House. I would like to pay tribute to both the men and women in this House who have made it possible. The change was not suggested by the Executive. It came out of the legislative body. In 1964 Congress recognized a woman's right to equal employment opportunity and approved the inclusion of a prohibition against sex discrimination in employment in the Civil Rights Act. The change was made possible by this House. The bill did not come here with the recommendation that women not be discriminated against. This body made it possible. I would like to pay tribute to the fairness of the men and women who make the laws.

Last year the other women Members of Congress and I attempted to include a provision in the civil rights bill which would have made it unlawful to make any distinction on account of sex in the qualifications for service on grand or petit juries in any State or in the selection of persons to serve. We were successful in the House, but the bill never reached the floor of the Senate. In the Senate jury service for women was the first measure jettisoned. The person who spoke in the Senate gladly gave up the right of women to serve on juries if he could have a few other things. I feel that the House has done more than either the Senate or the executive department, and I am happy that I sit here in this body where I have a chance to do something about these laws.

Last February a district Federal court in Alabama declared that a State law denying women the right to serve on juries in that State was in violation of the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment and therefore unconstitutional—White against Crook.

> The plain effect of this Constitutional provision—

The court said—

> is to prohibit prejudicial disparities before the law. This means prejudicial disparities for all citizens—including women.

The State of Alabama has decided not to appeal the case, so the constitutional issue is unsettled. But the decision is clearly a landmark and precedent for extending to women citizens equal protection of the laws in many areas.

In spite of these steps forward, however, progress generally has been painfully slow. In many areas the advances have been merely token. In education and employment the disparities between men and women are still shocking. There are, for example, about one-half million fewer women and girls than men and boys with less than 5 years of education. More girls than boys complete high school, but this is one of the few indexes of social and economic status in which women's level exceeds men's. The percentages of women holding bachelors, masters, and doctoral degrees were smaller in 1964 than 1940, despite large increases in the numbers of degrees earned by women and large doses of Federal aid for college students.

In employment, the situation is even worse. Increasingly women are becoming concentrated in the relatively less skilled, less rewarded, and less rewarding types of work. Since 1947 there has been an almost continuous decline in the percentage of all professional, technical, and kindred workers who are women. In contrast, women constitute a considerably larger proportion of those in service and clerical jobs. Despite title 7 of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, there is flagrant discrimination in employment.

But women all over the country are awakening. They are becoming aware of recent favorable changes in the law. They are beginning to see the irrationality and injustice of other laws and of the attitudes and administrative practices perpetuated, indeed, encouraged, by them. They are beginning to demand. And the possibilities for action are enormous: social security, protective labor legislation, retirement and fringe benefits programs, employment practices, jury duty.

In many instances, work has already begun. This year I have advanced a number of proposals to eliminate gross inequities in social security provisions affecting working wives. Together with the 1965 amendments, these should go far toward reducing the discrimination against women which is so deeply embedded in the social security law. I have also introduced a bill—H.R. 643—to provide equal treatment in retirement and certain fringe benefits for married women employees of the Federal Government. The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs has entered a California case—Mengelkoch against Industrial Welfare Commission—challenging State protective legislation which limits women's promotion opportunities and earning power as amicus curiae. Nullification of the California law would bring into question the validity of similar laws across the country.

In my mind, carrying on the tradition of Susan Anthony and Jeannette Rankin whom we honor today, demands that we pledge ourselves to insisting on enforcement of existing laws which recognize the rights of women and to fighting for recognition by the Supreme Court of the equal rights of women—truly equal rights—so that a woman can be under the laws of this land as full a citizen as her father, husband, and brothers.

I congratulate the gentlewoman from Ohio for bringing to the attention of the House both Mrs. Anthony's birthday and Mrs. Rankin's historic seating in this body.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentlewoman very much.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] for making it possible for us in the House of Representatives today to make special mention of these two occasions that we celebrate.

I will begin my remarks by reading a telegram that was sent to the lady Members of the House, but intended for all Members of the House.

First I should like to read a telegram from the honorary chairman of the National Woman's Party, Alice Paul. She says:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 27, 1967.

Hon. CATHERINE MAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your ceremony tomorrow celebrating fiftieth anniversary of opening of doors of Congress to women. We are glad that the women who are now in Congress are making this tribute to Jeanette Rankin in recognition of what she did for women when she took her seat in Congress March 4, 1917.

ALICE PAUL,
Honorary Chairman, National Woman's Party.

Because it follows well on this message from Mrs. Paul, I should like to read the message from Jeannette Rankin herself, who is still with us, living in Watkinsville, Ga. She has sent this message to the women Members of the House of Representatives, and to all our colleagues:

WATKINSVILLE, GA.,
February 28, 1967.

Mrs. CATHERINE MAY,
Chief Cosponsor of the Equal Legal Rights for Women, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

I wish you success in your gallant campaign for the equal legal rights for women amendment as a member of the National Womans Party. I am working for this amendment as I worked and voted in Congress for the amendment to give women the right to vote.

JEANNETTE RANKIN.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly think that on this day we would be remiss if we did not pay special tribute to the National Woman's Party. The National Woman's Party is a nonpartisan organization of women whose program is to secure for women complete equality with men under the law and in all human relationships. This is its only objective, and, as an organization, it takes no action on any other issue.

Many Members of this House have again introduced the equal rights amendment and we certainly urge the Committee on the Judiciary to take action on this legislation this session.

The women of today are not dealing with the time when suffrage for women was a national issue. They are not dealing with 19th century cultural patterns and statistics. We are now in the second half of the 20th century. Not only women, but men alike, are dealing with the growing contributions of women to the political, social, and economic life of our country in a changing world.

Women must pursue a course of excellence in order to keep up with the changing times. This need is reflected in the rising number of women workers, their expanding job opportunities, and their effective job performances. Any existing working partnership of men and women has developed largely as a result of the many social and economic changes of the last half century.

Scientific and technological improvements have not only simplified many home duties and have reduced the time required for the physical tasks of homemaking, but also more jobs, specialized jobs, and new employment opportunities are available. But we ask, are women taking advantage of these facts?

Increased opportunities for women's services have been accompanied by broadened opportunities in education and training. The nationwide development of free education for girls and the gradual achievement of equal opportunities for higher learning have encouraged women to prepare for and seek employment in ever-expanding occupational fields.

Women can be found in each of the some 480 occupations listed by the U.S. Census Bureau. There are women beauticians, of course, but there are women barbers, too. Women work as ambassadors and fill other high Government posts. There are women teamsters, doctors, automobile mechanics, railroad yard workers, architects, interior decorators, and baggage handlers. Women run colleges, newspapers, hospitals, and homes.

The variety of work that women do today outside the home, and the number of women workers, are in marked contrast to the state of affairs when this century began.

The great changes in the situation today, and the fact that the proportion of women who work goes right on growing, show how important womenpower is to the Nation. It is important for what is accomplished. It is important because it has been called "the greatest reserve of additional manpowers."

I need not tell you that the expansion of woman's sphere in all fields—education, club work, the professions and business, and so on—was accompanied by steady advances toward the cherished goal of equal political rights. The exodus of great numbers of women from the home in the year following 1870, sparked the ever-present suffrage movement. World War I proved to the country that women were entirely capable of making broader and more valuable contributions to our society and the suffrage amendment was passed in 1920. It took a century to do this.

It was a discouraging and slow process; many backward steps had to be retraced; tempers flared through the years; marches of protest were held; steady streams of petitions were presented to Government officials and the President of the United States. Indeed, it was not without "blood, toil, tears and sweat" that the 19th amendment was passed, signed, and ratified, and women at long last had their rightful place as voting citizens.

This seems long ago and far away. The changes in our pattern of living have created new and startling problems. Also patterns of conduct have shifted. But the fact remains that in 1967 it is incumbent upon women to exercise the rights they have gained.

Women, as citizens, share the responsibilities for the nature and level of services performed by our Government. It behooves women to examine the functions of Government. Their responsibilities do not cease after the ballots are cast.

The average woman of 1967 is active in her community. She may belong to the PTA. She may work as a nurse's aid for the Red Cross, or help out during the American Cancer Society and United Givers Fund drives. Her interest may be working in her church. Perhaps she is active in a woman's group such as the Business and Professional Women's Clubs, or the League of Women Voters, or the General Federation of Women's Clubs. She may belong to any of a number of service clubs or be actively engrossed in one of many professional organizations.

The woman of 1967 knows that life today demands knowledge and awareness of what is happening politically and economically both in the United States and around the world. She is to be much admired if she does something about it and keeps informed.

The era of 1967 finds us with tremendous examples to which we can point where women in ever-increasing numbers are making outstanding contributions to the most important special causes and to their country and to good government.

Many of our problems of this century arise out of ignorance and desire to avoid change. It is up to the women to keep up with the times and to contribute all they can on their community level. That is where good government begins.

May I remind you that it is important for all of us to urge girls to stay in school and to get higher education if at all possible. We must also see that there is ample opportunity for adult education for women who want to keep their skills current or who want to learn marketable skills.

Opportunities were never better for women. There is lively interest in the potential of womanpower as a national resource. Now women must do their part by setting their sights high, preparing themselves for better pay, more rewarding employment and proving by performance that they can and will make a valuable contribution to our national life.

And certainly when all legislative obstacles that still bar women from entering into full partnership with men in the political, economic and social life of the United States are removed, she will finally have her chance to make that contribution fully.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to join Mrs. BOLTON and other distinguished Members in commemorating the 147th anniversary of the birthday of Susan B. Anthony, an outstanding citizen and great leader in the cause of women's rights, and Jeannette Rankin, who 50 years ago became the first woman to hold a seat in the House of Representatives. These women were among the first to begin a long crusade. Their example has offered much encouragement to those who have continued the struggle for equal rights for women.

Although much progress has been made, let us remember there still exist many inequities in the employment and educational opportunities and legal rights of men and women. To find remedies for these inequities is a challenge which the responsible citizens of our Nation must accept. I support equal rights for women, as is evidenced by my bill providing for an equal rights for men and women amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Adoption of this amendment will complete women's long movement toward legal equality, which was one of Miss Anthony's primary goals. Yet there still remains the responsibility to see that the spirit of the law is carried out in private and individual action in order that women's rights will in fact be truly equal.

I commend the gentlewoman from Ohio for affording the opportunity for this House to pause and reflect upon the careers of Miss Anthony and Miss Rankin. It is my hope that their accomplishments will stand as a constant reminder of the results determination and dedication can foster.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in the 50 years since the first woman took her seat in the Congress of the United States on March 4, 1917, only a comparative handful of women have had the opportunity to serve in this body. As a woman privileged to be a Member, I am proud of the caliber and abilities of the women Members who are serving or who have served here, and I believe most of the male Members have shared that pride.

In recent Congresses, particularly, women have generally been accorded the consideration their abilities justified in assignment to important House committees, joint committees, and commissions, so that very few doors are closed to us. This was not always true. You, Mr. Speaker, have been particularly conscientious and fair in assuring to qualified women Members opportunities to rise to positions of leadership in committees and in the House, and for this—and for many other qualities of character and leadership—I salute you today on this occasion in which we mark the anniversary of the opening of the door of the House to women.

It is noteworthy that the first woman to serve in the House, Miss Jeannette Rankin, of Montana, was sworn into this body several years before the vast majority of American women won the fundamental right of any adult citizen in a democracy—the right to vote.

After 50 years, however, we must still recognize that the election of a woman to the Congress is a comparative rarity. That is unfortunate. Most of us privileged to serve here in these past 50 years have been the widows of respected Members and we were elected the first time, at least, on the basis of the reputations and records of our husbands, rather than on our own. After the first term, of course, any Member, male or female, must run on his or her own record and abilities, and it is significant, I believe, that most of the women Members have been reelected as often as they have run. Furthermore, some of the foremost women Members—whose achievements have won the admiration of the entire House—have been women whose entry into politics was made possible not by the record of a husband, but through their own political efforts and initiative. I sincerely hope that more women throughout the country who are qualified for service in Congress will file for nomination and run for this important office. Undoubtedly, it is more difficult for a woman than for a man to run successfully for Congress, but only the determined efforts and the courage of more and more women willing to undertake the arduous preparation and campaigning for a congressional career will ever change that fact.

Recently at a dinner sponsored by Downtown St. Louis, Inc., an organization of our central city business leaders which annually conducts a week-long salute to women who work, I mentioned the accomplishments of some of the women with whom I am privileged to serve in the Congress—such as Mrs. BOLTON, Mrs. KELLY, Mrs. GREEN, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, and Senator SMITH—and stated that in my opinion the women as a group, do more, and work harder, than the men as a group. This situation arises not because women are better at this work than men or because all of the women Members work harder than all of the male Members, but because we are so visible—so few among many—and we, therefore, all feel a responsibility to each other and to the women of this country not to let down those who believe women can handle these challenging assignments with honor and effectiveness.

I hope the day will come when women serving in the Congress will be numerous enough not to be so highly visable as individuals. There will still be sufficient spur to individual effort and achievement, but it will be based on factors other than being part of a tiny minority in a highly visible situation. When that day comes, the level of democratic opportunity in this country and the level of democratic effectiveness will be much higher than they are today.

We salute Miss Rankin, still 50 years after her swearing-in, for her pioneering courage. But, considering the fact that only 11 women serve in the House in the 90th Congress, and only one in the Senate, the progress women have so far achieved in politics in these 50 years has not been startling.

I know there is among all 11 of us priviledged to serve here a strong sense of mission to do our best for all of our constituents, regardless of sex or party. I thank our male colleagues for treating us as equals, while also evidencing at all times gentlemanly recognition of the fact that we are women.

Thank you.

Mrs. BOLTON. Thank you.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I will be happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I am very happy that the distinguished dean of the women Members of the House has taken this opportunity to give us a chance to salute two great women for their remarkable work and in the process to express our appreciation for the magnificent service rendered by the women who are now and have been Members of Congress. There is not a man in the House who would not agree that the women who have served with us here have laid to rest for all time any notion that sex should be a disqualification for high public office. As a matter of fact, I believe on the average our female colleagues outperform their brothers in the House.

I appreciate the fact that we do have 11 women Members. I wish we had more women in the House. We need them. They contribute enormously to our deliberations here. We believe in the basic equality of human beings, and we believe that equality should extend to both sexes as well as to other differences within our population.

Again I congratulate the gentlewoman from Ohio for taking this time.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], for his most appropriate and timely remarks.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in commending the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] for giving all of us this opportunity to celebrate the occasion in which we are engaged today in honoring these two outstanding women who have done so much for this country.

Anniversaries and commemorative ceremonies represent a renewal of faith; they reexpress, reaffirm, restate what has gone before. They seek to perpetuate, to remind the individual of his place in history—the daily events of his particular life—recorded moment to moment—as well as to the fulfillment of his larger destiny. These events rightfully remind us of our own existences; they recall events and figures of our past; they enable us to see ourselves in relation to a larger perspective. Accordingly it is fitting that we pause today to renew our dedication to the principle of equality for women, so eloquently expressed in the lives and thoughts of two early defenders of this important concept of our democracy, Susan B. Anthony, ardent champion of woman suffrage, and the Honorable Jeannette Rankin, first woman Member of Congress.

Today we celebrate Susan B. Anthony's birthday of 147 years ago. Miss Anthony's lifelong quest for "principle, not policy; justice, not favor; men, their rights and nothing more; women, their rights and nothing less," saw fulfillment in 1920 when the women's suffrage amendment became law of the land. Women who cast their ballots since that date owe a debt of gratitude to Susan B. Anthony. Our history will always reserve a special place of honor and tribute to her for her courage and conviction and for the many outrages that she had to bear to press the cause of equality.

Today we also commemorate the 50th anniversary of the first woman Member of the Congress, Representative Jeannette Rankin who was selected to serve in the 65th Congress as a Member of the House of Representatives.

The achievements of Susan B. Anthony and Honorable Jeannette Rankin serve as an inspiration from which to view our present-day achievements. To their early efforts, we owe the increased participation of women in politics; to their voices, we owe our presence as Members of Congress.

To Susan B. Anthony and Honorable Jeannette Rankin, we express our profound admiration and sincere appreciation; and while doing so, we use the paths they have trod to discover new avenues for expanding and achieving greater opportunities for women in all aspects of American life.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Hawaii for her eloquent contribution.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. REID].

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to join with my colleagues in the House as we pause during this month of February to commemorate the life and work of still another great American. Certainly Susan B. Anthony rates a well-deserved place among these ranks—for through her life work and unceasing efforts in behalf of suffrage for all, she made a vital and proud contribution to the richness of our American heritage. It is most appropriate, therefore, that we pay tribute at this time to this outstanding citizen.

During her lifetime, Susan B. Anthony was no stranger to Capitol Hill. She appeared during every session of Congress for many years—always with the same slogan and same goal—"principle, not policy; justice, not favor." To her above all others, the women of this Nation owe the political rights we now possess; and we know that with these political rights there also followed the economic and social benefits which we also enjoy today. But the crusade which Susan B. Anthony began in America did not end with the adoption of the Women's Suffrage Amendment. It is being carried forth in other parts of the world where people still seek the acceptance of equal rights and opportunities.

I also want to join with my colleagues in celebrating the 50th anniversary of the first woman to serve in the Congress of the United States, Jeannette Rankin. She literally opened the doors of Congress to those of us who have followed in her footsteps.

The deeds and dedication of these two great women continue to be an inspiration to all who seek to safeguard the rights of free people everywhere. Certainly, the names of Susan B. Anthony and Jeannette Rankin have come to be synonoymous with courage, vision, freedom, and democracy.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in recognizing the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Dwyer].

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton] is performing an important public service today by calling attention to the twin anniversaries of two significant events in the long and continuing struggle for women's rights: the birthday of Susan B. Anthony on February 15, and the seating of the first woman Member of Congress, Jeannette Rankin, on March 4, 1917.

The achievements of these two outstanding women are too well known and forever enshrined in history to require extensive elaboration at this time. What is important is what they repesent today. Women's suffrage, to which Susan B. Anthony dedicated her life, and the admission of women to the Nation's highest law-making body were major milestones along the road to civil and political equality. But they are only milestones. The end of the road has not been reached; women's rights are not fully recognized as equal. And until they are, then the accomplishments of the past can only serve as inspiration and encouragement, not as resting places.

Little by little, Mr. Speaker, progress is being made. Many of us here can take special pride in the enactment of the Equal Pay for Women Act and in the extension of the equal opportunity provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to prohibit discrimination based on sex. The enactment of laws, however, does not necessarily mean the achievement of objectives, and I would urge the women of America to look to the administration of these laws and assure themselves that the full intent of the Congress is being carried out.

Looking ahead, Mr. Speaker, there are two matters of special concern to women which I hope this Congress will favorably consider. The first concerns discrimination against women in the selection of juries, and the second is passage of the equal rights amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

As our colleagues will recall, several women Members of the House and Senate joined with me last year to urge the President and the Attorney General to draft the jury selection provisions of the administration's civil rights bill in such a way that women would be fully protected in their right and responsibility to serve on State and Federal juries. When the administration failed to do so, the House adopted the amendment offered by the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. Griffiths].

This year, when rumors reached me again that the administration might ignore this demonstration of congressional intent regarding women's right to serve on juries without discrimination, I reminded the Attorney General of last year's House action and suggested that he could avoid another floor fight by incorporating our language in the administration's new civil rights bill. And I am pleased to report to our colleagues that this has been done.

Mr. Speaker, women have learned that they have to fight for every right to which they are entitled. From the past, we have inherited a gallant record of women's determination to secure those rights. This is the lesson which we should read in today's memorial to Miss Anthony and to Congresswoman Rankin.

From my own congressional district, however, there is further evidence in the life of Mrs. George W. Bates, of Cranford, N.J., to show how deep and widespread this concern for equal rights has always been, and I include an article about Mrs. Bates from the February 26 issue of the Newark Sunday News as a part of my remarks:

A SUFFRAGETTE LOOKS BACK—CRANFORD RESIDENT, 88, RECALLS EFFORTS IN LONG DRIVE

CRANFORD.—An exhibit on the women's suffrage movement at the Historical Society Museum here has brought to light some long-ago moments in the life of one of the township's senior citizens.

The exhibit, sponsored by the Cranford League of Women Voters, shows the development of the women's movement for equal rights from 1875, when Susan B. Anthony first drafted the 19th Amendment proposal, until its eventual ratification in 1920. A look at Cranford's role in this movement recalls the part played by Mrs. George W. Bates of 21 Central Ave. in bringing the cause of women into the public eye.

Mrs. Bates, the former Elizabeth Miller, remembers clearly her reasons for becoming a suffragette shortly after the turn of the century.

"I was," she said, "a watcher at the polls, checking on who voted. I remember an illiterate man, so drunk he could hardly stand, who came in and put his 'X' on the ballot. It made my blood boil to realize I could not vote."

WENT TO TRENTON

Mrs. Bates joined the Cranford Equal Franchise League, and was one of its representatives at hearings on the suffrage bill in Trenton. She recalls marching in the first suffrage parade in Newark in 1913.

"It was raining," she said, "and I was dressed in white. None of the women seemed to have raincoats, but I had borrowed my husband's."

While the women marched, the sun came out. "We looked terrible," Mrs. Bates said.

New Jersey voted against the amendment that year. "I can't blame them," Mrs. Bates laughed. "We all looked so bad."

But the following year Mrs. Bates was chosen by an all-male Board of Education to become its second female member. She was the only woman in the country nominated to such a post that year.

She does not, to this day, understand why she was picked, but she served for some 13 years. She was chairman of the teachers' finance committee when the board "wasn't sure where its next pay check was coming from."

MISTAKEN IDENTITY

In 1922, Mrs. Bates was summoned to serve on the Union County Grand Jury. She was the first woman called to such a duty, and the summons began with the words: "Greeting, Sir." "They weren't prepared for women yet," she speculated.

Once an amateur actress, Mrs. Bates had acted in a play staged by a local dramatic club. She played the part of an Irish woman who killed a man who had molested her sister.

She remembers this vividly, because the first case she heard on the jury was that of a father who had killed a young man who had molested his daughter. Her part in the play had made her sympathetic, she supposed, and she was influential in the jury's decision that let the man go free.

Mrs. Bates is now 88 but has lost little of her zeal. She is still actively interested in the Boy Scout movement and birdwatching, but confesses she has been remaining home a great deal since her husband's death two years ago.

BORN IN BROOKLYN

Mrs. Bates was born in Brooklyn and lived in Englishtown before moving to Cranford at the age of 11. Her formal education ended with graduation from high school but she said, "My real education started when I went to London to visit my uncle. It was then that I became intensely patriotic. It was during the Spanish-American War and I felt so proud of my country that every time the stars and stripes went by I would stop and salute."

The lively octogenarian's patriotism did not end with saluting the flag. Mrs. Bates said that she was a member of the Red Cross for 45 years, joining the organization during World War I. She served then in an Army hospital in Colonia and later helped fight a flu epidemic in Elizabeth in the early 1920s.

And what does she think about her 88 years? "I've lived in a little rut here on Main Street almost all that time but I've seen an awful lot of life."

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today we are honoring two courageous women who contributed much to the emancipation of women. Susan B. Anthony, whose birthday we are commemorating today, struggled 50 years on behalf of equal rights for women; her efforts led to the enfranchisement of American women. Jeannette Rankin, who we are also saluting today, promoted suffrage in my own State of Washington as well as in her native State, Montana; her seating as the first woman in Congress March 4, 1917, was a milestone in the cause Miss Anthony so valiantly championed.

When Miss Anthony was born, February 15, 1820, American women were not only unable to vote; they were without social, economic, or legal rights. About the only occupation open to women was teaching, and the pay was disgracefully below that of male teachers. A women was under legal control of her father until she married—and then she came under legal control of her husband.

It was not until 14 years after Miss Anthony's death that her equal-rights efforts began to be realized in law. In 1920, under the administration of a Democrat, Woodrow Wilson, American women gained political rights with the passage of the 19th amendment.

Since that time, women have also won substantial legal and economic rights, but on a piecemeal basis, with their rights varying from State to State. To secure full economic and legal rights for women, the Democratic Party since 1944 has included in its national platform a plank urging an Equal Rights for Women amendment.

Today, most nations have given women the vote and have increasingly expanded women's opportunities in areas other than political. Women such as Susan B. Anthony and Jeannette Rankin not only opened doors for American women; their efforts offered hope and inspiration to women throughout the world.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, Jeannette Rankin, the valiant gentlewoman from Montana, should be proud of the noble tradition she sparked 50 years ago in these halls for it was she who first opened the doors of Congress to the gentler sex. Serving with the women of Congress today assures me of the wisdom of Montana voters who in 1917 decided to set a national precedent and send Miss Rankin to Washington. Elected as a Republican to the 65th Congress, Miss Rankin was the first woman to be elected to the National House of Representatives.

Suffrage had to come with women like Jeannette Rankin working on its side and it was only appropriate that a Montana woman—whose breed is known to be pioneering, independent and hard-working—was the first to take advantage of the opportunity for public service.

Today I salute Miss Rankin for her contribution to the feminine side of politics and to the other gentlewomen who continue the Montana precedent. The many other women who have served their country in Congress for these past 50 years prove that suffrage was a wise investment for the United States.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Susan B. Anthony helped change the mind of our Nation. She assisted beyond measure in improving the status of women—politically, socially, and economically. While she neither began nor ended woman's struggle for equality, she left upon the movement the stamp of an imperishable personality. One might say she is the mother of all enfranchised women today.

Born on February 15, 1820, on a farm near Adams, Mass., she was a pioneer in more than the suffrage movement. She was for justice alike for both sexes and all colors and races.

Courage and determination are New England traits, and it took tremendous courage for Miss Anthony to persist whenever the women for whom she was fighting drew their skirts aside and turned their backs on her. She appeared on the American scene at a time when the cause of woman suffrage was not only unpopular among men but among some women as well. It was for her to kindle the spark of public opinion in favor of the cause of woman suffrage. It is said that public opinion is one of the great factors in America, and when it is refined by the fire of full and free discussion, it becomes a wholesome expression of the views of the people.

An obscure schoolteacher, at the age of 33, she vowed to change the minds of men concerning the degraded position of women. Until the day of her death, she never faltered in her determination to win equality for women.

Her last notable appearance was as a delegate to the International Council of Women in London, England, in the year 1899. In 1900 there was a great demonstration in our Nation's Capital in celebration of her birthday, and in that year she retired from the presidency of the National American Women's Suffrage Association which office she had held for a great number of years.

In her last speech, Miss Anthony left as a memorial to her efforts the follow ing words of wisdom:

> When will men see that what we ask is not praise but justice?

This last speech concluded with these words: "Failure is impossible."

The work of Susan B. Anthony and her colleagues made it possible for the first woman to be elected to Congress. Jeannette Rankin, of Montana, took her seat in the House of Representatives 50 years ago—March 4, 1917. She served one term but returned to Congress in 1941 and served until January 3, 1943.

Jeannette Rankin attended public school and was graduated from the University of Montana at Missoula in 1902. She later engaged in social work. She also was vitally interested in promoting the cause of woman suffrage and it should be noted she served in Congress prior to the establishment of the suffrage amendment in 1920.

A firm believer in peace, she took a courageous stand as an elected representative of her people.

It is, indeed, a privilege for me to pay tribute to these two outstanding women—Susan B. Anthony and Jeannette Rankin.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in commemorating the 50th anniversary of the arrival of the first woman in Congress. It is fitting that I pay tribute to the Honorable Jeannette Rankin, of Montana, because we are both westerners and are proud of the lead the West has taken in the cause of women's suffrage. My own State of Washington is unique in that it is the only State now represented in Congress by two women, the very able and distinguished Hon. CATHERINE MAY and Hon. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN.

Miss Rankin has spent her life furthering the cause of equal rights for women, a cause in which I deeply believe as my bill proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women will indicate. This gallant lady began her career as a social worker in Seattle in 1909, and she later engaged in promoting women's suffrage in the States of Washington, California, and Montana. It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that Miss Rankin led the successful campaign to give women in Montana the vote and today at 86 years of age she is still devoted to the cause of equal rights for women. She is now engaged in creating a "cooperative homestead for unemployed homemakers" on her farm in Georgia. The "homestead" is for mothers whose children have grown up and left them alone. Miss Rankin is still working toward pride and dignity for women.

SCHIZOPHRENIC NUCLEAR PACIFISTS TRY UN-INVENTING THE WHEEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, despite the stern U.S. policy against nuclear spread, the world's Nuclear Club now has a membership of five. The British, who gained American nuclear knowledge honestly, and the Russians who got it otherwise, evidence the impossibility of suppressing technology for long by secrecy measures and security regulations. On their part, the French and Red Chinese demonstrate that neither a democracy nor a dictatorship will be long deterred by pleas, pacts, protests, or other means from fulfilling a want for nuclear capability. Now that the nonproliferation policy has failed for 20 years, the Johnson administration is making an all-out drive to formalize it into a treaty. To police the treaty, it proposes that International Atomic Energy Agency inspectors roam through nuclear installations to assure that fissionable materials are not diverted surreptitiously to secret bomb factories. Even if the IAEA had the capacity to inspect adequately—which it has not as I discussed last week—its efforts would be directed only at diversions from legitimate operations, not secretly established illegitimate ones where the real danger of proliferation lies. Let me explain.

There are two bomb ingredients—highly enriched uranium and plutonium. In the nuclear fuel cycle—fuel processing, fuel use in reactors, and fuel reprocessing—only natural uranium or uranium slightly enriched in the fissionable isotope U^{235} is involved. It is not usable to make bombs. Plutonium, which might possibly be used to make bombs, is manufactured as a byproduct in reactors. Assuming adequate inspection, its diversion theoretically could be policed. The few massive gaseous diffusions, which enrich uranium by separating fissionable U^{235} atoms from nonfissionable U^{238} atoms, theoretically could be policed to insure that no highly enriched U^{235} is produced and diverted to weapons. So far, so good. But what we are not told, and what the AEC has clamped a tight technological lid on, is the fact that a much more simple way to obtain enriched uranium is coming along which does not involve massive hard-to-hide diffusion plants. It is the gas centrifuge process to accomplish the segregation of U^{235} from U^{238} by the same simple principle that cream is separated from milk. During World War II this process was rejected because tough metals were not then available to construct high-speed centrifuges. Since then long strides have been taken in metallurgy. Tough new materials are available which put practical uranium centrifuges just on the horizon if, in fact, they are not already here. These devices will require neither the great capital investment nor the large physical plants associated with gaseous diffusion. Both technologically and financially, uranium enrichment will pass within the grasp of a growing number of countries. Already the West Germans have spent some $1¾ million on advanced research and the East Germans have filed patents.

The U.S. response to these developments is a quixotic effort to "un-invent the wheel," which, in simplest terms, is the heart of the centrifuge. Access to such work as the AEC may carry on is denied to industry generally. This despite the fact improved centrifuges have great economic appeal in such civilian fields as separation of viruses for preparation of vaccines, chemical production, and other industrial purposes. Although the Japanese apparently have refused to do so, the British, West Germans, Dutch, and others have been induced to classify their research. Such moves cannot, of course, stop centrifuge progress any more than the wheel can be un-invented. At most, they only delay the day when its consequences in terms of nuclear proliferation—secret or otherwise—must be dealt with.

Insofar as nuclear weapons spread is concerned—with or without a treaty—this unfortunate U.S. technology suppression policy has two obvious adverse effects. First, it sets an example of legitimacy for the use of this means of getting an important weapons ingredient in secret. Second, it withholds from IAEA inspectors the very technical information they would need to ferret out hidden centrifuge plants and inspect them.

POSTAL RATES

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

POSTAL WORKERS AND THIRD-CLASS MAIL

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take sharp issue with those who claim that postal employees—postmasters and postal clerks and mail carriers—really like junk mail, and like the fact that third-class mail in great volume is being subsidized by the low rates now in effect.

This is an allegation that has been made on a number of occasions. I would simply like to refute this allegation. Our hard-working postal employees who handle all classes of mail would be much happier if third-class mail paid its way. They also have some very healthy ideas and suggestions on third-class or junk mail.

I sent a letter out to all of the postmasters and mail carriers in my congressional district to ask them for their frank and personal feelings on how third-class mail is being handled. I stated in the letter:

> I want to make it clear that I am not in favor of abolishing "junk mail," but I am in favor of having it pay its way.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, at the present time third-class mail pays a little over 60 percent of the cost of delivery—which means that this advertising through the mail is subsidized by the taxpayers of this country to the extent of the difference between 60 and 100 percent.

First-class mail pays more than 100 percent of its way.

In the fiscal year 1966, all third-class mail cost the Post Office Department $1.014 billion to deliver, while $682 million was realized in third-class mail revenues. This means a loss of $359 million on third-class mail.

Under my bill, third-class rates will be raised about 50 percent, which will enable third-class mail to pay its way without subsidy from the taxpayers.

I want to urge the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to seriously consider the raising of third-class rates. I see one of the distinguished members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service here on the floor, my good friend, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN]. I would urge that his committee give serious consideration to the raising of third-class postal rates.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from West Virginia yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I gladly yield to the gentleman, my colleague from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to assure the gentleman that the question of rates paid by third-class mail will be very seriously reviewed, as will rates for second class because neither of them are paying their own way by any stretch of the imagination.

I think second-class mail is paying about 20 percent of its own way and third-class mail is paying about 60 percent of its own way. The question of how much they should be increased has to be seriously weighed and very seriously, before we make any change in first class or any increase on first class.

I assure the gentleman we are going to have long and deliberate hearings on this subject.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Montana. I certainly concur that hearings are very much needed.

Mr. Speaker, we have had a little correspondence on this and I have assured the gentleman from Montana that if he will join me in supporting a raise in third-class rates that I will join him in supporting a raise of second-class rates.

Mr. OLSEN. I thank the gentleman and again assure him that this is what we are going to have to do. We are just going to have to give serious study to second and third class before we ever give consideration to raising the first class.

I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for yielding.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I think the position of the gentleman from Montana is eminently sound. I concur with those views although we may have a difference of opinion as to the steepness of such increases as may be necessary.

I commend both the gentleman and the committee for their determination to hold thorough hearings to bring out the facts of this very vital question.

We have too long overlooked the fact that many advertisers have gotten a free ride through absurdly low third-class rates. I am very much in favor of advertising. I am very much in favor of the free enterprise system also. That is why I do not believe the "Big Brother" of our Federal Government has any business stepping in to give a fat subsidy to advertising through the mail. Why should advertising through third-class mail be any different than advertising on billboards? The Government does not subsidize billboards, so it should not subsidize third-class mail.

Let me read a few excerpts of letters from postal employees that demonstrate that the postal employees feel also that third-class mail should have higher rates. I received 84 responses from postmasters and carriers, and 79 of them favor higher third-class rates, four are neutral, and one is opposed.

I will read some excerpts from these letters:

EXCERPTS FROM POSTMASTERS' AND MAIL CARRIERS' LETTERS

> As you know under the strict economy movement in the Post Office Department there is always a constant challenge to postmasters to provide good and speedy service to the public without curtailing or delaying mail service. At the same time we are faced with the problem of conserving man hours and expenses. The tremendous amount of third class mail which we receive today really causes a problem which at times seems insurmountable. I have spent many hours studying this problem and agree with you that sufficient increase in rates will alleviate this problem and the department will be able to lift some of the restrictions on man-hour usage and therefore it will give us further opportunity to improve the service.
>
> Also, I wish to state that I do not favor an increase in first class mail rates in order to solve deficit problems because it would only work further hardship on the lower income groups and would not in any way solve the problem facing the Post Office Department today.
>
> ACTING POSTMASTER.

> After 12 years in the mail service I cannot agree with the defenders of low third-class rates, that regardless of the volume of this type mail, it never slows first class mail.
>
> POSTMASTER.

> As a rural carrier . . . for the past six years and working the 11 previous years as a city letter . . . I am 100 per cent in accord with your drive to have this sort of mail ("Junk mail") pay its own way and to curb the unrestricted use of this mail.
>
> There is not a day goes past that we don't have about 35 to 40 pieces of this third class junk mail to throw away because of insufficient addresses, wrong address, or for people who have moved away.
>
> I have always felt it an injustice to the taxpayer to have to subsidize second and third class mail. The principal complaint I receive is not the slow or "shoddy" mail service as some people claim we are giving but simply the one of filling their mail receptacles with third class mail.
>
> POSTMASTER.

> It is certainly not true that third class mail, regardless of volume, does not slow down the time of delivery of first class mail. It is true that if necessary we can postpone the delivery of second class mail until the day following arrival, but it must be delivered. Pigeon holes and space for flats in carriers' desks have only so much space. Before they are completely full, extra time and effort are required to insert first class mail. Then, when completely full, the mail must be withdrawn and later combined with the residue, thus requiring a great deal of extra time.
>
> It seems to me that the odd size and shape of so much of third-class mail is one of the larger problems. For example, an envelope

containing a pencil or a pen is hard to stack and requires more space in the carrier's desk. Then, those containing larger objects such as Indian babies, totem-poles, samples of soap, flea powder, etc. require much more time and space.

I have a heavy duty rural route and have considerable mail to deliver and at times the volume of third-class mail is tremendous. This necessitates extra effort to prepare the mail for delivery and makes my work burdensome. I am not kicking on the amount of work but the time it takes to handle the third class matter sometimes takes longer than the time to handle the first class mail.

RURAL CARRIER.

There is more bulk, more weight and more work in the delivery of it than there is about the first-class mail.

POSTMASTER.

It takes twice as long to handle the second and third class as it does the first class and the parcel post.

POSTMASTER.

It is a constant problem to case and deliver third class mail and stay within our budget and also operate our routes on schedule.

ACTING POSTMASTER.

My patrons often complain of the volume of "junk mail" they receive in their boxes, partly because they aren't interested in it and also because much of it is repetitious. The carriers complain for the same reasons besides it being so time consuming.

POSTMASTER.

The vague separation of where service stops and business begins in the postal service has been greatly abused in recent years by subsidized mail rates to certain advertisers using bulk mail rates. The original concept of the postal service was reasonable transportation and delivery rates for personal messages.

Can anything be more distasteful than borderline obscene advertising mailed at bulk rates to teenagers and parents who object to receiving this unsolicited material? Yet, this objectionable material is unwillingly subsidized by the recipients.

POSTMASTER.

If this type of mail (third-class) was to pay the complete cost of its delivery, then its interference with other mail would no longer be an issue.

ACTING POSTMASTER.

It takes longer to handle mail of this type (third-class) than it does the first-class mail that pays its own way.

POSTMASTER.

I want you to know that all of us *carriers* at this P.O. are thoroughly disgusted with its increase in volume and the nature of its contents ("junk mail").

Patrons generally are as disgusted with it as we are. So much of it is practically worthless—fit only for the trash can.

CARRIER.

There appears to be more and more resentment among the postal patrons over the ever increasing amount of this type mail that is placed in their boxes or is delivered to their homes. I would say that not over half of this matter ever leaves the post office, only by the wastebasket. This is particularly true of the flat or one or two sheet newspaper type of matter. Letter type third-class matter offers no problems in delivery.

POSTMASTER.

There is as much work in delivering third class mail as there is in first class mail. Many of the patrons throw the junk mail on the ground as soon as they leave the post office and I have to pick it up.

POSTMASTER.

I am in complete accord with you concerning this junk mail. I personally think it is the worst thing we rural carriers have to contend with, and if they want to use the mail to advertise, let it pay its own way.

RURAL CARRIER.

* * * is a country post office. We have a good number of our patrons to come in each morning, and while they wait for their mail, they talk. I am of the opinion that if the mailers of this advertising matter could listen in on these discussions of their mail, there would be much less "junk mail."

There is a large waste can in the lobby of the post office that has been labeled "File 13" by the patrons. Here is where much of the third-class mail is left. I doubt that as much as 10 per cent of this mail is read by these patrons. I notice that when we burn the trash, most of it is still sealed.

Many people ask me how their names get on the mailing list of these firms. They seem to think that we in the Post Office Dept. give out the mailing list. They also ask for advice on the means of having their names removed from the mailing list. It is safe to say that as many as 75 per cent of the people served by this Post Office don't want to receive this mail.

POSTMASTER.

As for the junk mail, it is properly named. I would say 90 per cent in my office is junked and never read. I have noticed the more postage on a piece of mail, the more attention the patron gives it.

However, junk or not, my office and force will continue to do our part in making the delivery.

POSTMASTER.

Any claim that third class mail does not slow down or interfere with the handling of first class mail is absurd, especially in the smaller offices with city delivery, as we are limited as to regular hours used and are allowed almost no overtime hours, which to be exact, is just one-tenth of one per cent of our allotted hours for each accounting period, which is four weeks.

POSTMASTER.

Third class mail seldom interferes with or slows down delivery of first class mail in our office, if we are to limit reference only to the box section of such office. This is true only because it is our policy to handle all first class mail at once, and the other when time is available.

Third class mail and advertising does, however, slow the delivery of mail on our star route; sometimes to a quite appreciable extent. It is also instrumental in carrier errors in delivery because occasionally first class mail is misplaced in the jumble of "bargains."

Many of our patrons complain that they receive so much of this type material that their important mail is sometimes discarded by mistake along with the "junk."

POSTMASTER.

I will say that in my office it (second and third class mail) does not slow the distribution of first class mail. However, it does slow the rural carrier. The first class mail could be delivered up to an hour sooner provided the third class mail was not in the larger quantities which it is.

POSTMASTER.

Third class mail is a very useful class of mail if it was used as intended but as of today it is used for the benefit of a few at the cost of the majority. The American public must help pay the cost of mail they do not want, mail that the sender doesn't even put his name on. The sender also may say what day he wants his mail delivered on. Wish I could tell the P.O. what day I wanted this letter delivered on. It is even first class.

Box holder mail, I guess is the worst kind of mail sent. I have received several letters from people on my route asking me to leave no more JUNK of this type in their box. Wish I could comply. Box holder is easier to deliver than mail of this type with name and address on it would be. We are required to deliver this type of mail at the rate of 25 per minute, which I guess is a quick way to get rid of it. It doesn't help our time standard much. I have 600 boxes on my route so am allowed only 24 minutes extra to deliver box holders. Sometimes I get disgusted the next day when I see these advertisements scattered along the highway.

CARRIER.

Personally I am in favor of an increase in rates especially third class. It is true that third class mailings do not slow down first class or newspapers before attempting to handle third class.

Newspaper rates are probably not high enough considering the fact that they receive priority handling. However, small weekly newspapers, such as we have here, have a struggle to stay in business. They do perform a service to the community and differ greatly from third class 'junk mail'. I believe you should take a long look before suggesting an increase in second class.

POSTMASTER.

It is an established fact that the postal service was set up as a service to the people and not as a profit making concern. However, our nation has changed so much over the years that it is going to be impossible to give 1967 service on 1919 operating expenses.

I believe that advertisers have forgotten that the reason the government subsidized them in the first place was that there was no other way for them to communicate with the people which was certainly necessary at that time in order for the nation to progress to where it is today.

Since we now have radio, TV and automobiles, I do not see where this service is needed and should be cut out to the point that anyone wishing to use the mail system should agree to help pay for their proportionate share of the expense and not pass it off on the individual citizen.

POSTMASTER.

I have been a rural mail carrier for 25 years, and during that time I have seen some third class junk mail.

It takes as long to handle a hundred pieces of third class mail, size and weight being the same, as first class mail. Everyone knows it slows the mail.

As a postal worker and a taxpayer, I am much in favor of letting the mailers pay the full cost of handling the mail, junk, third class or what you will.

I mentioned this to one lady who said she thought they should have to pay the full cost of handling the junk and then pay her a little something for carrying it from her box and burning it.

RURAL CARRIER.

After 12 years in the mail service I cannot agree with the defenders of low third class rates, that regardless of volume of this type mail, it never slows first class mail.

As postal employees, handling third class mail is part of our job. But I am sure we employees and postal patrons as taxpayers, could enjoy knowing that second and third class mail was paying its fair share, and we were not having to subsidize the payment of this type of advertising.

POSTMASTER.

Many concerns give no thought to the number of pieces of mail they send out. Many people receive two or three pieces ex-

> actly alike, because the postage is so cheap, it's not worth the effort to check mailing lists for duplication.
>
> Many patrons complain about the amount of junk mail left in their boxes. However, some of them show great interest in some types of this mail. Therefore if the postage rate was raised, there would be less pieces and possibly the quality would be higher too. An advertiser would hesitate to send out his literature without being sure it would be to his advantage to do so.
>
> As for delivering this mail, I'm paid to do a job, and bulk mail is part of it. My only complaint is for the happiness of the patron, whose taxes pay my wages.
>
> RURAL CARRIER.

> In my opinion, third class mail is much harder to deliver than first class mail. And it also interferes with and slows down the delivery of first class mail.
>
> ACTING RURAL CARRIER.

> I feel that this type mail that you have reference to, is important to those that send this so-called "junk mail" and if they do deem it to be important and worthwhile, then let them pay their own way in mailing this type mail.
>
> POSTMASTER.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to identify in the RECORD the names of these individuals because some of these individuals have asked that their names be withheld. But I would be glad to show to my colleagues the original text of all of these letters which I have received in response to a letter sent out to postmasters and rural carriers. I have them here before me.

Mr. Speaker, the contention has also been made that third-class mail generates some $40 billion of business annually, according to the Department of Commerce. If this be true—and I am not immediately challenging that $40 billion figure—I would say that a business that is that profitable and extensive could certainly afford, under our free enterprise system, to pay its way without being subsidized.

All I am asking in my bill is to raise the rates so that, under the free enterprise system, an advertiser who advertises through the mail will pay the cost of such advertising.

Members of this House are receiving many letters now from third-class mail users and from many others who are protesting that my bill will drive thousands of employees out of work and will put many businesses out of business. I do not think it is the responsibility of the U.S. Government or the taxpayers of this Nation to keep businesses in business by subsidizing them through absurdly low rates. Neither do I believe the contention that hundreds of thousands of postal employees will be deprived of a source of employment if these rates go into effect. Higher rates will bring more income and help balance our postal budget and reduce the deficit.

I think that Members of the Congress must stand up and be counted as lobbyists for the American people—for the workers, for the many individuals who daily receive junk mail that they do not appreciate, that they feel they have to pay for in higher first-class rates and in higher taxes in order to maintain the deficit which the Post Office Department annually incurs, which has now reached $1.2 billion a year.

For all of these reasons I would urge that my colleagues take a strong second look at this flood of mail from the lobbyists, which is now coming in protesting against my bill, H.R. 99, which I believe is a reasonable and just approach toward making advertising and third-class mail pay its own way.

Mr. Speaker, in the course of the next few weeks I will have a great deal more to say on this subject in answer to the many contentions and allegations which have been made and to the letters that are now reaching Members of the House. I invite my colleagues in the House to consult with me for any further factual information they need in support of H.R. 99 or in order to answer this correspondence which is now coming in.

ACTION OF THE HOUSE WITH RESPECT TO ADAM CLAYTON POWELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House of Representatives will be confronted with an extraordinary vote.

At issue will be whether the House of Representatives will or will not vote to seat ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Representative-elect from the 18th Congressional District of the State of New York.

A special investigating committee, which was constituted when the House, on January 10, 1967, refused by an overwhelming vote to seat the Representative-elect, has now recommended that he be seated, but with certain conditions.

These conditions are utterly unacceptable.

Among other conditions, the committee provides that the Representative-elect pay back $40,000 in public funds which he allegedly obtained or manipulated illegally. This would be accomplished, according to the committee formula, by a $1,000 per month deduction from his pay checks.

In the first place, the committee does not know whether $40,000 represents all of the financial manipulations of the individual in question. It could be $60,000 or $80,000. Apparently $40,000 was a good round figure that somehow appealed to the committee.

In the second place, to seat the Representative-elect for the purpose, among others, of collecting $1,000 per month, is in the nature of "robbing Peter to pay Paul"; it is "sending good money after bad money"; it is in the nature of picking the taxpayer's pockets to pay a culprit's fine.

And the committee does not say how it is expected the Representative-elect, if seated for the remainder of the 22 months of the 90th Congress, would meet an obligation of $40,000 when the rate of pay deduction is only $1,000 per month, or a total deduction of $22,000.

By its financial legerdemain, is the committee suggesting and putting a premium on the reelection of this individual in 1968 in order to go through the motions of recapturing the remaining $18,000?

The committee, in its "therefore be it resolved" portion of the resolution, provides that—

> Said sums received by the Clerk (of the House of Representatives) shall offset to the extent thereof *any liability* of the said Adam Clayton Powell to the United States of America with respect to the matters referred to in the above paragraphs 3 and 4 of the preamble to this resolution.

But in the committee recommendations it is stated that—

> Said sums received by the Clerk shall offset *any civil liability* of Mr. POWELL to the United States of America.

What does this difference in language mean? And why should not a Federal court or the Internal Revenue Service, if either or both decide to take action in this case, be free to fix liability to the Government without interference, restriction, or direction on the part of the House of Representatives?

The committee recommends that ADAM CLAYTON POWELL be administered the oath of office and then censured and condemned by the House of Representatives. Interesting is the fact that in the resolution now pending in the House the word "condemned" is not to be found. Why?

The pending resolution, if adopted, and let us hope it will not be, provides that ADAM CLAYTON POWELL shall present himself to take the oath of office on or before March 13, 1967. What is magic about March 13? The Representative-elect has given ample evidence in the past that with or without companions and playmates he can bridge the distance between the island of Bimini and Washington, D.C., in hours, much less 13 days. If the abortive resolution is to prevail, why not put the cap on the sheaf of this sordid affair by administering the oath tomorrow afternoon?

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL does not deserve to be seated in the House of Representatives—conditionally or otherwise. Without identification he has publicly denounced Members of the House as "hypocrites," and again without specification or identification has publicly asserted that his illegal acts have been no worse than those of other House Members.

Yet when given the opportunity to provide evidence in support of these statements and defend himself against charges of gross misconduct, he has either refused to appear or, when subpenaed, answered only virtually meaningless questions.

For some 3 years this Representative-elect has arrogantly defied the courts of New York where four criminal and civil contempt orders have been pending against him. Of him, the courts of New York have said:

> His disregard for the law, for the ministry, and for justice and decency . . . is monstrous defiance of everything that is decent in this community, sets a very bad example for the youth of this city and this country . . . The blatant, cynical disregard for the law on the part of a U.S. Congressman is detrimental to the law, the ministry, and to democracy.

The special investigating committee of the House says it is forwarding copies of its hearings, records, and report to the Department of Justice for prompt and appropriate action. Yet in the light of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL's continuing defiance of the New York courts the committee blandly asks that he be seated; thus, it would continue the cloak of congressional immunity behind which he has taken refuge.

Yes; it is a strange proceeding with which we will be confronted tomorrow. Here is a Representative-elect who is guilty of defrauding the Government of thousands of dollars; here is an individual the investigating committee of this House describes as "contemptuous" in his conduct and "unworthy of a Member"—who has brought into "disrepute the House of Representatives and its Members."

Yet by some strange outpouring of emotionalism the committee, having branded this individual as being unworthy of membership in Congress and of bringing the House and its Members into disrepute, now asks that he be seated so that he can be paid a salary from which a portion would be extracted to compensate partially for that which he previously manipulated to his own ends.

I wonder when it will be suggested that Bobby Baker be permitted to pay what he owes the Federal Government and be free to again wheel and deal his way through Washington and way points across the country.

Mr. Speaker, public opinion across the country to the seating of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL is 3 to 1 against.

For altogether too many months the public was fed a steady diet of whitewash and coverup in the cases of Walter Jenkins and Bobby Baker, among others. Ethical standards in Government seemed to be at their lowest point. There was the grave question of whether law enforcement officials had the courage and dedication to come to grips with this situation.

In recent weeks there seemed to be some improvement in the moral climate, due in part to the conviction of Bobby Baker and James Hoffa, and the refusal of the House on January 10 to seat ADAM CLAYTON POWELL.

The House of Representatives tomorrow can either help this moral climate or it can further destroy it.

Mr. Speaker, I have a reasonably strong stomach but it will revolt at the aroma that will arise if tomorrow ADAM CLAYTON POWELL is offered a seat in this Chamber. I will vote to defeat the previous question so that an amendment may be offered to deny membership to this individual. Failing in that, I will vote against the resolution.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the gentleman from Iowa for the position that he has taken on this matter. As usual, he has demonstrated, in his brief remarks here this afternoon, the fact that he has made a careful study of this matter and, having reached a conclusion which he believes, as I do, is in the best interests of this House and of the Nation, he has had the courage and the guts, if you please, to express himself on the issue.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will have an opportunity, those of you who, as I do, oppose this resolution, to express ourselves tomorrow on the floor of the House. Quite frankly, I am apprehensive about that opportunity being given us. Accordingly, I have prepared a memorandum which I plan to send to each Member of the House overnight, but I do think it advisable that we put it in the RECORD at this time today in order that the Members might have an opportunity to read it overnight. If they read this, I believe they will join with the gentleman in the well and with me and others in saying that it is not only POWELL who is on trial but it is this House that is on trial.

On January 10 we marched uphill and we regained some of the prestige and respect of the American people. If we were justified, as we were then, in temporarily denying him his seat, if we look at the record of the hearings of the select committee and the attitude taken by the accused, then we will see we are doubly justified and in fact it is mandatory that we make that exclusion permanent tomorrow. I hope we will do it. I hope that the Members, inasmuch as no doubt many of us will not be given the opportunity to speak in opposition to this resolution tomorrow, will avail themselves of the opportunity to read your comments and additionally mine that I will put in the RECORD.

I hope that as we marched uphill on January 10, we will not be running back downhill in retreat and indeed destroy the degree of confidence that the American people placed in us in the action we took on January 10.

Again, I applaud the gentleman from Iowa for his very courageous and very forthright and intelligent statement. I fail to see how any Member of this House could not help but be persuaded by the arguments he has made.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask unanimous consent that the memorandum I have prepared on this matter be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of the gentleman from Iowa's special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman very much for his excellent observations and now yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding and I appreciate the step he has taken here today. As the gentleman from South Carolina just said, not only is the Congress on trial with regard to bad apples in its barrel, but indeed the public trust is on trial with the people of the United States. I noticed the gentleman in his very succinct and properly phrased remarks mentioned the conditions for being sworn in by the gentleman from New York. One of those was the payback of the $40,000.

Does not the gentleman from Iowa agree with me that the prisons of the United States and the Department of Justice are probably filled with larcenous individuals or, indeed, forgers who would welcome the chance simply to make restitution and escape a jail sentence?

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his observation. Of course, the jails are full of people who would gladly buy their way out in much the same manner that is being offered by the committee in this resolution.

Mr. HALL. And, secondly, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Iowa will yield further, I believe the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] referred to the Department of Justice.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Justice is a headless organization of our Cabinet under the present administration and at least a nepotic one under the last administration.

Mr. Speaker, since when does the Congress of the United States have to relinquish all powers wherein the Department of Justice should act in cases of forgery, forgery which has been proved to two committees of Congress, to say nothing of the civil guilt hereunder?

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Justice ought to long ago have moved into this case, long ago, when it became evident as to what was taking place.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. And, finally, Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentleman from Iowa will yield further, does the gentleman from Iowa not agree with me that in the evidence that has been adduced to the full satisfaction of the American public and in this House, under article I, section 5, of our Constitution, clause 2—that notwithstanding clause 1 which deals with election qualifications only, that we have had enough proof to judge our own Members, and to refuse to seat on the basis of forgery, larceny, and/or preaching riot and insurrection as of October 1964, in the case of this individual?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is the slightest doubt, but what there is ample evidence to this effect.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentleman from Iowa will yield further, I certainly agree with the gentleman and I shall vote at every opportunity to preclude that Member.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentlemen from Iowa yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Iowa for taking this special order in order to give himself, as well as the other Members of our fraternity, ample opportunity to discuss this question.

Mr. GROSS. For the reason that none of us in opposition to the seating of POWELL will be likely to obtain adequate time tomorrow.

Mr. CURTIS. That is exactly what I am coming to—to give the Members of this body some opportunity of discussing this matter with intelligence.

Mr. Speaker, for a number of years there have been many of us who have tried to reform the procedures of the Congress in one particular area, the

1-hour rule, which does not provide for equal opportunity for the Members of the House to debate an issue.

Mr. Speaker, for the life of me, I cannot see any excuse for the leadership of this House of Representatives bringing a measure of this seriousness to the floor of the House under this kind of rule, a rule which does not permit full debate and does not provide for amendment.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to go on to say that I note in the select committee report that committee's failure to understand the rules of the House or to report accurately what has transpired in this House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, on page 2, in recounting the development of the Powell committee, they say that House Resolution 1, in the form offered by Representative UDALL, was rejected on a rollcall vote. This is not accurate. The vote was on moving the previous question and not upon the Udall resolution. It was had upon moving the previous question and was voted down, which was the only method of opening up the debate in order that a substitute resolution or amendments could have been offered.

Mr. Speaker, I noticed this same error was made in the brief submitted to the select committee by the Civil Liberties Union, and I further have noticed that the news media—and I can hardly blame them with reference to what happened—but the vote was to the effect that the Udall resolution was voted down by a rollcall vote. That vote was to open up debate so that the Udall resolution—if other amendments and substitutes were not rejected, the Udall resolution would have been before the House and could have been voted upon.

Mr. Speaker, it is very true, as the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has said, that under the procedures of tomorrow, it is unlikely that anyone, except those on this select committee, all of whom apparently support the seating of POWELL, will have adequate time. For those who have a differing point of view the time is likely to be extremely limited.

Mr. Speaker, if the committee thinks that its composite wisdom is so great, why do they bring this matter before the House of Representatives under the most restrictive types of rules of the House of Representatives?

I say that to my colleagues on my own side. I see the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE], who is the ranking minority member on the subcommittee. Why is this brought in under these kinds of procedures? Certainly those who might have differing viewpoints after reading the report of the committee, and reading the hearings, should have an opportunity to ask questions at full length, and from other points of view. But under this procedure they cannot.

And, Mr. Speaker, I can visualize the situation tomorrow when Chairman CELLER will control the 1 hour of time provided for debate on the resolution. Maybe he will give equal time to both sides. But if it follows the usual procedure then the Members are not going to be given their own time. We may be given a half hour, but it is at his disposal. But certainly what opportunity will there be for those who want to present differing points of view, or to even offer amendments and debate them?

So, Mr. Speaker, this committee, which is seeking to have Congress move on one of the most serious issues we have had, is bringing the measure before the House in this fashion. I join the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], in hoping that the previous question is voted down. That will be a vote to open up the debate on this serious matter. And if the House wishes, then that debate can go on for hours under the hour rule. If no one moves the previous question, then any other Member can be recognized for 1 hour, and continue the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see one day in the House of Representatives—and I have been here 17 years—where we really have debate opened up so that the membership can express their judgment and their wisdom, and have the opportunity to interrogate the committee members. I do respect the committee members, but I do believe they should subject themselves to interrogation and cross-examination on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise that the time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], has expired.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, while I shall make every effort to obtain sufficient time to outline my objections to the acceptance of the special committee's recommendation on the seating of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, I am fearful that such will be impossible, so I hope that you will find a few minutes between now and the time that we vote on this tremendously important issue to read this memorandum. Let me emphasize the fact that I have the highest regard for the Members who undertook this most difficult assignment, and my opposition to their conclusion is not based upon personal antagonism, but the sincere conviction that we would be making a serious mistake were we to adopt their recommendations in their present form.

Let me dispel immediately any suspicion of racial motivation that may be prevalent because of the fact that I am from a southern State. My position is not based on race, but on what I believe is right; it is not a matter of prejudice, but of propriety. No one admires our fine Negro Members of this House more than I, and I believe that they, with other Americans, are frankly disgusted over the smokescreen of racism which POWELL has injected into the question.

In fact, even an official publication of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in New York has discredited that threadbare and phony argument. The Nation knows, as do we, that his race has been in his favor rather than his disfavor. That, and that alone, has prolonged his position of legislative leadership and forestalled this day of accountability. I firmly believe that had any of us been charged with such actions of malfeasance, we would have long ago suffered the severest of punishment by the House. Actually, many citizens believe that no congressional action would have ever been taken by us against POWELL, primarily because of the race factor, had there not been such a public outcry demanding that something be done.

The argument advanced by the committee that under the various sections of article I of the Constitution relating to the powers of the House of Representatives, we do not have the authority to exclude ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, tortures all constitutional and judicial interpretation of the applicable sections. Not only do we have more than adequate House precedent in this regard, witness the Whittemore case, but even the committee must agree that the power to expel includes the power to exclude. Should we follow the recommendation of the special committee, our constitutional authority to exclude a Member would be restricted to merely a failure of the Member-elect to meet the age, citizenship, and inhabitancy requirements.

However, clauses 1 and 2 of section 5 of article I of the Constitution clearly state:

> Each House shall be judge of the elections, returns *and qualifications* of its own Members.

And:

> Each House—may * * * punish its Members for disorderly behavior, and with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a Member.

Acceptance of the committee's restrictive interpretation would virtually tie the hands of this House and force us to seat any Member-elect regardless of his lack of qualifications.

If we do not want to face up to our clearcut constitutional responsibility of determining qualifications of our membership, then the proper course of action is not to close our eyes and say such responsibility does not exist, but to be forthright and recommend that the Constitution be amended to place that trust and responsibility in some other body, or let the electorate be the final judge of both those who are qualified to run for Congress and also qualified to be seated in the respective Houses.

The argument advanced that excluding POWELL from the House would only result in making a martyr of him and his subsequent overwhelming reelection is sheer rationalization rather than logical reasoning. Regardless of how many times he should be reelected, we still have the authority of repeatedly excluding him. As in the Whittemore case, cited above, the Member was accused of malfeasance in office and faced expulsion by the House. He subsequently resigned to avoid this severe action and was later reelected, but when he presented himself for membership, the House correctly refused to admit him, stating that mere reelection did not exonerate him from his earlier malfeasance. The question of martyrdom falls on its face unless we are to conclude that the American public martyrs a criminal. There may be the fleeting moment of attempted retribution, but I would never be one to indict the constituency of the district of Adam Clayton Powell, for I believe they would ultimately elect to the House a qualified person.

Another argument being advanced in support of the committee's resolution is that failure to seat him would be denying the people of his district representation in this body. If the reputation of Powell and the people of his district were the only matter involved, then this argument might hold water. But the reputation of this House is at stake. If Powell only voted on matters dealing exclusively with his district, then we could probably ignore his malfeasance, but when he votes on matters of nationwide import, then this House must assume our constitutional responsibility to judge his qualifications. Perhaps I may be wrong, but I choose to believe that the voters of Harlem could and would find someone among their hundreds of thousands of residents who was not a fugitive from justice.

Then, too, why should the question of representation be of such grave concern to us when apparently Powell is not concerned about his district not having representation. Witness the fact that despite our leniency in continuing his salary for the past 2 months, the legality of which I seriously question, he has not bothered himself to even visit his Washington or New York offices in an effort to represent his people. Perhaps he has accustomed his constituents to accept such lack of concern, but that acceptance by them constitutes no valid reason for us to bewail the situation. This battle by Powell against the House is not a fight for his people, but a selfish fight for himself alone. If he were genuinely interested in his constituents, he would have conducted himself with the respect and decorum of the other members of his race, who serve so dedicatedly in this Congress.

It is further argued that the forfeiture of pay penalty is a severe one. To any of us, it would be, but actually such action would be playing into his hands and result in a benefit rather than a detriment to him. He has dramatically disclosed to us and the people his modus operandi, and were we to deny him his full pay, he and his principal cohorts would launch a nationwide campaign to offset this loss of pay, maligning this House in the process and accuse us of rankest discrimination against him.

As a consequence, he would probably make more money through such a venture than he has made with his current record, "Keep the Faith, Baby." Then too, should we follow this recommendation, it would be a clear admission on our part that the crime lies in being caught and not in the commission of the act. Even when a criminal voluntarily offers to make monetary retribution, which certainly is not true in Powell's case, for he has been anything but repentant in the matter, that criminal is not exonerated from guilt.

The argument that public censorship by the Speaker of the House, and its subsequent personal humiliation to him would be sufficient punishment is in my opinion meaningless. Since the committee recommends that Powell be seated prior to censure, he can and most probably will thumb his nose at us, leaving the Chamber, and return to the plaudits of his supporters. Then what would we do? Cry foul? It would be too late to consider exclusion if he refuses to accept the verbal lashing as has been recommended, but which even members of the special committee believe he would never submit to.

If that be true, why pass the resolution ordering something which we believe Powell would not agree to and the House is powerless to force him to do so. Should such eventuate, as most agree it will, we would no doubt then seek to expel him because of his refusal to agree to the condition subsequent to his seating. Then, we would be placed in the ironic and ridiculous position of saying to the American people that his gross malfeasance and criminal flouting of the law are not reasons for denying him his seat, but disobedience to our orders would be sufficient justification to exclude him. In my judgment, the public would join Powell in laughing up their sleeves at us.

The further argument that should we fail to seat him, we will be faced with prolonged litigation with doubtful outcome, should not influence our vote one iota. That Kunster and Kinoy, and Powell's battery of lawyers will resort to every conceivable judicial tactic is conceded, but God help us if we predicate our actions on what these attorneys might do or what the courts might decide. If we knuckle under to that threat, then the people will have even less respect for and confidence in this House. After all, the short route is not necessarily the correct route.

If the Supreme Court should decide that Congress cannot deny a Member-elect his seat except on grounds of failure to meet age, citizenship, and inhabitancy requirements, then it will be the Court ordering the criminal to sit in our midst and not this body voluntarily doing so.

As I understood the intent of the resolution passed on January 10 past, we told the American people that we believed sufficient grounds existed for denying Powell his seat. But in all fairness, we thought that his salary should be continued while ordering an expeditious investigation to confirm the charges against him and, most importantly, to give him another chance to explain or deny them. The testimony by the special committee not only reaffirmed but enlarged upon the alleged malfeasance in office, and the accused Member again flouted the authority of the House virtually ridiculing the committee as he haughtily refused to answer proper questions propounded to him. Maybe he thinks he is above the law and this body, but let us not make the mistake of agreeing with him.

If we were justified in temporarily denying him his seat on January 10, then, of a certainty, the subsequent investigation by this committee and the refusal of Powell to deny the charges against him, make it mandatory that the exclusion be made permanent.

My colleagues, you can argue all you wish that in supporting this resolution you were punishing Powell, but you will never be able to refute the charge that in doing so you voted to seat him. You can argue all you wish that in supporting this resolution you were choosing the wise and just course, but you will never be able to refute the charge that in doing so, you voted to seat him. Seating is the question. These other arguments are rationalization; the people are only interested in the central issue: Namely, did you or did you not vote to seat Adam Clayton Powell—the Congressman charged with criminal contempt of court, facing a prison term if he ever returns to his home district, and the Congressman who has never denied that he falsely and fraudulently misused public funds?

Last January 10, this body by a vote of 364 to 64, bravely marched uphill in an hour of glory; God forbid that we meekly march back downhill today in an hour of shame.

REASONS WHY POWELL SHOULD NOT BE SEATED

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker we have a difficult task thrust upon us. It is both a legal and moral problem. As a freshman Congressman, I cannot speak from experience as a legislator, but as a man just come from private life, perhaps I am somewhat closer to the general public than had I been here a longer time. Because of that fact, and traveling over 35,000 miles in my district during the last campaign, I know people are concerned about integrity in their Government.

As an attorney, I am much persuaded by the arguments advanced by the select committee in support of its recommendation that Powell be seated. We are all familiar with the rule of statutory construction that by enumerating certain items, by implication, you exclude all others. However, I would submit that the rule must be given a reasonable construction to prevent absurd results.

Historically all democratic legislatures have plenary power over the qualifications and disqualifications of their members and methods of organization except as limited by higher law. In our case, section 5, article I of the Constitution provides that—

> Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members.

The select committee rests its entire argument on the constitutional provision which states:

> No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the age of 25 years, and been 7 years a citizen of the U.S., and who shall when elected be an inhabitant of the State in which he shall be chosen.

These they say by implication are the exclusive qualifications involved plus Powell's New York election certificate. Is it not equally reasonable to say that these three items set forth the minimum requirements for election, the certificate of election takes care of the return and that reasonable qualifications may be set by the House.

However, I do not base my thesis so much on this approach as on plain commonsense. For instance, if the committee's reasoning were carried to its logical extreme, we would be compelled to seat Members if they met the minimum requirements in the following situations:

First. If he were insane.

Second. If he shot another Member of the House on the floor just before he was sworn in.

One could indulge in dreaming up bizare examples ad infinitum.

Is it not the real question before us simply this: Is a man—of whatever color—who has misappropriated Government funds, shown contempt for our judicial system and failed to cooperate with a duly constituted committee of this House—fit to help make our country's laws? Certainly the case of Brigham Roberts is ample precedent to deny such an individual his seat.

As men and women elected to one of the highest offices the people can bestow upon us, we have a solemn obligation by example and deed to exact high standards for ourselves and our colleagues. I ask no less for myself and I ask no less for Adam Clayton Powell.

He should not be seated.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Member desiring to do so may extend his remarks in the Record following the remarks I made previously on the subject of Adam Clayton Powell.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

ARAB PRESSURE TACTICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of bills introduced in this session, including one which I introduced, to put teeth into our efforts to knock the props out from under the Arab boycott.

I need not tell you that a mere proliferation of bills cannot achieve this end. It will take a law—a tough, straight-from-the-shoulder law prohibiting American firms from yielding to the Arab pressure tactics.

As the ranking minority member of the International Trade Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I did my utmost in 1965 to have the subcommittee adopt unequivocal language preventing American firms from submitting to any boycott by a foreign nation aimed at a nation friendly to the United States.

Testimony at subcommittee hearings convinced me of the need for such strong language. I was certain that it would not be enough merely to express our opposition to boycotts.

We have seen many developments since then to prove that a mere policy statement opposing boycotts is not enough. After 2 years of that, you can judge its ineffectiveness very simply. Today, if you drove up to an Arab border, in a Ford car, with your RCA radio playing a Sammy Davis tune, while you were drinking a Coke, you would not be admitted.

There are recurring instances showing that American businesses are still feeling the pressures of the Arab restrictions against firms which trade with Israel.

It is the duty of the Congress to protect American businessmen from being used as pawns in foreign political maneuverings. We have a clear obligation to prevent harassment, intimidation, and blackmailing of American business by a foreign power.

The amendment as it was finally approved by the 89th Congress contained a declaration of policy, which was virtually the same language as the first page of the amendment which I had offered to the subcommittee.

But the second part of my amendment—the teeth—was not included. It left action to implement our opposition to boycotts up to the executive branch, which has done nothing of any consequence in the past 15 years to counteract the pressures of the Arab boycott.

Since the enactment of the amendment, in its amputated form, we have seen that not only the titans of American industry have been threatened and plagued by the Arab boycott, but also smaller business. It becomes clearer every day that my conclusion in 1965 is still true. Without a specific prohibition in the language of the amendment, we cannot hold much hope for Presidential action.

We can wait no longer to carry out our duty toward American business. We must move at once for active consideration of more forceful language in the antiboycott amendment.

I offer two ways in which this can be accomplished. First, we can take positive action to restore the prohibition to the amendment, and thus to repair the damage done by the amputation.

Second, I offer a resolution today directing the Committee on Banking and Currency to reopen the study of the boycott, to determine the effectiveness, or the ineffectiveness, of the protections offered to American business.

On the basis of testimony heard by the International Trade Subcommittee in 1965, a report supporting the need for stronger language was signed by 17 members. One additional member, who was not available at the time, afterward declared his agreement with the view. The total of 18 would have provided a clear majority in favor of that view.

I am sure that many of the points made in testimony during the 1965 hearings can be made again, and can be made more strongly on the basis of the additional evidence of the results of Arab intimidation since then.

I urge the Congress to act at once, either to enact the amendment I have offered, or to reopen the hearings as provided in the alternative resolution.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CIVILIAN CASUALTIES AND REFUGEES IN SOUTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of this week the House will consider the 1967 supplemental authorization for Vietnam. No doubt widely differing opinions concerning the policy of the United States in Vietnam will be expressed. What will probably not be discussed very much is the tremendous suffering of the South Vietnamese people in this tragic war.

The number of civilian casualties and refugees in South Vietnam is truly staggering. A report issued on March 4, 1966, by the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Problems Connected With Refugees and Escapees had this to say concerning the number of refugees in South Vietnam:

> Last year, 1965, the numbers of refugees vastly increased. Their number was estimated by reliable authorities, to be some 200,000 in the early months of the year. By midyear this number had risen sharply to nearly 400,000. It was more than 600,000 in September, and nearly a million by the end of the year.

There is no doubt that with a million refugees by the end of 1965 there are now, in 1967, well over that number. For those refugees who are lucky enough to be housed in refugee camps life is a squalid struggle for survival. The Senate report comments:

> The refugee camps, by and large, contained a series of long hutlike buildings to house refugees. The buildings were divided into single rooms with dirt floors, bamboo sides, and aluminum roofing. Health conditions were poor. Sanitation facilities and water supply were often inadequate.

As bad as the situation is for civilian refugees, it is much worse for the civilian casualties. The issue of civilian casualties in South Vietnam was beyond the jurisdiction of the Senate committee. In fact, hard statistics are impossible to obtain. However, there have been estimates. William F. Pepper, director of the Commission on Human Rights of New Rochelle, spent some time in South Vietnam investigating the plight of civilian casualties. In an article in the January 1967 edition of Ramparts magazine Mr. Pepper, extrapolating from figures supplied by a former Canadian member of the International Control Commission in Vietnam, from statistics from American medical personnel and from a UNESCO population study, concludes that approximately 250,000 children have been killed in South Vietnam, and another 750,000 have been injured. The children account for a very high percentage of civilian casualties since most ablebodied men have left their homes to join one side or the other. For the same reason the Senate report states:

> The refugees were mostly children, women, older persons. There were few men ranging from 16 to 40 years old.

Even if this estimate of casualties is off by two-thirds, the number is appalling. It is even more appalling when one becomes acquainted with the terrible shortage of medical aid for civilians and the abominable conditions of South Vietnamese hospitals. The Senate subcommittee report did go into the question of medical aid. It reported:

> 1. There are approximately 800 South Vietnamese doctors, of whom 500 are in the Army, 150 treat only private-paying patients,

> and 150 are available for 15 to 16 million citizens of South Vietnam.
>
> 2. Cholera cases increased in South Vietnam from a few hundred in 1963 to over 20,000 in 1964. Malaria incidents are also increasing.
>
> 3. There are 28 provincial hospitals in South Vietnam in which surgical suites have been constructed. Only 11 of these hospitals were being used, because additional medical personnel were unavailable.
>
> 4. There is a lack of linen and sterilizers in many Vietnamese hospitals.
>
> 5. There is a general shortage of trained nurses, some surgical teams having none.

These are some of the statistics. It is hard to imagine what they mean in terms of human suffering.

Dr. Richard E. Perry, an American who has served as a physician in South Vietnam several times, in an article in Redbook for January 1967, translates these statistics into human terms in an eyewitness account of a South Vietnamese hospital. After commenting—

> When a soldier is wounded he can expect prompt medical care and probably will survive. A wounded civilian is unlikely to get prompt medical care and will probably die—

He describes a civilian hospital at Can Tho. The following is an excerpt from the article by Dr. Richard E. Perry:

> I flew down to Can Tho, formerly the center of Vietnam's rice market. Its hospital was built by the French in the 1890s and now has two additional Quonset huts. I had arrived during the monsoon period and everything seemed mildewed; to go from one place to another meant tramping in ankle-deep mud. Around the buildings were open-trench sewers smelling of human waste. Some windows had screens that were torn; others had no screens at all; flies and mosquitoes filled the hospital. The doors were badly warped, leaving gaps at the bottom for insects and vermin. At night, when it was quiet, rats could always be heard pattering through the wards.
>
> The female surgical ward had approximately 60 beds. Here, as in almost all hospitals that take care of Vietnamese civilians, there were two patients in every bed. There were no sheets or rubber mats on the beds. There were no privacy screens. There was no running water; the patients were never bathed. The windows admitted insufficient light, and few electric fixtures were working.
>
> The male wards, in the Quonset huts, were terrifying. They were enveloped in such perpetual darkness that it was difficult to dress wounds and almost impossible to determine their condition. When it rained, water leaked through the roof. When the sun shone, the sheet-metal huts became unbearably hot; on occasion I literally burned my skin by accidentally brushing against the walls.
>
> Everywhere the smells were vile enough to weaken even a physician. The stench of human waste, burned flesh, pus-soaked bandages and open, draining wounds trapped in hot, stale air would eventually overpower me. I could work for an hour or two and then, dizzy with nausea, I would have to go outside and get far enough away to breathe fresh air before returning. And in those hellholes people—some men, a great many women and a few children—lived for months on end, never having a breath of fresh air, never feeling sunlight, never having a bath.
>
> Outside the buildings women and children squatted, either cooking meals for ill or wounded members of their families who were patients or waiting to tend their most primitive needs. This was the only care a patient could count on; if there were no one outside to look after him, he would almost certainly die.
>
> Some indication of what happens to a Vietnamese civilian who is caught in the cross fire of combat can be illustrated by an actual case. A young girl, perhaps 17 or 18 years old, was hit by hand grenade fragments. She was brought to the hospital, where she lay outside for 12 hours before she could even be admitted—and then only a bandage and splint were applied to her wounded arm and leg. When I saw her, four days later, her condition was quite grave. I amputated one leg above the knee and one arm below the elbow.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on documenting the suffering of the South Vietnamese people caused by this war. There have been several articles concerning this tragedy in recent months, and I have inserted several of them into the Congressional Record. But I do not think further documentation is necessary. There is ample evidence that we as Americans and as Congressmen have a deep responsibility to do as much as we can do for the victims of this conflict. There are some private groups such as the Committee of Responsibility, Inc., which have already acted upon this responsibility. As laudable as private efforts are and as much as they should be encouraged, our Government must also take responsibility. The burden is too large to be borne solely by private groups.

In order to best execute that responsibility, a select committee of the House should be immediately established to thoroughly analyze the situation concerning civilian refugees and casualties in South Vietnam. This committee would advise the House as to the legislation or administrative action which is necessary to alleviate the suffering of the South Vietnamese civilians.

Today 13 Members of the House, in a bipartisan effort, are introducing a bill to establish such a committee which shall report to the House within 4 months. Under this proposal the Select Committee on Civilian Casualties and Refugees in South Vietnam shall consist of nine members appointed from both parties by the Speaker. It will conduct an investigation into such matters as:

First, the number of civilian refugees in South Vietnam who are out of their usual place of abode and unable to return thereto because of military operations;

Second, the number of civilian war casualties in South Vietnam resulting from military operations, and specifically the number of such war casualties under the age of 18 years; and

Third, the adequacy of medical care and facilities available to civilian war casualties in South Vietnam.

The committee shall also consider the feasibility of special legislation or administrative action to accomplish the following:

First, permit South Vietnamese civilian refugees and war casualties, particularly those under the age of 18 years, to enter the United States as permanent residents;

Second, permit South Vietnamese war casualties to enter the United States for medical care or treatment, with the option of remaining as permanent residents;

Third, facilitate adoption by U.S. citizens of South Vietnamese refugees and war casualties under the age of 18 years; and

Fourth, provide for the construction of medical centers in the United States to provide extensive medical care and treatment of South Vietnamese civilian refugees and war casualties, particularly centers for the care and treatment of burns.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and urge that this bill will be given prompt consideration. The people of South Vietnam desperately need our help. We owe it to them and to ourselves. We must not let future generations say that we did not care.

The following Members of the House are introducing the bill: George E. Brown, Jr., Daniel E. Burton, John G. Dow, Don Edwards, Henry B. Gonzalez, Seymour Halpern, Augustus F. Hawkins, Henry Helstoski, Theodore R. Kupferman, Richard D. McCarthy, Patsy T. Mink, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, and William F. Ryan.

The full text of the bill follows:

H. Res. 335

Resolution to establish a Select Committee on Civilian Casualties and Refugees in South Vietnam to conduct an investigation and study of the effects of military operations in South Vietnam on the civilian population of South Vietnam.

Whereas thousands of South Vietnamese civilians are homeless refugees as a result of military operations in South Vietnam; and

Whereas thousands of South Vietnamese civilians, including a substantial number under the age of eighteen, have become war casualties as a result of military operations in South Vietnam; and

Whereas the people and the Government of the United States must have a responsibility toward South Vietnamese civilian refugees and war casualties resulting from military operations in South Vietnam: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of nine Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman, and not more than five of whom shall be appointed from the same political party. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

Sec. 2. The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the effects of military operations in South Vietnam on the civilian population of South Vietnam. In the conduct of such investigation and study the matters considered by the committee shall include but not be limited to—

(1) the number of civilian refugees in South Vietnam who are out of their usual place of abode and unable to return thereto because of military operations;

(2) the number of civilian war casualties in South Vietnam resulting from military operations, and specifically the number of such war casualties under the age of eighteen years;

(3) the adequacy of medical care and facilities available to civilian war casualties in South Vietnam.

Sec. 3. The committee shall consider and make recommendations with respect to the feasibility of special legislation or administrative action to alleviate the hardships imposed on the civilian population of South Vietnam as a result of military operations, including, but not limited to, legislation or administrative action designed to—

(1) permit South Vietnamese civilian refugees and war casualties, particularly those

under the age of eighteen years, to enter the United States as permanent residents;

(2) permit South Vietnamese war casualties to enter the United States for medical care or treatment, with the option of remaining as permanent residents;

(3) facilitate adoption by United States citizens of South Vietnamese refugees and war casualties under the age of eighteen years; and

(4) provide for the construction of medical centers in the United States to provide extensive medical care and treatment of South Vietnamese civilian refugees and war casualties, particularly centers for the care and treatment of burns.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of carrying out this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, or elsewhere, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

SEC. 5. The committee shall report to the House, not later than 120 days following the date on which the committee is first appointed under this resolution, the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON EDUCATION

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have been immensely impressed by, and warmly commend, the President's message on education. The President has not been willing to accept the momentous achievements in the field of education in the 88th and 89th Congresses, although they will ever be notable landmarks in the progress of education in America, but has called upon the Congress and the country to go forward in this vital field of education. The President recognizes, as do all thoughtful citizens of our country, that the greatest natural resource that America has is the potential brain power of our boys and girls—men and women. The development of this enormous resource can produce greater wealth, more happiness, and deeper satisfaction for our country than the development of any other resource we have. One significant example is what the original GI bill and subsequent extensions of it have meant to our Nation.

While I warmly applaud all of the President's able message, one aspect of it particularly demands our hearty support. That is the phase of the President's recommendations providing signal assistance in the development of educational television. Not only the cause of education, but the intellectual and spiritual enrichment of all of our people lies within the scope of educational television which has received such meaningful stimulus from the President's recommendations. I hope Congress will promptly give favorable consideration to all of the President's message, but I shall especially look forward to the enactment of those features of the message dealing with the vast enlargement of educational television with all of the struggles it has had to endure in surviving and expanding into its present valuable service to our people.

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE DANIEL FLOOD TO THE BOB HOPE DINNER GIVEN IN SUPPORT OF THE PARKINSON FOUNDATION

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of the 14th of this month, the Honorable DANIEL FLOOD, the able gentleman from Pennsylvania, chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the House Appropriations Committee, delivered in my district at the Fontainebleau Hotel, at the Bob Hope dinner in support of the Parkinson Foundation, of which dinner my wife had the honor to be chairman, a very eloquent address devoted to warm words of praise for our late distinguished colleague, John Fogarty, who was the predecessor of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] as chairman of the Health Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, and upon the challenging problem Parkinson's disease presents to America and what the National Parkinson Foundation is doing to help to meet that challenge.

I was exceedingly pleased that my distinguished and devoted friend, the able gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] and his lovely wife, not only honored the occasion with their presence, but that the gentleman delivered such a moving address in honor of our late friend, John Fogarty, and in behalf of the fight against the crippling and killing Parkinson's disease.

I am pleased to include the splendid address of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania following my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

A RAY OF HOPE IN THE DARKNESS

(Address by Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD)

We meet here tonight in the shadows cast by the recent loss of a great fighter against the manifold diseases that afflict mankind. John Fogarty's loss was a shocking personal tragedy for all of us who knew him, and it was a great tragedy for all of us who are waging the never-ending war on disease. John Fogarty fought to free mankind from the scourges of illness and pain and premature death. There is no greater cause—the cause of humanity.

It was with some reluctance that I decided to come here, tonight, to fill an engagement John Fogarty had made. Having worked with him intimately on the House Appropriations Subcommittee through past Congresses, I know what a challenge it is to follow in his footsteps. It is with humble heart that I succeed him to the chairmanship of the subcommittee he so ably chaired. But the mantle of leadership has descended to me, and I have no desire but to be worthy of it. I know what goals John Fogarty had in mind—I saw him hammer them out as perhaps no one else did—and I will try—with all my heart—to see them realized or—if that is impossible—then to see them brought nearer to realization.

One of the secrets of John Fogarty's effectiveness was his phenomenal grasp of the facts with which he dealt. I know that the parade of witnesses who passed before his committee hearings over the years were often startled at the information at John's fingertips, at the acuteness of his questions, at the breadth of his knowledge concerning the public health, education and welfare in all their ramifications. He often said that the parade of illustrious witnesses had given him a liberal education, and to him that was a plain statement of fact. I can only hope to try to emulate John, in this, but, at the moment, I realize the tremendous job of self-education that confronts me and stand somewhat in awe of it. But, thanks to having worked with John, I am at least aware of many things I would not otherwise have known, and I am grateful for this.

Thanks to committee hearings, I knew something of the National Parkinson Foundation and of the heroic efforts of your courageous founder, Mrs. Jeanne Levey. I knew that when Mr. Levey was stricken with this strange disease she had almost single-handed fought for and gained national recognition for this disease and a national program aimed at its conquest. I knew the story of how this effort, founded with a staff of one, in 1957, has grown to the stature it now has among the voluntary health agencies and that Bob Hope—whose warm heart matches his ready wit—had many times donated his services to assist in fund raising for the Foundation's worthy aims.

I am pleased to know that the Foundation not only sponsors and supports basic and clinical research in Parkinson's disease but also develops and provide referral services for patients and their families. Too—the Foundation's reservoir of Parkinson patients provides an invaluable research tool for our scientific attack upon this disease and that the Foundation founded the world's first "Brain Bank"—a pioneering project that asks Parkinson patients who wish to forward research for a preventive for this ailment to make provision to donate their brains for Parkinson research after their lives are over.

As I reflected on the nature of this voluntary effort, the more it came home to me that this organization—as with so many others in the health field—grew out of some great personal tragedy. And it grew and flourished upon the great traditional spirit of giving which Americans have always relied upon to help them overcome problems or crises too great for one family, one city or one region.

Yet all too often I receive letters in which the question is asked—Why should I contribute to a voluntary health fund drive? Aren't my tax dollars supporting research through the National Institutes of Health and other Government agencies? This public confusion should be dispelled—and you and I must work together to dispel it.

The public should be told that the health research conducted by the voluntary health agencies is very important because—unlike Government research programs, which tend to be long-term and continuing—voluntary organizations can give grants for important, short-term research and can do so with great flexibility.

Voluntaries can also act with greater speed and keep up with the latest research techniques on a closer, more personal basis. Voluntary groups can also more easily make grants to young researchers who have not yet proven themselves to the degree necessary for justifying Federal grant support. For all these reasons, substained support of private voluntary organizations will continue to be an important component of the Nation's total medical research effort.

And, perhaps most important of all, the public should be made to understand how vitally needed are the special services that their contributions provide to victims of the dread diseases such as Parkinson's through your work in education and rehabilitation. These are jobs the Government cannot enter into as directly as you are able to do.

There exists a partnership so profoundly reinforcing, so deeply interwoven, between the Federal government and the voluntary health agencies that public ignorance of it is, to me, always a little frightening. Nothing must disturb this productive alliance in our nation's war on disease and suffering.

Both Federal and non-Federal support of medical research in this country expanded rapidly following World War II. In so doing, there gradually emerged for the first time a truly National medical research and research training effort in this country.

When we speak of Federal support of medical research it is the National Institutes of Health that come first to mind. John Fogarty was proud of the part he had played in helping develop a medical research establishment of national scope. For 16 years he worked tirelessly to increase Federal awareness of our national health problems, on the need for research to correct these problems, and on the growth of the National Institutes of Health as the agency to conduct and administer such research.

And I know that he was proud of the part he played in the establishment of the several Institutes—none more so than in the case of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness.

Having sat in on appropriations hearings for that Institute, I know something of its activities in relation to Parkinson's disease. I do not know all of the details, but I do know that its research spectrum includes grant support of research and the conduct of its own research in Bethesda. I know, too, that the Institute is supporting training in neurology, neurosurgery, neuropharmacology, and other disciplines bearing on the problem, and that it is coordinating a national program in the field.

I also know that one of the Institute's major programs over the past several years has been the establishment and support of the Parkinson Disease Information and Research Center at Columbia University in New York City. I am informed that some 30,000 items have been collected and indexed by that center in its first three years of operation.

I am not competent to understand the many scientific approaches being utilized by the Institute in its restless quest for more information about Parkinson's disease, but I do know that various disciplines—biochemistry, viral studies, brain probes, and new theories of movement control—are being brought to bear on this disorder.

And finally, I know that the cause and cure of Parkinson's disease remain unknown.

Once again I am reminded of Shakespeare's penetrating remark, "There is no darkness but ignorance." But our highly encouraging research gains thus far, together with the plans and cooperation between the Federal and private efforts in the health field justify an optimistic attitude among those working on Parkinson's disease. This is our one ray of hope in the oppressive darkness of ignorance that now surrounds us.

When the darkness lifts and a cure or a preventive for Parkinson's disease is found, the saving of as many lives as possible then becomes of transcendent importance. The practical application of research results has long been a concern of mine, as it was long a concern of John Fogarty. I like to recall his words in an address he made in May, 1965, at Cornell University Medical College when he said, "It was never proposed to build a kind of medical research ivory tower with the people's money. As one who had the good fortune to participate in the plans and policies governing the Federal support of medical research in this country, I can assure you that the aims of Congress have never been unclear."

In August of 1965, when we were debating on the floor of the House a Fogarty-sponsored proposal to establish a nationwide program designed to save lives being lost from heart disease, cancer and stroke, I wondered aloud if anyone in the Chamber at that time would like to go on record as considering such savings of lives as of marginal importance. And I said then—as I have often said before—"I think first of the health of my fellow citizens." We in the Congress have an obligation to our constituents—to all our fellow Americans—to think first, last and always in those terms.

When a cure is found for Parkinson's disease—and it will surely be found—we must move with all possible speed to bring this new knowledge to the practicing physicians. If legislation is needed comparable to that used to bring about the regional programs now being set up for heart disease, cancer and stroke—legislation will be introduced and urged upon the Congress to aid the sufferers of Parkinson's disease and to stop its ravages for all time.

CONCERNING REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE IN THE MATTER OF ADAM CLAYTON POWELL

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ECKHARDT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. **ECKHARDT**. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words calmly and, I hope, judiciously on the special committee's report on the matter of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL.

I. RELATING TO THE RIGHT OF ADAM CLAYTON POWELL TO BE SWORN IN AS A REPRESENTATIVE AND HIS FINAL RIGHT TO A SEAT IN CONGRESS

House Resolution 1 deals, first, with the right of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL to be sworn in as a Representative from the State of New York in the 90th Congress and, second, with his final right to a seat therein as such Representative.

Unless it can be shown Mr. POWELL is not an inhabitant of the State of New York, the first part of the resolution raises no substantial question. The report of the select committee pursuant to House Resolution 1 finds that Mr. POWELL is an inhabitant of the State of New York and meets the requirement stated in the Constitution.

Though the select committee has proceeded to consider matters other than constitutional qualifications, it has tacitly recognized that these matters cannot be considered at this juncture to deny Mr. POWELL his right to be sworn in. Indeed, unless seated, he could not be expelled.

In this respect Mr. GERALD R. FORD's substitute for the Udall resolution, which passed with massive support from Republican members, had the following anomalous effect:

It prevented the House of Representatives from using the constitutional machinery of article I, section 5, paragraph 2, for expelling a Member. This is the only authority by which Congress can reach misconduct as grounds for exclusion.

Of course, after passage of House Resolution 1, as amended, the special committee could, and should have, decided only the question to which the resolution and the Constitution limited it: Should Mr. POWELL be sworn in? The answer is "Yes," under the clearest constitutional authority. Then action could have been taken to expel him under article I, section 5, paragraph 2 of the Constitution.

Because the Republican resolution, unlike the Udall resolution, was directed at POWELL's original seating rather than his right to remain after being seated, the committee was without any constitutional authority to recommend that Congress expel him or otherwise deny his seat unless it found that he was not an inhabitant of New York. No other constitutional qualification—of article I, section 2 of the Constitution—was in question.

An action to expel cannot be taken in an action to determine whether Mr. POWELL should be seated.

See in this connection "Attachment I" of the attachment hereto.

II. RELATING TO THE PROPRIETY OF CONSIDERING OTHER PUNISHMENT UNDER THE RESOLUTION

The posture in which the Republican resolution placed the House has created another difficulty which would not have existed had Mr. POWELL first been seated and then had action been taken to expel or punish him. The fact that this was not done has raised serious constitutional questions concerning his required reimbursement which would not have existed had the proper process been followed. Any sums of money found to be misappropriated could be recovered back, not as a fine, but as a required reimbursement under title II, section 40(a), United States Code, in the following manner:

First. By the finding of a committee, adopted by the House, to the effect that any sum found misappropriated was in fact due;

Second. By the certification of the Committee on Education and Labor, or any other appropriate body or officer of the House, to the Sergeant at Arms that such sum was due to the House of Representatives;

Third. By action of the Sergeant at Arms, pursuant to such order, deducting said sum from Mr. POWELL's salary, mileage and expense money, as provided in title II, section 40(a), United States Code.

It is doubtful that such a sum may be recovered as a fine. Note that the committee recommendation is that Mr. POWELL "as punishment pay the Clerk of the House $40,000." No cases have been found where fines were imposed for punishment except under the direct authority of the Constitution "to compel the attendance of absent Members." A Member's original seating should have nothing whatsoever to do with money, and a penalty in the nature of a fine is unrelated to a hearing on constitutional qualifications, as this hearing was. It should be repugnant to all of us that constitutional rights should be sold, or ethical license bought, for money.

Authorities on levying a fine or recovering money due from a Member are included in II of the attached authorities.

I make these statements because I think it well to put upon the record how the insistence upon the Republican substitute; that is, the insistence upon withholding seating of Mr. POWELL, has gained nothing. Indeed, it has jeopardized the proceedings of this House, and has constrained the area of review of Mr. POWELL'S case. In summary:

First. It gained nothing by avoiding a two-thirds vote, because this action can only reach a determination of constitutional qualifications, which are really not in question.

Second. A simple majority is all that would have been necessary to recover money due the House by Mr. POWELL or to censure him after he had been seated—and this is all the report calls for.

Third. As has been pointed out, the process here applied is arguably in violation of due process and is arguably outside constitutional authority; and it may therefore be abortive.

Fourth. Within the process here followed the committee did not have one of the options which it should have had under the original Udall resolution: To recommend expulsion by a two-thirds vote. Thus, those who would be severe without being just have been neither just nor severe.

But I shall probably be compelled to vote for the report because it may become the only practical parliamentary way to give the 18th District of New York a seat in Congress. To vote against the report would neither create a vacancy that could be filled by special election nor permit the Congressman-elect to serve. This is a result which I think no thoughtful man will consider tolerable.

I want to read briefly from a very conservative newspaper in Texas, the Dallas Morning News. First, they think his misbehavior clear:

> But it is also clear that voters of any district have a right to choose the man they want to represent them.

Then it refers to the special committee report. I quote:

> It makes the best of a bad bargain by reducing Mr. POWELL'S influence in the House and by setting up a method for getting some of the taxpayers' money back.

I should have liked a better bargain and a fair process. In this matter I think I am arguing here for a procedurally conservative approach. This is what "due process of law" is.

ATTACHMENT I. RELATING TO THE RIGHT OF ADAM CLAYTON POWELL TO BE SWORN IN AS A REPRESENTATIVE AND HIS FINAL RIGHT TO A SEAT IN CONGRESS

The proposition that a Member-elect, whose election is not in contest, must be seated if he meets constitutionally defined qualifications is treated by the following authorities:

Federal Convention of 1787.

Article I, section 2, of the Constitution provides:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.
>
> No Person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the Age of twenty-five Years, and been seven Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

These provisions were considered by the Federal Convention which drafted the Constitution. See article IV, sections 1 and 2, of the report of the Committee of Detail, August 6, 1787. The only difference between that preliminary report and the language which appears in the Constitution, except in style, is that the period of 3 years of citizenship originally proposed was extended to 7 and the residence requirement was changed from "resident of the State" to "inhabitant of that State."

The debate upon this provision occurred in the Federal Convention on August 10, 1787. In article VI, section 2, of the committee's report, an additional permissive qualification was recommended. That section permitted Congress to establish "uniform qualifications of Members of each House, with regard to property." This was the subject of considerable debate. The Convention ultimately struck out the provision. This sequence of events, and the debate, clearly show that the Convention expressly intended to delineate all "qualifications" for the seating of a Member of the House of Representatives. It should be noted that the qualifications expressed in the Constitution are, throughout, referred to as "qualifications," and it is crystal clear that that term is used solely to refer to constitutional qualifications.

Charles Pinkney, delegate to the Convention from South Carolina, pointed out the dangers of leaving to Congress, itself, the determination of qualifications of its Members. He said:

> The Legislature would have the fate of the Nation put into their hands. * * * Should it be left on this footing, the first Legislature will meet without any particular qualifications of property; and if it should happen to consist of rich men they might fix such qualifications as may be too favorable to the rich; if of poor men, an opposite extreme might be run into. (Farrand, Records of the Federal Convention, Vol. II, p. 248.)

James Madison, delegate to the Convention from Virginia, "was opposed to the section as vesting an improper and dangerous power in the Legislature. The qualifications of electors and elected were fundamental articles in a republican government and ought to be fixed by the Constitution."

Mr. Madison also remarked on the impropriety of letting a particular body make an ad hoc determination with respect to emoluments of its Members, as follows:

> It was as improper as to allow them to fix their own wages, or their own privileges. It was a power also, which might be made subservient to the views of one faction agst. another. Qualifications founded on artificial distinctions may be devised, by the stronger in order to keep out partizans of (a weaker) faction. (Farrand, Records of the Federal Convention, Vol. II, p. 250.)

As has been said, the express, additional qualification was stricken on grounds, among others, that it was improvident to permit Congress itself to pass upon "qualifications" of membership even by general statute. It follows a fortiori that Congress may not enlarge "qualifications," and then determine whether they have been met, in the case of an individual Member, for the purpose of denying his seat.

The question of determining qualifications as the basis for seating a Member must not be confused with questions involved under the second paragraph of section 5 of article I, relating to the power of Congress to "expel a Member." It should be noted that the first paragraph of section 5 deals with qualifications of Members quite separately and apart from the question of expulsion, and the first paragraph uses the term "qualifications" in the same sense that the Members of the Federal Convention used that term as relating to age, citizenry, and residence. The report of the Committee on Detail dealt with the determination of "qualifications" in section 4 of article VI, as follows:

> Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own members. (Farrand, Records of the Federal Convention, Vol. H. p. 180.)

The original draft did not even refer to expulsion in this section but provided for it in a separate section 6 of the same article:

> SEC. 6. Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings; may punish its members for disorderly behavior; and may expel a member. (Farrand, Record of the Federal Convention, Vol. II, p. 180.)

Of course, if expulsion could be accomplished through the guise of withholding a seat on the pretense of determining "qualifications" used in a very broad sense—as was attempted to be done by the Republican resolution—then the two-thirds requirement for expelling a Member now written into the Constitution would be circumvented. The Federal Convention was very concerned about placing the two-thirds limitation on so drastic an action. Though Gouverneur Morris thought that "this power may be safely trusted to a majority," Madison stated strong disagreement, observing "that the right of expulsion—article VI, section 6—was too important to be exercised by a bare majority of a quorum and in emergencies of faction might be dangerously abused."

Thus, he moved that the words "with the concurrence of two-thirds" be inserted between "may" and "expel," and this was adopted by a vote of 10 ayes, no noes, and the delegation from Pennsylvania divided—records of the Federal

Convention, August 10, 1787, Farrand, volume II, page 254.

THE FEDERALIST

In reporting the result of the Convention and arguing for the reasonableness of the result, Alexander Hamilton in No. LII of The Federalist, February 8, 1788, commented:

> The qualifications of the elected, being less carefully and properly defined, by the state constitutions, and being at the same time more susceptible of uniformity, have been very properly considered and regulated by the convention. A representative of the United States, must be of the age of twenty-five years; must have been seven years a citizen of the United States; must, at the time of his election, be an inhabitant of the state he is to represent, and during the time of his service, must be in no office under the United States. *Subject to these reasonable limitations, the door of this part of the federal government is open* to merit of every description, whether native or adoptive, whether young or old, and without regard to poverty or wealth, or to any particular profession of religious faith. [Emphasis added.]

In No. LVII of The Federalist, February 19, 1788, Hamilton clearly delineates the sole basis for an evaluation of the character of the Representative as his acceptability to the "free suffrages" of his fellow citizens. He states:

> If we consider the situation of the men on whom the free suffrages of their fellow citizens may confer the representative trust, we shall find it involving *every* security *which can be devised or desired* for their fidelity to their constituents. [Emphasis added.]

In the entire paper, which relates to the general wisdom and virtue desired of representatives, Hamilton delineates no other limitation nor judgment than that of the voters, and he even recognizes that:

> It is possible that these [the influences upon, and impulses of, elected officials to live up to the public trust] may all be insufficient, to control the caprice and wickedness of men. But are they not all the government will admit, and that human prudence can devise?

Mr. Hamilton, in this and in many other things, envisioned 1967 in 1788. It may be true that Mr. POWELL has not lived up to his public trust and that the limitation of the free suffrages of his fellow citizens are not enough to check "caprice and wickedness." If so, the only remedy is to expel him by a two-thirds vote in a separate proceeding under article I, section 5, of the Constitution. And the proceeding must be with the due process normally attendant upon judicial proceedings, because such a proceeding is essentially judicial.

CONGRESSIONAL PRECEDENT

Until the Civil War, there does not appear a single precedent in the annals of the U.S. Congress contrary to these clear enunciations of constitutional policy.

Immediately after the adoption of the Constitution, the U.S. Senate was faced with the problem. In 1795, in the election contest of Humphrey Marshall, of Kentucky, the Member-elect had been charged with gross fraud and perjury, and a court had entered a decree against him; however, the Senate, approving a report of its committee, concluded that it was without jurisdiction to consider other than constitutional qualifications in such a contest—Journal Fourth Congress, First session, pages 194, 220, 223 to 228.

In 1807, in the election contest of William McCreery the chairman of the election committee said that:

> The committee of elections considered the qualifications of members to have been unalterably determined by the Federal Constitution. (10th Cong., 1807 1 Hinds 414.)

The House upheld the decision of the committee, holding that constitutional qualifications could not be added to or diminished and that deviation from the strictest constitutional qualifications might result in "any sort of dangerous qualifications of property, color, creed, or political professions"—1 Hinds, pages 872, 873, 875, 878, 887 to 888, 893 to 895, 908 to 910, 913, 915 to 916.

In *Turney* v. *Marshall,* 1856, 1 Hinds page 384, 1 Bart. El. Cas. 167, 168, it was said:

> The qualifications of a representative under the Constitution, are, that he shall have attained the age of 25 years, shall have been 7 years a citizen of the United States, and, when elected, an inhabitant of the State in which he shall be chosen. It is a fair presumption that, when the Constitution prescribes these qualifications as necessary to a representative in Congress, it was meant to exclude all others. (Report of Committee of Elections, 1 Hinds p. 385.)

In this case the question was with respect to the power of a State to add qualifications. *Foulke* v. *Trumbull,* also in the 34th Congress, 1 Hinds page 384, was to the same effect.

The same principle was enunciated in 1862 when a Senator-elect was challenged on the grounds that he had engaged in conduct "very unbecoming and very reprehensible of a loyal citizen—Congressional Globe, 1862, page 861. In that case the Senate seated the Senator-elect, supporting the principle enunciated in Senator Harris' presentation of the committee opinion, as follows:

> The Constitution declares what shall be the qualifications of a Senator. They are in respect to his age, in respect to his residence, and in respect to his citizenship; and the committee were of opinion that the Senate were limited to the question, first, whether or not the person claiming the seat and presenting his credentials produced the requisite evidence of his election or appointment; and, second, whether there was any question as to his constitutional qualifications.

The Civil War brought temporary deviation when the House barred Members-elect who had participated in the rebellion. See the cases of Kentucky Members in the 40th Congress, 1867.

But in 1868, in the case of *Smith* v. *Brown,* 2 Bart El. Cas. 395, 404, it was said:

> This House can only be the judge of the election, returns and qualifications of its members, that is, can judge whether each member has been elected according to the laws of his State and possesses the qualifications fixed by the Constitution. Here its power begins and ends. (Report of the Committee of Elections.)

The discussion was dictum, for the question in that case was whether or not a runner-up could be seated even though he had only a plurality of the votes of surviving candidates. The question was answered in the negative.

There is also passing reference to the point in a case involving John M. Niles, a Senator from Connecticut. It is said in Taft El. Cas. 136:

> Some members of the Senate doubted the constitutional power of the Senate to make such an inquiry.

A case at the turn of the century, the polygamy case of Brigham Roberts, 1899, 1 Hinds page 474, and a case at the peak of the war hysteria in 1919, involving Victor Berger, a Congressman-elect who had been found guilty of violation of the Espionage Act—58 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 1919—afford exceptions to the rule. In both these cases Congress considered the convictions in denying seating of the Members-elect.

Of course, at the time of these cases, it is reasonably certain that the Supreme Court would not have taken jurisdiction to review the action of the House. I have not discovered any court case in point.

Also, in 1928 the Senate refused to seat a Senator-elect from Illinois on the ground that his acceptance of certain funds in promotion of his candidacy had been contrary to sound policy, harmful to the dignity of the Senate, dangerous to the perpetuity of friendly government and had tainted his credentials "with fraud and corruption"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 1927–January 1928; resolution adopted January 19.

In the two more recent cases, Francis M. Shoemaker, 1933, and William Langer of North Dakota, 1942, Congress returned to the established rationale that only constitutional qualifications may be considered in determining the seating of a Member. Citations are, respectively, 77 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 131 to 134, 136, 139; 1933; Senate Journal, 77th Congress, first session, 1942, page 8, et seq., second session, page 3, et seq.

COURT PRECEDENT

There are no court cases in point, but the recent U.S. Supreme Court case, *Bond* v. *Floyd,* 87 S. Ct. 339, December 5, 1966, treats the point in footnote 13 as follows:

> Madison and Hamilton anticipated the oppressive effect on freedom of expression which would result if the legislature could utilize its power of judging qualifications to pass judgment on a legislator's political views. At the Constitutional Convention of 1787, Madison opposed a proposal to give to Congress power to establish qualifications in general. Warren, *The Making of the Constitution* (1928), 420-422. The Journal of the Federal Convention of 1787 states:
>
> Mr. Madison was opposed to the Section as vesting an improper and dangerous power in the Legislature. The qualifications of electors and elected were fundamental articles in a Republican Govt. and ought to be fixed by the Constitution. If the Legislature could regulate those of either, it can by degrees subvert the constitution. * * * Qualifications founded on artificial distinction may be devised, by the stronger in order to keep out partizans of a weaker faction.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Mr. Madison observed that the British Parliament possessed the power of regulating the qualifications both of the electors, and the elected; and the abuse they had made of

it was a lesson worthy of our attention. They had made the changes in both cases subservient to their own views, or to the views of political or Religious parties. 2 Farrand, The Records in the Federal Convention of 1787 (Aug. 10, 1787), pp. 249–250.

Hamilton agreed with Madison that:

> The qualifications of the persons who may choose or be chosen * * * are defined and fixed by the constitution; and are unalterable by the legislature. The Federalist, No. 60 (Cooke ed. 1961), 409.

ATTACHMENT II. RELATING TO THE PROPRIETY OF CONSIDERING OTHER PUNISHMENT UNDER THE RESOLUTION

House Resolution 1, as we have seen, related only to the right of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL to be sworn in as a Representative and his final right to a seat in Congress. Clearly, POWELL's right to be sworn in as a Representative was wholly dependent upon constitutional qualifications of age, citizenship, and inhabitancy. As we have pointed out, the second point in the resolution relating to "his final right to a seat in Congress" was not before the committee, because this could not be constitutionally reached until he was seated.

But even if the second part of the resolution were considered as authorizing the action of expulsion on a two-thirds majority, it does not follow that punishment in the form of a fine would be applicable.

There is certainly no express authority in the Constitution for fines as a lesser degree of punishment in all cases in which expulsion might be considered.

There is a very good reason for this. The power to expel can only be exercised by a two-thirds majority. Where fines are applicable, they may be levied by a simple majority.

For instance, the Constitution specifically empowers Congress "to compel the attendance of absent Members, in such manner, and under such penalties as each House may provide." Therefore, it is clear that such a penalty might be a fine, and Congress has imposed fines in such circumstances.

During the second session of the 47th Congress, on December 18, 1882—14 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 402 to 409; see footnote 1, page 118 volume II, Hinds', supra—the House after debate, adopted the following resolution:

> *Resolved*, That for the purpose of insuring such attendance upon the sessions of the House as is necessary for the proper transaction of the public business during the coming holidays, the penalty for absence by any Member who shall be absent upon a call of the House during that period shall be a fine of $50 for each day of such absence without leave of the House or valid excuse; the amount of such fine to be deducted from the salary of the absent Member by the Sergeant at Arms of the House on the certificate of the Clerk of the fact of such absence.

Before its passage, it was amended to substitute for "the coming holidays," the phrase, "from December 22, 1882, to January 3, 1883"—14 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 408 to 409.

It was adopted by a vote of 112 to 102, a quorum being present. Seventy-six Members did not vote.

During the debate, Mr. Robeson, of New Jersey, whose basic resolution was eventually adopted, stated that he believed that the Constitution required that the penalty for absence be fixed beforehand and that:

> The best lawyers, I think, are of the opinion if any penalty is to be affixed to enforce the attendance of members it must be fixed previously." (14 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 406).

Consequently, the resolution with the $50 per day fine for nonattendance had been submitted by him, he declared.

During the third session of the 56th Congress, on February 24, 1881, during a call of the House, the Speaker pro tempore held that the House might excuse a Member on the payment of a fine, basing his decision on the line of the rule: "and the House shall determine upon what condition they shall be discharged—presently House rule XV, section 2.

During the debate on the question, the Speaker pro tempore stated that, although a quorum was then present when penalties were being considered relative to absence during the call of the House, the same 15 Members who could compel attendance of absentees under the rule, could also impose penalties—11 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2048; for the debate, see 11 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 2044 to 2053; II Hinds', supra, section 3013 to 3014.

The penalty suggested in the case at question was 5 cents, in order to be discharged from the custody of the Sergeant at Arms, but the House declined to impose the fine. At various points during the debate, suggestions were made that the absent Members who had been apprehended by the Sergeant at Arms, pay the costs for such action, but these did not seem to be imposed either.

During the 30th Congress, first session, a quorum being present, after a call of the House, certain absent Members who were then in the custody of the Sergeant at Arms, were admitted to their seats upon the payment of a $2 fee, which was then authorized by rule 69 of the House. If a Member did not pay it, the Sergeant at Arms received it out of the contingent fund of the House—II Hinds', supra, section 3025.

Congress has even provided for punishment in a statute, title 2, United States Code, section 39, which was derived from House Resolution 68, July 17, 1862; 12 Stat. 628.

But the existance of specific constitutional authority and well-established precedent supporting a penalty in the nature of a fine to enforce attendance emphasizes the lack of specific authority and precedent for the levying of fines generally. Authority to impose punishment through the imposition of a fine on a member of a legislative body does not appear to be mentioned by any commentators, with the exception of Luther S. Cushing, "Law and Practice of Legislative Assemblies," who seems to feel that fines are limited to the situations referred to above where a constitutional basis exists. He states, page 266, section 676:

> In England, both houses of parliament were anciently in the practice of imposing the payment of a fine by way of punishment; and this is understood at the present day to be the practice of the lords; but the commons appear to have long since waived or abandoned this form of punishment; and it has even been laid down that they now have no such power. In this country, with one or two exceptions, in which there is a special constitutional provision to that effect, the legislative assemblies are not authorized to impose a fine by way of punishment.

Certainly, this is much more persuasive authority than the single case cited in the committee's report. The only case the committee cited was one involving Senators Tillman and McLaurin, 1902. This case involved fisticuffs on the floor of the Senate and resulted in an order declaring both Senators to be in contempt and, utimately, a reprimand. The citation in the committee's report is not from the main report of the committee nor even from the dissent wherein five Senators objected to even the temporary suspension of the Senators held in contempt. It comes from a statement signed by three Senators who voted for the report but thought the penalty "not sufficiently severe upon consideration of the facts"—II Hinds, pages 1140 to 1142.

It would appear that Congress is without constitutional authority to levy a fine particularly one of the magnitude involved here, as a punishment applied in lieu of expulsion. If a House of Congress could do so, it could in practical effect expel a Member by a single majority vote by levying so great a fine as to make it economically impossible for the Member to continue his service. It is inconceivable that the Constitution leaves such a loophole.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ECKHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman may have answered this in his further remarks. I wanted to know whether he felt the original Udall resolution was subject to the same criticism that he has directed against the substitute resolution which was adopted.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it was subject to the same objection for this reason. As I understand it, once a Member is seated, article I of the Constitution, section 5, second paragraph, provides for seeking expulsion on a two-thirds vote.

Mr. CURTIS. Let me read the resolution.

Mr. ECKHARDT. I will be glad to have the gentleman read it to me again. I believe I recall it.

Mr. CURTIS. The resolution states: "His final right to a seat—ADAM CLAYTON POWELL—be referred to a special committee."

So the committee is still looking into the question of the actual seating, the final seating. I believe—although I am very interested in the points the gentleman is making, which need to be considered—the original resolution is subject to the same points the gentleman makes against the Ford resolution.

Mr. ECKHARDT. The difference, as I understand it, between the two resolutions is this, that the Ford resolution, which was finally adopted, provided that Mr. POWELL could not take his seat until such time as the committee reported.

Mr. CURTIS. That is correct.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Therefore, if I am correct—and I believe I am, and I invite the reading of the first point in the attachment I shall append here—there could be only one question considered prior to seating, and that is the question with regard to the constitutional qualifications. The only serious one was the question of inhabitance. The Udall resolution first had the effect of seating Powell and then raising the question of his permanent seat.

Mr. CURTIS. The final right, only that.

Mr. ECKHARDT. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. And the argument was advanced that this resolution would not have permitted the committee to look into the actions the gentleman took prior to the seating, while the Ford resolution would permit that. Now, whether that would hold water, that was one of the arguments. I thought it was a very compelling argument.

This is argument, and I did not intend to get into argument, but I do believe the Udall resolution would be subject to the same points that the gentleman is making here. I believe under the Ford resolution it is perfectly in order for the committee to do what they have done here, which is bring in their findings. Had the committee wanted to, I believe it is implicit in the committee's report that they could have voted to expel. That might have raised other constitutional questions than the gentleman has raised, but I do not believe the committee felt they were barred from making such recommendations if, in their judgment, they wanted to do that.

Mr. ECKHARDT. If the gentleman recalls, in my statement I urged—and I may be wrong and the gentleman may be right—that before a man is seated action is not proper for the purpose of expulsion under article I, section 5.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, the gentleman made that point. I believe that is right.

The Ford resolution goes on and certainly implicitly gives the committee power to do what it has done, which is to take further action which is in the nature of exclusion, as I understand it. It also puts in the penalties—fining, or whatever it is—based upon actions that occurred not in the 90th Congress but on actions that occurred when he was a Member of previous Congresses, which I fear the Udall amendment would not cover.

At any rate, the gentleman has performed a real service, in my judgment, by taking the floor and exposing this point. I believe these facts are very much to the point.

Mr. ECKHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ECKHARDT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. As a lawyer it has been my understanding that there are only four ways by which an obligation to the U.S. Government can be disposed of.

The simplest, of course, is by payment of the entire obligation.

The second is by a suit brought by the Department of Justice, which it is required to prosecute to a conclusion to collect the entire amount, in the event it is determined or believed that the entire amount can be collected.

The third is by a compromise, which the Attorney General or his subordinate is authorized to enter into, on the ground that it would be impossible for the Government to recover the entire obligation and therefore a lesser amount should and can be accepted in full settlement as being in the interest of the Government.

The fourth is by an act of Congress, passed both by the House and by the Senate and signed by the President.

These are the only legal means by which obligations to the Government can be settled, according to my understanding as an ordinary country lawyer.

The Powell resolution is a unilateral resolution. It attempts to completely settle an obligation allegedly owed by Mr. Powell of an amount greater than $40,000 for $40,000. In other words, we are called upon to settle the debt by a simple resolution of the House of Representatives, with no agreement by the Senate and none by the President. There is no authority of law for such a settlement. And such would not be legal or binding.

What is the gentleman's opinion on that?

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Leggett). The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(On request of Mr. Abernethy, and by unanimous consent, Mr. Eckhardt was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. ECKHARDT. The gentleman's observations on this proposition are those I had immediately thought applicable. As a matter of fact, I thought at the time the question was whether or not this was a bill of attainder, that that might be involved, and therefore briefed the point.

I found a fifth method of satisfying obligations; that is referred to under title II, section 40a, United States Code Annotated.

Mr. ABERNETHY. But that statute does not provide for a compromise. It provides that he must discharge the entire amount of the debt. It does not provide for a compromise. That is section 40a, title II, United States Code.

Mr. ECKHARDT. It provides that he shall pay.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is right.

Mr. ECKHARDT. The amount due shall be deducted.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It does not say he must pay a part of the obligation. It means he must pay all of it.

Mr. ECKHARDT. The gentleman's observations certainly have a great deal of weight. As I read the statute, however, "the amount due" is what may be deducted. Ordinarily this has been a question of an amount due which is not in controversy, for some mere ministerial treatment of funds.

I see no reason why a committee might not establish the amount due and then the procedure be taken from that point.

I agree with the gentleman that the amount due has not been so established by the committee.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair will advise the gentleman from Texas that his time has now expired.

FRANK HEMELRIGHT

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDade] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday evening, in Scranton, Pa., Amos Lodge 136 of B'nai B'rith presented its 15th Annual Americanism Award to one of the finest men in the city of Scranton, Mr. Frank Hemelright.

To receive an award for Americanism is a signal honor. To receive such a reward from the oldest Jewish service organization in the world is even more notable. I assure you that Frank Hemelright is worthy of this distinction.

I will, with your permission, insert in the Record the description of Frank which was placed in the program for the evening. It is a biographical sketch of a man who has accomplished a truly astonishing variety of community betterment work in his lifetime.

But I would also call to your attention the remarks made by Frank Hemelright himself that evening. At a moment when other men might look back with immense satisfaction to a life of accomplishment, Frank took that occasion to look only to the future, to ask the questions and suggest the answers about what all of us must do to make the world a richer place for our children.

I will insert, also, the editorials on Frank from both the Scranton Tribune and the Scranton Times.

It is, indeed, a pleasure to bring before the House some of the laudatory remarks about Frank, but I want to pay him my own personal tribute.

In 1963, when I was sworn in as a Member of the 88th Congress, the unemployment rate in the city of Scranton and in Lackawanna County in my district was approximately 13 percent. There were wonderful men walking the streets seeking work, and there was no work to be found. But there were other men who were toiling day and night to bring jobs to that area. And their toil was not in vain.

Today in Scranton the jobs are seeking the men. In only a brief 4 years the disaster of unemployment has been replaced by an unprecedented prosperity. There is even a special section of our chamber of commerce that seeks former Scrantonians who left the area to find employment elsewhere so that they may be invited back to jobs that await them.

And Frank Hemelright led the crusade to bring in those jobs.

He has made the community richer by being a great citizen.

He has made his family richer by being a great husband and father.

He has made my own life richer by being a great friend.

OUR GUEST OF HONOR

The biography of the 1967 Americanism Award recipient reads like a Horatio Alger story. Frank Hemelright came up the hard way, proof of the American Way of life and encouraging to those who believe in the "old fashioned" way of doing a day's work for a day's pay! That's one way of becoming President of the Bank . . . and our good friend, Frank, made it.

Born up the valley in Jermyn on March 16, 1906, Frank Hemelright found himself moved to Scranton a few years later. It was in 1932, during the great depression, that Frank entered the banking field and served as a clerk in the First National of this city. The story goes that Frank was not to remain a clerk for long, his ability was quickly recognized and slowly but surely Frank crept up through the higher bank offices until in 1941, he was appointed assistant Vice President.

In other fields, especially sports, Frank Hemelright made his imprint. Central High School and Exeter College found his prowess on the basketball courts sufficient to bring the home teams many wins. The records show he starred at both schools.

The years 1942 through 1945 were critical to the well-being of our country; Frank took his place with the brave men of our country serving in the United States Navy for three years during which time he reached the rank of Lieutenant Commander. On leaving the service, Frank resumed his banking career and was made Vice President of the First National Bank.

Mr. Hemelright's concern with community welfare and growth was quite natural for a man of his vision and determination.

His early association with the Lackawanna Industrial Fund (LIFE) and the Scranton Lackawanna Industrial Building Co. (SLIBCO) manifested his burning desire to see Scranton regain her lost economic frontiers due to the steady decline of the mining industry.

Once his talents were known in the Community, Frank was called upon for valued advice in the city, county, state and nation. Governor Scranton appointed him to the Penna. Industrial Authority, and Frank served the Penna. Development Credit Corporation as Director and Vice President.

Mr. Hemelright was named President of the First National Bank in 1954, predecessor to the Northeastern National Bank.

Active in the Economic Development Council of Northeastern Penna., Frank became a member of the 100,000 Pennsylvanians for economic growth of the State. The success of this Committee was in no small way due to the instinct for progress and foresightedness of our Honored Guest.

It was no surprise by this time that Frank would have come to national attention. In 1962, Mr. Hemelright joined a group of bankers, at the request of the President of our country, to tour the Strategic Air Command and report to the President their recommendations. Frank also served the regional Advisory Committee on banking policies and practices for the U.S. Treasury Department, in an effort to keep banking policies abreast of the Nation's needs.

Awards and honors often abound to the credit of men of Frank Hemelright's character. In 1966, Frank was recipient of a triple honor. He was elected President of the Scranton Chamber of Commerce, appointed as a Trustee of 'LIFE' and later that year to the finance committee of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

With it all, Frank found time to engage in his favorite sport, golf, and carried off more honors in that field than you can shake a stick at. He was Champion of the Scranton Country Club no less than four times. Someone said of Frank, "Whatever he plays at he does good, because he works at anything he undertakes." Perhaps that statement best exemplifies the winning nature of Frank Hemelright!

Frank may also be classed as a winner in selecting for his lifelong mate the former Ruth Helen Theobold, his devoted wife and partner. They are blessed with three lovely children, Ann, 19, Andrew, 18, Martha, 16. Frank is a member of the Green Ridge Presbyterian Church, participating in many of its important activities. The family home is in Waverly.

When we add to the long list of interests Frank Hemelright has it will cause wonder that Frank finds time to act as President of the Board of Geisinger Medical Center of Danville, Pa., and as Director of the following companies: Mississippi Central Railroad, Keystone Junior College, Rumsey Hall School, Commonwealth Telephone Company, Penna. Gas and Water Co., J. J. Newman Lumber Co., U.S. Lumber Company and the Davidow Foundation.

"Get the busiest man for the toughest job" . . . that's

Frank Hemelright . . . our Honored Guest.

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH BY FRANK E. HEMELRIGHT UPON THE PRESENTATION OF THE B'NAI B'RITH AMERICANISM AWARD, FEBRUARY 26, 1967

Thank you, Ellis.

Members of the clergy, past recipients of the Americanism Award, Mayor Walsh, Mr. Shapp, members of B'nai B'rith, ladies and gentlemen, it is with the greatest pleasure and pride that I accept the B'nai B'rith Americanism Award. It is, of course, a special privilege to join the group of distinguished gentlemen who received the Award in prior years. I feel deeply honored and extremely grateful for the generous judgment that shaped the committee's decision.

I want you all to know that I accept the B'nai B'rith Americanism Award with the full realization of how very much any accomplishment credited to me depended on the help and cooperation of so many other people: The staff and the Directors at the Bank, the Chamber membership and staff, the United Fund staff, business colleagues and personal friends from all walks of life, the countless men and women who, year in and year out, perform their community responsibilities without fanfare or special acclaim—and, of course, a very special acknowledgment goes to my wife and family.

I want you to know, too, that to me the Americanism Award represents Brotherhood in the fullest sense—that ready exchange of personal respect which gives our society cohesion and strength. This is so not only for us, but more particularly for the young people who will succeed us. We rely on them to come to maturity with good, hard common sense. We ask them to understand Americanism in all of its implications.

It strikes me that this is a particularly propitious forum in which to air some of our mutual hopes and concerns. I think we can accept as demonstrable fact the progress achieved toward the industrial development and rehabilitation of northeastern Pennsylvania. Realistic self-appraisal, prudent planning, knowledgeable use of our financial and human resources and, above all, just plain hard work have been rewarded with notable results.

The disaster of wide-spread unemployment has been overcome. Our industrial complex is diversified. Non-manufacturing jobs are on the increase. Full employment beckons. Improvements in these basic economic factors nurture optimism for the near future.

Alright—are we ready to be rich? When everyone who wants a job can get one, what next? Where do we look then? Do we sit back and say the job is done? Or, do we keep working so that our children can stay here and prosper. Will we have the kind of area in which they will want to stay and to which others will want to come?

We've made a start. Studies are now in process and programs are now being implemented which will instruct us in the full meaning of our present economic structure—such matters as per capita income, the size and efficiency of our industrial units, the sufficiency of managerial talent, the need, if any, for manpower training and re-training, the role of tourism in our regional economy, the nature and sufficiency of capital investment. Let me emphasize that this is a long list of inter-related subjects all of which are receiving and must continue to receive our closest attention. It is not too much to say that these are key factors vitally important to our long term expectations.

Tonight I would like to suggest that we establish a clear and earnest dialogue between the public and private sectors which make up community life in northeastern Pennsylvania. Perhaps it would be clearer to say a re-energized dialogue, for, a great deal of this kind of discussion between private citizen and public official is already taking place. I venture to say, however, that some interchange of views will not suffice. The businessman, the industrialist, the merchant, the property owner, in fact every private citizen must be fully informed in public affairs—and from time to time guided by responsible public leadership. The public official needs and deserves broad support for those projects which make our communities better places in which to live. As we assess the total environment in which we live, what must we have to make our own future brighter and to make others eager to join us here in northeastern Pennsylvania?

A first rate educational system—from kindergarten through college. Adequate housing—and the enlightened zoning regulations that will protect and enhance it. An overall, detailed urban renewal program shaped and implemented by clear, consistent, continuing conversations between the private and public sectors of our communities. Waste disposal—including complete elimination of pollutions from our open waters and the air sheathe in which we live. Imagine the Lackawanna and Susquehanna rivers running clear and clean again, the way they did when the first settlers saw them.

We need green space and conservation measures that will preserve our watersheds, husband our forests and strike a balance between residential, industrial and farming areas.

Obviously, this list is not exhaustive. Nonetheless, these topics merit urgent consideration by representatives of the private and public sectors of our communities. In order to begin the necessary consultative process I suggest that our public officials immediately invite leaders of the private sector to meet with them, assess current position and evolve plans for action.

It will take the ingenuity and dedication of both public and private sectors to marshall and control our total environment. This is the effort it will take to permit us to practice the promise of what can be.

[From the Scranton Times, Jan. 20, 1967]

HONOR FOR HEMELRIGHT

There will be general agreement that the choice of Frank E. Hemelright as this year's recipient of the Americanism Award given each year by Amos Lodge 136, B'nai B'rith, to a local resident was a fitting one. The honor is designed for those whose work and dedication in behalf of the betterment of the community have been outstanding. Mr. Hemelright, we think, easily qualifies.

He has been president of the Scranton Chamber of Commerce and a director of LIFE and SLIBCo, the local agencies which have contributed so much to the industrial rehabilitation of the Scranton area. By appointment of Governor Scranton, Mr. Hemelright served as a member of the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority, which makes loans to community agencies to finance industrial plant construction. He has been associated with banking here for more than a third of a century and is now president of Northeastern Pennsylvania Bank & Trust Co. He will be the 15th recipient of the B'nai B'rith award and thus will become a member of a distinguished company. We congratulate him on this deserved honor.

[From the Scranton Tribune, Jan. 18, 1967]

An Excellent Selection

Another excellent selection has been made in designating Frank E. Hemelright for the 1967 Americans Award of Amos Lodge 136, B'nai B'rith.

Mr. Hemelright certainly meets the requirements for the award which goes to the individual who has helped to make the Scranton area a better place in which to live.

The lodge has a splendid method of determining the choice for the annual award. It leaves this to a committee comprising presidents of the local service organizations.

Mr. Hemelright long has been active in the community's business, industry, civic and welfare programs.

The energetic Scranton area booster received his start in his chosen banking profession as a clerk in 1932 and merited elevation to various higher posts, becoming president of the Northeastern Pennsylvania National Bank & Trust Co. in 1954.

His knowledge of business and banking has made him a valuable leader in the continuing expansion of industry in the area. He is currently serving as a trustee of the Lackawanna Industrial Fund Enterprises (LIFE) and a director of the Scranton-Lackawanna Building Co. (SLIBCO). He is also a member of the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority (PIDA); a director and vice president of the Pennsylvania Development Credit Corp. and a member of the 100,000 Pennsylvanians. All of these organizations and agencies have helped immeasurably in the area's success in its diversified industry programs.

Mr. Hemelright's leadership ability has also been recognized by the Scranton Chamber of Commerce of which he was elected president last April. He also serves on the national finance committee of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. He is currently serving as president of the Geisinger Medical Center board of directors.

The Scranton area is proud of Mr. Hemelright and is grateful for the part he is playing in its progress. He most certainly deserves being numbered among those selected over the years for the award to be presented to him next month.

MODERNIZING CONGRESSIONAL INFORMATION

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClory] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the membership's attention to an address given by Dr. George B. Galloway before the 10th Southern Assembly, Biloxi, Miss., January 28–31, 1965. Dr. Galloway's remarks, made prior to his retirement as Senior Specialist, American Government and Public Administration, Library of Congress, point out the value of automatic data processing—ADP—to the Congress.

We are all familiar with Dr. Galloway's distinguished service to the Congress, as well as his scholarship in the area of legislative reorganization and procedure. I am particularly pleased to have been associated with Dr. Galloway during his service as Permanent Executive Secretary to the Interparliamentary Union. I believe his brief discussion of "Modernizing Congressional Information" further marks him as a man of vast foresight in the field of congressional reform and reorganization.

The following remarks of Dr. Galloway relate specifically to the use of an ADP facility by the Congress—as proposed in a bill, H.R. 21, which 12 of my colleagues and I have introduced:

Modernizing Congressional Information

Modern electronics have enabled industry and the military establishment, and some parts of the Executive Branch of the Government, to store and retrieve knowledge and to automate their activities through the use of computers. For example, the Internal Revenue Service is now using computers to check the accuracy of income tax returns. But Congress is still operating with the simpler tools of the pre-automation age.

The question may be raised: Can Congress, faced with an increasingly onerous and technical workload of complicated problems, make use of modern technology to modernize and manipulate the information it needs for sound decision-making?

I suggest that Congress could use computers in the following ways:

1. To expedite the review of the Executive Budget and the legislative phase of the budget process.
2. To schedule committee meetings and hearings.
3. To provide the leadership of the legislature with a current picture of the status of all pending legislation—the equivalent of a national or military command center.
4. To save time on quorum calls and floor voting by an electric voting system.
5. To keep track of the payroll accounts of employees of Congress, and
6. To maintain an up-to-date telephone directory for the Legislative Establishment.

In addition, it has been suggested that such equipment could be used to catalog and index congressional documents, to store information on Federal contract awards (by subject, by contract recipient, by congressional district), to inventory research and development facilities and manpower, trends in Federal budgeting to show rates of growth of program components together with data on original enabling authority and points of decision-making when funding levels were either increased or decreased.

ANCHORAGE GIRL WINS STATE VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. Pollock] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, each year students across the country compete in the Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The contest theme this year is "Democracy: What It Means to Me." The winning contestant in the State of Alaska is Miss Ruth Elizabeth Avery of Anchorage. The speech is in the form of three letters from a 30th century man and is inserted in the Record at this point:

Voice of Democracy

The following is the private correspondence of Dekreon, the great teacher, written in the thirtieth century, when he was a youth:

"December 6, 2966.

"Dear Zamon: I apologize for not communicating in so long, but I have a most worthy excuse. It is my interest in prehistoric government again. I trust you will not reveal that I am investigating the Unmentionable Times.

"I have stumbled on an amazing type of government with the quaint name of 'democracy'. Seeking relaxation from my studies, I had twisted the dial of our secret time machine at random and suddenly I was on a street corner in the prehistoric twentieth century. A line of people led into a nearby building and I walked over to investigate. It was an election, but not the ordinary kind. The candidates chosen would actually rule the people. I cannot understand how the leaders of the country could allow a situation like this. Free to vote as they wished, the common citizens held all the cards. The political leaders bowed to the demands of ordinary men and women or were not reelected. The astonishing fact is that every adult citizen was allowed to vote. The truck drivers, the housewives, the merchants, the youth, all had a voice in their government. Imagine the chaos this power in the hands of the rank and file citizens must have caused.

"I am preparing for a second journey to this amazing era. Remember, no one must hear of this. Will communicate again soon.

"(Signed) Dekreon."

"December 27, 1966.

"Dear Zamon: I must communicate my thoughts. I am full of rebellion and strange longings. You won't believe my story, but listen anyway.

"I have been to the students' quarters where young people like us were engaged in a heated discussion. One rash youth leaped up shouting, 'Down with the administration. We need a change of power.' Horrified, I waited for a guard to take him away, but no one seemed disturbed; the students fell to arguing among themselves.

"For several days I watched students as young as you and I. They participated in debates about government policies. They read their newspapers. They campaigned fiercely for political candidates, organized meetings and gave speeches. They accepted the responsibilities that came with the privileges of their government. These students made the government their business.

"Think of that. We have been taught that men who dare to question their government are traitors. Yet these students criticized because they were genuinely concerned with the fate of the country. I do not understand how a country governed by millions of individuals with millions of ideas could exist. Wouldn't every man be tempted to seize power? Can you imagine the freedom of having an opinion and being not fearful, but proud to voice it?

"What wonderful, terrible thoughts!

"(Signed) Dekreon."

"July 2, 2967.

"Dear Zamon: I am still alive my friend. I have been in seclusion. I did not dare to communicate even with you for fear someone might discover my criminal thoughts.

"Oh, what I have seen in this year! I witnessed a trial where a man was considered innocent until proven guilty. I visited the great city where laws were made and heard public debates between the leaders.

"I have seen a document these people regarded as the supreme law of the land. This country gloried in its government of all the people, by all the people, for all the people. This manuscript, called the Constitution, obeyed and respected by every man, woman and child, was the foundation of their freedom.

"I saw citizens at attention, saluting their flag. Their hearts were one, united in a common loyalty to this magnificent cause, a cause honored not out of duty, but out of pride, a flag saluted not in fear, but as a symbol of hard-won personal liberty.

"Zamon, I have made a decision. I am going to devote my life to bringing freedom to our century. I will speak for the liberty of all men. I will speak for Democracy."

GASLINE SAFETY NOW

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to report that 1967's first death from a gasline explosion disaster took place in my district this past weekend. Mrs. Caroline Zelenka perished as a result of the explosion and fire that rocked the suburban community of Hastings-on-Hudson, N.Y., when a leaky gas main belonging to the Con Edison Co. of New York blew up suddenly on Saturday night.

The explosion instantly leveled two homes and the fire that followed it destroyed five buildings, injuring 15 and leaving 35 families homeless. It appears that only the heroic action of the police and firemen in evacuating the area prevented an even greater disaster.

The tragedy in Hastings represents the first death in 1967, but it does not represent the first major gasline explosion. In the past 2 months there have been major explosions in Jamaica, N.Y. and Milwaukee, Wis. Only heroic action and nearly miraculous coincidence prevented each of these from being major national disasters.

In Milwaukee, an entire church and school were totally destroyed only moments after 250 persons, including many children, were evacuated.

In Jamaica, an entire city block was engulfed in flames and 19 families were left homeless. Again, only the merest chance alerted police to evacuate the area; only heroic action by individual policemen got the residents of the area out before their neighborhood became a raging inferno.

Mr. Speaker, providence alone has protected us from a major disaster three times in the past 2 months. How much longer are we prepared to rely on providence? If the destruction of hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of property has not been enough to bestir us to action, let the loss of life do it now. Mrs. Zelenka is not the first to die in a needless accident. She is the first to die in this year. The sad fact is that although we do not know the total, hundreds of our citizens have been killed before.

One of the most important roles of Government, if not the most important, is protecting the life, limb, and property of its citizens. It is time we met our responsibilities in this most vital area of the public's interest—natural gas pipelines.

More than three quarters of a million miles of natural gas pipeline serves 38 million American homes today. If it were safe, we know it would be an efficient method of transportation, and, there is no reason why it cannot be extremely safe.

President Johnson, in his message on the consumer, proposed natural gas pipeline safety legislation. If this legislation, when it is finally drafted imposes effective Federal safety standards on gas pipelines, I will sponsor it and fight for passage.

It is inevitable that more tragedy will occur before uniform safety standards are established. It will occur because much of the pipeline now in the ground is old or obsolete. Some natural gas pipeline was first buried in 1886. More than 50,000 miles of interstate transmission lines were in the ground prior to 1931.

The Con Edison line that exploded in Hastings was built in 1916, more than 50 years ago. Even the most generous estimate of the safe useful life of such line could not be stretched to 50 years.

The gas industry has grown at a fantastic rate since that time. In terms of investment, natural gas is the 6th largest industry in America. Yet its safety standards are insignificant in some areas and nonexistent in others. The guide and standard for most of the industry's safety effort is the code of the American Standards Association for pressure piping. But it is a voluntary code. It is enforceable in only 25 States which have passed laws requiring either compliance with the code or imposing more stringent requirements. It does not apply to pipeline already in the ground.

This is extremely significant when you consider that pipeline age is a major contributor to several types of pipeline breaks. Corrosion causes deterioration of the pipes. Older pipes cannot stand the higher pressures required to meet today's consumer demands. Antiquated construction processes, such as pipeline bending, are still evident.

But more importantly, new advances in technology have not been applied to existing lines. Better coatings, cathodic protection, and radiographic inspection of welds are new industrial techniques that have not been retroactively applied.

If we are to see these advances properly utilized, they must be implemented now. The first builders of interstate transmission lines wisely placed them in remote rural areas wherever possible. Unprecedented national growth, however, has populated these rights-of-way with surburban communities, shopping centers, and sprawling industrial complexes. This problem is even more pronounced in our cities where distribution lines run under streets, homes, and office buildings. In short, pipeline deficiencies in these areas must be rectified immediately.

There are now approximately 1,000 municipally owned gas distribution systems throughout the Nation. Only a handful are subject to any regulation by State commissions. Ironically, these lines offer the greatest danger. The population is denser around them. There are more joints, mains, and welds to be inspected and repaired.

The need for Federal regulation is underscored by the slipshod procedures that resulted in the Hastings disaster.

First, contrary to the most obvious safety precautions, a sewer line was permitted to be constructed right across this 50-year-old gasline of the Con Edison Co. just at the point where the line exploded. Whether the weight of this sewer line, and the concrete blocks used to support it, actually caused the leak, has not yet been established. But there can be no question that such construction is ill advised and potentially a danger to the public.

Second, this line is already very old by any reasonable standard, but village records indicate that it has been more than 7 years since any Con Edison crews dug in this area and there is no evidence that the line was inspected or repaired at that time. We now have no way of assuring the kind of regular inspection that is needed.

Most important of all is the obvious inadequacy of present inspection procedures carried out by the industry.

Residents of the area of Hastings in which the line exploded, have been complaining of a strong gas smell for some time now. Finally, 2 weeks ago inspectors came out to check on it. If any action was taken, it was obviously insufficient to prevent the explosion on Saturday.

Certainly these incredible lapses in concern over public safety demand Federal action.

There simply is no reason why the American public should not have the most efficient and safe gas system possible. There is no reason why Government and industry should not share a concern for the public welfare. The implementation of Federal safety standards, properly enforced, could have prevented Mrs. Zelenka's death.

Mr. Speaker, as my memorial to the senseless death of my constituent and the suffering of her neighbors and to prevent the necessity for future such memorials, I will press to see strong and effective legislation enacted. I urge all of my colleagues whose constituents and friends may now be in peril, to join me.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM—XXV—THE NEGRO AND THE DRAFT

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the lowering of the physical and mental standards further aggravates the disproportionate share of draft calls filled by Negroes. For example, when lower standards went into effect in April 1966, there was a greater percentage of nonwhites drafted in each of the five recruiting areas than previously had been the case:

	July 1965–March 1966		April–May 1966	
	Total inductees	Percent nonwhite	Total inductees	Percent nonwhite
1st area (Northeast States)	96,821	10.3	20,296	13.7
3rd area (Southeast States)	34,904	25.1	7,672	30.4
4th area (Southwest States)	21,254	20.5	4,838	26.2
5th area (upper Midwest States)	69,544	7.2	15,719	10.1
6th area (Western States)	34,361	8.0	10,165	9.1
Total	256,884	12.0	58,690	15.2

For several days I have been presenting statistics regarding the Negro and the draft. I did not cite these figures to charge discrimination to individual local selective service board members. What these figures do impute, however, is that the draft, as constituted, discriminates against the Negro institutionally.

It is evident that the Nation's draft laws perpetuate the discrimination resulting from the economic and educational disadvantages the Negroes face. Their restricted economic and educational opportunities reduce their access to draft deferments, and this results in the Negro who is qualified for induction, standing twice as great a chance of being drafted as does the white who likewise is qualified for military service.

There are other ways in which the Selective Service System functions to institutionalize racial discrimination. For example, members of the local draft boards are automatically appointed by the National Selective Service Director on the recommendation of the State Governor. Where several State Governors are well-known segregationists, there is no guarantee that their local broad appointees do not also harbor racial prejudices. Last year, in Mississippi, a young Negro, who has been an epileptic all his life and had been classified 4-F, became president of his local NAACP chapter. He was promptly reclassified 1-A and drafted, despite letters from two physicians citing his condition. While in basic training, he had three seizures but fortunately, through the efforts of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, he was finally discharged.

No effort is made to assure that the composition of draft boards reflect the racial makeup of the draft-age population of the area covered. The same Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law has filed a suit in Jackson, Miss., that asks a three-judge Federal court to stop the military draft of all Negroes in Mississippi until their race is represented on the draft boards there. Said the suit:

> It is apparent that members of all local boards and appeal boards . . . have been nominated and appointed through a process by which Negroes have been purposely and systematically excluded.

Mr. Speaker, to eliminate this racial disparity, it will be necessary to reform the draft law with regard to local boards and deferments to make the draft more equitable in its application to the Negro.

REPRESENTATIVE JOE L. EVINS—A GUARDIAN OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Representative JOE L. EVINS, chairman of the House Small Business Committee, has once again acted in the public interest by his action in announcing the investigation of the proposed merger of the American Broadcasting Co. and the International Telephone & Telegraph Co. As pointed out in a recent editorial in the Nashville Tennessean:

> Congressman Evins should push a thorough investigation of the FCC's decision in this complicated case and determine whether the public interest is being served.

Under unanimous consent I include the full text of this editorial at the conclusion of my remarks.

Chairman EVINS has assigned the task of conducting this investigation to one of the Small Business Subcommittees for the purpose of determining whether the proposed merger and the actions of the Federal Communications Commission with respect to it have been in the public interest. As chairman of the subcommittee which has received this assignment, I believe that Chairman EVINS' action is calculated to insure that the public interest, and particularly that of small businessmen, is being fully protected.

Chaiman EVINS has built a solid reputation as a stanch guardian of the Nation's small businessmen and an effective spokesman for the full preservation of equality of opportunity to compete. Under his leadership the House Small Business Committee is currently investigating small business problems in a large number of fields including taxation, antitrust and trade regulation, small business problems in small towns, transportation, communications, the administration of a number of Federal programs, and the need to simplify Federal reporting requirements.

The editorial referred to follows:

CAREFUL WATCH BY MR. EVINS

> Congressman Joe L. Evins of Smithville, chairman of the House Small Business Committee, has announced appointment of a subcommittee to investigate the merger of the American Broadcasting Co. and the International Telephone & Telegraph Co. Mr. Evins also announced that five other subcommittees will investigate problems affecting small businesses.
>
> The ABC-IT&T merger has been approved tentatively by the Federal Communications Commission. The FCC's action caused some adverse reaction in Congress, and the FCC was asked by the Justice Department to withhold its final approval until March 8.
>
> The subcommittee's investigation may not have any direct bearing on the effective date of the merger. But Congressman Evins should push a thorough investigation of the FCC's decision in this complicated case and determine whether the public interest is being served.
>
> Small business matters to be investigated by the committees include freight rate discrimination, inequities in tax policies, the problems of business in small towns and numerous others. All the subjects are of vital concern to the small businessman and deserve careful attention by Congress.

REORGANIZATION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on the National Capital is clear and to the point.

Today, while we are concerned with large questions of war and peace, and with plans for the transformation of our Nation's cities, we often lose sight of the fact that the Congress of the United States has a very special legal and moral responsibility to the District of Columbia—a responsibility we have not always adequately fulfilled.

One major element in the President's message demands our particular attention—that is his proposal to reorganize completely the commission form of District government, and replace it with clearly defined executive-legislative form of government.

Such a new structure of District government would be more responsive to the needs of a modern metropolis of over 800,000 inhabitants—the ninth largest city in the country—and would yield countless benefits to the people and in the District's relationship with the Congress.

I would recall that the commission form of government which now exists in the Nation's Capital was originally adopted almost 100 years ago, and many of the problems it was then intended to solve have been bypassed by history.

A quick survey of local government in the United States shows that most of those cities which had once adopted commission government as a reform effort designed to curb one-man rule, have now discarded commissions for other forms of government.

What the District of Columbia needs today is a government which can respond to change quickly; a government in which responsibility can be fixed between an executive and a legislative arm; a government in which administrative powers are clearly defined, and where efficiency as well as new ideas will become a hallmark of administration.

As I understand the President's message, it is his clear intention to submit a reorganization plan modeled after a mayor-city council form of local government. In the District's case there would be a single Commissioner who would serve as executive officer. There would also be a council vested with legislative functions.

In my opinion, this is a responsible and logical way to begin placing the District on the modern footing it needs to begin its civic self-transformation—and I commend the President for it, and will fully support his plan.

In addition, I would point out, as the President himself does, that the reorganization of District government is not the sole solution to its social, economic, and political problems.

Critically related to any reorganization plan are the President's proposals for home rule, representation in the Congress, and the appropriation by Congress of new funds for a variety of District education, economic, social, administrative, and law enforcement programs.

These are, in truth, an interrelated package of elements, every one of which is essential for the future of our Nation's Capital.

Reorganization of local government without having the right to choose your local government representatives is only a partial answer.

Reorganization of local government without the financial resources to carry out new educational, social, and economic programs is less than meaningful.

Reorganization without an effective voice in the Congress of the United States is a limited victory in the great war the District can and will wage against crime, congestion, and decay.

The President has asked for all these elements in his message. I believe the Congress should adopt the President's reorganization plan when it is submitted.

We must also adopt the other proposals which, together, will draw a clear line into a bright future for the Nation's Capital—the capital, indeed, of the world today.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1967

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Helstoski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

STATE JURIES

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the Congress has enacted a number of far-reaching bills dealing with the great domestic issue of our time—the need to finally reconcile the Negro and white communities in this Nation after three and a half centuries of discord. But, as has always been true throughout our history, more remains to be done. For the first time in our long and troubled experience there is every reason to expect that the promise of equality set down in the Declaration of Independence may in fact be carried out. It behooves us, then, not to rest until we have in fact established equality of the races as the guiding principle of our public life.

The proposed Civil Rights Act of 1967 is a constructive step toward resolution of serious national problems. I will address my brief remarks today to title II of the bill which provides for elimination of discrimination in State juries.

I can think of nothing more fundamental to our legal system than the right to have an impartial trial of the facts in every criminal and civil case. This basic idea is traceable in Anglo-American legal history as far back as Magna Carta, through the English Bill of Rights of 1689, and article III and the sixth and seventh amendments of our own Constitution.

Congress began to face the problem of the place of the Negro in the American judicial system in the Civil Rights Act of April 9, 1866, which provided for equal treatment in all courts for the newly emancipated slaves, as, of course, does the 14th amendment. But it was not until 1875 that an act of Congress in terms outlawed discrimination in jury selection in both State and Federal courts. Acting to implement the 14th amendment, it enacted what is now section 243 of title 18, United States Code, which provides that:

> No citizen possessing all other qualifications which are or may be prescribed by law shall be disqualified for service as grand or petit jurors in any court of the United States, or of any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

The commands of the Constitution and the statutes, however, have not always been obeyed in all of our courts. In the last century there have been scores of court decisions dealing with jury discrimination, including at least 35 decisions on the merits by the Supreme Court of the United States alone. In recent years there have been judicial findings of discrimination in Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, and North Carolina.

The bill is designed to eliminate all forms of invidious discrimination in the selection of jurors in the State courts. Unlike that part of the bill which lays down detailed procedures for jury selection in the Federal courts, the provisions relating to State courts do not prescribe any particular procedure to be followed in selecting jurors. Generally, the States could continue to use most present selection procedures unless and until it is judicially determined that such procedures operate in a discriminatory way.

The act prohibits discrimination in State jury selection on account of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, or economic status. It authorizes the Attorney General to enforce the prohibition on discrimination by injunction proceedings against State jury officials. It also provides a discovery mechanism to facilitate determinations of whether unlawful discrimination has occurred in the jury selection process.

Since 1957 the Congress has enacted civil rights legislation on four separate occasions. The enforcement clause of the 14th amendment which empowers the Congress to enact appropriate legislation to insure that no person is denied the equal protection of the laws is not only a grant of power. In my view, it is a grant of responsibility. The State jury provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1967 meet this responsibility. I strongly urge their enactment, and the enactment of the entire bill.

STEPHEN AND AUDREY CURRIER

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Scheuer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, it has been more than a month since Stephen and Audrey Currier disappeared in the Caribbean. Their lives were private. Their lives were quiet. But in their silence the Curriers moved with strength to right wrongs and to seek social justice and equality. They were young people in their early thirties—and their careers were just beginning. In their passing, the Nation has sustained a great loss.

An article entitled "The Currier's Work" was published in the February 4 edition of the Economist. I wish to insert it in the Record so that more people will become aware of the great debt we owe Mr. and Mrs. Currier:

THE CURRIERS' WORK

Washington, D.C.—The part played by Stephen Currier and his wife Audrey in supporting activities for Negro betterment was little known in their lifetime outside a smallish circle. They disappeared on January 18th on a short Caribbean flight. Mr. Currier had begun to shed his anonymity in recent months. With the launching last year of Urban America, Inc., he even let his picture appear on a brochure, accompanying a statement over his signature as president. His wife, a painfully shy young woman, remained as invisible as ever. The money that flowed from them into the causes that they had at heart was Mrs. Currier's; as granddaughter of the late Andrew Mellon she was heiress to a huge fortune. (She was also the daughter of the American Ambassador in London, Mr. David Bruce.) The two were anything but "socialites" and there was too much money to spend even had their tastes lain that way. Mr. Currier created and supervised the arrangements for giving it away usefully.

This was no sinecure, at least in the way he interpreted his duty. His method of giving money was at once imaginative and remorselessly painstaking. As the main instrument he set up the Taconic Foundation, deliberately giving it a name that denoted nothing. This channelled funds to institutions (notably the Potomac Institute and Urban America) set up to do jobs that he and his friends believed necessary. Its grants to civil rights groups were a main source of the money that financed the drive to register Negro voters conducted by the Southern Regional Council. Apart from the foundation, he and his wife made anonymous benefactions for a host of purposes. They maintained a regular system of scholarships for promising students whose attainments fell just short of scholarship class. After the Alabama violence in 1963, Mr. Currier whipped up from among various wealthy people a fund of $1.5 million which was apportioned among the civil rights organisations and helped to hearten them when they needed it badly. Not much was said at the time about how this was done and less about who did it.

A solid part of the intellectual work of the civil rights movement is being done by the Potomac Institute, set up in 1961 with Mr. Currier as president, Mr. Harold Fleming as chief executive and supported mainly by grants from the Taconic Foundation. One side of the institute's work is the simple explaining and popularising of aspects of the civil rights laws. But it also does original work to push out the frontiers, like the searching pamphlet, "The Federal Role in Equal Housing Opportunity," which, in a sober and thoughtful way, expounded the case for a far more dynamic approach by the Administration to the task of ending racial discrimination in housing. Both in bringing liberal opinion to bear on the Administration, and in helping to get the Administration's aims understood and accepted in the country, the Potomac Institute has made itself very valuable.

The presumed deaths of Mr. and Mrs. Currier leave it uncertain how all the activities which they supported will fare. Enough seems to have been left to the Taconic Foundation to maintain, out of income, the grants to the Potomac Institute and Urban America. But other good causes may suffer. It may turn out, however, that Mr. Currier's work is harder to replace than the money.

OPEN HOUSING

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, during the last session of Congress I stood with the administration in its fight to end discrimination in housing. Last year the battle for open housing was lost. But with President Johnson's message on civil rights it has been joined again; and again I join with it. The field of battle is said to be housing; perhaps that is so. But the war is not for open housing, it is for open minds.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues, all of whom I trust have open minds, the following commentaries on President Johnson's message on civil rights by the ex-mayor of New York, the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, and by the Bronx Borough president, the Honorable Herman Badillo:

MESSAGE ON PRESIDENT'S CIVIL RIGHTS PROPOSALS, BY HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER, ALL AMERICANS COUNCIL, FEBRUARY 14, 1967

President Johnson's message dramatizes the gravity of the problems and lays out new ways in which progress can be made toward their solution.

The President's message today, as did his Lincoln Day address, reminds us that we must deal effectively with forces which threaten to tear apart the fabric of our national society. It is not enough to say that discrimination, prejudice, and racial strife have always been with us and therefore must always remain. The fact is that racial strife, prejudice, and discrimination are not found in all men, but only in some. Clearly, it is a source of weakness and danger to the nation.

We of the All Americans Council, representing more than 37 million Americans, have always striven to be in the forefront of the fight against discrimination. We, the minorities who together make up the majority of Americans, and whose voices, blended in harmony, are the true voice of America, have always spoken in opposition to prejudice, intolerance and hate.

Thus, it is only fitting that we call upon all right-thinking, responsible Americans, both within the All Americans Council and without, to join in supporting President Lyndon B. Johnson and his progressive and realistic program to eradicate the stain of "man's ancient curse and present shame."

A STATEMENT BY BRONX BOROUGH PRESIDENT HERMAN BADILLO ON PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S CIVIL RIGHTS PROPOSALS

I am delighted at the action of President Johnson in urging Congress to pass Open Housing Legislation. The passage of the Civil Rights Act under President Johnson's leadership in 1964 and 1965 were landmarks in the fight to give equal rights to all people, but a significant area of concern remained and that is the problem of open housing.

President Johnson is now moving forcefully to insure that housing bias is ended by 1969 and that all Americans will have the opportunity to buy or rent houses and apartments without regard to their color, religion or ethnic origin. The attack on housing bias is one of the most important fights we will have before us because, in my judgment, housing is the means by which we can strike at the hard core of the problem of racial discrimination. If the President is successful in winning this battle, I believe he will have come up with the key to solving our racial and ethnic problems in the next decade.

I intend to support the President's efforts and to urge all, who are concerned with Civil Rights, to lend their support to President Johnson's efforts.

TEACHER CORPS

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, legislation concerning the Teacher Corps will soon be coming before the Congress for consideration.

This body will have an opportunity to renew authority and to legislate funds to continue the great work being done by this program.

Examples of the Teacher Corps in action are cited in a story published in the New York Times on February 12, 1967, by education editor, Fred M. Hechinger. The story, entitled "Education: Uphill Fight for Teacher Corps," tells of the corps' continuing battle for funds and of its role in working with underprivileged children.

I believe it will be of interest to my colleagues.

EDUCATION: UPHILL FIGHT FOR TEACHER CORPS

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

"The Teacher Corps has brought a much-needed infusion of genuine commitment and imaginative talent to the schools of New York City. I would count it a serious setback to the cause of quality education . . . if the Teacher Corps were not to be allowed to continue and expand its work in New York and across the country."

So wrote New York's Mayor John V. Lindsay last month in a letter to John W. Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. Apparently, Mr. Lindsay's praise of the National Teacher Corps is shared by observers across the country. But shared, too, is his uneasiness about the experiment's future.

Ever since President Johnson in 1965 proposed the creation of a substantial force of idealistic young men and women who would, Peace Corps style, spend two years supplementing the teaching staffs of rural and urban slum schools, the idea has been widely hailed as a way of harnessing youthful commitment. At a time when the slum schools suffer most from the teacher shortage, the prospect of getting enthusiastic and expertly supervised interns, fresh out of college, seemed like a promise of rain during a drought.

Since the young teachers in addition would be attached to universities for professional training, it was reasonable to hope that many of them would be lured into teaching as a career—perhaps even specialized teaching in slums.

Although rarely had so much been promised for so little money, Congress has treated the National Teacher Corps as a legislative stepchild.

The reason for this coolness was never totally clear.

In part, it may have been the result of an almost pathological fear of Federal control of education, even though the Corps teachers are under the control of local school districts.

In part, too, conservative spokesmen for the education establishment, especially in its teacher training segment, may have infected some members of Congress with lack of enthusiasm for a scheme that placed premium on innovation rather than the status quo.

In part, the politically conservative sections of the country may fear Corps teachers as "outside agitators."

In part, finally, Congress may have used this fiscally relatively minor program as a means of getting back at the President for having his way with so many other proposals.

The plan called for 4,000 teachers during the current school year, but the program was put through successive wringers until only 1,227—262 veteran "master" teachers and 965 Corpsmen—could be put in the field. New York City, which hoped for several hundred, has only 93 corpsmen in 16 of its 860 schools.

Even more serious was the fact that the last Congress gave the N.T.C. only $7.5-million, just enough to see it through the current academic year. Since each contract is supposed to be for a two-year period, these young men and women are in the dark about whether they can continue their work next September. Meanwhile, they are under pressure to sign up for jobs or more graduate work.

Many of those entering the corps for the two-year service period are college graduates who want to serve the community before going on to other careers.

President Johnson last month said that he would propose legislation to "extend and enlarge the Teacher Corps." Secretary Gardner added that H.E.W. has requested $12.5-million in supplemental appropriations for 1967 and $36-million for the program in 1967–68. This would permit a total of 3,700 corpsmen in September and a subsequent increase to a total of almost 6,000.

Unless recruiting can begin almost immediately for the next school year and contracts with some 50 universities for pre-service summer training can be let soon, the N.T.C. is likely to expire just as laudatory reports on the initial round are coming in.

"It is a little program that is making a big difference in our system," said John W. Ambrose, Acting Superintendent of the Lexington, Ky., schools.

A school official in Pontiac, Mich., called it one of the most useful innovations sponsored by Washington.

Perhaps the most important testimony about the program's potential, however, comes from young corps members themselves. A group of young women, serving in slum schools in New York agreed last week that they are "reaching" many of the youngsters mainly because they have the time and opportunity to work with small groups, a luxury most regular teachers cannot afford.

Ann Schrand, a veteran of the Peace Corps in Colombia who is now an N.T.C. member in Junior High School 45 at 120th St. and First Ave., said: "This is like going into another country, too."

Wilease Fields, a young Negro corps member from Maryland, now attached to Public School 19 in Corona, Queens, said her team was offering physical education, which previously had not been provided at all, and art and science, of which there had been too little.

"We can spend a lot of time on research and preparation which the regular teachers simply can't," she added.

As many of the young people tell of their experiences, an even more important aspect of the program becomes clear. Speaking confidentially, they tell about how they had to persuade the regular teachers and school administrators "diplomatically" not to treat them as ordinary student teachers, who are often used mainly to observe and clean the blackboards. They talk about the resistance to such unconventional approaches as home visits. They express disappointment about the conservatism of existing teacher training.

While the universities' special summer programs were given high marks, the overly theoretical courses in the regular education departments during the school year frequently seemed irrelevant.

"I feel the universities have copped out and are taking only a token interest," one corps member said, and others agreed.

Such criticism underlies the potential value of the N.T.C. It could force a re-thinking of the existing teacher training procedures. It raises questions about the traditional ways of student teaching and about the need to switch boldly to a system of true internship and on-the-job training. It might make possible new patterns of liaison with the community and with the homes of deprived children. Neither the standard professional concepts nor the economics of routine school staffing has permitted such patterns to evolve.

This should not imply that the corps is magic that will solve the problems of the slums. Despite their enthusiasm, these young recruits quickly admitted that the problems of poverty, of fatherless homes and of omnipresent groups of disruptive and unresponsive children, who should not be in regular schools, cannot be solved by the schools alone.

They sympathize with the regular school staff and admire its competent members. But they also recognize more clearly—perhaps because they are not part of the establishment—the flaws of defensiveness and insecurity of too many school people.

"The good teachers leave first when a principal fails to respond to the real problems, just to avoid trouble with his superiors," said one young corps member.

"You're really in the trenches," said one young woman, not to complain, but to tell why she valued the experience. It is ironic that in the face of widespread criticism of the lack of commitment among today's young people, it remains far from certain whether Congress will keep and reinforce the Teacher Corps in its domestic trenches.

MAX BLUSTEIN

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, Max Blustein, a 76-year-old New Yorker forced into retirement by heart trouble 12 years ago, knows the war on poverty is not being lost. That is because he is helping to win it. Max Blustein, who was born in Russia and got his high school diploma at the age of 69 from P.S. 139, is working five afternoons a week as a foster grandfather to a little boy named Joseph in New York's Foundling Hospital. And Max Blustein is the subject of an excellent report on the foster grandparents program by Edward Sullivan, which appeared in the December edition of the Sign, a national Catholic magazine.

Mr. Speaker, the foster grandparents program is another achievement of community action in the war on poverty. And with the support of Congress its tremendous promise can continue to grow. As Mr. Sullivan says:

> The Office of Economic Opportunity hopes the grandparents' project "will demonstrate that low-income senior Americans can be a major new resource of responsible workers for communities and social agencies." They are already being used to assist foster mothers (San Francisco), help teachers (Fort Lauderdale, Florida), penetrate language barriers (San Antonio, Texas), bring Operation Head Start preschooling into the homes of disturbed children (Charleston, South Carolina) and teach youngsters failing between foster homes about adult relationships (Akron, Ohio).

Mr. Speaker, like hundreds of other foster grandparents in 35 communities across the country, Max Blustein has enlisted in the war on poverty at $1.25 an hour, and he is claiming victory. In a letter to President Johnson, Max Blustein called foster grandparents "the best idea you ever had."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have Mr. Sullivan's fine article entitled "Brighter Life at Both Ends," included at this point in the RECORD.

BRIGHTER LIFE AT BOTH ENDS

(By Edward Sullivan)

Don't get the idea that Max Blustein is an old codger. At seventy-six, he still lets off more warmth and light than, say, any twelve sloe-eyed teen-agers raised on television and pizza. The trouble is that when pious allusion is made to senior citizens, it still evokes an image of shabby, checker-playing, tobacco-spilling old gaffers or doddering old ladies. But as science and improved sanitation have extended life, they have also extended vitality, and Grandpa Max, for one, is drawing the extra dividends. "Don't feel sorry for me," Max keeps saying. "I'm not lonely. I am happily married to the best wife in the world. I've got friends, and I enjoy myself—except, well, most of the time, anyway."

He means he likes to feel, well, *useful*. As long as the tobacco-spilling image continues to libel twenty million Americans, they are going to be sequestered in third-rate jobs, Golden Age Clubs, out of harm's way, out of sight. It's a waste. In energy alone, they signify more available man-days than were needed to win World War II. What's more, here are twenty million people who have already proved the answers to simple questions that baffle most of us every living day. And they are predictable. They are no longer on the make.

Take Max. Washed out of the New York laundry business in 1955 by a heart attack, he flapped around on the beach for a while but then swam off in new directions.

First, he thought about his wife. (He's still in love.) "If I'm retired, she should be, too. So I share her housework. It's only fair, right?"

Then he went to school, for the first time in his life. There were no schools for poor lads like him in Russia, where he was born. At sixty-nine, he received his diploma from P.S. 139.

Then he tried the Golden Age Clubs around Rego Park, where he lives. "They're a very good thing, really. I like to make friends."

And there's his own family—five grandchildren. As a grandfather, he never thought he'd turn professional, but there's enough of Max to spill over.

One day he saw something in the paper about President Johnson's "foster grandparents program." That's all it said. Max wanted to know more. He believes in going to the top. He wrote to President Johnson.

The White House promptly replied: The President appreciates your interest and suggests you contact Catholic Charities, New York, et cetera. Nowdays, five afternoons a week, Max is "Grandpa" to Joseph, a handsome, two-year-old boy, currently resident in the New York Foundling Hospital, which is not really a hospital but a child shelter. Like 77,000 other institutionalized American children, Joseph needs extra visitors, extra attention, extra T.L.C. The Great Society is now subsidizing it, at $1.25 an hour.

With chubby little fist in hand, Max is today exploring parks, riding buses, picnicking, visiting stores and museums, playing games, bird-watching, spinning yarns, destroying ice cream sundaes, answering Joseph's first million questions—and getting paid for it. A dollar and a quarter doesn't sound like much, but think of the fringe benefits: to plant ever-blooming perennials in the garden of childhood, the glad-to-be-alive feeling of being useful again, and enough laughter per week to make an old man's eyes water.

More about Max later, but suffice it for now that foster grandparents are not lonely, old fogies necessarily reaching out for children from their own insufficiency, nor are foster grandchildren wallowing in neglect. It's a free exchange of gifts. It is being introduced in those institutions where alert staffs are doing everything they can in the human dimension and want to do more. They need help.

Max Blustein is one of thousands of senior Americans—not necessarily grandparents themselves—mustered for foster-grandparent duty in the War on Poverty. There are many kinds of poverty. There is the poverty of the disconnected child—not visited enough, innocent of the outside world in the important learning years, some days so aching to belong to someone that it hurts. There is also the poverty of old age in a youth-oriented society—families grown away, declining health, loneliness, really material poverty as savings and social-security checks are watered down with the ever-shrinking dollar. Most of all, there's the by-passed vacated feeling of not being a useful part of the world you helped make. Yet, both the very young and the very old have a need to, well, *function* in their respective roles. The foster-grandparents scheme helps them interact upon each other. Wrote Grandpa Max in a follow-up letter to the President: "It's the best idea you ever had."

They are not nurses' aides or baby-sitters. They are full-fledged grandparents. What's that? Well, a grandparent is the kind of parent that always has time for a child, reacts with equanimity, confidently answers any question, and introduces the very young to qualities like wonderment, silence, and wisdom. That's why they're called grand.

In the postwar fragmentation of family patterns in favor of the small connubial unit, millions of American youngsters are growing up without any domestic experience of fully bloomed maturity. Sixty youngsters at New York Foundling, and thousands elsewhere, are luckier than legions of suburban kids: they are guaranteed pre-selected, Grade A grandparents—who actually chose to be their grandparents.

"I asked for a ball-player," says Kurt Scheunert, a waiter in the better New York restaurants twenty-seven years, before he retired. "Of course, Carl wasn't much of a ball-player at two-and-a-half, but," he winked, "now, at three, he's beginning to bat and throw a little."

Carl is also learning table manners, self-reliance, mutual trust, and friendship. Kurt Scheunert, passing seventy, married and with no grandchildren, lives in an upper East Side settlement reserved to seniors. Every afternoon, he swings off the Second Avenue bus for grandpa duty at Foundling with a new spring in his step. "I feel like I'm getting healthier every day."

Said a foster-granny: "Now I have something to get up for in the morning. The sweetest sound I hear every day is my alarm clock."

No one under sixty need apply. Applicants must also come from the lowest third of aging America's income scale—under $3,000 for a family, $1,800 for an individual. They are screened, medically examined, and trained for two weeks. Said a supervisor: "One of the most striking things about the grandparents is their on-time dependability." They also report daily on what they did with each child: talking together, games, music, outings, refreshments, walking, reading, et cetera. How did the child react, the mimeographed form wants to know. Happy? Active? Quiet? Typically, the file at New York Foundling contains Max's report that Joseph one day "woke up a bit restless, but we had a great time, and I'm afraid he cried when I went home."

The Office of Economic Opportunity hopes the grandparents' project "will demonstrate that low-income senior Americans can be a major new resource of responsible workers for communities and social agencies." They are already being used to assist foster mothers (San Francisco), help teachers (Fort Lauderdale, Florida), penetrate language barriers (San Antonio, Texas), bring Operation Head Start preschooling into the homes of disturbed children (Charleston, South Carolina), and teach youngsters falling between foster homes about adult relationships (Akron, Ohio). In hospitals and child-care centers around the country, children who used to cringe in corners, insist on being carried everywhere, or surrender to tantrums are now discovering that childhood is supposed to be fun. A hospital for tubercular children reports children trying harder to recover, and it hopes to cut convalescences in half. In Cincinnati, a brain-damaged girl who could not move at all now turns her head toward the voice of her foster grandma—and smiles.

And of course, in Tampa, Florida, a seventy-seven-year-old foster grandfather married a foster grandmother.

In the very big cities, with their reservoirs of old folks, foster-grandparent rosters are easily filled. One hundred and twenty qualified applicants are on a waiting list to fill opening in the 114 assignments allowed New York Catholic Charities, though the same agency sorely needs grandparent applicants for Cardinal McCluskey Home in less urban White Plains.

The majority of foster grandparents are female, a condition the OEO would like to bring into better balance: "Some identification of the child with men is particularly important to young children who, in institutional life, are often surrounded by women."

"When I first met Joseph," recalls Max, "of course he shied away from me. I think I would, too. But a lollipop sweetened him up. Now, it's 'Hi, Grandpa,' all the time.

"I brought him to the zoo, and everything to him was a horse. Now he also knows the difference between 'boy,' 'girl,' 'man,' and 'lady.' So we walk down the street, and he say 'Hi, lady,' 'Hi, man.' He's a good boy, my Joseph."

Boys and girls at the 312-child Foundling (they're all under six) all share some of the by-products of the foster-gramps relationship, but they understand that it is a one-to-one arrangement.

"Why can't I have a grandpa, too?" a child will sometimes ask Max.

"Because you have a family that visits you frequently," he explains.

"Oh," they say, with tiny little oh's.

Max recalls that when he first reported for gramps duty, about six months ago, he was advised to steer clear of a little girl with an intense fear of men. Any man. Max understood and went about his business, glancing in her direction once in a while. Sometimes he noticed that when he was gamboling with other youngsters, she would glance at him, too—but then turn away.

Then one day, she screamed. A window-washer had suddenly appeared at her window, inadvertently startling her. Wailing and sobbing, she dashed into Max's arms. He took over from there.

"You know, I keep thinking: wasn't it a great thing that somebody was there at that exact instant to reassure her?"

HIS EXCELLENCY BISHOP WLADYSLAW RUBIN TO KEY VATICAN POST

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to note in a newspaper that His Holiness Pope Paul VI last week named a Polish Bishop, His Excellency Bishop Wladyslaw Rubin, to fill the extremely important post of Secretary General of the Roman Catholic Bishops Synod. His Excellency Bishop Rubin is auxiliary to Stefan Cardinal Wyszinski, Primate of Poland and I had the good fortune to meet with him when he was in this country last fall to take part in observances of the Polish Millenium of Christianity. His Excellency is a brilliant and devoted man, a true example of the Christianity Poland has fostered these past thousand years. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted to me by unanimous consent of this House I include with these remarks the newspaper story on the appointment of His Excellency Bishop Rubin:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 24, 1967]

POPE NAMES POLISH PRELATE AS HEAD OF NEW SYNOD OF BISHOPS

Rome, Feb. 23.—Pope Paul VI today named a Polish bishop, the Most Rev. Ladislao Rubin, a former Soviet prisoner of war, to the key post of secretary general of the Roman Catholic Bishops Synod.

The synod, which was created to assist the Pontiff in the government of the church, will hold its first meeting in the Vatican in the fall.

The Pope also announced the appointment of Archbishop Pericle Felici as Pro-president, or active head, of the important pontifical commission for the revision of the code of canon law.

Archbishop Felici, who was secretary general of the recently concluded Ecumenical Council Vatican II, had been mentioned in Vatican circles as likely candidate to head the synod since he is secretary general of the central commission formed to coordinate postcouncil work and implement council decrees.

His new appointment fills the position held by Pietro Cardinal Ciriaci, who died in Rome last Dec. 30. It is assumed that Archbishop Felici will be made a Cardinal in the Pope's next consistory.

The Archbishop's commission has the vital task of making canon law reflect council decisions.

Bishop Rubin, 49 years old, was born at Toki, in eastern Poland. Before he was able to complete his theological studies he was taken prisoner by the Russians in 1941 and sent to Siberia. He spent the next two years in prison or in a labor camp before he managed to make his way to Beirut, Lebanon.

He was ordained June 30, 1944, in Beirut and, after service as a priest, was sent to Rome in 1949 to study canon law. In 1959 he was named rector of the Pontifical Polish College in Rome.

In November, 1964, he was named a titular Bishop and appointed auxiliary to Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, Primate of Poland.

The master of eight languages, he has traveled widely, particularly in his capacity as Bishop of the Poles outside Poland. Last year he spent several months in the United States and is now in England.

Archbishop Felici, 55, who was ordained at the unusually early age of 22, is from Segni, near Rome.

A scholar and teacher of canon law, he is also a member of the Sacred Roman Rota. Named a titular Archbishop in September, 1960, he has spent several years working in connection with the council, of which he was secretary general.

The Synod is to meet in the Vatican Sept. 29 and to close Oct. 24, or later if necessary. Vatican sources said there had been no indication of the agenda.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert], said on the floor yesterday with reference to the President's message on the District of Columbia:

> It seems to me that the idea of a new Washington has arrived and it is irresistible.

President Johnson has taken a bold step in his recommendations for a three-part upgrading of the city of Washington into a modern American municipality. It should not be forgotten, however, that the first part of the program is home rule for the District; the second and third steps—a reorganization plan which would streamline the existing government of the city and enactment of legislation permitting immediate nonvoting representation in the House—are intermediate steps.

The final goal is still, and will continue to be, true home rule where the people of the Capital of history's greatest democracy elect their own government and have a say in the disposition of the taxes collected from them.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, on May 16, this body passed legislation—without one dissenting vote—to give the people of Guam and the Virgin Islands the right to elect their Governors. These two territories had already had years of experience in electing their own legislatures; now they also elect their executives. In 1965 the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands—over which this Nation has jurisdiction—elected a bicameral legislature for the first time; in 1960 American Samoa adopted a locally drafted constitution and has elected its own house of representatives. In short, Mr. Speaker, we have sought out every corner of the globe where we had any power and brought to its people representative government—every corner that is except the corner where the laws which made these things possible were enacted.

As the President so aptly put it:

> The District of Columbia is the Nation's ninth largest city. It is the center of the fastest growing metropolitan area in the country, with a population today of 2.5 million. As such, its citizens have all the problems—and are entitled to all the rights—of the citizens of any large city in this country.

The District of Columbia is the last remaining jurisdiction over which the Federal Government exercises authority which does not have home rule.

It is important that the needs of the District be brought directly and immediately before appropriate committees of the Congress and in debates on the floor of the House. This can be done by enacting the bill which the President will soon send us providing for a nonvoting Delegate to this body.

If this is done, the District will have an opportunity to set up election machinery which will be useful in preparing it for the time when a constitutional amendment giving it voting representation is adopted and ratified.

President Johnson deserves the thanks of every American and particularly of the citizens of Washington for his concern for the principles of democratic government.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, each element in the President's message is of critical importance for the future development of the District of Columbia and its citizens. But there is one proposal which goes to the heart of representative government—that the residents of the Nation's Capital must be permitted to elect a nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives.

This is admittedly a short-term arrangement while the Congress and the States consider the constitutional question of permanent congressional representation. Yet the nonvoting delegate proposal will have long-range benefits and is as essential to the District's future as any of the President's other substantive and legislative recommendations.

A nonvoting delegate of the District becomes the spokesman for District needs. He becomes the elected official link to Congress which the District has so desperately needed for so many years. He becomes the eyes and ears and conscience of more than 800,000 District residents who are now unrepresented.

But beyond the fact of representation, the participation of a nonvoting elected delegate in House deliberations would permit the development of more responsive local political leadership in the District. It would establish a new sense of political responsibility and public involvement in national affairs.

The Nation's Capital must have representation in the Congress. This is basic to its existence as a governmental entity. For combined with such representation—home rule, a reorganized government structure, and programs to improve health, education, economic opportunity, welfare and security of life and property—the Nation's Capital could become the model city which we all know it can be and must be.

The President is to be complimented for proposing a series of logical and compassionate programs to move Washington forward into the 20th century. It is our duty to support all of them. But we should act with special dispatch on the proposal to grant the District a voice in the affairs of our Nation.

CRIME IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the great city that surrounds the Capitol where we meet is, to our Nation, the fountainhead of government, and to all the world an expression of what America means. Our people look toward the city of Washington for a reaffirmation of the American faith. As the Capital of the major world power, Washington is the source of great worldwide news and the focus of international attention. This imposes a double duty upon us as legislators—to help make this Capital a city of which our people can be justly proud, and a city toward which the whole world can look with admiration and respect.

When we consider these obligations, it is a depressing and a discouraging thing to contemplate that crime in the Nation's Capital is approaching the proportions of a national disgrace. In many respects, our crime rate is among the highest in the Nation, and recent reports indicate it is getting worse.

I agree with the President, in the message he submitted to Congress yesterday, that lawlessness has struck our Capital like a plague, and that one of the greatest challenges we face is to make this a community of safe streets and homes, free from crime and the fear of crime.

The President should be commended by the American people and by this Congress for facing squarely this insidious threat to our national welfare and to the personal safety of ourselves and our families. It is apparent that much of the task is our own—a task for lawmakers. The first point of attack is our collection of laws that govern this District. And from there we must proceed toward the effective implementation of law in our law enforcement bodies and the courts. We can, and we must, regain the respect and honor we have lost. We can, and we must, make this Capital a fulfillment of the dreams and hopes of our Founding Fathers.

GOLD STOCKS STILL DECREASING

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, because of the upcoming vote on trade, gold, and the balance of payments, this is an important subject for Members to become more acquainted with. I offer the following material for their information.

According to an unofficial estimate of the Treasury not yet published, domestic consumption of gold in 1966 increased by approximately 18 percent over 1965. Thus 1966 consumption was running approximately 6 million ounces per year. Production was only 1.7 million ounces; thus the leak in our monetary gold stocks still continues because of the disparity between consumption and production.

The material referred to follows:

STATEMENT OF KENNETH C. KELLAR ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS

(Before the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels, of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, in re S. 2562, Gold Mines Assistance Act of 1965)

My name is Kenneth C. Kellar. I am a Vice President of Homestake Mining Company, currently the largest gold producer in the United States, and Chief Counsel of its gold operations at Lead, South Dakota, where I maintain a private law practice. I appear before you today representing the American Mining Congress of which organization I am a Director and a member of its Gold Committee.

The American Mining Congress represents all phases of mining in the United States.

Our organization favors the enactment of S. 2562 for the following reasons:

1. Outflow of gold in recent years has brought the Nation's gold reserves to a dangerously low level.

2. Increased costs of production since World War II have resulted in almost complete disappearance of our gold mines except for a few producers notably Homestake and the Carlin Mine in Nevada.

3. The objectives of the proposed relief legislation relate to subjects of internal domestic concern and should cause no apprehension in international monetary circles of any revolutionary impending change in our monetary policy.

4. Current annual consumption of gold in the United States for industry, the dental profession, the arts and crafts is more than twice our annual production. Any legislation designed to revitalize our domestic industry to enable it to take care of our own domestic requirements seems both timely and appropriate.

5. Enactment of S. 2562 will reactivate the defunct gold mining industry with resultant significant increased annual production of the precious metal. Such increases, while obviously insufficient to offset the tremendous loss in our gold reserves, nonetheless, will be in the national interest to relieve the drain on our monetary gold stocks caused by the present excess of consumption over production each year in the United States.

I am sure that the members of this Committee, most of whom come from western mining states, are as cognizant as I of the plethora of various types of gold relief bills which have been introduced in the past decade in the Congress and are as familiar as I with the inflexible opposition of Treasury officials over several successive Administrations to any type of gold remedial legislation. These objections have been consistent whether the proposed bill concerned greater depletion allowances, free coinage, free marketability, sales by a Presidential Commission to domestic consumers at a price up to $105 per ounce, the excess over $35 to be used to subsidize domestic producers, or to outright subsidy payments. Treasury has usually opposed such legislation basing its objections on the premise that a two price system for gold, one as a commodity, the other monetary, would be too disturbing or on the premise that, if the bill under consideration was enacted, such action might be interpreted by foreign central bankers as an indication of an impending change in the monetary price of gold with consequent loss of their confidence in the stability of the dollar.

Over the past several years, I have had a number of conferences with Treasury officials on the gold subject, and have always been greeted by a courteous reception followed by an adamant "No" and an expression of great sympathy for the worsening plight of the domestic gold miner. Nonetheless, I think this hearing is pertinent for several reasons:

1. The rapid deterioration in our national gold reserves.

2. The increased rate of consumption over production for our domestic annual industrial requirements.

3. The longer some form of relief is denied, the less likely dormant gold mines will be reopened, aggressive exploration for new gold ore reserves stimulated, and the certainty that our few existing producers, except for by-product gold, will be compelled to cease operations.

4. S. 2562 provides specific proposals for financial assistance payments which are neither illusory nor nebulous, which are tied to increased costs of production since 1939. Obviously, before any owners of closed gold mines will seek to rehabilitate their properties, they must be assured of sufficient relief funds to enable them to operate profitably in the fact of the tremendous cost increases in production which have occurred since the commencement of World War II. The same holds true with reference to the expenditure of large sums of capital in a search for new gold ore reserves. So, too, certain provisions of S. 2562 would establish modest payments for the benefit of current gold producers which would enable them to stabilize their operations and ward off the threat of closure because of every increasing costs of production.

Approximately 40% of the United States' total annual gold production is derived from Homestake's operations in South Dakota. In the last several years, Homestake's overall corporate earnings have remained on a fairly even keel owing to its diversification activities primarily in the field of uranium mining. Unfortunately, Homestake earnings solely from its gold property have shown an almost constant decline in recent years with the end of its gold operations in sight in the not too far distant future, barring either revaluation of gold or some form of domestic remedial gold legislation. We do not believe that S. 2562 provides excessive payments to current producers, including Homestake, nor that criticism should be made that the Nation's largest gold producer would be receiving an unjustified windfall. Under the provisions of S. 2562, for example, after taxes Homestake's assistance payment would be less than $1.00 per ounce. Further details respecting the effect of S. 2562 on Homestake's operations are set forth in the statement on file with this Committee submitted by Mr. James C. Harder, General Manager of Homestake's operations in South Dakota.

Much more generous payments are provided to aid the reopening of dormant mines or for the benefit of operators who may be fortunate enough to discover new gold ore reserves which warrant developing and mining. Under the terms of S. 2562, such potential operators would receive approximately the equivalent of $44 per ounce as financial assistance payments, assuming that they submit the requisite cost data and, further, that they convince the Gold Mines Assistance Commission that substantial marginal gold ore reserves will be mined only if such financial assistance is provided and demonstrate the existence of financial resources and technical capability sufficient to operate profitably under the conditions by which assistance under the Act would be allowed. When such operators sell their gold bullion to the Treasury, they would receive the $35 per ounce now being paid by that Agency, and the following year, if they met the eligibility requirements provided by this legislation, they would then receive the $44 relief payments from the Federal Government thus effectuating a total relief the equivalent of $79 per ounce.

We believe the evidence presented to this Committee will demonstrate that, if this bill were enacted, annual gold production in the United States will be substantially increased. While some underground lode gold mines would undoubtedly reopen at the $79 figure, we believe most of the increased production would be derived from placer operations. Further, we believe that the evidence presented to this Subcommittee, and also to the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining in the House on companion measures, will establish that a number of dormant underground lode gold mining properties will not be able to reopen unless a relief price the equivalent of somewhere in the neighborhood of $100 per ounce is provided by the Federal Government.

In 1940, production of gold in America, exclusive of the Philippines, amounted to nearly 5 million ounces per annum. There were then 9,569 operating gold mines employing 56,200 men. These are the figures contained in the report of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in 1963. Our domestic gold mining industry never recovered from the calamitous consequences of World War II shutdown under WPB Order L–208. Following World War II, and recision of the Order, the attrition of constantly increasing costs of production have so constricted the number of gold producers that today there are only a handful of true gold operations with annual production for the past several years running at the approximate rate of 1.5 million ounces per annum. In 1965, a slight increase in domestic production brought the figure to 1.68 million ounces reflecting increased production of Nevada when the new Carlin Mine became operational and some increased byproduct gold from copper mines as high prices for this metal induced maximum production efforts.

No doubt the members of this Committee would like to know by what amount our domestic annual gold production would be increased in the event a gold subsidy bill is enacted. I doubt if anyone can give a very definitive answer to this question. Many shutdown underground gold mines are in deplorable shape with flooded workings, ground caved, timber shattered and machinery dismantled. Mining staffs have been dissipated and skilled working forces have disappeared from the mining camps in search of more lucrative fields. However, I am sure that the analogy of the establishment of a thriving, vigorous uranium industry has not been lost upon the members of this Committee, for but a few years ago most competent geologists held the view there were no substantial uranium deposits in the continental United States. Yet, when attractive incentives were provided and a realistic price established for yellow cake, uranium was found in abundance not only by diligent search by individual prospectors, but by intensive exploration of major mining companies.

We think it is reasonable to assume, therefore, that by provision for adequate incentives the gold mining industry can be revitalized and that it is not illogical to assume that production levels could be restored to pre-World War II levels or even higher. Most certainly it should not be too difficult to step up production at least to a point where sufficient gold could be produced to take care of our defense and space needs, our industrial requirements, our dental demands and for arts and crafts removing this constant annual drain on our monetary gold stocks which are so rapidly dwindling.

We recall that when Senator Gruening's subsidy bill, S. 2125, was up for consideration in the Senate, Interior filed a report in opposition thereto with an alternate suggestion that greater exploration funds be provided through O.M.E. to aid the gold operators. However, greater provisions for exploration, while desirable, are only a very partial answer to significant increased gold production in this country. What is needed is assurance that gold ores once discovered can be mined profitably under present day high costs of production and, except for the fortuitous finding of bonanza grade gold ores, the probabilities would be that increasing reserves would simply compound the problem since most companies cannot now mine the reserves they do have under present day conditions. Thus the need of a relief price somewhere between $79 and $100 becomes even more obvious.

Furthermore, it should be pointed out that liberalization in the area of exploration has already drawn the opposition of Treasury to H.R. 4665, Representative Ullman's bill which recently passed the House, which provides for the removal of the $400,000 ceiling on deductibility of exploration expense with reference to all minerals subject to the recapture of those that result in a producing mine.

We have also been advised that a suggestion was advanced that an answer to the gold problem might be to provide federal funds for research to discover cheaper ways to mine and mill gold. This suggestion is of most dubious value in view of the fact that for years the metallurgical and technical staffs of major companies have been devoting themselves to this line of scientific endeavor. In point of fact, if considerable progress had not been made in this direction, the Homestake Mine would no longer be operating its gold properties in South Dakota. However, in the face of constantly escalating costs, there are limits to relief through technological improvements.

Press reports for months have emphasized the concern of Treasury officials over the outflow of gold from this country and our continuing balance of payments problem. An international momentary conference has been urged for the purpose of devising some new international unit of exchange. There have been more international monetary schemes proposed than there are operating gold mines left in the United States. On the outer periphery of experts there are those who would demonetize gold completely and, on the other side, those who staunchly advocate revaluation of gold.

A majority of our economists and monetary experts still hold to the view that the price shall be maintained at $35 per ounce. At the conference of international experts held in Tarrytown, New York, last fall, there was great diversity of opinion and considerable disagreement, but apparently the majority of those present agreed upon one subject, i.e., gold will continue to play a dominant role in international monetary transactions for several generations to come. This reverence for the power of gold was quite clearly demonstrated when foreign interests withdrew 1.6 billion from our gold reserves in the year 1965. It was further emphasized by the fact that virtually every ounce of 1965 world gold production went into hoarding rather than into national monetary stocks.

Despite the opening of several fabulously rich new gold mines in South Africa, world gold production has been increasing at approximately a rate of 3 percent per year while world trade has been expanding at a rate far in excess of that figure.

Whether gold should be revalued to provide sufficient liquidity to accommodate for the shortage of gold viewed in terms of world trade expansion or whether the nations of the Free World will be willing to accept an inflationary new type of paper international unit along with gold reserves poses a highly controversial problem which may not be resolved for some years to come. In any event, as previously observed, gold will continue to play a dominant role in world affairs. Query: In the meantime, pending settlement of these momentous monetary decisions, should the United States miss the opportunity of developing and reactivating a healthy, vigorous and productive domestic gold mining industry? We think not.

We do not believe there are any knowledgeable domestic gold operators, past or present, who would take the position that by the enactment of S. 2562 gold production would be sufficiently increased in the United States to solve the magnitude of our balance of payments deficit, but we do submit that any substantial increase in domestic gold production is in the national interest and therefore we believe that this Committee would be thoroughly justified in advocating the passage of S. 2562.

In conclusion, we wish to observe that apparently there is nothing new under the sun nor before the Senate of the United States. We have before us a report of the field hearings of the Commission of Gold and Silver Inquiry of the U.S. Senate, under date of January, 1925. Mr. Fletcher Hamilton in charge of field hearings, in his report commented as follows:

"During the War, gold was regarded as a war essential and was placed upon the preferred list. Furthermore, in the period 1917 to 1921 inclusive, the period in which the excess profits tax was in effect, the government recognized the difficult position of the gold mining industry and justly eliminated the excess profits tax. In the tariff act the gold mining industry was accorded the protection of free cyanide largely because the government had fixed the price of gold. It was not considered a preferment to the gold mining industry and for the same reason it would not now be a preferment if that industry were to be relieved of all governmental taxation as gold, its price being fixed by the government, is the only product the market price of which is not free to move in accordance with the laws of supply and demand".

These statements were made during the inflationary period following World War I, and I am sure the gentlemen of this Committee can appreciate the fact that the problems of the gold industry have magnified many fold by 1966, under the impact of present day costs of production.

We urge favorable consideration of S. 2562.

PREVENTIVE EDUCATION

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I think we can all use some cheerful comment on the news.

The Christian Science Monitor is cheering the announcement that the Office of Education has allotted $9.7 million to help the 200,000 children of migrant farmworkers.

As the paper says, the help was never more needed. Without education, there will be little future for these children. Machines are taking over their parents' occupation.

I include this editorial in the RECORD. It deserves wide readership:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 15, 1967]

PREVENTIVE EDUCATION

Announcement that the Office of Education has allotted $9.7 million to help in the education of children of migrant farm workers marks a big social gain. Many people have labored devotedly to get a better break for the 200,000 or more boys and girls who are cheated in their education because of their parents' migratory occupation. All should be cheered by this action.

It was never more needed. For as machines move into the fields and orchards as they are doing now, jobs normally filled by the unskilled and semiliterate disappear. By the time the present generation of migrant children reaches working age, there will probably be few field and orchard jobs left. If these children are not to become the unemployed of tomorrow, they must get adequate education today.

This they are not receiving. Teachers in the migrants' home towns who see their classes thin out at the start of the harvest season know all too well the difficulty of helping the absent children catch up when they return in the fall—late. These youngsters need a special type of instruction. Brief courses kindly offered them along the routes of their travels are helpful but not sufficient.

A pattern for a regular school program, approved in a grant just made to Texas, may be found adaptable to other states with communities which migrant workers call "home." The idea is to face the fact that six months of regular schooling a year is all these migrating children can expect to get. The plan offers, therefore, a six months curriculum. With a longer school day and fewer holidays it is hoped to make it possible for these youngsters to cover the normal school year in shorter time. Subjects taught will be chosen with a view to providing skills and concepts needed in a nonmigrant community.

All this is helpful. But it does not answer all needs of these boys and girls. Yet to be provided is a system of technical training for the teen-agers. Every move in this direction is a preventive of unemployment in the years to come. It is also a means of developing talent the country needs.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as a principal sponsor of the legislation which created the National Council on the Arts and its successor the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, I am pleased that the President today has recommended the appropriation of $16 million to continue the Foundation's programs. This suggested appropriation represents an increase of approximately one-third over the sums now available to the National Foundation for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. I can think of no better investment for the enrichment of our national life. Moreover, I am not alone in that assessment. The National Foundation's activities in its relatively brief tenure has elicited highly favorable editorial comment from respected newspapers and critics throughout the Nation.

I am pleased to commend to my colleagues some noteworthy examples of that comment. I do so with the observation that we have every reason to be proud of the work being done by the National Foundation and its respective Chairman, Roger L. Stevens and Barnaby Keeney.

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS PROGRAMS AND PLANNING

Washington Post, drama critic Richard L. Coe:

"Without any question whatever, the two years since President Johnson took the oath of office on the Capitol steps have brought more White House attention and action for the arts than any period during any Administration since the Presidency began. Creation of the Arts Council and progress on the Capital's bitterly needed homes for the performing arts, are unparalleled steps. . . . Since appointment of the Arts Council members in the spring of 1965, it has taken decisive, considered actions. Its spending has been limited to only $6.5 million for varied Federal programs and another $2 million to assist duly created state art agencies . . . the facts do prove that no preceding Administration has come close to this record." (January 15, 1967)

New York Times editorial:

"Now, through the agency of the National Council on the Arts, grants and pledges totaling $2.3 million have been designated for an impressive variety of artists, institutions and programs. There has been no suggestion of political interference—always a danger when government enters the field of the arts. The money has been distributed with an uncommon understanding of where and by whom it is most needed. The range of grants is wide. . . . A painstaking effort has clearly been made to support what is truly serious . . . the National Council on the Arts has discharged its responsibilities with admirable intelligence and taste." (December 26, 1966)

San Francisco Chronicle, art editor Alfred Frankenstein:

"The Endowment has accomplished infinitely more than anyone dreamed it could accomplish a year ago . . . the Endowment has instituted no less than 45 projects that were not contemplated a year ago. . . . The breadth of this program is staggering, and its implications for future development are quite incredible. . . . One hopes that the National Endowment for the Arts can demonstrate as much receptivity as capacity for growth. Its growth during the past year is beyond belief, and all of it has been to the good." (October 23, 1966).

Chicago Tribune, music editor Thomas Willis:

"In the arts and in the field of education, President Johnson has made far reaching, idealistic federal commitments without precedent. The arts in particular have received a series of shots in the arm which . . . are among the most creative fiscal allotments ever made. Taken in sum, they suggest a distinctively American plan for government aid to the arts which may overturn a good many notions and bromides. . . . The remarkable fact is that the National Council on the Arts so far has been a muscular, fast-moving, and unorthodox arm of the government which plants its punches where they likely will count most and wastes neither energy nor money . . . the council has created more excitement and less controversy than anyone had a right to expect." (September 18, 1966)

Reporter Dispatch (White Plains, N.Y.) editorial:

"The United States government has traditionally taken a perfunctory interest in the nation's artistic life. . . . But now the picture has been brightened somewhat. The National Arts Endowment, which is supported by the National Arts Council, has made grants to a number of projects which will encourage new ideas and fresh approaches in the creative fields. The experimenters are being given a chance to satisfy the ever increasing appetite of the American public for culture in general, and for new ideas in particular." (September 6, 1966)

New York Times, critic-at-large Howard Taubman:

"It is too early to assess the ultimate value of all grants that have been made by the National Arts Endowment, but it is not a bit too soon to commend its chairman, Roger L. Stevens, and his advisers, the members of the National Arts Council, for their energy and breadth of vision. The endowment is confounding the Cassandras who glumly prophesied that public funds would be spent on cautious principles and unadventurous programs. The reverse has been true. . . . Seldom has a new government program, especially one so beset with possible booby traps, been implemented with so much imagination and dispatch. . . . The arts endowment has elected to support a multiplicity of ventures in all the arts since it was approved less than 12 months ago by an act of Congress and received its initial appropriation." (September 1, 1966)

Washington Evening Star editorial:

"The first year's program, announced last November by chairman Roger L. Stevens, showed courage, imagination and much expert thought. There is no reason to believe those qualities will diminish. There is no reason to believe the need for financial help will diminish. The existence of the National Foundation and its Endownments and Councils in the arts and the humanities has been one of the most encouraging signs of these times. It has meant national concern for the higher reaches and the higher rewards of the human spirit, a concern very long overdue." (April 4, 1966)

Washington Evening Star, art critic Frank Getlein:

"The National Council on the Arts . . . set a pattern for thoughtful discrimination as to need and prospect in the arts. In its first major action the Council demonstrated brilliantly that it will be an imaginative force for intelligent change in the arts structure of this country, as well as a quick and generous support for the truly national institutions in their moments dire . . . the Council is not only doing things, it is setting an example of how these things ought to be done . . . (with) a paltry $3 million, the Council has made an utterly brilliant beginning. There isn't a false move. The return will be many, many times the investment. And almost every item is so beautifully constructed that it will teach the trustees, patrons, directors and customers of the American art establishment things they should have known before. . . . President Johnson, Senator Pell (D-R.I.) who was chairman of the Senate Special Sub-Committee on the Arts and Humanities and introduced the Administration's legislation, Mr. Stevens and a cast of thousands over the years have brought in a winner." (November 21, 1965)

Boston Record American, drama critic Elliot Norton:

"In Washington, D.C., the National Council on the Arts has made a good beginning . . . Before they make recommendations to Congress or even grandiose statements to the press, they propose to spend more time thinking about the prospects and possibilities. They are taking their responsibilities sensibly and are more concerned with making sense than with making news. That's admirable . . . The National Council on the Arts can do much to create a new image, to prepare the ground for big and substantial changes, by explaining to the public and the politicians how and why federal aid to the theater, music, painting and the other arts would be to the advantage of all the people . . . If these accomplished people, having carefully considered the hazards and the advantages, should recommend that the United States government follow the pattern of most foreign countries by helping the arts and artists, even to the extent of subsidy, they will be heard with respect and probably heeded . . . They are notable pioneers in a great and good cause." (April 15, 1965)

ON DANCE PROGRAMS

New York Herald Tribune, dance editor Walter Terry:

"The Treasury of the United States has saved a national treasure. Not directly, perhaps, but the taxpayers, through the government's recently established National Council on the Arts, saved the American Ballet Theatre from extinction . . . The engagement now ending has simply reconfirmed the findings of 1965 and that is that the American Ballet Theatre must not only be preserved but also served, in the future, by other government funds." (February 13, 1966)

New York Times, dance editor Clive Barnes:

"The American Ballet Theatre . . . became the first American performing arts enterprise to appear with the help of a Federal grant. For this relief much thanks. May it be the first of many enterprises so to benefit. . . ." (January 20, 1966)

ON MUSIC PROGRAMS

San Francisco Sunday Examiner and Chronicle article:

"This week part of a double dream for opera begins to be realized when the Western Opera Theatre, the newest branch of San Francisco Opera, makes its debut in Sacramento on Friday. Part One is the old American dream of having regional opera companies. . . . Reverie No. 2 is year-round opera for San Francisco. . . . Western Opera Theatre was founded just two short months ago with a $155,000 grant from the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities, and a matching amount from San Francisco Opera plus its own income." (January 22, 1967)

Washington Post editorial:

"The grants and programs announced by the National Council on the Arts at the end of its two-day meeting here are impressively varied. . . . Perhaps the most exciting of the new programs is the commission given Alexander Schneider to create a master chamber orchestra 'of virtuoso caliber.' . . . The matching grants for three educational television organizations come at a time when there is a growing interest in the medium. While not an enormous sum, even when matched, the $875,000 will make it possible for educational television to produce more programs on the arts." (September 6, 1966)

New York Times, critic-at-large Howard Taubman:

"You have heard the lamentations, and they are well-founded. We live in an age of speed, noise, tension and shocking violence. But all is not lost. The National Arts Endowment has made a grant of $400,000 for the cultivation of chamber music and its acolytes." (September 3, 1966)

ON THEATER PROGRAMS

New York Post editorial:

"For Joseph Papp's (New York Shakespeare Festival) troupe, the situation is considerably different today—thanks to its art, the generosity of public and private contributors and—most recently—to a new $100,000 matching grant from the National Council on the Arts. . . . The key word is . . . 'matching.' Both the Shakespeare Festival and the educational TV stations will have to find new private contributions. Contributors should remember this when they are approached for new gifts. The timely federal grants are a welcome beginning and a real encouragement. It is now up to audiences to participate." (September 3, 1966)

ON EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION PROGRAMS

Springfield News (Massachusetts) editorial:

"In this age of federal grants, where much of the emphasis has been on public works projects and physical facilities, it is encouraging to read of a $1.8 million nationwide program of government support for various educational and art forms. . . . Under the $1.8 million program, the largest single recipient is educational television as $875,000 has been offered to three non-profit organizations which must match the government's share. This is the most extensive government assistance program ever undertaken for educational television and can prove a tremendous boon in realizing the potential of educational TV which has been hampered by limited funds. . . . In a real sense, any nation is only as strong as its cultural heritage. Government financial aid to enrich this heritage promises to reap sound dividends." (August 31, 1966)

ON VISUAL ARTS PROGRAMS

Art News editorial:

"The National Council on the Arts has made its first awards to painters and sculptors—60 of them, each gets $5,000—and it is the best list of grants (or prizes or honors, call them what you will) that we have ever seen in the field. It reveals a sophisticated knowledge on the part of the regional advisory panels which made the recommendations and, even rarer, the facts have been tempered with tact, finesse and a humane understanding of individual needs. The money has gone to artists at a point in their careers when it can make a real financial or psychological difference, possibly a crucial one. Some of the recipients are well known, others are familiar and respected only in the art world itself. For almost all of them, the grant is a meaningful act of recognition and the whole enterprise is a major contribution to our culture." (February, 1967)

Detroit News, art critic Joy Hakanson:

"No better news ever came across this desk than the announcement that Michigan State University Prof. Charles Pollock and Detroiter Phillip Wilburn were among 60 painters and sculptors to receive $5,000 awards from the National Council on the Arts. No strings, no stipulations. Just an outright award 'in recognition of the work they have done and to encourage them to continue their work to the benefit of American art.' Since art is by nature singular, there is no better way to recognize painters and sculptors than by awards made directly to them and based on past achievement rather than potential." (January 22, 1967)

Boston Herald editorial:

"And now, for the first time, the Federal government has given its support to a contemporary art museum. We applaud the move. This shows that the Federal government is not limiting its grants to the more popular forms of art." (December 27, 1966)

Washington Post editorial:

"The National Humanities Foundation is well and truly launched. A two-day meeting here of the 27-member council that guides the Foundation resulted in an allocation of funds into a wide variety of promising programs. The grants fall into two categories, individual fellowships and grants to institutions or individuals who will concentrate their efforts on specialized projects . . . Henry Allen Moe . . . proved a peppery and imaginative first chairman of the younger Council. He now takes a seat on the Council and is succeeded by Barnaby Keeney. Dr. Keeney headed the study group that first suggested a National Foundation for the Humanities while still president of Brown University. His tenure here in Washington should prove fruitful for the Nation's scholars." (July 3, 1966)

Middletown Press (Connecticut) editorial:

"For the first time, this country is giving support to . . . the humanities on an organized scale, and with a distinguished panel of scholars and laymen . . . to delineate objectives. The country for some years has federally supported the sciences . . . The resulting unbalance has needed correction for some time because as President Johnson said at the (Council's) swearing in ceremony, "Science can give us goods—and goods we need. But the humanities—art and literature, poetry and history, law and philosophy—must give us our goals" . . . The Council has made a superb beginning, articulated the search for the great legacies of the country well, and bids fair to 'bring to the national consciousness the meanings and hopes to which our culture aspires.'" (March 23, 1966)

North American Newspaper Alliance, columnist Dr. Benjamin Fine:

"The humanities are finally getting a break . . . The National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities has recently taken action to influence teachers and professors towards the humanities . . . More than half of its total resources will be spent by the Humanities Endowment to develop leaders in the humanities. The Council will not limit itself to the upper reaches of scholarship but will attempt to bring the humanities to all citizens." (in *Des Moines Tribune,* October 15, 1966)

Charleston Gazette (West Virginia), columnist Bayard F. Ennis:

The National Council on the Humanities has acted wisely, in my opinion, in deciding to devote more than half of its total resources to the development of leaders within the scope of the humanities. After all, one of the major reasons for their neglect in this country is certainly the scarcity of informed, enterprising leadership, and it is something that needs to be remedied." (September 4, 1966)

New York Times, critic-at-large Howard Taubman:

"The humanities are the study of man: his languages, his literatures, his philosophies, his culture and the National Endowment for the Humanities rightly believes that they should be the interest of all Americans. In its first series of grants the Endownment has declared itself in favor of spreading its net to catch the largest number of our people. It intends to offer its support to gifted individuals and important enterprises, but it does not think that such persons and programs are to be found only in a few glamorized places. Nor does it think that the humanities should or need be the exclusive province of an elite . . . The Endowment has a lively awareness of its obligation to cultivate fields to which the foundations do not pay sufficient attention." (July 6, 1966)

EDITORIAL COMMENTS ON THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

Evening Star (Washington, D.C.) editorial:

"The Humanities grants are about five to one in favor of the traditional method of handing enough money to individual scholars to enable them to knock off teaching for a while and get some research done. The system displays a good flexibility in providing both for established experts in their fields and for younger scholars within five years of their doctoral degrees. There is also diversity in providing for summer-long grants as well as year-long ones. Most of the institutional grants are aimed, not at scholarship in the humanities, but at the diffusion of the results of such scholarship in elementary and secondary schools, among the handicapped and in the mass media. The figures are $403,000 to the institutions, $1,900,000 to individual scholars for their individual projects. That relatively small amount already makes the Endowment the prime source of financing for achievement in the humanities. This stark fact, in contrast to the vast amounts of Federal money being spent on the sciences, is ample proof of the need for the Endowment." (February 18, 1967)

The Christian Science Monitor:

"The humanities pocket in the federal purse . . . holds a total of $5 million, unless the Congress votes it more funds before the end of the fiscal year, June, 1968. So far $3.5 million has found its way to worthy teachers, scholars, and institutions." (February 4, 1967)

AN IMBALANCE OF RIGHTS

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much and are yet to hear much more about crime in America. We have heard from the President of the United States about this national problem. We have heard from his specially appointed Crime Commission, a group composed of distinguished Americans. We have heard from a few of the victims of what we must view as a national disgrace.

But, we have not heard much from the middleman in the crime picture. We have not heard much from him, because we have not asked him often enough for his opinion, for we too much take him for granted. The middleman in the triangle of crime, the man between the criminal and the victim, is our policeman. He is the man we take for granted will be there to protect our life and limb and our property.

We should ask the middleman more often for his views and his suggestions regarding crime—for he is more aware of crime and its aspects than any of us.

Recently, the chief of police in my hometown of Greensboro, N.C., made a speech to the Summit Rotary Club in Greensboro. He made an eloquent and enlightening talk on the subject of crime and law enforcement.

Chief Paul B. Calhoun points out one of the greatest handicaps facing our police, when he says that recent court decisions seem to place more emphasis on the conduct of the police officer than on the conduct of the criminal. And, Chief Calhoun asks a question that we should keep asking ourselves until we find the answer: Where do the rights of the criminal end, and where does the safety of the public begin?

I commend to all the remarks on one middleman whom I know to be a good and dedicated police officer and one whom I am proud to call my friend. For all interested in the national crime problem, I call to their attention Chief Calhoun's speech, "An Imbalance of Rights."

The text of the speech follows:

AN IMBALANCE OF RIGHTS

(By Chief Paul B. Calhoun at Summit Rotary Club, Feb. 3, 1967)

We in Law Enforcement, and many others throughout the Nation, are greatly concerned with the rising pattern of violent crime—crime which has grown at a rate far greater than that of our population. We are concerned for the hundreds of people who are assaulted each year on the streets of our cities. We are concerned for the mounting numbers of citizens who are the victims of violent crimes each year. We are concerned for their rights.

The Constitution of the United States guarantees each individual certain inalienable rights and further sets up a system of checks and balances to insure such rights are in fact a reality. The three branches of Government—judicial, Legislative, and Executive—were created for this purpose. These three branches of Government have specific areas in which they must operate and each guards their inherent powers and authority jealously. Law Enforcement, as you are aware, is an integral part of the Executive Branch. Our responsibility to perform this executive function of Government is clearly enumerated. However, recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, no matter how well intentioned, has handicapped Law Enforcement in fulfilling its responsibilities to the people.

Mr. Justice White has said and I quote, "The most basic function of any government is to provide for the security of the individual and of his property. These ends of society are served by the criminal laws which for the most part are aimed at the prevention of crime. Without the reasonably effective performance of the task of preventing violence and retaliation, it is idle to talk about human dignity and civilized values".

How are we to provide this security of the individual? The recent Court decisions seem to place more emphasis on the conduct of the Police Officer than on the conduct of the criminal. The question of guilt is obscured and lost in a maze of legal technicalities and semantic gymnastics which confuse and frustrate even our most learned attorneys and courts to say nothing of the Police Officer who—armed with a high school education—must carry out these edicts. My remarks today will deal primarily with the impact of court rulings and the resultant imbalance of rights between the criminal and society.

Just where do the rights of the criminal end, and just where does the safety of the public begin? And what are the rights of the poor forgotten third party—the bereaved family of the victim of a crime.

I do not judge the motives of the Judges who have rendered a series of opinions over the past decade, up to and including the *Miranda* decision, however, these decisions are based more upon theory than upon practice—the theory that Police throughout the Country inherently mistreat all those who come into contact with them and from whom the criminal must be protected. In so doing these Judges have tilted the balance of justice dangerously in favor of the criminal.

These decisions, over which much has already been written and said, are concerned primarily with confessions and interrogation by the Police. Permit me to review for a moment, some of the decisions causing this imbalance.

Courts in this Country have generally rejected involuntary or coerced confessions because they are not likely to be trustworthy. In *Brown* v. *Mississippi* the Supreme Court, in 1936, made it clear that confessions gained by torture violated the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment as well as the usual rules of evidence law and must be excluded. Since then, the Court has had great difficulty in deciding a number of State cases where apparently no force was used but there were other coercive practices—such as continued interrogation for hours or days. The Court finally got to the point that its decision whether due process had been violated had to turn on an individual evaluation of each interrogation case. Factors such as the age and experience of the defendant, the length of questioning, education, and other tactics used all had to be taken into account. The Court moved to eliminate the need for these difficult evaluations by ruling in 1943 in the *McNabb* Case that any confession gained after secret interrogation of long duration would be automatically presumed coerced. This rule was further implemented in the *Mallory* Case, decided in 1957, which held that an arrested person must be taken immediately before a Magistrate and if there is any unnecessary delay—such as to question the prisoner—the custody becomes unlawful and any confession obtained during the period of unlawful custody is excluded.

The next step in this Judicial "march to the sea" was *Massiah* v. *United States*, decided in 1964. Massiah, a merchant seaman had been indicted jointly with a fellow seaman named Colson, on various Narcotics charges. By arrangements with Federal Agents, Colson went for a ride with Massiah in a vehicle wired with radio equipment. The conversation between Massiah and Colson was relayed by radio to the Federal Agents, who were in another automobile. Massiah's statements were introduced in evidence and he was convicted. On appeal, the United States Supreme Court set aside the conviction on the grounds that Massiah did not have benefit of counsel when the conversation took place in the automobile.

In the same year, the Supreme Court handed down the *Escobedo* decision. In this case, Danny Escobedo's brother in law had been shot and killed. The Police had been informed by his partner in the crime that Escobedo had fired the fatal shots. Escobedo was taken into custody, and although he had not been formally charged with the crime, the Police investigation had centered on him as a prime suspect. While he was being interrogated by the Officers, his lawyer came to the Station but was refused permission to speak to his client. Escobedo asked to see his lawyer but was refused. Meanwhile, without being advised of his rights to remain silent, Escobedo made statements which definitely implicated him in the murder. He was convicted and on appeal the lower court decision was reversed due to his not being warned to remain silent. In reversing the conviction the court said, "We hold . . . that where . . . the investigation is no longer a general inquiry into an unsolved crime but has begun to focus on a particular suspect, the suspect has been taken in to Police custody, the Police carry out a process of interrogations that lends itself to eliciting incriminating statements, the suspect has requested and been denied 'the assistance of counsel' in violation of the Sixth Amendment of the Constitution . . . and that no statement elicited by the Police during the interrogation may be used against him at a criminal trial". It is of some interest to note that Escobedo had been arrested on January 20, 1960, and his attorney had secured his release on a Writ of Habeas Corpus that afternoon. It was not until January 30, 1960, that he was again arrested and gave his statement. It was brought out at the trial that Escobedo's attorney had in fact advised him, between January 20 and January 30 to remain silent. But yet Escobedo went free because the Police failed to repeat what his attorney had already advised.

The most recent case is that of *Miranda V. Arizona* decided June 13, 1966. In essence the Court held that before questioning a suspect in custody the Police must:

(1) Tell him in clear and unequivocal language that he has a right to remain silent and may refuse to answer any questions,

(2) Warn him that any thing he says may be used against him in court.

(3) The suspect must be told that he has an absolute right to have an attorney present at the questioning—and

(4) That, if he cannot afford to hire an attorney, one will be provided for him by the court at public expense.

When a suspect says he wants an attorney, there can be no questioning until the attorney is present. If, when without an attorney, a suspect indicates in any manner that he does not want to be interrogated, the Police may not question him. Even if he starts to talk, he may change his mind—and then questioning must stop until counsel is on hand. And when counsel is on hand the interrogation must, for all practical purposes, cease. For as Justice Jackson stated in his opinion in *Watts V. Indiana*, "Any lawyer worth his salt will tell the suspect in no uncertain terms to make no statement to Police under any circumstances".

This, gentlemen, is an imbalance of rights. The victim of a crime does not enjoy these rights nor can he appeal the outcome of an assault. Criminals are walking out of our courts more cockier and brazen than ever and looking for new prey. They "beat the rap"—a status achievement for the criminal underworld. In many of such cases, the acquittal or dismissal has resulted not from lack of evidence but from the fact that the evidence of crime was obtained by "unapproved" means. "Unapproved" means which prior to Escobedo, the Supreme Court had upheld many times. Let me give you an example of unapproved Police action.

On March 3, 1963, an eighteen year old girl was kidnapped and forcibly raped near Phoenix, Arizona. Ten days later, on the morning of March 13, petitioner Miranda was arrested and taken to the Police Station. At this time Miranda was 23 years old, indigent, and educated to the extent of completing half the ninth grade. He had "an emotional illness" of the schizophrenic type, according to the doctor who eventually examined him; the doctor's report also stated that Miranda was "alert and oriented as to time, place, and person", intelligent within normal limits, competent to stand trial, and sane within the legal definition. At the Police Station, the victim picked Miranda out of a lineup, and two Officers then took him into a separate room to interrogate him, starting at about 11:30 a.m. Though at first denying his guilt, within a short time Miranda gave a detailed oral confession and then wrote out in his own hand and signed a brief statement admitting and describing the crime. All this was accomplished in two hours or less without any force, threats or promises and without any effective warnings at all.

These unapproved Police methods caused a reversal of the conviction by the United States Supreme Court.

In his dissenting opinion in Miranda, Justice White wrote, "I have no desire whatsoever to share the responsibility for any such impact on the criminal process . . . nor can this decision do other than have a corrosive effect on the criminal law as an effective device to prevent crime. A major component in its effectiveness in this regard is its swift and sure enforcement. The easier it is to get away with rape and murder, the less the deterrent effect on those who are inclined to attempt it. This is still good common sense. If it were not, we should posthaste liquidate the whole Law Enforcement establishment as a useless, misguided effort to control human conduct".

Justice Harlan, in a separate dissent, said "How much harm this decision will inflict on Law Enforcement cannot fairly be predicted with accuracy . . . we do know that some crimes cannot be solved without confessions, that ample expert testimony attests to their importance in crime control, and that the court is taking a real risk with society's welfare in imposing its new regime on the Country. The social costs of crime are too great to call the new rules anything but a hazardous experimentation . . . ."

The Police will comply with this experimentation—so far as we possibly can. We will continue to train our men in the best manner possible. We will continue to call on citizens for their help and support. We will continue to seek new ways to combat crime and protect the rights of our citizens. And we will continue to improve our methods to prevent the guilty from walking out of court—free on a technicality.

And we will make mistakes—I think Thomas Cahill, Chief of Police in San Francisco, expressed it well recently when he spoke on court decisions. He said, "These very learned and distinguished people are split 50–50 amongst themselves, and then somebody says that the Police Officer down on the street level is supposed to have all the answers and know exactly what to do. Well, he'd have to be better than God himself".

As you view the "Big Picture", who is really on trial—the courts, the Police, or the public? Unquestionably, the inevitable answer is all three. The full impact of the Supreme Court's decision will not be evident for some time and the reactionary effect on other groups or agencies remain to be seen.

Subsequent Supreme Court decisions will continue to be made, with in all probability more explicit rulings on the "gray areas" of search and seizure, confessions, interrogation, rules of evidence, et cetera. Greater emphasis may be placed on circumstantial evidence and a fuller recognition of the use of scientific crime detection. Outmoded and archaic court systems may be abolished, with an overall increased effectiveness.

While Law Enforcement Officers are invariably caught "in the middle" it may result in a blessing in disguise. Without question, higher standards of recruits, greater emphasis on selection and expanded training will be necessary. This will provide the impetus that will hasten true professionalism of Law Enforcement.

Perhaps the greatest benefit will be that of the awakening of an apathetic public—those who will not testify as witnesses even when their testimony is vital to a case: Those who are indifferent to the needs and problems facing Law Enforcement: Those who flagrantly violate the laws and through precept and example are encouraging their own children to be openly defiant of law and order—perhaps these attitudes will change. The alarming rise in virtually all categories of crime and the staggering cost, in lives, property, and money to the citizenry, can only be ignored by or accepted by the public for so long. The public, who must pay these costs, will come to the realization that they play a crucial part in not only the effectiveness of Law Enforcement but more importantly in the overall system of justice. This aroused public will ultimately be the key to the solution of the problem.

The supreme need of this Country of ours is for a return of the balance of rights. A balance which will protect the innocent as well as the criminal. The Police and the Courts should, and must, have a common objective—the objective to develop and maintain a system of administering criminal justice which is fair, impartial, and effective. We would suggest to those of the Supreme Court whose concern appears to center on the rights of the criminal that the time is long overdue for equal concern for society—that the scales of justice should be balanced.

THE UKRAINE

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, the independence and the sovereignty of the Ukraine were proclaimed in 1918. For a short period Ukrainians lived in new freedom, but after 2 years, they were forced to become a part of the Soviet Union, a captive and submerged nation. The Ukraine is a colony of Communist Russia and the government is a "puppet" government imposed upon the people by the ruling Communist Party of the U.S.S.R.

Mr. Speaker, the Ukraine has suffered longer than all other captive nations who languish in Soviet Communist slavery. The Ukrainians have suffered religious persecution and economic exploitation. Today, they are the most hardworking citizens of occupied Russian territory, and their country is the most thickly populated. They are the second largest nationality group under the Soviet regime, making up 18 percent of the population.

The Ukrainian people never accepted foreign domination but continued to struggle for their freedom. The love of freedom and independence inherent in these sturdy people has not been stifled. We Americans are dedicated to the principle of self-determination. The principle of self-determination must apply to large established nations as well as to small emerging nations. We commemorate in 1967 the efforts made by the people of the Ukraine to be independent. This occasion serves as a reminder of the undemocratic tactics by which the Soviet Union has added territories to its empire.

This commemoration has special significance for the people of Ukrainian descent in Syracuse and Onondaga County, N.Y., as they are joined by free people everywhere in paying tribute to the Ukrainian people. We are mindful of the terrible burden borne by those who live in the Ukraine. I urge today, that the U.S. Government recognize the aspirations of the Ukrainians for freedom and independence.

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill H.R. 6231 to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921. The amendments in this bill will modernize the act, bring it in line with present business conditions and economics of the livestock industry, and move toward the most efficient possible competitive markets for the sale of livestock.

The Packers and Stockyards Act was enacted in 1921 to deal with serious abuses and flagrant, deceptive practices which were occurring in livestock marketing at the time. Because of these abuses and practices, there was no true free, competitive market in livestock.

After a long series of investigations and careful consideration, the Congress passed the act, setting up a system of regulation based on the principle that the major terminal markets or stockyards of the country were monopolies and should be treated as "great national public utilities" whose existence and functioning was essential to the flow of commerce. This principle of regulation—that stockyards are public utilities—was aimed at conditions as they existed nearly 50 years ago.

However, major changes have taken place in the 46 years since enactment of this legislation.

The first is that the terminal markets or stockyards are no longer in a monopoly position. The change is well illustrated by recalling the description of the stockyards industry contained in the 1922 decision of the Supreme Court upholding the Act, *Stafford* v. *Wallace* (258 U.S. 495, 514–16):

> The chief evil feared is the monopoly of the packers, enabling them unduly and arbitrarily to lower prices to the shipper who sells, and unduly and arbitrarily to increase the price to the consumer who buys . . .
>
> The act, therefore, treats the various stockyards of the country as great national public utilities to promote the flow of commerce . . .

This is not the stockyards industry in 1967.

The second major change in the livestock marketing industry in the years since 1921 has been the declining portion of slaughter livestock being purchased on terminal markets. The following table, compiled from figures supplied by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, dramatically underscores this fact.

Percent of total slaughter livestock purchased at terminal markets

Cattle:	
1923	90.0
1930	88.3
1940	75.1
1950	74.9
1960	45.8
1965	34.0
Calves:	
1923	86.0
1930	81.8
1940	60.9
1950	56.7
1960	25.4
1965	16.5
Sheep:	
1923	86.0
1930	84.7
1940	63.8
1950	57.4
1960	35.5
1965	25.5
Hogs:	
1923	77.0
1930	59.9
1940	46.7
1950	39.9
1960	30.3
1965	23.4

Let me draw the attention of my colleagues to the changes:

In 1923, 90 percent of cattle was purchased at terminal markets; in 1965, the total had dropped to 34 percent.

In 1923, 86 percent of calves was purchased at terminal markets; in 1965, the total was 16 percent.

In 1923, 86 percent of sheep was purchased at these markets; in 1965, the total was 25 percent.

In 1923, 77 percent of hogs was purchased at these markets; in 1965, the figure had dropped to 23 percent.

This is a startling decline. Since enactment of the Packers and Stockyards Act, a steadily increasing portion of livestock sales has been conducted at points other than the terminal markets. A steadily increasing portion of such sales is thus not subject to the forces of supply and demand that are present at these great terminal markets. A steadily increasing proportion of sales is thus being conducted outside the free, competitive market system.

This trend is expected to continue unless the Congress acts. The amendments which I have proposed today are designed to reverse this trend. This will be good for the livestock producer. He can be assured of true value. This will be good for the consumer. He can be assured that the price which he pays is established by the laws of supply and demand and not arbitrarily set by any small group within our economy.

I was a member of the National Commission on Food Marketing, which in its technical study No. 1, "Organization and Competition in the Livestock and Meat Industry"—June 1966—pointed up another effect of the decline in sales at stockyards. In the concluding chapter on "Trends and Prospects" the study summarized our findings on the pricing of livestock. It stated:

> An increasingly serious problem is pricing. In general, exchange arrangements have emerged which bypass established markets. As this has occurred, market knowledge about an increasing number of transactions has not been available. While prices at established markets have been reported, a question of growing significance concerns their representation of general supply and demand conditions. The state of current market knowledge available to many buyers and sellers has become less satisfactory to rely upon in making trading decisions. Although advancing technology in communications has facilitated rapid dissemination of information which has become available, the cost and effort required to become informed in order to buy or sell skillfully have remained substantial.
>
> The pricing of livestock and meat, historically a relatively inexact process, has been improved little, and many new problems have arisen. Pricing practices, along with other exchange arrangements which have been substituted for transactions at established markets, will require increasing attention to assure effectiveness and efficiency in allocating resources and distributing income in the changing livestock-meat economy.

It is a basic law of economics that true market value for both buyer and seller results only when the highest possible proportion of a commodity is sold under conditions of true competition. This is, of course, true in the livestock industry. As the number of livestock sold under other than competitive conditions increases, there is less likelihood for any livestock to be sold at its true value.

The amendments which I am introducing today are designed to bring the act up to date by redirecting the focus of Federal regulation so that the competitive forces of the free market system can more effectively determine the price of livestock, so that the producer and the consumer each obtain true value. This is done by clarifying the rights and responsibilities of market owners and operators so that today's livestock markets can be operated in the most efficient and competitive manner.

Let me repeat: If we do not act, and we let the present trend continue, the industry may well return to the noncompetitive situation that existed before 1921. We must not allow this to happen. We must not allow the forces of competition to be destroyed.

Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Mehren, who is charged with the administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act, discussed this possibility in a speech in Chicago in 1963. He said:

> We are all aware that terminal livestock markets as a whole have experienced a relative decline in volume in recent years. However, they are still the single most important factor in the livestock marketing pattern. . .
>
> In our administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act, we are seriously concerned with maintaining competition at these terminal market centers, so that producers can continue to rely upon a fair set of values in selling their livestock. The issue we face is no longer limited to whether certain practices are inherently bad or good, or whether some firms are intrinsically saintly or nefarious. The real issue is how to devise rules of conduct in marketing that are best suited to the kind of marketing system that has come into being.
>
> Let's consider within this context, one of the main problems with which we are faced—preserving effective competition.
>
> If [terminal] markets should cease to provide effective competition for livestock, the need for them would, for the most part, be eliminated. This would be a serious, if not fatal blow to the efficient functioning of open competition throughout our livestock marketing system.

Market owners and operators have recognized the need for improving the operations of their markets. Over the years, they have attempted to make changes which would eliminate abuses and attract a larger share of livestock to the competitive marketing system. However, their ability to make the necessary changes has been limited by the present language of the Packers and Stockyards Act, which, as I have said, was designed to deal with different conditions at a different time in our history.

There is no longer a need for regulation of the stockyards as monopolies. But as long as the act remains unchanged, there is little that can be done to reverse the present trend; there is little the stockyard owner can do. However, in *Denver Union Stockyard Company* v. *Producers Livestock Marketing Association*, 356 U.S. 282 (1958), the Supreme Court of the United States said:

> We are told, however, that the economics of the business has changed, that while at the passage of the Act most livestock purchases were at these stockyards, now a substantial portion—about 40 percent, it is said—takes place at private livestock markets such as feed yards and country points. . . . If the Act does not fit the present economics of the business, a problem is presented for the Congress. (p. 289)

That is why I am introducing these amendments today. The act does not fit the present economics of the business. These amendments will help to reverse the present trend and to assure a healthy, competitive market system in the future by clarifying, in the words of the proposed amendment—

> The responsibility and right of every stockyard owner to manage and regulate his stockyard in a just, reasonable and nondiscriminatory manner, to prescribe rules and regulations and to require those persons engaging in or attempting to engage in the purchase, sale or solicitation of livestock at such stockyard to conduct their operations in a manner which will foster, preserve, or insure an efficient, competitive public market.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that these amendments will be approved by the Congress in the near future.

EAST-WEST TRADE

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, in President Johnson's state of the Union message, he said:

> Our objective is not to continue the cold war, but to end it.

Toward this purpose he urged the Congress to help our foreign and commercial trade policies by passing an East-West trade bill. The President cited numerous recent examples of cooperation with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. He foresaw—

> A new future of enlarged partnership in nuclear affairs, in economic and technical cooperation, in trade negotiations, in political consultation, and in working together with the governments and peoples of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

In this connection, I would like to draw the attention of all Members to a well-reasoned editorial on this subject in the February 27 edition of the Washington Post. The editorial is entitled "Trading With the Enemy," and I offer it for insertion at this point in the RECORD.

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY

To Senator Karl Mundt, the Administration's proposal to loosen up East-West trade rules, by treating Soviet bloc countries roughly the same way as other American trading partners, is "bloody nonsense." Claiming to speak for GIs in Vietnam, the American Legion reports that United States troops are "puzzled, baffled and disturbed" about the idea of "bringing about a partnership with a government that is sending missiles to North Vietnam." Rep. Glen Lipscomb (R-Calif.) has attacked the idea of United States aid for an Italian project to build an automobile factory in Russia as a "dangerously deceptive travesty on the American public."

In short, opposition is strong to the idea of letting American businessmen compete on level terms with Western European and other non-Communist competitors in sales behind the Iron Curtain of things the Soviet bloc can readily acquire in any case. The same sentiment seems to apply to the proposition that bloc countries ought to be able to sell their products, be they Polish hams or rare minerals, in the United States at the same tariff rate as other suppliers.

Meantime, back in the real world, the Dow Chemical Co. has recently closed a deal which critics of East-West trade may find illuminating. Vietnam war demands, it seems, have contributed mightily to a shortage of magnesium in this country. To fill its needs, Dow Chemical, which is the world's largest producer of this metal, turned first to United States Government stockpiles, then to Western suppliers, and finally to guess who? The answer is the Russians, who have just delivered $2.3 million worth of magnesium to Dow Chemical for processing in this country, and at a 100 per cent duty rate, compared with the 40 per cent rate that would be charged against imports from non-Communist producers. Though Dow Chemical will apparently avoid some of this excess tariff by re-exporting the alloy to West German or other foreign consumers, this takes nothing from the fact that the Soviet Union is helping ease a pinch in the supply of a commodity vital to American aircraft production, and therefore to the Vietnam war effort.

The lesson here is not that the United States ought to clear the way for shipments of goods to the Soviets, and still less the Communist Chinese, which are crucial to their defense needs and unobtainable elsewhere. Nor is that contemplated in the commercial "bridge-building" which President Johnson is advocating. What this transaction does suggest is that the Russians, for all their supposed fidelity to the cause of international communism and for all their addiction to Socialist dogma, have apparently come to see a little merit in allowing the market to dictate where they buy or sell. Even if you leave aside the added incentive of "bridge-building," with all its political potential, it seems that the citadel of world capitalism can afford to be as nonideological as communism in its trade policies.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MARSH (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RYAN, for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ECKHARDT, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCDADE (at the request of Mr. BUSH), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PERKINS.
Mr. FINO.
Mr. BENNETT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BUSH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LIPSCOMB.
Mr. SPRINGER.
Mr. WYDLER.
Mr. COLLIER.
Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ECKHARDT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FRASER.
Mr. HOWARD.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 1, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

> "I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by each of the following Members and Resident Commissioner of the 90th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948:

ALABAMA

1. Jack Edwards.
2. William L. Dickinson.
3. George Andrews.
4. Bill Nichols.
5. Armistead I. Selden, Jr.
6. John Buchanan.
7. Tom Bevill.
8. Robert E. Jones, Jr.

ALASKA

At large

Howard W. Pollock.

ARIZONA

1. John J. Rhodes.
2. Morris K. Udall.
3. Sam Steiger.

ARKANSAS

1. E. C. Gathings.
2. Wilbur D. Mills.
3. John Paul Hammerschmidt.
4. David Pryor.

CALIFORNIA

1. Don H. Clausen.
2. Harold T. Johnson.
3. John E. Moss.
4. Robert L. Leggett.
5. Phillip Burton.
6. William S. Mailliard.
7. Jeffery Cohelan.
8. George P. Miller.
9. Don Edwards.
10. Charles S. Gubser.
11. J. Arthur Younger.
12. Burt L. Talcott.
13. Charles M. Teague.
14. Jerome R. Waldie.
15. John J. McFall.
16. B. F. Sisk.
17. Cecil R. King.
18. Robert B. (Bob) Mathias.
19. Chet Holifield.
20. H. Allen Smith.
21. Augustus F. Hawkins.
22. James C. Corman.
23. Del Clawson.
24. Glenard P. Lipscomb.
25. Charles E. Wiggins.
26. Thomas M. Rees.
27. Ed Reinecke.
28. Alphonzo Bell.
29. George E. Brown, Jr.
30. Edward R. Roybal.
31. Charles H. Wilson.
32. Craig Hosmer.
33. Jerry L. Pettis.
34. Richard T. Hanna.
35. James B. Utt.
36. Bob Wilson.
37. Lionel Van Deerlin.
38. John V. Tunney.

COLORADO

1. Byron G. Rogers.
2. Donald G. Brotzman.
3. Frank E. Evans.
4. Wayne N. Aspinall.

CONNECTICUT

1. Emilio Q. Daddario.
2. William L. St. Onge.
3. Robert N. Giaimo.
4. Donald J. Irwin.
5. John S. Monagan.
6. Thomas J. Meskill.

DELAWARE

At large

William V. Roth.

FLORIDA

1. Robert L. F. Sikes.
2. Don Fuqua.
3. Charles E. Bennett.
4. A. Sydney Herlong, Jr.
5. Edward J. Gurney.
6. Sam Gibbons.
7. James A. Haley.
8. William C. Cramer.
9. Paul G. Rogers.
10. J. Herbert Burke.
11. Claude Pepper.
12. Dante B. Fascell.

GEORGIA

1. G. Elliott Hagan.
2. Maston O'Neal.
3. Jack Brinkley.
4. Benjamin B. Blackburn.
5. Fletcher Thompson.
6. John J. Flynt, Jr.
7. John W. Davis.
8. W. S. (Bill) Stuckey.
9. Phil M. Landrum.
10. Robert G. Stephens, Jr.

HAWAII

At large

Spark M. Matsunaga.
Patsy T. Mink.

IDAHO

1. James A. McClure.
2. George V. Hansen.

ILLINOIS

1. William L. Dawson.
2. Barratt O'Hara.
3. William T. Murphy.
4. Edward J. Derwinski.
5. John C. Kluczynski.
6. Daniel J. Ronan.
7. Frank Annunzio.
8. Dan Rostenkowski.
9. Sidney R. Yates.
10. Harold R. Collier.
11. Roman C. Pucinski.
12. Robert McClory.
13. Donald Rumsfeld.
14. John N. Erlenborn.
15. Charlotte T. Reid.
16. John B. Anderson.
17. Leslie C. Arends.
18. Robert H. Michel.

19. Tom Railsback.
20. Paul Findley.
21. Kenneth J. Gray.
22. William L. Springer.
23. George E. Shipley.
24. Melvin Price.

INDIANA

1. Ray J. Madden.
2. Charles A. Halleck.
3. John Brademas.
4. E. Ross Adair.
5. J. Edward Roush.
6. William G. Bray.
7. John T. Myers.
8. Roger H. Zion.
9. Lee H. Hamilton.
10. Richard L. Roudebush.
11. Andrew Jacobs, Jr.

IOWA

1. Fred Schwengel.
2. John C. Culver.
3. H. R. Gross.
4. John Kyl.
5. Neal Smith.
6. Wiley Mayne.
7. William J. Scherle.

KANSAS

1. Robert Dole.
2. Chester L. Mize.
3. Larry Winn, Jr.
4. Garner E. Shriver.
5. Joe Skubitz.

KENTUCKY

1. Frank A. Stubblefield.
2. William H. Natcher.
3. William O. Cowger.
4. M. G. (Gene) Snyder.
5. Tim Lee Carter.
6. John C. Watts.
7. Carl D. Perkins.

LOUISIANA

1. F. Edward Hébert.
2. Hale Boggs.
3. Edwin E. Willis.
4. Joe D. Waggonner, Jr.
5. Otto E. Passman.
6. John R. Rarick.
7. Edwin W. Edwards.
8. Speedy O. Long.

MAINE

1. Peter N. Kyros.
2. William D. Hathaway.

MARYLAND

1. Rogers C. B. Morton.
2. Clarence D. Long.
3. Edward A. Garmatz.
4. George H. Fallon.
5. Hervey G. Machen.
6. Charles McC. Mathias, Jr.
7. Samuel N. Friedel.
8. Gilbert Gude.

MASSACHUSETTS

1. Silvio O. Conte.
2. Edward P. Boland.
3. Philip J. Philbin.
4. Harold D. Donohue.
5. F. Bradford Morse.
6. William H. Bates.
7. Horbert H. Macdonald.
8. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.
9. John W. McCormack.
10. Margaret M. Heckler.
11. James A. Burke.
12. Hastings Keith.

MICHIGAN

1. John Conyers, Jr.
2. Marvin L. Esch.
3. Garry Brown.
4. Edward Hutchinson.
5. Gerald R. Ford.
6. Charles E. Chamberlain.
7. Donald W. Riegle, Jr.
8. James Harvey.
9. Guy Vander Jagt.
10. Elford A. Cederberg.
11. Philip E. Ruppe.
12. James G. O'Hara.
13. Charles C. Diggs, Jr.
14. Lucien N. Nedzi.
15. William D. Ford.
16. John D. Dingell.
17. Martha W. Griffiths.
18. William S. Broomfield.
19. Jack H. McDonald.

MINNESOTA

1. Albert H. Quie.
2. Ancher Nelsen.
3. Clark MacGregor.
4. Joseph E. Karth.
5. Donald M. Fraser.
6. John M. Zwach.
7. Odin Langen.
8. John A. Blatnik.

MISSISSIPPI

1. Thomas G. Abernethy.
2. Jamie L. Whitten.
3. John Bell Williams.
4. G. V. (Sonny) Montgomery.
5. William M. Colmer.

MISSOURI

1. Frank M. Karsten.
2. Thomas B. Curtis.
3. Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.) Sullivan.
4. Wm. J. Randall.
5 Richard Bolling
6. W. R. Hull, Jr.
7. Durward G. Hall.
8. Richard H. Ichord.
9. William L. Hungate.
10. Paul C. Jones.

MONTANA

1. Arnold Olsen.
2. James F. Battin.

NEBRASKA

1. Robert V. Denney.
2. Glenn Cunningham.
3. Dave Martin.

NEVADA

At large

Walter S. Baring.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1. Louis C. Wyman.
2. James C. Cleveland.

NEW JERSEY

1. John E. Hunt.
2. Charles W. Sandman, Jr.
3. James J. Howard.
4. Frank Thompson, Jr.
5. Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen.
6. William T. Cahill.
7. William B. Widnall
8. Charles S. Joelson.
9. Henry Helstoski.
10. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.
11. Joseph G. Minish.
12. Florence P. Dwyer.
13. Cornelius E. Gallagher.
14. Dominick V. Daniels.
15. Edward J. Patten.

NEW MEXICO

At large

Thomas G. Morris.
E. S. Johnny Walker.

NEW YORK

1. Otis G. Pike.
2. James R. Grover, Jr.
3. Lester L. Wolff.
4. John W. Wydler.
5. Herbert Tenzer.
6. Seymour Halpern.
7. Joseph P. Addabbo.
8. Benjamin S. Rosenthal.
9. James J. Delaney.
10. Emanuel Celler.
11. Frank J. Brasco.
12. Edna F. Kelly.
13. Abraham J. Multer.
14. John J. Rooney.
15. Hugh L. Carey.
16. John M. Murphy.
17. Theodore R. Kupferman.
18. ——— ———.
19. Leonard Farbstein.
20. William F. Ryan.
21. James H. Scheuer.
22. Jacob H. Gilbert.
23. Jonathan B. Bingham.
24. Paul A. Fino.
25. Richard L. Ottinger.
26. Ogden R. Reid.
27. John G. Dow.
28. Joseph Y. Resnick.
29. Daniel E. Button.
30. Carleton J. King.
31. Robert C. McEwen.
32. Alexander Pirnie.
33. Howard W. Robison.
34. James M. Hanley.
35. Samuel S. Stratton.
36. Frank J. Horton.
37. Barber B. Conable, Jr.
38. Charles E. Goodell.
39. Richard D. McCarthy.
40. Henry P. Smith III.
41. Thaddeus J. Dulski.

NORTH CAROLINA

1. Walter B. Jones.
2. L. H. Fountain.
3. David N. Henderson.
4. James C. Gardner.
5. Nick Galifianakis.
6. Horace R. Kornegay.
7. Alton Lennon.
8. Charles Raper Jonas.
9. James T. Broyhill.
10. Basil L. Whitener.
11. Roy A. Taylor.

NORTH DAKOTA

1. Mark Andrews.
2. Thomas S. Kleppe.

OHIO

1. Robert Taft, Jr.
2. Donald D. Clancy.
3. Charles W. Whalen, Jr.
4. William M. McCulloch.
5. Delbert L. Latta.
6. William H. Harsha.
7. Clarence J. Brown, Jr.
8. Jackson E. Betts.
9. Thomas L. Ashley.
10. Clarence E. Miller.
11. J. William Stanton.
12. Samuel L. Devine.
13. Charles A. Mosher.
14. William H. Ayres.
15. Chalmers P. Wylie.

16. Frank T. Bow.
17. John M. Ashbrook.
18. Wayne L. Hays.
19. Michael J. Kirwan.
20. Michael A. Feighan.
21. Charles A. Vanik.
22. Frances P. Bolton.
23. William E. Minshall.
24. Donald E. Lukens.

OKLAHOMA

1. Page Belcher.
2. Ed Edmondson.
3. Carl Albert.
4. Tom Steed.
5. John Jarman.
6. James V. Smith

OREGON

1. Wendell Wyatt.
2. Al Ullman.
3. Edith Green.
4. John R. Dellenback.

PENNSYLVANIA

1. William A. Barrett.
2. Robert N. C. Nix.
3. James A. Byrne.
4. Joshua Eilberg.
5. William J. Green.
6. George M. Rhodes.
7. Lawrence G. Williams.
8. Edward G. Biester, Jr.
9. G. Robert Watkins.
10. Joseph M. McDade.
11. Daniel J. Flood.
12. J. Irving Whalley.
13. Richard S. Schweiker.
14. William S. Moorhead.
15. Fred B. Rooney.
16. Edwin D. Eshleman.
17. Herman T. Schneebeli.
18. Robert J. Corbett.
19. George A. Goodling.
20. Elmer J. Holland.
21. John H. Dent.
22. John P. Saylor.
23. Albert W. Johnson.
24. Joseph P. Vigorito.
25. Frank M. Clark.
26. Thomas E. Morgan.
27. James G. Fulton.

RHODE ISLAND

1. Fernand J. St Germain.
2. ——— ———.

SOUTH CAROLINA

1. L. Mendel Rivers.
2. Albert W. Watson.
3. W. J. Bryan Dorn
4 Robert T. Ashmore.
5. Tom S. Gettys.
6. John L. McMillan.

SOUTH DAKOTA

1. Ben Reifel.
2. E. Y. Berry.

TENNESSEE

1. James H. (Jimmy) Quillen.
2. John J. Duncan.
3. W. E. (Bill) Brock.
4. Joe L. Evins.
5. Richard Fulton.
6. William R. Anderson.
7. Ray Blanton.
8. Robert A. Everett.
9. Dan Kuykendall.

TEXAS

1. Wright Patman.
2. John Dowdy.
3. Joe Pool.
4. Ray Roberts.
5. Earle Cabell.
6. Olin E. Teague.
7. George Bush.
8. Bob Eckhardt.
9. Jack Brooks.
10. J. J. Pickle.
11. W. R. Poage.
12. Jim Wright.
13. Graham Purcell.
14. John Young.
15. Eligio de la Garza.
16. Richard White.
17. Omar Burleson.
18. Robert Price.
19. George Mahon.
20. Henry B. Gonzalez.
21. O. C. Fisher.
22. Bob Casey.
23. Abraham Kazen.

UTAH

1. Laurence J. Burton.
2. Sherman P. Lloyd.

VERMONT

At large

Robert T. Stafford.

VIRGINIA

1. Thomas N. Downing.
2. Porter Hardy, Jr.
3. David E. Satterfield III.
4. Watkins M. Abbitt.
5. William M. Tuck.
6. Richard H. Poff.
7. John O. Marsh, Jr.
8. William Lloyd Scott.
9. William C. Wampler.
10. Joel T. Broyhill.

WASHINGTON

1. Thomas M. Pelly.
2. Lloyd Meeds.
3. Julia Butler Hansen.
4. Catherine May.
5. Thomas S. Foley.
6. Floyd V. Hicks.
7. Brock Adams.

WEST VIRGINIA

1. Arch A. Moore, Jr.
2. Harley O. Staggers.
3. John M. Slack, Jr.
4. Ken Hechler.
5. James Kee.

WISCONSIN

1. Henry C. Schadeberg.
2. Robert W. Kastenmeier.
3. Vernon W. Thomson.
4. Clement J. Zablocki.
5. Henry S. Reuss.
6. William A. Steiger.
7. Melvin R. Laird.
8. John W. Byrnes.
9. Glenn R. Davis.
10. Alvin E. O'Konski.

WYOMING

At large

William Henry Harrison.

PUERTO RICO

Resident Commissioner

Santiago Polanco-Abreu.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

434. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting certain amendments to the request for appropriations transmitted in the budget for the fiscal year 1968 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for the Atomic Energy Commission (H. Doc. No. 62); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

435. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a statement relating to trade and other transactions involving Southern Rhodesia (H. Doc. No. 63); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with accompanying papers.

436. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Commissioner of Social Security, and the Secretary, Board of Trustees, transmitting the 1967 Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund (H. Doc. No. 64); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

437. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Commissioner of Social Security, and the Secretary, Board of Trustees, transmitting the 1967 Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Disability Insurance Trust Fund (H. Doc. No. 65); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

438. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Commissioner of Social Security, and the Secretary, Board of Trustees, transmitting the 1967 Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund (H. Doc. No. 66); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

439. A letter from the Chairman, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, transmitting a report covering refunds and credits of internal revenue taxes for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to the provisions of section 6405 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (H. Doc. No. 67); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

440. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on the agricultural conservation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of 50 Stat. 329; to the Committee on Agriculture.

441. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to transfer from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia court of general sessions the authority to waive certain provisions relating to the issuance of a marriage license in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

442. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that the Commissioners may accept or permit the acceptance of the performance by volunteers of services for and on behalf of the municipal government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

443. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 503(f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend for a period of 10 years the authorization to make appropriations for allocations and grants for the collection and publication of

documentary sources significant to the history of the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

444. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting the required report for the period July 1, 1966, to December 31, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-454; to the Committee on House Administration.

445. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal, pursuant to the provisions of 63 Stat. 377; to the Committee on House Administration.

446. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program, to expand the program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

447. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation, as follows: (1) for the relief of Robert M. Gilkey, Jr., and (2) for the relief of Dino J. Caterini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

448. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 5 of the United States Code with respect to pay received by public school teachers of the District of Columbia for employment during the summer vacation period; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

449. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entering in the case of certain aliens found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a) (28) (I) (ii), of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

450. A letter from the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, amendments to H.R. 3647, a bill authorizing appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1968; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 347. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 4515, a bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 31). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 6230. A bill to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education by extending authority for allocation of funds to be used for education of Indian children and children in overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense, by extending and amending the National Teacher Corps program, by providing assistance for comprehensive educational planning, and by improving programs of education for the handicapped; to improve programs of vocational education; to improve authority for assistance to schools in federally impacted areas and areas suffering a major disaster; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 6231. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 6232. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, and the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 6233. A bill to amend section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 6234. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 6235. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 6236. A bill to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education by extending authority for allocation of funds to be used for education of Indian children and children in overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense, by extending and amending the National Teacher Corps program, by providing assistance for comprehensive educational planning, and by improving programs of education for the handicapped; to improve programs of vocational education; to improve authority for assistance to schools in federally impacted areas and areas suffering a major disaster; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 6237. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 6238. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture jointly with the Secretary of Commerce to make a preliminary survey of the proposed Skyline Drive Recreation Way in the Manti-LaSal and Fishlake National Forests in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6239. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $250,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed Golden Circle National Scenic Parkway complex connecting the national parks, monuments, and recreation areas in the southern part of Utah with the national parks, monuments, and recreation areas situated in northern Arizona, northwestern New Mexico, and southwestern Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6240. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act and the civil service retirement law with respect to the tenure and retirement benefits of referees in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 6241. A bill to amend the Uniform Time Act of 1966 in order to permit certain States to determine the standard time which shall be observed within their boundaries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6242. A bill to amend the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965 to extend the time for filing certain claims for floor stocks refunds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6243. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 6244. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a child shall be considered to have been dependent upon his mother at the time required for entitlement to child's insurance benefits based on her wage record if at such time she was fully insured and was either living with him or contributing to his support; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 6245. A bill to amend chapter 235 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the appellate review of sentences imposed in criminal cases arising in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 6246. A bill to prohibit the introduction, or manufacture for introduction, into interstate commerce of master keys for motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 6247. A bill to establish a Federal sabbatical program to improve the quality of teaching in the Nation's elementary or secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 6248. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 6249. A bill to establish a National Institute of Criminal Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6250. A bill to assist State and local governments in reducing the incidence of crime, to increase the effectiveness, fairness, and coordination of law enforcement and criminal justice systems at all levels of government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6251. A bill to assist in combating crime by creating the U.S. Corrections Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 6252. A bill to provide assistance to students pursuing programs of higher education in the fields of law enforcement and of correctional treatment of law violators; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 6253. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 6254. A bill to modify the decrease in Federal group life insurance at age 65 or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6255. A bill to provide that the value of survivor annuities payable under chapter 83, title 5, United States Code, shall not be taken into account for State inheritance tax or Federal estate tax purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6256. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 to provide lump-sum payment for the unused sick leave to the credit of an officer or employee immediately prior to his separation from the service on retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6257. A bill to permit a retired employee or member receiving health benefits pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Employees Health Benefit Act of 1959 (5 U.S.C. 89) to elect coverage under the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1960 (Public Law 86-724); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6258. A bill to amend section 8341 of title 5, United States Code, to provide annuities for surviving spouses without deduction from a retired employee or member's annuity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6259. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide that the entire cost of health benefits under such act shall be paid by the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6260. A bill to amend title VI of the Public Health Service Act to establish a program under which assistance may be furnished for the construction of standby electrical systems in existing or proposed hospitals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6261. A bill to provide that Flag Day shall be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 6262. A bill to control unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products and associations of such producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 6263. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of the monthly benefits payable thereunder, to raise the wage base, to provide for cost-of-living increases in such benefits, to increase the amount of the benefits payable to widows, to provide for contributions to the social security trust funds from the general revenues, to otherwise extend and improve the insurance system established by such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 6264. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 6265. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, and the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 6266. A bill to provide for payment of postage at local zone rates on certain parcels mailed by or for delivery to members of the U.S. Armed Forces in combat zones; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 6267. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6268. A bill to establish a National Institute of Criminal Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 6269. A bill to amend Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6270. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 6271. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 6272. A bill to establish a National Institute of Criminal Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6273. A bill to amend section 8341 of title 5, United States Code, to provide annuities for surviving spouses without deduction from a retired employee or Member's annuity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6274. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the reduction in annuity when the potential survivor-annuitant predeceases the retired employee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 6275. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on paper industries machinery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 6276. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an aged survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits, or suffer any reduction in the amount of such benefits, by reason of marriage or remarriage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 6277. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Uniform Gifts to Minors Act to provide that gifts to minors made under such act may be deposited in savings and loan associations and related institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 6278. A bill to promote and support representation of U.S. interests in voluntary international commercial standards activities, to establish a clearinghouse for commercial and procurement standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 6279. A bill to provide for collection, compilation, critical evaluation, publication, and sale of standard reference data; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 6280. A bill to prohibit arbitrary discrimination in employment on account of age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 6281. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 6282. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall acquire additional land for the Beverly National Cemetery, N.J.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6283. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to obscene or harassing telephone calls in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 6284. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 6285. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the transportation of mail at no cost to the sender to and from the United States and combat areas overseas as designated by the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 6286. A bill to designate the locks and dam on the Ohio River, in the States of Kentucky and Ohio, known as the Greenup Locks and Dam as the Paul G. Blazer Locks and Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 6287. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 6288. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 6289. A bill to provide for the establishment of the St. Croix National Scenic Riverway in the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6290. A bill to provide that where the entitlement of a veteran, widow, or child, to a pension from the Veterans' Administration is based upon the veteran's having served in World War I, World War II, or Korean conflict, the beneficiary shall if otherwise eligible have the right to elect payment of pension under either the provision of title 38 as in effect on June 30, 1960, or as amended by the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959, whichever provides the greater benefit; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 6291. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 6292. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act so as to extend and improve the Federal-State program of child welfare services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 6293. A bill to amend section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 6294. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the rates of pension payable to certain veterans and their widows, to provide additional readjustment assistance for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6295. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer or spouse who has had a laryngectomy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6296. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow an additional income tax exemption for a dependent who is mentally retarded; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6297. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 6298. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 6299. A bill, to extend certain pay, leave, and retention preference benefits under title 5, United States Code, to employees of the agricultural county committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 6300. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6301. A bill to encourage equity investment in new and small business, to relieve unemployment and provide additional revenue to the Federal Government to be applied to debt reduction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 6302. A bill to amend title 10, United

States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6303. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.J. Res. 362. Joint resolution to establish the Golden Spike Centennial Celebration Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 363. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate Philadelphia, Pa., as the site of a world's fair commemorating the 200th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.J. Res. 364. Joint resolution to designate Monday, October 2, 1966, as Free Enterprise Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.J. Res. 365. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the power of courts of the United States to review convictions in criminal actions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.J. Res. 366. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H. Con. Res. 248. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the interest of peace in Vietnam the Government of the United States should only consider further expansions of trade, educational and cultural exchanges, and other related agreements with the Soviet Union and its East European satellites when there is demonstrable evidence that their actions and policies with regard to Vietnam have been redirected toward peace and an honorable settlement and when there is demonstrable evidence that they have abandoned their policy of support for so-called wars of national liberation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. QUIE:

H. Con. Res. 249. Concurrent resolution to provide for a permanent United Nations peacekeeping force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. Con. Res. 250. Concurrent resolution reaffirming the support of the Congress for United Nations peacekeeping and peacemaking operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H. Res. 321. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct and amending the Rules of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H. Res. 322. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Consumer Interests; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Res. 323. Resolution to authorize a study by the Committee on Banking and Currency with respect to the effectiveness of present law dealing with foreign restrictive trade practices or boycotts; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H. Res. 324. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McDONALD of Michigan:

H. Res. 325. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H. Res. 326. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BATES:

H. Res. 327. Resolution to extend the congratulations of the House of Representatives to the people of Puerto Rico on their 50th anniversary of U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLE:

H. Res. 328. Resolution to extend the congratulations of the House of Representatives to the people of Puerto Rico on their 50th anniversary of U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H. Res. 329. Resolution to extend the congratulations of the House of Representatives to the people of Puerto Rico on their 50th anniversary of U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. Res. 330. Resolution to extend the congratulations of the House of Representatives to the people of Puerto Rico on their 50th anniversary of U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia:

H. Res. 331. Resolution to extend the congratulations of the House of Representatives to the people of Puerto Rico on their 50th anniversary of U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H. Res. 332. Resolution to extend the congratulations of the House of Representatives to the people of Puerto Rico on their 50th anniversary of U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H. Res. 333. Resolution to extend the congratulations of the House of Representatives to the people of Puerto Rico on their 50th anniversary of U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H. Res. 334. Resolution to extend the congratulations of the House of Representatives to the people of Puerto Rico on their 50th anniversary of U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H. Res. 335. Resolution to establish a Select Committee on Civilian Casualties and Refugees in South Vietnam to conduct an investigation and study of the effects of military operations in South Vietnam on the civilian population of South Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BROWN of California:

H. Res. 336. Resolution to establish a Select Committee on Civilian Casualties and Refugees in South Vietnam to conduct an investigation and study of the effects of military operations in South Vietnam on the civilian population of South Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BUTTON:

H. Res. 337. Resolution to establish a Select Committee on Civilian Casualties and Refugees in South Vietnam to conduct an investigation and study of the effects of military operations in South Vietnam on the civilian population of South Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DOW:

H. Res. 338. Resolution to establish a Select Committee on Civilian Casualties and Refugees in South Vietnam to conduct an investigation and study of the effects of military operations in South Vietnam on the civilian population of South Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H. Res. 339. Resolution to establish a Select Committee on Civilian Casualties and Refugees in South Vietnam to conduct an investigation and study of the effects of military operations in South Vietnam on the civilian population of South Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HALPERN:

H. Res. 340. Resolution to establish a Select Committee on Civilian Casualties and Refugees in South Vietnam to conduct an investigation and study of the effects of military operations in South Vietnam on the civilian population of South Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H. Res. 341. Resolution to establish a Select Committee on Civilian Casualties and Refugees in South Vietnam to conduct an investigation and study of the effects of military operations in South Vietnam on the civilian population of South Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H. Res. 342. Resolution to establish a Select Committee on Civilian Casualties and Refugees in South Vietnam to conduct an investigation and study of the effects of military operations in South Vietnam on the civilian population of South Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H. Res. 343. Resolution to establish a Select Committee on Civilian Casualties and Refugees in South Vietnam to conduct an investigation and study of the effects of military operations in South Vietnam on the civilian population of South Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. Res. 344. Resolution to establish a Select Committee on Civilian Casualties and Refugees in South Vietnam to conduct an investigation and study of the effects of military operations in South Vietnam on the civilian population of South Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. MINK:

H. Res. 345. Resolution to establish a Select Committee on Civilian Casualties and Refugees in South Vietnam to conduct an investigation and study of the effects of military operations in South Vietnam on the civilian population of South Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H. Res. 346. Resolution to establish a Select Committee on Civilian Casualties and Refugees in South Vietnam to conduct an investigation and study of the effects of military operations in South Vietnam on the civilian population of South Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

37. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to rescinding all sanctions against the Republic of Rhodesia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

38. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to the power of the States to tax; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 6304. A bill for the relief of Filbert Montano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEVILL:

H.R. 6305. A bill for the relief of Claud Ferguson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 6306. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Farruggia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6307. A bill for the relief of Althea Hadaway; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6308. A bill for the relief of Georgia Christiana Jefferson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6309. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Vella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 6310. A bill for the relief of Dionisio Bautista; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 6311. A bill for the relief of Kewum Bong Choy, and daughter, So Young Choy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 6312. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Lt. Col. Harry L. Haverstick against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 6313. A bill for the relief of Jorge I. Aunon-Prieto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6314. A bill for the relief of George P. Edgell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6315. A bill for the relief of Kalatu Nair Gopalan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6316. A bill for the relief of Angele Magarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6317. A bill for the relief of Maria Puglisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6318. A bill for the relief of William L. Wilde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH:

H.R. 6319. A bill for the relief of Caterina and Guiseppe Furnari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 6320. A bill for the relief of Vivencia O. Consing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 6321. A bill for the relief of the Cuban Truck & Equipment Co., its heirs and assigns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 6322. A bill for the relief of Onofrio Alaimo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 6323. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rodolfo Eduardo Bustamante y Arriola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 6324. A bill for the relief of John A. Danisch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6325. A bill for the relief of 2d Lt. Allan L. Schooler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 6326. A bill for the relief of Chrisanthe Savas Karatapanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 6327. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tong H. Chang, and his wife, Whaja Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 6328. A bill for the relief of Ilyn (Eileen) Haywood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN (by request):

H.R. 6329. A bill for the relief of Victoria Frederick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6330. A bill for the relief of Ruby Gwendolyn Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 6331. A bill for the relief of Miss Paraskevi Stavropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 6332. A bill for the relief of Dr. Zito C. Alba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 6333. A bill for the relief of Martino de Benedetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6334. A bill for the relief of Carmine Pennella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 6335. A bill for the relief of Marciano Domingo Malapira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6336. A bill for the relief of Rita Shih-Yu Wang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN (by request):

H.R. 6337. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy (Wong) Wolff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 6338. A bill for the relief of Antonio Gerardo Pinto and his wife, Rosalia Reale Pinto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Howard University Celebrates 100th Anniversary—Former West Virginia Governor Atkinson Graduate of Howard—Past President Mordecai W. Johnson, Former Minister in Charleston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 28, 1967

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Howard University is celebrating its 100th anniversary this week. It has been brought to my attention by West Virginia's widely known journalist, Jim Comstock, editor of the West Virginia Hillbilly, that former Gov. George W. Atkinson, of our State, was graduated from Howard University Law School. After graduation and after an active period in the practice of law, he served as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives from 1890–91 before being elected Governor for the term 1897–1901.

Dr. Mordecai Wyatt Johnson, former Howard University president, was pastor of the First Baptist Church in Charleston, W. Va., from 1917–26. From Charleston, in the latter year, Dr. Johnson came to Washington and assumed the Howard presidency and served that institution until his retirement in 1960. There are other distinguished West Virginians who have had close ties with Howard University, but I felt it appropriate to mention Governor Atkinson and Howard's longtime effective leader, Dr. Mordecai Johnson.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my anniversary telegram of congratulations to Dr. James Madison Nabrit, Jr., president of Howard University, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 27, 1967.

DR. JAMES MADISON NABRIT, JR.,
President, Howard University,
Washington, D.C.:

I wish to extend my congratulations as Howard University celebrates its 100th anniversary. The School has served the area and the Nation well and I send my best wishes as the institution begins its second century of constructive activities in the field of education.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

The 100th Anniversary of the University of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1967

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the University of Illinois is 100 years old today.

It has been a century of achievement.

An illustrious alumnus, James B. Reston, of the New York Times, has written: "Anniversaries, rightly used, are the benchmarks of history."

Like all great institutions the University of Illinois means many things to many people. Those marking its centennial benchmark do so for widely varying reasons. The University of Illinois is noted—

For its role in the history of higher learning in this country. Starting as a land-grant college with three faculty members and 72 students it has grown into one of the Nation's top 10 universities with 42,500 students on three campuses and more than 6,500 teaching and administrative officers.

For the high quality of its instruction at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, reflected by the success of its alumni in all walks of life and by the number of students from other schools who choose it for their graduate work. Illinois ranks fourth among the Nation's universities in the number of doctorates awarded. In the American Council on Education's recently published Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education, the University of Illinois, among the more than 100 major institutions surveyed, was one of only nine which excelled in three or more areas of graduate study.

For its excellence in research. The teamwork of Illinois chemistry and chemical engineering produced such achievements as nylon and the synthetic sweeting agent, sucaryl. Three Illini have won Nobel Prizes: Edward A. Doisy for his identification and synthesis of vitamin K; Wendall M. Stanley for the isolation of crystalline viruses which play such an active role in so many animal and plant diseases, and Vincent du

Vigneaud for his synthesis of the mammary gland hormone, oxytocin. Engineering research at Illinois helped make railroads safer and contributed to the development of all-channel television antenna. The university's Betatron was one of the first "atom smashers" to be used in treatment of cancer and other scientific research. The University of Illinois ranked sixth among American universities for research activities in 1966 with an expenditure of $44 million. Currently, 1,700 projects involving more than 3,000 professional researchers, in addition to graduate students and technicians, are in progress.

For its pioneering work in agriculture. The university's Morrow plots are the oldest field experimental plots in the United States. Illinois researchers helped develop hybrid corn and the modern soybean. They have been in the forefront in the development of new ideas in animal husbandry, dairy production and manufacturing, horticulture, poultry science, agricultural engineering, farm management and agricultural economics. A distinguished alumnus, a constituent of mine and no stranger to my colleagues in the Congress, is Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

For its preeminence in the arts and humanities. The Urbana campus has the largest university art department in the country. The Krannert Center for the Performing Arts, now under construction, will offer superb facilities for opera, orchestra, choral groups, theater, and dance. Renowned Illini, present and past, include Sculptor Lorado Taft; the dean of American historians, Allan Nevins; Lincoln biographers James G. Randall and Paul M. Angle; Carl Van Doren, who won the Pulitzer Prize for his "Benjamin Franklin," his brother, the Pulitzer Prize winning poet, Mark Van Doren, and authors Gerald Carson, Robert Lewis Taylor, William Maxwell, Daniel Curley, Stanley Elkin, Jack Gelber and many others.

For the wealth of its physical resources. The university library is the fifth largest of all American libraries and largest of any State university. Complementing the 71,000-seat Memorial Stadium, dedicated in 1924, is the mammoth new Assembly Hall, one of the Nation's largest indoor arenas. The new Chicago Illini Union at the Medical Center and the buildings planned and under construction at the Chicago Circle Campus are examples of the expansion still going on.

For its contributions to business and industry. Corporation presidents who graduated from Illinois include Leslie B. Worthington, United States Steel; William G. Karnes, Beatrice Foods; Harry O. Bercher, International Harvester, and Arnold O. Beckman, Beckman Instruments. William B. Greene of Barber-Greene Co., manufacturer of paving and material handling machinery; Herman C. Krannert of the Inland Container Corp.; Harold Boeschenstein of Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp., and Robert L. Latzer of the Pet Milk Co., are Illini who now serve their respective firms as board chairmen. Clifford F. Hood, retired president of United States Steel, and Collett E. Woolman, late president of Delta Air Lines, are other products of the university.

For the prowess of its athletes in various fields of sports. Such names as the immortal Harold (Red) Grange; his famed football coach, Bob Zuppke; George Halas, owner-coach of the Chicago Bears who lettered in three sports at Illinois; George A. Huff, Illinois athletic director from 1896 to 1935, and all around athlete Lou Boudreau are writ large in the history of the "Fighting Illini." Avery Brundage, president of the International Olympic Committee, is an alumnus. Illinois ranks second in the alltime statistics for the number of championships in all Big Ten sports. Recent Illini football teams have won three Rose Bowl victories.

Henry T. Heald, a former president of the Ford Foundation, wrote recently:

> It is impossible to rank universities on any exact basis, but no one would question that the University of Illinois is one of America's great institutions of higher learning; one of significance not only to the state which supports it, but one of consequence on the national and international scene.

Among its alumni, Illinois claims 19 members of the National Academy of Sciences, three founding members of the National Academy of Engineering, and 12 members of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. The university is, in 1967, of a size and importance unimagined by those who took part in its establishment in 1867.

The university's centennial year begins today with the marking of the 100th anniversary of Gov. Richard J. Oglesby's signing into law on February 28, 1867, legislation passed by the Illinois General Assembly providing for the establishment of the "Illinois Industrial University" in Champaign County at a point halfway between the cities of Champaign and Urbana.

Under the able leadership of Fred H. Turner, dean of students and director of the centennial, the university has planned a yearlong series of observances to be climaxed by the 100th anniversary on March 11, 1968, of the formal ceremonies marking the inauguration of the new institution.

It is of significant interest that the University of Illinois is the land-grant institution in the State of the Union where the idea of the land-grant college or university originated. Furthermore the Land Grant Act of 1862, under which the national system of land-grant institutions has been established, was signed into law on July 1, 1862, by a President from Illinois, Abraham Lincoln.

But the history of the University of Illinois really precedes its foundation in 1867. As early as 1848, Jonathan B. Turner, of Jacksonville, Ill., corresponded with John Blanchard, president of Knox College, then one of several private colleges operating in the State, and made known his plan for establishing a State industrial and agricultural university.

In February 1853, the Illinois House and Senate adopted joint resolutions requesting Federal aid for a national system of agricultural and industrial universities and in 1854 forwarded the resolutions to Congress where they were read in the House and Senate.

Justin Morrill, for whom the Land Grant Act is popularly named, entered the House of Representatives in 1855 as a Representative from Vermont. Almost immediately after his election, he introduced, unsuccessfully, a bill calling for the establishment of a national agricultural school, to be chartered on the same basis as the national military academy. In 1857 he introduced yet another bill, which incorporated the essential features of the resolutions earlier put forth by the Illinois Legislature. The bill was passed by the House and Senate but vetoed by President Buchanan in 1859 on the grounds that it was unconstitutional. Finally passed and signed into law in 1862, the act provided for the granting of 30,000 acres of public land for each Senator and Representative in Congress of each particular State, "for the endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies—to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislatures of the States may prescribe." Thus Illinois' Jonathan Turner, while not the author of the bill to which the present University of Illinois owes its existence, was nevertheless instrumental in bringing about the establishment of the State university; he is still known today as the "father of industrial and agricultural education."

As required under the terms of the Morrill Act, the State of Illinois accepted its provisions on February 14, 1863. Four years passed before the State acted to bring the new type of State institution into reality.

The two decades previous to the passage of the Land Grant Act of 1862 had been marked with growing dissatisfaction with the colleges of the day, classical in course, basically preparing for the ministry or for the professions, and failing to meet the needs of the growing numbers of sons and daughters of workers and artisans, who felt the need for a type of education where agriculture and the mechanic arts might be taught, and while not excluding other classical and literary subjects, might better prepare the young people of the day for the demands of a faster moving industrial world.

It might be interesting to contemplate just what might have been in the minds of the young people of Illinois on February 28, 1867, when Governor Oglesby signed the bill establishing the new institution. Was their dream of an opportunity for higher education of a new type about to be realized? Was all this talk about a new institution within their financial means just talk? How could the proposed new university ever be readied for them, when it was known that in Champaign-Urbana there existed a partially built building, just one, to house the new university; there was no board of trustees, there was no faculty, there was no course of study?

Yet in the 12 months and 11 days from February 28, 1867, to March 11, 1868, the one building was completed and ready, the Governor had appointed a board of trustees, this board had hired a regent, and two additional teachers, had adopted a course of study, and 72 students had been registered between March 2, 1868, and March 11, when the formal opening was held.

The students of 1867 and 1868 had little more than hope and promises on which to base their educational dreams. Their reasons for optimism must have been severely strained as they watched the plans develop. Students of every generation have their problems, but the students of 1967 have much more on which to base promising opportunities than did the students of a hundred years ago.

The Illinois Industrial University of February 28, 1867, had one poorly built building. Today the three campuses of the University of Illinois occupy 179 major and 456 other buildings on three campuses, with 152 major buildings at Urbana-Champaign, 13 at the medical center in Chicago, and 14 at Chicago Circle, the total value of these buildings being about $425 million. The three faculty members of the first year have grown to about 5,000 at Urbana-Champaign, 600 at the medical center, and 700 at Chicago Circle, and in addition to the more than 6,000 teaching and administrative officers, there are 8,500 nonacademic employees engaged in various duties connected with the operation of the three campuses. The 72 students have grown to a total full-time student body of over 29,000 at Urbana-Champaign, 2,500 at the medical campus, and 11,000 at Chicago Circle, and in addition some 4,500 students are taught part time in extramural classes. The one pitifully small academic unit has become an organization of 15 colleges and schools at Urbana-Champaign, five at the medical center, and eight at Chicago Circle. And the library, which did not exist when the university was opened now has more than 5,700,000 items, and is exceeded only by Harvard and Yale among university libraries.

With a physical plant which is modern and ever growing, with a large and distinguished faculty, with a library adequate for any reference or research, and a choice of courses almost without restriction, the student of 1967 is placed in the promising position of almost no limitation on his educational opportunity as the university enters its Centennial Year.

In the last 100 years 19 men have served as President of the United States and the State of Illinois has had 20 Governors. During that time only 12 men have served as president of the University of Illinois. All of them left their mark on the university but none, in my judgment, has coped so successfully with such complex problems as the present chief administrator, Dr. David Dodds Henry, who has been the president of the University of Illinois since 1955. His predecessors and the dates of their administrations were: John Milton Gregory, 1867 to 1880; Selim Hobart Peabody, 1880 to 1891; Thomas Jonathan Burrill, 1891 to 1894; Andrew Sloan Draper, 1894 to 1904; Edmund Janes James, 1904 to 1920; David Kinley, 1920 to 1930; Harry Woodburn Chase, 1930 to 1933; Arthur Hill Daniels, 1933 to 1934; Arthur Cutts Willard, 1934 to 1946; George Dinsmore Stoddard, 1946 to 1952; and Lloyd Morey, 1953 to 1954.

The University of Illinois has proved to be an influence far greater than the short tenure of its existence would seem to demand. It has sought to educate, in the most profound sense of the term. For, "education is a high word," as Cardinal Newman wrote in his Idea of a University. "It is the preparation for knowledge, and it is the imparting of knowledge in proportion to that preparation." This university has achieved a quality of excellence in preparing for, and in imparting knowledge; and the stoic philosopher, Epictetus, spoke wisely in saying, "Only the educated are free."

Office of Education Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1967

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, this week, we pass a significant milestone in the history of education in the United States. We mark on March 2 the 100th anniversary of the U.S. Office of Education.

This agency, which events have propelled into the forefront of the national effort toward quality, is undergoing a change keyed to match the transformation within the public schools in their intensifying search for education adequate to the times.

A year ago, President Johnson spoke of the quality of country we are trying to build. In his message to the 89th Congress on new civil rights legislation, he said:

> We are engaged in a great adventure—as great as that of the last century, when our fathers marched to the Western frontier. Our frontier today is of human beings, not land. If we are able to open that frontier, to free each child to become the best that is in him to become, our reward—both spiritual and material—will exceed any that we gained a century ago through territorial expansion.

The Office of Education has, as a result of massive educational assistance programs enacted in recent years, been assigned a major role in this country's effort to afford quality education to all children. The thrust of recent educational aid programs for the children of poor families assures that the Office of Education must assume responsibilities for leadership in educational innovation and improvement.

It would be simple for a Federal agency to retreat into the obscurity, and into the security, of an identity as a statistical storehouse ready to provide the latest headcount on students, or to report annually to Congress on the number of square feet in the Nation's schoolhouses.

In an age, however, when world conditions compel the United States to assume a world leadership role in the struggle for human rights, it is no less essential that Federal leadership on the domestic front shall devote its attention to development of individual potential. Nowhere is the opportunity greater than in the education of our children in schools to afford them equal opportunity to do their best.

That is why the Office of Education is involved in the issue of racial segregation and the overlapping issue of inferior education of the children of poverty. Not to be so involved would be to ignore inequities that have multiplied because they have been ignored too long in the past, particularly during most of the century during which the Office of Education has progressed to its new level of maturity.

Under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, a billion dollars a year is flowing into new educational programs to strengthen education in poverty neighborhoods. Under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits Federal assistance for programs that discriminate as to race, color, or national origin, schools are required to end discriminatory practices in order to receive Federal funds.

These recent legislative actions, and numerous others directed toward expanding educational opportunity for children and college-age students, are helping to reshape American education.

The Office of Education is not only authorized by legislative action to express its concern for equal educational opportunity; it is obligated by law and by a national moral commitment to take the lead.

Fino Introduces Package of Civil Service Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a package of legislation to improve civil service conditions and retirement benefits.

My bills are: First, to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide that the entire cost of health benefits under that act shall be paid by the Government; second, to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 to provide a lump-sum payment for the unused sick leave of an officer or employee immediately prior to his separation from the service on retirement; third, to modify the decrease in Federal Group Life Insurance at age 65 or after retirement; fourth, to permit a retired employee or member receiving health benefits pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to elect coverage under the

Retired Federal Employees Health Benefit Act of 1960; fifth, to provide that the value of survivor annuities payable under chapter 83, title 5, United States Code, shall not be taken into account for State inheritance tax or Federal estate tax purposes; sixth, to amend section 8341 of title 5, United States Code, to provide annuities for surviving spouses without deduction from a retired employee or member's annuity, and for other purposes.

All of the legislation I am introducing today would benefit our civil service workers and retirees not only at retirement time, but during their tenure of service.

For example, I see no reason why the Federal Government could not bear the entire burden of the cost of health benefits.

I hope that the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee will give this legislative package their fullest consideration.

Dr. Carl Murphy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, American education, journalism, and the cause of equal rights suffered a great loss on Saturday with the death of Dr. Carl Murphy, of Baltimore, at the age of 78.

At the time of his passing, Dr. Murphy was chairman of the board of the Afro-American newspaper chain, chairman of the board of trustees of Morgan State College in Baltimore, and a member of the board of directors of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Any one of these posts would have filled the time and employed the talents of most men. Dr. Murphy held all three, and in this triple capacity served the Nation and the principles he cherished with extraordinary diligence, intelligence, and dedication.

The son of John H. Murphy, who founded the Baltimore Afro-American in 1892, Dr. Murphy began his career as an educator. After earning a bachelor's degree in German and ancient history at Howard University in 1911 and a master's at Harvard in 1913, he headed the German department at Howard for 5 years.

In 1918, he went to work for the Afro-American, and became president of the company in 1922 after his father's death. He continued as president until becoming chairman of the board in 1963, and during this long tenure saw his newspaper chain expanded to embrace papers in Washington, Philadelphia, Newark, and Richmond. Because of his continuing efforts and his influence over editorial policies, the Afro-American chain is now widely respected as a responsible spokesman for progressive, informed policies.

As a member of the board of the NAACP for 36 years, Dr. Murphy played an important role in the organization's growth and success in promoting equal rights through legal action. Although not a lawyer, he was chairman of the legal redress committee of the Baltimore branch of the NAACP for 32 years, and constantly worked with the attorneys involved in the landmark cases brought to the Supreme Court by the NAACP. His financial contributions to this cause were great; his contributions of time, effort, and thought were even greater and more generous.

Dr. Murphy's record of service has been widely recognized. In 1955 he became the first journalist to win the Spingarn Medal, the highest award offered by the NAACP. A fine arts building and an auditorium on the Morgan State College campus, and a scholarship fund for African students, bear his name. But perhaps the finest symbol of Dr. Murphy's achievements is the great progress made by Morgan State College during the 28 years in which he served on its board, and especially during the past 14 years, under his direction as chairman of the board.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Carl Murphy was a fine American, who gave his community and country the best in himself, and inspired many others to pursue the work which he advanced so far. His energies will be missed, but his constructive influence will continue.

I wish to extend my deepest sympathies to Mrs. Murphy; to their children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren, and to all of Dr. Murphy's closest colleagues.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1967

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, at this time we pause to pay tribute to the Estonian people. Forty-nine years ago in the midst of the World War I struggle an Estonian provisional government proclaimed to the world that Estonia was an independent and democratic nation.

Since the 18th century Estonians have endured the excesses of Russian rule. While there have been periods of lesser control during which Estonians established the first Estonian newspaper as well as held the first national song festival, more frequent have been the periods of oppression, when the Russian state, and later the Soviet state, applied severe Russification measures.

When the 1917 revolutions in Russia and the ravages of the war created the right moment, however, Estonians were not downtrodden and indecisive but, drawing on their national courage and heritage, boldly proclaimed their independence on February 24, 1918. When World War I ended, Estonians set about organizing a government based on broad democratic principles. Freedom was the keynote, except for the Communists who attempted to subvert Estonian freedoms. Estonia's success as a stable and prosperous nation was recognized by its admittance to the League of Nations in September 1921. The United States extended recognition to this bastion of freedom in July 1922.

We in the United States share in the joyous recollections of Estonia's 22 years of independence; we share a deep sense of grief over the tragedy of the Soviet Union's forced occupation of Estonia and of the resultant deprivation of her freedoms; and we share in Estonia's hopes that one day soon she will again be an outpost of freedom on the Baltic.

A New Offensive in the War on Hunger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the House will be interested to know that important private interests have joined the Agency for International Development and the Department of Agriculture in a new 3-year offensive in the world war on hunger and malnutrition.

Several days ago I attended two functions which made it clear that nothing less than the united efforts of this Government, the agricultural and industrial sectors, and organizations such as the Freedom from Hunger Foundation will be required to relieve the misery from protein deficiency in numerous countries.

In a ceremony appropriate to the occasion, William S. Gaud, Administrator of the Agency for International Development, signed the first in a series of private industry contracts with the Pillsbury Co., of Minneapolis. Under this Alliance for Progress agreement the company will evaluate the acceptability in El Salvador for newly developed protein supplements that can be derived from cottonseed, peanuts, and soybeans. These and other protein-rich crops can be grown in Central America.

PROTEIN-HUNGRY PEOPLE

Administrator Gaud stressed the need for an enlarged protein program to reduce the social, economic, and physical hazards faced by protein-hungry people.

In my view, this is more than a national or a continental problem. It is a human problem. Protein deficiency among children dominates the poverty chains around the globe. Thousands of people die from such malnutrition every day: An estimated 2 billion people—including up to 70 percent of children under age 6—suffer from a lack of protein. Recent studies have confirmed that protein malnutrition can lead to a permanent impairment of one's mental and physical health.

At the second function which I attended, a luncheon, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman hailed the new alliance of our public and private sectors and the cooperation of the developing countries in reducing the protein gap to a workable minimum.

The initial AID project with the Pillsbury Co., is small in scope but vast in its implications. It means that the skills and know-how of American private enterprise will be matched against the dietary blight which undermines the well-being of so many people.

TWENTY U.S. FIRMS

It means that within 3 years 19 other U.S. firms will have joined the war on hunger, thus helping our Government to discharge an obligation to help the developing nations to help themselves.

Neither one nor a hundred contracts will in themselves solve the problems arising from malnutrition. These AID contracts are intended only to catalyze and stimulate the private sector of our country and, indirectly, of other countries to give active support to this humanitarian drive.

The optimism generated by the initial contract between AID and the Pillsbury Co., is out of proportion to the dollar amount—a mere $60,000. Every dollar is a seed which, we trust, will bear rich fruit from our common endeavors.

TECHNICAL COMPETENCE

Our optimism reflects the fact that American private enterprise has—through research—acquired the technical competence to invent new protein supplies that are nutritious and desirable as food. Moreover, these food supplements are derived from crops that can be cultivated in most of the protein-short countries.

On this promising development we base a fervent hope that—with help from the recipient countries—we can make substantial improvement in the health and happiness of countless people.

Let us consider the Pillsbury contract and the funds committed by AID as symbols. They signify that in our desire to share our knowledge and abundance with less fortunate countries, we must be concerned with the quality of food as well as with its quantity. By "quality" we mean protein content—the essential ingredient for strengthening human minds and bodies and for maintaining their productivity.

SEVERAL REQUIREMENTS

It is not enough to produce or "invent" protein supplements that will safeguard public health and promote human development. These products—however effective—must meet the requirements of visual appeal, taste, flavor, and stability.

All our research and good intentions are in vain unless the high proteins are acceptable to consumers. They must be sold in food stores as part of the daily family diet. They must be adapted to local food traditions and preferences.

Here, perhaps, is the greatest hurdle for the high-protein program. Here, too, is a formidable challenge to the marketing abilities of American merchandisers.

In the Pillsbury Co. we have a firm whose experience in the food business spans almost one century. The company has made numerous overseas investments, including Central and South America, and it has concluded joint ventures with private firms in other countries. In El Salvador, for instance, Pillsbury has owned a minority interest in a flour mill since 1960. As a partner in this enterprise, it has formed valuable business contacts and acquired a first-hand knowledge of the country and its people.

COMPETITIVE PRODUCTS

The high-protein products which it plans to introduce in El Salvador will be competitive with other beverages and foods sold locally. The packaging will be as attractive as with other foods sold through commercial channels. Although the consumers' cost will be within the means of working people, neither the package nor its content will resemble so-called relief food.

Initially the company will introduce a beverage based on a patented technology developed in a research laboratory. It involves a process of blending and preserving nutritional ingredients such as protein and fat, heretofore considered difficult or impossible.

The company has also acquired experience in producing a milk-based protein supplement. However, the initial product testing in El Salvador will utilize a vegetable protein indigenous to that country. The company may also offer various solid foods such as a vegetable-based spread and chewable products based on this same technology.

DEMOGRAPHIC STUDIES

The choice of El Salvador as a proving ground for high-protein beverages and solid foods was deliberate. Through its local business connections the Pillsbury Co. has carried on demographic studies which will lead to a better understanding of the food preferences and customs of the people.

In cooperation with AID the company will establish a dialog with El Salvador's health officials and food industry leaders. Various high-protein products will then be offered to consumers in selected areas. The person-to-person approach will be supervised by personnel who have followed similar procedures with new food products in the United States. Through such detailed research the company hopes to develop high-protein products whose price, appearance, nutritional value, and taste will recommend themselves to consumers.

The goal in El Salvador as well as in the greater Central American common market area with its 13 million consumers is to market a product which can fortify the public health, win consumer acceptance and result in a successful economic enterprise.

JOINT VENTURE

Should the market survey and product testing prove successful, the company plans a joint venture with Salvadoran businessmen for the production, distribution, and sale of high-protein foods manufactured locally from home-grown vegetable proteins.

We can now appreciate why the so-called complete nutritional food (CNF) has stirred a lively interest among leaders in the food industry and in Government agencies. And we can appreciate why a new enterprise based on local farm production and employing local labor would appeal to leaders in the developing countries. In Latin America such ventures, jointly-owned and jointly-managed, will reflect the partnership spirit of the Alliance for Progress. Such joint ventures promote the self-help movement and lead ultimately to economic self-sufficiency and independence. They also contribute to a balanced industrial-agricultural economy as a basis for social and political stability.

May I add that AID's allocation of $1.2 million to this 3-year program, which is expected to involve about 20 American companies, represents but a fraction of the expenditures which the private sector has made and will continue to make for high-protein development.

INESTIMABLE LOSSES

But the total of all these costs cannot be compared to the inestimable value of human lives sacrificed every day to protein deficiency. Neither can we gage the true extent of illness, hardship, and mental frustration endured by its victims.

It is, therefore, heartwarming to know that two Government departments are mobilizing the technical and managerial resources of American private industry in waging a relentless war on hunger and malnutrition under the leadership of President Johnson.

High protein is a key element in this struggle. If it succeeds in practice, as we hope, it will bring honor and gratification to our country. If it fails, it means that we must perfect our tools and revise our methods. But—as in most human undertakings—it is better to try and fail than not to have tried at all.

Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1967

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, on February 26, 1942, the following words were spoken:

> The Voice of America speaks. Today America has been at war for 79 days. Daily at this time we shall speak to you about America and the war, and the news may be good or bad. We shall tell the truth.

And so the Voice of America began its first assignments in the midst of the critical times which faced our Nation and the world during World War II. The high standards enunciated in that sentence, "We shall tell the truth," Mr. Speaker, have prevailed throughout the 25 years of the Voice's existence.

Facing the task of explaining America and Americans to those abroad without the tools of the great lie or a censored press as other powers utilize, the Voice has handled its responsibilities in the finest tradition allowing a free flow of information and entrusting its audience to judge us on our accomplishments as well as noting our difficulties.

As our late President John F. Kennedy

said when addressing the Voice of America staff in 1962:

> The Voice of America carries a heavy responsibility. Its burden of truth is not easy to bear. It must explain to a curious and suspicious world what we are. It must tell them of our basic beliefs. It must tell them of a country which is in some ways a rather old country—certainly old as republics go. And yet it must make our ideas alive and new and vital in the high competition which goes on around the world since the end of World War II.

It is important for us to pause and pay tribute to the magnificent job the Voice of America has done for us in the world community. Under the directorship of the very able John Chancellor, the Voice continues to spread the truth. And as it does this it spreads the seeds of liberty and the cause of freedom.

Congressman Sikes, Citizen Patriot of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1967

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to be present last Friday night at the Sheraton Park Hotel to witness the award by the Reserve Officers Association to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], recognizing him "as the citizen of 1967 who has contributed most to the national security of the United States." It was a well-deserved award, because Congressman SIKES has indeed been at the forefront of such service not only in 1967 but in many years past. The citation backing up the famous Minuteman Award for 1967 reads as follows:

RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES

An association resolution with respect to the career of the Honorable ROBERT L. F. SIKES

Whereas, throughout more than a quarter century of service in the House of Representatives of the United States;

His devotion to the highest concept of duty to country;

The courage and independence of his leadership for adequate Preparedness which is necessary to National Security;

The steadfastness of his dedication to the Citizen-Reservist Tradition;

The clarity of his judgment to insure strength, effectiveness and high morale to the Nation's military force,

have given confidence to his generation, inspiration to posterity, and safety to this Nation's institutions and ideals.

Therefore, Be It Resolved, that in recognition of his great service to the United States, this Association proudly recognizes him as the Citizen of 1967 who has contributed most to the National Security shared by every American citizen in these times.

HORACE B. HANSON, Jr.,
Major General, USAR,
National President.

For the Association, the National Council, February 24, 1967.

JOHN T. CARLTON,
Colonel, USAR,
Executive Director.

Congressman SIKES delivered an eloquent address on that same evening, one which every American should read; and I am honored to include it here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ROA MIDWINTER CONFERENCE

I note a very pleasing degree of optimism here tonight. Things are different. Not like they were two years ago after the axe had fallen. The Reserves are still in business. Things are moving. ROA's leadership is capable—Horace Hanson, Jake Carlton, and dozens of others. Our members are confident. Our building is going up. This can be the best year of all.

But for our country there is a serious and unsolved problem. America finds itself at war—a dirty, lonely, unhappy, unintentional kind of war with an insatiable greed for men, materials, and money. It is halfway around the world in a place where we had not prepared to fight, but where Americans, as is their wont, have fought heroically, worked tirelessly and performed magnificently. It is not a glamorous war and a lot of people want us to get out. And the Communists have made noises which the press magnified into a search for peace. Now the peace agitators are back at work.

As I read the dispatches, communist North Vietnam, with a population of 16 million and scant resources, just isn't talking as much about whipping us. They have indicated that under certain conditions, like surrender of all stated objectives by the United States, they might be willing to "negotiate". I place "negotiate" in quotes. They will let our President state his case if he wants to go to Hanoi to do it. I suppose this would be called progress by the campus marching and demonstrating societies.

I would like to see one headline which simply says, "Losers Do Not Dictate the Terms for Peace". And, I would mail that headline to some highly placed gentlemen at home and abroad, in and out of the United Nations, less they forget. It is the United States that is winning, and will continue to win. We don't need negotiations.

We have too many people who are talking when they should be listening. There are some well intentioned peace seekers, and there is a nut fringe. Sometimes the efforts of both subvert national policy. They do not represent the character or the conviction of the American people.

On the night that women striking for peace were seen on network television battering away at the Pentagon doors, the same newscast picked up a Navy enlisted man, a petty officer in charge of a mine sweeper that had been severely damaged by Viet Cong fire on a river near Saigon. That young man speaking to the newscaster had tears in his eyes when he said, "Everyone of my men has a piece of shrapnel in him—but we are doing what we can." I think he had a stronger message for the American people, but I wonder why he had to compete for time on T.V. with a group of peace strikers.

We all believe in freedom of speech. But I have little regard for those elements whose members exercise license by taking advantage of our constitutional guarantees to criticize the very efforts of those American who are dying to guarantee their right to criticize.

Of course the Communists would like to talk peace. They are losing. They know it. North Vietnam has been hurt. Every bombing mission adds to their problems. But they think they can wait us out and we are told they can continue the war for a long time unless greater pressure is applied in the north. There are too many off limits areas—areas important to the continuation of the war, such as Haiphong, which receives two-thirds of North Vietnam's war supplies. If these off limits areas are taken out or sealed off; if the Delta and other major food producing areas are denied to the Communists; if pacification of cleared areas is forcefully carried out, this war will not long endure.

If our forces had been fully unleashed from the beginning, in the ways that American field commanders recommended, it already would have been over.

That's a lot of ifs. Our forces must fight at the level prescribed for them—not at the level of their capability. That can mean a long war. People will get tired of it. The crescendo of demand for negotiations will grow stronger, always stimulated by the communist propaganda machine. The Communists know the consequences much better than we of losing battles when the world is watching. If they could get U.S. forces immobilized or out of South Vietnam, the guerrillas could again have things their way, in a short time. So before we fall into the old and obvious and simple communist trap of negotiating, let's remember that however much we may want peace, we need victory more. A clear-cut victory will do more to guarantee peace in our time than all the words of all the diplomats at all the conference tables in the world. We can avoid the next war by winning this one.

In the meantime, the fighting goes on. There may be a great deal of fighting. There must be new manpower projections—a new look will have to be taken at equipment levels, ammunition stocks, construction of facilities. We are holding at a troop level of 410,000. If the fighting continues through the year, the Pentagon plans to level off at 470,000. More than that may be required unless we are able to get more fight and less talk from our allies.

Where shall we get additional forces? Everyone knows we are spread thin. If this is a "little" war, heaven forbid that we find ourselves in anything bigger until this one is finished. General John K. Waters, a very competent fighting man, listed ways that the U.S. can win in Vietnam. Did you know he placed the call up of the necessary Reserve elements first? This is an almost untapped resource.

This war has some strange ground rules. Very little use has been made of Reserve units. They are maintained for times of need. There has been a serious need. From the beginning of our involvement in Viet Nam there has been a need for Reserve units, engineer units, transportation units, port units, logistics support units—a need for specialists who are skilled from practice in private life in those areas where specialists could have bridged the gaps which were a chronic problem in Vietnam. Their presence could have saved our country millions of dollars in cost; could significantly have advanced the American cause timewise toward victory. Much more importantly, we have left a lot of dead in Vietnam and there will be more. Additional skilled and experienced personnel might well have minimized these losses.

The Joint Chiefs have asked repeatedly that the Reserves be used in this conflict. They weren't used. So it was necessary to withdraw trained specialists, thousands of them, from our forces in Europe and from units in the Z.I. This weakened America's worldwide defense structure, particularly in Europe, where it already had been hurt by allied shortcomings and by French defections. There are such specialists in the Reserves who want to serve. Congress even provided legislation to permit them to be called. None have.

Are the Reserve forces ready? Individuals, yes. Some units are ready, too. Some units haven't received adequate training. I do not think anyone would claim this is the fault of the Reserve components. They would welcome an opportunity to be trained and ready. ROA has said for years, "The Reserves ask only the right to be ready." Some units do not have modern equipment. Again, that is not the fault of the Reserves.

Many units just haven't received it. Other units—regular units too—have had their equipment taken for shipment to the fighting front in the frantic effort to make up for shortages which have been so forcefully portrayed by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, Mr. Stennis and his Committee.

There are Reservists who have made very significant contributions to the allied cause in Vietnam. Some of this has been done by Reservists serving on extended active duty; some by Air Reserve and Air National Guard Units. Fourteen of these airlift units ironically are scheduled for deactivation unless your Congress can convince the Pentagon to continue their services. These are fourteen important units embracing nearly 10,000 officers and men and 176 aircraft. Units which today are helping in an important way to lighten the unbelievably large logistics load associated with a war that is getting bigger.

Well, let's talk about the future of the Reserve components. No Pentagon leader holds nor attempts to hold that the Reserves are not an essential part of the nation's defense forces. If that is true, the Reserve components should be supported at a level which will insure their readiness to fill that essential place effectively in the defense structure. We want them to have a chance to stay alive and win when they are called.

For too long America failed to provide properly for those who wear the uniform. The pay scale was not commensurate with that available in civilian life. Too often they weren't given a comfortable and pleasant place in which to live and work. Now this picture is changed for those in the active forces—changed in large part through the leadership of the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Honorable L. Mendel Rivers, and his Committee.

Not only is there new awareness in the Congress of the need to insure dignity and to provide proper recognition and a respectable standard of living to military personnel and their families; there also is a positive acceptance by Congress of its responsibility to insure that weapons and equipment are modern and adequate in number. It is here particularly that the influence of that great Texan, George Mahon, and his Committee has been felt.

It is Congress which time and again has added weapons where needed and authorized additional research on new weapons systems where gaps existed. In these instances, Congress has not been clairvoyant. We simply have followed the recommendations of seasoned and dedicated commanders who live with the problem.

Even today, there is unspent money in the Pentagon for new weapons concepts which Congress believes are required to insure America's invulnerability. For instance, there is funding to further the development of the advanced manned bomber, so that there will be bombers in the next decade. There is funding to begin an Anti-Ballistic Missile System. The Russians are building one. The Pentagon feels a system here is not sufficiently required to spend 30 billion dollars Congress doesn't want to give Russia that important defense advantage. We believe it wiser to spend 30 billion dollars than to risk 90 million American lives.

In defense of the Pentagon let me state that it has many problems. Our defense commitments are worldwide and complex. There is always the problem of money and the pressure to avoid expenditures where possible. Its experts are human. They do the best they can, and like people elsewhere, they sometimes cannot agree among themselves on the best course of action. We respect the Secretariat and those in uniform who are associated with them and we applaud their contributions. They are dedicated men and they work endless hours. We all serve under the same flag.

Yes, positive strides have been made for those who serve in the active forces. Now we are going to make equally positive strides for those who serve in the Reserve components. For a time efforts in Congress for the Reserves had to be largely defensive. We were fighting to keep the Reserves alive. There were headlines which told of inadequate training, inadequate clothing, inadequate equipment. You know these conditions existed because you were there. The Pentagon sought a merger which the Congress would not accept and will not accept. But, in all of this there were those who feared we were witnessing the slow death of the time honored tradition of a strong Reserve. And, morale suffered, suffered grievously.

Even so, the line was held. For two years, a little handful of your friends in the Congress, ably backed by ROA, kept the Reserves intact. This is not enough. Defensive tactics alone cannot insure strong Reserve components. The best defense is a strong offense. Now, it is time and we are ready to seize the initiative, to press forward. Now is the time to insure strong and well equipped and well trained Reserve components of high morale.

For this we must have legislation. The evidence of the past 24 months has made it very clear that the Congress, as a part of its constitutional responsibility, must specify in detail the national policy and law governing this very important element of our national security team.

We must enact a Bill of Rights for the Reserves. We have such a bill in Congress. It is Congressman Eddie Hébert's bill. Here is a man to whom the Reserves—and America—owe much. Twice his bill has passed the House of Representatives by overwhelming odds. For the second time it is awaiting action in the Senate. A clear statement of intent to take up the bill there early this year has been voiced by Senate leaders such as that great stalwart for defense, Senator Russell, and no man in the U.S. has been a greater champion of the Reserves than he. America, not just the Reserves—America needs this bill written into law—intact—for America's security.

None of this implies a desire on the part of the Reserves for the perpetuation of dead wood. There must be constant planning and reorganization and pruning where needed to stay modern.

It could be disastrous not to have the insurance that effective Reserve components provide. It would be disastrous today to find ourselves in a larger war without backup forces from the Reserves. A Bill of Rights for the Reserves will spell all these things out in law. Nothing should be left to chance. Nor could the Reserves ever be struck down by the stroke of one pen.

Chairman Mao says power grows out of the barrel of a gun. If this is the kind of world we live in, I want it to be American power out of American guns. This then is what we seek: a powerful defense team, effective, modern, invulnerable, for this is America's security today and tomorrow. Give us this, but guard it zealously and use it carefully as is America's wont. Then our diplomats will have time in which to work and their words will be heeded—and God grant that they can do as well as those in uniform who fight on the field of battle.

And, while this is being done, let us remind ourselves—and the world—that America has not lost its unity or its purpose. Sometimes our objectives are not spelled out with the same detail that confusion and uncertainty are presented to us and the world. Sometimes the voices of those who counsel retreat receive greater play than those who say, "Whatever the cost, we will not haul down the American Flag." Sometimes the efforts of those who seek to build a greater America fail to achieve the prominence of those who lead marches and demonstrations, of the draft card burners and the protesting beatniks; and sometimes the world is confused by what it sees here.

As true today as it was in 1777 when he said it, is Thomas Paine's view that "those who expect to reap the blessing of freedom must, like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it."

But the challenge to freedom does not need to lie on one's own doorstep. When freedom dies anywhere in the world it dies a little in America too.

We in ROA know the soul of America is reflected by the glory of its past and the greatness of its present and its dreams for the future of mankind. And, we in ROA who have no problems in understanding the meaning of America or the significance of its mission, know that there may always be unpleasant and unhappy tasks like Vietnam, but we do not fear them. We know that our commitments must go on for as long as it takes to assure the nations of the world that America's dedication to the preservation of freedom is not a part-time obligation. We know that the symbol and the actuality of America are worth all our efforts. We just want to get on with the job.

There is a word for all of this—a word to insure the future of America as we know it. That word is called patriotism. May the God of our fathers help each of us to know patriotism in its richest meaning and to teach it to those around us every day that we live.

Estonian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1967

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the list of independent nations has grown rapidly in the last two decades. The list however, does not usually contain the names of some states. These are the unfortunate countries which lost their formal international identity through forced absorbtion within the Soviet Union. One such state is Estonia. Since July 1940, she has been an unwilling component of the huge Communist empire to the east of her.

Before the disgraceful conquest of Estonia over 26 years ago, that small Baltic nation had been a free, proud, and worthy member of the world community. The people of Estonia had shown the ability to work for a better internal life and a peaceful external relationship with their neighbors.

The opportunity to achieve freedom had come with the declaration of independence from the empire of the Romanovs on February 24, 1918. Taking advantage of the upheavals caused by the First World War, the Estonian people had thrown off the foreign domination of almost two centuries. The anniversary of that memorable event in Estonian history is truly worth commemorating. It was a stirring chapter in the march of liberty.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the fact that Estonians cannot today celebrate that national holiday in their homeland is another excellent reason that we should ourselves remind the world that Estonia was and should again be among the roll of independent nations. I wish to extend to the long-suffering people of Estonia my hope that their country may soon again be numbered in that proud assemblage.

Anniversary of Estonia's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1967

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, as the House was not in session last Friday, I will take this occasion to say a few words about the anniversary of Estonian independence.

We, the people of the United States, set aside 1 day each year to celebrate our freedom from foreign rule. The Fourth of July is always an occasion for parades, for patriotic music, and for oratorical pyrotechnics, as well as fireworks of the literal type. All in all, our Independence Day is a day of rejoicing because we have enjoyed almost two centuries of freedom.

Our Estonian friends, on the other hand, do not really celebrate on the anniversary date that marks the birth of freedom in that tiny Baltic nation—they merely observe it. Last Friday was the 49th anniversary of their independence. It was on February 24, 1918, that Estonia broke the shackles that had bound her to czarist Russia.

A short 22 years later, in 1940, Soviet Russia reforged the chains and Estonia again became a colony of the Communist empire. The Soviet empire of the commissars has been as tyrannical, as oppressive, and as vicious as the Romanoff empire of the czars.

If only Estonia could look forward to a restoration of freedom by the time the 50th anniversary of independence arrives on February 24, 1968. The people of that unhappy land would then truly have something to celebrate rather than a day to observe. The 50th anniversary would really be a year of jubilee.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1, 1967

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of all mercy, bowing at this wayside altar of Thy grace, may we be vividly conscious that we need not turn back to bygone centuries to hear Thy voice, as if Thou dost speak no longer to those now upon the earth.

In these days of destiny, by our response to the want and woe of Thy world and of Thy children, Thy throne is set up. Even now Thou art searching out the souls of men before Thy judgment seat. So, hearing and heeding the voice divine, may our compassion help to heal the open sores of the world as we serve the present age, our calling to fulfill. So teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.

May the final wisdom that charts the Nation's course in these perilous days be higher than our own.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 28, 1967, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES UNDER PUBLIC LAW 81-875—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 70)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President, which, without being read, was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I have the honor to transmit this report of activity during calendar year 1966 under Public Law 81-875. That law empowers the President to supplement the efforts and resources of States and local governments in alleviating the suffering and damage caused by natural disasters.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 1, 1967.*

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Do I correctly understand that at the conclusion of 3 hours on the authorization bill, which will be pending after the treaties are disposed of—the 3 hours being the time covering the Pastore germaneness rule—the Pastore roundrobin discussion will begin?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous unanimous consent agreement, that is the order.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Subcommittee on Government Research of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation of the Committee on the Judiciary.

On request of Mr. KUCHEL, and by unanimous consent, the following committees and subcommittee were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The Subcommittee on Securities of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON ACTIONS TAKEN BY FEDERAL AGENCIES UNDER 1964 AMENDMENTS TO THE ALASKA OMNIBUS ACT

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on actions taken by Federal agencies under the 1964 Amendments to the Alaska Omnibus Act, during the 6-month period ended December 31, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967

A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT OF 1945

A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, to shorten the name of the Bank, to extend for 5 years the period within which the Bank is authorized to exercise its functions, to increase the Bank's lending authority and its authority to issue, against fractional reserves, export credit insurance and guarantees, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

THE NATURAL GAS PIPELINE SAFETY ACT OF 1967

A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe safety regulations for the transportation of natural gas by pipeline, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Fire Research and Safety Act of 1967

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a fire research and safety program, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

Proposed Legislation Relating to the District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal language relating to the liability of contractors for the repair of new pavements in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a register of blind persons in the District of Columbia, to provide for the mandatory reporting of information concerning such persons, and for other persons (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report on Financial Condition and Results of the Operations of the Highway Trust Fund

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the financial conditions and results of the operations of the highway trust fund, dated June 30, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

Report of Board of Trustees of the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund

A letter from the acting managing trustee of the trust fund and members of the board of trustees of the Federal supplementary medical insurance trust fund, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that fund, for 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

Report on Lead and Zinc Mining Stabilization Program

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the lead and zinc mining stabilization program, for the calendar year 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Slator C. Blackiston, Jr.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Slator C. Blackiston, Jr. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Temporary Admission Into the United States of Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mental Health Amendments of 1967

A letter from the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the public health laws relating to mental health to extend, expand, and improve them, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Partnership for Health Amendments of 1967

A letter from the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend and expand the authorizations for grants for comprehensive health planning and services, to broaden and improve the authorization for research and demonstrations relating to the delivery of health (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RESOLUTION OF HAWAIIAN STATE SENATE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution

Whereas, the State of Hawaii, situated at the crossroads of the Pacific, is the center of military, industrial, and commercial activity between the countries of the East and West; and

Whereas, it is essential that the State of Hawaii, as the crossroads of the Pacific, have a system of highways to service the needs of all its military, industrial and commercial activities; and

Whereas, the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 and other federal statutes, created and established a program for the construction of a system of interstate and defense highways, and federal-aid primary and secondary highways with urban extensions in the State of Hawaii; and

Whereas, the federal government has urged the State of Hawaii and this state's highway industry to step up construction because Hawaii did not enjoy the full impact of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 until it attained statehood in 1959, and Hawaii has been most cooperative in this regard as is evidenced not only by the accelerated highway program but also by the training and establishment of a skilled work force, and by the large, long-term capital investments undertaken by contractors, subcontractors and material suppliers to meet this commitment; and

Whereas, the construction team of working men and equipment, of professional engineers and contractors, once developed and operating efficiently, cannot be sustained if the financing becomes spasmodic and unreliable; and

Whereas, it has been definitely demonstrated in Hawaii that better highways save the time, lives and money of our citizens, and that the consequences of a reduction in highway improvements would adversely affect the well-being of our citizens and cause further suffering and tragic loss of lives; and

Whereas, the cut-back announced by the President on November 23, 1966, reduced the federal funds available for fiscal year 1967 to Hawaii for highway construction purposes from $64,134,585 to $28,640,500, a reduction of $35,494,085; and

Whereas, the adverse effect of such a cutback not only affects the construction industry of Hawaii but will have a lasting adverse effect on the economy of the entire State of Hawaii; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the Fourth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1967, that the President of the United States be and is hereby respectfully requested to reconsider his decision to cut back on this most vital and necessary federal-aid highway program; and

Be it further resolved that certified copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each member of the Hawaii congressional delegation and the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

RESOLUTION OF SENATE OF STATE OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the first session of the 28th Legislature for the State of New Mexico is now in session in Santa Fe and the State senate has passed Senate Memorial 6 entitled "A memorial memorializing the President and the Vice President of the United States and the New Mexico delegation to the U.S. Congress to protect and replace waterfowl and game habitat in the middle Rio Grande Valley in New Mexico."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the Record and that a copy be referred to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Memorial 6

A memorial memorializing the President and Vice President of the United States and the New Mexico delegation to the United States Congress to protect and replace waterfowl and game habitat in the middle Rio Grande Valley in New Mexico

Whereas, the middle Rio Grande valley between the Cochiti diversion dam and Socorro, New Mexico, has suffered an extremely significant loss of waterfowl and wildlife habitat which exceeds eight thousand acres and which loss is due in major part to federal water development projects in the one hundred mile area;

Whereas, the area was a wintering area of great significance to waterfowl, and the losses of habitat therein, as an important section of the central flyway, influence the welfare of waterfowl nationally;

Whereas, the state of New Mexico has taken all possible measures, under the circumstances, to mitigate the losses to the wildlife and waterfowl nationally;

Whereas, there exists an immediate necessity to further mitigate the losses;

Whereas, implementation of such mitigation would be of significant economic benefit to the people of this state, as well as to the national welfare as is indicated by a special report on fish and wildlife resources of the Rio Grande valley by the United States bureau of sport fisheries and wildlife and the New Mexico department of game and fish;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the State of New Mexico, That the president and vice president of the United States and the New Mexico delegation to the United States congress are petitioned to instigate the immediate, necessary action to cause the congress of the United States to enact legislation appropriating four hundred twenty-seven thousand, three hundred fifty dollars (427,350) to the proper state or federal agency to be applied to the mitigation of the loss of waterfowl and wildlife habitat in the middle Rio Grande valley between the Cochiti diversion dam and Socorro, New Mexico, in accord with the recommendations of the United States bureau of sport fisheries and wildlife and the New Mexico department of game and fish;

Be it further resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the president and vice president of the United States and the New Mexico delegation to the United States congress.

R. C. (IKE) MORGAN,
President pro tempore, Senate.
JUANITA PINO,
Chief Clerk, Senate.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. Res. 86. Resolution to extend the congratulations of the Congress to the people of Puerto Rico on their 50th anniversary of United States citizenship (Rept. No. 59).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Gen. William F. McKee, U.S. Air Force, retired, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration;

David D. Thomas, of Virginia, to be Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration;

Maurice Cecil Mackey, Jr., of Alabama, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation; and

Donald G. Agger, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation.

By Mr. HART, from the Committee on Commerce:

John L. Sweeney, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I report favorably sundry nominations in the Coast Guard and in the Environmental Science Services Administration. Since these names have previously appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing them on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

Ralph J. Land, and sundry other persons, for permanent appointment in the Environmental Science Services Administration; and

John R. Allums, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Coast Guard.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DODD:

S. 1127. A bill for the relief of Lok Tim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 1128. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to revise the provisions thereof relating to the adjustment of underpayments of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits, and to provide for the settlement of claims for unpaid medical insurance benefits in cases where the enrollee dies without making an assignment of his benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 1129. A bill for the relief of Demetra Lani Angelopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1130. A bill establishing certain qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1131. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend and expand the authorizations for grants for comprehensive health planning and services, to broaden and improve the authorization for research and demonstrations relating to the delivery of health services, to improve the performance of clinical laboratories, and to authorize cooperative activities between the Public Health Service hospitals and community facilities, and for other purposes; and

S. 1132. A bill to amend the public health laws relating to mental health to extend, expand, and improve them, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BARTLETT (by request):

S. 1133. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment in the case of the city of Fairbanks, Alaska, against Daniel Agbaba, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BARTLETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 1134. A bill to amend the Fur Seal Act of 1966; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BARTLETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 1135. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1136. A bill to amend Section 9 of the Act of May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 702), as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 581h), relating to surveys of timber and other forest resources of the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. 1137. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to strengthen and expand food service programs for children; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. PEARSON):

S. 1138. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Great Plains Parkway; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 1139. A bill for the relief of Ulrich Otten (also known as Heinz Erhardt Nass); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER.

S. 1140. A bill to provide for the sharing of Federal tax receipts with the States for purposes of education; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1141. A bill for the relief of John G. Kazas; and

S. 1142. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Zuck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MILLER when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 1143. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Howard H. Adelberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

S. 1144. A bill to provide for the reauthorization of the project on the Pecos River at Carlsbad, N. Mex., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1145. A bill to establish a Commission on Government Procurement; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. JACKSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 1146. A bill to provide for the expansion of the Custer Battlefield National Cemetery; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1147. A bill for the relief of Mariam Mantzios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 1148. A bill to amend the act incorporating the Disabled American Veterans so as to provide for an annual audit of their accounts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGOVERN (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S. 1149. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. McGOVERN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ATLANTIC UNION DELEGATION

Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and Mr. CARLSON) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13); which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 13

Whereas the North Atlantic Treaty has committed its members to contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, and to encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them; and

Whereas it is imperative that free people unite in cooperative efforts toward the common economic, social, and political benefit of all; and

Whereas this union of peoples may be accomplished in a system founded on the American federal system, which has safeguarded member States from domination by one another, equitably apportioned among their citizens voting power on common concerns, and assured each State of control of internal affairs, while providing for the common defense and promotion of the general welfare; and

Whereas the transformation of the Atlantic Community into a functional union is both feasible and necessary, requiring these allies to officially declare that federal union, within the framework of the United Nations, is their eventual goal, and providing the democratic means for achieving the transition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That—

(1) the Congress create an Atlantic Union delegation, composed of eighteen eminent citizens, which is authorized to organize and participate in a convention made up of similar delegations from such North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies as desire to join in this enterprise, to explore the possibility of agreement on—

(a) a declaration that the eventual goal of their states is to transform the Atlantic Alliance into a federal union,

(b) a tentative timetable for the transition to this goal, and

(c) the creation of interim democratic institutions to hasten the process of integration and provide a channel of continuing fruitful contact toward unity among the North Atlantic Treaty Organization states.

(2) The Convention's recommendations shall be submitted to the Congress for action by constitutional procedure.

(3) Not more than half of the delegation's members shall be from any one political party, and all shall be citizens of stature and wide influence, representing a broad range of experience in the various major challenges facing this undertaking and conscious of its importance and urgency to be willing to give it personally the necessary priority and time.

(4) Eight of the delegation shall be named by the Congress and eight by the President of the United States.

(5) The Congress hereby requests former Presidents Harry S. Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower to serve as cochairmen of the delegation.

JURISDICTION OF U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA WITH RESPECT TO CLAIMS OF OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN LAND

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the city of Fairbanks, Alaska, has requested that I introduce legislation to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska for the purpose of resolving the conflicting claims of the United States, the city of Fairbanks, Alaska, and others with respect to ownership of certain lands in the city of Fairbanks.

Several years ago the city of Fairbanks filed a civil action in the Superior Court for the State of Alaska, Fourth Judicial District, to quiet title of the city of Fairbanks to a parcel of land known as Clay Street and the land between where Clay Street now runs and the Chena River, and other land accreted to the city of Fairbanks on First Avenue, including the municipal power and water plant, and also the land accreted to Griffith Park.

In a memorandum submitted to the superior court by the U.S. attorney in June of 1963, the United States took the position that title to the property involved is in the United States and that the United States was therefore a necessary party to the pending civil action. Since the United States cannot be sued without its consent, legislation such as that introduced by me today is necessary to confer jurisdiction on the Federal District Court, according to the Fairbanks city attorney.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill I introduce be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1133), to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment in the case of the city of Fairbanks, Alaska, against Daniel Agbaba, and others, introduced by Mr. Bartlett, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1133

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of resolving the conflicting claims of the United States, the city of Fairbanks, Alaska, and others with respect to ownership of certain lands in the city of Fairbanks, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the District of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment on the cause of action involved in the case of the city of Fairbanks, Alaska, against Daniel Agbaba, and others, in the Fourth Judicial District of the Superior Court for the State of Alaska, any judgment rendered therein to be subject to appeal in the same manner as now provided by law for actions within the jurisdiction of said district court.

Sec. 2. Upon enactment of this Act, the Fourth Judicial District of the Superior Court for the State of Alaska is requested to certify or remand the legal proceeding referred to in the first section to the United States District Court for the District of Alaska for trial on the merits.

FUR SEAL ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, during the last Congress I introduced and the Congress enacted into law the Fur Seal Act of 1966. The act provided for conservation and protection of the north Pacific fur seals, and granted extensive authority to the Secretary of the Interior for the administration of the Pribilof Islands, Alaska. It provided protection for sea otters on the high seas and it made certain provisions for the enforcement of the conservation and administration measures.

In addition to giving the Secretary of the Interior wide-ranging authority for the administration of the islands, the act provided for home rule for the citizens of the island of St. Paul in the Pribilofs. A similar provision was neither requested nor granted for the citizens of St. George, the smaller of the two inhabited islands of the Pribilof group.

Mr. President, today I introduce, for myself and for my colleague from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], a bill to amend the Fur Seal Act of 1966 with respect to home rule for St. George. I regret this amendment is necessary because the St. George home rule provision should have been included in the original bill.

I should point out that omission of the provision was not an oversight. It can be attributed, I think, to a breakdown in communications between the people of St. George and the Senate Commerce Committee.

Although we held hearings on the Fur Seal Act of 1966 both here in Washington and on St. Paul in the Pribilofs, weather conditions did not allow us to travel to St. George. As a matter of fact, we were several days getting into St. Paul.

When we arrived at St. Paul, there was a small delegation from St. George waiting for us so we held one hearing there and from testimony taken, we concluded, it turns out erroneously, that the citizens of St. George did not want home rule. Had the weather permitted us to visit St. George, it is probable that an exhaustive discussion of the provisions of the bill, similar to the one we had at St. Paul, would have disclosed otherwise.

At any rate, the people of St. George have now made their wishes known and I have prepared a bill which would give St. George citizens the same benefits as were afforded residents of St. Paul in the legislation approved by the President on November 2, 1966, at Anchorage, Alaska, as he returned from a trip to Southeast Asia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill I have introduced be printed in the Record, at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1134) to amend the Fur Seal Act of 1966, introduced by Mr. Bartlett (for himself and Mr. Gruening), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1134

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 206 of the Fur Seal Act of 1966 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) For the purpose of fostering self-sufficiency among the natives of the Pribilof Islands, and in order that they may enjoy local self-government, and to facilitate the establishment by such natives of municipal corporations under the laws of the State of Alaska, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to set apart so much of the land on St. Paul Island and St. George Island as he determines necessary to establish a townsite on each of such islands. The Secretary shall survey each such townsite into lots, blocks, streets, and alleys and he may issue a patent therefor to a trustee appointed by him, when he is satisfied that a viable self-governing community which is capable of providing adequate municipal services is established or will be established within such townsite prior to the conveyance by the trustee of title to any property to the natives of the Pribilof Islands. The trustee is authorized to convey to individual natives of the Pribilof Islands title to improved or unimproved lots or tracts of land within any such townsite for homesite, commercial, or other purposes not inconsistent with the purpose for which the Secretary administers the Pribilof Islands, upon payment of an amount to be determined by the Secretary. Any deed issued by the trustee shall provide, in addition to such terms and conditions relating to the use of such lots or tracts as the Secretary deems necessary, that the title conveyed is inalienable for a period of twenty years from the date of conveyance except upon approval of the Secretary. Any deed issued after twenty years from the date of conveyance shall not require approval of the Secretary. Any lot or tract conveyed by the trustee to such natives shall not, except as provided in the Act of March 29, 1956 (76 Stat. 62; 25 U.S.C. 483a), be subject to levy and sale in satisfaction of the debts, contracts, or liabilities of the purchaser or to any claims of adverse possession or to claims of prescription, except that such lot or tract shall be subject to taxation and levy and sale in satisfaction thereof under the laws of the State of Alaska."

Sec. 2. Subsection (c), (d), and (e) of section 206 of the Fur Seal Act of 1966 are amended to read as follows:

"(c) The net proceeds from the sale, pursuant to this section, of improved or unimproved lots or tracts shall be made available to the respective established local governing bodies to be used with other proceeds available to such bodies for the purpose of providing adequate municipal services to persons inhabiting the islands. With respect to the municipal corporation established on St. Paul Island, the Secretary shall, at the close of the first fiscal year following its establishment, certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment from the gross receipts of the Pribilof Islands funds to such corporation, the sum of $50,000, and, at the close of each succeeding four fiscal years, he shall pay from such fund the sums of $40,000, $30,000, $20,000, and $10,000, respectively. In the case of the municipal corporation established on St. George Island, the Secretary shall, at the close of the first fiscal year following its establishment, certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment from the gross receipts of such funds to such corporation, the sum of $25,000, and, at the close of each succeeding four fiscal years, he shall pay from such fund the sums of $20,000, $15,000, $10,000, and $5,000, respectively. The payments so authorized from the fund shall be in addition to such proceeds from the sale of improved or unimproved lots or tracts and shall be available to each such corporation to assist it in providing adequate municipal services; except that such payments shall be made only after there has first been deducted from such fund all costs to the United States in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

"(d) With respect to any improved or unimproved land which was authorized to be sold under subsection (a), and which is not needed in connection with the Federal activities on the Pribilof Islands, the trustee, upon approval by the Secretary of the Interior, shall convey to each municipal corporation established pursuant to this section all of such lands located within the townsite with respect to which such corporation was established, and which remain unsold five years after the establishment of such corporation. Any conveyance pursuant to this subsection may be made with or without reimbursement, and shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems necessary to enable him to administer the Pribilof Islands as provided in this title.

"(e) The trustee shall convey to each municipality established pursuant to this section at the time of its incorporation all surveyed streets and alleys of the townsite. All deeds issued by the trustee shall contain a reservation to the trustee of rights-of-way for streets and alleys to be surveyed and established upon and across land conveyed to the natives of the Pribilof Islands whenever he determines that it would be in the interest of the native owner to establish such streets and alleys. Such reservation shall be for a term not to exceed ten years. In addition, the Secretary may convey without reimbursement to any such municipality such lands or interests therein outside the town site boundaries for any purpose subject to such conditions as the Secretary deems desirable to carry out the purposes of this Act."

GREAT PLAINS PARKWAY

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am today introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for the establishment of a Great Plains Parkway. My colleague, Senator Pearson, joins me in sponsorship. This identical bill is also being introduced on the House side by all five Members of the Kansas delegation. The measure seeks the eventual establishment of a parkway and scenic roads through the heartland of our Nation, beginning in Oklahoma and traversing the States of Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota to its northern terminus in Montana.

In this region some of the most colorful and important history of our Nation was written. The proposed parkway would connect a multitude of historical, scenic, and educational attractions. In linking these nationally significant features together by parkways and scenic roads, untold numbers of Americans would be invited to become acquainted with the great frontier heritage of the region as well as its many contributions to the welfare of the Nation today.

All Members of the Kansas delegation are familiar with the singular beauty of the region—the rolling hills, the bluestem pastures, the cool streams and pleasant valleys and the historic spots along the way. We would like to have people from other States become acquainted with these features because we feel that one of the most appealing aspects of the whole parkway is the great prairie, the remaining vestiges of which are in Kansas.

The proposed route through Kansas runs from Sedan, near the Oklahoma line in southern Kansas, northward through the heart of the Flint Hills to historic Council Grove, up the Blue Valley by Tuttle Creek and ending at the Hollenberg Pony Express station near Hanover. The route is replete with history. It includes the Independence crossing on the famous Oregon Trail and Alcove Springs near Blue Rapids and Marysville, a spot of beauty which was once a famous camping spot on the Oregon Trail. The parkway route would cross the Santa Fe Trail at Council Grove, the home of the Council Oak, the Custer Elm and the Post Office Oak. At Cottonwood Falls stands the oldest Kansas courthouse. The route also includes scenes of ranching and agriculture in their productive contributions to the Nation's well-being and its economy.

The Kansas delegation in introducing the Great Plains Parkway hopes to elicit the support of the delegations in other States.

The feeling of the delegation is that subsequent studies by appropriate agencies will suggest areas of Federal responsibility, State responsibility, and joint cooperation in some areas. Studies already carried on in Kansas point in that direction.

The members of the Kansas delegation do not anticipate hearings or other congressional action in this first session of the 90th Congress. The introduction at this time is designed to stimulate interest from other States and hopefully to bring about feasibility studies and other research on the proposal by appropriate Federal agencies. Should the proposal in whole or in part appear feasible it would then be the intention of the delegation to request hearings and seek action at the second session of the 90th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1138) to provide for the establishment and administration of the Great Plains Parkway, introduced by Mr. Carlson (for himself and Mr. Pearson), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SHARING OF FEDERAL TAXES WITH STATES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill providing for the sharing of Federal taxes with the States for the purpose of education and ask that it lie on the desk until a week from this Friday, that it be printed in the Record, and appropriately referred a week from this Friday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record as requested by the Senator from Iowa.

The bill (S. 1140) to provide for the sharing of Federal tax receipts with the States for purposes of education, introduced by Mr. Miller, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1140

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Tax-Sharing Education Act of 1967".

Sec. 2. (a) There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the tax-sharing fund. The tax-sharing fund shall consist of amounts appropriated to such fund as provided in this section.

(b) There is hereby appropriated to the tax-sharing fund, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1969, and for each fiscal year thereafter, an amount equal to 2 per centum of the total Federal tax collections received during the preceding fiscal year.

(c) The Secretary of the Treasury (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall, from time to time, but not less often than quarterly, transfer from the general fund of the Treasury to the tax-sharing fund the amounts appropriated by subsection (b). Such transfers shall, to the extent necessary, be made on the basis of estimates by the Secretary of the amounts referred to in subsection (b). Proper adjustments shall be made in the amounts subsequently transferred to the extent that prior estimates were in excess of or less than the amounts required to be transferred.

Sec. 3. (a) The Secretary shall, during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1969, and during each fiscal year thereafter, pay to each State, from amounts appropriated to the tax-sharing fund for the fiscal year in which payments are to be made, a total amount equal to the allotment of such State in such fiscal year computed under this section. Such payments may be made in installments periodically during any fiscal year, but not less often than quarterly.

(b) (1) From the total sum of the amounts appropriated to the tax-sharing fund pursuant to section 2 for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall allot to each State in such fiscal year an amount which bears the same ratio to such total sum as the population of such State between the ages of five and twenty, inclusive, bears to the total population of all of the States between the ages of five and twenty, inclusive. The allotment of each State in any fiscal year so computed shall be reduced or increased in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(2) (A) Each such allotment computed under paragraph (1) shall be increased in the

case of those States whose annual per capita income is less than the average annual per capita income of all of the States and shall be reduced in the case of those States whose annual per capita income is greater than the average annual per capita income of all of the States. The amount of any such increase or reduction to be made with respect to the allotment of any State shall be computed by multiplying such allotment by the percentage by which the annual per capita income of such State is less or greater, as the case may be, than the average annual per capita income of all of the States.

(B) Each such allotment computed under paragraph (1) shall be reduced in the case of those States in which the annual cost of living falls below the average annual cost of living of all the States and shall be increased in the case of those States in which the annual cost of living exceeds the average annual cost of living of all of the States. The amount of any such reduction or increase to be made with respect to the allotment of any State shall be computed by multiplying such allotment by the percentage by which the annual cost of living of such State falls below or exceeds, as the case may be, the average annual cost of living of all the States.

(c) For purposes of this section—

(1) The population of a State between the ages of five and twenty and of all the States between the ages of five and twenty shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of the most recent data available from the Department of Commerce.

(2) The per capita income of a State and of all the States shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of the most recent data available from the Department of Commerce.

(3) The cost of living of a State and of all the States shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of the most recent data available from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, relating to the Consumer Price Index.

SEC. 4. (a) Each State may use payments from its allotment in any fiscal year under section 3 for activities, programs, and services in the field of education, including activities, programs, and services provided with respect to elementary and secondary schools, vocational and technical schools, and institutions of higher learning.

(b) Whenever the Secretary, after giving reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to a State, finds that such State (1) has used any amount of such allotment for purposes not within the scope of subsection (a), or (2) has not obligated any amount of such allotment within two fiscal years immediately following the fiscal year in which such allotment was made, the Secretary shall give notice of his intention to subtract, from any subsequent allotment or allotments to such State, a total amount equal to the amount referred to in clause (1) or (2). The State may, within thirty days following notice of such intention, appeal the decision to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. In the event of any reduction in the allotment of any State in any fiscal year under this subsection, the Secretary shall reallot and pay the amount of such reduction to other States in proportion to the original allotment to such States under subsection (b) of section 3 for such year.

SEC. 5. (a)(1) Any State desiring to receive its allotment in any fiscal year under this Act shall certify and provide satisfactory assurance to the Secretary that such State will—

(A) use such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursements of and accounting for any allotment paid to such State;

(B) make such accounting reports to the Secretary and the Comptroller General, in such form and containing such information as the Secretary and Comptroller General may reasonably require to carry out their functions under this Act; and

(C) adhere to all applicable Federal laws in connection with any activity, program, or service provided solely or in part from such allotment.

(2) For purposes of this subsection, the provisions of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 shall be deemed to be applicable to any activity, program, or service provided solely or in part from any allotment received by a State under this Act.

(b) Whenever in any fiscal year the Secretary, after giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State, finds that such State is not in substantial compliance with subsection (a), the Secretary shall, subject to appeal as provided in subsection 4(b), cancel any subsequent payments to such State under this Act in such fiscal year and reallot any remainder of the allotment of such State for such fiscal year to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (b) of section 3 for such fiscal year.

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall report to the Congress not later than the first day of March of each year on the operation of the tax-sharing fund during the preceding fiscal year and on its expected operation during the current fiscal year. Each such report shall include a statement of the appropriations to, and the disbursements made from, the tax-sharing fund during the preceding fiscal year and an estimate of the expected appropriation to, and disbursements to be made from, the tax-sharing fund during the current fiscal year.

SEC. 7. As used in this Act, the term "State" includes any of the several States and the District of Columbia.

COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Federal Government currently spends over $70 billion a year for goods and services, of which more than half is spent through the procurement functions of the Government. The practices and procedures under which these goods and services are purchased are varied and numerous.

We have reached the state where we now have a veritable army of procurement officers engaged in a highly escalating battle of paperwork. A battle that is often as baffling to the suppliers of goods and services as it is expensive to the Federal Government.

The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act and the Armed Services Procurement Act, the basic statutes governing civil and defense procurement, were enacted almost two decades ago. In the intervening years, Government budgets have leapfrogged far beyond the much heralded $100 billion mark. Government responsibilities have grown heavier as the scope of its activities expanded. New departments have been created, ambitious proposals to cope with compelling social problems have been undertaken, and our military arsenal now requires multibillion-dollar weapon systems.

The time has come for a close, hard look at the statutes, regulations, procedures, and practices governing Federal procurement. There are loopholes in the laws, inconsistencies in the regulations, conflicts in the procedures, and variations in the practices. The mountains of procurement paperwork grow taller, the maze of procedures more complicated, with each passing day.

Mr. President, I realize full well the different requirements and recourses of the departments and agencies of Government. I am also aware that with the millions of individual procurement actions each year, we cannot hope to reduce the existing complicated process to a simple, neat formula. We should insist, however, that arbitrary differences and inefficient practices be eliminated in the interest of consistency, economy, and fair dealing with contractors.

We should seek a unified approach to procurement problems, devise procedures to facilitate sound policy decisions at the top, and provide the means to see that they are implemented in the field. I am convinced that great economies can be realized through improvements in the present procurement practices by the Federal Government. Equally important, of course, are the savings in time, effort, and money that can be realized for those furnishing goods and services to the Government. Every Member of this body is keenly, and, sometimes painfully, aware of the problems encountered by those doing business with the Government. Complaints, inquiries, and suggestions regarding Government procurement, constantly flow through the office of every Senator. Each of us at one time or another has made an effort to correct inequities or deficiencies in Federal procurement practices. But these efforts have been fragmented, piecemeal and, at best, only stopgap remedies.

The solution, it seems to me, is to make a broad-scale, sweeping study of Government procurement policies and practices. To accomplish this, I am introducing legislation to establish a Commission on Government Procurement. The Commission on Government Procurement is a first step toward seeking answers to many of these problems. This would be a study commission with a 2-year life, composed of 14 members drawn from the two Houses of Congress, the executive branch, and private life. The Commission would be authorized to hire experts, to make studies, to hold hearings, and to make inquiries on all matters deemed relevant and important in the broad field of Government procurement. The findings and recommendations of the Commission would be reported to the Congress.

An identical bill has already been introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, one of Congress' leading experts on Government procurement, not only through his long and distinguished service on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy but as a member of the Second Hoover Commission, as ranking member of the House Committee on Government Operations, and as chairman of its Military Operations Subcommittee. His leadership and initiative in the other body some years ago was instrumental in the enactment of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

Mr. President, the work of this Commission would be in keeping with the recommendations of the leadership to conduct studies and reviews of existing Federal programs. The creation of this proposed Commission would, in my estimation, be one of the major accomplishments of the 90th Congress, and I will seek early enactment of legislation to this end.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be inserted in the RECORD following these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1145) to establish a Commission on Government Procurement, introduced by Mr. JACKSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1145

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in the procurement of goods, services, and facilities by and for the executive branch of the Federal Government by—

(1) establishing policies, procedures, and practices which will enable the Government to acquire goods, services, and facilities at the lowest reasonable cost;

(2) improving the quality and performance of Government procurement organizations and personnel;

(3) avoiding or eliminating unnecessary overlapping or duplication of procurement activities;

(4) identifying gaps, omissions, or inconsistencies in procurement laws and regulations;

(5) achieving greater uniformity, whenever appropriate, in procurement procedures;

(6) coordinating procurement policies and programs of the several departments and agencies;

(7) conforming procurement policies and programs to other established Government policies and programs;

(8) minimizing possible disruptive effects of Government procurement on particular industries, areas, or occupations;

(9) promoting fair dealing and equitable relationships among the parties in Government contracting; and

(10) otherwise promoting economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in Government procurement operations.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 2. To accomplish the policy set forth in section 1 of this Act, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Government Procurement (in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall be composed of fourteen members, including (1) four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate, and two from outside the Federal Government, (2) four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives, and two from outside the Federal Government, and (3) six appointed by the President of the United States, four from the executive branch of the Government, and two from outside the Federal Government.

(b) The Commission shall select a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(c) Eight members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(d) Any vacancies in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission shall study and investigate the present statutes affecting Government procurement; the procurement policies, rules, regulations, procedures and practices followed by the departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Federal Government; and the organizations by which procurement is accomplished to determine to what extent these facilitate the policy set forth in the first section of this Act.

(b) Within two years from the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall make a final report to the Congress of its findings and of its recommendations for changes in statutes, regulations, policies, and procedures designed to carry out the policy stated in section 1 of this Act. In the event the Congress is not in session at the end of such two-year period, the final report shall be submitted to the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate. The Commission may also make such interim reports as it deems advisable.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. (a) Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members of the Commission who are officers or employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Each member of the Commission appointed from outside the Federal Government shall receive compensation at the rate of $100 for each day such member is engaged upon work of the Commission, and shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission, or at its direction any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before such subcommittee or member.

(b) The Commission is authorized to acquire directly from the head of any Federal department or agency information deemed useful in the discharge of its duties. All departments and agencies of the Government are hereby authorized and directed to cooperate with the Commission and to furnish all information requested by the Commission to the extent permitted by law. All such requests shall be made by or in the name of the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission.

(c) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and such personnel may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and general schedule pay rates, but no individual shall receive compensation at a rate in excess of the maximum rate authorized by the General Schedule. In addition, the Commission may procure the services of experts, consultants, or such other temporary and intermittent services as are necessary, but at rates for individuals not in excess of $100 per diem in addition to travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses.

(d) The Commission is authorized to negotiate and enter into contracts with private organizations and educational institutions to carry out such studies and prepare such reports as the Commission determines are necessary in order to carry out its duties.

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES AUTHORIZED TO AID COMMISSION

SEC. 7. Any department or agency of the Government is authorized to provide for the Commission such services as the Commission requests on such basis, reimbursable or otherwise, as may be agreed between the department or agency and the Chairman or Vice Chairman. All such requests shall be made by or in the name of the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission.

TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. One hundred and twenty days after the submission of the final report provided for in section 4 of this Act, the Commission shall cease to exist.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commission such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

AMENDMENTS TO THE PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I have just introduced for the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and myself an amendment to the Packers and Stockyards Act intended to modernize the act to conform to present business conditions and the economics of the livestock industry, and to assure efficient, competitive markets for livestock.

The Packers and Stockyards Act was enacted in 1921 in response to flagrant and deceptive practices in livestock marketing and monopoly control of livestock purchasing through ownership or control of stockyards by several large packing companies. Congress established a regulatory system aimed at conditions existing at that time.

In the 46 years since passage of the act, there have been major changes in the livestock marketing industry. The terminal markets—stockyards—no longer have a monopoly position. They can no longer be considered "great national public utilities" on which the flow of commerce depends. A declining portion of slaughter livestock is being purchased on terminal markets. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a table showing this decline in the portion of business handled. It shows that a steadily increasing portion of livestock sales is not subject to the forces of supply and demand present at the terminal markets. An increasing portion of livestock is being sold outside the free, competitive market system.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Percent of total slaughter livestock purchased at terminal markets[1]

Cattle:	
1923	90.0
1930	88.3
1940	75.1
1950	74.9
1960	45.8
1965	34.0
Calves:	
1923	86.0
1930	81.8
1940	60.9
1950	56.7
1960	25.4
1965	16.5
Sheep:	
1923	86.0
1930	84.7
1940	63.8
1950	57.4
1960	35.5
1965	25.5
Hogs:	
1923	77.0
1930	59.9
1940	46.7
1950	39.9
1960	30.3
1965	23.4

[1] U.S. Department of Agriculture, Consumer and Marketing Service, Packers and Stockyards Division.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, since 1921, there has been no major amendment of the Packers and Stockyards Act to adjust to these changes in market conditions.

The proposed amendments are designed to bring the act up to date by redirecting the focus of regulation so that the competitive forces of the free market system can more effectively determine livestock prices and assure true value for both the producer and the consuming public, and by clarifying the rights and responsibilities of market owners and operators.

If the present trend in livestock marketing is allowed to continue, the industry could well return to the noncompetitive situation that existed before 1921. The freedom of choice to the livestock producer in the marketing of livestock could well disappear.

Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, G. L. Mehren, said:

> We are all aware that terminal livestock markets as a whole have experienced a relative decline in volume in recent years. However, they are still the single most important factor in the livestock marketing pattern . . .
>
> In our administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act, we are seriously concerned with maintaining competition at these terminal market centers, so that producers can continue to rely upon a fair set of values in selling their livestock. The issue we face is no longer limited to whether certain practices are inherently bad or good, or whether some firms are intrinsically saintly or nefarious. The real issue is how to devise rules of conduct in marketing that are best suited to the kind of marketing system that has come into being.
>
> Let's consider within his context, one of the main problems with which we are faced—preserving effective competition.
>
> If (terminal) markets should cease to provide effective competition for livestock, the need for them would, for the most part, be eliminated. This would be a serious, if not fatal blow to the efficient functioning of open competition throughout our livestock marketing system.

The proposed amendments are designed to reverse the present trend, and to assure a healthy, competitive market system for the establishment of livestock prices.

Today's livestock markets must be free to exercise control over operations, sales, and services in such a manner as to assure an efficient, competitive market which will maintain and attract even larger volumes of sales.

I have checked producers, feeders, farm groups, and others interested and find the proposal has support by all segments of the livestock and meat industry.

The Congress has declared that the purpose of the Packers and Stockyards Act is to—

> Provide a constructive measure that would properly safeguard the interest of the public and all elements of the industry from the producer to the consumer without destroying any unit of it.

I believe the proposed amendments are consistent with that mandate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1149) to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, introduced by Mr. McGovern (for himself and Mr. Young of North Dakota), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on February 28, an executive communication transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for use by the Secretary of Defense for the acquisition of properties pursuant to section 1013 of Public Law 89-754, was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee.

Properly, this executive communication should have been referred to the Armed Services Committee, for subsection (i) of section 1013 specifically places the jurisdiction for authorizing funds with which to implement section 1013 under the Armed Services Committee.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that this executive communication be rereferred to the Senate Armed Services Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF SMALL TAX DIVISION WITHIN THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 104

Mr. SMATHERS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 18) to establish a Small Tax Division within the Tax Court of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 291) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $3,000 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deduction from the monthly insurance benefits payable to them under such title, at its next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 949) to establish a Judicial Service Commission, the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Baker] be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 32) to establish a Joint Committee on Urban Affairs, at its next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 222, to insure that public buildings financed with Federal funds are so designed and constructed as to be accessible to the physically handicapped, that the names of Senators Bayh, Javits, Kennedy of Massachusetts, McGee, Mundt, Tydings and Yarborough be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke] be added as a cosponsor at the next printing of the bill (S. 1057) to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of February 16, 1967, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors of the following bills:

S. 991. A bill to amend title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to authorize financial assistance for the provision of street lighting facilities in aid of the prevention or reduction of crime: Mr. Brooke, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Prouty, and Mr. Randolph.

S. 992. A bill to establish a National Institute of Criminal Justice: Mr. Brooke, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Prouty, and Mr. Randolph.

S. 993. A bill to provide grants for the establishment and operation of Regional Academies of Criminal Justice: Mr. Brooke, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Prouty, and Mr. Randolph.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ROBERT C. BELLONI, OF OREGON, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF OREGON

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, March 8, 1967, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Robert C. Belloni, of Oregon, to be U.S. district judge, district of Oregon, vice William G. East, retiring.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON SAN RAFAEL WILDERNESS, LOS PADRES NATIONAL FOREST, CALIF.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Public Land Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will hold a public hearing on my bill, S. 889, to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California, on April 11, 1967, at 10 a.m., room 3110, New Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON ENLARGEMENT OF TEHAMA-COLUSA CANAL, CALIF.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Water and Power Resources Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will hold a public hearing on my bill, S. 1111, to authorize construction of an enlarged Tehama-Colusa Canal in California, on Monday, April 17, 1967, at 10 a.m., room 3110, New Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON SAN FELIPE DIVISION, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Water and Power Resources Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will hold a public hearing on my bill, S. 1098, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the San Felipe division, Central Valley project, in California, on Monday, April 17, 1967, at 10 a.m., room 3110, New Senate Office Building.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4573) to provide, for the period ending on June 30, 1967, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Address by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman before Nation's Cleanest Town Achievement Conference, Statler-Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., February 21, 1967.

WHAT DOES THE UNITED STATES SEEK IN VIETNAM?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, we have just concluded the second year of "accelerated" warfare in Vietnam.

It was 2 years ago, in February 1965, that the Marines were dispatched to Danang to prevent what appeared to be a serious threat of military defeat to U.S. forces in Vietnam. Had our Marines at Danang been defeated at that time, the forces of South Vietnam itself would have been in very serious jeopardy.

What has happened in those 2 years?

The only thing we can say definitely is that the threat of military defeat to our forces no longer exists; it has been removed.

All else is as uncertain now as it was then.

Meanwhile, 6,500 Americans have been killed and 45,000 wounded.

Many times that number of Vietnamese—soldiers and civilians from the factions on our side and the factions adhering to the Vietcong—have also been killed and wounded.

We have spent at least $50 billion in military expenditures and another several billion in economic aid expenditures over these same 2 years.

But this is not all the cost.

At home the postwar, bipartisan consensus, which since World War II supported the conduct of foreign policy in its important dimensions, has been fragmented.

The conduct of foreign policy has become a major source of public unrest and frustration all across our land.

Abroad, our word is no longer accepted as it was even 2 years ago.

There is a "credibility gap" separating us from countries with whom we used to counsel most closely about the great affairs of world peace and prosperity.

Those who would make light of this should ask themselves: "What more than credibility in American power and purpose keeps the peace of the world today?"

Now, what of our current and future prospects?

We are told by our gallant commander in Vietnam, General Westmoreland, that it may take 10 years or more to "pacify" South Vietnam; at least, we should be prepared for a seige that long.

We are told by some of the gallant political warriors in the vineyards here at home that the war must be over by 1968 or great changes will come about in the political complexion of our Government.

We are told by our professional airmen that more bombing of more targets will bring peace through capitulation.

We are told by some of high diplomatic repute that if we cease bombing altogether, a peace conference will follow.

We are prepared at a moment's notice to enter negotiations and stand ever alert for an initiative from the other side.

But it is still unclear what it is we are prepared to negotiate about.

What is it that we have not won which we still seek to win?

Surely, it is not a military victory beyond that which we already have achieved, for no military objective has ever been stated.

That is why I made so bold last fall to suggest that the President and our allies at the Manila Conference declare that, militarily, the war had been won.

I still believe that such a declaration would help to bring to the surface the essential political problems which beset the Vietnamese people and which only the Vietnamese people ultimately can resolve.

What makes the Vietnam war so incredible to so many here and abroad is the spectacle of the United States, largely through deployment of its matchless military power, attempting to reengineer the society of Vietnam.

Of course, sweeping changes in Vietnamese society are needed if the Vietnamese people are to defend themselves against the depredations of the Vietcongs' Murder, Inc., policy.

But how can we believe that this is a task which can be accomplished largely by Americans, and by American Armed Forces at that?

It is not surprising that within our Armed Forces today there is much frustration and bitterness over the conduct of the war.

These are professional men, trained to do a professional job; namely, to fight and win a military war.

They are not trained to reengineer the societies of other countries.

But their frustration and bitterness is a cause of deep concern to me.

If, as civilians, we fail so badly in our understanding that we place our Armed Forces in positions which bring their efficiency into question, we are ourselves endangering the peace.

For I say again that it is the credibility of American power and purpose which, more than anything else, keeps the peace.

Because the problem in Vietnam is one of social reengineering, it is folly to look for an escape from our predicament through extending the war to whatever targets or objectives might be conjured up outside of South Vietnam.

Even if the recent extension of bombing should force North Vietnam to a peace conference—which is by no means likely—our problem would not be eased in any significant way.

In fact, our negotiating position would actually be weaker than it is right now.

For it is folly, again, to pretend that it will ever be safe in our time to radically reduce our military presence in Southeast Asia.

The illusory hope of victory through airpower is made of the same stuff as the illusory hope of innocence through withdrawal.

The first illusion derives its justification from the idea that withdrawal will be possible in the foreseeable future.

We have two divisions in Korea 15 years after the onset of that war.

We will have to have more military power than that in or around Vietnam 15 years from now if we are to keep the peace in that part of the world.

What we cannot have is either total victory or withdrawal; the two ideas are rooted in the same illusion.

Yet we can say that we have won militarily all that is necessary and no power on earth will rise to challenge our word.

What would such a declaration mean?

It would mean a radical change in strategy—a change from a strategy of trying to reengineer Vietnamese society to one of mounting a strong watch over that society, a watch maintained at strong points on the coast and at sea.

We would be saying to our friends in Saigon that social change must be their job and that it is time they got down to it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if this means they will turn to negotiations with the Vietcong, so be it; it is their country.

We will be there watching, ready to retaliate against any military force that presumes to impose its will.

But political forces will be countered by political means.

If we expect to keep any friends in Vietnam, over the long run, we must be prepared to change our course.

No leader can hold power in that country for long who is as heavily dependent upon the United States as is the present Saigon regime.

This is no reflection on Prime Minister Ky for whose courage I have the greatest respect.

It would be true of anybody in his role.

For we are not helping our friends in Vietnam today as much as we are suffocating them.

It is the unavoidable byproduct of our present strategy.

And let our watch extend to North Vietnam, too, by substituting regular reconnaissance for bombing.

Let the infiltrators come, if they can and will; let South Vietnam return the compliment as it can and will.

But remove from the field for the moment such justification as our troops now provide for a policy of infiltration.

If this means that a new military situation will arise in the future—which is not at all inevitable—then let us deal with the situation when it arises.

We have nothing to lose through such a change in strategy and much to gain.

No one can drive us from Vietnam, much less defeat us in the field.

But at present we are in a very real sense our own worst enemy in that country.

We have chosen a strategy that ill befits our vast military power; we have persevered with that strategy to the point where we are encouraging even our own people to believe that we face either an unthinkable retreat or a hideous escape into a wider and more terrible war.

This is a strategy that denies options; it is a strategy that has failed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I noted with interest the candid remarks which the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont has made. As usual, he has been frank in his comments; and this speech, I know, has been the product of long study and some deep research.

I would hope that his indication that we could well be in Vietnam 15 years after the war in over, as we have been in Korea, where the war is not over and only a truce exists, would not come to pass.

I express the hope that if an honorable peace can be achieved in Vietnam, in line with the communiques issued by the Manila Conference, that we will be able to pull out in a 6-month period and that we would be in a position to turn over these bases we are building to the South Vietnamese and the Thai, to the end that we would keep our word that we have no vital and continuing interest on the Asian mainland, and, therefore, help to bring about a better relationship in that area.

The Senator mentions the fact that social change in South Vietnam must be undertaken by the South Vietnamese themselves. That has been one of the primary aims of the administration, but, unfortunately, conditions have taken such a turn since the unhappy conflict started that, as the Senator points out correctly, most of the responsibility has fallen on us even in the field of reengineering, I believe is the term used, in trying to bring peace and stability to the Vietnamese society.

I appreciate the fact that the Senator has made this speech. It is worthy of study and consideration and I am sure that will be the result downtown. I commend the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Montana for his remarks.

I still feel, however, that it is virtually impossible for us to get out of there within 6 months assuming that we achieve what I understand to be our present objective, which is to make Mr. Ho sit down, and he will not sit down. I think we will have our forces in there for many, many years in the future, not only for the security of that country, but for the security of all Southeast Asia and the southern Pacific area. But I do believe that we have to consider another form of strategy than we have been practicing up until now, in that we can neither withdraw unconditionally from some demand to get out of there, nor can we win the war by constantly expanding in this area.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Vermont for a very thought provoking statement. It is a statement that is going to be read and given a great deal of thought by people interested in this problem.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, every time the able Senator from Vermont speaks he speaks wisely.

Surely, as he has indicated, the semantics on our struggle in Southeast Asia have regrettably fuzzed up the obligation of the American people and the goal of the American people in their activities there.

I congratulate the Senator from Vermont on the speech that he has made.

(At this point, Mr. Moss assumed the chair.)

THE 25 MILLIONTH BALLOT CAST IN NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD ELECTION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, tomorrow several ceremonies will be held here in Washington to mark a significant milestone in America's industrial history—the casting of the 25 millionth ballot in a National Labor Relations Board election. This occasion is of great interest, of course, to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, since it was this committee which first considered Senator Wagner's bill and has since processed the various amendments which have been adopted.

We have come a long way in labor-management relations since the pre-NLRB days and the healthy state of our economy suggests that not only has it brought lawful, peaceful ways to adjust differences, but also unprecedented industrial growth and prosperity. In 1935, when the National Labor Relations Act was passed, almost half the labor disputes in the United States had as their major issues union recognition. Thirty years later, this number has decreased to less than three one-hundredths of 1 percent.

In 1937, there were 2,728 strikes for organizing purposes; in 1964, there were only 35. The election process has been broadly accepted by labor and management—currently, four out of five elections are conducted by agreement of the company and the union. In all, 25 million working men and women have exercised freedom of choice in collective bargaining elections. This number, I might point out, approaches a third of the entire civilian work force of the Nation.

In exercising their right to choose a union or not, working men and women are protected against retaliation, discrimination, or other unfair conduct, whether by employers or unions. Elections have grown in number and voter participation. In its first year, 1935, the Board held 31 elections for 7,734 voters with an average 80-percent participation rate. This year, the Board is holding about 8,000 elections for more than a half-million voters with an average 90-percent participation rate.

The value of the secret ballot election process is indicated by the fact that tomorrow's ceremonies are sponsored by both labor and management. It is gratifying to us all that the National Association of Manufacturers and the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations are jointly sponsoring a reception for the 25 millionth voter. It is particularly gratifying to me that the Board has chosen an employee of Reynolds Metals Co. plant for the special honors

Reynolds is a company which has always shown leadership and foresight in its activities. It has been my privilege to assist the firm in establishing several plants in my State and they have honored me by naming one of them the Listerhill plant. This is located at Sheffield, Ala., and helped satisfy the vast need for aluminum which this country encountered in World War II. If it had not been for the vision, the courage, and the leadership of R. S. Reynolds, Sr., and the help of our Government in helping him expand the Nation's aluminum resources, we could not have met the wartime demand for this vitally essential metal. Last year, the Reynolds firm marked the 25th anniversary of its founding.

I congratulate Mr. Scheno, the 25 millionth voter, and his employers, the Reynolds plant in Woodbridge, N.J., and the loyal employees of the National Labor Relations Board who have run more than 200,000 elections in the past 31 years. Their work has been a contribution to industrial peace and workers' freedom of choice.

A number of Senators have asked to speak on this occasion, and I am, therefore, glad at this time to yield to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. PROUTY. I thank the Senator from Alabama for yielding to me.

Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to note that the National Labor Relations Board will be honored at various ceremonies tomorrow commemorating the casting of the 25 millionth vote by employees in representation elections conducted under the National Labor Relations Act.

More than 30 years ago, Congress decided that a Federal labor law incorporating a national policy was desirable to protect the rights of individual workers and to promote more stability in relations between management and labor. The significance of tomorrow's celebration lies in the fact that the administration of this statute has clearly demonstrated the effectiveness of the democratic principles embodied in it to resolve issues of representation in an orderly and peaceful manner.

The National Labor Relations Act provides that employees may choose whether or not they desire to have a bargaining representative negotiate with their employer concerning their wages and other terms and conditions of employment. At appropriate times, it permits them to change bargaining representatives or to reject a bargaining representative which has failed to give them adequate representation, and it insures that employees shall vote in these elections without unlawful interference from any quarter with their rights to make a free and uncoerced decision.

Since 1935, more than 25 million rank and file employees have exercised their right of choice under the National Labor Relations Act. Currently more than half a million workers are taking advantage of their franchise each year.

The NLRB has reason for pride. Under the National Labor Relations Act, it has established a system of checks and balances for its elections which guarantees secrecy of the ballot cast by the individual employee. This cloak of anonymity has resulted in the turnout of a remarkably high percentage of eligible workers to vote in these elections. Thus, experience shows that more than 90 percent of eligible employees vote in representation elections conducted by the NLRB. Such a turnout record, I might add, should bring a touch of envy from those of us who go before the people seeking elective office.

Mr. President, I appreciate this opportunity to salute the Board for the manner in which it has provided the means for employees to express their choice and to make their decisions in collective bargaining elections. I also extend my sincere congratulations to the workers of our country who have demonstrated the dynamics of this law by their participation in these secret ballot elections.

Once again, I thank the Senator from Alabama for yielding to me.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

THE NLRB—GUARDIAN OF THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS IN LABOR RELATIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, 25 million voters ago, this was a nation torn by strikes—and very different strikes than those we see in labor-management disputes in the 1960's. Today, at least, when labor and management disagree, their dispute concerns wages and hours—the grist for the mill of collective bargaining. But 25 million voters ago, the central strike or lockout issue was something which should never have been an issue at all: the right of employees to form a union in the first place.

We have come a long way. Today, the right to form a union is an accepted, fundamental American right. And there is no longer any need to strike over it, for the National Labor Relations Board will protect that right. And it will also protect the right of employees to reject a union in the first place, or to oust one they no longer support. And all this can be and is accomplished peacefully—by secret ballot—and without any need to resort to the strike or picket line.

We hear so much these days about the headlinemaking sort of strike, or lockout, or labor dispute. Yet we and the public at large need to be reminded that for every labor crisis which makes the headlines, there are hundreds of labor-management controversies which are handled by the National Labor Relations Board in an impartial, expeditious, and effective manner which both labor and management have now come to take for granted.

That is a great accomplishment. It is what makes free collective bargaining and the American system of labor-management relations possible.

It is to the great credit of the National Labor Relations Board, to American labor and its leaders, as well as to the enlightened leadership of American management.

I join the chairman in congratulating all segments of the economy in American society on this accomplishment.

Mr. President, in this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in yesterday's Washington Post, entitled "Industrial Ballot Box."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRIAL BALLOT BOX

Sam Zagoria of the National Labor Relations Board reminded an audience the other day that the Board has conducted 200,000 secret-ballot elections since 1935. Attainment of this milestone is being celebrated in Washington this week with special honors for the New Jersey steelworker who became the 25 millionth voter in such an election. The occasion is a happy reminder of how routine this type of industrial balloting has become.

Only two decades ago bombings and violence were commonplace in union organizing campaigns. Mr. Zagoria reminds us that 2728 strikes were called for organizing purposes in 1937. By 1964 strikes of this kind had declined to 35. Today it is standard practice to settle the question of worker representation for collective bargaining purposes through an NLRB election. Judging from its record, the Board will hold about 8000 elections this year, with an average of 90 per cent of the eligible workers participating.

This is no meager accomplishment. The unsolved problems in the labor-management field are still enormous, but collective bargaining has become the established norm, and any group which has a majority in an industrial plant may obtain bargaining rights through peaceful and logical resort to the ballot box.

Four out of five of the NLRB elections these days are conducted by agreement of the company and the union. The willingness to accept orderly democratic procedures in place of repression on one side and violence on the other is a tribute to both. We hope that the next two decades will bring as much progress in other areas of conflict as the last two have brought in the acceptance of free industrial elections.

THE NLRB HAILS THE 25 MILLIONTH VOTER

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I am very much pleased to note that tomorrow in Washington there will be a number of events to commemorate the casting of the 25 millionth secret ballot cast by workers in National Labor Relations Board elections during the last 31 years.

In the morning there will be a public observance in the Department of Interior auditorium to honor Mr. Leonard P. Scheno, of Carteret, N.J., a technician in the Reynolds Metals Co. plant at Woodbridge, N.J. Mr. Scheno cast the ballot symbolic of the 25 millionth vote.

Thereafter, the AFL–CIO and the Electronics Industries Association will be cohosts at a Capitol Hill luncheon sponsored by Democratic and Republican leaders of the Senate and House Labor Committees. Concluding the day there will be a reception sponsored by the AFL–CIO and the National Association of Manufacturers.

This unusual cooperation of major labor and management organizations is eminently appropriate on this occasion. There can be no differences of opinion between labor and management as to the wisdom of the action of Congress in providing self-determination elections for working men and women as a substitute for the strikes and picketing for union recognition that marked the industrial scene in the 1930's and ofttimes erupted in bloody violence. It is difficult to realize today that almost half of the labor disputes in the country in the 1930's had recognition or organization as an issue; today union recognition is an issue in a minute number of disputes. In 1937, there were 2,728 strikes for organizing purposes; in 1964, there were only 35.

This secret ballot election process to determine the representative desires of working men and women has been called industrial democracy. Speaking of democracy and the secret ballot, Winston Churchill summed it up nicely when he said:

> At the bottom of all tributes paid to democracy is the little man, walking into a little booth, with a little pencil, making a little cross on a little bit of paper. No amount of rhetoric or voluminous discussion can possibly diminish the overwhelming importance of that point.

Mr. Churchill could have gone on to say that once his "little man" enters a voting booth he ceases to be a "little man"; all men are of equal stature when they exercise the right to determine their own destiny.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, representatives of labor, industry, and government will join tomorrow in observing the casting of the 25 millionth vote in National Labor Relations Board-conducted elections to determine the collective bargaining representation desires of workers. At the various events—a morning program at the Department of Interior, a luncheon on Capitol Hill, and a reception at the State Department—an honored guest will be the man designated as "25 millionth voter"—Mr. Leonard P. Scheno, of Carteret, N.J., who cast the symbolic vote in an election in which employees of the Reynolds Metal Co. plant at Woodbridge, N.J., selected the United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO, to represent them in collective bargaining.

These events tomorrow are to commemorate the reaching of a significant milestone in industrial history. Since the enactment of the National Labor Relations Act in 1935, the NLRB has conducted more than 200,000 elections in units including as few as two employees and as many as in the tens of thousands of employees.

The Board and its agents have taken great pains to bring the polling places to the voters: voting facilities have been provided in factories, warehouses, aboard ships, in railroad cars, in stadiums, movie studios, and in a rented circus tent. Elections have been conducted in the tropical heat of Pacific islands and the freezing cold of Alaska. The election experiences of the NLRB have been described by a historian of the times in the following words:

> Many elections through the years were conducted in large units, as in a textile plant of 12,000 employees in a southern mill town, for many of whom this must have been their first experience of casting a vote in a publicly conducted election, or in a steel corporation's mills where more than 116,000 voters were eligible in plants throughout the country, voting for a national union after a long company-union history; or in steamship companies where it took months before all the ships returning from far seas could be counted when they touched American ports . . .
>
> Many smaller elections involved their special difficulties and their own elements of chance, as when lumberjacks voted in the woods, or Negro workers in a cotton-seed-oil mill dared community opposition to come out and vote for a union . . . overall, the elections conducted by the Board were an experience with the democratic process, meeting some of its difficulties as well as giving the lift of spirit that often comes to the participant in such undertakings.

The NLRB has performed this election function, as well as its other responsibilities, with effectiveness and, where appropriate, with imagination. I am proud that one of the members of the Board—the Honorable John H. Fanning—is a good friend and distinguished constituent of mine.

John Fanning has the distinction of being the first Board member to be appointed to successive terms by Presidents of different political parties. He has been a member of the Board for nearly 10 years and has participated in more Board decisions than any other past or present member. Before becoming a member of the Board in 1957, John Fanning already had a long and distinguished career in the Government, starting in the Department of Labor in 1942 and continuing thereafter in various industrial relations capacities in the Departments of the Army and of Defense.

So I take this occasion of the 25 millionth vote in NLRB-conducted self-determination elections to salute my friend John Fanning and the other equally dedicated members of the Board, its general counsel, and staff members upon a job well done—one which has contributed greatly to the industrial peace and economic well-being of the country.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, it is always pleasant to take part in the celebration of ceremonies marking a successful exercise in democracy and at the same time marking a tremendous achievement in harmonious relations between labor and management. The fact that the 25 millionth voter is a resident of my State and an employee of a Reynolds Metals Co. plant in my State makes the pleasure no less.

Twenty-five million votes is a tremendous number of votes even in New Jersey, but the principle which underlies the whole process is even more significant—that each working man and woman shall be given the opportunity to vote a secret ballot for or against union representation. The action of Congress in enacting the National Labor Relations Act created a simple, lawful, and most important—peaceful—way to determine whether a group of workers wanted a union or not, and if so, which one.

The election process has been broadly accepted by labor and management. Evidence of this is that tomorrow the AFL–CIO will join with top organizations of management in honoring the National Labor Relations Board for achieving this milestone. I should like to extend my congratulations, too, to this tiny agency of some 2,300 employees which has held more than 200,000 elections, sometimes under most difficult conditions, and at remote places, so that individual workers can exercise their precious right to vote.

These representation elections have led to realistic discussions by labor and management about the problems that trouble workers and out of these bargaining table sessions have come hundreds of thousands of contracts. This process has helped our Nation achieve an ever-rising standard of living; has led to unprecedented industrial growth and has given the individual worker a sense of security and dignity essential to his welfare.

In concluding, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the National Labor Relations Board describing the selection of the 25 millionth voter.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NLRB SELECTS 25 MILLIONTH VOTER

The National Labor Relations Board announced Saturday that Leonard Paul Scheno (pronounced Shee-no), a machinist and mechanic of Carteret, N.J., was selected as the "25,000,000th voter" in secret-ballot elections conducted by the Federal agency for working men and women since 1935.

Mr. Scheno, 39, voted in an NLRB-supervised election in which employees of the new Reynolds Metals Company aluminum can manufacturing plant at Woodbridge, N.J., chose the United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO, to represent them in collective bargaining.

A maintenance technician, known as "Lenny" to his fellow workers, Mr. Scheno cast the ballot symbolic of the 25,000,000 votes the NLRB has counted in representation elections spanning three decades. It has been a period in which the industrial relations scene in the United States changed sharply.

In the 1930's, a wave of strikes, many involving violence and others involving sitdowns, marked workers' efforts to gain recognition for unions as their bargaining agents. The issue now is largely settled by secret ballots. Employees through self-determination elections conducted by the NLRB at the rate of more than 8,000 a year decide for themselves whether a union will represent them in dealings with their employers.

Based on election reports received in Washington from its 31 regional offices, the NLRB computed that the 25,000,000th vote had been marked and dropped in the guarded ballot box at the Woodbridge can plant on January 30, a few days earlier than anticipated. John J. Cuneo, NLRB Regional Director at Newark, was advised. It was difficult to pinpoint the exact voter but Mr. Scheno was selected to symbolize the 25,000,000 voters.

Mr. Cuneo drove to Woodbridge to tell him so. With plant manager Thomas Navia, he found the machinist, a husky, dark-haired man, at an automatic strip feed press.

At the news, Mr. Scheno said, "Well, 25-million—that's fantastic!"

Mr. Scheno and his family will be brought to Washington early next month for participation in several programs marking this milestone in industrial democracy. Details of the Washington programs will be released early next week.

A World War II and Korean veteran, Mr. Scheno is the father of three children, Geraldine, 13, and twins Nicholas and Grace, 12. He and his wife, Grace, are American-born children of fathers who came from the tiny town of Cisternino, Italy. It was through a get-together of the immigrant fathers in Nyack, N.Y., Mr. Scheno's hometown, that their courtship began.

A Navy flight engineer during service at the end of World War II and afterward, Mr. Scheno logged some 2,000 flying hours in the Pacific, Japan and Tsingtao, China. Honorably discharged in October, 1948, he worked under the GI bill as an apprentice stereotyper for the Rockland County Journal-News in Nyack. Two years later to the day he was recalled into the Navy for Korean service. Although he asked for overseas duty again, he was assigned to the reactivated Oak Harbor Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, and because of his experience as a bowling league organizer was placed in charge of the station's ten bowling alleys. The Oak Harbor team, with Mr. Scheno as its captain, won the bowling championship of the 13th Naval District. He attained membership in the 700 Bowling Club of America with a 721 series. He also was Oak Harbor's horseshoe and table tennis champion.

Athletically inclined all his life, Mr. Scheno is active in sports work with youngsters. For 3 years he has coached the Knights of Columbus Little League baseball team of Carteret—a championship winner in 1964 and 1965, second last season. He is involved, with other members of the Carteret Sportsman's Association, in sponsoring a boys Pop Warner football league team that also has a winning tradition. Mr. Sheno's own youngsters play their part—Nicholas as a baseball and basketball player and the girls as cheerleaders for the football and basketball teams.

After Korean war service, Mr. Scheno in 1952 married, personally built a two-story home at 280 Washington Ave., Carteret, with his father-in-law's help, and began a career as mechanic and manager of service stations for Cities Service on the New Jersey Turnpike and the Garden State Parkway. In 1956 he went into business for himself as operator for 8 years of a Cities Service retail dealership in Avenel, N.J. One of his biggest customers was a trucking fleet, and in 1964 he took over supervision of maintenance for that company as a member of its staff.

He joined Reynolds last September in the first group of technicians hired for the new Woodbridge plant, which is the fourth all-aluminum can-making installation in the nation. The first of several production lines for seamless aluminum cans went into service early in February, following the election.

This election brought to nearly a quarter-million the number of elections conducted by the NLRB since the first on December 16, 1935 at the Wayne Knitting Mills in Fort Wayne, Indiana. In that election workers selected the American Federation of Hoisery Workers, AFL, to be their bargaining representative in preference to a company association of employees, or to no representation.

Mr. Scheno had never been a member of a union until he went to work for Reynolds last Fall. The union's organizing effort was headed by Jack Hurvich, the Steelworkers' International Representative in Irvington, N.J.

Mr. Scheno said he was not surprised at the outcome of the voting at the Woodbridge plant, but added: "I was impressed at the way the NLRB people conducted the election, the absolute guarantee of ballot secrecy.

"And as to giving workers a voice in their own future, NLRB elections like this one make sense."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], and I am sure with other Senators in making a brief comment on the ceremony that will be held tomorrow, Thursday, March 2, when the National Labor Relations Board will observe one of the great demonstrations of democracy in this country.

The Board on that day will mark the 25 millionth vote cast by employees in elections held by that Agency in its administration of the National Labor Relations Act, which was enacted in 1935.

The march of these 25 million voters to the polls, to decide by secret ballot whether they wished to be represented in collective bargaining with their employers, could be characterized as one of the great freedom marches. The elections conducted by the Board give to workers a freedom of choice. And in the exercise of that choice the workers are protected by the law from interference or coercion, whether by employers or by unions.

That workers are eager to exercise this freedom is evident by both the numbers who go to the polls in NLRB conducted elections, and by the heavy percentage of eligible voters who actually cast ballots. Last year, in more than 8,000 elections, more than 500,000 employees voted. They represented close to 90 percent of those eligible to vote. This rate of participation is nothing short of remarkable. To NLRB staff people who conduct the elections, however, this turnout is commonplace.

The confidence placed in the NLRB elections by employees also is reflected in the attitude of employers and unions. Of elections in the past year, about 78 percent were conducted by consent of the parties. In other words, the holding of the elections in those cases was not contested.

On March 2, the Board will conduct proper ceremonies to note this 25 millionth vote. It is fitting that a 39-year-old plant worker, Leonard P. Scheno, of the Reynolds Metals Co., along with his wife and three children, will occupy the place of honor at the ceremonies. This worker will symbolize the 25 millionth voter in NLRB elections.

It is fitting that this man, a rank-and-file worker, be a symbol of a great and protected right which Congress 31 years ago saw need for, and provided for in farsighted legislation.

Mr. President, the National Labor Relations Board has prepared a press release which contains very interesting biographical and record information concerning Mr. Scheno and his record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall read from the introduction of the press release and ask unanimous consent later to have the entire press release printed in the Record.

The press release reads in part:

The National Labor Relations Board announced Saturday that Leonard Paul Scheno a machinist and a mechanic of Carteret, N.J., was selected as the "25,000,000th voter" in secret-ballot elections conducted by the Federal agency for working men and women since 1935.

Mr. Sheno, 39, voted in an NLRB-supervised election in which employees of the new Reynolds Metals Company aluminum can manufacturing plant at Woodbridge, N.J., chose the United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO, to represent them in collective bargaining.

A maintenance technician, known as "Lenny" to his fellow workers, Mr. Scheno cast the ballot symbolic of the 25,000,000 votes the NLRB has counted in representation elections spanning three decades. It has been a period in which the industrial relations scene in the United States changed sharply.

In the 1930's, a wave of strikes, many involving violence and others involving sitdowns, marked workers' efforts to gain recognition for unions as their bargaining agents. The issue now is largely settled by secret ballots.

A Navy flight engineer during service at the end of World War II and afterwards, Mr. Scheno logged some 2,000 flying hours in the Pacific, Japan and Tsingtao, China. Honorably discharged in October, 1948, he worked under the GI bill as an apprentice stereotyper for the Rockland County Journal-News in Nyack.

Mr. President, this man has a very favorable record, and I think it is particularly fitting that he should be chosen by the National Labor Relations Board to symbolize all the workers of this country that exercise the precious right under our system, that precious of right of collective bargaining without which, Mr. President, in my judgment we would not be really free in this country.

I think it is particularly fitting that Mr. Scheno should have been selected. I therefore ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record the National Labor Relations Board press release which sets out in detail the record of this fine American, a workman dedicated to the cause of elections in determining the collective bargaining unit that shall represent free men in the shops of America in the labor relations with their employer.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NLRB SELECTS "25 MILLIONTH VOTER"

The National Labor Relations Board announced Saturday that Leonard Paul Scheno (pronounced Shee-no), a machinist and mechanic of Carteret, N.J., was selected as the "25,000,000th voter" in secret-ballot elections conducted by the Federal agency for working men and women since 1935.

Mr. Scheno, 39, voted in an NLRB-supervised election in which employees of the new Reynolds Metals Company aluminum can manufacturing plant at Woodbridge, N.J., chose the United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO, to represent them in collective bargaining.

A maintenance technician, known as "Lenny" to his fellow workers, Mr. Scheno cast the ballot symbolic of the 25,000,000 votes the NLRB has counted in representation elections spanning three decades. It has been a period in which the industrial relations scene in the United States changed sharply.

In the 1930's, a wave of strikes, many involving violence and others involving sitdowns, marked workers' efforts to gain recognition for unions as their bargaining agents. The issue now is largely settled by secret ballots. Employees through self-determination elections conducted by the NLRB at the rate of more than 8,000 a year decide for themselves whether a union will represent them in dealings with their employers.

Based on election reports received in Washington from its 31 regional offices, the NLRB computed that the 25,000,000th vote had been marked and dropped in the guarded ballot box at the Woodbridge can plant on January 30, a few days earlier than anticipated. John J. Cuneo, NLRB Regional Director at Newark, was advised. It was difficult to pinpoint the exact voter but Mr. Scheno was selected to symbolize the 25,000,000 voters.

Mr. Cueno drove to Woodbridge to tell him so. With plant manager Thomas Navia, he found the machinist, a husky, dark-haired man, at an automatic strip feed press.

At the news, Mr. Scheno said, "Well, 25-million—that's fantastic!"

Mr. Scheno and his family will be brought to Washington early next month for participation in several programs marking this milestone in industrial democracy. Details of the Washington programs will be released early next week.

A World War II and Korean veteran, Mr. Scheno is the father of three children, Geraldine, 13, and twins Nicholas and Grace, 12. He and his wife, Grace, are American-born children of fathers who came from the tiny town of Cisternino, Italy. It was through a get-together of the immigrant fathers in Nyack, N.Y., Mr. Scheno's hometown, that their courtship began.

A Navy flight engineer during service at the end of World War II and afterward, Mr. Scheno logged some 2,000 flying hours in the Pacific, Japan and Tsingtao, China. Honorably discharged in October, 1948, he worked under the GI bill as an apprentice stereotyper for the Rockland County Journal-News in Nyack. Two years later to the day he was recalled into the Navy for Korean service. Although he asked for overseas duty again, he was assigned to the reactivated Oak Harbor Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, and because of his experience as a bowling league organizer was placed in charge of the station's ten bowling alleys. The Oak Harbor team, with Mr. Scheno as its captain, won the bowling championship of the 13th Naval District. He attained membership in the 700 Bowling Club of America with a 721 series. He also was Oak Harbor's horseshoe and table tennis champion.

Athletically inclined all his life, Mr. Scheno is active in sports work with youngsters. For three years he has coached the Knights of Columbus Little League baseball team of Carteret—a championship winner in 1964 and 1965, second last season. He is involved, with other members of the Carteret Sportsman's Association, in sponsoring a boys Pop Warner football league team that also has a winning tradition. Mr. Scheno's own youngsters play their part—Nicholas as a baseball and basketball player and the girls as cheerleaders for the football and basketball teams.

After Korean war service, Mr. Scheno in 1952 married, personally built a two-story home at 280 Washington Ave., Carteret, with his father-in-law's help, and began a career as mechanic and manager of service stations for Cities Service on the New Jersey Turnpike and the Garden State Parkway. In 1956 he went into business for himself as operator for eight years of a Cities Service retail dealership in Avenel, N.J. One of his biggest customers was a trucking fleet, and in 1964 he took over supervision of maintenance for that company as a member of its staff.

He joined Reynolds last September in the first group of technicians hired for the new Woodbridge plant, which is the fourth all-aluminum can-making installation in the nation. The first of several production lines for seamless aluminum cans went into service early in February, following the election.

This election brought to nearly a quarter-million the number of elections conducted by the NLRB since the first on December 16, 1935, at the Wayne Knitting Mills in Fort Wayne, Indiana. In that election workers selected the American Federation of Hosiery Workers, AFL, to be their bargaining representative in preference to a company association of employees, or to no representation.

Mr. Scheno had never been a member of a union until he went to work for Reynolds last Fall. The union's organizing effort was headed by Jack Hurvich, the Steelworkers' International Representative in Irvington, N.J.

Mr. Scheno said he was not surprised at the outcome of the voting at the Woodbridge plant, but added: "I was impressed at the way the NLRB people conducted the election, the absolute guarantee of ballot secrecy.

"And as to giving workers a voice in their own future, NLRB elections like this one make sense."

WESTERN WATER PROBLEMS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on February 11, 1967, I was privileged to address the 15th annual convention of the California Council of Civil Engineers and Land Surveyors in Palm Springs, Calif. I talked about the water problems of my State and of the entire Pacific Southwest. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

And Not a Drop to Drink

(Text of remarks by U.S. Senator Thomas H. Kuchel, at the 15th annual convention of the California Council of Civil Engineers and Land Surveyors, Palm Springs, Feb. 11, 1967)

"Population explosion" is a fashionable term to throw about these days. I'm sure it is what makes it impossible to find parking space at National Airport, but I can give you a jarring numerical definition.

From the early dawn of man's time on earth until the time of Christ, the population of the earth grew to one-quarter of a billion people. It was not until 1650 that the earth's population doubled, reaching one-half billion. It doubled again, reaching one billion about 1850, two billion in about 1930, and the human race is rapidly approaching four billion.

California's explosion is even more dramatic. Between 1860 and 1960, the State's population increased forty-fold. Each 24 hours we add 1,500 Californians. We will have 25 million Californians by 1980 and 50 million before the end of the century.

Early small irrigation systems, and later major reclamation projects, have allowed Californians to give a bountiful gift of food to all America.

Today, in the north, Shasta Dam on the Sacramento River creates a beautiful Shasta Lake; Oroville Dam nears completion; and Auburn and Folsom Dams are now authorized.

Near Fresno, at the southern end of the Central Valley, Friant Dam diverts the flow of the San Joaquin River to irrigate the arid southern valley.

Farther south, the Colorado River Aqueduct carries water across the entire width of our State from Parker Dam to the Los Angeles Basin, and the All-American Canal carries water to the agricultural heartland of the Imperial Valley.

These projects are masterpieces of engineering which should give each of you great pride in your profession. But they were conceived and built at a time when the pressures on our water supply were different from those which we must face today and in the future.

The total water supply available to support human life in the United States is 515 billion gallons per day. At the beginning of this century we used 8 per cent of this supply, and by 1960 we were using 60 per cent. Long-range forecasts indicate a need by the year 2000 for nearly twice the total available supply.

Our Nation's crisis will be greatly magnified in California, where, by the end of the century, we are destined to have wall-to-wall people jammed into a vast coastal metropolis. To support that civilization, water must be provided far in excess of its presently projected availability.

Let me read one suggested solution from Raymond F. Dasmann's book, *The Destruction of California*.

"One [answer] is relatively simple, and involves *not* planning for population growth. This means not encouraging new industries to move into an area. It means not developing our water resources to a maximum, and thus not providing the water that would make possible additional urban or industrial growth, or bring into production new farming areas. It means not building those new power stations or those new freeways."

To paraphrase—"Make California uninhabitable and people will move elsewhere."

I suggest that non-preparedness in the field of water development and conservation would thrust our State, and perhaps our Nation, into economic and social cataclysm.

Our existing water sources will adequately handle all of our projected growth up to about 1990—less than 25 years away. That day will come for many—maybe most—of those in this audience, who, with their 40 million to 50 million fellow Californians will enjoy a bountiful water supply, made possible by preparation in the 1960's and 1970's, or will face the bleak prospect of drying up and blowing away.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Pollution control is one hope for the future of both our State and our Nation. Study it and you find vivid examples of the disgraceful way in which America has treated its God-given resource.

Anyone who has walked along the banks of the Potomac River in our Nation's Capital in August will confirm the scientists' judgment that it would be safer to swim in a cesspool.

New York City discharges 400 million gallons of raw sewage into the Hudson River each day. Recently, several children found a watermelon floating in the Hudson, took it home, washed it off, ate it, and eight of them landed in the hospital with typhoid fever.

In 1963 an estimated 5 million fish were killed in the Mississippi River by the discharge of lethal chemicals from a single plant in Memphis.

The Detroit River, which flows into Lake Erie, each day absorbs 19,000 gallons of oil, 200,000 pounds of acid, 2 million pounds of chemical salts and 100,000 pounds of iron, along with the raw sewage of the city.

The cooperative action of State, local and Federal authorities appears to have averted the catastrophe of turning the beautiful blue waters of Lake Tahoe into a bed of green algae.

Perhaps because water pollution is the most visible aspect of our water crisis, it is one in which Congress is acting decisively. Congress approved amendments to the Water Pollution Control Act in 1965 and 1966 which will go far toward cleaning up our country's water.

WASTE WATER RECLAMATION

Waste water reclamation goes hand-in-hand with our efforts to control pollution of our streams. Although the concept of purifying and re-using second-hand water is new in some parts of the country, it is an old and growing practice in the Southwest. The fact of the matter is that the human race has used and re-used the same water from the beginning.

For several years Los Angeles has been producing about 11 million gallons of water a day from domestic sewage at the Whittier Narrows Water Reclamation Plant. The plant produces purer water than that from the Colorado River at only about half the cost of Colorado River water.

The Supervisors of my home County of Orange have completed an excellent, comprehensive plan for the disposal and reclamation of waste water in that county over the next 40 years. Orange County will use reclaimed water for irrigation; for recreation; to maintain an underground barrier against salt water intrusion; and for many other purposes.

DESALINATION OF SEA WATER

Surely a new, major area of hope in development of our water resources is desalination of sea water and purification of brackish water. The Federal effort in desalting began in the early days of the Eisenhower Administration. Since that time I have been a cosponsor of every major piece of desalting legislation enacted.

Since the program began, we have spent about $100 million, primarily in research and development, and we have built several pilot plants. One of them, producing one million gallons of fresh water per day, was built at Point Loma, San Diego. It was subsequently dismantled and moved to Guantanamo Bay when Castro threatened the base water supply.

Earlier this week the Senate passed a bill, which I introduced, to allow the United States to contribute $57.2 million toward the construction and operation of a massive, nuclear powered dual purpose, desalting and electrical power generating plant on a manmade island off the coast of Orange County. The plant will cost $445 million and will be built and owned by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California in conjunction with Southern California Edison Company, Los Angeles Water and Power, and San Diego Gas and Electric Compay. The plant will product 150 million gallons of water per day, enough to supply the domestic needs of a city the size of San Francisco, and will generate 1,800 megawatts of power, even more than Hoover Dam generates.

Existing desalting plants produce only one or two million gallons of fresh water per day, at a cost of about $1.00 per thousand gallons. It is estimated that the new plant will supply water to the Diemer Reservoir in Orange County at 27¢ per thousand gallons. This is cheap, next to the $1.00 cost at existing desalting plants, but the cost of water drawn from the Colorado River is only 10¢ per thousand gallons.

One hundred and fifty million gallons per day sounds like a lot of water, but this is only 168,000 acre-feet per year. By comparison, California draws 5.1 million acre-feet of water from the Colorado River each year.

Making sea water potable is a giant step forward, and nuclear energy will reduce the cost, but it would be a cruel delusion to depend on this source alone—this source which is still in the experimental stage—as the answer to the water needs of the 50 million thirsty Californians who will be with us in a short three decades.

WEATHER MODIFICATIONS

Our Nation is engaged in an extensive research program to test the potential of weather modification as a source of supplemental water. Scientists are probing the secrets of weather so that water in the clouds might fall where it will do the most good. Their laboratory is the whole outdoors, and our scientists have had to be very ingenious to know with assurance when they have changed the weather and when the thanks for the rain go to Mother Nature herself.

INTERBASIN TRANSFER

A final hope and, I think, the best hope, for adequate water for all of the semi-arid West is the importation of water into the Colorado River from outside its basin.

We have developed aqueduct systems in California which are engineering miracles. They bring water across mountains to our cities and farms. When proposed, each met stiff opposition, and the resulting water wars were a sad, if colorful, chapter in our western history.

The 40-year struggle which brought water to Los Angeles from the Owens Valley saw secret land purchases, dynamited irrigation ditches, and an incompetently built dam which broke, inundating the towns below and killing several hundred.

In the early 1930's the Governor of Arizona called out his National Guard to prevent Parker Dam from being built. Years later, in our own State, the proposed State Water Project was to draw bitter opposition by water rich areas whose fears were finally assuaged by adequate county-of-origin protection.

Meanwhile, as an increasingly thirsty Pacific Southwest becomes a vast megalopolitan complex, it is compelled to look, perhaps afar, for a new water supply to slake its thirst. That water supply could be as far away as the Klondike, or as near as the Eel or the Snake. And, indeed, it could be the mighty Columbia. If an area has surplus water—surplus to both its present and future requirements—and if another area is parched and unable to grow because of water shortage—then, at the very least, this Nation has a solemn duty to study, scientifically and with the utmost care, the problem of efficiently utilizing its water resource.

Those who oppose even studying the water needs of the Northwest and Southwest and diversion as a possible solution to our water shortage remind me of Aesop's fable of the dog and the ox:

"A dog was lying in a manger full of hay. An ox, being hungry, came near and was going to eat of the hay. The dog, getting up and snarling at him, would not let him touch it. 'Surly creature,' said the ox, 'You cannot eat the hay yourself, and yet you will let no one else have any.' "

Professor Ralph W. Johnson of the University of Washington, and consultant on water problems to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, captured the statement's attitude, which should be a model to all, when he said:

"What I am urging is that you not use the diversion issue as a whipping boy and let it blind you to the fact that 95 percent or more of the water problems and opportunities of this region will continue to exist and will have to be planned for and handled by the people of this region whether or not a diversion occurs.

"This is not to suggest that the Pacific Northwest should be unconcerned with the diversion issue, but rather that it should be kept in perspective. Our attitude should not automatically be against diversion, but rather should be one of ascertaining as accurately as possible the exact cost, social, economic, and political, of diversion, to this region, the true needs of the Southwest and which of the various alternatives available, including a possible diversion, might best provide the answer to those needs. We cannot simply be negative about this question. Rather, we must realize the very real water-related problems of the Southwest, and attempt to assist in the solution of those problems. This does not deny the necessity for some tough, hard looks at the way the Southwest is using its present water supply, as I have attempted to point out on other occasions. Nor does it mean to imply that a diversion of the Columbia must ultimately come about. Rather it does suggest an attitude of mutual acceptance of responsibility for a problem that must be considered as regional, and profoundly important to the whole of the west."

Make no mistake, supplemental water will come to the Colorado River Basin, and it will benefit every basin State. It will ease the honorable burden of the Mexican Water Treaty. Tens of millions of people are going to be added to the population of the Southwest in the next decade and they must and they will have water to satisfy their needs.

Some suggest that the 50 million people we expect to have in California by the year 2000 could be kept out by regulating immigration. Fifty years ago, when the infamous Bisbee deportation was investigated by a young lawyer named Felix Frankfurter, Arizona found that the Constitution of the United States prohibited deportation of United States citizens from its borders. In 1941, when California tried to keep refugees from the dustbowl from entering California, the Supreme Court held that such action by the State deprived citizens of liberty without due process of law and denied them the equal protection of the laws.

After the years of angry struggle, consummated by a decision of the Supreme Court in 1963, California and Arizona finally have been building an atmosphere of cooperation and friendship. Out of the amity built up between our two States, a seven State agreement emerged in the form of a bill, H.R. 4671, which was pending before the House Interior Committee last year. That bill is one of the significant documents in the history of western water. It marks the first time that representatives of an entire region have met, argued, compromised and finally hammered out an agreement on the water resource development of their region. In the closing days of the last Congress, it was not possible to pass that bill.

Earlier this week I introduced in the Senate a bill which incorporate most of the features of last year's seven State legislation. It will authorize the construction of the Central Arizona Project to alleviate water shortages in Phoenix and Tucson. It will protect California's existing uses in the water to which the Supreme Court said it is entitled. It will authorize the development of projects in the upper Colorado River Basin. It will authorize vital studies of the augmentation of the water supply in the Colorado River under the supervision of the National Water Commission. It will retain authorization of Hualapai Dam, but will eliminate Marble Canyon Dam. Perhaps the most important feature of the bill is the creation of a basin fund to finance the augmentation of the Colorado River flow.

I hope that we can establish regional support for this legislation, but last week the concept of regional cooperation was dealt a shattering blow by one of its strongest supporters.

Secretary of the Interior Udall, about the same time, announced that he will now support legislation to authorize construction of the Central Arizona Aqueduct and Hooker Dam in New Mexico, but which will eliminate any basin development fund, will eliminate any protection of existing uses in California, will eliminate any development of upper basin projects, will eliminate any study of importation, and will eliminate any new hydroelectric revenues to fill the basin development fund. In short, he will eliminate "regional cooperation" from his vocabulary to push a "stripped down" Central Arizona Project bill.

Perhaps prophetically he once said: "If a Secretary or a Commissioner becomes a champion of one region, I think this is a way to insure failure of any plan."

In August, 1965, preaching cooperation among all the Southwest states, Udall said:

"A successful resolution of the water problems of the lower basin requires consideration of the needs of the entire region."

Although Udall apparently contends that the simple Central Arizona Project may be financially feasible without new power generating facilities, the construction of the project without any provision for augmentation of the existing water supply in the Colorado River, would spell water disaster to the remaining basin states.

Both the bill introduced this year by Arizona Congressman Udall and the proposal of his brother, Secretary Udall, delete previously agreed upon protection of existing uses in California. California now draws 5.1 million acre-feet per year from the Colorado River, and the Supreme Court set our allocation of the normal flow at only 4.4 million acre-feet. Last year's seven State bill provided that in time of scarcity existing uses of Colorado River water in California, to the extent of 4.4 million acre-feet per year, and in Arizona and Nevada, should be given priority over new uses in Arizona. The existing uses were to be protected until 2.5 million acre-feet of water annually are delivered into the Lower Colorado River from sources outside the natural drainage area of the river.

Congressman Udall has called this "4.4 guarantee" a mere "piece of paper," but this piece of paper may be the difference between life and death for Southern California a little more than two decades from now. All California seeks is assurance that in water-short years newly created uses in the Central Arizona Project area will not reduce California's use of the river below 4.4 million acre-feet. There is no sound reason for shifting the use of water from its historic uses—taking it off the table in Los Angeles and off the land in Coachella Valley—merely to service new uses in Phoenix and Tucson.

We have come a long way from water wars to the seven State regional bill which was reported out of the House Interior Committee last year. I hope that the basin will not pause long to concern itself with the rejection of regional cooperation by the Secretary of the Interior, and that representatives of the entire Western United States might sit down together soon to plan to meet the water needs of the West in a lasting spirit of cooperation and understanding.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on the first of February, the distinguished Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall, announced a revised plan for the construction of the central Arizona project. The proposal has now taken the form of S. 1013 and is similar to S. 1004.

My views in opposition to it, and the position which the distinguished Secretary of the Interior has suddenly taken, are well known.

At any rate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD sundry editorials and comments concerning Mr. Udall's change in position.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 3, 1967]

UDALL'S WATERY COMPROMISE

Interior Secretary Stewart Udall has proposed an astonishing new plan for regional water development in the Pacific Southwest that is neither regional in scope nor creative in development.

It is, in fact, not so much a plan as a series of concessions.

The Colorado River Basin "compromise" announced Wednesday by Udall bears little resemblance to the imaginative concept of regional co-operation he once championed. Three years ago the secretary was urging the Basin states to join in developing new sources of supply so that present rights could be protected and future needs satisfied.

With Secretary Udall's support, the seven States served by the Colorado agreed last year on the introduction of legislation that would achieve the individual and collective aims of the states.

That regional approach is "rudely shattered" in Udall's new proposal, declared Sen. Thomas Kuchel (R-Calif.) one of the leaders in Congress most responsible for the progress that had been made. "The principles the secretary once espoused," said Sen. Kuchel, "are suddenly abandoned now. We have a right to ask: 'Why the switch?' "

Why indeed?

Secretary Udall explained that "This is not a big victory for anyone. It's a victory for common sense."

"Conservationist" groups, however, can claim victory in the dropping of plans to build Marble Canyon and Hualapai (Bridge) dams in spite of Udall's earlier insistence that hydroelectric development is essential to the economic integrity of a regional program. And Pacific Northwest members of Congress were victorious in insisting that no provisions for water importation studies be included.

Many Arizonans also will be elected because their cherished Central Arizona Project is included, even though the arrangements for financing and necessary power supply are at least debatable.

Politics thus prevailed, but it was hardly a "victory for common sense."

For as the secretary must know, there simply is not enough water in the Colorado to divert the 1.2 million acre-feet proposed for the Central Arizona Project and still provide the absolute minimum amounts guaranteed by law and court decree to the other basin states and by treaty to Mexico. Without the importation of new water, the CAP could be built only by cutting California's use nearly in half and by taking water granted to the upper Basin States by the original Colorado River Compact.

This is one of the reasons that Rep. Wayne Aspinall (D-Colo.), chairman of the all-important House Interior Committee, expressed immediate opposition to the new Udall plan. Chairman Aspinall had already introduced a bill authorizing the CAP but with provisions for importation studies and a guarantee of California's fundamental right to 4.4 million acre-feet.

He and the other Colorado River Basin members of Congress will be awaiting a much fuller explanation of what Sen. Kuchel called the "bewildering intellectual somersault" of Secretary Udall.

It is a time for the Pacific Southwest states again to join the common cause of sound water development. Or, as the 1963 Secretary Udall put it, if we do not work together, "we shall shrivel separately."

[From Engineering News-Record, Feb. 9, 1967]

UDALL DOES COLORADO TURNABOUT

Interior Secretary Stewart Udall, although he publicly denies it, last week kicked over the traces with his proposed bob-tailed version of a Lower Colorado River Project.

His $719-million plan includes only the Central Arizona Reclamation Project, drops both Hualapai (formerly Bridge Canyon) and Marble Canyon dams. It also drops a water guarantee to California which, in turn, could lead eventually to interbasin water transfers from the Pacific Northwest to the Colorado River.

Udall's plan is aimed at cutting budget requirements for the present, and quelling controversy, in order to push the project through this Congress. However, the new proposal seems to generate even more controversy. Udall has strong White House backing, but has stirred up California's congressional delegation, failed to quiet conservationists, and roiled reclamation traditionalists.

Californians are upset because of the deleted guarantee of 4.4 million acre-ft. of Colorado water, and because of a possible $5-per-acre-ft. hike in the charge for municipal and industrial waters, .to help pay Arizona irrigation.

The powerful Sierra Club, a conservation group, objects to the new plan because it doesn't completely reject Hualapai Dam. Udall leaves this to Congress. He did propose that Marble Canyon Dam be dropped permanently, and that the Grand Canyon National Park be extended upstream to include the site. Udall kept Hualapai open for debate, since a high dam there would be the next best plan for the Central Arizona Project, if the bob-tailed plan fails to win support. The sportsmen's club wants Hualapai made part of the park, too.

Reclamation traditionalists, however, appear the most unhappy. In fact, the Bureau of Reclamation only learned of Udall's "no-dam" decision a few days before his announcement. The plan goes to Congress in a few weeks.

Reclamation Commissioner Floyd Dominy, when he learned of the plan, was stuck with a report to the House Interior Committee, made two days before, which urged installation of "generation of maximum capacity for peaking use in all future hydro construction, such as . . . the proposed Hualapai Dam on the Colorado River."

Benefit-cost reversal—Instead of using power revenues to pay for the Central Arizona Project, Udall plans to buy a block of pumping power (400,000 kw) from a group of public and private utilities, the WEST group (Western Energy Supply & Transmission Associated). Udall proposes a federal "prepayment" of $88 million to WEST to reserve this block of power in a new steam generating plant.

At such a low rate, says Udall, the Central Arizona Project could still show a favorable benefit-cost ratio, since water revenues could cover the $88-million power prepayment. Irrigation water rates wouldn't be affected, but municipal and industrial rates would be hiked.

Udall and assistant Interior secretary Kenneth Holum claim the new plan's ratio will be the same as last year's (2.5:1). What puzzles some observers is that last year the costs for Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon dams were judged against higher-cost thermal power alternatives. This year, the power purchases are from thermal plants, and an alternate source, conversely, would seem to be the Bridge Canyon and/or Marble Canyon dams. If the dams were economically favorable in 1966, critics ask how can the steam plant be favorable in 1967 by the same margin?

What of regional plans?—While not satisfying the "no-dams" conversion movement, Udall's plan has also drawn immediate fire from proponents of comprehensive basinwide planning. Typical is the reaction of Sen. Thomas Kuchel (R. Calif.):

"Arizona is not very well served, and the other Pacific Southwest states are very poorly served by Secretary Udall's ill-considered proposals. . . . He has performed a bewildering intellectual somersault. The regional approach to solving the water problems of all Colorado Basin states, on which we had made such great progress, is now rudely shattered.

"Not too long ago, Secretary Udall himself, without equivocation, proposed the concept of regional water development (ENR 9/5/63 p. 18)."

Kuchel plans to introduce a bill this week that includes Hualapai Dam.

[From the San Diego Union, Feb. 11, 1967]

Kuchel's Regional Proposal Is Sensible: Udall Water Plan Doesn't Wash

Dividing scarcity is an exercise in futility, yet this is what Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall now proposes for the Colorado River Basin.

Three years ago the secretary endorsed a sensible regional water conservation plan that included a guarantee of all the states' basic rights to water.

It included the Central Arizona Project to bring water to Phoenix and Tucson and lifted sights to the time when water would have to be imported into the basin from other sources.

Implementation of regional water plans depends on funds to be obtained from the sale of power to be generated at proposed Marble Canyon and Bridge (Hualapai) Canyon dams.

Now in an astonishing reversal, Mr. Udall has abandoned this imaginative and realistic regional approach in favor of a Central Arizona Plan without the dams, but with construction of a thermal power plant. It is a retreat from pressure opposing the two dams in the name of "conservation."

And it is a plan that will again divide the basin into sectionalism, set neighbor state against neighbor state in a fight for water that does not exist and put the Interior Department further into thermal generation, where it does not belong.

There simply is not enough water in the Colorado Basin to serve the needs of the 190,000 square mile area. The river produces about 16.5 million acre-feet of water a year. Demands on this source total about 17.8 million acre-feet.

Without outside sources of water, construction of the Central Arizona Project would divert 1.2 million acre-feet to Phoenix and Tucson and cut California's fundamental right to 4.4 million acre-feet in half. It is a plan the Golden State could not tolerate.

There fortunately is a sensible compromise between the original plan for a regional program and the unthinkable retrogression of Mr. Udall. It is in the measure introduced by Sen. Thomas Kuchel, Republican of California, patterned after a bill approved by the House Interior Committee last year.

It would reinstate the original regional approach, but construct only the Hualapai Dam, 80.8 miles downstream from Grand Canyon National Park at the headwaters of Lake Mead. As a concession to "conservationists" Marble Canyon Dam, 12.5 miles above the eastern boundary of Grand Canyon National Park, would be eliminated. California's basic water rights, fundamental in any plan, would be protected.

It is a minimally essential plan to protect the regional approach and provide long range water needs of the Colorado River Basin that should be approved by Congress.

[From the San Jose (Calif.) News, Feb. 18, 1967]

New Water Plan Threat to State

The Colorado River war is flaming again, and the front line currently is on the banks of the far away Potomac.

A combine of senators from thirsty Arizona and jealously apprehensive Washington state have introduced a bill that runs completely counter to California's interests.

The bill would revive in modified form the Arizona water project which failed to get through the 89th Congress. Two of the modifications are deadly, from California's point of view. Missing from the bill are a guarantee that California will continue to get some Colorado River water and that a study will be made of the possibility of exporting excess water from the Pacific Northwest.

Sen. Kuchel of California has introduced his own bill which includes these vital provisions.

The state of Washington does not want anyone even talking about taking water out of the Northwest. And Arizona is willing to go along with this, apparently feeling that an alliance with the Northwestern bloc will be powerful enough to put the bill through. And it well might.

One sponsor of the anti-California measure is Arizona's Sen. Carl Hayden, chairman of the potent Appropriations Committee. Another sponsor is Washington's Sen. Henry M. Jackson, chairman of the Interior Committee, which will conduct hearings on any Colorado River bill that stands a chance of getting to the floor.

And the Hayden-Jackson bill is not far removed from the latest Colorado River plan of Interior Secretary Stewart Udall, himself an Arizonan.

This is a tough combination to beat. Sen. Kuchel may have to call in all the political IOUs he has collected in the Senate over the years to curb this anti-California move. The state's delegation in the House of Representatives must start mobilizing its resources as well.

The Kuchel bill, like its predecessor which was killed last year, benefits Southern California. This is important to the northern section of the state, however, because a thirsty South can be a heavy drain on the North's water supply.

[From the Los Angeles Herald Examiner, Feb. 21, 1967]

The Big Fault

California's U.S. Sen. Thomas Kuchel has thrown a stop-gap bill into Congress designed to continue protection of the 4.4 million acre feet of Colorado River water annually guaranteed to California.

What this bill really amounts to is the opening of a new battle in Congress to conserve and distribute to all of the Southwest states whatever water becomes available over the next quarter century.

The heart of it is what it always has been, a comprehensive study of the availability of a small portion of the 180 million acre feet of water from the mighty Columbia River which annually goes to waste in the Pacific Ocean. This demand for such survey also is included in the Kuchel bill.

Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall has thrown a monkey wrench into the plans of the Southwest states by dismissing Californa's guarantee of 4.4 million acre feet annually from the Colorado by declaring this now must become a matter of congressional determination.

It is significant that although some years ago the battle for the waters of the Colorado was been only two states, California and Arizona, now the other states along the Colorado have become seriously involved.

The influential Denver Post, for instance, relates the woes of Colorado in an editorial which includes the following:

"He (Udall) would drop plans to build dams in Grand Canyon—which we have suggested. But he also would drop plans to study importation of water from the Pacific Northwest—plans we think are vital.

"Logically, if it makes sense for Arizona to borrow surplus waters from other states upstream on the Colorado River it makes sense to consider importation of surplus water from the Pacific Northwest."

In other words, what's good for the goose is good for the gander, and if you are going to take water away from Colorado why not take it away from Washington and Oregon when the taking of normally wasted water is vitally necessary for the existence of arid areas?

On Arizona's part, the people there are not too happy, either. They must either gain the cooperation of other states to help them get Federal funding for their Central Arizona Project for irrigation or try to do the job alone at vast cost to the state's citizens.

The Phoenix Gazette laments editorially that:

"In retrospect it seems quite likely that our state's mistake last year was in tying itself down to specific plans and compromises without first having an airtight commitment from others which would have resulted in passage of project (CAP) legislation."

Last year, Arizona and California had finally reached the ultimate in rapport.

California was going to support legislation authorizing the Central Arizona Project and Arizona was to acknowledge California's right to 4.4 million acre feet of Colorado River water annually. Other Western states had joined in this important mutual accord.

And then there was a slipup and the necessary Federal legislation failed to pass in the closing days of that Congress.

What has just occurred, the new and vastly revised Stewart-Udall formula is due, we believe, to a gradual thaw and breakup of the Western states friendship treaty. This newspaper always has urged the necessity of such a treaty organization. We hope the senators, congressmen and governors of the Western states push for its revival again in rousing fashion.

NEBRASKA IS 100 YEARS OLD TODAY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, today, March 1, begins Nebraska's centennial year.

In 1860, the people of Nebraska first voted on the statehood question. Statehood was defeated, but the vote was close: 2,094 in favor of statehood, and 2,392 against, a difference of 278 votes. The issue was again presented to the people in 1866. This time they voted for statehood, but again the voting was close, winning by only 100 votes—3,938 for and 3,838 against. Following the congressional endorsement of statehood, the Nebraska Legislature met on February 20, 1867, and composed an acceptance. March 1, 1867, President Andrew Johnson by proclamation officially recognized the existence of the free State of Nebraska. Today we celebrate the fact that the 100-vote difference led to the first 100 years of progress.

We Nebraskans are proud of the heritage built for us by rugged pioneers who asked only for a chance to direct their will and energies toward building a future for themselves and for those who would follow. We who follow pay tribute to those pioneers this centennial year.

These pioneers perceived gold in Nebraska—the fields of golden wheat and golden corn inlaid with the stately beauty of the goldenrod, later to be adopted as our State flower.

This was a kind of gold that had to be won by hard work. It required dedication of heart, mind, and soul.

Nebraska pioneers were just the right kind of people to reap such a land. They asked for no quick spoils. They worked, and worked hard for everything they got.

Apart from the dedication of heavy-toiling men and women, what forces and events shaped the Nebraska of today? This question opens fascinating opportunities for speculation. It formed the basis for an imaginative and informative article in the centennial issue of the Omaha World-Herald on February 26. Some 16 historians, from Nebraska universities and colleges and the Nebraska Historical Society, were asked to join in the selection of significant events.

Not surprisingly, the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854 which opened the territory to legal settlement was deemed the most important event by the historians. Also stressed were subsequently enacted land laws, such as the Homestead Act of 1862. These attracted fresh and willing settlers.

Other forces and events influencing the State were the unicameral legislature adopted in 1934, the development of the railroad, and the Populist movement.

Of course, Nebraska's entry into the Union on March 1, 1867, marked the beginning of another stage of progress. The recognition of the importance of education, as symbolized in the chartering of the University of Nebraska on February 15, 1869, and the Morrill Act of 1862 which provided for the establishment of land-grant colleges, was noted.

The troubled years of depression of the 1890's and 1930's, the livestock industry and this century's technology are other factors mentioned by many of the historians.

This absorbing article contains the following observation:

> A vital relationship between the land and the law runs like a thread of continuity through much of the comment offered by historians as they discuss major Nebraska events.
>
> Their observations regarding the Kansas-Nebraska Act, for example, made these points: Territorial status paved the way to self-rule and eventual statehood. People could purchase or pre-empt land, charter towns, organize counties. They could make provision for public education, roads, bridges and other public structures.

The Lincoln Journal and Star's centennial issue of February 26 brings us back to where we began—back to the people themselves. In the introduction to the centennial picture story, "Nebraska and Its People," the editors of the Journal state this:

> Neither Government nor Place can provide the pulse of life. Only People can tame a Frontier, create a Society, build a State, and meet the challenges of Civilization's Adjustments to Time.

The promise of free land brought many people into Nebraska. Only those who were willing to pay a different kind of price succeeded. It was a hard life, but they were sturdy people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HRUSKA. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for another 5 minutes, or such part of that time as I may need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HRUSKA. Settlers who were determined to be a part of the land lived not only on the land, but in and under that land. This was the era of the sod house. Because of the scarcity of timber, many pioneers built their very homes out of sod. Huge slabs of Nebraska earth were plowed with a special blade made for this purpose and were laid together much as brick, excepting that the rooted grass growing in the sod served as a mortaring device. In the winter, the wall facing the cold wind was insulated with hay. Cellars were as necessary for preserving life as for preserving food, and were retreated to in times of severe blizzards and windstorms. In summertime, the sod houses literally came alive, blooming into a profusion of wild prairie flowers and grasses, providing a beautiful interlude amidst the stark plains.

The Lincoln Journal centennial issue captured the spirit of those times in an article called "Families and Homes." I shall ask to have this article inserted in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

Honoring our heritage is only one part of our celebration. We are going to have a birthday party, too. And, we are laying a proper foundation for the second 100 years.

The birthday party honors the Nebraska of today. The importance of the State's agricultural industry to the entire nation is apparent. The farmer produces enough to feed himself and nearly 40 others. He fed only 10 as recently as World War II, and in homestead days, 75 years ago, only four.

The cattle industry ranks third in the Nation. Nebraska ranks sixth in hogs. As for crops, Nebraska is fourth in corn, seventh in wheat, and third in sorghum grain. It is sixth in total cash receipts from farm production.

We are proud of our agriculture, but realize the importance of diversification. The State is attracting more industry, research, and education. Just as forces and events combined to bring in the pioneers during the last century, the unlimited future of a progressive State acts as a magnet to the ambitious and persevering pioneers of today.

The Nebraska Centennial Commission, working with local and county centennial committees, has arranged an interesting schedule of events.

More events are being planned on the State level and there are literally hundreds of other events being staged by counties, cities, and towns. There will be plenty to do and see. On behalf of the State of Nebraska, I extend a hearty invitation to all America to come visit us in this centennial year.

I ask unanimous consent that an article capturing the spirit of those times, which begins with the sentence "The family was the prairie work unit," which was published in the Lincoln Sunday Journal and Star of February 26, 1967, and a calendar of events starting with today and extending for 1 year, be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article and calendar of events were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Lincoln Sunday Journal and Star, Feb. 26, 1967]

The Family was the prairie work unit. Both sexes and all ages were involved in all problems of frontier existence: stripping and cutting the virgin prairie turf into bricks for the sod house; covering its wooden roof with dirt; digging the well; erecting the wooden windmill to pump its water; stringing the barb wire substitutes for rock and timber fencing to enclose the livestock; collecting cow or buffalo chips or cobs necessary as stove fuel for warmth and cooking; digging the storm cellar storage for potatoes and home canning, as well as protection against tornadoes and prairie fires, slaughtering and rendering; plowing, planting, shocking and harvesting; and education of the children.

The unity in leisure was similar. The family collectively enjoyed the soft green loveliness of the land in spring, planning from catalogs the first purchases with the first free dollar, gloring in the sunsets, the stimulation of fall mornings, the family table conversation, the respect of joint prayer, the excitement of visiting town or a neighbor.

Both toil and achievement were shared. Their being more toil than achievement, large families of children were an economic asset as well as a guarantee of the triumph that some children would be raised to adulthood despite disease, malnutrition, and frontier accidents remote from medical attention.

The discipline and dominating leadership was maintained by the father. The mother required all the biblical virtues to endure the range of frontier problems, work loads, privations and multiple childbirths, and the many tombstones of several wives predeceasing a husband bear testimony to their shorter life expectancy.

The goal of the family was self-betterment. They made do with what they had. Frequently all clothing was from a similar bolt of cloth. The entire family would be pictured with all of their possessions stacked before their soddy to show how far they had advanced on the scale of worldly achievement. As surplus money was accumulated, the damp, dark, poorly ventilated sod house was abandoned and the lumber was purchased first for a wooden frame house, the farmstead buildings, and finally a decorative fence.

The sod house frontier was most prominent in Nebraska west of Grand Island between the 1870s and 1900s, with Custer County its prairie capital.

Schedule of Events: Nebraska Centennial

March 1: Official centennial kick-off in Lincoln from the Legislative Chambers at the State Capitol Ceremonies, tentatively scheduled to begin at 9:30 A.M. will include greetings from The President, restaging of historic legislative sessions by some of our present State Senators, Governor's remarks, unveiling of Nebraska's commemorative stamp, and hopefully, the Postmaster General in attendance, the cutting of a birthday cake, and, at Noon, a 37 gun (37th state) salute outside the State Capitol by the military.

Official opening day of "The Lindell Palace" in Lincoln. An atmosphere of the "Gay 90's"—family style food—singing waiters—fun for the whole family.

All Nebraskans are urged to join in at Noon by ringing bells throughout the state to declare that "Birthday Party Time" is here. Other events in Lincoln, in cooperation with the Lancaster County Centennial Committee will commence at 3:00 P.M. and continue until 1:00 A.M. The morning events will be televised to schools by the ETV Network and all schools are being urged to have assemblies to view the ceremonies.

March 4: Miss Nebraska Centennial's kick-off Ball at Peony Park in Omaha with The Smothers Brothers as special guests. A gay time for everyone with prizes for best dress and beards, two bands, and special guests including Governor and Mrs. Tiemann. Inquiries for tickets can be made to the Centennial office.

March 5: Religious Sunday Centennial spectacular broadcast from the Fine Arts Theater of Nebraska Wesleyan in Lincoln (Tickets $1.00) by KOLN–KGIN/TV, Channels 10 and 11. It is hoped at press time that other Nebraska TV stations will also tie in with this. Nebraska-born Henry Fonda will return for this program, along with Joe Feeney of the Lawrence Welk Show. The Centennial Religious Committee has a fine program lined up for the broadcast time of 7:00 P.M.

March 17: Centennial St. Patrick's Day for all Nebraska Irish. Native born Frank Leahy, former Notre Dame Coach, will be honored at this event in O'Neill. The festivities run Mar. 17 and 18. O'Neill is planning many things, Irish stews, painted streets—this promises to be an event second to none, and hopefully, an annual event.

March 21–22: Triumph of Agriculture Centennial Exposition in Omaha promises to be one of the best ever, signifying Nebraska's important and vital contribution to the nation in the field of Agriculture.

April 1: Johnny Carson Day in Nebraska with a really big show at Pershing Auditorium in Lincoln. An event you won't want to miss. Johnny is returning for this event—Governor Tiemann has declared it "Johnny Carson Day" throughout the state.

April 23: Arbor Day ceremonies in Lincoln and then to Nebraska City. Dedication of a Centennial Avenue with a tree for each county. Plantings on all state capitol lawns on this day, planting on National Capitol lawn, featured speaker Mrs. Susette Morton Zurcher, great granddaughter of J. Sterling Morton.

April 29 to May 5: Nebraska Centennial Health Fair at Pershing Auditorium in Lincoln. The first of its kind in the mid-west. School children should plan trips to Lincoln to participate.

May: Emphasis on High School and College events—reunions—your Centennial Commission has furnished all schools with "The Birth of a State" pageant booklet. Your Centennial College Alumni Committee has been sending out slides and special flyers to all Alums around the nation.

May: Premiere of Centennial Agricultural Committee movie. (Date and site to be determined).

May 26: Re-opening of World War II Canteen in North Platte. A special week long program. Write North Platte Chamber of Commerce for details.

May 30: Memorial Day Youth Day at Fort McPherson. Nationally-known speaker, patriotic observance, youth barbecue—a full day of events.

June 14: Re-Dedication of the State Capitol in Lincoln. The Centennial Military Affairs Committee also plans a flag spectacular.

June 18–25: Nebraskaland Days in Lincoln. Bigger and better than ever before.

June 24–25: National Centennial Q.S.L. Hamfest (Ham operators from around the nation) at North Platte. Establishment of a Q.S.L. Hall of Fame. All resulting from the Centennial's Q.S.L. cards and certificates.

July and August: County Centennial Fairs—many pageants being planned this year with the County Fair—Pioneer Recognition programs, Notable Nebraskans programs, old time horseshoe contests, antique displays, etc.

July 12–14: National Grassland Management Field Days at Mead. Will bring over 50,000 people to Mead. Centennial theme and entertainment.

July 29: First Day Issue of Nebraska Centennial Commemorative Stamp in Lincoln.

July 29–30: Ash Hollow Pageant. An outdoor production being planned, staged, produced, directed, by the four counties of Keith, Deuel, Garden, and Arthur. Being supported partially by your Commission as an official event. A fine example of Nebraskans working together—a really great program.

Aug. 12 to 19: Re-Run of the Pony Express from St. Jo to Fort Laramie and Fort Laramie to St. Jo simultaneously. They'll crisscross at Gothenburg on the 16th for a big day of activity.

Sidney to Deadwood endurance trail ride with week long events in Sidney and a parade that promises to be the biggest ever staged in western Nebraska.

Aug. 13 to 25: National Centennial Agricultural Youth Institute. One week in Lincoln, the other week at Halsey. One youth from each state in the nation to be hosted by a Nebraska youth. Nationally-known leaders from business and agriculture. Another hoped-for annual event to establish Nebraska as the Agricultural Center of the nation and world.

Sept. 2: Centennial Parade of the Century in Lincoln. Following the theme of the Centennial. 1. Honoring our Heritage. 2. The Birthday Party. 3. The Second 100 years. Top-notch floats only with selected horse units, military units. One entry from each County will be allowed—also entries in classifications of State Organizations and Associations, Business and Industry, Military and State Veterans Organizations, and, State, Religious, Fraternal, and Civic Organizations. Nebraska's "Rose Bowl Type" Parade, meaning the biggest and best (and longest) ever staged. Details will be mailed out by April 1 on specifications for floats.

Sept. 2 to 9: Nebraska Centennial State Fair promises to be the Fair of the Century. Henry Brandt, State Fair Manager, promises the best entertainment ever, many contests like beards, costume dress, horseshoes—many displays of old versus new and of the future. Your Centennial Commission is working closely with the State Fair.

October: Premiere of Centennial Commissioned Symphony (dedicated to Nebraska's Centennial) of Dr. Howard Hanson by the Omaha Symphony. The Centennial Commission is also subsidizing performances of the Omaha Symphony throughout the state during the Centennial Year. They will perform Nebraska composed music. If your community is interested in their appearance, write to the Omaha Symphony.

October: Strong emphasis on college homecomings and reunions.

October: Conclusion of Nebraska Centennial Exhibits Caravan prepared by the Nebraska State Historical Society. These three 35 foot exhibit trailers will tour the state from about April 10 through October. You can request them by writing your Centennial Commission office.

Nov. 10 to 11: Nebraska Centennial Youth Days in Lincoln. Winners from each High School Essay Contest (now being conducted) on Opportunities for Youth in Nebraska will come to Lincoln courtesy of the local American Legion Posts and the County Committees. Top leaders of Business and Industry, 1,000 of the top youth of Nebraska—a big event in a salute to our youth.

Nov. 23: Official closing ceremonies of the Nebraska Centennial.

Nov. 25: Closing social event of the Nebraska Centennial.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I rise today to exercise a rare privilege. I rise to speak on the occasion of the 100th birthday of the State of Nebraska. I rise to pay tribute and homage to the great men and women through the years who have made it possible for me to be here, including those valiant men of the Senate and House of Representatives who 100 years ago gave their consent for Nebraska to become a part of these great United States.

To the citizens of Nebraska, Mr. President, I have said this is a time to pause both to reflect and to project—to look back and also to look forward.

Today I want to look briefly first at the present, and particularly at my immediate surroundings.

I see around me, Mr. President, a far different picture than the Senate of a century ago. In the first place, there is not a beard among us. Then, over to my left and down in front I see the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana, the beloved Senator MANSFIELD. I cannot shy from pointing out to him the wisdom he must ascribe to the Members of the Congress 100 years ago, even though the vast majority of them were of the opposite political party from him. Had the Senate and House of that day admitted the full Territory of Nebraska, instead of an abbreviated version of it as the 37th State of the Union, there would have been no Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Had that taken place, I think Nebraska might well have become the biggest State of the Union, because there seems to have been the Texas influence even in those days.

Mr. CURTIS. May I say that the course followed was a good one; otherwise we would not have had Montana.

And, knowing the infallible and indispensable nature of the Senator from Montana, Mr. President, I can only presume that the majority party today would be without a leader. I am sure the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois, can fully appreciate the heavenly bliss that would accrue to him politically under such a circumstance.

Next, I see a number of others who very well might not be here today except for the wisdom of their predecessors in this body a century ago. There is the other distinguished Senator from Montana, plus the distinguished Senators from Wyoming, North Dakota, and South Dakota. All of those States were, Mr. President, a part of the original Nebraska Territory.

Oh, I will make one exception to the banishment of all those capable gentlemen of the Great Plains. He is the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE]. Like his immediate predecessor, the late Senator Frank Barrett, he is a native Nebraskan. He migrated westward to the University of Wyoming to teach history, and his charges, perhaps in despondency over the grades he passed out banished him to Washington via the elective process. But we in Nebraska are proud of him, as we were of his forerunner, and by recent history, at least, we have come to regard his as Nebraska's third seat in the Senate.

On the front of the National Archives Building is the inscription "What is past is prologue. Study the past." The proposal to admit Nebraska 100 years ago provoked a controversy that settled for all time the course this Nation would pursue in reconstructing the Union after the Civil War.

It was not easy for Senator Benjamin F. Wade, of Ohio, chairman of the Committee on Territories, to bring the Nebraska bill before the Senate for consideration. He was rebuffed by Senators Luke Poland, of Vermont, and Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, who argued it was more important to take up a bill to establish a uniform bankruptcy system for the Nation.

The good Senator from Ohio persisted, saying:

> This is a territory which has always been loyal, always patriotic, which sent into the field to fight the battles against rebellion more troops in proportion to her inhabitants than perhaps any other State or Territory in the Union.

And right prevailed, Mr. President.

When it was allowed to proceed, the debate on the bill spread to a variety of issues not altogether foreign to the issues today.

There was a question of population—apportionment, if you please. Estimates of Nebraska's population ranged all the way from 30,000 to 100,000. Objectors to the bill said it was not fair to the eastern seaboard States to admit a new State and give it two Senators and a Representative when the population did not even justify one Representative.

The two distinguished Senators sitting here today from New Mexico would have smiled and then scoffed at the reference made to their State in that debate. It was said that the Territory of New Mexico, by the 1860 census, had more people than the Territory of Nebraska, and that, therefore, New Mexico should be admitted to statehood first. But a report from General Sherman did not promise much future for New Mexico. An excerpt as follows was read to the Senate:

> The whole Territory seems a pastoral land, but not fit for cultivation. The mines undeveloped are mostly in a state of nature. We have held this Territory since 1846, 20 years, at a cost to the National Treasury of full $100 million, and I doubt if it will ever reimburse to the country a tithe of that sum.

Obviously, General Sherman had never heard of the income tax or the cattle industry.

One of the Senators from Maryland, Reverdy Johnson, suggested no more Western States should be admitted because they were growing too rapidly to a position of power likely to prove harmful to the Atlantic States. He was rebuked by a Senator from Wisconsin, Timothy O. Howe, for attempting to inaugurate a sectional fight.

But the overriding controversy—the big issue of the debate and of the times, Mr. President—was one that grew out of the principles that were tested and the blood that was shed a few years earlier in the great Civil War. It was a cause we are still fighting to achieve today. It was the cause of equal voting rights for all citizens.

I am proud to point out, Mr. President, that Nebraska was the first State, both in its own constitution and by Federal charter, to guarantee persons of all races the right to vote and to have their votes counted. I am proud to point out that the issue was decided right here on this floor in heated debate 100 years ago on the occasion of admitting Nebraska to the Union.

And I am proud to point out that in this cause the Republican Party became firmly established as one of the two great parties of this Nation, and is itself today a firm 100 years old.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. **CURTIS.** I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator may continue for 3 minutes.

Mr. **CURTIS.** The setting for the debate in the Senate in the weeks and months leading up to March 1, 1867, was a dark and dreary one with many uncertainties. The country had been torn asunder by the Civil War. Only 26 of the 36 States were represented in the Congress. The brutal death-by-assassination of a great President who had fought so valiantly to hold the Union together was still fresh in the minds of the people and the Congress. The Territory of Nebraska, by a bare majority of 100 out of 7,776 votes cast, had adopted a constitution and submitted it to the Congress for admission, and the constitution, although broad and forward-looking in all other respects, granted the right to vote in elections only to white male adults.

There were those who argued that Congress could not insert a provision in a State constitution and make it binding, and those who charged that to do so not only would do violence to the sovereignty of the States but also would discriminate against a new State compared with those already in the Union.

Senator Wade of Ohio, the Committee on Territories chairman, pleaded with the Senate not to tamper with the constitution which had been adopted by the people of Nebraska. Adversaries presented figures charging that 108 votes against the constitution had been invalidated illegally by election officials while 40 votes cast illegally in favor of the constitution by Iowa soldiers stationed at old Fort Kearny in Nebraska Territory had been counted, and they contended the document did not in fact have the blessing of even a majority of the citizens who voted.

On and on the debate raged, and gradually the sentiment began to weigh in favor of inserting an equal-rights provision by Federal requirement.

Senator Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, who initially had opposed even considering the bill, declared:

> It seems as if Providence presented this occasion in order to give you an easy opportunity of asserting a principle which is of infinite value to the whole country. Only a few persons are directly interested; but the decision of Congress now will determine a governing rule for millions.

Senator Sumner continued:

> Nebraska is a loyal community, small in numbers, formed out of ourselves, bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. In an evil hour it adopted a constitution which is bad in itself and worse still as an example. But neither the tie of blood nor the fellowship of party should be permitted to save it from judgment. At this moment Congress cannot afford to sanction this wrong. Congress must elevate itself if it would elevate the country. It must be itself the example of justice, if it would make justice the universal rule. It must be itself the model which it recommends to others. It must begin "reconstruction" here at home.

So, Mr. President, the Senate did. After voting three times and each time failing to approve identical or similar amendments, the Senate adopted by the narrow margin of 20 to 18 an amendment which read:

> And be it further enacted, that this act shall take effect with the fundamental and perpetual condition that within said State of Nebraska there shall be no abridgement or denial of the exercise of the elective franchise or of any other right to any person by reason of race or color, excepting Indians not taxed.

The House lengthened the amendment to provide for its acceptance by a vote of the territorial legislature, so that the Constitution would not have to be submitted to a popular vote in Nebraska again, and the Senate concurred.

Mr. President, that bill passed the Senate on January 9, 1867. That was more than a month before Congress considered the 15th amendment, which provided that the right to vote could not be denied because of race or color. It is significant that it was Nebraska, on February 17, 1870, which ratified the 15th amendment, whereupon Secretary of State Fish certified that the 15th amendment was part of our Constitution.

The fight still was not won. President Johnson vetoed the bill—President Andrew Johnson, that is. He contended the action of Congress was unconstitutional because it imposed "conditions which, if accepted by the legislature, may, without the consent of the people, so change the organic law as to make electors of all persons within the State, without distinction of race or color."

But Congress had made up its mind. By the lopsided vote of 31 to 9, the Senate pased the bill over the President's veto. The House also overrode the veto. Nebraska was a State.

One hundred years later, Mr. President, a stewardship report seems in order. First in importance, the territory approximately 430 miles long and 210 miles wide entrusted to us has been converted from the uninhabitable desert described by the first explorers into a highly productive agricultural region.

In an average year we have in excess of 6 million cattle, 600,000 sheep, 2,600,000 hogs, and 7 million chickens on our farms and ranches. We produce annually a crop of 2 million calves, more than 4 million pigs, 1¼ billion eggs, 1¾ billion pounds of milk, 210 million pounds of potatoes, and 900,000 tons of sugarbeets. Our farms yield in an average year upward of 275 million bushels of corn, 56 million bushels of wheat, 29 million bushels of oats, 17 million bushels of soybeans, 1,750,000 bushels of rye, 127 million bushels of grain sorghums, 2 million tons of sorghums for silage and forage, 7 million tons of hay, and 55 million pounds of popcorn. We are striving always to do our part to feed the Nation.

Our people have pioneered in soil and water conservation. We are pushing a Federal-State-local effort to eliminate pollution in our 11,000 miles of streams and 2,300 lakes and reservoirs. We have built lakes ranging in size from farm ponds to a reservoir which occupies 35,000 surface acres on the Platte River near Ogallala. We have discovered a vast underground water supply, estimated at one and a half billion acre feet, or enough to cover the entire State with 30 feet of water if it were pumped to the surface at one time.

Our people have developed gravity or ditch irrigation for more than 750,000 acres and pump irrigation from wells tapping the vast underground water supply to bolster crops on an additional 2 million acres. Our water supply and especially our underground reserve is today such a valuable resource that some Nebraskans regard it as the fabulous "Kingdom of Quivira" which Francisco Coronado's Spanish soldiers sought but did not find when they explored the central plains in 1541. We have the largest man-made national forest, covering 30,000 acres near Halsey. We prospered from the Homestead Act, and we have established a national park at the site where Daniel Freeman claimed the very first homestead in America on 160 acres near Beatrice, Nebr.

We have built an integrated transportation system including more than 100,000 miles of highways and streets, enough to reach four times around the earth. A four-lane superhighway has replaced the Oregon and Morman Trails which the early wagon trains traveled. We also are served by ten major railroads which come into Omaha, the fourth largest rail center in the United States, and five railroads which operate throughout the State. Five commercial air carriers operate to and in the State. We have built the world's largest livestock market at Omaha.

The Federal grant of 3,500,000 acres of school lands has been reduced to about 1,600,000 acres. However, a permanent trust fund of $31 million has been retained from the lands that were sold. The rental income from the lands and interest from investment of the trust fund provides additional revenue for the common schools, as originally intended by Congress. The State legislature recently decided to sell the remaining lands and put all of the receipts in the permanent trust for investment at a higher return for the support of the schools.

We have built 20 universities and senior colleges for higher education. In addition, we have a growing system of junior colleges and vocational technical schools. We have the only one-house legislature in the United States, and the State capitol in which it is located is one of the architectural wonders of the world. We supplied 47,801 men for military service in World War I and 128,000 men and women in World War II. We also did our part in Korea and are doing it in Vietnam.

Moving into our second century, we still have many problems in Nebraska. We would be remiss as a State if we did not acknowledge that this Nation of which we are a part also has great problems, such as the war in Vietnam, crime in our cities, huge Federal spending and debt, economic strife among certain segments of our population and in certain sections of the country, Federal interference in the affairs of the States, the need for improving our sprawling transportation system and the never-ending challenge to provide better education and better health for our citizens.

To the Senate and the Nation today I want to say that our sentiments in Nebraska are the same as those voiced by Senator William Sprague, of Rhode Island, 100 years ago during the great debate on the admission of Nebraska. Senator Sprague told his colleagues in this Chamber:

> I have no fear for the future, because that future has for its leading object the virtue, the independence, and the progress of the mass of the people. A branch of the government that holds on to that which is gained for these objects, and does not lose hold of them in a too eager reach after greater progress before the people are educated to enjoy it, will not be inconsiderately treated in the future.

As I told the people of Nebraska in an open letter published recently:

> We have great problems facing us, but they are no greater than the trials and tribulations that our forefathers faced in battling their way westward—in fending off unfriendly tribes of Indians, in cultivating virgin soil, in battling wind, hail, drouth and snow to carve a livelihood out of the newfound soil.
>
> The promises of the future are unlimited, but not without the drive and the zeal on the part of all of us to achieve new heights. We must cultivate and display the same drive, the same zeal that the pioneers demonstrated paving the way for us if we are to do for tomorrow what we owe our children and their children in building a better Nebraska (and, I would add, a better nation).
>
> I am sure that all of us are equal to the task.

With God's help, and it is my prayer that we shall always seek it, I am certain we shall succeed.

Mr. President, on my right is a flag of the United States with 37 stars—the number of States in the Union on Nebraska's admission. It was crocheted by a disabled veteran of North Platte, Nebr., Mr. Howard Saunders and presented to me. I prize it most highly.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA and Mr. CURTIS] have pointed out this morning, this is a very notable occasion—the 100th birthday of the great State of Nebraska. Nebraska is the good neighbor of my home State of South Dakota. I offer my neighborly congratulations to the people of Nebraska, where prosperity and progress have gone hand in hand for a full century of statehood and development.

As the 37th State of the Union, Nebraska is a State much like my home State of South Dakota. It is a rich farm and ranch State, but it contains some great urban areas, filled with thriving industries. In this regard it has an asset which South Dakota is working earnestly to acquire. In this regard Nebraska clearly outranks our State.

The people of Nebraska are energetic and thrifty. They constantly seek the improvement of the resources of their State. With the other States of the great Missouri Valley, they work to harness the power of the river in order to bring better living to their people, and they are a partner in the great plans for Missouri River development.

Nebraska has been assigned some of the best reclamation projects. Constant efforts were made to preserve the precious soil and water of the State.

It has been my experience since I first began to serve in Congress than the Representatives and Senators from Nebraska have driven forward relentlessly to obtain additional projects for this purpose.

I wish also to say a word about the quality of the representation which Nebraska has had in Congress. If I speak with special affection of CARL CURTIS, it is because he and I have served together—both in the House and Senate—for more than 28 years—the longest continuous records of service of any Republican Members of the 90th Congress. We came to Congress together. But I can speak just as laudably about many others whose names and deeds are now recorded in the history books of our Nation. The senior Senator from Nebraska, ROMAN HRUSKA, with long and valuable service in both the House and the Senate, is another typical example of Nebraska's significant contributions to our National Congress.

Nebraska has given of its people and its wealth in the service of the United States. It continuously provides much of the natural wealth of our Nation. It is an expanding and a vital State.

I speak with every assurance when I say that this first 100 years marks only an initial step. Nebraska is destined for greater achievement. We in South Dakota applaud this destiny, for we feel that our own future is bound up with that of our lusty, growing neighbor to the south. We cheer her for her people. We join with her in the dream of a splendid future. And, of course, we congratulate her on her good fortune in having the proud State of South Dakota as her northern neighbor.

SENATE RATIFICATION TODAY OF 10 TREATIES EMPHASIZES NEED FOR HUMAN RIGHTS RATIFICATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in just a few minutes the Senate will vote on 10 treaties. These 10 treaties are:

First. Exploration of the Sea Convention.

Second. Notes amending the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries.

Third. International Convention for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas.

Fourth. Convention of Mar del Plata on Facilitation of International Waterborne Transportation.

Fifth. Convention on Facilitation of International Maritime Traffic.

Sixth. Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Professional Equipment.

Seventh. Customs Convention on the ATA Carnet for the Temporary Admission of Goods.

Eighth. Customs Convention Regarding ECS Carnets for Commercial Samples.

Ninth. Customs Convention on Containers.

Tenth. Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods Under Cover of TIR Carnets.

Perhaps prophesying the results of a record vote by the Senate is a presumptuous exercise, but I am going to predict that the Senate will ratify all 10 of these treaties with virtual unanimity.

I congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] for his flawless floor managership. But with all due deference to Senator Lausche and his able colleagues on the committee, I am certain they would agree that the relatively noncontroversial subject matter of the documents contributed significantly to their ratification.

It could be argued that today's 10 treaties fall under the general classification of "marine life and merchandise." As Senator from Wisconsin, I am keenly aware of the importance of both. I will be happy to support ratification.

Nevertheless, the very ratification of these treaties establishes very clearly the interdependence of nations. These treaties prove that international covenants are not only helpful, but oftentimes imperative, for the preservation of international commercial harmony. The United States is willing and even eager to enter treaties for the settling of international disputes.

Mr. President, I have been rising on the floor of the Senate every day now since this session of the Senate convened, pleading for action on the human rights treaties which have been pending for 4 years, in the case of three of the treaties, and 18 years in the case of the genocide treaty.

I hope that very soon the Senate will have the chance to ratify the Human Rights Conventions. Perhaps their ratification will not have the salutary effect on the American dollar that today's 10 treaties will have, but the Human Rights Conventions deal in a far more precious and perishable currency than dollars—the dignity of man.

ECONOMISTS DISAGREE ON RECESSION, AGREE NO TAX INCREASE NEEDED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this morning's New York Times carries an exceedingly interesting account of the ongoing debate among the Nation's top economists over whether the long period of the great American boom and economic growth has turned the corner and is now headed for a recession.

Economists disagree, as the New York Times reports. This disagreement was evident in the 3 weeks of hearings before our Joint Economic Committee.

But whereas economists disagree on whether or not we may be heading for a recession, the New York Times reports:

> Most forecasters are sufficiently disturbed by what has been happening to business activity to question the need for tax increases called for by the Johnson Administration.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the article to which I have referred, entitled "Recession Debate," written by M. J. Rossant and published in the New York Times of March 1, 1967.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Recession Debate—Forecasters Cannot Agree on Whether the Present Slowdown Will Continue

(By M. J. Rossant)

Is it or isn't it? Business forecasters pondering whether the economy is in a recession have been unable to reach a consensus. Forecasters should know by now what kind of pattern will prevail for the rest of 1967. After all, the results of the first two months are already in and it should not be overly difficult to figure out what happens next.

But forecasters appear to be in agreement only in observing that the economy is experiencing a definite slowdown in business activity. They are at odds over whether this current pause will be followed by a fresh upsurge or a further decline.

This dispute over the outlook is renewed proof that business forecasting remains an imprecise art rather than a precise science. It also emphasizes the special difficulty in determining economic turning points—those critical periods when activity undergoes decisive change.

TAX RISE QUESTIONED

But whether or not the economy is at a turning point now, most forecasters are sufficiently disturbed by what has been happening to business activity to question the need for tax increases called for by the Johnson Administration. Even those who believe the slowdown will soon come to an end do not think that the ensuing rise will be vigorous enough to warrant curbing demand through an increased tax on individual and corporate incomes.

In taking this position, forecasters are not only suggesting that it is a mistake to formulate economic policy too far in advance of actual developments. They also are saying that the whole idea of managing the economy through the "fine tuning" of monetary and fiscal instruments is unlikely to work during the most critical periods if forecasters cannot decide with assurance whether a turning point is at hand.

Some economists have no doubt that the present loss of momentum is for real. But most want more evidence before deciding that the expansion has come to an end.

Caution is understandable. The expansion has suffered temporary pauses in the past only to move forward again at an accelerated clip. Forecasters say that the present slowdown was caused in part by bad weather and suggest that once spring comes, consumers will begin spending freely once again.

But the evidence that is available tends to support the turning-point camp. There is weakness in consumer demand, in new orders, in nonresidential construction, in the pile-up of unsold goods.

According to the National Industrial Conference Board, the economy is particularly plagued by "top-heavy inventory positions and decreasing orders." So it looks for a "further leveling-off or decline in business in the months ahead."

Yet there are some bright spots. Housing is showing signs of recovery from its long slump. And the most recent surveys of corporate plans for investment in new productive facilities disclose that intended outlays are higher now than they were just a few months ago.

Howard Sharp, economist for The Bond Buyer, is one forecaster who thinks a turning point has been reached. He argues that the recovery in housing is likely to be limited and that there are some indications that investment spending will turn down. In any case, he predicts "a higher unemployment rate, lower levels of industrial production, employment and retail sales."

Because crosscurrents are at work right now it may take some time to determine conclusively if a turning point is at hand. But forecasters who do wait for positive proof aren't really forecasting. They are simply confirming what has already taken place.

The inability to forecast with pinpoint accuracy also makes things difficult for the Administration. It is asking for trouble by anticipating economic trends too far in advance. But it can be in just as much trouble by waiting too long. If a decline is in fact in the cards a policy to counter it won't work very well if it goes into effect only after a downturn is clearly recognizable.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE EMERGENCE OF NEW LEADERS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, we hear a great deal today about the goals and morals of the younger generation. We are told that Americans have grown soft. Yet the record reflects a different image.

Across the Nation and throughout the world we are shaping new leaders. They are emerging from the ranks of such organizations as the Peace Corps and VISTA and from the armed services.

My esteemed senior colleague from Missouri [Mr. Symington] recently confirmed his confidence in youth before the Khoury League annual dinner in St. Louis. I believe his remarks are indicative of the optimism many of us feel about the future. I ask unanimous consent that Senator Symington's fine speech be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Our Youth Today—Leaders of Tomorrow

(Address by Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat, of Missouri, annual Khoury League dinner, St. Louis, Mo., February 12, 1967)

Some people in this country are consistently criticizing our young people as both soft and irresponsible. I cannot accept that blanket indictment.

After three trips to the Vietnam theater in the past 14 months, during which I talked to hundreds of our servicemen, and after talking with many volunteers in such programs as the Peace Corps, I am convinced that most of our young citizens are dedicated to making a living reality of our American way of life. It is organizations like the Khoury League that help to build the strong and intelligent younger generation which has my full confidence.

Let any who believe our young people don't care, or have grown soft, examine the record they are setting in the Far East and all around the world.

Not only are they proving their courage and stamina, but also their humanity. More than ever before in history, American servicemen give much to their time to working for the people of the villages.

In their spare time, men of the 173rd Airborne Brigade built 30 classrooms, 11 bridges, drilled 17 wells and personally contributed $5,000 as their individual support of the program. They have outfitted a repair shop for bicycle maintenance, and once a week collect damaged bicycles in the villages, and they repair them free of charge.

These are but two examples of the thousands new being carried out by our young men.

Around the world, volunteers in the Peace Corps also help to dispel any illusion about a "soft generation." The 24,000 men, and women, who have served in the Peace Corps illustrate well the deep commitment and sense of purpose young Americans have in their desire to help the less fortunate, abroad as well as here at home.

Kae and Donald Dakin, both in their early twenties, were given the job of launching 85,000 landless Africans on farm land in Kenya. In this formidable project, they have helped form ten farm cooperatives and have organized a dairy farmers' market.

Ben and Jeanette Killingsworth live in the most primitive section of Borneo, in a mud hut without telephone, electricity or any of the modern comforts. They travel by dugout canoe to establish conservation projects and 4–H clubs. The pay isn't great—$3.30 a month—but the challenges are many, and the Killingsworths are proud of the opportunity their own country has given them.

Two years ago a group of girls spent the summer break from their Peace Corps project in West Africa. They walked across the Sahara Desert, then wrote an article on the experience for Life Magazine. Twenty students are attending the university under the sponsorship of scholarships founded as the result of the earnings from this article.

The Peace Corps sends our young people abroad. But right here at home we also have a comparable domestic version of service. VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America) has also produced many fine examples of the idealism and dedication of our youth.

Judy Lewis works in the slums of a great city. She hasn't been responsible for many visible changes since she moved into the area as a VISTA volunteer. But she now knows almost all of the 320 families on her block, and has done a very great deal to open her area to new programs. Since Judy came with her teammates, the women of the area are no longer afraid to go out alone at night, children show more curiosity about the world outside of their block, drug addicts, saddest of all the young, come to her for guidance.

Karen Mark and Charles Weber found that their area had no playground facilities, so they have persuaded landlords to donate money for renting vacant lots; and have begun a program for bringing the youth of the area out of their shells. Karen and Mark receive only $235 a month for living expenses, but they believe that pride of accomplishment makes up the difference.

The building of a strong and responsible young generation is not an easy task. It is one which takes a great deal of effort and patience.

But speaking as the grandfather of three Khoury Leaguers, I know that organizations like this league make the job immeasurably easier.

The 750,000 boys that play Khoury League baseball are being taught the best things of life—good sportsmanship, the need for physical as well as mental fitness—skills necessary for the building of good young citizens today, leaders tomorrow.

Here's a Khoury League story you may not have heard. Recently a 75-year-old retired school teacher from the Middle West finished two years in the Peace Corps in Ethiopia. Before going she had heard of the work of the Khoury League.

Soon after her arrival, she attempted to start a baseball league; and when she had difficulty finding people to help, tackled the problem herself.

Serving as coach, umpire, sometimes even as pitcher, this 75-year-old lady organized eight teams of Ethiopian schoolboys; and after a shaky start, her efforts have resulted in an enthusiastic baseball program in the Ethiopian communities she served.

Because of those grandsons, I know personally of the benefits resulting from this superb program in 13 states and five foreign countries.

None of us here tonight, however, can foretell the resulting impact of this noble idea in the years to come—in Ethiopia, in Vietnam, in our own neighborhoods; in business, in industry, and in government. The lessons learned in the Khoury Leagues, wherever our boys play, can only be interpreted in a better America, a more understanding leadership, and therefore a better world.

HERBERT A. TRASK

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it is with deep regret that I have learned of the death of Herbert Trask, political correspondent of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. Trask was one of those able and experienced newspapermen in whom all politicians, Republican as well as Democratic, had complete confidence.

Hard working and reliable, Herb knew in detail at least as much of the politics of his State as any reporter.

In addition, he was an understanding and attractive person, and those of us who were privileged to have him for a friend will sorely miss him.

I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the Post-Dispatch of February 28 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERBERT A. TRASK

Herbert A. Trask, 55 years old, died at St. Luke's Hospital yesterday after suffering a heart attack at his home, 1720 Kenmont Drive, Ladue. He collapsed as he was preparing to leave for Jefferson City to cover the Legislature.

Trask, State Political Correspondent of the Post-Dispatch, joined the news staff in 1934 after attending the University of Missouri School of Journalism. He had been State Political Correspondent since 1951.

An expert on legislation and politics, Mr. Trask was consulted frequently by State officials and Legislators, particularly members of the Missouri State Senate, which he normally covered. He was sometimes called the "35th Senator."

Governor Warren E. Hearnes said that Mr. Trask's death was a "personal loss to me as well as a severe loss to the profession he served in such an outstanding and devoted manner."

After several years as a general assignment reporter, he was assigned to cover the 1937 session of the Missouri Legislature. He was present at every session thereafter, including the wartime 1945 session.

Mr. Trask had covered every national political campaign for the newspaper since 1948 and activities of Missouri delegations at the national conventions of both major parties since 1952.

The Missouri Senate adjourned for the day and the chair normally used by Mr. Trask was draped in black. Senator John W. Joynt of St. Louis, President Pro Tem, appointed the Senate as a committee of the whole to attend the funeral.

Both the Senate and House today passed Resolutions of tribute to Mr. Trask. The Senate Resolution said members "were always aware of his friendly presence and untiring efforts for good government . . . virtually every member has sought his advice and counsel."

The House Resolution described Mr. Trask as "a conscientious, trusted, dedicated and loyal member of his profession, always highly respected for his sincerity of purpose and devotion to duty."

ADDITIONAL AEC AND NASA FUNDS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the President yesterday announced his decision to request funds to permit the development of space rocket propulsion using nuclear energy. This request is affirmation of the intent of this country to advance its scientific and technological strength on a broad front.

This country's research on nuclear propulsion has resulted in a substantial fund of scientific and engineering information in physics, chemistry, metallurgy, electronics, and so forth, that would not have been available to us without such a program. At the same time, it has provided the technological understanding required to assure that we can develop such systems so as to increase our space propulsion capability to meet any future space mission requirement. The President's request assures the continued growth of this knowledge and the capabilities. This request is another indication that we intend to be a leader in space exploration so that the benefits of that activity can be applied to all mankind.

The technical success that has been achieved in the development of nuclear propulsion is outstanding. This technical success has been the result of a combined effort of the Government, industry, and universities. Since 1960, the Westinghouse Electric Co., of Pittsburgh, has been an important element of this research and development team. Westinghouse, working with the Aerojet General Co., is responsible for the development of the Nerva engine which would be initiated by the request made by the President yesterday. Westinghouse has designed, built, and successfully tested several experimental reactors over the past several years. These tests demonstrate the high efficiency of these nuclear propulsion systems. Westinghouse is continuing to provide the technology of nuclear propulsion and is proceeding into the development of the Nerva engine.

The high efficiency of this Nerva engine will provide a substantially increased capability to explore space. With that engine propelling the third stage of the Saturn V launch vehicle that is being developed for the Apollo program, the payload of that vehicle could be almost doubled for a wide variety of space missions from earth orbit maneuvers to probes to the planets. The same engine may even permit men to explore the planets.

The President's overall space program budget recommends continued use of this Saturn V vehicle for missions to be conducted in the years following the Apollo manned lunar landing mission so that the availability of the Saturn V for use in combination with this new nuclear rocket system will be assured. With these systems and missions, this country can indeed plan prudently, and with due regard to other demands upon the economy, toward extended orbital operations, extended lunar base operations and unmanned and manned planetary exploration.

ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH SUPPORTS BILL TO COMPENSATE INNOCENT VICTIMS OF CRIME

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on January 25 I introduced a victim compensation bill, S. 646, which is the subject of an interesting February 18 article and a Februry 19 editorial published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. The fact that a national newspaper so distinguished as the Post-Dispatch has joined an already growing group of well-informed commentators is quite encouraging. In this widespread support we can see that the plight of the innocent crime victim, until now the forgotten man in American jurisprudence, is no longer unheeded. Prompt action on S. 646 will demonstrate that the innocent victim is no longer either forgotten or neglected. Interest in this problem is gratifying, and I would hope for Senate consideration of this measure at this session of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article entitled "Help Victims of Crime" and the editorial entitled "Compensation for Crime Victims."

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Feb. 18, 1967]

HELP FOR VICTIMS OF CRIME—CRIMINAL DEFENDANTS ARE GIVEN LEGAL HELP AND PROTECTION BUT WHO AIDS THE VICTIM?

(By Eugene G. Bushmann, Administrative Hearing Commissioner for the State of Missouri)

On July 11, 1966, the Supreme Court of Missouri handed down several opinions dealing with criminal law matters. They were representative of the normal type of criminal law case which reaches our appellate courts.

It must be assumed that in each of the cases the state showed considerable concern for the constitutional rights of the defendants. If unable to afford counsel then the court appointed an attorney to represent the defendants or else they were counseled by a Public Defender. Large and dedicated organizations are available to aid and assist the criminal defendant. But who aids the victims of crimes?

There are many today who charge the Bar and the judiciary with having a greater concern for the well-being of the accused or the convicted criminal than for those who are victims of such crimes.

I believe the members of the Bar can help to eliminate these complaints by devising a scheme, and working for its enactment into law, which will compensate those who are innocent victims of criminal activity. Both New Zealand and Great Britain have such a law and a bill has been introduced in the United States Senate by Senator Yarborough to create a Federal Violent Crimes Compensation Commission. No state has enacted legislation on this subject, other than New York and California.

It is generally assumed that society should not be liable for losses incurred from violence, regardless of whether or not it arose from criminal activity. We all have civil remedies against those who wrongfully injure us, but is this remedy of much value against criminals? Society owes a duty to all its members to protect them from violence. It has certainly assumed total and complete responsibility for the punishment of criminals.

Individual retribution cannot be tolerated in a civilized community. Vigilante groups have been outlawed. We may not carry concealed weapons. With an increasing crime rate and shamefully financed police departments, should we not look to the state for some compensation when injuries arise as a result of crime?

The average layman cares little about whether or not an enforceable duty exists to pay for these injuries when the legal duty to protect people from criminal violence is breached. He does, however, feel a strong sympathy for the widow and children of a bank teller murdered during a robbery, for the innocent bystander who was crippled by the bullet of a fleeing felon or for the 12-year-old girl recovering from the horrors of a felonious assault. He knows that when the state is unable to prevent these criminal injuries it is best able to bear the cost of compensating those who suffer such losses.

It might be argued that the Missouri Constitution prevents the establishment of such a compensation scheme. Our Constitution prohibits the General Assembly from granting public money or property "to any private person, association or corporation." This basic prohibition, however, is qualified by several exceptions, one of which states, "excepting . . . general laws providing . . . for direct relief . . ."

It is my opinion that a scheme to compensate innocent victims of crimes meets all constitutional limitations. It would be a general law providing for direct relief. The money awarded under the scheme would be spent for public purposes.

If we insist that the definition of "innocent victim" includes those who prevent or attempt to prevent a crime and those who assist in the arrest or attempted arrest of an offender or suspected offender, then we attack another social problem. The anonymity and personality of urban living causes many people to avoid "involvement." Effective law enforcement depends on the fullest cooperation between the police and members of the community.

The differences between the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act of Great Britain, the New York statute and the law proposed in Congress are not of major significance. The British Act applies only to injuries which occurred within the territorial limits of Great Britain while the federal law is to apply to injuries received in Washington, D.C., and jurisdictions wherein the Federal Government exercises general police power. The New York statute applies to "crimes" committed within that state.

The principal distinction between the three schemes is their definition of compensable injury. The proposed federal law applies to personal injury or death resulting from specifically listed offenses. The New York statute seeks to compensate those who suffer "personal physical injury as a direct result of a crime." In Great Britain the applicant must have suffered physical injury which is "directly attributable" to a crime or an attempt to prevent a crime.

There are several provisions in the three schemes which should be considered when drafting a compensation plan for Missouri. The governmental unit which is created to administer the law will need the authority to determine if the injury complained of resulted from, or is directly attributable to a crime, even if criminal proceedings have not been initiated.

The compensation should be limited to the personal injury or death of the victim. Property loss should not be considered. Compensation should be awarded to the surviving spouse, children or relatives who were dependent upon the deceased victim.

Several limitations on the awarding of compensation will be needed. The primary restriction should be the requirement that the victim must prove a lack of responsibility on his part for his injuries. The entire thrust of this compensation scheme is to assist innocent victims.

Such a plan will cost money. New York appropriated $500,000 to administer its law and make awards for the first year. The Missouri Legislature will want a reasonable estimate of the cost of financing such a project in this state. After many years of experience with our Workmen's Compensation Act and personal injury cases, our Bar Association should be able to reasonably determine the monetary loss suffered through injury caused by criminal activity.

The uncompensated loss and suffering by those who are innocent victims of crimes is a brutal injustice. A compensation scheme can be adopted for Missouri. The Bar should assume the responsibility of designing the program and actively working for its enactment into law.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Feb. 19, 1967]

COMPENSATION FOR CRIME VICTIMS

Should innocent victims of crimes of violence get compensation from the state?

California and New York answered that question affirmatively by enacting compensation laws, the latter in 1966, the former in 1965. Gov. Otto Kerner has asked the Illinois General Assembly to do the same. A federal law applying to the District of Columbia and other places where the Government has sole jurisdiction is being planned. And now Missouri is being urged to develop a compensation program, as an article in Saturdays Mirror of Public Opinion related.

When Arthur J. Goldberg was a Supreme Court justice he argued for compensation statutes, making the point that "the victim of a robbery or an assault has been denied the protection of the laws in a very real sense and society should assume some responsibility for making him whole."

The New York and California laws provide for compensation for medical expenses and loss of pay resulting from bodily injury suffered at the hands of criminals. They also authorize payments to survivors of a person killed in a crime if the survivors were dependent on the victim for support. Neither state compensates for loss of property.

The idea of state compensation for innocent victims of violent crimes has merit. Its application in Missouri and Illinois deserves the discussion now under way.

BANKER SUPPORTS TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I recently received a letter from Mr. J. W. Wallis, a prominent banker in Muscatine, Iowa. Mr. Wallis has had 16 years of practical experience in the consumer credit field, 7 years with a sales finance company, and 9 years with a bank.

Mr. Wallis, who is now a bank vice president, supports the truth-in-lending bill—S. 5—which I introduced on January 11. Some members of the credit industry have argued that the disclosure of an annual rate is unworkable. Mr. Wallis believes these arguments are groundless. His long experience in the consumer credit field makes him uniquely qualified to express this judgment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wallis' letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUSCATINE, IOWA,
February 21, 1967.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing in support of S. 5 "Truth in Lending". I am not using my employer's letter-head, but I am a Vice President of a bank with approximately 26 million dollars in footings, of which 4 million dollars is in consumer installment loans. I have been in banking since 1958 and prior to that, worked for Commercial Credit Corporation, a sales finance company, from college graduation in 1951 until leaving to join a bank in 1958.

I feel that because of the vast impact on so many people, it is not only right and proper but absolutely necessary for your bill to become law. It is as important as a pure food and drug law. The fact that there are improper practices in installment selling and financing is well known. I have certainly seen abuses by auto dealers, roofing and siding dealers and, for that matter, by all those selling things on "time", particularly in larger metropolitan areas, where I have worked, such as St. Louis, Springfield, Illinois, etc.

The argument that your bill, as relating to the expression of the finance charge in simple, annual interest, is too difficult to live with, is silly. Certainly, someone is able to devise a method of arriving at this in an easy manner. Could it be that some auto and other dealers (and their cooperating banks and finance companies) would just as soon people not be too well informed? I believe so, using my past experience as a basis of reference.

My bank generates consumer installment loans on a direct basis. We must advertise heavily to counteract loans arranged by auto and other dealers. We express our finance charge by a method as clearly as is now possible, but we would be killing ourselves to tell people in ads that our $5.00 per $100.00 per year on a new car (as we do state it) is actually approximately 10% simple interest per year. Our competitors in the auto selling and financing business would crucify us by saying that *their* rate is "bank rate" 6% (really about 12%).

Much luck to you and your co-sponsors of S. 5 in achieving this needed legislation.

Very sincerely,
J. W. WALLIS,
Muscatine, Iowa.

COST-EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS OF THE SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last December, at the American Economic Association Annual Convention, Dr. Stephen Enke delivered a brilliant paper on the supersonic transport. Dr. Enke is a distinguished economist with long years of experience in systems analysis and economic evaluation. He has worked for the Rand Corp., the Institute of Defense Analysis, and for the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Dr. Enke has been a leader in applying the techniques of cost-effectiveness analysis to military weapons systems.

In his paper on the supersonic transport, Dr. Enke has applied the same techniques to the proposed Federal development of a supersonic transport aircraft. In order to justify Federal or private investment, Dr. Enke argues that the overall rate of return should be at least 10 or 15 percent. Dr. Enke said:

> Under certain sets of favorable assumptions the overall rate of return *could* be 10%–15%. But under other sets of equally plausible assumptions the return is negative. Perhaps a best guess is an overall program rate of return of 0% to 5%.

Dr. Enke also goes on to criticize the argument that the development of the supersonic transport will benefit the U.S. balance of payments in the 1970's. According to Dr. Enke, such claims ignore many substitution effects. For example, offsetting adjustments would have to be made to reflect fewer subsonic exports and the loss of U.S. tourist business to foreign airlines. Presumably the supersonic transport would make the foreign lines more competitive. Dr. Enke estimates that the net balance-of-payments credit for the United States from the sale of a supersonic transport is no more than 5 to 10 percent of its U.S. export price and may even be negative as increased U.S. tourist spending abroad is considered.

Dr. Enke concludes that it would be premature to embark upon the construction of a prototype SST until we have a sounder economic justification.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Enke's paper be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT-INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT OF A COMMERCIAL SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

(By Stephen Enke[1])

The U.S. Government is expected to spend $2 billion or more to develop a commercial supersonic transport (SST) that will be safe, profitable, and available for airline use around 1974.

Among the major policy questions now being raised by the U.S. SST program are:

1. Is a U.S. SST economically justifiable?
2. Why is federal assistance necessary?
3. How much of its expenditures on the SST should the federal government recover, and through what means?
4. How can government finance an SST monopoly, and yet protect the public interest without concerning itself with aircraft prices, flight frequencies, and passenger fares?
5. Are the benefits of the SST sufficiently general to justify a federal subsidy of its development and possible manufacture?

The answers to these questions are of very broad interest because the U.S. SST may be the first of several federal government programs to develop products of advanced technology for commercial use.

SST'S ECONOMIC JUSTIFICATION

The President has declared that the US SST must be safe and "profitable" but what is the interpretation of "profitable," and how can it be estimated far in advance?

Airline managements presumably will not buy an SST unless it can earn as much as its investment cost as can be earned on the advanced subsonics of the Seventies (e.g. the Boeing 747). Practically, this means that SST prices flight costs, and receipts must permit a return of about 20% before taxes and interest. (Publicized "orders" for SSTs are revocable until performance and prices are known.)

What airframe and engine manufacturers must ordinarily *expect* to earn from a new aircraft is more uncertain. *Realizations* have often been far worse than expectations, and several new commercial aircraft of the past 10 years have lost money for their manufacturers (e.g. Convair 880). Expectations of profit must presumably be higher the greater are the sums to be risked and the greater the dispersion of possible financial outcomes.

If the USG is initially to finance 80%–90% of the US SST's development costs and if up to $4 or $5 billions of American resources must somehow be invested in development *and* manufacture before the program generates a net cash inflow from sales to airlines, an obvious economic test of the US SST's justification is its ability to earn the 10%–15% rate of return earned on an average by domestic resources employed in US industry.

Whether the resource and money costs sunk in the US SST's development and manufacture can earn a 10%–15% rate of return depends upon:

1. Costs of development, for airframe and engine;
2. Costs of manufacture, for airframe and engine, as a function of production rate, cumulative output, and calendar date;
3. Operating costs per plane mile, as a function of various performance parameters (e.g. specific fuel consumption) and permissible altitude of transonic acceleration;
4. Operating receipts per plane mile, as a function of seating capacity, load factor (percentage capacity sold), and fare levels;
5. Availability of supersonic passengers, as a function of number of long haul passengers, subsonic passenger fares, willingness to pay more for less time in the air, and extent to which sonic boom nuisance restricts available routes and schedules.

All of these factors remain shrouded in uncertainty.

Development costs of aircraft have often been underestimated by a factor of two—especially where the necessary state of art has yet to be attained.

SST operating profits are extremely sensitive to specific fuel consumption, lift-drag ratio (a measure of aero dynamic efficiency) and aircraft weight empty. Of its maximum gross take-off weight of maybe 650,000 lbs., 10% or less will be payload and about 45% will be fuel. An X% improvement in fuel economy, if translatable into greater seating capacity could increase net flight receipts by perhaps 3X% proportionately increasing the selling price the aircraft can command.

Supersonics will have to compete with subsonics. Advanced subsonics may have costs per seat mile 20–30% below those of the US SST Airlines unless they acquire SST's at subsidized prices, will hence buy relatively few SSTs so that load factors are exceptionally high (e.g. 75% of seats are filled instead of the 55% typical of today's jets) *and* levy a surcharge (e.g. 10%–20%) on SST tickets. No one knows how many long haul passengers would be diverted to subsonic by such fare differentials. Estimates are that one half may be lost.

The growth rate of passenger demand is also uncertain. Long haul revenue passenger miles have increased at an average of 14% during the past 10 years, but this rate is expected by most to decline. Continued growth will presumably vary with quality of service, per capita incomes and population growth. The *lowest* estimate of passenger volume growth between 1966 and 1990 is 5 times.

Public acceptance or non-acceptance of frequent sonic booms by commercial aircraft remains doubtful. If commercial overland supersonic flight is *not* permitted by the US and most foreign governments, no more than 40% of long haul passengers remains to be shared with subsonics on the available routes over water. Conversely, as the SST's engines are "sized" for high altitude transonic acceleration (above 35,000 ft.) and fuel consumption per mile at subsonic speeds is much higher, the economics of the SST are improved if it is permitted to cross the sound barrier at lower altitudes nearer to airport terminals. Unfortunately, as SST designs increase in gross take-off weight to permit more seats and hence lower seat mile costs, the severity of expected sonic boom increases and the possibility of operating restrictions (e.g., curfews on transcontinental flights) is increased. The prudent assumption, until more conclusive predictions can be made of public reaction to boom, is that commercial supersonic flights over populated land areas will be prohibited.

Anyone who has been intimately involved in econometric assessments of SST "profitability" realizes full well that its prospects will remain most uncertain at least until prototype flight test and possibly until regular commercial operations begin. The total market for SSTs to 1990 is probably somewhere between 150 to 600 aircraft. The profitability of the program is sensitive to numbers of SSTs sold. Under certain sets of favorable assumptions the overall rate of return *could* be 10–15%. But under other sets of equally plausible assumptions the return is negative. Perhaps a best guess is an overall program rate of return of 0% to 5%.

---

[1] The author wishes to acknowledge contributions from Drs. Arnold B. Moore, Edward H. Rastatter, and John A. Walgreen. The views expressed are the author's own. They do not necessarily reflect the opinions of any former, current, or prospective employer.

The simple truth however is that such a complex and technically advanced aircraft must be an investment gamble in its first generation.

NECESSARY FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

There is general agreement that, if there is to be a US SST program, the federal government must finance it, through flight test and possibly certification, by means of outright grants, advances to be recouped later, and/or guarantees of borrowings by the airframe and engine contractors from the financial community.

Three of the principal manufacturers and their suppliers lack both the ability and willingness to provide $4 billion or so for the development and production funds required before the date around 1975 at which time net cash inflows commence. Their collective net worths, including that of some of their probable subcontractors, do not approach such a figure. Besides, even if able, why should an airframe or engine manufacturer risk such sums on an SST? They have alternative investment opportunities involving fewer technical uncertainties, smaller investments, and shorter "dry" periods before recovery of principal. That one airframe and one engine manufacturer are expected to be selected around 1 January 1967 for continued development with government assistance, almost guaranteeing a limited monopoly of a usable design eventually, is not enough apparently to evoke more than 10%–20% participation in development costs by the manufacturers.

Potential airline customers are not expected to be a significant source of funds. No way remains of compelling the airlines to depart from their usual policy of "wait and see" before purchasing. Firm orders cannot be expected until after successful prototype flight tests in 1970 perhaps. And even then it seems unlikely that more than half the aircraft's flyaway price can be extracted through progress payments 6 to 12 months before delivery. (Although the first 50 or so SST's delivered probably have a special *premium* value of several million dollars each, because of high load factors during their initial two to three years of service, the first 100 odd US SST's have already been allocated for refundable deposits of $100,000 each.)

The combination of high technical risks and large dollar magnitudes makes it most improbable that the manufacturer, or indirectly the financial community, will provide the needed funds. Thus the federal government must either provide assurance against certain risks (e.g. accidental loss of a prototype) and/or become a sort of silent partner (providing say 80% of the net cash outflows and sharing say 80% of the net cash inflows). Such a scaling down of the private sums at risk to one fifth of the total funds involved, with a commensurate scaling down of cash surpluses later, might be sufficient to evoke limited private financing despite the program's many uncertainties.

In addition to the funds required for development and production of a SST, safe and economical operation of SSTs will be possible only if government expenditures are made for improved air traffic control, solar and cosmic radiation monitoring systems, and an improved meteorological forecasting capability.

The SST will cruise at 65,000 as compared to 35,000 feet for subsonics. The effects of wind and temperature on SST fuel consumption and the consequent impact on SST operating costs and payload make better data on these parameters vital. At supersonic speeds more advance warning is required to maneuver around unfavorable weather. In the period from 1970 through 1990 meteorological improvements alone could cost governments over a billion dollars.

These negative "externalities" should be considered part of the price of having an SST.

HOW SHOULD THE GOVERNMENT RECOVER?

The manufacturers will not risk even limited sums unless they and the government can agree on a financial plan that specifies at least the formula by which government will recoup its share of development and other "sunk" costs.

Unless there are significant and "external" national interests served by the program, a controversial issue discussed below, the federal government must be placed in a position to obtain the same rate of return on its investment as do the manufacturers of an impolitic and unwarranted subsidy is to be avoided. Thus if the program is continued because the $4 billions odd worth of resources invested in it are expected to earn 10% to 15% before taxes or interest, and if the government were to accept say 5% on an 80% share of costs, the manufacturers would be expected to earn 30% to 55% on their investments. The only way government can avoid paying such a subsidy, and still accept say 5% for itself, is to continue a program that prospectively wastes some of the nation's resources by promising a return less than that ordinarily obtained from domestic labor and capital used by industry in the U.S.

Thus government must be expected to share in profits if (1) the program appears economically justifiable and (2) unjustified subsidies to manufacturers are to be avoided. There is no logical escape. This requirement for government profit sharing has nothing to do with "socialism".

A major issue is whether government recovery should be either through some sort of tax or through sharing in net cash inflows as a silent partner.

Levies most often mentioned are:

1. A "royalty" or tax "on the top", added to the manufacturer's price of the aircraft: this would probably mean a $10 million tax added to say a $35 million manufacturer's price, and such a tax would lose sales to competing subsonics and possible supersonics.

2. An annual tax on SST aircraft operated by US airlines: this would advantage foreign airlines, and a tax adequate for full government recovery plus an equity risk return would have the same present discounted value and incidence on price and sales as would an adequate "royalty" on delivery.

3. A tax of 10%-20% on fares charged all SST passengers originating or terminating in US territory: such a tax would further divert passengers to subsonic aircraft.

A tax on jet fuel purchased in the US by all commercial supersonics may have to be reserved to pay for the special SST flight support services discussed above.

The alternative to a *tax* is *sharing* through a financial partnership or "pooling" arrangement. There could be one pool on the airframe and another on the engine. In each case the selected manufacturer and the federal government would be the initial members—able to sell their shares later to financial intermediaries. They would contribute, quarter by quarter, development and production costs in some agreed upon ratio. And, when net cash inflows start around 1975, these would be shared by the contractor and the government in proportion to their credits in the pool. Such credits should include both advances and an equity rate of return, preferably the same for each partner, of from 10%-15% compounded.

One advantage of pooling as against taxing is that there is less likelihood of handicapping US SST manufacturers or US airlines operating SSTs.

Another potentially important advantage of pooling is that the self interests of the airframe and engine manufacturers are made coincident with the interests of the federal government. If the contractor believes some design change will more than pay for itself, i.e., that it will earn a good rate of return on the extra cost of making a change, government will similarly be advantaged if the contractor knows his business. And ordinarily, because airframe and engine manufacturers are experienced in commercial air transport and presumably know the airlines' needs better than FAA officials, pooling could permit the federal government to give the manufacturers the maximum degree of private initiative possible. Such freedom may be needed to make the program an economic success. Certainly, the SST program should not be administered as though the US were developing and procuring a bomber say, for it is airlines and not the federal government that will buy and use this aircraft.

Another recoupment issue is whether the government should share in manufacturers' receipts or net cash inflows *forever* or only until such time as the government has realized some previously stipulated rate of return on its outlays.

Making either the royalty or pooling claims to SST sales revenue transferable would enable the government to sell its rights to future revenues to the private sector if and when success of the program seems assured.

Why should government seek to recover all its advances from those who buy or use the SST, for are there not other broad national interests being served?

The most intangible and commonly suggested "external" benefits are (1) technological "fall-out", (2) contingent military use, and (3) national prestige, but each of these proclaimed grounds has been vigorously denied by others.

A more explicit argument is that the sale of US SST's at $35 million or so each will benefit the US balance of payments in the Seventies. Such claims ignore many substitution effects. Traditionally half US aircraft exports have been financed in the US. Each US SST exported many mean at least one less US subsonic exported. If the US sells competitive aircraft to foreign airlines, US airlines may lose passengers to them. Estimates suggest that, over 5 years from date of sale, the net balance of payments credit for the US from the sale of an SST is no more than 5%–10% of its US export price (and may even be negative if increased US tourist spending abroad is considered).

Nevertheless, *some* gross external benefits must exist, although not necessarily net of special high altitude meteorology costs, etc. In the end the program's Phase I and II (design competition) costs to the federal treasury might be "forgotten" as an alleged contribution of $300 million odd to some vague "national interest". But beyond that, and starting with Phase III (prototype development) in 1967, the program should be treated as a commercial risk enterprise of manufacturers and government in partnership.

MITIGATING THE MONOPOLY

The federal government in early 1967 may select a single SST airframe and engine contractor to continue prototype development. The selected manufacturers will emerge with considerable monopoly power that could be of considerable value. How can the government use public funds to create a monopoly and yet protect the public interest without destroying the authority and efficiency of private manufacturers and airlines?

First, the monopoly will be limited, for there may be some competition from the supersonic Anglo-French CONCORDE: but more important should be the rivalry of growth subsonics, competition that compels the selected US SST manufacturers to provide the best possible performance at a price.

Second, the selected prime development contractors will have many subcontractors, especially on the airframe. These subcontractors will acquire a competence that later could be used by a rival prime contractor.

Also key employees have been known to transfer at higher salary to a rival manufacturer.

Third, the federal government is expected to have the right to license patents at zero cost, together with shop drawings, to any other airframe and/or engine manufacturers who might later seek to compete.

Hence, *if* a really large and profitable SST market were to prove itself, it is not evident that rival manufacturers could not materialize. The DC–8 did follow the Boeing 707. A *first* generation manufacturer is not always sure of developing a profitable aircraft that excludes competition.

A single airframe and single engine manufacturer for the US SST should create other novel problems more easily overlooked.

One is division of the flyaway aircraft's price between airframe and engine. There is a very large range of indeterminacy. The engine for example might be priced almost down to its marginal production cost. But its price could be as high as the aircraft price minus marginal *airframe* cost. The maximum conceivable engine price could be three times the minimum. Previously an airplane company had some choice among engine firms to narrow the range of possible engine prices.

The airlines will be face to face with a limited monopolist able to charge variable (i.e. discriminatory) prices unless prevented by government. Some of the earlier deliveries, assuming they can maintain schedules, have potentially higher load factors and hence should command premium prices. Should the competition of CONCORDE and the subsonics prove minor, some airlines may ask for federal ceilings on US SST prices.

This could be a dangerous step. If government regulates SST prices, should it not more energetically regulate SST fares so that airlines do not receive unjustified profits, and perhaps depress load factors through excessive competition in flight frequencies on approved SST routes? The situation of the US merchant marine should be enough to deter any airline management from inviting government intervention.

The remaining alternative would be to develop two airframe-engine combinations—which practically would mean also *producing* two rival aircraft. This would double development costs. It would also lose some "learning curve" efficiencies in manufacturing. These extra costs would be justified only if, attributable solely to prolonged competition, operating costs were reduced by about a quarter.

ARE THE BENEFITS GENERAL ENOUGH?

Costly public enterprises of great inherent risk are more easily justified if the spending of taxpayers' funds occasions widespread benefits. It is not enough that they provide employment and profits for a few localities and firms. How diffused are the benefits of the SST program likely to be?

About 85% of US residents have never flown, those who do fly do not always take long haul flights, and perhaps less than 5% of all Americans will ever fly SSTs at their higher fares. Private, non-expense account, long haul passengers will mostly continue to fly subsonically. (It is not even certain that the federal government will reimburse its employees and those of its contractors for a supersonic surcharge.)

Further, American SST passengers will tend to travel to and from a few areas, such as New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Seattle, Washington, D.C., and Miami, Americans living elsewhere may never use an SST except on international flights. But 100 million Americans may find themselves subjected daily to sonic booms if overland SST flights are permitted.

For all these reasons, and as the US SST program is seen increasingly as a rival of expansion of Great Society programs, it is certain to become increasingly controversial.

CONCLUSIONS

There are few modern instances of development with public funds of a technologically advanced product that is to be produced and used commercially by private firms. Desirable guidelines in such cases are:

1. continuation only so long as the program is expected to earn a rate of return comparable to that expected by US industry in making investments;
2. equal government sharing in such a rate of return, partly to avoid subsidization, but also to provide incentives for only economical design changes, etc.;
3. full recoupment by government, plus an equity or risk taker's return, except in so far as they clearly are *net* "external" or national interests;
4. recoupment by government of its advances, not by taxes that reduce sales and use, but through some partnership (pooling) arrangement;
5. avoidance of special controls that will prevent the usual exercise of experienced management by the airframe and engine manufacturers;
6. use of public funds only to the extent that a private and excessively profitable monopoly will not be created;
7. no unrecovered government subsidies except where adequate benefits are likely to be diffused among a large fraction of citizens.

Finally, it is to be hoped and expected that a US prototype of an SST will be flying well before the end of the '70s, one that promises to be safe and profitable without being a public nuisance because of sonic boom. This means a state of art that will permit a rate of return of at least 10% on all resources invested in development after 1966 *without* supersonic flight over populated land areas. Until proposed designs can give this promise with more confidence it seems premature to begin construction of a prototype aircraft.

ROSCOE DRUMMOND SAYS VIETNAM TALKS NEARER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the eminent columnist Roscoe Drummond has recently written an excellent article supporting the wisdom of the Johnson position on negotiations and military tactics in Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Drummond's column, entitled "Vietnam Talks Nearer," published in the Christian Science Monitor of February 20, 1967, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM TALKS NEARER

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Negotiations to end the war in Vietnam are getting nearer.

One of the main indications which persuade me that Hanoi is getting nearer to going to the conference table is the very thing which some cite as evidence that North Vietnam is unwilling to talk—that is, its mounting pressure to get the United States to stop bombing the North.

This is a Communist negotiating tactic of long use. Whenever the Communists decide to do something which both they and the other side are willing to do, they do not disclose their acceptance until they have tried to get a price for it. And if they see a chance of getting one unearned concession, they will ask for still another before doing what they had already decided to do.

ONE-SIDED PRICE

This was the technique used by the Soviets during the negotiations which led up to the Austrian peace treaty and it was used by the Chinese and the North Koreans at Panmunjom which produced the Korean truce.

For months Hanoi has been mounting a worldwide diplomatic and propaganda campaign to see if it can get the United States to agree to a unilateral deescalation of the fighting after which, it says, peace talks "could" begin.

On the basis of past experience, this suggests that the North Vietnamese are now in the middle of testing Washington and Saigon to see if they can get some one-sided dividends in advance of agreement to negotiate.

My conviction is that the firm decision of President Johnson, spelled out in clear terms by Secretary Rusk at his latest press conference, not to pay one-sided prices to get Hanoi to peace talks, actually brings negotiations nearer. If United States policy was vague or uncertain on this point, you could expect Hanoi to step back from negotiation and start asking for more.

NEWS DEPRESSING

There are, of course, additional factors which tend to push the Communists toward peace talks. They are these:

1. The military news is depressing for Hanoi. It is evident that at the very least the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong cannot win on the battlefield. Unless the United States gives up, they are not going to take South Vietnam by force.

2. The political news is depressing for Hanoi. The new South Vietnamese constitution will be ready shortly and the prospect now is that national elections will be held no later than summer from which a popularly elected civilian government will emerge.

To Hanoi this means that unless the Viet Cong can negotiate their way into a preelection coalition South Vietnamese government soon, the prospect of the Viet Cong winning political power in the South will be increasingly slim. They never believed they could win elections; that is why they turned to force.

3. The nearly total break in relations between Red China and the Soviet Union makes each an uncertain ally and the internal turmoil weakens Peking's prowar influence on Hanoi.

CREDIBILITY GAP

It seems to me that Mr. Rusk has taken a wholly reasonable position in saying that the United States will not accept ending just half of the war, that the United States cannot turn North Vietnam into a secure sanctuary unles Hanoi is prepared in return to turn South Vietnam into a sanctuary secure from North Vietnamese attack.

Hanoi can have negotiations at any time by any one of several reciprocal actions—a mutual deescalation, stop bombing and stop infiltration, a cease-fire or a peace conference at which a cease-fire would be the first or an early item on the agenda.

As I see it, the greatest credibility gap in the United States has been created by the pessimists and the cynics who have long and erroneously said that the United States couldn't fight effectively in Vietnam, that we were bound to lose, that the South Vietnamese leaders could never agree on a new constitution and would never hold elections.

Their lack of credibility is being proved at all points.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I pause in tribute to a proud, courageous people who are celebrating this year the 49th anniversary of the Estonian Declaration of Independence. Since the Soviet conquest and annexation of Estonia in 1940, faithful friends of a free Estonia around the world have marked February 24 each year as a moment for rededication to the cause of Estonian self-determination and independence. I extend this tribute today, 1 day before Texas Independence Day.

I sometimes imagine that it must be a source of considerable embarrassment to Estonia's Soviet masters that it required an alliance with a feared and hated Fascist Germany as well as the naked power of the Red army to subjugate the Estonian people. Only the most cynical opportunism and unprincipled force could have achieved and enjoyed such a tragic result.

Time, I believe, is on the side of vigilant, purposeful, freedom-loving people. Dictators can enslave people, but they cannot destroy a people's spirit or desire for freedom. The Estonian people who have known freedom and slavery before will know freedom again. I can only believe that history is on the side of the just and that they will one day prevail in a free and independent Estonia.

THE GROWING CRIME PROBLEM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, this Nation's great and growing crime problem will never be solved if we wait for somebody else to do the work for us. The citizen cannot expect government to do everything; he also must become involved. He must help to make every police force more efficient, every part of the criminal justice procedure more just. And there must be support for complex, long-range programs to erase many of crime's causes.

There also must be a partnership of real dimension and solid understanding among governments at the local, State, and Federal levels. Crime cannot be efficiently fought alone. It can be subdued through cooperation.

Vast programs are suggested in the report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice. None is more vital to success than the call for intelligent involvement by all citizens, by every public official.

The importance of this facet of the report was recognized and discussed most meaningfully by the Nashville Tennessean in an editorial entitled "Crime Rate Reduction Calls for Firm Effort," published on February 21. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a letter dated February 9, 1967, from G. B. Burrus, president and chairman of the board, People's Drug Stores, Washington, D.C., to President Johnson, and an accompanying table showing losses to People's Drug Stores due to burglaries and armed robberies in the Metropolitan Washington area.

There being no objection, the editorial, letter, and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRIME RATE REDUCTION CALLS FOR FIRM EFFORT

President Johnson's crime commission has laid out a tough prescription for the cure of lawlessness in the nation.

The commission held out no promise of a quick and easy solution to the problem of crime. It well call for "an unremitting national effort," the commission said, and it will take money, manpower and drastic reforms. But, the commission said, the job is possible—which was about the most optimistic note in the report.

The commission's gloomy report was not surprising. The underlying causes of the growing crime rates have become increasingly apparent in recent years.

They are rooted in the squalid slum conditions that abound in American cities, and they are promoted by inequities in the law, uneven application of the law, ignorance and indifference, and countless other evils that have accumulated over many decades.

At this point, however, the important thing is not to look back with regret but to move ahead as quickly as possible to get the job done. If crime is to be controlled, it is essential that the nation recognize the real causes of crime and act to remove them instead of merely fighting the symptoms of crime.

The commission recommended widespread reorganization of police departments, more vigorous recruiting of police and higher pay for the officers. It proposed a new system of youth services, a new kind of penal institution near the city so that inmates could stay closer to society and be better prepared for re-entering society at the end of their terms. Dangerous convicts would be sent to more traditional institutions.

In the field of justice, the commission called for reform of the bail system, greater care in seeing that defendants are properly represented, and an end to "assembly line justice." It also called for stricter gun control and more vigorous action against organized crime.

The commission, however, centered its heaviest fire on the slums and other conditions which serve as a breeding ground for crime. It called on lawmen and all Americans to join in the effort to eliminate slums and ghettoes, to improve education and provide jobs.

"We will not have dealt effectively with crime until we have alleviated the conditions that stimulate it," the commission said.

The report issued over the weekend was a preliminary to seven additional volumes to be released by the commission. The volumes, detailing the commission's 18 months of study, will deal in depth with the various subjects covered.

However, the preliminary is enough to show that reducing the threat of crime will take effort and money—a great deal of money. And, as President Johnson properly pointed out, the effort will require action at the federal, state and local level.

The objective may be possible to achieve—but the success of the effort depends on the will and determination of the American people.

PEOPLES DRUG STORES, INC.,
Washington, D.C., February 9, 1967.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I should like to endorse the letter sent to you recently by the District of Columbia Clearing House Association respecting crime in the District of Columbia.

There can hardly be any dispute as to the magnitude of the problem. The overall statistics on incidence of crime in the District tell the story accurately, but it is possible that the appalling significance of those statistics may be blurred by their generality.

As I realize only too keenly, "robberies per thousand population" translates into actual robbers in actual stores jeopardizing the lives of actual men and women. I attach a list of the robberies and burglaries committed in my company's stores in the District of Columbia metropolitan area since January 1, 1966. As you will see, in the past 56 weeks Peoples Drug Stores in this area have been the scene of 31 armed robberies and 62 burglaries, and the pace of these crimes is accelerating rather than abating.

The dollar loss to Peoples Drug Stores during this period—$116,000, none of it insured—is obviously heavy. But the threat to the lives and well being of our employees and customers is of a much more serious order. Every crime listed in the attachment carried the seeds of grave human tragedy, and in some instances violence did indeed occur.

Just this past week the assistant manager of one of our stores was kidnapped at his Maryland home, pistol-whipped, and bound and gagged by four criminals who forced him to return to our District store so that they could gain entry to the store and the safe and secure cash and narcotics. They left him, still bound and gagged, in his car. The very next day at another of our stores armed robbers, at 8:40 in the morning, forced 7 of our employees and 20 customers to lie on the floor and robbed the store of cash and narcotics.

Or consider our experience at a single store. On November 6, 1966, that store was robbed of $6,910.93. On January 8, 1967, the manager of the store was accosted at gun point by three robbers, forced to re-enter the store, open the safe, and turn over cash and narcotics. Upon leaving, the criminals knocked him unconscious. On January 22, 1967, this same manager, upon opening the store, was again faced by armed robbers who forced him to open the safe and to turn over cash and narcotics. Finally, on January 25, 1967, the police apprehended five persons burglarizing the store. The manager and all employees tendered their resignations and it was necessary to close the store permanently.

I cite these figures not because they are unusual, but because I have no reason to think they are not representative. Indeed, the burden of crime has not fallen as heavily upon my company as upon others in our community. We have been spared loss of life, but there are families whose breadwinner has been cut down by robbers. We are a large company, but there are small merchants to whom robbery and burglary has meant financial ruin.

I, and those who share my anxiety, are greatly heartened by your demonstrated concern about crime, both nationally and in the District, where the federal government has a special responsibility. While I do not pretend to be equipped to evaluate the particulars of your legislative proposals or the recommendations of the District of Columbia Crime Commission, certainly your policy of a two-pronged attack upon both the sources and the effects of crime should command widespread support. If disagreements arise over particular ingredients of an anticrime program, it is my hope that in any event those disagreements will not prevent the Congress and the community from uniting in unstinting support of those measures as to which there can be no reasonable dispute. The urgency of the problem surely demands no less.

I am confident that the stockholders, employees and customers of Peoples Drug Stores join me in pledging our cooperation in your efforts to give meaning in our community to the principle that, as you put it to the Congress, "public order is the first business of government."

Very truly yours,

G. B. BURRUS,
President and Chairman of the Board.

Peoples Drug Stores—Losses due to burglaries and armed robberies in the Metropolitan Washington area

Store No.	Burglary or robbery	Date	Total
	JANUARY 1966		
165	Burglary	Jan. 2	$213.90
1	do	Jan. 3	130.80
70	do	Jan. 4	120.00
1	do	Jan. 9	51.25
5	Robbery	Jan. 21	80.00
27	Burglary	Jan. 26	119.46
3	do	Jan. 27	192.89
40	Robbery	Jan. 28	3,363.86
24	Burglary	Jan. 31	2,283.67
	FEBRUARY 1966		
126	Burglary	Feb. 13	$536.40
103	do	do	4,584.56
	MARCH 1966: NONE		
	APRIL 1966		
130	Burglary	Apr. 10	$250.74
233	do	Apr. 12	252.87
	MAY 1966		
191	Burglary	May 2	$1,614.37
151	do	May 4	2,743.39
27	do	do	405.47
249	do	May 5	1,793.61
27	do	May 11	25.80
233	do	May 27	881.72
	JUNE 1966		
126	Burglary	June 12	$2,219.42
217	do	do	3,531.57
5	do	June 24	490.39
	JULY 1966		
18	Burglary	July 1	$25.75
75	Robbery	do	339.00
89	do	July 3	5,750.53
133	do	July 5	202.62
25	do	July 6	174.00
88	Burglary	July 8	99.00
74	do	July 9	707.94
191	do	July 14	90.24
161	Robbery	July 15	630.00
18	Burglary	July 20	243.11
161	do	July 28	4,020.81
	AUGUST 1966		
25	Robbery	Aug. 8	$1,913.86
90	Burglary	do	180.29
42	do	do	82.93
10	do	Aug. 25	1,506.82
107	do	Aug. 27	674.47
155	do	Aug. 28	776.55
89	do	do	611.47
146	do	do	294.82
	SEPTEMBER 1966		
255	Burglary	Sept. 2	$16.00
236	do	Sept. 6	645.65
1	do	Sept. 8	240.00
107	do	Sept. 9	369.01
90	do	Sept. 16	283.00
158	Robbery	Sept. 19	2,405.31
11	Burglary	Sept. 20	1,057.00
237	Robbery	Sept. 23	50.00
233	Burglary	Sept. 24	1,484.15
200	do	Sept. 25	924.56
73	do	Sept. 26	71.18
	OCTOBER 1966		
15	Robbery	Oct. 1	$1,012.52
3	Burglary	Oct. 5	1,003.35
90	do	Oct. 12	283.00
233	do	Oct. 13	149.51
27	do	Oct. 17	160.23
133	Robbery	Oct. 25	5,800.00
	NOVEMBER 1966		
77	Robbery	Nov. 6	$6,910.93
10	Burglary	Nov. 9	2,148.82
15	do	Nov. 15	2,446.98
245	Robbery	Nov. 21	2,538.76
42	Burglary	Nov. 23	485.92
27	do	do	955.68
	DECEMBER 1966		
150	Robbery	Dec. 3	$3,749.30
27	Burglary	Dec. 5	567.24
19	Robbery	Dec. 11	149.41
15	do	Dec. 16	585.55
42	Burglary	Dec. 22	668.94
2	Robbery	Dec. 23	1,045.77
120	Burglary	Dec. 29	388.40
27	do	Dec. 30	100.00
237	do	do	2,111.00
75	do	Dec. 31	2,600.00
	Total, 1966		88,117.52
	JANUARY 1967		
42	Robbery	Jan. 3	$6,035.04
75	do	do	60.00
24	do	do	2,600.00
9	do	Jan. 4	380.00
27	Burglary	Jan. 5	57.48
(1)	do	Jan. 7	349.18
77	Robbery	Jan. 8	2,366.72
82	do	Jan. 19	1,188.22
237	do	Jan. 20	99.00
114	do	do	2,291.85
201	Burglary	Jan. 21	171.34
77	Robbery	Jan. 22	4,047.65
75	do	Jan. 23	380.00
237	Burglary	Jan. 24	47.38
77	do	Jan. 25	10.31
90	do	Jan. 27	52.78
17	Robbery	Jan. 29	3,003.28
	FEBRUARY 1967		
133	Robbery	Feb. 2	$3,000.00
25	do	Feb. 3	2,000.00
	Total, 1966-67		116,257.75

[1] Warehouse.

L.B.J. EFFORT TO HALT SPREAD OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS MERITS STRONG SUPPORT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the President recently highlighted a tough and difficult choice for all people who believe that the wondrous atomic power should be converted to peaceful uses.

He pointed out that if nuclear testing should spread for peaceful purposes, the difficulty of stopping weapons proliferation will be very difficult indeed.

In a recent editorial supporting the President the Philadelphia Inquirer puts it very well when it writes:

> (The President) suggests that a ban on nuclear proliferation should prevent a spread of nuclear testing for peaceful purposes as well as for weapon development. He points out that the distinction between nuclear testing for peaceful purposes is too fine a line to draw.

Mr. President, President Johnson has proposed a logical way out of this dilemma: that this country and other nuclear powers supply nuclear components under mutually agreeable conditions and safeguards to countries desiring them for legitimate purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial published in the Philadelphia Inquirer be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO HALT THE SPREAD OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Resumption of the 17-nation Geneva Disarmament Conference, after a six-month recess, offers renewed hope that agreement can be reached on an effective treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

President Johnson, in a message to delegates at Geneva, has stated the position of the United States in cautious and flexible terms. The substance of the President's remarks is both conciliatory and constructive.

In earlier discussions the question of peaceful uses of nuclear energy had been raised. It is a reasonable question.

The answer from President Johnson provides a fair starting point for negotiations. He suggests that a ban on nuclear proliferation should prevent a spread of nuclear testing for peaceful purposes as well as for weapons development. He points out that the distinction between nuclear testing for peaceful or non-peaceful purposes is too fine a line to draw. Weapons testing could be easily disguised as a testing for peaceful purposes. Moreover, the development of nuclear facilities for genuinely peaceful uses would inevitably entail as a byproduct, the technological competence to produce nuclear weapons.

Mr. Johnson asserts the readiness of the United States, under mutually agreeable conditions and appropriate international safeguards, to supply nuclear components for peaceful purposes to countries desiring them for legitimate projects. Other nuclear Powers are invited to make a similar commitment. Under this arrangement there would be no necessity for non-nuclear Powers to develop nuclear capabilities of their own.

THE NEW WORLD

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, last weekend, the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] was the principal speaker at the Michigan State Republican Convention.

His remarks focused on what he termed "The New World" of political change. I ask unanimous consent that his significant address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW WORLD

(An address by Senator CHARLES H. PERCY, to the Michigan State Republican Convention, Detroit, Mich., Feb. 25, 1967)

My friends, I accepted Governor Romney's invitation to speak here this afternoon because I owe him a debt of gratitude. There can be little question that the outstanding records he and other Republican governors have compiled in the 1960's played a significant part in the widespread Republican victories of last November. Clearly it was an autumn of discontent for many American voters. But they would not have turned to us in such numbers were it not for the fact that men like George Romney have given our party such a good name in recent years.

Economic growth; restoration of fiscal integrity; dramatic progress in such areas as civil rights, mental health, education and conservation—these things have been achieved under your governor in Michigan and other Republicans elsewhere. They have not escaped the attention of the American voter.

So I owe a large debt of thanks to Governor Romney, as well as to all of you in the Michigan Republican Party who have backed him up so well. Led by people of the calibre of the Governor and Senator Griffin, my able and highly regarded colleague, you have built a party here which is a credit not only to Michigan, but to Republicans everywhere.

I would like to talk to you today about a new world of political change emerging all around us—a world which ultimately may allow us to more fully devote ourselves to the kind of sensitive and sensible government Republicans have envisioned.

As long as we are spending 73 billion dollars on the military in a single year, critical domestic needs will go unmet. As long as we have a federal deficit of 9.7 billion dollars, soundly conceived programs such as federal tax rebates to the states must be postponed.

We in America like to tell ourselves that we are a peace-loving people. But if our quest for peace is to be taken seriously—if it is to be something more than slogans and charades—then we must grasp every legitimate opportunity to nurture peace. If we ignore such opportunities when they present themselves, in time the world will come to ignore our protestations of peaceful intention.

In the months just ahead, several such opportunities will come before the American people and their Congress. Without risking the nation's security, we can take more practical steps toward harmonious East-West relations this year than perhaps at any other time since the Cold War began.

It is my hope that the Republican Party will lead, not lag, in this gradual movement toward détente. It is my conviction that the Republican Party *must* lead in a rational discussion of a flexible, creative foreign policy, leaving the cant and chauvinism to others.

Let us for once dispense with both the shrill cries of self-righteous nationalism and the wishful dreams of peace at almost any price, and objectively develop new policies which might lead to an easing of tensions among nations. If a policy would actually threaten our national security, then let us reject it. But if it would advance the prospects for peace in even a small way, while threatening nothing more than some stale cliches about American foreign policy and the Communist world, then let us adopt it.

President Eisenhower was among the first to recognize the necessity of improving communications with Communist regimes. He negotiated an end to the Korean War, started cultural and technical exchanges with the Soviet Union, sent Vice President Nixon to Moscow and invited Chairman Khrushchev to the United States. Trade in nonstrategic goods was gradually increased.

Many denounced President Eisenhower, and President Kennedy after him, for these policies. They said it wasn't possible to do business with the Russians. They said even limited accommodation with the Soviet Union was naive and possibly suicidal. Some spoke darkly of softness on Communism.

But despite intermittent crises, communications between the great powers improved, and gradually the mutual fear which had characterized the previous decade abated. By 1963, it was possible to conclude a nuclear test-ban treaty, which has been honored by both the Soviet Union and the United States.

Now new opportunities for civilized contact between East and West are nearing. A Consular Convention with the USSR is before the United States Senate. A treaty banning nuclear weapons from outer space has been signed and awaits ratification. A treaty to stop nuclear proliferation is being negotiated. Legislation opening the way to increased East-West trade may soon come before Congress.

If we invoke the fears of the past to block these initial steps, then I think our children will find little security in the future. And if we close the door now, who can say when opportunity will knock again?

Our most immediate opening for conciliation lies in the U.S.-Soviet Consular Convention. It was Vice President Nixon who, in 1959, first suggested that the cause of peace would be well served if an American consulate were opened in the Soviet Union and a Soviet consulate in the United States. The late Christian Herter, then Secretary of State, proposed later that year the opening of negotiations for a consular convention.

In 1964, the convention was signed by both sides, and today it needs only Senate approval to take effect. I strongly support Senate ratification of this agreement, and I urge your support of it as well.

We need widespread public support of this treaty, for public opposition is skillfully organized. My mail, and that of many other Senators, is running 200 to one against ratification. I do not believe this is an accurate reflection of American sentiment on the issue, but unless supporters of the treaty make their views known, the determined opposition could make ratification difficult.

I believe this opposition is based on faulty premises which veil the real value inherent in the Consular Convention.

It is argued, for instance, that the personnel in a Soviet consulate would pose a serious security risk to the United States.

Since more than 1000 Russians are already officially employed here, it is hard to believe that another dozen will significantly endanger the Republic. J. Edgar Hoover has satisfied the President of the United States that ratification of the treaty would impose no insurmountable security problem. Acting Attorney General Clark has assured me in a recent letter that additional F.B.I. costs which might be incurred by a Soviet consulate would be very small, and "would represent only a minute fraction of existing F.B.I. appropriations."

It is argued that *any* cooperation with the Soviet Union while the Soviets help arm the North Vietnamese is a betrayal of American soldiers in Vietnam.

I cannot agree. I think we owe it to the men who must fight our wars to promote peace and peaceful contact in every way we can. What better time to narrow the differences between adversaries than in time of war?

And that, really, is what the Consular Treaty is all about—it will help narrow the gulf between peoples and nations. It will *not* usher in a Golden Age of Harmony between America and the Soviet Union. It will *not* cause men to instantly lay down their arms and beat their swords into plowshares. Nothing would be more unwise than to tempt renewed aggression by unilaterally weakening our defenses, but the Consular Treaty has no bearing on our defenses.

The treaty *will* move us toward more agreeable East-West relations and away from the fearful tensions of recent years. Ratification of the Consular Convention is an important symbol of America's readiness to join a world already in the process of readjustment. If we wish to keep pace with history, I do not see how we can fail to take this small step.

How, in fact, can we fail to take other, larger steps toward readjustment and reconciliation?

Our choices are basic ones: we move ahead with the times, or we remain frozen in Cold War attitudes that the rest of the world is swiftly discarding; we continue to isolate the people of Eastern Europe or we take steps that will keep them in touch with Western ideas and institutions; we progress, or we stand still.

The recent decision of the Italian automobile firm, FIAT, to build a plant in the Soviet Union says much about progress in other nations. Some in this country will denounce the Italians for consorting with the enemy. Some will call for reprisals. I think they will be taking a limited view of a promising development.

I see the new FIAT plant in Russia as symbolic of a new era in East-West trade. I welcome the increased Soviet concentration on consumer production, and especially automobile production.

You in Detroit know so well the impact automobile production has on a nation's economy. In the Soviet Union, automobiles could soon beget new investments in highways instead of runways, in gas stations instead of fueling bases, in motels instead of barracks.

Today, the USSR has only a toehold in the automotive age. We—I should say you—produced 8½ million cars in 1966. Soviet production was 230,000. In Moscow, there are exactly eight service stations, and less than 1800 in the entire Soviet Union. In the United States, there are well over 200,000.

As Soviet automobile production increases, I believe it will result in greater internal pressure on the Soviet government to gear its economy to its own domestic needs rather than to war. We should not forget that we are engaged in competition between ideologies, but how much better it would be if the contest were to take place on an economic battlefield where we have preeminent strength and are the envy of the world. Surely this is preferable to the nightmare of a military competition which no one can win.

If increased East-West trade is to become a reality, if we are to ratify the Consular Convention and the agreements which will follow it, then the United States must be prepared to adjust much of its foreign policy and its thinking.

For we are dealing here with more than mere bridge-building between East and West; potentially, we are dealing with the beginning of the end of the Cold War. This will require not only good faith on the other side, but willingness and innovation on our own.

It will require a willingness to put away comfortable old ideas and adopt unfamiliar new ones. We cannot afford the extravagance of simplistic dogmatism. We cannot wage holy wars of anti-communism. If we remain inflexibly addicted to a world view which is no longer relevant, we shall soon lose any semblance of Free World leadership. Let us deal with the real world, not with a world of make-believe in which all Communists are equally villainous and America is presumed to be 99$\frac{44}{100}$ per cent pure.

Twenty years ago, an outstanding Michigan Republican, Senator Arthur Vandenberg, recognizing a changing world, broke with the past and led his party and his nation to a new kind of international responsibility.

Now the world is changing again, rapidly and dramatically, and we must adapt to it. The United States—and the Republican Party—can lead the way to this new world, or they can be left behind.

I am confident that our country and our party will choose to lead.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I dare say that no issue in modern times has caused most of our Nation's leaders more agony than the war in Vietnam. I have personally spent far more time studying this issue, talking to constituents, national organizations, and Government officials about it, and deliberating on it than any other issue.

The Vietnam issue has divided the Nation. Some, a small minority, would have us withdraw from Vietnam altogether, with no guarantee of the safety of the millions of Vietnamese we would leave behind who oppose the Vietcong.

Others would have us cease bombarding North Vietnam and limit our military activities to South Vietnam. Still others, among them my good personal friend, Mr. Henry E. Niles, of Baltimore, additionally urge a reduction of our military efforts in South Vietnam and negotiations with all parties. Mr. Niles has sent me a copy of the "open letter" he and a number of other business executives addressed to the President which more fully states their position. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it seems clear, however, that the large majority of Americans support both the level of our operations in Vietnam and the continued bombing of North Vietnam. The Gallup poll of Saturday, February 25, 1967, indicated 67 percent approval of the continued bombing of North Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that the report of that poll also be reprinted at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, some Americans would have us bomb the dams, Haiphong harbor facilities, and civilian industries in North Vietnam, regardless of the consequences for world peace.

No rational human being can want the war in Vietnam to continue. All of us want the war ended. Many of us wish we had never become involved in Vietnam. Had I the power to rewrite history, there are many pages and chapters in the story of the last decade, both in Vietnam and elsewhere, that I would rewrite. So, I am sure, would President Johnson, Ho Chi Minh, and scores of other world leaders who, with the benefit of hindsight, might rearrange the events which have brought us to the agony of Vietnam.

But we are in Vietnam. Whatever wisdom for the future we have gained from our experience with Vietnam, no protesting against the barriers of time past can alter the fact that we are there, or change the dimensions of our presence there today.

We are currently debating in the Senate the amount of money which should be authorized for use in Vietnam and the conditions, if any, to be placed upon that use. One amendment proposed would forbid the use of these funds "in or over North Vietnam or to increase the number of U.S. personnel in South Vietnam above 500,000," in the absence of a declaration of war.

If the public opinion polls are at all reliable, this amendment, which would prevent any bombardment of North Vietnam, is opposed by two of every three American citizens. Moreover, it restricts U.S. flexibility to achieve a negotiated settlement by setting limits, clear and favorable to our opponents, on our ability to bring military pressure to bear directly on North Vietnam, the origin of many of the troops, and the overwhelming bulk of supply for the Vietcong. The massive resupply by North Vietnam of Vietcong units in South Vietnam during the recent Tet bombing pause; which allowed the Vietcong to undertake substantial offensive action against American forces for the first time in several months, gives us little hope that North Vietnam is prepared today to respond to a cessation of bombing by reducing the level of its infiltration into South Vietnam. Our men will pay in blood for that supply effort by the North Vietnamese. I must therefore oppose this amendment.

But we must continue to hope and work for a just settlement in Vietnam with a minimum loss of life on all sides. I strongly support every reasonable effort to settle the war in Vietnam through unconditional negotiations with every party to the conflict. Therefore, I intend to vote for Senator MANSFIELD's proposed amendment, which, while pledging all necessary support for our forces in Vietnam also pledges full congressional support for all efforts to achieve a negotiated settlement, including reactivation of the Geneva Conference or any other such international group through which peace in Vietnam might be achieved. I ask that the full text of Senator MANSFIELD's amendment be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLE IV. STATEMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL POLICY

SEC. 401. The Congress hereby declares—

(1) its firm intentions to provide all necessary support for members of the Armed Forces of the United States fighting in Vietnam;

(2) its support of efforts being made by the President of the United States and other men of good will throughout the world to prevent an expansion of the war in Vietnam and to bring that conflict to an end through a negotiated settlement which will preserve the honor of the United States, protect the vital interests of this country, and allow the people of South Vietnam to determine the affairs of that nation in their own way; and

(3) its support of the Geneva accords of 1954 and urges the convening of that Conference or any other meeting of nations similarly involved and interested as soon as possible for the purpose of formulating plans for bringing the conflict to an honorable conclusion in accordance with the principles of those accords.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, nearly 6 years ago, when the war in Vietnam was very real, but only second-page news, President John Kennedy spelled out what he believed our course should be in dealing with our adversaries in this incredibly difficult, dangerous, and complex world. Addressing the University of Washington, President Kennedy said:

> Diplomacy and defense are not substitutes for one another. A willingness to resist force, unaccompanied by a willingness to talk, could provoke belligerence—while a willingness to talk, unaccompanied by a willingness to resist force, could invite disaster . . . While we shall negotiate freely, we shall not negotiate freedom . . . in short, we are neither "warmongers" nor "appeasors", neither "hard" nor "soft". We are Americans.

Mr. President, let us all, as Americans, redouble our efforts and our prayers for peace with honor in Vietnam.

EXHIBIT 1

OPEN LETTER FROM BUSINESS EXECUTIVES TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the undersigned American business executives, most of whom have served at least once in the Armed Services of the United States, protest against the escalation of the war in Vietnam. We believe that this war is against our national interest and world interest. We feel this on moral and practical grounds.

Whatever may have been the reasons for past involvement, the United States is now in a situation in which the risks we are running and the price we are paying seem to us to be out of proportion to any possible benefit that can reasonably be foreseen for the South Vietnamese, for the United States, or for the Free World.

Secretary McNamara in his speech in Montreal on May 18, 1966, said:

"But neither conscience nor sanity, itself, suggests that the United States is, should, or could be the Global Gendarme . . .

"The United States has no mandate from on high to police the world, and no inclination to do so . . .

"Certainly we have no charter to rescue floundering regimes who have brought violence on themselves by deliberately refusing to meet the legitimate expectations of their citizenry."

We agree with the Secretary. We believe that his words are applicable to the Vietnamese situation today.

We urge you, Mr. President, to follow the suggestions of Secretary-General U Thant, which seem to us to be reasonable and constructive. They were:—stop the bombing, de-escalate military activity in South Vietnam, negotiate with all parties which are now fighting. Our opponents are not likely to be impressed by our words of wishing a peaceful settlement until we suit our actions to our words. Such actions have risk, but are less dangerous than continuing along the present course.

Respectfully,

(Initially this letter was drafted for signature only by executives who had served in the Armed Forces of the United States, but other executives, many of whom had served the Government in other capacities, desired to sign. More than half of the signers have served in the Armed Forces. Signers signed as individuals and NOT in their official capacities. Affiliation is given for identification only.)

Thomas B. Adams, President, Adams Security Co., Boston, Mass.

B. Aisenberg, President, Rosedale Engin. Co., Bronx, N.Y.

B. L. Aldrich, Owner, A & A Remodeling Co., Denver, Colo.

Benedict S. Alper, Brookline, Mass.

Ralph B. Atkinson, President, Ferroprint Corp., Monterey, Calif.

Bradford Bachrach, President, Bachrach, Inc., Newton, Mass.

Erwin H. Baker, Adv. Sales Man., R. R. Bowker Co., New York, N.Y.

Lisle Baker, Jr., Exec. Vice-Pres., Courier-Journal & Louisville Times Co., Louisville, Ky.

Leslie L. Balassa, President, Barrington Industries, Inc., Providence, R.I.

Cyril Bath, President, Cyril Bath Co., Solon, Ohio.

George E. Beggs, Jr., President, Leeds & Northrup, Phila., Pa.

Nelson Bengston, President, Bengston & Co., Inc., N.Y., N.Y.

Raymond L. Benoit, Manager, Hollingshead Co., Moorestown, N.J.

Henry A. Berg, President, Direct Mail Envelope Co., New York, N.Y.

Edmund C. Berkeley, President, Berkeley Enterprises, Newtonville, Mass.

Harold Berliner, President, Berliner & McGinnis, Inc., Nevada City, Calif.

William L. Berlinghof, Jr., Pres., Woodmont Products, Inc., Huntingdon Valley, Pa.

Nat Bernard, Sales Man. Coun., Bernard Associates, Roslyn, N.Y.

Robert L. Berney, Treasurer, Hamburger's, Baltimore, Md.

Karl Bernhard, Partner, Bernhard Studios, New York, N.Y.

Daniel J. Bernstein, Member, New York Stock Exchange, Scarsdale, N.Y.

Peter L. Bernstein, President, Bernstein-Macauley, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Harold Berry, Vice President, Fischer-New Center-Co., Detroit, Mich.

Paul H. Berwald, Vice-President, Consolidated Retail Stores, Inc., St. Louis, Mo.

Alan H. Blank, Executive, Central State Theatre Corp., Des Moines, Iowa.

Don A. Brennan, Director-Market Development, Automatic Retailers of America, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.

William C. Brown, Vice-President, Pioneer Hi-Bred Corn Co., Des Moines, Iowa.

Stimson Bullitt, President, King Broadcasting Co., Seattle, Wash.

Benjamin J. Buttenwieser, New York, N.Y.

Richard E. Bye, Vice-President, R. R. Bowker Co., New York, N.Y.

Henry B. Cabot, Boston, Mass.

G. Cheston Carey, Chairman of the Board, Carey Machinery & Supply Co., Baltimore, Md.

Chester F. Carlson, Consultant, Xerox Corp., Pittsford, N.Y.

Simon Casady, Secretary, Pioneer Hi-Bred Corn Co., Des Moines, Iowa.

Nathan Chalnick, President, Chase Cleaners, Birmingham, Mich.

Ernest R. Chanes, President, Consolidated Water Conditioning Corp., New York, N.Y.

Robert A. Childers, President, Childers Manufacturing Co., Houston, Texas.

Bronson Clark, Vice-President, Gilford Instrument Lab. Co., Oberlin, Ohio.

Randolph P. Compton, Investment Banker, Scarsdale, N.Y.

Nolan K. Kerschner, President, Kerschner Construction Co., Norwalk, Conn.

Samuel E. Kirk, Retired Builder, West Grove, Pa.

Edward E. Klein, President, Edward E. Klein, Associates, Pleasantville, N.Y.

Alan E. Kligerman, Senior Partner, Sugar-Lo Co., Atlantic City, N.J.

Arthur S. Kling, Chairman of the Board, Kling Co., Louisville, Ky.

Shepard Kurnit, President, Dezehanty Kurnit & Geller, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Irving F. Laucks, Past President, I. F. Laucks, Inc., Seattle, Wash.

Jack L. Levin, Partner, Shecter & Levin Ad. Agency, Baltimore, Md.

Lester S. Levy, Chairman, Exec. Com. (ret.), Men's Hats, Inc., Baltimore, Md.

A. Barton Lewis, President, A. Barton Lewis & Co., Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.

Norman S. Lezin, President, A. K. Salz Tannery, Inc., Santa Cruz, Calif.

William A. Longshore, Partner, I. Reifsnyder Sons Co., Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.

Graeme Lorimer, Director, Girard Trust Bank, Phila., Pa.

Richard Haber, Berkeley, California.

Philip Macht, President, Welsh Construction Co., Baltimore, Md.

David B. Mackenzie, Manager, Geology Dept., Denver Research Center, Marathon Oil Co., Littleton, Colo.

Herbert D. Magidson, President, Metric Products, Inc., Culver City, Calif.

J. J. Mallon, President, Midwest Mutual Insurance Co., Des Moines, Iowa.

Malcolm McWhorter, Vice-Pres., Vidar Corp., Mt. View, Calif.

Paul M. Merner, President, Merner Lumber Co., Palo Alto, Calif.

J. A. Migel, Charlestown, Rhode Island.

Morris Milgram, President, Planned Communities, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.

Sol Millman, Owner, National Monogram Co., Detroit, Mich.

Maurice F. Mogulescu, President, Designs for Business, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Peter B. Moore, President, LDJ, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.

David A. Moreines, President, Triplex Machine Tool Corp., Long Island City, N.Y.

Marlin W. Morgan, Vice-President, Baltimore Life Insurance Co., Baltimore, Md.

Elliott Morganstern, Secretary, Nor Jay Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

Jacob M. Moses, General Counsel, Sun Life Insur. Co. of America, Baltimore, Md.

Howard H. Murphy, Business Man., Afro-American, Baltimore, Md.

Herbert L. Myers, President, Climax Dental Supply Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

Leo A. Drey, Owner, Pioneer Forest, St. Louis, Mo.

Melvin Dubin, President, Slant/Fin Corp., Greenvale, N.Y.

Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman of the Board, First Security Corp., Salt Lake City, Utah.

Lee Eiseman, Jr., General Manager, Arundel Distributors, Balto., Md.

Henry W. Eisner, President, S. A. Levyne Co., Baltimore, Md.

Norman Eisner, President, Lincoln Graphic Arts, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Armin Elmendorf, President, Elmendorf Research, Inc., Palo Alto, Calif.

M. R. Emrich, Chairman of Exec. Committee, International Shops, Inc., Denver, Colo.

Julius Epstein, President, Worth Electric Supply Co., Houston, Texas.

Michael C. Erlanger, Chairman of the Board, Erlanger Mills, Inc., Redding, Conn.

B. A. Feldman, M. C. Feldman & Co,. New York, N.Y.

William F. Fischer, Jr., President, Fischer Machine Co., Phila., Pa.

Louis J. Frank, President, L. J. Frank Corp., San Francisco, Calif.

Robert C. Garretson, New York, N.Y.

Otto E. Geppert, Chicago, Ill.

Saul R. Gilford, President, Gilford Instrument Lab. Co., Oberlin, Ohio.

Morris Gleicher, President, M. G. Advertising Co., Inc., Detroit, Mich.

David A. Goldberg, Owner, David A. Goldberg & Son, New Haven, Conn.

Jack Gomperts, President, Calagrex, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.

Arnold Goodman, Owner, Property Management-Insurance, Racine, Wisc.

Jack D. Gordon, President, Washington Fed. Savings Asso., Miami Beach, Fla.

S. Norman Gourse, President, Gorsart Co., Inc., New York, N.Y.

Jerome Grossman, President, Massachusetts Envelope Co., Boston, Mass.

G. Stanley Grumman, President, G. S. Grumman & Associates, Inc., Boston, Mass.

T. Walter Hardy, Jr., President, The Hardy Salt Co., St. Louis, Mo.

Thomas B. Harvey, President, Thomas B. Harvey Leather Co., Camden, N.J.

Clarence E. Heller, Partner, Schwabacher & Co., San Francisco, Calif.

Al Henselyn, Vice-President, Processed Foods, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.

Ezra Himelfarb, Partner, Himelfarb Bros., Baltimore, Md.

Harold K. Hochschild, New York, N.Y.

Sidney Hollander, Sr., Past Pres., Md. Pharmaceutical Co., Baltimore, Md.

Sidney Hollander, Jr., Partner, Sidney Hollander Associates, Baltimore, Md.

Irving Hollingshead, Owner, Hollingshead Co., Moorestown, N.J.

Proctor W. Houghton, President, Philip A. Houghton, Inc., Boston, Mass.

Theodore Jones, President, WCRB–WCRQ–WCRX, Boston, Mass.

Frederick Kaufmann, President, Certified Business Forms, Inc., Newton, Mass.

Harold A. Kaufman, Vice-President, Kaufman Luggage Co., Hartford, Conn.

Edwin M. Keating, President, Ramparts Magazine, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.

L. Melvin Nelson, Hotel Owner, North Shore Hotel Co., Evanston, Ill.

Henry E. Niles, Chairman of the Board, Balto. Life Insur. Co., Balto., Md.

Earl D. Osborn, Business Exec., New York, N.Y.

R. Wilson Oster, Financial V-Pres., U.S. Fidelity & Guaranty Co., Baltimore, Md.

Seniel Ostrow, President, Sealy Mattress Co. of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.

John B. Paine, Jr., Trustee, Boston, Mass.

Stanley I. Panitz, President, Stanley I. Panitz, Inc., Balto., Md.

Augustin H. Parker, Chairman of the Board, Old Colony Trust Co., Boston, Mass.

William M. Passano, President, Williams & Wilkins Co., Balto., Md.

Harry J. Paton, Owner, Paton Photography, Balto., Md.

George T. Peck, New York, N.Y.

John Brittain Pendergast, Jr., Vice President, Southern Cross Industries, Inc., Atlanta, Ga.

Miles Pennybacker, President, Voltarc Tubes, Inc., Fairfield, Conn.

Robert B. Perry, President, Wash. Trust Co., Westerly, R.I.

Gerard Piel, President, Scientific American, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Stanley K. Platt, President, Platt, Tschudy & Co., Minneapolis, Minn.

William N. Plymat, President, Preferred Risks Mutual Insur. Co., Des Moines, Iowa.

John B. Ramsay, Jr., Exec. V-Pres., T. Rowe Price & Associates, Baltimore, Md.

William G. Raoul, President, Cavalier Corp., Chattanooga, Tenn.

Stuart Reiner, President, Teca Corp., White Plains, N.Y.

Delbert E. Replogle, Chairman of the Board, Molecular Dielectrics, Inc., Clifton, N.J.

Dudley Robinson, President, A. R. Barnes & Co., Skokie, Ill.

Joel Rothman, Secretary-Treasurer, Advance Printing Co., Inc., New York, N.Y.

Richard A. Russell, President, Northeast Leasing, Inc., Boston, Mass.

R. D. Russell, Asso. Research Dir., Marathon Oil Co., Littleton, Colo.

Arnold Sabaroff, Vice-President, Max Sabaroff & Co., Inc., Detroit, Mich.

John Saemann, San Francisco, Calif.

Erwin A. Salk, President, Salk, Ward & Salk, Inc., Chicago, Ill.

F. Porter Sargent, Owner, Porter Sargent Publications, Boston, Mass.

Ezra L. Schacht, President, Lightguard Elec. Manuf. Co., Houston, Texas.

Philip J. Scharper, Vice-President, Sheed & Ward, Inc., N.Y., N.Y.

Martin L. Scheiner, President, Electronics for Medicine, Inc., White Plains, N.Y.

Harry S. Scott, Jr., President, Harry S. Scott, Inc., Balto., Md.

Milton G. Shaller, New York, N.Y.

Robert Siegel, President, Arrow Photo Service, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Harold Silverman, President, Maid Rite Novelty Corp., N.Y., N.Y.

Charles G. Simpson, Gen. Manager, Philadelphia Gas Works, Phila., Pa.

N. L. Smokler, Builder, Ferndale, Michigan.

Robert J. Snyder, Lyntex Corporation, Rye, N.Y.

Martin Solow, President, Solow-Wexton, Inc., N.Y., N.Y.

George C. Sparks, President, Sparks Corp., Harleysville, Pa.

William E. Spaulding, Former Chairman of Board, Houghton-Mifflin Co., Boston, Mass.

Walter A. Spiro, President, Lavenson Bureau of Advertising, Philadelphia, Pa.

Armand C. Stalnaker, St. Louis, Mo.

G. Maxwell Stanley, President, Stanley Consultants, Inc., Muscatine, Iowa.

Dale I. Steele, President, National Instrument Lab., Inc., Rockville, Md.

Robert D. Stern, Exec. Vice-Pres., U.S. Shoe Corp., Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. Ian Thiermann, President, Johnson & Thiermann, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.

Lee B. Thomas, Jr., President, Vermont American Corp., Louisville, Ky.

Donald A. Thompson, President, Arthur Thompson & Co., Baltimore, Md.

Sidney H. Tomlinson, Jr., V-Pres., Tomlinson Furniture Co., High Point, N.C.

Richard Travis, Partner, Travis Oil Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

Sidney Unger, President, Kord Manuf. Co., Bronx, N.Y.

J. H. Voorsanger, San Francisco, Calif.

Ira D. Wallach, President, Gottesman & Co., New York, N.Y.

Arthur W. Wang, President, Hill & Wang, New York, N.Y.

Robert M. Way, Owner-Manager, Robert M. Way Greenhouse, Kennett Square, Pa.

R. Wehmeyer, General Agent, Lincoln National Life Insur. Co., Denver, Colo.

Eugene J. Weisberg, Exec. V-Pres., Denver, Colo.

Bernard S. Weiss, Controller, Gimbel Bros., Philadelphia, Pa.

Milton M. Weiss, Executive, New Rochelle, N.Y.

Max Wender, President, Wender Presses, Inc., Detroit, Mich.

Barclay White, Chairman, Barclay White Co., Phila., Pa.

Harold Willens, President, Factory Equipment & Supply Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

Henry J. Wineberg, Evanston, Illinois.

Thomas Yoseloff, President, A. S. Barnes & Co., Inc., Cranbury, N.J.

Exhibit 2

The Gallup Poll: 67 Percent Back Bombing of North Vietnam

(By George Gallup)

Princeton, N.J., February 25.—An overwhelming majority of the American people, 67 percent, favor continuing the bombing of North Vietnam.

The most common view of those in favor of bombing—mentioned by nearly a third—is that this is the only way to end the war. A 36-year-old aircraft worker said: "How else can we get them to negotiate? We've got to keep the pressure on them."

Among those who want to see the bombing halted, the most common reason is that too many lives are being lost in the war.

The day after the resumption of bombing, Gallup Poll interviewers were in the field asking the following question:

"In your opinion should the United States continue the bombing of North Vietnam or should we stop the bombing?" ("Why do you feel this way?")

Here are the results based on 1506 interviews:

	Percent
Should continue	67
Should stop	24
No opinion	9

UNCHECKED IMPORTS HURTING DAIRY FARMERS

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, the American dairy farmers have banded together to support the Dairy Import Act of 1967. This is evident in the letters from dairymen over the country who are writing to me and to other Members of Congress calling for the passage of this bill to slow down the import flow of dairy products. Already 42 Senators, including myself, have sponsored the bill S. 612.

If unchecked imports are allowed to come into this country, the dairy farm industry will be severely weakened. This is not merely a farm problem. The consumer will, in the long run, have to pay more for his dairy products if farmers keep leaving the farms, because there will be a shortage of milk. We can count on supplies from importers only where there is a surplus market. Naturally, the dairy products which are manufactured overseas and shipped here—products such as butterfat-sugar mixtures and cheese—are also taking business away from this country's dairy manufacturing plants. Under the present situation the Government has had to increase Commodity Credit Corporation purchases of butter and cheese, while at the same time allowing imports to flood the country.

A newspaper article I read recently put the problem in proper perspective. The article said:

> The days of milking the dairymen are numbered. With two-thirds of the nation's farmers reaching 65 within 15 years, who will replace them . . . will they be dairy farmers? The number of dairy farms in the nation has declined from 2,400,000 in 1940 to 50,000 today. At this rate there will be no dairy farms by 1980. Predictions are that the number will level off at 100,000. Tomorrow's young dairyman is not married to the farm. . . . Prices will have to be better than those of the last 14 years. . . . And unless the financial rewards for their labor and management are much greater than those of the operators they replace, the well-educated farm boys of today won't select dairying as an occupation.

The reason these farmers are going into other industries could not be simpler. They are not making enough money on the farm. Unchecked imports are a large part of the cause of this problem.

The Dairy Import Act of 1967 allows for quotas which are based on average imports of butterfat and nonfat milk solids during 1961–65. It also states that, as our markets expand, importers will receive a proportionate increase in their quotas.

This bill will certainly not prevent foreigners from shipping dairy products to this country, but it will protect a fairer share of the market for the American dairy farmers.

PROPOSED CONTINUATION OF THE TEACHERS CORPS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, yesterday the President sent to Congress his request to continue and expand the National Teachers Corps.

Since the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] and I introduced this legislation in 1965, it has received the enthusiastic support of city government officials, school administrators, and teachers.

The dedicated and imaginative Teachers Corps interns are now working in 275 inner core and poor rural school districts. Disadvantaged children are given the hope and opportunity to break out of the cycle of poverty.

I have visited Teachers Corps teams in Wisconsin. In one school in Milwaukee more than 50 percent of the students being helped by Teacher Corpsmen showed academic improvement in only a few months.

Milwaukee is asking that its Teachers Corps teams be expanded from four to 10. Racine is asking for five teams instead of one. Kenosha, which does not now have a Teachers Corps program, has asked for three teams next year.

The Congressional Record has been filled in recent weeks with similar stories of success.

President Johnson has recommended that the Teachers Corps be expanded from its present 1,200 members to 3,450 in September of 1967, and to 5,500 in September of 1968.

I am confident that after studying the remarkable record of success that the Teachers Corps has made in its first few months of operation, Congress will act upon the President's recommendation and honor its commitment to the children who so desperately need the help of the Teachers Corps.

Several days ago I received from the Director of the Teachers Corps in Wisconsin, Dr. Harvey Goldman, a letter describing their requests for the expansion of the Corps. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee,
Milwaukee, Wis., February 22, 1967.

Hon. Gaylord Nelson,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Nelson: During recent weeks I have had the pleasant opportunity of meeting with the superintendents of Racine and Milwaukee, the two school systems in which our National Teacher Corps teams are currently operating, and both have indicated highly favorable attitudes toward the concept of the National Teacher Corps and also toward the quality of work being undertaken by teams in the schools at present.

Mr. Harold Vincent, superintendent in Milwaukee, stated at the American Association of School Administrators' Convention in Atlantic City a few weeks ago that the National Teacher Corps is one of the better federally financed programs and that it holds considerable promises for dealing with some problems of disadvantaged students. In a meeting just a few days ago, he stated that Milwaukee could utilize ten teams next year (including the four teams currently in operation).

In another meeting held a few weeks ago, Dr. John T. Gunning, superintendent of the Racine Unified School District, indicated his pleasure with the National Teacher Corps operation within his school district and requested that we place five teams in Racine next year if possible (including the one team currently in operation).

Representatives from the school system in Kanoshe, Wisconsin, are also interested in having National Teacher Corps teams operate within their schools next year. I have met with them in the past and they feel that Corps members could be a valuable addition to their school staffs. In line with their feeling, they have requested three teams for the coming year.

In summary form, the requests are as follows:

Kenosha, Wisconsin: 3 teams (12 interns) and 3 team leaders.

Milwaukee, Wisconsin: 10 teams (40 interns) and 10 team leaders.

Racine, Wisconsin: 5 teams (20 interns) and 5 team leaders.

Totals: 18 teams (72 interns) and 18 team leaders.

Since we now have a total of five teams (20 interns) and five team leaders, and as is obvious from the above chart we could easily accommodate thirteen teams (52 interns) and thirteen additional team leaders.

The most significant factor to note here is that these school administrators are requesting that National Teacher Corps teams be placed in their school districts. This is as true of those who have had experience with the Corps this year as it is of those who have only heard by word of mouth of the Corps operations in Milwaukee and Racine.

When school administrators, after observing the quality of Corpsmembers' operations for a full year, are so desirous of having them work in their school districts, I find it impossible to conceive of the fact that Congress will even consider not funding the project for the coming year. My work with the interns leads me to conclude that this program represents one of the "brighter lights" in education in recent years.

Thank you for your consideration and interest shown us by your office this year.

Sincerely,

Dr. Harvey Goldman,
Director, National Teacher Corps at Milwaukee.

PEACE CORPS ANNIVERSARY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, today the Peace Corps observes its sixth birthday. I send it many happy returns, and I wish to mention, particularly, the pace-setting participation of my fellow Californians.

From the first days of the Peace Corps, California has led all other States in the contribution of volunteers. Of the 13,452 volunteers serving in 52 nations, 1,740 are from California; another 720 are now training for their overseas assignments. By the end of 1967, some 4,000 Californians will have served in the front lines of the Peace Corps global effort against disease, ignorance, and other root causes of war.

Of the five California institutions that make up the Nation's top volunteer-producing universities, the University of California at Berkeley ranks at the top, with 901. UCLA and Stanford are tied for fifth, with 387 each; San Francisco State is 12th, with 305; and San Jose State is 13th, with 304. California has also produced the greatest number of overseas staff.

Congress put aside party lines to bring the Peace Corps into existence on September 22, 1961. We have watched with pride and satisfaction as the Peace Corps has grown and matured, as the volunteers were able to prove their worth under strange and difficult circumstances. Now we are becoming aware that the benefits of the Peace Corps are touching the United States, as these people return to their places in society.

The real impact of these returning volunteers will be to impress on all of us the increasing degree to which all free nations are interdependent.

It is with pride that I observe the success of the Peace Corps volunteers and the great role played by Californians in its success.

SENATOR GORE AND THE NONPROLIFERATION TREATY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference has now reconvened in Geneva. Once more the negotiations will be dominated by the drafting of a nonproliferation treaty. Once more the search begins for a treaty formula that will reconcile the draft treaties presented by the United States and the Soviet Union. But this time other obstacles to the signing of a nonproliferation treaty have emerged. These obstacles are the interests and the uncertainties of all those countries who have the capacity to build nuclear weapons but are asked not to do so. The reasons for these uncertainties are complex; but most of the countries who hesitate fear that unless the major powers make some commitment to begin curbing their own nuclear forces, the nonnuclear states, in signing an open-ended treaty, will be giving up a great deal of leverage which might otherwise help force such a reduction.

I appreciate there are no easy answers here. I commend the President for his restraint and patience, as well as his determination to attain a nonproliferation treaty; and I wish his negotiators well. At the same time, I commend to the President's attention, and to the attention of delegates at Geneva, the suggestions offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee in a speech given on the floor of the Senate last August. I believe the analysis offered by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the obstacles before a nonproliferation treaty and his recommendations are as relevant and important today as they were 6 months ago.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the senior Senator from Tennessee, entitled "A Nonproliferation Treaty Is Urgent," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Nonproliferation Treaty Is Urgent

(Remarks of Senator Albert Gore, chairman, Subcommittee on Disarmament, on the floor of the U.S. Senate, August 18, 1966)

The late President Kennedy observed in March of 1963, that in the 1970's the President of the United States might be forced to face a world "in which 15 or 20 or 25 nations" have nuclear weapons, a situation which he regarded "as the greatest possible danger and hazard." President Kennedy's sense of urgency in dealing with the problem of nuclear proliferation was most explicit during his report to the nation in 1963 on the nuclear test ban: He said that "we have a great obligation . . . to use whatever time remains to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, to persuade other countries not to test, transfer, possess, or produce such weapons."

President Johnson has characterized nuclear proliferation as the "gravest of all unresolved human issues," thus indicating the deepest of concern.

Nor has Congress been remiss in sounding warning of this ominous threat to man's very existence. In January of this year, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island introduced a resolution commending the President's "serious and urgent efforts to negotiate international agreements limiting the spread of nuclear weapons," and urging the administration to make a supreme effort to win an anti-proliferation agreement. This resolution was wholeheartedly supported by roll call vote. The distinguished junior Senator from New York also spoke persuasively of the dangers of a further spread of nuclear weapons, as did others.

This concern of the United States has apparently also been keenly felt in the Soviet Union. This was one of the subjects in which Soviet citizens bespoke to me their interest during a recent conference in Geneva. Mr. Kosygin, in his message to the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference on the occasion of tabling a Soviet draft treaty on nonproliferation, said: ". . . If we do not put an end to the proliferation in the world of nuclear weapons, the threat of the unleashing of a nuclear war will be increased."

With so much good will, common purpose, and general concern, it must be virtually incomprehensible to the world's public that no meaningful steps to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons have been taken. Yet, all signs indicate that the current session of the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference will be as unsuccessful as its predecessors, and will return a report of total failure to the General Assembly of the United Nations in the fall.

How can we account for this lack of progress when the world faces the prospect that the future quarrels of most of the industrial nations may be accompanied by the rattling of nuclear arms? The imagination is staggered by the thought that in a balkanized Africa or Near East these fatal new arms will inevitably play a role in the resolution of disputes unless the spread of nuclear weapons is somehow checked.

In 1963 when the limited test ban was signed there was much optimism here and abroad that the way had now been opened to even more significant agreements. Yet the great promise of that time has not been realized. No doubt the conspicuous absence of Communist China and France from the discussions at Geneva, the preoccupation of the United States with the war in Vietnam, the frictions in NATO, and the present attitude of the Soviet Union with regard to existing NATO defensive arrangements, have all contributed to the general paralysis of the nonproliferation discussions. Nonetheless, Mr. President, I firmly believe that if the United States and the Soviet Union were to clarify and redefine their purposes and policies with regard to a nonproliferation treaty, agreement might be achieved. I strongly urge that such an effort be made.

The current negotiations in Geneva have been characterized by shadow boxing. The official positions of the United States and of the Soviets, as reflected in the draft treaties which have been tabled, are unrealistic. We surely could not accept the proposal advanced by the Soviets, nor, in my opinion, should we reasonably expect them to accept ours.

Indeed, when we review the record and compare the draft treaties there is little wonder that the present impasse appears total and seemingly unyielding. Can this impasse be broken without damaging the vital interests of all the participants at Geneva—be they nuclear or non-nuclear powers, with or without the capacity to develop a national nuclear force? I suggest there may be a way if the United States and the Soviet Union would precisely clarify for themselves and the other participants in Geneva their objectives, their priorities and final positions in a nonproliferation agreement. The Soviet record on the proliferation issue thus far has unfortunately been more notable for propaganda than any real willingness to negotiate.

If one examines the Soviet draft treaty on nonproliferation, it is clear that the language they presently propose is patently designed not only to foreclose the Western option for the possible future creation of a collective nuclear force, but to disrupt and ultimately destroy existing nuclear arrangements which are the backbone of NATO's defense. For example, the Soviet treaty demands of the parties to the proposed treaty that they "shall not acquire control over nuclear weapons or over their emplacement and use for units of their armed forces or personnel thereof, even of such units or personnel that are under the command of a military alliance." Such demands are totally unacceptable to the West. If agreed to, these provisions would destroy the vital role of our NATO allies in the defense of Europe. It would also aggravate the problem of nuclear proliferation by forcing the Western

European Nations to develop their own nuclear strength for protection.

Surely the Soviets must know—and if they don't we should explicitly state—that the United States cannot and will not, under present circumstances, agree to the dismemberment of NATO, which, notwithstanding passing irritations, constitutes the cornerstone of the defense of Western Europe and is fundamental to United States foreign policy. We shall not sacrifice Western Europe upon the altar of Soviet suspicions, in the name of nonproliferation, or otherwise. Demands for the wrecking of present NATO alliance arrangements go far beyond the maintenance of the status quo. Such demands are simply wholly unacceptable.

But, Mr. President, the Soviet Union is not alone in its lack of realism at Geneva. The United States has also contributed to the impasse by sticking with a negotiating position that is something less than clear.

As I read the text of the United States draft nonproliferation treaty submitted at Geneva last August and amended this spring, it seems to me that the noblest of intentions has somehow been obscured, if not disabled, by uncertainties of policy. As now drafted, this treaty seems to be attempting to blend unblendable ingredients in an effort to hold open options that will most likely not be picked up, at least by the United States Congress. By insisting on a nonproliferation treaty which would hold open the option of the future creation of a joint European deterrent, presumably with United States nuclear support or participation, the United States has built the other side of a diplomatic log jam holding back progress on a nonproliferation agreement.

If I sound at all critical of the United States efforts to reach international agreement prohibiting the further spread of nuclear weapons, it is not criticism of the urgency with which we have pursued such an agreement. In his message to the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference when it reconvened last January 27th, President Johnson made our position clear and unequivocal when he said: "We are prepared to work with other countries to assure that no non-nuclear country acquires its own nuclear weapons, gains national control over nuclear weapons, or receives assistance in manufacturing or testing nuclear weapons." For this statement, I commend the President.

Despite this clear statement of purpose, the Soviet Government has accused the United States of submitting a draft nonproliferation treaty which they contend is nothing more than a mask designed to open the way for the United States to give the West Germans nuclear weapons. What the Soviet Union objects to most strongly is the language in the United States draft treaty tabled last year and revised in March which would permit formation, at some future date, of an Atlantic Nuclear Force or some other variety of a multilateral force within NATO.

There may be persuasive reasons for the United States to hold open the possibility of the development of such a force. But it has been challenged by our allies, as well as by the Soviet Union. In the case of France, resistance to such an idea seems total; as for the British and most of the European countries represented at Geneva, I detect no enthusiasm for such an arrangement. That Britain would not co-sponsor this draft treaty is some indication of British sentiments on this point. Indeed, Lord Chalfont, the British disarmament head, has said that the American draft treaty leaves open options which Britain would rather see closed. Thus, there is created the strong impression that the United States seems determined to hold open an option in anticipation, or perhaps only in hopes, that European enthusiasm for a collective nuclear force will be greater than it is today.

This is certainly a defensible point of view, but is it worth a stalemate on a nuclear nonproliferation treaty? That, for the United States, is a critical question. The answer may be "yes" and if it is then perhaps we should put aside our efforts to obtain a nuclear nonproliferation treaty until we and the Europeans decide whether nuclear sharing arrangements are really in the vital security interest of the West. If the answer is "no," however, we should reconsider a position that is vulnerable on grounds of logic and fully exploitable by those who would make propaganda at our expense before a collapse of the conference is permitted to occur.

The United States has argued—and the point is valid—that our existing NATO arrangements are wholly consistent with the principles of nonproliferation. Of this there can be no doubt; our present program of training of and consultation with our NATO allies on nuclear matters, coupled with the complete control of the use of NATO's nuclear weapons, is a positive brake on the spread of nuclear weapons. Moreover, the administration has constantly reiterated the intention of the United States to maintain strict and unyielding control of our nuclear weapons. Secretary of Defense McNamara has recently reaffirmed the United States Government's determination that there will be no change in this situation. Is it either desirable or necessary, then, to table and to defend against Soviet hostility, against the resistance of non-aligned nations and to the general discomfort of our Western allies, a draft treaty that holds open an option that we professedly have no intention of exercising? If what prevents progress on a nonproliferation treaty is the American desire to hold open the door for a collective European nuclear force—such as the ill-fated MLF—then let us seriously consider giving the Soviets formal assurance that we are prepared to reconsider this position if, and only if, the Soviet Union is prepared to reconsider its demands that present NATO arrangements be broken.

If it would ease the difficulty of making such a decision, let me say that I detect no eagerness in Congress to permit the transfer of ownership or control of nuclear weapons to any nation or association of nations. And without Congressional approval no such plans could ever be implemented.

It might be argued that such a course would constitute a concession by the United States in closing the door to a future course of action in return for mere Soviet acquiesence in an arrangement already in effect. But are we making a concession, or only being realistic, in forgoing a possible course of action which, for different reasons, has failed to command solid support either in our own country or among our NATO allies?

The United States should now weigh carefully the advantages and disadvantages of further efforts in the pursuit of a nonproliferation treaty. I suggest that real interest in a nonproliferation treaty may best be tested by a generalized treaty—simple in form—which makes no attempt to hold open options for the future, but binds the parties neither to give nor to receive nuclear weapons or the skills with which to manufacture them. One cannot be certain that such an agreement will stop the spread of nuclear weapons—but it would be, it seems to me, a major step, a major achievement. And, perhaps more importantly, such an agreement could possibly set the stage for other agreements—such as a halt in the production of nuclear weapons, and the establishment of nuclear free zones—areas in which it might then be possible to make general progress in the direction of disarmament.

But we cannot walk the last mile—or even the first mile—alone. We will take this walk, let it be known, in step with Russia or not at all. If such a treaty is to become reality, then, the Soviet leaders must abandon their present position of demanding the dismantling of NATO's present nuclear arrangements. Both the Soviet Union and the United States must be satisfied with maintenance of the status quo vis-a-vis the United States and Russia if the world is to have a breathing spell in the seemingly relentless spread of nuclear weapons power. If all the Soviet Union really wants is to foreclose a change in the nature of our nuclear relationships with Europe that would involve nuclear sharing arrangements, then I have hopes that a nonproliferation treaty is yet attainable. If, however, the Soviet Union insists upon seeking to fragment the Atlantic Alliance and frustrate the United States' attempt to deepen mutual understanding of the problems implicit in the nuclear defense of Western Europe, then we might as well put aside efforts to achieve a nonproliferation treaty until the Soviet Union accepts the fact that NATO will not be sacrificed for this purpose—or any other. In the interest of peace, though, we owe it to ourselves and to the world to test true Soviet intentions by making clear our own.

I suggest, therefore, that the United States Government consider sounding out the Soviet Union on the possibility of a generalized treaty wherein the major nuclear parties concentrate on constructing barriers to a further spread of nuclear weapons rather than "keeping doors open" or alternately "nailing them shut." Time and the evolution of the world's great political and economic regions will solve the problems of political unity and the role of nuclear weapons in regional arrangements. Other treaties can be renegotiated if future circumstances require.

But let us not sacrifice a solution of such a pressing problem of today in the interest of somehow anticipating tomorrow's political developments.

I have faith that with genuine good will on all sides a nonproliferation treaty may yet be achieved. Let us find out whether the Soviet Union's expressed interest in a nonproliferation agreement is more than a shallow attempt to disrupt the Western Alliance, or expose it as such.

At the same time we clarify our own position on a nonproliferation agreement and test the interest of the Soviet Union, let us not forget that such an agreement would be a critical act of national self-denial on the part of potential nuclear countries. I refer here to nations such as Israel, India and West Germany. The nuclear powers at Geneva cannot expect these countries to impose permanent restraints upon themselves unless progress is made in the general disarmament field. Nations will be reluctant to deny to themselves permanently that which such nations as the United States and the Soviet Union consider vital to their security. Therefore, I believe that serious consideration should be given to the idea of a nonproliferation agreement with a definite time span—say ten years—subject at the end of this period to renegotiation or renewal. I believe that such an arrangement would be attractive to those nations concerned over the implications for their own security of an open-ended treaty. During the time a treaty is in force, nations with special problems such as West Germany could see if such an agreement would bring in its wake an international atmosphere wherein Germany's national problems would have a better chance of resolution. On the other hand, other nations such as India or Israel would have time to see if their strong desire for substantial progress in the general disarmament field meets with any success. Moreover, such a provision for automatic renegotiation might well allay apprehensions which the United States and the Soviet Union may legitimately have about the impact of such a treaty on future political developments not now foreseen.

To be sure, this is a limited objective, but it makes a start, and a start must be made. In order to make genuine progress in the disarmament field, I believe that some form of atomic moratorium is necessary. And a nonproliferation agreement could provide that moratorium.

One question that will be raised is that of Communist China and France. Probably neither will sign such an agreement. Under present circumstances, we could not even enter into a treaty with the Communist Chinese government which we have not recognized, at least in a formal diplomatic sense. This formality would not, I am sure, be permitted to obstruct a constructive agreement, should China become so disposed. But France and Communist China are already nuclear states and it appears reasonable to assume that both would share the desire of the nuclear powers at Geneva that further proliferation be halted—if only because it would dilute their own nuclear advantage. Whether these two nations will participate in general disarmament discussions is a real question. I have no way of predicting their receptiveness to participation in general disarmament discussion which, hopefully, would follow a nonproliferation agreement. But I suggest that it is in such an atmosphere that we have the best chances of bringing the Communist Chinese and French to the disarmament table. This is a goal of highest priority, or so it seems to me.

Mr. President, I do not hold out these proposals as a revolutionary cure-all. They are offered simply as one possible answer to the challenging question of what more is there that we can and should do. The means I have suggested—a generalized nonproliferation treaty with a definite duration—may not be the only answer. But I offer it as one suggestion to help break the present impasse. Nevertheless, whatever the means, I strongly believe that if a solution to this formidable problem is to be found within the bounds of practical international politics, the United States must reevaluate and then redefine its national priorities. Once we decide whether we place a greater value on a nonproliferation treaty, or, alternately, holding open nuclear options for Europe, we can then test the Soviet Union's scale of priorities. Do they really want a nonproliferation treaty or are they content with propaganda attacks on present NATO nuclear arrangements? We both have a choice to make. Let us begin to make that choice.

It seems to me that the questions I have raised merit exploration. I have invited the Secretary of State to appear before the Disarmament Subcommittee to discuss the nonproliferation negotiations, and arrangements are being worked out for his appearance at an early date.

PRIZE-WINNING ESSAY BY MARGARET HASSE, VERMILLION, S. DAK.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, our South Dakota Voice of Democracy contest winner, Miss Margaret Hasse, of Vermillion, has written an essay that effectively expresses her convictions relative to some of the challenges and hopes that lie ahead for America.

I ask unanimous consent that the essay be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Democracy: What It Means to Me

The Ministry of Truth was startlingly different from any other object in sight. It was an enormous pyramidal structure of glittering white concrete, soaring up, terrace after terrace, three hundred meters into the air. Picked out on its white face in elegant lettering were the three slogans of the Party: War Is Peace, Freedom Is Slavery, Ignorance Is Strength.

George Orwell's *1984* is the great modern classic of "Negative Utopia"—not a drama of what life might be . . . but a nightmare of what it is becoming.

The world of *1984* is one in which eternal warfare is the price of bleak prosperity, in which the Party keeps itself in power by complete control over man's actions and his thoughts. As the lovers Winston and Julia learn when they try to evade the "thought police," and then join the underground opposition, the Party can smash the last impulse of love . . . the last flicker of individuality.

Let Americans beware: *1984* is more than a satire of totalitarian barbarism. Its message is intended for democracy, too.

"But the United States?" he protests vigorously. "Why in America, democracy offers me many freedoms. And Americans tolerate people whose opinions or race is different. We speak our own thoughts. I am able to thrive under my equal opportunity—I can develop freely to my fullest capacity! Democracy!" he repeats reverently.

Whose voice is speaking?

Probably the echoes of an average American—an average American who doesn't quite remember the words to the National Anthem and who is often negligent about displaying the stars and stripes. You might find him at home on election day. Oh, but he's neatly dressed and a law-abiding citizen.

I can tell you who he is not: he is not an atheist or a Jew; he's not Japanese, not a beatnik, not Mexican, nor an ex-convict; he's not a Negro.

Yet this average American stated patriotically: "We tolerate minorities"—with the white cross of the Klu Klux Klan on him. "We thrive under equal opportunity"—with a "No Jews Allowed" sign. "We have the power to develop freely to our fullest extent"—with "dirty Injun" on our lips.

"Freedom is Slavery": the party's slogan stands before us.

Perhaps I sound unpatriotic, but then my intentions have been misinterpreted. I only intend not to laud democracy as something that it isn't. And it is not a perfect government, wholly unblemished by flaws. The government is constructed with people—people who have petty dislikes, faults, and shortcomings, as is the nature of human beings.

What, then, does democracy mean to me?

I believe democracy to be the best attempt on earth at a government by the people, characterized by tolerance toward minority, freedom of expression, and regard for the dignity of the individual, with equal oppotunity for each.

Because democracy allows for a man to be a non-conformist and a thinker, as no other government permits, the tragedy of "Freedom is Slavery" portrayed in *1984* will never engulf the United States.

The hope can be realized by recognizing, as Orwell's book teaches us, the danger of a society of automatons who will have lost every trace of individuality, of love, of critical thought.

The hope is when Americans know that democracy is not perfect because man is not perfect, but that this form of government attempts perfection in freedom, equality, responsibility, and rights.

The hope is when Americans recognize that democracy has succeeded remarkably well.—
Margaret Hasse.

ARMY CORPS WILL UTILIZE ON-SHORE DISPOSAL SITES FOR CHICAGO AREA DREDGE MATERIAL

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we in Indiana and Illinois—the Lake Michigan area—are pleased with the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration and Army Corps of Engineers announcement that they will use on-shore disposal sites for dredge material from channel clearance in the Little Calumet River area.

Other areas of the Great Lakes are not so lucky; alternative sites for dumping their dredge material are yet to be determined.

Last summer I called upon the Corps of Engineers to stop dumping into Lake Michigan because this activity was further contributing to our already critical pollution control problems. Although we knew that the corps dredge activities were vital to keeping our ports and channels open, we were alarmed by the ramifications of this nutrient laden dredge material to the water pollution cycle in the Great Lakes.

During the 1967 dredge season, in the Chicago area, the corps will utilize dump deposits on shore and investigate with the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration the possibilities of diking, treatment, or on-shore sites in the other Great Lakes areas.

I call upon the local and State officials of the neighboring Great Lakes ports to work with the corps in helping to find alternatives to dumping these dredge materials into the Great Lakes.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the Department of the Interior and Department of the Army joint statement on the dredging.

There being no objection, the joint statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Joint Public Statement by the Departments of the Interior and Army Regarding Dredging on the Great Lakes

The Department of the Army and the Department of the Interior have reached agreement on a program and plan for attacking the problem of the disposition of polluted material dredged from harbors on the Great Lakes. The agreement covers an interim program, effective immediately for calendar year 1967, and a permanent plan of action to be implemented as rapidly as alternate procedures can be developed, tested and funded. The Federal agencies charged with carrying out the agreement are the Corps of Engineers for the Department of the Army, and the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (FWPCA) for the Department of the Interior.

By acts of Congress, the Corps of Engineers is responsible for improvement and maintenance of the waterways of the United States in the interest of navigation. These waterways are life-lines of America's growth, industrial might and prosperity and their proper maintenance is an exceedingly important responsibility of the Corps. The Corps of Engineers recognizes that considerable time will be required before complete treatment of municipal and industrial waste will prevent the introduction of pollutants to the waterways. During this time a means must be found to keep the waterways open. Doing so involves dredging of polluted material. The Corps is therefore studying alternate procedures for the disposal of the polluted dredging resulting from these industrial and municipal wastes.

The Department of the Interior (FWPCA) by Congressional acts has the responsibility to enhance quality and value of all water resources and to carry out, in cooperation with State and local governments, a national program aimed at the prevention, control and abatement of water pollution. Additionally, by Executive Order No. 11288, the Department of the Interior shall provide technical advice and assistance to heads of other Departments, who are to provide leadership in the nationwide effort to improve water quality through prevention, control and abatement of water pollution from Federal Government activities.

The two agencies agree that joint effort is required for the development of acceptable alternative disposal means with the ultimate objective of providing leadership in the nationwide effort to improve water quality through prevention, control and abatement of water pollution by Federal water resources projects.

In order to maintain navigation, the Corps of Engineers will proceed with dredging in calendar year 1967 on 64 of the 108 channel and harbor projects in the Great Lakes. A list of these 64 projects is given at the end of this release. While some of these projects are seriously contaminated, disruption of local and national economies would result if dredging were to be deferred this year; and alternate disposal methods cannot be developed and funded in time. Detailed observation and measurement of the polluting characteristics will be jointly conducted by the two agencies during the dredging operation. These observations will include water and material sampling at the dredging site before and after dredging operations and selected sampling en route and at disposal areas with the objective of evaluating the effects of the operations. The analysis of the samples will be done by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. These studies will serve to guide plans for alternate methods thereafter.

For the longer range permanent plan, the Corps of Engineers will initiate a pilot program of experimentation in March 1967. An amount of $1 million has been made available for this program during fiscal year 1967, and the President's budget includes $5 million for continuation of the program during fiscal year 1968. The purpose of this program is to develop, with the aid of consultants, the most practicable methods for management of pollution problems related to dredging operations on the Great Lakes that will be consistent with the objectives of cleaning up our rivers and lakes. The Department of the Interior is in agreement with the pilot program and will participate in it. The pilot program will investigate all alternate disposal methods, such as alongshore diked areas, disposal at some distance inland from the shore, and treatment methods, and evaluate pollution abatement results.

Five localities have been selected for institution of the pilot program. The Green Bay project, where scheduled disposal in an away-from-shore land site will permit development of acceptable means of treating the polluted drainage from such an area; the Cleveland project, which has a high pollution index and where a favorable opportunity exists for field experimentation with the dike types; Toledo; and Detroit's River Rouge where existing near-shore diked areas are in use and where the Toledo site represents an intermediate pollution index; and Great Sodus Bay where there is a low pollution index. In the Chicago area, the use of onshore disposal areas shows great promise and such areas are being actively explored in connection with the forthcoming maintenance dredging on the Calumet River. The work at these selected areas in 1967 will provide a full-scale test of ways for filtering the liquids draining back into the lake from such areas, as well as confining the solids.

When acceptable alternate methods of dredge disposal have been agreed upon, and at the earliest possible time, the Corps will take appropriate budgetary action to secure the necessary funds. This may require substantial funds programmed over a period of several years.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration will contribute to the pilot study effort by providing leadership in the development and implementation of an effective program for measuring the pollutional efforts of the materials to be dredged. Skilled personnel, as well as fixed and mobile laboratory facilities of that agency, will be made available to analyze these materials for chemical, biological, physical and other characteristics and thus determine the effectiveness of the various methods proposed.

In carrying forward the nationwide Federal-State-local program to prevent, control and abate pollution in our rivers, lakes and coastal waters, the Department of the Interior will further utilize all of its resources and powers in the support of measures which prevent pollution *at the source.* By June 30, 1967, the States will submit quality standards and plans for their implementation for approval by the Secretary of the Interior. As State plans of implementation get underway, it is expected that the quantity of polluting materials from municipal, industrial and other sources deposited in navigable waters will be drastically reduced. Thus, the pollutional effects of dredging will be reduced in direct ratio to the success of the nationwide control effort and improved methods of spoil disposal.

The agreement announced today reflects the determination of the two agencies to present an example of what the Federal Government must do to help preserve the incomparable values of the Great Lakes Water resources.

ESTIMATED DREDGING REQUIREMENT—CALENDAR YEAR 1967

Lake Ontario Projects: Rochester Harbor, N.Y.; Oswego Harbor, N.Y.; Great Sodus Bay Harbor, N.Y.; Little Sodus Bay Harbor, N.Y.

Lake Superior Projects: Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. & Wis.; Ontonagon Harbor, Mich.; Big Bay Harbor, Mich.; Cornucopia Harbor, Wis.; Grand Traverse Harbor, Mich.; Keweenaw Waterway, Mich.; Presque Isle Harbor, Mich.; Whitefish Point Harbor, Mich.; Little Lake Harbor, Mich.

Lake Michigan Projects: Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. & Ind.; Indiana Harbor, Ind.; Green Bay Harbor, Wis.; Two Rivers Harbor, Wis.; Kenosha Harbor, Wis.; Muskegon Harbor, Mich.; Ludington Harbor, Mich.; Frankfort Harbor, Mich.; St. Joseph Harbor, Mich.; Grand Haven Harbor, Mich.; Manistee Harbor, Mich.; Waukegan Harbor, Ill.; Michigan City Harbor, Ind.; Manitowoc Harbor, Wis.; Sturgeon Bay & Lake Michigan Ship Canal, Wis.; Menominee Harbor, Mich. & Wis.; Holland Harbor, Mich.; New Buffalo Harbor, Mich.; Racine Harbor, Wis.; Port Washington Harbor, Wis.; Kewaunee Harbor, Wis.; Pentwater Harbor, Mich.; Saugatuck Harbor, Mich.; South Haven Harbor, Mich.; Charlevoix Harbor, Mich.; Sheboygan Harbor, Wis.; Milwaukee Harbor, Wis.; Manitowoc Harbor, Wis.; White Lake Harbor, Mich.

Lake Erie Projects: Cleveland Harbor, Ohio; Toledo Harbor, Ohio; Lorain Harbor, Ohio; Sandusky Harbor, Ohio; Fairport Harbor, Ohio; Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio; Black Rock Channel & Tonawanda Harbor, N.Y.; Conneaut Harbor, Ohio; Huron Harbor, Ohio; Erie Harbor, Pa.; Monroe Harbor, Mich.; Rocky River Harbor, Ohio; Dunkirk Harbor, N.Y.; Bolles Harbor, Mich.

A decision respecting Buffalo Harbor will be made at a later date.

Lake Huron & Connecting Channels Projects: Channels in Lake St. Clair, Mich.; Detroit River, Mich.; St. Clair River, Mich.; Saginaw River, Mich.; Rouge River, Mich.; Alpena Harbor, Mich.; Cheboygan Harbor, Mich.; AuSable Harbor, Mich.

THE NEED FOR QUALIFIED EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I should like to speak about yesterday's Presidential education and health message, for I am particularly encouraged by his emphasis on the training of teachers and others within the education profession. This program must be supported.

An adequate, well-trained teaching staff is absolutely essential to insure the desired quality of educational opportunities for all children and to assure the success of the Federal educational programs which are now in operation.

The recent report transmitted by the Commissioner of Education to the President and Congress on the availability of education opportunities contains many valuable facts. It demonstrated that of the outward characteristics of schools—facilities, programs, and teacher staff—teacher quality has the greatest effect upon pupil achievement, especially where increased achievement is most needed, among the educationally disadvantaged.

Last year many school officials stated that the most crucial problems encountered in making Federal-aid programs meaningful was the lack of skilled personnel, able to do the job. About 34,000 additional, qualified teachers are needed to meet the demands created by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, of 1965, as amended. Without these skilled people, this law will not succeed.

The need for highly qualified persons in education is also felt at the college level. Student enrollments between 1930 and 1960 increased on an average of 45 percent every 10 years. During the present decade, the enrollment will more than double. Approximately 60,000 new college instructors are needed each year to meet the increased enrollments.

The Federal Government has been active in supporting the training of teachers and other educational personnel; however, this has been done through a number of diverse programs. What is needed is a coordinated and flexible approach that is broad enough to cover all levels of education, all subject matter, and all professional levels.

Therefore, I urge Senators to support the various legislative proposals which are encompassed within the Presidential message.

URBAN IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on January 23 I proposed an urban action program, and introduced a number of bills to improve life in the cities of America. Since then, many newspapers have commented on these proposals. I have been pleased by this response and ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 5, 1967]

To Rescue the Cities

The recent proposals made by Senator Ribicoff of Connecticut for reorganizing Federal agencies dealing with urban affairs go far beyond an administrative reshuffle. On the basis of hearings before his subcommittee on the crisis of the cities, Mr. Ribicoff was really issuing a summons to this country to make a commitment of money and talent, on a large scale and over a long term, to the solution of persistent poverty and urban blight.

Bureaucratic conflict and overlapping exist, and they need to be corrected. But they are much less of a problem than inadequate funds and shortsighted Congressional requirements. The Economic Development Administration, for example, was specifically created to provide new jobs in areas of high unemployment or low family income. It is authorized to make direct loans for 65 per cent of the money needed by firms starting plants in depressed areas.

Why has E.D.A. had so little impact? Although Congress originally authorized $170 million annually for this loan program, it last year appropriated only $56 million. Since $10,000 of private investment is needed to create a single job, that appropriation committed the nation to the creation of a mere 5,600 jobs. Moreover, Harlem or Watts or Southside Chicago cannot qualify at all because they are only sections of large cities, and those cities do not qualify as "economically depressed."

Senator Ribicoff proposes an immediate increase in the program to "at least $1 billion a year," as well as subsidized interest rates for private loans, Government guaranteed loans, and a start on regional economic development planning. The Federal Government, in his view, should be not only a "lender of last resort" to the businessman who cannot raise enough private capital but also, as the National Commission on Technology recommended, it should be the "employer of last resort" for persons who cannot find private jobs.

As for the physical rebuilding of the nation's urban areas, Senator Ribicoff urges that the next three years—and the money now authorized—be devoted to planning, experimentation, and small demonstrations. Then, in 1970, instead of limiting the program to approximately sixty model cities, he would have the nation undertake a ten-year program to eliminate the physical blight in *all* urban areas at a total cost of $50 billion.

This sum, although it seems awesomely large, is less than the cost of the Interstate Highway Program or of the probable total cost of placing a man on the moon. It is a justifiable expenditure, well within the nation's economic capacity. But is this Congress prepared to move in any of these directions? The preliminary soundings suggest that a majority of the members would rather use the secondary problem of administrative reorganization as a pretext to avoid the national commitment that many Americans in addition to Senator Ribicoff see as the highest need.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 28, 1967]

Agenda for the Cities

Local government has, for all practical purposes, vanished in the great centers of population. Its disappearance is one of the great causes of the isolated, disorganized character of the modern urban slums. These slums are the very example of the absence of any relationship between the government and the governed. For many Americans, the smallest and nearest unit of government is a city or county with hundreds of thousands of citizens. The city of Washington, for example, now has more people than any of the states at the time that the Constitution was ratified; it has more people than 11 of the states today. But no new level of politics has been introduced in the cities to re-establish the local political life that was once held essential to healthy American communities.

Senator Ribicoff, in his speech on the cities, proposed neighborhood development corporations, limited to areas of 50,000 people, within the great urban agglomerations. He suggested using these corporations to run activities like basic education and small-business assistance. The idea extends the concepts of the neighborhood centers established under the war on poverty and of the model neighborhoods under the Demonstration Cities Act. The neighborhood ought properly to be not merely a unit of administration from above, but an element of genuine influence and decision from below.

The neighborhood is the level at which to carry out many of the employment and housing programs that Senator Ribicoff outlined. The Senator's forceful and imaginative agenda for the cities offers a highly useful guide to Congress in dealing with the legislation of the next two years. The rebuilding of the cities begins with the rebuilding of the neighborhoods.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times, Jan. 24, 1967]

Ribicoff: Housing Now!

As Senator Ribicoff sees it, for thirty-five years the nation has acted as if each individual problem of its society could be solved by adopting a new program.

The approach, he explains, has been programmatic, not systematic.

Yet, in society's interrelations, the time has come when nothing less than a systematic conception of action will do. There is need for an entirely revised view of responsibility and commitment at the federal level.

That is the sound of the opening salvo of the Senator's proposed urban action scheme, of which the first part is a 10-year, $50 billion assault on the 4.5 million units of substandard housing in all cities during the decade of the 1970s.

He suggests that for the next three years and with the entire $924 million authorized for the Model Cities program, a vast research and planning job be done, aimed at the systematic elimination of slums and resultant human blight from the American scene.

His proposal calls for inducement of private capital to flow into the clearance and improvement job; consolidation of all related federal programs related to the issue, and the maintenance of decent minimum environmental standards for everyone.

Senator Ribicoff losses nothing by his boldness.

The problem of rehabilitating the nation's cities is so huge that, "blue-sky" in nature as his ideas are, they fit the dimensions.

And despite the occasional improvement in the skylines of our cities as redevelopment projects are completed, the haphazard application of such measures only emphasizes the insufficiency of the current programs.

The Senator is thinking not only of metropolises but of the smaller centers, with populations of 10,000 to 50,000, as well. Some of the most dismal and disturbing decline and human hopelessness exist in such surroundings.

Senator Ribicoff has the right perspective. He has introduced certain precise recommendations to draw together means for a systematic handling of modern social concerns.

Some will still prefer to go at the task in a fragmented way, unsure that the nation has the means to do otherwise, or unaware of the ultimate cost if the problem is not tackled now on its own huge grounds.

We think that although Senator Ribicoff's proposal still must be refined and perfected, his is the realistic attitude and his the practical type of approach.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, Feb. 2, 1967]

Senator Ribicoff and Model City Program

Senator Ribicoff might well set himself up as prophet after forecasting what was going to happen to the government's model city program. In announcing his own program to eliminate slums he said that the Administration's model city program would develop into a vast competitive game with one city trying to outdo the other. In New York this week at a meeting of municipal representatives 600 government people got on the mark to take off for the race.

They were there at the invitation of the U.S. Housing and Urban Development Department. The main speaker said cities haven't been given specific details on how to qualify for the program and described the briefing merely as "an attempt to give the philosophy of the program." The government spokesman while creating a quite amorphous situation said it was up to the local communities to lay out their ideas. "This is the responsibility of the governments of the communities to make it work."

In his speech ten days ago Senator Ribicoff contended that the program as it now stands "establishes a competition among cities that is basically unfair because it forces some hairline decisions in choosing the few over the many." That is precisely what is now happening. Under the Ribicoff plan the Model Cities program would be reshaped to provide all cities that wanted to participate with the opportunity to do so.

There is another angle to this program that makes this competitive aspect even more unfair. Those cities that are in pretty good shape usually have alert and responsive political leadership. Cities like Hartford that have such leadership are already in much better shape than some slum areas where the leadership is lacking. Yet it is in precisely these same areas where the need for the model city or slum clearance programs are most needed. In other words, as these programs continue it is likely that among cities the good get better and the poor get poorer all the time.

There is nothing like good local leadership to get things done. But as the anti-poverty program has amply demonstrated local leadership is not always responsive to the public need. There is need also for supportive leadership from the top in those areas where the needs are greatest. In Senator Ribicoff's opinion we should begin planning now for the elimination of substandard housing and ghettos in "an orderly, intelligent fashion rather than experience another pell-mell dash to Washington before the federal dollar runs out." Looks as though the pell-mell dash is started.

[From the Danbury (Conn.) News-Times, Jan. 26, 1967]

An Imaginative Program for the Competent City

Sen. Ribicoff has presented to the Senate an imaginative program to improve American cities. He wants the "competent city" in his "action program for urban America."

He introduced several bills to carry out his proposals, which he developed after the extensive hearings conducted by his subcommittee on executive reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations.

His program has five main points:

1—Guaranteed job opportunities, with expansion of private and public job markets.

2—Attaining and maintaining a decent home in a decent environment for every American.

3—Encouragement of private investment in the rebuilding of cities.

4—Emphasis on neighborhood development and more involvement of the individual.

5—Application by the federal government of modern techniques of management and organization to urban problems.

Senator Ribicoff pointed out that much of the latter can be done through administrative reorganization, rather than requiring new laws.

His detailed statement—it took up 20 pages in the Congressional Record along with texts of the bills and favorable comments of several other senators—should be must reading for everyone concerned with the future of America.

That future is in urban areas, which in the East alone now overlap one another from north of Boston to south of Washington.

Sen. Ribicoff pointed out that the subcommittee hearings had "examined both sides of the urban coin." And found on one side the highest standard of living known to man, a strong and growing economy, high wages and record employment.

The other side, he said, is "etched with the acid of despair. There is an urban America seething with discontent, erupting in violence, rotting at the core of its cities, bound with the chains of problems too long unsolved and too massive to be ignored."

His program would work toward solving the problems on a concentrated, overall basis.

While much has been undertaken in recent years by the federal government, it is much only in contrast to the inaction in former years. And the approach has been on a "demonstration cities" or piecemeal basis.

Sen. Ribicoff's call for concentrated, overall action drew warm support from a number of senators.

Sen. Kuchel of California called his statement "excellent and provocative," and Sen. Randolph of West Virginia "a very comprehensive picture."

Sen. Proxmire of Wisconsin called it one of the three or four most significant speeches he had heard in his 10 years in the Senate.

Their warm support, however, will not be enough. The demands of the Vietnam war and other federal programs make it all too easy for others to describe Sen. Ribicoff's program as too expensive for the country to undertake at this time.

But the problems the Connecticut senator so clearly outlined will not go away. They will only increase in size and complexity.

A start must be made to solve them. Sen. Ribicoff has pointed the way.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, Jan. 25, 1967]

Mr. Ribicoff's Plan To Rebuild Cities

Senator Ribicoff's 10 year, $50 billion plan to end substandard housing in American cities is both comprehensive and imaginative. Its aim, boldly stated, is "to eliminate the slums of America today and build the competent city of tomorrow." Mr. Ribicoff's program is the result of prolonged hearings of the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee of Government Operations. This group spent most of its time inquiring into the federal role in urban affairs.

Aside from its social implications which are great, Mr. Ribicoff has once more set himself apart from President Johnson and the Great Society. In this report, in fact, he calls the drive toward the Great Society, "the end, not the beginning of an era." The implication here is plain: That the Great Society is merely a continuation of the New Deal and is therefore out of date for an affluent society no longer staggering in the depths of a depression. In thus pointing out different goals and different mechanisms for reaching them, from President Johnson's, Mr. Ribicoff again gives the impression of being allied with the Kennedy faction.

Mr. Ribicoff sets out five principal objectives: 1. Guaranteed job opportunities through an expansion of public and private job markets. 2. Achieve and maintain the standard of a decent home in a decent environment for every American. 3. Encourage private investment to play a more active role in rebuilding cities. 4. Involvement of the individual and emphasis on neighborhood development. 5. Reorganize the Federal Government to apply modern techniques of management and organization to the problems of today. Mr. Ribicoff admits that his program calls for the most massive and complex domestic goals this nation has ever set. And he must be realistic enough to realize that with the present temper of Congress, and probably so long as the war in Vietnam continues to be our albatross, there is little chance that an economy-minded Congress will embark on this program. Yet it is a program that should not be filed and forgotten. The problems Mr. Ribicoff outlines are real and they are growing. And, as he points out the "demonstration city" program of the Johnson Administration is a piecemeal approach that sets city against city in a frantic rush to get in there first and get the most money.

Congress over the years displays convulsive reform motions in response to public problems. These are invariably followed by periods of reexamination and cautious reappraisal. Speaker Mansfield has already outlined this course of action for the 90th Congress, following the convulsion of the last Congress with its flood of social legislation. Mr. Ribicoff's program is idealistic and that is a virtue, not a fault. The alternative to it is not pleasant to contemplate. The question is not whether, but when?

[From the Greenwich (Conn.) Time, Jan. 25, 1967]

Ribicoff Proposal

Once again Connecticut's junior senator, Abraham A. Ribicoff, has captured the headlines. First it was with his now-famous automobile safety campaign. Now it is with his proposal for a broad reshuffling of key Great Society programs. He urges this, he says, to strengthen the federal government's attack on the many problems facing our cities. Sen. Ribicoff has made the plight of the cities almost as important in the public's mind as auto safety. It will be remembered that he presided a few months ago at a series of Senate sub-committee hearings into every major aspect of the so-called urban dilemma.

Sen. Ribicoff would not jettison any of President Johnson's domestic program but, instead, would shift the emphasis in various ways. All this to change much of the federal approach to the cities. For example, he would give new authority to the Department of Housing and Urban Redevelopment. He would bring the scattered manpower programs together and he would establish a 10-year, $50 billion plan to eliminate and rebuild the 4.5 million substandard housing units that now exist in metropolitan areas throughout the nation.

The Connecticut Democrat was careful to point out that while he approved of the Great Society programs he felt they represented what he called "the end of an era." The time has come, he said, for a new approach to social problems. He was critical of the Johnson programs not because of their objectives but because, in his view, some of their methods had become outmoded and even irrelevant. Once again, then, we see Sen. Ribicoff taking pains not to be misinterpreted as breaking with the Johnson Administration. He was accused of just that some time ago. Nonetheless, it is apparent that if he had his way, he'd do a lot of things differently than the President. In any event, what he now proposes to reshape the Great Society deserves careful consideration and perhaps even by President Johnson himself.

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican, Jan. 25, 1967]

For Better Jobs

We don't see how Sen. Ribicoff's proposals to reshuffle federal aid for urban redevelopment could do anything but improve their administration.

As outlined by the senator his plan calls for the major antipoverty programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity to be transferred to other agencies. The federal government's various manpower programs he suggests should be consolidated and administered by the Labor Department.

At present there are manpower programs scattered among three departments with a combined budget of about $2.1 billion a year.

Mr. Ribicoff plans to introduce legislation to accomplish this merging of programs, in accordance with a proposal made recently by the President's Manpower Policy Task Force.

Chief area of change in the senator's streamlining operation would be the Office of Economic Opportunity, which at present administers the antipoverty program. It would lose the Job Corps and various work-training, study and experience programs.

It is here, in the area of providing technical training for a potential labor force of men and women who are at present unemployed precisely because they lack skills, that Waterbury's greatest needs lie.

The jobs are here. Given the job training they need to remake their lives before it is too late, these men and women will be happy to surrender their relief payments for pay checks.

Sen. Ribicoff's proposals represent a summary of conclusions reached in the course of six weeks of hearings held last year by the Senate subcommittee on executive reorganization, of which he is chairman.

We're glad to see the recommendations include periodic review of programs to measure their effectiveness. These reviews would be conducted by an Office of Legislative Evaluation, to be established under another bill he plans to introduce.

We are hopeful that the administrative reshuffling urged by the senator will prove to be considerably more than a paper maneuver. Waterbury needs the strengthening and revitalizing of its antipoverty programs that Mr. Ribicoff expects to follow from the departmental reorganization.

[From the Reformer & Vermont Phoenix (Brattleboro, Vt.), Feb. 8, 1967]

Ribicoff Versus City Slums

Connecticut Senator Ribicoff, a former Democratic governor and ex-secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, has topped off long hearings on the problems of cities by proposing that Congress okay a bundle of programs to rebuild slums. Ribicoff, who has gone further than the Johnson Administration in recommendations to reverse urban decay, not only would give local government a shot in the arm by financing neighborhood development corporations, but he would bring the private sector into significant harmony with the growing involvement of the public sector in cleaning up the metropolitan centers.

Specifically, the Senator would enlist private enterprise by having the Federal Government guarantee loans made to those willing to invest in depressed cities—and underwrite part of the interest rate, too. A combination of several approaches to the rapid decay of American cities will likely be necessary for success. But, this approach deserves thoughtful attention in the lawmaking halls of Washington. J.F.

[From the Manchester (Conn.) Herald, Feb. 2, 1967]

Ribicoff's Big Speech

The most helpful part of Senator Ribicoff's big speech on the cities last week may very well be its look back at how Federal planners have failed so often to solve the nation's social problems.

Mr. Ribicoff is particularly well equipped to speak on this matter. A subcommittee he heads has been holding extensive hearings on the subject of cities. Better yet, he has had first-hand experience as a Washington problem-solver; he once headed the sprawling Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. So it's only natural that he would propose a vast reorganization of the Federal bureaucracy to bring closer together all the many agencies that now have to do with cities. Washington's administrative mess has made an impression on the Connecticut Democrat.

It takes much more than splitting up and tying together Federal agencies, however, to salvage what is basically a bad philosophy. The proliferation of Federal programs to do this, that, and the other thing—on the city, the farm, and everywhere in between—is a symptom of what is wrong, not the cause. And here is where Senator Ribicoff has given the Washington bureaucrats something to think about, if they care to.

"For 35 years," he said, "we have acted as if each individual problem in our society—large or small—could be solved by passing a new program." Plainly, to Mr. Ribicoff and a lot of other people, most new programs failed to live up to the promises made for them.

But the old ways have their adherents, not only in Washington but elsewhere.

On the day Senator Ribicoff was reading his indictment of the New Deal-Great Society philosophy, Mayor John Collins of Boston was in the nation's capital for a panel discussion on urban affairs. He said the senator's criticism would "serve nothing and no one." "There is no point," said the mayor, "in characterizing and emphasizing the mistakes of the past."

There is much point in doing so. Sometimes the best constructive criticism is of the destructive kind, and mistakes have a way of being repeated over and over again. The repetition can continue, in fact, for 35 years—or longer.—NATIONAL OBSERVER.

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post, Jan. 27, 1967]

RIBICOFF ATTACK ON OEO

Sargent Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity, which has command of the war on poverty, has come under a barrage of criticism leveled by Senator Abraham Ribicoff. It would not be surprising if the OEO eventually beats a hasty retreat and surrenders much of its power.

The bureaucratic thinking of the OEO, its failure to coordinate programs involving billions of dollars have been spotlighted by the senator. The neighborhood has been forgotten, Senator Ribicoff charges, in the confusion of concern with metropolitan, regional and national relationships.

"We have not accomplished effective coordination at the federal level and the coordination function given OEO has largely been ignored," asserted the senator.

The OEO was put in the ticklish position of carrying out jobs that normally would fall within the jurisdiction of existing agencies. Without riding herd over these agencies, the OEO was expected to stimulate them to action. The assignment is all but impossible.

Now, Senator Ribicoff notes that other government agencies regard the OEO as a competitor and therefore are difficult to direct and coordinate. He suggests transferring the OEO's community-action programs to the Housing and Urban Development Department, leaving Mr. Shriver's agency to experiment with neighborhood-uplift activities.

If Senator Ribicoff has his way, the OEC Job Corps and other manpower-training programs would be switched to the Labor Department. If this kind of change is made, it would be logical to transfer the Head Start program to the Health, Education, and Welfare Department.

The President himself admits that the war on poverty has been handicapped by administrative failures. Billions of dollars that could have benefited communities have been wasted by bungling.

THE NUCLEAR-POWERED SHIP "SAVANNAH"

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Maritime Administration, on January 24, announced that the nuclear-powered ship *Savannah* will be withdrawn from operation in August of this year.

The *Savannah* was launched with much fanfare and a cost to taxpayers of some $50 million as the initiation of a new era of peaceful use of nuclear energy and a new chapter in the history of the American merchant marine. Now, a relatively short 8 years later, the project is being abandoned, and the *Savannah* is being ignominiously put in mothballs.

I am asking the Maritime Administration for a complete report on this decision and the economic consequences that it entails, including how present operating costs compare with the costs of deactivating the ship and defueling its nuclear reactor.

I would also like to know what will be the consequences of the dispersing of its highly trained crew and what this may mean to the future of nuclear-powered merchant marine vessels. And finally, I would like to know why we are now faced with this situation.

When the ship was being planned, were none of the problems that have plagued the unhappy history of the *Savannah* anticipated? Were no surveys of the use of the ship or estimates of operating costs made?

Were these problems unavoidable, or was this a case of lack of administrative foresight and bad management?

The planned withdrawal of the *Savannah* is not only significant in itself, but is, I think, a manifestation of the existing sorry state of our country's merchant marine.

The Vietnam situation has highlighted how very important the merchant marine is to this country. Yet the decline of our merchant marine continues unabated. The distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the Committee on Commerce, recently pointed out some of the disturbing trends of our declining merchant marine. We now carry only 8 percent of our foreign waterborne trade. While the world fleet has increased by 61 percent in the last 15 years, America's privately owned fleet has decreased by almost a quarter. Today only some 100 of the nearly 900 American merchant ships can be considered "modern." It seems to me that our existing maritime policy is like a ship with neither rudder nor anchor; we have been in a state of drift.

It is reported that the administration is in the process of developing a new policy in an effort to remedy the situation. I look forward with great interest to seeing the results of this effort and will give it a great deal of study.

It is certainly time that we faced up to this problem and gave it the attention it deserves.

I ask unanimous consent that the article and editorial on this subject, published in the New York Times, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 27, 1967]

WHITE HOUSE MAPS MARITIME SWITCH IN 5-YEAR PROJECT—BOYD SEEKS LABOR SUPPORT OF AGENCY TRANSFER FROM COMMERCE TO TRANSPORT—INDUSTRY IS RECEPTIVE—$2.5-BILLION PROGRAM WOULD OVERHAUL 250 VESSELS AND HELP ADD 150 CRAFT A YEAR

(By David R. Jones)

BAL HARBOUR, FLA., February 26.—The Johnson Administration is developing a new five-year maritime program that would enable it to put the Maritime Administration under the control of the Department of Transportation.

Alan S. Boyd, the Secretary of Transportation, has described the plan in recent days to maritime leaders here and in Washington. He hopes to have the program ready to send to Congress by the end of next month.

Authoritative sources said the program had met with a rather friendly reception from shipping operators. But they said it had run into strong opposition from ship builders and labor.

NOT ENOUGH INFLUENCE

The sources said that Mr. Boyd, who was here yesterday for a second private visit, talked with labor leaders about his proposals and was trying to convince the maritime interests that supporting him was the only realistic way to obtain a program.

The sources said he had conceded that they could block his plan but argued that they did not have enough influence to push their own program through Congress without Administration backing.

The Administration bill that set up the Department of Transportation last year called for inclusion of the Maritime Administration in the department, but this was eliminated by Congress.

When President Johnson signed the bill last Oct. 15, he said one of its deficiencies was that it did not include the Maritime Administration. He said he hoped that "as experience is gained in the new department," Congress would re-examine its decision to leave the Maritime Administration outside the Transportation Secretary's jurisdiction.

ENLARGEMENT URGED

The President's proposal for this action was attacked by various maritime groups, especially the unions. Backers gave up the fight to include the Maritime Administration when it appeared they might lose the bill entirely.

The sources, both here and in Washington, said the current program called for the enlargement and overhaul of 100 ships now in the Reserve fleet, the reconditioning of about 150 Victory ships being operated to Vietnam by Military Sea Transportation Service and the construction of 15 new ships a year in United States yards.

The 100 enlarged ships, which would be returned to the Reserve fleet for emergency use rather than be put into operation, would be improved at Government expense. The construction of the 15 new ships a year, representing an increase of two annually over the current level, would receive a 55 per cent subsidation from the Government.

The program would also provide for United States shipping companies to build additional vessels in lower-cost foreign shipyards. But for the first time it would permit such ships, flying the United States flag and using American crews, to obtain operating subsidies to compete with foreign vessels.

The sources said the program would also liberalize significantly the restrictions that exist on foreign-built ships, permitting them to carry foreign aid and defense cargo and to operate in coastal trade. Foreign built ships now cannot operate in coastal trade and can only carry foreign aid and defense cargo if brought under the United States flag for at least three years.

EASING OUT EXPECTED

The program makes no mention of passenger vessels, which the sources took as an indication that the United States would be eased out of the passenger trade. There is a provision, however, for the construction of three new nuclear-powered ships.

The sources said the use of operating subsidies would be extended to nonsubsidized scheduled operators. Some suggested that the subsidies might be expanded to new ships built by other nonsubsidized carriers, but this was not certain. Most companies would be given wider latitude in the trade routes they followed, and the ports they could serve.

The procedures for calculating operating and construction subsidies would be simplified, the sources said. The Government's control over such business decisions as ship design, construction and operation would be relaxed.

The legal provisions whereby United States flag ships are guaranteed at least 50 per cent of all United States foreign aid and 100 per cent of defense cargo will be continued, the sources said. But they said United States ships would be required to offer a rate within 5 per cent of that offered by foreign ships before taking into account the United States subsidy, to get the aid business.

COST NOT CLEAR

There was no firm statement of the program's cost, but the initial outlay for enlarging and modernizing 250 ships seemed likely to push the price above the $450-million now being spent on shipping. The enlargement program alone could cost more than $250-million, and sources said the total program might exceed $2.5-billion over five years.

The program would probably include the creation of an independent subsidy board within the Maritime Administration to make decisions on subsidy disputes, the sources said. The present board's decisions can be overruled by the Secretary of Commerce.

The sources said, however, that a fundamental idea of the program was to transfer control of the Maritime Administration from the Commerce Department to the Transportation Department.

Mr. Boyd and the White House favor this, but labor wants an independent agency, free of a department Secretary's full control, and says it will surrender that point only in return for safeguards that there will be an expanded maritime program.

TWO REPORTS USED

The program borrowed ideas from two major maritime reports sent to the White House in 1965. One report was killed by political opposition from labor and management. The other was an expansionary program that was not acceptable to the Administration.

Administration sources said that their aim was to develop a strong merchant marine with greater productivity and a "reasonable" level of employment that would permit the United States to increase its share of foreign trade at a lower subsidy level.

Some labor sources said they believed that the program amounted to a reshuffling of subsidy money rather than any significant new commitment to a greater merchant marine. They said the program was designed to begin the gradual elimination of all maritime subsidies.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 1, 1967]

BEACHING THE "SAVANNAH"

To have laid up the Flying Cloud, pride of the clipper fleet, in her heyday in the mid-nineteenth-century period of American maritime greatness would have been a major nautical heresy and a gross economic misjudgment.

Today, the modern equivalent of the Flying Cloud—the only nuclear-powered merchant vessel in the world, the Savannah—will soon be warped, unless a reprieve saves her, into some brackish backwater because she cannot operate competitively.

The tentative decision to lay up the Savannah, after only four years of labor-plagued operation, dramatizes the prodigious problems of the United States merchant marine and demonstrates the urgency of the President's long-promised statement on maritime policy. Alan S. Boyd, Secretary of Transportation, has told industry and union leaders that he hopes to have the Administration program ready for Congress late this month. Details which have already leaked make it plain that the program will be highly controversial, but the important element is that it will serve as a spur for debate and needed action.

Only about 8 percent of America's foreign trade is carried in American bottoms; the United States ranks a poor tenth among the nations of the world in merchant ship construction. The unsubsidized portion of the merchant fleet—the bulk-cargo carriers and dry-cargo tramp ships—are diminishing in number and obsolescent in technology.

Seventy per cent of the merchant fleet is overage. To meet the relatively small needs of the Vietnam war 149 ships—many of them in sad condition—have been taken out of the reserve fleet; but difficulties and delays have attended the entire operation.

To state the problem merely emphasizes its complexity. Part of the fault rests with Secretary of Defense McNamara and his aides who have downgraded the importance of a strong and modern merchant marine. Shipyards and labor unions have almost priced the merchant fleet out of business.

Where subsidized operators have built advanced, automated cargo carriers—container ships, roll-on-and-roll-off cargo vessels and high-speed, small-crew ships with revolutionary new cargo-handling equipment—featherbedding and union disputes have nullified some of the economies new technology was designed to permit.

Drastic "solutions," such as the hiring of civil service crews or operation of some merchant ships by the Navy, have been proposed. The entire subsidy program needs reassessment. Many ship operators have shown themselves more interested in what the Government could do for them than in what they could do for the Government.

Many voices cry "havoc," but there is no consensus on cure. The direction of maritime policy has been divided, uncertain, incomplete. The President's program should provide the basis for rational evaluation of what is needed to combat the decay of the merchant marine.

SAM PRYOR, RETIRED VICE PRESIDENT OF PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRLINES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it is a distinct pleasure for me to join the senior Senator from Washington in extending warmest greetings to my old and dear friend Sam Pryor, retired vice president of Pan American World Airlines, on the occasion of his 69th birthday.

While the winds of March are descending on Washington, Sam is being warmed by the more temperate winds of Hawaii. I envy him; but he has certainly earned all of the pleasures that retirement can hold.

His achievements as a chief executive of Pan American and his noteworthy career as a public servant constitute a distinguished record of accomplishment of which he can be very proud.

All of us who are fortunate enough to number Sam Pryor as a friend have only the highest respect, and admiration for him.

I know that all of Sam's friends in Connecticut join me in extending congratulations, and best wishes for many more happy and healthy birthdays.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S FARM PROGRAM FAILURE HURTS BADLY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon the Department of Agriculture released its latest figures on agricultural prices. A brief glance at them reveals some hard and discouraging facts of farm life. The parity ratio declined one point from a month earlier to 74, while the index of prices paid for commodities and services rose two points to 339, an all-time high. The index of prices received declined another three points to 252. The parity ratio figure for 1934 was 75. Today it is 74, even though we are in the midst of a wartime economy, whereas in 1934 our Nation was drought ridden and in deep depression.

With these facts in mind, it was quite enlightening to read two articles in a recent edition of the Omaha World-Herald. The first, by Washington Correspondent Darwin Olofson, states that Secretary Freeman is now "exploring with other Federal agencies the whole broad question of defense and other Government contracts in rural areas." What a revelation this is. It is tantamount to a stark admission from Mr. Freeman that his program has failed so miserably that he must turn to defense and other Government contracts to bail him out. It is an act of a desperate man who has run out of ideas on how to improve farm income. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the second article recounts a White House luncheon for farm leaders at which President Johnson cited farm income gains while appealing for continued support of his farm program.

The President apparently stated that gross farm income was up over 30 percent from 1960 and that per capita farm income has increased at a faster rate than the income of others. Of course, the President had to be quite selective in the figures he used. He referred only to gross farm income, not net farm income. He had to ignore soaring farm production expenses to make his claim. And he could not compare farmers' income directly with others because after 7 years of Mr. Freeman's programs, it is still less than two-thirds that of the nonfarmer, notwithstanding the fact that Government subsidy payments have increased over 700 percent in 7 years—from about one-half billion dollars in 1960 to $3½ billion for the current fiscal year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article also be inserted at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. HRUSKA. It is high time, Mr. President, that this administration back off from its planned depression for the farmer. It is high time that it abandon its power play to vote-rich urban centers by artificially holding down farm prices with its dumping and other manipulating practices. It is high time the Secretary of Agriculture got down to business and cleaned up his own barnyard rather than looking on the other side of the fence.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Feb. 21, 1967]

FARMS FEEL LEFT BEHIND—FREEMAN NOW SEEKS MILITARY CONTRACTS

(By Darwin Olofson)

Midwest Congressmen long have complained that their part of the country has been short-changed on Federal contracts and installations.

The Department of Agriculture now apparently is taking up the cudgel, not just for the Midwest, but for rural areas generally.

Citing the concentration of prime military contracts in such states as California, Secretary Orville Freeman said:

"The Department of Agriculture is in the process of exploring with other Federal agencies the whole broad question of defense and other Government contracts in rural areas.

"When new public installations—Federal, state and local—are planned, consideration should be given to the advantages of placing some of them in rural areas rather than in large metropolitan areas."

Mr. Freeman feels the country is hampered by the lack of a national policy on what he calls "rural-urban balance."

Urban areas now cover only about 1 per cent of the land in the United States, he points out, but they have 70 per cent of the population.

He obviously believes a broader population distribution would be desirable.

"Dispersal of population more widely over the continent in no sense implies a 'back to the land' movement," he says, adding:

"Potential growth centers are widely dispersed.

"Approximately two-thirds to three-fourths of our rural population lives within 50 miles, or commuting distance, of one of these potentially viable growth centers."

His views on population dispersal tie in with the idea of channeling more Government contracts and facilities into rural areas.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Feb. 21, 1967]

"BRIGHTER DAY FOR FARMER," L.B.J.: GOOD PROSPECTS FOR HIGHER INCOME

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson said Monday the nation's farmers have a bright future even though their income is lagging behind other segments of the economy.

He spoke at a White House luncheon for 107 farmers and leaders of farm organizations who are delegates to a national farm conference called by the Administration to muster support for continued Federal agricultural programs.

Gross farm income in 1966 was more than 30 per cent higher than it was in 1960.

"Per capita, the income of farm people has increased at a faster rate than the income of others," the President said, "but farmers were still about nine hundred dollars short of equality with the rest of the country last year."

CHILDREN'S ASTHMA RESEARCH

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, as a cosponsor with my colleague from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] of Senate Joint Resolution 4, which authorizes the President to proclaim "National CARIH Asthma Week," it gives me a great deal of pleasure to present for the consideration of all Senators an article from the February 25 issue of the Saturday Evening Post. This article sets out in very eloquent terms the work that is being done for asthmatic children at the Children's Asthmas Research Institute and Hospital in Denver, Colo.

Perhaps the most dramatic example of the fine work done at CARIH is illustrated by the fact that the institute's baseball team, the "Asthmatic Nine," won the baseball championship in their league in Denver last summer. When we take into consideration the fact that these children, mostly fifth and sixth graders, competed against healthy children from the Denver public schools and community centers, and came to Denver with varying degrees of severity of asthma, this is an even more dramatic victory for these asthmatic youngsters.

Mr. President, I think this article demonstrates clearly the importance of the work done at CARIH, and I hope it will serve to bring about the speedy passage of Senate Joint Resolution 4. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KIDS WHO CONQUER ASTHMA

(By Steven M. Spencer)

Hidden in a pile of stones on top of Mount Morrison, in the Rockies west of Denver, sits a gallon jar containing a list of names—Stanton Chew, of San Francisco; William Heinig, of Chicago; Jack Lazar, of Windsor, Ontario; Mike Gallagher, of Henrietta, N.Y., and some 30 more. Each summer the list lengthens as new groups of hikers toil up the trail, lift a few rocks off the cairn, reopen the jar and proudly add their signatures.

Thousands of youngsters climb mountains every year; and except for the sense of achievement that surges through them there is nothing very remarkable about it. But the kids who planted their names on Mount Morrison did so to mark a crucial turning point in their lives—lives which often had been swathed in the soft, cottony wrappings of caution and overprotectiveness. Some of them, before coming to Denver, had never walked to school alone, much less climbed a mountain. Most had lived in panicky fear of the penalties of overexertion. All of them carried, though concealed now like spare socks in their rucksacks, the label of chronic, severe and intractable asthma.

The hikers were resident patients of the Children's Asthma Research Institute and Hospital (shortened to C.A.R.I.H.), a free, privately operated establishment in Denver. For many years it was known as the Jewish National Home for Asthmatic Children, but it is nonsectarian. In its cluster of small buff-brick buildings on a 17½-acre campus it houses and treats, for periods of one and a half to two years, 165 of the most difficult asthma patients (ages 6 to 16) encountered by doctors all over the United States and in many foreign countries. A hand-lettered sign outside one residence cottage room reads: NO BUDY HERE ONLY MOSHE FRANKEL, HAIFA, ISRAEL.

The cairn on Mount Morrison is not the only symbol these youngsters have raised in triumph over near-invalidism. Most of them participate in C.A.R.I.H.'s full sports program, which includes competition with healthy children from Denver's public schools and community centers. Last summer the "Asthmatic Nine," mostly fifth- and sixth-graders, won the league baseball championship.

The team's youngest member was eight-year-old Mark Campbell, of Orange, Calif. Allergic from birth and racked by asthma from the age of one and a half, Mark had never been able to play ball at home. Yet a few months after arriving at C.A.R.I.H. he was displaying his new-found talents at second base and in the outfield. In a 33-to-3 walkaway over the Jewish Community Center Dodgers last August, just before his ninth birthday, Mark chalked up four runs and, in his own words, "stoled from first base all the way home."

Such records are genuine miracles for youngsters whose lives had previously been ruled by a steady stream of such maternal admonitions as:

"Don't play too hard."

"Don't get too hot."

"Don't get excited."

These warnings have not all been without justification. The asthmatic child teeters on a precarious ledge. A few grains of pollen, a nibble of chocolate, a single peanut, a romp with a dog, a family argument over neglected homework—any of these may pitch him into a dangerous bout of wheezing and gasping for breath. His face turns blue, and in panic he cries out for help. Usually he can be brought around with a few puffs of bronchodilator medicine from a nebulizer, one or more adrenalin injections, or, if those don't work, a mad dash to the hospital. But each year in this country 5,000 in such asthmatic attacks end in death.

Asthma affects some 5,400,000 persons in the United States of whom more than three million are children up to 16. And the problem continues to grow. A Boston allergist has reported that children's hospital admissions for acute asthma have doubled there and in several other cities since 1960. Allergies are involved in a majority of cases, and many patients have both hay fever and asthma. As in other allergic conditions there is a strong hereditary tendency. Polluted air, infections and emotional disturbances are major contributing causes. But the psychological factors are so difficult to weigh, and all the troublesome ingredients are so subtly intermixed, that much of asthma is a mystery and each patient is an individual puzzle.

The symptoms are produced by a sudden narrowing of the smaller bronchial tubes in the lungs. This narrowing may result from muscle spasm, from swelling of the tissues, from mucus plugs or from all three. The victim struggles with all his strength to draw his breath in and force it out. The National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, which allocates over nine million dollars a year to research in allergy and related immunology, warns that repeated asthmatic attacks may eventually cause a stretched-lung condition known as emphysema and may place an extra load on the heart.

The majority of asthmatic children are kept under fair control by bronchodilator medicines, by avoidance of allergenic foods and by injection of pollen and dust extracts to reduce their sensitivity. But about 10 percent are so seriously afflicted that they gain little help from any therapy. These are the refractory or intractable cases—about 300,000 in this country—from which C.A.R.I.H. and 13 smaller homes in the United States and Canada draw their 625 patients.

Nearly all chronic diseases disrupt family life, but few can match asthma in its demand on the patience and resources of the parents. They drag the sick child from doctor to doctor, try one medicine after another, move to what they've been told is a more favorable climate, exhaust their savings and run up debts, resent the fruitless expenditure of money and then feel guilty about feeling resentful. The youngsters miss weeks or months of school. ("I missed all of the fifth grade, half of the eighth and half of the ninth," a 14-year-old California boy told me.) Frequent respiratory illnesses and sharply restricted diets leave many children frail and scrawny. About one in five of those on prolonged therapy with cortisone and related hormone products is severely stunted in growth by these drugs. Frustrated by their inability to keep pace and by their exclusion from normal fun and games, the asthmatic children become irritable and tense, and their emotional episodes touch off more attacks of asthma.

How to break this cycle is the challenge being taken up by the residential research and treatment centers, among which C.A.R.I.H. is the pioneer and world's largest, and the one to which many of the most stubborn cases are brought. In Tucson, Ariz., 13-year-old Connie Swanick, a sweet, poised, freckle-faced child who aspires to be a ballerina, had been fighting asthma since she was three. Her family had been advised to move from their old home to a new house in a supposedly more dust-and-pollen-free suburb, but Connie did not improve. She was so chronically short of breath that she attended school only half days and spent the afternoons in her air-conditioned home. Excitement, contact with animals, being away from home and suddenly finding she'd forgotten her medicine—any of these situations would throw Connie into an asthmatic attack. On family outings—she is one of eight children—she was often left at home for her own protection.

Finally, early last year, Connie was brought to Denver. "I was homesick at first," she said later, "but now I love it." Connie now plays freely and goes on hikes. Her hopes about ballet, dimmed at home because asthma prevented her from taking lessons, have revived. "And if I can't become a professional ballet dancer—after all, thirteen is pretty old to start—I'd like to take it just for fun, and study to be a doctor," she says.

Just what happened in Denver to quiet Connie's asthma? How does C.A.R.I.H. transform intractable "cases" into healthy, vigorous, near-normal youngsters? First, the doctors appreciate the complexity of the disease. They know that a child is seldom allergic to just one thing but is explosively reactive to many elements of his environment. He suffers, as a New York psychiatrist once put it, from an "allergy to life." One secret of C.A.R.I.H.'s success is that so many aspects of the child's life are changed all at once. Suddenly, he is free of the old household allergens and family frictions. "We've jokingly said the rate of improvement seems proportional to the distance traveled," observed C.A.R.I.H.'s medical director, Dr. Constantine J. Falliers.

Although all the patients have long histories of severe asthma, and 90 percent are on cortison-type drugs when they arrive, the vast majority of the whole group—about 80 percent—are rehabilitated at Denver. Fewer than 25 percent continue to require corticosteroids and are classed as "steroid dependent," and even for them the dosage levels are usually tapered down. About 40 percent can be controlled with milder forms of medication. And what is most astonishing, 30 percent of the arriving patients—the so-called "rapid remitters"—begin to improve the moment they step off of the plane and stay well with almost no medication for the rest of their residence period.

"It may, of course, be partly the change in climate," Dr. Falliers says. "Denver is five thousand feet high and the air is fairly clear and dry, although recently it has become smoggier and this may be why the proportion of 'rapid remitters' has declined somewhat."

However, Dr. Falliers knows that questions cannot be left half-answered if the improvements the child makes in Denver are to be maintained when he goes home. Although the word "cure" isn't used, follow-up studies are continued for at least two years after the children return home from C.A.R.I.H. and show that 80 percent maintain a remarkable degree of improvement, and many never suffer another asthmatic episode.

In dealing with a disease that fluctuates notoriously from hour to hour, day to day and season to season, the C.A.R.I.H. doctors find it essential to observe everything. The large and closely organized staff includes 8 full-time pediatricians and allergists, 7 psychologists, 17 nurses, 20 house parents, 5 night attendants, a dietitian and her helpers and a number of research chemists and laboratory technicians. These skilled observers note the way the young patient eats and plays and sleeps. Some of them are making a study of dreams as a possible trigger of night attacks. They watch how a child reacts to exercise and games and other children. A program is under way to monitor several hours of his daily routine with microphones that pick up his conversation and his breath sounds. Are asthma symptoms more often touched off by anger and aggression, the doctors ask, or by anxiety and withdrawal?

The research tasks are endless. Just the symptoms alone may present a confusing combination of factors. "A child may eat eggs in the winter without bad effects," Dr. Falliers points out, "but if he eats an egg during the August ragweed season, he may have trouble. He may have even more trouble if at the same time he gets into an argument with his parents about why he can't go swimming. By feeding all the data into computers, we can detect the interplay of many factors. We can see the variations in biological rhythms, the daily, weekly or monthly changes that may, for example, suggest that medication is more effective at one hour of the cycle than at another."

The total environment at C.A.R.I.H. provides a kind of instant therapy. The new arrival, previously alone in his terrifying battle for breath, is immediately sustained and encouraged by 164 other youngsters who have successfully faced the same threat, and whose lives are obviously now freer of restrictions than his own has been.

Everything is at hand to cope with an emergency, and the young patients know it. At the first hint of trouble the child may leave a baseball game, run to the hospital in the center of the grounds, take a few deep breaths from a "neb" (a bronchodilator nebulizer), rest for several minutes and then dash back to the game. Even the severe night attack, which at home often meant a terrified child, a distraught family, a struggle for breath during the long ride to the hospital and an oxygen tent, is here dealt with simply and calmly. The child who feels his symptoms coming on climbs out of bed, pushes a button near the dormitory door to flash a light alerting the nurses, and walks with his house parent the few steps to the hospital.

Nor is there panic in class. C.A.R.I.H. children attend public schools—and their teachers know all about asthma and have medication on hand.

At times familiarity breeds a youthful contempt for the common enemy, an almost reckless disregard that calls for adult measures of caution. This is true especially of the boys, who predominate here in a ratio of 2½ to 1, about usual for asthma.

"I've watched these kids at ball games," a nurse said. "Sometimes they'll turn blue and almost fall on their faces before they'll ask for help."

A typical C.A.R.I.H. experience was that of Howard Kipnes, a slender 15-year-old with an engaging grin, who returned home to the Bronx last summer after 20 months in Denver, six inches taller and a lot healthier.

"Howard had never really known anyone with asthma before he went out there," explained his mother, Mrs. Irving Kipnes. "And when he saw boys who had been worse off than he, but who were able to do so many things without having attacks, that made a lot of difference in his attitude."

In Denver, Howard played baseball and basketball, swam and went on camping trips. "We weren't coddled out there," he said. "If you coddle kids too much they don't get enough exercise, and exercise is what helps us. It's what improves our breathing capacity."

Mrs. Kipnes smiled. "Yes, but there were times when you had to be coddled. When you were about six years old you asked me one day—you were having a terrible time getting your breath—whether you were going to die."

Although it costs $6,000 a year to house and treat a child at C.A.R.I.H., the parents are not charged. They supply only $20 or $30 a month for clothing and spending allowances. The institution's support comes almost entirely from private contributions, including about half a million dollars a year raised by a nationwide network of 140 women's auxiliary chapters.

A happy discovery most patients make as they settle into the life at C.A.R.I.H. is that they aren't allergic to as many things as they thought. On the wall of the big, sunny kitchen is a blackboard where Mrs. Jo Ann Pegues, a dietitian, keeps an up-to-date list of who can't eat what.

"Usually when a child first comes in he has a whole list of things he is allergic to," she said. "Then as the doctors test and study him the list narrows down to two or three items.

"No one here gets peanuts or peanut butter. But next to that there are more fish and egg allergies than anything else. We've had as many as 30 children sensitive to fish at one time."

Few threads in the puzzling skein of allergic asthma are so snarled in notions, unproved theories and rampant controversy as this business of food. At C.A.R.I.H. the task of straightening out the tangle has been assigned to a brisk, outspoken young pediatrician named Edwin Bronsky.

"Some doctors say all intractable asthma is due to food allergy," he told me. "Others believe that 40 percent is directly caused by food and 40 percent has some connection with food. And a few doctors are positive asthma is *never* caused by food. All of them get together at conventions and argue. So we are trying here to find out just what part food does play."

In an effort to get an exact picture, Dr. Bronsky is placing a few children at a time on a program in which he knows the ingredients of every bite of food each consumes. He can then watch closely to see what symptoms or measured differences in breathing follow.

Virtually all species of family pets, with the possible exception of goldfish and turtles, are assumed allergically guilty until proven otherwise. But so strong are personal attachments for a dog or cat that parents will sometimes refuse to give it up, or will deny its existence when filling out an application for a child's admission to the treatment center. One family replied "none" to the dog-or-cat question, only to be found out later when their son, discussing with a C.A.R.I.H. doctor the parents' forthcoming visit, asked, "Can they bring Spot with them?"

Parent-child relationships have long been the favorite hunting ground of the psychologists and psychiatrists. Many have discussed the effect, in asthma, of a type of "smother-love" that originally flows from concern about the youngster's health but eventually expresses itself in oversolicitous or overrestrictive behavior. Some parents, on the other hand, have been described as resentful of the burden that the child's asthma places on them, or as holding an ambivalent attitude of love and rejection.

Today's debate often focuses on whether the emotional tensions between parent and child are primary causes of asthma or are only secondary effects which then enter into the cycle that aggravates and perpetuates the condition. The C.A.R.I.H. physicians and psychologists believe asthma is a heterogeneous symptom, and that it is important to identify for the individual patient which factors are primary and which secondary. They don't see parent-child emotional conflicts in every case, but in many families the evidence is so clear that they recommend psychological counseling for parents and child.

A youngster from the Midwest illustrates the common theme of the child whipsawed between conflicting parental attitudes toward him. The father was a violent, overbearing and demanding man, and insisted on high academic marks. The mother was clinging and overprotective. Neither parent would admit his own faults, and each blamed the other for the child's problems. "Donald is afraid of his father," the mother told a psychiatric interviewer. "No wonder he wheezes and gasps." Said the father, "I'm sure I've had nothing to do with his symptoms. But my wife simply spoils the boy, and that's why his asthma doesn't get better." Donald, timid, shy and in the middle, was made to feel guilty because his asthma caused so much parental wrangling, and yet the only way he could stop the painful, accusatory quarreling was to bring on asthmatic attacks to divert their attention.

The fact that so many children suddenly improve when separated from their parents is seen by some observers as proof that family stresses and conflicts are, indeed, a major causative element. "Our ultimate goal," says Dr. Falliers, "is the happy and healthy reunion of child and family. But we believe that temporary separation is helpful to the parents as well as to the child. Most parents need a rest. And getting the child away does relieve tensions and permit the family to settle down, take a fresh look at things and perhaps develop a calmer atmosphere for the child to come home to."

Searching for helpful leads in the parent-child relationship, a C.A.R.I.H. psychologist, Dr. Kenneth Purcell, compared the parents of the "rapid remitters," with parents of the "steroid dependent" youngsters, those who continued to require medication. He discovered that the parents of the "rapid remitters"—those who get better as soon as they leave home—were more apt to be authoritarian and restrictive in their ideas on child-rearing.

A high proportion of the parents of the "rapid remitters" expressed agreement with such concepts as:

"It is sometimes necessary for the parents to break the child's will."

"A good spanking is often the only way to convince children you mean it when you tell them to go to sleep."

Such an approach is hardly recommended, even for the infant under 18 months, but, says Doctor Purcell, if continued as the child grows and strives for independence, it can cause trouble.

"It is during this period of early childhood stress," the psychologist concludes, "that the child may be highly motivated to learn to use asthma as a neurotic response to cope with neurotic conflict and anxiety." He may do this subconsciously or deliberately. Several children, talking with C.A.R.I.H. psychologists about what seemed to turn their wheezing on and off, frankly admitted they had been able to bring it on at home by breathing hard, coughing or running. Why did they do it? Usually, they said, to get out of something they didn't want to do. It was encouraging, though, Dr. Purcell commented, to find that some youngsters who were once adept at producing asthmatic attacks were later, after some months at Denver, unable to do so.

Asthma specialists have always wondered why so many of the attacks come at night. Now Dr. William Hahn, a young psychologist and physiologist at C.A.R.I.H., is looking into the possible role of dreams.

He told of a girl of about 12 who reported that she had a recurring dream of falling into a monster's mouth. She would then wake up in an asthmatic attack. "By her account the dream caused the attack," said Dr. Hahn. "But did it? Or did the discomfort of the asthma cause the nightmare?"

To help Dr. Hahn find the answers, teenage patients volunteer to sleep in his laboratory. Electrodes are taped to the patient's head to record brainwaves, which indicate the various depths of sleep. Wires from the eyelids record the rapid eye movements that accompany dreams, and chest leads measure respiration and signal the onset of wheezing.

Eventually the dream project and other research studies may lead to better ways of managing this vicious affliction. And in the meantime C.A.R.I.H.'s calm and thoroughgoing approach, with its emphasis on frequent medical consultation, has proved that the disease can be controlled—even conquered. For the fortunate youngsters at Denver, asthma has finally lost its terror.

PROBLEMS OF OUR CITIES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Jason R. Nathan, administrator of the Housing and Development Administration of New York City, recently appeared as a guest on the award-winning public affairs television program "Youth Wants To Know," which is created and produced by Theodore Granik.

Mr. Nathan discussed with a panel of students from Walt Whitman High School, in Bethesda, Md., the problems of our cities, a subject about which, by background and experience, he is well versed.

Mr. Nathan, an Air Force veteran, is a graduate of Syracuse University and Harvard Law School, a member of Phi Beta Kappa, and was one of 11 semifinalists in the Nation selected for the Junior Chamber of Commerce Arthur S. Flemming Award to outstanding young men in Government.

I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the "Youth Wants To Know" program of Saturday, February 25, 1967, on which Mr. Nathan appeared, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW

(Created and produced by Theodore Granik; associate producer, Jay B. Cutler; assistant to the producer, Susan Gallagher)

Youth Wants To Know Presents: Jason R. Nathan, Administrator of the Housing and Development Administration of New York City

Announcer: Youth Wants To Know—the penetrating, provocative questions of America's young people, created and produced by Theodore Granik.

Mr. Granik: Welcome to Youth Wants To Know. Our guest is Jason R. Nathan, Administrator of the Housing and Development Administration of New York City. Mr. Nathan has had a distinguished career in urban development. He was Regional Director of Federal Urban Renewal, headquartered in Philadelphia. The necessity for organizing and reorganizing municipal housing and development will be the subject of many questions by our panel of Walt Whitman High School students.

Question: Mr. Nathan, do you consider yourself one of those dedicated young urbanists that Mayor Lindsay has been putting into New York City lately?

Mr. Nathan: I'm not sure if I can consider myself young any more. I've been back in New York for about six months and I think I've gotten a few more grey hairs, but I think that what we're really talking about is the Mayor's concern and his complete commitment to bringing professionals into local government, which has been one of the real great criticisms of city government all over the country, that there has been too much hackism and far too little professionalism.

Question: Mr. Nathan, many people contend that the American city is dying. Is urban renewal the means for revitalizing large American cities, that is, both socially and physically?

Mr. Nathan: I think if you talk about what some people call the bulldozer approach, the answer is if that is what you mean by urban renewal, the answer is no. If you're talking about urban renewal, which is combined with social programs, and family programs, and I guess it is becoming trite and overfashionable to say human renewal, then I think the answer is yes. It happens. I think that many of us have a tremendous amount of conviction that this kind of a program is the basis of rebuilding the cities with social and economic integration and opportunities for jobs and housing, not just in a few small areas, but all over the city. In New York we call it "Operation Open City," and I think that's what we're shooting for.

Question: Mr. Nathan, could you give us your explanation of the Demonstration Cities program? And is it applicable in New York? If so, how will it be used?

Mr. Nathan: Well, the Demonstration Cities program is one that President Johnson persuaded Congress, after much difficulty, to pass last year. It is a relatively new concept of tying together a number of these separate programs. As I was just mentioning to Carol, too often in the past, these things have been handled separately. Urban renewal has gone its way. The social programs have gone their way. The housing and the school programs have gone their way. The model cities is an attempt to demonstrate in a small number of selected cities that by concentrating programs, both functionally, in terms of putting the programs themselves together, and geographically, by concentrating, instead of scattering efforts, that you might be able to see real impact and real improvements in neighborhoods. We think it has tremendous application in New York City.

Question: The cost of the war in Vietnam is rising every day. Many people have said we are going to have to cut down on domestic spending to meet this cost. Do you think that we're going to have to cut out in areas such as health, education and welfare? And in relation to this, do you think New York is going to be able to obtain $50 million from the federal government that they want?

Mr. Nathan: No, I don't think it is necessary to cut these programs back. And I think it would be a tragedy if we did. I have yet to see anyone be convincing that the United States with its resources does not have the capacity to deal with the problems at home, without simply deferring and deferring and deferring.

Question: To what percentage can you fill the need dollarwise right now without this extended federal aid that you're counting on?

Mr. Nathan: I'm not sure if I get that, Richard, about the percentage. But let me say this. I don't think that we ought to be lying back and depending solely on the federal government. Everybody is talking nowadays about this business of getting the states into the act. And I think that's what we ought to be talking about very, very seriously. Mayor Lindsay, for example, presented a number of legislative proposals to the State Legislature of New York a week and a half ago, and what we are hoping for is state permission to proceed with a number of programs with state assistance and with the city going it alone. And we feel, for example, that with the state approval of these programs that we will have the capacity as an immediate objective of doubling the construction of low and middle income housing in New York City. And this is without being dependent on the federal government. Let's face it, we cannot wait for the problems of the world, including Vietnam, to be settled before we start moving very decisively on these problems that face us at home.

Question: Is it possible to get private grants for the housing program from large foundations?

Mr. Nathan: Well, I think that generally speaking, foundations are tremendously resourceful in supplementary kinds of assistance for special studies and specialized kinds of approaches. I would think that in order to deal with the basic problems of low and moderate income housing needs, government assistance is utterly essential. I don't think you can do it in any other way because the mass, the volume, the size of the funding that is necessary is too great.

Question: When you double the construction rate, where are you going to put the houses?

Mr. Nathan: Well, there's been a long history in New York of saying that there aren't sites, there are no places to put the houses. Well, New York City alone owns literally thousands of pieces of land around the city. There are all kinds of sites, vacant land, properties on which there are derelict buildings, air rights over highways and railroads. The sites are there, with enough resourcefulness and enough push. Those sites can be used.

Question: It seems to me that the actual construction is only secondary to the sociological problems of urban renewal. How is the HDA coordinated with welfare and transportation, say?

Mr. Nathan: Well, the HDA, you're becoming very knowledgeable in this, that is the Housing and Development Administration, which has been in existence for about one month, what we're doing, this is under the Mayor's Reorganization Program of the city government, what we're doing right now is evolving a very, very close and detailed working relationship with the other one of those triple initials, HRA the new Human Resources Administration of the city, which has responsibility for all social programs. We are focusing our physical development efforts in the great core ghetto areas in New York City, of Harlem, the South Bronx and Central Brooklyn. This is our major emphasis, and by the same token, the Human Resources Program will be focusing its activities in these areas, so that you will have an unprecedented concentration of public action, family assistance, job training, home assistance, all these things at the same time, as we are planning and carrying out physical development programs. So that we're hopefully going to be able to put an end to the scatter shot approach that we've had over the years in the city, where you've had each individual project scattered in many places around the city, and none of them with real impact on the core problems.

Question: Mr. Nathan, if we go into the ghetto and we start an urban renewal project, and we relocate these people in the urban renewal, setting an income limit on the families that can live here, and setting the rent at a minimal, how can we prevent urban renewal projects from becoming a ghetto all over again?

Mr. Nathan: You've hit at the essential question, and if we do what you say, then we will be creating the ghettos for the next generation. We cannot provide only housing and provide only one kind of housing. We've got to provide resources in those areas for a mix of housing for different economic levels of housing. We've got to provide institutions or reasons for other people to go to Harlem, whether it is a state office building or a college or a medical center or whatever, and we've got to provide middle-income housing, and in fact, some of the people from Harlem, and I have talked about it, they're convinced, for example, that Central Park North in Harlem is one of the great opportunities for upper middle income housing. They tell me that there is a market, there are people in Harlem, many people in Harlem who have the financial ability to be able to pay for that, and they want this kind of mix of housing.

Question: Don't you think it is possible to destroy a culture like that? Don't you think that the culture should be preserved along with the people?

Mr. Nathan: I think that this goes right back to the question that Carol asked originally. I believe that that is so. And if we propose to go forward in renewal and redevelopment with the old bulldozer approach, then we're heading right in that direction. There are areas in every single one of these core areas which have fine opportunities for rehabilitation, they have row houses and brownstones, and they can be saved, and the neighborhoods can be saved. And if we use the old philosophy that we clear, and if it is convenient, we rehabilitate, then we're going to lose the battle. But if we accept and really work, and commit ourselves to the concept that first and foremost we are talking about rehabilitation, and clearance is as a last resort, then what we're talking about, hopefully, is maintaining neighborhoods and identities, and offering people the opportunity to remain.

Question: What about the idea of planned communities—recreation facilities and schools, and both low, middle, and possibly high class housing, all combined into one unit, that works?

Mr. Nathan: Exactly what we were talking about a minute ago. We can't create, we cannot proceed and merely build a new low rent ghetto. We've got to have a mix of housing. We've got to have commercial and institutional users. We have to try to create or reinforce or rebuild neighborhoods that have a reason for being, not merely a place to go at night, all of the same class, with no other opportunity and no other reason for being.

Question: Yes, but the problem is, Mr. Nathan, many sociologists have said that for a person to raise his position in life, he must get the incentive from living with people who are in a higher class economically and socially. But, however, when you have many times middle class that is living one place and the people of the ghetto come in, the middle class tends to move out into the suburbs. How can you prevent this, and how can you get people in the lower and middle class living together?

Mr. Nathan: That one question is probably the subject of the whole half hour conversation. The problem of incentive, the problem of people moving out, people moving back in, all these things, it seems to me, relate to progress in education, progress in opportunity, offering housing choice, offering education and job opportunities. We had a marvelous discussion on television a few weeks ago—which is most important, housing, jobs or education? And each member of the panel, I guess, was arguing about—arguing in favor of one. And I think the real answer is that you can't pick a winner, that you've got to have all three. I have a tremendous amount of confidence on this issue of incentive, that given opportunity, the incentive will be there. I think we're dealing with an unbelievable rise in expectations, and these expectations relate to incentive, and they've got to be answered. And I think that the problem of people moving out has been exaggerated. I think Philadelphia has proved that the middle income whites flight to the suburbs can be reversed by making the city exciting and attractive and by offering better than we've had before, the diversity, and the reason for coming there.

Question: Mr. Nathan, are there enough trained personnel to carry out all your programs?

Mr. Nathan: No, not today. Congress two years ago passed a state-local training act as part of the housing act, and unfortunately the Appropriations Committee for two years hasn't seen fit to give any money for it. I think that we've got a major problem of bringing young, dedicated people, the urbanists that Mike talked about, young, dedicated people into these programs. I'm firmly convinced, for example, that the glamour of foreign affairs is at least matched by the challenge of domestic affairs.

Question: What kind of people are you looking for? How should they be trained?

Mr. Nathan: We're looking for architects, engineers, planners, lawyers, administrators, every kind of person with a background, and most important, the ability to use with dedication, his intelligence, in these kinds of programs. This area of the city, the problems of the crisis of the city, that it has now become fashionable to talk about, this, to me, and I think to many of you here, is the most exciting single challenge facing this generation. Before we started one of you were kidding me about my generation having presented you with the problem. And until I started getting grey in New York when I came back six months ago, I used to kid my seniors and say, your generation gave us the problem. Well, I think it is all of our problem, and if there is a lack of people trained, I think that can be beaten, but we've got to start now.

Question: Rockville has been trying to solve the problem of Negroes forming slums in the area by setting up a quota system. They're trying to get it so no more than 10 per cent, if there is more than 10 per cent Negroes in the neighborhood, fair housing rules no longer need apply. Have you considered using something like this in New York?

Mr. Nathan: Well, you have to face a very very complicated situation which relates (a) to the fact that quota systems are illegal, (b) to the fact that you must try and achieve some balance, and I think that many of the civil rights groups have been working on this with us, as a matter of fact, in New York, in trying to stimulate different groups of people to move into areas, and move into new housing projects, for example, that we have built, in order to achieve some kind of balance. The most important thing is that come heck or high water, the most important thing is under no circumstances must we lose sight of the fact that we must insist on free choice. Whatever the quota system, we've got to work in terms of persuasion and incentive, and not say, you're not going to be admitted, or you are going to be admitted because of what your skin happens to look like.

Question: Mr. Nathan, getting away from New York's specific problems, and back to the problem of the redevelopment, considering what happened at Pruitt, where they generated another slum, they redeveloped, they rebuilt, they tore down the old slums, they made a new one, what can you see in this development, what have you learned from examining it that you can change when you redevelop in New York City?

Mr. Nathan: It seems to me that what you're really talking about is the recognition of the fact that if you simply deal with a redevelopment project as an end, as an entity, without relation to the rest of the city, and you have a large dislocation program, then you are going to be merely dislocating or relocating a slum. You've got to be thinking in terms of dealing with the families and why they have had problems, they have had to live in slums, and again this relates to job opportunities as well as housing opportunities. You've got to create realistic choice in housing, different locations, so that you're not taking—see, one of the problems on most previous situations is that you relocated and tended to concentrate. We've got to create diversity of housing choice. We've got to create diversity of housing choice. We've got to create housing not merely in Harlem for people who want to remain, we've got to create housing in many areas of the city.

Question: Mr. Nathan, citizens groups in many neighborhoods have tried to deal with problems of housing on their own. Does your department work with them in any way?

Mr. Nathan: Not enough. I think that this is one of the real great important efforts we have to make. It is always complicated. There's always the problem of who represents the community. It seems to me, however, that one of the things that we're—that is significant, is what we're trying in one of our renewal projects in New York City, and that is out in the Rockaways. We went out there a few months ago to begin the planning. And we had a meeting of a tremendous portion of the community. We said, now here's a map of the area. Let's start talking sense about what do you want to do, how do you want this area to be, what are the ideas? And, of course, a classical planner might very well say, well this is crazy because they're not trained. Well, we got more ideas out of one evening of working with the community and they said, well we want you to take that area and demolish it. And I said to them, well, why that area, what about the people? And they all started talking at the same time. Well, that's an area where there are no families living. It's a bunch of shacks. And if you went in and demolished that area first and built your housing first, you'd have a place to relocate the rest of us as you go through stage first. These kinds of ideas of working with the community make sense to me.

Question: Mr. Nathan, do you have any long-range plans so that all needs will be taken care of eventually, say twenty or thirty years, so that you are working on a certain progression that will take care of everything that has to be taken care of, all slums will be cleared, in this order by this time, it will all work, all of New York City?

Mr. Granik: Do you expect to be an administrator twenty years from now?

Mr. Nathan: I just don't know if it is possible to answer that. I think that we have the immediate plan of trying to focus our programs into the areas that need it most, of trying as an immediate goal to double our production of low and middle income housing, and hopefully, within the framework of a valid master plan for the city, which New York City has never had, and which we are approaching hopefully, the day when we have that, we hope that we can deal with these problems in a comprehensive manner. Up until now, the problem in New York City, and this is not unique by any means, is that they've been dealt with on a catch as catch can basis.

Question: Mr. Nathan, Mayor Lindsay has said the whole process of obtaining moneys from the federal government for urban renewal will take about two years now. What I want to know is will the social position of the people in the ghetto, will they wait this two years? Can they wait, or is New York faced with, and the rest of the nation in the cities, faced with social unrest?

Mr. Nathan: The city is faced with social unrest. It is faced with desperate social unrest. I don't think that we can wait, and I think, as a matter of fact, the Mayor was saying that these will not happen overnight, our immediate goal is to get the federal assistance and start the planning, and start redeveloping the areas, and it would take two or three years. But if people have a feeling that progress is being made, if they have a feeling that they're not being conned, and if they have a feeling that years of promises are not being continued as mere promises, I have a tremendous amount of feeling myself that they're going to get, and we are already seeing indications of this, that they're going to reach the conclusion that we're working legitimately on the problems that face them, and I think that the patience will be there. Patience, not unlimited, and tough patience, and knowledgeable patience, but I think that if there is progress which is tangible and real, they'll work with us on it.

Question: Mr. Nathan, geting back to the work of individual organizations, I've heard a great deal lately about the scattered-site program, whereby they move low income families into middle class and high class neighborhoods. Is this program effective in New York? Is it being carried out?

Mr. Nathan: Yes, it is already being carried out. One of the things that fascinates me is whenever you talk about a public program, everybody says you can't mix economic groups. You talk about private enterprise, and you've all heard about the fact that they knocked down the "El" along Third Avenue a few years ago, and there's been a tremendous amount of private building there. Well, there is economic integration like you've never seen along there. You have all these luxury apartments along Third Avenue, and right around the corner, there's a five-story walk-up, under rent control, and you have all kinds of economic groups living near each other, next to each other, no problem. Scattered-site public housing, privately assisted or government assisted housing, is something that is essential. We can't continue to build great monolithic public housing projects with the famous flag pole in front and the bronze plaque which means that the person who lives there is somehow different. He's got a label. We ought to be talking in many cases about invisible public housing, whether by rehabilitation or leasing of public housing units, these new tools that Congress made available only a year ago. It seems to me that a scatter-site program of integrating housing of different economic levels within the communities is essential if we're going to deal with the problem.

Question: Doesn't this mean also, you say you shouldn't put a label on them, but people who have grown up under different conditions are different. For instance, down in the District, I know you have different high schools, one high school in a good neighborhood—quote, unquote good neighborhood—another one in a quote, unquote bad neighborhood—and education does differ. Don't you need to have, for instance, schools that will help reeducate the people so they can take an equal footing?

Mr. Nathan: Absolutely. The point I make is that we do not need to continue with artificial, governmentally-induced distinctions. Variety, of course, is important. We're dealing with individuals. But we don't have to have all of those people in a public housing project identified as non-individuals. That's the point I make. Diversity, of course, is important, and it seems to me the scatter program is just that.

Question: Mr. Nathan, one of the charges of the building industry is that the urban renewal field yields no profit because of the long administrative delays and the strict building codes that are imposed on builders. And they have no incentive in this field. Could you comment on this comment?

Mr. Nathan: I think the best answer is, or I guess two. The typical progress of a renewal project in New York City has been four to five years in planning, and we're trying to cut around two-thirds out of that time under our new administration. The second thing, I guess this is the best answer of all, is that it may be that somebody says that there is no incentive but every time in the renewal program in New York City, they put a piece of land up for sale, we are inundated with requests for designation as sponsors. The last one resulted in thirty-five bids on one parcel of land.

Question: Could you explain to me and to the rest of the panel exactly whether you think it is fair for a builder who has put a great deal of money into his land to lose it simply because he cannot keep up the payments? Should we provide for a new regulation?

Mr. Nathan: No, I don't. I'm not quite sure—were you speaking about something specific, Mike?

Question: Well, what I mean is many New York land owners put a great deal of money into their buildings, and then along comes a new ex post facto law, you might call it, and the government takes over their building.

Mr. Nathan: There's such a large series of assumptions in there, each one of which is at least debatable, Mike. I would only say this, that the police powers not of the city, necessarily, but of the state, have always for hundreds of years, been used to regulate housing and building. For example, the state legislature a year ago passed a law requiring furnace enclosures and peepholes and certain light requirements. This was a considerable expense on the property owners. But the state legislature, within its power, has the authority, and the responsibility, to provide for the safety of the public, and in their wisdom have done it. It makes it difficult, but I would say that, generally speaking, there has been no dearth of people investing in property in any of our cities.

Question: Mr. Nathan, it has been commented that in rebuilding the buildings are really ugly and they're not well planned for the future when the program is going to be finished. The program may be finished in a certain area in twenty years, and by that time the building is outmoded, the whole design is twenty years behind. Are you geared to put your buildings twenty years ahead into the future?

Mr. Nathan: I'd like to establish that we are in the process of insisting on the highest quality of design in everything that goes into our redevelopment efforts. I'm not going to guess what is going to happen twenty years from now. I want outstanding design today. We are putting teeth into that requirement. We are rejecting proposals for redevelopment on the basis of design, solely on the basis of design. And we are looking to bring to New York City the really high quality, pace-setting design for the urban landscape today. Twenty years from now, I don't know.

Question: I was speaking to a former New Yorker this morning who said he was very dissatisfied with the Metro North Complex. When was this designed and built and why was it permitted to be built?

Mr. Nathan: Metro North was designed by the people in the area, who hired one of the outstanding architects in the country, and that is the first criticism I have heard of it.

Mr. Granik: I'm sorry to interrupt: I know there are many more questions. There just isn't time. Thank you, Mr. Nathan for being our guest on Youth Wants To Know. Our thanks to you, panel, for your most interesting questions, and to you, ladies and gentlemen, for being with us. Please join us again next week on Youth Wants To Know, where through the eyes of youth, we explore, we discover, we measure the important people, ideas and events of our time. And now this is Theodore Granik bidding you goodbye.

"OUR SELF-DEFEATING DUALISM": THE CIA AND OUR POSTURE TOWARD COMMUNISM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in his column in this morning's Washington Post, Marquis Childs points out that the recently revealed intervention of the CIA in international student affairs has so badly undermined the position of any American students who may attend the World Youth Festival next September in Sofia, Bulgaria, that it has been made untenable.

The theme of that meeting, as Mr. Childs says, will undoubtedly include a picture of "perfidious American youth corrupted by the American spy agency." The damage will be in terms not only of the Communist bloc but also in aggravating the deep-seated anti-Americanism of many from Western Europe as well. Mr. Childs says:

> The fundamental error was to believe that since what should be done could not be done openly it must be done by subterfuge.

The result has been a "self-defeating dualism." This question is not solely that of the CIA and the students only, but a larger question of the relationship of the whole educational establishment with a Federal establishment seeking to subvert its independence by such means as tying university research to the purpose of the Department of Defense, "including such unmentionables as biological warfare."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Childs' column be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Money in Secret: The CIA Funds

(By Marquis Childs)

Coinciding with the storm over the CIA came a significant announcement. The next World Youth Festival will be held in Sofia, Bulgaria, in September. No crystal ball is needed to predict a major theme of that rally.

Perfidious American youth corrupted by the American spy agency seeking to subvert the true spokesmen of democracy will be roundly denounced. For the deep-seated anti-American forces in Western Europe as well as the professional anti-Americanism of the Communist bloc the Youth Festival should be a walkaway.

This is a measure of the damage done by the disclosures of the relationships between the CIA and the National Student Association and a host of other liberal and moderately left organizations. Barry Goldwater's reaction was as predictable as that of the World Youth Festival. He had no objection to the subsidies as such. But the CIA was caught subsidizing socialism and he demanded to know why the Youth Republicans and Young Americans For Freedom had not got some of the money.

Predictable, too, was the outcry in the Soviet press. "All progressive America is boiling with indignation over this shamefully scandalous business with the Agency . . ." one newspaper in Moscow reported. This can be translated as: The CIA has been unmasked and with it those middle-ground liberal organizations that believe they could use CIA money to oppose Communist aims.

Behind the sensational headlines in the American press there is revealed the confusing and, in a sense, self-defeating dualism of this Nation's posture in the face of the worldwide Communist movement. The CIA subsidies began in 1951 and 1952 as the McCarthyist attack was mowing down anyone and everyone to the left of center with even the slightest suspicion of pro-Communist sympathies.

The directives of the National Security Council authorizing the CIA payments were ing and broadened our horizons as the autodone to insure that the American viewpoint was expressed in youth and other world organizations could be done by secret subsidies. Certainly, Congress at the time would never have sanctioned help for the Student Association, the American Newspaper Guild or the American Friends Service Committee no matter what valid purpose they might serve overseas.

This was the fundamental error—to believe that since what should be done could not be done openly it must be done by subterfuge. The secret could never be kept in an open society. And in view of the reputation of the CIA, enhanced by such tragic blunders as the Bay of Pigs and a constant stream of propaganda out of Moscow and other Communist capitals, the disclosure when it came was bound to be disastrous.

Britain in a quiet and understated fashion with an appropriation of $30 million a year has given encouragement to student, artistic and other groups functioning overseas through the British Council. A semi-independent body with a majority of its 30 members chosen outside of government, the Council is one of those British compromises that seems to work.

But our self-defeating dualism goes deeper, in the view of those now trying to appraise the damage, than the flaw of secrecy through an intelligence agency. Negotiating with the Soviet government to try to get a standstill agreement on antiballistic missiles has basically no relation to trying to get adequate representation for the American view at an international student rally. They are two different problems that must be met, if they are to be met at all, in different ways.

Here is the larger question. Is there any real interest, particularly in view of what appears to be growing neo-isolationism, in confronting the second problem and insuring that a free exchange with the American viewpoint fairly presented takes place? If the answer is no, the rally in Sofia will be a solo exercise for those who mean to control all such forums.

In the uproar over the CIA subsidies are echoes out of America's age of innocence. The voice of a conscience long silent could be heard. With the encroachment of big government and the vast military expenditure, a large part of the budgets of most universities is in research for the Department of Defense, including such unmentionables as biological warfare. This is so taken for granted that many educational institutions keep lobbyists in Washington to get projects. What this does to the independence of institutions of learning, with, in effect, subsidies on a far greater scale than those of the CIA, is a troubling question.

DAYTONA, FLA., NEWS-JOURNAL ENDORSES INTERSTATE LAND SALES FULL DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1967

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, President Johnson in his American consumer protection message endorsed S. 275, the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act of 1967, a bill which I introduced on January 12 of this year.

In his message to the Congress the President said:

> I recommend the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act of 1967 to afford the public greater safeguards against sharp and unscrupulous practices.

The Daytona, Fla., News-Journal, in its February 18 editorial entitled "Since We've Failed," discusses with great wisdom the need for this legislation.

This editorial, which I believe will be of great intrest to all Members of this body, coming from a newspaper in the State of Florida, a State which is intimately concerned with the interstate sale of land, declares:

> Federal authority can set up rules to be observed in all states, and it has the machinery to see to it that they are enforced. Since we've failed as a state, let's urge that the authority and the machinery be put to work.

I believe the Senate should have the benefit of the full text of this informative commentary; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Since We've Failed

In a message to Congress Thursday, President Johnson said many Americans—particularly those in the older age brackets—become victims of interstate mail order land sellers and "have wasted much of their life savings on a useless piece of desert or swamp land" they had expected to be a retirement paradise.

He asked for a law that would require these land sellers to state clearly what the offer is, with the Securities and Exchange Commission as the enforcement agency.

So—again the federal government will have to take over in a situation in which the states have failed.

There was such a bill as Johnson now requests in last year's Congress, with essentially the same features. But it got only as far as hearings. A similar bill is in the works in the 90th Congress.

Now it has the President's backing, along with other phases of consumer protection that are badly needed.

Florida should be glad to turn the problem of these land sales over to the federal government. The state has been damaged enough by the bad publicity we've endured by the sales. State politics seem to be insurmountable in gaining a state solution. Too much time has been wasted on failure.

Besides, it's a national problem, concerned with interstate commerce. We can't prevent lures that are shady from being received by Floridians from operators in other states. We can't cull the mail for the same kind of lures going out from our own.

But federal authority can set up rules to be observed in all states, and it has the machinery to see to it that they are enforced. Since we've failed as a state, let's urge that the authority and the machinery be put to work.

AUTO THEFT PREVENTION CAMPAIGN

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, today the Attorney General-designate, Mr. Ramsey Clark, addressed a luncheon inaugurating the national auto theft prevention campaign.

I welcome the involvement of the Justice Department and the other distinguished sponsors of this effort to reduce the Nation's costliest crime against property. The Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency has conducted hearings on car theft to explore the attraction of this crime to our Nation's youth, who are responsible for committing 85 percent of this thievery.

We were glad to welcome the Justice Department's representative, Mr. Fred Vinson, Jr., as a witness at our hearings and to share with him our concern over the increased availability and use of so-called master keys, or jiggle keys, for opening locked doors and starting ignitions.

But we know that in about 40 percent of the cars taken from parking lots, garages, and other "safe" places, thieves found an open ignition or the keys in the ignition with the doors unlocked.

Especially for a juvenile, the ease or difficulty with which he can steal that first car is crucial to whether or not he embarks on a life of crime. We know that 75 percent of the Federal juvenile offenders and over 20 percent of the youth now in State training schools are there for stealing cars; also that the rate of recidivism among young auto thieves is extremely high.

So I congratulate the Justice Department on its participation in this campaign to prevent auto theft, which can mean so much in preventing a great deal of juvenile delinquency.

Also, I believe the 19 organizations participating in this effort to prevent a crime before it happens should be acknowledged.

They are:

American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators.
American Automobile Association.
American Petroleum Institute.
Automobile Manufacturers Association.
Insurance Information Institute.
International Association of Chiefs of Police.
National Association of Counties.
National Automobile Dealers Association.
National Automobile Theft Bureau.
National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
National District Attorneys Association.
National Exchange Clubs.
National Highway Users Conference.
National Institute of Municipal Law Officers.
National League of Cities.
National Professional Driver Education Association.
National Sheriffs Association.
Optimists International.
United States Conference of Mayors.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Clark's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL-DESIGNATE RAMSEY CLARK AT THE WASHINGTON HILTON HOTEL, NATIONAL AUTO THEFT PREVENTION CAMPAIGN OPENING, MARCH 1, 1967

We are here to talk about car theft. The subject may seem narrow and unimaginative. Perhaps unworthy of our interest. But is it?

Of all the mass phenomena of the 20th Century, few have so changed our way of living and broadened our horizons as the automobile. Today 78 million cars travel our streets, roads and highways. They are, as an astute young Negro resident of Watts told me, "like part of your wardrobe. Man, you can't go anywhere without a car."

Among the things that happen to cars is that they get stolen—thousands of them, half a million last year. This is no small tragedy. Car theft ranks third in frequency among all felonies. It is second in direct financial loss—140 million dollars a year. But what hurts more is that nearly two-thirds of all car thefts are committed by kids under 18 . . . and as Burke said "crimes lead into one another."

We are a nation deeply concerned about crime in our midst. Well we should be. Crime measures the moral temperature of a people. A nation that cares about the quality of its life must therefore be concerned. Moreover we have a fever which must be checked.

But, by and large, we, as a people, treat crime as we treat the weather. Everybody complains about crime, but nobody does anything about it. Hence this citizen effort.

We know that we can reduce car theft if we care.

Those 500,000 stolen cars might well have been 400,000 fewer if you and I had followed a few simple precautions. Remove the ignition key before leaving the car. Lock the doors.

But last year, ignition keys were left in 42 percent of the cars stolen. The doors were left unlocked in 80 percent. Carelessness invites theft.

Did we not invite it, we could halve the number of cars stolen. The overwhelming majority of stolen cars are taken for joyriding, usually by young people. Eighty-eight percent of those arrested for car theft in 1965 were under the age of 25. Sixty-four percent were under 18.

There are professional car thieves, of course. But they too can be thwarted by locked doors, and other plans are underway to help baffle the pro. Automobile and automobile parts manufacturers can add several promising anti-theft devices, such as steering wheel locks, transmission locks, pop-out keys and more secure ignition systems. The Department of Justice is considering legislation to regulate the sale of master keys.

Car thefts cost money. The direct financial loss of $140 million did not include the enormous costs of dealing with the more than 100,000 persons arrested for car theft.

The toll in damaged lives is the greatest loss. The unlocked car often tempts a youngster to commit his first crime. That beginning can set a pattern, regardless of whether he is caught. A recent sampling by the FBI of a group of persons taken into custody for car theft showed it was the first offense for 42 percent.

There are nearly 20,000 inmates in facilities operated by the Federal Bureau of Prisons. More than 5,000 of them—or 26 percent—are serving terms for interstate transportation of stolen cars. More than half of the Bureau's youth and juvenile institution inmates were convicted of the same offense. The cost of keeping these inmates in prison exceeds $3 million a year.

These are only figures from the federal experience. The overwhelming majority of stolen car cases are handled by the states. In California alone, the state's system of criminal justice, police, courts and corrections expends an estimated $60 million a year on car thefts.

This is why 19 organizations have joined to sponsor the National Auto Theft Prevention Campaign. They and their local chapters are going to spread a message from coast to coast: Remove your keys—lock your car.

Locking your car can save you money. It can remove a temptation from a youngster who otherwise might never get into trouble.

More than 17,000 basic campaign kits have been distributed by these groups to their local chapters. They contain advertisements and spot announcements that will appear in newspapers and on television and radio. There are plans for educational campaigns. There are posters and bumper strips.

The Criminal Division of the Department of Justice is honored to coordinate the campaign. You should know that the 19 groups are bearing the financial expense. They are contributing their time and talent as well as money.

They are accepting a challenge and a dangerous one. Failure is demonstrable by statistics. To succeed they must secure the commitment of us all. If you take care of your car and I take care of mine, we will succeed. This is a practical attack on crime and its causes that can make a difference. In concert with other direct and practical actions we can reverse the trend toward lawlessness.

As with all crime, the cure is in the commitment of the people.

HALTING THE TRAGEDIES OF FIRE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Commerce [Mr. MAGNUSON] together with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] yesterday introduced the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1967.

The mention of fire calls up in the minds of most Indianians the Maples Convalescent Home fire which took place in December 1964.

Few fires in the country's history have evoked such tragedy. Twenty of the 34 aged people in the home died that night. Others were driven into the subzero weather outside, some without shoes, all inadequately clothed. So great was their suffering that a few of them tried to return to the blazing building because it was "warmer inside." The death toll was high because many of the patients were too infirm to use fire escapes or other forms of exit which might have saved their lives.

That disaster illustrates well the extent of the ravages wielded by fire. The loss of lives and property each year amounts to nothing less than a national problem, to be ranked along with pollution, crime, and all the other tribulations which we must face.

But fire, like other problems, should be solvable by men of reason. What problems man can create, he should also be able to remedy. We need but become aware of the magnitude of the problem; then we can marshal our forces against it.

There are numbers to show the magnitude. The President's consumer message cited 12,000 lives and $1.75 billion in property damage lost to fire in 1 year—1965. The President's message also showed clearly that our losses are higher than other highly industrialized nations. On a per capita basis, we lose more lives and property to fire than any of the other highly developed countries. We must intuitively and rationally come to the conclusion that this need not be so.

To bring our best capabilities to bear on this problem, the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1967 has been introduced. I endorse the bill as a well-planned and efficient approach to the Nation's fire problems.

There are a number of things we must do in approaching the problem. The proposed Fire Research and Safety Act of 1967 covers the entire scope of jobs which we can see to do, and gives us the flexibility to do them in reasonable order and in the shortest time. Beyond that, the bill gives us the maximum opportunity to utilize our existing fire research resources by utilizing already established private and public organizations.

The act provides a statistical and scientific base for fire protection by support of both fact-gathering and laboratory research.

It provides a mechanism for distributing information on fire prevention and fighting technology to assure the most rapid possible introduction of new techniques.

It supports education of the public, to make them more aware of fire hazards and fire prevention techniques; of the fireman, to assure that he is as capable as modern knowledge and technology can make him.

The bill authorizes support and grants for pilot projects to prove out new technology, for new management arrangements, and other aids to fire prevention and fighting.

The need for a response to the national problem of fire loss cannot be argued. The cold figures demand it. And behind the numbers lies a crushing weight of human suffering, of human bereavement, of financial disaster.

I truly believe that we have a strong response with the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1967. We carry a burden—of things we have not done; of people, mostly aged or very young, who cannot be saved even by our most prompt action at this time. This burden grows heavier with each day and constantly reminds us that we now have an opportunity to start in the right direction.

I urge the passage of the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1967.

SAM PRYOR, RETIRED VICE PRESIDENT, PAN AMERICAN AIRWAYS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Samuel F. Pryor, a retired vice president of Pan American Airways, today is celebrating his 69th birthday. During his life he has contributed greatly to the political and aeronautic life of the United States. He has also played a major role in the development of the U.S. economy through fostering trade and tourism overseas as well as in this country. We all wish him, I know, much happiness on this occasion.

THE NATIONAL SCHOOL VOLUNTEER PROGRAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we all have a concern for good education. The training of our youth is the single greatest activity we can pursue in our efforts to insure the improvement of this Nation in the years to come. We in Congress have in recent years taken an increasing role in stimulating the Federal Government to encourage in a variety of ways the upgrading of education at every level, from kindergarten and the Headstart program to adult education and retraining opportunities.

But it is a difficult task for our public schools to keep abreast of the demands upon them merely for expansion to keep up with the growing numbers of children and youth who must be educated. The world of education is in constant flux and change, with the development of new improvements for the teaching process. Many of these put additional strains and demands on the time of teachers, and frequently there are just simply insufficient numbers of them and not enough time in the day to do the task as well as it could be done.

It is for that reason that the movement to lend voluntary assistance to the classroom teacher is one which should be encouraged. This is being done through the national school volunteer program, which was discussed recently by Alex Dreier in one of his ABC radio network broadcasts. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Dreier's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSCRIPT OF ALEX DREIER COMMENTARY BROADCAST ON THE ABC RADIO NETWORK, JANUARY 31, 1967

If there is one thing that just about every American understands, whether he has a child or not, it is education, and if there is one thing every American wants for his child, it is a good education. Education is no panacea for all the ills of the world, but it could do more to eradicate them. And here in these affluent United States, blessed with so much of everything, we are most proud of our public educational institutions. They are, indeed, the best in the world. We keep announcing it to each other proudly . . . in fact, we have bragged about our schools so much that we have not noticed a jarring condition, which is nothing really new, but has been glossed over or gone unnoticed.

Consider these facts, presented by the Public Education Association: As many as one-third of all the children in our elementary schools are educationally disadvantaged. And 47% of our public elementary school children go to schools that have no libraries. 40% of the teachers' time—that is, almost one half—is now devoted to non-instructional duties.

Unbelievable? Perhaps, but it is quite true, and they have the statistics to back up the charges, if you want to call them that. The average class size in American schools nationwide is now so large that individual attention has become a practical impossibility. And consider this shocking statistic: one out of every three students who is now in the fifth grade will drop out before finishing high school. One out of every three will never finish high school.

But what's to be done about it? A lot of things are being talked about, but not many things are being tried. One of the most interesting programs aimed at helping to solve these serious national social problems is the National School Volunteer Program. People are being asked to volunteer their services to help in the public schools. Through the National School Volunteer Program, persons who care can donate their time and energies to help supply additional manpower for the overworked teacher in the understaffed school. The volunteer teacher can relieve the regular classroom teacher of routine non-teaching chores that now take up so much of his or her time. The call is out for educational amateurs to go right into the classroom and become a part of academic life, volunteering their time so the professional teachers can spend more of their time doing what they were educated and trained to do, and that is to teach.

But what could a volunteer do? Well, they already are doing it. Grading objective tests, preparing classroom materials, maintaining bulletin boards, helping with classroom or school chores, doing clerical work, answering correspondence, supervising gym and playground activity. All of these things are important and things which must be done. But when the overworked teacher at the understaffed school must do them all, education itself suffers. We are spreading our teachers too thin. They cannot keep up with all the regular intracurricular duties imposed on them. They need help, desperately, and volunteers are one answer. Not the whole answer, but one answer. The volunteer program was pioneered in New York. And now it is spreading out to twenty more cities, from Boston to San Francisco. And many a volunteer is bringing to the classroom his own individual skills and talents, enriching the students with abilities and experiences that even the regular teacher may not have. It's not the degree that counts, it's the degree of interest the private citizen has in making a better community by helping to help the teacher make our schools better than they are.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday, the Senate will now go into executive session to consider and vote on 10 treaties on the Executive Calendar, without further debate.

CONVENTION FOR THE INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE EXPLORATION OF THE SEA—AMENDMENT OF THE CONVENTION ON GREAT LAKES FISHERIES—INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE CONSERVATION OF ATLANTIC TUNAS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, will now proceed to the consideration of Executive Calendars Nos. 1, 2, and 3, Executive H, Executive T, and Executive U, 89th Congress, second session.

The conventions were read the second time, as follows:

CONVENTION FOR THE INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE EXPLORATION OF THE SEA

PREAMBLE

The Governments of the States Parties to this Convention

Having participated in the work of the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea, which was established at Copenhagen in 1902 as a result of conferences held in Stockholm in 1899 and in Christiania in

1901 and entrusted with the task of carrying out a programme of international investigation of the sea

Desiring to provide a new constitution for the aforesaid Council with a view to facilitating the implementation of its programme

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE 1

It shall be the duty of the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea, hereinafter referred to as the "Council",

(a) to promote and encourage research and investigations for the study of the sea particularly those related to the living resources thereof;

(b) to draw up programmes required for this purpose and to organise, in agreement with the Contracting Parties, such research and investigation as may appear necessary;

(c) to publish or otherwise disseminate the results of research and investigations carried out under its auspices or to encourage the publication thereof.

ARTICLE 2

The Council shall be concerned with the Atlantic Ocean and its adjacent seas and primarily concerned with the North Atlantic.

ARTICLE 3

(1) The Council shall be maintained in accordance with the provisions of this Convention.

(2) The seat of the Council shall remain at Copenhagen.

ARTICLE 4

The Council shall seek to establish and maintain working arrangements with other international organisations which have related objectives and cooperate, as far as possible, with them, in particular in the supply of scientific information requested.

ARTICLE 5

The Contracting Parties undertake to furnish to the Council information which will contribute to the purposes of this Convention and can reasonably be made available and, wherever possible, to assist in carrying out the programmes of research coordinated by the Council.

ARTICLE 6

(1) Each Contracting Party shall be represented at the Council by not more than two delegates.

(2) A delegate who is not present at a meeting of the Council may be replaced by a substitute who shall have all the powers of the delegate for that meeting.

(3) Each Contracting Party may appoint such experts and advisers as it may determine to assist in the work of the Council.

ARTICLE 7

(1) The Council shall meet in ordinary session once a year. This session shall be held in Copenhagen, unless the Council decides otherwise.

(2) Extraordinary sessions of the Council may be called by the Bureau at such place and time as it may determine and shall be so called on the request of at least one-third of the Contracting Parties.

ARTICLE 8

(1) Each Contracting Party shall have one vote in the Council.

(2) Decisions of the Council shall, except where otherwise in this Convention specially provided, be taken by a simple majority of the votes cast for or against. If there is an even division of votes on any matter which is subject to a simple majority decision the proposal shall be regarded as rejected.

ARTICLE 9

(1) Subject to the provisions of this Convention the Council shall draw up its own Rules of Procedure which shall be adopted by a two-thirds majority of the Contracting Parties.

(2) English and French shall be the working languages of the Council.

ARTICLE 10

(1) The Council shall elect from among the delegates its President, a first Vice-President and a further 5 Vice-Presidents. This last number may be augmented by a decision taken by the Council by a two-thirds majority.

(2) The President and the Vice-Presidents shall assume office on the first day of November next following their election, for a term of three years. They are eligible for re-election according to the Rules of Procedure.

(3) On assuming office the President shall cease forthwith to be a delegate.

ARTICLE 11

(1) The President and Vice-Presidents shall together constitute the Bureau of the Council.

(2) The Bureau shall be the Executive Committee of the Council and shall carry out the decisions of the Council, draw up its agenda and convene its meetings. It shall also prepare the budget. It shall invest the reserve funds and carry out the tasks entrusted to it by the Council. It shall account to the Council for its activities.

ARTICLE 12

There shall be a Consultative Committee, a Finance Committee and such other committees as the Council may deem necessary for the discharge of its functions with the duties respectively assigned to them in the Rules of Procedure.

ARTICLE 13

(1) The Council shall appoint a General Secretary on such terms and to perform such duties as it may determine.

(2) Subject to any general directions of the Council the Bureau shall appoint such other staff as may be required for the purposes of the Council on such terms and to perform such duties as it may determine.

ARTICLE 14

(1) Each Contracting Party shall pay the expenses of the delegates, experts and advisers appointed by it, except in so far as the Council may otherwise determine.

(2) The Council shall approve an annual budget of the proposed expenditure of the Council.

(3) In the first and second financial years after this Convention enters into force in accordance with Article 16 of this Convention the Contracting Parties shall contribute to the expenses of the Council such sums as they respectively contributed, or undertook to contribute, in respect of the year preceding the entry into force of this Convention.

(4) In respect of the third and subsequent financial years the Contracting Parties shall contribute sums calculated in accordance with a scheme to be prepared by the Council and accepted by all the Contracting Parties. This scheme may be modified by the Council with the agreement of all Contracting Parties.

(5) A Government acceding to this Convention shall contribute to the expenses of the Council such sums as may be agreed between that Government and the Council in respect of each financial year until the scheme under paragraph 4 provides for contributions from that Government.

(6) A Contracting Party which has not paid its contribution for two consecutive years shall not enjoy any rights under this Convention until it has fulfilled its financial obligations.

ARTICLE 15

(1) The Council shall enjoy, in the territories of the Contracting Parties, such legal capacity as may be agreed between the Council and the Government of the Contracting Party concerned.

(2) The Council, delegates and experts, the General Secretary and other officials shall enjoy in the territories of the Contracting Parties such privileges and immunities, necessary for the fulfillment of their functions, as may be agreed between the Council and the Government of the Contracting Party concerned.

ARTICLE 16

(1) This Convention shall be open until 31st December, 1964, for signature on behalf of the Governments of all states which participate in the work of the Council.

(2) This Convention is subject to ratification or approval by the signatory Governments in accordance with their respective constitutional procedures. The instruments of ratification or approval shall be deposited with the Government of Denmark, who will act as the depository Government.

(3) This Convention shall enter into force on the 22nd July next following the deposit of the instruments of ratification or approval by all signatory Governments. If, however, on the 1st January, 1968, all the signatory Governments have not ratified this Convention, but not less than three quarters of the signatory Government have deposited instruments of ratification or approval, these latter Governments may agree among themselves by special protocol on the date on which this Convention shall enter into force and on other related matters; and in that case this Convention shall enter into force, with respect to any other signatory Government that ratifies or approves thereafter, on the date of deposit of its instrument of ratification or approval.

(4) After the entry into force of this Convention in accordance with paragraph 3 of this Article, the Government of any State may apply to accede to this Convention by addressing a written application to the Government of Denmark. It shall be permitted to deposit an instrument of accession with that Government after the approval of the Governments of three quarters of the states which have already deposited their instruments of ratification, approval or accession, has been notified to the Government of Denmark. For any acceding Government this Convention shall enter into force on the date of deposit of its instrument of accession.

ARTICLE 17

At any time after two years from the date on which this Convention has come into force any Contracting Party may denounce the Convention by means of a notice in writing addressed to the Government of Denmark. Any such notice shall take effect twelve months after the date of its receipt.

ARTICLE 18

When the present Convention comes into force it shall be registered by the depository Government with the Secretariat of the United Nations Organisation in accordance with Article 102 of its Charter.

FINAL CLAUSE

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned being duly authorised have signed the present Convention:

DONE at Copenhagen this twelfth day of September 1964, in the English and French languages, both texts being equally authentic, in a single copy which shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of Denmark who shall forward certified true copies to all signatory and acceding Governments.

For the Government of Belgium

———— ————

For the Government of Dahomey

———— ————

For the Government of Denmark
J. NORGAARD

For the Government of Finland

———— ————

For the Government of France

———— ————

For the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany

———— ————

For the Government of Iceland
DAVID OLAFSSON

For the Government of Ireland
D. P. WALDRON
A. E. J. WENT

For the Government of Italy

For the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands

For the Government of Norway

For the Government of Poland
GASIOROWSKI

For the Government of Portugal

For the Government of Spain

For the Government of Sweden

For the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
V. ZAITSEV

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
A. J. AGLEN

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE CONSERVATION OF ATLANTIC TUNAS

PREAMBLE

The Governments whose duly authorised representatives has subscribed hereto, considering their mutual interest in the populations of tuna and tuna-like fishes found in the Atlantic Ocean, and desiring to co-operate in maintaining the populations of these fishes at levels which will permit the maximum sustainable catch for food and other purposes, resolve to conclude a Convention for the conservation of the resources of tuna and tuna-like fishes of the Atlantic Ocean, and to that end agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

The area to which this Convention shall apply, hereinafter referred to as the "Convention area", shall be all waters of the Atlantic Ocean, including the adjacent Seas.

ARTICLE II

Nothing in this Convention shall be considered as affecting the rights, claims or views of any Contracting Party in regard to the limits of territorial waters or the extent of jurisdiction over fisheries under international law.

ARTICLE III

1. The Contracting Parties hereby agree to establish and maintain a Commission to be known as the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas, hereinafter referred to as "the Commission", which shall carry out the objectives set forth in this Convention.

2. Each of the Contracting Parties shall be represented on the Commission by not more than three Delegates. Such Delegates may be assisted by experts and advisors.

3. Except as may otherwise be provided in this Convention, decisions of the Commission shall be taken by a majority of the Contracting Parties, each Contracting Party having one vote. Two-thirds of the Contracting Parties shall constitute a quorum.

4. The Commission shall hold a regular meeting once every two years. A special meeting may be called at any time at the request of a majority of the Contracting Parties or by decision of the Council as constituted in Article V.

5. At its first meeting, and thereafter at each regular meeting, the Commission shall elect from among its Members a Chairman, a first Vice-Chairman and a second Vice-Chairman who shall not be re-elected for more than one term.

6. The meetings of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies shall be public unless the Commission otherwise decides.

7. The official languages of the Commission shall be English, French and Spanish.

8. The Commission shall have authority to adopt such rules of procedure and financial regulations as are necessary to carry out its functions.

9. The Commission shall submit a report to the Contracting Parties every two years on its work and findings and shall also inform any Contracting Party, whenever requested, on any matter relating to the objectives of the Convention.

ARTICLE IV

1. In order to carry out the objectives of this Convention the Commission shall be responsible for the study of the populations of tuna and tuna-like fishes (the Scombriformes with the exception of the families Trichiuridae and Gempylidae and the genus Scomber) and such other species of fishes exploited in tuna fishing in the Convention area as are not under investigation by another international fishery organization. Such study shall include research on the abundance, biometry and ecology of the fishes; the oceanography of their environment; and the effects of natural and human factors upon their abundance. The Commission, in carrying out these responsibilities shall, insofar as feasible, utilise the technical and scientific services of, and information from, official agencies of the Contracting Parties and their political sub-divisions and may, when desirable, utilise the available services and information of any public or private institution, organization or individual, and may undertake within the limits of its budget independent research to supplement the research work being done by governments, national institutions or other international organizations.

2. The carrying out of the provisions in paragraph 1 of this Article shall include:

(a) collecting and analysing statistical information relating to the current conditions and trends of the tuna fishery resources of the Convention area;

(b) studying and appraising information concerning measures and methods to ensure maintenance of the populations of tuna and tuna-like fishes in the Convention area at levels which will permit the maximum sustainable catch and which will ensure the effective exploitation of these fishes in a manner consistent with this catch;

(c) recommending studies and investigations to the Contracting Parties;

(d) publishing and otherwise disseminating reports of its findings and statistical, biological and other scientific information relative to the tuna fisheries of the Convention area.

ARTICLE V

1. There is established within the Commission a Council which shall consist of the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman of the Commission together with the representatives of not less than four and not more than eight Contracting Parties. The Contracting Parties represented on the Council shall be elected at each regular meeting of the Commission. However, if at any time the number of the Contracting Parties exceeds forty, the Commission may elect an additional two Contracting Parties to be represented on the Council. The Contracting Parties of which the Chairman and Vice-Chairman are nationals shall not be elected to the Council. In elections to the Council the Commission shall give due consideration to the geographic, tuna fishing and tuna processing interests of the Contracting Parties, as well as to the equal right of the Contracting Parties to be represented on the Council.

2. The Council shall perform such functions as are assigned to it by this Convention or are designated by the Commission, and shall meet at least once in the interim between regular meetings of the Commission. Between meetings of the Commission the Council shall make necessary decisions on the duties to be carried out by the staff and shall issue necessary instructions to the Executive Secretary. Decisions of the Council shall be made in accordance with rules to be established by the Commission.

ARTICLE VI

To carry out the objectives of this Convention the Commission may establish Panels on the basis of species, group of species, or of geographic areas. Each Panel in such case:

(a) shall be responsible for keeping under review the species, group of species, or geographic area under its purview, and for collecting scientific and other information relating thereto;

(b) may propose to the Commission, upon the basis of scientific investigations, recommendaitons for joint action by the Contracting Parties;

(c) may recommend to the Commission studies and investigations necessary for obtaining information relating to its species, group of species, or geographic area, as well as the co-ordination of programmes of investigations by the Contracting Parties.

ARTICLE VII

The Commission shall appoint an Executive Secretary who shall serve at the pleasure of the Commission. The Executive Secretary, subject to such rules and procedures as may be determined by the Commission, shall have authority with respect to the selection and administration of the staff of the Commission. He shall also perform, *inter alia*, the following functions as the Commission may prescribe:

(a) co-ordinating the programmes of investigation by the Contracting Parties;

(b) preparing budget estimates for review by the Commission;

(c) authorizing the disbursement of funds in accordance with the Commission's budget;

(d) accounting for the funds of the Commission;

(e) arranging for co-operation with the organizations referred to in Article XI of this Convention;

(f) preparing the collection and analysis of data necessary to accomplish the purposes of the Convention particularly those data relating to the current and maximum sustainable catch of tuna stocks;

(g) preparing for approval by the Commission scientific, administrative and other reports of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies.

ARTICLE VIII

1. (a) The Commission may, on the basis of scientific evidence make recommendations designed to maintain the populations of tuna and tuna-like fishes that may be taken in the Convention area at levels which will permit the maximum sustainable catch. These recommendations shall be applicable to the Contracting Parties under the conditions laid down in paragraphs 2 and 3 of this Article.

(b) The recommendations referred to above shall be made:

(i) at the initiative of the Commission if an appropriate Panel has not been established or with the approval of at least two-thirds of all the Contracting Parties if an appropriate Panel has been established.

(ii) on the proposal of an appropriate Panel if such a Panel has been established;

(iii) on the proposal of the appropriate Panels if the recommendation in question relates to more than one geographic areas, species or group of species.

2. Each recommendation made under paragraph 1 of this Article shall become effective for all Contracting Parties six months after the date of the notification from the Commission transmitting the recommendation to the Contracting Parties, except as provided in paragraph 3 of this Article.

3. (a) If any Contracting Party in the case of a recommendation made under paragraph 1(b)(i) above, or any Contracting Party member of a Panel concerned in the case of a recommendation made under paragraph 1

(b) (ii) or (iii) above, presents to the Commission an objection to such recommendation within the six months period provided for in paragraph 2 above, the recommendation shall not become effective for an additional sixty days.

(b) Thereupon any other Contracting Party may present an objection prior to the expiration of the additional sixty days period, or within forty-five days of the date of the notification of an objection made by another Contracting Party within such additional sixty days, whichever date shall be the later.

(c) The recommendation shall become effective at the end of the extended period or periods for objection, except for those Contracting Parties that have presented an objection.

(d) However, if a recommendation has met with an objection presented by only one or less than one-fourth of the Contracting Parties, in accordance with sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) above, the Commission shall immediately notify the Contracting Party or Parties having presented such objection that it is to be considered as having no effect.

(e) In the case referred to in sub-paragraph (d) above the Contracting Party or Parties concerned shall have an additional period of sixty days from the date of said notification in which to reaffirm their objection. On the expiry of this period the recommendation shall become effective, except with respect to any Contracting Party having presented an objection and reaffirmed it within the delay provided for.

(f) If a recommendation has met with objection from more than one-fourth but less than the majority of the Contracting Parties, in accordance with sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) above, the recommendation shall become effective for the Contracting Parties that have not presented an objection thereto.

(g) If objections have been presented by a majority of the Contracting Parties the recommendation shall not become effective.

4. Any Contracting Party objecting to a recommendation may at any time withdraw that objection, and the recommendation shall become effective with respect to such Contracting Party immediately if the recommendation is already in effect, or at such time as it may become effective under the terms of this Article.

5. The Commission shall notify each Contracting Party immediately upon receipt of each objection and of each withdrawal of an objection, and of the entry into force of any recommendation.

ARTICLE IX

1. The Contracting Parties agree to take all action necessary to ensure the enforcement of this Convention. Each Contracting Party shall transmit to the Commission, biennially or at such other times as may be required by the Commission, a statement of the action taken by it for these purposes.

2. The Contracting Parties agree:

(a) to furnish, on the request of the Commission, any available statistical, biological and other scientific information the Commission may need for the purposes of this Convention;

(b) when their official agencies are unable to obtain and furnish the said information, to allow the Commission, through the Contracting parties, to obtain it on a voluntary basis direct from companies and individual fishermen.

3. The Contracting Parties undertake to collaborate with each other with a view to the adoption of suitable effective measures to ensure the application of the provisions of this Convention and in particular to set up a system of international enforcement to be applied to the Convention area except the territorial sea and other waters, if any, in which a state is entitled under international law to exercise jurisdiction over fisheries.

ARTICLE X

1. The Commission shall adopt a budget for the joint expenses of the Commission for the biennium following each regular meeting.

2. Each Contracting Party shall contribute annually to the budget of the Commission an amount equal to:

(a) U.S.$1,000 (one thousand United States dollars) for Commission membership.

(b) U.S.$1,000 (one thousand United States dollars) for each Panel membership.

(c) If the proposed budget for joint expenses for any biennium should exceed the whole amount of contributions to be made by the Contracting Parties under (a) and (b) of this paragraph, one-third of the amount of such excess shall be contributed by the Contracting Parties in proportion to their contributions made under (a) and (b) of this paragraph. For the remaining two-thirds the Commission shall determine on the basis of the latest available information:

(i) the total of the round weight of catch of Atlantic tuna and tuna-like fishes and the net weight of canned products of such fishes for each Contracting Party;

(ii) the total of (i) for all Contracting Parties.

Each Contracting Party shall contribute its share of the remaining two thirds in the same ratio that its total in (i) bears to the total in (ii). That part of the budget referred to in this sub-paragraph shall be set by agreement of all the Contracting Parties present and voting.

3. The Council shall review the second half of the biennial budget at its regular meeting between Commission meetings and on the basis of current and anticipated developments, may authorize re-apportionment of amounts in the Commission budget for the second year within the total budget approved by the Commission.

4. The Executive Secretary of the Commission shall notify each Contracting Party of its yearly assessment. The contributions shall be payable on January first of the year for which the assessment was levied. Contributions not received before January first of the succeeding year shall be considered as in arrears.

5. Contributions to the biennial budget shall be payable in such currencies as the Commission may decide.

6. At its first meeting the Commission shall approve a budget for the balance of the first year the Commission functions and for the following biennium. It shall immediately transmit to the Contracting Parties copies of these budgets together with notices of the respective assessments for the first annual contribution.

7. Thereafter, within a period not less than sixty days before the regular meeting of the Commission which precedes the biennium, the Executive Secretary shall submit to each Contracting Party a draft biennial budget together with a schedule of proposed assessments.

8. The Commission may suspend the voting rights of any Contracting Party when its arrears of contributions equal or exceed the amount due from it for the two preceding years.

9. The Commission shall establish a Working Capital Fund to finance operations of the Commission prior to receiving annual contributions, and for such other purposes as the Commission may determine. The Commission shall determine the level of the Fund, assess advances necessary for its establishment, and adopt regulations governing the use of the Fund.

10. The Commission shall arrange an annual independent audit of the Commission's accounts. The reports of such audits shall be reviewed and approved by the Commission, or by the Council in years when there is no regular Commission meeting.

11. The Commission may accept contributions, other than provided for in paragraph 2 of this Article, for the prosecution of its work.

ARTICLE XI

1. The Contracting Parties agree that there should be a working relationship between the Commission and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. To this end the Commission shall enter into negotiations with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations with a view to concluding an agreement pursuant to Article XIII of the Organization's Constitution. Such agreement should provide, inter alia, for the Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations to appoint a Representative who would participate in all meetings of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies, but without the right to vote.

2. The Contracting Parties agree that there should be co-operation between the Commission and other international fisheries commissions and scientific organizations which might contribute to the work of the Commission. The Commission may enter into agreements with such commissions and organizations.

3. The Commission may invite any appropriate international organization and any Government which is a member of the United Nations or of any Specialized Agency of the United Nations and which is not a member of the Commission, to send observers to meetings of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies.

ARTICLE XII

1. This Convention shall remain in force for ten years and thereafter until a majority of Contracting Parties agree to terminate it.

2. At any time after ten years from the date of entry into force of this Convention, any Contracting Party may withdraw from the Convention on December thirty-first of any year including the tenth year by written notification of withdrawal given on or before December thirty-first of the preceding year to the Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

3. Any other Contracting Party may thereupon withdraw from this Convention with effect from the same December thirty-first by giving written notification of withdrawal to the Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations not later than one month from the date of receipt of information from the Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations concerning any withdrawal, but not later than April first of that year.

ARTICLE XIII

1. Any Contracting Party or the Commission may propose amendments to this Convention. The Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations shall transmit a certified copy of the text of any proposed amendment to all the Contracting Parties. Any amendment not involving new obligations shall take effect for all Contracting Parties on the thirtieth day after its acceptance by three-fourths of the Contracting Parties. Any amendment involving new obligations shall take effect for each Contracting Party accepting the amendment on the ninetieth day after its acceptance by three-fourths of the Contracting Parties and thereafter for each remaining Contracting Party upon acceptance by it. Any amendment considered by one or more Contracting Parties to involve new obligations shall be deemed to involve new obligations and shall take effect accordingly. A government which becomes a Contracting Party after an amendment to this Conven-

tion has been opened for acceptance pursuant to the provisions of this Article shall be bound by the Convention as amended when the said amendment comes into force.

2. Proposed amendments shall be deposited with the Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Notifications of acceptance of amendments shall be deposited with the Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

ARTICLE XIV

1. This Convention shall be open for signature by any Government which is a member of the United Nations or of any Specialized Agency of the United Nations. Any such Government which does not sign this Convention may adhere to it at any time.

2. This Convention shall be subject to ratification or approval by signatory countries in accordance with their constitutions. Instruments of ratification, approval, or adherence shall be deposited with the Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

3. This Convention shall enter into force upon the deposit of instruments of ratification, approval, or adherence by seven Governments and shall enter into force with respect to each Government which subsequently deposits an instrument of ratification, approval or adherence on the date of such deposit.

ARTICLE XV

The Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations shall inform all Governments referred to in paragraph 1 of Article XIV of deposits of instruments of ratification, approval or adherence, the entry into force of this Convention, proposals for amendments, notifications of acceptance of amendments, entry into force of amendments, and notifications of withdrawal.

ARTICLE XVI

The original of this Convention shall be deposited with the Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations who shall send certified copies to the Governments referred to in paragraph 1 of Article XIV.

In witness whereof the representatives duly authorized by their respective Governments have signed the present Convention. Done at Rio de Janeiro this fourteenth day of May 1966 in a single copy in the English, French and Spanish languages, each version being equally authoritative.

Certified true copy of the International Convention for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas.

Rome, *29 July 1966.*

Oris V. Wells,
(For B. R. Sen, Director-General,
Food and Agriculture Organization
of the United Nations).

Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas

(Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, May 2 to 14, 1966)

FINAL ACT

1. The Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, at its Thirteenth Session held in Rome in November and December 1965, authorised the Director-General of that Organization to call a conference of Plenipotentiaries to prepare and adopt a Convention for the purpose of establishing a Commission for the conservation of tuna and tuna-like fishes in the Atlantic Ocean.

2. The Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Conservation of Atlantic tunas met, on the invitation of the Government of Brazil, in Rio de Janeiro from 2 to 14 May 1966.

3. The Governments of the following seventeen States were represented: Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, Democratic Republic of Congo, France, Japan, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of South Africa, Senegal, Spain, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

4. The Governments of the following three States were represented by observers: Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Poland.

5. The Conference elected His Excellency General Ney Aminthas de Barros Braga, Minister of Agriculture of Brazil, as President.

6. The Conference elected as Vice-Presidents: Argentina, France, Japan, Senegal, Spain, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

7. The following Committees were set up: *General Committee,* Chairman, The President of the Conference; *Main Committee,* Chairman, Dr. J. L. McHugh (United States of America); *Drafting Committee,* Chairman, Mr. B. H. Brittin (United States of America); *Credentials Committee,* Chairman, Mr. J. Rougé (France).

8. The Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations was represented by Mr. R. I. Jackson, Assistant Director-General (Fisheries).

9. The Conference had before it a draft Convention prepared by the FAO Working Party for Rational Utilization of Tuna Resources in the Atlantic Ocean at its second session held in Rome from 6 to 13 July 1965 and comments thereon submitted by Governments.

10. On the basis of its deliberations, as recorded, the Conference prepared and opened for signature Convention which is reproduced as Annex I hereto. The Convention will remain open for signature in Rio de Janeiro until 31 May 1966 and thereafter at the Headquarters of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations in Rome.

11. In addition the Conference adopted the following Resolution which is reproduced as Annex II hereto.

In witness whereof the representatives have signed this Final Act.

Argentina
Brazil
Canada
Cuba
Democratic Republic of Congo
France
Japan
Portugal
Republic of Korea
Republic of South Africa
Senegal
Spain
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
United States of America
Uruguay
Venezuela

Done at Rio de Janeiro this fourteenth day of May 1966 in a single copy in the English, French and Spanish languages, each text being equally authentic. The original texts shall be deposited in the archives of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Resolution on the Collection of Statistics on the Atlantic Tuna Fisheries

The Conference

Taking note of documents FID: AT/66/4, Annex 6, and FID: AT/66/INF–5 relating to the collection and publication of statistics on Atlantic tuna fisheries; and

Agreeing that it is essential that all countries fishing these Atlantic tuna resources should collect adequate statistics on catch and fishing effort and the necessary biological data, and make available for publication the statistical and related economic data with a view to enabling the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas to fulfill its functions adequately as soon as it is established;

Urges all countries to take steps without delay to create, where they do not already exist, offices within their fisheries administrations suitably staffed and having appropriate financial and legislative support to undertake the collection and the processing of the data to be used by the Commission, and

Suggests that all countries faced with the tasks of establishing and operating such offices, to give priority to requests for assistance in this connection through the United Nations Development Programme and through the Regular Programme of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Department of External
Affairs, Canada,
Ottawa, April 5, 1966.

No. X–92.

Excellency,

I have the honour to refer to conversations between representatives of our two Governments concerning amendment of the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries between Canada and the United States of America signed at Washington on September 10, 1954 to provide for the appointment by each Contracting Party of an additional member on the Great Lakes Fisheries Commission.

In accordance with those conversations, it is the understanding of the Government of Canada that the above-mentioned Convention shall be amended by substituting the word "four" for the word "three" in the second sentence of paragraph 1 of Article II.

I also have the honour to propose that, on confirmation of the foregoing understanding on behalf of the Government of the United States, this Note and Your Excellency's reply to that effect shall constitute an agreement between our two Governments, which shall enter into force on the date of Your Excellency's reply.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

Paul Martin,
Secretary of State for External Affairs.

His Excellency W. Walton Butterworth,
Ambassador of the United States of America,
100 Wellington Street,
Ottawa.

(Proposed Reply from the Government of the United States)

Excellency:

I have the honor to refer to Your Excellency's note of April 5, 1966, which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to refer to conversations between representatives of our two Governments concerning amendment of the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries between Canada and the United States of America signed at Washington on September 10, 1954 to provide for the appointment by each Contracting Party of an additional member on the Great Lakes Fisheries Commission.

"In accordance with those conversations, it is the understanding of the Government of Canada that the above-mentioned Convention shall be amended by substituting the word 'four' for the word 'three' in the second sentence of paragraph 1 of Article II.

"I also have the honour to propose that, on confirmation of the foregoing understanding on behalf of the Government of the United States, this Note and Your Excellency's reply to that effect shall constitute an agreement between our two Governments, which shall enter into force on the date of Your Excellency's reply."

I have the honor to confirm the foregoing understanding on behalf of my Government. Accordingly, Your Excellency's note and this reply shall constitute an agreement between our two Governments, which shall enter into force this day.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

FISHERIES TREATIES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the first group of treaties before the Senate includes the three fishery items Nos. 1, 2, and 3 on the calendar: The Convention for the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea—Executive H, 89th Congress, second session; the notes amending the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries—Executive T, 89th Congress, second session; and the Atlantic Tuna Convention—Executive U, 89th Congress, second session.

They all have the same basic aim of conserving the living resources of the seas. This is accomplished through the establishment of Commissions which study these resources and, on the basis of these studies, recommend conservation measures to the participating countries.

The International Council for the Exploration of the Sea is concerned with fishery resources in the Atlantic with particular emphasis on the Northeastern Atlantic. It was established in 1902 and the United States was briefly a member of it before World War I. It is now getting its first formal constitution and the administration thinks it is desirable to have the United States be a party to it again because of its broadening scope, the important and growing fisheries and oceanographic programs of our country, and the fact that this Council works closely with other organizations of which we are a member.

The Great Lakes Fisheries Commission obviously is concerned with the Great Lakes. A rather minor amendment to the original convention approved in 1955 is before the Committee, enlarging the Commission from six to eight members, with three instead of four appointed from each, the United States and Canada. The enlargement is to give representation to the Eastern Great Lakes States, since the Commission until recently had been mostly concerned with the sea lamprey problem in the Western Great Lakes and representation on the Commission was drawn from the States bordering those lakes.

The Atlantic Tuna Convention concerns tuna and tunalike fish in the whole Atlantic. It is very closely patterned on the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention of 1949 which deals with cod, haddock, flounder, and the like. Like it, it provides for a Commission to study the tuna and formulate conservation measures to be recommended to the participating countries. None of these recommendations will be binding on the United States if we disapprove of them. The exploitation of tuna in the Atlantic has been on a rapid increase and in the eyes of United States and other fishery experts the time is at hand to prepare conservation measures.

My subcommittee held hearings on these fishery matters on February 7 and so far as is known, there is absolutely no opposition to these treaties. In fact, on the Tuna Convention we had two specific endorsements from the Tuna Research Foundation and the American Turnabout Association.

Conservation is certainly in the highest U.S. tradition and for that reason, the Committee on Foreign Relations recommends that the Senate advise and consent to ratification of these treaties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. These conventions will be considered and voted on en bloc. The three treaties will be considered as having passed through their various parliamentary stages up to and including the point of the consideration of the resolutions of ratification.

The clerk will read the resolutions of ratification.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Convention for the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea, signed at Copenhagen under date of September 12, 1964. (Executive H, Eighty-ninth Congress, second session.)

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of a note of April 5, 1966, from the Government of Canada and a proposed reply from the Government of the United States concerning amendment of the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries between the United States of America and Canada, signed at Washington September 10, 1954. (Executive T, Eighty-ninth Congress, second session.)

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the International Convention for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas which was formulated by the Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas, Rio de Janeiro, May 2–14, 1966. (Executive U, Eighty-ninth Congress, second session.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the three treaties.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the first three treaties will be voted on en bloc. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator From Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent because of death in their respective families.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 90, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 34 Ex.]

YEAS—90

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hatfield
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—10

Bayh
Brewster
Carlson
Church
Fannin
Gruening
Jordan, N.C.
Montoya
Smathers
Williams, Del.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolutions of ratification are agreed to.

INTER-AMERICAN CONVENTION ON FACILITATION OF INTERNATIONAL WATERBORNE TRANSPORTATION (CONVENTION OF MAR DEL PLATA)—CONVENTION ON FACILITATION OF INTERNATIONAL MARITIME TRAFFIC

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, will now consider Executive Calendars Nos. 4 and 5, Executives Q and R, 89th Congress, second session, and vote on them en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The conventions were read the second time, as follows:

INTER-AMERICAN CONVENTION ON FACILITATION OF INTERNATIONAL WATERBORNE TRANSPORTATION (CONVENTION OF MAR DEL PLATA)

The Contracting States, inspired by the Charter of Punta del Este and by the Declaration of San Jose on the Principles on the Development, Administration and Operation of Ports in the Americas, and with a view to facilitating international waterborne transportation in the Western Hemisphere by reducing to a minimum the formalities, documentary requirements and procedures for the entry and clearance of vessels and the treatment of their passengers, crews, cargo and baggage, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE 1

Each Contracting State agrees to adopt all practicable measures, through the issuance of special regulations or otherwise, to facilitate and expedite waterborne transportation between the territories of the Contracting Sates, and to prevent unnecessary delays to vessels, passengers, crews, cargo and baggage in the administration of the laws relating to immigration, public health, customs, and other provisions relative to arrivals and departures of vessels.

ARTICLE 2

Each Contracting State undertakes, so far as it may find practicable, to establish appropriate procedures and legal provisions on immigration, public health, customs and other matters relative to arrivals and departures of vessels, in accordance with the standards and recommended practices which may be established from time to time, pursuant to this Convention. Nothing in this Convention shall be construed as preventing the establishment of customs-free ports or free zones.

ARTICLE 3

Each Contracting State undertakes to collaborate in securing the highest practicable degree of uniformity in appropriate procedures and legal provisions in relation to the entry and clearance of vessels and the treatment of passengers, crews, cargo and baggage in all matters in which such uniformity will facilitate and improve international waterborne transportation.

ARTICLE 4

(a) To these ends, the Inter-American Port and Harbor Conference of the Organization of American States shall, from time to time, when necessary, adopt and amend inter-American standards and recommended practices dealing with all matters relating to formalities, requirements and procedures relevant to the efficient and economic entry and clearance of vessels, and the expeditious and appropriate treatment of their passengers, crews, cargo and baggage.

(b) A Group of Experts from the governments of the Contracting States, established within the Permanent Technical Committee on Ports, attached to the Inter-American Economic and Social Council, shall, from time to time, when necessary, study and propose standards and recommended practices through the Committee to the Inter-American Port and Harbor Conference.

ARTICLE 5

(a) The adoption by the Inter-American Port and Harbor Conference of the standards and recommended practices and amendments thereto, as provided in paragraph (a) of Article 4 hereof shall require the affirmative vote of two thirds of the accredited delegations of the Contracting States present at the Conference.

(b) The standards and recommended practices adopted, and any amendment thereto, shall enter into force three months after submission to the Contracting States, unless the date of the entry into force is extended by the Conference or unless, in the meantime, a majority of the Contracting States notify their disapproval to the General Secretariat of the Organization of American States.

(c) The standards and recommended practices, and amendments thereto, shall constitute an Annex to the present Convention upon their entry into force, subject to the provisions of Article 6.

(d) The General Secretariat shall notify each of the Contracting States of the date of entry into force of the standards and recommended practices and of any amendment thereto.

ARTICLE 6

(a) Any State which finds it impracticable to comply with any inter-American standard or to bring its own regulations or practices into full accord with any such standard after amendment of the latter, or which deems it necessary to adopt regulations or practices differing from those established by an inter-American standard, shall give immediate notification to the General Secretariat of the Organization of American States of the differences between its own regulations or practices and those established by the inter-American standard.

(b) In the case of amendments to inter-American standards, any Contracting State which does not make the appropriate amendments to its own regulations or practices shall give notice to the General Secretariat within sixty days of the adoption of the amendment to the inter-American standard, or indicate the action which it proposes to take.

(c) In any such case, the General Secretariat shall notify all other States of the difference which exists between one or more features of an inter-American standard and the corresponding national practice of that State.

ARTICLE 7

The present Convention shall be open for signature or adherence by the member states of the Organization of American States or any other state to which an invitation to sign or adhere has been transmitted at the direction of the Council of the Organization of American States.

ARTICLE 8

(a) The original instrument, the English, French, Portuguese, and Spanish texts of which are equally authentic, shall be deposited with the General Secretariat of the Organization of American States, which shall transmit certified copies to each of the governments of the signatory States for ratification.

(b) The present Convention shall be subject to ratification by the signatory States in accordance with their respective constitutional procedures. The instruments of ratification and instruments of adherence shall be deposited with the General Secretariat of the Organization of American States, which shall notify each of the governments of the signatory States and each of the governments of the adhering States of the said deposit.

ARTICLE 9

The present Convention shall come into force on the thirtieth day following the date of deposit of the eleventh instrument of ratification or adherence with the General Secretariat of the Organization of American States. For each State ratifying or adhering to the Convention after the deposit of the eleventh instrument of ratification or adherence, the Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after deposit by such State of its instrument of ratification or adherence.

ARTICLE 10

The task of providing continuity in the implementation of this Convention, including periodic review of the standards and recommended practices, shall be entrusted to the Permanent Technical Committee on Ports. On its own initiative, or at the suggestion of a Contracting State, the Committee shall direct the Group of Experts to which reference is made in paragraph (b) of Article 4 hereof to study the desirability and feasibility of any proposed amendment to the Annex referred to in paragraph (c) of Article 5 and make recommendations thereon. Should the consideration and study of any amendments to this Convention be of interest to the Inter-American Travel Congresses or the Pan American Highway Congresses, they shall be consulted.

ARTICLE 11

The adoption of any amendment to this Convention shall require the affirmative vote in an Inter-American Port and Harbor Conference of two-thirds of the accredited delegations of the Contracting States present and shall then come into force in respect of States which have ratified such amendment in accordance with their respective constitutional procedures 30 days after there has been deposited in the General Secretariat of the Organization of American States the number of ratifications specified for this purpose by the Conference.

ARTICLE 12

(a) The present Convention may be denounced by any Contracting State at any time after the expiration of four years from the date on which the Convention comes into force for that State.

(b) Denunciation shall be effected by a notification in writing addressed to the General Secretariat of the Organization of American States which shall notify all the other Contracting States of any denunciation received and of the date of its receipt.

(c) A denunciation shall take effect one year, or such longer period as may be specified in the notification, after its receipt by the General Secretariat of the Organization.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned Plenipotentiaries, being duly authorized by their respective governments for that purpose, have signed the present Convention. Done at Mar del Plata, the seventh day of June of nineteen hundred and sixty-three.

RESERVATIONS AND STATEMENTS

Reservation made by the delegation of Chile

While signing the present Convention, Chile reserves the right to apply a more favorable treatment with respect to international maritime transportation regulations and procedures in virtue of existing bilateral or multilateral agreements.

Statement Made by the Delegation of Chile

On signing the Inter-American Convention on the Facilitation of International Waterborne Transportation (Convention of Mar del Plata), the Delegation of Chile declares that it believes that this Convention in no way affects other conventions on international waterborne transportation, which remain in full force and will continue to be applied.

Mar del Plata, Argentina
June 7, 1963
(Signed) ANDRES AVENDANO FUENZALIDA,
Delegate of Chile.

[Here follow the signatures of the Plenipotentiaries.]

I hereby certify that the foregoing document is a true and faithful copy of the original of the Inter-American Convention on Facilitation of International Waterborne Transportation (Convention of Mar del Plata), signed at the Second Inter-American Port and Harbor Conference, Mar del Plata, Argentina, May 29–June 7, 1963.

July 15, 1963

WILLIAM SANDERS,
Assistant Secretary General of the Organization of American States.

ANNEX TO THE INTER-AMERICAN CONVENTION ON FACILITATION OF INTERNATIONAL WATERBORNE TRANSPORTATION[1] (CONVENTION OF MAR DEL PLATA)

Standards and Recommended Practices as contained in this Annex shall be defined as follows:

Standards. Any specification, uniform compliance with which is recognized as practicable and as necessary to facilitate international waterborne transportation.

---

[1] Adopted by Resolution approved by the First Special Inter-American Port and Harbor Conference, April 19, 1966.

Recommended practice. Any specification, the uniform observance of which is recognized as desirable to facilitate international waterborne transportation.

CHAPTER I

Definitions and general provisions

A. Definitions

For the purposes of the provisions of this Annex, the following meanings shall be attributed to the terms listed:

Cargo. Any goods, wares, merchandise, and articles of every kind whatsoever carried on a ship, other than mail, ship's stores, ship's spare parts, ship's equipment, crew's effects and passengers' accompanied baggage.

Crew's effects. Clothing, personal effects, and any other articles, which may include currency, belonging to the crew member and carried on the ship.

Crew member. Any person actually employed for duties on board during a voyage in the working or service of a ship.

Mail. Dispatches of correspondence and other objects tendered by and intended for delivery to postal administrations.

Passengers' accompanied baggage. Articles, which may include currency, carried for a passenger on the same ship, either in his cabin or elsewhere, so long as they are not carried under a contract of carriage or other similar agreement.

Public authorities. The agencies and or officials in a contracting state responsible for the application and enforcement of the laws and regulations of that state which relate to any aspect of these Standards and Recommended Practices.

Seafarer. Any person who works on board a ship as a regular occupation and who is accredited as such by competent authority.

Shipowner. Any person, corporation, or other legal entity that is the owner, operator, or agent of a ship, or any person who lawfully represents such owner, operator, or agent.

Ship's stores. Goods for use in the ship, including fuel and lubricants and other consumable goods, and goods carried for sale to passengers and crew.

Ship's equipment. Articles, other than ship's stores or ship's spare parts, on board a ship for use thereon in connection with a voyage that are removable, but not of consumable nature, including accessories such as life boats, lifesaving equipment, furniture, ship's apparel, and similar items.

Ship's Spare parts. Articles or materials to be used to repair or replace parts or fixed equipment of the ship.

B. General Provisions

The provisions of this Annex apply to all categories of vessel operation except where a particular provision specifically refers to one type of operation without mentioning others.

The provisions of this Annex recognize the principle of equality between all forms of transportation with regard to measures for facilitation and further recognize that such measures may differ according to particular requirements of international waterborne transportation.

The provisions of this Annex shall not prevent public authorities from taking such appropriate measures, including calling for further information, as may be necessary in cases of suspected fraud or to deal with special problems constituting a grave danger to public order (order public), public security, or public health, or to prevent the introduction or spread of diseases or pests affecting animals or plants.

1.1 *Standard.* Public authorities shall in all cases require only essential information to be furnished, and shall keep the number of items to a minimum.

Where a specific list of particulars is set out in this Annex, public authorities shall not require to be furnished such of those particulars as they consider not essential.

1.2 *Recommended practice.* Notwithstanding the fact that documents for certain purposes may be separately prescribed and required in this Annex, public authorities, bearing in mind the interests of those who are required to complete the documents as well as the purposes for which they are to be used, should provide for any two or more such documents to be combined into one in any case in which this is practicable and in which an appreciable degree of facilitation would result.

1.3 *Standard.* None of the provisions contained in this Annex shall prevent a contracting state from adopting standards or recommended practices of a more favorable character for purposes of facilitation of international waterborne transportation.

CHAPTER II

Entrance and clearance of the ship

This section contains the provisions concerning the formalities required of shipowners, or persons appointed on their behalf, by the public authorities on the entrance and clearance of a ship and shall not be read so as to preclude a requirement for the presentation for inspection by the appropriate authorities of certificates and other papers carried by the ship pertaining to its registry, certificate of seaworthiness, measurement, safety, manning and other related matters.

A. General

2.1 *Standard.* In cases of entrance and departure of ships, public authorities shall not require for their retention, any basic documents other than the following:

General Declaration
Cargo Manifest
Ship's Stores Declaration
Crew's Effects Declaration
Crew List
Passenger List
The document required under the Universal Postal Convention for mail
Maritime Declaration of Health

B. Contents and Purpose of Documents

2.2 *Standard.* The General Declaration shall be the basic document on entrance and clearance, providing information required by public authorities relating to the ship.

2.2.1 *Recommended practice.* The same form of General Declaration, duly authorized, should be accepted for both the entrance and the clearance of a ship.

2.2.2 *Recommended practice.* In the General Declaration the public authorities should not require more than the following information:

Name and description of ship
Nationality of ship
Particulars regarding registry
Particulars regarding tonnage measurement
Name of master
Name and address of ship's agent
Brief description of the cargo indicating whether or not any of it is dangerous
Number of crew
Number of passengers
Brief particulars of voyage
Date and time of arrival, or date of departure
Port of arrival or departure
Position of the ship in the port

2.2.3 *Standard.* Public authorities shall accept a General Declaration dated and signed by the master or the ship's agent, or some other person duly authorized by one of them.

2.3 *Standard.* The Cargo Manifest shall be the basic document on entrance or clearance providing information required by public authorities relating to the cargo. Particulars of any dangerous cargo shall also be required to be furnished.

2.3.1 *Recommended practice.* In the Cargo Manifest public authorities should not require more than the following information:

(a) On Entrance:
Name and nationality of the ship
Name of master
Port of loading
Port of discharge
Marks and numbers, number and kind of packages; weight and/or measurement, and description of the goods as shown by the bill of lading specifying if it is explosive, flammable, or poisonous, as required in Standard 2.3
Name of consignee of the goods
Bill of lading number
Ports at which the cargo remaining on board will be discharged
Original ports of shipment in respect of goods shipped on through bills of lading

(b) On Clearance:
Name and nationality of the ship
Name of Master
Port of destination
In respect of goods loaded at the port in question: marks and numbers; number and kind of packages; weight and/or measurement and description of the goods as shown by the bill of lading specifying if it is explosive, flammable, or poisonous as required in Standard 2.3, bill of lading numbers.

2.3.2 *Recommended practice.* In respect of cargo remaining on board, public authorities should require only the minimum essential details to be furnished on arrival.

2.3.3 *Standard.* Public authorities shall accept a Cargo Manifest dated and signed by the master or the ship's agent, or some other person duly authorized by one of them.

2.3.4 *Recommended practice.* In case of justified necessity, public authorities should accept in place of the Cargo Manifest a copy of the ship's manifest, provided it contains all the information required in accordance with Recommended Practice 2.3.1 and is dated and signed in accordance with Standard 2.3.3.

As an alternative, public authorities may accept a copy of the bill of lading dated and signed in accordance with standard 2.3.3 or certified as a true copy if the nature and quantity of cargo make this practicable and provided that any information in accordance with Recommended practice 2.3.1 which does not appear in such document is also furnished elsewhere and duly certified.

2.4 *Standard.* The Ship's Stores Declaration shall be the basic document on entrance and clearance providing information required by public authorities relating to ship's stores.

2.4.1 *Standard.* Public authorities shall accept a Ship's Stores Declaration dated and signed by the master or by some other qualified and duly authorized ship's officer.

2.5 *Standard.* The Crew's Effects Declaration shall be the basic document providing information required by public authorities relating to crew's effects. It shall not be required on clearance of the ship.

2.5.1 *Standard.* Public authorities shall accept a Crew's Effects Declaration dated and signed by the master or by some other ship's officer duly authorized by the Master. The public authorities may also require each crew member to place his signature, or, if he is unable to do so, his mark against the declaration relating to his effects.

2.5.2 *Recommended practice.* Public authorities should normally require particulars of only those crew's effects which are negotiable, dutiable or subject to prohibitions or restrictions.

2.6 *Standard.* The Crew List shall be the basic document providing public authorities with information relating to the number and composition of the crew on the entrance or clearance of a ship.

2.6.1 *Recommended practice.* In the Crew List, public authorities should not require more than the following information:

Name and nationality of the ship
Family name and given names
Sex

Nationality
Rank or rating
Date and place of birth
Nature and number of identity document
Port and date of arrival
Arriving from

2.6.2 *Standard.* Public authorities shall accept a Crew List dated and signed by the master or by some other ship's officer duly authorized by the master.

2.7 *Standard.* The Passenger List shall be the basic document providing public authorities with information relating to passengers on the entrance or clearance of a ship. This document shall not be required when that ship is not carrying passengers.

2.7.1 *Recommended practice.* Public authorities may not require Passenger Lists on short water routes or combined ship railway services between neighboring countries.

2.7.2 *Recommended practice.* Public authorities should not require embarkation or disembarkation cards in addition to passenger lists. However, where public authorities have special problems constituting a grave danger to public health, a person on an international voyage may on arrival be required to give a destination address in writing.

2.7.3 *Recommended practice.* In the Passenger List, public authorities should not require more than the following information:

Name and nationality of the ship
Port and date of arrival
Family and given names
Nationality
Date of birth
Place of birth
Port of embarkation
Port of disembarkation

2.7.4 *Recommended practice.* A list compiled by the shipping company for its own use may be accepted in place of the Passenger List provided it contains the information required in Recommended practice 2.7.3 and is dated and signed in accordance with Standard 2.7.5.

2.7.5 *Standard.* Public authorities shall accept a Passenger List dated and signed by the master, the ship's agent, or some other person duly authorized by one of them.

2.8 *Standard.* Public authorities shall not require on entrance or clearance of the ship any written declaration respecting mail other than that prescribed in the Universal Postal Convention.

2.9 *Standard.* The Maritime Declaration of Health shall be the basic document providing information required by port health authorities relating to the state of health on board a ship during the voyage and on arrival at a port.

C. Formalities on Entrance

2.10 *Standard.* In respect of a ship's entrance in port, public authorities shall not require more than:

5 copies of the General Declaration
4 copies of the Cargo Manifest
4 copies of the Ship's Stores Declaration
2 copies of the Crew's Effects Declaration
4 copies of the Crew List
4 copies of the Passenger List
1 copy of the Maritime Declaration of Health

D. Formalities on Clearance

2.11 *Standard.* In respect of a ship's clearance from port, public authorities shall not require more than:

5 copies of the General Declaration
4 copies of the Cargo Manifest
3 copies of the Ship's Stores Declaration
4 copies of the Crew List
4 copies of the Passenger List

2.11.1 *Standard.* A new Cargo Manifest shall not be required on clearance from a port in respect of cargo which had been the subject of a declaration on entrance in that port and which has remained on board.

2.11.2 *Recommended practice.* A separate Ship's Store Declaration should not be required on clearance in respect of ship's store which have been the subject of a declaration on entrance, nor in respect of stores shipped in the port and covered by another Customs document presented in that port.

2.11.3 *Standard.* Where public authorities require information about the crew of a ship on its clearance, a copy of the Crew List, presented on entrance, shall be accepted on clearance if signed again and endorsed to indicate any change in the number of composition of the crew or to indicate that no such change has occurred.

E. Measures to Facilitate Port Traffic Movement

2.12 *Recommended practice.* Public authorities should, with the cooperation of shipowners, or users of port services, take appropriate measures so that the time of stay of the ship in the port will be kept to a minimum and should take measures to permit satisfactory movement of traffic; they should frequently review all procedures in connection with the entrance and clearance of ships and related arrangements for loading and unloading, as well as the supplying of the ships; and they should make arrangements so that ships may be entered and cleared and perform all loading and unloading operations, insofar as practicable, at the ship working area.

Public authorities should limit as strictly as possible the number of persons who are to act officially on board the ships. They should likewise prohibit access to the ships by persons not connected with the activities of entrance, loading, unloading, or clearance.

F. Consecutive Calls at Two or More Ports in the Same State

2.13. *Recommended practice.* Taking into account the procedures carried out on the entrance of a ship at the first port of call in the territory of a State, the formalities and documents required by the public authorities at any subsequent port of call in that country, visited without intermediate call at a port in another country, should be kept to a minimum.

Public authorities may, however, require that formalities be fulfilled and documentation presented again, where the immediately preceding port of call in the territory of the same State enjoys preferential customs treatment.

G. Completion of Documents

2.14 *Recommended practice.* Public authorities should as far as possible accept the documents provided for in this Annex, except as regards Standard 3.7, in which the required information is furnished thereon in English, French, Portuguese, or Spanish, provided that they may require a written translation into the official language of the country.

2.15 *Standard.* The documents that are referred to in Chapter II shall be accepted when either typewritten or handwritten legibly in ink or indelible pencil. Corrections or additions shall also be accepted in either form provided they are duly initialed or signed.

2.16 *Recommended practice.*[1] Public authorities of the country of any intended port of arrival, discharge, or transit, should not require any document relating to the ship, its cargo, stores, passengers, or crew, as mentioned in this chapter, to be legalized, verified, authenticated, or previously dealt with by any of their representatives abroad. This should not be deemed to preclude a requirement for the presentation of a passport or other identity document of a passenger or crew member for visa or similar purposes.

CHAPTER III

Arrival and departure of persons

This section contains the provisions concerning the formalities required by public authorities from passengers and crew on entrance or clearance of a ship.

A. Requirements and Procedures

3.1 *Standard.* A valid passport shall be the basic document providing public authorities with information relating to the individual passenger on his arrival or departure.

3.1.1 *Recommended practice.* Contracting states should as far as possible agree, by bilateral or multilateral agreements, to accept official documents of identity in lieu of passports.

3.2 *Recommended practice.* Public authorities should make arrangements whereby passports, or official documents of identity accepted in their place, from ship's passengers need be inspected by the immigration authorities only once at the time of arrival and once at the time of departure. In addition, these passports or official documents of identity may be required to be produced for the purpose of verification or identification in connection with customs and other formalities on arrival and departure.

3.3 *Recommended practice.* After individual presentation of passports or official documents of identity accepted in their place, public authorities should hand back such documents immediately after examination, rather than withholding them for the purpose of obtaining additional control, unless there is some obstacle to the admission of a passenger to the territory.

3.4 *Recommended practice.* Public authorities should not require from embarking or disembarking passengers, or from shipowners on their behalf, any information in writing supplementary to or repeating that already presented in their passports or official documents of identity, other than as necessary to complete any documents provided for in this Annex.

3.5 *Recommended practice.* Public authorities which require written supplementary information other than as necessary to complete any documents provided for in this Annex, from embarking or disembarking passengers, should limit requirements for further identification of passenger to the items set forth in Recommended practice 3.6 (Embarkation/Disembarkation Card). Public authorities should accept the Embarkation/Disembarkation Card when completed by the passenger and should not require that it be completed or checked by the shipowner. Legible handwritten script should be accepted on the card, except where the form specifies block lettering. One copy only of the Embarkation/Disembarkation Card, which may include one or more simultaneoucly prepared carbon copies, should be required from each passenger.

3.6 *Recommended practice.* In the Embarkation/Disembarkation Card public authorities should not require more than the following information:

Family and Given names
Nationality
Number of Passport or other official document of identity
Date of birth
Place of birth
Occupation
Port of embarkation/disembarkation
Sex
Permanent address
Designation address
Signature

3.7 *Standard.* In cases where evidence of protection against cholera, yellow fever, or small-pox is required from persons on board a ship, public authorities shall accept the International Certificate of Vaccination or Re-vaccination in the forms provided in the International Sanitary Regulations.

---

[1] "Standard" was changed to "recommended practice" by decision taken in plenary session held April 19, 1966, First Special Inter-American Port and Harbor Conference.

3.8 *Recommended practice.* Medical examinations of persons on board or of persons disembarking from ships should normally be limited to those persons arriving from a local area infected with one of the quarantinable diseases within the incubation period of the disease concerned (as stated in the International Sanitary Regulations). Additional medical examination may, however, be required in accordance with International Sanitary Regulations.

3.9 *Recommended practice.* Public authorities should normally perform customs inspection of inbound passengers' accompanied baggage on a sampling or selective basis. Written declarations in respect of passengers' accompanied baggage should be dispensed with as far as possible.

3.9.1 *Recommended practice.* Public authorities should waive inspection of accompanied baggage of departing passengers.

3.9.2 *Recommended practice.* Where inspection of accompanied baggage of departing passengers cannot be waived completely, such inspection should normally be performed on a sampling or selective basis.

3.10 *Standard.* A valid seafarer's identity document or a passport shall be the basic document providing public authorities with information relating to the individual member of the crew on arrival or departure of a ship.

3.10.1 *Standard.* In the seafarer's identity document, public authorities shall not require more than the following information:

Family name
Given names
Date and place of birth
Nationality
Physical characteristics
Photograph (authenticated)
Signature and fingerprint
Date of expiry of the document
Issuing public authority

3.10.2 *Standard.* When it is necessary for a seafarer to enter or leave a country as a passenger by any means of transportation for the purpose of:

a. joining his ship or transferring to another ship,

b. passing in transit to join his ship in another country, or for repatriation, or for any other purpose approved by the authorities of the country concerned,

public authorities shall accept from that seafarer in place of a passport the valid seafarer's identity document, when this document guarantees the readmission of the bearer to the country which issued the document.

3.10.3 *Recommended practice.* Public authorities should not normally require presentation of individual identity documents or of information supplementing the seafarer's identity document in respect of members of the crew other than that given in the Crew list.

B. Measures To Facilitate Clearance of Passengers, Crew, and Baggage

3.11 *Recommended practice.* Public authorities should, with the cooperation of shipowners and port administrations, take appropriate measures to end that satisfactory port traffic flow arrangements may be provided so that passengers, crew, and baggage can be cleared rapidly even on holidays; should provide adequate personnel; and should ensure that adequate installations are provided, particular attention being paid to baggage loading, unloading, and conveyance arrangements (including the use of mechanized systems), and to points where passenger delays are frequently found to occur. Arrangements should be made so that, when necessary, passengers and crew can proceed under shelter from the ship to the point where the passenger and crew check is to be made.

3.11.1 *Recommended practice.* Public authorities should:

a. In cooperation with shipowners and port administrations introduce suitable arrangements, such as:

i. An individual and continuous method of processing passengers and baggage.

ii. A system which would permit passengers readily to identify and obtain their checked baggage as soon as it is placed in an area where it may be claimed.

b. Ensure that port administration take all necessary measures so that:

i. Easy and speedy access, for arriving and departing passengers and baggage, to and from local transport, is provided.

ii. If crews are required to report to premises for governmental purposes, those premises should be readily accessible, and as close to one another as practicable.

3.12 *Recommended practice.* Public authorities should require that shipowners ensure that ship's personnel take all appropriate measures which will help to expedite arrival procedures for passengers and crew. These measures may include:

a. Furnishing officials of public authorities concerned with an advance message giving the best estimated time of arrival (docking or anchoring), followed by information as to any change in time (and stating the itinerary of the voyage where this may affect inspection requirements);

b. having ship's documents ready for prompt review;

c. providing for ladders or other means of boarding to be rigged while the ship is enroute to berth or anchorage;

d. providing for prompt, orderly assembling and presentation of persons on board, with necessary documents, for inspection, with attention to arrangements for relieving crew members for this purpose from essential duties in engine rooms and elsewhere.

3.13 *Standard.* Public authorities shall, without unreasonable delay, accept passengers and crew for examination as to their admissibility into the state when such examination is required.

3.14 *Recommended practice.* Public authorities should invite shipowners to take all reasonable precautions to the end that passengers hold any control documents required by Contracting Governments.

C. Completion of Documents

3.15 *Recommended practice.* The practice of entering names on passenger and crew documents should be to put the family name or family names first. Where both paternal and maternal family names are used, the paternal family name should be placed first. Where for married females both the husband's and the wife's paternal family names are used, the husband's paternal family name should be placed first.

CHAPTER IV

Entry and departure of cargo and other articles

A. General

4.1 *Recommended practice.* Public authorities should, with the cooperation of shipowners, and other users of port services, take appropriate measures to the end that satisfactory port traffic flow arrangements are provided so that handling and clearance procedures for cargo will be smooth and uncomplicated. These arrangements should cover all phases from the time the ship arrives at the dock for unloading, customs clearance, warehousing (when required), and reforwarding (when required). There should be convenient and direct access between the cargo warehouse and the customs area, both of which should be located close to the dock area, and mechanical conveyance systems should be available, where possible.

B. Documentary Requirements

4.2 *Standard.* Public authorities which require the bill of lading to be presented for inspection in connection with the clearance of cargo shall not require the consignor or operator to place special information for customs or other governmental purposes on the bill of lading.

4.3 *Recommended practice.* Where the public authorities require documents such as commercial invoices, declaration forms, import licenses, and the like, they should not make it the obligation of the operator to ensure that these documentary requirements are met, nor should the operator be held responsible, fined, or penalized for inaccuracies or omissions of facts from such documents, unless he is, or is acting for, the importer or exporter.

C. Procedures Concerning the Clearance of Particular Articles

4.4 *Standard.* Public authorities shall grant preferential treatment to the clearance of spare parts, fuel, and any other articles not available to the shipowner in the port and that are necessary for the operation or security of the ship.

4.5 *Recommended practice.* Public authorities should give preferential treatment to the clearance of terminal and water equipment needed for immediate use by the shipowner.

4.6 *Recommended practice.* Unaccompanied baggage by water should be considered as baggage and not as cargo for the purpose of clearance through customs controls. (It is the intent of this provision that the same customs concessions be granted as for accompanied baggage, subject to compliance with the regulations of the contracting state concerned.)

D. Cargo and Other Articles not Unladen at Intended Destination

4.7 *Recommended practice.* When cargo or unaccompanied baggage do not arrive at their intended destination, the shipowner, without prejudice to his civil liability, should, in country of intended destination, be exempt from penalties, fines, customs duties, and taxes if it is shown by the shipowner to the satisfaction of the public authorities concerned that the goods in question were not actually laden at the point of origin or were sent to another point of destination because of error, emergency, or inaccessible stowage or were destroyed by accident.

4.8 *Recommended practice.* When cargo or unaccompanied baggage are not unladen at their intended destination, because of error, emergency, or inaccessible stowage, and the public authorities at the place of intended unlading are satisfied that no unlading has taken place, they should accept a notation on either the manifest or the General Declaration by the shipowner that the articles in question have not been unladen and the reasons therefor, and should not require the shipowner to prepare new documentation.

4.9 *Standard.* When by error, or for other valid reason, any cargo is discharged at a port other than the port of intended destination, public authorities shall facilitate reforwarding to its intended destination.

CHAPTER V

Public health and sanitary measures for animals and plants

By a decision of 25 May 1951, the Assembly of the World Health Organization adopted International Sanitary Regulations which, together with subsequent amendments thereto, are in force between those States which have accepted them.

A. General

5.1 *Recommended practice.* Public authorities of a State not party to the International Sanitary Regulations of the World Health Organization should endeavor to apply the relevant provisions of the regulations to international shipping.

5.2 *Recommended practice.* Contracting states having certain interests in common owing to their health, geographical, social or economic conditions should conclude special arrangements pursuant to Article 104 of the International Sanitary Regulations when such arrangements will facilitate the application of those Regulations.

B. Documents

5.3 *Recommended practice.* Where Sanitary Certificates or similar documents are required in respect of shipments of certain animals, plants or products thereof the requirements should be simple and widely publicized and contracting states should cooperate with a view to standardizing such requirements.

C. Formalities

5.4 *Standard.* Public authorities shall whenever practicable, authorize granting of practique by radio to a ship when, on the basis of information received from it prior to its arrival, the health authority for the intended port of arrival is of the opinion that its arrival will not result in the introduction or spread of a quarantinable disease. Health authorities should as far as practicable be allowed to join a ship prior to entry of the ship into the port.

5.4.1 *Recommended practice.* Public authorities should require that ships report promptly by radio any illness on board to health authorities for the port for which the ship is destined, in order to facilitate provision for the presence of any special medical personnel and equipment necessary for health procedures on arrival.

5.5 *Standard.* Public authorities in cooperation with shipowners and all other agencies concerned shall take appropriate measures in an endeavor to ensure that, before embarkation: a) passengers and crew shall obtain any vaccinations or revaccinations in accordance with the requirements of the states concerned, and b) proper certificates are obtained and such certificates are completely and properly executed.

5.6 *Standard.* Public authorities shall ensure that sanitary measures and health formalities are initiated forthwith, completed without delay and applied without discrimination.

D. Facilities

5.7 *Recommended practice.* Public authorities should provide facilities for the completion of International Certificates of vaccination or revaccination as well as facilities for vaccination, at as many ports as feasible.

5.8 *Recommended practice.* Public authorities should have available at as many ports in a state as feasible adequate facilities for the administration of public health, animal and agricultural quarantine measures.

5.9 *Recommended practice.* There should be maintained at as many ports in a state as feasible such medical facilities as may be reasonable and practicable for the emergency treatment of crews and passengers.

5.10. *Standard.* A ship which is not infected or suspected of being infected with a quarantinable disease, shall not on account of any other epidemic disease be prevented by the health authorities for a port from discharging or loading cargo or stores, or taking on fuel or water.

CHAPTER VI

Miscellaneous provisions

A. Bonds and Other Forms of Security

6.1 *Recommended practice.* Where public authorities require bonds or other forms of security from shipowners to cover liabilities under the port and customs services, immigration, public health, agricultural quarantine or similar laws or regulations of a state, they should permit the use of adequate and reasonable bonds for cash case. Whenever possible they should accept a single comprehensive bond.

B. Errors in Documentation and Penalties Therefor

6.2 *Standard.* Public authorities shall, without delaying the ship, allow corrections of errors in a document provided for in this Annex, which they are satisfied are inadvertent, not of a serious nature, not due to recurrent carelessness and not made with intent to violate laws or regulations on the condition that these errors are discovered before the document is fully checked and the corrections can be effected without delay.

6.3 *Standard.* If errors are found in documents provided for in this Annex signed by or on behalf of a shipowner or master, no penalty or fine shall be imposed until an opportunity has been given to establish to the authorities that the errors were inadvertent, not due to recurrent carelessness, and not made with intent to violate laws or regulations.

C. Service at Ports

6.4 *Standard.* The normal services of public authorities shall be provided at ports without charge during their regular working hours.

6.5 *Standard.* Public authorities shall establish regular working hours for their services at ports consistent with the usual periods of substantial work load.

6.5.1 *Recommended practice.* When the services of public authorities are provided outside the regular working hours referred to in Standard 6.4 and Standard 6.5, they should be provided on terms which shall be moderate and not exceed the true cost.

6.6 *Standard.* Where the volume of traffic at a port warrants, public authorities shall ensure that services are provided for the accomplishment of the formalities in respect of cargo and baggage, regardless of value or type.

6.7 *Recommended practice.* Contracting states should endeavor to make arrangements whereby one state will permit another state certain facilities before or during the voyage to examine ships, passengers, crew, baggage, cargo, and documentation for customs, immigration, public health, and plant and animal quarantine purposes when such action will facilitate clearance upon arrival in the latter state.

CONVENTION ON FACILITATION OF INTERNATIONAL MARITIME TRAFFIC

The Contracting Governments:

Desiring to facilitate maritime traffic by simplifying and reducing to a minimum the formalities, documentary requirements and procedures on the arrival, stay, and departure of ships engaged in international voyages;

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

The Contracting Governments undertake to adopt, in accordance with the provisions of the present Convention and its Annex, all appropriate measures to facilitate and expedite international maritime traffic and to prevent unnecessary delays to ships and to persons and property on board.

ARTICLE II

(1) The Contracting Governments undertake to co-operate, in accordance with the provisions of the present Convention, in the formulation and application of measures for the facilitation of the arrival, stay and departure of ships. Such measures shall be, to the fullest extent practicable, not less favourable than measures applied in respect of other means of international transport; however, these measures may differ according to particular requirements.

(2) The measures for the facilitation of international maritime traffic provided for under the present Convention and its Annex apply equally to the ships of coastal and non-coastal States the Governments of which are Parties to the present Convention.

(3) The provisions of the present Convention do not apply to warships or pleasure yachts.

ARTICLE III

The Contracting Governments undertake to co-operate in securing the highest practicable degree of uniformity in formalities, documentary requirements and procedures in all matters in which such uniformity will facilitate and improve international maritime traffic and keep to a minimum any alterations in formalities, documentary requirements and procedures necessary to meet special requirements of a domestic nature.

ARTICLE IV

With a view to achieving the ends set forth in the preceding Articles of the present Convention, the Contracting Governments undertake to co-operate with each other or through the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (hereinafter called the "Organization") in matters relating to formalities, documentary requirements and procedures, as well as their application to international maritime traffic.

ARTICLE V

(1) Nothing in the present Convention or its Annex shall be interpreted as preventing the application of any wider facilities which a Contracting Government grants or may grant in future in respect of international maritime traffic under its national laws or the provisions of any other international agreement.

(2) Nothing in the present Convention or its Annex shall be interpreted as precluding a Contracting Government from applying temporary measures considered by that Government to be necessary to preserve public morality, order and security or to prevent the introduction or spread of diseases or pests affecting public health, animals or plants.

(3) All matters that are not expressly provided for in the present Convention remain subject to the legislation of the Contracting Governments.

ARTICLE VI

For the purposes of the present Convention and its Annex:

(*a*) "Standards" are those measures the uniform application of which by Contracting Governments in accordance with the Convention is necessary and practicable in order to facilitate international maritime traffic;

(*b*) "Recommended Practices" are those measures the application of which by Contracting Governments is desirable in order to facilitate international maritime traffic.

ARTICLE VII

(1) The Annex to the present Convention may be amended by the Contracting Governments, either at the proposal of one of them or by a conference convened for that purpose.

(2) Any Contracting Government may propose an amendment to the Annex by forwarding a draft amendment to the Secretary-General of the Organization (hereinafter called the "Secretary-General"):

(*a*) Upon the express request of a Contracting Government, the Secretary-General shall communicate any such proposal directly to all Contracting Governments for their consideration and acceptance. If he receives no such express request, the Secretary-General may proceed to such consultations as he deems advisable before communicating the proposal to the Contracting Governments;

(*b*) Each Contracting Government shall notify the Secretary-General within one year from the receipt of any such communication whether or not it accepts the proposal;

(*c*) Any such notification shall be made in writing to the Secretary-General who shall inform all Contracting Governments of its receipt;

(*d*) Any amendment to the Annex under

this paragraph shall enter into force six months after the date on which the amendment is accepted by a majority of the Contracting Governments;

(*e*) The Secretary-General shall inform all Contracting Governments of any amendment which enters into force under this paragraph, together with the date on which such amendment shall enter into force.

(3) A conference of the Contracting Governments to consider amendments to the Annex shall be convened by the Secretary-General upon the request of at least one-third of these Governments. Every amendment adopted by such conference by a two-thirds majority of the Contracting Governments present and voting shall enter into force six months after the date on which the Secretary-General notifies the Contracting Governments of the amendment adopted.

(4) The Secretary-General shall notify promptly all signatory Governments of the adoption and entry into force of any amendment under this Article.

ARTICLE VIII

(1) Any Contracting Government that finds it impracticable to comply with any Standard by bringing its own formalities, documentary requirements or procedures into full accord with it or which deems it necessary for special reasons to adopt formalities, documentary requirements or procedures differing from that Standard, shall so inform the Secretary-General and notify him of the differences between its own practice and such Standard. Such notification shall be made as soon as possible after entry into force of the present Convention for the Government concerned, or after the adoption of such differing formalities, documentary requirements or procedures.

(2) Notification by a Contracting Government of any such difference in the case of an amendment to a Standard or of a newly adopted Standard shall be made to the Secretary-General as soon as possible after the entry into force of such amended or newly adopted Standard, or after the adoption of such differing formalities, documentary requirements or procedures and may include an indication of the action proposed to bring the formalities, documentary requirements or procedures into full accord with the amended or newly adopted Standard.

(3) Contracting Governments are urged to bring their formalities, documentary requirements and procedures into accord with the Recommended Practices insofar as practicable. As soon as any Contracting Government brings its own formalities, documentary requirements and procedures into accord with any Recommended Practice, it shall notify the Secretary-General thereof.

(4) The Secretary-General shall inform the Contracting Governments of any notification made to him in accordance with the preceding paragraphs of this Article.

ARTICLE IX

The Secretary-General shall convene a conference of the Contracting Governments for revision or amendment of the present Convention at the request of not less than one-third of the Contracting Governments. Any revision or amendments shall be adopted by a two-thirds majority vote of the Conference and then certified and communicated by the Secretary-General to all Contracting Governments for their acceptance. One year after the acceptance of the revision or amendments by two-thirds of the Contracting Governments, each revision or amendment shall enter into force for all Contracting Governments except those which, before its entry into force, make a declaration that they do not accept the revision or amendment. The Conference may by a two-thirds majority vote determine at the time of its adoption that a revision or amendment is of such a nature that any Contracting Government which has made such a declaration and which does not accept the revision or amendment within a period of one year after the revision or amendment enters into force shall, upon the expiration of this period, cease to be a party to the Convention.

ARTICLE X

(1) The present Convention shall remain open for signature for six months from this day's date and shall thereafter remain open for accession.

(2) The Governments of States Members of the United Nations, or of any of the specialized agencies, or the International Atomic Energy Agency, or Parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice may become Parties to the present Convention by:

(*a*) signature without reservation as to acceptance;

(*b*) signature with reservation as to acceptance followed by acceptance; or

(*c*) accession.

Acceptance or accession shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument with the Secretary-General.

(3) The Government of any State not entitled to become a Party under paragraph 2 of this Article may apply through the Secretary-General to become a party and shall be admitted as a Party in accordance with paragraph 2, provided that its application has been approved by two-thirds of the Members of the Organization other than Associate Members.

ARTICLE XI

The present Convention shall enter into force sixty days after the date upon which the Governments of at least ten States have either signed it without reservation as to acceptance or have deposited instruments of acceptance or accession. It shall enter into force for a Government which subsequently accepts it or accedes to it sixty days after the deposit of the instrument of acceptance or accession.

ARTICLE XII

Three years after entry into force of the present Convention with respect to a Contracting Government, such Government may denounce it by notification in writing addressed to the Secretary-General who shall notify all Contracting Governments of the content and date of receipt of any such notification. Such denunciation shall take effect one year, or such longer period as may be specified in the notification, after its receipt by the Secretary-General.

ARTICLE XIII

(1) (*a*) The United Nations in cases where they are the administering authority for a territory, or any Contracting Government responsible for the international relations of a territory, shall as soon as possible consult with such territory in an endeavour to extend the present Convention to that territory, and may at any time by notification in writing given to the Secretary-General declare that the Convention shall extend to such territory.

(*b*) The present Convention shall from the date of the receipt of the notification or from such other date as may be specified in the notification extend to the territory named therein.

(*c*) The provisions of Article VIII of the present Convention shall apply to any territory to which the Convention is extended in accordance with the present Article; for this purpose, the expression "its own formalities, documentary requirements or procedures" shall include those in force in that territory.

(*d*) The present Convention shall cease to extend to any territory one year after the receipt by the Secretary-General of a notification to this effect, or on such later date as may be specified therein.

(2) The Secretary-General shall inform all the Contracting Governments of the extension of the present Convention to any territory under paragraph 1 of this Article, stating in each case the date from which the Convention has been so extended.

ARTICLE XIV

The Secretary-General shall inform all signatory Governments, all Contracting Governments and all Members of the Organization of:

(*a*) the signatures affixed to the present Convention and the dates thereof;

(*b*) the deposit of instruments of acceptance and accession together with the dates of their deposit;

(*c*) the date on which the Convention enters into force in accordance with Article XI;

(*d*) any notification received in accordance with Articles XII and XIII and the date thereof;

(*e*) the convening of any conference under Articles VII or IX.

ARTICLE XV

The present Convention and its Annex shall be deposited with the Secretary-General who shall transmit certified copies thereof to signatory Governments and to acceding Governments. As soon as the present Convention enters into force, it shall be registered by the Secretary-General in accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

ARTICLE XVI

The present Convention and its Annex shall be established in the English and French languages, both texts being equally authentic. Official translations shall be prepared in the Russian and Spanish languages and shall be deposited with the signed originals.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned being duly authorized by their respective Governments for that purpose have signed the present Convention.

DONE at London this ninth day of April 1965.

For the Government of the Kingdom of Afghanistan:

——— ———

For the Government of the People's Republic of Albania:

——— ———

For the Government of the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria:
subject to ratification
L. KHELIFA

For the Government of the Argentine Republic:
subject to acceptance
H. MARIO

For the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia:

——— ———

For the Government of the Republic of Austria:

——— ———

For the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium:

——— ———

For the Government of the Republic of Bolivia:

——— ———

For the Government of the United States of Brazil:
subject to acceptance
GERALDO EULALIO DO NASCIMENTO E SILVA
RUY DE MIRANDA E SILVA

For the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria:

——— ———

For the Government of the Union of Burma:

——— ———

For the Government of the Kingdom of Burundi:

——— ———

For the Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic:

——— ———

For the Government of the Kingdom of Cambodia:

For the Government of the Federal Republic of Cameroon:

For the Government of Canada:
sous réserve de ratification
J. M. COTE
GEORGE G. LEASK

For the Government of the Central African Republic:

For the Government of Ceylon:

For the Government of the Republic of Chad:

For the Government of the Republic of Chile:

For the Government of the Republic of China:
subject to acceptance
TSING-CHANG LIU

For the Government of the Republic of Colombia:

For the Government of the Republic of the Congo (Brazzaville):

For the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (Leopoldville):

For the Government of the Republic of Costa Rica:

For the Government of the Republic of Cuba:

For the Government of the Republic of Cyprus:

For the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

For the Government of the Republic of Dahomey:

For the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark:
Subject to acceptance
SVEN LUNDDAHL

For the Government of the Dominican Republic:
Subject to acceptance
A. A. ESPAILLAT

For the Government of the Republic of Ecuador:
ad referendum
J. Z. MENENDEZ

For the Government of the Republic of El Salvador:

For the Government of the Empire of Ethiopia:

For the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:
subject to acceptance
KARL SCHUBERT

For the Government of the Republic of Finland:
subject to acceptance
H. ANDERSON

For the Government of the French Republic:
sous réserve d'approbation
JEAN MORIN

For the Government of the Gabon Republic:

For the Government of the Republic of Ghana:
subject to acceptance
Y. K. QUARTEY

For the Government of the Kingdom of Greece:
subject to acceptance
TH. SOPHOULIS

For the Government of the Republic of Guatemala:

For the Government of the Republic of Guinea:

For the Government of the Republic of Haiti:

For the Holy See:

For the Government of the Republic of Honduras:

For the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic:
Subject to acceptance:
J. INCZE

For the Government of the Republic of Iceland:

For the Government of the Republic of India:

For the Government of the Republic of Indonesia:

For the Government of the Empire of Iran:

For the Government of the Republic of Iraq:

For the Government of Ireland:
Subject to acceptance
M. A. HAYES
M. DELANY

For the Government of the State of Israel:
With reservation as to acceptance
CAPTAIN I. AUERBACH
I. J. MINTZ

For the Government of the Italian Republic:
With reservation as to acceptance
FERNANDO GHIGLIA

For the Government of the Republic of the Ivory Coast:
Subject to acceptance
J. M. BESSETEAUX

For the Government of Jamaica:

For the Government of Japan:

For the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan:

For the Government of Kenya:

For the Government of the Republic of Korea:
Subject to acceptance
H. K. LEE

For the Government of the State of Kuwait:

For the Government of the Kingdom of Laos:

For the Government of the Lebanese Republic:
Ad referendum
ELIE J. BOUSTANY

For the Government of the Republic of Liberia:

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Libya:

For the Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein:

For the Government of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg:

For the Government of the Malagasy Republic:
subject to acceptance
A. BOTRALAHY

For the Government of Malaysia:
subject to acceptance
RAJA AZAM BIN RAJA KAMARALZMAN

For the Government of the Republic of Mali:

For the Government of Malawi:

For the Government of Malta:

For the Government of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania:

For the Government of the United Mexican States:

For the Government of the Principality of Monaco:
A. PASSERON

For the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic:

For the Government of the Kingdom of Morocco:

For the Government of the Kingdom of Nepal:

For the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands:

For the Government of New Zealand:

For the Government of the Republic of Nicaragua:
Subject to acceptance
J. SANDINO

For the Government of the Republic of the Niger:

For the Government of the Federal Republic of Nigeria:

For the Government of the Kingdom of Norway:

For the Government of Pakistan:

For the Government of the Republic of Panama:

For the Government of the Republic of Paraguay:

For the Government of the Republic of Peru:

For the Government of the Republic of the Philippines:
With reservation as to acceptance
M. P. LICHAUCO

For the Government of the Polish People's Republic:
Subject to acceptance by my government
M. FILA

For the Government of the Portuguese Republic:

For the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic:

For the Government of the Rwandese Republic:

For the Government of the Republic of San Marino:

For the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia:

For the Government of the Republic of Senegal:
subject to acceptance
H. R. DODDS

For the Government of Sierra Leone:

For the Government of the Somali Republic:

For the Government of the Republic of South Africa:

For the Government of the Spanish State:

For the Government of the Republic of the Sudan:

——— ———

For the Government of the Kingdom of Sweden:

Subject to acceptance

G. LINDENCRONA

For the Government of the Swiss Confederation:

——— ———

For the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic:

——— ———

For the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania:

——— ———

For the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand:

——— ———

For the Government of the Togolese Republic:

——— ———

For the Government of Trinidad and Tobago:

Subject to acceptance

E. H. MURRAY

For the Government of the Republic of Tunisia

——— ———

For the Government of the Republic of Turkey:

——— ———

For the Government of Uganda:

——— ———

For the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic:

With reservation as to subsequent acceptance

L. A. KOROTKOVA

For the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

With reservation as to subsequent acceptance

A. SOLDATOV

For the Government of the United Arab Republic:

Subject to acceptance and reserve to be made by the Government of the U.A.R.

M.O. EL-HEFNAOUI

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

With reservation as to acceptance

A. W. WOOD

For the Government of the United States of America:

Subject to acceptance

ROBERT V. MCINTYRE

CARROLL PERRY, JR.

For the Government of the Republic of the Upper Volta:

——— ———

For the Government of the Eastern Republic of Uruguay:

——— ———

For the Government of the Republic of Venezuela:

——— ———

For the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam:

——— ———

For the Government of the Independent State of Western Samoa:

——— ———

For the Government of the Yemen Arab Republic:

——— ———

For the Government of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia:

Ad referendum

A. BLAZEVIC

For the Government of the Republic of Zambia:

MARITIME FACILITATION CONVENTIONS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the two conventions in the next group—Nos. 4 and 5 on the Executive Calendar—the Inter-American Convention on Facilitation of International Waterborne Transportation—Executive Q, 89th Congress, second session—and the Convention on Facilitation of International Maritime Traffic—Executive R, 89th Congress, second session—deal with paperwork for ships on international voyages. Their common aim is to reduce and standardize the number of papers, the entries on these papers, and the number of copies, that ships have to leave with authorities at ports upon entering and leaving.

The two conventions follow the pattern established by the International Civil Aviation Organization—ICAO—for airplanes in international flights, which makes possible their rapid processing through international airports. These treaties are expected to speed up ships on international voyages and thereby reduce the costs to shipowners, travelers, and the shippers of goods.

The conventions themselves pledge the parties to adopt all appropriate measures to facilitate and expedite international maritime traffic and to cooperate in securing the highest practicable degree of uniformity in formalities, documentary requirements, and procedures in relation to the entry and clearance of vessels. The annexes to the conventions list the eight basic papers which may be required by port-of-entry officials; namely, general declaration, cargo manifest, ship's stores declaration, crew's effects declaration, crew list, passenger list, the Universal Postal Convention mail document, and the maritime declaration of health. The type of information and number of entries for each of these pieces of papers is further spelled out in detail.

I might add that the annexes of the conventions are not subject to ratification. To the extent that presently there exist differences between the standards and recommended practices contained in them and U.S. laws and regulations, these differences will be passed on to the administering authorities of the conventions, and will continue to exist until such time as our administration decides to eliminate them by asking Congress to enact appropriate legislation, if such is necessary.

The hearing, by my subcommittee, on February 7 brought out only favorable testimony by executive branch officials. To their knowledge, there is no opposition to these conventions. The subcommittee itself received letters urging approval from the Pacific American Steamship Association, the Labor-Management Maritime Committee, the American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., and the Propeller Club of the United States.

At the hearing I wondered why we need two separate conventions which are so very much alike. It appears that the Organization of American States—OAS—became active in this field first and drafted the Inter-American Convention. Then the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization—IMCO—became interested and drafted the international one. The State Department recommends approval of both, so that the simplified standards will have the widest possible application.

Mr. President, I recommend that the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of these treaties.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The conventions, Executive Q and Executive R, 89th Congress, second session, will be considered as having passed through their various parliamentary stages up to and including the presentation of the resolutions of ratification.

The resolutions of ratification will now be read.

The resolutions of ratification were read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Inter-American Convention on Facilitation of International Waterborne Transportation (Convention of Mar del Plata), opened for signature on June 7, 1963. (Executive Q, Eighty-ninth Congress, second session.)

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Convention on Facilitation of International Maritime Traffic, opened for signature at London on April 9, 1965. (Executive R, Eighty-ninth Congress, second session.)

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent because of death in their respective families.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—93 yeas, 0 nays, as follows:

[No. 35 Ex.]

YEAS—93

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hatfield
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—7

Bayh Fannin Jordan, N.C.
Brewster Gruening Williams, Del.
Church

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolutions of ratification, Nos. 4 and 5 on the calendar, are agreed to en bloc.

CUSTOMS CONVENTION ON THE TEMPORARY IMPORTATION OF PROFESSIONAL EQUIPMENT—CUSTOMS CONVENTION ON THE ATA CARNET FOR THE TEMPORARY ADMISSION OF GOODS—CUSTOMS CONVENTION REGARDING ECS CARNETS FOR COMMERCIAL SAMPLES—CUSTOMS CONVENTION ON THE INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT OF GOODS UNDER COVER OF TIR CARNETS—AND CUSTOMS CONVENTION ON CONTAINERS

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, will now proceed to the consideration of Calendars Nos. 6 through 10, Executive K, Executive L, Executive M, Executive N, and Executive J, 89th Congress, second session, which will be considered and voted on en bloc.

The conventions were read the second time, as follows:

CUSTOMS CONVENTION ON THE TEMPORARY IMPORTATION OF PROFESSIONAL EQUIPMENT

PREAMBLE

The States signatory to the present Convention,

Meeting under the auspices of the Customs Co-operation Council and the CONTRACTING PARTIES to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), in consultation with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO),

Having regard to proposals made by representatives of international trade and other interests for the extension of temporary duty-free importation procedures,

Convinced that the adoption of general rules on the temporary duty-free importation of professional equipment would facilitate the international exchange of specialised skills and techniques,

Have agreed as follows:

CHAPTER I. DEFINITIONS

Article 1

For the purposes of the present Convention:

(a) the term "import duties" means Customs duties and all other duties and taxes payable on or in connection with importation and shall include all internal taxes and excise duties chargeable on imported goods, but shall not include fees and charges which are limited in amount to the approximate cost of services rendered and do not represent an indirect protection to domestic products or a taxation of imports for fiscal purposes;

(b) the term "temporary admission" means temporary importation free of import duties and free of import prohibitions and restrictions, subject to re-exportation;

(c) the term "the Council" means the organisation set up by the Convention establishing a Customs Co-operation Council, done at Brussels on 15th December 1950;

(d) the term "person" means both natural and legal persons, unless the context otherwise requires.

CHAPTER II. TEMPORARY ADMISSION

Article 2

Each Contracting Party bound by any Annex to the present Convention shall grant temporary admission to the equipment referred to in that Annex, subject to the conditions specified in Articles 1 to 22 and in that Annex. The term "equipment" shall be taken to include any relevant ancillary apparatus and accessories.

Article 3

In cases where a Contracting Party requires security for compliance with the conditions attached to temporary admission, the amount of such security shall not exceed the amount of the import duties chargeable by more than 10%.

Article 4

Equipment granted temporary admission shall be re-exported within six months from the date of importation. For valid reasons the Customs authorities may, within the limits laid down by the laws and regulations of the country of temporary importation, either grant a longer period or extend the initial period.

Article 5

Equipment granted temporary admission may be re-exported in one or several consignments to any country, through any Customs office open for such operations, and such re-exportation shall not be confined to the Customs office of importation.

Article 6

1. Notwithstanding the requirement of re-exportation laid down by the present Convention, the re-exportation of all or part of equipment badly damaged in duly authenticated accidents shall not be required, provided that it:

(a) is subjected to the import duties to which it is liable; or

(b) is abandoned free of all expense to the Exchequer of the country into which it was temporarily imported; or

(c) is destroyed, under official supervision, without expense to the Exchequer of the country into which it was temporarily imported;

as the Customs authorities may require.

2. When all or part of equipment granted temporary admission cannot be re-exported as a result of a seizure, other than a seizure made at the suit of private persons, the requirement of re-exportation shall be suspended for the duration of the seizure.

Article 7

Component parts imported to repair temporarily admitted equipment shall also be granted the facilities provided for in the present Convention.

CHAPTER III. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Article 8

In the application of the present Convention, the Annex or Annexes for the time being in force to which a Contracting Party is bound shall be construed to be an integral part of the Convention, and in relation to that Contracting Party any reference to the Convention shall be deemed to include a reference to such Annex or Annexes.

Article 9

The provisions of the present Convention set out the minimum facilities to be accorded. They do not prevent the application of greater facilities which certain Contracting Parties grant or may grant in future by unilateral provisions or in virtue of bilateral and multilateral agreements.

Article 10

For the purposes of the present Convention the territories of Contracting Parties which form a Customs or economic union may be taken to be a single territory.

Article 11

The provisions of the present Convention shall not preclude the application or prohibitions or restrictions imposed under national laws and regulations on grounds of public morality or order, public security, public hygiene or health, or for veterinary or phytopathological considerations, or relating to the protection of patents, trade marks and copyrights.

Article 12

Any breach of the provisions of the present Convention, any substitution, false declaration or act having the effect of causing a person or goods improperly to benefit from the facilities provided for in the present Convention, may render the offender liable in the country where the offense was committed to the penalties prescribed by the laws and regulations of that country and to payment of any import duties chargeable.

CHAPTER IV. FINAL PROVISIONS

Article 13

1. The Contracting Parties shall meet together when necessary in order to consider the operation of the present Convention and, in particular, in order to consider measures to secure uniformity in the interpretation and application of the present Convention.

2. Such meetings shall be convened by the Secretary General of the Council at the request of any Contracting Party; provided that where the matter to be considered concerns only one or more Annexes for the time being in force, such request may be made only by a Contracting Party which is bound in respect to such Annex or Annexes. Unless the Contracting Parties concerned otherwise decide, the meetings shall be held at the Headquarters of the Council.

3. The Contracting Parties shall lay down the rules of procedure for their meetings. Decisions of the Contracting Parties shall be taken by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Contracting Parties present at the meeting and voting, provided that only those Contracting Parties which are bound by any Annex for the time being in force shall be entitled to vote on matters concerning that Annex.

4. The Contracting Parties concerned shall not take a decision on any matter unless more than half of them are present.

Article 14

1. Any dispute between Contracting Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the present Convention shall so far as possible be settled by negotiation between them.

2. Any dispute which is not settled by negotiation shall be referred by the Contracting Parties in dispute to the Contracting Parties, meeting in conformity with Article 13 of the present Convention, which shall thereupon consider the dispute and make recommendations for its settlement.

3. The Contracting Parties in dispute may agree in advance to accept the recommendations of the Contracting Parties as binding.

Article 15

1. Any State Member of the Council and any State Member of the United Nations or its specialised agencies may become a Contracting Party to the present Convention:

(a) by signing it without reservation of ratification;

(b) by depositing an instrument of ratification after signing it subject to ratification; or

(c) by acceding to it.

2. The present Convention shall be open until 31st March, 1962, for signature at the Headquarters of the Council in Brussels, by the States referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article. Thereafter, it shall be open for their accession.

3. In the case envisaged in paragraph 1 (b) of this Article, the present Convention shall

be subject to ratification by the signatory States in accordance with their constitutional procedures.

4. Any State, not being a Member of the Organizations referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article, to which an invitation to that effect has been addressed by the Secretary General of the Council at the request of the Contracting Parties, may become a Contracting Party to the present Convention by acceding thereto after its entry into force.

5. Each State referred to in paragraph 1 or 4 of this Article shall at the time of signing, ratifying or acceding to the present Convention declare the Annex or Annexes in respect of which it shall be bound. It may subsequently declare itself to be bound in respect of one or more further Annexes, by notification given to the Secretary General of the Council.

6. The instruments of ratification or accession shall be deposited with the Secretary General of the Council.

Article 16

1. The present Convention shall enter into force in relation to any Annex thereto three months after five of the States referred to in paragraph 1 of Article 15 thereof have signed the Convention without reservation of ratification or have deposited their instruments of ratification or accession and have declared themselves to be bound in respect of that Annex.

2. For any State ratifying or acceding to the present Convention after five States have signed it without reservation of ratification or have deposited their instruments of ratification or accession and have declared themselves to be bound in respect of the same Annex or Annexes, the present Convention shall enter into force, in relation to such Annex or Annexes, three months after the said State has deposited its instrument of ratification or accession together with a declaration that it will be bound in respect of such Annex or Annexes.

3. For any State which after signing the present Convention without reservation of ratification, or having ratified or acceded to it, declares itself to be bound in respect of any further Annex after five States have declared themselves to be bound in respect of that Annex, the present Convention shall enter into force in relation to such Annex three months after the said State has declared itself to be so bound.

Article 17

1. The present Convention is of unlimited duration but any Contracting Party may denounce it at any time after the date of its entry into force under Article 16 thereof.

2. The denunciation shall be notified by an instrument in writing, deposited with the Secretary General of the Council.

3. The denunciation shall take effect six months after the receipt of the instrument of denunciation by the Secretary General of the Council.

4. The provisions of paragraphs 2 and 3 of this Article shall also apply in respect of the Annexes to the present Convention, any Contracting Party being entitled, at any time after the date of their entry into force under Article 16 thereof, to declare that it is no longer bound in respect of one or more Annexes. Any Contracting Party which denounces all the Annexes in respect of which it was bound shall be deemed to have denounced the Convention.

Article 18

1. The Contracting Parties meeting in conformity with Article 13 of the present Convention may recommend amendments thereto.

2. The text of any amendment so recommended shall be communicated by the Secretary General of the Council to all Contracting Parties, to all other signatory or acceding States, to the Secretary General of the United Nations, to the CONTRACTING PARTIES to GATT, and to UNESCO.

3. Within a period of six months from the date on which the recommended amendment is so communicated, any Contracting Party or, in the case of an amendment concerning only an Annex for the time being in force any Contracting Party bound in respect of that Annex may inform the Secretary General of the Council:

(a) that it has an objection to the recommended amendment,

or

(b) that, although it intends to accept the recommended amendment, the conditions necessary for such acceptance are not yet fulfilled in its country.

4. If a Contracting Party sends the Secretary General of the Council a communication as provided for in paragraph 3(b) of this Article, it may, so long as it has not notified the Secretary General of its acceptance of the recommended amendment, submit an objection to that amendment within a period of nine months following the expiry of the six-month period referred to in paragraph 3 of this Article.

5. If an objection to the recommended amendment is stated in accordance with the terms of paragraphs 3 and 4 of this Article, the amendment shall be deemed not to have been accepted and shall be of no effect.

6. If no objection to the recommended amendment in accordance with paragraphs 3 and 4 of this Article has been stated, the amendment shall be deemed to have been accepted as from the date specified below:

(a) if no Contracting Party has sent a communication in accordance with paragraph 3(b) of this Article, on the expiry of the period of six months referred to in paragraph 3;

(b) if any Contracting Party has sent a communication in accordance with paragraph 3(b) of this Article, on the earlier of the following two dates:

(i) the date by which all the Contracting Parties which sent such communications have notified the Secretary General of the Council of their acceptance of the recommended amendment, provided that, if all the acceptances were notified before the expiry of the period of six months referred to in paragraph 3 of this Article, that date shall be taken to be the date of expiry of the said six-month period;

(ii) the date of expiry of the nine-month period referred to in paragraph 4 of this Article.

7. Any amendment deemed to be accepted shall enter into force six months after the date on which it was deemed to be accepted.

8. The Secretary General of the Council shall, as soon as possible, notify all Contracting Parties of any objection to the recommended amendment made in accordance with paragraph 3(a), and of any communication received in accordance with paragraph 3(b), of this Article. He shall subsequently inform all the Contracting Parties whether the Contracting Party or Parties which have sent such a communication raise an objection to the recommended amendment or accept it.

9. Any State ratifying or acceding to the present Convention shall be deemed to have accepted any amendments thereto which have entered into force at the date of deposit of its instrument of ratification or accession.

10. Any State which, after signing the present Convention without reservation of ratification or having ratified or acceded to it, declares itself to be bound in respect of any further Annex shall be deemed to have accepted any amendments thereto which have entered into force at the date of its notification to the Secretary General of the Council.

Article 19

1. Any State may, at the time of signing the present Convention without reservation of ratification, or of depositing its instrument of ratification or accession or at any time thereafter, declare by notification given to the Secretary General of the Council that the present Convention shall extend to all or any of the territories for whose international relations it is responsible and the Convention shall extend to the territories named in the notification three months after the date of the receipt thereof by the Secretary General of the Council but not before the Convention has entered into force for the State concerned.

2. Any State which has made a declaration under paragraph 1 of this Article extending the present Convention to any territory for whose international relations it is responsible may notify the Secretary General of the Council, in accordance with the provisions of Article 17 of the present Convention, that the territory in question will no longer apply the Convention.

Article 20

No reservation to the present Convention shall be permitted.

Article 21

The Secretary General of the Council shall notify all Contracting Parties, the other signatory and acceding States, the Secretary General of the United Nations, the CONTRACTING PARTIES to the GATT and UNESCO of:

(a) signatures, ratifications, accessions and declarations under Article 15 of the present Convention;

(b) the date of entry into force of the present Convention and of each of the Annexes in accordance with Article 16;

(c) denunciations and declarations under Article 17;

(d) any amendment deemed to have been accepted in accordance with Article 18 and the date of its entry into force;

(e) declarations and notifications received in accordance with Article 19.

Article 22

In accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations, the present Convention shall be registered with the Secretariat of the United Nations at the request of the Secretary General of the Council.

In witness whereof the undersigned plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention.

Done at Brussels this eighth day of June nineteen hundred and sixty-one, in the English and French languages, both texts being equally authentic, in a single original which shall be deposited with the Secretary General of the Council who shall transmit certified copies to all States referred to in Article 15, paragraph 1, of the present Convention.

For the Federal Republic of Germany:
K. OPPLER (8 March 1962)
K. ZEPF (8 March 1962)
Subject to ratification
For Australia:
——— ———
For Austria:
J. STANGELBERGER (30.10.1961)
Subject to ratification
For Belgium:
——— ———
For Burma:
——— ———
For Brazil:
——— ———
For Canada:
——— ———
For Ceylon:
——— ———
For Chile:
——— ———
For Cuba:
GUSTAVO ARCOS B.
Subject to ratification (28–II–62)
For Denmark:
E KNUTH
Subject to ratification (27.III.62)
For the Dominican Republic:
——— ———

For Spain:
CASA MIRANDA
Subject to ratification (21–II–62)
For the United States of America:
——— ———

For Finland:
——— ———

For the French Republic:
RAYMOND BOUSQUET (31–3–62)
For Ghana:
——— ———

For Greece:
——— ———

For Haiti:
——— ———

For India:
——— ———

For Indonesia:
——— ———

For Iran:
K. HEDAYAT
Subject to ratification (16 February 1962)
For Ireland:
——— ———

For Israel:
——— ———

For Italy:
UGO CALDERONI
Subject to ratification (7.XII. 1961)
For Japan:
——— ———

For Lebanon:
——— ———

For Luxemburg:
——— ———

For the Federation of Malaya:
——— ———

For Nicaragua:
——— ———

For Nigeria:
——— ———

For Norway:
N. A. JORGENSEN (30 March 1962)
For New Zealand:
——— ———

For Pakistan:
——— ———

For the Kingdom of the Netherlands:
——— ———

For Peru:
——— ———

For Portugal:
EDUARDO VIEIRA LEITAO (15 March 1962)
For the United Arab Republic
——— ———

For Niger:
G CONDAT (14 March 1962)
For the Republic of South Africa:
——— ———

For the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland:
——— ———

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
JOHN NICHOLLS (27th February, 1962)
Subject to ratification
For Sierra Leone:
——— ———

For Sudan:
——— ———

For Sweden:
GUNNAR LJUNGDAHL (30.3.62)
Subject to ratification
For Switzerland:
LENZ (7.12.61)
Subject to ratification
For Czechoslovakia:
VLAD, LUDVIK (28.3.62)
Subject to ratification
For Turkey:
H E ISIK (31 March 1962)
Subject to ratification
For Uruguay:
——— ———

For Yugoslavia:
——— ———

CUSTOMS CONVENTION ON THE A.T.A. CARNET FOR THE TEMPORARY ADMISSION OF GOODS (A.T.A. CONVENTION)

PREAMBLE

The States signatory to the present Convention,

Meeting under the auspices of the Customs Co-operation Council and the CONTRACTING PARTIES to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), in consultation with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO),

Having regard to proposals made by representatives of international trade and other interests for facilitating the procedures for the temporary duty-free importation of goods,

Convinced that the adoption of common procedures for the temporary duty-free importation of goods would afford considerable advantages to international commercial and cultural activities and would secure a higher degree of harmony and uniformity in the Customs systems of the Contracting Parties,

Have agreed as follows:

CHAPTER I. DEFINITIONS AND APPROVAL

Article 1

For the purposes of the present Convention:

(a) the term "import duties" means Customs duties and all other duties and taxes payable on or in connection with importation and shall include all internal taxes and excise duties chargeable on imported goods, but shall not include fees and charges which are limited in amount to the approximate cost of services rendered and do not represent an indirect protection to domestic products or a taxation of imports for fiscal purposes;

(b) the term "temporary admission" means temporary importation free of import duties in accordance with the conditions laid down by the Conventions referred to in Article 3 of the present Convention or by the national laws and regulations of the country of importation;

(c) the term "transit" means the conveyance of goods from a Customs office in the territory of a Contracting Party to another Customs office within the same territory, in accordance with the conditions laid down in the national laws and regulations of that Contracting Party;

(d) the term "A.T.A. carnet" (Admission Temporaire—Temporary Admission) means the document reproduced as the Annex to the present Convention;

(e) the term "issuing association" means an association approved by the Customs authorities of a Contracting Party for the issue of A.T.A. carnets in the territory of that Contracting Party;

(f) the term "guaranteeing association" means an association approved by the Customs authorities of a Contracting Party to guarantee the sums referred to in Article 6 of the present Convention, in the territory of that Contracting Party;

(g) the term "the Council" means the organisation set up by the Convention establishing a Customs Co-operation Council, done at Brussels on 15th December 1950;

(h) the term "person" means both natural and legal persons, unless the context otherwise requires.

Article 2

The approval of an issuing association envisaged in paragraph (e) of Article 1 of the present Convention may be subject, in particular, to the condition that the price of A.T.A. carnets shall be commensurate with the cost of services rendered.

CHAPTER II. SCOPE

Article 3

1. Each Contracting Party shall accept in lieu of its national Customs documents, and as due security for the sums referred to in Article 6 of the present Convention, A.T.A. carnets valid for its territory and issued and used in accordance with the conditions laid down in the present Convention, for goods temporarily imported under:

(a) the Customs Convention on the temporary importation of professional equipment, done at Brussels on 8th June 1961,

(b) the Customs Convention concerning facilities for the importation of goods for display or use at exhibitions, fairs, meetings or similiar events, done at Brussels on 8th June 1961,

in so far as it is a Contracting Party to those Conventions.

2. Each Contracting Party may also accept A.T.A. carnets, issued and used under the same conditions, for goods temporarily imported under other international temporary importation Conventions or for temporary admission procedures under its national laws and regulations.

3. Each Contracting Party may accept A.T.A. carnets issued and used under the same conditions for transit.

4. Goods intended for processing or repair shall not be imported under cover of A.T.A. carnets.

CHAPTER III. ISSUE AND USE OF A.T.A. CARNETS

Article 4

1. Issuing associations shall not issue A.T.A. carnets with a period of validity exceeding one year from the date of issue. They shall indicate on the cover of the A.T.A. carnet the countries in which it is valid and the names of the corresponding guaranteeing associations.

2. Once an A.T.A. carnet has been issued no extra item shall be added to the list of goods enumerated on the reverse of the front cover of the carnet, or on any continuation sheets annexed thereto (General List).

Article 5

The period fixed for the re-exportation of goods imported under cover of an A.T.A. carnet shall not in any case exceed the period of validity of that carnet.

CHAPTER IV. GUARANTEE

Article 6

1. Each guaranteeing association shall undertake to pay to the Customs authorities of the country in which it is established the amount of the import duties and any other sums payable in the event of non-compliance with the conditions of temporary admission, or of transit, in respect of goods introduced into that country under cover of A.T.A. carnets issued by a corresponding issuing association. It shall be liable jointly and severally with the persons from whom the sums mentioned above are due, for payment of such sums.

2. The liability of the guaranteeing association shall not exceed the amount of the import duties by more than ten per cent.

3. When the Customs authorities of the country of importation have unconditionally discharged an A.T.A. carnet in respect of certain goods they can no longer claim from the guaranteeing association payment of the sums referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article in respect of these goods. A claim may nevertheless still be made against the guaranteeing association if it is subsequently discovered that the discharge of the carnet was obtained improperly or fraudulently or that there had been a breach of the conditions of temporary admission or of transit.

4. Customs authorities shall not in any circumstances require from the guaranteeing association payment of the sums referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article if a claim has not been made against the guaranteeing association within a year of the date of expiry of the validity of the carnet.

CHAPTER V. REGULARISATION OF A.T.A. CARNETS

Article 7

1. The guaranteeing association shall have a period of six months from the date of the

claim made by the Customs authorities for the sums referred to in paragraph 1 of Article 6 of the present Convention in which to furnish proof of the re-exportation of the goods under the conditions laid down in the present Convention or of any other proper discharge of the A.T.A. carnet.

2. If such proof is not furnished within the time allowed the guaranteeing association shall forthwith deposit, or pay provisionally, such sums. This deposit or payment shall become final after a period of three months from the date of the deposit or payment. During the latter period the guaranteeing association may still furnish the proof referred to in the preceding paragraph with a view to recovery of the sums deposited or paid.

3. For countries whose laws and regulations do not provide for the deposit or provisional payment of import duties, payments made in conformity with the provisions of the preceding paragraph shall be regarded as final, but the sums paid shall be refunded if the proof referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article is furnished within three months of the date of the payment.

Article 8

1. Evidence of re-exportation of goods imported under cover of an A.T.A. carnet shall be provided by the re-exportation certificate completed in that carnet by the Customs authorities of the country into which the goods were temporarily imported.

2. If the re-exportation of goods has not been certified in accordance with paragraph 1 of this Article, the Customs authorities of the country of importation may, even if the period of validity of the carnet has already expired, accept as evidence of re-exportation of the goods:

(a) the particulars entered by the Customs authorities of another Contracting Party in the A.T.A. carnet on importation or re-importation or a certificate issued by those authorities based on the particulars entered on a voucher which has been detached from the carnet on importation or on re-importation into their territory, provided that the particulars relate to an importation or re-importation which can be proved to have taken place after the re-exportation which it is intended to establish;

(b) any other documentary proof that the goods are outside that country.

3. In any case in which the customs authorities of a Contracting Party waive the requirement of re-exportation of certain goods admitted into their territory under cover of an A.T.A. carnet, the guaranteeing association shall be discharged from its obligations only when those authorities have certified in the carnet that the position regarding those goods has been regularised.

Article 9

In the cases referred to in paragraph 2 of Article 8 of the present Convention, the Customs authorities shall have the right to charge a regularisation fee.

CHAPTER VI. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Article 10

Customs certificates on A.T.A. carnets used under the conditions laid down in the present Convention shall not be subject to the payment of charges for Customs attendance at Customs offices and posts during the normal hours of business.

Article 11

In the case of the destruction, loss or theft of an A.T.A. carnet while the goods to which it refers are in the territory of one of the Contracting Parties, the Customs authorities of that Contracting Party shall, at the request of the issuing association and subject to such conditions as those authorities may prescribe, accept a replacement document, the validity of which expires on the same date as that of the carnet which it replaces.

Article 12

1. When goods temporarily imported cannot be re-exported as a result of a seizure, other than a seizure made at the suit of private persons, the requirement of re-exportation shall be suspended for the duration of the seizure.

2. The Customs authorities shall, so far as possible, notify the guaranteeing association of seizures made them or on their behalf of goods admitted under cover of A.T.A. carnets guaranteed by that association and shall advise it of the measures they intend to take.

Article 13

A.T.A. carnets or parts of A.T.A. carnets intended to be issued in the country into which they are imported and which are sent to an issuing association by a corresponding foreign association, by an international organisation or by the Customs authorities of a Contracting Party, shall be admitted free of import duties and free of any import prohibitions or restrictions. Corresponding facilities shall be granted at exportation.

Article 14

For the purposes of the present Convention the territories of Contracting Parties which form a Customs or economic union may be taken to be a single territory.

Article 15

In the event of fraud, contravention or abuse, the Contracting Parties shall, notwithstanding the provisions of the present Convention, be free to take proceedings against persons using A.T.A. carnets, for the recovery of the import duties and other sums payable and also for the imposition of any penalties to which such persons have rendered themselves liable. In such cases the associations shall lend their assistance to the Customs authorities.

Article 16

The Annex to the present Convention shall be construed to be an integral part of the Convention.

Article 17

The provisions of the present Convention set out the minimum facilities to be accorded and do not prevent the application of greater facilities which certain Contracting Parties grant or may grant in future by unilateral provisions or in virtue of bilateral and multilateral agreements.

CHAPTER VII. FINAL PROVISIONS

Article 18

1. The Contracting Parties shall meet together when necessary in order to consider the operation of the present Convention and, in particular, in order to consider measures to secure uniformity in the interpretation and application of the present Convention.

2. Such meetings shall be convened by the Secretary General of the Council at the request of any Contracting Party. Unless the Contracting Parties otherwise decide, the meetings shall be held at the Headquarters of the Council.

3. The Contracting Parties shall lay down the rules of procedure for their meetings. Decisions of the Contracting Parties shall be taken by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Contracting Parties present at the meeting and voting.

4. The Contracting Parties shall not take a decision on any matter unless more than half of them are present.

Article 19

1. Any dispute between Contracting Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the present Convention shall so far as possible be settled by negotiation between them.

2. Any dispute which is not settled by negotiation shall be referred by the Contracting Parties in dispute to the Contracting Parties, meeting in conformity with Article 18 of the present Convention, which shall thereupon consider the dispute and make recommendations for its settlement.

3. The Contracting Parties in dispute may agree in advance to accept the recommendations of the Contracting Parties as binding.

Article 20

1. Any State Member of the Council and any State Member of the United Nations or its specialised agencies may become a Contracting Party to the present Convention:

(a) by signing it without reservation of ratification;

(b) by depositing an instrument of ratification after signing it subject to ratification; or

(c) by acceding to it.

2. The present Convention shall be open until 31st July, 1962, for signature at the Headquarters of the Council in Brussels, by the States referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article. Thereafter, it shall be open for their accession.

3. In the case envisaged in paragraph 1(b) of this Article, the present Convention shall be subject to ratification by the signatory States in accordance with their constitutional procedures.

4. Any State, not being a Member of the Organisations referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article, to which an invitation to that effect has been addressed by the Secretary General of the Council at the request of the Contracting Parties, may become a Contracting Party to the present Convention by acceding thereto after its entry into force.

5. The instruments of ratification or accession shall be deposited with the Secretary General of the Council.

Article 21

1. The present Convention shall enter into force three months after five of the States referred to in paragraph 1 of Article 20 thereof have signed it without reservation of ratification or have deposited their instruments of ratification or accession.

2. For any State signing without reservation of ratification, ratifying or acceding to the present Convention after five States have signed it without reservation of ratification or have deposited their instruments of ratification or accession, the present Convention shall enter into force three months after the said State has signed without reservation of ratification or deposited its instrument of ratification or accession.

Article 22

1. The present Convention is of unlimited duration. However any Contracting Party may denounce it at any time after the date of its entry into force under Article 21 thereof.

2. The denunciation shall be notified by an instrument in writing, deposited with the Secretary General of the Council.

3. The denunciation shall take effect six months after the receipt of the instrument of denunciation by the Secretary General of the Council.

4. Where a Contracting Party denounces the present Convention in accordance with paragraph 1 of this Article, or makes a notification under paragraph 2(b) of Article 23 or paragraph 2 of Article 25 of the present Convention, any A.T.A. carnet issued before the date when the denunciation or notification takes effect shall remain valid and the guarantee of the guaranteeing association shall hold good.

Article 23

1. At the time of signing, ratifying or acceding to the present Convention or thereafter, any State deciding to accept A.T.A. carnets in accordance with the provisions of paragraphs 2 and 3 or Article 3 of the present Convention, shall notify the Secretary General of the Council, specifying the cases in which it undertakes to accept A.T.A.

carnets and stating the date from which such acceptance takes effect.

2. Similar notifications may be addressed to the Secretary General of the Council to:

(a) extend the scope of any previous notifications; or

(b) subject to paragraph 4 of Article 22 of the present Convention, restrict the scope of, or cancel any previous notifications.

Article 24

1. The Contracting Parties meeting in conformity with Article 18 of the present Convention may recommend amendments thereto.

2. The text of any amendment so recommended shall be communicated by the Secretary General of the Council to all Contracting Parties, to all other signatory or acceding States, to the Secretary General of the United Nations, to the CONTRACTING PARTIES to the GATT, and to UNESCO.

3. Within a period of six months from the date on which the recommended amendment is so communicated, any Contracting Party may inform the Secretary General of the Council:

(a) that it has an objection to the recommended amendment,

or

(b) that, although it intends to accept the recommended amendment, the conditions necessary for such acceptance are not yet fulfilled in its country.

4. If a Contracting Party sends the Secretary General of the Council a communication as provided for in paragraph 3(b) of this Article, it may, so long as it has not notified the Secretary General of its acceptance of the recommended amendment, submit an objection to that amendment within a period of nine months following the expiry of the six-month period referred to in paragraph 3 of this Article.

5. If an objection to the recommended amendment is stated in accordance with the terms of paragraphs 3 and 4 of this Article, the amendment shall be deemed not to have been accepted and shall be of no effect.

6. If no objection to the recommended amendment in accordance with paragraphs 3 and 4 of this Article has been stated, the amendment shall be deemed to have been accepted as from the date specified below:

(a) if no Contracting Party has sent a communication in accordance with paragraph 3(b) of this Article, on the expiry of the period of six months referred to in paragraph 3;

(b) if any Contracting Party has sent a communication in accordance with paragraph 3(b) of this Article, on the earlier of the following two dates:

(i) the date by which all the Contracting Parties which sent such communications have notified the Secretary General of the Council of their acceptance of the recommended amendment, provided that, if all the acceptances were notified before the expiry of the period of six months referred to in paragraph 3 of this Article, that date shall be taken to be the date of expiry of the said six-month period;

(ii) the date of expiry of the nine-month period referred to in paragraph 4 of this Article.

7. Any amendment deemed to be accepted shall enter into force six months after the date on which is was deemed to be accepted.

8. The Secretary General of the Council shall, as soon as possible, notify all Contracting Parties of any objection to the recommended amendment made in accordance with paragraph 3(a), and of any communication received in accordance with paragraph 3(b), of this Article. He shall subsequently inform all the Contracting Parties whether the Contracting Party or Parties which have sent such a communication raise an objection to the recommended amendment or accept it.

9. Any State ratifying or acceding to the present Convention shall be deemed to have accepted any amendments thereto which have entered into force at the date of deposit of its instrument of ratification or accession.

Article 25

1. Any State may, at the time of signing the present Convention without reservation of ratification, or of depositing its instrument of ratification or accession or at any time thereafter, declare by notification given to the Secretary General of the Council that the present Convention shall extend to all or any of the territories for whose international relations it is responsible. Such notification shall take effect three months after the date of the receipt thereof by the Secretary General of the Council provided, however, that the Convention shall not apply to the territories named in the notification before the Convention has entered into force for the State concerned.

2. Any State which has made a notification under paragraph 1 of this Article extending the present Convention to any territory for whose international relations it is responsible may notify the Secretary General of the Council, in accordance with the provisions of Article 22 of the present Convention, that the territory in question will no longer apply the Convention.

Article 26

1. Any State may declare at the time of signing, ratifying or acceding to the present Convention, or notify the Secretary General of the Council after becoming a Contracting Party to the Convention, that it will not accept A.T.A. carnets under the present Convention for postal traffic. Such notification shall take effect on the ninetieth day after its receipt by the Secretary General.

2. Any Contracting Party having entered a reservation as provided for in paragraph 1 of this Article may at any time withdraw such reservation by notifying the Secretary General of the Council.

3. No other reservation to the present Convention shall be permitted.

Article 27

The Secretary General of the Council shall notify all Contracting Parties, the other signatory and acceding States, the Secretary General of the United Nations, the CONTRACTING PARTIES to the GATT, and UNESCO of:

(a) signatures, ratifications and accessions under Article 20 of the present Convention;

(b) the date of entry into force of the present Convention in accordance with Article 21;

(c) denunciations under Article 22;

(d) notifications made in accordance with Article 23;

(e) any amendment deemed to have been accepted in accordance with Article 24 and the date of its entry into force;

(f) notifications received in accordance with Article 25;

(g) declarations and notifications made in accordance with Article 26, and the date on which reservations or withdrawals of reservations take effect.

Article 28

In accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations, the present Convention shall be registered with the Secretariat of the United Nations at the request of the Secretary General of the Council.

In witness whereof the undersigned plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention.

Done at Brussels this sixth day of December nineteen hundred and sixty-one, in the English and French languages, both texts being equally authentic, in a single original which shall be deposited with the Secretary General of the Council who shall transmit certified copies to all the States referred to in Article 20, paragraph 1, of the present Convention.

For the Federal Republic of Germany:
  Subject to ratification (5. 6. 62)
    K. Oppler
    K. Zepf
For Australia:
  Subject to ratification (26/7/62)
    J W C Cumes
For Austria:
  Subject to ratification (5. 6. 1962)
    Joseph Stangelberger
For Belgium:
  ——— ———

For Denmark:
  Subject to ratification (21. VI. 1962)
    E Knuth
For Spain:
  Subject to ratification (4. VII. 62)
    Casa Miranda
For Finland:
  ——— ———

For France:
  ——— ———

For Greece:
  ——— ———

For Haiti:
  ——— ———

For Indonesia:
  ——— ———

For Iran:
  ——— ———

For Ireland:
  ——— ———

For Israel:
  ——— ———

For Italy:
  Subject to ratification (6.6.1962)
    Ugo Calderoni
For Lebanon:
  ——— ———

For Luxemburg:
  ——— ———

For Norway:
  ——— ———

For Pakistan:
  ——— ———

For the Kingdom of the Netherlands:
  ——— ———

For Portugal:
  Subject to ratification
    Eduardo Vieira Leitao (20/7/62)
For the United Arab Republic:
  ——— ———

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
  Subject to ratification
    John Nicholls (July 5, 1962)
For Sudan:
  ——— ———

For Sweden:
  Subject to ratification
    Stig Unger (31.7.62)
For Switzerland:
  Subject to ratification
    Charles Lenz (6.6.62)
For Turkey:
  ——— ———

For Yugoslavia:
  ——— ———

For Cuba:
  Subject to ratification
    Gustavo Arcos B. (20–VII–62)
For Ivory Coast:
  Allouko Fiankan (14.6.62)
    For implementation as from (1.1.63)
For Tunisia:
  Subject to ratification
    El Goulli (27–VII–62)

Customs Convention on the E.C.S. Carnets for Commercial Samples

CUSTOMS CONVENTION REGARDING E.C.S. CARNETS FOR COMMERCIAL SAMPLES DONE AT BRUSSELS ON 1ST MARCH 1956 AS AMENDED BY THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE CUSTOMS CO-OPERATION COUNCIL DATED 15TH JUNE 1960

The Governments signatory to the present Convention,

Desiring to facilitate the temporary importation of commercial samples,

Having regard to the aims of the International Convention to facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Material drawn up at Geneva on 7th November, 1952, and opened for signature on 1st February, 1953,

Have agreed as follows:

Article I

For the purposes of the present Convention:

(a) The term "samples" means articles which are representative of a particular category of goods already produced or are examples of goods the production of which is contemplated, on condition that they:

(1) are owned abroad and are imported solely for the purpose of being shown or demonstrated in the territory of importation for the soliciting of orders for goods to be supplied from abroad; and

(2) are not sold or put to normal use except for purposes of demonstration or used in any way for hire or reward while in the territory of importation; and

(3) are intended to be re-exported in due course; and

(4) are capable of identification on re-exportation;

but does not include identical articles brought in by the same individual, or sent to a single consignee, in such quantity that, taken as a whole, they no longer constitute samples under ordinary commercial usage.

(b) The term "import duties" means customs duties and all other duties and taxes payable on or in connection with importation, and shall include all internal taxes and excise duties chargeable on imported goods, but shall not include fees and charges which are limited in amount to the approximate cost of services rendered and do not represent an indirect protection to domestic products or a taxation of imports for fiscal purposes.

(c) The term "E.C.S. carnet" (Echantillons commerciaux—Commercial Samples) means the document drawn up under that description by the Council, reproduced as the Annex to the present Convention. This document shall be printed in French, English, and the official language, or one of the official languages, of the country of issue.

(d) The term "approved association" means an association approved by the Custom authorities of any Contracting Party for the issue of E.C.S. carnets or for the provision of the guarantee of the payment of the import duties and other charges referred to in Article II of the present Convention.

(e) The term "issuing association" means an approved association which issues E.C.S. carnets in the country of original exportation of the samples.

(f) The term "guaranteeing association" means an approved association in the country of importation which provides the guarantee for the payment of the import duties and other charges referred to in Article II of the present Convention.

(g) The term "the Convention establishing the Council" means the Convention establishing the Customs Cooperation Council done at Brussels on 15th December, 1950.

(h) The term "the Council" means the Customs Co-operation Council referred to in subparagraph (g) of this Article.

Article II

1. Each guaranteeing association shall guarantee to pay to the Customs authorities of the territory in which it is established the amount of the import duties and other charges referred to in paragraph 4 of this Article which may become due in respect of samples imported into that country under cover of E.C.S. carnets issued by a corresponding issuing association. The liability of the guaranteeing association shall not exceed the amount of the import duties by more than ten per cent.

2. E.C.S. carnets shall be issued by issuing associations. Carnets shall be issued only to persons, natural or legal, resident in the country of issue who can establish that they are manufacturers or traders or representatives or employees of manufacturers or traders.

3. Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 2 of this Article, issuing associations may issue carnets to persons not resident in the country of issue if the Customs authorities of the country of temporary importation agree to accept carnets so issued.

4. Each Contracting Party shall, in the case of samples which are imported into its territory by a natural person resident in the territory of another Contracting Party and which qualify for temporary admission into its territory free of import duties, accept, as due security for the amount of the import duties and of other charges (other than the fees and charges mentioned in subparagraph (b) of Article I of the present Convention) which may arise as a result of the temporary duty-free importation of such samples, E.C.S. carnets valid for its territory and issued and used in accordance with the conditions laid down in this Convention.

5. Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 4 of this Article, Contracting Parties may accept E.C.S. carnets under such conditions as they may determine, for unaccompanied samples or for samples imported by a natural person resident in their territory.

Article III

E.C.S. carnets or parts of E.C.S. carnets intended to be issued in the country into which the carnets are imported and which are sent to an approved association concerned with the issue of such carnets by a corresponding foreign association, by an international organisation or by the Customs authorities of a Contracting Party, shall be admitted free of import duties and free of any import prohibition or restriction. Corresponding facilities shall be granted at exportation.

Article IV

If applicable, the issuing association shall indicate on the cover and on the importation vouchers of the carnet the countries in which it is not valid.

Article V

Issuing associations shall issue E.C.S. carnets with a period of validity not exceeding one year from the date of issue.

Article VI

Once an E.C.S. carnet has been issued by an issuing association no extra item shall be added to the list of samples enumerated on the reverse of the cover of the carnet.

Article VII

1. The samples imported under cover of an E.C.S. carnet shall be re-exported in the same general state within the period of validity of the carnet and within the period determined by the Customs authorities of the country of temporary importation which shall not in any case exceed the period of validity of the carnet.

2. Samples covered by an E.C.S. carnet which are exported or imported in one consignment, shall also be re-imported or re-exported in one consignment unless the Customs authorities of the countries concerned allow otherwise.

3. Evidence of re-exportation shall be provided by the re-exportation certificate completed in the E.C.S. carnet by the Customs authorities of the country into which the samples were temporarily imported.

Article VIII

1. In any case in which the Customs authorities of a Contracting Party waive the requirement of re-exportation of certain samples admitted into their territory under cover of an E.C.S. carnet, the guaranteeing association shall be discharged from its obligations only when the Customs authorities of the country of temporary importation have certified in the carnet that the position regarding samples not re-exported has been regularised.

2. When samples temporarily imported cannot be re-exported as a result of a seizure, other than a seizure made at the suit of private persons, the requirement of re-exportation within the periods provided for in Article VII of the present Convention shall be suspended for the duration of the seizure.

3. The Customs authorities shall notify, so far as possible, to the guaranteeing association, seizures made by or on behalf of the Customs authorities of samples admitted under cover of E.C.S. carnets guaranteed by that association and shall advise it of the measures they intend to take.

Article IX

When the Customs authorities of a Contracting Party have unconditionally certified the re-exportation of samples in an E.C.S. carnet they can no longer claim from the guaranteeing association payment of the amounts referred to in Article II of the present Convention in respect of these samples. A claim may nevertheless still be made against the guaranteeing association if it is subsequently discovered that the certificate of re-exportation was obtained improperly or fraudulently or that there had been a breach of the conditions of temporary importation.

Article X

Customs certificates on E.C.S. carnets used under the conditions laid down in the present Convention shall not be subject to the payment of charges for Customs attendance at Customs offices and posts during the normal business hours.

Article XI

1. If an E.C.S. carnet has not been regularly discharged, the Customs authorities of the country of temporary importation may, even if the carnet has expired, accept as evidence of re-exportation of the samples, unless they are in possession of positive evidence of non-re-exportation:

(a) the particulars entered by the Customs authorities of another Contracting Party on the E.C.S. carnet on re-importation into the country of departure, provided that the particulars relate to a re-importation which can be proved to have taken place after the re-exportation which it is intended to establish;

(b) a certificate by the Customs authorities of another Contracting Party which is based on the particulars contained in a voucher which has been detached from the carnet on importation into the territory of that Contracting Party, provided that the particulars relate to an importation which can be proved to have taken place after the re-exportation which it is intended to establish.

2. The Customs authorities of the country of temporary importation may also accept any other documentary evidence that the samples are outside that country.

3. In the case of the destruction, loss or theft of an E.C.S. carnet while the samples to which it refers are in the territory of one of the Contracting Parties, the Customs authorities of that Contracting Party shall, at the request of the issuing association, subject to such conditions as those authorities may prescribe, accept a replacement document, the validity of which expires on the date of expiration of validity of the carnet which it replaces.

Article XII

In the cases referred to in Article XI of the present Convention, the Customs authorities shall have the right to charge a regularisation fee.

Article XIII

Customs authorities shall not in any circumstances require from the guaranteeing association payment of the import duties and other charges referred to in Article II of the present Convention when a claim has not been made against the guaranteeing association within a year of the date of expiry of the validity of the carnet.

Article XIV

1. The guaranteeing association shall have a period of six months from the date of notification of the nondischarge of an E.C.S. carnet in which to furnish proof of the re-exportation of the samples under the conditions laid down in the present Convention.

2. If such proof is not furnished within the time allowed, the guaranteeing association shall forthwith deposit, or pay provisionally, the amount of the import duties and other charges referred to in Article II of the present Convention. This deposit or payment shall become final after a period of three months from the date of the deposit of provisional payment. During the latter period, the guaranteeing association may still avail itself of the facilities provided by the preceding paragraph with a view to repayment of the sums deposited or paid.

3. For countries whose regulations do not provide for the deposit or provisional payment of import duties, payments made in conformity with the provisions of the preceding paragraph will be regarded as final, it being understood that the sums paid may be refunded when proof of the re-exportation of the samples under the conditions laid down in the present Convention has been furnished to the Customs authorities.

Article XV

Nothing in this Convention shall prevent Contracting Parties which form a customs or economic union from enacting special provisions applicable to residents of the States forming that union.

Article XVI

In the event of fraud, contravention or abuse, the Contracting Parties shall, notwithstanding the provisions of this Convention, be free to take proceedings against persons using E.C.S. carnets for the recovery of the import duties and other charges payable and also for the imposition of any penalties to which such persons have rendered themselves liable. In such cases, the associations shall lend their assistance to the Customs authorities.

Article XVII

The provisions of the present Convention shall also apply to positive cinematograph advertising films of a width not exceeding 16 mm. shown to the satisfaction of the Customs authorities to consist essentially of photographs (with or without sound track) showing the nature or operation of products or equipment whose qualities cannot be adequately demonstrated by samples or catalogues, provided that the films:

(a) relate to products or equipment offered for sale or for hire by a person established in the territory of another Contracting Party; and

(b) are of a kind suitable for exhibition to prospective customers but not for general exhibition to the public; and

(c) are imported in a packet which contains not more than one copy of each film and which does not form part of a larger consignment of films.

Article XVII bis

1. The Contracting Parties shall meet together when necessary in order to consider the operation of the present Convention and, in particular, in order to consider measures to secure uniformity in the interpretation and application of the present Convention.

2. Such meeting shall be convened by the Secretary General of the Council at the request of any Contracting Party and, unless the Contracting Parties otherwise decide, shall be held at the Headquarters of the Council. The Contracting Parties shall lay down the rules of procedure for such meetings.

3. Decisions of the Contracting Parties shall be taken by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Contracting Parties present at the meeting and voting.

4. The Contracting Parties shall not take a decision on any matter unless more than half of them are present.

Article XVIII

1. Any dispute between Contracting Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the present Convention shall so far as possible be settled by negotiation between them.

2. Any dispute which is not settled by negotiation shall be referred by the Contracting Parties in dispute to the Contracting Parties, who shall thereupon consider the dispute and make recommendations for its settlement.

3. The Contracting Parties in dispute may agree in advance to accept the recommendations of the Contracting Parties as binding.

Article XIX

The present Convention shall be open for signature until 30th September, 1956 by any Government which is a Contracting Party to the Convention establishing the Council.

Article XX

The present Convention shall be subject to ratification. Instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which shall notify all signatory and acceding Governments and the Secretary General of the Council of each such deposit.

Article XXI

1. Three months after the date on which the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs has received the instruments of ratification of three Governments the present Convention shall come into force in respect of those Governments.

2. For each signatory Government ratifying after that date, the Convention shall come into force three months after the date of the deposit of its instrument of ratification with the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Article XXII

1. The Government of any State which is not a signatory to the present Convention but which is a Contracting Party to the Convention establishing the Council may accede to the present Convention as from 1st October, 1956.

1. bis. The Government of any Member of the United Nations or its specialised agencies and the Government of any other State to whom an invitation to that effect has been addressed by the Contracting Parties to the present Convention may also accede thereto.

2. Instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which shall notify all signatory and acceding Governments and the Secretary General of the Council of each such deposit.

3. The present Convention shall come into force for any acceding Government three months after the date of the deposit of its instrument of accession, but not before it comes into force in accordance with paragraph 1 of Article XXI above.

Article XXIII

1. The present Convention is of unlimited duration, but at any time after the expiry of twelve months from its entry into force under paragraph 1 of Article XXI above, any Contracting Party may withdraw therefrom. Withdrawal shall take effect three months after the date of receipt by the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs of a notification of withdrawal. The Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs shall notify each withdrawal to all signatory and acceding Governments and to the Secretary General of the Council.

2. Any E.C.S. carnet issued before the date when the withdrawal takes effect shall remain valid, and the guarantee of the guaranteeing association shall hold good.

Article XXIV

1. Any Government may at the time of its ratification or accession, or at any time thereafter, declare by notification given to the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs that the present Convention shall extend to any of the territories for whose international relations it is responsible, and the Convention shall extend to the territories named in the notification three months after the date of the receipt thereof by the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, but not before the Convention has come into force for the Government concerned.

2. Any Government which has made a declaration under paragraph 1 of this Article extending the present Convention to any territory for whose international relations it is responsible may by notification given to the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs withdraw in respect of that territory in accordance with the provisions of Article XXIII of the present Convention.

3. The Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs shall inform all signatory and acceding Governments and the Secretary General of the Council of any notification received by it under this Article.

Article XXV

1. The Contracting Parties may recommend amendments to the present Convention.

2. The text of any amendment so recommended shall be communicated by the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs to all Contracting Parties, to the Governments of other signatory or acceding States, to the Secretary General of the United Nations, and to the Secretary General of the Council.

3. Any recommended amendment communicated in accordance with the provisions of the above paragraph shall be deemed to be accepted if no Contracting Party has notified its objection to such amendment within six months of the date on which the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs has communicated such amendment.

4. The Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs shall inform all Contracting Parties and the Secretary General of the Council if an objection has been notified against a recommended amendment and should there have been no objection the amendments shall come into force for all Contracting Parties three months after the expiry of the six months referred to in paragraph 3 of this Article.

5. The Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs shall notify all Contracting Parties, the Governments of other signatory or acceding States, the Secretary General of the United Nations and the Secretary General of the Council, of accepted amendments or amendments deemed to have been accepted.

6. Any Government ratifying or acceding to the present Convention shall be deemed to have accepted any amendments thereto which have entered into force at the date of the deposit of its instrument of ratification or accession and also to have accepted the rules for the amendment of the E.C.S. carnet in force at that date.

7. Notwithstanding the provisions of this Article, the Contracting Parties shall establish rules for the amendment of the E.C.S. carnet.

Article XXVI

Reservations to this Convention shall not be permitted.

In witness whereof the undersigned, having been duly authorized thereto by their respective Governments, have signed the present Convention.

Done at Brussels on the 1st March, 1956, in the English and French languages, both texts being equally authentic, in a single original, which shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of Belgium which shall transmit certified copies thereof to each signatory and acceding Government.

PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE

At the time of signing the Customs Convention regarding E.C.S. carnets for commercial samples of this day's date the undersigned, having been duly authorised thereto by their respective Governments, make the following declarations:

1. The provisions of the present Convention set out the minimum facilities to be accorded. They do not prevent the application of greater facilities which certain Contracting Parties grant or may grant in future by unilateral provisions or in virtue of bilateral and multilateral agreements.

2. The Contracting Parties undertake to consider the E.C.S. carnet as a new facility and not as an obligation binding on persons temporarily importing samples.

3. The Contracting Parties recognise that the good working of this Convention entails the granting of facilities to approved associations in respect of the transfer of currency:

(a) to settle claims by the Customs authorities of Contracting Parties;

(b) when import duties are repaid in accordance with the provisions of Article XIV of the Convention;

(c) to pay for blank E.C.S. carnets forwarded to approved associations by their federations or corresponding associations.

In witness whereof the undersigned have signed the present Protocol which shall form an integral part of the Convention.

Done at Brussels on 1st March, 1956.

For Germany (Federal Republic of):
Dr. Franz Schillinger (5–6–1956)
For Austria:
Dr. Josef Stangelberger (5–6–1956)
For Belgium:
P.-H. Spaak (1–3–1956)
For Denmark:
L. Tillitse (4–7–1956)
For Spain:
——— ———
For France:
Bernard DuFournier (9–8–1956)
For Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
George P. LaBouchere (29–5–1956)
For Greece:
——— ———
For Ireland:
Denis R. Mc. Donald (29–9–1956)
For Italy:
Bon. Michele Scammacca del Murgo (20–9–1956)
For Luxembourg:
L. Schaus (4–5–1956)
For Norway:
Otto Kildal (29–9–1956)
For Pakistan:
——— ———
For the Netherlands:
Bon. van Harinxma thoe Slooten
Voor het Rijk in Europa. (29–9–1956)
For Portugal:
Eduardo Viera Leitao
sous réserve de ratification (17–7–1956)
For Sweden:
Hugo Wistrand
sous réserve de ratification (29–9–1956)
For Switzerland:
Charles Lenz
sous réserve de ratification (7–6–1956)
For Turkey:
D. Türkmen (11–7–1956)

CUSTOMS CONVENTION ON THE INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT OF GOODS UNDER COVER OF TIR CARNETS (TIR CONVENTION) AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE DONE AT GENEVA ON 15 JANUARY 1959

The Contracting Parties,

Desiring to facilitate the international transport of goods by road vehicle,

Have agreed as follows:

CHAPTER I. DEFINITIONS

Article 1

For the purpose of this Convention:

(a) the term "import or export duties and taxes" shall mean not only Customs duties but also all duties and taxes whatsoever chargeable by reason of importation or exportation;

(b) the term "road vehicle" shall mean not only any road motor vehicle but also any trailer or semi-trailer designed to be drawn by such a vehicle;

(c) the term "container" shall mean an article of transport equipment (lift-van, movable tank or other similar structure);

(i) of a permanent character and accordingly strong enough to be suitable for repeated use;

(ii) specially designed to facilitate the carriage of goods, by one or more modes of transport, without intermediate reloading;

(iii) fitted with devices permitting its ready handling, particularly its transfer from one mode of transport to another;

(iv) so designed as to be easy to fill and empty; and

(v) having an internal volume of one cubic metre or more;

the term "container" includes neither vehicles nor conventional packing;

(d) the term "Customs office of departure" shall mean any inland or frontier Customs office of a Contracting Party where the system provided by this Convention begins to apply to an international transport by road vehicle of a load or part-load of goods;

(e) the term "Customs office of destination" shall mean any inland or frontier Customs office of a Contracting Party where the system provided by this Convention ceases to apply to an international transport by road vehicle of a load or part-load of goods;

(f) the term "Customs office *en route*" shall mean any frontier Customs office of a Contracting Party which a road vehicle merely passes through in the course of an international transport under the system provided by this Convention;

(g) the term "persons" shall mean both natural and legal persons;

(h) the term "heavy or bulky goods" shall mean any object which, in the opinion of the Customs authorities of the Customs office of departure, cannot readily be dismantled for transport and of which

(i) the weight exceeds 7000 kg; or

(ii) one dimension exceeds 5 metres; or

(iii) two dimensions exceed 2 metres; or

(iv) the height, taking account of the loading position, exceeds 2 metres.

CHAPTER II. SCOPE

Article 2

This Convention shall apply to the transport of goods without intermediate reloading across one or more frontiers between a Customs office of departure of one Contracting Party and a Customs office of destination of another Contracting Party, or of the same Contracting Party, in road vehicles or in containers carried on such vehicles, notwithstanding that such vehicles are carried on another means of transport for part of the journey between the offices of departure ond destination.

Article 3

For the provisions of this Convention to become applicable:

(a) transport must be performed under the conditions set forth in Chapter III by means of road vehicles or containers previously approved; however, in the territory of Contracting Parties who have entered no reservation in accordance with paragraph 1 of Article 45 of this Convention, it may also, save in the cases covered by paragraph 2 of that Article, be performed by means of other road vehicles under the conditions set forth in Chapter IV;

(b) transport must be guaranteed by associations approved in accordance with the provisions of Article 5 and be performed under cover of a document known as the TIR carnet.

CHAPTER III. PROVISIONS CONCERNING TRANSPORT IN SEALED ROAD VEHICLES OR SEALED CONTAINERS

Article 4

Provided the conditions laid down in this Chapter and in Chapter V are fulfilled, goods carried in sealed road vehicles or in sealed containers carried on road vehicles—

(a) shall not be subjected to the payment or deposit of import or export duties and taxes at Customs offices *en route;* and

(b) shall not, as a general rule, be subjected to Customs examination at such offices.

However, in order to prevent abuse, the Customs authorities may, in exceptional cases and particularly when irregularity is suspected, carry out at such offices a summary or full examination of the goods.

Article 5

1. Subject to such conditions and guarantees as it shall determine, each Contracting Party may authorize associations to issue TIR carnets either directly or through corresponding associations, and to act as guarantors.

2. An association shall not be approved in any country unless its guarantee covers the responsibilities incurred in that country in connexion with operations under cover of TIR carnets issued by foreign associations affiliated to the same international organization as that to which it is itself affiliated.

Article 6

1. The guaranteeing association shall undertake to pay the import or export duties and taxes due, any interest due thereon, any other charges, and any pecuniary penalties incurred by the holder of the TIR carnet and the persons participating in the performance of the transport under the Customs laws and regulations of the country in which an offence has been committed. It shall be liable, jointly and severally with the persons from whom the sums mentioned above are due, for payment of such sums.

2. The fact that Customs authorities authorize the examination of the goods elsewhere than at a place where the business of Customs offices of departure or destination is usually conducted shall not affect the liability of the guaranteeing association.

3. The liability of the guaranteeing association to the authorities of a given country shall run only from the time when the TIR carnet is accepted by the Customs authorities of that country.

4. The liability of a guaranteeing association shall cover not only such goods as are enumerated in the TIR carnet, but also goods which, though not enumerated therein, are contained in the sealed section of the road vehicle or in the sealed container. It shall not extend to other goods.

5. For the purposes of determining the duties, taxes and, where applicable, pecuniary penalties mentioned in paragraph 1 of this Article, the particulars of the goods as entered in the TIR carnet shall be valid in the absence of proof to the contrary.

6. When the Customs authorities of a country have unconditionally discharged a TIR carnet they can no longer claim from the guaranteeing association payment of the amounts mentioned in paragraph 1 of this Article unless the certificate of discharge was obtained improperly or fraudulently.

7. Where a TIR carnet has not been discharged or has been discharged conditionally the competent authorities shall not have the right to claim from the guaranteeing association payment of the amounts mentioned in paragraph 1 of this Article unless, within one year of the date upon which the TIR carnet was taken on charge, they have notified the association of the non-discharge or conditional discharge. The same provision shall apply where the certificate of discharge was obtained improperly or fraudulently, save that the period shall be two years.

8. The claim for payment referred to in paragraph 1 of the present Article shall be made to the guaranteeing association within three years of the date when the association was informed that the carnet had not been discharged or had been discharged subject to a reservation or that the certificate of discharge had been obtained improperly or fraudulently. However, in cases which, during the above-mentioned period of three years, become the subject of legal proceedings, any claim for payment shall be made within one year of the date when the decision of the court becomes enforceable.

9. The guaranteeing association shall have a period of three months, from the date when a claim for payment is made upon it, in which to pay the amounts claimed. The amounts paid shall be reimbursed to the association if, within a period of twelve months from the date on which the claim for payment was made, it is established to the satisfaction of the Customs authorities that no irregularity took place as regards the transport operation in question.

Article 7

1. The TIR carnet shall conform to the standard form contained in Annex 1 to this Convention.

2. A TIR carnet shall be made out in respect of each road vehicle or container. Such carnet shall be valid for one journey only; it shall contain such number of detachable vouchers for Customs control and discharge as are required for the transport operation concerned.

Article 8

Transport under cover of a TIR carnet may involve several Customs offices of departure and destination; but, save as otherwise authorized by the Contracting Party or Parties concerned,

(a) the Customs offices of departure shall be situated in the same country,

(b) the Customs offices of destination shall be situated in not more than two countries and

(c) the total number of Customs offices of departure and destination shall not exceed four.

Article 9

At the Customs office of departure the goods, the road vehicle and, where appropriate, the container, shall be produced to the Customs authorities together with the TIR carnet for checking and the affixing of Customs seals.

Article 10

For journeys on the territory of their country, the Customs authorities may fix a time-limit and require the road vehicle to follow a stipulated itinerary.

Article 11

At each Customs office *en route* and at Customs offices of destination the road vehicle or container shall be produced with its load to the Customs authorities, together with the TIR carnet relating to the load.

Article 12

Save where they examine the goods in accordance with the last sentence of Article 4, the Customs authorities of the Customs offices *en route* of each of the Contracting Parties shall respect the seals affixed by the Customs authorities of the other Contracting Parties They may, however, affix additional seals of their own.

Article 13

In order to prevent abuse, the Customs authorities may, if they consider it necessary,

(a) in special cases require road vehicles to be escorted on the territory of their country, at the carrier's expense;

(b) require examination of road vehicles, containers and their loads to be carried out *en route*.

Loads shall be examined only in exceptional cases.

Article 14

If the Customs authorities conduct an examination of the load of a road vehicle or of a container at a Customs office *en route* or in the course of the journey, they shall record on the TIR carnet vouchers used in their country and on the corresponding counterfoils particulars of the new seals affixed.

Article 15

On arrival at the Customs office of destination, the TIR carnet shall be discharged without delay. If, however, the goods are not immediately entered under another Customs regime, the Customs authorities may reserve the right to make discharge of the carnet condiitonal upon a new liability being substituted for that of the association guaranteeing the said carnet.

Article 16

When it is established to the satisfaction of the Customs authorities that goods the subject of a TIR carnet have been destroyed by force majeure, exemption from payment of the duties and taxes normally chargeable shall be granted.

Article 17

1. In order to fall within the provisions of this chapter, road vehicles must fulfil the conditions as regards construction and equipment set out in Annex 3 to this Convention and containers those set out in Annex 6.

2. Road vehicles and containers shall be approved according to the procedures laid down in Annexes 4 and 7 to this Convention; the certificates of approval shall conform to the specimens reproduced in Annexes 5 and 8.

Article 18

1. No special document shall be required for a container used under cover of a TIR carnet, provided the characteristics and value of the container are entered in the "Goods Manifest" of the TIR carnet.

2. The provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article shall not prevent a Contracting Party requiring the fulfilment at the Customs office of destination of the formalities laid down by its national regulations or taking measures to prevent the container being used for a fresh consignment of goods intended for delivery within its territory.

CHAPTER IV. PROVISIONS CONCERNING TRANSPORT OF HEAVY OR BULKY GOODS

Article 19

The benefit of the provisions of this Chapter shall extend only to the transport of goods which are heavy or bulky goods as defined in sub-paragraph (h) of Article 1 of this Convention.

2. The benefit of the provisions of this Chapter shall be accorded only if, in the opinion of the Customs authorities of the Customs office of departure.

(a) the heavy or bulky goods and any accessories thereto can be easily identified by reference to the description given, or can be provided with identification marks, or can be sealed, so that the goods and accessories cannot be replaced in whole or in part by others and that nothing can be removed from them;

(b) the road vehicle contains no hidden spaces where goods can be concealed.

Article 20

Provided the conditions laid down in this chapter and in Chapter V are fulfilled, heavy or bulky goods carried under cover of a TIR carnet shall not be subjected to the payment or deposit of import or export duties and taxes at Customs offices *en route*.

Article 21

1. The provisions of Articles 5, 6 (except paragraph 4), 9, 10, 11, 15 and 16 of this Convention shall apply to the transport of heavy or bulky goods under cover of a TIR carnet.

2. The provisions of Article 7 shall also apply, but the cover and all vouchers of the TIR carnet shall bear the endorsement "Heavy or bulky goods" in bold red letters in the language in which the carnet is printed.

Article 22

The liability of the guaranteeing association shall cover not only such goods as are enumerated in the TIR carnet, but also goods which, though not enumerated in the carnet, are on the loading platform or among the goods enumerated in the TIR carnet.

Article 23

The Customs authorities of the Customs office of departure may require packing lists, photographs, blueprints etc. of the goods carried to be appended to the TIR carnet. In this case they shall visa these documents, one copy of the said documents shall be attached to the reverse of the cover page of the TIR carnet, and all the manifests of the TIR carnet shall incorporate a reference to such documents.

Article 24

Transport of heavy or bulky goods under cover of a TIR carnet shall not involve more than one Customs office of departure or more than one Customs office of destination.

Article 25

If the Customs authorities of a Customs office *en route* so require at the time of entry, the person who produces the load to the Customs office shall insert and sign a supplementary description of the goods in the TIR carnet manifests.

Article 26

The Customs authorities may, if they see fit—

(a) require examination of the vehicles and their loads at Customs offices *en route* or in the course of the journey;

(b) require road vehicles to be escorted on the territory of their country at the carrier's expense.

Article 27

The Customs authorities of the Customs office *en route* of each of the Contracting Parties shall, as far as possible, respect the identification marks and seals affixed by the Customs authorities of other Contracting Parties. They may, however, affix additional identification marks or seals of their own.

Article 28

If Customs authorities conducting an examination of the load at a Customs office *en route* or in the course of the journey are obliged to remove identification marks or break seals, they shall record on the TIR carnet vouchers used in their country and on the corresponding counterfoils particulars of the new identification marks or seals affixed.

CHAPTER V. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Article 29

1. Each of the Contracting Parties shall have the right to exclude temporarily or permanently from the operation of this Convention any person guilty of a serious offence against the Customs laws or regulations applicable to the international transport of goods by road vehicle.

2. Such exclusion shall be notified immediately to the Customs authorities of the Contracting Party on whose territory the person concerned is established or resident, and also to the guaranteeing association in the country where the offence has been committeed.

Article 30

TIR carnet forms sent to the guaranteeing associations by the corresponding foreign associations or by international organizations shall be admitted free of import duties and taxes and free of import prohibitions and restrictions.

Article 31

When a road vehicle, or a combination of coupled road vehicles, is carrying out the international transport of goods under cover of a TIR carnet, a rectangular plate bearing the letters "TIR", the specifications of which are laid down in Annex 9 to this Convention, shall be affixed to the front and to the rear of the vehicle or combination of vehicles. These plates shall be so placed as to be clearly visible; they shall be removable and capable of being sealed. The seals shall be affixed by the Customs authorities of the first Customs Office of departure and shall be removed by the Customs authorities of the last Customs office of destination.

Article 32

If seals affixed by the Customs authorities are broken *en route* otherwise than in the circumstances of Articles 14 and 28 or if any goods are destroyed or damaged without breaking of such seals, the procedure laid down in Annex 1 to this Convention for the use of the TIR carnet shall, without prejudice to the application of the provisions of national law, be followed and a certified report shall be drawn up in the form set out in Annex 2 to this Convention.

Article 33

Each Contracting Party shall send to the other Contracting Parties facsimiles of the seals it uses.

Article 34

Each Contracting Party shall send the other Contracting Parties a list of the Customs offices of departure, Customs offices *en route* and Customs offices of destination approved by it for TIR carnet traffic, indicating, where appropriate, those offices which are only open for traffic dealt with under Chapter III. The Contracting Parties of adjacent territories shall consult each other in determining the frontier offices to be included in this list.

Article 35

As regards Customs operations mentioned in this Convention, no charge shall be made for Customs attendance, save where it is provided on days or at times or places other than those normally appointed for such operations.

Article 36

Any breach of the provisions of this Convention may render the offender liable in the country where the offence was committed to the penalties prescribed by the law of that country.

Article 37

The provisions of this Convention shall preclude neither the application of restrictions and controls imposed under national regulations on grounds of public morality, public security, hygiene or public health, or for veterinary or phytopathological considerations, nor the levy of dues chargeable by virtue of such regulations.

Article 38

Nothing in this Convention shall prevent Contracting Parties which form a Customs or economic union from enacting special provisions in respect of transport operations commencing or terminating in, or passing through, their territories, provided that such provisions do not attenuate the facilities provided by this Convention.

CHAPTER VI. FINAL PROVISIONS

Article 39

1. Countries members of the Economic Commission for Europe and countries admitted to the Commission in a consultative capacity under paragraph 8 of the Commission's terms of reference may become Contracting Parties to this convention—

(a) by signing it;

(b) by ratifying it after signing it subject to ratification; or

(c) by acceding to it.

2. Such countries as may participate in certain activities of the Economic Commission for Europe in accordance with paragraph 11 of the Commission's terms of reference may become Contracting Parties to this Convention by acceding thereto after its entry into force.

3. The Convention shall be open for signature until 15 April 1959 inclusive. Thereafter, it shall be open for accession.

4. Ratification or accession shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article 40

1. This Convention shall come into force on the ninetieth day after five of the countries referred to in Article 39, paragraph 1, have signed it without reservation of ratification or have deposited their instruments of ratification or accession.

2. For any country ratifying or acceding to it after five countries have signed it without reservation of ratification or have deposited their intruments of ratification or accession, this Convention shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the said country has deposited its instrument of ratification or accession.

Article 41

1. Any Contracting Party may denounce this Convention by so notifying the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

2. Denunciation shall take effect fifteen months after the date of receipt by the Secretary-General of the notification of denunciation.

3. The validity of TIR carnets issued before the date when the denunciation takes effect shall not be affected thereby and the guarantee of the association shall hold good.

Article 42

This Convention shall cease to have effect if, for any period of twelve consecutive months after its entry into force, the number of Contracting Parties is less than five.

Article 43

1. Any country may at the time of signing this Convention without reservation of ratification or of depositing its instrument of ratification or accession or at any time thereafter, declare by notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations that this Convention shall extend to all or any of the territories for the international relations of which it is responsible. The Convention shall extend to the territory or territories named in the notification as from the ninetieth day after its receipt by the Secretary-General or, if on that day the Convention has not yet entered into force, at the time of its entry into force.

2. Any country which has made a declaration under the preceding paragraph extending this Convention to any territory for whose international relations it is responsible, may denounce the Convention separately in respect of that territory, in accordance with the provisions of Article 41.

Article 44

1. Any dispute between two or more Contracting Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention shall, so far as possible, be settled by negotiation between them.

2. Any dispute which is not settled by negotiation shall be submitted to arbitration if any one of the Contracting Parties in dispute so requests and shall be referred accordingly to one or more arbitrators selected by agreement between the Parties in dispute. If within three months from the date of the request for arbitration the Parties in dispute are unable to agree on the selection of an arbitrator or arbitrators, any of those Parties may request the Secretary-General of the United Nations to nominate a single arbitrator to whom the dispute shall be referred for decisions.

3. The decision of the arbitrator or arbitrators appointed under the preceding paragraph shall be binding on the Contracting Parties in dispute.

Article 45

1. Any country may declare at the time of signing, ratifying, or acceding to this Convention, or notify the Secretary-General of the United Nations after becoming a Contracting Party to the Convention, that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Chapter IV of the Convention; notifications addressed to the Secretary-General shall take effect on the ninetieth day after their receipt by the Secretary-General.

2. The other Contracting Parties shall not be required to extend the benefit of the provisions of Chapter IV of this Convention to persons established or resident in the territory of any Contracting Party which has entered a reservation as provided for in paragraph 1 of this Article.

3. Any country may, at the time of signing, ratifying or acceding to this Convention, declare that it does not consider itself bound by paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 44 of the Convention. Other Contracting Parties shall not be bound by these paragraphs in respect of any Contracting Party which has entered such a reservation.

4. Any Contracting Party having entered a reservation as provided for in paragraph 1 or paragraph 3 of this Article may at any time withdraw such reservation by notifying the Secretary-General.

5. Apart from the reservations provided for in paragraphs 1 and 3 of this Article, no reservation to this Convention shall be permitted.

Article 46

1. After this Convention has been in force for three years, any Contracting Party may, by notification to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, request that a conference be convened for the purpose of reviewing the Convention. The Secretary-General shall notify all Contracting Parties of the request and a review conference shall be convened by the Secretary-General if, within a period of four months following the date of notification by the Secretary-General, not less than one-third of the Contracting Parties notify him of their concurrence with the request.

2. If a conference is convened in accordance with the preceding paragraph, the Secretary-General shall notify all the Contracting Parties and invite them to submit, within a period of three months, such proposals as they may wish the conference to consider. The Secretary-General shall circulate to all Contracting Parties the provisional agenda for the conference, together with the text of such proposals, at least three months before the date on which the conference is to meet.

3. The Secretary-General shall invite to any conference convened in accordance with this Article all countries referred to in Article 39, paragraph 1, and countries which have become Contracting Parties under Article 39, paragraph 2.

Article 47

1. Any Contracting Party may propose one or more amendments to this Convention. The text of any proposed amendment shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall transmit it to all Contracting Parties and inform all other countries referred to in Article 39, paragraph 1.

2. Any proposed amendment circulated in accordance with the preceding paragraph shall be deemed to be accepted if no Contracting Party expresses an objection within a period of three months following the date of circulation of the proposed amendment by the Secretary-General.

3. The Secretary-General shall, as soon as possible, notify all Contracting Parties whether an objection to the proposed amendment has been expressed. If an objection to the proposed amendment has been expressed, the amendment shall be deemed not to have

been accepted, and shall be of no effect whatever. If no such objection has been expressed the amendment shall enter into force for all Contracting Parties nine months after the expiry of the period of three months referred to in the preceding paragraph.

4. Independently of the amendment procedure laid down in paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of this Article, the Annexes to this Convention may be modified by agreement between the competent administrations of all the Contracting Parties; such agreement may provide that during a transitional period the old Annexes shall remain in force, wholly or in part, concurrently with the new Annexes. The Secretary-General shall fix the date of entry into force of the new texts resulting from such modifications.

Article 48

In addition to the notifications provided for in Articles 46 and 47, the Secretary-General of the United Nations shall notify the countries referred to in Article 39, paragraph 1, and the countries which have become Contracting Parties under Article 39, 2, of—

(a) signatures, ratifications and accessions under Article 39;

(b) the dates of entry into force of this Convention, in accordance with Article 40;

(c) denunciations under Article 41;

(d) the termination of this Convention in accordance with Article 42;

(e) notifications received in accordance with Article 43;

(f) declarations and notifications received in accordance with Article 45, paragraphs 1, 3 and 4;

(g) the entry into force of any amendment in accordance with Article 47.

Article 49

As soon as a country which is a Contracting Party to the Agreement providing for the provisional application of the Draft International Customs Conventions on Touring, on Commercial Road Vehicles, and on the International Transport of Goods by Road, done at Geneva on 16 June 1949, becomes a Contracting Party to this Convention, it shall take the measures required by Article IV of that Agreement to denounce it as regards the Draft International Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods by Road.

Article 50

The Protocol of Signature of this Convention shall have the same force, effect and duration as the Convention itself, of which it shall be considered to be an integral part.

Article 51

After 15 April 1959, the original of this Convention shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall transmit certified true copies to each of the countries mentioned in Article 39, paragraphs 1 and 2.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned, being duly authorized thereto, have signed this Convention.

DONE at Geneva, this fifteenth day of January one thousand nine hundred and fifty nine, in a single copy, in the English and French languages, each text being equally authentic.

For Albania:

——— ———

For Austria:
Subject to ratification
Dr. JOSEF STANGELBERGER (15 February 1959)

For Belgium:
Subject to ratification
J. ETIENNE (4 March 1949)

For Bulgaria:
With a declaration of not being bound by paragraphs 2 and 3 of Article 44
A. BELINSKI (15.IV.1959)

For the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic:

——— ———

For Czechoslovakia:

——— ———

For Denmark:
ERIK HAUGE (15.IV.1959)

For the Federal Republic of Germany:
Subject to ratification
RUDOLF THIERFELDER (13 April 1959)

For Finland:

——— ———

For France:
Subject to ratification
DE CURTON (14 April 1959)

For Greece:

——— ———

For Hungary:

——— ———

For Iceland:

——— ———

For Ireland:

——— ———

For Italy:
Subject to ratification
ALBERTO BERIO (15 April 1959)

For Luxembourg:
Subject to ratification
I. BESSLING (14 April 1959)

For the Netherlands:
Subject to ratification
W. H. J. VAN ASCH WIJCK (9 April 1959)

For Norway:

——— ———

For Poland:

——— ———

For Portugal:

——— ———

For Romania:

——— ———

For Spain:

——— ———

For Sweden:
B. KOLLBERG (14 April 1959)

For Switzerland:
Subject to ratification
CH. LENZ (12.3.1959)

For Turkey:

——— ———

For the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic:

——— ———

For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

——— ———

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
Subject of ratification
E. SNIDERS (April 13, 1959)

For the United States of America:

——— ———

For Yugoslavia:

——— ———

CUSTOMS CONVENTION ON THE INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT OF GOODS UNDER COVER OF TIR CARNETS (TIR CONVENTION) AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE DONE AT GENEVA ON 15 JANUARY 1959

ANNEX 3: REGULATIONS ON TECHNICAL CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO ROAD VEHICLES WHICH MAY BE ACCEPTED FOR INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT OF GOODS UNDER CUSTOMS SEAL

Text of article 5 of annex 3 as modified by agreement between the competent administrations of all the Contracting Parties, in accordance with paragraph 4 of article 47 of the Convention.

Entry into force: 19 November 1963

The text of annex 3, article 5 is superseded by the following:

Article 5. Sheeted vehicles

1. Where applicable, the provisions of articles 2 to 4 above shall apply to sheeted vehicles. However, the system of closing and protecting the ventilation apertures mentioned in article 2, paragraph 3, may consist externally of a perforated metal screen (maximum dimension of holes: 10 mm) and internally of metal gauze or some other very strong gauze (maximum dimension of meshes: 3 mm, the strands being such that they cannot be pushed together without leaving visible traces), the screen and the gauze being fixed to the sheet in such a way that their assembly cannot be altered without leaving obvious traces. In addition, sheeted vehicles shall conform to the following conditions.

2. The sheet shall be either of strong canvas or of strong nontensible plastic-covered or rubberized cloth which shall not be of a dark colour. It shall be fashioned in one piece or of strips each in one piece. It shall be in a good condition and made up in such a way that once the closing device has been secured, it is impossible to gain access to the load without leaving obvious traces.

3. If the sheet is made up of several strips, their edges shall be folded into one another and sewn together with two seams at least 15 mm apart. These seams shall be made as shown in sketch No. 1 attached to the present Regulations; however, where in the case of certain parts of the sheet, such as flaps at the rear and reinforced corners, it is not possible to assemble the strips in that way, it shall be sufficient to fold the edge of the top section and make the seams as shown in sketch No. 2 attached to these Regulations. The threads used for each of the two seams shall be plainly different in colour; one of the seams shall be visible only from the inside and the colour of the thread used for that seam shall be plainly different from the colour of the sheet itself. All seams shall be machine-sewn.

4. If the sheet is of plastic-covered cloth, and is made up of several strips, the strips may also be welded together in the manner shown in sketch No. 3 attached to these Regulations. The edges of the strips shall overlap by at least 15 mm. The strips shall be fused together over the whole width of the overlapping parts. The edge of the outer sheet shall be covered with a band of plastic at least 7 mm wide, affixed by the same welding process. The plastic band and a width of at least 3 mm on each side shall have a well-marked uniform relief stamped on it. The strips shall be welded in such a way that they cannot be separated and then rejoined without leaving obvious traces.

5. Repairs shall be made in accordance with the method described in sketch No. 4 attached to these Regulations; the edges shall be folded into one another and sewn together with two visible seams at least 15 mm apart; the colour of the thread visible from the inside shall be different from that of the thread visible from the outside and from that of the sheet itself; all seams shall be machine-sewn. Nevertheless, sheets of plastic-covered cloth may also be repaired in accordance with the method described in paragraph 4 above.

6. Securing rings shall be so fitted that they cannot be removed from the outside. Eyelets in the sheet shall be reinforced with metal or leather. The interval between eyelets or rings shall not exceed 200 mm.

7. The sheet shall be so fixed to the sides as to render the load quite inaccessible. It shall be supported by at least three lengthwise bars or laths resting at the ends of the loading platform either on hoops or on the end walls of the platform; where the loading platform is more than 4 metres long, at least one intermediate hoop must be provided. The hoops shall be fixed in such a way that it is impossible to alter their position from the outside.

8. The following types of fastening shall be used:

(a) steel wire rope of at least 3 mm diameter; or

(b) hemp or sisal rope of at least 8 mm diameter encased in a transparent nontensible plastic sheath; or

(c) iron bars at least 8 mm in diameter.

Steel wire ropes shall not be covered, except with a transparent non-tensible plastic sheath. Iron bars shall not be coated with non-transparent material.

9. Each wire rope or hemp or sisal rope shall be in one piece and have a metal end piece. The fastener of each metal end piece shall include a hollow rivet passing through the rope so as to allow the introduction of the string of the Customs seal. The rope shall remain visible on either side of the hollow rivet so that it is possible to ascertain whether the rope is in one piece (see sketch No. 5 attached to these Regulations).

10. Each iron bar shall be in one piece. It shall have a hole at one end to take the closing device and, at the other end, a head forged to the bar and so constructed as to make it impossible for the bar to turn on its axis.

11. When ropes are used the sides of the vehicles shall be at least 350 mm high and the sheet shall cover the sides to a depth of at least 300 mm.

12. At the openings used for loading and unloading the vehicle, the two edges of the sheet shall have an adequate overlap. They shall likewise be fastened by a flap attached to the outside and sewn in accordance with paragraph 3 of this article. In addition to the fastenings referred to in paragraph 8, leather thongs may be accepted, provided that they are at least 20 mm wide and 3 mm thick. These thongs shall be attached inside the sheet and fitted with eyelets to take the wire rope or iron bar mentioned in paragraph 8.

Insert the new sketch No. 3 reproduced as an appendix to this document, sketches Nos. 3 and 4 of the TIR Convention being renumbered 4 and 5.

I hereby certify that the foregoing text is a true copy of the text of article 5 of annex 3 to the Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods under Cover of TIR Carnets (TIR Convention), done at Geneva on 15 January 1959, as modified by agreement between the competent administrations of all the Contracting Parties, in accordance with paragraph 4 of article 47 of the Convention.

For the Secretary-General:

The Legal Counsel
C. A. Stavropoulos

United Nations, New York, *11 November 1963*

Customs Convention on Containers

PREAMBLE

The Contracting Parties,

Desiring to develop and to facilitate the use of containers in international traffic,

Have agreed as follows:

CHAPTER I

Definitions

Article 1

For the purpose of this Convention:

(*a*) The term "import duties and import taxes" shall mean not only Customs duties but also all duties and taxes whatsoever chargeable by reason of importation;

(*b*) The term "container" shall mean an article of transport equipment (lift-van, movable tank or other similar structure):

(i) Of a permanent character and accordingly strong enough to be suitable for repeated use;

(ii) Specially designed to facilitate the carriage of goods, by one or more modes of transport, without intermediate reloading;

(iii) Fitted with devices permitting its ready handling, particularly its transfer from one mode of transport to another;

(iv) So designed as to be easy to fill and empty; and

(v) Having an internal volume of one cubic metre or more.

and shall include the normal accessories and equipment of the container, when imported with the container; the term "container" includes neither vehicles nor conventional packing;

(*c*) The term "persons" shall mean both natural and legal persons unless the context otherwise requires.

CHAPTER II

Temporary importation free of import duties and import taxes and free of import prohibitions and restrictions

Article 2

Each of the Contracting Parties shall grant temporary admission free of import duties and import taxes and free of import prohibitions and restrictions, subject to re-exportation and to the other conditions laid down in articles 3 to 6 below, to containers when they are imported loaded to be re-exported either empty or loaded, or imported empty to be re-exported loaded. Each Contracting Party shall retain the right to withhold these facilities in the case of containers which are imported on purchase or otherwise taken into effective possession and control by a person resident or established in its territory; the same applies to containers imported from a country which does not apply the provisions of this Convention.

Article 3

Containers temporarily imported free of import duties and import taxes shall be re-exported within three months from the date of importation. This period may be extended for valid reasons by the Customs authorities within the limits laid down by the legislation in force in the territory into which containers have been temporarily imported.

Article 4

1. Notwithstanding the requirement of re-exportation laid down in article 3, the re-exportation of badly damaged containers shall not be required, in the case of duly authenticated accidents, provided that the containers:

(*a*) Are subjected to the import duties and import taxes to which they are liable; or

(*b*) Are abandoned free of all expense to the Exchequer of the country into which they were imported temporarily; or

(*c*) Are destroyed, under official supervision, at the expenses of the parties concerned, any salvaged parts and materials being subjected to the import duties and import taxes to which they are liable;

as the Customs authorities may require.

2. When a container temporarily imported cannot be re-exported as a result of a seizure, other than a seizure made at the suit of private persons, the requirement of re-exportation laid down in article 3 shall be suspended for the duration of the seizure.

Article 5

1. Component parts imported for the repair of a particular container already temporarily imported shall be admitted temporarily free of import duties and import taxes and free of import prohibitions and restrictions.

2. Replaced parts which are not re-exported shall be liable to import duties and import taxes except where, in conformity with the regulations of the country concerned, they may be abandoned free of all expense to the Exchequer or destroyed, under official supervision, at the expense of the parties concerned.

Article 6

The procedure for the temporary admission of containers and component parts free of import duties and import taxes shall be governed by the regulations in force in the territory of each Contracting Party.

CHAPTER III

Technical conditions applicable to containers which may be accepted for transport under customs seal

Article 7

Each of the Contracting Parties which applies a system of transport of containers under Customs seal shall accept for such transport containers complying with the provisions of the regulations contained in Annex 1 and shall apply the approval procedures laid down in Annex 2.

CHAPTER IV

Miscellaneous provisions

Article 8

The Contracting Parties shall endeavour not to introduce Customs procedures which might have the effect of impeding the development of international transport by containers.

Article 9

Any breach of the provisions of this Convention, any substitution, false declaration or act having the effect of causing a person or an article improperly to benefit from the facilities provided for in this Convention, may render the offender liable in the country where the offence was committed to the penalties prescribed by the laws of that country.

Article 10

Nothing in this Convention shall prevent Contracting Parties which form a Customs or economic union from enacting special provisions applicable to persons resident or established in one of the countries forming that union.

Article 11

Each Contracting Party shall have the right to deny the benefit of temporary importation free of import duties and import taxes and free of import prohibitions and restrictions to, or to withdraw that benefit from, containers which are used, even occasionally, for the purpose of loading goods within the frontiers of the country into which the container is imported, for deposit within those frontiers.

CHAPTER V

Final provisions

Article 12

1. Countries members of the Economic Commission for Europe and countries admitted to the Commission in a consultative capacity under paragraph 8 of the Commissions' terms of reference, may become Contracting Parties to this Convention:

(*a*) By signing it;

(*b*) By ratifying it after signing it subject to ratification;

(*c*) By acceding to it.

2. Such countries as may participate in certain activities of the Economic Commission for Europe in accordance with paragraph 11 of the Commission's terms of reference may become Contracting Parties to this Convention by acceding thereto after its entry into force.

3. The Convention shall be open for signature until 31 August 1956 inclusive. Thereafter, it shall be open for accession.

4. Ratification or accession shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article 13

1. This Convention shall come into force on the ninetieth day after five of the countries referred to in article 12, paragraph 1, have signed it without reservation of ratification or have deposited their instruments of ratification or accession.

2. For any country ratifying of acceding to it after five countries have signed it without reservation or ratification or have deposited their instruments of ratification or accession, this Convention shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the said country has deposited its instrument of ratification or accession.

Article 14

1. Any Contracting Party may denounce this Convention by so notifying the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

2. Denunciation shall take effect fifteen

months after the date of receipt by the Secretary-General of the notification of denunciation.

Article 15

This Convention shall cease to have effect if, for any period of twelve consecutive months after its entry into force, the number of Contracting Parties is less than five.

Article 16

1. Any country may, at the time of signing this Convention without reservation of ratification or of depositing its instrument of ratification or accession or at any time thereafter, declare by notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations that this Convention shall extend to all or any of the territories for the international relations of which it is responsible. The Convention shall extend to the territory or territories named in the notification as from the ninetieth day after its receipt by the Secretary-General or, if on that day the Convention has not yet entered into force, at the time of its entry into force.

2. Any country which has made a declaration under the preceding paragraph extending this Convention to any territory for whose international relations it is responsible may denounce the Convention separately in respect of that territory in accordance with the provisions of article 14.

Article 17

1. Any dispute between two or more Contracting Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention shall so far as possible be settled by negotiation between them.

2. Any dispute which is not settled by negotiation shall be submitted to arbitration if any one of the Contracting Parties in dispute so requests and shall be referred accordingly to one or more arbitrators selected by agreement between the Parties in dispute. If within three months from the date of the request for arbitration the Parties in dispute are unable to agree on the selection of an arbitrator or arbitrators, any of those Parties may request the Secretary-General of the United Nations to nominate a single arbitrator to whom the dispute shall be referred for decision.

3. The decision of the arbitrator or arbitrators appointed under the preceding paragraph shall be binding on the Contracting Parties in dispute.

Article 18

1. Each Contracting Party may, at the time of signing, ratifying, or acceding to, this Convention, declare that it does not consider itself as bound by article 17 of the Convention. Other Contracting Parties shall not be bound by article 17 in respect of any Contracting Party which has entered such a reservation.

2. Any Contracting Party having entered a reservation as provided for in paragraph 1 may at any time withdraw such reservation by notifying the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

3. No other reservation to this Convention shall be permitted.

Article 19

1. After this Convention has been in force for three years, any Contracting Party may, by notification to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, request that a conference be convened for the purpose of reviewing the Convention. The Secretary-General shall notify all Contracting Parties of the request and a review conference shall be convened by the Secretary-General if within a period of four months following the date of notification by the Secretary-General, not less than one third of the Contracting Parties notify him of their concurrence with the request.

2. If a conference is convened in accordance with the preceding paragraph, the Secretary-General shall notify all the Contracting Parties and invite them to submit within a period of three months such proposals as they may wish the Conference to consider. The Secretary-General shall circulate to all Contracting Parties the provisional agenda for the conference together with the texts of such proposals at least three months before the date on which the conference is to meet.

3. The Secretary-General shall invite to any conference convened in accordance with this article all countries referred to in article 12, paragraph 1, and countries which have become Contracting Parties under article 12, paragraph 2.

Article 20

1. Any Contracting Party may propose one or more amendments to this Convention. The text of any proposed amendment shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations who shall transmit it to all Contracting Parties and inform all other countries referred to in article 12, paragraph 1.

2. Any proposed amendment circulated in accordance with the preceding paragraph shall be deemed to be accepted if no Contracting Party expressed an objection within a period of six months following the date of circulation of the proposed amendment by the Secretary-General.

3. The Secretary-General shall, as soon as possible, notify all Contracting Parties whether an objection to the proposed amendment has been expressed. If an objection to the proposed amendment has been expressed, the amendment shall be deemed not to have been accepted and shall be of no effect whatever. If no such objection has been expressed the amendment shall enter into force for all Contracting Parties three months after the expiry of the period of six months referred to in the preceding paragraph.

4. Independently of the amendment procedure laid down in paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of this article, the annexes to this Convention may be modified by agreement between the competent Administrations of all the Contracting Parties. The Secretary-General shall fix the date of entry into force of the new texts resulting from such modifications.

Article 21

In addition to the notifications provided for in articles 19 and 20, the Secretary-General of the United Nations shall notify the countries referred to in article 12, paragraph 1, and the countries which have become Contracting Parties under article 12, paragraph 2, of:

(*a*) Signatures, ratifications and accessions under article 12;

(*b*) The dates of entry into force of this Convention in accordance with article 13;

(*c*) Denunciations under article 14;

(*d*) The termination of this Convention in accordance with article 15;

(*e*) Notifications received in accordance with article 16;

(*f*) Declarations and notifications received in accordance with article 18, paragraphs 1 and 2;

(*g*) The entry into force of any amendment in accordance with article 20.

Article 22

The Protocol of Signature of this Convention shall have the same force, effect and duration as the Convention itself of which it shall be considered to be an integral part.

Article 23

After 31 August 1956, the original of this Convention shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall transmit certified true copies to each of the countries mentioned in article 12, paragraphs 1 and 2.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned, being duly authorized thereto, have signed this Convention.

DONE at Geneva, this eighteenth day of May one thousand nine hundred and fifty-six, in a single copy in the English and French languages, each text being equally authentic.

For Albania:
——— ———

For Austria:
Subject to ratification
Dr. JOSEF STANGELBERGER
For Belgium:
Subject to ratification
LEROY
For Bulgaria:
——— ———

For Byelorussian SSR:
——— ———

For Czechoslovakia:
——— ———

For Denmark:
——— ———

For the Federal Republic of Germany:
Subject to ratification
RUDOLF STEG
For Finland:
——— ———

For France:
Subject to ratification
DE CURTON
For Greece:
——— ———

For Hungary:
Subject to ratification
SIMON FERENCZ
For Iceland:
——— ———

For Ireland:
——— ———

For Italy:
Subject to ratification
NOTARANGELI
For Luxembourg:
Subject to ratification
R. LOGELIN
For the Netherlands:
For the Realm in Europe
Subject to ratification
W. H. J. VAN ASCH VAN WIJCK
For Norway:
——— ———

For Poland:
Subject to ratification and subject to the reservation that the Government of the People's Republic of Poland does not consider itself as bound by article 17 of the Convention
JERZY KOSZYK
For Portugal:
——— ———

For Romania:
——— ———

For Spain:
——— ———

For Sweden:
Subject to ratification
G. DE SYDOW
For Switzerland:
Subject to ratification
CH. LENZ
For Turkey:
——— ———

For Ukranian SSR:
——— ———

For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:
——— ———

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
Subject to ratification
JAMES C. WARDROP
For the United States of America:
——— ———

For Yugoslavia:
——— ———

CUSTOMS CONVENTIONS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, this last group of treaties before the Senate—Calendars Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10—are also designed to assist our international commerce. As the President states in his letter of transmittal, our accession to them "will aid the American export drive."

Briefly, they deal with or are related to the temporary importation of certain equipment and the papers, or so-called carnets, which cover these importations. The first treaty in this group—the Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Professional Equipment—Executive K, 89th Congress, second session—provides for temporary—about 6 months—duty-free entry of all kinds of professional equipment, TV cameras, and so forth. An instance where this would be useful is the case of an American broadcasting company sending a crew to Europe to cover an important event. The second treaty—the Customs Convention on the ATA Carnet for the Temporary Admission of Goods—Executive L, 89th Congress, second session—provides for the issuance of a document, which the U.S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce has agreed to do, to cover this temporary importation so that bonds do not have to be posted for this equipment.

The third treaty—Customs Convention Regarding ECS Carnets for Commercial Samples—Executive M, 89th Congress, second session—does the same for commercial samples covered by the International Convention To Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Material which we approved in 1956. Again, the U.S. council of the international chamber will issue the carnet to make posting of bonds unnecessary.

Under both of these conventions the U.S. council will be responsible for paying the duty that would otherwise be due, if the items covered do not leave the country within the proper temporary period.

The fourth convention—the Customs Convention on Containers—Executive J, 89th Congress, second session—provides for duty-free temporary entry of those big containers, like lift vans and movable tanks, which are being used increasingly in international trade. They must be of permanent construction, so they can be used repeatedly, and must meet other standards.

The last convention—Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods Under the Cover of TIR Carnets—Executive N, 89th Congress, second session—concerns the contents of these containers when they are moved by road and spells out a system of documentation that will provide for inspection and payment of duties only at the final point of destination and not at each border crossing. In an area like Europe, the advantages of this carnet system are obvious.

The common aim of all these treaties is to make it easier for our citizens to do business abroad and vice versa. The fact that the American business community has a deep interest in these treaties is attested by the large volume of favorable mail that the committee has received on them. As a matter of fact, the Committee on Commerce, of which I am also a member, has urged approval in particular of the container convention. I know of no opposition to these treaties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending conventions will be considered as having passed through their various parliamentary stages up to and including the point of consideration of the resolutions of ratification.

The resolutions of ratification will be read.

The resolutions of ratification were read, as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the customs convention on the temporary importation of professional equipment, done at Brussels on June 8, 1961. (Executive K, Eighty-ninth Congress, second session.)

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the customs convention on the ATA carnet for the temporary admission of goods, done at Brussels on December 6, 1961. (Executive L, Eighty-ninth Congress, second session.)

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the customs convention regarding ECS carnets for commercial samples, with protocol of signature, done at Brussels on March 1, 1956, as amended by the recommendation of the Customs Cooperation Council, dated June 15, 1960. Executive M, Eighty-ninth Congress, second session.)

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the customs convention on the international transport of goods under cover of TIR carnets, with protocol of signature, done at Geneva on January 15, 1959, with modifications of annexes (Executive N, Eighty-ninth Congress, second session, and Executive Report No. 3, Ninetieth Congress, first session.)

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the customs convention on containers, together with the protocol of signature which forms an integral part thereof, done at Geneva on May 18, 1956. (Executive J, Eighty-ninth Congress, second session.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent because of death in their respective families.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted: yeas 92, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 36 Ex.]

YEAS—92

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hatfield
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—8

Bayh
Brewster
Church
Fannin
Gruening
Jordan, N.C.
Tower
Williams, Del.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolutions of ratification are agreed to en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, even though it is not 2 o'clock, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside and that the pending business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 665) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on amendment No. 103 to S. 665, which is proposed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], in the nature of a substitute for amendment No. 99, proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], for himself and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I modify my amendment, on line 9, page 2, after the numeral "1954", by adding "and 1962".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana modifies his amendment accordingly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays may be ordered on the Clark amendment, and the substitute, and the bill at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may I know what the request is?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The yeas and nays on the Clark amendment and the substitute.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understood the Mansfield amendment as a substitute was pending.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator wish to have the yeas and nays on the Clark amendment and the Mansfield substitute?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Is there objection to the request that the yeas and nays be ordered on the bill, the substitute amendment, and the Clark amendment at this time? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I now ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on these three votes.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], I wish to make a brief statement; so I yield myself enough time to do so.

I was asked by a member of the press yesterday if I had discussed this substitute with the administration. My answer to that gentleman was "No." I have not discussed this proposal with any Member of the Senate, though I believe I did give an indication to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that I was considering a substitute. But, as far as I am concerned, this substitute is basically the second Clark amendment, with language somewhat broadened. Whatever credit there is for it, therefore should go to the Senator from Pennsylvania. But I want to repeat, as far as the amendment itself being offered is concerned, it was the sole and complete responsibility of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend the Senator from Montana for his generous attributing to me of the basic authorship of the substitute amendment. I am grateful to him for that public statement about it. But I would like to ask the Senator a question with respect to paragraph (3).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. I refer to paragraph (3) of the substitute amendment, which reads that the Congress declares "its support of the Geneva accords of 1954 and urges the convening of that Conference or any other meeting of nations similarly involved and interested"—

Is it the opinion of the Senator from Montana that the phrase I have just read would include the United Nations?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Without question, and, as I tried to indicate in the colloquy yesterday, it would include any group of nations, including the United Nations, including, in line with the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], an Asian group of nations. As a matter of fact, it could include the OAS, if there were anything it could do. It would include, I repeat, any organization of nations.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his answer. Since this amendment is similar to my "fall back" amendment, I shall support the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not want to interfere with the Senator from New York, but will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. How much time is going to be available on the Senator's substitute amendment? I understand that, under the unanimous-consent agreement there will be available 1 hour, 30 minutes to a side. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. I would like to have time for a subsequent discussion.

I wish to comment on the point the Senator from Pennsylvania has raised. I think that the Senator's third paragraph should be perfected, as he knows; I have talked to him about it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. MORSE. But I wish to make the record clear as to why I think it should be perfected. The Senator from Montana feels that the colloquy he had a moment ago with the Senator from Pennsylvania is adequate. I do not share that view, and although I shall vote for the amendment, I wish to make a brief statement as to why I think the United Nations should be specifically mentioned in the third paragraph, and go into why I would like to have him perfect it at that point.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How much time does the Senator wish?

Mr. MORSE. Ten minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield to me before he yields the floor?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. As the majority leader knows, I talked to him about a group of Senators who wish to discuss the textile situation this afternoon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. He indicated to me that he thought it would be some time around 3 hours after the pending business was laid before the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. I notice that in the unanimous-consent agreement nothing was mentioned in regard to that matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That was taken care of yesterday. It was then ordered that at the end of the pertinent 3-hour period today, the Senator from Rhode Island would be recognized.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask the distinguished majority leader if this so-called statement of congressional policy is intended to effect any modification or change or limitation in the so-called Tonkin Gulf resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. None whatsoever.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator does not believe it would have any effect whatever on that resolution?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. As a matter of fact, one of the reasons for offering the substitute was a feeling on my part—may I say here parenthetically that I do not think a bill of this nature is the place for a Senate resolution——

Mr. RUSSELL. I wholeheartedly agree with the Senator on that statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But my reaction to the original Clark amendment was that a negative vote might, in effect, be interpreted as another Tonkin Bay resolution, because of the open-ended implication which could be implied from the rejection of the ceiling contained in the Clark proposal.

Mr. RUSSELL. It was a very undesirable approach to the whole subject. I do not favor statements of policy on authorizing legislation or appropriations. As a general rule, it is a very bad practice.

I have no particular quarrel with the language of this substitute, but I have very grave doubts about the propriety of attaching it to an authorization bill. It ought to be considered separately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes on the minority's time. First, I should like to ask the Senator from Montana a question; then I shall make my own statement.

This paragraph 3 is not intended to be exclusive; in other words, it does not exclude other ways of settling the Vietnamese question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not at all.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I take this time to state my views upon the authorization measure to the Senate, as I have expressed myself in a rather prominent public way on this issue heretofore.

I intend to support the substitute of the Senator from Montana, and to vote against the original amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I intend to vote in favor of the supplemental military procurement bill; and I shall state my reasons.

I wish to make it clear at the outset, Mr. President, that my vote does not constitute an open-ended and "forever" support of the President's policies in Vietnam.

My vote means one thing and one thing

only—that I will stand behind the U.S. commitment to allow the South Vietnamese people to freely determine their own future. If I believed that our present policy undermined that commitment, I would feel free and conscience bound to vote against this authorization. While I do find myself dissatisfied with our effort to bring about a negotiated peace in Vietnam—which seems to me the practical way to meet our national need—I do not think that our policy has reached the crucial point where I must vote against an authorization to maintain our forces in the field.

When our Nation is at war, Congress inevitably has restraints on its actions. I have continually urged that the President come before us to seek another support resolution to replace the Tonkin Bay resolution of August 1964. That resolution is out of date and no longer relevant. I agree with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] that the way to do that is on its own, just as we did the Tonkin Bay resolution. A resolution initiated by the President is the most proper vehicle for determining the sentiment of the American people on this issue.

If the President resists this course, as he apparently does—and he has not come to us for any other resolution—we in the Congress have two alternatives. We can either deny him funds for his policy through the appropriations process, or we can speak out against those aspects of his policy with which we disagree. That is a qualitative question: When do we speak out, and what do we vote against? I have reached the stage where I have spoken out vigorously in the public forum. I have not reached the point where I would deny support to our soldiers in the field or for the commitment for which they are fighting.

I have tried to make plain on many occasions where my own thinking diverges from the President's policy. It is as follows: First, that our negotiating position has tended to be a collection of vague generalities that confuses both the American people and the Vietnamese. We must ask ourselves not only who we would like to talk to at the peace table, but what we are prepared to talk about when we get there. Some compromises and assurances to the other side are the only way to settle this war peacefully, and we can make certain concessions without undermining our commitment.

So my first point, Mr. President, is that a Korean-type settlement in this sense seems likely to be the most in order.

Second, the United States should declare an unconditional cessation of our bombing in North Vietnam, stating in this declaration that it expects the cessation of bombing will not be used as a cover for continued infiltration of men and supplies from North Vietnam to South Vietnam. This is not "permanent" cessation but it is "unconditional." In the alternative, we should consider restricting our bombing in the north solely to access routes. A cessation in our bombing or a deescalation of it seems to me a fair way to test the representations of the other side that they are interested in a peaceful settlement. We should be ready to take such risks for peace as we are for war. If the other side is simply using the bombing issue as a ploy to weaken international and domestic support for our commitment, or to infiltrate more men and supplies into South Vietnam, we will soon find that out, and then the American people will have done what they can for peace. If the other side is serious, we must take the necessary steps to explore that possibility.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. President, the argument that this may cause casualties begs to question that casualties are now being caused and will continue to be caused in the Vietnamese struggle. The question is, When do we get to the point when the casualties may be ended?

My third point is I feel that our Government has been sluggish in bringing about a legitimate government elected by the people and getting the present government to make the necessary social, economic, and political reforms necessary to gain the support of the South Vietnamese people.

I have always recognized that we are committed to use force in South Vietnam, but that force alone is not the answer. Force must be coupled with a genuine revolution of expectations for which these people have fought for 25 years.

So, I believe the best hope of bringing the war to an end is to legitimize the Saigon government at its roots. Only through such strength will that government feel willing and able to come to terms with its opponents. Only then will it have the confidence and power with which to protect itself.

That is our No. 1 priority, to bring about elections and legitimatize the South Vietnamese Government.

I shall continue to express my thinking on these points to the American people. It is in the public forum that those of us who differ with the administration's policy must work to see that we pursue our course properly and that we are watchful for peace.

As I back the basic commitment, and now that it has been made, I believe it can be made worthwhile—and as I have not reached the point of breaking with the administration, I must support this authorization and vote against the Clark amendment and for the Mansfield substitute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last night I presented in detail the point of view opposite to that presented by the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], and other Senators who support the supplemental appropriations.

In essence, I simply said: "If you want to stop killing American boys in southeast Asia, stop appropriating the money with which to kill them."

It is that simple. If we exercise the check of the purse strings that is provided for us as U.S. Senators, the President will have to change his policy and fall back on the policy of General Ridgway or General Gavin or George Kennan. He will have to fall back on the statement of the former Commandant of the American Marine Corps made in his speech before college students in Los Angeles on May 26, 1966, which statement made a conservative out of me in regard to my opposition to this war.

In his speech, the former Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Shoup, pointed out that the whole area there is not worth the life of a single American boy. And so it is not. This unconscionable, illegal, and unjustifiable war ought to be stopped by the President of the United States, and he ought to resort to the peaceful procedures available to him for reaching settlement. That is my position on the general problem, but I have urged my majority leader to accept a modification of his amendment.

It is fair to say that he feels he has covered it by colloquy in the Senate, and he again covered it by colloquy in his exchange with the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I do not think that is adequate. Therefore, I suggested to him and I suggest now for the record, because it ought to be made of record, that on page 2, line 10, in the third paragraph of his amendment, after the word "conference," there be added the following language: "or a conference under the sponsorship of the United Nations or any of its organs."

The amendment would then continue to read as at present.

Why do I think this is important? May I first answer a staff member of the majority leader who argues that the original Clark-Morse amendment to which the Senator from Montana now offers a substitute does not say anything about the United Nations. That is true. In my judgment, it would have been better if it had. However, neither does the Clark-Morse amendment include the other language in the Mansfield substitute starting on line 10 "or any other meeting of nations similarly involved."

If we use that language, then in the interest of clarity and unquestioned intent of Congress, the United Nations should be specifically mentioned. If I were not in the parliamentary situation in which I cannot offer an amendment because the Senator from Montana has closed the doors to amendment by offering his amendment as a substitute, I would offer my language as an amendment to the substitute amendment of the Senator from Montana. However, the parliamentary rules do not permit that.

Why do I think the United Nations ought to be specifically mentioned? I think they ought to be specifically mentioned because the United States is bound by the Charter of the United Nations.

The United Nations has a legal obligation not only to just file a resolution, which we have done, before the Security Council. That, in my judgment, is pretty much pro forma and nothing but an empty gesture because the President of the United States has never used the power of his office to insist that our rights be respected in the Security Council and insist on a vote on the resolution up or down. The President of the United States has yet to make clear to the signatories to the charter that we are going to pursue our rights under the General Assembly if the Security Council vetoes the resolution that we submit to the signatories.

I say it respectfully and sadly, but the fact is that this administration has never pressed for action before the United Nations in accordance with its obligation to insist on action before the United Nations. That is why it ought to be specifically mentioned.

Furthermore, every other signatory to the charter has the same legal obligation under international law that the United States has to proceed to keep faith with its primary obligation under the charter.

What is that parliamentary obligation? Why, the main reason for setting up the United Nations was to enforce the peace when there is a threat to the peace anywhere in the world. All the other activities of the United Nations are ancillary and subordinate to that primary obligation.

Thus, for 3½ years I have charged and charge again this morning that there is not a single signatory to the charter that has kept faith with its legal obligation under the charter.

I do not think my country should continue to put itself in that position. I think my country has a great obligation to world history now to make clear to the signatories to the charter that we want them to proceed to take the action that they could take that would give us some hope for an honorable settlement of this war under a multilateral action by the signatories to the charter rather than by this unilateral course of action that the United States is following.

We ought to stress the United Nations in the amendment because the United States, in my judgment, on the basis of its sordid record in continuing this aggressive war in South Vietnam without, in my judgment, a scintilla of international law or right has lost its right to insist on bilateral negotiations. For all the proposals of President Johnson thus far have a condition precedent imbedded in them that the administration never talks about. That is the condition precedent that there must be negotiations conducted between the United States and the enemy on the basis of the assumption that there shall be two Vietnams.

By what right do we say that there must be two Vietnams?

We have not the slightest right to decree unilaterally that there must be two Vietnams. That should be worked out, and it should be worked out not on the basis of saying: "You come to the conference table with us on the basis of this assumption."

They are not going to do it unless we kill enough, destroy enough, and devastate enough so that they have to surrender.

Embedded in all of President Johnson's proposals about negotiation is this concealed but perfectly obvious intention that we are going to bomb. Listen to the Vice President's speeches and you have enough evidence that we are going to bomb, evidence that we are going to kill, evidence that we are going to despoil, evidence that we are going to defoliate, until they come to a surrender table.

The administration tries to get the American people to believe that that is going to give us peace. The American people need to be warned that it is going to give them only a truce at best. Those people will dig in for the decades to come, and pursue what guerrilla activity they can, until they finally drive us out. A truce will not give us peace.

Therefore, I do not believe that the hope is to be found in any bilateral negotiations; but the only hope remaining, I believe, the only possibility of ending this ghastly war in South Vietnam, is through multilateral negotiations. I repeat, that the negotiating table should be tripartite in nature, with the United States and South Vietnam, two of the warmakers, on one side of the table, the Vietcong, Russia, the North Vietnamese and as I have always said, China, too—because she has been involved in it from the beginning—on the other side of the table.

At the head of that table, calling the combatants to an accounting should be the representatives of the international tribunals.

It is interesting that the Geneva accords should be mentioned in the substitute amendment, for there would be no war in Vietnam today had we abided by them in the first place and not subverted them within weeks of their signing. Now, we say we are ready to accept them.

At the head of that table should be the representatives of the international tribunals, the international agencies, including the United Nations. The Geneva Conference, SEATO, and any existing international body that can be of assistance should be utilized in leading the combatants to an honorable settlement.

It grieves me to think that mention of the United Nations will not be accepted as a perfection of the amendment. Absence of mention of the United Nations will be subject to much misinterpretation and misunderstanding around the world. The Senate is not willing to write the reference to the United Nations into the amendment, but seeks to settle, on the basis of colloquy on the floor of the Senate, that the language of the Mansfield amendment, "any other meeting of nations similarly involved and interested as soon as possible for the purpose of formulating plans for bringing the conflict to an honorable conclusion in accordance with the principles of those accords"——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we are told that that language includes the United Nations. If it does, why do we not say so? And if we say so, it will give great hope and great encouragement to U Thant, and to those who believe that only through the channels of the United Nations, with other agencies such as SEATO and the Geneva Conference working under its auspices and sponsorship and canopy, is there a chance to lead mankind back to the substitution of the rule of law for the jungle law in the jungles of South Vietnam. We are trying to settle the most unjustifiable war that this country has ever engaged in—worse than the Mexican war.

I was brought up in accordance with the great statesmanship of Abraham Lincoln, when he stood on the floor of the House and protested the Mexican War, and pointed out, with the courage that was typical of his statesmanship, that there, too, the United States was following an illegal, immoral, and unjustifiable course of action.

This war is different from the Mexican War, bad as the Mexican War was. For decades we attempted to mollify the dislike of the United States that the Mexican War created in the minds of the Mexican people, and there are still remnants of that dislike. But this war is so many times worse than the Mexican War that I am at a loss to understand why we cannot even get a specific reference in the substitute amendment for the use of the peacekeeping procedures of the United Nations. All I ask is this mild reference to the United Nations, or a conference under the sponsorship of the United Nations or any of its organs. Have we really reached the point when, in considering the settlement of the war in South Vietnam, we are unwilling to specifically mention the United Nations in the amendment?

I submit that my request is fair and it is reasonable; and in the interest of a better understanding of America's position, we ought to adopt it as perfecting language.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has 13 minutes remaining; the minority leader has 22 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 13 minutes, and when I get through, I intend to yield back the remainder of my time.

I will withhold at this time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I find that I cannot vote for the amendment offered by the distinguished majority leader or for the Clark amendment. I am not suggesting or urging the course of any other Senator, but I cannot vote against it without a statement of the reason, which will be brief and simple.

The compromise offered by the distinguished majority leader is carefully drawn; its sentiments are such that it is difficult to differ with. But this is an authorization bill for an appropriation to maintain the men we have drafted and sent into the field in this war. I wonder what would have been the effect on the world and on the thinking of our enemies if, in World War II, Congress had suddenly attached to an authorization or an appropriation for the support of the war an amendment calling for peace and for peace negotiations with Hitler or with the Axis—even though I am sure that then, as now, everyone longed for peace.

I never believed that we should have gone into southeast Asia—certainly not unilaterally; certainly not unless we went as a part of an international police force, preferably under the authority of the United Nations; certainly with the agreement of the free world. But we are there. We have drafted and sent there our men to fight. The President has again and again assured the world—enemies and neutrals alike—that we desire to negotiate and are ready to negotiate.

He has said it so many times it could not be misunderstood, and to me, when we are passing an authorization bill for the money to maintain our forces and to put arms and supplies in the hands of our men that we have sent to Asia, I think it is not only inappropriate but also it is doing them a wrong to again, after all of our protestations of anxiety to meet anyone, anywhere to bring about peace, to attach any kind of amendment to it, even though it is as carefully drawn and as much of a compromise as has been presented by the very able and sincere majority leader.

If there is any way to strengthen the will of our enemies and to assure them that all they have to do is keep killing our men because we are not firm, we are not ready to back up our forces in the field, because we are never going to withdraw——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may continue for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, if there is any way to strengthen the will of our opponents, it is to attach to an authorization of an appropriation to take care of our forces in the field another plaintive plea for peace. We certainly want peace but the way to get it is not to repeatedly crawl on our bellies beseeching it.

For that reason, and not because I am out of sympathy with the purpose behind this amendment, I find myself compelled to vote against any of the amendments and any of the declarations of policy that are sought to be attached to a simple authorization bill for an appropriation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself unlimited time.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire in what he has just said concerning the attachment of Senate resolutions to bills of this nature. It is my belief, and I so stated previously, that they should be considered on their own merits, separate and apart from legislation which has gone through appropriate committees. However, once the issue is presented to the Senate for a vote, I think it is imperative that the Senate's action should be an accurate reflection of the sentiment of the Senate. It was for this reason that I offered my substitute amendment.

I must disagree with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire when he, in effect, tries to draw a parallel between the Second World War, the Korean conflict, and the situation as it is in South Vietnam, in my judgment there was more justification for our participation in the Second World War, and there was more justification for our participation in the Korean conflict.

Like the Senator, I am sorry we ever became involved in Vietnam, but the question is now behind us. We have to face up to the realities of the situation and do the best we can.

In response to the fervent argument and long-held point of view of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, I think it was brought out last night and today that, as far as the intent of the authors of this particular substitute is concerned, the United Nations, or any other organization, or any group of nations can be considered in relation to the resolution now before us.

I would point out it is my belief that the emphasis should be placed on the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962. Why? Because it is the centerpiece of the situation in and around Vietnam. Furthermore, South Vietnam and North Vietnam and China, which must be considered, are not members of the United Nations. And where does the NLF fit in that approach?

It is my opinion that what we have said and what we have written in this amendment, this substitute, makes it fully apparent to all that the United Nations is not forgotten, that its help and assistance will be welcome, and I congratulate the Senator from Oregon for his consistent attitude in this respect over the last 3 years.

The other day I reviewed amendment No. 99, the first Clark amendment, and I made some penciled notations relative to the first part of it, on pages 1 and 2. My reactions to that original Clark amendment concern possible interpretations, however erroneous they may be, if it were voted on and lost. It could be interpreted to constitute a Senate go-ahead to continue and increase escalation in the north. No. 2, a defeat of that Clark proposal might be construed as Senate endorsement in advance of some executive branch decision to raise the manpower figure in Vietnam far above 500,000, which is 30,000 in excess of the goals for this year, according to the executive branch; would a negative vote on that Clark proposal not also tend to strengthen the overall power of the executive branch by setting still another precedent and so weaken the role of Congress still further? These implications, I think, are worthy of consideration.

It was because of my concern for the implications of amendment No. 99, the original Clark resolution, that I paid much attention to his second resolution, and, on the basis of widening its scope a little, I offered a substitute to the pending amendment. I wish to say again that the genesis of the pending substitute lies with the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] because he was the one who furnished the original idea.

Mr. President, it was not my intent to offer any Senate or congressional declaration to this measure prior to the submission of the amendments by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE]. However, since the issue has been raised and the Senate will go on record, I believe the Senate should be offered the opportunity to vote on a substitute amendment which I am hopeful is representative of the viewpoint of a substantial part of this body.

This substitute simply voices the intent of the Congress to give the full measure of support to the needs of the men who risk their lives daily in Vietnam. It expresses to the Americans who are fighting in southeast Asia that Congress will do its part to see that they are well equipped and supplied. I am confident that this expression represents the opinion of the entire Senate. It should not have to be stated. However, even the slightest prospect of misinterpretation or misunderstanding at home and abroad justifies this affirmation of complete and unequivocal support for the men who have been sent to Vietnam in pursuit of the Nation's policies.

Sustained also by this substitute for the Clark amendment would be the continuing efforts of the President and others throughout the world to find a peaceful solution to this savage conflict. The substitute expresses the hope that the conflict will not be expanded and that a negotiated settlement will be reached which not only protects our vital interests and preserves our national honor but also allows the people of South Vietnam to determine their own affairs in their own way. I am hopeful that this position is also expressive of the overwhelming viewpoint of the Senate.

And finally, the amendment notes the relevance of the 1954 and 1962 Geneva Conferences and their resultant accords to a settlement of the dispute and the possibility of using that vehicle or any other meeting of interested nations as a basis for resolving the conflict in Vietnam.

The Clark amendment for which I have offered the substitute would seek to govern the scope and nature of military operations in Vietnam, short of a declaration of war by fiat of Congress. However deeply any of us in this body may deplore any particular phase or tactic or episode in the Vietnam conflict, the fact is that the responsibility for the conduct of the conflict can only rest in one place, with the Commander in Chief, with the President of the United States.

We are deeply involved in this conflict. The question of how we became involved is moot. The question now is, "How can this war be terminated at the soonest possible time in an honorable peace for all concerned?" The Clark amendment, as it now stands, in my judgment would not contribute to the finding of an answer to that question. I say this most respectfully because I know that the Senator from Pennsylvania has proposed the amendment in good faith in the hopes of bringing the war to a prompt conclusion.

I would point out, further, that if the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania were defeated substantially, as well it might be for a number of reasons, I for one would not welcome some of the possible interpretations, as I have tried to indicate previously—however erroneous they might be—which would flow from such a defeat. Some quarters might seize upon a negative vote as a go-ahead for the unlimited intensification and expansion of the conflict and as a blank check from the Congress for deploying American manpower in any number—I repeat—in excess of 500,000 in southeast Asia. That interpretation, however erroneous it might be of the sentiment of the Senate—and it would be grossly erroneous—nevertheless, is inherent in a defeat of the Clark amendment. It would serve not merely to aggravate the situation in Vietnam but it would also move a long way, in my judgment, in the direction of an expanded war throughout southeast Asia.

It is for these reasons that I have offered the substitute. Since the issue has been raised, I believe that the Senate should have the opportunity to express clearly its sentiments on the Vietnamese problem and thereby eliminate the possibility of any misunderstanding or misinterpretation. In voting for the substitute, the Senate would express not only full support for the Americans whose lives are on the line in Vietnam but it would also lend encouragement to every reasonable effort to find an honorable and lasting peace for southeast Asia.

Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have read the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by the distinguished Senator from Montana. It is highly preferable to the original proposal made by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I find nothing in it, if it were presented as a Senate resolution, to which I could reasonably object. In my opinion, it expresses very clearly and succinctly the aims and the objectives of the present administration and of a majority of the people of the United States in this present, tragic, and unfortunate conflict in Vietnam.

If the amendment were brought before the Senate as a separate proposal, as a resolution, I would cast my vote in its behalf.

But, I am very leery of the precedent of attaching policy statements to authorizing legislation. This is sure to lead to a proliferation of amendments declaring policy of Congress with respect to a great many matters, some of which are not entirely in its area of authority and responsibility. That is the case with some parts of the amendment

It expresses opinion. When it comes to negotiating, Congress cannot participate. That is an activity solely and entirely within the domain of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. President, I shall cast my vote against the amendment, not because I disapprove of its contents but because I fear the precedent that this procedure will set in the Senate.

I realize that we have no rule of germaneness. I do not favor a rule of germaneness, but I am apprehensive that if we cannot enact a simple authorization without farflung declarations of policy of Congress attached to it, there will be no end to the debate that will occur and to the suggestions that will be offered to various authorizing measures.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent because of death in their respective families.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 2, as follows:

[No. 37 Leg.]

YEAS—89

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Hansen
Harris
Hartke
Hatfield
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—2

Cotton
Russell

NOT VOTING—9

Bayh
Brewster
Church
Fannin
Gruening
Hart
Jordan, N.C.
Tower
Williams, Del.

So Mr. MANSFIELD's amendment (No. 103) in the nature of a substitute, as modified, was agreed to, as follows:

In lieu of the language of amendment numbered 99 insert the following:

"TITLE IV—STATEMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL POLICY

"SEC. 401. The Congress hereby declares—

"(1) its firm intentions to provide all necessary support for members of the Armed forces of the United States fighting in Vietnam;

"(2) its support of efforts being made by the President of the United States and other men of good will throughout the world to prevent an expansion of the war in Vietnam and to bring that conflict to an end through a negotiated settlement which will preserve the honor of the United States, protect the vital interests of this country, and allow the people of South Vietnam to determine the affairs of that nation in their own way; and

"(3) its support of the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962 and urges the convening of that Conference or any other meeting of nations similarly involved and interested as soon as possible for the purpose of formulating plans for bringing the conflict to an honorable conclusion in accordance with the principles of those accords."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania, as amended by the amendment of the Senator from Montana as modified.

Mr. CLARK. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. CLARK. Is time on this question allotted on the basis of one-half hour to each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania may proceed.

Mr. CLARK. I understand that from a pragmatic point of view, the Senate has approved overwhelmingly the Mansfield amendment as a substitute for my amendment, which would have made further bombing and increase in military personnel beyond 500,000 men subject to a declaration of war. So the Senate is on record as supporting the substantially peaceful tenor of the Mansfield amendment, which in effect was the second Clark amendment.

However, it is my further understanding that, the substitute having been adopted, Senators still have the option of determining, by voting "no" on the pending question, to prevent the Mansfield amendment from being attached to the bill.

I hope very much that that will not be done and that the Senate will confirm the decision it made a few minutes ago in support of the Mansfield-Clark amendment.

I shall therefore, because I understand that several Senators intend to vote differently, not ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays which have already been ordered be rescinded. But I shall vote "yea" on the pending vote, and I hope that everybody who voted for the Mansfield amendment will do the same thing.

Mr. President, I ask who controls the time in opposition to the vote on the Clark amendment as modified by the Mansfield substitute?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The senior Senator from Illinois has control of the time in opposition.

Mr. **CLARK.** Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the balance of my time if the Senator from Illinois will do the same.

Mr. **DIRKSEN.** Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. **CLARK.** Then, Mr. President, I withdraw my yielding back of time.

Mr. **COOPER.** Mr. President, I know it is not often that one takes time to explain the vote that he has just made.

I voted for the substitute amendment of the distinguished Senator from Montana because it is a statement of policy regarding Vietnam which I approve and have approved in the past.

But I do raise a question concerning the advisability of voting on such an important amendment with debate limited to 1 hour.

Mr. President, we remember that the Tonkin Bay joint resolution was debated at some length. But 2 years later some of those who voted for that resolution stated in the Senate that they did not understand at the time they voted for it, its full implications.

Today, we have voted upon another measure regarding policy, and I am fearful that in the future, it will be said that it was not fully considered and understood.

The President has primary responsibility for the conduct of the war and foreign policy. We can advise, but we should fully understand the purpose and implications of our resolutions.

I raise this issue only to say that, with all of the discussion in the Congress and the country concerning the conduct of the war and the great issues involved, I think there ought to be extended debate on such an important amendment.

Mr. **CLARK.** Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes to reply to the comments of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. **RUSSELL.** Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. **CLARK.** Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Georgia for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. **RUSSELL.** Mr. President, who has control of the time? It is a strange state of affairs when the opposition controls no time and is completely excluded.

Mr. **CLARK.** It is under unanimous consent.

Mr. **RUSSELL.** That is one of the reasons I dislike unanimous-consent agreements, and I expect more objections to them in the future than have been heard in the past.

Mr. **CLARK.** Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will state it.

Mr. **CLARK.** Mr. President, as I understand it, the vote will occur now on the language of amendment No. 99 as amended by the Mansfield complete substitute No. 103.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator is correct.

Mr. **THURMOND.** Mr. President, may I have time to express an opinion on this matter?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor.

Mr. **CLARK.** Mr. President, I will be very happy to yield to the Senator from South Carolina after I have had an opportunity to reply to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. **THURMOND.** Mr. President, I shall only require one-half a minute.

Mr. **CLARK.** I will be happy to yield.

Mr. **RUSSELL.** Mr. President, a point of order.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will state it.

Mr. **RUSSELL.** Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania has yielded back his time, and I do not know how it can be given to him again. I heard him say he yielded back his time.

Mr. **CLARK.** Mr. President, does not the record show that I yielded back my time on the understanding that the Senator from Illinois would yield back his time, and since he said he did not yield back his time I said that I did not yield back the remainder of my time, either?

Mr. **RUSSELL.** Mr. President, I did not hear that part of the statement. I think if he had said it that loudly I would have heard it.

Mr. **CLARK.** Mr. President, I take it a consensus has been established, if not unanimity, that I still have some time.

Mr. **MILLER.** Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. **CLARK.** I do not yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Pennsylvania declines to yield.

Mr. **MILLER.** Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. **CLARK.** I do not yield for a point of order.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Pennsylvania declines to yield for any purpose.

Mr. **CLARK.** Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky has made the point that the vote on the Mansfield amendment, and now the vote on the Clark amendment as modified, is the subject of debate for only an hour. I must respectfully disagree with my friend from Kentucky.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. **CLARK.** Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

What actually happened was that the bill was called up last Thursday. At that time, I announced that I intended to call up two amendments, and they have been the subject of debate ever since that time. While those amendments were not formally before the Senate, nevertheless there was full debate on Thursday, on Friday, on Monday, and on Tuesday, lasting until 7:15 o'clock last night.

Technically, the Senator from Kentucky is correct; pragmatically, he is not, because for 4 days these amendments have been fully debated. I think that one of the most rewarding debates I have ever heard on the floor of the Senate took place yesterday afternoon on the Clark amendment and its substitute between the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] with participation by several other Senators. So I want the record to show that this matter was not hastily decided, it was not considered for a very short time, and that actually the Senate has given a good deal more consideration to this subject than it has to many others in the last few weeks, months, or years.

Mr. President, if no other Senator desires to be heard——

Mr. **DIRKSEN.** Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. **THURMOND.** I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, I desire to have the record show that I am opposed to the Clark amendment and to the Mansfield amendment. I voted for the Mansfield substitute as the lesser of two evils. Now that the Clark amendment has been rejected, the larger evil, the Mansfield amendment, remains. I shall oppose it. It is unnecessary to go into details or to give reasons why; suffice to say that I think this authorization bill is not a vehicle on which to be legislating policy.

Mr. **MILLER.** Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to permit me to make a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. **DIRKSEN.** Let me first yield briefly to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. **COTTON.** Mr. President, during the debate on the Mansfield substitute, I ventured to state on my own behalf, without conferring with any other Senator, that I regretted that I could not vote even for the Mansfield substitute; that I felt that at a time when our Nation is at war, and Americans are fighting under fire, the Congress should not tack onto an authorization bill, or an appropriation bill, some kind of plea for peace which would have an effect on the world and an effect on the enemy that is bound to be highly significant. It could bring into question our resolve to bring the war to an honorable conclusion.

The vote was taken, and the result was 89 to 2. All that the Senator from New Hampshire desires to do is to explain why he could not, in good conscience, vote for the amendment.

But now I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that after the vote was taken—and this carries no implication against the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]—instantly the Senator from Pennsylvania was on his feet, doing exactly what I expected would be done and what I expect the country will do—interpret the vote on the Mansfield substitute—which was a very innocuous and nicely worded substitute, the sentiments of which anyone finds it difficult to disagree with—as a definite declaration on the part of the Senate that we were adopting a so-called dove policy.

No one here does not want peace. All of us want peace.

The President has said that we are ready to negotiate and we want peace. But so long as we draft men and have them under fire in Vietnam, the Senator from New Hampshire wishes to reiterate that we had better think twice before we go out of our way to attach to an authorization bill or an appropriation bill some kind of declaration that indicates to the world that we are furnishing this money, but that our heart is not in the war and our intentions are infirm. We must not encourage our foes to hang on and kill more Americans because they get that kind of encouragement.

The President has stated that he wants to negotiate. Let us leave it to the President, and let us not muddy the waters by putting that kind of declaration on an appropriation bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. A few moments ago, the Senator from Pennsylvania made a parliamentary inquiry. May I ask whether or not the Chair responded to the inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair). What is the inquiry? Will the Senator state the inquiry again?

Mr. MILLER. It was not my inquiry, Mr. President. This was an inquiry by the Senator from Pennsylvania, and the Senator from Iowa did not hear the Chair respond; but if the Chair responded, I should like to know what the answer was.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The inquiry was with respect to the sharing of time, and it was resolved on the floor, without a ruling by the Chair.

Mr. MILLER. My understanding was that the inquiry was with respect to the yielding back of all time by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MILLER. May I ask if the Chair responded to the Senator's inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, it did not.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time, if there are no other demands.

Mr. CLARK. I yield myself 2 minutes, to make a brief comment about the statement just made by the Senator from New Hampshire.

In my opinion, the position taken by the Senator from New Hampshire should not prevail on this vote. The amendment which in fact we are about to attach to this bill states in its first paragraph:

> (1) its firm intentions to provide all necessary support for members of the armed forces of the United States fighting in Vietnam;

To me, this is a rather complete answer to the argument made by the Senator from New Hampshire, that this might be interpreted as an amendment showing a weakness on the part of the American people in support of that war. The first paragraph categorically says that that is not true.

The next two paragraphs of the amendment do nothing more than what the President has said he has been trying to do, and therefore they consist of a congressional support of the President's desire and the desire of other men of good will throughout the world to bring the hostilities to an honorable end, which, I take it, is also the objective of every Member of the Senate.

Unless somebody else desires to be heard——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, I will yield for a question, on my time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it the position of the Senator from Pennsylvania that the substitute amendment supports the course that the President of the United States has been taking with reference to the waging of the contest and his efforts to bring about a settlement for peace?

Mr. CLARK. Well, I think the Senator from Ohio is as capable of responding to that inquiry as I. What the amendment actually says is that we are going to support the boys in Vietnam, and we commend the President and other people of good will for trying to seek an honorable solution to the conflict. Any other implication the Senator from Ohio is as capable of drawing as I.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I gather, from what the Senator from Pennsylvania said a moment ago, that he argued the justice of this amendment because it accords with what the President is trying to do. I now ask the Senator whether it is his position that this amendment is in accord exactly with what the President is trying to do—that is, to support our men in Vietnam in the fullest degree with the supply of military equipment, and also to try to negotiate peace in accord with the Geneva accords.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator from Ohio will tell me what the President is trying to do, I shall be able to answer his inquiry.

Mr. LAUSCHE. No. The Senator from Pennsylvania attempted to tell the Senate that he argued in favor of the resolution because it was in accord with what the President stood for, and I should like to now know whether or not that is the position of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I said it once.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then, the Senator refuses to answer, and I will let it stand that way.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I hope that this record will be allowed to stand, without alteration; and I do not mean by that statement that anyone would intentionally alter it to change the meaning of words.

Mr. President, my good friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, has just said that the Mansfield substitute does nothing but reaffirm our desire to back up our boys in Vietnam. But not 5 minutes ago, immediately after the vote of 89 to 2 was announced, the Senator from Pennsylvania arose and said—in reply to the Senator from Kentucky, who complained that we had not had enough debate—that we have been debating this matter now for several days, and that the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania was involved, and this was a redrafting. Then the Senator from Pennsylvania said, if my memory serves me correctly—and I hope the record will be allowed to stand and show what he said, and I am not blaming him for it—that the vote we had just taken indicated an intention on the part of the Senate to go on record against the expansion of the war and for negotiating a peace. There is nothing wrong with that interpretation. We all want peace. But the interpretation taken by the Senator from Pennsylvania a few moments ago will, in my humble opinion, be taken by the country and the world and bring into question our resolve in this war.

In my humble opinion our enemies, the aggressors in southeast Asia, who are bombing and mowing down Americans every day, will take it as another attempt on the part of the Congress—in a most unusual manner by attaching this to an authorization bill to support our armies in the field that we have drafted and sent there—another attempt to creep to them, and it will stiffen the determination of our enemies. That is exactly the interpretation which the Senator from Pennsylvania, if I understand plain and straight English, put on it immediately after the vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am indeed sorry that I was called from the Chamber to keep a commitment for which I was an hour and a half late.

As I listened to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, I would like to state, as one who offered the substitute to the original Clark amendment, that what he said was not my belief in the offering of this amendment or in the passing of it.

What has been stated in the substitute has been stated many times by practically every Senator in the Chamber, and by the administration, including the President, the Secretary of State, and the Vice President. It is the kind of amendment which indicates we will support fully our men who are in Vietnam, who are there because of the policy of this

Nation. No American can do less than give them his full support.

Then, it also repeats phrases which have been used by the President and other men of good will relative to the war in Vietnam and their desire to seek an honorable conclusion. I know of no man or woman in this Chamber who does not seek that objective.

We do not intend to withdraw. We will not withdraw. The question of how we got in is moot. The immediate question is: "How do we get out and how do we get out under honorable circumstances?"

The third section of the amendment repeats what has been said by the administration, time and time again; not only by the administration, but also by all of the Geneva powers, North Vietnam, and, until lately, even mainland China. That is the basis on which the difficulty in Vietnam may well have to be settled. That is the reason why we put it in as the centerpiece and pointed definitely to the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962.

It seems to me that this is a straightforward sense of the Senate statement which a person can adhere to without creating any unnecessary, or implied, or imperfect connotations.

I express the hope, Mr. President, that this amendment, as modified, will be considered on the basis of the intent of the Congress when it debated the matter and gave its approval.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I propound to the Senator from Montana the question that I propounded to the Senator from Pennsylvania. The Senator from Montana is the sponsor of the amendment. Am I correct in my understanding that what this amendment declares to be the policy is in accord with the policy that the President has been following?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Without question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then, it should not be, therefore, construed to be taking exception or advocating a course different from that which the President is following.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As far as the amendment is concerned, no. As far as each individual Senator is concerned, that is up to him and his conscience.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The amendment advocates, in accordance with paragraph 1, that we provide our men with all the implements of defense and offense that are needed for their protection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And that is what the President advocates.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; and that is what the present legislation seeks to implement.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Subparagraph 2: The Congress declares—

> (2) its support of efforts being made by the President of the United States and other men of good will throughout the world to prevent an expansion of the war in Vietnam and to bring that conflict to an end through a negotiated settlement which will preserve the honor of the United States, protect the vital interests of this country, and allow the people of South Vietnam to determine the affairs of that nation in their own way.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has stated it correctly.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And that is what the President advocates.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The President and the Secretary of State.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. Now, going to the third paragraph. Congress declares:

> (3) Its support of the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962 and urges the convening of that Conference—

Is it not a fact that the President has advocated that course?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed; time and time again.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then, it is clear that this amendment, offered by the Senator from Montana, is a redeclaration of the things that the President has advocated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What the President, the Secretary of State, and many Members of this body have advocated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. COTTON addressed the Chair.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall need only 30 seconds.

I shall vote for the amendment. I shall vote for it because the best way to support the troops is to deny the President the money to kill them. That is why I shall vote against the supplemental $4 billion program. But I think that the purpose of this amendment should be that we make very clear as we vote to support the troops in accordance with what we think is the best way to support the troops, and the best way is to deny the President the supplemental appropriation so that he will have to fall back on the recommendations of Ridgway, Gavin, and others who believe we should not escalate the war.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly for a question?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I have asked the Senator to yield because I wanted to make sure in my mind that the substitute amendment was not intended, nor did it intend and carry the implications that have been carried out in the Senate in the last several days by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] with his very frank—and I respect him for it—attempt, to tie to this authorization bill a denial of this war. I was going to ask the Senator that question, but the question has been answered unexpectedly by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, in his opinion at least. I would be glad if, in the opinion of the majority leader, he feels a vote for the Mansfield amendment is essentially a vote for the whole thing that has been fought for by the Senator from Pennsylvania. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not think that I fully understand the point. As far as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is concerned, he, I believe, was replying to the point that he would support the amendment, that is, the Clark amendment as modified, and he would vote against the authorization bill. I shall vote for the amendment and for the authorization bill because I think that that is the only way, in my opinion, that we can show any support for the men who are there—there, not by choice, but because of the policies of this country.

Mr. COTTON. In other words, the amendment of the distinguished majority leader is, in his opinion, an entirely different breed of cats, as we say in New Hampshire, from the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania, and a vote for his amendment cannot be interpreted as supporting the position of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. CLARK and Mr. STENNIS addressed the Chair.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, but first I yield to the majority leader so that he may answer.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The substitute has basically within it the Clark language, but it has been modified, broadened, and amended so that the meaning is made clear and, in my opinion, it is quite different from the original two resolutions which the Senator from Pennsylvania announced he would offer, one of which he actually did.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall be glad to do so in a minute. Just to clarify that, however, I think I can say, on the floor of the Senate, that the majority leader would not have voted for the Clark proposal unamended.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am happy now to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Even though the Senator from Montana is a careful, astute, and scholarly man, let me ask him, has the language in the amendment received the microscopic examination of any committee with a combination of minds?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, it has not. It is entirely my responsibility. I consulted with no one.

Mr. STENNIS. I invite the Senator's attention to paragraph 3 on page 2, where we are pledging ourselves to the full support of the Geneva Accords of 1954 and urge the convening of that conference or any other meeting of nations similarly involved and interestsd as we are. Involved and interested as we are.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Involved and interested as we. I do not know of any other nation which is similarly involved and interested as we are. I am one Senator who is not fully conversant, on short notice—and I believe other Senators are in the same position—with all of the Geneva accords, as to what they mean and their implications as applied to the present situation.

Thus, with all due respect to the Senator from Montana, I want to be recorded as being against the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There were 14 nations who signed the Geneva agreements in 1954 and 1962. The resultant accords have been endorsed time and time again by the President, by the Secretary of State, and by many Members of this body. Let me invite attention also to the fact that the Senator from Illinois

[Mr. PERCY] has long been an advocate of an all-Asian conference to consider the situation in Vietnam. I would say that there is nothing wrong with the third part of the amendment, which has been expressed many times by the administration and many times by distinguished Members of this body.

Mr. STENNIS. I am familiar in part with the Geneva accords, of course, but as applied to the present situation—our situation in particular, and other points involved—I do not think we should send up such an amendment, especially one amended from the floor.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I listened to the full, formal presentation. Do I correctly understand that there is nothing in the Mansfield substitute that would in any way restrict the Commander in Chief from carrying on whatever military operations—and in whatever manner—he felt best in North and South Vietnam?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is nothing in the amendment whatsoever, because he is recognized in his constitutional capacity as Commander in Chief and President of the United States. It would be our hope, though, that the sentiments expressed here would have appropriate effect downtown because what we have stated, in effect, is what the President has stated time and time again.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. May I ask another question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, of course.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. In other words, there is nothing in the amendment in the nature of a substitute, introduced by the Senator from Montana, which would prevent the President of the United States, acting through his military leaders, at any time he felt it desirable from a military standpoint, intensifying the bombing of North Vietnam, or ordering the bombardment of North Vietnam by naval vessels?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The answer is "No." However, speaking personally, I would hope that he would not do so.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. So far as the amendment is concerned, there is nothing to prevent the President from taking whatever military action he feels desirable?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, there is not, of course, there is not any amendment of this nature which could be offered that I know of which could prevent the President from doing the things which the Senator from Virginia has in mind.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. So this would continue to give the President an entirely free hand as to how to conduct military operations?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course. It takes nothing away from him. This is purely a Senate sense substitute.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator from Rhode Island correct in interpreting the amendment to mean nothing more than the fact that—even though we appropriate this money to support our troops in Vietnam—our objective is peace?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. And we would welcome support from anyone, anywhere——

Mr. MANSFIELD. For an honorable peace.

Mr. PASTORE. To bring us peace.

Mr. MANSFIELD. To bring us an honorable peace.

Mr. PASTORE. That is all the amendment means?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is all I had in mind.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In this amendment, if it is adopted, is there any implication whatsoever that would carry reflection or implication that the Senate does not support the President in the war effort?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not that I know of. How each Senator feels individually is, of course, a matter for him to decide. But what we have done, in effect, is to compile in a single substitute many of the things, in brief, which the President and the Secretary of State and Members of the Senate have stated time and time again over the past several years.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What is the actual purpose of such an amendment? Why is it felt that it is needed?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Because, if I may use the words, and if they can be understood in that way, it will furnish a consensus of the feeling of the Senate regardless of one's particular position on the war in Vietnam.

I have read the previous amendments which were to be offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania and I felt that they contained loopholes by which a vote on them could misinterpret the sense of the Senate. It was to try to bring out a valid consensus of Senate sentiment that, on my own responsibility, this amendment was developed to be presented to the Senate for its consideration and vote.

Mr. McCLELLAN. My concern is, notwithstanding what my faults may be, or what my intentions may be, should I vote for this amendment, it may be interpreted altogether differently from what I think or believe the intentions and purposes are.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is a possibility.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Are we not laying ourselves open to interpretations which will help the enemy and not help our side?

Mr. MANSFIELD. In my opinion, we are not.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think there is some danger here. That is what gives me such concern. I am for peace as much as anyone else, but I do not want to do anything, or cast my vote, or make any statement from which the enemy can gain the slightest implication that I am not supporting the President in the war effort.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Knowing the distinguished Senator from Arkansas as I do, I am sure that there is no possibility of that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Not as to me, although many Senators do know me quite well—but I think that if I should vote for this amendment, it may be interpreted, not by us, by me, by those who support the President, but it will go abroad and the enemy will place his interpretation on it. I would certainly like to have something in here that would make it crystal clear, so that no one could place any misinterpretation or indulge in any assumptions that I am weak, or hesitant, or have any reservations about supporting our forces over there, and about continuing to fight the war if we have to, if we cannot get to the peace table and negotiate an honorable peace.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas, and would like to ask the Senator from Montana if it is not an indication of the fact that Senators are getting more and more interested in this colloquy and are coming closer to the center of the Chamber in order to understand exactly what we are dealing with.

Is it not true that it has been stated here it would be up to the individual interpretation of each Senator. We know that whatever happens with this piece of legislation, if it is adopted and goes out to the world, it will be the sense of the Senate. We cannot divide it and say that it is up to each and every one to——

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is, personally.

Mr. MURPHY. It is, personally, in the vote, but it will not be assessed that way in the public press or other communications. Therefore, I agree with those who see the possibility of misinterpretation.

I am completely in accord with the expression of the Senator from Montana as to the meaning of the amendment, but I am concerned that the mere fact we are having this colloquy, there is a possibility that it will be unfavorably developed, unquestionably, by those who want to make the situation and the sense of the Senate appear to be other than I believe it actually to be. That is my concern.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say to my good friend from California, that I would not agree with his statement. It is true that there are more Senators in the Chamber now than there were a while ago; but at the time the author of the substitute took the floor, he made a formal speech in which he outlined the actual intent of the substitute, one, two, three. I think that if there is any interpretation to be given, it should be based on that statement, if the Senator from Montana can be pardoned for mentioning something that he said previously.

Mr. MURPHY. I would agree with the Senator from Montana. From the question raised by the Senator from New Hampshire, it would appear to be a different interpretation than that of the Senator from Pennsylvania. Since it is evident that there is a possibility of a difference of interpretation, is not this a dangerous piece of legislation? Would it not be possible to nail this down absolutely, so there could be no misinterpretation, because it is very important?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am afraid, if it were voted down, there would be far greater misunderstanding than if it were adopted.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I am concerned about the fact that in this provision of the Senator's substitute it reads that Congress hereby declares "its firm intention to provide all necessary support for members of the Armed Forces of the United States."

But it does not add to it our allies, such as the Koreans and the South Vietnamese.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Why not leave it to the Koreans and the South Vietnamese to handle their affairs, and let us concentrate on our own business?

Mr. MILLER. I was wondering, if there was no reference to the Koreans, South Koreans, and our allies being included, there was any intention of not doing anything to support them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That was not thought of, considered, or mentioned until now. As far as I was concerned, I was talking about this particular bill and our particular procedure insofar as it affects American soldiers, Marines, and Air Force and Coast Guard personnel in Vietnam and southeast Asia. I was talking about this Congress concerns with our own forces. What is done about the Koreans, the South Vietnamese, the Laotians, the Thais, and others, is a different matter—one apart.

Mr. MILLER. So it could not be interpreted by this language that we would not continue to support them?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not as far as this amendment is concerned.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say that it is my intention to vote for the amendment. I hope I may vote for it. I will vote that way on the basis, first, that we are really urging a negotiated settlement of the war under the procedures of the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962, and the availability of other organizations that may step in and be of help. Second, therefore, it does not mean that the amendment advocates unconditional surrender on the part of the enemy and an unconditional victory on the part of the United States. Third, it does not mean that one who votes for this amendment therefore commits himself to vote for the supplemental appropriation, which I shall vote against. That is not the way to support our men over there; that is the way to kill them. The way to help them is to have a negotiated peace.

There is a lot of talk about this being an appropriation bill. This is an authorization bill, and in an authorization bill it is perfectly proper to add a sense-of-the-Senate provision.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am glad that the suggestion I made immediately after the vote, that there had not been sufficient time to be acting on this proposition, has been borne out by about 20 witnesses—who have entered the debate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would disagree, if I may interject. It was debated yesterday, Friday, and Thursday. If Senators had been on the floor, they would have heard the debate. That is no fault of the amendment.

Mr. COOPER. I understand. I am saying that what I said earlier has been proved by at least 15 or 20 Senators who have since spoken, and given their interpretations of the meaning of the amendment. It indicates that there was not sufficient understanding of such an important statement of policy.

The Tonkin Gulf resolution was debated at much greater length, but yet 2 years later Members were disagreeing about its interpretation and purpose. Policy statements on the Vietnam issue must be thoroughly considered. I will vote for the amendment. It is my interpretation that it assures full support of our troops and that we support negotiations on the principle of the Geneva accords. I support negotiating, but nevertheless, if good faith negotiations cannot be secured, I do not believe the President's authority, as Commander in Chief, to take whatever steps he deems to be necessary for the security of our forces, and the United States, can be limited by the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if I may have 2 or 3 minutes, I would like to be heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think events of the last hour have clearly pointed out the danger of adopting far-reaching professions dealing with national and international policies when they have not been considered by the appropriate committees.

We have had more interpretations of the amendment since its adoption than before, and the interpretations as to what the amendment meant have varied more widely than before the amendment was agreed to. The difference in interpretation between the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Arkansas would seem to indicate that this is a fatuous exercise in futility, because we will have 50 different interpretations made on the stump after the Congress has adjourned and the Senators have gone home.

To my mind, nothing could better demonstrate the faults in such a procedure. I inveighed last Thursday and Friday against proposals that undertake to speak out on international problems by declarations of policy on an authorization bill. We always get into difficulty when we do that.

I could not support this amendment, though I agree with its general purpose, because I frankly doubt that any man in the Senate could know the effect of what he was voting for when there could be many highly subjective interpretations of the meaning and effect.

I have always had some questions about the Geneva accords. The fact is that this Government refused to sign the Geneva accords, although the President gave out a statement that we were sympathetic with their objective and would not use force to disturb the settlement.

The Geneva accords provided for elections in both South and North Vietnam in which the votes would be totaled and that that would determine the kind of government they would have. That agreement is spelled out in the Geneva accords.

President Diem stated, very correctly, that in North Vietnam, a police state, 99 percent of the people would vote in favor of the Communist doctrines and that perhaps 40 percent in South Vietnam would.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. May I have an additional moment or two?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Therefore, those people under a free system would have been voted under the Communist philosophy by a controlled election. Therefore, I am hesitant about an unqualified endorsement of the Geneva accords.

I doubt that there is a single Member of the Senate, unless possibly it be the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], who knows exactly the effect of all of the provisions of these accords which were adopted in 1954 and 1962. I have read them both several times, and I do not understand all their ramifications; but I still say that a rider of this kind, with possibly far-reaching implications, capable as it is of so many hundreds of different misinterpretations, should not be affixed to a simple authorization of an appropriation that is essential to preserve the lives of a half million young men.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Who yields time?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I should like to have a minute.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I will yield the Senator from North Carolina 1 of my 7 precious remaining minutes.

Mr. ERVIN. I ask the Senator from Georgia, under the Geneva accords, when an election is held, whether the vote of North Vietnam and the vote of South Vietnam are to be counted together, or whether they are counted separately.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will read the language. I think it is clear:

> The Conference declares that, so far as Viet-Nam is concerned, the settlement of political problems, effected on the basis of respect for the principles of independence, unity and territory integrity, shall permit the Viet-Namese people to enjoy the fundamental freedoms, guaranteed by democratic institutions established as a result of free general elections by secret ballot. In order to ensure that sufficient progress in the restoration of peace has been made, and that all the necessary conditions obtain for free expression of the national will, general elections shall be held in July 1956, under the supervision of an international commission composed of representatives of the Member States of the International Supervisory Commission, referred to in the agreement on the cessation of hostilities.

So the election was to be held in both states at the same time, and on the same issue as to the kind of government they should have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. RUSSELL. It was to be an all-Vietnam election, North and South.

No Senator could desire to achieve peace in Vietnam more earnestly than the Senator from Georgia. My vote against the substitute and the vote I shall cast against the amendment, as amended, reflect my conviction that sense-of-the-Congress declarations on authorizations of appropriations constitute an unwise practice. They lend themselves to varying interpretations and constructions and can introduce an undesirable element of confusion.

But I urged no Senator to join in my opposition. In fact, to those who flattered me by consulting on the vote I explained that my objection was based on procedural grounds and indicated that I perceived no reason for them to vote against the substitute.

I favor the most strenuous exertions to create peace in Vietnam and to bring our forces home. But I believe that a sense-of-Congress declaration on an authorization really contributes nothing substantial to our reaching these goals and that this practice can torment us in the future.

Mr. PASTORE. May I have 2 minutes?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I promised to yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island immediately thereafter.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise to reply to the Senator from Georgia, who raises a very serious question as to whether or not we may vote to express ourselves in the way we have—and I hope we will—on an authorization bill.

Mr. President, many of us cannot vote for this authorization bill unless we express ourselves in just that way. That is the only way we can do it, by tying it to the authorization bill. I do not wish to vote against this authorization bill; I want to vote for it. I want to back our commitment, and I want to back our troops in the field; but I want the President to know that we expect him to put the United States in the best possible negotiating position for peace.

I shall not argue the details of the Geneva accords, because all that the amendment of the Senator from Montana says is that Congress supports the principle of the Geneva accords—which is self-determination, freely expressed, by the peoples of both North and South Vietnam.

Mr. President, it is very important to understand that many of us can vote for this appropriation, and we will, as we deeply feel in our hearts this tragedy, only because of this very ability to express ourselves on policy. If we did not have that ability to express ourselves on the policy, I, for one, would not wish to be forced to the wall, and made to vote against the appropriation for men who are fighting for their very lives in the field.

So this is essential. It expresses the right policy, and I am glad that the Senator has done it.

Mr. CLARK. I yield now to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Rhode Island has no compunction about voting for this amendment. I wonder if all Senators have read it carefully. This is all it says:

> The Congress hereby declares—
>
> (1) its firm intentions to provide all necessary support for members of the Armed Forces of the United States fighting in Vietnam—

What is wrong or unclear about that?

> (2) its support of efforts being made by men of good will—

And so forth, not to expand the conflict but to search for peace.

Now we come to the third subsection, which has to do with the Geneva accords.

I hope that on this first day of March in the year 1967, the Senate is not going to take a position that we are against the Geneva accords, when we have said time and time again that we want the Geneva Conference reassembled, so that we can talk about peace.

I say to the Members of the Senate that this is a very clear resolution. It shows that while we are willing to support our men, and appropriate billions of dollars, we stand ready to search for peace, we do not want to expand the war, and we call upon others to use their good offices to bring the parties together, so that we may have peace and bring the boys back home.

We have been talking about boys dying; let us talk about bringing our boys back home. That is the best way to save them from death. The only way we can accomplish that is by negotiating a peace that will be an honorable solution to the conflict in Vietnam; and I shall vote for the amendment of the Senator from Montana as a means toward that end.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is much that I do not know; but there are a few things I do know.

I know pretty well that the President of the United States is as much interested in an honorable termination of this war, and in peace, as is any Member of this Senate.

The second thing I know, unless they have slipped up on me, is that not since the Republic began has there been a court decision that has delimited the power of the Commander in Chief.

The third thing I know is that sometimes I have been mistaken for a falcon instead of a hawk, but I have never been mistaken for a dove; and I am going to vote for this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have only 1 minute remaining, and I yield it back.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate be called to order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

All time having expired, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania as modified. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent because of death in their respective families.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] would vote "nay."

The yeas and nays were announced—yeas 72, nays 19, as follows:

[No. 38 Leg.]

YEAS—72

Aiken
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hatfield
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—19

Allott
Byrd, W. Va.
Cotton
Curtis
Dominick
Eastland
Griffin
Hansen
Hill
Hollings
Hruska
Long, La.
McClellan
Murphy
Russell
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower

NOT VOTING—9

Bayh
Brewster
Church
Fannin
Gruening
Jordan, N.C.
McCarthy
Williams, Del.
Yarborough

So Mr. Clark's amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed.

Mr. GORE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I believe there has been an attempt in the Senate today to make legislative history to the effect that the majority of the Members of the Senate are not fully in accord with the job that is being done by our gallant fighting men.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator suspend for a moment?

Who yields time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. I ask for 3 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. On the bill.

Mr. TOWER. The impression may be conveyed that we are not in full support of what our fighting men are doing in Vietnam today. It has been said around the Senate, during the course of this vote, that this is going to be interpreted as a victory for the so-called doves. I do not accept this "dove" and "hawk" classification, because I conceive of myself as a dove because I eminently want peace.

I have probably spent more time in Vietnam than any other Member of this body, and I do not like the spectacle of seeing American boys being shot at and killed, too often risking their lives and too often losing them.

What we have done in the Senate today points up the inadvisability of debating policy when we are passing on the matter of providing the money to provide our American fighting men with the hardware and the resources they need to fight a war.

I hope that this vote will not have the stultifying effect that I am afraid it will have on the morale of our fighting men. I hope that every Senator who voted for this measure will make it adequately clear to the press that he is not withdrawing or withholding his support from the men who are risking their lives daily in Vietnam; because this is the way it will be interpreted unless the Members of the Senate make themselves adequately clear on the subject.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I do not believe that there is a state of confusion or misinterpretation of what the Senate has done this afternoon. I believe that the press is fully capable of understanding just what this amendment means. The language is simple, the interpretation is clear, and the meaning is subject to no double interpretation.

I think that it is a good thing, now and again, that we have a little dissent in this body. I think it does us much good to express our opinions, if we do so constructively and with the idea of being helpful.

I do not understand, for the life of me, why there has been confusion in the Chamber this afternoon, I think that perhaps one way to overcome at least part of the confusion would be for more Senators to be on the floor more often—I refer to no Senator in particular—so that they can follow the debate on this subject, which has been going on for 7 days.

There is no doubt about the fact that the position of the Senate is in support of the President, in support of the fighting men in Vietnam and southeast Asia, and anyone who has any doubt about it should read the resolution.

AMENDMENT NO. 102

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 102, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke] proposes an amendment:

At the end of the bill add the following:

"TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

"Sec. 401. It is the sense of the Congress that these funds shall be used in pursuit of the administration's aims for a peaceful settlement under effective guarantees in Vietnam, including (1) the right of the people of South Vietnam to choose their own government free of outside coercion, (2) the withdrawal of foreign troops and the dismantling of foreign installations after the termination of hostilities, as pledged in the communique of the Manila Conference, October 25, 1966, (3) the achievement of peaceful reunification if desired by the free choice of all Vietnamese, as stated in the Manila communique, and (4) the grant of substantial aid by the United States to the countries of the Mekong River Basin for the multipurpose development of that fertile but turbulent region, as pledged by the President in his address at Johns Hopkins University on April 7, 1965."

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the amendment which is before the Senate at this time was submitted by me last Friday.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may we have order? I cannot hear the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the amendment before the Senate at this time is an amendment which was submitted to the Senate last Friday, before the substitute was presented by the distinguished majority leader, dealing with the proposals by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark].

Basically, the sense of Congress position of the Mansfield substitute, in my opinion, parallels the ideas of my own amendment and encourages me to feel that this is really a declaration by the Congress not in support or opposition to what the President has been doing but a declaration that we intend in the future not to be bypassed with respect to the activities in Vietnam.

I would like to have the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania with regard to his amendment No. 100, the original amendment which was affected by the substitute of the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield]. Basically, the substitute covered the same ideas as those which were contained in the original amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARTKE. As far as the purposes of that amendment are concerned, although the wording is different, the Senator from Montana stated that it might clear up some confusion in regard to the original purposes stated by the Senator from Pennsylvania. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. The substitute of the Senator from Montana is almost the same, with a few verbiage changes. In substance, it is the same as the amendment which was submitted by me in amendment No. 100.

Mr. HARTKE. In view of that statement, I would like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if in his opinion the substitute which was adopted, and which was in the nature of an amendment to the proposition submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], reduces escalation of the war?

Mr. CLARK. I think it quite definitely does. I understand that some Senators, including one or two who are still in the Chamber, disagree with me. My interpretation of the amendment we have just agreed to is that it places the emphasis on negotiation and, by implication, indicates we do not support escalation and further intensification of the war.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. That was the reason that I voted for the substitute and supported the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania, as amended by the Senator from Montana.

I wish to point out that when I introduced my own amendment I stated that its purpose was to emphasize that the policy of the United States was to be the pursuit of peace. I hope that the amendment we have adopted will have the effect of encouraging the President to put every possible emphasis on peace. I think it clearly shows that the Senate has gone on record as wanting the emphasis not on escalation but on peace and on a settlement of the war, on a negotiated basis, using those institutions which are available. This is not a practice, contrary to that which may have been stated by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Texas following the enactment of the amendment.

The position it takes is that repeatedly taken by the administration and is an endorsement of the general purposes laid down on March 4, 1966, in a legal brief in which the State Department discussed the legality of U.S. participation in the defense of Vietnam. These they say they base their interpretation of the attitude of the Congress in part on the fact that there was enactment of necessary authorizations and appropriations for conducting the war.

The Secretary of State at one time strongly justified our commitment and reason for being in Vietnam by the fact that we had voted foreign aid to Vietnam.

As far as I am concerned, since this substitute amendment basically is oriented toward peaceful negotiation and settlement, I do not intend to ask for a vote on the amendment now pending. The amendment we have passed would not preclude us from going to the United Nations. Likewise, it would not preclude admitting North Vietnam and South Vietnam to the United Nations, where both of their applications for membership are already pending. In 1957 a resolution submitted by Russia asked that the pending applications of North Vietnam, South Vietnam, North Korea, and South Korea be simultaneously approved. If that were done, this matter could more readily be brought to the United Nations.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I know that the Senator does not intend to bring his amendment to a vote. Therefore, I wish to express my accord with the sentiments of the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

The first portion of his amendment is that it is the sense of the Congress that money authorized by this bill should be used to pursue—

> (1) the right of the people of South Vietnam to choose their own government free of outside coercion.

I do not see how any Senator could object to that. It has been stated by the President on many occasions and it would seem to me that this is not only noncontroversial but a good and wise move for the Senate to go on record in favor of it.

Amendment No. 102 further states:

> (2) the withdrawal of foreign troops and the dismantling of foreign installations after the termination of hostilities, as pledged in the communique of the Manila Conference, October 25, 1966.

I ask my friend if he does not include the U.S. troops in those foreign troops?

Mr. HARTKE. Yes, I do. I meant foreign to the soil of the native people of Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to ask my friend if the U.S. Government was not a party to the communique of the Manila Conference?

Mr. HARTKE. It was.

Mr. CLARK. Could I not say with accuracy that the second part of the amendment has been approved by the United States, the administration of President Johnson?

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. The third section is:

> (3) The achievement of peaceful reunification if desired by the free choice of all Vietnamese, as stated in the Manila communique.

The same answer would apply to that, would it not?

Mr. HARTKE. The same answer would apply. The Senator is exactly right. That Manila statement, on which we have heard very little, incidentally, since the Manila Conference, and on which we have had no real further affirmation, I would think should be reaffirmed. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for placing emphasis on the Manila communique, because it was a statement made by the administration at that time as a declaration of policy for the future of the United States.

Mr. CLARK. Do I understand correctly the Manila Conference received the approval of Secretary of State Rusk?

Mr. HARTKE. I understood that it did. I hope that he still approves of it.

Mr. CLARK. I hope he does. I wish he would tell us.

With respect to the fourth part of the Senator's amendment:

> (4) The grant of substantial aid by the United States to the countries of the Mekong River Basin for the multipurpose development of that fertile but turbulent region, as pledged by the President in his address at Johns Hopkins University on April 7, 1965.

I understand this is still the policy of the administration; is that not correct?

Mr. HARTKE. I would hope it is. But that statement was made on April 7, 1965, at a time when escalation of the war had not reached its height, at a time before the severe escalation which occurred at a later date. Reaffirmation of policy along this line by the President or by the administration certainly would not only be helpful to those who are concerned about the future course of the United States in that part of the world, but it would also be reassuring to the rest of the world. That was an excellent speech, and I commend the President for it. I wish he would make more of the same kind of statements, following his speeches with action to execute the policy.

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree. But is it not true that the President has, to some extent, implemented that by his encouragement of the Asian Development Bank, and with other substantial sums of American money in support of the activities of the Bank?

Mr. HARTKE. There is no question about that. I hope the Asian Development Bank will go forward.

Mr. CLARK. In conclusion, I congratulate the Senator from Indiana on his amendment. I only wish that it could be brought to a vote.

Mr. HARTKE. I want to thank my good friend from Pennsylvania for his comments.

Mr. President, a number of purposes for which this amendment was submitted last Friday have been effectuated as a result of the amendment which was adopted this afternoon.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I correctly understand that the amendment of the Senator from Indiana will not be submitted to a vote by the Senate?

Mr. HARTKE. That is correct.

Mr. President, I think that we could make a greater effort toward peace. I am hopeful that we will.

I suppose that many people are confused, but as I listened last Friday afternoon to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] making his statement about some of the things which should be done to escalate the war, and then as I heard the news reports that several powerplants in North Vietnam were being bombed for the first time—which was one of the recommendations made by the Senator from Washington—I can only anticipate that there will be further escalation of the war. This makes me feel very sad.

I notice that the President has refused to say that that escalation is the policy of the United States, that we are escalating the war. In fact, he has said that he did not consider this to be further escalation of the war. But since I anticipate that the docks at Haiphong will be bombed, and that much of what the Senator from Washington predicted will come true, I am hopeful that the amendment adopted this afternoon will have a sobering influence on those who advocate that policy.

Mr. President, for these reasons, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be withdrawn.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Michigan—and more if he needs it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, I voted against the amendment, in the nature of a substitute for the Clark amendment, offered by the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] and I wish to take a few minutes to explain the reasons for my vote.

I strongly support every reasonable effort to achieve an honorable, negotiated peace at the earliest possible moment. I have been among those who believe it would serve a useful purpose to convene an all-Asian conference of foreign ministers, to search for a path to an honorable peace.

I have listened carefully to the discussion which took place prior to the vote concerning the merits of the Mansfield amendment. The only thing made clear to me as a result of the discussion was that there is no clear understanding or agreement among the Members of this body as to the meaning of the amendment, or as to the interpretation that will be placed upon it by the press, by our friends, or by our enemies.

Some of the Senators who spoke indicated that they would support the amendment as an expression of full support of the administration and its policies in Vietnam, but others who spoke indicated that they would support the amendment as a means of directing criticism at the administration and its policies.

There is obvious confusion and wide differences of opinion concerning the meaning of the amendment. Under the circumstances, I believe that the amendment should have been tabled or referred to the appropriate committee for hearings and study.

I believe it is unfortunate that the Senate does not speak in a clear voice on a subject of such great importance.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am voting against the supplemental authorization in order to express my opposition to past escalation of the conflict and the future escalation that is certain to follow; and, furthermore, I am voting against it to express my deep regret that we have failed adequately to explore the possibility of reaching the negotiating table by the cessation of bombing for a sufficient time to test the real intent of Hanoi. This could have been done at the time of the 4-day truce a few days ago, and it should be done now.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I rise to support S. 665, which will authorize supplemental appropriations for the Defense Department for 1967. That more funds are needed is clear and has been clear to most Members of the Congress for some time. The size of this supplemental authorization spotlights the Defense Department's faulty judgment. The Department's estimates of the funds needed for the war appear to be almost as erroneous as the Secretary's predictions regarding the duration of the war. Over $12 billion in supplemental appropriations have been requested for southeast Asia, of which $4.5 billion must be first authorized. This bill provides the authorization.

While there is little question that the war is a costly one, now estimated at around $2 billion monthly, there can also be little question that our boys must be provided with the equipment and materials that are the finest and best available necessary to complete the task.

Mr. President, it serves little purpose to debate at this point whether we should have become involved initially in Vietnam. We are there. About 450,000 brave American boys are daily placing their lives in jeopardy in defense of freedom. No finer American soldier ever wore the American uniform than today's soldier in Vietnam. They are performing magnificently. Their morale is high. They are confident of the outcome.

Mr. President, we hear a great deal of controversy regarding the bombing activities in the north. Many say we should halt the bombing for a few days. We are told that Hanoi will rush to the bargaining table. Each time, whether the pause lasted a few days or 37 days, North Vietnam has used the time to regroup its troops and replenish its supplies. The net result on each occasion has been no negotiation and the enemy's position has been improved, thus delaying the day when they are forced to negotiate. When the bombing resumed, we heard cries that "if we had only waited another day, negotiations would have come about." Only recently during the TET, we extended the cease-fire for 2 days, and our intelligence sources tell us that the supply lines from the north resembled a California freeway during rush hour, as the enemy frantically built up its supplies in the south.

Mr. President, I do not believe that we should fight the enemy on his terms. We should make maximum use of our strengths, and this means greater use of our air and sea power. By so doing, I am convinced that we will not only save American lives, but we will also hasten the ending of the conflict.

Bombing of the north should continue. It is effective. Although it obviously has not stopped all of the infiltration, it has hampered and impeded the enemy's efforts. And it has raised the price of aggression for the aggressor. The Secretary of Defense tells us that 300,000 persons have been diverted in the north to the repairing of damaged roads, bridges, and supply centers. General Westmoreland, who is so brilliantly commanding our forces in Vietnam, has stated that bombing is needed and necessary. The American people, particularly those with husbands, sons, and relatives in Vietnam, expect and demand that our boys be given this air support.

Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr., in an article concluded that the bombing has hurt North Vietnam and points to the loud and continuous protests of Hanoi as evidencing its effectiveness. As Mr. Hearst states:

> This is the clearest possible giveaway that the bombing is hurting and hurting bad. In turn, nothing could be a greater argument for continuation and intensification of this form of attack, all howling to the contrary.

Mr. Hearst further concludes by saying:

> The lessons of the bombing are therefore clear: The North Vietnam government is obviously deeply concerned about the bombings' effect on its war effort. So to stop or to "pause" again would merely relieve old Ho of some of his main concern, and that's not what we're there for.

Mr. President, there has also been a great deal of discussion around the country regarding civilian casualties. I personally cannot recall any war where there have not been civilian deaths. These civilian deaths are most unfortunate and most regrettable. But let us face it—war is not pleasant.

Vermont Royster, in an October 27, 1966, Wall Street Journal article, stated:

> The horrors of this war, including the horrors to the civilians, are the horrors of all wars; so are the confusion and the foulups.

Mr. President, never in the history of modern warfare has a nation taken such great pain to avoid civilian casualties. This, despite the fact that it causes greater risk for our pilots. The enemy, of course, is well aware of, and has taken advantage of, this policy. It has placed many military operations in civilian areas. Contrast our concern for the civilian with the deliberate and concerted effort of the Vietcong to murder, maim, and harass the civilian population in the south.

In 1965, Mr. President, Communist guerrillas killed or captured 1,500 Vietnam civil officials. To appreciate the significance, it would be the same as if this Nation lost 30,000 mayors, board of education members, and city managers.

Mr. President, Winston Churchill said:

> One cannot expect security by throwing small nations to the wolves.

We are in Vietnam to make certain that the "wolves" of communism do not overrun South Vietnam and destroy the right of the South Vietnamese to determine their own destiny.

Mr. President, I resent those who question the motives of this great country. We are in South Vietnam at the expressed invitation of the Government of South Vietnam. We are in South Vietnam to preserve the right of the people of South Vietnam to determine their own destiny. This Nation's record in Asia is a good one and we should be proud of it. The actions of our country, both in war and in peace, speak for themselves. So, unfortunately, do the actions of the Communist world. Together with our allies, in World War II we liberated the conquered lands in both Europe and Asia from the iron grip of dictators. Again in Korea the United States responded to aggression's call, and as a result South Korea remains independent today. Following these conflicts, we gave generously of our resources, rescued these nations from the despair and destruction of war, and rebuilt them until today they enjoy unprecedented prosperity. Japan, the Philippines, and many European countries are monuments to our successful efforts.

Mr. President, the record is clear, this Nation has given the best of our manhood and our wealth to a greater degree than any other nation in history. In so doing, we had and have no ulterior motives. Our Nation desires no new territory. Our Nation desires no dominion over the lives of others. Our Nation seeks only to secure the right of the peoples of the world to determine their own destiny.

There is little question of the decision of the world's people if allowed a free choice. For whenever and wherever a nation has been given a free choice, its verdict is unmistakable. Citizens of the world know full well that the performance of a democratic society far overshadows the promises of the Communist world. The contrast between democracy and communism is evident throughout the world.

Mr. President, I am convinced that a firm policy in Vietnam is a proper policy—a policy which will lead us to our goal of peace.

Mr. President, I was deeply saddened with the news of the death of Mr. Henry R. Luce. He was a pioneer and a giant in the field of journalism. Only recently, I had occasion to correspond with Mr. Luce. I wrote him congratulating him on a speech that he gave entitled, "The Pacific Community." During my campaign for the Senate, I called for a Partnership of the Pacific. I found that Mr. Luce's "Pacific Community" and my Partnership for the Pacific had much in common. Mr. Luce helped us to see the promise and hope for Asia if we remain firm.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in full in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Pacific Community

(An address by Henry R. Luce, editorial chairman, Time Inc., at the 33d annual meeting of the Life Insurance Advertisers Association, New Orleans, La., September 22, 1966)

One way in which the purpose of Time, The Weekly Newsmagazine has been stated is to say that "TIME makes the news make sense." I am sure you will agree that that is indeed a worthy purpose—one which is basic to journalism. And yet it is also a very presumptuous claim. For how do we know that anything makes sense? We have all heard that human history is ". . . a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

We hear that same verdict today in many of our most admired plays and novels.

I propose to speak to you today about Vietnam. I will do so on the assumption that the whole human adventure does make sense and that, at this turning point in the human adventure, the war in Vietnam, however strange it seems, makes the greatest possible sense.

Cyrus Sulzberger, the distinguished foreign affairs expert of the *New York Times*, recently said: "What has emerged from the Great Debate on Vietnam is a deep-seated doubt about ourselves and deep-seated ignorance of the world we inhabit." Pretty harsh words to direct to the readers of the *New York Times!*

We shall certainly have to deal with modern American doubt about America. And we shall also have to deal with that ignorance.

As to the Vietnam war, the first thing to say is that it is not primarily a war about Vietnam, nor even about China; it is a war about the future of Asia. And the second thing to say is that our determination in Vietnam has already resulted in a radical change in the prospects for the future of Asia.

The basic drive throughout Asia is to become modern. Two routes to modernity are offered. One is the road marked Freedom, the other is the road marked Tyranny. For tyranny we may read, concretely, Communism.

In the past year throughout Asia there has been a remarkable swing toward the choice of the Freedom road. And it is perfectly clear that this swing has been decisively influenced by confidence in the American decision to stand and fight in Vietnam.

Most of the non-Communist countries of Asia—in fact, virtually all of them—are strongly in favor of the American military presence, even though for more or less obvious reasons not all of them can say so out loud.

And this is perhaps the place to remind ourselves that we are by no means fighting alone. There are two full divisions from Korea—and they are truly fighters. There are also military units from Thailand and the Philippines, as well as from Australia and New Zealand. Altogether 30 nations are contributing to South Vietnam in other ways.

A third thing to say about Asia is that it is a vast territory inhabited by deeply separated people. In the East-West Center in Honolulu we discovered that the Asian students are often better acquainted with the West than they are with each other's countries. In the past year, there has been more cooperative action among Asian countries than ever before in their thousands of years of history. And this cooperation has not centered around Communism. Quite the contrary. A newly cooperative Asia centers around Freedom.

Most of the cooperative action concerns economic progress. But the political implications are profound. To cite only a few examples:

Item: Last December's treaty between the Republic of Korea and Japan, ended more than a half-century of hostility. Korea will receive from Japan an eight-hundred-million-dollar program for modernization of Korean agriculture and industry, and the creation of a modern transportation system.

Item: Earlier this year the long estrangement between Malaysia and the Philippines was also brought to an end. Malaysia and the Philippines, together with Thailand, revitalized the cultural and educational agency they had created back in 1961—the Association of Southeast Asia, or "ASA" as it is called. The initials stand for "hope" in the language of all three nations.

Item: The creation of the Asian Development Bank. This owes much to the genius of that extraordinary American, Eugene Black, and to the support of President Johnson. With a capital of one billion dollars, it will be the Asian equivalent of the World Bank but entirely managed and largely financed by Asians.

Item: The latest dramatic step for the future took place in June with the formation of the Asian and Pacific Council—or ASPAC. Some 80 delegates from 9 nations—Japan, Malaysia, Nationalist China, Australia and New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand, South Vietnam and South Korea—met in Seoul. Like the older but smaller sister organization, "ASA," ASPAC's first goal is to pool technicians and skills and boost agricultural production. Because of its size and promise, it points to an Asian Common Market.

Thus, the Exodus of Asia from old patterns of disunity and poverty comes not from war's loud clashing but by a movement of the spirit, through the quiet means of statesmanship, toward Freedom and friendship. And yet this could not have happened without the presence of American military power. For American military power was and is essential to give Asian nations, including even India, a feeling of security—a feeling of security internally as well as against the looming threat of Chinese Communism which in recent years, has been sensed much more keenly over there than here.

But I have not yet mentioned the two most spectacular events of the past year in Asia. The first was the anti-Communist revolution in Indonesia and the second is the convulsion in Red China.

The revolution in Indonesia was a bloody affair. Probably not less than 300,000 people were slaughtered. It was a terrible price to pay for the overthrow of Sukarno—that weird mixture of Father of his Country and crazy, strutting peacock. But the alternative was Chinese Communism which came very close to enslaving 100,000,000 Indonesians.

The United States had nothing whatever to do directly with the Indonesian anti-Communist revolution. Yet, the American military commitment in Southeast Asia was and is a mighty source of reassurance to the men in Djakarta who are now trying to bring order out of the chaos into which Sukarno threw it.

As for the current convulsion in Red China, it is too early to predict. It looks like the final descent into insanity. But one thing it says with the clarity of neon light—economically, Communist China has been a total bust. As for external affairs, Red China has suffered nothing but defeat. On top of its bloody repudiation in Indonesia, the ultimate humiliation suffered by Red China was when North Korea turned openly against her—North Korea, whose very existence is owed to the hundreds of thousands of Red Chinese soldiers killed and buried in the North Korean valleys.

Every topic on which I have touched would require a whole semester of lectures to explicate. My effort, in these few minutes, can only be to paint a picture of the whole with strokes which, however simple, are, I believe, true.

The conclusion so far reached is that during recent years and especially in the last 12 months, the menace of Communism in Asia has declined to an amazing degree. And along with the decline of the Communism menace, the forces of progress and freedom have gained a most hopeful momentum. And all of this is inconceivable without the fighting determination of the United States in Vietnam.

What, then, about Vietnam itself? Why am I prepared to say that our battle in Vietnam not only makes sense but makes the greatest possible sense? Here the limitations of time really put me in trouble. Because, as you know so well, it is a long and complicated story.

First of all, I could say, with I think good sense, that we have to fight in Vietnam because there is where Communists are fighting—not just talking, fighting. But I should like to put my emphasis on another point. The other point is the one basic to all of Asia. I have said that the greatest drive throughout Asia is to go modern. To go modern means, superficially, to acquire the end-products of Western technology and to enter into the age of affluence—at least to climb out of the immemorial mud of poverty. But obviously that cannot be done without the benefit of stable governments. Let me put it more precisely—and also more profoundly. Modernity cannot be achieved without nationhood. And nationhood is something which Asia in its past never knew. This is a sweeping statement, which may be subject to some qualifications, but it is a statement which can be sustained.

We commonly speak today of "the emerging nations." What does that phrase mean? It means nations that are not nations but are trying to become nations.

The Vietnamese are a civilized people. They have a long cultural background—incidentally, that background is mainly Confucian, not Buddhist. But of all civilized people, Vietnam has had the least chance to achieve modern nationhood. This is owing to the fact that for nearly 100 years it was ruled by France and that after World War II the French were totally incapable of transferring their rule into an acceptable form of self-government.

Thus, after a century of foreign rule, the Vietnamese have known nothing but war for independence, mixed with and continued into the most vicious of all wars—civil war.

Thus, to put the matter further, in Vietnam there has been only a minimum basis for the organization of law and order.

Therefore, Vietnam is the place which most needs our help in its efforts to become modern by becoming a nation.

In my view the key word in Vietnam is Pacification. Pacification means many things. One of the things it means most is security—that is, that the farmers in their villages and the townsfolk in their towns should feel that they can proceed with their daily occupations without fear of being suddenly butchered. That means rooting out the Viet Cong from right in the midst of the people as well as rooting them out from their jungle lairs. And I don't need to tell you that that is a most difficult business. But Pacification means somewhat more than security—although we might be glad to settle for just security. Pacification means bringing to the people better ways of life—better methods of agriculture, more schools, more doctors and medicines. The more this is achieved, the more the people will feel they have something worth defending against Viet Cong terror. And it means still more than that: it means increasing confidence that there is a government in Saigon which is dedicated to making a nation.

But I must not seem to deprecate our military action—either its necessity or its valor. Of course, we have to stop North Vietnam and we have to stop its intrusion absolutely. We also have to disintegrate all organized units of the Viet Cong. Our Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines have conducted themselves magnificently. From four-star generals to first class privates, they have been terribly efficient in battle and as considerate to the populace as any troops ever were in a foreign land. We can be deeply proud of our 600,000 American fighting men on land and sea and air throughout the far Pacific.

Pacification and battle action go together, of course. But it is my belief, as it is, of course, our hope that very soon, and even now we can give the top priority to Pacification.

One more point and I must be done with the drama of Vietnam. The chief problem of Pacification lies rather at the top than at the bottom of the emerging Vietnamese nation. The specific problem in Vietnam as elsewhere, but most acutely in Vietnam, is the staggering shortage of trained personnel—civil servants, competent bureaucrats, as well as medical and production technicians. A large training program is now going on; it is headed by a most able person—Nguyen Duc Thang.

This great effort stems from President Johnson's meeting in Honolulu last April.

Somewhere along the tortuous and frustrating road to victory in Vietnam, President Johnson made the decision to go all-out militarily—meaning to do all that would be required. At Honolulu he made the decision to go as fast and as far as possible with Pacification. Those two decisions together mark one of the great turning points in the prospect for freedom and prosperity in Asia. The rightness of those two decisions got resounding confirmation in the Vietnam elections in September.

The title which I have given to these remarks is The Pacific Community. What, exactly, do I mean by that? I do not know—exactly. I put the phrase before you as something to think about—to consider what meaning it ought to have.

Ever since World War II we have been accustomed to the phrase, The Atlantic Community. What, exactly, does anybody mean by The Atlantic Community? Nothing very exact. The phrase is meaningful because it refers back to something which all the nations of The Atlantic Community have in common—namely, Western Civilization. The Pacific Community has no such point of reference. Perhaps we might say that The Atlantic Community refers to a common past and The Pacific Community refers to a common future.

In last summer's Great Debate about Vietnam, a curious attitude came to the surface. In effect, and almost explicitly, a number of anti-Vietnam Senators and learned pundits were saying that Asia, the Orient, is so utterly different from the West, that the United States should have nothing to do with it.

Well, now, if, in this scientific age, it were possible to construct a wall right down the middle of the Pacific Ocean—and let us call it an atomic wall—the idea of total isolation from Asia might be worth considering. But the idea is obviously absurd. We have been deeply involved with Asia and we will become inescapably more involved—like it or not. I say, we should like it. Our involvements with Asia during the 20th Century have by no means been to our discredit. We occupied Japan and out of that occupation emerged a new Japan, more prosperous than ever, and, we can say with some confidence, newly democratic. The MacArthur occupation was surely one of the happier great events of history.

Long before that, we found ourselves in possession of the Philippine Islands; we promptly promised them independence and moved vigorously to that end. More recently, we saved Korea at the cost of 30,000 American lives and are receiving now the finest expression of Korean gratitude. During World War II, the Republic of China was one of our major allies and—well, tragedies happen. But it is possible to hope—now more than ever—that the tragedy may be redeemed and that the whole of China will one day take its place in a new Pacific Community.

I am certainly not saying that to begin to think of a Pacific Community is in any way to lessen our devotion to an Atlantic Community. My credentials on that score are, I think, in order. I treasure all the dynamic greatness of Western Civilization and if the defense of Western Civilization now rests largely on the United States, that is a responsibility we should feel proud to bear.

But the mission of the United States in the 20th Century extends far beyond our own shores and the peninsula of Europe. Mission? There are those who scoff at the word mission. They say there is no such thing as a national purpose or mission. They are at bottom the same kind of faithless people who say that history has no meaning, that human life itself has no meaning.

And, say the scoffers, if the United States has a purpose, a mission, pray tell us what it is. I think that is not too difficult.

The mission of the United States is to use its power and resources to help create a world community. This mission begins by a vision of a number of communities, large and small. There is The Atlantic Community, to which we happily pledge ourselves. There is The Western Hemisphere Community, in which we try, with both success and failure, to conduct ourselves as a Good Neighbor. And there is The Pacific Community.

The Pacific Community, now coming into our vision, is a new hope for a new and better world. It brings together a variety of meanings. It means that Asian nations themselves should develop greater unity of both material and political commerce. But its greatest meaning will be that at last the East that was East and the West that was West will have met as partners of equal dignity in a multi-racial concert of ideals and interests.

Everyone speaks of Peace. But Peace is inconceivable without a constructive relationship between Occident and Orient. And that relationship finds its natural place around the Pacific Ocean, including Australia with its immense potentialities for the future. The giant stride toward Peace will be the formation of The Pacific Community, as its very name so happily implies.

In The Pacific Community, each nation will have its rights and its obligations according to its ability. To the United States, by reason of its strength, will fall the main burden of military defense. We are and should be responsible for the defense of The Pacific Community no less than for The Atlantic Community. We shall also share our economic capabilities and whatever treasures we possess of democratic ideals and realities. In doing so, we shall meet as partners the vigorous drive of Asian nations to become modern and to express their own talents and identities—in their quest for prosperity under the flag of Freedom.

Before many of you were born, Woodrow Wilson said that the mission of America is to make the world safe for democracy.

If you will reassess these words, I think you will find them remarkably precise. He did not say that we are to impose democracy on the world. He said simply that it was up to us to see that democracy should be made a live option for all the people in the world who wish to adopt it.

We have learned an enormous lot since Wilson's day. We have learned how difficult it is to make democracy work—even in Europe and even here. We have learned how difficult it is to meet the greedy and egotistic claims of men and still maintain a balance of justice and freedom.

But this is the mission to which our nation now is called—at home and throughout the world. Instead of finding excuses, even high-minded excuses for running away from this assignment, might we not rather say: Now God be thanked who matched us with this hour.

Let us heighten our resolve. Let us look forward to the day when we can say, with pride and with truth: here, now, has been established The Pacific Community, and America is glad to be a part of it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. METCALF (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent because of death in their respective families and, if present and voting, would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 2, as follows:

[No. 39 Leg.]

YEAS—89

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Hansen
Harris
Hartke
Hatfield
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—2

Morse
Nelson

NOT VOTING—9

Bayh
Brewster
Church
Fannin
Gruening
Hart
Jordan, N.C.
Metcalf
Williams, Del.

So the bill (S. 665) was passed, as follows:

S. 665

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

SEC. 101. In addition to the funds authorized to be appropriated under Public Law 89–501, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year 1967 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles in amounts as follows:

Aircraft

For aircraft: for the Army, $533,100,000; for the Navy and the Marine Corps, $1,703,300,000; for the Air Force, $1,303,000,000.

Missiles

For missiles: for the Army, $6,100,000; for the Navy, $48,700,000; for the Marine Corps, $2,100,000; for the Air Force, $45,000,000.

Tracked Combat Vehicles

For tracked combat vehicles: for the Army, $62,200,000; for the Marine Corps, $4,200,000.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Sec. 201. In addition to the funds authorized to be appropriated under Public Law 89–501, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year 1967 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for research, development, test, and evaluation, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

For the Army, $40,000,000;
For the Navy (including the Marine Corps), $40,000,000;
For the Air Force, $33,000,000; and
For Defense Agencies, $22,000,000.

TITLE III—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Sec. 301. The Secretary of each military department may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, which are necessary in connection with military activities in southeast Asia, or in support of such activities, in the total amount as follows:

Department of the Army, $288,500,000;
Department of the Navy, $140,000,000; and
Department of the Air Force, $196,000,000.

Sec. 302. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529) and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

Sec. 303. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this title, but the appropriations for public works authorized by section 301 shall not exceed: Department of the Army, $288,500,000; Department of the Navy, $140,000,000; Department of the Air Force, $196,000,000, or a total of $624,500,000.

Sec. 304. The Secretary of Defense is hereby directed that insofar as practicable all contracts shall be formally advertised and awarded on a competitive bid basis to the lowest responsible bidders.

TITLE IV—STATEMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL POLICY

Sec. 401. The Congress hereby declares—

(1) its firm intentions to provide all necessary support for members of the Armed Forces of the United States fighting in Vietnam;

(2) its support of efforts being made by the President of the United States and other men of good will throughout the world to prevent an expansion of the war in Vietnam and to bring that conflict to an end through a negotiated settlement which will preserve the honor of the United States, protect the vital interests of this country, and allow the people of South Vietnam to determine the affairs of that nation in their own way; and

(3) its support of the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962 and urges the convening of that Conference or any other meeting of nations similarly involved and interested as soon as possible for the purpose of formulating plans for bringing the conflict to an honorable conclusion in accordance with the principles of those accords.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. PASTORE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1967

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 355) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair recognizes the Senator from Montana.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

REDUCTION OF TROOPS IN EUROPE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, 2 or 3 weeks ago I discussed with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] the desirability of creating a joint subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee to consider a resolution submitted by the majority leader on the subject of troops in Europe.

I have consulted with the senior Senator from Georgia, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. Russell], and the following Members have been designated to be members of that joint committee from the Committee on Foreign Relations: Senators Mansfield, Fulbright, Church, Hickenlooper, and Aiken.

I have requested the majority leader, and he has consented, to act as chairman of that joint committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. As the Senator from Arkansas has stated, we discussed the matter and decided that, due to the large volume of business before both of these committees, it will be better to conduct these hearings before a subcommittee of members of the two committees. We agreed that the subcommittee should be composed of members of the Committee on Foreign Relations and members of the Committee on Armed Services.

The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has requested the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] to serve on the subcommittee as representatives of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield to me on that subject?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of both committees whether or not they will, at the same time, consider the resolution which I authorized, and which was cosponsored by 10 other Senators, which I had by unanimous consent referred to both committees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Oh, yes; that resolution, the Dodd resolution, and the Clark resolution will all be given impartial consideration.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the majority leader.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 4573) to provide, for the period ending on June 30, 1967, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and it was signed by the Vice President.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW—COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senate, and especially of the manager of the pending business—with apologies to the Senator from Rhode Island for delaying his matter—on February 21, I made the following statement:

> It is the intention of the joint leadership to continue the consideration of that bill, reported by the Committee on Armed Services, until it is disposed of. It may take 3 or 4 or 5 days. Then we will return to the Monroney reorganization bill and will stay with that legislation until it is finished. When we do take it up again next week, as I hope we shall, it will be the intention of the manager of the bill, with the approval of the leadership, to have amendments voted upon whether Senators are in the Chamber or not, in an effort to conclude action on the measure.

I repeat that statement at this time for the information of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the majority leader, first with respect to the remainder of the day: Do I correctly understand there will be an extended textile discussion which will probably consume the remainder of the afternoon, and that there will be no further votes and no further business today?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. There will be no votes today, but a number of Senators on both sides of the aisle, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], have for some weeks now been preparing for this round-robin discussion affecting the wool and textile industries, which is about to get underway.

Mr. DIRKSEN. One further question, Mr. President. I queried the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] yesterday with respect to his remaining amendments to the Reorganization Act. He said he would offer five more; and I understood that one of those would relate to rule XXII.

I do not know whether he expects to take much or little time, but he does expect a rollcall vote on each one. I wonder, therefore, whether under the circumstances the majority leader thinks it advisable to have the Senate meet at 11 o'clock, with the understanding that committees can meet.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; I had forgotten we had discussed that matter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all Senate committees be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I was in the rear of the Chamber, and could not hear the colloquy with the distinguished minority leader. It is my understanding that the leadership intends, when it takes up the Reorganization Act, to go ahead and finish the bill, without laying it aside again; is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. And that all Senators having amendments at the desk or wishing to present amendments must be present during the legislative part of the session to present their amendments, or the leadership will be entitled to ask for a third reading when there is no one present in the Chamber willing to call up amendments which they have at the desk, or to present them from their seats?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. We will, of course, try to exercise a degree of flexibility, and not be dictatorial.

Mr. MONRONEY. No; subject to quorum calls and an effort to notify Senators to come in and call up their amendments; but not to automatically lay aside the bill, or adjourn at 2 o'clock because they do not appear to present amendments which they have heretofore introduced.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like the privilege of calling up my amendment first thing tomorrow.

Mr. MONRONEY. We will be perfectly happy to accommodate the Senator, as well as others on his side, to fully develop the question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the leadership expects the usual full cooperation of the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who was ready to offer five amendments on a rollcall basis when this matter was set aside, and he has indicated, if I recall his conversation correctly, that he is prepared to call up the five amendments tomorrow, on each of which there will be a rollcall vote.

JOHNSON EFFORT TO HOLD SPENDING LINE GETS BRICKBATS, DESERVES PRAISE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, over the years I have attempted to do my best to reduce wasteful Federal spending. Of course I have been critical of the administration from time to time when I disagreed with their spending policies. I expect to continue to oppose some of the President's spending programs this year.

However, I want to make it very clear that, in my estimation, the Johnson administration has tried hard to keep spending down and has run into a buzzsaw of congressional and pressure group criticism whenever it has done so. Over the years President Johnson's budget directors have worked effectively to carve the fat out of Federal programs and give us a more intelligent basis for evaluating the Federal budget.

This has not been a popular course. It has raised hackles and brought forth howls from the special interest groups who want something for nothing. It has upset many who genuinely feel that important activities have been given too low a priority.

Unfortunately, all too often those who speak out most loudly in support of Federal cutbacks also object most vociferously when those cutbacks are made. A case in point is the highway program.

President Johnson, wisely, in my estimation, decided to reduce highway spending substantially. Then the screams of anguish went up. Liberal and conservative alike decried the administration's decision as false economy, tampering with a trust fund, and otherwise destroying the warp and woof of our democracy.

I think every man, woman, and child in the country owes a vote of thanks to the Johnson administration for its determined effort to hold down highway spending. As Secretary of Transportation Boyd indicated at Tuesday's hearings on the highway holdback:

> The interest of the country is better served by having a sound dollar than by having more highways.

I hope the President will continue to resist the strong pressures from Congress and continue to spend wisely. The American people will be the gainers in the long run.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair recognizes the senior Senator from Rhode Island.

THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I speak to the Senate today on a matter which has had the active consideration of President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and President Johnson over the past 12 years. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Textiles of the Committee on Commerce, I believe I have some familiarity with textile matters.

Many Members of the Senate are likewise interested in that large segment of our economy where 4 million people are engaged in producing fibers, textiles, apparel, and numerous other textile products. The time has come for plain talk.

The jobs of these millions of Americans depend in large measure on the wisdom of our decisions and the determination with which they are carried out.

It is my intention to lay before the Senate in plain and simple words the serious situation which now confronts us. I am motivated by the interest we all have in the people whose jobs are in this industry in various parts of the country; in those who have no jobs or training and who need opportunities for gainful employment; in those who seek with our help to leave forever the desperate cycle of poverty; and lastly, in those who need to create an economically strong family where the father can have access to secure, stable and respectable employment without going on relief.

These people—the employed, those seeking employment, and those in need of training—in short the secure and the insecure—all these people who are our greatest resource are our primary responsibility.

Through their efforts in fields, forests, and pastures, they produce textile fibers which are passed on to a million others who spin, weave, and knit these fibers into fabrics for industrial, military, home, and apparel uses—1,400,000 of these people are engaged in the fabrication of these textiles into wearing apparel alone.

These men and women and their jobs are enough to alert us to the national interest involved. Beyond this, however, we cannot but be aware that the fiber-textile-apparel complex is essential to the functioning of our whole national economy both in peace and in war. I am interested in people, prosperity and peace.

BACKGROUND

So much for my reason for speaking today. The matters which I intend to take up with the Senate have had bipartisan support and understanding and I trust will continue to do so.

WORLD TEXTILES

The textile industry's problems caused by the rising level of imports began in the post-World War II period. With the help of the United States, the vast textile industries of the whole world were rebuilt. In their search for dollars those nations have exported their products in ever-increasing amounts to the United States.

Japanese resurgence in the cotton textile sector had reached such proportions by 1956 that President Eisenhower had to take some action. A comprehensive voluntary bilateral agreement establishing quotas on all exports of cotton textile products from Japan to the United

States was made covering the years 1957 to 1961.

Late in 1956, the administration activated a tariff quota on wool fabrics on imports in excess of 5 percent of the domestic production.

When the Japanese bilateral on cottons and the tariff quota on wool fabrics were announced, it was stated that such actions were indicative of what would be done in the event that similar problems arose with other textile products or from other sources.

Exports of textiles from many other sources soon developed as textile capacity and production in many parts of the world increased. Tariff schedules had little effect in restraining imports of fabrics and garments coming from factories in every corner of the world. Made by workers who were glad to earn 10 cents an hour, these goods landed on the American market and undermined the wages and employment of our people.

The tariff quotas on wool fabrics had little restraining effect. Lower wage, lower cost countries chose the U.S. textile market as a place to earn dollars.

DOMESTIC INDUSTRY

Meanwhile, employment in the U.S. textile industry continued to decline. Between 1950 and 1960, employment shrunk by 332,000 jobs; 676 American mills closed; areas of chronic and persistent unemployment grew.

We imported unemployment.

Confidence in the textile industry fell. Investment shrunk. The feeling grew that this industry was the victim of Government policies which would phase it out.

INVESTIGATION

My colleague from New Hampshire, Senator COTTON, in 1958 proposed to the Senate a resolution establishing a special subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce to make a thorough investigation and recommendations relative to the worsening textile situation. The resolution passed.

At that time imports had increased by over one-third since President Eisenhower's action in 1956 and had reached 601 million square yards equivalent. The subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman, held extensive hearings throughout the country and made a number of recommendations. By 1960, imports had risen to 1,297 million square yards, of which 1,054 million was cotton, 111 million was wool textiles, and 132 million was synthetic textiles.

It was apparent by mid-1960 that a course of conduct which would eventually phase out 4 million jobs in fibers, textiles, and apparel was already creating hardship throughout large areas of the country. If the country was to move ahead, then remedial measures would have to be taken in the textile sector.

FEDERAL PROGRAM

President Kennedy endorsed the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Textiles, and following his inauguration in 1961 moved promptly. I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point excerpts from the report of the Subcommittee on Textiles dated February 4, 1959, Senate No. 42, pursuant to Senate Resolution 287 of the 85th Congress.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is evident from the brief review of postwar trends in the domestic textile industry outlined in this report that this industry is faced with a number of serious problems. It would not be wise national policy to allow conditions in the domestic textile industry to continue to deteriorate. Although there may be disagreement over the specific equipment and manpower requirements essential for defense purposes, there can be no disagreement that it is imperative to national security for this Nation to maintain sufficient capacity to satisfy its military and civilian needs in the event of a national emergency. One of our needs is for good estimates of the equipment and manpower needs in the textile industry in the event of an emergency. We have requested the Office of Civilian Defense Mobilization to provide the subcommittee with such estimates which will become part of the permanent record of this study.

It is also difficult to justify the administration of various policies of the Federal Government in such ways that the effects bear far more heavily upon one industry than upon others. The members of this subcommittee have repeatedly emphasized that they support the broad policy objectives of an expanded program of international trade, and a soundly administered program of economic aid to friendly nations. But it is imperative that such policies be administered in ways which will spread the costs over a wider segment of our society than has been true in the past.

We recognize the complexity of the problem. Every nation of the world today is interested in economic development. Because in the past higher incomes have been associated with industrialization, nations which traditionally have been producers of raw materials are now anxious to industrialize. Historically, one of the first industries to be established in a country as it begins the process of industrialization is the textile industry. Hence throughout the world we have witnessed especially during the past few years, a rapid development of textile capacity in many countries which formerly imported most or all of their textile products. To some extent the new textile production is for domestic consumption. But there has also been a pronounced shift in the pattern of international trade, and this is nowhere more noticeable than in the case of textile products. These developments will not come to a sudden stop, and it is entirely likely that unless the nations of the free world work together to establish a rational and workable pattern of trade there will be further dislocations. In view of the complexity of the textile problem it is important that all interests which might be affected be kept informed of new developments in the world textile situation. With this in mind the subcommittee recommends:

1. That a permanent interagency committee be established within the Department of Commerce to deal exclusively with textile affairs. This committee will serve the function of keeping both the Congress and the appropriate executive departments informed of all new textile developments and of their probable consequences. It will provide liaison between the industry and Government agencies. It will make a continuing review of the administration of Federal policies which affect the domestic textile industry; it will point out to the appropriate agencies the consequences of these policies, and suggest necessary changes. The Textile Interagency Committee will indicate areas in which there are deficiencies in our knowledge about the textile industry, and it will recommend programs to fill these gaps in our knowledge. It will meet at regular intervals to review conditions in the industry and to suggest appropriate remedial action.

We recommend that the Secretary of Commerce establish this committee to be made up of representatives of the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Labor, State, and Treasury. We recommend that it also include representatives of the International Cooperation Administration; the Office of Civilian Defense Mobilization; and of the Tariff Commission. The Chairman of the Textile Interagency Committee should be the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Domestic Affairs.

In addition to the Textile Interagency Committee, we recommend that there be established an advisory committee to consist of three representatives of management, three representatives of textile labor, and three representatives of the public at large. The advisory committee would also be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce.

In addition we recommend that there be appointed at each session of Congress a Textile Subcommittee within the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to work in close cooperation with the Textile Interagency Committee, and the advisory committee, to see that the administration of Federal policies which impinge upon the domestic textile industry will be in the best interests of the public at large.

2. There is a need for improvement in the collection and publication of statistical data dealing with textile production, sales, inventories, and other matter which affect the production and distribution policies of the domestic textile industry. Throughout the history of the textile industry, production has been highly cyclical. Perhaps fluctuations in production could be smoothed out to some extent if more timely statistical data were available to permit production to be regulated more nearly in accordance with the current state of demand for textile products.

We recommend that a program for the collection and analysis of such needed data be instituted within the Department of Commerce, and that the necessary studies and publication of data be carried out under the supervision of the Textile Interagency Committee.

3. We do not recommend sweeping changes in our foreign trade program. The policy which our Government expects to follow has been spelled out in the recent extension of the Trade Agreements Act. But we urge that Government agencies administering this policy recognize that the problem of declining employment in the domestic textile industry has been aggravated by rising imports and the loss of export markets. We do not suggest that our foreign trade policy has been the only cause of the loss of textile jobs, but we do point out that an industry faced with declining job opportunities feels the impact of rising imports more than an industry which is expanding its output and employment. Thus we recommend that in the administration of our foreign trade program every effort be made to channel imports into those markets which can most easily absorb production from abroad, and that an effort be made to avoid further losses to the domestic textile industry lest we reach the point where our national security would be endangered in the event of a future emergency.

We recognize that tariff adjustments cannot be used to regulate the flow of textile products into this country. Our trade agreements, treaties and commitments are based on a "most favored nation" policy under which like imports are dutiable at the same rate regardless of the country of origin. The wide spread in wage rates and hence costs between European and Far Eastern textile producers make it impossible to set a tariff duty which would be fair and equitable. Therefore we recommend that quotas be established which will permit foreign producers of textile products to sell in our markets within limits which will not further endanger existing textile capacity. We also recommend that quotas be established by specific categories of textile products. Although imports constitute a small fraction of domestic textile production, they have been concentrated in a limited number of categories with damaging consequences for specific segments of the domestic textile industry. The Textile Interagency Committee should assume the responsibility for the determination of such quotas in consultation with representatives of the domestic textile industry, and the Textile Advisory Committee. The guiding principle to be followed is that imports should be regulated so that the distribution of fabrics entering this country is such that no one branch of the domestic textile industry will feel the full impact.

We recognize that it is not a simple matter to establish quotas on imports. We have found it necessary to do so in the case of agricultural products, however. It was recognized that such quotas would be necessary if the agricultural sector of our domestic economy were not to suffer extensive curtailment in the face of domestic overproduction. We find the situation in textile to be very similar. And in view of the defense essentiality of the domestic textile industry we feel that the only answer to the problem is to regulate the flow of foreign textile products into this country. The quotas established need not be fixed for all time. As the population of our Nation increases the demand for textile products will rise, and the growing market for textile products can and should be shared by the domestic textile industry and by the textile industries of nations friendly to the United States. The Textile Interagency Committee would be the appropriate agency to periodically review quota arrangements, and could suggest necessary adjustments as changes in demand conditions occur.

4. We also recommend that the agencies responsible for the administration of our foreign aid program recognize the potential impact upon the domestic textile industry of the expansion of textile capacity abroad. The entire program of providing financial aid for capital expenditures in foreign countries appears to us to require careful review. While it would be contrary to our policy to dictate the form which such aid could take, it appears to us that it would be entirely feasible for the administrators of our foreign aid program to point out to receiving countries the economic consequences of further expansion of textile capacity at a time when the world textile industry appears to be feeling the effects of overcapacity. Some expenditures for textile equipment can and should be made if a country is interested in establishing a textile industry to raise the level of domestic consumption. What we suggest is that careful study be made of the long-run consequences of further expansion of world textile capacity before additional grants be made to other countries to expand their own textile production for the international market. There need be no fear of a lack of other investment outlets. And while the textile industry is attractive to underdeveloped countries because of the large number of jobs created per dollar of investment, there are numerous alternative investment opportunities which would provide new job opportunities and rising income in those countries.

5. We recommend more realistic interpretation of the current peril-point provision of the Trade Agreements Act and faster action on escape-clause cases brought before the Tariff Commission. In the past, various public pronouncements have been made that no domestic industry will be damaged by our program of expanded foreign trade. But segments of the textile industry seeking relief under existing provisions have encountered innumerable delays. Such proceedings can be speeded up so that decisions are rendered within a reasonable time limit.

6. It is evident that the textile industry needs and wishes to have an expanded research program. The dilemma facing the industry has been how to finance the additional research that is needed in the face of dwindling earnings. We recommend that some proportion of custom duties collected on textile products entering the United States be used to finance research—especially basic research designed to find new end uses for textile products, and economic research which would aid the industry in planning its future production program. Some of this research could be conducted by existing Government agencies. But grants could also be made to universities and other research organizations capable of effectively assisting the textile industry. There is a need, for example, for sound projections of the future industrial and consumer demand for textile products; for a well-conceived and carefully executed program of market research, and for an expanded program of basic research to develop new industrial and consumer uses for fibers and fabrics. The Textile Interagency Committee mentioned in our first recommendation could be assigned the responsibility of supervising the program of research activities suggested here.

7. Depreciation rates now contained in Bulletin F of the Internal Revenue Service are obsolete. These rates are based on the assumption that textile machinery is operated on an average of 2,000 hours per year. With three-shift operations, much textile equipment in this country is operated at 6,000 hours per year, and the useful life of such equipment is correspondingly shortened. The current, long-term depreciation rates are hampering investment in an industry which must step up its modernization program if it is to remain viable. We recommend that at the earliest opportunity the Internal Revenue Service publish a revised schedule of depreciation rates taking into account current industry practices which would permit a more rapid writeoff of new equipment for tax purposes.

8. We also recommend careful review of the loss carryforward and carryback provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. As these now stand, they offer inducements to financial speculators to liquidate textile mills which could be operated successfully. We recommend that the Finance Committee carefully study the relevant provisions of the Internal Revenue Code with a view toward revision to protect against further abuses under the loss carryforward and carryback provisions.

9. We recommend immediate elimination of the two-price system on cotton which adds to the competitive disadvantage of the cotton textile industry vis-a-vis foreign producers of cotton textiles who use American grown cotton to manufacture textile products sold in our markets. If it is not feasible to eliminate the two-price system on cotton immediately, we recommend that tariffs on imported cotton products be increased by an amount equal to the difference in cost between foreign produced and domestically produced cotton products resulting from the two-price cotton system. If the two-price system is to be eliminated gradually, as is envisaged under legislation now in effect, we recommend that tariffs be increased immediately to compensate for differences in cost resulting from the two-price cotton system, and that these additions to the tariff be scaled down as the price differential to foreign and domestic purchasers of American cotton is reduced or eliminated.

10. We recommend that the Foreign Assets Control Division of the U.S. Treasury Department review its policy regarding the importation of partly processed textile fibers such as scoured or dehaired cashmere, silk fibers or similar partly processed textile products.

Our present policy appears discriminatory and contradictory. It permits the importing of finished products manufactured in Western European countries from raw materials which originate in countries with which we do not now maintain normal trading relationships, but denies American manufacturers access to partly processed fibers of the same raw materials, from the same Western European countries, at the cost of jobs for American workers.

(At this point, Mr. HOLLINGS assumed the chair.)

Mr. PASTORE. A Cabinet Committee headed by the Secretary of Commerce was created on February 16 and a textile program was announced on May 2. I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point the textile program issued by President Kennedy in a release dated May 2, 1961.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE,
PRESS SECRETARY,
The White House, May 2, 1961.

The President today announced a program of assistance to the United States textile industry, designed to meet a wide range of the problems it faces as a result of rapid technological change, shifts in consumer preference, and increasing international competition. The program was developed by the Cabinet Committee, headed by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, which was formed by the President on February 16, 1961.

In announcing the program, the President said:

"The problems of the textile industry are serious and deeprooted. They have been the subject of investigation at least as far back as 1935, when a Cabinet committee was appointed by President Roosevelt to investigate the conditions in this industry. Most recently these problems were the subject of a special study by the Interdepartmental Committee headed by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges. I believe it is time for action.

"It is our second largest employer. Some 2 million workers are directly affected by conditions in the industry. There are another 2 million persons employed in furnishing requirements of the industry at its present level of production. Two years ago, the Office of Defense Mobilization testified that it was one of the industries essential to our national security. It is of vital importance in peacetime and it has a direct effect upon our total economy. All the studies have shown that unemployment in textile mills strikes hardest at those communities suffering most from depressed conditions.

"I propose to initiate the following measures:

"First, I have directed the Department of Commerce to launch an expanded program of research, covering new products, processes and markets. This should be done in cooperation with both union and management groups.

"Second, I have asked the Treasury Department to review existing depreciation allowances on textile machinery. Revision of these allowances, together with adoption of the investment incentive credit proposals contained in my message to the Congress of April 20, 1961, should assist in the modernization of the industry.

"Third, I have directed the Small Business Administration to assist the cotton textile industry to obtain the necessary financing for modernization of its equipment.

"Fourth, I have directed the Department of Agriculture to explore and make recommendations to eliminate or offset the cost

> to United States mills of the adverse differential in raw cotton costs between domestic and foreign textile producers.
>
> "*Fifth*, I will shortly send to the Congress a proposal to permit industries seriously injured or threatened with serious injury as a result of increased imports to be eligible for assistance from the Federal Government.
>
> "*Sixth*, I have directed the Department of State to arrange for calling an early conference of the principal textile exporting and importing countries. This conference will seek an international understanding which will provide a basis for trade that will avoid undue disruption of established industries.
>
> "*Seventh*, in addition to this program, an application by the textile industry for action under existing statutes, such as the escape clause or the national security provision of the Trade Agreements Extention Act, will be carefully considered on its merits.
>
> "I believe this program will assist our textile industry to meet its basic problems, while at the same time recognizing the national interest in expansion of world trade and the successful development of less developed nations. It takes into account the dispersion of the industry, the range of its products, and its highly competitive character. It is my hope that these measures will strengthen the industry and expand consumption of its products without disrupting international trade and without disruption of the markets of any country."

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, an essential part of the program was a plan for a conference of the principal textile exporting and importing countries to reach an international understanding on trade in textiles which would avoid undue disruption of established industries.

The program was comprehensive in its scope, covering all textiles and textile products regardless of fiber or export source. This was because our experience since 1956 had proven that a piecemeal approach would not do. Partial remedies only increased the import pressure in those areas which were not covered. Responsible conduct such as that of the Japanese in 1957 in limiting exports of cotton textiles only increased the opportunities for other countries to enlarge their markets in this country.

The program also included faster depreciation allowances on textile machinery which was carried out promptly. Another point was to eliminate the inequitable two-price cotton system. This was finally accomplished by the Congress in 1964. The President created a structure within the Government to keep in contact and communication with textile labor and management and to carry out the remedies proposed in the program.

I wish to say parenthetically at this point that in the Senate were some skeptics who thought that the industry was looking for a handout on the elimination of the two-price cotton system. That was never the case. As a matter of fact, it was the textile industry that endorsed the program to pay whatever subsidy was to be paid to the producers of cotton, and the industry then would have no part of it. But it was so decided by Congress, and they abided by it.

Through my sincere talks with the members of the industry, I found that they were never happy with the fact that the payment was being made to them. So they were happy when finally it was resolved by Congress to give it to the producer. The textile industry has never looked for a handout. All it wants is equity and justice.

ACTION—COTTON

On the vital matter of import control, action began immediately. There was concluded in the summer of 1961 a 1-year global arrangement on trade in cotton textiles.

This proves the point that only when there is determined action will results be forthcoming.

Initially, some 19 nations participated. This was followed by a 5-year long-term arrangement, commonly called the LTA, which expires on September 30 of this year. Thirty nations now participate. Negotiations for a renewal of the LTA for 3 to 5 years are in progress now. Both the short-term and the long-term arrangements gave to the United States and other importing nations the freedom to control imports of all cotton textile products on a category and country basis. The short-term arrangement was intended to hold imports at the then current levels, and the long-term arrangement which took effect on October 1, 1962, permitted a growth of 5 percent per year.

There was no capriciousness; there was no arbitrary motive on the part of the industry. They took into account that there would be a growth, and they made the allowance of 5 percent per year to take care of that growth.

Except for the first year—STA—when there were many unforeseen administrative problems, the arrangement worked fairly well during 1963 and 1964. Thereafter the administration of the arrangement became looser and I daresay somewhat careless and imports of cotton textiles rose by 24 percent in 1965 and by a whopping 39 percent additional in 1966.

The STA base for cotton textiles was 813 million square yards, but for the fourth LTA year ending September 30, 1966, imports had grown to 1.7 billion square yards equivalent. During the first 3 months of this final LTA year, imports have already risen by an additional 29 percent compared with the same period in 1965.

The ratio of imports to domestic consumption of cotton goods was 5 percent in the base period. In 1966 this ratio rose to 10 percent.

WOOL AND SYNTHETICS

The cotton textile arrangement was intended as the first step in carrying out an all-fiber control program which would cover wool and synthetic textiles. There was a reason for this. Imports of wool and synthetic textiles to this country came chiefly from industrialized countries of Europe and from Japan, whereas the sources of cotton textiles were much more widespread. Members of this body and of the House, as well as industry and labor, were given repeated assurances by both the Kennedy and Johnson administrations that the program would be carried out for wool and manmade fiber textiles. The search for a multilateral agreement covering wool textile trade was pursued by a mission to Europe in May 1964 and another one was held in Europe in July 1964, and by a third mission to Japan in June 1965. On every occasion, U.S. representatives were met by adamant refusals by those Governments to even sit down together and discuss a solution. I can well understand that. Who wants to kill the goose that laid the golden egg? Meanwhile, these exporters increased their share of the U.S. wool textile market from 8 percent in 1956 to 24 percent in 1966. In other words, these exporters had increased their share of the U.S. market threefold since the first attempts to stop them were made.

This does not tell the full story, however. There are even heavier concentrations in worsted cloth and in knit goods. In woolens the domestic industry is continually plagued by evasion of tariffs through technical loopholes. The Congress has closed several such loopholes, and it is hoped that legislation will be adopted soon which will bring a halt to these tactics once and for all.

I wish to say at this point I was hoping the State Department would lose some of its enthusiasm in insisting and persisting in its attempt to not eliminate these loopholes. We have had enough along that line. As a matter of fact, until a short while ago they would import woolen textiles into the Virgin Islands because the tariff was lower, make them waterproof. Nobody there wanted that anyway so they would add waterproofing there to get the lower tariff, and when they got to the United States they wash the waterproofing off. When we discussed this with the Federal Trade Commission, they recognized that there was a loophole but they suggested that we should live with it. I believe that the time has come when we should stop being Santa Claus.

Other harassments include mislabeling of imports due to our failure to enforce the Wool Products Labeling Act on imports. I wish to tell Senators about this. There is a difference between a long fiber and a short fiber. A short fiber is cheaper. It can be derived from discarded rags and cloth. However, in the United States, in order to protect the consumer, the material must be labeled. The only way it can be detected is by going into the factory to make sure that they are living up to the requirements of the law.

What is done in other parts of the world with respect to mislabeling? The only way to detect it is by going into their factories and you do not think they are going to let us go in and inspect. In the long run, this is cheating the American consumer. Here is another place where I think we should exert a little more pressure and a little more influence on the Federal Trade Commission to make sure that we do not make cheaters out of our friends who are the exporters.

It is my fervent hope and expectation that the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, Mr. Paul Rand Dixon, and other members of the Commission will not be swayed by the pressures of foreign governments which seek to let their exporters of wool products continue to disregard our labeling laws and deceive American consumers.

If that is going to continue I say that we should repeal our own labeling law.

If we cannot enforce them in toto for the benefit of all consumers then, I say, a haphazard job should be eliminated completely.

The most startling increase in recent years has been in imports of manmade fiber textiles. From 151 million square yards in 1961, they have grown to almost 800 million square yards in 1966, an increase of 428 percent. The increase was not 20 or 50 percent, but 428 percent. An increase of 428 percent in a period of 5 years. Currently these imports are a relatively higher proportion of the domestic market than was the case with cotton imports in 1961 when action was taken. The most rapid increase had been in the last 2 years. Imports in 1965 were 73 percent above 1964, and 1966 was another 41 percent above 1965.

Additionally there has been a major increase in the imports of manmade fibers themselves—158 percent from 1962 to 1966. It is apparent that exporters are taking advantage of free access to our market in this area and if it continues will lead to disastrous results.

The major problem of unrestrained imports continues. We now accept the fact that the industrialized countries of Europe and Japan, as well as Hong Kong, will not voluntarily agree to restrain their exports of wool and synthetic textiles to us. It is an economic and political fact of life that they will continue this practice unless our Government does something about it. They can hardly be blamed for not wanting to shut off such a lucrative source of dollars and profits.

This is one thing that galls me no end. We talk to our friends abroad about limiting their exports to us and entering into an agreement with us. They challenge us each time we make this statement. They refuse to do so, and yet, these very same countries control and limit their own imports of the very same merchandise.

We only ask that they treat us the same as they treat themselves. All that I am asking the State Department and the White House to do is to give us the same treatment they take unto themselves.

INDUSTRY RESPONSE

I must here note how the U.S. industry responded to the international arrangements on cotton textiles, to the promises of action on other textiles, to the more rapid depreciation allowances, to the prospect—and later the reality—of one-price cotton and lastly, to the cooperation and understanding which was offered by Government to labor and management of the textile industry.

Beginning in 1962 confidence in the industry revived. Investment in new equipment, technology, promotion, and research grew. The industry investment provided new jobs, better jobs, and better products.

So much so that President Johnson took note of it in October of 1964 when, speaking of the administration's textile program in Georgia, he said—and I wish to emphasize this for my distinguished friend from Georgia because that is where it was said:

> The result has been increasing confidence and well being for the industry and its workers.

Continuing, he said:

> We must now focus on the remaining weak spots, and implement the rest of our Program.

That is all we are pleading here today. We want the program implemented as it has been promised under three administrations.

After referring to keeping cotton textile imports from disrupting the market and the need to restore the wool textile industry to good health, he concluded:

> I am convinced that our Program for Textiles is in the best interests of all America. I intend to pursue it to a successful conclusion.

That is all we ask. The month before in my own State at Providence, President Johnson said:

> The administration has made and will continue to make various efforts to solve this problem. Wool textile and apparel imports must be kept at reasonable levels. For it is essential that the wool textile industry be restored to good health.

Mr. President, not maintained, but "restored to good health." There are some who will point to the improved profit position of the textile industry in recent years. I should like to direct my remarks to this topic. There is every reason why textile profits should be adeadequate. The industry is vital to our national defense. Indeed it was declared that textiles are second only to steel as a defense essential industry. In peace and war President Kennedy noted that "textiles are our second largest employer" and as President Johnson has said:

> The textile industry plays a vital role in the health of the economy.

We know that between 1950 and 1960 the industry was sick and as President Johnson said:

> The result was not only a stricken industry, but damage to the economic health of the entire Nation.

From this sad situation in the early sixties, the textile industry has improved. We are proud of this. I only hope that the recent downturn in the industry can be arrested and that textile program will be carried out effectively.

The argument has always been, "You may suffer a little bit in cotton but you are doing all right in synthetics. You may be suffering in woolens but you are doing all right in cotton." That argument does not hold water any more. The fact is that the trend is downward in all sectors of the textile industry and this can be documented easily.

We should realize, however, that when we talk of improvement in the textile industry, we are moving from a low base when the industry was sick to a very modest position among America's major industries. The latest industrywide figures available covering the first three quarters of 1966 show that profits after taxes in textile mill products rank 17th out of the 20 major U.S. industries. As a percent of stockholders' equity, textiles are at the bottom—No. 20. In the case of the apparel industry, profits as a percent of sales hold the unenviable position of No. 20. On the basis of stockholders' equity, apparel ranks No. 11 out of America's 20 major industries.

If an industry is to grow, to invest in development and promotion, and to attract capital funds, it must, of course, have adequate earnings. Without sufficient return, capital will leave the industry and some of it at least will find its way to those countries where low wages and low standards make textile production cheaper.

I am not overly concerned about the welfare of owners of capital. Dollars and gold are fluid and will find areas for adequate return. I am interested in the hundreds of thousands of men and women who will lose their jobs and who at middle age or later find that their skills are useless. They then face the prospect of poorer jobs or retraining for jobs that may or may not be available.

During the past 3 years when profits improved, wages have been increased three times. In some mills agreements already exist for wage increases this spring and again in 1968. Wage levels in textiles and apparel, however, are modest compared with other American industries and I hope that Government actions will be such that the industry can earn profits and continue to raise wages.

A CHANGED SITUATION

Times change and we must go forward to meet each challenge. I realize as all of you do that we must move forward with a full understanding of our obligations to the world in which we live, but also to the people whom we serve.

I have become concerned about the situation which confronts us and with those in Government who fail to comprehend the importance of the program initiated by President Kennedy and carried on by President Johnson.

In plain words there has been an unprecedented growth in imports of textiles into the United States from all parts of the world.

The growing production in Japan, Hong Kong, and other areas in the Far East, in numerous locations in Europe such as Portugal and Italy, and in South America, seeks an outlet and concentrates on the U.S. market. Europe accepts textile imports from the Far East in a very limited way. The result is a chaotic situation as these worldwide sources compete in the U.S. market, disrupting our domestic industry as well as each other.

The proliferation of import sources began first in cotton textiles and in the last 2 years has developed in blends and synthetic textiles. The wool textile situation has been bad for many years. It had its origin in Japan, Italy, and Britain and more recently we see Hong Kong, Korea, and a number of other countries moving into a situation which is already critical.

RISING IMPORTS

The pattern of rising imports since 1961 and particularly in the last 2 years speaks more plainly than rhetoric. It tells the story of what is happening. The facts are these:

U.S. imports of textile manufacturers

[In millions of square yards equivalent]

	Cotton	Manmade fiber	Wool	Total
1961	720	151	93	964
1962	1,165	213	165	1,543
1963	1,101	221	172	1,494
1964	1,057	328	138	1,523
1965	1,312	566	205	2,083
1966	1,823	798	190	2,811

In round numbers imports of cotton, wool, and synthetic textiles have risen from less than 1 billion square yards in 1961 to almost 3 billion in 1966—three times as much. The dollar value was over $1 billion last year.

The imports of cotton, synthetic, and wool textiles in the table above are all on a calendar year basis. In the case of wool textiles, imports rose 125 percent between 1961 and 1966, and now account for about one-fourth of all the wool products consumed in this country. Manmade fiber textile imports grew by 428 percent and in 1966 reached an estimated 798 million square yards equivalent. The synthetic textile industry, being smaller than the cotton textile industry, these imports are a relatively higher proportion of the market than cotton textile imports were when the cotton arrangement was negotiated in 1961. You will note that the very rapid increase in synthetic textile imports began in 1964, then increased another 73 percent in 1965 and 41 percent more in 1966. These imports more than doubled between 1964 and 1966 and there is nothing to indicate that this trend will stop, and in the same period imports of manmade fibers themselves increased by 35 percent.

In the case of cotton textiles 1961 imports amounted to 720 million square yards, rose in 1962 to 1.1 billion and held fairly steady under the long-term arrangement at about this figure through 1964. Then in 1965 imports jumped 24 percent and in 1966 by another 39 percent.

Cotton textile imports should also be viewed from the point of view of the long-term arrangement years which are October 1 to September 30:

U.S. cotton textile imports

Long-term arrangement years [millions of square yards]:	
1st, 1962–63	1,122.6
2d, 1963–64	1,035.2
3d, 1964–65	1,232.4
4th, 1965–66	1,724.4
Percent change, 4th LTA from—	
1st	+53.6
2d	+66.6
3d	+39.9

In the first 3 months, October through December 1966, of the fifth LTA year, imports were 29 percent higher than the same period a year ago.

The dollar figures for the last 4 years by fiber are as follows:

U.S. imports of textile manufacturers

[In millions of dollars]

	Cotton	Manmade fiber	Wool	Total
1963	299	82	265	646
1964	308	120	260	687
1965	369	183	330	880
1966	463	243	328	1,034

TRADE DEFICIT

Putting aside for a minute the impact of these rising imports on the jobs of over 2 million American workers in textiles and apparel and the 2 million additional who produce fibers—a matter to which I shall return—we should look at the critical matter of balance of trade and balance of payments.

The ability of the U.S. textile industry to supply the domestic market is unchallenged. Yet in 1966, it is estimated that our total textile and textile product imports exceeded our exports of such products by $902 million. This deficit in our textile trade should be viewed in the light of our Nation's entire payments deficit of 1.4 billion last year. There may be products which we need in this country and which we cannot produce and, therefore, must import. Cotton and manmade fibers, all textiles and apparel are certainly not in this category. The more textiles we import, the more serious the situation becomes. The more of our textile industry that is phased out, the more permanent this becomes. As the President has pointed out, the balance of trade is a problem which involves all of us and a challenge to which we must all respond in full measure. Our net outflow of dollars has averaged close to 2.5 billion annually for many years and our gold stocks have dropped. We are engaged in trimming governmental expenditures abroad where possible. We have asked business and financial institutions to limit the use of U.S. funds for expansion abroad. We try to increase our exports yet our imports in total have been rising faster than our exports. Between 1964 and 1966, the annual overall U.S. trade surplus has dropped from nearly $6.7 billion to about $3.7 billion this year.

Textiles is a dramatic example of the challenge in trade. In 1947 we enjoyed a textile trade surplus of over $1 billion. By 1958 it had turned to a deficit of $165 million. In 1966 our total textile imports reached $1,453 million while our exports dropped to $551 million—a deficit of $902 million.

I could give you examples of dramatic changes in particular textile products or in trade with particular countries. The textile trade deficit is of such magnitude, equal to 63 percent of our payments deficit, that it cannot be disregarded. I realize that this is a complicated field and that we also sell quantities of agricultural and industrial products to many of these countries, but we cannot overlook the fact that we are moving in the wrong direction in textiles.

DEVELOPING AREAS

There are those who say that other countries have a natural advantage in the production of textiles and apparel because they can make them cheaper. This means that they have large numbers of people who must work at wages which would be considered intolerable in this country. Are we then to import these low standards? This poverty? Are we to tell the millions of workers in this country that they must accept unemployment? I suggest that such a policy is neither reasonable nor responsible.

We are all humanitarians. We desire to help the people of the underdeveloped and the developing nations. We are also moved by a desire to have these countries aline themselves with a free and prosperous world. I share these motives and aims.

But we should note to what extent our textile imports are contributing to the development of these emerging nations. As I have pointed out, wool textile imports come principally from industrialized countries, including Japan and Hong Kong.

In 1966, 90 percent—measured in dollars—came from these sources. In synthetic textiles, almost 90 percent comes from industrialized countries. In cotton goods, Japan and Hong Kong alone account for 42 percent and other industrialized countries bring this to over 50 percent.

These figures indicate that this trade is not being used for the purpose so often alleged of helping developing countries.

I wonder if a desire merely for volume of trade regardless of source is not the real motivation. Surely the developing countries, whose neutrality and independence we seek to encourage, can be helped without causing displacement, despair, and disruption at home. I refuse to accept the premise that the price for encouraging independence and industry in less developed areas in the world is the destruction of jobs and opportunity at home. The importing of poverty and the weakening of our own industry cannot be advantageous to either ourselves or the world. The reasonableness of our policies and our actions is vital to the security of the world. Our responsibilities to people of the world cannot be discharged by a lack of responsibility and reasonableness at home. We have enough crises at home and abroad without creating more. We can move ahead in decency and in dignity to reconcile our best interests with those who need our help, but this is not done by phasing out and destroying one of our own basic industries and reneging on our responsibilities to those we serve.

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

You may say that we are a strong and wealthy country, that we will respond by creating other and more sophisticated industries; and that we do not need to produce our own fibers, textiles, or apparel.

May I suggest, however, that before we adopt such a view, we take a hard look at ourselves.

Let me give one example. I have here a map of the eastern half of the United States in which the counties of Appalachia are shown in various colors.

The area covered by the four colors on the map constitutes the entire Appalachia region. The colors show the relative concentration of textile employment in each county as a percentage of the total manufacturing jobs. Textile employment means jobs in textile, apparel, and manmade fiber producing plants. In the counties colored in red, 75 percent or more of all the manufacturing jobs are in textiles. As you can see, they are significant in number and account for at least three out of four jobs in these counties in Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Virginia, Tennessee, North and South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama.

In the counties colored blue, which number about the same as those in red, textile employment accounts for between 50 and 75 percent of manufacturing jobs. Those colored in green have 12 to 50 percent in textiles and the yellow or tan colored area shows countries where there is some textile employment but not in excess of 12 percent.

In total there are 453,000 textile-apparel jobs in Appalachia and account for 26 percent of its manufacturing employment. If the counties in New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio are excluded, we find that 41 percent of all manufacturing jobs are directly in textiles. Not included are those related employment opportunities in service industries and other activities which depend upon the existence of the textile, apparel, and manmade fiber producing industries. For every textile job there is usually another job supplementary to it.

The importance of the textile import problem can be seen dramatically in this area of our country where we seek to encourage industrial development. This vast area of Appalachia stretching from New York to Alabama covers 180,000 square miles where over 18 million people live. The land mass of Japan, Taiwan, and Hong Kong could be put into Appalachia with room to spare.

The problems of Appalachia are known to you. They include poverty, illiteracy, underdeveloped economic opportunities, and chronic and persistent unemployment. The United States is determined to find a solution to these problems, not only in Appalachia, but wherever they exist. The President's advisers have estimated the budget for poverty for the next fiscal year at $25.6 billion, up 16 percent from the current fiscal year. The budget for total assistance for major education programs for the next year is $4.5 billion, for manpower training $1.1 billion, and for area and regional economic development $324 million.

Returning to the Appalachia story, we find that in the counties contiguous to and bordering on Appalachia, which number 118, there are 89 counties with 236,000 textile and apparel jobs or 31 percent of the manufacturing employment. It requires no stretch of the imagination to realize that employment across the county line for the people of Appalachia is equally important.

But if we take a line 50 miles outside the perimeter of Appalachia, we find there are an additional 377,000 textile-apparel jobs. In short, there are 1,063,180 textile jobs in Appalachia and within 50 miles of it.

This accounts for nearly one-half of textile, apparel, and manmade fiber employment in the country. It is 25 percent of total manufacturing employment in the area.

One-half of all the jobs in the manmade fiber producing industry are in Appalachia. This is the sector of the textile industry which has made such progress in developing and promoting new fibers. It is also that sector of the industry that is currently feeling the impact of imports of fibers and of textiles and apparel made of synthetic fibers, which have increased so sharply in the last 2 years. This is the sector of the textile industry which has led the world in fiber and textile development.

I hardly need draw the obvious conclusion that textiles are vital to Appalachia with a million jobs in the region and nearby counties. On the basis of a conservative labor turnover of 4.5 percent, there are 45,000 job opportunities every year.

If, as some believe, the cost of our international commitments requires frugality in our war against poverty, then it is all the more essential that we pursue policies which maintain jobs.

Textiles led the way in the industrial revolution. There are many who feel that it is an industry particularly well fitted for developing countries and areas. The textile industry of the United States today is, of course, vastly different than it was even a generation ago. It is much more capital-intensive, much more research and promotion-minded, and much more sophisticated. Nevertheless, it and the apparel industry employ large numbers of men and women. The large number of processes in a textile mill make it possible for people to enter the industry with relatively little training and then train on the job for promotions. It usually takes 6 weeks for the fiber to be turned into a fabric and even the smallest mill probably has well over 100 different job titles.

Textile mills like to train their own employees. The industry gladly makes a substantial investment to train the workers it seeks—and starts them on the promotion ladder.

Millions of dollars in the aggregate are spent in developing the skills possessed by men and women by the time they have reached middle age in the textile industry. It does not seem human to sacrifice those jobs through an illogical textile import policy.

It does not make sense to have to spend additional millions of dollars to retrain those middle-aged men and women—to make them turn their backs on the textile and apparel skills they have acquired and try to fit them for other jobs.

These are probably nonexistent jobs for men and women of their age and attainments.

Our import policies should seek the expansion of American industry not its retraction.

Is it more important to make a job for a Japanese or a Pakistani than to save the job of an American citizen?

That is not jingoism—that is just every day commonsense.

We have neighbors close at home to love, too.

Furthermore, this map does not show that in the Appalachia region there are thousands of workers engaged in the producing, harvesting, ginning, and bailing of cotton fibers. In the States which make up Appalachia there are over 200,000 cotton farms.

But Appalachia, big and significant as it is, is only an example. Outside of Appalachia we know that there are large areas of our country where per capita money income is less than $1,000 a year and where people need productive jobs.

In New England we have a relatively high per capita income and we are proud of it.

We have learned that poverty is usually hidden. As the affluent society spreads and becomes more prosperous; as superhighways and high-rise apartments increase, we tend in both urban and rural areas to push the poor into narrower limits where we cannot see them. As Americans speed by on six-lane, limited access highways, they seldom see these areas of poverty.

Mr. President, even in New England we find that there are a substantial number of households where the total income for all members of the household is less than $2,500 per year. This is the equivalent of one member working a 40-hour week for 50 weeks at $1.25 per hour. In Connecticut about 11 percent of the households have less than $2,500 income annually. In Massachusetts 13 percent; in Maine and Rhode Island 18 percent; in New Hampshire 16 percent; and in Vermont almost 20 percent of the households are so situated.

In New England we cannot afford to lose the 200,000 textile and apparel jobs which we have. We want to see the low income households transformed into families with rising incomes and expectations.

In short, neither Appalachia nor New England; New York with its thousands of garment plants, South Carolina nor California are unique.

I have here another map of the United States which shows the extent of the textile and apparel industries throughout the country.

This map pictures U.S. textile manufacturing employment. Like the Appalachia map, it includes textile mills, apparel plants, and manmade fiber producing plants; and like the Appalachia map, also, the textile and apparel employment is as reported by the U.S. Government for 1964, while the manmade fiber plant employment is as estimated by will-informed representatives of that industry for the year 1966.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point tables showing employment in textiles by States.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. textile manufacturing employment

State	Textile mill products, 1964	Apparel and related products, 1964	Manmade fibers, plants, estimate, 1966	Total
Alabama	36,038	32,015	5,204	73,257
Alaska				
Arizona		3,036		3,036
Arkansas	2,229	10,407		12,762
California	7,786	64,752		73,263

U.S. textile manufacturing employment—Continued

State	Textile mill products, 1964	Apparel and related products, 1964	Manmade fibers, plants, estimate, 1966	Total
Colorado	112	1,659		1,771
Connecticut	12,690	15,793		28,768
Delaware	1,924	3,189	4,000	9,113
Florida	1,269	12,330	6,728	20,327
Georgia	94,380	55,453	1,749	151,582
Hawaii		2,149		2,149
Idaho		23		.023
Illinois	6,868	38,721		45,589
Indiana	1,035	13,395		14,430
Iowa	257	2,910	100	3,267
Kansas		3,640		3,640
Kentucky	2,751	21,041		23,792
Louisiana	331	5,815		6,146
Maine	11,496	3,278		14,774
Maryland	2,636	23,273	3,205	29,114
Massachusetts	39,141	57,212	300	96,653
Michigan	2,939	16,964	200	20,103
Minnesota	2,496	7,458		9,954
Mississippi	6,285	30,651		36,936
Missouri	2,796	33,313		36,109
Montana				
Nebraska	180	1,582		1,762
Nevada				
New Hampshire	10,020	2,125		12,145
New Jersey	25,334	74,124	600	100,058
New Mexico		145		145
New York	50,891	308,563	600	360,054
North Carolina	219,336	49,231	10,630	279,197
North Dakota				
Ohio	8,215	19,440	3,000	30,655
Oklahoma	319	5,182		5,501
Oregon	2,261	2,660		4,921
Pennsylvania	66,125	174,142	5,691	245,958
Rhode Island	21,577	3,947	200	25,724
South Carolina	132,745	36,429	11,002	180,176
South Dakota				
Tennessee	32,475	54,954	24,550	111,979
Texas	6,388	41,904		48,292
Utah		1,915		1,915
Vermont	673	1,261	300	2,234
Virginia	36,119	27,837	21,709	85,665
Washington	639	3,912		4,551
West Virginia	1,358	4,560	3,224	9,142
Wisconsin	7,158	7,044		14,202
Wyoming				
Total, United States	857,328	1,279,624	102,492	2,239,944
Puerto Rico	5,121	28,092		33,213

Sources: "County Business Patterns," Bureau of the Census, March 1964; U.S. Industry Data.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, this is the data upon which this map is made. I ask unanimous consent to include a table showing for selected States the percentage of textile employment to total employment based on the data of this map.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Textile employment compared to total manufacturing employment for selected States

	Total manufacturing employment (thousands)	Total of textile, apparel, and manmade employment	Percent textile employment of total manufacturing
NEW ENGLAND			
Connecticut	421.0	28,768	7
Maine	104.0	14,774	14
Massachusetts	649.9	96,653	15
New Hampshire	85.6	12,145	14
New York	1,794.8	360,054	20
Rhode Island	116.0	25,724	22
Vermont	34.7	2,234	6
SOUTHEAST			
Alabama	257.1	73,257	29
Delaware	61.6	9,113	15
Florida	237.1	20,327	9
Georgia	377.9	151,582	40
Kentucky	192.2	23,792	12
Maryland	257.4	29,114	11
Mississippi	140.1	36,936	26
New Jersey	806.2	100,058	12
North Carolina	562.3	279,197	50
Pennsylvania	1,429.3	245,958	17
South Carolina	277.9	180,176	65
Tennessee	362.2	11,979	22
Virginia	308.6	85,665	28
West Virginia	126.2	9,142	7
California	1,389.1	73,263	5
Texas	542.5	48,292	9

Sources: "County Business Patterns," Bureau of the Census, March 1964; U.S. Industry Data; and "Employment and Earnings Statistics for States and Areas," U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. PASTORE. The 1966 employment data shows that the largest concentration of textile employment is in New York State with 353,000 jobs or 18.7 percent of total manufacturing employment. Next comes North Carolina with 323,000 jobs and a whopping 52 percent of employment. Pennsylvania ranks third with 256,000 jobs or 16.6 percent of manufacturing employment.

In my own State of Rhode Island close to 22 percent of the manufacturing jobs are in textiles with 27,000 workers. Massachusetts has 96,000 workers or 14 percent; Maine 16,000 workers or 14.5 percent; New Hampshire 13,000 workers and 13 percent of all manufacturing employment.

I am sure that the gentlemen from South Carolina are conscious of their 200,000 textile jobs, almost two out of every three manufacturing jobs in that State. I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point a table showing the 1966 employment in 16 selected States from Maine to Alabama.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Textile, apparel, and manmade fiber employment in selected States and percent of total manufacturing employment in these States, 1966

	Textile, apparel, and manmade fiber employment	Percent of total manufacturing employment
Alabama	83,200	29.0
California	74,700	5.3
Connecticut	31,600	6.8
Georgia	174,300	41.4
Maine	16,200	14.5
Massachusetts	96,500	13.9
New Hampshire	12,900	13.5
New Jersey	105,800	12.4
New York	353,200	18.7
North Carolina	323,000	52.3
Pennsylvania	255,900	16.6
Rhode Island	27,400	21.6
South Carolina	199,300	64.0
Tennessee	125,400	29.8
Vermont	2,300	5.3
Virginia	95,600	28.3

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, in cooperation with State employment agencies.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, not included on this map are the 243,000 sheep ranches. Practically all of the wool produced on them is used in American mills. Nor does this map show the 500,000 cotton farms. Without the domestic consumption of 9.5 million bales out of annual crop of 11–15 million bales, there would be little hope for them.

I have been speaking of the threat to my own State of Rhode Island. The general assembly of my State has expressed this in a formal resolution the language of which is to the point, and I ask that it be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

WHY INJURY?

Mr. PASTORE. Now there are those who will remark that what I have been saying is all well and good but there is no need to get excited because neither the textile industry nor the apparel industry nor the fiber industry has been injured by imports. They will say why should our Government undertake to place limits on imports which have not caused any injury.

Part of the answer is that they are not up to date on what has been happening in recent months. In spite of a strong and prosperous national economy and in spite of the demands and inflationary pressures brought about by the Vietnam war, activity in the textile industry began to turn down as early as last summer.

Several important economic indicators show a definite weakening in the textile industry. The Federal Reserve Board seasonally adjusted index of industrial production for textiles peaked in June 1966, while the overall manufacturing index continued to rise. Sharply lower profit figures have been published for several of the largest textile companies including the biggest, Burlington Industries, which reported earnings down for last quarter 1966 by 18 percent. Deering Milliken has reported a 600-man cutback in key areas.

The industry, according to the latest McGraw-Hill capital expenditures survey, will reduce its capital spending in 1967 by 19 percent, far more sharply than any other major industry.

A similar survey by McGraw-Hill on corporate pretax profits shows that whereas such profits for all corporations will increase by 4 percent in 1967 over 1966, the textile industry will show a decline of 6 percent in profits. Next to the iron and steel industry, this is the largest profit decline forecast for any American industry. Textiles share the unenviable role with the iron and steel and auto industries of being the only industries which are expected to show a decline in profits in 1967 from the 1966 levels.

The Wall Street Journal of February 20, 1967, shows that fourth quarter 1966 profits of 478 companies gained an average of 4.2 percent over the like quarter of 1965. The Journal lists 25 industries comparing earnings for the two periods and the percentage changes. Textile earnings are down 19.4 percent, lower than any others except building materials. In fact, 19 industries show increases. Except for aircraft, building materials, chemicals, and textiles, the decreases are modest.

Textile prices hit a 5-year low with the wholesale index at 97.4, the lowest since August 1961. Seasonally adjusted average hours worked in the textile industry trended down all during 1966. Many mills are on short time or curtailed.

Wool consumption in the woolen and worsted mills was 19 percent lower in the last quarter in 1966 compared to the last quarter of 1965.

In the synthetic sector production of manmade fiber broad-woven grey goods dropped sharply from 3 billion linear in the fourth quarter 1965 to 836 million in the fourth quarter 1966 or 6 percent. Mill owned inventories rose from 718 million in the fourth quarter 1965 to 882 million in the fourth quarter 1966, an increase of 23 percent. Unfilled orders dropped sharply from 30 billion linear yards to 2.4 billion. Man-hours worked in this segment of the industry also fell off sharply in the fourth quarter of 1966 compared to the fourth quarter of 1965.

There is, however, something wrong with the concept of injury before Government action is taken. The old idea is that after an industry has suffered liquidation, unemployment and loss of jobs, it is sufficiently "injured" so that the management of the now defunct plant or the union representing the displaced workers may begin the long process of petitioning the Tariff Commission to raise tariffs against products which neither the management nor the workers will ever produce again. It is a "closing the stable door after the horse is stolen" approach.

Many of us and particularly those of us from New England went through this long period of attrition during the 1950's when a series of Government policies seemed designed to phase out the industry.

We have bitter memories of mills closed—jobs lost—homes impoverished. Our hard hit economy sought remedies that proved too little and came too late.

We do not want to go through that again.

We do not need to go through that again.

We have the measures and the means to prevent all this.

We must have the mind to put these means to work—and keep our people at work.

It is precisely because we have had this experience in the textile industry that we are acutely aware of the situation today. Hardships which already exist will become more widespread. It is precisely because of this that those of us who wish to see the national economy strong and moving ahead, wish to prevent a repetition of the mistakes which have been made in the past.

It is because of this that all those who have a responsibility to the 4 million people engaged in the industry feel that the time for action is now. We are not satisfied merely to preserve the jobs of those currently employed until such time as they die. We have the challenge of providing jobs and a growing number of jobs for those who each year enter the labor market. We have a responsibility to those communities, States, and areas where the industry is located.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Since 1961 the Federal Government has had a textile policy and program.

The very existence of the program and its implementation in part has resulted in a revival of the industry, a revival in confidence and an increase in investment and job security.

The prosperity of the past 2 years coupled with the pressures of the war in Vietnam have confused the real picture. Import growth is undermining all that has been accomplished and is jeopardizing the jobs of 4 million people engaged in the fiber-textile-apparel industries.

A program which was intended to control imports has resulted in a threefold increase in imports. The program has been carried out only in the limited area of cotton textiles and in the last 2 years even this has gotten out of control.

Nothing has been done about the badly disrupted wool textile situation or about the rapidly deteriorating situation for manmade fibers and manmade fiber textiles.

The U.S. trade deficit in textile manufacturers reached $902 million in 1966.

The hour of decision is at hand. Delay must give way to determination. Earnest implementation of our textile program must replace inaction—and indecision.

There can be no halfway—half-hearted handling of the crisis. It will take industrywide action by our Government—or there will be no solution of our textile import problem.

There must be control of textile and apparel imports of all fibers.

In the case of cotton goods this control can be effected by the extension and proper administration of the long-term arrangement.

In the case of wool and synthetic textiles this can be done by international agreement and careful administration by the United States.

If this fails—as it has failed up to now—control must be established by unilateral action of the United States before it is too late.

In the immediate meantime it is essential to hold the line.

There must be no lowering of tariffs on these fibers, textiles, and textile products.

It is inconceivable that there should be any reductions as we await the remedies the industry acutely needs—and work for their achievement.

We must maintain the status quo until our goal is attained.

No one must make matters worse.

It would indeed be tragic if insult were added to injury.

EXHIBIT 1

"S. 172

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass legislation strengthening the long-term control program on textile imports since a stricter quota system is necessary to the well-being of the New England textile industry

"Whereas, Any disruption in the New England textile industry would cause vast unemployment, tremendous expense for the United States government, and a dangerous increase in the United States balance of payments deficit; and

"Whereas, The textile industry is still New England's second largest source of manufacturing employment providing for approximately 200,000 jobs; and

"Whereas, The President of the United States has assured the New England region of his support for extending such specialized agreements as we now have to cover wool imports as well as cotton imports; and

"Whereas, Imports under the present agreements have more than doubled when such imports were expected to increase only 25 per cent; and

"Whereas, It has been established that the textile industry, the second largest industrial complex in the United States providing four million jobs, deserves being treated as an "exception" in our trade policy; and

"Whereas, The loss of the textile industry to New England would deal a severe blow to the economic resurgence of the entire area; now therefore be it

"Resolved, That the general assembly of the state of Rhode Island does hereby memorialize the congress of the United States to pass legislation strengthening the long-term control program on textile imports since a stricter quota system is necessary to the well-being of the New England textile industry; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he hereby is authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the senators and representatives from Rhode Island in the congress of the United States in the hope that they will pursue every means to enact legislation which will benefit the textile industry of the New England region and, thus, brighten the economic outlook of their own state."

I, August P. LaFrance, Secretary of State of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, hereby Certify that the afore-going is a true copy of resolution (S 172) entitled "Resolution Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Pass Legislation Strengthening the Long-Term Control Program on Textile Imports Since a Stricter Quota System Is Necessary to the Well-Being of the New England Textile Industry" taken from the records in this office and compared with the original resolution (S 172) passed by the General Assembly at the January Session, A. D. 1967 and approved by the Governor on the sixteenth day of February, 1967 and now remaining on file and of record in this office.

In Testimony Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State of Rhode Island, this seventeenth day of February, A. D. 1967.

AUGUST P. LAFRANCE,
Secretary of State.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, it was generous of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island to mention my part in the original formation of the committee.

As a result of that resolution, the committee was formed under the chairmanship and leadership of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island. The Senator from New Hampshire served with him.

From that moment on, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island rendered splendid leadership all through the years in this battle to save the Nation's textile industry.

Through the kindness of the Senator from Rhode Island, I have been able to familiarize myself with the analysis that he is about to give the Senate today.

I commend him for it.

I associate myself with him in his endeavor here today, and I ask unanimous consent that, at the end of his speech, and after any insertions that he makes in connection with his speech, the remarks that I have prepared in this connection may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, there is a crisis in our textile industry.

In 1961, the United States imported 93 million square yards of wool textiles. In 1966, that figure had more than doubled—190 million square yards.

In 1961, the United States imported 151 million square yards of manmade fiber textiles. By 1966, manmade fiber imports had jumped to 798 million square yards.

In 1961, the United States imported 720 million square yards of cotton textiles. In 1966, the figure was 1,823.

This trend can only mean unemployment for American workers. It just simply cannot be allowed to continue.

In my own State of New Hampshire, there are 13,000 textile workers—13 percent of all manufacturing employment—and an estimated 50,000 or more of New Hampshire's citizens are directly or indirectly dependent upon the textile industry for food, clothing, and shelter.

Our textile workers' products are good, and I do not believe that these workers should be added to our Nation's unemployment rolls because the administration will not adequately administer a textile program which I helped to formulate in 1961.

I have been concerned about this problem since 1958 when, as my friend Senator JOHN PASTORE, of Rhode Island, has pointed out in the Senate today, I proposed a Senate resolution establishing a special Senate subcommittee to investigate and recommend solutions for the then already worsening textile situation. My resolution passed, and our deliberations resulted in a program to curb textile imports which was put into effect in 1961.

But this program, which was in intended to control textile imports, has instead resulted in a threefold increase in textile imports.

Our competitors abroad cannot be expected to voluntarily limit their textile exports to this country. It is up to the administration to see that they do so.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island. He has fought this battle for many years.

So far as I know, our woolgrowers in the State of Colorado, who represent another end of the industry, rather than the one which he represents, have felt the need for reasonable limitation on imports of wool textile products.

There is full agreement among the woolgrowers of the State of Colorado as to the need for reasonable limitations on imports of wool textile products. I am glad to state my concurrence with the remarks of Senator MCGEE, Senator PASTORE, and my other colleagues who have spoken on this subject.

President Johnson, as President Kennedy before him, publicly declared that he favored import limitations. I think it is important to hear the exact words of President Johnson as he delivered them on three occasions over 2 years ago. He said in part:

> The Administration has made and will continue to make vigorous efforts to solve this import problem. I share with our late beloved President Kennedy the view that wool textile and apparel imports must be kept at reasonable levels . . . I consider it essential that the wool textile industry be restored to good health.

Mr. President, these are fine words, and they constitute, I believe, a firm commitment; but the statement was made more than 2 years ago—in September 1964, to be exact. Action is long past due.

If the administration is unable to persuade wool textile exporting nations to sign an international trade arrangement—and it has not succeeded in this regard—then there must be unilateral action by our Government. The administration should either act on its own or sponsor legislation in Congress to carry out its policy.

Mr. PASTORE. I believe it is appropriate to say at this time that the interest of the woolgrowers of America is certainly a very emphatic one in the entire textile situation, for the simple reason that insofar as the woolgrowers of America are concerned, they have no export market to speak of. All their sales are made to the domestic industry; and if the domestic industry dies, they die with it.

Mr. ALLOTT. There is no question about that.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island draws our attention to a very important problem; namely, the alarming increase in imports in textiles and manmade fibers and related apparel industries as they affect not only Appalachia, and the State of West Virginia, but also the country as a whole.

I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] for his meaningful and constructive statements relative to this serious problem. His concern is shared by many Senators.

The industry and its people—the people whose daily existence, whose livelihood rests with the textile industry—also share this deep concern over the trend in rising imports of these products. Actually, it is more than a trend, it is an established fact. The able Senator has already given us these figures.

Our colleague from Rhode Island has discussed in detail the high concentration of textile employment in the Appalachian region. As he noted, 26 percent of all manufacturing jobs in that area are in the textile-apparel-manmade-fiber complex. Certainly, the threat of textile imports is thus dramatically underlined, because this is in our Appalachian States where we have worked diligently to develop a program of economic development. This is a program to quicken the economic and social progress so that over 18 million people may more fully share in the general prosperity enjoyed by our Nation. The Congress has committed itself in bringing this creative Appalachian program into being. Now we are in the process of reviewing that effort and reauthorizing it. Our Special Subcommittee on Economic Development has completed hearings and soon we will bring legislation to the Senate.

But while we are laboring to develop a humanitarian and economic program to secure a better climate for jobs, education, training, and recreation, the extensive imports of textile and manmade fiber products threaten a substantial segment of the Appalachian economy.

The importance of the manmade fiber, textile mill products, and apparel industries to the Appalachian region was outlined by E. Fontaine Broun, president of the Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, in his testimony at the recent hearings of the Special Subcommittee on Economic Development. Mr. Broun was speaking also on behalf of seven other trade associations. These statistics and the potential impact on the Appalachian area were revealing. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks more information on this situation.

There being no objection, the material

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Textile employment,[1] Appalachian region—Summary

Appalachian counties in—	Textile employment	Textiles including man-made producer plants	Total manufacturing
Alabama	41, 541	45, 651	173, 412
Georgia	57, 318	59, 067	89, 571
Kentucky	4, 865	4, 865	22, 846
Maryland	2, 380	5, 385	22, 820
New York	4, 162	4, 262	120, 360
North Carolina	55, 196	60, 667	133, 175
Ohio	1, 892	1, 892	76, 185
Pennsylvania	93, 193	98, 884	654, 340
South Carolina	80, 820	82, 277	106, 589
Tennessee	47, 684	68, 727	171, 966
Virginia	7, 535	11, 963	21, 489
West Virginia	6, 093	9, 317	117, 091
Total	402, 679	452, 957	1, 709, 844

[1] Employment in textile mill products, apparel and related products, and manmade fiber production.

The Federal Government and the Appalachian States are active in the creative efforts to secure an understanding of the special situation of the region and the need for policies which will truly foster increased employment and economic redevelopment. To illustrate the seriousness of the problem in Appalachia from the point of view of employment, let me remind the members of this body that since 1948 nonagricultural employment in West Virginia declined by nearly 80,000 jobs. Since 1957, nonagricultural employment in the State declined by 35,000 jobs. Employment in the manufacturing industries located in West Virginia between 1948 and 1965 declined by 13,200 jobs. Since 1957, employment in manufacturing industries declined by 4,400 jobs. These are employment statistics as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in June of 1966. But we are attacking these problems.

During the recent hearings on the Appalachian program, certain research materials prepared for the Appalachian Regional Commission and made available to the Committee, focus attention on those manufacturing industries with special potential for increased employment in the Appalachian Region.

Ironically, among the nine nondurable goods industries singled out as having special potential to benefit the Appalachian Region, there are three which are intimately involved in the alarming import problem which is being discussed here today. They are noncellulosic man-made fibers, textile mill products, and apparel.

In all, 25 industries, including 16 durable goods industries and 9 nondurable goods industries, have been identified as providing the best hope for increased economic inputs into the Appalachian Region and the creation of additional jobs for the benefit of the people. The noncellulosic man-made fiber industry and the plastic resins industry had the highest rates of growth among these 25 industries during the period 1960–1965, each expanding at the average rate of 15½%. Furthermore, these two industries have the highest potential or projected rate of growth during the period 1965–1970. The textile mill products and apparel industries had a lower but still substantial growth rate (1960–65) of approximately 6 percent.

A significant aspect of the man-made fiber industry in Appalachia is that it creates an exceptionally strong ripple of economic activity through the Region by the purchase of raw materials from other industries located in Appalachia. The so-called inter-industry impact of the operations of the man-made fiber industry in the Appalachian Region ranks as one of the highest of the 25 industries offering hope for increased economic progress and employment in Appalachia. These data are contained in the Summary Report and Recommendations of the Appalachian Location Research Studies Program submitted to the Regional Commission in December 1966. The point is that these three industries are believed to have special potential for the region.

It appears, from the research reports submitted to the Appalachian Regional Commission and from the testimony submitted to the Special Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, that the failure of the United States Government to exercise any control over the rate of increase of man-made fibers and man-made fiber textiles, the similar lack of control of wool textile imports, and the operation of the Long-Term Cotton Textile Arrangement-based controls over cotton textiles, could have an adverse impact on the economic base and employment potential of three vital industries in the Appalachian Region.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I have addressed my thoughts to the textile industry in the Appalachian area. It was my belief that it would be appropriate and not provincial, for me to do so. In West Virginia there are more than 9,300 workers in this field, and in Appalachian States a total of over 452,000 workers. Nevertheless, I fully realize that this is not merely an Appalachian problem, it is a serious national problem. The cogent comments of the Senator from Rhode Island attest to this fact. This is a major industry we are discussing—I am advised there are well over 2 million workers. It will be my purpose to cooperate in efforts to secure equitable policies for our vital textile, man-made fiber, and apparel industries. I congratulate the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Let me ask the Senator this question: As the Senator knows, we spend hundreds of millions of dollars fighting poverty and unemployment; is that not correct?

Mr. PASTORE. Oh, that is more than true.

Mr. HILL. Yes; it is more than true. Well now, then, is it not true that the continued increase in textile imports is contributing to both these problems? In fact, are we not, in essence, importing poverty and unemployment into this country when we continue to permit the entry of foreign textiles in such alarming quantities?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is absolutely correct. If he will be patient—I know that Senators are pressed for time—I have covered 11 pages of a 31-page speech. I think it is all very important, but at one stage I will come to the section on Appalachia, which is a dramatic illustration of what is plaguing this country concerning the problem of poverty and unemployment.

We spend millions and millions of dollars for training programs to do this, to do that, and to do the other thing.

The answer to it is simple: Restore the textile industries in many sections of this country and bring them back to good health.

Expand them, if necessary, by cutting out some of the imports. If we do that, then we can expand our domestic industries.

We want to give foreigners a fair share of our market, but when it gets to the point that the import is almost 30 percent of one category in all of American consumption, we say to ourselves, "At what point will that kill our domestic industries?"

Take a man 50 years old, who loses his job in a mill.

He is a skilled worker only on the loom on which he has worked all his life.

What are we going to train him for? To run a computer? That is ridiculous.

What are we going to train him for? Train him for a job that does not exist? Or to run an elevator?

We know that any man or woman who works in a mill does not have an easy life. I come from a section of my State where the workers got up in the dark of the night because most of the textile mills were running on a 3-shift basis. Their profits were on such a low margin that they had to keep their looms going continuously, otherwise they could not compete.

Yet we have the most modern machinery in the world. We have the most efficient management in the world and the best trained millworkers in the world. But we cannot compete with 10 cents an hour, 20 cents an hour, or 30 cents an hour because we just do not live under that kind of wage standard.

Naturally, we cannot compete. We cannot overcome that.

What happens?

Millworkers are thrown out of work.

We keep training them, but we cannot find jobs for them, because there are no jobs for them at which they can work.

The answer, therefore, as I just stated, is simple: Save the textile industries and we will save half the money we spend or throw away on the antipoverty programs.

Mr. HILL. The Senator spoke about Appalachia. Is it not true that unemployment and other hardships to which the Senator has referred as a result of increased textile imports has, in a large measure, occurred in areas in parts of the country which have long been economically depressed?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct. A most dramatic example is Appalachia.

Mr. HILL. Yes; a most dramatic example is Appalachia itself.

Mr. PASTORE. Another example is New England. There are towns there which rely completely upon the textile mill. Should that mill close, there will be chaos.

We talk about training programs. What are we going to train them for? For jobs that do not exist?

That is the point I am trying to make this afternoon, that if we can expand—hopefully, even only save—the textile industries in this country, we can absorb many unemployed workers.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it has been a privilege to hear the very eloquent and impressive address of the Senator from Rhode Island in his own inimitable style.

I wish that all of those dealing with

this subject in every branch of Government—the State Department, the Department of Commerce, at the highest reaches of the executive department—could hear the magnificent presentation made by the Senator from Rhode Island.

This is not the first time that he has assumed leadership in the effort to preserve the textile industry. He has been our leader for several years. I have been happy to support him to the full extent of my ability.

Today, I am pleased to associate myself with all of his superb statements on the precarious condition which now confronts this indispensible industry, and the essentiality of firm, vigorous, and prompt action if this all-important industry is to be preserved.

Mr. President, it is difficult to see how any fair-minded person could have listened to the very able documentation by Senator PASTORE without realizing that the textile import problem has taken on entirely new dimensions. Any previous concept that any of us might have had concerning the diversity, the complications or the depth of this problem have been swept aside by developments of the past 2 years. Clearly, these developments call for a reevaluation of our policies and positions, and certainly for immediate action to prevent further erosion until a reasoned, long-range course can be decided upon.

Most of my collegues here in the Senate probably are under the impression that for the past few years, the level of textile imports has been controlled. Nothing could be further from reality. Since 1961 when a control program supposedly was in effect, total textile imports have increased from 964 million square yards to 2.8 billion, or more than 200 percent. It seems fairly obvious that this basic industry cannot stand much more of this so-called help.

Cotton textile imports have doubled in the past 5 years, although many of us have been led to believe that these were being controlled. And we are not talking about meaningless percentage figures. We are talking about big numbers—big volume—from 800 million yards to a current rate of more than 1.8 billion. But as Senator PASTORE so ably stated, the problem has not been confined to cotton textile products alone. While cotton textiles supposedly were controlled, imports of manmade fiber products and blends, many of them directly competitive with cotton, have tripled since 1962. And again, we are talking about large volume—from less than 300 million yards to almost 800 million.

Wool textile imports now account for about one-quarter of total U.S. consumption. In the case of worsteds, the level has reached more than 50 percent. The impact is on the same worsted manufacturing industry that our Government has called upon in a succession of national emergencies to supply essential items for national defense.

This is a matter of great concern to me, both from the standpoint of my State and the Nation as a whole.

Georgia ranks third in U.S. textile production, being exceeded only by the States of North Carolina and South Carolina. There are about 175 weaving, dyeing, finishing, and bleaching plants in our State, located in 66 of our 159 counties. These plants provide jobs for more than 100,000 Georgians and a payroll of more than $400 million.

Georgia mills consume more than 1.5 million bales of cotton annually. Georgia farmers produced cotton and cottonseed in 1965 for which they received almost $100 million. And it is only through the textile industry that cotton for domestic consumption moves to market. Our mills also consume large volumes of manmade fibers, some of which are produced in Georgia plants.

The apparel industry which is the most important customer of the textile industry, provides another 65,000 jobs in Georgia.

My State has a rich heritage in textiles. It may be of some interest to know that a Georgia mill supplied the duck material that was used to cover the broad-wheeled conestoga wagons that rolled west to push our Nation's boundaries to the Pacific. Today, that same plant produces fabric which houses the telstar tracking stations.

But as I indicated earlier, not only do unfair and excessive imports threaten injury to the economy of Georgia, they have nationwide repercussions. It is almost impossible for one to conceive of the enormity of the textile industry complex in this Nation—almost 1 million employed in the industry directly; another 1.3 million in the directly related and equally vulnerable apparel industry; over 500,000 families in the growing of cotton; tens of thousands more in the production of manmade fibers and wool. It may come as a surprise to know that the textile industry is the largest customer of our Nation's giant chemical industry. Add to this the large textile machinery manufacturing industry, the transportation, insurance, and financial network that serves this vast operation, the hundreds of service operation of every conceivable sort, and one begins to realize that an irrational import problem that jeopardizes this complex is not an issue for Georgia or North Carolina or New England alone.

If these imported textiles were coming onto our shores because the quality is better than our own mills can produce, I would have no quarrel. But only a tiny percentage, primarily a few specialty items, can make claim to better quality.

If the products were coming in because they are better styled or more attractive than our own, I would not complain. Again, only a small percentage of specialties can challenge us in this regard. To the contrary, I am told that the vast majority of imports are duplicates of what we produce here—taking advantage of developments by our own people in styling, designing, advertising, and promoting.

If the textile imports were coming in because they were produced more efficiently than we can produce them here, I would not resist them. But every informed textile man I know, both in this country and abroad, testifies to the fact that the American industry overall is by far the most efficient in the world, producing the greatest variety and selection.

If the imports were reaching our shores because our own mills and apparel makers were taking advantage of the consuming public in the pricing of textile products, I would have no sympathy for them. But both the Government's wholesale price index and the consumer cost-of-living measurements demonstrate beyond doubt that no large industry in America has done a more competitive nor a fairer pricing job. And the fact that the industry's profits consistently range very substantially below the average of all manufacturing profits is added proof.

If the textile imports being unloaded here in such enormous volume were actually needed—if our own industry did not possess the diversity or the capacity to provide for the consumer, I could not and would not object. But except for some temporary shortages created by the Vietnam emergency and, again, a few specialties, our domestic industry historically has maintained the necessary capacity. And during the past few years, when its earnings have permitted additional expenditures, the industry has demonstrated its own courage and responsibility by pouring its money back into improved plants and machinery at a rate which, based on profits or net worth, has been unequaled by any other major industry in the country.

Mr. President, the cold, hard and irrational truth is that the great volume of these imports is coming in for one simple reason, and one reason only—because they are cheaper. And they are cheaper because they are produced by low-wage labor; they are cheaper because they are produced under working and wage conditions that would be illegal in the United States.

We are dealing here with the country's oldest and certainly one of its most basic industries. We are talking about an industrial product that in its hundreds of uses is essential to every living American. We are considering the future of an industry that time and again has proved to be essential to our national security. And, as I have touched upon already, we are talking about an economic complex so vast that it involves the livelihoods of millions of people and penetrates every area of the land.

In view of these facts, by any rule of reason how can those who are responsible for administration of trade policy fail to act?

Mr. President, there are few, if any, of us here in the Senate who are isolationists where matters of trade are concerned. We understand the basic facts of the situation—that for many obvious reasons our country must encourage and participate in a healthy program of international trade—that we must demonstrate leadership in the development of reasonable and workable trade policy. But we also understand the tragic and inevitable consequences of international trade policies that permit, and actually encourage the replacement of efficient American workers and basic American industry by foreign interests that offer nothing more than low-wage substitution.

The truth, of course, is that a workable correction of the illogical textile import problem need not be inconsistent with our international trade obligations. The answer lies in taking a reasonable volume of textiles, even though they are not actually needed, and permitting growth in the future. But, at the same time, we must establish the machinery necessary to insure an orderly pattern of imports that will not permit unfair concentrations or burdens on any segment of the industry.

I wish again to congratulate the Senator from Rhode Island on his excellent presentation.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator from Georgia. I realize that he has been held on the floor for the past week on his authorization bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have been in the Chamber for 6 days now, from early until late in the afternoon.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Georgia must have a backlog of work in his office and piled up on his desk. Let me say to all Senators that the Senator from Georgia has been a stalwart colleague and has stood shoulder to shoulder with me and other colleagues in fighting this thing out. I hope that some day we will achieve some success.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am ready to respond to any call which the Senator from Rhode Island may wish to make upon me, or any suggestions he may care to make.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in the Senate in the sentiments expressed concerning the seriousness of the textile import problem. I want to particularly congratulate the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] for the role he has played, both here today and over the years in bringing facts into the open which point out the disastrous effects of virtually unrestrained imports of textiles pouring into the United States.

It was my privilege and pleasure to serve as one of the original members of the Special Subcommittee on Textiles of the Senate Commerce Committee. That subcommittee was chaired at that time by the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, and he still holds the post. The early and detailed work of the subcommittee was responsible, in large measure, for the negotiation of both the short-term cotton textile agreement and the long-term cotton textile arrangement.

Initially, neither the short-term cotton textile agreement nor the long-term textile arrangement worked very well, although there was much hope within the industry that this would be the answer to their problems. It has been proved since that time, however, that a vigorous enforcement and administration of the long-term arrangement will provide a workable and suitable solution to the problem of cotton textile imports which have such a disruptive effect upon the employment picture in the textile industry.

Mr. President, the textile industry is of utmost importance to the United States, and particularly to the State of South Carolina which I have the pleasure to represent in this body. In South Carolina, the textile and related industry is the largest single employer, providing more than 180,000 jobs. This is in excess of 70 percent of the labor force employed in industry in the State of South Carolina. While an unrestrained flow of textile imports into the United States has a marked effect upon our economy, the balance-of-payments situation, and employment on a nationwide basis, it naturally has a more concentrated effect in the State of South Carolina. The sharply rising volume of textile imports poses a real and present danger to the future growth of the textile industry and places in jeopardy the gains which were made in the years that the long-term textile arrangement proved effective.

The situation at the present time is somewhat different than it was in the late fifties and early sixties. The trend in the countries providing the major amount of imports into the United States is such that the textile import problem has taken on entirely new dimensions. The statistics reveal that since 1961, the rate of growth of imports has far exceeded the rate of growth of our domestic textile and apparel market. During that period of time, textile imports have tripled, while U.S. textile and apparel production has grown by only one-third.

The chief concern in the early sixties was with cotton textiles and apparels. Since that time, the textile imports finding their way to the market in the United States are now of the multifiber variety—cotton, manmades, wool, and blends. At this time, I particularly wish to emphasize the manmade fiber and manmade fiber textile-apparel part of the problem.

In the past 4 years, imports of manmade staple fibers, filaments, and yarn have increased by 144 percent on a quantity basis, and by 133 percent on a dollar basis. Exports increased only 16 percent on a quantity basis, and 3 percent on a dollar basis during this same period. As a result, the manmade fiber industry lost a healthy piece of its domestic market to imports and at the same time lost a sizable part of the export outlet for its production. Our Nation lost $42 million of its hitherto favorable balance of trade in manmade fibers.

The picture is even more extreme in manmade fiber textile mill products and apparel. On a quantity basis, imports have shot up by 274 percent during the past 4 years, while exports have virtually stood still. On a dollar basis, imports of manmade fiber textile manufactures and apparel rose by 248 percent during the past 4 years, while exports increased only 21 percent in value during this period. As a result, our balance of trade in these products deteriorated by $139 million and the Nation would up 1966 with an absolute trade deficit of $44 million in manmade fiber textile mill products and apparel.

When you put manmade staple fiber and filament yarns together with manmade fiber textile mill products and apparel, our trade balance has shrunk from a favorable figure of $224 million in 1962 to only $43 million in 1966. In combination, imports of these products shot up by 210 percent since 1962, with exports rising only 12 percent.

By mid-1966 this great flood of manmade fiber and manmade fiber textile mill products and apparel was too much for the domestic market to absorb. The total domestic and import supply so saturated the market that it softened to such an extent that textile mills cut back the number of shifts worked, reduced the number of hours of employment, and even furloughed employees.

The manmade fiber producers were also severely affected both by the direct effect of imports of these products and by the loss of sales of fiber to their textile mill customers whose markets were disrupted by the tide of fabric and apparel imports. From mid-1966 to the end of the year, there occurred a loss of 39,000 jobs in the manmade fiber-textile-apparel industry group, and such major fiber producers as Du Pont and Monsanto announced a sharp loss of earnings for the year.

The problem here is the virtually unimpeded access which foreign-produced manmade fibers and textiles have to the U.S. market. What is obviously needed, and needed urgently, is some effective control over the rate of increase. It must be kept within bounds so that the market can absorb both domestic output—increasingly shut out of foreign markets—and a reasonable share of imports.

The textile import problem is naturally of utmost importance and interest to the State of South Carolina. As I mentioned previously, more than 70 percent of the industrial employment in our State is in the textile and related industries. South Carolina produces on an annual basis 25 percent of the cotton, synthetic, and silk fabrics in the Nation. The State of South Carolina alone produces 42 percent of all the cotton cloth in the Nation on an average annual basis.

Even though the cotton textile industry has had the benefit of the long-term cotton textile arrangement, in cotton textiles the situation is much the same as it is in man mades. In 1966 there was an increase in the cotton bale equivalent of imports of 300,000 bales over 1965. Although there is an absolute quota on the importation of upland type raw cotton imports, this quote does not extend to manufactured cotton textiles. The United States is importing almost 35 times as much semifinished and finished manufactured cotton textiles as the quota would allow, if all the imports came in as raw cotton.

As a result of this cheap labor competition, the hiring rate in cotton mills declined from its peak of August 1966, to the point that by December 1966, it was only one-half of what it was in August.

Mr. President, this set of circumstances will have a double-barreled effect in the long run. Not only does it have an immediate effect upon the cotton textile industry and those employees engaged in the industry, but it will seriously affect the cottongrowers in our country in time. In South Carolina, for instance, cotton is the No. 2 agriculture money crop in the State. The market for this cotton is in the domestic textile mills of the Nation. If production and employment continue to turn down in domestic mills as a result of low-price imports, the market for our own domestic cotton will be decreased proportionately. This in turn means that the Government's cotton program will be more expensive to the taxpayers of our country since there will be an insufficient market to handle domestic cotton production.

There are a number of things which can be done to correct the problem which exists in the textile industry, both as to cotton and other fibers. The No. 1 thing is that no tariff reductions on any textile products should be negotiated by the administration. It is apparent that there is no need for a tariff reduction to make the U.S. market available to foreign imports of textile products. The only purpose any negotiated reductions in our present tariff structure on textiles would serve would be to inflict irreparable damage upon the textile industry.

The second thing which should be done is to extend the existing cotton textile arrangement for an additional 5 years. This arrangement does provide a framework for keeping imports at a reasonable level, but it must be faithfully and vigorously administered. We have seen in recent years the result of a lax administration of this arrangement. This can no longer be tolerated.

The third item on the agenda is to establish a means for bringing manmade fiber and wool product imports under reasonable volume restraints.

The United States can afford to delay no longer in taking effective action to bring the rate of increase of imports of manmade fibers and manmade fiber textile mill products and apparel under effective control. As a member of the Textile Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee, I joined in a report issued in 1963 which warned that the signs of future distress were at hand in the sharp and unrestrained import trends in the manmade fiber sector of the textile industry. Our prediction then has only too unfortunately proven to be accurate. The hour is at hand; action must be taken.

The action required is that recommended by the Textile Subcommittee in its March 1961 report; namely, and I quote from the subcommittee's report, that—

> Quotas on textile mill products and on garments and apparel, and on man-made fiber staple, filaments, and filament yarn, be established by country and by category of product.

Mr. President, the importance of this matter to the entire Nation cannot be overstated. The textile and apparel industry is second only to steel as a defense-essential industry. We must take every step to prevent any disruption in the textile industry so that we will always have a sound, viable industry to meet any contingency which may arise.

In closing, Mr. President, again I thank the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island for the fine leadership he has provided in this important matter.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

It is a privilege and a pleasure for me to join the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and my other colleagues.

We are speaking this afternoon because of the grave threat excessive imports are inflicting on one of our key domestic industries, the textile industry.

We hope to focus enough attention on this problem, so the executive branch will not take any steps to exacerbate what is already a serious situation.

And we hope also to encourage the executive branch to take other steps toward bringing some order and reason into what now looks like a very unfavorable future for American companies and workers.

The damage that would be caused to the domestic textile industry by any reduction in textile duties or any increases in the import quotas would be severe.

So I join in urging that the United States not offer reductions for textile products during the trade negotiations this year.

And I join in urging that the United States, preferably through international agreement but unilaterally if necessary, establish quotas on all textile and apparel imports of all fibers.

I do not advocate the imposition of quotas so low as to be unfair to nations exporting to the United States. I think the division of our market along the lines of the long-term cotton arrangement, which provides for an annual increase in the foreign share of our expanding domestic market, is a good way to help our own producers without being unfair to other countries.

Unfortunately, the cotton agreement has not been enforced strictly enough, and during 1965 and 1966 cotton textile imports jumped 24 percent and then another 39 percent.

But tighter administration of this arrangement now and once it is renewed later this year, can help here.

An agreement on wool and one on manmade fibers has never been implemented, because other nations have been unwilling to cooperate with us.

If the administration cannot work this out with our friends and allies, I think we will have no recourse but to impose quotas unilaterally.

Just look at the increased imports during recent years. Manmade fiber imports have increased by 428 percent since 1961. Wool imports, since that time have risen by 125 percent.

Mr. President, 4 million people are engaged in the production of fibers, textiles, apparel, and other textile products.

Surely, this is too large and important an industry to be treated in a cavalier fashion.

My State is not one of the largest textile-producing States, but we still have over 31,000 people employed in this industry, with a total payroll of $141,126,000 in 1966.

In 85 Connecticut communities, 457 mills will be affected one way or another by what our Government does during the next few months.

I would not be properly serving these constituents and communities if I did not do what I can, such as by speaking today, to help save this industry from the fate which faces it if an enlightened policy is not undertaken this year.

However, I think the magnitude of the problems besetting the textile industry go beyond the serving of the interests of my own State.

It is a national problem. For example, our trade deficit in textiles alone was $902 million in 1966, over 60 percent of the American balance-of-payments deficit for that year.

Only 20 years ago, we had a textile trade surplus of over $1 billion.

Certainly a country with a sophisticated textile industry such as we have, should not be in the position of importing such large quantities of these products.

When we consider the fact that the import situation becomes worse each year, not just progressively worse but in a "careening downhill" manner, we should know that it is time to take action.

I know it is time, just as Senator PASTORE and my other colleagues who have spoken know it is time.

I hope we can get something done, and I think we are in a position to do so, if people will pay heed to what the Senator from Rhode Island has been saying. I hope that his concern, and ours, will be heeded by others before too long.

I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his courtesy.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not wish to argue with my good friend from Rhode Island about the import and export question, but as he remembers, I opposed this one-price system, and the record will show the reasons I advanced.

The one-price system has been in operation since the 1964 crop of cotton. The record will show that instead of an increase in consumption by the textile industry of a million bales of cotton during the first year of operation, as claimed by the proponents, the increase amounted to only one-half that amount. This is the third crop year in which this plan has been in operation. Only now are the mills expected to use the 1 million more than that consumed 3 years ago.

The cost of the program to the taxpayers has been substantial. When the proposal was submitted to the committee of which I am chairman in 1964, I can well remember Mr. Hodges, who was then Secretary of Commerce, coming before us and stating that the consumers would save anywhere from $650 million to $700 million per year.

But that has not come to pass. Payments to mills during the first 2 years averaged about $441 million each year. In 1966, payments amounted to $772 million. Today, of the total fibers used by the industry less than 50 percent is cotton. The rest of it is manmade fiber. I think this trend, as I pointed out 3 years ago, will continue. How to remedy the situation I do not know.

However, I did wish to bring those facts to the attention of my good friend from Rhode Island; and I hope he will cover the matter. As I have stated, the one-price system, in my opinion, has been more or less a failure, because there has been less cotton used than expected; the cost, as I have stated, has been well in excess of $500 million; and the consumers have not been given the relief that was expected through lower cloth prices.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I dispute that most vehemently. The fact of the matter is that whatever money has been paid the subsidy goes to the cotton growers and producers in Mississippi, Louisiana, and such States. It certainly does not go to the millowners and the workers in the mills in Rhode Island. This subsidy is not being paid to the management, nor is it being paid to the workers. It is being paid to the farmers who produce the cotton.

Naturally, this is a very creative and imaginative industry. We have some of our best minds, and some very good workers, in the textile industry, with all its problems. Naturally, as styling changes and as the techniques change, there may be greater use of one product as against another, but I am saying that cotton is an essential part of the textile industry, and that the textile industry is sick in all of its parts, including synthetics.

I reiterate that when we have a situation in which the American manufacturer has to pay 8 cents a pound more for the same basic product that is being bought by a foreign manufacturer, who makes it into cloth and sends it back here—mind you, not only do they pay their workers 10, 15, or 25 cents an hour, but they are even permitted to buy American cotton 8 cents cheaper than the American manufacturer—if anybody can show me the sense, the justice, or the equity of that situation, then I will apologize.

The fact remains that we have invented a system to get rid of surplus cotton, and it came back to plague us, because what we actually did was sell a lot of raw cotton, which does not require much manpower, and we sold it cheaply. We sold it 8 cents a pound cheaper than the American manufacturer could buy it. And what did the foreigner do? He gave a lot of people jobs in making it into shirts and other clothing, where much more manpower is required. What we were actually doing, in order to get rid of the raw cotton, was selling it cheaper in order to meet the world market price, and at the same time we were actually exporting American jobs. And it came back to plague us. Mill after mill closed down in my State. Mills are still closing. I am being told, on the floor of the Senate, that the situation may not be as bleak as that. Well, that is like trying to tell a person who has a toothache that he is all right; but he knows he has the toothache. You cannot see it, but he has got the pain. And whether the Senator believes it or not, we have serious pains in the textile areas of this country, including Massachusetts.

I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. First of all, Mr. President, I commend, as have other Senators, the splendid exposition that the Senator from Rhode Island, once again, has made on the floor of the Senate. He has, over many years, presented vital material, debated critical issues, and enlightened this body on many important and significant matters which affect us as a nation.

The Senator from Rhode Island has performed nobly and ably this afternoon in bringing to the attention of the Senate one of the dramatic needs that confronts not only the State which I represent, or New England in general, but one which confronts many other sections of our country as well.

I commend the Senator for the extraordinary speech that he is making this afternoon, and I am pleased to associate myself with the observations and presentation he has made.

Mr. President, concerning the point made by the Senator from Rhode Island about the persistent hardships facing the textile mills in his State of Rhode Island—they are identical to the problems faced by textile mills in the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the appropriate place in the RECORD a resolution passed by the City Council of the City of New Bedford, Mass., on December 22, 1966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the resolution of the City Council of the City of New Bedford dramatizes what has happened in the Berkshire Hathaway textile plant located in New Bedford. Berkshire Hathaway is one of the major employers in that community.

Massachusetts is replete with other examples of companies that have suffered, and suffered recently. In spite of the fact that in recent times so much of the textile industry has fled to other parts of the country, there are still some 98,000 Massachusetts jobs related to the textile and apparel industries, and we who represent the Commonwealth are deeply concerned about this problem.

There have, in the last 6 years, been some developments, particularly those concerning investment credit and accelerated depreciation, which have assisted this industry. These have assisted the modernization of the capital facilities of the industry.

There have been other developments as well, in the field of international agreements. The long-term cotton agreement, for example, has been helpful.

I should like to know if the Senator is as concerned as I am that the recent administration of the long-term cotton agreement has not really achieved what the agreement was expected to do. I think that the administration of it could be more effective, with respect to the interests of the United States.

Mr. PASTORE. Absolutely. If the agreement is not administered properly, it would be just as well not to have an agreement at all. It is true that there has been some carelessness and some looseness in the administration of it. Those are the words that I used. This matter needs to be taken up. There have been some men, as when Hickman Price was in the Commerce Department, who lived up to the spirit of the law and did a marvelous job. That is not said in derogation of anyone else. There are other good men there.

I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts. Whatever agreements there are, whether multilateral or bilateral, they ought to be properly enforced.

When the American market is being disrupted, we should stand up and say so.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Will the Senator from Rhode Island agree with me that it is difficult for us to understand why we have not been successful in achieving the long-term wool agreement with other countries throughout the world? That it is difficult to understand why they have from time to time rejected the overtures which have been made by the industry and by our Government in an attempt to achieve a similar kind of agreement to that which has been made with other countries?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, as I pointed out, we tried to talk with Great Britain, with Italy, and with France, and with Japan. The fact still remains that Japanese imports are controlled in Italy by agreement. They are controlled in France by agreement. They are controlled in Great Britain by agreement.

All we want to do in Japan is to do the same thing that Italy does with Japan. I think they should do it. You can lead a horse to water, but you cannot make it drink. However, where we have it within our power to show some determination and can show that we are being hurt, we ought to stand up and say so. We ought to stand up for our rights. I think that perhaps then some of our friends would respect us more.

The Senator knows that we are a very compassionate people. We are a bighearted people, even though once in a while we do get booted around. However, we are bighearted. We always come back for more. We always have our hands in our pockets ready to help somebody else. Yet, we cannot get these others to understand our problems.

That is all I am asking to have done. That is the reason why we are meeting today, to point out for public understanding and administrative recognition a problem that exists in the textile industry in the hope that something will be done about it.

If anyone should challenge them, then let them point to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of today and let them use the RECORD as a crutch to insist upon American interests being observed.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Would not the Senator agree with me that this is a particularly important time to act? One of the reasons that I feel the Senator is providing such a service to the Senate in bringing this matter to its attention in the rather crucial days of negotiation which are taking place at Geneva is that we certainly believe in the concept of expanded trade. Nonetheless, it is important, does the Senator not believe, that the record be made so that not only the Senate but also all of our friends throughout the world will have an appreciation of the actual facts and our feelings concerning them?

Mr. PASTORE. That is precisely why we are here.

I emphasize the point just made by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

With reference to the renewal of the long-term agreement on cotton, I hope we do not pay a price for it in our negotiations on the Kennedy round. I hope we do not pay a price for it when it comes to textiles. I hope they do not take the shirts off our backs in reaching a renewal of that agreement.

I hope that they do not add insult to injury by reducing the tariffs further.

I agree with the Senator. It is wonderful to have an expansion of trade, but it has been pointed out here by the Senator from Connecticut and others that we had a balance of trade about a year or two ago of approximately $1 billion or $1.5 billion.

The imbalance of trade in the textile industry was almost $1 billion.

We have hardly any export market in textiles. We have no export market.

Does the Senator think we can sell to some of our allies as easily as we can buy from them? Of course we cannot. If we disrupt their market, they shut us off. And we understand that.

All we are doing is asking the administration to stand up and be determined about this matter and say:

> I promised the industry that I would save it, that I would restore it to good health, and I insist that it be done.

You talk that way to some of those boys, and I think they understand that kind of language.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Rhode Island.

We are all indebted to the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] for his thorough exposition of the disturbing situation in the textile-apparel industries and the problems facing its 2 million workers.

The recommendations of the Textile Subcommittee, which he has introduced into the RECORD, are as valid today as when they were first made in 1959, as valid as when adopted by the administration in 1961, and as valid as when reaffirmed by President Johnson in 1964.

In the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, we have 98,000 textile and apparel jobs, which constitute 14 percent of the manufacturing employment in the Commonwealth. Over 1,500 textile establishments in 140 Massachusetts communities are a vital part of our economy. In many of our metropolitan areas, textile employment constitutes 25 to 50 percent of the manufacturing employment.

Massachusetts is also a major producer of textile machinery, an industry employing 10,000 workers. Massachusetts is the principal producer of wool fabric. Raw wool accounts for 20 percent of the value of goods entering the port of Boston.

The impact of the high level of imports of textiles and particularly, the accelerating rate of growth of imports is a reality in my State. It is not a hypothetical matter to be debated in theoretical terms. As a major producer of wool textiles we already feel the effects of the decline of 19 percent in that industry in the last quarter of last year alone. Several mills closed last year.

I have, over the last 5 months, met repeatedly both with members of the local union and with representatives of management on the problem of the textile and apparel industries in Massachusetts. It is plain that the problems are those of people, people out of jobs.

In New Bedford, Berkshire Hathaway, Inc., operates a textile mill which employs 2,400 workers. The mill was forced to curtail production throughout the last quarter of last year, and is currently 20 percent curtailed. That means 480 families whose wage earner is earning no wages. This mill produces combed ginghams. Back in 1961, imports of combed ginghams already constituted 23.5 percent of total U.S. domestic production. In 1966, imports of gingham and apparel made from gingham had reached 53.9 percent.

This mill is also engaged in the production of manmade synthetic textiles used for linings of clothing. As Senator PASTORE has pointed out, imports of manmade fiber textiles have increased in just the last 2 years from 328 million square yards to 798 million square yards, an increase of 143 percent.

Many of the people working in the mill came to this country, and to New Bedford, in the hope of improving their situation in life. It is no consolation to them to be told that people in other lands, working at low wages, should displace them from their jobs. As an indication of their great concern, the employees of the mill and other people of New Bedford, sent President Johnson a total of 3,200 postal cards asking for his help.

I would, at this point, like to ask that a resolution passed by the New Bedford City Council on the plight of this plant be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

An example of an even more rapid assault upon our domestic textile industry by foreign imports is the experience of a mill in Lowell, Mass. This mill, which makes high-quality knitwear for the fashion market, spent 6 months working with designers in New York on color shades and textures for sweaters, for the fall season. Two weeks after these sweaters were marketed, foreign copies selling at half price, were also on the market. The development costs incurred by the Lowell mill were, of course, never recovered.

But we need not despair of the proper course of action to help these workers and the industry which employs them. We have a Federal textile program. It is based on a generation of concern, a decade of study, and 5 years of experience. It was instituted in May of 1961, 5 months after President Kennedy was inaugurated.

This program has helped, particularly with cotton goods. But the time has come to undertake a fresh and effective look at the implementation—which has not been vigorous—of this textile program. This means:

First, continuation of long-term cotton arrangement in its present form for an additional 5 years.

Second, effective administration of this arrangement, as occurred in the early years of its life.

Third, multilateral international agreements covering imports of wool textiles and manmade fiber textiles. If this cannot be achieved in the near future, the United States must embark upon other appropriate action.

This textile program precedes the Trade Expansion Act by a year and a half. The first cotton textile arrangement had been in effect for 12 months before the Trade Expansion Act was approved. We should remember that the act was not intended and should never be used to undermine the textile program or to eliminate the industry and the textile jobs, whether they be in New Bedford, Mass., Pawtucket, R.I., Charlotte, N.C., Atlanta, Ga., or any other place in the United States.

Until the foregoing program can be made fully effective, it would be folly to make matters worse by any actions in the current round of negotiations in Geneva which would accelerate the decline in the textile and apparel industries.

The authority granted in the Trade Expansion Act should be exercised with caution and judgment. It does not require tariff reductions in any particular category. Indeed, if authority for future negotiations is to be forthcoming, it is essential that the present authority be used with wisdom and good conscience.

The situation of our textile and apparel industries is such as to command the attention of all Americans. The distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island has performed an invaluable service with his stirring speech, and I am pleased to associate myself with it.

EXHIBIT 1

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF NEW BEDFORD, IN CITY COUNCIL

DECEMBER 22, 1966.

Whereas: Imports of textile products are rising sharply and are posing a serious threat to the job security of America's textile worker, and

Whereas: Effective Government action to stem the rising tide of textile imports is imperative, and

Whereas: Regulation of textile imports to safeguard the domestic industry from disruption and unemployment has been an essential element in the government's Textile Program since its initiation by President Kennedy in 1961, and

Whereas: the five-year Long-Term Arrangement regarding international trade in cotton textiles (LTA) was entered into in 1962 for the purpose of assuring "that the development of this trade proceeds in a reasonable and orderly manner so as to avoid disruptive effects . . .", and

Whereas: Imports of textile products are rising at a rapid rate, for instance woolen imports have more than doubled between 1964 and 1965 and synthetic textile products have risen by more than two and a half times in a two-year period, and

Whereas: The tremendous increase in these imports has lead to the weakening of many sectors of the domestic synthetic textile industry, and combined with the effect of a rise in cotton textile imports, it was the major cause of the recent shutdown of the New Bedford (Mass.) plant of Berkshire Hathaway, Inc., resulting in a one-week lay-off of 2000 workers, with half of these workers facing the prospects of future additional layoffs, and

Whereas: the record of markedly increasing imports of textile products in each major fiber category is clear proof of the need for a reappraisal of the United States Textile Program. Continuation of current trends threatens the future of the textile and apparel industry, with its two million employees, as well as the domestic producers of fibers, employing an additional two million, and

Whereas: The Government has been unsuccessful in its efforts to achieve a multilateral solution to the wool and man-made textile import problem. It is time for the United States to take unilateral action to limit the importation of wool and man-made fibers and textile products, including apparel, now, therefore,

Be it resolved that:

1. The President of the United States insure that the administration of the Long Term Arrangement will be strengthened so as to prevent further disruption of our cotton textile markets and forestall additional layoffs of textile workers.
2. That the President and the Congress take immediate steps to impose restraints on imports of wool and man-made textiles and textile products in order to safeguard the domestic textile and apparel industry.

Submitted by Mayor Edward F. Harrington.

In City Council, December 22, 1966, Adopted—Yeas 11, Nays 0.

CHARLES W. DEASY,
City Clerk.

Attest:

ELLEN M. GAUGHMAN,
Assistant City Clerk.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I strongly commend my good friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, on the brilliant presentation he has made here this afternoon.

It is a presentation in which he has given us a most graphic and cogent picture of the serious problems facing the domestic textile industry and the compelling need for action and action now to protect our domestic textile industry from this unfair foreign competition.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I congratulate the senior Senator from Rhode Island for his clarion-clear message on the adverse effect that excessive foreign imports of textile products are having on the domestic textile industry, and particularly on its growth and job opportunity potential. He has sounded the call. He has duly warned us all. Proper action by this Government must be taken in the weeks and months ahead to preserve and strengthen this oldest of U.S. industries.

Since passage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, I have served as a congressional delegate on the U.S. trade expansion negotiating team and as congressional adviser to the United Nations Conference for Trade and Development. Other members are: Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware, Congressman CURTIS of Missouri, and Congressman KING of California. In this capacity I have made several trips to Geneva and have had numerous conferences with various officials charged with administration of the act. Consequently, I believe it is accurate to say that I have more than a passing knowledge of the purposes of the act and of the complications involved in its implementation. Also, I have had an unusual opportunity to view the total textile import problem as it relates to the concept of the Trade Expansion Act.

Several conclusions have been reached:

First. The Government's so-called program of import controls on cotton textiles worked reasonably well during its first 2 years, but during the past 2 years its effectiveness obviously has been of much less benefit.

Second. A program designed to control cotton textile imports alone, even if effectively administered, will fail in its basic objective of providing reasonable order in the pattern of trade. The reason is that such a concept is out of date with the times. Our textile industry today is a multifiber industry; most of our mills are multifiber producers; most of our 2 million or more textile and apparel employees are involved with textiles manufactured from all fibers. A control program designed for cotton products alone, leaving out the vast volume produced from blends and fibers, is just about as effective as a dam across half a river. And when the half-sized dam is leaky to begin with, you can imagine how effective the operation must be.

Third. There is adequate reason and precedent for dealing with the textile import problem within the context of existing international trade policy. My own exploration of the subject convinces me that for a combination of reasons practically every major country of the free world gives special treatment to textile products.

As the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island so clearly pointed out in his lucid remarks, President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and President Johnson have recognized the special circumstances surrounding this industry, both here and abroad, which require special consideration. The long-term arrangement on cotton textile imports is the prime example of an exception from our regular trade policy.

Fourth. The ability of our own industry and its employees to meet this low-wage competition is not related to the efficiency of our industry. I am convinced beyond doubt that the domestic industry, by a wide margin, is the most efficient and most diversified textile-producing operation in the world. But it is not efficient enough to bridge the gap between a $2 average wage in this country and a 36-cent average wage in Japan, or a 25-cent average wage in Hong Kong—not to mention the fact that many countries are subsidizing their exports to the United States in order to earn dollars.

Fifth. Although our market is the easiest market in the world for imported textile products to enter, our own textiles are barred from scores of countries, including many of those that export to us. The techniques they use are many and varied, mostly of the nontariff variety. Thus, there is little chance for the U.S. industry to offset imports with exports. And I am sorry to report to this body that our representatives at the Kennedy round long ago gave up on trying to get anything done to correct these nontariff barriers during this round.

Sixth. The signers of the long-term agreement recognized the need for cooperation and constructive action in fostering world trade and for facilitating the growth of emergent or developing countries. The keynote of the plan was "orderly growth." This is to say: In order to provide for growing opportunities for "developing" countries and to allow increasing access to established markets, there would be a minimum of disruption affecting the well-established markets from the increase in imports. The idea was that the imports would increase participation in growing markets.

The GATT long-term cotton arrangement anticipated a 5-percent increase in import levels annually. Actually, however, our cotton textile imports have increased much more rapidly than the anticipated rate. The 5-year period from the base year 1961 to 1966 witnessed an alarming increase of 60 percent in imports from the developing countries.

The significance of the increasing share of imported cotton textiles in our domestic market is underscored by the fact that 62 percent of total cotton imports are currently supplied by five countries: Hong Kong, Japan, Mexico, India, and Portugal. Are our obligations to these countries such that we should permit them to seriously cripple an efficient, essential industry?

In fact, 42 percent of our cotton textile imports and an even higher figure—48 percent—of all-fiber textile imports come from Japan and Hong Kong alone. By any yardstick of reason, can we go on trying to satisfy what appears to be the insatiable appetites of these people? Are they the "underdeveloped" and "emerging" countries we are trying to help?

Mr. President, my interest and the interest of many of my colleagues in this situation is not limited to the textile and apparel manufacturing industries alone, big and important as they are. There is another segment—a vast segment—of our population that is vitally concerned with developments. I refer to the hundreds of thousands of families engaged in the growing of cotton, and the additional tens of thousands who gin, warehouse, and handle this product. The hundreds of thousands of people throughout our Nation who work in these textile mills also should be considered in this matter.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, and as one who for years has given intensive study to the very complicated problems of cotton, I am bewildered by the inconsistencies involved in this import situation. On the one hand, the Commodity Credit Corporation for a long time has been plagued by a burdensome surplus of cotton—millions and millions of bales, with no market at home or abroad. I am pleased to say that legislation I sponsored last year, which was enacted by Congress, is beginning to have some important effect in reducing this surplus. But the fact remains that our overriding problem in attempting to develop workable cotton policy has been the burdensome surplus.

In order not to build unnecessarily upon this surplus, or to compete unfairly with domestic cotton production and pricing policy, our Government for 30-odd years has maintained rigid import quotas on cotton, permitting entry into the United States of only 30,000 bales of upland cotton each year—less than 1 day's supply for our mills.

Also, in an effort to cut down the surplus, our farmers have been encouraged to reduce their cotton acreage drastically, creating far-reaching hardships for great segments of the cotton economy from North Carolina to California.

But now we sit here and watch cotton in the form of manufactured textile products enter this country at the rate of more than 1 million bales annually. This is equal to more than the entire 1966 production of Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia combined. Or, to state it another way, if the acreage necessary to produce the million-plus bales could be allocated to these four States, stimulation in the economy of the entire area would amount to hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

There are some who are not familiar with the facts who say, "Well, you want to export cotton. You must be prepared to import cotton textiles." Nothing could be further from reality. I have examined the facts of the situation and find that there is little, if any, relationship between cotton exports and textile imports.

Mr. President, the record will show that the overwhelming majority of the textile imports that are coming into the United States at the present time do not even come from the raw material which we have exported overseas.

Japan is a prime example. She is the largest exporter to this country by far. She produces no cotton; she must purchase it somewhere. Her purchase record indicates clearly that she buys where she can get the qualities she wants at the best price and on the best credit or financing terms.

We produce no raw silk in this country; we buy large quantities from Japan. Does anyone contend we should sell manufactured silk products to Japan to pay for the raw silk we buy? Of course not. Any notion that in order to export a given product, we must import a related product violates every concept and theory of international, multilateral trade.

During the next few weeks in Geneva, our trade negotiators will be deciding what tariffs to cut, and by how much. With the textile tariffs now in effect obviously serving as no barrier whatsoever to imports, it would be sheer folly deliberately to invite an even greater import problem by cutting textile tariffs. The President should instruct his negotiators immediately to remove from the list all textile items, including cotton, manmade fiber and wool.

I strongly urge that the long-term arrangement for cotton textiles be extended for 5 years, and that it be enforced according to its original concept.

I strongly urge immediate attention to be given to some plan for limiting in a reasonable manner imports of wool and man-made fiber imports.

Such a course of action will be in the long range best interest of everyone concerned—foreign government and industries, as well as our own.

Again, I congratulate the Senator from Rhode Island for his leadership on this subject, and assure him of my complete support in efforts to find a reasonable, workable solution.

Mr. PASTORE. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that no one has been of greater help in this problem than the junior Senator from Georgia. I thank him for his remarks, and for his cooperation and efforts in this discussion.

Mr. TALMADGE. I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate and commend the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island for taking the leadership again in this problem that confronts a great part of the Nation. This is an important matter for my State, for many States of the Union and, in fact, for the entire Nation.

The Senator from Rhode Island has placed before the Senate details of a situation that cannot and must not be ignored. Every Member of this body, and every official of the executive branch who has any responsibility in the area of international trade policy, should take notice.

The dimensions of the total textile import problem are much too broad, and involve too much of the country's total economy to be swept aside with a few indifferent words.

In my State the interest we have in this subject is prompted by several factors. We raise cotton, most of which is spun and woven by U.S. mills. We have a textile industry which consumes a great part of our domestically grown cotton. We produce manmade fibers. And we have a significant apparel industry. Of course, there are also present in Alabama various supporting and allied industries and services. When all of these interests are threatened by a condition in our economy and may be further jeopardized by international negotiations to which we as a nation are a party, it is time for us in the Senate to pause and take inventory of the situation.

I want to talk briefly about the rapidly rising tide of textile imports to the United States and the threat this poses to our ability to consume raw cotton domestically in the coming years.

In 1966, the equivalent of about 1 million bales of cotton was imported in manufactured form. In addition, some 300,000 cotton bales equivalent were imported in the form of manmade fiber textiles and blends.

Cotton textile imports are currently regulated to some degree under the GATT long-term arrangement—LTA. This quota authority is now in its fifth and final year with negotiations proceeding in Geneva, looking for a possible extension of 3 to 5 years beyond the current expiration date of September 30, 1967. In the last complete control year, that ending September 30, 1966, we imported 78.5 million pounds of cotton yarn, an increase of 63 million pounds from the preceding year, an increase of more than 400 percent. Remembering that there is a tight import quota on raw cotton and on picker lap, it certainly is illogical to permit uncontrolled imports of cotton in the next processing stage—yarn.

It may be of interest to note that Mexico sent us 18.5 million pounds of cotton yarn last year and Brazil shipped us 17.2 million pounds. Of course, neither one of these raw cotton producers would be allowed to ship more than a fraction of these amounts into the United States in either its raw form or as picker lap.

Taking all textile imports together, regardless of fiber content, in the past 5 years, U.S. textile imports jumped 200 percent while U.S. textile production grew by less than 35 percent. Thus, even in a generally prosperous period, imports are far outstripping the growth in textile markets in the United States. Such a situation long continued would mean ruin for the domestic textile industry.

Only cotton textile imports are subject to any sort of volume control. The long-term cotton textile arrangement—LTA—negotiated under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—contemplated an annual growth of 5 percent per year over its 5-year life. The actual increase in cotton textile imports under the LTA has been far in excess of this agreed rate. Indeed, cotton textile imports have doubled over the past 5 years.

Imports of manmade fiber textiles have more than tripled since 1962, rising from 213 million to nearly 800 million square yards annually. They are subject to no quantitative controls whatsoever, and are approaching the absolute level which triggered the long-term arrangement for cotton textile trade—813 million square yards. But as a proportion of U.S. consumption, they are almost twice as large.

Wool textile imports, for which quantitative limitations also are lacking, now account for one-fourth of U.S. consumption of wool textiles.

Because the technology of the industry is so widely known and used, and because of the great disparity in wage levels between the United States and the low-wage nations of the world, it is impossible for the American industry, despite its efficiency, to compete effectively with the textile industry of such nations as Japan, Hong Kong, India, Portugal, Mexico, and others. These wage rates vary from $2 an hour in the United States to 18 cents in Portugal.

Nationwide, textiles employ 954,000 people, and, with 1,400,000 in the related apparel industry, accounts for one out of nine U.S. manufacturing jobs. Significantly, the American textile industry, the world's most efficient, still offers wide employment opportunities for semiskilled workers.

In addition to direct manufacturing employment, the textile industry is most important as a customer for numerous other industries, including particularly cotton agriculture. Tens of thousands of workers are employed producing cotton for U.S. mills. It is only through the textile industry that cotton can be marketed domestically. Many other jobs in the chemical, transportation, machinery and other industries involved in servicing and supplying the textile industry depend on its economic health.

An estimated $1,180 million was spent for new plant and equipment in 1966, almost double the industry's net earnings. Modernization of facilities is a key factor in offsetting rising manufacturing costs. It is only through such expenditures that the industry can ever hope to compete with foreign imports, and to meet its competition may well require levels of spending comparable to that of 1966 for at least the next 10 years.

Of great significance to the Nation is its balance-of-payments position. As a result of the rising tide of textile imports the U.S. textile trade deficit is now at an annual rate of $902 million—equal to two-thirds of the total U.S. balance-of-payments deficit.

We are now supplying about 10 percent of our total cotton textile and manmade fiber textile requirements with imports from abroad and the trend is up. Although Japan has increased her exports of cotton textiles to the United States by 68 percent over the past 5 years, she is now shipping us manmade fiber textiles at an annual rate 100 million yards higher than her agreed cotton textile quota. Almost all of these manmade fiber textiles are directly competitive with domestic sales of U.S. cotton textiles, and hence have a drastic impact on the American textile industry's capacity to consume raw cotton.

The timing of this discussion is most significant. At this very moment the U.S. representative for trade negotiations, Ambassador William M. Roth, is in Geneva, Switzerland, negotiating tariff reductions under authority of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. If we are properly informed by the press, all textile products are being considered for cuts up to 50 percent by the United States. This must not be. I sincerely hope the President will recognize the error of such contemplated action and will immediately instruct Ambassador Roth not to negotiate any tariff cuts on any textile products

Also, at this time the renewal negotiations of the 30-nation Long Term Cotton Textile Arrangement (LTA) are pending in Geneva. If the administration's textile programs of both President Kennedy and President Johnson are to be continued and implemented, it is essential that the President direct Ambassador Blumenthal, the U.S. negotiator on the LTA, to seek a 5-year extension of this arrangement without change or modification.

The third step required at this time is for the President to direct the Secretary of State and the representative for trade negotiations to negotiate an appropriate arrangement covering woolen and manmade fiber textile products similar to the LTA, which now cover only cotton textiles.

If these three steps are immediately taken, they can constitute the capstone in the arch of a textile program designed to preserve and enhance this segment of our economy, which is so indispensable to the military as well as economic security of our Nation.

Mr. President, Alabama's interests are vitally affected by the manmade fiber, textile-apparel import problem. More than one out of every four jobs in manufacturing industries in my State is provided by manmade fiber producers, textile mills, or apparel plants.

The major manmade fibers—rayon, nylon, acrylic, and polyester—are produced in Alabama. The Chemstrand Division of Monsanto, the Courtaulds North America Co., and the Beaunit Fibers Division of the Beaunit Corp. each have plants in the State. Some 4,000 of my constituents are employed in these fiber-producing plants. The presence of these plants in Alabama also generates an equal or greater amount of employment in the service and supply industries which support their production.

Apparel manufacturing is an especially fast-growing industry in Alabama. Between 1958 and 1966, employment rose from 22,000 to 34,000 jobs—better than a 50-percent increase. There are 187 apparel plants in the State. In large part these are small business establishments and represent the kind of entrepreneurial activity which I personally have sought for so many years to encourage through my sponsorship of small business legislation and my chairmanship of the Select Committee on Small Business.

The foreign trade trends in manmade fibers and manmade fiber textiles and apparel are very disturbing to me because they forecast a positive harm to the healthy growth of employment in these industries in Alabama and to the exercise of initiative by small businessmen through such activities as the new apparel plants which have been constructed in Alabama in recent years.

Recently the Alabama delegation met with the manmade fiber textile-apparel industry leaders from the State. Their dominant concern was the manmade fiber and textile and apparel import problem. From my study of the foreign trade statistics I can appreciate their concern.

Between 1962 and 1966, the value of imports of manmade fibers increased 133 percent, but exports by only 3 percent. During the same period, imports of manmade fiber textile manufactures increased 248 percent, but exports only 21 percent. Taking the whole vast group of textile manufactures; namely, manmade fibers, textile mill products, and apparel, imports rose 75 percent during the past 4 years, but exports by ony 12 percent. The result of these dramatically different trends was that our Nation in 1966 had a one-half-billion-dollar trade deficit in these products—up sharply from an 84-million-dollar trade deficit in 1962.

Mr. President, it is worthy of reemphasis that the unregulated imports of manmade fibers, textiles, and apparel by 1966 were equivalent to approximately one-third of our total deficit in our international balance of payments.

When the import flow reached floodtide in 1966, the domestic textile and apparel market simply collapsed. Prices dropped, company earnings were down sharply, extra shifts of production had to be eliminated, and employees were furloughed and then ultimately laid off entirely. About 39,000 workers were laid off in manmade fiber plants, textile mills, and apparel plants during the latter half of 1966.

Mr. President, two of our major fiber producers with plants located in the State of Alabama suffered a sharp loss of earnings in 1966 as a result of these events. Let me quote from the published financial statements of the Monsanto Co., which has its fiber-producing headquarters at Decatur, and the Beaunit Corp., which has a new rayon staple fiber plant at Childersburg, Ala. The 1966 annual report of the Monsanto Co. states as follows:

> The adverse effect of current U.S. overcapacities in chemical fibers is intensified by sharply rising imports of the fibers and of fabrics and finished goods made from them. Such imports have increased more rapidly than U.S. demand for these products, thus undermining the sales volumes, prices and profits of domestic producers.

The annual report of the Beaunit Corp. for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1966, states:

> One problem for the industry is the increasing competition of imports which, in many cases, come from subsidized or state regulated shippers and currently are unfairly concentrated on the United States market because it is the only unrestricted one in the world. We urge the Government to deal with this problem for all textiles in some effective manner as has been done for cotton textiles.

Beaunit's statement for the quarter ended September 30, 1966, states, concerning the unsatisfactory results for that quarter, that—

> The most serious was the weakness in the man-made fibers and fabrics markets, * * * and an extraordinary amount of imports unsettled the markets.

Mr. President, I am personally acquainted with the executives of these companies. Neither they nor their colleagues are in the habit of "crying wolf." When these companies put in their published financial statements to their shareholders statements such as I have quoted concerning the gravity of the import problem, we can be sure that these companies are suffering acutely from the unregulated imports.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that what we need is a fresh initiative by the executive branch to achieve by negotiation or by unilateral action a system of import controls on an all-fiber basis by product category and by country of origin which will keep the increase in imports within the boundaries of the domestic market's capacity to absorb such foreign supplies. Until such regulation is achieved, it would certainly be most unwise for any further reduction in the import duties on manmade fibers or textile and apparel products of cotton, wool, or manmade fibers to be agreed to in the Kennedy round.

I certainly hope the President will instruct his negotiators to refrain from granting reductions in duty on these products and that he will, amidst his many problems, find the time to instruct his subordinates to make a fresh effort to secure the type of import regulation which has been referred to in these remarks today.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, it is with a true sense of admiration and respect that I stand to applaud the words of my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island as he sets out the facts regarding textile imports and trade policies. Senator PASTORE deserves the thanks of the entire American people for his statement today, not just those who are employed in the textile industry, but all persons who are concerned that our Government take those steps which are necessary to see to it that American jobs are not lost by the default of our own Government.

I would like to associate myself with every single sentence of the Senator's statement. I find it absolutely incomprehensible that our negotiators in Geneva could even be thinking about reducing tariffs on fibres and textiles and textile products at this time. I have supported the principles involved in the Trade Expansion Act, but only because I believed that the powers granted to the executive branch would be used cautiously and with full regard for the legitimate needs of our own workers and industries. Any lowering of tariffs on textiles at this time would, in my mind, constitute a callous disregard for these needs.

I wish to comment on another point raised by my distinguished colleague. I have been told time after time, generally by some bright-eyed young man fresh out of college, that many of our industries, such as the textile and the shoe industry, are outmoded, or inefficient, or too labor intensive for our economy, or that they simply will have to disappear to be replaced by more sophisticated types of technology. I think that this is the type of thinking which is too often found in Washington, D.C., where people who get a taste of governmental power suddenly seem to lose all grasp of reality when it comes to economic planning.

What these people forget is that the textile industry employs 4 million citizens of the United States, and that the first responsibility of our Government is to see to it that these 4 million Americans are not thrown out of work, onto relief rolls, or into the street because of some starry-eyed decisionmakers' thought that it would be nice to put all of these resources to work in electronics or nuclear engineering or some similar industry.

I do not need to be reminded that in my State of New Hampshire the textile-apparel industry provides just about 13,000 jobs and an annual payroll of $48.5 million.

Mr. President, I think that it should be made very clear that those of us in the Congress who are concerned with the future of the textile industry will not stand by and permit our own Government to torpedo the textile industry. We are standing up today to make it clear to friend and foe alike that we shall expect a full recognition of the legitimate needs of 4 million textile workers by their own Government.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for yielding to me, especially under the circumstances. I highly commend him for his fine leadership and the splendid speech which he has presented and is presenting to the Senate.

I heard a part of the speech, and I read a part of the speech. It is highly commendable, and he is performing a worthy service.

Mr. President, I share the concern which has been expressed in the accelerated rise of imports of textile and apparel products into the United States and particularly as it relates to cotton textiles and apparel. The long-term cotton agreement was designed to provide an orderly flow of imports into the United States and we in Congress were gratified when this agreement was consummated and visualized it as a vital move in the right direction. It is surprising to find that cotton textile imports have reached a record level which threatens the basic structure of this important industry.

There are several aspects of this problem which call for immediate attention, but I would like to stress the impact from the standpoint of our cotton farmers who have been forced to make sharp reductions in acreage in an effort to balance supply and demand. This has been done at an expensive sacrifice to our producers and to the local economy.

It is alarming to discover that in 1966 over 1 million equivalent bales of cotton were imported into the United States in the form of textile products. This has occurred in spite of the fact that there is an absolute quota which limits raw cotton imports to 30,000 bales. The importation of approximately 35 times this quota in the form of manufactured cotton textiles is certainly not in keeping with the spirit or intent of the acreage control program.

The question of imports should also be carefully evaluated from the standpoint of military security and military preparedness. Textile products are considered second only to steel from the standpoint of combat readiness. Textile products are vital in terms of clothing, equipment, and shelter to our military forces in Vietnam, and it should be noted that the textile industry has performed an outstanding job in fulfilling the need of the defense program in a most effective manner.

Imports should certainly not be permitted to weaken the ability of this industry to fulfill the military requirements of this Nation.

I would like to make it amply clear that I am not suggesting a complete ban on textile imports. It is essential that the United States permit a reasonable quantity of textile imports, but it must be at a level which will prevent undue hardship on the domestic industry.

The manufacturing of wearing apparel is one of the major industries in Mississippi. We have about 150 plants scattered throughout the State which make shirts, trousers, underwear, work gloves, and other articles of clothing from cotton and other fibers. This industry directly employs about 35,000 people and indirectly supports many others who are engaged in growing cotton and related economic activities. This vital and developing industry is being seriously threatened by increasing imports of foreign-made apparel products. These imports started back in the mid-1950's and have lately taken a sharp upturn. I am concerned about the rapid increase in these imports because they are undermining the development of the clothing industry in Mississippi and threaten the jobs and incomes of thousands of people which it employs. Imports, unless regulated, are going to continue to increase and take even larger portions of the domestic market.

Domestic manufacturers cannot compete on the basis of price with imports made by cheap labor abroad. Of course this problem eventually can be overcome through research and greater capital investment, but this will take time, and time is against the industry with imports increasing so rapidly. Under the long-term international cotton textile arrangement, which covered the 5 years from October 1, 1962, to September 30, 1967, the overall import growth rate measured in physical terms was not to exceed 5 percent per year. In practice, this rate has been greatly exceeded.

U.S. cotton apparel imports during the first 4 years of this arrangement increased almost three times faster than agreed. That is 57 percent rather than 20 percent. During the same period, total cotton products imports, which include all cotton apparel and textile products, increased 72 percent. In areas such as men's and boys' trousers and shirts, imports equal about 10 to 15 percent of the total domestic production. In women's and children's blouses, slacks and shorts, the import volume equals one-fifth and one-third, respectively, of domestic production. Most of these ratios have doubled and trippled in the last 8 years.

Now there has been a substantial change in the domestic industry's use of fabrics from cotton to synthetic fibers. The substantial rise in imports of synthetic fabric apparel products has to a large degree undermined the cotton arrangement. Five years ago, imports of clothing made from synthetic fibers was negligible. By the end of 1966, however, imports of these products were equal to almost one-half of the total cotton apparel imports. During the same time there has also been an increase in wool apparel imports.

Imports of both synthetics and wool fabric apparel are limited only by the existing tariff rates which are obviously no real barrier. This is clear from the rapid increase in these imports. The importation of synthetic fabric apparel in such large quantities is negating the long-term cotton arrangement.

In the past 3 years men's and boys' synthetic and cotton fabric imports have increased 13 percent. Imported cotton trousers regulated by the arrangement have increased 9 percent while imported synthetic fabric trousers, controlled only by tariffs, have increased 53 percent. These increases will be even more dramatic as foreign countries increase their abilities to produce durable press trousers which are almost always made with synthetic fabrics.

Imports of men's and boys' woven sport shirts of cotton and synthetic fabrics have also shown a large increase in the past 3 years. These imports rose 37 percent and domestic production has begun to decline. Woven sport shirts made in foreign countries now have more than 10 percent of the U.S. market, and this ratio is growing every year.

Foreign-made men's and boys' dress shirts are entering our markets at an alarming rate. In 1966 we imported 12 million more dress shirts than we did in 1964. This is an increase of 75 percent in the imports of this one item alone. Synthetic fabric dress shirts are taking a larger and larger share of this market. In 1964 synthetic dress shirts were only 10 percent of our dress shirts imports. In 1966 they constituted 45 percent of these imports.

No industry can grow or even maintain its present position in the face of such competition in its own markets. The clothing industry in Mississippi needs time right now before it is too late to develop a strong foundation for competing with foreign products. This cannot be accomplished without orderly growth in the domestic market. Only with orderly growth will manufacturers be willing to invest and make the necessary long-range plans which will make the industry competitive with foreign manufacturers.

Until the American industry can be assured of a satisfactory arrangement with regard to imports there should be no cut in the tariffs on textiles and wearing apparel as has been proposed in the Kennedy rounds of tariff negotiations.

The domestic industry will not be able to furnish American markets if it is forced much longer to compete under present conditions. It will not be able to build a competitive basis for the future if tariffs are reduced and imports come rushing in. The long-range solution to this problem is an arrangement for international trade of wearing apparel of all types similar to that embodied in the long-term cotton arrangement. Under this expanded arrangement the American industry would be more assured of orderly growth in domestic markets and would be able to plan ahead with more confidence. The short-run solution is to extend the long-term cotton arrangement for at least another 5 years and to retain the tariffs on wearing apparel at least at the present level.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the textile industry in the State of Virginia is greatly indebted to the Senator from Rhode Island for the very effective work he has done on its behalf for many years.

Just today, two of the leaders of the industry in my State told me of the tremendous job the Senator from Rhode Island has done for the textile industry, which in my State is one of the most important. I point out that the largest single employer of labor in the State of Virginia is the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., with 20,000 employees, but the second largest employer of labor is the Dan River Mills in Danville, which employs 12,000 citizens of that community.

My keen interest in the problem on which the Senator from Rhode Island has so effectively focused, is jobs—jobs for the people of our Commonwealth, and jobs for the people of the Nation.

For the past 4 years, I have been chairman of Virginia's Advisory Board on Economic Development, trying to get new industry to come into Virginia, not to take industries away from Rhode Island, or Ohio, or from any other State, but to point out the advantages to certain industries to come into Virginia and build new plants, not transfer present plants from other parts of the country to Virginia, but where a manufacturer would desire to establish a new plant, we want him to consider Virginia.

I want to do this in order to create jobs for the splendid working men and women of the Commonwealth.

As I visualize it—which the the Senator from Rhode Island so effectively brought out in his remarks—that is the salient point of the whole discussion today, that the very splendid working men and woment of our Nation who work in the textile mills not lose their jobs.

In Virginia, more than 100,000 of its citizens work in the textile plants. That includes chemical fibers as well.

Let me say again to the Senator from Rhode Island that the State which I represent in part is greatly indebted to him for focusing attention on this most important subject.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the families of 279,000 of my constituents, I express to the able and distinguished Senator from Rhode Island the gratitude of my State for the valiant fight he is making on this occasion, a fight which he has made over a period of many years in behalf of America's second greatest industry—the textile industry.

I am totally incapable of understanding the attitude of some of those in Government with respect to the textile industry. As the Senator from Rhode Island has so well pointed out, there are approximately 2 million Americans who gain livelihoods for themselves and their families in the textile industry. There are approximately 2 million additional Americans who, by reason of their connection with the manufacturers of apparel, also gain their livelihoods from textiles in one form or another.

We have been engaging in a constant fight to get some measure of consideration for those engaged in this great industry. Thus far, most of what success we have had has been confined to the textile industry as distinguished from the synthetic and wool industries.

It seems to me that the Government has shown a contradictory policy, especially in connection with the agricultural problems which confront the Nation. We are engaged in farm programs trying to bring the earning capacity of the farmers up to a parity with other workers in the cities. There has been a tendency on the part of those in charge of our trade policy to ignore the self-evident fact that the best customer which the cottongrower in the United States has is the domestic textile industry.

In making our trade policies, that fact should not be ignored. At the same time, it seems to me, with the little regard which has been shown the textile industry in recent years, with the exception of the fact that we were able to get the short-term and the long-term arrangements, which applied only to cotton, we have had the synthetic fibers domestically manufactured, and the wool industry completely ignored.

It seems to me there is a great contradiction between the attitude manifested with respect to the textile industry and a policy which conflicts with the best interests not only of the textile industry but also of the American cottongrower.

Another thing was pointed out most ably and forcefully in the very fine speech made by the Senator from Rhode Island. One of the great problems of this country has been the deficit in our balance of payments. This deficit has persisted over the years. Nine-tenths of a billion dollars of that deficit is attributable to our loss resulting from the difference between our imports and our exports of textiles. If we could eliminate this difference, we would go a long way toward solving the deficit in our balance of payments.

Something else concerns me. Many times those who advocate, apparently, making a sacrificial lamb out of the textile industry undertake to justify their position by invoking the spirit of Cordell Hull and his advocacy of what we call our trade policies. I have made a study of, I think, all the speeches made by Cordell Hull on this proposition. The policy which has been pursued in respect of the textile industry is in direct conflict with everything that Cordell Hull ever said on this subject, so far as I can ascertain it. Several years ago, I asked the Library of Congress to furnish me with copies of the speeches of Cordell Hull in which he set forth his ideas about the kinds of trade policies this Nation should have.

He said that in our trade relations with other nations, we should enter into reciprocal agreements. He said that the only kind of trade policies we should have are trade policies which are truly reciprocal. He said that reciprocal trade agreements involve an exchange of surpluses and that the only kinds of trade agreements the United States should make with other nations are trade agreements under which the United States exported to other nations goods which we produce in surplus quantities, and under which the United States imported from other nations goods which we either could not produce or could not produce collectively.

Mr. Hull pointed out in his speeches that when our Nation has a trade policy which encourages the importation of goods which we are already producing in surplus quantities, the inevitable result is that American investors in the industry affected are denied a fair return on their investment, and that the jobs of Americans who labor in that industry are sacrificed and, in effect, are exported abroad.

So nothing can be found in the principles of trade espoused by Cordell Hull that would justify our trade policies in respect to textile products, because this Government, or at least a part of it, has encouraged the giving of discretionary power to administer our trade acts. It has actually encouraged the invitation of textile products produced by cheap labor abroad, under low standards of working conditions. Inevitably, the result has been that Americans working in the textile industry have lost jobs, and those who invest in that industry have lost a fair return on their investment.

Not only that; we lose nine-tenths of $1 billion as a deficit as between our exports and imports. So we have a contradiction in terms insofar as the very sound policies advocated by Cordell Hull are concerned.

The Senator from Rhode Island pointed out another thing in a very forceful manner and documented it for the RECORD. It is that this Nation has been engaged in trying to give Appalachia an opportunity to compete on a somewhat equal basis in the effort to better itself as compared with the rest of the country. The Senator from Rhode Island pointed out that over 1,060,000 persons in Appalachia, or within a 50-mile radius of Appalachia, were engaged in the textile industry or the textile apparel industry.

Here, as in the case of the deficit in our balance of payments, and in the case of the relationship between our cottongrowers and our textile industry, we have a contradiction in terms. While the Government is attempting to lift the level of the economic state of the people in Appalachia, it is following a trade policy which has exactly the opposite effect, and which has a tendency to deprive of the means of livelihood those who work in the textile industry in Appalachia and immediately adjacent to Appalachia.

It seems to me the only sensible course for this Government to pursue is to take steps that will preserve not only the textile industry, insofar as it is based on the production of natural fibers by cottongrowers, but also to take steps to protect the industry from importation of synthetic fibers which compete with fibers produced in this country, such as the natural fiber of cotton, and also to do something to protect American industry.

It seems to me the only practical way for those of us who seek to preserve this basic American industry is to urge that the long-term agreement be extended for at least 5 years, and not only that it be extended, but that it be enforced, as it was in earlier days, and as it has not been enforced in the last 2 years.

Otherwise, we are going to have to depend on legislation for the protection of an industry which is second in importance in the number of people employed in industry in the United States.

It is about time that this country stopped these contradictory policies and took active steps to preserve this great industry.

I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for yielding to me. I shall certainly go along with him in seeking needed protection for an industry which employs at least half of the people in my State who are employed in the manufacturing business.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator. We need his help.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this is my 11th year as a U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania. During that period it has been my privilege to serve under the leadership of the Senator from Rhode Island as he, year after year, stood up in defense of our textile industry. He has again done the same thing today. I congratulate him on his splendid speech, which I have read with interest.

I note also the recommendations which he has made with respect to improving the condition of our domestic textile industry. He has my complete support in trying to persuade the Johnson administration to take steps to protect both the employees and employers, and, for that matter, the stockholders, in our textile industry.

The map which the Senator from Rhode Island has directed our attention shows that in Pennsylvania there are counties in Appalachia which have a substantial textile industry. I note that there are approximately 25—I have not counted them carefully—counties of Pennsylvania in Appalachia where there is substantial production and also substantial employment in this industry.

I thoroughly support the comments made in the Senator's speech with respect to the need to protect these employment opportunities in Appalachia for our workers.

I would point out for the record, as I am sure the Senator from Rhode Island already knows, that there is also, and has been for many years, a substantial textile industry in the eastern part of Pennsylvania, centered around Philadelphia and the surrounding counties. I note also that most of the textile manufacturers in Pennsylvania are small businesses, and not large businesses, and therefore perhaps deserve support.

The industry in Pennsylvania accounts for about 16 percent of our employment. The trade unions in that industry, such as the Knit Goods Workers, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, and the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union, are among our most dedicated and patriotic labor groups. They have contributed much to liberal causes, and have demonstrated the highest level of statesmanship. They account, together with one or two nonunion shops, for two or three hundred thousand of our employed people. In the old days, the Philadelphia area and western Pennsylvania were the carpet maker kings of the Nation. Unfortunately, the carpet industry has fallen upon evil days, but there is still a substantial concern which makes carpet, and I speak on behalf of that concern as well as these others.

May I ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question or two, first with respect to the balance of payments, with which he deals on page 16 of his speech?

The senior Senator from North Carolina has pointed out, taking his facts from the speech of the Senator from Rhode Island, that in the neighborhood of $900 million of our trade deficit is accounted for by the fact that so many textile imports are coming into our country.

I am seriously concerned about the growing crisis in our balance of payments. I think the two most important factors in that regard are the cost of our troops in Europe and the cost of the war in Vietnam. But here is a situation in the textile industry which is perhaps more easily remediable than the Vietnam and the European situations, and it is accounting for something in the neighborhood of two-thirds of what our balance-of-payments deficit was last year, which was in the neighborhood of $1.6 billion

I wonder whether the Senator—and I am sure he has—has called to the attention of the Treasury Department and the other individuals and organizations at the governmental level in our country which are dealing with our balance of payments, the need to correct this situation.

It is true, of course, that even last year the excess of our exports over our imports was substantial. But where we get into a situation where foreign competition, from Japan and some of the other eastern countries, is creating, by reason of the fact that we are importing such a large amount of textiles, a balance-of-payments deficit of around $900 million, it occurs to me that this is an additional reason for doing something about it.

I wonder whether the Senator does not feel that representations should be made—and perhaps they have been—to the Treasury, to see if we cannot do something to reduce this figure. Because I am personally quite fearful, as I stated in connection with the Vietnam debate yesterday, that if we do not do something pretty quickly, we are going to find a balance-of-payments crisis and a run on our gold next year, possibly during the presidential election, which could be a very serious matter.

Mr. PASTORE. To point it up more particularly, in 1966 our total textile and textile products imports exceeded exports—that is, the difference between what we took in and what we sent out—by $902 million.

Mr. CLARK. Of course, that creates a dollar balance abroad, which in turn can be converted into gold, and our gold supply has been shrinking at a very fast rate.

Mr. PASTORE. They can cash their dollars in for gold, that is true, and the deficit in the balance of payments last year was $1.4 billion. So it is approximately the two-thirds that the Senator mentioned.

I am not saying that that is the way

we are going to correct the imbalance in payments; we all understand that. But what we are saying, in fact, is that if we can improve the health of the textile industry, and do something about this importing, which of course has gone up astronomically, not only will we be creating jobs in America, we will be alleviating this imbalance in payments; and I think that is quite important to consider.

But the thing that disturbs me more than anything else—more than the balance-of-payments deficit—is the fact that we are actually trading off American jobs. We are faced with this poverty program, and all of us are for it, this fight against poverty. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Pennsylvania and my own colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] are on the committee which has worked on the authorization legislation with reference to the war against poverty.

Yet here we are, actually putting people out of work, so that they fall within the army of the unemployed. Then we spend a lot of money to try to retrain them; and sometimes it is quite difficult to do, because they reach a period in life when it is hard to train them for another job, and even if we succeed in doing so, perhaps that job does not exist.

So I say, let us save some of our appropriations on this antipoverty program, by saving some of these jobs, so we can put these people in gainful employment; and, if we can, save the textile industry and hopefully expand it somewhat.

I believe we ought to give our allies a piece of the market. There is no question about that. But when we get, here, to where the jump in 5 years is 428 percent, that is something else—I realize much of the prosperity we are enjoying today must be attributed, of course, to the acceleration of our economy because of the Vietnam situation; but one day, hopefully, that will come to an end, and we want it to come to an end as soon as possible. That will drain off from our economy quite a number of jobs. Here we are, the only nation in the free world that is in a wartime economy in peacetime, so to speak. We supply our allies with the protection of atomic weapons, nuclear and thermonuclear. We have almost 300,000 American soldiers spread all over Europe, to make sure that Russia does not move in on them. We are engaged practically all by ourselves in Vietnam, at a cost of $2 billion a month.

Do you know what I have been told about $2 billion? This is quite a shocking thing, the illustration that was given to me.

They tell me that if you take thousand-dollar bills, and stack them up one on top of the other, in order to reach a million dollars, your stack will be 8 inches high.

For a billion dollars, the stack will be 8,000 inches high, which means that it will be 140 inches higher than the Washington Monument.

We spend two of those stacks every month in Vietnam. Two every month in Vietnam alone. That is what we are talking about when we speak of a billion dollars. Sometimes we do not realize what all this means.

Mr. CLARK. May I say to the Senator that I am in complete accord with what he has just said. I would like, very briefly, to pursue the textile matter a little further.

Mr. PELL. Could I inject one question? Were those thousand-dollar bills?

Mr. PASTORE. Those were thousand-dollar bills. Not too many people handle those, because if you do, they will investigate you. I am talking about a thousand-dollar bill, something I have not yet seen. Never in my life have I seen a thousand-dollar bill.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Neither have I.

Mr. PASTORE. If you stack them one on top the other, to reach a million dollars the stack will be 8 inches high. To reach a billion dollars, it will be 8,000 inches high—140 inches higher than the Washington Monument.

How do you like that? As my daughter would say, "How do you like them apples?"

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to point out that while the apparel industry and small businesses staffed by union labor represent the major part of the textile industry in Pennsylvania, we do raise some sheep in southwest Pennsylvania, particularly in Greene County, and there is an area also where wool production is affected by this problem of the domestic textile industry and the problem of keeping it in a healthy condition.

I should like to offer to my friend from Rhode Island, in the event it has not already been placed in the RECORD—perhaps he could tell me whether it has, because I have not been here all the time—a resolution adopted by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, at their last biennial convention.

Mr. PASTORE. No, we have not, but if the Senator will furnish us with a copy, we will be very happy to put it in at the conclusion of his remarks.

Mr. CLARK. I have here the resolution of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, who have many fine locals in our Commonwealth, many of which, speaking to the Senator from Rhode Island in lighter vein, have as their principal officers splendid individuals of Italo-American ancestry; and I should like very much to have that resolution placed in the RECORD, because I think it sets forth quite succinctly the problems in connection with the apparel industry in Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit 2.)

Mr. PASTORE. Inasmuch as the Senator speaks facetiously, I reply in the same vein that there are no such people as individuals of Italo-American ancestry. There are Americans of Italian descent.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. The Sons and Daughters of Italy is a fine organization with many constituents in my State.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

EXHIBIT 2

No. 36

Resolution on the United Italian-American Labor Council

Substitute resolution for resolution submitted by Joint Board of Shirt, Leisurewear, Robe, Glove and Rainwear Workers.

The United Italian-American Labor Council has worked tirelessly for nearly a quarter of a century on behalf of immigrant workers. The Amalgamated has been an active participant with the Council in this work. Many foreign-born members of minority groups have been aided by this organization in the difficult task of establishing themselves in this country. Many of these immigrants might otherwise have remained strangers in new and different surroundings. The organization has also been one of the major links in the continuing friendship between this country and democratic forces in Italy.

Resolved, that the 25th Biennial Convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO, CLC, reaffirms its deep sense of fraternity and solidarity with the Council and recognizes the significance of the Council's work.

No. 37

Resolution on imports of apparel

Substitute resolution for resolutions submitted by Joint Board of Shirt, Leisurewear, Robe, Glove and Rainwear Workers; and Local 71, (Troy, N.Y.).

The rapid increase in garment imports in the past few years, particularly from low wage countries, threatens the labor standards and jobs of apparel workers in the United States and Canada. Our workers have learned from bitter experience that the apparel industry has special characteristics which expose them to great danger from unfair competition based on low wages, no matter what the source. Even in the absence of imports, the intensely competitive nature of the industry generates strong downward pressures on prices, profits and particularly wages. In an industry with a cost structure in which labor cost represents a large proportion of total cost, the overseas apparel producer enjoys an overwhelming competitive advantage: he pays his workers a small fraction of the wages paid to apparel workers in the United States and Canada, but has access to the same machinery and equipment, the same production and merchandising techniques. His labor cost advantage is so great that domestic apparel producers, no matter how efficient, have little basis on which to compete.

The problem is serious. Manufacturers in the developing countries and other low wage areas, often encouraged by their governments, seek to take advantage of these characteristics of the apparel industry, as well as its simple capital requirements, to establish a foothold in the apparel markets of the United States and Canada and expand their exports. They are assisted by domestic mail-order houses, chain stores, department stores and large apparel purchasing organizations which place apparel orders abroad in order to run away from domestic wage levels influenced by the Fair Labor Standards Act and collective barganing. This is an extension overseas of earlier efforts by these same interests to depress apparel wages by encouraging domestic runaways and by shifting orders from firms in established production centers with union contracts to newly created non-union firms.

The Amalgamated has played a leading role in alerting the nation to the special character of the apparel import problem and in urging upon our government multi-nation arrangements for orderly international trade in apparel products. As a result of its efforts, together with other unions and interested industry groups, imports of cotton textiles and apparel have been covered by international agreement since the fall of 1961 and continue to be governed by the Long-Term Cotton Textile Arrangement. In spite of conscientious efforts by United States Government officials administering the Arrangement, results have been disappointing. Cotton apparel imports continue to increase at a worrisome rate. In individual categories there has been just the kind of undue concentration of imports that the Long-Term Arrangement was expected to forestall. On balance, however, the Arrangement has been a constructive instrument. Because of it, domestic markets for cotton apparel have undoubtedly been less disrupted than would otherwise have been the case.

Despite the expansion of world trade in cotton textiles and apparel under the Long-Term Arrangement, and the large and growing shipments to the United States, low wage countries have continued to attack the Arrangement and cirticize United States administration of it as restrictive. The future of the Arrangement is scheduled to be discussed in the sector talks of the Kennedy Round. The United States Government is seeking an extension of the Arrangement in its present form for five years on the basis of liberalizing its administration and reducing tariffs on cotton textiles and apparel. There is a real danger that the continued liberalization of the administration will seriously dilute its effectiveness as a shelter against market disruption.

Domestic markets for apparel of wool and man-made fibers continue to be disrupted by a marked increase in imports of these products. There is most serious concern, therefore, over the absence of an international agreement or any other government machinery to regularize trade in these garments. In the case of wool textiles and apparel the Administration has tried; it has made several unsuccessful attempts to persuade Great Britain, Italy and Japan to participate in an international meeting to discuss the problems of international trade in wool products. There have been no analogous efforts to create a machinery for orderly international trade in textiles and apparel of man-made fiber, increasing amounts of which have been disrupting domestic markets as a bypass of restraints under the Cotton Textile Arrangement. International agreement to regulate trade in non-cotton apparel items is urgently needed.

In view of the special problems of the apparel industry and the fact that garment imports have been rising too rapidly under existing tariff rates, it is important too that no apparel product be subjected to further duty cuts during the Kennedy Round of tariff negotiations. Such duty reductions would be particularly destructive in the case of products not governed by any international arrangement to regulate trade.

The import threat revives memories of the struggles of the garment unions since the turn of the century to win decent standards in an industry long notorious for its exploitation of labor. The sweatshops of those days now function abroad and, in the name of free trade, threaten the hard-won progress of the intervening years. They invade the markets of the United States and Canada, not on the basis of a better product, more attractive styling or superior merchandising, but on the basis of their low wages and sweated conditions—long hours and homework with its unsanitary conditions, health hazards and dependence on the labor of the young, the aged and the infirm. The history of the Amalgamated is a record of successful struggle against these evils at home. We shall not permit them to undermine or destroy us from abroad.

Resolved, that the 25th Biennial Convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL–CIO, CLC:

1. Commends the Johnson Administration for:

a) recognizing the need for special arrangements to insure orderly international trade in apparel products,

b) seeking a meeting of interested governments to discuss problems of international trade in wool products, and

c) seeking a five-year extension of the Long-Term Arrangement in its present form;

2. Urges the governments of the United States and Canada to:

a) Press for an international agreement regulating trade in wool and other non-cotton apparel and textile products, by country and category,

b) enforce strictly the existing international agreements governing trade in cotton garments and firmly resist any further erosion—in the name of more liberal administration or through any other pretext—of existing safeguards against disruption of cotton apparel markets by imports,

c) withdraw apparel items from the negotiating list for duty cuts in the Kennedy Round;

3. Authorizes the General Officers and General Executive Board to:

a) continue efforts to ensure an understanding by the executive and legislative branches of the government of the seriousness of the problem of imports of apparel and related products,

b) continue educational activities to acquaint retailers, consumers and the general public with the deplorable wage, working and unsanitary conditions under which most of the imported apparel is produced, and the consequences for apparel workers and the economy as a whole of unfair competition from imports, and

c) take such action as they consider necessary to safeguard the interests of Amalgamated members against the dangers of imports.

No. 38

Resolution on Canada

Substitute resolution for resolution submitted by Montreal Joint Board; Toronto Joint Board; Local 178 JTU (Vancouver, B.C.); and Local 459 (Winnipeg, Man.).

Strong bonds of trade union fraternity have linked the history, traditions, and goals of the Canadian and American labor movements.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield now to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. President, I speak on behalf of 160,000 textile workers of South Carolina which hold 70 percent of the industrial jobs and comprise over 75 percent of the industrial payroll of my State.

We look this afternoon for executive action and determination in this textile area.

I happen to know the difference between executive inaction and executive action.

In March of 1960, I appeared as a witness before the Tariff Commission at the suggestion of the then administration that the appropriate approach was through the Tariff Commission on a section 22 hearing and that no law was necessary and that we would most assuredly succeed.

In appearing as a witness at that particular time, I sought every authoritative source I could find. Quite to the contrary of the statement of the administration, Mr. President, the only real authority in the textile field from an objective overall standpoint was the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island.

It was his research, his findings, and his constant perusal of the record of textiles and his practice of keeping the problem up to date before Congress and the American people that a record was made available for us who were trying to present a comprehensive picture of the need in the field of textile jobs.

We failed in June of that year, and I corresponded with the then Senator John F. Kennedy in August of 1960. He set out in his letter the loss of some 400,000 textile jobs between 1950 and 1960 and resolved that if he were elected as the President of the United States, he would give Executive attention to this particular problem.

Immediately after his election, on the Friday succeeding the Tuesday, I spoke with him. We made an appointment and conferred at Palm Beach and later for 3 hours in his Georgetown home and agreed on the approach of Cabinet committee and sub-Cabinet committee which my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Rhode Island has pointed out was headed by Hickman Price, of the Department of Commerce.

We brought in witnesses and again tried to secure what we needed not only for the southern, but also for the northern textile industry, and not only for management, but also for labor.

We again looked at the record of the hearings of the Pastore committee.

The program was promulgated on a seven-point program on the afternoon of May 2, 1961, and I was there with the then labor and textile management leaders in the press room at the White House when the President announced his seven-point program.

We immediately set about the implementation of the program with respect to the depreciation allowance in August of 1961 by the Treasury Department.

In the latter part of November, the Secretary of Agriculture made certain requests of the Tariff Commission. Theretofore, we had always been opposed by the Department of Agriculture.

This action culminated in the one-price cotton program in 1963. At that time, even though I had left office, I appeared as a windup witness before the Gathings committee, the House Agriculture Committee, in March of that year.

While there have been very positive statements made by the administration in an appreciation of the problem, as the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island has pointed out, the program has languished.

It has lacked Executive direction, and long-term arrangements or agreements have expired or have somehow or other been allowed to expire in the last 2 to 3 years. The Executive has shown indirection toward solving this particular problem and implementing a program—particularly in the fields of woolen and manmade fibers.

The Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. ELLENDER] laments the fact that they have not bought cotton. The fact is that the industry was looking to Congress itself and wondering how long the program would last and what reliance they would have on the particular program and what support they would have from the Executive.

Immediately with the depreciation allowance, the industry transferred to manmade fibers, so much so that in 1965 the administration took the position on the continuation of the one-price cotton program that it was not any longer a textile problem but a farm problem, because if we would revert to the two-price cotton, the manufacturers would automatically go to manmade fibers and the cotton farmers of South Carolina, Alabama, and other Southern States, would suffer.

Now is the time, and the Senator from Rhode Island has given, in a most meaningful and cogent fashion, impetus and direction to the Kennedy round in Geneva and to the administration at a time when the long-term arrangements and reciprocal agreements expire this year and come up for renewal.

Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to continue the fight for fair competition for the American textile industry begun by President Kennedy in May of 1961. After long hearings and studies, after report of a sub-Cabinet committee, and a recommendation for action by a Cabinet committee, President Kennedy promulgated a seven-point program.

The points on cotton, depreciation allowance, and long-term agreements have been generally implemented. But now the long-term arrangements are about to expire, and the four remaining points concerning fibers, woolens, and finished products put the industry in a crisis much the same as was intended to be corrected some 6 years ago. In the past 5 years, the industry has geared to foreign competition by the modernization of its plants. But now the automation of the foreign competitor, plus the discriminatory wage differential, plus the flood of foreign imports, endangers the industry and endangers textile jobs. Inadequate protection by our Government for our industry has made possible an unprecedented increase in foreign imports that now pose a dramatic threat to the economic well-being of this segment of American business.

This threat is particularly alarming to me as a Senator from the State of South Carolina—a State that counts 75 percent of all its industrial wages as textile and textile-related industry wages—a State where 70 percent of all industrial employment is textile and textile-related industry employment—a State where the textile industry contributes $700 million in salaries annually to our economy.

In South Carolina, Mr. President, we know the advantages a prosperous industry can provide, and we know all too well the severe economic consequences that a sick industry can cause.

Since 1961 prosperity has prevailed, and my State—with a per capita income lower than all the others, save one—has made progress. That progress must not be hindered because of an unrealistic quota system. This dangerous trend must be reversed before it imperils the jobs of 1 million Americans—over 160,000 of which are located in South Carolina.

Let me say now, Mr. President, that my plea for quota stability does not come without consideration for and recognition of the tremendous importance of international trade. I fully understand the contributions it has made to the growth and progress of this Nation and realize that the world's economic stability is directly related to its success.

But I do believe that this Government's primary concern must be reasonable protection for domestic industries caught up in an unequal battle with foreign competitors.

The most significant inequality comes, of course, in the level of wages paid employees. While the salaries in our textile industry will never be as high as any of us would like them to be, certainly they are so vastly superior to those of other nations as to make comparison ridiculous.

And I submit that in an industry where machinery, availability of raw material, and transportation facilities, are roughly equal or offsetting, that wages become a determining factor in pricing the finished product.

There are three major areas in the textile industry that must be considered in attempting to establish a workable solution for our growing problem.

The first of these is cotton textiles. An attempt—albeit an increasingly unsuccessful one, has been made to help in this area. This attempt is the so-called long-term arrangement, which came into being under the auspices of the International General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—at Geneva in February of 1962. The LTA provides that participating nations may enter into bilateral cotton textile trade agreements to control imports by establishing imports by establishing import control levels. It provides that imports from one country to another may be increased by 5 percent annually—increases above this level are supposed to depend on market conditions and growth in the importing country. And it provides that a nation may unilaterally restrict imports if such imports disrupt that nation's domestic cotton textile industry.

As it has been administered, obviously the LTA has been permissive, if not downright promiscuous. It certainly has not been restrictive in the sense of closing U.S. markets to foreign imports.

To see the magnitude of failure of this program, one has only to note that in the Federal fiscal year 1960–61, imports of cotton, yarn, fabric, apparel, and all other cotton textile items into this country amounted to 813 million square yards. Through the calendar year 1966, such imports amounted to 1,823 million square yards—more than double the established base of 1960–61.

The second major area of concern in this overall textile import matter lies in manmade fibers. Imports in this segment of the industry have jumped from 213 million square yards in 1962 to 798 million square yards in 1966.

Losses, unfortunately, have occurred in this particular segment of the industry at a much higher rate than in the other sectors of the textile-apparel industry complex.

This deluge is rapidly breaking the strength of the domestic textile market, and this flood of imports has all but wiped out the industry's modest employment gains. Tremendous supplies of foreign textiles overhang the domestic market. U.S. mills have cut back output, furloughed employees, and finally laid off workers. During the latter half of 1966, nearly 40,000 workers in manmade fiber plants and in textile mills and apparel plants lost their jobs.

This is of vital interest to South Carolina. During my term as Governor, one of my major efforts was to attract new industry to the State. An outstanding part of our success in this endeavor was the creation of new establishments and jobs in the manmade fiber area.

Three new manmade fiber plants, 10 new manmade fiber-broad woven fabric mills, and 52 apparel plants, were constructed in the State, adding more than 15,000 new jobs to the employment opportunities for the citizens of South Carolina. Now this vital segment of the industrial economy of my State is being threatened by unregulated manmade fiber, textile, and apparel imports.

The third area of concern in our domestic industry deals with woolen and worsteds.

South Carolina's woolen and worsted textile plants are major factors in the American industry. My State is second—19 percent—in the number of worsted combs—machines that produce wool tops from which worsted yarn is spun. It also is second in the number of worsted spinning spindles—14 percent—and it accounts for virtually a tenth of both woolen/worsted looms and woolen spinning spindles. Our mills are modern, efficient and well managed, contributing to the fact that the U.S. industry is the most efficient in the world.

Yet South Carolina's mills, as modern and efficient as they are, continue to be seriously injured by the steady rise in imports of wool products. Mr. President, these products are made at wages and under other conditions which are barred in this country by the Fair Labor Standards Act.

I understand that duties on major wool products are reserved from negotiation in the Kennedy round under the GATT. They must continue to be reserved. Let me tell you why in the words used by an executive of a large textile company in a statement to the Tariff Commission last year:

> A reduction in duty could only be regarded by American mills as an indication that the United States government had little or no interest in maintaining and strengthening the wool textile industry. Let me assure you . . . in regard to the industry at large, that duty reductions on any wool products would be prime consideration in decisions whether to expand and update—or, indeed, maintain—our existing plants.

Mr. President, I strongly concur with Senator PASTORE. As he has urged in his well-documented and thoughtful address there must be reasonable limitations on imports of textile products of all kinds regardless of fiber. Moreover, the duties on wool products and other textile products must be, at a bare minimum, maintained at present levels—levels which are far from adequate to equalize competition.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I think it might be interesting for my friend, the Senator from South Carolina, to know that every time I went to the White House to speak to President Kennedy about textiles, he always told me: "Governor HOLLINGS just left here."

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished and able senior Senator from Rhode Island. I congratulate him on the splendid presentation of this very important address. I also wish to associate myself with the remarks of other Senators who have joined this afternoon in this discussion concerning the growing imports of cotton textiles, wool textiles, and apparel, and the impact of these growing imports upon our own industries and upon the jobs of people who have been accustomed to working in those industries.

I believe that the Senator from Rhode Island and other Senators who have joined with him this afternoon have performed an eminent service in taking the time to point to the growing imports, to the careless administration of the long-term agreement, and to the laxity on the part of the administration in performing its duty to the industries of our own country and to the people who are employed in those industries.

It is somewhat ironic that the United States has provided the money for the industries of Europe and other areas of the world which today compete with our own industries and with our own people. Yet, nothing is more important to the economy and security of other countries than a strong American economy. America's economic strength underlies her military strength, and America's military strength provides the umbrella of security for the very countries whose products are disrupting our own markets. The Senator from Rhode Island has placed various maps before the Senators today, and he has repeatedly referred to that area in our country, reaching from New York to Alabama, known as Appalachia, and of which the State of West Virginia is the only State that is wholly within the region. He obviously has spent much time in preparing his address. His maps very dramatically highlight the extent of the textile and textile manufacturing industry in that area, and the Senator has repeatedly referred to the impact upon the economy of the area and upon the jobs of people in that section of the country.

The people of Appalachia do not want to live on the dole. They, of course, are grateful for the various programs which have been provided by Congress, and implemented by the Federal Government, to help Appalachia. Congress has passed the accelerated public works legislation, the Area Redevelopment Act, the Economic Development Act, the economic opportunity legislation, the food stamp legislation, manifold programs dedicated to helping unemployed people get on their economic feet. Then, of course, we have had the conventional welfare programs which have been in vogue for a long time. But the people of my State and the people of all Appalachia, in my judgment, are more interested in jobs than in poverty programs. They are not interested in the dole because it is self-defeating, stultifying, and degrading. I believe that the worst thing we can do for employable people, other than perhaps letting them starve, is to put them on the dole. The character of a nation is destroyed when the incentive of a people to work is destroyed.

The people in my State have long suffered from unemployment. The unemployment rate in West Virginia has remained almost double the unemployment rate in the Nation. My State is the only State, I believe, which continues to lose population. So we look at these growing imports with considerable seriousness, because in reality we are continuing to import poverty and to export jobs. Poverty, once it sets in, is hard to eradicate; and jobs, once lost, are difficult to regain.

I saw them tearing a building down,
A group of men in a busy town.
With a ho-hi-ho and a lusty yell,
They swung a beam and the side wall fell.

I said to the foreman, "Are these men skilled,
The type you would hire if you had to
build?"
He laughed and then he said: "No, indeed.
Just common labor is all I need.
I can easily wreck in a day or two
That which takes builders years to do."

I said to myself, as I walked away,
"Which of these roles am I trying to play?
Am I a builder who works with care,
Building my life by the rule and square?
Am I shaping my deeds by a well laid plan,
Patiently building the best I can?
Or am I a fellow who walks the town,
Content with the labor of tearing down?"

This bit of verse, Mr. President, emphasizes a point that I believe has been made this afternoon by the senior Senator from Rhode Island and others: that it is easy to tear down; it is difficult to build or to rebuild. It takes a long time to train people for jobs that have been lost and to which they have been accustomed throughout their lifetimes. And all too often, they are trained for jobs that are nonexistent. It takes a long time to renew their faith in the future, faith in their Government, and their faith in themselves, when they have lost their jobs. It takes a long time to rebuild West Virginia, to rebuild Appalachia, to rebuild the shaken economies in Rhode Island, the New England States, or the Southern States. I believe that we should rededicate our efforts to the strengthening of those economies. Because—let us face it—charity begins at home.

And so I repeat, the Senator from Rhode Island this afternoon has performed a signal service in alerting his colleagues so that they might join with him in speaking out on this vital subject. I join with others in saying that we will support him in his efforts, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Textiles of the Committee on Commerce, and that we will support him in his efforts to insist that the long-term agreement be carefully administered; that there be control of imports of textile, apparel, and all fibers; that there be a proper administration of these various import programs, and that there be no lowering of tariffs on these fibers, textiles, and textile products.

I appreciate the kindness of the Senator from Rhode Island in yielding to me. I once more congratulate him, and I assure him of my continuing efforts to support him in his endeavors in this regard.

The people of my State are not only concerned with the rapidly accelerating imports in textiles, but they have also been long concerned with growing imports of glass and pottery and now iron and steel. These other items of course, are not within the context of the subject this afternoon, but they are of great and growing concern to all our people.

I again thank the able Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank my colleague, the Senator from West Virginia, for his generous remarks.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to my distinguished colleague and dear friend, the junior Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, my eloquent, able, and distinguished senior colleague and good friend from Rhode Island has today rendered a great service to the American people by outlining in an excellent and strong way the very serious problem which imports are causing one of our basic industries. I want to associate myself with his remarks and commend him for the excellent job he has done.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and a Senator from a State in which nearly 26,000 people are employed by the textile and related industries, I have always had a particularly strong interest in the way imports affect the textile industry.

Members of the Foreign Relations Committee are charged with the responsibility of developing the basic policies on which our relations with countries throughout the world are based. We realize, that trade historically has been one of the best means of helping nations get along with each other. Trade is a vital weapon in the cold war. But we also realize that trade policies can work to the detriment of our economy at home. We must continually review our basic trade policies to make certain that they are serving the best interests of the American people.

Twenty years ago the United States was the world's largest textile exporter. Today, we are the world's largest textile importer.

In 1947, we exported a billion and a half square yards of coton fabrics; 233-million square yards of manmade fiber cloth—a total of more than a billion, seven hundred million yards. This, in a year when our imports of cotton and manmade fiber cloth amounted to less than 20 million square yards.

Today, that situation has reversed itself. From a nation with a favorable fabric trade balance of a billion, seven hundred million square yards, we have shifted to a nation with a net fabric trade deficit of a little over 500 million square yards a year.

By 1966, our total cotton and manmade fiber exports had dwindled to less than 500 million square yards, hardly as much textiles as arrive in American ports every 60 days from foreign nations.

In dollars, our textile trade deficit in 1966 is $902 million. The overall U.S. balance-of-payments deficit is now $1.4 billion. The textile trade deficit is equivalent to almost two-thirds of this.

The plight of the textile industry today has been partly financed by the U.S. Government. Since World War II, millions of U.S. tax dollars have been used to build up textile-producing facilities abroad.

American aid money has been used to buy textile machinery for foreign countries; to finance technical assistance; management services and new mills—mills whose excess production capacity overseas has not only produced market disruptive import pressures on the U.S. market but also has served to depress an already declining world market for American textiles.

In this connection, the main reason why I have questioned the advisability of according the investment credit to Thailand as part of the projected tax treaty with that nation is that this would mean that the American taxpayer could be subsidizing a textile plant abroad to compete with our own industry.

America's declining share of the world textile market involves factors over which this industry has no control.

Take wages for instance. America's textile workers are the highest paid in the world. Compared to wages in countries with which the United States must compete in the world market, there can be no basis for fair competition on manufacturing cost alone.

The average wage in the American textile industry today is $2 an hour. Compare this with $1.27 in the United Kingdom; 75 cents in Belgium, 53 cents in Italy, 36 cents in Japan, and 25 cents in Hong Kong. Japan alone accounted for 910 million square yards of U.S. textile imports in 1966; one-third of total textile imports to the United States.

The simple economic truth is that American manufacturers cannot compete, either at home or abroad, in a market in which the price structure of the product involves a wage disadvantage amounting to more than 80 percent of the labor cost in any given product.

Why has the textile industry not created new products; promoted foreign markets; improved its technology to offset the built-in competitive advantage enjoyed by our friends across the sea?

The facts are that the textile industry has made a tremendous effort and in some cases achieved tremendous results in the face of equally difficult odds.

In research and development, the industry has created new products to meet the demands of an increasingly affluent and sophisticated public. More than 40 percent of textile products in the American market today were not even in existence 15 years ago, fabrics that stretch—without rubber—fabrics that resist soil, fabrics that turn water when it is raining; but let in air when the sun is shining, laminated fabrics, fabrics made of glass fiber, and fabrics that will hold a crease for the life of a garment.

These are only a few of the industry's new products—products which are meeting a wall of legalistic resistance in some 50 countries which virtually exclude importation of U.S. textiles. And 20 more countries which make it almost impossible to sell American textiles because of tariff barriers and hidden taxes. The textile industry has made every conceivable effort to create, develop, and promote foreign markets. In an industry in which there are more than 5,000 manufacturers, competition is a way of life.

At least 20 of the major manufacturers have established foreign sales offices and appointed sales agents throughout the world despite formidable and often unsurmountable obstacles in the form of protectionist policies of some of the very countries which are dumping textile imports in the ports of America.

The textile industry has cooperated 100 percent with the U.S. Department of Commerce in efforts to promote demand for some of the industry's new developments. The industry has been represented in at least nine world trade fairs of the past 10 years—from Thailand to Australia to London.

In every instance American products have attracted wide attention and interest, but in no case have we succeeded in breaking through the visible and invisible barriers that the countries of the world have erected to protect their own industries.

The long term arrangement which was intended to develop two-way traffic in cotton textile trade has turned into a one-way street in which the United States has been the loser.

Why has the textile industry not improved its production methods; modernized its equipment to offset higher manufacturing costs; and thus enable the industry to compete more easily in the world market?

It has.

During the 1950's the two-price cotton system, obsolete and inequitable tax depreciation policies and increases in imports caused textile earnings to slump in the 1958 recession to a low of 1.6 cents per dollar of sales, compared to 4.1 cents for all manufacturing.

Concurrently, textile investment for new plants and equipment dropped to an annual average of approximately $410 million in the years 1957–60. With the aid of more favorable tax depreciation allowances on the 7 percent tax credit on new plants and equipment, from 1960 to 1964, the average increased to $628 million. In 1966, industry investments in new plants and equipment reached an alltime high of more than $1.2 billion.

Up to now, the textile industry has resisted the temptation toward heavy investments abroad to offset domestic manufacturing costs. In fact, in March 1966, when President Johnson asked for a reduction in domestic capital spending, the textile industry complied with a 10-percent reduction from a January forecast of $1.3 billion.

All told, the textile industry's technology has advanced with such rapidity that a 20,000 spindle plant today can equal the production of a 50,000 spindle plant of just 16 years ago. The speed of conventional looms has increased 70 percent, and more and more high-speed shuttleless looms, operating at double the speed of conventional looms are replacing the conventional variety.

Computerization of the textile industry is proceeding at a rapid rate. Today more than 2,000 different jobs are performed by computers. Increasing use of electronic data processing will continue as long as the industry is permitted to manufacture and sell its product in a market that is fair to the American manufacturer.

However, computerization, improved technology, better products, aggressive selling efforts in the international marketplace have not solved this industry's problems. Why? Because the real problem is outside the control of the industry. The real problem is with the nations of the world which have erected trade barriers to prohibit American competition; countries which maintain a wage scale with which we can neither compete nor would want to compete if it means a sacrifice of our high standard of living.

Mr. President, the textile import-export situation has reached the point where it is not serving the best interests of our country. We must act now to stem this very dangerous tide.

I heartily endorse the recommendations of my colleague from Rhode Island that the long term arrangement on cotton textiles be extended for another 5 years; that wool and manmade fibers be brought under a long-term agreement type of arrangement and that textile duties be exempt from any tariff cuts made during the Kennedy round of GATT negotiations.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] has spoken at some length on a matter very close to the hearts of people in New Jersey—the textile industry and its prospects, and the problems that face it.

New Jersey is a State in which more than 100,000 people are employed in the textile manufacturing industry. It is a matter of first importance to us. I wish to say personally that the leadership the Senator from Rhode Island has given this cause has been something for which we in New Jersey have been most grateful. I am happy to work shoulder to shoulder with him in attempting to work out, for the benefit of the Nation and the people in this industry in my State and throughout the country, solutions to problems for which we must find solutions.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. Though Montana may rank near the end of the list of States in the amount of textile industry, our State is fourth in the country in the production of wool. Any threat to the textile industry, therefore, is a threat to the economy of Montana, whose wool growers brought, according to preliminary figures of the Department of Agriculture, $6,217,000 in value of sales to the State during 1965.

The increase in imports of wool textile and apparel to which the Senator from Rhode Island has referred may not constitute an immediate danger, but it gives emphasis to the need for this discussion. I am grateful to my friend for initiating it while there is time to act.

Senators may be interested in a table which lists the top four States in the order of total wool production and the value of sales.

These four alone contribute more than $40 million annually to our gross national product. The displacement of this amount or any part of it would have a very serious economic result.

I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the shorn wool production be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

State	Shorn wool production (pounds)	Value of sales
Texas	43,941,000	$19,773,000
Wyoming	19,123,000	8,797,000
California	15,732,000	7,551,000
Montana	12,190,000	6,217,000

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I support Senator Pastore's position on the textile import problem. I have participated actively in the frustrating attempts of the past 6 years to obtain implementation of President Johnson's and President Kennedy's policies in favor of reasonable import limitations of wool products.

The woolgrowers of Wyoming and of the United States, as a whole, have a very direct interest in the health and prosperity of the American wool textile industry. Their interest is readily understood when it is realized that American mills are the sole customers of the American woolgrowers.

Therefore, every pound of wool imported in manufactured form strikes not only at the American mills whose products are being displaced but also at the American grower because his only customers are being injured.

Mr. President, in 1966 the weight of imports of wool textiles and apparel was approximately equal to U.S. production of shorn wool—approximately 100 million pounds, clean basis.

Allow me to give further emphasis to this point by comparing it directly to wool production in Wyoming, the second largest wool growing State. Annual production of shorn wool—clean basis—in my State is about 9 million pounds. Nine million pounds, Mr. President, are not even one-tenth of the 98.5 million pounds of wool textile product imports in 1966. In other words, it would take the woolgrowers of Wyoming—the second largest producing State—over 10 years to equal the weight of wool product imports in 1966.

Is it any wonder, Mr. President, that American wool growers are gravely concerned by the ever-mounting flood of low-wage wool product imports.

There is another facet to this problem; one in which the Congress is directly concerned. The effect of the import influx runs directly counter to the aims of the National Wool Act, which was first passed in 1954 and has been extended three times since then. The act states that wool "is an essential and strategic commodity" and adds:

> It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress as a measure of national security and in promotion of the general economic welfare, to encourage the annual domestic production of approximately 300 million pounds of shorn wool, grease basis, at prices fair to both producers and consumers in a manner which will have the least adverse effects upon foreign trade.

Wool production has been declining and without doubt it would have dropped even further except for the incentive program provided by the National Wool Act. But one of the principal reasons for the decline is the devastating impact of rising wool product imports upon both manufacturers and growers. Mr. President, the disruptive imports of wool products run directly counter to the aim of Congress in passing and extending the National Wool Act; that is, the encouragement to wool growing in the United States.

It is ironic that in the portion of the act which I have just read there is the statement that the program should be carried out "in a manner which will have the least adverse effects upon foreign trade."

At the time the act was drawn there appears to have been no recognition of what has become so readily apparent today—that foreign trade in the form of wool product imports would interfere with the successful operation of the National Wool Act.

I maintain close relationship not only with the wool growers but with the wool manufacturers of the United States because they are both so important to the economy of Wyoming.

I can say to you that the wool manufacturers have only one desire and that is to move forward with the economy of this country. They want to be able to hire more American workers at American wages. They want to expand their plants and productive equipment. Such growth cannot be achieved, however, if the manufacturers, their employees, and the growers are to be sacrificed to unfair competition from low-wage foreign countries and cartelized trading arrangements.

Senator Pastore has covered the defense essentiality of textile products but I shall add a few comments. The Wool Act, as I have said, declares that wool is an "essential and strategic" commodity and cites national security as a reason for the law. Let us not forget that wool, or any other fiber, has absolutely no security value unless the United States possesses the machinery to convert it into needed military and civilian articles.

It is significant also that though tropical Vietnam is essentially a cotton textile war, the American buildup in 1965 and 1966 resulted in sharply increased military demands for worsted fabrics.

Only a few months ago, an executive of one of the handful of remaining U.S. worsted producers—one of the great American textile companies—told a Tariff Commission hearing that 42 percent of its worsted production was for the military. One can only imagine the demands in a greater emergency or for a conflict in a colder climate—for worsted cloth, for woolen cloth, and all kinds of wool products.

It is pertinent to note at this point that since World War II some 300 wool textile plants have disappeared, along with 60 percent of key manufacturing machinery and tens of thousands of jobs. Clearly this is not the time to allow low-wage imports to further decimate so vital an industry.

Certainly no member of this body and no person in the United States wants to be dependent on foreign sources for wool products in time of emergency.

Mr. President, the late President Kennedy made it abundantly clear that his textile program was intended to encompass limitations on imports of wool products. The policy of his administration was officially stated to be that wool textile imports should be held at 1962 levels because any imports in excess of these levels would cause market disruption.

Today the more than 300,000 woolgrowers in this country and their only customer, the American wool textile industry, find the situation has markedly and disruptively worsened. Government figures show that, as measured at the fiber level, 1962 imports were 20 percent of domestic production.

When President Johnson in 1964 stated his conviction that imports of wool products must be held at reasonable levels and that the industry should be restored to good health, the ratio had advanced to 22 percent. Mr. President, the ratio in 1966 has increased again—to 26 percent. This is the highest concentration of imports in relation to either domestic production or consumption of any kind of textile products.

In some categories, such as worsteds, knitwear, and wool shirts, the import concentration is in the range of 50 percent. Perhaps you will be as shocked as I was to learn recently that one out of every two men's regular-weight suits manufactured in this country is made from imported wool cloth, mainly worsted. Most of Wyoming's wool is the kind that goes into worsteds and the damaging impact of these imports is self-evident.

Perhaps there will be a question as to whether wool textile exports do, or might, offset at least some of the imports. Mr. President, exports are virtually nil. If American mills were able to compete in foreign markets to any extent there would be no import problem. I am informed, moreover, that the American industry without question is the most efficient in the world, yet its efficiency cannot overcome the low-wage advantage abroad. In fact, imported wool textiles—duty paid—frequently sell for less than the cost of production in highly efficient American mills.

Although what remains of the American wool textile industry experienced a degree of prosperity in 1965 and the first half of 1966—due in part to military orders—the industry has undergone a marked decline since that time. This is reflected in a dearth of orders, lower prices, and a buildup in inventories. Reversal of this downtrend is not presently in sight. As might be expected the decline in the domestic markets also affects imports and there was a slight decrease. However, the ratio of imports to domestic production continues to increase, as I have pointed out.

Mr. President, I wholeheartedly support President Johnson's policy in favor of reasonable limitation on wool textile imports. Nowhere has the critical nature of this problem been better expressed than in the resolution adopted unanimously at the recently concluded convention of the National Wool Growers Association. It said:

> We are seriously alarmed by the rapid growth in imports of wool textiles and apparel, and cannot hide our disappointment at the failure of the Government thus far to take action to achieve reasonable limitations on these imports. The wool manufacturers of the United States are our only customers. If the steady rise in the proportion of imports to domestically produced wool textiles and apparel is not reversed, it will inevitably mean the extinction of the U.S. manufacturing industry and, therefore, of our own industry. We urge that President Johnson's policy, as expressed in his stated conviction that wool product imports must be kept at reasonable levels, be promptly implemented, unilaterally if necessary.
>
> We also urge early enactment of legislation to close the unconscionable tariff loophole on wool and silk blend fabrics, and other potential loopholes.

As the resolution points out, the trend of wool product imports in relation to domestic production is steadily upward. Simple mathematics prove that unless this trend is reversed the American wool manufacturing industry will be further reduced to the point that no woolgrowing industry will be needed.

I am previously on public record as being in favor of unilateral action by the United States—the President or the Congress—if all attempts fail at securing cooperation of other governments in a wool textile trade arrangement. Senator PASTORE has reaffirmed his position in this regard, and I reaffirm mine. However achieved, import limitations are needed—urgently needed in the interest of the woolgrowers, their customers, the woolen and worsted mills and, indeed, in the national interest as well.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wish to compliment all Senators whose remarks have pointed up the dangers to our American textile and wool industry if the imports of wool continue and if textiles continue at present levels.

I join my colleague by stating that these imports are hurting our South Dakota wool growers—and South Dakota is the fourth largest wool-growing State in the Union—because these imports damage our South Dakota growers' only market, the U.S. textile industry.

Mr. President, these imports are definitely having an adverse effect on our producers' economy. In 1958, the imports of wool textile and apparel exceeded exports by $104 million. In 1966 this trade deficit had more than tripled to $350 millions. If we add carpets and rugs to this figure, it adds another $24 million to the 1966 deficit, or a total of $374 million.

No wonder that this morning's report entitled "Agricultural Prices," which reached my desk from the Department of Agriculture, shows that parity has again declined and is now even 1 percent below a month ago and stands at 74 percent. The report shows that since February 15, 1966, parity has declined 8 percent—from 82 to 74 in just 1 year. Mr. President, in the face of this economy-depressing parity ratio the administration must take immediate action, in my opinion, to curb these imports.

Further, the report states:

> The index of prices received by farmers declined 3 points during the month ended February 15.

Since February 15, 1966, the index of prices received by farmers has declined from 270 to 252, a total of 18 points. It declined 3 points in the last month alone. Is it any wonder, Mr. President, that my office is flooded with letters from farmers complaining about the decisions of this administration to permit these imports to continue to take away the American market from the American producer?

To add insult to injury to our lamb producers' plight, I was advised this morning by the Department of Defense that Defense procurement has contracted for 10 million pounds of lamb from Australia and New Zealand. This action, again taken by the Johnson administration, gives away our American market and, in my opinion, considering the depressed state of agriculture, is most shameful.

It is shameful because if one looks at the report entitled "Agricultural Prices," dated February 28, 1967, he will find that in the last year lamb prices have dropped $6.50 per hundredweight, from $26.60 to $20.10. Sheep prices in the last year are off $1.03 per hundredweight—from $7.78 to $6.75; and wool is off 4.1 cents per pound from 47.7 cents to 43.6 cents.

Mr. President, it is time for this administration to take effective action to protect our American markets for our American producers. I sincerely hope that all policymakers in this administration will carefully read tomorrow morning the remarks made in the Senate today and that they will then take emergency action to curb these imports and restore to the American farmer the markets to which he is justly entitled. It is a national disgrace that parity is steadily declining and has reached the low of 74 percent—and that when the Nation is at war in Vietnam. Never before in American history have farm prices been pushed down so low at a time when the Nation is in a full-scale war.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I join with the senior Senator from my neighboring State of Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] in strongly emphasizing the need to implement President Johnson's and President Kennedy's expressed policies calling for reasonable import limitations on wool products.

I, too, have been to the White House on this problem because my own State of Utah is one of the very important woolgrowing States of the Nation. In fact, sheep production is very important to the economy of Utah, utilizing land that otherwise would not be productive.

However, I hasten to add, Mr. President, that there will be no market for the wool production of Utah or the other 49 States of this Nation if wool textile imports continue to grow and choke out our domestic mills, the only outlet for our domestic wool.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Finance Committee I have been concerned with the fact that wool textile imports are not only entering this country in tremendous volume at regular duty levels, but that the domestic industry is constantly plagued by tariff loopholes through which the duty established by Congress is circumvented.

In recent years Congress has had to enact legislation closing three of these loopholes which had enabled importers to pay only a fraction of the regular tariff. The importers accomplished this by such simple devices as sewing braid along one edge of the cloth, mixing small quantities of vegetable and fur fiber with wool, and now the mixing of a little silk with the wool or laminating a cotton or linen backing on the fabric.

By these simple means the importers have been able to get the cloth classified under other tariff provisions than those applicable to regular woven wool cloth even though wool actually constituted as much as 85 percent of the weight of the fabric. Furthermore, these fabrics on which the duty was circumvented went into the same end uses as regular wool fabrics.

The Tariff Commission is scheduled to report shortly to the Ways and Means Committee of the other body its recommendations for closing existing and potential loopholes. While action is urgently needed on the overall import problem, the loophole aspect of this problem is a rather major matter. Since 1961, imports of woven cloth through tariff loopholes have exceed 80 million square yards.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I wish to support the eloquent remarks of the senior Senator from Rhode Island.

What we are talking about, here today, is preventive medicine. We do not want another situation to develop as it did in the 1950's when many textile mills were forced to close or relocate. If we act now, to see that the textile program adopted by the Federal Government in 1961 is fully and effectively implemented, we can lick this problem.

We are discussing the livelihood of some 4 million Americans. During the last 5 years, textile imports have risen threefold from 1 to 3 billion square yards. Under the terms of the original long-term cotton agreement, imports were permitted a growth of 5 percent a year, whereas in actual practice during the last 3 years, cotton imports have expanded by 53, 66 and 39 percent, respectively. Imports agreements have never been concluded with respect to wool and synthetic fibers. The effect has been to create job opportunities in other nations at the expense of the domestic textile industry. Unless our Government takes a firm stand, many of our existing jobs could well be in jeopardy.

I would like to emphasize a specific example, wool import loopholes. There is a long record of importers using technicalities in existing customs regulations to import wool-blend products, taking advantage of lower wool tariff rates rather than the higher rate normally imposed on the blend product. On two occasions, bills have been enacted into law closing loopholes. This year I have joined the junior Senator from Georgia, as I did in the last Congress, in cosponsoring legislation designed to close another loophole, that of wool/silk blend textiles. In the meantime, still one more loophole has already appeared—laminated wool cloth.

To close one of these loopholes requires the enactment of legislation. Administration support must be obtained. Hearings must be held. Because of the cumbersome process required, it takes a period between 2 to 3 years to close the door on a given loophole once imports begin to flow through. For example, domestic woolen manufacturers are still facing competition from wool/rabbit fur blend products on the dealers' shelves today even though the loophole was closed by enactment of legislation in April 1966.

If we take wool/silk blend imports from Italy, as a concrete example, we see that imports have risen from 1,216 square yards in 1964, to 82,250 square yards in 1965, to 1,849,629 square yards in 1966. In the face of this clearly unfair competition, I know of two mills in my State that have closed while others have been forced to curtail their production, operating with a vastly reduced work force.

Since loopholes are only one small part of the overall textile import problem, it is easy to see that the dimensions are awesome, the impact devastating on employment in the domestic industry. Strong medicine is needed now before the patient faces the chronic problems encountered in the 1950's.

One answer is through more rapid action to close loopholes. We must do away with the lengthy period between identification and closing wool loopholes. Quicker action by the Tariff Commission and the Congress is an urgent necessity.

Another approach must be enforcement of the existing Wool Products Labeling Act provisions to eliminate deliberate mislabeling of foreign products. That act requires strict compliance with expensive and extensive recordkeeping by domestic manufacturers and sellers subject to the law.

While the act always has applied to imports entering interstate commerce, as well as to domestic articles, in fact there has been little or no enforcement on foreign-made wool products. It has become increasingly apparent that foreign manufacturers were not conforming to the law. This gives imports an added, wholly unwarranted advantage over properly labeled domestic articles and misinforms the consumer.

To correct this enforcement inequity, the Federal Trade Commission late in 1966 issued proposed rule 36 to the Wool Products Labeling Act and held a public hearing on it. In essence the proposed rule would require that importers establish by tests that their goods are correctly labeled before importing them to the United States. The proposed rule has drawn strong complaints from importers and exporting nations. I understand representations have been made to the State Department alleging that the rule would constitute a nontariff barrier to trade and would violate GATT.

It cannot be overlooked that the Wool Products Labeling Act, a congressional statute, had been in effect years before the GATT, an executive agreement, came into being. Moreover, the objections would seem to indicate that the complainants fear that a major portion of their exports are mislabeled. To say the least, it is difficult to understand why anyone properly labeling his exports to the United States should complain of a procedure aimed at increasing his protection against mislabeled wool products in the American market.

I commend the Federal Trade Commission for its proposal to enforce the WPLA against imported wool products and urge that rule 36 be put into effect as soon as possible.

The message is clear. We have a problem. Action is justified. We can see where some of the answers lie: greater control over wool, cotton, and synthetic imports as envisioned by the textile policy originally adopted in 1961, the rapid closing of all wool-blend import loopholes and strict enforcement of the Wool Products Labeling Act. If these actions are not taken, stronger medicine may be required. If we cannot accomplish the job with the tools we now have, stronger laws must be enacted, more rigid import controls must be imposed. The livelihood of 4 million Americans is at stake.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I heartily concur with my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island in his remarks on the problems in our textile industry. I think an expansion on the subject will show that the same problems are being faced today by our sheep ranchers because of the inundation of our markets by foreign wool.

Mr. Paul W. Swisher, executive secretary of the Colorado Wool Growers Association, when asked about the problems of the sheep ranching industry, said:

> I am seriously alarmed over the tremendous increase in imports of wool and apparel and textiles into this country. If this trend is not reversed in the near future, the Colorado and United States sheep industry faces extinction.

His words gain even more significance when we look at the figures of production for Colorado. In Colorado in 1962, there were 1,676,000 sheep and lambs sheared. We produced 15,266,000 pounds of wool. In 1965, Coloradans produced 11,676,000 pounds of wool from 1,287,000 sheep and lambs. And by 1966 this production had dropped even further, to a total number of sheep and lambs sheared of 1,128,000.

Why has our production decreased? By checking the import situation, it becomes quite obvious that our markets are being taken away from our domestic producers by cheap foreign wool. In 1961, 13.3 percent of the U.S. wool textile and apparel market was of foreign origin. By August 1965 this percentage had increased to 29.9 percent. And worsted wool imports were one-half of our domestic worsted wool production.

In 1965, 144.4 million yards of wool apparel and textiles were imported. During 1966 this rose to 154.4 million yards, and at the present time, one out of every three men's and boys' wool suits in this country are foreign imports. Obviously the trend is worsening, and our sheep ranchers are facing a terrible dilemma.

As my colleague from Rhode Island pointed out, the Eisenhower administration in 1956 recognized the threat to our domestic sheep and wool industries and activated a tariff quota on wool fabrics on imports in excess of 5 percent of domestic production. However, this tariff did not achieve the desired results, so when President Kennedy took office he called for a multilateral agreement covering wool textile trade. President Johnson carried the program forward and in 1964 the first of three missions was sent abroad to discuss the problems with the wool-exporting countries. All three missions met with the same result: refusal by those wool-exporting nations to even talk business.

Mr. President, when we consider the need for our economy to prosper, the talk always comes around to our imbalance in payments. Here is one area in which we could do some concrete good by helping our domestic industry and our balance of payments. Wool textile imports accounted for an imbalance in the U.S. balance of payments in 1961 of $144 million. In 1965, this had risen to $318 million. The wool deficit for 1965 accounts for one-half of the total textile deficit. Thus, if we remedy the problems faced by our sheep ranchers, we can also assist in balancing our trade deficit.

It seems clear to me, Mr. President, that we must not allow our domestic wool and sheep industry to be sapped by unfair competition from countries whose workers do not get as much for a day's work as our workers get for an hour. We must allow our industries to strengthen themselves. By cutting back on the flow of wool into this country we can protect that vital segment of our economy which provides woolen clothes for our citizens. We can provide incentive for our sheep ranchers to increase production.

We must take steps toward multilateral agreements on wool trade with the wool-exporting nations of the world. If they refuse to talk, as they have in the past, we must then move ahead on our own, in the understanding that the wool industry is vital to our economy's strength. We must enforce the standards we place on our own woolgrowers on the wool which does come into this country. And we must take these actions immediately, or, as Paul Swisher points out, we are in danger of losing our sheep industry.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I rise to declare my full agreement with my colleagues on the urgent need for import limitations on wool textiles, specifically, and on textiles, in general. I congratulate Senator PASTORE on his leadership.

There long have been bipartisan efforts to solve the textile import problem and this is as it should be because the fiber-textile-apparel complex is a basic and essential American industry vital to the economy. Senator PASTORE noted that President Eisenhower initiated action on both cotton textile and wool fabric imports. Moreover, woven wool cloth duties were renegotiated and increased during his administration.

Since I am closely associated with the livestock industry, I realize full well how important it is to our wool growing industry of the Western States to solve this wool textile import problem. Due to the high costs of producing domestic wool, we must sell to domestic mills. Unless we solve this import problem on the finished products, our wool growers in Wyoming and other States will have no domestic mills to which they can sell their wool.

The near-crisis situation facing our domestic producers in our western agricultural States cannot be overemphasized. Wyoming, recent figures show, is now second in the production of sheep, wool, and lamb in the United States. The sheepmen of Wyoming in the last several months have found themselves assailed from all sides. First, the Department of Defense proceeded to purchase 10 million pounds of carcass lamb from Australia and New Zealand. This purchase could have meant the sale of 266,000 head of 75-pound feeder lambs as produced in Wyoming. This is equivalent to one-sixth of Wyoming's total feeder lamb production.

Further, this Defense Department purchase came at a time when the market was over $4 lower than it had been a year previous. The market situation has strengthened in the last couple of days, specifically on our heavy lambs which were so far depressed, but it still remains desperately low. Prices remain at or below levels reached 2 years ago while the costs of production have continued to rise.

With regard to imports, we know that there are no quotas presently applicable to lamb imports. As I have stated earlier, I generally favor freer trade, but this trade must not become so free and unrestrained that it jeopardizes American producers who could not possibly compete with their counterparts in low-wage countries. Wages and production costs are part of our affluent society, but this must be viewed in terms of our affected industries. Increased imports of lamb, beef, steel, wool, and other commodities all pose a real threat to the economic vitality of Wyoming. The tide has now turned to the extent that we can no longer be blind to the fact that sheepmen and cattlemen will be forced out of business within the very near future if the import rate of foreign products continues to increase.

I point with pride to the recent efforts made by the National Wool Growers Association working in cooperation with our major chainstores to increase buying and consumption of the heavy lambs which are now glutting our market. But, as my colleagues have made crystal clear, such efforts will be of no avail absent sympathetic support from our country's Government. More than words from our administration are required now. I look forward to working with President Johnson and with my colleagues in the Senate to reasonably limit textile, wool, and meat imports. Immediate action is required. I am hopeful that there will now be bipartisan support for a prompt and forthright program which will carry forward the steps first taken during President Eisenhower's administration.

Mr. President, my colleague, the junior Senator from Tennessee, was sorry, indeed, that a previous commitment prevented his being here to compliment the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Senator BAKER, keenly aware of the value of the textile industry to his State, supports fully the senior Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of several Senators today on the need to curb growing imports of wool products.

Just last session the Congress passed my amendment to strengthen our wool production incentive payment system. It is difficult for me to believe the Federal Government should encourage wool production, on the one hand, while permitting imports of wool products to increase, on the other. Without reasonable import limitations we are choking off the market for the very wool production we seek to increase.

The import question is a very real problem for Nevada wool growers as it is for those in other States who are engaged in this very important sector of our Nation's agriculture.

Unquestionably, there is a very real need to implement now the policies of President Kennedy and President Johnson which support reasonable import quotas.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I want to commend the Senator from Rhode Island for his excellent presentation. He has done this body a great service by his lucid explanation of a very serious problem facing the American textile industry today.

As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I have become well acquainted with the problems facing that industry. Over the years, the Finance Committee has been forced to deal time and time again with the subterfuge used to avoid the tariff rates for textiles set by this Congress. To swell the volume of imports—to avoid lawful duty—fabrics have been dipped, waterproofed, and coated. Simple ornaments and tucks have been added, to be taken off and discarded after importation. Vegetable fiber has been added to manmade fabric. Flax, ramie, and even rabbit fur has been added to wool—not to create a different fabric, but to create a fabric that looks like wool but avoid the duty on wool.

Many of these loopholes we have closed. However, as the Senator from Rhode Island has so well pointed out, the American textile industry—and the American market—are considered fair game throughout the world. American labor and American industry deserves fairplay and a fair opportunity.

The Senator from Rhode Island has again performed a great service in bringing to light the recent difficulties on this industry.

APPAREL IMPORT PROBLEM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in the State of Indiana approximately 14,000 people work in the apparel industry. These people are employed in 150 plants scattered throughout the State. The majority of apparel workers in Indiana make men's and boys' clothing.

Our Nation has been faced with the problem of increasing quantities of imported apparel for about the last 12 years. This problem has become more acute in the last 5 years, since many developing nations have found a lucrative and open market for their apparel products in the United States. These developing nations of Asia and southern Europe have established apparel industries since World War II and have built modern plants equipped with new and efficient machinery. Workers in these plants are paid a mere fraction of the wages paid to our apparel workers. The efficiency of the foreign workers is not on a par with that of American workers, but with machines which are in some cases more efficient than ours, the apparel worker in Hong Kong or Japan can produce goods which can sell profitably in the United States at a cost substantially under that for a comparable, domestically produced apparel product.

Imports of almost every major type of apparel are available in large quantities in our markets. In 1966, total apparel imports of cotton, wool, and synthetic fabrics were 778 million equivalent square yards. This total represents almost all apparel imports, since apparel of linen, silk, and other fabrics constitutes only a small part of imported apparel items. Of the three major fibers used in apparel production, synthetic fabric apparel imports are growing at the fastest rate—370 percent since 1962.

Men's and boys' shirts and trousers, children's clothing, and knit outerwear of cotton, wool, and synthetic fibers are areas of particular concern to the apparel industry because import growth has been especially rapid there. The people of Indiana share in this concern, knowing the potential harm it can do to their own economy in terms of lower employment and reduced incomes. If American-produced apparel cannot be sold in our own markets because imported clothes are selling there at lower prices, employment in the domestic apparel industry will have to be reduced over a period of time, and incomes from apparel employment will be lowered accordingly.

The rapid rise in the quantity of imports, particularly those made of synthetic fabrics, and to a lesser extent those made of wool and cotton, gives us concrete evidence that the present tariff levels provide only a small barrier to the entry of foreign-produced apparel into American markets. Cotton apparel imports have not increased as much as those of wool or synthetics during the last several years because imports of cotton apparel are regulated by an international trade arrangement. The United States is one of 29 countries to sign the long-term international cotton textile arrangement which regulates the trade of cotton textile and apparel products among these nations. The main purpose of this arrangement is to provide access for the products of developing nations into the markets of developed nations without unduly disrupting the domestic markets of these nations. Although the growth rate in cotton apparel imports into the United States has been somewhat larger than that agreed under the arrangement, it is felt that the rate would have been much greater had the arrangement never been negotiated.

The American apparel industry needs time to establish a competitive base which will enable it to produce goods which can sell at prices comparable to imported apparel products. The industry welcomes competition, not only from within itself, but also from imports. The industry is willing to share the growth in domestic markets which will inevitably come from our growing population. However, the industry is not willing to give all the growth in these markets to imports.

It is expected at this time that reductions in apparel tariffs will be authorized before the expiration of the Trade Expansion Act in June. These tariffs could be cut by as much as 50 percent. The small barrier provided by present apparel tariffs would be almost completely destroyed if they were reduced. We would simply be opening up our domestic apparel markets to as much foreign-made apparel as exporters wished to ship to us. We would be doing away with any possibility that the American apparel industry could increase efficiency by installing new machinery and introducing the results of their research into production methods. Very few apparel manufacturers would be willing to invest the large amounts needed to become competitive with imports, if the markets are already flooded with foreign goods. The incentive of potentially profitable markets would not exist if current markets belonging to domestic producers are taken away by imported goods. Many producers would be put out of business now, and they certainly would not be willing to spend large sums of capital investment to reenter a market they have already lost.

The industry's experience tells it that the most effective solution to its problem would be an international arrangement which includes trade of all types of apparel, similar to that currently operating which covers only cotton products. This more extensive arrangement would provide for orderly growth in all apparel markets and would give the industry time to establish methods and machines to make products competitive in price with imports. We should not cut tariffs while awaiting the negotiation of this type of arrangement. Let us not lose ground which we may never be able to regain later.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] be added as a cosponsor at its next printing of the resolution (S. Res. 86), to extend congratulations of the Congress to the people of Puerto Rico on their 50th anniversary of U.S. citizenship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RAMSEY CLARK RIGHT CHOICE FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Ramsey Clark is unquestionably the correct choice to be named Attorney General by the President. His record of service to the Government in the Justice Department is one of fine accomplishment in posts of increasing responsibility. His nomination by the President ratifies what has been obvious—as Acting Attorney General his performance has been so distinguished that no replacement would be possible.

Ramsey Clark's service in the Department of Justice commenced in 1961 after several years of private practice in Dallas. From Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Lands Division he advanced to Deputy Attorney General and then to Acting Attorney General, showing great competence in each position. In my associations and work with him, I have always found him to have combined those gifts of advocacy and judicial temperament that place him among the finest of the legal profession. The President could not have made a finer selection.

INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the recommendation of President Johnson for a 20-percent increase in social security benefits is a proposal widely endorsed by the public. The people of the country can see the inadequacy of the payments to many beneficiaries; they support efforts to attain a standard of decency in our social security system.

This position is well stated in a resolution adopted by the Tarrant County, Tex., Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO, on February 21, 1967. Their recommendations are sound. I ask unanimous consent that their resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution—Social Security Improvements

Whereas, President Johnson has urged the Congress of the United States to increase Social Security benefits by an average of 20 percent with the biggest proportionate share going to the 2½ million retirees who now get only the minimum of $44 a month ($66 for a couple); and

Whereas, even the proposed increases would fall short of assuring Social Security beneficiaries genuine financial independence, as contemplated by the Social Security Act; and

Whereas, many other nations, far less affluent than the United States, have far more adequate social welfare systems, and

Whereas, no remotely comparable insurance protection is available to Americans at any price,

Therefore be it resolved, that the Congress of the United States take prompt, positive action to attack the deficiencies that exist in the Social Security system, so that older Americans, widows and children, and the disabled can live out their retirement years in dignity and self-respect rather than in poverty and despair, and

Be it further resolved that since the program's biggest single lefect is lack of adequate cash benefits, that the Congress act to increase these benefits as proposed by the President; and

Be it further resolved the copies of this resolution be sent to the United States Senators from Texas and the Congressmen from the 6th and 12th districts, requesting them to support the President's proposals, and to place this resolution in the records of Congress.

Adopted unanimously by the delegates to the Tarrant County Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO in regular meeting February 21, 1967.

TARRANT COUNTY CENTRAL LABOR
COUNCIL, AFL–CIO,
Fort Worth, Tex., February 24, 1967.
Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: Enclosed you will find a Resolution adopted by unanimous vote by the delegates to the Council Labor Council in regular meeting February 21, 1961.

We urge your support of President Johnson's Social Security program and request that this be placed in the Congressional Record.

Yours sincerely,

DELBERT ADAMS,
President.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION CENTENNIAL OBSERVANCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, looking back over the past ranks high on the list of time-honored anniversary observances, especially if there is anything exciting or outstanding or noteworthy in that past. For the U.S. Office of Education, celebrating its centennial this year, there is much to look back upon in pride.

Because it has solved a lot of problems? Because it has developed new formulas to meet the ancient needs of mankind?

No; although it is helping to work on them. Quietly and with amazing competence, considering the nature of the field in which it is employed, the Office of Education has now for 100 years been engaged in helping the citizens of this Nation in their vast educational enterprise.

Beginning small, with a handful of employees and a total operating budget that would scarcely satisfy a medium-ranking executive as salary today, the Office was first given the charge of determining the condition of education in the United States. Then, over the years, it was called upon by the legislators and schools and colleges and the decisionmakers—the American public—to do a variety of things related to the task of "collecting and disseminating such information as shall show the condition and progress of education."

In the confusing years after the Civil War, in the expansion of the Nation westward, in the great influx of population from the rest of the world, there was a great and continuing need to know just how the Nation was faring in education. Later, with the changing world of the 1900's, there was a need for new thinking and new programs in vocational education—and the Office of Education was charged with administering the program the Congress devised to help the schools.

Then, during the years of the great depression, the Office helped to plan the training of men and women in the skills needed for those times.

Following World War II and during the international competitions of the current decades, new responsibilities for the American people have put new pressures on education. Over the years, Congress has instituted new programs to help carry out those responsibilities, new programs to help the people, the schools, and colleges—and new duties for the Office of Education. These programs range from construction of college libraries and laboratories to devising new teaching materials for the blind, from preschool education to postgraduate study, from curriculum demonstration to the farthest reaches of research. Today, there is scarcely any legitimate area of educational concern that does not have an appropriate Federal program.

And so, a hundred years of services rendered, lessons learned and passed on, experience gained that will be of benefit in the future. For the first century is just a start. So long as our Nation endures, surely there will be a need for the U.S. Office of Education. For education surely is the keystone in the arch that supports our democracy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a press release commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Office of Education which was released today be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The U.S. Office of Education will be 100 years old this week.

The law establishing a "department" of education was signed by President Andrew Johnson on March 2, 1867. The present U.S. Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe II, was appointed by President Lyndon B. Johnson December 18, 1965. He is the 17th commissioner to hold office.

The Office of Education will observe the centennial March 2, 1967, with a brief ceremony at 12:30 p.m. in the plaza in front of its headquarters at 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John W. Gardner and Commissioner Howe will be the speakers.

Members of Congress, Government officials, representatives of educational associations, and other members of the educational community have been invited to attend the ceremony. Music will be provided by the bands of Calvin Coolidge and St. John's College High Schools.

The plaza ceremony will be open to the public. However, in the event of inclement weather, the ceremony will be held in the auditorium of the main DHEW building, 3rd St. and Independence Ave., S.W. Because of limited seating capacity, the indoor ceremony would be restricted to invited guests and members of the press.

Legislation establishing the Office of Education was introduced in the House of Representatives on February 18, 1866 by Rep. (later President) James A. Garfield of Ohio. It passed the Congress on March 1, 1867, and was signed by President Johnson the next day.

Garfield, a former president of Hiram College in Ohio, had presented the bill at the request of leading educators. They wanted a Federal agency to assist the States in setting up and maintaining efficient schools and systems of education.

The law as passed created "a department of education, for the purpose of collecting such statistics and facts as shall show the condition and progress of education in the several States and Territories, and of diffusing such information respecting the organization and management of schools and school systems, and methods of teaching, as shall aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems, and otherwise promote the cause of education throughout the country."

Henry Barnard, an educator who had served as superintendent of Connecticut schools and president of St. John's College in Annapolis, Md., was appointed the first Commissioner of Education. His initial salary was $4,000 a year, and his first budget of $18,592 included salaries for three clerks.

In 1869, the Department of Education became an Office within the Department of the Interior. In 1939, it was transferred to the Federal Security Agency and in 1953 to the newly created Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Office of Education now has about 2,500 employees and an annual budget of nearly $4 billion. It administers more than 75 education programs under such landmark legislation as the Land Grant Colleges Acts (1862 and 1890), the Smith-Hughes Act for vocational education (1917), the National Defense Education Act (1958), the Higher Education Facilities Act (1963), the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965), and the Higher Education Act (1965).

TEXAS INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, tomorrow is Texas Independence Day—a day held dear to the hearts of all Texans. It was on March 2, 1836, that the delegates representing the people of Texas adopted the Texas Declaration of Independence. They had met at the town of Washington-on-the-Brazos, and from this gathering emerged the declaration, signed by 58 good and courageous men.

This monumental document stands out in man's never-ending march toward democracy. Its importance to the people of Texas and the United States can never be forgotten. One interesting aspect of its significance is often overlooked. That fact is that the Texas Declaration of Independence marked the first time in the history of the world that a rebelling force had declared as a cause for revolution the failure of the government to provide a public system of education. That was 131 years ago, when the very idea of public education was in its infancy.

At the same time those men were signing the Texas Declaration of Independence, another group of brave men were valiantly fighting the forces of the huge Mexican Army at the Alamo. General Santa Anna had gathered the entire main force of his well-equipped army to lay seige to this tiny mission in San Antonio. But 182 men inside the Alamo—in the face of thousands surrounding them—pledged to fight to the death, rallying behind their young colonel, William B. Travis, who proclaimed the immortal words which became the theme of the Alamo: "Victory or Death." Although the Alamo did fall after 13 days of bitter fighting and Travis, Bowie, Crockett, and Bonham, and their men did not live to see the victory, victory was surely theirs; for barely more than a month later Gen. Sam Houston and his troops, who had been organizing while the Mexican Army was detained at the Alamo, swept down on Santa Anna at the Battle of San Jacinto, defeating his army, and bringing independence to the new Republic of Texas.

Tomorrow is important to all Texans for another reason, too. It is the birthday of Sam Houston, one of the truly outstanding men in the history of the United States as well as Texas. This statesman was the commander of the Texas Army during the battle for independence and served as the President of the young republic. When Texas became a State within the United States, Houston was elected Governor and later represented the great State of Texas in the U.S. Senate.

CRIME IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record the following editorials and articles dealing with crime in the United States.

"Let's Have Justice for Non-Criminals, Too," an article which appeared in the December 1966 issue of The Reader's Digest.

"Fruits of Court Decisions Ripen," a column by James J. Kilpatrick, which appeared in the Washington Star on January 26, 1967.

"More Funds Needed to Fight Crime," a column by David Lawrence, which appeared in the Washington Star on January 26, 1967.

"Liberal Supreme Court Menacing Nation's Life," a column by Austin V. Wood, which appeared in the Martinsburg (W. Va.) Journal on February 7, 1967.

"The 'Plague' of Crime," an editorial which appeared in the Washington Star on February 7, 1967.

"What Is a Cop? Here's Answer," an editorial which appeared in the Wheeling (W. Va.) News-Register on February 16, 1967.

"Beating Around the Crime Bush," an editorial which appeared in the Huntington (W. Va.) Herald-Dispatch on February 23, 1967.

"Crime Report Is Disappointing," an editorial which appeared in the Williamson (W. Va.) Daily News on February 23, 1967.

"Crime Control in a Mess," an editorial which appeared in the Wheeling (W. Va.) News-Register on February 24, 1967.

"Our Crime-Ridden City," an editorial in today's Washington Star.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

Let's Have Justice for Non-Criminals, Too

(By Eugene H. Methvin)

In a Washington, D.C., courtroom, Federal Judge George L. Hart faced the jury and shook his finger angrily at 41-year-old James W. Killough, on trial before him for murder. "On three separate occasions this man voluntarily confessed foully killing his wife and throwing her body on a dump like a piece of garbarge. He led police there. Yet the U.S. Court of Appeals has seen fit to throw the confessions out. Though it makes me almost physically ill, I must direct a verdict of acquittal. I feel I'm presiding not over a search for truth but over an impossible farce. We know the man is guilty, but we sit here blind, deaf and dumb, and we can't admit what we know. Tonight felons can sleep better."

Thus, in a spectacle now being repeated across the nation, after confessing a murder the confessor walked free, a scoffing example of the "impossible farce" the Supreme Court has made of American justice. For, in a series of rulings over the past nine years, the Court has progressively handcuffed the police, turned trial judges into automatons, and blindfolded juries, all to the immense benefit of criminals.

Last June 13, the Court went further than ever before in a decision the New York *Times* called "an over-hasty trespass into the legislative area, . . . lacking either constitutional warrant or constructive effect." Chief Justice Earl Warren, in a razor-thin five-four decision, announced a new interpretation of the 175-year-old Fifth Amendment: now it requires that police, in questioning suspects, not only first warn them of their right to silence, but even furnish a lawyer and allow him to sit in on the interrogation if the suspect wishes. Moreover, if the suspect "indicates in any manner" that he does not want to answer questions, the police must stop.

Dissenting thunderously, Justice Byron R. White said the Court's ruling "has no significant support in the history or language of the Fifth Amendment" and "in some cases will return a killer, a rapist or other criminal to the streets to repeat his crime whenever it pleases him. As a consequence, there will not be a gain but a loss in human dignity."

"I Did It!" Justice White's prediction was speedily verified. Consider these two cases.

After a $10,000 fire almost killed a sleeping housewife and her three children, a Washington policeman answered a radio call. Two men walked up to him. "This is the guy who set the fire," said one. The policeman blinked, looked at the other and asked, "What have you got to say?" "I did it!" the man blurted. A painter who showed up for work drunk and was ordered off the job, he had returned at night to explode a Molotov-cocktail firebomb in the home.

At the arson trial, his lawyer argued that the mere presence of the uniformed policeman psychologically coerced him, thereby violating his Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination. Incredibly, the judge excluded the confession from the jury. (However, in this case a conviction was obtained on other evidence.)

A young probationer in Cleveland admitted killing another youth. But because police neglected to warn him of his rights, Judge Angelo J. Gagliardo had to let him go.

"There is no question in my mind that this is anything but a willful, deliberate act of murder without any justification," Judge Gagliardo fumed, "Someday members of the Supreme Court will engage themselves in the practical problems of life in a modern urban society, and deal with realities rather than theories that place individual rights far above the community."

Since Chief Justice Warren announced the new rules, Philadelphia police are finding that 56 percent of the suspects they arrest refuse to answer police questions. In Brooklyn, police find four times as many suspects as before—96 out of 239—arrested in homicide, robbery, felonious assault and rape cases are refusing to make statements. "Most of these men will walk the streets as free men," warns District Attorney Aaron E. Koota. "These vicious crimes may never be solved." Police in Boston, Washington, Cleveland, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Memphis report similar results, and the percentages can be expected to increase in every U.S. city.

Squeal-Room Tactics. The Supreme Court's foray into legislating rules for police conduct springs from one of the oldest riddles of American criminal justice: How can we ensure that police obey the rules protecting individual liberties, yet have enough freedom themselves to protect society against criminals?

The Constitution offers no solutions. When the Bill of Rights was written, the United States had only four million citizens and was 95-percent rural; the largest city, New York, had only 33,000 people; there was no such thing as *police*. Magistrates questioned defendants—vigorously—and their statements or refusals could be laid before a trial jury.

As police evolved, city by city, the chief demand was that they catch criminals, and few questioned how. With no authoritative guidance, police did the best they could—and often that was horrendous. In 1931 a Presidential commission documented shocking "lawlessness in law enforcement," including the use of third-degree interrogations in at least two-thirds of America's cities. Cleveland police, for example, would beat prisoners from behind (so they couldn't be identified in court), over kidneys, and in the soft hollows above the hips, using a sausage-shape sandbag made of silk to avoid leaving telltale bruises.

The Supreme Court waited five years for state legislatures and courts to start cleaning up this sordid mess. Then came a murder conviction, duly approved by Mississippi's supreme court—a case in which a deputy sheriff had hanged a Negro suspect by his neck to a tree and whipped him until he confessed. The deputy unblushingly admitted he had beaten the man, "but not too much for a nigger." The Supreme Court reversed the conviction, using the Fourteenth Amendment's "due process" clause to limit state law-enforcement officers for the first time in history.

Hair-Split Decisions. In undertaking to police the police, basically a legislative and executive function, the Supreme Court until recently operated under Justice Cardozo's wise injunction: "Justice, though due to the accused, is due to the accuser also. The concept of fairness must not be strained till it is narrowed to a filament. We are to keep the balance true."

Now, as Dean Erwin Griswold of the Harvard Law School points out, the Court has become "absolutist." It is pursuing defensible doctrines beyond the realm of rationality and common sense. Such extremism has spread like moral rot throughout federal and state appellate courts until, as the then Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach last year protested: "The judges have left the public behind, and even among judges the margins of consensus have been passed."

Take, for example, the crucial problem of search and seizure. "It must be remembered that what the Constitution forbids is not all searches and seizures, but unreasonable searches and seizures," says Justice Potter Stewart. But judges are handing down increasingly unreasonable decrees on what constitutes reasonable police conduct. Consider:

In Tucson a policeman followed a suspected stolen car. The driver parked and went into a college fraternity house. The officer crawled under the car, looked at the transmission serial number and, sure enough, it matched one on the list of stolen property.

In Washington, police had a tip that a known prostitute had illegal dope. They went to her rooming house, knocked on the door, then started inside to find her room. At that moment she dashed past them and dropped a small package into a garbage can under the front porch. The officers looked in the garbage can and found a package of narcotics.

In each of these cases, hair-splitting judges ruled the searches "unreasonable," dismissed the evidence and turned the defendants loose upon the community, as a "lesson" to police.

Yet the reasonable citizen is likely to agree with Federal Judge Warren Burger's acid dissent in the garbage-can case: The police would have been derelict in their duty if they had *not* done precisely what they did. Judge Burger declared, "I cannot find a constitutional right to privacy in the garbage pail of a rooming house." He denounced the "unfortunate trend of judicial decisions which stretch and strain to give the guilty not the same but vastly more protection than the law-abiding citizen."

The Meaning of Mallory. Until 1957, noncoercive police interrogations were taken for granted. Then came the Mallory case. After police questioning and a lie-detector test, Andrew Mallory, a Washington, D.C., handyman, confessed to raping a woman in the apartment house where he lived. But the Supreme Court freed Mallory by—in effect—writing a new rule for federal law-enforcement officers. The Court said taking Mallory to the police station for questioning represented an "unnecessary delay" in presenting him before an arraigning magistrate, and his confession therefore could not be used in evidence.

The net results? Thirty-three months after Mallory's release he attacked another woman in a Philadelphia apartment. This time he got a 10-to-20-year sentence. His Philadelphia victim was, as one Justice Department lawyer told me sardonically, "deprived of her constitutional right to equal protection of the laws by the Supreme Court, without due process of law."

Unnecessary delay in Mallory's case meant seven and a half hours. In 1962 the courts said "three hours" was unreasonable; in 1964, 30 minutes; in 1965, *five* minutes.

Since the *Mallory* decision applied only to federal officers, federally ruled Washington, D.C., was the only city affected. But there the impact was devastating. In the five years before *Mallory*, with crime rising nationally, Washington's police had reduced serious crimes 37 percent. But thereafter the rate began to climb sharply, and in nine years it has gone up 124 percent. Holdups, purse-snatchings and muggings, down a third before *Mallory*, skyrocketed 305 percent—five times the national increase. Worse, the rate of police success in solving crimes has been cut in half, to an all-time low.[1]

True Confessions. Other American cities can expect similar results now that the Supreme Court is undertaking detailed supervision of their police in questioning suspects. Consider two recent decisions:

In Tacoma, Wash., shortly after a filling-station holdup, police in a squad car saw a likely-looking suspect walking through a suburban neighborhood. They drove up alongside and asked him what he was doing. "Going home," he said. As the officers followed him slowly, he turned in at a house, walked up to the door—and found it locked. At that, he came back to the parked police car and said, "Okay, you got me! Let's go." On the drive to the police station, he pointed out the filling station. Before locking him up for the night, the officers questioned him for 30 minutes, and he confessed again. Next morning he made a third oral confession and asked to call his wife. "Let's get this in writing first," the police said. Taken to a prosecutor's office, he confessed a fourth time and signed a transcript.

No easily led youngster, the man had previously been convicted of housebreaking, robbery, jailbreak, car theft and other crimes. He made no claim of abuse or prolonged questioning. Yet the Supreme Court ruled that the refusal to let him call his wife meant that the signed transcript "cannot be said to be the voluntary product of a free and unconstrained will."

A wave of brutal street crimes erupted in a Los Angeles low-income area. Women—Negroes, Mexican and Japanese—were being knocked down from behind in the dark, horribly beaten and robbed. One elderly Negro woman was kicked to death. Police had not the slightest clue until a check from one victim's purse was cashed under a forged signature. They traced the passer, Roy Allen Stewart, and found his residence to be a veritable Fagin's nest lined with empty purses, wallets and other stolen property. Stewart, his wife and three others in the house were arrested. But which, if any, had committed the street crimes?

---

[1] Like Mallory himself, both his victims were Negroes from underprivileged backgrounds. A survey of slum dwellers in Harlem and Watts (Los Angeles) found that the problem worrying most families was "crime in the streets" and "the need for more police protection"—not "police brutality." In a similar poll in Washington, D.C., 1500 people were asked to name the two or three biggest problems "something should be done about." More than half singled out crime and law enforcement.

Under California law the police had five days before they were required to produce the suspect before a magistrate for arraignment. They questioned Stewart eight times, for a total of two hours and 46 minutes, and on the day of arraignment he confessed robbing and kicking the woman who died. At his trial he made not the slightest claim that police had abused him or denied any right to see anyone—lawyer, family or bondsman. Yet Stewart's was one of the four convictions based on confessions historically admitted as voluntary and reliable that the Supreme Court reversed in last June's landmark decision.

"RIDE LOGIC TO HELL"

Such monstrous miscarriages of justice result directly from the Supreme Court's practice of excluding evidence not because it is unreliable but because the judges may disagree with police conduct in gathering it. They hand police a complete set of "interpretations" that, says California Chief Justice Roger Traynor, "dot just enough t's to cross the eyes." In the quiet of their chambers they cannot themselves agree on just what the law prescribes, yet they demand absolute perfection of the policeman who must make a snap judgment in the heat of conflict and danger. An American Bar Association committee long ago protested that the rigid exclusionary rule "warps the conduct of a criminal trial from the main issues which determine guilt or innocence" and turns it into "an inquiry into the misconduct of police after the crime itself."

British courts have found a middle way. They have given police a set of "Judges' Rules" to follow in interrogations: They must warn the suspect only of his right to silence; he may consult a lawyer, but the lawyer is not allowed to be present during questioning. If, however, police for some reason depart from these rules, judges are not automatically bound to exclude whatever evidence might result. The trial judge inquires into all the circumstances. Was the police infraction a mere questionable judgment, or a willful disregard of settled standards? The judge is then free to decide which in this case is more important: to protect the public from such police conduct, or from the criminal.

Thus the power to exclude valid evidence is a seldom-used club, hanging on the courtroom wall as a reminder, not a bludgeon used indiscriminately against the police even when the real victim is the law-abiding public. A similar process could be applied to police searches and seizures of physical evidence.

Says Chief Judge Edward Lumbard of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit: "The British are much better at these commonsense compromises. We ride logic to hell."

Tell the Police How. Congress has the clear duty and power to curb the Supreme Court's extremism; Article III of the Constitution lays on the legislators the responsibility to make "exceptions and regulations" for the Court's appellate jurisdiction. Thus, declare the classic essays in *The Federalist*, Congress "would certainly have full power to provide that in appeals to the Supreme Court there should be no re-examination of facts where they had been tried by juries." Or it clearly could permit the jury to decide finally whether a confession is voluntary within the Fifth Amendment's terms. What could be a more democratic way of enforcing standards upon police and safeguarding individual rights?

Moreover, state legislatures have a heavy duty to provide safeguards against "squeal room" secrecy and the occasional instances of police abuse. "It's time the American people tell policemen how they want the law enforced, and back them to the hilt in doing it," says former New York City Police Commissioner Michael J. Murphy. "We want and need legislative guidelines. Virtually every policeman in America wants to obey the Constitution—if somebody will only tell him what it says."

One fact is clear: Police must be allowed a fair opportunity to do their job. To police its 198 million people the United States has 397,000 state and local law-enforcement officers. Only 70,000 are on duty on any 4 p.m.-to-midnight shift. With 7600 serious crimes reported every day (on the average), and untold thousands more unreported, police already have to pick and choose which they will investigate. Says Quinn Tamm, executive director of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, "It would be grand if the officer could play Sherlock Holmes and contemplate all aspects of a case for hours on end. But he has 15 cases, and, in the real world, many of them simply cannot be solved without questioning." Even vast increases in police manpower and scientific techniques will not prevent a substantial loss in law enforcement effectiveness. Some form of interrogation is necessary.

The American Law Institute, representing 1800 law professors, judges, prosecuting and defense attorneys, is working on a Model Code that provides police authority to stop and frisk citizens on the streets in suspicious circumstances, question them for 20 minutes without formal arrest, and question them at the police station up to four hours. They must warn the subject of his rights, and tape-record the station-house sessions so judges and jurors can be sure what goes on. On their own, New Orleans police have even installed a television-tape device so they can later *show* courts the whole interrogation process.

Find Out the Truth. The Supreme Court today is rewriting the Bill of Rights. Dominating this process are five Justices who apparently prefer turning patently guilty criminals loose if the slightest flyspeck can be found on police conduct. But, as Brooklyn's erudite prosecutor William I. Siegel reminded them last spring, "No human institution is perfect, and we cannot require from a prosecutorial apparatus a level of perfection not found anywhere else in human affairs. 'Ideal' is by definition unobtainable. The true function of a court is to find out where the truth lies." Even Chief Justice Warren has recognized that the Court is ill-fitted to "police the police" on a case-by-case basis, and has urged legislative action.

A wholesale revision of state and federal laws is urgent. British practice suggests one form of compromise that would be more workable than the Supreme Court's absolutist doctrine. If nothing is done, we will live under a system prescribed not by elected representatives but by a committee of five lawyers sitting in a faraway marble palace and unaccountable to anyone at the ballot box for the results of their legislating.

So extreme have the present Court rulings become that Federal Appeals Judge Wilbur K. Miller spoke for millions when he protested in Washington's Killough murder, "Nice people have some rights, too!"

FRUITS OF COURT DECISIONS RIPEN

NEW YORK.—The conversation of cab drivers, shop clerks and old drinking companions offers an admittedly poor basis for drawing conclusions on the leading topic of conversation in New York these days. Yet it is curious, all the same, that here one subject crops up so constantly—crime. A visitor finds it at the very top of public concerns.

The concern goes to more than crime as such. New Yorkers have always known bloody crime. Out of random conversations, one gains an impression that many residents of the big town are experiencing a sort of crisis of confidence in their courts. It is a feeling not confined to New York alone. As the effects of several Supreme Court decisions become more evident, the fruits of Mallory, Escobedo, and Miranda begin to ripen. New theories of criminal treatment, of which much more soon will be heard, suddenly are emerging in the public view. And the public is not amused.

This last Friday, there appeared before the bar of the State Supreme Court here in New York a 23-year-old defendant by the name of Charles Wright. He had confessed to the brutal murder of two women whom he had stabbed to death. There was no question of the man's guilt. Yet inadvertently he had not been informed of his right to counsel before making his 41-page confession. Reported the New York Times:

"A distraught young assistant district attorney, who said he had taken the confession, moved to dismiss the charges to the dismay of court personnel and a courtroom filled with spectators."

"I cannot help but note," said the prosecutor, "that if it were not for assaults upon eight other women, many of whom were prepared to testify against the defendant, I would now by virtue of the Supreme Court decisions hailed and praised in many circles, be recommending that your honor return this admitted killer to a community that he ravaged for more than five months."

Presiding Justice Charles Marks, "with much reluctance," granted the motion to dismiss the two murder charges. As it happened, the defendant did not go free, even though he addressed the court eloquently on the subject of his "constitutional rights." He already had pleaded guilty to a separate and unrelated charge of first-degree rape. On this charge he was sentenced to 30 to 40 years in prison. Otherwise, the rule of Miranda would have set him free.

On the same day that the Times was reporting the abortive trial of Charles Wright, the World Journal Tribune was reviewing the tragic tale of a young architect, Edward Orman. He was shot and left paralyzed during the Christmas season by a mental patient, Theodore Neely, who was walking the streets of Manhattan on holiday parole from the Central Islip State Hospital. It appeared that Neely had an obsession against germs. He somehow got it into his head that Orman threatened him with contagious disease; so he shot him. Orman's young wife, the mother of two young children, asked the anguished question, "Why did the hospital give this man parole?"

Under different circumstances, the two cases might be rationalized. Most persons would agree that coerced confessions, obtained by third-degree methods, ought not to be received in evidence. Everyone would agree that the very system of probation and parole, whether from mental or from penal institutions, entails an element of risk. Some degree of recidivism must be accepted. Yet here the evidence was that Wright had been abundantly advised of everything except his right to counsel before he launched into his detailed confession, there was nothing "coerced" about it. In the case of the obsessed Neely, the fact of the paralyzed young architect attests the hospital's error in judgment.

But the dismissal of the murder charges against Wright, and the granting of a holiday parole to Neely, are typical manifestations of the new school of thought in criminal jurisprudence. Within the next two or three weeks, the President's Commission on Crime will release its massive report. Enough has been leaked from inside sources to support a prediction that the commission's heart will bleed with solicitude for the criminals that infest American society.

Once more we will be told (as we were told in the recent report of a separate commission on crime in the District of Columbia) that punishment is not the answer. The answer, it will be said, lies in better housing, better jobs, better education, greater rehabilitation and strict observance of all of the new constitutional rights.

As the D.C. commission's staff said of recidivists, "backsliding need not be taken as evidence of failure."

The New Yorkers one talks with are developing a slow burn against the coddling of criminals and lunatics. Their feeling, one surmises, is shared widely across the nation. It is a feeling the Supreme Court of the United States cannot wisely ignore. In the fruits of Miranda lie the seeds of a terrible loss of confidence in our courts. As surely as the high court sows this wind, a whirlwind will be reaped.

More Funds Needed To Fight Crime

With all the billions of dollars to be spent on the Great Society, it's amazing that virtually nothing is being provided to organize an effective war on crime throughout the country.

The rate of crime is growing every year, and in the nation's capital the rise in serious crime is three times the national average. But a bill dealing with the problem in the District of Columbia was recently vetoed by President Johnson because of its "possible" unconstitutionality.

It seems certain now that one of the biggest issues in the 1968 campaign will be crime—the inability of the citizen to walk the streets in safety.

Senator John L. McClellan, D-Ark., in a speech to the Senate yesterday, pointed out not only that the federal government has a responsibility to act, but that the Supreme Court by its decisions has made it easier for the criminal to escape punishment. The President has promised to recommend legislation to help. One problem, however, is how the states are going to get enough money to do the job.

Apart from the inadequacy of public funds for states and cities to multiply the number of their policemen and detectives, the biggest single obstacle today is the attitude of the Supreme Court of the United States, which has made it more difficult to convict persons who have committed a crime. Numerous technicalities have been interjected, so that criminals have more and more ways to evade the law.

McClellan said in his speech that federal legislation is urgently needed with respect to the admissibility of evidence obtained through voluntary confessions and other statements made by suspects after their arrest. The Arkansas senator said:

"Congress simply must rectify the mockery of justice and protect society from the dire consequences of a number of recent 5-to-4 Supreme Court decisions that allow selfconfessed, vicious criminals to go free.

"Self-confessed criminals should be punished—not liberated. These enemies of law and order and decent society should be penalized—not freed on the basis of frivolous and dubious technicalities . . .

"A majority of the Supreme Court appears to be so obsessed in its quest of discovering new rights for the criminal and so enthusiastic in its efforts to magnify and articulate them that it has lost sight of law enforcement—an indispensable ingredient of our internal security."

The senator referred to what is known as the "Miranda" case, in which the Supreme Court declared that no confession—even if wholly voluntary—can be admitted in evidence in state or federal criminal proceedings unless, before any questioning by the police, the accused is given a lengthy warning about his rights. Just why policemen must give preference to the rights of the criminal, instead of to the rights of the public, is difficult to understand.

McClellan recited what has happened in a number of cases, including the following:

"Recently a self-confessed murderer was turned loose in Columbus, Ohio, because of the Miranda decision. He had voluntarily confessed and told where the murder weapon, a shotgun, could be found. It was found, and tests proved it was the weapon used in the commission of the crime. Both confession and gun had to be excluded from the evidence. As a consequence, that murderer walks the streets today—free and unpunished for his terrible crime."

The American people are bewildered and dismayed by decisions of the high court and have been expecting President Johnson, as the leader of his party, to recommend to Congress a comprehensive program to halt the rise in crime. His apparent indifference to conditions in the District of Columbia has already resulted in much criticism.

It is evident now that, without waiting for the President to act, Congress itself will have to do something about the nationwide problem. Otherwise, in the 1968 campaign, the issue could bring about the defeat of many Democrats seeking re-election.

Liberal Supreme Court Menacing Nation's Life

Last week two episodes took place which illustrate my conclusion that the liberal convictions of some of our members of the Supreme Court are a menace to our way of life. In the first episode the Court overruled a New York statute which permitted the discharge of any teacher advocating the overthrow of our government by force. Justice Brennan, speaking for the five liberal Justices, pronounced the statute a "highly efficient terror mechanism" and a menace to academic freedom. Incidentally, Justice Clark, in a dissenting opinion, said, "No Court has ever reached out so far as to destroy so much with so little." The second episode came to light in New York where a twenty-three year old man was on trial for the murder of two women whom he had confessed stabbing to death. He also had admitted the assault and rape of eight other women. The confession had been completely voluntary. There was no evidence at all of police coercion. Nevertheless, the Court was compelled to dismiss the case because there was no affirmative proof that the defendant had been informed of his right to counsel before he made the confession. It is worthy of note that the defendant harangued the Court as to his constitutional rights in language strangely resembling the language of several recent decisions of our Supreme Court.

Now both of these decisions were based upon the newly emphasized theory that the rights of an individual are superior to the rights of the public. In the first case, the liberal Justices evidently were convinced that more overall good would come from protection of the rights of one individual who wished to teach school in New York than from propaganda advocating the overthrow of their government by force and establishing a Communist rule. With this reasoning, I cannot agree. Carried to extremes it might be possible to seize upon all of our children in their formative years and establish permanently in their minds the principles of Communism. That was precisely the procedure of the Communist movement in the satellite Russian states. It also was the procedure of the Nazis in Germany. It is not enough to say that such a program could not succeed in the United States. True, it is very unlikely, but the overruling of the New York statute created an instrument of Communist propaganda which I am sure the great majority of Americans resent. I am equally sure that it never was the intention of the framers that our constitution be used for such a purpose.

Our Supreme Court's leniency toward criminals is based upon the same conception. It is better that public rights be sacrificed than that the constitutional rights of one individual go unprotected. The theory this time affects us more immediately and more directly. Literally thousands of desperate criminals have been turned loose to prey upon all of us and the Court in its zeal to protect the individual from the depredations of the public has made it almost impossible to obtain a conviction of a defendant caught in the act of crime. Meanwhile, much of the public in our large cities is afraid to go upon their streets and are terrified of an unlocked door in their own homes.

Nor is this all. I am convinced that the sociological concepts of a majority of our Supreme Court have vastly encouraged the uprisings upon our campuses and to some extent at least are responsible for the riots we have witnessed in our Negro centers.

Moreover, they underlie the ever enlarging theory of public responsibility for crime and criminals. It seems to me quite strange that if, as it is urged, crime derives from poverty and unemployment, our crime rate goes up with each wave of prosperity and the accompanying increased employment. Neither can I understand why our increased crime comes largely from those districts and from those age groups which are receiving the most care from their government. Can it be that these criminals act upon the theory that they are forgiven in advance? It is a dire situation.

The "Plague" of Crime

Lawlessness, President Johnson has told Congress, is "like a plague" in this country. No one can accuse him of exaggeration.

The recommendations which he put before the legislators are generally consistent with proposals which he previously made, And, in the main, they will be helpful, even essential, in any successful effort to combat the spread of crime.

Basically, his message was a call for millions of dollars to bolster law enforcement at the local level—to provide better salaries, better training, better equipment and the like. He also urged several innovations at the federal level which should be of substantial assistance. Finally, the President put appropriate stress on the need to alleviate conditions in the slums and elsewhere which nurture the roots of crime.

In two respects, however, one affirmative and one negative, the message was a disappointment.

Mr. Johnson again called for legislation within "the full reach of the constitutional powers of the federal government" to outlaw all wiretapping, public and private, whereever and whenever it occurs, as well as "all willful invasions" of privacy by electronic devices such as radio transmitters and concealed microphones. The only exception would be in matters of national security.

The President made this affirmative recommendation after receiving the report of his National Crime Commission, a report which will be made public later this month. It has been indicated, however, that a majority of the crime commission did not share the President's view, and that the report itself will spell out the majority belief that court-supervised eavesdropping by the police is esssential to combat organized crime.

This, we believe, is the right view. And we hope that Congress, when and if it acts on this subject, will authorize the use of wiretaps and electronic devices in major cases by law-enforcement agencies, subject to strict supervision, and that all other taps and "bugs" will be outlawed and that any illegal use made subject to severe penalties.

On the negative side, Mr. Johnson had not a word to say about legislation to ease the heavy burden which court decisions have laid on law-enforcement officials. Some correction of this sort is also essential, however, if the "plague" of crime is to be abated, and we hope that Congress will follow Senator McClellan's lead and adopt remedial legislation in spite of the President's silence on the point.

President Johnson concluded his message by saying: "Thus, it is the citizen who will be determining whether the streets will be safe to walk, whether homes will be secure, whether property rights will be respected, whether integrity and honest dealing will govern relationships between men."

No one doubts that the role of the citizen in any war on crime will be important. But the citizen, not to mention the police, will need more effective tools than the President seems willing to give him.

BEATING AROUND THE CRIME BUSH

After reading the lengthy and scholarly report of the President's Crime Commission, one has the feeling that the members might have said something more startling about crime in America if they had not been so self-conscious.

As became known several weeks ago, a majority of the commission concluded that "the present status of the law with respect to wiretapping and bugging is intolerable," and that "Congress should enact legislation dealing specifically with these matters."

These majority members called for a law, subject to "stringent limitations," which would permit the use of wiretaps and bugs by law-enforcement agencies. How else, they ask by implication, can these agencies hope to curb the activities of crime syndicates which make use of every device—including electronic aids—that assist them in their nefarious business?

President Johnson was well aware of this majority conclusion when he made his report on crime to Congress earlier this month. Yet he chose to ignore the advice and earnest recommendation of his own commission and ask Congress for a ban on all such devices except in national security cases.

In view of the untold billions reaped by criminal organizations from their operations in prostitution, gambling, narcotics and the corruption of public officials, the President's insistence that there is some "right of privacy" which forbids honest law-enforcing agents from using the most modern and efficient methods of apprehending these racketeers is beyond comprehension.

The other area where a breakthrough in public policy was almost achieved was in the study of limitations imposed on police by the 5–4 decisions of the Supreme Court on voluntary confessions and police interrogations.

Seven of the 19 members of the commission were severely critical of these rulings and implied that the court majority has unduly tipped the scales in favor of the criminal suspect and against the public's right to be protected against robbers, rapists and other hoodlums.

It is significant that much of this seven-member supplemental report on police handicaps is drawn from dissenting justices and from frustrated judges who are obliged to abide by the rulings.

The citizen will read this report with a growing sense of alarm. Crime is increasing at a rate exceeding population growth, yet a prestigious commission handles the subject with such dignified delicacy that it might be discussing the Kennedy round or the balance of payments situation. It is too bad the gentlemen did not take off their kid gloves before they began their study.

WHAT IS A COP? HERE'S ANSWER

Never has there been more cause for all right-thinking decent citizens to throw their fullest support behind good policemen everywhere than today.

The cop's job has become more difficult than ever and at the very time when crime rates are skyrocketing alarmingly in this country. Restrictive court decisions tie his hands and render him ineffective against the most notorious criminals. The weepers who urge more leniency for hoodlums have turned thousands of dangerous criminals free onto the streets through easy probation and parole practices and its up to the cop to deal with them. When he attempts to protect himself, the policeman is accused of brutality and too often the public goes along. The time has come when the public must begin understanding the tremendous challenge which faces the individual policeman in the performance of his duties.

The other day on the television "Dragnet" episode, Jack Webb, the actor and producer of this show depicting policemen at work provided one of the best descriptions we have heard as to "What Is A Cop?" The script written by Mr. Webb and Richard L. Green is deserving of the attention of all citizens interested in law enforcement. Therefore we are reprinting it in these columns which follow:

WHAT IS A COP?

It's awkward having a policeman around the house. Friends drop in. A man with a badge answers the door. The temperature drops twenty degrees. Throw a party and that badge gets in the way. All of a sudden there isn't a straight man in the crowd. Everybody's a comedian. "Don't drink too much," somebody says, "Or the man with the badge will run you in." . . . Or, "How's it goin', Dick Tracy? How many jaywalkers did you pinch today?" . . . And there's always the one who wants to know how many apples you stole. All at once you've lost your first name You're a "cop," a "flatfoot," a "bull," a "dick," "John Law." . . . You're "the fuzz," the "heat," . . . you're poison, you're trouble . . . you're bad news. They call you everything but never a policeman. It's not much of a life . . . unless you don't mind missing a Dodger game because the hotshot phone rings . . . unless you like working Saturdays, Sundays, holidays . . . at a job that doesn't pay overtime. Oh, the pay is adequate. If you count your pennies, you can put your kid through college. But you'd better plan on seeing Europe on your television set. Then there's your first night on the beat. When you try to arrest a drunken prostitute in a Main Street bar and she rips your new uniform to shreds. You'll buy another one . . . out of your own pocket.

You'll rub elbows with all the elite: pimps, addicts, thieves, bums, winos, girls who can't keep an address and men who don't care. Liars, cheats, con men, the class of Skid Row. And the heartbreak: underfed kids, beaten kids, molested kids, lost kids, crying kids, homeless kids, hit-and-run kids, broken-arm kids, broken-leg kids, broken-head kids, sick kids, dying kids, dead kids. The old people that nobody wants, the reliefers, the pensioners, the ones who walk the street cold and those who tried to keep warm and died in a three-dollar room with an unvented gas heater. You'll walk the beat and pick up the pieces. Do you have real adventure in your soul? You'd better have. You'll do time in a prowl car. It'll be a thrill-a-minute when you get an "unknown trouble" call and hit a back yard at two in the morning, never knowing who you'll meet . . . a kid with a knife . . . a pill-head with a gun, or two ex-cons with nothing to lose. And you'll have plenty of time to think. You'll draw duty in a "lonely car" . . . with nobody to talk to but your radio. Four years in uniform and you'll have the ability, the experience and maybe the desire to be a detective. If you like to fly by the seat of your pants, this is where you belong. For every crime that's committed, you've got three million suspects to choose from. Most of the time you'll have few facts and a lot of hunches. You'll run down leads that dead-end on you. You'll work all-night stakeouts that could last a week. You'll do leg work until you're sure you've talked to everybody in California . . . people who saw it happen, but really didn't. People who insist they did it, but really didn't. People who don't remember, those who try to forget. Those who tell the truth, those who lie. You'll run the files until your eyes ache.

And paperwork . . . you'll fill out a report when you're right, you'll fill out a report when you're wrong, you'll fill one out when you're not sure, you'll fill one out listing your leads, you'll fill one out when you have no leads, you'll make out a report on the reports you've made. You'll write enough words in your lifetime to stock a library. You'll learn to live with doubt, anxiety, frustration, court decisions that tend to hinder rather than help you: Dorado, Morse, Escobedo, Cahan. You'll learn to live with the District Attorney, testifying in court, defense attorneys, prosecuting attorneys, judges, juries, witnesses. And sometimes you won't be happy with the outcome. But there's also this: There are over five thousand men in this city who know that being a policeman is an endless, glamorless, thankless job that must be done. I know it, too. And I'm damned glad to be one of them.

CRIME REPORT IS DISAPPOINTING

The long-awaited report by President Johnson's Crime Commission released last Saturday was disappointing but not unexpectedly so.

There had been advance warning that the ultra-liberal element would prevail among the drafters of the report and thus emphasis again would be placed on the idea that crime is a social sickness.

Only last October in an address at the University of Maryland, President Johnson set the tone when he said:

"Poverty! There is the real enemy. Strike poverty down and much of crime will fall with it . . . If we wish to rid this country of crime, if we wish to stop hacking at its branches only, we must cut its roots and drain its swampy breeding place, the slum."

This it is not surprising that the President's Commission on Crime echoed these sentiments by repeatedly harping on the need to wipe out poverty and slums with a heavy dose of the "Great Society" remedies so crime will disappear.

Ridiculous. Everyone knows that some crime does stem from the poorer neighborhoods but the social-economic ills in this country cannot be blamed entirely for the sweeping upsurge of criminal activity we are experiencing today. When the Commission says, strike down poverty and a lot of crime will fall, the same can be said about politics. Eliminate the graft, corruption, bribery and fixing in high political places and a lot of crime also will vanish. Get rid of the racketeer-politician alliance and syndicated crime will be toppled. Put some teeth in the laws so policemen can make arrests stick and crime will begin to diminish. Get the courts to stop coddling the criminals and we'll start reversing the crime rates. What it boils down to is the need to realize that crime is crime and merits punishment. As it stands today too many criminals get away with their misdeeds because of political conniving, weak laws, ineffective prosecution and lenient courts.

During the depression this country suffered greatly from abject poverty, distress and misery but there was no vast upsurge in crime. Between 1931 and 1935 when the nation was gaining a million in population most major criminal offenses declined. Today we live in an affluent society but the crime rates soar. It is a terrible injustice to constantly place the burden of blame for this condition on the poor among us.

One section of the Crime Commission's report went so far as to urge sending suburban children to replace Negroes in troubled slum schools. If that came about, the commission said, the influence of middle-class parents would "result in rapid upgrading of

poor schools to which their children had been sent." We do not know what evidence there is available to bear out this thinking. In fact the very reverse might be true. If there is anthing we need to teach our children, whether they come from the richest neighborhoods or the slums, it is a respect for law and order. This is where we are failing. The young see adults in high position continually evade, twist or disregard the law. Bad example has led them to believe that maybe crime does pay.

Not enough has been said publicly about the definite ties that do exist between the higher echelons of the criminal organizations and politicians and government officials. Every now and then a case does break into the open and the sordid details come forth. However, in most instances these connections and operations are kept out of view through careful maneuvering. In the terms of those who deal in such activities the "fix" is on. Many so-called legitimate businesses today are underworld-dominated and they manage to get away with their misdeeds because of political influence. It has become fashionable in too many instances for politicians, entertainment personalities and sometimes businessmen to pal around with racketeers. When they get "burned" it is too late to cut the ties.

There is much more to this problem of crime in the United States than eliminating poverty and slums. Of course we must do all possible to eradicate these ills but in so doing, let's not label all of the unfortunate as criminals. Let's begin turning the spotlight and the heat on all who make a mockery of the law regardless of their position or title in life. Let's admit that a criminal must be punished for his crime!

Crime Control in a Mess

A man who confessed to killing his wife and five children has been turned free by a judge who said there was nothing else he could do in light of decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

In releasing the man the judge said, "This is a very sad thing. It is so repulsive it makes one's blood run cold and any decent human being's stomach turn to let a thing like this out on the street."

The basis for the judge's decision was that the killer had not been informed of his rights as outlined in an historic decision of the Supreme Court.

Here is just one more instance of how we have twisted and distorted justice today in this country to a point where we are paying a terrible price in an ever-rising rate of major crime. Our streets are filled with killers, rapists, muggers and thieves who have made a mockery of law and order.

The administration of criminal law in the United States is becoming a national disgrace. In general the crime control process today is an uncoordinated, ineffectual, leaderless mess often conducted on the one hand by the most ignorant, arrogant, untrained, political hacks, and on the other hand, by a conglomeration of futile or over-zealous social workers, religious conformists, workshop technicians, academic sociologists, and budding "head shrinkers."

The Bar itself is becoming concerned with these conditions. The legal profession is all too familiar with judges assigned to the criminal bench who have never handled a single criminal case in their careers, who have never visited a prison or a jail, or young lawyers assigned as juvenile court judges who know little or nothing of the sociology or psychology of child development and who often have never even read the Juvenile Court Act.

Instead of a unified, coordinated crime control program in this country we have everyone running off in different directions. The police fight the courts and the parole authorities. The prisons, probation and parole agencies seldom if ever cooperate. The courts nullify the efforts of the police and shun any responsibility for treatment. Prevention falls down between the home, the school, the church and the police. There is no leadership. No one benefits from these conditions except the criminals. We had better wake up pretty soon and begin pulling together or no one will be safe on the streets after dark.

Our Crime-Ridden City

Three days before the President's District crime message went to Congress the law-abiding residents of this community received the latest bit of bad news. Washington crime in January jumped by 42 percent over the figure for January a year ago. Ten years ago the crime index was 205.4 percent lower than it is today.

Against this dismaying background, Mr. Johnson got off to a splendid rhetorical start. "So long as I am President," he said, "I will take every step necessary to control crime in the District and to make it a community of safe streets and homes, free from crime and the fear of crime."

Unhappily, the presidential performance fell far short of promise.

This is not to say that the recommendations offered by the President would not be helpful if put into effect. Conceivably, they could be of considerable help. But of themselves they will never control crime in the District or make this a safe city, and Mr. Johnson for some incomprehensible reason seems unwilling to take the last crucial steps in his campaign against crime.

In October, after some six years of work, Congress enacted a District crime bill designed, within presumed constitutional limits, to ease some of the handicaps which the courts have clamped on the police in the investigation of crime and the interrogation of suspects. Had this bill become law, it certainly would have helped. But it was vetoed by the President because, he said, some of its provisions possibly might have been struck down by the Supreme Court. Of course this might have happened. But why couldn't he have left that question to the courts?

There is not one word in this message which asks Congress to do anything about the Mallory rule or other crippling decisions. And this despite the fact that his own District Crime Commission agreed that some legislation is needed. A majority of his National Crime Commission said that the present status of the law on bugging and wiretapping is "intolerable" and that legislation is also needed in this area. But not a word of guidance or request came from the President. And the White House has made it clear that nothing of the sort is likely to be forthcoming.

Toward the end of his message, Mr. Johnson said this: "I pledge myself—and I urge Congress—to take every step which is necessary to ultimate success in our drive against crime."

This is repetition as far as the President is concerned. But the invitation to Congress is new.

The hope for this crime-ridden city is that the legislators will take the invitation at face value, enact the best bill they can draft and send it to the White House. If his words mean anything, the President this time will sign it—and let the courts decide its constitutionality.

SCENIC ROADS AND PARKWAYS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the U.S. Department of Commerce has issued its report on a 2-year study for a national program of scenic roads and parkways. The study was conducted by the Bureau of Roads for the President's Advisory Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty and recommends two alternative development programs. Under the first, a total of 54,000 miles of scenic roads and parkways would be constructed at a cost of $4 billion. The second would provide for the development of 90,000 scenic roads and parkways for a cost of $8 billion.

Mr. President, I cannot urge too strongly that we accept and act quickly to authorize a national program of scenic roads and parkways. I compliment the Bureau of Roads for its thorough investigation of the costs and benefits of such a program, and I extend warm praise to the President's Advisory Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty for its foresight in requesting the study.

The need for well planned roadways through our scenic areas is clearly stated in the opening section of the report. It states:

> At least one-third of all U.S. motor travel is for social, recreational, or vacation purposes. Much of this travel is inspired by America's scenic splendors. A more adequate and extensive physical setting must now be provided to satisfy this increasingly significant segment of mobile America.
>
> Driving for pleasure is the Nation's most important outdoor recreation activity. More Americans engage in it more often than in swimming, boating, hunting, fishing, or any of the other sports. It accounts for 42 percent of all outdoor recreation. If Americans want to drive for pleasure, we must meet their demand through a national program of scenic roads and parkways.

I have for several years introduced legislation to authorize an Allegheny Scenic Parkway which would traverse some of the most scenic areas of West Virginia, Virginia, Maryland, and Kentucky. A study was made of this proposal in 1962 by the National Park Service which found it to be both feasible and desirable. However, the Bureau of the Budget has withheld its recommendation—thus preventing authorization—until a survey could be made in connection with a national program of scenic roads and parkways. Let me quote from the findings of the National Park Service on the Allegheny Scenic Road proposal, to indicate its value. It states:

> (The Parkway) . . . would pass through a rich variety of scenic locations embracing rugged large-scale mountains, highland valleys, mountain pastures, lowland agricultural and orchard lands, forests, and rivers. It would connect two National Historical Parks and provide access to or traverse a wide range of recreational areas, including national forests and States parks and forests, a proposed national recreation area, and Corps of Engineers reservoirs. For 22 miles it would adjoin the highly scenic Bluestone Reservoir in the New River Gorge with access to fishing and boating facilities and would parallel for 27 miles the historic and picturesque Potomac River.
>
> This parkway would provide much needed outdoor recreation opportunities to the heavily populated eastern portion of the country. It will be within one day's driving distance and readily accessible to half the population of the United States.

I am hopeful that the development of this important new addition to the tourist facilities of our country may now be accomplished under a national program of scenic roads and parkways.

If there is any doubt as to the economic or recreational value of these roads, let me quote this section from the report of the Commerce Department:

> Tourism is among the world's biggest businesses. Travelers and tourists spend about $30 billion annually in the United States. Half of the States consider tourism one of their three major sources of revenue. Some rate it their most important industry. The magnitude of the recreation travel business is indicated by the fact that the combined annual payrolls of 12 of the Nation's largest corporations equal only one-half of the annual tourist expenditures.
>
> Furthermore—

The report states—

> by dramatizing the splendors of the United States, the proposed national program will tend to encourage travel at home and conserve dollar exchange.

What is its value to communities along the scenic roads? We are told in the report that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce estimates that cash returns from two dozen tourists per day benefit a community as much as a factory with an annual payroll of $100,000.

It may be asked whether this program will also mean employment? The study estimated that the minimum program of $4 billion would generate an estimated 864 million man-hours of work, both on-site and off-site. The extended program of $8 billion would generate double that amount.

I am fully aware of the squeeze for funds that is being exerted by our national security needs at this time. However, I believe that we must act quickly to authorize and begin the plans for a program of this type to use it when the need occurs for increased Federal spending.

I join with the authors of the report in saying that—

> A study of its merits will reveal that this program of scenic roads and parkways ranks high among other present or projected national programs which will return a maximum of benefit per dollar of investment to the average American.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment to 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 2, 1967, at 11 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed are they who hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled.—Matthew 5: 6.

Eternal God and Father of us all, amid the maddening maze of daily duties and the fever and fret of trying times, we would dwell for a moment in the secret place of the Most High and abide under the shadow of the Almighty.

In this quiet moment of prayer we would make ourselves receptive to Thee. Help us to hear Thy voice and to be obedient to the call of Thy spirit. May our hunger for truth and our thirst for life find their fulfillment in Thy presence. As we live through this day may we keep our hearts open to Thee, who art the source of strength for the faithful soul.

To Thee we bring the Members of this body and for them we pray. Give them clarity of insight to see what is right, confidence to do what is right, and the courage to keep on the right path now and always. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

JUNK MAIL

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to raise charges on so-called junk mail users enough to cover the cost of mailing.

Advertisers using junk mail presently have a large part of their expenses paid for by the taxpayer, and this is wrong.

Rates for this class of mail are so low that the taxpayer, who has to pay 5 cents to mail his own letters, subsidizes about 40 percent of the mailing costs on third-class mail. The rate increase proposed in my bill would bring in millions of dollars in added revenue for our Post Office Department. It would remove an unjust subsidy. People who wish to advertise in newspapers, or on radio and television, are charged the full cost of the ad. There is no reason why the taxpayer should pick up a substantial part of the tab for someone who uses the mail to advertise his products or services.

Under my bill, rates for third-class mail would go from the present 4 cents for the first 2 ounces for a single piece to 5 cents, and from 2 cents for each additional ounce to 2½ cents.

Bulk mailings of books and catalogs would go from the present 12 cents a pound or fraction of a pound to 18 cents.

Matter mailed in bulk would be subject to a minimum charge of 4½ cents per piece, up from the current rate of 2⅞ cents.

Rates for mailings by nonprofit educational, charitable, and religious organizations would be half of the regular rates.

The annual bulk mailing fee would be raised from $30 to $40.

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, realizing that there is going to be quite a bit of debate on the matter of House Resolution 278, regarding the seating of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, I would like to go on record to state that should I be recognized, I will offer the following amendment:

> Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That Adam Clayton Powell, Representative-elect from the State of New York, is found to have abandoned prior to November 8, 1966, his inhabitancy in the State of New York and does not meet constitutional requirements and shall not be seated in the House of Representatives, and the seat of the 18th District of New York is hereby declared vacant."

SENIORITY SYSTEM

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the House and the country are properly outraged by the conduct of Mr. POWELL, and it is entirely proper that disciplinary action be taken against him. At the same time action should be taken to correct a condition without which the sorry affair could not have developed.

The House today would not be confronted with this difficult, constitutionally complicated problem—and the House's reputation would not have been so damaged—had it not been for the archaic system used in selecting committee leadership.

No one could imagine Mr. POWELL getting by with the conduct recited in the committee report if his position and tenure as chairman of the Education and Labor Committee had depended on periodic approval by the committee majority. Public criticism long ago would have forced Mr. POWELL to change his ways or leave the chairmanship.

For Mr. POWELL the seniority system was a protective shield behind which he could misuse funds and otherwise act in a disgraceful manner.

The seniority system may have merit here and there, but as a means of selecting the people for high legislative positions—to whom the Nation must look for imaginative, effective leadership, it is as outdated as the divine right of kings and the right of primogeniture.

Admittedly it has put some excellent people in committee chairmanships in the past—and has done so today. But even these would be better equipped to help give Congress the influence it should exert if they held their position because their committee colleagues voted them there.

I can think of no single step which would do more to strengthen public confidence in the House than to require that committee chairmen be selected by majority vote of committee members, rather than by seniority.

BILL TO MAKE BIRTHPLACE OF JOHN F. KENNEDY A NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill to make the birthplace of President John F. Kennedy, in Brookline, Mass., a national historic site. The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the property by gift, to administer it in accordance with the laws relating to historic sites, and to develop a plan to maintain the property and allow access to it for the public.

John F. Kennedy was born in this house, at 83 Beals Street in Brookline, on May 29, 1917. For this reason, the property has assumed a historic importance, and there has already been considerable interest expressed, in Brookline and in Massachusetts, in preserving this site for posterity.

Many of the homes of our Presidents are owned by the Federal Government and administered as historical sites by the National Parks Service. Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Herbert Hoover, and Franklin D. Roosevelt are some. I feel this is the most prudent way to preserve for the future President Kennedy's birthplace. Too often in our history, the birthplaces of Presidents have passed from hand to hand as private property, sometimes being allowed to deteriorate, sometimes even being destroyed to make room for improvements. The Nation has lost valuable historical treasures when this is allowed to happen.

The property at 83 Beals Street is presently owned by the family of President Kennedy. It is their intention, if this legislation is enacted, to make a gift of the property to the Federal Government, thus relieving the Government of acquisition costs.

I hope the Congress will take suitable action on this bill, to allow the birthplace of our late, beloved President to become a part of the national historic preserve.

SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the sixth anniversary of the Peace Corps. The record shows that it has survived original skepticism to achieve great success.

As chairman of the House committee which oversees Peace Corps operations—now expanded to 52 countries overseas—I am particularly pleased to be able to note that not only my State but my congressional district has played a leading role in this success. Today, one out of every 21 Peace Corps volunteers is from Pennsylvania, and already more than 500 Pennsylvanians have completed 2 years of Peace Corps service. Among the States of the Union, the Commonwealth's participation ranks fourth largest.

Pennsylvania has provided the Peace Corps with key leadership during these past 6 years: 67 of the staffers who have served at the Peace Corps' Washington headquarters and overseas are from my State.

Finally, I would like to point out that the Commonwealth has served as an important training ground for Peace Corps volunteers. In fact, one out of every 12 volunteers was trained for overseas service at a Pennsylvania university.

As the Peace Corps expands its efforts in education, agriculture, and public health to new areas, it is my hope that Pennsylvania will continue to play a leading role in this exciting international program.

For the accomplishments of the Peace Corps provide one of the most satisfying aspects of our foreign aid.

Particularly impressive, I believe, are the signs of growing maturity which the Peace Corps is showing by tackling life-and-death problems, as it did in India last year with a stepped-up effort in food production.

It is a pleasure to take note of the agency's anniversary and to wish it continued success.

NATURAL DISASTERS — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 70)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I have the honor to transmit this report of activity during calendar year 1966 under Public Law 81-875. That law empowers the President to supplement the efforts and resources of States and local governments in alleviating the suffering and damage caused by natural disasters.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 1, 1967.*

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, shortly this body will take up the important question of seating the Member-elect from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Members of this body versed in the law are divided over the definition of the word "qualifications." Some say we cannot look beyond the constitutional qualifications of age, U.S. citizenship, and inhabitancy in the State of New York. Some say that a broad interpretation of the word lets us look beyond this.

Many of us—and I think most of us—have been critical of the courts for their decisions which legislate for us. For this body to legally define this word here today, we could be called to task for attempting to invade the arena reserved for the courts.

The committee unanimously found that the Member-elect "wrongfully and willfully appropriated" various sums of public money "to his own use." In other words, the committee found that he, in effect, stole from the Treasury of the United States. What this committee has found is no less an offense than if a Member would steal gold from the Fort Knox vault. The committee report, if adopted, would say to the American public that you can be a Member of Congress and—you can stay a Member—even though you are found by the Congress to have "wrongfully and willfully appropriated public funds for your own use."

If we seat the Member-elect today—under any circumstances and regardless of the penalty—then we cannot expect the people to have one ounce of respect for this body.

Some predict that the Supreme Court will order the Member-elect seated. My people do not want him seated. The people of this country do not want him seated. We are the people's Representatives and our actions should reflect their desires. Let it not be said that we are guilty of seating the Member-elect. If the Supreme Court should in the final analysis do what some predict—and this is speculative—then let it be their responsibility; not ours.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 20]

Anderson, Ill.
Ashley
Blanton
Bow
Cahill
Clark
Dawson
Donohue
Edwards, La.
Fraser
Friedel
Holifield
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Long, Md.
Macdonald, Mass.
Morse, Mass.
Murphy, N.Y.
Pepper
Philbin
Ronan
Sisk
Willis
Young

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 405 Members have answered to their names; a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 4573) to provide, for the period ending on June 30, 1967, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk commenced the reading of the statement.

By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. MILLS), the further reading of the statement was dispensed with.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 28)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4573) to provide, for the period ending on June 30, 1967, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its amendments to the text and to the title of the bill.

W. D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
FRANK KARSTEN,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
THOMAS B. CURTIS,
JAMES B. UTT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RUSSELL B. LONG,
GEORGE SMATHERS,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4573) to provide, for the period ending on June 30, 1967, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as passed by the House provided a temporary increase in the public debt limit as set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to $336 billion for the period beginning on the date of the enactment of the bill and ending on June 30, 1967.

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill struck out all after the enacting clause and inserted new text providing for a permanent increase in the debt limit to $336 billion. Under the conference agreement, the Senate recedes.

The conferees on the part of the House stated they will recommend that an increase in the permanent debt limitation be considered by the Committee on Ways and Means in connection with the Committee's next review of the debt limitation, which must occur prior to July 1, 1967.

The Senate recedes on its amendment to the title of the bill.

W. D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
FRANK KARSTEN,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
THOMAS B. CURTIS,
JAMES B. UTT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago, on February 8, the House passed H.R. 4573, a bill which raises the temporary ceiling on the public debt to $336 billion for the remainder of the fiscal year.

THE NEED FOR A HIGHER DEBT LIMIT

We took this action after it became clear from the testimony of administration officials that the present $330 billion limit is inadequate. For 3 months now—since late November 1966—the Treasury has been operating uncomfortably close to the present ceiling. Under these circumstances, the Treasury has been left with virtually no margin for contingencies. At times, they have also been forced to operate with cash balances well below the $4 billion that has always been considered the minimum necessary for flexible cash management.

For example, on November 30 last year, the level of the debt reached $329.6 billion, just $400 million short of the statutory limitation. In order to operate within the limitation, the Treasury was forced to reduce its operating cash balance on that date to $3.3 billion. By December 15, the situation had become even tighter. The amount of the debt was then only $149 million below the limitation and the Treasury's operating cash balance was down to $916 million, only enough to cover a few days' expenses.

While the situation improved a bit in late December, the improvement was temporary. By January 15, when the level of the debt was $329.8 billion, the cash balance was reduced to $2.6 billion.

IMMEDIATE ACTION IS IMPERATIVE

When Secretary Fowler and other Treasury officials appeared before your committee to request an increase in the $330 billion limitation, they pointed out that the situation would become intolerable in March and April under the present limitation. The debt for the fiscal year has in the past reached its peak during the first 2 weeks of March, a period when the flow of cash into the Treasury is relatively light. At the same time, tax refunds must be paid in addition to regular monthly expenses. The Treasury officials predicted that they would be unable to meet all the obligations which will fall due during this period unless this bill is approved.

We already have evidence of the accuracy of those predictions. Because this bill has not already been approved by Congress, the Treasury is being forced to take certain unusual actions to pay the debts of the Federal Government without exceeding the $330 billion debt limitation. For example the Treasury expects to have to redeem about $700 million of special Treasury issues from the civil service retirement fund, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and go out into the market with these funds and buy outstanding securities. Normally these securities would remain invested in the special Treasury issues. Furthermore, the Treasury has announced that if it did not have the larger limitation by the beginning of business this morning, it might be required to disinvest $700 million of the funds of the exchange stabilization fund.

These actions are within the legitimate powers of the Treasury. They do not, however, constitute good debt management. Similar actions have not had to be taken in order to operate under the debt ceiling since the years 1957–58. If we give prompt approval to this report, these actions can be terminated promptly. They will not have to be continued for several months as was necessary in the earlier period of their use.

THE SENATE AMENDMENT

The Senate amended the house bill to make the $336 billion limitation approved by the House the permanent debt ceiling. That is, under the bill as amended by the Senate, the debt ceiling would not revert to the permanent level of $285 billion on June 30, 1967, but would remain $336 billion until such time as Congress amended it.

In conference, the conferees on the part of the House insisted on the House version of the bill because we felt the House should be given time to consider such an amendment. The conferees on the part of the Senate receded from their amendment, restoring the bill to the form in which it passed the House.

Personally, I think the Senate amendment is one that should be given careful consideration. I want this considered at the same time we consider the proper treatment under the debt limit for guaranteed debt for which the Government has only a contingent liability. I support the commitment made by the House conferees that the question of the permanent limit be taken up the next time the question of the debt limitation is considered. Such consideration will have to occur, of course, before the end of the fiscal year.

If I have my way, the limitation will be made permanent when we consider the debt limit in the next 2 or 3 months. But I will want to make sure if we do alter the permanent limitation that it will replace the temporary limitation as a rein on Federal spending. We may agree that the present permanent limitation is no longer meaningful, but we must make sure that a new permanent limitation continues to have some control over the level of expenditures.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I urge the prompt approval of this conference report. The bill agreed to in conference is exactly the same as the bill that was approved by this House 3 weeks ago. Any delay in its passage will only force the Treasury Department to resort to undesirable debt management practices.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to my good friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman give us the number of times the debt ceiling has been increased under the present administration?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, sir. In the report—if the gentleman has it before him—which was filed by the committee to accompany the bill H.R. 4573, we listed the number of times that the debt ceiling has been increased, beginning on page 9, appendix III, table 1, which continues through pages 10 and 11.

Now, getting to the gentleman's question, would the gentleman want me to go to 1961 or from December 1963?

Mr. GROSS. I am directing my question to the present administration, to the Johnson administration. How many times has the debt ceiling been raised under the Johnson administration?

Mr. MILLS. Let us start, then, with the first action under that administration, which was for the period June 30, 1964. On June 29, 1964, we increased the debt limit from $309 billion to $324 billion. Then on June 24, 1965, we raised it to $328 billion, and then on June 24, 1966, we raised it to $330 billion. This bill is for an additional $6 billion, which will raise it to $336 billion. This will be the fourth time in this Administration the debt limit has been increased.

Mr. GROSS. The reason I ask the gentleman this question is because the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], in the well of the House earlier this afternoon, spoke of the remarkable achievements of this administration. I noted that he made no reference whatever to the number of times the debt ceiling has been increased, under the present administration, nor to the Federal debt as it presently exists, nor to the interest payments on the Federal debt. Neither did the gentleman from Texas mention the fact that this Nation now has $1 trillion 380 billion of public and private debt. I cannot conceive of a more inappropriate day for the gentleman from Texas to have made his dissertation on the remarkable achievements of this administration than on this day when an increase in the huge Federal debt is an issue.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, is it not also a fact that during the Kennedy administration and the Eisenhower administration there were debt increases?

Mr. MILLS. There were increases in all but one year since 1954 and in some of the years there were two or more increases.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that anyone took the floor this morning to talk about the remarkable achievements of those years.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I signed the conference report. All members of the House conference signed the report. I will support the report of the conference as it comes before the House this afternoon. The bill is brought back exactly as it passed the House of Representatives. There is no basis, therefore, under the normal rules that govern a conference report to object to the conference report as long as the action of the House prevailed.

I believe, however, that I should say, Mr. Speaker, a few words about the Senate amendment that was rejected in the conference.

I should say a few words about the Senate amendment because of the significance the amendment would have had, as well as the effect the action of the conference will have, in connection with further consideration of debt ceiling legislation by the Congress of the United States.

The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Arkansas, suggested that because we came back to the House with the identical bill which passed the House it was a great victory.

I am not sure what there was a victory about. In my judgment, it certainly was not a victory for responsible action.

Frankly, I believe it is preposterous that we should turn down a Senate amendment which had as it sole objective the elimination of a fiction which serves no useful purpose; namely, the fiction that the ceiling established by the bill of $336 billion is only temporary.

It is not temporary, I would tell my colleagues. My colleagues might just as well make up their minds on that today, because the facts are that they are going to be asked within the next 4 months—not 6 months, and not a year from now, but within 4 months, or less than that—to take action again. We are going to be debating on the floor of the House, and the administration will have asked for an increase in the debt ceiling above the $336 billion. That debate will take place prior to June 30.

The administration will probably be asking, if we can rely on present projections of spending and income, a further increase of some $10 billion over and above the $336 billion that is approved by this legislation.

So where is the temporary nature of this particular ceiling that we are establishing today? It is temporary only in that we know it will be increased; not temporary in terms of reverting to the permanent ceiling of $285 billion.

Let me tell you some things that our rejection of the amendment will do, of a more affirmative nature and I think dangerous nature.

We would be much better off in considering debt legislation if we would act responsibly and accept the Senate amendment.

First, our refusal to accept the Senate amendment will mean that we shall have to come in here and act before June 30. We shall have to act within the next 4 months. There will be no alternative. Why? Because otherwise the ceiling will go back to $285 billion, and we already have outstanding debts of $330 billion. By that time, in June, they will be in the neighborhood of $336 billion.

It will be argued, and correctly so, that we cannot bring our public debt within the ceiling of $285 billion. To do so would mean we would have to manage our fiscal affairs in such a way as to produce a surplus in excess of $45 billion within the next 4 months. This, of course, is an impossibility. This administration is not producing surpluses—it is producing deficits.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

They will say we cannot pay off $45 billion or $50 billion of our outstanding obligations in the next 4 months, or by June 30, so we have to prevent a return to the $285 billion as the maximum debt that can legally be outstanding after June 30.

What will that mean when we have to act within 4 months? First, it will mean that again we will be acting under an emergency situation. We will be threatened with the dire consequences of a $285 billion ceiling which we cannot meet.

We will be asked to increase the ceiling before we know what the facts are with respect to fiscal year 1968. If we adopted the Senate amendment, at least we would have time between now and next September or even December to act on any further increases that may be necessary, because a $336 billion ceiling would carry us until about the first of September if there was not any enactment of the tax increase recommended by the President. If the tax increase recommended by the President is enacted, we are told we could operate until December before we increased the debt ceiling above $336 billion. The point is, however, that by rejecting the Senate amendment we force ourselves again to act in haste and without all of the facts and under the threat of an emergency. Yet, what the majority did by insisting in the conference on rejection of the Senate amendment was to keep over your heads and over all of our heads this sword of Damocles posed by the $285 billion ceiling with a temporary ceiling of $336 billion. Thus they distort the debate that will take place when we consider the next debt ceiling bill in June.

Mr. Speaker, mark my words, they will say, "Oh, you have to pass this bill because the permanent debt ceiling is only $285 billion. You have to pass some legislation giving us a bigger debt ceiling."

Well, let me say this, and this is really the point of my remarks this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. I think that it will come with bad grace for anybody to threaten any Member of the House with the consequence of reverting to a $285 billion ceiling when we come to the debate on this matter next June. Why? Because the very people who will make that argument are those who rejected the possibility of eliminating this fiction.

This fiction has no place in the law of the United States. The majority members on the conference committee by agreeing to eliminate this fiction the next time we act on debt ceiling legislation admit the continuation of this fiction is wrong.

The House conferees should have accepted the Senate amendment.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELATIVE TO THE SEATING OF REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT ADAM CLAYTON POWELL

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1, I call up for immediate consideration the following privileged resolution, House Resolution 278, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas,

The Select Committee appointed Pursuant to H. Res. 1 (90th Congress) has reached the following conclusions:

First, Adam Clayton Powell possesses the requisite qualifications of age, citizenship and inhabitancy for membership in the House of Representatives and holds a Certificate of Election from the State of New York.

Second, Adam Clayton Powell has repeatedly ignored the processes and authority of the courts in the State of New York in legal proceedings pending therein to which he is a party, and his contumacious conduct towards the court of that State has caused him on several occasions to be adjudicated in contempt thereof, thereby reflecting discredit upon and bringing into disrepute the House of Representatives and its Members.

Third, as a Member of this House, Adam Clayton Powell improperly maintained on his clerk-hire payroll Y. Marjorie Flores (Mrs. Adam C. Powell) from August 14, 1964, to December 31, 1966, during which period either she performed no official duties whatever or such duties were not performed in Washington, D.C. or the State of New York as required by law.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HARDY (during reading of H.R. 278). Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 21]

Bolton
Bow
Brown, Calif.
Button
Cahill
Dawson
Edwards, La.
Fraser
Friedel
King, Calif.
Macdonald, Mass.
Morse, Mass.
Ronan

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 420 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

RELATIVE TO THE SEATING OF REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT ADAM CLAYTON POWELL

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will resume the reading of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fourth, as Chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, Adam Clayton Powell permitted and participated in improper expenditures of government funds for private purposes.

Fifth, the refusal of Adam Clayton Powell to cooperate with the Select Committee and the Special Subcommittee on Contracts of the House Administration Committee in their lawful inquiries authorized by the House of Representatives was contemptuous and was conduct unworthy of a Member; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

1. That the Speaker administer the oath of office to the said Adam Clayton Powell, Member-elect from the Eighteenth District of the State of New York.

2. That upon taking the oath as a Member of the 90th Congress the said Adam Clayton Powell be brought to the bar of the House in the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House and be there publicly censured by the Speaker in the name of the House.

3. That Adam Clayton Powell, as punishment, pay to the Clerk of the House to be disposed of by him according to law, Forty Thousand Dollars ($40,000.00). The Sergeant-at-Arms of the House is directed to deduct One Thousand Dollars ($1,000.00) per month from the salary otherwise due the said Adam Clayton Powell and pay the same to said Clerk, said deductions to continue while any salary is due the said Adam Clayton Powell as a Member of the House of Representatives until said Forty Thousand Dollars ($40,000.00) is fully paid. Said sums received by the Clerk shall offset to the extent thereof any liability of the said Adam Clayton Powell to the United States of America with respect to the matters referred to in the above paragraphs Third and Fourth of the preamble to this Resolution.

4. That the seniority of the said Adam Clayton Powell in the House of Representatives commence as of the date he takes the oath as a Member of the 90th Congress.

5. That if the said Adam Clayton Powell does not present himself to take the oath of office on or before March 13, 1967, the seat of the Eighteenth District of the State of New York shall be deemed vacant and the Speaker shall notify the Governor of the State of New York of the existing vacancy.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended for an additional hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half of the time allotted to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

The SPEAKER. For debate only?

Mr. CELLER. For debate only.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I care to use.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Louisiana for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CELLER. I yield for one inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The time is coming out of the hour allotted to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I yield for one inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I am limited to one inquiry, that one inquiry will of necessity be rather long.

Am I correct in assuming that under the rules in debating House Resolution 278 that now, since the time has been extended an additional hour by unanimous consent over and beyond what the rules of the House provide for, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] will control the time for the 2 hours less that yielded to the gentleman from West Virginia and that this time will be used for no purpose except debate of House Resolution 278; that he will have the option of determining whether or not amendments or substitutes can be offered; that at the conclusion of this 2 hours of debate on House Resolution 278 he will move the previous question, which, if voted down, will make amendments or substitutes to House Resolution 278 in order; at that time will the Speaker give preference, if the previous question is voted down, to the minority who oppose the resolution to control the ensuing hour, or will the Chair give preference to committee members who oppose the resolution regardless of which side of the aisle they sit on to offer amendments or substitutes to House Resolution 278; and if amendments or substitutes are offered then will there occur another vote on the previous question, if the preceding previous question is voted down, and what will be the order of priority in recognizing some Member of the House on either side of the aisle, either alternatively Democratic and Republican or alternately Republican and Democratic in determining who will control each ensuing hour; and will we have the opportunity to vote on all previous questions no matter how many amendments are offered as long as preceding previous questions are voted down?

The SPEAKER. In answering the several questions involved in the statement made or in the parliamentary inquiry made by the gentleman from Louisiana, the Chair will state that the Chair will follow the rules of the House of Representatives as it is the duty of the Chair to do, and the precedents. The question of the allocation of time is a matter for the chairman of the committee, one-half of the time being yielded to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE]. Both the chairman and the ranking minority member of the select committee control the allocation of time. The question of recognition is one that the Chair will pass upon if that time should arise.

On the other questions of the gentleman from Louisiana the Chair will determine them as they arise in accordance with the rules of the House and the precedents.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I care to use.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the nine men appointed by the Speaker of the House were weighted with the heaviest responsibility that can be placed on any one group—to sit in judgment on their fellow man. What is asked of us when we judge one who had been a colleague for 22 years, who had been sent to Congress time and time and yet time again by his constituency?

That we set all passions aside.

That we examine to the furthest degree possible all the facts before us.

That we, as lawyers, study the precedents of the House and Senate.

That we review all pertinent law.

That we place objectivity above politics and fairness above fear.

That we preserve the dignity of this House.

That we respect the wishes of a constituency.

That we set no precedent that long after we are gone may come back to haunt this representative body.

That we devise the structure of punishment that will be immediate, effective, certain and lasting.

That we act with complete integrity in service to this House.

We followed all these injunctions, laboring for weeks, meeting for as much as 8 hours a day. There is not a facet of the law or facts, as we knew them, that we did not hold up to the light of reason.

This committee recommended:

First. That the Speaker administer the oath of office to the said ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Member-elect from the 18th District of the State of New York.

Second. That upon taking the oath as a Member of the 90th Congress the said ADAM CLAYTON POWELL be brought to the bar of the House in the custody of the Sergeant at Arms of the House and be there publicly censured by the Speaker in the name of the House.

Third. That ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, as punishment, pay to the Clerk of the House to be disposed of by him according to law, $40,000. The Sergeant at Arms of the House is directed to deduct $1,000 per month from the salary otherwise due the said ADAM CLAYTON POWELL and pay the same to said Clerk, said deductions to continue while any salary is due the said ADAM CLAYTON POWELL as a Member of the House of Representatives until said $40,000 is fully paid. Said sums received by the Clerk shall offset to the extent thereof any liability of the said ADAM CLAYTON POWELL to the United States of America with respect to the matters referred to in the paragraphs third and fourth of the preamble to House Joint Resolution 278. The liabilities referred to here are civil liabilities; and, it is the intention of the committee that if the Department of Justice finds there is criminal liability, then prosecution in the courts for criminal acts shall ensue.

And last, that if the said ADAM CLAYTON POWELL does not present himself to take the oath of office on or before March 13, 1967, the seat of the 18th District of the State of New York shall be deemed vacant and the Speaker shall notify the Governor of the State of New York of the existing vacancy.

You have the report before you. The facts and the reasoning are there. I am sure you have studied the report most carefully.

There are those who believe we acted too leniently, others that we acted "to annihilate by humiliation," as one man put it. Some say in words of common parlance, "kick him out."

Mr. Speaker, to them I say read the precedents. Expulsion is the most drastic action. It has been rarely availed of, and then only during the Civil War for treason, the treason being spelled out of Members joining and fighting on the side of the Confederacy against the Union. Except for three instances of treason, resolutions of expulsion either failed to receive the necessary two-thirds vote, or lost, and a resolution of censure was substituted and was approved.

Mr. POWELL's wrongdoing does not rise to the heights of malevolence such as treason. Remember he was reelected by his constituents after and despite well-advertised shortcomings. That was an important factor in our deliberations. However, it was not controlling, because the House of Representatives can also pass judgment on conduct which is injurious to its processes, its dignity, and its official committees. Yet we could not permit his dalliance and defaults to go unwhipped without suitable sanctions and discipline. We had to face up to the necessity of meaningful punishment.

The penalties imposed satisfy a stern sense of justice.

You will note that we went beyond censure. Never before has a committee devised such punishment short of exclusion which went beyond censure. Censure is a dreadful act to contemplate. Imagine, if you will, yourself walking down the aisle of this Chamber accompanied by the Sergeant at Arms, and in the well of the House listening to the strictures placed upon you by the Speaker in the presence of your colleagues.

Exclusion or expulsion seemed deceptively simple. Yet neither could bring into play the punishments herein devised, keeping as well the recommendations of this committee within the boundaries of the Constitution and the precedents. Some may demand exclusion—ouster at the threshold by majority vote. The Constitution lays down three qualifications for one to enter Congress—age, inhabitancy, citizenship. Mr. POWELL satisfies all three. The House cannot add to these qualifications. If so it could add, for example, a religious test or conceivably deny seats to a minority by mere majority vote.

Madison and Hamilton were aware of the danger of permitting the House to regulate qualifications. They therefore said the Constitution unalterably fixes and defines qualifications. Madison said that to allow the Congress such power would be improper and dangerous.

There is the charge of racism, which has been heard. That is as baseless as it is cruel. Baseless because we have within recent memory condemned and punished white Members. Cruel because it gives a false impression to the Negro, especially to the lowly Negro, that the black man is singled out for penalties. This is a canard that arouses hostile emotions and results in acts that only add fuel to the backlash.

The eight men who labored with me put their minds and their hearts to the task.

They did so without rancor, without the paralyzing spirit of revenge. They acted as lawyers and as free men with not a trace of bending to the blinding forces of hysteria.

We are met today in solemn conclave. I am certain we will act with the same integrity to preserve the high traditions of this House, and for the honor of the House I ask approval of the pending resolution.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the fine analysis that we have just heard has come from the distinguished dean of this House who has served here for much more than 40 years. His long experience as a Member, his stature as a lawyer, his long tenure on the Committee on the Judiciary and his long tenure as chairman of that great committee, which is the lawyers' committee of this House, all tend to equip him as few Members have ever been equipped, to pass judgment where legal, equitable, and moral issues are involved. He has been assisted in this endeavor by a very strong select committee on both sides of the aisle, outstanding Members of the House, Members who have worked at the job, Members who have the confidence of the House.

It is true that what the committee has recommended adds up to stern punishment. But in its wisdom, the committee has decided that this is a just punishment. There may be extremists who would go in one direction or another further than the committee has gone. But the committee—and the committee alone—has spent 8 hours a day studying all aspects available on this case. I think the committee has done an outstanding job. I think the committee deserves the support of the House, and I trust it will have the support of the House and that the House will vote up the previous question when that time comes and adopt the resolution as it has been brought here to the House by the committee. The committee had no alternative under the circumstances than to take stern action. This it has done and the committees deserves our support.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from New York yield for just one question, please?

I think the gentleman knows the respect that all Members of the House have for him. I wonder if the gentleman would object to having the Members of this House turn to page 31 of the report and read the nine specific findings of this committee. If the gentleman would be gracious enough at this time for the record to read into the RECORD the findings—No. 3, which alleges that as a Member of Congress, Mr. POWELL wrongfully and willfully appropriated $27,505.34 of public funds—read all of that into the RECORD.

Then read finding No. 4 in the RECORD, which is identical except for a smaller amount of money.

Then turn to page 32 and read specifically into the RECORD wherein the committee finds that the gentleman from New York, in his capacity as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor in the 89th Congress, falsely certified for payment from public funds—and read that in its entirety into the RECORD.

Then read finding No. 9—the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, made false reports.

I wonder if the gentleman would ask the Speaker of the House at this point to permit the insertion into the RECORD in its entirety the nine findings that are included on pages 31 and 32 of this report.

Mr. CELLER. I shall include those in my remarks.

Mr. LENNON. Now, if the gentleman will yield for a question: How can you say to me, my distinguished friend, that the Members of the House, in conscience and in morality, can say to the world and to the people of America, that the gentleman from New York should be seated?

Mr. CELLER. Is this a speech or is the gentleman asking a question? Would the gentleman try to state his question briefly, as we are very pressed for time.

Mr. LENNON. How can we say in conscience to the people of America, when this distinguished committee finds the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], both in his individual capacity as a Member and as chairman of a great committee, has willfully and wrongfully and falsely misappropriated public funds to his own personal use—and the gentleman knows that that is almost identical language that is sent to a grand jury on a bill of indictment for embezzlement. Just how can we vote to do it, my friend, in conscience and morality?

Mr. CELLER. The report speaks for itself. The report went into all those facts to which the gentleman has adverted, and we came to the conclusion and stated our findings in the report that we feel the censure and the punishment that we would mete out to Mr. POWELL would be ample and sufficient.

Mr. LENNON. I thank the gentleman for his answer. But I cannot agree with it. I cannot and will not vote to seat him.

The SPEAKER The gentleman from New York has consumed 20 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself so much time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues of the House, in the 180 years that this great parliamentary body has met there have been only 17 occasions in which we have previously met to consider the censure of one of our Members and, indeed, in which censure has been the order of the House. There have been three times that we have met in that 180 years in which the House considered and did expel three of its Members.

This is truly an occasion of history, but indeed it is a sad occasion when we must again review the record that been presented to us under this resolution and report to the House. I believe it should be understood by all, regardless of how easy it may feel or how easy it may look, that it is not easy, by any stretch of the imagination, to sit in judgment on one's colleague. The action which is recommended by the select committee, it should be understood by all, is unprecedented in the annals of the House of Representatives.

True, it rises out of the unprecedented conduct by a Congressman who served also as the chairman of one of our most important committees, the Committee on Education and Labor.

The select committee in this case, in reviewing all the matters, found that this Member-elect brought this House of Representatives into great disrespect by his behavior toward the courts of our land and toward two committees of the Congress.

We also found, and we have submitted in our report to you our belief, that he has violated the trust that has been placed in him or was placed in him as a Congressman and as a chairman by appropriating for his own use certain public funds.

In such a case the committee has sought to make the punishment commensurate with the misconduct and still to take into consideration the rights of a constituency of this Nation of ours to have the Representative of its choice.

I think it should be said here, and perhaps it need not even be stated, every member of this select committee has conscientiously tried to come to a just decision on this matter, and I hope that this House, which must make the ultimate decision, will do so also. We acted as a grand jury. We have brought in the results of our findings, and you, each one of you, as a Member of this House, occupies the position of a juror. The ultimate decision and the fate of our recommendations rests in your hands.

I should like to mention the attitude of all the members of the select committee that I was privileged to serve with in this instance, including certainly, with a maximum amount of expression of love, affection, and appreciation for his tremendous talents, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. This, indeed, was a refreshing experience, and I believe it would be fair to say, as one Member, it reinforces my faith in the House of Representatives.

The staff selected by us acted superbly and untiringly.

The recommendations represent a consensus position, reached after long and weighty deliberation involving considerations of the greatest magnitude. Still it should be emphasized that at no time was this matter dealt with in a partisan way. We never considered ADAM POWELL as an American Negro. We never considered ADAM POWELL as a former Member or a Member-elect of this Congress. We never considered ADAM POWELL as a minister of the Gospel. We never gave consideration to ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, the man.

Rather, the issue which was thrust at us in the erecting of a special committee was to detemine and report back to the House of Representatives on the conduct of a Member-elect who had presented himself, as we all did, on January 10, with the appropriate credentials for being sworn in as a Member of this body.

I took the assignment as a member of this select committee with no strings attached to me. When I was asked to serve, nobody asked what result I would bring back. I believe there was an element of trust on January 10 that in the wisdom of the Speaker and the minority leader those who were ultimately to be named to serve on this highly difficult assignment would do the best job they possibly could, resisting certainly all of the pressures of the times.

I believe it is fair to say that every member of this committee—and I do not draw any deeper inflection or less inflection in the tone of my voice when I say this—approached this assignment with that same devotion and same attitude.

There are those who believe, as the chairman has indicated, that we should have excluded this Member-elect from our midst, that there was more than an adequate amount of information that we had put together that would merit such a position and such a recommendation.

But if we only read that which is presently on our desks concerning a matter of this grave consequence, and if we were not charged—as we were—by this House of Representatives with the responsibility of how others of our numbers decided on a same set or a similar set of facts at an earlier time, perhaps it would have been easy for us to have come and recommended that the Member-elect be excluded.

Likewise it is suggested that we should have come in with a motion that we expel the Member-elect appropriately applying the two-thirds criteria of the Constitution. In the same vein had we only read that which for the moment was on our desks and based our decisions upon that, the decision would have been relatively easy.

But you, my fellow Members, charged each one of us with the responsibility of going back 180 years and finding out what this House of Representatives, what this great legislative body, had done and considering certainly what the other body had done on matters of similar grave importance.

It is after a thorough and complete study of the precedents of the House in these particular matters, of the long numbers of cases that have been referred to, that we feel we have come to this House with a resolution which involves, in perhaps its harshest terms, more punishment than has ever been dealt to any single Member of the House of Representatives in the history of our Nation.

Some Members may be quick to rise and say, "But there have been other instances in which individuals for far less indiscretion and far less misconduct have been excluded or expelled."

I only say to those Members that a clear reading of the cases will show that some third force always intervened. When the Member was charged with either a willful misappropriation of funds or with any one of a number of different types of misbehavior in the realm of dishonesty—which are here in this report today—a third force always intervened. In some instances the individual Member either resigned or the matter was never put to the conscience of the House of Representatives.

I believe those in this House who talk

in terms of the ethics of the U.S. Congress should read the recommendations of this select committee.

It had been the hope that we could come before the House and say we truly had established for the first time some enumerated ethics which would call upon every Member of this House to live up to them or bear dire consequences.

We have asked in this resolution that the House of Representatives make a study in depth to determine whether or not the existing procedural and substantive rules are adequate in cases involving charges of breach of public trust which have been lodged against any Member.

And in the next point, in order that we might clear the air, we have asked that the Committee on House Administration, which is currently undertaking a revision of its auditing procedures, be directed by the House to file an annual report of its audit of the expenditures of every one of the committees of this House of Representatives, and of the clerk-hire payroll of every one of its Members.

There is an abundance of beginning in the field of ethics in this report.

If Members lay it aside and torture their consciences that we have not done enough to punish the Member-elect from the State of New York, I would only take a moment to say that in their desire to mete out the maximum punishment, if there is anything greater—I do not say this with any sense of levity or trying to be humorous—if there is any greater punishment and humiliation than that which we have meted out to him, if they desire to approach the problem of expulsion or exclusion, they could very well be on a collision course with courts of this land. Some would care not to have such a circumstance present itself.

But the fact that must visit with us here today is: Do we want to handle the problems of this Member-elect from the 18th Congressional District of New York on the wisest and most permanent course, or do we as Members want to be continually harassed over the next number of years determining whether or not we are right in the procedures and determination that we make, or whether the courts of the land may have a superior thought?

It is my fond hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of this House will fully understand that truly this resolution is the annihilation of a Member of this House by total humiliation. In the event of its adoption the only thing that a Member-elect from the State of New York will have in this House is a key to an appropriate suite in some one of the several office buildings and that beyond that it will be up to him to regain the faith of the membership here.

If we turn him out, his constituency will turn him back with an even greater majority.

For those who seek to impress what in their own minds is the far harsher treatment of excluding him or expelling him I say, "In your haste to do it, you may be defeated in the very purpose which you desire to accomplish."

If we lose this opportunity in this resolution, subsequent matters brought before the House for our consideration will present us with far graver decisions, as Members of this body, than this resolution presently presents for our consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend to this body the adoption of the recommendations of the committee appointed under the resolution, House Resolution 1.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman would give us his opinion, if the recommendations of the committee are adopted, as to the possible situation in which the subject of this resolution were to fail to be sworn in and/or refuse to present himself for the censure as provided in the resolution. What would happen and what would be the status of the individual?

Mr. MOORE. With respect to the question asked, under the terms of the resolution, in the event the Member did not take the oath as is envisioned in the resolution, on or before the date which is therein specified, which is March 13, 1967, the Speaker is obligated to inform the Governor of the State of New York that a vacancy occurs in the 18th Congressional District in order that an election might then be held.

Mr. ADAIR. Would the gentleman give that answer, if the subject of the resolution had been sworn in and had advanced and had taken the oath?

Mr. MOORE. In the event the individual submitted himself to take the oath, then did not follow through with presenting himself for censure and did not follow through with the other matters set forth in this resolution—I am certain then a resolution of expulsion would be in order.

Mr. ADAIR. If the gentleman will yield further, would it be the intent of the gentleman that it should then be the action of the House that expulsion should be considered if the gentleman about whom we are speaking here should fail to present himself for the censure?

Mr. MOORE. It is my intention that such a resolution would be in order and it would have my support.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I will be very happy to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In further answer to the question raised by the gentleman from Indiana, I think it is appropriate to read the second paragraph in the resolution on page 34 of the report. A reading of that paragraph, I think, I would say to the gentleman from Indiana, clearly indicates what would happen. Let me read it to the membership:

> *Now, therefore be it resolved,* That upon taking the oath as a Member of the 90th Congress the said Adam Clayton Powell be brought to the bar of the House in the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House to be there publicly censured by the Speaker in the name of the House.

It is my impression that if the resolution is approved, and if Mr. POWELL appears, that he would be brought down the center aisle to the well of the House in the custody of what amounts to the law-enforcing officer of the House of Representatives. He would be in his custody, and would not be released until—and let me finish up the final part of the paragraph—"and be there publicly censured by the Speaker in the name of the House." He would not be released from the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms until the full treatment had been accorded to him under this particular paragraph.

Mr. MOORE. May I say to the gentleman that is the very reason for the language. The question was anticipated. That is the reason for the language being in the resolution in the way it is.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. In addition, if it took place after the gentleman had taken the oath of office and he deliberately left the Chamber so that he could avoid the censure, the Speaker could order his arrest so that he could be brought to the Chamber for censure.

Mr. MOORE. Absolutely.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia yield further?

Mr. MOORE. Yes, I am delighted to yield further to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement which has just been made by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], then a motion for expulsion would immediately lie and would, of course, require a two-thirds vote?

Mr. MOORE. The motion would immediately lie and would, as the gentleman has said, require a two-thirds vote.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote down the previous question, so that I may be recognized later to offer an amendment to exclude Mr. POWELL from the House of Representatives before he is sworn in.

My reasons for denying Mr. POWELL a seat are these:

First, he has shown himself to be unworthy of membership.

Second, the fine is insufficient, it would be paid in full only if he were reelected in 1968; and it could be invalidated by the courts.

Third, if there is a possibility of a prison verdict, it is important to the honor of this House that he not be a Congressman at the time.

Fourth, any responsibility for returning Mr. POWELL to his seat should rest on his constituents and the House should not assume in advance that they will not live up to that responsibility.

If we have the moral obligation to exclude Mr. POWELL, do we have the constitutional right?

The Constitution says that—

> No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained the age of 25 years, and been seven years a citizen of the United

> States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of the State in which he shall be chosen.

In the language of mathematics, these are necessary but not sufficient conditions. They say a man must meet these conditions to be seated, but they do not say that he must be seated if he does meet them.

In four major cases, the House of Representatives did in fact decide that it could exclude a Member-elect for reasons other than the constitutionally-cited limitations.

No court has ever considered or reversed any of these decisions of the House.

Two strong doctrines, in fact, militate against such court consideration.

First, is the doctrine of separation of powers; the Constitution provides that each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its Members.

Second is the political questions doctrine. The courts will not handle questions inherently in the power of other coordinate branches at the same level of Government.

Mr. POWELL's conduct as stated in the resolution has disqualified him for membership in the House of Representatives, and this Chamber has both the duty and the constitutional right to exclude him from taking a seat.

I therefore urge you to vote down the previous question on Mr. CELLER's amendment.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON].

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker and friends of the House, of course it is impossible to discuss this issue in the matter of 4 or 5 minutes, or even 10.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the eminent chairman of this select committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], when the gentleman said that this is a "solemn conclave."

Ladies and gentleman, we are not deciding the fate of one ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. Indeed, we are deciding the fate of this House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States states that we have the responsibility to determine the qualifications of our membership.

Mr. Speaker, the question is, do we face up to that responsibility, or do we not?

The guilt or innocence has been decided by the people of this Nation.

The public knows that POWELL is guilty; the public knows that he is a fugitive from justice. The public knows that he has flaunted and flouted the courts of the great State of New York. The public knows that he is charged with defrauding the taxpayers of the United States of America. The public knows that he had the responsibility as a Member of this body to conduct himself in such manner as to reflect credit both upon this body and the people of this country. The public knows that he is not on trial; but, no, you and I are on trial. The public wants to know whether or not we condone this type of conduct and whether or not we want a man such as ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, charged with criminal acts, to sit in this august body.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the membership of this select committee when it says that they had a difficult assignment.

I cherish the friendship of each one; I applaud them as able legislators and as able lawyers.

Let me say this to you: Some may think they had a difficult decision to make, and they did, but yours and mine is doubly difficult. We have ultimately the responsibility of deciding this issue, and also we have the added difficulty of opposing our friends in their unanimous decision insofar as this committee is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said here about "annihilation by humiliation." We cannot believe POWELL can be humiliated. Is there a humiliating bone in the body of the man under discussion? Has he displayed any repentance or given any indication that he is regretful? Why, even at this moment, Mr. Speaker, as we are debating this agonizing and difficult issue, where all of us are on the spot, where is ADAM CLAYTON POWELL? As far as I know he is down in Bimini with a glass in one hand and a woman in the other. Can you think a man so calloused to his fate today be humiliated? Certainly none could logically contend that.

The Members know what the courts of New York said about this man being repentant in the position he is in there. There is no indication of regret, and there is no trace of repentance or retribution on his part. Can we believe that we can humiliate him by bringing him down into this House and letting him receive a censure? To you and to me it would be important, but to him, he has already thumbed his nose at this House and told us we are a bunch of hypocrits. He has said, in effect, "I care nothing what you think about the situation. I am above the law. I am above the Congress."

If you pass this resolution you are going to be telling the American people that we have no qualifications for membership in this body; that there are only three requirements about which we are concerned and that is the matter of age, citizenship, and inhabitancy, not residence. We are telling the Nation that we are not concerned about other qualifications.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Members that back there on January 10 this House regained some of the lost prestige and respect of the American people. Today I am fearful that today we are fixing to march back down the hill in our hour of shame.

You can rationalize all you wish to that in censuring POWELL you will annihilate him by humiliation, but the people of this Republic do not understand that. The only question they want to know is did you or did you not vote to seat POWELL, the fugitive from justice, the man accused of defrauding the people. As I say, you can rationalize all you wish, but the central issue is seating the man and that alone.

Mr. Speaker, the proponents say we must realize that we are going to fine him $40,000, a heavy punishment indeed. Ladies and gentlemen, to you and to me that would be a serious matter, but let me tell you we would be doing him a favor if we fine him $40,000. For the rest of the days of this session we will be having this man running around organizing a national committee to pay for POWELL's loss of salary, accusing us of working him without pay. He will raise $100,000, on the plea that you and I refuse to pay him. He will make more from that than he will from his record, "Keep the Faith, Baby."

Mr. Speaker, let me say to you that it is our reputations which are at stake, and not the reputation of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON], for purposes of debate only.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it is not easy for a Member from New York State to oppose the recommendation of the distinguished select committee, or of the distinguished dean of our delegation, the beloved gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. But in all conscience, as one Member of this body, I am not happy with the recommendation that has come out of this committee. I feel that it needs to be amended in one important respect.

The committee has addressed itself to narrow constitutional grounds. I am not sure that I approve that position, but I think that, having limited ourselves to those narrow constitutional grounds, there is still one important point which the select committee has failed to examine carefully, and that is the continued defiance of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] in choosing to disregard the orders of the courts of New York State. In fact, this was the real issue that first brought his case before this body.

Mr. Speaker, let us not forget that his defiance of the courts was based upon his membership in this House. As a part of his defiance he has deliberately and intentionally for some months removed himself physically from the State of New York, so that he would not have to conform with the rulings and decrees of its courts. By thus removing himself, I believe, a very grave cloud has been raised over the question of his inhabitancy, one of the basic constitutional qualifications for membership in this House.

Now we are told that we should not act on this matter of inhabitancy because the nine men on the Supreme Court might make a different decision on it, and we are also told that perhaps the courts of New York State might make a different decision on inhabitancy. But, Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States says clearly that we in this House shall be the judge of inhabitancy, and I believe that we have a responsibility to insist that until the gentleman from New York has removed this cloud over the matter of his inhabitancy, and has demonstrated that he can go back into the State and district which he seeks to represent—and he can go back only by purging himself of contempt of court in New York—we ought not to seat him in this House.

I refer the Members of this House to the committee's own report. On page 24 is the text of the most relevant House precedent on the matter of inhabitancy. It comes from the Beck case report, handled in 1928 in the 70th Congress:

> He must have and occupy a place of abode within the particular State in which he claims inhabitancy, and that he must have openly and avowedly by act and by word subjected himself to the duties and responsibilities of a member of the body politic of that particular State.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, obeying the orders of the courts is one of the duties and responsibilities of a Member from New York State. Yet Mr. Powell has openly and avowedly by act and word defied this duty and has deliberately moved out of New York State to avoid his responsibility.

Therefore, I propose that if the previous question is voted down, as I hope it will be, to offer an amendment to this resolution, that the oath shall not be administered to Mr. POWELL until he has first purged himself of all contempt and thereby made it clear that he is an inhabitant of the State of New York within the meaning of the precedents of this House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to reply to the gentleman from New York who has just spoken.

Mr. Speaker, the committee gave the matter of inhabitancy most careful and exhaustive study.

You will find a mature discussion of the matter on pages 22 to 24 of its report.

Our study indicates that the term "inhabitant" was substituted for the term "resident" by the framers of the constitution in order to avoid the problems of technical construction.

The committee's record in these proceedings show that the Member-elect, Mr. POWELL, is a qualified elector in the State of New York.

That he has filed New York State income tax returns for the years 1962 to 1965 and a declaration of estimated personal income tax for the year 1966; and that he retains an apartment residence in New York City for which he pays rent and utilities.

He was pastor of a New York church and is presently pastor emeritus of that church.

Applying established criteria to the facts in this case, the committee concluded that Mr. POWELL was an inhabitant of the State of New York on the day of his election within the spirit of the constitution.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me on that very point?

Is it not true that the committee's investigation indicated that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] did not vote in person on November 8, but voted by absentee ballot?

Mr. CELLER. It did, but that does not militate against being an inhabitant of the State.

Mr. STRATTON. Did the committee's inquiry not also elicit evidence that he could not remember clearly the last time he was in New York State? Does not the committee's own report on page 24, quoting the precedents of the House, indicate that inhabitancy depends not only on occupying a place of abode within the particular State in which he claims inhabitancy, but "that he must have openly and avowedly by act and word subjected himself to the duties and responsibilities of a Member of the body politic of that State"?

Mr. CELLER. That is correct. The cases and the precedents uphold that there are many indicia which indicate inhabitancy. In this case they support the conclusion of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes for purposes of debate to the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE], a member of the committee.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, several Members on both sides of the aisle have told me within the last few days that they are satisfied that the recommendations of the select committee are sound and should be adopted but they were afraid that they could not vote to do so. They said that their mail was 100 to 1 to "throw the rascal out" and that under this kind of pressure, it would be most difficult for them to vote to seat ADAM CLAYTON POWELL even with the severe punishment we have suggested.

I am not now speaking to those who sincerely believe that we took the wrong course. Rather, I am appealing to those who believe that we were right but find it politically embarrassing to support us.

I am sure that we have all read John F. Kennedy's book "Profiles in Courage." Perhaps some small amount of courage might be required to vote to seat, censure, and punish Mr. POWELL, but I suggest not much.

I am convinced that all of us who believe that the select committee came up with the best, the toughest, and the most permanent solution to a most difficult problem can convince the American people of that fact. We are all good salesmen or we would not be sitting here in the House of Representatives.

I believe that substantial majority of the American people will support us when we explain to them:

First. That there are serious problems of constitutional law involved in this whole matter. If we refuse to seat Mr. POWELL, this case could well be in the courts for years.

Second. That if we do not seat Mr. POWELL, even assuming that the courts might eventually decide we had that right, we might well be establishing a very dangerous precedent. Should we add to the qualification of age, citizenship, and residency? Should we tell the voters of any congressional district that they cannot send anyone here to represent them, no matter what his character may be, as long as he is duly elected? We might not like a Congressman or Congresswoman's religious, political views, race, or general morals, but in a representative form of government is it wise for us to overrule, by a simple majority, the will of the voters in any congressional district, not just those of the New York district with which we are today concerned?

Third. That what we propose is severe, tough, and practical, and is less likely to result in long drawn out court battle than other courses would.

Fourth. That persons who have been critical of our courts for too loosely interpreting the U.S. Constitution should be gratified that in this case our recommendations entail a strict, rather than loose, interpretation of what the Constitution says.

Fifth. That we are by no means just slapping ADAM CLAYTON POWELL's wrist. We should explain to our citizens just how humiliating censure and loss of seniority really is.

Sixth. That your committee has turned important information over to the Department of Justice. This could well result in criminal action as well as civil suits. Mr. POWELL will not be anywhere near out of the woods even though the House, as I hope it will, supports your committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN].

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, service on the ad hoc committee has been difficult, and in some ways distasteful. My colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS], very accurately stated that:

> It is unpleasant to sit in judgment of one's colleague.

But in the broader sense it was an interesting, challenging and reassuring experience for me. Each of us was acutely aware of the gravity of the situation. To assume responsibility for recommending to this House, action in a case of the highest importance, a case with few—and I suggest to you—poor precedents; a case in which basic constitutional issues are at stake, and a case which is surrounded and shot through with emotion, passion, and prejudice, is to assume a monumental task.

Very rightly, the House gave us a short time in which to reach our decision and make a recommendation to this body. Within this time framework, we conducted as thorough an investigation as the circumstances permitted. Additionally, our job was made substantially easier by the thoroughness and objectivity of the Hays committee investigations last fall. Although our time was short, we had adequate evidence of the nature and scope of the misconduct of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL to satisfy us in arriving at our decision.

Our second step was to review carefully the applicable constitutional law, to explore in some depth every possible recommendation available to us, testing each of them against the Constitution, disposing of those we concluded were outside the range of our authority, and searching for a fair, efficacious recommendation within our authority. One of the most significant results of this process was the consensus which developed among the nine of us.

The reward to me in serving on this committee was that, having been forced to review carefully our constitutional form of government and the condition of this House at this point in our history, I found renewed and greater confidence in and respect for both. For 5 weeks I heard about and thought about the shameful, inexcusable misconduct of a colleague who turned great talent for good into an object of shame and embarrassment because of his incapacity for self-discipline and trust. But, I also saw that this House has both the ability and the integrity to expose and discipline one of its Members for such conduct. And we have, I believe, the intellectual honesty and political integrity necessary to stay within the confines of our constitutional limitations and overcome the pressures and prejudices that are in conflict with that position.

Our committee brings you a recommendation which does four things. First, it stays within a strict interpretation of the Constitution itself. I urge each Member to consider carefully the words that control this case. The Constitution says that we are sole judges of the qualifications of our Members, but the document specifies what those qualifications must be. They are age, citizenship, and inhabitancy. The word qualification was not haphazardly selected by the Founding Fathers. They did not mean fitness or acceptability, and we are not recommending that Adam Clayton Powell is found to be either of those two things. We do say that he is qualified to be a Member of this House as that word "qualified" is given meaning by the Constitution. For those who question whether the House could survive under such a strict interpretation, I would suggest to you that it has nicely for nearly 200 years, because the Founding Fathers and all of those who have lived under this Constitution since that time have accepted the fact that the people themselves are capable of self-government. They are capable of making the decision as to who is fit to be their Congressman. Now, as working politicians, we would all agree that the people frequently make decisions with which we disagree, though I assume all of us here feel that our own districts made wise decisions on November 8, 1966. But the point is, that our system is safe and secure because there is no appellate authority above the decision of the people themselves. The men who wrote the Constitution thought the system would work, history has proven that it does work, and we today have an opportunity for a vote of confidence of that system—a vote which regrettably, must take place on a complex and an unpleasant set of circumstances. The second thing this committee's recommendation does is confirm our faith in the capacity for self-government of the American people.

The logical question follows, if we conclude that we must live with the decision of the voters in each district, can we protect ourselves when we feel those decisions are wrong? Has the institution of the House become so complex that we cannot live with the decision of the voters of the 18th District of New York; are we so exposed in our moral stability that we must say to them, "We cannot accept Adam Clayton Powell because he would corrupt our House and destroy the faith of the American people in our institution."

I say to you, that these propositions are false and absurd. So long as this House is composed in large measure of men of honesty and integrity, then a lack of it on the part of one constitutes no danger, and I suggest to you that should this House ever be composed of a majority of dishonest men, there would be no hope for its survival nor the survival of our system of self-government.

The third thing our recommendation does is protect the integrity of the House.

And lastly, I would address myself to those who question the fairness to Adam Clayton Powell of our recommendations. Each Member should be aware of the fact that if our recommendations are adopted they set a new precedent for punishment of a Member of this body. No Member has ever been expelled from this body except for bearing arms against his country. No Member has ever been punished before except by censure. It was the consensus of your committee that the conduct of Adam Clayton Powell warranted substantially more than censure, although it certainly warranted that too. We felt the punishment should do two things: first, it must be sufficiently severe to stand as a historic warning against future misconduct; second, it ought to retrieve for the American taxpayers, at least in substantial proportions, funds which were misappropriated; and third—and I think of great importance—it ought to leave the door open for redemption. Adam Clayton Powell has unquestionably contributed to good legislation in the past 6 years. The committee recommends that he be given the opportunity to do that in the future, but we clearly and carefully deny him any opportunity to pursue the dishonest and disgraceful conduct which was the genesis of today's action.

I fully recognize that each Member is sorely troubled by the decision which he must make today. Those of us on the committee have necessarily given more thought and more study to the matter than some have been able to do, and yet, we all share equally the burden of fair and final decision. Little of what we do in this House is easy, yet, nothing is more difficult and nothing is more important to this House as an institution and to our form of self-government than the decision which we must make today.

I respectfully urge each Member to support the committee's recommendation.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. Corman] for the diligent manner in which he discharged a most difficult task as a member of the select committee created pursuant to House Resolution 1. However, some aspects of the committee's findings trouble me.

Although the powers of the House are virtually plenary in disciplining its Members, its authority with reference to the seating of a Member is severely limited by the clear mandate of the Constitution.

It is the integrity of the House in this instance, not the integrity of the gentleman from New York, which history will judge. It is the constitutional right of the people of any district to select in free and fair elections the person of their choosing to represent them in Congress which we must safeguard.

Mr. Speaker, apart from this very serious challenge to the basic democratic institution of representative government, I am further deeply troubled that we would invite a confrontation between the judicial and legislative branches of our Government.

In my view, the Supreme Court would have to rule that the gentleman was an inhabitant of the State of New York and duly elected by his constituency to represent them in the House and that the Court would order seating him if this House should ill-advisedly fail to do so.

Precipitous action by the House not only invites two of the three branches of Government to pursue a collision course, but in so doing would further invite ill-advised attempts to limit the role of the Supreme Court in interpreting the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, few men in our history have been publicly censured. In addition, for the first time, this House seeks to impose a fine coupled with censure on one of its Members. The action in the Democratic caucus, in reference to his chairmanship, was a most stinging rebuke, and to attempt to strip the gentleman from New York of his seniority, only adds insult to injury.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, it is the integrity of this House, and an abiding concern for the Constitution which we have sworn to uphold which must guide our course today.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from California, so that we may have a colloquy on the matter of exclusion and expulsion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. CELLER. On the matter of exclusion, as I understand it—and I should like to get the gentleman's view—the Constitution provides that there shall be three qualifications—namely, age, citizenship, and inhabitancy—and that the Congress cannot add to those qualifications.

That has been borne out by the articles of Madison and Hamilton in the Federalist, and borne out by the decision in the Bond case recently decided by the Supreme Court. Am I correct in that?

Mr. CORMAN. The gentleman is correct. In our review we noted that at the time of the debate on this provision by the Convention there was consideration as to whether or not the qualification of property ownership ought to be included. The Founding Fathers were very explicit that the sole qualifications should be the three specified in the Constitution. They rejected additions at that time.

Mr. CELLER. These qualifications are set forth explicitly in the Constitution. And if Congress had a right to add to those qualifications then conceivably Congress could prescribe a qualification based, for example, on religion. Am I correct in that?

Mr. CORMAN. Yes, sir; the chairman is correct.

Mr. CELLER. There could conceivably be a situation arise in which the majority Members of the Congress could by some device exclude the entire minority membership. Am I correct in that?

Mr. CORMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. CELLER. And that led Hamilton to agree with Madison that:

> The qualifications of the person who may choose or be chosen are defined and fixed in the Constitution; and are unalterable by the Legislature. (The Federalist, No. 60.)

Now, as to expulsion, that, of course, is a very serious, very drastic sanction. Am I correct?

Mr. CORMAN. Yes, sir; Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CELLER. It is a sanction that has been very rarely imposed by the Congress, either the House or the Senate. Am I correct in that?

Mr. CORMAN. Yes, sir. My recollection of history is that it was used only a few times.

Mr. CELLER. And used only in the cases of the high crimes, such as those that arose out of the Civil War, when Members of Congress joined the Confederate forces and fought against the Union. Am I correct?

Mr. CORMAN. The gentleman from New York is correct.

Mr. CELLER. In all other cases where attempts were made to provide for the elimination of a Member from the House—expulsion—the resolution failed, or resulted in a censure or some other arrangement, which fell short of expulsion from the House. Am I correct in that?

Mr. CORMAN. The chairman is correct.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am rather pleased that this colloquy just preceded my remarks, because I take the floor to discuss the aspects of the power of Congress, which I believe is one of the basic issues involved, and my great fear that as a result of the committee report as well as some of this debate we are very seriously impairing the power of Congress.

Let me also say that I am disturbed that so much of the committee report and the debate has been around an issue of punishing a person rather than around the issue of the integrity of the Congress. The integrity of the Congress should be the issue. What is necessary to preserve the integrity of the Congress in respect to the qualifications of who should be Members? It sounds very strange to me to hear from certain people who have long recognized the various implied powers that exist in the Constitution—and I am among those who do recognize implied powers—words that indicate that all of a sudden they are forgetting all about this theory and are moving toward strict constitutional construction.

Let me suggest that when the Constitution provided that the Congress had the right to expel, it certainly implied that it has the right to exclude. In fact, look at the fiction that is gone through by some who would seat Mr. Powell and then move to expel him almost immediately or to have him continue to step aside. The implication that the power to exclude exists in the power to expel is quite obvious.

I would add one caveat: The power to expel requires a two-thirds vote and, therefore, any power that comes as an implication therefrom would also require a two-thirds vote. Indeed I think that this is proper.

Let me go on to try to lay at rest the arguments that if you then open up this area of qualification, you will then get into such things as religion and political beliefs and so forth. This is a red herring, because, of course, there are other sections of the Constitution that would forbid any such qualifications based on this, but we are not talking about this in this case.

We have mentioned the cases with regard to expulsion having to do with treason, but we all recognize that this committee we appointed mainly to find the facts in our behalf on whether or not these charges made against Mr. Powell were true. I did not want to expel him or exclude him on the basis of just a hearsay evidence guide. I wanted to see a forum created where he had an opportunity to be heard. We created this forum, and I want to commend the committee for its careful job in establishing these points. However, the points established constitute the gravamen of the offenses of felonies, embezzlement, and forgery and not to mention such things as scofflaw actions which are themselves serious matters. These kinds of crimes carry with them the deprivation of many aspects of citizenship.

Are we putting ourselves in the ridiculous position where we say we do not have the power to exclude or expel from the body designated to represent the people in deliberating and determining governmental decisions on a serious matter that goes to the heart and to the basis of any organized society; namely, that which has to do with, and I might mention one of the 10 commandments here; namely, the commandment that thou shalt not steal. I think we should be discussing what is necessary for this Congress to move forward to represent the people as ably and conscientiously as possible. It has to do with the kinds of qualifications all of us expect from all who sit with us. The negatives are very essential and basic things which are carefully spelled out in our criminal laws, and this would prevent any unreasonable use of the power of exclusion or expulsion.

I urge that we do vote down the previous question and support the motion for exclusion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from West Virginia has 29 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 22 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the observations that have been made concerning the fact that our recommendations and our findings indicate a man has stolen from the House of Representatives or committed acts which are commensurate with being a felon, may I make this one observation to the House: We did not feel that it was the province of the House to find a verdict of guilty of stealing. We have taken this complete record, with all of its innuendos and all of its rumors—and there are many of them in here—which this select committee was investigating and did experience difficulty in attempting to run down—we have sent this complete record to the Department of Justice for the express purpose of having them determine, in an adversary way, any amounts of money that have been diverted here willfully and in violation of the resolutions of the House and the law of the land.

In addition to that, we have asked them to inspect and to closely analyze the appropriate sections of title 18 of the United States Code. This is the title, Mr. Speaker, which deals with the violation of the criminal laws of the land.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 additional seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the question with respect to whether or not this Member-elect has stolen, converted funds to his own use, or has committed a felony, does not rest upon the House today.

Mr. Speaker, we anticipate and hope that the Department of Justice, as our report indicates, will expeditiously look into this matter, and if there has been a conversion of funds that there be a civil action instituted to recover the amount of funds involved.

And, Mr. Speaker, if there has been any violation of the criminal statutes the individual involved here is responsible for those acts; and, further, let the record show that we do not endorse or recommend the dropping of any such violations, by any stretch of the imagination.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes for the purpose of debate only to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Conyers].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker and my fellow colleagues, I am reminded of the story that has been told to me about a pastor who had the problem of a deacon sleeping in the front row. So, one morning during the sermon, when he noticed him nodding, he told his congregation—"Everyone who wants to go to heaven raise their hands." Everyone raised their hands with the exception of the nodding deacon.

And, Mr. Speaker, since that did not make the point, the pastor said in a very loud voice, "Everyone who wants to go to hell stand up." This deacon jumped to his feet, and blinking his eyes, noticed the rest of the congregation laughing and smiling. He looked up to the pastor and he said, "You know, reverend, it looks like you and I are alone in the minority again."

So, Mr. Speaker, when I think of my distinguished colleague from the Southland who served with me on the select committee, and the positions that that gentleman and I took, I can turn to him and say, "It looks to me as if we are again in the minority."

Congressman Pepper and I, though from different positions, were the two principal members of the select committee who had the most divergent views on what the committee's final recommendations should be. We often found ourselves both voting against a given proposal, though for contrary reasons. But we both were finally able to sign a unanimous committee report.

May I speak personally about the distinguished former Senator from Florida, our beloved colleague, Claude Pepper, because although we were on somewhat opposite sides in this matter, and nearly prevented a unanimous committee report, I think that I might attest to the integrity not only of Senator Pepper, but of every member on this select committee, Republican and Democrat. I have never in my very brief career been so completely impressed by the complete absence of partisanship and racial considerations, in the select committee's deliberations which led to the report that is before this great House today.

There are a few things that some of us may have forgotten about Senator Pepper. Difficult and controversial questions are nothing new to him. In 1929, when the first Negro Congressman to return to these floors since reconstruction days, was elected to the House, Claude Pepper objected in the Florida State Legislature to endorsing a resolution censuring President Hoover for inviting Congressman De Priest and his wife to the White House in 1929. And as a U.S. Senator he moved and supported the exclusion in 1946 of a U.S. Senator from Mississippi, the late Theodore Bilbo.

So, although we have disagreed rather drastically at times, I must honestly declare that I feel that the basis for his position was completely without any racial overtones whatsoever.

COMMITTEE'S CONDUCT WAS EXEMPLARY AND WITHOUT ANY RACIAL BIAS

Regarding my other distinguished colleagues, and our esteemed and beloved chairman, let me say here in the House what I have said to the press and at public meetings in my district. At no time during these 5 weeks of the committee's deliberations were racial considerations involved—neither for nor against Member-elect Powell. I feel every member of the committee did everything within his power, to the extent humanly possible, to preclude such matters from having any effect.

APPEAL TO THE HOUSE FOR NONRACIAL AND NONPOLITICAL DECISION

My colleagues, I look forward to being able to make a similar statement, in my own district, that racial considerations were not a factor in today's deliberations and ultimate decision by the full House of Representatives.

I also recognize that this matter has aroused an incredible emotional and political furor throughout the country. I can personally testify to this fact, because in my own office I have countless items of correspondence from all over the country. I would even hazard the statement that the correspondence represents a majority of the congressional districts. Many of these communications are bitter and harsh. And some even include strong personal statements, not just about Member-elect Powell, but some of them even include strong personal statements about myself. I am sure that my mail is but a very small sample of the mail received by all Members.

But regardless of the emotions involved, and regardless of the terrible political impact of this matter, I appeal to each of you to consider this matter exclusively on the constitutional and legal questions involved.

My colleagues, service on this committee was, in my humble estimation, no easy task, either professionally or politically for any of the members. When I accepted appointment to the committee, I resolved to put aside my personal feelings toward the Member-elect and also to put aside consideration of the political consequences of any particular decision. I resolved, that to the best of my ability, I would base my decisions solely on the Constitution, the law, the relevant precedents of the House, and the dictates of my own conscience. I come before you today in this same spirit, to outline to you my conclusions.

AWESOME RESPONSIBILITY

I feel that the matter before the House presents each of us with an awesome and special responsibility. This question involves the right of a duly elected Member-elect to take his seat in the House and the right of his constituents to be represented by the man of their own choice. These questions are of the highest constitutional importance.

All the possible steps that have been suggested in this case, whether censure, exclusion or expulsion, involve exercises of constitutional prerogatives that the House has exercised with the greatest care and reluctance. Censure has been voted only seventeen times in our history. The last motion of censure was in 1921 and no motion to censure has even been introduced since then. There have only been six Members-elect excluded for reasons other than contested elections or questions or disloyalty arising at the time of the Civil War. The last case of exclusion occurred in 1919, and in that case the House later seated the person as a result of a Supreme Court decision in the person's favor. In all our history only three Members have ever been expelled and all of those occurred as a result of accusations of treason at the time of the outbreak of the Civil War. Surely the vote each of us casts today will be one of the most important votes we will cast in our entire careers in Congress.

CONSTITUTION REQUIRES MEMBER-ELECT POWELL TO BE SEATED

The unanimous and very positive decision by the entire committee, after careful consideration, was that Member-elect Powell possessed a valid election certificate from his State, that there was no dispute regarding the validity of his election, and that he fully satisfied the three enumerated constitutional requirements for membership in the House; namely, a minimum age of 25 years, U.S. citizenship, and inhabitancy of the State from which he was elected. The committee felt, quite definitely, that if those criteria were satisfied that the Constitution and the burden of the precedents allows the House no option but to seat such a duly qualified Member-elect.

The committee further considered the fact that Mr. Powell's constituents were aware of the various allegations of misconduct made about him and that they had still reelected him overwhelmingly to his 12th term in the Congress. For us to override that decision would counter the high constitutional privilege of his constituents to be represented by the man of their own choice. In fact there is every indication that Mr. Powell will be reelected continuously for the foreseeable future regardless of the House's action today.

WHY THE COMMITTEE REPORT WAS UNANIMOUS

The committee report was signed by all nine members of the select committee even though some of us disagreed with some of the report's findings and recommendations. I feel that the principal reason for this unanimity was the feeling on the part of all committee members that the major responsibility given us by the House was to report on "the right of Adam Clayton Powell to be sworn in as a Representative from the State of New York in the 90th Congress." This primary question is so important, and involves such basic constitutional considerations, that even those members of the committee who strongly object to certain other of the recommendations did not want the committee's position on this fundamental point to be muted or diffused in any way because not all of the members signed the report. I signed the committee report in order to contribute to the strongest and most definitive statement possible on the part of the committee, that Adam Powell must be seated.

MY DISAGREEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE REPORT

And so the committee report, my colleagues, was unanimous, but I alone filed additional views that I feel I should share with you very briefly.

I want to now outline my strong disagreement with some of the committee's procedures, findings, and recommendations. My present disagreements with certain aspects of the committee's work are exactly the same as those mentioned in the statement of "additional views" filed with the committee report. I place my statement at this point in the Record:

Additional Views of Hon. John Conyers, Jr.

(Submitted with the report of the select committee regarding the right of Adam Clayton Powell to be seated)

(1) The question of the right of a Member-elect to be administered the oath and the responsibility of the House to punish its Members should be distinguished with great precision.

(2) Any Member or Member-elect and his counsel should be afforded the right to cross-examine all witnesses brought before this committee or any other committee inquiring into the qualifications, punishment, final right of a Member to be seated, or other related questions.

(3) In his appearance before this Select Committee, his declination to accept the invitation extended by the Hays subcommittee, and his conduct with reference to the litigation in the New York courts, Adam Clayton Powell, Member-elect, acted at all times upon advice of counsel. Therefore, it cannot accurately be held that his conduct impugned the dignity of Congress or was in disrespect of Congress.

(4) A review of all cases of alleged misconduct brought before the House and Senate indicates that punishment has never exceeded censure. There is no precedent for the removal of accumulated seniority combined with a monetary assessment, as is proposed in the instant case.

JOHN CONYERS, Jr.

ON THE PROCEDURES OF THE COMMITTEE: QUESTIONS OF SEATING AND PUNISHMENT FOR PAST CONDUCT SHOULD HAVE BEEN SEPARATED

I questioned the confusion of the two great constitutional questions of the right to have an oath administered when a Member-elect presents a certificate from the Secretary of State of New York who, incidentally, presented the chairman of this select committee with a certificate of election that was no more or less valid. And when we confuse the question of the right to punish and even to expel a Member for misbehavior with the right of the Member to be administered the oath, I think we create serious problems.

We should not merge in one proceeding, and in one resolution these two separate powers authorized by the Constitution. I fear that combining these two separate questions has clouded the issues further in the mind of the country and possibly even the House, and certainly confused the legal questions involved.

ON THE FINDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE: COMMITTEE IMPROPERLY FOUND MEMBER-ELECT POWELL GUILTY OF CONTEMPTUOUS BEHAVIOR

The committee report, in its findings of fact and law, erroneously, I feel, found Member-elect POWELL guilty of contumacious and contemptuous behavior in his conduct with reference to the litigation in the New York courts. In his refusal to accept the invitation extended by the Hays subcommittee and in his appearance before the select committee. At all times he was acting on the advice of counsel, and very distinguished counsel at that. In fact, Mr. POWELL was acting in accordance with precedents set by the last Member-elect whose right to be sworn in was challenged and referred to a special committee. Certainly, Mr. POWELL's conduct in strictly following the precedents and legal counsel cannot be judged as contemptuous of this lawmaking and precedent-following body. It certainly should not be used as one of the bases for imposing severe punishment upon him. In fact, using against Mr. POWELL his refusal to testify in a case brought against him, where he was advised by counsel that such testimony was not legally required, is clearly flying in the face of the fifth amendment guarantee that no man shall be required to testify against himself.

WHY IT WILL BE IMPOSSIBLE UNDER THE HOUSE RULES FOR ME TO OFFER MY AMENDMENT TO STRIKE THE LOSS OF SENIORITY AND THE FINE

My colleagues, I contacted each of you by letter yesterday morning informing you that I intended to offer an amendment this afternoon to House Resolution 278 striking out the sections imposing a fine and the monetary punishment. Unfortunately I will not be able to offer the amendment. Yesterday and this morning I have been doing research on the precedents of the House. I have also had consultations with the Parliamentarian. The result of this inquiry has been that there is just no way possible for me to get the floor to offer my amendment.

The simple fact of the matter is that if the previous question, to be demanded at the close of general debate, does not pass then the floor cedes to the Republican side of the aisle. Under the precedents of the House, when the previous question fails, the Speaker is to recognize those Members who led the opposition to the previous question. But among those who led the opposition he is to give precedence to Members of the minority. As we all know JOHN MCCORMACK has been a conscientious and zealous Speaker in his responsibility of protecting the rights of the minority. The precedents are correct and he is absolutely right in doing this.

However, if any Republican will have priority over me in gaining recognition then I know that I will never get the floor to offer my amendment. For that reason I will vote for the previous question. I surely do not want to help any of the suggested substitute resolutions which all would, in one way or another, exclude Mr. POWELL from the House. I am, therefore, reluctantly having to forgo the offering of my amendment and so will vote for the previous question. I urge everyone who agrees with me regarding the substantive matters I am discussing now to join with me in such a vote for the previous question.

ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS: STRONG OBJECTION TO LOSS OF SENIORITY AND THE FINE

However, I cannot allow, in good conscience, of imposing a monetary fine and loss of seniority, be allowed to go unmentioned.

Because, Mr. Speaker, never before have we had to consider the imposition of a monetary assessment on an individual. Never before has any Member of the Congress been stripped of his seniority in the course of such proceedings.

The severe punishment of a loss of all seniority and imposition of a $40,000 fine is, first, violative of our system of Government; second, contrary to constitutional rights of Mr. POWELL; third, subjects this matter to appeal in the Federal courts; and is, fourth, totally unprecedented.

VIOLATES OUR SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT

Under our system of government the power to investigate and prosecute violations of the law is reserved to the executive. The power to determine guilt and pass sentence is reserved to the judiciary. Congress power in this matter extends only to determining whether the Member-elect is duly qualified, and, if, after being sworn he should be censured. Action beyond that to determine the extent of his violation of Federal law and to impose punishment is clearly beyond Congress power. Congress must be on constant vigil to insure that the other two branches of our Government do not encroach on our powers. At the same time we must act to protect our Constitution and our system of government, as we are required to do by our oaths, to insure that we do not usurp powers reserved for either the executive or the judiciary.

UNCONSTITUTIONAL FOR CONGRESS TO DETERMINE GUILT AND TO IMPOSE PUNISHMENT: OUR PROCEDURES NOT SET UP TO PROTECT DUE PROCESS

As a further illustration that Congress is not the proper body to investigate, judge and impose punishment for violations of law, I would point out that our procedures do not include the usual judicial requirements. Our committee combined within itself the functions of prosecutor, judge, and jury. The committee staff made investigations. The committee passed on motions regarding questions of procedure and law. And the committee issued findings relating to the facts of the case.

Though prior committees judging the right of a Member-elect to be sworn allowed the Member-elect to cross-examine witnesses against him, our committee, over my strong objections, unfortunately denied this usual right to the Member-elect. It was only after the Member-elect's procedural motions to gain something like a normal judicial procedure were overruled by majority vote of the committee that he decided not to testify beyond what he felt were the clear constitutional questions of his qualifications. All the other evidence against him by various witnesses was relied on without ever giving him a chance to cross-examine.

When we deny any Member, or Member-elect, the full right to cross-examine any and all witnesses, to be allowed the provisions of due process that are guaranteed in the Bill of Rights and in the 14th amendment to the Constitution—and I surely do not believe that was meant to exclude Members of Congress—I believe everybody has the right not to be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law.

I think these are questions that have been properly raised, not only by the American Civil Liberties Union, by the National Bar Association, and by lawyers and students of constitutional law across this country—questions which disturb us very deeply.

POSSIBILITY OF DOUBLE JEOPARDY MIGHT CAUSE THIS WHOLE MATTER TO RESULT IN INTERMINABLE LITIGATION IN THE COURTS

If the House votes a monetary fine on Mr. POWELL he then might be able to enter Federal court and seek an injunction to forestall the fine from being levied on the claim that it would involve double jeopardy. He could very approprately claim he is subject to prosecution for the same offense in the Federal courts and that for him to be subject to punishment by the House, even though the fine would be credited against his indebtedness, would still mean he could be subjected to double jeopardy for the same offense.

I doubt if many Members of the House want to open up a Pandora's box which can bring the Congress into direct conflict with the judiciary and that might also tie this matter up interminably in the Federal courts.

FINE AND LOSS OF SENIORITY COMPLETELY UNPRECEDENTED

A fine and a loss of seniority is a completely unprecedented procedure for the House to use in punishing a Member. There is simply no precedent whatsoever for the House to punish its Members other than by censuring or expelling. My colleagues will note that the committee report, in discussing this point on page 29, makes no mention of any precedent. The report merely states a dictum, an opinion of its own, and then gives reasons why that position should be considered valid. The only precedent cited is from the Senate where the punishment beyond censure was a suspension of a Member for 6 days, in other words a temporary expulsion. Even that suspension was strongly dissented to by one-third of the Senate committee involved.

NO EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES IN THIS CASE WHICH REQUIRE EXTRAORDINARY PUNISHMENT

There are no extraordinary circumstances in this case which require unusual punishment. Let me review what I consider to be the two relevant sets of precedents.

First. Five cases of censure in history of Congress involving monetary offenses. Censure has been imposed only five times in the history of the Congress for financial misconduct. Two of the Members were censured for offering bribes to influence other Members' votes on legislation. The three other Members had accepted bribes in return for making appointments to the military academies. In none of the five cases was punishment imposed beyond that of censure. In the entire history of the House no punishment beyond censure or expulsion has ever been imposed on a Member for any type of offense, financial or otherwise.

Second. Examples of financial misconduct by Members regarding misuse of funds in their capacities as Congressmen which were never punished nor even recognized by the House. No motion of censure regarding financial matters has been carried since 1873. No motion of censure, whatever the offense, has been passed or even offered since 1921. But I regretfully must point out that this is not because Members of Congress have not been found to be guilty of financial irregularities directly connected with their roles as Congressmen.

And, Mr. Speaker, I am going to put in the Record five cases of censure in the history of the Congress involving monetary offenses in which the Member was not fined by Congress.

Instead, in all of these cases the House never even took official cognizance of the Members' conduct. The House took what I consider to be a very sound legal position. Each of these cases was pending before the courts and they left it to the courts to find the Members guilty and sentence them.

Most of those cases were disposed of by his own electorate.

In each case the Member was not reelected to a subsequent term.

First. Representative J. Parnell Thomas, of New Jersey: Convicted of misuse of his clerk-hire allowance in the House of Representatives; specifically payroll padding and receiving of kickbacks from his employees. While a Member of Congress he was indicted, pleaded nolo contendere, and was sentenced to the penitentiary and fined. I would point out that Mr. Thomas was chairman of a committee of the House; namely, the Un-American Activities Committee.

Second. Walter Brehm, of Ohio: Convicted of five counts of accepting campaign contributions from his office clerks in direct violation of the law and received suspended sentence and fine while still a Member—all while still a Member of the House.

Third. James Michael Curley, of Massachusetts: Convicted in January 1946 of use of the mail to defraud. Sentenced to 5 months in the penitentiary. All while a Member of the House.

Fourth. Earnest K. Bramblett, of California: Indicted in 1953 for making false statements regarding his receipt of payroll kickbacks from his employees. Convicted and fined and given suspended sentence. All while still a Member of the House.

My colleagues, I offer these examples to support my position that of the many positions that might be taken on this question, support for anything beyond a resolution of censure is clearly unconstitutional, violative of the Member-elect's rights and contrary to the great preponderance of precedents, particularly the most recent ones.

APPROPRIATE METHOD IS AVAILABLE FOR PUNISHMENT OF MISCONDUCT AND RECOVERY OF MISAPPROPRIATED FEDERAL FUNDS

Let me be sure to point out at this time that there is definitely an appropriate method for punishment of any illegal conduct involved and for the recovery of Federal funds misappropriated. My distinguished colleague, Mr. Moore, has pointed out that the Justice Department has full cognizance of all these proceedings, and that this matter is not going to be disposed of on this floor because they are involved in this matter, and they are going to stay involved.

The select committee, in referring its findings and hearings, has even asked the Justice Department for continuous reports on their conclusions and actions in this matter. I would also point out that in the Federal courts the alleged misappropriation of funds by Mr. Powell can result in the payment of double damages plus an additional penalty of $2,000 according to title 31, United States Code, section 231.

THE SPECIAL ROLE OF ADAM CLAYTON POWELL

But there is something else about Adam Powell, the symbol of Negro America, a personal hero of mine, that makes this a tragedy that I cannot do other than make sure every Member on this floor is perfectly cognizant of before we, hopefully, vote for the previous question here today.

The Congressman Adam Clayton Powell is a false caricature of the Powell, to whom the churches, the synagogues, the labor unions and educational institutions—not just black Americans but all Americans—owe an unparalleled debt for the unexcelled legislation that has been passed in the House of Representatives under his leadership as the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

It is Adam Clayton Powell who has steered through the Manpower Development Training Act, the antipoverty bill, the Juvenile Delinquency Act, the Vocational Education Act, the National Defense Education Act and all of these bills which have redounded to the benefit not only of Negro Americans but to the benefit of all Americans.

Certainly Negro Americans cannot forget that Powell is disliked by many white Americans not only because of allegations regarding his personal conduct, but because it was Powell who desegregated congressional facilities for his staff and himself when he first came to Congress in 1945; because it was Powell who attached the "Powell amendment," a desegregation rider to school, housing, and labor bills which Congress was considering passing and which did not outlaw discrimination. It was Powell who forced congressional recognition of discrimination in the Daughters of the American Revolution. It was Powell who brought to a vote the question of segregation in the Nation's Capital. It was Powell who demanded that Negro journalists also be seated in the Senate and House Press Galleries. It was Powell who introduced a bill prohibiting segregation in the Armed Forces.

So I say to you, my friends, I urge that we remember what was said on the fifth anniversary of his chairmanship by the President of the United States of America, Lyndon Baines Johnson:

> The Fifth Anniversary of your chairmanship of the House Education and Labor Committee . . . represents the successful reporting to the Congress of 49 pieces of bedrock legislation. . . . The passage of every one of these bills attests to your ability to get things done. . . . Only with progressive leadership could so much have been accomplished by one committee in so short a time. I speak for the millions of Americans who benefit from these laws when I say that I am truly grateful.

FINAL APPEAL

My colleagues, let me finally restate my opening sentiments. It is our job here to not only settle this particular question but also to set some very important precedents. We must begin to establish, and quickly so, uniform standards of ethical conduct for all of our Members and our employees. But surely in our first major effort to establish these principles, we should be particularly careful to do it in a manner that is clearly constitutional, that will withstand all legal attack, and is effective, and that will be recognized as just and fair by dispassionate observers.

If I may I should like to close by citing to you the famous statement by George Washington during debate at the Constitutional Convention in 1787:

> Let us now raise a standard to which the wise and honest repair.

What we are asked to do here is to work within the confines of our conscience and within the confines of the Constitution and to use the standard I think every Member of this Congress would use—what is best for America and what is best for this Congress.

I think if we do adopt that standard, we will adopt the previous question, Mr. Speaker, and then this Congress will go on record as supporting the historic precedents relating to censure, which precedents we should certainly observe; and that we will fulfill the confidence that all America places in this Congress and make America the greater for our actions here today.

In recent years Congress has set an admirable record in refurbishing the honor of America in guaranteeing to all of its citizens equal justice before the law. I would appeal to you in this case to not only do justice to an individual but to also do justice to the principles for which so many have sacrificed and for which, in the last analysis, we shall all be judged.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Thomson] 4 minutes for the purposes of debate.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I share the concern of the gentleman from Michigan over the grave constitutional problems with which we are confronted here today.

I am worried by the light manner in which we assume that we have implied powers under the Constitution; and the assumption that we have the power to add to the language of the Constitution.

I think we have reached here today a point in history that had been envisioned by the Founding Fathers of this great system of government.

I think it is very clear on reading the debates in the Constitutional Convention and the precedents that the Founding Fathers envisioned in the years that followed them the waves of emotion that would sweep this country and sweep the Congress over questions of this kind. We are here today, I think, in a capacity of not only people who are citizens of their districts but as Representatives who should provide some leadership and who should maintain the high standards which were outlined in the forming of this Constitution.

In those early days the requirement to vote and the requirements to hold office were—sex—you had to be male if you wanted to vote. There were property qualifications. There were religious qualifications. And there were qualifications against having been guilty of a criminal conviction.

Our Founding Fathers who went to Philadelphia in 1787 brought with them experience and an understanding of the need for limitations on representative government, and those limitations were written clearly into the Constitution. We do not have power to examine a qualification unless it relates, first, to age, and we have done that. People have been elected to this body before they were 25 years of age. Second, inhabitancy; third, citizenship. We do not have implied or actual powers to go beyond those qualifications.

I was not a candidate to serve on this committee. I was not a volunteer. I was drafted. As I told my colleagues yesterday, some of my friends came up to me and said, "We hope among your qualifications is one of being prejudiced. We are looking forward to the minority report that you bring in."

But the longer I studied the implications of this constitutional problem, the more convinced I became that it was not only a constitutional requirement of this body to seat this Member-elect, but also it is the wisest course, and we should follow that course.

The easy way out would be to say, "Kick him out." The easiest vote I could cast would be to exclude this Member. But I think the writers of the Constitution well covered that subject when they said that a Member had a right to be seated if he met the three constitutional qualifications, and that the House had the right to discipline a Member, but in the event he was to be expelled, the expulsion was to be by a two-thirds vote.

Today this Congress should not follow the easy course. We should not simply say, "Kick him out." We should be conscious that in the history that follows they are going to look at this Congress and see if we measured up to the standards that were set by our forebears.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gibbons], for the purpose of debate.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman. This is really going to have to be a short speech. I did not think I could let history be so perverted on this floor as it has been here. I think that every Member of this body should realize that on five occasions in this Chamber, right here, Members-elect have been excluded and never seated. I will give you their names and the States where they were from.

Mr. Roberts, who was a Member-elect from Utah; Mr. Berger, who was a Member-elect from Wisconsin; Mr. Brown and Mr. Young from Kentucky; and Mr. Whittemore from South Carolina.

Let us take the Whittemore case that occurred in the 1870's. Mr. Whittemore sold appointments to the Service Academies. He was investigated and censured. He resigned. He went home. He was reelected, and he came back up here. Do you know what the Congress did? They did not seat him in this Chamber. He was excluded.

Now, do not be deluded by the arguments that we are taking upon ourselves powers that are not ours. That argument has been made ever since this country has been founded, and during that 180 years, on five specific occasions in this House of Representatives we have excluded Members from this House of Representatives. We have done so twice in this century.

Mr. Speaker, when I read the briefs that had been submitted in Mr. Powell's behalf the question of exclusion worried me and I asked the American Law Division to prepare a rebuttal brief for me. Many Members have asked that I place this brief in the Record. Therefore I include it in the Record at this point:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., February 14, 1967.

To: Honorable Sam M. Gibbons.
From: American Law Division.
Subject: Briefs Submitted Re Matter of Representative Adam Clayton Powell.

The two briefs submitted, one by Representative Powell and the other by the American Civil Liberties Union and the New York Civil Liberties Union, relate to the jurisdiction of the Select Committee of the House of Representatives considering the case of Representative Powell.

They are, of course, adversary briefs, and the following analysis is made of them.

A. THE POWELL BRIEF

The major point of the brief is that Mr. Powell meets the three qualifications for membership in the House set forth in Article I, Section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution in that he is above the age of 25 years, has been a citizen of the United States for more than 7 years, and was an inhabitant of the State in which he was chosen at the November 8, 1966, election. It also asserts that the validity of the election of Mr. Powell and returns from his 18th Congressional District in New York have not been questioned.

It asserts that the qualifications in Article I, Section 2, clause 2, are the sole and exclusive qualifications for membership in the House and that the Select Committee "is required under the Constitution and Precedents of Congress to recommend the immediate swearing in and seating of the Member-Elect" (Mr. Powell).

The first point made by the brief submitted by Mr. Powell is that it was the clear mandate of the Constitutional Convention that the House is required to seat a Member-elect who meets the qualifications set forth in Article I, Section 2, clause 2.

Cited as authority for such a statement are: (1) Professor Charles Warren, *The Making of Our Constitution*, 1928, p. 420; (2) a statement by Madison referred to in Farrand, *Records of the Federal Convention*, Vol. 2, p. 249; (3) reference to "leading commentators" to the effect that the intention of the Convention was to establish a mandate that the Legislature (Congress) has no power to vary, alter, or add to the constitutional qualifications and must seat as a Member any duly elected Representative who meets these qualifications; and (4) the recent Supreme Court decision of *Bond* v. *Floyd*, Dec., 1966, 87 Sup. Ct. 339, footnote 13.

As respects any clear mandate of the Constitutional Convention respecting the qualifications for Members of the House, see the attached report by Miss Julia Sayles of the American Law Division, "Qualifications of the Members of the House of Representatives", February 2, 1967, marked A, in which the conclusion is reached, after a study of Farrand's debates on the Constitution and Elliott's debates in the state ratifying conventions, that it cannot be said definitively that the Founding Fathers determined that the three qualifications of age, citizenship and inhabitancy were the sole ones. See also the study printed in 88 *Congressional Record*, 3047–3050, during the debate in 1942, marked B, concerning Senator Langer, a study that had been printed as Senate Document 4, 70th Congress, in 1927.

In other words, relevant records are too scant to determine with complete certainty the intention of the Founding Fathers.

As respects the statement on leading commentators affirming the same point of view, i.e., Justice Story, Cooley, Cushing, Tucker, Foster, Paschal, and McCrary (p. 4 of the Powell brief), attached are two pages from the minority report in the case of Mr. Brigham Roberts of Utah in the 56th Congress (House Report 85, 56th Congress, 1900), marked C, as reprinted in Hinds, *Precedents of the House of Representatives*, Vol. I, pp. 545–546. It will be noted that the same commentators cited in the brief for Mr. Powell are exactly those cited in the minority report in the Roberts case (Mr. Roberts was excluded).

Views of commentators to the contrary, as contained in the committee majority report on the Roberts case, are attached, pp. 532–533 of Hinds', marked D. For the comment by Burgess, see page 7 of the attached report by Miss Sayles, *supra*. See also, the attached study printed in 88 *Congressional Record* 3047 at 3050.

Commentators themselves are not in accord on the matter.

Of the law review articles cited in the brief, 4 Notre Dame Lawyer 3 (1928), 15 Georgetown Law Journal 382 (1927), 30 Law Notes 181 (1927), and 33 Virginia Law Review 332 (1947), the first three, while discussing the power of the Senate over qualifications of Senators-elect, actually related to the cases of Frank L. Smith of Illinois and William S. Vare of Pennsylvania, during the 69th and 70th Congress, which were essentially cases of elections purity and not qualifications. This interpretation was expressed by Senators in the debate over Senator Langer in 1942. Such Senators as Senator Murdock and Senator Overton, who strongly espoused the concept that exclusion could not be based on any qualifications except absence of the three set forth in Article I, Section 2, clause 2, stated that the Smith case was entirely an elections case and had no relevance to the matter of qualifications (for Senator Murdock's remarks, see 88 Cong. Rec. 2477; for Senator Overton's, see 88 Cong. Rec. 2773). For similar views, see "The Legislature's Power to Judge the Qualifications of Its Members", 19 Vanderbilt Law Review 1410 at page 1424 (Oct., 1966). See also, Willoughby, *The Constitutional Law of the United States*, Vol. I, 2nd Ed., p. 610, attached, marked E.

The article in 33 Virginia Law Review, which appeared relative to the case of Senator Bilbo of Mississippi in 1947, takes a strict view of the application of the three constitutional qualifications but grants that the bodies of Congress have interpreted their powers in respect to them more broadly (a copy is attached, marked F).

The *Bond* decision was a free speech, First Amendment decision in which the judicial standard of "political question" doctrine was not raised by the Supreme Court because the case involved a state legislature and the federal judiciary, not the Congress and the federal judiciary (see resume of the case, attached, marked G). The footnote was not only dicta but it was related to text in the decision relating to freedom of speech. The case has little relevance, under existing precedents, to the situation of Mr. Powell.

The next point in the brief for Mr. Powell is that of House and Senate precedents.

It discusses the case of William McGreery of Maryland in the 10th Congress. Although remarks were made in the debate about the power of Congress to add further qualifications than those in Article I, Section 2, clause 2, the point at issue in the case was whether a state could add qualifications (see resume of the McGreery case, attached, marked H). It will be noted that a resolution was submitted during the debate that neither Congress nor the States could add to or take away from the qualifications in the Constitution prescribed for the House, but it was never voted on.

The case of Humphrey Marshall of Kentucky in the Senate, in the Fourth Congress, is erroneously depicted in the brief. Mr. Marshall had been sworn in as a Senator and was not a Senator-elect (see Hinds, *Precedents of the House of Representatives*, Vol. II, § 1288). At issue was whether, for a crime alleged to have been committed prior to his election but for which the courts had not held him to answer, a Senator should be tried by the Senate. The Senate declined to proceed in the absence of prosecuting action from the constituency. There was no motion for exclusion involved. It seemed, rather, a question of possible expulsion (see Hinds, *supra*, Vol. II, p. 819), and as such is not really relevant to the existing case.

The quotation from *Myers* v. *United States*, 272 U.S. 52 (1962) (see I attached), actually adds little to the brief because the two cases to which it is applied (i.e., McGreery and Marshall) did not relate to excluding for disqualification on grounds other than those set forth in Article I, Section 2, clause 2.

The cases of Turney v. Marshall and Forke v. Trumbull, in the 34th Congress (Hinds, *supra*, Vol. I, p. 384), are quite similar to the McCreery case, *supra*, in which, although statements were made about the alleged absence of power in Congress to add to the qualifications set forth in Article I, Section 2, clause 2, the real issue was once again that of the power of the States to add qualifications.

McCrary, in *A Treatise on the American Law of Elections*, 2nd Ed. (1880), writes as follows (pp. 205–206):

"A State law requiring that a representative in Congress shall reside in a particular town or county within the district from which he is chosen, is unconstitutional and void. (Barney v. McCreery, Cl. and H. 169).

"§ 228. The Constitution of Illinois, of 1848, provided as follows:

"'The judges of the Supreme and Circuit Courts shall not be eligible to any other office or public trust of profit in this State, or the United States, during the term for which they are elected nor for one year thereafter. All votes for either of them for any elective office (except that of judge or of the Supreme or Circuit Courts) given by the General Assembly or the people, shall be void.'

"The House of Representatives held that this clause of the constitution of Illinois, so far as it related to the election of Members of Congress, was void, because in conflict with the federal constitution, and, also because it was an unauthorized attempt on the part of State of Illinois to fix or to change the qualifications of Representatives in Congress. Mr. Marshall and Mr. Trumbull, of Illinois, were elected Representatives in the thirty-fourth Congress. They had previously been elected, respectively, judge of the Supreme and Circuit Court of that State, for terms which had not expired. This was held to be no objection to their holding the office of Representative in Congress. . . ."

The case of Senator Stark of Oregon is referred to in the brief for Mr. Powell on page 7, under part 4, citing I Hinds, p. 433. Once again, remarks from debate are quoted but not the actual occurrence of events. When Mr. Stark appeared in January, 1862, in the 37th Congress, he was asked to stand aside from the administration of the oath because of alleged disloyalty, and a resolution was submitted that the oath not be administered to him and that his credentials be referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. This motion was adopted, 29 to 11, after an amendment to strike the word "not" from the resolution had been defeated, 10 to 29.

On February 7, 1862, the Judiciary Committee reported a resolution, without expressing any opinion on the question of disloyalty, that Mr. Stark was entitled to take the oath of office. After considerable debate including that on qualifications and additions thereto by the Senate, the resolution to admit Mr. Stark was amended by adding thereto the words "without prejudice to any subsequent proceedings in the case." It was explained that this was proposed so that the Senate might not be precluded from passing on the question of expulsion. The amendment passed, 24 to 16, and the resolution, as amended, passed, 26 to 19. The oath was administered to Mr. Stark.

On February 28, a resolution was passed, following a request by Senator Stark, that a select committee be appointed to investigate the charges against him. On April 22, 1862, the select committee reported concluding that Mr. Stark had been disloyal. On May 7, Senator Sumner submitted a resolution to expel Senator Stark on the grounds of disloyalty.

Little of the session was left, but on June 6, 1862, after little debate, the resolution was disagreed to, 16 to 21.

The question was much like those on later occasions, to swear in a Member-elect (or Senator-elect) pending an investigation. Senate precedents that followed, such as Reed Smoot in the 57th through 59th Congresses, and William Langer in the 77th Congress, also adopted the view that once a Senator had been sworn in, though even on a prima facie right, expulsion was the only procedure to oust him thereafter.

The case of Francis Shoemaker in the House, in the 73rd Congress, is attached hereto, marked J. The sole question as disclosed by the debate was: should he be sworn in and then investigated, or should he not be sworn in until investigated? The House voted for the former procedure. It was, in effect, a reverse of the vote taken in respect to Mr. Powell, but it in no way obviated the Roberts, Berger, etc., precedents.

The case of Senator Langer, in the 77th Congress (1942), is erroneously stated in the brief on page 9. Senator Langer was not a Senator-elect. He was sworn in on opening day "without prejudice to the rights of the Senate." The Elections Committee reported that even though he had been sworn in, it was not final and he could be excluded by a majority vote. The Senate decided, however, after long debate, that since he had been sworn in, he could only be expelled by a two-third vote. The two-thirds vote did not materialize and the Senator retained his seat (see attached resume of the case, marked K). The real decision once more was that once a Senator had been sworn in, he could only be ousted by expulsion procedure. It is again not relevant to the present case where Mr. Powell has not been sworn in, and, like the cases of Senators Stark and Marshall, it did not reach any vote on the question that qualifications other than those of age, citizenship and inhabitancy could be considered. As noted in the attached resume of the Langer case, Senator Overton offered an amendment which would have squarely raised this question before the Senate, but there were too many objections and it was withdrawn.

In respect to the report of the Judiciary Committee in the so-called Credit Mobilier case in the 42nd Congress, 1872, a report is attached hereto dealing with the censure of Oakes Ames and James Brooks, marked L. A select committee was created which considered the question of expulsion for offenses allegedly committed by the two men as Members of Congress five years previously. The select committee recommended expulsion on the ground that the acts committed and the influences brought to corrupt Members were as likely to be as operative on them in the future as in the present. Consequently, it was charged that the acts of Messrs. Ames and Brooks "may properly be treated as offenses against the present House, and so within its jurisdiction upon the most limited rule."

The Judiciary Committee also issued a report "particularly on the question whether or not it warranted articles of impeachment of any officer of the United States" (Hinds, *supra*, Vol. II, p. 855). Its main point was that "neither impeachment nor expulsion should be invoked for offenses committed before election" (*ibid.*). It did touch on the question of qualifications.

A resolution was offered on February 26, 1873:

"Whereas by the report of the special committee herein it appears that the acts charged as offenses against Members of this House in connection with the Credit Mobilier occurred more than five years ago, and long before the election of such persons to this Congress, two elections by the people having intervened; and whereas grave doubts exist as to the rightful exercise by this House of its power to expel a Member for offenses committed by such Member long before his election thereto, and not connected with such election; Therefore

"Resolved, That the special committee be discharged from the further consideration of this subject.

"Resolved, That the House absolutely condemns the conduct of Oakes Ames, a Member of this House from Massachusetts, in seeking to procure congressional attention to the affairs of a corporation in which he was interested, and whose interest directly depended upon the legislation of Congress, by inducing Members of Congress to invest in the stocks of said corporation.

"Resolved, That this House absolutely condemns the conduct of James Brooks, a Member of this House from New York, for the use of his position of Government director of the Union Pacific Railroad and of a Member of this House to procure the assignment to himself or family of stock in the Credit Mobilier of America, a corporation having a contract with the Union Pacific Railroad, and whose interests depended directly upon the legislation of Congress."

This was a substitute resolution for resolutions to expel both Mr. Ames and Mr. Brooks. Both substitutes were adopted as respects Mr. Ames and Mr. Brooks, and then, on motion to adopt the preamble, it lost by a vote of 98 to 113, and the preamble was repealed.

Thus, the primary question in this case was that of either expulsion or censure, and the preamble to the substitute resolution, to the effect that grave doubts existed as to whether the House could expel Members for acts occurring in prior Congresses, was deleted.

Point Three of the brief for Mr. Powell deals with what are called deviations "from the constitutional mandate on rare occasions under intense partisan pressure and public hysteria. These isolated cases have been subsequently overruled or discarded by the House or Senate."

Mentioned is the case of Brigham Roberts of Utah in the 56th Congress, I Hinds, § 474 et seq.

This case is alleged to have been repudiated by the Senate case of Reed Smoot of Utah in the 58th Congress, I Hinds, §§ 481–484. In the latter case, however, Senator Smoot had been sworn in, while Mr. Roberts had not been. The majority report in the case of Senator Langer (S. Rept. 1010, 77th Congress, pp. 16–17) distinguished between the two cases as follows:

"Reed Smoot case. I Hinds' Precedents, page 561:

" 'Although it was understood that objection was made to a Senator-elect on the question of qualification, yet the oath was administered on his prima facie showing. The indispensable existing membership at time of offense was basis for two-thirds vote (for expulsion).' "

" 'In the present case the power of expulsion could be invoked'. . . (citing p. 563 from I Hinds)."

In the debate in the case of Senator Langer (88 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 2489), Senator Lucas stated:

"In the Roberts case, the House of Representatives refused to permit Roberts to take the oath. They asked that he stand aside. They said:

" 'What is the use in permitting him to take the oath, and then, after he takes the oath, expel him by a two-thirds vote?'

"The House excluded Roberts by a majority vote.

"In the Reed Smoot case, Smoot was admitted, and he qualified by taking the oath. The moment he became a Senator he immediately came under the constitutional provision of expulsion, provided his conduct was such that the provision was violated."

In addition, in the report on the Smoot case, in "Senate Election, Expulsion and Censure Cases from 1789 to 1960", S. Doc. 71, "iron bound oath" of 1862. None were immediately sworn in, and the credentials of all were referred to the House Committee on Elections. Of the seven, five were eventually sworn in. This would seem to give little credence to the allegation of hysteria.

In addition, the fact that the power to exclude on grounds other than age, citizenship, and inhabitancy has been utilized so sparingly can be argued to constitute a tribute to both the House and the Senate that it has not been abused. It can be argued that it has rather been used judiciously and not hysterically.

As respects the allegation that section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment was adopted because of doubts of excluding Members-elect on the grounds of disloyalty, attached are copies of pages 127–133 of *The Adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment*, by Horace E. Falck (1965), marked N, a study of the actual history of the inclusion of section 3. Nowhere does he refer to doubts about excluding from the House Members-elect on the grounds of disloyalty.

Point Four in the brief for Mr. Powell deals with the December, 1966, decision by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Bond* v. *Floyd*, the case of the Member-elect excluded from the Georgia Assembly for statements alleged to indicate an unfitness to sit as a Member. The attached report on the *Bond* case shows that it was one relating wholly to the right of free speech under the First Amendment as applied to the States through the Fourteenth Amendment. It deals with a State legislature and the federal courts. It is totally distinguishable from the case of Mr. Powell where no free speech claim is made and where the legislative body involved is the U.S. House of Representatives.

In summary, the brief does not really support its contentions. The cases it cites are not in point and it contains quotations which, though apt as respects the arguments made, were not related to the fundamental questions in the cases in which they are cited.

B. BRIEF AMICI OF THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION AND NEW YORK CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION

The major arguments analyzed in the brief for Mr. Powell are presented in this brief and have already been discussed. As has been noted, it cannot be said definitively from the records that the Constitutional Convention delegates explicitly intended that the three qualifications of age, citizenship, and inhabitancy were to be maximal. As has also been noted, commentators are not unanimous in their interpretation of the actions of the Convention.

In respect to the argument that the power to consider additional qualifications is denied to the Congress, since there can be no proper exercise of a power to review a decision which in a democracy belongs exclusively to the electorate, both the House and the Senate have so acted as illustrated by the cases of Roberts, Berger, Brown, Young, and Whittemore in the House, and of Senator-elect Thomas of Maryland for disloyalty, in the 40th Congress, etc.

On the charge that the exercise of the power is fraught with possibilities for bias (Brief, p. 6), Senator Lucas of Illinois, during the debate regarding Senator Langer, stated: "I also submit that a careful study of the Senate precedents indicates beyond the shadow of a doubt that this power has not been lightly considered" (88 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 2393).

The brief, again like the Powell brief, tends to intermix situations of possible expulsion with exclusion (not reference to Senator Langer on page 8 of the brief), and also situations of administering the oath or not along with an investigation (see case of Shoemaker on pp. 8–9 of the brief).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). The gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I shall speak briefly in terms of trying to avoid the constitutional problems.

Mr. Speaker, on January 10, 1967, in the exercise of fair play and without judging the issues, this House determined that ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Member-elect from the 18th District of New York, should stand aside until he had been furnished an opportunity to explain some serious charges with respect to his handling of the funds of the House as a standing committee chairman. At no inconsiderable expense and time of responsible Members, the House designated a select committee who afforded Mr. POWELL an opportunity to come in and answer its questions.

What happened? ADAM CLAYTON POWELL told the special committee where to go. Mr. POWELL refused to answer questions concerning his handling of the public moneys in the contingency fund of the House. He did not explain. He refused to explain.

In short, he has defied the entire House of Representatives. He has continued to place himself as an individual above the rules applicable to Members of the House. He has continued to disgrace the House before the people of the United States and the world.

Mr. Speaker, in this situation we should not vote to seat any man who is defiant of the House, who refuses to account, who declines to explain serious complaints of his own deliberate, if not criminal, abuses of the public trust with the funds of this House. I believe Mr. POWELL should continue to stand aside until he explains.

If he sees fit to continue to refuse to explain it should be made clear that he will not be seated in this 90th Congress. I should like to add nor in the 91st or 92d but of course the 91st Congress under the Constitution will make its own separate determination.

There is no need to become involved in the intricacies of the constitutional requirements. There is no need to consider Mr. POWELL's contempt of the courts of New York, nor his alleged adventures on Bimini and elsewhere. True, this background cannot help but irritate the situation. Constitutionally, it muddies the waters. For perhaps the moral character of a candidate is more properly for the judgment of his constituency.

But when a former Member who asks to be seated, refuses to answer questions about his own alleged embezzlements, conversions and possible thefts of moneys entrusted to him by this House, surely we are not compelled to seat him until at least he explains to the House. This would be true of any Member on either side of the aisle, from the Speaker to the newest face on board.

Such refusal alone, without the need for going into any of the other collateral matters is, in my opinion, more than sufficient cause and reason to so act to maintain the necessary dignity and public respect for the National House of Representatives.

We must face this challenge to our responsibility to manage our own membership. We cannot, nor should we, ignore our obligation in the face of defiance, contumacy and failure to account.

The suggestion that other Congresses have seated persons convicted of crime are wholly inapt, for the complaint in this instance relates peculiarly to tampering with congressional funds while a Member of Congress and contrary to the rules of the House, and—more importantly—Mr. POWELL's failure to answer was not in the 89th Congress. His failure to answer is in this Congress. It took place last month, in February 1967. This Congress is under no obligation to seat a Member-elect who so defies its rules. His dilemma is of his own creation.

It has been suggested that such a position will place the Congress on a collision course with the courts. I do not think so. But if this be the case I doubt that the high court would undertake to tell the House of Representatives of the United States that it cannot decline to seat a Member-elect defiant of the House in the circumstances of Mr. POWELL.

Mr. Speaker, I think also it should be made clear today that, in the event Mr. POWELL is asked to continue to stand aside until he responds to the questions of the House, it will be without pay. For again his dilemma is of his own creation. It should also be made crystal clear to the electorate of the 18th District of New York that, special election or no, this House will not seat ADAM CLAYTON POWELL until he first answers its questions and explains these serious charges relating to his conduct as a Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the previous question will be voted down.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL], for the purpose of debate.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to state that I shall vote to vote down the previous question, and I shall continue to do so until such time as the proper motion is submitted under the rules of the House to exclude ADAM CLAYTON POWELL of New York from membership in the 90th Congress.

In so doing, I do it with full respect for the committee which has reported House Resolution 278 today and for its long labors. I hope they do not feel hurt, or that to vote their resolution down is a vote of irresponsibility, because perhaps they are too well trained in the objectivity of seeing both sides of the question and the law to come to a prudent judgment as to the qualifications therein.

In that connection, it seems to me that the crux of the situation before us here today is not in article I, section 2, clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution, but indeed, if there be a question about the qualification of this Member, it is in article I, section 5 of the Constitution—and I will quote from my pocket Constitution, not being a lawyer and not trained in objectivity, but yielding to no man as to what I hope is prudent judgment, and reading the conjunctive sentences—"Each House may punish its Members for disorderly behavior."

I submit to the Members that all the humiliation, all the pleas that have been brought, all the evidences of censure in this report toward this man who has referred to all of us as hypocrites, and who dared us to rest well on the night of January 10—and I never rested better in my life—indicate this man is uncensurable, unembarrassable, and irresponsible.

He, indeed, is the one who has grandiose ideas and delusions of grandeur. As one of the "doctors in the House," that adds up to something extraneous to the public trust and best interests of this House.

I say to the Members here today that regardless of all the constitutional questions, if I may paraphrase another man who has been in this Chamber before us, the people of the United States will little note nor long remember the money that may be recouped, whether or not he [Mr. POWELL] is seated is the question—rather whether or not he is seated, in spite of preaching insurrection, in spite of being proved guilty of forgery, in spite of being guilty of larceny.

As I have said before, I shall vote at every opportunity to prevent this man from being seated, who is, indeed, by the committee report itself which accompanies House Resolution 278, guilty of disorderly behavior according to article 1, section 5, paragraph 2 of the Constitution.

I hope all will join me in voting down the previous question and in excluding this Member-elect from the House.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], for the purpose of debate.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a special investigating committee, which was constituted when the House on January 10, 1967, refused by an overwhelming vote to seat Representative-elect POWELL, has now recommended that he be seated, but with certain conditions.

These conditions are utterly unacceptable.

Among other conditions, the committee provides that the Representative-elect pay back $40,000 in public funds which he allegedly obtained or manipulated illegally. This would be accomplished, according to the committee formula, by a $1,000 per month deduction from his paychecks.

In the first place, the committee does not know whether $40,000 represents all of the financial manipulations of the individual in question. Apparently $40,000 was a round figure that somehow appealed to the committee.

In the second place, to seat the Representative-elect for the purpose, among others, of collecting $1,000 per month, is in the nature of "robbing Peter to pay Paul"; it is "sending good money after bad money"; it is in the nature of picking the taxpayer's pockets to pay a culprit's fine, the chairman of the committee, Mr. CELLER, is quoted as saying.

And the committee does not say how it is expected the Representative-elect if seated for the remainder of the 22 months of the 90th Congress, would meet an obligation of $40,000 when the rate of pay deduction is only $1,000 per month, or a total deduction of $22,000.

The committee resolution provides that:

> Said sums received by the Clerk (of the House of Representatives) shall offset to the extent thereof *any liability* of the said Adam Clayton Powell to the United States of America with respect to the matters referred to in the above paragraphs 3 and 4 of the preamble to this resolution.

Why should not a Federal court or the Internal Revenue Service, if either or both decide to take action in this case, be free to fix liability to the Government without interference, restriction or direction on the part of the House of Representatives? The pending resolution if adopted, and let us hope that in all conscience it will not be, provides that ADAM CLAYTON POWELL shall present himself to take the oath of office on or before March 13, 1967. What is magic about March 13? What if POWELL decides to interrupt. If the abortive resolution is to prevail, why not put the cap on the sheaf of this sordid affair by administering the oath this afternoon?

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL does not deserve to be seated in the House of Representatives—conditionally or otherwise. Without identification he has publicly denounced Members of the House as "hypocrites," and again without specification or identification has publicly asserted that his illegal acts have been no worse than those of other House Members.

Yet when given the opportunity to provide evidence in support of these statements and defend himself against charges of gross misconduct, he has either refused to appear or, when subpenaed, answered only virtually meaningless questions.

Yet by some strange outpouring of emotionalism the committee, having branded this individual as being unworthy of membership in Congress and of bringing the House and its Members into disrepute, now asks that he be seated so that he can be paid a salary from which a portion would be extracted to compensate partially for that which he previously manipulated to his own ends.

I wonder when it will be suggested that Bobby Baker be permitted to pay what he owes the Federal Government and be free to again wheel and deal his way through Washington and way points across the country.

For altogether too many months the public was fed a steady diet of whitewash and coverup in the cases of Walter Jenkins and Bobby Baker, among others. Ethical standards in Government seemed to be at their lowest point. There was the grave question of whether law enforcement officials had the courage and dedication to come to grips with this situation.

In recent weeks there seemed to be some improvement in the moral climate, due in part to the conviction of Bobby Baker and James Hoffa, and the refusal of the House on January 10 to seat ADAM CLAYTON POWELL.

The House of Representatives today can either help this moral climate or it can further destroy it.

Mr. Speaker, I have a reasonably strong stomach but it will revolt at the aroma that will arise if today ADAM CLAYTON POWELL is offered a seat in this Chamber. I will vote to defeat the previous question so that an amendment may be offered to deny membership to this individual. Failing in that, I will vote against the resolution.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE].

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives is writing a record historians will study as precedent for centuries. Constitutionality seems to be the key problem, or issue; however, we must admit the entire situation is laced through and through with emotionalism, anger, pique, together with unwarranted racial overtones. Actually, many Members in making a final judgment about their vote are vitally and properly concerned with the reputation of the U.S. House of Representatives.

The subject of the controversy himself has put in issue, either by accident or design, the reputation of each individual Member of this body by suggesting that his conduct is the same as every other Member of Congress. It should hardly be necessary to deny this outrageous general condemnation; however, for the record, it categorically is not true.

Yes, there may be some isolated instances of indiscretions by some Member from time to time, in the past, and if such be the case, they should enjoy no more immunity than any other wrongdoer. If there is such evidence, let it be presented and properly handled. There should be no double standards.

Meanwhile, drawing on a personal background of quite a few years in various areas of law enforcement, it comes as no surprise to find any cornered felon ready to "make a deal" by paying back what has been stolen. This has been the plea of defense attorneys and criminals for decades, particularly in embezzlement cases, larceny cases, forgeries, and cold checks. They say, "I'll give the money back if you will give me a suspended sentence, or probation." What do the members of the select committee recommend? Well, give him back his seat, let him pay back what he stole, and put him at the end of the line. That is all. He is still a Congressman, just like everyone else sitting here in this Chamber today, no more, no less.

Oh, yes, as perhaps an afterthought, at the bottom of page 32 of the report of the select committee, they are "forwarding copies of its hearings, records, and report to the Department of Justice for prompt and appropriate action"—whatever that means.

This may carry some weight with Justice, but it really is nothing new. Congressman DICKINSON, of Alabama, a member of the Hays committee, referred this whole matter to Justice and the General Accounting Office 6 weeks ago. And I did the same thing separately last January. Why? Because the hearings conducted by the Hays committee developed sufficient facts to warrant further investigation by the Justice Department to determine or verify whether there had been a violation of the Federal laws by this individual, and appropriate prosecutive steps no matter who was involved. Also, the General Accounting Office was requested by both of us to review the report and hearings, and conduct further investigation to determine whether there has been an illegal expenditure of public funds, and, if so, to take whatever steps were proper to recover. Again, no matter who was involved. Incidentally, less than an hour before this session started today, a reply was hand delivered from GAO which appears following my remarks—quote attached—at the end.

The Justice Department, through Fred Vinson, Jr., advised me they were pursuing the matter—however, would await the outcome of the work of this select committee to see what their evidence might develop. They did admit the issue before the select committee was different than the issues surrounding violation of the Federal laws.

Now, let us look at the reasoning offered by the members of the select committee. They concluded it was not necessary to determine whether they could legally, under the Constitution, recommend the Congressman-elect be denied his seat because the whole issue might be tied up in the courts for months, or even years. So? Big deal. What makes them think it will not, under any circumstances? And since when should action in this House be predicated on fear of what the Supreme Court may or may not do? In my opinion, this type of reasoning should be rejected.

The committee decided to recommend seating, censure, and discipline, because, in order to censure and punish, the Member must be seated. Or to put it another way, they decided they wanted to censure and require restitution, and the only way they could do it was seat him first. The relative importance of these items seems to me to be a bit tortured. As long as the Justice Department may be involved, the business of restitution would properly rest with them, or the General Accounting Office.

Much emphasis has been placed on depriving a 22-year Member of his seniority. Of course, this has a great personal impact on the Member, but in 1965 the majority party stripped seniority from a highly respected Member with 20 years of service, JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, and he did not steal a thing.

There is talk of humiliation, and to unseat would make a martyr of the man. Who are we kidding? Humility does not appear to be one of his virtues. In fact, the New York Times on the day before yesterday, with a Bimini dateline, quoted a reporter as saying:

> You don't seem worried at all.

To which the subject of this discussion is reported to have responded:

> Negro people have a policy of wearing the world like a loose garment—You will never understand, but it is fun to be colored.

The same newspaper in an editorial on February 25 said:

> Are Representative CELLER . . . And his colleagues on this Select Committee telling the House and the nation that a man evading prison for criminal contempt is fit to serve in the House as long as he pays back a few dollars to the Treasury? This is a strange value to place upon obedience to the law, and respect for the courts.

The select committee members seem to feel the people in the Harlem district would elect and reelect, again and again. This is a presumption only, and if correct, the House would still retain the right to judge the qualifications of its Members. Perhaps the "inhabitant" requirement would overcome this problem, since this man has been absent from the area he was elected to represent for a long period of time in order to avoid being arrested.

The argument that the people of Harlem would be deprived of representation should bear little weight since the man they elected for the past two decades has one of the poorest attendance records in Congress, and he has demonstrated his complete lack of concern for their representation, even today, by habitual lolling in Bimini rather than taking care of their interests. There certainly are other inhabitants of the Harlem area, qualified to represent their citizenry, and with honor and respect. They have a choice. So do we, here today.

Finally, I would point out that the eyes of the Nation are focused on the House of Representatives today. Particularly, the young people of this country want to know whether we operate on a double standard—whether different guidelines apply to politicians and people elected to a position of public trust, than to the common, ordinary, average American citizen. Our system is on trial today. Our young people want to know if it is permissible to cheat on an exam, as long as you do not get caught.

The select committee, made up of able Members of this body, served in the capacity of a grand jury, and made recommendations. We, the House of Representatives, must make the final decision, and it must be the right decision. Let me say to my colleagues, the people of this country are not interested in a maze of legalistic, technical explanations, justifications, and rationalizations. They want to know whether the greatest legislative body in the world is willing to tolerate its Members violating the public trust. As far as I am concerned, the answer is "No," and I shall not vote in a manner that would permit the seating of Mr. POWELL. The young people of this Nation will then know that we did, indeed, "keep the faith."

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1967.

Hon. SAMUEL L. DEVINE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DEVINE: We refer to your letter of January 12, 1967, requesting that we study and analyze the contents of House Report No. 2349, 89th Congress, and the hearings held before the Special Subcommittee on Contracts of the Committee on House Administration, relating to the investigation into expenditures during the 89th Congress by the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Upon the basis of such study and analysis you request that we determine whether there has been a violation of the public trust and whether the United States Government should make an effort to recover funds that may have been wrongfully expended.

The questionable expenditures fall into two general categories, namely, those relating to salary and those relating to transportation furnished at Government expense.

Section 103 of Pub. L. 89-90, approved July 27, 1965, enacted into permanent law the provisions of House Resolution No. 7 which continued in effect the provisions of House Resolution No. 294 of the 88th Congress, reading, in part, as follows:

"SEC. 2. No person shall be paid from any clerk hire allowance if such person does not perform the services for which he receives such compensation in the offices of such Member or Resident Commissioner in Washington, District of Columbia, or in the State or the district which such Member or Resident Commissioner represents."

As disclosed in the hearings of the Special Subcommittee (see page 62) neither the House Resolutions nor section 103 of Pub. L. 89-90 contained any enforcement or penalty provision. Moreover, that law is not clear as to what percentage of the services of a clerk must be rendered in Washington, D.C. or the State or district the congressman represents to authorize payment of such services from the clerk hire allowance.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives has maintained the position that all he needed as a good acquittance for the salary payments made to Y. Marjorie Flores was a properly executed appointment document which he advised he had on file in his office. See 2 U.S.C. 92.

The Chairman, Committee on House Administration introduced a bill in the 89th Session (H.R. 11114) which provided, in part, as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) No appropriation for clerk hire shall be paid to any person designated to be placed upon the roll of employees of the House of Representatives by a Member of the House of Representatives unless such Member has on file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives a certificate, under oath, that every person so designated by such Member will receive compensation from such clerk hire only for services performed in the offices of such Member in the District of Columbia, or in the State or the district which such Member represents.

"(b) Any Member of the House of Representatives who knowingly pays or causes to be paid from his clerk hire compensation for services performed other than in the offices of such Member in the District of Columbia, or in the State or the district which such Member represents, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both."

Enactment of that bill would have, we believe, provided the necessary authority to make the restriction practicably enforceable. However, H.R. 11114 was not enacted into law.

In any event neither Mr. Powell nor Y. Marjorie Flores appeared and testified at the hearings of the Subcommittee on Contracts and the record of those hearings does not establish conclusively that Y. Marjorie Flores did not perform some service in Washington, D.C. or in New York State. Therefore, while there is substantial doubt whether the statutory conditions were met, we do not consider that the evidence presented at those hearings provides a sufficient basis for recovery of the salary payments made to Y. Marjorie Flores from Mr. Powell's clerk hire allowance.

Also in question are the salary payments made to Sylvia J. Givens. Miss Givens was hired as assistant clerk for the House Committee on Education and Labor. Her appointment was effective August 1, 1966, and was terminated September 6, 1966. The record indicates that she performed clerical services in Washington, D.C. for the Committee from August 1 to 6, 1966, and from August 22 to September 6, 1966. By her own admission Miss Givens performed only domestic duties for Mr. Powell at Bimini during 13 days of the period August 7 to 20, 1966, the balance of the time being spent in a travel status to and from Bimini. Such domestic duties reasonably may not be construed as constituting any part of the official work of the Committee. Therefore, the record of the Subcommittee reasonably viewed would appear to establish a prima facie case for recovery from Mr. Powell of the compensation paid Miss Givens for domestic services performed for Mr. Powell during the period August 7-20, 1966. It should be noted, however, that the Committee on House Administration has approved the vouchers on which such salary payments were made. The provision contained in 2 U.S.C. 95—declaring such payments to be conclusive—would appear to prevent any department or officer of the Government from questioning payments made on vouchers so approved. Thus unless and until that Committee withdraws or revokes its approval of such payments it would appear that no department or officer of the Government would be authorized to effect recovery thereof.

Concerning the second category of questionable expenditures (traveling expenses), the Subcommittee report and the related hearings clearly established a lack of control of the purchase and use of airline tickets obtained with air transportation credit cards. However, in most of the instances we have examined, the evidence obtained falls short of establishing clearly that persons other than Committee employees, in fact, utilized tickets procured on such credit cards except in those instances in which Mr. Powell has made reimbursement from personal funds. Moreover, in the majority of cases the evidence does not clearly establish that the travelers utilizing such tickets failed to perform any official business of the Committee incident to their travel.

The following instances warrant special comments:

1) Procurement on the credit card of Mrs. Louise Maxienne Dargans of 4 one-way shuttle tickets from Washington, D.C., to New York to be used by Mrs. Lillian Upshur, a Mrs. Pearl Swangin, Mr. Jack Duncan clerk in Mr. Powell's office, and other persons who were not Government employees—Mrs. Pearl Swangin, Mrs. Jack Duncan and Adam Clayton Powell III. Mrs. Dargans testified that she was instructed by Mr. Powell to purchase airline tickets for such persons using her credit card. In fact she turned the card over to Mrs. Upshur who actually purchased the tickets after boarding the plane. Mrs. Dargans also testified that the three non-Government employees accompanied her and Mrs. Upshur to the airport although Mrs. Dargans did not actually see who boarded the plane.

Thus while the evidence does not establish conclusively that the three non-Government employees actually boarded the plane and traveled on the tickets procured by Mrs. Upshur using Mrs. Dargans' credit card, the evidence is viewed as prima facie evidence of such fact.

2) The travel of Miss Givens to and from Florida was, by her own admission, incident to the rendition of domestic service for Mr. Powell. Our understanding is that Mr. Powell recognized that this travel was not for official purposes and has made reimbursement for a part of this travel. However, there appears to be due $56.39, representing the cost of return travel from Miami to Washington, D.C.

3) Mrs. Emma T. Swann, by her own admission, performed three trips between Washington, D.C., and Miami, Florida, for vacation purposes—exact dates not shown—on tickets apparently given to her by Mr. Powell. The record, however, does not conclusively establish that Government funds were used to procure the tickets. Upon a showing that Government funds were so used, we believe that she should be held accountable for the cost thereof.

4) In the case of Alfred Vidal Chacon, the record shows a trip from Washington, D.C., to New York, New York, on March 1, 1965, and from New York to Washington on March 4, 1965. On March 5, 1965, he traveled from New York to San Juan, Puerto Rico. This travel was prior to his appointment with the Committee and was purchased with a Committee on Education and Labor Travel Plan credit card. By Mr. Chacon's own admission the travel to San Juan was "to see if I can move my family here in Washington." It was not shown whether the return portion of the ticket from San Juan was used. Mr. Chacon said at the hearings that he would arrange to pay for the San Juan ticket but that he has not reimbursed the Government for any part thereof. We are of the view that since the travel to San Juan was prior to his appointment and was for personal reasons, and paid by Government funds, a sound basis exists for recovery of the cost of travel to that point. Computed on the basis of one-half the cost of the round trip ticket the amount for repayment would be $60.75. Concerning the New York-Washington travel, the record is not clear as to whether this may be considered as preemployment travel incident to his subsequent appointment with the Committee. Therefore, on the present evidence, a request for refund of that item would not appear warranted.

Concerning the question of recovery of amounts expended for unofficial travel from persons who actually were furnished tickets purchased on Government credit cards for unofficial purposes, there is for consideration the provision appearing in 2 U.S.C. 95 which precludes any department or officer from questioning payments made from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives on vouchers approved by the Committee on House Administration. Admittedly, a convincing argument can be presented for the view that recovery may be effected from the persons illegally receiving the benefit of the travel without regard to 2 U.S.C. 95, since the only payments made on the vouchers approved by the Committee on House Administration relating to such travel were payments to the carriers concerned.

However, the matter is not entirely free from doubt and we do not consider that collection action against the individual travelers concerned would be warranted in the absence of formal advice from the Committee on House Administration that its approval of the vouchers in favor of the carriers did not and was not intended as a validation or approval of the unauthorized travel received by the individuals concerned.

Since receiving your request the Select Committee pursuant to House Resolution No. 1, 90th Congress, has filed its report. The Select Committee has taken official notice of the hearings, exhibits, and report of the Special Subcommittee on Contracts of the Committee on House Administration, upon which our comments expressed above have been predicated. Based on the hearings, exhibits, and report of the Subcommittee, and on additional evidence developed by the Select Committee, the Select Committee has found wrongful and willful appropriation of public funds by Mr. Powell by allowing salary totaling $44,188.61 to be drawn on behalf of Y. Marjorie Flores in violation of Pub. L. 89–90, and of House Resolution No. 294, 88th Congress, and House Resolution No. 7 of the 89th Congress.

Also, the Select Committee found that Mr. Powell wrongfully and willfully appropriated $214.79 of public funds to his own use by allowing Sylvia J. Givens to be placed on the staff of the House Education and Labor Committee in order that she do domestic work in Bimini from August 7 to 20, 1966, and in that he failed to repay travel charged to the Committee for Miss Givens from Miami to Washington, D.C.

The Select Committee also found that Mr. Powell wrongfully and willfully appropriated $72 of public funds by allowing the Committee's air travel cards to be used for the purchase of air transportation for his son (Adam Clayton Powell III), a member of his congressional office clerk hire staff (Lillian Upshur), and for personal friends (Pearl Swangin and Jack Duncan), none of whom had any connection with official Committee business; and $461.16 of public funds by giving to Emma T. Swann, a staff receptionist, airline tickets purchased with a Committee credit card for three vacation trips to Miami, Florida, and return to Washington, D.C.

In addition, the Select Committee found that during his chairmanship of the Committee on Education and Labor, Mr. Powell falsely certified for payment from public funds vouchers totaling $1,291.92 covering transportation for other members of the Committee staff between Washington, D.C. or New York City and Miami, Florida, when, in fact, Mr. Powell and a female member of the staff had incurred such travel expenses as a part of their private travel to Bimini.

Recommendation No. 3 of the Select Committee is that as punishment $40,000 be paid by Mr. Powell, to be collected by deductions from salary payments otherwise due him at the rate of $1,000 per month, and that the amounts collected be offset against any civil liability of Mr. Powell to the United States with respect to the indicated overpayments set forth in the Committee's findings.

The report of the Select Committee states that simultaneously with the filing of its report and the hearings in connection therewith it is forwarding copies of its hearings, records, and report to the Department of Justice for prompt and appropriate action with the request that the House be kept advised in the matter. We assume that the Department of Justice in reviewing the matter will take into consideration the appropriate statutes of the United States including the statute dealing with false claims against the Government set forth in 31 U.S.C. 231.

We trust the foregoing will serve the purpose of your inquiry.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) ELMER B. STAATS,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the House to act on ADAM CLAYTON POWELL.

While I respect the recommendations of the special committee which investigated, I must say I think this report is morally defective. The people of America are outraged, especially since the committee report spelled out POWELL's improprieties and misuse of public funds.

The committee seems to take the position that denying POWELL a seat on the basis of his improper actions would simply mean speedy reelection and furthermore, obviously it attempts to avoid a court test of how far the House of Representatives can go in disciplining its Members and judging qualifications of Members-elect.

There may well be constitutional restraints on Congress, but the public expects, as has been done in the past, the crime of payroll padding and misuse of travel funds to be punished. Also, I think the public has been outraged at POWELL's contempt of both the courts and Congress itself.

Great harm has been done to the institutions of government, and it seems to me a slap on the wrist in the form of censure, and a fine is not sufficient.

I voted to have Congressman-elect POWELL stand aside until his alleged crimes were investigated. Now, Mr. Speaker, the report shows the charges were substantiated, and I hope the Justice Department will act swiftly to bring this before the courts. In the meanwhile, the discredit and disrepute on our system of government is such that I feel ADAM CLAYTON POWELL should be denied his seat, and I am compelled to vote accordingly.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. WIGGINS].

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the action to be taken today concerning the seating of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL is fraught with emotion and the troublesome legal issues are conveniently overlooked by some Members, just as those issues have been brushed aside by a large segment of the public.

The sole issue in the minds of many of my constituents, for example, is simple morality in government. Since the record before the House today abounds with facts which clearly demonstrate that Mr. POWELL has falsified official records and has misappropriated public moneys, my constituents quite logically conclude that he does not deserve to be seated in Congress under any circumstances. And I agree. He does not deserve to be seated. But that judgment does not come to grips with the more fundamental question: May an undeserving person nevertheless be entitled to a seat in Congress?

It is a regrettable fact that Members who will cast their vote today may take a pragmatic view of the issue before the House. I suspect that some will conclude that it is solely a matter of POWELL's seat or their own—that if POWELL is seated, public resentment will damage their own prospects for reelection. I can understand such a position since the reaction of my own constituents to my vote may in fact produce exactly that result. But I cannot agree that such a consequence justifies a legally indefensible vote.

The report of the Celler committee fully and accurately documents the "tragic disrespect for the judicial process" by POWELL and his "monstrous defiance of the law." The members of that committee properly concluded that such conduct "clearly brings great disrespect on the House of Representatives." Can any other Member who disregards the Constitution and the unchallenged legal precedents interpreting it so as to cast a politically popular vote do other than bring further disrespect to this body?

As I understand the question, Mr. Speaker, we are to decide: First, is Member-elect POWELL to be seated? And second, if so, what punishment, if any, is appropriate to the offenses committed by Mr. POWELL? On the first question, there can be no doubt that Mr. POWELL possesses the constitutional qualifications to be seated in this House. The select committee concedes this point. Those who have opposed seating Mr. POWELL have presented no compelling legal or factual basis upon which to rest any decision upon this first question other than the obvious one. Mr. POWELL is entitled to his seat. In reaching this conclusion, I confess some uneasiness about following a strict definition of the word "qualifications" rather than a definition which would admit of some discretion by the House.

For example, it is perhaps inconsistent that the Constitution would require a strict adherence to the three-factor-test of qualifications for seating a Member, and yet would permit broad and unlimited discretion in removing him after he has been seated. But my concern only underscores the complexity of the legal issue.

On balance, I am persuaded that an affirmative vote to seat Mr. POWELL is not only legally correct, it is in the long-range interest of good government as well. To appreciate the profound impact of a negative vote as a precedent, it is absolutely necessary to divorce the question from the personality, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. We should concern ourselves with the fundamental questions:

> Should a representative body have the discretion to veto the decision of the electorate as to membership in that body? If such discretion is deemed advisable, should it be absolute or subject to qualifications, and if so what qualifications?

The questions I pose, Mr. Speaker, are not new. These same questions were debated by the framers of the Constitution and their answer was that our representative government can best be protected by severely limiting the power of Congress to exclude a Member. I commend to my colleagues the authoritative work of Prof. Charles Warren, "The Making of Our Constitution," for an illuminating discussion of this subject. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that as a member of a minority party, I have good reason to reject the notion that my seat is subject to the whim of the majority of seated Members.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that if Mr. POWELL desires to be seated, it must be available to him. And his right to be seated under the facts of the case is unconditional. It is not dependent upon his acceptance of the punishment of this House. His right to remain a Member, however, may well depend upon acceptance of such punishment. In this connection, the distinction between the power to exclude a non-Member, and the power to expel a seated Member must be carefully drawn, just as that distinction is carefully drawn in the Constitution itself—compare article 1, section 5, clauses 1 and 2.

I am grateful to the scholarly members of the select committee for their careful research with respect to the power of Congress to punish a Member. It has, for example, thoroughly exploded the proposition that punishment must be limited to those acts of misconduct committed during the session in which punishment is inflicted.

The power to punish Mr. POWELL in this body after he becomes a seated Member thereof is established. I question, however, whether or not the resolution proposed by the committee exercises that power wisely. According to the resolution, Mr. POWELL is to be denied his seniority, to be censured, and to be limited in his clerk-hire privileges. This is severe punishment which is without precedent in the House of Representatives. But the conduct of Mr. POWELL is also without precedent to my knowledge and such punishment appropriately fits the offense.

But the resolution also seeks as punishment to require that Mr. POWELL pay to the Clerk of the House $40,000, said sum to offset any civil liability of Mr. POWELL to the United States of America. If the findings of the committee are correct that Mr. POWELL willfully and unlawfully appropriated public funds to his own use in the total sum of $46,228.48, the act of repaying a just debt is not punishment at all. If Mr. POWELL is to be punished by a fine—a proposition with which I totally agree—the fine should not offset his civil liability to the United States, but rather should be in addition to it.

In view of the real prospect of subsequent proceedings against Mr. POWELL by the Justice Department wherein criminal penalties and punitive civil damages may be in order, the failure of the committee to analyze its recommended fine of Mr. POWELL as punishment correctly, does not persuade me to oppose the resolution.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, a word needs to be said in defense of the charge that the action to be taken today is motivated by racial bias against Mr. POWELL as a Negro. I cannot believe that a single Member of this House is so motivated and the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] who is a Negro and who served ably on the select committee has specifically negated this charge. But the complaint persists.

It may be idle to reply to those who have no interest in listening, but we should try. To the concerned and objective citizen who may suspect racial overtones in the House action today, we can only refer to the facts: Mr. POWELL is a Negro; he has falsified public records; misappropriated public funds; shown contempt for this House; and disrespect of the courts. He is to be punished. That such punishment is founded upon the one fact that he is a Negro is nonsense. And the dissemination of such nonsense by a few who are themselves Negroes is in itself a racially biased act of the lowest order.

Mr. Speaker, it is at times such as these that one must put the strength of his constitutional convictions to the test. I urge an affirmative vote on the previous question and on the pending resolution.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of emotional speeches, and angry feelings, sometimes bitter. This House of Representatives should be sitting in judgment as a court, and should not be influenced by prejudice or emotion.

For my part I would feel better if more were being said by the Members allotted speaking time that gave a more balanced view of Mr. POWELL's service as a Congressman. Mr. POWELL did accomplish much in the fields of education, labor, and social legislation, for which he will be long remembered.

We should not quickly vote the previous question which cuts off debate and prevents other solutions to be offered by Members. We should be reasonable and hear moderate as well as extreme proposals.

I will vote in opposition to the previous question on the recommendations of the special committee.

It is my opinion as an attorney of some years' experience that this resolution contains several violations of constitutional rights under the U.S. Constitution.

Special committee members have stated that even they do not feel that ADAM POWELL would accept the proposed extremely severe penalties. When this is the situation, House passage of the special committee resolution amounts to an indirect method of expulsion of a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives without the necessary two-thirds vote. This is contrary to principle and contrary to any Member's constitutional rights.

It should be noted that the resolution of the special committee on page 34 of the report under paragraph 3 states the $40,000 is to be paid to the Clerk of the House as punishment. I repeat as punishment and not as restitution. But the last sentence of paragraph 3 certainly mixes it up.

The Sergeant at Arms of the House is directed to deduct $1,000 per month from the salary otherwise due. Is this payment taxable by the U.S. Government, or the State of New York? Or is it after tax deductions? The report is indefinite, hence the amount is indefinite.

It is clear that this deduction is to continue while any salary is due while continuation of membership in the House. As $40,000 cannot be deducted in the remainder of the 90th Congress, it is plain that this restriction of payment is invalid for the 91st Congress and any succeeding Congress. This Congress cannot legally bind the hands and decisions of any succeeding Congress, or future Member. Such proposal must be rejected, and as the provision is not separable, nor is there any specific provision for separability, the whole must fall.

In addition it is very poor procedure to have the House interfere in a Member's legally authorized salary, to have the Sergeant at Arms intervene to collect even his just debts—where does this authority stop? Is this deduction not illegal if the Member objects.

The amount of the fine or penalty certainly has no logical or arithmetic justification and must therefore be deemed to be an arbitrary figure. No special committee member has proved it to be reasonable under the circumstances to this point. What is the method of setting this high amount, and what are the House, the legal, and constitutional limits of this procedure—what of due process? Nobody knows.

If this amount is partially a contempt fine or penalty, what are the procedures for contempt of Congress, through the Attorney General, the courts and jury, or our House action on such resolutions?

If this proposed amount is in reality an approximation of restitution, as some committee members have openly stated, then this procedure as punishment is clearly wrong. The remedy is a suit in the Federal courts with a judicial decision on the amount, with opportunity for hearing of the evidence, and judicial processes to be followed on issue joined.

Paragraph 2 of the resolution of the special committee is clearly in error and unconstitutional, with all due respect, I must firmly state that the opinion on paragraph 2 is not unanimous even on the Republican side. With all due respect I disagree strongly with the statement of our minority leader and other Members, that any Member can be placed in custody on the floor of the House, where no disturbance, threatened violence, injury, or breach of the peace of the House is concerned.

The Sergeant at Arms can bring Members to the House under direct authorization, but that officer certainly has no power to bring a Member once on the floor, in custody and restraint, as a prisoner or restricted Member if you will, to the bar of the House, or any other location. Can there be prisoner Members on the floor of the House, restricted Members in any degree over any other Members? I think not. It would be ludicrous to presuppose "an escapee" from the House floor, in case the Member asserted his rights as a Member, refused to be coerced or physically forced, and simply walked off the floor. There are constitutional provisions concerning the arrest or detention of a Member by lawful authorities. But these provisions certainly do not cover this novel procedure.

Gertrude Stein has said "A rose is a rose is a rose."

I repeat: "To me, a Member is a Member is a Member!"

I had hoped against hope that ADAM POWELL in the interest of his friends in this House, would appear today, to reason and to adjust, to make amends, to be heard on the past and for future plans. He has such legislative ability and friends over the years before these difficulties, that his many years of previous service could be taken into account, and weighed in the balance by the Speaker, the House leadership of the majority and the minority, in making further recommendations to this House.

The gentleman from New Hampshire, the former Republican Governor of New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN] has made legal points upon an impartial point of view that should be carefully considered. Views of calm and reasonable Members should be considered at length, and full discussion had on various proposals from the floor, with amendments being presented freely, without debate being closed forthwith and amendments cut off by passage of the motion for the previous question. This House should not be forced into the adoption of the extremes without adequate discussion and full debate. I will vote to keep open the debate by voting against motions for the previous question.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK].

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, all men in their lifetimes perform many tasks. We fill many roles. I think that there is no question today but that the role that is being filled by the ladies and gentlemen of this Congress is an important one and for many of us it is a rare one. The role that we fill is a role that is established by a section of the Constitution to which there has been no prior reference today. I refer you to article VI of the Constitution, which reads in part:

> The Senators and Representatives . . . shall be bound by oath or affirmation, to support this Constitution . . .

Every one of us, every one of us on the floor of this Congress today took that oath on the first day of the Congress, January 10 of 1967. I suggest to every one of you that took that oath with me on January 10 that the basic issue before us today is not whether we are going to seat or not seat ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. The basic issue that we really face today is whether this is a government of laws and whether we who took this oath, whether trained in the law or not and whether you serve in this Congress as a lawyer or come from a different professional or trade background, whether or not you are prepared to measure up to sustaining and supporting the Constitution of the United States.

I state to those of you who are not trained in the law that there is a major distinction between determining the qualifications of Members of this Congress and judging the qualifications of Members of this Congress.

If we were meeting today as a constitutional convention, I think we could possibly write into the Constitution different qualifications. We might add to the qualifications of age, citizenship, and inhabitance other qualifications. However, this is not our task today. Our task today is to judge whether somebody who has been elected as a Member of this body meets the qualifications that are spelled out in the Constitution.

It has been argued today by some that in addition to the express conditions which are spelled out in this Constitution there are certain implied qualifications and that anyone who would sit in this body should also be not a thief and should be free from crime and so on and on we might go. However, ladies and gentlemen, those conditions are not in the Constitution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Let me say this: The select committee established to study the case of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL brought out clearly the fact that POWELL's behavior has been atrocious. He has abused the trust reposed in him. He has lied. He has stolen. He should be punished severely.

But—except as was done on January 10 when, in order to determine the facts, we temporarily refused to administer the oath to POWELL—it is my opinion that, based on the findings of the special committee of the House, the Congress does not have the constitutional authority to exclude POWELL from membership in the 90th Congress. To do so for the reasons cited constitutes the addition of some additional qualification—of vague and uncertain dimension—to the qualifications spelled out in the Constitution. Such action would be most unwise and fraught with tremendous danger for the future of this Congress.

If we seek to add today to this Constitution any single additional qualification, we play with trouble for the future. We do not dare to do this, because if we seek today in our wisdom to add this qualification, then who knows what bodies in the future will add.

So far as whether we should support this report of the committee, I think we should. This judgment is severe. The road is always open if there be further dereliction on the part of the gentleman from New York, to punish again in the future. I think we should support the previous question and I think we should support this committee today which we have charged with a task that they have performed so ably and well.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], a member of the select committee, for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it has been a difficult moral struggle for me to determine whether under the circumstances I should say anything at all today or not.

Mr. Speaker, I have the most profound respect for the distinguished chairman of the select committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], with which our committee had the honor to serve.

Mr. Speaker, I have never served with a group of gentlemen who pursued their difficult tasks and who tried to bear their onerous burdens with more dedication and devotion, than did the members of this select committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am always immeasurably honored by any expression of confidence from the distinguished Speaker of this House of Representatives, the illustrious gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

So, Mr. Speaker, I was reluctant even to express my own deeply felt convictions, lest they might be taken as a token of disloyalty either to the Speaker or to the chairman or to the fellow members of this select committee on which it was my duty to serve.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do feel, with all my heart, that we are concerned with problems far more grave and issues far more grievous than our sensibilities or even our indisposition to express our opposition to those whom we so highly esteem the honor and the integrity of this House.

Nor, Mr. Speaker, could I remain silent and not publicly express my gratitude for the generous words which were spoken of me by my eminent colleague and friend on that select committee, the able gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. Speaker, every member of that committee was deeply impressed not only by the gentleness but by the character of the able gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], and how earnestly he sought to perform tasks more difficult for him than even the remainder of us on that select committee.

Mr. Speaker, finally I did sign the committee report, because the expressions of those recommendations were the only consensus at which we could arrive in the committee.

But, Mr. Speaker, I moved that the committee should recommend to this House the seating and then the immediate expulsion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]. That motion was voted down.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I moved that the committee recommend that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] be excluded. That motion was voted down.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I agreed to sign the report, as the only consensus at which we could arrive, and upon the kindness of the committee in agreeing to insert on page 33 of the report the words:

> Representative PEPPER feels strongly that Mr. POWELL should not be a Member of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I do feel that way. I feel that was because of the findings which the committee itself has made as to the official misconduct of Mr. POWELL.

Can anyone imagine the Speaker of this House being associated with such conduct? Can any Member imagine the chairmen of any committees of this House for 5 years keeping his wife on the payroll, permitting her only for the span of 2 months out of a total period of 5 years to receive her own check coming out of the Treasury of the United States and in all that time having those checks forged, as to endorsement, and deposited in his personal account, and by means of this subterfuge misappropriating 20-odd thousand dollars a year of the money of the taxpayers of this country?

Mr. Speaker, can anyone imagine another chairman of a committee traveling for personal purposes at his committee's expense under an assumed name and deceiving the auditing authorities, and in so doing not by inadvertence but by design?

Can any Member imagine another chairman exhibiting the contumacious conduct toward the courts of his State which the Representative-elect Mr. POWELL exhibited toward the courts of New York?

Does it inculcate national respect for law when a prominent lawmaker flouts the law, and the authority of the courts? Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that it does.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, that I have studied carefully the constitutional question, and I am convinced that Madison and Hamilton, particularly, and the other framers of our Constitution, never intended to accord to either House of Congress the power to prescribe the qualifications of either an elector of Congress, or those elected to the Congress.

That is the reason that I thought the proper way to set the proper precedent, and to correct the ambiguity and the conflicts of the precedents of this House and of the other body, was to establish a course that when a man met the three constitutionally prescribed qualifications and was duly elected, that got him into the door of this House, but that he stayed here dependent upon the suffrance of two-thirds of the Members.

The Members of each House were given an unlimited, unreviewable, omnipotent authority to oust at will. The only safeguard was the requirement of two-thirds, and it was Madison who offered the amendment which was adopted in the Convention requiring two-thirds of the Members of each House to expel a Member.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not vote for the previous question because I believe that this recommendation ought to stand on its own merits, and it ought to be open to amendment by Members of this House. And if the opportunity affords, I still shall offer an amendment that Mr. POWELL be seated and expelled. But if I find I cannot offer such an amendment to remove Mr. POWELL—as I think he should be—from this House, I shall vote, in accordance with the several precedents of the House, however they may be open to constitutional question for his exclusion.

The moral issues involved here demand such action by this House.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota, and a member of the committee, Mr. MACGREGOR, for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the politically expedient thing for our select committee to recommend was ADAM CLAYTON POWELL's exclusion. This would have been highly popular in the emotionalism of the moment. Emotionalism is rampant in the communications addressed to each Member of this body. It is clearly evident in the cloakrooms. It has manifested itself today on the floor of the House of Representatives.

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL's morals are shocking, his conduct is revolting, his character is disreputable, and he has repeatedly insulted the Members of this body—and the House of Representatives as an institution. I readily agree that his misconduct has been gross and his behavior disorderly in the extreme.

Then why not exclude Mr. POWELL? Why not bar the door of the House to his entry? Why not disregard his Certificate of Election?

Our committee meticulously developed the facts with respect to Mr. POWELL's constitutional qualifications. We find by the overwhelming weight of the evidence that he was indeed an inhabitant of New York on election day last fall. The people of his district by a huge majority have indicated that they want him to represent them. This is a precious right of theirs, guaranteed by the Constitution and many precedents, which we must not angrily sweep aside.

The debates in the Constitutional Convention make it crystal clear that Madison and others of our Founding Fathers intended that the qualifications enumerated in the Constitution of age, citizenship, and inhabitance should be exclusive. I believe it is the best course if we limit our power to judge to a determination that a Representative-elect has those qualifications.

Many of you in this Chamber have joined me in criticizing the Supreme Court for its broad constructions of the Constitution. We have called for strict interpretations, and will again. How anomalous it would be for those of us in this Chamber who have berated the Supreme Court for its broad constructions of the Constitution to now act on the question of Mr. POWELL's exclusion under the broadest interpretation possible.

It has been suggested that we require Mr. POWELL to continue to stand aside until he purges himself of contempt in the New York courts. To do so would deny indefinitely the fundamental right to congressional representation of one-half million people.

Our recommended punishment is unprecedented in its severity. No one in the entire history of the U.S. Senate or House has been punished so harshly as we ask that Mr. POWELL be punished. And if Mr. POWELL does not appear by March 13 to take his punishment, then under the terms of our recommended resolution his seat will be declared vacant.

There is no final determination of the fraudulent transfer lawsuit and the criminal contempt citation that flows from his contumacious conduct in that litigation. The fraudulent transfer action in the court of New York is on appeal, and we cannot say when it will be concluded.

We have recommended the exercise of our punishment power. That power includes the power to expel. If we exercise our expulsion power today, we cannot later inflict upon Mr. POWELL items of punishment predicated on the same grounds which now support his expulsion.

If our resolution is adopted and if Mr. POWELL does not appear and thus subject himself to the punishment recommended—or if he resigns—and is then reelected, he returns to this Chamber subject to every item of punishment that we recommend.

If you expel him, however, you have exhausted the punishment power of the House for the official misconduct found by our select committee.

It is my earnest hope that our committee's work will spearhead the establishment of a permanent Committee on Standards and Conduct. That has been a longstanding objective of mine and it has been the earnest wish of many of you on both sides of the aisle. It is the position of the House Republican leadership.

I sincerely feel that the adoption of the select committee's recommendations is the best way to advance the objective of a Permanent Committee on Standards and Conduct with enforcement powers to deal with all types of official misconduct charged against any Member of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the action we take will be valid today and instructive to future generations.

Let us now look to the past for guidance.

I have a great and high regard for the judgment of the late Senator Robert Taft of Ohio. When the Senate in the early forties was considering the exclusion or expulsion of Senator-elect Langer, of North Dakota, Senator Taft took the floor of the Senate. The Langer case involved charges of shocking immorality, disreputable behavior and insults to the high public offices that Senator Langer had held. The Langer case is surprisingly similar on its facts to the case we now have before us.

Here is what Senator Taft said in urging that Langer be seated:

> If the Senate can say that the absence of moral turpitude is a qualification, it can impose qualifications based on morals * * * or the philosophical views of any person elected * * *. The existence of such a power would give the majority of either House the ability to exclude those who disagreed with the opinions of the majority * * *. It is my belief that Section 5 of Article I was only intended to make each House the final judge of whether a man was properly elected and whether he met the qualifications prescribed by the Constitution itself.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACGREGOR. I respectfully decline to yield. I only have a few seconds left.

I urge you, my colleagues, to harken to the words of Senator Bob Taft and adopt the philosophy of strict construction. Ours is a constitutional government of laws, not an emotionally influenced government of men.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] for the purpose of debate.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, those who do not study history are ill equipped to make it.

One lesson of history is that those of authority who have made historic decisions on the basis of the emotions of the moment, quite often were the ones who hindered our heritage of freedom.

At about the midpoint of the 18th century John Wilkes, a member of Parliament from the Middlesex district of England, was convicted of the crime of libel. Wilkes was then expelled by the Parliament. The voters of his district reelected him four times and on each occasion the Parliament voted against seating him.

The Parliament disagreed with the people of his district and the Parliament decided it had the final word. But a little over 10 years later the Parliament decided it had used the wrong words because it voted to expunge from the record the entire proceedings. That was the important point of the Wilkes case, and

I believe it is the important historic point of this Adam Powell case.

Mr. Speaker, as clearly reported, we of this select committee found wrongdoing on the part of Mr. Powell, serious wrongdoing, including payroll and expense padding. As to the law, we found jealous regard in the Constitution for the fundamental right of the people of a congressional district to choose their own Representative without permission from the people of any other congressional district; and we found that in this case the better part of wisdom is to preserve a fundamental right of freedom by not setting aside the choice, wise or unwise, of the people of Mr. Powell's district.

Each Member of Congress is two persons at the same time. He is at once a Member of the institution of Congress, and also a Representative of a congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, we concluded that Mr. Powell is not entitled to the things that this House has to give. And what can this House give? It can give a committee chairmanship. It can give seniority. It can give a salary. And it can give its respect.

Since the House can give these things, and since Mr. Powell has deeply offended the House, we recommended that the House take away from Mr. Powell what the House has given him.

We recommended that the House take away the committee chairmanship, the seniority, the salary, and, saddest of all, we recommended that the House take away its respect for Mr. Powell by censure.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that the House cannot give, and that is an appointment to represent the people of the 18th District of New York. This is the one office for which no Congress, no Governor, only the governed can make a choice.

The Constitution clearly allows the Congress to veto that choice, once that choice has been honored by seating the Representative, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] has pointed out. But this is where the matter of wisdom comes in.

In my judgment the better part of wisdom cries out against tinkering with the fundamental right of the people to choose their Representative by assessing the same veto of the voters' choice in the case of payroll padding that would be assessed in the case of treason.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we are not holding a popularity contest. We are not even deciding criminal or civil penalties. Other courts will decide those matters. But we do sit as a kind of a court nevertheless. And if we kick aside the right of the people to choose their own Representative, so long as he is a loyal American citizen of age and proper inhabitancy, whether we decide he is a good guy or a bad guy, if we kick aside their right to make this judgment in this case, we might just be dropkicking history out the window.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud of the debate that has taken place here today. It has done great credit for the House of Representatives.

Obviously, we have deep differences based upon conviction. I will respect anyone who votes differently from myself. But I do have deep feelings of my own that the recommendations of this committee should be approved.

As all of you know, I was the author of the resolution that resulted in the appointment of this select committee. It provided that Adam Clayton Powell should stand aside, which he has during this interval. It provided that the committee should fully investigate the many allegations, and funds were provided for that purpose. It provided for a hearing for the accused.

He did appear. He did not appear as many of us would have wanted him to, to explain or defend his conduct, but he did exercise the right that he had to appear. His appearance before the committee was based on the recommendations of his legal advisers.

The resolution also provided that this committee should come up with findings and recommendations. After reading their record, after analyzing their findings, after seeing what they have proposed, I am going to vote for the resolution without any hesitation, qualification, or reservation.

I know the Speaker was as careful as I was in selecting people to serve on this committee. The gentlemen on our side were Arch Moore, of West Virginia, a man long experienced in the law, both in private practice and as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary; the gentleman from California, Mr. Teague, who has a fine record as a private practitioner and who is a man of integrity in the House of Representatives; the gentleman from Minnesota, Clark MacGregor, who is an able lawyer both in private practice and as a Member of the House; and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Thomson], who for 6 years was the attorney general of the State of Wisconsin, and for two terms its Governor. These men were as fine as we could find in our midst. They have labored hard. They have avoided the pitfalls of passion. They have not taken the easy course.

In my judgment, they have come up with recommendations that will stand the test of time, as a precedent for subsequent Congresses, long after all of us—and each of us—have left.

I believe we owe a debt of gratitude to these men. I feel very strongly that they are right. I hope and trust we will not be guided by what might be the most popular thing to do today. That would be the easy course. I believe we must look down the road and see what our action today will be as a precedent for the future.

I do not admit that we do not have the authority to exclude the gentleman from New York. I believe we well may have that authority. But by following the dispassionate, conscientious course of action recommended to us by these nine men, we can have a clear conscience, knowing that we have done what is right from the point of view of our House of Representatives.

I recommend strongly the approval of this resolution and a vote for the previous question.

However, in this debate and in this vote I am not passing on the constitutional question of the right of Congress to exclude a Member-elect. I know that many others feel as I do with respect to this important and basic question. The committee in its report did not treat with this issue one way or the other. It would appear they considered only the facts relating to the Member-elect and then on the basis of these facts recommended what I believe is a fair disposition of this most difficult case.

Unfortunately, during the course of this debate, statements have been made which would indicate, if not challenged, that this Congress has the power to exclude a Member-elect only if such Member-elect does not satisfy the three constitutional qualifications. I do not believe that the historical record or the precedents of this House support this conclusion. For example, the majority report in the Brigham H. Roberts case dealt with this problem in great detail. I believe the conclusion that they reached and the reasons for that conclusion are as valid and appropriate today as they were then. In this report in support of the conclusion that Congress did have the right to exclude, it was stated:

> First—On Principle
>
> As to the first proposition, what is the argument on principle? We think it will be undoubted that every legislative body has unlimited control over its own methods of organization and the qualifications or disqualifications of its members, except as specifically limited by the organic law. We do not think that this proposition needs amplifying; it is axiomatic. It is apparent that every deliberative and legislative body must have supreme control over its own membership, except in so far as it may be specifically limited by a higher law; there is a distinction to be drawn between the legislative power of a legislative body and its organizing power, or those things which relate to its membership, and its control over the methods of performing its allotted work. That is to be distinguished from the legislative power to be expressed in its final results.
>
> When our Constitution was framed there was practically no limit to the right and power, in these respects, of the English Parliament. Such power is necessary to the preservation of the body itself and to the dignity of its character. In England it was at one time admissible to permit the admission into the House of Commons of minors, or aliens, and of persons not inhabitants of the political subdivision in which they were elected. To this day it is well known that an inhabitant of London may be elected by a Scotch constituency, and a member has been elected by more than one constituency to the same Parliament.
>
> The framers of the Constitution, familiar with these facts, proposed to prevent their happening in this country. They knew also that a similar latitude of choice had been exercised in the original colonies and in the States of the Federation, and it was proposed to put a stop to it so far as Congress was concerned. A very luminous argument was made on this subject by John Randolph in the House of Representatives in 1807.
>
> We quote as follows from his remarks:
>
> "If the constitution had meant (as was contended) to have settled the qualifications

of members, its words would have naturally run thus: 'Every person who has attained the age of twenty-five years, and been seven years a citizen of the United States, and who shall, when elected, be an inhabitant of the State from which he shall be chosen, shall be eligible to a seat in the House of Representatives.' But so far from fixing the qualifications of members of that House, the constitution merely enumerated a few disqualifications within which the States were left to act.

"It is said to the States, you have been in the habit of electing young men below age; you shall send us none but such as are five and twenty. Some of you have elected persons just naturalized; you shall not elect any to this House who have not been some seven years citizens of the United States. Sometimes mere sojourners or transient persons have been clothed with legislative authority. You shall elect none whom your laws do not consider as inhabitants."

In pursuance of the idea in the mind of the framers of the Constitution, we have the peculiar words "no person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained, etc." How happy indeed are these words if we give them precisely the force and meaning for which we contend. How unhappy and how misleading, how impossible, in fact, to the masters of the English language who wrote them, if they were intended to exclude all other possible requirements or disqualifications. We might admit such construction if suitable language was difficult to find or frame; but note how easily such a purpose could have been served in fewer words and with unmistakable meaning. Thus, "Any person," or "a person," or "every person may be a Representative who shall have attained the age of twenty-five years," etc.

The provision seems to be worded designedly in the negative so as to prevent the suspicion that it was intended to be exclusive, and so as to prevent the application of the rule, "the expression of one thing is the exclusion of another." The immediately preceding clause is affirmative, and says: "The electors in each State shall have the qualifications," etc. With some show of propriety it can be claimed that this provision is exclusive. It at least does not have the negative form to condemn such construction.

Story says (Constitution, sec. 448):

"The truth is, that in order to ascertain how far an affirmative or negative proposition excludes or implies others, we must look to the nature of the provision, the subject-matter, the objects, and the scope of the instrument. These, and these only can properly determine the rule of construction. There can be no doubt that an affirmative grant of powers in many cases will imply an exclusion of all others."

It is a notable fact that in the first draft of this constitutional provision which provides for qualifications of Representatives in Congress, the language was affirmative and positive, and that when it was finally presented for adoption it appeared in the form in which we now find it.

The slight contemporaneous discussion in the Constitutional Convention was upon the provision in the affirmative form. Why was it changed in the negative? Surely not for the sake of euphony. And certainly not to make it more explicitly exclusive.

In the report of the committee of detail, submitting the first draft of the Constitution, this section read in the affirmative and as follows:

"Every member of the House of Representatives shall be of the age of 25 years at least; shall have been a citizen of the United States for at least three years before his election, and shall be at the time of his election a resident of the State in which shall be chosen."

In the discussion Mr. Dickinson opposed the section altogether, expressly because it would be held exclusive, saying he—"was against any recitals of qualifications in the Constitution. It was impossible to make a complete one, and a partial one would, by implication, tie up the hands of the legislature from supplying omissions."

Mr. Wilson took the same view, saying:

"Besides, a partial enumeration of cases will disable the legislature from disqualifying odious and dangerous characters."

The next day after this discussion, and when the clause respecting age, etc., had in its general sense, been informally approved, a proposed section respecting a property qualification was discussed. Mr. Wilson said (Madison Papers, vol. 5, p. 404) that he thought "it would be best, on the whole, to let the section go out; this particular power would constructively exclude every other power of regulating qualifications." What did Mr. Wilson mean if the result of the discussion in which he participated on the preceding day was to "constructively exclude every other power of regulating qualifications?"

In view of the objections urged by Dickinson and Wilson and their opinions as to the construction that would result and the consequences thereof the conclusion seems reasonable, if not absolutely irresistible, that the change from the affirmative to the negative form was intentionally made, and with the very purpose of obviating such objections, and hence that in being negatively stated it was considered by the convention that the particular qualifications mentioned would not be exclusive and would not render impossible the "disqualifying odious and dangerous characters" and would not prevent "supplying omissions."

This section was finally reported and adopted in the negative form in which it now appears. The report of the committee seems to have been elaborately discussed.

I believe it is also important to note that on four different occasions this House after long and careful consideration voted to exclude a Member-elect. This is a well-established procedure, and it was contemplated as a possible alternative by the resolution that I offered and which was adopted on opening day. It was contemplated at that time that the nine-member committee after carefully studying the facts could come back with one of four recommendations. The committee could recommend:

First. That the Member-elect be excluded.

Second. That the Member-elect be seated and then expulsion proceedings be commenced.

Third. That the Member-elect be seated and disciplined.

Fourth. That the Member-elect be seated unconditionally.

Also, as part of this resolution, the Member-elect was ordered to stand aside and not be seated pending the outcome of this investigation at the recommendation of the committee.

Therefore, the adoption of this resolution in and of itself asserted the right of Congress to exclude a Member-elect. When the resolution was adopted by an overwhelming vote, the Member-elect was excluded for a period of 5 weeks, and he is excluded today pending the outcome of this debate.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, in order to conclude the debate in the time that is left, I feel to exclude the Member-elect from the State of New York can very well bring crashing down upon the shoulders of this House the Constitution of the United States. To expel the Member-elect from the State of New York, I say to the House, is a one-time effort that we have available to us, and if his constituents reelect him, he returns to us without any reservations. If we give great weight to the matters under litigation in the State of New York in the decision we make, where the matters therein are still pending, on appeal, I caution that at some future time the court may reverse itself or could determine that the gentleman or Member-elect from the State of New York has a further right not yet accorded him, this will leave this House in a place of great jeopardy.

If you defeat the motion that we have presented to the House, the Member-elect, I say, to the House, will at some future time be returned to this House of Representatives to sit among us with all of the elements of punishment, which we seek to administer, wiped out and no redress available to us.

He would be free to enjoy the same privileges, have the same seniority as enjoyed by any Member who has been a Member of this body for 12 terms.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this resolution is the wisest and the most permanent way the Members of this House can write a final chapter to the problem presented us by the Member-elect from the 18th District of New York, Mr. POWELL, and I believe a final chapter in the legislative life of that Member-elect.

I urge the ordering of the previous question and the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I want to refer to the former distinguished Member from Missouri, Clarence Cannon. He, in his very excellent volume, "Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives," has a quotation from the "Merchant of Venice" which is very pertinent to the situation at present.

In the frontispiece of that very fine book of the late lamented Clarence Cannon, he illustrates by the quotation from the "Merchant of Venice" the folly of establishing a bad procedure to accomplish what at the moment may seem to be a desirable objective.

This is the quotation:

> BASSANIO. And I beseech you wrest once the law to your authority; to do a great right, do a little wrong.
>
> PORTIA. It must not be; * * * 'twill be recorded for a precedent, and many an error by the same example will rush into the state.

There is indeed temptation in this case to inflict the uttermost penalty rather than, in my opinion, to do justice—justice in terms of today's setting, and for the future.

Our resolution seeks to do justice.

It is difficult to banish emotion and prejudice against the Member-elect today, but we must do so if we would avoid plaguing this body in the future.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and its preamble.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 202, nays 222, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]

YEAS—202

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Ayres
Barrett
Bates
Biester
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Brasco
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Dellenback
Dent
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Farbstein
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Flood
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Halleck
Halpern
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Howard
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kupferman
Kyros
Laird
Leggett
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McEwen
McFall
MacGregor
Madden
Mailliard
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Matsunaga
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patten
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Pollock
Price, Ill.
Pucinski
Railsback
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Robison
Rodino
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ruppe
Ryan
Sandman
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Steed
Sullivan
Taft
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Whalen
Widnall
Wiggins
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—222

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Baring
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Blackburn
Blanton
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Bush
Cabell
Carter
Casey
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Colmer
Corbett
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
de la Garza
Denney
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Esch
Eshleman
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Fascell
Fisher
Flynt
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Gibbons
Goodling
Gross
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Henderson
Herlong
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Kazen
Kee
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyl
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McMillan
Machen
Mahon
Marsh
Mathias, Md.
May
Mayne
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minshall
Mize
Montgomery
Morris, N. Mex.
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
Nichols
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Pepper
Pettis
Pickle
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, Pa.
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Staggers
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Tuck
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Williams, Miss.
Williams, Pa.
Willis
Winn
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Younger
Zion
Zwach

NOT VOTING—8

Bow
Cahill
Dawson
Edwards, La.
Friedel
King, Calif.
Macdonald, Mass.
Morse, Mass.

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Cahill.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CURTIS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the resolution offered by the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Curtis as a substitute for House Resolution 278:
>
> "*Resolved*, That said Adam Clayton Powell, Member-elect from the 18th District of the State of New York, be and the same hereby is excluded from membership in the 90th Congress and that the Speaker shall notify the Governor of the State of New York of the existing vacancy."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman for the purpose of making a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CELLER. Anticipating that the Member-elect from the 18th District of New York satisfies the Constitution, and a question is raised in this resolution, would the resolution offered by the gentleman from Missouri require a two-thirds vote, in the sense that it might amount to an expulsion?

The SPEAKER. In response to the parliamentary inquiry, on the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis], action by a majority vote would be in accordance with the rules.

Mr. CELLER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York for a further inquiry.

Mr. CELLER. Insofar as the resolution of the gentleman from Missouri refers to the duration of the 90th Congress, if the Member-elect were to run again in the 18th District of New York and be elected, would the fact of the wording of the resolution preclude him from taking his seat?

The SPEAKER. That is a matter which the Chair cannot pass upon at the present time. That is a matter which, if it arises, would require consideration in the future by the House.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, is it in order to ask that the amendment be read again?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment will be reread.

The Clerk reread the amendment, as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Curtis as a substitute for House Resolution 278:
>
> "*Resolved*, That said Adam Clayton Powell, Member-elect from the 18th District of the State of New York, be and the same hereby is excluded from Membership in the 90th Congress and that the Speaker shall notify the Governor of the State of New York of the existing vacancy."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, first let me say I do intend, to the best of my ability, to yield to those who might want to discuss this proposal, but before doing so let me express concern again that this matter was not brought on the floor of the House under a rule, so that there could have been what I feel would have been the much more orderly debate, to which we are accustomed. Then we could have had general debate, amendments could have been offered and all the Members would have been privileged to take time under the 5-minute rule.

Getting back to the substance of this, this is a motion of exclusion. I can only say that there is some difference of opinion as to what vote is required on exclusion. During the debate on the resolution, for which this is a substitute, I advanced my own theory on what power was derived from the power of expulsion. I said that I felt the power of expulsion very clearly implied the right of exclusion. I do not see how anyone can argue very seriously against this implied power.

Also, if this is true, then in my own judgment exclusion would require a two-thirds vote.

Now, it is true—and I want to hasten to make this remark—there are some who feel a constitutional interpretation of the language does not require a reference to this additional power to expel. There are those who do hold that under the Constitution's clause on qualification itself this is something the Congress can do. I do not attempt to resolve that question for the Members of the House. I advance the arguments as to implied power, and I feel very strongly these arguments are sound.

Now, if I may, let me discuss the basic issue as I see it, and as I have tried to present it during the general debate. I shall not prolong this.

I pointed out that I felt too much attention in the committee report and in the debate was directed toward punishing a person when I felt that the issue was an affirmative one, that is, what does the Congress do in order to preserve itself as a body qualified to represent the people and to study and deliberate in regard to legislation. This is what I think our attention should be directed toward. That is what the term "qualification" means; when we look at the power of expulsion we see that is why it was in the Constitution. It was to give to this body the right of protecting its integrity in respect to deliberation and decision.

Now, I respected the arguments of those who said, "Well, if you open this door, then you can have no end to its extensions." I respect Senator Taft's remarks, but that had to do at the time, mind you, with what was called moral turpitude. Senator Taft said that if you got into the question of moral turpitude, you could get into the question of religion. I responded by saying that there was no such opening of a door because in the Constitution there are other provisions that prohibit us from establishing qualifications along these lines. I said I thought this was a red herring and, indeed, I think it was one; because clearly in the Constitution there is an explicit provision which says you cannot deny a person any high office, whether in Congress, the executive branch, or the judicial branch of the Government on the basis of religious tests.

However, let us get back to the issue here. To what extent does this exclusion I am recommending here "open the door"? I think we have the specific case before us. We also have the specific cases in the past where expulsion was based on treason. I said I think that the gravamen of the offense we have in this case goes to the heart of basic order in any society; namely, stealing. This case also involves forgery. The limitation here is clearly the limitation in our criminal laws. There are criminal laws that describe the kind of offenses this committee found the subject in this instance had committed. These describe what are interdicted by criminal statutes—and on conviction, by the way, a person loses many aspects of his citizenship.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I argued that for this House to get itself into a position whereby it could not protect its own integrity, to the extent of applying these kinds of qualifications——

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I shall yield to the gentleman from California as soon as I finish my main argument—that it would be restricted in a very careful way by the criminal statutes that have been enacted. I, too, think that this body has to apply its own test on these violations. This is not a criminal action we are proposing to take here. We are proposing to simply relate it to the kind of offense and not relate it to whether he would be convicted or not.

Mr. Speaker, I am simply saying that we in this body, in interpreting in our branch of the Government the relationship of these same kinds of offenses have in respect to the judicial branch of the Government—and after a proper proceeding, and so forth, in convicting a person—that these acts must be viewed by this body in testing whether or not we would expel. And, Mr. Speaker, if we have the power to expel, of course we have the power to exclude for the same basic reasons.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me go a little bit further and I will have finished all I want to say here.

Mr. Speaker, my deep concern in this area stems also from the work that six of your Members, elected to serve on the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress have been digging into in the past 2 years—and now it is going on 3 years—about what is necessary in order to make the Congress more effective. One will notice that many of the proposals that this committee—consisting of 12 members; 6 Democrats and 6 Republicans, and I happen to be the ranking Republican on this committee—has unanimously made bear upon this area.

The one thing I certainly want to call attention to, and which appears on page 45 in the final report of our joint committee, is that we recommend the creation of a Joint Committee on Congressional Operations, a very small group consisting primarily of the leaders. One of the things in our hearings and in our arguments, one will find, is the belief that the Congress needs, in effect, an attorney to be ever watchful of the powers of the Congress, particularly as they relate to the powers of the other two coordinate branches of the Government, the executive and the judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, time and time again we have seen the situation in a Supreme Court case where the congressional powers were at issue and the Congress was represented by the Attorney General. We, in effect, had no counsel of our own to plead amicus curiae in these various decisions what we in Congress, at any rate, thought were the arguments that established and bolstered the powers of the Congress.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to dwell upon that any further, other than to call attention to this question. In my judgment if an office like this were created, it would solve a great many of our problems and would solve a great many problems that confront the Congress from time to time, including the one pending before us right now.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what are the powers of the Congress in this area, and how do we best move in order to maintain and establish the dignity and integrity of the Congress?

I think that is the forthright manner in which to deal with this problem, because I reviewed what our committee was created to do, and that was to find the facts—whether, indeed, the allegations made back in January asking the gentleman to step aside were based on facts. Our committee found out what he would say if he were given an opportunity to appear before the committee. And the committee has found these facts in very strong language. I think these facts warrant his exclusion from this body—not to punish him—but in order to maintain the dignity and the quality of this so-important body that represents the people of the United States.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from California for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, if I understood from what the gentleman stated, he said that there were allegations made in this matter. Is the gentleman under the impression that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] was presented with a bill of particulars and allegations in that format, is that the gentleman's impression?

Mr. CURTIS. No. I do not think that they were actually in that format, but I think the evidence is very clear, and the members of the committee have so stated that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] was given every opportunity.

The gentleman had full knowledge of what the charges were, and he chose not even to assist the Congress in explaining what was done with the Congress' money.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of California. In line with the comments of the gentleman from Missouri, there are other questions I should like to pose.

First, as I understood the gentleman earlier today, is it the gentleman's belief that the power to exclude is derived from the power to expel, and therefore requires a two-thirds vote?

Mr. CURTIS. In my judgment, yes.

But I do want to point out that there are others who feel that the power of exclusion still rests within this first section of the Constitution. I am not commenting on that one way or another.

Mr. BURTON of California. Just to clarify the gentleman's position, as I understand it, the gentleman made allusions to certain conditions which, if found as a matter of fact by this body, would be the equivalent of that felonious conduct if similarly found under the judicial system?

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BURTON of California. In other words, if those acts which constitute a felony when found by the judiciary—are found by the House—it should be a basis for exclusion? Is that the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; that is very, very true.

Mr. BURTON of California. Then may I ask the gentleman that in arriving at any such conclusion, can we assume the gentleman would insist upon due process as we understand due process being followed in this body in establishing those facts that would form the basis for such a finding?

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is now talking about something that is very close to my heart, and it is also in the recommendations of this Joint Committee on Organization where we have pointed out that the Congress has been derelict for years in not creating a committee of ethics which will establish a code, clearly, and at the same time establish the machinery for enforcing that code.

Mr. BURTON of California. Would the gentleman be more specific, because I know the gentleman and I have a great concern in this particular area, but I would like the gentleman to particularize it to this kind of situation.

Mr. CURTIS. No. My only answer here would be that the ad hoc committee—and I am pleased to be able to say this in the presence of the committee members, the Chairman included—I think the conduct of the proceedings by the ad hoc committee was exemplary. And I believe the rights of the accused in this instance were fully protected. And I believe the manner in which this investigation was conducted was in accordance with the highest traditions of our judicial courts, or of any other fact-finding tribunal.

Mr. BURTON of California. I have one final question:

I think, given the mission of the committee, the gentleman's statement is correct, but I think if the committee were an explicit factfinding commission, as concerning conduct that would be tantamount to a felony, I am sure that the gentleman would agree with me that anyone so charged should be given a bill of particulars, his counsel should have the right to cross examine his accusers, and he should have the power to call in witnesses of his own selection.

I am also sure the gentleman would agree with me that the very essential aspect of due process was not present in the select committee's deliberations because it was not part of their primary mission.

Mr. CURTIS. Let me say to the gentleman that he has stated what I hope we will establish. But let me say beyond that, that I do not think it is necessary for the Congress to do what he describes because we are not considering endangering the life and limb of any individual as one would be in a criminal court. We are talking about a precious privilege to serve in the Congress. This is not a right—it is a privilege. I think there is all the difference in the world between the two. I still would hope that we would establish these kinds of procedures, but I do not think it is necessary here.

Mr. BURTON of California. The gentleman and I are in complete and full agreement in the sense that we are dealing with rights and privileges—one of them being the right of a given constituency in this country to elect a person of their own choosing.

Mr. CURTIS. I will grant that because hardly enough of his constituency had any opportunity to know that a tribunal would make these kinds of findings. All that existed in his community were rumors. I do not know what they will do now that there has been a careful and sober judgment rendered here. I hope that the constituency will show the responsibility for the importance of law that every other district would.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOORE. May I say on that question, a careful review of the proceedings before the select committee will indicate, first, that the Member-elect from the 18th District of the State of New York was invited to appear on an unrestricted basis; was invited to produce witnesses in his behalf; was invited to tender testimony in his behalf—all of which he either personally or by counsel refused to do.

The precedents of the House in this particular area convey to us no specific responsibility. This was an extra effort on the part of the select committee to be fair. We do not have to grant to the Member-elect an opportunity to be heard. We do not have to grant the opportunity under the precedents to summon witnesses. None of these elements were present. But to assure him of that right of an adversary proceeding, the select committee placed in its findings and recommendations that this record in its entirety be sent to the Department of Justice in order that, in the event there was a violation of criminal law or of civil law, the executive branch would institute appropriate action in an appropriate court, so that at that time the individual would then, again, have the opportunity to produce witnesses in his behalf.

Now the select committee, I believe, was more than fair—especially when you take into consideration the fact that we had no ironclad rule by which we had to grant these rights to this Member-elect. But we did it and he refused it.

Mr. CURTIS. Let me respond to the gentleman from West Virginia by again emphasizing the fine manner in which, in my judgment, the House has acted as demonstrated by the remarks of its individual Members, and the fine manner in which this committee of ours conducted itself, and did its very best to afford all rights and protections to the individual. I commend you and I think we all appreciate that.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. As the gentleman knows, from my statement during the debate, I had intended to introduce an amendment to the resolution which would have stipulated "that ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, the Representative-elect from the State of New York, ought not to have or hold a seat in the House of Representatives; and the seat to which he was elected is hereby declared vacant." This language was taken from the resolution to exclude Brigham Roberts in 1900.

I wish I had been recognized to offer my amendment. But since I was not, it does seem to me the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri answers substantially the same purpose that my amendment would undertake to do.

I do believe we have full constitutional power to refuse a Member-elect a seat in the Congress.

I have not been impressed by the committee's argument that age, citizenship, and inhabitancy were the sole requirements.

It is my opinion that the Constitution clearly spells them out as minimum requirements, both because of its wording in article I, section 2, clause 2, and because article I, section 5, clause 1 goes on to state that:

> Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own Members.

I support the gentleman's amendment and I hope it is adopted.

Mr. CURTIS. I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland and I would join with him in what he is doing.

Let me say something and this is a personal thing. I was pleased, because I do have such a high regard for him, to know that independently we have reached the same judgment about this.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's statement and his resolution. I rise in support of it.

I appreciate particularly what the gentleman said about the special committee of the 89th and the continuing resolution of the 90th Congress on "The organization of the Congress and its related agencies."

As to the question of constitutionality, let me submit to the gentleman and to the House that under 18 U.S.C. 203, there are two separate paragraphs that prove inviolably the constitutionality of the House legislating on its own Members. One is permissive and the other is mandatory. One states in part "shall be fined and shall be incapable of holding any office of honor, trust or profit under the United States."

The other paragraph states "shall be fined,"—and it gives a legitimate amount—"and may be disqualified from holding any office of honor, trust or profit under the United States."

That is the law of the land. I am referring to House Report No. 20, Union Calendar No. 1047, Resolution 1013, of the last Congress. It clearly establishes constitutionality of the House of Representatives legislating on its own membership, as does article I, section 5, paragraph 2.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York, 5 minutes, and if he needs more time, I shall be glad to yield him additional time.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the proposal to exclude Mr. POWELL from membership in this House by denying him the right to be administered the oath on a majority vote.

The Constitution expressly sets forth the qualifications for membership in the House of Representatives:

> No Person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the Age of twenty five Years, and been seven Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen. (Art. 1, sec. 2, cl. 2.)

This enumeration provides a clear standard for congressional judgment. By the very nature of its enumeration of qualifications, it is plain that the Constitution meant to exclude all others. In fact, the only other "qualification" contained in the Constitution is found in section 3 of the 14th amendment. It was not added by majority vote of the House, but required an amendment to the Constitution.

The power of exclusion is a matter of law, to be exercised by majority vote in accordance with legal principles and exists only when a Member-elect lacks some of the qualifications expressly required by the Constitution. No other rule for seating Congressmen would be compatible with democratic elections. If the Congress had broader discretion to judge the qualifications of its membership, it would have the power of final approval of elected Representatives. This power is denied Congress since there can be no proper exercise of a power to review a decision which in a democracy belongs to the electorate. If one would support the motion to exclude, one concedes that the House has the power to add qualifications. If the power to add qualifications exists and a Member-elect can be denied his seat by a majority vote of this body, then the power to expel, which under the Constitution requires a two-thirds vote, would become a nullity. The weight of the precedents and analysis of the constitutional conventions support the view that neither the States nor the Congress may add to or diminish the qualifications for membership in this body prescribed by the Constitution.

Despite a laudable record of faithful obedience to the constitutional mandate, the Congress has in rare instances of extreme political tension waivered from its usual adherence to constitutional principle and precedent. These deviations occurred in three categories of cases reflecting anti-Mormon—case of Brigham Roberts—anti-Confederate—cases of Kentucky members—and antiradical—case of Victor Berger—feeling. I urge the repudiation of such precedents which reflect the prejudices of prior eras.

Modern congressional practice of strict adherence to constitutional qualifications is required in the instant case. This House should not resurrect a long discredited view of the Constitution and follow precedent bespeaking furor instead of fairness.

I strongly urge rejection of the motion to exclude Member-elect Powell by majority vote.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri, who has been trying to get the floor.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague from Missouri for offering this amendment, and I concur with him as to his interpretation of the Constitution, which I believe is not only a reasonable interpretation, but is one which is borne out by the precedents.

However, I would ask the gentleman from Missouri one question: How far does his language reach?

Assuming that the amendment is adopted and that the resolution is adopted, the resolution states that the gentleman from the 18th District of New York is hereby excluded from the 90th Congress. My question is: Would this also preclude the gentleman from the 18th District of New York from filing for the vacancy that will be declared if the resolution is adopted?

Mr. CURTIS. In my judgment it would, but on the other hand, this would be the result of another jurisdiction, in effect, and we might, if they did proceed that way, be faced with this problem again. But I think the way this is worded, it should be interpreted in that fashion.

Mr. ICHORD. Then, assuming that the gentleman from the 18th District of New York [Mr. Powell] files and is certified again to this body as the nominee, then under the resolution of the gentleman from Missouri, under the language of his amendment, does the gentleman believe the House would again face the question?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, I do. I believe we would have to face it.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri that I am very much interested in his remarks and very much impressed with the point he makes.

I would like to point out, however, that I still feel my amendment is a somewhat better one than is the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri, even though I am inclined to feel, as he does, that this House can go beyond the mere items of age, citizenship, and residency in determining qualifications of Members.

I might say that if the parliamentary situation presents itself, I intend to offer my amendment. I believe, things having developed as they have, that some Members may be somewhat more interested in this amendment than they were a moment ago. My amendment would simply provide that we could not administer the oath of office to the gentleman from the 18th District of New York until he had first purged himself of contempt of the courts of New York State. Unless and until he does so, he is not an inhabitant.

I might say that those who feel we can act on these narrow constitutional grounds would have, if my amendment were adopted, such a constitutional basis on which to act.

May I also say to the gentleman from Missouri that regardless of whether my amendment prevails or not, he might well support my point of view. He might well agree that when we have a Member who by act and intention "openly and avowedly," in line with the wording of the report in the Beck case, in the 70th Congress, has removed himself from the State and made it clear he does not want to carry out the responsibilities of citizenship insofar as obeying the orders of the courts of his State are concerned, he is not an inhabitant of the State.

Therefore, to answer the question just raised by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Ichord], Mr. Powell could not be a candidate for reelection because he could not qualify on the grounds of inhabitancy. And this House, after all, is the only judge of whether an individual is or is not an inhabitant as the Constitution provides.

Mr. CURTIS. Let me respond to the gentleman from New York by saying, yes, I have paid attention to that argument, and I believe there is a great deal of meat in it.

This same argument has been advanced on our side in discussion, and so on.

There are many bases on which Members of this House could in their own conscience vote for the substitute I have proposed.

What we are attempting to discuss here is what might be a later interpretation, if this matter got before the courts.

Certainly the argument which the gentleman from New York is making has a great deal of merit to it, in my judgment, and would bear also on the question of whether he could run again or not.

Many other arguments advanced here could be interpreted in the same way.

There was another reason why I felt so strongly. There were many reasons that bolstered the position of exclusion, and I have not even mentioned one which to me is the deepest, perhaps—that is, "scofflaw." If there is a "scofflaw" sitting in a tribunal which is seeking to make laws, where can a society move?

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. STRATTON. I agree. I want to congratulate the gentleman for indicating that there is no conflict between his position and mine.

If my amendment were adopted, the "scofflaw" issue would have been removed. I believe those who want to follow narrow constitutional grounds will recognize that this approach does meet their view.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is correct.

I might say that the New York Times editorial, which many are familiar with, which recommended that Mr. Powell be asked to stand aside, I believe also clearly indicates that power would have to be based upon the power of Congress to deny him the seat either by expulsion or exclusion.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York, who has some data to present on this matter, for debate only.

Mr. GOODELL. As the gentleman is aware, I supported the committee resolution because I felt it was the wiser course of action, but I was troubled in the debate by what I considered to be some rather gross oversimplifications of constitutional history and the history of the Constitutional Convention itself with reference to the power to exclude.

It is my view that the House does have the power to exclude.

I felt it would have been wiser to follow the committee recommendation, but

I should like to point out for the legislative history in this debate some of the background of that Constitutional Convention.

In the case of Brigham Roberts, in 1900, when this House excluded Mr. Roberts, they went into this question at some length, and they said, among other things:

> We think it will be undoubted that every legislative body has unlimited control over its own methods of organization and the qualifications or disqualifications of its members, except as specifically limited by the organic law. We do not think that this proposition needs amplifying; it is axiomatic. It is apparent that every deliberative and legislative body must have supreme control over its own membership, except insofar as it may be specifically limited by a higher law; there is a distinction to be drawn between the legislative power of a legislative body and its organizing power, or those things which relate to its membership, and its control over the methods of performing its allotted work.

Then it goes on to quote from the very luminous argument of Mr. John Randolph in the House in 1807:

> If the constitution had meant (as was contended) to have settled the qualifications of members, its words would have naturally run thus: "Every person who has attained the age of twenty-five years, and been seven years a citizen of the United States, and who shall, when elected, be an inhabitant of the State from which he shall be chosen, shall be eligible to a seat in the House of Representatives." But so far from fixing the qualifications of members of that House, the constitution merely enumerated a few disqualifications within which the States were left to act.
>
> It is said to the States, you have been in the habit of electing young men barely of age; you shall send us none but such as are five and twenty. Some of you have elected persons just naturalized; you shall not elect any to this House who have not been some seven years citizens of the United States. Sometimes mere sojourners and transient persons have been clothed with legislative authority. You shall elect none whom your laws do not consider as inhabitants.

Then, with reference to the Constitutional Convention itself, I would point out that the first draft of the constitutional provision we are talking about providing for qualifications had language which was affirmative and positive but it was finally presented for adoption in nearly the form in which we find it now. The affirmative form was changed to negative.

> The slight contemporaneous discussion in the Constitutional Convention was upon the provision in the affirmative form. Why was it changed in the negative? Surely not for the sake of euphony. And certainly not to make it more explicitly exclusive.
>
> In the report of the committee of detail, submitting the first draft of the Constitution, this section read in the affirmative and as follows:
>
> "Every member of the House of Representatives shall be of the age of 25 years at least; shall have been a citizen of the United States for at least three years before his election, and shall be at the time of his election a resident of the State in which shall be chosen."
>
> In the discussion Mr. Dickinson opposed the section altogether, expressly because it would be held exclusive, saying he "was against any recitals of qualifications in the Constitution. It was impossible to make a complete one, and a partial one would, by implication, tie up the hands of the legislature from supplying omissions."
>
> Mr. Wilson took the same view, saying: "Besides, a partial enumeration of cases will disable the legislature from disqualifying odious and dangerous characters."
>
> The next day after this discussion, and when the clause respecting age, etc., had, in its general sense, been informally approved, a proposed section respecting a property qualification was discussed. Mr. Wilson said (Madison Papers, vol. 5, p. 404) that he thought "it would be best, on the whole, to let the section go out; this particular power would constructively exclude every other power of regulating qualifications." What did Mr. Wilson mean if the result of the discussion in which he participated on the preceding day was to "constructively exclude every other power of regulating qualifications?"
>
> In view of the objections urged by Dickinson and Wilson and their opinions as to the construction that would result and the consequences thereof the conclusion seems reasonable, if not absolutely irresistible, that the change from the affirmative to the negative form was intentionally made, and with the very purpose of obviating such objections, and hence that in being negatively stated it was considered by the convention that the particular qualifications mentioned would not be exclusive and would not render impossible the "disqualifying odious and dangerous characters" and would not prevent "supplying omissions."

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I think it is imperative in this particular debate that we point out the balancing side of this argument as to what our powers are under the Constitution to exclude. We have done it five times in this House of Representatives and have never been challenged. The history of the Constitutional Convention is by no means clear, and it is a disservice for anybody to say that it is clear the original Constitutional Convention delegates maintained that we did not have the power to exclude.

Mr. CURTIS. I want to thank the gentleman.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to ask unanimous consent that all Members wishing to speak on this matter be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD for 5 legislative days and that those who have spoken also be given permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. I make this request because I want to make this point again: It is very good that we are developing the history behind this. As I said earlier, I was disturbed about the weakening of the power of Congress. I think we are now getting back on the beam and are asserting what are the true powers of the Congress.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding, because my interest also is in the record being made today and it is with reference to this item. I would like to ask the gentleman if in his view the unanimous committee findings that are set forth on pages 31 and 32, in which specific findings are made as to the wrongful misappropriation of public funds in amounts in the committee report totaling up to over $46,000—if these findings are in his view a basic and fundamental requirement to the action that is being taken here today?

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman. Yes, indeed, they are. The basis of the discussion is that this motion of mine is a substitute, but it is based upon—and I emphasize again—the fine work that this committee did and upon its findings. Incidentally there has been little or no mention about this, but there is also a finding of forgery, which disturbs me very much.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Missouri for yielding to me at this point.

Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] knows, I supported the action to have the Member-elect from New York stand aside pending a full and fair investigation of his conduct.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the distinguished select committee came up with a recommendation that was appropriate and I supported it and voted for it.

However, Mr. Speaker, the action that I believe we are now about to take is not appropriate. We are engaged here today in an act of history—an act of history which I believe is one of doubtful constitutionality, and in any event, in contravention of the intent of the Founding Fathers.

Further, I believe it is in dereliction of a great body of precedent in the House and the other body.

I most respectfully, then, would urge the Members of this body to vote down this resolution.

Mr. CURTIS. I appreciate the point of view which has been expressed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID], but, of course, I could not disagree with the gentleman more.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding to me at this point.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], his position is that inhabitancy, citizenship, age, plus a valid certificate of election will get one to the door, but not get one in the House of Representatives, and that this House does have the power to exclude, under the conditions that since it has that power heretofore mentioned, it has the corollary power to expel.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to section 6 of article VI of the Constitution. No one has brought this question to the attention of the Members of the House today. This states that no person holding any office under the United States shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office.

Mr. Speaker, that provision has nothing to do with inhabitancy, it has nothing to do with citizenship, it has nothing to do with age. It is a specification of a condition which calls for the exclusion of someone who has all of the other stated qualifications and who meets all the other conditions which get him to the door of this House of Representatives, but under it he can still be excluded. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] is contending the same situation exists in this case and the gentleman from Missouri is urging, in order to protect the good repute of this body, it having legislatively determined that someone at the door has indulged in contempt which would in the judicial process of government involve certain criminal actions, that it is incumbent upon us in the House to protect against the shadow cast upon it, and that an act of exclusion or the exercise of the power to expel would require more than a majority vote.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman for his comments. Time is passing, but I will yield one time to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pursue this point to its ultimate conclusion as to the effect of the amendment on the possible or probable future election procedures in the State of New York.

I understand the gentleman to state that there is no lack of probability that, should the amendment carry and should exclusion be voted, this will in no way bind the electors of the 18th District of the State of New York in reelecting the Member-elect who is now under discussion.

This being the case, and assuming in due course the courts in New York dispose of the pending action involving contempt, is it not true that were the gentleman from the 18th District of New York, and who is now under discussion, to be reelected, he could quite conceivably come back to this body, be seated, and undergo none of the penalties voted by the select committee after its procedural discussion, since these penalties were voted down he would come into the House and be under no penalties whatsoever?

Mr. CURTIS. Let me say to the gentleman that the gentleman under discussion will be in exactly the same position he is in now, and the offenses would still hold, but I would suppose this body would act in the same way at that time, so I would not regard that as a very serious matter.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is that if the pending amendment, the substitute resolution, is adopted, the previous question is ordered, and the amendment is adopted, then that concludes the matter?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state there would have to be a final vote on the resolution as amended.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I had intended to include that in my parliamentary inquiry.

Then that would end it, if the final vote were taken on the resolution as amended?

The SPEAKER. When a final vote is taken on a resolution as amended, then the House has taken its final action.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the issue before the House today is both difficult and complex. Even if we were able to set aside all social, political, and racial aspects, the constitutional and legal questions would be both formidable and perplexing.

I, too, commend the select committee which has reported back its findings and recommendations with respect to Adam Clayton Powell. Their task, it must be remembered, was threefold: First, to look into the right of Mr. Powell to be sworn in as a Representative from the State of New York in the 90th Congress; second, to determine his right to hold a seat in the 90th Congress; and third, to make such recommendations to the House with respect to these questions as the committee might deem advisable.

I agree with the findings of the committee and in principle with its recommendations. It seems to me clear that the Constitution establishes only three qualifications for the seating of a Member-elect to the Congress: namely, age, citizenship, and inhabitancy. The committee has found that Mr. Powell meets these qualifications and therefore I agree with the committee that no constitutional basis exists for refusing to seat him.

The further questions arise, of course, as to whether Mr. Powell, after being seated, should be censured and otherwise disciplined or whether, because of the seriousness of his misconduct he should be expelled pursuant to article 1, section 5, of the Constitution. On the basis of the findings of the committee it seems to be abundantly clear that Mr. Powell's serious misbehavior has been established beyond any doubt. It is my view therefore that the committee has properly determined that he should be censured and disciplined.

The recommendations of the select committee in this respect are extraordinary. The disciplinary action which it suggests is unprecedented in the history of the House and is harsher than contained in any motion to censure which has been entertained by this body in its 180-year history. Those who seek to vote down the unanimous report and recommendations of the select committee and to then support a motion to exclude him—by refusing to allow him to take the oath of office—are pursuing a course which in my opinion is absolutely contrary to the language and intent of the Constitution.

While the Constitution provides that the House shall be the judge of the qualifications of its Members, article 1, section 2 makes it clear that the qualifications to be adjudged relate exclusively to age, citizenship, and inhabitancy. If these qualifications are met, a Member-elect must be seated and thereafter, of course, a Member may be punished for disorderly behavior or expelled by a two-thirds majority pursuant to article 1, section 5. I intend to vote for the resolution offered by the select committee which follows established constitutional doctrine; namely, to seat Mr. Powell, because he meets the constitutional qualifications of a Member-elect, and then to mete out disciplinary punishment.

If the resolution of the select committee is voted down, I will not support a motion to exclude Mr. Powell because such a motion in my opinion will be in clear violation of the Constitution and a precedence of the House of Representatives.

While a Member, having once been seated can be disciplined or expelled for bad behavior, there simply is no provision for excluding a Member in the first instance who meets the three basic qualifications for taking the oath of office, regardless of whatever misconduct he may have been guilty of. In such a situation, as I construe the Constitution and long-established precedence, the Member-elect must first be seated and then disciplined or expelled, depending upon the circumstances and facts of the particular case.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state why I will vote against the previous question closing debate on adoption of the preamble if such a vote comes up later. I will also vote against the preamble itself. I believe it is highly inconsistent to take the words of the preamble, on the basis of which the Celler committee unanimously registered its conclusions, and then substitute the conclusion of the Curtis substitute which is diametrically opposite. Although the words of the preamble have no effect on the force of the resolving clause of the resolution, and although they merely express the conclusions of the select committee and not the will of Congress, I still do not feel they have a place along with the conclusion we finally reach in the resolution.

Specifically, I do not feel that Mr. Powell is a bona fide inhabitant of New York, as claimed in the first section of the preamble. Otherwise, I will vote for the Curtis substitute, and will support the resolution as amended by the Curtis substitute.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the evidence as confirmed by the select committee was so damaging and so incriminating that I can see no justification, constitutionally or otherwise, for seating Adam Clayton Powell in the House of Representatives. To seat any man under such circumstances would be to endorse what I consider a completely unacceptable set of standards on moral and ethical conduct.

With an increasing disregard for law and order across the Nation, Congress must strike the first blow for responsibility and citizenship. It can do so through the example of denying Adam Clayton Powell a seat in Congress.

The immediate need is for Congress to put its house in order and set up the machinery needed to police itself. A special committee should be formed at once with instructions to hammer out a real and meaningful code of ethics. Public confidence must be promptly restored so that the entire Congress is not condemned for the misdeeds of a few errant Members.

To publicly denounce a Member, and then turn around and seat him, falls far short of our responsibility to the Nation.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the Nation are focused on this great legislative body today as we decide what action should be taken against one of its Members who has placed himself above the law and brought shame on every person and every institution within his reach. I am sure that every honorable American is watching with great interest the attitude of Congress toward one of its own Members.

The most important question is not whether ADAM CLAYTON POWELL should be punished for his serious misconduct but whether he is worthy of membership in the Congress of the United States.

A select committee has reviewed the case and determined that POWELL is a fugitive from the justice of his own State, that he has wrongfully and willfully appropriated $46,228.48 of public funds for his own use, and that his refusal to cooperate with two investigative committees authorized by the House of Representatives was contemptuous and was conduct unworthy of a Member.

Therefore, it is shocking that the committee has recommended that he be seated conditioned on being publicly censured, stripped of all seniority and his salary reduced at the rate of $1,000 per month for a total of $40,000.

My own feeling is that ADAM CLAYTON POWELL should be denied his seat, sued, and prosecuted.

No doubt we will be smothered with arguments and rationalizations against expelling a Member of Congress who meets the constitutional requirements of age, citizenship, and inhabitancy.

But we should not be concerned with smokescreens and diversionary tactics for the Constitution also provides that—

> Each House shall be judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own members.

We should not be concerned with the charge that failure to seat him would be denying the people of his district representation in the Congress for POWELL's misconduct has transcended the boundaries of his Harlem district.

We should not worry about the charge of racial prejudice for many who have found POWELL's actions most disgusting have supported civil rights legislation strongly.

We should not fear the threat of conflict with the Supreme Court if we truly believe in the concept of separation of powers in Government. It is our duty to take the necessary action to restore public confidence in our own household.

And let us not be confused by arguments that the punishment suggested by the committee is sufficient for his wrongdoing. My background includes 23 years as a prosecuting attorney in the courts of my home State, and such arguments are clearly foreign to my concept of American jurisprudence.

I will personally vote to deny ADAM CLAYTON POWELL a seat among honorable men, and I am hopeful that I will be joined by a majority of my colleagues.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution that the Member-elect from the 18th District of New York, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, be excluded from this Congress, and that the seat be declared vacant, I cannot agree with the recommendation of the select committee that he be seated and censured. If POWELL is guilty of the criminal conduct with which he is charged, and I believe he is, and it was so found by the select committee, he ought not to be seated in the U.S. Congress. If he is not guilty, he would deserve no censure. There is no in between in a case like this. On the proof and debate we have heard here, this resolution to deny the seat demands an "aye" vote, and I so urge.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I have always felt that no man who is in open violation or defiance of the law is entitled to a seat in Congress. Accordingly, on November 30, 1966, I announced my intention to oppose the swearing-in of Congressman-elect ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, unless—by January 10, 1967—he had purged himself of a criminal contempt judgment and was no longer subject to jail sentences then pending against him.

On November 29, 1966, the New York State Court of Appeals denied Mr. POWELL's appeal of an order by Mr. Justice Levy imposing a 30-day jail sentence for criminal contempt of court. The sentence to jail was the third such sentence that had been passed upon Mr. POWELL by the courts of New York State, and the appeal was the last in a series of such appeals which had been denied.

Detailed study turned up historical precedent supporting my position. In fairness to Mr. POWELL and to my fellow Members, it had to be made at that particular time. Nearly 6 weeks remained before the 90th Congress would be sworn in. These 6 weeks, I felt, afforded Mr. POWELL time enough to take the steps necessary to square himself with the courts, if he desired, after being apprised of my intentions. These 6 weeks would also give my colleagues in Congress sufficient time to study the matter and determine the action they would take if called upon to vote on seating Mr. POWELL.

It should be made clear that my proposed action with regard to Mr. POWELL was not predicated upon any acts committed in his capacity as a Member of Congress during any preceding Congresses—however fraudulent these acts may have been. I based my action solely upon his status in relation to the courts. For this, I found the main historical precedent in an action of the 56th Congress.

When the first session of that Congress convened on December 4, 1899, Member-elect Brigham Roberts, of Utah, was challenged on grounds that he had continuously and willfully violated the laws against polygamy. The House adopted a resolution to deny Mr. Roberts his seat and ordered a committee of nine members to investigate. On January 20, 1900, the investigating committee recommended the permanent exclusion of Mr. Roberts, and his seat was declared vacant.

In its report to the House, the committee concluded that the exclusion of Mr. Roberts was justified for, among other reasons, his "notorious and defiant violation of the laws of the land." The committee report—a landmark treatise of 77 pages—also advised the House that it had not only the right, but the duty, to refuse to seat a Member for any of a number of reasons, including "disloyalty and crime."

In its report, the committee expressed hope hat the House for all time would be guided by several general principles which included the following:

First. The House has never denied that it had the right to keep a Member-elect from taking his oath, even though he had met the Constitutional requirements of age, citizenship, and residency.

Second. The House, in many instances, has "affirmatively declared" that it does have the right to refuse membership to a constitutionally qualified individual.

The 56th Congress accepted that premise, as did the Congress some 19 years later in the case of Victor Burger, a Member-elect from Wisconsin who had been found guilty of treason.

When, on January 10, 1967, it became clear that Congressman-elect POWELL had failed to purge himself of the criminal contempt commitment pending against him, and apparently did not intend to do so, I asked that he stand aside during the swearing-in of Congress. A motion to exclude him, pending a committee report, was made by Mr. GERALD R. FORD, and adopted by the House. The matter of Mr. POWELL's final seating was left to the Members of the House for later action.

The select committee of nine that was appointed under the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] resolution fulfilled its arduous assignment faithfully and with an admirable spirit of bipartisanship. In substance, its report and recommendations were that Mr. POWELL was qualified to take the oath by reason of age, citizenship and inhabitancy, and that he should be sworn in subject to certain conditions. The major provisos were that he be stripped of all seniority, that he be censured and that $1,000 a month be deducted from his pay until restitution was made for a total of $40,000 in Government funds he was found to have used illegally or improperly.

Undeniably, the committee faced a difficult task, and its recommendations represented the fruits of long deliberation. That its findings would not be entirely satisfactory to everyone was to be expected. There are those, for instance, who wonder whether sufficient study was given to the question of Mr. POWELL's qualifications as an inhabitant of the State of New York.

They note, for example, that the House Committee on Elections, in a 1928 report on the definition of an "inhabitant," stated that such an individual "must have openly and avowedly, by act and word, subjected himself to the duties and responsibilities of a member of the body politic of that particular State." In refusing to respond to repeated court orders, it may be asked, is Mr. Powell "by act and word subjecting himself to the duties and responsibilities of a member of the body politic" of his State of alleged residency?

In its report, the committee made no reference to the fact that Mr. Powell was and is "living in open defiance of the law." It was just such contempt of the law by Brigham Roberts that led to the strongest precedent for excluding a Member of the House. The committee apparently has ignored this precedent in making its recommendations for the resolution of the case against Mr. Powell. But the penalties suggested by the committee would, in fact, be imposed for offenses committed prior to the convening of the present Congress. The House, traditionally, has been reluctant to mete out punishment to Members for actions taken in prior Congresses. I, for one, have no affection for this tradition. I only wish to point out now that the committee's recommendations seem to overlook established precedent on the one hand while suggesting action that departs from tradition on the other.

In calling for Mr. Powell to stand aside on January 10, I acted in accordance with my conscience. Having taken that action, and having voted my convictions, I am content to abide by the ultimate decision of the House.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, most of us learned in our youth to honor and respect the office of a Member of Congress. We were taught that any man chosen to represent all of the people of his district must be a man of honesty, integrity, and some wisdom.

We learned of scandals which occurred during the history of our Nation, but we were taught that the Congress of the United States would not allow corruption by public officials to go unpunished.

Today we are asked to determine what penalty shall be imposed upon one of our own. We have chosen nine of our esteemed colleagues to serve as a select committee to advise us, and they have reported to us.

They have reported that Adam Clayton Powell has repeatedly asserted a privilege and immunity from the processes of the courts in his home State not authorized by the Constitution; has been held in civil and criminal contempt; has wrongfully appropriated more than $44,000 in public funds by having salary drawn on behalf of his wife in defiance of public law; has wrongfully appropriated public funds by placing an individual on the payroll of the committee of which he was chairman in the amount of $214.79 in order that she might do domestic work for him in Bimini; wrongfully appropriated $72 of public funds by ordering the purchase of air transportation by the committee of which he was chairman for travel for his own son, an employee, and personal friends, none of whom had any connection with the official duties of the committee; misappropriated $461.16 of public funds by giving an employee of the committee airline tickets for three vacation trips to Miami, Fla.; falsely certified payment from public funds of vouchers totaling $1,291.92 covering transportation of other committee staff members, when, in fact, he and a female staff employee had incurred such expenses as part of private travel to Bimini; and made false reports on expenditures of foreign exchange currency to the Committee on House Administration.

The special committee now recommends that we seat Mr. Powell, censure him, strip him of his seniority, and require him to pay $40,000 through deductions from his congressional salary to offset liability to the U.S. Government.

Mr. Speaker, if a member of the President's Cabinet were ever to be found guilty of having wrongfully and willfully appropriated some $44,000 of public funds for his own use, and made false certifications as to expenditures, would the Members of this House allow the President to punish that man by requiring him to pay back the money misappropriated and by demoting him to a lower Cabinet rank? I think we all know the answer. It is a resounding "No."

If Mr. Powell is guilty of the offenses as our special committee has found, a vote to seat him would be a vote to seat right along beside him every charge of corruption against the Congress of the United States. His guilt, abuses, and illegal actions will taint all of us so long as he remains a Member of Congress. It is inconceivable that we should allow this man to be seated.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, the arguments and debate on the floor here today have been scholarly and persuasive on both sides. My feelings have already been expressed for the most part and I can add little to what has been said.

Many Members here at this very moment are still wrestling with the problem of how to vote on this issue. Should we seat Adam Clayton Powell and punish him, or should we refuse to seat him?

I think my young son pretty well resolved this question for me with one question. He said:

> Daddy, if Congressman Powell did everything the papers say he did, how can he stay in Congress?

What is the answer to that question? The young people all over this country are asking the same question.

Yesterday's paper carried the news item that 36 fine young men had been forced to resign from the Air Force Academy because they were guilty of cheating. Are we going to tell these young men that if they cheat under the honor system they cannot cheat and be a cadet at the Air Force Academy, but that a Member of Congress of the United States—the greatest legislative body in the world—can, in effect, steal public funds, violate his public trust, flout the courts and become a fugitive from justice, and still be a Member of Congress? I say the answer is "No." And we should say so today in a voice that every boy and girl—every man and woman—can readily understand and applaud.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the substitute resolution proposed by the gentleman from Missouri.

The substitute resolution would exclude from the 90th Congress the representative whom the people of the 18th Congressional District in New York have overwhelmingly chosen. Thus, this resolution would punish, not the man who by his actions has brought discredit upon himself and the Congress, but the people of the 18th Congressional District of New York.

The distinguished special committee of nine, appointed to investigate and report on this matter, concluded unanimously that the three qualifications for Congress stated in the Constitution, age, citizenship, and residency, were intended to be exclusive qualifications, and that the Congress did not have the power to add to them. The proposed substitute resolution flies in the face of this conclusion by nine distinguished lawyers and proceeds upon the opposite conclusion, namely, that the Congress' power to exclude Members-elect is not limited in any way.

I believe that this is a dangerous precedent. Based upon the action which appears to be impending here today, the day may well come when Representatives-elect may be excluded from the Congress because their views are unacceptable to the majority.

The special committee of nine had recommended drastic and unprecedented punishment for Adam Clayton Powell, but it was punishment which was within the power of the Congress to impose. In my judgment, the proposed substitute would have Congress exceed its powers under the Constitution. As the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee said during the debate, this action may well put the Congress on a collision course with the judiciary branch of our Government. A constitutional crisis may well result which will weaken the structure of our Government and which could easily be avoided by adopting the resolution recommended by the committee.

Whatever disposition is made of this particular case, it is vital that there be a restoration of public confidence in the Congress in this time of crisis and change.

I think it essential that a comprehensive and effective code of ethics be promulgated applicable to Congressmen and employees of the Congress. I believe that enforcement of such a code should be assigned to a committee which has no other functions and which, by its bipartisan character would create confidence in its judgments. In effect, we need a new mechanism to deal with this problem.

Last year, before the problems involving Mr. Powell arose, I introduced a bill which included a broad disclosure provision designed to minimize the danger of conflict of interests. I note that this is not included in the bill recommended by the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct of the 89th Congress chaired by Congressman BENNETT, and I believe this is a serious omission.

I generally agree, however, with the purposes and approach outlined in the select committee's report. However, I find it weak in that the proposed Select Committee on Ethics would be powerless to act except on a written, sworn complaint filed by one Member against another. This is unduly restrictive. If we are to have a watchdog committee, it should have the responsibility to investigate possible wrongdoing without limiting it to cases in which one Member may be willing publicly to protest against the actions of a colleague.

I am prepared to support establishment of the proposed new Ethics Committee and hope that, as established, it will be even more effective and far reaching than is now proposed. If no steps are taken to preclude any future conduct of the type we are reviewing today, then we will lend credibility to the charges that Mr. POWELL is the victim of discrimination.

For our own protection and for the purpose of protecting and advancing the good name of the House of Representatives, we should proceed without delay to demonstrate our determination that no improper conduct will be tolerated in this House.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I add these brief comments to the many words that have been spoken on the floor of this House this afternoon. For the first 2 hours of the debate, I hoped to be able to support the resolution which was reported to the House by the select committee chaired by the very able gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

I did not believe, Mr. Speaker, that that resolution was perfect. I did not believe that it was perfect justice to require from the Representative-elect from New York, as the price of a seat, the kind of punishment that was provided for in the resolution as originally reported. I was not prepared to vote with pleasure to censure and humiliate and to punish with a degree of severity unprecedented in the history of the House a duly elected Member for misbehavior which was largely conjectural, and which, if true, was neither unique nor unprecedented. But I was prepared to vote for the resolution as the closest approximation of justice which I thought the House would accept.

I was, Mr. Speaker, overoptimistic in my estimate of the House's temper. It seems, at this point, that the violent and well-organized anti-Powell campaign which has been carried on from one part of this country to another will not be satisfied with anything less than the exclusion from this Chamber of ADAM POWELL. I cannot and will not vote for that.

The issue transcends the personal privileges or position of the Representative-elect from New York. While I have never been among those who derive deep personal satisfaction from throwing stones at ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, I am willing to admit that his personal right to a seat in this House ranks second in my mind to the right of his constituents—450,000 Americans—to be represented in this body by a man of their own choice.

Representation in this House is not a privilege, casually to be taken away from 450,000 free people because we do not like the way they wish to exercise it. If the people of my district, or of any district in the Nation, have the right to have their own voice, freely elected, speak for them in this Chamber, the 18th District of New York deserves that right. If they do not deserve it, if we can lightly take away from them the right to be represented here, the same thing can be done to any one of us. Someone said at the beginning of this controversy, last January 10:

> They are determined to show the people of Harlem that they can't have a Congressman until they will find one who will shuffle a little.

Someday, Mr. Speaker, this decision may return to haunt us all. Someday, other districts may be told they are not entitled to have representation because their choice is not sufficiently conservative, or liberal, or does not go to the right church, or does not belong to the right political party. These considerations, I admit, are not remotely related to those which are alleged to be the reasons for excluding ADAM C. POWELL from the seat to which he was elected. But neither the reasons I have just listed, nor the reasons which are publicly cited for excluding ADAM POWELL, have any relationship to the constitutionally prescribed qualifications for a seat in this body. If we can lightly violate the Constitution today for the reasons alleged in some of the speeches we have heard on this floor, we can just as lightly break it next year, for other reasons, also not listed in the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, there have been many charges outside of this Chamber, though the subject has been generally avoided here today, of racism in connection with this case. For my own part, I can agree neither with those who assert that the entire thing stems from racial considerations, nor with the fervid assertions of those who state that there are no racial overtones whatever involved.

The select committee which presented House Resolution 278 to the House proposed very severe punishment for Mr. POWELL. I had reservations about the provisions of that committee's report. But that resolution—or a thousand like it—could not persuade me that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has turned in the slightest degree away from a lifetime of courageous leadership in the field of human equality. The gentleman is, in my considered judgment, incapable of bigotry. It simply is foreign to his entire nature. The same can be said of most of the members, Republicans and Democrats, on the select committee. Last January 10, this House gave these nine men a difficult, thankless task to do, and they did it with care, with diligence, and with honor. My reservations as to the correctness of their decision does not extend to the credit I believe they deserve for their work. Unfortunately, this House, by the vote of many of the same men who called for the select committee to be established, has decided to ignore their careful scholarship and their recommendations, and indulge in punishment of a more drastic nature.

But not even all those who voted to repudiate the committee they had established were guilty of "racism, pure and simple." There is little that is pure, and less that is simple about this entire situation.

Neither can I agree with those who have asserted that the question of racism does not enter into the Powell case. We have been told that "if the gentleman from New York were white, he would have been punished long since." Like who, Mr. Speaker? Is ADAM CLAYTON POWELL the only sinner in this House? Does this House have such a long and complex list of precedents of censuring and demoting and fining Members who do not meet its high moral standards? I can think of a few cases in recent years where Members of this House were guilty of far greater moral and even criminal offenses than the gentleman from New York is even charged with, and yet I cannot remember that the House took action. We left punishment for these offenses to the voters of these Members' districts.

There is some reason, surely, that the Powell case alone has given rise to such drastic punishment. I find it impossible to shake the conviction that a large part of the intense public compaign against Mr. POWELL stems from the fact of his race. Some of this stems directly from the view entertained in many quarters of this country that the Negro enjoys the rights of full citizenship only on a tentative basis—that if a Negro offends community sensibilities in any way, he and all other Negroes should be made to suffer for it, while white men who commit the same sins are judged by a different, more lenient standard, and their punishment is not visited upon the white community as a whole.

ADAM POWELL is being judged, not for his sins alone. He is being punished for the statements of Stokely Carmichael and the bad poetry of Cassius Clay and the sins of every other Negro in the country, just exactly as every law-abiding decent Negro citizen finds the pattern of discrimination against him "justified" by the argument that some Negroes break the law. This concept of joint responsibility for each other's shortcomings is a handicap that white Americans would have risen up in arms against had it been visited upon them, as it has been visited upon every minority group in this country.

No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept the notion that ADAM POWELL is being punished by colorblind justice. I, too, have read the mail that has been cited as "evidence of deep public concern." Let me quote some of the mail that I received for the RECORD.

> Shame on you and Congressman ———. You are both nigger lovers. We will remember you at the polls next election.

That postcard was, of course, anonymous. I received, naturally, some letters opposed to Mr. POWELL which avoided using racial slurs, and a few which did not even seem to be motivated by racial ill will. But the mail I have received on this subject left no doubt in my mind that it was largely motivated by the notion that a Negro Congressman ought to be more circumspect, more humble, and more "grateful" than his white colleagues need to be. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that whatever may be the motives of individual Members in this case, the effort to exclude the gentleman from New York could not have succeeded, and might not even have been attempted, had ADAM C. POWELL done everything he is accused of doing, but had he been—to coin a phrase—"less colorful." And I think, Mr. Speaker, that we all know that to be true.

And I believe, too, Mr. Speaker, that there would not have been the intense newspaper and other public pressure—which dates back to the very day Mr. POWELL assumed the chairmanship of the Education and Labor Committee—had he not been so vigorous and so successful a fighter for long-needed economic, social, educational, and labor legislation. This, too, while not cited in the select committee's report and while never mentioned in the editorials that demand ADAM CLAYTON POWELL's scalp—this, too, I say, is part of the "case against" ADAM CLAYTON POWELL.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote against the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri, and, if it passes, against the resolution as amended. I cannot vote to deny the people of the 18th District of New York their representation among us. I suspect that those people, who have borne generations of injustice with an undiminished optimism about democracy that shames their more fortunate fellow citizens, will not learn from this episode to "elect someone who is willing to shuffle a little."

I suspect they will continue to choose as their Representative a man who is a courageous spokesman for their interests and their rights. I hope they do. I hope they continue to send us Representatives who are 25 years of age, inhabitants of the State, and citizens of the United States for 7 years or more—and who, otherwise, meet such qualifications as the sovereign people of the 18th District wish to impose. I hope, too, that this House, when it gets over its present frame of mind, will once again recognize that it is the people in their several districts and not just a majority of the Members of this House who are supposed to decide who can and who cannot sit here among us.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the select committee under the experienced and wise guidance of one of the most respected Members of this House, Mr. CELLER, deserves our commendation for performing a very delicate task without rancor or sensationalism. However, due to the serious nature of the allegations, I believe the defendant, Mr. POWELL, is now entitled to all the protection of a regular adversary proceeding.

One of the committee's recommendations already provides the framework for this protection by referring certain of its preliminary findings to the Justice Department. If the Department considers the evidence sufficient, I am certain that this matter will end up in the courts where Mr. POWELL will then have the opportunity to face his accusers and properly defend himself according to the tradition of our judicial system. Any action short of this would deny him his proper rights. Additionally, I consider the recommendations regarding censure and involving Mr. POWELL's seniority extremely excessive in view of the fact that already he has been divested of his most valuable privilege, chairmanship of the House Education and Labor Committee. To have lost the prestige and prerogatives of this important office in effect already censures him and already has effected the most significant aspect of his seniority.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart, indeed, that I feel compelled to address the House today on an issue that affects the future of a former Member who served 24 years in this House and who, in absentia except perhaps for occasional appearances in the pulpit of the church he serves as pastor, was elected to yet another term in this body.

It is always a matter for serious soul-searching when our decision affects so intimately the life of an individual. The effect of our decision today will have far-reaching effects not alone upon this one man but upon each and every one of us and upon the future of this great legislative body of our Government.

In a sense, the issue of whether or not to seat ADAM POWELL, to allow him to associate himself with us as a Member of this House, is made almost academic by the report of the House select committee which details many of his activities through the last few years and which reflects his utter disregard of the rules of this House and respect for its Members, to say nothing of his disregard of his moral responsibilities as a clergyman and a representative of the people. The issue before us is not only whether or not ADAM POWELL should be seated but whether or not the integrity of this body is to be preserved and whether or not the faith and respect of the American people in representative government shall suffer serious damage.

I feel compelled as a clergyman who has spent 25 years in active parish work to bring to you a point of view from my walk of life, which I believe must be added to this debate because too often this point of view is ignored in the deliberations of those whose only concern is for the technical correctness of legal procedures without due regard for the even more basic consideration of whether what is to be done is morally correct.

The genius of our form of government rests in the fact that among the persons the people choose to represent them on all levels of government, and the Federal level is no exception, are persons from every walk of life who bring to bear on their legislative deliberations the best of their thinking, their knowledge, their experience. It is with regret that among the three Members of this House who represent the profession of ordained clergymen is one against whom we must take some action in order to preserve the integrity of this House. As one of the remaining two I cannot be silent.

I have a profound respect for the integrity and ability of those of the legal profession and have in a sense a humble pride in the privilege granted me to be associated with such outstanding men of the legal profession as the chairman of this select committee, the Honorable EMANUAL CELLER, of New York, and my very personal friends representing the minority side of the aisle, ARCH A. MOORE of West Virginia; CHARLES M. TEAGUE of California; CLARK MACGREGOR of Minnesota, and especially, VERNON W. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I am sure that if I knew the other members of this select committee as well as those whom I mentioned I would have equal pride in my association with them.

These very able men have approached the matter of whether or not to permit ADAM POWELL to be seated from the very definitive point of view of the legal technicalities involved in the issue. It is correct and understandable that they should have done so. With this I have no quarrel. It would be somewhat more than disappointing if they had not. The fact that equally honest and capable men of the legal profession disagree with their conclusions and suggest that the right of this House to be the judge of the qualifications of its Members is not limited to the criteria outlined in article I, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution compels me to state the issue before us from the moral point of view and I hasten to add, not without justification.

I have no personal feeling of ill will toward Mr. POWELL, I feel sorry for him because of his disgraceful display of arrogance and his utter lack of regard for the moral and legal responsibilities that are his as a member of the cloth and a representative of the people. The real tragedy is that with his intellect and ability, and I would like to believe dedication to service, that perhaps prompted him to seek a seat in this House when he was first elected, he has denied to this country the leadership of which he is capable—leadership which is needed to bring understanding and mutual respect between the peoples of our Nation that could hasten the reconciliation that is needed to effect responsible and orderly change in a world in which society is making unprecedented readjustments. However, the fact that I feel sorry for him and wish circumstances for him and the House would be different than they are, in no way deters me from seeking justice either for Mr. POWELL or for this body in which he served for 24 years or for such action that will not only apply equal demands upon others who might be guilty of equal offense but will protect this House from future embarrassment.

I am deeply concerned that justice be done; that the people of his district have the kind of representation they deserve and that he is not permitted to continue to be an offense to those with whom he must work to fashion legislation.

I will vote to deny Mr. POWELL a seat in this House not because I have any personal desire to further embarrass him, not because the majority of the people of my district, most of whom have limited knowledge and understanding of the nature of the decision we are here forced to make, would want me to do so, but because by his own words he has served notice to this House that he has no regard for the character and integrity of those of us with whom he would have to serve if he were sworn in; because by his own admission he is either incapable of knowing right from wrong or else he is indifferent toward his responsibility in this regard.

I will vote to deny him a seat in this House because I do not believe in various levels of congressional representation. He is either fit to act in the full capacity of a representative of his district or he is unfit to serve in this House. If we would ever want to set the stage for continuous demonstrations and pressures against us, we are asking for it when we are willing to accept him as a second-class Member by denying him the full opportunity of serving his district and this would be done not only by denying him seniority rights but by the refusal of most of us to accept him as a colleague of equal stature.

I will vote to deny him a seat in this House because I believe he should not be permitted to further stain the image of the House of Representatives.

I will vote to deny him a seat in this House because to do otherwise would, in my opinion, serve notice to the law-abiding citizens of this land that we have a double standard, one for the citizen, the other for a public servant.

I will vote to deny him a seat in this House because at present he is a fugitive from justice and, until he is willing to face up to the charges, or at least the courts have made a ruling in this matter, I cannot in conscience feel I would be serving the best interests of the people of my district who are forced to abide by the laws he would help to frame but from which he claims immunity.

Law is never any better than the character and integrity of the men who write the laws, or those who administer them or those who interpret them. We have a moral as well as a technical legal obligation to protect the integrity of our laws. While it can be argued that he is only one among 435 lawmakers, it was his boast recently in a news interview that he had authored 60 pieces of legislation, all of which passed into law.

Our laws are built upon a moral foundation. If that foundation be destroyed, the whole structure of law will fall, no matter how many technical legal devices are devised to hold it together.

Let me take Mr. POWELL's own words to point out his lack of respect for Members of this House with whom he would be expected to cooperate in the fashioning of legislation. Standing in the well of this House on January 10, 1967, he said, and now I quote from the daily House Journal of that date:

> There is no one here who does not have a skeleton in his closet. I know and I know them by name.

I have no skeletons in my closet that I know of. I am not anxious to cover up anything and I doubt if 99 percent of this House have skeletons in their closets. What a neat way to take the onus of guilt from one's shoulders; accuse everyone else. Mr. POWELL, as a clergyman at least, should not hope to justify what he has done merely because others may be as guilty as he in varying degrees. He must know that he must answer for himself. If all 434 of his colleagues lied and cheated and robbed the others of their substance, there is no moral law nor civil law that would justify the 435th member for committing the same offenses. If Mr. POWELL has convinced himself that all of the Members of this House are crooks, he needs help, not membership in the order.

Mr. POWELL, leaning upon the respect the public has displayed for men of the cloth, then proceeded to quote scripture: "He who is without sin should cast the first stone." Had Mr. POWELL, who certainly does not lack for a knowledge of scripture, bothered to quote in context the full impact of the scripture he so capably quoted, he would have told you that the woman being charged was subject to stoning under the law and that when no one proceeded to throw the stone, He turned to the woman and said, "Go and sin no more."

The House, I am sure, would be willing to forgive and forget the past would Mr. POWELL be willing to admit his guilt, but he stood before this House justifying his conduct as if he had no guilt at all.

It was shortly after his statement, "He who is without sin should cast the first stone," that he added, "Gentlemen, my conscience is clear, my case is in God's hands."

I submit that, based on the report of this committe, we are either not talking about the same ADAM POWELL or he does not in his own mind consider himself guilty of having done anything wrong. This being the case, can we vote to seat a man who takes what he has been doing as the norm for living and expects the people of this Nation to have respect for the House?

Gentlemen, there comes a time in the history of individuals and nations when the moral demands of God must take precedence over the technical interpretations of the laws of men. Our Nation is witnessing chaos and crime unlike that of any period in our history. Of course, there is more than one reason for this condition. Underlying it all is a moral breakdown in standards of conduct in faith and in the basic element of intergrity. This House must lead the Nation by example as well as by legislation into a more stable society in which moral foundations are again restored. We cannot expect our people to accept standards we are not willing to impose upon ourselves.

If I were a member of the board of directors of a corporation and was faced with the decision of whether or not to deny membership on this board of directors to one who had no regard for the integrity of the other members of that board and who was loose and irregular in his misuse of the funds of that corporation, I would have no doubt as to my decision nor of what my stockholders would want me to do. I am a member of the board of directors of this great Nation. Faced with this present decision, my conscience directs me to do what I must to preserve the integrity of the corporation on whose board of directors I am privileged to serve. Since Mr. POWELL by his own admission can see no wrong in what he has done, the report of the select committee notwithstanding, we would have to conclude that he would not mend his ways if he were again granted membership on this board of directors.

Mr. POWELL closed his remarks on January 11 by saying, "My case is in the hands of God."

I agree with Mr. POWELL that his case is in the hands of God. It is incumbent upon all of us to recognize that we are all instruments in the hands of God.

His case will also be in the hands of the courts.

But we must face the awful reality that today his case is in our hands. We must decide whether it is more necessary to bend to the letter of the law as interpreted by some very able lawyers; to publicly humiliate him and to satisfy a desire to punish him—although it may well be that the courts may well mete out justice and punishment due him—or to protect the integrity of the House; the respect for representative government and the interests of the people we represent. There is certainly room here for a decent difference of opinion in whatever course we choose to take. I trust that we will temper our sense of mercy and justice with commonsense.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the Curtis substitute on two principal grounds.

First, in a matter of the kind presented in the case of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, the proceedings against him have a quasi-judicial character. The select committee which considered the charges against Mr. POWELL did its work diligently. Despite its bipartisan makeup, it returned a unanimous report to this House. It is my judgment that under these circumstances, the deliberations and conclusions of that committee should be sustained unless there are compelling reasons to set them aside. I found no such compelling reasons in this case. I do fear that the unwillingness of the House to accept the recommendations of this select committee flows from the widespread popular reaction against ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. This reinforces my conviction that the committee's findings should be sustained lest the House yield to pressure on a matter peculiarly within the province of this House to determine.

Second, the procedure incorporated in the Curtis substitute permits a Member to be deprived of his seat by a simple majority vote, notwithstanding the lack of any claim that Mr. POWELL has not met the constitutional qualifications. To deprive a Member-elect of his seat in this House is a very grave matter. As in the case of removal of other officials, it should require a two-thirds vote. Thus, as a matter of precedent and commonsense, I believe it is wrong for the House to proceed on a course requiring only a one-vote majority.

In all of this, Mr. Speaker, I hold no brief for the conduct of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. But I do believe it is essential that, though there is widespread concern, the House give even more attention to the importance of maintaining procedures which will safeguard the interests of everyone concerned.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, this House and indeed the Nation owes a distinct debt of gratitude to our distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. Curtis]. Although I voted in favor of House Resolution 278, and support the report of the select committee established pursuant to House Resolution 1, I certainly do so with some reservations.

Among my reservations are the committee's implication that this House does not have the constitutional power to either exclude or expel a Member whose actions have been in clear violation of the law and thus brought disrepute to this body.

The substitute offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] brings this issue into clear focus and if it is adopted, I shall support it on final passage.

In my opinion, the record that we have established in the debate here today shows clear justification for excluding the Member-elect from New York [Mr. Powell]. In addition to the findings of the select committee, which are part of the record, it is clear to me, as has been pointed out here, that his actions have been in direct contempt of this body. Surely we have the power to punish by exclusion or otherwise a Member who is in continuing and flagrant contempt of the House.

It is not my purpose here to repeat or discuss the many arguments that have been brought forth in the debate. However, I do particularly wish to praise the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] for impressing on this body the importance of the work of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, of which I am a member. I hope that this situation today will add fresh urgency to the need for immediate and aggressive action by this House to set our house in order.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, serious constitutional history is being written here today and I, for one, have doubts that it is being written sensibly.

I voted for the previous question on the original resolution presented by the select committee because I feared that if the matter were opened to hastily conceived amendments, the parliamentary situation would become tangled and sober, mature thought would not be possible.

The debate which has resulted and the confusion which prevails in this Chamber at this moment proves the wisdom of my vote.

Mr. Speaker, I am a strong constitutionalist. I bitterly resent the conduct of Adam Clayton Powell and earnestly desire the opportunity to inflict the punishment upon him which his wrongdoings deserve. But I will not do this by using the Constitution as a document of convenience.

In my opinion, the section of the Constitution which empowers Congress to determine and pass upon the age, citizenship, and inhabitancy of a Member-elect is clear and absolute. In my opinion, these words do not give the Congress any right to exclude a Member-elect except for failure to meet one or more of these three requirements. This, in my opinion, is all Congress is empowered to do insofar as exclusion is concerned.

The matter of expulsion is different. Clearly the Congress has the right to set up standards and qualifications for a Member and can expel a Member by a two-thirds vote for violation of these qualifications. But, it should be noted he must be a Member before he can be expelled.

To exclude a Member-elect on qualifications other than the three mentioned in the Constitution is to invite a court case and bring the judicial and legislative branches of government together on a collision course.

Furthermore, if we are to start the practice of placing new interpretations on the Constitution for the purpose of fitting them to specific instances or cases, then we are embarking on a dangerous practice which could be subject to future abuse. Who knows where it might end?

The strength of our Constitution is its consistency and we should not urge an inconsistent interpretation to exclude under a majority vote when the proper course is to expel by a two-thirds vote.

Had we passed the committee's recommendations, Adam Clayton Powell would have been seated and he would have been punished. Furthermore, he would still be liable to expulsion.

If the Curtis amendment is adopted, a legal cloud will be cast over our action. I, personally, would favor seating him and then doing the thing which is clearly proscribed by the Constitution and is subject to no doubt whatsoever. We should seat him and then expel him.

I shall vote against the previous question on the Curtis amendment simply because I believe future and perfecting amendments should be allowed. But if the previous question is ordered, then I will be placed on the horns of an impossible dilemma.

Mr. Speaker, I want to expel Adam Clayton Powell, by seating him first, but that will not be my choice when the Curtis amendment is before us. I will be forced to vote for exclusion, about which I have great constitutional doubts, or to vote for no punishment at all. Given this raw and isolated issue, the only alternative I can follow is to vote for the Curtis amendment. I shall do so, Mr. Speaker, with great reservation.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the question before the House today is highly complex and deeply troubling. It touches not only upon a matter of public policy, but also upon an issue of private justice toward an individual, and upon the very integrity of the House itself.

There is much to be said about each of these aspects—but the specific decision that must first be made is the acceptance of the report of the select committee. I cannot accept the report as written, and briefly direct my remarks to the third recommendation made by the report, which provides:

> That Adam Clayton Powell, as punishment, pay to the Clerk of the House to be disposed of by him according to law, $40,000. The Sergeant-at-Arms of the House is directed to deduct $1,000 per month from the salary otherwise due the said Adam Clayton Powell and pay the same to said Clerk, said deductions to continue while any salary is due the said Adam Clayton Powell as a Member of the House of Representatives until said $40,000 is fully paid. Said sums received by the Clerk shall offset to the extent thereof any liability of the said Adam Clayton Powell to the United States of America with respect to the matters referred to in the above paragraphs 3 and 4 of the preamble to this resolution.

I object strongly to the use of the words "as punishment" in connection with the provision for repayment of the funds that the select committee has determined, as a finding of fact, were public funds "wrongfully and willfully appropriated—for his own use." I cannot conceive of a situation where the payment of a just debt could be construed to be "as punishment." This is particularly difficult to accept when the repayment is to be made from public funds placed in the House salary account, and in $1,000 installments insufficient to cover the alleged misappropriation within the 22 months remaining in the 90th Congress.

But over and above this question of propriety, I must agree with the constitutional point raised by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Conyers], that the imposition of this punishment is of doubtful validity. The Constitution guarantees that "no person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury—nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." Thus I would conclude that this House does not have the power to order this relatively meaningless game of pitching pennies back and forth.

This conclusion is fortified by an analogy to the provisions of article I, section 3 of the Constitution, relating to the power of impeachment. It is there specified that upon conviction by two-thirds of the Members present:

> Judgment in Cases of Impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from Office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any Office of Honor, Trust or Profit under the United States; but the Party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to Indictment, Trial, Judgment, and Punishment, according to Law."

There is, at the very least, an implication that the Constitutional Convention was attempting to avoid the creation of any sort of legislative tribunals or parliamentary magistrates. I am convinced that the attempt to collect any debts due the United States or to impose any fine or "punishment" should not be undertaken by the Congress, but must be the responsibility of the Attorney General and the courts.

I am forced to reject the recommendation of the select committee and to vote against the previous question.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] to exclude the Member-elect, Adam Clayton Powell, from membership in the 90th Congress presents grave constitutional and policy questions.

There is no doubt that ADAM CLAYTON POWELL was duly elected by the voters in the 18th Congressional District. This is not similar to the Mississippi delegation challenge which I initiated at the beginning of the 89th Congress. In that case there was a clear disenfranchisement of substantial numbers of voters. The question was not the qualifications of the individual Members-elect but the unconstitutionality of the process by which they were elected. Although there was overwhelming evidence to show that their elections were unconstitutional, the House voted to seat the five Members-elect from Mississippi. In fact, many of my colleagues, who are so anxious to exclude Mr. POWELL, stated at the time of the Mississippi challenge that to exclude Members of the House would set a very dangerous precedent.

When the issue is not the unconstitutionality of his election but the qualifications of the individual Member-elect, then indeed exclusion is a dangerous precedent.

If today the House is able to exclude a member because it disapproves of his conduct, tomorrow the House may feel free to do so because it disapproves of opinions, philosophy, or political action. Although the conduct may be reprehensible and the views repugnant or controversial, the democratic process is only as strong as our faith in the judgment of the voters.

In our democracy it is up to the voters to choose their representatives. When the voters have free choice and full opportunity to exercise their franchise, we should not substitute our judgment for theirs. To do so undermines the right to vote, the very foundation of our democratic form of government.

That is not to say the House cannot take measures to insure proper conduct of its Members. The House can and should pass a code of ethics which applies equally to all Members. The House can also deprive a Member of his position in the House. In fact, the Democratic caucus has already severely punished Congressman POWELL by depriving him of his committee chairmanship.

The exclusion of a Member is not only a dangerous precedent but it also raises grave constitutional questions. This amendment is particularly subject to constitutional objections since the expressed purpose is to prevent the Member-elect from being seated if he runs for reelection and is again elected by his constituents. Since in all likelihood he will be overwhelmingly reelected if he chooses to run again, the amendment before us may very well disenfranchise the people in the 18th Congressional District for the duration of this Congress. Does the House have the right to do this under the Constitution?

Mr. Speaker, there is also the basic question of whether or not the House has the right to question the qualifications of an individual Member-elect other than the three set forth in article I, section 2, of the Constitution, which states:

> No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained the age of twenty-five years, and been seven years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

Able constitutional lawyers, including distinguished members of the select committee, believe that the House cannot constitutionally exclude a duly elected Member-elect who possesses the requisite qualifications of age, citizenship and inhabitancy.

The Curtis amendment to exclude does not rest upon a challenge to the Member-elect's qualifications under article I, section 2 of the Constitution.

The Curtis amendment would deprive the voters of the 18th Congressional District of their right of representation. If the voters are not permitted to be the final arbiters of a Representative's eligibility to be a Member of this body, then the fabric of our democracy is impaired.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the recommendations of the select committee because I believe them to be inadequate for the offenses enumerated in its report. There is a listing in this report of misconduct on the part of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL that involves both abuse of his prerogatives as a powerful committee chairman and contempt of the courts of the State of New York to a degree that is shocking and unprecedented by a man in his position.

His actions were even more despicable because the moneys he misused were available to him on the assumption that a responsible chairman of one of the House's major committees would have the honor and respect to utilize his privileges only in the service of his constituents and the Nation.

Yet this report uses language similar to that of a criminal indictment to describe the manner in which funds were diverted for personal purposes.

I cannot believe that censure of a man like this who has already mocked the dignity of the judiciary and flaunted his disregard for his colleagues and their opinions would be any punishment at all.

And I further have grave reservations about the wisdom of the fine that was recommended by the committee. For one thing, the terms of repayment make an absolute assumption that the people of the 18th District of New York will return this man to office again in the 91st Congress.

Second is the legal question of the bearing such restitutional payment would have on possible criminal action to be taken by the Justice Department in this case. As a lawyer, this point disturbs me and I did not feel that I could acquiesce in such a recommendation. Thirdly, acceptance of a fine implies to me that his original misappropriation has been condoned.

However, now that the difficult decision has been made to exclude a Member who had served in these Halls for over 22 years, the House cannot quickly turn its back and pretend as though nothing has happened.

The Nation and the world have watched our actions closely and I know that there is a question in many quarters as to why Representative POWELL's behavior went on so long. The actions of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL were deplorable but they were tolerated by this House over a long period of time.

The formation of a strong Committee on Ethics is the best answer to that question. I believe that support for such a committee is the moral obligation of every Member who voted against the select committee report. The Powell case must provide the catalyst for the establishment of such a body that would not only have the authority to investigate but the power to enforce its sanctions.

There was much reference in the debate to the damage done to the reputation of the House by the behavior of the Harlem minister. We do not wipe out this stain by one moralistic act. We must be consistent, just and firm. We will only play into the hands of the more emotional opponents of punishment unless we demonstrate that they are wrong when they argue that POWELL only did what others do, or that his punishment was related in any way to his race.

We have nothing to fear from the formation of such a committee. Let us not permit the American people to think we do.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I intend to cast my vote today in support of the recommendations made by the select committee. I commend Chairman CELLER and the eight members of the committee for handling a difficult assignment with courage, skill, and sound judgment. I also commend the distinguished minority leaders, Representative FORD and Representative ARENDS, and the other leaders of the minority party in the House for their support of the select committee and for their refusal to be stampeded by the public emotions which have been aroused in this case. I am particularly gratified to learn that my able colleague from Arizona, Representative RHODES, one of the important leaders of the minority, will support the adoption of the select committee's recommendation.

I know the pressures my colleagues are under and the public clamor aroused by this case. The mailman comes to my office, too. We are served by Western Union and our telephones continue to ring. There is often a difference, however, between what is momentarily popular and what is right.

Particularly appropriate in the debate today is the adage among lawyers that "hard cases make bad law." What the lawyers mean by "hard cases make bad law" is illustrated in the suit, Little Orphan Annie against United States Steel. In this suit, Little Orphan Annie simply has no legitimate claim and there is a temptation to stretch legal principles in order to find some tenable basis for a ruling that one's emotions would like to make. Thus, in our case today, with all the clamor and publicity, there is understandably a tendency to try and find some constitutional or legal basis for excluding Mr. Powell, when the best lawyers of the House and the constitutional precedents of the past tell us clearly that the proper course is to seat the Member-elect, and then punish him as recommended by the select committee.

When the Founding Fathers met to draft our Constitution, they pondered the fundamental question before us today;

that is, can or should the House impose additional qualifications beyond the three enumerated: age, citizenship, inhabitancy. It was Madison and Hamilton who argued successfully that the answer should be negative. Their philosophy was simple and it was wise. It has worked for 180 years. These men were keenly aware of the danger of adding to these three qualifications—perhaps a religious test, personal morality, and the rest—not because they hoped the voters would elect immoral or irreligious men, but because such a power might dangerously permit a majority to disenfranchise a minority.

The basic belief of Madison and the others was that the people are capable of self-government. As practical politicians, they recognized that, in the short run, individual constituencies might make mistakes, but in the long run, they would come out right, and they must be left to make the decisions as to whom will represent them in Congress. Democracy would remain safe and secure, they thought, because there would be no appealable authority above the people of a constituency themselves. They had faith, and I have faith in the capacity of the people of America for self-government.

But, if we must ordinarily live with the decisions of the voters in each district, should we not provide some machinery to protect the honor and dignity of the House when we believe that a particular decision has been wrong? Must we sit by idly when the 500,000 people have selected, as we might think, a scoundrel?

Of course, all of us would like to see in every Congress that every Member is uniformly loyal, trustworthy, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, cheerful, brave, clean, and reverent. In real life, however, in a Federal system with 435 diversified constituencies, it is inevitable that some Members will be elected who might appear to the Nation at large—even a large majority of the House—to be thoroughly unqualified.

The Federal system is built on tolerance of these diversities. And, except for a few isolated cases involving treason or conviction of a felony, we have followed the principle that a Member elected by his constituency will be seated.

We have heard much about the need for an effective ethics committee, and we do need one. Yet, each one of the 435 constituencies is, in effect, a kind of "grievance or ethics committee," which meets in November of even-numbered years. Sooner or later, and usually sooner, this constituency will remove members of unquestionable moral or ethical standards. POWELL's is a hard case and an extreme case because we have a most unusual constituency of the kind we have rarely seen in our history—a constituency which will elect a man who is guilty of all the sins and omissions found by the select committee. Let me pose this question: Can my colleagues name any other Member of the House who could do, or be charged with doing, even one-half of the misdeeds charged against Mr. POWELL and still get reelected? The answer is clearly no. Yet, in the emotionalism of the day, we are asked to violate and discard a sound principle of 180 years' standing in order to reach this one unusual case.

The vast majority of the 10,000 men who have served in Congress have been above reproach, and this is still true today. But, under the overriding principle described above, this House, on occasion, has seated abolitionists, segregationists, integrationists, former Confederate generals, men under indictment, and those fresh out of jail, tax evaders, reformed alcoholics, the very young, the senile and the very old, those with one eye or one leg, the halt, the lame, and the blind.

We have done so because of this fundamental federal principle of tolerance for the decisions of the diverse constituencies which make up the House. It is not a perfect rule, but it works better than any other that might be devised.

It is for these reasons and for these reasons only that I favor seating Mr. Powell. He is most definitely not my idea of a proper Congressman. But the question of seating is an entirely different one from the undoubted and constitutional right of the House to censure or to punish. I specifically support the extreme, harsh and unprecedented punishments proposed by the select committee. Let me list what the committee proposes: that Mr. Powell be given the oath of office, that upon taking the oath, he be publicly censured by the Speaker in the name of the House; that he pay to the Clerk of the House $40,000; and that in the event he does not appear on or before March 13, 1967, to take the oath of office, under these harsh terms, his seat shall be deemed vacant.

This brings me to another reason why I support the committee's recommendation to seat and then punish Mr. Powell. Let us assume for a moment that the Founding Fathers were wrong; that we agree that the House can and should set additional qualifications beyond those of age, citizenship and inhabitancy. Let us assume further that we can somehow agree on what those additional conditions should be; that we can resolve the arguments whether to include private morals and conduct, payment of taxes, church attendance, or whatever.

Having decided what these additional conditions should be, the fundamental question then arises: can we apply these additional conditions ex post facto? If we should enter this field, as a majority of the House seems to feel today, is it fair to make these additional requirements for seating and then apply them retroactively? I think not. If we are to have these additional qualifications, let us create the permanent Committee on Standards and Conduct as proposed by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] and by my identical bill, House Resolution 102. Let that committee recommend the standards and let the House adopt them. Then let them be applied thereafter to all who fail to measure up.

The final irony to me is that it is unnecessary to make bad law, unnecessary to violate 180 years of sound tradition—which has served us not perfectly but better than any other system in a diverse federal union—when the result, in my judgment, will be the same.

Sometimes, it is not so important what is done as it is how it is done. In my judgment, if the resolution of the select committee is adopted Mr. Powell will not be seated because he will refuse to take his seat under the harsh terms prescribed. In that case, he will have faced the hard choice, and excluded himself of his own volition.

On the other hand, the substitute proposed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] requires that we exclude him in violation of our sound constitutional tradition and procedures.

What is worse, instead of his making him a martyr of himself, we will make the martyr and we will convince many of our 20 million Negro fellow citizens that we acted, in part, out of prejudice.

I know the temper of the House today, and suspect that my vote will be in the minority. But, I believe the bipartisan select committee's recommendations are right, and I think my vote will clearly appear to be right when today's understandable passions and feelings of outrage—which I personally share—have subsided.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the right of the people of the 18th Congressional District to have their constitutionally qualified and duly elected Representative seated in the House of Representatives.

If the behavior of the man they have elected is such that he should not be permitted to be a Congressman, the House should proceed in a constitutional manner under section 5 of article I, which provides that each House of Congress may "punish its Members for disorderly behavior, and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a Member."

The question before the House is the behavior of Adam Clayton Powell, not his constitutional qualifications. The only constitutional qualifications for membership are age, citizenship, and inhabitance. There is no question but that Adam Clayton Powell meets these constitutional qualifications. Section 5 of article I provides that:

> Each House shall be the Judge of the . . . qualifications of its own Members.

The Constitution authorizes the House to judge constitutional qualifications but not to establish new qualifications not enumerated in the Constitution.

If the Congress has the power to expel Mr. Powell by a two-thirds vote, should it exert this power? The select committee thought not. The select committee thought that the right of the people of the 18th District of New York to select their own Representative is a right so basic in our democracy that it should not be lightly tampered with. On the other hand, the select committee thought that the behavior of Mr. Powell was such that the committee recommended the most serious punishment that has ever been recommended in a case of a Member or Member-elect to the Congress.

The select committee recognized that the people of the 18th Congressional District of New York are entitled to choose their Representative, but not necessarily to have their Representative be a chairman of a standing committee. The select committee therefore recommended that Mr. Powell be placed at the bottom of the seniority list. The select committee also recognized that as a practical matter the removal of the chairmanship and his seniority was not subject to appeal to the people of the 18th Congressional District of New York. Whereas, after expulsion by a two-thirds vote, Mr. Powell would probably be reelected to Congress by an overwhelming majority and either the vote of expulsion would be nullified or an unending series of expulsion votes and reelections would ensue, which would have racial overtones of the most unfortunate kind.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, let us proceed strictly in accordance with the Constitution and seat this duly elected and constitutionally qualified Member-elect and then determine what punishment should be administered to him. Let us not punish the people of the 18th Congressional District by depriving them of representation in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to general leave granted to revise and extend my remarks on House Resolution 278, I insert the following observations on the power of the House of Representatives to exclude a Member-elect.

I have made an exhaustive study of congressional history and past practice and precedent of the Senate as well as the House of Representatives for the purpose of determining the scope of the power, if any, of Congress to exclude a Member for qualifications not specified in article I, section 2. It is generally accepted that the roots of the power of the legislature to exclude its Members lie deep in the history and customs of this country and England.[1] Thus the framers of the Constitution were generally aware that in England the qualifications for membership in the House of Commons were not fixed either in a written constitution or a statute, and that the absence thereof had led to the famous John Wilkes case. Wilkes was four times reelected by the voters of Middlesex and each time refused a seat by the House.[2]

The Wilkes event was well known in the Colonies and apparently led to the general procedure of fixing in the State constitutions the qualifications for membership in the two legislatures.

The framers of the Constitution were also well aware of the wide diversity of approach adopted by the various State legislatures in judging the qualifications in seating their members.[3] Thus, the reported debates and records of the Constitutional Convention reflect that the framers of the Constitution were aware, on the one hand, of the need for the Legislature to maintain some control over the election of its own Members while, at the same time, recognizing the evils which might flow from the unrestrained legislative power in this area. These framers were familiar with the scenes so graphically described by English historians of the exclusion of Members of the House of Commons by a strict party vote in order that the party might remain in power.[4] For example, the Convention considered the proposal of Gouverneur Morris which would have left the Legislature entirely at large to set qualifications for membership in each House—Second Farrand, The Records of the Federal Convention, page 250. Madison opposed the vesting of such broad powers in the Legislature, pointing out that it could thereby subvert the republican form of government, that qualifications founded on artificial conditions might be devised by the stronger party in order to keep out weaker parties of a faction, and that the British Parliament possessing such a power had so abused it as to make changes subservient to their own views or to the views of religious or political parties—Second Farrand, page 250.

Warren has commented that—

> The Convention evidently concurred in these [Madison's] views, for it defeated the proposal to give to Congress the power to establish qualifications in general by a vote of seven states to four. . . . (Warren, The Making of the Constitution (1928), p. 421.)

The Supreme Court of the United States, in its recent decision in the case of *Bond* v. *Floyd*, —— U.S. ——, 87 S. Ct. 339, December 5, 1966, summarized the constitutional history concerning the power of the Congress to alter the qualifications, in footnote 13, as follows:[5]

> Madison and Hamilton anticipated the oppressive effect on freedom of expression which would result if the legislature could utilize its power to judging qualifications to pass judgment on a legislator's political views. At the Constitutional Convention of 1787, Madison opposed a proposal to give to Congress power to establish qualifications in general. Warren, The Making of the Constitution (1928), 420–422. The Journal of the Federal Convention of 1787 states:
>
> "Mr. Madison was opposed to the Section as vesting an improper and dangerous power in the Legislature. The qualifications of electors and elected were fundamental articles in a Republican Govt. and ought to be fixed by the Constitution. If the Legislature could regulate those of either, it can by degrees subvert the Constitution. . . . Qualifications founded on artificial distinction may be devised, by the stronger in order to keep out partizans of a weaker faction.
>
> "Mr. Madison observed that the British Parliament possessed the power of regulating the qualifications both of the electors, and the elected; and the abuse they had made of it was a lesson worthy of our attention. They had made the changes in both cases subservient to their own views, or the views of political or Religious parties." 2 Farrand, The Records in the Federal Convention of 1787 (Aug. 10, 1787), pp. 249–250.
>
> Hamilton agreed with Madison that:
>
> "The qualifications of the persons who may choose or be chosen . . . are defined and fixed by the constitution; and are unalterable by the legislature." The Federalist, No. 60 (Cooke ed. 1961), 409.

The general proposition that since the U.S. Constitution specifies the qualifications of Members of Congress in article I, section 2, Congress may not add additional qualifications of its own, has found general support from constitutional commentators and text writers. Thus Professor Warren, in his study of the history of the Constitutional Convention, "The Making of the Constitution," in referring to the action of the Convention in establishing the qualifications of age, citizenship and inhabitancy, concludes:

> Such action would seem to make it clear that the Convention did not intend to grant to a single branch of Congress, either to the House or to the Senate, the right to establish any qualifications for its members, other than those qualifications established by the Constitution itself, *viz.*, age, citizenship, and residence. For certainly it did not intend that a single branch of Congress should possess a power which the Convention had expressly refused to vest in the whole Congress. As the Constitution, as then drafted, expressly set forth the qualifications of age, citizenship, and residence, and as the Convention refused to grant to Congress power to establish qualifications in general, the maxim *expressio unius exclusio alterisu* would seem to apply. . . . The elimination of all power in Congress to fix qualifications clearly left the provisions of the Constitution itself as the sole source of qualifications.[6]

Mr. Justice Story, in his Commentaries, similarly concludes that:

> It would seem but fair reasoning upon the plainest principles of interpretation that when the Constitution established certain qualifications as necessary for office, it meant to exclude all others as prerequisites. From the very nature of such a provision, the affirmation of these qualifications would seem to imply a negative of all others.[7]

I believe that the force of the foregoing constitutional construction is reenforced by the provision of amendment XIV, section 3:

---

[1] *The Right of Congress to Exclude its Members*, 33 Va. L. Rev. 332 (1947).

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.* For example, the qualifications to vote often listed age, sex, religion, residence, citizenship, office holding, freedom from criminal conviction, and most important of all, freeholding. Qualifications for election to office were often even higher than those required for voting. Also see, Clark, *Parliamentary Privilege in the American Colonies* (1943).

[4] See 15 Georgetown L.J. 382, 389.

[5] The *Bond* case involved the exclusion of a Representative-elect by the Georgia legislature. While the court's decision turned on the point that the disqualification of the Representative-elect from membership in the Georgia legislature because of certain statements he had made violated Bond's right of free expression under the First Amendment, the court's interpretation of the constitutional history of the power of Congress to alter qualifications for seating is the best indication of its probable position on this question.

[6] Warren, at p. 420.

[7] Story, *Commentaries on the Constitution* (5th Ed., p. 460). For other commentators reaching similar conclusions, see Cushing, *Elements of the Law and Practice of Legislative Assemblies in the United States of America*, Sec. 65, p. 27 (1866); McCrary, *Elections*, 3d Ed., Sec. 312, p. 214 (1887); Tucker, *Treatise on the Constitution*, p. 394; Foster, *Treatise on the Constitution*, p. 367 (1895); Willoughby, *Constitutional Law of the United States*, 2d Ed., Sec. 337; Meecham, *Public Offices*, 164 (1890). See also 33 Virginia Law Review, 322 (1947): 30 Law Notes 181 (1927); 4 Notre Dame Lawyer 3 (1928). Also, where the question has arisen in regard to State constitutions, the above principle has been affirmed. *Black* v. *Trover*, 79 Va. 123 (1884); *Thomas* v. *Owen*, 4 Md. 189 (1953). *Contra: Ohio ex rel. Att. Gen.* v. *Covington*, 29 Ohio St. 102 (1876); *Darrow* v. *The People*, 8 Colo. 417 (1885).

> No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress * * * who, having previously taken oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature or as an executive or judicial officer of any state, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

Persuasive arguments have been advanced that if Congress were able to impose qualifications as it saw fit, it would not have been necessary to amend the Constitution to achieve the above result—Thirty-third Virginia Law Review, supra at page 332. A comprehensive discussion of this point of view may be found in the minority report of the House of Representatives on the Brigham Roberts case. House Report No. 85, part 2, 56th Congress, first session (1960). Also see 88 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2859 (1942).

CONGRESSIONAL PRECEDENT IN EXCLUSION CASES

An analysis of congressional precedent in exclusion cases reveals that historically both the Senate and House of Representatives have given constant recognition and attached significant weight to the proposition that Congress in seating a Member should not consider qualifications other than those specified in article I, section 2 of the Constitution.[8]

Two comparatively recent election cases, the case of the seating of Francis H. Shoemaker in the House of Representatives in 1933, and the case of the seating of William Langer in the Senate in 1942 serve to illustrate recent decisions on this issue.

The case of Francis H. Shoemaker in the 73d Congress, 1933, is one of the most recent decisions on the issue of the House of Representatives. Representative Shoemaker was seated by the House in 1933 although he had been convicted of a violation of a Federal mail libel statute and had served a sentence in the Federal penitentiary.[9] Representative Lemke, who led the fight for the seating of the Member-elect, stated the issue as follows:

> Mr. Speaker, the question before the House is whether Mr. F. H. Shoemaker is entitled to a seat in this House or whether he is disqualified.
>
> I make the statement without fear of contradiction that he is not disqualified but is qualified to sit here as a Member of this House under the Constitution of the United States of America and under the rules and regulations of this House.
>
> In the first place, the qualifications for a Congressman are the following:
>
> "No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the age of 25 years, had been 7 years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen."
>
> This is the qualification required by the Constitution of the United States.

Representative Carter of California referred to the case of Brigham Roberts and posed the following question:

> Do you desire to maintain the integrity of this House, or are you going to admit every person that has those three necessary Constitutional qualifications that were referred to a few moments ago for admission to this House?

In response to Representative Carter, Representative McKeown stated:

> The Constitution says that there are three qualifications for a member of the House. Neither the State Legislature of Minnesota nor the Congress of the United States can change these qualifications. They are written into the Constitution by the great fathers of the Republic, and they cannot be changed by law.

At the close of the debate, it having been determined that Member-elect Shoemaker possessed the three constitutional qualifications, the House adopted a substitute resolution calling on the Clerk to administer the oath to Mr. Shoemaker.

One of the most exhaustive discussions of the constitutional issue of qualifications is contained in the debates[10] involving the seating of Senator William Langer, who was seated in 1942 despite a challenge involving—

> Charges against Langer [which] were numerous and chiefly involv[ing] moral turpitude, embracing kickbacks, conversion of proceeds of legal settlements, acceptance of a bribe in leasing government property, and premature payments on contracts of advertising. *Senate Election, Expulsion & Censure Cases*, Sen. Doc. No. 71, 87th Cong., 2d Sess. p. 141.

Senator Murdock stated the issue as follows:

> What do we judge? A man comes here and presents his credentials and claims that he has the constitutional qualification to be a Senator. As judges of that fact, we look at his credentials; we consider his constitutional qualifications. Where do we find them stated? We find them set out in the Constitution. I believe it was contemplated by the framers of the Constitution that when a man came here with credentials from his State, and claimed to have the constitutional qualifications, the matter could be judged by the Senate in not to exceed a week or 2 weeks' time; but when the word 'judge' is construed to mean the power to add qualifications, about which the State does not know, about which the Senate does not know, then, of course, there is brought about the type of farce which resulted in taking 4 years to determine that Reed Smoot was entitled to sit here as a United States Senator, and the type of farce which has resulted in Senator LANGER's right to a seat being held in abeyance for more than a year, the committee searching his life almost from childhood up to the present time.
>
> Oh, did the men who wrote the Constitution ever contemplate that such a thing as that would happen? In framing the Constitution they had the right to decide what tribunal should be the judge of the morals and the intellectual qualifications of the men sent here, and they decided that the people of the sovereign States should have that power, restricted only by the very definite but simple qualifications enunciated in the Constitution itself, 88 Cong. Rec. 2476–77 (1942).

At another point, Senator Murdock went on to say:

> I desire to read again the provision—
>
> "Each House shall be the Judge of the Elections, returns, and Qualifications of its own Members. . . ."
>
> To my mind, the word "judge" means to look at the qualifications contained in the Constitution. That is what the verb "judge" means: To judge of something in existence—law or facts—and to apply the law to the facts. To extend the definition of the word "judge" to mean that we can superadd to these qualifications, in my opinion, is a misconception of the word itself. 88 Cong. Rec. 2475 (1942).

During the debates, Senator Taft further stated:

> If the Senate can say that the absence of moral turpitude is a qualification. it can impose qualifications based on morals, the religion or lack of religion or the philosophical views of any person elected * * * The existence of such a power would give the majority of either House the ability to exclude those who disagreed with the opinions of the majority * * * It is my belief that Section 5 of Article I was only intended to make each House the final judge of whether a man was properly elected and whether he met the qualifications prescribed by the Constitution itself. 88 Cong. Rec. 2859 (1942).

In a small number of cases affected by the temper of the times, Congress has considered the qualifications other than those enumerated in the Constitution. Broadly speaking, these deviations fall into three general categories reflecting anti-Mormon—polygamy[11] and anti-Confederate[12] feeling and a case involving a Member-elect found guilty of giving aid and comfort to the enemy.[13] A fourth category sometimes referred to is that Congress may exclude a Member who has resigned to escape expulsion.[14] The exceptions represented by these categories has been both explicitly and implicitly overruled by the House of Representatives and the Senate in recent years in the Shoemaker case, supra, 1933, and the Langer case, supra, 1942. In short, although House and Senate precedent may be found where qualification factors other than those enumerated in the Constitution have been used as grounds for exclusion, these instances reflect a minority viewpoint. Whatever divergency of viewpoint appears in congressional precedent makes it all the more imperative in my opinion that strong adherence be given to the language of the Constitution itself, and the intent of the framers of that document as reflected in the history of the Constitutional Conventions.

---

[8] See the contested election case of *William McCreery*, 10th Cong., 1807, 1 Hinds, Sec. 414 Report of the Committee on Elections, Annals of Cong., Nov. 1807, p. 872; *Turney* v. *Marshall* and *Fouke* v. *Trumball*, 34th Cong., 1856, 1 Hinds, Sec. 415. Senate Precedent; see the contested case of *Benjamin Stark*, 37 Cong., 1862, 1 Hinds, Sec. 443; case of *Humphrey Marshall*, S. Journ. 4 Cong., 1st Sess., pp. 194 *et seq*. Thus the report of the Election Committee in *Turney* v. *Marshall* and *Fouke* v. *Trumball* cases, *supra*, stated the concept as follows: "The qualifications of a Representative, under the Constitution, are that he shall have attained the age of 25 years, shall have been seven years a citizen of the United States, and when elected, an inhabitant of the state in which he shall be chosen. It is a fair presumption that when the Constitution prescribes these qualifications as necessary to a Representative in Congress it was meant to exclude all others.

* * * * *

"By the Constitution, the people have a right to choose as Representative any person having only the qualifications therein mentioned, without superadding thereto any additional qualifications whatever." 1 Hinds, pp. 385–386.

[9] 77 Cong. Rec. 73–74 (1933).

[10] 77th Cong. (1942), S. Journ. 77 Cong., 1st Sess., pp. 8 *et seq.*, 2d Sess., pp. 3 *et seq.*

[11] Case of *Brigham Roberts*, 56th Cong. 1899, 1 Hinds, Section 474. This case involved a Member-elect from Utah who was barred from his seat on the ground that he was a polygamist in accord with the Mormon faith and had been convicted of violating a federal act prohibiting bigamy. But see case of *Reed Smoot*, 58th Cong., 1903, 1 Hinds 481–484 (Mormon seated by Senate.)

[12] Cases of Kentucky members, 40th Cong., 1867, 1 Hinds, 449, 550, 551 which were barred on the grounds that the Members-elect had served in the Confederate Army during the Civil War. It is noteworthy, however, that Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment was subsequently adopted, which expressly disqualified former active Confederates from serving in Congress.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have already asked consent for all Members to extend their remarks during this debate. Because time is now running out, Mr. Speaker, I do now move the previous question on my amendment and the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri moves the previous question on the amendment to the resolution and on the resolution.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is this: If the previous question is not voted down it will not be possible to offer other amendments to this resolution?

The SPEAKER. If the previous question is voted down then the question of recognition would be taken up, and the Chair would give recognition to some other Member who could offer a motion.

Mr. STRATTON. But, Mr. Speaker, if the previous question is voted up, then other amendments will not be in order? Is that the case?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. STRATTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STRATTON), there were—ayes 151, noes 66.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. All Members in favor of taking the vote by the yeas and nays will rise and remain standing until counted.

Sixty-five Members have arisen, a sufficient number.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, there was so much confusion, we did not hear whether this was on the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question on the amendment and the resolution.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 263, nays 161, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]

YEAS—263

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Baring
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Blackburn
Blanton
Bolling
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Corbett
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
de la Garza
Denney
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Eilberg
Esch
Eshleman
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Fascell
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Gibbons
Goodell
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Herlong
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
Kazen
Kee
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lukens
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McMillan
Machen
Mahon
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
May
Mayne
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minshall
Mize
Montgomery
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
Nichols
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Pepper
Pettis
Pickle
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, Pa.
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Tuck
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Williams, Miss.
Williams, Pa.
Willis
Winn
Wright
Wyatt
Wylie
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—161

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Annunzio
Ashley
Ayres
Barrett
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Brademas
Brasco
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Carey
Celler
Cohelan
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Dellenback
Dent
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Farbstein
Feighan
Findley
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Gallagher
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gubser
Gude
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Howard
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kelly
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kupferman
McCarthy
McEwen
McFall
MacGregor
Madden
Mailliard
Marsh
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neill, Mass
Ottinger
Patten
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Pollock
Price, Ill.
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Robison
Rodino
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ryan
Sandman
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Stanton
Steed
Stratton
Sullivan
Taft
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Vanik
Whalen
Widnall
Wiggins
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wydler
Yates

NOT VOTING—8

Bow
Cahill
Dawson
Edwards, La.
Friedel
King, Calif.
Macdonald, Mass.
Morse, Mass.

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.

Mr. PIKE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DELANEY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

---

[13] Case of *Victor Berger*, 66th Cong., (1919), 6 Cannons, Sec. 56. This case involved a refusal to seat a Congressman-elect who had been found guilty in World War I of violation of the Espionage Act. It is noteworthy that, in addition to looking at the so-called qualification factors, the majority House report further justified the exclusion of Berger under Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment barring from the office of Representative anyone who has "given aid or comfort to the enemies" of the United States.

[14] This category is predicated upon the novel facts involving the exclusion of B. F. Whittemore during the 41st Congress, 1870, 1 Hinds, Sec. 464. Rep. Whittemore resigned his seat while expulsion proceedings were pending against him for having sold appointments to the military academy. In a special election during the same session of Congress held to fill the vacancy he was reelected, but the House by resolution refused to seat him. In support of the resolution it was stated that since the House would have had the right to expel Rep. Whittemore for his crime committed during the session of Congress, that it certainly had the right to exclude him upon re-election after his resignation.

Mr. **BROOMFIELD** changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. **O'HARA** of Michigan changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was as above recorded.

Mr. **BURTON** of California. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. **BURTON** of California. In view of the fact that this resolution, among other things, states that the Member from New York is ineligible to serve in the other body, and therefore clearly beyond our power to so vote; and in addition to that fact it anticipates election results in the 18th District of New York, a matter upon which we cannot judge at this time, I raise the point of order that the resolution is an improper one for the House to consider, and that it clearly exceeds our authority.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair will observe to the gentleman that if the point of order would be in order it would have been at a previous stage in the proceedings, and the gentleman's point of order comes too late.

Mr. **BURTON** of California. May I make a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker?

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. **BURTON** of California. Am I not correct in my statement that under the resolution on which we are about to vote, the only clear meaning of it would preclude the gentleman from New York from serving in the other body.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair would state that that is not a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair cannot pass upon that question.

Mr. **GOODELL**. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. **GOODELL**. Mr. Speaker, if the Curtis amendment which is now pending is defeated, then is it in order to move the previous question on the committee resolution?

The **SPEAKER**. If the amendment is defeated, the original resolution will be before the House for a vote.

Mr. **GOODELL**. For an immediate vote?

The **SPEAKER**. Yes, for an immediate vote.

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD**. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD**. If the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri prevails as a substitute for the committee resolution, then there will be an opportunity for a further vote, however?

The **SPEAKER**. Then the question will occur on the adoption of the resolution, as amended.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. **CELLER**. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 248, nays 176, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 24]

YEAS—248

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Blackburn
Blanton
Bolton
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Bush
Cabell
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Collier
Colmer
Corbett
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
de la Garza
Denney
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Eilberg
Esch
Eshleman
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Fascell
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Gibbons
Goodling
Gross
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Herlong
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
Kazen
Kee
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lukens
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McMillan
Machen
Mahon
Martin
Mathias, Md.
May
Mayne
Meeds
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minshall
Mize
Montgomery
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
Nichols
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Pepper
Pettis
Pickle
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, Pa.
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Staggers
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Tuck
Tunney
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Williams, Miss.
Williams, Pa.
Willis
Winn
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—176

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Barrett
Bates
Biester
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Carey
Celler
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Dellenback
Dent
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Farbstein
Feighan
Findley
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Halleck
Hanley
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Howard
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kupferman
Laird
McCarthy
McClory
McEwen
McFall
MacGregor
Madden
Mailliard
Marsh
Mathias, Calif.
Matsunaga
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patten
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Price, Ill.
Railsback
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riegel
Robison
Rodino
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ryan
Sandman
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Steiger, Wis.
Sullivan
Taft
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Udall
Ullman
Vanik
Whalen
Widnall
Wiggins
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Yates
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—8

Bow
Cahill
Dawson
Edwards, La.
Friedel
King, Calif.
Macdonald, Mass.
Morse, Mass.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the adoption of the resolution as amended.

Mr. **MacGREGOR**. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 307, nays 116, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 25]

YEAS—307

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Blackburn
Blanton
Boggs
Bolton
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Corbett
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Denney
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch

Eshleman
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Fascell
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Gibbons
Goodell
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Herlong
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
Kazen
Kee
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lukens
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McMillan
MacGregor
Machen
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
May
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minshall
Mize
Montgomery
Moore
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morton
Mosher
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
Nichols
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Pepper
Pettis
Pickle
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, Pa.
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
St Germain
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Tunney
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams, Miss.
Williams, Pa.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—116

Adams
Addabbo
Annunzio
Ashley
Barrett
Bingham
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Carey
Celler
Cohelan
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Delaney
Dellenback
Dent
Diggs
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Farbstein
Feighan
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Gallagher
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hansen, Wash.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Howard
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kelly
Kirwan
Kupferman
McCarthy
McEwen
McFall
Madden
Marsh
Matsunaga
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moorhead
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patten
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Price, Ill.
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rodino
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ryan
Sandman
St. Onge
Scheuer
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Sullivan
Taft
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Udall
Vanik
Wiggins
Wolff
Yates

NOT VOTING—9

Baring
Bow
Cahill
Dawson
Edwards, La.
Friedel
King, Calif.
Macdonald, Mass.
Morse, Mass.

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.

Mr. TEAGUE of California and Mr. CONTE changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the preamble.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California will state his point of order.

Mr. BURTON of California. The gentleman from Missouri is urging a motion that duplicates an action already taken by the House. The House already has had a motion to close debate on the preamble and on the resolution as amended.

We have already had that vote. I make the point of order that the gentleman's request and/or motion is out of order. I think the record of the proceedings of the House will indicate that the point being advocated reflects accurately the proceedings as they have transpired.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the previous question was ordered on the amendment and the resolution but not on the preamble.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Just one minute. The Chair will protect the rights of all Members. The gentleman from California.

Mr. BURTON of California. Yes, Mr. Speaker. As I understand the reading of the minutes, I would imagine they would reflect that the House had already voted on the motion to close debate on the preamble as well as the resolution as amended. If the minutes so reflect, my inquiry of the Speaker is this, then: Am I not correct that the request of the gentleman from Missouri would be out of order without further approval of this body in some form?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already answered that and advised the gentleman from California that the previous question heretofore ordered was on the amendment and the resolution but not on the preamble itself. The gentleman from Missouri is making a motion to apply the previous question to the preamble and the question is on that motion.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York will state it.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, would I be in order to move that we strike out the word "inhabitancy" from the third or fourth line of the preamble?

The SPEAKER. If the previous question is ordered, that motion would not be in order.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I was seeking recognition on the parliamentary inquiry since I desired to move we amend the preamble by striking out the word "inhabitancy" on line 4 of page 1 of the preamble.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the motion for the previous question takes precedence over a motion to amend.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, in what way, then, would one who opposed a finding that ADAM CLAYTON POWELL was an inhabitant of the State of New York register his views under this circumstance? I was seeking recognition to find the proper parliamentary point at which to make that motion.

The SPEAKER. That is a matter which is within the control of the House. If the previous question is ordered, then the motion of the gentleman or any other motion on the preamble would not be in order. The Chair cannot enlighten the gentleman from New York any further.

Mr. STRATTON. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STRATTON. If I desire to register my view and if other Members desire to register their views that it is inconsistent for the word "inhabitancy" to remain in this preamble, would it be in order for us to vote against the previous question?

The SPEAKER. If the previous question is voted down, then someone who opposed it would be recognized by the Chair.

The question is on the ordering of the previous question.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from California wish to make that point of order now or wait until after the Chair puts the question?

Mr. BURTON of California. After the Chair puts the question, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] objects to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and makes the point of order that a quorum is not present and evidently a quorum is not present. The rollcall is automatic.

Those in favor of ordering the previous question will when their names are called vote "aye," those opposed will vote "no."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 310, nays 9, not voting 113, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]

YEAS—310

Abbitt
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Aspinall
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Betts
Bevill
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Brademas
Brinkley
Brock
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Burke, Fla.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtis
Daddario
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dent
Devine
Diggs
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Duncan
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Fascell
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harvey
Hathaway
Hays
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lukens
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Meeds
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Minish
Mink
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morton
Moss
Multer
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Poage
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Reid, N.Y.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Sandman
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Scott
Selden
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Miss.
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—9

Burke, Mass.
Dingell
Hechler, W. Va.
Minshall
Murphy, N.Y.
Pike
Pollock
Stratton
Wydler

NOT VOTING—113

Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashmore
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Berry
Biester
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Brasco
Bray
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Cahill
Carter
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Conyers
Daniels
Dawson
Derwinski
Dickinson
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Flood
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Gardner
Garmatz
Gettys
Green, Oreg.
Gurney
Halleck
Hanley
Harrison
Harsha
Hawkins
Hébert
Herlong
Holland
Hull
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Latta
Lloyd
McCarthy
McClure
McFall
Macdonald, Mass.
Mailliard
Martin
May
Meskill
Mills
Mize
Monagan
Morse, Mass.
Mosher
Murphy, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Pelly
Pettis
Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Robison
Ronan
Satterfield
Schweiker
Schwengel
Shipley
Skubitz
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Teague, Tex.
Ullman
Utt
Willis

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the preamble.

For what purpose does the gentleman from California rise?

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, do I understand correctly that the yeas and nays on this vote are solely on the preamble?

The SPEAKER. The Chair states in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from California that that would be the question.

The question is on agreeing to the preamble.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote and lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri make his motion on the resolution, as amended, and the preamble?

Mr. CURTIS. That is right, Mr. Speaker, the resolution, as amended, and the preamble.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

The motion was agreed to.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the resolution as amended which just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL GAINS UNDER PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, historically it has been popular to find fault with incumbent administrations. While it is a relatively simple matter to select isolated circumstances and magnify them beyond all reality, we should, from time to time, pause to look at the overall situation in order that our prospective not be distorted.

Brushing aside the flamboyant rhetoric and often irresponsible claims which frequently are the product of partisan feelings rather than studied logic, let us look at the realities, let us look at the progress that has been made.

Since the end of 1963, the Johnson administration has presided over the most remarkable period of economic and social progress in the Nation's history. Here are 20 outstanding achievements:

First. Six million more people are at work, and at higher paying jobs than ever.

Second. The unemployment rate has dropped from 5.7 to 3.7 percent, the number out of work is down by 1¼ million, and the number of long-term unemployed by 565,000.

Third. Industrial production has risen by 25 percent.

Fourth. The gross national product, corrected for price change, is up more than $100 billion or 17 percent—almost as much as during the entire 8 years of the Eisenhower administration.

Fifth. The average American's real income—after taxes and corrected for price changes—has increased by 14 percent—a larger gain than in the prior 8 years.

Sixth. Net income per farm—corrected for the rise in prices farmers pay—has increased by 23 percent.

Seventh. Profits after taxes have risen by 36 percent.

Eighth. Total wages and salaries paid have grown by 29 percent.

Ninth. American families have increased their net financial wealth by $150 billion.

Tenth. Some 4 million Americans have moved above the poverty line.

Eleventh. Federal income and excise taxes have been cut by $20 billion.

Twelvth. Some 3 million older Americans have received hospital care and an estimated 5½ million have received physicians' services under medicare.

Thirteenth. Some 13,500 medical students and more than 18,000 nurses are receiving Federal scholarships or loans.

Fourteenth. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act is helping more than 8 million disadvantaged children in over 17,000 school districts.

Fifteenth. More than 1 million college students are realizing their hopes of higher education through the Federal programs such as the education opportunities grants, the college work-study program, the National Defense Education Act, and federally insured loans.

Sixteenth. Some 1,050 community action agencies have been established to assist poor families.

Seventeenth. An estimated 6 million people have been reached by new antipoverty programs, including this year 737,000 Headstart children; 350,000 youths in the Neighborhood Youth Corps; and 31,000 youths in the Job Corps.

Eighteenth. Eight million more workers are covered by minimum wage and overtime provisions, and the minimum wage has been raised to $1.40 for 32 million previously covered.

Nineteenth. Training has been provided for almost 1 million workers under Federal training programs.

Twentieth. The annual flow of Federal aid to State and local governments has expanded by $5¼ billion.

The advance in the welfare of the average American under President Johnson has never been equaled. This is true whether we look at the gains made in the private economy in response to wise overall economic policies; or the direct economic and social benefits to individuals from new Federal programs.

This has truly been the era of America's greatest progress. And during this period of enormous economic progress, growth, and opportunity the United States has had greater price stability than any other industrial country in the free world.

Somebody must be doing something right in this country.

IMPROVING CRIMINAL LAW ENFORCEMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to indicate my support for the proposals to improve criminal law enforcement in the District of Columbia. All of us in Congress are daily exposed to the problems within the District and are fully aware of the urgent need to reverse the increasing trend of criminality and the need to turn this city into a model for all of our citizens and all the nations of the world to follow and admire.

Crime is not a simple problem. It is deep rooted in certain elements of our society. The proposals of the President are a fine step in our battle against the evils of lawlessness. We cannot hesitate now or overly long delay consideration of these matters. Each Member of this Congress should carefully weigh and study the proposals, analyze their value and then promptly move forward so that we may strike out against the problem of crime in the District of Columbia.

I am certain that after a close scrutiny of these proposals we will all recognize their inherent merit.

There is one particular aspect of this program which I would like to speak about and that is the segment of the proposal which suggests that witness fees be increased to more adequately compensate individuals in our community who come forward to testify at trial. Every citizen has a duty to aid in the prosecution of criminal defendants when they have evidence that is relevant to such prosecution. However, we must recognize that these good citizens often come forth to testify at tremendous personal sacrifice. They lose time from their jobs, are absent from their homes and may even in extreme cases be subject to harassment by the criminal element in the city. Therefore, a bill which proposes to increase the fees to be paid to such witnesses should be endorsed. I recognize that the amount is modest but it represents a substantial increase over the existing fee schedule and I urge enactment of this proposal together with the rest of the District of Columbia crime program as it is designed to make the District of Columbia a better and a safer place in which to live.

NEW ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson is to be commended for his wisdom in naming Ramsey Clark to be our new Attorney General.

Mr. Clark, at 39, already has demonstrated his ability and dedication as a public servant. He has acquired invaluable experience within the Justice Department, first, as Assistant Attorney General, then, as Deputy Attorney General, and finally, as Acting Attorney General, in which post he is serving at the present time.

Mr. Clark is the son of Supreme Court Justice Tom Clark, and is himself a distinguished attorney. He was born in Dallas Tex., received his B.A. degree from the University of Texas, and his M.A. and juris doctor degrees from the University of Chicago. He has served as the national president of the Federal Bar Association, and was engaged in the private practice of law before joining the Justice Department.

Ramsey Clark's background and experience make him the ideal choice for the responsible position of Attorney General of the United States. It is my pleasure, therefore, to insert in the Congressional Record an editorial which appeared in the March 1 Washington Post heartily endorsing Mr. Clark for this position:

> ### New Attorney General
>
> President Johnson followed the logical course in naming Ramsey Clark to be Attorney General. In the position of Deputy Attorney General under Nicholas Katzenbach, Mr. Clark proved to be a dedicated public servant and an administrator of substantial ability. Since Mr. Katzenbach's reassignment to the State Department last September, Mr. Clark has presided over the Department of Justice as acting Attorney General with poise and good judgment as well as alertness and energy. President Johnson could scarcely have passed him by in making a permanent appointment without discouraging the kind of public service that he most prizes.
>
> If Mr. Clark had been chosen from private life at the age of 39, questions would have been raised about his experience and knowledge of governmental problems. But having risen to the top within the Department, he is in the position, despite his age, of being the most experienced man for the job. Though quiet by nature and cautious in charting his course, he appears to have a keen sense of right and wrong and ample courage to act on his convictions.
>
> This community has special reason to be grateful to Mr. Clark for his wise advice to the President to veto the District crime bill passed by Congress last year. In a delicate position because of his uncertain status and because of the mounting volume of crime in Washington, he held fast to constitutional principles and a sociologically sound approach to the problem. Since he is known to be a liberal with his feet on the ground, we surmise that this incident may well provide an index to the kind of service he will render as Attorney General.
>
> The President has done well to promote a highly promising public servant, and we think the response of the country as well as that of the Senate will be enthusiastic.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased that the President in his education and health message has called for an expanded and strengthened national program in occupational health. The time has come to do something about the effects of a working man's job on his health. This problem has been neglected too long.

Today, our Government supports medical and health services for many groups of American citizens—mothers and children, oldsters, people with heart disease, strokes, cancer, and mental problems, and the poor and the unemployed. Yet we have not paid sufficient attention to the health of the largest group of our citizens—the workers who keep our Nation strong, productive, and free. The proposed legislation is a major step toward alleviating this problem.

The health hazards faced by our 80 million workers are very real and very serious. They range from vexing skin diseases to deadly lung cancer. One of every 10 soft-coal miners in Appalachia has a disabling chest disease caused by his work. Four million others in the manufacturing, construction, and automotive repair industries work under conditions either immediately dangerous to their health or hazardous enough to require continual inspection. Millions of workers hold jobs where the high level noise is potentially damaging to their hearing.

These problems do more than adversely affect the worker, although that in itself is enough to merit our attention. They also affect the health and strength of our Nation. In areas of our Nation machinists, whose skills are crucial to our defense effort, are in short supply—their factories on double shifts. If they miss work, production suffers. Similarly, reports of occupational diseases occurring in one plant or industry are not widely available to prevent their recurrence in other areas. Nor is there any effective mechanism for testing the burgeoning avalanche of new products and processes. We need to protect our workers and to take needed precautions before health hazards occur.

Because the health hazards facing our workers are varied and complicated, solutions are not easily found. I think the President's proposals, if effectively carried out, can have a substantial impact on this problem.

THE SUPPLEMENTAL MILITARY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the upcoming supplemental military appropriation bill will be regarded by some as a referendum on the U.S. policy in Vietnam. No single vote, however, can possibly delineate the measure of congressional or public endorsement on a problem so intricate or vexing as that which confronts us in Vietnam. I, for one, cannot support the course of escalation in which we are now engaged.

There is reason to believe that both sides want talks. There was an opportunity for some probing for these talks about 3 weeks ago. The truce provided an opportunity for peace talks to begin. The North Vietnamese Foreign Minister had said that only after unconditional end to the bombings of North Vietnam could there be talks. This represents what is thought to be a considerable shift in the position of the North Vietnamese. They do not now insist upon their "four points" which includes the evacuation of all American troops.

Second, the military importance of the bombing of North Vietnam is questionable. It is not something that we need to do to sustain the military effort or maintain our military strength in South Vietnam. For Secretary of Defense McNamara has said:

> I don't believe that bombing up to the present has significantly reduced, nor any bombing that I could contemplate in the future would significantly reduce the actual flow of men and material to the south.

If Secretary McNamara is right and if the Vietnamese Foreign Minister is sincere, our policy with respect to bombing ought to be clear. If cessation of bombing of North Vietnam cannot significantly affect our military position, and if it would be construed by the North Vietnamese as a step toward peace, it is a course of action which we should attempt. That is why I telegraphed the President, at the time of the truce, expressing my deep disappointment at the resumption of the bombings as a destructive force against negotiations.

We, as the most powerful nation on the face of the globe, can afford to make a first gesture of peace and the first concession without it being taken as a sign of weakness. We will be able to deduce the intentions of the North Vietnamese by whatever follows. If they are persistent in exploiting the cessation of the bombing for their own military advantage we will know, once and for all, their intent. The burden of what follows will fall heavily upon them and will remove all doubt as to who is responsible for the continuance of the conflict. I believe we can take this initiative toward peace. And I believe we ought to take it now.

Mr. Speaker, when those peace talks begin, it is clear that the so-called National Liberation Front must be a participant in the negotiations, because they are a participant in the present conflict. Evidence is mounting that the National Liberation Front is independent of the government of Hanoi, and will not necessarily be bound by decisions reached in a negotiation in which they did not participate. Even if they were not independent of Hanoi, they could assert at any future date that such a conference is not binding on them if they are not represented there.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that regardless of when the negotiations begin, we must take our cue from the people of Vietnam. We must accept the decisions of the electorate of that country. The recently elected constituent assembly is an expression of the will of the people of South Vietnam, and is now drafting a Constitution designed to represent all the people and to preserve their rights and freedoms. I think we should do everything possible to indicate our support for these efforts. If we should do so, we indicate our objectives clearly: that we are not there to subjugate a people but that we are there to insure their right of self-determination.

GREAT PLAINS PARKWAY BILL

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, a bill calling for the establishment of a Great Plains Parkway is being introduced in Congress today by my Kansas colleagues and me.

Sponsored by both U.S. Senators from Kansas, Senator FRANK CARLSON and Senator JAMES PEARSON, and all five Members of the House of Representatives from Kansas—Representative ROBERT DOLE, of the First District; myself from the Second District; Representative LARRY WINN, of the Third District; Representative GARNER SHRIVER, of the Fourth District; and Representative JOE SKUBITZ, of the Fifth District—the measure seeks the eventual establishment of a parkway and scenic roads through the heartland of our Nation, beginning in Oklahoma and traversing the States of Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, and North Dakota to its northern terminus in Montana.

In this region some of the most colorful and important history of our Nation was written. The proposed parkway would connect a multitude of historical, scenic and educational attractions. In linking these nationally significant features together by parkways and scenic roads, untold numbers of Americans would be invited to become acquainted with the great frontier heritage of the region as well as its many contributions to the welfare of the Nation today.

All Members of the Kansas delegation are familiar with the singular beauty of the region—the rolling hills, the bluestem pastures, the cool streams and pleasant valleys, and the historic spots along the way. We would like to have people from other States become acquainted with these features because we feel that one of the most appealing aspects of the whole parkway is the great prairie, the remaining vestiges of which are in Kansas.

The proposed route through Kansas runs from Sedan, near the Oklahoma line in southern Kansas, northward through the heart of the Flint Hills to historic Council Grove, up the Blue Valley by Tuttle Creek, and ending at the Hollenberg Pony Express station near Hanover. The route is replete with history. It includes the Independence crossing on the famous Oregon Trail and Alcove Springs near Blue Rapids and Marysville, a spot of beauty which was once a famous camping spot on the Oregon Trail. The parkway would cross the Sante Fe Trail at Council Grove, the home of the Council Oak, the Custer Elm, and the Post Office Oak. At Cottonwood Falls stands the oldest Kansas courthouse. The route also includes scenes of ranching and agriculture in their productive contributions to the Nation's well-being and its economy.

The Kansas delegation in introducing the Great Plains Parkway hopes to elicit the support of the delegations in other States.

The feeling of the delegation is that subsequent studies by appropriate agencies will suggest areas of Federal responsibility, State responsibility, and joint cooperation in some areas. Studies already carried on in Kansas point in that direction.

The members of the Kansas delegation do not anticipate hearings or other congressional action in this first session of the 90th Congress. The introduction at this time is designed to stimulate interest from other States and hopefully to bring about feasibility studies and other research on the proposal by appropriate Federal agencies. Should the proposal in whole or in part appear feasible it would then be the intention of the delegation to request hearings and seek action at the second session of the 90th Congress.

HENRY R. LUCE

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, with the sudden death yesterday of Harry Luce, editor and publisher of Time-Life-Fortune, America has lost one of its ablest and most creative newspapermen.

He brought a new approach to magazine journalism, and a new dimension to magazine news reporting. More than this, for many years he stood strongly for internationalism and for a responsive and responsible U.S. foreign policy. In the days of McCarthy he vigorously opposed the Senator and those rightwing elements of that era that clearly deserved to be revealed to the American people.

Throughout Harry Luce strongly supported the need for civil rights legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I join, I am sure, with all Members of the House of Representatives in expressing our deep sympathy to Clare Boothe Luce and to members of the family in our deep expression of respect for Harry Luce and particularly for those things for which he stood and which will live on.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include an editorial:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 1, 1967]

HENRY R. LUCE

Henry R. Luce created an entirely new approach in magazine journalism and indirectly influenced the techniques of presenting the news in daily newspapers. He built a large, complex, highly successful publishing enterprise. For personal force, ambition, intelligence, calculated daring and sustained executive skill, he ranked among the most successful of contemporary American businessmen.

Critics have questioned whether Time magazine, for all its wit and technical inventiveness, has been a force for raising standards of responsibility in the writing and editing of news. The moral ambiguities of group journalism as practiced by Time are as unresolved today as they were 44 years ago when Mr. Luce and the late Briton Hadden published its first issue. Objectivity is a myth, Henry Luce argued, but what he saw as a news magazine presenting facts in a lively fashion and in their proper context, many others saw as thinly disguised journal of opinion.

There has been much less dispute about his other magazines. They are all eminently successful and Fortune, for example, has become an outstanding publication in its field.

Henry Luce was a missionary's son who believed that the United States has a unique moral mission. His adversaries accused him of misguided zeal in trying to mount unlimited crusades in the inherently limited spheres of politics and diplomacy. But if his effect on Asian policy over the past generation was often unfortunate, he was a powerful influence for internationalism over isolationism in the critical years leading up to American involvement in World War II. His magazines moved courageously against the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy when that demagogue was at his peak, and they have consistently worked in behalf of Negro equality.

A shy, reticent man in public, Mr. Luce sought power not for himself but for his controversial ideas. But he will be best remembered for the pioneering and provocative journalistic enterprises he created to advance those ideas.

NEED FOR ACCURATE WEATHER FORECASTING

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to a weather problem.

While it is true that everyone talks about the weather but no one does anything about it, this need not be true of the Weather Bureau and weather forecasting.

The people of my congressional district of northeast Missouri, as well as those in southeast Iowa and northwestern Illinois, have been systematically deprived of the advantages of accurate weather forecasting. As weather forecasting techniques become more modern, scientific, and accurate, the inhabitants of the areas I have mentioned find themselves able to learn with speed and accuracy the immediate weather forecasts for Bombay and Bermuda, but they are forced to rely on the Farmer's Almanac to determine what their own weather will be. This is true because of the elimination of weather stations—in particular, those at Keokuk and Burlington, Iowa, which ably served this tri-State area for many years.

Reestablishment of the Burlington, Iowa, weather station in the immediate future is urgently needed, and the problem is well delineated in the attached editorial which appeared Wednesday, February 15, 1967, in the Quincy Herald-Whig, which I insert at this point in the RECORD:

BETTER FORECASTS NEEDED

Sometimes we blush for the weather. We don't mean the showers, the cheek-stinging cold winds, or even the snowflakes falling from a partly sunny sky. We mean the forecasts we print—to us the "weather."

You read them, and you hear and see them on radio and television. Next morning they come reasonably true, and you don't give them another thought.

Or, next morning, it's 40 when 15 was forecast, or it's the start of a blizzard that was supposed to be a chance of rain and colder.

So you wonder or growl, and we blush.

The weather itself we can't do anything about—even if we fill the skies with storm-tracking satellites. But the forecasts—today more important than ever because weather can snarl traffic as never before, shut down factories and schools more dependent than ever on transportation, or break levees to flood rich farm lands—they're something else.

Weather-wise, Quincy lies in northeast Missouri and southeast Iowa. Weatherwise Quincyans look to the west—when they sniff the wind for a meteorological change.

So, as weather-detecting methods improve, as the weather bureau claims an ever higher percentage of accuracy and becomes so bold as to state the precipitation percentage possibilities, as we move toward a day of total world observation and analysis, there is something that can be done about the so vital forecasts.

That is: Re-establish a weather station for the large area now dependent on St. Louis and Des Moines for its forecasts.

In the words of the Burlington (Ia.) Hawk-Eye, printed elsewhere on this page:

"Bring back the weather bureau!"

Located as we are, jutting into northeastern Missouri, so that weather forecast for western Illinois has passed us before we've heard about it, we need the pinpointing attention that we formerly enjoyed from the Burlington weather station. We need it for safety for those threatened by storm or flood, for its value to industry and business, for personal convenience, for general satisfaction—and to reduce the number of blushes.

Retrenchment eliminated the Burlington weather bureau at the end of 1964 after a 23-year stand there that followed 70 years of operation at Keokuk.

Burlington, with its eye on the sources of our weather, issued twice-daily forecasts that swept out a wide area of southeastern Iowa, northeastern Missouri, and western Illinois, giving timely words of warning or promises of good things to come. Old friend C. F. Jespersen, the meteorologist in charge, not only had a 23-year record of accuracy hard to equal, but in this land of river floods he had a perceptive and wary eye on the Iowa and north Missouri streams that can swell the Mississippi to levee-breaking proportions. At the end of a telephone line to Burlington, he might have been sitting in the Herald-Whig news room putting the pieces together to give us the best possible forecasts—that is, the most timely and accurate for the area.

Burlington and its southeast Iowa neighbors find themselves unhappy with forecast service from distant Des Moines, just as Quincy, heir to northeast Missouri's weather, finds surprises in forecasts that lump us with all of eastern and southern Missouri or with western Illinois, most of which is east of us. It's not just that we're on the border; there's a broad weather lane west of us that needs a special watch.

Fliers and others who have to be constantly alert to weather changes, as well as the ordinary citizen, will testify to this. They know this part of the Mississippi valley can generate sudden and erratic switches in the weather that seem independent of the major systems dominating the national picture.

Re-establishment of the weather bureau at Burlington—or at any point in the area involved—would recognize the ever-greater importance of adequate forecast service and the need of a growing agricultural and industrial land to be restored to the weather map.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNGATE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I congratulate the

gentleman on his statement and commend him for his support of this measure. The Quincy-Herald Whig has pinpointed the nature of this problem. Our colleague from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL], should likewise be commended for his efforts to restore the weather bureau station at Burlington, Iowa.

Mr. HUNGATE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

MRS. CAROLYN FOREMAN, AUTHOR AND HISTORIAN

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, last month one of the greatest, finest ladies ever to live in my State passed away. She was Mrs. Carolyn Foreman, of Muskogee, Okla., who died at her home at age 93. She not only lived a long life; she lived a full life, useful, and productive. She was an outstanding human being and a great author and historian.

Mrs. Foreman was the widow of the late Grant Foreman who was unquestionably Oklahoma's most illustrious historian. The story of the life of Grant and Carolyn Foreman is one of the most beautiful chapters in the history of American scholarship. It was a beautiful chapter in the human story, as beautiful as the fabled tales of "Camelot."

The story of the Foremans is probably unique in our Nation's history. They met and married in what is now Oklahoma when it was still Indian territory. Grant Foreman came to Oklahoma at the turn of the century with the Dawes Commission to study Indian affairs. Mrs. Foreman came with her father, the late Honorable Judge John Robert Thomas, and settled in Muskogee where she lived until the day of her death. Mrs. Foreman was born in Illinois and educated in Washington, D.C., and Monticello College, Godfrey, Ill., and in Europe.

Judge Thomas, Mrs. Foreman's father and a Union veteran of the Civil War, served four terms in this House from Illinois. He died in my hometown of McAlester, Okla., in 1914.

Grant Foreman preceded his wife in death, having departed this life in 1953. He was an elderly man at the time.

After his work with the Dawes Commission Mr. Foreman began the practice of law in Muskogee. He was successful both professionally and financially. He was able to retire at a relatively early age and spent the rest of his life along with Mrs. Foreman in studying the background of Oklahoma history. They knew and loved the Indians of Oklahoma and told their story probably better than it has ever been told. Scholars for a thousand years will be indebted to the Foremans for their research, observations, and chronicles.

The Foremans, more than anyone I ever knew, were scholars in the pure sense. They had no ax to grind. They were completely free and independent. Their only interest was in digging up and writing the history of Oklahoma and of its Indian tribes.

Their devotion to Oklahoma history was only superseded by their devotion to each other. They lived the good life of love and work.

I regard it as one of the most fortunate facts of my life that I have been able to know the Foremans for many years. When I received my Phi Beta Kappa key at the University of Oklahoma, Grant Foreman was made an honorary member of the same chapter. Although I had known them through their works, I had never before met them in the flesh. I am happy that I got to know them well as time went by. I have been in their home scores of times. I never went through Muskogee without paying them a visit. My conversations with them always did something for me. They were among the noblest of mankind.

The last time I visited Mrs. Foreman she was becoming feeble, but she had the strength to tell me that she and Grant had lived a wonderful life, and she had the kindness to tell me that they had appreciated my friendship over the years.

I love my State and its glorious history. For many years one of my hobbies has been the collection of history books on Oklahoma. The Foreman collection heads the list. Among Mrs. Foreman's writings which I am proud to own are "Park Hill," "Crossed Timbers," "Oklahoma Imprints," "Indian Women Chiefs," "Indians Abroad," and "North Fork Town." I love them all. I have read them all.

I have lost a friend whom I adored. Oklahoma has lost the second member of the greatest historical team in the annals of our State. Mrs. Foreman died without children or close relatives but she left her writings and she left a host of friends unnumbered.

THE FINANCIAL CONDITION OF THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT FUND

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, last week during debate on H.R. 2, the Reserve bill of rights, some concern was expressed here on the House floor as to what effect title II of the bill would have on the civil service retirement fund. Title II, by making National Guard technicians Federal employees, brings them under the civil service retirement program and grants them credit for all previous technician service, credit for which they are not required to pay. As with any other Federal employees, upon retirement their final annuities would be reduced by 10 percent of any amount of money that they would owe for past service.

In commenting on the general condition of the retirement fund, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] stated:

> I think this question of the solvency of the civil service retirement fund deserves immediate and careful consideration by the administration, the Civil Service Commission, and the appropriate committee of Congress.

I could not agree more with the gentleman. In fact, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I can assure all the Members of the House that the financial condition of the civil service retirement fund has been and will continue to be a matter of extreme interest and importance to my committee. We are prepared to face this problem directly and realistically during this Congress and I have already announced that my subcommittee, at the earliest opportunity, will undertake extensive studies and investigations with a view to finding the proper solution.

I am confident the gentleman from North Carolina, a ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, will agree with me that there are no obvious or simple solutions even though there is a rather simple reason for the existence of the problem. The $45 billion deficit in the civil service retirement fund exists quite simply because the Congress, over the years, through the appropriation process, has failed to appropriate its share of the required contributions. This is true even though the Civil Service Commission each year must submit estimates of the appropriations necessary to finance the fund on a normal cost plus interest basis. It was not until July 1957 that each agency was required by law to contribute directly to the fund amounts equal to the deductions of its employees, thus supporting the yearly normal cost of the retirement system.

Over the years the deficiency in the fund has grown for a number of reasons—liberalization of benefits, the inclusion of additional employees with no requirement for payment to cover past service, annuity increases for those already retired payable from the fund, and pay increases for active employees. Simply by our failure each year to meet the accruing interest at 3½ percent of the present deficiency, we automatically increase the total deficiency by over $1½ billion.

Recognizing the problem that exists is easy, but finding solutions that will be in the best interests of the Government, the employees, and the taxpayers will not be so easy. There are very serious disagreements that continue unresolved among knowledgeable people on this subject, both over the extent to which the individual should share his retirement costs, and over the best approach to financing. Any methods we may find to resolve these problems will most surely have a tremendous impact on the administrative budget of the Government, as well as on the sense of security of hundreds of thousands of persons who depend on their civil service retirement benefits for economic security in their old age.

We have very real and almost solemn commitments in this whole area that we are deeply obliged to honor. I am confident that I and the members of my committee will be joined by every Member of the House in a common effort to protect the rights and welfare of this Government's employees and their families.

THE HONORABLE JAMES H. "JIMMY" QUILLEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this special order today to honor one of our outstanding colleagues, the Honorable JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN, and to give recognition to his many achievements, including the support he earned in his reelection to this House last November. When the votes were counted, he had achieved an amazing 87 percent of the total. This topped all Republicans who were opposed and exceeded the 72 percent figure with which he led Republican candidates in 1964.

It took no computer to predict the outcome, but even JIM QUILLEN must have been surprised by the total in his 1966 race. As one who has been elected and defeated by computer predictions, perhaps more often than anyone in this House, I claim a special privilege to speak. It took about 12 hours to determine the outcome in the First District of Ohio. It cannot have taken more than 12 seconds in the First District of Tennessee.

But for those of us who live dangerously at the polls, there is surely a lesson in JIMMY's record, for he came to this House in 1962 after a primary victory of 78 votes and election by less than 55 percent. The change since is no accident. It reflects hard work, and fine representation for his constituents regardless of party. It shows a recognition of his fine efforts on the Public Works and Rules Committees while he has been here in Washington. It also testifies to the close personal association that has developed with thousands of voters in the First District by JAMES QUILLEN and his lovely wife, Cecile. I have had the honor and pleasure of witnessing this myself.

His "open door" and his thousands of personal interviews reflect his strong belief that the people should be a vital part of our legislative process and that the Representative should be a part of his district. These are the truths that none of us here should forget.

Our distinguished colleague from Tennessee has set a mark and an example for us to follow. We thank him and congratulate him for it. May he long continue his valuable service among us and the attainment of even greater records of success will be his.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the body of the RECORD the following statement by the Honorable HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr., Senator from Tennessee:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HOWARD H. BAKER, JR., OF TENNESSEE

It is indeed a pleasure for me to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to this great American, this great Tennessean and great Republican, the honorable JIMMY QUILLEN.

We are honoring Congressman QUILLEN because he has for the second straight time received a higher percentage of the votes of the people of his district than any other Congressman in the United States.

This is indeed a singular honor, both for him and for his State and his district. In 1964, Congressman QUILLEN won reelection by 72 percent of the votes and in 1966 he received 87 percent of the votes.

But the significant fact here is not the percentage of the votes but what this represents.

In winning reelection in 1964 by such a large majority and substantially increasing this majority in being elected 2 years later, JIMMY QUILLEN has demonstrated that he has, in his 4 years in Congress, truly interpreted the desires, ambitions and needs of his people.

JIMMY QUILLEN has shown that he is perfectly attuned to the feeling and currents of opinion of virtually all of his people.

JIMMY QUILLEN keeps this close relationship with the people of his district by making himself constantly available to them both here and in his Tennessee field office where he maintains a staff as large as his Washington staff.

Hardly a week passes that the Congressman does not go back to his district to move among his people and sit with them personally to discuss how he can best represent them here in Washington.

This is what our representative system is all about. I fully believe this is what the framers of the Constitution had in mind when they designed the system.

JIMMY QUILLEN knows this and he has learned to transform the theory into practice. This is why 87 percent of the people of his district cast their votes of confidence in him come election day.

Last fall, I had the privilege to join with Congressman QUILLEN in an exhaustive campaign sweep through the heartland of his district. Nowhere in all of our campaigning across the State did we see such enthusiasm and spirit as we did that last Saturday before the election.

There seemed to be hardly anyone in those thousands who thronged about us at every stop that JIMMY QUILLEN did not know on a first name basis. More than that he knew the particular problems of each and was able to report to them as we moved about what he was doing for them and they knew from his past record that when he says he will do something for a constituent he means it.

So you see, any attempt for us here to eulogize this great American will fall far short of the tribute given to him where it counts, by the votes of 87 percent of the people of the First District of Tennessee.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAFT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WAMPLER].

Mr. WAMPLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct privilege today to pay honor to a great American and a great neighbor, the Honorable JAMES H. QUILLEN, of Tennessee. His concern for his people and the Nation has led him to a position of respect in Congress and won for him the highest of tributes from a grateful citizenry back home.

Those of us in southwest Virginia feel a special kinship to JIMMY QUILLEN. He was born in the rolling hills of Scott County, in my own Ninth District of Virginia. There and in nearby Kingsport, Tenn., he was instilled with those principles which have become the guiding influence of his life.

Mr. QUILLEN is unexcelled in his service to the people of the First District. I know of no other man who spends as much time working for his constituents, or who maintains such an effective system of keeping in touch with the people who are, after all, the final voice of this great Government of ours.

Through his series of open door meetings, JIMMY QUILLEN has brought government as close to the people as humanly possible. They know they have an interest in the events of the day and, through Mr. QUILLEN, they know they have an effective voice in the Nation's Capitol.

It is this attitude which has led JIMMY QUILLEN to a position of esteem in Washington and of strength back home. I consider it a high honor to be able to pay my respects today.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for taking this opportunity to recognize the good qualities of the gentleman, our colleague from Tennessee.

In view of the subject under consideration by the House today, it gives me even greater pleasure to second the remarks that you have so far made.

I also think it ought to be recognized in view of this great Republican function that we are going to later this evening that there are enough of us here who feel so strongly about the gentleman from Tennessee that we wanted to remain here even at this late hour on the floor of the House to listen to the splendid remarks the gentleman has just made.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to pay a warm and sincere tribute to my distinguished and respected colleague, Mr. JAMES H. QUILLEN.

The most apparent and outstanding tribute to Mr. QUILLEN and his tremendous ability to communicate with his constituents is his phenomenal endorsement at the ballot box. Mr. QUILLEN increased his impressive 72-percent vote percentage of 1964 to the truly tremendous figure of 87 percent of the vote in 1966. This fantastic ability to draw such a clearly decisive vote must command the highest respect and commendation.

Mr. QUILLEN was first elected to the 88th Congress in 1962, as the first man from his home county of Sullivan to represent the district in Congress since 1843. In 1962 he defeated his Democratic opponent with less than 55 percent of the vote cast. He substantially increased his plurality in the next two general elections.

Prior to running for Congress, Mr. QUILLEN served 8 years as a Republican member of the Tennessee House of Representatives, serving as minority leader, and was twice nominated for the speakership of the House. In the first primary election race in 1962, there were five Republicans in the primary—one of the hardest fought races in the history of the district. In 1964 and 1966 he had no opposition for reelection.

During the off-election years, Mr. Quillen initiated an "open door" policy by visiting each of the 14 counties in his district. He set up an office in the courthouse and asked the people to come in with their problems. This was one of the most popular moves he made, and some 10,000 people came in for personal interviews during the district tour the first time and over 12,000 came in 1965.

Mr. Quillen is the undisputed leader of all Republican congressional candidates for two successive elections. This accomplishment clearly speaks for itself, but I want to add my congratulations for his amazing record and very best wishes for much continued success.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues on this side of the aisle in congratulating the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Quillen, on his achievement in leading all Republican congressional candidates in vote getting for the second consecutive time the 1966 elections.

His constantly accelerating pluralities in the First District of Tennessee indicates the conscientiousness with which Mr. Quillen has handled his assignment here in the Congress. I congratulate the gentleman on this outstanding achievement and wish him many more years of success in the House of Representatives.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues in noting the magnificent job being done by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Jimmy Quillen has set a remarkable record in winning votes, a task all of us can appreciate.

It is noteworthy that his constituency must appreciate him—not so much for the results of the vote count, but for the very solid reasons behind it. Jimmy Quillen has distinguished himself and his office by the way that he continues to serve the people of his district.

He has never failed to go to them and give them the opportunity to be heard.

He has never failed to bring back to us their ideas and their views.

He serves a high role here in this Chamber and it is a pleasure to join in commending him for it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today my colleagues and I join in saluting a fine gentleman, an outstanding American, the top Republican vote-getter in the House.

Representative James H. (Jimmy) Quillen of Tennessee's First Congressional District is a champion in many ways—not only in vote-getting ability. He is intelligent, hard-working, honest, honorable, and humble.

He came from modest beginnings, this "mountain man" who was born into a tenant farm family of 10. But Jimmy possessed the strength, independence and fierce pride in accomplishment that distinguished the people of the mountain district he represents in Congress. He has demonstrated those qualities dramatically since he was first elected to the House in 1962 with less than 55 percent of the total vote.

It is true that Jimmy's congressional district is a traditionally Republican area which has only once sent a Democrat to Congress—and then for only one term. But the fact that Jimmy increased his percentage of the total vote to 72 percent in 1964 and then to the truly amazing figure of 87 percent in 1966 reflects far more than traditional Republicanism.

To me Jimmy Quillen is a symbol of political truth which is beginning to spread throughout our great States of the South. That truth is that it is the Republican Party of today which practices the philosophy espoused so eloquently by one of our greatest Presidents—Thomas Jefferson. It is the Republican Party which follows rather than gives lipservice to the Jeffersonian teaching that government must be the servant of the people, that an all-powerful central government is destructive of personal liberty and that strong State and local government is vital to the well-being of our American democratic system.

Many voters who normally vote for the Democratic ticket contributed to the overwhelming victory achieved by Jimmy Quillen last November. Like the Republicans who support Jimmy Quillen, the Democrats in his district voted for him because he gives them great service, actively seeks their advice, and tirelessly works to solve the problems of his area at the same time that he fulfills admirably the other duties thrust upon him by high national office.

All of those who cast their votes for Jimmy Quillen in the last election did so, too, because they find their thinking agrees with the basic Republican philosophy which advocates the revitalizing of our State and local governments as opposed to further intrusions into the lives of all Americans by an all-pervasive Federal Government.

We congratulate Jimmy Quillen on his tremendous victory. We salute him as a great Republican standard bearer in the new South. And we congratulate the people of the First District of Tennessee for recognizing and rewarding Jimmy Quillen's diligence and outstanding abilities.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Republican Congressional Committee, I am pleased to take part in Jimmy Quillen day. I have followed Jimmy's political career closely since August 13, 1962, when he first got his party's nomination to represent Tennessee's First District in Congress. And he won by a substantial margin that year, I might note.

During his first term in Congress, he gave notice that he was going to be a vigorous representative of his district. Without question, he was. In 1964, he led GOP congressional winners with 72 percent of the vote. He has had a rapid rise in congressional responsibility and in the esteem of his colleagues in the House. He was appointed to the Rules Committee during his second term, an honor that falls to few Members of Congress.

Last fall, the voters of the First District expressed their high regard for his services by giving him 87.1 percent of the vote. An impressive record, this was the highest percentage run up by a winning Republican congressional candidate. It is deserved. Congressman Quillen has stoutly resisted the inroads of what is called "Potomac fever." He has kept in mind constantly that, in addition to considering the Nation's laws, he is here to serve the people of his district. He has, in short, helped his country, the people of his district, and his party. We are proud of him.

One of the tasks of our Congressional Campaign Committee is to urge capable men to run for Congress. The congressional career of Jimmy Quillen can well serve as an example of the benefits to the Nation and to the people of a congressional district that accrue from having men of his caliber make the race for Congress.

I am pleased to join my Republican colleagues in the House in honoring an outstanding Congressman and a great guy. On this, Jimmy Quillen day in the House, may I wish him many more happy election returns.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, it is a genuine pleasure to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to Jimmy Quillen for the tremendous victory he rolled up in Tennessee's First District last November. Victories such as he rolled up do not just happen. I know this from personal experience. To win big as Jimmy did requires several things. First and foremost, of course, is an able candidate who enjoys the confidence and respect of the people. In addition to being able and respected, the candidate must be willing to work, not only on the stump during campaigns but throughout the year attending to his duties in Washington and keeping in touch with his constituents. And of almost equal importance is the necessity of being able to put together a smooth functioning organization at the grassroots. And, of course, it always helps to have favorable issues, and they were all on our side in that last campaign.

I have always felt very close to the people of Jimmy's district, because for many years the district I had the honor of representing joined Tennessee's First District along the North Carolina-Tennessee line and along the top of Roan Mountain. There is a community of interest between his people and those I used to call mine just across the border from him.

These people are rugged individualists and exceedingly independent in their thinking. It matters not to them how other sections of the country vote; they vote their convictions regardless of how the political winds are blowing across the Nation. They are hardy, industrious, frugal, and do not like to take dictation. They believe in making their own decisions and like to stand on their own two feet. I was always proud of the opportunity of representing the mountain people who live across the line in North Carolina from Jimmy's district in Tennessee. I knew he is equally proud to represent those who live on the Tennessee side of the border, and am quite sure they are very proud of their Representative or they would not continue to send him back to Congress with such overwhelming majorities.

Congratulations, JIMMY, on leading the way last November. Keep up the good work; continue to set the pace; and present the rest of us a goal on which we can fix our eyes in the hope of sometime being able to match your accomplishments. While few if any of us will ever reach that objective, it is helpful to know that it is possible because you have shown us the way.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased, indeed, to join with others here today in honoring JIMMY QUILLEN. The comments being made certainly are a testimonial to the high esteem with which our friend is so universally held by the Members of the House.

It has been a great privilege to serve with our friend from Tennessee. His dedication to the people of the First District is surely in the finest tradition of American public service. What he is doing is well understood by the people of his area and they have demonstrated their feelings by the vote of confidence they have given him.

We are proud that JIMMY QUILLEN has served in the 88th, 89th, and 90th Congresses and that every 2 years he has returned with vastly greater support. In 1966, he polled 87 percent of the vote in the congressional race. This is such an overwhelming vote of confidence that it deserves special honors and recognition. It may stand as the nearest record we will see to the unanimous endorsement of a public official at the ballot box.

My own congressional district in North Carolina lies immediately to the east of the First Congressional District of Tennessee and I know well the people and the beautiful area of this country that JIMMY QUILLEN represents so ably here. I can say from my own observation and knowledge that the support he has received at the polls is a token of the respect and affection that can be found in every community. His "open door" policy during which he conducts office hours in each of his 13 counties is only one of the reasons JIMMY has won the hearts of the people of the First District. In him they see a man who sincerely believes that a Congressman should bring his activities to the people, make his services available to them at a local level, seek out their views in face-to-face contacts, and strive diligently to represent those views as issues great and small arise in Washington.

In JIMMY QUILLEN, they see a man of ability and integrity who is moved by compassion for his fellow men and an earnest desire to serve them unselfishly. It is that rare combination of attributes that we see in JIMMY QUILLEN. As the years pass, all of us here can benefit by his example, his wisdom, and the warmth of his friendship. May he continue his good works and enjoy the respect that he has so fully earned.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those paying tribute today to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] on the tremendously smashing victory he achieved last November. I know the confidence Mr. QUILLEN's constituents have placed in him is a source of great pride and satisfaction to him.

Mr. Speaker, last November I won my bid for reelection by a margin of 71 percent—which I thought was very good. But, compared with Mr. QUILLEN's great victory, I now feel as left out of things as Whistler's father.

I congratulate Mr. QUILLEN on his victory and wish him years of continued representation of those he serves so well in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a distinct pleasure for me to join in the special order today in paying tribute to our esteemed and distinguished colleague from the First District of Tennessee, Congressman QUILLEN, who has earned a reputation for outstanding leadership. I congratulate JIMMY QUILLEN on receiving the highest vote percentage of any opposed Republican in the last two general elections. He increased his 72 percent vote percentage of 1964, to the extraordinary figure of 87 percent of the vote in 1966—an outstanding accomplishment and evidence of the confidence and appreciation of this able legislator and his dedicated service to the people he represents.

As further testimony of his legislative talents and abilities in the House of Representatives, he was selected in 1965 to serve on what is perhaps the most distinguished committee in the House—the Committee on Rules. It has been indeed an honor and a privilege for me to serve with my worthy colleague on this important committee and I have been very impressed with his exceptional abilities. Since he was first elected to serve in this great body in 1962, he has proved to be a most valuable Member. He is a credit to his district, his State, and to our Nation. I congratulate him and look forward to many more years of working with him in the Congress.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago I was privileged to stand here in the well of the House to extend my personal congratulations to our colleague JIMMY QUILLEN, upon his being reelected to his second term from the First District of Tennessee by more than 72 percent of the total vote cast. That, to me, was a great achievement, particularly when you consider that he had served only one term and it represented a 17-percent increase in the 55-percent margin by which he was first elected.

Now here he is back again for another term with a still larger margin at 87 percent of the vote. It is almost unbelievable, knowing as we so well do the vicissitudes of politics to which all of us, whatever the nature of our congressional district, are subject from year to year and from election to election. One might be disposed to think that his huge margin of victory as a first termer was due largely to the type of campaign he conducted or certain unique political factors at the time. That there is considerably more to it than that is attested by the fact his majority after 4 years' service is even greater than after 2 years' service.

There is only one explanation for JIMMY QUILLEN proving himself to be the Nation's top votegetter. It is the man himself. He is a man who commands confidence. We who have served with him, and the people who sent him here to speak for them, appreciate JIMMY QUILLEN as a man of high principle, courage, and determination. He is a stalwart in the fullest sense of the word. He says what he means and he means what he says. This accounts for his being assigned by us Republicans to the vitally important Rules Committee. It also accounts for the huge majority by which his people returned him to Congress.

It was my privilege to be invited to speak in JIMMY QUILLEN's district. One need only be there a few minutes and he is impressed with the affection and respect the people of Tennessee hold for our colleague.

In extending my congratulations to JIMMY QUILLEN today I should like also to extend congratulations to the people of his district who so overwhelmingly select him to be their spokesman in the councils of Government.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues today in paying tribute to Congressman JIM QUILLEN. He has an enviable vote-getting record. By capturing 72 percent of the votes in his congressional district in 1964 and an even more impressive 87 percent of the vote in 1966, he has established a record that will be hard to beat.

I was privileged to serve with JIM QUILLEN on the Public Works Committee in the 88th Congress. He established himself there as a hardworking legislator. He made many valuable contributions to the committee's work. Now as a member of the Rules Committee he is continuing to serve with distinction in the Congress.

No doubt JIMMY QUILLEN's remarkable success at the polls is due in no small measure to his attention to his constituents. He follows a procedure I have used for 12 years, that of going to a county courthouse and opening the door to any constituent who wishes to talk to his Congressman. His expert use of the questionnaire and his meticulous attention to the problems of his constituents also have endeared him to the residents of the First Congressional District.

Congressman QUILLEN certainly deserves the admiration and respect of his constituents and of his colleagues in the Congress.

I want to wish him the best in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure for me to add some words of praise for our distinguished colleague [JIMMY QUILLEN], not only for his outstanding vote-getting ability, but also for his capable service in representing the people of the First District of Tennessee.

JIMMY's accomplishments in gaining and keeping the confidence of his constituents are well known to us all. He came to Congress in 1963 after having survived a bitter party split in the primary election, winning in November by a modest margin of something less than 55 percent of the vote. During the next 2 years he did everything a man could do to heal the wounds at home while at the same time establishing himself as an exceptionally able Congressman here in Washington.

The result—JIMMY's folks back home showed their approval of his efforts by sending him back for a second term with 72 percent of the vote. At the same time, many incumbent Congressmen were defeated for reelection. Then, last fall, his constituents voted to keep him here for another 2 years—this time with 87 percent of the vote cast. This was the highest majority given to any Republican Member of the House.

The people of east Tennessee are indeed fortunate to have as their Representative, my friend, colleague, and fellow 88th club member, the Honorable JAMES H. "JIMMY" QUILLEN, and we are equally fortunate to have him as a Member of the 90th Congress.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues today in honoring JIMMY QUILLEN and can only wish that I may emulate his record of rapport and confidence with the citizens of his district as demonstrated by his most recent endorsement by 87 percent of the votes of the First District of Tennessee. Certainly his performance should serve as a goal for all Republicans.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join in saluting JAMES QUILLEN, the Republican Party's top 1966 vote getter. Although we congratulate JIM in the House today for his extraordinary vote-getting ability, our kudos are only second best to the tribute paid him at the polls by his constituents in 1964 and again in 1966—perhaps the highest tribute that anyone in political life can receive.

It is a political fact of life that no one can be reelected by such wide margins unless he has obviously and sincerely given the best of himself. Certainly JIM QUILLEN's election achievements are a direct reflection of the outstanding and exemplary service he has given his district. Clearly, his knowledge and ability, his genuine interest and effort in behalf of his district, his understanding of their needs and problems have earned the respect and admiration of both his constituents and his colleagues in the House. Having worked with him when he was a member of the Public Works Committee during his freshman year in Congress, I can testify to his capabilities.

The Republican Party is proud of its outstanding votegetter. I compliment the voters of Tennessee's First District for their astuteness in returning this highly qualified man to the Congress.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a distinct honor to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and other colleagues in congratulating the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] for his outstanding achievements here in the Congress and in serving his constituency with such dedication and effectiveness that he has been returned to Congress with the phenomenal plurality of 87 percent of the vote cast. This accomplishment occurred in the face of stiff opposition in the general election last fall. JIM QUILLEN's latest accomplishment is even more remarkable when you consider that he won by 72 percent 2 years ago and by only 55 percent of the vote in 1962.

Winning a seat in Congress against stiff opposition is always an accomplishment, but the real test comes in the races to retain that seat. JIM QUILLEN has come through in both instances with flying colors. There are good reasons for this impressive record. First of all, JIM has served his constituents well in Congress. His proficiency was rewarded in 1965 when he was chosen to fill a vacancy on the prestigious Rules Committee. He has served in that position with distinction.

The other apparent reason for JIM's success at the polls is his genuine concern for the people he represents and his constant efforts to keep in touch with them on a personal basis. It is no secret that he deliberately visits every town and community in his 13 counties at every opportunity. Over 12,000 of his constituents accepted his "open door" invitation in the off-election year of 1965 and visited him in offices set up across his district following the adjournment of Congress. JIMMY QUILLEN knows his people, and his people know JIMMY QUILLEN.

It is refreshing to know someone who really understands the meaning of "representative" and who has been generously rewarded by those he represents.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is a special pleasure to join with our colleagues today in paying tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee's First Congressional District [Mr. QUILLEN]. JIMMY QUILLEN's remarkable accomplishment in winning reelection last November with 87 percent of the vote merits our recognition, both as a personal achievement of the highest order and as a notable reflection of the significance of maintaining close contact with the people a Member represents.

In the correct perspective, Mr. Speaker, our colleague's victory takes on even greater luster. It was not a matter of luck or the default of the other party. It represented hard work, unfailing attention to detail, and the determination to know his district and represent it well. In 1962, when he first ran for Congress, JIMMY QUILLEN triumphed in one of his State's hardest fought primaries, defeating four opponents in spite of the handicap that no one from his own Sullivan County had represented the district in Congress since 1843. In the equally difficult general election, he won by less than 55 percent.

Once in the House, however, JIMMY QUILLEN proceeded to demonstrate that his constituents had made no mistake. Combining conscientious work on legislation, attention to the needs of his district, and personal contact with constituents, he was reelected in 1964—in the face of a national sweep by the opposition—with 72 percent of the vote. With reelection, he won the title of our party's top votegetter.

With his 87 percent sweep of 1966, JIMMY QUILLEN might be expected to rest on his laurels—a double winner of the title. But those of us who know him, who have watched him always making that extra effort, are confident he will never rest. For this is the secret of his success, his unending determination to do his very best—for his people, his party, and his own self-respect.

JIMMY QUILLEN sets a high standard for his colleagues. It is a privilege to serve with him, and it is good to know that men of his stature and character will be here for a good long time.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio as well as all my other colleagues in congratulating the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] for being the top votegetter of all Republicans in the congressional elections of 1966.

Mr. Speaker, in a year of resounding success for the Republican Party, the gentleman from Tennessee best typified that success by rolling up the truly tremendous figure of 87 percent of the vote. This not only reflects his own ability as a campaigner but also shows the good judgment of the people of Tennessee.

I wish to publicly offer him my congratulations and best wishes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join in this special order today honoring my distinguished colleague from Tennessee [JIMMY QUILLEN], upon his tremendous victory at the polls last November. The fact that his constituents have seen fit to return him since his first election to Congress with ever increasing majorities which have now reached the astounding percentage of 87 percent is an indication of the high esteem in which he is held by those he represents. I should like to add by these few words how his colleagues here in the House regard him. Serving as I do with him on the Committee on Rules I have had the opportunity almost daily over the past several years to observe his work as a Representative. I can attest not only to his diligence and faithfulness in attending the sessions of the Committee on Rules, but also his mastery and grasp of the details of the great variety of bills that come before this committee. No man could exhibit such an understanding of the work of his committee unless he were willing to devote a great deal of time outside of regular office hours to a study of the many complex matters that confront us.

In conclusion, I am proud to be his colleague, and grateful for the opportunity to call upon him for assistance and advice in resolving some of the questions that confront us almost daily in the pursuit of our legislative duties. He is a credit to the Committee on Rules, to the House of Representatives and to the people of his home district in Tennessee.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio and all my colleagues in congratulating the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] for his outstanding achievement in the 1966 congressional elections.

In beating his own record as the top votegetter among all opposed Republicans, JIM QUILLEN deserves the praise and admiration of all his colleagues in this House. His 87 percent majority is an even more impressive tribute than the 72 percent he obtained in 1964 and should serve as an inspiration to all who are in politics or who would enter the political arena.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased to be able once again to rise on the floor of this House to take note of JIM QUILLEN's singular achievement. It demonstrates not only his own very impressive vote-getting ability but the wisdom and support of his constituents and their confidence in his abilities. JIM is a great legislator and his friends in Tennessee have shown they know it.

Mr. Speaker, I wish personally and publicly to offer my congratulations to the gentleman from Tennessee and extend my sincere best wishes for continued success in the years ahead.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today is indeed a wonderful day for Republicans in Tennessee. They too share in the great pride we are expressing in the record of our honorable colleague, JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN, here in this Chamber.

JIMMY is my neighbor, representing the First Congressional District of Tennessee. I have watched his votes come in bigger margins, bigger victories, ever since his first rather stormy race for a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives three terms ago. At that time five hard-working Republicans put in their bids for the Republican nomination. JIMMY, of course, led the race and fought hard to reconcile Republicans for a November victory against his Democratic opponent. Since then he has scored a larger percentage of votes in each succeeding election, in fact, topping the list of Republican candidates throughout the country each time.

Truly, JIMMY's record is remarkable, and it is only fitting that we pay tribute to him.

It is with honor and pleasure that I serve with JIMMY QUILLEN for he is always cooperative and attentive to ideas and suggestions of others. If any one thing can be singled out as his best attribute or way of succeeding, it would be hard work. He is always ready to help constituents and colleagues.

To both my colleague JIMMY QUILLEN and his lovely wife Cecile, I express sincere friendship and the hope that we can serve together for many years to come.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join with many of my colleagues in extending heartiest congratulations to Congressman JIM QUILLEN, who once again is the leading Republican votegetter of the November election.

It certainly is a much deserved tribute from the constituents of his district for the fine manner in which he has represented them in the past and an expression of confidence from them that he will continue to do so in the future.

Since his election to Congress in 1962, JIM has served his district, his State, and our Nation with great distinction. The residents of Tennessee's First District can indeed be proud of the able representation he is giving to them.

I offer my most sincere congratulations to JIM on this tremendous accomplishment.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with my colleagues in honoring the gentleman from Tennessee, the Honorable JAMES H. QUILLEN, for his achievement in being the outstanding votegetter of the Republican Party for two successive terms. Mr. QUILLEN led all Republican candidates in 1964 with a 72-percent majority. In the 1966 election, he exceeded this accomplishment by rolling up a majority of 87 percent. It is obvious that JAMES QUILLEN's constituents in the First Congressional District of Tennessee recognize in him what we all know here: that he is a man firm on principles in which he believes, courageous in his convictions, and determined in his desire to serve his district, State, and our country.

The Congress of the United States is fortunate in having the services of JAMES QUILLEN, as are the people of the First District of Tennessee, who can look with pride and satisfaction to their Representative in this great body.

My sincere congratulations to the top votegetter, and many, many more of the same in the years ahead.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to participate in this tribute to my esteemed colleague, JIM QUILLEN, Republican Member of this body since 1962 and the first man from his county to represent his district since 1843.

We are familiar with his astounding abilities as a votegetter; obtaining 87 percent of the vote cast in his district in 1966. More remarkable, of course, is that this was achieved in what was so recently referred to as "the solid South."

His service to his constituency has been evidenced by his defense of Wilford Metcalf, the Cocke County farmer who was resisting the efforts of the Federal Government to confiscate his land on behalf of an unjust claim of the Government. Due to the work of Congressman QUILLEN, the charge that Mr. Metcalf had cut timber growing on U.S. Government property was dropped and Mr. Metcalf vindicated.

Mr. Speaker, JIM QUILLEN has served his district and party by introducing an amendment to the Federal-Aid Highway Act to guarantee that future sections of the Federal Interstate Highway System will be constructed so as to adequately accommodate traffic for at least 20 years from the date of completion.

He exemplifies the highest type of elected official and the Republican Party is privileged to claim him for its own.

Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to know that JIM QUILLEN's special talents and qualifications have been recognized by his constituency in their overwhelming vote of confidence.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a genuine pleasure for me to join with my colleagues in honoring JIMMY QUILLEN of Tennessee. In both the 1964 and the 1966 elections JIMMY won reelection to the House by the highest percentage of any Republican who had an opponent, but these tremendous victories did not just happen. It took hard work and attention to legislative responsibilities to win that type of commanding support from his constitutents. Hard work has always been an important part of JIMMY's political career. As the Republican leader in the State house of representatives it took hard work to make a small Republican minority an effective bloc in the legislature. As a member of the Rules Committee, JIMMY had distinguished himself by his knowledge of the provisions of the bills coming before his committee for clearance to the floor.

As representative of the "hill country" of Tennessee JIMMY continues in the fine tradition of such great men as B. Carroll Reece and Thomas A. R. Nelson.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to honor my colleague, the Honorable JIMMY QUILLEN of Tennessee, for his outstanding ability as a true representative of his people—a fact which was substantiated last November when he polled 87 percent of the vote in his successful bid for reelection to the 90th Congress.

When describing the man and his contributions to this body, there simply are not enough superlatives at my immediate disposal. Like the title of a recent Broadway success, JIMMY QUILLEN is indeed a "Man For All Seasons." His effective and enviable record as a legislator since first coming to Congress in 1962 mark him as a bright gem on the Republican horizon.

It really comes as no great surprise to me that JIMMY QUILLEN is able to pile up such an overwhelming plurality. Like all the people in his home of eastern Tennessee, he believes that the only way to success and happiness comes through hard work and devotion to duty. The people of the First District of Tennessee take their politics seriously, and they know a good man when they see him. Their great vote of confidence is a clear indication of their feelings toward him.

I feel very privileged to add my name to the distinguished list of my colleagues paying tribute to JIMMY QUILLEN today. I am very confident that he will continue to merit the esteem and respect of both his constituents and this body in the years ahead.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a pleasure to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the notable accomplishments of Representative JAMES H. QUILLEN of the First District in Tennessee.

JIMMY, as he is affectionately known on both sides of the aisle, was the most powerful votegetter among Republicans elected to the House in the 1966 elections. He captured a remarkable 87 percent of the vote in his district. In my view, that merely reflects what a remarkable Congressman JIMMY is.

Since being elected to the House in 1962, he has established an enviable record in Congress. Not only has he been a most able Congressman, but he has worked successfully to weld Republicans in his district into a potent organization. He won by the narrow margin of 55 percent in 1962. The marked increase of his margin since that first victory is proof of his ability to work with the party in his district. JIMMY established himself as a highly successful mender.

It is just this kind of "mending" ability the Republicans across the Nation must use if we are to win the Presidency and capture the House and Senate in 1968, which I firmly believe can be accomplished.

We should pay close attention to the

advice of such men as JIMMY QUILLEN. They have clearly demonstrated that it is better to pull together and save our ammunition for the opposition.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, approximately 2 years ago, it was my privilege to join my colleagues in honoring the Honorable JAMES QUILLEN, of Tennessee, for his superior votegetting ability. In the previous election, he had polled more than 72 percent of the total vote cast in the First District of Tennessee and was the top Republican votegetter in the Nation.

We congratulated JIMMY QUILLEN and we also paid tribute to his constituents who demonstrated their wisdom by electing him with such an overwhelming majority.

We have now learned that he has once again led all Republican congressional candidates, this time with 87 percent of the vote cast in his district. Thus, it is apparent that the tremendous vote of confidence he received in 1964 was no accident. The people of his district recognize his tireless efforts, his intelligence, and unswerving integrity.

The U.S. Congress is fortunate in having the services of JIMMY QUILLEN and so are the people of the First District of Tennessee who can look with pride and satisfaction to their Representative in the Congress.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the First District of Tennessee has overwhelmingly endorsed my fellow 88th Club member, the Honorable JIMMY QUILLEN, for a third term in the Congress. JIMMY led Republican votegetters in 1964 by polling more than 72 percent of the total vote cast—an outstanding achievement indeed. To gain, as he did, 87 percent of the total vote in 1966 is an even greater achievement and endorsement of his fine representation.

JIMMY's popularity in Tennessee and in the Congress is a tribute to hard work, dedication, and service. The problems and interests of his constituency are approached with firmness and candor, and the problems and interests of the Nation are met directly and forthrightly.

I am pleased to join my colleagues in recognition of this outstanding public servant. My sincere congratulations go to him on another spectacular victory. May he have many more.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio and all the other gentlemen in Congress regarding my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], for his outstanding achievements not only in the election of 1966, but to the State of Tennessee. The gentleman from Tennessee tends to play down the "rags to riches" story which led him from a small farm in east Tennessee to the position of the Nation's top Republican votegetter. My east Tennessee colleague has proven an inspiration to all of us in the State by his own example of progress having progressed from a minority winner in a five-way primary to his present outstanding vote-getting record during only 4 years of service to his people. He has shown us all that a Congressman is elected to serve and that through his serving, the people will come to recognize their obligations to him by overwhelming reelections. To those of us across the State who have labored so diligently to build a two-party system, we number the gentleman from the First District among our leaders. I wish him continued success in his own district as I hope for all of us in helping build a strong two-party government.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join with many other friends in the House in honoring the gentleman from Tennessee, JIM QUILLEN. He continued to amaze and delight us with his phenomenal ability to win and "win big." In a year which saw many minority candidates pile up sizable majorities, his was the outstanding percentage. His impressive 72-percent margin of 1964, we learn was increased in November to 87 percent. This leads to the conclusion that nothing succeeds like success, especially when a man has ability, is not afraid of hard work and can point to an outstanding record of service to his country and the people of his congressional district. JIM QUILLEN's distinction is hard won and he richly deserves the commendation of his colleagues today.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join my colleagues in honoring the gentleman from Tennessee, JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN. His signal victory in the past election, gathering a phenomenal 87 percent of the vote in his district, is eloquent recognition of his outstanding service to his constituents. I congratulate JIMMY QUILLEN and I salute the discernment of the people of the First District of Tennessee, who have expressed how they feel about JIMMY in clear and unmistakable terms.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to JAMES QUILLEN. The fact that he has been elected and reelected by such tremendous margins indicates the respect, affection, and esteem in which he is held by his constituents.

We, his colleagues, from our associations with him know that these sentiments on the part of his electorate are certainly well founded. He is a dedicated, effective legislator, and one that will continue to serve, I hope, for many years.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to again join my colleagues in paying respects to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], on his tremendous victory at the polls.

His resounding vote of confidence from the people of his district can be directly attributed to his concern for those people and his conscientiousness and hard work in the 88th and 89th Congresses. We have served together on the Public Works Committee where I gained firsthand knowledge of his many talents and attributes.

I salute the gentleman and look forward to many more years of working with him in Congress.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in honoring my party's top percentage votegetter, the Honorable JIMMY QUILLEN of the First District of Tennessee.

Coming from the State of Texas, I have great admiration for Tennesseans because such Texas heros as Sam Houston and Davy Crockett were native Tennesseans who fought for my State's independence. But I do not think either of these Texas-Tennessee legends could have polled 87 percent of the vote in a race for Congress. In Texas, we remember the Alamo—but in Tennessee, they remember JIMMY QUILLEN, and for good reason. This capable, likeable Congressman stands out as a leader in this Congress, just as he stands out as his party's leading percentage votegetter. I commend him and can only add that it is a personal pleasure to serve with him in this Congress. When it is said, "Would you believe 87 percent?" your only answer is I would believe it only with JIMMY QUILLEN.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in paying my respects, and extending congratulations to my good friend JIMMY QUILLEN. Regardless of the party represented or the area from which the congressional seat is sought, I doubt if any other Member of this House could point to a similar degree of support. When one considers that in November of 1964 this man received 72 percent of the vote cast and in November 1966 increased this fantastic majority to 87 percent, well, I guess we must acknowledge that he truly speaks for his people. JIM is a great Member of Congress. He gives the type of representation that all people desire. He is tireless in his dedication to help all that need his help and is an inspiration for all of us to try to do just a little better. I am pleased to have him as a friend and colleague.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have great admiration for a man of JIMMY QUILLEN's character. His personal industry as a young man is testimony to his abilities. Having been associated with the newspaper business for many years, I can appreciate the challenge he faced as a publisher at the age of 20. To publish, write, edit, and sell advertising for a paper is a huge task, a task he was equal to. His election as "Young Man of the Year" by the Johnson City, Tenn., Jaycees is an indicator that he was and is a young man of action. The Jaycee creed has, as one of its points, that "Service to humanity is the best work in life." JIM QUILLEN clearly exemplifies the adherence to that creed, for service is one of my colleague's fortes. I am happy to congratulate him as the top votegetter in the Republican Party.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN. JIMMY QUILLEN is again the best votegetter of us all. He deserves a turnout like he got as he always works hard to get that turnout.

His rules, I am sure, are simple and few. He knows his district, being raised there, and he served it in the State legislature for 8 years. He had a tight race, both in the primary and in the election of 1962—but he won. He has been winning, not only votes, but the confidence of the people of the First District of Tennessee, ever since.

JIM also has the confidence and respect of his colleagues in this body and for the same reasons: real knowledge of the legislative process, fair dealing, and just plain hard work. He is a close friend of mine, but he is more than that. JIM QUILLEN is proof that dedicated service and ability in the House is recognized and appreciated by the people, and in this case, 87 percent of all the voters.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, for the second successive election, our colleague from Tennessee, the Honorable JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN, rolled up the highest House Republican vote.

It is a tribute not only to his remarkable ability and energy, but to his successful effort to keep voters of the First District in Tennessee well informed on the problems and nature of our National Government.

I often think of representative government as a two-way street. On the one hand, we bring local and regional viewpoints to bear on national questions; second, it is our obligation to keep the people informed on issues which affect their immediate interests and those of the Nation at large.

Assuredly, our colleague from Tennessee has recognized this responsibility. His success at the polls proves it. Modern-day politics, in most instances, is no longer a closed-door affair handled exclusively by the privileged and powerful of the community. It is a personal relationship cemented between the representative and the governed. JIMMY QUILLEN has personified this democratization of our political processes.

First elected to the 88th Congress, our colleague has steadily enhanced his political fortunes through service to his constituency and constructive work in the Congress. His "open door" policy in his district is well known. A member of the Public Works Committee during his first term, Representative QUILLEN's influence on legislation was marked, particularly in connection with the Federal highway program. He now serves on the influential Committee on Rules.

We Republicans can be justly proud of JIMMY QUILLEN's accomplishments. His superb service reflects admirably on our collective Republican posture in the House. It has been my privilege to serve here with him, and I trust that JIMMY's formidable record will lead to further achievements in the years ahead.

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor and a great pleasure to join my colleagues today commending Representative JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN not only for his overwhelming majority on November 8, 87 percent of the vote, but also for his dedication and service to the First District of Tennessee. It has been a privilege to serve in Congress with Representative QUILLEN since 1962.

He has compiled an enviable record and has won the respect and admiration of his constituents and the Members of this great body.

Being selected to the House Public Works Committee in his first term of office, JIMMY QUILLEN's most noted achievement was an amendment to the Federal-Aid Highway Act to guarantee that future sections of the Federal Interstate Highway System will be constructed to adequately accommodate traffic for at least 20 years from the date of completion. This is an outstanding accomplishment for a freshman in Congress and he deserves a lot of credit.

JAMES H. QUILLEN is truly a credit to our Nation, and Tennessee's First Congressional District is fortunate in having such a capable, hard-working, and dedicated man as their Representative in Washington.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great honor to be able to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a gentleman whose friendship I cherish and whose work as a public servant, first in the Tennessee State Legislature, and now as a Member of this House, entering his third term, has been a model from which we all might learn a great deal.

The people of Tennessee's First District are justly proud of JIMMY QUILLEN and the job he has done for his community and his State.

As a Republican, I am inspired by the the overwhelming response which JIMMY's service has earned him at the polls. In 1964, a year marred by many defeats, JIMMY led all Republican congressional candidates with a 72-percent majority in his district.

Last November, he managed to improve on even that formidable mandate when he received an overwhelming 87 percent of his constituents' votes.

The reasons for this striking success are many; JIMMY's dedication to his job; his now famous "open door" policy taking his congressional office to the people; his work on the prestigious Rules Committee, one of the most coveted appointments opened to any Congressman; and his untiring fight for the sound principles of humane, responsible government. All of these factors have contributed to JIMMY's tremendous success and popularity.

Mr. Speaker, I think all Americans can find it reassuring to know that despite all of the changes, turmoil, and confusion our country has undergone in recent years, the American system of government is still capable of producing leaders of JIMMY QUILLEN's stamp.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege and an honor to join with my colleagues here today in honoring Congressman JAMES H. QUILLEN.

Some time ago, when an opening occurred on the Republican side of the Rules Committee, those of us thereon were in unanimous agreement that we wanted JIM to fulfill this opening. He readily accepted this assignment and has proven to be a very able, thorough, and conscientious Republican member on the Rules Committee.

As the ranking Republican member on the Rules Committee, I can state without hesitation that he is prompt in attendance and always available to present rules assigned to him, which he does in a very able and efficient manner.

JIM is, indeed, a fine Congressman and certainly deserves this tribute for having placed No. 1 among the Republicans in winning in 1966. His district, the State of Tennessee, and the United States are fortunate in having the services of a man such as JIM in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BOB WILSON. As chairman of the Republican Congressional Committee, I am pleased to take part of JIMMY QUILLEN day. I have followed JIMMY's political career closely since August 13, 1962, when he first got his party's nomination to represent Tennessee's First District in Congress. And he won by a substantial margin that year, I might note.

During his first term in Congress, he gave notice that he was going to be a vigorous representative of his district. Without question, he was. In 1964, he led GOP congressional winners with 72 percent of the vote. He has had a rapid rise in congressional responsibility and in the esteem of his colleagues in the House. He was appointed to the Rules Committee during his second term, an honor that falls to few Members of Congress.

Last fall, the voters of the First District expressed their high regard for his services by giving him 87.1 percent of the vote. An impressive record, this was the highest percentage run up by a winning Republican Congressional candidate. It is deserved. Congressman QUILLEN has stoutly resisted the inroads of what is called "Potomac fever." He has kept in mind constantly that in addition to considering the Nation's laws, he is here to serve the people of his district. He has, in short, helped his country, the people of his district, and his party. We are proud of him.

One of the tasks of our congressional campaign committee is to urge capable men to run for Congress. The congressional career of JIMMY QUILLEN can well serve as an example of the benefits to the Nation and to the people of a congressional district that accrue from having men of his caliber make the race for Congress.

I am pleased to join my Republican colleagues in the House in honoring an outstanding Congressman and a great guy. On this, JIMMY QUILLEN day in the House, may I wish him many more happy election returns.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my distinguished colleagues from throughout this Nation to pay tribute to the Honorable JAMES H. QUILLEN, of Tennessee.

In two successive congressional elections, Mr. QUILLEN has been the champion votegetter on this side of the aisle, a record which attests to the respect and endearment in which he is held by the constituents of the First District of Tennessee.

He has maintained a close relationship with the problems and triumphs of the people of his district in a way which would do any Member of this honorable body well to emulate. He has not forgotten the people of his district and they most certainly have not forgotten him on three successive election days.

I feel privileged to have entered this distinguished body on the same day as Mr. QUILLEN, and look forward to a continuing close relationship with him.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues in noting the magnificent job being done by the gentleman from Tennessee.

JIMMY QUILLEN has set a remarkable record in winning votes, a task all of us can appreciate.

It is noteworthy that his constituency must appreciate him—not so much for the results of the vote count, but for the very solid reasons behind it. JIMMY QUILLEN has distinguished himself and his office by the way that he continues to serve the people of his district.

He has never failed to go to them and give them the opportunity to be heard.

He has never failed to bring back to us their ideas and their views.

He serves a high role here in this Chamber and it is a pleasure to join in commending him for it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to add my voice to the chorus of praise that is rightfully JIMMY QUILLEN's today as his colleagues honor a man who has won a distinguished reputation in this House.

His gentlemanly ways, his sincerity and friendliness, his courtesy and kindness are all outstanding even here where these qualities are possessed by so many Members.

After his first term in Congress, he was designated by the Members who were elected with him to the 88th Congress as "Congressman of the Week." At that time he was congratulated by them for his "outstanding contributions in the Roads Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, and especially for his successful amendment to the Federal Highway Act guaranteeing that future sections of the Federal highway system shall be constructed adequately to accommodate traffic for at least 20 years from the time of construction."

His legislative achievements have indeed been many, but so have his electoral triumphs. The very large percentage of the vote which he received after his two reelection campaigns were stunning victories. The size of those victories showed the devotion which his constituents feel for him. They did not get that devotion from the air or out of the ground. It came mainly from Representative QUILLEN's unceasing and utterly dedicated efforts to provide solutions to their problems, to represent them honestly, efficiently, and wholeheartedly. In 1966 he polled 87 percent of the vote. Somebody back there in Tennessee likes him.

He was born in Virginia, close to the border of Tennessee. His parents moved their large family to Kingsport, Tenn., when he was a boy. With his nine brothers and sisters he worked hard as a youngster in fields where tobacco, corn, and beans grew only when backbreaking toil was mixed with them. Working his way all his life came easy to someone like JIMMY QUILLEN. He has shown as a Member of the House of Representatives some of the pride in honest work that he acquired as a Tennessee farm boy.

He had a straight "A" average in his high school work. He might have won some high marks in some of his other activities, but marks were not given for opening a restaurant every day before school and cooking and serving breakfast there, or for working all day Saturday until midnight in a grocery store.

His family could not afford to send him to college in those depression days of 1936. He earned $10 a week at his first job, and then $12 a week at the next one, in the advertising department of the Kingsport Times. He soon was the shoestring publisher of a weekly called the Kingsport Mirror; every word in it was written by young JIMMY QUILLEN. Eventually he sold his Kingsport paper, and moved to Johnson City where he began another one. He made a daily out of this weekly in 1940, the year in which he was awarded a citation as eastern Tennessee's youngest publisher; he was then only 24.

He served with distinction in the Navy during World War II, and after the war made his mark in the real estate business. When he was 38, by now financially secure, he began his career in public service by winning election to the Tennessee Legislature where he served for 8 busy and productive years. In his first campaign for Congress in 1962, he visited every town and hamlet in the 14 counties of the district that he wanted to represent. He has been here ever since; it is doubtful that his constituents will ever retire him.

In our midst, then, is a fine man, an able legislator, an unusually successful campaigner, a man who has worked for his victories, a man whose future is promising indeed. I salute my dear friend, JIMMY QUILLEN, of Tennessee.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great personal pleasure, and perhaps a small tinge of envy, that I rise to add my tribute to the many paid here today to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from the First District of Tennessee, JAMES H. QUILLEN.

All of us are here by virtue of a mandate by the people, but I know of no other mandate which is quite so formidable.

Those of us who have known JIMMY QUILLEN since he was first elected could have told the good people of Tennessee that they had chosen wisely—that they were sending us one of their finest citizens.

But, Mr. Speaker, judging from the overwhelming margin by which JIMMY won his third term in this body, sending our advice would have been like carrying coals to Newcastle.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I have had the honor of knowing JIM QUILLEN from his first day as a Congressman. In fact, he is a member of the 88th Club with me. Certainly his record of achievement and popularity is one of the outstanding records achieved by a Member of Congress.

I have found him to be a strong and worthy Member of the Congress and of the Rules Committee. Having seen him in action on that committee I realize what important contributions can be made by an intelligent, effective, and sincere Member of Congress.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join with my colleagues in the House in this special tribute to our good friend and fellow Republican, JAMES H. QUILLEN.

It was just 2 years ago that we met on a similar occasion for a similar reason—to congratulate JIMMY on the distinction of being the foremost votegetter among all the Republican candidates for Congress in the general election of 1964. As many of you will recall, he won reelection in that election by the biggest majority of the year—72 percent of the votes cast in his First Congressional District of Tennessee. This was indeed outstanding praise of JIMMY's record—for the greatest honor any elected official can receive is to have the overwhelming support and confidence of the people he represents.

But the general election of 1966 paid an even more impressive compliment to our good friend and colleague. His plurality of 87 percent was once more the highest percentage received by any Republican congressional candidate in the Nation—and once again well-deserved recognition of JIMMY's outstanding ability and his dedication and devotion to the cause of good government and the ideal of public service.

Those of us who have had the privilege of working with JIMMY in the Congress are happy that the people of his district, whom he serves with such distinction, have again endorsed him with such a resounding majority. I join with his many friends in congratulating him on a job well done; and I commend, also, the people of his district for their wisdom in sending him to Washington to represent their interests.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleagues in congratulating JAMES H. QUILLEN of Tennessee on his resounding victory in the November 1966 election. For 2 years, JIM has led all Republican congressional candidates—rolling up an 87-percent majority in 1966 and a 72-percent majority in 1964.

These are scores which speak well for the man and for his relationship with the voters in the First District of Tennessee. His phenomenal vote-getting ability indicates how close he is to the people, and how successful he is in representing their views and opinions in the Congress of the United States.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STRATTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAFT. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, this tribute belongs to the people of the First District of Tennessee for they have made it possible, not only by sending me to Congress but by expressing their views to me and allowing me the opportunity to serve them. To them and to you, my colleagues, I express my heartfelt thanks.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the gentleman and I am sure I speak for all Members of the

House of Representatives when I say that his remarks are certainly very much in order.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 26 which was the vote on the preamble of the Powell resolution, I started out to attend the American Legion dinner as well as the Republican dinner this evening, thinking that the legislation was over for the day.

Mr. Speaker, I never heard of a vote on the previous question on a preamble or of a record vote on a preamble before in 22 years. I rushed back but I did not get here in time. I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 26 had I been present and not been caught by a complete legislative surprise.

TRIBUTE TO BERNARD B. FALL

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a saying that the first casualty in war is truth. On February 21, 1967, a man who dedicated his life to disproving that proposition became a casualty of the war in Vietnam. Bernard B. Fall was killed in Vietnam while out on a combat mission with the U.S. Marines.

The fact that he was with the Marines was characteristic of Professor Fall's approach to scholarly research. He refused to be restricted to research in libraries or from the comfortable vantage of capitol cities. For Bernard Fall the place of the serious scholar was where the events were taking place. For him, the foremost historian of Vietnam in the United States, this meant being not only in Vietnam but at the frontlines. This took courage. But courage was a quality which Bernard Fall exhibited early in life.

Professor Fall first experienced guerrilla warfare at the age of 16, when, after the death of his mother in a German concentration camp, he joined the French resistance. Two years later he was wounded twice in guerrilla fighting in the French Alps. After the war Bernard Fall assisted the French prosecution team at the Nuremberg war crimes trial.

In 1951 the future historian came to the United States on a Fulbright scholarship and took his doctorate at Syracuse University where, at the suggestion of his professor, he concentrated on Southeast Asia. His firm conviction that scholarly research could not be limited to documents led him in 1953 to leave the United States for Indochina. Because of his war record he was permitted to accompany French troops into the combat zone. Out of this experience he wrote "Street Without Joy," the classic work on the French in Vietnam.

For Bernard Fall, "Street Without Joy" was just the beginning. He returned to Southeast Asia several times and interviewed Ho Chi Minh. He also started what was to be the most extensive private library on Southeast Asia in the world.

As professor of international relations at Howard University, Bernard Fall, when not in the field, lived and worked in Washington. When his major work, "The Two Vietnams," was published, he became increasingly in demand as a speaker and an unofficial consultant to those in Government who were vitally concerned with Vietnam. He not only brought his tremendous knowledge and insight to many of us in the Congress but was engaged by the U.S. Army to lecture on guerrilla warfare. In recognition of his work he received the George Polk Award for outstanding interpretive reporting in 1966 and was awarded a Guggenheim fellowship to help finance his trips to South Vietnam last year and this year. A French citizen, he was decorated by President Charles de Gaulle last year.

Through the years Bernard Fall became recognized as the leading authority on Vietnam in America. The great demand for his talents, however, never changed his devotion to objectivity and the search for truth. In his books and in over 250 articles, Professor Fall consistently pointed out that those who make policy are often not fully aware of the facts. In personal briefings he would, with great gusto, deflate sweeping generalizations by quoting, often with incredible recall, a vast array of factual material. He was highly critical of those who went to Vietnam for the official briefings. In a New York Review of Books article published February 9, 1967, he referred to "the Washington pundits who honor us with their presence here for a few weeks and go from high-level briefing to a carefully stage-managed pacification operation without ever seeing the real, bleeding Vietnam."

Professor Fall with great intensity tried to bring home to the policymakers and to the public that it was a serious mistake to view the National Liberation Front as a mere puppet of North Vietnam. In an excellent article last October in Foreign Affairs Quarterly, he contended that the NLF "must be treated as what it is—a political force in South Vietnam which cannot be simply blasted off the surface of the earth with B-52 saturation raids, or told to pack up and go into exile to North Vietnam."

Bernard Fall was an advocate of direct negotiations between the South Vietnamese Government and the National Liberation Front and firmly believed that in the last analysis the only solution to the Vietnam conflict was a political one.

We are indeed fortunate that, just before Professor Fall's untimely death, another book of his was published. "Hell In a Very Small Place—The Siege of Dien Bien Phu" takes its place beside "Street Without Joy" and "Two Victims" as compulsory reading for anyone who is concerned with the struggle in Vietnam. This book is a brilliant analysis of the historic battle of Dienbienphu. In a New York Times Book Review article, one of many highly acclaiming this work, Professor Mus, of Yale, wrote on February 12, 1967:

> In sum, the book is a monument of accurate and vital information, written so directly and grippingly that one relives the drama with its actors . . . Besides being a direct help to a better understanding of the human setting and of the interconnection between the first and second Indochinese Wars, the process will lead the reader to evaluate the author as the first rate historian this book proves him to be.

Mr. Speaker, all major policy decisions must rest upon knowledge—a knowledge of the facts—not only on the part of the policymaker but also on the part of the public from whom, in a democracy, the authority of the policymaker is ultimately derived. Bernard Fall contributed knowledge in an area in which some of the most important policy decisions in American history are being made. For that the Congress and the Nation owe him a great debt of gratitude.

For those of us who had the privilege of knowing him, Bernard Fall's death is a great personal loss. We will never forget his undaunted enthusiasm, his overwhelming intellect, and finally, and most important of all, his deep humanism. To his wife Dorothy and their three young daughters we offer our deep felt condolences.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert at this point in the RECORD an article from the New York Times Book Review of February 12, 1967, and an article by Professor Fall which appeared in the New York Review of Books of February 9, 1967:

[From the New York Times Book Review, Feb. 12, 1967]

VICTORY AND DEFEAT

(NOTE.—"Hell in a Very Small Place," The Siege of Dien Bien Phu, by Bernard B. Fall. Illustrated. 515 pp. Philadelphia and New York: J. B. Lippincott Co., $8.95.)

(By Paul Mus)[1]

Bernard B. Fall, the foremost expert on contemporary Vietnam, has now turned his attention to the siege of Dienbienphu, where France lost the crucial battle of the First Indochinese War in 1954. As the Second Indochinese War becomes more and more an American one, extending even into the Mekong Delta, it will be interesting to see how Americans will accept Fall's historic evidence, and what conclusions they will draw from it.

Fall's book achieves the closest possible synthesis of previous research and known documents with the personal, impartial, but profoundly human contribution of a good historian. The first three chapters show how and why the French chose the site of the battle which had to be fatal for them: 300 kilometers from the heart of the Tonkin Delta, they could not imagine that the Vietminh could assemble and supply an artillery force in a forest with poor trails, and without the use of a single airplane. Four chapters deal forcefully and lucidly with the military sequence: Siege, Assault, Strangulation and Asphyxiation. Three more chapters conclude the dramatic story, and the books ends with an Epilogue, and a Postface ("Where Are They Now?"). There are also highly relevant bibliographical and biographical appendices.

The book's illustrations are outstanding; they present the men, the site and the heat of the battles vividly. In sum, the book is a monument of accurate and vital information, written so directly and grippingly that one relives the drama with its actors, and one is happily surprised to find, after reading of so many moving episodes, that the Postface contains a list of those who survived the trial of combat and captivity.

---

[1] Mr. Mus, author of "Vietnam Sociologie d'une Guerre," is professor of Southeast Asia studies at Yale, and of Far Eastern civilization at the Collège de France.

They have become, for the reader, real people.

As Fall stresses discretely but firmly—for speaking plainly, as a true friend has always been his characteristic tone on the relations between France, the United States and Vietnam—the French military defeat was also a diplomatic defeat for the United States, American policies encouraged France to establish, in that pivotal point in Asia and the world an independent, anti-Communist Vietnam, assuming that all that was necessary was to provide it with its own army, so that it could defend itself against the actions of its neighbors to the north. But after Dienbienphu the United States was forced to substitute itself for its ally, when France could no longer maintain her presence.

The political defeat for the United States therefore consisted in that it inherited from France (more discouraged than physically eliminated by this battle) a war which it has not succeeded in getting the Saigon government to fight any more effectively than France did, even if the United States has tried more sincerely than did the French.

The results are before us. They are so discouraging that the United States might well ask itself, from time to time, if it is not headed for a new Dienbienphu. And for a long while this attitude has been possible necessary to some, because there has not been a sufficiently impartial, thorough documentation of the siege of Dienbienphu, so that we could judge its lessons objectively. We must have calmer times before we can reflect philosophically on what this confrontation of East and West, with its victory for the former, meant. The important thing is to determine if the conditions are likely to be duplicated, and with the same results. This possibility preoccupies many Americans, and it stems from a perfectly justifiable feeling: Santayana's famous warning that those who don't understand history are condemned to repeat it.

Mr. Fall's book leaves no excuse for those who make the error of drawing the wrong conclusions from Dienbienphu. An error? Indeed. If one wants a government *by* the people, the people must not allow themselves, because they are ill-informed or do not understand, to let those who govern *for* them act independently according to their own inspiration or the judgments of military experts who are particularly suspect when it comes to judgment about men. We saw where their planning led the French in Indochina.

In order to understand man, that "wonderful, vain, diverse, and wavering subject," to quote Florio's beautiful 17th century rendering of Montaigne, the best analytical instrument is Democracy—the people themselves: the millions of minds of a great nation which wants and is able to inform itself. These millions of approaches provide the only valid method with which to understand corresponding human factors in other nations—there concealed again, in millions of initiatives, renunciations, risks and contradictions which finally tend toward a certain statistical consistency.

But the complexities would defy a computer as much as an individual mind, no matter how good a mind it was, unless it took its inspiration and information from the people. To gain an insight into an external object both human and statistical, one must apply another statistical instrument which at the same time knows how to think. Thus, when one is dealing with a people, one must appreciate them through themselves, with only a transfer from one nation to another—a transfer which doesn't change despite obvious differences, the essential character of the other nation.

Feed a people to a people and the result, unobtainable otherwise, might be an answer to a critical situation. The balance of these two infinite complexities would tend to some coherence of purpose, and perhaps a mutual adjustment. The direct instrument of this feeding-in should, of course, be a free and active press—the sort of press that has made possible Harrison E. Salisbury's reports from North Vietnam, which would seem to have contributed to the recent political and military decision not to bomb within five miles of Hanoi.

But the usefulness of a feedback effect depends on the collective computer, the people multiplying to infinity its grasp on an infinitude of facts and factors; it has to be conditioned into a truly democratic nation. So this instrument, this technique, may well represent the ultimate means of effecting Lincoln's immortal set of three: *of*, *by* and *for*, boldly extended over diplomatic and governmental protocol, from the domain of internal politics to the international level.

One could hardly ask for more suitable material than the present book in order to support this process—a process which, being alive, should take care of itself and what it needs. Had I the disquieting responsibility of feeding the machine on the Vietnam situation, I would unhesitatingly bring in Bernard Fall's account of Dienbienphu at a very early point, because it covers so many processes which seem to be vital to the decisions that must be made today.

In the first place, it gives the layman something which specialists in the field have often experienced: an extraordinary and at times almost unbearable intensity about the problems in this troubled area and the reactions they evoke. The deep convictions and wholehearted devotion of each person to his task, on both sides; the violence of the struggle in its most brutal form. Fall, French himself, saw enough of the war to be able to pay to his countrymen and their adversaries the supreme homage of preserving them in history by showing them exactly as they were.

There is no vain bragging in his statement that on the 24th of April, 13 days before the end, the beleaguered camp had 3,250 infantrymen in fighting condition, including "men who had lost one eye or even one arm." Captain Hervouet had plaster casts removed from his forearms, both fractured during earlier operations, in order to take part in the last stand. Captain Luciani, wounded three times, commanded his unit "with a heavy bandage over one of his eyes, which had been removed." On the last day, May 7, to the very last moments of the fierce fight on the overrun French positions, an automatic rifle team was seen firing point blank into the Vietminh assault wave. The rifleman wore a huge, bloody bandage around his waist, leaving a bloody print on the ground every time he shifted position. Passing him the loaded ammunition clip was a one-armed soldier who also wore a bandage around his chest. Goya!

During the first and successful assault that stormed an advance position on March 13, "One of the Viet-Minh soldiers who led the assault on the northeast bunker of *Beatrice*, squad leader Phan Dinh Giot, was to become the first hero of the Communist siege force. When a French machine gun firing from the bunker endangered the assault wave by its enfilading fire, Phan Dinh Giot threw his body against the bunker's firing slit. He was torn to shreds by a machine gun burst but blocked the gun long enough for the assault wave to pass."

What will your collective computer make of this? It must surely confirm the conclusion that short of the annihilation of one of the parties, there can be no purely military solution to a conflict evoking this kind of loyalty.

Is the society as computer is to take all relevant information into account, it must also be fed some pages of Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap's book. "Dien Bien Phu." In this statement of a total victory, all the credit for the great success is attributed to the plans made by the Party's central committee, plans determined according to the faultless analyses of the situation made periodically by that body, whose clairvoyance is explained in turn by its total adhesion to Marxist-Leninist military doctrine. Giap was present in this committee, and victory lay with him; nevertheless, the only name mentioned isn't his.

"The main and fundamental factor in this victory was the correct political and military line of our party, headed by President Ho Chi Minh." From that perspective, the adversary was merely a dummy. The reason why is clear. "The aggressive war grew from bad to worse . . . because the war made by the French capitalists was an unjust war. As a result their troops, from the very beginning, were inefficient and thoroughly demoralized." "On January 30, 1954, a platoon defending a position north of Dien Bien Phu repelled seven assaults of five enemy battalions," and so on till the end.

Needless to say, such a picture is hardly consistent with all other sources and with the actual course of events. Why didn't Dienbienphu then fall on the first attempt? This, too, is explained by the tactics fixed by the central committee, immediately after the success of the assaults on *Beatrice* and *Gabrielle*, March 13–15. The new slogan was "to strike surely and advance cautiously." So, during the second, protracted and fierce phase of the battle, the slowing down of the Vietminh progress would not have been the result of the active, often daring and tenacious resistance put up by the defenders, but of a judicious decision of the central committee, aware, in the true Marxist-Leninist military doctrine, that "an underestimation of the enemy" would generate "a rightist and negative tendency . . . subjectivism and self-conceit."

Is Giap, then, clearly wrong in his interpretation by undisputable facts? This would be the classical way to take history, record against record. But choosing the "human computer" line, with serial classifications, disassociations, and realignments, offers a much better analytical approach. The mistake would be to process Giap's document on the same cards and perforations as Fall's, or the book by Gen. Pierre Langlais on Dienbienphu. We would then miss the point, that the latter two are recorded history, whereas Giap's is history in the making. Speaking essentially to his army and his people and not for them, Giap's calculated, deliberate distortions become impulses and thus very positive factors in the situation.

For all this is not processive but constructive computer work, in strict application of Marx's axiom that it is not a question of understanding the world but of changing it. The notion that the colonialists as such could not fight well was part of the initial equipment of the victors and served them well; when they met an unexpected obstinacy on the part of their opponents, the background provided by the party's instructions took care of that, too: they were firmly assured that superior strategy was at work directing them, whereas the enemy would be blundering on from mistake to mistake. (And this happened to be not so far from the truth.)

When one checks Fall and other Western sources, one must face the unpleasant—however we interpret it—fact that the garrison of Dienbienphu and more generally the troops in the First Indochinese War were far from enjoying the full support of the home country's public opinion. In order to fight wholeheartedly, as everything seems to indicate they did, these soldiers must have had to find almost entirely within themselves, on the battlefield the moral power necessary to push them to the limit of their human resources—and beyond. This is a frequently misunderstood force; their principal support was their camaraderie among themselves, whose effects on these career soldiers, fighting outside the strict military hierarchy they were used to, was surprising. "Rank and seniority no longer counted. The only criterion for command responsibility was the net worth of the officer. A number of lieutenant colonels and majors found themselves unemployed or relegated to minor takes. . . ." The actual conduct of the battle was now completely in the hands of the "Paratroop Mafia," indomitable fighters.

But—and this was to weigh heavily on the history of France in the years to come—this intense camaraderie, this attachment between commanders whose prestige in the eyes of their troops was the very reason the troops had something to hope for—this spirit, transferred back to France, and even more so in Algeria, was the preparation of a political point of view which led to humiliation and defeat. This group of men fanatically devoted to what they considered their mission without asking—and one could see why, at Dienbienphu!—anyone to define it for them, made a de Gaulle necessary to save the French from fascism and the threat of fascism brought the French to de Gaulle.

Here we should feed into our computer two chapters from "Deux Actes du Drame Indochinois," by Gen. Georges Catroux, which charges that the full responsibility for the Algerian conspiracy lies in the hesitations of the government of the Fourth Republic during the Indochina crisis. Though Fall is sympathetic to the best military accomplishments of the later protagonists in the "revolt" of Algiers, he clearly shows by what process they were led to turn against both their people and their country, in their misguided devotion to the idea they had formed of the latter among themselves, out of all contact with the former.

How might one draw any lesson from the First Indochina War and the Algerian affair relevant to the Second Indochina War and the American involvement? Neither the political circumstances and tradition of America nor the present general situation of the war make a close analogy valid. There is a great difference between a professional army, no matter how courageous and humanly motivated it is fighting as at Dienbienphu against a people resolved to find its true place in the world, and the direct will of a nation sending its sons as a result of a national decision, and thus less likely to feel themselves isolated—as long as the politics which got the troops there is truly the authentic expression of what the nation is in its own eyes, and of what it stands for to the rest of the world.

The French philosopher Alain used to quote Vauvenargues (1715–47), a fighter as well as a brilliant writer, who died prematurely of terrible wounds received during the seige of Prague: "Vice makes wars, virtue fights them." In a democratic climate of open and sincere national adjustment, it can do no harm to feed these words to the American political computer, verified as they have been by more than two centuries of active experience, as well as by the French experience at Dienbienphu.

Go up and down the precious lines and files into which "Hell is a Very Small Place" has to be broken in order to be used in the way I recommend—keeping an eye on the diagonals! Besides being a direct help to a better understanding of the human setting and of the interconnection between the First and Second Indochinese Wars, the process will lead the reader to evaluate the author as the first rate historian this book proves him to be.

[From the New York Review of Books, Feb. 9, 1967]

THE VIEW FROM VIETNAM

"SOE in France," by M.R.D. Foot. Her Majesty's Stationery Office (London), 550 pp., $9.00.

"Vietnam! Vietnam!" by Felix Greene. Fulton (Palo Alto), 175 pp., $5.50, paper, $2.95.

"Vietnam in the Mud," by James Pickerell. Bobbs-Merrill, 129 pp., $5.00, paper, $2.25.

"Vietcong: The Organization and Techniques of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam," by Douglas Pike. M.I.T., 490 pp., $8.95.

"Vietnam Seen from East and West," edited by Sibnarayan Ray. Praeger, 192 pp., $5.95.

"The Politics of Escalation in Vietnam," by Franz Schurmann. Fawcett, 160 pp., $.60 (paper).

"Bernard B. Fall"

DANANG, SOUTH VIETNAM.—One of the added pleasures of covering the Vietnam war from inside Vietnam is that it is possible to lose track completely of what is going on elsewhere in the world—not only in the world, in fact, but in Vietnam as well. When with the Marines in the northern part of South Vietnam, it is perfectly easy to learn that Private Smith—whose first and middle names, home town and state, age, high school, are supplied on the spot by the ever-helpful PIO's—wiped out a Viet Cong position with a burst of his trusty M-14; but it is almost impossible to find out whether the landing in the Mekong Delta was really the hopeless botch it seemed to be from eyewitness reports. The reader of a good newspaper at home is likely to find out about this before I do.

Furthermore, very few books on Vietnam are available here, because, until a few weeks ago, it was nearly impossible to find one in any Western language that was not heavily critical of either the United States or South Vietnam. As was recently reported, this is also true of the United States Information Agency's USIS Library, where almost all books dealing with Vietnam (including my *Street Without Joy*, which does not even deal with post-1954 Vietnam) are locked up on closed shelves. Indeed, the US military forces have a far more liberal policy than the USIS: while uncritical books are more widely displayed, some critical books can be bought without difficulty at the military newsstands. (Whether this means that the US military have an inherently stronger belief in American principles than the USIS is not clear.) As for the Vietnamese themselves, book censorship seems to depend on the caprice and spotty reading of the censors. For instance, there is for open sale at this moment in Saigon a book on the Tri-Continental Conference against Colonialism and Imperialism, held in Havana a year ago. It was issued by an extremely left-wing Paris publisher, and is a running indictment against the United States and its policy here. Apparently the author's name didn't appear on somebody's blacklist, so the book slipped by.

Hence, to receive books about Vietnam here is suddenly to be confronted with enlarged and different perspectives on a war which, in spite of the best electronic communications in the world, has been distorted by a foxhole view if one is in the field (there are foxholes, by the way, in this jet-propelled war), or into an equally narrow view based on rumor (did Marshal Ky really say he admired Hitler?) if one is in Saigon. Yet Michael Foot's *SOE in France*, published by Her Majesty's Stationery Office, not only fails even to mention Vietnam, but deals with a war that took place a quarter-century ago and ten thousand miles away. It has been virtually ignored by the American press, but in Western Europe it became a best seller much as the Warren Report was in the United States, and brought about what was probably the most unusual interference of a foreign power in the freedom of expression of another country to occur in a democracy in peacetime. And what it says *does* have a bearing on Vietnam, after all.

On June 3, 1966, a French court bailiff arrived at the offices of the liberal weekly *Le Nouvel Observateur* in the rue Royale in Paris, escorted by two police commissioners. He presented the astonished editors with a valid injunction by a French court enjoining the magazine from publishing a book review "at the request of Her Britannic Majesty." On June 6, despite urgent queries at the British Embassy in Paris, and the latter's consultation with the Foreign Office, the injunction was maintained, thus turning the book from a dull buckram-bound official history into a *cause célèbre*.

SOE was Britain's wartime special Operations Executive, the equivalent of the American OSS, forerunner of the CIA. As all of mainland Europe slipped under Nazi control in late 1940, it became necessary for the hard-pressed British not only to gather far more intelligence than the peacetime Intelligence Service could provide, but also to inflict upon the Germans whatever military harassment was possible under the circumstances. SOE built up networks of local groups and provided them with the basic means of organizing resistance movements which in turn could tie down more German troops and provide the Allies with intelligence. Commissioned by the Foreign Office, Foot, a solid academic specialist on nineteenth-century diplomacy, accepted in 1963 the task of writing this book under restrictions which resemble those of the Kennedy-Manchester arrangements: he was first to work on the documents alone, and only afterward to meet with some of the survivors. Apparently London never gave him permission to request access to French documents or surviving French witnesses. In all likelihood those limitations were the reasons for certain built-in biases which provoked the ire of the *Observateur* and, in turn, the heavy-handed official attempt by the British to interfere with the book's reviews in Paris.

For the book, in a readable and understated style, argues that the French Resistance was essentially a creation of the British. By the time the first copies of the book entered France, dozens of French Resistance leaders, authentic heroes to a whole generation of their countrymen, were ready to file libel suits against the hapless Foot. Even the revised versions of the pieces the *Observateur* finally published were far from tender—for Foot, on the basis of the SOE records, documented what the Nazis and their Vichy collaborators had said all along: the French Resistance was nothing but a tool of the British. It had no life of its own. Its leaders were faceless and of no importance except to their masters in London.

In Foot's words: "Till 1944 the British had a virtual monopoly over all of De Gaulle's means of communications with France," and the French "could not introduce a single agent or a single store"—the latter being Anglicism for "supply items"—without Allied permission. While the actual facts were somewhat at variance with this sweeping assertion (De Gaulle's establishment in Algiers gave him access to the gold reserves of the Bank of Algeria and control of some ships and aircraft that owed nothing to SOE) the main point surely holds. Furthermore, the Americans and British—the former operating only a little more blindly than they do now, and the latter as shortsighted at times as they later were in their attitude toward the Rome Treaty in 1957—were grimly determined to keep aid to the French Resistance "nonpolitical," i.e., entirely tuned to *their* objectives rather than to French objectives. "Any thing the French planned with marked political implications," says Foot, was liable to "be vetoed by any of the three major Western allies." Aside from the slip of *three* "major Western allies" (which was the third? the Canadians? the Dutch? the London Poles? Or perhaps Stalin?) the general point again is true: Foot describes how the British, contrary to their agreement, broke the Free French code and unleashed extremely costly (to the French) guerrilla uprisings, over the objections of the staff of the French Forces of the Inerior (FFI). As a young boy I was in the French Alps among those *maquis* units offered up for sacrifice. With our SOE and OSS mentors, we were to delay a German mountain division and an elite SS Brigade from reaching the Allied beachheads. The order, given too early and disregarding the pleas of the FFI command, resulted in the Vercors massacre, still a sore subject in Resistance circles.

But Foot is too good a historian to have confused the SOE's ability to organize an existing French will to resist the Nazis with SOE's obvious inability to create a widespread popular movement out of whole cloth. As he says (p. 442), "All these victories by and through resistance forces in France had a common basis: overwhelming popular support." In other words, SOE, like its traditional brother agency, the Intelligence Service, could (and did) recruit a small group of devoted (and paid) intelligence agents, some of whom betrayed them, while others died with their lips sealed, in torture chambers. But SOE could not recruit me, a boy of sixteen, and 30,000 other men and women like me, some younger and many older, to go out and live for a few years in the inclement climate of the Alps or the Pyrenees to face the *Wehrmacht* with light weapons. I went only because I felt I had to, and I stayed because I knew the cause was right. To the very end, I was part of an "armed minority" led by "faceless leaders" and imposed my will with the help of some Englishmen and Americans who arrived by parachute. And that is where Foot's book becomes relevant to the Vietnam debate, for it clearly delineates what makes a guerrilla movement genuine—*any* guerrilla movement, be it left-wing (as here in Vietnam), Moslem nationalist (as in Algeria), Christian Orthodox (as in Cyprus), or Jewish (as in Palestine).

All of these movements started abroad—General Grivas, in his memoirs, tells us how he decided to liberate Cyprus one day, sitting at a sidewalk cafe in Athens; Masaryk started the Czech Republic in Pittsburgh—and all others had foreign support. Their underground leaders (unless they were candidates for immediate suicide or prompt arrests) had faces which were not reproduced on their country's postage stamps. An outside specialist can only organize what is *willing* to be organized, for it is as easy to run away from a guerrilla force (people did so all the time in the FFI), as it is to desert from a a regular army, if not easier. Yet, in Vietnam during 1966 a total of 20,242 *Chieu-Hoi* ("Open Arms" defectors) came out of the jungle, bringing with them a total of only 1,963 weapons—i.e., most of these defectors were unarmed civilians, a fact which is not denied here. Meanwhile the South Vietnamese Army lost, that same year, at least 110,000 men, who simply walked off and out of the war. Apparently, fourteen years of American organization here have yet to match the effectiveness of the Viet Cong's organizational efforts.

The theme of Douglas Pike's book *Viet Cong,* is, like Foot's, Organization. It had also an unexpected notoriety. Its author works for the Joint United States Public Affairs Office (JUSPAO) here as the U.S. Mission's No. 1 Viet Cong expert. Like the books critical of U.S. policy which are hidden by the USIS but kept by the U.S. military, Pike's presence is one of those small illustrations of the good side of the American system. No other book is likely to demolish more completely and more seriously all the convenient myths dished out officially about the National Liberation Front (NLF), for this is the work of an "insider." In his job Pike sees more material than anyone except the Front Leaders themselves. He has read reports from captured Viet Congs, translations of the huge quantities of captured documents (the NLF, like all movements influenced by Communism, is afflicted with such bureaucratism that several wits here have suggested that one way of stopping them completely would be to parachute in to them hundreds of mimeograph machines), and publications from Hanoi or from Front sources abroad. At least eight hundred such documents are cited in this book. That does not exactly make it bedside reading (and an enormous amount of typical M.I.T. pseudoscientific verbiage does not help, such as "externalization" and "proselyting" [*sic*], but anyone who wishes to discuss intelligently a solution to the Vietnam problem should read his book.

"What struck one most forcibly about the N.L.F.," Pike writes, "was its totality as a social revolution first and as a war second. . . . Even more important, it openly communicated its intentions to the Vietnamese population. Such an ambition far exceeded that of the Viet Minh" of earlier days, who, under the leadership of Ho Chi Minh, fought the French. Here is an enemy who, according to Pike, lives by a highly moralistic mystique, "far more moral than ideological. Virtue was the golden word." An enemy who, supposedly, obeys the tenets of Communism but who, at the same time, can be taxed with "extreme romanticism . . . Idealistic appeals abounded: the promise of the good life in utopian terms; the opportunity to revolt against all the evil, injustice, and inequity of this world; the chance to be part of a great crusade." To see how far away we are from that kind of appeal, one has only to look at downtown Saigon, to cast a glance at the kind of ideals Saigon offers the population, or to read some of the leaflets our own psychological warfare uses. The black market here seems to be even more resistant to "sweep-and-destroy" operations than the NLF's stronghold around Bong-Son, which was "cleared" by large elements of two American divisions *four* times in 1966, and is still as unsafe as ever.

It would be totally depressing to compare a batch of official handouts of, say, the years 1960–63 with Pike's statement: "In horror, Americans helplessly watched Diem tear apart the fabric of Vietnamese society more effectively than the Communists had ever been able to do. It was the most efficient act of his entire career." So much for the golden days of the Diem regime, so eloquently described in past State Department White Books. As for the origin of the NLF, Pike, more than any other Westerner thus far, has successfully analyzed the Vietnamese *cultural* proclivity for secret societies, and he also faces up squarely to the fact that an overwhelming number of the original NLF supporters were not necessarily Communist but certainly anti-Diem, simply because they were left with no other choice: "Many of the original participants in the NLF had turned to it because they had been denied participation in South Vietnam's political process, *even in the role of loyal opposition* . . . " (my italics). If there is any illusion in America that the same opposition is being offered any better alternative today, that illusion should be dispelled by what one of the highest civilian officials of the government of Air Vice Marshal Ky told me: "If somebody wants to oppose us," he said, "let him do it in Hanoi. Not here." The chances are that nothing that is going to happen in the future will change the views of such men. With such a system in place, any real opposition is going to stay not only disloyal, but underground; permanent instability is almost built in to such a system. In any case, it can be assumed that at some point Hanoi, perhaps even reluctantly, decided to intervene in behalf of the opposition to Diem. After all, a far more alien power had been intervening on Diem's side ever since 1954.

Compared to Pike's book, the small book, *Vietnam Seen from East and West,* edited by Ray and first published in Australia is, in its antiquated way, almost funny. The Anglo-American hawks have managed to find a few like-minded Vietnamese, Laotians, Koreans, and Filipinos to justify its title, but the authors really look at Vietnam from the Right to the Far Right, and all that they can see is a proxy war with Red China. Nothing else, certainly not the Vietnamese people, seems to count. Once the Vietnam problem is posed in those Ruskian terms, anything goes. To paraphrase Samuel Johnson's observation that patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel, grand strategy seems to have become the last refuge of some pretty strange people.

It would be pointless to recite all the factual errors (let alone weird views) of most of the authors. One Vietnamese writer escalates the number of people killed during North Vietnam's botched 1956 land reform from the commonly accepted figure of between fifty and a hundred thousand to a half million; another gives false, far-too-low desertion figures for his country's army; a British hawk still describes Bonze Tri Guang as a "Communist"—in spite of the fact that in May, 1966, when faced with the choice of being captured by Ky in rebellious Hué or joining the NLF he opted for capture and house arrest. Ho Chi Minh is said to be "surrounded by Stalinists" (!) and North Vietnam fights this war "under the aegis of China." Even such responsible journalists as Brian Crozier produce undocumented non-facts, for example, the statement that General Giap led, in 1955, an "extreme" wing in Hanoi which wished to invade South Vietnam even before the election deadline of 1956. Only Maximo V. Soliven, a Filipino drawing on the Huk example, and Arnold Beichman, who quotes General Lansdale as saying that "the Communists have let loose a revolutionary idea in Vietnam and it will not die by being ignored, bombed, or smothered by us," at least make some valid points. The Australians sound like Bulgarians trying to explain Russia's viewpoint on NATO. And when they call themselves "a part of Asia" they sound as convincing as Rhodesia's Ian Smith when he refers to himself as an "African." I'm sure I shall soon find this book on the "open" bookshelves of USIS.

Franz Schurmann's book is probably the best single investment anyone can make in the literature on Vietnam (it costs sixty cents). It is a work which I would like to see seriously and thoughtfully debated by Administration advocates. Like any book written by a committee (the book also has a foreword by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.), it won't win high marks for style, but it presents clearly much of the story of the failure of the American government to pursue a diplomacy that would lead to a negotiated settlement: the peace-feelers that were missed, the ignored appeals, the "cues" that were not given, the tendency of the U.S. to escalate the war when chances for détente were most hopeful.

Not that it is by any means complete, because it falls into the common ethnocentric error of American scholarship of quoting mainly Anglo-American sources. Yet, this is, unfortunately, understandable: they are the only sources the US believes. Reliable firsthand observers have reported for more than a year that some North Vietnamese cities had been demolished: after all, there are Frenchmen, Canadians, Indians, and Britons stationed there, and the French pilots of the International Control Commission who have flown over North Vietnam every week for the past fourteen years have seen a great deal. Several American travelers had been to Nam-Dinh—but it took *The New York Times'* reporter Harrison Salisbury to make it "official" that the city was in ruins. The same seems true of peace feelers. Schurmann could have interviewed Philippe Devillers to confirm the disappearance of the 325th North Vietnamese Division from combat in the South in 1965 after Secretary Rusk called for a "sign." The American response was, as a senior North Vietnamese official pointed out, more air raids. It is now clearly established that there was a slow-down in infiltration during last year's bombing halt. On this side, about 30,000 reinforcements arrived. I spent Christmas with US Marines on the 17th parallel; according to the available information, American patrols found few, if any, infiltrators, and the same was true at New Year. But according to official announcements, the better part of an American division went ashore during the truce. We all can look forward to new enlarged editions of *The Politics of Escalation* as more peace feelers get muffed all over the map.

Vietnam! Vietnam!, biased though it is, is still likely to go down as *The Disasters of War* of this conflict. As to the bias of this collection of photographs of the Vietnam War: just as it must be acknowledged that the French Resistance killed more Frenchmen in two years than the French Revolution's terror in six—many of whom were not collaborators—it must be clearly realized that the Liberation Front does not fight its share of the war with snowballs. Whatever the provocation, and however genuine the NLF's hatred of the largely avoidable barbarisms of the other side, it is nonetheless true that the NLF also kills innocent people and that photographs to that effect are also available and should have found their way into the final selection. With that caveat in mind, Greene's book tells a story that is sickening. It has by now been clearly established that American troops at least witness tortures, if nothing more than that. On one page, an Army officer, identified by name (was his head cropped off by UPI, which took the picture, or by Greene?) stands by with a radio-telephone as a man is being slowly garrotted. There is an unforgettable shot of an American M–113 armored personnel carrier (its markings identify it as vehicle 21, "B" Squadron, 12th Cavalry, presumably), with part of its American crew looking on unconcernedly as a dead (one hopes) enemy is being dragged behind the vehicle like Hector behind Achilles' chariot. The picture, again by UPI, won an international photography prize.

With that picture a problem arises: it shows, according to US Army Field Manual 27–10, issued over the signature of General Maxwell D. Taylor, and entitled *The Law of Land Warfare,* prima facie evidence of what the Manual calls a "war crime." Indeed, Paragraph 499 of the Manual reads in full:

"The term 'war crime' is the technical expression for a violation of the law of war by any person or persons, military or civilian. Every violation of the law of war is a war crime."

FM 27–10 also says under Paragraph 504: "Other Types of War Crimes."

"In addition to the 'grave breaches' of the Geneva Conventions of 1949, the following acts are representative of violations of the law of war ('war crimes'):

"a. . . .

"c. Maltreatment of dead bodies."

The American Unified Code of Military Justice (UCMJ, Article 18) provides for trial by general courts-martial of war crimes "if committed by persons subject to United States military law," under Paragraph 506 (c) of the Field Manual; and Paragraph 507 makes it mandatory that "Commanding officers of United States troops must insure that war crimes committed by members of their forces against enemy personnel are promptly and adequately published."

That is what the Law says. But perhaps that UPI picture is a fake, and all the other pictures of similar types are anti-American fakes, and what I am being told happens here is all nasty anti-war propaganda. I haven't heard of anybody in this whole conflict who has yet been prosecuted for violation of the Laws of War. But I will keep looking.

James Pickerell's book is of the same type as Greene's: lots of photographs, since he is a photographer, and some text. At first glance, this looks like just another one of those Vietnam quickies which are beginning to flood the market. The photographs, though they too depict torture at one point, and violence throughout, are of the kind which we have seen before on TV and in the newspapers. But—there is the text, and Pickerell, who now has his own photo studio in Saigon, suddenly turns out to be more than just an eye behind a lens. He has a conscience, and like Pike he speaks out, but with a quiet emphasis which perhaps carries more weight than the sometimes strident approach of Greene. Like may of the other journalists here, he is, as Neil Sheehan recently said in *The New York Times,* "A Dove Not Yet, A Hawk No More."

Pickerell sees the war far more closely, and in many more places, than the Washington pundits who honor us with their presence here for a few weeks and go from high-level briefing to a carefully stage-managed pacification operation without ever seeing the real, bleeding Vietnam. In Pickerell's view, the war will escalate and it will extend beyond 1968 at the least. In the best of circumstances he believes it would take at least three years to set in motion the programs of reform that might conclusively reshape the war. But, he says:

"We will lose in Vietnam, not because it was inevitably from the start, but because we failed to think and change with the times. . . . We will always place military action above economic and political development. It is for these reasons that we will lose. . . . The years will go by and the public will begin to wonder why, if we are always winning, the situation never seems to improve. This more than anything defeated the French, and it will probably defeat us too."

But Pickerell, like all of us who are here, is too close to his subject, and loses sight of the big picture which is perceived so clearly ten thousand miles away. He can't see the Grand Strategy of it, the Containment of China—soon there will be tens of thousands more troops "containing" the same threat in Thailand, and the deterrent example this quagmire is supposed to offer other peoples elsewhere. At the end of his book Pickerell warns his readers of the fate of Goliath. Yet the duel between David and Goliath was recorded in the Bible precisely because David's victory was so unlikely. Here, a massive military effort is deployed to show that the strong will prevail over the weak. And never mind the Laws of War.

THE TRAGIC LOSS OF BERNARD FALL

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, we were deprived last week of the invaluable perspective of our foremost expert on Vietnam, Prof. Bernard B. Fall. With his experience as early as 1953 with the French troops behind the lines at Dienbienphu, his subsequent residence in North Vietnam, and his patrols with American troops during six trips to the war zone, Professor Fall was the American's, and much of the world's, definitive authority on the roots of that devastating conflict. He directed all of his considerable scholarly skills to examination of the historical backdrop for the present war. His reportorial instincts and his insistence upon facts from the field took him back to the battlefront again and again. These same instincts, tragically, led to his death last Tuesday along The Street Without Joy, an area he enthusiastically described to an information officer in Da Nang as "my home ground."

Typically, he died not in a book-lined study, but in the midst of the fighting about which he was writing. It was this combination of up-to-the-minute journalistic detail and thorough historical background that made his seven books on Vietnam so valuable to the highest military authorites as well as to students and other citizens seeking greater understanding of what he called "this quagmire."

One mark of Professor Fall's great integrity and the esteem with which he was universally regarded was the recommendation of his books by Vietnamese students in exile in Paris as the most balanced accounts of what is really happening in Vietnam. His knowledge of the conflict made him a truly irreplaceable source of understanding for all of us. I can think of no more fitting memorial to him than for the United States to reflect his contributions in a more realistic approach to the war, and in seeking an early solution to what many lesser authorities joined Professor Fall in defining as an internal strife over which an international war has been superimposed.

In addition to the tragic loss suffered by our country and, indeed, the entire world, with the death of Dr. Fall, I must add a personal expression of deep sorrow. Bernard Fall was a dear friend of mine and I found profound comfort and sustenance in my close relationship with him. To Dorothy Fall and the children, I extend my deepest sympathy.

I would like, at this time, to include in the Congressional Record these articles from the New York Times, the Salt Lake Tribune, and the Washington Post paying tribute to Bernard Fall.

[From the New York Times]

Bernard Fall Killed in Vietnam by a Mine While With Marines

(By R. W. Apple, Jr.)

Saigon, South Vietnam, February 21.—Bernard B. Fall, the writer and historian of the strife in Vietnam, was killed today by a Vietcong mine while on patrol with American marines.

Dr. Fall, a 40-year-old professor of international relations at Howard University, in Washington, had written seven books about Vietnam. The most recent, "Hell in a Very Small Place: The Siege of Dienbienphu," was acclaimed by reviewers when it was published by Lippincott last month.

He had often written of the subtle ironies of the battle for Indochina and his death conformed to the pattern he had discerned.

He was killed about 14 miles northwest of Hue, along a desolate stretch of seacoast known as "The Street Without Joy." He had chosen that phrase as the title of one of his major books and had dedicated it to "those who died there."

Capt. Henry C. Stackpole of Guilford, Conn., an information officer at Danang, said Dr. Fall dined with Lieut. Gen. Lewis W. Walt, the Marine commander, on Friday. Later, Captain Stackpole said, Dr. Fall asked "where the action was."

The captain told him of three Marine Corps operations that were under way south of Danang. Dr. Fall, as was his habit, pressed for details, and Captain Stockpole mentioned a fourth operation northwest of Hue.

"Why, that's my area!" the scholar replied. "That's my home ground. I'll go there."

A Marine photographer was also killed when the mine went off, an American military spokesman said. Two Marine combat photographers were wounded by shrapnel and evacuated.

FAMILY IN HONG KONG

The Vienna-born professor, who came to Vietnam in December for research on yet another book, was also contributing to American and European periodicals during his stay here. He had written a number of articles for The New Republic in recent weeks, as well as critiques for The New York Review of Books.

He is survived by his wife, Dorothy, an American citizen, who has been living in Hong Kong, and two sons and a daughter.

A spokesman for the United States mission said that it "deeply regretted the death of this outstanding scholar of Vietnam."

Dr. Fall had been criticized by many officials as "an apologist for the French" and as an exponent of a defeatist attitude toward American involvement here.

A well-built man of medium height, Dr. Fall spoke with contempt of those who wrote from the safety of the United States about Vietnam and the men who are fighting here.

BOTH GENERALS AND GI'S

More than a year ago, during an earlier visit, he accompanied members of the newly arrived United States First Cavalry Division (Airmobile) on an operation in the Central Highlands. When the troops arrived at the spot he knew well, he gathered them around him and recalled the destruction of French Mobile Group 100 in a battle three years before.

His books were on the shelves of senior American officers and in the tents of a surprising number of G.I.'s.

This pleased Dr. Fall almost as much as the increasing acclaim he had recently won, and he made no effort to hide his delight. He told a friend recently of having seen all of his works lined up on the desk of a senior general, and, without pause, pulled from his briefcase copies of favorable reviews of his books.

"My ambition," he said, "is to be the foremost military writer of my generation."

The remark was typical, for Dr. Fall was a man of enormous enthusiasm as well as powerful intellect. Confronted by a dinner party whose members seemed unaware of the niceties of World War II, he would launch, without embarrassment, into a penetrating and detailed analysis of, say, the Maginot Line.

Among Vietnam specialists he had a reputation for total recall. He could supply on a moment's notice the precise order of battle for both sides at Dienbienphu, North Vietnamese infiltration rate for the last two years or the bomb tonnage dropped by United States planes on North Vietnam in a given week.

He cut a dashing figure, dressed in shorts and a sports shirt open to the middle of his chest and wearing specially tinted sun glasses. He had begun to grow a small goatee.

His tools were a talent for languages and an ability to dig out telling detail. He spoke French, English, Polish, Russian and German and sometimes managed a few words of Vietnamese. He was conscious that his English was not as elegant as it might be, and he spoke with admiration of Joseph Conrad, who wrote English with facility although Polish was his mother tongue.

Dr. Fall maintained in the basement of his Washington home an astonishingly extensive filing system on Southeast Asia.

He said he had conducted hundreds of interviews and read thousands of documents to develop the vignettes with which he spiced his account of Dienbienphu. In a typical passage, he wrote of the last day of the 1954 battle in terms of a rifleman who "wore an extensive bandage around his waist, leaving a bloody print on the ground every time he shifted position."

Dr. Fall was skeptical in his attitude toward American participation in the war. He felt that President Johnson had failed to articulate his goals, and we wondered aloud whether the United States would be willing to preserve here.

In "Street Without Joy," he wrote of a French Operation launched against the Communist Vietminh on July 28, 1953. He considered it an instructive example. The French deployed 30 battalions against a Vietminh regiment the 95th. They killed more men than they lost, but they failed to trap the enemy and they were eventually forced to withdraw their troops to fight elsewhere.

FAR GREATER FIREPOWER

Dr. Fall pointed out later that American troops were faced with similar problems. But he also noted that the allies had far greater firepower than the French. He agreed with the thesis that the Vietcong could never win a purely military victory.

Sensitive to allegations that he had been soured on Indochina by the experience of his countrymen, he wrote in his most recent book: "If the trite phrase 'telling the truth without fear or favor' has any meaning, it can in all fairness be applied here."

The book suggested that the United States might have avoided its present travail if it had acceded to a French request for air support at Dienbienphu. He laid the blame for the American refusal at the feet of President Johnson, who was then the minority leader of the Senate.

However, Dr. Fall savagely criticized the French military and political authorities for their major policy decisions.

His own career gave him a backdrop against which to evaluate the struggle for domination in Southeast Asia.

He served in the French Underground from 1942 to 1946 and worked as a research analyst for the Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal. He went to the United States for the first time in 1951 as a Fulbright scholar and earned a master's degree in political science from Syracuse University.

VISITED NORTH VIETNAM

In 1953 he came to Indochina and accompanied French forces in the field, covering areas north of Dienbienphu behind enemy lines. After earning his doctorate at Syracuse, he returned to Indochina and spent several months in North Vietnam.

He won the George Polk Award for outstanding interpretive reporting in 1966, and was awarded a Guggenheim Fellowship to help finance his trip to South Vietnam last year and this.

Dr. Fall had retained his French citizenship, but had recently told friends that he intended to apply for American papers as soon as he returned to the United States. He had hesitated to do so, he said, in the hope of gaining an entry visa for North Vietnam, but had been turned down repeatedly.

Dr. Fall was the ninth combat correspondent to die in Vietnam since the intervention of American ground forces here, and was by far the best known. His death took place in circumstances strikingly similar to that of the noted photographer Robert Capa, who was killed by a land mine in the Central Highlands in 1953.

FAVORITE OF DOVES AND HAWKS

In the debate over American involvement in Vietnam, few experts were so often quoted approvingly, and out of context, as was Bernard B. Fall. Doves favoring a softer policy were pleased by his insistence that the war was not the product of unilateral aggression by North Vietnam. They were appreciative when he asserted there had been blunders in United States policy in Southeast Asia and when he charged, as he did in the Feb. 9 New York Review of Books, that the United States had a tendency to escalate just when the outlook for a solution seemed most hopeful and that President Johnson had ignored peace cues from Hanoi.

Hawks favoring a firmer policy were pleased by his view that the commitment of American combat forces to Vietnam was necessary to prevent the military collapse of the Saigon Government.

Mr. Fall was born in Vienna but spent his formative years in France. He fought with the maquis, the French underground, against the German occupiers and was awarded a medal by France after the Liberation.

Although he had been living in the United States since 1951, he retained his French citizenship. His French passport gave him more freedom of movement than an American passport, and he was able to travel to Hanoi long before any American correspondents did so.

A SENSE OF FOREBODING

No one could have made so many trips, six, to the war zone without a sense of foreboding. This he confided to his editor, Stewart Richardson of Doubleday, last November. "He had a premonition," Mr. Richardson said yesterday. "He felt that something might happen and he told me: 'My wife knows where everything is.' "

He was under contract to do another book on Vietnam for Doubleday. He was also to send articles to The New York Review of Books and The New Republic.

A report that he had been engaged by the Rand Corporation to interview Vietcong prisoners and defectors and report on their attitudes was denied yesterday by an official of Rand, a Santa Monica, Calif., nonprofit organization that does research for the Defense Department and other Government agenices.

His books and articles were storehouses of enduring information. Many an American officer got his first real appreciation of the agony of Vietnam by reading Mr. Fall's "Street Without Joy: Indochina at War," published in 1961. Mr. Fall's material was mostly gathered first hand in 1953–54 when he lived in Hanoi and accompanied French forces on combat operations.

Bernard Fall was born in Vienna Nov. 11, 1926, the son of Leon and Anne Seligman Fall. He was a student for two years at the University of Paris and later studied at the University of Munich.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, Feb. 24, 1967]

Death of a Scholar on "Street Without Joy"

Fourteen years ago, Bernard B. Fall went to war-torn Indochina to do research for his doctoral thesis. Because he was a French citizen he was allowed to accompany French forces fighting the Viet Minh, thus seeing action at first hand and gaining personal experience in Communist guerrilla methods. He received his Ph.D., then wrote a book, "Street Without Joy," choosing as the title the soldiers' name for a stretch of desolate seacoast northwest of Hue. This week, while accompanying U.S. Marines operating on "the street," Fall was killed by the explosion of a Viet Cong mine.

Fall was a scholar-reporter. He wrote numerous magazine articles and several books on Indochina and Vietnam, the latest being "Hell In a Very Small Place," a detailed account of the siege of Dienbienphu, which was acclaimed by reviewers when it appeared early this year.

Born in 1926, Fall got his first taste of guerrilla warfare in his teens when he joined the French underground and fought against the Nazis. Later he served two years in a Moroccan mountain division, then came to the United States where he completed his education and married. For the past 10 years he was a professor at Howard University, Washington, D.C., though he took frequent leaves to study and write about Communist infiltration in Southeast Asia.

Some American officials called Fall "an apologist for the French" and a defeatest in his views on U.S. involvement in Viet

Nam. But a spokesman for the U.S. mission in Saigon, expressing deep regret at his death, called him "this outstanding scholar of Vietnam." Fall was no cloistered scholar. He did not hesitate to take risks to find out what he wanted to know. Finally, as for so many other brave men in Vietnam, his luck ran out.

[From the Washington Post]

Bernard B. Fall

The qualities that endeared Professor Bernard B. Fall to his admirers and most exasperated his antagonists in the Vietnam debate were brutal candor and uncompromising intellectual integrity. There were no platitudinous ifs, ands or buts in what Fall wrote and said that could leave any doubt as to where he stood, or that might make it possible to engage him in polite but indeterminate sparring. He argued his case angrily, brilliantly, brashly and with a missionary's passionate conviction. He was a relentless gadfly who deserves much of the credit for stirring up a meaningful democratic discussion of the Vietnam issue.

Whether or not one agreed with him, and this newspaper often did not, Fall earned increasing respect over the years as a well-informed critic of policy in Vietnam and as a distinguished advocate of a "political" approach to ending the war. Confronted with the question, "What would *you* do?", Fall answered that he would encourage the Saigon government to make its own peace with the Vietcong by treating it as an indigenous southern political force. Whether or not it is "northern-controlled" at present, he contended, it has powerful southern regionalist elements within it; and these could be induced to join a coalition regime in Saigon irrespective of Hanoi's wishes or discipline. In this way, he suggested, the existence of a separate South Vietnam might be assured for a number of years, permitting the two Vietnams to achieve "a specifically Vietnamese solution" to the reunification problem.

Fall shied away from policy prescriptions for the most part and has emphasized his role as a chronicler and historian. His two principal works of military history, *Street Without Joy* and *Hell In a Small Place*, are memorable scholarly achievements and will be remembered long after the struggle for Indochina is finally resolved.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the recent tragic death of Bernard Fall was a great loss for our Nation. It was a loss not only in the sense that a brilliant and dedicated political scientist lost his life at the peak of his career, but in the sense that Bernard Fall was one of this country's most perceptive and penetrating writers on the Vietnam struggle. For almost 15 years he dedicated his life to making the remote struggle for freedom in Vietnam understandable to Americans whether they live in New York or Council Bluffs. His books including "Street Without Joy," "Hell Is a Small Place," "Two Vietnams," and "Vietnam Witness" were well-balanced treatments of the political, military, economic, and social confusion which have existed for over a quarter of a century in Vietnam. While I did not always agree with every one of Mr. Fall's observations and recommendations, I recognized that his work was a significant contribution to our knowledge of events now in progress in that corner of the world.

Bernard Fall was one of those men who felt his understanding of a situation was not complete unless he knew every facet of a problem from firsthand experience. Rather than conducting his research amidst dusty archives, compiling bibliographies, footnotes, and chapters from secondary sources, he went instead to the place of action. Not satisfied with the conclusions of others, he wanted to see for himself. In so doing he exposed himself to all the dangers of war, and for his daring he paid with his life.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened by the tragic death of Bernard B. Fall. I was fortunate to know him personally, and as a person, I shall miss him. A man of enormous enthusiasm as well as a brilliant scholar, Bernard Fall was a recognized authority on Vietnam, having specialized for over a dozen years on southeast Asia.

Although born in Vienna, he spent most of his formative years in France. A member of the Marquis, he was awarded a medal by the French Government after the liberation. Living in the United States since 1951, Dr. Fall was a professor of international relations at Howard University.

Bernard Fall's books have been required reading for all Americans who are interested in this country's growing involvement in the Vietnamese war. He had accompanied the French Army in Indochina and was one of the few qualified Western observers to have traveled both in North and South Vietnam. He had a deep affection and respect for the long suffering Vietnamese people, the victims of an international quarrel not entirely of their own making.

Although his books and articles were frequently critical of American tactics and the American presence in Vietnam, Dr. Fall frequently lectured at the Pentagon and at the U.S. War College. In the world of the cold war, the big establishment and the powerful secret organizations, Bernard Fall was not the agent of anyone. He was always his own man.

Trying to explain the tangle of history in Vietnam was perhaps Bernard Fall's most important contribution to the current reader and the future historian. He took pride in the fact that his books were not based on research in libraries but on firsthand involvement and was one of the few westerners to have done field research in Vietnam's Communist zones. His writings stand as essential documents on Vietnam.

I am including reviews of several of Dr. Fall's books which are not only scholarly achievements but also important chronicles on the Vietnam stuggle.

[From the New York Times Book Review, June 4, 1961]

Enemies Everywhere

"Street Without Joy": Indochina at War, 1946–54. Bernard B. Fall, 322 pages, Harrisburg, Pa.: The Stackpole Co., $4.95

(By Tillman Durdin)

For eight years, from 1946 to 1954, the Indochina war seared the tropical, rice-growing deltas, the jungle-fringed mountains and far-stretching plateaus of the former French colonial territories of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia in one of the bitterest, bloodiest, most haphazard conflicts of modern times. In "Street Without Joy" Bernard Fall tells in graphic detail the story of this brutal war.

There were regions of intense combat in Indochina but never any real fronts. The hundreds of thousands of anti-French partisans of one side, led by Vietnamese insurgents in an independence struggle that became a Communist revolution, were everywhere. They were the individual bomb-throwing terrorists in Saigon, the hit-and-run guerrillas harassing the highways of Cochin-China and Tongking; they made up the well-armed battalions assaulting French defense lines. The 280,000 French Army, Foreign Legion and colonial troops of the other side were endlessly entangled in a futile cycle of protecting strategic areas while simultaneously flailing and lunging about with tanks, trucks and airplanes in never-successful attempts to catch and pin a feinting, elusive army of foot-soldiers in a set-piece battle.

The French side suffered 172,000 casualties (more than the United States in the Korean War). Communist-nationalist losses were even higher. The Communist-led Vietnamese, heedless of death, hurled their lean little bodies against torrents of lead and seemingly impregnable barriers of barbed wire and concrete. French-led contingents fought until killed in beau-geste forts and pitched mass battles. Prisoners in Vietnamese hands underwent incredible suffering and few lived to remember.

The whole hopeless struggle cost France billions in treasure, and to this the United States added a billion more in terms of supplies, transport and other assistance. It all ended with the needless French blunder of Dienbienphu, where a big, air-supplied French force, built up in a hill-rimmed valley deep in enemy territory, was overwhelmed after weeks of carnage by a bigger Vietnamese army using masses of new Russian and Chinese guns.

This book is no armchair study. French-born Mr. Fall, after World War II service as a Resistance fighter in France, spent 1953 in Indochina, often accompanying French units into combat while gathering material for a doctoral thesis. He has had access to French Army records in Paris; he visited Indochina in 1957 and 1959. Now married to an American girl, he is Associate Professor of International Relations at Howard University.

The vast panorama of the Indochina struggle emerges with graphic impact in his volume. He gives first-hand accounts of engagements—for example, of the little, isolated French fort in North Laos whose 300 defenders held out and died to a man under thirty-six days of Vietnamese mortar pounding and infantry assaults. He portrays the soldiers, the generals, the women, and he unfolds many little side episodes. (There is the story of the Jew who joined the Foreign Legion to find and kill, in Indochina, the Nazi Legion recruit who had liquidated his family and friends during World War II in Rumania.)

What makes Mr. Fall's book important today is his portrayal of the Indochina conflict as a major example of the new kind of warfare waged by revolutionary forces that enjoy the advantages of what he calls an "active sanctuary." The anti-French partisans in Indochina won because they had this "active sanctuary" in Communist China, from which they received a steadily increasing flow of supplies and to which they could send their troops for training and their wounded for recuperation. Americans who want to understand the in-fighting and the odds we would face if we got involved in a new Indochina war would do well to read Mr. Fall.

The author does not claim to have written a comprehensive history of the Indochina war, but even so he would have improved his presentation if he had given more treatment to the broad lines of the war's development and the related political events in the Indochina states. The debacle of Dienbienphu, for example, would have been portrayed more understandably if Mr. Fall had provided additional details on the immense Vietnamese Communist build-up of Russian and Chinese supplies and the fantastic human chain of carriers, that transported these supplies for the Dien Bien Phu battle and the Communist drive into North Laos. A little more space might have been devoted to this sort of thing and a little less to describing battles.

Also, Mr. Fall might profitably have amplified his references to "Atlante," the big ill-advised French counterattack launched on the South Annam coast in 1954. Atlante drained off many French Union battalions and aircraft and large amounts of supplies for an operation of peripheral importance at a time when all these resources could have been better used in saving vital positions in Tongking. Atlante was just one of the instances of faulty strategy and leadership on the French side in Indochina.

One would wish, also, that Mr. Fall had told more of the Communist Vietnamese terrorist attacks in Saigon and other cities and expanded his comments on the affluent living, the war profiteering, the corruption that went on among the French and non-Communist Vietnamese in Saigon while men died in combat elsewhere in Indochina.

There are minor points however. Mr. Fall's book is a dramatic treatment of a historic event that most Americans know too little about. It is recommended reading particularly at this time of resurgent Communist aggression in Laos and Vietnam.

[From the New York Times Book Review, Nov. 17, 1963]

Background for Today

"The Two Vietnams:" A Political and Military Analysis. By Bernard B. Fall. With maps and appendices, 493 pages, New York: Frederick A. Praeger, $7.95

(By Robert Trumbull)

Bernard B. Fall's earlier book on Vietnam, "Street Without Joy," has long been required reading for diplomats and correspondents in Saigon, although it was banned there by the Ngo Dinh Diem Government. His new volume, analyzing elements of the conflict in that unhappy Southeast Asian land, is of even greater stature and should be read by all Americans who are interested in this country's growing stake in the war with the Vietnamese Communists, an ugly jungle war that has already cost the lives of more than a hundred United States military personnel and will undoubtedly cost us a great deal more in blood and treasure before it is finished.

The downfall and death of President Ngo Dinh Diem does not by any means render Mr. Fall's second book on Vietnam out of date. On the contrary, the uncertain political situation following the recent *coup d'état* gives even greater relevancy to this expert recapitulation of the basic factors behind the headlines from Saigon, many of them unknown to the American public that is paying so heavily in money and lives to support the fight against Communists in a faraway tropical battleground.

It is one measure of Mr. Fall's expertise that, on the next to the last page of his book, he foresees the authoritarian Ngo Dinh Diem regime collapsing "of its own weight, more or less along Korean lines." He adds that in this event—the event that has now happened, remember—"the amount of American leverage that will remain in such a case will be . . . open to question."

Perhaps, he suggests, out of the turmoil there may emerge an obscure officer "who one day may step forward and claim for himself the power other contenders have failed to grasp. And that obscure officer," he adds with ominous pertinency, "may be anti-American."

So it is more important today than ever before that Americans subject the situation in Vietnam to cold reappraisal. In the past, Mr. Fall remarks, United States policies in Vietnam have included "probably one of the most confused chapters of recent American diplomatic history and one that, in spite of its importance, has thus far escaped the scrutiny of American political scientists."

According to the Fall version of events leading to the current mess in Vietnam, key elements in the political and military developments have utterly escaped such influential American observers as Walt W. Rostow, Senator Mike Mansfield and President Kennedy. In fact, Mr. Fall has little praise for any prominent Americans who figure in the book except George Kennan, whom he rates as unquestionably the keenest American diplomatic mind since Benjamin Franklin. He pins the President, for one, to the wall on outright ignorance of documented historical fact in Vietnam. The late President Franklin D. Roosevelt comes out even worse, nor do President Eisenhower and the late Secretary Dulles exactly shine.

This fat but readable book begins with the physical setting, and traces the history of the Vietnamese nation to its present divided state. Those who have read Mr. Fall's other work will follow with respect his analysis of how the French lost Indochina, how the Communists got North Vietnam and part of Laos, and how the Vietcong achieved their present position of challenge in the South. The path traced by Mr. Fall is strewn with the shreds of military and political reputations as he recalls, for example, such obvious miscalculations as the American efforts to build a conventional Vietnamese army to fight an unconventional war. The latter mistake, at least, has been under recitification.

A major dimension of the scope and value of the book is probably indicated best, by Mr. Fall himself in the following paragraph from his preface:

"An important part of this book—and I hope this will be its particular contribution to the body of knowledge about Viet-Nam—is devoted to a comparison of the governmental and economic institutions of both zones *not* as they have been designed on paper to impress their friends and fool their foes, but as they *really operate* in everyday practice. This may not please the most ardent advocates of either regime, but the time for semantic niceties—if there ever was such a time in Viet-Nam—is long past. The weaknesses and strengths of each zone of Viet-Nam deserves our most careful attention; for, at a time when American and other Western troops may be committed in one form or another to holding South Viet-Nam, what we *don't* know may most definitely hurt us."

Mr. Fall has been a close student of Vietnamese affairs for 10 years. Recently he visited North Vietnam, talked to Ho Chi Minh and toured significant portions of the Communist-held zone. His first-hand report shows economic and social conditions to be very bad indeed under Ho Chi Minh's rule, but conditions in the South do not get a very good balance sheet either. He notes, as other reporters have, the striking similarity in methods employed by the rival governments of Ho and Ngo—suppression of liberties, neighbor encouraged (or forced) to inform on neighbor, and even the imposition of foreign ideologies that seem to have a great deal in common under their different labels of Communism and Personalism, the latter supposedly anti-Communist.

The reader may have noted an inconsistency in the spelling of Vietnam, or Viet-Nam, as Mr. Fall has it. The author explains in a footnote that the hyphenated form, which is used officially in the country itself, seems more appropriate to the grammar of the native language. Both renderings can be found in different foreign publications, according to the style adopted by their respective editors.

"The Two Viet-Nams" contains the best biographies of Ho Chin Minh and Ngo Dinh Diem, and the clearest exposition of how the Vietcong operates, that this correspondent has seen. Mr. Fall, a professor of international relations at Howard University, is a highly regarded political and military analyst. He is also an excellent reporter. His occasionally controversial views—for instance, did the Americans let down the French in Indochina or vice versa?—will be left by this reviewer for comment by personages on both sides, still living, who were directly involved in the events.

[From Saturday Review, May 28, 1966]

The Tragic Course in Vietnam

"Viet-Nam Witness 1953–66," by Bernard B. Fall (Praeger, 363 pp. $6.95), charges that high policy-makers, misreading the signposts, have followed an erroneous and tragic course in Southeast Asia. As CBS News chief correspondent in France from 1946–61, David Schoenbrun first met and interviewed Vietnam's President Ho Chi Minh in Paris in 1946 and during the next ten years closely followed the course of events in Indochina.

(By David Schoenbrun)

If the essential difference between tragedy and misfortune is the difference between the evitable and the inevitable, then the story of Vietnam is a tragedy, for, of all wars, the wars of Vietnam have been and are the most unnecessary, most evitable of struggles.

Vietnam is the land of lost opportunities and missed options, the victim not so much of lies, plots, and power politics—although all played and play a role there—but rather of error and of miscalculation. *Viet-Nam Witness,* by Professor Bernard B. Fall, of Howard University, America's leading authority on Vietnam, describes, documents, dissects, and diagnoses the tragic death of hope in Vietnam, from the birth of that hope in March 1946, when France recognized Ho Chi Minh's Democratic Republic of Vietnam, through the betrayal of hope in the war that broke out at the end of that year, on through the almost incredible, irrational, unbroken series of errors and defeat in the war and at the conference tables in Saigon, Hanoi, Geneva, Moscow, Washington, and Peking.

Viet-Nam Witness concentrates on the period from the winter of 1953 through the spring of 1966, but it also provides the reader with the necessary background events of 1945–53, the period that Fall calls the "First Indochina War," the French attempts to win back the colony of Indochina. The present struggle is called the "Second Indochina War." Fall insists, quite correctly, that the American intervention, although not colonial, grows out of the French war, involving many of the same participants, repeating many of the same errors. He cites historian Arthur Schlesinger, "referring precisely to the case of Vietnam," who stated that "error creates its own reality." And he further cites the able *Time* correspondent who became the Public Affairs Officer of the U.S. Embassy in Saigon, John Mecklin, author of *Mission in Torment* (Doubleday, 1965):

"The root of the problem was the fact that much of what the newsmen took to be lies was exactly what the Mission genuinely believed, and was reporting to Washington. Events were to prove that the Mission itself was unaware of how badly the war was going, operating in a world of illusion. Our feud with the newsmen was an angry symptom of bureaucratic sickness."

Errors, illusions, anger, and bureaucratic sickness have characterized the nature of the struggle in Vietnam all through the first and second Indochinese wars, and they still poison relations between observers and officials. Press and academic critics of the Administration are attacked, vilified, shadowed, impugned, not because their criticism is unfounded or inaccurate, not, as Professor Fall points out, "on the basis of an alternate set of facts," but simply because "they interfered with what was said to be 'policy.' "

Writing long before the recent revelation of CIA penetration of Michigan State University projects and subsidy of MIT studies, Professor Fall sounded this warning: "When social-science research has reasons-of-state limitations placed upon its conclusions, it runs into heavy risks of losing its validity. . . . In the case of Vietnam, that situation was finally pushed to a tragic extreme in which practically all specialists dealing with the country were operating under contract either with the Saigon government or with one of the American aid programs. As a result, their often excellent work, by virtue of its quasi-official character, could be kept out of public circulation as a matter of administrative procedure and thus might have no effect in bringing about remedial action." As long as ten years ago, Fall points out, authorities were alerted to the "explosive relationship between Vietnamese lowlanders and mountain tribes" but "even the beginning of a beginning of an effective remedy has not yet been undertaken."

Fall is surely right to claim "with considerable pride" that he was the first to offer, as early as 1956, detailed descriptions of guerilla tactics, and, as early as 1957, evidence of the "resurgence of revolutionary war, based on direct field research. He also points out that American policy-makers failed to take any of this evidence into account until General Maxwell Taylor's arrival late in 1961. However, Professor Fall is on less solid ground in holding back some of his wealth of documentation: "Both charity and good taste persuade me not to recite here the long list of erroneous and wildly overoptimistic statements and timetables with regard to Vietnam that officials have provided the world for the past fifteen years." Yet this is surely not a time to invoke good taste, when a brave, long-suffering little nation is being destroyed by bitterly contending forces which, however noble each may believe its motives to be, have shown little consideration for good taste as a guide to action. Professor Fall can, however, be forgiven for his reticence in naming names of error-ridden officials, for he has offered the reader analyses with vast documentation that reveal the errors of current and recent policies in Vietnam.

One of the greatest values of this study is that it is a compilation of articles written by Fall over the past fifteen years, updated and commented upon in the light of developments, but not changed from the time of the writing. One can, therefore, see clearly just what data and opinions were available to policy-makers and how right the scholar was and how mistaken the decision-maker. As any student of this sorry affair knows, and as any lecturer has soon discovered, the American public finds it hard to accept the fact that its highest officials, all very able men, could possibly have been as wrong as the situation suggests. This gives rise to the doctine of demonology; there must have been subervision or conspiracy or something foul afoot, for things have gone so wrong. It is exceedingly difficult for the public to believe that a professor of political science like Dean Rusk, or a master administrator and computer-brain like Robert McNamara, or such brililant, liberal leaders as John F. Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson, and Hubert Humphrey could have failed to see the signs made so many wrong decisions, or decided on major policies so far off the realities of the situation. Schlesinger's thesis that error makes a reality of its own is a subtle, sophisticated concept, hard to grasp. For public acceptance it must be supported by massive proof and finely reasoned argument by a master of the subject. Fortunately, Bernard Fall is such a master and does provide the finely reasoned arguments in his *Viet-Nam Witness*.

This study is divided into six parts. Part I, "France Loses Indochina," relates the background of the First Indochina War, documenting the defeat at Dien Bien Phu and its consequences, through the cease-fire and settlement at the Geneva Conference. In the opening six articles of part I, Fall shatters the Administration claim that the conflict is the result of Communist aggression from the North and not a civil war. The French, Fall demonstrates, transformed an essentially colonial war "into a civil war by setting up a Vietnamese government under their aegis in March 1949." He also notes that "at that point the war had become a part of the over-all Western policy of containment of Communism in Asia." The change in American policy of opposing the French colonial war came as a result of the Chinese Communist victory over Chiang in December 1949, and was hardened by the outbreak of the Korean War. The Chinese intervention in Korea completed the process of fixing the mold of American policy in Southeast Asia.

As far back as March 1954 Fall observed that "it is certainly not by sheer coincidence that General Donovan, wartime OSS chief, is now Ambassador in Thailand." The move had less to do with the freedom of the Vietnamese people, or the independence and integrity of that nation, than with a maneuver to maintain a strong base near China. Fall foresaw the future and felt that this was the wrong strategy. "Massive economic aid," he wrote, "might swing the balance and substitute for the total loss of Indochina in a creeping war the building up of a neutral régime. Such a régime would depend upon Western supplies to survive economically, for neither Red China, plagued by its own lack of consumer goods, nor the Soviet Union, already behind in its promised deliveries to North Korea, could possibly fill the immediate requirements of the ravaged country." He related such a policy proposal to similar and successful creations of neutral régimes on the fringes of a Communist power. "Any solution that accomplishes the effective neutralization of Indochina," asserted Fall, "would be more desirable than this hopeless stalemate in the jungle swamps." He concluded with these words: "A farsighted policy in Indochina, based on well-administered aid, might do more to stem the Communist tide in Southeast Asia than the sending of a few technicians or of a few additional planeloads of napalm."

During the interim we have sent far more than just a few technicians or planeloads of napalm. A quarter of a million men and hundreds of thousands of planeloads of bombs later, the same hopeless struggle in the swamps is being fought, with as little chance of success. Twelve years ago President Eisenhower wrote to President Ngo Dinh Diem offering economic aid but requiring social reforms as a counterpart. Our aid grew to be billions but the reform counterparts were never lived up to by the succeeding régimes in the South. At the Honolulu conference, more than a decade after the first Eisenhower offer, Johnson was still proposing more economic aid and getting no positive reply to his request for land reforms.

Dr. Fall describes in part II a trip through the North, recounts his interview with President Ho Chi Minh, and analyzes the nature of the Communist régime then and today. In part III Dr. Fall traces the history of South Vietnam, from the autocratic Diem régime and the religious problem in politics, through the various military insurrections. Part IV is one of the most fascinating and useful studies in the book: a documentation and analysis of the Vietcong and the National Liberation Front. Fall makes it clear that the Vietcong is no more the mercenary or servant of the North than Hanoi is of China. He thus demonstrates the fallacies in two of the more serious illusions and fantasies on which American policy is predicated. Fall quotes a high-ranking spokesman of the Front who told French reporter Georges Chaffard, of *Le Monde*, that the NLF had got along without the North for a long time, and would "prefer to settle our affairs among 'Southerners.'" "We have not," the NLF spokesman added, "fought all these years simply to end up by installing a new set of dictators in place of the old."

In part V, Professor Fall concentrates on American involvement. It is a tragic story of good intentions paving a road to hell; of small, step-by-step decisions adding up to huge unforeseen stakes and nontreaty commitments. Fall substantiates the truth of Ambassador George Kennan's shrewd perception of a peculiarly American syndrome: unlimited optimism about our adopted protégés. He cites Major General Edward Landsdale on American attempts "at engineering a great patriotic cause led by some universally loved Vietnamese of American selection." As Landsdale remarked, it was a "type of puerile romance [that] should not be attempted in real life." But, concluded Fall, "this was precisely what was done."

The book's last section presents the terrifying statistics of what Fall calls "The Impersonal War." He gives us the whole tragic story of lost opportunities, of suppressed facts about peace negotiations and peace hopes, and "those thresholds on the road to the no-return point in the Vietnam War. . . . It is now clear, from the record," states Fall, "that this is what the Secretary General of the U.N. had in mind when he told a press conference on February 24 [1965] that 'the great American people, if only they knew the true facts and the background to the developments in South Vietnam,' would view the conflict in a different light."

This reporter and observer, could not agree more whole-heartedly, and more sadly with that judgment. It must be sad for all Americans, proud of our traditions of a free press, one of the greatest press corps in the world, to hear the highest official of the World Organization charge that the American people do not know the true facts and the background of developments in South Vietnam. How did this happen? What are these true facts and background, and where can the people get them?

Most of the answers to these anguished questions can be found in the excellent essays and studies of a few men, among whom Bernard Fall, a Frenchman born and bred, but an American by college education and training, is one of the most eminent. His treatment of the record is comprehensive, accurate and coherent. *Viet-Nam Witness* is an excellent companion piece to Fall's earlier, admirable *The Two Viet-Nams*.

In a recent talk that we had, the author told me that the Defense Department has been calling him in for a series of lectures and seminar discussions on Vietnam. That is truly good news. If officials have failed to read him in the past, maybe now that they are listening to him in person there is a chance that he, and those of us who believe as he does in the urgent need to end the war and bring about a Vietnamese solution to the war in Vietnam, will be heeded.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 6, 1967]

BOOKS OF THE TIMES: DEATH-RATTLE

(By Eliot Fremont-Smith)

"Hell in a Very Small Place": The Siege of Dienbienphu. By Bernard B. Fall, 515 pages, Lippincott, $8.95

Dienbienphu—or, in English, "Seat of the Border County Prefecture"—is a village in the northwestern corner of North Vietnam. It is situated in a jungle-surrounded 10-mile-long highland valley, through which meanders a small river. The valley, which contained a small airstrip, had been occupied by the Japanese in World War II, then briefly by Chinese Nationalist forces. In 1953 it was deep in Vietminh territory—the territory of French Indochina controlled by Ho Chi Minh's Communist-oriented Vietnam nationalists.

On Nov. 20, 1953, French paratroopers landed at Dienbienphu, took control of the village and the airstrip and set about establishing a fortress. The operation went under the code name, Castor. Its purposes were several. Primarily, it was to tie up and eventually force to conventional battle a major portion of Vietminh forces which, under Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap's guerrilla strategy, were gradually winning the war for Indochina.

Secondly, Castor was to prevent a successful Vietminh invasion of neighboring Laos. The third purpose, which became increasingly important as the months wore on, was to give the French a better bargaining position at the forthcoming Geneva conference on Indochina, scheduled to convene in May 1954.

As Bernard B. Fall tells it in this exhaustive account, the battle of Dienbienphu consisted of three subbattles, all of which the French lost. The first was the battle for control of the edges of the valley and the hills that surrounded it. This was probably lost by the end of December 1953, anyway by February 1954. The second was the attempt of French Union aircraft—75 planes in all—to inderdict the several hundred miles long Vietminh supply route to Dienbienphu. The third was the siege itself, lasting from March 13, 1954, when the bombardment began in earnest, to May 7, when the surviving defenders, pinned down to an area the size of a baseball field, were at last overrun.

A CLASSIC BLUNDER

Dienbienphu has gone down as a classic military blunder. Mr. Fall, a French-born political scientist based in the United States who has become one of the major authorities on the Vietnam conflict and, for this account, was given exclusive access to secret French documents, attempts in several ways to modify this view. The result is a curiously ambiguous book.

For instance, he puts much of the blame for the catastrophe on America's failure to come into the war by saturation bombing of Vietminh positions surrounding the valley. Much is made of Lyndon B. Johnson's role in this. As the Senate majority leader, he put the kibosh on Secretary of State John Foster Dulles' go-it-alone policy for military intervention, possibly with A-bombs, in Indochina. Yet Mr. Fall also emphasizes the lesson that should have already been learned in Korea (and which, he notes, we have still not accepted), that saturation bombing has minimum logistical effect over undeveloped areas.

It is true that the United States encouraged and supplied the French, and that two myopic American generals, visiting Dienbienphu in January and February, 1954, blandly approved the pathetic fortifications they saw there (as did all sorts of top-rank French visitors); but this hardly puts the major responsibility for Operation Castor on American shoulders.

RHETORIC OF BRAVERY

As for French responsibility, Mr. Fall mutes it in two ways. First, he tries to set the record straight in the continuing feud between Gen. Henri Navarre, the over-all commander of French Union forces in Indochina in 1953–54 with headquarters in Saigon, and Gen. René Cogny, commander of French forces in North Vietnam, then operating out of reoccupied Hanoi.

Dienbienphu was General Navarre's idea; General Cogny opposed the plan, but then took responsibility for carrying it out.

Both relied heavily on the rhetoric of bravery and patriotic glory—an affliction which has been particularly acute in the French military establishment but which no country is without. But then, so does Mr. Fall. He shows where each general is not as much to blame relatively as the other maintains (thus correcting Jules Roy's "The Battle of Dienbienphu," published here in 1965, which sided with General Cogny's interpretation of events), as if by doing so the errors of both could be made somehow less grotesque.

Finally, the whole incredible enterprise is seen through the fog of glory Mr. Fall allows to permeate his book—as if Dienbienphu could be justified at last (as the generals attempted to justify it virtually from the beginning) by the heroism shown there and the notion that heroism should be its own reward. But the heroism of the beleaguered garrison at Dienbienphu was born of desperation; its reward was betrayal, defeat and death. Mr. Fall is proud to point out that the defenders never capitulated; it is a pride that here suggests itself as the other face of barbarism.

The evidence in this book shows that Operation Castor never had a chance. The defenders were outgunned by the Vietminh from the beginning.

Against the defenders, General Giap mounted a force of nearly 50,000 combat troops (with some 30,000 reserves) and enough artillery and ammunition (most of the weaponry, on both sides, was of American manufacture) to pound the valley to pieces. As French intelligence could have predicted—Mr. Fall emphasizes that the French knew all about the build-up—this was precisely what the Vietminh proceeded to do. Dienbienphu was the death-rattle of French colonialism in Indochina. Mr. Fall's murmurings to the contrary notwithstanding, it is hard to see how it could have been anything else.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Bernard Fall was born in Vienna amid the confusion of interwar Europe and he died 40 years later in a Vietnamese swamp. The interim years were devoted to finding and disseminating the truth as he saw it, regardless of the prevailing popular view, about the events transpiring in southeast Asia.

Bernard Fall carried more than his French passport, he carried a visa to inspect, probe, penetrate, question, and delve into every fact and nunance of information until he could assemble the fragments and threads into the fabric that is history. An inquiring, analytical mind coupled with almost total recall produced the reasoned descriptions which became required reading for every student of the explosive situation in that far corner of the world called Vietnam.

It is a tribute to Bernard Fall that his critics read his reports as avidly as did his disciples.

For the loss suffered them by a Vietcong mine, our condolences go to his wife and three children. The marines with whom he traveled, the men of the First Cavalry about whom he wrote, his friends, associates and students at Howard University, the Asian specialists and Congressmen to whom he gave his counsel, and every American that read his words telling the story of Vietnam will miss him also.

Bernard Fall fought one war against tyranny in France as a member of the underground; his second war was fought with a journalist's pen and in each of those battles he conducted himself like a true soldier.

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late Dr. Bernard Fall, professor of international relations at Howard University, who had met a tragic death on February 20 while in Vietnam.

The loss we sustain in the untimely passing of this distinguished gentleman is emphasized by the respect and admiration he has received from the Members of this great body.

I particularly remember his testimony before the Subcommittee on Far East and Pacific of the House Foreign Affairs Committee on March 16, 1965 and was very much impressed with his presentation expressing his views during testimony on the Sino-Soviet dispute.

In life, he was recognized as an outstanding leader in his particular field. In death, he is remembered with the greatest respect by many people as a man of principle and a most competent statesman.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in an expression of deep respect for Bernard B. Fall, who was killed on February 21 by a land mine while on patrol with the U.S. Marines near Hue, South Vietnam.

While I did not know Dr. Fall well, I admired him as a man of powerful intellect and great courage. Both qualities ran consistently through his written books on the tortured history of Vietnam, on which he was an authority without peer.

His loss deprives the academic world of an outstanding scholar, our country of one of the keenest analysts of the war in Vietnam, and men of verve and honesty everywhere of a kindred spirit.

I ask that the perceptive Washington Post editorial on Dr. Fall's death be included in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1967]

BERNARD B. FALL

The qualities that endeared Professor Bernard B. Fall to his admirers and most exasperated his antagonists in the Vietnam debate were brutal candor and uncompromising intellectual integrity. There were no platitudinous ifs, ands or buts in what Fall wrote and said that could leave any doubt as to where he stood, or that might make it possible to engage him in polite but indeterminate sparring. He argued his case angrily, brilliantly, brashly and with a missionary's passionate conviction. He was a relentless gadfly who deserves much of the credit for stirring up a meaningful democratic discussion of the Vietnam issue.

Whether or not one agreed with him, and this newspaper often did not, Fall earned increasing respect over the years as a well-informed critic of policy in Vietnam and as a distinguished advocate of a "political" approach to ending the war. Confronted with the question, "What would *you* do?", Fall answered that he would encourage the Saigon government to make its own peace with the Vietcong by treating it as an indigenous southern political force. Whether or not it is "northern-controlled" at present, he contended, it has powerful southern regionalist elements within it; and these could be induced to join a coalition regime in Saigon irrespective of Hanoi's wishes or discipline. In this way, he suggested, the existence of a separate South Vietnam might be assured for a number of years, permitting the two Vietnams to achieve "a specifically Vietnamese solution" to the reunification problem.

Fall shied away from policy prescriptions for the most part and has emphasized his role as a chronicler and historian. His two principal works of military history, *Street*

Without Joy and *Hell In a Small Place,* are memorable scholarly achievements and will be remembered long after the struggle for Indochina is finally resolved.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, Bernard Fall, activist, strategist, and scholar was a blunt and brillant contemporary historian.

His early involvement with the Vietnamese, dating back to the French phase of the fighting, his language versatility and his profound scholarship provided unique insights into the conflict in Vietnam. He interpreted the complexities of that ceaseless conflict, complexities which were challenging rather than confusing to him.

I am impressed with the depth and extent of his work. Professor Fall was a firsthand observer. His conclusions were not academic abstractions but the result of personal observations, hard research and a humanitarian point of view. He recognized political as well as military entities and at the time of his death was preparing a book on the psychology of the Vietnamese.

Bernard Fall was a brave man who assumed the physical stress of travel and the dangers of combat involvement. He possessed the constructive character of a civilized man and the manner of his death lends a special poignancy to his vital and constructive life.

I do not believe that his death was in vain though he held no real brief for either of the parties to the conflict.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice to the remarks of my colleagues here today and to express my personal dismay concerning the death of Dr. Bernard B. Fall.

Because of my deep conviction that our policies in Vietnam were in error, I sought out Dr. Fall in order to better acquaint myself with the background information which I felt he could provide.

Needless to say, I found him to be extremely knowledgeable, and I was also quite impressed by his enthusiasm and his willingness to be as helpful as possible.

I consider Dr. Fall's death to be one of the great tragedies of this war. The contributions which he would have undoubtedly made as a scholar and historian without peers in the Indochinese area are lost to us now. Nevertheless, I am grateful for the fine legacy he has left in his works to date.

Bernard Fall has now become a part of the history which he was so involved in studying, evaluating, and writing about.

At this point, I would like to insert a review of Dr. Fall's latest book, "Hell in a Very Small Place: The Siege of Dien Bien Phu," written by Mr. David Schoenbrun, and appearing in the Saturday Review, February 18, 1967:

The Fall of the French Empire in Indochina: A Battle That Ended One War and Started Another

(By David Schoenbrun)

I have often read a splendid book and thought, as so many writers do, "God, I would have loved to have written this." But when I sat down to read Bernard Fall's latest work on Vietnam, *Hell in a Very Small Place: The Siege of Dien Bien Phu* (Lippincott, $8.95), I was startled to discover that it was a book that I had been asked to write and had turned down. I could not indulge in any personal fantasy as I read Professor Fall's exciting narrative and masterful analysis of the Battle of Dien Bien Phu, for he had done what I had earlier conceded to be beyond my own capacities. How wise I was to have been modest, for Fall alone could have produced this dramatic, authoritative reconstruction of one of the great battles of history.

The idea of having a complete study of the battle that ended the French-Indochina war was originally conceived by America's eminent journalist-historian of military affairs, Hanson Baldwin of *The New York Times,* who had taken on the assignment of editor, for Lippincott, of a series on the great battles of history. Baldwin talked to me about doing the Battle of Dien Bien Phu after he had read my comments on it in *As France Goes.* In covering that battle through the spring of 1954 I had become convinced that I was watching more than just a localized sector, involving a relatively small force of some 15,000 French inside the garrison and some 45,000 siege troops. It was, I felt, even more than a battle between a colonial army and a national, Communist-led revolutionary force. Dien Bien Phu was the site of the first pitched battle between an Asian nationalist army of yellow men once-despised as inferior against the élite, modern, white armies of the long-dominant Western powers.

A victory by the Vietnamese over the French would be a far greater accomplishment psychologically than all the triumphs of the Japanese in the Forties, for Japan had long been an independent nation, one of the leading industrial powers of the world. And the Japanese, like the white men they imitated so painstakingly, were imperialists in Asia, not the representatives of a subject people fighting for freedom against a colonial oppresssor. At Dien Bien Phu the Vietnamese thus won an enormous victory, not only for the Communists, but for all Asians. I saw this clearly when I witnessed the pride in the faces of the most anti-Communist Vietnamese as they read of the achievement of their blood brothers at Dien Bien Phu.

Hanson Baldwin had come to the same conclusion about the historic significance of that battle which, having broken the will of the French to fight on, led to their rapid withdrawal and America's stumbling into the Vietnamese trap. But when he asked me to write the full story of what had happened I told him I was convinced that only a historian who could examine the archives of the French government and have reasonable access to North Vietnam would be able to obtain the necessary official documents and interview the principal actors in the drama. I knew that no American would be able to do the job. It was my guess that only Frenchmen like Jean Lartéguy, Jules Roy, or Paul Mus could accomplish it.

Lartéguy did do the job, but in the form of novels. Paul Mus has written many brilliant essays and books on Indochina, but not on the Battle of Dien Bien Phu. Jules Roy, until now, has been the author of the pioneering work on the subject, his excellent *Dien Bien Phu,* a history written with the special talents of a novelist and a playwright. Now, I believe, the definitive work, one destined to be a classic, has been produced by Bernard Fall, who in his impressive earlier studies—*The Two Viet-Nams, Vietnam Witness,* etc.—had already won a leading position among authorities on Vietnam in American universities. Although he is French, most of Professor Fall's work has been done here, notably at Howard University. His proximity to Washington, his access to American observers and to some U.S. official records as well as to French archives, his relative freedom to travel, his contacts in North Vietnam, which he has visited, have all been invaluable, almost unique tools at the service of his scholarship.

However, in the passages describing the battle as the Communist ring tightened around the gallant but hopelessly trapped French garrison, Fall the scholar rises to the heights of a dramatic writer, in some of the best prose he has ever offered to his readers. He has even managed to obtain transcripts of the last radio conversations between the besieged garrison commander, Colonel de Castries, and the zone commander in Hanoi, General Cogny.

It was shortly before the end and de Castries had to deal with the fate of the wounded, the service troops unused to jungle warfare, and the "Rats of the Nam Yum"—all who would have to be left behind if de Castries were to try a then-contemplated break-out. He did not know at the moment of this conversation that he would not be able to break out.

"Well, then, *Mon Dieu,* I'll keep here, well—those units which don't want any part of it."

"That's it, yes."

"Then—well, how shall I put it, [there are] the wounded, of course; but many of them are already in the hands of the enemy. . . ."

"Of course. Yes."

"*N'est-ce pas?* And then, I'll keep all that under my command."

"*Qui,* old boy."

"That's it then."

"*Au revoir,* old boy."

"I'll still be able to telephone you again before [there was a moment of hesitation and faltering in de Castrie's voice]—before the end.

"Come, come—*au revoir,* Castries, old boy."

"*Au revoir,* General."

"*Au revoir,* old boy."

De Castries sent out reconnaissance patrols and discovered that the Viets had built three new trenches, sealing off the last open stretch of terrain south of the encampment. Any break-out attempt would have ended in a slaughter. He radioed back the bad news to Cogny. Headquarters knew it was all over. They did not want to order de Castries to a final butchery of his men but they did not want him to surrender. They called de Castries on the secret Z.13 ultrashortwave transmitter for final instructions.

(General Cogny) "Tell me, old boy, this has to be finished now, of course, but not in the form of a capitulation. That is forbidden to us. There can be no hoisting of the white flag, the fire has to die of its own, but do not capitulate. That would mess up all that you have done that is magnificent until now."

"All right, General, I only wanted to preserve the wounded."

"Yes; however, I do have a piece of paper. I haven't got the right to authorize you to capitulate. Well do as best as you can—but this must not end by a white flag. What you have done is too fine for that. You understand, old boy?" . . .

"I'm blowing up all the installations. The ammunition depots are already exploding. *Au revoir.*"

"Well, then, *au revoir,* old boy."

A giant of a man, with the body of a pro-football fullback, General Cogny, veteran of many campaigns around the world, kept his voice steady, his familiar "old boy" casual, but those of us in the dugout in Hanoi saw tears flow with the sweat running down his face. I stood in the corner, trying to make myself invisible as I watched the old-line, aristocratic, icy French officers fighting to keep self-control as they stared at the radio set, now crackling with static—and at the Communist troops crashing into the command-trench of Dien Bien Phu, the first of a shock-wave that would flood and sink the French empire and end forever white, Western domination of an Asian nation.

That is what many of us thought that day, not only those of us in Hanoi, but the many thoughtful observers in Washington, London, and Paris who from their own vantage points watched the death throes of the French empire and the fumbling, faltering, finally abandoned American attempts to meet the challenge. The most important pages of Bernard Fall's detailed, colorful account of that turning-point battle tell the story of the Dulles-Eisenhower reactions to the challenge, a story so pertinent to what is happening today that it deserves to be extracted from the massive, 515-page book and published separately in magazine or brochure form. It ought to be required reading for every American citizen.

Fall notes gently, perhaps too gently, that American officials even now will not cooperate with scholars studying the Indochinese war. "Precisely because the political by-play which took place in those tragic days of spring 1954 still has relevance today for the United States, it is difficult to obtain from American official sources a coherent picture of what exactly went on." Fall, however, was able to reconstruct the whole sorry story from British and French official sources, from the memoirs of Anthony Eden, those of the then French Prime Minister Joseph Laniel, and, to some extent, from the Eisenhower memoirs, as well as from "certain press articles whose correctness was not denied by the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles." Fall observes that in U.S. foreign policy the fates of Korea and Indochina were linked from the date of the outbreak of the Korean War in June 1950 to the end of the Truman Administration in January 1953.

It was the American concept that "none of the Western powers engaged in military operations against a Communist aggressor would negotiate a separate cease-fire since the immediate results would be an increased burden upon the others' theaters of operations." Thus the French, Professor Fall points out, broke off negotiations with the Viet Minh, while the United States, in return, began to assume an ever-increasing part of the financial burden of the Indochina war. However, this relationship was unilaterally broken by the U.S. when the Administration of President Eisenhower "felt it important to honor its commitment to the American electorate to settle the Korean stalemate . . ." Professor Fall was in Hanoi when America signed the armistice with the Chinese in the summer of 1953, and he writes that he personally witnessed "the increased weight of new matériel for the Communists and of Chinese instructors for the Viet-Minh forces [that] made itself readily felt immediately after the Korean cease-fire." Eisenhower later admitted in his memoirs that our settlement in Korea gave the Chinese a chance to pour new supplies into the Vietnamese theater of war. This is only one of many reasons why the French feel no commitment to help us now in Vietnam. Suez is another reason. But the one most pertinent today is the memory of America's refusal to send planes to break the Communist seige ring around Dien Bien Phu.

Admiral Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the fiercest hawk of his day, was ready to intervene and promised France's General Paul Ely that he would propose a raid on the current Communist artillery positions, Chinese mortars overlooking the Dien Bien Phu encampment. Radford used a new expression; he called the proposed action a "matching escalation." Dulles bought the idea, and on April 3, 1954, he called a secret meeting at the State Department with eight senior legislators, including Minority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson, Senators Richard B. Russell, Earle C. Clements, William F. Knowland, and Eugene Millikin, and Representatives Joseph Martin, Jr., John W. McCormack, and J. Percy Priest. He told them that Eisenhower had asked him to call the meeting to put to them a proposal for a joint resolution of Congress authorizing use of air and naval power in Indochina. As Fall puts it, "in other words, a resolution granting him a far more restricted freedom of maneuver than that which President Lyndon B. Johnson was given in August, 1964."

Minority Leader Johnson insisted upon knowing whether any other allied nations had been queried about their willingness to join the United States in intervening in Vietnam. Dulles admitted there had been no such inquiry. Johnson said he would not consider any intervention unless there were a coalition of the other free nations of Southeast Asia and the British Commonwealth. All eight legislators agreed that America must not act unilaterally. "That, for all practical purposes," Fall comments, "killed all chances of rescuing Dien Bien Phu." Dulles's subsequent efforts seemed to some to have been an attempt to shift the blame to the British.

Fall argues that the decision not to intervene was basically an American decision and not just the result of England's refusal to come along. We did not consult anyone when we went into Korea, or out of Korea. The call for a coalition looked like a subterfuge to hide America's reluctance to get involved. Leading military men, such as Generals Matthew Ridgway and James M. Gavin, were strongly opposed to any intervention. Chairman Arthur B. Radford was in the minority in the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Defense Secretary Charles Wilson backed Ridgway and Gavin, "and for once, President Eisenhower stood his ground against Dulles." Fall strikes a bitterly ironic note when he cites a Dulles memo to French Foreign Minister Georges Bidault written on April 24, 1954, which "makes interesting reading in 1966: 'An act of war can only be effected with authorization of Congress.'" That was the final decision that condemned Dien Bien Phu. Two weeks later the Vietnamese forces overran the garrison. The Geneva Conference, then in session, could no longer negotiate; it could only prepare the French withdrawal. It was all over.

Fall believes that American policy had been uncertain all through the war. At first we regarded it with distaste as a colonial war; then, when the Chinese Communists drove out Chiang and extended their territorial sweep down to the Indochinese border, we suddenly "discovered" that the French were fighting for Western civilization against the Communists. We did not put enough pressure on France to grant genuine independence to a South Vietnamese group that might have tried to compete with the Communists in the fight for national independence. We therefore were supporting the French colonial war in the name of anti-Communism. We then refused to help them in their hour of most dire need at Dien Bien Phu and blamed it on the British (some Americans were so blind as to call Prime Minister Winston Churchill an appeaser). Fall remarks that President Lyndon B. Johnson forgot all the advice of Minority Leader Johnson against unilateral intervention when, in August 1964, he "committed the United States to an open-ended defense of South Vietnam and Thailand (and perhaps the rest of Southeast Asia), regardless of the policies or attitudes of other allies."

Fall writes that "there can be no doubt but that Dien Bien Phu, far from being a purely French defeat, became an *American* defeat as well. That is why the magic name of Dien Bien Phu is conjured up whenever North Vietnam is exhorted by its leaders to stand fast under the deluge of American bombs that rain down on the country. And it is Dien Bien Phu (along with Suez) which comes to the mind of French military commanders and politicians when General de Gaulle avers that, in a crisis not involving her directly, the United States cannot be counted upon with full certitude. From 1965 onward, the United States was willing to go to war for the sake of preserving what her President calls her 'national honor.' In 1964, one hundred airplanes could not be found to save 15,000 French troops at Dien Bien Phu."

Bernard Fall does not tell us whether he thinks we should have intervened to save Dien Bien Phu. He does not say whether Dien Bien Phu could have been saved by U.S. air intervention. Many competent French and British historians believe that intervention in the spring of 1954 would have come too late. If America had felt that it was vital to hold the line against the Communists in Vietnam, its leaders should have acted much earlier and most particularly after the peace settlement with China in Korea sealed the fate of Vietnam. It is a great pity that at the very end of a brilliant, dramatic, lucidly told story, the writer bows out and leaves these questions to be answered by "future historians."

Future historians will nonetheless be using Fall's book as their main source material. He has done them and us, his contemporaries, a very great service. His book also offers everyone, historian or not, a thrilling story of man's gallantry and folly.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues who are this day expressing their grief at the tragic death of Bernard Fall.

During 1965 and 1966, I was privileged to read a number of Dr. Fall's writings and to talk with him on more than one occasion. Last fall, before leaving on a trip to Vietnam, my wife and I spent a delightful and stimulating evening with Dr. and Mrs. Fall at their home in Washington.

No one knew more of the history and background of the present conflict in Vietnam than Bernard Fall. He wrote and spoke fearlessly on the subject and made not only telling criticisms of U.S. policy but also constructive suggestions for a peaceful solution.

It is ironic in the extreme that such a man should have lost his life as the result of the very conflict he was trying so hard to bring to an end. To Dr. Fall's widow and children, I want to express my profound sympathy.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, no man in the Western World had a more detailed knowledge of Vietnam than Bernard Fall. He combined scholarly wisdom with the facility of sharing his wisdom through the written word.

On several occasions I had the privilege to meet with Mr. Fall to discuss the war in Vietnam. At each meeting I was impressed with his encyclopedic knowledge of the country, its people, and the history of its wars. My own attitudes toward the war were influenced, I am sure, by the clear thinking and clear writing of this man.

One publication that printed Mr. Fall's reports on the war was the New Republic. In its latest issue, the magazine carried the following account of his death:

> Bernard Fall, killed last week by a land mine explosion while with U.S. Marines north of Hue, began writing on Vietnam for the New Republic in 1961. No one better understood that war or exposed more clearly or as early the dangers of the deepening American military involvement. Vietnam was an agony to him. He had lived with it wherever he was every day for more than a decade. He was careless of his own survival; he had had a series of painful operations over the past several years. For this, his sixth visit, he had prepared him-

self by learning Vietnamese; fluent French was not enough. He had taken leave of absence for a year from Howard University, where he was professor of international relations, and settled his wife and three children in Hong Kong so they could be closer to him. He read everything on Vietnam—the dry reports, the speeches, the news accounts. His knowledge and viewpoint were available to anyone who called. He had written numerous books—*The Viet-Minh Regime, Street Without Joy, Indochina 1946–62, The Two Vietnams, Ordeal At Dienbienphu,* and *Hell in a Very Small Place.* He risked and lost his life because he could not long be content with secondhand reports.

BOOZERS AND TEETOTALERS AND NONPROLIFERATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Americans have a tendency to believe that once an international treaty is negotiated on such subjects as war, aggression, disarmament, or arms control, thereafter everybody can relax. Why this should be is somewhat inexplicable after such dismal experiences as the Treaty of Versailles, the Kellogg-Briand pact, the pre-World War II Soviet nonaggression pacts with Finland, Germany, and others, the Treaties of Yalta and Potsdam, and many similar tragic disappointments. Perhaps treaties get broken because national states are inherently incapable of keeping their promises. Or because, in the first place, the promises are made with no intention of being kept, but only for the purpose of euchring a calculated advantage over less sophisticated or more naive signatories. Stalin is reputed once to have claimed:

> Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or wooden iron.

Recently a member of the West German Bundestag, Felix von Eckardt, said of the nonproliferation treaty now under negotiation at Geneva:

> Nonproliferation is like a club of notorious boozers who demand a written agreement from teetotalers that they never take alcohol and won't even touch a drop when a glass is offered them. And then after the pact is signed, these drinkers not only sit together and booze it up again, but also throw the empty bottles at the teetotalers.

Another possible reason for the failure of treaties is that negotiators fail to anticipate and provide for many possibilities of changes in events and technology which make treaty promise keeping improvident or ridiculous or impossible. Yesterday I spoke of the possible development of a gas centrifuge process which might bring widespread access to fissionable U^{235} onto the scene and thereby ease the path for a country toying with the notion of going nuclear. The treaty negotiators at Geneva are not taking into account this development in technology. Unless they do so, a pact will result which cries even louder to be broken than many anticipate. There is another possible advance in technology posing additional proliferation incentives and treaty-breaching inducements dwarfing even those threatened by the centrifuge. It is the probability of someone inventing an all fusion weapon—a pure hydrogen bomb. Today's H-bombs require the great heat and energy from a plutonium or enriched uranium "trigger" bomb to start the thermonuclear process of hydrogen fusion. H-bomb yields are in the megaton ranges while A-bomb yields are largely in the kiloton ranges. The comparisons are yields equivalent to the explosive power of millions of tons of TNT rather than thousands of tons. If a nonatomic means to initiate hydrogen fusion can be found, the entire plutonium enriched uranium requirement can be skipped. The world's vast supply of hydrogen will become available for unlimited manufacture of a truly "poor man's" H-bomb. It will be as easy to make them in secret as it is with public knowledge. Recent demonstration of the capability of lasers to focus great energy on a given point at a precise time is a case in point. In their present stage of development these devices are powerless to trigger hydrogen fusion. But future developments powerful enough to the purpose, utilizing lasers or some other exotic technique for energy storage and quick, massive release, cannot be ruled out.

From both practical and technical standpoints, the nuclear genie is out of the bottle. Efforts—like the nonproliferation treaty negotiations—to ram it back in seem increasingly futile. Since all indications are that there will be nuclear spread whether or not such a treaty is negotiated and signed, perhaps we are addressing ourselves to the wrong problem. Instead of romantically engaging upon high-flown treaty negotiations, we should be devoting our time practically to assessing the nature of a world with an inevitable degree of nuclear spread and determining realistic means to prevent undue peril from resulting.

ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF NEBRASKA STATEHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, for more than a century the great State of Nebraska, which I proudly represent, has been the gateway to the Golden West. For those hundreds of thousands who took seriously the admonition to "Go west," Nebraska was the high road to the fabled lands that beckoned the rugged pioneers that built this great Nation of ours.

Nebraska contrasts the old and the new, the past and the present, the broad and the beautiful. Rolling river lands of the east strentch into the fertile sand hills of the west. These great grasslands, in turn, twist into the rugged buttes and hills, the prelude to things to come as the prairies rise to meet the Rockies. Men and women of courage and stamina carved a great State where once there was only untamed land.

One hundred years ago today, Nebraska was officially proclaimed the 37th State of the Union by President Andrew Johnson. But statehood had not come easy. For over 20 years the people of Nebraska fought for the right to join the Union and to draft a suitable code of laws. Once the victory and statehood had been won "Equality Before the Law" was adopted as the motto of the State, and utilized on the great seal of Nebraska.

Nebraska was a tough land, 100 years ago. Nature was often unkind, and the Indians were not particularly willing to give up their lands to the white man. Only the sturdiest, hardiest, breed of men and women were capable of wresting a successful livelihood from the land. When settlers first arrived in Nebraska, they lived in houses made of sod. Very little lumber grew naturally on the plains, and transportation facilities were not developed to facilitate bringing lumber in from the East, so the Nebraskan settlers developed a capacity for hard work and endurance, qualities that still prevail in Nebraskans, and are reflected in the ever-increasing progress of our State.

We are truly a pioneer State. Never afraid to pioneer a new concept, Nebraska was the first, and still the only State to adopt the unicameral system for the State legislature. Although the unicameral system has been declared superior to the bicameral system by some of the best political science scholars in the land, no other State has had the courage to overcome the force of inertia which tends to keep them moving in the same organizational direction that was suitable for the early years of State development.

Nebraska has pioneered not only in State government organization, but in the architectural concept to house its State government. Nebraska was the first to break with tradition and choose an ultramodern style for our State capitol. Uniquely designed for Nebraska, the building is distinguished by four symmetrical entrances, open to north, south, east, and west, symbolizing Nebraska's centrally located position among the States. The building is centered by a tower rising high to the sky and visible for miles over the Great Plains.

Because Nebraska is so centrally located, serious consideration was, at one time, given to the proposal to move the capital of the United States to a site near Lincoln. In fact, in 1920, a convention met in St. Louis to discuss the proposal. Another strong factor in favor of the move, was the location of salt mines in Lancaster County. Salt was, at that time, such a valuable mineral that it was deemed prudent to locate the Nation's Capital near the quarries. Salt has since declined in value, and modern means of transportation have eliminated much of the time distance between Washington, D.C., and the rest of our country, so the likelihood of such a move has faded from a popular topic of conversation into the reveries of oldtime Nebraskans, who still remember how seriously the issue was debated.

Nebraska has inspired many kinds of pioneers, including the famous pioneer of the air—Charles Lindbergh. Although not a native Nebraskan, Lindbergh came to Lincoln to learn to fly at the Lincoln Aircraft School. It was from Nebraska sod that Lindbergh first ascended into the air. Of course, everyone knows of his famous transatlantic flight in May of 1927. We Nebraskans like to think we rubbed a little of our daring spirit off on him while he was with us and perhaps we played a silent part in inspiring that historic flight.

We have come a long way from the days when transportation was such a slow, tedious effort that the settlers lived in houses made of sod because timber was so difficult to transport so far from the east coast, to our present era when men can orbit the earth in less time than it took those early pioneers to come from the east coast to their new home. We can expect still greater progress in our State, for the qualities of the pioneer, the adventuresome spirit, and courage coupled with patience, are still in the hearts of Nebraskans.

Nebraska takes great pride in its rich heritage. Our State is a living book of history and with this in mind I have placed in the Appendix the story of Nebraska's fight for statehood as written by Warren Spencer. It is aptly titled "The Fight To Belong."

As we proudly celebrate our centennial this year I invite my distinguished colleagues to explore Nebraska, for a week or a weekend. Once you do, you will want to come back again.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and honor to address my colleagues here in the House today and to pay tribute to the people of Nebraska on a very significant date in our western history and heritage. Today is the 100th anniversary of Nebraska's statehood. Today, in Nebraska, we are celebrating the kickoff of our centennial celebration throughout the State.

I am especially pleased to be the U.S. Representative from the Third District of Nebraska in this Congress during the centennial. This district is composed of 59 western counties and about two-thirds of the State of Nebraska. During the time I was preparing for this celebration and these remarks I took the liberty to reflect on the history of my State and the first 100 years as a member of the Union. I would now like to take a little time and share some of our history with the Members of the House. While I am convinced the Third District is unique I will not confine my remarks to it, but for a special article to follow in the Appendix.

It was President Andrew Johnson who signed the proclamation admitting Nebraska to the Union back on March 1, 1867, and the period of time since that great day only scratches the surface of the history of Nebraska. I can assure you we are all proud of our first 100 years as a State and we are looking forward to the future with renewed vigor and anticipation.

Prior to the great western movement brought on by the gold rushes and the Homestead Act of 1862 the eastern population as well as the European countries had heard many stories of the abundant wildlife, Indians, and natural wonders of the territory known as Nebraska. The name itself is an Indian word meaning "flat waters," presumably named after the Platte River which spread far and wide throughout the State.

When the people started moving to the West they were originally more concerned about getting through the Nebraska Territory via the Mormon or Oregon Trails. Little by little people began to settle along the Missouri River and some of the other rich farming valleys of the territory. They faced the Indians and the elements and found they could survive against both and reap the bounty of a new rich virgin territory. As these settlers attracted more, communities sprang up in the eastern part of the territory. The Army established 11 forts throughout the territory and these became centers of trade as well as protection centers.

In 1862 the Homestead Act brought more settlers from all walks of life to the new territory. These were very hardy, down to earth people, representing all nationalities. The first homestead settled under the 1862 act was also settled in Nebraska. Cries of statehood were growing and as might be expected a good deal of turbulence was created from it. After several years of argument over three constitutions and the changing of the capitol, statehood was achieved in 1867.

This was only part of the battle for a new State, now they had to prove themselves. Slowly the population creeped to the western part of the State and an economy was founded on the new cattle industry which was developing at the end of the Texas Trail located at Ogallala, Nebr. The rich fertile grasslands of the sandhills furnished lush grass for feeding and raising cattle. The first transcontinental railroad, the Union Pacific, went through the State and created greater accessibility to the rich eastern markets. No longer did they have to live off the wildlife, but a flourishing beef industry was established. As new farming techniques developed the agricultural economy of the State grew with great speed and finally we had developed into a national leader in all forms of agricultural production.

Of course it was not all a bed of roses and these early pioneers and settlers had to fight prairie fires, blizzards, droughts, floods, and grasshoppers. They did fight and they did succeed and Nebraska is now a leader in conservation, reclamation, and irrigation.

These new pioneers, foreign-born immigrants and others left a mark on our country and especially the State of Nebraska. We certainly owe them a debt for coming to Nebraska when they were needed and we can thank them from the bottom of our hearts for what they left as a legacy in their offspring; that same strong will and determination to succeed. Our early settlers certainly provided the anvil from which Nebraska was formed upon and their following generations have continued with the same spirit.

In my part of the State as well as others, our native Nebraskans are the children and grandchildren of these early settlers. They are on the same ranches and farms their parents and grandparents worked. The present-day Nebraskan is not soft by any means and he continues to work in the same pioneer spirit with fight, determination, and stability to secure for his children and the world, better lives in the future. They are not resting on the wonderful heritage and history that is theirs, but they are looking ahead to face the realities of the future with plans, ideas, and action. These people are the new face of Nebraska and their success is assured by their past accomplishments.

I think it would be a real thrill to be able to take one of our early pioneers on a tour through the State as it exists today. He would not notice a great deal of change in the land itself in the western part of the State.

The real significant changes would be in what is on the land. The central part and northwestern part of the State would now have a very large manmade forest. Oil wells and pumps would be working in the southwest, the Platte River would be a little lower due to the irrigation pumps operating in some areas, large lakes built for reclamation and irrigation would dot the countryside, large sprinklers and motors with loud exhausts would break the silence of a growing cornfield. The cattle grazing in the sandhills would be smaller and more uniform than the rangey longhorns that once covered the land, the old trail ruts would be covered with interstate highways and shining powerlines would cross the land bringing life and light from the public powerplants throughout Nebraska. The railroad would still be there but there would be more tracks. The capitol would be a gleaming 450-foot structure topped with gold and seen for miles around displaying the strength and stamina of the people of Nebraska.

In any event I am sure the old visiting pioneer would be pleased with what he saw and the plans he would hear of for the future. I believe our plans for the future speak for themselves in the image of the many fine new schools and colleges that have been built during our first 100 years. This is only the beginning. It is great to be a Nebraskan during this period and I congratulate all Nebraskans on a job well done and future worth facing.

I certainly hope that many of my colleagues will try and visit Nebraska during our celebration and in the years to come. Nebraska is truly the land where the West begins.

As I stated earlier in my remarks I would not try and overemphasize the Third District of which I have the distinct honor of representing. This is rather a hard thing to live up to, but I would like to place an article in the Appendix of the RECORD and request that you read it. The article is written by a constituent of mine, Mr. Jack Pollock, editor of the Keith County News in Ogallala, Nebr. Ogallala was the end of the Texas Trail and marked the advent of our great cattle industry.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and honor to address my fellow Members in the House of Representatives and pay tribute to the fine people of the State of Nebraska on the date of its State centennial. March 1, 1967, is the 100th anniversary of the admission of Nebraska to full statehood. Nebraska, where the West begins, is a leading State in the production of many agricultural products and related industries. Nebraska has a fine educational system and is second to none of its sister States in art, literature, science, and religion.

The best thing that Nebraska has to offer to this great country of ours is its people. I would like to take this opportunity to invite all of you to visit our State this centennial year. Nebraska is a State richly endowed with natural beauty and vacationland attractions.

On behalf of the First Congressional District of Nebraska, I wish to thank you for the opportunity to present these remarks.

WHAT DEMOCRACY MEANS TO ME

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy Contest.

The winning contestant from each State and the District of Columbia then compete for top prizes, which are five scholarships to the school of the contestants' choice.

The contest theme this year was "Democracy: What It Means to Me."

The winning contestant from the District of Columbia was Stephen Gary Kraskin. In spite of concerted efforts on the part of many of my colleagues as well as myself, the District of Columbia has no Representative in Congress. I am therefore pleased to act, in this instance, as Stephen's Congressman, and present the winning speech from the District as delivered by him so that all my colleagues may have the opportunity to read the presentation of this fine young man.

Stephen's speech, in full, reads as follows:

WHAT DEMOCRACY MEANS TO ME

The term democracy comes from a Greek word meaning rule by the people. The United States government is a representative democracy. This means that the people elect representatives who establish and enforce the laws of our society. Democracy itself, though, is much more than a type of government. It is a philosophy that has developed a pattern of life for millions of people. Democracy is associated with creativity, and it has become synonomous with freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and other rights prescribed in the first eight amendments to the Constitution. Democracy has also become synonymous with the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness prescribed in the Declaration of Independence.

The greatest right given by a representative democracy, though, is the vote. Through this right, all others can be preserved by electing those to office who express, and will maintain and carry out the wishes of the electorate. With the vote goes a great responsibility, not only to our country, but to ourselves. Because a democratic government exists for the sake of the people, the people must be aware of what they need and who is the right candidate to elect to preserve their government. This awareness is the result of education, and, therefore, intelligence in using one's vote is the great responsibility that goes with our greatest right. Thomas Jefferson said in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, and I quote, "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." As a high school student, one must take on this responsibility even before he is granted the privilege that goes with it. For it is at this age that one begins to form his own philosophic outlook, and so, accordingly, education must strive to give the student an incentive to carry out the democratic way of life. The United States does not try to indoctrinate students, though. This is proved by the fact that education is controlled by local government. Also, education in the United States places emphasis on teaching people to examine, question, and think for themselves about their country's policies rather than just accept the existing situation.

It is apparent that this emphasis is getting through to today's high school generation. Evidence of this is seen in formal or informal discussions and debates about policies concerning such areas as civil rights and Viet Nam. These discussions and debates would seem to be healthy for the United States, but when they become violent objections and demands, they can be both disgraceful and detrimental. While the student has the right to question the government, he does not have the right to demand of it. Examining and questioning situations and problems of the government and the world will help the student to keep the nation strong and free when he later gets the privilege of voting. Demanding of his government by the high school student is inappropriate and it will benefit neither the student, nor the United States. The factor that makes this difficult for a high school student to understand is that he must accept responsibility without immediate compensation. The high school student, and all citizens must realize what President Lyndon Johnson said in his Inaugural Address in 1965—quote—"That democracy rests on faith, that freedom asks more than it gives."

OUR REAL ENEMY IN VIETNAM—THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one important fact that some people choose to ignore concerning the war in Vietnam is that our real enemy in Vietnam is the Soviet Union. David Lawrence, the highly regarded columnist of long standing, in his column appearing in the Columbus Dispatch on February 12, 1967, states:

> Peace could come overnight in the Vietnam War if the Soviet Union—which is spending billions of dollars to supply war planes and other weapons and is providing military technicians to the North Vietnamese—were to decide to withhold its aid unless hostilities are ended.

Mr. Lawrence goes on to further state:

> The figures derived from official sources show that in the last two years more than $2 billion worth of supplies—oil, field artillery pieces, heavy infantry weapons and modern jets, including light bombers—have been furnished by the Soviet Union to the North Vietnamese military forces.

For those who would increase trade with the Soviets, this column should test their judgment—or sanity. I include the column, "Our Real Enemy—United States Ignores Proof That Soviet Is Chief Hanoi Ally," in the Record at this point:

OUR REAL ENEMY: UNITED STATES IGNORES PROOF THAT SOVIET IS CHIEF HANOI ALLY

(By David Lawrence)

Peace could come overnight in the Vietnam War if the Soviet Union—which is spending billions of dollars to supply war planes and other weapons and is providing military technicians to the North Vietnamese—were to decide to withhold its aid unless hostilities are ended.

For the Moscow government is at present the real adversary of the United States in Vietnam and has been indirectly responsible for the killing of thousands of American soldiers.

Yet instead of demanding an end to such acts of war, the President and his administration are actually asking Congress to ratify a new consular treaty which could mean assistance to the Soviet system of infiltration.

The figures derived from official sources show that in the last two years more than $2 billion worth of supplies—oil, field artillery pieces, heavy infantry weapons and modern jets, including light bombers—have been furnished by the Soviet Union to the North Vietnamese military forces.

In addition, hundreds of pilots have been sent by the Hanoi government to Russia to be trained. More than 2000 Soviet technicians are in North Vietnam training missile crews and operating military supply stations.

The tendency heretofore has been to portray Red China as the principal factor in the bolstering of the North Vietnam government.

But the evidence is coming out now that Russia has become in the last two years the mainstay of the North Vietnamese.

The Red Chinese, despite their internal troubles, are continuing to supply light weapons, ammunition and rice, all of which is a big help to the guerrilla forces. The Russians, however, are providing the real sinews of the war which are causing America and its allies to incur thousands of casualties.

Oddly enough, the United Nations and its secretary-general, U Thant, have not said or done anything to protest this action. Inside the U.N. the facts about the Russian aid have not been publicized.

Historically, the action of the Soviet government would long ago have been the subject of a formal protest by the American government and could have brought about a severance of diplomatic relations.

The Moscow government in 1953 openly boasted that it had been furnishing arms and supplies to Red China, though that country had been denounced in 1951 by a formal U.N. resolution as an aggressor in South Korea.

Today the Russians are again giving military aid to an aggressor, and the subject isn't even being discussed in the U.N.

Nor is it being mentioned by administration spokesmen in Congress or elsewhere.

Instead, the pressure for peace moves is centered on the North Vietnamese without regard to the fact that the Soviet government is encouraging the Hanoi regime to keep on fighting and is supplying the necessary military aid for that purpose.

The question is why the President and the Congress remain silent though they have indubitable proof that the Soviet Union is North Vietnam's principal ally.

LENIN AND THE "DEAF MUTES"

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the bulletin of the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R. in Munich, Germany, was inserted in the Record on November 21, 1966, but unfortunately one complete paragraph of Lenin's statement was not designated as a quote. As the subject of East-West trade is of current importance, I believe this statement of Lenin's is of value at the present time. The institute is a highly regarded organization which has as its purpose the exhaustive and authoritative study of the Soviet Union and its policies. A number of students from American universities have studied Soviet affairs at the institute in recent years through arrangements with educational institutions in the United States. For the above reasons, I include the article, "Lenin and the 'Deaf Mutes,'" in the Record at this point.

Lenin and the "Deaf-Mutes"

(The following contribution by Mr. Annenkov contains some notes of Lenin's which are here published for the first time in English. They were first published in Russian in an article by the same author in *Novy zhurnal* (The New Review), New York, No. 65, 1961, of which the present contribution represents a brief extract in modified form. Mr. Annenkov describes how these notes fell into his hands and why they have remained unpublished until now. Despite the fact that they were written over forty years ago, they are of especial interest today, as Khrushchev, having liquidated the cult of Stalin, asserts that Soviet policy is now being founded once more on Leninism and that the chief expression of the Leninist spirit in foreign affairs is the principle of peaceful coexistence. The following notes throw a different light upon this question.)

(By Yury P. Annenkov)

Lenin died on January 21, 1924. Three weeks later, I was summoned to the Higher Military Editorial Council, where the director V. Polonsky (later shot on Stalin's orders) proposed that I visit the V. I. Lenin Institute which had been founded in Moscow and there acquaint myself with photographic documents which were intended as illustrations for books dealing with Lenin. The process of "acquainting myself with the documents" lasted about a fortnight. Among a mass of photographs, printed articles and manuscripts, I came across some brief, fragmentary notes hurriedly jotted down by Lenin in his own hand with many of the words unfinished—a characteristic feature of many of his writings, including even private letters. These notes, dated 1921, the year of the Kronstadt mutiny, struck my fancy and for no particular reason I copied them surreptitiously into my notebook. Soon afterwards, these pages of Lenin's jottings disappeared from the Institute and were hidden away in the Party archives; at any rate, with the exception of two or three individual sentences, I never saw them in published form, which was not surprising in view of their contents.

When in 1926 Boris Suvarin in France and Max Eastman in the United States published Lenin's famous anti-Stalinist *Testament*, which had been given to Suvarin by Lenin's widow Krupskaya, Communist parties all over the world fell upon them, calling them slanderers and claiming that the *Testament* was their own fabrication. Credulous Europeans and Americans straightway accepted the Communists' story and the *Testament* was quickly forgotten. Thirty years were to pass before Khrushchev, under the pressure of de-Stalinization, was forced to recall public attention to the document, which had been preserved in the Kremlin, and only then was everyone suddenly prepared to accept it as genuine.

When I came to France, my notebook was in my pocket. For the time being, I thought no more of Lenin's jottings. Even if I had tried to publish them abroad, they would doubtless have shared the fate of the *Testament*. With the passage of time, however, they gradually came to occupy a major place in my consideration of the international political situation and, after Khrushchev's admissions, I resolved to have the notes published. I translated them into French and offered them to certain Paris newspapers, which all declined to accept "such a responsibility," justifying their refusal on the grounds that I could not provide official proof of the authenticity of the text. In answer to my comment that in this case it was up to the Soviets to prove that Lenin had not written the notes, the editors merely shrugged their shoulders. Thus the text remained unpublished, despite the fact that its historical significance (of which in 1924 I could have no idea) was enormous, especially in view of the proclamation of a "return to Leninism" in the Soviet Union. As regards international Communist tactics, the whole of "Leninism" was contained in those lines of Lenin which I had copied down.

Lenin's unpublished notes stated:

"As a result of my own direct observations during my emigration, I must admit that the so-called cultured elements of Western Europe and America are incapable of comprehending the present state of affairs and the actual balance of forces; these elements must be regarded as deaf-mutes and treated accordingly. . . .

"A revolution never develops along a direct line, by continuous expansion, but forms a chain of outbursts and withdrawals, attacks and lulls, during which the revolutionary forces gain strength in preparation for their final victory.[1]

"On the basis of these same assertions and in view of the protracted nature of the growth of the world socialist revolution, it is necessary to resort to special maneuvers capable of accelerating our victory over capitalist countries. We must:

"(a) In order to placate the deaf-mutes, proclaim the (fictional!) separation of our government and governmental institutions (the Council of People's Commissars, etc.) from the Party and Politburo and, in particular, from the Comintern, declaring these latter agencies to be independent political groups which are tolerated on the territory of the Soviet Socialist Republics. The deaf-mutes will believe it.

"(b) Express a desire for the immediate resumption of diplomatic relations with capitalist countries on the basis of complete non-interference in their internal affairs. Again, the deaf-mutes will believe it. They will even be delighted and will fling wide open their doors, through which emissaries of the Comintern and Party intelligence agencies will quickly infiltrate into these countries disguised as our diplomatic, cultural and trade representatives.

"Speaking the truth is a petty-ourgeois prejudice. A lie, on the other hand, is often justified by the end. Capitalists the world over and their governments will, in their desire to win the Soviet market, shut their eyes to the above-mentioned activities and will thus be turned into blind deaf-mutes. They will furnish credits, which will serve us as a means of supporting the Communist parties in their countries, and, by supplying us with materials and techniques which are not available to us, will rebuild our war industry, which is essentially for our future attacks on our suppliers. In other words, they will be laboring to prepare their own suicide."

It should be mentioned that, at the time when I copied down these notes of Lenin's, I was as yet unable to link them with the preparations behind the scenes for a transition from "permanent revolution" to the building of "socialism in one country," a process of which I knew nothing. Only much later, after acquainting oneself with materials relating to Lenin and the events of that period, was it possible to establish that, toward the end of the Civil War, Lenin had very quickly realized the impossibility of bringing about an immediate Communist revolution on a world-wide scale and, as early as the Third Congress of the Comintern (June 6–July 12, 1921), had admitted the need to restore diplomatic and trade relations with capitalist countries in order to put an end to the isolation which constituted too great a threat to the U.S.S.R. The task of taking the first diplomatic steps in this direction was entrusted to G. Chicherin.

Lenin's observations have indeed proved prophetic. As one looks back now over nearly forty years of "diplomatic," "trade" and "cultural" relations between the free world and the Soviet Union, it becomes clear to what extent these "relations" have been based on the method prescribed in Lenin's notes and to what extent they have facilitated the immense expansion and consolidation of the Communist world. They have served to further Communist propaganda, espionage and sabotage in the free countries by encouraging these countries to open their doors to Soviet diplomatic, cultural and trade representatives. Indeed, in every free country the Soviet Union enjoys two forms of representation: the official one, which must not interfere too openly in the internal affairs of the country to which it is accredited, and an undercover one, whose task is to interfere in internal affairs and lead unobtrusively the central committee of the Communist party of that country. A number of major spy trials have clearly demonstrated that this second and more important form of representation carries on its silent work under cover of diplomatic immunity, which Lenin had meant when speaking of the "deaf-mutes" in the free world who are ready to accept Soviet "diplomats," trade and cultural representatives, not to mention all manner of sportsmen, dancers, scholars and anonymous "tourists," at their face value.

---

[1] This passage became known even in Lenin's lifetime and was repeated and commented on more than once by Stalin, and later by Khrushchev.

MISS BONNIE McGUIRE—"ON THIS ROCK WE STAND"

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. King] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, recently a young lady who I am privileged to represent here in the Congress won the oratorical contest sponsored by her local American Legion post in Washington County, N.Y. She is Miss Bonnie McGuire, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Richard McGuire, of Cambridge, N.Y. The title of Bonnie's speech was "On This Rock We Stand."

Qualities of thoughtfulness and of obvious sincerity are readily apparent in this young lady's prize-winning speech. Her remarks show a maturity and a clarity of thought that is uncommon in one of such relatively tender years.

In this day and age, Mr. Speaker, I find Bonnie's expression of her thoughts indeed inspirational, not only for their content, but also as testimony of the fact that there are many young citizens like Bonnie in our country, who see the great value in our democratic way of life and are depending on us to preserve it.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to introduce the text of Miss McGuire's speech into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the Congress may have the benefit of this young lady's thoughts:

ON THIS ROCK WE STAND

A man and his small son walked one day beneath the mighty redwoods which are found in our Pacific Northwest. The man was trying to impress upon the boy the strength and permanence of these gigantic trees. "Son," he said, as they paused beneath one of the largest trees, "This redwood has withstood the storms of a thousand years." His son turned, pointing to the distant rocky cliffs, and asked, "Dad, are they as strong as those rocks?"

From the beginning of time man has recognized the strength and perpetuity of stone. How often we use this association in our conversation. We say "as strong as the Rock of Gibraltar,—as old as the pyramids,—and as everlasting and pure as a diamond."

The milestones of civilization have also exemplified these same characteristics of strength and durability. Just what are the milestones of civilization? What are those things which have changed the course of history, that are directing our way of life today, and will influence men's lives in the centuries ahead?

I would say that the first of these is the Ten Commandments. They are so simple, yet so inclusive that even through thousands of years they still serve as the moral standards of the civilized world.

The Magna Carta, written in 1215, gave to the individual the important privilege of trial by one's peers. This was an important milestone in the establishment of justice.

The next great milestone in history came in 1689 with the signing of the English Bill of Rights which limited the power of the rulers and guaranteed to the ruled a voice in the government.

The fourth and greatest milestone in history came less than 100 years later, when in 1787 a group of delegates from the 13 states met in Philadelphia to discuss a written form of government. From this convention came the Constitution of the United States of America which went into effect on June 21, 1788.

What has made our Constitution so famous? Why has it endured? And what provisions have made it the foundation for so great a nation?

Let us look at the men who wrote our Constitution. Two-thirds of these men were lawyers; others were businessmen or farmers; three-fourts of these men had served in the Continental Congress; several had helped to frame state constitutions, and had served in state legislatures; eight had signed the Declaration of Independence; seven had been state governors, ten had served as judges, and two were college presidents. In short, they were a group of able and seasoned men, mature in judgment, and prepared by experience for the task which faced them. They realized that the future of their country would depend upon the solidity of the document they were about to create.

Like true craftsmen they carefully chose their cornerstones. Looking back through history they wisely selected those documents which had contributed most to the welfare of man. The principles recorded in the Ten Commandments, the Magna Carta, and the English Bill of Rights were incorporated in the writing of our Constitution. On these cornerstones they set a new concept of freedom, equality, and justice. These made our Constitution a living document, combining the old with the new, and making provisions for future growth.

Our Constitution forms a foundation for the workings of our society, but what good is a foundation unless we build on it? As a free people we cherish those rights and liberties guaranteed to us in the Bill of Rights. These alone are a mighty bulwark against despotism and oppression. However, these privileges are never so safe, never so assured, that we dare take them for granted. Our personal freedoms are the lifeblood of our society—cut off the flow and the organism can't function properly as a democracy.

But, none of these privileges are unlimited; each requires a corresponding responsibility; and all of them must be considered in the light of how they affect other people. There can be no guarantee of privileges without laws that limit these so that all may have a chance for "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness:" Ernest S. Griffith quotes a judge unknown who once summarized our privileges and their limitations thus: "My freedom to swing my arm ends where the other fellow's nose begins."

Because of the great insight of the group of men who wrote our Constitution, it served well the citizens of our country then, it serves us well today, and will serve us well tomorrow —for democracy's work is never finished.

The very nature of democracy requires perfection. Although we haven't achieved perfection in every aspect of our democracy, our efforts have afforded us a higher standard of living, more personal freedom, and greater human dignity than are enjoyed by people who have adopted other forms of government.

We have in our power the possibility for further improvement and happiness as long as we continue to build on this solid foundation—our Constitution.

To conclude, I have written the following poem to summarize my feelings about the goal before us which I believe will be achieved because:

ON THIS ROCK WE STAND

Down through the years since time began
Man has sought a more perfect plan—
A way of life, a book of rules,
A task to do, and a set of tools.

The search has continued from age to age,
And history has recorded it, page by page.
And once in a while man's inspiration
Has built a cornerstone for civilization.

A group of men, inspired thus,
Have passed a heritage on to us.
They knew in order for a house to stand
It must be built on Rock—not sand.

So they placed each cornerstone with care,
Freedom and Justice—they placed each there
Sealed with the blessings of liberty
For themselves and their posterity.

Nor do we fear another's might
Secure in knowing that we are right.
We open our gates for all to see
The home of the brave, the land of the free.

Yes, we the people of the United States
Proudly guard our golden gates,
For the Constitution of this land
Is the Rock on which we stand.

THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives should be above the dark shadow of doubt spread across this Nation's Capitol by recent charges and findings. It is my sincere hope that this Committee on Standards would help restore proper respect for and confidence in the Congress as an institution.

The Committee on Standards would examine the financial status of each Member and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico and set uniform standards for all to follow. Each Member would be required to file a report within 90 days of the first session of and each succeeding session of Congress with the Committee on Standards.

The report would make a full and complete disclosure of financial status as of December 31 of the preceding year, including, but not limited to, a list of personal equity holdings, loans, trust interests, and a complete disclosure of investments owned by the Member and his immediate family. It would also require a full and complete disclosure of all income received by the Member and by members of his immediate family during any preceding year in which he served in the Congress.

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the problems presented to the House today were difficult ones. Unfortunately the attitude and misconduct of Mr. POWELL were such that the issue became clouded. While I can understand that honest feelings and motivation of those Members who voted to exclude POWELL, I cannot agree with them. I fear that we may have either set a dangerous precedent or that we have engaged in a futile act that will be set aside by the courts.

If, in the future, Members may be excluded because of qualifications in the minds of the Members rather than those set in the Constitution—proper safeguards of minority opinion and expression can be lost.

The same question presented itself in the debate on the seating of Senator William Langer in which my father was a participant and said:

> If the Senator can say that the absence of moral turpitude is a qualification it can impose qualifications based upon the morals, the religion or lack of religion, or the philo-

sophical or political views of any person elected. This would be such a dangerous power that it certainly should not be implied unless entirely clear. The existence of such power would give the majority of either House the ability to exclude those who disagreed with the opinions of the majority.

Later in the debate he concluded:

> It is my belief that Section 5 Article I of the Constitution was only intended to make each House the final judge as to whether a man was properly elected and whether he met the qualifications prescribed by the Constitution itself.

I believe that this principle should be controlling of our action in this case. It would not leave us without remedies. The investigating committee's recommendations demonstrated several avenues. The remedy of expulsion by two-thirds vote, with broader powers in the House, would remain, although even this should be exercised with caution where the people of a congressional district have clearly indicated their choice of Representative. The proceses of law enforcement by the enforcement authorities can and should be used where law is violated. This case transcends the issues relating to Mr. POWELL.

Hopefully, while disposed of for the moment as to him, it will lead the House to the better definition of standards of conduct for Members. To that end, I have today reintroduced a bill I first presented in 1963, calling for the setting up of a committee on standards. The House should act on some such proposal, and cut off any future Powell case at an early date.

FORMULA FOR HOSPITAL CARE UNDER MEDICARE PROGRAM IN NEED OF REVISION

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, after a long struggle, medicare became the law of the land last summer. Its intent was plain; to pay full cost of hospitalization for the Nation's elderly, especially the indigent. Although debate on medicare went on for years there probably can be no serious quarrel with the ultimate aim of the legislation.

There was no immediate large influx of elderly patients into the Nation's hospitals when the act became law. It is clear now that many elderly waited to see just what benefits they were to receive under medicare. Others did not wish to be hospitalized for any reason while weather was plain. It is equally clear that the situation now has changed. Leading hospital authorities estimate that the Nation's hospitals now are short about 800,000 beds.

Not only has the shortage of beds caused hardships to hospitals and their personnels but it probably has caused many patients to wait before needed hospitalization.

These are important results of the medicare program, probably the most important. But also of interest is the fact that hospitals have been forced into monetary hardships by medicare and its payment provisions.

Under Public Law 89-97, medicare, the Social Security Administration set up a reimbursement formula whose key is a 2-percent allowance to hospitals for costs not included in reimbursable expenses.

Several leading hospital groups, including the American Protestant Hospital Association have protested medicare payments, especially the 2-percent formula.

To begin with, hospital groups believe medicare has added to the cost of operation of hospitals by increasing the paperwork needed for reimbursing of medicare patient expenses.

In addition, hospital groups believe the Social Security Administration has failed to give serious consideration to the deficiencies in the payment formula in regards to such items as depreciation, communitywide load of charity and bad debts and principal payments on loans for modernization and expansion.

Many hospitals believe that it is discriminatory to other patients who must carry the financial burden for costs not covered by medicare which must be incurred to provide service to all patients.

I have received some of these expressions of opinion from a number of hospitals from my district.

Here is what some other hospital administrators say:

Jack A. L. Hahn, executive director of Methodist Hospital of Indiana, Inc.:

> Because medicare payments are too low, self-supporting hospital patients are paying more than their share of hospital expenses.

James H. Moss, administrator, Bethesda Hospital, Cincinnati, Ohio:

> Voluntary church related hospitals are facing disaster. The present allowance of only two per cent of hospital basic costs per patient for refurbishing, modernization and expansion are unfair.

Therefore, I propose that until effective methods can be agreed upon to measure the full costs of providing hospital care, the present 2-percent allowance be increased to 7 percent.

Unless something is done, hospitals cannot continue indefinitely with a contractual agreement for reimbursement at less than full economic cost for medicare patients.

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION CALLING FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A GREAT PLAINS PARKWAY

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleagues from Kansas in introducing legislation calling for the establishment of a Great Plains Parkway. I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE], for his leadership on this project and associate myself with his remarks.

It is appropriate that an effort be made to preserve the colorful history and the singular beauty of the Great Plains through the establishment of such a parkway and scenic roads.

It is important to reemphasize that we are introducing this legislation today with the hope that it will catch the imagination and support of the delegations in other States including Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana. We do not call for action in this session; but we are hopeful that there will be sufficient interest from other States to result in feasibility studies and other research leading to action in the second session of the 90th Congress.

I include the text of the bill at this point:

H.R. 6435

A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Great Plains Parkway

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) in order to present and interpret for the benefit, education, and enjoyment of the people of the United States the remaining vestiges of the great prairie of the Midwest and associated wildlife, and the frontier experience in the settling of the West, and in order to portray contemporary ranching, agriculture, and historical landmarks in the great prairie region, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") may acquire by donation, purchase, or otherwise, a right-of-way traversing a generally north-south route through the States of Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, and Montana. The right-of-way may vary in width, and various portions of the route may be projects of joint cooperation between the Secretary and the respective States. The route should be determined on the basis of connecting the most possible scenic, historic, and great prairie features. Where the right-of-way traverses Federal lands, the head of the Department, agency, or instrumentality, having jurisdiction over such lands may transfer them to the Secretary without reimbursement.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to construct on such right-of-way a highway to be known as the Great Plains Parkway. The construction of all or portions of such highway may be a project or projects of joint cooperation between the Secretary and the respective States.

SEC. 2. When a State, a political subdivision thereof, or any Federal Department, agency, or instrumentality has a park, historical monument, landmark, site, building, or other similar object of historical significance, that is planned or is in being in the vicinity of the Parkway, the Secretary may enter into agreements under which he may coordinate the development and administration of the Parkway with such parks, monuments, landmarks, sites, buildings, and objects. When the public use of the Parkway will benefit thereby, the Secretary may construct such roads or trails over lands under his jurisdiction as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall administer the Great Plains Parkway in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented, and in accordance with other laws of general application relating to areas administered by the Secretary through the National Park Service, and in accordance with statutory authority otherwise available to the Secretary for the conservation and management of natural resources which he finds will further the purposes of this Act.

LET THE RETIREES HELP THEMSELVES

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am, today, introducing legislation to aid our social security retirees by increasing the amount of outside earnings which they may receive.

Our social security system was never intended to be the sole means of support for all retirees. It was designed to supplement other retirement plans, 'and to round out the income from savings and whatever other financial preparations a person may have made for his retirement years.

As they grow older, many people find that part time or less strenuous employment enables them to retire but still keep active and earn money to meet their obligations. Social security was designed to supplement these other sources of income, which are less in a person's retirement years than they were during his full-time working years.

And yet, the social security laws prevent the retiree from earning more than $125 a month without losing a portion of his social security or more than $2,700 a year without losing his social security altogether.

The retirees whose letters fill my mail do not ask for a free ride. They have worked hard all their lives. Many of them had their life's savings swept away in the depression and began the laborious job of providing for their retirement over again. They have finally retired, only to see their savings and even the value of their social security checks eaten away by inflation. What once seemed like modest security today hardly pays the grocery bill.

Now they ask only to be allowed to help themselves. The bill I introduce today would permit another $300 a year in outside earnings without loss of any social security. A retiree could, in addition, earn up to $3,000 a year before losing all of his social security.

This still does not leave the social security retiree with any princely sum, but at least it brings him up to the President's poverty level.

I was disappointed that no action was taken on similar legislation I introduced last year. Despite the rising cost of living fostered by the administration's reckless fiscal policies, this legislation and another proposal of mine to grant automatic cost-of-living increases were blocked by administration opposition last year.

I am hopeful that the 90th Congress will take early action to ease the plight of the beleaguered retiree, or at least allow him to help himself, by enacting the bill I introduce today.

PEOPLE IN IOWA DISTURBED ABOUT THE EFFECT OF RECENT ORDER OF THE PRESIDENT TO WITHHOLD FUNDS FOR INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the people in Iowa are disturbed about the effect of the recent order of the President to withhold funds for the construction of interstate highways.

Iowa has made substantial progress in the building of its interstate highway program. Iowa now has the longest stretch of toll-free four-lane highway in the United States. The people of Iowa want to see this progress continue unabated.

Recently the Iowa General Assembly passed a concurrent resolution which calls upon the President to reconsider his decision to cut back on highway construction funds. This resolution reflects the feelings of Iowans on the order of the President.

The resolution follows:

H. CON. RES. 9

Whereas, the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 and other federal statutes, created and established a program for the construction of a system of interstate and defense highways, and federal-aid primary and secondary highways with urban extensions in the state of Iowa and the several states of the nation; and

Whereas, the federal statutes have defined the sources of revenue and have dedicated the funds exclusively for the timely and orderly development of the highway system; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States, under the Highway Act of 1956, as amended, has specified that these funds SHALL be distributed; and

Whereas, for the past decade the federal government has urged the state of Iowa and this state's highway industry to step up construction, and Iowa has been most cooperative in this regard as is evidenced not only by the accelerated highway program but also by the training and establishment of a skilled work force, and by the large, long-term capital investments undertaken by contractors, subcontractors and material suppliers to meet this commitment; and

Whereas, the construction team of working men and equipment, of professional engineers and contractors, once developed and operating efficiently, cannot be sustained if the financing becomes spasmodic and unreliable; and

Whereas, it has been definitely demonstrated in Iowa that better highways save the time, lives and money of our citizens, and that the consequences of a reduction in highway improvements would adversely affect the well-being of our citizens and cause further suffering and tragic loss of lives; and

Whereas, the orderly development of these modern highway systems is essential to preserve the national defense by providing the means of moving expeditiously the critical weapons, materials and personnel, and of coping with the aftermath of natural disaster or nuclear attack; and

Whereas, the rapid and convenient transportation of field crops, dairy and food products, livestock, lumber and minerals from the farms, ranches, mines and mills to distant consumer markets is essential to preserve these basic industries in the state of Iowa, and to expedite the flow of commerce between the states.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the Sixty-Second General Assembly of the state of Iowa, now in session, the Senate and House of Representatives concurring, that we respectfully petition the President of the United States, although justifiably concerned with the inflationary trends developing throughout the nation, to reconsider his decision to cut back on this most vital and necessary federal-aid highway program which, if not continued in an orderly fashion, will have lasting adverse effects upon the national defense and the economic stability of the state of Iowa and the several states.

Be it further resolved, that the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the state of Iowa be hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this Resolution to the President of the United States, to each member of the Iowa congressional delegation and to the leadership of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

We, Maurice E. Baringer, Speaker of the House of Iowa, and William R. Kendrick, Chief Clerk of the House, hereby certify that the above and foregoing Resolution was adopted by the House and Senate of the Sixty-second General Assembly.

WILLIAM R. KENDRICK,
Chief Clerk of the House.
MAURICE E. BARINGER,
Speaker of the House.

VOTE AGAINST THE COMMITTEE REPORT ON THE POWELL CASE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I voted against the committee report on the Powell case. My decision to do this did not come easy. In fact, it was one of the hardest I have had to make since I have been in the Congress. It is not easy, Mr. Speaker, to cast this vote after having served with the individual involved for 10 years in the great decisions in this House. The fact that he did make a positive contribution to the national welfare and to his district is admitted. It could be argued that he could have done a better job, but that argument applies to each of us as well.

I have read with interest and considered all the precedents of the House that apply directly and indirectly to this case. Because of my avid interest in the history of the Capitol Building and interest in what happened here since 1800, when the Congress moved here, I have considered this as a historian and as an elected Representative of this body. I am willing to testify and believe I could prove that contrary to the belief of some historians that this House in which we serve has also had its great moments and its great men. A man with whom most of us have served, Mr. Sam Rayburn, has referred to Congress and particularly the House as "the greatest legislative body in the world." I believe this is so. I am also convinced that more has happened here to find, to establish, and to extend basic freedoms than has happened anywhere else in all of time. We, the Representatives of the people, and there have been some 11,000 of us since the beginning, have made our share of contributions to the great society in which we live.

Speaking as a historian and Representative, I have noted the high respect that the Congresses of the past have enjoyed in the hearts and minds of people. At the present time the prestige of this body may be at an alltime low. It behooves us, then, to begin now to do something that will restore the image we should enjoy, for I believe that the vast majority of this Congress, as has been the case through the years, are men and women of integrity. They are devoted to the great ideals of our Nation. They are dedicated to the job at hand. They are people whose personal character is equal to or surpasses that of any comparable legislative body anywhere else. In order to restore the image we deserve, we must deal with the people at hand. As a result of the testimony and the revelations from the hearings, the people that have elected Congressman Powell last November ought to be given a chance to reconsider their judgment. In many instances, what was rumor then as to misconduct is crystal clear now. Our report and that of others have revealed his sordid record.

Parenthetically, I want to join my colleagues in saying I think the select committee worked hard. They did so in a nonpartisan and objective manner under the most disagreeable of circumstances. I am not here to challenge any of their statements. I only differ from their recommendation to seat Mr. Powell.

There are several important things that should be noted on which I formed the basis for my judgment.

The select committee has called his behavior contemptible and his conduct unworthy. I agree.

He has made little more than a token effort to settle his litigation problem in New York. He has, on this floor, falsely accused the Members of this Congress. He has misused and misappropriated public funds in various ways.

In response to the constitutional question, I believe the Constitution is clear. We have not only the right, but the implied duty, to judge the qualifications of the Members of this House. I find it hard to believe that the Supreme Court would deny us that right, even if they thought we were wrong. I do not think they will believe we are wrong in view of the facts clearly stated and proven. We have a right, Mr. Speaker, to refuse to seat to Mr. Powell.

Mr. Speaker, surely there must be a lesson for us all in this sad affair. I hope and I pray that this House will reflect deeply upon the implications of this matter. Let it not be said of us that while acting on this matter we failed to correct the situation that permitted him to act as he did.

It is in this spirit that I heartily concur in the special committee's recommendation that the House make a study in depth to determine whether or not our existing procedural and substantive rules are adequate in cases of charges against a Member that he has violated the public trust. Furthermore, I vigorously support the special committee's final suggestion that the House Administration Committee file annual audits of expenditures of our standing committees.

I note that the special committee has announced that it is forwarding copies of its hearings, records, and reports to the Department of Justice for appropriate action. The people of this Nation will insist that the Department give immediate and urgent attention to those documents. I would think that the Department would seriously consider convening a grand jury to consider the evidence and to hand down indictments if they are indicated. If the basis for such indictments exist, they should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. The Department has done so in other cases, most recently in 1963 when two Members of the House, one from Alabama—Frank W. Boykin—and another from Maryland—Thomas F. Johnson—were convicted of conspiracy and conflict of interest charges. My colleagues may also recall that in 1949 a Member was convicted of padding his payroll and accepting salary kickbacks—J. Parnell Thomas, of New Jersey—and in 1954 another was found guilty of substantially the same charge—Ernest K. Bramblett, of California.

Mr. Speaker, the action of the House in this case will set precedents in more ways than one. On infrequent occasions, Members have been deprived of their seniority, but usually by action of their political parties.

I call to the attention of my colleagues the statement I delivered to the House on January 10 of this year in which I suggested that committee chairmen be elected by secret ballot from among the three ranking majority members of each committee. On that same day I introduced House Resolution 96 to implement that plan.

Mr. Speaker, if the rules of the House had been amended as suggested in House Resolution 96, this entire unfortunate matter never would have occurred. Which committee chairman would dare to misuse his office when faced with the necessity of biennial secret election by his own committee? Indeed, the adoption of the rule I have proposed would act to restrain committee chairmen from a whole range of unethical and unresponsive acts.

As I reminded the House earlier this year, the incompetents, the dictatorially inclined, and the dishonest come along infrequently among us, but they do come along. The great difficulty with our current method of applying seniority to the selection of committee chairmen is that it makes no allowance for these exceptions. The rule of seniority is too rigid, too inflexible. I urge my colleagues to give my proposal serious consideration in the light of the case upon which we are now passing judgment.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to serve on the Committee on House Administration. As a member of that great committee, it is my intention to push for meaningful action on the recommendation of the Select Committee that we give intensive study to the class of cases of which the present one is an instance. The House Administration Committee is the proper organ for such a study. The matter falls within the jurisdiction of that committee. It has the authority to conduct the kind of investigation such a study would entail. I am gratified that the House Administration Committee has given signs in recent months that it is now awakening to its responsibilities in this area. I repeat that I shall give all efforts of the committee to discharge those responsibilities my utmost support.

Mr. Speaker, a number of vague charges have been made to the effect that other Members of the House have taken or improperly used funds of the House. Like Caesar's wife, we must all be above suspicion. I urge the House to establish an instrumentality charged with the duty to investigate every charge of this kind, to expose every Member who may have committed acts of this sort. And I urge the House to prosecute with the same penalties we recommend today every similar instance we find of wrongdoing by others. Let those who have made these vague charges come forth with evidence. If and when they do, let this House give each charge rigorous examination, excoriating the guilty if they be proven so, and exonerating the innocent.

The evidence in the case before us today is clear to me, Mr. Speaker. On the record, on the evidence, and on the judgment of not one but two of our committees, the gentleman from New York has committed acts unbecoming a Member of the House of Representatives. The commission of those acts deserves the strongest censure and condemnation. Therefore I will not vote to seat Adam Clayton Powell. His attitude and his acts do not warrant it.

Finally, I plead with my colleagues not to let this opportunity pass to reform the procedures and practices that permitted this situation to arise. Let some good come from this distressing moment. The proper way to guard against any future indiscretions is to change our rules and procedures. The basic flaw in those procedures, as I see it, lies in our current interpretation of the custom of seniority. The responsibility for improving those practices lies right here, in the House, not in the parties. It should not be necessary to appeal to the party caucuses for relief from the inequities and dangers of seniority.

It is to the House as an institution that we must answer. It is the House that possesses the power to make and break chairmen, just as it is the House that must decide upon the qualification of its Members. When a Member of this body commits flagrant violations of accepted standards of conduct, the judgment must be rendered by the House. Let us render that judgment in good faith and conscience and let us see to it that our practices and procedures are so devised that no such painful judgment will ever again be required.

SUPPORT FOR SCHWEIKER DRAFT PLAN

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, on February 7, I introduced the Draft Reform Act of 1967, a comprehensive plan to modernize and make equitable our antiquated draft laws.

I again urge my colleagues to give serious attention to this proposal and call to their attention various editorials which have appeared in support of this plan together with an excellent brief summary news article by Dan Rapoport of United Press.

The material follows:

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Feb. 7, 1967]

SCHWEIKER'S BILL PROPOSES DRAFT OVERHAUL

WASHINGTON, Feb. 7 (UPI)—Rep. Richard Schweiker (R-Pa) member of the House Armed Services Committee, yesterday introduced a bill that would subject the Selective Service Act to a top-to-bottom overhaul.

The Montgomery County Republican said it would mean "a vastly different draft system for American young men."

Schweiker's bill would cut the present period of draft eligibility from seven years to four years, and would mean the drafting of younger men before older men, a reversal of the present system.

Schweiker's measure was the first piece of draft legislation introduced in the House. The Selective Service Act expires on June 30 and the Armed Services Committee is scheduled to start hearings next month.

A presidential commission studying the draft since last fall is expected to submit its findings and recommendations to President Johnson later this month. The major points of Schweiker's bill:

A man would be eligible for the draft for four years (18½ to 22½) instead of seven (19 to 26). Schweiker said this would allow men to plan their futures with more certainty.

College students could still get deferments, but as soon as they finished school, their four years of eligibility would begin and they would be placed in the top priority category.

College students would not be permitted a marriage or family deferment if granted a student deferment.

Separate draft calls of the Selective Service systems' 4,084 local boards would be replaced by a single national manpower pool, to "wipe out all differences in the type and number of men drafted that now exist from one board to another."

The Montgomery County Republican claimed the present draft system represented "a crazy quilt pattern of inequities and uncertainties."

[From the Baltimore Sun, Feb. 13, 1967]

DRAFT DEFERMENTS

Debate on the draft always gets around to student deferments. The present system is unfair. Young men who can afford college and post-graduate studies use the system not just to delay induction, but to avert it. A series of deferments leads to marriage and fatherhood, a draft haven, or to arrival at a draft-secure age. That's not what the system intended, but that's what it results in.

According to "informed source" leaks in Washington, the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service is planning to recommend gradual abolition of student deferments. That would deal with the draft avoiders in schools but it would not allow conscientious young men to get an education before service—an education that would be an asset to them and the military.

A better idea is advanced by Representative Schweiker, a member of the Armed Services Committee. He suggests student deferments that are just that—*deferments*. A young man who was 1-A when he entered college would be 1-A when he got out, despite any new family status. Schweiker would have the draft take the youngest rather than the oldest 1-A's first. A 22-year-old college graduate who had been deferred since 18 would go in the 18-year-old pool at graduation, just where he was when he got his deferment.

Schweiker has apparently given the whole problem of the draft much study. He makes several other excellent suggestions aimed at making the draft both dependable and fair. The basic draft law expires this June. Congressmen interested in improving the new law ought to look into these proposals.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Jan. 17, 1967]

RIGHT EMPHASIS IN DRAFT REFORM

Possibly the loudest complaints against the present Selective Service system have stemmed from the apparent opportunity it provides for college students to avoid military service while the non-college high school graduate is much more likely to be called.

We agree with Congressman Richard S. Schweiker, of Montgomery county, that guarantees ought to be written into law that remove this source of legitimate dissatisfaction with the system. Representative Schweiker is preparing his own version of how this should be done, with the emphasis on random selection of draftees by computer from a national pool which would include recent college graduates and dropouts as well as those just out of high school.

The college students would be put in the same category exactly as the high school prospect, regardless of marital or job status. This would give the military services the benefit of their added qualifications, without opening up unfair opportunities for some to evade serving altogether. Representative Schweiker's idea makes practical sense.

One trouble with eliminating college deferments entirely is that, except in periods of emergency build-up, there are far more young men in the draft-eligible status than the services can use, and there is a considerable variation as to the number of eligibles from one area to another. While one draft board may use up its supply in a hurry and be forced, by the quota system, to draft borderline cases, others have many more than they need. Indefinite delays in drafting such men, as Representative Schweiker points out, make it difficult for them to plan their lives.

The object of draft reform is to be fair, not to discourage young people from going to college or planning to improve themselves and their future. The present system certainly falls short of the goal.

A thorough-going overhaul to restore confidence in the integrity of the Selective Service system deserves top priority in Congress.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Jan. 18, 1967]

REVISING THE DRAFT

Congressman Schweiker of Montgomery County, a member of the House Armed Services Committee, has put forward legislation for the first major reform of the draft in over 15 years. The basic law expires this June, and there is an obvious public demand for the correction of what are felt to be the inequities of the present system.

Basically, Mr. Schweiker would change the present policy which starts selective service with the 26-year-old group and works down to age 19. This seven-year period of liability could be cut, he thinks, to just four years, from 18½ to 22½, and the first ones taken would be the younger candidates. Those who are deferred to go to college would be ineligible for marital deferment, and would revert upon the completion of their studies to the 18½ classification.

The operations of local boards have also come in for criticism, since they do not always seem to follow the same guidelines in determining who shall go into the armed services and who shall not. A national manpower pool, it is contended, would wipe out regional and local differences in the nature and size of draft calls. Presumably, a computerized random selection would render impartial decisions.

In any case, the 4,084 local draft boards should follow stricter and more specific guidelines in estimating student deferments and critical civilian jobs meriting consideration.

A general review of our draft legislation is certainly in order. The President has a special commission studying the matter and all its ramifications. The Defense Department has given its own views, and the House Armed Services Committee, in an unusual move, has set up its own advisory civilian panel, composed of distinguished educators and retired senior officers. The hearings which will start in March ought to add further sound information on which Congress can base a revised draft law. A government policy which affects so many thousands of homes and communities across the nation deserves the most careful consideration and debate.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Feb. 9, 1967]

MILITARY MANPOWER NEEDS

The President's commission on the draft reportedly will favor gradual ending of student deferments, a conclusion said to have been reached by a slim majority after acrimonious argument. But this is surely not the only cure for the obvious abuses and inequities that exist in deferments.

The reported minority commission view that these abuses could be removed by better administration, without losing sight of overall national manpower needs, seems the more rational approach.

Any draft that does not take every able-bodied man is going to be criticized as unfair in one way or another. This is true even when a major war requires vast numbers to be conscripted. When fewer men are inducted in a long-drawn-out period of international tension punctuated by limited hot wars, the criticism of unfairness mounts. There is really no way completely to avoid this; what should be borne in mind, however, is that the aim of a Selective Service System must be to select and use manpower in a way that most effectively serves overall and long-range national interests in as fair a way as possible.

Student deferments are logical if standards are sound and well-administered because the nation simply cannot afford to neglect or delay educating young men to meet the needs of a complex society in a period of revolutionary change. College training, moreover, is necessary to build an officer corps on a scale that the service academies and promotion from the ranks cannot possibly provide. And all of this must be considered, not merely in the light of battlefield requirements of the moment, but of what the national needs will be in the years ahead.

Rather than calling off student deferments, it seems better to concentrate on removing the kind of inequities that jointly arouse indignation in wartime. Corrective steps can be taken to insure that students are not able to parlay deferments as a draft-dodging mechanism: deferment should be just that, a postponement in induction that cannot be dragged out to escape service altogether. Legislation just proposed by Representative Schweiker (R-Montgomery Co.) points in this direction.

The draft commission, it is said, will propose reforms to get some uniformity of procedure in the present chaotic approach taken by thousands of local draft boards in applying standards for deferments, which are made on hardship and occupational as well as educational grounds. And the commission is said to be making other proposals to reform recruitment procedures in reserve components, which have been criticized as affording a haven for young men ducking combat.

The aim should be to tighten the draft system up and down the line. A system that works more fairly than it does now can be achieved. But there is no way, short of some form of universal conscription, to avoid selecting some men for immediate military service, deferring others, and excusing still others entirely. Selection should be on as rational a basis as possible, not merely by grabbing the youngest men first.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 11, 1967]

BETTER DRAFT LAW A CRYING NEED

(By Gould Lincoln)

Re-enactment of the military draft act, with or without revision, must be completed by June 30—the deadline—or the country will have to rely entirely on voluntary enlistments, an impossible situation. This is a fact of life that the legislators fully realize, particularly because of the involvement of the United States in the Vietnam war. In all likelihood it will be March before hearings on the draft are begun by the House Armed Service Committee, and by its Senate counterpart.

During World War I, the country resorted to the draft to meet its military needs, and 2,820,000 men were inducted. We entered that war in 1917 and the war ended in 1918. In World War II, when the draft law was reenacted in 1940 and we entered the war in 1941, 10,022,000 men were inducted.

With a Cold War on our hands since the close of World War II in 1945, then a hot war in Korea and more recently the Vietnamese war, the draft laws have been kept alive continuously but virtually unchanged. The present law is for a four-year period, now about to expire. Obviously, for the sake of national defense and in view of the world situation, the greatest folly would be discontinuance of the draft laws.

Yet there are today many people demanding that the draft be abolished. Most of these demands come from those who are violently opposed to the war in Vietnam, and particularly from many who do not wish to serve in that war or any other. Others say that the best way to revise the draft is to abolish it and rely on voluntary enlistments.

Two members of Congress who have given much study and thought to the improvement of the draft laws are Senator Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts, a Democrat, and Rep. Richard S. Schweiker of Pennsylvania, a Republican.

Schweiker, a member of the House Armed Services Committee, this week introduced a bill to revise and continue the draft law—the first legislation of the kind actually proposed in the 90th Congress.

Kennedy gave his views on the draft when he appeared last June before the House committee, and more recently when he addressed the National Press Club here.

Both men heartily agree that the draft law must be extended. Both pointed out the many inequities that have grown up in the administration of the draft law, and both have proposed remedies, some of which are on all-fours. Last year the President set up a commission to study and report on the draft system, and that report is expected within a week or two. The House Armed Services Committee also has its own study group, headed by Gen. Mark Clark.

Kennedy did not mince words when he addressed the National Press Club on the draft, officially called the Selective Service System.

"We have a system," he said, "which sends tens of thousands of young men into the Army simply because they cannot afford to go to college, and which lets 75 percent of those wealthy enough or bright enough to go on to graduate school to escape military service completely. We have a system which allows professional athletes to join National Guard units which neither train nor guard.

"We have a system of local boards which apply widely different rules, which result in calling up married men in some states, while tens of thousands of single men in other states remain untouched: which conscripts 19-year-olds in one city and 22-year-olds in another.

"But beyond these place-to-place variations lie two faults which are uniform throughout the whole system. The first is the present policy of drafting the oldest men (26-year-olds) first, and the second is the policy of granting liberal deferments. The former breeds uncertainty and the latter inequity. The military prefers 18 and 19-year-old draftees. They make better soldiers. They are at their physical peak; they are easier to train and discipline."

Kennedy's plan, when worked out in detail, would leave to the 4,088 local draft boards the duty of classifying registered young men, but would have a central "fishbowl" out of which numbers would be drawn, creating in effect, a national lottery. There would be no educational deferment under this plan.

Schweiker's bill would continue the registration and classification of the draftees by local boards, but would set up national standards for deferments.

"The recent major build-up of manpower for the Vietnam war," Schweiker said on introducing his bill, "has brought home the worst features of the draft to hundreds of thousands of American families. The answer at this time lies in a full modernization of the creaky, unfair draft structure."

INTRODUCING BILL TO MAKE FAMILIES IN GOVERNMENT HOUSING ELIGIBLE FOR SEPARATION ALLOWANCE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing a bill which I feel is of great importance, particularly in view of our continuing and ever-expanding commitment in Vietnam. Literally thousands of families are deprived of their husbands and fathers for periods of at least a year. No one can estimate the amount of hardship this separation causes each family, but at present the law does not treat all those in this situation equitably. Basically, the problem is simple. According to the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1963, members of the Armed Services above grade E-4—with more than 4 years service—who are stationed apart from their families, may receive a $30 per month family separation allowance. However, only those individuals receiving basic allowance for quarters are authorized such a separation allowance.

This is based on the unrealistic theory that the family living in Government housing does not need this separation allowance because housing maintenance services are provided by the military. The theory, I submit, is full of holes. In reality, service families, whenever the head of the house is required to be away, encounter the same expenses for auto repairs and maintenance, upkeep of appliances and other household services regardless of whether they are in Government quarters. The law, as it reads at present, in unfair and unrealistic.

For this reason, I am today reintroducing a bill which would make those families in Government housing eligible for this separation allowance, provided they would otherwise be so entitled. In 1965 the Air Force, reporting for the Department of Defense, endorsed this bill and my colleagues in the House recognized the need for this legislation, acting favorably on it in the summer of 1965. Unfortunately, the Senate failed to take action prior to the adjournment of the 89th Congress. I sincerely hope that we will be able to secure rapid passage in both Houses this time around in view of the fact that the need for such legislation is even more critical now than it was 2 years ago.

AGRICULTURE AT THE KENNEDY ROUND

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that the United States take a hard line on agriculture in the current GATT negotiations at Geneva.

American farmers have a $1.6 billion market at stake in the Kennedy round. The Common Market is the largest market for U.S. agricultural products, receiving in 1966 nearly one-fourth of our exports. Almost every commodity we ship to Europe would be adversely affected if we fail to reach a meaningful agricultural agreement at Geneva.

In these farm talks, it is not just a simple matter of either getting a better trade position or maintaining the status quo, for there is no status quo to which we can cling. The maintenance of our present European markets for grains, fruit, vegetables, and other agricultural products depends on a good agreement at the Kennedy round.

Failure to obtain some agricultural concessions from the Common Market by the time our trade agreement authority expires at the end of June will leave us facing new and more formidable barriers against our exports. Consequently, although we have increased the value of agricultural shipments to the Common Market countries by nearly 40 percent since 1962, prospects for further such increases will be dim indeed, and we may well be faced with some serious curtailments.

The markets which we gain or lose at Geneva in the coming weeks, are markets which can make or break many U.S. farmers. With the produce of one out of every four of our farm acres exported, any sizable loss of foreign markets will mean loss of producer income, and will create the conditions for a potential surplus buildup.

The Department of Agriculture announced yesterday that the farm parity ratio has now dropped to 74. There is nothing I can say which better emphasizes the point I am trying to make. Farmers are losing the battle against the cost-price squeeze. Prices farmers receive are going down while the prices of virtually everything they need are going up. Real estate taxes, feed, fertilizer, labor costs, insurance, seed, interest, fuel, machinery—all are taking more of the farmer's dollar, and he is getting paid less. American producers need the chance to expand their exports, not see them cut off.

In addition, the significance of diminished agricultural exports to our balance of trade cannot be overlooked. Farm products now make up approximately 20 percent of all U.S. exports and contribute substantially in our favor on the balance of payments ledger. Loss of export markets could tip the scales the other way.

This is why the present apparent lack of progress in the agricultural talks at Geneva is cause for grave concern.

I have written to Hon. William Roth, Acting Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, expressing my concern over this situation, and assuring him of my full and wholehearted support of efforts to strengthen the U.S. negotiating position in agriculture. I urged him to take a firm stand in demanding reciprocal benefits for U.S. agriculture, and reiterated my view that agreements on tariff reduction of European industrial goods should be contingent upon meaningful concessions for our agricultural exports.

Mr. Speaker, I question the wisdom of committing ourselves in finality on reduced tariffs for European industrial goods unless it becomes clear that satisfactory farm agreements will be reached in the Kennedy round negotiations. Otherwise, I fear that the chances of negotiating anything of value for U.S. agriculture will be less than zero.

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Latta] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the seating of Adam Clayton Powell notwithstanding the recommendation of a House select committee that he be seated, censored, and forced to return a reported $40,000 that he is alleged to have collected illegally from the U.S. Government. I fail to see any punishment in an order which merely requires an alleged wrongdoer to repay funds he is supposed to have acquired illegally. Such punishment would be like telling a little boy to put the cookies back after he had been caught with his hand in the cookie jar without slapping his wrist, or like telling the burglar to give his loot back after he had been caught and all will be forgiven. If the Congress is going to mete out such ridiculous penalties how can it complain about the increased lawlessness in the United States, its soaring crime rate, or about judges who fail to hand down proper penalties as a deterrent to crime.

Mr. Speaker, for all practical purposes, this committee recommendation would permit Adam Clayton Powell to pay his way back into Congress, and I do not believe the American people will permit the Congress to function on this basis. The good people of our country have been appalled by some of the revelations in this case. In my opinion, they do not want any person so charged sitting in the Congress of the United States and voting on legislation which will affect their lives.

In my judgment, the adoption of the committee report would establish a bad precedent for future Congresses in that it takes a narrow view on the constitutional right of Congress to be the judge of the qualifications of its own Members and of its right to expel a Member. The select committee, apparently was swayed by the argument put forth by Powell's eight attorneys that Congress could only inquire into the age, election, citizenship, and residence of a Member. If this constitutional provision is to be so narrowly construed, the Congress of the United States would be compelled to accept any person sent to it having these basic qualifications regardless of his moral fitness to serve. I do not believe the framers of our Constitution intended that the powers of the Congress be so limited.

LOOK-AND-LISTEN MEASURES

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, today's session on the floor of the House provided another strong argument on why adoption of two of my previously introduced measures is so important to the continued dignity and integrity of this body.

I refer to House Resolutions 228 and 229, which I again introduced February 8, 1967, and which have been referred to as the look-and-listen package. These resolutions would allow debates in the Hall of the House and committee hearings to be both broadcast and telecast—in effect they would allow the public to look and listen to their Congress in action.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we have spent several hours on the floor debating and voting on the fate of Adam Clayton Powell. This is an issue which has been accorded voluminous publicity in media throughout the world. The great public interest was obvious from the throngs of persons who tried to crowd into the House galleries for the debate. I say tried, because many had to be turned away. Countless hundreds were forced to wait for more than an hour before being allowed into the gallery.

I also point to the publicity which has surrounded the controversy over the seating of Mr. Powell and the thinly veiled innuendos in many segments of the press that other Members are guilty of similar indiscretions; that these Members are trying to "cover up" their wrongdoings and fear publicity.

If telecasting and broadcasting were allowed, two things would have been accomplished yesterday.

First of all, we would have effectively answered any criticisms of the press that we feared publicity. We would have had on record, in the public view, our opinions and our reasons for our actions on Mr. Powell. We would not have left the public with any vague afterthoughts that we preferred to dispose of the case in secret.

Second, we would have allowed the public to view the functioning of the Congress, an institution they support each year with many millions in tax dollars. In an era when we constantly preach the importance and necessity of public participation in governmental processes, we would have allowed the public to practice this participation we preach. We would not have restricted it to the lucky few hundred who were able to squeeze into the crowded galleries.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I again point to the necessity of adoption of my two look-and-listen resolutions. Yesterday's action is one more example of the increasing need for public access to our deliberations.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—XXVI—THE NEGRO AND THE DRAFT

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Kastenmeier] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, in a further examination of Negro induction rates, I am presenting a comparison of draft figures for March 1966 with those of April 1966, when a lowering of acceptable standards took effect. Bear in mind that the total number of inductions decreased for the April month.

Inductions	March 1966	April 1966
Total	26,707	21,240
White	23,325	17,805
Nonwhite	3,382	3,435
Nonwhite percentage	12.6	16.1

A representative sampling of induction centers across the country, shows, dramatically in some instances, the effect that lower standards had upon the Negro percentage of inductions.

Induction center	Negro percent of total inductees in March 1966	Negro percent of total inductees in April 1966
Los Angeles, Calif	8.2	11.2
New Haven, Conn	10.8	12.7
Jackson, Miss	50.9	68.4
Oakland, Calif	8.9	13.3
Raleigh, N.C	37.0	42.3
Houston, Tex	30.7	36.2
Shreveport, La	44.3	62.7
New Orleans, La	50.8	61.7
Coral Gables, Fla	26.8	32.1
Richmond, Va	30.9	36.8
Jacksonville, Fla	35.2	39.1
Fort Jackson, S.C	41.3	59.5
Memphis, Tenn	30.8	46.2
Montgomery, Ala	28.6	36.5
Baltimore, Md	33.2	47.9
Roanoke, Va	13.2	17.1
Charlotte, N.C	11.8	18.8
Dallas, Tex	16.6	27.6
Chicago, Ill	8.9	13.2
Denver, Colo	1.1	4.2
Detroit, Mich	3.1	16.2
St. Louis, Mo	9.2	11.8
Cincinnati, Ohio	10.6	13.9

The rationale advanced for acceptance of men who were formerly rejected and the effect this will have on the Negro inductee, who previously was judged unfit for service, will be the subject of future remarks.

STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bingham] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include herewith a statement which was signed and issued yesterday by 10 Members of Congress:

Statement on Vietnam

A number of our colleagues have issued a statement setting out their views, at length, regarding the supplemental defense authorization bill which the House will vote on tomorrow. As part of their discussion of the Vietnamese situation, the signers of the statement have offered a four-point program which the United States should adopt. In essence, it includes the following:

1. Immediate cessation of United States bombing of North Vietnam;
2. United States support for truly free elections in South Vietnam; and full acceptance of any role won by the National Liberation Front as a result of those elections;
3. United States proposal of four-party negotiations, including the United States, North Vietnamese government, South Vietnamese government, and National Liberation Front, to secure a cease fire in Vietnam;
4. Encouragement of the formation of an appropriately sponsored international conference to seek international guarantees for any agreements reached by the participants in the Vietnamese conflict.

We have previously made similar proposals for achievement of a peaceful settlement of the Vietnamese conflict. We agree with the substance of these proposals and believe that adoption of them would greatly enhance the possibilities for successful peace negotiations in that unhappy part of the world. Resolution of the conflict would then enable us to devote our full energies and resources to the many unfinished tasks we still have before us at home.

Joseph P. Addabbo, Jonathan B. Bingham, Frank J. Brasco, Jeffery Cohelan, Leonard Farbstein, Jacob H. Gilbert, Richard L. Ottinger, James H. Scheuer, Herbert Tenzer, Sidney R. Yates, Members of Congress.

THE U.S.S. "WILL ROGERS"

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the U.S.S. *Will Rogers* is the last of 41 Polaris submarines authorized by Congress. The occasion seems appropriate for a brief summary of the purpose of the Polaris program.

It was just a dozen years ago that the world's first nuclear-powered submarine, the U.S.S. *Nautilus* put to sea—January 17, 1955. That same year the Navy began developing a ballistic missile for launching from a nuclear submarine. The first such missile was launched from the U.S.S. *George Washington*, July 20, 1960.

It is the combination of nuclear propulsion with long-range atomic missiles that makes Polaris submarines virtually invulnerable and highly lethal weapon systems. Nuclear propulsion enables these ships to travel enormous distances beneath the surface of the ocean and remain submerged for months at a time. They are completely self-sustaining. They make their own air and water. Their crews maintain and repair all equipment on board.

Senator Clinton P. Anderson, of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, commenting on the effectiveness of the Polaris submarine, said:

> The nuclear propelled ballistic missile submarine marks the closest approach now foreseeable to an ultimate deterrent.

President John F. Kennedy, after observing a successful launch of a Polaris missile from the U.S.S. *Andrew Jackson* in November 1963, said:

> Once one has seen a Polaris firing, the efficacy of this weapons system as a deterrent is not debatable.

And President Johnson, in his special message on national defense, January 18, 1965, announced that the administration proposed to develop a new missile system—Poseidon—to increase the striking power of our missile-carrying submarines.

The advantage to the United States is obvious. Any would-be aggressor is aware that we possess 41 Polaris submarines, whose location he does not know, each equipped with 16 missiles having destructive power greater than that of all explosives used in World War II. For him to attack the United States proper, unless he had previously destroyed our Polaris fleet, would be futile.

With unanimous consent I am inserting in the Record a copy of a letter written to me by Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, the father of the Polaris and one of the great men of our time:

U.S.S. "Will Rogers" (SSBN 659),
At Sea, North Atlantic, February 13, 1967.
Hon. Henry B. Gonzalez,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Gonzalez: We have just successfully completed the first sea trials of our 41st Polaris nuclear submarine, the last of this type currently authorized by Congress. The Will Rogers was built by the Electric Boat Division of the General Dynamics Corporation, Groton, Connecticut. We also have in operation 27 attack-type nuclear submarines, making a total of 68. This ship is named for Will Rogers (1879–1935), the Oklahoma cowboy who became one of America's most popular folk humorists. He was born and raised near Oolagah, Indian Territory, in what is now Rogers County, so named for his father, a prosperous rancher prominent in the councils of the Cherokee Nation and member of the convention that drafted the first constitution of the State of Oklahoma. Both parents were part Cherokee, and Will was named for William Penn Adair, an Indian Chief who was his father's friend.

The only son of a well-to-do family, he was offered every educational advantage but never got beyond the fourth grade. As told in Will's autobiography, his father "tried terribly hard to make something" of him, sending him to "about every school in that part of the country." Will, who hated school and loved the outdoor life on the ranch, seldom lasted more than four months at any one of them before deciding that the teachers weren't "running the school right, and rather than have the school stop," he would leave. Though he joked about the tricks he used to avoid schooling, Will did not recommend them to others. "I have regretted all my life," he would say, "that I did not at least take a chance on the fifth grade." When he left home at 19, to make his own way, he had little formal education but was an expert cowpuncher and lariat thrower. Neither he nor anyone else could have foreseen that these skills would open the door to a highly successful career.

He began modestly enough as a cowhand on ranches in Texas and Oklahoma. Wanting to see the world, he worked his way on cattle boats, roped mules in Argentina, and broke horses for the British army in South Africa. It was there, in Johannesburg, that he got his start in show business. He joined Texas Jack's Wild West Show as a rope artist and trick rider. Calling himself "The Cherokee Kid," he toured South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand for three years. On his return to the United States in 1905, he appeared regularly in wild West circuses and on the vaudeville circuit.

Quite by accident, Will discovered he had a gift for making witty impromptu remarks which kept his audience in paroxysms of laughter and greatly enhanced the popularity of his rope tricks. When he joined the Ziegfeld Follies in 1915, he was an instantaneous success though, to hear him tell it, he "was the least known member of the entire aggregation," doing his "little specialty with a rope and telling jokes on national affairs, just a very ordinary little vaudeville act by chance sandwiched in among this great array."

From the stage Will moved to screen and radio, becoming one of the highest paid performers of his time. His rope tricks had given him a start but what made him a success was his talent as a humorist.

He was a humorist, not merely a comedian. He wrote his own lines and it was their content no less than his inimitable delivery that appealed to the public. This is why he could progress from showmanship to authorship. In 1922 he became a newspaper columnist for the McNaught Syndicate, his column eventually being printed in 350 papers and reaching an audience of 35 million. He was the only syndicated columnist of his time whose daily comment was printed on the front page of metropolitan papers. In addition to his column, he wrote many magazine articles and was in great demand as a radio broadcaster, platform lecturer, and after-dinner speaker. His popularity was not restricted to the United States. He traveled extensively and met many of the world's greats, but fame never changed his innate modesty, his natural and unassuming bearing. "I am just an old country boy in a big town trying to get along," he once said. "I have been eating pretty regular and the reason I have been is because I have stayed an old country boy."

He wrote for what he called "the big Honest Majority" and felt himself a part of this majority—the people who believed in doing right, in tending to their business, and letting other fellows alone. He shared with them a certain skepticism toward the men elected to public office, a suspicion that these were not always doing what the voters wanted nor telling them the whole truth about the country's position in the world. Will appointed himself reporter to the American people on the doings of the government. His comments were sometimes sharp but usually fair and never wounding. Perhaps because he never met a man he didn't like, Will was more lenient toward individuals in public office than toward groups such as the Congress or the bureaucracy. He shared with "the big Honest Majority" a tendency to deprecate the Congress, seemingly not realizing that it is the great bulwark of the people's rights and closer to the electorate than any other branch of government.

Will got the material for his comments from the newspapers, from personal observation, and from contact with people. He traveled the length and breadth of this country, taking its pulse, watching its foibles and follies, joshing it gently, and sometimes telling it disagreeable homely truths. Since he dealt mostly with contemporary events, much of what he said has a slightly archaic flavor now but some of his remarks remain relevant. Here are a few samples, just as he wrote them, with spelling and grammar unchanged:

"We are going at top speed, because we are using all our natural resources as fast as we can. If we want to build something out of wood, all we got to do is go cut down a tree and build it. We dident have to plant the tree. Nature did that before we come. Suppose we couldent build something out of wood till we found a tree that we had purposely planted for that use. Say, we never would get it built. If we want anything made from Steam, all we do is go dig up the coal and make the steam. . . . If we need any more Gold or Silver, we go out and dig it; want any oil, bore a well and get some. We are certainly setting pretty right now. But when our resources run out, if we can still be ahead of other nations then will be the time to brag; then we can show whether we are really superior." He returns to this thought time and again. "The Lord has sure been good to us," he wrote. "Now what are we doing to warrant that good luck any more than any other Nation?" These ideas cannot have been overly popular in isolationist America of the 1920's and 30's.

Then, as now, Americans found it hard to understand why they were not as popular abroad as they thought they should be. "It will take America 15 years steady taking care of our own business and letting everybody else's alone to get us back to where everybody speaks to us again," was Will's comment.

Another time he said: "You don't know what a Country we have got till you start prowling around it. Personally I like the small places and sparsely populated States. A place looks better before it gets houses on it than it does afterwards." And here are a few shorties "Humanity is not yet ready for either real truth or real harmony." "A remark generally hurts in proportion to its truth." "You must judge a man's greatness by how much he will be missed."

Charles Collins said of Will Rogers that he was "the average American, as that theoretical figure likes to imagine himself." His humor was in the tradition of Mark Twain, Artemus Ward, and Finley Peter Dunne's "Mr. Dooley." It was typically American in its determination to see things as they are and in its lack of reverence for established pomposities and pretensions. In his homely way Will made sense out of life as it is lived by ordinary men and women. And he made them laugh. He once wrote: "I have been over 20 years trying to kid the great American public out of a few loose giggles now and again. Somebody had to act the fool, and I happened to be one of the many that picked out *that unfunny business of trying to be funny.*"

The sense of loss so widely felt at his untimely death in an airplane accident showed that Will Rogers had done far more than entertain his public; he had touched their hearts.

Respectfully,

H. G. Rickover.

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Meeds] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, in 1838 an educator named Henry Bernard visited Washington, D.C., in search of reliable facts about the Nation's school system. Because he found none, he fought for 30 years for the creation of a Federal education agency.

In 1866 the movement he initiated bore fruit. James A. Garfield, then a Congressman but later to become a President, presented to Congress a request of the National Association of State and City School Superintendents for a national education bureau. On March 2, 1867, an act was approved that created a Department of Education.

Its primary purpose was to be statistical and factfinding organization as to "the condition and progress of education in the several States and Territories."

To staff the fledgling Department, the President was authorized to name a Commissioner of Education who was to receive a salary of $4,000 per year. The Commissioner was authorized to name three clerks—a chief clerk to receive $2,000 per year, and two others to receive $800 and $1,600.

It is not my purpose to trace step by step the development and growth of a four-man Department whose payroll totaled $10,000 to today's U.S. Office of Education which has some 2,500 employees and handles a budget of some $4 billion per year.

However, I would like to paint with a broad brush the trends and directions of education in the United States today. Concurrent with the creation of the Department of Education a hundred years ago, we saw the birth of the land-grant college system which played such a key role in this Nation's great agriculture development.

This year we have seen the President of the United States propose the creation of sea-grant colleges. It takes no great stretch of the imagination to visualize the role that the sea must play in supporting mankind.

Nevertheless, from the birth of our Nation, to the creation of the Department of Education 100 years ago, and until this very day, the people of the United States in their wisdom have determined that the education of their children shall remain at the local level and not be directed by some Central Government fiat. The system has its drawbacks, we must admit. But when we compare it with others, who can say any other educational system in the world comes close to giving its citizenry the quantity and quality of education available to the boys and girls of America in their public school systems?

So, I for one, want to praise the U.S. Office of Education which today is burdened with the responsibility of masterminding the Federal Government's support of local education. Through the Office's creative programs, its vision, and dedication to the goal of equal educational opportunity and creative federalism, our American education system will continue to grow and our Nation will be the better for it.

THE GEORGIA RADIO AND TELEVISION INSTITUTE, ATHENS, GA.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Stephens] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the privilege of being a cohost to a very distinguished member of the North Carolina delegation representing the Sixth District, the Honorable Horace R. Kornegay, who addressed the 22d annual Georgia Radio & Television Institute held at the University of Georgia in my hometown of Athens. This institute was inaugurated in 1946 under the leadership of John Drewry, dean of the Henry W. Grady School of Journalism at the University of Georgia in conjunction with the Georgia Association of Broadcasters.

The program for the 22d annual institute was arranged by Mrs. Katherine Bankston, of radio WGAU, of Athens, and Dr. Worth McDougald, of the university school of journalism. Mr.

Donald McDougald, president of the GAB, from Statesboro, presided at all sessions.

Representative KORNEGAY, eighth ranking member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, eloquently traced the progress in radio and television since the 1920's, and took up some of the industry's present problems. His speech was one of the main features of the program. I take pleasure in inserting it in the permanent RECORD of Congress.

The address follows:

Address by Hon. Horace R. Kornegay, Member of Congress, Sixth District of North Carolina, Before the Georgia Radio & Television Institute, Athens, Ga., January 26, 1967

It is a real pleasure for me to come back to Georgia. I have spent many happy days in your great state and some of my finest and closest friends live here.

Thanks to good fortune and Uncle Sam's Army, I spent a year back in 1943 going to school in a little school in Atlanta they call Tech. I learned to love Georgia and I come back down here every chance I get.

I truly appreciated the invitation to come down here and take part in your fine program. I accepted your gracious offer because of my friend, Congressman Bob Stephens.

Let me say that the State of Georgia has been blessed for many decades in having responsible leaders in its government. The Georgia delegation in the Congress is one of the most respected and most able groups of legislators in both the House and the Senate. Certainly, the Georgia members of the House include some of my very best friends in Washington.

You are fortunate to have representing you men like Bob Stephens, my host here in Athens. Bob and I went to the Congress at the same time and it is an honor to serve with him and your other capable representatives.

Bob was good enough to meet me at the airport in Atlanta yesterday and drive me over here to Athens, where I had the pleasure of staying last night at the Stephens home. I asked Bob during our conversations what he thought I might talk about today. Bob didn't tell me what I should talk about but he did tell me not "to make one of those Texas longhorn speeches"—one with a point here and a point there and a lot of bull in between.

The more I thought about the contents of my remarks to this distinguished group, the more I wondered about my judgment in accepting your invitation. For each of you is an expert in your field. You are in day-to-day contact with the problems you face and you are part of the fantastic progress made in the broadcasting industry in its relatively short life span. I do not have the expertise in this field that you have. Yet, my experience on the Communications and Power Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce does, I think, give me some insight into your problems and your progress. And, then, I think I am far enough away from home and from Washington to qualify this morning as something of an expert.

I would like to share with you in the next few minutes some of my general observations concerning the broadcast industry.

This is indeed an exciting time in the field of communications. This is also a very challenging time for those who are a part of this great industry that is yours. In your short, but dramatic half-century of progress, you have accomplished much. And with the sky not even the literal limit today, undreamed of achievements are just ahead.

But, there are some issues and some problems that will need immediate attention before the future for broadcasting and broadcasters can be brought into sharper focus.

Rightly or wrongly, like it or not, broadcasting and government, or politics—if you will, are partners. And, neither side of this equation has always been silent partners. Some of you, no doubt, feel you have been squeezed too hard by the Federal Communications Commission—and the Congress, on occasion.

This reminds me of the side-show strongman who awed crowds by squeezing a lemon dry, then offering $1,000 to anybody in the audience who could get just one more drop out of the lemon. Nobody paid much attention when a wispy little man in one audience dared to challenge the strongman.

The strongman first squeezed the lemon until it was little more than a pulp, then handed it to his frail challenger. The little man not only squeezed out another drop—but got almost a saucerful of lemon juice.

"Amazing!" the strongman conceded. "What kind of work do you do?" he asked the little fellow.

"I'm with the Internal Revenue Service," the little man replied.

So, I'm sure you agree that the government does have some squeezers.

But, the government has exercised some control over broadcasting, in various degrees, since the Wireless Ship Act was passed in June, 1910. This act required ships carrying 50 or more persons, including passengers and crew, to install wireless sets capable of transmitting or receiving messages over a distance of 100 miles. An amendment was added in 1912 to govern radio on merchant ships.

Until the 1920's radio was pretty much a self-regulated industry, with industry representatives meeting annually with the Secretary of Commerce. But, this was a period of growing confusion.

It was realized in the 20's by almost all concerned that something more definite was needed and Congress experienced the rather strange phenomenon of an industry requesting the government to regulate it.

This is an important factor to consider in connection with the development of broadcast regulations. The pioneers in the field of radio recognized that they could not operate in a vacuum, devoid of regulation and proper control measures. Thus, after several years of consideration of a Radio Act, in 1927 a compromise was reached and the Federal Radio Commission was established—on a temporary year-to-year basis. The next several years were precarious ones for the Federal Radio Commission, with the Commission almost dying at the end of each year. It limped along for several years with little authority and little to work with except for some impractical and infeasible laws passed by the Congress.

Congress tried to bring some order out of chaos during 1932 and finally managed to pass a bill which would have combined the Radio Division of the Department of Commerce with the Radio Commission, but President Hoover stuck the bill in his pocket—where it remained.

Then, after much legislative jockeying, the Communications Act of 1934 was enacted, establishing the Federal Communications Commission. Unfortunately, this act did not immediately alleviate the chaotic conditions which then existed and even more unfortunately has not up until this very minute. The Congress gave the Commission powers either too broad or too vague and the only standard it was given to follow is the phrase "the public interest, convenience and necessity." This phrase conferred an almost unlimited area for administrative judgment and discretion and, oh, how many sins have been committed in its name!

It was expected that this admittedly broad language would furnish the Commission with an effective means by which it could formulate its own firm policy in a rapidly developing area about which Congress had little knowledge.

Due to a chronic lack of effort toward control, and a general tendency for hand-sitting by the Commission, coupled often-times with some strong pressures against active regulation by the industry, the Commission has failed over the years to channelize its discretionary power by establishing firm policy and standards. History shows that it has only been active in those areas of traffic control where activity has been largely forced upon it.

Just as you in the industry have not always been satisfied with the actions and activities of the Commission, neither has the Congress. This is evident in the plethora of resolutions to authorize investigations and the harsh criticism of Commission activities or lack of activities in Congressional hearings and debates.

Of course, Congress can realistically be accorded some of the blame for much of the criticism aimed at the FCC. Responsibility can be assessed against the Congress for its failure to provide definite guides and standards for the Commission to follow. In our defense, however, let me say that the field of broadcasting, however important, is but one of the many things requiring the attention of the Congress, the Commerce Committee and the Communications Subcommittee. There are literally thousands of bills and important issues that command the time and the consideration of the Congress, so that it is something of an impracticality to assume the constant watchdog role to the Congress for something an agency of the government should be doing.

If the FCC does not have the authority or the tools it needs, it should come to the Congress and ask for them. We can and we should give general guidance, but the Congress is not equipped either with the time or the talent to run the everyday operations of a government agency or department.

The Congress, in 1966, had litte legislation of major interest to the broadcasting business, except for rather lengthy hearings regarding community antenna television, a subject which a West Coast Circuit Court judge recently classified as a "gory mess." As much as I hate to open up that can of worms again, I believe that the Congress must give thoughtful and careful attention to this fast emerging new field and lay down some general guidelines. This will not be an easy task, for not all the problems are black and white, if you radio people will excuse the expression. There are many shades of gray that complicate an already complex situation.

Yet it is the duty and the responsibility of the Congress to establish basic principles for the operation of community antenna television services, while insuring the continuation of a healthy, viable local broadcasting system. We cannot and we should not let the courts assume all of this burden, if for no other reason than that litigation can take years to determine proper areas of responsibility and liability. Meanwhile, CATV and broadcasting are groping in the dark, awaiting some light to be shed on the confusing subject.

The 90th Congress, and the broadcasting industry, can reasonably expect a number of interesting and challenging legislative and regulative issues to arise.

One that you have heard a lot about and talked a lot about yourselves is not exactly a new controversy, but one which has recently been placed closer to the front burner. That one is editorializing.

This subject has been kicked around for years—or since the "second Mayflower decision" 19 years ago. Earlier this month, my friend Vince Wasilewski, in a speech to a joint session of the North Dakota Legislature, sounded the NAB call to arms, saying in effect that he had "rather fight than switch" the right of broadcasters to editorialize.

If Congress should tell broadcasters to stop editorializing, Vince said, "it would destroy broadcasting not only as an instrument assisting in the formation of public opinion, but even as an effective conduit of political news." Vince might have used a slight "overkill" in his pitch to the North Dakota legislature, for broadcasting had been around for years before the industry came slowly and deliberately to the recognition of the responsibility of editorializing. Still, Vince voiced a serious concern for a serious attempt on the part of some to restrict or limit the broadcasting of editorials.

Actually, the Communications Act of 1934 does not have any specific provision which sets forth Congressional policy towards broadcast editorializing. Neither does it specifically permit or prohibit broadcast editorializing, or lay down any ground rules for such activity.

The FCC tried to deal with the problems of editorializing first in 1941 in the first Mayflower decision by applying the general provisions of the Act, that a broadcast license may be granted only if it serves the public interest, convenience or necessity. The Commission construed that provision as precluding broadcast editorializing by licensees because the Commission felt that licensee editorializing could not be reconciled with the interest of the public in having broadcast operations conducted fairly and impartially.

Later in its Report of 1949, after extensive hearings on the subject, the Commission reached the opposite conclusion and determined that licensee editorializing was compatible with the public interest, provided licensees would affirmatively aid and encourage the airing of opposing views.

What this means is that the Commission construed the statutory language of an act of Congress to reach diametrically opposite results. Consequently, I think that the Congress does have a responsibility in the exercise of its oversight function to examine the practices and policies and consider the possible need for further clarifying legislation.

It is my conviction that the broadcast industry has not only the right to editorialize, but often it has the responsibility to do so. But, in so doing, I also feel that the broadcaster should observe basic rules of fairness as generally prescribed in the Communications Act, that broadcasters must operate in the public interest.

Few arguments can be made against the application of good faith judgment in airing controversial issues. Broadcasting stations are licensed to serve the public and not for the purpose of furthering the private or selfish interest of individuals. Certainly, it does not serve the public interest, for example, to allow a one-sided presentation of political issues of a campaign.

Incidentally, politicians think there are but two kinds of voters: Those who will vote for your candidate and a lot of ignorant, prejudiced fools.

The Old Radio Commission many years ago came to this conclusion: ". . . there is no room for the operation of broadcasting stations exclusively by or in the private interests of individuals or groups so far as the nature of programs is concerned. There is not room in the broadest band for every school of thought, religious, political, social and economic, each to have its separate broadcasting station, its mouthpiece in the ether. If franchises are extended to some, it gives them an unfair advantages over others, and results in a corresponding cutting-down of general public-service stations. It favors the interests and desires of a portion of the listening public at the expense of the rest. Propaganda stations (a term which is here used for the sake of convenience and not in a derogatory sense) are not consistent with the most beneficial sort of discussion of public questions. As a general rule, postulated on the laws of nature as well as on the standard of public interest, convenience, or necessity, particular doctrines, creeds, and beliefs must find their way into the market of ideas by the existing public-service stations, and if they are sufficient importance to the listening public the microphone will undoubtedly be available. If it is not, a well-founded complaint will receive the careful consideration of the Commission in its future action with reference to the station complained of."

Generally speaking, this has been the attitude of both the Commission and the majority members of Congress with respect to broadcast editorials. Yet, with the end of each campaign season and the rising number of stations amplifying their views and comments on issues, renewed proposals of editorial bans or restrictions are raised anew.

Another issue that probably will get attention in this Congress is the handling of election results. This, to me, is an ironic twist, for the first formal broadcasting is considered to have begun on November 2, 1920, by KDKA in Pittsburgh. And the subject of that first formal broadcast was the returns of the Harding-Cox election campaign.

Contrary to network studies, some members of Congress advance the proposition that forecasts of elections influence the voters and suggest that election coverage and the projection of winners be shut off until the polls close.

Of course, Congress can ascertain whether a broadcast station is a propaganda outlet for canned material bolstering the political philosophy of some tax exempt institution or bolstering the concealed economic interests of those in control of the station.

I think that there will be more, not less, scrutiny of electronic journalism in the future. This is only natural, I feel. For Congress has consistently and increasingly looked upon public broadcasting as a powerful moulder of public opinion and a potential instrument of political power.

This is the reason that every year since the passage of the Communications Act, bills and resolutions have been introduced in the Congress relative to monopoly in broadcasting. The Congress, historically, has been more concerned with the problems of monopoly in broadcasting than with any other facet. It is my opinion that the 90th Congress might very well take another look at this area. There is, and should be, a growing interest in Congress in the changed pattern of station ownership, with a growing number of corporate conglomerates that now hold broadcasting licenses. The ITT-ABC case has emphasized the possible need for further legislation in this field.

In the early years of radio, ownership of a radio station was more of a personal thing and until recent years, a man was expected to go through details of application before operating a station. Now, the expansion is done by purchasing stations through a license transfer procedure at the FCC that is usually brief and perfunctory. This has brought on buying and selling of licenses by organized brokers, who get the FCC rubber stamp of approval. This area might well be looked into to determine if the public interest is impeded.

One issue that may well come before Congress soon is one wrought by our tremendous advance in technology. The question of a domestic communications satellite system is almost certain to get Congressional attention. The Congress surely will be asked to reexamine the questions of the control and operation of the earth stations.

Speaking of technology, a man walked up to a vending machine and put in a coin. He pressed the button labeled "coffee, double cream, sugar." No cup appeared, but the nozzles went into action, sending forth coffee, cream and sugar. After the proper amounts had gone down the drain, the machine turned itself off.

"Now, that's real automation!" the man exclaimed. "This thing even drinks it for you."

The growth of the broadcast industry also has brought on a problem that must be dealt with soon, and the sooner the better. This is the problem of the electromagnetic frequency spectrum. We must give this problem the attention it deserves, for we are simply running out of space in the airwaves, which is in reality one of our great natural resources. In considering the allocation or reallocation of the spectrum, we must realize that over 80 per cent of today's uses of the spectrum have been put into operation since the end of World War II. This is a concern for both public and private broadcasters, and especially for the mobile land users, for the spectrum is a silent partner to all of our national enterprises. More research into this problem is vitally needed to conserve this resource and to produce new channels of communications for our growing population.

Educational television is another subject for continued and increased attention. The development of ETV should be stimulated and the private sector should be encouraged to work in partnership with the public sector in its development. President Johnson indicated in his State of the Union message to the Congress that his administration was committed to the advancement of ETV. He told the Congress that he would submit proposals to us on this subject and I will withhold any comment until I have seen his suggestions. It is my personal feeling that educational television has great potential for the enrichment of our educational, cultural and social well-being, but as yet we have barely scratched the surface.

Then, of course, we will continue to hear complaints and suggestions and even proposed legislation about advertising and commercials. And, these will run the spectrum of length and frequency, rates and discounts, volume and so forth.

You may have seen the results of North American Newspaper Alliance's weekly TV poll, which I noticed in the Washington Star a few days ago. Even so, the results are worth repeating. Some 95 per cent of those responding to this poll want controls on television commercials and more than half, 52 per cent, want the government to do it.

Many of those responding say that they are basically opposed to more government control, but they want more regulation of the frequency, length, volume and content of the commercials.

I believe you know that the Congress is made up of politicians, or those who were good enough politicians to get elected and that the only way to get elected is to have more people vote for you than the other candidate. It is logical to assume that if 95 percent of the people want something through their elected government, they stand a pretty good chance of getting it. All that needs to be said on that score is, "heal thyself" before Congress heals it for you.

There are other winds stirring in Washington that effect advertising, a $16 billion business of which you in the broadcast field have a large stake in. There are some individuals and agencies of the government and some individuals in the Congress who are determined to make basic changes in the market place and their ideas, if carried to fruition, will have a definite bearing on your own business.

For instance, the Justice Department wants new sources—sources other than advertising—of information on products for public use. This would be government-sponsored consumer reports. Donald Turner, Chief of the Justice Department's Anti-Trust Division, would develop counter influences to advertising, since he feels that advertising restricts trade and creates artificial monopolies.

Mrs. Esther Peterson, the President's adviser on consumer affairs, would effect great changes on advertisers, by making ads more specific.

Ad discounts, trading stamps, pricing of private brands and many other areas in the advertising and promotion field are getting close, hard looks in Washington and all of these could have a direct bearing on your advertising departments.

And, most of you are undoubtedly familiar with the proposal made recently by Senator Warren Magnuson, Chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee. Senator Magnuson said just last week that the cigarette industry must give up broadcast advertising or work with the networks to provide public service time for education about smoking and health. He would place a ban on cigarette advertising, he says, because a law passed in the last Congress which placed a warning on all cigarette packages and containers has not proved adequate in getting smokers to quit smoking.

The advertising moratorium Senator Magnuson wants for cigarettes is contrary to the very basic concepts of democracy. For all that the Surgeon General's Report on Smoking and Health contained, there is not yet any documentary evidence that cigarette smoking is the cause of lung cancer, emphysema or any other major illness. There is only suggested a causal relationship. To this date, no one has offered any documented proof of inducing cancer in any animal or human by the inhalation of cigarette smoke. But, without a fair trial, the Senator from Washington would hang not only the cigarette industry but the advertising industry along with it.

Thus, would Senator Magnuson kill well over $200 million worth of cigarette advertising each year—for radio and TV commercials alone. This figure represents only the six major cigarette producers.

Not only is this a drastic punitive measure against an industry that so far has been found guiltless, but it is ludicrous to think that an advertising ban will prevent cigarette smoking. Surely, the Senator must remember the results of the liquor prohibition attempt and the creation of speakeasies and bootleg booze.

NLRB MILESTONE

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, a voter symbolic of the 25-millionth vote cast in representation elections under the National Labor Relations Act will be honored in ceremonies here in the Nation's Capital. The occasion will also be marked by ceremonies in cities in which regional offices of the National Labor Relations Board are located.

The use of the secret ballot to determine the wishes of workers as to which, if any, union will represent them for purposes of collective bargaining is a far cry from the numerous and oftentimes violent strikes, picket lines and sitdowns for union recognition which took place in the early 1930's before the passage in 1935 of the National Labor Relations Act. The contrast between today's peaceful resolution of questions of representation and yesterday's tempestuous resolution is the difference between industrial democracy and industrial anarchy.

In these past 31 years, some 200,000 elections have been conducted by the NLRB. These elections follow the principle of majority rule. If a majority of employees in a bargaining unit vote for a union as bargaining representative, it becomes the agent for all employees in the unit. If, on the other hand, less than a majority vote for representation, there is no bargaining agent and a year must elapse before another election can be held.

The election procedures of the National Labor Relations Act have paid off handsomely in the form of industrial peace. Before these procedures were established in 1935, almost half of the labor disputes in the country had as a major issue union recognition and other aspects of the right of workers to organize. Today recognition and organization are issues in a very small number of labor disputes; in 1965, less than three one-hundredths of 1 percent of man-days lost by strikes arose from disputes involving these issues.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to join in paying tribute to the National Labor Relations Board and the 25-millionth voter on this significant milestone in the Board's 31-year history.

CASTING OF THE 25 MILLIONTH VOTE SINCE PASSAGE OF THE NLRB ACT IN 1935

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Thompson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow on March 2 the National Labor Relations Board commemorates the casting of the 25 millionth vote in the secret ballot elections it has conducted since passage of the National Labor Relations Act in 1935.

Members of the Cabinet and other distinguished speakers will participate in a morning program at the Department of the Interior and a luncheon here on the Hill will follow. That evening there will be a reception at the Department of State. It is a unique salute to the NLRB election process that the hosts at the reception will be the AFL–CIO and the National Association of Manufacturers. Indeed it augurs well, I believe, for the future of stable labor relations to find these organizations joining in tribute to the election process by which working men and women can vote to express themselves as to whether they want a union to represent them in collective bargaining with their employers.

I was pleased to learn that an election in my own State was the one in which this historic ballot was cast. Mr. Leonard Paul Scheno of Carteret, N.J., who was designated by the NLRB to symbolize the 25 millionth voter, exercised his franchise in an NLRB-supervised election in which employees of the new Reynolds Metal Co. aluminum can manufacturing plant at Woodbridge, N.J., selected the United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO, to be their collective bargaining representative.

The fact that 25 million working men and women have given free voice to their aspirations for a better life for themselves and their families cannot but remind us that before passage of the act sponsored by the late Senator Robert F. Wagner, of New York, violence, even death, often accompanied efforts by employees to win the right to speak for themselves about the wages they will be paid and the conditions under which they are employed.

Congress provided a ready and reasonable way—a peaceful way—for them to express their opinion. They have done so by the millions and the Nation is sounder economically for their having done so. Free collective bargaining is essential to a free and healthy economy. Responsible management and labor have few restraints upon them in this country. This is as it should be in a political democracy which insists that the men and women who produce our abundance should know and exercise industrial democracy to the fullest.

SELF-INCRIMINATION

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. Hathaway] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the editors of the Washington Post perceptively point out that the students of Stanford University condemned their own conduct by yelling "Shame, shame, shame," as they tried to mob the Vice President on his recent visit.

The Post's editors go on to decry the Stanford incident as "the kind of violent intervention in disciplined debate that the world grew accustomed to in Germany during the rise of nazism." They assert that nothing is more likely to diminish or impair the right to orderly dissent than the emptyheaded, irresponsible, irrational disorder of such demonstrations.

The article warns that if our universities cannot assure safe conduct for the Government officials who visit their campuses, prudent public men will have to decline such appearances.

I believe that the Post's comments will be of interest to my colleagues and I make them a part of the Record:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1967]

Shame! Shame! Shame!

The students of Stanford University who tried to mob Vice President Humphrey were right to cry "Shame! Shame! Shame!" They have uttered the precise reproach that their conduct deserves. And it is a reproach that is deserved by everyone who resorts to physical violence in a democratic society, where other means of dissent exist.

Those who are governed by a domestic or foreign tyranny sometimes have no other means of making known their resentment at governmental policy. Those who enjoy every right of freedom that our society can confer must be required to confine their methods of protest to those that are orderly and parliamentary.

The Stanford students deserve reproach because they were threatening the second-ranking constitutional officer of this Republic, and that is indefensible enough. But they deserve it, in addition, because their disorderly behavior is the typical anti-intellectual response to orderly discussion. It is the kind of violent intervention in disciplined debate that the world grew accustomed to in Germany during the rise of Nazism. The first resort of a sterile anti-intellectual fringe in a country is to rowdyism. No group in this country ought put a higher value on the right to orderly dissent than those who have a minority antigovernmental view to express. And nothing is more likely to diminish or impair that right than the empty-headed, irresponsible, irrational disorder of such demonstrations.

Citizens of this country differ about many governmental policies. And they have a right to express that difference. They have a right, moreover, to try to organize other citizens so that they may attempt to make their minority view the majority view. They do not have the right to send their roughnecks, rowdies and storm troopers into the streets or meeting places to intimidate those with whom they do not agree.

If universities and colleges cannot assure officials of the Government or other citizens of safe conduct on their campuses, the orderly debate of public issues will have to take place on other forums and prudent public men will have to decline appearance in an environment where orderly discussion is not possible.

THE 25 MILLIONTH NLRB VOTE

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, on March 2 the National Labor Relations Board commemorates the fact that since passage of the National Labor Relations Act in 1935 more than 25 million workers have voted in NLRB secret ballot elections. Ceremonies that day in Washington will be followed by programs throughout the country in tribute to the voting process by which employees can determine without coercion or intimidation whether they want to be represented by a labor organization in dealing with their employers concerning their wages, their hours, and their conditions of employment.

This meaningful demonstration of industrial democracy in action, in which some 90 percent of the eligible voters cast their ballots, has been made possible because the agency charged by Congress with the responsibility of conducting the balloting has not only taken every precaution to guard the secrecy of the ballot but to assure the widest possible exercise of the franchise by an informed electorate. Notices of election, notices of statements of employee rights, and ballots have been printed in 14 different languages and the ballot box has been taken into factories, offices, retail establishments, and mines—even aboard ships—in all 50 States and to Guam and Puerto Rico.

More than a half million working men and women vote in about 8,000 of these NLRB elections each year and no test of politics, race, creed or of any other such nature is applied. If they work, they vote.

Self-expression through these votes opens the door for responsible management and labor to bargain about the livelihood of those upon whom our industrial vigor depends. Good faith collective bargaining leading to labor contracts is a procedure encouraged and protected by Congress. It is economically sound. Of no less importance is the contribution that industrial democracy makes to the sense of well-being and to the dignity of the men and women who produce our national abundance.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON EDUCATION AND HEALTH

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my unqualified approval of the President's 1967 education proposals outlined in his message on education and health in America presented on the floors of Congress yesterday. His thoughtful and persuasive remarks focus upon areas of great need; they sensitize us to these demands and point to the continuation of the fine record in education legislation begun by the 89th Congress. I laud President Johnson's call to further build programs which have proven their worth after only a few years of existence; I commend his emphasis on quality, an ever-present goal toward which we strive in order to provide maximum opportunity and self-fulfillment for every individual in America.

I specifically point to the President's recommendation for an Education Professions Act and his statement that the work of an enriching education "finds its focus in a single person: the classroom teacher, who inspires each student to achieve his best."

The teacher is indeed the focal figure in the school system; he is the very heart of our educational effort, and I am pleased to call attention to this facet of the President's proposal which closely parallels one of my major legislative concerns. President Johnson clearly calls for a massive coordinated program for the training and improvement of teachers. My own Teachers' Sabbatical Leave Act, reported out of the Committee on Education and Labor in the 89th Congress and reintroduced in the 90th as H.R. 3372, is designed to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance in order that teachers return periodically to college on a full-time basis to renew their knowledge and skills.

At present, there are NDEA Summer and Academic Year Institutes, National Science Foundation Institutes and fellowship programs, and a limited number of experienced-teacher fellowships available under title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965. All are fruitful means of professional improvement; yet as President Johnson has termed, they are fragmentary in their total effect.

My sabbatical leave program would enable thousands of teachers throughout the country to return to school without the subject matter limitations of most present opportunities. Such a program would also help answer the President's call for replacement of uncertified teachers. Many school districts, short of qualified teachers, are forced to hire persons lacking credentials; consequently, they remain in the classroom, and in many cases do not have time to finish courses which would add to their skills and enable them to meet certification requirements.

My bill carries a provision for 50 percent of the Federal program to be directed at teachers lacking the baccalaureate, and thus relates to the President's concern for the shortage of qualified teachers. I truly believe that a most significant advance in education this year will be made if expanded opportunities are provided for that most significant figure in the schools of our Nation—the classroom teacher.

I am also grateful for the President's desire to expand the Teacher Corps. Increasingly, school systems are eager to enlist the services of these dedicated volunteers. On February 15, I called my colleagues' attention to the effectiveness of the Teacher Corps in my State of Hawaii and asked for support of the President's $12.5 million supplemental appropriation as well as the $36 million he is asking for 1968.

The work of the Teacher Corps closely parallels that of the Neighborhood Youth Corps and work-experience programs in its goals of reducing the dropout rate and returning students to school for the completion of an education. I am pleased to see the President's emphasis on these vital programs. We acted last year to earmark increased funds for work-experience programs, and I am certain we will support the President once again in order to maintain this important national effort being made to salvage potential failures in our schools.

I note with appreciation the President's emphatic statement of support for the guaranteed loan program for college students which already fulfills a need in Hawaii most effectively. Banks and credit unions are cooperating to make loan funds available, thus opening doors of higher education to many young people who otherwise would not be able to continue their schooling.

I intend to fully support the President in his call for $44 million for Adult Basic Education, another extremely valuable program for the State of Hawaii. It is vital that we continue this program which provides adults with the opportunity to be more fully assimilated into American life.

Nor did the President neglect important new developments in technology and their implications for the future of education. Most school systems trail far behind the world of business; they fail to adapt new machines designed to facilitate their procedures and purposes. I am pleased to note the call for initiation of Federal research in the use of computers. The broad-scale approach to noncommercial television, which I regard as the major innovation in the President's message, is a subject to which we will be giving serious thought in the coming months. Television has too little been used as a medium for the exchange of ideas; too seldom has it been used for the dissemination of knowledge to all Americans.

The President's recognition of such a technology gap is significant, and his proposed Public Television Act of 1967 is a meaningful step toward the upgrading and expansion of our national educational potential. We speak of man's being subdued by machines; yet we fail to adapt the machine for the enrichment of human life. I believe President Johnson's statements provide us with guidelines that merit our earnest attention and study.

The benefits of Headstart to primary classrooms and the emphasis on research in and preparation of teachers for the handicapped are not to be overlooked. Surely it is time for massive Federal effort in these directions.

Finally, I commend the President's request for appropriations for international education to provide the necessary culmination of actions begun in the 89th Congress. As a member of the Task Force on International Education last year, I was made fully cognizant of the nationwide deficiency of courses centering upon international relations and their consequent effects upon our foreign policy. I am pleased to note the President's affirmation of support. I hope that we will continue to build our educational potential here.

Mr. Speaker, the President's message can only be regarded as an encouraging sign of his continuing commitment to education. These positive and imaginative guidelines emphasize what must be considered the first work of these times. They provide us with outlines leading to an understanding of contemporary education and the directions it will take. In this decade the possibilities for development and fulfillment of each person's promise challenges us to assess our hopes and desires and then to take responsible and forceful action to meet the onrushing future. President Johnson speaks to that future in his message and clearly delineates our task in the coming months. The goals are attainable and demand a like commitment from each of us as we widen our horizons and look hopefully ahead to a brighter future for all mankind.

PX OPERATIONS IN VIETNAM ARE A CREDIT TO THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT AND OUR SERVICEMEN

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, for some time there have been recurring stories reporting what would appear to be a scandalous black market in U.S. post exchange supplies in Vietnam. My own impression has been that these stories have been greatly exaggerated. I was pleased, therefore, the other day to run across an article on this subject by an author for whom I have great respect, Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, director of national security and foreign affairs, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. His column is circulated nationally by the highly respected Copely News Service.

General Hittle's report comes at a very appropriate time and helps to put some of these earlier press accounts into better perspective. He maintains that there is no PX scandal. Rather, General Hittle says, the control by our military officials and the overall conduct of our military personnel in connection with post exchange items in Vietnam should receive our commendation, not our condemnation.

I believe Members of the House will be reassured, a I was, to read General Hittle's conclusion that—

> The handling of our PX supplies under the extremely difficult circumstances existing in Vietnam has reflected credit on the Defense Department organizationally, and on our servicemen individually.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the text of the article by General Hittle from the San Diego Union of January 15, 1967, entitled "Color Marketing of Vietnam GI's Slightly Gray":

HABIT IS "GIVEAWAY"—COLOR MARKETING OF VIETNAM GI'S SLIGHTLY GRAY

(By Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle)

WASHINGTON.—Once again the U.S. fighting man is the target of unjustified criticism.

This time it is the sensational reports of rampant black marketing of U.S. military post exchange (PX) supplies in Vietnam.

Some of the stories create the impression that the U.S. troops are freewheeling, profiteering peddlers of goods straight off the PX shelves.

This is not what investigators, dispatched from Washington to check the reports of mismanagement and black marketing of PX supplies, discovered.

UNDER 3 PERCENT

They found that, contrary to some news accounts, the extent of black marketing in Vietnam is remarkably limited. They found out that pilferage of PX supplies is running less than 3 per cent and is expected to go even lower with the new controls being set up by U.S. officials. Considering the speed and size of the U.S. buildup in Vietnam such a low pilferage rate indicates surprisingly good control of shipping and distribution of PX items, generally items which are in such demand in Vietnam's war-torn economy.

It is all the more remarkable when compared to loss by pilferage in more peaceful and stabilized areas of the world where U.S. forces are stationed. In Africa, for instance, our PX pilferage losses are 2.7 per cent. In spite of local difficulties, Africa certainly is not an active combat theater.

Even in our department stores in the United States, protected by public and private police, electronic alarms and hidden TV cameras, the pilferage rate is about 1.5 per cent. That is half the theft-loss of PX supplies under war conditions in Vietnam.

Such comparisons make the PX system in Vietnam look all the better.

LEGAL SALES

Of course, pilferage is not the only way PX items can find their way illicitly into the black market. It can be done by resale of goods purchased in the PX. Some stories from Vietnam suggest this is a widespread practice with our servicemen clearing big profits from such black market operations.

If there were much of this reselling going on it would be reflected in the size of the black market in PX supplies. Here again, the investigators came up with findings that indicate stories of profiteering by our troops have been highly exaggerated.

For instance: The investigators quietly made three separate surveys of the stocks of PX supplies available in Saigon's highly publicized black markets on Tu Do Street. These stocks, of course, would include PX items that found their way to the black market by pilferage or resale. After what amounted to "an unofficial inventory of Tu Do Street's black market, the investigators said that all the PX supplies there could be bought for between $12,000 and $15,000."

That is not much of a Saigon black market in post exchange items, considering that the post exchange sales in Vietnam are running close to $20 million this year.

GENERAL'S RULE

Stories of the alleged black market seem to overlook, also that PX supplies can get into the hands of the Vietnamese by legally authorized means. With his usual common sense, Gen. William Westmoreland has approved regulations permitting U.S. servicemen in Vietnam to give away $10 worth of nonrationed PX items each week.

This discourages blackmarketing. Also, by making it possible for the generous fighting men to give needed small items like soap and candy to the Vietnamese, it helps establish better relations between our forces and the Vietnamese at the rice paddy level.

When the facts are known, the "great PX black market in Saigon" is not a scandal after all. Rather, the handling of our PX supplies under the extremely difficult circumstances existing in Vietnam has reflected credit on the Defense Department organizationally, and on our servicemen individually.

ENDANGERED SPECIES PRESERVATION ACT

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, 1967, I introduced H.R. 6138, a bill designed to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States, and to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law.

The 89th Congress enacted the Endangered Species Preservation Act (Public Law 89–669), providing the Secretary of the Interior with authority to conduct a comprehensive program to conserve, restore, and propagate endangered species of native fish and wildlife. The Secretary now has underway various measures which enable us to look with confidence toward the continuation of our bountiful fish and wildlife heritage in this country.

It is my view, however, that legislation is needed which would authorize the United States to participate in the international effort to extend protection and assistance to endangered species of vertebrate animals throughout the world. A portion of my bill is designed to provide such authority.

Within the next few decades, unless immediate and vigorous action is taken, some of the most interesting and famous creatures the world has produced during the millions of years of evolution will become extinct. The International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources has listed more than 300 species or subspecies of birds, and more than 200 mammals, as being rare and endangered throughout the world. In addition, there are many fishes, amphibians, and reptiles that are endangered. The total number of endangered vertebrates, according to the World Wildlife Fund, is about 1,000; and about one species of animal a year crosses the threshold to oblivion.

Many species of animals are in dire straits because their skins are in demand as luxury furs and status symbols. These include spotted cats, and zebras. Wild pigs as well as alligators and other reptiles are killed wantonly to provide leather for specialty and decorative wearing apparel. Monkeys and other primates are captured for medical and pharmaceutical research. Rhinos are slaughtered senselessly, their horns removed, and their carcasses left to rot. Many species of rare and beautiful tropical fish have been decimated to supply an ever-increasing market with aquaria fish. The demand for leopard skins to supply the fad for leopard skin coats has attracted a hoard of profit-seeking poachers into Africa. The leopard is ominously reduced in numbers and may be wiped out in a few years unless something is done to stop the slaughter.

A new type of white hunter has emerged. He is an entrepreneur who hunts only for an African or Asian middleman. The middleman has no difficulty finding natives willing to poach. The poacher runs no great risk anyway, for he is hard to catch and when caught faces very little real punishment. The poachers' pay is low, but the entrepreneur can boast earnings as high as $50,000 a year.

The developing countries, with their limited resources, find it difficult to stop this illegal trade. On the other hand, nations such as the United States, with laws banning the importation of animals or animal products illegally exported from their land of origin, find the laws virtually unenforceable since there is no way of telling whether a particular leopard skin or other animal part was exported legally or not. Action to ban or limit imports of endangered wild animals or products would strike at the poachers' incentive to crime and would put new difficulties in their way.

Many of the emerging nations look to us for guidance and for example in natural resource husbandry. Many of the countries of the Western Hemisphere, including Brazil, Peru, Ecuador, and Argentina have officially declared to the Organization of American States that certain of their species are in danger of becoming extinct. The 1940 Convention on Nature Protection and Wildlife Preservation in the Western Hemisphere attaches special urgency to endangered species. The United States ratified this Convention in 1941, and it was proclaimed by the President in 1942. H.R. 6138 will help implement this inter-American treaty and will go further—to help save threatened animals in Asia, Africa, and Europe as well.

My bill also extends Federal protective law to curb interstate traffic in alligators and certain other animals taken and transported in violation of Federal, State, or foreign laws. The State fish and game directors of the southeastern States have long urged the Congress to assist them in stopping the million dollar a year alligator poaching racket. There is also illegal traffic in frogs and baby alligators as well as in alligator hides. Existing law makes it a Federal offense to transport in interstate traffic illegally taken wild mammals and birds. My bill extends the law to cover reptiles, such as alligators; amphibians, such as frogs; mollusks, such as oysters and clams and, crustaceans, such as lobsters and crabs.

This bill also contains enforcement and penalty provisions with respect to importation and interstate commerce in injurious or illegally taken wild animals.

TRIBUTE TO JEANNETTE RANKIN

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to join with my colleagues in their comments on woman suffrage. I think it is appropriate and necessary that I speak on this subject because our very distinguished former colleague, Miss Jeannette Rankin, represented my district in Montana.

I wish to dwell on this because Miss Rankin is a woman of very outstanding courage. She is presently residing in Georgia but, Mr. Speaker, we are proud of her in Montana, and we are particularly proud that she was a courageous person on her own points of view.

Miss Rankin was elected at large in Montana in 1916. She was here in the session of 1917, and was one of the very few who voted the conviction of being against World War I. For that she was severely punished by her own political party, and generally by the voters of Montana. But she maintained her lovely personality. She did not become embittered. She again attracted the love of her constituency, and they returned Miss Rankin to Congress in the general elections of 1940. At that time again the question of going to war was before this House, and again Miss Rankin voted against going to war, being the sole Member of Congress to have done so.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I greatly admire Miss Rankin, although I do not agree with her particular viewpoint, but I do greatly admire a person who, in the face of knowing what would happen to her political career, would here on this floor vote her convictions, and stick steadfastly with it on a second occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly happy that the ladies of the House of Representatives have taken time in Congress to pay tribute to these women. I believe if we had more women here we would have more compassion for our fellow human beings, just as did Mrs. Jeannette Rankin. I, for one, would like to be able to stay in this House long enough to see more women here, and see that that does happen, and that the Congress will have even more compassion for our fellow human beings.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point a feature article in the Washington Post, February 28, by Marie Smith, which tells of a recent interview with Miss Rankin who now resides in the State of Georgia.

First Woman in Congress: Her Pioneer Spirit Still Flames

(By Marie Smith)

While the House of Representatives celebrates the 50th anniversary of the arrival of the first woman in Congress today, that woman, Jeannette Rankin, is pioneering in a new field in Georgia.

The 86-year-old, silver-haired Miss Rankin, a Republican who was sent to Congress from Montana in 1917, is "working on a cooperative homestead for unemployed homemakers" on her farm at Watkinsville, Ga.

The 50th anniversary of her arrival is being celebrated early by the House today jointly with the birthday of another battler for woman suffrage, Susan B. Anthony, whose birthday was Feb. 15.

Miss Rankin sent a telegram to Rep. Frances Bolton (R-Ohio) yesterday extending greetings to the 11 women members of the House who are expected to participate in today's speechmaking celebration.

In an interview yesterday Miss Rankin talked enthusiastically about her new project but confessed nostalgically, "I'd run for Congress now if anybody wanted me to. I'd be just as impudent as old people are supposed to be," she said.

And if she had her life to live over, she'd still vote against the United States' declaration of war on Germany as she did at 2 a.m. on April 5, 1917, her second day in Congress and her first vote on an issue.

"That was the first vote ever cast in Congress by a woman and 55 men voted with me," she recalled.

Elected to Congress for a second term 24 years later, on Dec. 8, 1941, she cast the solitary "nay" in the vote of war against Japan. Immediately afterward she fled from the Republican cloak room and hid herself in a telephone booth to escape from reporters.

When the declaration of war with Germany and Italy was made on Dec. 11, Miss Rankin voted "present", and on June 3 of the following year when Congress declared war on Rumania, Bulgaria and Hungary, her pacifist resistance was so worn down, she failed to appear for the roll call.

She is still just as firmly opposed to war. Of the current conflict in Vietnam, she said "I think we ought to get out as soon and as gracefully as we can."

She has no plan for how it should be done, but said, "We should announce we're going to get out and then make plans for doing it."

Active despite her age, Miss Rankin is serving as her own contractor in building a "cooperative homestead" for unemployed homemakers. The ten-bedroom and ten-bath structure with a community kitchen, dining room and living room, is not for domestic workers, she explained, but "mothers whose children have grown up and left them alone."

In the cooperative homestead, where she will let them live for $15 a month rental, "they'll manage like a family. Women with low incomes can manage it with dignity and pride."

She will select the first ten from people who make application for residency there, and then let them make the selections for any vacancies that occur thereafter. Miss Rankin herself lives in a farmhouse a couple of hundred feet away. She shares the house with a pet dachshund named Sam.

Miss Rankin has very definite opinions on politics, especially the election of members of Congress and the President. She thinks there should be larger districts with more than one representative elected from each district. "This way the minority can be represented," she said.

Miss Rankin advocates also a "direct election for President. Let everyone run who wants to run and let everyone vote. This way the people could make a second and third choice." She is opposed to presidential primaries, although there could be a primary for the platform for each party, and candidates could adopt the platform they chose.

"I wish I had the means to propagandize my plan," she said with a sigh.

The sprightly octogenarian said she doesn't have any choice for the GOP presidential nomination next year but in her opinion Senator Everett McK. Dirksen (R-Ill.) is the most distinguished living Republican today. "But I was in Congress before his day," she added. "I knew him well in my second term (1941–42)."

Miss Rankin regrets both her terms in the House were during wartimes. She feels as a result the humanitarian legislation she introduced didn't have a chance. She said yesterday she introduced the "first bill authorizing free instruction in hygiene in maternity and infancy" which was introduced by someone else in a later Congress and enacted; and she introduced the first "independent citizenship for women" bill.

Miss Rankin was born on a ranch near Missoula, Mont., where she still spends her summers. Her father was John Rankin, who entered the state in the late 1860's, and worked as a contractor and boat builder. Her mother was a schoolteacher from New Hampshire.

She was graduated from the University of Montana at the age of 22 and in 1908–09 attended the New York School of Philanthropy. While in New York she became interested in woman suffrage.

Later she was engaged in social service work in California and Washington state, and was subsequently chairman of the committee that waged the successful campaign to give women in Montana the vote.

In 1915 she went to New Zealand and took a job as a seamstress to learn intimately the problem of women workers. Upon her return to Montana the next year she filed her intention to run for the House of Representatives on the Republican ticket. She was elected and came to Washington to take her seat on April 4, 1917.

COLUMNIST CARL ROWAN URGES SUPPORT FOR THE TEACHER CORPS

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, columnist Carl T. Rowan recently wrote the following of the Teacher Corps:

> The major school superintendents, mayors and other astute observers already have seen enough to conclude that the Teacher Corps offers something without which the antipoverty program cannot succeed.

He goes on to describe the need to eliminate "the insidious hopelessness" which plagues the schools of poverty and which the Teacher Corps—with new teaching methods and enthusiastic, committed teachers—is helping alter.

Support for the Teacher Corps, he concludes, "can strike a blow for decency and dignity for a lot of long-neglected kids.

Mr. Speaker, the column by Mr. Rowan recently appeared in the Indianapolis Star. I insert it in the Record, and call it to the attention of my colleagues:

Article on the Teacher Corps From a Recent Issuf of the Indianapolis Star

by Carl T. Rowan

In Chicago's Shakespeare Elementary School one day last fall, 35 third graders were designated as "slow learners" and placed in a separate class.

These youngsters were already two years behind their classmates in reading and other schoolwork. The "experts" figured that by the eighth grade, they would be four years behind.

Then some teachers who had some extra time, extra skill and extra concern took a look at those 35 youngsters. Their conclusion: Given adequate, sympathetic instruction, all but two of these children can complete high school with adequate grades, make competent career decisions, and become responsible, self-supporting members of society.

The teacher team that cared, and took that extra look at 35 kids who, at the ripe old age of 9 had been consigned to failure, are part of the National Teacher Corps.

There are now 1,213 Teacher Corps members trying to carry that extra care, that special skill, that vitally needed imagination, into the slum schools of 111 school districts in our urban and rural slums.

They are hardly a token of what is needed in the Chicagos, New Yorks, and Hernando, Mississippis of America.

But the school superintendents, mayors and other astute observers already have seen enough to conclude that the Teacher Corps offers something without which the antipoverty program cannot succeed.

They know that if we cannot alter old processes where insidious hopelessness is drilled into 8- and 9-year-olds, that if we cannot educate these children and lift them above despair that engulfed their parents and grandparents, then there is no hope for our inner cities. And there is little hope that we can cut our relief rolls; or win any real victories over crime; or improve in any lasting way the relations between the races.

So, educators around the country are asking for three times as many Teacher Corps teams as they have. Whether they get them, or keep the ones they have, will probably be decided by a tall, gentle-natured Texan.

He is George Mahon, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. Since the death of Rep. John Fogarty, the House subcommittee that must pass on President Johnson's request for additional funds for the Teacher Corps has been full of conflict, and is more anti-Great Society than it was before. Many vital issues in the fields of health, education and welfare may live or die by the margin of one vote in this panel. Thus Mahon's influence is likely to be crucial.

Probably he alone can remove from the "stepchild" category a program that has received effusive praise from a variety of people such as Jack J. Efurd, superintendent of schools in Gentry, Ark.; Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York City, and Alfred Gilpin, president of the Indian Tribal Council and a school board member in Macy, Neb.

Congressional enthusiasm for the Teacher Corps seemed widespread in Congress in 1965 when President Johnson proposed creation of a large force of idealistic young men and women who would supplement the staffs of slum schools. It was no secret to congressmen that many teachers shunned these schools. (An official in Boston recently proposed "combat pay" for teachers serving in certain slum schools.)

So the Higher Education Act of 1965 spelled out a program under which a team composed of one master teacher and several interns (often former Peace Corps volunteers who are paid $75 to $125 a week while undergoing intensive summer training) is assigned to schools to work with disadvantaged children.

Congress authorized $64,000,000 for the program for the fiscal year ending this June 30. It finally got around to appropriating only $7,500,000. The President has asked for a supplemental allocation of $12,500,000—or enough to train 2,500 more interns this summer.

That is what is before the subcommittee now chaired by Rep. Daniel Flood, D-Pa. And the President has asked $36,000,000 for fiscal 1968.

Richard Graham, director of the Corps, recently asked school districts for a frank appraisal of the program. Of the 79 reports received so far, 77 districts asked for more Teacher Corps teams, one was happy with what it had, and one district was critical of the personnel it received.

Not a bad record for a program that is being run on peanuts.

Mahon is under a lot of pressure to hold down spending. But he just might find the Teacher Corps a place where he can strike a blow for decency and dignity for a lot of long-neglected kids and still not get the feeling that he's bankrupting the treasury.

RIGHTING THE RURAL-URBAN IMBALANCE

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, on several recent occasions, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman has spelled out the need to right the rural-urban imbalance in the United States.

In a speech to the National Association of Counties here in Washington on February 27, he said:

> In a very real sense, the poverty problem of the cities is a problem transplanted from rural America, for the urban slums are peopled largely by displaced rural migrants who sought in vain to earn a living in the countryside and finally fled to the city in desperation.
>
> (The cities') problem cannot be solved . . . until the out-migration from the country is slowed, stopped, and, hopefully, reversed. And this can only be done by bringing opportunity to the countryside.
>
> Rural America has much to offer business and industry—the providers of jobs. Many rural communities have excellent communications and transportation systems. Most

> have trainable labor forces. Some have adequate community facilities. All have clear air, space to grow, modest land costs, a frank need for more jobs . . . and an appreciation of them when they get them. I know that your communities—and the USDA's Rural Industrialization staff—are working hard to sell business and industry on the advantages of rural location.
>
> If we are successful in this sales campaign, we can stop the outmigration from the country. We can hold people there with new jobs and new hope. We can stop the brain drain and the leadership run-off. We can make it possible for the people who *want* to live in rural America to stay there or to move there.

And in a speech at the Nation's Cleanest Town Achievement Conference in Washington on February 21, Secretary Freeman said:

> I speak now of the urgent need to slow the exodus of people from the countryside to the cities. If we can stem that tide, we can give our crowded cities a little breathing room . . . and the lead time they need to assess where they are and where they want to go in the years ahead. The only way to stem that tide is to build opportunity into the countryside . . . for that is the only way we can hold people there.
>
> There no longer remains a compelling reason why business and industry—and jobs—cannot be distributed equitably throughout America. And this one action alone—if enacted in substantial enough measure—would do a great deal to restore biological and esthetic balance to this nation.
>
> Instead of building industry where people are—without considering whether they want to be there or even if it is good that so many of them are there—we must start to build industry and provide jobs where more people want to be . . . where more people ought to be.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Freeman's voice is not crying alone in the wilderness. Many of us share his conviction. And foremost among us is the President of the United States.

On September 3, 1966, President Johnson addressed a centennial celebration in Dallastown, Pa. There he said, in part:

> A few months ago, one of the poll-takers went out across the nation asking this question: "If you could live anywhere in the United States that you wanted to, would you prefer a city, a suburban area, a small town or a farm?"
>
> Half of those polled said they preferred the small town or the farm. I didn't get asked any question in that poll, but you know where my vote would have been.
>
> What does this mean at a time when more and more Americans are moving to our big cities? It means that millions of Americans feel deprived of a fundamental human right: the right to live where they choose . . .
>
> Not just sentiment demands that we do more to help our farms and rural communities. I think the welfare of this Nation demands it. And strange as it may seem, I think the future of the cities of America demands it, too . . .
>
> Modern industry and modern technology and modern transportation can bring jobs to the countryside rather than people to the cities. And modern government could also help.
>
> I want to see more factories located in rural regions. I want more workers able to supplement their incomes by part-time farming—and more farmers working part-time in industry. I want those who love the land to reap all the benefits of modern living.

These statements by the President and Secretary of Agriculture emphasize the need for legislation that I shall introduce soon, to be called the Rural Opportunities Act. It will provide incentives for industry to locate in less-populated areas—not runaway industries from their present city locations, but new industries or expanding industries.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of February 25 featured an editorial which lends support to the President's and Secretary Freeman's contentions. I ask unanimous consent that the Post editorial, entitled "Flight From the City," be printed in the RECORD.

FLIGHT FROM THE CITY

> Mayor John Lindsay of New York City has disclosed that in 1966 New York City acquired 40 new factories employing an average of 100 persons. The Mayor, obviously, regards this as a piece of good news. But citizens are entitled to wonder if it is good news that this great city, or other great cities, continue to pile up more industry in overcongested central areas already choked with traffic, smothered with fumes, befouled by sewage and staggering with the social consequences of previous excessive growth.
>
> The fierce competition of frontier cities for more factories, more people. more stores, more everything, should be left behind by modern sophisticated leadership. If there is anything that New York doesn't need it is more factories, more people, more traffic, more congestion, more social and political problems.
>
> Factory growth in this country ought to take place anywhere and everywhere but inside city limits. Factory growth stimulates the whole dreadful cycle of urban problems. Each factory means more traffic. More traffic means more streets and highways. More streets mean more destruction of urban housing. Destruction of urban housing means more governmentally supported housing. Sooner or later, the economic adversity of the urban environment will operate so unfavorably on the factories that they will become high-risk enterprises with fluctuating employment. This will be followed by more people on New York's growing relief rolls, already risen above 600,000 persons.
>
> The last century's notions of growth and progress are out of date. It is not bigger cities but better cities we need. The Mayor ought to be depressed by the new problems that 40 new factories will create for New York City.

THE 25 MILLIONTH NLRB VOTER

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the 25 millionth vote in National Labor Relations Board conducted representation elections is being commemorated tomorrow in various ceremonies here in Washington. A guest of honor will be a resident of my congressional district, Mr. Leonard P. Scheno of Carteret, N.J., a maintenance technician in the Reynolds Metals Co. manufacturing plant at Woodbridge, N.J. Mr. Scheno cast the ballot symbolic of the 25 million votes the NLRB has counted since 1935, in an election in which he and his fellow employees chose the United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO, to represent them in collective bargaining.

A World War II and Korean veteran, Mr. Scheno is the father of three children, Geraldine, 13, and twins Nicholas and Grace, 12. He and his wife, Grace, are American-born children of fathers who came from the tiny town of Cisternino, Italy. It was through a get-together of the immigrant fathers in Nyack, N.Y., Mr. Scheno's hometown, that their courtship began.

A Navy flight engineer during service at the end of World War II and afterward, Mr. Scheno logged some 2,000 flying hours in the Pacific, Japan, and Tsingtao, China. Honorably discharged in October 1948, he worked under the GI bill as an apprentice stereotyper for the Rockland County Journal-News in Nyack.

Two years later to the day he was recalled into the Navy for Korean service. Although he asked for overseas duty again, he was assigned to the reactivated Oak Harbor Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Wash., and because of his experience as a bowling league organizer was placed in charge of the station's 10 bowling alleys. The Oak Harbor team, with Mr. Scheno as its captain, won the bowling championship of the 13th Naval District. He attained membership in the 700 Bowling Club of America with a 721 series. He also was Oak Harbor's horseshoe and table tennis champion.

Athletically inclined all his life, Mr. Scheno is active in sports work with youngsters. For 3 years he has coached the Knights of Columbus Little League baseball team of Carteret—a championship winner in 1964 and 1965, second last season. He is involved, with other members of the Carteret Sportman's Association, in sponsoring a boys' Pop Warner football league team that also has a winning tradition. Mr. Scheno's own youngsters play their part—Nicholas as a baseball and basketball player and the girls as cheerleaders for the football and basketball teams.

After Korean war service, Mr. Scheno in 1952 married, personally built a two-story home at 280 Washington Avenue, Carteret, with his father-in-law's help, and began a career as a mechanic and manager of service stations for Cities Service on the New Jersey Turnpike and the Garden State Parkway. In 1956 he went into business for himself as operator for 8 years of a Cities Service retail dealership in Avenel, N.J. One of his biggest customers was a trucking fleet, and in 1964 he took over supervision of maintenance for that company as a member of its staff.

He joined Reynolds last September in the first group of technicians hired for the new Woodbridge plant, which is the fourth all-aluminum canmaking installation in the Nation. The first of several production lines for seamless aluminum cans went into service early in February, following the election.

Mr. Scheno had never been a member of a union until he went to work for Reynolds last fall. The union's organizing effort was headed by Jack Hurvich, the Steelworkers' international representative in Irvington, N.J.

Mr. Scheno said he was not surprised at the outcome of the voting at the Woodbridge plant, but added:

I was impressed at the way the NLRB people conducted the election, the absolute guarantee of ballot secrecy.

And as to giving workers a voice in their own future, NLRB elections like this one make sense.

A BILL TO ELIMINATE THE GOLD COVER ON FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing H.R. 6428, to eliminate the requirement that the Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation.

Two years ago, the 89th Congress approved a similar act removing the reserve requirement against the deposit liabilities of the Federal Reserve banks. By doing so, the Congress gave expression of the belief that a gold reserve requirement was not an effective or necessary constraint on the Federal Reserve System in its dealings with its depositors.

Who are the depositors and what are the deposits at the Federal Reserve banks? At the end of 1966, of $20.8 billion in deposit at the Federal Reserve banks, very nearly $20 billion were the reserve deposits of member banks of the Federal Reserve System. That $20 billion, plus about $4 billion of currency and coin, was the reserve base of the banking system. It was on that base, of credit and currency, that the member banks supported $119 billion of demand deposits and $128 billion of time and savings deposits.

The Nation's money supply, as customarily defined, consists of currency and demand deposits. It totaled $175 billion at the end of last year. So the Congress said that the $119 billion of demand deposits—over two-thirds of the money supply—was not going to be affected by gold.

Paper currency is a minor part of the money supply nowadays, smaller in amount and less subject to official management than commercial credit. All but a tiny fraction of the note issue is now supplied by the Federal Reserve banks. The $39½ billion of Federal Reserve notes in circulation at the end of last year were less than one quarter of the $175 million money supply.

What is needed now is that the arguments accepted with respect to bank money 2 years ago should be recognized as exactly applicable in the same way in respect to folding money. Congress should take action accordingly, to repeal the gold reserve requirement against Federal Reserve notes.

This is by no means a new debate. But I shall attempt to protect the interests of the Republic by stating my case in propositions of facts and events, and in opinions originating in reason and prudence.

For the past third of a century, gold has performed in the United States no active domestic monetary function. It is not currency. The gold reserve requirements have on no occasion been permitted to restrain the growth of the money supply when that was deemed to be necessary.

I have observed no change in behavior as a result of this, or even of the withdrawal of silver as a monetary metal. Nobody that I have known has questioned the law by refusing to accept payment in legal-tender dollar bills. I have yet to hear of anyone seriously doubting that the new sandwich quarters will buy the same as the old silver quarters. Money is all credit now.

The retention of the gold-reserve requirement for certain liabilities of the Federal Reserve banks was an action that was not seriously intended as a restraint. It was and is an irrelevance to domestic monetary policy. Its partial removal was only a partial response to an imperative need.

But gold is important in the international scene, in transactions between the United States and foreign official institutions. It occupies a definitive role in the international monetary system of the International Monetary Fund. The President and the Secretary of the Treasury have on many occasions declared the firm policy of the United States to retain the existing dollar price of gold. The most recent reaffirmation by the Secretary of the Treasury was in January.

The way to assure this policy is to provide visibly a supply of gold that will meet any conceivable demand from foreign official institutions—to make available not just the marginal amount of somewhat more than $3 billion, as at present, but the entirety of our stock, over $13 billion.

The reason for doing this now is not that our margin is inadequate for present needs. It is that our margin is big enough to allow us to do this without any suggestion of strain. Furthermore, since October of last year, when the French gave up their purchases from us, for reasons associated with their own balance of payments, the net change in the gold stock of the United States has been only a small reduction—some $150 million. To act now is to demonstrate our determination to make our policy work.

Moreover, this action would have a healthy influence in calming the evident concern of the people of the United States about our continuing trouble with the balance of payments. I do not ignore that concern when I say that some part of it arises from a mistaken interpretation of our strong basic position. For example, it is likely, on my analysis of the course of events, that the 1967 first quarter balance-of-payments deficit on a liquidity basis will be substantially greater than in any quarter of last year. The outflow of short-term capital that will, I expect, be the principal reason for this increased deficit should not lead to drastic reaction by the United States, or for foreign concern about the quality of the dollar.

It is a reason for prompt action. I shall seek a favorable report on the bill from the administration, and that the House Banking and Currency Committee schedule hearings soon.

Finally, let me say that the issue of removing the gold cover is not new. This is no suddenly discovered need. It has a long history.

As Secretary Dillon testified before the House Banking and Currency Committee on February 1, 1965, in regard to the earlier removal of gold cover:

> The current gold cover requirement is an outgrowth of a much earlier period in our monetary history, and can be fully understood only in the context of circumstances that have long since vanished.

Indeed, it was a mere accident of history that caused the retention of the gold-cover requirement at all during the 1930's.

On December 20, 1960, I submitted a report to the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee which recommended, among other things "repeal at an appropriate time."

Let me give more recent testimony. On the same occasion on which Secretary Dillon testified—February 1, 1965—Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors who, incidentally, supported the limited aim of the previous bill, nevertheless declared:

> The all-important need for legislation at this juncture is to assure the world that U.S. monetary gold is always available to maintain the convertibility of the dollar and that the United States will honor its debts and liabilities in the form of foreign dollar holdings, as I have said many times before, down through the last bar of gold, if that be necessary.

That reasoning applies today. And it applies to all our gold, not just a part.

I shall refrain from quoting any of the repeated recommendations from the Joint Economic Committee, or from its Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments of which I have been chairman. All that I can say is that the recommendation of repeal has had no dissent. But in the recently concluded hearings of the Joint Economic Committee, the proposal was actively endorsed by several witnesses. I quote from the testimony of Robert V. Roosa, in answer to a question that I asked him on February 20:

> I would say that in any case the gold cover should be repealed. That is necessary in any event.

Mr. Speaker, the informed opinion of the country stands in support of the measure of repeal of the gold-cover requirement against Federal Reserve notes that is introduced herewith.

DREW PEARSON AND SOVIET ROULETTE

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, with the permission granted me, I would like to

bring to the attention of the House a chapter from the Drew Pearson story, written by Frank Kluckhohn and Jay Franklin and published by Charles Hallberg & Co.:

SOVIET ROULETTE

One of the many puzzles in the Drew Pearson story is his relations with Soviet Russia and to Communism. During the nearly 40 years which have passed since Stalin's first "Five-Year Plan," Drew has achieved a growing personal acceptance in official Soviet circles and is frequently quoted by Russian leaders in support of their anti-American policies. He has frequently been aligned with the Communists on domestic issues and some of his leg-men have had Communist affiliations. Has he done this to create a sensation? What has been his motive?

Drew once suggested that balloons be launched over the Iron Curtain in order to get word to the Russian people in spite of their communist leaders' jamming of the air waves and their refusal to allow American publications on their news stands. He has also on occasion jabbed at the communists.

Yet as late as September 2, 1966, Pearson wrote in his column:

"In Cairo in May, 1964, I talked with Khrushchev. He gave me a message for President Johnson regarding cooperation between the United States and Russia over Cuba."

In these off-hand words, Pearson disclosed that he had been willing to act as a go-between for the then Soviet Premier in connection with an island right off our coast which was then, and still is, a Soviet base. Despite a strong inclination to do so, it is thus difficult to avoid the subject of communism in any honest work on Drew Pearson.

For instance, Alger Hiss, then a ranking State Department official, slipped Drew Pearson the British anti-communist guerrilla Order of Battle in Greece, and Pearson published it.

General Douglas MacArthur raged when someone in Washington slipped Pearson, MacArthur's troop dispositions in Korea and Pearson published them.

Harry S. Truman, as a new President, was being tough with the Russians and Molotov was, consequently, threatening to wreck the United Nations organizing meeting in San Francisco. Pearson immediately wrote that Truman could not get along with the Russians as well as the recently deceased Franklin D. Roosevelt. Truman wilted, and even began to talk of Soviet Dictator Stalin as "Good old Uncle Joe."

Drew is still at it.

"In Moscow in the winter of 1965," he wrote recently, "I found Soviet leaders indignant over the new Johnson policy of bombing North Vietnam."

Then ignoring the fact that the Soviet Union is many hundreds of miles from North Vietnam and is arming the Vietcong with everything from machine-guns, mortars and MIG-21s to fight American forces, Pearson declared: "To bomb North Vietnam just after Kosygin arrived, the Russians told me, was comparable to Russia bombing Mexico just after the President of the United States arrived in Mexico City for an official visit."

Mexico, of course, is our next-door neighbor and we are not arming her to fight Soviet troops.

In nothing else, the record shows, has Drew Pearson been so consistent as in his attitude toward Russian communism. Drew, for instance, has attacked every chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, beginning with Republican Hamilton Fish of New York and Democrat Martin Dies of Texas. Pearson's exposure sent one Chairman, Parnell Thomas, to jail for padding his payroll. Then Pearson went after his successor, Chairman John Wood of Georgia, again questioning his financial integrity, although this time in vain.

"It was Pearson who first broke the inside story (about Wood)," crowed the *People's World*, an official communist publication. And it justified the action thus:

"Pearson emphasized that Wood was the ranking Democrat member of the Un-American Committee while Thomas headed it." And this was "when Eugene Dennis, Communist Party general-secretary, was held in contempt and imprisoned."

Wood, the publication made clear, deserved at least the same; Pearson himself claimed directly that his charge against John Wood, which proved abortive, involved "a penitentiary offense."

Pearson attacked the careful Richard M. Nixon, who is credited with the questioning that exposed Alger Hiss as a Soviet agent. Drew went after Nixon incessantly for years and is widely credited with being one of those who cut him down in the 1960 election. Drew went after Senator Joe McCarthy and helped pursue the Wisconsin Senator to his censure by the Senate and his early death. Anti-communists have been, and are, Pearson's meat: Senator Tom Dodd and General Julius Klein merely being two of his latest targets.

While he was among the first-line in the media attack on Joe McCarthy, it must have piqued Pearson that it was columnist Doris Fleeson, and not he, who coined the phrase "McCarthyism" and James B. "Scotty" Reston of *The New York Times* who made the epithet, "McCarthyism," respectable. It probably touched him in a tenderer spot that a conservative Republican—John Bricker of Ohio—was responsible for the bon mot on Senator Joe. Long before McCarthy's censure by the Senate, the Wisconsin solon entered the Republican cloak room at the Capitol and told assembled colleagues that he had been hunting near his home and had shot a deer. At this point Bricker laid down his newspaper, removed his spectacles and, looking searchingly at Joe McCarthy, remarked: "With a shotgun, I presume."

Joe McCarthy, moreover, had jumped in first, with his usual impetuousity, and announced that Drew was guilty of "complicity" with communism. McCarthy then added injury to insult by punching Drew Pearson in the men's room of the fashionable Sulgrave Club with, or all people, Dick Nixon stepping between them to prevent a further brawl.

Pearson hasn't been as lucky with anti-communist Irishmen as with others. Washington attorney Patrick Clark slugged Drew in another men's room, this time in the Mayflower Hotel, for what Pearson had written about him. Clark had been highly successful in getting money out of Congress for Spain. Again others dragged the battlers apart. Drew claimed he did all right, but the Press Corps consensus was that the battling Quaker is more successful with words than fists.

Pearson, however, has not confined himself to writing and speaking where communism is involved. The *Daily Worker*, official organ of the Communist Party, USA, reported June 26, 1947, that Pearson testified in Federal Court for the District of Columbia on behalf of the 16 leaders of a "Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee" on trial "for contempt and conspiracy."

"Drew Pearson," stated the *Daily Worker*, "appeared in Court to testify to the undemocratic character of the House Un-American Activities Committee."

Now to this day it has not been possible to muster more than a handful of votes out of 435 plus in the House, among the elected representatives of the American people, against the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The only conclusion that appears logical is that it is undemocratic to disagree with Drew, who has recently publicly announced that he is the "conscience" of Congress. It should be added that it was the House as a whole which voted the contempt citation for the 16 leaders of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

The Washington Press veterans have privately and publicly long debated the reasons for Drew Pearson's activities which, when the cards were down, so frequently ended up defending communist interests.

Declared Cissy Patterson's Washington Times-Herald, August 11, 1946, "When Hitler rose to power in Europe, a collection of un-American crackpots, intellectuals, intrigue lovers, revolutionaries and plain crooks saw an opportunity to get rich over here and at the same time to build up their apparent importance."

"Pearson is just one example, but he worked out of Washington and we know him." With Pearson, the *Times-Herald* went on, "apology and special pleading for communist Russia" constituted "an old line which he has been peddling without variation from the day the United States recognized the Soviet regime in 1933."

"Many people were taken in and believed the guff to the effect that Russia was our great ally and had gone to war to save us,' continued the *Times-Herald*. "No mention was made of the now forgotten fact that Hitler and Stalin jointly pulled the trigger that started World War II in 1939—and nobody in Russia ever lifted a finger contrariwise until Hitler attacked Russia in 1941."

It was amidst the war-time ally atmosphere cited, when ordinary people believed that real peace would follow the end of World War II, that Pearson helped change a newly tough U.S. policy toward Soviet aggression by charging that President Truman did not get along with the Russians as well as did FDR. It was not, in fact, until several years later, after the Russian communists took over Czechoslovakia, that Winston Churchill at Fulton, Missouri, publicly branded Soviet Russia a menace to world freedom in his famous "Iron Curtain" speech.

But leaving his domestic detractors and critics aside, Drew Pearson has been perhaps the most quoted American by the Soviets in their own propaganda broadcasts to their people and to the world. Drew, in fact, has the highly unusual distinction of being the only American media man ever quoted by a Soviet leader in an "election" speech and that in Moscow itself.

Beginning a speech "Dear comrades" at an "election" meeting February 27, 1963, Nikita Khrushchev ridiculed American campaign promises saying:

"Various promises of golden mountains and rivers of milk are made. What do you expect? This is sales talk of which there is plenty I should say, according to tales about this in the West. One of them goes something like this. A candidate of one party was making an election speech and called on people to vote for him. If our party wins the election, he told the voters in a certain village, we shall build you a new bridge. But there is no river here, why should we want a bridge? The voters asked in bewilderment. Never mind that, the candidate replied, we will bring you a river as well." (Laughter)

Then Khrushchev followed by quoting Pearson as follows:

"An interesting judgment of the current situation in U.S. democracy is contained in an article by the well-known American journalist, Pearson: 'Many people will write today about Lincoln and the aims he advanced—the rule of the people, by the people and for the people. They will also meditate on how many people can be deceived, and for how long. The situation has not changed very much since the time of Lincoln. In a dictatorship it is necessary to keep the people in a quiet state. In a democracy—the American journalist has in mind democracy in the United States—it is necessary to fool at least 51 percent of the people all the time, or to fool all the people for 51 percent of the time.'

"And further the journalist writes: 'If Lincoln were alive today and in an ironic mood, he might paraphrase one of the lines of his message thus: The rule of the rich is by the will of the rich and for the rich.' This is true. This is really well said, truthfully said.

"In the same article it says that tens of millions of Americans live in poverty."

Now even critical journalists may have an interview with the Soviet ruler of the moment if it serves communist purposes. The journalistic ore produced may be newsworthy, as William R. Hearst, Jr. and his "team" found. Pearson, however, seemed able to get together with Khrushchev almost at will. One of his columns, datelined Gagra, Georgia, USSR, as published in the Raleigh *News & Observer* of August 22, 1963, began "The last time I interviewed Khrushchev" and then, much later, Drew was able to get right to the carefully guarded Soviet Boss at the Aswan dam in Egypt.

In 1963, Drew Pearson took Chief Justice Earl Warren of the Supreme Court with him to meet the Soviet Prime Minister. Drew reported Agnes Meyer as participating in his "interview" but did not, in a series of articles, mention Chief Justice Warren, whose meetings with the ruler of communist Russia were thus carefully guarded as a secret.

Pearson, for his part, reported on this interview that "Socialist Life Keeps Khrushchev Young," according to the headlines on his column in the Washington *Post* of August 24, 1963.

"When I asked how he kept so young," reported Pearson, Khrushchev replied: 'It is the good Socialist life I lead'."

Immediately thereafter in Bucharest in a Pearson column dated September 3, Drew said he talked with Rumania's Communist Boss, Gheorghiu-Dej, and reported: "Rumania in the old days was the most graft-ridden country in the Balkans. * * * Gheorghiu-Dej is certainly right that Rumania is making progress because it was so far behind."

In a dispatch run August 30, also right after he had seen Khrushchev, Drew reported an interview with Soviet Ruler Todor Zhivkov of Bulgaria during which a tea was served. This consisted of "caviar, two kinds of sausage, two of cheese, nuts, ice cream, cake and coffee." While munching this proletarian fare, the Bulgarian ruler was able to tell Pearson that Khrushchev hadn't meant it when he said he would "bury" us and to assert atomic war will destroy Bulgaria "so we hope relations between us will improve."

And from the first non-communist country visited on his trip, Turkey, Pearson declared flatly in his column on September 6, 1963:

"The tough, unrelenting communism of Stalin's day is past, replaced by liberal Socialism and even a certain amount of free enterprise." This was less than a year after the Cuban missile crisis and while Soviet and satellite secret police were operating right off our cost in Cuba, controlling by murderous terror those Cubans who had not fled their native land.

While the Cuban missile crisis was building to a climax, it was former Senator Kenneth Keating of New York, now a judge, who called the shots on the Soviet missile buildup. Yet afterwards, in the winter of 1963, Radio Moscow Domestic "news" service told the Russian people:

"The fuss over Cuba * * * has perfectly well-defined political motives. The usually well-informed U.S. observer Drew Pearson writes that when Senator Keating makes his war-mongering speeches about Cuba, thus reminding his colleagues in the Senate of the times of the late Senator McCarthy, "we hear the voice of Keating, but it is Rockefeller who is doing the prompting."

"Pearson reports that Nelson Rockefeller is the chief Republican pretender to the Presidency of the United States in the next election."

Also in 1963, in connection with his Khrushchev visit, Pearson wrote in his column:

"Castro (and therefore communism) is not the real trouble for the United States in Latin America." The trouble, according to Drew, was that "there is no middle class."

The Cuban official radio quoted Drew with great joy and great length on this. Earlier in 1960, Sergio Diaz Brull, an arrested Castro agent, asserted to U.S. interrogators that Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson were friends of his and were highly regarded for their "friendship" with Castro.

After Lyndon Johnson had landed the U.S. Marines in the Dominican Republic, next to Castro Cuba, Red China's international broadcasting service said from Peking on May 15, 1965:

"U.S. columnist Drew Pearson wrote that one reason the landing of Marines in the Dominican Republic has so riled some of our staunch friends in Latin America is because it comes on top of a long and consistent U.S. policy of supporting 'military dictators.' "

Woodrow Wilson, who tried to encourage democracy in Latin America by refusing to recognize dictatorial regimes, and FDR, with his Good Neighbor policy, must have turned over in their graves at this latter statement.

Then Pearson reported in his column April 26, 1966, that communist-supported Juan Bosch "will almost certainly repeat, or top, his 1962 election victory." He lambasted Joaquin Balaguer "Trujillo's loyal servitor for 25 years" whose "background makes it next to impossible" for him to win the election. He couldn't have been more incorrect. Balaguer not only won in free elections, but won overwhelmingly. But not before Pearson, by his persistent attacks, had added the scalp of Deputy Under Secretary of State Thomas Mann of Laredo, Texas, to his collection. Mann was blamed for advising the landing of Marines in what, as a result of the election returns, turned out to be LBJ's one outstanding international success.

Apart from being frequently quoted on Russia's and Red China's radio, on December 27, 1950, during the Korean war, Drew Pearson received an accolade from the U.S. communist paper the *Daily Worker* when it linked him editorially with the "Hollywood Ten," Paul Robeson, and others of like ilk who were alleged to have been "victims" of U.S. anti-communist forces.

This same day, coincidentally, the *Daily Worker* objected to American troops fighting the invasion of South Korea asserting:

"Let's leave Korea to the Koreans. Let us seat People's China in the UN and quit Formosa. We have no business in these territories of other countries. There is not a single reason why a single American boy should die attempting to seize or hold them. * * *"

A decade passed and a similar event occurred, the Soviet-supported invasion of South Vietnam. On February 17, 1966, Radio Moscow on an international broadcast declared:

"Well-known commentator Drew Pearson ridicules official claims that U.S. troops are in South Vietnam at the request of the Saigon Government to defend freedom and remarks: 'This is pure nonsense. Governments in South Vietnam follow each other in such quick succession that no one can keep track of whether Big Minh, Little Minh or simply Minimouse is in power."

And on May 21, 1966, Radio Moscow in its English language broadcast told the world:

"Well-known U.S. columnist Drew Pearson exposes Lodge's role in the DaNang operation. In an article entitled 'Lodge's Advice to Ky,' published in the *New York Post*, Drew Pearson says: 'The inside fact about Premier Ky's dispatch of troops to DaNang to crush his political opposition was that U.S. Ambassador Henry Lodge advised him to do it.' "

Korea or Vietnam. It would seem the place changes, but the words and music are the same. It was over LBJ's actions to counter communist invasion of South Vietnam and the Dominican Republic that Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson swung away from Lyndon Johnson.

On May 26, 1966, after moving far into the camp of the Kennedys, Drew was still using the guise of an intimate knowledge of Lyndon Johnson's ideas to make some points.

"The United States," claimed his column, "is ready to revise its long-time policy of barring Communist China from the United Nations. * * * The President has learned the hard way that the key to Southeast Asia is Red China."

But then, when almost at once, the Red Chinese demonstrated violently before the Soviet Russian Embassy and its satellite embassies in Peking, Drew's tune immediately changed. He advocated that Soviet Russia and the United States get together to deal with the Red Chinese.

"It will be difficult," Drew remarked, "to pick up the pieces broken by the bombing, escalation and Mr. Johnson's own vituperative vocabulary to justify the war in Vietnam."

Nevertheless, Drew claimed, "with the Russian fear of Chinese communism still rampant," there was some hope the Kremlin and the White House could get together against Red China.

Where did Drew first get this theme? Right from the horse's mouth—from Khrushchev himself in Drew's interview in August, 1963.

Khrushchev, as then reported by Drew, declared:

"I should say the Chinese people want peace. But, of course, better relations between the United States and the USSR will better stabilize the world situation."

Drew added that, in any such alliance of the USA and USSR against Red China, the Russians wanted to take the lead with China.

Drew said: "But I asked Khrushchev, wasn't one of the quarrels between China and the Soviet the fact that China did not believe in co-existence?"

"The Soviet Premier replied: 'Let us agree on one thing. Put the responsibility for negotiating with China on our shoulders.' "

Another question is why Drew Pearson, who is no one's fool, has had identified communists working for him. These include David Karr and Karr's wife, Madeleine. Both wrote for the *Daily Worker* on occasion. The Executive Director and Chief Examiner of the Civil Service Commission asserted Karr was an active communist. Harold Rushmore, once an editor of the *Daily Worker*, said, "I used to give him assignments. He, at the time, was working on one of New York's non-communist papers, and he had to show his communist card to get these assignments."

Senator Joseph McCarthy charged that David Karr "is the link between Pearson and the Communist Party." Adolph A. Berle, now a leader in the New York Liberal Party but then Assistant Secretary of State, testified before the Senate Internal Security Sub-Committee that Karr conveyed confidential information to Pearson.

There is no evidence that Pearson and Karr have ever broken; Karr has gone on to make a great deal of money. He left Drew's staff to join the New York advertising firm which handled the account of Lee Hats, then Drew's radio sponsors, and went on to become president for a time of Fairbanks-Whitney Corporation, formerly the Penn-Texas Corporation.

Pearson defended Karr against the attacks of Martin Dies, the first to expose him. In a speech on the House floor February 1, 1943, Dies stated:

"For two years Karr was on the staff of the Communist Party's official newspaper, the *Daily Worker*. There is not the slightest doubt that all members of the *Daily Worker* staff were required to be members of the Communist Party."

Over twenty years later, July 7, 1964, Drew wrote:

"It was over half a dozen years ago that David Karr sought out a Russian refugee in Israel named Alexander Zarkin and signed a contract with him for the Israeli Government and the Fairbanks-Whitney Corporation, of which Karr was then president, to pioneer a desalination process in arid Israel.

"Fairbanks-Whitney directors, irked at Karr because he spent money which did not bring immediate dividends, eased him out."

"But," applauded Drew, "this was the first private, commercial project of its kind ever built."

The one thing clear from this report is that David Karr is probably the smartest of the communists, including Andrew Older, whom Drew ever employed and, second, that Drew had been in touch with Karr for decades after he left Pearson's employ. This is particularly interesting in the light of other facts.

Among the ideas advanced by veteran members of the Washington Press Corps for Drew's consistency on communism are these:

1. Drew needs a "social" compensation for the earthy contents of most of his columns, contents which the Alaska Supreme Court has recently held can be called "garbage."

2. The Washington *Times-Herald* cited "a desire to get rich" and charged that, moreover, "it satisfied his natural and overpowering lust for lying, smearing, intrigue, character assassination and spying, all of which, next to money, are his aims in life."

3. Morris Beale, whom Pearson once sued, asserted in a vitriolic pamphlet against Pearson entitled "The All America Louse", that Pearson was being blackmailed by the Russians in connection with an unsavory incident in his youth involving a Negro boy in the Southern railroad yards in North Carolina.

Pearson himself has given some indications that the first point, involving his Quaker desire to promote peace, may provide at least a partial explanation. Drew once suggested, as noted, that, to reach the Soviet people, we should go over the Iron Curtain with propaganda balloons. The prevailing winds are West to East and Drew's idea may have had merit.

On December 28, 1962, commentator Vladimslov Kozyakov noted over Radio Moscow that The Washington *Post* yesterday published an article by Drew Pearson entitled, "The time for peace is right now." The commentator asked why Washington did not take the initiative in this. The reason, perhaps, was that this was just after the Cuban Missile crisis and John F. Kennedy and his aides were still too shocked by the nearness of disaster. This, nevertheless, was the opening gun in the campaign which ended in the Test Ban Treaty in 1963.

Shortly after the Test Ban Treaty was signed; under the headline "Russia has kept its word under K," Pearson blandly asserted:

"My own conclusion, from careful examination of the record, is that the Soviet Union has been a tough negotiator but keeps its word when given."

This statement, printed August 31, 1963, kicked up a ferment in Congress and the news media. Lt. General John W. O'Daniel, ret. snapped, "Just whose side is Pearson on?"

At the time of Pearson's statement, the Soviet Union had broken 500 international agreements, including 50 of the 53 it had made with the United States.

Also, Pearson apparently forgot that President John F. Kennedy had told the American people and the world at large on TV that Khrushchev, and his envoy, Andrei Gromyko, had lied to him personally when they assured him that Russia was placing no "offensive weapons" on Cuba at the very time medium-range ballistic missiles with nuclear warheads were moving onto Cuba pads.

There is no denying that Drew's interviews with Soviet leaders and the controversies he has created as a result of his activities involving the issue of communism have added grist to the media mill from which he has taken pure gold.

Yet anyone who has observed Drew Pearson's operation rather intently for years becomes aware, as indeed the record as outlined here shows, that Drew Pearson is not always a free agent. There are indications that Pearson's troubles come when two or more opposed influences come to bear on him at the same time.

And it must be noted that Joe Barnes, wartime Deputy Director of the Office of War Information, was at that time, and has been since, a pal of Drew's. Barnes' attitude subjected him to such public criticism that he was eventually dropped as Editor of the *New York Herald Tribune*.

Under Joe Barnes at the Office of War Information as an assistant and later as associate, was the pro-communist David Karr. Karr was head of OWI's Foreign Language Division and he came under suspicion after the American Ambassador to Hungary complained about him.

Testifying before a Congressional Committee under oath, Karr, head of the Foreign Language Division, admitted to knowing no foreign languages.

This is the official text:

Q. Are you a specialist in foreign languages?

A. No, sir.

Q. Do you speak any foreign languages?

A. No, sir.

Q. Do you read any?

A. No, sir.

Maybe why Drew Pearson has written, talked and acted as he has with respect to communism is not important. Perhaps his motives are high.

The over-all record, however, shows that, whatever his reasons and motivation, Drew Pearson has written, spoken and acted in a way that has helped the communists in almost every key showdown. He has attacked, with many successes, a long list of men in public life who have exposed, or tried to expose, communist activities.

No one has charged Drew Pearson, ever, with being a communist himself, which makes the record of his activities what Churchill, in another context called a mystery wrapped in a conundrum. No one has ever denied either that Drew Pearson is a most "unusual guy." To paraphrase John O'Donnell's favorite lines: he may waddle like a duck, quack like a duck, and associate with ducks, but he retains a clear and uncontested constitutional right to insist that he is a prothonotary warbler.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIME

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, this week radio station WTOP broadcast an excellent editorial on the President's crime proposals. Since many Members may not have heard the editorial at the time it was broadcast, I include the text of the WTOP editorial in the Record:

District of Columbia Crime

(Editorial broadcast on February 28 and March 1, 1967, over WTOP radio and television)

This is a WTOP Editorial.

It would be tempting to look for simple remedies to deal with rising crime rates. But the problem is not simple and the remedies can't be simple either. Necessarily, the program for strengthening District law enforcement that President Johnson has just sent to Congress is a complex one. That is the source of its real strength.

For one thing, the program focuses on more budget support for such urgent community services as police protection, health, education, welfare, and recreation. These are among the services that give the greatest hope of getting at the roots of crime and relieving the problem by prevention.

Along with this broad social welfare effort, Mr. Johnson calls for a variety of steps to give the police, the courts, the jails, and other public agencies a stronger hand for dealing with crime. There would be a new gun control law, limiting pistol purchases to those who show a need for protection, and increasing penalties for those who use guns to commit robberies. Police would be able to make arrests without warrants in assault and housebreaking cases, as they now can do in murder, robbery and some other cases. Defendants on bail awaiting trial could be supervised by the Department of Corrections. Drug addicts would get more treatment as sick people; the pushers would still be prosecuted as criminals. The law would be changed to recognize alcoholics as sick people, except when arrested for violence of some kind. A District Youth Service Office would be created to "plan and direct" all the public services needed to combat juvenile delinquency.

The President described his program as the "immediate battle plan". He has wisely avoided drastic remedies or police powers that could infringe the Constitution. His program merits broad public support and early action in Congress.

This was a WTOP Editorial, James Hudgens speaking for WTOP.

ETV AN EXAMPLE OF CREATIVE FEDERALISM

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Ronan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Speaker, the President's recommendation for continued efforts to expand and more fully develop educational television deserves the support of Congress and the country. The public has an increasing need for education and information. An educational television broadcast system can provide great assistance in meeting this need. Encouragement and assistance should be provided to help in the prompt development of this important resource.

Educational television is an excellent example of creative federalism. Of particular importance is the growth of State networks of stations making for greater effectiveness and efficiency of service. Since 1963 the number of States affected in some degree by network interconnections of this type has increased from 9 to 27. Such networks, for the most part, serve to carry educational television programs of concern and importance to all areas of a State. These networks serve as an effective means of linking the citizens of a State to better serve their needs.

State networks of this type will also serve as a necessary component of national ETV interconnections. National programs can be delivered to a single point within a State and further distribution can then take place by means of the intrastate system.

New communications technology has brought added importance to intrastate interconnections. Recent studies in California, Nebraska, South Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, Oregon, Indiana, and other States have indicated that a wide variety of needed communications services can be provided by the same type of interconnection system required for television transmission. Computer centers can be made available to a number of interconnected locations. Information retrieval systems can make central library resources instantly available to remote locations. Teletype, facsimile, and other electronic communications devices can interconnect a variety of locations within a State.

With careful planning a single interconnection system can serve not only the needs of ETV, but a wide range of communications needs that will result in greater provisions for the needs of the people.

Physicians and public health workers, law enforcement officers, teachers and scholars, welfare workers, and public administrators of all types can benefit from the immediate accessibility of information such a system makes possible. Their increased effectiveness will in turn better serve the needs of the people.

Building an expanded educational television service, important as it is in its own right, can also carry with it therefore increased utilization of a variety of communication techniques. I am delighted to endorse the President's educational television recommendations as an important step toward that development.

TRIBUTE TO A. J. MUSTE

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Scheuer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a man who exemplifies the best traditions of free thought in America, A. J. Muste who died at 82.

Abraham John Muste was a symbol of the way of love and nonviolence in a world which sometimes seems determined to destroy itself in an apocalypse of hate and violence.

As teacher, writer, leader, and prophet of peace, he left an indelible impression upon the people and institutions of the church, organized labor, government, and the academic community.

Executive secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation and member almost from its beginning in 1915, A. J. Muste led this interdenominational nonpolitical pacifist organization through its most crucial prewar, wartime, and postwar periods. During his administration such vital offshoots as the Congress of Racial Equality, the Worker's Defense League, the Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors, the American Committee for Africa, and others emerged to challenge the status quo and to make new benchmarks for the freedom of the dispossessed, the segregated, and the exploited peoples of the earth.

Zealous always for the rights of others, A. J. Muste never stooped to invective or intolerance for those with whom he differed. His loving spirit and gentle mode of persuasion when dealing in strenuous discussion and debate with forces hostile to him were always in evidence.

In 1953, Mr. Muste "retired" as executive secretary of the FOR and entered into one of his most fruitful periods, in which he helped found Liberation magazine, the Committee for Nonviolent Action, and literally dozens of ad hoc groups dedicated to peace and social justice. Many a young man or woman, alienated and bereft because of positions taken as a matter of conscience, found in A. J. a faithful friend, wise counselor.

An excerpt from a poem titled simply "A. J." by Edward P. Gottlieb, describes his place in contemporary life well:

The White Cloud that led by day
And the Pillar of Fire
We hung on through darkness streaked
With violence
Has slipped across a threshold
Of our Time.
It is most questionable
That he should now belong to our Past
We shall most probably find him
In the Future.

It is men like this who set the standards we hope to live by and whom we can respect and honor even when we differ.

SEATING OF MR. POWELL

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Marsh] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I have considered the report of the select committee of this House with respect to the seating of the elected prospective Member from New York, Mr. Powell.

My colleagues will recall that I voted in favor of the resolution requiring the prospective Member from New York to stand aside, pending investigation of his qualifications to sit in the 90th Congress, and that I also voted in the Democratic caucus to deny the prospective Member the committee chairmanship which he held in previous Congresses. Although I concur with the recommendation of the select committee with respect to censure, nevertheless, it is my conclusion that the law and precedents, as applied to the facts in this case, do not justify the House in denying the seat to the Member-elect from the 18th District of New York.

As to levying against the salary of a Member, I question the legal capacity of this House to exercise judicature powers. In this connection, it does not appear that this House holds judicature powers in the manner held, at least until the latter half of the 19th century, by its progenitor, the British House of Commons.

If we lack in this House judicature powers, in the normal usage of the term, it seems to me that we lack capacity to pass judgments on civil liabilities or criminal guilt.

To do so, in the absence of the aforementioned specific authority, would violate safeguards established in the Bill of Rights of the Constitution, including those fashioned by the Founding Fathers to provide for prompt arraignment, trial by jury, and freedom from self-incrimination, to mention a few.

To withhold or reduce the salary, in the absence of a judgment by a court after the exercise of due process of law, would, in my opinion, be an exercise of a power which I do not find this House has definitely in its hands.

As much as I respect the considered judgment of the members of the select committee, and as much as I concur in the basic objective of exercising the rights of this House to pass on the qualifications of prospective Members to sit, I should regret our taking an action at this time which, through lack of clear authority, would give the Supreme Court opportunity to review a portion of a judgment taken by this House in regard to the qualifications of a prospective Member.

THE JOHN J. HUDSON CO. OF PROVIDENCE AND THE OIL IMPORT PROGRAM

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. St Germain] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the February 27th edition of the Washington Post included a very enlightening article on the mandatory oil import program which I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues.

The article, entitled "Asphalt Justice," depicts the plight of John J. Hudson, Inc., a small independent distributor of asphalt in Providence, R.I., in its endeavor to compete with the major oil companies.

Though the company is small on a national scale, it is the largest asphalt dealer in Rhode Island. It accounts for close to 100 employees and plays a significant role in the economy of my State.

Regardless of its size, the fact of the matter is that a very apparent inequity exists in the oil import program and the Hudson Co. does not intend to accept the resulting injustice which is forcing it out of business. It has courageously taken it upon itself to fight this Goliath. Though its very survival is at stake, so are the principles of a free enterprise system. The real loser in this case is the consumer if these principles should continue to be denied.

As the Washington Post news article noted:

> Hudson is challenging a complex that derives its power from a union of the petroleum refining industry with the Federal bureaucracy. If it succeeds in smashing—or even modifying—the oil import program, it will confer benefits on consumers in the shape of lower prices and provide the petrochemical industry with the cheap raw materials that it requires for rapid growth.

Mr. Speaker, I place this noteworthy article in the RECORD at this point:

ASPHALT JUSTICE

> A frontal legal assault is being made on the constitutionality of the Mandatory Oil Import Program, the system of import quotas that protects the petroleum industry against lower prices at great cost to consumers.
>
> John J. Hudson, Inc., will not be found in corporate directories or on stock exchange lists. It is—but may no longer be—an independent distributor of asphalt in the New England area, a small Providence firm headed by a former truck driver. Until recently Hudson was supplied with asphalt by Cities Service, but when Citgo closed down its Linden, N.J., plants Hudson was left without a source of supply at prices that are competitive with those charged by the major oil companies.
>
> Since Hudson has an option to purchase ample dockside storage facilities from Citgo, it asked the Oil Appeals Board, a tribunal set up to hear hardship cases under the import quota program, for permission to import 762,000 barrels of asphalt a year. No one was surprised when the Board refused Hudson's request, although the second decision was split when the representative of the Department of Commerce held that Hudson's petition deserved reconsideration.
>
> Hudson now has taken its case to the District Court. Among the 30 grounds cited in arguing that the Board's action should be set aside, several got to the very heart of the public policy issue. Although the Mandatory Program is rooted in a Presidential Proclamation of 1959 which in turn rests on sections of the Tariff Act of 1930, the action of the Board in forcing Hudson out of business, the company argues, is a violation of due process. The second point is that the Board, in systematically turning down appeals for allocations of finished petroleum products—and here petrochemical companies without oil refining facilities are also adversely affected—discriminates in favor of the oil companies.
>
> Finally, there is a grave question as to the objectivity of the Board. One of its three members is from the Department of Defense. But since Defense is the holder of the largest single import allocation, its representatives might be expected to view a rival claimant to a predetermined supply of imports with a jaundiced eye.
>
> The triumphs of Davids over Goliaths are noteworthy because they are rare. Hudson is challenging a complex that derives its power from a union of the petroleum refining industry with the Federal bureaucracy. If it succeeds in smashing—or even modifying—the oil import program, it will confer benefits on consumers in the shape of lower prices and provide the petrochemical industry with the cheap raw materials that it requires for rapid growth.

THE UNITED STATES AND VIETNAM

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I have noted in the New York Times issue of February 28 that my esteemed colleague from Wisconsin, the very able Mr. LAIRD, has written a letter to the President critical of U.S. policy in Vietnam.

According to an Associated Press story, Mr. LAIRD has asserted that American goals and objectives in Vietnam have been "cloudy."

As one who has been deeply interested in our Vietnam involvement and who has attempted to keep informed on both the situation and our policies, I am frankly concerned and disturbed about this charge. It seems to me that things may seem cloudy to those who attempt to throw up a smokescreen. I realize that the temptation to play some politics with Vietnam is sometimes strong—and will get stronger as time goes along—but I truly cannot see what can be gained from casting doubt on our aims in that conflict.

The American people rightfully regard the war as a serious cause for concern and thought, not as an opportunity, however, for innuendo and nit-picking.

Anyone who has approached the facts with an open mind knows that the entire American effort in Vietnam is designed to assist the South Vietnamese to preserve their freedom from external aggression.

This has been the U.S. objective since 1954 and our aims will continue to be such.

There is nothing "cloudy" or ambiguous about that policy.

We have said often that our aim can be sought at the conference table or at war on the battlefield. We wish most sincerely to talk rather than to fight. As long as Hanoi is unwilling to come to the table, however, the issue must be met militarily.

There is nothing vague about this position.

The United States has pursued this policy and will continue to pursue it because of a commitment to the people of South Vietnam, a commitment to protect them against external Communist aggression.

We have undertaken this commitment for three reasons:

First. Because help has been requested by the Government of South Vietnam;

Second. Because our Government remains convinced that the people of South Vietnam do not wish to live under communism; and

Third. Because the United States regards the defense of South Vietnam as vital to its own national interests.

Mr. Speaker, the United States does not and will not renege on its commitments. Those commitments have been sealed in the blood of thousands of our finest young men.

At the same time, however, it does not mean that the American forces must remain in South Vietnam forever.

If Hanoi can be persuaded to give up its objective of conquering South Vietnam, to cease the infiltration of men and supplies across the 17th parallel, and to withdraw its forces back to the north, then the aggression will cease. If Hanoi demonstrates the least bit of sincerity in this regard, steps will be taken to end the conflict.

At such a time South Vietnam would be able to set about resolving their internal problems free from massive external pressures.

Under these circumstances, the conditions will have been created which will permit the withdrawal of American forces within a 6-month period.

It is obvious, however, that our withdrawal cannot and will not be accomplished until it is clear that aggression has ceased, infiltration has ceased, and that the forces of North Vietnam have gone home.

Under these conditions genuinely observed, the withdrawal of American forces from South Vietnam does not constitute either the abandonment of the South Vietnamese people or a betrayal of an American commitment.

Rather, it is the fulfillment of what we wish for the people of the war-torn, war-tired nation: peace, economic growth, political stability, and national security.

As President Johnson has so often stated, the United States will remain ready to assist in the job of rebuilding Vietnam once the hostilities have ceased.

This will be true regardless of whether the South Vietnamese people choose a policy of alinement or nonalinement. In the long run, it is in America's interest to guarantee the South Vietnamese peoples freedom of choice—not a solution imposed from outside.

Mr. Speaker, these are the essential points of our policy. They are clear and unambiguous.

I believe they deserve the understanding and support of all Americans, regardless of partisan political leanings.

EDUCATIONAL TV

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the President's declaration in his state of the Union message, "to develop educational television into a vital public resource," and in the proposals made to Congress to speed that development.

The great potential of the service that noncommercial television can bring to the public was dramatically illustrated by the coverage given by educational television to the state of the Union address over the National Education Network. For the first time, a nationwide network of some 70 coast-to-coast stations was established for a live telecast. Many millions of Americans saw and heard the President. Before and immediately after this address, they witnessed some of the Nation's most distinguished commentators from diplomatic, political, economic, and journalistic fields discuss the Nation's problems and the President's approach to them. While the three commercial networks as Newsweek noted, provided only scant analysis, NET employed 11 top-level specialists.

It was an outstanding illustration of the coast-to-coast potential of ETV and all that it can accomplish for each and every community throughout the Nation.

Every educational television station belongs primarily to its own community and has its greatest strength in its unique ability to serve the needs of that particular community.

We have worked for many years for educational television in Kentucky because we believed in that strength to help us to solve the many problems that we face. We are now building, with Federal help, a 12-station network at a cost of between $8 and $9 million. When those stations are on the air, well over a million students in Kentucky and nearby States in Appalachia will get more out of their classroom instruction than ever before. Five million people living in the area will, we are confident, get more out of their lives because of the programs produced for their specific needs.

Our 12-station network represents one of the most ambitious enterprises undertaken by a State board of education in the history of educational television, and is the first ETV network to be organized in one operation for complete statewide coverage. We intend to make Kentuckians proud of that coverage and grateful for all that it will mean to them. We want persons in every corner of this Nation to have the same benefits available to them. Thus, I strongly urge my colleagues to support the President's proposal.

SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORIZATION, PROCUREMENT, AND MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, because of long-standing commitments before farm organizations in our district—I asked an official leave of absence for Thursday, March 2. Because I am a member of the House Armed Services Committee I want to be on record as in favor of the authorization which will be considered tomorrow.

I am pleased to add my voice in support of H.R. 4515. This bill would authorize supplemental appropriations in fiscal year 1967 for: First, procurement of aircraft and missiles; second, research, development, test, and evaluation; and third, military construction. The total authorization proposed by this bill is $4,548,200,000.

As we are all aware from the fiscal year 1967 Defense budget which was presented to the Congress, the Department of Defense assumed for planning purposes that the war in Vietnam would end by June 30, 1967. The word is clear that this assumption was not a prediction, but instead was a more or less arbitrary basis for determining the amount of the funding then to be sought, just as July 1 of one year through June 30 of the next are the more or less arbitrary limiting dates for determining the size of authorization and appropriation for any given year.

I recognize that some Members of Congress believed last year that it was practical and desirable to provide some of the additional funding that would be required for our operations in Southeast Asia. However, the Department of Defense insisted that the amount of the additional funding needed in this fiscal year was subject to so many contingencies and so much uncertainty that the supplemental needs could not be computed precisely. Thus, while there may be disagreement over whether at least a part of the supplemental funding should have been asked for last fall, there is no disagreement at least within our committee that the support of the Armed Forces in Southeast Asia requires further authorization and appropriation in fiscal year 1967.

We have been assured that barring an unforeseen turn in the situation in Southeast Asia, there will be no additional supplemental for 1967, and Department of Defense witnesses have estimated that the fiscal year 1968 regular bills will eliminate the necessity for a supplemental in fiscal year 1968.

In discussing this bill, I feel that we must bear in mind that leadtime on aircraft is approximately 18 months. Thus, this bill plus the regular 1968 program would further requirements through December 1969. Similarly, for missiles, the funding is intended to cover the needs through whatever period is required to secure deliveries on orders placed on July 1, 1968.

And speaking of airplanes, this authorization is also intended to replace aircraft estimated to be lost in combat and to provide aircraft for expanding our training base to increase the output of pilots.

Almost $1 billion of the total procurement authorization is intended for additional aircraft, spares, and repair parts. Another large part of the authorization would be used to modify aircraft to make them more effective in combat in Vietnam and to make them less vulnerable to antiaircraft weapons and other defenses.

The procurement portion of this bill for the Army is $601,400,000, broken down as follows: for aircraft, $553,100,000.

This would provide for the purchase of Iroquois, Cobra, TH-55A, TH-13T, and U-21A aircraft.

For missiles, $1,100,000 is to be authorized. This would provide for spares and repair parts only.

For tracked combat vehicles, this bill would authorize $62,200,000 and would provide for full-tracked, armored personnel carriers; full-tracked cargo carriers; full-tracked command post carriers; full-tracked 81-millimeter mortar carriers; field artillery 175-millimeter guns; self-propelled M110 8-inch howitzers; full-tracked M578 recovery vehicles; self-propelled M109 155-millimeter howitzers; and self-propelled 20-millimeter XM163 air defense artillery guns.

The Navy procurement portion of this bill totals $1,839 million. For aircraft for the Navy and Marine Corps, $1,748,300,000 is provided. This amount is intended to finance the procurement of 502 new aircraft, together with their supporting components and spare parts, the cost of modifying and modernizing aircraft already in inventory, and related items such as aircraft support equipment and industrial facilities. The following aircraft are included for purchase:

Combat aircraft: A-6A Intruder, EA-6A Intruder, A-7A/B Corsair II, F-4J Phantom II, CH-46D Sea Knight, SH-3D Sea King, and P-3B Orion.

Trainer aircraft: T-2B Buckeye and TA-4F Skyhawk.

In the missile area, this bill would allocate $48,700,000 to the Navy, and $2.1 million for the Marine Corps. This will purchase the Shrike/ARM missile and standard ER missile.

For tracked combat vehicles, the bill authorizes for the Marines $4,200,000, and provides for the procurement of the 155-millimeter self-propelled howitzer M-109.

The bill allocates $1,348,000 to the Air Force for procurement. Of the $1,303 million allocated for aircraft, the following types of aircraft will be procured:

Combat aircraft: A-7D, tactical attack fighter; F-4E, tactical fighter; F-5A, tactical fighter; RF-4C, tactical reconnaissance fighter; O-2A/B, forward air controller/psychological warfare; A-37B, tactical fighter; and OV-10A, counterinsurgency forward air controller aircraft.

Trainer aircraft: T-37B, primary jet trainer; T-38A, supersonic jet trainer; and T-41A, primary trainer.

Other aircraft: HH-53B, heavy lift helicopter.

The bill also authorizes $45 million for missiles, but the description of the missiles is classified information.

The supplemental authorization request for research, development, test, and evaluation totals $135 million. Department of Defense witnesses testified that the purpose of the R.D.T. & E. supplemental request is to provide immediate response to the war needs of the operating forces. While this amount is relatively small, it should be borne in mind that the total fiscal year 1967 authorization for research, development, test, and evaluation totals $7,180,520,000.

Of the $135 million in this bill, $40 million is authorized for the Army to be used on projects to improve the night combat capabilities of our forces in Vietnam, including suppressive fire from aircraft.

For the Navy a $40 million authorization is included to be used for the developments in aircraft electronic warfare and reconnaissance equipment as well as efforts to increase the capabilities of certain ship-launched and air-launched missiles.

Thirty-three million dollars has been authorized to the Air Force for developments to enhance interdiction capabilities at night and to increase the accuracy and effectiveness of weapon deliveries.

The remaining $22 million in the research area are authorized to the Department of Defense for classified development work.

The military construction portion of this bill totals $624,500,000 and includes construction not only in South Vietnam but also in other places in Southeast Asia as well as the United States. But all of the construction directly relates to our efforts in South Vietnam. Others have detailed a type of construction, so I will attempt not to be repetitious.

For the Department of the Army, $288,500,000 is included. For the Navy, $140 million, and the Air Force, $196 million.

I want to assure this great House that the committee carefully considered the subject of construction and are in general satisfied with the progress being made. We share your concern that the programs were underestimated last year by approximately $138 million or a total overrun of 23 percent. We have been given assurances that the planning is much better this year although it is not possible because of the deployment picture and the uncertainties of construction in any war zone that we will be able to estimate with the same degree of accuracy that exists on construction projects in the United States. It is somewhat staggering when we think of the total construction program associated with the war in Vietnam because with the approval of this bill, we will have authorized a total of over two and one-quarter billion dollars and we have spent most of this money on projects to which we have no base rights agreements with the host countries. Nevertheless, as long as our troops serve in Vietnam they must be housed, they must be provided operational facilities, and there must be adequate hospitals. I, for one, am less concerned about base rights than I am about providing essential facilities needed to allow those who serve there to carry out their assigned mission.

I am hopeful that every Member of this House will join tomorrow in supporting this bill to show those we are asking to give so much that we in the House of Representatives are willing to support their efforts—efforts to which most of them have been called upon by their country to perform.

IMPORTANT AND INFORMATIVE ADDRESS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE PALMER ON QUESTION OF SOUTHERN RHODESIA

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include the address on Southern Rhodesia by Assistant Secretary of State Palmer at Pasadena, Calif.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the full text of the informative, timely, and important address of the Honorable Joseph Palmer II, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, at the invitation of the California Institute of Technology faculty committee on programs at Beckman Auditorium, Pasadena, Calif., on February 28, 1967. The address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH PALMER II, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR AFRICAN AFFAIRS, AT THE INVITATION OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY FACULTY COMMITTEE ON PROGRAMS, BECKMAN AUDITORIUM, PASADENA, CALIF., FEBRUARY 28, 1967

The question of Southern Rhodesia has lately attracted a great deal of attention here in the United States, as is appropriate for a matter of such paramount concern to the world community. But the problem is not a new one.

More than a year has now passed since November 11, 1965, when the Rhodesian regime illegally declared its independence from Great Britain. In that time, the Security Council, acting at the request of the UK—the sovereign authority responsible for the welfare and progress of the people of Southern Rhodesia—attempted to assist in resolving the controversy by measures involving the voluntary cooperation of member states.

Why, we may ask ourselves, has this issue now taken on such added importance, and how has it become a focus for the attention of virtually the entire international community?

The most immediate and dramatic reason for this is the fact that on December 16, 1966, the Security Council of the United Nations, exercising its responsibility as the world body primarily concerned with the maintenance of international peace and security, adopted a resolution declaring that the situation in Southern Rhodesia had become a "threat to the peace", under the terms of Article 39 of the UN Charter. To cope with this situation, it imposed against that territory limited mandatory economic sanctions in accordance with Article 41 of the Charter, which authorizes the Security Council to "decide what measures not including the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions", and to "call upon the Members of the United Nations to apply such measures."

FIRST TIME FOR 21 YEARS

It is noteworthy that this marked the first time in the 21-year history of the United Nations that the Security Council applied the measures called for in Article 41. In so doing, it decided that all Member States shall prohibit imports of Rhodesian asbestos, iron ore, chrome, pig iron, sugar, tobacco, copper, meat and meat products, and hides, skins and leather as well as dealing by their nationals or in their territories in such products originating in Southern Rhodesia. The resolution also obligates UN members to embargo shipments of arms, aircraft, motor vehicles, and petroleum and petroleum products to Southern Rhodesia.

These are indeed serious measures; they are, nonetheless, limited. There were many demands in the United Nations and elsewhere for more comprehensive sanctions, or for the use of force to bring down the Smith regime. The Security Council, however, in line with the desire of the majority of its members to find a peaceful solution to the problem, decided on more limited measures.

Under Article 25 of the Charter, the members of the UN have agreed to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council. This is a solemn treaty obligation, binding on all members. Accordingly, the President of the United States, acting under the authority granted to him by the Congress in Section 5 of the UN Participation Act of 1945, issued an Executive Order on January 5 of this year to prohibit US firms and individuals from engaging in the activities proscribed by the Security Council resolution, including transactions involving the commodities described therein.

It is primarily this action that has attracted the attention that we find in the United States today. This interest has been reflected in wide-spread comment much of which is favorable. However, much is also critical. Doubts have been cast on the legality of the action as well as on its wisdom. The line between informed opinion and misinformation or misunderstanding has often become blurred. For example, we hear that US support for the Security Council action derogates from our own sovereignty, that it constitutes misguided support of the British and that its purpose is to curry favor with some members of the international community at the expense of others.

We are all aware of the fact that the United States as a Permanent Member of the Security Council, has the power under Article 27, paragraph 3, of the Charter to prevent the Council from taking any action in any situation where we may deem it inappropriate. But in the case of Southern Rhodesia, we considered that the Council's finding of a threat to the peace and its decision to impose mandatory sanctions were appropriate and necessary. We voted for them only on the basis of a considered judgment that it was clearly in our national interest to do so.

INTEREST OF THE UNITED STATES

This raises the question of the US interest in the Rhodesian problem. As the leading free world power and as a member of the United Nations, we have a direct interest in contributing responsibly to stability and progress in Africa, as in many other areas of the world. The situation in Southern Rhodesia, where a racial minority has seized power illegally and attempts to continue its domination over the vast majority of Rhodesians, forms a basic threat to that stability. It has already served to heighten racial tensions in and around Rhodesia itself. In time, there is a real danger that it could develop into a confrontation along racial lines between the African countries north of the Zambezi River and the white-dominated nations of southern Africa.

Black Africans, frustrated and embittered by vestiges of colonial or racial repression, are understandably concerned by the state of affairs in Rhodesia. At the same time, the continued defiance by the white minority regime of Ian Smith of legal authority and international opinion in Southern Rhodesia could serve to consolidate and extend the strength and attitudes of white-supremacists in southern Africa. The result of such a continued polarization in Africa of extremist racial philosophies can only be instability, strife and chaos. To do nothing to avert such a confrontation would play into the hands of those forces seeking to undermine the stability and progress of Africa as a whole.

Our national interest therefore dictates that we play our proper role in doing what we can to strengthen the forces of moderation among white and black alike, to try to minimize those conditions of instability that create the opportunity for Communist penetration and subversion, and above all to encourage peaceful and responsible change. Our policy on Southern Rhodesia supports these ends.

I will not dwell tonight on the detailed legal arguments in support of the Security Council's decision to impose mandatory sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. Ambassador Goldberg has eloquently and forcefully expounded them in his recent speeches and letters on that subject. I intend instead to concentrate on the nature of the problem the international community faces in Southern Rhodesia itself.

Only twice in history have British territories unilaterally declared their independence of Great Britain—the American colonies in 1776 and Southern Rhodesia in 1965. Rhodesian spokesmen have chosen to equate these two events and have carried on a vigorous campaign to try to convince the world of the identity of these two acts. Central to this effort has been their deliberate attempt to model the Rhodesian declaration of independence after our own. Both documents contain Bills of Particulars. Moreover, the Rhodesian declaration begins:

"Whereas, in the course of human affairs, history has shown that it may become necessary for a people to resolve the political affiliations which have connected them with another people . . ."

Perhaps we should be charitable and attribute this pallid formulation to a general decline in style over the intervening 190 years. But if we look more closely at the substance of the two documents, we find that any superficial parallel breaks down in one very vital respect: the Rhodesian declaration is completely silent on human rights. There is not attempt to state or even to rephrase the ringing words of the American Declaration:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

HEART OF THE DIFFERENCE

Here is the heart of the difference. Very few remember the details of our Bill of Particulars against the King of England. But every child has learned the words of these self-evident truths. Without a passionate commitment to their realization, our Revolution might have been just another national conflict, important to the participants but not significant for the future of mankind. But instead, our forefathers chose to place themselves in the broad stream of human aspirations and progress. They justified their bold, enlightened rebellion in a way that lit fires in men's minds and hearts. They reaffirmed the validity of man's age-old search for justice and equality and gave direction and substance to our national development. They set forth a broad view of human aspirations, charting such an imaginative course that it subsumed the immediate act of rebellion.

The authors of the Rhodesian declaration sought to assert an historical parallel. I suggest that they missed the point completely. Seldom in history have two such superficially similar acts been so vastly different in purpose and meaning. The Rhodesian document makes glancing references to "civilization" and the "principles of Western democracy" but its aims are narrow and its direction is a retreat from the main currents of the times and from the international community of nations. No broad vision emerges to inspire mankind; rather, an obstinate defense of narrow privilege, based on racial bias and minority rule. The Rhodesian document is inward-looking and static, holding no promise either for progress for the majority or for creativity for the minority.

The decisive difference in the American and Rhodesian experience lies in the direction of each society. I do not wish to suggest that we were or are perfect. Man is a fallible being and perfection will probably always be a distant goal as mores change. But the conceptions underlying the American experiment were and are bold, imaginative and liberating, providing a built-in dynamic for the achievement of the American promise. They remain responsive to the needs and aspirations of the American people and in accord with the principles of the United Nations Charter which were laid down 170 years later. Thus Jefferson, after his work on the Declaration, returned to Virginia to give meaning to his beliefs by plunging into political war with the ruling oligarchy of the day. He crusaded for a more equitable distribution of land, the expansion of limited educational opportunities, reform of the penal code, broadening of the franchise, and the abolition of slavery. He succeeded in some of his efforts, partly succeeded in others, and failed in others. But he took a stand, based on principles of enduring validity. His acts as well as his words charted a course for the democracy of the future, not only for our America, but for many diverse peoples, providing clear proof of the universality of his beliefs and of a common humanity.

ENLARGING FREEDOM FRONTIERS

Each generation of Americans has joined in this adventure and enlarged the frontiers of freedom. It has not been an easy, nor a straight, nor an uninterrupted path. We have been steadily, if too slowly, removing discriminations due to religion, sex, national origin and race. We have continuously reexamined our concepts in order to broaden the contents and limits of human rights. Underlining the continuity of this concept in American history, President Johnson stated this month on Lincoln's birthday, "So Lincoln began his troubled journey—to the establishment of a multi-racial community in which man's pride in his racial origins would be wholly consistent with his commitment to the common endeavor."

There could be no greater contrast than exists between the words and deeds of 1776 and those of 1965. Jefferson spoke out against British tyranny and gave meaning to his words by waging political war against the entrenched minority ruling Virginia. The Rhodesian Front attacks the British for supporting the principle of government deriving from the just powers of the governed. The Front seeks to perpetuate minority rule, using almost exactly the same instruments of power in Southern Rhodesia that Jefferson tried to destroy in Virginia. In twentieth-century Southern Rhodesia, by comparison with eighteenth-century America, the roles of rebel and constituted authority are reversed.

At the time of our Revolution, America produced leaders who were more modern in their political and social thought by twentieth-century standards than the men who rule Southern Rhodesia today, nearly two hundred years later. We set out on our road inspired by principles that continue to lead us forward and attracted millions to America to these shores to share in this great adventure. What promise does the Rhodesian declaration hold for its own people and the world? Even leaving aside what cannot be left aside—the 4 million Africans in Southern Rhodesia—what course is charted for the 220,000 white minority? Can they really hope to find creative expression by trying to isolate themselves from the continent in which they live and by incurring rejection by the rest of the world? Can they hope to continue indefinitely to defy world opinion and really create a narrow sanctuary of privilege and domination? I think not.

STATEMENT OF OUR PRESIDENT

There is a continuity between the principles enunciated in our Declaration of Independence and our present policy toward the Rhodesian situation. President Johnson spoke in the authentic American tradition when he stated to the Ambassadors of the member nations of the Organization of African Unity last May:

"As a basic part of our national tradition, we have supported self-determination and an orderly transition to majority rule in every quarter of the globe. These principles have guided our policy from India to the Philippines and from Viet-Nam to Pakistan. They guide our policy today toward Rhodesia.

"We are giving every encouragement and support to the efforts of the United Kingdom and the United Nations to restore legitimate government in Rhodesia. Only when this is accomplished can steps be taken to open the full power and responsibility of nationhood to all the people of Rhodesia—not just six percent of them . . .

"The foreign policy of the United States is rooted in its life at home. We will not permit human rights to be restricted in our own country. And we will not support policies abroad which are based on the rule of minorities or the discredited notion that men are unequal before the law."

Let us now examine the situation in Southern Rhodesia. How does it appear in practice? Despite the racial disproportion in the population, the Land Apportionment Act divides the land roughly equally between the white and the African communities. According to the Rhodesian Ministry of Information, there are approximately 44 million acres for 2,400,000 Africans and 36 million acres for 220,000 Europeans. The Ministry does not add, incidentally, that the acreage reserved for the white minority consists of the best land, much of which lies unused. I lived for two years in Southern Rhodesia and vividly recall an instance in the rural area in which the African population was required by the Government to destroy part of its cattle wealth because of the fact that the pasture land was overgrazed. Meanwhile down the road a white farmer was burning off his surplus grazing land! Need one look more deeply for one basic cause of discontent?

UNEQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

Let us look at education. Southern Rhodesia spends roughly equal amounts on the education of white children and of African children, although the latter greatly outnumber the former. Upper secondary and college education is available to more whites than Africans. Although it is true that a higher proportion of Africans receives education in Southern Rhodesia than in African-ruled countries, the fact remains that relatively few Rhodesian Africans are permitted the facilities to complete the highest secondary grade or to go to college. They are trained for a place in society determined by the ruling minority, not by themselves. A few statistics will reveal the disparity: In 1965 there were 638,000 African children and 32,000 white children in primary school. In the same year there were some 15,000 African children and 20,000 white children in secondary schools. Thus only 2⅓ percent of the African children continue from elementary to secondary school as compared with 62½ percent of whate children. Nor do these figures really tell the whole story since many additional white children receive their secondary education at boarding schools outside the country.

These circumscribed educational opportunities have an obvious relationship to political expression in a country in which the franchise is severely limited on the basis of property, wages and educational qualifications laid down by the white minority.

Even before the illegal declaration of independence, the direction of the Rhodesian governments had become increasingly repressive and racially motivated. Each succeeding government has moved further to the right. Prime Minister Garfield Todd was removed by the minority-dominated electorate because he favored the liberalization of the African franchise. His successor, Sir Edgar Whitehead, was considered too liberal because he favored some modification of the Land Apportionment Act to benefit the African, even though he had also introduced the Preventive Detention Bill to curb African political expression. He was succeeded as Prime Minister by Winston Field, the head of the new Rhodesian Front. And Field, in turn, was replaced by Ian Smith. And now reports are current that some elements in the Rhodesian Front consider Smith as too soft on African advancement. Must this trend continue and where will it end?

VOICE OF REASON SILENCED

The Rhodesian regime is at pains to present the image of a successful rebellion by a united people. And yet not even its geographically and philosophically closest neighbors have recognized it. Within the country, 3,000 white Rhodesians recently took their courage in their hands to sign the book of the Governor, who still represents the Crown, as an apparent gesture of displeasure that the regime failed to reach agreement during the "Tiger" negotiations. There is also evidence that the business community would prefer to negotiate a settlement and end this anomalous situation. But despite these and other encouraging signs, it would be premature in the superheated and controlled atmosphere of Salisbury to conclude that the voices of reason and moderation can yet give effective expression to their doubts—much less their dissent. On the contrary, there are elements on the right who are demanding an even more extreme course. In accusing the present illegal Smith regime of moderation, a recent Rhodesian Front party document asks rhetorically:

"Where in the Party Principles is it stated that we, the Rhodesian Front, favor a multiracial society or even a multi-racial state?

"Where in the Party Principles is it stated that we accept 'majority rule'?

"Where is it stated that we accept full integration?"

Thus, the present leaders of the white minority have embarked on a course which increasingly leads them to separate themselves from the majority of the people in their own country and to isolate themselves from the world community of nations. One seeks in vain some principle that would justify such a course of action. Whatever the deficiencies of the policy of "partnership" pursued by the predecessors of the Rhodesian Front, there was at least the possibility of a continuing dialogue and the prospect for conciliation among the races and orderly progress toward majority rule. All the evidence indicates that the dialogue has been broken off and that there has been an increasing polarization of political life. There is a growth of suspicion, which inhibits even whites from expressing any doubts. For more than a year, there has been censorship of the newspapers and of mail of anyone considered unsympathetic to the Smith regime. Smith himself has said that he will lift censorship only if "satisfactory alternatives to safeguard our national security can be devised." Under the Emergency Powers Act, the Rhodesian Front regime has established regulations which provide for "the summary arrest or detention of any person whose arrest or detention appears to the Minister (of Law and Order) to be expedient in the public interest." Detainees are placed in distant camps, without trial or hearing. The effect is to develop a closed society, which feeds on myths and rumors and maintains an unnatural stability enforced by police control. These repressive measures have their effect not only on the African but also on the white community. As long as these circumstances prevail, there is little prospect of an accommodation between the races.

VULNERABILITY OF REGIME

The regime itself is apparently aware of its vulnerability to charges of repression of the African majority and has been at pains to enlist the support of the African chiefs. But there is serious question as to the representative character of a group that is paid by the regime and is part of its administrative arm at the same time that the leaders of the African political parties remain under detention.

Rhodesian Front spokesmen have at times indicated that they favor majority rule ultimately. If they really accepted this premise, within a reasonable timespan, it should be possible to reach a satisfactory resolution of the Rhodesian problem. But hear what Ian Smith himself had to say when he was questioned in an interview in "Newsweek" of December 19, 1966:

"Q. Are you an adovate of eventual majority rule in this country?

"A. No, I cannot in all honesty claim that I am an advocate of majority rule. When one sees the evidence of Africa to the north of us, this is the last thing I would advocate—in fact quite the reverse. But I am a realist. I accept that our present constitution, whether I advocate it or not, is one that was planned for majority rule. . . ."

"Q. How long do you think majority rule might take?

"A. This I find very difficult to try and predict. I have heard predictions that have varied from five to 50 or even 75 years. . . ."

All of the evidence suggests that Smith's "realism" would place him with those who favor the long term, the very long term, rather than the short term of expectations.

The Rhodesian Front viewpoint is clearly reflected in a South African article, quoted approvingly in the January 13, 1967 issue of "Rhodesian Commentary", published by the Rhodesian Ministry of Information, which states, "Democracy, in the popular sense that Jack is as good as his masters, is not the divinely ordained method of government. It is not a method at all".

Here you have the true feelings of the Rhodesian leaders. If they resist meaningful progress toward democracy and majority rule, what do they envisage—the eternal rule of a minority whose only distinction is their color?

There is abundant evidence that the policy of the Smith regime is pushing it increasingly in a racial direction. There is less talk of a multi-racial society or pretensions of partnership. There have been intimations of the acceptance by the white community of apartheid. In a recent speech, Ian Smith stated, "I believe that ideal after which we are striving is a system which acknowledges our different communities and provides safeguards which will enable the different communities to live according to their own wishes and with adequate protection for their rights and freedoms". We wonder if the white community understands the implications of this position and where this road will lead them.

The Smith regime has attempted to enlist sympathy and support by proclaiming itself the defender of Western civilization and a bulwark against communism. But a system whose purpose is to exclude majority rule is a mockery of accepted Western principles and a travesty of an effective defense against communism.

FALSE REASONS FOR POLICE FORCE

Yet one of the most persistent themes of the Rhodesian Front leaders is that they are building a dike against communism and chaos. This becomes a justification for police measures; the use of force; the detentions at Gonakudzingwa and Wha-Wha; and the constricting political and emotional atmosphere. By neutralizing the possibility of a free exchange of views and fruitful negotiations, they have helped to deprive the African nationalists of their options and to create a situation which encourages resort to illegal activity and assistance from foreign, including Communist, sources.

The Rhodesian minority is thus encouraging the very instability it professes to wish to avoid. In the long run it is frustration and loss of hope that creates the climate for Communist influence. It is pertinent to this problem that, despite energetic efforts, the Soviets and Chinese Communists have not succeeded in making any significant inroads against true independence in Africa. But they could succeed if Africans believed that the West would not support legitimate African aspirations for self-determination.

The Rhodesian Front spokesmen assert their right to independence on the basis of self-government, which Southern Rhodesia first acquired in 1923. But they overlook one important fact: that Britain always reserved constitutionally the right to veto any discriminatory legislation directed at the indigenous population, and that Britain never yielded these reserved rights. Britain was the ultimate sovereign authority and when Rhodesia adopted the Unilateral Declaration of Independence, the powers of government over Rhodesia reverted to the British. The white Rhodesians have always had the option of fruitful collaboration with the Africans and the support of Britain but instead they have progressively resorted to a policy of repression, the dissolution of African nationalist parties, the detention of their leaders, the expulsion of religious figures and university professors, the suppression of newspapers, the censorship of press media, and finally UDI.

AFRICAN RESPONSIBILITIES

In this sad chain of events, one must also consider the question of African responsibility. The leadership of the African community in Rhodesia is deeply divided and even in exile tends to be more concerned with its factional conflicts than with the true needs of the society. It is often maintained that this division in ranks led the nationalists to oppose taking full advantage of the franchise provisions of the 1961 Constitution and that if the African nationalists had been more flexible and statesmanlike, they might have been able, with British support, to achieve a minimal power base which would have hindered the shift of each succeeding government to the right.

There is undoubtedly some validity to these contentions and the Southern Rhodesian Africans might well have been in a better moral position today if they had shown more disposition to cooperate. At the same time, the African nationalist decision to boycott the 1962 elections must be viewed against the pedestrian rate of African advancement until that time, the highly limited franchise provisions of the Constitution of 1961, and the general African suspicion of the chasm between what the minority government professed and the implementation of its professions. Whatever the merits of its past positions, however, the African community of Rhodesia must find means of submerging its differences and of presenting a strong and wise leadership which will cooperate to ensure the interests of the country. We have seen this happen in other countries.

In Kenya, a national leadership has emerged under the guidance of President Jomo Kenyatta which is providing a bond of unity among all segments of the population and uniting them in the spirit of Harrambee, i.e., working together. It is significant, in this connection, that there are now more Western business interests and representatives in Kenya than before independence.

During the period I lived in Southern Rhodesia, I came to know a number of the men now in power, as well as many others who support them. Like all of us, they are conditioned by the environment and we must acknowledge that the environment is almost unique—one of the very few places in the world where an outmoded political structure based on colonial principles of race repression fights to preserve itself even after colonialism has been generally discredited and has all but disappeared. They refuse to come to terms with the realities of twentieth-century social and political change and they have been too isolated to understand this obvious truth. In a very real sense, our policy is designed to bring them into the contemporary world, not remove them from it.

Fundamentally this must mean acceptance of the inevitability of majority rule. There is an honorable place for the white minority in Southern Rhodesia—a place where the white man can live and prosper and contribute to the healthy development of his country. The realization of the rights of the majority, which we accept as a social and political imperative, can certainly be attained without the destruction or deprivation of the minority. The white minorities in Kenya, Tanzania and Zambia have learned this. And it must be emphasized that there are white men of good will in Southern Rhodesia who are aware of the enormous potential of cooperation among the races. Some of them have carried their convictions to the point that they are now in prison along with their African compatriots. There is every valid reason for other white Rhodesians to heed these lessons.

But why do we agree that the UN should press this issue of principle with Southern Rhodesia to a point beyond that we have taken with respect to other places in the world? Why do we assert the universal application of self-determination but not take active measures to give effect to it everywhere? And, further, if we support steps against Southern Rhodesia, won't we have to agree to similar steps in the future when they are proposed to combat denial of self-determination elsewhere?

UNIQUENESS OF THE PROBLEM

The answer to these questions lies in the uniqueness of the Rhodesian problem. We acknowledge this uniqueness and consider that our policy on Southern Rhodesia creates no precedents or obligations with respect to similar measures elsewhere either now or in the future. Southern Rhodesia is a colony in rebellion against the universally acknowledged sovereign, Great Britain. It is not an independent state in whose internal affairs the United Nations is intervening. Furthermore, the sovereign authority, Great Britain, has asked the international community, including the United States, to help it in its task of restoring legitimate, constitutional authority in Southern Rhodesia.

In terms of the UN Charter, Southern Rhodesia is a non-self-governing territory and Great Britain is the administering authority, obligated "to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions".

The illegal regime is obstructing the carrying out of these responsiblities of the administering power in the territory. In no other place in the world that I can think of do these conditions apply. Therefore, the mode of our response to the challenge of illegal independence creates no problem of corollary obligations. We are free to continue our support of self-determination and our opposition to racial discrimination elsewhere in ways appropriate to each different case.

What the British seek and what most of the world would find acceptable in Southern Rhodesia is a settlement that assures an orderly but reasonble transition to majority rule, with minority rights fully protected. The British have never and do not now demand *immediate* majority rule. Neither does the British Commonwealth, the UN, nor the United States. The issue is not independence under minority rule versus immediate majority rule.

Even now, after the present British Government has committed itself not to seek a settlement that involves independence before majority rule, these are not the choices facing Southern Rhodesia. If the white minority were willing to accept what the outside world sees as both right and inevitable, it should be possible to reach a settlement that provides for a restoration of constitutional authority and for a transitional period before legal independence in which African educational opportunities were considerably broadened and African training in government accomplished by actual participation. The alternative to such a settlement, if most of the white minority persists in its efforts to hold back history, is a gradual deterioration of the Rhodesian economy, a continuing and probably increasing net emigration of whites, mounting dissidence and political activism, radicalization of the African approach to the whole problem, facilitation of Communist penetration of the opposition movement, and, eventually, the danger of organized violence on a scale that the present regime will be unable to contain. Not a welcome prospect, but one for which the intransigent white minority in Southern Rhodesia would bear a heavy responsibility.

MOUNTING RACIAL TENSIONS

If the rebel regime leads the Rhodesian people into this tragic morass, more and more of Africa will be affected. Racial tensions will mount, reasoned counsels of restraint on the part of responsible African leaders will spell their political suicide, and proponents of moderation outside Africa will be discredited in the eyes of Africans.

There are sincere and honestly motivated Americans who say that the Rhodesian rebellion is of no concern to this country and that we should not become involved in the international community's efforts to resolve this problem. But we cannot ignore the consequences of inaction. We can—and will—determine the extent of our involvement but we cannot escape our responsibility to act with others on a problem that has engaged the concern of the world. Even if we were not obligated to concern ourselves with these issues by virtue of our responsibility under the UN Charter, we would inevitably be morally involved because of our national traditions and principles.

As we have developed our measured responses to this threat, we have stayed within the confines of what is clearly authorized under American law and the UN Charter. The assertion from some quarters that the Executive Branch of our Government is acting illegally in pursuit of the Government's Rhodesian policy is wholly without foundation. Everything that has and will be done will adhere scrupulously to the letter—as well as the spirit—of the law.

Within this framework, let me summarize:

First, we believe that the efforts of the illegal regime in Southern Rhodesia to perpetuate minority rule contributes to instability in that area. Therefore, we intend to continue to work with the United Kingdom as the administering authority and with the international community in an effort peacefully to restore constitutional authority and thus open the way to an orderly transition to majority rule.

Second, we accept the obligation imposed upon us by the UN Security Council Resolution of December 16 providing for selective mandatory economic sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. We hope that this program of sanctions will convince the illegal regime in Southern Rhodesia that it faces nearly universal opposition and convince it of the wisdom of agreeing to a settlement acceptable to the international community. We hope, too, that all members of the UN will similarly accept their obligation under the Charter to comply with the Security Council resolution.

Third, we continue to recognize the sovereign authority of Great Britain in the British colony of South Rhodesia and, like every other government in the world, we refuse to recognize Rhodesia as an independent state.

Finally, we have adopted this policy toward Southern Rhodesia because it is right in terms of principle, because it strengthens our position in the world and because it helps promote our objectives of stability and orderly development in Africa. Surely a policy that meets these tests is in the national interest of the United States.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include therein extraneous material on the special order today granted the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Friedel (at the request of Mr. Fallon), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. Randall, for March 2, on account of official business in congressional district.

Mr. Hosmer, for March 6, 7, and 8, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Brown of Ohio), for 5 minutes, on March 2.

Mr. Cramer (at the request of Mr. Brown of Ohio), for 30 minutes, on March 2.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Pickle.

Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. Bow.

Mr. Fino.

Mr. Gibbons (at the request of Mr. Brinkley) to include extraneous material in the remarks he made during general debate today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Brown of Ohio) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Kupferman.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Brinkley) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. St. Onge.

Mr. Flood.

Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Reuss in two instances.

Mr. Fraser.

Mr. Perkins.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4573. An act to provide, for the period ending on June 30, 1967, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. **BURLESON**, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4573. An act to provide, for the period ending on June 30, 1967, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. **BRINKLEY**. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 2, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

451. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the fifth semiannual report of actions taken by Federal agencies under the 1964 Amendments to the Alaskan Omnibus Act, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88–451 (H. Doc. No. 69); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

452. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the 11th annual report on the financial condition and results of the operations of the highway trust fund, June 30, 1966, pursuant to section 209(e)(1) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, as amended (23 U.S.C. 120 note) (H. Doc. No. 71); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

453. A letter from the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

454. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, to shorten the name of the Bank, to extend for 5 years the period within which the Bank is authorized to exercise its functions, to increase the Bank's lending authority and its authority to issue, against fractional reserves, export credit insurance and guarantees; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

455. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal language relating to the liability of contractors for the repair of new pavements in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

456. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a register of blind persons in the District of Columbia, to provide for the mandatory reporting of information concerning such persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

457. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

458. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, and the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reduce crime and improve criminal procedures in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

459. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of distribution of Government-donated food commodities in selected counties in Pennsylvania, Consumer and Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

460. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of the sale of federally owned electric power and salt water distillation facilities to the government of the Virgin Islands, Virgin Islands Corporation, Department of the Interior, General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

461. A letter from the Acting Governor of the Canal Zone, Vice President, Panama Canal Company, transmitting a report of disposal of foreign excess property by the Panama Canal Company and Canal Zone Government for the year ended December 31, 1966, pursuant to 63 Stat. 398; to the Committee on Government Operations.

462. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the fifth annual report entitled "Lead and Zinc Mining Stabilization Program," pursuant to section 8 of the act of October 3, 1961; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

463. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend and expand the authorizations for grants for comprehensive health planning and services, to broaden and improve the authorization for research and demonstrations relating to the delivery of health services, to improve the performance of clinical laboratories, and to authorize cooperative activities between the Public Health Service hospitals and community facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

464. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the 32d annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, with notations of subsequent important developments; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

465. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting his third report pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 89–175; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

466. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe safety regulations for the transportation of natural gas by pipeline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

467. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions of certain aliens, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

468. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of that act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

469. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Slator C. Blackiston, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

470. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a copy of cost ascertainment report for fiscal year 1966, pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 2331; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

471. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a fire research and safety program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

472. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 6339. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the transfer of tobacco acreage allotments and acreage-poundage quotas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 6340. A bill to exclude certain State employees from the application of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 6341. A bill to provide for a more effective and equitable draft system by amending the Universal Military Training and Service Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 6342. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 6343. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, so as to make its provisions applicable to agriculture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6344. A bill to provide for the establishment of a council to be known as the National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6345. A bill to repeal the coolie trade laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6346. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of housing facilities for agricultural workers by permitting the amortization over a 60-month period of the cost, or a portion of the cost, of constructing such housing facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6347. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1948, as amended, relating to the acquisition of property for the Independence National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 6348. A bill to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 6349. A bill to provide assistance to students pursuing programs of higher education in the fields of law enforcement and of correctional treatment of law violators; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 6350. A bill to provide that certain aircraft may travel between the United

States, Canada, and Mexico without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 6351. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide that the entire cost of health benefits under such act shall be paid by the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 6352. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exclude from that act's minimum wage coverage persons employed in agriculture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6353. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include prescribed drugs among the items and services covered under the supplementary medical insurance program for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 6354. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to protect the constitutional rights of mentally incompetent persons committed thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 6355. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that employers having pension plans under which payments are correlated with social security benefits shall be subject to an additional tax in cases where increases in such benefits result in a reduction in their own contributions under such plans and are not passed on to their retired employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 6356. A bill to designate Columbus Day, the 12th day of October in each year, a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 6357. A bill to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housng practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 6358. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 6359. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 6360. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other educational expenses paid by him, whether for his own education or for the education of his spouse or a dependent or any other individual; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H.R. 6361. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 6362. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6363. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to the determination of average pay for retirement purposes and the computation of retirement annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6364. A bill to require mailing list brokers to register with the Postmaster General, and suppliers and buyers of mailing lists to furnish information to the Postmaster General with respect to their identity and transactions involving the sale or exchange of mailing lists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6365. A bill to specify the number of hospital beds that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs must maintain and operate at the veterans' hospital, East Orange, N.J.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6366. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for optometrists' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6367. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include drugs requiring a doctor's prescription among the medical expenses with respect to which payment may be made under the voluntary program of supplemental medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6368. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of facilities to control water and air pollution by allowing a tax credit for expenditures incurred in constructing such facilities and by permitting the deduction, or amortization over a period of 1 to 5 years of such expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6369. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6370. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit, in certain additional cases, the use of social security records to aid in locating runaway parents who are failing to comply with court orders for the support of their children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 6371. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6372. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 6373. A bill to reserve certain lands along a segment of the Wolf River, Wis., for designation as a scenic river area in the national scenic rivers system, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 6374. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase the rates of pension payable to certain veterans and their widows, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts:

H.R. 6375. A bill to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 6376. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6377. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act so as to extend and improve the Federal-State program of child welfare services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 6378. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to revise the rates of postage on third-class mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 6379. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 6380. A bill to amend titles 10, 14, 32, and 37, United States Code, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6381. A bill to improve the safety of railroad transportation under the jurisdiction of the Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia:

H.R. 6382. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the transfer of tobacco acreage allotments and acreage-poundage quotas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6383. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the transfer of peanut acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 6384. A bill to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit employer contributions for joint industry promotion of products in certain instances or a joint committee or joint board empowered to interpret provisions of collective bargaining agreements; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 6385. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H.R. 6386. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to the admissibility in evidence of confessions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6387. A bill to amend chapter 73, title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the obstruction of criminal investigations of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6388. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 6389. A bill to prohibit arbitrary discrimination in employment on account of age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 6390. A bill to protect the civilian employees of the executive branch of the U.S. Government in the enjoyment of their constitutional rights and to prevent unwarranted governmental invasions of their privacy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 6391. A bill to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned long-lines communication facilities in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 6392. A bill to assist State and local governments in reducing the incidence of crime, to increase the effectiveness, fairness, and coordination of law enforcement and criminal justice systems at all levels of government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6393. A bill to assist in combating crime by creating the U.S. Corrections Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6394. A bill to protect the right of privacy by prohibiting wire interception and eavesdropping, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 6395. A bill to provide for expansion of the national cemetery system and to insure burials therein for veterans of the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 6396. A bill to provide for expansion of the national cemetery system and to insure burials therein for veterans of the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 6397. A bill to modify the existing project, Salem Church Reservoir, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 6398. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for surviving spouses without deduction from original annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 6399. A bill to provide for the temporary suspension of duty on stoppers of cork suitable for wine bottles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 6400. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to the admissibility in evidence of confessions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6401. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 6402. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6403. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6404. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 6405. A bill to amend section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6406. A bill to establish a Federal sabbatical program to improve the quality of teaching in the Nation's elementary or secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6407. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WATKINS:

H.R. 6408. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 6409. A bill to provide for a more effective and equitable draft system by amending the Universal Military Training and Service Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 6410. A bill relating to replacement property for certain real property acquired in federally assisted programs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 6411. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 6412. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Alcoholism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.R. 6413. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax credit for tuition expenses of the taxpayer or his spouse or a dependent at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6414. A bill to repeal the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 6415. A bill to repeal the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 6416. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6417. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing job training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 6418. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend and expand the authorizations for grants for comprehensive health planning and services, to broaden and improve the authorization for research and demonstrations relating to the delivery of health services, to improve the performance of clinical laboratories, and to authorize cooperative activities between the Public Health Service hospitals and community facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6419. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to permit the mailing, without cost to the sender, of first-class letter mail to Armed Forces personnel in overseas combat areas designated by the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 6420. A bill to amend title 37 of the United States Code to provide that a family separation allowance shall be paid to any member of a uniformed service assigned to Government quarters providing he is otherwise entitled to such separation allowance; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 6421. A bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act to increase the protection afforded consumers against injurious flammable fabrics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARMATZ (by request):

H.R. 6422. A bill to amend section 805(c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to salaries for personal services paid to a director, officer or employee; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 6423. A bill to establish a pilot program under which the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall direct housing loans available to certain veterans residing abroad; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 6424. A bill to establish the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Historic Site in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 6425. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction in disability insurance benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 6426. A bill to increase the maximum amount of public land which the Secretary of the Interior may sell to a religious or fraternal association for cemetery purposes from 80 acres to 160 acres; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 6427. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide a priority in the allocation of funds thereunder to those cities which will permit senior citizens to use the facilities involved at specially reduced fares during nonrush hours; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 6428. A bill to eliminate the requirement that the Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against Federal Reserve notes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 6429. A bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1967 for use by the Secretary of Defense for acquisition of properties pursuant to section 1013 of Public Law 89–754, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 6430. A bill to amend the public health laws relating to mental retardation to extend, expand, and improve them, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6431. A bill to amend the public health laws relating to mental health to extend, expand, and improve them, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr MIZE:

H.R. 6432. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Great Plains Parkway; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 6433. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Great Plains Parkway; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 6434. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Great Plains Parkway; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 6435. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Great Plains Parkway; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 6436. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Great Plains Parkway; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 6437. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to permit advance payments to wheat producers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 6438. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to permit advance payments to wheat producers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KLEPPE:

H.R. 6439. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to permit advance payments to wheat producers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 6440. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to permit advance payments to wheat producers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H.J. Res. 367. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim April 9, 1967, as Bataan-Corregidor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.J. Res. 368. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 369. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim April 9, 1967, as Bataan-Corregidor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.J. Res. 370. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.J. Res. 371. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $250,000; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.J. Res. 372. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 373. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee to Investigate Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.J. Res. 374. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.J. Res. 375. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the right to vote of citizens who have attained the age of 18 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.J. Res. 376. Joint resolution concerning a national education policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.J. Res. 377. Joint resolution providing that an environmental health center that may hereafter be established in the Public Health Service shall be known as Rachel Carson Memorial Research Center for Environmental Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.J. Res. 378. Joint resolution to provide stricter control over expenditures by Members of Congress traveling outside the United States, to promote ethical standards of conduct among Members of Congress, and to prohibit nepotism in Government employment; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.J. Res. 379. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H. Res. 348. Resolution to extend the congratulations of the House of Representatives to the people of Puerto Rico on their 50th anniversary of U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H. Res. 349. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H. Res. 350. Resolution relating to nonproliferation of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H. Res. 351. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TAFT:

H. Res. 352. Resolution that there is hereby established a Select Committee on Standards; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H. Res. 353. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Res. 354. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the first session of the 90th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

39. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the Smith-Hughes Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

40. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to the cutback of Federal highway funds to the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

41. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the elimination of trade barriers by the several States of the Union against California wines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

42. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to enacting legislation to prohibit the use of the mails to advertise, sell, and deliver master keys and master key sets; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 6441. A bill for the relief of Antonio Ng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6442. A bill for the relief of Liley Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 6443. A bill for the relief of Luisa M. Enriquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6444. A bill for the relief of Mary Warnick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 6445. A bill for the relief of Dino J. Caterini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6446. A bill for the relief of Robert M. Gilkey, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 6447. A bill for the relief of Elisabeth Emilie Muckerman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 6448. A bill for the relief of Richard K. Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6449. A bill for the relief of Dr. Orlando O. Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 6450. A bill for the relief of Pericles Peponias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6451. A bill for the relief of Angela Vendetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 6452. A bill for the relief of John E. Coplin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 6453. A bill for the relief of Gene R. Hugh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 6454. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Gambino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6455. A bill for the relief of Miss Rosalia Elvira Sparacino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 6456. A bill for the relief of Arie Eliazarov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 6457. A bill for the relief of Alejandro Debeljkovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 6458. A bill for the relief of Yoshiko Ishizawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6459. A bill for the relief of Mordechai Zvy Lapidot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 6460. A bill for the relief of Nick Karagianis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 6461. A bill for the relief of Mostafa Mirhashemi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 6462. A bill granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to render judgment on certain claims of the Algonac Manufacturing Co. and John A. Maxwell against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 6463. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zofia Michalczyk-Ligeza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONAN:

H.R. 6464. A bill for the relief of Catherine Balbinis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 6465. A bill for the relief of Trinidad Laceras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 6466. A bill for the relief of Eliezer Beitelman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 6467. A bill for the relief of Cecilia Chen Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 6468. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Jorge Rocha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 6469. A bill for the relief of Farida Hanna Hazbon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

38. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Ohio Bell, Chicago, Ill., relative to birthrights under the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

39. Also, petition of Christian Action Commission, Reformed Church in America, Clifton, N.J., relative to the citizens of the 18th Congressional District of New York not having representation; to the Committee on House Administration.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman Urges That Countryside Beauty and Tranquillity Also Be the Objective of Urban America so as To Correct Environmental Imbalance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 1, 1967

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was my privilege to have participated with Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman in a portion of the Nation's Cleanest Town Achievement Conference, February 21, 1967, in our National Capital City.

It was a gratifying experience, not only because my home city, Elkins, W. Va., was an award winner but also because Secretary Freeman delivered an informative and thought-provoking address. I hope Senators will distribute his address to thousands of citizens because it is a challenging approach to a vital problem.

As he has done so well on other occasions, our dedicated Secretary of Agriculture spoke of "the urgent need to slow the exodus of people from the countryside to the cities." He observed cogently that—

> If we can stem that tide, we can give our crowded cities a little breathing room . . . and the lead time they need to assess where they are and where they want to go in the years ahead. The only way to stem that tide is to build opportunity into the countryside . . . for that is the only way we can hold people there.

Mr. President, three additional paragraphs of Secretary Freeman's speech are especially worthy of being underscored; namely:

> There no longer remains a compelling reason why business and industry—and jobs—cannot be distributed equitably throughout America. And this one action alone—if enacted in substantial enough measure—would do a great deal to restore biological and esthetic balance to this nation.
>
> Instead of building industry where people are—without considering whether they want to be there or even if it is good that so many of them are there—we must start to build industry and provide jobs where more people want to be . . . where more people ought to be.
>
> There *is* beauty in the countryside. There is tranquillity there. But there can *also* be beauty and tranquillity in urban America—as you people have proved (in making this Cleanest Town Achievement Conference possible). We *must* and *can* have both.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, from which I have quoted in part.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN AT THE NATION'S CLEANEST TOWN ACHIEVEMENT CONFERENCE AT THE STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 21, 1967.

The other day I saw a bumper sticker on a passing car.

It read:

"Help beautify your local dump. Throw something lovely away today."

Now far from being offended by this cavalier comment on a subject as important as beautification, I was encouraged. Let me tell you why.

Bumper stickers, sloganeering buttons, and graffiti—those frequently witty and sometimes profound observations on human foibles and the vicissitudes of life we find scribbled on fences, the sides of buildings and restroom walls—are as "in" as "in" can be these days.

The name of the game is intellectual one-upmanship. Design a sticker or a button or concoct a graffito that challenges the reader to look beyond the obvious to the whimsical, the ironic, or the ridiculous . . . and you've scored.

The key to scoring is contemporary perceptiveness. You've simply got to know what's going on in the world to play the game.

That's why I found that particular bumper sticker encouraging. Its designer knew that beautification was becoming a big thing. If it wasn't, there was no point in spoofing it.

I'll return to this point, but now let me consider beautification—and the urgent need for it—in a more serious vein.

Today we hear much about the hostility between man and his environment. We hear that there is a basic antipathy between the nature of man and what he has fashioned for his domain. We hear that modern man is living in violation of biological law . . . and that this unnatural existence is taking its toll in bleakness of spirit and mental disease.

Moreover, at last week's international seminar on "The Quality of Man's Environment"—sponsored by the Smithsonian Institution here in Washington—speaker after speaker noted that man seems to have lost the ability to launch coordinated attacks, governed by some overriding common ideal, on all aspects of his environment.

When did it come about—this hostility between man and his world?

Some say within the last generation.

In 1910, most Americans still lived in the countryside. The 2,300 towns in existence then had average populations of less than 10,000, and were separated from one another by miles of open land and virgin forest. Whatever the hardships in those days—and they were considerable—there was also the environmental compensation of abundant natural beauty.

But by 1960, most Americans lived in 6,000 urban concentrations. Twenty-five of these had populations of more than 500,000 . . . and were spreading into one another.

Space photographs discern what appear to be single cities stretching 500 miles from Chicago to Buffalo . . . or 800 miles from Richmond to Bangor.

Today, 35,000,000 Americans are jammed into a narrow strip of Eastern Seaboard running from Washington, D.C., to Boston, Massachusetts.

Thirty-five million Americans trying to live . . . and trying to find the open, green space they instinctively crave to right the violation of biological law and restore some balance of order, beauty and tranquillity to their environment.

Each year another 3 million Americans pour into the biggest cities. And with each incoming wave of humanity, a million more acres of fields, woods and hills near urban centers are inundated by asphalt, concrete, shopping centers, and housing developments.

And while the surburbs too often are sprawling without grace, rhyme or reason, the inner cities too often are rotting with decay.

Billboards, garish neon signs, undisguised trash depots, rundown housing, parking lots instead of parks, waterfronts cluttered and defaced with concrete plants, railroad spurs and elevated express-ways . . . these are the sights too many harried city workers see as they go to work and return home in bumper to bumper traffic.

They breathe—not fresh air—but noxious fumes. They hear—not the meadowlark—but the cacophony of auto horns. They see—not vistas of natural beauty—but skylines of ugliness.

Where—in all this—is man to find relief and solitude and that communion with the esthetic that will ease the hostility between him and his environment?

Happily, the outlook is not as bleak as it once appeared. We have it within our power to change all of this . . . if we have the will to do it. The cities represented here today have demonstrated that determination.

Millions of Americans have demonstrated the same determination over the many years since the Cleanest Towns contest was instituted by the National Clean Up—Paint Up—Fix Up Bureau way back in 1912. This year 50 million people in 233 cities and towns pitched in to clean up and beautify their communities . . . and entries in the 1966 contest were 50 percent greater than they were the year before.

Had it not been for the inspiration of the Clean Up—Paint Up—Fix Up Bureau—and the response by cities such as yours, the face of today's America would be even less attractive than it is. I'm confident that these efforts will continue to make an even greater contribution to beautifying America in the years ahead.

Efforts to improve the current environment of the city will always be a major tool in reducing environmental hostility. But there are two other tools important to our future environment that I would like to discuss with you today.

First, we must rebuild many of our older cities . . . and build new ones.

Charles Burchard, the dean of Virginia Polytechnic's Institute of Architecture, recently noted that we're going to have to build a second America to house the doubled population we expect by the year 2000.

In effect, he said, we are going to have to duplicate every single structure in the United States today.

"But," he pointed out, "this doesn't mean we're going to do it right. We do have a choice, *but the general population has never been asked to make such choices before.*

"In past ages," he said, "the church, the pharaoh, the king, the noble, and the very wealthy made the environmental decisions for their communities. Now it's up to us, and there's no reason why our government—for which we pay and to which we elect representatives—should not share in this effort . . . as there is every indication they now will. Our government programs for community improvement, however, will be merely tools for local use. The basic decisions must remain ours."

Dean Burchard then pointed out that several hundred communities already are in the process of planned change.

"The pattern seems to be working out this way," he said. "The central area of downtown will have relatively fewer uses than it once had. Manufacturing, warehousing, and distribution will continue to disappear from the central city. They will be replaced by various forms of housing, and by administrative offices, businesses, hotels, theatres, and shopping. The central city will be served by loop highways which tend to delineate it."

He envisions future cities built to esthetic as well as practical demands . . . cities where through traffic will be routed around or even under the densely populated areas . . . where the cars which must come into the center are parked underground or in landscaped lots whose terrain and foliage screen them from view . . . where eyepleasing buildings are set off from one another by parks and pools and trees and flowers and shrubs.

I believe we can have more and more such cities—*if we want them badly enough to do what has to be done to get them.*

And this group—this organization—these contest participants have the knowledge and experience to take the leadership in this effort.

There is also a third tool to use in reducing the hostility between Americans and their environment, but the use of this tool may require a 180-degree turnabout in our conventional thinking.

Up to very recently, one of the obvious recourses to solving the problem of cities with too little space for too many people has been ignored or overlooked.

I speak now of the urgent need to slow the exodus of people from the countryside to the cities. If we can stem that tide, we can give our crowded cities a little breathing room . . . and the lead time they need to assess where they are and where they want to go in the years ahead.

The only way to stem that tide is to build opportunity into the countryside . . . for that is the only way we can hold people there.

There no longer remains a compelling reason why business and industry—and jobs—cannot be distributed equitably throughout America. And this one action alone—if enacted in substantial enough measure—would do a great deal to restore biological and esthetic balance to this nation.

Instead of building industry where people are—without considering whether they want to be there or even if it is good that so many of them are there—we must start to build industry and provide jobs *where more people want to be . . . where more people ought to be.*

There *is* beauty in the countryside. There is tranquillity there. But there can also be beauty and tranquillity in urban America—as you people have proved. We *must* and *can* have both.

Fortunately, we have *more* than hope that tomorrow's America can be a more orderly, tranquil and beautiful America. We have the beginnings of policy, programs and guidelines to do what must be done.

The Johnson Administration clearly perceives the urgent need to redesign man's environment to eliminate its hostile aspects.

The Demonstration Cities program, for instance, will spur the rebuilding of the cores of certain major cities.

Rural development programs have been launched to save and enhance rural resources and rural beauty . . . and to bring parity of opportunity to the countryside.

Department of Agriculture agencies are in the vanguard of this effort. Our soil conservationists work with housing developers to protect and enhance the beauty of areas being developed. REA has developed materials, equipment and system designs which lowered the cost of putting telephone wires underground . . . rather than stringing them along unsightly poles. Agricultural researchers have developed new eye-pleasing plants. Other agencies are participating in cost shared projects to develop new vistas of green space and beauty . . . are working to end pollution of lakes and streams . . . and are improving and protecting our national forests. And still others are working to develop all the resources of rural America to make it more attractive to industry . . . and to the people we must hold there.

The President and the First Lady are leading the campaign to beautify all of America . . . and that campaign is making real headway. We need no more proof of this than the greatly increased participation in this year's Cleanest Towns contest.

And here is another significant development—the gearing up of the professions involved in environmental design and redesign to face the challenges of the future . . . and the way colleges and universities are upgrading curricula and redirecting emphases to focus upon what must be done with the made environment in the years ahead.

But most important—and encouraging—is the fact that rank and file Americans across this land have become aware of our nation's biological imbalance and esthetic shortcomings . . . and are doing something about it.

This is why I was encouraged by the bumper sticker I mentioned in my opening remarks. It proved to me that Americans *are* aware.

"With the support and the understanding of the American citizenry," Dean Burchard said, "we can now create an environment sufficiently varied and related in its parts to the human scale . . . where the cultivation of mind, body and spirit is possible once again . . . and in which we will be able to live in harmony with biological law."

Led by you, that support . . . that understanding is growing with each passing day.

McCarthy Urges Reduction of Voting Age to 18

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I am, today, introducing a bill to reduce the national minimum voting age to 18. I strongly urge passage of this bill in the light of the mature contributions being made by our 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old citizens. I feel that the practice of making our younger citizens wait until they are 21 to vote has become obsolete.

In proposing this bill—which would require an amendment to the U.S. Constitution—I am supporting House Joint Resolutions 18 and 56, introduced by Representatives JAMES J. HOWARD and KEN HECHLER.

I know that a reduction in the voting age has long been a point of discussion in this country. I recall debating the issue when still a high school student in Buffalo, N.Y.

But now, more than ever before, I feel the voting age should be lowered: Our 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds are better educated than any citizens of their age have ever been before. History and social studies courses offered in high schools today are finer and have deeper scope than ever before, and youths graduating from high school possess a strong knowledge of political and historical affairs. They deserve the right to vote.

They deserve the right to vote because they are fully and newly equipped to do so—and it is my feeling that their interest may wane during the 3-year wait to do so. The privilege of being able to put to use the tools they have gained in high school will never be as strong to youths as it is at age 18.

In addition, we know that 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old citizens are often required to fight for their country. They may hold full-time, responsible jobs and pay full taxes.

They are allowed to marry without parental consent in most States. They raise families, make wills, and own property. They are allowed to drive and to drink in most States just as persons 21 and over are. They serve their country in the Peace Corps. They are given adult sentences if they are convicted of a crime.

The States of Georgia and Kentucky already allow voting at the age of 18. Alsaka does so at 19, and Hawaii at 20.

I think the time is overripe for instituting a uniform voting age of 18 for all 50 States.

Crime in the Nation's Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1967

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the program President Johnson sent to us this week to deal with the problems of crime in the District of Columbia is a basically sound approach to the matter. The problem is one which has been growing rapidly in the District in the last few years, and the time has come to do something about it. I believe the administration's program, if implemented, would do a great deal about it.

I am especially impressed with the firearms portion of the program. The statistics on deaths and assaults resulting from the use of firearms in the District are appalling. The notion that pistols should be readily available to alcoholics and mental defectives is difficult to comprehend. I urge my fellow Congressmen to give especially careful consideration to the proposed firearms legislation. We must come up with an answer that will allow protection to individual rights but not allow wholesale availability of weapons to undesirable individuals.

The other elements of the program—dealing with such important subjects as insanity defenses, arrests without a warrant and obstruction of investigations—are all desirable. In each of these areas, the police of the District and the two prosecutorial agencies have been hamstrung by defects in existing law. In each of these areas, the proposals submitted by the President would go far to eliminate these defects.

There must, of course, be many other defects in the law of the District as it relates to the criminal process. And the President's program offers something to take care of them, too. It would establish a Commission to study the District of Columbia Criminal Code and to make recommendations for improvement.

All in all, I believe this to be a sensible and desirable program.

The 49th Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1967

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1967, the 49th anniversary of Lithuanian independence was observed and it will be recalled that many Members of this body participated in the program held here to mark that historic occasion. In further recognition of that event, I submit for the RECORD the translated excerpts from a speech in Lithuanian delivered by the Honorable Joseph Kajeckas, Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of the Legation of Lithuania here in Washington, at a meeting of the American Lithuanian Society in Washington on February 12, 1967, together with a letter to Mr. Kajeckas from Secretary of State Dean Rusk and a copy of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence.

The excerpts follow:

THE 49TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Today we celebrate the anniversary of the joyous day when the Lithuanian nation achieved free and independent national life in modern times. On this day 49 years ago, Lithuania, after scores of years of hardship and foreign oppression, broke the shackles of its slavery. February 16, 1918 is the day of the Lithuanian state's resurrection. It is important for us today to celebrate and commemorate that day when Lithuania's independence was declared, especially because today the Soviet occupants of our Lithuanian homeland employ every means to belittle the achievements of Lithuania's free and independent existence in this century, and to suppress our countrymen's aspirations to regain Lithuania's rightful freedom and territorial sovereignty.

The February 16 Declaration of Independence succinctly expressed the will of all Lithuanian people to lead their own independent national existence. That Declaration insistently affirmed our people's determination to govern themselves according to the principles of a free and democratic state.

Our nation's revival, however, took place against very uneven odds. From the beginning, the Kremlin attempted to retain Russian control of Lithuania by force. Three Red Army divisions were sent to suppress Lithuania's fledgling hold on freedom. But this particular attempt of the Soviets failed because they were counting on their own might and overlooking the concerted determination of the Lithuanian people. The Lithuanian volunteer army forced the invaders back at the end of 1919. The Soviets also failed to retain control of Lithuania's sister Baltic states, Estonia and Latvia. As an aftermath of this overt colonialistic attempt, the Kremlin signed a Peace Treaty in 1920 with Lithuania. In that treaty, Russia recognized "without any reservation the sovereignty and independence of the state of Lithuania, with all juridical consequences resulting from such recognition, and voluntarily and forever renounce[d] all sovereign rights . . . over the Lithuanian people and territory." A further provision of that Peace Treaty was that neither signatory would allow its territory to be used by any state, organization or group for the purpose of militarily threatening the other party.

Then, in 1926, a Treaty of Non-aggression was signed whereby the two countries reiterated the provisions of the Peace Treaty and explicitly agreed "to respect their respective sovereignty and also their integrity and territorial inviolability." By this Treaty each country also pledged to refrain from any act of aggression towards the other.

All of these solemn and binding international agreements were systematically broken by the Soviet Union. They allowed their territory to be the site of the organization of the so-called Lithuanian Communist Party, which was to be the vehicle of military intervention in Lithuania. Later, the Kremlin contracted a secret agreement with Hitler's Reich for the purpose of dividing Lithuania between them. Finally, and with not a little irony, the very People's Diet organized by Moscow in Lithuania for the purpose of spuriously dissolving Lithuanian liberty, in its supposed petition to join the Soviet Union, affirmed the overt nature of the Soviet aggression against Lithuania. According to that Diet, "Now the people, helped by the mighty Red Army . . . have established in their country the Soviet government."

It was a curious reminder of the Kremlin's double standards when, several days ago, the Kremlin guest in London expressed concern over the revival of fascist influences in Western Germany, and complained that to tolerate such a revival was a violation of the Potsdam agreement. The Soviet leader's outrage will take on a more credible ring on the day when he expresses similar unhappiness about the fascist pact of 1939 between Molotov and Ribbentrop, whereby Lithuania became a pawn in a secret chess game between Hitler and Stalin.

How much more honorably did Lord Halifax act in December of 1939 when he said in the House of Lords that in the dealings of Great Britain with the Soviet Union "we had always maintained the position that rights of third parties must remain intact and be unaffected by our negotiations. . . . The people of this country would prefer to face difficulties and embarrassment rather than feel that we had compromised the honour of this country and the Commonwealth on such issues."

In the light of the facts I have mentioned, nobody would believe today that the Soviet system was established by the desire of the Lithuanian people. The Soviet presence in Lithuania is a clear and odious act of aggression. There has never yet been born a country which of its own free will would exchange freedom for slavery, death, deportation, suffering, exploitation, thought and word control, totalitarian suppression, torture and genocide.

By remembering these few facts about the continuing Soviet aggression against Lithuania, one might well say that the Soviet actions towards Lithuania, ever since the 1918 Declaration of Independence, were all acts of treachery and deceit. But just as that 1918 Declaration was, under the circumstances of the time, a brave and noble act, how much more bravery, how much more determination, how much more dedication is called for in these days of freedom's maximum danger. If the hope of freedom is to survive, either for Lithuania or for any people who cherish freedom, we must answer the call to defend freedom. To answer that call is our duty if we truly claim to be lovers of freedom. As freedom is Lithuania's past, so we must see to it that it will be Lithuania's future.

There were several events during this past year which promise much for Lithuania's future. One of them was the tremendous activity among our free Lithuanian youth—during an officially celebrated Year of Youth—especially as manifested in such events as the highly successful Lithuanian Youth Congress. It was a stirring attestation to the fact that it is not just old men who dream dreams about Lithuania's future; it is the young who have visions as well.

Another significant event of the past year was the very impressive Religious Congress which gathered here in Washington to dedicate a chapel in honor of Our Lady of Siluva. This chapel is a living symbol of the continuing dedication of Lithuanians to their cultural and religious heritage and its preservation.

And as usual, one of the most heartening reasons for Lithuanian hope is the consistent and firm stand of the United States government. America has always firmly refused to recognize the forcible absorption of the Baltic republics, and it has attested to this policy of non-recognition in many and eloquent statements of American Presidents, Secretaries of State, and American legislators. Moreover, the warm encouragement and support of the American people has heartened the Lithuanian people themselves, not only in this country but abroad, to redouble their efforts to hasten the day of regained liberty for Lithuania.

It is a happy coincidence that this 49th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence coincides with the celebration of the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, that towering champion of freedom for all men. It was Abraham Lincoln who said, "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master." He thus brilliantly echoed the American national purpose as it was embodied in America's Declaration of Independence—that all men are created equal, and endowed with such inalienable rights as liberty. It was Abraham Lincoln who said that the American Declaration not only brought freedom to America, but hope to the whole world and to all peoples.

Under the aegis, then, of Abraham Lincoln, who came from small beginnings to human greatness, we pledge ourselves to remain true to the privilege of working for the day when Lithuania, though small, will be a great example of the blessings of freedom within a world community of free nations.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, February 11, 1967.

Mr. JOSEPH KAJECKAS,
Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of the Legation of Lithuania, 2622 16th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES: On the occasion of the forty-ninth anniversary of Lithuania's independence, I extend to you the best wishes of the Government and people of the United States.

United States support of the Lithuanian people's just aspirations for freedom and independence is reflected clearly in our refusal to recognize the forcible incorporation of your country into the Soviet Union and in the warm sympathy manifested by the American people in the Lithuanian cause.

In continuing to look resolutely toward a free and independent existence, the Lithuanian people both here and abroad have established a firm foundation for the hope of free men everywhere that the goal of Lithuanian national self-determination will ultimately be realized.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

The Council of Lithuania, sole representative of the Lithuanian people, in conformity with the recognized right to national self-determination . . . hereby proclaims the restitution of the independent State of Lithuania, founded on democratic principles, with Vilnius as its capital, and declares the severance of all ties which formerly bound this State to other nations.

The Council of Lithuania also declares that the foundation of the Lithuanian State and its relations with other nations will be finally normalized by a Seimas (parliament), elected in a democratic way by the people of Lithuania.

VILNIUS, *February 16, 1918.*

Signed by twenty members of the Council (Taryba).

War in Vietnam: New Policy Approaches Are Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday several other Members of Congress and I issued a statement on Vietnam expressing our opposition to the coming Vietnam authorization bill and appropriation.

The statement includes four proposed initiatives which we believe are realistic and consistent with our national interest.

I include the full text of the statement in the RECORD:

STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

(BY GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., PHILLIP BURTON, JOHN CONYERS, JR., JOHN G. DOW, DON EDWARDS, DONALD M. FRASER, HENRY HELSTOSKI, ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, THOMAS M. REES, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, and WILLIAM F. RYAN)

The coming Vietnam authorization bill and appropriation will be seen by some as a referendum on policy in Vietnam. We believe viewpoints regarding that policy are far too complicated to be represented in any single vote. We do not feel, therefore, that the margin of passage will provide an accurate picture of congressional or national sentiment on the war.

For various reasons, and in varying degrees, we have questioned U.S. policy in Vietnam. We are presently united in the conviction that the strategy of escalation against North Vietnam has produced deepened involvement at higher and more dangerous levels of commitment and brought the war no closer to settlement. At the same time, American diplomacy has appeared to be inflexible and unresponsive to opportunities for negotiations. This is particularly pertinent since prior withdrawal of American troops is apparently no longer insisted upon by Hanoi as a precondition to negotiations.

Secretary McNamara has said, "I don't believe that bombing up to the present has significantly reduced, nor any bombing that I could contemplate in the future would significantly reduce the actual flow of men and material to the South." It is our view, therefore, that the United States can afford to stop the bombing and take that step for peace, particularly in view of representations made throughout the world that such a step may open the way for negotiations.

It has been stated that our goal in Vietnam is a limited one and is not total victory. Yet too many policies and statements leave that intention ambiguous. We do not believe, for example, that the war is a simple case of external aggression. Our policies should take into account the differing interests of the North Vietnamese and National Liberation Front and should give our adversaries reason to believe that their basic interests would be acknowledged in a settlement.

Therefore, to secure peace, we believe the United States must take additional initiatives to reach a political settlement in South Vietnam. Specifically, it must be recognized that the National Liberation Front as one of the principal belligerents in the war, is a necessary party to peace negotiations.

We thus propose the following four initiatives:

1. The U.S. should cease bombing North Vietnam immediately and without preconditions.
2. The U.S. must support truly free elections in South Vietnam. We must be prepared to accept whatever role for the National Liberation Front results from such elections.
3. The U.S. should propose to the North Vietnamese government, the South Vietnamese government, and the National Liberation Front four-party negotiations to secure a cease-fire in Vietnam.
4. The U.S. should seek appropriate sponsorship of an international conference to guarantee agreements reached by the belligerents.

We believe these recommended initiatives are realistic and consistent with our national interest.

We believe the nation as a whole is restless and confused by events in Vietnam. There is continually growing evidence of alienation and discontent. And the country's general support for our present course, in our view, is based less on convictions regarding policy than respect for Presidential leadership.

The war in Vietnam has raised profound questions regarding the direction and machinery of American diplomacy. An enormous commitment was allowed to develop gradually and with inadequate reflection and debate. Bureaucratic investment in that commitment has interfered with its review and reform. And beneath all this is the risk that reflex interventionism may become the normal American response to disorder in the third world.

Meanwhile, the war has had serious if subtle consequences in this country. The impulse of the New Frontier and Great Society has deadened. Public interest in social reform has lapsed. Disorder and distrust are all too prevalent. We are, in short, at a somber period in a decade that opened bright with promise.

The goal of peace will require this country to display a sense of priorities, an awareness of capacities, and an overriding commitment to relieve swiftly the terrible suffering of the Vietnamese people, and those Americans serving in Vietnam.

Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1967

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, for the fourth time, the Constitution Day Committee of Louisville, Ohio, has been awarded the George Washington Medal of Honor by the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., for its outstanding work in calling attention to this important anniversary.

The celebration of Constitution Day in Ohio began in Louisville in 1952 and the town was designated "Constitution City" by the Ohio Legislature in 1953. Parades, a banquet and a patriotic oration are features of the annual event. Mrs. Olga T. Weber has been a leader in this program throughout the years, ably assisted by the 1966 program chairman, Mrs. Merriott Whitmer. It is gratifying to know that the Freedoms Foundation has again recognized the excellence of the program and the leadership of the people of Louisville, Ohio.

NLRB

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1967

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the occasion of the casting of the 25 millionth vote in representation elections conducted by the National Labor Relations Board will be observed in a number of commemorative events to be held here in Washington. One of these will be a luncheon, cohosted by the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations and the Electronics Industries Association, and cosponsored by myself and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, and leading Democratic and Republican members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The commemorative events will begin with a public observance in the Department of Interior Auditorium, at which the NLRB will honor the man who cast the ballot symbolic of the 25 million votes registered in NLRB elections since 1935. He is 39-year-old Leonard P. Scheno, of Carteret, N.J., a maintenance technician in the Reynolds Metals Co. manufacturing plant at Woodbridge, N.J.

The concluding event of the day will be a reception sponsored by the AFL–CIO and the National Association of Manufacturers, to which have been invited leaders of management, labor, universities, and the Government.

As chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, which has the responsibility for developing labor-management relations legislation, in which the National Labor Relations Act plays so significant a part, it is appropriate that I address myself to the observance of what has been referred to as "this milestone in the exercise of industrial democracy."

It is also appropriate that this observance have the sponsorship of representatives of both political parties and of both labor and management. All of us can agree on the wisdom of a congressional policy which provides for employee selection or rejection of a collective bargaining representative by means of a secret ballot. This policy has produced a great degree of management-labor cooperation and significant economic progress.

Many of us can remember the turmoil of the early 1930's when over one-half of the labor disputes—many of which culminated in violent strikes and picketing—involved issues of union recognition and other aspects of the right of workers to organize. In 1937 there were 2,728 strikes for organizing purposes; in 1964 there were only 35. Today the orderly procedures of Board-conducted elections have taken the place of costly and disruptive strikes of yesterday. I am sure that none of us would want to return to those days of industrial warfare.

The Board and its employees should be commended for the manner in which this most important function has been carried out over the past 31 years. In this time, over 200,000 elections have been conducted in units including as few as two employees and as many as in the tens of thousands. The largest election under one roof was held in 1941 at the Ford River Rouge plant for 78,000 eligible employee voters. Sixty polling places were set up and the election was completed in 1 day. During the last fiscal year the Board held 8,324 elections for more than half a million voters with an average participation of 90 percent of those eligible to vote; in the last national election, only 62 percent of those eligible voted.

I will be very happy, Mr. Speaker, to participate in honoring the voter who, symbolically, has cast the 25 millionth vote and to honor the agency which has effectively performed the task of registering and counting those 25 million votes.

Graham Barden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1967

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, Graham Barden, who departed this life only recently, was one of the most courageous and productive members who has served in this body during the past quarter of a century. On many occasions he helped apply the brakes when they needed to be applied. Yet he always moved forward when the Nation's welfare was involved. His legislative record was a most impressive one.

Graham was a gracious, charming southern gentleman. At the same time he was a fighter when the welfare of the country was involved. He was a man of character, who stood and fought on the side of right and progress. Few men in our time have contributed more to the cause of good government.

To the surviving family I extend my deep sympathy in their bereavement.

One of Our H-Bombs Is Missing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1967

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant occurrences in recent years was the incident involving the loss of a SAC bomber over the coast of Spain and the subsequent events leading—80 days later—to the recovery of the missing H-bomb.

In extremely interesting fashion, Flora Lewis has described exactly what happened in that memorable situation in her book entitled "One of Our H-Bombs Is Missing."

Flora Lewis, until recently, was chief of the New York Bureau of the Washington Post with headquarters in my congressional district. She is now a columnist appearing in the New York Post and Newsday, among other major newspapers, and writes a column from Europe called "Today Abroad."

Miss Lewis has written a significant and highly readable account of what our activities—though perhaps necessary—did to Palomares, a small village which knew little of the controversies of East versus West.

It is my pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues a distinguished analysis of the book from the Saturday Review of January 28, 1967, by our colleague, Congressman OGDEN R. REID of the 26th District of New York.

ONE OF OUR H-BOMBS IS MISSING

(By Flora Lewis (McGraw-Hill. 225 pp. $5.95), tells what happened last year when one of our B–52s collided with an aerial tanker over Palomares. OGDEN R. REID, who is former United States Ambassador to Israel, is a member of the House of Representatives.)

(By OGDEN R. REID)

Flora Lewis, one of America's ablest reporters, and until recently correspondent of the *Washington Post* in Bonn, London, and New York, has written a thoughtful, poignant, and engrossing account of the Palomares affair.

Here, on January 17, 1966, a small Spanish town reflecting "the innocence of one age" collided with "the shared despairs and hopes of another" when a Strategic Air Command B–52 ran into an aerial tanker, releasing four unarmed H-bombs.

One of Our H-Bombs Is Missing (to be published March 6) deals with the "eighty overwhelming days of fear and strain and ingenuity and effort" that followed. For the village of Palomares—the place of the doves—"the legacy of the bomb was not anger, not disease or damage, but the insidious, consuming plague of uncertainty that had already swept much of the world and had reached out to infect a handful of people whose poverty had been a shield."

The graphic and highly readable account covers the take-off and crash of SAC Bomber 256; the prompt and vast actions taken by the U.S. government's "Broken Arrow" or nuclear accident procedures; the arrival within hours of doctors and disaster control teams; the recovery of the first three bombs within twenty-four hours, and the agonizing and skillful underwater probe by small research submarines, culminating in the recovery of H-bomb number four, eighty days later on April 7—after it had been lost two additional times at 2,500 and 2,800 feet depths, where darkness prevailed and visibility was often limited to six feet.

Miss Lewis describes the fear that came to the villagers of Palomares from abroad—the foreign broadcasts that spoke of "possible tragic consequences of nuclear contamination"—while the Spanish and U.S. governments were virtually immobilized over what the "public should be told" and as a result said nothing "to settle the rumors" for weeks.

Fear, fed on rumor and lack of official word, spread further than the actual radiation when plutonium was scattered by the detonation of conventional explosives in two of the bombs. In spite of efforts by U.S. Ambassador Angier Biddle Duke, it was not until some forty-three days had elapsed that official comment came from Madrid and Washington and the fact of radiation was admitted. By then—even though some guarded assurances were made to the villagers that every precaution was being taken, including medical tests, advice to townspeople, and substantial decontamination measures (plowing under of fields, destruction of tomato plants)—bewilderment was followed by a "growing sense of helplessness."

"*Radioactividad*" was on everyone's lips. The destruction of crops led to fears that all fresh food was dangerous; for the fishermen of nearby towns the price of shrimp plummeted; and people would not eat what came "fresh from the sea."

The Spanish government felt silence was the best policy lest tourism and exports be hurt. The U.S. was convinced that it could say little until the Spanish agreed. To help reassure public opinion, Ambassador Duke, along with the Minister of Tourism, Señor Manuel Fraga Iribarne, took a diplomatic swim at Palomares March 7.

Predictably, the USSR made the most of a propaganda advantage. Radio Moscow broadcast that "weeks have gone by and the bomb is still in the sea, irradiating the water and the fish."

On February 16 the Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs handed U.S. Ambassador Foy Kohler a note claiming the U.S. had broken its commitments under the 1963 Test Ban Treaty and stating, "It is common knowledge that . . . the southern coast of Spain and also the sea expanses washing it are now subjected to radioactive contamination from U.S. nuclear weapons." The note "demanded an immediate end to all such flights 'beyond the boundaries of national frontiers.' "

The following day Soviet Ambassador Semyon Tsarapkin read from the note at the Geneva Disarmament Conference and added that "a densely populated Mediterranean area is now in grave danger."

He was promptly and forthrightly told by American delegate William C. Foster that the "charges were false" and that the Soviets, by not even waiting for a U.S. answer to their note, were indulging in a propaganda ploy.

Subsequently, on February 25, the U.S. was to answer formally the Soviet note, pointing out that "no violation" of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty had occurred; that "no radioactive pollution of the sea was involved," and that it was a matter of "deep regret that the Soviet Union should be willing to distort the meaning of international treaties to suit the purpose of a propaganda campaign."

The whole matter of nuclear overflights beyond national boundaries was to be raised again last fall in the United Nations' Committee I—by Poland and the Ukraine—but the NATO countries, as well as certain Latin American and African nations, rallied to the United States' defense, and the resolution was withdrawn without a vote.

Earlier Spain had asked that the overflights be ended, and on January 22 the U.S. had agreed. They have not been resumed.

Eight weeks after the accident some 604 acres of topsoil had been scraped in Palomares, and an agreement was reached to ship the "mildly radioactive soil" to the U.S. for burial near the Savannah River, at Aiken, South Carolina.

With the recovery of the fourth bomb the Americans were to leave. A legacy of uncertainty remained. "Maybe it is all right," the villagers said, "and maybe it isn't. Who knows? You just don't feel so quiet any more." It has been "calculated that fifty years after a person absorbed a dose of plutonium (which is a bone-seeker) 80 per cent of the dose would still be in his body."

Dr. Wright Langham, the Los Alamos plutonium expert who supervised the decontamination efforts in concert with the Spanish atomic energy officials, will return in February to Palomares to conduct extensive tests once again. Dr. Langham is "extremely confident" that these tests will show "no real problem," but he, along with others in the government, recognizes the clear and continued responsibility of the U.S.—in concert with Spanish authorities—to make sure. The fine plutonium particles were carried by the wind over an area of about "one square mile," and a "few people," it is believed, "inhaled or ingested" very small amounts. Further careful tests of the effect on tomatoes of plutonium in the soil transported from Palomars are being carried on in New Mexico, but the tomatoes as yet "are not growing well." This, according to Dr. Langham, may be a question of whether the sample is good agricultural soil; and in Palomares the plowing to depths could have upset the soil balance and raised the salt level.

Flora Lewis's book is an intensely human story. More than that, it focuses clearly on our atomic age and "the ultimate dilemma of maintaining ultimate power."

Today the United States stands at the threshold of an agreement on nuclear nonproliferation with the Soviets (which, if it is to mean much, must be signed before too long by the Red Chinese); the U.S. and the USSR also have a chance in the next few months—perhaps their last—to draw back from a new nuclear arms race of a much higher order of magnitude, involving a new generation of ICBMs and an extraordinary costly anti-ballistic missile system.

The true legacy of Palomares should be to remind the world of how close to the precipice we have come and the imperatives now of establishing a nuclear freeze to be followed, under strict international inspection, by a mutual reduction in weapons and delivery vehicles.

Disclosure of Financial Holdings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1967

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, an important ingredient of any congressional code of ethics is that of periodic disclosure of financial holdings by Members of Congress. I hope that the Congress will soon enact legislation to require an orderly procedure for such reporting.

Along with other Members, I have in the past made such a financial disclosure pending the adoption of a uniform system.

Meanwhile, the President, on May 10, 1965, issued Executive Order No. 11222, prescribing standards of ethical conduct for Government officers and employees. The Executive order requires—part IV, section 401—that executive branch agency heads and top Presidential appointees shall submit to the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission a detailed reporting of financial interests. While this Executive order does not apply to members of the legislative branch, I submit herewith a statement responsive to Executive Order No. 11222:

1. A list of the names of all corporations, companies, firms, or other business enterprises, partnerships, nonprofit organizations, and educational or other institutions—

(A) With which he is connected as an employee, officer, owner, director, trustee, partner, adviser, or consultant:

Member, Wisconsin Chapter, National Institute for Infantile Paralysis.

Member, Cornell University Council.

Director, American Youth Hostel Association.

(B) In which he has any continuing financial interests, through a pension or retirement plan, shared income, or otherwise, as a result of any current or prior employment or business or professional association: None.

(C) In which he has any financial interest through the ownership of stocks, bonds, or other securities:

U.S. Government; New York City; Jersey City, New Jersey; Government of Israel; American Electric Power Co.; Bank Stock Corp. of Milwaukee; Central and Southwest Corp.; Johnson Service Co.; Majestic Mines, Ltd.; Niagara Share Co.; Northwestern National Insurance Co.; Public Service Co. of Indiana, Inc.; U.S. and Foreign Securities Company.

2. A list of the names of his creditors, other than those to whom he may be indebted by reason of a mortgage on property which he occupies as a personal residence or to whom he may be indebted for current and ordinary household and living expenses. None.

3. A list of his interests in real property or rights in lands, other than property which he occupies as a personal residence: None.

The War on Crime in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1967

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the crime problem in the District of Columbia has mushroomed in the past decade. This situation has many causes, such as population increase and widespread poverty. Urgent is the need to alter this situation. The President's proposed District of Columbia Crime Control Act of 1967 is a significant and, I believe, especially effective measure to meet head on this acute problem.

Bills relating to the notice of intent to raise the insanity defense, the obstruction of criminal investigations, arrests without warrant in cases involving misdemeanors committed outside the presence of an officer, material witnesses, and increased witness fees for the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions provides greatly needed changes in criminal procedures in the District.

The District of Columbia Criminal Code has been called a hodgepodge and, as such, has contributed to mass confusion afflicting our system of criminal justice in the District of Columbia. The President's proposal to set up a commission for the revision of the District of Columbia Criminal Code is an excellent and farsighted step to rid our Nation's Capital of this deterrent to effective crime control.

Our Capital City should be a model in the area of crime control. The President's proposed bill truly can be said to be the opening shot heard 'round the country in the war on crime in the District of Columbia.

Revive the Spirit of the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1967

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, last year on October 4, I addressed this body on the subject of reviving the spirit of the Marshall plan. Subsequent to my remarks on the floor of the House, my article was printed in the February 1967 issue of the Progressive magazine under the title "Twenty Years Afterward: Revive the Spirit of the Marshall Plan."

The article follows:

TWENTY YEARS AFTERWARD: REVIVE THE SPIRIT OF THE MARSHALL PLAN

(By Henry S. Reuss)

One of the worst effects of U.S. involvement in Vietnam is to hypnotize us in almost everything else we do. Notably, we stand paralyzed in the very international economic cooperation where once we shone.

Twenty years ago next June 5, Secretary of State George C. Marshall made his memorable Harvard speech inaugurating the Marshall Plan for the rehabilitation of war-torn Europe.

The nations of Europe, as Marshall proposed, got together and agreed upon their common needs; and the United States, as Marshall predicted, joined the recovery effort. To many Americans the outcome resembled something like the old Quaker vision of the Peaceable Kingdom. It was one of those dawns in man's history when the intelligent person with knowledge of man's past and hope for man's future finds it a joy to be alive.

But the exhilaration of the dawn has given way to the languor of high noon. Twenty years after, preoccupied by Vietnam, a mood of complacency and drift has replaced our former urgency and dedication.

I propose that we free ourselves from the transfixing cobra stare of Vietnam. I propose that we celebrate the twentieth anniversary of the Marshall Plan by reviving, on a grand scale, the 1947 spirit of international economic cooperation.

The areas of drift in international economics are easy enough to list. The first is trade. The original Kennedy round of international trade negotiations moves ponderously toward its conclusion next June with little or no hope of achieving the goals set when President Kennedy initiated it five years ago. Whatever happens to the Kennedy round, the trading world will need a new trade policy after next June when the round ends. Such a policy should aim toward what the Kennedy round aimed at in its conception, but is badly missing in its conclusion: a nondiscriminatory free trade area as broad as the industrialized free world—mainly the United States, Canada, Europe, and Japan.

There is a similar lack of policy on the thorny question of trade between East and West. The industrial nations of the West go each their own way, at varying speeds, in arriving at trade arrangements with the Communist world. It is time to decide whether that trade is to be conducted with some semblance of order, or whether the helter-skelter free-for-all of the present is to continue, with its inevitable political consequences.

The second great area in need of international order and cooperation is that of aid. Aid is the late Twentieth Century's transition from the Nineteenth Century's policies of colonization in the non-industrial world. Aid programs must be aimed at bringing the emerging nations to some degree of self-sufficiency.

Yet today the will of the industrialized nations to help those less favorably situated is much eroded. At the start of this decade, the United Nations called upon the industrialized nations to devote at least one per cent of their gross national product to economic aid. In fact, scarcely one-half of this goal is being met. In this country, voices in Congress that once were raised to further the cause of aid are now silent, or speak of doubt or delay. Our European partners, themselves the first and greatest beneficiaries of aid, act now as if little obligation existed to extend the benefits of that system to other parts of the world. Aid needs grow even as willingness to help shrinks.

The concept of international aid is too noble, the prospects it holds for mankind are too fair by far, to let it now wither and die for lack of interest.

Again, action is needed and needed now.

The third area of drift in international relations is that of the balance of payments. The easy and willing adjustment and the facilitation of settlements that marked the early postwar years have now given way to rigid exchange rates embellished by recriminations as to which nations ought to adjust to keep the system in balance. Our own unilateral efforts to achieve balance still have not done so, after seven years. What we get, mostly, is the rapid conversion of foreign-held dollars into gold by countries such as France, and endless lectures by foreign central bankers that we should slow down our $750 billion economy in order to fix up our $1 to $2-billion annual payments deficit.

Once more, action is needed.

In the light of such dismal realities of the dismal science of economics, it is not surprising that heads of national treasures and central banks have been talking international monetary reform for more than five years. Nor is it surprising that nothing much has come of the talks. There is agreement only on brilliant exegeses of alternatives: what will happen if we do this, what will happen if we do not. There is no agreement on what actually ought to be done. The best hope in this field is that about a year from now everyone except France will be in agreement on what ought to be done if the world runs into serious financial trouble.

If we learn anything from economic history, however, it is that economic trouble does not give much real warning of its approach. It is upon us before steps can be taken to deal with it. Hence, we had better have the machinery for monetary reform set up and working; not simply agreed upon in principle.

Action is needed here as elsewhere.

In recent years the industrialized nations have been noting an unwelcome product of their unparalleled prosperity: steadily rising prices and the inflation they signal. Germans still remember with horror their disastrous inflation after World War I. Britain's stop-and-go cyclical economic policy is once more in its stop phase. At the end of five years of price stability, the United States views with dismay the steep rise in prices of recent months. None of the industrialized nations has solved the problem of how to maintain prosperity without inflation. If it is not solved soon, we face a spiral into catastrophe that is all too well known in economic history.

A most promising prospect for renewed economic cooperation on a grand scale lies in scientific research. France and the United Kingdom are as busy pouring their resources into the Concorde supersonic transport plane as we are into our own SST.

The Eighty-ninth Congress, in its closing days, enacted an excellent project of research and development for whole new systems of urban mass transport designed to move people about our metropolises speedily, safely, without fouling the atmosphere, and in accord with sound city planning; and it approved a breakthrough program of research into new methods of combating water pollution. Yet the streets of Paris and Rome are as congested as those of New York and Los Angeles. And the Rhine and the Danube are as polluted as the Hudson and the Potomac.

Why don't the two sides of the Atlantic combine their efforts to turn science loose on the real problems of mankind?

President Johnson plans a European trip this spring. Instead of weekend bilateral visits to the European heads of state, with the same dreary agenda of who pays for arms or flirtations with multilateral nuclear forces, why not a heads-of-state conference of the twenty-odd leading industrial nations, looking toward a renewed plan of international cooperation to be activated on June 5, 1967, the twentieth anniversary of Secretary Marshall's speech?

Given Vietnam, the initiative for such a conference and plan could much better come from outside America. But this country should certainly be ready to welcome and support such an initiative wherever it originates.

At a minimum, such an anniversary conference should produce: (1) a trade policy to succeed the present round of Geneva negotiations; (2) an aid policy that would see a real transfer of goods and services from the advanced countries to developing ones on a scale commensurate with their actual needs; (3) a program of international monetary reform, through the International Monetary Fund, to reconcile the interests of reserve-currency countries with those of the rest of the world, and to minimize the destructive impact of balance of payments adjustments; (4) machinery for achieving full employment and price stability throughout the cooperating community of nations, by a radical upgrading of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; (5) a pooling of resources for scientific research and development to accomplish a great breakthrough in the interests of all.

It is foolish to pretend that these are goals easy to achieve. But it is imperative that we try. And our attempts should be guided by the certain knowledge that if we do not do so now, in freedom, we shall be compelled to the same decisions later, under much less favorable circumstances and under the necessities induced by economic chaos.

The benefits for the United States would even go beyond those of the actual points at issue. Our wholehearted participation in such a conference would be a needed reminder to the world—and perhaps to ourselves—that our interests in the world far exceed the narrow boundaries of military action in Southeast Asia and military alliances in Europe and elsewhere.

The material progress in the world over the last twenty years has largely come from the initiative and impetus of the Marshall Plan. It has come, that is, from international economic cooperation. It is time to get back to that spirit of good will and cooperation. The nations of the world have it in their power to build a new world of unparalleled prosperity and lasting peace.

It will be a long task, but the time to begin is at hand.

Fino Introduces Bill To Stop Corporations From Reducing Pensions Because of Social Security Benefit Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code to discourage employers from reducing the pensions of retired employees when those employees receive social security increases. My bill would achieve this by increasing the employer's tax by the amount saved by reducing the employee's pension.

I expect that Congress will vote a substantial increase in social security benefits this year. Unfortunately, a large number of companies will use this as an excuse to cut the pensions they are giving to employees by half the amount of the social security benefit increase.

I do not hold with letting corporations use social security increases to reduce the amount of pensions they are paying. Congress does not increase social security payments for the benefit of the corporations of America, but rather for the benefit of the people of America.

When social security increases are voted by Congress, the idea is to give all of that money to pensioners. If corporations insist on reducing their own pension payments by half of the social security increase, then they ought to be curbed. The best way to curb them is to tax away the profits of pension reduction.

Estonian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1967

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, February 24 marked the 49th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Estonia. It is fitting that we who are so abundantly endowed with the blessings of freedom pause to reflect upon the struggle of a people less fortunate than ourselves.

In 1918 the people of Estonia established an independent republic under which they enjoyed freedom and prosperity. By the end of 1940 this intrepid nation became enslaved in the onslaught of Communist expansion and conquest. But the resistance to Communist domination that these courageous people displayed in 1940—and continue to display today—should serve to inspire free men everywhere.

We who are blessed with liberty must never cease to sustain and encourage the Estonian people in their struggle for freedom and dignity. We must continue to hope that these people will at a future day be able to exercise their right of self-determination. We must never allow the hope of the Estonian people to subside in their heroic struggle against Communist domination.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 2, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy.—Matthew 5: 7.

Almighty God, Heavenly Father, the creator of all things, the sustainer of all life, and the giver of every good gift—again we bow in Thy presence and in spirit kneel before the Throne of Mercy. We acknowledge our selfishness, our shortcomings, and our sins. We have done that which we ought not to have done, and we have left undone that which we ought to have done. We do earnestly repent and are heartily sorry for these our misdoings. Have mercy upon us, most merciful Father, we humbly beseech Thee. Forgive us, and receiving Thy forgiveness, may we in turn, forgive one another; as we have received mercy may we also be merciful; as love has come to us may love also go out from us to others.

As we bow before Thee in prayer give to us the assurance, that with Thee, all good things are possible. So may we do good, speak good, live good, because in Thee, we are good. In the Master's name we pray. **Amen.**

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 665. An act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 67-5.

JOINT RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE FIRST-CLASS CITIZENSHIP FOR THE LADIES

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a toast to the ladies, but a toast which is highly proper on the austere floor of this august body. I offer the ladies first-class citizenship for the first time in the history of the Republic.

We wink at the everyday discrimination practiced against the ladies; discrimination in hiring, in compensation, in position, and in rank. In our present climate of militant equality, here is a vast pocket of longstanding bias which we must rout out at once.

Today, I offer a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prevent the Nation, or any State, from denying equality of rights under the law on account of sex.

We owe this to the ladies. It is an old debt. Let us pay our debt at once.

APPLYING FAIR, OBJECTIVE STANDARDS OF CONDUCT TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I have a bad taste in my mouth today about the actions of this House yesterday, relative to Mr. Powell.

I believe that future events will prove that we made a serious mistake yesterday when we rejected the select committee's recommendations.

I will place in today's daily RECORD two articles on this subject from today's Washington Post.

Yesterday, this Chamber was swept by a prairie fire of righteous indignation and a desire to "clean up the House." Having now barred Mr. Powell, I deeply hope that we have not exhausted our interest in "cleaning up the House." I hope there is enough of that indignation left today so that we can follow through and develop some tough—but fair—objective standards of conduct which will apply to all Members.

On Monday of this week I cosponsored, with 42 other freshmen Republican Members, a House resolution which would establish a permanent Select Committee on Standards of Conduct for Congressmen. We called for bipartisan support. It would be refreshing to me—and I think to the American people—if just one Member from the other side of the aisle would rise and join with us to accomplish this desperately needed reform. I will gladly meet today with anyone on the other side of the aisle—from a freshman, through you, Mr. Speaker, to begin work on this problem. But let us get together to break this logjam in ethics reform. The people of the country are waiting. We know that reform cannot be achieved without the active support of the Members of the majority.

We must not stop with Mr. Powell's exclusion—and I ask the help of the House to complete this job of ethics reform.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 27]

Anderson, Tenn.
Ashley
Baring
Blanton
Blatnik
Bow
Cabell
Cahill
Celler
Conyers
Culver
Curtis
Dawson
Dickinson
Diggs
Edwards, La.
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Goodell
Griffiths
Hammerschmidt
Holifield
Holland
King, Calif.
McCarthy
McEwen
Macdonald, Mass.
Marsh
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Ottinger
Pool
Randall
Resnick
Rosenthal
Shipley
Taft
Teague, Tex.
Van Deerlin
Waldie
Williams, Pa.
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 382 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF U.S. CITIZENSHIP FOR THE PEOPLE OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of House Resolution 314 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 314

Whereas the Jones Act of March 2, 1917, granted United States citizenship to the people of Puerto Rico; and

Whereas March 2, 1967, marks the fiftieth anniversary of this historic event; and

Whereas the bond of common citizenship has played a major role in the development of close and mutually beneficial, economic, cultural, political, and legal relationships between the United States and Puerto Rico: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby extends to the people of Puerto Rico its congratulations on their fiftieth anniversary of United States citizenship.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I think it is appropriate that we note the Judiciary Committee, for all practical purposes, has twice in 2 days been discharged on the subject of a resolution.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman. It is doubly appropriate that we do this today because this is really the celebration date for the 50th anniversary for the citizens of Puerto Rico.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago a man of great courage, vision, and conviction spoke in this Chamber in defense of the moral right of his countrymen to govern themselves. The man was Luis Muñoz-Rivera, and the event was the debate on a bill to grant U.S. citizenship and a more equitable representation in local affairs to the people of Puerto Rico.

For many years Muñoz-Rivera had fought to secure home rule from Spain. In 1897 his efforts were rewarded with the charter of autonomy which granted to the island almost complete control over its local affairs and 19 voices and votes in the Spanish Cortes. But 4 months later, as the Spanish-American War drew to a close, U.S. forces occupied the island, and the political freedom of the autonomous charter vanished.

For 20 more years Muñoz Rivera would have to endure broken promises, indifference, and frustrated hopes. But he did endure all his legion disappointments, and in 1916, as he addressed the House of Representatives as the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, his life-long crusade was drawing to a close. He did not live to witness the signing of the Jones Act by President Wilson on this date five decades ago, but the fruits of his efforts and vision will honor him forever.

In Puerto Rico, Muñoz-Rivera is revered as one of the island's great heroes, as the man whose dedicated and ceaseless labors started Puerto Rico on its way from helpless dependency to strong self-sufficiency.

Also entrenched in our hearts and memories are other men who played valiant roles in those days. Santiago Iglesias-Pantin, our first labor leader, rallied the emerging U.S. labor movement to the support of Puerto Rico's cause. Deeply attached to the United States and the principles of democracy, Iglesias strove for the extension of U.S. citizenship to Puerto Ricans in the firm belief that desperately needed economic and social reforms would follow. Jose Celso Barbosa, former head of the Republican Party in Puerto Rico, will likewise always retain an honored place in the history of our land. As the leader of the party which advocated immediate incorporation of Puerto Rico into the federated union, his influence was instrumental in securing the grant of U.S. citizenship.

And, of course, we owe tribute to the farsighted Americans, William Jones, of Virginia; Horace Turner, of Iowa; Senator John Shafroth, of Colorado; and the many other legislators who championed the cause of Puerto Rico in Congress.

The first organic law, the Foraker Act of 1900, was cruel in its deprivation of political rights to the people of Puerto Rico. It vested both executive and legislative power in a council composed of Presidential appointees. The people were permitted to constitute a house of delegates, but the actions of this body could be nullified by the council, by the appointed Governor, or by the Congress. To Muñoz-Rivera, the system represented "the most absolute contradiction of republican principles"; and in his view, the Jones bill was far from a perfect solution to the problem. But if we listen to his words, we will hear a prophesy which contains the true historical importance of the Jones Act:

> This bill cannot meet the earnest aspirations of my country. It is not a measure of self-government ample enough to solve definitely our political problem or to match your national reputation, established by a successful championship for liberty and justice throughout the world since the very beginning of your national life. But, meagre and conservative as the bill appears when we look at its provisions from our own point of view, we sincerely recognize its noble purpose and willingly accept it as a step in the right direction and as a reform paving the way for others more acceptable and satisfactory which shall come a little later, provided that my countrymen will be able to demonstrate their capacity, the capacity they possess to govern themselves. In regard to such capacity it is my duty, no doubt a pleasant duty, to assure Congress that the Puerto Ricans will endeavor to prove their intelligence, their patriotism, and their full preparation to enjoy and to exercise a democratic regime.

Thus, the Jones Act was a beginning, and in its grant of U.S. citizenship was a most auspicious beginning. It paved the way for Puerto Rico's economic and political renaissance, so that today we may proudly say of Muñoz-Rivera that his words have proved true. We did demonstrate our capacity for self-government and Congress did respond. Under the leadership of his son and our former Governor, Luis Muñoz-Marin, we have achieved a free associated state—free in the governance of our internal affairs but firmly and permanently allied to the United States. We choose our own Governor, our own legislature, our own executive branch, our own courts; we govern ourselves, limited only by the U.S. Constitution, the Puerto Rico Federal Relations Act, and mostly by the human bounds of wisdom.

We also have our U.S. citizenship, which my fellow Puerto Ricans, as a people, carry with pride and dignity. It is easy, much too easy, to take for granted the many blessings of citizenship. But let me assure my colleagues in this Congress that the people of Puerto Rico, as relative newcomers to this great U.S. community, fully recognize and appreciate its value. To the people of Puerto Rico, it is a relationship with the people of your neighborhoods across the land; it is a passport to opportunity, to a new society in which each person may set his goal and know that with sufficient desire, sufficient energy, and sufficient ability, he will attain it. That our Operation Bootstrap has flourished is, in no small measure, attributable to our association with the United States and our common citizenship.

But U.S. citizenship is much more meaningful than that; it is symbolic of obligation, responsibility, and sacrifice—the obligation of abiding by the laws of one's country, the responsibility of fighting to defend its causes and its institutions; it involves sacrifices to uphold the principles upon which those institutions are based. The grave conflict in Vietnam has stimulated our consciousness of this aspect of citizenship. I am proud that our young men, U.S. citizens from Puerto Rico, are at this very moment bearing arms in defense of the principles of justice and human freedom on these foreign shores. As was the case during the Second World War and the Korean conflict, Puerto Rico is foremost in voluntary enlistments in the Armed Forces.

So, while we are grateful for the benefits that come from our citizenship, we are willing also to assume all of its responsibilities. We are also happy that the United States has greatly benefited from our unique and successful relationship. In its grant of U.S. citizenship to Puerto Ricans and political autonomy to Puerto Rico, it has demonstrated its firm commitment to the ideals of democracy and self-determination for its sister nations around the globe. The success of Puerto Rico's economic recovery program has created a valuable market for U.S. goods, the fourth-ranking extracontinental market. This has provided dramatic proof to the underdeveloped countries of the world that rapid economic progress can be achieved within a framework of democratic principles. It has given many of them new hope and inspiration. We gladly offer our strategic location in the Caribbean as a vital link in the defenses of this hemisphere, just as we offer our island as a pathway of ideas and good will between neighbors to the north and to the south.

To dwell too long on the past, however, is to ignore the goals and challenges that are the promise of the future. The relationship between Puerto Rico and the United States is unique both in political concept and in economic success. But we cannot rest contented in our progress yesterday or today. In many areas that relationship must be improved, clarified, and solidified for the common good. This is the task for our joint consideration and effort and for which both sides must apply a further measure of wisdom and statesmanship.

I know that the years ahead will be marked by the harmony of understanding and good will that the people of Puerto Rico and the people of the United States have shared in the past. Our common citizenship will continue to demonstrate our common interest in our relationships. I place my trust in the results of our efforts together.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GRANTING OF U.S. CITIZENSHIP TO THE PEOPLE OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 50th anniversary of the granting of the U.S. citizenship to the people of Puerto Rico. A few minutes ago, I was received by the President of the United States and he handed me a message to the people of Puerto Rico. The message reads as follows:

MESSAGE TO THE PEOPLE OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO, FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GRANTING OF THE U.S. CITIZENSHIP

Today marks the Fiftieth Anniversary of the granting of United States citizenship to the people of Puerto Rico by the Congress of the United States.

The cause of justice and human dignity for which the people of the United States and the people of Puerto Rico share an equal dedication is embodied in our common citizenship. It has formed a strong foundation for our present association, and it gives us confidence that our future relationship will be even more rewarding to both island and mainland.

I am confident that I speak for the people of all the United States when I extend to you felicitations and warmest congratulations on this historic occasion.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 2, 1967*.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman. I have just recently visited the wonderful island of Puerto Rico, and I, for one, am happy that it is a part of America.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, likewise I join in the tribute to the people of Puerto Rico. We are fortunate that the Puerto Rican people are citizens of the United States. We are doubly fortunate that the distinguished gentleman in the well—Resident Commissioner SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU—is serving so ably among us.

I was pleased to introduce a companion resolution congratulating the people of Puerto Rico upon this important anniversary. So I am delighted that the House has just acted to extend its official congratulations.

Fifty years ago today—March 2, 1917—the citizens of Puerto Rico became citizens of the United States. This was the first major manifestation of American confidence in the maturity of a proud people; and that confidence has been rewarded magnificently, with our insular compatriots having made Puerto Rico a showcase of American democracy in the Caribbean and an inspiration for developing nations the world over.

It must be admitted that encouragement of local autonomy has not always been either swift or generous. Puerto Rico became an American possession on December 10, 1898, when the island was formally ceded by Spain to the United States. For more than a year the War Department held jurisdiction over Puerto Rico; then, in 1900, Congress passed the Foraker Act, which, as the First Organic Act, established civil rule.

Under American hegemony, the Puerto Ricans elected a lower house, known as the house of delegates; but the Governor, other key officials, and an upper legislative house, the executive council, were all appointed by the President of the United States. Puerto Ricans were declared citizens, not of the United States, but of Puerto Rico; as Puerto Ricans, nevertheless, they were adjudged entitled to Uncle Sam's protection.

It was not until 1917, with the passage of the Jones Act—the second organic act—that Puerto Ricans became citizens of the United States, and were accorded the right to elect the membership of both legislative houses. The Governor and other officials were still, however, to be appointed by the President.

The Puerto Ricans, in the main, evinced sincere pride in their American citizenship, but they soon realized that limited self-government was no panacea. With the onslaught of the worldwide depression and an accelerating population increase without corresponding industrialization, Puerto Rico was in economic trouble. It was not until the middle 1940's, when Luis Muñoz Marín sired and promoted the economic concept that became internationally renowned as Operation Bootstrap, that the "stricken land" began to emerge from its travail.

Recovery was speeded immeasurably by an amendment, in 1947, to the Jones Act which provided for the election of the Governor and all other top officials save the auditor and members of the judiciary. In January 1949 Luis Muñoz Marín became the island's first popularly elected Governor; and with a free hand to guide his people's destiny, he soon proved himself one of America's very greatest and productive statesmen. It was he, along with other Puerto Ricans of similar vision, dedication, and awesome energy, who formulated, with the blessing of the U.S. Government, that unique political design known as the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or Associated Free State.

Officially instituted on July 25, 1952, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has demonstrated for all the world the infinite capacity of a free people to find meaningful—and effective—political and economic solutions to apparently insoluble problems. The gross product of Puerto Rico is now nine times greater than it was in 1940, and has more than doubled in the last decade. The net income of the economy rose from $225 million in 1940 to $2,525 million in 1966. Per capita income in 1966 was $955, compared to $121 in 1940. Life expectancy is now 70 years; in 1940, it was 46 years.

A plebiscite will probably be held some time this year, at which time our fellow citizens of Puerto Rico would express their preference for one of three alternatives: continuation of the Commonwealth, application for statehood, or a request for independence.

Mr. Speaker, the citizenship first accorded Puerto Ricans in 1917 has enabled them to be the final arbiters of their own destiny. They have honored America, in full, these 50 years, and they have enriched forever our joint heritage.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the statement of the distinguished delegate from Puerto Rico.

Recently I was in Puerto Rico, visiting Ramey Air Force Base, our great naval base at Roosevelt Roads, and the Marine Corps amphibious training base on the Island of Vieques. Our group was received courteously, graciously, and hospitably.

The people of Puerto Rico are a fine people. I am sure we are all happy they are celebrating this 50th anniversary of American citizenship.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join in the commemoration so ably described by the distinguished gentleman in the well, the distinguished Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico. As the chairman of the Territorial and Insular Affairs Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I am tremendously impressed by the progress being made in so many ways by the people of the great Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The obvious success of the long planned Operation Bootstrap, with economic growth so evident in the Commonwealth, and the obviously orderly and systematic way the people of the Commonwealth are going about the determination of their status, and all the economic and social progress being made in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, are things of which every American can be proud.

I, for one, as a New York City resident, am very gratified by the many contributions being made to our cultural and social life by the persons from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico who now reside in my community.

I hail the gentleman in the well for taking this time to bring to the attention of the Members the very fine contributions to all America being made by the great Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN].

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks about the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

We are also proud of the Puerto Ricans who came to our area, who are serving our industry and our farms. Their help is very necessary.

Their growth in becoming Americans, in learning to speak English, is proceeding at a rapid rate. We are proud of the citizens who left the island. They are a great asset to our community.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the distinguished gentleman in the well [Mr. POLANCO-ABREU] and to join my colleagues in extending felicitations to our fellow Americans of Puerto Rico on this great occasion.

Representing a State which has much in common with the Commonwealth which the gentleman represents, I cannot but feel that Puerto Rico is destined for greatness. As the only Latin-speaking political entity under the American flag, Puerto Rico can play an important role in bringing about better understanding between the United States and our South American neighbors, just as Hawaii hopes to serve as a bridge between the United States and the nations of Asia.

The gentleman no doubt will be interested to know that we do have a very active Puerto Rican community in our Aloha State. Americans of Puerto Rican ancestry have contributed greatly to the welfare of Hawaii and no doubt will continue to do so. The situation in Hawaii I am sure has been, and will be, repeated in other areas of our country.

For the people of Hawaii and for myself I extend congratulations, aloha and best wishes to our fellow Americans in the great Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN].

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, should like to associate myself with the remarks of the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

I recently had an opportunity, as a member of the Housing Subcommittee, to spend some time in Puerto Rico and to view the tremendous strides which have been made by the people in and around San Juan, especially, in the field of housing and in the field of urban renewal. The task has been a very difficult one. The work is very clearly evident.

The results are beginning to show and beginning to bear fruit. The program which especially impressed me was the program of shell housing, where the residents themselves take over a shell and go on to completion of the home.

The Puerto Rican people have shown that, given an opportunity to put themselves into decent, safe, standard housing, they will take advantage of it to the fullest extent.

I say to the gentleman in addition, this Operation Bootstrap was very impressive. The people of Puerto Rico are on their way, and they certainly do make a welcome and highly contributive addition to the United States of America.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New York. I wish to compliment the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico on sharing with this House the message from the President of the United States offering felicitations not only to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and to our fellow citizens but also to the United States, in this sharing of mutual respect that has gone on for the past 50 years.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I should like to inform the gentleman that I very respectfully associate myself with his remarks.

I am also quite happy that the gentleman put in the RECORD the statement made by the President of the United States, a great fellow Texan.

I should like to inform the gentleman that today is also Texas Independence Day, and I should like through him, in behalf of our fellow Americans and Texans, to express to his people the great love, admiration and respect the people of Texas have for their cocitizens, the people of Puerto Rico.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Resident Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico on the occasion of the celebration of 50 years of American citizenship for the fine people of Puerto Rico.

Thank you for sharing with us the timely comments of the President of the United States.

This year we celebrate also the centennial of the purchase of Alaska from Russia in 1867, perhaps the wisest single act of our Government in all its glorious history.

My warmest congratulations to you and all the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico on this your 50th year of citizenship under the radiance, the warm cloak and symbol of freedom, the inspiring American flag. We in Alaska only recently were granted the status of statehood and we are delighted with that status and with the concomitant opportunity to have greater representation in the U.S. Congress, for I believe this will be most fruitful many, many times in the future.

Nevertheless, we of Alaska, Americans all, warmly join in celebration of your 50 years as distinguished citizens of the United States of America.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the district that I have the honor to represent in this distinguished body are many sons and daughters of Puerto Rico who have come to live with us and to give enrichment to our community. They are fine people and good neighbors. They have made a large and valued contribution. I join with the able and highly esteemed Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and others of my colleagues in a salute from the heart to Puerto Rico and her people on this happy anniversary occasion.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. I thank the gentleman very much for that statement.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Resident Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and other Members of the House on March 2, 1967, commemorating the 50th anniversary of the granting of U.S. citizenship to the people of Puerto Rico.

With the initial confrontation of two different cultures, there was a need for a continuing association to encourage economic growth of the island and create a lasting relationship between Puerto Rico and the United States. It was the bond of common citizenship which served as the foundation for this development of mutual interests and continuing association. Today after 50 years of common citizenship, the United States and Puerto Rico are equally committed to the principles of representative government, individual freedom, and fundamental human rights. Both share an abundance of goodwill and mutual understanding, and both are vitally concerned about the political development and economic growth of the Caribbean area.

The success of the relations between the United States and Puerto Rico during the past 50 years bears witness to the fact that economic and political progress can take place even under extreme difficulty and gives assurance such advancements will continue. Having introduced a resolution identical to House Resolution 314, I am pleased to see the House extend official congratulations on this historic occasion. I wish to thank the delegate from Puerto Rico, Mr. Polanco-Abreu, for calling this celebration to the attention of the Members of the House. I join him in expressing confidence in future relations between Puerto Rico and the United States. Regardless of whatever official changes are made in the future, these years of common citizenship will stand as a lasting bond between the people of the United States and Puerto Rico.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join today with my colleague from Puerto Rico, Mr. Santiago Polanco-Abreu, in saluting his people's 50th anniversary of entitlement to U.S. citizenship.

I thank him for his thoughtfulness in calling this significant occasion to our attention and for inviting us to join with him.

Certainly the close ties between Puerto Rico and mainland United States are nowhere more evident than in my home State of New York. More than 220,000 Puerto Rican citizens migrated to New York within the past 15 years, many of them settling in Rochester and its vicinity.

More than 2,000 persons of Puerto Rican birth or heritage live in the Rochester metropolitan area and the 36th Congressional District at this time. They are valuable and loyal members of the Rochester community. Their presence has added to the physical and cultural enrichment of Rochester society. They have become an integral part of Rochester's business and economic life, and are taking an active part in its government and politics.

New York State's ties with Puerto Rico have been strong in other ways. More than 89 percent of all tourists who annually visit Puerto Rico are New York State residents. Tourism is a most vital part of the Puerto Rican economy, and New Yorkers have taken advantage of the hospitality, friendliness, and fine weather which is a way of life in Puerto Rico.

Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller called attention to the contributions of the Puerto Rican community to this country's welfare by declaring March 2 as "Puerto Rican American Citizenship Day in New York State."

Because it expresses so well my feelings of pride in being elected to represent so many members of the Puerto Rican community in Rochester and Monroe County, I am pleased to share it today with my colleagues:

Proclamation

For 50 years the people of Puerto Rico have been citizens of the United States, a citizenship they have enjoyed with dignity and patriotism. They have borne their full share of the task of defending American freedoms in three major wars.

It is interesting to recall that the Jones Act which conferred citizenship on Puerto Ricans allowed them the right to retain their old status if preferred. Out of the entire population of Puerto Rico only 288 persons declared in favor of retaining their former status. This, we must say, is characteristic of the loyalty of Puerto Ricans whether here or in Puerto Rico.

Our Puerto Rican neighbors, with their unaffected friendliness, warm hearts, and intuitive grasp of human relations, their industry and adaptability, have contributed greatly to the cultural, economic and social life of our State and have won the affection and respect of their fellow Americans.

They command our admiration for their success in adapting themselves, despite the grave difficulty of the language barrier, to new environments, new customs, a whole new way of life. They are overcoming the obstacles they have faced and are making a happy adjustment.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim March 2, 1967, as "Puerto Rican-American Citizenship Day" in New York State.

Given under my hand and the Privy Seal of the State at the Capitol in the City of Albany this thirteenth day of February in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-seven.

Nelson A. Rockefeller.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the Record on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TEXAS INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise as the chairman of the Texas Democratic delegation in the House to call the attention of this body to the fact that March 2, today, is Texas Independence Day. Texas, and the republic which was founded as the result of the movement begun at Washington-on-the-Brazos when independence was proclaimed, and it has, of course, become not only an integral part of our country but it is known worldwide.

On March 2 on that historic occasion in this little hamlet of Washington-on-the-Brazos a group of enterprising Texans, patriotic men, who were imbued with the traditional spirit of liberty and justice and the chance to found their homes and enjoy a secure life with liberty and freedom, declared their independence from a tyrannical government and the tyrant of the day. The rest, of course, is history.

When we look at the list of names that today shines out in Texas and in American history we realize that at the time this intrepid band of Texas patriots gathered on the Brazos and declared their independence, they were not assured of victory. At that time there was division and a conflict of opinion. There were those who were moderate in their views. These men, who declared their independence, did not, by any stretch of the imagination, have universal support or confidence. Yet they were right and they went on ahead and triumphed. The decade of the Texas Republic is a very, very dramatic illustration of what free men who are passionately desirous of obtaining freedom can do, for it was the Texas Republic which gave birth, among other things, to the tremendous land grants given in order to insure an educational system which would guarantee free men and their children a chance for education from the very lowest up to the highest grades. This is so despite the fact that the treasury at that time was broke. There was just no money in the treasury. And there was constant harassment in the nature of Indian raids and the constant threat of further invasion by hostile armies with their cannon. However, the faith in an ultimate triumph of the people through their desire for liberty and freedom was a faith that was redeemed.

Mr. Speaker, it is a real privilege to call the attention of my fellow Members and colleagues in the Congress to the fact that this is such a historic occasion. Back home in the State of Texas schoolchildren are out on vacation. It is a State holiday. I wish to underline and stress this fact, that March the 2d does commemorate Texas Independence Day.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today is the 131st anniversary of the signing of the Texas Declaration of Independence. On this day in 1836 while the Alamo was still besieged, delegates of the people of Texas in general convention in the town of Washington on the Brazos signed this memorable document which rallied the people of Texas in defense of the rights they had been guaranteed but denied by a tyrannical ruler of Mexico. All 187 defenders of the Alamo died 4 days later without knowing their decision to die rather than surrender, would not be a sacrifice in vain. A few weeks later when Gen. Sam Houston led his little band of renegade Texans against the splendid and professional army of Santa Anna, the battle cry of the Texans was "Remember the Alamo," as they routed and annihilated their oppressor's army and guaranteed the independence their fellow Texans had declared.

Mr. Speaker, in these days of grave threats to freedom, independence, and constitutional government, I ask permission that the Texas Declaration of Independence be printed in the Record as a reminder of the sacrifices these brave men made for freedom.

The Texas Declaration of Independence follows:

Texas Declaration of Independence

When a government has ceased to protect the lives, liberty and property of the people from whom its legitimate powers are derived, and for the advancement of whose happiness it was instituted; and so far from being a guarantee for the enjoyment of their inestimable and inalienable rights, becomes an instrument in the hands of evil rulers for their oppression; when the Federal Republican Constitution of their country, which they have sworn to support, no longer has a substantial existence, and the whole nature of their government has been forcibly changed without their consent, from a restricted federative republic, composed of sovereign states, to a consolidated central military despotism, in which every interest is disregarded but that of the army and the priesthood—both the eternal enemies of civil liberty, and the ever-ready minions of power, and the usual instruments of tyrants; When, long after the spirit of the constitution has departed, moderation is at length, so far lost, by those in power that even the semblance of freedom is removed, and the forms, themselves, of the constitution discontinued; and so far from their petitions and remonstrances being regarded, the agents who bear them are thrown into dungeons; and mercenary armies sent forth to force a new government upon them at the point of the bayonet: When in consequence of such acts of malfeasance and abdication, on the part of the government, anarchy prevails, and civil society is dissolved into its original elements in such a crisis, the first law of nature, the right of self-preservation—the inherent and inalienable right of the people to appeal to first principles and take their political affairs into their own hands in extreme cases—enjoins it as a right towards themselves and a sacred obligation to their posterity, to abolish such government and create another in its stead, calculated to rescue them from impending dangers, and to secure their future welfare and happiness.

Nations, as well as individuals, are amenable for their acts to the public opinion of mankind. A statement of a part of our grievances is, therefore, submitted to an impartial world, in justification of the hazardous but unavoidable step now taken of severing our political connection with the Mexican people, and assuming an independent attitude among the nations of the earth.

The Mexican government, by its colonization laws, invited and induced the Anglo-American population of Texas to colonize its wilderness under the pledged faith of a written constitution, that they should continue to enjoy that constitutional liberty and republican government to which they had been habituated in the land of their birth, the United States of America. In this expectation they have been cruelly disappointed, inasmuch as the Mexican nation has acquiesced in the late changes made in the government by General Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna, who, having overturned the constitution of his country, now offers us the cruel alternative either to abandon our homes, acquired by so many privations, or submit to the most intolerable of all tyranny, the combined despotism of the sword and the priesthood.

It has sacrificed our welfare to the state of Coahuila, by which our interests have been continually depressed, through a jealous and partial course of legislation carried on at a far distant seat of government, by a hostile majority, in an unknown tongue; and this, too, notwithstanding we have petitioned in the humblest terms, for the establishment of a separate state government, and have, in accordance with the provisions of the national constitution, presented to the general Congress, a republican constitution which was without just cause contemptuously rejected.

It incarcerated in a dungeon, for a long time, one of our citizens, for no other cause but a zealous endeavor to procure the acceptance of our constitution and the establishment of a state government.

It has failed and refused to secure on a firm basis, the right of trial by jury; that palladium of civil liberty, and only safe guarantee for the life, liberty, and property of the citizen.

It has failed to establish any public system of education, although possessed of almost boundless resources (the public domain) and although, it is an axiom, in political science, that unless a people are educated and enlightened it is idle to expect the continuance of civil liberty, or the capacity for self-government.

It has suffered the military commandants stationed among us to exercise arbitrary acts of oppression and tyranny; thus trampling upon the most sacred rights of the citizen and rendering the military superior to the civil power.

It has dissolved by force of arms, the state Congress of Coahuila and Texas, and obliged our representatives to fly for their lives from the seat of government; thus depriving us of the fundamental political right of representation.

It has demanded the surrender of a number of our citizens, and ordered military detachments to seize and carry them into the Interior for trial; in contempt of the civil authorities, and in defiance of the laws and the constitution.

It has made piratical attacks upon our commerce; by commissioning foreign desperadoes, and authorizing them to seize our vessels, and convey the property of our citizens to far distant ports of confiscation.

It denies us the right of worshipping the Almighty according to the dictates of our own consciences, by the support of a national religion calculated to promote the temporal interests of its human functionaries rather than the glory of the true and living God.

It has demanded us to deliver up our arms; which are essential to our defense, the rightful property of freemen, and formidable only to tyrannical governments.

It has invaded our country, both by sea and by land, with intent to lay waste our territory and drive us from our homes; and has now a large mercenary army advancing to carry on against us a war of extermination.

It has, through its emissaries, incited the merciless savage, with the tomahawk and scalping knife, to massacre the inhabitants of our defenseless frontiers.

It hath been, during the whole time of our connection with it, the contemptible sport and victim of successive military revolutions and hath continually exhibited every characteristic of a weak, corrupt, and tyrannical government.

These, and other grievances, were patiently borne by the people of Texas until they reached that point at which forbearance ceases to be a virtue. We then took up arms in defense of the national constitution. We appealed to our Mexican brethren for assistance. Our appeal has been made in vain. Though months have elapsed, no sympathetic response has yet been heard from the Interior. We are, therefore, forced to the melancholy conclusion that the Mexican people have acquiesced in the destruction of their liberty, and the substitution therefor of a military government—that they are unfit to be free and incapable of self-government.

The necessity of self-preservation, therefore, now decrees our eternal political separation.

We, therefore, the delegates, with plenary powers, of the people of Texas, in solemn convention assembled, appealing to a candid world for the necessities of our condition, do hereby resolve and declare that our political connection with the Mexican nation has forever ended; and that the people of Texas do now constitute a free, sovereign and independent republic.

SALUTE TO MOROCCO AND HASSAN THE SECOND

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago, on March 3, 1961, a young man of 32 ascended to the throne of the Kingdom of Morocco. I had met him during the last year of the life and reign of his distinguished father and the impression he made on me was most favorable.

It was shortly after the election of President Kennedy, and I had gone to Morocco and other African countries with the members of the Subcommittee on Africa of which I was then as now privileged and honored to be chairman. The prince told me with warmth and enthusiasm of his feeling of close friendship to President Kennedy. It was akin with the stout friendship and warm affection that his father had shown to President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Hassan the Second is a worthy successor to his father and to earlier rulers in an unbroken dynasty that has reigned in Morocco since 1664.

Throughout much of this history the relations between Morocco and the United States have been of the very best. An ancestor of the King, the Sultan Mohamed ben Abdallah, was one of the first foreign rulers to recognize the new United States of America and, in 1786, to sign a treaty of friendship with our infant Republic.

Morocco celebrates March 3 as the day of the Feast of the Throne for King Hassan. It is appropriate that this day is a national holiday in Morocco. King Hassan is the symbol of his country's independence and of its determination to move ahead into the modern world of social justice and economic fulfillment.

The United States is fortunate to have a firm friend in King Hassan. The Moroccan people must be proud of their enlightened and progressive leader. On this happy day, my colleagues and I add our congratulations to those coming from throughout the world to King Hassan and the people of Morocco.

My personal felicitations go also to His Excellency Dr. Ahmed Laraki, the able and popular Ambassador from Morocco to the United States.

SUPPLEMENTAL MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1967

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 347 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 347

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4515) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the minority side, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON], and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 347 is a resolution, as its reading indicates, providing for an open rule with 3 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 4515.

This bill authorizes appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4515 would authorize supplemental appropriations in the amount of $3,788,700,000 for procurement of aircraft and missiles; $135 million for research, development, test, and evaluation; and $624.5 million for military construction.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not go into detail about it as that will be done by the able gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the committee [Mr. RIVERS], and his associates, but I would point out that this bill is a supplemental authorization for around $4½ billion. It is designed to authorize the necessary sinews of warfare for our Armed Forces, and particularly for the war that is going on in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most Members share the view entertained by this humble Member of the House, that this is a highly complicated matter, this matter of the national defense and the waging of war and that, with the multitudinous duties that we must perform as Members of the Congress, it is a physical impossibility for the Members generally to keep up with all of the various facets and phases of the operation of the entire Congress. Therefore, in a matter particularly of this sort where technicians and experts are required, with a knowledge of the technicalities of waging war, we must of necessity rely upon the committees entrusted by the Congress to bring these matters to our attention so that the necessary authorizations and appropriations may be made.

Mr. Speaker, in that connection I would like to pay my respects not only to the Committee on Armed Services, but to the distinguished and able gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], who is the chairman of that committee. I think that the committee is doing, and has been doing, a good job. I know of no man in this House who is more dedicated to the duties of his office than the gentleman from South Carolina. He, like some of the rest of us, is required to wear two hats, as it were. He must not only look after his congressional duties, but he must look after the very serious job that he has as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Moreover, I should also like to call attention to the fact that under his able leadership the committee is unanimous in bringing to the floor not only this bill but, so far as I can recall, every other bill that has come from that committee. This shows a degree of patriotism not only on the part of the gentleman from South Carolina, but by his counterpart, the able gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] as well as other dedicated members who perform in a similar manner, and helps to provide the necessary authority for the sinews of warfare necessary to carry on the war successfully.

Mr. Speaker, this war we have going on now in Vietnam is a very serious thing. I wonder if we, not only we in the Congress, but the people back home, really appreciate the gravity of this shooting war that is going on over in that far-flung part of this world, and the implications of it—not only upon the political philosophy of the world but also upon the drain that it is imposing upon our own economy?

I am sure when you reflect for a moment that this war is costing some $70 million, and get this, some $70 million a day, and over $20 billion a year, it is clear that we are faced with a very serious situation.

I am sure that this House will, just as the committee has done, vote this authority unanimously. I know of no alternative at this point.

That brings us, of course, to another question—the old debate—whether we can have butter and guns. I just happen to belong to that old-fashioned school that thinks that prudence requires that when we get into a situation of national crisis such as we are in now that we must of necessity trim our sails.

That we cannot, and I want to emphasize this, we cannot, without facing serious tragedy further on down the line, go on with the expenditure of needless funds for needless programs and at the same time carry on the war in Vietnam.

I hope that the Congress will bear this in mind as we go along now in the program for this year, not only should we not have any new programs, brand them whatever you want to, the New Society, the Great Society, the New Deal or whatever you want to call them, but the present programs upon which we have embarked should be curtailed in their implementation and in their funding. Otherwise, and I come back to my often repeated statement on the floor of this House, somewhere down the line there is going to be a day of reckoning and we cannot afford to run the grave risk of the destruction of our economy. When that is destroyed, everything is destroyed and all of the blood that will have been shed and all of the lives that will have been sacrificed will be of no avail on the part of those precious boys who are fighting our battles overseas.

Only yesterday in our action on the conference report we raised the debt ceiling to $336 billion. In the emotionalism that existed here on the floor yesterday with reference to a former Member of this body, the action of the House on that conference report seems to be completely lost sight of. No one paid particular attention to the fact that the debt limit was increased again, nor does anyone seem to be concerned that it will have to be increased again within a few months.

So the purpose of these remarks, Mr. Speaker, so far as this Member is concerned, is merely to hoist the danger signals again, to raise the storm flag, and, to put it another way, to suggest that we stop, look, and listen. I am sure that we all want to see this glorious young Republic preserved. I am sure that we all want to see democracy throughout the world prevail. But I hope that in the process of doing so we do not lose the most precious heritage that any free people have ever had, this young Republic of free men with its coveted and highly valued institutions.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to my very warm friend from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman very sincerely for his kind reference to our committee. We have the largest legislative committee in this House of Representatives. They are dedicated and they are hard working. Yesterday we went to work at 8:30 a.m. This morning we went to work at 9:30. Tomorrow morning we go to work at 9:30 a.m. and we shall work all day on the authorization following this one we are considering today. To be recognized for the things we are attempting to do makes one feel good, for the membership of the House knows that we are striving to carry out the missions assigned to us by this House. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution will make in order upon its adoption the consideration of H.R. 4515, which is a bill that is necessary to fund the war in Vietnam, for of the approximately $4.5 billion—$4,548,200,000—authorized by this bill, virtually all of it, with possibly the exception of some of the funds that are authorized for research and development, testing, and evalution of weapons systems, can be attributed to the need to fund and to support our troops, almost a half million of them, who are now fighting the war in southeast Asia.

I certainly would join the chairman of my committee in applauding the members of the House Armed Services Committee for the very mature and thoughtful consideration that they have given, in their usual fashion, to this authorization bill.

It is necessary, of course, because the 1967 budget estimates of the Secretary of Defense as presented in the budget for fiscal 1967 were wrong; and this is not the whole amount of the supplemental appropriation requested. We are going to have to come up with a supplemental appropriation bill of almost $12.3 billion. And, very frankly, I think the committee has been a little bit more charitable in its report about the Secretary of Defense than I would be in suggesting that even though the war did not end on the 30th of June 1967, or will not end on that date, as the Secretary had indicated in the budget estimate that he made a year ago, he could be excused perhaps on the ground he was not making a prediction but, rather, attempting to use this date for planning purposes. The fact is that he guessed wrong to the tune of more than $12 billion.

I do want to add one thing to our discussion at this point. When this bill was being considered in the Committee on Rules, the suggestion was made that perhaps the rule ought to make in order the substitution of the Senate bill S. 665 upon the conclusion of our action on this bill, H.R. 4515. We did not adopt that kind of rule, and obviously we could not, because the Senate had not yet completed its action on Senate bill S. 665.

I am glad we did not, and that we could not, adopt that kind of rule. I believe, perhaps, this would be a good time at which to alert the Members of the House that in passing this bill yesterday afternoon the other body did something more than authorize $4.5 billion. They went a step further and added a policy declaration—and I have the language of it—which is called title IV, a statement of congressional policy as it was added to that bill.

I heard some rumors when I came to the floor this afternoon that there might still be some Members in this body who would have the intent and purpose to seek by the unanimous-consent procedure, or otherwise, to add this policy declaration to the bill, either by seeking unanimous consent that we substitute the Senate bill, or, perhaps, during the time that the bill is being read under the 5-minute rule to offer the policy declaration contained in title IV of S. 665 as an amendment to H.R. 4515.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman's apprehension is correct. I do intend at the proper time to offer as an amendment to the defense authorization before us today, using the wording of the so-called Mansfield amendment, which the Senate did adopt. I intend to do so because I believe our legislation needs to display not only the bolts of lightning, but also the olive branch. I believe that a full statement on congressional policy would be as constructive for this body as for the other.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his candor in revealing at this time his intentions for the House. It gives me, frankly, the opportunity to do what I was prepared to do anyway, in anticipation such a move would be made, and that is to comment on what I believe is the lack of wisdom in trying to tack onto a military authorization the broad language of a policy declaration.

I am not challenging the precise language of title IV in S. 665 as I read it, but this is a bad way to legislate; this is the wrong vehicle upon which to base a general Asian policy debate.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is extremely unwise to try to use the vehicle of this authorization bill to do what the gentleman from Wisconsin apparently wants to do. I do not know that there is no precedent for it. There may be an instance when it was done.

Certainly when we vote for this bill, what we are doing is making an authorization. We are not approving all the actions of the administration in southeast Asia. I am not. I certainly find many things with respect to the present policies there that are not to my liking. When I vote yes, as I most certainly will do in support of H.R. 4515, I do not for a moment consider that I am ratifying everything that the administration has done or will seek to do in the coming months. I am not doing this in my affirmative vote for this bill.

I am simply going to give my support to the extent that the House Armed Services Committee has decided will be necessary to give our troops the material support they need to fight the war in southeast Asia. They are not there, most of them perhaps, because they want to be. They are there because they were drafted. We can scarcely do less in aiding our services there than by voting in this House today to approve this legislation.

But let us not make the mistake of trying to use this bill as some kind of an attempt to tack on a policy declaration. If the administration wants to initiate the kind of grand debate which I believe the gentleman from Wisconsin has in mind, then fine, let them bring out a resolution that we can debate as we did on the Gulf of Tonkin resolution in August 1964, as to what our policy in southeast Asia should be.

I believe we becloud the issue if we try to tack that kind of thing on this military authorization bill.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. I shall be brief. I appreciate the gentleman's indulgence.

I believe I understand the gentleman's view. My own view, which differs from his, is that I should like to be in a position so that I may vote for the defense authorization which comes to us from the Armed Services Committee, and I feel that I can vote for it only if we have an opportunity to express the sense of Congress on the great policy issues underlining what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], has just called, I believe quite rightly, the war in southeast Asia. Without my proposed amendment, I oppose H.R. 4515.

We have to have a fist in front of us, but I also believe that fist has to be connected with a brain and with a heart.

Thus, I would hope my amendment would be favorably considered, although, as the gentleman from Illinois indicated, when it comes up he will oppose it, as it is, of course, his right to do.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I certainly do not want to be misunderstood, as challenging the gentleman's right to debate this broad area of policy. It ought to be debated, goodness knows, more than it is in the House. I merely say that this is not the way to do it. This is not a proper vehicle.

Let me give one concrete example. I have it on good authority—indeed, said by some who supported the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, adopted, I believe, with only two opposing or negative votes in August 1964—that some have said:

> Oh, we would not have voted for that if we had only known what that resolution was going to call for and where it would lead us. We would not vote for that legislation today.

Consider how much more favorable were the conditions for a full debate on the issue when it was confined to the issue as stated in the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, than if we mix it up with a $4½ billion military authorization bill, as to which some people are going to be voting because they want to support the boys in Vietnam and some, apparently, like the gentleman, are going to feel, "No, we cannot even do that unless we have a policy declaration."

This, I suggest, is not only a bad way to legislate but also not fair to the men in Vietnam, who need the kind of support we will be giving them when we vote on this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman not think that in the orderly process an amendment of this nature, dealing with foreign policy as it does, ought to come from the House Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. The gentleman from Iowa has obviously made an excellent point. I understand that right now a subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs—I believe I am correct in saying the Subcommittee on the Far East—is conducting some very valuable and I am sure useful hearings on the broad general aspects of our policy in southeast Asia. I would hope that perhaps as a result of its deliberations it will report some kind of a sense of Congress resolution which could be the vehicle on the floor of the House for the gentleman to express his views and for me to express mine as to what is right and as to what is wrong with the present policy in southeast Asia.

The administration should and could through its majority on the House Foreign Affairs Committee bring to the floor of the House a proper resolution under which our policies in southeast Asia could be debated and critically assessed.

I feel that much of the wave of dissatisfaction and unrest that has swept the country in recent months which has manifested itself in a dangerous disunity within our Nation is due to the administration's failure to speak with one voice and in words that can be clearly understood. Vague pronouncements and glittering generalities about self-determination and national self-interest are no substitute for clear and concise statements as to why we are in Vietnam, how long we will remain there, what we intend to negotiate about when a peace conference is called, and what our final and ultimate goal will be. We have had a very recent example of doubletalk by the administration when at a recent Presidential press conference the President spoke in one breath of "far-reaching moves" and then in the next breath blandly denied that the naval bombardment, long-distance artillery shelling, and mining of North Vietnamese rivers represents any escalation in the war. It would be better to be honest and admit that these moves do represent another tightening of the screw. Such statements as those made recently by the President only expose us to charges of hypocrisy and deception. There is no substitute for truth in the ever arcane language of international diplomacy. The American people are waiting for the clear and clarion call that only the President can give and which will serve to unify the American people for whatever difficult tasks that may lie ahead.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman from Illinois referred to the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, which passed this body in August 1964. I remind the gentleman that I voted for that resolution.

I will say here and now, I believe I erred in voting for a resolution so worded, and I am anxious that this body have an opportunity to state with greater particularity its concept of the issues underlying the war in southeast Asia, for the guidance of the executive branch.

I would say further that one-fourth to one-third of the Members of this body here today were not Members in August 1964, and they, too, are entitled here and now to an opportunity to express themselves.

I have the greatest of respect for the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and particularly for its Subcommittee on Asian Policy, under the chairmanship of my great colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

However, today we are confronted with a vote on the defense authorization. I think it is not only our right but our duty to instruct the administration in the sense of Congress, without which that defense authorization is an incomplete thing.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point that the composition of the membership of this House has changed vastly since August of 1964, and I am very happy he is correct in that statement of fact. Still the fact remains, and you can look around you on this floor today and from the number in attendance here you can be pretty sure that the Members of the House of Representatives think they are going to be voting today not on some policy declaration with respect to the issue of the war in Vietnam but, rather, on the issue of this bill which was brought out of the House Committee on Armed Services on what the extent of our funding or authorization should be for the Department of Defense. It would be highly unfortunate, I believe, if, without any prior notice and without laying a very careful basis for it, which ought to be laid in the form of committee hearings, with proper evidence and proper testimony given, if we would try to do what I think was done—and I would almost risk offending the rules of this House if I were to describe what I think the action of the other body on yesterday was, so I will refrain from doing so. I think it would be extremely unwise for this body to repeat that kind of a performance here today.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding. The point I wanted to make before related to the gentleman's reference to the Tonkin Bay resolution as the proper time when it should have been debated. However, it was brought up under a legislative process which permitted only debate of 30 minutes on each side, as the gentleman will recall. I was not a Member of the House at that time. I think a resolution of that great importance certainly should have much more time for its debate. I think this is sustained by the colloquy which took place in another body the day before yesterday between the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas and the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia in the course of which the senior Senator from Arkansas placed into the RECORD the debate which appeared in another body at the time that another body passed the Tonkin Bay resolution. That reveals it is his thinking at the time that he was floor manager for that resolution on the floor of another body that it was never intended for our country to get into a land war in Asia. He was specifically asked that question and said that the resolution permitted it, but it was certainly never contemplated that it would happen. Other Members of another body, too, were equally vigorous in their assertion that this would not happen, but, of course, in the course of events it has happened. Now we are in a war that Members did not foresee. The issue deserves our consideration and our very serious debate. The question of the vehicle to debate the issue is something that also deserves our consideration here. It has not been debated since the Tonkin Bay debate. Do we not have to take advantage of whatever vehicle comes along in order to debate it?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Let me respond to the gentleman's point by saying I do not think so, and I am inclined to the point of view that the administration ought to take the initiative here in presenting a resolution to this House, which it has the means of doing, to precisely and definitely presents the issue in context as to whether or not our present policy in Vietnam is all it should be. But I insist and I do not disagree with you for a moment that the Tonkin Bay resolution was debated under conditions where there was only 30 minutes of debate. It is wrong, and there should be more time allowed. I will say here that if they will bring that kind of a resolution out and bring it to the Committee on Rules and ask for a rule on it, I will certainly try to urge the chairman and the majority of that committee to afford the maximum time for debate of it so that we can have in the House the kind of searching inquiry that we ought to have. But let us not do it at a moment's notice today on a basis which would only serve to confuse the issue.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Briefly.

Mr. YATES. The representations were made when a bill similar to this was presented to the Congress last year. It was an appropriation bill for Vietnam. The representations that were made then were that if we voted for that bill we were supporting in full the administration's policy in Vietnam. I assume that that sort of representation will be made again today. The reason for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, I believe, will be to clarify that point and to say those of us who may vote for the bill do not necessarily endorse every detail of the policy in Vietnam. What we do, all we do, is to support our troops in the field.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, permit me to interrupt the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] at this point to say, as I have already stated, that my vote for this bill will not mean that I support in every detail everything which the administration has done or which it may do in southeast Asia.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that we need an amendment to manifest the fact that if one votes in favor of this bill which has been brought to the floor of the House by the Committee on Armed Services that that necessarily represents a blanket endorsement of these actions.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman and I agree on that point.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, there have been no hearings held on this subject matter by the Committee on Armed Services and, certainly, not by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

Mr. YATES. On this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Not on the bill, but on the amendments which have been proposed to be offered.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. The gentleman from Iowa is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Illinois will yield further, the gentleman properly criticized the restrictions in the consideration of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. But I would remind the gentleman that it was the Committee on Rules, backed by the House of Representatives for the stated purpose of permitting the House to work its will, and its free will, upon bills which brought forth the restrictive rule.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] is complaining in the wrong place when the gentleman complains about restrictive amendments.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I only wish to point out that the procedure which was followed with respect to the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was a standard procedure of the House and one which was used during the Eisenhower administration as well. Further, if there is to be criticism of one majority party, then the other party at the time that it was in majority control is equally culpable.

Mr. GROSS. I do not agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, permit me to conclude the debate on the rule on my side of the aisle by saying once again I believe we ought to respect the jurisdictional integrity of the committees of this House of Representatives. We can best do that by considering this bill today, as it was brought out by the Committee on Armed Services and by not adopting any extraneous amendments.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER].

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] for yielding this time to me. It may be that I shall not use or consume the full 5 minutes. I have asked for this time simply for the reason that I intend to ask our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON], a question. I do not know whether the gentleman would care to respond, but my desire to be recognized is primarily for the purpose of pursuing this question which has been under consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] has indicated—and I believe with some force to his argument, that this is not the vehicle for the general expression of sentiment about the policy decisions that we now find controlling our conduct of the Vietnam war.

But, Mr. Speaker, permit me to pose a more specific question. I am one of the Members of this House of Representatives who has been concerned and who has expressed his concern about the bombing of North Vietnam. I do not believe that this is the time to say why I do not believe this is a just and proper thing to do, and why I believe it has led us away from the possibility of negotiation and why I further believe that it has led to escalation of the war. However, in any event, I do have these reservations about the bombing of the north.

Mr. Speaker, I note on page 3 of the committee report the statement to the effect:

> The largest part of the authorization of this bill would provide for the procurement of aircraft and missiles.

Mr. Speaker, this authorization, therefore, in part, goes to replace the aircraft which have been shot down over North Vietnam.

We might say that one of the purposes of replacing these aircraft is to permit them again to continue to carry out their missions over North Vietnam.

Since I have very deep reservations about this, not so much as a tactical measure which I think I could justify on moral grounds, but in terms of broader strategy, do you not think I would be put in an untenable position to vote for this bill, particularly without any qualifications of any kind, where I have these reservations about a major aspect of this war?

I do not know whether the gentleman cares to reply to my inquiry or not. I might just say it is an open-ended question, but I am sure I know the gentleman would respond in the same manner in which I asked the question.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Mississippi will yield——

Mr. COLMER. I would state to the gentleman that the gentleman from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

Then if the gentleman from Minnesota will yield to me?

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I would not, of course, purport to answer for the conscience of the gentleman from Minnesota, and to try to tell him here on the floor of this House today how he should vote on this bill in which he feels in good conscience some of the funds that will be authorized and ultimately appropriated would be used to acquire aircraft, bombs, and other materiel that would be used by our forces north of the 17th parallel. I do not know if that is a fact. Presumably it is, because as I said in my opening statement, it was my understanding that these funds are largely for the prosecution of the war in Vietnam.

But I believe that the gentleman, being a member, as he is, and a distinguished member, of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, he of all people would prefer that it be done within the confines of that committee room after the summoning of witnesses and conducting the kind of free and open debate that would be proper within that committee, and that it would then be far preferable for that committee to report out for action on the floor of this House a resolution either in support of or in criticism of the war as presently being conducted in Vietnam, or in southeast Asia. And then to use that as the basis for securing a record vote as to whether we should continue or alter our present tactics in southeast Asia.

I just repeat what I said before: that, of course, one cannot vote very well against part of this bill and say "I am going to vote for part of the bill and vote against the specific requests for aircraft that are going to be used in southeast Asia." I believe that would be a rather difficult thing to do.

I do not know what kind of an amendment, frankly, one could ever present that would accomplish that purpose. If so, it would be a very neat parliamentary trick indeed to come up with an amendment where you could single out those items you wish to delete because they were in pursuit of policies with which you disagreed, and yet vote for other items which you feel are necessary to supply the men and boys who are fighting in the jungles and in the rice paddies of South Vietnam.

I, for one, would not want to legislate on that basis, and I do not believe the gentleman from Minnesota, being the careful and conscientious legislator that he is, would wish to either. Let us deal with the question of our policy in South Vietnam on the basis of a resolution within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which, I believe, would be competent to deal with this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ASPINALL). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 more minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I do want to make my own position clear. I have spoken out again and again on this question of bombing in the North, but the truth of the matter is that no matter how often one may speak or how often one may sign a letter or statement, the administration still pursues this policy which it apparently thinks is in our national interest.

I now come to the question of voting today on this bill. I agree with the gentleman that it is not feasible or possible to carve out a piece of the authorization that we do not like with reference to the military hardware stated in the bill. I might add, in that connection, that in general I have supported a strong defensive posture for the United States. I believe the power that we have in both conventional and nuclear force is very much to the benefit of this world.

My question comes when I do not agree with the way in which this force is being applied—being brought to bear in a particular situation—and in view of that, then I am confronted with the question as to how I should vote on the bill. May I say, that I have never to this day turned the administration down on a matter of this kind, yet I cannot continue this support in the face of what I regard as an ever more serious policy disagreement and specifically when the authorization in question does carry the means to implement that part of the policy with which I am in disagreement.

I respect the gentleman's views. I certainly respect the valor of our soldiers in Vietnam who are doing a wonderful job. I would like to see the fruits of their labors result in the improvement of the welfare of the people of Vietnam.

But I do have this very sharp policy disagreement and it seems to me at this time the problem I have here is more than just making a statement. While the gentleman says we should have a resolution out of our committee the realities are that we are not likely to get such a resolution under the present circumstances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4515) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4515, with Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the bill which I wish to present to you today is H.R. 4515, a bill authorizing appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, tracked combat vehicles, research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces.

I would like to state at the outset that regardless of the debate that is raging on South Vietnam, one thing is crystal clear to me: our troops are in South Vietnam. And they need weapons. This bill is an essential step in providing those weapons. For my part, I do not need to know anything else.

Normally, these weapon procurement bills do not include military construction; however, in the supplemental that has been presented to the committee we have combined both procurement, research and development, and military construction for ease of consideration. Also, since all of this bill, including military construction, is directed toward southeast Asia, there is certainly logic in following this course.

This bill contains authorization for appropriations as follows:

Procurement	$3,788,700,000
Research, development, test and evaluation	135,000,000
Military construction	624,500,000
Total	4,548,200,000

I will draw your attention to tables in the report which set out very clearly the authorizations and appropriations requested in this bill. The first of these tables appears on page 2 and shows only the authorizations in H.R. 4515. The second table which appears on page 24 sets out the total fiscal year 1967 programs. The first two columns of this second table show the authorizations and appropriations which are already law for fiscal year 1967. The third column sets out the now obligational authorizations contained in H.R. 4515. The military construction tables appear on pages 17 and 26.

In virtually every respect, this bill is exactly like those which you have considered in the past and merely represent more of the same. One difference from the usual authorization bill is that there are no naval vessels contained in it.

Perhaps I should point out at this time that this bill contains authorization for only a portion of the funds sought in the supplemental for southeast Asia. The Department requested $12,275,870,000. The bill, as I have indicated previously, contains authorization for only about one-third of this—$4,548,200,000. This smaller sum contained in the bill represents those items which require specific annual authorizations.

PROCUREMENT

On page 4 of the report you will see that the Army will receive a total of $601,400,000, broken down into aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles. Each aircraft, missile, and tracked combat vehicle is named and described. For obvious reasons, numbers are not given but you may be sure that if you, Mr. Chairman, or any member of the committee wishes to have that kind of detail, I will be very glad to furnish it.

On page 7 of the report you will see that the Navy and Marine Corps will receive $1,839,300,000. This again is broken down in the same fashion and on page 9 it will be seen that the Air Force will receive $1,348 million, in this case broken down only into aircraft and missiles. In all of these instances each of the items is named and described.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The amount in this bill for research and development totals $135 million, spread among the military services and the Defense agencies. These research and development funds are to support development efforts to meet requirements of our combat forces in southeast Asia. These requirements were unforeseen at the time of the original budget submission for fiscal year 1967. The development efforts supported by this budget include projects to improve the night combat capability of our forces in Vietnam including improvements of aircraft suppressive fire, improved ship-launched and air-launched missiles, and to increase the accuracy and overall effectiveness of our weapons delivery capability.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

The military construction portion of the report begins on page 15. The total program is for an authorization of $624,500,000. On pages 17 and 26 are set out in quite considerable detail the areas in which the construction will be carried on and the amounts involved. You will note that of the total amount, approximately $74 million will be spent in the United States.

I feel I must call your attention to the fact that of the $624.5 million for military construction, $138.8 million represents cost growth on prior programs. The bulk of this or $126.2 million is for Vietnam. The cost growth there is attributed to a combination of factors associated with construction in undeveloped territory and in a combat environment without previous experience in estimating such work under contract. In addition, monsoon weather, high shipping demurrage rates, untrained labor, effects of sand on equipment, maintenance, increase in cost of materials, strikes, and civil unrest contributed to higher costs.

As you will recall, last year when the bill was submitted to the Congress, there was only a total dollar amount requested for construction with very little backup information. This year, the program has been more refined and was submitted considerably more in detail. Concern was expressed, however, during the hearings regarding the blank-check approach to military construction authorization for the southeast Asia program. We recognize that there cannot be, under circumstances existing today in southeast Asia, a firm commitment that the particular items shown will actually be constructed. Changing deployment patterns prevent this. Nevertheless, the committee believed that the construction items in the United States as shown in the backup books supporting this bill should be treated as firm projects. The committee also believed that notification should be given to the committee in advance of a final decision by the Secretary of Defense whenever reprograming is done on projects in southeast Asia in an amount in excess of $1 million.

By mutual agreement, I am happy to say the Secretary of Defense sent me a letter in the nature of a memorandum of understanding in which he agrees to treat all projects in the United States as firm, agrees to notify the committee one week in advance of any final decision reprogramming projects in southeast Asia which cost $1 million, thus giving an opportunity for the committee to voice an objection, and a further notification upon reaching an ultimate decision regarding reprograming in southeast Asia. This will permit the flexibility demanded by General Westmoreland in performing his military mission and at the same time will make the Congress a partner in the decision-making process of construction there.

The construction portion of the bill this year is approximately one-half of that provided last year.

One last matter. The committee amended the bill in only one respect. It added $81 million for the EA-6A airplane. Under questioning by the committee, the Marine Corps indicated that some of these aircraft had been requested by them but that the Secretary of Defense had declined to give them permission to request them of the Congress. The Marines indicated that the EA-6A airplane was the highest priority item not granted by the Secretary of Defense.

This aircraft is a two-place electronic countermeasures version of the A-6A. It is manufactured by the Grumman Engineering Corp. and has J-52 Pratt & Whitney engines.

The committee considered this a necessary addition to the bill.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, that is the bill. As I have indicated, it is in no substantial fashion different from all the other bills which have authorized funds for our defensive and offensive weapons. Indeed, the only real difference here is that everything in this bill relates to the conflict in southeast Asia and is directed specifically to our needs there.

As is probably well known, I have very strong opinions about the war in Vietnam and I have expressed myself frequently on this subject. Notwithstanding this fact, I feel that my views have very little to do with the passage of this bill.

Our young men are in Vietnam. They require our support and our help. The passage of this bill is that support and that help.

Debate will continue as to our being in Vietnam and the conduct of the conflict there. I will participate in that debate at the proper time. This, however, in my opinion is not the proper time to engage in this debate. This is the time for only one thing and that is a vote of confidence for our people who are fighting in southeast Asia.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman. Can the gentleman tell us for what length of time this funding is to be provided? Is it only for the remainder of this fiscal year?

Mr. RIVERS. It must be appropriated during this fiscal year. Some of it will be extended after the fiscal year.

Mr. YATES. It does not extend beyond this fiscal year?

Mr. RIVERS. This is a supplemental for fiscal year 1967.

Mr. YATES. For 1967. It will not fund any operation for fiscal year 1968?

Mr. RIVERS. No. We have that bill coming up. We are holding hearings on it now.

Mr. YATES. How many fighting men will this bill fund? Will the bill fund the activities of more troops than are presently in Vietnam?

Mr. RIVERS. It is not intended for that purpose. There are in the neighborhood of 500,000 there now.

Mr. YATES. This bill is for the purpose of funding only that number?

Mr. RIVERS. That is certainly substantially correct.

Mr. YATES. So far as the gentleman knows, this bill is not one for escalating the conflict?

Mr. RIVERS. No, it is not. Has it been escalated? I have not seen much escalation. I should like to see more than there is now.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, one of the great and outstanding members of our committee.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, my colleague embarrasses me, but I will accept it with graciousness.

Mr. RIVERS. Maybe you will reciprocate.

Mr. HÉBERT. The gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. Chairman, has demonstrated, with that remark, his great capacity for anticipation and his full knowledge of human beings. However, Mr. Chairman, may I say to my distinguished chairman and to my colleagues that in his summation he used two expressions which I think indicate more than anything else the position which he occupies and the position which I am compelled to draw the attention of the House to today. He said that he had strong opinions in the beginning of the summation and closed by saying that this would be a vote of confidence. I do not think any two expressions encompass or better explain what I would like to say at this moment with respect to the gentleman. The strong opinion which he has is certainly reflected in those of the 39 other Members who make up the House Committee on Armed Services. I am sure every one of those 39 members outside of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina has a strong opinion which is equally shared by every Member of this body who has had the opportunity to observe this gentleman since he became the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services a little over 2 years ago. At that particular time he stepped into the broad and big shoes of perhaps one of the most honored Members of Congress in the entire history of Congress, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Carl Vinson, at whose feet we all learned much. It was almost like asking an individual to succeed George Washington in his time.

There were many eyebrows raised and they would have been raised in many quarters regardless of the known capacity and ability of any individual, but I feel certain that nobody, regardless of their favorable prejudice expected the gentleman from South Carolina to grow in so short a time to the stature to which he has grown and in which he appears before us today.

Mr. Chairman, I say this without reservation: The American people will never know or never realize what a debt of gratitude they owe to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina. Certainly every Member of this House should know by this time and realize by this time that one individual standing out above all others has done more in a short space of 2 years to recapture that which the Congress unfortunately in the past has given up. The day the Mendel Rivers became chairman of the Committee on Armed Services he dedicated himself to a restoration and a recognition of the Constitution which he had taken the oath to uphold in this body on so many occasions. It does not often get in the press or come to the attention of the commentators because these fundamental returns to Americanism are not as attractive of attention as other degrading and downgrading expression of opinion. I refer to those who would tear up the Constitution. The gentleman from South Carolina carried through every promise he has made. Those of us on the Committee on Armed Services of the House are indeed most fortunate in being able to serve under his leadership and know of his unfailing devotion to duty and his constant inspiration to keep our words and to uphold that Constitution to which we are pledged by oath.

Perhaps I am prejudiced to a degree because I have grown up with this man, but I think it gives me the credentials to evaluate him. Those of you who know me know I am not a man of easy acquiescence. I like to pride myself, if I may momentarily pause to refer to myself personally, as being independent. I am not a "yes" man. With that background I can say that I am not fawning on my chairman. I feel that I am expressing what is in the heart of every man on the committee which he leads.

Mr. Chairman, a vote of confidence will be expressed in voting in favor of this legislation. I am sure we will find that there will be only a handful of votes against it.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that every piece of legislation which has been brought before this body since the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers] became its chairman, without exception, was brought here under overwhelming majorities.

Mr. Chairman, every piece of legislation that has been presented to this body since the gentleman has been the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has passed overwhelmingly. The debates involved thereon were heated and lengthy and certainly in depth. However, when the final vote came it represented an overwhelming recognition, I feel, of the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers] and, certainly, a vote of confidence in his leadership and the members of the committee which he chairs.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina has never accepted these plaudits or these accolades as personal to himself. He has shared them as an expression of appreciation of his own committee, in his humility and his understanding of human beings, because, certainly, this man above all men is a human being and a man just the same as you and I, a man with his own thoughts and virtues.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot think of a better manner in which to refer to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers] than by using the time-honored thought of that great fraternal organization:

> Their faults we write upon the sands, the virtues of their labors become a memory.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I have not lingered too long upon this tribute, but I would consider myself derelict, if I did not pay this tribute on this particular occasion when this most important piece of legislation is pending before this body.

So, Mr. Chairman, I again urge an overwhelming vote of confidence, backed by a strong opinion, not only in favor of this most important legislation but, as a tribute to a great American, a tribute to an individual who has given much to his country and to whom all of us owe much, the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not deserve such an encomium. However, whatever the gentleman from Louisiana has said I accept for the 39 other members of the Committee on Armed Services. Never have I worked with a group of men more dedicated to the interest of their country.

Mr. Chairman, it is I who is privileged to work with this magnificent group.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. I thank the distinguished chairman.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services upon the able presentation which he has made of this bill.

I have a couple of questions to which I hope the gentleman from South Carolina will be able to respond. First, on page 3, with respect to the matter of reprograming, would the chairman be able to tell us, roughly, what the amount of reprograming was and how this was handled in terms of this bill? In other words, funds appropriated here, will they be used to repay the funds from which the reprograming funds were taken?

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me on that point?

Mr. RIVERS. Would the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts like to respond to that question? If so, I shall be glad to yield to him.

Mr. BATES. The gentleman and I discussed this matter, and I intend to make this the subject of my remarks when I take the floor.

Mr. BROWN of California. Fine. My question was premature and I shall withdraw it at this time.

I thank the gentleman, and if my question is covered at that time then I will withdraw the question.

But, Mr. Chairman, may I ask one further question with regard to the item which was added by the Committee on Armed Services for the Marine Corps, will that be explained in more detail at a later point in the discussion?

Mr. RIVERS. If the gentleman desires it, we will explain it at a later time, and supply him with all the information he wishes on it.

Mr. BROWN of California. I am particularly constrained to understand why it was that the highest priority item in the Marine Corps, which was not presented by the administration, was approved by the committee, and why the highest priority items of, say, the Army, or of the Air Force, which also were not submitted by the administration, were not likewise approved by the committee?

Mr. RIVERS. There are two answers I can give the gentleman. This is not at all an unusual situation.

The gentleman must understand that we evaluate these matters one after the other. In the case of the Marines we did not think the time lapse involved was a wise chance to take. This addition was made because of its unusual priority—even urgency.

I might say to the gentleman, incidently, that I am not sure $81 million is enough. I think it may have been wiser to have put in about $106 million.

However, I must say that getting figures from the DOD is a man-sized undertaking.

Mr. BROWN of California. I understand that, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for your explanation.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I want to join in the remarks of my colleagues, and to compliment the gentleman on his work. I would also like to ask a question in an attempt to put this supplementary military procurement authorization in perspective.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard again and again that the conflict in Vietnam has more than one component; that it has more than the military aspect to it. We hear, for example, that this is an economic war, that above all else this is a political war. The problems that are found in South Vietnam require a military presence, but the military presence alone will not bring a final solution to that troubled area. I assume that the gentleman shares that view, at least in a general way?

Mr. RIVERS. Certainly. I do not believe that the military alone wins wars. We have won military victories in Europe, as you know, and then blundered. I can give you concrete examples.

Mr. FRASER. So the gentleman would recognize that the supplemental military authorization provided here is only one component of a total program which would have to be brought to bear on the Vietnamese problem and the total problems that are confronting us in the battlefield. Is it not a fact that the part of the problem in Vietnam which seems to be the most intractable is the political problem? It is sometimes put as the problem of having the people of Vietnam come to relate or identify with the Saigon government, or to have a sense of nationalism, or to feel that they have a stake in the future by being with the Government instead of being neutral or being against it.

Mr. RIVERS. I cannot deny that. I want to say this: I am happy to see the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the floor. You are a member of that committee; are you not?

Mr. FRASER. Yes; I am.

Mr. RIVERS. I believe that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has handled this difficult problem extremely well, and I would say that during last year I not only voted for all the bills from that committee, but I spoke for them.

Mr. FRASER. I appreciate that.

Mr. RIVERS. I do not believe guns, tanks, and planes alone win wars. You must light something in the hearts of the people, touch something in their souls.

Let me say to the gentleman that the military man in our forces does not merely carry on a military program, today our military men are engaged in all kinds of activities. I wish the gentleman could go down to Fort Bragg, N.C., and see what our Special Forces—the Green Berets—see how they are trained to do all manner of things. They are trained to do almost everything, even to aiding in childbirth, which they have been doing in Vietnam. They do literally everything. I think it is a total package which we must make for the image of America.

Mr. FRASER. I assume the gentleman would agree that it would have been well had the United States understood better, and prepared more adequately, for this aspect of the struggle. In other words, it would have been wise had we understood better the political elements of this insurgency situation, and had perhaps a better understanding of all that was involved in this political situation?

We have put so much money there now that inflation is a first-class problem.

The point I want to bring to the chairman's attention as a Member of the House, because this is not a matter which is within his committee's jurisdiction, is the $135 million for research and development, test, and evaluation which is in the supplementary measure. This is added to the figure of nearly $7 billion already authorized.

Mr. RIVERS. That is $7 billion?

Mr. FRASER. Yes, $7 billion. So that altogether the Department of Defense is provided better than $7 billion for research and development, test, and evaluation of military hardware and military techniques, and so on.

Mr. RIVERS. And this is vital. It must go on. The distinguished gentleman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] heads this subcommittee, and the cream of technical know-how is on that committee. This is vital. We must do this.

Mr. FRASER. I want to draw the gentleman's attention to the fact on the political side, which typically and traditionally is the responsibility of the Department of State, that the total budget they are given each year for research into those areas, a concern which would embrace the political problems that we find in South Vietnam totals something on the order of $2 million.

Mr. RIVERS. That is $2 million?

Mr. FRASER. That is $2 million a year as compared with to some $7 billion for the Department of Defense.

Would the gentleman agree that there may be some disproportion here?

Mr. RIVERS. Oh, no, no.

Mr. FRASER. In this sense, Mr. Chairman. The amount accorded to the Department of Defense need not come down, but if we are going to understand better how to work at the political level, the amounts provided in this field which belong to the Department of State and related agencies ought to be increased. One simple purpose would be to assimilate the experience in Vietnam.

Mr. RIVERS. I think your committee is wisely directing its attention to that. I have every confidence in the final solution by your committee as to what the Department of State needs. I have every confidence in the gentleman knowing more about his business than I do.

So far as the military is concerned we are, in this hour of need, providing all that we need. A lot of military research and development devolved to the benefit of the civilian economy.

Mr. FRASER. Of course, Mr. Chairman, I want to add, coming back to the $2 million for the Department of State, and I find that the correct figure is $4 million, but the point of my inquiry is that this is not a matter that lies either in your jurisdiction or in the jurisdiction of our committee. We do not pass on this question in the Committee on Foreign Affairs. This matter relates to the appropriation request of the Department of State. We do not have an authorizing bill for the Department of State in our committee. I thought it worthwhile, so long as we were talking about the problems of Vietnam, to bring out the fact that we are spending billions of dollars in research and development on the military side, but on the political side where we are really fighting a tough struggle, we are shelling out pennies to the agency that bears the ultimate responsibility. I thought it worthwhile at least to mention this so that perhaps we might be guided appropriately when the appropriation measures come before the House.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. Of course, I am delighted to yield.

Mr. YATES. Is it in order to ask the gentleman about a question, the answer to which was deleted in the hearings?

For example, on page 79 it says this:

> The CHAIRMAN—

That means yourself, of course—

> The CHAIRMAN. Well, now Premier Ky has indicated and said some things about invading the north; of course, it would have to be approved by you; wouldn't it?
>
> General WHEELER. [Deleted.]
>
> Secretary MCNAMARA. [Deleted.]

Is this confidential so that it cannot be revealed in the open as to what was said?

Mr. RIVERS. If it could have been revealed, it would have been left in the record.

Mr. YATES. I wonder whether or not there was any reference to it in the conversation that could be revealed?

Mr. RIVERS. I will be glad to give you the sum and substance of our conversation off the floor of the House.

Mr. YATES. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] has consumed 37 minutes.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join the gentleman from Louisiana in respect to his remarks concerning our distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. The unanimous legislation which we so frequently report to the House attests to his leadership. His dedicated efforts and cooperative spirit have provided outstanding leadership to our committee and I have been pleased to labor with him in our united effort to provide for the security of our beloved country.

I rise in support of H.R. 4515.

I agree with all that our very distinguished chairman has said with respect to this bill which provides for supplemental military procurement, research and development, and construction authorizations for the present fiscal year.

There is no doubt in the minds of the committee that these supplemental moneys are needed in the light of the Vietnam situation. We were unanimous in our approval of this bill. We did believe many of these matters could and should have been taken care of earlier, but now that the request is in front of us we do approve it.

I would like to address myself particularly to one phase of the relations between the Department of Defense and the Congress as illustrated by this bill.

After the Congress has appropriated moneys for the operation of the Department of Defense, the Department is able to change its program either by coming back to the Congress for supplemental moneys as it has done here or by reallocating moneys available within the Department in accordance with reprograming actions.

It was in 1959 that the Congress began to reassume its constitutional role over the operations of the Department of Defense by requiring authorization not only for naval vessels as had earlier been the case but also for the procurement of aircraft and missiles. This exercise of congressional responsibility was later extended to research and development, test, and evaluation carried on by the Department of Defense and then to the procurement of tracked combat vehicles. The purpose of these revisions was to permit the Armed Services Committees to examine more carefully the operations of the Defense Department in these specific areas with the results of the examination being written into law.

Shortly after the present Secretary of Defense first assumed his position, he wanted more flexibility with these moneys in order to be able to shift the programs of the Department to meet changing conditions. Hence it was that the Department of Defense came into agreement with both Armed Services Committees and both Appropriations Committees whereby the Department could shift moneys, reporting this shift for approval in some instances and merely reporting them for the committees' information in lesser instances. Those times when the approval was required are the times when funds for the items have been deleted or reduced by the Congress or when the items have been authorized by legislation reported by the Armed Services Committee in accordance with the law. Otherwise the Committees will be notified if there is going to be any procurement of new items costing $2 million or more or if there is any proposed increase in the procurement program involving $5 million or more on a cumulative basis. This method of reprograming was designed to allow the Department some flexibility while at the same time maintaining the control by the Congress as set forth in the 1959 statute.

Exercising its ability to reprogram, the Department of Defense obtained prior approval for a quarter of a billion dollars of reprograming in fiscal year 1965 and had a total of $1.1 billion of reprograming for that year. In fiscal 1966, the Department again obtained prior approval of a quarter billion dollars of reprograming and had a total reprograming of $1.2 billion. Through the first half of fiscal 1967, there have been $1.8 billion of reprograming brought to the committees under 47 different actions.

While all these figures alone are impressive, they do not tell the whole story. In fiscal 1965, there were 152 different programs given increased funds by the reprograming actions, while 253 programs were deleted or cut. In fiscal 1966, there were 173 programs given increased funds and 419 programs were deleted or cut. This means that within the overall package presented to the Congress for approval for procurement and for research and development, there have been many individual programs which have had to be changed either by increasing or decreasing their funds. Sometimes this change is warranted on a permanent basis but more frequently the change is accomplished by holding back programs that do not have as high a priority as others which are needed at the moment only to have these same programs receive new funds either from later reprograming actions or from new appropriations.

The whole picture could have been presented to the Congress at the time of the original authorization action. Congress might have taken the view of increasing the funding to the items which are needed at a particular time without cutting others. Each time a program, whether it is a procurement or research and development program, has funds removed from it and later restored there can be a very serious adverse effect on the program and particularly on the morale of those working in it. While research and development programs are more likely to run into unknown problems, since that is why they are research and development programs, nevertheless a steadier control of them will in the long run be more beneficial to the country and less costly. Where moneys have been added to a program, by the reprograming, often it is done on a crash basis, which is also harmful to the program as well as costly.

However, I would like to present to the attention of the House some information as to the size of these actions. In the reprograming actions so far in this year, there have been 18 involving sums between $1 million and $25 million. There have been eight between $26 and $50 million, one between $51 and $75 million, two between $76 and $100 million, and two of over $100 million. In one reprograming action, there was over $300 million for one type of aircraft alone and over $100 million on another aircraft—or nearly half a billion dollars in one reprograming action alone. This kind of a program should have been undertaken in the original authorization legislation.

In the past our committee, in exercising its responsibilities under the Constitution, has tried to persuade the Department of Defense on several different occasions that it was being shortsighted in its actions. It was only after the committee insisted on an RB–70 that the prototype of this bomber was developed and their research continued in the manned systems. Our committee has also directed the attention of the Department to the serious need for fighter aircraft, tactical aircraft, and even for helicopters which have proved so vital in our operations in Vietnam. It was at the insistence of our committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that we now have our nuclear submarine fleet—over the initial objections of the Pentagon.

Aside from the reprograming, the Department of Defense has sometimes received more money through supplemental legislation. In 1965, it received an additional $700 million in appropriations that were passed in exception to the authorization process. Last year there was a supplemental of almost $5 billion which required authorization; this year we are again back with another supplemental of almost $5 billion which needs authorization. All of the supplementals have arisen because the Department of Defense has proceeded up to now on the erroneous assumption that the war in Vietnam would be over by the end of each fiscal year.

I do not believe that the Department of Defense really is unable to plan its programs for each fiscal year in such a way that it needs to obtain either this kind of a supplemental authorization or to exercise the kind of reprograming actions that it has. Our committee has already given notice to the Department that it is going to reexamine the Department's reprograming actions this year. It seems to me, too, that it is very desirable for our committee to examine the planning of the Department when it needs supplements of this kind.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts upon an excellent statement. However, I should like to ask the gentleman this question: In response to my questions earlier, the distinguished chairman of the committee indicated that this was not a bill which would permit escalation of the conflict in Vietnam, but that it provides the funds that are designed to maintain the operations of our forces presently there at the present time.

Is that the impression of the gentleman from Massachusetts as well?

Mr. BATES. I do not know if I could give a categorical answer to that question. However, I would say that without this bill there could be escalation in South Vietnam with the funds which have already been provided. Whether these funds or other funds might be used is another question, as I believe the gentleman from Illinois is aware.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, was any information given to the gentleman's committee during the hearings to the effect that the funds authorized in this bill would result in an escalation of the conflict?

Mr. BATES. I believe, to the degree to which the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] referred to that matter, and within the realm of security, I want to say that I concur with the general observation of the chairman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, that it does not?

Mr. BATES. Within the general statement of the chairman; that is correct.

Mr. YATES. That it does? The gentleman agrees with the chairman that it does not provide for an escalation?

Mr. BATES. Specifically, this bill does not provide for the escalation of the war in South Vietnam. However, I am not saying that other funds already appropriated, or even the funds provided herein might not be used. No one can tell that, as the gentleman from Illinois knows.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if possible, certainly, the funds that were voted last year were, presumably, limited to the scale of the operations at that time, but the Department went ahead and escalated the war anyway.

Mr. BATES. The fact of the matter is we have funds which can be used and through their use this situation could be escalated.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman means without the further use of funds authorized in this bill?

Mr. BATES. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that we have troops and equipment all over the world for whom and for which appropriations have previously been made. How much of this materiel and how many men might be applied to South Vietnam, is beyond the competency of the gentleman from Massachusetts to explain to the gentleman from Illinois. I only say that there are sufficient troops elsewhere and sufficient instruments of war located elsewhere which could be used in South Vietnam, if the President so decided, with or without the funds proposed to be authorized through the enactment of this bill.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I read through the hearings of the Committee on Armed Services which were held on this subject and I saw no testimony in the hearings that reflected upon the value of the bombing of North Vietnam. Was there any testimony presented before the gentleman's committee on that subject?

Mr. BATES. Yes. I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois that on many occasions, the chairman of the committee, and the policy committee, and many members of the committee have discussed this at great length with the Secretary of Defense. We intend to discuss it further when the posture hearings are resumed. Undoubtedly you have yourself discussed this at the White House.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I saw no reference in the hearings to any statement by the Secretary of the Department of Defense as to his impression of the value of the bombings.

Mr. BATES. Permit me to say to the gentleman from Illinois that the matter was covered. Whether or not it has been deleted, I do not know.

Mr. YATES. The Department does delete matter, does it not?

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, going back to this question of escalation, would it be proper to say that there is nothing contained in this bill which either provides for or prevents the escalation of the war?

Mr. BATES. That was the essence of my general statement.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not true that, for example, the greater escalation which I believe any of us could imagine—the dropping of a nuclear device upon Hanoi—would require no additional funds above those which have already been provided to the Department of Defense?

Mr. BATES. I feel that it would require a decision, not additional funds. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BROWN of California. I recognize the fact that it would require a decision.

Mr. BATES. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BROWN of California. So additional legislative authorization by the Congress is not required?

Mr. BATES. It would not require that.

Mr. BROWN of California. In other words, the basic decisions as to escalation are not contained in any of the documents before us?

Mr. BATES. Escalation, whether it would be represented by decisions or not, is not in this bill, as I tried to indicate to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. When Mr. McNamara came before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I asked him the specific question of who made the decision with respect to creating sanctuaries in North Vietnam, and he replied that it was "constitutional authorities." He would go no further.

I leave it to the gentleman to figure out who "constitutional authorities" may be.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman in the well for his leadership of the minority on the Commitee on Armed Services. His comments with regard to the partnership with the chairman of our great committee are certainly worthy of note by all of us because it has been in an atmosphere of serious dedication and cooperation that we have sought to resolve these problems, and the leadership that those two gentlemen have provided.

He has materially aided in achieving unanimity within the committee on the objectives we seek and the solutions we have recommended.

I join in support of this measure, H.R. 4515.

I would like to call your attention to certain aspects of the construction portion of this 1967 supplemental request.

This bill provides military construction authorization in the amount of $624,500,000 to support our activities in southeast Asia as follows: For the Army, $288,500,000; for the Navy, $140 million; and for the Air Force, $196 million.

The program has been developed from the requirements submitted by the commander in chief of the Pacific and the military departments to support our forces presently deployed and planned for deployment in southeast Asia.

From the fiscal year 1965 construction authorization bill through this 1967 supplemental, if we pass it, total funds will have been authorized in the amount of $1,486 million for South Vietnam; $796.6 million for construction activities outside of South Vietnam but associated with our efforts in southeast Asia; and $70.2 million for planning money for construction; or a total of $2,352,800,000 for construction.

The military construction program in South Vietnam consists of the following major elements: five deep water ports; four major depot complexes, including warehousing, open, refrigerated, POL and ammunition storage and maintenance shops; eight jet-capable airfields; a number of tactical and logistic support airfields; shallow draft ports for coastal shipping; the repair of and extension to roads and railroads; and troop cantonments and hospital facilities for United States and free world military assistance forces personnel.

Outside of South Vietnam in support of this program, in southeast Asia we have had to build a deep water port, two major depot complexes, two jet-capable air bases, and an air commando base in addition to improving numerous operational facilities at existing air bases, augmentation of maintenance and supply facilities, POL and ammunition storage facilities and numerous hospitals.

In the United States in support of this program, we have been required to expand aviation and other tactical training facilities at various air bases and military installations and service schools as well as improve the maintenance and supply facilities.

The very logistical problem of accomplishing in 3 years a job of this magnitude almost staggers the imagination. The program has been expensive. For instance, the cost factor varies from two to five times the cost of similar construction in the Washington, D.C., area, with the average being approximately three times the cost. This seems inordinately high until we realize that we are building projects in areas completely infested with the Vietcong, and we must pay for the risk involved. The risk alone is not the sole reason for this very high cost. Can you imagine building a facility miles from any proper line of transportation? The transportation costs alone for the 11,000 miles of supply pipeline are a significant factor.

As you know, the construction in southeast Asia is being done by one major private contractor and military personnel. The private contractor is a combine of the following firms: Raymond, Morrison, Knudsen; Brown & Root; and J. A. Jones. The original contract carried with it his fee, which was a fixed fee but amounted to 3 percent of the estimated value of the construction and that applied during the period from 1962 to 1966 when the volume was relatively small.

In 1966, this contract was changed to a cost-plus-award fee basis and on this at the present time the fee amounts to just under 2.4 percent of the total estimated cost of the work.

Let me give you an illustration of how this works: The Navy and the contractor must arrive at an agreed-upon value for the proposed project, and this is the estimated cost. The cost-plus-award fee includes a base fee. This base fee in the case of the Vietnam joint venture is 1.7 percent of the agreed-upon value of the work to be done. Then in addition to that, there is an award fee which can amount to as much as 0.7 percent of the agreed-upon value of the construction. The amount of the award fee that is given to the contractor is in the judgment of the contracting officer based on the contractor's performance of the contract. In essence, the fee the contractor is paid depends on how well he builds as well as how fast and economical. Thus, the most profit that a contractor can make would be 2.4 percent on the agreed figure and out of this the contractor must take his central or home office expense because this is not reimbursable.

During the hearings the committee went into detail regarding the comparison of the cost of projects conducted by military personnel as compared to the contractor, and were satisfied with the philosophy under which we are operating; that is, to do as much as possible with available troop resources, with only the balance being performed by contractors.

You will note that in the request of this year, $138.8 million is for cost growth on prior programs. This means that we failed to estimate the cost correctly. While this appears to be a very substantial variation, I think we have to face the fact that there are certain things about this operation in Vietnam that just defy accurate estimating. In the first place, we do not have a complete plan nor can we have one under terms of changing deployment patterns. In Vietnam, the construction is subject to constant disruptions of all character from enemy operations. Also we are plagued by inflation in this war-torn country. Fortunately, it has been kept within reasonable bounds, but it has had a substantial impact on the cost of the construction program.

I recognize the construction program has required a vast expenditure of funds in that the projects being built are, insofar as possible, on a temporary basis. But as long as our national policy requires us to be in Vietnam, we have no alternative but to support and supply our troops with the basic requirements to perform their mission.

Therefore, I urge each and every one of you to support H.R. 4515.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts on his very fine statement. I would also like to join with my colleague from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] on his comments, and with our colleague from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] on the remarks he made with respect to the operation of the Committee on Armed Services under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from South Carolina.

One of the things that makes me feel so much better about our Defense Establishment under the chairmanship of the gentleman from South Carolina is the teamwork which goes into all of our committee deliberations. I think that this is the one hope, that our Nation has that the defense of our country will not be dependent upon the judgment of a single man in the Pentagon. Because under the way our committee is now operating, there is exchange of ideas, there is discussion and deliberation, and there is an attempt to secure the thinking and judgment of the most competent military experts. By this means our committee always brings to the floor legislation which reflects our collective judgment and which is not necessarily consistent with the official position of the Department of Defense.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I notice from the figures in the report that aircraft for the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force come to something over $3 billion of the total amount.

Mr. BATES. $3.1 billion.

Mr. BINGHAM. It is 1.74, and 1.303, which I think is a little over $3 billion.

Mr. BATES. The gentleman is pretty close.

Mr. BINGHAM. Would it be a fair assumption that a substantial part of this aircraft procurement is considered to be necessary to replace aircraft that will be lost through continuation of the bombing operation in North Vietnam?

Mr. BATES. The gentleman cannot project what might happen in the future. All I can say is that there is a current need, and we are trying to fill that current need.

Mr. BINGHAM. Can the gentleman enlighten us somewhat as to the basis on which these estimates are made. Why, if there is, as the report states, about an 18-month leadtime required here, then the funds which will be used for aircraft procurement will not be used until 1969, is that correct?

Mr. BATES. That is correct.

Mr. BINGHAM. I am just trying to get at the basis on which the estimated need in 1969 is founded.

Mr. BATES. We actually use a 5-year plan, I will say to the gentleman.

There have been losses in Vietnam. Obviously when you have losses, and you have originally had a 5-year schedule, you try to go along with the schedule, and that is what we are trying to do.

Mr. BINGHAM. If the gentleman will yield further, would it be a fair statement to say that if the bombings were to be discontinued over North Vietnam, that a substantial part of the procurement of aircraft now requested would not be necessary?

Mr. BATES. The gentleman uses the word "substantial." I cannot comment on that word. All I can say is that the answer would be to the effect that there would be an impact.

Mr. BINGHAM. And the gentleman cannot give us an estimate, actually based upon the amount sought that might be affected?

Mr. BATES. No; I cannot give you that figure as to the impact upon the future.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman in the well of the House, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] for his statement. I would point out to the Members of the House that all the members of the House Armed Services Committee, both Democrats and Republicans, have a deep and abiding respect for the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I also concur in the remarks made by the gentleman from Louisiana in regard to the great leader of the House Committee on Armed Services, Hon. MENDEL RIVERS, from South Carolina. I have had the opportunity in the 7 years that I have been in the Congress to serve on four committees and I have never served on any committee whose chairman was fairer and who carries out his responsibilities in a more competent and democratic manner.

But I would particularly like to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts for his discussion on the matter of reprograming. I think this is one matter which the members of the committee should look at very closely.

I remember in one discussion on the floor of this House, when the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] was quite critical of either an appropriation bill or an authorization bill concerning foreign aid. In his statement, he said that the State Department could obligate funds for one purpose and then the next day it could deobligate it for that purpose and the next day it could reobligate it for another purpose.

The situation is almost getting as bad in regard to reprograming. In the case of the Department of Defense, it is programing for one purpose—reprograming for another purpose—and then perhaps re-reprograming for still another purpose. This constitutes a surrender of our legislative responsibilities. It is unfair to the Members of the House especially those who are not members of the House Armed Services Committee.

It is very difficult for Members of the Congress who are concerned with the defense of the Nation to actually curtail this type of activity when we are told that not to reprogram would impair the defense of the Nation.

I hope our distinguished chairman and the distinguished minority member on the committee will continue to work for the curtailment of what is rapidly becoming a very reprehensible practice.

Mr. BATES. I thank the gentleman from Missouri. It is a matter of great concern to the committee. I can assure the gentleman, and I know that he will be helpful in this respect, that this year will not be a repetition of last year.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I want to say it has always been a distinct pleasure to me to be privileged to serve in the Congress, and to serve on the House's Committee on Armed Services.

I certainly would join in the statement that he has made today and commend the gentleman from Massachusetts and, indeed, the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman, for the way they have presented the meat of this bill.

I am particularly interested, as the gentleman knows, in the reprograming proposition that has grown like "Topsy" in the "spirit of commonality," with the separation of powers—and the loss thereof—between the executive and legislative branch. This exists to the point where for the last 2½ years while serving on the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress and its related agencies, I have even introduced supplemental views pertaining to amendments on appropriation bills that perhaps made a part of this "taking over" by the Department of Defense possible.

Second, I would particularly commend the gentleman on his overall statement and on that portion that pertains to the legislative action.

I think this must stop. As indeed perhaps some of the power should be regained by the people's Representatives in the legislative branch under the constitutional requirements for raising an army and supporting a navy and determining the policies pertaining thereunto.

Specifically, it has, therefore, been a pleasure to serve where the leadership of the committee has worked in a bipartisan manner, and where there is a tendency to regain unto the Congress itself these powers that were made and through the Congress are divested unto the people.

I would like to say another thing as far as research and development is concerned. I have been privileged, as the ranking minority Member in the well knows, to serve on that committee as well as the Airlift Subcommittee almost since I have been here. The research and development, test and evaluation cannot be developed only in a vertical manner, but must be developed horizontally and simultaneously. For this reason no one supplemental or no one appropriation—as much as we decry deficiency bills—especially when it hides deficits of a bygone fiscal year, must of necessity be on a long leadtime and must be funded and financed in advance.

Now, as far as airlift is concerned, I would certainly say we would not have any plans, as the gentleman in the well said, for follow-on aircraft if it had not been for the Congress rather than the executive branch. Now, that is a broad-brush statement, but generally it is true, just as he referred to the nuclear Navy and the nuclear submarines, in particular. We could go down the list where this Armed Services Committee and its combined years of experience and expertise, especially under the guidance of our chairman, who, for a long time, served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Military and Strategic Airlift, has developed.

I am concerned, and I think the Members of the House should know, as indeed the members of the committee do, that we are at the present time writing into the record here, in both the report on page 13 and certainly in the hearings, possibly based on a penchant maybe simply by pride of authorship, to eliminate the Reserve Forces and make them all Active-duty Forces, whether for the purpose of posse comitatis or for the purpose of complete executive control, or for any other reason. Therefore we must not let either tactical or strategic airlift be disassembled, especially at a time when we are fighting a war halfway around the world wherein the salvation has been in our strategic airlift. This is not to deny the need of tactical airlift. And I know that many of the Members will be happy to know that such techniques as developed by the old C-119G's of the National Guard and/or Reserve Forces, referred to on pages 13 and 14 of this report, required by the Strike Command, required by the Army, required in tactical areas for intratheater airlift as contradisposed to intertheater strategic airlift, if you please, have developed among some of our Reserve Forces and the Guard units that still have the C-119G's. All should be replaced as rapidly as possible with more modern machines, but the militia and their organizations not eliminated. Such "slingshot" technique as rapid evacuation and unloading in which only these planes could be used, meet real requirements and must not be junked due to pique or lack of judgment.

So there is a constant and a permanent tendency upon the part of this committee, the House should know—certainly in research and development as well as in general procurement of arms, and certainly in the provision for airlift and sealift, to see that the troops derive what they need, and that the production is available for them to use in proper time. It is not always perfect, but if it were not for the surveillance, the review and the foresight of this committee, this would not be nearly so well done.

I would like for the Members to read in the Strike magazine, for example, "The do it spirit," or how the C-119 crew uses a "slingshot" technique in order to evacuate these planes at low level or from a dead stop. I will be glad to make that available to any of the Members.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding this time, and I certainly hope that this bill does pass unanimously in order that our men, the consumers of the hardware which this bill provides, as well as that which the R. & D. will provide in the future, will vote it up unanimously.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the learned gentleman from Missouri.

I believe the Members of the House know of his great knowledge with respect to matters outside our own committee, but I do not know how many know of his great competence as a renowned surgeon in the U.S. Army prior to his coming to Congress. During the course of his service here, he has been of great use to our committee in many of the detailed matters pertaining to hospitals or, recently, in the loss of the astronauts.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would just like to take this opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentlemen who have preceded me and say that I, too, would like to compliment both the distinguished chairman, Mr. MENDEL RIVERS, and the ranking minority member, Mr. BATES, for the outstanding nonpartisan leadership which they have given this committee. They have submitted a forthright and bipartisan report on the needed supplemental defense appropriation now before the House. The complexity of defense funding is simplified considerably when a committee can count on this kind of informed and experienced leadership.

As a new member of this committee, I have been very much impressed at the hard work, dedication, and cooperation between all members of this committee, and I have been continually pleased by the enthusiasm of the members toward getting the job done.

We have had hearings at length on this supplemental budget for Vietnam and I join in urging its passage by the House. I do not feel that we can afford to do anything except appropriate such sums as are needed to supply the materiel, arms, and equipment for our fighting forces in southeast Asia. There is one thing that is conspicuous by its absence in this appropriation, however. I refer particularly to an appropriation for the Nike X missile.

I am well aware that there is no particular need or urgency for the Nike X missile in southeast Asia, although there are items in this appropriation for missile development. It is my information that $167 million was appropriated in the last defense budget for research and development of the Nike X missile, which to this date, has not been spent or utilized. It is my very earnest hope that the Secretary of Defense will go forth with all deliberate speed toward the development of the Nike X missile and that the regular defense appropriation will contain sufficient funds for the full development of this much needed weapon. The Joint Chiefs of Staff feel strongly, and have publicly stated, the need for an air defense missile system like the Nike X. They agree unanimously that the United States should start production of American missile defenses this fiscal year.

I would like to serve notice at the present time that I will insist that this matter be included in the anticipated budget for the next fiscal year and I am calling on the Department of Defense now to take whatever steps necessary for the completion of this vital project.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding to me.

I want principally to get some information.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, compliment all the members of the Armed Services Committee for the work they have been doing throughout the years. This, of course, affects every person in America. Everyone is interested in our defense, our defense capability and our capability in waging war. More than in any other phase of our lives, we have to protect ourselves first.

As has been said by many other Members of the House, I compliment the leaders and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr RIVERS], chairman of the committee. I have been in Congress for 19 years, and throughout those years the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] has certainly been a very courteous and affable gentleman in every word and every action I have known. From every report that I get from members of the committee, certainly he has done a great job with the committee since he has become chairman.

I would like to ask the chairman one or two questions having especially to do with the National Guard. I notice there is a statement with relation to the National Guard. I believe it is the intent of the committee to keep the National Guard intact as much as possible, as it is constituted today. Is that correct?

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and for his comments.

I suppose the gentleman is talking about the Air Guard?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes.

Mr. RIVERS. The Air Guard is treated on pages 13 to 15 of the report. There we express our concern about our tactical airlift capability. We have served notice, that we need all of the airlift we possess, all of it, and all of the airlift coming into being, with the C-5A and the C-130E and the C-141. We are coming to the C-5A, which will carry some 750 people. When all of these come into existence, plus the ones we have, such as the C-97, the C-121, and the C-124, which are used by the National Guard—with all of these we still cannot accommodate all of our airlift requirements. So long as southeast Asia is as it is, it is the unanimous feeling of the committee—and I have two subcommittees working on these—that this airlift should be kept intact, and we have so notified the Secretary of Defense. In addition, we have the C-119 flying boxcars. We do not think they should be eliminated. They are needed, and we are going to strive to keep them.

These men are doing magnificent work.

The gentleman is making a fine contribution by inquiring about their welfare and in providing me with the opportunity to give him the assurance that we are going to keep these, because we cannot and must not be without them. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STAGGERS. I certainly thank the chairman of the committee for this assurance.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

I believe the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services would agree with me that this was the subject to which I was addressing myself, perhaps not in too clear terms, just prior to the gentleman's taking the floor.

I believe it is fair to say, in complete answer to the question of the gentleman from West Virginia, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, that the Secretary of Defense did announce only yesterday, as a result of statements by the Committee on Armed Services and as a result of information on tactical airlift printed here pertaining to the Air National Guard and the Air Reserve units, that they would not be further demobilized during the remainder of this fiscal year and the first 3 months of the next. Only yesterday that statement was made according to my information.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. We want to phase in the C-130's. We have made this not only a tactical aircraft but also a strategic aircraft by putting tanks on the wings and reinforcing it. This C-130, made by Lockheed down in Georgia, with turboprop engines, can fly 5,000 miles, as far as the C-141. We want to phase this aircraft into the Guard.

We do not want to deny the National Guard anything, because we need them. We want to modernize the National Guard, and we are going to do that. We want to give them more modern aircraft, and we are going to do it.

Mr. STAGGERS. I am very happy to hear the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services make this very definite statement, and I am also glad to have the statement by the gentleman from Missouri as to the reaction of the Department of Defense. This is essential to the welfare of our country. I believe it is very deserving.

I thank the chairman and the members of the Committee on Armed Services.

I support the committee's recommendation that the existing Air National Guard units be maintained in active form, at least so long as this country is engaged in declared or undeclared war. I congratulate the committee on its thorough and dispassionate analysis of the situation. And I agree with them that this is no time to abandon any effective arm of our national defense.

The Air National Guard has proved its worth and capability in hundreds of lifts as far as southeast Asia. Larger and swifter transport carriers are on the drawing boards, but they will not be operational until some months in the future. When they are operational, they will serve the major operations. Hundreds of lesser operations will remain, most of which can be best served by smaller units.

These air units are training grounds for needed Air Force personnel. The news from Vietnam constantly stresses the shortage of qualified pilots. No other source is available if we are to fill the need.

Air National Guard units are visible evidence in the community of the might and power of the United States. Scattered over the Nation as they are, they provide a practically invulnerable protection in case this country is attacked. They could scarcely be knocked out, all in one blow, as our fleet was in Pearl Harbor in 1941. In recent years we have been inclined to forget that we have enemies who would destroy us if they could. While we may say that a sneak attack is improbable, we could scarcely claim that it is impossible. These widely scattered air units are additional insurance against what might happen.

Speaking particularly for the unit at Martinsburg, in my State, I would say that the community is proud of it, and the State is proud of it; it has State and local importance, as well as national importance; not only does it attract ambitious and highly useful young men to the service of their country—it is of practical value in a variety of unusual situations. An example of this is found in a very recent editorial in the Martinsburg Journal, which I take the liberty of quoting in part, as follows:

> Due notice should be taken and proper credit given to the 167th Military Airlift Group, West Virginia Air National Guard, based in Martinsville, for the fine job it did Sunday (February 26) in air-lifting back to this city some of the St. Joseph's High School students and associates who had been injured in last Friday's train wreck tragedy.
>
> Planes from the local unit flew to both Clarksburg and Parkersburg to bring home a number of the injured who otherwise would have had to remain in faraway hospitals for longer periods of time. This was especially helpful at this time because of the hazardous condition of highways in the mountainous sections of the state.

An organization of this versatility and usefulness should not be disbanded. Incidentally, in the train wreck to which the Journal alludes, four people were killed and 72 were injured, which points up the importance of the help which the air unit was able to give.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from West Virginia, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on which I serve, yielding to me so that I may state my views briefly on H.R. 4515.

Because of a speaking commitment to business and defense leaders in my own district to discuss the ramifications of this and other present governmental policy and legislation, I shall be unable to be present on the floor late this afternoon when this bill is expected to be voted and passed overwhelmingly.

However, I should like to make clear that I am in general support of this piece of legislation. Like other Members of the House, I am relying on the discretion and judgment of the Committee on Armed Services to have properly acquitted their responsibility to the Nation to assure that the American people are receiving full value for the tax money which is spent on this military investment.

I say this both with reference to the needs of the immediate military situation, and in connection with the long-range needs of the United States and the world to bring us to an honorable peace which can be maintained. No one regrets more than I that money spent for machines of war is not being spent, instead, for materials of peace and the achievement of human decency and the development of world resources. When we come to the time that all nations in the world share my view, then we can utilize these resources for more noble purposes.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], for yielding me this time. His kindliness and courtesy are very dear to all of us, and I appreciate his thoughtfulness.

I wish now to explain briefly the amendment which, at the proper time, when we read the bill under the 5-minute rule, I shall offer. If it is accepted, I shall support H.R. 4515, as amended.

The amendment is identical in its substantive language with the amendment passed yesterday in the other body known as the Mansfield amendment. That passed by a vote of 72 to 19.

As I say, the language of my amendment is identical, except in a very minor way in the introductory clause where, in order to conform with great detail to procedures in this body, it is made clear that this amendment is in the nature of a limitation on the authorizations of H.R. 4515.

In essence, what the amendment does is to state the policy of Congress on the matters involved in the military authorization for Vietnam.

The first statement that is made is one of a firm intention to provide the necessary support for our armed servicemen who are now fighting in Vietnam.

Having said that, the amendment goes on to support those efforts that are being made to prevent an expansion of the war in Vietnam; to bring that conflict to an end through a negotiated settlement which would preserve the honor of the United States and protect the vital interests of this country; to allow the people of South Vietnam to determine the affairs of their country in their own way; and, finally, to indicate support for the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962 and urge the reconvening of that Geneva Conference or any other international meeting of nations interested in the conflict, so as to formulate plans for bringing it to an honorable conclusion in accordance with those principles.

I point out once again the four central points that are made in this amendment with respect to the peaceful side of our activities. I thoroughly agreed with what the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services said in debate just a few minutes ago; namely, that our effort in Vietnam cannot be solely a military effort and that we must consider not just the bolts of lightning but the olive branch.

The four facets of the peacekeeping part of this amendment are, as I said, to prevent an expansion of the war; to use all opportunities to achieve a negotiated settlement; to support the constructive interests of other international bodies and nations involved. Here I point out that while they are not specifically mentioned, what is clearly meant by this is the United Nations, the International Control Commission, and conferences of Asian nations such as those suggested by some members of the minority, and any and all consortiums of nations which can bring an end to the war in Vietnam.

I would like to call the attention of the Members here to what the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962 are all about. According to material supplied to me by the Foreign Affairs Division of the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service, the Geneva agreements of 1954 provided for a cease-fire in Vietnam and for the withdrawal of French forces to the south of the military demarcation line, at approximately the 17th parallel. The entry of additional military units or fresh military equipment, except to replace wornout equipment, was prohibited. Neither zone was to adhere to any military alliance nor permit the establishment of foreign military bases. The country was to be unified with general elections scheduled for July 1956.

The so-called Geneva accord of 1962 had to do mainly with Laos, but there there was the clear provision that Laos was to remain neutral; a provision which is today being violated by the use of the Ho Chi Minh Trail through portions of Laos.

I mention these because in the sense of Congress amendment which the other body passed there is a reference to the Geneva accords, and it is important, I believe, that we refresh our recollection as to what those accords provided.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this is a constructive amendment. I am very hopeful that there will not be opposition to it. I think it is a constructive amendment because this military authorization which we are being asked to vote on cannot tell the whole story. The whole story can only be told by a piece of legislation similar to that passed yesterday by the other body, which displays not only the bolts of lightning but the olive branch.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I will be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HALL. Just as a contribution at this point, I would inquire if the distinguished gentleman, who I know is a student of this proposition, does recall and does have in mind the text and the conclusions, but for the last few paragraphs, of the speech of our U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations at Howard University on the Vietnam peace efforts, which was dated February 10 of this year?

The reason why I ask that question in particular, is because after he made a strong plea that we must look for the kernel of the problem, or the meat of the nut, as we would say in my hills at home; for some way where we can get together on peace, he looks back to the Geneva accord and says:

> But I must add quickly that this does not necessarily indicate a real meeting of the minds, because of doubts that all sides interpret the Geneva agreements in the same light. Hanoi has said that the essence of the Geneva agreements is contained in its "four points." But the four points would not put Hanoi under any restraint or obligations in its hostile activities against the South, which the Geneva accords explicitly prohibit.
>
> Besides, as I already pointed out, these points insist that the South's future be regulated in accordance with the program of a group which was not referred to in the Geneva accords and did not even exist when they were written. And in any case, if the Geneva accords were to serve as a basis for settlement, it would obviously be necessary to revitalize the international machinery which they provided for supervision—which is presently operating under severe limitations; to incorporate effective international guarantees; and to update other provisions of the accords which on their face are clearly out of date.
>
> Despite these problems of interpretation, it can be said that if the meaning of the Geneva agreements were accepted as a matter for genuine negotiation, then the constant reference to these agreements by both sides would be more than a verbal similarity; it would be a significant and hopeful sign of the prospects for settlement.

And then, Mr. Chairman, he continued with three other paragraphs which at the proper time I shall ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point, making it very questionable as to whether the Geneva accord, to which neither South Vietnam nor the United States were signatories in 1954, and even as changed in 1962, would be applicable at this time.

I wonder if the gentleman from Wisconsin has that information?

Mr. REUSS. Yes. I shall be very glad to expound further upon that subject.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I shall later propose does not cover Hanoi's four points, and I would be very desirous that this point be clearly made. It refers, not to any Hanoi declaration, but to the Geneva accords. The mere fact that Hanoi may have taken some part of the Geneva accords and clothed them in its own language and floated various formulations of that from time to time, was indeed the subject matter of the paragraphs from Ambassador Goldberg to which the gentleman from Missouri just referred.

But, Mr. Chairman, in the amendment which I shall introduce, and which I am now previewing so to speak, there is no such suggestion that Hanoi's four points are identical with the Geneva accords to which we refer.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the Ambassador does refer to the Geneva accord in his Howard University speech.

Mr. REUSS. Yes.

Mr. HALL. And he summarizes them in the balance of these paragraphs.

The gentleman from Wisconsin would certainly agree with me, I believe, that had the Geneva accord worked in the first place, there would be no difficulty in southeast Asia, at least, concerning the independence of South Vietnam at this time; is that not correct?

Mr. REUSS. It is so correct that it has had us and the other side——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, had the United States and our adversaries in North Vietnam respected the 1956 free-election mandate of the 1954 Geneva accords, South Vietnam might have been on the way to free elections, and toward the beginnings of democracy, which might well have obviated the horrible agonies which we are now undergoing.

I thank the gentleman from Missouri for raising that point.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, that was an election of all of Vietnam, was it not, as is subscribed to in the Geneva accord, but not separate of North Vietnam and South Vietnam? Further it was controlled by a "troika" with veto power.

Mr. REUSS. That is correct, and I regret that our side was as misguided as the other side, in our not insisting upon free elections in that part of Vietnam which was not under Communist control.

GENEVA, 1954: THE BROKEN MOLD

(By Victor Bator)

For all their differences, many of the leading participants in the Vietnam debate seem to agree that the military and political provisions of the Geneva Agreements of 1954 offer the best basis for peace negotiations. The point has been argued, with different emphasis to be sure, by Senator J. William Fulbright and Secretary of State Dean Rusk, by Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg and Prime Minister Harold Wilson. As the French diplomat Jean Chauvel put it in *Le Monde* in January after a round of official visits in Asia, "No matter where one turns, Washington, Peking, Hanoi, or the National Liberation Front, all take their cues from the joint declaration of the Geneva Conference." But can the emergency solutions adopted twelve summers ago be applied to the crisis in Southeast Asia today?

The Geneva Agreements of July, 1954, were reached at a conference of nine states. Five of them—France, the People's Republic of China, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States—were non-Indo-Chinese, "outsiders," as it were. The other four—Cambodia, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (North), Laos, and the State of Vietnam (South)—were parts of the old French Indo-China. The signed documents of the conference were six unilateral declarations by Cambodia, France, and Laos—two from each, with none from either of the two Vietnams—and three armistice agreements, one each for Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam.

The "Agreement on Cessation of Hostilities in Vietnam" contains six chapters with forty-seven articles and an annex. Chapters I, II, IV, and V deal, respectively, with a provisional demarcation line separating the north and south zones, with the cessation of hostilities, with the exchange of prisoners of war and internees, and with miscellaneous details. There are provisions in them to prevent reprisals, to secure democratic liberties, and to assure the right of choice of domicile. Chapter VI deals with a joint commission of the two armies—the People's Army of Vietnam and French Union Forces—and with an international supervisory commission that was to control and supervise the cease-fire. These five chapters clearly state that the parties to the agreement are not governments but the two opposing army commands, the People's Army and the French Union Forces. Chapter III provides that no military personnel, war matériel, or new military bases shall be introduced, nor shall any military bases under the control of a foreign state be allowed, or military alliances or either area (north and south of the demarcation line) be used to further an aggressive policy.

DRAWING THE LINE

The political dispositions were all supposed to be contained in a document entitled the "Final Declaration of the Geneva Conference." This document, which remained unsigned, had no contracting parties and no common obligations. Agreement to it by the seven assenting powers was simply oral.

Nine of the Declaration's thirteen paragraphs (1–5 and 8–11) in essence take cognizance of the six unilateral declarations and the three armistice agreements. Paragraph 12 does not say anything specific affecting the Vietnamese situation but enjoins the five non-Indo-Chinese conference participants "to refrain from any interference in [the] internal affairs" of Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam. In Paragraph 13 the participants at the conference agree to consult each other on any question that might be referred to them by the International Supervisory Commission. This leaves us Paragraphs 6 and 7, which might form the basis for a new Vietnam agreement if the idea of the return to Geneva 1954 is at all workable.

Paragraph 6 has considerable significance. It asserts that the purpose of the Vietnam armistice agreement was to settle military questions, and that the demarcation line it prescribed was not meant to be "a political or territorial boundary." This paragraph also expresses the conviction that the execution of the agreements "creates the necessary basis for the achievement *in the near future* of a political settlement." (Italics added.)

Paragraph 7 prescribes such a settlement "effected on the basis of respect for the principles of independence, unity, and territorial integrity." It directed that the settlement "permit the Vietnamese people to enjoy the fundamental freedoms, guaranteed by democratic institutions." And it called for "free general elections by secret ballot" to be held in July, 1956. The text in no way linked the elections with unification.

None of these political dispositions could be interpreted as partitioning Vietnam into two states. The armistice agreement, however, had just this effect. Though the first article of Chapter I, on the "Provisional Military Demarcation Line and Demilitarized Zone," appears purely military in nature, when combined with Article 14 in Chapter II it was the indicator of a line (roughly along the 17th parallel) that was to become the frontier separating the two Vietnams.

Article I merely said that "A provisional military demarcation line shall be fixed, on either side of which the forces of the two parties shall be regrouped after their withdrawal, the forces of the People's Army of Vietnam to the north of the line and the forces of the French Union to the south." Chapter II, Article 14, dealt with "Political and administrative measures in the two regrouping zones." It said: "Pending the general elections which will bring about the unification of Vietnam, the conduct of civil administration in each regrouping zone shall be in the hands of the party whose forces are to be regrouped there in virtue of the present agreement."

The text thus allocated temporary civil administration to the People's Army of Vietnam and the French Union Forces in Indo-China, although neither of them had an organization to do this. It ignored altogether the existence of the most interested parties of the conference, the two Vietnamese delegations, and in this single clumsy and cloudy sentence provided the basis for two bitterly antagonistic states. A provision that no one was to be allowed to cross the demarcation line unless specifically authorized to do so by the Joint Commission of the two parties underscored the division.

Curiously, when the text took up the special treatment of the Red River Delta (Hanoi and Haiphong), reference to the People's Army of Vietnam was dropped. In its place, the civil administration north of the line was assigned to the "Democratic Republic of Vietnam," which up to that point had not been mentioned at all.

This clause of the cease-fire agreement poses endless legal dilemmas. First of all, when it was signed in July, 1954, by French Brigadier General Henri Delteil, there existed a solemn declaration and a treaty not yet ratified, but initialed by French Premier Joseph Laniel and the State of Vietnam's Premier Buu Loc, by which France recognized Vietnam "as a fully independent and sovereign state." Thus, although a French general could well sight a purely military cease-fire agreement, he had no legal authority to be a party to either the temporary or permanent bisection of the soverign State of Vietnam. How was it possible, then, for seven conference participants to assert—through the Final Declaration—to the French general's acts affecting political and administrative matters in Vietnam?

Again, there is a conflict between Paragraph 7 of the Final Declaration, which stated that the purpose of the free general elections was purely to establish fundamental freedoms guaranteed by democratic institutions, and Article 14 of the armistice agreement, which said that elections were to bring about Vietnam's unification. Which purpose was to take precedence? Moreover, since Vietnam was not legally disunited but was simply to be provisionally divided into "regrouping" zones, what was the intent of the words "pending the general elections which would bring about the unification of Vietnam"? If unification was indeed necessary, separation was already implicit. Vietnam was in fact represented at the Geneva Conference by two governments, each recognized as sovereign by a different group of countries. The pretense that a single Vietnam was being dealt with was a weird diplomatic evasion.

These legally contradictory features of the cease-fire agreement are perhaps understandable in the circumstances; the five "outside" powers could not disenfranchise and banish the government of the State of Vietnam, which at the time of the conference had been recognized by more than thirty foreign states; nor were they seeking to set up Ho Chi Minh's rebellious Vietminh as a separate but equal government that in July, 1954, had no territory, no frontiers, and no capital, and was recognized only by China, the Soviet Union, and a few Communist satellites.

In addition, it might be maintained that Vietnam was not actually partitioned but that the two political groups claiming to represent the majority of the Vietnamese had each been assigned a part of the country pending elections to decide what government the people wanted. The purpose of the conference, it could be argued, was to end the war. The political settlement was to be left to the electorate.

THE DISSENTERS

The Geneva Conference, in fact, ended with two great achievements: it did stop the war and it eliminated a crisis in the western alliance, ending, in President Eisenhower's words, "anxious hours and days when the leaders of the free world tried to find among themselves at least a temporary, workable unity."

Yet no matter how important these two achievements were at the time, when one compares the war today with the situation in 1954 it is obvious that different areas, antagonists, and military situations are involved. Nor did the Geneva Conference produce an agreement among the seven assenting participants, or even an agreed text. What came out of the conference—the unsigned Final Declaration—was a skillful *trompe-l'œil* to which the two parties most directly concerned did not subscribe.

The State of Vietnam protested solemnly against the conditions of the Declaration, although it undertook "to make and support every effort to re-establish a real and lasting peace and not to use force to resist the procedures for carrying the cease-fire into effect." It did not promise to respect the political result. The United States took note of the first 12 of the 13 paragraphs, and promised to refrain from the threat or use of force that might disturb the execution of the agreements. Its unilateral declaration, however, supported the Vietnamese protest against arrangements made without their consent by saying "that peoples are entitled to determine their own future and that [the United States] will not join in an arrangement which would hinder this." Essentially, the U.S. objection to Paragraph 13 was that it opened the way to the embarrassment of being consulted by Communist China.

There is no doubt that all of the participants except the State of Vietnam and the United States wanted above all to end the fighting. France was eager to be relieved of military involvement. For the other three "outside" participants—China, the Soviet Union, and Britain—the end of the fighting removed the danger of entanglement in the quarrels of minor nations that might lead to a large-scale war between East and West. These three powers were more moderators than opponents at Geneva.

The primary motivation of the Vietminh was to consolidate their rule somewhere, anywhere, in Vietnam. To accomplish this, Ho Chi Minh was willing to make political concessions from his militarily superior position. So it came about that, on May 25, the head of the Vietminh delegation first mentioned partition. It was to be based on a regrouping of forces on either side of a line of demarcation that would give both parties an area with a sufficiently large population to exist independently.

Firm opposition came mainly from the State of Vietnam, which the other parties had expected to make the sacrifices clearing the way for a settlement. But in spite of its otherwise weak position, the State of Vietnam held one trump card—the support of the United States. Thus it proved impossible to obtain the consent of the French-backed Chief of State, Bao Dai, or later of President Ngo Dinh Diem, to partition or to the cession of any part of Vietnam to the Communist rebels. The Vietnam delegation operated upon the assumption that a settlement was not an absolute necessity for them, because if Geneva failed, the United States would enter the fight.

Ho Chi Minh, with the prestige that the victory at Dienbienphu had given him and the military superiority that was his, would not renounce his claim to leadership of all Vietnam. He was willing to make concessions for a temporary settlement but would not agree to anything that would preclude his ultimate rule of a unified Vietnam. Even so, Molotov and Chou En-lai had to put considerable pressure on the Vietminh at Geneva to surrender—for what it expected would only be a short time—some of the areas it had conquered and controlled.

POINT OF NO RETURN

The contradictions and the equivocations in the documents that emerged from the Geneva Conference gain added emphasis by the procedure by which they were reached. As narrated in memoirs such as those of Anthony Eden, who presided at Geneva, or in the detailed accounts of Bernard B. Fall, Jean Lacouture, and Philippe Devillers, partition—so ambiguously treated in the documents—was the most important subject of bargaining, both in principle and in its geographical application. It was discussed continually, if confidentially, within each delegation, but for a time was carefully ignored when the delegations met.

When at least partition was openly broached by the Vietminh, the French and British were elated. From that moment the location of the dividing line became the principal hurdle blocking the road to a settlement. Secretary of State Dulles, in order to underscore his insistence that it be drawn on the 17th parallel and to demonstrate western unity on this point, flew from Washington to Paris to meet with Eden and Premier Pierre Mendès-France. There were discussions even about the viability of the two parts. It is hard to believe that all this activity could have been devoted to the location of a temporary military demarcation line, a kind of billeting arrangement that would shortly disappear. The innocent-sounding text of the final agreement must have signified something of greater import.

Since the contradictions and equivocations thus involve more than the documents themselves, to what agreement is it now suggested that we return—to the explicit sense of the texts, or to the tacit understanding masked by them? If it is the texts that are now so inviting, which ones shall be taken out of the drawer—those which held that Vietnamese unity remained intact or those which provided for reunification of the two parts? Or, if such technicalities are to be ignored, should we return to the negotiated agreement as it was understood by Ho Chi Minh, as it was understood and repudiated by the United States and the government of Bao Dai and of Diem, or as it appeared in 1954 to France and the United Kingdom—or to Russia and China—as a basis of a new balance of political power? It is obvious that a "return" to Geneva of 1954 would mean as many things as there were parties to it, as would immediately become clear when the assorted representatives reached the conference table.

Finally, the fundamental consideration why the Geneva Agreements of 1954 cannot provide the basis for a settlement today is that the power balance in Asia has been irreparably altered. China, which was neither strong nor independent, today is both. France, the most interested party in 1954, is almost out of the picture now. If another conference is to be called, it must include such vitally concerned nations as Australia, New Zealand, Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, India, and Pakistan. China has now become one of the heaviest elements in the balance of power in Asia and it has become

> independent of the Soviet Union. As a military threat its potential is steadily growing.
>
> The Geneva Agreements were an accommodation among a Soviet Union that was not much interested, a post-imperialist France and Britain, and a still weak China. All were seeking the end of a chapter. The problem today is not one of the liquidation of French colonial possessions but the remaking—with the participation of the great and small nations whose interests are at stake—of the power structure of Southeast Asia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to support this bill which has been brought to the floor of the House under the very able leadership of our distinguished chairman, a man whom I intensely admire and respect.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support H.R. 4515, the supplemental authorization bill for fiscal year 1967.

But before I delve into certain contents of the bill, I take this opportunity to congratulate the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, for the fair manner in which he conducted the hearings. After hearing from the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, we then went into the procurement portion of the bill by service and followed the same format in connection with research and development and military construction. At each juncture, every member of the committee was permitted to question every witness. While this is a time-consuming process, I can assure you this results in a thoroughly considered bill by informed members of the committee.

I would call your attention specifically to the military construction portion of the bill. This totals $624,500,000. Last year, the fiscal year 1966 supplemental provided $1,238 million for construction in connection with our efforts in southeast Asia. No authorization and funding have been provided for southeast Asia support since the enactment of the fiscal year 1966 supplemental legislation. That act provided for planned deployments and a base for a limited number of additional deployments should they be required.

As we all know, there has been a substantial increase in total numbers of personnel now serving in southeast Asia. As a result, facilities which were constructed to minimal quality standards must now be upgraded. Additional facilities to support increased operations must be provided. These include supply, communications, ship repair, hospital, and maintenance facilities. The increase also requires backup in the United States principally in the nature of training facilities. Of the total request, approximately $74 million are for facilities in the United States.

For the Army, we have provided authorization in the amount of $288,500,000. The Army construction program in South Vietnam consists primarily of operational facilities, troop housing, roads, utilities, and hydraulic fill. In addition, some supply maintenance, administrative and medical facilities are included. With the approval of this bill, the Army's military construction portion of support for southeast Asia is approximately $1,102 million of which approximately 69 percent would be applied to South Vietnam. The largest single Army requirement in this supplemental program represents about 31 percent of the total request for South Vietnam and is for operational facilities consisting mainly of airfield complexes, communications, and waterfront facilities.

The bill includes $140 million for the Navy. It provides for piers, airfield facilities, communications, administrative housing, utilities, and lines of communication. Construction for the Navy primarily is needed principally in the First Corps area. When we approve this bill, the Navy will have had authorization for approximately $546 million for construction in southeast Asia, of which 75 percent is for construction in South Vietnam.

For the Air Force, we have included an amount of $196 million. Fifty-three percent of the Air Force military construction program in this supplemental is for nine airbase complexes in South Vietnam. The Vietnam requirements are for nine airbase complexes. Generally, these requirements cover the complete spectrum of categories of operational facilities; that is, fueling systems, navigational aids, communications, radar, base, ordnance, and squadron operations as well as maintenance, supply, housing, and utilities. When we approve this bill, the Air Force will have had construction authority in support of southeast Asia in the amount of $704 million, of which 52 percent is for South Vietnam.

During the hearings concern was expressed regarding the so-called blank check approach to military construction authorization for the southeast Asia program. I am happy to say that we have arrived at an agreement through the cooperative efforts of the Secretary of Defense and the committee. In a memorandum of understanding, the Secretary of Defense agreed to consider the military construction projects in the United States as firm items that could not be reprogramed. In addition, he agreed to notify the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House at least 1 week prior to approving authorization to reprogram items contained in the Service-furnished backup books when such reprograming would amount to one million dollars or more. This, in essence, gives the committee a chance to make its voice known on reprograming efforts. While it does not bind the Secretary to follow the recommendations of the committee, it is a step toward bringing the Congress closer into partnership with the Secretary in arriving at major decisions.

I think this is the best we could do at this particular time because a certain degree of flexibility must be permitted in order to meet ever-changing conditions in the war area.

Our report on pages 27 and 28 contain a list of the installations where projects are to be built in the United States. From the comprehensive hearings that we have held, I know that what is authorized in this supplemental is essential to our efforts in southeast Asia. I know our men need these items. They are committed by their commander in chief to a desperate struggle and they are performing bravely without bitterness or doubt. The least we can do is provide what is necessary to give those brave men the best possible chance of coming home alive.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL].

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, after much reflection, I find I must oppose this bill. The decision to do so has not come easy. But conscience and conviction require that I do so.

For the past 2 years, I have questioned the wisdom of our course in Vietnam. In any number of speeches here and in my district, I have sought to present the basis of my disagreement with the administration's course in southeast Asia.

A statement issued by 11 Members of Congress on Tuesday, announcing their intention to oppose this supplemental authorization, included what I believe useful alternatives to our present course in Vietnam.

There are certain points in the statement, however, which I believe deserve some amplification.

It now seems clear that the case for suspending the bombings of the north is very strong indeed. Secretary McNamara has admitted that the bombings have not "significantly reduced the flow of men and materiel to the south." Others have so argued for months. Nor is it any longer necessary to argue that the morale of the South Vietnamese Government turns on our continuation of the bombings. I do not believe that the morale of that government should occupy the highest place on our priorities. I do believe, on the other hand, that the negotiations and a settlement occupy the highest priority on our national agenda.

There is considerable evidence, expressed in reports of journalists and statements of diplomats from all over the world, that a cessation of bombings might be an important step toward bringing about negotiations.

In light of those representations, I find it deeply disturbing that our Government continues to insist that the North Vietnamese offer a reciprocal military act in exchange for a bombing cessation. It is the view of many—and one which I share—that certain fundamental diplomatic questions underlie this insistence. Our demand for reciprocity, they argue, is at the same time a deeper demand that the North Vietnamese accept our definition of the war. It is a demand that they equate infiltration from the north with the bombings of the north. It is a demand that they accept aggression as the sole cause of the war in Vietnam. And as such, it is a very serious and very basic demand.

But what do our actions look like to

the North Vietnamese? What, after all, to them, distinguishes infiltration from the north and infiltration from the west? Can they be expected to equate an increase in bombings with an increase in ground forces? The view from the north, in other words, is quite different from ours.

The North Vietnamese view may be cause for interesting historical study. But I see no reason why two nations anxious for peace must prevent it by proud insistence that their theory of war prevail. I see no reason why the United States, by virtue of its strength as a world power, cannot afford to forsake its insistence that the north accept our interpretation of the struggle. I believe we can abandon our demand for reciprocity and gain in exchange some deeply needed world respect, as well as progress toward negotiations. In order to accomplish these purposes the bombing of the north should be terminated.

Far more complicated, however, and finally far more important, is the problem of political settlement in the south. By refusing to recognize and negotiate with the National Liberation Front, the United States seems to be pursuing a policy of total political victory. The alternatives are to acknowledge the considerable influence and power of the front in the south or to seek to deprive them of that power and any future power. The latter course, in effect, aspires to total political victory. And such a policy could be disastrous. The issue, of course, is somewhat more complex. I do not happen to believe that as yet the administration is clearly seeking to deny the National Liberation Front all, or even any, political power in the future. But I do believe that our course so far leaves that impression.

Yet the issue remains, and simply stated amounts to this: At what point are we prepared to seek to integrate the National Liberation Front into the political process in South Vietnam? For example, we now say we would accept the participation of any South Vietnamese faction in a future government following free elections. That is a laudable policy. Yet it also begs an important and prior question: Are we prepared to see the participation of any South Vietnamese faction in the preparation of those elections? It does not take great sophistication to appreciate that the results of many elections are largely determined by the procedures under which those elections are conducted. Who is to set those procedures? Who is to participate in their enforcement?

That question is still unanswered.

Nonetheless, it is not at all encouraging to find the administration constantly maintaining that the National Liberation Front is merely an instrument of Hanoi. A policy which thus characterizes the front is not one which is likely to contribute to realism about the front's eventual and, to my mind, necessary role in the future political life of South Vietnam.

I believe we must be prepared to accept some form of National Liberation Front participation in negotiations to set election procedures. I also think we must be prepared to accept that a future South Vietnam may be insecure and unstable. And I think we must be prepared to find the Communists with considerably more influence in the south than we might prefer.

In effect, then, we must be willing to accept in South Vietnam tomorrow what we accepted in Laos 5 years ago—coalition government.

The prospect is not a happy one. Popular front and coalition governments do not have a record of stability or progress. On the other hand, we must choose in Vietnam, not wish. We must choose between an open-ended military conflict and a risky political conflict. And we must weigh that choice against the interest of America as well as that of South Vietnam.

I believe our interest lies in an immediate end of the war in Vietnam, and a gradual disengagement from southeast Asia. And I believe those goals can be achieved if the United States ends the bombings, and makes known in the appropriate way its willingness to discuss and eventually accept some form of coalition government in South Vietnam.

That course of action is apparently being passed by in the hope that new increments of escalation will achieve what past measures have not. And so we are now mining rivers in North Vietnam. We are continuing to seek that hypothetical point of maximum pressure with minimum risk. And yet the war continues, our troops expand, our casualties grow, and the prospects for peace—almost in sight last month—have now dimmed.

As long as this trend continues, I cannot in good conscience support authorizations for supplemental appropriations for Vietnam. The 1965 defense supplemental was offered with the argument that it was necessary to support existing troop levels. I voted for it on that understanding. A year later our troop level had doubled and once again we were asked for supplemental appropriations to support the boys already in Vietnam. I voted for that as well. And now, in 1967, we have again twice as many troops in southeast Asia—whose presence is being supported by funds which many of us understood were intended only to finance existing operations and commitments.

The process therefore seems to have reversed itself, so that supplemental appropriations are used to ratify past acts of escalation rather than to authorize future policy. War financing, of course, is a complicated affair. And yet I find profoundly troubling the procedure by which the administration seems to make decisions, implement policy, and then come to Congress for funding after the fact. The way we finance our policies, of course, is less important than the policies themselves. But I believe the Congress has a special interest in preserving the integrity of its constitutional duties regarding the power to appropriate. While it can be argued that a vote against a military authorization bill is a crude way to oppose escalation of the Vietnam war, the fact is that such a vote is one of the few effective means by which a Congressman can influence the conduct of our policy.

Let me say here that I do not support the simplistic notion that to oppose this authorization is necessarily to deprive our boys of supplies. To say that Congress must not vote against the Defense Department's requests for money for the Vietnam war because such a vote would harm our troops in Vietnam is to be unfair to the Congress and indeed, inaccurate. The Defense Department, not the Congress, is responsible for the decisions which have escalated the war in Vietnam. Must the Congress, then, on the grounds of being fair to our boys be obligated to provide funds, after the fact, for any level of escalation which the Defense Department chooses to embark upon. I think not. For one thing, acceptance of such arrangement is tantamount to admitting that the Congress must surrender its constitutional power to determine the amount of funds which executive departments shall have. Second, the Defense Department has within itself the power to provide adequately for our troops in Vietnam. Presumably it has considerable budgetary flexibility which it can use to concentrate resources on the Vietnam war. Second, by deescalating the war the Defense Department can bring down the level of expenditures required.

There are problems about Vietnam, finally, which go beyond specific policies. And I would not be honest or comprehensive in my explanation of this vote were I not to raise them.

Vietnam is the watershed of American postwar internationalism. It has raised as has no other incident since 1945 absolutely basic questions about the nature of American commitments and the limits of American power. Recently, America has been spoken of as suffering from the arrogance of power. While there may be something to that suggestion, I would also submit that the arrogance of power would not be possible were it not for the illusion of omnipotence. We can only be arrogant in the exercise of American power, in other words, because we believe there is almost unlimited American power to exercise.

The war in Vietnam has begun to teach differently. We have dropped bombs to force the North Vietnamese into submission. It has not worked. American power failed. We have sent troops to destroy the National Liberation Front. That has not worked. The front is still there.

I believe there are profound implications to those events. For while we may have admited in our national rhetoric that there can be no American answer to every world problem, the lessons of such language have not adequately been learned. And thus, as Algeria taught the French that the end had come for colonial empire, so Vietnam can begin to teach us that there will be no Pax Americana.

Those of us who have seen American power as a hopeful vehicle for exporting the American dream—and I do not exclude myself from that group—must stop and think anew. What is the American dream, after all? How can it be shared or even should it be shared? How can we effectively focus the genuine idealism of this Nation so that we do not smother those we proclaim to love and those we wish to love? I do not see how we can think about Vietnam and not ask such questions.

There are others. For Vietnam is also our first major crisis since a reduction in the cold war. It has been argued often that our enemy in Vietnam is expansionist communism. But where is that enemy? Whose banner does he carry? Is the enemy Russia, and hence the power with whom we are seeking detente, a missile freeze, and an antiproliferation treaty which many see as an American-Soviet tactic against smaller world powers? Is the enemy China, and hence a power ridden with divisions which despite enormous insecurity and, in its terms, total provocation, has refused to commit any troops against us?

We have learned, at least many statements suggest so, that America must accept and coexist with the varieties of communism. And yet there is the traditional lag of policy behind rhetoric. For quite obviously, we are not yet prepared to accept and live with South Vietnamese communism. We are not yet willing to translate the ideal of coexistence in general into the particular reality of coexistence in South Vietnam.

Until we do so, and until we accept that an independent, completely non-Communist South Vietnam cannot be assured by the exercise of American power, this country will remain mired in Asia—displaced, frustrated, lost.

Nor will the consequences of such a condition evade this country. It has been the perverse luxury of this war that America has largely thought of itself as free from serious domestic effects as a consequence of Vietnam. We have suffered loss of life and diversion of resources to be sure. But generally speaking this war has been a tragedy only for brave soldiers, dead or wounded, and their families. The rest of us, despite concern and even quiet personal despair, have managed to live as comfortably—or in too many cases as uncomfortably—as we did before 1965.

Or so it has seemed. And yet a subtle change has touched this country. The impulse of the New Frontier and the Great Society has deadened. Many of our people have lost an interest in social reform. We have lost a sense of priorities. We have found ourselves confused by or uncertain of what our Government tells us. There has been—and what honest observer can contest it—some erosion of trust and hope.

All this troubles me almost as much as the terrible suffering in Vietnam itself. For how often do nations have at once the easy opportunity, the available resources, and the general will to take steps for social reconstruction and development? Those factors, I think, have been with us during the sixties and we have had leadership ready to respond. And yet now they are in grave danger of repression and frustration.

None of us will know just how seriously this war has affected American life until we are free to view the past dispassionately. As long as we are where we are, however, we owe it to ourselves to ask those questions we must wait to answer. And so I vote against this authorization with as much concern for the broader consequences for American life as for the policies of the war in Vietnam.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I will read into the RECORD the statement earlier referred to:

STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

The coming Vietnam authorization bill and appropriation will be seen by some as a referendum on policy in Vietnam. We believe viewpoints regarding that policy are far too complicated to be represented in any single vote. We do not feel, therefore, that the margin of passage will provide an accurate picture of congressional or national sentiment on the war.

For various reasons, and in varying degrees, we have questioned U.S. policy in Vietnam. We are presently united in the conviction that the strategy of escalation against North Vietnam has produced deepened involvement at higher and more dangerous levels of commitment and brought the war no closer to settlement. At the same time, American diplomacy has appeared to be inflexible and unresponsive to opportunities for negotiations. This is particularly pertinent since prior withdrawal of American troops is apparently no longer insisted upon by Hanoi as a precondition to negotiations.

Secretary McNamara has said, "I don't believe that bombing up to the present has significantly reduced, nor any bombing that I could contemplate in the future would significantly reduce the actual flow of men and material to the South." It is our view, therefore, that the United States can afford to stop the bombing and take that step for peace, particularly in view of representations made throughout the world that such a step may open the way for negotiations.

It has been stated that our goal in Vietnam is a limited one and is not total victory. Yet too many policies and statements leave that intention ambiguous. We do not believe, for example, that the war is a simple case of external aggression. Our policies should take into account the differing interests of the North Vietnamese and National Liberation Front and should give our adversaries reason to believe that their basic interests would be acknowledged in a settlement.

Therefore, to secure peace, we believe the United States must take additional initiatives to reach a political settlement in South Vietnam. Specifically, it must be recognized that the National Liberation Front as one of the principal belligerents in the war, is a necessary party to peace negotiations.

We thus propose the following four initiatives:

1. The U.S. should cease bombing North Vietnam immediately and without preconditions.

2. The U.S. must support truly free elections in South Vietnam. We must be prepared to accept whatever role for the National Liberation Front results from such elections.

3. The U.S. should propose to the North Vietnamese government, the South Vietnamese government, and the National Liberation Front four-party negotiations to secure a cease-fire in Vietnam.

4. The U.S. should seek appropriate sponsorship of an international conference to guarantee agreements reached by the belligerents.

We believe these recommended initiatives are realistic and consistent with our national interest.

We believe the nation as a whole is restless and confused by events in Vietnam. There is continually growing evidence of alienation and discontent. And the country's general support for our present course, in our view, is based less on convictions regarding policy than respect for Presidential leadership.

The war in Vietnam has raised profound questions regarding the direction and machinery of American diplomacy. An enormous commitment was allowed to develop gradually and with inadequate reflection and debate. Bureaucratic investment in that commitment has interfered with its review and reform. And beneath all this is the risk that reflex interventionism may become the normal American response to disorder in the third world.

Meanwhile, the war has had serious if subtle consequences in this country. The impulse of the New Frontier and Great Society has deadened. Public interest in social reform has lapsed. Disorder and distrust are all too prevalent. We are, in short, at a somber period in a decade that opened bright with promise.

The goal of peace will require this country to display a sense of priorities, an awareness of capacities, and an overriding commitment to relieve swiftly the terrible suffering of the Vietnamese people, and those Americans serving in Vietnam.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. In connection with bombing, is the gentleman referring to unconditional and permanent cessation of bombing?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Unconditional.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER].

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, several days ago I joined with a number of my colleagues in a statement about U.S. policy in Vietnam. In that statement we urged that the United States take the initiative to stop bombing in the north, and to recognize the National Liberation Front as a principal belligerent in the conflict in Vietnam.

My questions regarding our policy relate more to the means by which we are exercising our commitments than to the commitments themselves. I believe we should be pursuing limited aims in Vietnam. I believe we should be seeking to preserve the independence of that country. And I believe America can find ways to help South Vietnam develop into a future viable state.

I am troubled, however, when our analysis of the war, and the rhetoric of that analysis, obscure rather than illuminate a policy of limited aims.

Foremost in that process is our continued insistence that aggression from the north constitutes the basic reality of the war. From that proposition has followed the view that the Vietcong or National Liberation Front occupies a "servant's" capacity subject to the absolute will of the North Vietnamese "masters." It thus becomes the administration's military strategy to bomb the master and thereby pressure him into calling off the military effort that he and his servant are conducting in the south. Our diplomacy, moreover, chooses to view recognition and relations with the Vietcong as gratuitous and unnecessary. Governments will negotiate with governments. But servants may only be allowed to eavesdrop or perhaps stand by the door.

The servant-master analogy, often propounded by the administration in testimony before Congress, seems to me fundamentally mistaken. I do not wish to rehash here the familiar arguments which testify to the independence of the National Liberation Front, its separate origins and so on. I merely wish to suggest that as long as our analysis of the war is being expressed through analogies, we should try to understand that the relationship between the Hanoi Communists and the Vietcong Communists is more nearly one of father-son.

This difference about the nature of the enemy is central to my criticism of administration strategy in this war. Therefore, let me set out my reasons for believing that Hanoi must work within narrower limitations in directing the Vietcong than the master-servant analogy implies.

The North Vietnamese have spawned and supported an ideological movement in the south. There are many thousands of South Vietnamese who have been proselytized, motivated, actuated, directed, and supplied from the north, and as a result are deeply committed to a cause—to a cause, not just to Hanoi. They are "comrades," not servants. They "joined" a movement; they did not enter into a contract of employment. They are committed to a way of life, a set of ideas and ideals, not just loyal to the business and welfare of the master.

But because, finally, the son must eventually reach a point of independence, identity, and autonomy, his interests may ultimately diverge from those of the father. It is that divergence of interest which I believe the administration is ignoring—to its peril. I do not dispute the contention that punishment of the father may be likely to cause him to seek to prevail upon the son. But what he may seek may be quite different from what he can reasonably expect to achieve.

Suppose, for the moment, that the leaders in Hanoi believe it advisable to settle the conflict—if only as a temporary expedient. It is probable that Hanoi believes itself to be in an awkward—if not untenable—position to advise the forces in the south that the time has come to quit. What rationale could Hanoi put forth to support its conclusion? It clearly has suffered far less punishment than those fighting in the south. But it is suffering nonetheless.

When we come to consider the problems of settlement, then, the bombing may appear in quite a different context. Punishing the north makes it more difficult for its leaders to argue convincingly that their desire for settlement is anything other than a desire for their own relief. In order to prevail upon the Vietcong to abandon their activity in the south, Hanoi must be given room to argue that negotiations for settlement are in the general interest and common cause of all Communists in Vietnam rather than the specific national interests of North Vietnam.

The Vietcong remember several occasions in which their interests were sacrificed to those of their northern comrades. And they are as likely to be sensitive to this now as they ever have been. I submit, therefore, that as long as we continue to punish the north, we are curtailing its diplomatic effectiveness over the Vietcong. Only when Hanoi can argue that a common cause, rather than a specific self-interest, is at stake in settlement, will it be able to prevail upon the National Liberation Front to approve and enter negotiations?

This, in any case, is how I believe the dynamics of Vietnamese communism are presently at work. For while many claim that the north can control the Vietcong, it may appear quite the opposite to Hanoi which, after all, is dealing and arguing with the National Liberation Front every day.

So I hold we must stop bombing the north in order to free settlement possibilities.

From that position there follows a complementary viewpoint. We must begin to talk directly with the National Liberation Front in order to understand and make use of its specific interest in settlement. We can no longer pretend that the front is not a principal belligerent in the war. And as long as we refuse to admit the existence of the front, we are hardly likely to convince it that we have anything in mind save its total destruction. Under such circumstances, and given the revolutionary passion of its members, the National Liberation Front will surely choose to fight on rather than surrender.

Ceasing the bombings, and recognition of the front, therefore, lead to a third point. The United States must be prepared to lower its conditions and expectations for a settlement in the south. The choice here seems to me inevitable. For as long as we are not willing to pursue a policy of total victory over the Vietcong—and this has been the administration's public position—we must ultimately find a way in which to acknowledge and accommodate the Vietcong's considerable power in the south.

In other words, are we prepared to see the National Liberation Front brought into the political processes of the south? That is the principal question underlying the issue of political settlement in Vietnam.

How that is answered remains a highly complex question. Do we seek to have friendly members of the Constituent Assembly establish quiet relations with members of the National Liberation Front? De we seek to involve the front in discussions of election procedures? All these matters become important once we accept the need to lower our conditions for political settlement in the south so as to make quite clear that we do not expect a total victory over the National Liberation Front.

While this is happening, I believe the United States should consider increasing the troop level in the south. There need be no inconsistency between such action and the lowering of settlement conditions if we make those new conditions absolutely clear to the front. Hostility and suspicion are difficult to overcome. So while we are increasing the pressure on the Vietcong—the Vietcong, not Hanoi—we must leave no uncertainty as to our diplomatic intentions. That combination of new, redirected military pressure and the new diplomatic flexibility, in my view, has a strong chance of moving the war to settlement. Meanwhile, increased activity in the south could be directed to sealing off the 17th parallel from the eastern border of Vietnam over to Thailand so as to prevent continued support from the north to the insurgency efforts in the south.

At this point let me say one or two words regarding the other war.

I want to pay tribute to the valiant efforts, to the range of approaches, which our Government has pursued in finding the key to the social and political side of this conflict. We were not prepared for this kind of conflict, and in my opinion, we are still not organized adequately in Washington for this aspect of the conflict. The Agency for International Development has struggled earnestly with this problem despite the fact that it was not given this mission at the outset, was not trained for it, and indeed had not even a working philosophy as to the solutions which might be most effective. Yet AID continues today to explore new, and perhaps more hopeful, means of involving the people of South Vietnam in their own future so as to build the kind of support neded to prevail in this conflict.

Those who talk with confidence about our capacity to intervene in these societies have their heads stuck firmly in the sand. We know very little about nation building. Few of us even understand how our own Nation developed, much less how other nations are likely to develop. We operate on simplistic, almost pious assumptions which have failed repeatedly. There is as much risk—yes, even greater risk—in overestimating our capacity to be helpful in this respect rather than underestimating it. For this reason I find great wisdom in the statements of people such as Ambassador Reischauer who do have a more realistic—and hardheaded—understanding of our abilities.

I believe we must concentrate all our energies on new programs of political development in the south. For when all the arguments about bombings, negotiations, masters, servants, fathers, sons, and settlement are exhausted, the reality of South Vietnam will remain. Torn apart by war, divided in its politics, its economic and industrial infrastructure disrupted, South Vietnam must find some sort of new future.

Our ability to meet that challenge will in all likelihood provide the final answer to the terrible tragedy of Vietnam. To provide the answer there, and thus to be able to apply it elsewhere, will reduce the likelihood of future Vietnams, future disorders, future deaths, and future distractions from the positive goals of American diplomacy.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I cannot help noting in the report, as is usually the case, and particularly with respect to construction, that the States of California, Texas, and Georgia are doing very well.

On page 16 of the report, I also note

there is $138.8 million for cost growth on prior programs dealing with military construction. What is the reason? This seems a very steep increase in cost growth. What would be the reason for this? Can someone tell me?

Mr. RIVERS . Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I have tried to explain that to the Members. There are a number of factors involved. The cost growth in Vietnam is attributed, for example, to a combination of factors associated with construction in undeveloped territory and in a combat environment without benefit of previous experience in estimating the cost of such work. In addition, monsoon weather, high ship demurrage rates, untrained labor, effects of sand on equipment maintenance, increase in cost of materials and strikes and civil unrest contributed to higher costs. There are all kinds of factors.

Mr. GROSS. Has not the situation, for instance in Vietnam, improved to the point where costs ought to be less with regard to construction?

Mr. RIVERS. Yes, they are coming down, but our people went in there cold. Almost anywhere in Vietnam they are in the front lines. They have had numbers of their people kidnaped. The costs are pretty high because of these considerations. Transportation is a vital factor and it is very high. As I say, there are many factors.

Mr. GROSS. I note this country is selling military hardware around the world at the rate of about $2 billion per year. There has been established a superduper sales agency in the Defense Department. Is it necessary to pass supplemental appropriation bills in order to finance the manufacture of military hardware for sale around the world? For instance, the F–111 is being sold to the British. I wonder on what terms these F–111's are being sold?

Mr. RIVERS. Whenever we get them operational. They are not operational now. I hope the terms will be the very best we can get.

Mr. GROSS. We have already entered into an agreement to sell them to Britain, have we not?

Mr. RIVERS. There has been such an agreement.

Mr. GROSS. I would be very much interested in knowing the terms of this sale.

Mr. RIVERS. I can say, collaterally, to the gentleman that the airplane itself has undergone a considerable change in cost, to the extent of a lot of money.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is exactly right. I wonder whether it is an acceptable plane, after all the hundreds of millions of dollars that have been spent on it up to this time. I wonder if, included in the sales ticket to the British, there was included some of the enormous costs of developing this plane.

Mr. RIVERS. I say to the gentleman that we are now beginning to take up the so-called section 412 fiscal year 1968 authorization. We are going into all of the areas that the gentleman is referring to. You may be sure that we are going into these matters quite fully.

Mr. GROSS. On top of the sales of $2 billion of arms around the world, we are spending $10 million a year on a "superduper" disarmament agency. Does the gentleman think there is much consistency in spending $10 million a year, or $30 million in 3 years, on a disarmament agency, when we are peddling hundreds of millions and billions of dollars worth of arms around the world? How contradictory can we get? Who is going to disarm at this time?

Mr. RIVERS. I do not think anyone is. I believe the gentleman understands my position. I do not think this will amount to a thing.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I think I do. I swear, this is the most contradictory thing I can think of, to spend millions a year on so-called disarmament and at the same time peddle $2 billion worth of arms around the world.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM].

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding me this time.

I rise primarily to express my support for the amendment which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] has described and which he intends to offer at the proper time.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this body should not lag behind the other body in expressing interest in a negotiated settlement of the conflict.

It may be that the amendment is not perfectly worded. It may be that questions could be raised about this or that. But it was adopted by an overwhelming majority in the other body. This body should go on record similarly as supporting the principle of a negotiated settlement.

Mr. Chairman, everyone in this country wants this war to be ended quickly. I do not believe there is any disagreement about that. In my view, the only way the war can be ended quickly is through negotiations.

There is no practical possibility of unilateral withdrawal. Mistakes may have been made in the past, and I believe some mistakes were in fact made in the past. But as we stand today, it seems to me, to be realistic we simply have to rule out the possibility of unilateral withdrawal.

At the other end of the spectrum, a military victory in the usual sense seems to me equally out of the question. We could flatten North Vietnam, in my judgment, we could level every city there, and we still would not necessarily win the struggle in South Vietnam, and we certainly would not put an end to the problem of communism in the Far East. I might say that this judgment was shared by every military and civilian official I talked to in South Vietnam last December when I was there.

I do not say that we cannot be successful in the long run in South Vietnam by pursuing our civil programs there, including especially the so-called "revolutionary development" program, by supporting the process toward representative government that is now underway, by helping the Vietnamese Government to win over the active support of the population of South Vietnam as against the Vietcong. However, this will take 5 to 10 years, in my judgment, Mr. Chairman. This war cannot be won in a hurry. Again I would say that every responsible official I spoke with in Saigon and in Da Nang and Hue and in the delta last December expressed the same feelings.

That being the case, I repeat, it seems to me the only way we can bring this war to a conclusion swiftly is through negotiation.

I happen to believe that the President is very sincere in his desire to get negotiations going and to bring the war to an end by that method. But our approach to that end has not been sufficiently vigorous or sufficiently imaginative. Our approach should include a number of points, including the suspension of bombing in the north, recognition of the National Liberation Front as a full party to any negotiations, and initiatives toward reciprocal deescalation or, better still, a mutual cease-fire in the south. In such a cease-fire, of course, terrorist attacks would also have to cease if the cease-fire were to be mutual and effective.

There are other steps that we could and should take, in my judgment, if we are to pursue the objectives of a negotiated settlement as vigorously and as imaginatively as we should.

The amendment to be proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] certainly does not go so far. My views on this matter may be shared by only a minority of this body, but it does seem to me we could all agree on reiterating for this country and for the world the support of this body for a negotiated settlement.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOW].

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, every time it has been necessary to vote on one of these bills for supplemental funds for Vietnam, I have been torn to know the right way to vote. The question rises, Is the fund necessary for arms for the boys in Vietnam? On the other side, the question is, Should this endless warfare be continued when there are clearly so many things wrong with it—and more and more of our boys will be called in?

A year ago, I voted for the appropriation. Now, however, it seems clearer to me that Vietnam is a bottomless pit with no end in sight. Enough time has been given for the optimistic military predictions to prove themselves. But I am afraid they have not.

From the standpoint of geography and military strategy it is beginning to prove unwise that we disregarded General MacArthur. He warned not to commit the landpower of the United States on the continent of Asia.

From the standpoint of politics, it was unwise for us to disregard the United Nations and go into Vietnam as if all the nations had appointed us to be a policeman.

From the standpoint of history, it was hardly wise for us to disregard the fact that this is the age when all the great Western nations, such as England, France, and Holland, are being thrust out of Asia.

It was probably an exaggeration for us to view North and South Vietnamese coming through the jungle to fight in their own country as armed aggressors.

From the standpoint of morality, it is truly not excusable for the greatest country in the world to send its great machines over a tiny backward nation, bombing and burning innocent children and old people with jellied gasoline and white phosphorus.

From the standpoint of wisdom, is it realistic to believe that our fight in Vietnam will prevent rebellions in South America or Africa and in other places in the future?

From the standpoint of the safety of all people in the world, there is a risk being run for everybody when we drop our bombs near China, and plant mines that may sink Russian ships.

From the standpoint of the years ahead, it is pretty certain that we can never have peace as long as our troops remain on the coasts of Asia. The place is too vast and the people too numerous for us to expect a victory. By staying there, I regret to say, we are keeping a sore open that Asiatics will oppose until it is gone.

For all these reasons and many more, I believe the obligation we owe our boys in Vietnam is to reduce the level of the hostilities and finally bring them home.

In reviewing the statements of Secretary McNamara in support of this appropriation, he has indicated that the lead time for obtaining ammunition is 6 months. With 6 months' ammunition or more which the men now have, they are adequately protected. If the war were reduced as I believe it should be, their present stock of ammunition would protect them longer.

This authorization asks for more funds for more ammunition. That, Mr. Chairman, is escalation. In good conscience how can wise and humane Americans support this perpetual escalation that haunts the world with danger, agony, and destruction time after time? And there is no end in sight. It has come to the point where we must put our shoulder to the wheel, take the responsibility and see to it ourselves that an end is brought to all this. That is why I shall vote in opposition to this authorization.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, once again, I must rise in opposition to a request for supplemental funds to pursue the war in Vietnam. On May 5, 1965, I voted against supplemental funds reflecting the escalation of this war. I did so again on March 1, 1966, and I do so again today because conscience demands my act.

It will be said, I am sure, that to vote against these funds is to vote to deny brave men the arms and supplies they require. But, Mr. Chairman, it is precisely my concern for these young men, and the men who are committed to follow if we persist in this futile course, which requires my nay vote.

In 7 years, we have increased our forces and expanded the conflict from a commitment of 800 military advisors in 1960 to the nearly 500,000 combatants referred to in the state of the Union message.

On March 1, 1966, I said on the floor of the House:

> I oppose this bill as a futile attempt to achieve, by additional force of arms, solutions to problems which are not primarily military but essentially political, economic and social.

I said then and emphatically repeat now:

> I am concerned lest the money that is voted today be interpreted as support of this most futile course. I am concerned for the lives, American and Vietnamese, that this act of expansion will cost.

At that time—just a year ago—we had approximately 200,000 men committed to this conflict. The supplemental funds voted then were not needed to supply those men but rather to multiply their number by 2½ times in the intervening year.

We have repeatedly been asked to vote more money, and more and more men are being sent to Vietnam. Yet, the objectives we seek continue to remain obscure and our strategy for achieving peace, obtuse.

The price we pay for this war grows daily and that price, Mr. Chairman, is paid not only in the dollars we vote, but in the lives we commit.

In the 4 years from 1960 through 1964, 255 men died in this conflict. In 1965, the numbers had increased to 1,365, and last year, 1966, 5,008 American fighting men and women made the supreme sacrifice. The valor of these nameless dead is no less because I question the necessity of so great a sacrifice. It is precisely their sacrifice and the horror of this continued carnage which must make men of reason and humanity cry out as did Pope Paul, "No more war."

Can we reasonably believe that the continued and apparent open-end assignment of men to Vietnam, the terrifying rain of napalm and phosphorous from the skies, and the defoliation and destruction of the productive capacity of the countryside will achieve peace?

Mr. Chairman, the peace we seek cannot be a "Pax Americana," where apparent tranquillity reigns, imposed by fear on a people overwhelmed by the presence of sheer numbers and numbed by pain and suffering.

We do not seek conquest. I am equally sure, we do not seek in this day a colonial role in Asia for which we are ill-prepared and 100 years late. We do not seek to take over where the French left off. But how else can our conduct be interpreted.

We seek reform but maintain in power the tyranny of a petty puppet who has dangerous ambitions and delusions of grandeur.

We seek peace but escalate war.

We are a nation of compassion but we are party to the devastation of a country and its people.

Our actions, Mr. Chairman, speak more clearly than our words. We have lost, in the words of Thomas Jefferson, "A decent respect to the opinions of mankind." Vietnamese war escalates. Thirty-five thousand of our men are already stationed in Thailand. Where will it end if we do not achieve peace now?

The dollar cost of this war has its impact, too. In January 1966, the administration estimated that the Vietnam war would cost $10 billion for fiscal 1967. In December they had to admit error. The costs were not $10 billion for the year but $20 billion—exactly double the previous estimate. Will this be our experience again this year? I do not know and I do not think anyone can know, for the kind of war we have drifted into is an open ended war which is capable of producing costs beyond our most imaginative estimates.

We spent $20 billion for 1 year of destructive war in Vietnam, yet the most imaginative program of the New Frontier, The Alliance for Progress, has assisted the 240 million people of Central and South America for the past 5 years with an expenditure of only $2.3 billion.

The war on poverty falters while the war in Vietnam grows.

The impulse of the New Frontier and Great Society has deadened. Dollars that could relieve hunger, provide housing, education, job opportunities, and training are being diverted to destruction.

Disorder and distrust are all too prevalent. Liberties essential to a free society stand in jeopardy as dissent is subject to ridicule.

We are, in short, at a somber period in a decade that opened bright with promise.

Mr. Chairman, the cost in lives, in dollars which would be more wisely and humanely spent, in stress to the fabric of our democracy, is too high. The war must end. In my opinion, our present course does not bring us closer to that day.

We must seek a negotiated settlement and cease-fire by making it indisputably clear that we are willing to talk to all parties to the conflict, specifically the National Liberation Front as well as the government in Hanoi. As a sign of our seriousness and good faith—for in the words of President Kennedy, "Sincerity is always subject to proof"—we should follow the advice of the U.N. Secretary General Thant and halt all bombing of North Vietnam immediately and without preconditions. We should seek appropriate sponsorship of an international conference to guarantee agreements reached by the belligerents. We must support truly free elections in South Vietnam, and we must be prepared to accept whatever role for the National Liberation Front results from such elections.

Mr. Chairman, history will judge this Nation harshly if in its judgment we have contributed, by act or failure to act—to the prolonging of this war or escalating it until it engulfs all mankind in one final holocaust.

The survival of mankind, the honor of this great Nation, the anguish and suffering of millions, American and Vietnamese, cries out for sanity and peace. I am mindful that I find myself in opposition to the prevailing will of my distinguished colleagues on this issue of supplemental funds, and in opposition to the President, but I cannot in good conscience do other than to speak out and to vote to oppose what I consider another futile and dangerous act of escalation.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT].

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the committee for granting me this time.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I wish to compliment the chairman of our committee once again on the high grade of excellence he continuously maintains in the management and review of the most meaningful and expensive legislation which is heard in this House of Representatives.

I support the pending bill although I have serious reservations whether a defense expenditure of $76 billion programed for next year on an indefinite basis is in the long-term interest of the United States. There is no one in this room, I do not believe, who would not like to see this money expended and reoriented toward peaceful efforts. Therefore for this reason I support the olive branch, which I hope will be offered by my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], in his amendment.

We seek no real estate in southeast Asia, no colonial interest or control of the people, no allegiance or alliance of any people, but the expression of the peaceful free will of the people of South Vietnam.

What the Reuss amendment proclaims is self-evident, and requires no hearing or debate, and is but a restatement of the administration policy.

The amendment is not objected to by the President, by the Department of Defense, or by the Department of State.

In this regard I would commend to my colleagues again the 14 points urged by President Johnson last year. which I would like to see restated.

The President sent these to me in a message directed to my office:

> The following statements are on the public record about elements which the U.S. believes can go into peace in Southeast Asia:
>
> 1. The Geneva Agreements of 1954 and 1962 are an adequate basis for peace in Southeast Asia;
>
> 2. We would welcome a conference on Southeast Asia or on any part thereof;
>
> 3. We would welcome "negotiations without preconditions" as the 17 nations put it;
>
> 4. We would welcome unconditional discussions as President Johnson put it;
>
> 5. A cessation of hostilities could be the first order of business at a conference or could be the subject of preliminary discussions;
>
> 6. Hanoi's four points could be discussed along with other points which others might wish to propose;
>
> 7. We want no U.S. bases in Southeast Asia;
>
> 8. We do not desire to retain U.S. troops in South Viet Nam after peace is assured,
>
> 9. We support free elections in South Viet Nam to give the South Vietnamese a government of their own choice;
>
> 10. The question of reunification of Viet Nam should be determined by the Vietnamese through their own free decision;
>
> 11. The countries of Southeast Asia can be non-aligned or neutral if that be their option;
>
> 12. We would much prefer to use our resources for the economic reconstruction of Southeast Asia than in war. If there is peace, North Viet Nam could participate in a regional effort to which we would be prepared to contribute at least one billion dollars;
>
> 13. The President has said "The Viet Cong would not have difficulty being represented and having their views represented if for a moment Hanoi decided she wanted to cease aggression. I don't think that would be an insurmountable problem."
>
> 14. We have said publicly and privately that we could stop the bombing of North Viet Nam as a step toward peace although there has not been the slightest hint or suggestion from the other side as to what they would do if the bombing stopped.

These measures I believe are all included in the Mansfield amendment or are included in the Reuss amendment.

I do not believe that these items are overstated at all by the amendment which occurred in the other body or which will be offered in this House.

I believe the amendments are softer than the administration position in many respects.

While in one way the policy might be beyond the purview of the Committee on Armed Services in this legislation, certainly I believe it is in our interest totally to state American policy in defense, in war, and in peace in one simultaneous effort.

I think we could do that this afternoon without overcommitting the administration.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEGGETT. Certainly, I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. RIVERS. If this is under the jurisdiction of another committee, would the gentleman insist on our arrogating this jurisdiction?

Mr. LEGGETT. If that is so, I would not insist that we usurp the prerogatives of any other committee of this Congress.

Mr. RIVERS. Of course you would not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. RIVERS. I will share 50 percent of that time with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] and now yield him 1 minute.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his kindness.

However, Mr. Chairman, I regret that there is very little that I can say in 1 minute except to say this—I voted for the appropriation bill last year and I want to do so this year. I do not think it is asking too much in asking for a declaration in the bill as provided by the Reuss amendment or the Mansfield amendment.

I think we can very readily state that although we are seeking to support our boys and that we refuse to turn our back on our boys who are fighting in Vietnam, we nevertheless are seeking an early and honorable peace and that it is our prime aim to do so.

This declaration in the preamble will give evidence of our intention to seek peace as early as possible.

I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I will support the supplemental appropriation. I wish to state that this vote should not be interpreted to mean that I support the escalation of the war in Vietnam. I support the supplemental appropriation only because our men in Vietnam who are there at the will of this Government need these funds for their personal security and safety. Until we can urge our Government to proceed with the necessary moves toward a negotiated settlement, I believe that I have a moral obligation to provide these men with whatever is deemed necessary for their personal safety.

Many who view this war in Vietnam with concern and dismay have urged me to vote against this supplemental appropriation as an affirmation of belief that peace can be negotiated and that a further escalation is not necessary. If the measure before us was merely this simple question, I would have no hestitation to make such a reaffirmation. But this appropriation bill is not such a simple measure, for underlying it all is the consideration for the lives of 414,000 men in Vietnam who are there under orders by the Government of the United States. I cannot find the justification in my conscience to use this fund request as an occasion to register my protest against the policies of escalation in Vietnam.

The President in his state of the Union message on January 12, 1966, stated clearly that:

> We fight for the principle of self-determination. . . . The people of all Vietnam should make a free decision on the great question of reunification. . . . We have also made it clear from Hanoi to New York that there are no arbitrary limits to our search for peace. . . . We stand by the Geneva Agreements of 1954 and 1962. . . . We will meet at any conference table. We will discuss any proposals—4 points or 14 or 50—and we will consider the views of any group. We will work for a cease fire now, or once discussions have begun. . . . We have said all this and we have asked and hoped and we have waited for a response. . . . So far we have received no response to prove either success or failure. We have carried our quest for peace to many nations and peoples because we share this planet with others whose future, in large measure, is tied to our own action and whose counsel is necessary to our own hopes. We have found understanding and support, and we know they wait with us tonight for some response that could lead to peace.

I believe that we have now had such a response from Hanoi in the numerous reports recently carried in the capitals of many nations. Where once there was only a flaunting unequivocal demand that the United States withdraw all troops from Vietnam before any consideration for a settlement, today we hear of pleas for the cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam, emanating from Hanoi itself.

I know that thousands of Americans are as bewildered as I am over our refusal to consider this retraction on the part of Hanoi as that "response" which we were searching for only a year ago. Instead of only a response from Hanoi, is it now our position that we demand a promise of cessation of hostilities in advance of negotiations? Has our increased military effort in Vietnam now prompted a more ambitious course of action? Are we now demanding surrender as a prerequisite to "peace" talks? I know that our military capability reasons for such conciliation on the part of Hanoi. It is this very departure from the President's own words spoken scarcely a year ago that causes me to remind this country again of this promise of faith and earnest intentions to do all that is necessary for peace in Vietnam.

On April 7, 1965, months before we landed our own military forces on the shores of Vietnam, the President in a speech at Johns Hopkins University, said:

> We will never be second in the search for such a peaceful settlement in Vietnam. There may be many ways to this kind of peace: in discussion or negotiation with the governments concerned; in large groups or small one; . . . And we remain ready—with this purpose—for unconditional discussions . . . We have no desire to devastate that which the people of North Vietnam have built with toil and sacrifice. We will use our power with restraint and with all the wisdom we can command.

I believe that that time for restraint and wisdom is now. Pope Paul VI in September 1966 said:

> Let all those responsible strive to bring about those necessary conditions which will lead men to lay down their arms at last, before it becomes too late to do so owing to the mounting pressure of events.

I have no wish for this country to assume any unnecessary risks, and I would not advocate any step which I earnestly believed would amount to such a risk. There is no question in my mind that Hanoi is hurting badly from our bombing of the north. In the words of our President in January of 1966, we began that bombing, "to give courage to the people of the south and make our firmness clear to the north. Thus, we began limited air action against military targets in North Vietnam." On the essentiality of the bombing of the north to the security of our defense operations on the south, Secretary McNamara has said:

> I don't believe that bombing up to the present has significantly reduced, nor any bombing that I could contemplate in the future would significantly reduce the actual flow of men and material to the South.

I, therefore, feel compelled to conclude that we could have made a reply to that response for which we have waited so long from Hanoi and agreed to cease the bombing of the north, and then made a public plea for the convening of a conference "without preconditions" and "at any place" calling upon the nations of the world to intercede in laying the groundwork for the parties to meet and to discuss the means to achieve our hopes for peace in Vietnam, together with the guarantees of the rights of all Vietnamese to determine for themselves their own destinies.

I do not doubt that this Nation possesses the power and will to bring the enemy to his knees. As this war continues, the vast majority of the people of this country will seek this solution as the only means to end this brutal conflict in order to bring our sons and husbands home from these foreign lands. I can see the beginnings of this unreasoned argument taking hold, and fear that unless we move with greater conviction that what we have done thus far is right, this Nation will be moved to a wider and wider war of all-out military victory in which no small voice for peace will ever again have a chance to be heard amid the cries that patriotism to our country demands only that the enemy surrenders.

Should it ever again happen, and I hope soon, that a friendly nation speak to us, if even ever so softly that another "peace feeler" has been sounded from Hanoi, I would hope that in a great testimony to our dedication to peace, our President will find it possible to interpret it as a call for peace, and with all the honor that I have found in his pronouncements of the past, magnify it into those first most difficult steps to the conference table.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I believe the last 2 years have demonstrated that the administration policy of escalation of the war in Vietnam is not in the interest of peace or our long-range national security.

Accordingly, I must vote against the Vietnam supplemental authorization bill. I cannot support a measure that promises only to continue the present course which will send still more troops to Vietnam, widen the land war in southeast Asia, and further increase American casualties.

I take this action reluctantly, because in the past I have been constrained to vote for defense appropriations on the understanding they were necessary to support American soldiers already there. Instead, they have resulted in doubling our troops there and deepening our involvement in the war.

The hope for peace does not lie in bombings and more war but, rather, in a realistic pursuit of a political settlement in the south. To this end, I have joined a number of my colleagues in proposing a four-point program which holds greater promise for the early resolution of the conflict.

Existing defense authorizations, coupled with this year's enormous defense budget, are more than sufficient to carry out the policy we have outlined and to provide for the support and safety of Americans now in Vietnam.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I will support the motion to recommit because it provides the only opportunity to vote against our present policy of bombing North Vietnam, although I have reservations about the form and logic of the motion to recommit. The proposed amendment offered by Representative HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin, would have offered a far more sound and thoughtful statement of the sense of Congress, had it been permitted to come to a vote.

I believe that the continued bombing of North Vietnam is inimical to the national interests of the United States and presents a continuing danger to world peace. I am very much impressed by the recent testimony on this point of such authoritative and respected military and diplomatic experts as General Gavin and Ambassadors Reischauer and Kennan.

The answer to the failure of escalation to attain peace cannot be merely more escalation.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today—H.R. 4515—is a most important measure to our Armed Forces in Vietnam. That fact has been more than adequately established by the distinguished floor managers of the bill. The purpose for my rising is to discuss the importance of an extra $81 million that was added to the bill by our Armed Services Committee. This item is most essential to the Marine Corps in that it would provide that service with a much-needed squadron of EA6–A aircraft. These planes are electronically sophisticated attack aircraft used for close air support of our ground forces in Vietnam.

During our committee hearings on this bill, Navy and Marine Corps witnesses pointed out the need for these aircraft and acknowledged that, of all the items eliminated in their original request to the Defense Department, this additional squadron of EA6–A aircraft had the highest priority.

The committee recognized the vital importance of authorizing the additional squadron, not only for Vietnam requirements, but to correct a deficiency in our present inventory of this type aircraft.

Last year our Subcommittee on Tactical Air Support, on which I have been most honored to serve, held hearings on some of the problems of supplying our ground forces in Vietnam with adequate close air support. It was clearly shown that of all the services, Marine pilots flying EA6—A's were giving our boys the best support. I firmly believe that it is imperative that we give the marines more of these planes to do an even better job.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support H.R. 4515—the supplemental military appropriations bill—which is before the House today. The clear and direct purpose of this legislation is to make authorizations that will help to insure that our fighting men in Vietnam have the military means to uphold the national interest in southeast Asia. The passage of this bill will broaden the authorization base on which the Armed Forces can mount responses to threats by the enemy.

This supplemental funding of approximately $4.5 billion is expensive, but necessary to meet our national and worldwide responsibilities in the face of foreign military aggression.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I have notified the people of Ohio's 13th Congressional District that I will vote today in opposition to the authorization for some $4.5 billion in supplemental funds, and later against the more than $12 billion supplementary appropriations to fund military expenditures for the Vietnam war.

I want it understood that my negative vote represents a very personal decision. I do not necessarily associate myself with the views expressed by any other Member or group who may also oppose the supplemental appropriations for the war.

I feel impelled, Mr. Chairman, to make this gesture, to indicate my own personal doubt that our increasingly massive military action is the wise, right, effective way for our country to achieve its long term best interests in southeast Asia, or in the broader worldwide relationships which are so immediately affected by the war in Vietnam.

Frankly, I am not convinced that our terrible sacrifices in lives lost or ruined, families and careers disrupted, billions invested in the military at the expense of other crucial national needs—I am not convinced these American sacrifices in southeast Asia are warranted, nor do I see any probable ultimate result which will make them warranted.

My vote today will also be a gesture in recognition of the doubts and unhappiness many other Americans feel concerning the growth and nature of U.S. military involvement in Asia.

I recognize there will be a huge majority, almost unanimous vote today in favor of the additional billions for the war; but that vote will not accurately reflect the degree of uncertainty and variety of points of view among the American people and in the Congress.

At least a few of us should go on record against the supplemental appropriations, as a reminder that there is no unanimous mandate or carte blanche authority being granted here to expand the war.

Our U.S. position in Vietnam is ambiguous, and many of us in the Congress have ambiguous feelings on the whole question. I am confident that is true of many of my colleagues who will vote for the supplemental authorization today.

Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend that my negative vote today will represent the majority opinion in my district or in the Nation. I know that President Johnson has majority and bipartisan support throughout America for his policies in Vietnam.

Moreover, I know that my vote today may surprise and displease many of my friends and constituents in Ohio, even though for more than 2 years I have repeatedly and publicly revealed to the people of our district my own profound unhappiness about the nature of our involvement in Vietnam. I am prepared for severe criticism because of my vote here today.

Also, I am a realist, Mr. Chairman. I know that the U.S. forces now are not going to be withdrawn from Vietnam; we are not going to back out or back down. Our President has set our course and the American people will support him. There will be no conclusion to the war which smacks of defeat for our military.

But I suggest it also is realistic to recognize that any ultimate success we may achieve for our goals, and the world's needs, in southeast Asia must be achieved by political agreements, and will be measured in terms of social, economic, political gains. We have to hope that our military action may somehow contribute to a degree of security which might help make possible those social, economic, political goals. The crucial need is to somehow end the fighting, so that the work of reconstruction can begin.

Mr. Chairman, previously I have voted consistently in support of President Johnson's Vietnam appropriation requests, even though with great uncertainty and unhappiness.

I have argued that the administration has so completely committed our military forces to the war, that the Congress has had little choice but to supply the money. That still seems true.

Last July, in my newsletter to constituents, I reported that:

> Members of the Congress feel one compelling obligation, whenever the President says he needs added money to supply and support the U.S. forces, then certainly we will vote to appropriate that money. It is unthinkable that we would turn our backs on their needs. In effect the more men the President sends to Vietnam, the more certain it becomes that the Congress must support his policies.

At the time I wrote that newsletter, there were some 300,000 American fighting men in Vietnam. Today, I understand the number approaches 500,000.

That feeling of obligation to support the President as Commander in Chief, and to support our thousands of friends, neighbors and relatives who are fighting in Vietnam, and who are ordered there or have volunteered there out of an honorable sense of duty—that feeling of obligation I still recognize as a valid reason to vote for the war appropriations, and my friends here in the House today will vote for today's bill on that basis. I in no way criticize their vote.

But how many blank checks should the White House continue to use? Where does this sort of vicious circle end? The President, without any real declaration of war by Congress, at will expands the war and sends more and more American troops over there. The more troops sent, the more the Congress feels bound to vote the funds for their support. And then each such vote, as that today, is interpreted as new approval to carry the war further.

Mr. Chairman, an added reason for my negative vote today is my belief that the White House tended to hide the full truth of the war's costs, and this year's probable budget deficits, until after the 1966 elections.

I submit it is a bad habit for the Congress to be voting approval of supplemental funds really after the fact, after the President and the Pentagon have already gone ahead and committed us.

In closing, I want to repeat the viewpoint I expressed in a personal letter to the President last August, that I urge and support his every effort by negotiation to bring the war to any feasible conclusion which may allow the people of South Vietnam to freely determine their own destiny and with the participation of all factions in that determination.

Mr. Chairman, I have been reluctant to express my own doubts and criticism of the U.S. intervention in Vietnam. I have been reluctant because of my abiding allegiance to our country and our government, and also because I have profound compassion for our President and his advisers in the terrible load of responsibility, and the decisions they must make, affecting the lives of millions and the fate of the world.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, I now feel personally obligated to vote as I do today. I cannot be true to my own strong feelings if I do otherwise.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the committee's recommendation that Secretary McNamara's planned deactivation of Air Force Reserve and National Guard airlift units be deferred until the Vietnam conflict is resolved.

I think we should wait until it can be clearly shown that a requirement no longer exists for this airlift capability to meet contingency plans before we do away with these units.

These airlift units have been making an important contribution. The four Air National Guard airlift units scheduled by DOD for extinction last year accomplished more than 400 productive overseas airlift missions for the Military Airlift Command. Included were 136 missions for direct support of our forces in southeast Asia. By performing these missions while carrying out training flights, these units produced over 16 million ton-miles of productive airlift. One of these units was the 171st Military Airlift Group at Greater Pittsburgh Airport in my own State of Pennsylvania.

The eight Air Force Reserve airlift units scheduled for inactivation reportedly performed 4,900 productive airlift missions in support of our active forces during 1966. They airdropped over 53,000 troops in direct support of the combat ready training of the airborne divisions while accomplishing their training missions.

Deactivation could mean the loss of over 1,300 officers and 800 pilots. Now is not the time for this deactivation and it is my hope that our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee will look carefully at Secretary McNamara's plans in this regard.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote today for the $12,300 million supplemental Vietnam appropriation, but I am not very happy about it. I would like to explain, for the benefit of the administration, my colleagues and constituents why I am not very happy.

First, of all, I am unhappy because we are involved in this war at all. I have listened to a great many speeches and read a great many rationalizations about this war, but as far as I am concerned it is the wrong war in the wrong place at the wrong time. And I do not quite know how we ended up making a commitment so binding that it would require such a high price as we are paying, both in our precious resources and in the irreplaceable lives of our young men.

I listened the other day to the words of the great historian, Henry Steele Commager, and one word struck me as particularly incisive and appropriate. He described the succession of commitments we have made in Vietnam as "mindless." It is as though at each moment when a world-shaking decision was to be made we had our minds on other matters and as though we thought such decisions of such little consequence as to require no debate and no sober reflection.

Mr. Chairman, this Nation is caught on a treadmill, and sometimes I think we have no interest in getting off. What in the scheme of things makes that patch of real estate in South Vietnam worth thousands upon thousands of American lives and billions upon billions of American dollars?

I know, I have heard the answers, and in a certain sense they are persuasive. But they are persuasive only in the sense that certain arguments of the Middle Ages were persuasive in demonstrating that an infinite number of angels could stand on the head of a pin. They require the acceptance of certain premises, and I am not sure I accept any longer some of those premises.

But here we are in the middle of a war. Our troops are committed on the battlefield. Our Nation has set its course. And, unhappy as I am about this war, unhappy as I am that we have been unable—or unwilling—to end it on honorable terms, I see no alternative to hanging on until a decent peace can be arranged. Like it or not, we are now deeply involved in the Asian land war our military experts have always warned against.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this little, additional chunk of money even though by itself it exceeds the largest total budget of the Federal Government during the entire New Deal. But in so doing I shall indeed begrudge the fact that this same money cannot be spent to combat air and water pollution, to fight poverty, and to attack the problems besetting our schools, health facilities, parks and cities.

While I have concluded that I should cast my vote for this expenditure, I want to make clear that there are some things I am not voting for.

While funds appropriated in this bill are probably sufficient to do this, I am not voting for an expanded or escalated war. I am convinced that military escalation will not win this war. If 400,000 soldiers now in Vietnam cannot defeat an impoverished nation of 16 million, then 750,000 or 1 million cannot do it either. If 18,600 air sorties a month over North and South Vietnam will not "win" this war, twice that many would not do the job either. If 5,008 American soldiers killed on the battlefield in 1966 could gain us a "victory," then several times that number of American lives will not win us that elusive prize. For, Mr. Chairman, the really serious problems of Vietnam are not military; they are economic and social. And no escalation of bullets and bombs will solve them.

Mr. Chairman, I am not voting today for any increase in military activity at the expense of our civil efforts in that war-torn country. These efforts are the key to resolution of the conflict. We could wipe out North Vietnam as a nation tonight, and the problems of a stable government in South Vietnam would remain as long as the people in the villages do not identify with the Saigon government and do not accept it, rather than the National Liberation Front, as the government most able and willing to serve their needs.

Furthermore, I am not voting for any delay in moving to a democratic, civilian government in that country. In fact, I believe the United States must insist and use all its influence to see that the constitution now being drafted is voted upon and put into effect at the earliest possible time. And I want it understood I am not voting to perpetuate a military oligarchy in office on the ground that any other government would fail to support the U.S. military effort there.

Mr. Chairman, I also want it understood I am not voting for any kind of "total victory" or dictated peace by the United States. I believe this great Nation of ours should be willing to negotiate with all factions and groups and indicate its willingness to settle this war on any basis which leaves South Vietnam free. And I specifically include terms which might provide for neutralization, eventual withdrawal of U.S. troops, enforcement by the United Nations, or other reasonable concessions.

Mr. Chairman, I most certainly am not voting to "win and then get out," the theme of a current rightwing mailing campaign many of us have been receipients of. If there is a more contradictory or preposterous bit of advice in current circulation, I have not seen it.

I have a couple of other things I am not voting for today.

I am not voting for any policy which will increase our already subsantial risk of confrontation with Red China or the Soviet Union. To risk or actually wage a world war over our supposed national interests in Vietnam would be, indeed, to pile angels on the head of a pin.

Mr. Chairman, while my vote for this appropriation certainly can be considered a vote to "support our boys in Vietnam," I believe the best way to support our boys, in the final analysis—my highest obligation to those fine young men now there and those many more who will soon have to go if the fighting continues—is to find an honorable way out of this war.

As Senator MANSFIELD has said:

> We owe an unremitting search for a peaceful solution in Vietnam to the young Americans who have gone and who will go to that tortured land.

I agree with those words.

Mr. Chairman, we have been told repeatedly that we can fight this war in Vietnam and continue our vital nondefense programs at home. But this is nonsense. In the past 2 years I have seen the great promise of the war on poverty shrivel and nearly die. I have seen the great expectations of our assault on urban ghettos all but vanish. These are the prices we are paying for this war to save the Vietnamese from themselves.

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, we are not helping our boys in Vietnam by perpetuating this war and sapping the lifeblood out of our domestic programs. On the contrary, the best thing we could do for the boys in Vietnam is to bring them home to an America that is cleaner, safer, healthier, and better able to deal with its internal problems.

We cannot bring our boys home today, but I want it understood my vote for this appropriation is not a vote to keep them in Vietnam indefinitely in order to win one more ounce of meaningless concession from the government of North Vietnam and the leaders of the National Liberation Front.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that an amendment will be offered this afternoon along the lines of the Mansfield amendment adopted by the Senate yesterday. This amendment has three points—to provide all necessary support for our troops, to support the efforts of the President to prevent expansion of the war and achieve a negotiated settlement, and to support the Geneva agreements and reconvening of that conference or any other meeting to bring the conflict to an honorable conclusion. I plan to vote for that amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am not unfamiliar with the history of other times, and I am not unfamiliar with the psychology of war. Wars tend to develop their own rationale, to feed on themselves. Limited objectives lead to less limited objectives. Power feeds on power. Risk taking becomes a way of life, and bravado replaces commonsense. I fear that our objectives in this war may imperceptibly, but definitely shift. We have been told by our leaders this Nation would be willing to halt the bombing of North Vietnam if Hanoi would but make any gesture to show its willingness to negotiate. I trust this is still true.

As a Member of Congress I represent over half a million people, and I want and expect to be consulted about any changes in that policy. The people who elected me expect to have a voice in any decisions which may mean many more American lives lost. Such basic decisions if they are made should not be presented as a fait accompli, with we in the Congress expected, not to reason why, but to vote "aye."

Mr. Chairman, the conduct of this war disturbs me greatly, and in casting my vote today to keep it going—a vote I find necessary if our Nation is not to be greatly imperiled—I simply want it understood I am not lending my unequivocal support to the policies requiring that expenditure.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, as the House debates the Vietnam supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1967, it becomes apparent that a vote on this legislation will not truly express a Member's feelings on the Vietnam conflict. For that reason it is most important that we dispel any notion that a "yes" vote on the appropriation measure is a blank check to escalate the Vietnam conflict or even that it indicates tacit approval of every aspect of our policy in that area.

I am voting in favor of the supplemental appropriation because I believe that full support of the American and allied troops in Vietnam requires this action notwithstanding my concern over recent developments. But lest the President or the public interpret this vote as unqualified endorsement of present policy in Vietnam, I reiterate what was stated in March 1966, when I joined with 78 Members of the House in stating:

> We therefore reject any contention that approval of this legislation will constitute a

mandate for unrestrained or indiscriminate enlargement of the military effort, and we strongly support continued efforts to initiate negotiations for a settlement of the conflict.

Six months ago, on August 31, 1966, I wrote to the President of the United States, outlining a comprehensive proposal for peace in Vietnam together with a timetable for holding a world conference to achieve the desired results. I appreciate the efforts which have been made to explore the various aspects of my proposals.

On December 3, 1966, I sent a telegram to the President urging acceptance of the holiday truce and I was pleased when the United States accepted the truce proposals.

I was extremely pleased when the United States did not resume the bombing of North Vietnam at the conclusion of the truce. My elation was not long lived, because the bombing was resumed 48 hours thereafter. I was distressed by the resumption of the bombing for a number of reasons, not the least of which was that sufficient time was not given to permit a full and complete exploration of the possibility of organizing a peace conference, by those who were actively pursuing peace.

The stated purpose for our bombing in the north has been to "raise the cost of aggression"—in other words to let Hanoi know we are serious in meeting our commitment to South Vietnam. A bombing pause to determine Hanoi's willingness and to encourage Hanoi to come to the conference table, would not in any way indicate to Hanoi that we have lost our determination to defend the south.

After a bombing pause of indeterminate duration, we would look hopefully for some demonstration of desire for peace through reciprocal deescalation, on the part of Hanoi.

Should Hanoi fail to come to the conference table after such a bombing pause the world would then know that the United States had made every effort to find a political solution to the struggle and that Hanoi simply had no desire for peace.

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken out in favor of a bombing cessation in the north on several occasions in the 89th Congress because our objectives in Vietnam should be to move toward an honorable peace—through diplomatic and political means, as distinguished from ending it through military means.

I want the war to come to an end, because I want the death and destruction to come to an end. I want it to end in both the north and the south. I want to stop the slaughter of the brave men in our Armed Forces and those of our allies. I also want to save the lives of innocent civilians—the unavoidable victims of the conflict.

Mr. Chairman, a considerable number of my constituents, including the wives and parents of men fighting in Vietnam, share the view that the bombing in the north should be stopped—not for 5 days, not for 38 days, and not for 48 hours, but for an indeterminate period—hopefully permanent—but at the very least long enough to give all diplomatic and political forces an opportunity to work their will to the end, that the parties to the conflict will move to the conference table.

In making this proposal I do not intend that our men and allied forces in Vietnam should be left unsupported to the fullest extent. I agree with our President and his advisers that we must prevent the infiltration of men and materiel from the north to the south.

How this is to be accomplished must be left to our military men, however, I am constrained to ask a question and to offer a suggestion.

It has been admitted that the bombing of North Vietnam has not substantially reduced the flow of men and materiel from the north to South Vietnam. Does it not therefore follow that a bombing pause would not endanger our troops in the south?

When we stop the bombing in the north, we can fly the same number of sorties below the demilitarized zone and we can thus provide even greater support to ours and our allied forces in the south.

We can concentrate the forces necessary below the demilitarized zone, with adequate air cover and protection to prevent infiltration of men and materiel from the north. Thus we would only attack the infiltrators and the materiel.

I do not overlook the military need to provide by appropriate means stopping the infiltration through other borders and other routes.

Though I am not a military man, I take the risk of suggesting that such a concentration of power, in a fixed area would be far more effective to prevent infiltration than the present pattern of bombing in the north, which is very much like sprinkling salt on the ocean. I suggest that such a plan would save many American lives.

On March 1, I joined with nine of my colleagues in issuing a statement endorsing the following four-point program:

First, immediate cessation of U.S. bombing of North Vietnam.

Second, U.S. support for truly free elections in South Vietnam, and full acceptance of any role won by the National Liberation Front as a result of those elections;

Third, U.S. proposal of four-party negotiations, including the United States, North Vietnamese Government, South Vietnamese Government, and National Liberation Front, to secure a cease fire in Vietnam.

Fourth, encouragement of the formation of any appropriately sponsored international conference to seek international guarantees for any agreements reached by the participants in the Vietnamese conflict.

I would like to point out that in no way does my endorsement of the above four-point program to cease bombing in the north conflict with my suggestions to support and protect with air cover our allied forces in the south. I said in the 89th Congress and repeat again that the pursuit of peace is in the proudest tradition of our American democracy.

I have made it perfectly clear that I want my Government to stop bombing in North Vietnam and I want to make it equally clear that I do not want to tie the hands of my Government in any manner or means.

Let all who want to pursue peace in the American tradition call upon the leaders of North Vietnam and their advisers, if any, not to misjudge American intentions.

Let us call upon Hanoi to indicate a willingness to go to the conference table without preconditions, if there is a pause in the bombing of the north for an indeterminate period of time.

If they go to the peace table then we can encourage our Government to continue the pause—so long as they continue to negotiate in good faith.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, we have before us today the supplemental military procurement authorization bill for fiscal 1967 and I know that this body will demonstrate overwhelmingly its support of our policy in Vietnam by passing this bill with a large majority.

Our President is doing everything possible to bring the war in Vietnam to a peaceful conclusion. In the meantime, however, we must support our troops who are fighting that war. There is no way to know when the Communists will come to the conference table; they have not shown themselves to be interested in any way in reaching a peaceful settlement.

There is a great deal of talk about supposed U.S. failure to respond to alleged peace feelers from Hanoi. The plain and simple truth is we have followed through every time there was even the slightest hint that the Communists were interested in peace. Not once was there any substance to the supposed peace feeler.

In 1966 our President became convinced that perhaps a cessation of bombing in the north might persuade the enemy of our good intentions. Obviously they were not interested in examining our motives or our interest in bringing peace to southeast Asia. They only used the bombing lull to build up their supplies of men and equipment in the south. It would be sheer folly to permit this to happen again.

Everyone is familiar with the situation. There has been more than enough responsible press coverage of the war so that everyone should see without any difficulty that the course we are pursuing is the only correct and proper one. Unfortunately, however, there as those in a very vocal minority of self-proclaimed military experts and diplomats who have seen fit to insist that their imperfect judgment should supersede that of the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense. It is equally unfortunate that some of these self-proclaimed experts sit in the House of Representatives.

I cannot urge our colleagues too strongly to demonstrate today their support of American policy and of American fighting men in Vietnam by voting for the military procurement supplemental bill. This will be the best proof of our desire to insist upon an honorable peace and that at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to talk extensively on the provisions of this bill. Certainly, anything I might say after the thorough, comprehensive, impressive speech of my beloved friend and distinguished chairman, MENDEL RIVERS, would be entirely redundant. I am also sure that everyone was also very much impressed by the excellent speech of my dear, able friend and distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. Bates].

Since this bill authorizes supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1967 for the procurement of aircraft and missiles; research, development, test, and evaluation; and military construction, proposing funds in the amount of more than $4½ billion, and has direct impact upon Vietnam requirements, I do not anticipate that there will be any real opposition to the bill, and it should pass the House with merely token dissent.

Our Armed Services Committee has already started consideration of the procurement bill for fiscal year 1968, and it will be reassuring to know the strong, enthusiastic, solid backing which our committee programs have in the House, as evidencing the strong, determined support of our boys engaged in Vietnam combat, and for the cause of freedom, security, and peace for which they are fighting so gallantly. Let it be known that we are striving to the best of our ability to sustain and strengthen them and be able to return home as soon as possible.

I desire to commend and thank my colleagues of the committee for the exceptionally fine piece of work they did on this important bill, which was handled so expeditiously, and with so much vigor, careful attention, concern, and understanding of the defense and operational problems involved.

To our great leader, Chairman Rivers, whose knowledgeable, articulate mastery of armed services matters is so well known to all of us, I extend special commendation and thanks for a job exceptionally well done.

I have served for many years with Chairman Rivers, and it is my studied conviction that this Nation owes to this great son of South Carolina an everlasting debt of gratitude for his long-sustained, invaluable contributions to the security and defense of this Nation and the free world.

We are all very fortunate, indeed, that we have such a dedicated, attentive, persevering, well informed and able, determined leader to head the vital work of our committee. He has demonstrated in highest degree devotion to his great trust and superlative talents and we are behind him in this great work. I also believe that the wholehearted cooperation extended by our very able, distinguished ranking minority member, our good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Bates], and his very diligent, persistent, able work and expert knowledge of the military field is very gratifying and will continue to bear constructive results for our distinguished, effective Armed Services Committee.

I would be glad to urge the Members of the House to support this bill, but knowing them as well as I do, I do not believe this is necessary at this time, because I am convinced that they will support this measure, and all other meritorious defense measures presented to the Congress, with a virtual unanimous vote that will make it clear to our enemies and allies alike that this Congress intends to fulfill its great commitment of protecting the Nation and making this Government the powerful, meaningful instrumentality it is for promoting law and order, freedom, and peace in the world and guarding the homes and boundaries of the country.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, in the 1 minute remaining on our side, I would like to close this debate by saying that for the last 35 or 40 minutes, nobody has been for the bill.

I just want the Committee to understand that I favor the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

Sec. 101. In addition to the funds authorized to be appropriated under Public Law 89–501, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year 1967 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles in amounts as follows:

Aircraft

For aircraft: for the Army, $533,100,000; for the Navy and the Marine Corps, $1,703,300,000; for the Air Force, $1,303,000,000.

Missiles

For missiles: for the Army, $6,100,000; for the Navy, $48,700,000; for the Marine Corps, $2,100,000; for the Air Force, $45,000,000.

Tracked Combat Vehicles

For tracked combat vehicles: for the Army, $62,200,000; for the Marine Corps, $4,200,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 3, strike "$1,703,300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,784,300,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Sec. 201. In addition to the funds authorized to be appropriated under Public Law 89–501, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year 1967 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for research, development, test, and evaluation, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

For the Army, $40,000,000;

For the Navy (including the Marine Corps), $40,000,000;

For the Air Force, $33,000,000; and

For Defense Agencies, $22,000,000.

TITLE III—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Sec. 301. The Secretary of each military department may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, which are necessary in connection with military activities in southeast Asia, or in support of such activities, in the total amount as follows:

Department of the Army, $288,500,000;

Department of the Navy, $140,000,000; and

Department of the Air Force, $196,000,000.

Sec. 302. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

Sec. 303. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this title, but the appropriations for public works authorized by section 301 shall not exceed: Department of the Army, $288,500,000; Department of the Navy, $140,000,000; Department of the Air Force, $196,000,000, or a total of $624,500,000.

Mr. RIVERS (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as read and open at any point to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REUSS

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Reuss: On page 4, line 10, after "$624,500,000", insert:

"TITLE IV—STATEMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL POLICY

"Sec. 401. None of the funds authorized by this Act shall be used except in accordance with the following declaration by Congress of—

"(1) its firm intentions to provide all necessary support for members of the Armed Forces of the United States fighting in Vietnam;

"(2) its support of efforts being made by the President of the United States and other men of good will throughout the world to prevent an expansion of the war in Vietnam and to bring that conflict to an end through a negotiated settlement which will preserve the honor of the United States, protect the vital interests of this country, and allow the people of South Vietnam to determine the affairs of that nation in their own way; and

"(3) its support of the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962 and urges the convening of that Conference or any other meeting of nations similarly involved and interested as soon as possible for the purpose of formulating plans for bringing the conflict to an honorable conclusion in accordance with the principles of those accords."

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order on the ground that the amendment is not germane to the bill. The bill before the House is a supplemental authorization bill. The amendment contains no limitation. It declares a matter of policy which obviously is under the jurisdiction of another committee, since it deals with foreign affairs and commitments. We are not privy to the 1954, 1958, or 1962 Geneva agreements, nor are we signatory to the Geneva accords.

As I said before, there is no limitation on the funds indicated in the amendment, and I make the point of order that it is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard in opposition to the point of order.

I have had an opportunity to examine fully the precedents of this House, and I am confident that the amendment I offer is germane because it is a limitation on the legislative authorization for military procurement, research, and construction contained in the first three titles of H.R. 4515. By stating the circumstances under which the authorization may be pursued, it is well within the precedents of this body, and the mere fact that a portion of the language relates to the foreign policy specialty of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs is entirely irrelevant.

On May 7, 1959, there came before this House H.R. 3460, to permit the Tennessee Valley Authority to raise revenues for the construction of electric facilities. That bill came here from the House Committee on Public Works. Mr. Dent, of Pennsylvania, offered an amendment—Congressional Record, volume 105, part 6, page 7720—to require that any of those TVA facilities be manufactured under labor standards then prevalent in the United States.

Labor standards, of course, were within the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Education and Labor. A point of order against the amendment was made by Mr. Smith of Mississippi on the ground that it was not germane. The chairman overruled the point of order, saying the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania was germane to the bill. It will be noted that the Dent amendment was held germane because it related to the policies under which the authorized funds might be spent.

In the case of my amendment, the policies under which the funds authorized are to be spent are policies within the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Armed Services or the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Since the limitation goes to the funds authorized, the TVA precedent is governing.

Another precedent: On May 20, 1959, a House bill from my committee, the House Committee on Banking and Currency, was before this House. The gentleman from New York, Mr. Powell, offered an amendment providing that none of the funds authorized by the housing bill should be used except under a policy that such housing should be available without discrimination. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Colmer] made the point of order, "that the amendment is not germane." The chairman, our late colleague, Mr. Walter, of Pennsylvania, overruled the point of order, and held the amendment germane upon the ground, "that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is restricted to any title of this act and is specific in the opinion of the Chair."

In drafting the amendment I have presented, I have relied closely on those carefully reasoned decisions as to germaneness of those two predecessor chairmen of the Committee of the Whole House. Those rulings are squarely in line with my amendment.

In one, an amendment was sought to the Banking and Currency bill with regard to the competence of the Committee on the Judiciary. It was held germane. In the other case, an amendment was offered to the bill produced by the Committee on Public Works, which amendment involved the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Education and Labor. It was held germane. Based on these precedents and in view of the imperative need that this body have the opportunity to vote on the policy underlying the military authorization here sought, I respectfully urge that the point of order be overruled.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard in support of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I do, in effect, believe this amendment affects the national policy. I do believe that there is a question of germaneness. I believe that there has been no hearing, except precipitously this morning in the Committee on Armed Services. I believe there is a question of jurisdiction.

As far as the substance of the amendment is concerned, and presuming that with the limitation of expenses in the preamble thereunto—and the gentleman from Wisconsin will correct me if I am wrong—it is identical with the so-called Mansfield amendment passed in the other body yesterday. It would be unwise for the House to declare a sense of ratification blindly to a statement of Vietnamese peace terms contained in this preamble.

It would in effect endorse the Geneva agreements of 1954 as the basis of settling the conflict in Vietnam in 1967. The agreements of 1954 did not work. If they had, we would not be involved in a war in southeast Asia today, and neither our Nation nor the Republic of South Vietnam are signatories to that agreement.

The Geneva agreements of 1954 contemplated an election in all of Vietnam, united South and North Vietnam as one constituency. There were at that time more people in the North than in South Vietnam. An election of this kind, with Hanoi running the elections in the north, would mean a Communist victory and Communist control of both halves of the country.

Mr. Chairman, the Geneva agreements of 1954 provided that their terms would be carried out by an International Control Commission of three members, one of whom is the representative of Communist Poland.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the gentleman is not making a point of order. He is making a speech on foreign policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is listening to the gentleman, and the Chair believes the gentleman from Missouri is within his right.

Mr. HALL. I will make one other point and then come to my point, Mr. Chairman.

The Geneva agreements of 1954 provided that their terms would be carried out by an International Control Commission of three members, one of whom is the representative of Communist Poland. They give to each member of the Control Commission a power of veto which makes it impossible for the Commission to act, which has failed miserably in other countries.

This is my final or fifth point, Mr. Chairman. I believe the point of order is in order because this amendment at this time would be unconstitutional.

Article VI, clause 2, of the Constitution provides:

> This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof, and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land * * *

In the 1965 Corwin edition of the Constitution, the relationship of treaties and Federal statutes says, at page 470:

> It is in respect to his contention that when it is asked to carry a treaty into effect Congress has the constitutional right, and indeed the duty, to determine the matter according to its own ideas of what is expedient, that Madison has been completely vindicated by developments. This is seen in the answer which the Court has returned to the question, as to what happens when a treaty provision and an act of Congress conflict. *The answer is, that neither has any intrinsic superiority over the other and that therefore the one of later date will prevail.*

Here we have the reverse of the above situation. In the amendment before us, we will by statute make the Geneva accords the supreme law of the land. Yet the United States has deliberately kept from making this agreement the supreme law of the land by the regular constitutional route of signing it and submitting it to the Senate for ratification. This is indeed a novel procedure and should not be employed at this time, on this short notice, and with so little study and thought.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, this amendment probably commits one of the most grievous of legislative errors. By incorporating—albeit if by reference—and approving the principles of the Geneva accords, we are making as the supreme law of the land provisions which are not even before us at this time. I believe that this is most unwise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order raised by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] has offered an amendment to which the gentleman from South Carolina, [Mr. Rivers] has raised a point of order on the grounds of germaneness.

The bill presently before the Committee authorizes appropriations for military procurement, research, development, and military construction both in the United States and abroad.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin provides for a new section to be added at the end of the bill which would contain a "statement of Congressional Policy" relating to the foreign policy of the United States in Vietnam and southeast Asia.

The Chair is of the opinion that the subject matter of the amendment comes within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and not the Committee on Armed Services which reported the bill now before the Committee.

The Chair refers the Committee to a decision by Chairman Metcalf, of Montana, in the 85th Congress. The bill then under consideration authorized the sale or loan of certain vessels to friendly foreign nations. It had been reported by the Committee on Armed Services. The amendment on which the Chair was called upon to rule provided that no vessels could be made available under the act unless the recipient country agreed to waive criminal jurisdiction over troops of the United States stationed therein—an amendment which clearly called for diplomatic negotiations with the foreign nations involved.

In holding the amendment not germane, the Chair stated that it consisted of an unrelated matter under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs—Congressional Record, volume 103, part 6, page 7272.

The Chair feels that this precedent is very persuasive in the present situation. Here, as there, the bill before the Committee deals with military authorizations. Here, as there, the amendment touches upon the foreign policy of the United States.

The Chair, applying one of the accepted tests for germaneness, is of the opinion that the amendment is essentially on a "subject other than that under consideration" and is not germane to the bill under consideration.

The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Yates of Illinois: On page 4, line 11, insert a new section as follows:

"Sec. 401. That in connection with the procurement of the items hereinabove provided none of the funds shall be used except (1) to provide all necessary support for members of the armed forces of the United States fighting in Vietnam; and (2) to support efforts made by the President of the United States to prevent expansion of the war in Vietnam and to bring military activities to an end."

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I do not see how this can be germane, because it cannot be carried out. Therefore, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to be heard on his amendment?

Mr. YATES. Yes, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman wishes to be heard.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is not subject to the same defects that were present in the amendment that was previously offered. This amendment relates to the expenditure of funds on which the basic bill is based. All that this does is to state that the funds shall be used for the military activities of the troops in Vietnam. Certainly that is a very pertinent provision.

Also, Mr. Chairman, it provides that the President's efforts toward settlement of the conflict shall be taken into consideration in the procurement of the items.

I think it is perfectly germane. I point out on page 3, line 7, reference is made to the purchase of equipment which are necessary in connection with military activities in southeast Asia, and my amendment goes to that point.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of a bill that covers southeast Asia. The gentleman's amendment restricts it to Vietnam.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois has been challenged on a point of order of germaneness by the gentleman from South Carolina. Part 2 of the gentleman's amendment certainly deals with the foreign policy of the United States and, therefore, for the reasons stated in the previous ruling, the Chair holds the amendment not to be germane, and sustains the point of order.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, with all due deference, I point out that point 2 relates to the military policy of the United States and not to the foreign policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has ruled that part 2 directly affects the foreign policy in that it states the United States is to prevent the expansion of the war in Vietnam and to bring military activities to an end, which is definitely foreign policy.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the appropriate number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

M. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I just rise to express my regret that we did not have a chance to debate the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] because I think that there is some misunderstanding that when a Member votes for an authorization such as this he is necessarily bellicose or belligerent. I think it is time that we show our support of the President in his reasonable efforts to obtain an honorable peace.

Now, I know that we divide one another into hawks and doves.

Mr. Chairman, I say I would rather be known as an owl, not because I am blind to what is going on, but because I try to apply wisdom to this situation.

Therefore, I believe that we must let the President of this Nation know that the Congress of the United States is behind him in his efforts to obtain an honorable peace in South Vietnam.

Mr. Chairman, this does not mean in any way that I do not support our commitment. We have a commitment and it is my opinion that it would be foolish and dangerous on our part to turn our back upon it. However, I want the matter to be made crystal clear that insofar as this one Member of Congress is concerned, just because I vote for military authorizations and appropriations, this does not mean that I do not pray that the President will persevere and succeed in taking this conflict out of the jungles and on to the conference table.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have supported America's efforts in Vietnam from the beginning and I do very much regret the fact that we will not have an opportunity to debate the Senate-passed Reuss-Mansfield amendment which was proposed by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss]. I expected to support this amendment and then support the authorization.

Mr. Chairman, it is necessary that we Members of the House speak today upon this authorization, because there has been little opportunity in the House of Representatives to speak upon the U.S. policy in Vietnam, and judging from the rulings there will be very little opportunity in the future to do this.

Mr. Chairman, I shall continue to support the position that America has a responsibility to assist developing nations to achieve their own destiny, free from overwhelming outside pressures, whether they take the form of military invasion, subversion, or infiltration.

I do not want to fly with the hawks or the doves. I would rather prefer not to fly at all. I think a middle course is still possible if we control our emotions and begin with a decision to stop widening this conflict into an American war. I think we should limit first our military rhetoric and then realistically examine our goals and correlate the size of our forces and actions to these goals.

First this requires that we try to see the war as it really is. It is a horrid, dirty, civil, guerrilla war in which Communist troops, aided and to a great degree directed from Hanoi, are trying to establish a Communist dictatorship in South Vietnam. From the beginning the experts on Vietnam, including General Westmoreland, have said the problem in South Vietnam was 95 percent social, political, and economic, and only 5 percent military. In the past 2 years we have approached it with 95 percent military and less than 5 percent in the other areas.

It is necessary that we Members of the House speak today on this authorization because there has been and will be little opportunity to comment in the House on U.S. policy in Vietnam. The other body with its greater constitutional responsibilities in the field of foreign relations has had an opportunity to discuss Vietnam policy in depth. On the other hand, we in the House have been left in the undesirable position of simply voting for appropriations in which meaningful discussion is quickly squelched by statements that these are necessary to support our men in Vietnam. Mr. Speaker, let me say here and now, I support our men in Vietnam and will continue to do so, and I know every other Member of this body feels the same way.

Each of us, however, has a responsibility to his constituents. Many of us have promised that we would participate in a reexamination of Vietnam in the early part of the 90th Congress. This is our first and, for all we know, may be our last, opportunity for those of us who, I believe, are in the growing majority to speak out for a rational middle ground in Vietnam.

I agree with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] who just spoke. I do not wish to fly with the hawks or with the doves; in fact, I would really not prefer to fly at all. However, if I have to do so, I would like to be an owl who is afraid of neither the hawk or the dove, but who asks the question "Who?" And in this instance I feel we should also ask what and why.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the hawks and the doves to come back to earth, stand with their feet on the ground, and see if we cannot change the course of events in Vietnam. Presently these policies are committing more and more American troops, expanding bombing, increasing naval action—in short, Americanizing the war.

What are our goals in Vietnam? As I understand our policies, we are attempting to give the South Vietnamese the opportunity to decide their own social, political, and economic destiny. To this end military action is indispensable. We must have sufficient American armed force in South Vietnam so that no doubt will be left in the minds of our adversaries that a Communist government will not be imposed on South Vietnam. However, the lessons learned by Lansdale in the Philippines and Thompson in Malaysia, must be applied. Certainly we have enough American troops and firepower in the country to make it clear that we cannot be beaten unless we decide to run, and we are not going to do that. Is it not possible to slow down the American war effort without standing still? Is there not a South Vietnamese army of over one-half million men that can take all the initiative it wants to? If they are unable or unwilling to fight the Vietcong whom they greatly outnumber, then should we not question whether the foundations of our policies are laid in quicksand?

It is possible that someone in charge of this conflict has in mind a date for declaring that we have achieved our military objectives in Vietnam and we are now going to deemphasize our military efforts. I hope some of those in charge of American policy have a date in mind when we can declare that the Government of South Vietnam has become sufficiently responsive to the people through reform, elimination of corruption, and establishment of contact with the people that it can maintain itself. I hope even more deeply that the 5 percent of our nonmilitary effort in Vietnam is going to be enough assistance so this can occur.

In this limited time available I cannot discuss the details of each step in changing policy to a middle ground, but I will continue to try to make these views in greater detail available to those in charge of this conflict. I think some things are apparent:

First. We should maintain our troop strength in South Vietnam in a supporting and assistance role to the South Vietnamese Army, and de-emphasize our carrying on the land war. We should emphasize that the South Vietnamese must now conduct their war with our troops in a support role.

Second. We should declare that the bombing activity in North Vietnam has achieved most of its objectives, which were to strengthen morale in South Vietnam, and to indicate that we were committed to opposing the North Vietnamese aggression. We should declare that we are now de-emphasizing the bombing to both de-escalate the war and to remove from the North Vietnamese the propaganda weapon they have been using.

Third. We should discontinue the massive offensive sweeps by American troops, but indicate that our military presence in South Vietnam will continue while the Constitutional Assembly is deliberating, and the civilian government of South Vietnam is being formed.

Fourth. We should indicate to Thailand, the Philippines, Malaysia, and the other countries of southeast Asia, that we expect to meet our commitments to them and ask if they wish a transfer of troops from South Vietnam to their areas when we de-emphasize our military involvement in South Vietnam.

Fifth. Finally, we should indicate to the military directorate in Saigon that their only hope for eventual survival is to create a civilian government that has broad popular support through immediate reforms and the establishment of a constituent assembly through the existing Constitutional Assembly.

This is not blind criticism, or advocacy of a precipitous abandonment of South Vietnam. Neither is mine a simple belief that the other side will suddenly be amicable and negotiate. What I advocate is a basic shift in the American position from an expansion of the military war to contraction of it on our part, and the establishment of a running clock for the South Vietnamese Government requiring it to do what is necessary to become a self-sufficient, viable society.

It is crucial that we have future American public support for our Government's efforts throughout the world. There is great danger that a continuance by inertia of our present military expansion in Vietnam will disillusion our people so they will not want to meet future potential commitments in other lands.

I would like to say, in conclusion, I think it is vital that we keep the American public with us. A great deal of criticism occurs because it is not clear that we are sincere in desiring deescalation of this hot war.

I thank the chairman for yielding to me.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin was a modest proposal, generally representing the stated views of the administration on the war in Vietnam. It was approved by the Senate yesterday by the overwhelming vote of 72 to 19 and virtual unanimous approval by this body today would seem appropriate.

I sincerely regret that the point of order has been sustained, thus preventing the House of Representatives from expressing its opinion as to the general policy accompanying the expenditure of these funds.

I am not among those who think that the issue of war and peace is strictly up to the White House. I am conscious of no amendment to the Constitution that relieves me as a Member of Congress from my responsibilities pursuant to article I, section 8 of the Constitution providing that the Congress shall decide whether or not to declare war. Unfortunately, opportunities for substantive debate on the war in southeast Asia are scarce, as was pointed out earlier in the debate today. The last opportunity for a policy discussion was in 1964 when the Bay of Tonkin resolution was adopted. The debate then could hardly be described as meaningful inasmuch as it was under a procedure wherein 30 minutes was allowed each side. And so, I repeat that adoption of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin seems to me to be appropriate to the constitutional obligations of our branch of the Federal Government.

The amendment would have given a hint to the State Department, the Pentagon, and the administration that we expect a great deal of skill and brilliance in their political efforts to bring this undeclared war to an honorable conclusion.

Mr. REUSS' amendment suggested that perhaps other international machinery might be utilized to bring this conflict to the negotiating stage. I am sure that none in this Chamber could assert seriously that any real attempts have been made by us to involve international organizations. Indeed, Secretary General U Thant has for nearly 2 years been proposing his three-point program to end the Vietnam war—stop the bombing of North Vietnam, scale down the war, agree to negotiations with all combatants. To use the Secretary General's own words of last December, he "strongly believes that my three-point program is necessary to create the possibility of fruitful discussion."

Perhaps our greatest failure in this war has been to concentrate on the military aspects, and not to use comparable skill and devotion in seeking political answers.

On my part, I find it hard to understand why we have refused to accept Secretary General Thant's proposals, and evidence is clear that most nations throughout the world also find our reluctance puzzling.

Mr. Chairman, again I regret that a technicality has prevented this body from expressing its opinion on a subject of such overwhelming importance, and I urge a no vote on the supplementary appropriation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows: Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of California:

On page 4, after line 10, insert the following:

TITLE IV—STATEMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL POLICY

SEC. 401. It is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that none of the funds authorized by this Act shall be used to carry out military operations in or over North Vietnam.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from California on the ground that the amendment is not germane. It is in the realm of policy.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has nothing to do with policy.

Mr. Chairman, there is no limitation in this amendment. It could not be carried out. If it were adopted, there is no way on earth that you could segregate these funds to eliminate any activity in the area to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is clearly out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] desire to be heard on the point of order raised by the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. BROWN of California. I would like to be heard, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to have any knowledge of parliamentary procedure myself, but I have had this examined by the legislative reference service in the Library of Congress and they assure me it is a germane amendment and with that assurance I offer the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI). The Chair is ready to rule.

The bill presently before the Committee authorizes appropriations for military procurement, research and development, and military construction.

It is clear from the terms of the bill that part of the expenditures authorized therein will be in the United States and part in overseas locations.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from California declares it to be the sense of the Congress that none of the funds authorized by this act shall be used to carry out military operations in or over North Vietnam.

The amendment relates only to funds authorized in this bill and is similar in concept to an amendment offered to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1950.

That amendment provided that no money authorized by the bill should be granted to any country which violated the Charter of the United Nations.

It was thus a restriction on funds authorized by the bill.

Chairman Harris of Arkansas ruled that it was germane—81st Congress, March 30, 1950, RECORD, page 4550.

The Chair thinks the present amendment simply places a restriction on authorizations contained in this bill and relates only to the funds in this bill.

The Chair holds that the amendment is germane.

Mr. BROWN of California. I thank the Chairman for that ruling.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear that the position I take with regard to the pending legislation is not as extreme as some of those who have spoken earlier, who indicated that they were going to vote against the bill.

It is my intention to vote for the bill in the event this amendment is adopted, or the next amendment which I will offer.

Now what is my purpose in offering this amendment?

I want to make it absolutely clear that this is not an indication on my part that I support a policy which would result in the precipitate withdrawal of our troops in South Vietnam.

Likewise it does not represent an effort on my part to deprive the gallant soldiers we have in South Vietnam and other parts of southern and southeast Asia of the supplies that they need to carry on their activities there.

This amendment is the only way I know of to get to the heart of the policy involved in this war in Vietnam.

Basically my position is that this war can only be ended by a negotiated solution—that there is no such thing as a military victory. There is the military destruction of the enemy, I grant you. But there is no such thing as a military victory, because the destruction would not only not be in accordance with the aims of the United States, but it would not produce the benefit that we seek. It would leave a vacuum in southeast Asia which would be a festering sore for generations. That is the result that the military destruction would produce.

To obtain a negotiated solution which would recognize the political realities of this part of the world is a policy to which we give lipservice. Our actions, however, make such a negotiated solution impossible to attain at the present time. We think that we are destroying a Communist enemy in South Vietnam. This enemy is one which Marshal Ky himself says does not number more than 3 or 4 percent of the Vietcong. The other 95 percent or more see themselves as fighting for the liberty and freedom of their country. We are, therefore, not fighting the same war that our enemies are fighting. They are motivated by the desire for freedom that we say we want, and we are not going to change that by destroying them.

Now, the only way, in my opinion, and in the opinion of others who know something about this part of the world, that we are going to get to negotiations is to stop the bombing of North Vietnam. This is the sole purpose of my amendment—to stop the bombing of North Vietnam. If that occurs, I am convinced we can bring this whole situation to the negotiating table within a matter of days, and I think we can, if we are realistic, bring about a solution which is in accordance with the best interests of the United States, which will provide that freedom, that liberty which we say we are seeking in Asia, which will provide for an opportunity to cease this destruction which has brought death and devastation to at least a quarter of the population of that area, and which will allow us to again start using our energies and our resources in pursuit of the kind of peaceful world and an improved domestic life in this country which we are dedicated to obtaining.

That is my purpose in offering the amendment. I think it is a good and valid amendment. I solicit your support of it. I think it would go a long ways toward reaffirming the right, the constitutional right, of Congress to have some voice in how the affairs of this great country are conducted.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I served a little while in World War I, and I kept a Reserve commission for a long time. But since I have come to Congress I have just about become convinced that if you get into a war, you have to let the people in the military run the war, and that goes from the Commander in Chief on up and down.

I did not have anything to do with getting us into Vietnam. I was one of a few called to the White House years ago by President Kennedy. Secretary McNamara—and I do not know how many others—was there. We were told there for the first time—we were not asked—we were told that we were sending 10,000 combat troops to Vietnam.

As I remember it, I broke up the meeting by saying, "Mr. President, this decision has been made. So far as I am concerned, I stand with you."

Now, we have gone along. The one thing I have said is that we ought to spell out our objectives. We ought to tell the American people, and all of us around here, how and when we expect to achieve those objectives. I believe in that. Most of the mail I get from back home indicates that people are getting tired of fighting this war left handed.

I do not know. I was not called on to make the decision whether to bomb Vietnam or not. I have never been to Vietnam. I believe it is about time for me to go. I said to the Chairman, I hope it is written up in the papers if I do, because I want to be sure to get credit for going.

But I do not know which is the best way to bring this affair to an honorable conclusion. I do not like it either, but it seems to me that some of the people on the other side of the aisle ought to be addressing their complaints to those who are actually running the war, and not be coming in here and attempting to run this war from the floor of the House of Representatives.

What other amendment will there be that will undertake to say to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and to the Commander in Chief, your President and mine, that, "This is the way to run the war. We do not like the way the war is being run. We want it run our way."

I wish we were out of it with honor, and all the people I represent wish that. I am sure every boy over there under the guns wishes that. But I doubt very much if some of the people who are catching it in South Vietnam would think very much of an amendment that would provide sanctuary for the people who are cutting them to pieces. I do not think they would.

I believe this is the first time I have had anything to say in this session. I hope it is not the last. But I could not sit here and refrain from making these few observations, because we are in trouble, and I want to get out of it. I want to get out of it with honor.

But I believe, particularly for those on that side of the aisle, we should not be in here making these suggestions to the House. They should be addressed to the Department of State or to the Commander in Chief of the gentlemen on the other side—he is mine, too, but I did not vote for him for President, and he understands that.

The gentlemen are talking to the wrong people. I do not believe we can run this war from the floor of the House of Representatives. I am not going to be a party in any manner to pulling the rug out from under the boys taking it on the chin over there. The gentlemen say it will not pull the rug out from under them. That is not the way I understand it.

The way I understand it is that we had this trouble once before, in another controversy, in another war. I did not vote to declare this war, but we are in it. It is like the old jail story: The man is in jail, he has no right to be there, he should not be there, but he is there. So we are in this. I think the best thing for us to do is to put our shoulders to the wheel and see if we can get out of this with honor. I do not believe this is any way to do that.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I have the highest regard and appreciation for the motivation of the gentleman who offered the amendment. I do believe, however, that his fundamental honesty brings us to the essence of the question. He has set forth that although he has worded this amendment so that it can fit into this procurement bill, actually that is not what he wants to talk about, and I take my hat off to him for saying so.

Many of us are concerned legitimately about the policies that we are involved with. Quite frankly, had the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss], been ruled germane, I would have voted for it, because I believe in it. I do believe that many of us are concerned about these policies. Do we have a legitimate interest in southwest Asia? Is the government we are supporting there worth supporting? Is the state of the cold war in such a detente that we do not have to worry about this any more?

But this is not the place to argue these policies. The question, it seems to me, is whether we are going to procure the hardware which is set forth in this procurement bill. This is a procurement bill. We need this hardware. Three-quarters of this bill is for aircraft. We need these aircraft.

How does anyone know, when we start to spend the money, where the plane is going to be used? Do we stop spending the money when we first start to build the plane? Do we stop spending the money when we first start to fly the bomb? Or do we build the plane and let it go over to South Vietnam, but only cut off the money when it approaches the border?

We cannot do this in a procurement bill. We need the tactical aircraft which are set out in this bill.

I agree thoroughly with the distinguished new member of the Armed Services Committee from the other side who preceded me here in the well. If we start talking about tactics on the floor we will be opening a Pandora's box which will go all over the place. There are Members in this body who would be very happy to approach a tactic that went in the other direction. There are Members in this body who know we have mines capable of mining Haiphong Harbor, and that we have bombs which are capable of bombing civilian centers, and that there are airfields in North Vietnam which are full of Mig 17's, 19's, and 21's.

We could offer resolutions on every one of these tactics.

I believe it is to the credit of the vast majority of the Members of this body, who would like to go ahead with a higher degree of tactical effort in this regard, that they have not tried to offer such amendments, that they are not trying to put the pressure on the President in this bill, which is the wrong vehicle to put it on.

I would say, let us at the proper time fully debate the policies and the principles, but let us in the meantime permit the generals to decide the tactics of the war in which we are engaged.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIKE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ECKHARDT. I compliment my colleague from New York for his very lucid analysis, and I share his views. I, too, would have supported the amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] had it been held germane, because I agree with the policy statement adopted by the overwhelming majority of the other House.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I do not propose to tell the military how to run the war, but I should like to tell the world that we want an early and negotiated peace with honor.

I believe that if we accept this amendment, this will be notice to the world that we seek such a peace.

The amendment does not call for unconditional and permanent cessation of bombing. The amendment solely calls for a cessation of bombing. If we do this and it is determined that the enemy is using the pause solely for the purpose of regrouping, then we can determine what there is to be done in our own interest.

I believe that the people—and especially those in my district—are crying for peace.

I am in the unhappy situation of being considered a "dove" here and a "hawk" in my district.

I was satisfied in my last primary campaign, after having voted for the appropriation, to take the position that I was behind the President; and I have quite a district, because I have Greenwich Village West and Greenwich Village East in New York, and the Members know what that means. But I stood up. I also told my people that I was in favor of an early and negotiated peace, because I believe that the great majority of our people want this. I believe that we have incurred the displeasure of the entire world by taking the position we do, that is evident.

This would appear to be a reflection of our actions up until this time.

In this morning's paper there was an article by Walter Lippmann, in the Washington Post. This is the item:

> Premier Kosygin, at his news conference on Feb. 9, and President Podgorny, at a state dinner in Moscow on Monday, said that peace talks would follow the suspension of U.S. bombing in North Vietnam. These two highly placed Soviet spokesmen tell us that the reciprocal action in return for suspending the bombing is the opening of peace negotiations.

There is no suggestion that this be permanent cessation or unconditional cessation. I do sincerely believe that we should advise the administration that we favor an early and a negotiated peace and this is the manner in which we can do so.

I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I shall offer the amendment that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] offered. This is its text:

> TITLE IV—STATEMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL POLICY
>
> Sec. 401. The Congress hereby declares—
>
> (1) its firm intentions to provide all necessary support for members of the Armed forces of the United States fighting in Vietnam;
>
> (2) its support of efforts being made by the President of the United States and other men of good will throughout the world to prevent an expansion of the war in Vietnam and to bring that conflict to an end through a negotiated settlement which will preserve the honor of the United States, protect the vital interests of this country, and allow the people of South Vietnam to determine the affairs of that nation in their own way; and
>
> (3) its support of the Geneva accords of 1954 and urges the convening of that Conference or any other meeting of nations similarly involved and interested as soon as possible for the purpose of formulating plans for bringing the conflict to an honorable conclusion in accordance with the principles of those accords.

It was turned down because of the fact that it was not germane. I shall reintroduce it in the Foreign Affairs Committee and hope it will pass. Still, I shall vote for the appropriation, because, as I said last year, despite the fact that I oppose an escalation of the war, I will not turn my back on the soldiers and deny them medicine, food, clothing, and a means of defense.

Yet I implore you, gentlemen, give evidence of the fact that you, too, seek an early negotiated peace with honor.

Thank you.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman and Members, I think it would be unfortunate if the amendment and the issue raised by the amendment were settled on the ground that this is no way to run a war, because if it were settled on that ground, obviously there would be no reason to talk about the underlying policy which has resulted in the continuation of the bombing of North Vietnam.

The realities are that this amendment, if adopted, is purely symbolic, because the military hardware authorized by this bill will not be forthcoming for some 18 months or perhaps longer. So the practical effects of this restriction on this bill would not be to deter the President or the military from a continuation of the bombing month in and month out until such time as some of the hardware authorized in this bill were to be deployed for the purposes of carrying on those missions over North Vietnam.

Therefore, as I say, this is a symbolic gesture. It is an effort to try to bring before the House the policy questions involved in the decision to continue or to discontinue the bombing of North Vietnam.

Now, the gentleman from New York says that this is not the time to debate these issues, but this is all I have heard for the last 2 or 3 years. They say this is not the time. Do not talk about the policy decisions when we are talking about military hardware. Do not talk about policy decisions when we are just talking about appropriations. Do not talk about these policy decisions when what we have in front of us is the foreign aid bill.

The truth of the matter is that we never have a chance to talk about this policy in meaningful terms because the basic decisions are in the hands of the President. He has the resolution of August 1964 already in hand, and there is no need to pass another resolution to deal with the question of the conduct of the war, at least insofar as the administration is concerned.

Now, it is clear to many of us that our views are in the minority. We cannot get a resolution out of the committee when the position that we represent is the minority position. So the effect of those who say "Do not talk about this until the right resolution comes to the floor" is to say that the minority should never have the opportunity to express themselves on these policy matters.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FRASER. I will yield very briefly for a question.

Mr. CEDERBERG. That is just what I wanted. What is the difference in the United States using its Air Force bombers to bomb North Vietnam and the North Vietnamese using their mortars to bomb South Vietnam?

Mr. FRASER. Let me be very clear. I have no moral objection to bombing North Vietnam. My objection lies on practical grounds. It is my opinion that the bombing of North Vietnam is counter productive to our interests of getting the war settled.

Mr. CEDERBERG. What do the generals say, if that is the case?

Mr. FRASER. Our generals, unfortunately, do not know very much about politics; and, the truth of the matter is that we are confronted with the matter under consideration.

Mr. CEDERBERG. How many times have we suspended the bombing of North Vietnam?

Mr. FRASER. I believe twice but, clearly, as temporary suspensions, leaving the pressure upon Hanoi, which limits its abilities to deal on behalf of the forces in the south.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, what were the results of those suspensions?

Mr. FRASER. Exactly what one would predict when they were suspended under the terms which were then authorized.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, what does the gentleman think would happen now? Does the gentleman feel that we would be able to obtain negotiations?

Mr. FRASER. It is my view—I do not know now what would happen, because there has been a hardening of the positions in the last 30 days, but it is my view that likely we could get a discussion started.

Is the gentleman from Michigan opposed to discussions?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I am all for talk, but I think we have to have some action from the other side as well.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. FRASER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, on that point, is it not true that Hanoi has recently been indicating that they would talk after the bombings were suspended, which was not the case previously?

Mr. FRASER. The gentleman from New York is perfectly correct, and I believe it might also be pointed out that at one time that is what the administration said it wanted to have in order to stop the bombings.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not also true that there is a great deal of dissatisfaction and chaos in China today and that there are experts in this field who feel for that reason that Hanoi is more ready to talk today than they were last year?

Mr. FRASER. I agree with the gentleman. I feel that we are losing an opportunity which may not recur when this current strife in China subsides.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Minnesota will yield for one second further, I spoke earlier in the day in support of this position, and I wish to go on record as being in support of this amendment.

Mr. FRASER. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto conclude in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto conclude in 20 minutes, with the last 5 minutes reserved to the committee.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, is this intended to preclude the offering of additional amendments to the bill itself?

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, this does not preclude all amendments. It is just directed toward this amendment and all amendments thereto.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] that all debate conclude within 20 minutes upon this amendment and all amendments thereto, with the last 5 minutes thereof reserved to the chairman of the committee.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair observed standing at the time the motion was agreed to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER], and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] for 1¼ minutes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for the positions taken by my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER].

First, this is the most appropriate time we have had during which to conduct a meaningful policy debate. I feel that this represents a great opportunity to discuss issues such as the one we are discussing today.

Mr. Chairman, as to the merits of the amendment, I urge adoption of the amendment.

As I said in my opening remarks today, I feel that there are risks for peace which one has to occasionally take.

I think the time has come when this Nation, with all its might and ability can afford to take the modest military risk which may be inherent in a secession of the bombing. I think if we cease the bombing and negotiations can commence, as they may well do, this is a risk we should take. It is a worthwhile risk, and it is useful not only to the Vietnamese people and to that country, but to our own people who are involved in a prolonged war in Asia. This may be the way to terminate that war and I urge passage of the amendment so that our country can take this very important first step.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], is recognized for 1¼ minutes.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this debate here this afternoon, and I have observed the objections that have been voiced by many of the same group that has contributed toward destroying the morale of our boys in the service, particularly those serving in Vietnam.

It just happens, Mr. Chairman, that in my hometown daily paper, received today, is a letter to the editor written by a boy who was on the U.S.S. *Franklin D.*

Roosevelt, which was forced by the Department of Defense and the State Department not to make the landing at Capetown for shore leave a few weeks ago.

This young man asked this question:

> What is this country coming to when we allow the pressure of 38 Congressmen, an extreme minority of the Congress, to force a decision to make "prisoners" out of 3,700 officers and men of this ship? Not to mention that they no doubt hurt our relations with the South African Government. We on the ship feel nothing but contempt towards this minority group of our Government, and I personally question their motives for the pressure they put on the Defense Department that forced this particular decision.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the time allotted to me to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding to me, in order that I may express my opposition to the proposed amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the State Department was in on this deal, and that it succumbed to the pressure exercised by this minority, but highly vocal, group.

This letter continues:

> I will explain this further. On February 4, 1967, about half an hour before liberty call, we were told to muster on the flight deck. Our officers informed us that our liberty in Capetown was cancelled until further notice. They added that the action was taken because "our policy is incompatible with the policy of this country."

Then he goes on to say—and I think I know what this group had hoped to do, with the racial overtones that were included there—this young man says:

> Our Negro shipmates were delighted at the invitations they received and they all wanted to go ashore. But none of us got to go ashore and now we don't know where to turn. Is this the thanks we get for going to war and losing some of our shipmates?

(The letter referred to, which appeared in the February 27 issue of the Daily Dunklin Democrat, of Kennett, Mo., follows:)

From U.S.S. "F.D.R."

To the Daily Democrat:

At the present time I am in Light Photographic Squadron 62, Detachment 42 on board the USS Franklin D. Roosevelt, and now we are a few days west of Capetown, South Africa. I would like for you and the people of Dunklin and Pemiscot Counties to know how the government's decision of the cancellation of our liberty has affected the men of this ship and the people of Capetown.

Up to this point after combat duty in Vietnam, the morale of the men on this ship was very good. We were told that our country was behind us one hundred per cent. We were also told that on our arrival home we could be proud to hold our heads high, knowing that we have done a service to our country and the Free World.

But Editor, it was very difficult for me to hold my head high, and to say that I was proud to be an American, when our South African visitors, who numbered in the tens of thousands, came aboard each day. These people had made preparations for the personnel on board this ship, which I can say must have cost thousands of dollars. Not only did the fine people of this wonderful city plan an extremely large dance for both the Negroes and the Whites of this ship, but many of the individual citizens had planned costly parties for whoever could attend. Their preparations for us exceed the hospitality and friendship of any other port that we have visited. Now don't misunderstand me. The remorse I feel is not for the men of this ship as much as for the wonderful, thoughtful and hospitable people of South Africa.

We represent the U.S. Government here, and in their small way, the people wanted an opportunity to express their respect and friendship towards the United States through the personnel of this ship. Our disappointment can only be exceeded by theirs, their being denied the opportunity by our government. What can we do now? Can we undo the damage that has been done? I think it is unlikely.

What is this country coming to when we allow the pressure of 38 Congressmen, an extreme minority of the congress to force the decision to make "Prisoners" out of 3,700 officers and men of this ship. Not to mention that they no doubt hurt our relations with the South African government. We on the ship feel nothing but contempt towards this minority group of our government and I personally question their motives for the pressure they put upon the Defense Department that forced this particular decision. I will explain this further. On February 4, 1967, about half an hour before liberty call, we were told to muster on the flight deck. Our officers informed us that our liberty in Cape Town was cancelled until further notice. They added that the action was taken because "our policy is incompatible with the policy of this country." That quotation was published by M. M. Levin of the Cape Town Sunday Times dated February 5, 1967. I assume that this policy refers to their segregation laws.

Sir, assuming that this minority group of congress does have the right to dictate to other countries how their policies and laws should be written, this is deplorable. I would like to bring up the following points. On this cruise we have entered ports in which we have been confronted with legalized prostitution, obscene public exhibitions, other vices, and venereal disease. These are regular Navy ports of call! To my knowledge these customs are certainly not "compatible" to the customs of the United States. Why are we allowed to go ashore there if we can't go ashore in a wonderful city like Cape Town? I might add that these regular ports of call probably drain thousands of dollars a year from American servicemen by cheating them and stealing from them. Do you honestly think this shows respect and friendship towards the United States from these people? Where have those 38 Congressmen been all this time if they are so concerned about our welfare? Now you can understand why I question their reasons for causing this decision.

I would like to say that I don't particularly agree with the segregation laws in Cape Town, any more than I condone the cesspools of vice and corruption in the regular ports of call. We certainly can't expect these governments to alter their laws to be "compatible" with ours simply because we are visiting their countries, nor would we tolerate the violation of our laws while they are visiting our country.

We were all briefed beforehand to the nature of the strict segregation laws in Cape Town. Our Negro shipmates were delighted at the invitations they received and they all wanted to go ashore. But none of us got to go ashore and now we don't know where to turn. Is this the thanks we get for going to war and losing some of our shipmates?

Sir, I certainly appreciate your time and patience that you have taken in reading this letter. I hope that you can find a small place to fit this into your newspaper, so others can see how one feels that was there.

Bobby Mullenix.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Yates], is recognized for 1¼ minutes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the remarks that were made both by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal]. I think we do have to take risks if we want peace, and that is what is involved in this amendment. A few weeks ago there were signs from all over the world that if the United States stopped its bombing of North Vietnam that peace negotiations would begin. But for some reason—what the reason was was not made clear, the door was slammed shut by the Secretary of State. It was said only that Hanoi had not made any kind of a gesture of peace to warrant cessation of bombing by the United States. Yes, there were signs from nations all over the world, and hopes rose for negotiations. Such signs were not only from Russia, not only from Poland, who admittedly are our adversaries, but they came from England, one of our strongest allies, they came from Canada, they came from France, nations who, over the years, have been associated on our side in matters of foreign policy.

Admittedly, this is not a clear-cut presentation of the issue that is most prominent in the war; namely, the question of bombing of North Vietnam. Another bill might have been better, another form of the amendment would have been preferable. But the issue is so important I believe we must face it, we of the Congress.

It was an issue in my campaign and I met it squarely. I told my constitutents that I favored the proposals of U Thant, the Secretary General of the United Nations to bring the war to the negotiating table. One of his three suggestions was to halt the bombing of the north. This has become the symbol, the apparent sine qua non to break the barrier now preventing negotiations which could lead to peace.

It is said that by this action we are depriving our troops of necessary support from the air. This is untrue, first, because of the lead time. The planes authorized by this bill will not be built or completed on the average for 18 months. Second, if through this step negotiations for peace are approved as is indicated from so many sources, we will have protected our troops, not threatened them. Third, this is a "sense of Congress" resolution which is opinion providing rather than mandatory.

The symbol of our Nation, the eagle, as President Kennedy stated so well in his inaugural address has an olive branch, as well as arrows in his claws. We have emphasized the arrows up to now. Has not the time come to advance the olive branch?

Secretary McNamara himself has said:

> I do not believe that bombing up to the present has significantly reduced, nor any bombing that I could contemplate in the

> future would significantly reduce the actual flow of men and material to the south.

Mr. Chairman, if there is to be escalation it must be in the realm of our efforts to begin negotiations for peace. It is not enough to say that we are ready to talk. We have said that for a long time, and there are some who say we, too, must be ready to consider taking a first step, a step which apparently we insist be taken by the North Vietnamese. The political aspects of the problem are as important as the military. It is that aspect which I conceive this amendment proposes to emphasize, and I shall support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS], for one and a quarter minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague from California [Mr. ROYBAL].

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I associate myself with the remarks made by the previous speakers who are in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am confident we all can agree on our ultimate goal of peace in Vietnam.

Certainly we are united in full support of continuing our country's vigorous search for ways to move this tragic conflict away from the battlefield and to the conference table—where we may have a chance to begin meaningful negotiations aimed at achieving equitable terms for a just settlement of the war in Vietnam.

The measure before the House today is directed toward providing adequate defense support for our American troops in that wartorn land.

On many occasions I have publicly outlined my thoughts on our involvement in southeast Asia and on our primary goal of promoting the cause of lasting peace in that vital part of the world, pleading with the administration to find a common ground for negotiating the conflict in a way which will preserve the honor of the United States, protect the vital interests of this country, and at the same time, allow the people of Vietnam to have self-determination.

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I also have a deep personal interest in assuring that Congress exercise its constitutional duty of participating actively in developing and implementing American foreign policy around the world.

This means that the Members of the House and Senate must be provided an opportunity to discuss in depth, debate thoroughly, and state our position in clear and concise terms on all the vital matters that affect our relations with other countries.

We must not, by default, surrender this key responsibility—that in many ways goes to the very heart of a Congressman's solemn duty to represent the essential interests of his constituents.

For this reason, I regret that the parliamentary rules of the House have prevented us from including in today's measure the text of the excellent "Statement of Congressional Policy," adopted by the Senate yesterday on an overwhelming bipartisan vote.

That statement, which I wholeheartedly endorse, asserted:

> The Congress hereby declares—
>
> (1) its firm intention to provide for all necessary support for members of the Armed Forces of the United States fighting in Vietnam:
>
> (2) its support of efforts being made by the President of the United States and other men of good will throughout the world to prevent an expansion of the war in Vietnam and to bring that conflict to an end through a negotiated settlement which will preserve the honor of the United States, protect the vital interests of this country, and allow the people of South Vietnam to determine the affairs of that nation in their own way; and
>
> (3) its support of the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962 and urges the convening of that Conference or any other meeting of nations similarly involved and interested as soon as possible for the purpose of formulating plans for bringing the conflict to an honorable conclusion in accordance with the principles of those accords.

It is most unfortunate that the House rules will not allow us to consider this fine statement of policy, which also precludes us from taking up many of the important policy questions involved in America's approach to achieving our goal of peace in Vietnam.

But I nevertheless believe that we have a deep and solemn obligation to discuss and debate these vital issues, and it appears that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from California may be the only opportunity we will have to fulfill this congressional function.

We can all appreciate the total inadequacy of attempting to utilize a short verbal formula to express a precise position on such a complex problem as we face in southeast Asia.

However, it is possible that the cessation of the bombing may result in peace discussions if it were done with the specific intent of having our representatives "on the spot" ready to enter into immediate negotiations.

I might add that even the military contention that the bombings have made a major contribution to the war effort would appear to be a highly debatable proposition.

Secretary of Defense Robert McNarama has stated to Congress:

> I don't believe that bombing up to the present has significantly reduced, nor any bombing that I could contemplate in the future would significantly reduce the actual flow of men and material to the South.

So, strictly from a military standpoint, it would seem that the effectiveness of the bombings is somewhat problematical.

Be that as it may, I feel the prospects for starting genuine negotiations of the issues involved in the Vietnam conflict are good enough, given a cessation of the bombings in the North, to warrant taking this step.

If these hopes should prove to be of no avail, or if the other side is unwilling to start talking about a plan for bringing the conflict to an honorable conclusion, we have at least given evidence to the world of our sincerity of purpose—and of the earnestness of our desire to bring about a true and lasting peace in that war-torn part of the world.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

On December 19, 1966, U.S. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg asked UN Secretary General U Thant to—

> Take whatever steps you consider necessary to bring about the necessary discussions which could lead to a . . . ceasefire. I can assure you that the Government of the United States will cooperate fully with you.

Here is what U Thant replied:

> A powerful nation like the United States should take the initiative in the quest for peace and show an enlightened and humanitarian spirit . . . I strongly believe that my . . . three-point program, of which the (unconditional) cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam is the first and essential part, is necessary to create the possibility of fruitful discussion . . .

Mr. Chairman, the Members of this body know my deep concern regarding the policy which our country has pursued in southeast Asia. The spiraling escalation has not brought about negotiations; it has not stopped the infiltration of men and materials from the north; and it has not reestablished the authority of the South Vietnamese Government. It makes no sense to commit our Nation to even further escalation which might include such dangerous and folly-ridden steps as invading North Vietnam, expanding the war to Laos, Cambodia, or Thailand, saturation bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong, or even the use of nuclear weapons.

In the past, the votes on appropriations for Vietnam have been seen as evidence of support and endorsement of our policy. There is every indication that the question today—authorization of supplemental appropriations—will similarly be seen as a referendum on our policy. In light of this, I cannot support these funds and intend to vote no.

It is my firm belief that escalation cannot succeed in accomplishing the explicit goals of the administration. Here we come to the heart of the issue—the very nature of that terrible conflict.

I fail to see how we can contend that this is merely a case of external aggression—an argument which might support the kind of policy the administration has undertaken and intends to pursue. As the late Bernard B. Fall said in the October 1966 issue of Foreign Affairs:

> The Vietcong must be treated as what it is—a political force in South Vietnam which cannot be simply blasted off the surface of the earth with B–52 saturation raids or told to pack up and go into exile to North Vietnam.

He went on to cite what could be the central lesson for all in this, that in revolutionary guerrilla wars.

> Unless the local regime undertakes a measure of true reforms, even the hugest military power in the world can be successfully stalemated for a long period of time by lightly-armed peasant guerrillas and the infantry in a tiny under-developed country.

I believe with President John Kennedy that this is in the end a South Vietnamese war—that if it is to be won, it must be won by the South Vietnamese themselves. The war now, however, is clearly an

American war. By assuming the entire direction and responsibility for the conflict we have assumed as well the role of a new colonial force and strengthened the argument of the Vietcong that their fight is a nationalist one against Anglo foreign invaders.

Thus, we see that the security of the countryside is no better now than a year ago, that even where clear and secure operations have been conducted, guerrillas still are active. Further, the bombing has not been effective in stopping the flow of support from the north. Although national route 1 and the railroad running alongside it have been repeatedly bombed, transportation somehow is maintained. Secretary McNamara reported to congressional committees in February:

> I don't believe that the bombing up to the present has significantly reduced, nor any bombing that I could contemplate in the future would significantly reduce, the actual flow of men and material to the South.

The tragedy of war is compounded when a futile and inflexible military policy persists in an effort which cannot succeed, which has other consequences adverse to our long-range goals and which heightens the danger of thermonuclear war.

Ambassador Reischauer, Professors Commager and Kennan, and Lieutenant General Gavin all have addressed themselves in recent days to the self-defeating negative characteristics of the bombing, particularly as a deterrent to negotiations.

At the same time, American diplomacy seems frozen in its response to repeated possibilities for negotiation—from the account by Eric Severeid in "The Final Troubled Hours of Adlai Stevenson" to the flurry of reports before and during the Tet, lunar new year truce just last month.

I want to reiterate the four initiatives that I and my colleagues who today protest this supplemental appropriation believe the United States must take to secure a political settlement and peace in South Vietnam. We must above all recognize that the National Liberation Front is in fact a principal belligerent in this war and a necessary party to peace negotiations.

We thus propose the following four initiatives:

First. The United States should cease bombing North Vietnam immediately and without preconditions.

Second. The United States must support truly free elections in South Vietnam. We must be prepared to accept whatever role for the NLF results from such elections.

Third. The United States should propose to the North Vietnamese Government, the South Vietnamese Government, and the NLF four party negotiations to secure a cease-fire in Vietnam.

Fourth. The United States should seek appropriate sponsorship of an international conference to guarantee agreements reached by the belligerents.

We believe these recommended initiatives are realistic and consistent with our national interest. Moreover, they are realistic and consistent with the issues at conflict in South Vietnam.

In considering whether the House of Representatives is today to approve funds to escalate the war, we must realize that this war already has been enlarged to where it has absorbed a disproportionate share of our national resources.

The production program in this budget and in the fiscal year 1968 budget, according to Secretary McNamara—

> Will provide for a rate of consumption almost equal to the total air ordnance consumed by U.S. forces in the peak year of World War II in Europe, and almost four times the consumption in the peak year of the Korean war.

The Department of Defense asks $74.1 billion for fiscal year 1968—much of it for Vietnam. If the war continues to escalate, tack on to this another $10 billion or so in a supplemental request next January. This brings the defense budget alone to a total very near the level of the entire Federal budget just before I came to the Congress 4 years ago. It is no wonder that the Department of Defense plans four new buildings for its approximately 73,000 military and civilian employees in the Washington area alone.

Additionally, the war has distorted long-range goals of our foreign policy and has hampered the development of a viable and realistic policy respecting the inevitable revolutionary movements of the third world.

Progress toward a workable detente with the Soviet Union is all but halted.

Our leadership and influence are disintegrating. Look, for example, at the recent statements of Japan's most influential political leader, former Premier Shigeru Yoshida. In an article which was prepared with the assistance and approval of the Japanese Government, Yoshida spoke to a new role for Japan in the international arena. In contrast to our rigid stance toward China, Japan, he said, should not become "China's archenemy but if anything should be prepared to head China in the right direction." Much more disturbing, however, is that Yoshida—and thus Japan—is no longer opposed to Japanese rearmament. This is an extremely significant and troubling shift in that nation's policies.

Finally, our commitment to peaceful international settlement of conflicts, manifest in the principles of the United Nations, has given way to the old idea that any nation has the right to take whatever action it deems necessary without consultation or consideration of the international community.

The strategy of escalation has produced deepened involvement at higher and more dangerous levels of commitment and brought the war no closer to settlement. I shall continue to disagree with this strategy and urge the actions outlined in the four initiatives listed above.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, I should like to join and associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleagues from California, Messrs. BROWN, EDWARDS, and ROYBAL, and to join and associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER]. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment limiting the bombing of the north.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the debate this afternoon, although limited, has been healthy because we really have explored some of the problems inherent in the policy that has been followed in Vietnam.

The authorization and appropriation process is the only place during the year when we as Members of the House of Representatives have an opportunity to discuss these very vital issues.

The question which confronts the administration and which confronts the country is how to bring about a cessation of this war through negotiations.

One way, in the judgment of a number of us this afternoon and in the judgment of a number of respected diplomats around the world, would be to cease the bombing of North Vietnam.

In looking at the question of bombing, let us see what the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, said about bombing.

In his testimony before the Senate, he said and I quote:

> I don't believe the bombing up to the present has significantly reduced, nor any bombing I could contemplate in the future would significantly reduce, the actual flow of men and material to the South.

In the New York Times of February 23, in an article by Henry Tanner, it was reported:

> A spokesman for Hanoi reaffirmed today its offer to enter into talks with the United States if American bombing attacks against North Vietnam were unconditionally and permanently halted.

Should not this be tested?

Mr. Chairman, the war in Vietnam is basically a political issue which will be resolved through diplomacy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, there was a time when I would have thought that an amendment like this would have been incredible and impossible. But it is getting to be now that I am not surprised at anything.

Here is an amendment that has no time limitation whatsoever. It does not stop it for a day or for a week or for a month. As long as this equipment is in being, we cannot take whatever military action might be necessary.

This is not the first time, Mr. Chairman, that we have crossed this bridge. I was down to the White House after we had suspended for some 36 days. We waited for Hanoi to act then and in the meantime Americans were getting killing. The gentleman from California can take any road or course that he wants to, but so far as I am concerned when Americans are getting killed, I believe we owe it to them to give them protection. This amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am happy that we have had this debate today.

There is a great unrest all over America. All over America there is a deep down prayer for peace and understanding. I think no one is firmer in that prayer than the President of the United States. I think he is looking in every way to bring about peace.

I know that those who have spoken here today represent constituents who are uneasy as my constituents are. So, Mr. Chairman, I think we have rendered a great service today by having this debate.

In voting on this bill, I am going to bear this in mind. This authorization will buy the ammunition, the weapons and ships that will be used 18 months from now. Mr. Chairman, I am making the prediction that long before 18 months have passed—and I think it will be within the next 5 or 6 months—that there will be peace and understanding and that which every American is praying for—and peace will actually be here.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I will vote for the supplemental defense authorization bill for quite clearly it is a necessary measure to support our troops, and those of our allies, who are presently serving in Vietnam.

But I am compelled to say that I support this bill with serious reservations and regrets. I think there are legitimate questions to be raised as to whether we ever should have gotten involved in this conflict, at least to this extent. More importantly, I question whether we have made every effort possible to secure an early and fair peace. I question whether we have pursued those efforts we have made as vigorously and persistently as we possibly could.

I have stated repeatedly that I am no advocate of precipitous or unconditional withdrawal. Such action might well cause more deep and abiding problems than it would solve. But I am equally opposed to the path of escalation that I fear we have repeatedly resorted to, though probably with the best intentions.

I believe it would have been wiser to have continued the recent pause in the bombing of North Vietnam that extended during Tet. I believe it would have been wiser to pursue this calculated risk that U Thant, Senator MANSFIELD and other leaders have consistently felt offered the best opportunity to turn down the war and open the way to negotiations.

There is, obviously, no certainty that the other side would have responded to such an initiative. But leaders of the National Liberation Front and the North Vietnamese Government have said on numerous occasions that such a halt was a necessary first step.

There can be no question that risks are involved in any halt to the bombing of North Vietnam. But these risks, it seems to me, are more than counterbalanced by the dangers present in the existing stalemate that daily escalates to higher and more dangerous levels, and by the possibility that a halt in bombing of North Vietnam would break the present deadlock and lead to serious discussions.

Yesterday, I joined nine of my colleagues in supporting an affirmative four-point program that could open the door to negotiations to end the war. I would like to repeat those points:

One, immediate cessation of United States bombing of North Vietnam.

Two, U.S. support for truly free elections in South Vietnam, and full acceptance of any role won by the National Liberation Front as a result of those elections.

Three, U.S. advocacy of four-party negotiations, including the United States, the North Vietnamese Government, the South Vietnamese Government, and the National Liberation Front to secure a cease-fire in Vietnam.

Four, encouragement of the formation of an appropriately sponsored international conference to seek international guarantees for any agreements reached by the participants in the Vietnamese conflict.

Mr. Speaker, our choices are not easy. Clearly, though, the alternative to a longer and larger war is to exert every effort to turn down the present conflict, to pursue with vigor and determination, no matter what the frustrations, those efforts that could lead to mutual deescalation.

Our objective should not be unconditional military victory or conquest by the might of arms. Rather, it shoud be a steady, persistent, patient, and determined desire to secure that early and just peace which can lead to nationbuilding both in Vietnam and at home.

The fact is that true victory can come only through the political process. Free elections and vigorous policies of land reform, as we learned from other experiences in the Far East, are essential to securing any significant or lasting peace.

The present Government in South Vietnam would not exist without our support. Our commitment should be to the people of that country. We must identify with policies that can bring healthy reform and progress as part of the nationbuilding process. To be identified indefinitely with the Mandarin landlords and the sons of the French elite will only justify the Vietcong charges that we support the old guard, the colonialists, and the imperialists.

Our emphasis must be placed—and I regret that it has not been so far—on basic economic reforms, on free elections, on self-determination, and on political change that can win the support and allegiance of men. The achievement of these goals is the kind of victory to which we can and properly should commit our resources and our efforts.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, not because I would not like to see the bombing stopped, not only temporarily, but permanently, but because it seems to me that this House floor is not the place to conduct the military phase of these activities. We have often said the same thing about policy on the conduct of foreign affairs. I think this applies to military affairs as well.

What we are interested in is the best protection for the men who are fighting the war, and we are entitled and compelled to rely upon the advice of our military experts. Certainly the effect of past bombing pauses has not been such as to give us any confidence that there would be a different effect this time.

In addition, the suggestion has been made that for some reason Hanoi is particularly receptive at this time to advances for peaceful talks. Beyond newspaper speculation that has not appeared to be the case. I, myself, believe that that is not the case and from all that I can learn the same is true of the President and the Secretary of State.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, it is a little hard for me to understand how those who support this amendment can say they support our men in South Vietnam, but still want to stop the bombing of North Vietnam unilaterally. We saw what happened during the New Year's truce when we stopped the bombing of North Vietnam. Before the truce we had something, if I recall the figures correctly, like 100 trucks a day coming down from North Vietnam to South Vietnam, loaded with ammunition and weapons to be used against our men. The minute the bombing stopped that number rose to something like 700 trucks a day.

This is what will happen again if the amendment of the gentleman from California goes through.

I, for one, feel it makes a lot more sense for us to stop that ammunition, and those bullets on the way down than to have to wait and pick them out of the bodies of our men below the demarcation zone. The effect of the amendment would be greatly to increase the dangers to the 400,000 American soldiers who are fighting in Vietnam today, unless we also insist, as President Johnson has insisted, that there be some valid corresponding reduction in the aggression on the other side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina for 5 minutes to close the debate.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to let you know exactly what confronts you. This says:

> It is hereby declared to be the sense of Congress than none of the funds authorized by this Act shall be used to carry out military operations over North Vietnam.

By law you would declare an indefinite lull over Vietnam.

As the gentleman from New York has said, during the lunar holidays there were over 260 violations of the truce. A battalion was ambushed outside of Saigon. Two hundred and fifty-odd vessels sailed down the coast and carried over 25,000 tons of supplies, and many GI's lost their lives. If you adopt the amendment, you will have declared open season on every GI in southeast Asia.

Make no mistake about it. Make no mistake about it. They are brave boys who are carrying out the orders of the military.

What did President Johnson do during the 30-day lull? He sent envoys all over the world in search for peace. He did not get an inkling. And now—I do not care what has been said on the floor—there is no reason to believe that there is going to be any peace talk by Ho Chi Minh.

I have just been informed that a Member of the other body is urging another lull. For the life of me I cannot think of anything more unrealistic, anything more against the best interests of our people in Vietnam, more against the interests of our country.

These lulls in the fighting mean only one thing: an opportunity for the enemy to regroup and resupply its forces and to use the lull as a cover for every kind of military activity designed to better their position and worsen ours. I might take a somewhat different view—although I am not at all sure that I would—if the previous cessations of combat had been accepted by the other side in a manner consistent with the underlying purpose of the cessation of combat. But the clear, unmistakable, and irrefutable evidence is before us and before all the world that a lull or cessation in combat is nothing more or less than a military advantage freely given to an implacable enemy. I do not like to use the word "fool," but would we be anything other than fools if we suggested or even tolerated any further cessation of battle? I do not intend to extend my hand in friendship to a man who I know is going to chop it off. And it is just as simple as that.

As I said before, I not only will not be a party to declaring open season on our boys in southeast Asia, I will fight any attempted action which would have this effect. One does not meet with, treat with, and declare lulls with an enemy whose fundamental philosophy is one of lying, of cheating. The past lulls speak for themselves. The matter we are now considering is an aspect of that kind of thought. I will not be a part of it and I do not think many Members of this House will be a part of it.

In the words of Johnny Magee:

Do those who make your fevered pulse run slowly
Whose stern remembered image cools your brow?
To the far dawn of victory mean only night's stillness
And Valhalla silence now?

If this is the kind of lull the Members want, take it, but without me.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BROWN of California) there were—ayes, 15; noes, 128.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, can there be any doubt that the objectives of our Nation in Vietnam are cloudy?

The debate that has taken place this afternoon over the Brown amendment clearly shows that members of the President's own party do not know what the short-term aims or long-term objectives of our country are in Vietnam.

The fact that members of the majority party—the President's party—sought through the Brown amendment to tie the hands of the President by providing that none of the funds in this supplemental could be used for fighting in or over North Vietnam clearly demonstrates how uncertain our objectives are to many Members on the other side of the aisle.

Anyone who reads the debate that has taken place this afternoon would immediately know how vitally important it is for the President of the United States to answer the very fundamental questions raised by me in a recent letter to him dealing with these matters.

Under unanimous consent, I ask that my letter to the President dated February 9, 1967, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The letter referred to follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 9, 1967.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Recent press reports indicate you have decided to forego presenting a detailed report to Congress on the Vietnam war, as originally pledged in your State of the Union message.

I realize that the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense annually make detailed presentations to the Congress on these vital matters. May I respectfully suggest, however, that only the Commander-in-Chief can effectively dispel many of the confusions, frustrations and misconceptions that beset the American people with respect to the foreign policy of our country.

In recent weeks and months I have had occasion to travel extensively throughout our country. In discussions on college campuses, with civic and business groups, with individuals and small discussion groups—invariably the discussion would turn to the overriding problem on the minds of all our citizens: Vietnam.

It is a perplexing, frustrating and disheartening problem to all who contemplate it, and I know how heavily it must weigh on your own shoulders.

Many of the questions which distress most Americans apparently have not been dispelled by the presentations of your Cabinet officers. If I may, I would like to list several of the more important questions which have recurrently come up in my travels from one end of this country to the other.

They fall into three main categories:

1. The nature of our objectives in Vietnam both short-term and long-range;

2. the prospects of attaining those objectives and the cost-effectiveness factors both in lives and resources of present methods versus possible alternative courses of action; and

3. an accounting of what we have learned from Vietnam in relation to other possible Vietnams.

THE NATURE OF OUR OBJECTIVES

In all candor, Mr. President, I think it must be stated that our objectives in Vietnam have been cloudy. Both at home and abroad there is some feeling that inherent contradictions exist between announced objectives for Vietnam and various peace proposals offered by spokesmen for the United States Government. For example, you have stated on numerous occasions that our goal is "achieving victory," (December 31, 1965); that our objective is "to convince the Communists that we cannot be defeated by force of arms," (January 28, 1965); that our country's goal is "to help South Vietnam defend its independence," (April 7, 1965).

Certainly the American people and most of their representatives in Congress have demonstrated support of these stated goals. Yet, the terms of some peace offers outlined by official Government spokesmen seem to undermine these objectives.

Permit me to illustrate:

In Ambassador Goldberg's speech to the United Nations General Assembly on September 22, 1966, he suggested the phased withdrawal of all external forces from South Vietnam. This offer was later repeated—with some qualification—in the Manila Communique.

In attempting to understand the meaning of the Goldberg speech, I wrote to Secretary of Defense McNamara. Assistant Secretary Townsend Hoopes responded for Secretary McNamara. He advised me that ". . . Viet Cong military units would be deactivated in any proposed withdrawal of external forces from South Vietnam." But Secretary of State Rusk, shortly after your own November 4th statement that the violence must "cease" in South Vietnam, apparently contradicted both your own statement and that of the Defense Department. Making no mention of "deactivation" of the Viet Cong, Secretary Rusk simply said that ". . . if the Northern elements go home, then we believe that the South Vietnamese can work these things out among themselves very quickly."

This, of course, did not appear to be true either under Diem or prior to our basic shift from "advisors" to active combatants.

Some very disturbing questions arise in connection with this apparent divergence of opinion among the State Department, the Defense Department and your own statements:

"If deactivation is a requirement, who would deactivate the Viet Cong?

"How would such deactivation be enforced?

"If they are not to be deactivated, is the government of South Vietnam and its army capable at this time of coping with the Viet Cong?

"Would not such a plan—if agreed to during negotiations—leave the Viet Cong intact in South Vietnam? Would it not leave them free to carry on the fight after our withdrawal either immediately or at some later time of their own choosing? Wasn't this our experience after American withdrawal from Laos?

"What would be the publicly stated policy of our government concerning our own return to Vietnam if such eventualities occurred at a future date?"

The 1954 Geneva Agreements, supported by your Administration as a basis for peace, also raise serious questions. They provide, as enforcement machinery, an International Control Commission. Its membership provides for representation from an ally of the United States, a neutral power and a Communist nation—each with a veto power. Our experience with the ICC overseeing the 1962 Geneva Agreements on Laos should raise grave doubts about the effectiveness of such an arrangement. Our late Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, effectively denounced the use of the veto power with regard to Laos.

The 1954 Agreements gave the ICC authority to supervise any general election to bring about the unification of the two Vietnams. In light of the ineffectiveness of the ICC throughout its history, can we reasonably expect it to police violations of a peace agreement or to insure honest elections?

Your own views on these critical questions would be of immeasurable assistance to the American people.

THE PROSPECTS

Our present bombing program in the North has been subject to serious question. So has the planned further escalation of American ground forces in the South.

Official Government spokesmen from time to time have indicated that the bombing has not been very effective in reducing the infiltration of men and materiel to the South. Questions have been raised about the apparent restrictions on bombing significant military targets—notably the airfield in and around Hanoi and the port of Haiphong.

Still further questions are raised about the trade policies of the United States especially with regard to the war in Vietnam. I have been asked many times why our country refuses to use trade as a weapon or tool of war. Many Americans cannot understand our country's stated intention to increase trade with the Soviet Union and its East European satellites. They cannot reconcile this intention with the known fact that 80% of the strategic war materials now being provided the Communists in Vietnam come from these countries.

I must confess that I, too, am perplexed by our past reluctance to escalate with the more humane weapon of trade before escalating by means of bombing. We have certainly indicated our awareness that trade is an effective weapon by our cooperation with Britain's economic boycott of Rhodesia. Millions of Americans are wondering why the most powerful nation in the world cannot convince its allies—much less the Communist world—to stop trading with North Vietnam.

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED FROM VIETNAM?

Of overriding concern to me and many Americans is the question of what we have learned in Vietnam. What lessons have we drawn with regard to the future prevention of the Communists' so-called "wars of national liberation"?

Both the past and the present masters of the Kremlin have made abundantly clear their intention to pursue and foment wars of "liberation" at an accelerated pace.

So, for that matter, have the Red Chinese.

The Tri-Continental Conference held in Havana in January of 1966 left no doubt of their intentions. Recent activities in Thailand, for example, demonstrate the sincerity of their purpose. Our own growing involvement in Thailand—in a pattern grimly reminiscent of our experience in Vietnam—causes grave concern.

Of prime importance, as we look to the future, is a clear enunciation of the policies your Administration is developing to prevent other Vietnams from erupting in Asia, in Africa and in Latin America.

Of equal importance is a similar spelling out of the policies we are evolving to cope with such "wars of liberation," should our preventative measures fail.

Of overriding interest to the American people would be a declaration on your part of what different responses we are developing. They look at Vietnam and see a record of thousands of Americans killed, of tens of thousands wounded, and of an annual cost of more than $25 billion. They look at Thailand and dread the prospects of a repeat performance. They need a clear and ringing declaration from the Commander-in-Chief of the United States that our country is in fact aware of these grim prospects and that we are developing different policies and different responses that will be less costly in lives or treasure and more effective in attaining our country's goals.

Mr. President, the questions I have posed have really been posed by the American people in the cities and the towns and the rural communities of our nation. Our country is a great country and our people a great people. They are willing to make whatever sacrifices are necessary in time of war to insure honorable success for their country's cause.

I pray that you, as our nation's leader, will take them into your confidence and lay before them a full and detailed report on the foreign policy of the United States.

I sincerely believe that no greater responsibility faces the President of the United States than that of uniting the American people behind a foreign policy they can understand and support.

With best wishes and kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Member of Congress.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the funds requested in the supplemental. They are needed to replace stocks of weapons, ammunition, aircraft, and other materials that have been expended as a result of our involvement in Vietnam. Additional billions in supplemental appropriations will be needed in this session of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, there is no other choice than to support the request for these funds by our Commander in Chief. It involves the national security of our country.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I had originally intended to offer a second amendment but I will not offer it at this time because I recognize that most of the issues have been adequately explored. I recognize, as well, that the time is growing late, but I do want to say a few things in rebuttal to some of the debate on my amendment designed to prohibit the use of these funds for a continuation of bombing over North Vietnam.

I respect the sincerity of those who say that a step of this sort—that any step to deescalate this war—poses a threat to our boys who are fighting in Vietnam. I hope they will recognize my sincerity when I say that what poses the greatest threat to our boys who are fighting in Vietnam is the continued escalation of this open-ended war.

There is no military victory possible in this situation because our political goals in Vietnam are unattainable. If we do not open our eyes to this single fact, then this country is headed for a tragedy, the likes of which we have never seen.

As we have increased our forces over there from 200—which the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee in the other body said he opposed when it was first done many years ago—to close to half a million men, our casualty list has continued to grow.

What has happened? As we have increased our ground forces, they have increased their ground forces. As we increase our air bombardment, they increase their air defenses. Today our aircraft over North Vietnam are faced with the greatest assemblage of sophisticated antiaircraft weapons in the history of the world, provided by Soviet Russia. As we step up the use of artillery, and Naval gunfire, they obtain and use longer range rockets and other weapons—likewise from Soviet Russia or Eastern Europe.

This will continue to happen. We can continue to put more aircraft over there, and more of them will continue to get shot down. We can continue to put more men over there and more of them will continue to get killed.

I noticed press reports last week that the Vietcong now have sophisticated ground-to-ground missiles, with which they are attacking our bases from outside the expanded perimeters of these bases.

You can bet your bottom dollar that just as quickly as the operators can be trained and the Russians can ship the equipment over there they are going to have more—and they are not going to stop as long as the situation continues as it is.

The fact is, our losses in Vietnam will continue to increase in direct ratio to the number of men we send there and the number of air sorties or battles in which they are engaged.

If we wish to go into world war III over the question of whether South Vietnam is essential to the security of the United States, then we are going to achieve that wish by the course we are now following. With the Russians providing the sophisticated equipment and the Chinese providing the manpower—if it becomes necessary—there is very little left to provide in terms of military opposition to the American troops over there.

So, my contention is that those who argue that my course would be "deserting our boys in Vietnam" do not realize the full danger of the situation. Their course is the one which is deserting those boys. Their course is piling up casualties by the thousands week after week. If that course continues, it will result in casualties by the hundreds of thousands.

This is the course which, it is said, we have no opportunity to do anything about—we cannot do it on an authorization bill, we cannot do it on an appropriation bill, and we cannot do it on a foreign aid bill.

When can we do it? What is the power of Congress, if it is not to indicate its feelings by use of the legislative power and the control of the pursestrings? If not that, there is no power in Congress.

Many on both sides of the aisle have complained about the great and growing power of the Executive. There is no greater example of that power today than that being exercised by the President in Vietnam, with no congressional control whatsoever, in this most critical course that has ever faced the United States, and we sit here and say Congress cannot do anything about it.

Congress can do something about it. Congress should do something about it. This is the way to do it—by action on this bill we have before us today.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, this is the third time in 2 years—on May 5 of 1965, March 1 a year ago, 1966, and now March 2, 1967—when we have had before us a supplemental authorization bill for military activities in southeast Asia.

As I said earlier, the authorization and appropriation process offers the only opportunity to debate our policy in Vietnam. It offers the only opportunity to vote on that policy.

We have never had before us the question of a declaration of war. Approval of this bill will be interpreted, as approval of the last two bills was interpreted, as congressional approval of the policy which we have followed.

In 1965 and 1966 I voted against similar authorizations. I propose to do so again.

Proponents of the present policy will always contend and will always attempt to pose the issue as one of support of our boys. I do not think anyone would argue that the courageous fighting men in Vietnam should not have whatever they need to protect and defend themselves, but let us remember one thing: they did not make the policy which has committed them to battle.

A year ago I pointed out that we were, in my opinion, at a watershed in terms of our policy. There was a serious dispute within the administration and within the country over whether the war should be escalated or whether the situation should be stabilized. There was the Ridgway and Gavin theory, on the one hand, and there was the course, on the other hand, which ultimately prevailed, the course of escalation.

One year ago I pointed out that the supplemental authorization and appropriation represented an escalation budget. It passed, and the war escalated. In February 1966, there were 201,000 U.S. military personnel in Vietnam. Today there are 414,000.

The greatest part of this bill for $4,548,200,000 is for procurement of aircraft, aircraft spares, and repair parts. Also, $3,620,400,000 is included for the purchase of aircraft. According to Secretary of Defense McNamara, about $1,525 million of the even larger supplemental appropriation request is for replacement of future combat losses, so it may be assumed that at least $2 billion of this total is for aircraft beyond expected combat losses; $168,300,000 is for missiles and tracked combat vehicles; $135 million of this authorization is for research, development, test, and evaluation; $624.5 million is intended for military construction, of which $108.5 million is for military construction in Thailand—Senate Report No. 58, February 17, 1967, page 8—where U.S. military involvement is expanding without any meaningful debate. This authorization relates to part of the $12,300 million supplemental appropriation request for southeast Asia, which will be before us soon and which includes $1,363,870,000 for military personnel. In requesting the funds, Secretary of Defense McNamara said the money was "to support the larger deployments and higher activity rates in southeast Asia and to provide a more adequate training and rotation base for the longer pull." Hearings before the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Subcommittee on Department of Defense, Committee on Appropriations, January 23, 24, 25, 1967, page 22. Hereinafter referred to as Senate hearings.

The supplemental appropriation request includes $6,306 million for procurement which will provide for marked increases in munitions and aircraft.

The appropriation provides $3,561,500,000 for operations and maintenance, and $1,294,500,000 for research, construction, and revolving funds.

Last March, when we debated the 1966 supplemental, I pointed out that there were two schools of thought concerning strategy in Vietnam.

As I said at that time:

> The general objective sought by one view is a limited one, to prevent the Vietcong from taking over South Vietnam by force, and to end hostilities in such a way that ultimately the United States can honorably leave the country . . . those who take this line have a military strategy which they believe will lead to a solution. That strategy is based on the theory that we must show Hanoi and the Vietcong that they cannot win the war. This military strategy has been most clearly outlined by Generals Gavin and Ridgway. Proponents of this view oppose escalation of the war. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 112, pt. 4, p. 4435.)

I pointed out that the other side of this debate held a much wider objective in Vietnam:

> It holds that the United States should help the Siagon government to gain control of South Vietnam and to carry out an extensive pacification plan which will deny the Viecong the allegiance of a significant part of the population . . . They want the United States to conduct search-and-destroy missions—to drive the Vietcong out of areas which they now control. Then they want our troops to "hold" these areas, while pacification plans proceed.

The latter policy, which I called mindful escalation, prevailed. Throughout the past year, the United States has been engaged in a continuous increase in the military commitment in Vietnam.

A few facts indicate the nature of the escalation during 1966.

Already in January 1966, 40,000 American soldiers were engaged in five offenses at one time—Le Monde, February 1, 1966; at the end of that month, bombing of North Vietnam was resumed in the face of much criticism at home and abroad.

By March, raids on North Vietnam were running at three times the prepause level—New York Herald Tribune, March 13—and American troops were pushing through war zone D in the most massive penetration thus far of an enemy stronghold—the Washington Post, March 15.

In April, the air war intensified again. On April 12, the first B–52 raid over North Vietnam dropped more than 1 million pounds of bombs in the heaviest single raid in terms of tonnage of the war—New York Times, April 13; U.S. planes struck 15 miles from Hanoi and 10 miles from Haiphong—Washington Post, April 18; New York Times, April 13.

And in June, U.S. planes attacked oil depots 3½ miles from Hanoi and 2 miles from Haiphong—Washington Post, June 30.

Meanwhile, the theater of the war was also expanding. By July, the United States was making more than 100 air strikes a day over Laos, more than double the number 6 months earlier—New York Times, July 12. Twenty-five thousand American servicemen were reported to be stationed in Thailand, twice as many as were reported there in January—Washington Post, July 25. And the number of U.S. Air Force personnel in southeast Asia had doubled in size over the preceding 8 months to 40,000—New York Times, July 12.

On October 13, the number of U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam reached 328,000, more than the peak figure in Korea during the Korean war, and shortly thereafter began Operation Attleboro, the largest single American operation of the war. The 7th Fleet ships by October were firing more than 30,000 rounds of ammunition a month in support of American and Vietnamese forces, compared with 350 shells fired in May 1965—New York Times, October 3—and U.S. destroyers began firing on the North Vietnamese shore for the first time—except in defense of downed pilots—and began destroying and damaging hundreds of barges—New York Times, November 19.

By November, the average monthly consumption of artillery and small arms ammunition had doubled since January; consumption of mortar ammunition had increased by 86 percent—Secretary of Defense McNamara, January 23, and Department of Defense Press Office.

In December, U.S. planes again struck in the Hanoi area; planes targeting in on the Yen Vien railroad yard 6 miles northeast of Hanoi and the Van Dien truck depot, 5 miles south of the city, apparently went off course and struck residential areas within the city limits of Hanoi—New York Times, December 15; Washington Post, December 15. American and Vietnamese began the largest airborne assault of the war deep into the Mekong Delta, initiating a planned offensive in the Delta region.

During the course of 1966, U.S. troops in Vietnam more than doubled from 181,000 to 398,000. At the beginning of the year, there had been 1,636 Americans killed and 7,645 wounded; by the end of the year, these totals had risen to 6,644 killed and 37,738 wounded.

In 1967 the pattern of escalation has continued. Rivers have been mined and beaches shelled in North Vietnam.

What has been the effect of this policy of escalation? Has it brought us closer to a peaceful settlement of the war, created a basis for freedom in South Vietnam, or furthered our overall aims of developing a peaceful world order?

ESCALATION AND NEGOTIATIONS

There seems to be general agreement among Americans about the desirability of negotiations to bring an end to the war in Vietnam. But there is a basic disagreement about how to achieve that objective. One theory of escalation is that the increasing cost of the war to North Vietnam and the Vietcong will force them to the conference table. But the evidence suggests that the effect of escalation is to harden, rather than weaken, their resolve.

An indication of the effects of escalation on attitudes in North Vietnam is found in the series of dispatches from

Hanoi by Harrison Salisbury, assistant managing editor of the New York Times. According to Salisbury:

> The populace (of North Vietnam) has been aroused to a state of solidarity that represents a formidable asset for a country struggling against a foe many times more powerful in material means and techniques.
>
> It is generally believed by non-Communist diplomats in Hanoi, rightly or wrongly, that American bombing in the North not only has strengthened the regime in its conviction that the Americans aim at its destruction but also has crystallized a national spirit of patriotism and self-defense that gives the country a united aspect in standing against the United States regardless of how some citizens may privately feel on the question of Communism. (*New York Times*, January 18, 1967.)

He also wrote:

> The net conclusion of many foreign residents of Hanoi is that while American bombing has damaged North Vietnam severely, causing heavy material and human losses and compelling the Government to invest men and material in the neutralizing attack, it is not likely to prove a decisive factor in maintaining the fight in the south or in compelling Hanoi to capitulate.
>
> Foreigners in Hanoi believe the North Vietnamese when they say they are prepared to sacrifice Hanoi, Haiphong, all their cities and towns, rather than yield under American bomb power. (January 12, 1967.)

He further observed:

> The basic question would seem to be: Has all this hurt the North Vietnamese so much that they are ready to quit? Their answer is, "By no means!" And they say that they expect their task to get a lot harder before it gets easier. (January 1, 1967.)

Many other reports corroborate Salisbury's conclusion that the escalation policy has hardened North Vietnam's attitude.

The escalation policy has also impeded efforts to achieve a negotiated settlement, and opportunities for moving toward peace talks have been missed.

For example, after President Johnson temporarily extended the bombing pause at Tet this year, U Thant issued a statement saying:

> Non-resumption of the bombing is a wise move. If it means cessation of bombing, then I believe that meaningful talks will take place within a few weeks. Within hours, on February 13, the United States announced resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam. On January 14 the *Washington Post reported*, U.N. sources said the Secretary-General's statement was based on firm information, not speculation. U.N. officials were stunned by the Pentagon announcement that followed, but said later that the Secretary-General was standing on his statement.

On another recent occasion, escalation of the war seems to have shot down our own peace initiative. According to the respected U.N. Correspondent Robert H. Estabrook of the Washington Post:

> North Vietnam definitely agreed last December to an American suggestion for direct discussions toward settling the war, a highly authoritative Western source said.

Ambassador Lodge met with the Polish representative on the International Control Commission, Ambassador Janusz Lewandowski, at the home of the Italian Ambassador in Saigon on December 2 and 3, 1966.

> Lodge is reported to have asked the Polish representative to take the initiative in setting up contacts with Hanoi.
>
> On or about December 4 a reply came from Polish Foreign Minister Adam Rapacki stating that Hanoi had agreed to talks at the ambassadorial level in Warsaw. North Vietnam asked that special representatives be dispatched from Washington for the purpose.
>
> Hanoi reportedly attached no conditions about a prior cessation of American bombing of North Vietnam to its agreement.

This report has never been denied by the State Department. But according to Estabrook:

> After the American bombing raids near Hanoi December 13 and 14—which Hanoi charged damaged civilian areas—North Vietnam withdrew its agreement, accusing the United States of bad faith. (*Washington Post*, February 4, 1967.)

Here again, our own negotiating efforts were undermined by the escalation of the war.

Nor is this problem new. For instance, according to Philippe Devillers, director of southeast Asia studies at the University of Paris:

> Another approach was made through France in February 1965. M. Couve de Murville went to Washington to inform the government there that both France and the U.S.S.R. felt that the time was propitious for a conference and were ready to work for it; that Hanoi (where Mr. Kosygin had visited recently) would accept talks, and that even the Chinese had indicated they would not object. The American response was to bomb the North (March 2, 1965) (*Nation*, December 5, 1966).

If the administration is serious about a negotiated settlement, then opportunities should not be lost because of military escalation. For, as Senator MANSFIELD said:

> We owe an unremitting search for a peaceful solution in Vietnam to the young Americans who have gone and who will go to that tortured land.

WAR IN THE SOUTH

President John F. Kennedy said on September 2, 1963:

> In the final analysis, it is their (the Vietnamese) war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them, we can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it—the people of Vietnam—against the Communists. (CBS Interview, Sept. 2, 1963.)

Yet the history of American involvement has been an ever higher level of commitment for the United States. We seem to be following the course against which Senator MANSFIELD warned in his 1963 report:

> Vietnam and Southeast Asia—

When he said that intensification of American support—

> inevitably has carried us to the start of the road which leads to the point at which the conflict in Vietnam could become of greater concern and greater responsibility to the United States than it is to the Government and people of South Vietnam. In present circumstances, pursuit of that course could involve an expenditure of American lives and resources on a scale which would bear little relationship to the interest of the United States or, indeed, to the interests of the people of Vietnam.

While more than 200,000 U.S. troops arrived to support the Government of South Vietnam during 1966, 116,000 South Vietnamese military personnel deserted from the forces of their own country. By October 1966, the number of American troops in Vietnam had surpassed the number of men in South Vietnam's regular army. Now, according to Secretary of Defense McNamara:

> It has been agreed by all parties concerned that the main weight of the effort of the South Vietnamese armed forces should be placed on clear and secure operations—

That is operations—

> designed to hold territory.

Thus, the South Vietnamese Army has ceased playing a major role in offensive operations.

Has our massive intervention in Vietnam won over the population and secured the countryside? In the hearings on this bill before the Senate committees, Senator YOUNG of North Dakota asked Secretary McNamara about this:

> Last year, Mr. Secretary, you stated with respect to the population of South Vietnam, the Ky government controlled 53%, the Vietcong 23, and 23% in disputed areas. With respect to the land areas you said your own estimate was that the Vietcong controls 60% of the land area. Has this situation changed in the last year?

To which Secretary McNamara replied:

> I do not think so, Senator Young . . . I think the figures I gave you last year are fairly representative of the situation today. (Senate hearings, p. 48.)

Respected Washington Post reporter Ward Just, writing from Saigon on the progress of the war, reported:

> The effect of the massive military operations this year is not at all clear, except for the obvious fact that the enemy main forces have not been defeated and do not appear to be on the verge of being defeated. (December 27, 1966, *The Washington Post*.)

Mr. Chairman, despite the superior military power brought to bear in South Vietnam, despite the repeated bombings of the north, the war continues. Does not this suggest that the problem is not entirely susceptible of a military solution? Will continued military escalation defeat the basic Vietcong strategy?

According to Sir Robert Thompson, head of the British advisory mission to South Vietnam, formerly Secretary for Defense in Malaya and the author of "Defeating Communist Insurgency":

> It is the political aim of the insurgents (in the "second" guerrilla stage of the revolutionary war) to erode the prestige and authority of the government, starting in the remoter areas of the countryside and gradually penetrating to the main town. It is their military aim, not to defeat the government's armed forces in battle because that would be obviously beyond their capability, but to demoralize and neutralize the armed forces thereby rendering them incapable of saving the state.
>
> There is every prospect that this two-pronged attack, still supported by subversion and terror, will collapse the whole structure of government and destroy the fabric of society so that the insurgents can achieve victory without having to progress to the final phase of a war of movement. (*Washington Post*, January 22, p. E–1)

Can American military power shore up the prestige and popularity of the

Saigon regime or prevent the demoralization of the South Vietnamese Army? According to Secretary McNamara:

> Our own experience, e.g., the U.S. Marines in the First Corps area, has demonstrated that clearing and securing is a very slow and painstaking process, and that a military presence must be maintained for a considerable period of time after the area has been initially "cleared." In fact, we have found that it is very difficult to clear, completely and permanently, any area in which the Vietcong guerrillas were once well established. Even around Danang, where the U.S. Marines have been conducting clear-and-secure operations for some 18 months, guerrilla hit-and-run attacks still occur. (Senate hearings, p. 13).

According to Ward Just of the Washington Post:

> In many areas, a persuasive case can be made . . . that security in the countryside is worse now than 12 months ago. (December 27, 1966).

The desertions from the South Vietnamese regular armed forces reflect the results of the attempt to "demoralize and neutralize" them—Senate hearings, page 154.

Mr. Chairman, the fundamental problem in Vietnam is a political, not a military one. Secretary of Defense McNamara recognized this when he said:

> The risk of introducing political instability or additional political instability into the Government of South Vietnam . . . is the greatest risk of all under current circumstances. (Senate hearings, p. 75.)

To what extent does the massive American intervention contribute to political instability by undercutting the authority of the Saigon Government?

As Secretary McNamara said:

> There is a limit to the number of foreigners that can be absorbed in a small country of that kind without such adverse effects as to—lead to a negative rather than a positive influence. (Senate hearings, p. 51.)

In this vein is Ward Just's report of January 23, 1967, in the Washington Post:

> Anti-Americanism in Vietnam, particularly in the cities, is growing . . . the heavy weight of the American presence and "advisory effort," which has become in fact a parallel government reaching down farther into Vietnamese society, is producing a new colonialism different in character but often similar in effect to the French.

The policy of escalation has created the liability of inheriting the resentment against colonialism. It has meant becoming identified as a foreign army of occupation which, rather than the North Vietnamese, may appear to be the force trying to dominate the country. Of course, the Communist propagandists use such charges, however unjust they may be. Recruiting appeals by the Vietcong urge national unity against the foreign invasion.

ESCALATION AND OUR FOREIGN POLICY GOALS

Mr. Chairman, I think we should examine the effect of our Vietnam policy on our more general foreign policy objectives. Here is a recent statement delivered in New York on December 8, 1966, by the eminent Swedish economists, Gunnar Myrdal:

> The American government is increasingly entering into a political and moral isolation. . . . It is, in particular, the war in Vietnam that has caused the world to disassociate itself from official American policy.
>
> The nearest historical parallel was the growing isolation of France during her last, cruel and hopeless, colonial war in North Africa. Only by putting an end to it did she regain moral status and political prestige in the world.

Myrdal spoke especially of the underdeveloped nations with whose problems he is so familiar:

> Among all the poor and colored nations of Africa, however much they need financial assistance for development and, indeed, for survival, I know of no government or any articulate individual who can be counted as a supporter of the Vietnam policy of the United States Government.
>
> I believe the same is true of Latin American opinion. The Vietnam war is commonly adding its influence to the many other elements of irritation in that continent's relations with the United States. There is certainly in Latin America no government and hardly an independent leader of any stature who would openly side with official American policy in Vietnam.

Although some Asian countries have supported our policy:

> The very much larger part of South Asia, which was absent from Manila, particularly India and Pakistan with now more than 600 million people, are equally, or even more, dependent on America for development and, indeed for sheer survival from hunger. In spite of this, they have not done so but have expressed even more open criticism than the Western European governments.

Senator Robert Kennedy, in his speech to the China Conference at the University of Chicago, on February 8, said:

> This is a time of unique opportunity. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, whatever else it has done, ensures that China will wish to focus her attention on internal affairs for at least the immediate future.

As Senator Kennedy said:

> The Cold War in the West is calmed, allowing us to divert some energy and thought to this part of the world.

Just as change has occurred within the Communist nations in Europe, so changes can be expected in Asia as well. With China in ferment, new approaches might be possible were they not blocked by a policy which makes it likely that whatever faction emerges in China will be imbued with a continuing hostility to the United States.

The Vietnam war has also had a profound effect on our relations with Western Europe. As Senator Fulbright wrote in "The Arrogance of Power."

> One detects in Europe a growing uneasiness about American policy, a feeling that the United States is becoming unreliable and that it may be better—safer, that is—to keep the Americans at a distance.

According to Gunnar Myrdal:

> There is not a single government in Western Europe who would dare for their own people to send a squad of soldiers to Vietnam as a symbolic gesture of sympathy with the United States' policy there. (Myrdal, op. cit.)

According to President Johnson, one of our national foreign policy objectives now is to end the cold war. Yet the effect of the Vietnam war is to make it difficult to ease relations elsewhere.

The United States has long recognized that in a world of nuclear weapons, intercontinental missiles, and economic interdependence, no one nation can, through its own strength, preserve world peace or its own security. Only international cooperation and the effort to create a world of law can provide long-term security for the United States. Yet our policy in Vietnam has undercut the United Nations and respect for international law by discouraging the rule of law in settling international disputes and emphasizing unilateral military action.

Mr. Chairman, I believe there are alternatives to the present course in Vietnam. I have outlined in the past possible approaches to bring this conifict to the conference table.

In the first place, a cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam would make clear to the world our own good faith. It would strengthen the position of Secretary General U Thant who was encouraged last December 19 by Ambassador Goldberg to "take whatever steps you consider necessary to bring about the necessary discussion which could lead to such a cease-fire."

Secretary of Defense McNamara has testified:

> I don't believe the bombing (of North Vietman) up to the present has significantly reduced, nor any bombing that I could contemplate in the future would significantly reduce, the actual flow of men and materiel to the South." (Senate hearings, p. 70).

Bombing of the north seems to have had little military effect on the war in the south, yet its cessation might well be the long-sought diplomatic breakthrough.

According to Secretary McNamara on January 23, 1967:

> We have had opportunities to make clear to the North Vietnamese that we would be willing to stop the bombing without any action on their part preceding it, with no firm guarantee as to what they would do, but with just some general indication of how they would act . . . We have never received any indication whatsoever that they would respond favorably. (Senate hearings, p. 92).

In the light of this statement, I was most interested to read a New York Times account of a statement made February 22, 1967, by Mai Van Bo, North Vietnamese representative in Paris. According to the New York Times' account of February 23, 1967, by Henry Tanner:

> A spokesman for Hanoi reaffirmed today its offer to enter into talks with the United States if American bombing attacks against North Vietnam were unconditionally and permanently halted.

Should not this be tested?

Since Secretary McNamara has stated that the bombing has not significantly reduced, and would not significantly reduce, the actual flow of men and materiel into South Vietnam, what would be lost by a cessation of bombing now?

Secondly, the National Liberation Front should be permitted to play an independent role in the negotiations. It is now recognized that the National Liberation Front is not merely a puppet of North Vietnam but, in fact, as has been reported by Harrison Salisbury and others, is a separate entity which does not necessarily agree with Hanoi on policy.

Ambassador W. Averell Harriman in a television broadcast on February 17, 1967, indicated that the National Liberation Front contained non-Communist elements as well as Communist and that some of its members envisioned a "mixed Socialist, open postwar society in South Vietnam rather than a Communist-run state."—New York Times, February 23, 1967.

In summary, I propose the following four-point peace program:

First. The United States should cease bombing North Vietnam immediately and unconditionally.

Second. The United States must support truly free elections in South Vietnam. It must further be prepared to accept whatever role for the National Liberation Front results from such elections and, if necessary, maintain its willingness to deal with the front thereafter.

Third. The United States should propose to the North Vietnamese Government, the South Vietnamese Government, and the National Liberation Front four-party negotiations to secure a cease-fire in Vietnam.

Fourth. The United States should seek appropriate sponsorship of an international conference to guarantee agreements reached by the belligerents and effective neutralization of southeast Asia.

This war can end, and it can end honorably. The way to end it, however, is not to enlarge it as the supplemental authorization bill before us would do.

Mr. Chairman, gallant Americans are fighting a cruel war, and their country owes them everlasting gratitude for their courage and determination. Their service to our Nation is unparalleled. However, the issue is not their bravery under fire but the policy which continues to commit them to battle. As a veteran of another jungle war in the Pacific, I believe that their best interest lies in an honorable settlement through negotiations. In the final analysis, the situation in Vietnam is still a political problem which must be resolved through diplomacy.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4515) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 347, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The **SPEAKER**. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. **REUSS**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The **SPEAKER**. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. **REUSS**. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. REUSS moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4515 to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

On page 4, line 10, after "$624,500,000", insert:

"TITLE I—STATEMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL POLICY

"SEC. 401. None of the funds authorized by this Act shall be used except in accordance with the following declaration by Congress of—

"(1) its firm intentions to provide all necessary support for members of the Armed Forces of the United States fighting in Vietnam;

"(2) its support of efforts being made by the President of the United States and other men of good will throughout the world to prevent an expansion of the war in Vietnam and to bring that conflict to an end through a negotiated settlement which will preserve the honor of the United States, protect the vital interests of this country, and allow the people of South Vietnam to determine the affairs of that nation in their own way; and

"(3) its support of the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962 and urges the convening of that Conference or any other meeting of nations similarly involved and interested as soon as possible for the purpose of formulating plans for bringing the conflict to an honorable conclusion in accordance with the principles of those accords."

Mr. **RIVERS**. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the instructions contained in the motion to recommit are not germane to the bill under consideration. Therefore, they are not in order and are not germane to the matter under consideration.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] makes the point of order that the motion to recommit contains provisions that are not germane to the bill presently under consideration.

Mr. **RIVERS**. And, Mr. Speaker, further that a ruling has already been made upon the instructions contained in this motion.

The **SPEAKER**. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] desire to be heard?

Mr. **REUSS**. Mr. Speaker, I shall appreciate proceeding briefly in opposition to the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment contained in the motion to recommit is precisely the amendment which I offered earlier. It was ruled not germane by the able and respected Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI]. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] cited an earlier precedent, that precedent handed down by another able and respected Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union on May 20, 1957, the gentleman from Montana, Mr. METCALF, who ruled in a similar fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I cited in my argument earlier, and I recite now, two rulings to the contrary, one made by the able and respected Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], on May 7, 1959, upon a bill emanating from the House Committee on Public Works authorizing TVA construction of facilities and upon an amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], to the effect that the funds thus authorized should not be spent in a way that would affect the standards of labor in this country—a subject matter that came within the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Education and Labor. The Chairman ruled that the amendment was germane.

Again, on May 29, 1962, the House Committee on Banking and Currency had the housing bill before the House. The gentleman from New York, Mr. Powell, introduced an amendment to require that housing constructed pursuant to that authorization be such as to be nondiscriminatory, a matter within the jurisdiction of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

The able and respected Chairman, Mr. Walter, of Pennsylvania, ruled that the amendment was germane.

Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves thus in the position of having two precedents on both sides of the question, which is not an unprecedented matter in the history of precedents. It is a matter analagous to where there is disagreement in the circuit courts of appeals, thus requiring the Supreme Court to rule to resolve the dispute.

Accordingly, I hope and trust that the Speaker will rule that the motion to recommit, and the amendment contained in it, is germane, and thus that this body may vote on this important question of war and peace.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The bill presently before the House authorizes appropriations for military procurement, research, development, and military construction, both in the United States and abroad.

The amendment in the motion to recommit with instructions offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, provides for a new section to be added at the end of the bill which would contain a "Statement of congressional policy" relating to the United States involvement in Vietnam and southeast Asia. The policies declared by this amendment relate not only to our military position but also to our diplomatic efforts in that area.

Because of the nature of this amendment, the Chair is of the opinion that it deserves the attention and consideration of a committee of this House other than armed services, which reported the bill now before the Committee. Were this amendment introduced as a bill, it would be within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The bill before the House deals with military authorizations; the motion to recommit goes to the foreign policy of the United States.

It is evident to the Chair that the amendment—or at least portions thereof—are not germane as they involve different subjects than the field covered by the pending bill.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. **BROWN** of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill H.R. 4515, to the Committee on Armed Services, with instructions to report it back forthwith with an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair will ask if the gentleman is opposed to the bill?

Mr. **BROWN** of California. I am opposed to the bill in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BROWN of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4515 to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: On page 4, after line 10, insert the following:

"TITLE IV—STATEMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL POLICY

"SEC. 401. It is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that none of the funds authorized by this Act shall be used to carry out military operations in or over North Vietnam."

Mr. **RIVERS**. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. **GROSS**. I respectfully ask the Speaker if the rule which made this bill in order provided for only one motion to recommit.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair will state it applies to one valid motion to recommit. The other motion was ruled out of order.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. **BROWN** of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 18, nays 372, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 28]

YEAS—18

Bingham
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Conyers
Diggs
Edwards, Calif.
Farbstein
Fraser
Green, Oreg.
Helstoski
Kastenmeier
Mink
Rees
Rosenthal
Roybal
Ryan
Scheuer
Yates

NAYS—372

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Blackburn
Blanton
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Ford, William D.
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Green, Pa.
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Sandman
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watson
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Miss.
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki
Zion

NOT VOTING—42

Baring
Blatnik
Bow
Brown, Ohio
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Celler
Clark
Edwards, La.
Evins, Tenn.
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Friedel
Gallagher
Gray
Griffiths
Hammerschmidt
Hays
Howard
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Macdonald, Mass.
Marsh
May
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Randall
Resnick
Riegle
Sisk
Skubitz
Steed
Van Deerlin
Watkins
Williams, Pa.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Zwach

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Watkins.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. Foley with Mrs. May.

Mr. Fountain with Mr. Skubitz.

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.

Mr. King of California with Mr. Riegle.

Mr. Marsh with Mr. Hammerschmidt.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Williams of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Steed with Mr. Zwach.

Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Morris of New Mexico.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Howard.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Clark.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Kluczynski.

Mr. Cabell with Mr. Resnick.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Randall.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. **RIVERS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 665), a similar Senate bill; to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert the provisions of H.R. 4515 as just passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 665, and insert the provisions of H.R. 4515 as passed, as follows:

"TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

"SEC. 101. In addition to the funds authorized to be appropriated under Public Law 89–501, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year 1967 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles in amounts as follows:

"AIRCRAFT

"For aircraft: for the Army, $533,100,000; for the Navy and the Marine Corps, $1,784,300,000; for the Air Force, $1,303,000,000.

"MISSILES

"For missiles: for the Army, $6,100,000; for the Navy, $48,700,000; for the Marine Corps, $2,100,000; for the Air Force, $45,000,000.

"TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES

"For tracked combat vehicles: for the Army, $62,200,000; for the Marine Corps, $4,200,000.

"TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

"SEC. 201. In addition to the funds authorized to be appropriated under Public Law 89-501, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year 1967 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for research, development, test, and evaluation, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

"For the Army, $40,000,000;

"For the Navy (including the Marine Corps), $40,000,000;

"For the Air Force, $33,000,000; and

"For Defense Agencies, $22,000,000.

"TITLE III—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

"SEC. 301. The Secretary of each military department may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, which are necessary in connection with military activities in southeast Asia, or in support of such activities, in the total amount as follows:

"Department of the Army, $288,500,000;

"Department of the Navy, $140,000,000; and

"Department of the Air Force, $196,000,000.

"SEC. 302. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

"SEC. 303. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this title, but the appropriations for public works authorized by section 301 shall not exceed: Department of the Army, $288,500,000; Department of the Navy, $140,000,000; Department of the Air Force, $196,000,000, or a total of $624,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 4515) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to ask the majority leader the legislative program for the remainder of this week and for the following week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished acting minority leader, we have finished the legislative business for this week, and will ask to go over upon the announcement of the program.

The program for the House of Representatives for the week of March 6 is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar Day. There are no bills under suspension.

Tuesday is Private Calendar Day.

Wednesday we will take up House Resolution 312, authorizing investigation by the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Thursday, House Joint Resolution 267, Emergency Food Assistance for India.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservations that conference reports may be called up at any time, and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I do want to advise Members that we expect next week a number of privileged resolutions to be reported from and called up by the Committee on House Administration. We will advise Members as to those bills as soon as we have definite information.

I would like to make this one further statement. It appears that the week following next week will be a week in which we will have a considerable number of important bills. So that the membership may govern themselves accordingly in fixing their programs.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Mr. SISK. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure on this, the 100th anniversary of the U.S. Office of Education, to call to the attention of the House some of the landmarks of the programs of the Office of Education and its great importance to the people of the United States.

Those people who, in the early days of our Nation's history, started on an experiment in representative government, were aware of the importance and development of education. The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 set forth the policy which was followed thereafter that "schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged" as the Nation grew. Although the Constitution made no mention of education, the tradition of a national interest in education and a responsibility for its conduct has been continued through the years.

In all the 100 years since the establishment of an Office of Education, its role has been to promote the cause of education by collecting statistics and facts to show the condition and progress of education by publishing such information to aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems. Since that first bit of legislation, subsequent acts and Executive orders have added related functions, including responsibilities for Federal financial assistance to education and for special studies and programs.

During its growing period the Office has passed through periods of somnolence as well as periods of struggles with more and more responsibilities.

A century ago, on March 2, 1867, an act was approved that provided for the establishment of a Department of Education, to be directed by a Commissoner appointed by the President. Its growing years were changing ones: First, it was an independent agency; then, it became an office attached to the Department of Interior; later, it was transferred to the Federal Security Agency, and finally, it was established as a constituent agency of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1953.

This Office, established first in only two rooms, has grown to fill space in several large buildings. Its cost has jumped from an administrative outlay of about $13,000 to a total budget of approximately $4 billion; and from a staff of 3 people to a present staff of approximately 2,250.

Of the many reorganizations the Office has undergone, the National Defense Education Act of 1958—NDEA—brought about more changes and caused the assignment of more significant duties to the Office than any other legislation up to that time.

Under the NDEA and other recent legislation the Office has developed in importance and has been given increasing responsibility for the administration of educational assistance programs. Four specific functions added over a period of a few years were: Collecting and disseminating educational data, administering grants, performing educational research and studies, and providing consultative services and planning conferences.

Expenditures of Federal, State, and local funds for the various fields of education have grown phenomenally in the last 20 years. A nation concerned with communication began to see that its educational system was not simply an instrument through which youth were processed on the way to adult responsibility, but rather a tremendous enterprise relating to every aspect of society.

A major function of educators is to raise the quality of schooling so that schools can help hold a community together. States and school districts throughout the country are taking advantage of the funds available under various education acts for this purpose. A variety of special projects has begun to help encourage the pursuit of intellectual attainment among all. Research is underway on the development and use of various communicative instruments—books, music, clubs, meetings, films, television—as new educational media. The Office of Education has assumed more responsibility for the provision of professional advisory services to aid in improving educational practices, including the organization, management, and financing of school systems and colleges, methods of instruction, and preparation of teachers. Funds are being provided along with the necessary personnel so that these developing projects can be continued and improved.

Before the present-day organization of the Office of Education came about, a special appointed committee had submitted recommendations to establish an efficient system.

Today the Office of Education consists of the Office of the Commissioner, a number of offices which provide staff, administrative, and program support, and five program bureaus. These are the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, Bureau of Adult and Vocational Education, Bureau of Higher Education, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, and Bureau of Research. They all develop and coordinate specific programs cutting across all levels of education.

The Office of Education has made considerable headway in standardizing educational terms, definitions, and measures that are needed to provide complete, accurate, and timely educational information for planning purposes at all governmental levels. It has also created a facility by which administrators and researchers in education can quickly and easily get access to research that has been done on particular problems. Progress has been made and is continuing on another program to widen educational horizons in the international area.

All the various means of improving the educational process and encouraging the pursuit of intellectual attainment are being exploited by this growing organization.

A sentence which summarizes briefly the goals of the Office of Education appeared recently in one of its booklets. It says:

> No enterprise in the Nation is of greater importance than the education of its citizens, for education is responsible for the preservation of the spiritual, moral, and human values in life.

BUSINESS AND THE GOVERNMENT ENVIRONMENT IN 1967

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues an outstanding treatise on Business and the Government Environment in 1967 delivered by the Honorable Eugene M. Zuckert, an outstanding former Secretary of the Air Force. The speech was made before the 1967 Stanford Business Conference, Graduate School of Business, Stanford University, San Francisco, Calif., on February 9.

Mr. Zucker's speech follows:

BUSINESS AND THE GOVERNMENT ENVIRONMENT IN 1967

(Remarks of Hon. Eugene M. Zuckert)

For thirty years the Stanford Business Conference has provided a prestigious intellectual forum for the discussion of questions of national significance which has earned for the Conference the highest esteem from coast to coast. But I doubt whether any topic that has come before it has been of more crucial importance to the future of our free society than the central theme of this Midwinter Conference—Business-Government Relations.

It is a subject that I have studied for a long time, with deepest concern.

Let me say at the outset that a long career in government service—at whatever level—does not *ipso facto* qualify a man to pontificate on the vast and relatively unexplored subject of Business-Government Relations. Indeed, it is more likely that this experience will have taught him to approach the subject with caution and considerable humility. If he has acquired some wisdom in the process, as I hope I have, he will bypass the temptation to come up with "easy answers." Because there aren't any. And if he is a realist, he will approach this sensitive problem-area with a limited objective in view.

So my objective today is to share with you *not* a blueprint but an *approach* to the government environment, an understanding of which is indispensable if meaningful relations between government and business are to be established and maintained. This is an approach I have developed over the years. It is within the framework of business and government institutions as they now exist. And the timing seems right.

I. BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT IN AN AGE OF CHANGE

The past is prelude

Triggered in part by technological change, our country is undergoing an institutional revolution comparable to that which the Greater Depression unleased in the '30's. The setting then was an economy of scarcity. It was a time of political and social turmoil. The fate of such pillars of the New Deal as TVA, Social Security, the Labor Relations Act was savagely fought out in the Congress, the nation's press, finally in the Supreme Court of the United States. That revolution of three decades ago ushered in the era of Big Government *and* a chronic state of distrust and hostility between government and business.

Since that time Government has become a consolidated power structure. The government Environment has all-pervasive impact, exercises all-pervasive influence over our institutions.

I suppose the fact that I've been part of the Big Government machinery in every Administration from President Roosevelt to President Johnson is one reason Dean Arbuckle was good enough to invite me here this morning.

But my approach to business-government relations is not conditioned solely by my experience as a representative of the government, dealing with business in a variety of situations. Also, as a practicing lawyer representing business clients in their affairs with government, I have been involved in and with business and the business viewpoint. And as a teacher of Business-Government relations at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, I have sought to assess impartially the attitudes and behavior of *both* government and business.

From my experience in these three separate but interrelated vantage points, I've come up with some basic convictions which provide a frame of reference for my remarks.

Let me summarize them briefly:

First: American business as represented by the modern corporation is the *only* form of technological and economic development consistent with free political institutions.

Second: In our pluralistic society, government and business are *interdependent* in technological innovation and economic development. Therefore their intelligent, continuing cooperation is indispensable to maintaining a healthy and expanding economy.

Third: Big Government is a condition, not a theory. Its influence over the U.S. economy will continue to expand in response to the forces and pace of technological, political and social change. For the common good business must understand, adjust to, and help shape the emerging political and social environment.

Fourth: In the best interests of the business community of the nation, its relationships with the government must be stabilized in a form of coexistence diplomacy.

Fifth: What I call "coexistence diplomacy" must be based on a vastly improved understanding by business of the government environment; and by the government of the problems of business within the market environment on which it depends for survival.

Over the years, in government and out, I have urged that these convictions be assimilated into the attitudes and behavior of all concerned with relations between business and government. I confess I found it heavy going. At times there seemed little hope of inducing *either* business *or* government to regard each other as anything but a hostile adversary. Fortunately, that attitude has begun to change. Now it is my hope that 1967 may see the first steps toward a new era of coexistence diplomacy between these political and economic power structures of our society.

The emerging political climate

Ecology is the science of the mutual relations of organisms with their environment and with one another. I am glad to report some signs—as yet feeble but encouraging—that the leaders of the business and government organisms at long last are becoming more aware of the *politics* of ecology. However reluctantly, they have learned to accept the inexorable interdependence of the government and business power structures and to recognize the need for improving the relationship of these organisms to one another.

The result has been a shake-up, and some improvement in the climate of political and public opinion.

To illustrate:

Few business leaders still regard the government environment as an arena of jungle warfare in which a sort of anti-business Vietcong lies in wait to ambush the unwary corporate executive.

The *government bureaucracy* for the most part has discarded many of its long-held notions about the evils of business. By and large, business leaders are no longer regarded as unyielding opponents of social progress.

Moulders of public opinion have shifted their attention to more pressing social issues of the day.

As have the *university intellectuals.*

But let me add a note of caution. The skies are by no means clear. This relatively favorable climate could change with startling rapidity.

Businessmen and business institutions are notoriously "safe targets" for demagogues and propagandists. They must be ever alert to the danger of being abused in the press. Or criticised in televised public "trials" before various Congressional committees. For this is the path that could lead to making business the public scapegoat for all our social ills—from urban slums to LSD!

Let us take a quick look at some of the more explosive issues now the subject of current agitation: They have already begun to cast ominous shadows across the political skies.

The automotive industry and the highway safety of its products.

Pharmaceutical companies and the marketing of dangerous drugs.

Industry and air pollution.

Industry and water pollution.

The mutual fund industry and its marketing practices.

Foods . . . their packaging and labeling, and how they are affected by chemicals, additives and processing.

It is not for me to say at this time and on this occasion whether I think business could have anticipated the explosive implications of these problems. Or whether it has been delinquent in their handling. The point is that others have accused business of culpable action or inaction. And they will keep hammering away.

Because of public sensitivity, I believe that ill-considered or parochial or short-sighted attitudes and behavior by our great corporations in these problem-areas *could* lead to tragic and foreseeable consequences. The public image of business as a predatory antisocial system for the pursuit of profits and privilege—which haunted it prior to World War II—*could* be reactivated.

Business must never forget that we live in a pressure-group democracy where the politics of turmoil and discontent—aided by instant mass communications—have been developed to an art and science. There still are plenty of diehard anti-business propagandists who subtly and assiduously pursue their line that business is not discharging its public responsibility to the general public. Given the right opportunity and some lethal ammunition they know all too well how to put over such a neat, easy-to-assimilate propaganda package.

In the resulting atmosphere of public mistrust, it would be too late to organize a continuing dialogue between business and government. The stage would be set for *anti-business legislation and tougher regulation* . . . as the cure-all for any social ill that can by any stretch of imagination be attributed to technological change or business practice!

Signs of new business leadership

Of course there are still some business leaders who look on any proposal for improvement in business-government relationships as a Trojan Horse arrangement by which government will first infiltrate and then take over business management.

Fortunately these intransigent voices are receding. The modern and realistic generation of managers shows promise of a new willingness to *understand*—not only the essential interdependence of business and government in technological innovation and the nation's economic development, but the *new dimension* in management responsibility resulting from that interdependence.

Perhaps this stems from and credit must go to a native of the West Coast, Ralph Cordiner and the address he made in December of 1957. The then Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the General Electric Company, speaking before the Executives Club of Chicago, called for a *new dimension in business leadership*. Mr. Cordiner's remarks, if offered by a business leader of lesser stature, might have been dismissed by the audience as hopelessly visionary.

The central theme of his speech was that the technological and social revolution sweeping the world had introduced the *social* dimension as a new and decisive element of management.

I regard Mr. Cordiner's address as a realistic approach which the managers of our institutional corporations could study with profit. Let me quote a few sentences relevant to the theme of this conference. Mr. Cordiner said:

"America is undergoing profound change and growth, part of a world wide crisis of change. The company that does not anticipate these changes and plan accordingly is going to find itself like a fish out of water, in a strange and hostile environment."

At another point:

"We in business will have to become far more sensitive to the social and political undercurrents in this country. We will have to become students, humbly seeking to know more about the economic, political and ethical principles that vitalize this new people's capitalism. . . ."

Now hear this note of warning from Cordiner:

"We must anticipate the social, political and economic trends, both nationally and internationally, and help to shape them for the common good. We must also help the public understand these changes and make choices that are in their own best interests."

End of quote.

That was almost ten years ago. And what has business done about these words of advice and warning? Very little, as far as I can judge. But at least there *are* encouraging signs that *some* of the nation's top business leaders recognize that the problem of business-government relations exists; that it can no longer be ignored; and that a realistic, unemotional approach must be developed.

All to the good, in the past two years there have been two notable discussions on the urgency for developing a relationship between business and government that is viable and meaningful.

The July 17, 1965 issue of Business Week carried a symposium of views on the subject. Views of the nation's eminent business leaders. Men like AT & T's Kappel, duPont's Copeland, IBM's Watron, Morgan Guaranty's Gates and others.

In the autumn of 1966, Business-Government Relations was a major theme of the National Industrial Conference Board's 50th Anniversary Convocation at New York City.

These are efforts I applaud. They serve a variety of useful purposes. Such discussions center the attention of our great-corporation community on a massive and complex problem whose solution is pivotal to maintaining our system of private enterprise, a healthy economy and the autonomous status of our institutional corporations in an unregimented society.

But eloquent speeches by business leaders are not enough. No matter how eminent the speaker or how prestigious the forum. The time has come to substitute deeds for words. Business-government relations as a matter of concern is *not* new. One of the earliest and most thoughtful studies of the problem in all its ramifications appeared as far back as 1943! Read it if you can. *Business and Government Tomorrow* by the late Donald Richberg and published, I might add, under the aegis of Stanford University.

What we need *now* is for the declarations of today's business leaders to be translated into the management policies and actions of our institutional corporations.

But in doing so, managements should bear in mind that there is an essential distinction between what I call the *traditional* areas of relations between business and government and the *new* kind of business-government relations called for by the age in which we live.

Let me make myself entirely clear on this point.

Modernizing business-government relations

I do *not* propose on this occasion to dwell on the traditional business-government relationships which have been with us for a long, long time. To be sure all of them are constantly expanding and are important to the government, to the business community as a whole, and to specific corporate entities. There are many such areas. For example:

Government as the massive purchaser of the products and services of industry. The defense and space-marketing sector is a highly specialized segment of the government environment—with its own structure of policies, procurement trends, regulations and management techniques. To a lesser extent, the same is true of other areas of government procurement.

Then there's the vast field of *management-labor relations*—where the government shifts from its role of customer to that of policy-maker, mediator and regulator.

And of course there are the long-established areas of regulation such as transportation, communications, food and drugs, rail and corporate mergers, monopoly and antitrust, trade practices, securities and their marketing.

The list could go on and on. But in all these areas the companies involved have been active for many years. Many have well-organized, experienced and skillful departments and personnel to anticipate problems and to deal with them in long-established and familiar surroundings as they arise.

So I will limit my comment on these *traditional* fields to one general observation. There is certainly plenty of room for improvement in practically all of them. But the improvement basically involves changes in attitude and behavior within a long-established and institutionalized framework.

In any event . . . even if we could produce instant and optimum improvement in these traditional areas they are inadequate as mechanism for coping with the problems of tomorrow. Problems that challenge the combined initiatives and resources of business *and* government.

What I am concerned with is something *new.* A new *concept*—with a new *purpose.* Not an adversary or buyer-customer relationship. But one designed to develop a new kind of continuing cooperation between business and government. What I call "coexistence diplomacy."

The new *purpose* is to mobilize the resources of government *and* the managerial, technological resources and entrepreneurial skills of our total business community to the solution of the awesome problems this age of technological, political and institutional change has thrust upon us. Such as:

Reconstruction of our physical environment.

Conservation of our human and natural resources.

Vital as these are, there are other problems of even greater urgency. Particularly, the necessity of coping with explosive tensions which threaten to disrupt our social fabric and undermine public order.

Problems like these and others of like moment will be with the nation long beyond our times. But our job at *this* time—if we are to avoid a regimented society—is to organize the machinery of continuing cooperation by which such problems can be anticipated and analyzed; proposed solutions evaluated; and the consequences of feasible alternatives rationally assessed before final action is taken.

In establishing the machinery of cooperation, the initiative should be taken by the managements of the institutional corporations of our business community. Responsibility for exercising that initiative *cannot* be ignored or permitted to go by default.

For any such default will be cured by the government moving in to fill the vacuum. Invariably at the expense of the private sector of our economy.

II. TOWARD A COEXISTENCE DIPLOMACY

The role of our institutional corporations

The principal parties in interest to the development of a viable system of continuing cooperation between business and government are three. The total business community. The government. And the nation's universities, which educate and train the business and government leadership of tomorrow.

Of these highly specialized cultures, the institutional corporation is the only one having at its disposal the combination of managerial resources, the entrepreneurial skills and the organizations ability necessary to launch the new form of business-government cooperation on a *company-by-company* basis.

And its immediate stake? Incentive? The modern institutional corporation has responsibility for and is responsive to a variety of groups. In effect, it serves a form of stewardship. For its shareholders. Customers for its products or services. Employees. Supplier. Dealers and distributors. The local and state communities where it does business. These diverse groups have two unifying interests. One is the economic well-being of the company and their participation in the business prosperity it generates. But all of these groups have a broader and related *social interest*—their common concern with the political tranquillity and social stability of the environment in which the company must function.

In a market economy such as ours—based on full employment—political tranquillity and social stability are the underpinnings of business prosperity. The Employment Act of 1946 squarely places on the government the burden of maintaining maximum employment to the extent the business system fails to provide it. This is a fundamental fact of business life that should be a matter of grave concern to all modern management.

For this *new* dimension of business leadership, the managerial concepts, attitudes and skills that sufficed for an earlier day will no longer do.

Let me cite an example of what "will no longer do."

A favorite attitude, emotionally defended by many managers, goes like this. Economics and politics are different things which should be kept separate and apart. Economics is the responsibility of business; politics is that of government. Neither should encroach on the preserve of the other. Of course a basic tenet of this philosophy is the creed that business discharges its full social responsibility by producing and distributing goods and services with maximum efficiency.

This was an understandable attitude under conditions existing forty years ago. *Then* business functioned under ownership-management in a *laissez faire* economy of scarcity where all able-bodied men had to work in order to eat. But such an atttiude is blind to the grim realities of an age of economic abundance in which everybody has to eat and consume like mad so that there may be enough work for all!

Like it or not. The Act of 1946 made business and government interdependent partners in the realization of a primary goal of our domestic policy—full employment.

Inevitably, pressures for action which will generate employment are concentrated on the government. And the government environment—the Executive Branch where legislation initiates and both Houses of Congress where it is enacted into law—has become the arena in which the political, economic and social future of the nation is moulded. *Government* has become the principal engine of institutional change.

Here is the challenge facing the managements of our institutional corporations.

They must *understand* the forces brought to bear on the government environment and help shape their thrust in the best interest of the nation as a whole.

They will have to get organized to do the kind of job the new era of business-government relations calls for.

The "form" of that organization will vary from corporation to corporation, depending on the nature of its business, the degree of sophistication of its management and other factors. But "form" is of secondary importance. So long as two simple but basic principles are observed:

First: The business-government relations of institutional corporations must be established as a continuing corporate function and as a prime management responsibility.

Second: It must be based firmly on a well-organized and continuing research and analysis of the government environment—conducted with the same skill the company devotes to the continuing research and evaluation of its technological and market environments.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of these two interrelated principles to the integrity and success of the company-by-company approach to business-government relations I have outlined.

And let there be no misunderstanding about this. The new management portfolio should not be confused with traditional areas of business-government relations. It is beyond their scope. As it is beyond the scope of conventional staff services.

This means it must be given appropriate status in the company's hierarchy and power structure. Status which will attract to its service—from within the company, or at least the industry in which it functions—men with the intellectual capacity, political maturity and communications skills who are able and willing to assume the responsibility and risks the new portfolio entails.

This is the most promising way I can think of by which our great corporations can organize to anticipate and take action—that is, creative initiative—on the problems that affect society as a whole—where a default in private leadership not only invites government action, but makes it imperative.

And in so modernizing their managements, the nation's business leadership would convince the government and the other leadership groups of the nation that it is conscious of the *public* responsibility of *private* power.

So much for the conceptual and organizational aspects of my proposal.

Can the company-by-company approach work in actual practice? Let me cite a few examples in such unrelated fields as slum rehabilitation, water pollution and education.

U.S. Gypsum Company acquired a block of tenements in New York City's Harlem slum and is rehabilitating them into decent standard dwellings at less than half the unit cost of new public housing. *Without* the destruction of communities, homes and the uprooting of families entailed in relocating families to make way for public housing. In so doing, it has made a significant contribution to the political stability and social tranquility of one of the nation's most explosive slum areas.

West Virginia Pulp and Paper Company. The company invested $4 millions to install in Virginia an advanced biological process for treating industrial waste from paper manufacturing processes. It has helped the States of Maryland and Pennsylvania finance municipal plants to clean up slum pollution. Not only are the plants in Maryland and Virginia cleaning up industrial wastes but they are treating domestic sewage from nearby municipalities as well. These communities benefit doubly from the company's pioneering effort in social responsibility.

Radio Corporation of America. In 1965, following the lead of the General Electric Company (which teaches more people than any institution in New York State, public or private) RCA assigned 15 of its top scientists and engineers to deliver classroom lectures at four Brooklyn high schools. The idea caught on quickly and now eight other industrial firms have pooled their resources with RCA to conduct regular lectures and demonstrations on contemporary science for New York City high school students.

Think of what this means to young people at the most impressionable and formative stages of their lives. Sharing with outstanding scientists—coming directly from the lab—a glimpse of activities at the frontiers of science and an insight into the scientists' private world of exploration.

These are only three instances. There is an enormous social potential if these examples were to be multiplied by other businesses—large, medium and small, from coast to coast—making their talents, and techniques available to improve the environment of their own communities!

In a much broader framework, our institutional corporations could make a tremendous contribution to the ultimate solution of one of our most critical national problems. I refer to a privately financed, privately directed citizens' organization—sponsored by our institutional corporations but completely independent of business or any level of government—to develop a sound national water policy. A policy which would place in true national perspective the component elements of the total water problems . . . resources development, distribution, quality, conservation and utilization.

Business leadership at State and local levels of government

The Administration approaches the reconstruction of the nation's physical and social environment under the banner of "creative federalism." This concept envisages a broadly-based federal effort joined in common purpose with that of other levels of government—state and local—and all types of private institutions.

Federal grants-in-aid for the past 3 years total $40 billion. Public spending by state and local governments runs at a rate of $70 billion a year and is expected to top the $100 billion mark by 1970.

It is in this vast, community or grass roots public investment that all business has a vital stake. And an unrivalled opportunity for public service which improves the quality of community life and advances its own enlightened self-interest.

And this is where medium-size and small-business leadership can make a crucially important and effective contribution.

For I believe that most of the nation's environmental problems, physical or social, will lend themselves to practical and lasting solution *only* if they get the benefit of local diagnosis and the interest of local people who, as the Quakers say, "have a concern."

No Administration operating out of Washington through a massive bureaucracy can some up with a local approach to local problems.

Our Big Business system—made up of institutional corporations operating on a nationwide basis from far-off executive suites—is not in the best position to provide a local diagnosis and approach to local problems.

But the medium and small businessmen of the nation "have a concern." They *can* and *must* play a decisive role.

They have a vital interest in the political stability and social tranquility of the community in which they do business. The business effort to improve the economic situation in Watts is a vivid illustration. And they can help improve the physical environment so that their communities remain attractive places in which people can and want to live and work and play. These are the elements that build a better quality of community life. And more. They are the essential preconditions to business prosperity on which the welfare of the community and the financial stability of the local government depend.

Businessmen must safeguard these precious stakes. By every means at their disposal. And they have the ability to do so. An ability commensurate with their interests and obligations.

They can "spot" potential problems, social or environmental, long before they become acute. Being activists by temperament, they are usually able to propose workable solutions *before* the social reformers move in with grandiose schemes. Of course, this takes time and initiative and community leadership. But it is the kind of leadership the communities have every right to expect from their businessmen.

What I am suggesting is that local businessmen can and should engage in—at the local and state levels—the kind of business-government relations for which they are uniquely qualified.

Otherwise the results are predictable and inevitable. Local demagogues needled by social reformers put the pressure on City Hall. More bureaucracy. More expansion of the public sector. All paid for largely by the expansion of the local debt-structure. With this goes a progressive weakening of the business sector, an undermining of its capabilities to generate a high level of private employment and healthy economic growth.

But when businessmen and citizens' groups go to work with a will, the results can be dramatic. It has been done. In California, as I have said, in Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Newark, New Haven. In each of these, non-political groups—local businessmen—have given revitalized leadership to projects for the well-being of *all* in the community. Of course they were busy people. But not too busy to "have a concern."

In the cities I have mentioned there have been some very practical bonus results. The business leadership won the respect and appreciation not only of the citizens but of the local government officials. Their intelligent and purposeful activity has made certain that federal aid funds flowing to their communities will support the local plans and programs they helped to develop. Plans that serve the best interests of the community as a whole rather than those of the noisiest pressure-groups.

Building tomorrow's leadership: The mission of our universities

A phenomenon of our times is the fact that we have become a nation of specialists and highly specialized leadership-groups.

Now, specialization is not peculiar to the world of business alone. Technology, coupled with the tendency to bigness and concentration, has made it almost endemic in all segments of our society. In Government. The Military Services. The Universities. Science and Technology. Even in our ancient and respected professions of Law and Medicine, the generalist has all but disappeared.

For all the vast benefits it has brought us, specialization is fraught with danger to a democratic society such as ours, where our free institutions must be safeguarded by continuing communication and interaction among its specialized leadership groups.

In actual practice the vice of this system of pluralistic specialized leadership is that it is no one's responsibility to worry about the questions that *cut across* the specialties. These usually are the most important questions facing our society. And what happens is that any question that cannot be dealt with by one or more of our specialized leadership-groups tends to be dealt with by the government.

One of the features of the approach to business-government relations I have proposed is that it is designed to attract from within each corporation's hierarchy men with the competence and the temperament to deal with problems that cut across specialities.

But where will the business-government leaders of tomorrow come from?

The university is one of society's most cherished institutions, everywhere regarded as a principal agency whereby a country may protect the future as well as its past. It is also the one indispensable source for trained leadership for almost every segment of our society.

If we hope to achieve a feasible and practical framework that will establish continuing and effective communication between business and government on the transcendent issues of our times, it is up to the *university* to provide the kind of education and training that will prepare tomorrow's business and government leadership to meet the task.

The university must plant the seed-corn for a new crop of business leaders. Potential leaders conditioned *not* to a speciality, but to an understanding of and willingness to cope with problems and issues that cut across the specialities.

I believe this is a crucial problem which I hope our universities will be able to solve. Lest you think this is only of passing importance, I refer you to a brilliant essay on the subject. Eloquent. Lucid. Penetrating and brief. And written by a distinguished member of the Stanford Advisory Council—the present Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, John W. Gardner. The title of the piece is *The Anti-Leadership Vaccine*. Be sure to read it.

Surely, if the modern corporation is worth preserving as an autonomous and socially responsible institution of our pluralistic society, then the *university's mission* must be to develop a new managerial philosophy to accomplish that purpose. It must, in sum, develop a new breed of leaders with the intellectual equipment, political maturity and the communications skills indispensable to the business-government leadership of the future.

This is a vast project. But the nation's graduate schools of business administration can lead the way toward realization of these goals.

A fresh approach by government

I believe government should welcome business' efforts to establish a coexistence diplomacy. It should encourage a "cultural exchange" between business and the public service culture of government. Each has much to gain from better understanding of the other.

To be sure, during the past few years some "cultural exchange" contacts have been arranged under the auspices of the Brookings Institution and other institutions of like character. But these efforts are only a drop in the bucket.

The kind of business-government relations I propose would go a long way toward multiplying and routinizing contacts between business and government on a company-by-company basis. It certainly would improve, expand and institutionalize the channels of communication far beyond the present traditional areas.

Let a substantial number of institutional corporations listed in the FORTUNE 500 organize their business-government relations function on a continuing basis and as a prime management responsibility; and the results—over a few short years and regardless of what Administration may be in office—would be a long overdue reorientation in the concepts, attitudes and prejudices held by each side about the other.

There is another way in which the government could play a constructive role. It could speed the reconstruction of our physical environment by enlisting the profit incentive for the service of public purpose. This would be a real breakthrough. A kind of economic "system engineering."

In the highly specialized organization of the federal government the Council of Economic Advisors and the Bureau of the Budget provide the point where all its policies and programs, revenues and expenditures can be seen in focus and perspective. It would be my hope that the President direct the Council and the Bureau to undertake a *continuing study of what combination of profit and tax incentives would best provide the stimulus* necessary to mobilize the enormous managerial and technological and scientific resources of our big business system to the reconstruction of our nation's physical environment.

This, as I see it, is the big picture of business and the government environment as 1967 ushers in the last third of the century in which we live.

If it has a grand design, it is my faith that a free society—with millions of points of initiative—will produce swifter progress with greater liberty than *any* system of centralized control, whether coercive or manipulative.

And it is a major article of that faith that the organized and continuing business-government relationship I propose could unleash these millions of points of initiative toward the democratic solution of the awesome problems that confront us.

Perhaps in the past leaders of all segments of the business community—like the leaders of other specialized groups—have not felt that such lofty considerations were a part of their assignment.

They are now.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON SUBMITS COMPREHENSIVE DRAFT REVISION PLAN

The SPEAKER. The Chair has previously agreed to recognize at this time the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, 5 days ago in Rochester, N.Y., I sponsored a citizen's conference on the Selective Service System. At that conference, which included 4½ hours of testimony and questioning, nearly every shade of opinion on the question of draft revision was discussed. As a result of that conference, and of my study of the whole area of military manpower needs and procurement methods, I am today introducing a comprehensive plan for revision of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

The plan I am submitting today seeks to eliminate a great number of inequities and weaknesses in the present law:

First, it eliminates the preferred position and treatment afforded deferred students under the present system;

Second, my bill follows the announced preference of the Defense Department for younger inductees;

Third, it provides for a shortened period of draft eligibility;

Fourth, it offers a plan whereby during peacetime, the period of uncertainty for a potential inductee would be shortened from seven to no more than two years;

Fifth, it provides for the maximum utilization of acquired skill and specialization of an inducted individual;

Sixth, it provides liberalized and improved procedures for appeal of classification and induction decisions;

Seventh, it provides for selection of inductees from a national manpower pool, established under clear priority categories;

Eighth, my plan provides for random selection of inductees from the national pool;

Ninth, it provides for national standards and regulations governing student deferments and occupational deferments; and

Tenth, it provides for a mandatory period of first priority eligibility for one year, with certain exceptions, for students who have completed one postsecondary school educational objective for which they have been deferred. Under this provision, those receiving undergraduate degrees who had not previously fulfilled a year of first priority eligibility and who are not going directly into medical or dental training, would be required to fulfill this first year of undeferred eligibility before obtaining a second educational deferment for graduate study.

Since, under my bill, one receiving a student deferment automatically waives any right to a marital or fatherhood deferment after the expiration of his educational deferment, this provision will tend to lessen the number of husbands and fathers who will be eligible for induction without deferment. Since a higher percentage of graduate students marry than undergraduates, this provision will tend to eliminate uncertainty and/or the service obligation before a student becomes a husband or a father.

A second object of this provision is to eliminate induction of too many men after they have completed highly specialized graduate education. One of the persuasive points brought out at the Rochester conference was that a large number of graduate specialists are drafted and assigned to nonspecialized duty. This means that specialized manpower goes underutilized, since it is limited by the Defense need for the particular specialty. Also, it means a costly career interruption for many such specialists. This provision makes a choice for the prospective graduate student, which will interrupt his career at a less crucial time.

THE LATE WHARLEST JACKSON, A NEGRO CIVIL RIGHTS LEADER

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, Monday night, February 27, 1967, Wharlest Jackson, a Negro civil rights leader, was killed in Natchez, Miss., thereby becoming the 83d person to die in civil rights strife since 1951. This list of deaths is already a national disgrace which we can never expunge. We can at least serve notice now that such cowardice and injustice shall no longer be tolerated.

Mr. Jackson, treasurer of the local branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, recently had been promoted to a higher job in one of the local industries on the basis of merit. Whether this fact, since he had displaced a white person, or his civil rights activities was the cause of the dastardly attack is at this time unknown.

The killing, another in a long series of racial violence on the Mississippi Delta, again reveals to the world a weakness in our system of justice that has permitted a long list of such attacks on our citizens to go unpunished. It is precisely such practices that have gone a long way in producing the crisis in race relations now facing our country, North and South alike.

While city and county officials in Mississippi have joined in condemning the murder as irresponsible, their concern must be viewed within the context of a system that too long has been tolerated in our Southern States—that whites are not to be brought to trial, or if tried, then not to be convicted for the slaying of a Negro.

Unfortunately, the record to date offers little hope that this southern tradition is likely to be broken in this case or in the foreseeable future.

The incident, however, points up again, if emphasis is needed, another reason for the early enactment of a Federal civil rights law providing more adequate protection to civil rights workers, equal employment opportunities, and jury reforms.

Pertinent to this point is a telegram which I received today from the executive secretary of the NAACP, Roy Wilkins, which I insert at this point in my remarks:

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 28, 1967.

Hon. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Last year the House passed the 1966 civil rights bill although it later was killed in the Senate. The House was right and the bill, containing the provision for Federal prosecution in cases where persons are persecuted and even killed for seeking their human rights, should have been passed by the Senate. Yesterday Wharlest Jackson, father of six children, was murdered in Natchez, Miss., by a bomb in the engine of his pickup truck which exploded as he was driving away from his work at the plant of the Armstrong Tire and Rubber Company. Jackson, who had just been upgraded by the company, had been treasurer of the Natchez NAACP. In August 1965, George Metcalfe, then president of the Natchez NAACP was maimed for life by a bomb in the engine compartment of his car in the parking lot at the Armstrong plant. The Civil Rights Bill of 1967 sent to Congress February 15 should be enacted without delay unless the Congress wishes to give absolution to Natchez killers.

ROY WILKINS.

Mr. Speaker, the killers of Wharlest Jackson must be apprehended and brought to trial. Likewise, we must redouble our efforts in this Congress to provide added protection in such cases at the Federal level which seems necessary if such protection is to be provided at all. It is clearly up to the advocates of home rule and States rights to prove, which thus far they have failed to do, that such Federal action is not required in the enlightened self-interests of our country.

ADVERSE EFFECT THAT MOUNTING TEXTILE IMPORTS ARE HAVING UPON OUR DOMESTIC TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I pointed out to my colleagues in the House recently the adverse effect that mounting textile imports are having upon our domestic textile industry.

My congressional district has the heaviest concentration of textile plants of any section in the United States. Many of the textile mills in my district have been forced to curtail operations due to the unfair competition brought about by low-wage textile imports. As a result, many textile employees are working only 2 or 3 days a week, and in some instances plants have temporarily suspended operations.

The Gastonia Gazette at Gastonia, N.C., recently carried a series of very fine articles concerning the difficult situation in which the domestic textile industry has been placed by reason of inordinate textile imports.

The Gazette is located in the heart of the textile manufacturing area in this country. The articles in question were written by Paul Crooke, a very fine staff writer with a keen insight into the problems of the textile industry. I include his excellent articles in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks:

[From the Gastonia (N.C.) Gazette, Feb. 19, 1967]

THEY WANT ACTION—TROUBLESOME IMPORTS BOTHER TEXTILE MEN

(By Paul Crooke)

The textile industry is worried about its future.

Chief cause of concern is the increasingly troublesome problem of imports from foreign countries.

Textile men say they think that what was a good arrangement to bring order out of confusion has failed badly because of inadequate administration by government.

At the same time, however, there is quiet optimism that help will be forthcoming, if for no other reason than that the situation is so bad it calls attention to itself.

There appears to be a strong preference throughout the industry to speak quietly and with restraint, to depend on reason and negotiation to arrive at a workable program.

The American Textile Manufacturers Institute has proclaimed what its members think necessary for health and continued growth of the domestic industry.

It is opposing any tariff cuts further to benefit exporters of textiles to the United States.

It is calling for extension of the Long Term Arrangement which will have completed its five-year run and expire next September.

And the ATMI wants man-made fiber and wool textile controls added to cotton products controls now in effect.

The Combed Yarn Spinners Association, representing a part of the textile industry, a most important part as far as this area is concerned, is of like mind.

Local mill men, expressing concern and a need for action, point to curtailment in some plants, threatened curtailment in others, and all the implications of reduced income and lowered consumer buying.

They indicate J. H. Campbell, mainspring of the Combed Yarn Spinners Association, as their industry watchdog and spokesman.

Campbell said the present situation has roots back in the late 1950s. In the final year of that decade, only about one million pounds of cotton yarn, for example, was imported into the United States.

The following year, the figure was 15 million pounds.

Behind the extraordinary growth was one enabling circumstance over which the United States had no control, and one cause which was set in motion by the Americans.

There was and remains a very large differential in one of the chief costs of production, wages. American workers earn more, in most cases very much more, than textile workers in other parts of the world.

When the U.S. undertook to allow more cotton to be sold abroad, it devised the two-price cotton system by which foreign buyers could buy American cotton at a lower price than domestic industry could buy it, the government making up the difference.

By the time the gradually increasing subsidy had reached six cents a pound, manufactured product imports had become a big problem as foreign countries recognized and jumped at a golden opportunity to take a slice of the American market.

There was nothing wrong in the principle of sharing the market, from the textile men's point of view.

As the ATMI put it in one of its publications:

"Achievement of our country's foreign policy goals depends to some degree on permitting both developed nations which help block Communism and underdeveloped nations which we want on our side to engage in profitable trade with us."

To that end, the domestic textile industry considers that it has demonstrated its willingness to do its part.

By 1960, the problem of textile imports was so pronounced that both presidential candidates committed themselves to action, if elected, to bring some order to the increase in imports.

Before September, 1961, under pressure from President Kennedy, negotiations had been completed for a Short Term Agreement to level off imports.

The STA, to run from Oct. 1, 1961 through the following September, was to serve as the basis for negotiation of a five-year Long Term Arrangement.

Foreign manufacturers, to no one's surprise, sought to establish as large a base as possible in order to achieve the higher long-term volume.

The STA originally had 18 member nations. The number grew to 30 for the LTA.

"An inherent provision" was that imports from any given country could increase five per cent per year, or up to 15 per cent for five years.

There was further provision which permitted any country unilaterally to restrict imports from anywhere if the importing nation suffered "market disruption." In contrast to other rules under General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, there was to be no indemnity for cutbacks or opening of other categories of goods in compensation.

Also, the agreement encouraged the development of bilaterals between any two nations within the framework of the larger agreement.

Both the larger agreement and the bilaterals were considered good ideas. But there were flies in the ointment.

[From the Gastonia (N.C.) Gazette, Feb. 20, 1967]

TEXTILE IMPORTS—NO CEILING, NO END IN SIGHT

(By Paul Crooke)

Immediately after the Long Term Arrangement was signed, things began to happen.

The industry has to use figures to show what happened and how quickly.

Whereas in 1961, under STA, some 14 million pounds of yarn, for instance, was imported—which was high in the effort to build bases for the future—by 1962, the figure had climbed to 28 million, and continued to grow.

The year 1964 marked the end, after a very long and hard fight by textile industry area congressmen and senators, to the two-price cotton era.

With one of the major advantages removed, imports dropped that year back to 16 million pounds and, by 1965, came to 21 million pounds, which was not considered too inconsistent with ideas of normal growth, although definitely on the high side.

Under expectation that the outline of the agreement would be adhered to, the domestic industry had made its plans, including modernizing plants and equipment, at great cost, with apparently solid reason for optimism.

The 1966 figure for imports of yarn, combed and carded, was put at more than 89 million pounds.

There is no ceiling on any country, and there is no end in sight.

Thus far this year, imports have come—in three months—to 21 million pounds. If LTA projections had held good, imports for the year would come to 32 million.

The textile men are still convinced the LTA was a good idea and still is; they want it renewed and supplemented with agreement on non-cotton goods.

The trouble has been in administration.

The LTA was to be administered in each country by a special committee for that purpose.

In the United States, it was the Inter-Agency Textile Advisory Committee. It consisted of a presidential representative, and the Secretaries of Commerce, Labor, Treasury, State, and Agriculture.

In practice and for understandable reasons, the work load fell on subordinates and their machinery.

Thus, in one area, the prime matter of international trade had dropped from top-level control, under congressional scrutiny, into third, fourth, and even lower echelons of government.

As imports soared higher and higher above the projections—upon which the domestic industry based its plans—there were repeated warnings from the industry and from congressmen that the market was being threatened badly.

Nothing was done to find that market disruption did in fact exist, and nothing was done to slow the growth rate of imports.

Explanation as to why not is given with confidence of the industry that it is right.

The rule of unanimous consent was in effect—any negative vote was a veto—and the domestic industry encountered the veto time and again.

It came from State.

The philosophy of "easy giving to win friends and influence people" was hurting.

There are two lines of thought expressed in Congress and out.

One is that the government believed that "now" was the time to "open up" to the end of a freer trading world and the U.S. contribution to it, that the impact of imports could be absorbed with no great and permanent damage to the industry.

Others insist on a harsher explanation:

That the American textile industry is, in effect, expendable.

It was judged, so the argument goes, that a textile industry would be one of the easiest for a developing country to achieve.

And, to continue, that the development of such countries was more important in the long run than the industry in the United States.

Theory attributed to the planners in government was that textiles as an industry could dissipate—its energies, skills, and money being absorbed into industry of a higher technological order.

It is to this point that the textile men speak of the industry as a basic one, second only to steel in national defense. A healthy domestic textile industry is and will continue to be an absolute essential.

And they argue that economic considerations are merely one part of the picture. There are social and humanitarian aspects which takes such expression as "why worry so much for the textile worker in Hong Kong and so little about the one in Gastonia?"

And, as it stressed in Congress by Basil Whitener, the textile industry as much is in turn a part of an extremely important complex built around it.

There are literally hundreds of other industries to be affected, among them machinery manufacturing, chemicals, corn products.

There is evidence the latter point is winning converts. Help-the-textile-industry is becoming no longer a sectional cry as representatives join in who come from areas where partial dependency on the industry is made clear.

And, as with Appalachia, regional planning is taking into account, as it must, the basic role of textiles, including man-made and wool as well as cotton.

[From the Gastonia (N.C.) Gazette, Feb. 21, 1967]

SPECIAL CATEGORY—TEXTILE TROUBLE EASILY TRACED

(By Paul Crooke)

A large part of the trouble for American textile manufacturers which stem from imports falls into a special category.

The Long Term Arrangement to which the United States and some 29 other nations are committed was so constructed as to encourage the development of bilateral agreements between one country and another.

Bilateral agreements are being negotiated by the State Department. They involve about two-thirds of the exporters of textile products to the United States.

Each is a specified case, but the Combed Yarn Spinners Association points to some examples and to their effects.

In the spring of last year there was such an agreement reached with Hong Kong. In it, the United States agreed to an increase of 15 per cent over the previous agreement, plus a five per cent annual increase.

That contrasts with an estimated national growth rate officially put at about 4.5 per cent but which the textile industry thinks is actually somewhat less.

Last year imports under such an agreement with Mexico came to about 19 million pounds, whereas only five years ago the total was 450,000.

Imports from many other countries jumped by like percentages, or from zero to 18 million pounds. And the exporting countries ranged from Hong Kong, to Central America, to Pakistan, and to Africa.

The textile industry had thought it could count on orderly, equitable growth of imports, and had so based its plans.

But the confusion grew worse.

It is estimated that the U.S. balance of payments deficit will be this year some $1.3 billion. Of that figure, more than half will be due to textile imports.

J. H. Campbell, head of the Combed Yarn Spinners Association and an industry spokesman, stressed that it is understandable that other countries would seek to take the best advantage possible.

"Any country will do what it is not told not to do."

So the effect is that the orderliness upon which the industry counted, and invested, was not realized at all.

"Industry feels it has been let down by its government," is Campbell's matter-of-fact summation.

There were other problems. One was Vietnam.

Starting about September, 1965, there was a "difficult time."

The Defense Department found that its stores were much too low. In consequence, it began to place "astronomical demands" on the industry in a hurry-up build-up.

While the government requirements multiplied by a factor of perhaps 10 in one year, as delivery times got shorter and shorter, the textile industry struggled to keep up by producing at maximum and helping each other when and as needed.

The period 1965–1966 was one of great requirement.

"And industry met it."

But one further thing was required. Demand among knitters and weavers was so great and growing so fast for yarn to make fabrics that pressure for yarn imports mounted sharply.

So, while the domestic industry was for the first time beginning really to share substantially in general prosperity, there was even then an undermining force at work.

And what some industry men think is the State Department's "eagerness to give away" coincided with plausible justification.

Although the need was met in what the industry considers shining fashion, a most important lesson contained in the experience apparently was missed.

A sound, efficient, responsive, and capable textile industry is an essential in peace and war.

And there were smaller lessons missed, also.

One of them is that any concept of the textile industry as easy to develop is wholly wrong. It is an industry no longer of simple machines requiring minimum skills.

It is rather one of increasing technology, rising skills, greater management capability, and tremendously large investment.

Even the giant, steel, has come to realize that, according to reports of its activities, and to understand that the textile industry is not merely a thing within itself to be treated singly, but in fact the heart of a complex of industry upon which steels itself depends to a high degree.

Congressman Basil Whitner, who is credited by industry leaders as being as knowledgeable as anyone of the overall situation, has told his colleagues in Washington that, "The experience of the domestic textile industry under the long term agreement has not been in the best interest of the industry or of the American economy."

He went on:

"The flood of textile imports has decreased job opportunities for our people and is estimated to produce a balance of trade deficit of approximately $1 billion this year."

"Textile plants in my congressional district have been forced to curtail production as a result of competition through imports. A number of the mills are operating only three days a week. Others are closing completely for as much as two weeks at a time. During the past several weeks I have received hundreds of letters from constituents who earn their livelihoods in these plants expressing their concern over loss of income and the resulting personal hardships they experience."

[From the Gastonia (N.C.) Gazette, Feb. 22, 1967]

LOW WAGES ABROAD HURT, TOO—TEXTILES HURT BY IMPORTS

(By Paul Crooke)

The textile industry occupies an almost unique place in the thinking of American foreign policy makers.

The place is assigned to it by the belief that a strong hand in aid from the United States to developing countries is demanded by world conditions.

Both hemispheres have bumper crops of "new nations" and old but undeveloped ones crowding for a place on the world scene. It makes little sense to state a case for, say "African freedom," when the people are in fact enslaved by lack of opportunity.

And it makes little sense to demonstrate American principles in the Far East by fighting with arms while denying Asians the privilege of selling goods to us to earn their own place in the world.

There is a parallel belief that the United States must also maintain a good posture, for practical reasons of money and power politics, among the developed nations, such as Britain, West Germany, Japan, Italy.

Put another way, Japan is a great and highly developed nation where the textile industry has been cultivated to full bloom. Her friendship and cooperation in other matters is a bargain of allowing her to sell in this country in competition with our own industry.

The textile industry argues neither point in principle.

The industry does argue what it considers basic error in assumption and bad judgment in practice.

One error is the apparent belief that a textile industry is easy and quick to build and, that, with a little aid from the U.S., the world will be full of happily prosperous and grateful small friends.

Ever since the end of World War II, millions of dollars have been poured into the plans for and the construction of textile producing plants abroad, for textile mills, for technical assistance, management services, and so on down the list of needs.

While foreign capacity was thus boosted by American aid money, much of it supplied by taxes on the victim industry, exports to the United States were permitted to steadily grow easier.

In contrast, American mills find it increasingly difficult to balance imports by exports of their own. The big reason is that about 50 foreign nations virtually prohibit the import of American goods and another 20 countries have such high tariffs as to have the same practical result.

The industry considers it not good judgment, in view of that principle by foreign countries, to pursue full-throttle a good will course that gets no response.

Another ceiling on American exports is the very real one of costs. Two big elements are taxes and wages.

On the latter, ATMI supplies typical figures for 1965, the latest year for which comparable figures are computed.

While the American textile worker averaged $1.87 an hour, their counterparts in Italy got 53 cents.

In Spain, it was 37 cents, in Japan 36 cents, in Hong Kong 25 cents, in Brazil 18 cents, and in India 14 cents.

The cost of providing a textile job in the United States has risen from about $10,000 to about $50,000. The contrast is a gauge of the stress being placed on efficiency in the industry.

That great efficiency shows sharply in the higher pay the American worker receives. It is considered that it could show even sharper in still fatter pay checks of American workers if so much were not siphoned off indirectly to benefit non-Americans.

Textile men point to another error than that a foreign textile industry can provide many jobs, whereas in fact the cost per job is very high.

It is said also that the lion's share of imports is not coming from developing countries. It is coming from mature nations that ought to be able to stand on their own.

Japan is supplying more than half of all non man-made fiber imports and one-third of the woolen product imports.

Just as cotton export policy once was a great aid to foreigners, now American know-how in the production of other raw materials is being thrown back to the harm of the domestic industry.

In addition to its singular role on the foreign scene, the textile industry is highly sensitive to government action at home, such as faster depreciation now allowed, and to general conditions such as current prosperity.

In the wake of favorable developments since the 1964 end of two-price cotton, there is argument that the textile industry now enjoys "unparalleled prosperity."

But the fact is to the contrary. The third quarter of 1966 found the industry's net earnings on sales at 3.7 cents per dollar. That contrasts with 5.4 cents for American industry as a whole figured the same way.

Present earnings are higher, as the industry urged they would be, than the 1961 figure of 2.1 cents, but still are far behind the pack.

Wholesale prices of basic textiles have actually gone down since 1957–59. That is, they stood at 98, while the all-industries commodities index was at 105.4 of the base.

[From the Gastonia (N.C.) Gazette, Feb. 13, 1967]

A PLIGHT—SENSELESS TRADE POLICY

(By Paul Crooke)

The only way in which the American textile industry can portray what it considers its plight in the face of government encouraged imports is by the use of figures.

The American Textile Manufacturers Institute and the Combed Yarn Spinners Association have compiled a vast amount of data, category by category, comparing nation with nation, one year with another.

And spokesmen such as the CYSA's J. H. Campbell can translate from "cotton year" to fiscal year to calendar year with the ease of long familiarity.

One summary-type conclusion is:

"Since 1961, when the Seven-Point Textile Program was announced, imports have tripled, rising to almost three billion equivalent square yards.

"Current annual rates of imports are: for cotton, 1,853 million square yards; for man-mades, 809 million square yards; for wool, 187 million square yards. This is a 50 percent increase over 1965, which was then an all-time high."

All of the data seems to point in the same direction, and there appears to be no challenge of the figures.

The information on imports has been supplied repeatedly and forcefully to members of the Congress, as well as to officials of the executive branch, by industry spokesmen and by lawmakers concerned with the industry's health and worried about its problems.

Results have been minimal outside of Congress. But among the lawmakers there is stirring.

The textile men think they have made abundantly clear over and over that the health of the domestic industry is threatened.

They consider also that it is self-evident that a healthy American textile industry is essential now and in time to come. The textile men concede greater, or more basic, importance, only to steel.

Putting the two beliefs together, it is their position that America is suffering greater damage than it can sustain, by allowing a vital industry to be hurt too much.

Certainly, they believe, the injury being done is not approached by any gains which are being realized on the world scene.

It is a one-way proposition, involving a very real giving by American industry and American workers, but only speculative and sentimental reward.

And the combination of beliefs—that facts get little attention and the industry's welfare little concern—has been a fertile ground for the suspicion that the industry is being given away, surrendered; that, indeed, others are being paid to take it away from us.

The industry finds it foolish to abdicate in favor of other "have" nations, and absurd to try to transplant modern industralization to thrive where simple crafts tax the people's resources.

The one requires a kind of suicide and the other endless feeding from the American trough.

Textile industry people and new-found allies from related industries are stating their position for now.

It is that there be no tariff reductions on products coming into this country, and that the Long Term Arrangement be extended.

It is also that man-made fiber textile controls be created, along with wool textile controls.

And finally, it is that other countries permit American imports on the same basis that the United States permits their exports to come into this country.

Part of that position rests upon the belief, which is clearly expressed, that the Long Term Arrangement was, in concept and construction, a very good one, which would help the nation without hurting any part of it unduly.

Part of the position implies the same belief, that is, that what ought to have been good for one part of the industry could be good for all of it.

Blame for failure in achieving the LTA's purposes is placed at the door of its administrators.

The industry wants a better job done in the future, assuming that LTA is extended beyond next September, and assuming also even partial realization of its other goals.

And insurance that a better job will be done in the future has become a prime concern in the more sensitive legislative branch of government.

"The responsibility should be met by the Congress," 10th district Rep. Basil Whitener told his colleagues.

"Voluntary agreements negotiated by people in the executive agencies have failed to protect the job opportunities of the textile worker. The Congress should take a new look at the situation.

"I feel that Congress should by law regulate the importation of textile products and take whatever other means are necessary to guarantee the jobs of our people and the survival of the American textile industry and the cotton producer."

Referring to a "senseless" foreign trade policy, Whitener added a very strong denial of executive department freehand:

"I urge that the Congress once again assume its constitutional authority over the regulation of the foreign trade of the United States. The alternative is the destruction of basic industry and job opportunities for hundreds of thousands of our citizens."

PROBLEMS IN THE LABOR FIELD

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include pertinent extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1967, I introduced legislation to attack the problem of interruption of services resulting from strikes in the transportation industry.

On February 25, 1967, Mr. A. H. Raskin, assistant editor of the editorial page, of The New York Times, published an article in the Saturday Review entitled "Collision Course on the Labor Front."

This article points up some of the major problems faced in this area, and Mr. Raskin has some very interesting suggestions on possible ways to deal with them.

As the title of the article indicates, now is the time for us to begin to consider this matter, and now is the time to familiarize ourselves with the issues involved.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the article of Mr. Raskin:

COLLISION COURSE ON THE LABOR FRONT

(By A. H. Raskin)

"Never forget that the public occupies a third seat at the bargaining table," President Johnson likes to warn labor and management whenever their quarrels rock the economy. This year the public may feel inclined to ask whether the seat reserved for it is the electric chair, so dismal is the outlook for peaceful, noninflationary agreements on the industrial front.

Every early sign indicates that 1967 will be a year of labor turbulence. Unions approach negotiations in a dozen major fields convinced that high prices and high corporate profits entitle their members to the biggest wage increases ever. Employers, fearful that business is starting a downhill slide after six years straight up, are in a mood to fight unions harder. This fact alone would guarantee more discord even if there were less to fight about.

The public seems likely to wind up the loser whichever way the slugging match comes out. It will pay the price of more strikes in the cutoff of essential services and the dislocation of an economy already puffy with soft spots. But the community will get no bargain if the alternative to strikes is a decision by industry to give overlarge pay increases and then translate them into even bigger price increases. The current indications are for the worst of both worlds—more strikes and more inflationary settlements.

The most disturbing aspect of all this is that, in many strategic sectors of industry, no remote relationship exists between the capacity or social responsibility of the negotiators and the degree of damage they are able to visit on the economy. People need licenses to drive a taxicab, practice medicine, install plumbing, or clip hair. Yet labor-management negotiators who ought not be allowed to cross the street without a seeing-eye dog are free to inflict hardship on millions of their fellow citizens through sheer incompetence at the bargaining table. And there is not one thing anyone in the community can do to arrest them for reckless use of a dangerous economic weapon.

Three decades after the Wagner Act put a foundation of law under the bargaining process as a road to constructive industrial relations in the public interest, this process remains a field in which the ingredients of equity are incapable of acceptable definition. There is no standard by which to measure what is fair and what is extortionate, even where the community itself is the employer. Muscle is enshrined as the indispensable element, despite the enormous range of situations in which the government-certified size of the bargaining unit or the pivotal nature of the service affected makes the public the primary sufferer whenever unions and employers collide. The more ludicrous the whole performance becomes, the more insistently experts in and out of government explain why it all makes sense and why any action to protect the community by substituting reason for unrestrained force represents a stab in the back for Nathan Hale, Patrick Henry, and all the other apostles of American liberty.

The anniversary celebration of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service in Washington a few weeks ago turned into a barbecue of all who advocate new laws to keep the peace in industrial relations. The predominant view of the savants at the sessions was that the country already has too many labor laws, rather than too few. Yet only a year earlier, in the middle of New York's paralyzing public transportation strike, the President himself promised to send Congress proposals for dealing effectively with strikes which threaten "irreparable damage to the national interest."

Fulfillment of that neglected pledge would infuse some substance into the now vacuous concept of the public as a third force at the bargaining table. It is nonsense to suggest that the right to make war deserves sacrosanct status in the labor field when the zenith of aspiration in every other field, including the global relations of sovereign powers, is to banish that right. When all the people have to suffer because of the *wilfulness or ineptitude* of economic power blocs, the establishment of improved governmental machinery for breaking deadlocks is an affirmation—not a denial—of democracy.

The need for more dependable community safeguards is heightened by a confusing new crosspull in bargaining which is expanding the public's stake in socially responsible agreements at the same time that it cuts down the chances of getting them. One half of the pull comes from an AFL–CIO campaign to pool the economic strength of its major industrial unions in negotiations with the giant corporations in electrical manufacturing, chemicals, and other mass industries. At General Electric and Westinghouse, for example, the union goal is to compel management to sit down with a united front of eleven unions, instead of taking them on one at a time and thus exploiting their divisions.

Since each of the eleven unions has been officially certified over the years as sole bargaining representative for the workers in specific GE and Westinghouse units, the consolidation raises legal questions that the National Labor Relations Board and the courts will be stewing over for a long time. But, in the adversary terms that underlie most current labor relations, the federation's coalition tactics represent a perfectly logical maneuver to pit union centralism against corporate centralism. On that basis, it would be surprising if the unions did not find a way to preserve coordinated decision-making, no matter how many corkscrew turns that requires to avoid conflict with their separatist certifications.

For the community, of course, the bigger the orbit of bargaining, the greater the impact on the total economy when negotiations break down. If there is a strike under coalition aegis, all of a company's plants go down, not just those represented by a single union. That danger focuses the spotlight on the other half of the new bargaining crosspull—an increasing disposition on the part of rank-and-file unionists to reject proposed industry-wide settlements because they fail to deal adequately with local plant problems.

The effect of the two contradictory developments is to put unions in the position of creating new layers of centralized authority to move control over contract policy even farther away from the individual union members at the same time that these same members are already engaged in a kind of states' rights revolt against too much submergence of their day-to-day concerns in the mold of union bigness. The repeated recent result in other situations where several hundred thousand workers are covered by a single across-the-board negotiation has been to hold the whole enterprise in bondage over local issues after accord has been reached on all terms of the national pact. Coalition bargaining could mean a considerable growth in the frequency of such massive tie-ups built out of the pyramiding of thousands of relatively microscopic grievances.

Does this escalation of potential public hurt justify a law prohibiting coordinated bargaining? That could prove a dangerous answer in terms both of public protection and of equity. In several industries, notably the New York hotel trades, union coalitions are an important source of stability. By setting common objectives for all the unions that deal with a single set of employers, they rule out the chaos that is inevitable when each union tries to climb over the back of every other union to get something better than the others have got.

The most devout wish of New York's daily newspapers, now seeking to stave off their fourth crippling strike in four years, is to eliminate union whipsawing by persuading the ten crafts with which they negotiate to form a joint bargaining council. Such a coalition would free the publishers from their present necessity of running ten distinct strike gauntlets in every round of negotiations—a process that has contributed to the death since 1963 of the *Daily Mirror* and the *Herald Tribune*.

The nation's railroads are in danger of a strike in April or May because they cannot get the unions that represent their shopcraft employees to accept the same 5 per cent wage increase that has already been agreed to by most of the unions that speak for train crews. In the airlines, divided union representation added to the complications that bedeviled the companies and the White House in last summer's strike, one of the worst-botched episodes in national labor history.

An important factor in the strike called against five big airlines by the International Association of Machinists was the union's resolve to display its muscle as a shield against raids by two militant rivals, the Transport Workers Union and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. Before the strike was over, President Johnson had sustained two humiliating rebuffs at the Machinists' hands and had seen his wage-price guideposts chopped into matchsticks. But that didn't end the damage to the defenses against inflation. The unstruck airlines quickly bowed to notice that they could not keep flying unless they gave still larger pay increases to mechanics represented by the TWU and the Teamsters. Once again whipsawing was the fruit of an every-union-for-itself policy.

The simple fact is that the employers most resolutely opposed to coalition bargaining are those who believe they can use divide-and-conquer methods more effectively against the unions than the unions can against them. Companies such as General Electric and American Telephone & Telegraph, for instance, have established a dominant position in negotiations by practicing a kind of whipsaw in reverse. They capitalize on fragmented union strength by setting a handsome pattern with the first union in line, then insist that all the others accept pacts embodying substantially the same model. Employers blessed with so tidy an arrangement understandably see no virtue for themselves or the country in a change that would make government intervention virtually automatic whenever a union coalition threatened to post picket lines.

Nevertheless, it is delusive to contemplate a legislative taboo based on forcing unions to stay apart or on breaking big unions up into small ones. Grass roots unionism can never become the prevailing mode of organization in an economy whose prosperity is built on ever-increasing concentrations of industrial power. Every month brings reports of new mergers of corporate titans—the Pennsylvania and the New York Central, IT&T and ABC, Douglas Aircraft and McDonnell, on and on without end.

General Motors and United States Steel establish their overall labor policy at company headquarters, and it is silly to suggest that their union counterparts should attempt to bargain with them on a plant-by-plant basis. The question at General Electric is not whether the company wants to negotiate centrally with a union coalition, but whether that is what its employees want. If they alter their bargaining certifications to make such a desire clear, no law could forbid a united front on the union side unless it also called for a dissolution of GE—a remedy no one in industry or labor seriously believes would be in the public interest.

However, acknowledging the inevitability of bigness on both sides of the negotiating table implies no need to toss in the towel on the possibility of effective community restraints when the public gets mashed in the rockcrusher. The notion that any tampering with the right to strike sets the nation irretrievably on the road to Fascism is of a piece with the mindless sloganeering that caused labor to denounce the Taft-Hartley Act as a "slave labor law" when it was passed twenty years ago. Now that law, with its provision for eighty-day national emergency injunctions, has become the rock to which union chiefs cling in their effort to dissuade the President from recommending legislation better calculated to protect the public interest.

One reason that the general record of industrial peace has been good in the last seven years—an average of less than one workday in every 500 lost through strikes—is that all but one of the four classic sources of strikes have been largely closed out by a combination of law and private arbitration.

Law has been the saving element in what were once endless and costly battles over union recognition. Government election machinery has permitted a peaceful expression of employee will on unionization; the chief problem in this field now is whether the unions that win certification have a right, through coalition bargaining, to function as a holding company.

Strikes over jurisdiction also have been made illegal. The availability of federal injunctions to rescue employers caught in a squeeze between warring unions has spurred labor to set up independent machinery for resolving disputes over which union is entitled to what workers, a perfect illustration of the helpful interaction of public and private peace devices.

The most spectacular progress has been registered in the orderly adjustment of local grievances, once the most prolific and intractable focus of strike disruption. Contract clauses for arbitrating all disputes arising out of labor-management agreements are now virtually universal. To the extent that difficulties arise in this connection these days, they stem from a burgeoning tendency in local unions to squirrel away problems so that they can be used as a club in industry-wide bargaining, instead of being disposed of routinely through the grievance machinery.

The one big area in which no adequate system of public protection yet exists involves strikes that grow out of inability by unions and employers to agree on what should go into the contract. Too often this inability asserts itself in precisely the fields in which the public's stake is greatest—railroads, airlines, shipping, newspapers, and, closest to home of all, the public service.

An important part of the answer to this problem can come from a redefinition of the responsibility of the AFL–CIO, a logical extension of the new powers it has assumed as *pater familias* in the union coalitions at General Electric, Westinghouse, Union Carbide, and other corporate mastodons. The old watertight compartments of union autonomy began breaking down at the time of the AFL–CIO merger twelve years ago, under the force of union realization that the prestige and immunities of all labor hinged on the actions, for good or evil, of its affiliated unions.

The current threat to union status comes not from crooks, racists, or interunion raiders—all forces over which the federation has been given summary power. It comes from the community's irritation over crippling strikes and settlements that aggravate the upsweep in living costs. Under these circumstances little validity is left in the idea that every union has the right to do anything it wants for as long as it wants, with the central body confined to mumbling ritualistic expressions of solidarity. Experience in the Scandinavian countries has demonstrated how significant a role the *parent federation* can play in promoting industrial stability; it is time for a comparable demonstration here. Unhappily, the Meany-Reuther split and the likelihood of outright secession by the United Auto Workers cast a pall over the chances for any real unifying action now.

The advent of Big Three automobile negotiations this fall, plus the union drive for coalition bargaining in other key industries, calls attention to another area of inexcusable neglect in the erection of private defenses against economy-shaking strikes. In autos both the union and the companies have been at fault, after bad strike experiences in 1961 and 1964, in coming to the lip of new contract talks with nothing fundamental done to prevent a mountainous accumulation of local plant issues from again torpedoing a national peace settlement.

Year-round task forces, moving from plant to plant under joint top-level auspices, could help the locals liquidate their backlogs of problems and thus keep them from piling up as time bombs to put on the company-wide negotiating table. Such a program already has worked at International Harvester and Kaiser Steel; it deserves a sustained trial in other big companies to end the travesty that magnifies controversies over washrooms and parking lots into walkouts involving a quarter-million workers.

In general, the mechanics of bargaining require recasting to get rid of the explosive notion that the world stops on the date the contract runs out. The existence of an expiration deadline ("no contract, no work") has become the single most powerful element in the deification of force as the determinant of equity in industrial relations. Since public hardship is often the coin out of which victory is purchased, a considerable advance in national welfare will be registered when wider use is made of procedures for taking the countdown out of contract talks.

In its landmark report last year, the President's tripartite automation commission gave strong backing to the noncrisis approach. "Basic issues such as adjustment to technological change cannot be resolved by a small team of negotiators working themselves into a state of physical and mental exhaustion for a few months every two or three years," the panel said. "These issues must be dealt with patiently, carefully, and, above all, continuously until satisfactory solutions emerge."

In steel, the year-round bargaining process was dropped after it had become a political football inside the steel union, but much of the trouble there stemmed from a rank-and-file belief that the industry's joint Human Relations Committee was too conspiratorial in its operations and too remote from the union membership. Fuller reports to the members on the course of discussions might have guarded against this sense of a tiny group of leaders making all the decisions in a bombshelter totally cut off from outside communication or concern.

The very nature of the continuous consultation technique is an encouragement to the use of reason as an alternative to muscle. The emphasis organized labor is currently putting on weekly, annual, and lifetime income for blue-collar workers should help in the transformation of attitudes that is needed to downgrade the strike as the ignition key to higher standards. Once workers get off the roller-coaster of the hourly pay scale, it will be easier to scrap the stale ritual of "Stop the World—I Want to Get Off" every time a contract runs out. One hopeful sign is the recent decision of a local union representing 10,000 employees of the Schrafft's and Bickford's restaurant chains in New York to write into its contracts clauses guaranteeing that disputes over the terms of future agreements will be settled through binding arbitration, not strikes.

Until such voluntary renunciation of the right to strike becomes a much less isolated phenomenon, the basic burden for keeping the public from becoming the primary punching bag in industrial disputes will rest on government. The most apparent deficiencies in existing relationships are in the civil service, where the employer is the body politic and any exercise of union economic coercion is aimed directly at the public purse.

Strikes by firemen, nurses, teachers, doctors, transit workers, garbage collectors, and other groups of state and municipal employees have made it plain that present legal prohibitions on government walkouts have broken down. Even policemen have been involved in brief tie-ups. Unless prompt action is taken to shore up defenses at the local level, the contagion will spread to federal civil service workers, and the country will be moving backward rather than forward in public protection.

The essential elements for a sound law are simple enough: Exhaustive machinery to assure equity for public employees through union recognition and bargaining; impartial fact-finding to establish what is fair when no direct agreement is reached; fines against the union treasury and, in extreme cases, union decertification as a penalty for illegal strikes. However, one basic caveat goes with the emphasis on mandatory procedures. The citizens must be prepared to pay the price of economic justice for their public employees and not expect them to subsidize community agencies by taking less. No city has anything like enough money to do all the things that need doing in education, urban renewal, health and a thousand other fields. But no ban on civil service strikes is going to work for long if fact-finders go below the point of fairness to fit the municipal pocketbook or if the community reneges on the contract improvements the fact-finders declare deserved.

In private industry the yardstick for government intervention must be the extent to which a strike imperils the public interest. A lot of political rubber goes into the measuring rods the White House uses to determine what is or is not an emergency, as was illustrated most recently in the airlines strike, but it would be an exercise in futility to try to establish detailed criteria in an act of Congress.

Whenever the President decides the country's welfare requires action, he should have at his disposal a broad range of weapons in addition to the eighty-day Taft-Hartley injunction that is now his sole recourse. To be meaningful, intervention must not only assure uninterrupted operation but also provide a medium for impartial determination of the issues so that the disputes will not break out all over again the moment Uncle Sam steps out. A full-fledged labor court would introduce too much rigidity into the process, but compulsory arbitration of the kind used in the railroad feather-bedding case in 1963 ought to be one of the choices open to him. So should fact-finding injunctions, or temporary seizures covering all of a struck industry or only those parts that are deemed essential to meet national needs. The object of all these distasteful alternatives would be to make the whole process of Presidential intervention as painful as possible to both sides so that it does not get to be a habit. That goal might be further served by special tax levies on employers and suspension of union dues checkoffs during a period of government injunction or seizure. Out of such assorted tortures should come an enhanced appreciation on both sides of the virtues of private decision-making as an instrument for making decisions, not avoiding them.

The salvation of collective bargaining is up to labor and management. They can save it—or kill it. But they cannot tell the government to keep hands off in an interdependent economy in which 10,000,000 people work directly for federal, state, and local agencies, and the borderline between what is public and what is private in industry generally has become so blurred that it is hard to tell whether we have a mixed economy or a mixed-up one. Democratic values are not served when bumbling negotiators are given unlimited right to beat one another over the head, with the public welfare as the stick they use to do the beating.

WHAT KIND OF AN AMERICAN IS GEORGE WALLACE?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, there is a rumor circulating the country to the effect that George Wallace thinks he is a big enough man to be President of the United States. Maybe he is, although I have always doubted it.

At any rate, he is an acknowledged contender and should be considered as such. As an Alabama Democrat, he is the problem of the Democrat Party and not mine. Yet, if he wants to become a national leader, he becomes my problem, too, and I am therefore interested in just what kind of an American he is. A letter from a constituent gives a rather good insight:

> DEAR JOHN: Two weeks ago, on our way back from Florida, we came through Montgomery, Alabama, and stopped to see the Capitol.
>
> While the Capitol itself, and the surrounding buildings, are beautiful, there is one thing that hit us squarely. At the top of a high flag mast on top of the building is the Alabama state flag and directly under it is the confederate flag. No U.S. flag is in sight. We were met at the door by a charming hostess who did a job selling Alabama and the Wallaces and who, in her prepared presentation, mentioned that they were frequently criticized for not flying the U.S. flag on the dome. She explained that we would find one on a short mast in the south lawn, which we did. I have a picture of the combination.
>
> I realize that they are still fighting the war but I have no time for State Capitols not flying the U.S. flag above all others.

What kind of an American is George Wallace? Read the letter—"No U.S. flag in sight." If he had no other shortcomings I would say that on this fundamental issue alone, he certainly is not my kind of American. Maybe he thinks the boys in Vietnam should be under an Alabama banner rather than a U.S. flag.

There is a group of flag burners and desecraters in the country today. There is a group which finds Old Glory an abomination. George Wallace is clearly not of their ilk but it is curious, is it not, that a self-styled patriot who would lead our country spurns our flag. Of course, his wife is now the Governor but this cannot be said to be the responsibility of Mrs. Wallace. It clearly is the policy of George Wallace.

When anyone asks me what kind of an American George Wallace is, I will simply state "He belongs to that breed which finds our American flag repugnant. No flag, whether it be the Alabama flag or the United Nations flag, should ever take priority over Old Glory. He's not my kind of American."

I believe that my conservative credentials are reasonably well established. It cannot be said that I am a leftist seeking to downgrade George Wallace. In truth, I will not ever try to downgrade him. I believe that he will do it quickly enough by himself. No responsible conservative, in my judgment, could countenance support of him. His domestic record is one of opportunism. His disbelief in our flag might bring him some cheers in sections of Alabama but I think Americans are intelligent enough to take one look at him and say "Not for us."

THE GREAT RESEARCH BOONDOGGLE

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the March 1967 edition of the Reader's Digest carries a very appropriate article for this time of year entitled "The Great Research Boondoggle." As everyone familiar with Government service here in Washington knows, this is "appropriations time" when the many Federal agencies bring to Capitol Hill their budget requests and justifications for the coming fiscal year. The Appropriations Subcommittees of the House and Senate each year perform a monumental task in view of their limited staffs, the shortness of time and the complexity of the testimonies in reviewing the budgetary requirements of the vast network of Federal departments and agencies. Later in the year many volumes of printed hearings will be made public detailing the financial justifications rendered by the many Federal agencies to Congress.

Author William Schulz in the abovementioned article, has provided a valuable service in highlighting various questionable uses of taxpayers' moneys in the field of research. Commenting on some of the abuses in this field, Congressman RICHARD ROUDEBUSH, of Indiana, long a watchdog of Federal expenditures, stated: "The public has been taken."

To render to the public a partial accounting of the use of their tax dollars, I place the article, "The Great Research Boondoggle," by author William Schulz, in the RECORD at this point:

THE GREAT RESEARCH BOONDOGGLE

(By William Schulz)

Last October in Washington, D.C., newsmen were summoned to a press conference in the offices of the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc. There publication was announced of a new book in which the Federal Bureau of Investigation was assailed for exaggerating the nation's crime rate.*

Headlines carried the sweeping attack. Less publicized was this fact: the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) ladled out $231,000 to finance the study. Why? Simply because NASA thought that sponsoring such research, so remote from its official mission, would, in the words of a Washington *Post* reporter, lend it an image of "social concern"!

Fantastic as it may seem, the foregoing is a fairly typical episode in today's Washington. At this moment, when we are being told that government is paring expenditures to the bone, scores of similar projects are being financed in the sacrosanct name of "research" by a maze of government bureaus. What we have is, quite literally, a federal research craze, and it has mounted to absurd proportions.

No one denies that U.S.-supported research has led to gains in military technology, health and science. But this government-subsidized "research and development," now the second largest item in the bloated federal budget, has multiplied *five times* in the past decade—to a staggering total of *$16 billion* a year. Inevitably, this unchecked proliferation has brought on vast boondoggles, and also a regrettable waste of scientific manpower.

Researchers and scientists are alarmed. Famed biologist Dr. Paul A. Weiss, now on the staff of New York's Rockefeller University, says that the excessive federal largess has encouraged "shoddy, redundant, uncritical and ill-conceived research." Basil O'Connor, president of the National Foundation-March on Dimes, says, "The log-rolling and sheer waste which accompany ill-advised, massive government appropriations could undermine the public's confidence in the whole scientific enterprise."

Most concerned of all is Congress. A half-dozen committees have launched full-scale investigations, audited books, held hearings, quizzed federal officials and issued reports. After years of hacking his way through the complex jungle of federal research, Rep. Richard Roudebush, of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, concludes that there have been "senseless, tragic abuses of legitimate scientific inquiry." The Indiana lawmaker says bluntly: "The public has been taken."

Here are the main reasons why:

Everybody's in the act. Recently, the Library of Congress attempted to index the government's sprawling research program. After months of digging, the Library's experts reported that *no one* in the federal government knows precisely how many government-supported laboratories are in operation, where they are located or what they are doing.

The Defense Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation and NASA are the giants of federal research. But more than 30 other agencies have hopped aboard the bandwagon. The Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare spends more than $100 million a year on research ventures, among them: "Understanding the Fourth-Grade Slump in Creative Thinking." The Department of Agriculture spent five years revising pickle standards, spelling out in minute detail the difference between curved and crooked pickles.

The Commerce Department hired a private accounting firm to determine why shipping rates are lower on imported goods than on exported ones. Among the explanations: It is "more expensive to load and stow cargo than to unload it." Chairman John Rooney, of the House appropriations subcommittee overseeing Commerce, blew up. "Did you have to spend $95,000 to find that out?" he asked. "Any hatch boss on the Brooklyn waterfront could have given you the answer, without cost."

One consequence of the research craze is that federal agencies have orbited into areas far beyond their legitimate purview. For example, despite the reams of election analyses offered by news media, the National Science Foundation has doled out taxpayer dollars for a computerized study of the 1966 Maryland gubernatorial campaign.

Much of the federally financed research fails to meet what a House Government Operations subcommittee has termed "the test of urgency." The number of trivial projects has led one prominent scientist to explain: "We see bewildered youngsters composing research papers like abstract paintings, picking some colorful and fashionable words from recent literature, then reshuffling and recombining them into another conglomerate, both undigested and indigestible. Narrow specialists lavish their pet techniques in yet another dozen ways on what has already been superabundantly established to everyone's satisfaction."

Many projects are "makework." Sen. William Proxmire, of the Senate Appropriations Committee, has repeatedly accused federal officials of engaging in "research for the sake of research," in costly projects of little benefit to the taxpayer. "And the worst offender of all," Proxmire adds, "is the National Institutes of Health." The Senator maintains that there can be no justification for NIH support last year of such marginal projects as "A Social History of French Medicine, 1789–1815" ($11,782); "Emergence of Political Leadership: Indians in Fiji" ($10,917); and "Changing Patterns of (Moslem) Family Life" ($28,755).

The research bug has also bitten the commanding generals of the War on Poverty. Hardly a month goes by that the Office of Economic Opportunity does not award lucrative contracts to private researchers who operate what the magazine *New Republic* terms a "profitable parasite industry at the fringes of government." National Analysts Inc., a Philadelphia research firm, was asked, for instance, to gauge "low-income" reaction to "It's What's Happening, Baby!", a nationally televised rock 'n' roll show extolling the Job Corps. Critics roasted the program as "tasteless, degrading and obscene," but OEO shelled out $39,000 to determine why some underprivileged youths reacted favorably to it, while others did not.

The National Science Foundation has financed individual foreign junkets of what might well be considered dubious worth. Consider the case of Stephen Smale, a University of California mathematician working on an NSF project who spent the summer of 1966 traveling in Europe, with taxpayers picking up the $6,556 tab. A virulent foe of U.S. policy in Vietnam, Smale had organized California demonstrations aimed at halting troop trains. In Paris, he helped draft an anti-American resolution. In Moscow for a mathematicians' convention, he held a press conference at which—although he attacked Moscow's repressive intellectual atmosphere—he called what his own government was doing in Vietnam "much more dangerous and brutal" than the Soviets' massacre of Hungarian freedom fighters 10 years earlier.

Outraged, Representative Roudebush fired off an angry letter to NSF director Leland Haworth, insisting that federal tax funds should not be used to send abroad individuals who would "run down the policies of the United States government."

UNIVERSITIES SCRAMBLE FOR THE DOLLARS

Government agencies annually underwrite $2 billion in university research alone. Intensive investigation convinced the members of the House Subcommittee on Research and Technical Programs that massive research grants have actually harmed higher education by "excessively diverting scientific manpower from teaching."

Rep. Henry S. Reuss, chairman of this group, estimates that more than 40,000 faculty members have left the classrooms to work on federally financed research. He echoes the warning of Dr. W. T. Lippincott, a professor of chemistry at Ohio State University, that government support of research is "potentially the most powerful destructive force the higher education system has ever faced."

One institution, the University of California, receives $400 million a year in federal research funds—and leading members of its faculty are apprehensive about this. Sociology professor Robert A. Nisbet recently charged that many of the research projects at California and other large public universities could "more easily and appropriately be placed in non-university settings." He noted disapprovingly the growing practice in many universities of opening Washington offices, manned by "experts in the art of catching the scent of dollars over the horigon." (More than two dozen colleges and universities now employ Washington lobbyists.)

---

*The FBI flatly denies the charge. "The high volume of crime nationally," says Director J. Edgar Hoover, "is a fact which cannot be rationalized away."

Several colleges receive more than 40 percent of their operating budgets from federal research projects. The vast majority of these grants go to a relatively few universities. Result? Says a North Dakota educator: "The small institutions have been subject to so much faculty raiding by the more successful applicants for federal research funds that higher education of acceptable quality is moving beyond the reach of many young Americans."

Smoke screens veil waste. It is difficult for any member of Congress to question the massive research expenditures earmarked for "national defense." But the Special Investigating Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee uncovered a shocking situation when it probed the Aerospace Corporation, a "non-profit," Pentagon-created missile-research firm. To put it bluntly—and the subcommittee did—Aerospace officials have been getting fat at the public trough. For instance, president Ivan Getting received a pay hike of $45,000 when he left private industry (Raytheon Co.) and joined Aerospace at $90,000 a year—a salary more than double that paid to Defense Secretary Robert McNamara. In addition, Getting was given a $350,000 life-insurance policy, a retirement program that costs taxpayers $9,000 a year, and an expense account that covered such incidentals as $3,113 for transporting his yacht from Massachusetts to California.

Investigations for the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee uncovered a similar situation when they audited the books of another government-financed research firm. One of its vice presidents, apparently unable to make ends meet on a $42,900 salary plus a $5,000 expense account, was handed another $22,381 in taxpayer funds for the mortgage payments and caretaker fees of his private estate. From 1956 to 1964, the Pentagon funneled more than $40 million into this firm. Yet nowhere in the government files are records of its contract negotiations to be found. Appropriations Committee Chairman George Mahon says flatly that the records, required by law, "do not exist."

Then consider the infamous case of Project Mohole, unveiled in 1961 as a "truly exciting" attempt to gain knowledge of our planet's structure by boring a hole three miles beneath the bottom of the Pacific Ocean into the mantle of the earth. National Science Foundation officials assured Congress that the project would cost no more than $20 million. Within five years they had hiked the price tag to $127 million!

Why the spiraling cost? The record shows that an NSF panel set up in 1961 to review potential contractors rated the Texas firm of Brown and Root as least qualified of five companies under consideration. Nevertheless, Brown and Root (with virtually no experience in deep-water or deep-well drilling, but with White House connections) was later awarded the Mohole contract, at a price almost double the lowest bid.

By 1966, Project Mohole was so far behind schedule that disgusted members of the House Appropriations Committee refused to approve that year's $19.7 million request. But at this point the President made an extraordinary appeal for the restoration of funds, as did administration lobbyists.

Then came the bombshell. It became known that shortly before the President turned the screws on a reluctant Congress, the family of Brown and Root's board chairman, George Brown, had contributed $23,000 to the "President's Club," a Democratic fund-raising group. Outraged Congressmen now killed off Mohole—at least temporarily.

Research dollars are used to influence public opinion. The Pentagon, often accused the news management, contracted in 1966 for a $69,400 study of public reaction to controlled press releases and the withholding of information. The project was canceled only after Rep. John Moss, crusading chairman of the House Subcommittee on Government Information, denounced the plan as "totally inappropriate to our free society."

The Office of Economic Opportunity announced with fanfare last year that it would hire prominent social scientists to conduct "independent" appraisals of the War on Poverty. What the OEO didn't say was that anti-poverty officials would retain absolute authority to prohibit publication of the investigators' findings. "These scholarly studies of the War on Poverty will be used to defend future budget requests and to persuade public opinion," the Washington *Post* commented sharply. "The public, which is paying for them, would like to see the adverse results as well as the favorable ones."

Fifteen miles from downtown Washington, in Springfield, Va., stands the Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information, a brick-and-glass monument to government's obsession with research. Occupied for less than three years, the 30,000-square-foot warehouse is already bulging at the seams. Nearly half a million federally financed scientific reports are stacked in piles 15 feet high, and as many as 65,000 more are expected this year.

Government publicists grandiosely speak of a federally spurred "knowledge explosion," but leading scientists dissent. Dr. Paul Weiss, for one, argues that the sheer number of reports is no more indicative of progress than "the amount of junk mail reflects economic growth." It is time, he says, to replace the fetish of unfettered research with the maxim that scientific inquiry "should have a purpose and be selected with a sense of relevance."

At its current rate of increase, the annual price tag for federal research is expected to reach $20 billion by 1970. Here is an opportunity for all political leaders who believe in responsible government to express themselves. Here is a specific area where, irrefutably, the monstrous federal budget can be cut—*now*.

ATTITUDES AND ACTIONS OF THE SOVIET UNION TOWARD ITS MINORITY GROUPS AND FAMILIES TORN APART BY WORLD WAR II

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, people of good will throughout the world have long been concerned and have repeatedly raised their voices against the attitudes and actions of the Government of the Soviet Union toward its minority groups and those families torn apart by World War II. The most abusive aspects of those attitudes and actions have been against the Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union, despite the guarantees of freedom of religion set forth in the Soviet Constitution.

To express my indignation and concern, and, I am certain, the indignation and concern of all the people of our country, on January 17, 1967, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 68 for the purpose of expressing the sense of Congress and this great Nation—to condemn the Soviet Union for its continued actions of religious persecution.

I urge every Member of the Congress to join me and support the purpose of the resolution, which follows:

H. CON. RES. 68

Whereas the Congress of the United States deeply believes in freedom of religion for all people and is opposed to infringement of this freedom anywhere in the world; and

Whereas abundant evidence has made clear that the Government of the Soviet Union is persecuting Jewish citizens by singling them out for extreme punishment for alleged economic offenses, by confiscating synagogues, by closing Jewish cemeteries, by arresting rabbis and lay religion leaders, by curtailing religious observances, by discriminating against Jews in cultural activities and access to higher education, by imposing restrictions that prevent the reuniting of Jews with their families in other lands, and by other acts that oppress Jews in the free exercise of their faith; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has a clear opportunity to match the words of its constitutional guarantees of freedom of religion with specific actions so that the world may know whether there is a genuine hope for a new day of better understanding among all people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that presecution of any persons because of their religion by the Soviet Union be condemned, and that the Soviet Union in the name of decency and humanity cease executing persons for alleged economic offenses, and fully permit the free exercise of religion and the pursuit of culture by Jews and all others within its borders.

AMERICA SHOULD REPAY HER DEBTS

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Samuel Johnson once observed that if a man does not keep his friendships in good repair, he will soon discover that he has no friends. This caution is as sound for nations as it is for individuals.

Throughout our history, America has been served well by her friends—not just by the nations with whom we have maintained formal alliances or informal accords, but also by the individuals from many countries who have given generously and freely of their time, talents, and wealth to help our Nation and its citizens.

In every international war in which we have become engaged, individual Americans, military and civilian, have been saved from death, rescued from capture, protected, and aided in escape by the friends they found behind enemy lines or in the midst of battle zones. Many of these benefactors are anonymous. Most of them risked their lives, endangered their families, and jeopardized their property by aiding Americans. All of them served our Nation and deserve our gratitude.

Of course, we can never fully repay these debts. In some cases we have tried, and have rewarded friendships lavishly. In others, though, our thanks have been too little and too late. If we wish to keep these friendships in good repair, and to sustain the feeling of good will toward America which endures in so many parts of the world, we should do what we can to show, time after time, that America does not forget her friends.

One friend who has long merited, and now needs, our help is a gentleman named **Demetrio Sarsfield Salazar**, of Naples, Italy. When I was in Naples last fall, I met Count Salazar and became acquainted with the tremendous services which he performed for Americans during World War II—services for which I think he ought to be repaid.

Count Salazar was born in Naples on June 16, 1884. His father once served as Italian Ambassador to Dublin. The Count himself became a British citizen in 1916, and since that time has held many responsible positions, including that of aide-interpreter to the Prince of Wales.

In 1940, soon after the outbreak of war, Count Salazar was interned by Mussolini's government in a detention camp for British citizens near Naples. During the following 2 years he became camp leader, and was subsequently released to serve as liaison officer with the Swiss delegation visiting detention camps for British POW's and civilians. In these capacities he helped many internees and was able to improve prisoner treatment and camp conditions in several instances.

In 1943, after Mussolini had been deposed and an armistice declared, many Allied prisoners of war either escaped or were released from detention camps run by the Italians. When the Germans moved in and began rounding up these servicemen, Count Salazar was summoned by the British legation in the Vatican and asked to help rescue and protect the fugitives. During the next 10 months, until the arrival of the Allied forces in June 1944, Count Salazar performed these dangerous tasks with admirable persistence and great effectiveness.

His methods of operation have been described both in Maj. Sam Derry's book, "Rome Escape Line," and in a memo which the Count himself wrote in 1946. As these accounts outline, the Count and his colleagues took charge of the American and British escapees reaching the British Legation and the Vatican; provided food, clothing and temporary shelter for them; obtained faked identity cards; and eventually, through a complicated network, forwarded the soldiers to safer hiding places. In the course of this difficult work, the Count maintained records of the names and serial numbers of many of the Americans whom he helped. An admittedly partial list contains 173 names.

Count Salazar's work proceeded under the most dangerous conditions. At one point in December 1943, he was forced to leave his apartment and take refuge suddenly in the British Embassy just before Nazi S.S. troops raided his lodging and smashed all his furniture. As Count Salazar himself observed 2 years later:

> All this looks very simple on paper, but it was nerve wracking work at the risk of my life as the Germans had put a reward of one million lire for my capture.

In addition to tremendous amounts of time, energy, and ability, Count Salazar invested a substantial share of his personal resources in saving American lives. He reported in 1946 that—

> In the beginning, I gave all my spare suits, shirts, boots, etc., until I got permission (from the British Legation) to purchase about 200,000 lire of clothes on credit and my personal guarantee. . . . I also supplied false identity cards for which I used to pay rather highly and at my expense as I was told that money was to be used only for clothing.

At my request, Consul General Homer M. Byington, Jr., and Vice Consul Russell, of the American consulate in Naples, have thoroughly investigated all available records in an effort to determine, in dollars, the amount contributed in cash and kind by Count Salazar for the rescue of Americans in Italy in 1943–44. Although records are understandably incomplete, Count Salazar has given them the surviving minute sheets on which he recorded at the time many of his expenditures and the reimbursements received from the British. The amounts which he reported as being "short," and which he paid from his own pocket, total 149,534 lire, which at wartime exchange rates equalled about $935. Since these existing notes cover only the period of December 1943 through April 1944, while the Count's efforts lasted from September 1943 through June 1944, he has estimated that the documented sums may represent only about two-thirds of his full personal investment. If this is true, the total of his unreimbursed expenses on behalf of American servicemen may approach $1,400, again in terms of the exchange rate and prices of 1944.

Mr. Speaker, Count Salazar deserves our gratitude. He also needs our help. Now 82 years old, he has lost all of his capital and sold most of his property, and now is sustained only by a pension of 52 pounds per year from the British Government, small contributions from the Anglo-American nursing home and the British Officers' Association, and gifts of food from friends. His income of less than $50 per month must support not only himself, but also his two small daughters. Bedridden by a recent stroke and bronchial asthma, he lives with his daughters in desperate poverty in an attic in a Naples slum.

In my judgment, we have already delayed far too long any repayment to Count Salazar for the great investments of time and resources which he made during World War II as a friend of Americans and of the United States. We should not perpetuate our negligence, but rather should act now to pay him adequately for his services, and in so doing express at least part of the gratitude owed him by the United States.

Accordingly I am introducing today a bill to compensate Demetrio Sarsfield Salazar for the expenses he bore so willingly during that troubled time in Italy. Since both his monetary burdens and his tremendous effectiveness are uniquely well documented, I urge the Congress to act promptly on this bill, and to demonstrate again that America intends to keep such friendships in good repair.

I would like to include in the RECORD at this point two memorandums prepared by Vice Consul Russell and a partial list compiled by Count Salazar of the servicemen he assisted.

If any of these men are now able to do so, they may individually wish to help their Government in helping a man who once helped them.

REPORT ON COUNT DEMETRIO SARSFIELD SALAZAR'S ACTIVITIES ON BEHALF OF U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL DURING WORLD WAR II

I. BIOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Count Demetrio Sarsfield Salazar was born in Naples on June 16, 1884. His father was at one time Italian Ambassador to Dublin. The Count was naturalized as a British citizen on July 1, 1916 and received a temporary officer's commission in the British Army on March 8, 1917. Among other responsible positions he subsequently served as Aide-Interpreter to the Prince of Wales. He is the bearer of a British passport (No. C 39284) issued at Rome on April 5, 1956.

Count Salazar was thrice married. By his third wife, Anna Maria Sarzfield Salazar (nee Pino), whom he married on May 11, 1947, he had two daughters: Patricia (born May 13, 1950) and Caterina (born January 19, 1952). Under British nationality law the girls do not have the right to British nationality and therefore bear the Italian nationality derived from the nationality of their mother at the time of their birth. Count Salazar's third wife died on February 1, 1960 of tuberculosis, leaving him with the care of two young daughters.

At one time the agent in Naples for the Rootes Group and DKW automobile firms, Count Salazar was apparently "squeezed out" of the business in 1958 by his Italian partners with little or no compensation. He has been in increasingly bad financial straits since that time and, after selling virtually all of his family's saleable property, his condition is now desperate.

He is sustained by a 52 pounds per year pension from the British Government based on the loss of a son (by an earlier marriage) as an RAF pilot during World War II and by small contributions from the Anglo-American nursing home and the British Officers' Association. His total income is less than $50 per month. This amount does not cover all his expenses and most of the family's food is contributed by a few friends and benefactors in Naples.

The Count recently suffered a stroke which has left him bedridden and has been afflicted with bronchial asthma for several years. At 82 and in such weak physical condition he believes that repatriation to England, which he has not visited for 40 years and where he has no close relatives, would kill him.

II. WARTIME ACTIVITIES

Count Salazar was interned in an Italian detention camp for British subjects near Naples during the period 1940–42 and became Camp Leader. He was later released to become a liaison officer visiting POW and civilian detention camps for British nationals with the Swiss Delegation. According to three British nationals at the British Consulate in Naples (Mr. Charles Metcalf, Mr. Albert Spurle and Mr. William Spurle) who knew him in Italy during this period, Count Salazar was able to help many internees and POW's in particular distress and, in some cases, managed to improve camp standards and the general treatment of the prisoners.

With the ouster of Mussolini in July 1943 and the declaration of an Armistice in September a chaotic situation resulted in which many Allied prisoners of war were either released or escaped from Italian-controlled detention camps. When German forces moved in to gain control of the situation they began to hunt down the escaped Allied personnel at large in Italy. As described in Sam Derry's book *Rome Escape Line* (George

C. Harrap & Co., London, 1960) these escapees in many cases attempted without success to gain shelter in the Vatican. As described in the Derry book, see pages 46–47, 63–64, 90 and 199, and in the attached memorandum prepared by Count Salazar (#1 drafted in 1946, #2 prepared recently by Count Salazar at the request of Mr. William G. Bench, British Officers' Association representative in Naples) these escapees, including many Americans, were eventually referred to Count Salazar.

At continual risk of his life, Count Salazar passed the British (including Dominion) and American escapees who came to him along to other members of his network who hid them and arranged to provide them with an initial quantity of clothes, food and cigarettes. The money, and, in some cases, the goods and clothes themselves were provided by the British Legation in the Vatican for the British and Dominion troops handled. Count Salazar states that although he was sometimes able to provide these items to American escapees from British supplies, in about 60% of the cases he paid out of his own pocket for material for the Americans. The cost of this initial "packet" Count Salazar estimates at about 1000 lire (wartime) (roughly equivalent to $6.65)[1] per escapee. This sum was provided by the Count to contacts further along in the escape chain who then purchased the clothes, food and cigarettes. The American escapees subsequently mingled with their far more numerous British counterparts and were settled by the Count's contacts in safe hideout. The funds for their long-term maintenance were then provided out of a common "pot" which was furnished by the British Legation to the Vatican. In addition to his unreimbursed expenses for the initial packet given to many of the American escapees, Count Salazar states that he personally paid for false identity cards for about 30 of the Americans who were hidden in Rome or its nearby suburbs and who therefore needed identity documents more than their compatriots hidden in the country. The cost of these cards he estimates at 1200 wartime lire (roughly equivalent to $8.00).[2] They were purchased through a contact named Fiorentino from forgers active in Rome at the time.

The list attached to document #2 mentioned above lists the names and serial numbers of most of the Americans aided by Count Salazar. It was submitted by him in 1944 to the British Minister in the Vatican, Sir D'Arcy Osborne. Although the Count believes that some of the Americans aided were not included on the list he refuses to make any claim for those not named. Those included on the list number 173. Taking the Count's estimate that he paid out of pocket 1000 wartime lire each for 60% of those Americans aided plus 1200 wartime lire for about 30 identity documents for Americans hidden in Rome itself, his total claim would amount to 140,000 wartime lire or approximately $935.

III. COMMENT

As a result of interviews with three persons at the British Consulate in Naples who knew Count Salazar during the war, reading the Derry book concerning the British organized network for aiding escaped prisoners of war in Rome during 1943–44 and talking with the Count himself about his wartime activities (the latter rendered difficult because of his stroke), the reporting officer has been impressed with the extent of his valuable and often courageous efforts on behalf of Allied civilian and military prisoners and escapees in Italy during World War II. The reporting officer has also been impressed with Count Salazar's evident personal modesty and integrity. Although he is not in a position to evaluate the latter's estimate regarding personal funds expended to aid American personnel, the figures supplied appear to him to be uninflated and reasonable in the light of evidence presented in the Derry book. A final point to be noted in judging the Count's testimony is that Mrs. William Bench, the wife of the British Officers' Association representative in Naples, states that she urged Count Salazar to provide information to the American Consulate General concerning his wartime activities and that he did not do so on his own initiative.

EXPLANATORY NOTES

Documents labeled 1. and 2a-b represent further biographic data on Count Salazar which may be useful to you. Documents labeled 3a-d are photostats of coded listings of the Counts contacts within the "Rome network" and places where escaped Allied POWs were concealed. Document #4 is a sample of the type of intelligence report which the Count often submitted to the British and American Legations at the Vatican.

The most important documents for use in supporting the Count's case are labeled 5a-q. These represent an *incomplete* file of the Count's minutes covering receipts from the British Legation to the Vatican and expenditures on behalf of Allied escapees. These minute sheets prepared at the time and submitted to the British Legation in many cases bear a handwritten notation "short" accompanied by a figure which Count Salazar states represents primarily out of pocket expenditures to Americans. Adding these "short" figures produces a total of 149,534 lire which is rather close to the 140,000 lire ($935*) estimate of claim made in the January 25 report.

Two problems are raised by the Count's minute sheets. On the one hand, sheet 5a at item 2 shows that the cost of false identity cards was 1,000 lire each and the Count confirms that the same price was paid for all cards. The January 25 report quoted the Count's estimate that these cards cost 1,200 lire and thus the amount of his claim derived from this item would have to be reduced by 1/6. On the other hand, these minute sheets on which the Count has calculated his out of pocket "shortage" represent only the period December 1943–April 1944 whereas his activities actually extended from September 1943–June 1944. Count Salazar estimates that the minute sheets enclosed only represent about ⅔ of his actual unreimbursed expenditures on behalf of Americans. This would suggest that his estimate of total expenditures reported in the January 25 report were low by about ⅓.

The reporting officer believes that the Count's original (January) estimate may have been low and that he was bending over backwards not to claim too much. However, account keeping by nationality under wartime conditions and now subject to the exactness of memory of an 82 year old gentleman can hardly be precise.

Ashton, T. P., Pvt.—11064938.
Bass, W. A.—14042813.
Baukenna, E. J., Sgt.—35024719.
Baylan, W., Jr.—3230462.
Been, Lieut. Raymond V.
Belsma, Major Alfred D.
Blacket, G. R.—34519785.
Brobeck, Arthur—34285309.
Brodniak, Sgt. A. R.—32460028.
Cain, H. S.—34670016.
Capeheart, Lieut. J. G.—O–791362.
Carnathan, R. C.—34625098.
Castle S/Sgt. G.—15055054.
Catledge, Lt. R. G.—O–748366.
Clark, Sgt. C. C.—34051438.
Clem, Lt. Roy—O–672033/T42.
Cook, Sgt. N. E.—35470690.
Cooper, Sgt. H.—654628.
Cooper, Sgt. L.—6653052.
Coto, Pfc., W. W.—11011629.
Cox, G. P.—33535580.
Crow, J. R.—34065827.
Curoles, Lt. L. E.—O–733836.
Daoust, W.—?
Delisle, S/Sgt. H. W.—32276510.
Delouchs, Lt. R. T.—O–795366.
Derau, S.—33185323.
Deutsch, H.—10800168.
Dewey, Cpl. S.—12005009.
Downey, Major R. J.—O–23233.
Downs, E., 60957679.
Drinkwater, Cpl. H., 31115677.
Dukate, Cpt. E. E., O–739924.
Dumas, Floyd, 32213910.
Dyda, Pfc. C., 33183989.
Eaton, Sgt. R. E., 19059340.
Edwards, Sgt. H., 16052117.
Edwards, Lt. J. C., 0–659942.
Espinia, Cpl. S., 37354115.
Everett, Sgt. C., 16010254.
Fancourt, Pfc., J. L., 13095724.
Fassoulis, Lt. S. G., O–744871.
Flounders, Sgt. T. E.—?
Fowler, T. L., 34530417.
Frasca, G., 17006159.
Friedman, Sgt. E., — ?
Gardner, S/Sgt. W. J., 32338039.
Gibson, Lt. J. C. — ?
Gidding, Lt. H. R. — ?
Green, C. P. J., 3355580.
Griffin, Lt. E., O–660350.
Gronsky, Cpl. W. W., 31062882.
Guell, M. R., 31305363.
Gurrieri, M., 32204804.
Hapton, Sgt. J. W., 6652900.
Hankins, S/Sgt. H. W., 20639901.
Hape, G., 6276675.
Hard, Sgt. J., 12005378.
Harrington, Sgt. D.,—?
Harrison, Cpt. W. A., O–1201262.
Hawkins, Lt.—?
Hayes, S/Sgt. W. L.—39380719.
Hernandez, N.—38017377.
Herzing, Sgt. J. J.—37174271.
Hillman, S/Sgt.—15082385.
Hrybincyak, Sgt. A.—32212392.
Hubbard, C. R.—?
Humphrey, Cpt. B. K.—0–23475.
Hurst, S/Sgt. L.—?
Incer, Lt. J.—?
Jackson, Sgt. W.—38182160.
Jennings, Sgt. G.—37093761.
Johnson, Sgt. E.—6839131.
Johnson, Cpt. K. M.—0–659988.
Jordan, C.—33593614.
Joseph, S/Sgt. E. T.—11094580.
Joulman, P. J.—13185171.
Kasun, S/Sgt. M.—33000539.
Keirsey, S/Sgt. G. H.—380890004.
Kelly, S/Sgt. W. T.—34076306.
Kemilliano, H.—?

---

[1] It is extremely difficult to derive a dollar equivalent for the value of wartime Italian lire in Rome, September 1943–June 1944 which Count Salazar was paying out. I have done so on the basis of statements made by Major Derry in his book cited above. As the administrative head of the entire Rome organization he was dispensing large sums in British pounds and Italian lire and was in a good position to make an estimate of the effective value of the lire vis a vis the pound, then officially worth US$4.03. On page 89 of his book he states that "in purchasing terms 120 lire represented about four shillings". Later, on page 116, he cites a transaction in which English pounds were exchanged on the black market for 650 lire per pound and on page 117 he mentions exchange rates of 450 and 525 lire per pound. The rate obviously fluctuated sharply and I have derived a lire-dollar rate of 150 lire per dollar from the figures cited on page 89.

[2] Count Salazar has not been informed of the estimated dollar amount of his claim made by the reporting officer and all the Count's own estimates have been made in terms of 1943–44 Italian lire for which he does not recall the exchange value. This course was taken initially to reduce the possibility of a claim influenced by the Count's present financial needs and, once the dollar amount was calculated, to avoid raising his hopes excessively.

Kennedy, C. J.—34621668.
Kerr, G.—37353883.
Kohlrieser, T/Sgt. N. H.—?
Konvalinka, Lt. H. F.—0–744857.
Koziol, J. E.—31288013.
Kunkler, Pfc. R. W.—35605586.
Kurtz, G.—?
Lanier, Sgt. M. D.—14067698.
Lawler, Cpt. M. J.—0–378186.
Laybe, T/Sgt. V.—30844486.
Lewis, T.—?
Livingston, E. A.—38040539.
Lorenzo, A. J.—31531740.
Lucer, Lt. J. A.—?
Manbech, G. W.—?
Mayer, Cpt. W. N.—?
Mints R. S.—14062346.
Moffett, J. A.—31101147.
Moody, C.—36590875.
Morrison, Lt. W. G.—O–740515.
Moyer (or Moyers), Sgt. L.—160525507.
McCarver, Capt. M. K.—?
McCoy, Major—?
McDowell, Lt. C. D.—O–807266.
McLaughlin, S/Sgt. E. H.—31252563.
Nankins, S/Sgt.—20838801.
Nelson, Sgt. W.—13442656.
Newby, Pfc. R.—37591989.
Newman, Lt. W. L.—O–1307485.
O'Neil, J. E.—326776854.
Pacciotti, S/Sgt. J. C.—33057029.
Parlett, Lt. D. O.—O–740538.
Parry, Sgt. L. D.—?
Parsons, Capt. G.—?
Partridge, Glen—36743752.
Payne, T. L.—35026131.
Pederson, Lt. W. I.—O–794682.
Peiol, S/Sgt. A. J.—33324063.
Perry, Capt. H. O.—O–2729655.
Pickett, Capt. F. D.—?
Pistilli, Pfc. A. V.—32676140.
Preller, G. W.—13103118.
Putnam, Sgt. G. W.—3188652.
Randell, PFC. R. L.—33688141.
Rascon, A.—39112633.
Reimherr, T/Sgt. E. A.—34290593.
Rigney, Lt. H. D.—O–796195.
Riney, Lt. Joseph P.—?
Ringler, S/Sgt. C. E.—35383051.
Robinson, Lt. E. E.—O–731225.
Romero, Albert—?
Rose, Lt. Jack—?
Rose, S/Sgt. W. A.—20123753.
Rouse, S/Sgt. W. M.—20123753.
Rulien, Capt. D. W.—O–724226.
Sanford, G.—13053624.
Scalisi, T/Sgt. B. L.—1406556.
Schisler, Robert P.—?
Sergakis, T/Sgt. J. B.—19072607.
Sexton, Lt. W. K.—O–730873/T45.
Shearer, Sgt. F.—18056181.
Shrenke, PFC. J. A.—36741446.
Sierreot, Percy D.—724217.
Simon, R. E.—35394798.
Simons, S/Sgt. O. S.—?
Skowrow, F. A.—36064940.
Smith, W. F.—34576781.
Smithson, Pfc. H. W.—36627418.
Sorrentino, S/Sgt. J.—32220859.
Spiro, Lt. J. H.—?
Stevens, S/Sgt. H. W.—?
Stewart, Lt. J. B.—O–670657.
Stokes, S. A.—3233628.
Stockwell, Cpl. H. W.—12003316.
Stuake, C. W.—33756981.
Tasler, T/Sgt. N. R.—38627146.
Thomas, W. W.—3467523.
Thompson, Capt. B. R.—?
Tracey, S/Sgt. D.—88321052.
Truesdale, Sgt. R. W.—14983964.
Tucker, Sgt. Sam—?
Valdez, Capt. P. H.—?
Vaughn, Lt. J. R.—O–373092.
Wakeland, Sgt. P.—6669758.
Ward, J. A.—12005278.
Weintraub, Lt. H.—O–667465.
Wieosoorak, E. J.—32712467.
Williams, Flight Lt. O. H. I.—O–667465.
Williams, Robert H.—?
Wilson, Glen P.—?
Wilson, Capt. R. E.—O–77467.
Zlock, Cpl. A.—35024719.

CENTENNIAL OF HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, this is an important day in the history of American education and of the city of Washington. One hundred years ago today, on March 2, 1867, President Andrew Johnson signed into law an act establishing—

> In the District of Columbia, a university for the education of youth in the liberal arts and sciences, under the name, style, and title of "The Howard University."

In the intervening hundred years, Howard University has grown far beyond even the greatest dreams of its founders. Today this institution stands proudly as a leader in the Washington community and in the national community of universities. More than 1,000 teachers serve a student body of about 11,500 in facilities valued at over $50 million. Although not the largest university in America, Howard holds first place in two significant categories: it is the only comprehensive university system in the country where a majority of students are Negro, and it has the largest percentage of foreign students—one in every seven of its enrollees—of any American university.

The school which became Howard University was conceived in November 1866 by Gen. Oliver Otis Howard, Commissioner of the Freedman's Bureau, and his colleagues in the First Congregational Missionary Society. Originally planned as a theological seminary to provide spiritual training for the freed slaves who crowded Washington, the school was expanded even before it opened to include a normal school for teacher training and a medical department. When the charter for the new institution was presented to Congress, it was most appropriate to name the school after General Howard, since he was not only the principal advocate of the plan but also, as head of the Freedman's Bureau, a major contributor of funds for the purchase of land.

Although Howard University was planned as an institution for the Negro, it was symbolic that the first four students to enter its first term were white. From that beginning, Howard has been a truly biracial university, serving not any single race or class, but rather all America. Its faculty, students, and alumnus have given us a continuing, dynamic example of the excellence which emerges when all men are considered strictly on their individual merits, and of the progress which can be made when men grow beyond passive toleration of other races and nationalities to active cooperation among human beings, regardless of their color, country, or creed.

The Howard University tradition is indeed one of excellence. Its presidents have ranked among the foremost educators in the Nation, and its current president, Dr. James M. Nabrit, Jr., is renowned not only as a teacher and administrator, but also as a diplomat and statesman. Howard's faculty has included and now includes many of the Nation's most renowned scholars in history, political science, philosophy, medicine, and the physical sciences. Among the prominent men who have taught, studied, and written at Howard are Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, Under Secretary of the United Nations and a Nobel Peace Prize laureate; John Hope Franklin, distinguished professor of history; Dr. Charles R. Drew, acclaimed as an authority on blood plasma; Charles Houston, considered by many to be the dean of civil rights law; Dr. Alain Leroy Locke, America's first Negro Rhodes scholar and a major force in the renaissance of Negro literature; Dr. E. Franklin Frazier, the renowned sociologist; and Dr. Bernard Fall, a leading authority on Vietnam until his tragic death last month.

Howard's alumni have extended the school's tradition of excellence into many professions and fields of public service.

Solicitor General Thurgood Marshall, Senator EDWARD W. BROOKE, and Ambassador Patricia R. Harris are all Howard graduates, as are Judge Spottswood Robinson of the U.S. Court of Appeals, U.S. District Court Judges William Bryant and Joseph Waddy, U.S. Customs Court Judge Scovel Richardson, President Martin Jenkins of Morgan State College, Mr. Hobart Taylor of the Export-Import Bank, and countless others who hold high positions in Federal agencies, commissions and boards, or in other American universities. More than half of the Nation's Negro physicians, surgeons and dentists, about one-quarter of our Negro lawyers, and about half of our Negro engineers and architects have studied at Howard. In the Supreme Court school desegregation cases, six of the nine lawyers for the plaintiffs were Howard men.

Public service has been a trait of Howard graduates. It has also been a tradition of the university as a whole. The Howard commitment to the city of Washington is a constant and constructive one, unexcelled by that of any other American university. Far from being an "ivory tower" of scholarship, Howard is in the finest sense an urban university, deeply involved in its neighborhood and community. As such it has set an example and a standard for other American colleges, both in Washington and in our other great metropolitan areas.

Mr. Speaker, Howard University in its first hundred years has established great traditions and high standards of scholarship and service. As we mark its centennial today, I am sure that the entire House joins me in congratulating President Nabrit, the faculty, and student body of Howard on their century of achievement and their present stature in the first rank of American universities. The second hundred years will, I am confident, bring even greater growth for this institution, and even greater gains for the community, the country, and the world which Howard serves.

It is appropriate to close this tribute today by calling to the attention of the House the following statement by President Nabrit, summarizing some of Howard University's contributions to the city of Washington, contributions which have certainly earned for the university the title of one of the finest builders of the Nation's Capital.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY—ITS COMMUNITY ROLE

On Thursday Howard University will observe its 100th anniversary. It was on March 2, 1867, that the 39th Congress of the United States authorized a charter for the establishment of the University, and President Andrew Johnson affixed his signature to the legislation, providing for "a university for the education of youth in the liberal arts and sciences under the name, style and title of 'The Howard University'."

Howard University is, in an important sense, a child of the Washington community. Those persons who in November, 1866, proposed that a theological school be established in Washington to minister to the newly emancipated Freedmen, and those who two months later became the incorporators of Howard University, were all residents of this city, all actively associated with the First Congressional Church. From the University's earliest days, when its "Social Center" provided food, medical care, and training for the Freedmen, Howard has undertaken the responsibility of making its services and facilities available to those in need. This spirit of service has never ceased to exist.

More recently, Howard's influence in the community has been seen in the Second Precinct, where it created, in cooperation with residents of the Precinct, the Community Service Project. With the support of the Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Foundation, this organization brought religious and lay leaders together in active and fruitful association for the purpose of solving many of the problems plaguing the area—food, clothing, education, housing deficiencies, health, crime, and delinquency. Similarly, the University-Neighborhoods Council of the Tenth and Thirteenth Precincts was organized on the Howard University campus, and conducted in its early years with the support of the University faculty, staff, and student body. The services provided by the University-Neighborhoods Council are many and varied. They range from the revival of the Meridian Hill summer concerts to the rescue of residents from pitiable housing conditions, the support of tutorial summer services for area youth, monthly programs in civic education, and representation of the area before local authorities in the interest of improved services.

In 1964 the first grant made by the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency was to the Institute for Youth Studies at Howard University. This program includes research, experimental training, and demonstration projects on the processes and problems of youth development, especially in an urban environment. The achievements of the Institute, including its reports and publications, have received wide recognition. Particularly important has been its role in anti-delinquency, anti-poverty, and mental health programs.

These community programs have involved the participation of scores of teachers and staff members and hundreds of students working side-by-side with unnumbered volunteers in this city. To these organized activities must be added the day-by-day, year-by-year participation in community affairs by officers, teachers, students and alumni of the University. This is testimony of the will of Howard men and women to discharge responsibly their obligations to the community.

Today more than 5,000 Howard graduates live and work in the city of Washington. For 100 years they and their predecessors have taught in the schools and administered them; they have guarded the health of the people, pastored the churches, led in business, practiced law and risen to judgeships; and in social work, the arts and sciences, and engineering and architecture, they have likewise made substantial contributions. They have occupied and now occupy positions of distinction in the administration of the District government and in the unofficial but influential councils—political, financial, and social—of this city.

As Howard University's first 100 years come to an end, we feel proud of the relationship which has obtained between the University and this community. We are aware, however, that the past is never more than prologue. The 100 years of association with the Washington community have been notable, but we need pass swiftly from satisfaction to the resolution that the future of this relationship will be equal to the growing complexities which mark this and every great city of our nation and the world.

JAMES M. NABRIT, Jr.,
President, Howard University.

THE STANFORD LINEAR ACCELERATOR

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned over the amounts contained in President Johnson's budget for the operation of the Stanford linear accelerator.

Congress authorized and appropriated approximately $125 million to build the Stanford linear accelerator which is now completed and operating very successfully. It is conceded to be one of the world's finest tools for research in high energy physics.

Naturally, I have been very interested in following the progress of SLAC's research work.

In a discussion with my colleague from California, Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, I found that a hearing of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy had been held on February 9, during which SLAC was discussed. I learned that although SLAC is capable of running 21 8-hour shifts per week, the fiscal year 1968 budget will finance only 10 such shifts—less than half of its maximum capacity. An excerpt from the record of the hearings follows:

> Representative HOSMER. As I understand this SLAC business, they figure they can run about 21 shifts, and you are planning to finance only 10, I believe. Is that somewhere in the right ball park?
>
> Mr. McDANIEL (Director, Division of Research, AEC). That is about right; yes. We have provided $21.3 million in the 1968 budget estimates before this committee. Dr. Panofsky would need substantially more than that to run the 21 shifts.
>
> Representative HOSMER. In other words, it will be operating at less than half of the maximum capacity, according to what they tell us; is that right?
>
> Mr. McDANIEL. Yes, sir.

The demand for use of the accelerator has been tremendous. Had all technically sound proposals received from the U.S. scientific community been accepted, the accelerator would have been scheduled for a time in excess of 3 years at the current availability of running time.

The fiscal year 1968 budget now provides $21.3 million for SLAC operations. This amount will not even allow for the maintenance of the present level of operation, which is now 10 high energy shifts per week.

It is my understanding that an additional $3.7 million per year would allow a 50-percent increase in the use of this $125 million facility; another $3.7 million—or a total increase of $7.4 million—would give maximum utilization of the accelerator at 21 shifts per week.

Of course we are all aware of the overall fiscal pressures on the Government at this time and understand that we must be realistic in our budget requests, but I do hope that the Appropriations Committee and the entire Congress will give some serious study to the questions raised by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. We have already invested $125 million in a highly sophisticated research tool, and we are not going to get full value from it unless it is used to the maximum.

An additional $7.4 million in the fiscal year 1968 budget allocation for SLAC would make possible important experimentation in new scientific concepts by allowing SLAC to run a greater variety and expanded number of projects concurrently with those already underway.

This is something which I think deserves our attention. Perhaps, on a second look, this is an area where additional current spending is justified in order to utilize our past investment and benefit from potential future scientific advances.

BULGARIA OBSERVES NATIONAL LIBERATION DAY

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the brave people of Bulgaria observe their national liberation day on Friday, March 3. Throughout their long history they have been oppressed by cruel dictatorships and threatened by aggression from neighboring countries.

The Bulgarian people were compelled during the Second World War to become the ally of Nazi Germany. Although the United States was forced, therefore, to declare war on Bulgaria, we knew that this alliance was not the wish of these courageous people, so many of whom had volunteered to join our own Armed Forces.

One of the grim ironies of history is that Russia did not declare war on Bulgaria until after their animosity toward Germany was over. At that time Russia declared war on the unfortunate Bulgarian nation so as to have an excuse for subjugating the country and, supported by subversives within Bulgaria, installed its puppet dictatorship. The conquest of Bulgaria was confirmed by the infamous agreement to which President Roosevelt agreed permitting Russia to retain its unjust jurisdiction over Bulgaria. As Americans, we certainly should be ashamed of this chapter in our diplomatic history. From that time to the present, Bulgaria has been under the cruel oppression of the international Communist conspiracy.

We can certainly be proud of the many momentous contributions which Bulgarians who have come to the United States have made to our country. We must also work to compensate for the great injustice done to the Bulgarian people by allowing them to be subjugated by the Soviet Union by working in every possible way to support their national aspirations. May I take this opportunity to commend the actions of the Bulgarian people and their leaders in exile and give them all possible aid in their efforts to achieve independence for their beloved land once again.

Mr. Speaker, we should not only observe great historic days to recall the glories of the past but to use the record of national virtues and accomplishments of a people as the inspiration on which to build a future. The people of Bulgaria are among the unhappy quarry of Communist suppression. Their government is not legitimate and does not truly reflect the objectives of its people. Therefore, we must be alert against the trap now being set by Communist governments, luring the United States into trade concessions on the pretext that their communism is mellowing. Aid or subsidized trade with the Bulgarian Government merely serves to perpetuate its totalitarian control over the brave people of Bulgaria.

FRESH APPROACH TO AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that Congress take immediate action to curtail skyrocketing agricultural imports. More muscle is needed in our agricultural import control procedure—which prompts me to introduce today a bill that provides a means of limiting agricultural imports that have depressing effects on prices received by American producers.

My bill is a fresh approach and would be a more forceful instrument for restricting the flow of such imports into our country.

Recordbreaking imports of meat and dairy products continue to usurp markets from our domestic producers, and are a major reason why farm prices have fallen far short of parity. Only this week the Agriculture Department announced that the farm parity ratio hit a near-record low of 74.

To struggling dairy farmers, the 2.7 billion pounds of foreign dairy products last year—whole milk equivalent—meant their market was reduced by the milk which could have been produced by over 300,000 cows, or the production of more than 6,000 dairy farms with 50 cows each. The same dire situation exists with respect to increased imports of beef and veal, pork, lamb, mutton, and other commodities as well.

The fight to curb unwarranted agricultural imports should have been fought and won years ago, in accordance with my repeated urgings since coming to Congress in 1959. Had the administration imposed meaningful import controls on foreign dairy products, for example, well over 6,000 dairy farms could have been saved from extinction. But, to the detriment of American agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture has time and again failed to recommend to the President that the authority of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, be invoked to limit these price-depressing agricultural imports.

My new bill, by amending section 22, is designed to put more muscle into the agricultural import control procedure.

First. The President would be given the authority to cause an immediate investigation to be made by the U.S. Tariff Commission on the damaging impact of agricultural imports without waiting for the initial such recommendation from the Secretary of Agriculture.

Second. Such an investigation by the Tariff Commission could also be initiated upon resolution of either House of Congress, upon resolution of either the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or the House Committee on Agriculture, or upon application of any interested party—including producers' organizations.

Third. The Tariff Commission would be authorized and directed to hold hearings on and investigate the imports of any agricultural commodities upon the resolution of either the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or the House Committee on Agriculture.

Fourth. Within 60 days, or sooner if the President has taken such action, the Tariff Commission would be required to send to the respective congressional Agriculture Committees exact copies of its report and recommendations to the President.

Fifth. If the President failed to take the recommended action to limit such imports within 60 legislative days, the Congress would put the recommended import-limiting action into effect by passing a concurrent resolution supported by a two-thirds vote of each House.

I sincerely believe that my bill to strengthen section 22 and provide Congress with a powerful option to effect any and all agricultural import controls recommended by the Tariff Commission, would be most beneficial to American agriculture.

There is no more enlightening presentation of the extent to which domestic producers' markets are usurped by foreign agricultural products than statistics from the Agriculture Department itself:

Meat imports to the United States

	Millions of pounds		Percent change
	1965	1966	
Total beef and veal (product weight)	701.1	893.3	+27
Meat under the meat import quota amendment (Public Law 88-482) [1] (product weight)	614.2	823.4	+34
Pork (product weight)	262.3	298.3	+14
Lamb (carcass weight)	12.5	14.9	+19
Mutton (carcass weight)	60.0	121.1	+102

[1] Imports of foreign fresh, chilled, and frozen beef and fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of goats and sheep (except lamb).

Dairy imports to the United States

	Billions of pounds		Percent change
	1965	1966	
Dairy products (milk equivalent)	0.9	2.7	+300

Just ponder, for a moment, what a more equitable economic position our producers of food would be in today if the administration had taken the action necessary to restrict these agricultural imports.

Mr. Speaker, we simply cannot wait until the year 2000, as some have suggested, before a determined effort is made to save what is left of the family farm system in our country. The time to take action is now, and my legislative proposals provide the basis for comprehensive and effective import controls.

EQUITY IN VETERANS' PENSIONS

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the galloping rate of inflation in this country is reason enough for giving veterans full equity in pensions. That is why I have introduced and urged committee approval of my bill to boost veterans' income limitations and pension payments.

My bill would raise the income limitations by 20 percent, so that recipients of veterans' pensions could not be further adversely affected by the 1965 increase in social security benefits, as well as by any increase enacted by the current Congress. In addition, my bill would provide an increase in veterans' pension payments patterned after last year's House-passed veterans' bill, which unfortunately died in the Senate.

It is to be remembered that over 29,000 veterans, widows, and survivors had their monthly pensions reduced or wiped out completely as a result of the Social Security Amendments of 1965. That is why I sponsored legislation in the 89th Congress known as the veterans' pension equity bill, and presented a statement in support thereof during committee hearings last July. And because this hardship and inequity still exists, I have again asked the Veterans' Affairs Committee, during subcommittee hearings today, to approve the provisions of my pending bill.

In short, my bill would permit full pension entitlement as well as a much deserved cost-of-living increase. As their purchasing power melts away, because of inflation, pensioners can put every last dollar to good use.

INFLATION

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, it takes no special extrasensory perception to predict that sometime—and perhaps frequently—in 1968 the spokesman for the administration will proclaim that the "larger-than-expected deficit was caused by unexpected costs of national defense."

It is therefore advisable to read the record.

On February 28, a message was delivered to the Congress from the White House, delineating recommendations for two areas of nondefense spending. The message is replete with recommendations for increased spending and supplemental appropriation requests.

To quote at random:

> I have requested $30 million—nearly a fourfold increase over this year's appropriation.
>
> This year I am requesting $44 million—an increase of nearly fifty per cent.
>
> I recommend that Congress enact the Public Television Act of 1967 to: Increase federal funds . . . more than three times this year's appropriations.
>
> Create a corporation for Public Television . . . and provide $9 million in fiscal 1968 as initial funding for the corporation.
>
> I recommend that Congress appropriate for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities $16 million—an increase of nearly one-third.
>
> I urge the Congress to approve promptly my forthcoming request for a supplemental apropriation of $350,000 for the International Education Act to permit necessary planning for next year's program, as well as an appropriation of $20 million for fiscal 1968.
>
> In the 1968 budget, I am recommending an increase of $65 million—to an annual total of almost $1.5 billion to support biomedical research.
>
> I also recommend an appropriation of $20 million for research and development in health services—nearly twice as much as in 1967.
>
> The O.E.O. has developed a program of Neighborhood Health Centers . . . our goal will be to double the number of centers in 1968.
>
> I recommend that Congress extend the Partnership for Health legislation for four years: provided supplemental appropriations for planning in fiscal 1967 and total appropriations of $161 million—an increase of $41 million.
>
> To sustain (Regional Medical Centers) I recommend $64 million—an increase of $19 million.
>
> I am recommending (for research, training, in occupational health) $8.1 million—a 25% increase.

Now, Mr. Speaker, each request may be legitimate. But when American citizens are faced with a new round of inflation which must certainly result from more deficit spending, they should know where prime responsibility lies for higher living costs, higher interest rates and higher taxes.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the Office of Education. From a small bureau devoted to the collection of educational statistics, the Office of Education has grown to include the administration of some 75 programs involving nearly $4 billion.

New funds flow into elementary and secondary schools at the rate of more than a billion dollars a year. The scope and depth of educational research has been vastly expanded. More funds are going into vocational education, educational television, loan programs, and grants to help all qualified students attend college, regardless of their financial means. New libraries and classrooms are rising on college campuses financed in part by Federal funds. An array of fellowship and institute programs are designed to improve the quality of teaching and to attract dedicated teachers to the classroom. The concept of equal educational opportunity is gradually being turned from an academic principle into a classroom reality.

Under the creative leadership of former Commissioner Frank Keppel, and now under the able aegis of Harold Howe, the Office of Education has administered increasingly complex and far-reaching programs, ever mindful that the education of our children is the key to the future of our Nation.

As the Office of Education enters its second century, however, the need to establish a sense of priorities among these various programs—and not to cut back in funds for meaningful programs—becomes increasingly clear. The talented and dedicated men and women of OE cannot do their best if their efforts are spread over such a large variety of endeavors. Funding many programs, each with a fraction of what is necessary, does not maximize the opportunities for progress. Paperwork generated by the need to keep track of so many projects often discourages creative administration.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the tradition of innovation, ability, and progress that has characterized the Office of Education in recent years. I am hopeful that the necessary long-range planning will be instituted so that the Office of Education will continue to implement effectively our commitment to equality of educational opportunity and the enhancement of education for all Americans.

LEGISLATIVE CONTROL OVER FEDERAL AGENCY REGULATIONS

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which would provide Congress with an expedited procedure for vetoing certain proposed regulations of Federal administrative agencies.

The Federal administrative agencies have become a fourth branch of Government. Their regulations affect every American and have the force of law. Yet I need not remind my colleagues that it was not the administrators that the people of this country elected to make their laws, it was the Congress. If the agencies "legislate," they do so as the agents of Congress, and as such they ought to be subject to congressional controls. My proposal would provide such controls.

As you know, the Congress presently has the power to veto administrative regulations by enacting legislation dealing with the particular subject covered by the given regulation. This procedure, however, is quite cumbersome. It requires that a bill be introduced, be acted upon by both bodies in committee, and if successful in reaching the floor of the House and Senate, it must be passed by both and signed by the President. All of this takes time, and by then the regulation objected to may be so firmly entrenched as to be almost impossible to repeal without prejudicing those who have relied upon it in good conscience.

Under my proposal, whenever notice of proposed rulemaking is required to be published in the Federal Register under Public Law 89-554, the successor of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946, either House of Congress shall have 60 days in which to pass a resolution disapproving the proposed regulation. Passage of such a resolution by either body would have the effect of preventing the regulation from becoming operative.

Furthermore, my proposal would provide for an expedited procedure for bringing such resolutions to the floor of the House or Senate. Modeled after the procedure for the consideration of plans dealing with the reorganization of Congress, it would enable a majority of the membership of either body to work its will with regard to the approval or disapproval of proposed administrative regulations. In other words, it would eliminate the present obstacles to an effective policy of congressional control of the Federal agencies in their rulemaking functions.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in upholding the Congress in its responsibilities under article I of the Constitution wherein it is stated:

> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Let me make it clear once and for all that the Constitution divides our Government into three, not four, branches of government and that the administrative agencies in their rulemaking activities are exactly what their names implies, the agents of the Congress.

REPEAL SUSPENSION OF INVESTMENT CREDIT AND ALLOWANCE OF ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to repeal the suspension of the investment credit and of the allowance of accelerated depreciation, to become effective March 3, 1967.

In October 1966, I warned that suspension of the 7-percent investment tax credit would have a damaging effect upon the economy generally and would be especially discriminatory against Cincinnati's machine tool industry and might reduce orders some 30 percent.

Unfortunately, I was correct. Hamilton County's 241 firms involved in machine tool production are already suffering the effects of the tax credit suspension. In January of this year, production orders dropped 23 percent over December 1966, and 37 percent over January 1966. Greater Cincinnati, the home of the machine tool industry, is feeling the adverse effects of the tax credit suspension more than any other city in this country.

There are 26,428 persons employed by Hamilton County's machine tool firms. A 30 percent cutback in orders, and we may be already at this point, could mean a loss of up to 7,000 jobs which could affect over 20,000 people—their families, children, and relatives. This would obviously mean a major blow to retail trade of the entire area and the economy generally.

The full impact of the tax credit suspension has not been felt. Under the present plan, the 7-percent credit is scheduled for restoration December 31, 1967. This means that businesses interested in expansion will almost certainly delay expansion plans until after the December 31 date.

The effects on the industry and Hamilton County are obvious. Similar effects can be expected elsewhere. Congress should act on this proposal now. Delay only increases the problems already descending on the machine tool industry.

UNITED STATES-U.S.S.R. TALKS ON ICBM-ABM LIMITATIONS MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, frequently I have been severely critical of far-out Johnson administration arms control and disarmament schemes. However, I want to indicate approval of plans just announced by the President for discussions with the U.S.S.R. on simultaneously limiting the build up of both offensive and defensive nuclear missiles.

Each country now has a sufficient strategic nuclear offensive capability to deter the other from starting a war. Piling additional offensive capability on top of the existing deterrent is a waste of money for both sides.

As to defensive ABM systems, although the Soviet Union has started a deployment, it is only in an early stage and insufficient to blunt the U.S. deterrent by substantial damage limitation. At this point it is not much better off than the United States, which possesses only the early rudiments of an ABM system.

If one of the two goes ahead with a full system, the other is required to do so to maintain its deterrent capability. Further, and for the same purpose, both are compelled to factor costly sophistications into their offensive systems in order to overcome ABM defenses. After massive outlays in the magnitude of billions of dollars and rubles, the net result is that each is no better off vis-a-vis the other than before.

Mutual restraint in expenditures for offensive and defensive systems thus do not involve risks to the national security of either power. It is advantageous to each in that the resources otherwise consumed may be diverted to more productive channels.

All this would not be true except for the fact the existing intelligence systems of both countries are fully capable of detecting cheating on the restraints by the other. A properly drafted agreement in this area would not be subject to a charge that undetectable cheating might lead to a nuclear Pearl Harbor. This cannot be said of most other Johnson arms control and disarmament proposals.

PLAN TO SCUTTLE PARITY

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, it has been reported in several publications that the administration is seeking to build support for a change in the formula by which farm parity is figured. Parity, of course, is the relationship between the prices received by a farmer for production in comparison with what he must pay for goods and services. On this basis, present parity for farmers is now a dismally low 74 percent, reflecting rather accurately the great present inequity between farm and nonfarm income.

If the administration were to succeed in changing the present parity system to one confusingly called parity of income, the ramifications to family farmers and rural America would be enormous. One of the best analyses of this whole matter which I have seen to date appeared in a recent issue of the NFO Reporter. It is aptly titled "The Plan To Scuttle Parity." I include the editorial at this point in my remarks:

THE PLAN TO SCUTTLE PARITY

The basic call for farm parity was sounded in 1922 by George Peek and Hugh S. Johnson in a pamphlet circulated at the time the Capper-Volstead Act and the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Bill were very much in the news. Parity insisted that there should be a fair relationship between the prices for which the farmer sold, and the prices on things the farmer had to buy. The farmer sold his production at wholesale; he bought his tools and equipment at retail. Obviously, if the prices on farm production at wholesale were not in balance with prices of tools and equipment at retail, farmers would either consume their capital and go bankrupt, or work for nothing, or both.

When parity was first calculated, it was obvious that the mechanism through which a farmer got his income was simply "sale of farm production." Either a farmer gained enough on the sale of farm production to cover his costs, or he didn't. This simple fact has not changed.

It took simple arithmetic, no more, no less, to compute whether wheat, corn, rye, soybeans, etc, were high enough in the market at wholesale to cover the costs incurred by a farmer at retail in producing them.

Not so any more, according to USDA. A new formula being leaked to the press suggests that now the government yardstick will deal in "parity of income" rather than in "parity prices on crops." The hush-hush document presumably suggests that the farming operation is worthy of an hourly wage rate, and a certain percentage as a return on the investment. In short, a judgment on whether the payment to agriculture is satisfactory for the wealth agriculture produces would—under the new USDA formula—be based on "wages" and a "return on investment," not the market value of basic commodities at wholesale.

At first glance, a sophomore in ag school might ask: "What's the difference."

Presumably there would be no difference if all computations were made honestly, and if the payment for wages actually covered all the hours, not just part of them, and if the interest on investment matched the payment being made on investment to other producers of wealth. In a word, if farmers were to be paid for as much wealth as they produce, it might not matter which method would be used to make the appropriate computation.

Unfortunately, we do not believe the change-over from plain parity to "farm income parity" is being made in good faith, or simple ignorance, but rather to comply with a thoroughly informed self-interest.

Failure to obtain farm parity these many years has meant one thing: farmers have not been paid for as much wealth as they have produced in terms of a fair relationship between the prices for which the farmer sold, and the prices on things the farmer had to buy. Taking the term "farm parity" and throwing it away cannot change the real economic facts of life, at least not from any overall vantage point.

But adopting a new concept of "farm income parity" is full of promise for those who look at economics from a mercantilistic point of view. A new term and a new concept at this stage of agricultural-industrial imbalance allows those in charge of public policy to define away the low farm income problem as far as newspaper eyewash is concerned, and makes secure for a time an artificial technique for collapsing agriculture for the benefit of others. The fact of agriculture earning 4% on its investment and nothing for its wage bill in 1965 was pointed up by both parity and by the arithmetic of cost-in-production computation. Such an indictment has to be hidden if anyone is to claim that agriculture is approaching parity.

Presumably the "parity of income" formula will allow the USDA to redefine what constitutes a farm, and therefore the number of farms that enter into parity of income calculations. It has already been suggested that having gross sales from $10,000 to $12,000 a year would put a man in the "farmer" category, and make his operation an "adequately sized farm." Thus by definition there would be less than 1,000,000 farms in the nation.

The production from "non-farmers" would still be production, but only those big enough to be "adequately sized farms" would hit the USDA decimal system and be included in the news releases.

Those experienced in governmentese feel that they occupy safe grounds. The money-price or exchange value of wealth can be calculated in terms of many considerations. The state of the arts, the laws pertaining to taxation, competition, trusts, monopolies, the growth rate of population—all figure into any formula. The average money-price relationship between wealth produced in different sectors of an economy is of utmost importance, and failure to maintain a balance in the payments made for wealth allows an economy to mangle itself from within, even at a time when it is being attacked from without.

A dominant class with political power can exact tribute from actual producers of wealth by arranging the market mechanism of an economy so as to accomplish that purpose. This has been done. But as raw material producers find out what's going on, it becomes ever more necessary to hide the fact of this tribute-taking.

It is now being argued that the old parity formulas are outdated because new machine efficiency is being used on farms, and that costs in production have not moved ahead on the same basis in farming as costs in production in industrial America. Therefore, the argument runs, taking a base period when wholesaling indexes were in balance for developing what the price tag on a bushel of corn or wheat should be is an unsound procedure.

To be sure, machine efficiency has been introduced in agriculture. But machine efficiency has also been introduced in industrial America. Calculated in terms of parity or in terms of plain, simple accounting, i.e., gross sales less costs in production, it is at once apparent that farmers have been penalized for their machine efficiency, whereas factory workers have been paid for their machine efficiency.

As a matter of fact, honest parity has consistently pointed up this strange development, and the embarrassment it has caused both Republican and Democratic administrations has not been covered up with even a flow of farm bankruptcies removing millions from the farms.

The idea of using a base period—when all wholesale indexes were in balance—to compute prices farmers should receive for basic commodities at a later period proved to be so accurate that the disparity it spotlighted simply had to be hidden. It was. The index base period was changed so that statisticians could take 49 cents off each bushel of corn with a lead pencil. Under the formula that was used when the 90% of parity law was in effect, corn should now be priced at $2.04. Under the formula now being used, one struck up when wholesale indexes were no longer in balance, corn was computed to be $1.55 at parity.

From 1946 to 1950, the average industrial wage was $1.33 an hour. In 1966 it was $2.64 an hour. Simple arithmetic will prove that an hour of work today can pay $2.05 for corn and buy 40% more corn than in the day when wages were $1.33 an hour.

Nor can it be argued that agriculture has become so efficient that it no longer has costs. Production costs for agriculture increased from $17.5 billion in the average 1946–1950 period to near $30 billion in 1965—up nearly 70%. In the 1946–1950 period, net farm income averaged $15.1 billion. In 1965 it averaged about $14 billion, even counting "income in kind" for farmers living in their own homes.

What would be the situation of a businessman who still had to price his products for less than he did 15 years ago? What would be the posture of a laboring man who earned no more today than he did 15 years ago? Yet this is precisely the situation in farming. Farm prices are touted as being too high, even though they have averaged less than 15 years ago while costing 70% more to produce than 15 years ago.

It costs more to produce a bushel of wheat, corn or soybeans today than it did 10 years ago, and it does not look as if "parity of income" (return for labor and investment) can be developed out of prices that make it impossible.

For newspaper stories, of course, it will be possible to dump "non-farmer" crops in with "farmer" crops and conclude that parity of income has arrived for agriculture because "adequately sized farms" aren't going into bankruptcy.

And "non-farms" badly in need of loans can be denied farm loans as a matter of policy because they are not farms in any case. Thus those who are being defined out of farming can count on being "busted" by a lack of working capital—something farmers, large and small, all need.

But this is double-think, the last stage in the decay of administrative justice. Writer John Dos Passos has noted that it took bureau people 300 years to grind the Roman Empire into the dust, but that American bureau people in government promise to do the job in less than 50 years. Perhaps. If so, the change-over in parity formulas will be seen by historians as one of those pieces of mischief that hid the truth of what was happening so that a basic mistake could not be repaired.

It is always a basic mistake to pay less than parity for the wealth farmers produce.

TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR TEACHERS FOR EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow teachers and educators to deduct from their gross annual income educational expenses incurred in pursuing courses required by a teacher's employer to meet the expressed requirements of his employment, or is related to the improvement of the teaching, administrative or other skills of the teacher.

The bill provides for the deduction of tuition and fees required by the institution which a teacher may attend, the cost of books, supplies, and other materials required in the courses for academic credit, and the traveling and living expenses incurred while attending an educational institution.

The teaching profession deserves our full consideration. Teachers already are underpaid. Yet they provide a vital service in every community. It is they who are charged with giving to the citizens of tomorrow the tools with which to meet the challenges of tomorrow.

It is important that our teachers and educators be encouraged not only to remain in their field but to improve their knowledge through additional advance education. The bill I am introducing today will provide part of that encouragement.

Last year the Internal Revenue Service attempted to rescind their practice of allowing these deductions. They have since revised their proposed rulings. Mr. Speaker, I believe the bill which I am introducing today will absolutely clarify this area. Deductions of this nature should be regulated by law, not by rules made by an administrative bureau. By stating clearly what shall be deducted, it will be possible to avoid the "on again, off again" approach of the Internal Revenue Service in establishing a policy of deductions for educational expenses of teachers.

Mr. Speaker, if we expect to retain well qualified teachers and if we expect them to keep abreast of developments in their field, then it is only fair that the expenses incurred in obtaining additional education for themselves be deducted from their gross income.

Passage of this bill will upgrade the quality of all of our schools. It is, therefore, an investment in the future of America.

CHEATING AT THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent days we have heard and read a great deal about cheating at the Air Force Academy. Some of the comment has been highly critical of the Academy and has attempted to equate the present situation with the more widespread and varied practices disclosed in the 1965 cheating scandal.

Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that the present episode at the Academy is a minor problem. It certainly is not.

Neither do I believe that the honor code imposed by the cadets themselves should be discarded, as has been suggested by some. Character and integrity are important attributes of an officer.

Rather than criticizing the Academy, the cadets, and academic authorities, we should praise them in their efforts in building one of the finest educational institutions in the United States.

On March 1, 1967, the Washington Evening Star commented on the current cheating at the Air Force Academy. The Star's editorial is a realistic and fair appraisal of the current situation. I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues and include it at this point in the Record:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, March 1, 1967]

Cheating at the Academy

There are some distinctions to keep in mind in comparing the current state of cheating at the Air Force Academy with the scandal there two years ago.

The episode in 1965, which evoked a full-scale investigation by the Air Force, involved not only burglary of Academy buildings and plundering of files and safes, but also widespread sales of examination papers. This year the cheating assumed no such complexity; the cadets were scheduled for exams in shifts, and some of those in the first shift discussed the questions with others about to follow. For this they were forced to resign, after an investigation handled by the cadets themselves.

The 1967 affair also was on a smaller scale. At this writing, the number forced to resign is about a third of the 109 involved in 1965. And, lastly, "recruited athletes" accounted for a large proportion of the cheaters two years ago, but the current episode does not appear to center on any particular group of students.

All this is not to say that the cheating can be lightly dismissed. Nor can it be blamed on a code that, in the words of one lawmaker, is "too strict." The pledge required of cadets is much like that used in honor systems at many other colleges and universities. There is nothing in it unfair or unusual.

The outcome is, of course, a personal tragedy for every cadet obliged to resign, and a loss to the nation. But character is part of an officer's basic equipment, and some would say the most important part. As an Academy chaplain, the Rev. Francis J. Gilchrist, observed in defending the code, "Can you imagine the frustration of a commander who knows that his officers are not men of integrity?"

Perhaps the most encouraging aspect of the affair was the refusal of students to tamper with the code. "We would not change it," declared Richard Cathcart, the cadet heading the investigation. "It is something to live up to, and it is important for our integrity now and as officers later."

That attitude augurs well for the future.

COLORADANS ARE DISTURBED ABOUT THE EFFECT OF THE RECENT ORDER OF THE PRESIDENT TO WITHHOLD FUNDS AUTHORIZED FOR THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Brotzman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, last November the President announced that $1.1 billion of the $4.4 billion Federal highway construction funds authorized by Congress for fiscal year 1967 would be withheld. Last week, Transportation Secretary Alan S. Boyd, at a joint session of the House and Senate Public Works Committees told us that the administration was freeing $175 million of the funds.

Mr. Speaker, these gestures by the administration are hardly worthy of comment. They are only token reinstatements.

The people of Colorado recognize the administration's action as dangerous to the continued development of a very important program. They believe that the President's action will have an adverse effect on the Nation's economy.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to fill the Record with all of the letters and petitions I have received from my constituents in regard to this matter. However, a few select phrases will suffice to demonstrate Colorado's thinking on this action.

From the Colorado Good Roads Association:

> Taking about $10,000,000 out of our funds for fiscal 1967 is a major blow to our highway program. We have been planning on the assumption that we would receive the full $50,896,943 which was apportioned to us by Secretary Connor on August 30, 1965.

From the Colorado Labor Council, AFL–CIO:

> We are, of course, extremely concerned with the severe cutback of Federal Highway Trust Funds. We are not only concerned with regard to impairment of the schedules of interstate highway construction but because we know it is have more than a telling effect of the economy of many areas of our State.
>
> We would hope that the Congress would take action to restore these cuts as quickly as possible.

From the Colorado Equipment Distributors Association:

> The Construction industry in the West represents a major tax paying segment of the economy. . . . We fail to understand how these discriminatory cuts can be justified with a continuance and possible increase in the tax appetite of the Welfare Program which absorbs tax dollars and produces no taxable revenue base.

From a petition signed by 43 residents of Golden, Colo.:

> We are working men and depend on highway work for a livelihood and have gone through a very severe winter and some of us have been unemployed for several months with the consequent suffering by our families and the prospects of our highway work being reduced is most discouraging to us.
>
> Please help us get back to work and provide for our families by restoring these funds.

Mr. Speaker, these are but a few examples of the many letters and telegrams I am receiving about the highway trust funds.

Colorado has made substantial progress in the construction of its Interstate Highway System. It is important that the program go forward, unabated.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Congress to take the necessary steps to assure the full restoration of the Federal highway construction funds originally authorized for expenditure in fiscal 1967 by the Congress.

CONGRESS SHOULD REFUSE TO ABROGATE CONGRESSIONAL POWERS TO EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Denney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, during the progress of the hearing conducted by the Joint Senate and House Public Works Committee on the administration cutback of $700 million from highway funds the administration announced that $175 million of the cutback was being restored, that the $400 million additional would not be cut back, and that some more of the highway funds would be restored to the States prior to July 1, 1967. After 2 days of hearings, in my opinion Democrats and Republicans alike were critical in their questioning of the administration witnesses as to the legality of the President's Executive order to tamper with highway trust funds and critical that the executive branch did not confer with the Public Works Committees prior to ordering the cutback on November 23, 1966.

The hearings were called off at the close of the committee hearing on Tuesday, February 28 by the Democratic chairmen of the Senate and House Public Works Committees. In my opinion, they were called off because of the critical attitude of all members of the committees and the line of questioning of the committee members that the National Interstate Defense Highway funds represented a trust fund paid in by users of the highways and should not be tampered with by the executive branch as an anti-inflational measure, when in reality it creates a source of funds to invest Government securities to help finance nonessential Federal spending.

The hearings were called off prior to testimony by opponents to the Executive order being granted their "day in court." These witnesses included former Governor of Nebraska Robert Crosby, currently president of the National Good Roads Association, and the heads of other national associations vitally concerned with the economy of this country.

The administration's cutback order is a prime example of robbing Peter to pay Paul, done under a basis that there is a crisis, but the real problem is that the administration is always finding crises, then directing a remedy which creates a new crisis.

Congress can protect the interest of the citizenry from the arbitrary Executive orders of the administration if the respective Congressmen will continually watch what goes on in Washington and refuse to abrogate their congressional powers to the executive branch.

EDUCATIONAL CHAOS STEMS FROM CONGRESSIONAL DELAYS

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Wyatt] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I have previously brought to the attention of Members of this body the importance of early appropriations for our educational programs. As I have stated, we are failing in our duty to our Nation's youth when we deprive them of the best education possible.

We always manage to put off the important appropriations legislation until very late in the session. This works an impossible hardship on school administrators who are working anxiously for information on grant approval.

Because of laws relating to teacher contracts, and because the school year begins in September each year, academic programs must be carefully mapped out early in the calendar year, and budgets must be drawn up. When we in the House do not pass appropriations till late in the fall, the educators have only confusion in planning for new and continuing federally funded programs.

I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 120. This would require that all education appropriations be reported out of committee by May 1. In seeking the feelings of the academic community on this matter, I sent out letters to many prominent educators and school officials in Oregon's First Congressional District. The replies I have received thus far have been unanimous to the letter in support of early House action on education funds. It is apparent from these letters that May 1 is none too early, but no earlier date is practical for congressional action.

I herewith present a number of these letters from academicians and school administrators in Oregon, ranging from elementary school to college level, indicating their feelings on this important subject:

Dear Mr. Wyatt: Your proposed resolution concerning early establishment of appropriations for Federal educational programs certainly has our enthusiastic endorsement and support. This is particularly true of funds involving personnel such as projects under Title I, P.L. 89–10. Commitments for competent personnel to carry out these programs, as you know, must be made in advance of the beginning of the fiscal year.

I think your resolution would provide appropriate direction and timing for determining allocations in advance of the fiscal year. The only other suggestion I might make would be that the administrative agency, such as the U.S. Office of Education, be instructed to disseminate information regarding appropriations and entitlements as soon as possible after the May 1 date.

Again let me express our appreciation for your efforts in this matter.

Respectfully yours,
Russell M. Esvelt,
Superintendent,
Lake Oswego Public Schools.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: A sincere thank you for your letter and the enclosed resolution you are proposing regarding the appropriating of Federal funds for schools. Under the present program, it is almost an impossibility to plan a definite worthwhile project and inaugurate it at the beginning of the regular school year, due to the lack of knowledge as to the amount of money being appropriated for use for a year. If, however, schools could be informed by May as to how much money will be available for a program, the application could be made and approved, required personnel employed to carry out the program, and all necessary equipment could be ordered and ready for use in the fall. This resolution would not only simplify the initial applying, but would also guarantee the project's start right at the beginning of the year, making it a more effective program.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Jean Lundy,
Principal, Cottrell Grade School, Boring.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: Congratulations on joining with other Congressmen to push for earlier appropriations in connection with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I can not think of anything that would be more appropriate. As you know, this has worked a hardship on districts, particularly the middle-sized and smaller districts.

Sincerely,
Thomas E. Woods,
Superintendent, Beaverton School District, No. 48.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: To facilitate adequate planning for the effective use of funds for Federal educational programs, it is imperative that school districts be notified of the availability of Federal funds well in advance of the beginning of a new school year. May 1st of the year preceding the beginning of the fiscal year for which such funds are authorized to be appropriated would be helpful; however, an even earlier date would enable school districts to consider these appropriations (or lack of them) in their budget planning, which is underway right now.

We appreciate your concern in this matter, and are most grateful for your efforts in behalf of education.

Very truly yours,
Robert A. Park,
Principal, Hebo School District No. 13.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: As a school person I want to thank you and concur with you that the funding of Federal projects must be early enough in the spring to give the schools time to plan properly and staff with adequate personnel the programs sponsored through Federal funds. We are constantly waiting until the last minute for the allocation of funds, many of which come so late in the summer that we cannot even place them on our budgets in time for usage without special consideration by persons on the budget committee.

This in turn leaves us at a turn where poor planning to keep up with the Jones'es often makes the school district accept Federal funds and then place poorly trained persons in the project.

May I thank you for your continued interest in education and working on our behalf.

Sincerely,
Robert A. Matson,
Princ'pal, Seaside Union High School.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: We appreciate the effort you are making to speed up the Elementary and Secondary Education Act financing.

It will certainly be an assist to the schools to have early information concerning the amounts to be budgeted.

Sincerely,
Fred J. Patton,
Superintendent, McMinnville Public Schools.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: Your letter of February 3, 1967 has been received. My personal thanks and the appreciation of educators in general is certainly due you for your action in regard to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act fiscal timing.

Your active interest in education and informing people in the field regarding your feelings is a significant contribution. You have my respect for the very professional and meaningful way in which you operate, involving us on topics of significance. Your solicitation of advice and information from the "grass roots" as in your meeting last year in Corvallis, speaks well for you as a representative of the people.

I felt a personal obligation to comment upon this topic. Too often you probably hear the criticisms rather than appreciations. Again, thank you for your very fine consideration in behalf of education.

Sincerely yours,
H. D. Harp,
Director Campus Elementary Schools, Oregon College of Education, Monmouth.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: I am in receipt of your letter informing me of the resolution requiring action on ESEA appropriation on or before May 1st. Please be informed that I personally, and the board of directors, urge you to continue in your efforts as we feel the dire necessity for such action. It is impossible for us to plan for personnel additions or curricular changes when the monetary issue is undecided.

Again let us urge you to pursue your intentions with all good speed.

Respectfully yours,
Donald E. Gilman,
Superintendent-Principal, Yamhill County Union High School District No. 1.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: In addition to giving my personal support to the proposal which you have endorsed to appropriate school funds by May 1, I am enclosing a copy of the Oregon Education Association's Legislative Commission Report which indicates interest on the part of Oregon educators regarding such legislation. As Chairman of the Commission, I feel this is strongly supported by school people. The Oregon Education Association's position (in support) is underlined on page three of the report. It is listed among other recommendations for action in the field of federal legislation which you may wish to consider.

Sincerely,
Ray K. Godsey,
County Superintendent, Columbia County Education Department.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: Thank you for your concern for the schools and the need for the schools to know the amount of Federal funds available to them as early as possible. Of course it would help us a great deal, in Oregon, if we knew by March 1, as budgets are being made up at that time.

Thank you, and I am very much appreciative of your concern for education.

Sincerely yours,
Dr. Marlen D. Yoder,
Superintendent, Monmouth-Independence School District 13J.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: We are grateful for your leadership in solving this problem. You have our united support. We in Milwaukee are well satisfied with your work in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

Jerome C. Lillie,
Principal, Milwaukee High School.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: With reference to H. Con. Res. 120, be assured that you have the complete support of the seven board members and administration of School District 30, Warrenton, Oregon.

Along with this, you fellows will want to find out from LBJ how come, when you do appropriate the money for educational programs, H.E.W. and the President can decide not to distribute the funds until they get darn good and ready . . . which seems to be nine to eleven months late.

Your attention to duty is observed and appreciated.

Sincerely,

Richard B. Knotts,
Superintendent of Schools, Warrenton School District No. 30.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: I am in complete agreement with your concurrent resolution to provide early appropriations for Federal Educational Programs.

Such action would make provision for more effective planning and implementation of programs. My one concern is if the suggested date is as early as it could be.

Sincerely,

Harry L. Wahlstrom,
Principal, Broadway School, Seaside.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: In regard to your letter in which you call attention to a proposal for earlier financing of ESEA appropriations, I agree with your thinking. It would be of considerable help if appropriations would coincide with the July 1, June 30 fiscal year employed by all school districts.

Sincerely,

Austin Scrafford,
Superintendent, Washington County Intermediate Education District.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: I am in receipt of your letter concerning the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I certainly share the position you take regarding this measure.

I concur with your position in setting a date not later than May 1st of the year preceding the beginning of the fiscal year for which such funds are appropriated. We need the money, and we need to know the amount in time to include it in our total planning.

Sincerely,

Charles McLin,
Principal, Gaffney Lane School, Oregon City.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: Thank you for your letter and the copy of H. Con. Res. 120 which we received in this morning's mail. I am certain that all school districts in Tillamook County will agree with it 100 percent. We, by experience, have had quite a few problems that have developed by late appropriation of funds.

We will be most happy to support this in any way that we might be able, if you will let us know what we should do.

Sincerely yours,

Lee R. Hanson,
Superintendent, Tillamook County Public Schools.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: Thank you for your letter. I would commend you in your efforts to make known the amount of Federal aid to local school districts by May 1 of each year.

The lack of this information has been a very serious handicap to the planning of programs utilizing Federal money.

John Wood,
Principal, Cloverdale Grade School.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: Our school system has been grateful for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and we have had some very successful projects. However, we have found it very difficult to get our projects launched due to the great delay in receiving funds or even knowing what funds will be available.

I would join with you in supporting your resolution to require the Appropriations Committee to act by May 1 each year.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Margaret Goff,
Principal, Forest Grove Elementary Schools.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: I wish to say that your efforts on behalf of education are well founded. It is hard to do much planning if you do not know what money will be available next fall.

We at the Mary Harrison Elementary School sincerely thank you for your efforts in our behalf.

Sincerely,

Hillard Brown,
Principal, Mary Harrison Elementary School, Lincoln County.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: Thank you very much for your letter enclosing the resolution which would require Federal funds for education to be in phase with local school district budgeting. This would be a great advance if it can be done.

We certainly appreciate your effort with respect to this proposal, and we shall watch its development with interest.

Sincerely,

Melvin W. Barnes,
Superintendent, Portland Public Schools.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: In reference to your letter concerning the date of financing of Elementary and Secondary Education Act projects, may I say that I heartily endorse your House Concurrent Resolution No. 120. Any speed up of information that we can have will be most appreciated.

Sincerely,

Wendell E. Curry,
Superintendent, Rainier Public Schools.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: You have my wholehearted support in your efforts to establish a deadline for the appropriation of funds for educational assistance programs. The concurrent resolution clearly points out the reasons for such a measure.

Actually a date of January 31, or no later than the end of February, would be more helpful to those of us involved in local school district budget development.

Since you have become a Member of Congress, I have appreciated your interest in the area of education.

Very truly yours,

A. A. Biederman,
Principal, Twality Junior High School, Tigard.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: My congratulations to you for your efforts in submitting the concurrent resolution on early appropriations for Federal Educational Programs to the Committee on Rules. This has certainly been a problem to all school districts, and your resolution should have the approval of all school officials.

Sincerely yours,

William P. Ambrose,
Superintendent, School District No. 47J, Vernonia.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: I have just read your letter in regards to a resolution to have action taken on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act appropriations before May 1st of each year.

Wiser and more efficient use could be made of Federal money by local districts if we knew earlier the amount of aid to be received. It would allow school people to give more thought to their program and would get our programs started at an earlier date so as to make maximum use of the school year.

Respectfully,

Pete Trott,
Principal, Amity Elementary School.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: I am in hearty agreement that appropriations for Federal Educational Programs should be made by May 1st of each year.

I will support you in this effort.

Yours truly,

E. V. Strait,
Principal, Garibaldi Grade School.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: Thank you for your recent letter concerning funds for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Yes, one of the problems involved is receipt of funds; however, the major problem is approval of applications prior to budget planning time which starts in January of each year. If applications for the 1967–68 year, which starts in July, 1967, were approved prior to December 31, 1966, we could have planned better for the project. As it is, applications are submitted in April and approved sometime during the summer, usually, and if our allocation should change you can imagine what this does to the program.

Also, most project deadlines are at different times and this adds to the confusion such as N.D.E.A. Titles and E.S.E.A. Titles.

We thank you greatly for your interest, as we benefit greatly by the Federal program; however, there are many problems concerning financing.

Sincerely yours,

Dorothy B. O'Dell,
Clerk, Colton Public Schools.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: I concur with you that one of the most serious problems for E.S.E.A. has been the late approval given the projects. The resolution you have introduced will help local districts to do a better job of administering new programs instituted under the Act.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Roy R. Seeborg,
Superintendent, Astoria School District No. 1C.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: I am much interested in House Con. Res. 120 relative to funding educational programs. This will be a real aid in our planning and setting up programs. In most cases now under the present methods of funding we have been unable to make definite plans when we are planning our fiscal year's program.

We certainly will appreciate anything that can be done to remove the delay and uncertainty of these funds.

Yours truly,

Thomas L. McBride,
Superintendent, Molalla Consolidated Grade School.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: I heartily endorse the resolution which you sent to the Catlin Gabel High School in re the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Please be assured that you have my fullest cooperation.

Sincerely,

Edward Blair,
Headmaster, The Catlin Gabel School, Portland.

Dear Mr. Wyatt: In answer to your letter, I am very pleased to see you are taking such action as introducing a resolution to the Appropriations Committee so that we may know what funds will be available to the Schools by May 1st.

It really has been a serious problem as most of our planning is long range and our budgets are made up in the Spring in advance of the next school year. We feel this will enable us to better plan and to make better use of the money available to us.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Cecile Trost,
Principal, Howard Eccles Grade School, Canby.

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF JOHN GLENN SPACE FLIGHT

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 20, 1967, I attended the luncheon celebrating the fifth anniversary of the space flight launch of John Glenn at the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, with Chairman George Miller, of California, of the House Science and Astronautics Committee. As the ranking minority member on this committee, as well as the only Congressman now serving who was present at Cape Kennedy for this historic occasion, I felt it my duty to be present to honor John Glenn, who has done so much in pioneering for our country and the American people.

Had I been able to be present on the House floor, I would have voted "aye" on passage of H.R. 2, a bill to strengthen the Reserve components of the armed services and clarify status of National Guard technicians, rollcall No. 15.

For this reason, I missed rollcall No. 14, a quorum, on February 20, 1967.

ONE IF BY LAND, TWO IF BY SEA, AND THREE IF BY TREATY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, at each session of the House during the past 3 weeks I have figuratively been hanging a trio of lanterns "from the steeple of the old North Church" in response to the code, "one if by land, two if by sea, and three if by treaty." Insofar as notice by news media is concerned the lanterns have had very wet wicks. U.S. newspapers during this period have carried numerous lengthy dispatches by foreign correspondents in Geneva where the nonproliferation treaty is being negotiated, but little domestic comment on the treaty, either pro or con. I intend to speak out further by way of warning on this subject in the future, but it is somewhat futile to continue talking on a daily basis when no one is really listening. Here is a summary, keyed to Congressional Record date and page number, of what I have said so far during these 10 trips to the well of the House:

Plowshare Program Victim of Disarmament Zeal (2/13, 3292)—Johnson Administration has caved in to pressure from noisy liberals to go to extremes to get disarmament treaties. It has cancelled a peaceful nuclear explosive test called Cabriolet on which $2½ million already is spent. This technology is needed to build a new Panama Canal and to help underdeveloped countries rise from poverty by creating lakes, harbors, mining resources and the like.

The Nonproliferation Treaty Hoax (2/15, 3465)—Treaty will be useless as to nuclear powers who are not giving weapons away; useless as to over 100 non-nuclear states who have no resources to go nuclear; useless as to around 18 more who have the resources, but not the will to go nuclear; and futile as to four or five who have security reasons to go nuclear and will not be deterred by useless promises from others. Tear jerking and hand wringing over the treaty is a contrived hoax over useless nothing.

Proliferation Consequences Exaggerated (2/16, 3551)—Although consequences of atomic weapons in the hands of the few countries who may go nuclear, like India, Israel and Egypt, would be troublesome, they would be localized. Not even the most hopeless pessimists can make a credible case that the US and USSR would stupidly be triggered into a nuclear exchange by minor league squabbles such as these.

Disarmers Substitute Pact Pledges for Military Muscle (2/20, 3875)—Johnson Administration fully embraces disarmament philosophy, including the extreme of total and complete disarmament on which it has drafted a proposed treaty and wants to negotiate. Disarmers working to erode principle that treaties must depend on self-enforcing mechanisms rather than international good faith. Muzzled military leaders no longer are allowed to hoist warning signals. Disarmers' dreams can turn into nightmares and the public should wake up before they take us beyond the point of no return.

Nonproliferation Treaty Cheating Cannot Be Inspected or Verified (2/21, 4169)—Proposed International Atomic Energy Agency inspection for treaty compliance is an illusion. IAEA is financially incapable of doing the job. It has only 10 inspectors to discharge world-wide responsibilities. IAEA is technically incapable to inspect. No one even knows how much disappearance of fissionable material during peacetime manufacturing processes is normal loss and at what point deliberate diversion should be suspected.

Nonproliferation Treaty Flunks Cost Effective Test (2/21, 4187)—Pentagon's cost-effective, systems analysis technique for resolving major defense problems has not been applied to the treaty. If it were, treaty would flunk the test since it paints us into a corner and denies options which national security requires. Defensive nuclear arming of allies would be denied. Instead US assumes risky role of a nuclear Sir Galahad rushing hither and thither to the rescue of all.

Treaty Will Not Stop Nuclear Spread or Enhance Security (2/23, 4383)—Despite 4600 treaties in force we are not even in an uneasy peace, we are at war. Pres. Johnson's assurances to all nuclear "have-nots" that they "will have our strong support against blackmail" will pose far greater risks and dangers to US security than a world without a nonproliferation treaty.

Nonproliferation Treaty—A Nuclear Yalta? (2/27, 4518)—Soviets really want the treaty and believe playing difficult is the way to get it. The treaty negotiations are disrupting the NATO alliance. Possibly Soviets feel they have gained nuclear superiority, particularly in ABM warheads, and that if they can get a ban on underground tests as a price for the nonproliferation treaty, they can freeze their superiority into permanence and thereby eliminate the U.S. strategic deterrent to communist aggression.

Schizophrenic Nuclear Pacifists Try Un-Inventing the Wheel (2/28, 4818)—New, simplified centrifuge process for obtaining fissionable U^{235} to make atomic bombs may be developing which treaty negotiators are overlooking. It would make treaty breaking easier. US secrecy about the development is a precedent for others to hid their efforts and secretly go nuclear. US secrecy also deprives IAEA inspectors of technical know-how needed to ferret out such installations.

Boozers and Teetotalers and Nonproliferation (3/1, 5064)—Possible discovery of a means to achieve pure hydrogen fusion will bring in the era of the "Poor Man's H-Bomb." From practical and technical standpoints "the genie is out of the bottle." Trying to ram it back in is futile. We should concentrate on learning to live safely with an inevitable degree of nuclear spread.

MINIMAL 5-PERCENT THAW IN JOHNSON'S HIGHWAY FREEZE—STILL LEAVES CONSTRUCTION OUT IN THE COLD

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer] for 30 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on February 27 the Subcommittees on Roads of the House and Senate Committees on Public Works commenced joint hearings on the President's freeze of highway funds. These hearings were scheduled to continue for 4 days, and witnesses were scheduled for all 4 days. However, the hearings were abruptly recessed over the minority's objection at the end of the second day.

Except for Gov. John Volpe, of Massachusetts, chairman of the Governor's Committee on Highways, who was highly critical of the cutback in the Federal-aid highway construction program, only witnesses from the executive branch were heard. At least two of these witnesses, Alan S. Boyd, Secretary of Transportation, and Charles L. Schultze, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, participated in the decision by the Johnson administration to impose the cutback. Obviously, the administration's witnesses defended the action taken by the President.

I am keenly disappointed that the hearings were terminated. I feel that only one side of the story has been told. Nevertheless, the hearings did result in a token relaxation in the highway cutback. I hope the hearings will resume in the near future. I want to make it clear, however, just how limited and restricted this relaxation or slight thaw actually is.

On November 23, 1966, it was announced that obligations for the Federal-aid highway program would be limited to $3.3 billion during fiscal year 1967. The estimated receipts of the highway trust fund could finance expenditures resulting from the obligation of $4.4 billion during fiscal year 1967. Thus, the announced cutback totaled $1.1 billion, or 25 percent.

The Bureau of Public Roads was notified on or before November 10, 1966, that an additional $100 million could be used for acquisition of right-of-way.

However, by the administration's edict,

this relaxation in the obligation ceiling was kept secret. Of this $100 million, $41,576,000 has been released to just two States and the District of Columbia as follows: District of Columbia, $25,218,000 to be used for right-of-way projects approved between July 1, 1966, and November 23, 1966; Indiana, $13 million to be used for completing gaps in Interstate Route 70; Rhode Island, $3,358,000, a little over $1 million of which was to cover a previous overdraft and about $2 million to be available for obligation without limitation. We have no information as to when or whether the balance of about $59 million of this unannounced $100 million relaxation will be released. Under the wraps of secrecy, thus, over 40 percent of this $100 million was released to two States and the District of Columbia contrary to the practice of allocating funds released to all States under the apportionment formulas.

At a press conference on January 17, 1967, the President announced that serious consideration was being given to an additional cutback beyond the $1.1 billion of $400 million, for a total of $1.5 billion, during fiscal year 1967. It was announced at the hearings that this additional cutback would not be made. This announcement was probably the most significant benefit derived from the hearings.

Other actual and possible relaxations in the cutback were announced by administration witnesses. Some $175 million of deferred funds is being released immediately for preliminary engineering and right-of-way acquisition. A full annual program level of $4.4 billion will, according to the witnesses, be put into effect for fiscal year 1968. Additional amounts of the deferred funds will be released if "the economic situation warrants." And funds which have been accumulated during the deferral period may be used to increase the program above $4.4 billion for fiscal year 1968, providing economic circumstances permit, and depending upon decisions yet to be made by the administration this fiscal year.

With regard to the release of $175 million, it should be emphasized that these funds can be used only for preliminary engineering and right-of-way acquisition. No part of these funds can be used for actual construction. I seriously question the legal authority for attaching such limitations to the release of obligational authority. I also seriously question the legal authority for releasing funds to a few selected States, and placing varying limitations on the use of such funds. This is certainly not the kind of uniform treatment of the States contemplated by the Congress.

The other relaxations or unfreezing in the highway cutback are simply proposals, and very vague, indefinite ones at that. Funds will be released if the economic situation warrants—if the moderation in economic activity and price trends continue. Funds accumulated during the deferral period may be used to increase the program above $4.4 billion for fiscal year 1968 if economic circumstances permit and depending upon decisions yet to be made by the administration in this fiscal year. Thus, the "iffiness" is in and the certainty is out of the highway program.

What we are left with is a cutback in the highway program this year of some $884 million, or 20 percent, from the $4.4 billion level that the highway trust fund can finance.

The administration has converted the Federal-aid highway program from a stable program, for which advance planning could be undertaken with the assurance of orderly construction financed by an inviolate trust fund, to an "iffy" program which goes up and down like a yo-yo depending upon the policies and economic theories of the administration.

To further illustrate the inconsistencies of the administration, on March 1, 1967, the day following the close of the hearings on the highway cutback, the Department of Commerce released a study for a proposed program of scenic roads and parkways prepared for the President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty. This study recommends a minimum program for scenic roads and parkways of $4 billion, and a maximum program of $8 billion, over a 10-year period from 1966 to 1976. It is proposed that this program be conducted at an annual minimum level of $400 million and up to an annual maximum level of $800 million. To finance this program it is proposed that $155 million annually be taken from the highway trust fund for the minimum program and $310 million annually for the maximum or extended program. This recommendation is made in spite of the fact that the trust fund already is inadequate to complete the Interstate System.

On February 6, 1967, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 2601 to 2602, a table—table 2—showing the amounts of Federal-aid highway funds that could be made available to each of the States for reimbursable obligations during fiscal year 1967, without exceeding estimated revenues of the highway trust fund, and the amounts frozen by the administration. This table, based upon the experience of recent years, shows that for the States to obligate up to $4.4 billion during fiscal year 1967—which amount can be financed by the trust fund—approximately $5.4 billion of obligational authority would have to be released to the States. The fact that all States do not obligate all of their funds during the fiscal year in which they are made available has been taken into account in the release of obligational authority in past years, resulting in an annual carryover of about $1 billion in obligational authority. This permits the States that are able to do so to obligate their apportionments as fast as the trust fund will permit, rather than holding all the States back to the obligation level of the slower States.

I have updated the information contained in this table to reflect the changes produced by the release of the additional $175 million to all the States and some $41 million to two States and the District of Columbia, for a total of $216,576,000 new obligational authority. The updated table follows:

Amounts of Federal-aid highway funds that could be made available for reimbursable obligations during fiscal year 1967, without exceeding estimated revenues of the highway trust fund; limitations on the obligation of such funds; and amounts of such funds frozen by the administration during fiscal year 1967

State	Amounts of apportioned Federal-aid highway funds that could be made available for reimbursable obligations during fiscal year 1967			Limitations imposed by the administration on the obligation of apportioned Federal-aid highway funds during fiscal year 1967				Amounts of apportioned Federal-aid highway funds frozen by administration that could be made available for reimbursable obligations during fiscal year 1967	
	Unobligated reimbursable obligations carried forward from fiscal year 1966	Additional amounts that could be made available	Total amounts that could be made available	Original limitation imposed, Nov. 23, 1966	Additional obligational authority for preliminary engineering and right-of-way released, Feb. 28, 1967	Other obligational authority released subsequent to Nov. 23, 1966	Total limitations on obligations	Amount	Percent
Alabama	$48,706,555	$91,949,107	$140,655,662	$68,685,000	$3,698,000		$72,383,000	$68,272,662	48.5
Alaska	24,612,822	40,404,391	65,017,213	31,016,000	1,625,000		32,641,000	32,376,213	49.8
Arizona	2,579,405	64,477,381	67,056,786	48,110,000	2,593,000		50,703,000	16,353,786	24.5
Arkansas	13,528,891	39,689,081	53,217,972	29,772,000	1,596,000		31,368,000	21,849,972	41.0
California	8,573,124	388,061,988	396,685,112	289,184,000	15,606,000		304,790,000	91,845,112	23.1
Colorado	30,165,072	55,734,732	85,899,804	41,743,000	2,241,000		43,984,000	41,915,804	48.8
Connecticut	5,566,508	80,502,314	86,068,822	59,869,000	3,237,000		63,106,000	22,962,822	26.7
Delaware	9,526,378	10,337,680	19,864,058	7,774,000	416,000		8,190,000	11,674,058	58.8
Florida	17,516,890	95,562,162	113,079,052	71,401,000	3,843,000		75,244,000	37,835,052	33.4
Georgia	16,321,329	71,032,410	87,353,739	53,307,000	2,857,000		56,164,000	31,189,739	35.7
Hawaii	53,028,354	33,626,047	86,654,401	25,047,000	1,352,000		26,399,000	60,255,401	69.6
Idaho	15,512,122	28,933,946	44,446,068	21,683,000	1,164,000		22,847,000	21,599,068	49.1
Illinois	23,301,411	234,848,593	258,150,004	173,109,000	9,444,000		182,553,000	75,597,004	29.3
Indiana	60,880,720	96,418,521	157,299,241	72,084,000	3,877,000	[1] $13,000,000	88,961,000	68,338,241	43.4
Iowa	4,857,462	61,442,004	66,299,466	46,124,000	2,471,000		48,595,000	17,704,466	26.7
Kansas	4,083,680	44,981,263	49,064,943	33,823,000	1,809,000		35,632,000	13,432,943	27.3

See footnotes at end of table.

Amounts of Federal-aid highway funds that could be made available for reimbursable obligations during fiscal year 1967, without exceeding estimated revenues of the highway trust fund; limitations on the obligation of such funds; and amounts of such funds frozen by the administration during fiscal year 1967—Continued

State	Amounts of apportioned Federal-aid highway funds that could be made available for reimbursable obligations during fiscal year 1967			Limitations imposed by the administration on the obligation of apportioned Federal-aid highway funds during fiscal year 1967				Amounts of apportioned Federal-aid highway funds frozen by administration that could be made available for reimbursable obligations during fiscal year 1967	
	Unobligated reimbursable obligations carried forward from fiscal year 1966	Additional amounts that could be made available	Total amounts that could be made available	Original limitation imposed, Nov. 23, 1966	Additional obligational authority for preliminary engineering and right-of-way released, Feb. 28, 1967	Other obligational authority released subsequent to Nov. 23, 1966	Total limitations on obligations	Amount	Percent
Kentucky	$30,641,690	$86,542,748	$117,184,438	$64,595,000	$3,480,000		$68,075,000	$49,109,438	41.0
Louisiana	2,917,670	101,192,631	104,110,301	75,426,000	4,069,000		79,495,000	24,615,301	23.6
Maine	2,776,022	21,695,830	24,471,852	16,264,000	873,000		17,137,000	7,334,852	29.8
Maryland	119,362,346	65,944,078	185,356,424	49,226,000	2,652,000		51,878,000	133,478,424	72.0
Massachusetts	35,873,661	89,645,511	125,519,172	66,874,000	3,605,000		70,479,000	55,040,172	43.9
Michigan	14,476,565	133,867,415	148,343,980	100,139,000	5,384,000		105,523,000	42,820,980	28.8
Minnesota	3,287,466	102,305,647	105,593,113	76,429,000	4,114,000		80,543,000	25,050,113	23.6
Mississippi	4,077,089	51,804,606	55,881,695	38,855,000	2,083,000		40,938,000	14,943,695	26.6
Missouri	10,649,702	108,275,603	118,925,305	80,924,000	4,354,000		85,278,000	33,647,305	28.3
Montana	30,019,380	48,807,210	78,826,590	36,563,000	1,963,000		38,526,000	40,300,590	41.1
Nebraska	5,392,793	34,143,170	39,535,963	25,690,000	1,373,000		27,063,000	12,472,963	31.6
Nevada	2,204,452	29,911,065	32,115,517	22,398,000	1,203,000		23,601,000	8,514,517	26.5
New Hampshire	10,844,733	20,647,714	31,492,457	15,421,000	830,000		16,251,000	15,241,457	48.2
New Jersey	92,232,001	107,769,326	200,001,327	80,363,000	4,334,000		84,697,000	115,304,327	57.6
New Mexico	483,234	53,061,492	53,544,726	39,640,000	2,134,000		41,774,000	11,770,726	22.1
New York	15,735,753	229,264,106	244,999,859	171,445,000	9,220,000		180,665,000	64,334,859	26.2
North Carolina	994	54,337,663	54,338,658	40,881,000	2,185,000		43,066,000	11,272,658	20.4
North Dakota	7,906	26,283,769	26,291,675	19,780,000	1,057,000		20,837,000	5,454,675	20.5
Ohio	47,179,738	246,546,138	293,725,876	183,778,000	9,915,000		193,693,000	100,032,876	34.1
Oklahoma	8,028,097	53,948,259	61,976,356	40,415,000	2,170,000		42,585,000	19,391,356	31.3
Oregon	2,710,113	73,104,672	75,814,785	51,121,000	2,940,000		54,061,000	21,753,785	28.8
Pennsylvania	56,606,484	205,237,836	261,844,320	153,242,000	8,254,000		161,496,000	100,348,320	38.3
Rhode Island	3,879,519	23,981,293	27,860,812	17,913,000	964,000	[2] $3,358,000	22,235,000	5,625,812	20.1
South Carolina	1,078,420	34,227,551	35,305,971	25,711,000	1,376,000		27,087,000	8,218,971	23.2
South Dakota	1,647,689	41,886,505	43,534,194	31,340,000	1,684,000		33,024,000	10,510,194	24.1
Tennessee	4,105,483	93,351,303	97,456,786	69,710,000	3,754,000		73,464,000	23,992,786	24.6
Texas	5,207,054	228,920,087	234,127,141	171,195,000	9,206,000		180,401,000	53,726,141	26.9
Utah	9,289,381	60,444,805	69,734,186	45,037,000	2,431,000		47,468,000	22,266,186	31.9
Vermont	19,662,266	28,053,838	47,716,104	20,898,000	1,128,000		22,026,000	25,690,104	53.9
Virginia	7,664,734	123,923,826	131,588,560	92,336,000	4,984,000		97,320,000	34,268,560	26.1
Washington	25,920,556	97,247,495	123,168,051	72,490,000	3,911,000		76,401,000	46,767,051	38.0
West Virginia	10,649,034	87,293,256	97,942,290	64,959,000	3,511,000		68,470,000	29,472,290	30.1
Wisconsin	1,319,228	50,875,316	52,194,544	38,286,000	2,046,000		40,332,000	11,862,544	22.8
Wyoming	3,948,870	42,153,529	46,102,399	31,433,000	1,695,000		33,128,000	12,974,399	28.2
District of Columbia	94,715,980	50,276,060	144,992,040	37,404,000	2,022,000	[3] 25,218,000	64,644,000	80,348,040	55.4
Puerto Rico	6,028,398	6,627,027	12,655,425	5,088,000	267,000		5,355,000	7,300,425	57.9
Total	1,029,385,233	[4] 4,351,600,000	5,381,035,235	3,246,000,000	175,000,000	41,576,000	3,462,576,000	1,918,459,235	35.6

[1] For completing gaps in Interstate Route 70.

[2] To cover previous obligation overdraft of approximately $1,000,000 and $2,000,000 new obligational authority without limitation.

[3] For right-of-way projects approved between July 1 and Nov. 23. 1966.

[4] $4,400,000,000 including amounts deducted for administrative and research costs of the Bureau of Public Roads.

This drastic cut in highway construction is wrong for the following reasons:

First. It is contrary to the assurances given all concerned by the President when he signed the 1964 Highway Authorization Act and made it appear that the program was not going to be impaired.

Second. A stop-start, yo-yo highway program disrupts State planning and programing, contractor performance and cost factors, and gives no continuity to the program that must have long-range planning by its very nature.

Third. This executive cutback is contrary to the clearly expressed intent of Congress that the highway construction program advance as fast as trust fund receipts will permit.

Fourth. This is a back-door way of raiding the trust fund accomplished through executive order that reduces spending, thus increasing surpluses that are available for borrowing and ends up in other Great Society programs apparently nearer and dearer to the Washington planners.

Fifth. The cutback violates the good faith assurances made to the highway users, who are paying user taxes into the trust fund, that such funds shall be used exclusively for highway purposes.

Sixth. This cutback demonstrates the unwillingness of the Great Society to make priority decisions. It prefers to cut back on-going and essential programs while undertaking new and unnecessary programs. Beauty, yes; construction, no. A 25-percent increase in poverty funds, a 20-percent cut in highway funds. Teacher Corps, and demonstration cities, yes; highways, no.

Seventh. This cutback was ordered without consultation with the States, the committees of Congress, the industry, or the road user organizations to first determine the true impact and effect.

Eighth. As ordered, it penalizes the States that have gone forward with 1967 construction in the first 5 months, before the November order, leaving minimal funds under the 20 percent annual reduction order for the last 7 months. The reduced cutback amounts to 33.4 percent in Florida.

Ninth. The order permitted the Bureau to favor with huge sums two States and the District of Columbia for a total of over $41 million for "emergency" purposes contrary to customary equal treatment procedures for allocating funds under the established apportionment formulas to all States alike, under a cloak of secrecy.

Tenth. It means either accelerated construction at a later date, which invites higher contract prices, or a stretch-out of the program to make up for the cutback remaining for fiscal year 1967. Thus, the program becomes full of "ifs" contrary to the intent of Congress.

Eleventh. It unjustly penalizes the urban areas that are now coming fully into the program in that the first construction emphasis was in the rural areas and makes the metropolitan development emphasis discussed by the Great Society sound hollow in practice.

Twelfth. This adversely affects our Interstate and Defense Highway System at a time when we are engaged in the third largest war in history. Does this make sense?

These are some of the reasons that would seem to require further unfreezing of the frozen highway funds. A decision on this must be forthcoming soon or contract letting in some States will be brought to a halt.

If this happens and the steady programing of highway construction is brought to a halt, the administration will be inviting chaos in the highway construction industry similar to the recession being felt in the home construction industry. But, added to this, is the deterioration of the Federal-State relationship. The partnership in highway construction, built upon mutual consultation and trust, is suddenly interrupted by an order of the President.

Federal allocations based upon established apportionment formulas and Federal laws become empty promises; the Highway Trust Fund becomes a slush fund for Great Society borrowing for other programs; and the highway users' "trust" in the fund and the program becomes meaningless.

Only a reinstatement of the full amount of the funds frozen, including unfreezing obligational authority in excess of $1 billion for pre-1967 years, will restore confidence in this program and prevent serious dislocations that will be with us for years to come.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, concluding the hearings of the Joint Subcommittee on Roads of the House and Senate Committees on Public Works by the administration without hearing the other side of the issue involved is truly, in effect, denying the defendant, so to speak, his day in court. Those most directly involved and those most seriously affected by the administration's cutback were denied an opportunity to even explain the effects of this cutback upon them, their industries, their employees, and the economies of the various States. The administration witnesses, in effect, admitted that they were not fully aware of the final impact, not only on the highway construction program, but also upon the economy of the States, the highway construction industry and allied services to deny these people their day in court and, in effect, preclude them from pointing out to the administration or demonstrating what the full impact and effect of the administration's actions will be, indicating very clearly that the administration has little regard for the consequences of its actions. Now the release of $175 million restricted to engineering and right of way acquisition is nothing more than a token effort on the part of the administration to appease those who have been seriously jeopardized.

Ohio's portion of this sum amounts to $9,915,000. This, in effect, is nothing but a crumb to a starving animal. Ohio actually spends about $8 million per month on interstate right-of-way acquisition. So the release of this amount of money will only provide work for some 5 or 6 weeks at best for the personnel of the department of highways. It does nothing, absolutely nothing, to help the highway construction industry, the thousands of employees of that industry, or the thousands of employees of industries serving the construction industry, nor those millions of American citizens that are daily using the highways. They are being subjected to injury or death because the highways are not being completed as quickly as possible. To give you an indication of why I say the highway construction program is becoming a second-class citizen as compared to some of the more pet programs of the administration, I want to give you the following examples:

The poverty program received an appropriation for fiscal 1967 in the amount of $1,612,500,000. I am advised by OEO that OEO will obligate all of this appropriation of fiscal 1967. Here the administration on the one hand is spending over $1,600 million, in an effort, so it claims, to alleviate poverty by a program that at best is questionable. While on the other hand it is creating poverty by cutting back on such a proven program as the highway program. I have here the daily statement of the U.S. Treasury of February 21, 1967, and in that statement is an analysis of certain withdrawals and expenditures. The statement shows that from the period of July 1, 1965, through February 21, 1966, there was spent $1,342 million on economic foreign assistance. For the comparable period beginning July 1, 1966, through February 21, 1967, the Federal Government spent $1,482 million on foreign aid—an increase of $150 million. Now just this week the administration announced its willingness to supply some $70 million in foreign aid in 1967 to Indonesia.

Here again the highway program is being made a second-class citizen while the administration has increased foreign aid $150 million over a comparable period from the year before. The urban renewal program received an appropriation for 1967 of some $750 million. In addition there were some carryover appropriations of about $75 million from previous years. I am advised that the urban renewal agency intends to obligate in fiscal 1967 over $800 million. This is some $50 million over and above the actual appropriation for fiscal 1967. Where is the cut in this program comparable to that in the highway program? There was an $11 million appropriation for fiscal 1967 for the model cities program. I am further advised that all of this will be obligated for fiscal 1967. The mass transportation program received an appropriation for fiscal 1967 in the amount of $130 million. This sum together with carryover appropriations from previous years will permit the obligation of over $133 million in this particular program and I am advised that it is the intention of the agency handling this program to obligate in fiscal 1967 expenditures in this amount. Where is the cut in this program comparable to the highway curtailment? For highway beautification there was an appropriation of $80 million. The administration expects to obligate all of it. The Economic Development Administration received an appropriation of over $296 million and expects to obligate it all. There is certainly no 25- to 40-percent cut here. One other item, Mr. Speaker, on February 28 the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System announced a reduction in member bank reserve requirements. The release reads as follows:

> The action is intended to assist in meeting developing credit needs throughout the country in a manner consistent with the Federal Reserve's policy objectives of assuring that the availability of credit is adequate to provide for orderly economic growth.
>
> Reserve requirements are being reduced from 4 percent to 3 percent against savings deposits, Christmas and vacation club accounts, and the first $5 million of other time deposits at each member bank. The reduction will be made in two equal steps: the first, from 4 to 3½ percent, will become effective with the reserve computation period beginning March 2, 1967; and the second, from 3½ to 3 percent, will become effective with the reserve computation period beginning March 16, 1967.
>
> It is estimated that the combined effect of these changes will be to reduce required reserves at member banks by about $850 million—approximately $500 million at country banks and $350 million at reserve city banks.

This has the effect of releasing some $850 million to be pumped into the economy. Now I am not critical of any efforts to reduce interest rates. I believe interest rates are far too high. But the fact remains that this sum is going to be pumped into the economy while an almost comparable sum in the highway program is going to be extracted from the economy. Now, Mr. Speaker, I cite these examples not to be critical of the use of the various appropriations but to point out the fact that the administration is making the highway program a stepchild and using this program to accumulate funds to be put to a use which it feels are more politically potent. It is obviously not making a comparable cut in other programs but rather is singling out the heretofore highly successful highway construction program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it purports to do this in the guise of economizing but I would like to point out to you what has occurred in Federal employment since September of 1966. At that time the Federal employment, as reported by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, stood at 2,773,724. At the end of December 1966, Federal employment was at the figure of 2,842,491 or, in that 3-month period, an increase of 68,767 persons. The average civil service salary of a Federal employee is roughly $7,000 annually. This means that these additional employees added to the Federal payrolls will increase the Federal payroll by over $400 million a year. In addition, the budget for fiscal 1968 asks an additional 68,500 employees.

This will add another $400-and-some million to the Federal payroll over and above what it is now. The runaway nature of Federal employment has been starkly dramatized by the Presidential cutback ordered in December 1965. At that time President Johnson ordered a 1-percent cut—25,000 employees—to be achieved by June 30, 1966. However, as of June 30, 1966, the number of employees had risen by 192,000 instead of being reduced by 25,000. The Federal payroll from 1965 to 1966 had increased by more than $1,400 million. If the administration is interested in economizing, it could cut back on this excessive increase of Federal employees.

It has been said that the mere award of highway construction contracts is inflationary, even before the States and the Federal Government expend any funds, and that this is the reason for drastically cutting back the obligation of funds. It is true that upon the award of a contract, a highway contractor ordinarily will prepare to undertake the work, which work may not actually commence until the next construction season. He may assemble some of his professional and supervisory personnel, repair and overhaul his construction equipment, possibly order some new equipment, and, if the job calls for it, order prefabricated items and steel and other shapes. But, on the average, this would account for no more than 20 percent of the dollar value of the contract. Most of the contractor's expenditures occur while the construction work is in progress, for labor and material. Even assuming that early expenditures resulting from the award of contracts would amount to 20 percent, only about $220 million would find its way into the economy this year if the entire $1.1 billion cutback were obligated during fiscal year 1967. This is a drop in the bucket when considered in light of the estimated Federal expenditures of $126.7 billion this year, and its effect upon inflation this year will be infinitesimal.

Furthermore, the average lagtime between the obligation of Federal-aid highway funds, that this, the certifying by the Bureau of Public Roads of the availability of funds to the States, until the actual expenditure of such funds from the highway trust fund amounts to some 18 months; therefore, even though contracts were awarded during the balance of fiscal 1967 the actual expenditure of the great bulk of the funds would not occur until fiscal 1968 and possibly beyond. So there is really little merit to the argument that the cutback will dampen inflationary pressures now. In the interest of protecting the economy generally and the welfare and safety of millions of people using the highways to say nothing of assuring many thousands of people that their jobs will not be jeopardized, the administration should, at the earliest possible moment, reinstate the cutback it has erroneously ordered.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], the ranking Republican on our Public Works Roads Subcommittee for again demonstrating his ability to lead the minority in the presentation of facts, as he sees them relating to highway matters throughout the Nation.

The recent cutback by the administration in the Federal-aid highway construction program has caused a great deal of furor in my State of California as well as other sections of the country. Many people have written to me expressing their strong objections to the administration's decision.

I thought Secretary of Transportation Boyd and Budget Director Schultze did a commendable job in defending the administration position before our committee. However, I am frank to say, that I sincerely believe they were genuinely lukewarm to the idea of cutting back on a badly needed construction program. Their recommendations to reinstate some of the funds tends to bear out my point of view.

I will not go into the details of the minority position because Mr. CRAMER has very ably presented it.

Like most of the Members of Congress, I am very much concerned about the inflationary problems facing the country. There are many and varied theories as to why the problem occurs. Mr. Boyd and Mr. Schultze both revealed many of the reasons causing the dangerous inflationary trends and factors, before our committee.

Actually, most of what has actually occurred was predicted by many Members of Congress during various legislative debates on the floor of the House. Some have called it the guns and butter issue.

I have always felt that we have an obligation to establish priorities on the various programs that require Federal expenditures. I sincerely believe, and have tried to vote accordingly to reflect that belief, that we are overcommitted in many of our lower priority domestic programs.

We cannot permit the highway construction program to be subjected to this stop and go type action because too many people in the construction industry—workers, equipment operators, engineers—people associated with State and local units of Government charged with the responsibility for planning, and programing of their respective highway programs, are adversely affected.

Actually, the building and construction union organizations in California have had a rather severe recession, prior to this announced cutback and have so communicated this message to me.

The principle point that I want to make is that I believe we should not tamper with the highway trust fund. The traveling public, who are the principal taxpayers, have been paying their taxes, with a minimum amount of objection, in full anticipation of completing the Interstate Highway System on schedule, if at all possible.

As legislators, we have the prime responsibility of seeing to it that the intent of the Federal Highway Act of 1956 and subsequent Federal-aid highway legislation is carried out. The fact that a trust fund was established, indicates, without question, that the money is to be held in trust for future allocations to advance the highway construction programs—without permitting any type of transfer for other general fund programs.

While fiscal policy is a factor, I believe they have chosen the wrong program for cutbacks. With the authoritative estimates suggesting that 8,000 lives a year will be lost until our Interstate Highway System is constructed, which is more American lives than are lost in Vietnam, I can never support a showdown in the program. As long as I am a member of this Road Subcommittee, I shall vigorously oppose any raids on the trust fund and support any effort to accelerate road construction programs, within, of course, the boundaries of sound fiscal policy.

We all seek economic growth, Mr. Speaker. Highway construction and a balanced transportation system will do more to promote growth and build a sound economy than anything I can think of—it creates jobs, promotes safety and in general helps make America a better place to live. Let us complete the job of building the finest network of roads in any country in the world. Our position of leadership in the field of international economic competition may well depend upon the success of our efforts.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works for his report bringing to the attention of this House the seriousness of the cutback in Federal highway funds. I associate myself with everything he has said.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to congratulate my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], for his excellent statement in regard to the precipitous recess of joint hearings on the Johnson administration's freeze and cutback of highway funds. Congressman CRAMER is to be congratulated for his forthright statement and his clear call for continued hearings.

MINORITY NOT CONSULTED

It is a matter of particular regret to me that we, on the minority, were not consulted in regard to the abrupt recess of the hearings. This high-handed overriding of the minority creates precisely the type of situation that brings the U.S. Congress into disrespect. There is a clear and unmistakable implication that these hearings were recessed because the administration wanted to have them recessed. Congress is meant to be a separate and coequal branch of government and not a mere adjunct of the executive.

Testimony at the hearings indicated that there had been no real consultation with the Public Works Committees of the House and Senate at the time the administration was wielding the ax on the highway construction program. Now they expect Congress to accept this with supine equanimity and apparently this is just what we plan to do. This underscores the need for these hearings to be reopened.

In a February 14, 1967, news release, Chairman FALLON said:

> We are prepared to consider every authoritative point of view on this but we cannot escape the fact that this cutback and freeze makes it impossible to maintain an orderly highway construction program, and that the failure to do so is not only economically shortsighted but puts us in the highly questionable position of acceding to an action that inevitably must spell death and injury.

I was shocked last Tuesday when, at the end of Director Schultze's testimony, the hearings were abruptly recessed. In Chairman FALLON's words:

> Every authoritative point of view—

Has not been heard as of yet and we are still in the—

> highly questionable position of acceding to an action that inevitably must spell death and injury.

I strongly urge that the hearings be continued immediately.

SETTLEMENT FOR A CRUMB

The release of $175 million of the deferred funds announced by Secretary Boyd apparently accomplished its goal. It was a small price for the administration to pay, with someone else's funds, to have the hearings called off. This nominal release of $175 million out of the total $1.1 billion held back, plus a promise not to cut an additional $400 million, are the only two concrete promises extracted from the administration. No definite promise of how much money or when further restorations will be made to the highway program have been obtained.

The legality of the cutback and freeze has been quite properly questioned by Senator BROOKE.

The legality of the tight restrictions placed upon the expenditure of the $175 million has not been established.

The question of "iffyness" in the program has not been resolved. No definite answers regarding the "ifs" in the economy, in cost, and in the administration's need or desire for highway trust fund moneys have been answered.

If the administration's cutback and freeze of highway funds was designed to curb inflation and if some success has been reached as administration witnesses have testified, what assurances have we gotten that this will not happen again—that future releases of funds will be immediately forthcoming, and how much would these releases amount to?

WERE GREAT SOCIETY PROGRAMS CUT?

Are Great Society programs, such as Appalachia, poverty, and beautification bearing their fair share, if any, of the administration's newly found interest in economy?

The testimony of the administration witnesses has answered some questions but has in turn created many more questions which deserve immediate concrete and definite answers.

We still do not know, and must find out, if the economic purposes referred to by Director Schultze are worth the sacrifice in jobs and human lives that the cutback and freeze have imposed, and will continue to impose, until their full restoration.

To date, excepting only Governor Volpe's excellent and highly adverse testimony, administration spokesmen only have testified. It is vital that the hearings be continued so that all sides of the story can be heard. Secretary Boyd and Director Schultze told us that the Federal employment of civilians has been reduced. Secretary Boyd said:

> The President ordered government agencies to reduce or defer purchasing, travel, employment and other activities to minimize expenditures.

Director Schultze said that—

> Directives issued last September reducing the use of paid overtime and setting ceilings on Federal civilian employment for the remainder of fiscal 1967.

Both these statements appear erroneous. Congressman MAHON's Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures clearly states as follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
October	2,798,212	24,488	....
November	2,834,940	36,728	....
December	2,842,528	7,588	....
January 1967	2,848,179	5,651	....

Thus, employment in this 4-month period increased by 74,455 persons, not decreased. The checks and balances created by our democratic form of government must be maintained to keep the administration honest and frank.

In the national interest, Mr. Speaker, hearings should be continued on the highway cutback.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned in my remarks that Senator EDWARD BROOKE, of Massachusetts, questioned the legality of these cutbacks. For this reason I thought my colleagues might be interested in his excellent letter to Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH substantiating his claim that the cut in Federal-aid highway program is unlawful. His letter follows:

FEBRUARY 27, 1967.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RANDOLPH: The announcement by the Bureau of Public Roads on November 23, 1966, that there would be an immediate cutback of $1.1 billion in the Federal-aid highway program for the fiscal year, ending on June 30, 1967, which cutback would affect approximately 25 percent of the new construction work which should be begun during fiscal year 1967, has provoked widespread, adverse comment throughout the country. These comments have been based primarily upon important public policy questions. It has been pointed out, for example, that the cost of highway construction has increased substantially during the past decade. Consequently, deferment of essential highway construction will inevitably result not only in substantial construction cost increases, but also in additional engineering design and administrative expenses.

The ever increasing, tragic loss of life in automobile accidents could certainly be reduced by prompt completion of a modern and safe system of interstate highways. Contractors and other business men who have responded to the Federal Government's repeated requests to "stand by" and be prepared for sustained effort so that the Federal-aid highway program could be completed on time will suffer severe financial reverses as a result of the delay in the construction schedule. Finally, since the inflationary pressures upon the nation's economy appear to be easing, the cutback now no longer serves a sound fiscal purpose; it could instead conceivably contribute to a recession, the potential for which has already been identified by a number of respected economists.

All of these factors are important. They ought to be fully explored. But I believe that a more fundamental issue has yet to be considered: specifically, the legal justification—or lack thereof—of the cutback. I respectfully suggest that the cutback in question is one which can only be imposed by Congressional action; it is *not* a matter which may lawfully be made the subject of an administrator's order.

As Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts from 1963 to 1967, I had frequent occasion to consider the Federal-aid highway program statutes and to advise the State departments and agencies with respect to their implementation. It is my belief that the legal effect of these statutes is such that the directives contained therein can be altered only by the Congress, and that accordingly the cutback announced on November 23, 1966 is unlawful and should be rescinded.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 related both to the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary systems (as well as to extensions of these systems within urban areas), and to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, usually referred to as the "Interstate System." The Act briefly treats the questions of apportionment and expenditure with respect to the primary and secondary systems, a subject treated more fully below. It then proceeds to determine the future of the Interstate System.

The language used by the Congress in 1956 with respect to completion of the Interstate System is clear. There is no doubt as to what the Congress intended.

"It is hereby declared to be essential to the national interest to provide for the early completion of the 'National System of Interstate Highways,' as authorized and designated in accordance with section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838). *It is the intent of the Congress that the Interstate System be completed as nearly as practicable over a thirteen-year* (now fifteen-year as a result of an amendment effected by Pub. L. 88–4237) *period and that the entire system in all the states be brought to simultaneous completion.*" (Emphasis supplied.) *Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956,* Title I, S108(a).

Thus, legislative intent was not left to conjecture. The statute speaks in terms of legislative intent, providing specifically that it was the will of the United States Congress that the Interstate System be completed by a certain year (now determined to be 1971). All of the provisions of the 1956 act, as well as subsequent amendments to it, must be interpreted in accordance with this statement of intention.

The passage from S108(a) which is quoted above is not an isolated declaration of intent. The desire of the Congress that the construction of the Interstate System be accelerated and completed by a specified date is reflected throughout the 1956 Act. Section 108(b), which authorized the appropriation of sums for Interstate System construction for the fiscal years 1957 through 1969, indicates that the early authorization is "for the purpose of *expediting* the construction, reconstruction, or improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels of the Interstate System, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838) . . ." (emphasis supplied). The size of the amounts authorized by S108(b), which amounts range from $1 billion to $2.2 billion per fiscal year for the period from 1957 to 1969, dramatized the fact that the Congress had thought this matter through. Congress deliberately gave top priority to the speedy completion of the Interstate System.

There are further indications in the statute that Congress wanted and expected maximum speed with respect to construction of the highways in question. Under certain conditions, states are permitted to construct portions of the Interstate System in advance of specific apportionment of funds to them; such states would subsequently be reimbursed for the amounts expended upon such construction when the necessary funds were apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce. Thus the Act provides for possible further acceleration of the highway program by individual states (see S108(h)). Still another indication of the speed desired by Congress appears in S110 which relates to the advance acquisition of rights-of-way for the Interstate System. Section 110(a) provides for the early availability of funds for such acquisitions "for the purpose of facilitating the acquisition of rights-of-way on any of the Federal-Aid Highway systems, including the Interstate System, in the most expeditious and economical manner. . . ."

It is therefore obvious that the Congress in 1956 expected that the funds authorized to be appropriated by S108(b) would be used for the purpose of early completion of the Interstate System. The 1956 Federal-Aid Highway Act is replete with references to the importance of the systems referred to therein and to the need for their speedy construction. Nothing has been added to the Act in the intervening period which would in any way indicate that the intentions so clearly expressed in 1956 have been altered. The Act read as a whole leaves no doubt that the Congress intended—and still intends—that the funds should be used to complete the various construction programs within the time limits specified.

The statutory provisions set forth above show Congress' intent. A reading of the statute demonstrates that the use of the authorized funds is not subject to administrative fiat. The act is not discretionary. The mandate of Congress should be carried out.

There are other significant sections of the 1956 Act which impose clear and unmistakable requirements with respect to the amounts in question. Congress has not only set forth its general intention that the highway systems be speedily completed; it has also directed with great specificity how each dollar of the authorized amounts is to be handled.

The statute carefully sets forth, for example, how the funds in question are to be apportioned among the various states. Apportionments relating to the Federal-Aid primary and secondary highway systems are to be calculated in accordance with the formulas appearing in Section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (See S102(a)(2)). Apportionments for the Interstate System are governed by S108 (c) and (d), wherein the Congress set forth further specific directions as to assignment of the authorized amounts to the states. Section 108(d) requires continuous re-estimates by the Secretary of Commerce of the cost of completion of the Interstate System, so that Congress may from time to time re-evaluate the distribution formulas.

The cutback order of November 23, 1966, alters the apportionment formulas carefully developed by Congress. There is no provision in the statute which provides for a suspension insofar as financial awards to the states is concerned. Such suspensions, in fact, directly and adversely affect the careful apportionment formulae which Congress has enacted. Congress itself has included in the statute machinery under which the program will be continually re-evaluated. But the re-evaluation must be done and decided by the Congress, not by the Executive branch of the government. Congress would hardly have developed the distribution formulas at all had it anticipated that unnamed administrators would be free to apply them or not as they chose. I believe it is clear simply from the existence of the formulas that Congress intended the formulas to be applied from year to year (within the time period of the programs) and not to be subject to executive or administrative orders which would result in even the temporary suspension of their use.

But even this point has not been left to conjecture. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 contains specific directions with respect to the availability of highway funds for expenditure by the states. Section 108(b) provides, with respect to the Interstate System:

"Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State *for two years* after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized . . ." (emphasis supplied).

The section further provides that such funds shall be deemed to be expended if they are covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the construction, reconstruction or improvement of specific projects.

Similar language appears in the section of the 1956 Act relating to the Federal-aid primary and secondary highway system (see S102(b)). These provisions are couched in mandatory terms. It was obviously the intention of Congress that apportioned funds be available to the states for a period of two years from the close of the fiscal year for which they are authorized. Such an additional period provides time for sober and considered decision-making relative to the use of the amounts authorized. The period of availability can be altered in one way—and in one way only—by legislative action. Thus, the so-called "freeze" placed upon authorized amounts which have not been obligated by the states is directly in conflict with statutory provisions which identify a specific time in which the funds may be used. The "freeze" is accordingly invalid. Likewise, the announced cutback in present authorizations further conflicts with the legislative apportionment and availability scheme. It too is invalid.

The statute does set forth specific conditions under which authorized funds may "lapse" and no longer remain available to be obligated by a particular state. Section 102(b) provides in part 3, with respect to the primary and secondary systems:

"Any sums apportioned to any State under this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for two years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, *and any amounts so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse. . . .*" (emphasis supplied).

Section 108(g) provides in part, with respect to the Interstate System:

"Any amount apportioned to the states under the provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure under the terms of subsection (f) of this section shall lapse, and shall immediately be reapportioned among the other states in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d) of this section. . . ."

These provisions set forth the sole grounds for the lapse of funds which have been apportioned. Had Congress envisioned or intended other reasons for lapse, it would certainly have referred to them. Notwithstanding the unmistakable language of the act the order "freezing" authorized but unobligated funds seeks to create a new ground for lapse, one clearly never contemplated by the Congress. Accordingly, it must be concluded that the "freeze" contradicts the lapse provisions of the 1956 Act, and is consequently unlawful. (It is interesting to note that section 108(g) provides that Interstate System funds which lapse are to be immediately re-apportioned among the other states, a further indication that these funds have been "earmarked" for highway construction and for no other purpose.

The funds which are to be apportioned and expended for highway construction are raised by taxes and fees imposed upon those who make use of the highways. Although the income derived from such taxes and fees has frequently been referred to as being held in "trust" for the benefit of the highway program, a "trust" in the normal legal sense has not been created. It would of course be within the prerogative of Congress to redesignate the use to which such income should be put. But it has not done so. Given the clear indications contained in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 that the funds in question are to be used solely for highway construction, it is logical that such amounts be raised by levying upon those persons who will most directly benefit from improved highways. However, if the objective of accelerated highway construction is not pursued, the logic of the related revenue-raising measures disappears. The Administration's cutback order has destroyed the logic of a perfectly sound Congressional plan.

A careful examination of amendments to the 1956 Act reveals that the Congressional intention and mandate set forth eleven years ago and implemented throughout the intervening period remains intact. What Congress desired in 1956 Congress still desires—an interstate highway program completed as speedily as possible. To this end, Congress has clearly directed how and when funds are to be spent. Alteration or suspension of such directives is beyond the lawful authority of the Executive branch of government.

If the Administration believes that it is essential to the economy that the highway program be delayed, it should make recommendations to that effect to the Congress. The ultimate decision as to retention or rejection of the present statutory highway construction procedures can only be made by the Legislative branch. The Administration's cutback order—which is unsound from a public policy viewpoint as well since it discriminates against states such as the Commonwealth of Massachusetts which has moved soberly and carefully and therefore has yet to obligate all available Federal funds—cannot lawfully do the work which requires action by the Congress.

I respectfully request the Committee to take full note of the declarations of policy which appear in S116 (a) and (b) of the 1956 Act:

"It is hereby declared to be in the national interest to accelerate the construction of the Federal-aid highway systems, including the Interstate System, since many of such highways, or portions thereof, are in fact inadequate to meet the needs of local and interstate commerce, the national and the civil defense. . . . It is further declared that one of the most important objectives of this Act is the prompt completion of the Interstate System . . ."

The appropriation of money, and decision with respect to its use, are the responsibility of Congress. This responsibility cannot be abdicated by Congress, nor should it be usurped by the Executive branch. Nor can the court be relied upon to protest that Congressional prerogative, for litigation begun by the states to restore frozen or cutback funds would be long and complex, and would involve perhaps inseparable "standing" obstacles to the success of the petitioners.

It must be the Congress which calls the Executive branch to account on this matter. I hope that this Committee will examine the important legal and Constitutional ramifications which the Administration's action have raised. I hope that this Committee will do more than that for much more than the Interstate Highway System is at issue here.

I am, finally, very grateful for the opportunity to present my views.

Very truly yours,

Edward W. Brooke,
U. S. Senator.

Mr. **SKUBITZ**. Mr. Speaker, the administration's announcement last November 23 of an immediate cutback of $700 million in funds for the Federal-aid highway construction program came as a shock to me, as I know it did to many Members. I was further disturbed that the joint hearings of the Subcommittees on Roads of the House and Senate Committees on Public Works were terminated 2 days prior to the scheduled completion.

The statement of Alan S. Boyd, Secretary of the Department of Transportation, that the administration intends to restore $175 million to the highway trust fund does not relieve my concern. The release of $175 million comes with the restriction that it will be used only for right-of-way acquisition and advance planning. The problem with regard to highway construction is still very much with us.

The cutback—which actually amounts to $1.1 billion or 25 percent of the new construction work that should be commenced during fiscal year 1967 and which the highway trust fund can finance—will be detrimental to the Nation and disruptive to the State of Kansas.

As a result of the administration's cutback, essential highway transportation arteries throughout the Nation will not be built. Safety hazards, created by obsolete and inadequate roads, will be perpetuated. The motoring public will be forced to continue to endure conjestion, inconvenience, and increased travel costs. The planned and financed highway construction programs of the States have been suddenly and needlessly disrupted. Similarly, planned highway construction that has been stopped by the cutback will be more expensive to build in the future. Many contractors will suffer substantial losses in carrying unproductive, surplus staffs, and equipment. Some contractors will go bankrupt. Tens of thousands of highway construction workers could be discharged; thousands will be discharged. Hundreds of employees of State highway departments will have to be discharged or reassigned. Once the highway construction program is accelerated again, if we can depend on that, States will have to retrain employees at additional costs. Highway construction material and equipment manufacturers as well as equipment and material suppliers will lose one-fourth of their market. All of these existent or anticipated results of the President's cutback in Federal-aid highway construction funds will be reflected in the State and National economies.

It was unfortunate and unnecessary that the President decided to slash funds for this essential program. According to the administration, the cutback was made "in recognition of the need for reducing nonmilitary Federal expenditures as a contribution to the Vietnam effort and the resultant program to reduce inflationary pressures." This purported justification is an outright admittance by this administration that "Johnson juggling"—budget gimmickry without absolute legal authority—will continue.

The trust fund receives its revenues from certain Federal highway user taxes. Under existing law, moneys in the trust fund are available only for expenditures in carrying out the Federal-aid highway program. Therefore, cutting funds from the highway trust fund for construction will not reduce expenditures from the general fund of the Treasury—from which come the funds for carrying out the war in Vietnam, a supposed purpose for the cutback, and from which come the funds for the financing of Great Society programs. With respect to the general fund of the Treasury, the cutback would thereby free no money for diversion to other programs.

The cutback will, however, result in an excess of funds in the highway trust fund which then must, by law, be invested by the Secretary of the Treasury in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States. Here is where "Johnson juggling" comes into play. Through various budgetary "shenanigans" the administration will be able to "borrow" this excess of funds in the highway trust fund for financing programs which would otherwise have to be financed out of the general fund of the Treasury—financing which would otherwise be shown in the President's budget—contributing also to its deficit.

What the cutback will permit, then, is the dipping into the highway trust fund for the financing of programs which have higher priority within the administration. Through circuitous budgetary devices, the administration can use moneys in the highway trust fund, not used for highway construction, for program which might otherwise be deferred. Somehow, this administration is going to find a way to finance rent supplements, highway beautification projects, and continue poverty squandering when funds are otherwise insufficient in the general fund of the Treasury.

What we are about to see during the next several months, I fear, is an outright raid on the highway trust fund. If so, the President will be breaking faith with the citizens of this country, the highway users of America, who have paid their highway user taxes for one purpose—highway construction. Thousands of Kansans in the highway construction field and in related areas of endeavor—from the legislators who authorize the programs to the construction workers who sweat out the toil of building our highways—view this cutback as another example of the "credibility gap" and of the President's increasingly thick record of breaking faith with the people.

In Kansas, the cutback will have detrimental effects on the completion of the all-important National System of Interstate and Defense Highways as well as the continued construction on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems in Kansas. Kansans would like to have Interstate Routes 35 and 70 wholly completed at the earliest possible date. As of December 31, 1966, only 431.7 miles on the Interstate System in Kansas were completed to full and acceptable standards out of the 799 total designated mileage on the system in our State. The completion of these routes will be greatly impaired by the administration cutback of funds and not without incurring the dissatisfaction of Kansas citizens and citizens of other States who travel through the midsection of this country.

An astounding 43.1 percent of unobligated Federal-aid highway apportionments have been frozen by the administration during fiscal 1967 in the Sunflower State. Out of approximately $59.5 million in total unobligated Federal-aid highway apportionments in fiscal year 1967 in Kansas, the limitation on the obligation of Federal-aid highway funds during this fiscal year—imposed by the administration last November 23—is approximately $33.8 million. The amount of Federal-aid highway funds apportioned to the State which is frozen by the administration's action is about $25.7 million.

Out of a total amount of around $49.1 million that could be made available for reimbursable obligations during fiscal 1967 in Kansas, the amount frozen by the administration is approximately $15.2 million, or a disturbing 31.1 percent. These are amounts that could be made available for reimbursable obligations during fiscal year 1967 without exceeding estimated revenues of the highway trust fund, I hasten to point out.

The amount of Federal-aid highway funds limited by the administration for obligation during fiscal year 1967 in Kansas is approximately $33.8 million. This compares with about $45.2 million obligated during fiscal year 1966 in Kansas. This is a marked decrease of 25.2 percent.

The President's cutback has already reduced the scheduled lettings of construction contracts for fiscal year 1967 in Kansas by $8.3 million. We are indeed already encountering difficulties in program rescheduling. In the opinion of our State highway department, the cutback is already adversely affecting the economy of the Sunflower State. The only thing we have to be thankful for at this moment is that an additional $400 million cutback, as had been alluded to by the President in a recent press conference, will not be made. This little bit of thankfulness does not make us optimistic about the future nor does it erase the concern we have for the freeze.

At this time, let us not forget the bearing of some very important and basic questions which relate to our discussion. Is it really necessary for citizens nearing the 21st century to remind ourselves that transportation is the very cornerstone of civilization, that the remarkable history of our country's culture and civilization is for a large part the history of transportation contributing to the mobility of our people and our resources? Need we read again our high school textbooks to realize the importance of transportation in accommodating the growth of this country? And finally, when our attention is now drawn to the population explosion which is upon us, will the continued progress of our transportation systems be impaired by this cut in Federal-aid highway construction funds without our protest?

At a time when we should be concerned with providing for additional revenues for the highway trust fund to complete the Interstate System on schedule and at a time when we should be more concerned with additional authorizations needed to complete the System on schedule, it is most discouraging to be called upon to discuss ways of restoring a cut made in the existing program.

I hope that the Congress will find effective and enforceable means to implement restoration of the full amount of funds. The need is urgent. Now is the time to act. We must act decisively and constructively.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida, for his pursuit of full discussion of the freeze and thaw of funds for the Interstate and Defense Highway System. The theme of Senator Brooke's letter to Senator Randolph—as introduced in the Record by Mr. Cleveland—touches the issue: the legality of the administration cutback of highway funds. But in an area of longstanding concern to me, highway safety, it is ironic that the administration promotes safety through vast new programs of automotive safety standards, but by this action of last November, delayed about 1,000 miles of crucial highway construction. Since the President has said the completed Interstate System will save 8,000 lives a year in the traffic toll, I shudder to think of the cost of this cutback. I strongly urge the restoration of the full amount of the trust funds to their proper use according to the legal formula.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may be allowed 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks relating to the subject matter of my special order.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Murphy of New York). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

A BLOW AGAINST U.S. SECURITY

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, American parents are shocked, dismayed, and resentful in consequence of the Supreme Court decision invalidating a New York law requiring teachers to sign a certificate stating they are not Communists. At a time when U.S. servicemen are putting their lives on the line in defense against Red aggression and terrorism, the rule is particularly cruel.

I am happy to find that members of veterans' organizations and other patriotic citizens throughout the land are rising to demand legislation that would overturn the strange and revolting ruling. At the conclusion of my remarks I should like to insert in the Record an editorial from the January 28 issue of the Johnstown, Pa., Tribune-Democrat entitled "A Blow Against U.S. Security."

Protests will continue to multiply as it becomes generally recognized that the decision removes from the people of a sovereign State the right to protect their children from being taught a philosophy of self-destruction. For the record, I should like to quote a statement that was written 17 years ago but remains a most effective argument for a law barring Communists from teaching positions in our classrooms. The paragraphs are from a report written in 1949 by the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association:

> Members of the Communist Party of the United States should not be employed as teachers. Such membership, in the opinion of the Educational Policies Commission, involves adherence to doctrines and discipline completely inconsistent with the principles of freedom on which American education depends. Such membership, and the accompanying surrender of intellectual integrity, render an individual unfit to discharge the duties of a teacher in this country.
>
> At the same time we condemn the careless, incorrect, and unjust use of such words as "Red" and "Communist" to attack teachers and other persons who in point of fact are not Communists, but who merely have views different from those of their accusers. The whole spirit of free American education will be subverted unless teachers are free to think for themselves. It is because members of the Communist Party are required to surrender this right, as a consequence of becoming part of a movement characterized by conspiracy and deceit, that they should be excluded from employment as teachers.

Members of the commission preparing that report included such outstanding American figures as Columbia University President Dwight D. Eisenhower and Harvard University President James B. Conant.

At this time I should also like to call attention to a statement issued in March 1953, by the Association of American Universities. The following extracts are from that statement, "The Rights and Responsibilities of Universities and Their Faculties," which was drafted by a committee that included such distinguished educators as Dr. A. Whitney Griswold, president of Yale University; Dr. Arthur H. Compton, chancellor of Washington University; Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, chancellor of the University of Kansas; Dr. John E. W. Sterling, president of Stanford University; and Dr. Henry W. Wriston, president of Brown University:

> We condemn Russian Communism as we condemn every form of totalitarianism. We share the profound concern of the American people at the existence of an international conspiracy whose goal is the destruction of our cherished institutions. The police state would be the death of our universities, as of our Government. Three of its principles in particular are abhorrent to us: the fomenting of worldwide revolution as a step to seizing power; the use of falsehood and deceit as normal means of persuasion; thought control—the dictation of doctrines which must be accepted and taught by all party members. Under these principles, no scholar could adequately disseminate knowledge or pursue investigations in the effort to make further progress toward truth.
>
> Appointment to a university position and retention after appointment require not only professional competence but involve the affirmative obligation of being diligent and loyal in citizenship. Above all, a scholar must have integrity and independence. This renders impossible adherence to such a regime as that of Russia and its satellites. No person who accepts or advocates such principles and methods has any place in a university. Since present membership in the Communist Party requires the acceptance of these principles and methods, such membership extinguishes the right to a university position. Moreover, if an instructor follows communistic practice by becoming a propagandist for one opinion, adopting a "party line," silencing criticism or impairing freedom of thought and expression in his classroom, he forfeits not only all university support but his right to membership in the university.

These and similar convictions of these prominent Americans were printed in House Document No. 213 during the first session of the 83d Congress. Entitled "Permit Communist-Conspirators To Be Teachers?" the document was prepared by Hamilton A. Long and 25,000 copies were printed under House Resolution 201, for distribution by Members of Congress.

Nothing has happened in the intervening period to indicate that communism is less atheistic, less disdainful of human dignity, or less bestial than it was 14 years ago. Nothing has changed here or in Moscow to make the Communist teacher more acceptable to our schools.

The fact is that dedicated followers of Communist theory have tenaciously held to their objectives for the past decade and a half and for the past half century. Like their alien allies who have continually extended—through force and deception—Communist influence in Europe, Africa, Asia, and South America, those in this country have steadfastly pursued their plan to capture the minds of youth through calculated indoctrination in the classroom. The Supreme Court decision can only open wider the doors of our educational institutions to those sworn to remove the Stars and Stripes and substitute the hammer and sickle. It is the responsibility of Congress to stay this subversive move and to make certain that our teachers are leading our youngsters under a banner consecrated to love of God and liberty instead of one reflecting the diabolic theory of Moscow's totalitarian legions.

[From the Johnstown (Pa.) Tribune-Democrat, Jan. 28, 1967]

A Blow Against U.S. Security

The constantly amazing Supreme Court of the United States has done it again.

In what can be evaluated as one of its most serious miscarriages, the nation's highest court has shattered a state's attempt to keep its public schools and state colleges uncontaminated by the teachings of subversives.

By declaring unconstitutional New York's antisubversive laws and regulations, the court wiped out:

A provision that required public school and college teachers to sign a certificate saying they were not Communists.

A provision that Communist party members could not be employed in the educational system.

A requirement that teachers must be removed for "the utterance of any treasonable or seditious word."

The New York laws, dating back to 1917 and as recent as the late Fifties, also were directed at keeping subversives out of civil service jobs, but most of the uproar about the court's decision has swirled around the schools issue—and rightly so.

In the majority opinion (the court voted 5-to-4) written by Justice William J. Brennan Jr., it was stated that the New York laws constituted "a highly efficient terror mechanism" and a menace to academic freedom.

So with those and other words, members of the Communist party are to be allowed to teach in New York's schools. And using that as an example, there is little reason to feel that New York will be alone.

There can be no justification for allowing Communists to teach in the nation's public schools and colleges. If they are members of the Communist party they are committed to the overthrow of the government of the United States—forcible overthrow if need be. And that should without doubt bar them from being within reach of the nation's young minds.

This decision once again reflects the Supreme Court's fetish for technicalities, for the majority ruling admitted that "there can be no doubt of the legitimacy of New York's interest in protecting its educational system from subversion." But the court could not tolerate the wording of New York's legal moves to, among other purposes, protect youngsters from the teaching of Communists.

When it comes to protecting the young from the philosophies of communism, there should be no bending. Even if adequate rebuttal to such teachings could be provided it is asking too much to have a youngster sort the good from the bad. It is unsafe to take chances when the security of the United States is threatened even from a philosophical standpoint. Yet the Supreme Court has taken a chance.

And because this is so serious a matter, the public should known how the voting went.

Declaring the New York laws unconstitutional—Chief Justice Warren and Justices Black, Brennan, Douglas and Fortas.

Dissenting — Justices Clark, Harlan, Stewart and White.

Several paragraphs from Justice Clark's dissenting opinion serve to sum up our feelings:

"Our public educational system is the genius of our democracy. The minds of our youth are developed there and the character of that development will determine the future of our land. Indeed, our very existence depends upon it. The issue here is a very narrow one. It is not freedom of speech, freedom of thought, freedom of press, freedom of assembly, or of association, even in the Communist party.

"It is simply this: May the state provide that one who, after a hearing with full judicial review, is found to wilfully and deliberately advocate, advise, or teach that our government should be overthrown by force or violence of other unlawful means; or who wilfully and deliberately prints, publishes, etc., any book or paper that so advocates and who personally advocates such doctrine himself; or who wilfully and deliberately becomes a member of an organization that advocates such doctrine is prima facie disqualified from teaching in its university? My answer, in keeping with all of our cases up until today, is 'Yes'!"

A REAPPRAISAL OF U.S. POLICY IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, as is generally appreciated, the subject of U.S. foreign policy is a vast and complex one, with circumstances and policies varying from one country to another. The average citizen—let alone the foreign policy expert—is overwhelmed with the many considerations involved in dealing with the numerous nations inhabiting the globe. Therefore, views and recommendations from responsible sources on various facets of our foreign policy cannot but help throw light on the merit of present policies, and especially in currently troublesome areas where debatable U.S. policies are involved.

The following address by John Davenport, journalist and author of the book, "The U.S. Economy," is, I believe, a prudent approach to one such troublesome area, southern Africa, which comprises the countries of South Africa, its legal dependency, South-West Africa, the new state of Rhodesia, and the Portuguese possessions of Angola and Mozambique. Having traveled to southern Africa last summer, Mr. Davenport's appraisal of this area and the U.S. policies involved combines firsthand experience with a trained journalistic background.

On the thorny question of South Africa the comparison of the treatment of the natives there with the fate of the American Indian is a provocative one. When our ancestors encountered a fairly large population of native Indian tribes, they proceeded to "exploit and indeed nearly to exterminate." In the case of South Africa, the 17th century Dutch and then English settlers found the area comprising the Republic today, for the most part, barren of inhabitants. It was precisely because the whites did not kill off the Bantus pushing down from central Africa that a real racial problem exists today. It is well to consider that thousands of blacks from northern Africa to this day continue to enter South Africa because of the higher living standards and chances for economic advancement.

Mr. Davenport proceeds to examine the apartheid question, which he views with reservations, against the backdrop of native Bantu responsibility and economic advancement:

> In the early days South Africa tried to experiment of just letting the Bantu immigrate to the city at his own free will. This bred some of the worst slums in the world. Today that is getting to be a thing of the past. While controlling the influx of Bantus into the cities, the government has largely rehoused all that are there. Today new homes for non-whites are going up at the rate of sixty per day. There have also been enormous steps forward in education. Over 80% of all Bantu children of school age are now in school. The educational record is far better than in most of the other states of Africa.

Unfortunately, information of this type is not presented the American reader to help him objectively appraise our foreign policy in this area. Indeed, it is much simpler to apply simple cliches such as the one-man, one-vote standard to South Africa, conveniently forgetting the makeup of the population and the many decades of American history which lapsed before this Nation, rightly or wrongly, applied the same standard.

In the case of South-West Africa and Rhodesia the same reasoned approach prevails. Though one may disagree with the Davenport recommendations, it cannot be denied that these cases merit much more than the cursory treatment of half-truths, pat generalizations, or oversimplifications.

The examples of Angola and Mozambique demonstrate most poignantly of all the one overriding factor which is missing in U.S. policy in the southern Africa area—the security and best interests of our Nation. It matters not that Portugal is a stanch ally of the United States and a member of the NATO alliance. Those who excoriate Portugal in the United Nations and elsewhere had little to say when Communist elements from the Congo descended on Luvo in Angola and committed unbelievable atrocities on both blacks and whites there.

It is becoming increasingly more difficult to treat with charity those policies which apply the one-man, one-vote standard to South Africa and Rhodesia but overlook the desirability of such a standard in Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and so forth. One must strain not to view with cynicism those charges of Rhodesia's threat to peace while Castro exports revolution to Latin American shores.

Make no mistake about it: our double-standard foreign policy is now a matter of public record, and every 4 years the American voter has an opportunity to accept it or reject it. Next year, in 1968, the final judge of U.S. foreign policy, the American people, will again hand down their decision as to whether our foreign policies will continue "to speak with forked tongue."

I insert the address by John Davenport entitled "Gentlemen, Put Up Your Guns," in the RECORD at this point.

GENTLEMEN, PUT UP YOUR GUNS

(By John Davenport)

Gentlemen: I am very honored to be asked to speak in a purely personal capacity, and not as the representative of any organization or publication, to this distinguished group. I do so with some reluctance because what I shall have to say will not be pleasant, and I am cognizant of the old adage that fools rush in where angels fear to tread. I believe that my country, our country, is on dangerous collision course with what I shall be calling southern Africa and that our policies are currently misguided and misdirected. It is time that we recognized this and tried in our individual capacities to rectify matters before incalculable harm is done.

As you all know, southern Africa, where it was my privilege to travel last summer, is an enormous and complex region. It includes the Republic of South Africa, its legal dependency, South West Africa, the newly declared independent state of Rhodesia, and finally the Portuguese possessions of Angola and Mozambique, to which I can refer only in passing. It is an area of many races, cultures, and languages. It also includes many natural wonders—rolling veldt, high mountains, rivers and waterfalls, and abundant game parks where lions, tigers, elephants, and other wild animals roam at will.

But as you have perhaps already gathered, it is not these animals of which I wish to speak. My concern is rather with certain big game hunters who have taken it upon themselves to wage an unremitting ideological war against this southern third of the continent, where it is charged that the white man continues to exploit, and indeed to enslave, the black man through such condemned practices as apartheid, discrimination, denial of majority rule, and other so-called "crimes against humanity."

I propose to deal with some of these charges in the context of actual fact, but let me make one point abundantly plain in the beginning. Even *if* conditions in this part of the world were as bad as they are so often painted—and it is a big if—this would not in my opinion justify present U.N. and U.S. actions. United States foreign policy cannot, in my judgment, be based on vague ideological abstractions such as majority rule, one man one vote, and other cliches, good or bad. Foreign policy, which implies in the last analysis willingness to fight, must be based on hard-headed assessment of this country's fundamental national interest.

THE POWER HOUSE OF SOUTH AFRICA

I believe this holds particularly true in the case of the Republic of South Africa, where, at first glance anyway, the U.S. national interest would seem to dictate a policy of accommodation, understanding, and respect for international decórum. This is partly because the U.S. generally honors economic progress, and certainly South Africa can display plenty of that. We Americans are justly proud of the fact that, with only about 6% of the world's population we produce about 33% of the world's goods and services. Well, the Republic of South Africa can in a way match this record. With just about 6% of the population of the African continent, and with only 4% of its land area, it produces no less than 25% of the entire continent's product, and some 40% of its industrial output!

That is, indeed, a stunning statistic, but it is not all that binds or should bind South Africa and the West together. U.S. business firms have now invested well over $600 million in South Africa's mines and factories, and Britain has invested four times that amount. In 1965 South African imports ran to no less than $2.5 billions—one quarter of the imports of the entire African continent, and its commercial exports ran to about $1.5 billions. It is a major producer of uranium and the world's largest producer of chrome, manganese, and diamonds. More important still, it supplies no less than 70% of the gold production of the West, which balances its accounts with the outside world and which also serves as the vital buttress of our international monetary system. Finally, let me remind you that South Africa, by its very geographic position, has certain strategic advantages. Its tracking station is used in almost every space shot which the U.S. makes. It has harbors which command the vital Atlantic approaches to the Indian Ocean.

Now given all that, and given the fact that South Africa leads all other African states in per capita income, one might suppose that our relations with its republic would be of the closest. This is not the case. At recent Congressional hearings various pressure groups advocated that U.S. business should cut all connections with South Africa, and the United Nations has passed no less than 100 resolutions condemning South Africa and its policies. What policies? You all know the answer. The dread word here is *apartheid*, meaning specifically the separation of the races, and it is on that rock that all efforts to maintain friendly relations with South Africa and its dependency, South West Africa, have foundered.

TWO FACES OF APARTHEID

So I feel today in duty bound to comment on this business of apartheid, laying down some broad distinctions or guidelines in the beginning which are all too often overlooked. In the first place, separation of the races is not necessarily the same thing as *exploitation* of one race by another, and I believe that rising income levels for all in South Africa, and increasing education for all, tend to make good this distinction. In the second place, apartheid is not the same thing as the problem of majority rule, though linked with it. In the third place, I must say that I find nothing abhorrent in the separation of the races so long as such separation is *voluntarily* chosen by those concerned. *De facto* and voluntary separation of the races has always existed and probably always will exist to greater or less extent. It is because South Africa has made *de facto* separation a *de jure* separation, because the state has intervened to make separation stick, that its policies prick the conscience of the West and of many of us in this room.

Yet I also believe it is necessary to understand how these policies evolved and what exactly they entail if we are to pass rational judgment in this matter. And here the whole history of South Africa differs from the American experience. When the Cavalier and the Puritan—your ancestors and mine—first came to American shores, they found it already inhabited by a fairly large population of native Indian tribes, which they proceeded, I am sorry to say, to exploit and indeed nearly to exterminate. That was *our* solution of the only real colonial problem we have ever faced. South African experience is quite different. When in the 17th century Dutch and then English settlers landed at Cape Town, they found a few scattered tribes such as the Hottenots, but otherwise the great area which today comprises the Republic lay bare and empty. It was only later, when the white man pushed into the interior, that he encountered large numbers of black, or Bantus, pushing at the same time down from central Africa, that a real racial problem arose.

And this problem, it is important to note, has grown to its present proportions precisely because the whites did *not* kill off these alien races as we Americans did. On the contrary, they allowed them to wax and multiply and to increase their numbers through further immigration. Even today it is extraordinary that thousands of blacks from northern Africa continue to enter the Republic which reputedly enslaves them. As the saying goes, they continue to "vote with their feet" for South Africa precisely because they find higher living standards and economic advance.

The second point I would emphasize is that, due to this multiplication and immigration, the racial mix in South Africa today is a highly complicated one. The descendants of the early Dutch and British pioneers, who largely built the country and who, unlike the European in other parts of Africa, have no Western homeland to return to, now number about 3,500,000. Early mingling of whites and Hottentots has produced the so-called Coloreds, now numbering nearly 2,000,000. Indentured servants coming from India in the 19th century have built up their own Indian society numbering about 500,000. Finally, and this is the real problem, there are now some 12,500,000 blacks or Bantus, belonging to many different tribes and speaking no less than seven different languages and many more dialects, who in part live in South African cities and on its farms and in part live on native reservations initially set aside for them to prevent their exploitation.

Now it is the considered policy of the South African government, which is today controlled by the white minority, that no good can come of trying to jumble and mix this great diversity of racial groups into a single centralized nation state along European democratic lines. Believing so, apartheid has taken two different forms, one negative and one positive. Where whites and blacks live in close contact with each other in city and on farm, they can work together by day but they must occupy separate living quarters. To make this separation stick involves minute rules as to where and how people shall live. It also involves minute rules, applying especially to the Bantu, as to when and how he can enter urban areas and how he can shift jobs. His "passbook", as the saying goes, is his vital passport so far as his movement within the country is concerned.

Now I cannot say that as an old-fashioned liberal I like this system. It involves a high concentration of government power and often discretionary power. It cuts all too often against the grain of the free market, which, as our good friend Professor Hutt as well as Dr. von Mises have again and again pointed out, works best where men and women can work where they choose, for what they can get and for what they are worth. Yet I am also bound to say that I see no way by which the system could be suddenly reformed or abolished without unbearable racial tension, and I must also point out that under it very considerable social progress has been made. In the early days South Africa tried the experiment of just letting the Bantu immigrate to the city at his own free will. This bred some of the worst slums in the world. Today that is getting to be a thing of the past. While controlling the influx of Bantus into the cities, the government has largely re-housed all that are there. Today new homes for non-whites are going up at the rate of sixty per day. There have also been enormous steps forward in education. Over 80% of all Bantu children of school age are now in school. The educational record is far better than in most of the other states of Africa.

Finally, I would point out that South Africa has not stopped short at just keeping the races separate where they exist today. It is planning for the future in what can be called a positive way. As noted, a large segment of the Bantu population—indeed, 40% of it—still lives on native reserves of homelands scattered around the country. The government is making a very considerable effort to develop these homelands into going economic concerns and to give their inhabitants a kind of home rule. In theory, at least, every Bantu, no matter where he works, will be a citizen of a so-called Bantustan. He will vote for his parliament there just as white South Africans now vote for their central parliament in Cape Town. Progress along this line has been made in an area called the Transkei. It has also been given a boost by the fact that the former British protectorate of Basutoland has now become the independent state of Lesotho, and that the protectorate of Swaziland will presently achieve this condition. These areas are completely surrounded by South Africa, which is now forging with them the closest political and economic ties. I suppose that I should offend many modern Liberals if I called what is going on an experiment in "creative federalism." I will say that the principle of federalism as applied to different races and, indeed, different nationalities holds out great hope for South Africa and for all of southern Africa.

In any case, you will see that the domestic and also the foreign policy of South Africa is far more constructive than you are apt to gather from your newspaper. Admittedly, much remains to be done. For while the theory of separate development as enunciated by the late Hendrik Verwoerd may indeed be a way to harmonize the interests of the European and the Bantu, it leaves unresolved what will happen to other groups—notably the status of the Coloreds, who are tied in closely with the white community but who are today denied political privileges. Yet there is a strong pressure within South Africa itself to resolve this particular problem, and that is precisely where the pressure should be coming from. What solves nothing is the constant pounding of outside critics who prefer to talk in the stale language of coming "blood baths" rather than to face realities. What is being done merits better than epithets and scorn. It deserves, if not blank-check approval, at least the civilized give and take of opinion in what Clarence Randall has called "constructive dialogue." That too is my hope for U.S. relations with South Africa.

THE CASE OF SOUTH WEST AFRICA

Unfortunately, those relations are now being disturbed and brought to the boiling point, not just by often ill-informed opinion about South Africa, but by overt attack in the United Nations and elsewhere on its policies in South West Africa and by the situation that has developed in Rhodesia. I should like to deal with South West Africa first because it is probably least familiar to you. It is an enormous and largely arid territory twice the size of California and very sparsely populated (less than two inhabitants per square mile—that's right, per square mile!), which stretches down along the Atlantic between Angola to the north and

South Africa. Despite its rugged terrain and sparse population, it is an area of great strategic value precisely because it commands the southern approaches to the Republic and because it likewise commands shipping trade down the long African Atlantic coastline.

As you will recall, this strange territory, now populated by some 75,000 whites and 450,000 blacks, has had a weird political history. In the 19th century the Germans under Kaiser Wilhelm made an abortive attempt to colonize it. In World War I the territory was captured by British and South African troops, and at that time, and indeed later, South Africa could easily have annexed it. Instead it accepted a Class C League of Nations mandate over the territory under a "sacred trust" agreement to care for the "material and moral" well-being of its inhabitants. From that day in 1919 forward, South Africa has, as was its right to do under the old mandate, administered South West Africa as an integral part of its own territory. Economically the two are linked by interconnecting railroad lines and roads and by a common currency system, without controls or tariff barriers of any kind. Politically they are linked through an arrangement whereby a provincial parliament, for which, it should be noted, only whites vote, is given certain local autonomy, with power over defense and internal security resting with the South African government.

Now it is not surprising that other and newly independent African states should view this persistence of what they refer to as "colonialism" in their midst with concern, if not with deep hatred. What is surprising and sad is the amount of venom that has been put into the attack to detach South West Africa entirely from South Africa. That attack has taken several different lines. It is contended that South Africa has no rights whatever in the territory since her mandate lapsed with the death of the old League of Nations after World War II. It is contended that the United Nations as the legal successor to the League of Nations now has full supervisory rights over this immense area. And finally, it is contended that, given these supervisory rights, the U.N. must now become the launching pad for propelling South West Africa into complete independence with the initiation of full majority rule, one man one vote, and all the rest of it.

I shall not try to comment at length here on all the twisted legalities involved in this dispute. *I would suggest that on the evidence South Africa may have as much right to the control of South West Africa as the U.S. had in the case of Texas; and I would deny strenuously that the United Nations is in any meaningful sense the successor to the old League.* I would also emphasize that most of the charges brought against South African rule—exploitation, enslavement, etc., etc.—are simply untrue and were so proved in the recent World Court case brought by Ethiopia and Nigeria. But what concerns me most is the whole atmosphere of unreality which broods over recent U.N. debates.

In this matter our U.N. representatives are constantly referring to the rights and the aspirations of the "people" of South West Africa. I would respectfully ask them what "people" they are referring to, for as in the case of South Africa we are dealing, not with one people, but several. There are first of all the Europeans, who over the years have been chiefly responsible for developing the territory's agriculture, fisheries, and industries. As noted, there are also some 450,000 non-Europeans who work partly on South West Africa's farms and in its factories but who also remain in very large numbers in its native reserves as in South Africa itself. By far the largest of these native homelands is a place which, I daresay, you have never heard of. It is called Ovamboland, lying for to the north along the Cuayne River at the Angola border and comprising land which is largely cultivateable given sufficient water. The Ovambos, who incidentally lived here long before the white man arrived, now comprise no less than 45% of the black population of the territory.

Now that is another stunning statistic and one which puts the whole matter of apartheid and majority rule into new perspective. For if self-determination and majority rule were granted tomorrow, it would be the Ovambos who would hold the majority, leaving other tribes to the south as discontented, hostile, and explosive minorities. I do not believe that the Ovambos want such power or could possibly exercise it if it were granted to them. It would seem far wiser to develop at least this area of South West Africa as a separate entity within the larger whole, and that is precisely what is being done. Large irrigation projects are now being installed in the north. Very considerable local autonomy is being given to Ovambo chiefs and to their own peculiar institutions of government, and this is likewise taking place in other reserves—the counterparts of the Bantustans in South Africa itself. Within a generation, and given further educational effort, might not this effort at home rule and this kind of federalism serve the divergent peoples of South West Africa far better than current U.N. proposals to create one more completely independent, centralized, and no doubt strife-torn democracy?

At any rate, this is the way that South African policy and administration are heading, and on the evidence this is contributing to the well-being of the territory. Between 1940 and 1965, South West's per capita income jumped from a bare $42 to $380—a faster advance than in most of Africa. This was partly the result of government subsidy, but it is also the result of creating the conditions of stability and confidence where private enterprise can take hold in cattle raising, sheep raising, and in the exploitation of mineral resources—chiefly copper and diamonds. If South African administration ends, who will step into the vacuum left behind? The United Nations is hard put to it today to pay its own administrative bills, let alone finance an area of this kind. Perhaps the United States will step in, but does the U.S. taxpayer really want to assume this load and this responsibility even if we could fulfill it? Once again my counsel is to go slow, to maintain our critical faculties, but to abstain from and if necessary to veto those ringing declarations in the U.N. which embitter our relations in all of southern Africa and which, if ever taken seriously, could lead on to war. For make no mistake about it, if the U.N. ever actively tried to intervene in South West Africa with force, South Africa would oppose force with force.

AND NOW RHODESIA

And this leads me, gentlemen, to that third area of southern Africa—namely, Rhodesia—where again, unhappily, discord and even threats of force are in the air. In Rhodesia, to perhaps an even greater extent than in South West Africa, the U.S. has been led to a wholly tragic and dangerous confrontation which, however resolved, again demonstrates that the road to perdition in statecraft is, indeed, paved with good intentions. The blunt fact is that as I write the U.S., a nation of 190 million people, is waging an open and declared economic war against a small country of 4 million people which has never harmed American life or limb and which is one of the few countries that I know which accept an American passport without visa! How in the name of common sense, let alone justice, did we ever get ourselves into this appaling situation?

The story is a sad one, and once again some background is necessary. As you all know, Rhodesia, lying just to the north of South Africa, was conquered by Cecil Rhodes in the 19th century and for some time was developed by a private chartered company. In 1923 it became a part of the British Empire under special arrangements which gave it virtual home rule and a strong promise of independence. Such independence might in fact have come years ago had not Rhodesia, at British urging, joined in the creation of a federation which included the former colonies of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland. In 1963 that federation came to an end when first Nyasaland (now Milawi) and then Northern Rhodesia (now Zambia) packed their bags and walked out of the Commonwealth.

In view of their breakaway, the Rhodesian government confidently expected that Rhodesia would also be untied from Britain's apron strings—the more so because in 1961 a constitution had been adopted under British sponsorship which guaranteed the franchise to all Rhodesians, black and white, who met certain qualifications in terms of income, property, and/or education. It was not to be. Throughout 1964 the British government, with one eye fixed on those areas of Africa which have always looked on Rhodesia with suspicion, kept stiffening the terms on which independence could be granted. Indeed, at one point it wanted a definite timetable as to when Rhodesia's 4 million blacks would be accorded full majority rule whatever their qualifications. In the upshot the white minority of 220,000 rallied behind the government of Ian Smith and in November, 1964, Smith made his fateful declaration of independence.

Now I am not here to defend the prudence of that declaration, for as events turned out Ian Smith, a former RAF pilot, by the way, was taking some fearful risks. I am here to question the wisdom of my country's joining with Britain in a policy of economic sanctions against Rhodesia, and to question the reasoning which led us to that step. In the beginning voluntary sanctions voted by the United Nations were backed by our State Department on the argument that we must support and follow the lead of our old and trusted ally Britain. I yield to none in my admiration of the Britain of 1940 when she stood alone under Winston Churchill. I am less than enchanted with the Britain of Harold Wilson. But my main point is that the argument that the U.S. was bound to follow the British "lead" in the matter of sanctions was and always has been hokum. For one thing we Americans once had a little argument with Britain in the matter of independence, and I do not recall that Washington or Jefferson ever fell for the doctrine of the King, right or wrong. But more practically I would suggest to you that in the twentieth century, with most of Britain's Empire gone with the winds of change, we are simply deluding ourselves in talking about the British "lead." The blunt fact is that it would be quite impossible for Britain to maintain sanctions against Rhodesia for a moment without U.S. collaboration and connivance. No British cruiser could or would stop a tanker of an American oil company from delivering oil to Rhodesia. What stopped the flow of oil, or attempted to stop it, was the pressure of our own President and Administration on major U.S. oil companies to prevent delivery. I have constitutional doubts as to whether the President acted legally. In any case, make no mistake about it, this was *our* blockade.

As you know, initial efforts to bring down the Smith regime by voluntary sanctions proved a miserable failure. Oil flowed in from South Africa, and during 1965 the Rhodesian economy survived fairly well. So nothing would do but for Britain to go to the U.N. Security Council and get a vote for *mandatory* sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter, and these are now in force. Whether Rhodesia can withstand this second onslaught remains to be seen, but I for one trust that she does, the more so because I find the further arguments made for mandatory sanctions by the U.S. and the United Nations wholly unconvincing.

These arguments are two in number. The first is that the Smith government is denying majority rule in Rhodesia and that in doing so it is violating the purposes of the United Nations which is to promote "respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion." Well, I sometimes wonder whether those who put forward this argument have ever read the present Rhodesian Constitution whose principles were laid down in 1961 and reaffirmed in 1965. The most remarkable fact of that Constitution is that so far as the franchise in Rhodesia is concerned, there *is* no mention of race, creed, or color.

As I have indicated, all Rhodesian citizens can vote—some on the A. roll where qualifications are higher, some on the B. roll where they are lower—who can show a certain level of income, property or education. It is true that these qualifications especially for the A. roll are relatively high and it is true that in fact white Rhodesians do still control its Parliament. But blacks are also represented there and as education proceeds, as it is now proceeding, at a very rapid pace, more and more black Rhodesians will in fact be given the vote and will find representation. How sad then that the U.S. and the U.N. should pick on this particular country to vent their wrath or their prejudices when there might be so many others to choose from. Does majority rule *now* obtain in Soviet Russia? Does it obtain in Eastern Europe? Does it obtain in large portions of South America or in Africa itself? You all know the answer. If the U.S. is to follow this kind of logic to its bitter end, we must declare war against two-thirds of the civilized and uncivilized world.

The second argument for the application of sanctions is even more fantastic. It is that Rhodesia, with a population of only 4,000,000, is a "threat to the peace" and so falls within the ambit of Chapter VII of the charter which deals with such threats. But it is obvious to anyone reading that chapter that threats to the peace means armed aggression across state borders, and who is making those threats? Certainly not Rhodesia. We are here involved in a cloud-cuckoo-land of legal hair splitting which I am glad to say that such a fine international lawyer as Dean Acheson has fully exposed. In plain English, the present logic of the U.N. comes down to this. If I as a private citizen do something which annoys my neighbor, and if that neighbor starts out to threaten and bully me, than I, not he, am threatening the peace and can be held accountable. Such argument would not stand up for a moment in a U.S. court of law, and I for one find it ridiculous when applied to the law of nations. The truth is that present U.N. action is probably illegal in terms of the Charter itself. It is certainly not benefitting the people of Rhodesia and it is fundamentally against the U.S. interest itself. I conclude that sanctions should never have been imposed in the first place and that they should be lifted forthwith—in concert with other nations if possible, if not, unilaterally by this country.

FREEDOM AND ORDER

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I end my specific survey of these three great trouble centers in southern Africa and my specific assessment of U.S. policy toward the same. It should be clear to you now why my concern is not with the lions and tigers of this region but rather with the ideological game hunters who have chosen to mount a costly safari into southern Africa which in the end is not worth the price. I would say to these gentlemen—be they politicians or statesmen or just plain troublemakers—"Put up your guns." In the phrase of Charles Burton Marshall of Johns Hopkins University, "Simmer down!"

That is sound advice for many members of the United Nations, who have turned that organization away from its initial objective of promoting peaceful progress. It is also sound advice for U.S. policymakers both in and out of the U.N. If our objective is to promote stability in Africa, then we must avoid pulling down the whole structure of going societies, leaving nothing but disorder and turmoil in their place. More fundamentally, I submit that the problems of Africa cannot be solved simply by trying to export from the West certain glittering generalities which we take all too much for granted at home. In the United States and in Britain we have come to assume that because majority rule "works" in certain highly advanced countries it will work everywhere and will resolve all difficulties. We forget that even Winston Churchill was once led to remark: "Democracy is the worst form of government—until other forms are considered."

In any case, we must realize that current efforts to transplant Western political ideas into alien soils without a long period of preparation has proved something less than a brilliant success. It is remarkable in this connection how the so-called "show-pieces" of the African continent have changed before our very eyes. Yesterday the show-piece was Ghana, until, of course, it turned into a dictatorship. Then came Nigeria, which is now riven into contending factions. Today it is Kenya, where all the fierceness of Kenyatta and the Mau Mau has apparently been forgotten, and all is for the best in the best of all possible worlds. Perhaps so. Yet the central fact to grasp about all these situations is that in no part of Africa are majorities really effective. In all countries relatively small minorities actually rule. I am not presuming to say whether they rule well or ill. I am saying that even in the north progress toward true constitutional two-party republican government is slow and halting.

Does this mean, then, that in the end we shall have to choose between minority rule of the blacks or minority rule of the whites? Is it really that bad? There are those in South Africa and elsewhere who talk that way, but I, for one, hope they are wrong, and I believe that there is some evidence to show that they are wrong. If my analysis of apartheid is correct, then it holds out the promise that in time both black men and white men in South Africa and South West Africa will enjoy very large political privileges. If the Rhodesian Constitution means what it says, then over time—and provided sanctions do not destroy the economy—more and more blacks will in fact join the voting roll in the formation of a true multi-racial society. Finally, I would point out that in Portuguese Angola and Mozambique still a third approach to the race problem is being tried—namely, completely free social intercourse and indeed intermarriage between whites and blacks at levels where they are culturally equal. I rejoice that in southern Africa there are not one but many approaches toward allowing the races to live in harmony together. The one thread that runs through all of these approaches is that certain human standards of decency, of education, and of civilization exist and that these standards cannot be lightly thrown away. On this point I honor Ian Smith when he says he is fighting, not for white against black, but for the enduring values of civilization itself.

It is these values that we fortunate Americans should seek to protect and to promote, however the chips may fall. I have said that the first business of foreign policy is to protect and further the national interest. That interest is a broad one. It should involve cultivating good relations with those nations on which we are dependent for raw materials and trade, and in avoiding threats and commitments which can only lead to war—economic or otherwise. It should also involve encouraging where we can a world of individual liberty under law, with the emphasis on the *individual*, not pressure groups, and a full realization that law implies not revolution but evolution, not chaos but *order*. In southern Africa we may yet have a chance to further those ideals if we finally come to realize that political arrangements are only means to higher ends, and that in the end it is the ends that count. Our mistakes in policy, in my judgment, derive to no small degree from reversing that equation. We have been so busy preaching the virtues of democracy that we have forgotten that the purpose of democracy is, in the last analysis, human betterment. Perhaps this is why we have lost friends and influence in the lower third of a great continent. It is time we regained them.

THE FEDERAL CITY COLLEGE AND THE WASHINGTON TECHNICAL INSTITUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most gratifying experiences I have had as a Member of the House of Representatives is to have been privileged to serve as the chairman of the subcommittee which handled legislation in the 89th Congress establishing the Federal City College and the Washington Technical Institute.

I was pleased to read in today's Washington Post that the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, Mr. MORSE, speaking at the District of Columbia Teachers College on yesterday, said that he felt that the District of Columbia Teachers College should not be used as a nucleus for the city's new liberal arts college. The story quoted Senator MORSE as saying:

> I believe that it would be a serious mistake to attempt to convert the D.C. Teachers College into a liberal arts college even on a temporary basis.

He was further quoted in the article as saying:

> The teacher training program of this college should be made an integral part of the four-year liberal arts college. It should become the department or school of education within the four-year institution.

Mr. Speaker, this statement by Senator MORSE, in my judgment, very succinctly states the intent, the hopes, and the desires of those of us who worked so hard to bring about legislation which would establish the Federal City College and along with it the Washington Technical Institute. I hope that those who are charged with this responsibility will not ignore the wishes which the proponents of this legislation so clearly set forth last year and will not try to establish a college based upon a rundown proposition such as we know to exist at the District of Columbia Teachers College.

I would go further and say that it was our expression at the time that there should be no requirement, morally or otherwise, upon the new college to take on any of the faculty or any other aspects of the old college, but rather that they should start out to build the finest liberal arts college that we are capable of establishing here in this country.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wish to endorse the observations my colleague has made.

I believe most Members will recall that the bill which set up the liberal arts college and the technical school was my bill. I must say there was bipartisan support by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener], and others, and we enjoyed fine cooperation in arriving at a conclusion on this very necessary facility.

As I have pointed out many times, and as my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener], has also, this is our Federal City. We should have the best educational facilities and the best transportation facilities.

In my judgment, to start with the teachers college as a base would not be giving this community the type of institution they are entitled to.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman for those remarks. Mr. Speaker, I was very proud of the work the gentleman did as author of this legislation and was happy to cooperate with him. I think the gentleman from Minnesota will agree at the time we were discussing the establishment of the college we decided that it should have a name completely different from the District of Columbia Teachers College and get away from any failures that had appeared in the past history of that institution. It was at that point that the subcommittee very graciously permitted me to give the name of the Federal City College to this institution. One of the reasons was to eliminate any real or imaginary association between the new college and the old.

May I say further, Mr. Speaker, that I was delighted to see that the distinguished Senator from Oregon further commented on the excellence of the District school superintendent, Dr. Carl Hansen. According to this news story in the Washington Post, Senator Morse voiced high praise for District School Superintendent Carl Hansen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. The Senator referred to Dr. Hansen as "a statesman" in his educational work. While I have not always agreed with Dr. Hansen on every detail of his testimony before our committee, I must say that I have found him in fact to be a statesman in education, a courageous gentleman, and one of whom any community could be proud.

Further, I commend our distinguished colleague from Oregon, Senator Morse, for the very marvelous approach that he is taking to this educational situation not only as to the college but in upholding the beleaguered Superintendent of Schools in the Washington area, Dr. Carl Hansen.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LOS ANGELES APPROVES PARTICIPATION IN DESALTING PLANT

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Hanna] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, an Associated Press article from Los Angeles reports that the Los Angeles City Council has given its approval to participation in the construction of the world's largest nuclear-powered desalting plant.

This is indeed welcome news. By joining with the Federal Government, the Metropolitan Water District, Southern California Edison, and San Diego Gas & Electric, the Los Angeles Council has virtually insured the long-range success of the program.

There were some anxious moments over the past few months. While it is not necessary to reveiw the questions that prevented expeditious action on the part of the Los Angeles City Council, it is important that these schisms were ably resolved. It is conceivable that without the participation of Los Angeles the entire project would have had immense difficulties in coming to final fruition.

The nature of Los Angeles' participation includes the development of one of the two power generators. The Los Angeles Water and Power Department will be the participating agency. The city will also make a contribution of $130 million to the overall cost of $444 million. Los Angeles' contribution will be from power revenues.

The only remaining authorization necessary for this worthwhile and farsighted undertaking must come from the House of Representatives. We have before us the consideration of legislation authorizing the Interior Department to participate in the construction of the desalting plant.

The Senate has already passed this legislation. It only remains for the House to give its approval, and the last major hurdle will be overcome.

Now that the House Interior Committee has completed public hearings on the bill I am confident that the House will soon have the opportunity to vote.

TO CONTROL INFLUENCE PEDDLING

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill designed to deal with the continuing problem of attempts to influence the outcome of decisions made by independent regulatory agencies. I am resubmitting the proposal today because I feel strongly that this is an area which demands prompt attention.

Regulatory agencies have been entrusted by the Congress with singular authority over our country's private economic institutions, and, in order to carry out their duties, are empowered to exercise a unique combination of legislative, executive, and judicial powers. For this reason, it is vital that the commissions be allowed to function in as nonpartisan an atmosphere as possible, removed from the unauthorized influences and pressures of concerned parties.

There is evidence that efforts to influence agency determinations are still going on today, despite investigations into this question over the past 7 years, and despite the recommendations of the American Bar Association that steps be taken to end these improper representations. I first proposed this measure in 1960 as a direct result of the bar association's study, conducted at that time. After long and thoughtful deliberation, the ABA concluded that the approach embodied in this legislation was the best one.

The bill I am introducing today provides clear standards of conduct for agencies in their quasi-judicial proceedings which ultimately affect the public. It provides that after a forthcoming proceeding, which is by law subject to notice and opportunity for hearing, has been officially made public, any agency member or hearing officer who participates in the conduct or decision of such proceeding and receives any ex parte communication concerning the business of the proceeding, should make full disclosure of such contact in the public record. Failure to make the disclosure under the terms of the act could result in censure, removal from office, fine, or imprisonment.

I feel that this proposal is a good one because it eliminates secrecy and requires that all representations be made available in the public record of the proceeding. By this approach, rather than strict prohibition of all such contacts, it resolves the delicate question of Members of the House and Senate who feel that they should properly make some representation on behalf of their constituents. In this way it gives all parties to the proceeding an equal opportunity to be heard, and preserves the integrity of the commission's final decision through the elimination of secrecy.

Many steps have been taken—while others yet remain—toward insuring the highest ethical standards in the Government and the Congress. This proposal is one more step in that process—a process of prime importance in order to maintain the public's confidence in the reputation of our Government's institutions. I hope, therefore, that this bill may receive favorable consideration during this session of Congress.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—XXVII: THE NEGRO AND THE DRAFT

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Kastenmeier] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, starting last fall, and throughout the remainder of this fiscal year, some 40,000 men in the lowest mental category—Group IV—as classified by the Armed Forces Qualification Test—the equivalent of a fifth grade education—will be "salvaged" for military service.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara announced that special training programs were prepared to "rehabilitate" these young men. In succeeding years, about 100,000 will be inducted and given special training to bring them up to acceptable standards.

This program, of course, raises the question as to whether the services should be used as a training school to bring about educational and social reforms. There are those who claim that the proper function of the armed services is to deter war or to win it should it occur.

Furthermore, there is the effect this policy will have upon the Negro who previously had been found unacceptable. It is estimated that approximately 30 percent of these men will be Negroes. According to one of America's outstanding military authorities, Hanson W. Baldwin of the New York Times, very few of the men affected by the new reduced standards "will qualify for any extensive service schooling; most of them will probably end up—in the Army and Marines, at least—with an MOS—military occupational specialty—of rifleman, and will thus increase the present imbalance of Negro to white in the rifle platoon, company and battalion—the units that do the fighting and take the casualties."

Baldwin further reported that the disproportionate percentage of Negroes in the combat units will necessarily increase, particularly in view of the need to provide more manpower for Vietnam. He concluded that while there is a war on, "the training the Group IV's will receive will not be specialized or adapted to slow learners," and as a result, this new program will have little, if any beneficial effect.

If Baldwin is right, then the Defense Department should not deceive the American people into believing that their programs will "salvage" and "rehabilitate" these young men.

This plan poses particular difficulties for the Negro, who is more susceptible to such a program as a result of the inferior educational system that he experiences and the limited opportunities open to him in the labor market as a result of a restricted education. According to a survey released by the Office of Education, it was found that Negro pupils have fewer facilities that seem most related to academic achievement; they have less access to physics, chemistry and language laboratories, there are fewer books per pupil in their libraries, their textbooks are not in sufficient supply.

Teachers in Negro schools are found educationally less qualified than those in white ones. Secondary school Negro students are less likely to attend schools that are regionally accredited, particularly so in the South. Negro students have less access to college preparatory and accelerated curricula.

The Negro has suffered enough indignity and humiliation. He now must be given the opportunity to participate fully in the mainstream of American life. The Negro youth should not have to exist in a condition where eventually he has to be "salvaged" by the military. The educating and training of these young men should not be the responsibility of the military. It must be shared generally by our society.

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. Hathaway] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, in 1867, an institution was established which focused on the Federal Government's concern that education for its citizens and residents be continually revitalized. The U.S. Office of Education now has been responsible for congressional, executive, and judiciary goals in American education for 100 years, and yet, to many, its work has just begun.

It has been a century of growth unparalleled in the history of any nation. Education has matured rapidly, spurred on by the interest and dedication of educators and statesmen alike. Although an anniversary is a fitting occasion to eulogize any organization, the Office of Education cannot easily be fitted to a single mold. The nature of society—the personalities of man—make education a center of controversy, and the Office shares in that facet of education's character. Education is many ideologies, and the shaping and compounding of the Federal position toward these educational ideologies has become the legacy of an agency founded with only a vague congressional mandate "to promote the cause of education throughout the country."

With humble beginnings, the Office of Education accepted this cause. First as an independent agency, then as a bureau in the Department of the Interior, and now as an office in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, its position changed and expanded from the original 1867 statement of purpose.

The annual report of the Commissioner of Education in 1915 explained the Office of Education as a clearinghouse for accurate and comprehensive information about education and a place for the best opinions on school organization, administration, curriculums, and teaching methods. The report further states that the Office of Education advises school and government officials and others who direct education, promotes what is desirable in education and in the organization of educational agencies so that all citizens may have full and equal educational opportunities, works to determine standards of measurement, and conducts experiments in education and educational processes and methods. Although recent reports are much more complex, these are still among the goals of the Office and justify its existence to the public and the Congress of the United States.

In the passing 100 years, the Federal interest and share in education has expanded, contributing in direct proportion to the growth of the Office of Education. This emphasizes the Office of Education as the Federal partner in education. Congress provides a spearhead of legislation, which the Office of Education, in its executive capacity, uses to subdue the enemies of society—illiteracy, economic lag, cultural deprivation, apathy.

It seems a phenomenon that the very intrinsic value of education has also caused so much dispute about how much, or where, or to whom, or when the Federal Government should concern itself with education. Direct Federal governmental involvement in education did not begin until 1867, with the establishment of a bureau of education. The ideals and principles which brought the first colonists to an unknown destiny in this land dictated that each government—local or regional at the time—must encourage education for its people. It was a survival technique. Throughout the history of this country's development, educational goals and aspirations played a most important role.

Our United States was founded upon standards which could only be met through education—education for all the people. The demands of a new manner of living, the emerging American culture growing from a transplanted European system, created needs which Europe had not been able to anticipate.

The growth of these United States as a new Nation made more evident the need for a Federal agency which concerned itself with the betterment of the Nation through education of the people. So it was that statesmen of the last century authorized the U.S. Office of Education to assist the individual States in their educational tasks. Education was recognized not only as a common goal but as an urgent one. Just as with the first colonists, education continued as a survival tactic.

With only the sketchy framework previously cited, Henry Barnard accepted duties as the first Commissioner of Education, and the official executive organ began functioning to serve the American public. After almost 50 years, Elmer

Ellsworth Brown, Commissioner of Education, wrote in 1909:

> The States are so secure in their control of their several systems of education that they find no need of holding themselves severely aloof from one another and from the national government for fear of encroachment from without. Each year, in fact, the sense of need of cooperation among them grows keener. On the other hand, the national government, while respecting the educational autonomy of the several states, has never assumed that it could escape all responsibility in so important a matter as the education of its citizens.

This was the ideal—it is the ideal. The States should feel secure enough to accept Federal moneys and suggestions. What is needed in one region may well be perfected in another. An Office goal is to help the diverse American communities profit from the educational experiences of all.

Education is a necessary security action—security for the States, for private institutions, for citizens. Freedom from dismay and spiritual depression is gained when citizens are educated to know and evaluate what happens in the world around them. The "better" life is not just a slogan of economic plenty—rather, it is a guarantee that each person will be equipped with psychological tools to perform his work, to strive so that all people may live as well as possible, to accept the daily routine and make it function for him rather than over him. The Office of Education should be applauded for its leadership toward helping our Nation's residents become more able to achieve their personal aspirations and goals.

BULGARIAN LIBERATION DAY

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the modern history of all peoples in the Balkan Peninsula is summed up in their subjugation to Ottoman Turkish despotism until the late 19th century. For more than 400 years these peoples, among them some of the stanchest defenders of freedom in Europe, lived under the ruthless regime of the sultans. The Bulgarian people suffered the same fate, and not until the 1870's were they able to free themselves from the yoke of their oppressors. This was done with the effective aid of Russia's armed forces at the end of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78. Then Turkey was defeated, and as one of the terms of peace, Russia secured Bulgaria's freedom. The peace treaty signed on March 3, 1878, marked her liberation from Turkish tyranny, and since then that date has become Bulgaria's national holiday.

Today when the Bulgarians are deprived of their freedom once more, and are suffering under Communist totalitarianism, that memorable day of 89 years ago naturally looms large in their memory. They rightly think of it as the day which had ushered in a new era for them, marking an important turning point in their national political history. Since that epoch-making event the Bulgarian people have endured much suffering and many misfortunes. They went through the two world wars as if caught in a crossfire, and in neither of them were they the gainers. Although they lost in both of them, their loss at the end of the last war was the more tragic and grievous because they did not expect to lose their hard-earned freedom. The rudest shock they experienced was in 1945, when they found themselves imprisoned in their historic homeland behind the then forming Iron Curtain.

For more than 20 years the Bulgarian people have been living under a Communist totalitarian regime imposed upon them and maintained over them by the Kremlin. Sad and tragic has been their lot, but fortunately in the last few years they have been allowed to assert some form of freedom in certain spheres, though their goal is and remains complete national independence. Let us all hope that they will attain their goal and then enjoy the blessings of peace in their picturesque and rich homeland.

AS A NATION WE HAVE HISTORICALLY RECOGNIZED THAT EDUCATION FORMS THE VERY CORNERSTONE OF OUR DEMOCRACY

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, as a nation, we have historically recognized that education forms the very cornerstone of our democracy. Thomas Jefferson once said:

> If we expect a nation to be ignorant and free, we expect what never was and never will be.

And President Johnson has declared:

> America badly needs educated men and women. And America needs not just more education, but better education. Nothing matters more to the future of our country. Not our military preparedness—for armed power is worthless if we lack the brain power to build a world of peace. Not our productive economy—for we cannot sustain growth without trained manpower. Not our democratic system of government—for freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant.

So this chain of concern about the importance of education in our society does indeed run from the Nation's earliest days to the present. However, in our early years as a nation and even after the founding of the U.S. Office of Education in 1867, our feeling about education was in some ways limited. We felt our citizens should attain a good education, but we also seemed to feel that it should take the same form for everyone. We did not generally recognize that differing groups of individuals might need varying kinds of training.

But little by little over the past 100 years, and especially within the last decade, Congress has seen fit to strengthen the hand of the U.S. Office of Education to help it to work more effectively with local school districts and State departments of education in meeting the exacting educational needs and requirements of all our citizens. Infused with new talent and new ideas, the Office of Education has creatively met the challenges and opportunities given to it by the Congress.

Programs for the socially and economically disadvantaged have been successfully mounted. College students are given needed financial assistance. The handicapped—physically and mentally—now have new hope, thanks to the educational programs mounted to help them overcome their particular problems. Older citizens, who in many cases through no fault of their own missed the benefits of a sound education, now are able to make up for their deficiences in adult basic education classes. Youngsters who take vocational education now are becoming able to receive the highly technical training needed to get a job in an increasingly complex industrial society. Nor has the average or gifted student been neglected; through curriculum reform and improvement and other specific programs, they too have benefited from the congressional mandates given to the U.S. Office of Education.

As the Office of Education celebrates its 100th anniversary, we see an agency gearing up to meet the very specific educationl requirements of every segment of our society. What is more, as we look down the road, we see promise that the Office of Education, working in close partnership with local school districts and State departments, will one day be able to help educators effectively meet the challenge of serving all groups and segments of our society, while being able to tackle the even more precise educational needs of every individual. This is now becoming possible because the Office of Education has been given an increasing role in recognizing the potential of still-emerging educational technology.

Through the agency's research and development programs, brought into being by Congress a decade ago, efforts are underway that truly individualize the learning process. In Palo Alto, Calif., for instance, youngsters are learning spelling and arithmetic with the assistance of a computer. Each youngster is able to proceed through his assignments at his own pace. Earlier pilot studies had shown that children can learn as much as five times faster than normal using computer-assisted instruction.

Just outside of Pittsburgh, Pa., in a suburban elementary school, children working on programed instructional materials developed by University of Pittsburgh researchers are performing two and three grade levels above the average for children their age. These and other innovative projects supported by the Office are enabling us, for the first time, to tailor programs to individual education needs of pupils, instead of forcing the pupil into the mold of a particular program. These revolutionary developments in technology, which include instructional television, as well as programed instructional materials and computer-assisted instruction, hold promise of making the age-old educational dream of individualized instruction a reality.

So we see a gradual but steady evolution that is refining the educational process. The specific programs of today have replaced or strengthened the more general ones of the past. And now on the horizon emerge the individualized learning programs, supported by the will of Congress and the leadership provided by the Office of Education.

On its agency's 100th anniversary, it is well worth noting that the U.S. Office of Education is keeping pace with change, that it is not allowing itself to become a stodgy bureaucracy content to rest on its past laurels. Rather, the Office of Education is looking ahead, seeking to play its proper partnership role—today and tomorrow. We can heartily applaud that effort.

REMARKS MADE BY SENATOR JOHN O. PASTORE ON MARCH 1, 1967, IN THE SENATE ABOUT TEXTILES—THURSDAY, MARCH 2, 1967

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. St Germain] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday my highly esteemed colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, John Pastore, delivered a very eloquent and constructive speech in the other body on textiles. I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues in this body to Senator Pastore's remarks for I believe they constitute one of the most accurate and penetrating studies of the textile industry in these United States.

In particular, I would like to focus attention upon Senator Pastore's cogent statement that the answer to our Nation's poverty and unemployment problems can largely be found in the restoration and expansion of our domestic textile industry. He stated:

> We are importing unemployment and poverty.

For rising imports and further foreign dominance of our domestic market, Mr. Speaker, has resulted in substantial reduction in production and jobs in the textile industry. If only more people were cognizant of this, perhaps our persistent plea for relief from the overwhelming rise in textile imports would be heard. Perhaps we would get remedial action rather than mere expressions of compassion.

I have been intimately involved in seeking a solution to this problem through appearances and correspondence with the Tariff Commission, Trade Negotiations Office, and President Johnson. My efforts have not been stimulated solely because the very existence of Rhode Island's textile industry is threatened by these soaring imports, though this surely would be a most sufficient reason. My efforts have also been motivated by the glaring injustices that exist in the present status of tariffs on textiles which allows low-cost foreign textile goods to flow, practically without limit, into this country while the same countries place great limitations and high tariffs against what little we export to them.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of my colleagues to the seriousness and magnitude of this problem of textiles which was so eloquently explained yesterday in the other body by my colleague from Rhode Island, Senator John Pastore. I urge every one of my colleagues to take the time to acquaint themselves with Senator Pastore's cogent comments.

FOR THE BENEFIT OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing seven bills which will be of particular benefit to the Nation's postal employees.

For too long, post office workers have been underpaid. Despite Public Law 87–793 which specifically states that Government salaries should be comparable to those in industry, salary inequities remain throughout the Post Office Department. To correct that situation, one of my bills will upgrade to the next salary level all postal workers in levels 1 to 5. The other will reclassify a number of key positions and increase salaries in the postal field service.

I am also introducing a bill which gives formal recognition to unions and organizations formed by Government employees, and which asserts the right of such organizations to present grievances in behalf of their members. Here again, I feel that Federal employees deserve the same right to be heard as employees outside Government. Currently there is no effective administrative procedure by which postal employees and other civil servants can obtain redress from management. This bill, I feel, would go far to improve existing employee-management relations in the Federal service.

Three of my bills would extend fringe benefits already available to Federal employees. One requires the Federal Government to pay the entire cost of health benefits, rather than just one-fourth as is the case now. Another liberalizes the formula used in computing retirement annuities, and the third bill provides additional life insurance and accidental death and dismemberment insurance for Federal employees. Fringe benefits offered by the Federal Government should, at the very least, keep abreast of the benefits offered by private industry to its employees.

Finally, I am introducing a bill to provide for a new system of overtime compensation for postal field employees, thereby eliminating the practice of arbitrarily changing established employee work schedules without granting overtime pay. My bill would establish a standard Monday through Friday workweek, with 150 percent pay for any work done in excess of 8 hours in a day and on Saturdays, and 220 percent pay for any work done on Sundays and holidays. It seems to me that, at a minimum, these provisions are entirely consistent with modern employment practices.

I strongly urge that Congress give prompt and favorable consideration to these seven bills. We cannot expect to attract competent postal employees unless their working conditions are comparable to those in private industry. These bills would correct that discrepancy. Their passage is both necessary and just.

LEGISLATION DESIGNED TO PROTECT CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Fulton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is with great concern and a sense of urgency that today I introduce legislation designed to protect the constitutional rights of our Federal employees and to prevent unwarranted governmental invasions of their privacy.

This is not a new bill. It was introduced during the 89th Congress by Senator Ervin and again during this Congress by the Senator from North Carolina.

The bill is specifically designed to prohibit indiscriminate requirements that Federal employees and applicants for Government employment disclose their race, religion, or national origin; attend Government-sponsored meetings and lectures or participate in outside activities unrelated to their employment; report on their outside activities or undertakings unrelated to their work; submit to questioning about their religion, personal relationships, or sexual attitudes through interviews, psychological tests, or polygraphs; support political candidates, or attend political meetings. It makes it illegal to coerce an employee to buy bonds or make charitable contributions; or to require him to disclose his own personal assets, liabilities or expenditures, or those of any member of his family unless they would show a conflict of interest. It provides a right to have counsel or other person present, if the employee wishes, at an interview which may lead to disciplinary proceedings. It accords the right to civil action in a Federal court for violation or threatened violation of the act.

The need for this legislation has been graphically demonstrated in the hearings held by the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Hearings into the abuse suffered by Federal employees at the hands of thoughtless, overzealous, and even willful supervisors and bosses have exposed the glaring light of public consideration and conscience the ugent need for reform.

An excellent documentation of this need may be found commencing on page 4039 of the February 21, 1967, Congressional Record under the heading: "Protection of Constitutional Rights of Government Employees and To Prevent Unwarranted Invasions of Their Privacy—Protection of the Rights of the Military."

Mr. Speaker, I commend this to the attention of my colleagues for their study and consideration.

WHAT KIND OF CHINA DOES THE UNITED STATES WANT?

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Waggonner] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, one of the truly distinguished ambassadors to this country represents the Republic of China, Ambassador Chow Shu-kai. It has been my pleasure to have known His Excellency for several years and I have benefited greatly from his insight into Asian problems.

The insight he brings to this subject is one that is trained firsthand by 18 years of observation of Communist China. He speaks with logic, sincerity, and reason when he addresses himself to these problems. Tragically enough, there have been times in the past when we have not heeded the advice and counsel of our friends in Free China, but we cannot afford that error again.

Last week Ambassador Chow addressed the Comstock Club in Sacramento, Calif., and during his remarks, he dwelt at length on the long friendship between our two Governments before the tragic capture of the Government there by the Communists. I urge every Member to read the text of His Excellency's speech. It is both provocative and informative, as we who admire the Ambassador have come to expect. It follows:

Address by Ambassador Chow Shu-kai

It is a rare pleasure and privilege to meet this distinguished gathering at the capital city of California. By history and geography, your great State has always occupied an important place in the relationship between the United States and China. This relationship has become the subject of an incessant and animated debate since the fall of the Chinese mainland to communism. The convulsions behind the Bamboo Curtain in recent months have further heightened the interest of the American public. Those members of the intellectual community seeking to achieve fame or to defend their reputation find the China issue a fertile field to peddle their respective favorite theories. The topic also affords a convenient forum to some prominent figures who are eager to display their expertise in foreign affairs. There are experts and experts. There are politicians and politicians.

This time last year certain specialists confidently asserted that communism was going to stay in China and that Mao Tse-tung's regime was solid and stable. Now they must feel as sorry as Mao himself. If an imprudent and uninformed person who prepared a speech on China a year or so ago and, without taking account of what has transpired during the past year, should choose to deliver it today, the empty rhetoric and dangerous illusion contained therein must be amazingly and amusingly startling.

A famous English author, Horace Walpole, once said that the world is a comedy to those who think and a tragedy to those who feel. As the representative of the legitimate Government of China which has been waging a life-and-death struggle for the restoration of freedom and cultural heritage to our enslaved compatriots on the mainland, I cannot treat the subject lightly, and I welcome this opportunity to express our serious viewpoints.

It is particularly gratifying that I should be afforded a platform in California, the gateway to the Orient.

Although the cradle of United States civilization is located on the Atlantic coast, the epic of American enterprise and achievements has been notable in its westward movement, which results in the spectacular development of the Pacific coast. Despite the occasional appearance of some false prophets, your nation has produced many illustrious statesmen endowed with immense wisdom and vision. As early as 1852, William H. Seward, though he was the Senator from New York, predicted that the United States interests in the Atlantic "would relatively sink in importance while the Pacific Ocean, its shores, its islands and the vast region beyond" would become "the chief theater of events in the world's great hereafter." Subsequent events proved that the United States had indeed become a major power in the Pacific before she developed into a world power.

Being a Pacific power, the American people and their Government are naturally concerned with their relationship vis-a-vis China, the largest and the most populous country on the other shore of this ocean. In his syndicated article published about ten days ago, a well-known columnist, Mr. Joseph Kraft, concluded by saying: "For Washington to do the right things, it needs first to go through the long hard process of developing a China policy, of thinking out *what kind of China the United States wants to have."* This is indeed a pertinent question, and I therefore use it as the title of my remarks this afternoon.

I have just alluded to your many illustrious statesmen endowed with immense wisdom and vision. They have provided the answer to this question in successive years. Foreign policy is, of course, determined by national interests. As a vast country rich in natural and human resources and with unlimited potentialities, you do not have to seek any aggrandizement or domination at the expense of other lands. All you need are good neighbors to provide peace and tranquillity in which you can exercise your rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The United States desires nothing from China and the Chinese people except the reciprocation of friendship. On the other hand, the Pacific Ocean can be pacific only when there is a peaceful China. To protect your security, therefore, you cannot and should not tolerate the seizure of China by any force of aggression, be it from without or within. Indeed, contemporary history has made it abundantly clear that whenever the mainland of China has fallen into the hands of an aggressor, it invariably poses a direct threat to your national interests and you are dragged into a bloody war.

The foundation of your China policy was first laid during the administration of President Lincoln when Senator William H. Seward became the Secretary of State. A distinguished Congressman from Massachusetts, Anson Burlingame was appointed American Minister to China in 1861. President Lincoln and Secretary Seward instructed him that he should make China feel that she could count on the friendship of the United States in the midst of the humiliation and oppression she was receiving from other Western powers. Mr. Burlingame's mission was a tremendous success. He assuaged the pressure brought to bear on China by the British, the French, etc., and he tried to prevail upon the Chinese Government to work for modernization. His mission was so successful that later it created an epoch-making milestone not only in the relationship between our two countries but also in the annals of international diplomatic practice.

Exactly 100 years ago, when Anson Burlingame retired from his ministership, the then Government of China was so gratified with him that he was appointed the first Chinese diplomatic envoy to the United States as well as other Western countries. The announcement was made in November, 1867. A few months later, Anson Burlingame arrived at San Francisco and began his function as the head of the Chinese Special Mission. In July, 1868, he succeeded in concluding a new treaty with the United States Government which, among other things, started the flow of Chinese immigration into California.

Our two countries developed a closer and closer relationship as time marched on. Towards the end of the 19th century, however, China became weaker and weaker due to the misrule of the Empress Dowager, whose fanaticisms and whims can be likened to those of Mao Tse-tung. Taking advantage of this situation, the imperialist powers of Europe, now joined by Japan, attempted to dismember China. In order to counter this move, the then Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. John Hay, declared the historic Open Door Policy concerning China. The significance of this policy was manifold. It served as a warning to the imperialist foreign powers to refrain from the partition of China. It also endeavored to persuade China and the Chinese people to desist from self-imposed isolation and to catch up with the modern world.

In conformity with the spirit of the Open Door Policy, the United States influenced the concerned countries to sign the Nine-Power Pact in 1922 to preserve the sovereignty and the territorial and administrative integrity of China. After Japan's invasion and occupation of Manchuria in 1931, the United States, under President Hoover and Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson, steadfastly refused to recognize the fruits of aggression.

As the Japanese militarists escalated this aggression throughout China in 1937, we warned the outside world that our country would be used as their stepping-stone to launch further conquests of other parts of Asia and the Pacific. The warning was not taken seriously. In fact, on October 27, 1938, Walter Lippmann wrote admiringly that Japan had won the war and securely established one of the greatest empires in history.

Following Japan's seizure of Indo-China and her preparation for other adventures, President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Cordell Hull sought feverishly to negotiate with her so as to avoid a head-on clash. The peace effort failed because the United States simply could not accept the Tokyo demand for leaving China entirely at Japan's mercy. Then came the Pearl Harbor attack.

Through the courage, perseverance and untold sacrifices of our two peoples, Japan was deprived of that victory predicted by

Walter Lippmann. But, alas, China also lost the peace. The best description of that miserable episode was made by a young and upcoming Congressman who was destined later to become the President of the United States. On January 30, 1949, John F. Kennedy said in a speech:

"Our relationship with China since the end of the Second World War has been a tragic one, and it is of the utmost importance that we search out and spotlight those who must bear the responsibility for our present predicament.

"It was clearly enunciated on November 26, 1941, that the independence of China and the stability of the National Government was the fundamental object of our Far Eastern policy. That this and other statements of our policies in the Far East led directly to the attack on Pearl Harbor is well known.

"During the post-war period, began the great split in the minds of our diplomats over whether to support the Government of Chiang Kai-shek or force Chiang Kai-shek as the price of our assistance to bring Chinese Communists into his Government to form a coalition.

"Our policy in China has reaped the whirlwind. The continued insistence that aid would not be forthcoming unless a coalition government was formed was a crippling blow to the National Government. So concerned were our diplomats and their advisors with the imperfections of the political system in China after twenty years of war, and the tales of corruption in higher places, that they lost sight of our tremendous stake in a non-Communist China.

"This is the tragic story of China whose freedom we once fought to preserve.

"The failure of those in authority to implement existing United States policy brought about the downfall of an ally and jeopardized the very security of our nation. We have seen the growth of a Communist enemy where we once had a staunch ally. We have watched Communist imperialism spread its influence throughout the world. We have seen thousands of our young men vainly sacrifice their lives in blind pursuit of sterile policies of appeasement based on ignorance of history and of this enemy."

The Republic of China was founded by Dr. Sun Yat-sen. The United States was one of the first to accord recognition to the new Republic. When Dr. Sun's successor, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, unified the country in 1928, the United States was again the first to embark upon a new relationship with her on the basis of equality, friendship and cooperation.

I do not for one moment suggest that our government has been manned only by angels and saints. We have had faults and we have made mistakes. By and large, however, we have been dedicated to the principles of Dr. Sun Yat-sen for the building up of a free, viable, democratic and peace-loving China. We made great efforts along this direction in the early 1930s with considerable success, which has been forgotten or deliberately ignored by certain China-watchers in foreign lands. Long years of war against overwhelming odds made the country hapless after the defeat of Japan. While the hands of the Chinese Government were tied, the Soviet Union aided and abetted the Chinese Communists to overrun the mainland. Now that Moscow and Peiping are quarreling violently, it is appropriate to point out the Mao Tse-tung once received Russian assistance because he accepted Stalin's terms which had been rejected by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek.

It may be recalled that towards the end of World War II, Stalin proposed to Generalissimo Chiang that China surrender to Russia many rights and concessions beyond what were granted by the Yalta Agreement. More especially, Stalin wanted us to expel the influence of the United States from China after the war. Had Generalissimo Chiang agreed to these conditions, Mao Tse-tung and his cohorts would have been driven into oblivion during the postwar period. For his patriotism to true China and his friendship for the United States, President Chiang incurred the enmity of the Soviet Union, the evacuation to Taiwan, and the insults by certain elements who, unlike John F. Kennedy, are "ignorant of history."

Communism as a theory and the practice of the Chinese Communists are utterly repugnant to our cultural tradition and against the interests of our people. That the Chinese Communists were able to seize the mainland was a tragic accident. Nothing could be further from the truth than to say that communism is acceptable to the Chinese people, that Mao Tse-tung and his cohorts are interested in promoting the people's welfare, and that the Peiping regime or any regime of a similar character is a going concern.

On June 28, 1957, another great American, Mr. John Foster Dulles, in a speech at San Francisco spoke of Communist rule in China as "a passing and not a perpetual phase." This statement was often ridiculed in the past years. It has now been vindicated by events.

If the Chinese Communists were agrarian reformers as some people portrayed, they had ample opportunity to prove it. On the contrary, they were determined first to dehumanize the Chinese people into robots, then to turn China into a huge military camp, and finally to use it to communize the rest of the world. They have militarized the national economy for the sole purpose of strengthening their capability to make wars. By depriving the people of their daily necessities, they have squandered resources in producing nuclear weaponry and in sending money and agents to countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America to stir up revolutions. Their avowed objective vis-a-vis the United States is to drive you out completely from Asia and the Pacific. Their grandiose ambition and their insane behavior seem to be too fantastic to be credible to rational people. But the blueprints for world domination of Hitler and the Japanese militarists were also dismissed as fantasies at the time.

A liberal Jewish rabbi who visited the mainland and saw the Red Guards' rampage a few weeks ago came back with the frightful impression that it was worse than the Nazi spectacle. He felt so much horrified that he suffered nightmares during his sleep even after his return to this country.

The sheer madness of the Chinese Communists has brought about many a fiasco at home and abroad. As things went wrong, they began to quarrel among themselves. The intra-party struggle is like a gangland war. There is no such distinction as a hard-line Communist and a soft-line Communist. If there are two kinds of Communists, they would be the hard and the harder. Like a group of gangsters who have failed to pull a "job", different factions try to put the blame on the others. In order to attain supremacy, they turn to mutual liquidation. Years of their persistent misrule have antagonized the intelligentsia, the peasantry, the workers, and the rank-and-file of the armed forces, As a last resort, Mao Tse-tung has to mobilize the school children to destroy the party and the administrative machineries created by himself.

The so-called proletarian cultural revolution is nothing short of total obliteration of our traditional culture. In the ensuing convulsions, both the pro-Mao and the anti-Mao forces have to seek popular support. By so doing, they have released the latent anti-Communist sentiments of the masses. A seesaw warfare has been going on for some time among the various elements throughout the country. It can only end in a state of anarchy.

As the Communist tyranny on the mainland enters into a critical stage of its "passing phase" as Mr. Dulles put it, you will surely ask me about the future role of the Republic of China.

My Government is the legitimate Government elected by the people of China according to the constitutional procedure before the fall of the mainland. Since our evacuation to Taiwan, we have been determined to continue the program of reconstruction interrupted by Japan's aggression, to make it a showcase of Dr. Sun Yat-sen's principles and to prepare for the deliverance of our brethren on the mainland. For the first time in China, constitutional provisions for local self-government are fully implemented. Elections are held regularly and smoothly. Peaceful measures have been adopted for the reform of agricultural institutions and techniques. Coupled with this is the program of rational industrialization.

Thanks to our own efforts and the generous assistance of the United States we have achieved substantial progress. From 1949 to 1966 our agricultural production has increased three times, industrial production nine times, and foreign trade 16 times. The per capita income from 1952 to 1966 has doubled.

Certain people have deemed it fit to ignore completely our efforts to promote the welfare of the Chinese people on Taiwan and call the situation there "flagrant" and "outrageous". This travesty of truth is not only a gross injustice to the Chinese Government and people but also an act of violence against common intelligence.

We are not complacent and self-satisfied with our modest achievements. We admit that there is always room for further improvement, but we have been moving in the right direction. We have done all these things on Taiwan as experiments to be introduced throughout China when freedom is restored to our people on the mainland.

Much hope has been entertained by the outside world for a change to moderation on the part of the Chinese Communists. In the course of the past year, President Johnson made more than one appeal to Peiping to be sensible. Each time the appeal met with rebuttal and scorn. In response to the latest pronouncement made by President Johnson in his State of the Union message last month, an article in the "People's Daily" of Peiping dated January 24, 1967, shrieked: "Pooh, Johnson, you are daydreaming."

As long as there is a Communist regime in China, no matter who are their chieftains, it would never shift its ultimate goal, namely, the complete expulsion of the United States from Asia and the Pacific. Would a victory by the anti-Mao forces within the Peiping regime be slightly better? I do not think so. The bickerings among the Chinese Communists have gone on for a long time. Since 1958, there has been a collective rule by pro-Mao and anti-Mao elements in the Communist leadership. The domestic and foreign policies of these past years were joint products. There might be differences on emphases and tactics, but their basic ideology and objective are the same.

Fortunately, the present power struggle among the Communists and the popular uprising generated by this struggle will bring the downfall of communism and the Communist regime in China. The eventual return of the Government of the Republic of China is not empty rhetoric and dangerous illusion but will be a reality. Please do not think in terms of a purely military campaign. Our task will be mainly a political one. The millions of our compatriots on the mainland now beginning to rise up against the Communist regime are our allies. As the Communist elements are cancelling one another out, the masses will soon be ready to ask us to join them to restore freedom to China.

The Government of the Republic of China is not fighting to preserve its own position. It received the mandate from the entire Chinese people and is anxious to return it to them. After our recovery of the mainland, while we shall first engage ourselves in the difficult task of rehabilitation, the earliest opportunity will be afforded to the people to once more express their free will through a general election to determine the future of China. As disciples of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, we shall put before the electorate a program for the conduct of our domestic and foreign affairs in accordance with Dr. Sun's principles and in the light of our experience on Taiwan in the last 17 years. We believe in the preservation of our best cultural heritage on the one hand and the absorption of the best of foreign cultures on the other. We believe in a healthy form of nationalism in the sense that while we treasure our sovereignty, freedom and independence, we respect those of others. We believe in a healthy form of political democracy in the sense that the people should have fundamental rights and the Government should have the ability and competence to administer public affairs. We believe in a healthy form of economic democracy in which there is an equilibrium of governmental planning and private enterprise. We shall first attach great importance to the modernization and reform of agriculture side by side with a program of gradual and orderly industrialization. As a signatory to the nuclear test ban treaty, we shall continue to engage in nuclear research and development only for peaceful purposes. We shall encourage and broaden the contact between our people and the outside world. We shall welcome foreign economic assistance and attract private investments in capital and technical know-how. We shall, within our capability, also render similar services to friendly countries, as evidenced by the presence today of our agricultural teams in most of the new nations in Africa. This is the kind of China we intend to build for ourselves. It must be the kind of China the United States and the rest of the world hope to see and live with.

China is not merely a geographical and political term. It is a civilization and a way of life. In this sense, China is eternal, despite her historical vicissitudes. We are confident that the true China that is free, civilized and peace-loving will be reestablished in its entirety in the not distant future. Only then can the United States resume her traditional friendship with the resurgent integrated Chinese nation to work for the benefit of our two countries and for that of mankind as a whole.

PRESENT-DAY CHALLENGES TO THE PARTY OF VANCE AND AYCOCK

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Taylor] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, one of the most challenging addresses that I have heard in recent years was delivered last October 29 by the dean of the North Carolina congressional delegation, the Honorable L. H. Fountain, Representative of North Carolina's Second Congressional District. The occasion was the annual statewide Democratic Party dinner honoring Zebulon B. Vance and Charles B. Aycock, North Carolina's two representatives in the Congressional Hall of Fame, and the Democratic Party's greatest gift to good government in our State. I recommend the address of the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman Fountain, which follows, to the attention of my colleagues and to all people who seek and support sound, responsible government:

Present-Day Challenges to the Party of Vance and Aycock

(An address by the Honorable L. H. Fountain, Representative of the Second Congresional District of North Carolina, at the Vance-Aycock Dinner, Asheville, N.C., October 29, 1966)

It's good to be in Asheville once more and among so many fine Democrats from all over the State.

I realize that in asking me to speak tonight, you honor our entire Democratic Delegation in Washington. I would not want this occasion to pass without expressing my deepest admiration for my Democratic colleagues from North Carolina. I think you will all agree that we have a hard-working, dedicated and able delegation of Democrats in the Congress. The need for independent thinking and freedom from me-too-ism is no less necessary just because we have a Democratic President and a Democratic majority in the Congress. You can be proud of the manner in which your Democratic delegation are exercising their independent judgment on your behalf. Their positions on issues are determined on the basis of the needs and wishes of their constituents and the best interests of the nation. We have neither a "rubber stamp" nor an abstructionist among us.

Through a high degree of cooperation and teamwork, our Democratic Delegation is able to exert greater influence than our number would imply on most of the important issues which come before Congress. In addition, because of the balanced committee assignments we have been able to obtain, and the seniority we have managed to accumulate, we are better able to represent and protect the interests of the whole State and all of our people.

I'm glad we have this chance periodically to remind ourselves of our Party's ideals and principles, which are illustrated in the lives of the men whose memory we honor here tonight.

Zebulon Vance and Charles B. Aycock came from widely separated parts of our great State. They represented different generations and, to some extent, different political views. But both served North Carolina and the Democratic Party with wisdom and imagination in some of the most trying periods of our history. They were great leaders in times which required greatness, and we shall never forget them.

For several reasons it is difficult for me to say much which is original about Vance and Aycock tonight—the basic facts concerning their lives and accomplishments are well known to every North Carolina school child. Several books have been written about each of them, and previous speakers on this happy occasion have given very enlightening accounts, such as the one by Edwin Gill two years ago. Furthermore, each of these men became a legend in his own time and with the passage of years it has become increasingly difficult to separate man from myth.

So perhaps the best I can do to summarize our feelings about these two men is to borrow the words of Asheville's own Tom Wolfe in describing Zebulon Vance:

"If, as Carlyle says, the history of the world is recorded in the lives of its great men, so, too, the spirit of a people in recorded in the heroes it picks. No better illustration of this fact could be found than in the life of Zachariash Joyner (the name Wolfe used for Zebulon Vance). Historians will remember him as a leader in the affairs of his own state for almost fifty years; as an able and resourceful Governor; later, as one of the most forceful and colorful leaders of debate in the affairs of the United States Senate; and, all in all, when the whole record of his life is weighed and estimated as a man of great natural ability and intelligence. . . . But these honors and accomplishments, splendid as they are, do not in themselves explain the place he holds in [North Carolina's] heart. For he is their hero; in the most local and particular sense, they feel that he belongs to them, is one of them, could in no conceivable way belong to anything else, . . . He was not alone their hero; he was their legend and their myth. . . . What does it matter if many of the things which they describe never happened? They are true because they are the kind of things he would have said, the kind of things that would have happened to him."

Wolfe might well have said some of these same things about Aycock.

I have always thought it fitting that North Carolina chose to send statues of Vance and Aycock as its two representative figures in Statuary Hall in our Nation's Capitol, for the spirit of our people is reflected in the lives of these two great men.

Vance held the people of North Carolina together throughout the long and bitter strife and suffering of the Civil War. And later he came back to rescue the State from an incompetent, corrupt, and bankrupt Republican Reconstruction government. Two decades later, after another period in which the Republican Party had demonstrated its inability to cope with the challenges of the time, Aycock came forth to lay the foundation for a period of unparalleled progress under Democratic leadership.

According to the noted North Carolina Historian, Professor Hugh Lefler,

"Aycock's inauguration in 1901 coincided with the dawn of a new era, marked by a decline in political bitterness and racial antagonism, rapid industrialization, and urbanization, phenomenal educational expansion, and progressive responsiveness of the state government to the needs of the people."

This "new era" of responsible and forward-looking state government has continued through 66 years of unbroken Democratic leadership under Governors Aycock, Glenn, Kitchin, Craig, Bickett, Morrison, McLean, Gardner, Ehringhaus, Hoey, Broughton, Cherry, Scott, Umstead, Luther Hodges, Terry Sanford and Dan Moore. Every one of these men made significant and enduring contributions to the people of North Carolina.

Time will not permit a review of the accomplishments of each of these distinguished public servants, but I think we should acknowledge our special debt of gratitude to the two former Governors who are still with us. The outstanding accomplishments of Luther Hodges, in promoting industrial development within the State, and of Terry Sanford, in the field of education, are the ones we hear most about. But their foresight and untiring efforts in many other areas of endeavor will benefit the people of North Carolina for generations to come.

Our present fine Governor, Dan Moore, although in office less than two years, has already proven himself a worthy successor to his distinguished predecessors. I am confident that the great work he has already done and his further accomplishments during the next two years will mark him as one of North Carolina's truly great Governors.

We are justifiably proud of what the Democratic Party has done for North Carolina and the Nation. Our Party has a glorious history dating back to Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson. The periods of greatest progress and prosperity in our state and in the nation have coincided with Democratic administrations. In times of trouble, the people have always looked to our Party for leadership, as they did during the First World War, and during the dark days of the Great Depression and in World War II. And our Party did not fail them. Our great Democratic leaders of the past have always guided the ship of State out of the stormy waters and back on to the tranquil seas of progress and prosperity.

The mythical Senator Claghorn, who amused radio listeners some years ago, used to suggest that the recipe for a successful political speech is for the incumbents to point with pride to their accomplishments and to view the program of the opposition with alarm. There is much truth in that statement.

But I don't believe I can follow the second part of Senator Claghorn's suggestion because—so far as I've been able to determine—North Carolina Republicans do not really have a program. In fact, it is extremely difficult to tell whom they are running against, since they are spending most of their time campaigning against a man whose name will not appear on the ballot this November.

Consequently, I believe it will be more constructive to consider some of the problems which beset our nation today—problems which can be resolved only if we all re-dedicate ourselves to the principles upon which both our nation and our Party were founded. I would like to discuss some of these problems and the challenges which they present to the Democratic Party.

All of us are concerned about the rising crime rate in our land and the increasing disregard for law and order. A number of factors have, no doubt, contributed to this situation, but none of them justify it.

As Governor Moore said in a speech last year:

"[We] have always accepted the principle that ours is a nation of laws and not of men. . . . We cannot choose the laws that we will obey and the laws that we will violate. The hope of mankind, both here and throughout the world, depends upon the ultimate rule of law."

And even U.S. Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black said in a recent dissenting opinion:

"It is high time to challenge the assumption in which too many people have too long acquiesced, that groups that think they have been mistreated have a constitutional right to use the public's streets, buildings and property to protest whatever, wherever, whenever they want, without regard to whom it may disturb."

I never thought I would see the day that I would agree with Justice Black, but "wisdom so seldom comes, it should not be ignored because it comes late."

The greatest danger, as Justice Black went on to say, is "that the crowd moved by noble ideals today can become the mob ruled by hate and passion and greed and violence tomorrow. If we ever doubted that, we know it now."

There are many today who, in order to achieve their own ends, are attempting, in the name of freedom, to spread hatred and fear and suspicion. They have ignored the fact that true freedom carries with it responsibility, and that for every right there is a corresponding duty.

I want to emphasize that the problem of disrespect for law and order has not been nearly as great in North Carolina as it has been elsewhere. While we have had some misguided and intemperate action by frightened and frustrated people acting outside the law, the great majority of our people of all races have kept their heads and have realized, as Aycock put it in his 1901 inaugural address, that "the highest test of a great people is obedience to law and a consequent ability to administer justice."

Of course, we sometimes have difficulty in telling what the law is—for in truth, the Courts and the bureaucrats in Washington seem to change it from time to time without consulting the Congress or the people. And this points up another problem which I would like to discuss briefly—the erosion of our Constitutional system of checks and balances, both between the respective branches of the Federal Government and between the Federal and State Governments.

It has become fashionable in recent years for us to criticize the Courts—not the North Carolina Courts, to be sure, for we have some of the wisest and most respected judges in the land. The criticism, rather, has been aimed at the Federal Courts—and especially at the U.S. Supreme Court. Some of that criticism may have been unfounded.

However, there is sound basis for questioning whether the Courts have changed the philosophical basis upon which our country was founded and whether they have exceeded their traditional sphere of authority and infringed upon the functions of the Legislative Branch and the states in such areas as "one-man, one-vote" legislative reapportionment; Bible-reading and prayer in the schools; obscenity; state voting laws and the administration of criminal justice.

Even some members of the Supreme Court itself are concerned about these questions.

Justice Harlan, dissenting in a legislative apportionment case two years ago said:

"I believe that the vitality of our political system . . . is weakened by reliance on the judiciary for political reform. . . . These decisions . . . cut deeply into the fabric of our Federalism. . . . No thinking person can fail to recognize that the aftermath of these cases, however desirable it may be thought in itself, will have been achieved at the cost of a radical alteration in the relationship between the States and the Federal Government. . . . Only one who has an overbearing impatience with the Federal system and its political processes will believe that the cost was not too high or was inevitable.

"This Court . . . does not serve its high purpose when it exceeds its authority, even to satisfy justified impatience with the slow workings of the political processes. For when, in the name of constitutional interpretation, the Court *adds* something to the Constitution that was deliberately excluded from it, the Court in reality substitutes its view of what should be so for the amending process."

Other Justices have made similar statements. Unfortunately, however, their criticisms of the Court's actions have all been in dissenting opinions; and apparently a majority of the Court still adheres to the view that the Judicial Branch of Government is entitled to legislate against what it conceives to be social or political injustices.

Another factor in the erosion of our system of checks and balances is the burgeoning Federal Bureaucracy. A nation of over 191 million people, scattered over 50 states, must have agencies and people to carry out the programs enacted by Congress—although some of us think that we could do with a few less than we have. Most Federal employees are dedicated and hard-working people who strive to carry out their duties within the defined and circumscribed powers given them by Congress. But occasionally some misguided Bureaucrat decides that Congress has acted unwisely or hasn't gone far enough and decides to enforce the law, not as it is, but as he would like it to be.

This usurpation of the law-making responsibility of Congress is graphically demonstrated by some actions of the U.S. Office of Education, which have occupied much of the time of my colleagues and myself in recent months. Under certain circumstances, the law permits Federal funds to be withheld from school districts which have been found—after opportunity for a hearing—to be engaging in racial discrimination. But the Commissioner of Education has abused this authority by attempting to deny Federal funds to school districts which have not been shown to be engaging in racial discrimination, and have never even had an opportunity to defend themselves against such charges.

Fortunately, Congressmen from all sections of the country now realize—as demonstrated by the 221 to 116 vote in favor of an amendment I offered to a recent Education bill—that such disregard of the law can only result in harm to public education for all of our people. If the Commissioner of Education is allowed to ignore due process of law and to exert personal control over schools in the South today, there will be nothing to prevent him from doing the same thing in other sections of the country tomorrow.

There are other serious problems, less close to home. We are all anxious about the Viet Nam situation. A lot of people have difficulty understanding why we are there, and I wish we didn't have to be. But I'm convinced that our national security requires our presence there—just as our national security has required us to commit ourselves and our national resources in other strange and distant lands at other times in our history. "Peace in our time" was an appealing slogan in 1938, but it was appalling in 1939 as Hitler's hordes marched across Europe. Those who would have us seek a cheap peace now would discover, I'm convinced, that it would be costly in the long run. We must use all measures necessary to bring the war to an honorable and victorious conclusion and make it possible for our servicemen to return home.

But let us never close the door to an honorable and effective peace which would preserve our national security and provide to the people of South Viet Nam the democratic rights for which so many Americans have paid the supreme sacrifice throughout our history.

The cost of meeting our defense commitments in Viet Nam and elsewhere is great. And although we have tried to keep the cost of living down, we have seen that there has been some increase as a result of our attempt to have both a "guns and butter economy." But all of us must admit that in a material sense we have far more now than we have ever had before. There is less unemployment and less real poverty than we have ever seen in America. We see new schools, medical facilities and highways being built around us and other programs which show that our Party is concerned for the welfare of the people. But all of this costs money. And when the national budget is strained, as it is now, to meet an extraordinary heavy need, should we not cut back on less essential spending?

To favor a "government economically administered"—to borrow Charles B. Aycock's phrase—is not to be blind to the needs of the less fortunate among us. I have never felt that excessive spending is a necessary corollary to a socially responsive government. Ours is a Party with a heart—of which we are justly proud—but it is also a Party with a head, and we must use both in making economic decisions.

These are but a few of the major problems which we face at this moment in our history. They are less spectacular than some of our past problems such as World Wars and depressions, and by comparison they may even seem slight. But they are no less real, and they present a serious challenge to our Party today.

These problems cannot be attributed entirely to either political party, since they span periods in which both parties have held national power. However, I believe that our Party, the Democratic Party, is more capable of effecting a solution to these and other problems and must accept the challenge which they present, if we expect to remain in power—if we expect to retain the mantle of leadership in this great country.

I see nothing in the recent history of the Republican Party or their comments in the present campaign to suggest that they will do any more to solve *these* problems than they have to solve *past* problems. Too often the Republican Party has been content to sit still when a domestic or international situation required action, and we have had to take the blame for results which could have been much less severe had prompt action been taken at an earlier stage.

We Democrats must be the first to admit that our Party has made mistakes. But in the words of a wise old Scotch Presbyterian minister, we are tired of other people confessing our sins for us. North Carolinians are an intelligent electorate, and as the Republican Party will find out in the forthcoming election, they are not about to be lulled into complacency by political lullabies, no matter who may be singing them.

The people know that we Democrats have not been afraid to act when conditions made it necessary. Whatever may be said about us, the Democratic Party cannot be called a do-nothing party. We have chosen to light candles rather than curse the darkness. We may have gone further, or done less, at times than hindsight would have indicated, but our mistakes have been few in comparison to the service we have rendered to the people. We have used our talents rather than bury them, and North Carolina and the nation have prospered as a result.

A Republican heckler once asked Charles B. Aycock, "What is a Democrat?", and Aycock responded:

"A Democrat is a man who believes that our national government has the powers which were granted to it in the Constitution—and none other. A Democrat is a man who believes that the powers not granted to the national government in the Constitution of the United States are reserved to the people or to the States. A Democrat is a man who believes that the power of taxation is the power to destroy and that this power was never vested in any Government by a free people except to defray the expenses of the Government economically administered. A Democrat is a man who believes in the individual and thinks that his rights ought not to be restricted in any respect save only so far as is essential to the peace and progress of his neighbors. A Democrat believes in order to be responsive to the quick demands of the people the Government should be as close to the people as it is possible to bring it. A Democrat believes that when you have centralized your Government and made it strong and put it far away from the people, that the great mass of the people can't put their hands upon that Government and enforce the will of the multitude."

I believe that Governor Aycock's answer is one of the best statements I've ever heard of the principles upon which our Party was founded. I'm that kind of Democrat, and I trust that all of us here are. However, there have been and will continue to be times when we disagree among ourselves as to the best means of living up to our Party's ideals and objectives. In fact, we North Carolina Democrats have frequently disagreed with the Party's national leadership. But in the words of Zeb Vance, who found it particularly difficult to support his fellow-Democrat, Grover Cleveland, for President in 1892, "We have our differences and dissensions in the Democratic Party, but we will settle them inside the Church and without calling on the ungodly."

Ours is a broad based party, one which brings together men of diverse geographic, economic and cultural backgrounds, men such as Vance and Aycock. Ours is a party which achieves unity without uniformity, which encourages diversity of opinion without compromising to the lowest common denominator of inaction. Ours is a party which is responsible to the will and needs of the people—of *all* the people. Our Chairman, Tim Valentine, put it well when he said, "The very bedrock of the Democratic Party's greatness and the polar star which has guided it for decades is the fact that it is big enough, broad enough and strong enough to accommodate all shades of thought—the liberal, the moderate, the middle-of-the-roader, the conservative, the young, the old, the rich, the disadvantaged—all people of all creeds."

But as Aycock reminds us, "We must build on our own foundation of character, temperament and inherited traits. . . . We must seek out our own distinctive traits, our own traditions, and our deep-rooted tendencies and read our destiny in their interpretation." When we find ourselves in disagreement, we have an obligation to fight within the party framework for the things in which we believe. And if we North Carolina Democrats are to increase, or even to maintain, our influence within the National Party, we must get out and work to elect all of our candidates. Desertion to the opposition party is no solution, for by and large, their policy in recent years has alternated between do-nothingism and me-tooism, depending upon the circumstances of the moment and what seemed politically advantageous.

And if we Democrats are to continue our record of unbroken service to the people of North Carolina, we must provide a greater appeal to our young people. We live in a youthful world. Half of our population is not yet 26 years of age and by 1972 more than half of the voting population will be 25 or under. And the fact that their fathers and grandfathers were Democrats is not sufficient justification for young people to join our party. They must be made welcome and given a strong voice within our inner councils. They must be made aware of what our party stands for and the contributions which they can make to the achievement of its objectives; and they must be involved in a meaningful way in the work of our great Party. Otherwise, they will either join the opposition party or become totally alienated from political life, and neither of these must be permitted.

As we leave here tonight, let me read you these comforting words written by Tom Wolfe shortly before his early death in 1938:

"I think the true discovery of America is before us. I think the true fulfillment of our spirit, of our people, of our mighty and immortal land, is yet to come. I think the true discovery of our own democracy is still before us. And I think all of these things are certain as the morning, as inevitable as noon. I think I speak for most men living when I say that our America is here, is now, and beckons on before us, and that this glorious assurance is not only our living hope, but our dream to be accomplished."

Let us take these words of Wolfe with us as *our* hope, and let us also remember the inspiring words of Franklin Roosevelt as he stood before the Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia on a late June night in 1936 to accept re-nomination as President of the United States. The country faced difficult times then, too. But Roosevelt said:

"There is a mysterious cycle in human events. To some generations much is given. To some generations much is expected. This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with Destiny."

We Democrats met that rendezvous then, and God willing, we shall meet it now and in the years to come—with courage and determination.

MILITARY PERSONNEL LEGAL COUNSEL ACT OF 1967

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the Military Personnel Legal Counsel Act of 1967, which will provide legal counsel in all cases of a special court-martial as well as require that military personnel accused or suspected of an offense must be notified of their right to legal counsel before being interrogated or requested to make a statement.

Existing law presently provides that persons brought to trial by general court-martial be furnished with certified legal counsel; however, an individual who is tried by a special court-martial is not always furnished with certified legal counsel, although he may be tried, convicted, and sentenced to up to 6 months at hard labor and receive a bad-conduct discharge without ever having had the benefit of a certified legal counselor. My bill will fill this gap and insure this right. My bill also provides for measures to insure against self-incrimination of a suspected or accused person by writing into existing law a provision which will make it mandatory that such person shall be apprised of his right to legal counsel before being interrogated or requested to make a statement.

I believe that these two provisions are needed to provide our men in the Armed Forces with the same constitutional guarantees that are now provided to civilians.

BERNARD FALL

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, in paying my respects to the memory of Bernard Fall I am paying a tribute to intellectual honesty, moral integrity, and scholarship.

The remarkable quality about Bernard Fall and his writings on Vietnam and southeast Asia was that he always gave to his listeners and his readers practical knowledge about the world. Those of us who habitually read the superficial analyses and grab bag collections of "news" that pass for writing and journalism today can appreciate the rare thinker and writer who adds to our knowledge and understanding in a meaningful way by his efforts.

Bernard Fall assumed the risk of violent death knowingly in order to search for the truth, and he died in that search. For this reason as well as the great contributions he made to the public dialog over Vietnam, his death is tragic for the Nation and the entire world. Having read much of his work, including his latest book, "Hell in a Very Small Place," I know that his loss is irreplaceable.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY CELEBRATES ITS CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY, MARCH 2, 1967

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago today, March 2d, President Andrew Johnson signed a bill which established Howard University here in the Nation's Capital. It is therefore fitting that this body should pause and pay tribute to the university and its community of scholars during its centennial celebration.

I was privileged to attend the Charter Day Convocation at Howard this morning and to hear the inspiring addresses delivered by President James M. Nabrit, Jr., and the President, Lyndon Johnson, who surprised the audience with his unexpected appearance at the ceremony. I would like to have inserted following my remarks both Dr. Nabrit's address and the President's remarks. Since the Congress and the entire Federal Government have played such an integral part in the creation and growth of this university, I am sure that the Members of the House of Representatives will find both speeches and Dr. Nabrit's address which will be delivered at the banquet tonight of great interest.

President Nabrit, President Emeritus Mordecai Johnson, the Board of Trustees of Howard University, the hundreds of faculty members and the thousands of graduates who have all helped to make the university the proud academic institution which it has become in 100 short years all deserve special recognition on this Charter Day. May Howard's next hundred years be even more illustrious as the university seeks to implement the theme of this centennial, "The University in a Changing Society."

The material follows:

THE UNIVERSITY IN A CHANGING SOCIETY

(Centennial Charter Day address by Dr. James M. Nabrit, Jr., president, Howard University, March 2, 1967)

We are meeting this morning in celebration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of Howard University. It was precisely on March 2, 1867 that President Andrew Johnson signed into law a bill which provided that "there be established and is hereby established in the District of Columbia, a university for the education of youth in the liberal arts and sciences under the name, style, and title of The Howard University." The list of incorporators included the names of seventeen persons whom we are always proud to remember as our Founders and who were inspired to establish Howard, according to their own words, "in view of the pressing demand of the southern field".

The "pressing demand of the southern field" had been occasioned by the ending of the civil war in 1865 and the need to take steps to integrate the Negro minority in the mainstream of American life. Thus, Howard, like her sister institutions founded during the same period, has a truly exalted mission—to provide an education for youth to be sure, but also to help in advancing the social and economic growth of Negroes in particular, and to become involved in the development of the whole country in general. Our history and our future are inextricably linked to that of the people and of the country whom we were created to serve.

Profoundly wise and far-sighted as they were, the Founders of Howard University could scarcely have forseen that Howard would grow into the kind of institution that has now come into being. In terms of student enrollment, faculty and staff personnel, buildings and equipment, and strength and diversity of teaching and research programs, the University stands at a point where it can face the future with the assurance that it is well on the way to being an intellectual center of genuine distinction.

The first one hundred years of our history have run a course parallel to that of the Negro minority, and indeed, to that of all America. We have felt the effect of good times and bad, of wars and depressions, of peace and prosperity. Not only have we survived adversity, but we have emerged with the strength to move forward to higher levels of achievement.

As we gather here today, it is reasonable that we should ask what, indeed, did the Founders create one hundred years ago? What is the record which is laid bare on the pages of history? What does the future hold for us?

To begin, ours is a unique institution and our history, likewise, is not of an ordinary nature. We were founded as an institution to educate youth, not simply Negroes, but all who were qualified and presented themselves. The environment in which we were founded dictated, however, that the student body would be primarily Negro and that this would be true throughout our first one hundred years. And during the course of those years, the university has cast the light of a beacon in the darkness as it welcomed students and faculty who chose to ignore race, religion, and nationality and who sought only a haven where the minds and spirit of men and women are joined in the pursuit of knowledege and the building of a better life for all.

The history of Howard, therefore, includes a record of tolerance and compassion for all men. In our diversity of students and faculty, we have possessed a richness which has contributed vastly to our strength. This is a strength which cannot be measured by any quantitative means. To state it simply, the Founders created an institution with a soul.

One hundred years ago, it seemed foolish and rash to much of America to think of the possibility of educating people who only recently had been toiling in the fields as slaves. Crude and unlettered as they were, they seemed to have little kinship with white America. Indeed, there were many at the time and even later who argued that racial inequality was divinely ordered and who could undo the will of God?

The history of Howard has given evidence of the truth of the American revolutionaries, who, less than a hundred years before the founding of the university, had declared that "all men are created equal". So our history like that of people everywhere has made it evident that all people have the capability of climbing the highest pinnacle of intellectual development.

The pages of our history are filled with the names of men and women who have been numbered among our students or faculty and who have rendered extraordinary contributions to their professions or societies. I am sure that all of you can recall many such names as those of Kelly Miller, Alain Locke, E. Franklin Frazier, Charles R. Drew, Ralph J. Bunche, Thurgood Marshall, William Hastie and Edward Brooke. It is our custom each year to bestow a number of distinguished alumni awards. It is always a difficult task to single out the several persons to be honored. There are simply hundreds of names to be reviewed, and in so doing, one must be mindful of the numerous graduates of Howard who are performing valiantly and significantly with little public notice. If it is true that one of the important measurements of the quality of a university is to be found in achievements of its graduates, then Howard is to be judged as being an institution of eminence.

For many years Howard was the only American university combining a comprehensive program of undergraduate, graduate, and professional education attended by Negroes in the South and border states. Elsewhere, the number of Negroes attending any single institution was relatively small. In most cases this is true today. Howard was truly a pioneer in offering opportunities of higher education for Negroes. We have trained a major portion of all the Negroes in the country who are working as lawyers, dentists, doctors, pharmacists, social workers, engineers, architects, and ministers. Thousands of our graduates are employed in other fields such as teaching, business and government service.

The Founders of Howard were hopeful that a new day of freedom and justice, together with economic opportunity, was immediately at hand when they proposed this institution. But fate in the guise of racial prejudice and discrimination determined that this was not to be. Provisions of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments were ignored or only mildly enforced. The Reconstruction period engendered bitterness and hatred. In all of the southern states, and in some others as well, there was established a legally enforced system of segregation which was meant to be complete in every fundamental area of life.

The century since our founding has been a time of continuous struggle for Negro Americans to escape from this system with its stigmas of the past, to rid themselves of the handicaps of the present and to prepare for future careers or activities. Those who now say that Negro protestors want "too much too fast" should be mindful of the fact that Negroes are simply seeking that which they should have had a hundred years ago.

Not only have we not succeeded in this century old struggle but it has been suggested by some perceptive observers that 1967, like 1867, finds the country entering into a period of reaction. There are many facts that indicate that there is some truth in this statement. Among these are the substantial reduction in funds to aid the poor of whom Negroes are a significant portion but not the only ones adversely affected, some of the results of the November elections, and the apparent dwindling of interest in civil rights.

While these indicators of reaction are causes for alarm, it would be an error for us to fall into a mood of despair. Rather, they should move us to re-examine present programs and to devise new ones. We need to have a real understanding of the social revolution which has been taking place in our country. We must regird our loins for the long fight which lies ahead of us. The roots of this revolution are found in the accumulation of grievances over a period of many years among various segments of our population. In the case of the Negro minority, it can be said that at no time in the history of America have they ever been accepted into the mainstream of American life. If the civilization of the western world survives, future historians will surely comment on the extraordinary patience and endurance of Negroes in accommodating themselves to a system of segregation which bound them to a status of inferiority. They will be surprised not that we had Carmichael and other advocates of black power and racism, but by the fact that their numbers were so few. Who else but the Negro would have borne the burdens of discrimination, segregation, exploitation, cruelty, injustice with so much patience and reliance on promises, law, religion and legislation for one hundred years?

One must know, however, that the seeds of the present social revolution were planted a long time ago and that from these roots there sprang a vigorous movement of protest. It has waxed and waned but never ceased.

By now, the record shows that while Negroes had the support of many white people, in their long struggle for equal opportunity and for justice under law, the progress which they have been able to make with respect to their civil rights came about largely as a result of their own initiative. The majority of the population have not been too interested in civil rights. Indeed, as long as they saw the problems of civil rights as affecting them only remotely, most of them viewed these matters with the greatest apathy. To the Negro, civil rights are a matter of life and death. It is fitting that we then here and now recommit ourselves to this struggle for survival.

The world-wide revolution of colonial peoples, themselves non-white, has had its repercussions on our shores. It has generated extra momentum to the Negroes fight for equal status in the United States. The civil rights movement of the last decade has had great benefits for all the people. There have, of course, been some direct gains for the Negro minority. This progress has been largely in the nature of a clearing out of the remaining legal barriers and of enacting positive legislation. It is unfortunate that so many people believed that legal victories or legislation alone would achieve the final objectives of the struggle. The destruction of legal disabilities cleared the way for social and political action. Legislation resulted in an improvement of the social environment and brought us to the threshold of opportunity. But no further. The middle-class Negro has an improved position, but this is a small number. The actual real improvement in the status of the bulk of the Negro people has not yet been achieved. Let us not be deceived, the mass of Negroes is still poorly educated, poorly housed, underpaid and underemployed, denied equal treatment by law enforcement agencies, and is treated brutally and put to death in many instances with impunity.

What needs to be done? The answer is to be found partially in the fact that it can now be perceived that the afflictions of our society are long-standing, deep-rooted, and are wide-spread. The fundamental problems of Negroes are the problems of the poor, the weak, the shunned. the despised, the defenseless, plus the problems of racial discrimination. We discover that not only must we rouse the conscience of America, but also we must persuade the American people to appropriate the funds and to take other steps necessary to secure substantial improvement in the condition of all the oppressed, irrespective of race. We find that we must wage the battle on a thousand fronts as well as with a never-ending intensity until our democracy has a meaning for all citizens.

What I am really suggesting is that there is an urgent need for a very significant reordering and re-structuring of our society. In part, this means closing the gap between the rich and the poor and removing the lines of artificial distinction between racial and religious groups. It means genuinely to create a society in which all people are provided with the opportunity to lead useful and dignified lives. It means making civil rights a concern of all Americans. It means fulfillment of a promise made one hundred years ago but still honored primarily in the breach.

Now is a time for vision. We need more than the vision of scientists who tell us of the wonderful new things we can expect from the laboratories, yet we need the vision of science. We need more than the vision of those who travel beyond the atmosphere of the earth, yet we need the knowledge of outerspace. We need in addition the vision of those who see the problems of those who suffer in our midst—from hunger, from disease, from war, and from racial and ethnic discrimination. Let us not discourage those who find that their life's work takes them in pursuit of the stars. But let us also find a means of giving equal encouragement to those who seek the means of alleviating the problems of the hungry, the sick, and the unwanted, black as well as white. Let us support those who seek to teach us how to live with all people in peace and happiness.

The University, by its very nature, is an institution which can be extra-ordinarily helpful in solving many of the ills of our society. It is not by chance that many colleges and universities include the word "veritas" or truth in their mottoes and on their emblems, for it is in search of the truth that we are heavily engaged. The truth that we seek is objective and impersonal. It does not vary among nationalities or races or creeds. It holds for all of us knowledge and understanding which can broaden the horizons of mankind and illumine the mind and the spirit. In this search for truth we need the combined efforts of students and teachers. The light of the University must illuminate the dark recesses of society so that ignorance, disease and poverty may be eliminated.

The power of the University in its quest for knowledge, like the forces of nature itself, can be applied to the achievement of both good and ill. Thus, the resources of universities figured prominently in the discovery of the mysteries of the atom, thereby making it possible to destroy the very earth which gives us substance, or to make it a more productive world. Now, with much more difficulty, universities must renew their task of finding the means of encouraging and assisting the nations of the world to live in peace. We live in a world so closely bound together by space and time that all men in sheer self defense must learn to live with and to tolerate differences of race, color, religion, and nationality. The atom bomb will not discriminate between either the slums or suburbia if it ever falls on us.

The University in its majesty and power stands as one of the most valuable instrumentalities of any people. It affords means of transmitting knowledge from the teacher to the pupil, from one generation to another. It unlocks doors to new truths, opens windows through which come fresh ideas, and leads down corridors of learning which have no end.

Now that universities have been so effectively used or misused in developing weapons to facilitate the destruction of the world, it is more urgent than ever that they devote a larger portion of their intellectual resources to the issues of friendly relations and peace, to the means of feeding the hungry millions of the world, and to the other social and economic problems of our generation. Our hope for Howard is that it may be among the leaders in this development.

Every college and university must choose for itself what its mission will be. While every institution has a personality of its own, a uniqueness of history, and a variety of distinguishing characteristics, the common tie that binds them all is dedication to truth and learning. It is within this framework that each must choose the kind of service that it will give.

The mission of Howard University for one hundred years has been especially, but not exclusively, to assist the Negro people in crossing the threshold of opportunity. As we peer into the future, this will continue to be a major concern, for the problems of race have not vanished. And while we have a special regard for Negro youth, as was true of our Founders, we draw no lines of racial, religious, or national distinction among the men and women who are moved to seek us out. Nevertheless, we have an historic commitment to the education of the Negro and we shall not forsake that role. We have also a traditional commitment to excellence in teaching and research and we shall not shirk that task.

The historic interests of Howard lie in the areas of the development and utilization of human resources, the relationship of men to one another, the protection of the civil rights and civil liberties of the people, and the improvement of the environment in which they live. We are concerned about peace and the relief of human misery and needs, about liberty and equality, about human dignity and the essential value of every single human being. To seek these things is also the pursuit of knowledge. This is a broad perspective of the affairs of mankind.

For this year of centennial celebration, we chose as our theme "The University in a Changing Society" after long and careful deliberation. This theme reflects our major concerns. We are a university at work in a society which differs in fundamental ways from the society of our Founders. Succeeding generations celebrating other anniversaries of Howard University may well consider that ours was an antiquated society, much different from theirs.

No one can say precisely what kind of world there will be one hundred years from now. Nor can we say what Howard will be like when it comes to the end of its second one hundred years. But each of us today, and the University, too, has a part to play in the drama of our own age, and the way in which we play our parts provides the setting for those who follow after us. We are determined to make this a better world for all, through precept and example, through teaching and research.

Howard University, in many ways, can be regarded as a national and international university. Our students come from all the states and almost a hundred other countries. Our faculty likewise is drawn from many races and religions. We have had since 1867 with the exception of only seven years, a constant and close relationship with the national government which has been mutually beneficial and immensely helpful in making opportunities of higher education available to all segments of the population.

Howard University today—March 2, 1967—is the creation of the love, the faith, the hope and the toil of the seventeen original founders; the labor and sacrifice, the dreams and wisdom of the thousands of students, faculty and staff who have walked the campus and studied and taught and lived within its environs, the substantial assistance of the national government and numerous private benefactors, the love and affection of its alumni and friends, all of whom have shared the belief that education is of inestimable value in helping men to shape their destinies, and that Howard is a significant factor in bringing it to all the people.

While we give thanks for our inheritance from those who came before us, let us go forward with their work, so that we may bequeath to generations yet unborn a University that will continue to be a lively and useful place—a center of intellectual activity—in a changing society—a concrete justification of the vision, wisdom, and commitment of its founders, who one hundred years ago today created on this spot an institution whose influence far exceeds their fondest dreams, and to whose continuous development we here dedicate ourselves, our talents and our resources.

TEXT OF JOHNSON'S HOWARD U. TALK

WASHINGTON, March 2.—*Following is the text of a speech on civil rights delivered today by President Johnson at Howard University:*

This day is for prayers of thanksgiving. It is a day for remembrances and wonder.

One hundred years ago, out of the embers of a terrible war, this university was born to serve a people who had been liberated from the "peculiar institution" of slavery.

Another Johnson—the 17th President of the United States—signed his name to a law establishing Howard University, in the District of Columbia, as "a university for the education of youth in the liberal arts and sciences." The first four students were white—and they were the living witnesses to a faith in human dignity that has united men and women of both races to this very hour.

But the purpose of those who founded Howard University was not merely to create one more institution of higher learning. It was to fulfill the promise Lincoln had made four and a half years before:

"That on the first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, all persons held as slaves within any state or designated part of a state . . . shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free."

A UNIVERSITY CREATED

Howard University was created to help make the promise of the proclamation an ordinary fact of life.

I do not need to tell you that the purpose of the founders was not wholly achieved in their time—nor in the century that followed. Howard sent forth into the world trained teachers, doctors, artists, theologians, lawyers and businessmen—but for millions, the promise of freedom was unfulfilled. For them, the ordinary fact of life was enslavement—to poverty, to ignorance, to second-class citizenship.

In our time . . . nearly a century after the war that brought an end to official slavery . . . we have begun the long-delayed process of liberation. We have struck off most of the bonds of discrimination that bound the Negro to the tragic past. The fundamental rights of citizenship are his: to vote, to use public accommodations, to attend school, to seek a job, to receive hospital care—without discrimination because of race or color.

These rights had to be secured, not only to give life to Lincoln's proclamation, not only to render justice to Negro Americans, but because the conscience of humanity demanded that they be secured. They were not handed down from above, as a reward for good behavior. They were a legacy acquired by birth—and finally passed on to their rightful heirs.

"FREEDOM IS NOT ENOUGH"

Yet even they did not suffice. I came here twenty months ago, on an afternoon in June, to say, "Freedom is not enough. You do not wipe away the scars of centuries by saying: Now you are free to go where you want, and do as you desire, and choose the leaders you please . . .

"The task is to give 20 million Negroes the same chance as every other American to learn and grow, to work and share in society, to develop their abilities—physical, mental and spiritual, and to pursue their individual happiness."

I have come back to Howard today to renew my commitment to that task, and to tell you that so long as I live, in public or private life, I shall never retract or amend that commitment.

I have seen what can be done when hundreds of thousands of children are given a head start in life;

When eight million others begin to receive a better education in elementary and secondary schools;

When millions of men can find work in a thriving economy;

When millions of older people have the haunting fear of medical costs lifted from them;

When young men and women are given the chance to take hold of their lives in neighborhood Youth Corps and Job Corps programs;

When those without skills can acquire them;

When nine million workers—the forgotten ones at the bottom of the economic ladder—are assured a decent minimum wage for the first time this year.

I have seen these things happen, and much more—and I don't want to turn back.

"MILLIONS ARE TRAPPED"

I know that millions of men and women—Negro and white—are still trapped in poverty, in dark city slums and depressed rural towns. I know that results are slow in coming from the best efforts men can make, for our adversaries—ignorance and discrimination and the desparing conviction of failure—are old, well-entrenched, and tough.

But despite the shortcomings of what we have done so far, despite the stubbornness of the problems we face, I cannot bring myself to bewail our fate; for the last few years have convinced me that we have the will, and the knowledge, and the resources—and the stubbornness, too—to remain at our task until it is accomplished.

Ten short years ago as a Senator I fought to pass the first Civil Rights Act in 85 years. It was a frail instrument indeed—but it was only the first. Seven years later as President, I signed into law a measure that had the power to change the conditions of life for Negro Americans, and one year after that we opened the voting booths for good.

This is the work of ten years: four civil rights measures striking at the last chains of enslavement. This was the task of every man and woman who worked and prayed and legislated to bring it about.

"ONLY A PROLOGUE"

Because we have come so far. I know we have the power to go further; to make the past ten years only a prologue, and the next ten years the time when the Negro can say at last: I am a free man. I believe it will be so, and I shall bend my will to make it so.

It is not hard to feel this way, here at Howard.

This campus has been the home, and is the home today, of men and women who knew their mission in life was greater than service to themselves. Many of them have been my friends. Some of them have been called to the Federal service during my Presidency:

The great lawyer, Solicitor General Thurgood Marshall;

Three distinguished jurists, Judge Robinson of the Court of Appeals, Judge Bryant and Judge Waddy of the U.S. District Court;

Ambassador Patricia Harris;

Mr. Hobart Taylor, director of the Export-Import Bank;

Commissioner John Duncan of the District of Columbia.

Mrs. Frankie Freeman, of the United States Civil Rights Commission.

And Dr. John Hope Franklin, of the District of Columbia.

Scholarships.

These sons and daughters of Howard—together with Under Secretary Ralph Bunche of the United Nations and Senator Ed Brooke of Massachusetts, whom, I am sorry to say, I did not appoint are a testimony to Howard's maturity far more compelling than the passing of a hundred years.

For they represent the fruition of an ideal: that as men become free themselves, they assume responsibility for the freedom and well-being of others, regardless of race. These men and women are not devoting themselves to Negro problems alone, but to the problems of our entire society.

That is your challenge, you who will follow them. For the work that lies ahead is too demanding and involves far too many lives in urgent need of help, to be parcelled out by race. Tomorrow's problems, when will be placed squarely in your hands, will not be divided into "Negro problems" and "white problems." There will be only human problems, and more than enough to go around.

I said at the beginning that this day is for prayers of thanksgiving, for remembrance and wonder.

Our prayers are to the God Who has strengthened the will of a great people. Our remembrance is of those who created and sustained this great university, and brought here thousands of young men and women from all over the world, and gave them the power to serve their fellow men.

Our wonder—our great wonder—is for the human spirit, that having endured infinite wrongs, can yet hold to its faith in the dignity of life.

For 100 years, that spirit has prevailed here at Howard University. May it always be so.

Howard University—In Retrospect and in Prospect

(Charter Day Banquet Address by Dr. James M. Nabrit, Jr., President, Howard University, Sheraton Park Hotel, March 2, 1967)

Mr. Chairman, Miss Anderson, Mr. Warfield, Members of the Board of Trustees, Other Platform Guests, Howard University Alumni, Ladies and Gentlemen:

We gather tonight in the final event of a Charter Day marking the one-hundredth anniversary of the signing of the Charter of Howard University. The day marks also the approximate mid-point of our year-long Centennial celebration.

I am glad on this beautiful and auspicious occasion to thank you for your presence here, for the many contributions you have made to Howard in the past and for those which I am confident you will make in even larger measure during the years that are before us.

On a day like this in the life of an institution it is good for those intimately involved in its life to examine that institution seriously with respect to its past and its future. I have chosen, therefore, to speak tonight on the subject: *Howard University in Retrospect and in Prospect*. Manifestly, I cannot do this in any exhaustive way. I do want to touch on facts of Howard's past which have impressed me for years and which impress me increasingly as the high possibilities in Howard's future, including our obligations to this future which we dare not forget or neglect.

At the Formal Opening of our Centennial celebration on September 19, we placed special emphasis upon Howard's relation to the Washington community. We set forth in some detail the numerous important ways in which this community has enriched the life and work of Howard. We called attention also to the significant contributions which Howard has made to this community. These we need not repeat on this occasion. Our year-long plan calls for special emphasis on this Charter Day to be placed upon Howard's relation to the Nation—the Nation as represented by its central government and as reflected in its far flung communities from which our students have come and to which our graduates have gone.

In our statement on Howard's relation to this community it was emphasized that the idea which gave birth to the university was born in a meeting of officers of the First Congregational Church of this city. Tonight I wish to recall what we all know, namely, that one of those officers was General Oliver Otis Howard, not only an officer in the United States Army but also an officer in the Nation's service as the Commissioner of the Freedmen's Bureau. Here marks the beginning of our Federal Government's participation in the life of Howard University.

The most recent biography of General Howard—that of John A. Carpenter—records that "Without his (General Howard's) inspirational leadership, far-sighted vision, and the assistance he was able to lend as Bureau Commissioner it is hard to see how this great university in the national capital could have become the important institution it has grown to be."

It is also relevant that the First Congregational Church committee appointed to obtain a charter for Howard from the Congress consisted of three members of the

Congress—two from the House of Representatives and one from the Senate. It will not escape you that the spiritually devoted officers of the First Congregational Church were presumably also endowed with a keen political sense. And for that we have only praise since they were fashioning an institution which for a century has served a holy cause.

What kind of a charter was this resulted from the efforts of such a committee and the wisdom of Congress? First, it sanctioned a *university*—not a school, not a college, but a university.

Mr. Fred Brownlee for many years Secretary of the American Missionary Association used to tell the story of a man who inquired of him as to why so many educational institutions for Negroes in the South, ranging from the elementary upward, were called universities. Mr. Brownlee answered that when a child is born it is given the name which it will bear throughout its life. An educational institution at its birth should be given the name which it is expected to bear in its maturity. Fortunately, the name given Howard University at its birth has proved the right one throughout these one hundred years.

Of highest significance also is the fact that the Government of the United States sanctioned a university for which the only specific qualification for admission was "youth," under which, of course, all of you here would have qualified, and I would judge, looking out upon you tonight, would still qualify. There was no specification in Howard's charter as to race or color or even sex and that at a time when educational institutions in America were relatively few where women could study on the same basis as men. No other professional school in the District of Columbia was open to women.

Armed with this instrument, Howard opened its doors and the first students enrolled were women, white women, daughters of two of Howard's founders. At its first commencement in 1870 of its seven graduates, six were women.

The day was not far off, however, before Howard was taking fullest advantage of its liberal charter. Speaking of Howard on the floor of the House of Representatives in 1870, three years after Howard received its charter, the Honorable George F. Hoar of Massachusetts said: "Let it be remembered, too, that in this institution as in no other in the land, it is believed, the Anglo-Saxon, the Celts, the Indian, the Mongolian, the Greek, and the African sit side by side on the same benches. All races and both sexes have here in the pursuit of knowledge a fair and equal favor."

There is small wonder, then, that about this time a reporter of the *Washington Morning News* observed that "It is feared that our citizens are not aware that an institution has been established at our doors for the benefit of the colored race." The reporter promised a special article on this "interesting" situation.

The first need of the founders of Howard University was a charter. The second was a location—land and building—where those who came could be taught. Where was the money to be found to provide these facilities? The answer came from General Howard, who as Commissioner of the Freedmen's Bureau, ordered funds available to him to be invested in land and a building which were rented to the university.

When more land was needed General Howard drew funds from the Refugees and Freedmen's Fund with which to make the first payment on the magnificent site occupied in part by Howard today.

I have called attention to the beginning contributions of the Nation to Howard University and it is appropriate that I should say at once that, with the exception of seven years in Howard's history, the Federal Government has provided it with some financial support. During the first six years appropriations came principally by the way of the Freedmen's Bureau. From 1879–1880 until 1928 government support came in the form of annual appropriations by the Congress but subject always to be lost on a point of order by a member of Congress. In 1928 the Congress authorized annual appropriations to Howard University and these have continued without interruption.

Those who were present at the Charter Day Convocation this morning will recall the unveiling of a portrait of Mr. Louis B. Cramton, which will hang in Cramton Auditorium. The auditorium bears the name of Mr. Cramton in appreciation of his signal contribution as a member of Congress to making possible the legislation authorizing annual appropriations to Howard.

The interest in and support of Howard by the Federal Government have not been limited to grants of money. Counsel of officers of Government has been readily available as well as appropriate assistance in other forms.

In the above ways and otherwise Howard has been richly served by the Nation.

I have dwelt at some length on the contributions of the Nation to Howard. I can now say that in Howard's contribution to our country we can tonight feel a sense of pride.

In the absence of Howard or a similar institution, what today would be the state of the education of the American Negro, especially in the professions. Whence would have come the many doctors, dentists, pharmacists, lawyers, engineers, architects, trained ministers, trained social workers, graduates in the field of art, teachers and others whom Howard has been graduating for so many years?

Even now the Negro graduates of all American colleges and universities do not approach meeting the needs of one-tenth of the American population. Subtract those who annually pass from Howard into the service of the American society and the situation would be grievous indeed.

Howard graduates have served the people in all the fifty states of the Union. In the great cities, the small towns, the rural areas they are to be found. Some within narrow confines serve quietly and unheralded. Others are distinguished across national and international boundaries. Their voices are heard, their books are read, their art is displayed, their skill is praised in many lands.

Howard's contribution to American life is not confined to the number of its graduates. Its other great role is the number of youth who are inspired by its graduates to an achievement beyond the ordinary in whatever institution or field this achievement may occur. There are many towns where at one time a Howard graduate was the sole Negro in some profession but which are now blessed by other professional men and women whom he inspired.

What I have said thus far has been in the nature of a brief review of contributions of this Nation to Howard and of some of the gifts of Howard to the Nation. I wish now to speak of the future and of two important roles which Howard is obliged to assume as it enters its second century. One of these is the search for truth.

Those who have suffered from the irrational acts of a larger and stronger community should be the first to yearn for centers of learning dedicated to reaching reasoned and objective conclusions in relation to the critical problems of the times. It is my belief, moreover, that society will in time learn to protect and support with increased liberality universities in their objective pursuit of truth even when that society does not heed the counsels of these universities.

We know that this kind of objectivity cannot at present be expected of the masses of society for they themselves have long been the victims of superficial thinking, emotion laden attitudes, and unreasoned acts. And yet, these are largely the people who have the most votes, spend the most money, who determine in large measure who will govern a nation, what good men will make, in short, what the nature of our society will be.

Somewhere there must be a different climate, a different voice. Somewhere there must be a place respected pre-eminently for its search for truth only, and protected in that search. One such place should be the university—pre-eminently the university.

This will be the place of the open mind where scholars arrive at plateaus of thought and pause to breathe, but not to worship. Their religion will be the untiring search and promulgation of truth and even living by that truth.

In such a climate the emotional attachment to undigested crumbs of thought upon which so much of our society exists will not be tolerated. Moreover, those who compose this community will come increasingly to be respected by society and depended upon for objective, undistorted judgments on the great and disturbing problems of society. Out of this university community, moreover, will go graduates carrying this spirit into the larger world.

Indeed, a chief business of the community which we call the university will be to labor with the facts on which the great and determinative judgments in society are made, to make such judgments and to help build a wider society which increasingly can and will make such judgments.

The university will be a setting where the searcher for truth can be a part of the present and yet detached from it. His purpose will not be the craze for propagandizing which arouses men's passions and despoils their judgments but rather the constant, untiring search for truth and the sober, dispassionate teaching of that truth once it has been discovered.

The scholar will not be without passion but his passion will be the discovery of truth and its dissemination. He will have convictions but they will be convictions always subject to reason and newly discovered truth. He will not be moved passionately by every wind of change that blows but neither will be wedded unqualifiedly to a once held conviction. He will be a man whom society trusts because he will never be a self server but always the servant of truth as he sees it.

This man's greatest joy will come at the moment of what he feels is a new discovery. But he will not lose his head, mount the platform, condemn every contrary view and organize a revolutionary movement in support of his discovery. He will test and retest and argue with himself and others until the heart of the matter is laid bare and some intellectual consensus is achieved.

In the presence of social change this is what should transpire in a university. There, of course, old truths will be taught, discipline will be inculcated. But somewhere in our society new truths must be discovered and increasingly the university, in my view, should be that place especially. It is here where students who have participated in this practice of discovery will be so trained and so inspired that in their post-university years they will never cease to be devoted searchers after truth.

We know that there are now universities which approach this ideal in spite of growing pressures upon them to be all things to all men. I wish to see in Howard University increasingly a place of discovery and the inspired transmission of its discoveries. This is the reason that, when I assumed the presidency of Howard, I placed great emphasis upon research and teaching. These are the two great functions of a true university. And by research I have in mind for the more mature scholars the searching of answers to the great problems now faced by our world in flux.

It is with these thoughts that Howard selected as its Centennial theme, "The University in a Changing Society." It was in search of the validation of such thoughts that it organized a Pre-Charter Day Conference around this theme.

You have seen the announcement of this conference and I hope some of you participated in it. If you were not present I remind you of the problems which were discussed: One, "Race and Nationalism as Revolutionary World Forces;" two, "Human Needs and Aspirations in Developed and Developing Societies;" three, "Time, Leisure and the Computer: The Crisis of Modern Technology;" and four, "The Revolutions in Value and Belief."

Papers on these subjects were read by scholars of world-wide recognition. Panels of able scholars and students questioned and debated these subjects.

It was not asked that the distinguished participants in the conference announce new and necessarily world moving conclusions in reference to each of these problems although one would not have been surprised at such an event. What we had in mind was the demonstration of a university's responsibility for serious search in the presence of such serious problems as these four.

Race and Nationalism are at the root of agonies from which mankind has suffered long enough. If the past has any lesson for us, it is that. Political entities, economic forces, ecclesiastical establishments cannot be expected to give us an answer to the problems growing out of racial and national hates and rivalries. These forces too often have their own ends to serve, sometimes petty, self-seeking ends. In these circumstances men and women—learned, disciplines, objective, non-self seeking—can make an inestimable contribution to mankind's thinking and to the solution of its problems.

What I have said concerning the first of the four topics of the Pre-Charter Day Conference one can say of the other three—they cry for analysis and treatment by the Nation's best minds—indeed the world's best minds and non-self seeking scholars.

For us this conference was an example of the search for truth in a university-wide fashion that must characterize Howard's future as it has to a degree, characterized its past. We shall continue to train, in the finest way we can, men and women for the professions. But we shall also make every effort to prepare these leaders in their professions to be leaders also with a passion for laying hold of the great issues of their society; leaders able to arrive at dispassionate views on great issues and to provide guidance for those less fortunate.

There is another role to which the university is being called today and to which, surely, Howard University should be dedicated. That role is the university's discharge of its responsibilities to its community.

"Town and gown" is a phrase reminiscent of a past relationship of universities and communities. It is an unpleasant reminder of a period marred not only by aloofness but by bitterness, quarrels, even bloodshed. Moreover, in the light of our discussion of the university as a place for the discovery of truth one might wonder how that loftly concept can be reconciled with the idea of a university concerned with the practical problems of its surrounding community.

The answer is not difficult. The truth with which we are concerned here is not discoverable in isolation from the people; through the knowledge of higher mathematics or pure logic. The problems posed by the four topics in our conference just ended involve people—communities, small communities, large communities, even continents. These communities are potential laboratories for the seeker of answers to a multitude of social problems.

There must somehow be a bond between the privileged and the lesser privileged, between the learned and the unlearned. Howard has discovered that work, research among people—whatever one might call it—is a bond-welding experience, a partial solution, at least, to the problem of alienation.

There is clear logic and urgency demanding an understanding, sympathetic relation between a university and the people which it is preparing men and women to serve. How can students stand aloof from the people at their door while they are studying and then somehow miraculously work with them understandingly, sympathetically when they put off their caps and gowns and put up their shingles?

The problems of establishing a helpful, educationally sound relationship between a university and the community are many and difficult and increasingly American universities are searching for their solutions. Howard has experience in relation to this problem and has learned some lessons. It has learned that in reaching out to the community, identifying itself with that community, a university is not only proving a great service to the people there but is finding a rich contribution to itself.

We speak of the revolutions of our time. One of these revolutions is the resistance of the masses against any aloofness from them which they suspect in another social class. They may need to call upon the teacher, the preacher, the doctor, the lawyer, in days of their need. They and their leaders, however, are only biding their time when by virtue of numbers and organization, they will no longer ask for the services of the trained but demand them and upon their own terms. Already in response to the needs and demands of the people we have social security, medicare, legal services to the poor and important reforms in court procedures.

In a university like Howard the students, and indeed, the faculty and officers, come from the people. It is a university like Howard that should set an example of the will and the ability to make itself a part of the community, an intimate part of the people.

I repeat that we have some experience in this direction and it is my conviction that in following this course lies one of the greatest contributions Howard can make in the years that are before us.

And so, Ladies and Gentlemen, in these few minutes I have tried to say, what to have been said properly, would have taken hours—even days—perhaps. But I believe you understand. We are a part of the same tradition. We share the same convictions. We are borne up by the same hopes. And this, in great measure, is because our lives have been touched, indeed, in large part, molded by the institution in the name of which we meet at this hour.

I thank you again for coming here tonight. I bid Godspeed to you as you go forward in the discharge of your duties and what I hope will be the realization of your highest aspirations!

PENALTIES OF OVERCONCENTRATION IN URBAN AMERICA

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, almost daily we are confronted with the penalties of overconcentration in urban America, and hear of a new proposal to solve one of the many problems of our crowded cities. Generally, these solutions carry the seeds of further problems and astronomical price tags, making them impracticable in the face of more pressing needs.

Thus it is encouraging to know that there is an alternative to piling people upon people—and problem upon problem—in megalopolitan America. This alternative is rural America, rich in so many of the things which are denied to city dwellers—open space, abundant natural resources, and the beauties of nature. But this practical alternative is being overlooked in our preoccupation with the agonies of city man.

> There is an urgent need to take stock of rural America, its problems and its potential to everyone.

The Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, Norman M. Clapp, said last week to the more than 9,000 persons attending the 25th annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in San Francisco.

> To hold people in the rural areas rather than drive them into the cities . . . there must be greater economic opportunities . . . in rural areas. As machines replace people in agriculture, productive places must be found for people elsewhere in rural America. There must be new industry developed in rural areas. The standard of living, both in terms of income and convenience, must be able to match the attractions of urban standards of living.

He said.

Mr. Clapp also discussed the role electrification will have in regenerating rural America and some of the challenges the rural electric system will face in the future.

To give you opportunity to read his interesting talk, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD the text of Mr. Clapp's address, "Action in the Public Interest":

ACTION IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

(Remarks of Norman M. Clapp, Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, before the annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, San Francisco, Calif., February 20–24, 1967)

A Silver Anniversary annual meeting such as this is usually an occasion for retrospect, a time to look back over the years and review the accomplishments of the past. But this is not the usual kind of meeting. The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association is not the usual kind of organization. As for the accomplishments of the past, they are distinctly unusual, for they are part of the miracle of rural electrification in America. Moreover, they are but a prelude for the still unfinished business which lies ahead of us all.

So while there is a noticeable glow of pride in this great auditorium today over the progress of the past, the air of concern is definitely directed toward the future. While there is a rich history for thoughtful contemplation, the accent here this week is on action.

This is as it should be, for rural electrification has been an action program from the beginning. It took action to bring even basic electric service to the 90 percent of American farms that did not have central station electric service back in 1935. It took action to form an electric cooperative when the power company refused to extend service to rural consumers. It took action to arrange the financing, to building the facilities, and bring light where darkness had prevailed.

It has taken action—and plenty of it—to keep rural electrification moving ahead in the face of selfish and determined opposition.

It has taken action to build your national association from a group of 118 rural electric cooperatives when it was launched 25 years ago to its present membership of 979 strong. Those of you who remember that first annual meeting of about 1,000 delegates and friends know the kind of action it has taken to make possible a tremendous gathering of this size, nearly 10,000 people, for this Silver Anniversary meeting.

It has taken action—by you and by your representatives in Government. It has taken the leadership of a succession of Presidents from President Roosevelt to President Johnson. It has taken repeated action from the Congresses of the United States. It has taken action in the state houses across this land of ours.

So you are to be congratulated for your renewed "Accent on Action"—1967 style. But, I am sure, you who have fought the battle of rural electrification would be among the first to recognize that action alone is not enough.

Naked action without justice—without a justifiable and acceptable cause—will not succeed long in a democratic society. Acceptance of public aid and support without a reciprocal sense of public responsibility must likewise be of uneasy duration.

It was action coupled with the acknowledged righteousness of their cause which has, from the very outset, made the rural electric cooperatives a moving force in America. It has been a cause which people in the cities as well as the country could and did understand when it meant the difference between light and darkness for rural people.

But the lights are on now in most rural homes. An increasingly urban American public has turned its attention to other seemingly more pressing and immediate problems.

Consequently, as we move forward to meet the inescapable problems of rural electrification in a growing America, we must give greater attention than ever before to the need of renewed public understanding. We must make it crystal clear that our cause is the same. The problems of rural electrification, less dramatic perhaps but far more complex than 25 years ago, are still vital to the public interest.

We have to talk about this joint enterprise of ours so often as "rural" electrification because of the very special problems confronting those who try to bring electric service to rural areas. But really as a program, this is a part of nationwide electrification. Good low-cost electric service is vital to the life and economic development of rural areas. The needs of rural America are part of the needs of the Nation. Rural problems are everyone's problems for they must be solved—just as urban problems must be solved—if we are to achieve the maximum potential of our national life and a balanced development of our resources, including the greatest resource of all, our people.

In the face of a persistent growing concentration of people in the urban communities of America and the admitted trends toward the urbanization of our society, there is an urgent need for all of us, not just folks like you from rural America, but the people who live in the cities as well, to take stock of rural America, its problems and its potential value to everyone.

Rural America is 97 percent of the land mass of the United States. It is 3,440,000 square miles of geography, much of it covered with fertile soil—some of the finest in the world—which produces the most abundant food supply ever known to man. It is covered by great forests which supply raw material for great industries, as well as provide a priceless contribution to America's scenic wealth and recreational resources of value to all. Beneath the surface of rural America are located untold riches of mineral resources, which along with food and fiber, are basic ingredients of the American economy and the necessary support of the American standard of living.

Here is the source of the Nation's food supply. Here is the source for the great bulk of the Nation's raw materials. Here, too, is a vast market—well over $100 billion—for American industry around which our great cities are built. Here are good places to live, places to play. Here is the space to absorb the Nation's growing population without further crowding already over-crowded cities.

To hold people in the rural areas rather than drive them into the cities to add to the already grave problems of the cities, there must be greater economic opportunities provided for people in the rural areas. As machines replace people in agriculture, productive places must be found for people elsewhere in rural America. There must be new industry developed in rural areas. The standard of living, both in terms of income and convenience, must be able to match the attractions of urban standards of living.

Yesterday you heard the challenge so forcefully presented by Vice President Humphrey—that you, the leaders of America's rural electric systems, step up rural growth—electrically.

You can! Electricity is that vital to economic growth, whether it be rural or urban. Your cooperative organizations are likewise that vital to the life of the rural communities they serve.

But this is going to take capital—great quantities of it—greater than we have been supplying to date. Electricity, just like telephone service, water, and transportation, is a necessary key to economic development of any area, rural or urban, and the capital needs for rural electric service are growing at a very rapid rate.

We are very proud of the record you have made with the capital which has been provided through the REA program over the past 32 years. Six billion dollars of REA loan funds have been provided for electric facilities these past 32 years.

But as we study the future needs of rural electric systems in this rapidly growing industry, we estimate they will require $8 billion of new capital in the next 15 years, or $2 billion more in the next 15 years than has been provided in the past 32 years. With all of the pressures on the Federal budget, it is totally unrealistic to expect that the rapidly expanding capital needs of rural electric cooperatives can be met in the future solely through the REA direct loan program.

It is certainly fair and proper—and in the public interest—that the REA loan program with its favorable rate of interest be continued unimpaired for the assistance of those rural systems that must have this kind of financing, at less cost to the Federal Government and with greater participation of private capital, it is fair and proper—and in the public interest—that such kinds of supplemental financing be provided instead.

We can properly ask for public support in the solution of this problem because city people as well as farm or rural people have a common stake in the continued benefits of rural electrification. But if we are entitled to public support, we also have a public responsibility—an obligation to act responsibly—not just in a narrow self-interest but responsive to the public interest which is our justification.

What does all this mean in relation to our present problems—specifically?

First of all it means that our actions—yours through your cooperative organizations as well as ours in REA—must clearly and steadfastly be committed, by word and deed, to objectives consistent with the public objectives of the rural electrification program.

The real purpose of the rural electrification program has been, from the beginning, to bring the blessings of electric service to rural people so that they could enjoy them and profit from them just as do the people in our towns and cities.

This means that the service must be as readily available in the country as in the city. This is the significance of our objective of area coverage.

It also means that the service should be as good and as economical as the service in the towns and cities. This is the significance of our objective of parity of rates and service.

It means too that the service should be available not only now but indefinitely into the future. This is the significance of our objective of building strong permanent systems of sound management, adequate financial reserves, and proper territorial protection.

These are the public objectives of the rural electrification program. It is to achieve these objectives that favorable financing and technical assistance have been made available to rural electric systems through the Federal Government as a means of overcoming the handicaps of rural service.

The public has supported, and in my judgment, will continue to support necessary assistance to the rural systems to achieve these objectives because they are recognized as fair and just.

By the same token, however, let me say that I see no public commitment or inclination to provide Federal assistance through the REA program to provide advantages for the beneficiaries of the Rural Electrification Act going beyond these objectives. Those who, in their enthusiasm for the ultimate in cheap electricity or through their involvement in battles over other issues, subordinate the rural electrification program to other goals are inviting public repudiation and disaster for the entire program.

The free exchange of opinion through public and private debate is an indispensable tool of democratic decision making. The so-called parity concept of the REA program has been the subject of some debate in your ranks this past year and may be the subject of more debate here at your annual meeting this week. You may be called upon to stand up and be counted as to whether you, as a leader in rural electrification, accept or reject the parity objective for rural electric service as a basic criterion for action in this program. Any hasty, ill-advised, unrealistic, or uniformed expression from this meeting could cause irreparable damage to the public understanding and support of the rural electrification program.

Parity of opportunity, parity of treatment, parity of return are all well established as a just and proper objective of public policy in dealing with the problems of people who are seriously disdvantaged for one reason or another. Rural free delivery of mail, the farm commodity programs, our vast system of public highways are all examples of broad public commitments to help the rural areas overcome major disadvantages of rural people. So are the rural electrification and rural telephone programs. But to assume that the public assistance available under these programs is made available to provide special advantages to rural people, above and beyond advantages enjoyed by others, is a gross misunderstanding of public opinion and public policy.

To take the position that 2 percent financing made available at some public cost should be used to bring rates to rural consumers below the rates available to urban consumers would impress the average urban taxpayer about as favorably as a proposal to add to RFD services by giving rural patrons a special discount on their postage stamp purchases.

Parity and equal advantage, yes; but special advantage, no. And if I know rural people, that is the way they feel about it too.

Do not be misled by the confusion which seems to prevail in some quarters over the meaning of an old and honorable term, yardstick. Let me make it clear that there need be no disagreement in the rural electrification program over the need for good sound yardsticks in the electric industry by which the performance of all electric systems can be measured. The giant public power systems, such as TVA and Bonneville, are such yardsticks. They have set a pace for the electric industry which has demanded better and more efficient performance from the utility systems which come into competition with their example.

The REA-financed rural systems have been an effective and important yardstick in the field of rural service, but they cannot properly be regarded as a yardstick for the industry as a whole. It is completely unrealistic and misleading to attempt to represent rural systems averaging 3.5 consumers per mile of line with gross annual revenues of only $516 per mile of line as a pacesetter for urban-based systems with 10 times the density and 15 times the revenue base.

The plain and simple fact is that 85 percent of the REA-financed rural systems still have not attained the parity rate objective if their rates are compared to the rates charged for comparable usage in neighboring towns and cities.

Let there be no mistake about it; our commitment to the parity objective is by no means a high-rate policy. Under REA policies since July 1961, REA borrowers have adopted nearly 500 rate reductions which will provide savings of nearly $17 million a year to the consumers of REA-financed rural systems. Last year alone you made 151 rate reductions amounting to annual savings of $4.6 million. Compare this with the 14 rate reductions with annual savings of only $380,000 made the year before our current policies went into effect.

If we can achieve complete parity of rates between the REA-financed rural systems and those available in the towns and cities of their areas, this will be one of the monumental achievements of the REA program. If it could be done today it would save the present consumers on the REA-financed electric systems across this land an additional $55 million annually as compared with the cost of service under present rates.

Our public responsibilities imply a second kind of obligation. Not only must we hold steadfast in support of the public objectives of the rural electrification program itself, but we must also be responsive to the public objectives expressed in other laws and other public programs where our activities become involved.

In short, we must shoulder our general responsibilities as good, law-abiding, public spirited citizens. Good citizenship is an obligation incumbent upon us all, personally and officially, as representatives of rural electrification, It is an obligation incumbent upon our respective agencies nad organizations.

There is a special meaning in this as we face our broad power supply problems of the present and the future.

The recent decision of the Federal Power Commission, in which it ruled it did not have jurisdiction over REA-financed electric cooperatives under the Federal Power Act as now written, is an important victory for the rural electric systems and the REA program.

The Rural Electrification Administration and the Department of Agriculture took a firm position before the Commission in support of Dairyland Power Cooperative, Minnkota Power Cooperative, and South Central Rural Electric Cooperative, the cooperatives involved in the proceeding. We believed strongly the Congressional intent was clearly that REA-financed rural electric cooperatives were not to be subjected to FPC jurisdiction. We believe as strongly it is not sound public policy to impose superfluous public supervision over cooperative organizations in the name of consumer and investor protection when in cooperative organizations the investors and consumers are the owners and are thus completely capable of protecting themselves.

So we have welcomed, along with you, the forthright decision of the Federal Power Commission in this case.

The Commisison pointed out, however, that even though Congress has not seen fit to delegate to it any supervisory authority over REA-financed cooperatives, there are, nevertheless, some problems which may have to be met in the public interest. As the scale and scope of the bulk power supply systems furnishing power for the Nation expand and as they become more intricately interlocked, there is a mounting public interest and concern over the need for more adequate standards of reliability to protect the general public. The consequences of the massive Northeast blackout a year ago demonstrated how vitally the public is concerned in the reliability of interconnected bulk power systems and power pools.

If the REA-financed rural systems are to share fully in the economies of large scale power supply and the advancing technology of the electric industry, your power supply systems must be able to participate fully in the major bulk power pools of the Nation.

And yet participation of REA-financed power supply cooperatives in these interstate pools necessarily affects not just their own consumers and investors, but through the pool relationships, the consumers and investors of other, non-REA-financed, noncooperative systems as well. It is quite possible that the public interest in these relationships and optimum reliability in the basic power supply systems of the Nation will require new legislation affecting all organizations participating in these bulk power systems of national impact.

On the one hand I am sure most of us welcome the FPC decision in the Dairyland, Minnkota, South Central case. On the other I am equally sure the REA-financed power supply cooperatives are sensitive to their general public responsibilities. There is an important distinction in dealing with those public responsibilities on a limited basis through carefully drawn positive legislation, rather than by acceptance of a position which could imply blanket jurisdiction over all electric cooperatives and jurisdiction over their relations with their own owner-members.

So I would strongly recommend that with the important clarification which the recent FPC decision now gives us, we need now to give further constructive attention to the problem of how cooperative power supply systems which are or will be a part of interstate pools or interconnected bulk power systems can best discharge their public responsibilities in the Nation's big power picture.

Those of us in the Federal Government who have had the privilege of working with you in this great rural electrification program are confident you will discharge your responsibilities with the same high sense of public-spirited cooperation which has marked your achievements of the years past.

For current proof that this spirit still prevails let me call public attention to the dramatic and unselfish way you have cooperated in the Joint REA-Borrower Counter Inflation Program and the magnificent way you are lending your resources to assist the Federal Government in its efforts to combat the menace of inflation in the national economy.

We learned an important lesson back in 1933 and the years immediately following when President Roosevelt successfully and dramatically used the powers of the Federal Government to inject new money and credit into the economy and thereby stimulate our recovery from the great depression. We learned that the Federal Government is such a substantial factor in the total national economy because of the size and scope of its fiscal operations it can effectively operate as a balance wheel, stimulating the economy when necessary by injecting more money and credit into it and restraining it when necessary by withdrawing or soaking up excessive money and credit in an overactive national economy.

This has been the problem this past year. Inflationary pressures were building up to a point where President Johnson felt the Federal Government must act, in a careful deliberate way, to counter these forces before they became more serious.

The question of how such programs as the rural electrification and rural telephone loan programs are to make their contribution in this important battle to counter inflation without suffering serious loss and lasting damage to rural communities and the Nation was a challenging one.

Two basic considerations had to be taken into account. First of all it needed to be understood that the REA program, both telephone and electric, is a two-way street. It involves not only disbursements by the Federal Government from loans made, but also receipts by the Federal Government in the form of repayments of loans made. From the standpoint of countering inflationary forces in the economy therefore, the management of our cash transactions must be viewed in terms of their net impact on the economy.

Secondly, it needed to be fully understood that telephone and electric services are vital utility services, even more important to the economy and national well-being in times of stress than in times of ease. For the vast majority of REA borrowers the Federal Government is their only practical source of new investment capital. If these systems are to measure up to their responsibilities to plan ahead for growth and reliability, this planning cannot proceed realistically if there is any serious question about the security of their lifeline of credit.

So we went to the fiscal planners in the Federal Government and made them a proposition. We said we know the rural people with whom we work in this program. We know their sense of public responsibility. We have confidence in them. We think they have confidence in us—if we can only work with them on a cooperative basis in tackling this problem of making our contribution to the Federal Government's counter inflation effort.

We said we were sure that if you knew your line of credit was intact and would be kept intact, if we could continue to make loan approvals on the same basis as has been customary, we could then count on you to work with us in deferring postponable construction under the loans approved and use your own cash resources to the maximum, not drawing upon Federal funds except as immediately needed in this temporary situation.

They agreed. And since October 25 we have been seeking your full cooperation on this basis.

Your response to our proposal for joint action has been magnificent.

The shrinking cushion of credit you had on deposit with the Treasury is now growing again. Almost $9,300,000 of advance loan repayments have been received since November 1 from rural electric systems ahead of their due dates. The total REA borrower cushion of credit on deposit with the Treasury now stands at nearly $300 million, a very substantial cash asset for the Treasury in these days of high interest rates.

You are throwing your own cash reserves into the balance locally too, using them to meet construction bills and temporarily deferring your requests for reimbursement from the loan funds approved for these purposes. This has the effect of temporarily deferring significant cash disbursements from the Treasury at this time.

By combination of these two lines of action the new outflow of cash from the Treasury for REA purposes this fiscal year will be reduced $82 million.

This is your way of helping the Federal Government check the inflationary forces, which unchecked can cost every American consumer dearly. This is the way you cooperate in the public interest.

And reflecting this spirit of cooperation in the public interest we are moving to keep your lines of credit intact. Loans continue to be approved as before. Electric loans totaling $242 million have been approved so far this fiscal year. This is $50 million more than was approved last year at this time.

What is more, President Johnson has asked the Congress to make available $390 million for rural electrification loans next fiscal year. This would be $15 million more than the Congress provided for this fiscal year.

And the President has placed his Administration squarely beside you in your efforts to secure enactment of legislation to provide supplemental financing to meet your growing future capital needs.

Yesterday you heard the challenge of Vice President Humphrey to step up rural growth—electrically. Tomorrow you will have still another challenge from Secretary Freeman.

Your country needs you. It needs the electric power you bring to Rural America. It needs your leadership in Rural America combined as it is with your dedication to the national welfare through your sense of public responsibilities.

Together we can join in a United Program to Step Up Rural Growth Electrically, and through this UPSURGE help all America grow into a Great Society and a stronger Nation.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this year, 1967, marks the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the U.S. Office of Education.

On March 2, 1867, President Andrew Johnson signed into law a bill setting up a Federal Department of Education consisting of a commissioner, salaried at $4,000 a year, and three clerks.

Its creation was both a sop to vociferous reformers and an indication of the deep concern of many in the Nation at the emergence of a problem that is still very much with us today.

The Office of Education, Mr. Speaker, was established because 100 years ago the educators of our country were deeply concerned over the wide variation in the quality of public schooling offered across the country. In short, they were seeking to fulfill the 19th-century concept of equality of education opportunity.

The original role of the department, later styled an office, was on the surface a fairly minor one. It was empowered to collect and disseminate data "as shall aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems, and otherwise promote the cause of education throughout the country."

Its sponsors had high hopes that the stated work of this new Federal agency could bring about sweeping reforms in the national system of educating its young. By the end of the Civil War, the Nation had pretty well determined on the establishment of State-operated, publicly financed and free public schools as a settled policy. Federal assistance to education also had a long and honorable history by this time, dating back in principle to the Northwest Ordinance of 1787.

But educators were convinced the time was ripe for the next, needed, step. The Federal Government, they said, should take a hand, not by interfering in State control and direction of education, but by providing a central clearinghouse and point of dissemination for data about education.

In the words of a congressional proponent, establishment of this agency would:

> Give education a mouthpiece and a rallying point . . . It would form a public sentiment which will arouse to increase activity the friends of education everywhere, and ignorance will fly before it.

In actuality, the establishment of what we now know as the Office of Education came at the start of some nine decades of debate over the advisability of general Federal assistance to education.

The now timeworn specter—Federal "control" of education—was raised even as Congress debated the bill to establish the Department of Education.

One opponent claimed:

> We are to have a centralized power here to tell . . . the people of all the States of this Union what their system of education shall be.

This fear, plus the national preoccupation with other problems, continued to inhibit Federal efforts at assisting educational improvement, even though 18 Congresses considered the subject of general aid to education from 1881 to 1960.

Mr. Speaker, I am most happy to note that the Federal commitment to educational assistance continued to grow. Federal assistance to education through grants for specific purposes gradually expanded. Starting with the second Morrill Act of 1890, the role of the Office of Education widened.

Through the years, it took on missions involving war training programs, educational efforts contained in antidepression measures, pioneering vocational rehabilitation programs and administration of other programs such as aid to federally affected areas.

Mr. Speaker, in recent years we have come to a more complete realization of what we deny ourselves by failing to offer each child in our land his educational due. We have recognized, at long last, the harm that comes, both to individuals and to the Nation, from failure to provide everyone a chance at all the education he needs and can assimilate. We know now that equal justice requires the repair of past mistakes or failures; and that equal education, in practice, often requires more than equal effort in these repairs.

We have finally enacted a general aid to education measure, the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. We have made education the focus of our efforts to eradicate poverty. In the current fiscal year, the Federal Government will spend an estimated $4 billion on educational assistance.

The U.S. Office of Education has become a spearhead in the national effort to provide equal educational opportunity for all. As its sponsors intended, the Office of Education has become a seedbed of new thought and technical advancement, through its sponsorship of programs of experimentation on virtually every level of education.

Mr. Speaker, it was more than 150 years ago that Thomas Jefferson said:

> Enlighten the people generally, and tyranny and oppressions of body and mind will vanish like evil spirits at the dawn of day.

As the U.S. Office of Education enters its second century, we have reason to hope that the dawn is here.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, centennials in increasing number and variety come and go, most of them making small impression upon our consciousness chiefly because so many of them indicate nothing more than the passage of time.

But there are also centennials which mark 100 years of significant advance, of genuine contributions toward the progress of the people of our country.

I rise to take note of such a day today, March 2, 1967, for it was on the 2d day of March, in 1867, that the Congress established the independent Department of Education "for the purpose of collecting such statistics and facts as shall show the condition and progress of education in the several States and Territories, and of diffusing such information respecting the organization and management of schools and school systems, and methods of teaching, as shall aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems, and otherwise promote the cause of education throughout the country."

Henry Barnard, a crusader in the cause of educational reform, was named to head the new department, and was given a staff of three other persons to assist him with his chores in behalf of the Nation's schools.

Mr. Speaker, for most of its life this unit of the Federal Government has made quiet, steady progress, performing its functions well while weathering various changes in status and location—from department, to office, to bureau, and back to office. Finally, only 14 years ago, it was incorporated into the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

And then, Mr. Speaker, in 1958, another country accomplished a scientific feat so spectacular, unique, and unexpected that most Americans were stunned and many alarmed. Scientists of the Soviet Union had hurled a small electronic device—Sputnik—into orbit around the earth. Prodded by this Russian achievement, Congress passed the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to improve the quality of education in the sciences and in mathematics, and to increase the number of graduates in these disciplines. From that time on the commitment of the United States to the cause of education has been unwavering and generous.

In less than 4 years Congress has passed 24 major pieces of legislation for education—surpassing the total number of education bills passed in the previous 97 years. The bureaus and staff offices of the Office of Education this year are administering more than 100 different kinds of programs which benefit all segments of our population, from wide-eyed, preschool youngsters to adults of all ages. Federal money in support of these comprehensive programs is more than $4 billion this year.

Education legislation enacted by Congress includes funds to build facilities of colleges and universities, to support educational programs in areas with great numbers of low-income families, to assist in identifying and encouraging promising high school graduates, to establish adult literacy programs, and funds for many other vital activities in the world of teaching and learning. Staff members of the Office of Education, working closely with teachers and administrators of our schools, have made creative contributions to shaping programs to spark the advancements being made at all levels of the country's educational systems.

An insight into the significance of this centennial of the U.S. Office of Education, and of the importance of its mission in our society can be underlined by a comment President Johnson made at a 1965 teachers' meeting:

> Nor is it enough to give a student a place to sit and teacher to learn from. We must make sure that the quality of that education is equal to his capacity to learn—that it stimulates creativity rather than stifling it—that it enlarges the mind rather than narrowing it—that he receives not merely a diploma but learning, in its broadest, most meaningful and humane sense.

Mr. Speaker, on this day, March 2, 1967, I know that Members of Congress will want to join in congratulating the distinguished U.S. Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe II, and all of the persons who serve in this important Office on the century of service which the U.S. Office of Education has given to the American people.

TEACHER CORPS IS A FACE-TO-FACE ENCOUNTER IN THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to two lucid articles demonstrating the value of the Teacher Corps—one from the National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin and another from the Milwaukee Journal. Each article describes the practical work done by the Teacher Corps in the Nation's schools.

Mr. Speaker, the Teacher Corps is an effective instrument in alleviating a double-edged problem in education of the disadvantaged: finding teachers willing to work in far-from-ideal conditions and preventing the high dropout rate among disadvantaged students. These articles show how the Teacher Corps helps local schools deal with their most difficult responsibilities.

The articles follow:

[From the Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, March 1967]

THEY CAME TO HELP

(By Ed Powell)

(NOTE.—The National Teacher Corps is, to be sure, national in organization. But in actual operation it is local, immediate, face-to-face. All of the names used in these notes on the work of the Teacher Corps in one junior high school are real. So, it seems, is the value of the program.)

The National Teacher Corps is little more than an undernourished infant when set against the mammoth needs of schools that are trying to educate the millions of disadvantaged children in this nation.

A pioneering 1,200 corpsmen have taken on the commitment to help provide better schooling for poverty kids. Three hundred are veteran teachers, serving as team leaders for the other 900. These 900 are intern teachers who, this time last year, were still college seniors or first-year teachers, or perhaps Air Force colonels or housewives or social workers.

But despite its Lilliputian size and its halting first good steps, there is now a growing number of schoolmen who are deeply committed to the program—schoolmen who believe it points the way to producing teachers of superior ability, and who view the corpsmen as fresh reinforcements for faculties that are struggling against the by-products of poverty, apathy, and truancy: dropouts and failures.

In the beginning, these men also had to be convinced. And this included Robert Wagner, principal of Heinold Junior High School in Cincinnati, Ohio. His first reaction when hearing of the Corps: "Thanks, but no thanks. We've already scheduled 17 practice teachers and that is a pretty full load for our faculty."

He recently elaborated on his earlier statement: "There was another reason in the back of my mind. The truth was that I wasn't interested in running five more people through the same tired process of practice teaching."

It could have ended there, but Professor Charles Weilbaker, who directs the Teacher Corps project at the University of Cincinnati, was a persuasive salesman and had a unique offer to make.

ADVANTAGES CITED

First, the corpsmen need not add an extra burden to the faculty. They have their own team leader, Mrs. Margaret Smith, who is a really outstanidng teacher with years of classroom experience in ghetto schools of Detroit. In addition, she has taught at Delaware State College, Tuskegee Institute, and at Florida A.&M. in Tallahassee. Mrs. Smith has also been a social worker with Aid to Dependent Children families in Detroit, Hartford, and Suffolk City, Long Island. One of Mrs. Smith's jobs—and she would have many—would be to serve as an active supervising teacher. Hers was not to be the relatively passive role of assigning interns to other faculty members.

Secondly, the principal would be a primary authority in setting the training routine for corpsmen in his school. The exact two-year program would be planned cooperatively: Robert Wagner, Charles Weilbaker, and Mrs. Smith would work out the detailed activities, applying the Teacher Corps guidelines—internship training with heavy accent on one-to-one teaching and community activity—to the specific needs of Heinold High.

Perhaps this last was the winning point, for the school has plenty of problems. It is located squarely between two great public housing projects, one of which is all Negro, the other Appalachian poor white. In school, there had been a dangerous tension between the two groups. There is a certain irony in their antagonism, because all these children share a lot of common circumstances at home. Most of them live in extreme poverty, and a high percentage have only a single parent to raise the usually large family. Many have only welfare or unemployment assistance as their sole means of support.

They also share some personal traits. School, to these children, is a resented requirement; a place where they are forced to play a stupid game in which their best efforts are clumsy and ludicrous. There pride has been eroded and the result is an attitude of belligerence and resentment toward adult supervision and organized activities.

PLANNING A PROGRAM

"I began to see in the Teacher Corps an opportunity to make some real gains in the school," said Wagner, "so we began planning and came up with a program that looked very hopeful. First, I wanted the corpsmen to work with the young people outside the classroom where they could get to know them informally, through afternoon clubs and in extracurricular activities. I feel that through these clubs they have a chance to help the kids develop a feeling of belonging; of having a stake in the school and making an appreciated contribution to it.

"As for teaching itself, I wanted to keep the corpsmen out of the classroom for the entire first semester. Instead, I wanted them to learn what a school is all about from working in some central location. They have all spent at least 16 years in classrooms, so I want them to start off with something different."

When school began in September, Margaret Smith and her four intern teachers began their work at Heinold. During the day, their service was to the total school—interviewing tardy students, calling the home of absentees, supervising the lunchroom and playgrounds. In the afternoon they worked with regular faculty members to set up a broad range of extracurricular activities for the students.

Their work removed many burdens from the regular staff, but that effect was only tangent to their central purpose: to learn to work with the deep-seated problems of poverty's children. And from their attendance-checking and assistance to counselors they became increasingly familiar with these problems.

"I've made nearly 50 visits to the homes of kids who are chronic truants," intern Ron Priore explains, "and I've heard every excuse for absences that you can imagine. But in nearly every case you find the same things operating: the parent is kind of 'out of it,' pretty much unaware of what the school is all about. And the kids are staying out because they hate the place and they are sure they are going to fail anyway. They put in their time when they're forced to; it's just like a jail sentence. They think of school as another place where adults order them around, and they can't find any way to belong, to protect their pride."

EFFECTIVE TEACHER TRAINING

The visits have a specific purpose in the intern's training, and it is not to warm his heart to a maudlin sympathy, but to make him a more effective teacher in the classroom. The aim is to keep him from repeating the common error of equating silence and passivity with stupidity, to keep him from interpreting bizarre values, and behavior as simple antisocial rebellions. Interns are learning that sometimes they have to search deeply for basic, decent values on which they can build.

Searching for these values, corpsmen find a lot of contradictions, because in a twisted, distorted way the finest kind of middle-class values so often seem to work to turn some of these youngsters into hard core disciplinary cases. Wanting desperately to play a role with dignity and meaning—boys want to work and earn a salary, girls want to marry and begin a family—these young people do not have enough inner security to be patient, to wait.

There are a few who know they can escape the grasp of the compulsory education laws by getting themselves expelled from school, and they are determined enough to wage a grim and conscious campaign to "earn their freedom."

In their families and in their circles of friends, there is no one who got a job or won a husband because of having a high school diploma. And they don't want to wait and bet on the promises they hear about how important it is to finish school.

Good intentions and easy answers weren't much help for the students at Heinold! But there was hope and there were many ways to help. By way of constructive achievements, both Robert Wagner and Margaret Smith are proudest of the newly created after-school activities.

AFTER ONE SEMESTER

"Of the 1,000 students enrolled in Heinold, a full 800 were participating in one of the clubs by the end of the first semester this year. It has become a kind of status thing," Mrs. Smith goes on to say. "Hundreds of kids are now participating who never before had any way really to belong." (Mr. Wagner remarked that the number of boys and girls in the club program had doubled this year over last, and there are twice as many clubs.)

"Some of the clubs are academic-based like current events, dramatics and debate. And Raymonde Basone, a corpsman who was born and raised in Haiti, is running a Spanish Club where kids are learning conversational Spanish and studying Latin culture. Most of the clubs have had weekend tours. Ron Pirore took the current-events club to visit the newspaper and is now planning a trip to visit the legislature in Columbus.

"Dick Murphy holds a basketball clinic after school where white and Negro boys are planning together without any regard for racial differences, and some of the regular standbys are boys that the juvenile authorities have marked down as hard core delinquents. But my favorite," and Mrs. Smith frowns an admonition, "is the girls' drill team. And let me warn you, if you think that must be on empty frill, then you are dead wrong. It includes 300 girls who are really excited about the club. Most of them have never cared about anything that related to school, but now they are searching for some way to earn money for uniforms.

"We are convinced that these clubs are making a difference, and I believe the faculty thinks so, too. They have given a lot of kids their first chance to succeed at something and really be appreciated."

Something has made a difference. Many people in the school think they can sense a new school spirit beginning to emerge. Whatever the reason for the change, it is there and that is a fact that can be measured by attendance records—absences are now averaging a full 15 percent below last year.

A FUTURE PROJECT

Robert Wagner and his corpsmen are planning one more project that aims at better school-community relations. They are sure that many school problems stem from the fact that parents don't know what goes on at Heinold. They plan to remedy that. They are now working to line up the support of six local community councils in Heinold's district to help sponsor a "Community Jamboree" in each of the nearby neighborhoods. Besides refreshments, parents will get classroom demonstrations, musical programs and a session of questions and answers about the school.

Along with the jamborees, corpsmen are now working to prepare a "mobile school" in a trailer that will be on display in each shopping center and housing project. Containing textbooks and displays of student work in various subjects, it will be staffed by students and corpsmen who will answer questions and, you can be sure, issue standing invitations to visit the school itself.

But where does teaching fit into this busy schedule of school clubs, community activities and home visits plus eight to twelve hours weekly of graduate study at the University of Cincinnati?

At the beginning of the second semester, Margaret Smith and her interns began their first classroom teaching at Heinold. Taking nearly 50 children with records of multiple failures, Mrs. Smith worked out a schedule which assigned each intern small groups of three to five students which they are teaching an hour a day, three days a week. And they have already completed plans to do team teaching before full-size classes in English and geography, which they will begin as soon as scheduling will allow.

THE PAYOFF

The sessions they are teaching now are the payoff for all the lessons they learned from their work in the fall. They learned to respect the students for their ability to get along in spite of impossible home conditions. They learned that authoritarianism is a sorry substitute for good teaching. They now know that kids who live in slums have their own style of learning which *requires* action and motion and personal involvement on the part of the student. And finally, they have learned that children of poverty are the final test of a good teacher, that these kids lack the inner security and patience to subsidize poor teaching with quiet compliance.

These same lessons are being learned by interns in every project, whether they are teaching the Negroes and Puerto Ricans in Harlem, the mountain whites of Appalachia, the Mexican-Americans of Texas and the Southwest, or the reservation Indians of the Great Plains.

Intern Dick Murphy won the hearts of Heinold teachers at a party they gave to welcome the incoming corpsmen, when he told them, "I don't know exactly what our duties are going to be in the months ahead, but as far as I'm concerned, I'm supposed to learn by helping you. So whatever you want done, just let me know." This seems to be philosophy that runs throughout the program and it has led the corpsmen into a wild variety of jobs; some are picturesque, some humanitarian, but most are solid educational achievements.

WIDE-RANGING ACTIVITIES

In North Carolina they are cooking and serving oatmeals to children before school to make sure that they have had breakfast. And before the children leave in the afternoon, they are given haircuts because no barbers work in the mountain hamlets where the children live. In Tennessee, interns found themselves at a school with no playground although there was equipment—stored for years in a back room. So they organized the kids and cleared a plot of ground, then begged cement and mixed it with rocks that the children carried from a nearby creek. Result: one playground.

In Arkansas, interns found in one small community that children had deep-seated problems in speech and reading that needed advanced professional therapy. They found recognized specialists in the region and persuaded them to volunteer their assistance in diagnosing problems and outlining therapy. In Florida they have pioneered a whole system of field trips to museums, universities and sites of government, history and culture. The tours have worked out so successfully for children who had scarcely been outside their own neighborhoods that they have been incorporated into the regular curriculum of the school with several tours scheduled each week.

In Michigan, one team was asked to construct a one-semester unit in Negro History and teach it on a pilot basis in junior high school. The team traveled to Washington, D.C., to attend a national conference on Race in Education, and built the course after consulting with outstanding national authorities in Negro history. In Galveston, Texas, corpsmen are giving intensive tutoring to high school seniors in English, composition and speech, in an effort to reduce the dropout rate among the students that enroll in college.

But immediate service to children of poverty and the schools that teach them is a secondary benefit. The Teacher Corps' central purpose is teacher training—to implement new techniques of teacher preparation and to produce teachers who have a maximum chance of reaching and teaching kids who live in slums. Perhaps of greater importance than the first 900 teachers it will train is the chance that the Teacher Corps is giving to local schools and to colleges of teacher education to offer new services and to carry out their own programs of innovation in education.

If a composite were made of statements by university project directors about the significance of their work in training corpsmen, it would be something like this:

"Since we began training corpsmen at our university, our regular program of teacher education has been under continuous revision, for we have learned more in the past few months than we would have learned in years of normal operations. And what we learn today, we will teach tomorrow."

But the Teacher Corps interns are less aware and a lot less concerned about fundamental changes in teacher education. They are pretty busy, like Dick Murphy at Heinold Junior High School, trying to learn by doing the things that need doing.

(**EDITOR'S NOTE.**—The National Teacher Corps was launched last year by the U.S. office of Education to reach and teach economically and educationally handicapped children, to train promising college graduates in the special methods of teaching such children, and to increase the number of accredited teachers qualified for such teaching. The program operates through teams composed of an experienced teacher as leader and college graduates who serve as teacher interns and divide their time among teaching in the schools, community activities, and graduate study.

All corpsmen are enrolled for graduate study in a university within reach of their school district, and university staff members are associated with all Teacher Corps teams. Teachers Corps teams of one master teacher and three to six interns may be requested by schools with a predominance of students from homes with an annual income of less than $3,000 yearly. This year, 111 local school districts and 50 universities are participating in this program.)

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Feb. 15, 1967]

TEACHER CORPS PUSHES AHEAD

(By Ralph D. Olive)

Classes were over for the day at Racine's Garfield elementary school, but not all the pupils—or teachers—had gone home.

Fifth grade boys were playing basketball in the gymnasium. In a room just off the gym, several other boys were working with plaster molds. On the auditorium-gymnasium stage, a boy and a girl worked together, repairing the school's puppet theater. Each of these activities were supervised by a member of the national teacher corps.

At about the same time, a pupil in Milwaukee's Rufus King high school had stayed after school to receive a special lesson in algebra—from a member of the teacher corps.

PROGRAM IS NEW

The national teacher corps program is something new. It is a plan to find dedicated, well educated men and women and to give them the special training to teach where they are needed most—in the central areas of large and medium sized cities, where so many children need special help. Although there are some corps programs in rural areas, the emphasis is on cities.

The teacher corps was organized nationally with the idea of helping children who are having considerable trouble in school, and who probably will drop out if they do not receive help and encouragement. Most of these pupils are members of minority groups—Negro, Puerto Rican, Indian, Mexican—and are from poor homes.

The aim of the teacher corps is to give these boys and girls at least some of the same educational opportunities that the majority of American children have today.

In Wisconsin, five schools are co-operating in the teacher corps program—Garfield school in Racine, and Wells Street junior high, Rufus King senior high, Vieau elementary and Fifth Street elementary schools in Milwaukee. The University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee and the Racine and Milwaukee public school systems are joint sponsors of the project.

Wisconsin's program, like those in other states, has two aims: To prepare teachers and to give special help to under-privileged pupils. The interns are men and women who want to teach in central city schools and are willing to devote two years of rigorous work and study to prepare themselves for such assignments.

The typical Wisconsin intern has a bachelor's degree, but not in education. The program aims to help the intern build on the knowledge and experience he already has and to give him teaching skills. At the end of the two years, the intern will receive a master's degree from the UWM and certification to teach. The intern's time is divided three ways: Taking classes at UWM, teaching and working in community activities.

UNITED STATES PAYS 90 PERCENT OF COST

Harvey Goldman, director of the Wisconsin program, explained that federal funds financed 90% of the program. The two public school systems involved—Racine and Milwaukee—pay 10% of their costs. The interns work with other teachers and administrators in the schools where they are assigned. Goldman, 28, is on the staffs of both UWM and the Milwaukee school system. He received a doctor's degree in education from Michigan State university last year and has had several years' experience teaching underprivileged children.

Although the teacher corps is a national program, it is carried out "very much on a local basis," Goldman said. There are 63 university centers for corps programs in the country and 130 public school systems are taking part. Sen. Nelson (D-Wis.) and Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) were co-sponsors of the legislation establishing the corps.

Miss Patricia Wiser, 25, of 1869 N. Cambridge av., has found that the key to teaching and counseling is to tie school work in with things that interest the pupils.

Miss Wiser assigned the pupils to write a report on the recent boxing match between Cassius Clay and Ernie Terrell. The result: Some of the best papers she has seen from her English class.

Another intern, Jerald Hauser, 26, of 4600 N. 49th st., said:

"I feel I have been able to do something—I have helped four or five students, directly, that I know of."

One of the pupils Hauser helped is Thomas Henry, 17, of 3355–A N. 10th st., a sophomore at Rufus King.

"Last year, I was failing all my subjects," Henry said. "Then Mr. Hauser started working with me. He came out to my house—asked me what I was interested in. I told him I liked to repair radios and record players. I'm interested in electronics. He encouraged me, and helped me get the job as manager of the basketball team. And he helped me with my subjects—I always did all right in math, but not so good in English and reading. Now I'm going to school regularly, and studying, and I'm passing all my subjects."

WILL COMPLETE SCHOOL

Now Henry, who last year was thinking of dropping out of high school, plans to graduate.

"I definitely plan to finish high school," he said. "I'm not sure about college—but I may go, or go to a technical school. I would like to study electronics."

So it goes in the life of a teacher corps intern—good moments and bad, enthusiasm and discouragement.

But, in moments of fatigue, the interns can take encouragement from those who appreciate their work. Such a person is John A. Powers, principal of Rufus King.

"I think the interns are doing a tremendous job," Powers said. "They have helped us a great deal. They have fresh ideas; they are not tied down to old concepts."

And that is what the teacher corps is about—fresh approaches to old problems.

The program began last summer, with introductory courses at UWM for the interns. Many spent the summer living in Milwaukee's inner core, to get a grasp of the problems of children they would later teach.

Each school has an experienced teacher, called a team leader, who directs activities of interns. Mrs. Mary Hansen, team leader at Garfield school in Racine, said: "My job is to act as co-ordinator, and help the interns become good teachers."

During the first semester this year, the interns tutored the work with pupils in activities. This semester each is teaching two classes.

WE'RE MAKING PROGRESS

What is it like to be an intern in such an intensive program? Said Ladislaus Duic, 43, of Racine:

"I feel we're making progress. But sometimes it is discouraging. The kids like something new—then they all want to take part. But they soon lose interest; then you have to find something else."

One of Duic's more successful projects was a class newspaper.

"For the first issue, everyone wrote a story," he said. "But now no one has turned in anything for two weeks."

Duic's experience, Goldman said, is typical of teacher corps problems.

"These children have a short attention span," he said. "You have to keep changing activities."

Le Roy Fochs, also of Racine, has found the intern program rewarding but tiring. Fochs, 23, had little previous experience with urban poverty.

He has found the children are responsive, "if you use the right approach."

"They have a lot of enthusiasm, but they need direction," he said.

At Milwaukee's Rufus King high school, the pupils are older, but the problems are much the same.

WHOLE NEW CAREER

Although King is not an inner city school in the usual sense, it does have a number of pupils who live in poor neighborhoods and have severe educational problems.

One of the interns there is beginning a whole new career at the age of 53. He is William Ware, who retired as an air force lieutenant colonel in December, 1965, after 28 years of service. Now he plans to be a teacher.

BULGARIAN FREEDOM

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, March 3 marks the 89th anniversary of the freeing of Bulgarians from more than five centuries of subjugation under the Turkish Ottoman Empire. For it was on that date in 1878 that the Treaty of San Stefano ended Turkish domination and reestablished the historic nation of Bulgaria which had been conquered by the Turkish hordes which overran the Balkans in the 14th century. The Treaty of San Stefano marked the culmination of a whole series of revolts by Bulgarian nationalists in the 18th and 19th centuries, revolts which demonstrated that centuries of foreign domination had not dampened Bulgarian nationalism. Nor had they dampened the strong sentiments for self-determination and freedom from subservience to foreign overlords.

The Bulgarian revolts against Turkish rule had provoked violent reprisals and in the year 1875 alone it has been estimated that 20,000 Bulgarians—men, women, and children—were massacred. All of the governments of Europe were distressed by the Turkish reprisals in the Balkans but none of them would commit themselves to action in defense of the Bulgarians. It was left to the Russian czarist government to be the actual instrument of Bulgarian liberation from the Turks. It has been said that the war Russia declared on Turkey early in 1877 was one of the very few wars Russia has waged for the good of other peoples, and when that war ended, with Russian troops camped on the doorstep of the Turkish capital city of Constantinople, the Bulgarians found themselves freed for the first time in centuries.

Self-government and freedom from outside control lasted a little more than three generations in Bulgaria, for that nation found itself located in the unenviable heartland between East and West, between Europe and Russia, and being so located, was involved in two World Wars not of its making and in the end found itself a pawn under the control of that powerful Eastern neighbor which such a short time before had been the instrument of its freedom. As Russia had gained for Bulgaria its independence in 1878 so it was Russia who aided and controlled the Communist revolt of 1944 which toppled the legal government of Kosta Muraviev and instituted a Communist regime not of the people's choosing and subservient to the demands of the Communist government of the Soviet Union. Bulgaria had passed again under foreign influence and control.

Thus, tomorrow we pause to commemorate the date on which began an all-too-brief interlude of freedom and dignity for Bulgarians in their homeland, and we hope, we fervently hope, that the spirit which sustained these people through long centuries of Turkish domination shall not be extinguished and shall at length be rewarded with that freedom which Bulgarians so richly deserve.

POSTMASTER GENFRAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN'S IMPORTANT ROLES IN KENNEDY AND JOHNSON ADMINISTRATIONS

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, staff members of the Washington Bureau of the Springfield, Mass., Daily News, Erwin Knoll, Don Bacon, and Geoffrey Could, recently interviewed Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien, also from Springfield, on his important roles in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. I ask permission to have Postmaster General O'Brien's interview from the Springfield Daily News of February 25, 1967, included with my remarks at this point:

O'Brien Recalls That Fateful Day in Dallas

(Note.—The following on tape interview with Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien of this city was conducted by Erwin Knoll, Don Bacon and Geoffrey Could of this newspaper's national service.)

Q. Mr. O'Brien, you're one of the few holdover officials in high position from the Kennedy Administration. Did you find this a difficult transition?

A. I don't know whether I'm one of the few holdovers, but in any event I am now in my seventh successive year in the administration under two Presidents. When you talk about transition, I hark back to the moment of transition, if you will, and a conversation I had with President Johnson on the plane at Dallas, while we waited the arrival of a judge to conduct the swearing-in ceremony.

The President talked to me about his constitutional responsibility, and it was clear there was a need to insure continuity. That's really the key word—continuity in government, when the nations of the world were watching with bated breath.

Would this democracy really overcome a great moment of tragedy such as this, and go on without stumbling? And the President also pointed out to me that I did not have a constitutional responsibility, but he expressed the thought that perhaps I would feel a responsibility as an American citizen. And I did feel that responsibility. And he asked me to stand shoulder to shoulder with him, and I've done that.

I've had occasions when I thought I could phase out my activity in government. But the President has thought otherwise, and I serve my President.

So I think that looking back over these six years that we achieved continuity, not only in terms of the operation of the government, but in terms of progress in government. We had much going for us that day in Dallas in the enactment of the New Frontier program of President John F. Kennedy. And we moved forward. My recollection is that we did not stumble, we did not hesitate. We were able to continue the advantages we had in the legislative arena and otherwise to insure the enactment of these programs. I think the record is clear that this was brought about.

Every American would have reacted as I did, in a moment of tragedy where I had lost my leader—a man with whom I'd been closely associated for 14 years. I had been present at the moment of loss, and to see this democracy in action in a plane on the ground at Dallas—it brought to your mind and your heart just what it means to live in this nation.

So, public service, whatever form it may take, is a matter any American who is called upon to do it by his President will accept. So I haven't found difficulties.

I have found personal difficulties, in all candor, because all of us have other thoughts. We all have a life to lead, so to speak, we have personal goals that we might have in mind, we have families to bring up, and all the rest. But I do think all of that must go by the board, to use the vernacular, at a time when a President asks you to serve. And that's the attitude I had that day in Dallas and the attitude I have today.

Q. An enormous amount of attention has been focused recently on that day in Dallas, particularly the swearing-in ceremony in the plane. Could you tell us what it was like from your standpoint?

A. Well, let me say that I am determined that I will not become involved with the debate with authors of books and those associated with them at this point. I am not interested in getting into a pit with Mr. Manchester. or with anyone else. I do feel that perhaps it will be necessary for me to speak out on what happened at Dallas, what happened on the plane, what happened during those days, ultimately.

All I know about it at this moment are the four issues of a national magazine that carried in part some of the chapters of a book that's going to be published apparently in April.

I don't know one other word in that book, so I must await the publication of the book. I am concerned, however. It is already obvious to me that there are errors in fact. Are these glaring errors in fact that would have an effect on history? And to what degree are they errors in the context of the book as a whole? That remains to be seen.

So I'm not seeking a platform to debate anyone, but I do feel that it's very possible that once the book is published that I would find it necessary to speak out. And all I can say to you is that if that necessity arises in my conscience, my mind, I will not hesitate to speak out.

EFFECT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the Record, the following letter I received from H. Ronald Huber, superintendent of the Huntington area schools in my district.

Mr. Huber's letter discusses the effect of the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965—Public Law 89–10—on his school system. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I find this type of information invaluable and reassuring. This act has, probably more than most others, already begun to fulfill the promises it generated only a short time ago. To realize its favorable impact at the local level should give us all renewed confidence, and a desire to improve and expand it beyond the present limitations. Mr. Huber's letter follows:

Huntingdon Area Schools,
Office of the Superintendent,
Huntingdon, Pa., February 20, 1967.

Hon. John H. Dent,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Congressman Dent: We consider it our duty and our obligation to inform you of the tremendous impact that Federal aid to education has had upon the educational program of the Huntingdon Area Schools in Huntingdon, Pennsylvania.

According to a recent survey conducted by the Industrial Development Department of the Pennsylvania Electric Company and the Council for Economic Development Organization (CEDO), it was found that 31.7% of the people in our County earn less than $3,000.00. The same survey revealed that 33.1% of the people lived in what is classified as "dilapidated housing." In spite of these signs of poverty, Huntingdon County ranks fifth among all counties in Pennsylvania in local financial effort for the support of the schools. We were aware that much was being done for the education of our young people; but we were even more aware that much more had to be done if our children were to attain an education which would be an acceptable preparation for the future.

Public Law 89–10—The Elementary Secondary Education Act—made available $165,000.00 for the disadvantaged youth of our community. In the original allotment of 698 financially disadvantaged children, we found many frustrated children caused by inability to read, lack of culture in the home, lack of physical and dental care and also an inadequate diet. In our original grant of $165,000.00, we attacked these problems and believe that we are seeing remarkable results. Students in high school as a result of this program have an opportunity to go to a dentist for the first time in their life; physical impairments have been corrected; warm noon meals have been provided for those who previously had no lunch; and above all, the children who were reading below their grade level are now receiving remedial instruction from 11 specially trained reading instructors. It was revealed that 429 of these students improved their reading level one year and six months above the normal rate of growth as a result of the remedial reading program made possible through Public Law 89–10.

We are attempting to discover and care for those in dire need through the medium of an OEO sponsored Head Start program. Next year if Federal aid is continued we expect to provide follow-through services for these same students. There are many other aspects of Federal aid to education which I have not mentioned for which we are deeply grateful.

I would urge you as a member of the 90th Congress to support enthusiastically legislation to continue and even expand the Federal aid. It is our firm belief that the greatest defense America can have is an educated citizenry.

The story I have related to you can be repeated by thousands of educators in our nation; and it is only through Federal aid that all people will have an equal opportunity to become educated to their full capacity to learn.

Respectfully yours,
HUNTINGDON AREA SCHOOLS,
H. RONALD HUBER,
Superintendent.

THE EDUCATIONAL RENAISSANCE

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, 4 years after Representative James Garfield—later President—introduced legislation establishing the U.S. Office of Education in 1867, he remarked about higher education:

> A university is a student on one end of a log and Mark Hopkins on the other.

Even though schools were important in those days, a secondary school typically was attended only by those who could afford to pay tuition—and sometimes room and board, as well—and higher education was the prerogative of relatively few. Also, in those days, a person got an education and expected it to last throughout his lifetime with relatively little refurbishing. The Office of Education, in its fledgling period, was charged with gathering statistics about the schools serving the various towns and hamlets throughout the land.

In the intervening century, the changing needs of technology, of the professions, of society itself, have thrust increasingly broadened responsibilities upon the Office of Education. Our population has become so mobile that the local school must educate not just for work in the local community but for careers anywhere in the country or in the world. Technology is changing so quickly that schools must educate, not just for today's jobs, but for the kind of adaptability that will enable today's youth to carry on careers as yet unidentified.

In meeting these new challenges, schools throughout the country are undergoing an educational renaissance, a movement stimulated by the demands and needs of an increasingly complex society. The local autonomy our schools enjoy has been one of their great strengths in meeting this new turn of events, though in some circumstances it has been one of the factors that tend to inhibit necessary change. In such situations, the OE—through information, not coercion; through support, not control—is a definitely constructive and unifying force in helping us to improve our schools.

Clearly, it is important that we improve all our schools, not just a selected few. Today's world demands more intellectual maturity of all our people than ever has been the case in the past. The Office of Education acts as a junior partner with local school systems in developing sound educational programs. It supports research to investigate promising programs and practices so that local local schools may have objective information for choosing among alternatives. It supports exemplary programs that provide the leading edge of local educational improvements. It administers additional support to those areas beset by poverty.

This last function is particularly important because the areas most in need of education are those least able to pay for it. When one segment of society suffers deprivation, other segments invariably have to pay for it—either directly through welfare programs or indirectly through loss of productivity and buying power. The improvement of education, therefore, is everybody's business and everybody's responsibility. Without in any way diminishing local autonomy, the Office of Education is charged by Congress with administering programs that provide a helping hand in the educational improvement efforts of schools and colleges throughout the land.

On the centennial anniversary of the Office of Education, we can rightly take pride in the results of these programs authorized by the Congress on behalf of all of the people. We can point with pride to the States and localities, too, for their teamwork in helping to move forward the educational renaissance which will give today's youth and adults the educational tools they need for undertaking tomorrow's tasks. As President Johnson has said:

> If we are learning anything from our experiences, we are learning that it is time for us to go to work, and the first work of our society is education.

MAIL WITHOUT POSTAGE TO VIETNAM

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill providing for delivery of first-class mail to members of our Armed Forces in Vietnam without postage.

Frankly, I am hoping this will be a morale booster. A long, drawn out war under peculiarly baffling conditions lowers the will to fight on. Unless we continuously assure and reassure our boys in that far off and strange land, we can hardly expect them to keep up their spirit. We must not let them think that they will be mired down eternally and forgotten in the jungles of Southeast Asia.

The proposed and probably necessary increase in general postal rates falls with some heaviness on those whose letters would be most welcome to our fighting men. This bill is designed to remove whatever drawback may exist to a flood of letters flowing westward across the Pacific. I would have every serviceman reminded every day that he is constantly in the thoughts and prayers of those he loves back home. Free postage may not be a major fiscal operation, but this Government can well afford to do the little things that in the end may be more important than the spectacular ones.

THE NEED FOR A CIVILIAN AVIATION ACADEMY

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point a press statement of the Air Transport Association, which indicates the tremendous growth of the air transportation industry, and the job opportunities which this growth is creating. As the Members no doubt know, I have introduced a bill to create a Civilian Air Academy to help meet the burgeoning need for qualified personnel.

AIRLINES ADD 30,000 NEW EMPLOYEES IN 1966

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Airline growth during 1966 created 30,000 new jobs, Joseph L. O'Brien, vice president-personnel relations of the Air Transport Association, said today.

O'Brien said that the airlines have added more new jobs in the past two years than were added in the seven-year period 1958–1964. At the end of 1966, employment was 236,000. Total payrolls increased from $1,686,280,000 to $1,865,228,000. The annual average salary was $7,910.

The airlines estimate that they will need 6,800 mechanics and 4,300 pilots during 1967. "These new job opportunities, "O'Brien said, "are being created by the tremendous growth in airline capacity resulting from the greatest fleet re-equipment program in airline industry. Taken together, the five-year (1966–70) equipment expansion program of the airlines comes to over 1,000 aircraft valued at about $7 billion."

O'Brien said that the jobs being generated by airline growth are not limited to mechanics and pilots. There are jobs for properly qualified applicants in the stewardess, reservations and sales fields. And to an increasing degree, the airlines are conducting management training programs for recent college graduates leading to positions in marketing, accounting, operations and economic planning.

THE VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, outstanding scholarship should ever be encouraged. For this reason I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time the essay, "Democracy: What It Means to Me" which was the prize-winning essay from the State of New York in the national contest conducted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. The young author of the essay, Miss Barbara J. Sweeney, I am proud to report is from Bethpage, N.Y., which is in my district.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

(By Barbara Sweeney)

I know not what course others may take, but as for me—Give me Liberty, or Give me Death.

Patrick Henry voiced more than a patriotic slogan, a statesman's pointed phrase when he uttered these words. They were then a profound sentiment—they have become a creed.

Liberty or Death. The phrase is an epitaph to untold numbers; it is the briefest, fullest biography of a patriot. The sacrifice entailed in the words brings to mind noble deeds and nobler deaths.

Yet we tend to overlook the positive meaning behind the creed. Liberty or Death does not so much necessitate Death as it demands Life. Freedom must be lived, for it is the application of liberty to life which is democracy. Democracy is the practical realization of the ringing words of that fiery Virginia statesman.

Americans today must face a radical change in views. We must cease regarding death as our payment in kind of democracy and face the fact that the tax on liberty must be met with life. No one denies that a soldier in Vietnam loves his freedom, but what will he be defending if his neighbor back home refuses to vote. We must live our freedom before we can die for it.

The time to protect our liberty is when we have it. Only when a democracy is strong—when each individual contributes to a more perfect functioning, is freedom safe. Thousands of Americans have never seen a battlefield—how many have never seen a ballot box. Millions will never know the carnage of war—how many will never know the candidates of an election. We may never be called upon to bear arms against an enemy—but we are required each and every day to fight our own apathy.

Democracy is government of and by, as well as for the people. Each voice, each vote is insurance against the fall of freedom, for in a democracy each man and his opinion have value. We govern ourselves and we must express ourselves lest we be governed by the dictates of others.

Let us begin to practice what we preach. America seeks to implant in all men the creed we live by. Let us then truly live by it so that all men may see that we believe the meaning behind Patrick Henry's words . . . Give me liberty and give me life.

Thank you, Mr. Wyler.

FREEDOM VERSUS SECURITY

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, my fellow Montanan, Mr. John W. Mahan, Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board, recently delivered a scholarly speech on the problem of achieving freedom and security in a democratic society. The speech was delivered at the George Washington Birthday celebration at the George Mason Hotel, Tuesday, February 21, 1967. I commend it to my colleagues and under unanimous consent I place the speech at this point in the RECORD:

WASHINGTON DINNER SPEECH

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it was indeed an honor when Sam DeVaughan called and asked me if I would speak at this dinner in memory of the great first President of the United States. The last time I had the privilege of speaking at such a celebration was at a luncheon following the laying of the wreath at the tomb of George Washington in 1959. Little did I think then that eight years hence I would be living in the great Commonwealth of Virginia and working for our Federal Government, which this man so ably helped start and led. It thrills me to be with you to honor this great man who struggled to clarify and strengthen the rights of all men.

As the toastmaster stated, I came from Montana at the call of the President to be chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board of the United States. I should like to spend a few moments with you on a subject that is most important to all of us. It is one which we all should seriously consider. It is how best can we preserve the American way of life—freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assemblage, and the other rights that George Washington and our other forefathers gave us, and at the same time protect the security of the United States?

The matter is truly controversial. I must emphasize that any views that I maintain tonight are personal views. I am not speaking officially or for or on behalf of the Subversive Activities Control Board or any of its members.

We talk about free speech; we talk about national security. When we get a circumstance involving both we sometimes find ourselves trying to talk out of both sides of our mouths at once. This, of course, we must avoid. Either there can be circumstances which make valid restrictions on the complete exercise of free speech or there cannot. It is that simple.

We all know, at the outset, while we are considering freedom and security, that circumstances involving a conflict between individual rights and the national interest are not unique in the law. Not often can cases be decided according to one clearly applicable principle that presents itself without a competing principle. If such were the case, if there were no competing principles, there probably would be no case to decide. Therefore, no law, lawyers and non-lawyers alike, should let his thinking be unduly influenced and his approach unduly affected by the great importance of the competing principles involved in freedom versus security.

There are two aspects of the question of balancing freedom and security. These are, first, *is* there a principle whereby individual freedoms can be balanced away in the interest of national security? And if so, secondly, are the particular circumstances such as to warrant it? I will return to the latter in a moment.

The first amendment freedoms of speech and of the press had their historical antecedents in the old English common law. It was well settled under that law before our Bill of Rights was written that there were and had to be exceptions, and free speech or press did not mean unqualified immunity under all circumstances. The Bill of Rights was not intended to lay down any novel principles of government, but simply to embody certain guarantees and immunities which we had inherited from our English ancestors and which had from time immemorial been subject to well recognized exceptions arriving from the necesssities of the case.

James Madison, the father of our Constitution, a friend and co-worker of the man we honor here today, recognized that national security was one of these exceptions. He wrote in the 40th Federalist paper that security against foreign danger is one of the primitive objects of civil society. "It is an avowed and essential object of the American union." You know, as good Americans, it is well settled that the right to free expression ceases at the point where it leads to real danger to the government, and in addition, that the right to un-impeded expression of views does not apply to un-impeded conduct. In other words, a true danger poised at the security of the United States is such that first amendment rights may be restricted as a matter of law.

Here are some of the evils which the courts have held were a proper subject for legislative action that directly or indirectly resulted in restraint on complete freedom of speech or of the press or an assembly. Lobbyists may be required to register because of the danger that the voice of the people might go unheeded by the Congress due to being drowned out by the voice of special interests groups seeking favorite treatment while masquerading as proponents of the public interest.

Political parties can be required to make disclosure of the sources of their funds to prevent the corrupt use of money to affect elections. The evil aimed at by the non-Communist affidavit clause of the National Labor Relations Act was the obstruction of commerce due to political strikes. Misleading advertising in interstate commerce can be banned. Picketing is free speech plus, and hence can be restricted.

The evils to which these statutes were directed were relatively trivial compared to a circumstance which reasonably can be said to poise a danger to our national independence or security. Thus, calm and reasoned judicial determination, taking into account historical antecedents, the intent of the framers of the Constitution, and established principles of law, including practicality, have recognized circumstances which warrant at least incidental and indirect restraints on first amendment freedoms. The graveness of impairing individual liberties for any reason has been recognized by the fact that the courts have been quite exacting in adjudicating conditions touching first amendment activities. Strict standards have been laid down. The restrictions must be reasonably calculated to effectuate the remedial purposes sought to be accomplished. And the statutory restrictions may not go beyond the bounds permitted to remedies for the matter involved. In a nutshell, the courts look long and hard at the circumstances on each case, and therein lies our main protection.

Communism, with a capital "C", has been the subject of much discussion and legislation since the 1930's. And this has resulted in focusing considerable attention on the problem of individual freedoms of speech and association when national security is involved in the conduct and activities being pursued and which are said to be protected under the first amendment.

In 1950, Congress, after years of intensive study and investigation, found that there exists a world-wide Communist conspiracy which constitutes a clear and present danger to free American institutions and the welfare and security of the United States. Having found this danger to exist, the Congress was faced with what to do about it. The danger, of course, comes from the activities and conduct of real live people. Congress nor any other body does not have a magic wand which can be waved like a magician does and make this type of danger disappear into thin air. Short of a police state under a dictator, the conduct and activities of people can be regulated and controlled only by law.

Some people urged that Congress do nothing about what these people called the supposed or minimal danger so far as the United States was concerned. They said and still say that the remedy from this danger comes from education and contrary argument, and the American people can be counted on to remain loyal to any democratic government truly dedicated to freedom and to justice. Other people took a completely opposite view. They said that the only way to curb or prevent the Communist conspiracy from succeeding in taking over our country was full and total suppression—a law to outlaw communism. These people pointed out to Congress that Congress had a clear and expressed duty on promoting the general welfare, providing for the common defense, preserving the sovereignty of the United States as an independent Nation, and guaranteeing to each State a republican form of government. They also pointed out that the Communist movement operated in a conspiratorial manner, often concealing its true aims and purposes so there was no opportunity to meet the challenge in the arena of public debate. And further, that this international conspiracy was fostered and promoted from a foreign government.

The opposition to the total suppression or outlawry approach also had strong arguments. In brief, they contended that outlawing the particular concept or making mere membership in an unpopular cause a crime per se was clearly unconstitutional, and cited the first amendment privileges of freedom of speech, the press, and assemblage. Further, that this type of action would destroy the very ideals or freedoms which it was designed to preserve.

Congress, after listening to both sides, decided upon a compromise or an in-between approach. The scheme of the statute which Congress enacted was one of disclosure and restriction in the public interest, leaving the Communists free, at least in theory, to speak and write as they wish. The statute was designated the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950. The law was passed, President Truman vetoed the law, and Congress passed the law over the President's veto.

There have been some amendments to the act since its passage. As amended the statute defines three types of communist organizations. The first, called communist-action, covers those organizations which in effect are agents in this country operating for and on behalf of the world-communist movement. I might state at this point that our board has determined that the communist party of the United States is such an organization, and the board's decision has been upheld by the Supreme Court.

The second type of communist organization is termed communist-front. The concept is, as contained in the statute, that people render support to such organizations who would not do so if they knew the true purposes of, and the actual nature of the control and influence exerted upon, such organizations. Part of the statutory concept of a communist-front is that it conceals the facts as to its true character and purpose. There have been a number of cases before our board to unmask and identify organizations which are fronts for the communist party.

The third type of communist organization is termed communist-infiltrated. This covers for the most part labor unions which have been taken over by the communists. Any labor union determined in a proceeding in our board to be of this type is automatically denied the rights and benefits afforded to labor unions under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act.

The Subversive Activities Control Act places various restrictions or disabilities upon communist organizations, their officers and members. There are criminal penalties, with which the Subversive Activities Control Board is not involved, for failure to abide by the restrictions of the statute.

Just as the public has the right to know which organizations and individuals are working for the overthrow of our government, so should the officers and members of any organization so accused have the right to a fair and impartial determination whether the organization is in fact of such type.

The Subversive Activities Control Act guarantees to any organization which the Attorney General of the United States has reason to believe is a communist organization the right to an open public hearing before our board. Our decisions must be made on the basis of oral and documentary evidence adduced at the public hearings and such evidence is subject to full cross-examination. There is an absolute right to judicial review of the determinations of the board in the United States Court of Appeals, and, upon certiorari, by the Supreme Court of the United States.

As I have said, the Subversive Activities Control Act is primarily a disclosure statute. Organizations which are determined to be communist-action or communist-front must register with the Attorney General. They must thereafter submit annual reports giving, among other things, the names and last addresses of their officers, and an accounting of money they have received and expended.

There is a provision of the statute under which our board determined in quite a number of cases that particular persons were members of the Communist Party of the United States and required to register as such. This provision was held a year or so ago by the Supreme Court to violate the members' fifth amendment privilege against self-incrimination. Amendments of the act are being prepared so as to provide for disclosing members of Communist-action organizations, such as the Communist Party, within the legal requirements as enunciated by the Supreme Court.

There are other respects in which the act should be amended in the light of experience and court decisions. I hope that each of you will lend your support to such amendments. I am not quarreling with the court decisions. While lawyers sometimes disagree that the law is as stated by a court, once a valid decision has been made we must respect the law as so construed or interpreted. Any amendments of the act are designed to fit the provisions to the laws as laid down by the courts.

Respect for the law means an unquestioning obedience to its mandates. It does not mean, however, using one provision as a means for destroying the entire contents. There are forces within our country that behind a facade of righteousness would foment dissension among us. They at times appeal to prejudices in the hope of influencing unfairly your action.

It is your duty and mine, as Americans, to defend the Constitution of the United States from its enemies within this country as well as from its enemies abroad. As we are gathered here now, some 235 years after the birth of George Washington, what are the circumstances in which we find ourselves?

We see American forces in South Vietnam fighting, dying, being disabled for life to stop Communist aggression in that part of the world. We see beatniks in the streets of America burning draft cards while their brothers are sacrificing so much far away from home. We see riots and disorder.

We see efforts being made to use the first amendment as a shield behind which to instigate actions aimed at destroying us. The courts have likened Communist-front organizations to a person in a mask, or a man with a false beard. The courts have ruled, and I certainly agree, that the first amendment does not prevent removing the mask or false beard. Preservation of our national security requires that we look behind this shield to see who is there and what their true purposes are. This is what the subversive activities control act is aimed at accomplishing.

In conclusion, I believe it is your job and mine to see to it that the rights and freedoms we have acquired through the wisdom of George Washington and his contemporaries shall continue to our children and to theirs, with the preservation of our country and its security inviolate. Thank you.

BENEFICIAL EFFECTS OF PROGRAMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. Kyros] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Administration is a small Government agency. What it lacks in size, it makes up in vigor, and I am convinced that the beneficial effects of its programs on the Nation's economy are greater than many people may realize.

Since its inception in 1953 the Small Business Administration has made some 64,000 loans totaling approximately $3 billion to aid small firms with their long-term financing problems.

One way SBA encourages banks to make these loans is under its loan-guaranty plan. With this plan, SBA guarantees up to 90 percent of a loan, up to its statutory limit of $350,000 for any one borrower.

A bank making an SBA guaranteed loan uses its own funds. Government funds are required only in the few cases where a loan is in default, and the bank calls upon the Government guarantee.

Mr. Speaker, last year in my home State of Maine, the Small Business Administration approved 47 business loans totaling $1.5 million. Permit me to cite one example of SBA loan assistance:

In 1963 the SBA made a bank-participation loan of $10,000 to George E. Bowley and Fred Fillinger, Jr., who are partners in a small lathing and plastering contracting firm. The loan was used for working capital to expand operations. The business made steady progress and 2 years later the original loan was refunded and a new $25,000 bank-participation loan was approved.

This firm has been able to increase its employment from six to 50. The wages it pays its employees have increased fourfold, and its sales have shown a like increase.

I call this example to your attention as an illustration of the manner in which the Small Business Administration works with the commercial banks in Maine to help keep small business alive and prosperous.

ASSIGNMENT OF ROOMS, HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members, I include an action recently taken by the House Office Building Commission:

Assignment of Rooms, House Office Buildings

In connection with assignment of rooms to Members of the House of Representatives in the House Office Buildings, 40 U.S.C. 178 provides, in part, as follows:

"If two or more requests are made for the same vacant room, preference shall be given to the Representative making the request who has been longest in continuous service as a Member and Member-elect of the House of Representatives."

The question was raised before the House Office Building Commission as to whether the wording "longest continuous service" should refer to any period of continuous service whether or not such continuous service occurred before or after a break in service in the House.

At meeting of February 27, 1967, the House Office Building Commission unanimously ruled on this point, as follows:

"The term 'longest continuous service' as used in 40 U.S.C. 178, governing seniority in assignment of rooms in the House Office Buildings, is held to refer to the longest period of uninterrupted service as a Member and Member-elect of the House of Representatives (not necessarily the last period of uninterrupted service as held in Cannon's Precedents, Vol. 8, Page 981, Sec. 3651)."

This ruling is effective February 27, 1967 and is being submitted as a matter of record for the information of all Members of the House of Representatives.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on Texas Independence Day. I make this request at the request of Mr. Gonzalez.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Resnick (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today through March 10, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Saylor (at the request of Mr. Gude), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Ashbrook (at the request of Mr. Gude), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Pucinski, for 30 minutes on Tuesday, March 7; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Whitener, for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Hall in one instance and to include an exchange of correspondence and extraneous matter.

Mr. Hall to include a quotation in his remarks during his colloquy with Mr. Reuss on the bill H.R. 4515. Also following remarks of Mr. Reuss during that colloquy to insert an article entitled "Geneva, 1954, the Broken Mold."

Mr. Jones of Missouri (at the request of Mr. Stuckey) to include extraneous material in his remarks made in Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. St. Onge.

Mr. Mahon.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Gude) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Bow.

Mr. Bell.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Stuckey) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Rosenthal.

Mr. William D. Ford.

Mr. Brooks.

Mrs. Sullivan.

Mr. Fraser.

Mr. Pickle.

Mr. Eilberg in two instances.

Mr. Wolff.

Mr. Hagan.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 6, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

473. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of disposal of excess military property in Turkey, Department of State, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

474. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1966, Tennessee Valley Authority (H. Doc. No. 72); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

475. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

476. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Youth Corrections Act by changing the terms for commitment thereunder in certain instances, to permit the use of examiners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

477. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation in certain cases, as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

478. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation in certain cases, as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

479. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission, transmitting the 50th Annual Report of the Commission, pursuant to the provisions of section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

480. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the grade in which certain members of the Armed Forces are discharged or retired; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3799. A bill for the relief of the city of Pawtucket, R.I.; with amendment (Rept. No. 32). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 6470. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 6471. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, in order to increase by 20 percent the income limitations imposed by that chapter on persons entitled to pensions thereunder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 6472. A bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 6473. A bill to permit an individual to obtain coverage under title II of the Social Security Act on the basis of service which was not covered employment at the time it was performed, if service of that type has since become covered employment and such individual makes payment of the applicable social security taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 6474. A bill to amend the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to increase from $200 million to $500 million the amount of the annual appropriations authorized thereunder for grants for basic water and sewer facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6475. A bill to provide additional authority to the Secretary of the Interior for land acquisition in the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6476. A bill to provide full and fair disclosure of the nature of interests in real estate subdivisions sold through the mails and instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce, and to prevent frauds in the sale thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6477. A bill to provide for a nationally uniform system of automobile registration; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6478. A bill to establish a Federal Motor Vehicle Insurance Guarantee Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6479. A bill to protect consumers, homebuilders, building material suppliers, lumber manufacturers, and others against false grade markings of lumber, to promote interstate commerce in lumber, to strengthen the standards program of the lumber industry, and to promote the general welfare; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6480. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6481. A bill to designate Columbus Day, the 12th day of October in each year, a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6482. A bill to provide compensation to survivors of local law enforcement officers killed while apprehending persons for committing Federal crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6483. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of unsolicited sample drug products and other potentially harmful items, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6484. A bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative stamp honoring Dr. Enrico Fermi, the developer of the atomic energy reactor; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6485. A bill to require Members of Congress, their spouses, and certain other related persons, and all employees of the Congress to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealing in real estate, securities, and commodities; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 6486. A bill to establish legislative standards for the guidance of Members of Congress and to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress thereby; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 6487. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 6488. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to improve and expand the authority to conduct or assist research relating to air pollutants, to assist in the establishment of regional air quality commissions, to authorize establishment of standards applicable to emissions from establishments engaged in certain types of industry, to assist in establishment and maintenance of State programs for annual inspections of automobile emission control devices, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the investment tax credit with respect to air pollution control facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 6489. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 6490. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 6491. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to broaden the veterans' educational assistance program under that title to include certain flight training programs not creditable toward a standard college degree; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 6492. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 6493. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 6494. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 6495. A bill to authorize the establishment of a National Nuclear Museum; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 6496. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the transfer of tobacco acreage allotments and acreage-poundage quotas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 6497. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 6498. A bill concerning welfare and pension plans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 6499. A bill to establish standards of conduct for agency hearing proceedings of record; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 6500. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 6501. A bill to establish a National Institute of Criminal Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 6502. A bill to protect the civilian employees of the executive branch of the Government in the enjoyment of their constitutional rights and to prevent unwarranted governmental invasions of their privacy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 6503. A bill to provide for a more equitable and effective Selective Service System by amending the Universal Military Training and Service Act to nationalize standards of deferment and classification, to shorten the period of draft eligibility, to improve procedures for appeal, to change priorities for induction by age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 6504. A bill to restore non-service-connected veterans pensions which have been reduced or eliminated because of the receipt of increased social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6505. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6506. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 62 to 50 the age at which widows' benefits become payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6507. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction in disability insurance benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 6508. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the transfer of tobacco acreage allotments and acreage-poundage quotas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 6509. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Plymouth Rock National Memorial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 6510. A bill to amend section 704 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, wear, or reproduction of military insignias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 6511. A bill to make certain reclamation project expenses nonreimbursable; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 6512. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior in cooperation with the States to preserve, protect, develop, restore, and make accessible estuarine areas of the Nation which are valuable for sport and commercial fishing, wildlife conservation, recreation, and scenic beauty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 6513. A bill to amend the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 relating to donation of surplus property to permit the donation of such property to children's homes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 6514. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the rates of pension payable to certain veterans and their widows, to provide additional readjustment assistance for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 6515. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide additional group life insurance and accidental death and dismemberment insurance for Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6516. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to the determination of average pay for retirement purposes and the computation of retirement annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6517. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide that the entire cost of health benefits under such act shall be paid by the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6518. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6519. A bill to reclassify certain key positions and increase salaries in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6520. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6521. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide a new system of overtime compensation for postal field service employees, to eliminate compensatory time in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.R. 6522. A bill to postpone the application of daylight-saving provisions of the Uniform Time Act of 1966 in certain States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 6523. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TAFT:

H.R. 6524. A bill to repeal the suspension of the investment credit and of the allowance of accelerated depreciation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 6525. A bill to modify the proposed work of improvement on the Atchafalaya River, Morgan City to the Gulf of Mexico, La., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 6526. A bill to authorize project grants for construction and modernization of hospitals and other medical facilities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 6527. A bill to amend title 12, District of Columbia Code, to provide a limitation of actions for actions arising out of death or injury caused by a defective or unsafe improvement to real property; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 6528. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish and administer a plan to provide for the care and protection of children through public day care services, and to provide public assistance in the form of foster home care to certain dependent children; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 6529. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, relating to the power of the Supreme Court to pass on the constitutionality of provisions of State and Federal statutes and of State constitutions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 6530. A bill to amend section 203(b)(5) of the Interstate Commerce Act to clarify this exemption with respect to transportation performed by agricultural cooperative associations for nonmembers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6531. A bill to amend section 212(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6532. A bill to amend section 5(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act to eliminate the requirement for approval of pooling arrangements between motor common carriers of household goods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6533. A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission, after investigation and hearing, to require the establishment of through routes and joint rates between motor common carriers of property, and between such carriers and common carriers by rail, express, and water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6534. A bill to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6535. A bill to amend section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act to eliminate certain valuation requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6536. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to authorize exemption from the provisions of such part, services and transportation of such nature, character, or quantity as to not substantially impair effective regulation by the Commission, be unjustly discriminatory, or be detrimental to commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6537. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to utilize its employees more effectively and to improve administrative efficiency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 6538. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the occupational tax on coin-operated gaming devices for similar new taxes imposed by a State where the operation of such devices is legal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 6539. A bill to permit either House of Congress to disapprove certain rules proposed by executive agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 6540. A bill to amend section 521 of title 38, United States Code, to exclude from consideration as income, for the purpose of determining eligibility for pension, all payments of any kind or from any source, including salary, retirement or annuity payments, endowments or similar income, which a veteran receives or is entitled to receive after attaining age 72; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6541. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the rates of pension payable to certain veterans and their widows, to increase the income limitations applicable to the payment of certain pensions, to provide readjustment assistance for veterans of the Vietnam era, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 6542. A bill to establish a National Institute of Criminal Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 6543. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the use of contributions made to Members of Congress for personal purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 6544. A bill to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 6545. A bill to appropriate funds for the upper part of Wilmington Harbor, N.C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 6546. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 6547. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, in order to make unlawful as unreasonable and unjust discrimination against and undue burden upon interstate commerce, certain property tax assessments of common carrier property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 6548. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce, without unduly burdening such commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6549. A bill to provide that the National Bureau of Standards shall conduct a program of investigation, research, and survey to determine the practicability of the adoption by the United States of the metric system of weights and measures; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 6550. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 6551. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to authorize the Federal Power Commission to prescribe safety requirements for natural gas companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 6552. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 6553. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 6554. A bill to protect the safety and welfare of American workers by providing for a uniform system of identification for all receptacles containing compressed gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 6555. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide military personnel with the right to legal counsel under the Uniform Code of Military Justice in all cases of a general court-martial or a special court-martial and to require that military personnel accused or suspected of an offense must be apprised of their right to legal counsel before being interrogated or requested to make a statement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6556. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland:

H.R. 6557. A bill to provide for a more effective and equitable draft system by amending the Universal Military Training and Service Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 6558. A bill to consider children living in federally assisted public housing as federally connected children for purposes of educational assistance to federally impacted areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 6559. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 6560. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 6561. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment to an individual for the charges made by physicians and other persons providing services covered by the supplementary medical insurance program prior to such individual's own payment of the bill for the services involved; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.J. Res. 380. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim April 9, 1967, as Bataan-Corregidor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 381. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.J. Res. 382. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.J. Res. 383. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.J. Res. 384. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the power of the Supreme Court to pass on the constitutionality of certain provisions of State and Federal statutes and of State constitutions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.J. Res. 385. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim April 9, 1967, as Bataan-Corregidor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.J. Res. 386. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.J. Res. 387. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution with respect to the authority of the House of Representatives to exclude certain individuals from being seated therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.J. Res. 388. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H. Con. Res. 251. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to create the Roanoke Island Memorial Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H. Con. Res. 252. Concurrent resolution expressing the support of the Congress for the South Vietnamese Constituent Assembly; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GROVER:

H. Con. Res. 253. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing as a House document of the southeast Asia briefing map prepared by the United States Army Map Service; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KARTH:

H. Con. Res. 254. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain proposed regulations of the Food and Drug Administration relating to the labeling and content of diet foods and diet supplements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H. Con. Res. 255. Concurrent resolution expressing the support of the Congress for the South Vietnam Constituent Assembly; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H. Res. 355. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the effects of military operations in South Vietnam on the civilian population of South Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 356. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct full and complete investigations and studies of all matters within its jurisdiction under the rules of the House or the laws of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H. Res. 357. Resolution to authorize a study by the Committee on Banking and Currency with respect to the effectiveness of present law in protecting U.S. trade and business against restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H. Res. 358. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct an investigation and study of certain overseas activities; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H. Res. 359. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H. Res. 360. Resolution to extend the congratulations of the House of Representatives to the people of Puerto Rico on their 50th anniversary of U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H. Res. 361. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

43. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to the sale of wheat and other surplus agriculture commodities by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

44. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to the establishment of an adequate and permanent national cemetery system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

45. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to changing the period for daylight saving time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 6562. A bill for the relief of Theofanis Koystiaftis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 6563. A bill to require, in the alternative, delivery and return of property of the estate of John F. Hackfeld, deceased, vested by the Alien Property Custodian, on the basis of ownership by an enemy alien, or the repayment of income and estate taxes to said estate, collected on the basis of American citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6564. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the District of Hawaii to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Christel Guessefeldt, a natural-born American citizen, executrix and sole heir of her father, Richard Guessefeldt, late a resident of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 6565. A bill for the relief of Florentina S. Mallari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 6566. A bill for the relief of Maria del Carmen Corbo Mattos de Bernadet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6567. A bill for the relief of Francesco Fiordilino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6568. A bill for the relief of Marjorie Cynthia George; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 6569. A bill for the relief of Frank P. Arp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 6570. A bill for the relief of Manuel Lopez Pedroza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 6571. A bill to adjust the status of an alien who is in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 6572. A bill for the relief of Phillip G. Duffy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 6573. A bill for the relief of Angel Vilar Giner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 6574. A bill for the relief of Chaim Zvi Guttman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6575. A bill for the relief of Lenford A. Rowe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 6576. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Maria Baldini Dela Rosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6577. A bill for the relief of Sumio Yasutake; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 6578. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pascual B. Herrera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland:

H.R. 6579. A bill to compensate Demetrio Sarsfield Salazar for services rendered to the United States and its citizens during World War II; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 6580. A bill for the relief of Cho

Chung Foo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 6581. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Giglio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 6582. A bill for the relief of Mobile Structures, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 6583. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sutcharit Bhamornbutr and his wife, Yamlaor Bhamornbutr, and their children, Khacha, Naree, Pom and Prach Bhamornbutr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 6584. A bill for the relief of Juanita Cecile Sawyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 6585. A bill for the relief of Gholamali Homayoun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 2, 1967

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

Rev. Paul B. McCleave, D.D., Presbyterian, and director of the Department of Medicine and Religion of the American Medical Association, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everlasting God, Father and creator of us all; we humble ourselves before Thee and to the responsibilities which are ours in these days. We beseech Thee to look with favor upon Thy servants, the President of our free land, the Members of this Senate, and all others in authority. Imbue them with the spirit of wisdom, goodness, and truth; and so rule their hearts, and bless their endeavors, that law and order, justice and peace may everywhere prevail.

Almighty God, the refuge of all them that seek Thee, we turn to Thee in this time of troubled minds and hearts. Direct the course of this world, we humbly beseech Thee, in accordance with Thy holy will; take away whatsoever hinders the nations from amity and concord; prosper all counsels which make for a rightful and abiding peace.

Father in heaven, whether it be Thy will to give or to withhold the things that we ask, grant that this our prayer may continually draw our hearts nearer to Thee. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., March 2, 1967.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 1, 1967, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Ramsey Clark, of Texas, to be Attorney General;

Edward E. Davis, of Arizona, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Arizona;

William M. Byrne, Jr., of California, to be U.S. attorney for the central district of California;

Edward P. Gallogly, of Rhode Island, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Rhode Island;

Elmer J. Hardegree, of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Georgia; and

William F. Malchow, of Minnesota, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Minnesota.

By Mr. BURDICK, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Lindley G. Beckworth, of Texas, to be judge of the U.S. customs court;

Joseph C. Waddy, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia;

Frank G. Theis, of Kansas, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Kansas;

James A. Comiskey, of Louisiana, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana;

Myron L. Gordon, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin; and

Luke C. Moore, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. marshal for the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Paul F. Markham, of Massachusetts, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Massachusetts.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the executive calendar will be stated.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Federal Aviation Administration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of Transportation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—COAST GUARD AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard and the Environmental Science Services Administration which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? If not, the nominations are considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

SUMMIT MEETING AT PUNTA DEL ESTE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, according to a recent announcement, the long-awaited summit meeting of the heads of American states will take place from April 12 through 14 at Punta del Este, Uruguay. It will be the first such top-level gathering since the Eisenhower administration and, of course, the first one since the inauguration of the Alliance for Progress.

May I say that I am delighted with this development. A great deal has happened in recent years which demands the closest attention of hemispheric leaders. As is too often the case, needs close to home take a back seat because the crisis of the moment is occurring elsewhere in the world. But needs left unfulfilled have a way of growing into the crises of tomorrow. In recognition of this fact, President Johnson, echoing a call from former Argentine President Arturo Illia, proposed a high-level review of problems of mutual interest in April of last year. It is symbolic that he made the proposal while in Mexico on his first formal visit to Latin America as President.

It is my understanding that the recent foreign ministers' meeting in Buenos Aires, which had as its aim the making of last-minute preparations for the April conference, went very smoothly. This is heartening news and should increase the likelihood that substantial agreement on hemispheric problems can be reached at Punta del Este. I certainly hope so.

The problems of Latin America are many, but they can be overcome if communications remain open and the member nations of the OAS make teamwork their No. 1 priority.

In this connection, Mr. President, I note with some concern reports in the press that some heads of state may not attend the conference if individual items of importance to their countries are not included in the agenda. It would be my hope, of course, that the agenda as finally drawn will give the widest possible interplay to worthy ideas and proposals. If, however, items are omitted for any reason, it would likewise be my hope that all Presidents will find it to their country's advantage to attend. Those items remaining on the agenda will still affect every nation. And, given the personal nature of diplomacy, I should think that those who do not attend will miss a golden opportunity to meet their counterparts, take their measure of them, and explain their grievances to each in an informal manner.

The recent success of Latin American leaders on Mexico's initiative, in declaring their region a nuclear-free zone is proof that results can be achieved through unity of purpose. The same unity must be maintained if they, in concert with the United States, are going to make a dent in their problems. Total agricultural output in Latin America actually declined in 1966 under the 1965 levels. The population continues to grow and, if current rates prevail, will double in 25 years. Skilled labor, so essential to any permanent solution, continues to emigrate at an alarming rate. A disproportionate share of some economies still goes into armaments.

There are encouraging signs that hemispheric leaders are viewing these problems with greater realism. If so, meritorious projects like greater economic integration through common markets, and a broadening of assistance through multilateral channels can have a significant impact. If not, no amount of "summitry" can repair decades of neglect.

I am confident that President Johnson will make every effort consistent with this Nation's vital interests and current obligations to assure a successful summit meeting. I would hope that all Presidents will enter into the negotiations in a similar spirit and make the Conference a success.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF U.S. CITIZENSHIP OF THE PEOPLE OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Senate Resolution 86, No. 62 on the calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 86) to extend the congratulations of the Congress to the people of Puerto Rico on their 50th anniversary of U.S. citizenship.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, today, March 2, is the anniversary of a most historic occasion in the history of our relations with Puerto Rico and with Latin America as a whole. On this day 50 years ago, March 2, 1917, the Jones Act, Public Law 368, 64th Congress, became law.

This act extended American citizenship to all of the inhabitants of Puerto Rico who wished it. So great has been the progress, economic, political, and social, of this Latin American part of the United States in the half century since enactment of the Jones Act that on February 27 I introduced a resolution commemorating the event and extending, officially, the congratulations of the Congress to the people of Puerto Rico.

This is Senate Resolution 86, and today, the anniversary date, is the appropriate day to consider it.

Mr. President, it will be recalled that Puerto Rico came under the American flag in 1899 as a result of our war with Spain. American troops had landed in force on the island as a part of our military action in the Caribbean. Puerto Rico—then known as "Porto Rico"—was formally ceded to the United States by the Treaty of Paris, the second paragraph of article IX of which provided that the Congress should determine "the civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants" of the areas ceded.

On March 2, 1917, the Jones Act was enacted as a milestone in the fulfillment of that obligation by the Congress.

In addition to giving full American citizenship to those that wished—no one was required to abandon his allegiance and loyalties—the Jones Act also provided a bill of rights and established a civil government with very substantial powers of local self-government.

Still another legislative milestone was passed in 1948 with the enactment of the elective Governor bill, and then in 1950 the 81st Congress approved Public Law 600, which is the foundation of the present Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. It will be recalled that the constitution of the Commonwealth was approved on July 3, 1952, by the 82d Congress.

Mr. President, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which under the Legislative Reorganization Act, has had initial responsibility for legislation generally affecting Puerto Rico, finds that the history of the relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico and the present state of economic and political attainment of the people of Puerto Rico bear eloquent witness to the wisdom and statesmanship of the Members of the 64th Congress in enacting the Jones Act. The committee members unanimously urge that the Senate promptly give formal recognition to the 50th anniversary of that occasion by adopting Senate Resolution 86.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 86

Resolved, That the Congress hereby extends to the people of Puerto Rico its congratulations on their fiftieth anniversary of United States citizenship.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, with respect to Senate Resolution 86, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the resolution was agreed to be reconsidered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I send to the desk an amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The Assistant Legislative Clerk. In line 1, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, it is proposed to strike out "Congress" and insert "Senate".

Mr. CARLSON. As I understand the majority leader, this amendment merely changes the word "Congress" to "Senate" since it is only a Senate resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. It is a typographical error which is being corrected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 59), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Background of Resolution

As the text of Senate Resolution 86 sets forth, American citizenship was granted in 1917 to all inhabitants of Puerto Rico who wished it. In the half century since that historic occasion, Puerto Rico has made tremendous progress economically, politically, and socially. Every American everywhere has just cause for pride in the attainments of our nearly 3 million fellow citizens of the island.

It will be recalled that Puerto Rico came under the American flag as a result of our war with Spain. American troops had landed in force on the island as a part of our military action in the Caribbean. Puerto Rico—then known as "Porto Rico"—was formally ceded to the United States by the Treaty of Paris, the second paragraph of article IX of which provided that the Congress should determine "the civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants" of the areas ceded.

The act of March 2, 1917, known as the Jones Act, was a cornerstone in the fulfillment of that obligation by the Congress.

In addition to giving full American citizenship to those that wished—no one was required to abandon his allegiance and loyalties—the Jones Act also provided a bill of rights and established a civil government with very substantial powers of local self-government.

Still another legislative milestone was passed in 1948 with the enactment of the elective governor bill, and then in 1950 the 81st Congress approved Public Law 600 which is the foundation of the present Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. It will be recalled that the constitution of the Commonwealth was approved on July 3, 1952, by the 82d Congress.

CONCLUSION

The committee finds that the history of the relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico and the present state of economic and political attainment of the people of Puerto Rico bear eloquent witness to the wisdom and statesmanship of the Members of the 64th Congress in enacting the Jones Act extending American citizenship to Puerto Rico. Its members unanimously urge that this Congress promptly give formal recognition to the 50th anniversary of that occasion by adopting Senate Resolution 86.

The preamble was agreed to.

The title was amended, so as to read: "Resolution to extend the congratulations of the Senate to the people of Puerto Rico on their fiftieth anniversary of United States citizenship".

A FIRST LADY HELPS ANOTHER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in reading the Evening Star for Monday, February 27, 1967, I noted a most interesting article entitled "A First Lady Helps Another." It is concerned with a gift of 16 sets of playground equipment which the First Lady of Mexico, Mrs. Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, is presenting to Mrs. Lyndon Johnson, to help our First Lady in the beautification program in which she has shown such a great interest.

As stated in the article:

> Designed and manufactured in Mexico, the 16 sets, with 16 units each, include climbing devices shaped like a guitar, a barge representing Mexico's Xochimilco Gardens, an Indian, a cactus, and animals.

These items will be presented to the various playgrounds in the District of Columbia on March 8 by Mexico's outstanding Ambassador to this country, the Honorable Hugo B. Margain, and there will be a ceremony at that time at Hains Point.

Mr. President, to me this is the kind of assistance which contributes immensely to bringing relief to some of our underprivileged children. It is also an indication of a fine and firm friendship between the First Ladies of the United Mexican States and the United States of America.

Speaking on behalf of the Senate, we are delighted by this show of amity, and we extend our best wishes and thanks to Mrs. Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, the First Lady of the United Mexican States, for the interest she has shown and the understanding she has exhibited.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 27, 1967]

MEXICO'S GIFT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: FIRST LADY HELPS ANOTHER

(By Roberta Hornig)

Washington is getting a gift of 16 sets of playground equipment because a First Lady—Mrs. Gustavo Diaz Ordaz of Mexico—wants to help Mrs. Lyndon Johnson's beautification program.

The Mexican playground sets will be installed at several of the city's parks, schools and public playgrounds and at Junior Village, the White House announced yesterday.

Designed and manufactured in Mexico, the 16 sets, with 16 units each, include climbing devices shaped like a guitar, a barge representing Mexico's Xochimilco Gardens, an Indian, a cactus, and animals.

Mexican Ambassador Hugo B. Margain will officially present the first set of equipment to Mrs. Johnson at a ceremony March 8 at Hains Point, one of the playground sites.

Seven sets will go to District schools—Walker-Jones, Rutherford B. Hayes, Emma B. C. Merritt, Dr. Richard Kingsman, Strong John Thomson, Slater Langston and Anita J. Turner—and five to the following city park plots:

At 1st Street and Florida Avenue NW; Potomac Avenue, K and 12th Streets SE; F and 2nd Streets and New Jersey Avenue SE; 9th Street and Illinois Avenue NW; and Vermont Avenue at 10th Street NW.

Two sets have not been designated for specific sites as yet. The gift is a result of President and Mrs. Johnson's trip to Mexico. While there, Mrs. Johnson saw playground equipment in Chapultepec Park and was impressed because it was functional and gay.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS TO NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE RELATING TO GRADE IN WHICH CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES ARE DISCHARGED OR RETIRED

A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the grade in which certain members of the Armed Forces are discharged or retired (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, and the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reduce crime and improve criminal procedures in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE FEDERAL HOSPITAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND

A letter from the Acting Managing Trustee of the Trust Fund and members of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE AND DISABILITY INSURANCE TRUST FUNDS

A letter from the Acting Managing Trustee of the Trust Fund and members of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Disability Insurance Trust Funds, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1966, Tennessee Valley Authority, dated February, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of distribution of Government-donated food commodities in selected counties in Pennsylvania, Consumer and Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, dated February 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the sale of federally owned electric power and salt water distillation facilities to the government of the Virgin Islands, Virgin Islands Corporation, Department of the Interior, General Services Administration, dated February 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXEMPTIONS FROM THE ANTITRUST LAWS TO ASSIST IN SAFEGUARDING THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on exemptions from the antitrust laws to assist in safeguarding the balance-of-payments position of the United States, dated January 1, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF IOWA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HICKENLOOPER presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9

Whereas, the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 and other federal statutes, created and established a program for the construction of a system of interstate and defense highways, and federal-aid primary and secondary highways with urban extensions in the state of Iowa and the several states of the nation; and

Whereas, the federal statutes have defined the sources of revenue and have dedicated the funds exclusively for the timely and orderly development of the highway system; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States, under the Highway Act of 1956, as amended, has specified that these funds shall be distributed; and

Whereas, for the past decade the federal government has urged the state of Iowa and this state's highway industry to step up construction, and Iowa has been most cooperative in this regard as is evidenced not only by the accelerated highway program but also by the training and establishment of a skilled work force, and by the large, long-term capital investments undertaken by contractors, subcontractors and material suppliers to meet this commitment; and

Whereas, the construction team of working men and equipment, of professional engineers and contractors, once developed and operating efficiently, cannot be sustained if the financing becomes spasmodic and unreliable; and

Whereas, it has been definitely demonstrated in Iowa that better highways save the time, lives and money of our citizens, and that the consequences of a reduction in highway improvements would adversely affect the well-being of our citizens and cause further suffering and tragic loss of lives; and

Whereas, the orderly development of these modern highway systems is essential to preserve the national defense by providing the means of moving expeditiously the critical weapons, materials and personnel, and of coping with the aftermath of natural disaster or nuclear attack; and

Whereas, the rapid and convenient transportation of field crops, dairy and food products, livestock, lumber and minerals from the farms, ranches, mines and mills to distant consumer markets is essential to preserve these basic industries in the state of Iowa, and to expedite the flow of commerce between the states.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the Sixty-second General Assembly of the state of Iowa, now in session, the Senate and House of Representatives concurring, that we respectfully petition the President of the United States, although justifiably concerned with the inflationary trends developing throughout the nation, to reconsider his decision to cut back on this most vital and necessary federal-aid highway program which, if not continued in an orderly fashion, will have lasting adverse effects upon the national defense and the economic stability of the state of Iowa and the several states.

Be it further resolved, that the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the state of Iowa be hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this Resolution to the President of the United States, to each member of the Iowa congressional delegation and to the leadership of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

We, Maurice E. Baringer, Speaker of the House of Iowa, and William R. Kendrick, Chief Clerk of the House, hereby certify that the above and foregoing Resolution was adopted by the House and Senate of the Sixty-second General Assembly.

William R. Kendrick,
Chief Clerk of the House.
Maurice E. Baringer,
Speaker of the House.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 4. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim "National CARIH Asthma Week" (Rept. No. 60).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 1150. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for expansion and development of social work manpower training; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ribicoff when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1151. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kyung Hye Suh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 1152. A bill to establish a Department of Education; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ribicoff when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 1153. A bill to amend title 35 of the United States Code, "Patents," and the Trademark Act of July 5, 1946, as amended, with respect to appeals in patent and trademark cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McClellan when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and Mr. Scott):

S. 1154. A bill to amend the act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McClellan when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1155. A bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, to shorten the name of the Bank, to extend for 5 years the period within which the Bank is authorized to exercise its functions, to increase the Bank's lending authority and its authority to issue, against fractional reserves, export credit insurance and guarantees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Sparkman when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 1156. A bill to provide for the financing of the operations of the Bureau of the Mint, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Proxmire when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 1157. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the excused absence from duty, without loss of pay or reduction in annual or sick leave, of Federal employees in areas covered by official warnings of imminent danger of hurricanes or other inherently dangerous weather conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1158. A bill to amend section 7902 of title 5 of the United States Code so as to provide for the establishment of a Federal employees accident prevention program; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Brewster when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 1159. A bill to authorize (1) a transfer of credit between the Foreign Service retirement and disability system and the social security system and (2) social security minimum benefits for Foreign Service annuitants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1160. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. Jackson):

S. 1161. A bill to establish the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Historic Site, in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Cooper when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. Morton, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Byrd of West Virginia):

S. 1162. A bill to change the name of the "Greenup Locks and Dam," Ohio River, Ky., to the "Paul G. Blazer Locks and Dam"; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Cooper when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1163. A bill for the relief of Frank J. Kreysa; and

S. 1164. A bill for the relief of Rollo Oskey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and Mr. Mondale):

S. 1165. A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Indians on behalf of the Mississippi Bands and the Pillager and Lake Winnibigoshish Bands of Chippewa Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXPANSION AND DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIAL WORK MANPOWER TRAINING

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the profession of social work is very new, compared to most other professions. But a social worker, like a physician, a lawyer, or a teacher has mastered a body of knowledge which enables him to perform services that society needs.

Social workers have become essential to many of our most important institutions: schools, hospitals, churches, courts and correctional institutions, public and voluntary health and welfare agencies. Even industries, housing developments, and other private enterprises are employing social workers.

The demand for social work services has already far outgrown the supply of professionals that the Nation's graduate schools of social work can produce. It is increasing at a rate that is reaching crisis proportions.

For example, public welfare agencies do not even expect to have professional workers to deal with child abuse, family breakdown, dependency, and other serious social problems which come to their attention. They employ caseworkers who have learned the rudiments of dealing with social ills in undergraduate courses taught by social workers, hoping to give further professional training and supervision on the job.

But at present, most undergraduate colleges and universities do not offer any courses in social work, and public agencies cannot get enough professional social workers to fill even their key jobs. Other social worker employers are in the same position.

There is a great deal of work underway aimed to use social work services more efficiently—so that each professional social worker could serve more people in less time. Nevertheless, a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare task force has estimated that 100,000 more social workers will be needed by 1975.

The schools of social work have been making a valiant effort to meet the social work shortage. In 1964, there were 59 schools of social work with an enrollment of 7,196 students. By 1966, there were 63 schools with an enrollment of 9,226 full-time students and 2,696 part-time students. Eight additional universities have plans for schools of social work underway.

At this rate, however, it is obvious that we will never catch up with existing, let alone future, demand. Something has to be done. We cannot rely upon existing Federal measures for the support of social work education—extensive though they are—to do a job of this proportion. What is needed is seed money, which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare can use with care. This seed money would help present schools to expand enrollment, help develop new schools in regions of the Nation where there are now none, and help set up undergraduate courses in many colleges and universities. Then there would be a manpower reservoir which agencies could draw upon to fill rank-and-file jobs and from which schools could recruit candidates for professional training.

It is with these needs in mind that I am introducing the Social Work Manpower and Training Act of 1967. My bill would amend title VII of the Social Security Act by adding a new section 707. It would authorize an appropriation of $5 million for fiscal year 1968—and for each year thereafter such sums as Congress may determine—for grants by the Secretary of HEW to public and other nonprofit college and universities and to accredited graduate schools of social work, or an association of such schools, to meet part of the cost of development, expansion, or improvement of graduate and undergraduate training of social work personnel, including the costs of compensation of additional faculty and administrative personnel and minor improvements of existing facilities.

Mr. President, our Nation's efforts to improve the lot of our less fortunate citizens depend in large measure on the supply of trained, competent social workers. This bill would help assure such a supply. It is badly needed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1150) to amend the Social Security Act to provide for expansion and development of social work manpower training, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1150

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title VII of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"GRANTS FOR EXPANSION AND DEVELOPMENT OF GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

"SEC. 707. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $5,000,000 and for each fiscal year thereafter such sums as the Congress may determine for grants by the Secretary to public or nonprofit private colleges and universities and to accredited graduate schools of social work or an association of such schools to meet part of the costs of development, expansion, or improvement of, respectively, undergraduate programs in social work and programs for the graduate training of professional social work personnel, including the costs of compensation of additional faculty and administrative personnel and minor improvements of existing facilities.

"(b) In considering applications for grants under this section, the Secretary shall take into account the relative need in the States for personnel trained in social work and the effect of the grants thereon.

"(c) Payment of grants under this section may be made (after necessary adjustment on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and on such terms and conditions and in such installments, as the Secretary may determine.

"(d) For purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'graduate school of social work' means a department, school, division, or other administrative unit, in a public or nonprofit private college or university, which provides, primarily or exclusively, a program of education in social work and allied subjects leading to a graduate degree in social work.

"(2) The term 'accredited' as applied to a graduate school of social work means a school which is accredited by a body or bodies approved for the purpose by the Commissioner of Education or with respect to which there is evidence satisfactory to the Secretary that it will be so accredited within a reasonable time.

"(3) The term 'nonprofit' as applied to any college or university means one which is a corporation or association, or is owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations, no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual."

WE SHOULD ESTABLISH A DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, today is the 100th anniversary of the establishment of an independent Office of Education in the Federal Government. This afternoon, President Johnson—a man whose administration has done more for education than any other President in history—will honor the Office of Education at ceremonies commemorating its centennial.

The Office of Education deserves praise. Today it is a far different agency than the office established in 1867. What was formerly a data gathering, statistical operation has become a program agency—administering nearly $2¾ billion a year in various Federal aids to education. The Office continues a tradition of excellent leadership in Commissioner Harold Howe II, and has the great good fortune to be under the outstanding general direction of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John Gardner.

But the fact is that the Office of Education is not the primary education effort of the Federal Government. It is, in fact, only one of 10 Cabinet departments and more than 15 other agencies which support or conduct education, training, or related programs as an integral part of their missions. In a special analysis prepared by the Budget Bureau last year, it was estimated that the Office of Education spends less than one-third of the total Federal funds for education.

I believe that serious consideration must be given to the establishment of a separate Department of Education—not because the Office of Education is not doing its job, but because the job is bigger than the Office of Education. I therefore, introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a Department of Education and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1152) to establish a Department of Education, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1152

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established an executive department which shall be known as the Department of Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Department"). There shall be at the head of the Department a Secretary of Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level I of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule established by the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964. The Department shall be administered under the supervision and direction of the Secretary.

FUNCTION AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The function and purpose of the Department shall be to promote the cause and advancement of education throughout the Nation. To that end the Secretary shall, among his responsibilities, (1) advise the President with respect to the progress of education; (2) develop and recommend to the President appropriate policies and programs to foster the orderly growth and development of the Nation's educational facilities and resources; (3) exercise leadership at the direction of the President in coordinating Federal activities affecting education; (4) conduct continuing comprehensive surveys, collect data, and make available findings, on the progress of education; (5) provide information and such other assistance as may be authorized by the Congress to aid in the maintenance of efficient school systems; and (6) encourage comprehensive planning by the State and local governments with a view to coordinating Federal, State, and community educational activities at the local level.

UNDER SECRETARY AND OTHER OFFICERS

SEC. 3. There shall be in the Department an Under Secretary, four Assistant Secretaries, and a General Counsel, each of whom shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall perform such functions and duties as the Secretary may prescribe. The Under Secretary shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level III of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule established by the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, and the Assistant Secretaries and General Counsel shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level IV of such Schedule. The Under Secretary (or during the absence or disability of the Under Secretary, or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Under Secretary, an Assistant Secretary determined according to such order as the Secretary shall prescribe) shall act as Secretary during the absence or disability of the Secretary or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Secretary.

PROVISIONS OF LAW APPLICABLE TO THE DEPARTMENT

SEC. 4. Except to the extent inconsistent with this Act, all provisions of law applicable to the executive departments generally shall apply to the Department.

SEAL

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department, of such design as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 6. The Secretary may, without being relieved of his responsibility therefor, and unless prohibited by some specific provision of law, perform any function vested in him through or with the aid of such officials or organizational entities of the Department as he may designate.

TRANSFERS TO DEPARTMENT

SEC. 7. (a) The United States Office of Education, together with all of its functions, personnel, property, records, obligations, commitments, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations and other funds (available or to be made available), is hereby transferred to the Department, and all functions of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare being administered through such Office, and all functions of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to such Office, are transferred to the Secretary.

(b) All laws dealing with the relationship between Gallaudet College, Howard University, Freedmen's Hospital, and American Printing House for the Blind, respectively, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are hereby amended to substitute "Secretary of Education" for "Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare," and to substitute "Department of Education" for "Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

(c) Section 394(3) of the Act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television broadcasting facilities to be used for educational purposes (Public Law 87-447) is hereby amended to substitute "Secretary of Education" for "Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare".

(d) Title II, part B, sections 231 and 232, and title III, sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 309 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-415) are hereby amended by transferring from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Secretary of Education all duties and responsibilities contained therein.

(e) The President shall transfer to the Department from other departments, agencies, and intrumentalities of the Federal Government such additional functions relating to education as he determines necessary or appropriate to promote efficiency in Government and to carry out the purposes of this Act. Such transfers shall be completed within one year of the date of enactment.

TRANSFER MATTERS

SEC. 8. All laws relating to any agency or function transferred under this Act shall, insofar as such laws are not inapplicable, remain in full force and effect. Any transfer of personnel pursuant to this Act shall be without change in classification or compensation, except that this requirement shall not operate to prevent the adjustment of classification or compensation to conform to the duties to which such transferred personnel may be assigned. All orders, rules, regulations, permits, or other privileges made, issued, or granted by any agency or in connection with any functions transferred by this Act, and in effect at the time of the transfer, shall continue in effect to the same extent as if such transfer had not occurred, until modified, superseded, or repealed. No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against any agency or any officer of the United States acting in his official capacity shall abate by reason of any transfer made pursuant to this Act, but the court, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within twelve months after such transfer takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, may allow the same to be maintained by or against the appropriate agency or officer of the United States.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 9. The Secretary shall, as soon as practicable after the end of each calendar year, make a report to the President for the submission to the Congress on the activities of the Department during the preceding calendar year. Such report shall also contain objective data on enrollments, expenditures, numbers of teachers, numbers of professionals who lack full qualifications, needs for classroom and other construction, special needs of critical areas such as urban areas, and similar data.

PROHIBITION AGAINST FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION

SEC. 10. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 11. (a) Section 19(d)(1) of the Act of June 25, 1958, is hereby amended by striking out the phrase "Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare" at the end thereof and inserting the following: "Secretary of Health and Welfare, Secretary of Education".

(b) Section 158 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 1) is amended by adding at the end thereof: "Eleventh. The Department of Education." and by amending the phrase "Health, Education, and Welfare" to read "Health and Welfare".

(c) Any reference to the Office of Education or the Commissioner of Education, in any other law, rule, regulation, certificate, directive, instruction, license, or other official paper in force on the effective date of this Act shall be deemed to refer and apply to the Department or the Secretary, as may be appropriate.

(d) Any reference to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in any other law, rule, regulation, certificate, directive, instruction, license, or other official paper in force on the effective date of this Act shall be deemed to refer and apply to the Department of Health and Welfare and the Secretary of Health and Welfare, respectively.

FEDERAL INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

SEC. 12. (a) There is hereby established a Federal Interagency Committee on Education (hereafter referred to as the "Committee").

(b) The Committee shall study and recommend such actions as may be necessary to assure effective coordination of Federal programs affecting education including: (1) development of Federal programs in accordance with the educational goals and policies of the Nation; (2) consistent administration of policies and practices among Federal agencies in the conduct of similar programs; (3) full and effective communication among Federal agencies to avoid unnecessary duplication of activities; (4) adequate procedures for the availability of information on educational matters requested by the Secretary; and (5) full and effective cooperation with the Secretary on such studies and analyses as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(c) The Committee shall, not later than July 1, 1966, advise the President with respect to his responsibilities under subsection (e) of section 7 of this Act.

(d) The Committee shall be composed of the Secretary, who shall be the Chairman, and one appropriate representative of each of the following: the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, the Department of Health and Welfare, the National Science Foundation, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(e) The chairman may invite Federal agencies in addition to those which are represented on the Committee under the provisions of subsection (d) of this section to designate representatives to participate in meetings of the Committee on matters of substantial interest to such agencies which are to be considered by the Committee.

(f) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Director of the Office of Science and Technology may each designate a member of his staff to attend meetings of the Committee as an observer.

(g) Each Federal agency which is represented on the Committee under the provisions of subsection (d), of this section, shall furnish necessary assistance to the Committee in accordance with section 214 of the Act of May 3, 1945, 59 Stat. 134 (31 U.S.C. 691).

EXPENDITURES AUTHORIZED

SEC. 13. The Secretary is authorized to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere, for lawbooks, books of reference and periodicals, and for printing and binding) as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, and as may be provided for by the Congress from time to time.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 14. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the Department to carry out the provisions of this Act and to perform any other duties which may be imposed upon it by law.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 15. The provisions of this Act shall be effective on its date of enactment, except that section 7 shall be effective after ninety days following such date.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 35, UNITED STATES CODE, AND TRADEMARK ACT OF 1946 WITH RESPECT TO APPEALS IN PATENT AND TRADEMARK CASES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 35 of the United States Code, "Patents," and the Trademark Act of 1946 with respect to appeals in patent and trademark cases.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to simplify the procedure in appeals from the Patent Office to the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, mainly by eliminating the existing requirements that the appellant set forth "reasons of appeal" when the appeal is filed. The bill thus seeks to conform the procedure before the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals with that in other Federal courts where the requirement for "assignments of error" has been eliminated.

The bill which I am introducing today is identical to S. 2207, which was passed by the Senate late in the second session of the 89th Congress. No action was taken in the other body. This legislation has received the endorsement of the Judicial Conference of the United States, the Department of Commerce, the American Bar Association, and the American Patent Law Association.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1153) to amend title 35 of the United States Code, "Patents," and the Trademark Act of July 5, 1946, as amended, with respect to appeals in patent and trademark cases, introduced by Mr. McClellan, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

UNFAIR COMPETITION ACT OF 1967

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], the Unfair Competition Act of 1967.

The bill would establish a uniform body of Federal unfair competition law by creating a Federal statutory tort of unfair competition affecting interstate commerce, and by establishing Federal jurisdiction over such tort claims within the framework of the Trademark Act of 1946. The crux of the bill is a revised section 43(a) of the Trademark Act including, in five subsections, those torts generally acknowledged to give rise to the major part of the law of unfair competition. In a sixth subsection, provision is made for the courts to deal with miscellaneous types of unfair trade.

It is provided that all of the remedies set forth in the Trademark Act for infringement of trademarks would be available in respect to acts of unfair competition. However, the bill would not affect remedies which are otherwise available or preempt the jurisdiction of any State in cases of unfair competition.

The need for legislation in this area has been widely recognized. A national coordinating committee, composed of leading business and legal organizations, was established for the purpose of fostering such legislation. With only minor differences, this bill is identical to S. 3681, which I introduced in the 89th Congress. That measure received the endorsement of the patent, trademark, and copyright section of the American Bar Association and the U.S. Trademark Association.

It may well be that additional improvements could be made in the bill. Anyone interested in this subject should address their comments to the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1154) to amend the act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McClellan (for himself and Mr. Scott), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT OF 1945

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to amend the Export-Import Act. The amendment would extend the Bank's life for 5 years; it would increase the Bank's lending authority by $4.5 billion and its authority to issue insurance and guarantees against fractional reserves by $1.5 billion.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be printed in the Record at this point along with the Bank's letter of transmittal.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter of transmittal will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1155) to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, to shorten the name of the Bank, to extend for 5 years the period within which the Bank is authorized to exercise its functions, to increase the Bank's lending authority and its authority to issue, against fractional reserves, export credit insurance and guarantees, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Sparkman, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1155

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended (12 U.S.C. 635), be and the same is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) By striking from the name of the Export-Import Bank of Washington the words "of Washington" wherever the same appears in said Act.

(b) By striking from section 2(c) of said Act "$2,000,000,000" and substituting in lieu thereof "$3,500,000,000".

(c) By striking the last sentence from section 3(d) of said Act and substituting in lieu thereof:

"Members, not otherwise in the regular full-time employ of the United States, may be compensated at rates not exceeding the per diem equivalent of the rate for grade 18 of the General Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5332) for each day spent in travel or attendance at meetings of the Committee, and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for individuals in the Government service employed intermittently."

(d) By striking from section 7 of said Act "$9,000,000,000" and substituting in lieu thereof "$13,500,000,000".

(e) By striking from section 8 of said Act the date "June 30, 1968" and substituting in lieu thereof the date "June 30, 1973".

The letter of transmittal presented by Mr. Sparkman is as follows:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON,
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1967.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor of transmitting a proposed bill which would amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, to implement the recommendations of President Johnson in his Budget Message of January 24, 1967, and his Economic Report of January 26, 1967. In his Budget Message, President Johnson said:

"To enable the Export-Import Bank to fulfill its role of assisting our export trade, which is so vital to our balance of payments, I am recommending that its lending authority be increased and its life extended for another five years."

Further, in his Economic Report, President Johnson said:

"As part of our long-run balance of payments program, I shall also request continuation and expansion by $4.5 billion of the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank in order to support the expansion of exports."

The proposed bill would extend the life of the Bank for five years, would increase by $4.5 billion the Bank's lending authority, and within said limitation would authorize the Bank to utilize an additional $1.5 billion in connection with its program of guarantees and insurance for exports. The proposed bill would also shorten the name of the Bank, and would provide for certain minor adjustments in connection with the pay and allowances of members of the Bank's Advisory Committee.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that enactment of this legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

We are addressing a similar letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

HAROLD F. LINDER.

PROVISION OF FINANCING OF THE OPERATIONS OF THE BUREAU OF THE MINT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to provide for the financing of the operations of the Bureau of the Mint, and for other purposes. The purpose of the proposed legislation is to permit the operations of the Bureau of the Mint to be financed from an operating fund derived from revenues of the mint from coinage and from other sources, and from which all expenditures of the mint would be paid.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be printed in the Record at this point along with the letter of transmittal and a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter of transmittal, and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1156) to provide for the financing of the operations of the Bureau of the Mint, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Proxmire, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1156

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established in the Treasury Department a Mint Operating Fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation.

Sec. 2. (a) The Fund shall be capitalized as of the close of business of the day prior to the operative date of the Fund, which shall be the beginning of the next fiscal year following enactment of this Act, on the basis of:

(1) an initial transfer from revenues of the Bureau of the Mint (hereinafter referred to as the "Mint") of such amounts as the Secretary of the Treasury, after taking into account subsections (2) and (3) hereof, deems necessary to provide working capital for Mint operations;

(2) all receivables, inventories and other physical assets of the Mint, exclusive of land and buildings, as of the close of business of the day prior to the operative date, capitalized at fair and reasonable values as determined by the Secretary; and

(3) assumption of all liabilities of the Mint outstanding as of the close of business of the day prior to the operative date, except those incurred pursuant to authority granted by the Act of August 20, 1963, as amended (31 U.S.C. 291–294).

(b) All obligations and other commitments of the Mint outstanding as of the close of business of the day prior to the operative date, shall be paid out of the Fund, except obligations or commitments incurred or made in connection with the construction or equipment of any buildings authorized by the Act of August 20, 1963, as amended (31 U.S.C. 291–294).

(c) Revenues of the Mint on and after the operative date, exclusive of appropriations, shall be credited to the Fund in such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the approved programs. Excess revenues, as determined by the Secretary, shall be deposited to the general fund of the Treasury.

(d) On and after the operative date, all expenditures of the Mint shall be paid out of the Fund, except those in payment of obligations or commitments incurred under the Act of August 20, 1963, as amended (31 U.S.C. 291–294); *Provided*, That none of the cost of construction of additional buildings or of land acquisition shall be paid out of the Fund without the express approval of the Congress.

Sec. 3. The unexpended balances as of the close of business of the day prior to the operative date of appropriations for salaries and expenses of the Mint shall be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury. Any amounts remaining in the silver profit fund established by section 3526 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 335), or the coinage profit fund established by section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 340), after establishment of the Mint Operating Fund as provided herein, shall also be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury.

Sec. 4. There shall be included in the Budget of the United States each year a regular business type budget for the operations under the fund.

Sec. 5. (a) Section 3 of the Act of December 18, 1942, as amended (31 U.S.C. 317c), is further amended to read:

"Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause all worn and uncurrent coin of the United States, heretofore or hereafter issued, received in the Treasury, to be melted down, the resulting metal and material to be used for coinage or sold, which sale is hereby authorized. Such coin (including any metal and material derived therefrom), and any loss resulting from the difference between the nominal or face value of such coin and the amount the same will produce in new coin, and any loss resulting from the sale of the metal or other material, shall be charged to the Mint Operating Fund."

(b) Section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 340), and section 3552 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 369), are repealed. However, coinage metals held in the coinage metal fund (31 U.S.C. 340) as of the close of business of the day prior to the operative date will remain in such fund until purchased by the Mint Operating Fund for coinage requirements.

Sec. 6. (a) The second, third, and fourth sentences of section 3526 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 335), are repealed.

(b) Nothing herein contained shall affect in any manner the purchase of gold or silver bullion with the bullion fund established by section 3545 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 358).

The letter and section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. Proxmire are as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
The President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There is transmitted herewith a draft bill "To provide for the financing of the operations of the Bureau of the Mint, and for other purposes," together with an analysis of the bill and a comparative type.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to permit the operations of the Bureau of the Mint to be financed from an operating fund derived from revenues of the Mint from coinage and from other sources, and from which all expenditures of the Mint would be paid.

Experience during the past several years has clearly pointed up the need for a more flexible system of financing Mint operations. This need has become more pressing as a result of the new coinage requirements arising from the Coinage Act of 1965. Particularly, there is a need for a system which will permit the Mint to adjust its coin production schedules more quickly and adequately in order to be able to provide the increased quantities of coins needed at any given time without having to resort to supplemental appropriations or to reprogramming actions. Since Mint operations are strictly of a manufacturing type, I believe it to be essential that a method of financing be adopted which would be applicable to a similar commercial enterprise and which would not require appropriations for ordinary Mint operating expenses. The draft bill, which provides for an operating fund would, in my opinion, best meet these requirements.

Present financing of Mint operations is derived from several different sources: (1) the coinage metal fund, which is a permanent revolving type fund established for the purchase of metals used for coinage; (2) the silver profit fund and the coinage profit fund, which are funds for the deposit of profits on coinage and which are available for purchase of alloy copper, wastage incurred in coinage, recoinage losses, and for the cost of distributing coins; (3) reimbursements from foreign coinage and from the sale of medals, proof coins, etc.; and (4) annual appropriations for salaries and expenses. Silver for coinage is acquired through use of the bullion fund, which is a fund held by the Mint as depositary for the Treasurer of the United States.

This fund contains gold and silver bullion, coin and cash. The gain arising from coinage of silver bullion into coin is credited to the silver profit fund, which is also charged with certain costs and losses. Balances remaining in the silver profit fund are covered into the Treasury of the United States at least twice a year.

Under the proposed legislation there would be established an operating fund to be called the Mint Operating Fund. The operative date of the Fund would be the beginning of the first quarter of the next fiscal year following enactment of the act. This Fund would be capitalized as of the close of business of the day prior to the operative date, on the basis of (1) a transfer of such amounts as the Secretary of the Treasury deems necessary to provide working capital for the Mint's operations, such amounts to be derived from the revenues of the Mint; (2) all receivables and all physical assets of the Mint on the day prior to the operative date, other than land and buildings; and (3) assumption by the Fund of all the liabilities of the Mint as of the day prior to the operative date, except those incurred for the construction and equipment of the new Mint at Philadelphia and certain other facilities. The inventories and other physical assets thus taken over in the Fund would be capitalized at values determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be fair and reasonable.

Revenues on and after the operative date would be deposited in this Fund in such amounts as may be necessary to finance the approved programs, and all expenditures of the Mint from that date would be paid therefrom with the exception that the cost of construction of additional buildings or the cost of land acquisition may only be paid from the Fund if expressly approved by the Congress.

In view of the establishment of the Mint Operating Fund into which revenues will be deposited and from which expenditures will be made, certain of the special funds mentioned above—the coinage metal fund, the silver profit fund, and the coinage profit fund—will become unnecessary and will be abolished. However, the assets in the Coinage Metal fund at the time of the Mint Operating Fund becomes operative would remain in the Coinage Metal Fund until required for coinage purposes. At that time the Mint Operating Fund would purchase such assets. The operation of the bullion fund will continue unchanged. Silver required for coinage will be acquired by purchase from the bullion fund.

Adoption of the proposed method of financing the operations of the Mint will result in a number of advantages not available under the present system. Probably the greatest single advantage to be derived will be that the operations of the Mint can be conducted on a businesslike basis. The Mint is essentially a manufacturing type organization and for that reason its financing should be geared to commercial business type budgeting. The Congress will also benefit from a full disclosure of the income and the costs of operating the Mint which is not as readily available to it under the present system of budgeting, since under that system over 90% of Mint financing is from sources other than annual appropriations. Under the proposed procedure, annual estimates of funds needed for all Mint operations would be submitted to the Congress in the form of a business type budget, in accordance with procedures established by the Bureau of the Budget in such cases.

In addition to full disclosure to the Congress of past operations of the Mint and budgetary estimates of its future operations, as required by the Bureau of the Budget's procedures, the Bureau of the Budget would itself exercise budgeting controls over the Mint as provided by its regulations covering funds of this nature. This method of financing and system of accounting also lends itself to a commercial type audit by the General Accounting Office which would extend to the financial statements, accounting records, underlying transactions and systems of internal financial control. Obligations would be restricted to the amounts estimated in the budget except with the specific approval of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Bureau of the Budget. This exception is necessary to permit essential flexibility in meeting unexpected increases in workload.

The total funds required for the operations of the Mint under the proposed legislation would be no different from those which it would require if it were operating under the present arrangements. While the size of the budget estimates presented annually to the Congress under the proposed system would be substantially in excess of that under present procedures, the difference would result from the inclusion of substantial costs which are not at present covered by the appropriation requests for salaries and expenses. These costs include the purchase of metal used in the manufacture of coins as well as the cost of transporting the coins and other expenses, now paid from funds other than annual appropriations.

I am confident that the expanded coin production program of the Mint in furtherance of the new coinage measures embodied in the Coinage Act of 1965 will, in the very near future, result in a marked reduction, and ultimately, in the elimination of any local coin shortage. I believe that the proposed business type financing in the Mint's activities will enable it to carry out its role in the new coinage program more effectively than it could under the system it is operating under presently.

I regard this proposed legislation as having major significance for I believe it will not only improve the financial processes of the Mint but that it will enable it to operate in a more efficient and businesslike manner. I therefore, strongly recommend favorable action by the Congress.

It is respectfully requested that you lay the draft bill before the Senate. A similar proposal has been sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the Administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH W. BARR,
Acting Secretary.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

Section 1 establishes in the Treasury Department a Mint Operating Fund to be available without fiscal year limitation.

Section 2(a) provides that the Fund would be capitalized as of the close of business of the day prior to the operative date of the Fund, which is defined as the beginning of the next fiscal year following enactment of the bill. The Fund would be capitalized on the basis of (1) a transfer of such amounts as the Secretary of the Treasury deems necessary (after taking (2) and (3) below into account) to provide working capital for the Mint's operation, such amounts to be derived from revenues of the Mint, (2) all receivables and all physical assets of the Mint as of the close of business of the day prior to the operative date, other than land, and buildings, and (3) assumption by the Fund of all the liabilities of the Mint outstanding as of the close of business as of the day prior to the operative date, except those incurred for the construction and equipment of the new Mint at Philadelphia and certain other facilities. The inventories and other physical assets thus taken over in the Fund would be capitalized at values determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be fair and reasonable.

Section 2(b) provides that all obligations and other commitments of the Mint outstanding as of the close of business of the day prior to the operative date are to be paid from the Fund except those specifically incurred for the construction or equipment of buildings authorized under the Act of August 20, 1963, as amended (31 U.S.C. 291–294). This Act relates principally to the construction and equipment of the new Philadelphia Mint.

Section 2(c) provides that starting on the operative date the Fund would have available revenues of the Mint from whatever source except appropriations in such amounts as the Secretary of the Treasury determines are necessary to carry out the approved programs.

Section 2(d) provides that starting on the operative date all expenditures of the Mint shall be paid from the Fund except those in payment of obligations or commitments incurred under the Act of August 20, 1963, as amended (31 U.S.C. 291–294). Such expenditures include payments for the acquisition of metals for coinage, for equipment, for coin distribution and for salaries and other operating expenses of the Mint. Silver bullion for coinage will continue to be acquired with the bullion fund and purchased from it by the Mint Operating Fund when used for coinage. The cost of construction of additional buildings or of land acquisition may only be paid out of the Fund as expressly authorized by the Congress.

Section 3 directs that the unexpended balances, as of the close of business of the day prior to the operative date, of appropriations for salaries and expenses of the Mint shall be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury. Thus, these amounts will not be available to the Mint Operating Fund. Furthermore, such amounts as remain in the silver profit fund and the coinage profit fund after the Mint Operating Fund is supplied with working capital as provided in section 2, will also be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury, and these profit funds abolished.

Section 4 provides that an annual business type budget for the operations under the Fund would be included in the U.S. Budget.

Section 5(a) amends one statute and section 5(b) repeals two others in order to obtain conformity with the new Mint financing procedures, provided for in the preceding sections of the bill.

Section 5(a) amends section 3 of the Act of December 18, 1942, as amended (31 U.S.C. 317c), which provides for the melting of worn and uncurrent coins and recoinage or sale of the resulting metals and charging any losses on the transactions to the fund established for the purchase of metal for coinage and the coinage profit fund. The amendment eliminates references to these funds and provides that the worn coins and losses on recoinage or sale of metals resulting from melting shall be charged to the new Mint Operating Fund. Since it is elsewhere provided that revenues of the Mint are to be paid into the Fund, that would cover into the Fund all proceeds from recoinage.

Section 5(b) repeals section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 340), which provides for the use of the coinage metal fund for the purchase of metals for coinage and for the crediting of profits and the charging of expenses of such coinage to the coinage profit fund. These funds will no longer be necessary since the Mint Operating Fund will be used in general to finance all Mint operations. However, the assets of the coinage Metal Fund would remain in that fund until required for coinage purposes at which time the Mint Operating Fund would purchase such assets.

To conform with the new financing operation provided for by the draft bill, section 5(b) also repeals section 3552 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 369), which provides that all money arising from charges and deductions on and from bullion and from other sources be paid into the Treasury; that no part of such deductions or profit on coinage shall be expended for Mint salaries or wages, and that all expenditures of the Mint not otherwise provided for should be paid from appropriations. The Fund, rather than appropriations, will be used from the operative date for all salaries, wages and other costs and expenses of the Mint, except that the cost of construction of additional buildings or of land acquisition may only be paid from the Fund with the express approval of the Congress. Also, the provision in the existing law with respect to the transfer of money to the Treasury will no longer be necessary since the bill provides for the transfer of the Fund's excess income to the general fund of the Treasury.

Section 6 repeals a portion of a statute to conform with the new Mint financing arrangements provided for in the draft bill. Section 3526 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 335), provides at present for the acquisition of silver bullion for coinage with the bullion fund and for the crediting of the gain on coinage to a special fund called the silver profit fund and the charging of this fund with certain losses. That part of this statute which establishes the silver profit fund and provides for credits and charges to it in connection with silver coinage would be repealed, since accruals from all coinage are to be paid into the Fund and all charges in connection with coinage are to be paid from the Fund. The operations of the bullion fund, however, will not be affected by the repealer—silver bullion will continue to be acquired with this fund and purchased from it by the Mint Operating Fund when used for coinage.

EXCUSED ABSENCE FROM DUTY OF CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am, today, introducing proposed legislation which could be of considerable savings to the Federal Government in preventing the injury or the disablement of valuable Federal workers.

This bill would direct the appropriate authority in each Federal agency of the executive branch to excuse from duty any employee whose presence at work is not necessary to the public safety or the national security, whenever the Weather Bureau had issued warnings of imminent climatic dangers. This release from duty would not involve a loss in the employees' pay or result in a reduction in annual or sick leave.

Although the Federal Personnel Manual gives authorization to Government officials to make such dispensations, in too many cases such authorities have failed to exercise this responsibility and have therefore created excessive and unnecessary hardships for their employees.

My bill would make the exercise of this authority mandatory.

Mr. President, I am sure everyone here recognizes the dedicated and important service our postal and Federal workers perform for us day to day. However, I feel it is unreasonable of us to take these employees for granted and to expect them to set out for their jobs or remain on duty when every civilian worker has boarded up his home in preparation of an approaching tornado or hurricane, and to get to work when rainstorms have flooded roads and washed out bridges, or severe snowstorms and ice have made travel conditions hazardous and dangerous.

In short, as the Nation's No. 1 employer, we should not expect those who work for us to risk life and limb either to reach their jobs or to return home, in many instances also forcing the neglect of their families.

Many accidents could certainly be averted if management would take sensible precautions and use its discretion in releasing our Federal workers when weather conditions are perilous and commonsense would dictate consideration of the necessity to report to or remain at work.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1157) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the excused absence from duty, without loss of pay or reduction in annual or sick leave, of Federal employees in areas covered by official warnings of imminent danger of hurricanes or other inherently dangerous weather conditions, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BREWSTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE ACCIDENT PREVENTION PROGRAM

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am, today, reintroducing my bill to provide for a Federal employee accident prevention program to help reduce the suffering and cost involved in injuries to the Federal employee.

This legislation would vest in the Department of Labor authority to develop and enforce the application of safety standards by Federal agencies, and would provide a statutory basis for the participation of employee unions in developing the Federal Government's safety program.

At the present time, there is no general statute describing objectives for Federal agencies in developing safety programs. My bill would remedy this situation by outlining the responsibilities of the Secretary of Labor and other Federal agencies in providing minimum safety standards and safe working conditions. It reconstitutes the Federal Safety Council, authorizing union membership thereon, and sets up a Federal Safety Advisory Committee to assist the Secretary of Labor in working toward the objectives of the bill.

Although my bill is not the remedy or cure-all for all the safety problems existing in Federal agencies, I do believe very strongly that it provides the mechanism for achieving a much more satisfactory rate of progress in reducing worker injuries, material and property losses and the large expenditures involved.

It offers a highly effective tool in President Johnson's mission "Safety-70" campaign to reduce substantially the suffering of employees and loss of money resulting from job-related accidents.

Mr. President, I respectfully urge my colleagues to give their consideration to this measure to benefit the working conditions of our dedicated Federal employees, and hope that the bill will receive prompt action during the 90th Congress.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1158) to amend section 7902 of title 5 of the United States Code so as to provide for the establishment of a Federal employee accident prevention program, introduced by Mr. BREWSTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM AND THE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize, first, a transfer of credit between the Foreign Service retirement and disability system and the social security system, and second, social security minimum benefits for Foreign Service annuitants, and for other purposes.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve the right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter to the Vice President from the Assistant Secretary of State in regard to it dated February 20, 1967, and the section-by-section analysis and the cost estimate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, section-by-section analysis, and cost estimate will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1159) to authorize (1) a transfer of credit between the Foreign Service retirement and disability system and the social security system and (2) social security minimum benefits for Foreign Service annuitants, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 804 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is further amended by adding a new subsection (i) as follows:

"(i) 'Tax equivalent' means an amount equal to the taxes which would have been payable (but which have not been paid) under Section 3101 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to service after June 30, 1966, during which the participant was subject to this Act, if the basic salary received by him for such service had at the time constituted remuneration for employment for purposes of title II of the Social Security Act."

SEC. 2. Subsection 832(a) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 832. (a) In case a participant dies and no claim for annuity is payable under the provisions of this Act, his contributions to the Fund shall be paid in accordance with section 841."

SEC. 3. The heading immediately preceding section 841 and subsection 841(a) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"PART E—LUMP-SUM PAYMENTS

"SEC. 841. (a) Whenever a participant becomes separated from the Service without becoming eligible for an annuity or a deferred annuity in accordance with the provisions of this Act, his lump-sum credit consisting of (1) his compulsory and special contributions to the Fund less (2) in the case of a participant separated after 1967, the tax equivalent as defined in section 804 plus (3) interest thereon at 4 per centum per annum, compounded annually at the end of each fiscal year through June 30, 1960; semiannually as of December 31, 1960; annually thereafter as of December 31, and proportionately for the period served during the year of separation, shall be returned to him."

SEC. 4. Immediately following section 882 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, there is hereby added the following new part:

"PART K—TRANSFER OF CREDIT TO SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

"SEC. 883. If a participant separates from the service or transfers to a position wherein he is no longer a participant after 1967, and neither he nor any of his survivors is entitled to an annuity or a deferred annuity under this Act on the basis of his service at the time he or any of his survivors becomes entitled (or would become entitled if his Government service were counted) to monthly benefits or a lump-sum death payment under titile II of the Social Security Act on the basis of his wages and self-employment income, the participant's Government service performed after June 30, 1966, shall be taken into account for purposes of the Social Security Act and, if so used, shall not at any time thereafter be creditable for purposes of retirement under this or any other retirement system for Government employees. Upon request from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in connection with any determination under title II or title XVIII of the Social Security Act, the Secretary of State shall furnish a record of the former participant's service and basic salary received for such service performed under this Act after June 30, 1966, and shall certify whether such former participant or any of his survivors is entitled to an annuity under this Act on the basis of such service."

SEC. 5. Immediately following section 883 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, there is hereby added the following new part:

"PART L—SOCIAL SECURITY MINIMUM BENEFITS

"SEC. 884. (a) If after 1967 a participant retires on an immediate annuity, such annuity shall be at least the smallest of—

"(1) the minimum annuity base as determined under subsection (e) of this section;

"(2) the sum necessary to increase to the minimum annuity base the product of 12 times any monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for which he is eligible; or

"(3) 80 per centum of his high-five average salary computed under section 821.

Except for disability annuitants, this subsection will not apply until the month a participant or annuitant becomes sixty-five years of age.

"(b) If after 1967 a participant dies after completing at least five years of civilian service, or an annuitant dies whose annuity was based on service terminating after 1967, the annuity granted to the widow or dependent widower under section 832 or to the surviving wife or husband under section 821 shall be at least the smallest of:

"(1) 75 per centum of the minimum annuity base determined in accordance with subsection (e) of this section for any month before the month in which the survivor becomes 62 years of age, and 82½ per centum of such minimum annuity base for any month thereafter;

"(2) the sum necessary to increase to the applicable percentage of such minimum annuity base the product of 12 times any monthly benefit under title II of the Social Security Act for which the survivor is eligible;

"(3) 80 per centum of the deceased's high-five average salary computed under section 821.

This subsection does not apply to:

"(A) any surviving spouse under subsection 821(b) where the deceased annuitant did not elect to provide a survivor annuity based on the full amount of his annuity; or

"(B) the annuity of any survivor for any month before the month in which the survivor becomes 62 years of age, unless for that month an annuity is payable under this title to at least one surviving child of the deceased who is under 18 years of age or is incapable of self-support because of physical or mental disability incurred before age 18.

"(c) If after 1967 a participant dies after completing at least 5 years of civilian service, or an annuitant dies whose annuity was based on service terminating after 1967, the annuity granted to each surviving child under this title shall be at least the smallest of:

"(1) 75 per centum of the minimum annuity base determined in accordance with subsection (e) of this section;

"(2) the sum necessary to increase to 75 per centum of such minimum annuity base the product of 12 times any monthly benefit under title II of the Social Security Act for which the child is eligible; or

"(3) 80 per centum of the deceased's high-five average salary computed under section 821.

"(d) The total of the annuity payable to all survivors of a participant or of an annuitant computed under subsection (b) and (c) of this section may not exceed the difference between—

"(1) the family maximum determined in accordance with subsection (e) of this section, minus

"(2) the product of 12 times the sum of all monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for which all the survivors are eligible.

Whenever the total of such annuities exceeds such difference, the annuities shall be reduced proportionately except that this subsection shall not act to reduce the annuity of any survivor computed without regard to subsection (b) and (c) of this section.

"(e)(1) 'Minimum annuity base' is the greater of (a) the amount computed in accordance with the formula stated in 5 U.S.C. 8331(18) or (b) the amount appearing in column II of the table in 5 U.S.C. 8331(18) opposite the amounts in column I of said table which encompass the governing high-five average salary for the case.

"(2) 'Family maximum' is the amount appearing in column III of the table in 5 U.S.C. 8331(18) opopsite the lowest amount in column II of such table which is at least equal to his minimum annuity base."

The letter, section-by-section analysis, and cost estimate presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 20, 1967.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft bill "To authorize (1) a transfer of credit between the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System and the Social Security System and (2) Social Security minimum benefits for Foreign Service annuitants, and for other purposes."

This is a companion bill to the proposed Social Security Act Amendments of 1967. If enacted, this bill would further amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, to implement the transfer of credit plan and the Social Security minimum plan which are designed to achieve a measure of coordination between the Social Security System and the Foreign Service and Civil Service retirement systems.

These amendments will generally improve survivor and disability protection for participants in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System with short service. They are not intended to create new categories of persons eligible to receive Foreign Service retirement benefits.

These amendments are designed to implement recommendations A.4. (a) and (b) of the Cabinet Committee on Federal Staff Retirement Systems which were endorsed by the President in his message to the Congress on March 7, 1966 and again recommended in his January 23, 1967 Message on Older Americans.

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the presentation of this legislation and that its enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,
(For the Secretary of State).
DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations

Enclosures: Draft bill, section-by-section analysis, cost estimate.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

This is a companion bill to the proposed Social Security Act Amendments of 1967. If enacted, this bill would further amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, to implement the transfer of credit plan and the Social Security minimum plan which are designed to achieve a measure of coordination between the Social Security System and the Foreign Service and Civil Service retirement systems.

The transfer of credit plan would authorize a transfer of credit from the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System to the Social Security System for Government service performed by a former participant who is either not eligible for a Foreign Service annuity or has waived his rights to such annuity at the time that he or any of his survivors becomes entitled to Social Security benefits. The Social Security minimum plan would increase Foreign Service annuities to the extent necessary to assure that such annuities together with any Social Security benefits which may be payable, at least equal Social Security benefits that would be payable if the Federal service had been covered by that Act, except that benefits are limited to 80 percent of the participant's high-five average salary.

These amendments will generally improve survivor and disability protection for participants with short service. They are not intended to create new categories of persons eligible to receive Foreign Service retirement benefits nor to guarantee payments at levels that would reflect Social Security payments with respect to persons not eligible for retirement benefits.

These amendments are designed to implement recommendations A.4. (a) and (b) of the Cabinet Committee on Federal Staff Retirement Systems which were endorsed by the President in his message to the Congress on March 7, 1966 and again mentioned briefly in his January 23, 1967, Message on Older Americans.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 1. This section amends section 804 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, to include a definition of tax equivalent. The proposed definition is identical to the definition being proposed for inclusion in Civil Service retirement legislation. The term refers to a sum equal to the social security taxes which would have been payable if the Government service in question had been included under the social security system. This sum is to be deducted from the refund (lump-sum payments) to former participants and their survivors in all cases where no annuity has been paid.

Section 804 will also be proposed for amendment in legislation to be recommended by the Department of State for other purposes. In that legislation section 804(i) will be reserved for the addition of the definition of "tax equivalent" included in this bill.

DEATH IN SERVICE

SEC. 2. This section amends subsection 832(a) of such Act which authorizes a refund of contributions to a participant's beneficiaries whenever there is a death in service and no claim for annuity is payable. The change is necessary to provide for the withholding of the tax equivalent, as defined above, from such refunds. Since participants will enjoy certain benefits . . . of the social security system under this amendment, it is appropriate that amounts equivalent to social security taxes, which are not refundable in the case of a death of an employee covered by social security, be deducted from such refunds.

LUMP-SUM PAYMENTS

SEC. 3. This section amends subsection 841(a) of such Act which concerns the refund of contributions and the computation of interest thereon. The subsection is amended to introduce the term "lump-sum credit" which is defined as the participant's total contributions to the Fund less the social security tax equivalent plus interest on the difference.

Subsection 841(a) will also be proposed for amendment in other legislation to be recommended by the Department of State to change the interest computation formula to correspond with the formula now authorized under the Civil Service retirement system. Since this change in the interest computation formula requires changes in more than this section and since it does not relate to the transfer of credit proposal, it is not included in this bill. The wording of the proposed amendment has been carefully worked out so that it will not matter whether this bill or the other legislation sponsored by the Department of State passes first or whether one bill is deferred entirely.

TRANSFER OF CREDIT TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

SEC. 4. This section adds proposed new section 883 to such Act which will authorize a transfer of credit from the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System to the Social Security System for Government service performed by a former participant who is not entitled to an annuity under such Act at the time that he or any of his survivors becomes entitled (or would become entitled if his Government service were counted) to Social Security benefits. On the effective date of this section, credit will be given for all Federal Service performed subsequent to June 30, 1966. This will provide immediate Social Security survivor protection for employees on the rolls on the effective date with continuous service from June 30, 1966. Participants will require a total of five years' service from June 30, 1966 (counting service under the Civil Service, Foreign Service and Social Security systems) before becoming eligible for Social Security disability protection under this proposal.

SOCIAL SECURITY MINIMUM BENEFITS

Sec. 5. This section adds a new part "L" entitled "Social Security Minimum Benefits" to such Act and new section 884.

Section 884(a) authorizes minimum Social Security benefits for participants who retire on an immediate annuity after 1967. Participants who become eligible for a deferred annuity will not be eligible for this benefit because they will have the option to transfer their retirement credits to the Social Security System.

Section 884 (b) and (c) authorize Social Security minimum benefits to surviving spouses and children of participants who die in service after 1967 after completing five years of civilian service and to survivors of annuitants who retire after 1967. Social Security minimum benefits are authorized for survivors of deferred annuitants because such survivors do not have an option to transfer retirement credits to the Social Security System. Also the Social Security minimum benefit in all cases is reduced by the amount of any Social Security benefit otherwise due. Social Security minimum benefits would not be authorized for any surviving spouse of a deceased annuitant who at the time of his retirement did not elect to provide the maximum survivor annuity.

Section 884(d) limits benefits payable under this section to a family maximum which is equivalent to the family maximum authorized under the Social Security System.

Section 884(e) defines the terms "minimum annuity base" and "family maximum" which are used to determine benefits under this section. The terms are defined by making reference to the formula and the table proposed in other legislation for inclusion in 5 U.S.C. 8331(18) which covers proposed similar benefits under the Civil Service Retirement system. The formula and table are intentionally not repeated in the Foreign Service Act in order that whenever the Civil Service benefit changes, the changes will be extended automatically to the Foreign Service.

Cost Estimate

The estimated level annual cost of the attached bill to authorize (1) a transfer of credit between the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System and the Social Security System and (2) Social Security minimum benefits for Foreign Service annuitants, and for other purposes, is as follows:

Transfer of credit plan	$180, 000
Social Security minimum plan	100, 000
Total	280, 000

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the President of the United States on Tuesday, February 28, submitted to Congress his recommendations for legislation regarding educational television.

I have received today a draft of the legislation involving this subject matter, entitled "Public Television Act of 1967," and ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a fact sheet setting forth the background of educational television, as well as a summary of the proposed legislation, be printed at this point in my remarks.

In general, the Public Television Act of 1967 has three purposes: First, to extend and improve the program of grants for construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities; second, to establish and finance a nonprofit corporation to assist program operations in noncommercial educational television and radio; and, third, to authorize a study of instructional television and its relationship to educational television.

The bill is an amendment to the Communications Act of 1934 and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, fact sheet, and summary of the proposed legislation, will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1160) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educatonal television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1160

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Public Television Act of 1967".

TITLE I—CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

EXTENSION OF DURATION OF CONSTRUCTION GRANTS FOR EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

Sec. 101. (a) Section 391 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 391) is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: "There are also authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the purposes of such section, $10,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and such sums as may be necessary for the next four fiscal years.".

(b) The last sentence of such section is amended by striking out "July 1, 1968" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1973".

MAXIMUM ON GRANTS IN ANY STATE

Sec. 102. Effective with respect to grants made from appropriations for any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1967, subsection (b) of section 392 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 392(b)) is amended to read:

"(b) The total of the grants for any fiscal year made under this part for the construction of noncommercial education television broadcasting facilities or noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities in any State may not exceed 12½ per centum of the portion of the appropriation for such year available for such grants."

NONCOMMERCIAL EDUCATIONAL RADIO BROADCASTING FACILITIES

Sec. 103. (a) Section 390 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 390) is amended by inserting "noncommercial" before "educational" and by inserting "or radio" after "television".

(b) Subsection (a) of section 392 of the Communications Act of 1934 (42 U.S.C. 392(a)) is amended by—

(1) inserting "noncommercial" before "educational" and by inserting "or radio" after "television" in so much thereof as precedes paragraph (1);

(2) striking out clause (B) of such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "(B) in the case of a project for television facilities, the State educational television agency or, in the case of a project for radio facilities, the State educational radio agency,";

(3) inserting "(i) in the case of a project for television facilities," after "(D)" and "noncommercial" before "educational" in such paragraph (1) and by inserting before the semicolon at the end of such paragraph ", or (ii) in the case of a project for radio facilities, a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association which is organized primarily to engage in or encourage noncommercial education radio broadcasting and is eligible to receive a license from the Federal Communications Commission; or meets the requirements of clause (i) and is also organized to engage in or encourage such radio broadcasting and is eligible for such a license for such a radio station";

(4) striking out "television" in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of such subsection;

(5) striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (3), striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

"(5) that, in the case of an application with respect to radio broadcasting facilities, there has been comprehensive planning for educational broadcasting facilities and services in the area the applicant proposes to serve and the applicant has participated in such planning, and the applicant will make most efficient use of the frequency assignment."

(c) Subsection (c) of such section is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(c)" and "noncommercial" before "educational television broadcasting facilities", and by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) In order to assure proper coordination of construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities within each State which has established a State educational radio agency, each applicant for a grant under this section for a project for construction of such facilities in such State, other than such agency, shall notify such agency of each application for such a grant which is submitted by it to the Secretary, and the Secretary shall advise such agency with respect to the disposition of each such application.

(d) Subsection (d) of such section is amended by inserting "noncommercial" before "educational television" and inserting "or noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, as the case may be," after "educational television broadcasting facilities" in clauses (2) and (3).

(e) Subsection (f) of such section is amended by inserting "or radio" after "television" in the part thereof which precedes paragraph (1), and by inserting "or noncommercial educational radio purposes, as the case may be" after "educational television purposes" in paragraph (2) thereof.

(f)(1) Paragraph (2) of section 394 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 394) is amended by inserting "or educational radio broadcasting facilities" after "educational television broadcasting facilities," and by inserting "or radio broadcasting, as the case may be" after "television broadcasting".

(2) Paragraph (4) of such section is amended by striking out "The term 'State educational television agency' means" and inserting in lieu thereof "The terms 'State educational television agency' and 'State educational radio agency' mean, with respect to television broadcasting and radio broadcasting, respectively,", and by striking out "educational television" in clauses (A) and (C) and inserting in lieu thereof "such broadcasting".

(g) Section 397 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 397) is amended by inserting "or radio" after "television" in clause (2).

FEDERAL SHARE OF COST OF CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 104. Subsection (e) of section 392 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 392(e)) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Upon approving any application under this section with respect to any project, the Secretary shall make a grant to the applicant in the amount determined by him, but not exceeding 75 per centum of the amount determined by the Secretary to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project. The Secretary shall pay such amount from the sum available therefor, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine."

INCLUSION OF TERRITORIES

SEC. 105. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 394 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by striking out "and" and inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and by inserting before the period at the end thereof ", the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands".

(b) Paragraph (4) of such section is amended by inserting "and, in the case of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, means the High Commissioner thereof" before the period at the end thereof.

INCLUSION OF COSTS OF PLANNING

SEC. 106. Paragraph (2) of section 394 of the Communications Act of 1934 is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "In the case of apparatus the acquisition and installation of which is so included, such term also includes planning therefor."

TITLE II—ESTABLISHING OF NONPROFIT EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING CORPORATION

SEC. 201. Part IV of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 is further amended by—

(1) inserting

"SUBPART A—GRANTS FOR FACILITIES"

immediately above the heading of section 390;

(2) striking out "part" and inserting in lieu thereof "subpart" in sections 390, 393, 395, and 396;

(3) redesignating section 397 as section 398, inserting it before such section 398, and redesignating section 394 as section 397 and inserting immediately above the heading thereof

"SUBPART C—GENERAL";

(4) redesignating section 396 as section 394 and inserting it immediately after section 393;

(5) inserting after "broadcasting" the first time it appears in clause (2) of the section of such part IV redesignated herein as section 398 ", or over the Corporation or any of its grantees or contractors, or over the charter or bylaws of the Corporation,".

(6) inserting in the section of such part IV herein redesignated as section 397 the following new paragraphs;

"(6) The term 'Corporation' means the Corporation authorized to be established by subpart B of this part.

"(7) The term 'noncommercial educational broadcast station' means a television or radio broadcast station, which, under the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission, is eligible to be licensed or is licensed by the Commission as a noncommercial educational radio or television broadcast station and which is owned and operated by a public agency or nonprofit private foundation, corporation, or association.

"(8) The term 'interconnection' means the use of microwave equipment, boosters, translators, repeaters, communication space satellites, or other apparatus or equipment for the transmission and distribution of television or radio programs to noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations."

(7) inserting after section 395 the following new subpart:

"SUBPART B—CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC TELEVISION

"Congressional Declaration of Policy

"SEC. 396. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares—

"(1) that it is in the public interest to encourage the growth and development of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcasting, including the use of such media for instructional purposes;

"(2) that expansion and development of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcasting and of diversity of its programing depend on freedom, imagination, and initiative on both the local and national levels;

"(3) that the encouragement and support of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcasting, while matters of importance for private and local development, are also of appropriate and important concern to the Federal Government;

"(4) that it furthers the general welfare to encourage noncommercial educational radio and television broadcast programing which will be responsive to the interest of people both in particular localities and throughout the United States, and which will constitute an expression of diversity and excellence;

"(5) that it is necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to complement, assist, and support a national policy that will most effectively make noncommercial educational radio and television service available to all the citizens of the United States;

"(6) that a private corporation should be created to facilitate the development of educational radio and television broadcasting and to afford maximum protection to such broadcasting from extraneous interference and control.

"Corporation Established

"(b) There is authorized to be established a nonprofit corporation, to be known as the 'Corporation for Public Television', which will not be an agency or establishment of the United States Government. The Corporation shall be subject to the provisions of this section, and, to the extent consistent with this section, to the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act.

"Board of Directors

"(c)(1) The Corporation shall have a Board of Directors (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Board'), consisting of fifteen members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(2) The members of the Board (A) shall be selected from among citizens of the United States (not regular full-time employees of the United States) who are eminent in such fields as education, cultural and civic affairs, or the arts, including radio or television; (B) shall be selected so as to provide as nearly as practicable a broad representation of various regions of the country, various professions and occupations, and various kinds of talent and experience appropriate to the functions and responsibilities of the Corporation.

"(3) The members of the initial Board of Directors shall serve as incorporators and shall take whatever actions are necessary to establish the Corporation under the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act.

"(4) The term of office of each member of the Board shall be six years; except that (A) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be elected for the remainder of such term; and (B) the terms of office of members first taking office shall begin on the date of incorporation and shall expire, as designated at the time of their appointment, five at the end of two years, five at the end of four years, and five at the end of six years. No member shall be eligible to serve in excess of two consecutive terms of six years each. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this paragraph, a member whose term has expired may serve until his successor has qualified.

"(5) Any vacancy in the Board shall not affect its power, but shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointments were made.

"Election of Chairman: Compensation

"(d)(1) The President shall designate one of the members first appointed to the Board as Chairman; thereafter the members of the Board shall annually elect one of their number as Chairman. The members of the Board shall also elect one or more of them as a Vice Chairman or Vice Chairmen.

"(2) The members of the Board shall not, by reason of such membership, be deemed to be employees of the United States. They shall, while attending meetings of the Board or while engaged in duties related to such meetings or in other activities of the Board pursuant to this subpart be entitled to receive compensation at the rate of $100 per day (or such other rate as may be determined by a vote of more than two-thirds of the full membership of the Board), including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, equal to that authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Officers and Employees

"(e)(1) The Corporation shall have a president, and such other officers as may be named and appointed by the Board for terms and at rates of compensation fixed by the Board. No individual other than a citizen of the United States may be an officer of the Corporation. No officer of the Corporation, other than the Chairman and any Vice Chairman, may receive any salary or other compensation from any source other than the Corporation during the period of his employment by the Corporation. All officers shall serve at the pleasure of the Board.

"(2) No political test or qualification shall be used in selecting, appointing, promoting, or taking other personnel actions with respect to officers, agents, and employees of the Corporation.

"Nonprofit and Nonpolitical Nature of the Corporation

"(f)(1) The Corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock, or to declare or pay any dividends.

"(2) No part of the income or assets of the Corporation shall inure to the benefit of any director, officer, employee, or any other individual except as salary or reasonable compensation for services.

"(3) The Corporation may not contribute to or otherwise support any political party or candidate for elective public office.

"Purposes and Activities of the Corporation

"(g) (1) In order to achieve the objectives and to carry out the purposes of this subpart, as set out in subsection (a), the Corporation is authorized to—

"(A) facilitate the full development of educational broadcasting in which programs of high quality, obtained from diverse sources, will be made available to noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations;

"(B) assist in the establishment and development of a system of interconnection to be used for the distribution of educational television or radio programs so that all noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations that wish to may broadcast the programs at times chosen by the stations;

"(C) assist in the establishment and development of one or more systems of noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations throughout the United States;

"(D) carry out its purposes and functions and engage in its activities in ways that will most effectively assure the maximum freedom of the noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast systems and local stations from interference with or control of program content or other activities.

"(2) Included in the activities of the Corporation authorized for accomplishment of the purposes set forth in subsection (a) of this section, are among others not specifically named—

"(A) to obtain grants from and to make contracts with individuals and with private, State, and Federal agencies, organizations, and institutions;

"(B) to contract with or make grants to program production entities individuals, and selected noncommercial educational broadcast stations for the production of, and otherwise to procure, educational television or radio programs for national or regional distribution to noncommercial educational broadcast stations;

"(C) to make payments to existing and new noncommercial educational broadcast stations to aid in financial local educational television or radio programing costs of such stations, particularly innovative approaches thereto, and other costs of operation of such stations;

"(D) to establish and maintain a library and archives of noncommercial educational television or radio programs and related materials and develop public awareness of and disseminate information about noncommercial educational television or radio broadcasting by various means, including the publication of a journal;

"(E) to arrange, by grant or contract with appropriate public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, or institutions, for interconnection facilities suitable for distribution and transmission of educational television or radio programs to noncommercial educational broadcast stations;

"(F) to hire or accept the voluntary services of consultants, experts, advisory boards, and panels to aid the Corporation in carrying out the purposes of this section;

"(G) to encourage the creation of new noncommercial educational broadcast stations in order to enhance such service on a local, State, regional, and national basis;

"(H) to conduct (directly or through grants or contracts) research, demonstrations, or training in matters related to noncommercial educational television or radio broadcasting.

"(3) To carry out the foregoing purposes and engage in the foregoing activities, the Corporation shall have the usual powers conferred upon a nonprofit corporation by the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act, except that the Corporation may not own or operate any television or radio broadcast stations, system, or network, on interconnection or program production facility.

"Authorization for Free or Reduced Rate Interconnection Service

"(h) Nothing in the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, or in any other provision of law shall be construed to prevent United States communications common carriers from rendering free or reduced rate communications interconnection services to grantees of or contractors with the Corporation and local noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations, subject to such rules and regulations as the Federal Communications Commission may prescribe.

"Report to Congress

"(i) The Corporation shall submit an annual report for the preceding fiscal year ending June 30 to the President for transmittal to the Congress on or before the 31st day of December of each year. The report shall include a comprehensive and detailed report of the Corporation's operations, activities, financial condition, and accomplishments under this section and may include such recommendations as the Corporation deems appropriate.

"Right to Repeal, Alter, or Amend

"(j) The right to repeal, alter, or amend this section at any time is expressly reserved.

"Financing

"(k) (1) There are authorized to be appropriated for expenses of the Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum of $9,000,000, and for the next fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended.

"(2) Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this section, no grant or contract pursuant to this section may provide for payment from the appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, for any one project or to any one station of more than $250,000."

TITLE III—STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL AND INSTRUCTIONAL, TELEVISION BROADCASTING

STUDY AUTHORIZED

Sec. 301. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to conduct, directly or by contract, and in consultation with other interested Federal agencies, a study of instructional television, including its relationship to educational television broadcasting and such other aspects thereof as may assist in determining whether Federal aid should be provided therefor and the form that aid should take, and which may aid communities, institutions, or agencies in determining whether and to what extent such activities should be used.

CONTENT OF STUDY

Sec. 302. Such study shall be comprehensive in nature and shall cover particularly such items as—

(1) the quality and content of existing programs and how they can be improved;

(2) the financial factors involved in use of instructional television in educational institutions;

(3) the relative advantages or disadvantages of using instructional television as compared with other media;

(4) the advantages and disadvantages of closed circuit television;

(5) the relationship between instructional and educational television; and

(6) new technology not now available, including flexible teacher-controlled scheduling of programs based on videotapes, discs, films, and other materials or devices.

DURATION OF STUDY

Sec. 303. The study authorized by this title shall be submitted to the President for transmittal to the Congress on or before January 1, 1969.

APPROPRIATION

Sec. 304. There are authorized to be appropriated for the study authorized by this title such sums, not exceeding $500,000, as may be necessary.

Educational Television

BACKGROUND AND NEED

The concept of educational television and educational radio broadcasting has not met the promise forecast for it at the beginning of the television age. ETV has been chronically under financed; personnel shortages exist in both educational TV and educational radio; UHF-TV channels have developed rather slowly in an industry generally characterized by existing changes and rapid growth; and, finally, the function and quality of educational television itself and the range of the areas it covers very widely from State to State.

The legislation authorizing support for Education Television Broadcasting Facilities (Public Law 87–447) amended Title III of the Communications Act of 1934. This amendment provided grants for facilities and was designed to enable educational television to reach a broad range of people within each station's service area. With the assistance provided by the existing $32 million authorization, a total of 165 to 185 stations will be in operation or completing construction when the present term of the Act expires on June 30, 1967.

To allow minimum service of one ETV signal in all parts of the United States and two ETV signals in 40 major population centers, the Federal Communications Commission has reserved 632 channels for educational use. In authorizing the original legislation, Congress, in its Conference Report on Education Television, called for "and adequate television system to serve the needs of all the people in the United States." To fulfill this task, the original legislation must be increased and additional incentives for continued growth and training of personnel should be enacted. In addition, some stimulus for program innovation is necessary to improve the whole concept of educational television.

In his State of the Union Message, President Johnson declared that educational television should be developed as a "vital national resource." The recently issued Carnegie Commission Report, *Public Television: A Program for Action*, recommended "new legislation to enable the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide adequate facilities for stations now in existence, to assist in increasing the number of stations to achieve nationwide coverage, to help support the basic operations of all stations, and to enlarge the support of instructional television programming."

By December 31, 1966, a total of 124 public Education Television Stations were operating in the United States, a sharp increase since 1956 when, ten years before, 21 stations were in operation. The Carnegie Commission Report said that the past decade has seen a system of educational television come into being that now includes nearly two-thirds of the population, a national program service, patches of inter-connection, and a corps of dedicated men and women. The new legislation will build on this foundation.

PROPOSAL

The *Public Television Act of 1967* will amend the Communications Act of 1934 in several ways. Title I of the legislation will, first, extend and improve provisions for grants to construct educational television broadcasting facilities. Second, the legislation will add a new category for funding: noncommercial radio broadcasting facilities. Title I also authorizes an appropriation of

$10.5 million for fiscal 1968 and such sums as may be necessary for the next four years to extend the existing grant program for construction of ETV facilities and to provide funds for noncommercial radio broadcasting facilities.

Under the proposed amendments, applicants must clear their proposals with State Educaitonal Television or Radio agencies, if an agency exists in the applicant's state. The Federal share of grants shall not exceed 75 percent and no more than 15 percent of any grant funded may be used to acquire and install micro-wave equipment, boosters, translators, and repeaters which are used to connect two or more broadcasting stations.

Title II authorizes the establishment of a non-profit corporation to help develop public radio and television broadcasting and to protect public radio and broadcasting from extraneous interference and control. This non-profit corporation would be known as the *Corporation for Public Television*. The Board of Directors will consist of 15 members appointed by the President with the approval of the Senate.

The Corporation would have a variety of duties prescribed by the legislation based on the assumption that it is in the public interest to encourage the growth and development of non-commercial educational radio and television broadcasting.

Among other duties, the Corporation shall submit an annual report on its activities to the President for transmittal to Congress on or before December 30 each year on its activities.

Title III of the legislation would authorize $500,000 for a comprehensive study on the whole range of instructional television broadcasting, including its relationship to education television. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare could conduct the study directly or he could contract for this study.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TELEVISION ACT OF 1967

In general, the Public Television Act of 1967 has three purposes: (1) to extend and improve the program of grants for construction of noncommercial educational television broadcasting facilities and authorize a program of grants for construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, (2) to establish and finance a nonprofit corporation to assist program operations in noncommercial educational television and radio, and (3) to authorize a study of instructional television and its relationship to education television.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES (TITLE I)

Title IV, Part III of the Commmunications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 391–397) would be amended by title I of the bill—

1. To extend its provisions through fiscal year 1972, with $10,500,000 authorized for fiscal year 1968 and such sums as may be necessary authorized for the next four fiscal years.

2. To replace the $1,000,000 per State limit with a State limit annually of 12½ percent of the total appropriation for grants in that fiscal year.

3. To authorize grants for construction of noncommercial educational radio as well as television facilities.

4. To increase the maximum allowable Federal share in project costs from 50 percent to 75 percent and to eliminate the additional 25 percent credit for the cost of broadcasting facilities owned by the applicant before the date of filing his application.

5. To extend the territorial coverage to the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

6. To extend the scope of eligible project costs to include planning of the acquisition and installation of transmission apparatus as well as the costs of actual acquisition and installation itself.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NONPROFIT EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING CORPORATION (TITLE II)

1. Title II of the Public Television Act of 1967 amends part III of title IV of the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize the establishment of a nonprofit private corporation (the "Corporation for Public Television").

2. The Corporation would have a Board of Directors of 15 members appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The members must be citizens of the United States selected from fields such as education, cultural and civic affairs, or the arts, including radio and television; and must be representative of various regions of the country, professions, and occupations, and kinds of experience and talent, appropriate to the Corporation's functions and responsibilities. The members of the Board would serve six-year staggered terms. Each year (except the first year) one of the members would be elected by the Board to serve as Chairman and one or more would be elected to serve as vice chairmen.

3. In addition to the Board of Directors, the Corporation would have a president and other necessary officers; and no political test or qualification could be used in selecting, promoting, or taking other personnel actions with respect to the Corporation's officers, employees, or agents.

4. The Corporation would be nonprofit and it would have no power to engage in any political activity.

5. The purposes of the Corporation would, among others, include:

(a) Establishment and development of a system of inter-communication for distribution of public and instructional programs among noncommercial educational television and radio stations;

(b) Establishment and development of a system of noncommercial educational television and radio stations in the United States.

6. In carrying out the above purposes, the Corporation would have the usual powers conferred on District of Columbia nonprofit corporations and could—

(a) Accept grants and enter into contracts with other agencies and institutions;

(b) Contract for production or procurement of educational television and radio programs for distribution to educational television and radio stations;

(c) Make payments to noncommercial educational television and radio stations for programming and other operating costs;

(d) Establish and maintain a library and archives for noncommercial educational television and radio programs;

(e) Publicize and disseminate information on educational television and radio;

(f) Support interconnection facilities for distributing and transmitting instructional and public television or radio programs;

(g) Encourage the creation of new noncommercial educational television or radio stations.

(7) The Corporation could not own or operate any television or radio broadcast stations, system, or network or interconnection or program production facility; and it and its contractors and grantees would be free from Federal direction, supervision, or control.

(8) Nothing in the Communications Act of 1934 could be construed to prohibit U.S. communications common carriers from rendering free or reduced rate interconnection services to Corporation grantees or contractors and local noncommercial educational television and radio stations, in accordance with F.C.C. rules and regulations.

(9) Annual reports of its operations and on its condition would be made to Congress by the Corporation.

(10) For fiscal year 1968, $9,000,000 would be authorized to be appropriated, and for fiscal year 1969, such sums as may be necessary, to assist the Corporation in carrying out its activities. These appropriations would remain available until expended.

STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL AND INSTRUCTIONAL TV BROADCASTING (TITLE III)

Title III of the Public Television Act of 1967 authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct or contract for a study of instructional television and its relationship to educational television and its advantages and disadvantages in comparison with other educational media. This report shall be submitted to the Congress on or before January 1, 1969. An appropriation of such sums as may be necessary (but not exceeding $500,000) is authorized for this purpose.

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the 34th President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, was born in Brookline, Mass., on May 29, 1917.

President Kennedy lived in the house in which he was born for the first 3 years of his life, and this house, located at 83 Beals Street in Brookline, is now owned by members of the family of President Kennedy.

The family of President Kennedy has indicated that it is their intention to make a gift of this property to the Federal Government, if the necessary legislation can be enacted to insure that it is administered in accordance with the laws relating to historic sites.

In order to accomplish this purpose, for myself and Senator JACKSON, of Washington, I send to the desk a bill to establish the birthplace of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy as a national historic site.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire this property, together with any improvements thereon, and to maintain it and to allow access to it for the public.

As I have said, the family of the late President has indicated its intention to make a gift of the property to the Federal Government, and thus the Government would be relieved of the costs of acquisition.

I believe I should say that it is altogether fitting that the birthplace of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who had such a keen sense of history, should be preserved for this Nation and for its future generations.

Today, the birthplaces of 18 of the men who have served as Presidents of the United States are held in national, State, local, or foundation ownership. This ownership has insured that these properties will be available permanently as valuable and significant historic sites.

The United States, through the National Park Service, has ownership and responsibility for the birthplaces of George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Herbert Hoover, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

With the desire and cooperation of the family of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, his birthplace in Brookline, Mass., can also be preserved in this most appropriate manner.

I thank my colleague, Senator JACKSON, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, who shared service and friendship with John Fitzgerald Kennedy, for his sponsorship of this bill with me.

It is our hope that the Congress will take suitable action on this bill, so that the birthplace of the 34th President of the United States can become a truly national historic site at an early date.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1161) to establish the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Historic Site in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, introduced by Mr. Cooper (for himself and Mr. Jackson), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DESIGNATION OF THE PAUL G. BLAZER LOCKS AND DAM, KENTUCKY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the late Paul G. Blazer, of Ashland, Ky., who died December 9, 1966, was one of Kentucky's outstanding citizens. One of the founders of Ashland Oil & Refining Co., and for many years its chief executive, he was an industrial leader of national prominence, and much of his activity throughout his life was devoted to civic, State, educational, and philosophical undertakings.

In the early 1930's, Mr. Blazer recognized the vital importance of water resource development for flood control, navigation, water supply, and allied purposes to the economic welfare of the Ohio River Valley, and devoted his energies wholeheartedly to the encouragement of such development.

Recognizing the vast potential of the Ohio River as a major artery of commerce, he was among the first to counsel modernization of the Ohio River navigation system—which experience during World War II had shown to be inadequate for the emerging needs of industry for low-cost water transportation of bulk commodities and fuels.

Through the years he contributed his time and effort, insight and wisdom to public recognition of the need for replacement of the obsolete and inadequate locks and dams which were stifling traffic growth. He pioneered also in the development of improved towboat and barge designs and operation to permit fuller realization by the consuming public of the cost-reducing potential of inland water transportation.

It is therefore appropriate that Mr. Blazer's unique contribution to the initiation and prosecution of the Ohio River modernization program be given permanent public recognition. There could be no more fitting memorial to one of Kentucky's and the Nation's outstanding citizens than designation of the Greenup locks and dam, near his home in Ashland, Ky., as the Paul G. Blazer locks and dam.

The benefits of the Ohio River lock and dam program have resulted in the saving and improvement of life and property in many communities and areas of Kentucky and throughout the States of the Ohio Valley.

For myself and my colleague, Senator Morton of Kentucky, and for Senator Randolph and Senator Byrd of West Virginia, I introduce a bill to designate the Greenup locks and dams as the Paul G. Blazer locks and dams.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1162) to change the name of the "Greenup Locks and Dam," Ohio River, Ky., to the "Paul G. Blazer Locks and Dams," introduced by Mr. Cooper (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1967—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 105

Mr. HARTKE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 355) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 106 THROUGH 109

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina submitted four amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 355, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTION, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 1071, to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit States, under Federal-State agreements, to provide for coverage for hospital insurance benefits for the aged for certain State and local employees whose services are not otherwise covered by the insurance system established by such title, the names of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney] be added as cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill S. 1101, to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program, to expand the program, and for other purposes, the name of the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] appear as a cosponsor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], I ask unanimous consent that the name of Senator McIntyre be added to the list of cosponsors of S. 852, the bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance for certain public recreational or fish and wildlife development projects in the rural conservation and development program. I also ask that his name be listed among the sponsors at the next printing of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senator Javits, Senator Holland, Senator Talmadge, Senator Cannon, and Senator Pearson be added to the list of cosponsors of S. 1012, the bill regarding the tax treatment of certain moving expenses reimbursed to employees by employers, and that their names be added to the list of sponsors at the next printing of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 369) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to eliminate, in certain cases, the requirement that an insured individual have first been admitted to a hospital in order to qualify under such title for the extended care services provided thereunder.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 790) to amend the Uniform Time Act in order to allow an option in the adoption of advanced time in certain cases.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 2) to amend the Constitution to provide for the direct election of the President and the Vice President of the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Mondale] be added as cosponsors of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 10) to restore Federal aid to highways.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors of the following bills:

Authority of February 6, 1967:

S. 850. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to preserve as an area of historic interest certain structures and lands comprising the Washington Navy Yard: Mr. Hartke, and Mr. Scott.

Authority of February 8, 1967:

S. 911. A bill to prohibit certain interstate land sales in violation of State law: Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Miller, Mr. Scott, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Williams of Delaware, and Mr. Young of North Dakota.

S. 923. A bill to improve the safety of railroad transportation under the jurisdiction of the Department of Transportation: Mr. Bible, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Church, Mr. Clark, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Inouye, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Morse, Mrs. Smith, and Mr. Tydings.

Authority of February 9, 1967:

S. 945. A bill to abolish the office of U.S. commissioner, to establish in place thereof within the judicial branch of the Government the office of U.S. magistrate, and for other purposes: Mr. Allott, Mr. Baker, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Case, Mr. Clark, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Fong, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Harris, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McGee, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Miller, Mr. Moss, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Scott, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Stennis, and Mr. Yarborough.

Authority of February 16, 1967:

S. 1004. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the central Arizona project, Arizona-New Mexico, and for other purposes: Mr. Cannon.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING ON PATENT LAW REVISION

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the standing Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to announce that the subcommittee has scheduled public hearings on patent law revision.

These hearings will begin on Wednesday, May 17 and Thursday, May 18, commencing at 10 a.m. in room 3302, New Senate Office Building. The hearings will consider S. 1042, the administration bill for general revision of the patent laws, and S. 2, to permit the issuance of patents upon inventions after certain disclosures. I understand that other bills for the general revision of the patent laws may be introduced, and if this occurs, they will also be considered.

I was requested to schedule hearings on this subject at an early date. Because of the complexity of patent revision and the need to afford all interested parties a reasonable opportunity to study the proposed legislation at various meetings which have been arranged for late April and May, I believe that the dates announced are the earliest possible dates for an informed consideration of this issue.

Anyone who wishes to testify or file a statement for the record should communicate with the office of the subcommittee, room 349A, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510, telephone 225-2268.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], and myself.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FRANK J. MURRAY, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, March 9, 1967, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the following nomination:

> Frank J. Murray, of Massachusetts, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Massachusetts, vice George C. Sweeney, retired.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], and myself, as chairman.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, today marks an anniversary which we on the minority side commemorate with particular pride. One hundred years ago on this day President Andrew Johnson signed the bill which established the U.S. Office of Education. And a principal proponent of that measure was a Congressman from Ohio—and later a Republican President of the United States—James A. Garfield.

The words of then-Representative Garfield in the House debate on the proposal to create an Office of Education bear particular significance for us even today, on both sides of the aisle. He said:

> Even the most extreme advocates of the principle of laissez faire as a sound maxim of political philosophy admit that governments must interfere in the aid of education. We must not wait for the wants of the rising generation to be expressed in a demand for means of education. We must ourselves discover and supply their needs, before the time for supplying them forever has passed. . . .

He concluded his address on the House floor that day more than a century ago with this admonition:

> I appeal to those who care more for the future safety and glory of this Nation than for any mere temporary advantage, to aid in giving to education the public recognition and active support of the Federal government.

I am sure we all will have occasion to recall these words of a great Republican proponent of education as this Congress progresses.

One hundred years ago, when the Office of Education was born, we were a nation of 37 States with 39 million inhabitants. Only one out of every five citizens could read and write. Only 2 percent of those 17 years old had graduated from high school.

Today, a century of progress later, we number 50 States and 198 million people with a literacy rate of 98 percent. And 72 percent of our 17-year-olds have completed high school.

As the U.S. Office of Education marks its birthday, the 100 candles on its cake give us light. The Office looks back on 100 years of growth and energy that mirror the growth and energy of our own country. And it looks forward to the future. The words of the great American essayist, Ralph Waldo Emerson, ring true:

> The true test of civilization is not the census nor the size of cities nor the corps—no, but the kind of man the country turns out.

To the Office of Education, and its Commissioner, Mr. Harold Howe, I express best wishes for another 100 years of youthful vigor.

FINANCIAL NEEDS OF NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING IN INTERNATIONAL FIELD

Mr. HART. Mr. President, it would be my hope that out of the unhappy CIA episode this Nation might be able to bring a constructive result to offset the many very damaging consequences.

We have had a series of programs under which students went to Helsinki, church people went to Geneva, labor leaders went to South America, and women's organizations went to various countries where women were beginning to take part in public life.

Because of the intensity of the feeling about the impropriety of the CIA being the source of the funds for these and similar activities, a feeling that I share, I fear we are about to jeopardize a wide range of work being carried on by nongovernmental organizations to bolster democratic forces overseas.

Indeed, we are in danger of overlooking the basic problem; namely, the time has come, indeed, it is long overdue, for us to face up to the critical financial needs of our many nongovernmental organizations operating in the international field. We must seek new ways to make it possible for these private, largely voluntary groups to put their talents to the service of the Nation. Aboveboard sources of funds, private and Federal, adequate to do the job that the national interest requires must be available.

As James Reston pointed out in his article of February 17 published in the New York Times:

> The problem, however, remains. It is that the Communist nations, and particularly the Soviet Union, are constantly trying to influence university leaders, labor union leaders, leading writers, and other potentially powerful individuals of the coming generation all over the world . . . This battle for the allegiance of the coming leaders of the world has never really been faced openly and effectively by the United States Government . . . What has been needed for a long time, and what is still needed now, is a candid discussion of the problem of subversion, and Congressional approval of a Government-supported but privately administered institution that will defend the nation's interest in the intellectual communities of the world.

This very point was made last fall, before the present disclosures, in the 1966 annual report of the Carnegie Corp., of New York—a corporation whose president until August 1965, was the present Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner. Entitled "The Nongovernmental Organization at Bay," this report describes the agonizing efforts of our nongovernmental organizations to raise sufficient funds with which to carry out their work, particularly at the international level. The report makes the point that increasingly the Federal Government is calling on these organizations to help carry out our farflung responsibilities. Yet the organizations are inadequately reimbursed by the Federal Government and inadequately supported by either the private foundations or private industry.

If this was a problem in 1966, when, according to the newspapers, many millions of dollars were being made available by the CIA to nongovernmental organizations for their international programs, how much greater will it be in the months and years ahead, now that these funds are apparently to be shut off? Even a cursory reading of the papers suggests the vacuum that will be created and the blow that will be dealt to international endeavors—whose value no one has questioned—being carried on in the interest of the United States by nongovernmental organizations such as the YWCA, the NEA, the Institute of Public Administration, the American Newspaper Guild, and the many others that have been mentioned.

In a masterpiece of prophesy, the Carnegie Corp. report in 1966 concluded with a paragraph on "the central issue," in which it asks some key questions:

> The real issue is beginning to emerge clearly. Is the nongovernmental organization of the future to be simply an auxiliary to the state, a kind of willing but not very resourceful handmaiden? Or is it to be a strong, independent adjunct that provides government with a type of capability it cannot provide for itself?
>
> If it is to be the latter, and for most Americans the question is one that is likely to admit of no other answer, then we must face up to the difficult problem of how we are to finance these organizations. More can be done on the private side, as private responsibility will—and should—continue. For example, there might perhaps be some advantages to be found in experimenting more widely with the notion of cooperative fund raising which has worked so well for some community chest organizations. But the question must also be raised as to whether responsibility for the general financial health of at least the most important of the nongovernmental organizations should not now be shared by the Federal Government. Certainly the time has come for a comprehensive and careful study of the problem from both the governmental and nongovernmental sides.
>
> If such a study should confirm the findings suggested by informal evidence and indicate the need for a new approach by government, three problems will then have to be considered: the mechanism for distribution of general support, how much support can be given without compromising the independence of the organizations aided, and how quality can be maintained.

In the Carnegie report, Acting President Alan Pifer suggests that we consider something analogous to the National Science Foundation as a device for channeling general support grants to the nongovernmental organizations. Surely the time is now for us to put our best talents to work to devise the best mechanism for such a purpose. For as the article concludes:

> If we want to avoid an ever more extensive and powerful Federal Government, it would seem that we must now, paradoxically, use federal money to ensure that we have a viable alternative—a network of vigorous, well-financed nongovernmental organizations ready to serve government but able, in the public interest, to maintain their independence of it. This further financial burden on government may be unpalatable to many. But the logic of it is hard to escape.

Because it expresses so well this general point of view, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the Detroit News editorial of February 19, 1967.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Detroit News, Feb. 19, 1967]

CIA Not Playing Cricket—Cold War No Game

The first factor to take into account in the furor over CIA secret funds for university students is that major powers—and they are not all Communist—have for years been trying to influence students and other opinion-forming groups of the coming generation in every land.

It is a subtle, behind-the-scenes game, as most Cold War activities are. By the very nature of the game, any acknowledgment that any nation participates or has participated in it clandestinely is a rarity. Forget the cliche about playing the game. The hard fact is that not to participate is to leave the field of potential proselytes wide open to the opposition.

With foundations acting as go-betweens—as a cover for the source—CIA funds since the early 1950s have gone to the National Student Association to help finance representatives to student congresses abroad, to fund student exchange programs and to provide technical aid and counseling in seminars abroad on higher education and student leadership.

The project began when student groups in this country were unable to get funds from private groups or foundations here for work abroad. Those American students studying overseas at that time or those attending Congresses abroad were only too well and painfully aware that Soviet front organizations with whom, in a sense, they were competing in influencing the third world, were heavily financed and totally controlled by Moscow.

That being the situation, was this nation—powerful, with the means, and thrust into the role of western leadership—to sit on its hands and watch the other side win the Battle for the Minds of the Next Generation? NSA decided to accept CIA money to join battle and continued to do so until two years ago when NSA ended the relationship.

NSA itself says it was never a tool of the CIA. It served no intelligence function. No young American minds were being corrupted. NSA provided no sensitive information to any U.S. agency. It didn't even support all facets of U.S. foreign policy.

No American will contend we should have lost by default this struggle forced upon us when the Cold War was beginning. The ferment is over whether the CIA should have been the agency involved. In some Americans' book, the CIA is as much of a menace as communism; they fool themselves that the Cold War is a game of cricket. The CIA was not established as an organization to observe gentlemanly rules and never play dirty. It must meet the foe on a wide open battleground on his terms.

Its alleged failures we hear about soon enough. Its involvement in the Bay of Pigs will provide ammunition to its detractors for years. Its successes—again, by the very nature of the game—go unheralded. One such success must be its help to students for a decade. Without that aid, those students would have been chairborne in this country instead of countering falsehood and pleading democracy's cause overseas.

The CIA did not ask for the job. Yet those now bewailing CIA involvement, including some former students who took CIA cash, plead why not let the State Department do the job, or the USIA, or someone else, like Dick or Tom or Harry? The short answer is that congressmen in charge of State Department appropriations don't realize the sort of competition for young minds we are involved in and won't foot the bill. The CIA had the funds at the time and it stepped into the vacuum.

A good case can be made out to let some other George, not the CIA, do it. The CIA would probably be delighted if that happened. If today there are funds from private foundations to do the work, fine. If a privately administered and government-supported organization will do the job, splendid. Let's establish one.

The fault in this furor lies within ourselves for not recognizing the intellectual world outside these shores is a legitimate prize in the Cold War. Another fault, when the realization is forced on us, is screaming because some private Mr. Clean didn't pick up the gauntlet in the 1950s. The George who did it may not be St. George, but he helped do the job.

UNSUNG HEROES

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, with the major emphasis centered on our military effort in Vietnam, we tend to give less attention to the other war being fought in that country—the shirtsleeves war against hunger, poverty, and disease.

The Agency for International Development has many capable men dedicated to helping the Vietnamese people solve their problems. They are hard at work in the provinces of Vietnam teaching the Vietnamese to help themselves. Their work is done quietly. News of the small battles won daily seldom reach our newspapers, nor do the heroes of this other war receive medals for their acts of bravery and sacrifice.

Mr. Richard Ehrlich of New Haven, Conn., is serving with AID as a provincial representative outside Saigon. Recently the Agency's weekly newspaper, Front Lines, published a feature article describing the splendid work Mr. Ehrlich is doing. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Front Lines, Feb. 15, 1967]

"River Rat" Helps "28 Yellow Orchid" Survive in War

"Blue Moon, Blue Moon, this is River Rat."

"River Rat, this is Blue Moon, go ahead."

"River Rat departing home station for 28 Yellow Orchid will arrive 0720."

"Roger, River Rat. Please check in on arrival. Blue Moon out."

EARLY LAUNCHING

It was 7 a.m. as "River Rat," who is really Dick Ehrlich, AID's "Prov Rep" in Gia Dinh Province near Saigon, switched off his radio transmitter and pulled away from "Blue Moon," the U.S. Navy base at Na Be, Vietnam.

He maneuvered his outboard-powered, plastic assault boat through the junks, sampans, oceangoing freighters, and U.S. and Vietnamese patrol craft nearby, then opened the throttle as he hit clear water and headed downstream. His first destination of the day, "28 Yellow Orchid", was the hamlet of An Hoa on the banks of the Soi Rap River, one of the main channels between the port of Saigon and the South China sea.

IMPORTANT SWAMPS

Dick, 25, is AID's representative for the districts of Can Gio (pronounced "joe"), Quang-Xuyen (pronounced "kwahng zwin") and Na Be (pronounced "na bay") in Gia Dinh.

His districts are important for a number of reasons. They control the river approaches to Saigon and they could, if properly developed, provide much of the fish the city people need.

Ranging from the tough dock section of Na Be just outside Saigon to the swamps and forests of Can Gio and Quang Xuyen, once home of the notorious Binh Xuyen river pirates, they present a colorful, diversified, and impoverished corner of Vietnam.

The Vietnamese, in fact, call Can Gio and Quang Xuyen the "Rung Sat," or swamp, and at high tide, much of the area is covered by water. Dick drives from his home in Saigon to Na Be but from there on, all his traveling is done by boat.

An Hoa perches on the edge of the river so close to the highwater mark that twice a month, at flood tide, all the open land in town goes under water. The problems which Dick found there were typical of all those faced by the people of the Rung Sat.

"The people in the Rung Sat are becoming poorer and poorer because of the war", Dick noted. "Basically they are woodcutters and fishermen. But woodcutting has become a precarious affair, as they have to go out into areas controlled by the Viet Cong who tax them one-third of their produce.

WORKING PROBLEMS

"Meanwhile", he added, "the fishermen are hurt by the government's dusk to dawn curfew on the waterways which deprives them of their best hours for fishing."

To offset this, he is working with the district and hamlet chiefs on new ways for the people to supplement their food and to earn a living. Recently, he brought two and one half tons of American corn to An Hoa to help fatten the local chickens and pigs. He is also working on a feeding program for the fresh water fish breeding ponds where many of the fish in Rung Sat hamlets such as An Hoa are now being raised.

NYLON FISHING NETS

On the day of this story, Dick suggested to the hamlet chief, Dang, that the hamlet's fishing cooperative, which buys fingerlings for the ponds, consider buying nylon thread for their nets. Nylon nets can be made by the people, last up to five times as long as cotton nets, and require far less maintenance. Dang agreed that this would be a good undertaking, and said he would discuss it with co-op members.

Dick also talked about other needs of Rung Sat, such as water and better housing for the local Popular Force militia so the force could be increased to provide better protection for the woodcutters.

All good water, for instance, must be brought in by barge, and costs an estimated one-third of the peoples' annual income. Fresh water wells could be dug, but the expense will probably preclude that.

WATER FOR AN HOA

The local American military advisory team gave the hamlet a junk for carrying supplies. Dick hopes to equip it to carry fresh water.

Through hard work, Dick has been able to bring a number of badly needed items to An Hoa and other hamlets. These include corn, a surplus U.S. Army tank truck for carrying water in Na Be, sand for making cement, and a bargeload of construction materials for Popular Forces' housing.

All these things are doing something to make life better for the people there, said Dick. "They're so pitifully poor that anything AID does in the area has an immediate impact."

Dick describes his language ability as "minimal working Vietnamese" but he will not use an interpreter.

"Invariably you lose part of what you want to say when you filter it through an interpreter," he said. "Especially your feelings. If you can get your intentions across to these people, you invariably meet with a very warm welcome."

Dick is a graduate of Hotchkiss School in Connecticut and was majoring in architecture at Yale before he entered U.S. Military Service. A veteran of 20 months' service in Vietnam with the U.S. Special Forces, Dick returned to work with AID a year ago. He was administrative officer for the Field Operations Division before being assigned to Rung Sat and Na Be.

HIGHWAY FREEZE SHOULD BE THAWED FURTHER

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, as a member of the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works and as a Senator from a State deprived of more than 50 percent of its 1967 Federal-aid highway funds, I urge the administration to release additional funds soon for highway programs throughout the Nation.

The action announced 3 days ago by the Secretary of Transportation offers very little assistance in the current fiscal year. Only $175 million of the $1.1 billion in Federal highway funds the administration withheld from States last November is to be released.

Of the $175 million, Hawaii will receive the grand total of $1,352,000—a drop in the bucket compared with the $25.2 million that was withheld.

Meantime, more and more construction workers in Hawaii are losing their jobs. Latest figures show 33 percent of persons unemployed in Hawaii are construction workers. More and more businesses engaged in highway construction, materials supply, and related enterprises are facing drastic loss of income. Some are facing bankruptcy.

None of the $1,352,000 just released to Hawaii is available for highway construction, only for preliminary engineering and acquiring of rights-of-way.

At the joint hearings of the Senate and House Subcommittees on Roads, held Monday and Tuesday this week, Members of Congress cited similar bleak pictures in their areas.

Unfortunately, the full extent of the far-reaching impact of the administration's highway freeze was not presented in oral testimony before the joint hearing as the subcommittees decided to recess immediately after hearing administration witnesses.

I think it would have been very enlightening for the press and the American people to learn the widespread ramifications of the huge cut in highway funds, not only on employment, sales, and construction contracts, but also on the safety of the millions of Americans who comprise the motoring public.

Instead, on assurances of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that the administration would continue to scrutinize the Nation's economy to determine if additional highway funds can be released and on his testimony that there is more than a 50–50 chance that a significant sum would be released before June 30, the subcommittees recessed subject to call of the two chairmen.

I for one shall continue to follow closely the developments in my State and in the Nation and continue to press for full rescission of the order freezing highway funds.

Only 3 days ago, the Senate of the Fourth Legislature of the State of Hawaii approved a resolution, under bipartisan cosponsorship, citing Hawaii's plight and calling on the President to reconsider his action freezing highway funds for Hawaii.

The resolution is a strong expression of real concern on the part of State senators in Hawaii.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the State of Hawaii, situated at the crossroads of the Pacific, is the center of military, industrial, and commercial activity between the countries of the East and West; and

Whereas, it is essential that the State of Hawaii, as the crossroads of the Pacific, have a system of highways to service the needs of all its military, industrial and commercial activities; and

Whereas, the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 and other federal statutes, created and established a program for the construction of a system of interstate and defense highways, and federal-aid primary and secondary highways with urban extensions in the State of Hawaii; and

Whereas, the federal government has urged the State of Hawaii and this state's highway industry to step up construction because Hawaii did not enjoy the full impact of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 until it attained statehood in 1959, and Hawaii has been most cooperative in this regard as is evidenced not only by the accelerated highway program but also by the training and establishment of a skilled work force, and by the large, long-term capital investments undertaken by contractors, subcontractors and material suppliers to meet this commitment; and

Whereas, the construction team of working men and equipment, of professional engineers and contractors, once developed and operating efficiently, cannot be sustained if the financing becomes spasmodic and unreliable; and

Whereas, it has been definitely demonstrated in Hawaii that better highways save the time, lives and money of our citizens, and that the consequences of a reduction in highway improvements would adversely affect the well-being of our citizens and cause further suffering and tragic loss of lives; and

Whereas, the cut-back announced by the President on November 23, 1966, reduced the federal funds available for fiscal year 1967 to Hawaii for highway construction purposes from $64,134,585 to $28,640,500, a reduction of $35,494,085; and

Whereas, the adverse effect of such a cutback not only affects the construction industry of Hawaii but will have a lasting adverse effect on the economy of the entire State of Hawaii; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the Fourth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1967, that the President of the United States be and is hereby respectfully requested to reconsider his decision to cutback on this most vital and necessary federal-aid highway program; and

Be it further resolved that certified copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each member of the Hawaii congressional delegation and the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1967

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I wholeheartedly cosponsor and support each of the President's proposals for civil rights legislation at this session of Congress.

There are none among us, I am sure, who are opposed to the full enjoyment by members of minority groups of rights that other Americans often take for granted. Yet we all know that thousands of Americans are now denied many of these rights and privileges because of discrimination on account of their race, religion, or national origin.

We cannot allow this intolerable situation to continue.

Despite the enactment of two historic civil rights laws in two successive years—in 1964 and in 1965—barriers of discrimination and injustice are still to be found in to many areas of our Nation.

The President's proposals deal with several major areas untouched or inadequately treated by previous civil rights legislation. We should enact them promptly.

Two of the President's proposals are intended to preclude discrimination in the selection of State and Federal juries. While the federal system does not appear to have operated unconstitutionally, in some districts the representation of Negroes on juries has been substantially less than the proportion of Negroes in the community; in addition, other classes have sometimes been found to be inadequately represented.

The problem in the States is much more acute. Exclusion of Negroes from juries in certain areas appears to have been the rule and not the exception. To permit these practices to continue would be an intolerable effront to the rule of law.

A third proposal deals with one of the most important social problems facing this country today: that of disproportionately low employment among Negroes because of racial discrimination.

In 1964, Congress took the first step toward remedying the problem. That step has proved inadequate, because the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission was not given enforcement powers by the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Commission was given authority only to attempt to eliminate employment discrimination by conciliation.

The bill would give the Commission enforcement authority similar to that now possessed by other Federal regulatory agencies. It would strengthen the Commission's hand in conciliation efforts and give it effective power to proceed against recalcitrant violators of the law.

A fourth proposal deals with the issue of fair housing. The bill has been modified in some particulars from last year's fair housing proposal to provide more time for conciliation and persuasion, and to create a climate of opinion more favorable to open housing.

The prohibition on discrimination would not affect any housing not already covered by the Executive order until January 1, 1968. On that date new single-family housing and larger apartment dwellings would be covered. A year later all other housing except exempted religious housing would be covered.

The bill also provides for administrative enforcement by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, subject to judicial review. The Attorney General may also bring suit to eliminate a pattern or practice of resistance to the law.

A fifth proposal, dealing with racial violence, is practically identical to title V of last year's bill. The bill proposes criminal sanctions designed to deter and punish those who would interfere by force with various activities protected by other Federal statutes or the Constitution.

The current Federal laws on the subject are woefully inadequate. They do not even reach some acts of violence against Negroes; for example, attacks by mobs of private persons on helpless children seeking to enter desegregated schools.

A nation which prides itself upon the rule of law cannot further tolerate denial of such legal rights by violence. Since State and local officials have sometimes failed to do their duty, we must act.

A sixth proposal is that we extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 5 years. The Commission has played a vital role in the struggle for equality; its life should be extended as proposed.

Mr. President, there can be no doubt of the sincerity of our commitment, as a nation, to the precepts of equality and freedom contained in the Constitution.

It seems to me imperative that we act favorably on the proposals now before us. By doing so, we will have taken another gigantic step closer to the day when we are truly one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

NEW DIMENSIONS OF SEAPOWER

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, one of the major achievements of the 89th Congress was the enactment of legislation designed to advance oceanography. The year 1966 has been properly hailed as a period when more was done to promote marine science and technology than any other year in congressional history. Two new laws stand out in this regard: the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act and the Sea Grant College and Program Act.

As a cosponsor of both measures, I am happy to note that encouraging steps are being taken to implement the legislation initiated in the Congress.

A timely description of the coming of age of oceanography has been provided by Dr. Edward Wenk, Jr., Executive Secretary of the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development—the Cabinet-level policy planning group created under the new law. In an address to the 10th annual Seapower Symposium of the Navy League, delivered February 9, 1967, at the Sheraton-Park Hotel in Washington, Dr. Wenk stated:

> Today's return to the sea represents, in many ways, a virtual renaissance in our age-old courtship of the oceans.
>
> When I refer to a transition in our aptitude and our attitude, I mean that sea power has come to the forefront because *oceanography has come of age*. Marine sciences are now maturing as a significant area of *learning* about the sea. But our aptitude also includes *doing*.
>
> The time is *technologically ripe* to utilize the sea. As the beneficiaries of invention and innovation in our nation's activities, we possess the technological readiness to tackle problems of almost any description. The government-industry partnership, so successful in the aerospace and other industries, is a proven resource uniquely qualified to apply the technical cutting edge to the challenging marine environment.

Dr. Wenk spoke from his background as a specialist in ocean engineering in the mid-1950's, when he pioneered in the development of the concept for deep-diving submersibles, notably the *Aluminaut*. Within a decade, according to Dr. Wenk, a revolution has taken place in the use of the small, deep running research submarine by all agencies of the Federal Government, by industry, and universities. ***Aluminaut, Alvin, Deep Star***, and other U.S. deep submersibles that made about 30 research dives in 1965 completed over 200 in 1966.

As the Executive Secretary of the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, Dr. Wenk brings a wealth of experience and knowledge in science and engineering to his new post.

Since 1959, he served first as Chief of the Science Policy Research Division of the Library of Congress, and later as assistant to the Presidential Science Adviser, until his appointment to head the staff of the Marine Resources Council 6 months ago.

I commend the Council, whose chairman is Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, and Dr. Wenk and his staff for the swiftness and enthusiasm with which they have begun their task.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address by Dr. Wenk before the Navy League symposium on "New Dimensions of Sea Power."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW DIMENSIONS OF SEA POWER

(By Dr. Edward Wenk, Jr., Executive Secretary, National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development to the 10th annual Seapower Symposium of the Navy League, Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., February 9, 1967)

I am honored by this platform and by this distinguished audience. I am also grateful for the opportunity to discuss sea power with a group that so well understands its relationship to our national welfare. I want to examine with you some of sea power's new dimensions—elements of our national security beyond conventional terms of military strength that will assure our continued leadership for world order, and the attainment of scientific, technological, social and economic progress.

First, let me say a word about your exhibitions. The United States Navy's broadening range of interest is well expressed by the verbal and the visual scope of this Symposium. In sponsoring this program, the Navy League, through its District of Columbia Council, both illuminates achievements of the recent past and spotlights the potential which today's unfulfilled promise of the sea hold for mankind's future. To many people our defense activities are known only as cold and impersonal budget statistics. But they come alive in the types of exhibits on display here. The industries and organizations joining in this program deserve our congratulations for their informative presentations. All those who attend this Exposition, as participants or onlookers, will leave with a better realization of what we are gaining from our investments of public and private funds.

This 10th Symposium is also significant because it comes at a time of transition in our *attitude* and our *aptitude* toward the sea and its resources. In the past we have often overlooked our rich heritage as a seafaring nation. Some years ago we began to intensify our efforts to learn about the sea. Now we focus on functional exploration, on applications of oceanic sciences and technologies, and on gaining answers to the greater potential of sea power to contribute to human needs—to the issues of peace and international understanding; starvation; population pressures; health. We recognize that the vast resources of the sea can help solve our growing needs for food, usable water, minerals, and energy. Our sea power goals, therefore, are not only those of poets and prophets, but of practical men in search of practical treasures.

In our quest for improved national security, it should not be surprising that we have turned to the seas as well as to land, air, and space. The potentials for scientific and technical evolution today are universal; targets of opportunity appear in every direction. Not the least of these lie beneath the surface of the seas, an area as provocative and potentially rewarding as any wilderness we have ever known.

Today's return to the sea represents, in many ways, a virtual renaissance in our age-old courtship of the oceans.

When I refer to a transition in our aptitude and our attitude, I mean that sea power has come to the forefront because *oceanography has come of age*. Marine sciences are now maturing as a significant area of *learning* about the sea. But our aptitude also includes *doing*.

The time is *technologically* ripe to utilize the sea. As the beneficiaries of invention and innovation in our nation's activities we possess the technological readiness to tackle problems of almost any description. The Government-industry partnership, so successful in the aerospace and other industries, is a proven resource uniquely qualified to apply the technical cutting edge to the challenging marine environment. That partnership is now meeting new non-defense needs of the American people by undertaking challenges of air pollution, urban development, rapid transit, and others. By meeting human needs through the sea, we can also build sea power as a more effective link among the peoples of the world.

We are at a fulcrum of history when we should consider our sea power not only as a military force but as a force for economic, technological and sociological productivity. Like land power and air power, sea power will then take on a larger stature not only as a deterrent to aggression but as a creative force for peace. When I refer to sea power then, I refer to all the elements of a nation's power: Its people. Its brain power in understanding the marine environment. Its horsepower: a vigorous, imaginative marine technology that is both a shield and a producer of economic wealth. Power is exploration in the Magellan, Perry, Richard Byrd sense. And it is disciplined strength through interest in using the resources endowed by nature to benefit man.

The Federal Government, through its traditional leadership role, has done much to foster the growth of oceanography. We have an outstanding cadre of scientists, engineers, ships, laboratories.

Of paramount significance to this effort is the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act, passed by the Congress and approved by the President just six months ago. This mandate commits the nation for the first time in its history to a long-range and comprehensive program in marine sciences for the benefit of all men.

Two complementary organizations were established by law to assist the President in implementing this mandate. The first is the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, a Cabinet-level policy planning group chaired by Vice President Hubert Humphrey. The second body is an advisory Commission on Marine Sciences, Engineering and Resources, composed of 15 eminent Government, industry and university authorities, with four members of Congress serving as advisers.

In support of the marine science and technology program, President Johnson has proposed Fiscal Year 1968 appropriations of 462 million dollars, including 40 million dollars in "new initiatives" for the development of ocean food resources, deep ocean technology, and marine research and education. This request of $462 millions, allocated among eleven Federal departments and agencies, is up from $409 millions last year. This increase was approved by the President at a time of great budget pressures and very careful screening of budget items. It indicates, therefore, the importance the Administration is attaching to this field.

For the balance of my time with you tonight, I want to outline—rather briefly—a few of the potentials we see in a national program of marine science affairs. I want also to identify some of the challenges we face. Finally, I would like to encourage your support of the activities vital to our program for progress if we are to realize the values inherent in today's new dimensions of sea power.

Our objective is the effective use of the sea by man for all purposes peculiar to his life in the terrestrial environment. These include commerce, industry, defense, recreation, and—more generally—knowledge and understanding.

First, with regard to defense—the seas, traditionally, have afforded protection. First barriers to aggression, they are now refuges for the undersea component of our deterrent forces. Forty-one nuclear-powered submarines carrying armed Polaris missiles hide beneath the waves. It is likely that future strategic forces of the nation will rely heavily on ocean-based systems. Such systems may well require operations in a much wider range of ocean environment for much longer times than at present. Thus, the need for oceanographic research becomes even greater and will surely have to encompass widening problem areas in the maintenance of submarine forces.

Another security motivation stems from the need to continue advances in our antisubmarine capability. The effectiveness of current ASW forces is limited in part by the incomplete understandings of the environmental conditions in which surveillance sensors and weapon systems are deployed. Considering the cost of operating these forces, any increase in effectiveness would constitute a wise investment indeed.

We seek, incidentally, a dual objective. We would like to make the seas transparent for our purposes, while still maintaining the ability to operate free from detection.

The military search and recovery mission is another function where oceonography is related to national defense. In fact, the loss of the Thresher in 1963 and the more recent unarmed nuclear weapon incident off the coast of Spain cannot be regarded as isolated happenings, insignificant to the long-term conditions of national security. We can expect future requirements to call for the retrieval of objects from the ocean floor.

A capability in this area of ocean operations is one purpose of the Navy's Deep Submergence Program, continuing this year at a proposed funding level of 49 million dollars—up some $16 millions over the Fiscal Year 1967 figure.

National security depends on more than simply military strategy. Implicit in our concept of security is a true freedom of the seas—and the ability to operate or to utilize the resources of the sea anywhere on or within the oceans.

Admiral Mahon's classic observations on sea power are, I think, still relevant. His emphasis on the importance of a flexibility of attitude in our use of the seas suggests that today the Navy recognizes the non-defense aspects of sea power. As civilian research and development ventures grow, the Navy must continue as a significant partner to aid other Federal agencies to realize their expanding missions. In fact, one of the main objectives of the Marine Sciences Council is to help work of different agencies to be mutually reinforcing.

Let us consider another dimension of sea power—the seas hold vast untapped potentials for enlarged world food supplies and enriched nutrition. Only in the so-called developed areas is there an adequate balance of the calories, proteins, and vitamins necessary for general health. Chronic protein deficiency is a serious health hazard among the one-and-a-half billion people in the equatorial zone who subsist largely on a one-crop diet. One of the new initiatives in the marine resources program is a proposal to embark on an intensified long-range program to exploit the oceans as a source of food to help feed the undernourished people of the world.

The technologies are available for converting fish into a dry flour-like substance called *fish protein concentrate*. Tasteless and odorless, it has potential application for children in the less developed countries as a food additive in a variety of forms suited to the customs of the people.

Fish protein concentrate now appears to be one of the least expensive and richest sources of protein we have. Ten grams of FPC will provide adequate animal protein to meet the daily requirements of one child, at an estimated cost of less than one cent per child per day. Food and Drug Administration approval of FPC makes it possible to proceed without delay to refine the process for world market.

Our interest here is to help wage war on hunger by an export of American technology and managerial knowhow. If we are successful in finding ways to alleviate human hunger by harvesting the food resources of the oceans in new and imaginative ways, we shall advance the basis for a strong foundation of international good will and friendship.

A third area where marine activities are becoming increasingly significant concerns the preservation of the near-shore environment and utilization of resources on the Continental Shelf.

The United States has some 13,000 miles of coastline. Nearly 75 percent of our population live in the states bordering the oceans and Great Lakes. This concentration may well increase, for people always have been attracted to seaside locations. So have commercial interests. At the present time only three percent of our coastline is available for public recreation and the preservation of natural resources. Paradoxically, while we find increasing populations seeking to utilize our seashore, the resource itself is being degraded, often by man's own actions. The by-products of technological progress continue to detract from the value of coastal areas. In all too many instances, oil-covered beaches, polluted harbors and bays, and eroded shorelines have accompanied economic developments along our coasts.

Pollution of our water resources has become as serious a problem as the pollution of the atmosphere. And the oceans, huge as they are, are not immune to the effects caused by unthinking disposal of wastes.

Intensive, well-founded programs of marine research can help alleviate this problem: first, by better understanding the effects of pollution; second, by seeking alternatives or treatment measures; and, third, by defining positive ways in which the near-shore environment can be *used* but not *abused*. Urban planning no longer can end at the water's edge. Pilot studies for pollution control are one of our immediate goals.

We are, perhaps, on the threshold of arriving at a new understanding of what we mean when we say "near-shore environment." The average depth of the continental shelves is about 600 feet. This shelf area, almost one-third as large as the land territory, was added to our national holdings by a Law of the Sea Convention that went into force in 1964. If ways can be found for men to work or live at such depths, in reasonable safety and relative comfort, we could effectively add one million square miles of sea bed to our "inhabitable" environment. The scientific secrets and the mineral, animal and vegetable wealth of those submerged plains would be unlocked to man's use.

We would then have the technological key to "Davy Jones' Locker"—the underwater storehouse of offshore oil, gas, and minerals.

Some of what has been learned in the past two centuries of terrestrial engineering, fifty years of aeronautical engineering, and two decades of space engineering has already been applied to the seas. But the normal engineering solutions can seldom be applied directly. We must learn to cope with the unique qualities of the marine environment.

The Man-in-the-Sea program has aimed at finding ways for men to descend to 600 feet, perhaps to a thousand feet, and stay there for days, weeks, or even months.

Still, capabilities at these depths are sufficient only for reaching the Continental Shelves. The unarmed nuclear device lost in the area of Spain was recovered from nearly 2900 feet of water. To improve and extend its recovery capabilities the Navy plans to begin development of a small manned submersible and associated equipment operational at depths down to 20,000 feet. The first vehicle to be acquired through this substantial engineering task should be ready for test by mid-1971. Effective means for rescuing crews from sunken submarines is also under development. A 30-ton, 50-foot prototype rescue vehicle, air transportable and capable of removing two dozen people per trip, is being built. In fact, during the past year, we have seen a revolution in use of the small, deep running research submarine by all agencies of the Federal Government, by industry, and universities. Aluminaut, Alvin, Deep Star, and other U.S. deep submersibles that made about 30 research dives in 1965 completed over 200 in 1966.

This leads to a fourth dimension of sea power—knowledge of our marine environment. That "knowledge is power" is an old cliche. But it is true. There are tremendous opportunities for increasing our understanding of this planet through underwater investigations. The oceans are immense laboratories and the potentials here are well expressed in the theme of this Symposium—"Oceans Unlimited."

Satellites can now observe and report global weather, but they can't explain why certain weather conditions develop. Development of a theory of climate will certainly require treating the oceans and atmosphere as an interacting system. It is a distant thought, but the possibility exists that we might someday be able to modify the weather. If we are ever to achieve such a goal we must necessarily combine two or more of the environmental sciences. Oceanic circulation, for example, can't be understood apart from atmospheric circulation, nor can atmospheric circulation be predicted beyond a few days without considering the oceans. In large part, weather is "made" over the oceans. We must study the problem at its source.

In terms of the data to be acquired about our earth and its formation, the oceans undoubtedly hold a priceless reservoir of information. Oceans comprise 71 percent of the earth's geography. Four-fifths of all species of life exist in salt water. We must explore the seas and learn of its processes; map its current; discover its sources of economic wealth.

In short, our success in realizing any of these new dimensions of sea power depends entirely on our collective ability to meet the challenges that lie before us.

We must, first, understand better the role of the oceans in our national thinking. Sea power considerations, in the broadest sense possible, must become inherent in our formation of national policy. This applies not only to the military and maritime activities of our national life, but to research and development as well.

We gain some perspective on our present status when we consider that only three percent of our national research and development effort, as reflected in budgets, contribute to marine interests. A gain of just one percent in national R&D expenditures, both Federal and private, would effectively increase the intensity of our effort by one-third.

Second, we must meet the technical challenges that confront us. These involve the engineering and development of protective devices, new underwater equipment, and shore facilities for advanced research and development. We must solve ways of improving communications and devise techniques for assuring man's safety in the hostile environment of the sea's depths.

Third, we must attract more talent into the ocean sciences. Admittedly, ours is a young profession. The first degree in oceanography was granted only 35 years ago. Even today, of 2650 persons employed in the marine sciences and technologies, only 630 have oceanographic degrees.

The Sea Grant College program established last fall should help materially in the recruitment and education of future ocean engineers and technicians. One million dollars is being reprogrammed under the Fiscal Year 1967 budget for sea grant purposes, and four million dollars are included in the Fiscal Year 1968 budget requests.

A fourth challenge is one of stimulating initiative and sustaining a comprehensive program of research and development, test and experimentation. One month after the Council was created last June, President Johnson requested the Council to come up with recommendations for action. A start on meeting this challenge, I believe, will be provided by the first report of the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, soon to be released, that contains a number of explicit proposals. These are cast in the perspective of broad national policies and objectives, and reflect new areas of emphasis by mobilizing our ongoing effort to meet explicit goals.

Before closing, I want to stress the necessity to attract and encourage greater private investment in the future of sea power. The majority of Federal funds, of course, are expended through grants and contracts with private industries, universities, and research organizations. If these funds are augmented by private investments, the opportunities for meaningful and timely advances will surely increase.

In addition to funds, the advanced technology industries can contribute to sea power progress by thinking and acting imaginatively. But the opportunities are there to explore and exploit, to observe and apply, to design and develop: new ways of doing new things in and through the seas. We should pay special tribute to the example of industry that on its own initiative and with its own funds developed most of the research subs mentioned earlier.

A scant ten years ago we did not have a national space program. Today the moon is within our reach. We have launched hundreds of satellites for communications, meteorological warning exploration and other purposes. Our astronauts have traveled in space. We have rocketed instruments past Venus and Mars.

Three things have made these feats possible. One is the national leadership of the program at the executive level and the support of the people through the Congress. The other is entrepreneurship as demonstrated by American industries. The third is the creative contributions by our universities. This triad of independent institutions is our strength; we must focus this capability on new challenges.

These substantial resources, I submit, are available today for oceanographic research and development. Congress has passed legislation, supported by both parties, and the President has soundly endorsed it. The Vice President, as Chairman of the Marine Sciences Council has spoken widely and worked tirelessly in the cause of marine progress. Twenty-three bureaus in eleven Federal departments or agencies are engaged in the activities encompassed by the national program and their efforts are being coordinated by this Council. This Exposition testifies to the extent of industry interest already expressed in the challenges of the seas.

Today we need more engineering capability to tap the animal, vegetable, mineral and scientific wealth of the oceans. The Government-industry team can provide them. We need more management ability vital to so massive an undertaking. American enterprise can provide that, too.

The Navy, through its Office of Naval Research and its Deep Submergence Program, has pioneered the way. Industry, too, has played a crusading role in the development of submarines and in the impetus it has given to various forms of marine developments. Other agencies of Federal and state departments have contributed to the early quest of this new frontier. Universities and research centers have laid the base of sound research.

Today we have the means and the opportunity to forge these components into a strong and vibrant team, committed to realizing a broad, effective use of the seas. We have the capacity to turn stumbling blocks into stepping stones—to take giant strides into the last remaining frontier.

Federal involvement in marine science is the oldest of the Federal Government's scientific pursuits, dating back 150 years to the founding of the Coast Survey to meet the needs of the nation's navigators. Now we are navigating a new course into the future, and to do so we have again turned to the sea.

Sea power used to be viewed as a military commodity exclusively. Today the new dimensions of sea power embrace economic, industrial, and sociological strengths. The seas once were simply corridors of commerce and avenues of travel between nations. Today they are sources of new understanding and greater cooperation among people. The seas once fed only a few; now they can feed many. The seas were once a forgotten resource. Now they are a bright hope for a future of renewed plenty in a world of increasing need.

As Mr. Humphrey has said: "To the extent that we can foresee the future, we may be able to achieve some control over it."

Together we shall turn today's doubts into tomorrow's certainties. Together we shall realize new dimensions of sea power. For the seas around us are the sign and symbol and substance of the future before us.

Thank you, and good evening.

FLASH: FALSE FISH FILLETS

Mr. **BARTLETT**. Mr. President, on Tuesday the distinguished senior Senator from Washington and chairman of the Committee on Commerce [Mr. MAGNUSON] rose to decry a fraud being perpetrated upon the American consumer. The instrument of fraud is a relatively small fish caught in Greenland waters. It is commonly called Greenland halibut, but it is smaller and vastly inferior to the north Pacific halibut that U.S. consumers are familiar with.

Mr. President, the Senator from Washington very ably described the situation, which is growing more serious by the day. I shall limit my remarks by saying simply that I concur in everything the Senator from Washington said and that I most heartily agree that the American consumer and the halibut industry deserve the protection of the U.S. Government. Immediate action is imperative, and I have been in communication with both the Food and Drug Administration and the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries with regard to this matter.

RADIO WAS NOT FORGOTTEN

Mr. **BARTLETT**. Mr. President, Tuesday the President sent to Congress a recommendation that Congress enact the Public Television Act of 1967.

I support that recommendation, for it authorizes increased aid to educational television and assistance to educational radio for the first time and looks to the future by establishing a corporation which, among other things, is to investigate "the practicality and the economic advantages of using communication satellites to establish an educational television and radio network."

Mr. President, I was extremely pleased that while the word "radio" was omitted from the title of the act, the medium of radio was not forgotten in the language of the act.

In testifying before the Subcommittee on Communications in August on the proposal of the Ford Foundation that an educational television satellite system be created, I took the liberty to expand Thomas Carlyle's great law of culture to read:

> Let each become all that he was created capable of being; let man make full use of his inventions to help him become all that he was created capable of being.

It would be most shortsighted to limit the development of a broadcast educational program to television, for the experience of the past 2 years has demonstrated that educational radio has a part to play in helping man to become all that he was created capable of being.

In the little more than 2 years since National Educational Radio was founded, its membership has grown to more than 150 affiliates. Operating on a surprisingly and, I suspect, discouragingly small budget, NER each week sends out about 1,200 tapes.

Further, as Jack Gould, the distinguished television and radio critic of the New York Times, observed in a recent column:

> National Educational Radio at present is farther ahead in taping the rewards of international broadcasting than any other American or TV service.

Certainly a medium which can bring to rural and urban areas alike, news, discussion, instruction, and culture from around the world is an important extension of man's ability to receive the information and inspiration needed to cope with the complexities of the modern world.

Jerrold Sandler, NER executive director, stated the case for educational radio in this way:

> Is radio dead? How can it be at a time when education needs every creative weapon to deal with the population, knowledge, and technology explosions? Perhaps the appropriate question is: How can Educational Radio most effectively meet these new challenges? The answer, of course, lies immediately ahead—in an era of communication satellites, a time when an Educational Communications System will encompass existing electronic and related media (plus others yet to be developed) for the benefit of all. It will mean that radio—and especially Educational Radio—will have to play new roles, often complementary and supplementary to other media of communication. The real challenge will be in developing the unique ways in which educational radio can—and must—be the right medium for the right job.

Mr. President, I have directed most of my remarks at educational radio, not because I wish to downgrade the importance of educational television, but because I wish to call attention to the fact that educational radio has not been and, if I have any say, will not be forgotten as Congress seeks ways to help man make full use of his inventions.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gould's column entitled "And Please Don't Forget Radio" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AND PLEASE DON'T FORGET RADIO

(By Jack Gould)

In all the lofty and stimulating concern over the future of non-commercial television, there has been a persistent and ill-considered disregard of an older and equally deserving medium: non-commercial radio. Radio has been a victim of discrimination that surely should be corrected in any longrange consideration of developing broadcasting's cultural resources.

While millions of dollars are casually dispersed in the cause of educational TV, there has not even been a thought about some nickels and dimes for the sound medium that has so much to offer and can do it at a tiny fraction of the cost of improving the home screen.

The sturdy champions of non-commercial radio have reason to be discouraged. Congress passed the Educational Television Facilities Act to award Federal funds for construction and improvement of ETV plants, but the measure made no mention of radio. The Carnegie Commission on Educational Television, as its title implies, did not even concern itself with the problems of educational radio. It urged the establishment of a "Corporation for Public Television," apparently without so much as a thought for the more adequate alternative of a "Corporation for Public Broadcasting." The Ford Foundation gave a bit of passing lip service to radio, but the fund basically is all wrapped up in the glamor of TV.

Precisely because such august bodies have fallen under the hypnotic spell of video, it is not an exaggeration to suggest that non-commercial radio could face a crisis more severe than the multitudinous problems confronting educational TV. Congress is scheduled to act again this year on the Educational Facilities Act and, if radio is omitted once more, the sound medium might never get its foot in the door again. Non-commercial radio clearly belongs on the agenda of the Senate Commerce Committee when hearings on non-commercial TV are held.

E. G. Burrows, chairman of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, who is manager of the radio stations at the University of Michigan, said last week that his organization would press for favorable Senate consideration of the needs of educational radio.

The contrast in the economics of educational television and radio are little short of startling. The Carnegie Commission, for instance, suggested that $45,000 might be the cost of one hour of qualitative educational TV. On a budget of $60,000 for a full year, National Educational Radio, the taped network of non-commercial stations, turns out 1,200 programs from its headquarters in Urbana, Ill.

Mr. Burrows is not one to indulge in guesses as to what educational radio might need. But when it was noted that most everyone thinks educational television ultimately will need at least $200-million to do a respectable job, he was asked what $1-million might mean for educational TV. He was practically speechless. "We could do so much I couldn't spell it out," he said.

At the moment, there are approximately 350 licensed non-commercial radio stations of all types. Some are affiliated with churches, such as WRVR in New York; others are arms of city or state school systems and a great many are providing an overall community service under the auspices of major universities and colleges.

CIVILIZED RELIEF

Operating on veritable shoestring budgets, many of the stations have registered remarkable achievements in public service, in alert coverage of controversial issues and in substituting imagination for lush production resources. Especially in areas where the caliber of commercial radio has not been notably diversified, it has been the non-commercial station which frequently has provided an oasis of civilized relief with a schedule of classical music, talks by university faculty members and reportage of local affairs. If grass roots broadcasting is conceded to be a laudable national goal, much of it is now actually going on without salute or cheer.

It would be foolhardy to assume that only television is capable of educational broadcasting. There are many types of programs where visual illustration is not necessary and the exciting idea or the provocative dissertation can be distributed with great effectiveness by radio.

Throughout the country some of the non-commercial stations, most of which are in the FM band, are linked together either regularly or occasionally by a live state or regional network. But when it is thought how much might be done with regular live coast-to-coast networking in national and international news—and for almost pennies in comparison with TV's overhead—the potential of the neglected medium of non-commercial radio falls into exciting perspective.

National Educational Radio at present is farther ahead in tapping the rewards of international broadcasting than any other American radio or TV service; it regularly exchanges tapes with overseas broadcasters. With suitable yet modest financial aid, it is within the realm of possibility for educational radio to span oceans and continents via the satellites. Sampling a night of Japanese radio or British radio as the news happens is a new horizon for the sound medium and could overcome the erratic conditions now suffered in short wave transmissions.

As chairman of the N.A.E.B., which embraces both the television and radio branches of educational broadcasting, Mr. Burrows sees the two media as having a vital role to play in the use of the airwaves for audience enlightenment and enjoyment. But he is dead right in stressing that the advancement of educational TV should not entail any inadvertent stunting of the growth of non-commercial radio. It would indeed be shortsighted to leave the sound medium out of the forthcoming deliberations in Congress or the overall dialogue on educational broadcasting. Educational TV probably is bound to get 90 cents out of every philanthropic or governmental dollar committed to the cause of improved broadcasting; but the 10 cents left over could make a huge difference for non-commercial radio.

NCAA-AAU FEUD HARMFUL TO AMATEUR ATHLETICS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, all proclaim that amateur athletics are a good basic part of American life. That the student athlete needs to compete within the confines of proper rules, regulations, and organizations has never been questioned. But today, many aspects of amateur athletics give cause for concern.

Today, the continuing and arbitrary feud between the NCAA and the AAU is casting a cloud upon track and field events. This dispute has nothing to do with the students, their character, or their ability, but it finds expression in the governing body of both organizations who hold positions of responsibility but, to date, direct their main attention to the power struggle which is to the great detriment of our young people and amateur athletics in general.

Mr. President, so utterly silly is this controversy that the Wall Street Journal, normally occupied with business reports, economic technicalities, and the stock market quotations, now finds it necessary to speak on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Athletics for Athletes," published in the Wall Street Journal of March 2, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATHLETICS FOR ATHLETES

Young men and women are given to speculating about the usefulness of middle-aged adults, and in one corner of the athletic arena they have good reason at the moment.

The Amateur Athletic Union and the U.S. Track and Field Federation are two outfits supposedly run by wise, old heads, but they are carrying a feud onward to new absurdities. In some of its more temperate outbursts, the USTFF has labeled the AAU a monopolist and an "affront to American freedom."

The fact of the matter is that the AAU for a long time has competently run track and field meets in the U.S. Things were reasonably serene until a few years ago when the National Collegiate Athletic Association tried to cut itself in for a piece of the action by setting up the USTFF.

In one move to enforce what it assumed to be its authority, the AAU for a time barred from its meets certain foreigners who had competed under USTFF auspices. Now Jim Ryun, the very rapid young man from the University of Kansas, may be denied world recognition for the fastest half mile ever run anywhere; the record you see, was set in a USTFF meet.

Excessive commercialization is bad enough and bureaucratic bickering certainly doesn't improve the situation. Does anyone, young or old, remember when organized amateur athletics used to be for the benefit of the athletes?

SENATE'S FAILURE TO RATIFY HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS MAKES U.S. RATIFICATION OF U.N. CHARTER AN EMPTY GESTURE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the stinging indictment Lord Byron delivered upon Wellington has contemporary relevance to the Senate's inaction on the human rights conventions:

> Never had mortal man such opportunity, except Napoleon, or abused it more.

This Senate has balked time and again on the one single and most crucial question of this century—the inherent rights and dignity of man.

The Senate, almost as if to expiate this body's guilt over our predecessors' failure to vitalize the League of Nations, overwhelmingly ratified the United Nations Charter in 1945. By ratifying the U.N. Charter, the Senate pledged the United States to uphold "the dignity and worth of the human person."

But since that pledge was made, the Senate has continuously reneged, reneged on our pledge to the people of the United States, and reneged to all mankind. We have failed to ratify a single human rights convention, signed by U.S. Ambassadors and supported by U.S. Presidents.

The Senate's failure to support international legal instruments whose aims are identical with our own national goals has been the cause of both domestic shame and universal disillusionment.

All Americans have these rights and we are grateful for them. There is nothing alien or un-American about guaranteeing the right to live, the right to be free from forced labor or slavery, or the right of women to participate freely in political life.

The Senate has embarrassed the United States. The Senate has hurt the credibility of our Nation. This body's reluctance to ratify conventions establishing minimal standards of human dignity puts the United States in the comparable position of a Silas Marner sermon on "Personal Generosity" or Marie Antoinette lecturing on "The Evils of Opulence."

We have said to the young nations—60 in the past 25 years—"you ratify, you participate, you observe. As for me, I am content to give lipservice."

Let the Senate restore the international credibility of the United States. Let the Senate fulfill the pledge made by an earlier Senate to the United Nations by ratifying the Conventions on Forced Labor, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery.

THE AVIATION INDUSTRY—SUCCESS BRINGS PROBLEMS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, last Thursday I spoke in the Senate about the problems now confronting the aviation industry—problems brought about, in part, by the success the industry has recently enjoyed. In further consideration of the crisis which is now apparent at airports around the country, I present some statistical background which will show how much more grave this situation may become if prompt action it not taken.

Facilities at many air terminals in the United States are now overcrowded. At others, especially in smaller communities, they are grossly inadequate. These conditions exist at a time when the aviation industry is growing faster than ever. Aircraft operations at airports with FAA control towers have increased 70 percent in the last decade. Yet for every thousand aircraft operations at U.S. airports today, there will be 1,600 in 1971 and more than 2,000 by 1975.

More than 160 million people got on or off airplanes last year. But in the next 5 years, airports will be required to handle 70 percent more passengers. For every thousand passengers now using U.S. airports, there will be more than 2,000 by 1975.

Only a few short years ago, in 1963, the next major transition in the air transportation industry was thought by many to be the operation of the SST, an event which was more than 10 years away. However within this short time span, we have developed short-range jets and jumbo jets, all of which call for new facilities.

Consider what the introduction of the DC-9, 737, and BAC-111 airplanes has done. In early 1965, 70 U.S. airports were receiving jet aircraft. By early 1966, this number had risen to 111 airports. This year 130 airports will have the facilities to handle jets, and by 1970 more than 300 U.S. airports will receive jet aircraft. Almost every airport which upgrades its service to handle the jets will require new runway and terminal facilities.

The jumbo jets will require similar facilities improvements at our major airports. There is now evidence that the widely used 727 has caused severe runway damage at several ports. The DC-8-61 stretch will be in operation later this year. By 1970 the 747, DC-10, and C-5A will be in service. These aircraft will gross more than 500,000 pounds and carry in excess of 500 passengers. They will permit the air cargo industry to grow to an extent not yet fully realized.

Mr. President, I have yet to touch on the general aviation industry—the fastest growing element of aviation. Mr. Alan S. Boyd, the very capable Secretary of the new Department of Transportation, estimates that the number of general aviation aircraft will grow from the 1965 figure of 89,000 to as many as 140,000 by 1970, an increase of 61 percent. General aviation aircraft flew 15.7 million hours in 1964. They will fly 19.5 million hours by 1970, up 24 percent. An 85-percent increase in annual flying hours to 30 million is expected by 1975.

Mr. President, air transportation is the fastest growing industry in the country today. It has had a 14-percent average annual growth over the last 15 years. But the figures I have presented show how tremendously the industry will grow in the years to come—and I fear that many of the figures presented could prove to be very conservative. Much needs to be done to improve existing facilities for immediate use. Much planning and development remain to be done to provide for the jumbo jets, the SST, and the VSTOL aircraft.

Congress must take an active part in

assuring that the Nation's airport facilities keep pace with aviation growth. We have not met our responsibilities consistently in the past. In 1958 we did not provide a nickel for airport development. In recent years we have authorized $75 million annually. Not all of this has been consistently appropriated. Yet, estimates show that over $2 billion will be needed by 1970 to keep our current facilities functional. Federal participation, based upon what the local, county, and State units can provide, should be at least $150 million annually. Yet, last year we extended our authorization program for 3 years at the rate of $75 million annually.

Mr. President, the need for sound airport development to serve our Nation grows daily. Congress must provide more grants for such uses. We should establish a loan program for both major metropolitan and general aviation airport development. The need is urgent. The time for action is now.

THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION—PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, today is an important anniversary in our history in general and in education in particular. On March 2, 1867, President Andrew Johnson signed into law the legislation which established the U.S. Office of Education. The day before, Congress passed the legislation establishing an independent Department of Education. One hunded years later, with another President Johnson's help and leadership, coupled with the recognition and support of citizens, educators, businessmen, and Members of Congress, education continues to receive the local, State, and national recognition that is deserved.

History will undoubtedly record the 89th Congress as one that did more to recognize the problems of education and do more about them than any previous Congress. We surely agree with the President, who pointed out so well in his message to us on February 28:

> I believe that future historians, when they point to the extraordinary changes which have marked the 1960's, will identify a major movement forward in American education.

In 1867 the distinguished American educator from Connecticut, Henry Barnard, became the first Commissioner of Education. That first year Commissioner Barnard had a total staff of three and a budget of $18,592. Today the Commissioner of Education has a staff of more than 2,500 and a budget of almost $4 billion. Nationally, our country's belief in education is underscored by the economics of a nearly $50 billion a year expenditure for education. Yet, as many of us know, there are still areas of great need:

There are still 5 million of the Nation's children who are handicapped.

Members of minority groups, Negro-Indian-Puerto Rican-doomed to unemployment unless better education is made available to them.

Wide gaps in the quality of education remain in parts of our country.

Nearly 3 million totally illiterate adults and many functionally illiterates need basic education so they may profit from vocational education.

This year more than 1 million students will drop out of school before completing high school.

Some dropouts are a result of unrealistic and unattainable educational programs and curricula.

Vocational guidance and career information programs are needed, starting in elementary schools and continuing on through adult education.

Businessmen and educators recognize that not all youngsters can and should go to college. However, all agree that more and better vocational education is needed for young and old alike. Facilities and resources for vocational-technical education must be expanded. In fact, the time may well be here for us to establish residential vocational-technical education programs that will accommodate the needs of an entire family. Children as well as many parents need and can profit from realistic vocational-technical education.

Historically, the Office of Education started with responsibility aimed mainly at collecting statistics and facts to show the condition and progress of educaton in the States and to diffuse "such information respecting the organization and management of schools and school systems, and methods of teaching, as shall aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems, and otherwise promote the cause of education throughout the country." That our congressional predecessors had much foresight is without doubt. Today the Office of Education administers more than 70 major program areas that touch the lives of most of our citizens in one way or another. These programs range from the very young to the elderly.

If in this moment of retrospect I may be permitted a personal observation, I remember with some pride that as a high school debate team member, I participated in debating the proposition that there should be a Cabinet level Department of Education in the United States. Nothing that has happened since that time causes me to believe other than that education in a democracy is among the highest of callings and that within our governmental structure education merits the highest level of prestige, position, and support.

A century ago, Lord Brougham commented on the relationship between education and freedom in the following words:

> Education makes a people easy to lead but difficult to drive; easy to govern but impossible to enslave.

We stand today a free nation largely due to the successful educational efforts of the past century. Will historians and Americans in the year 2067 be able to say the same?

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, despite the continuing outcries against the alleged "escalation" of the war in Vietnam by the United States, the evidence is strong that our recent increase in pressure on the North Vietnamese is wise and prudent—that it makes sense, as the Denver Post editorialized on Tuesday afternoon. The use of heavy artillery to bombard infiltration points north of the demilitarized zone in North Vietnam and the harassment of our adversary's warmaking potential in the coastal areas of North Vietnam by the American fleet amount to a careful tightening of the screws. It is, as Denver's other newspaper, the Rocky Mountain News, observed Wednesday morning, a part of "doing the job." The job is convincing the Communists they cannot have their way. Further, as the News points out:

> It must be remembered these steps were taken following Hanoi's refusal to take advantage of three recent truces to answer our plea to mutually reduce the level of fighting.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorials from the Denver newspapers and a column written by Mr. Joseph Alsop, referred to in the Denver Post editorial, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Denver Post, Feb. 28, 1967]

Soviets Switch Pressure to Hanoi

(By Joseph Alsop)

Washington.—What happened in London 10 days ago between the British and Soviet prime ministers was very much more important than anyone has as yet admitted in public. Facts have been published, but in a manner three-quarters shorn of meaning.

Briefly, Premier Alexei Kosygin went to London with a lingering hope that this country might still be induced to "stop the bombing to get talks" about Vietnam.

Kosygin's aim had been foreseen in Washington. Chester Cooper, one of the ablest members of Averell Harriman's "peace task force," was, therefore, sent over very inconspicuously just before the Kosygin visit to give Prime Minister Harold Wilson the latest details of the situation as seen in Washington.

In the outcome, Wilson and Foreign Secretary George Brown refused to budge from their position that President Johnson was quite reasonable to refuse a bombing halt without some sort of reciprocal action by Hanoi.

Whereupon—and here is the vital, meaningful development—the Soviet premier took the wholly new tack of trying to budge Hanoi.

The Soviet government, at Kosygin's request, officially urged the Hanoi government to take important reciprocal action in order to secure the desired bombing halt and the opening of negotiations. After long delays (during which Harold Wilson has confessed that he thought peace was "within grasp") the Hanoi leaders refused to heed Moscow's urgings.

But Hanoi's obstinacy was really less significant than Moscow's new flexibility. When one partner is deeply and painfully engaged and another partner is merely giving aid and comfort, the engaged partner is always bound to meet the first suggestion that he cut his losses with an initial show of obstinacy. The thing to note is that Moscow has begun to give this kind of advice.

This means, first, that Hanoi's partners in Moscow now judge that the war is going very badly for Hanoi. It means, second, that Moscow seriously wants the war ended as soon as possible. Otherwise, Kosygin would never have done what he did.

The Wilson-Kosygin conversations had some other vividly interesting aspects. Quite spontaneously, for instance, and to all appearances quite disinterestedly, Premier Kosygin strongly advised Prime Minister Wilson to remain solidly faithful to his American alliance, whatever Charles de Gaulle might say about it. The United States, Kosygin implied, mattered immeasurably more than France.

Again, Premier Kosygin had the frankness to admit, at one point, that no less than 100,000 North Vietnamese are now at the front in South Vietnam.

The figure is far higher than any U.S. intelligence has ever used. It points to serious deterioration of the Viet Cong's popular support in the South.

This does not mean that an end is in sight—although it just could be. This is a situation demanding maximum American self-possession. To budge Hanoi, maximum pressure must be maintained at the front. Yet in outlining possible settlement terms, the most generous moderation must also be shown. It will be criminal if the first "smell of victory," as Walter Lippmann has put it, is allowed to cause intoxication from success.

The fact remains that if we are both resolute and generous, an end may be in sight before most people have dared to imagine.

[From the Denver Post, Feb. 28, 1967]

Increased Viet Pressure Makes Sense

Lyndon Johnson to the contrary notwithstanding, the United States has appreciably stepped up both the scope and the pace of the war in Vietnam during the last week. Since the increased pressure on North Vietnam makes good sense, we don't know why the President wouldn't call a spade a spade in referring to it.

No doubt there will be outcries from peaceniks about this new "escalation," but readers of Joseph Alsop's hopeful column elsewhere on this page can see why increased pressure on North Vietnam makes sense.

That is, if the Russians, as Alsop says, have begun pressing Hanoi to agree to some reciprocal de-escalation of the war if the United States quits bombing the North, but Hanoi has refused, it is only logical for the United States to step up the pressure to help persuade Hanoi to listen to the Russians.

That is evidently what we are doing. U.S. warships have begun to shell coastal roads and railroads in the narrow southern strip of North Vietnam. Land-based artillery in South Vietnam is shelling infiltration assembly points just north of the Demarcation Zone. And now naval planes have begun mining rivers along the North Vietnamese coast north of the DMZ.

We are somewhat dubious of the minelaying, but the overall object—to make it harder and costlier for North Vietnam to supply and reinforce its troops in South Vietnam—is unassailably sensible.

Coupled with these measures is the stepped-up scope of ground drives to clean out decades-old Viet Cong bases in South Vietnam, such as War Zone C in Tay Ninh province. The Viet Cong and their predecessors, the Viet Minh, have held some of these bases since the beginning of their war against the French in 1946.

Even if the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese lose no men defending them, loss of the bases themselves, plus tons of supplies—particularly rice—cannot help but hurt their whole war effort in South Vietnam, and be extremely damaging to their morale.

Taken together, the increased interference with supply lines in the North and destruction of bases and supplies in the South must make this war much more costly to North Vietnam, and make it much harder for Hanoi to keep the war going.

Only doubt we have about this general course arise from the suggestion of Gen. Maxwell Taylor, former U.S. ambassador to Saigon, that the United States should also start laying mines in Haiphong harbor.

Since the Viet Cong have been mining the river approaches to Saigon, we can stretch a point by retaliating in the southern strip of North Vietnam. But at a time when Soviet Russia is supposedly trying to persuade Hanoi to see the light about ending this war, the last thing we need is to take a chance of blowing up some Russian ship in Haiphong harbor.

Let's forget that idea, but quickly.

The name of the game at this stage of the war should be to convince Hanoi that it's time to quit fighting and start talking. And that involves coupling reasonable, even generous, settlement terms with prudently increased military pressure. The present pressure increase seems prudently limited; let's leave it that way.

[From the Rocky Mountain News, Mar. 1, 1967]

Vietnam: Doing the Job

One of the great imbalances in the Vietnam War is that everything we do is officially announced, reported, discussed and debated, while everything the Communists do is done stealthily, piece-meal, in the shadows, out of the glare of publicity.

The whole World knows we have upwards of 400,000 troops in South Vietnam, hence we are accused of "escalation." But North Vietnam keeps pouring more troops into the South and because they haven't admitted it, their escalation goes unnoticed.

If our planes accidentally kill civilians there is an outcry in some circles here and abroad; but the Viet Cong's systematic murder of civilians in acts of terror is taken for granted by the same people.

The air is bound to be filled with new cries of "American escalation" now that we have begun long-range artillery shelling into North Vietnam, mining North Vietnamese coastal rivers and increasing naval bombardments of targets along the North Vietnamese coast.

But it must be remembered these steps were taken following Hanoi's refusal to take advantage of three recent truces to answer our plea to mutually reduce the level of fighting. The infiltration into the South continues; our troops fought bloody battles last week with well-armed, well-equipped and well-rested Communist regulars along the Cambodian border.

The new steps we have taken to tighten the screws on continuing infiltration are, in plain English, simply part of "doing the job."

PROBLEMS OF THE ELDERLY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, President Johnson's recent message to Congress on older Americans masterfully pointed out many problems faced by the elderly, and suggests legislation which would, if enacted, provide the needed solutions. One cannot quibble nor make light of the facts which the President sets forth. In effect, he has said that the richest Nation in the world should not have 5.3 million older Americans with yearly incomes below the poverty level; only one out of five having a job, often at low wages; 2 million elderly citizens on welfare; nearly 40 percent of our single older citizens with total assets of less than $1,000. These are incontrovertible facts which cry for answers.

The President reviewed the history of the social security system and pointed out that Franklin Delano Roosevelt, upon signing the initial measure into law, looked upon it as a basic building block, a foundation upon which we could erect an all-inclusive and protective system. Interestingly enough, the February 13 edition of Newsweek contained a comment on social security by Prof. Paul A. Samuelson, of MIT, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Paul A. Samuelson on Social Security

Which program of the modern welfare state has been, by all odds, most successful? Undoubtedly, the social-security program. And it is a remarkable fact that both expert and layman will agree on this judgment.

It was not always thus. Just 31 years ago the social-security system came into operation. This New Deal measure was hotly contested. The insurance industry fought the program tooth and nail. Suicidally, the Republican Party denounced the concepts of old-age insurance and unemployment compensation as acts of the devil—the opening wedge to socialism. Even many of the pioneering exponents of social insurance came to blows over details of the program and bitterly resisted entry by the Federal government into this area of activity.

History has by now rendered its verdict. Those who said that a centralized system would break down from the sheer weight of the bookkeeping were proved wrong in the first year of the program. The punch-card machine in Baltimore did the job at costs far below those of the original estimates, and even farther below the costs involved in the largest of our private insurance companies.

THE MYTH OF STATES' RIGHTS

Our experience with social security is instructive for other progressive programs, past and yet to come. Consider, for example, the role played by "states' rights." This is a large and diversified country; and what could be more natural than to think that, just as each province is entitled to its own folk dances and customs, so the different states ought to be encouraged to experiment with their own varieties of social legislation.

A pretty theory. But what is the pragmatic truth? Every informed person knows that the Federal part of social security—the old-age insurance system—has worked out efficiently and equitably, free of graft and arbitrary bureaucratic intrigue. But, when it comes to the state-run unemployment-compensation program, we find 50 different systems that differ primarily in trifling details. Instead of creative, regional differences, the only significant disparities involve the attempt of the least humane regions to steal industry away from the rest, penalizing those areas most concerned to maintain decent standards.

An acute moralist said, "Patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel." If Dr. Johnson were alive today, he would add, "And states' rights is the first refuge of a reactionary."

The notion that grass-roots government is good government is a myth. The courthouse gangs of the country and the political machines of our cities, at the two-thirds mark in the twentieth century, are both irresponsible and unresponsive. Experts in the discipline of public administration have learned that the hand from Washington, far from being the hand that deadens, is the hand that purifies—that introduces civil service and minimal auditing of the petty cash.

SOMETHING FOR NOTHING?

Social insurance makes sense because we are all in the same boat. All of us are going to die; most of us face a period of retirement before death. It is a good way to run a railroad to take account of this basic symmetry.

The beauty about social insurance is that it is *actuarially* unsound. Everyone who reaches retirement age is given benefit privileges that far exceed anything he has paid in. And exceed his payments by more than ten times as much (or five times, counting in employer payments)!

How is this possible? It stems from the fact that the national product is growing at compound interest and can be expected to do so for as far ahead as the eye cannot see. Always there are more youths than old folks in a growing population. More important, with real incomes growing at some 3 per cent per year, the taxable base upon which benefits rest in any period are much greater than the taxes paid historically by the generation now retired. And social security, unlike actuarially funded insurance, is untouched by inflation: after Germany's terrible 1923 inflation, private insurance was wiped out but social insurance started all over as if nothing had happened.

Social security is squarely based on what has been called the eighth wonder of the world—compound interest. A growing nation is the greatest Ponzi game ever contrived. And that is a fact, not a paradox.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, Professor Samuelon's article points toward a great future for social security. However, I am sure that many other Members of this body have noted an increase in the volume of mail from senior citizens setting forth the plight which these older people suffer attempting to maintain basic dignity under the present social security system. It is due to the aforementioned statistics and these sad letters that I introduced S. 193 and S. 194, both of which would, if enacted, give relief to those persons relying on governmental pension systems.

S. 193 provides for the coupling of social security benefits with the cost-of-living index as prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor. It is my belief that an automatic benefit increase upon a rise of 3 percent in that index would be of greater aid to retired individuals than waiting for a legislative enactment every 2 or 3 years. Conversely, I have included in that measure an adjustment in benefits if the cost of living were ever to go down.

S. 194 provides for an increase in the amounts an individual may earn before his social security benefits are curtailed. The present limitation is $1,500, or $125 a month. The President, in his message, called for a limitation of $1,680, or $140 a month. In this aspect, I must differ with our President, for I believe that an additional $15 a month will not cure the problem. Raising the earning limitation $180 per year is a negligible increase which will still penalize those people who wish to work to their fullest potential. I propose, therefore, that the initial earning limitation be raised to $2,400, or $200 a month. To my mind, this is a more logical figure and would allow our country to make better use of the many skills possessed by those who are retired. A low earning limitation retards those people who want to help themselves; in effect, it penalizes initiative. A point of diminishing returns is reached. Therefore, I believe a higher limitation must be enacted.

I take this opportunity to urge the Committee on Finance and its distinguished chairman to hold early hearings on proposed amendments to the Social Security Act so that expeditious action can be taken to clear up the many problems existing under the present social security system.

HAWAII BROTHERHOOD AWARDS

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, last week three distinguished citizens of Hawaii were honored for their humanitarianism by the Men's Club of Temple Emanu-el. I applaud the men's club, for they have made wise selections in naming a minister, Rev. Abraham Akaka, a scientist, Dr. Max Levine, and an industrialist, Henry J. Kaiser, for this First Brotherhood Award.

The official citations are particularly meaningful because they describe in a few words the lifelong contributions to society of these men.

To the Reverend Abraham K. Akaka: "Beloved minister to his people, faithful servant to his God."

To Dr. Max Levine: "Distinguished scientist and teacher; devoted companion of knowledge and truth."

To Mr. Henry John Kaiser: "Distinguished builder of society and devout friend of all mankind."

These gentlemen deserve special recognition. I desire that all Senators may share with me the tributes paid to them by George Chaplin, editor of the Honolulu Advertiser and ask unanimous consent that Mr. Chaplin's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tributes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF GEORGE CHAPLIN, EDITOR, THE HONOLULU ADVERTISER, BROTHERHOOD DINNER, SPONSORED BY MEN'S CLUB, TEMPLE EMANU-EL, HONOLULU, AT ILIKAI HOTEL, FEBRUARY 18, 1967

Chairman Shapiro, President Bogost, Rabbi Schenkerman, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

When he was discussing this evening with me, Rabbi Schenkerman told me of an ancient legend of the wise father who knew he was about to die. He took all of his possessions and made them into one magnificent ring. Then he went to an artisan and had duplicate rings made, which he distributed to his children.

Each of the children was different. And when they perceived that each had duplicate rings, they came before the judges of the town saying, "Our father has left his blessings and inheritance to whichever of us shall possess his true and invaluable ring. How are we to know?"

The sages pondered and, understanding the wisdom of the father, said, "Whosoever of you children live your life in accordance with the faith of your father shall possess the valuable ring of truth. But it is only for the future to decide."

It has been said that "brotherhood must have a religious basis if it is to have any real significance." Without such faith people "drift off . . . into the society of the indifferent."

One of the most important things that can be said about the three distinguished citizens being honored tonight is that they have *never* been *indifferent*. They have always been involved—and for the betterment of their fellows.

They come from widely separated points of the globe. One of them was born in Hawaii. One of them was born in Poland. One of them was born in New York State. Their denominations are not identical—but their belief in brotherhood is. Their lives are lives of service, filled with action in pursuance of brotherhood—and it is this which brings us together at this time in this place.

The first to be honored is a man of whom one magazine writer recently said: "He taught Hawaii what aloha means." His father was a Honolulu ironworker. The worldly goods were few. There were seven other children and much of their life turned about the church, with Bible-reading and response each morning at 6. For the man we honor, the path then led to Y.M.C.A. activities and to a world religious conference in Amsterdam which set him upon his life's work. There were 2,000 youths there in Holland from 72 countries.

"Suddenly," he recalls, "everything came into focus. Here was a gathering of many nationals united by love of God and of man. There was no common language, but they understood each other. Faith cut through all language and racial barriers and unified them. . . . It dawned upon me that the ministry was my life."

And so it has been—but reaching far beyond the physical dimensions of pulpit and church. He believes and has said, "We must unhook our minds from the past and look to the future. We must choose between the conventional church of yesterday and the new church of today that serves the whole community. The church should help prepare people to live creatively. Hawaii is a laboratory proving what can be done."

He evidenced this in moving fashion with his sermon the day after Statehood was achieved. "Aloha," he said, "is the spirit of God at work in you and me and in the world, uniting that which is separated, overcoming darkness and death, guiding the feet of mankind in the ways of peace."

Most of us call him by his first name, but tonight I will ask Reverend Doctor Abraham Kahikina Akaka to now receive this token of appreciation for his ongoing contribution to the noble cause of brotherhood.

Abe, this citation says: "The Men's Club of Temple Emanu-el is honored to present our first annual brotherhood award to the Rev. Abraham Akaka, Beloved Minister to his people, faithful servant to his God."

(I might add that the Akaka twins, the 3rd and 4th of their five children were born during Brotherhood Week in 1952 and will be 15 tomorrow; one is named Kahikina, meaning East, and the other Komohana, meaning West. I think the names speak for themselves).

And now we turn to a man who came to American shores as an infant bridging the Old World and the New. He rose to eminence as a scientist, in the field of bacteriology, both as a professor and in the Hawaii Territorial and State Boards of Health. He has held important consultant positions with national government and industry; He has occupied key positions in many national professional societies; He has published more than 200 scientific papers—but most of all his quiet work in the lab has saved countless human lives. The Hawaii Medical Association, in dedicating its journal to him some 18 months ago, cited a small epidemic of infant illness here in 1957 when his skill and alertness helped to save many of our children.

He is a doctor of philosophy and a doctor of science, but an even more important degree, in symbolic terms, is being awarded him tonight—what might be termed the degree of Brother of Man. It is a pleasure to ask Doctor Max Levine to come forward and accept this citation to a "Distinguished scientist and teacher; devoted companion of knowledge and truth."

My problem tonight, as you've already witnessed, is how to condense into a handful of words the sweep and scope of the men we are honoring.

In the case of the man about whom I now speak, it is unusually difficult. He has ranged wide and he has ranged large—but always with an underlying sense of humility. Like Dr. Levine and Dr. Akaka, he came of modest circumstances—the son of German immigrants, his father a shoemaker, his mother a practical nurse.

His business career is the American dream in action—from a dollar-and-a-half-a-week cashboy in a dry goods store to the builder of a global empire with assets measured in billions, not millions, with a staff of more than 90,000 in 40 countries and 33 states, providing 300 different products and services, ranging from chemicals to motor vehicles to housing. His physical contributions to this community, in terms of hotels and more recently an entirely new community, are well known.

But I would judge that while these achievements give him great and deserved satisfaction, he derives even more gratification from his efforts in another field.

When he was 16, his mother died in his arms. I am told he felt her premature passing was related to the family's inability to afford adequate medical and hospital care. He resolved that, if he ever could he would help spare others such a calamity. His resolve was heightened when his father went blind and on another occasion when he himself had to give the anesthetic to a member of his family for an operation at their cottage, again for lack of funds for hospitalization.

His vow has now grown into 18 hospitals, more than 40 medical clinics and a health plan serving almost a million and a half members—the "largest private initiative hospital and medical care program in the world." He has often said, "Find a need and fill it." This has been his unremitting quest—to search out human needs and fulfill them.

The honors he has received from universities, from governments, from national and international publications are legion. He was the first industrialist ever to receive the highest award of the American labor movement—the Murray-Green Humanitarian Award of the AFL–CIO, presented two years ago. On his 81st birthday—he will be 85 this May—Congressman Patman of Texas called him "The Magnificent American." And so he is. But he has a special love for these Islands—this part of America—and I know that he may well take particular pride in tonight's recognition—here in Honolulu—of what he has done to advance brotherhood across the face of the earth. If Mr. Henry John Kaiser will please come forward.

Mr. Kaiser, it is a great joy to present to you this citation, deservedly recognizing you as "Distinguished builder of society and a devout friend of all mankind."

And now, finally, to Dr. Levine, to Dr. Akaka and Mr. Henry Kaiser—who deals with 1,500 doctors—our congratulations and warmest aloha.

NOMINATION OF RAMSEY CLARK TO BE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. **DODD**. Mr. President, it is a great pleasure to say a few words in support of the nomination of Ramsey Clark to be Attorney General.

Seldom, if at all, in the history of the Justice Department, has the Senate had the opportunity to vote confirmation on a man so well qualified, by intellect, temperament, capacity for work and experience to be Attorney General.

We all know well the outstanding work he has done in that Department, in a number of positions and in the handling of special tasks.

I think we can look forward with optimism and confidence to a significant, balanced, and aggressive administration of present statutes.

And we can look forward to a vigorous effort to achieve for all law enforcement officials better tools and techniques for fighting crime, delinquency, and the myriad of other problems that so heavily beset our society today.

Ramsey Clark will face great challenges as Attorney General during the next few years.

But his will really be a rare opportunity to put a firm imprint upon the fabric of American life.

It will be a demanding, exhausting, often frustrating task that confronts him, one that not many of us would be up to.

We in the Senate can ease his task, and I am sure I am only one of many Senators who will try to help make his tenure as Attorney General a notable one.

I wish Ramsey Clark well in his new position, pledge him my continuing support and best efforts, and urge prompt and unanimous confirmation of his nomination.

CREDIT UNION BILLS

Mr. **SPARKMAN**. Mr. President, on February 27, I introduced three bills—S. 1083, S. 1084, and S. 1085—at the request of CUNA. I have now received from CUNA an explanation of these proposals. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS OF CUNA INTERNATIONAL, INC.

The legislative program of CUNA International is contained in three separate bills. The bills are:

S. 1083, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to permit Federal credit unions to make long-term loans secured by real estate.

S. 1084, a bill to permit Federal employees to purchase shares of Federal- or state-chartered credit unions through voluntary payroll allotment.

S. 1085, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modernize the loan, investment, dividend and reserve provisions; to require the establishment of an education committee; and for other purposes.

S. 1083

Present law

There is nothing in the present Federal Credit Union Act which prohibits Federal credit unions from making loans on real estate. However, since Section 8 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 USC 1757) provides that the maturity on loans may not exceed five years, as a practical matter, Federal credit unions are precluded from engaging in contemporary real estate lending.

Effect of proposed amendment

The proposed amendment would not disturb the five-year maturity limit on loans other than real estate loans. It provides that a Federal credit union could invest up to 25 percent of its assets in loans to members secured by first liens on real estate for terms up to 30 years. Such loans could not exceed a loan-to-value ratio of 80 percent. The loans would be restricted to residential property containing not more than four-dwelling units and to farmland.

Reasons for change

During the recent period of tight money, many credit union members found it impossible to obtain loans for the purchase of real estate. This was particularly true of those members who wanted to purchase a home and of those credit unions who serve farmers, in which case the member needed the loan to finance the purchase of farmland. During this same period, while the rate of savings inflow to credit unions decreased, there was no noticeable outflow of savings. Therefore, credit unions had adequate funds with which to serve their members. As a matter of fact, some credit unions did have, and continue to have, excess funds. For these reasons, many Federal credit unions have expressed the desire to expand their powers to allow them to provide real estate loans for their members in accordance with contemporary real estate financing.

S. 1084

Present law

At the present time, there is no law which would allow civilian employees of the Federal Government to have payroll deductions. However, the military credit unions have a form of payroll deductions through the military allotment procedures. The 89th Congress did pass legislation which would allow a Federal employee to have his entire check sent to a financial institution, but very little use has been made of this authority.

Effect of proposed amendment

The amendment would allow a Federal employee who is a member of a Federal employee credit union to have payment on shares in the credit union made by allotment from his salary. This would have to be done by written agreement between the member-employee and the credit union. The credit unions would have to bear the expense of such a system and would have to reimburse the Government for the reasonable cost of making such an allotment. The Comptroller General would be given the authority to implement the amendment. This provision would apply to all departments and agencies within the Federal Government and to the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

Reasons for change

This proposal would furnish each Federal employee with a simple and painless method of saving. The resulting savings would be a benefit not only to the employee, but also to the national economy in that during inflationary periods money would be taken out of circulation. This amendment would also benefit the credit union in that it provides built-in stability. It therefore serves as an adequate protection to the credit union member. The entire history of the credit union movement has demonstrated that those credit unions which have payroll deductions are the most successful and serve their members in the most efficient manner.

S. 1085

Since there are seven separate provisions included within S. 1085, they will be treated individually.

Liquidity, Solvency and Security—Section 1 of this bill would allow a Federal credit union to invest an amount not exceeding 25 percent of its regular reserve in a credit union organization which uses its funds for the purpose of establishing and maintaining the liquidity, solvency, and security of credit unions.

Present law

There is no provision in the law allowing for such investments.

Effect of proposed amendment

This amendment would allow a Federal credit union to invest an appropriate amount in credit union organizations which exist for the purpose of establishing and maintaining the liquidity, solvency and security of credit unions. The credit union movement has a stabilization program through which it attempts to provide a mechanism to assist credit unions that have liquidity or solvency problems. The stabilization program is designed to minimize the need for Federal Government insurance. Stabilization programs exist in many states and at the present time they are all being linked together at a national level. This amendment would allow Federal credit unions to put some of their reserves in the stabilization program, thereby making such programs considerably more effective.

The credit union movement is also currently engaged in establishing an International Credit Union Services Corporation. This corporation is designed to enhance the solvency and liquidity of credit unions by providing mechanisms for the easy transfer of funds, for investment advice, and for providing many of the other financial services demanded by today's credit union member. Again, it is an attempt by the credit union movement to establish its own facilities for the protection of the individual credit union member without recourse to the funds of the Federal Government.

Reasons for change

This will permit the credit union movement to establish its own institutions for the purpose of protecting the liquidity, solvency, and security of credit unions. At the same time, it will provide the flexibility that credit unions need to serve their members in a modern-day economy. It will enable the individual credit union to expand its services to its members without undue risk, and it will enable the credit union movement to pool its insurance, to decrease its costs, and to increase its efficiency. This is basically a self-help proposal, in keeping with the traditional credit union philosophy of self-help.

Permit Aid to Liquidating Credit Unions—Section 1 of the bill also provides another instrument for helping to maintain the liquidity and solvency of credit unions. It is a simple method which would allow Federal credit unions to purchase the notes of individual members of liquidating credit unions.

Present law

There is no provision in the present Federal Credit Union Act allowing this to be done.

Effect of proposed amendment

This amendment would empower a Federal credit union to purchase from liquidating credit unions the notes of individual members at a price agreed upon by the board of directors of both the liquidating and the purchasing credit union. The member whose note is purchased would not become a member of the purchasing credit union unless he is within the common bond of the purchasing credit union. The member would, however, be kept within the sphere of low-cost credit and would be allowed to continue to deal with a credit union, the lender of his choice.

Reasons for change

The volatility of the United States' economy has resulted in an increase of mergers, plant moves, population shifts, military base closings, and other adjustments that occasionally have a serious effect on credit unions, which through no action of their own are substantially affected by such changes. This problem has become more pronounced during the past several years in the case of some military credit unions which were forced to liquidate due to the closing of military installations. In some instances, the credit unions have found it difficult to find a buyer for the notes of the members because of the fact that they were almost in the position of being forced to a distress sale. Under such conditions, it is impossible to get an adequate return for the sale. It seems appropriate therefore to allow other credit unions to purchase the notes of liquidating credit unions.

This is another provision which would allow the Federal credit union to fully implement the basic purpose of self-help. It would allow one credit union to help another. It would keep the individual credit union member within the sphere of low-cost credit, and it would provide an additional option to liquidating credit unions and regulatory officials, thereby increasing flexibility.

Require the Establishment of an Education Committee—Section 3 and Section 5 of the bill would require each Federal credit union to establish an education committee.

Present law

Under Section 12 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 USC 1761) the business affairs of a Federal credit union are managed by a board of directors, a credit committee, and a supervisory committee. Each of these groups has definite responsibilities under the Act.

Effect of proposed amendment

This amendment would require each Federal credit union to establish an education committee. The committee would be expected to meet at least once a month and would report quarterly to the board of directors.

The change would be accomplished by amending Section 12 of the Federal Credit Union Act to provide that, in addition to the board of directors, the credit committee, and the supervisory committee, that the business affairs would also be handled by an education committee. Additionally, a new subsection would be added setting forth the duties of the education committee.

Reasons for change

The statistics gathered by CUNA establish beyond any doubt that those credit unions that have established education committees have the greatest increases in savings and in loans and are generally quite efficient at serving the needs of their members. The establishment of an education committee would vest a special committee with the responsibility for informing the credit union members of the services available to them. It would provide a central clearing house that would provide to the members trends in consumer borrowing and saving and in economic developments which may affect the credit union, and it would provide a special group of people who would oversee family financial counseling, consumer information programs, and educational loan programs. The committee would thereby relieve many of the burdens which are placed on the board of directors under the present law.

Credit Committee Delegation of Functions—Section 4 of the bill permits the credit committee of a Federal credit union to delegate any of its functions to a loan officer.

Present law

Under Section 15 of the Federal Credit Union Act, a loan officer may approve loans up to the unsecured loan limit and for additional amounts only if they are fully secured by unpledged shares. The unsecured loan limit is presently $750.

Effect of proposed amendment

The proposed amendment would permit the credit committee to delegate any of its functions to a loan officer. In other words, it would provide that the loan officer would approve loans that are presently approved by the credit committee. This would, of course, expand the approval authority of the loan officer. However, the loan officer would continue to be required, as provided for in Section 15 of the Federal Credit Union Act, to furnish to the credit committee a record of each loan approved or of each loan not approved. The credit committee would still maintain the responsibility of reviewing the decisions of the loan officer. As is the case with the present law, all loans not approved by a loan officer must be acted upon by the credit committee.

Reasons for change

This provision is primarily designed to reduce the burden which is placed on the credit committee. The increasing amount of loan activity being done by Federal credit unions has placed an extremely heavy burden upon the members of the credit committee. The members of the credit committee are, of coures, volunteers who serve without pay. This change would retain the essential authority within the credit committee and would allow them to devote more time to do more serious problems. They would be able to give greater individual attention to the applications of the members who are in need of some special arrangements or of some financial counseling. It would further allow the Federal credit union to serve its members more quickly and more efficiently. It would eliminate waiting periods for the credit union member.

Relating Reserves to Actual Risks—Section 6 of the bill would change the present reserve structure by relating reserves to loans outstanding rather than to the total amount of member's shareholdings and by decreasing the total amount of reserves that must be set aside.

Present law

At the present time, Section 17 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 USC 1762) provides that credit unions must set aside all interest, fees, and fines and 20 percent of net earnings annually until the reserve equals 10 percent of the total amount of the member's shareholding. In addition to this basic reserve, the Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions is granted authority to require additional reserves by regulation or, in any special case, by fiat.

Effect of proposed amendment

This amendment would change the reserve requirement by basing it on loans outstanding rather than on member's shareholdings and by decreasing the statutory goal from 10 percent to 7 percent.

Reasons for change

Experience has indicated that the reserve requirements for Federal credit unions is more than is needed. Losses endured by Federal credit unions are minimal and reserves appear to be substantial. Moreover, the Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions has ample authority to require the establishment of special reserves when and if needed.

There appears to be no reason why credit unions should have a reserve fund equal to 10 percent of the total amount of member's shareholdings rather than on the loans outstanding. Actually such reserves are for bad loans.

In view of the fact that consumer loans are very limited and that credit union loans have a fast turnover, the 10 percent goal is excessive. Moreover, credit unions have an excellent mandatory bonding program which decreases the need for large reserves. Many credit unions therefore maintain that excess additions to reserves favor the future member to the expense of the present member. If a Federal credit union had a smaller reserve requirement, this would free funds for the payment of better dividends and greater interest refunds to members. It would also free funds which could be used for the purpose of financial counseling, consumer education, and other credit union programs.

Modernizing Dividend Payments—Section 7 of the bill contains two changes. One change would allow the board of directors to declare dividends quarterly and the other would allow the board of directors to apply dividend credit for the first ten days of the month.

Present law

Section 18 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 USC 1763) now provides that the board of directors may declare dividends annually or semi-annually and that a dividend credit for a month may be accrued on shares that are fully paid up during the first five days of the month.

Effect of proposed amendment

This amendment would allow the board of directors of an individual credit union to have discretion to declare a dividend quarterly, in addition to its present authority to declare dividends annually or semi-annually. It would also allow a Federal credit union to declare a dividend credit on shares that are fully paid up during the first ten days of the month, rather than for the first five days of the month.

Reasons for change

These amendments are simply in recognition of contemporary practices of attracting savings. It would allow individual Federal credit unions increased flexibility in adopting the inducements that are necessary to prevent a decline in the savings inflow. Any decline in the savings inflow, of course, results in a reduction of low-interest loans which credit unions must provide to their members.

DEMISE OF "GUNSMOKE" LAMENTED

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have always enjoyed watching the television program "Gunsmoke" whenever possible, and it comes as a disappointment to me that this program may be canceled, supposedly through lack of viewer interest.

I am wondering if the so-called rating poll which reported information that the general public no longer watched "Gunsmoke" was really accurate. I note that there is strong sentiment elsewhere on the desirability of retaining that program in preference to a number of others of lesser caliber. I wish to express my concurrence with the sentiments expressed in the editorial entitled "Gunsmoke Shot Down" published in the Fairmont, W. Va., Times of February 28, 1967. The editorial laments the impending departure of "Gunsmoke." I, too, regard its loss as a major downgrading of television entertainment, and I am hoping that enough followers of the adventures of Marshal Dillon and his law enforcement activities will protest loudly enough to drown out the reports of spot ratings.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"GUNSMOKE" SHOT DOWN

Somewhere recently we heard a rumor that Jack Kent Cooke, the Los Angeles sportsman and entrepreneur, is getting ready to dispose of his community antenna television interests, among which is American Cablevision, parent of the Fairmont Television Cable Co. So far as we are concerned, Cooke can tear down the poles and lines here after the end of the current TV season.

Columbia Broadcasting System has announced the cancellation of "Gunsmoke" at the end of the present series and a shift in schedules which will provide most viewers with an opportunity to catch up on their reading Saturday nights. One report has it that the James Arness production has become too costly to reproduce, now that color has been added to its hour-long format.

CBS hasn't batted an eye over its huge investment in the New York Yankees or the amount of money it pays out for professional football telecast rights. Surely some of the birdbrains on Madison Avenue ought to have been able to figure out a means of scraping up the dough necessary to keep Marshal Matt Dillon and his pals on the air.

Simply because the popular horse opera had dropped out of the top ten in the ratings, Columbia pushed the panic button. Here again is a case of a tiny segment of the viewing population calling the tune for the entire country. It has never been completely demonstrated that the ratings were an accurate reflection of the public's taste and only on Madison Avenue are they regarded as sacred, despite the fact that some evidence of rigging has been produced.

Columbia proposes to fill the gap between the Jackie Gleason Show and the 11 p.m. news with such offerings as "My Three Sons," "Hogan's Heroes" and "Petticoat Junction." Only the second named show, a burlesque about a prisoner of war camp, has any business being on the air at all, according to those who spend time in front of the magic screen.

"Gunsmoke" has come to be in its way, a minor entertainment classic. Every week for years it has depicted the triumphs of the good guys and struck a solid blow for red-blooded American decency. In sum, it was fun to watch.

There was a time when CBS offered its Saturday night viewers such shows as "Perry Mason," "Have Gun," "The Defenders," and other sagas of the plains and courtrooms. All are now gone, victims of the 1,200 little gadgets which reportedly show the Neilsen pollsters what programs are being watched.

We know of at least one color set that was purchased when "Gunsmoke" began its 1966–67 series in that medium. Doubtless there were hundreds of other viewers across the country who similarly helped the economy. Many of them are now bound to feel like suckers.

The impending departure of "Gunsmoke" must be regarded as a major tragedy in the field of television. Programs designed for the Pepsi generation and old movies will not, for members of the Matt Dillon-Festus Haggin-Doc Adams-Kitty Russell cult, be a satisfactory substitute.

STABILIZATION OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, the long-term solution of the farm program lies in our ability to develop markets here and around the world. The more we can establish ourselves in the world marketplace with cash sales, the more stable our agricultural economy will become. This goal received support at a breakfast meeting held here in Washington yesterday. Present at the meeting were representatives from Great Plains Wheat, Inc., and Western Wheat Associates. My own State of North Dakota was ably represented by Mr. Mearl Gifford, chairman of Great Plains Wheat's Foreign Marketing Committee and a member of the North Dakota Wheat Commission, of Gardner, N. Dak.; Mr. Floyd Poyzer, chairman of the North Dakota Wheat Commission, of Amenia, N. Dak.; and Mr. James Ole Sampson, vice chairman of Great Plains Wheat's board of directors, of Lawton, N. Dak.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speeches of Mr. Gene Moos, past president of the Western Wheat Associates, and Mr. Ralph Ball, president of Great Plains Wheat, Inc., be included in these remarks.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTERN WHEAT ASSOCIATES REPORT

(Presented by Gene Moos, past president, WWA, at the Congressional Breakfast sponsored by WWA, GPW, and NAWG on March 1, 1967)

Western Wheat Associates is a regional organization representing the wheat producers in the states of Washington, Oregon and Idaho. In addition to our own funds, we contract foreign currencies accrued under Section 104(a) of Public Law 480 from the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture. We also contract for wheat producer dollars from Great Plains Wheat, Inc., and the Nebraska Wheat Commission to further support our program, which is solely directed toward developing and maintaining markets overseas for U.S. wheat.

Western Wheat has regional offices in Japan, Taiwan, The Philippines and India. Each office is headed by a qualified American staff member. In addition to these four countries, we have market development activities underway in Korea, Okinawa, Hong Kong, Malaysia, Singapore and Thailand. We have also worked in Indonesia, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon.

Our Asian offices cover an area which received a total of 419,000,000 bushels of U.S. wheat in the 1966 crop year. This represents 52.7% of the total U.S. wheat exported during that period.

Our activities abroad can generally be divided into four major categories: *consumer education; product promotion and utilization; technical assistance; and market intelligence*.

Let's talk now briefly about each of the four major categories: First, *consumer education*. Our offices have established extensive demonstration programs for the dissemination of information on wheat food preparation and nutrition. Demonstrations are often carried right to the housewife's doorsteps by mobile demonstration units and even into the home via television. Skilled home economists demonstrate correct meal preparation which feature wheat foods as an integral part of the menu. Demonstrations and training courses are also held for hotel and restaurant chefs, as well as those responsible for institutional food preparation.

The second category, *product promotion and utilization*, is closely related to consumer education. Each supports and complements the other. Advertising and promoting wheat products follows similar patterns in each country, although adaptations must be made in accord with local customs, available facilities and food habits. We participate in many types of sophisticated programs in the cash markets. In a developing country like India, however, our primary objective is to assist in the most effective utilization of wheat and wheat products, rather than to promote increased consumption.

Category three, *technical assistance* to buyers and users of U.S. wheat and flour is another of our programs. To assist in this goal, trained technicians are employed to demonstrate how to improve quality and upgrade the milling and baking industry. In addition we assist in solving problems of wheat grading, transportation, storage and distribution in the recipient countries.

The fourth category, *market intelligence*, is one of the most important sectors of our programs. This means knowing—on a day to day basis—the source, quality, quantity, requirements, price and destination of wheat and flour imports. Information obtained from every conceivable source is used to decide whether or not we are competitive in price and quality within a particular market. With such precise knowledge, we can develop more effective wheat market development programs. It is simply good business to keep currently informed of a customer's needs and desires. This knowledge—transmitted to the USDA, producer groups, the grain trade and research agencies—enables us to meet those demands and needs.

No one single activity can be solely credited with increasing per capita or total consumption, but the results of the overall program have been impressive. In Japan, imports of U.S. wheat have risen from a yearly average of 40,000,000 bushels in the period from 1955 to 1959 to over 74,000,000 bushels for calendar year 1966. Japan is now the leading cash customer in the world for U.S. wheat. Last year The Philippines purchased 15,800,000 bushels of wheat from the United States for cash; 80% of their total wheat requirements.

Taiwan is an outstanding example of a country that is rapidly changing from total dependence on Food For Peace for their wheat requirements, to that of a cash market. This year, we expect Taiwan to become an important dollar buyer of wheat from the United States.

Western Wheat Associates, like many organizations representing American agriculture, is vitally interested in the current agriculture sector negotiations under the Kennedy Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. We would like to take this opportunity to briefly discuss our position on the four main points of the International Grains Agreement as proposed by the USDA. The four points are: *Access, Food Aid, Prices* and *Supply Management*.

The obvious purpose of an *Access* agreement is to allow wheat exporting nations to compete for a share of the present market in the importing countries and a reasonable share of any future expansion of that market. The need for meaningful assurances of access to the major commercial wheat markets of the world as well as equal opportunity for all to compete cannot be questioned. Our support for an access agreement, however, must be tempered with a word of caution. In negotiating for access in the European Economic Community, we must be assured that we are not sacrificing other, and perhaps, larger commercial markets for only a slight immediate advantage in a market that shows little potential for expanded wheat imports.

Our support of the United States position on access is conditioned by the fact that our negotiation team must take such a stand that the United States share of total world wheat exports will remain favorable, and that we will have equal competitive opportunities for the inevitable increase in the world's food requirements.

We strongly support multi-country participation in a *world food aid* program by all wheat exporting and importing countries who can afford to do so. The United States cannot be expected to unilaterally undertake the task of feeding the hungry world. Other developed countries must join in the sharing of this responsibility for supplying the rapidly escalating food requirements of hungry nations.

We support realistic *higher world prices* for wheat that would be reflected back to the U.S. producer. We would recommend an increase in the maximum, now set by the International Wheat Agreement, by 40¢ per bushel. If world demand for wheat continues to expand, an increase in world prices is needed to bring forth the necessary production incentives. The minimum price should be as high as is practical and still allow the United States to effectively compete for larger commercial sales. The range between minimum and maximum levels should be at least 40¢ at all export points. Justifiable higher wheat prices would also favorably affect the United States foreign exchange earnings and balance of payments deficit.

Some mechanism is necessary to establish price differentials and market sharing at the minimum price level. The following should be considered in these negotiations. First, all nations should recognize that only since January 1965 has the United States really been competitive in the world wheat markets. Prior to that time our position was largely that of a residual supplier for the world's needs. The use of a base period prior to January 1965 in the calculating of U.S. shares of world markets would be detrimental to the interests of the United States and its wheat growers.

Secondly, while the United States wheat marketing system is in most respects superior to the State controlled marketing systems of our major competitors, we do face certain disadvantages. Without an enforceable protective mechanism, long-term forward sales by our competitors at fixed prices could leave us with less than our fair share of the market. Experience has taught us that very often we are alone in the strict observance of the spirit of an agreement.

It is absolutely essential that any grains agreement entered into by our negotiators must not sacrifice our present price flexibility. It is neither necessary nor practical to revert to our previous position of holding an umbrella over the price structure of our competitors.

We support adequate *supply management* programs for all wheat producing countries. We feel it would be completely unrealistic to enter into any grains agreement that would raise world prices to stimulate production for some future need without having some agreement to adjust production and marketing until this demand becomes a reality. Two of our major wheat export competitors could quickly and easily increase their wheat production. One exporting country is already urging their wheat producers to plant "from fence to fence."

Though there are ominous signs even now appearing on the horizon which tell us that the future world demand for wheat will require supplies well in excess of today's production, we must approach that time with caution. The United States wheat producers insist that a delicate balance between scarcity and surplus must be the overriding goal of any World Grains Agreement.

Before I close, I would like to say a few words about P.L. 480 or the Food For Peace Program. In the past, the wheatgrowers strongly supported P.L. 480 as a necessary program to move our surplus production. Now that the surplus is gone and the concept of P.L. 480 has changed to a program of producing to meet the world's need, we still strongly support it. The wheatgrowers are quite proud to have had a part in such a humanitarian program and also to have had the opportunity to make their contribution to achieve the foreign policy objectives of the United States. Now, however, I must point out that if we are to be asked to increase production to meet these growing needs, then we must also have some additional incentives. We look with envy upon the industrial sector who produce for foreign aid on a cost-plus basis.

On behalf of Western Wheat Associates, I thank you for taking the time to be with us this morning.

RALPH BALL, PRESIDENT, GREAT PLAINS WHEAT, INC., REMARKS AT CONGRESSIONAL BREAKFAST, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 1, 1967

Also a regional association similar to Western Wheat Associates, Great Plains Wheat is supported by five wheat-producing states in the Plains area—Colorado, Kansas, North Dakota, Oklahoma and South Dakota—and represents about 360,000 producers.

As the surplus continued to grow in the 1950's, wheat producers soon realized they had a larger interest and responsibility in the wheat industry than just producing wheat. Accepting this responsibility, state wheat grower groups, associated with the National Association of Wheat Growers, founded the two organizations to increase markets for U.S. wheat.

These producers contribute their dollars to market development. In addition, Great Plains Wheat contracts with Foreign Agricultural Service of the Department of Agriculture for monies appropriated by Congress under the provisions of P.L. 480, the law you and your colleagues provided as a means of channeling support into a market development program.

The record of these organizations speaks for itself. Exports jumped by more than 500 million bushels since 1955, almost equal to the production of the five Great Plains states in 1964.

Many domestic activities carried on by the GPW member commissions have an effect upon the exports of U.S. wheat also. One such state-commission supported project is the development of a larger kernel Durum Wheat in North Dakota. Member state wheat commissions also carry on extensive programs of education and distribute nutritional information to anyone who asks as well as making crop and market surveys.

Sales are made on price the world over and wheat is no exception. And transportation is an important part of the price. Therefore, transportation is a major activity of GPW. The Great Plains is a vast landlocked area and producers are dependent on the transportation networks to move their wheat to market. This calls for a constant review of rates so that the competitiveness of U.S. wheat is maintained. For instance, the efforts of Great Plains Wheat and the state commissions were instrumental in reducing the export rate from the Plains to the West Coast.

GPW's prime responsibility are the markets of Europe, Africa and South America. We maintain regional offices in The Netherlands and Venezuela and a country office in Brazil. We also cooperate with Western Wheat in Asia.

We are the wheat producers' eyes, ears and mouth in the foreign field. In many cases, we are the only voice in the marketplace whose only interest is in U.S. wheat. We fill the gap that neither the government nor the grain trade can, due to the limitations placed upon both. However, we can work only when there is cooperation between all three groups.

The two-way flow of market information is vital to market development. Not only does the Great Plains Wheat staff provide the foreign buyer with information on the U.S. crop, price, availability, credit or the best means of using his purchase, but the staff also receives information concerning the quantity and quality of the local crop and the import needs of the country. This information is then relayed to the stateside staff, U.S.D.A. and grain trade.

One excellent example of GPW's efforts is the purchases by the Swiss Government for its strategic reserve of bread wheat. Normally the Swiss Government buys Canadian Manitoba for this reserve. However, in 1966, after years of effort by GPW staff, the Government purchased 20,000 tons of Dark Northern Spring Wheat. This one purchase clearly illustrated to the Swiss trade that the Government had confidence in the quality of U.S. wheat. After that, U.S. share of bread wheat sales to Switzerland jumped from 14.4 per cent in 1965 to 35.6 per cent for the first 11 months of 1966. The Government also recently announced another 10,000-ton purchase this year.

Even though a country may shift its purchases from a competitor to the United States, Great Plains Wheat's job is not finished. We must continue to inform the buyer of changes in the U.S. market system and aid in solving any difficulties he may encounter. The emphasis shifts from one of promotion to one of service.

The other segments of market development have been competently described by Mr. Moos. Therefore, I will discuss some points hindering our exports.

First is the lack of uniformity in U.S. wheat shipments. Although greatly improved since the change in Grain Standards two years ago, there is still some room for improvement. The change was initiated largely due to an extensive study and cargo-sampling program conducted by GPW and U.S.D.A.

Second, Great Plains Wheat has spent a substantial amount of time convincing the foreign buyer that the United States has a constant supply of quality wheat at competitive prices. The foreign buyer is bound by tradition and buys the same type of wheat year after year. But this position as a major supplier can be quickly put in jeopardy if the quality of our shipments drops or prices remain uncompetitive for any substantial period. Therefore, the United States, with your help, must develop trade and pricing policies that guard our intention of remaining a traditional supplier of quality wheat.

Third, the United States must develop an imaginative credit policy which will encourage sales. Many times our competitor to the north has succeeded in doing business because of its credit policies. The United States should grant credit for longer periods and liberalize the regulations concerning qualifications to accept letters of credit from reputable foreign banks. Even though our interest rates are fair, the strictness of the other rules has blocked many purchases. Another essential to increasing sales is the policy of setting the subsidy well in advance of the marketing year.

Last, trade in wheat and other agriculture products should be afforded the same freedom as trade in industrial products. Therefore, sales of U.S. wheat should be able to move to Eastern Bloc countries through regular shipping channels instead of requiring half of the shipment to move in U.S. flag vessels. Increased U.S. trade with East Europe, an accepted part of U.S. foreign policy, should not discriminate against the wheat producer.

Mr. Moos has mentioned other barriers to U.S. wheat sales such as the European Economic Community and the Latin American Free Trade Association, and discussed wheat-producer opinions on such vital negotiations as the Cereals Agreement under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The degree of dependence of U.S. agriculture on the export market this last fiscal year was 17 cents out of every U.S. farmer's market dollar. Wheat exports last year represented 70 per cent of U.S. production and exports for the first half of this fiscal year exceed comparable months by 22 per cent.

The cash exports last year provided $443 million towards alleviating the balance of payments deficit. In addition, monies received from concessional sales helped the drain of gold by paying many U.S. Government expenses overseas. Foreign marketing is of vital interest to both the wheat producer and the United States. Therefore, and I cannot stress it too strongly, the need for market development, in all its phases, will become more important to the future sales of U.S. wheat than it has been in the past.

If the United States is to continue to expand wheat dollar sales, an intensive, cooperative effort between the wheat producer, through his market development association, the Grain Trade and the U.S.D.A. is needed to maintain the United States' position as a traditional supplier of quality wheat at competitive prices. We must also continue working to remove world trade barriers.

Along with the National Association of Wheat Growers and Western Wheat Associates, we thank you for attending our breakfast this morning.

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS DEALING WITH U.S. FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, one of the valuable series of official Government documents is that dealing with the foreign relations of the United States. Over the years, these documents have provided scholars and other interested persons detailed knowledge of the issues and actions which have guided American foreign policy.

The Department of State is responsible for collecting and publishing these documents. In carrying out this responsibility, the Department has used the counsel of distinguished scholars in coordinating the publication of the foreign relations series. The members of the 1966 Advisory Committee on Foreign Relations were:

Dr. William W. Bishop, Jr., chairman, 1966, professor of law, University of Michigan Law School, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Dr. Robert H. Ferrell, professor of history, Indiana University.

Dr. Stanley D. Metzger, professor of law, Georgetown University Law School.

Dr. Philip E. Mosely, director, European Institute, Columbia University.

Dr. Robert E. Osgood, director, the Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research, school of advanced international studies, the Johns Hopkins University.

Dr. J. E. Wallace Sterling, president, Stanford University, California.

Dr. Robert B. Stewart, professor of international law and organization, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University.

Several years ago, members of this advisory committee recommended a more orderly process in publishing this series which, in the members' views had "fallen into serious disarray." They suggested that all volumes be released 20 years behind currency. This seems to be a reasonable manner in which to make these documents available to the public. If there are exceptions, they should be in the direction of publishing a series at an earlier date. Such was the case with the "Documents on Germany 1944–61," which the Committee on Foreign Relations was privileged to release as a committee print. Indeed, these "documents" have proven to be so profitable that the Department of State has requested the committee to authorize the revision and updating of this publication. I have informed officials in the Department that the committee would be happy to cooperate in this venture.

Similar volumes on China are available through the year 1943. Documents for the years 1944–49 have been prepared, but a decision made 10 years ago has prevented their release.

Because of the vast interest which the United States has in Asia at the present time, and because of the dramatic events which are now taking place in mainland China, it would be of inestimable value to all of us if the documents on postwar United States-China relations were made available. At the very least, publication of the papers for the years 1944–46 would be consistent with the suggestion of the advisory committee which was charged by the State Department to recommend procedures for the Historical Office to follow. It would, of course, aid the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations during our review of the responsibilities of the United States as a great power.

Perhaps the release of these documents from another period will help us forget our present troubles, or at least see them with a different perspective.

FAMILY PLANNING SERVICES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am disturbed to learn that the Office of Economic Opportunity intends to terminate or substantially cut back family planning services which had been made available to some 200,000 poor people in 24 States. A survey made public today by Planned Parenthood—World Population indicates that the reduction in OEO funds will directly curtail three-fifths of the family planning projects which had been established in local neighborhoods under community action programs.

The President's National Crime Commission has called for programs to insure availability of family planning assistance as a prime means for combating crime. The Commission recognized that unwanted children, whom parents are unable or unwilling to support, lead almost inevitably to rising crime rates. The war against crime is not, of course, the only reason to support availability of family planning assistance. But particularly in view of the findings of the Crime Commission, it seems incredible that an agency of the Federal Government would discard the family planning programs which have only recently been instituted.

I was also disturbed that the President's recent message on health and education did not mention family planning assistance programs. In the last Congress, I introduced legislation to authorize the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to finance voluntary family planning programs. Mr. Wilbur Cohen, Under Secretary of HEW, assured me that the purpose of my legislation would be accomplished under the administration-sponsored Comprehensive Health Services Act. In a letter to me, Under Secretary Cohen stated:

> In the field of family planning, our present plans contemplate $20 million in fiscal year 1968, $25 million in fiscal year 1969, and $30 million in fiscal year 1970.

To insure the continuation of the programs initiated under the Economic Opportunity Act, the administration should consider using these promised HEW funds.

In discussing the need for family planning programs throughout the world, the President declared in his state of the Union message:

The time for rhetoric has clearly passed. The time for concerted action is here, and we must get on with the job.

Termination or curtailment of the family planning assistance programs initiated under the Economic Opportunity Act is hardly an auspicious beginning in implementing this Presidential directive.

MEMORIAL OF THE WYOMING STATE LEGISLATURE ON THE KILLING OF ELK IN YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, in the context of debate on the recurring slaughter of elk in Yellowstone National Park, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD a house joint memorial of the recently concluded Wyoming State Legislature. The memorial, bearing 40 signatures, asks that the "Secretary of the Interior pass such laws and prescribe such regulations as necessary to prohibit the wanton killing of elk by park rangers in Yellowstone National Park."

As the Nation knows, the killing of elk is continuing in Yellowstone Park, despite agreements entered into 4 years ago that alternatives would be found, and despite a 3-year period free of killing; but free also of any ongoing range management plan which might serve as an alternative to slaughter.

As the magnificent elk of Yellowstone National Park fall before the rifles of park rangers, I ask that the words of the Wyoming State Legislature be read.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 12

(Introduced by Chuck Morrison, Alan K. Simpson, Hobie Williams, Steve Majhanovich, Louis Boschetto, Adrian W. Reynolds, Allen E. Campbell, Bob J. Burnett, LaVerne C. Boal, Nels J. Smith, D. Hubbard, Walter B. Estes, Harry H. Schaefer, James D. Van Velzor, John R. Smyth, Edwin H. Whitehead, Thomas J. Carroll, Arthur L. Buck, E. E. Lonabaugh, June Boyle, William F. Craft, George W. Hufsmith, Lawrence A. Yonkee, O. R. Bud Daily, Elton Trowbridge, Alton "Tony" Butterfield, W. H. Budd, Franklin Mockler, Newell B. Sargent, James Q. Kelly, Alfred T. Graham, Fred F. Kilfoy, Clyde W. Kurtz, Marvin E. Emrich, Warren A. Morton, Ralph Urbigkit, Wm. A. Megeath, Leon Keith, Floyde Pease, Earl K. Parsons.)

A joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Interior with reference to the killing of elk within the boundaries of Yellowstone National Park, by Park Rangers

Whereas, the animals that range within the boundaries of Yellowstone National Park in the State of Wyoming constitute a part of the natural resources of Wyoming; and

Whereas, the natural resources of the State of Wyoming should be utilized to the greatest good of the people of the State of Wyoming and of the United States of America; and

Whereas, the slaughter of elk in the past in Yellowstone National Park by park rangers was a gross waste of a natural resource as aforesaid; and

Whereas, the House of the Thirty-Seventh Legislature of the State of Wyoming, the Senate of said Legislature concurring, memorialized the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior to pass such laws and prescribe such legislation as necessary to prohibit the wanton killing of elk by park rangers in Yellowstone National Park; and

Whereas, the slaughter of elk in Yellowstone National Park by park rangers is again contemplated without regard to said memorial.

Now therefore be it resolved, by the House of the Thirty-Ninth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, the Senate of such Legislature concurring, that the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Interior be and are hereby memorialized to pass such laws and prescribe such regulations as necessary to prohibit the wanton killing of elk by the park rangers in Yellowstone National Park as has been the practice in the past to permit the State of Wyoming to trap and transplant the animals to other areas within the boundaries of the State of Wyoming and if trapping and transplanting practices do not give the necessary reductions, to permit the hunting of such animals in remote areas of the park.

Be it further resolved, that a certified copy of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Interior, United States Senator Gale W. McGee, United States Senator Clifford P. Hansen, and Representative in Congress, William Henry Harrison.

SMALL SHIPMENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, William H. Tucker, in a recent news conference, indicated that small shipments constitute one of the most critical problems in transportation today.

It is not only small shippers, but also those they serve that must bear the economic burden of any failure to provide service to this important area of transportation. The small shipment problem affects those seeking to ship and those seeking to buy goods possessing such characteristics as low density, light weight, odd size or shape, and fragile composition. It affects shippers and consumers in smaller suburban and rural communities. Further, it affects those who seek to ship small quantities whether they be a parent sending a gift to a son at school or a small furniture dealer seeking to obtain a replacement lampshade for a customer.

The failure to solve the small shipment problem ultimately costs the consumer both in difficulty in obtaining certain merchandise and in the purchase price he pays.

In a recent speech entitled "Small Shipments—the Nature of the Problem," ICC Chairman Tucker thoughtfully analyzed the challenge involved in meeting the small shipments problems, and suggested ways in which it can be resolved. He points out that the bill requested by the Commission, S. 751, which I introduced on January 31, 1967, to require the establishment of through routes and joint rates should provide a weapon to deal, in part, at least with this situation, but it surely will not alone resolve the problem. Chairman Tucker points to the definite need for innovative efforts by carriers and shippers to reduce the cost of handling small shipments and for imaginative rate proposals to implement these efforts. In his opinion the key to making progress is a recommitment by common carriers to the basic concept of service to the public.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Chairman Tucker delivered on February 10, 1967, before the meeting of the board of governors, regular common carrier conference of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL SHIPMENTS: THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

(Remarks of William H. Tucker, chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, before the meeting of the board of governors, Regular Common Carrier Conference of the American Trucking Associations, Inc, Feb. 10, 1967)

Few problems in the area of transportation have been given more diagnosis—and less remedy—than the small shipments problem.

The dispute over the adequacy of service available at reasonable rates for shipments moving in relatively small quantities has been accurately, if futilely, characterized as both chronic and critical. But despite the general consensus on the magnitude and seriousness of this problem, little has been done to define it in precise terms and generate appropriate solutions.

This morning, I will touch upon some of the primary considerations which must be faced if we are to get a navigating "fix" upon the small shipment problem. I do so with the hope and expectation that your fine organization and its individual members will actively join with the commission in our efforts to thoroughly identify all aspects of the problem, and develop and apply equitable solutions.

Small shipments are generally thought of as those weighing less than 10,000 pounds—the Commission's statistical zone for LTL and LCL shipments—and frequently possessing such "undesirable" transport characteristics as low density, light weight, odd size or shape and fragile composition. Within this weight range, are found several levels of traffic as well as several levels of problems.

For instance, the bulk of shipments weighing up to 50 pounds is handled by parcel post, by United Parcel Service, REA Express, and by bus express. Because of the distinct pricing and service characteristics of each of these operations, and because of their dedication to this particular type of traffic, many of the difficulties frequently claimed by shippers of heavier "small shipments" do not confront users eligible for these services. On the other hand, shippers may encounter other kinds of difficulties in the movement of small shipment traffic in this low weight range. For example, UPS, which has a 50-pound shipping limitation, will make daily pickup only on the basis of a weekly charge to shippers. Bus companies provide regular schedules between major cities, but they may offer no freight pickup or delivery service.

Between the "under 50-pound" class of traffic and the 10,000-pound per shipment, of course, lies the bulk of small shipment traffic. Freight forwarders, air carriers, trucks, trains, and REA—all may handle traffic in this category. We know that there is a great deal of overlap and duplication among the service areas of these carriers, but our detailed information in this matter is only rudimentary.

Today's commercial markets, with their emphasis on inventory buying, manufacturer's schedules, and new lightweight merchandise, have increased the need for small, fast and frequent shipments. Despite this, the growth in total volume of small shipment traffic moving by interstate regulated carriers has been insignificant since 1946.

Increased utilization of piggybacking, containerization, shipper associations, and rate incentives for consolidation of traffic account only in part for the static picture of small shipment traffic moving by regulated carriers. It is indisputable that private carriage has taken much of this traffic. Indeed, the phenomenal growth in the number of private carriers can be attributed in large measure to the general failure of regulated common carriers to provide adequate service for LTL and LCL shipments. Furthermore, a private carrier handling its own small shipments probably has no good reason to tender its truckload traffic to a common carrier.

Comparisons of small shipment volume by different regulated modes are difficult because of the various ways in which reporting systems have been developed. Class I motor carriers of general freight, with 1965 LTL traffic of 74.2 million tons and $3 billion of revenues have by far the highest totals. Class I railroads showed declines to 1.3 million tons and $51.3 million revenues from LCL traffic in 1965. Individual forwarders with more than $100,000 annual revenues handled 4 million tons or 16.1 million shipments in 1965, earning $459.3 million of revenues. REA reported 66.9 million shipments, or more than four times those of the forwarders, but lower total revenues, of $430.4 million for the year.

Small shipment traffic, with its relatively greater handling and documentation requirements, obviously involves certain higher costs to carriers. This is especially true in view of the increased cost of labor over the last several years. The carriers have responded to this increased cost by incorporating in their tariffs surcharges and high minimum charges per shipment. As a result, motor carrier LTL revenue rose almost 50 percent in 1965 above the 1960 figure, while LTL tonnage increased about 30 percent during the same period.

While the ratio of transportation cost to the value of the commodity shipped is several times higher for this traffic than for truckload traffic, it is not always clear whether existing rate levels adequately reflect the cost of service. It is here then that the Commission, in its role of economic regulator, must decide whether emphasis on cost as a criterion in determining reasonable rates for small shipment traffic will bring about an equitable result for the shippers, who need adequate service; for the carriers, who in the face of fierce competition must maintain sufficient operating revenues to stimulate industry growth; and for the consuming public, which ultimately bears the burden of increased rates.

It seems likely that the encouragement of adequate small shipment service may require higher charges in certain situations—although, obviously, the specific facts of each proposal must be examined on their own merits. Regulatory pressure on carriers to provide better service at existing rates is only part of an answer. With the increased and strenuous opposition by shippers to increases in charges proposed by the carriers in recent years, has come an intensification in the curtailment of service on this traffic. Where these trends may lead is not encouraging to contemplate. But it is certain that more cooperative efforts between carriers and shippers must be stimulated if this type of service is to be upgraded.

Because volume traffic ordinarily generates greater profits, many motor carriers are increasingly closing through routes and cancelling joint rates for other traffic, discouraging the tender of small shipments, "lacking" appropriate equipment, and finding other reasons for not providing the service required by small shippers. The statutory authority which the Commission has recently requested the 90th Congress to enact—to require the establishment of through routes and joint rates [1]—should provide a weapon to deal, in part, at least, with this situation, but it surely will not alone resolve the problem.

There is a definite need in this area for innovative efforts by carriers and shippers to reduce the cost of handling small shipments—and for imaginative rate proposals to implement these efforts. For one example, in an E.C.M.C.A. tariff [2] presently in effect the shipper is charged truckload or volume rates on consolidated shipments from origins in New York to either of two distribution points in Ohio. The shipper makes out the bills of lading and independently arranges for transportation from the distribution point to final destination. The result is a combination of standard line haul trucking and specialized small-shipment short-haul trucking that has great potential for improving the efficiency of all concerned.

Increased cooperation between shippers and carriers on the treatment of small shipments is certain to yield beneficial results. In packaging and documentation, there are wide possibilities for improvements which will result in better service at lower costs. Certainly situations which require individual treatment of packages at the teminals, such as multiple unmarked packages sent under a single bill of lading marked "see manifest for breakdown," can be avoided.

Apart from a consideration of whether rates are unreasonable or prejudicial, is the fact that the complexities of the present rate structure applicable to small shipments tend to make it difficult for the small shipper to determine the appropriate charges without the assistance of a tariff expert. Measures to simplify this present rate structure, which has developed unsystematically over the years in response to various competitive and non-competitive stimuli, appear highly appropriate and necessary.

Along this same line, a review of the relevant freight classifications to assure that the factors of density and value are applied consistently to all items in determining the proper class is a clear necessity, if pricing is to be equitable.

Various developments in consolidating LCL shipments as for example, TOFC and containerization, and lower aggregate and multi-pickup rates, are providing service at a lower cost to the volume shipper or to several contiguous shippers who are able to pool their traffic. But many individual shippers are unable to benefit from these reduced rates because of their location in small towns or suburban locations—and this fact raises serious policy considerations reaching beyond the scope of transportation alone, as former Commissioner Freas has noted.[3] The tendency of some types of rate reductions to encourage the growth of larger and larger shipping centers, in fact, transcends the problem of competition between carriers. It reaches into a range of broader social questions which will require the continuing scrutiny of the Congress.

The plight and number of small shippers who, because of their location away from major terminal areas and their lack of traffic volume, have serious difficulty in obtaining adequate transportation, will be increased with the greater availability of the national system of Interstate Highways. This system, providing a network of modern surface arteries linking the major population centers, may induce motor carriers to by-pass off-route communities to a greater extent than ever before.

Resolution of this aspect of the small shipments dilemma is vital not only to the small shipper but to the carriers—and, of course, to the public which has come to depend on the Nation's system of regulated common carriage.

Because of the importance of this subject, and the way in which the elements of the problem cut across the entire range of the Commission's responsibilities, a special Policy and Planning Committee of three Commissioners is now conducting an in-depth study of the situation. The mission of this Committee is to sift through all pertinent ideas that have been put forth for improving the Commission's response to this perplexing problem; and, in light of its analysis of the total situation, to recommend to the Chairman and the Commission a detailed course of action for the future. Its work should provide a firm basis for progress in finding needed solutions.

A recent editorial in Traffic World posed the question of whether a common carrier has a responsibility to transport traffic where the rates are such that he will not make a profit. Accepting the principle that rights are accompanied by concomitant responsibilities, it follows that when the Commission grants a carrier, in response to his request, a certificate granting *him* certain operating rights and stating that he is fit, *willing* and able to serve the public, the carrier has unavoidable obligations to perform this service.

The fact that we have reached the point of seriously discussing whether a common carrier's obligation to offer adequate service is contingent on his ability to make a profit certainly emphasizes a real need for a recommitment by common carriers to the basic concept of service to the public. This is the key to the small shipment problem and it cannot be accomplished by any government policy or program. You alone are able to deal with this most important aspect of the problem.

It is a tremendous challenge, but only when common carriers recognize their obligations to the public and act accordingly will we see progress made in the area of small shipments. In closing, let me say I am certain you will accept this challenge and prove equal to the task.

LUNCHEON HONORS VOTER WHO CAST SYMBOLIC 25 MILLIONTH VOTE IN NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD ELECTIONS; AFL–CIO'S GEORGE MEANY, NAM'S WILLIAM MAY; AND EIA'S JAMES SECREST ARE SPEAKERS; SENATOR RANDOLPH PRESIDES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, yesterday in this forum the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], chairman of our Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, was the leader of an appropriate and meritorious discussion of events scheduled for today in connection with observing the significance of the 25 millionth ballot cast in National Labor Relations Board elections.

I report on the luncheon held in the New Senate Office Building with the Electronic Industries Association, the Industrial Relations Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers, and the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations as the cohosts, honoring Leonard P. Scheno, of Carteret, N.J., the 25 millionth voter, and his employers, the Reynolds Aluminum Co., Woodbridge, N.J., plant.

---

[1] S. 751, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. (1967).

[2] Eastern Central Motor Carrier Association, Rules Tariff 35Q, MF–ICC A293, Item 305–10.

[3] See the excellent analysis of this problem by Commissioner Freas before the Western Traffic Conference, May 18, 1965.

It was my privilege to have shared with the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty], Representative Carl Perkins of Kentucky, chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and Representative William Ayers, ranking minority member of the House committee, responsibility for cosponsorship of the luncheon. I wish especially to commend Chairman Frank W. McCulloch and Sam Zagoria of the National Labor Relations Board and members of their staff for their leadership in the development of the luncheon and other events in today's 25 millionth NLRB elections voter celebration.

Appropriate remarks were made by Chairman Hill, Senator Prouty, and the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], and by Representative Ayers. Honored guests included Acting Secretary of Commerce Alexander B. Trowbridge, Under Secretary of Labor James J. Reynolds; former NLRB Chairman, Judge J. Warren Madden; NLRB Chairman McCulloch and member Zagoria, as well as NLRB General Counsel Arnold Ordman.

As toastmaster for the luncheon, it was the privilege of this Senator to have made the opening remarks and to have introduced the speakers representing the cohosts; namely, James D. Secrest, executive vice president of the Electronic Industries Association; George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO; and William F. May, chairman and chief executive officer of American Can Co., and chairman of the industrial relations committee of the National Association of Manufacturers. Also introduced for remarks was Mr. Scheno, the symbolic 25 millionth voter, who presented his wife and children, as well as labor and management officials from the Reynolds plant at which the symbolic election was held.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record, portions of the opening remarks and excerpts from the addresses of the representatives of the cohost organizations.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM OPENING REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH

I am happy to join in recognizing the occasion of the 25-millionth voter in a National Labor Relations Board election and to be associated on this occasion with my colleague from Vermont, Senator Winston Prouty, and with the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, Rep. Carl Perkins of Kentucky, and Rep. William Ayers of Ohio, ranking minority member of that committee in the House. We are serving as co-sponsors with the cohosts for this event—the AFL–CIO, the Industrial Relations Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers, and the Electronics Industries Association.

We too often overlook important anniversaries—until our wives remind us. Today we have such an occasion. It is gratifying that we gather in this appropriate way—all of us, government, labor and management—as we lunch together amiably to celebrate a significant event.

Our speakers will make clear to us what the National Labor Relations Board has done to develop and administer the Congressional act of 1935 under which was set a system of secret ballot elections for working men and women. We anticipate, too, that they will emphasize what such elections have meant to workers. We call it the Wagner Act, the designation frequently used in referring to the National Labor Relations Act.

It was enacted during my second term in the House of Representatives, and that was a time when our nation's economy, quite frankly, was very sick. The working men and women of America were handicapped and distraught by heavy unemployment; they were low in material possessions; they were low in spirit. Some even began to have doubts about the soundness of our economic system. Hundreds of thousands of our citizens lacked confidence, dignity, hope.

The Wagner Act was one of several far-reaching bills which were proposed, discussed and voted on as we attempted to bring this country's economy back to robustness and prove that democracy and a free enterprise system could withstand depression and recover from it. In providing by law the secret ballot method for determining whether workers desired union representation, we in Congress were continuing in the path of democratic tradition. Events of subsequent years have proven that the plan was a good one.

The 31 regional offices of the NLRB have supervised more than 200,000 elections for 25 million workers to exercise a free choice by casting a secret ballot. Recent statistics indicate that this system is widely accepted by workers, companies and unions. Approximately four out of five elections are set by joint agreement of union and management. In fact, on the average, 90 per cent of the eligible workers actually cast ballots in elections.

The Board has gone to great lengths, and I mean literally, to bring representation balloting to the workers. Elections have been held in all 50 states, in Puerto Rico and Guam. Notices of elections have been translated into almost every known language so that all involved workers will be informed on the election process. Board election agents have traveled by many modes of transportation, and have managed to carry out their responsibilities even if it involved becoming soaking wet, hitchhiking rides with native fishermen, or trudging through snow and ice—sometimes all of these uncomfortable conditions.

Those of us who have the opportunity to serve in public office, and as officers of labor organizations or of industries, recognize that the election process has brought peace and stability to the industrial scene. We are grateful to the Board members and staff, incidentally one of the Federal government's smallest agencies, for a job well done and we wish its 2,300 employees satisfaction and success in administering the voting of the next million voters and beyond.

SUMMARY OF REMARKS OF JAMES D. SECREST, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, ELECTRONIC INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION

Members of the Electronic Industries Association are pleased to participate in this luncheon honoring the National Labor Relations Board as co-hosts with the AFL–CIO. We also are grateful to our friends in Congress for sponsoring this tribute to NLRB and arranging for this luncheon at the Capitol.

EIA members are seriously concerned with our Government's involvement in labor-management relations and have been for more than a quarter of a century. One of our most active membership service groups is the Industrial Relations Department in which the industrial relations executives of electronic manufacturers—large and small—serve on committees, arrange conferences, call on Government officials, and publish a monthly newsletter. Only one staff man is required because our members contribute so much of their time and knowledge to this Association activity.

At our annual Industrial Relations Conference last year among our guest speakers were the Chairman of NLRB, Mr. McCulloch, and Assistant General Counsel Thomas W. Kennedy. Following their talks, the speakers answered questions.

This is typical of the approach of our Industrial Relations Department to both our relationship to Government and our consideration of labor-management problems. It also follows the pattern of our whole Association which as long ago as 1934 recognized the desirability, if not necessity, of establishing day-to-day channels of communication with Government departments and agencies whose responsibilities include some form of regulatory control of the electronics industry.

Several years ago EIA established a pattern of holding one of its three annual membership conferences in Washington at which the principal theme would be better understanding between Government and industry. This conference, which will be held this month, is addressed by numerous Government officials, and much time is devoted to a review of proposed legislation and Government actions of direct concern to electronics manufacturers. A highlight of the conference is the annual Government-Industry Dinner.

In all of our considerations of Government-industry problems we try first to get the facts and then to form our position. Our committees also make a realistic appraisal of the situation and the workability of any plan. We do not, like Don Quixote, fight windmills just to convince our members that we are defending their self-interests. We try to be constructive. Of course, we do not engage in labor-management negotiations.

While industrial relations disputes probably will always be charged with some emotion because they usually concern individuals and their personal welfare, I believe that the attitude of both management and labor today is much more rational than it was 30 years ago when the NLRB was established, and this attitude is reflected in the decline of strikes and violence.

Our members, like all progressive manufacturers, accept the principle of collective bargaining and the right of employees to choose their union representatives, if any. This is no longer news because it is no longer controversial. I believe the success of the NLRB in conducting more than 200,000 elections has been a major contribution to this stability.

EIA extends its sincere congratulations to the members and staff of the NLRB for reaching a milestone in its history and wish it many more happy anniversaries and secret-ballot elections.

SPEECH BY GEORGE MEANY, PRESIDENT, AFL–CIO

The passage of the National Labor Relations Act—or as we called it in 1935, the Wagner act—was a turning-point for the nation, and particularly for the labor movement.

This act established, as a matter of public policy, the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively with their employer.

Today we are celebrating the casting of the 25 millionth ballot in a representation election. It is an occasion well worth celebrating. But I think we should all keep in mind that the secret-ballot representation election, along with the processing of unfair labor practice charges, are not ends but means. They are mechanisms for assuring the basic purposes of the law—the right to organize and bargain collectively.

It is useful, I think, for all of us who are concerned with labor-management relations to pause now and then, and take stock of what has happened—and what has not happened—since 1935.

Many things have been achieved that would have seemed impossible in 1935.

The Wagner act was passed in a period of industrial strife. That strife involved some of the best-known and most powerful corporations in America. Their names were in the headlines—and in the reports of the NLRB.

Today, except for routine representation elections at new plants, a great many of these corporations are seldom mentioned in labor board proceedings. Their executives and their attorneys are strangers in the regional offices of the board.

Today they solve their problems through collective bargaining.

This is clear evidence that truly responsible employers have come to accept unionism and collective bargaining as a normal part of the American way of life—and a good way, for themselves as well as their workers.

They have discovered that union organization of their workers is not a threat to their existence. While a union contract may raise wages and fringe benefits; while it may limit the unrestricted right of management to set rates or impose discipline, it has advantages which—to wise employers—are worth this small price.

Their work-force, being more secure, will be more stable and more productive.

Grievances will be exposed to the light of reason, and to resolution, rather than grow and fester in darkness and fear.

The employer who is willing to scrap his authoritarian—or, at best, paternalistic—role and accept employees as free human beings, with all the dignity that term implies, has the most to gain, and gains the most, from collective bargaining. Recognition of that fact by many employers is a great accomplishment of the National Labor Relations Act.

For our part, we in the labor movement can be proud of our record in observing the onerous restrictions of the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts. Seven separate types of "unfair labor practices," some with numerous subdivisions, are forbidden to unions: while employers must follow only five simple mandates.

The clear assumption seems to be that unions are more apt to go wrong. Yet in 1966 only 18% of all unfair labor practice complaints were issued against labor organizations.

So in one sense we can say that the United States has passed the era when the way to organize was through an organizational strike. We are not in such desperate straits any more—not as a general proposition. But those who blandly insist that "labor is accepted today"—and they are usually people who want us to roll over and play dead—ought to look at the exceptions.

Let me give you two examples. One arises from a fault in the law. The other arises from the primitive behavior of a certain kind of corporate management—not, of course, the kind that is represented here today.

The first has to do with agricultural workers.

Today the farm worker is encountering all the techniques of jungle warfare from which most workers have long been protected by the Wagner Act. That such circumstances should exist in the wealthiest country in the world—and in some of the richest states of that country—is a national disgrace.

The farm worker does not ask for charity or special privilege. All he seeks is that the national labor policy, applied to all other industries, be applied to him as well. All he asks is that the machinery established by Congress, to resolve labor-management problems and settle any question of representation, be made available to him.

But it is not available. So farm workers must seek bargaining rights through their own resources, with all the turmoil and disruption that is supposed to be a thing of the past.

Obviously the law should be amended to meet this problem—to make the farm worker a first-class industrial citizen.

The second example relates to the continuing, calculated and concerted violation of the National Labor Relations Act by certain employers and groups of employers, including some very large corporations.

This deliberate law-breaking is primarily identified with the south, particularly the southern textile industry. But it can be found in other sections, too.

The behavior of these employers accounts for the fact that nearly two-thirds of the unfair labor practice charges filed against employers in fiscal 1966 involved the discharge of workers for union activity.

This not only indicates a widespread disregard for the law. It also reveals a total lack of humane regard for workers and their families.

Even as we meet today to mark the advance of civilization in labor-management affairs, in scores of benighted communities there are active vigilante groups in action, dedicated to prevent or destroy union organization.

These groups include merchants and bankers, clergymen and editors, mayors and sheriffs, following the lead of the dominant industrial interests in the community. These are often the same civic leaders who helped to lure runaway plants from organized industrial areas by providing cost-free plant sites and buildings, financed by tax-exempt bonds.

Union organizers face arrest for trespassing if they enter the employer's premises. Local police order them away from public property on some such pretext as "obstructing traffic" when they attempt to distribute union literature.

The violence that often has been directed against civil rights supporters is a routine occupational hazard for the union adherent. It comes from the same anti-American organizations, the same kind of local power structures and sometimes the same individuals who have figured in the most explosive civil rights developments in the south.

Master-minding most of these campaigns is one or another member of a new "profession" that has developed in the last 15 years. They call themselves "labor consultants." We call them union-busters.

Their purpose is not to help an employer to exercise his legal rights, but rather to show him how to evade his legal obligations.

Their hand has been apparent in the alarming increase in labor board charges involving refusal to bargain in good faith. Such charges accounted for only 16% of unfair labor practice cases in fiscal 1959. Last year they were 35%.

Please remember that I am not talking about the *legal* resistance of employers to union organization. We think even the legal resistance is short-sighted, but we acknowledge the constitutional right of employers to be foolish.

What I am talking about is the definance of law, right down to the perjury level.

Let me quote some of the milder remarks by Boyd Leedom, a labor board trial examiner who was once chairman of the NLRB in the Eisenhower Administration and also served as a state supreme court judge. He is talking about J. P. Stevens, the nation's second-largest textile chain:

"The reports of the NLRB indicate that Respondent (Stevens) is not the only giant in the textile industry, doing substantial business in the so-called 'south,' that seems to be rejecting the national labor policy. It is not generally known whether this position is due to a coincidence, to a common understanding, or to a fear on the part of each that should it break the barrier into enlightened employee policy, it would jeopardize its competitive position. Whatever the reason, thousands of employees and wide geographic areas are being denied such economic benefits as may flow from the LMRA."

We share Judge Leedon's view. We suggest that the attitudes he described are not limited to the south or to to the textile industry.

In a statement before a special subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, a little more than a year ago, the present NLRB Chairman Frank McCulloch noted that employer unfair labor practices were involved in almost 82% of the hearings before trial examiners the previous year. He then commented:

"The doubling of our caseload in the short span of eight years, much of it relating to clearly understood provisions of the law, evidences a regrettable unwillingness of some to accept the basic tenets of the law. . . . Too many people flout the national labor policy which you, the Congress, have established on behalf of all the people. . . .

"The rising level of the board's workload demonstrates to us that the national labor policy still meets determined challenge and resistance in some quarters."

One remedy for all this would be more adequate penalties on the deliberate lawbreakers. The NLRB has been moving in this direction, even under the present statute, and we hope it will move farther. But ultimately there may be a need for changes in the law itself.

Meanwhile, much could be accomplished if employers who have accepted unionism and collective bargaining—employers like you who are present today—would actively and publicly disassociate themselves from those who flout the law.

Unfortunately, although there has been a welcome change in some business groups, the fellow who makes a rip-roaring speech about the perils of "labor monopoly"—whatever that is—or the threat of coordinated bargaining, or the evil powers of the labor bosses—or maybe, these days, the evil lack of power of the labor bosses at ratification time—that fellow usually gets an ovation, even from an audience that knows better.

It would be very useful, we think if more often another fully-accredited employer got up and said "Yes, but . . ."

It seems to me that without people, on both sides, who said "Yes, but . . ." now and then, we wouldn't be here today.

However, we *are* here. That fact in itself is a tribute to the NLRB and the law it administers. And it is a tribute to the spirit of fair play, to the inherent devotion to law and justice, and to the plain common sense that have made America great.

Speech by William F. May, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, American Can Co., and Chairman, Industrial Relations Committee, National Association of Manufacturers

It is a distinct pleasure to speak at this luncheon on behalf of the National Association of Manufacturers and the substantial segment of the industrial community which it represents to observe the casting of the 25-millionth secret ballot in a representation election.

This ceremony represents more than a tribute to the National Labor Relations Act, the National Labor Relations Board, labor unions or management—it is really a tribute to the American concept of democracy. We place a high value in this country on the right of self-determination, whether it be to vote freely for government representatives or, in this case, to vote on whether to have a bargaining representative. We recognize that the expression of individual freedom is a vital aspect of the dignity of man.

As you all know, the right of an individual employee to decide in a secret ballot election, whether to be represented by a union was one of the foundations of the Wagner Act of 1935. We in industry have expressed concern about the use of authorization cards as a substitute for the secret ballot because we feel so strongly that the secret ballot is a right which should be preserved intact. Therefore, we are glad to join with labor unions, the NLRB, and other interested parties in taking special note that, in this free country of ours, 25 million employees have exercised this important right.

The same democratic principles which inspired the secret ballot election have produced free collective bargaining. Collective bargaining is at a critical juncture today, with the public becoming increasingly aroused by major disputes which evidence a failure in the collective bargaining process. We hear frequent proposals for compulsory arbitration, or other types of third-party intervention, which can only significantly undermine collective bargaining and the ability of the parties to reach agreement on their own. Despite occasional breakdowns, the collective bargaining process has been an important stabilizing influence in our industrial system, and we take this opportunity to reaffirm the need to preserve rather than destroy it.

There is an impelling need for labor and management to improve the collective bargaining process and to recognize their strong community of interest in achieving this goal. In fact, there is an impelling need today for the leaders of business and labor to recognize the importance of replacing antagonism and conflict with accommodation and cooperation.

Our joint support today of the secret ballot election demonstrates that the old philosophy of conflict in labor relations is being replaced by more constructive and responsible thinking. The Board recently issued a press release which referred to this event as an example of "unique cooperation" between major labor and management organizations. We believe that cooperation between labor and management should be a normal and continuing relationship. It is time that leaders of business and labor recognize the expanding scope of their common interests and the importance of advancing them together.

Our common goal must be increased productivity, for only then can wages and profits increase without contributing to inflationary pressures, which are of such current concern. Management recognizes that strong, responsible and democratic unions can be an asset to management and can represent an important force in our industrial system. Unions must accept management's right to manage and recognize that a profitable enterprise underlies gain for all. No one segment of our society can take more than its fair share of the fruits of increased productivity—employees, employers, stockholders, consumers, or government.

Our success will be judged in many ways; by the respect and confidence which the parties have for each other; by the extent to which collective bargaining promotes industrial peace; by settlements which are consonant with economic good sense; by the extent to which labor and management are able to resolve their own differences, without the need for outside intervention.

Open exchanges of information through clear channels of communication are basic. I recall several situations when my company was faced with uneconomic costs at some of its plants, and where we discussed the circumstances with both the local and international union representatives. After we had carefully explained all the facts, we had two types of experiences: one, where the union not only accepted the facts, but agreed to action to correct the situation; others where the union would take no action. In the first instance, the plants have continued to progress and grow, while in the latter case the plants have been closed. While agreements for wage cuts, or freezes are relatively uncommon, they demonstrate an awareness that objectives other than the pursuit of "more" are in the nation's interest.

Many fruitful experiments to encourage communications between labor and management well in advance of negotiations have been steps in the right direction. Committees which consult between contract negotiations without the pressures of deadlines and expiration dates can sharpen issues and resolve those complex problems which require much more time than crisis bargaining allows. Joint effort can resolve problems left unsettled during negotiations and can accumulate information for the resolution of future issues. This on-going relationship can have a constructive effect on labor and management leaders and can make them better qualified to represent their respective sides with a more rational approach to collective bargaining.

Consultation and continuous dialogue must not be confused with joint decision-making. Management must manage the business, and the union must manage its appropriate function of representing employees. Union interests in profits have grown in our affluent society, where employees are frequently stockholders, as well as beneficiaries, of pension and retirement plans, which invest their capital in corporate securities. The employee with two hats must have a union leader who, within his appropriate sphere, is concerned with both wages and profits. This leader must realize that unions can be assets to good management by recognizing the need for more efficient methods, and the orderly introduction of technology.

There are a number of important issues involving people at work which demand further cooperation between labor and management. The tight labor markets in many parts of the country emphasize the need to train the unemployed and to upgrade the underemployed, on a basis that will afford equal employment opportunity to all. In addition, our constantly changing technology requires that in-plant training programs be constantly reviewed and revised, so that employees' skills are consonant with job requirements.

In keeping with these needs and responsive to its members' interests, the NAM has developed its STEP (Solutions To Employment Problems) Program. More than 200,000 copies of some 50 case studies have been distributed to illustrate how industry and communities have solved employment problems. In addition, STEP workshops have been held across the country in order to stimulate industry to develop creative and innovative solutions to employment problems.

More recently, the NAM created a program, the purpose of which has been to develop inexpensive and efficient training and education programs which can be adapted for use in industry. As a result of the pilot research undertaken at the NAM, companies have been stimulated to develop their own training and skill upgrading programs which have proved extremely effective.

There are a variety of statistics available on the amount industry spends annually on training and education. In 1965, *Business Week* estimated a total amount of $18 billion, and *Fortune* gave a higher figure of $24 billion. More recently, I saw an estimate of $17 billion as the amount spent by industry in 1966 in this area. These figures are a strong indication of the awareness in industry of the need for training and education programs for its employees.

Similarly, optimal working conditions which promote better health and safety are mutual concerns of both labor and management. In October of 1966, the NAM held a National Conference on Mental Health and the Business Community, the first such conrefence sponsored by industry on a national level, in order to stimulate a greater awareness of the importance of mental health in industry. More recently, the NAM adopted a policy position in support of *off-the-job* safety in recognition of an awareness in industry that *total safety* of employees is an important matter.

Greater attention should be given to improving occupational medical programs; to assuring that air contaminants and other adverse factors within the work environment are kept within tolerable limits; to encouraging safe habits for employees. In short, the physical and the mental health and safety of the employee must be our joint concern.

Recommendations to narrow the scope of possible conflict through regular consultation are not a panacea for the labor-management problems of today. Competing interests will remain at the bargaining table, and it is conceded that they are necessary. But all attempts to strengthen the problem-solving capabilities of the parties, especially as they work together in support of common objectives, are certainly in the interest of everyone.

Going back 25 million votes, we can readily see the dramatic social changes that have occurred. Unions are accepted as an important economic force in our industrialized society. Management recognizes the need for constructive and responsible approaches and for exercising a greater degree of social responsibility.

We must increase the capability of free collective bargaining to be a dynamic, positive force in our industrial society. Let us seek more ways to lower those barriers which have traditionally separated labor and management, and let us recognize the importance—indeed, the necessity—of greater cooperation in support of our common goals.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1967

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The Assistant Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 355) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma may yield to me briefly.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio may be recognized in his own right. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

GOVERNOR ROMNEY'S CAMPAIGN CLAIMS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished Governor of my neighboring State of Michigan was present in the family gallery of the Senate, and I desire to advert to him and some of his recent statements rather briefly this morning.

Campaign oratory has started early this year. Gov. George Romney, of Michigan, has publicly asserted that the Johnson administration, in his words:

> Is traveling the road to economic catastrophe and . . . the destruction of free collective bargaining and a free competitive economy.

The Governor has, unfortunately, not been doing his homework. He has not been reading recent economic reports. He has not troubled to look at the situation and reports in his own State.

Economic indicators for the third quarter of 1966 showed that U.S. corporate profits before taxes had reached an estimated high of $80 billion compared with approximately $60 billion in 1963. This does not seem to reflect "the road to economic catastrophe." In fact, it looks like the high road to prosperity for American business.

Business was not the only sector to share in our prosperity of the last few years. From 1963 to 1966 almost 6 million new jobs were added to the American economy. American families increased their net financial wealth by $150 million. The Nation's unemployment rate fell from 5.5 percent to 3.7 percent—the lowest rate in 13 years.

In short, the businessman, the workingman, and the farmer have all shared in the Nation's unprecedented economic growth.

If Governor Romney had taken the trouble to look at his own State of Michigan, he would have found further evidence of the country's economic advances, rather than its decline.

From 1961 through 1966, his own State gained more than a half million new jobs. The unemployment rate fell from 7.2 percent to 3.1 percent. Average per capita income for every Michigan citizen rose from $2,296 to $3,009—a greater rate of increase than for most States in the Nation.

It is significant that the automobile industry, of which Michigan accounts for a good part, recorded an increase in profits after taxes during the first 9 months of 1966 of $428 million over the same period in 1963.

Is this the picture of a State—the Governor's own State—following a Nation on the road to "economic catastrophe?"

Governor Romney has also overlooked another basic factor in his condemnation of the economic policies of the Johnson administration. This administration does not measure success merely in dollars and cents, but in human benefits. The President measures our advances in potential fulfilled, in new job opportunities, in improved health, in education for the bright but needy young boy or girl, in the renewal of our cities, in the improvement of our living environment. Those advances may never show in just dollars or cents, but they show in the faces and the hearts of millions of American citizens.

It is becoming increasingly obvious that Governor Romney does not appreciate such intangible accomplishments.

Our economy is sound and strong. It has never been better. Its fruits are shared by more Americans than ever before in our history. The facts speak for themselves. No amount of oratory can undo them.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 355) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

(At this point, Mr. Tydings took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] has an amendment which he desires to present.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Assistant Legislative Clerk. In the amendment previously agreed to, in line 10, after "that day." insert a new sentence, as follows:

> On page 26, line —, insert the following: "Each Senator who (1) on that day was serving as a member of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences or the Committee on Government Operations, (2) on that date was entitled, under the proviso contained in the first sentence of paragraph 4 of this rule as such rule existed on that day, to serve on three committees named in that sentence, and (3) on June 30, 1971, is serving on three such committees, of which at least one is the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences or the Committee on Government Operations, shall be entitled to continue to serve on each of the committees of which he is a member on June 30, 1971, so long as his service as a member of each such committee remains continuous thereafter."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is entitled to 30 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this amendment has been around for some time, and I should like to explain it. I have asked the minority leader especially to remain in the Chamber because I would like him to hear my explanation. I know that we want to do what is the proper thing for the Senate. This is not a personal matter with me.

The amendment provides that during two Congresses—that is, for 6 months of the second Congress, in order to give Senators an opportunity to turn around—Senators who, because of the grandfather-clause provision, are members of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and the Committee on Government Operations, may keep not only those committee assignments but also all their other major committee assignments—that is, as is provided by the bill and by the rule.

However, after the termination of the 6 months, which would be during the second Congress, if a Senator who had benefited from the grandfather clause gave up any of his three committees, he would be compelled to treat the committee in which he had grandfather-clause protection as a major committee and would be able to serve on only two committees thereafter.

Twenty-two Senators would be affected by this procedure. I am one of them. The Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] is another. Many other Senators on both sides of the aisle would be affected. I have written each one a letter and have informed them of the proposal.

Originally, when I examined the bill, it struck me that there was an injustice inherent in it, for this reason: Senators who had three committees, one of which was a so-called minor committee—let us say the Committee on the District of Columbia or the Committee on Rules and Administration, for example—could continue to maintain the grandfather clause forever, so long as they did not leave a particular committee in which they were protected.

But when it came to special committees which had been escalated into major committees, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney]—with whom I have discussed the problem—has declared that he wants us to be squeezed back into the two committees, thereby penalizing us by requiring us to leave the grandfather-clause-protected committee the minute we changed any of our committees; whereas, in the other case, we would be affected only if we actually changed from a committee in which we had the grandfather-clause-protected provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would ask the Senator from New York if he realizes that the amendment which he has presented, since it is to an amendment which has already been adopted, and can be offered only by unanimous consent.

Mr. JAVITS. I did not realize that. Do I still have the time available whether unanimous consent is involved or not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. I will continue speaking. We will work it out.

Mr. President, the problem, as the minority leader states it, and after this discussion, and realizing what the desires of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney] are, and talking at great length with the Senator on the other side of the aisle who is the most interested—the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie]—we finally worked out a sort of compromise plan between both points of view, in which Senators in this situation, to wit, 22 Senators, would be protected for two Congresses; and, thereafter, the idea that the Senator from

Oklahoma felt strongly about, would be the rule.

That is acceptable to the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], and it is acceptable to me. The amendment affects several Senators. It is not a personal foray with me. Neither is it with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney]. We are trying to do what is best for the Senate and the committee assignments.

I felt that the minority leader should hear my argument for what I believe to be a fair disposition of what is a trying situation.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

We discussed this amendment thoroughly to try to protect individual Members of the Senate who might be adversely affected because of their assignment to two major committees and one minor committee. The reorganization bill before us provides the manner by which future assignments of Members of the Senate to committees shall be handled. We have run into some difficulties in individual situations, although with very, very few Senators.

We would "grandfather" these Senators into their present committee assignments and thus not prohibit them from enjoying their present committee assignments, whether the assignments be to two major committees and one minor committee, or if their minor committee has been made, within recent times, a major committee. The Senators would not have to give those assignments up in order to come under the provision of assignment to two major or one minor committee.

However, in preparing the language, it was found that this would result in "freezing" certain Senators into their present committee assignment structure and not give them an opportunity to help themselves in obtaining more important committee assignments, or committee assignments to their liking, as opportunity for those assignments might be opened to them in the future.

In other words, as the bill was prepared, a Senator assigned to the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee or the Committee on Government Operations would have to give it up and receive only one major committee assignment.

It was to avoid this sacrifice of a 2-to-1 change, with respect to their entitlement to committee assignments, that we finally worked out the language presented by the senior Senator from New York in "grandfathering" them in for the full three committees, any one of which may be changed or transferred, as they are entitled to another committee assignment, so long as they serve in the Senate, until the midyear of 1971.

This provision will give such Senators two additional Congresses to improve their committee assignments or get a committee to their liking, without sacrificing two major committees to get one they like.

I hope the explanation is clear. It is a difficult matter to discuss or to put into language. This amendment would allow Senators to get improvements in assignments if they were assigned to the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee and the Government Operations Committee, when they were minor committees, and allow them to request membership on another committee of their choice. This privilege will expire for all Senators in 1971, as provided by the amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I thank my colleague very much for his fine explanation of the matter.

Mr. President, I ask this parliamentary inquiry. Is the unanimous consent to which the Chair referred required to vote on the amendment, or is it required only to take it up?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To take it up.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be taken up notwithstanding its form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, may I have 1 minute?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I merely wanted to say that if at some future time we found it difficult to fill any spot, we would have two full Congresses to modify this particular rule.

I have no objection to the amendment; but if a future difficulty should arise, it should be pointed out that, in order to satisfy any difficulty in assignment, this particular rule could be modified. In that event, a bill would have to be introduced and would be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration for consideration.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, this provision does not give any Senator abnormal protection with respect to assignments to committees as the Congress might change its numerical proportion as between the majority and minority. We feel it will work out. We think this amendment, affecting only a very few Senators, will correct any injustice that may be done in compelling Senators to remain on their present committees when they want to have a change in assignment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That could be explored in the future.

Mr. JAVITS. I am delighted the amendment is satisfactory to the minority leader, in view of his enormous experience in this body, and pointing out that two factors affect it: One, the time phasing, and, two, the fact that succeeding Congresses may also decide on a different plan and the making of further changes in the future.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back my remaining time.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield back my remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], who is the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by Mr. Talmadge for Mr. Long of Louisiana is as follows:

On page 8, beginning with line 3, strike out all to and including line 25, page 9, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(e) If, at the time of approval of a measure by any such committee, any member of the committee gives notice of intention to file supplemental or minority views, each such member shall be entitled to no less than one day in which to file such views with the clerk of the committee in writing. All such views so filed by one or more members of the committee shall be included within and shall be a part of the report filed by the committee with respect to that measure. The report of such committee upon such measure shall be printed in a single volume which shall include all supplemental or minority views which have been submitted at the time of the filing of the committee report, and shall bear upon its cover a recital that supplemental or minority views are included as a part of the report.

"Nothing contained in this subsection shall preclude—

"(A) The immediate filing and printing of a committee report unless a timely request for the opportunity to file supplemental or minority views has been made as provided by this subsection; or

"(B) The filing by any standing committee of any supplemental report upon any measure which may be required for the correction of any technical error in a previous report made by such committee upon such measure.

"(f) The report of any such committee of either House of the Congress upon any measure shall be filed in that House at least three calendar days (exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) before any vote is taken upon that measure in that House. If there have been hearings held upon any such measure so reported in either such House, the committee shall make every reasonable effort to have such hearings printed and available for distribution to Members of that House prior to consideration of the measure. This section shall not apply to any measure for the declaration of war or the declaration of a national emergency by the Congress. In any event, this section may be waived by joint agreement of the majority leader and minority leader of the Senate or the Speaker and the minority leader of the House of Representatives upon a finding that in their opinion such waiver is required because of the imminence of sine die adjournment, the expiration of the Act sought to be amended, or to meet the immediate financial needs of the Government."

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the reorganization bill, as it was reported by the committee, was basically designed to streamline the legislative process. However, there are two features of this bill which operate in just the opposite direction. They hinder and retard the orderly movement of legislation from committees and on through the House and Senate.

I refer to the so-called 2-day rule for filing committee reports and the 3-day rule for taking up legislation on the floor.

Under the 2-day rule, the bill before us would require that where minority or supplemental views are to be filed on a measure, the report of the majority, once it has been completed, must be turned over to those seeking to file minority or supplemental views and thev are given a 2-day period within which to rebut the position taken in the majority report and to submit their own views.

In the Committee on Finance we have never experienced any difficulty with respect to minority views. Those seeking to file such views have always been given as much time as they need to prepare them. I am certain it is the chairman's intention that the Committee on Finance will continue to respect and honor the legitimate requests of those who desire to differ from the voting majority on a measure.

However, the 2-day rule fails to recognize the peculiar handicap under which much of the Finance Committee work must be performed. I refer to the provision in the Constitution which requires that measures affecting the revenues must originate in the House of Representatives. In many instances, the Finance Committee is called upon to consider legislation extending temporary provisions of our tax or debt laws and we are unable to do that until the House has acted on a bill and sent it to us. Often this occurs only a short time before the expiration date, or before the adjournment of Congress. An arbitrary 2-day delay in filing a committee report in these circumstances is difficult to justify.

I would like to describe just a few of the acts within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Finance which could be jeopardized by this rule because of special termination dates in the statutes. I refer to the interest equalization tax, the excise tax on automobiles and telephones, the suspension of the investment tax credit, the public debt law, the Renegotiation Act, the Trade Expansion Act, the Sugar Act, and a whole host of temporary tariff suspension measures.

I understand the chairman of the committee has discussed this rule with the chairman of the Reorganization Committee, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and with other Members of the Senate, and that an agreement has been worked out among them under which Members desiring to file minority or separate views on a measure would be given not less than 1 day to prepare those views.

I understand that under this amendment minority views could be submitted and the committee report filed the same day the committee acts on the measure if the work can be done that quickly. There is no requirement in the amendment that a report must be held up for 1 day if minority views have been submitted.

The other part of this amendment modifies the 3-day rule I have referred to. Many, in fact, most, of the objections to the 2-day rule on committee reports apply with equal force to the 3-day rule. In many instances, Congress must act more swiftly than the committee bill would permit. The chairman of the Finance Committee has conferred regarding this amendment and compromise language has been worked out with Mr. MONRONEY and with other members of his reorganization committee.

Under the agreement, the 3-day rule generally would apply to a measure and no vote could be taken on it until 3 days have elapsed after the report is filed by the committee. However, the majority leader and the minority leader, or their designees, could agree to waive part or all of the 3-day rule where, in their opinion, waiver is required because of the imminence of sine die adjournment of any session of the Congress, the expiration of the act sought to be amended, or to meet the immediate financial needs of the Government. Mr. President, the substance of these compromises on the 2-day rule and the 3-day rule are embodied in the amendment I have offered.

The chairman of the Committee on Finance has pointed out on other occasions that there are means available to a Member who desires to slow down the work of the Senate or of the House, but in order for him to be successful in his slow-down efforts, he must work at it. The bill as reported by the committee could arm such a person with a dilatory tactic which would tie up this body for a full week in those instances where the 2- and 3-day rules commence operation on a Monday. If he had a willing companion in the other House of Congress, a 2-week delay in considering a measure could be achieved without the slightest effort being exerted by the proponents of the slowdown and contrary to the wishes of a majority of the Members of both Houses.

The amendments I have described have been worked out with the able cooperation of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, who is the chairman of the Reorganization Committee, and with other distinguished Senators who serve on that committee. In our judgment, they bring the provisions of the bill into line with the requirements of the Constitution and make it possible for Congress to act with speed when speed is desirable for the proper function of this body. In doing this, they conform to the objective of the bill of streamlining congressional procedures.

Again on behalf of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], I urge that these amendments be agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, we have worked a number of days to try to bring into line the views of the minority and majority members of the Committee on Organization, and the minority and majority leadership of the Finance Committee. It is my understanding that the amendment has been approved by the representatives of the minority on the Organization and Finance Committees, and the majority has agreed to accept the proposals.

The amendment would simply reduce the length of the delay in filing a report, and give access to the minority for a minority report to be filed jointly and concurrently with the majority report within 1 day—instead of 2 days, as contained in the original amendment.

The other provision, as has been stated by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, is to make it possible under certain conditions, as we near adjournment or as laws are about to expire because of our failure to pass legislation to continue them, for the 3-day waiting period to be waived. It can be waived by the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, or the Speaker and the minority leader of the House of Representatives, upon a finding that in their opinion such waiver is required because of the imminence of sine die adjournment or the expiration of the act sought to be amended, or to meet the immediate financial needs of the Government.

With the understanding that we have arrived at with the minority membership of the Committee on Reorganization, and with the understanding that they have arrived at through their contact with the members of the Committee on Finance, the committee accepts this amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Oklahoma in supporting this proposal. I think it is a constructive suggestion, and would make the work of the Senate a little more efficient.

However, I wish to make it clear that my support of this proposal is not because of any special concern over the termination dates of various proposals, as outlined by the chairman of the Finance Committee; because I think that the administration, which while recognizing that some of the measures do have termination dates, has heretofore been lax in bringing its proposals before Congress in adequate time for Congress to give them proper consideration. I hope, therefore, the administration will not interpret the acceptance of this proposal as an indication that we endorse their past practices of waiting until the last minute, and then expecting emergency action on a measure that is going to expire in a couple days. When they know the date it will expire, let them ask for its extension in time so that we will have adequate time to consider the measure, or be on notice that if they do not, they may catch themselves in a jam some of these days.

Some of us are getting tired of these ever-recurring emergencies.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware. I believe these provisions will work out, and I believe that providing the 3-day general period that bills must be available to Members of Congress, with the emergency escape clause for the imminence of the sine die adjournment or the expiration of the act, will be a great step forward.

Heretofore, we have had this rule on appropriations: that appropriation bills must be before the Senate for 3 days before they are acted upon, with the transcripts of hearings and the reports available. We extend that provision, now, to all committees. But we recognize there are times of emergency, such as near the end of the session, when there will be a necessity, perhaps, for waiving the provision; and the amendment provides an escape, with the proper safeguards. We accept it.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield back the remainder of my time, and ask for a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, as presented by the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I observe the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 28

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 28 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> On page 2, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 122 of the bill, insert the following new item:
>
> "Sec. 123. Standing Rules of the Senate."
>
> On page 30, between the lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:
>
> "STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE
>
> "SEC. 123. Rule XIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:
>
> "'9. Whenever a Senator has held the floor for three consecutive hours, he shall be required to yield the floor upon objection and any Senator may raise a point of order at any time thereafter that such Senator yield the floor.'"

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I address an inquiry to the Senator from Oklahoma, the manager of the bill. As the Senator knows, I have told him I would like a rollcall vote on each of my five amendments.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the debate on this amendment can be relatively brief. I understand it is not subject to the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. And I assume at some point the Senator will want to move to table.

What is the desire of the Senator with respect to a quorum call to get enough Senators present to get the yeas and nays and give some indication that we will be voting pretty soon?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would be happy to have enough Senators present so that we may have the yeas and nays. Would the Senator like to have that done now?

Mr. CLARK. I suggest that the Senator suggest the absence of a quorum in order that we may get the yeas and nays, and I will defer my argument until that has been done.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on amendment No. 28 of the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania and the anticipated motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second, the yeas and nays are ordered on amendment No. 28; and, without objection, the yeas and nays are ordered on the motion to table if and when made.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I observe the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the pending amendment is very simple. It provides that whenever a Senator has held the floor for 3 consecutive hours, an objection to his continued possession of the floor, if made by any Senator, would compel him to yield the floor.

When this proposed change in the rules was first introduced in 1961, I characterized it, in my appearance before the Committee on Rules and Administration, as an antifilibuster measure. That was because shortly before that time, two of our most distinguished Senators had engaged in a marathon competition against each other, to see which Senator could speak the longest without collapsing. I do not recall which of the two won, but whichever won, it was close. On one occasion, if my recollection serves me correctly, a Senator spoke for 23 hours and 45 minutes. Shortly thereafter, he was topped by a colleague who spoke for 24 hours and 3 minutes. My statistics may not be correct.

I remember very well that this took place—at least one of these marathons took place—during my first year as a Senator, when it was my pleasure to serve as the Presiding Officer on a good many occasions. That year there was a slim crop of new Senators. There were only six of us on the Democratic side, and my recollection is that there were only three or four on the Republican side. So we had to work much harder in the chair than was the case after the election of 1958, when 18 new Senators were able to share the workload, with a much less onerous burden on each.

On this particular occasion, let history record in the RECORD—I have already enshrined it in a permanent volume entitled "Congress: The Sapless Branch"—I was at a rather gay dinner party in Georgetown, a perfectly proper and well-behaved dinner party, but nevertheless we were having a pretty good time.

I was wearing a dinner coat and a black tie. Shortly before midnight I was called by Bobby Baker. I see the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] in the Chamber, and I can assure him that no insidious or improper purpose occasioned Bobby Baker calling me.

Bobby Baker said, "I wish you would come on down here right quick." He said, "Senator CHURCH has been in the chair for a pretty long time and he is pretty tired. We want you to help us out."

I came to the Senate, clad in my dinner coat. About midnight I relieved my good friend from Idaho, and I composed myself to listen to the Senator who was making the speech, which had already been going for well over 12 hours. I think the Senator had gotten the floor shortly after the Senate had convened at noon, and it was at midnight that day that I appeared in the Chamber.

I remember being very much interested in the first several hours of his speech, which consisted of reading the laws of the 48 States dealing with civil rights. He had started with Alabama. At the end of the third hour the Senator in question had gotten to the State of Pennsylvania and I stayed awake long enough to hear the laws of my State read. Then, I regret to state, weariness overcame me.

I sent out for a copy of the Washington Post. I leaned back in the chair of the Presiding Officer, and I spread the front and last pages of the Washington Post over my eyes; and, admittedly in derogation of the dignity of the Senate, I fell asleep.

About 3 a.m. I was awakened by the then Senator from Arizona, Mr. Goldwater, entering the Chamber. I might say that this was during one of those old-fashioned filibusters against a civil rights bill. Then Senator Goldwater startled me into wakefulness by asking the Senator in question to yield. The Senator said he would yield on the understanding that he would not lose his right to the floor. I put the question of unanimous consent and unanimous consent was granted. The Senator in question left the Chamber briefly.

The Senator from Arizona made a few remarks in his usual witty and pertinent style, which, as I remember, did not comply with any germaneness requirement. The filibustering Senator returned and resumed his discussion of the civil rights laws of the 48 States.

Around 6 o'clock in the morning I

started to get restless. I sent for Bobby Baker, who appeared in due course. He was, I must say, a most excellent and dedicated secretary of the majority, as far as caring for the rights of individual Senators was concerned, whatever else might be said about him.

I said, "Bobby, I have been here long enough. I have been here for 6 hours." He said, "Yes, Senator, I think you have been here long enough but it is too early to awaken anyone. It is only 6 o'clock. If you can hold on for another hour or so, I can get somebody else."

Later, the late and lamented Dick Neuberger appeared in the Chamber and assumed the chair. I went home, I got some sleep, and the filibuster continued until after noon that day, when, the record, I believe, having been broken, the speech was terminated.

I do not wish to indicate anything other than that the particular Senator, whose record was broken—although it may have been the other way around—had every right to do what he did. I would merely suggest that the practice should not be encouraged by the Senate rules.

Therefore, I suggest that a reasonable limitation on the time that a Senator can talk without being required to yield the floor would be 3 hours. There is nothing magic about 3 hours. The limitation could be 2 hours, it could be 4 hours, and it might be some other period. I settled on 3 hours more or less arbitrarily.

However, last week I put my own rule to the test. It seemed to be desirable toward the end of last week, either on Thursday or Friday, to hold the floor for a reasonably extended time in order that the debate on the military authorization bill and its amendments should not come to a vote before the early part of this week. Therefore, I discussed it at some length. I was conscious of the rule that I was about to propose here. I think that I am correct in stating—fortunately there are no records kept so I do not think I can be challenged in what I am about to say—at the end of 2 hours and 59 minutes I yielded the floor in a state of some exhaustion.

While it is true that many Senators in this body are younger than I and presumably have greater energy, there are several Senators who are older than I, and I suggest—I do not charge it—perhaps they have a little less energy.

I would think that all Senators, young, old, or middle aged, would be benefited and protected if we had a rule that provided that at the end of 3 hours any Senator could take another Senator off the floor. If the Senator making the marathon speech feels that he could not adequately cover the subject in 3 hours, he could sit down, have a cup of coffee, and perhaps a little refreshment, and in due course obtain the floor again and make a second speech, under the proposed rule. The proposal is not what might be called a watertight amendment. I would like to suggest to Senators that 3 hours is about enough.

I see my good friend from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] in the Chamber. Before he came into the Chamber I had stated that in recent years this privilege of unlimited speaking has not been engaged in or abused. As I recall, none of the filibusters which have taken place in recent years have resulted in speeches of more than 2 hours at the most, or perhaps 2½ hours.

I do not think, as of today, since the filibustering procedures have been civilized since the election of 1960, I would say to my good friend from Florida, that there is any particular benefit from the privilege of holding the floor for marathon speeches. It seems to me that the dignity of the Senate is to some extent involved, as is the expeditious conduct of business. I wanted to make clear to the Senator from Florida that I do not think that the proposed rule would have any impact on filibustering whatever.

(At this point, Mr. GRIFFITH assumed the chair.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Pennsylvania in yielding to me.

As far as I am concerned, I have rarely spoken for more than 3 hours, but I have reserved the right to speak at considerably greater length, and at times have done so. I have seen occasions when it was very necessary that that period be largely exceeded. I wish to state for the RECORD why I believe this to be so.

There was a bill on the floor of the Senate, which in the opinion of the two Senators from Nevada, the late Senator Pat McCarran, and the late Senator George Malone, would have quite adversely affected their State because it would have prevented the shipment across State lines of slot machines and gambling equipment of various kinds, which we were told in the debate were——

Mr. CLARK. They were necessary to the economy of the State.

Mr. HOLLAND. We were told that they had a great deal to do with preservation of the sound fiscal situation in Nevada. Those two Senators were alone because no other State had quite that situation.

Mr. CLARK. I think that was because it was the only State which had legalized gambling, was it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. Except on race tracks—for the parimutuels. I believe that is correct.

Those two Senators gallantly, in support of their own State, for periods well beyond 3 hours, kept the Senate in such a state of suspense that the time for adjournment sine die was rapidly approaching, and the leadership had to yield and take up other necessary business and pass it.

I cite that as an example, because I want the RECORD to show that there are cases when periods of well beyond 3 hours have been used necessarily.

If the Senator will allow me to state another instance, at the time when the Senator from Florida was sponsoring the passage of the so-called Tidelands Act, there were some liberal friends of mine who very strongly resisted passage of that act and said their desire was to hold up action of the Senate long enough for the public to react in a way that they thought would uphold their position. That did not happen, as a matter of fact, but that is what they hoped for, and that is what they believed might happen.

My dear, close friend, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], set a record for speaking continuously at that time. I believe it was 22 hours and 26 minutes, but I may be corrected on that. His purpose, I am sure, was a conscientious one. He was hoping that by speaking for long periods of time the few Senators who felt as he did could create a favorable attitude toward their point of view throughout the Nation. I do not believe that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania would argue that the Senator from Oregon has ever trespassed beyond the rules, or beyond principle, in trying to get his ideas across. At that time, he had very few friends to stand with him in that situation.

I have named one case in which only two Senators were involved. I have named another in which, if I recall correctly, six or seven Senators were joined in opposing at length the Tidelands Act.

Senators simply cannot have the time to create what they hope for in the way of an attitude throughout the country, if we cut them off at 3 hours, or permit any Senator to cut them off at 3 hours. We know that there will always be someone on the opposite side who would be sufficiently sold on his point of view that he would cut off a Senator at 3 hours.

I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Pennsylvania in allowing me to make this statement.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my good friend from Florida. The yeas and nays on the amendment have already been ordered. Let me reply briefly in this way. I honor the Senator from Florida for his strong conviction on the question of filibustering, whether it be by groups or by one or two Senators. As he knows, I quite disagree with him on philosophical grounds; I believe that after appropriate debate, the majority of Senators should be permitted to bring any measure to a vote.

From my point of view, in order to clarify the record, I would be just as critical of my dear friend from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for doing what he did as I was at the time of the other Senator, also a good friend of mine, who broke the record of the Senator from Oregon a few years later.

Thus, this is really a philosophical question which, to some extent, goes back to the controversy over rule XXII, although it is rather a peripheral matter.

Mr. President, the proposed rule was the subject of a public hearing before the Committee on Rules and Administration in 1961. At that time, I made a brief statement in support of it which I should like to paraphrase for the RECORD.

Rather amusingly, if I do not paraphrase it but have it printed in full in the RECORD by unanimous consent, which I am sure would be granted, it will be printed in print so small that those of us who are getting a bit along in years will have great difficulty reading it; whereas if I paraphrase it, it will be printed in normal-sized type such as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is produced in each day—

another ridiculous practice under our present rules. Unfortunately my efforts to cause this practice to be revised have been conspicuously unsuccessful.

However, in 1961, as I suggested to the subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration, chaired by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], in the 18th century, when the Senate had only 26 Members and the Legislative Calendar was brief and did not contain matters of urgent importance to many millions of people, there was time to permit a filibuster.

The fact is, the first filibuster in history was not until 1840. Our Founding Fathers had long since gone to their just rewards. The filibuster was invented during the heydey of Webster, Clay, and Calhoun.

In any event, while the slavery issue was convulsing the Senate, as well as the rest of the country, there was a great deal of time available because the legislative calendar was still relatively short. I suggest that there was plenty of time for unlimited debate for a good long while after the first filibuster in 1840, but that there is no time for such tactics in the last third of the 20th century. We just do not have the time for that sort of debate, if we are going to do our job conscientiously and effectively.

Marathon speeches by any one Senator in a body which now numbers 100—when there were only 26 at the time of the first Congress—should not be permitted or tolerated. In my judgment, if a Senator takes more than 3 hours to expound his position on a particular subject, he is not going to add very many votes on his side.

Those of us who are lawyers will recall the injunction of many a judge to counsel, "Counselor, you had better quit while you are ahead."

Frequently, the more talk there is, the less effective is the discussion.

Who, in this day and age, is going to read, much less listen to, a speech of more than 3 hours duration? I suspect very few.

Senators will recall that when the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes was serving on the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts as a rather junior judge, he wrote an opinion which had been assigned to him by the chief judge of that court. Holmes apologized by saying, "I regret very much that this opinion is so long, but I did not have time to write a short one."

I think this is a pertinent comment with respect to the pending amendment.

When a Senator speaks for more than 3 hours, I suggest without exception that his purpose is purely one of delay.

If there have been occasions when that was not true, I do not recall them. When a Senator is interrupted repeatedly by colloquy, the Senate, I would think, could be relied upon to grant unanimous consent for the Senator to continue after the 3-hour period, unless the colloquy itself is obviously engaged in by proponents of the point of view taken by the long-speaking Senator for the purpose of delay. And if the Senator could not get unanimous consent to continue, he would still have the right, under rule XIX, to speak again on the same subject during the same legislative day if he could obtain recognition.

That argument fell upon sterile ground in the subcommittee chaired by our beloved friend from Arizona. The committee made a report thereon which was adverse to the proposal; and, at the risk of being charged with unfairness or bias, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that adverse report may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. May I say to Senators present on the floor that if any one of them wants to ask unanimous consent to have that adverse report printed in larger print, I shall not object.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON SENATE RESOLUTION 36

"*Resolved,* That paragraph numbered 1 of rule XIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to debate) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Whenever any Senator has held the floor for more than three consecutive hours, an objection to his continued recognition shall be in order at any time, and, if such an objection is made, the Senator shall yield the floor.'"

Senate Resolution 36 would amend rule XIX to provide that whenever any Senator has held the floor for more than 3 consecutive hours, if objection to his continued recognition is made, the Senator shall yield the floor.

The difficulties attendant upon any attempt to establish germaneness with respect to a Member's remarks on a given subject was pointed out in connection with the subcommittee's report on Senate Resolution 13. A similar difficulty would be encountered in any attempt to establish at what exact point in time freedom of debate would be transformed into filibustering. Senate Resolution 36 would arbitrarily set that point at 3 hours after a Member obtained the floor. While subscribing to the principle that it is the responsibility of Members ultimately to vote on any issue under discussion, the subcommittee also subscribes to the principle that such action should be taken only after full and complete debate. By its cloture provision in rule XXII the Senate has established the procedure under which that determination shall be made.

The terms of the present rule XXII were the same back in 1925 when it was proposed by a Vice President, Charles G. Dawes, to amend the rule to provide for termination of debate by the affirmative vote of the majority of Senators. It was then that Royal S. Copeland, a Senator from New York, made the statement which is still pertinent regardless of the shifts in population that have since occurred:

"I can quite understand why a citizen of Nevada might want to have the rules changed. Nevada has 77,000 population, and yet it sends 2 Members to the U.S. Senate. If New York were represented in the same proportion, it would have 144 Members in the U.S. Senate instead of 2.

"Here is another thing to think about: The States of New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Michigan pay 60 percent of the Federal taxes. The combined representation of these States in the Senate is one-twelfth of the total. Therefore, these States are totally submerged so far as voting power is concerned.

"New York State has as great a population as 18 other States combined. It exceeds the combined population of Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Wyoming, Maine, and Nebraska.

"Add to these 18 States 7 other States—Arkansas, Louisiana, West Virginia, Washington, South Carolina, Maryland, and Connecticut—and it will be found that these 25 States, controlling 50 of the 96 votes, have a majority vote in the Senate. These States represent less than 20 percent of the total population of the country and they pay not more than 10 percent of the Federal taxes. Mr. Dawes' cloture rule would give this minority in population and financial standing absolute control of the Senate."

It is not the purpose of this report to reiterate the arguments which have been advanced in favor of extended debate, but rather to recognize the role of the Senate as the protector of the rights of the States and of minorities in our system of Government. *At no time should a single Senator have the right to compel another Senator to yield the floor.*

Therefore, the subcommittee reports Senate Resolution 36 unfavorably.

Mr. CLARK. I yield the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, several Senators, having other engagements, inquired as to when we may expect a rollcall on this amendment. I shall take only about 2 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will yield, we are not operating under limited time, and he may take whatever time he wishes. I may wish a moment or two to reply, but I shall not be long.

Mr. MONRONEY. That will be fine.

Mr. President, the joint committee has scrupulously limited itself to the language of the resolution which created the committee to study provisions for the reorganization of Congress. I wish to read the proviso in section 2 of the concurrent resolution which established the joint committee:

> *Provided,* That nothing in this concurrent resolution shall be construed to authorize the committee to make any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, and/or precedents of either House, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House. . .

It continues:

> *Provided further,* That the language employed herein shall not prohibit the committee from studying and recommending the consolidations and reorganization of committees.

Thus, the joint committee was denied the right to study or make recommendations for change with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, or Standing Rules of the Senate.

I think this is pertinent because the Senate does have a Committee on Rules and Administration that is assigned this jurisdiction and is capable of meeting every week or 2 weeks to discuss and take up proposed changes if the members of the committee so desire.

Many such proposals have gone, and will continue to go, to the Committee on Rules and Administration. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania is a member of that committee. Some of these proposed rule changes have taken the form of action by slight changes to the rules over the past years, by direction of the Rules and Administration Committee in reporting these bills.

We would feel in breach of faith if we took advantage, by way of amendments made on the floor of the Senate, to support or propose changes in the standing rules, jurisdiction of which was denied the joint committee in the resolution creating it. I believe it has been the policy of the Senate not to take up specific standing rule changes, rather leaving them for the consideration of the Rules and Administration Committee.

Therefore, I must reluctantly state that I shall move to table the amendment. I do not wish to cut off the time of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania by making a nondebatable motion until he has concluded his remarks.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. I shall be very brief.

As I understand the position of the Senator from Oklahoma, he opposes the amendment strictly on technical grounds. He expresses no opinion as to the merits of the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is why I shall move to table instead of proceeding to a vote on the merits of the amendment, in which we would present adverse arguments. We do not wish to take sides or to recommend or to disagree; we feel it is not within the jurisdiction of the concurrent resolution which created the joint committee. We have no requirement or jurisdiction to support any amendment made on the floor in this field. For that reason, we concluded to proceed in this way. Of course, the Senator may try to have his proposals considered and studied by the appropriate committee.

Mr. CLARK. As the Senator knows, this is the 22d proposed change in the rules that I have brought before the Senate since the pending measure was first brought on the floor. My recollection is that the Senator from Oklahoma argued rather strenuously on the merits against some of these proposals, but in more recent days, possibly because of exhaustion, he is confining himself to the technical position which he takes here.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe the senior Senator from Oklahoma made arguments on several amendments which did not propose to change rules of the Senate, and we did not move to table those proposals. I have reserved the making of motions to table, to those amendments which made proposals going beyond the jurisdiction of the committee. In so doing we did not take any position on the merits of the proposals but left future adoption or rejection of them to be handled by the Committee on Rules and Administration. The Senator from Pennsylvania, being a member of that committee, knows it is difficult, but legislative patterns change. The Senator from Pennsylvania has been here for some time. He will be here for a long time.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for that compliment.

Mr. MONRONEY. He is a diligent and tireless crusader, and I am sure he will be able to present and propose changes to the appropriate committee, and offer such arguments as he may wish to. We do not wish to make recommendations on this amendment because it goes beyond the jurisdiction for which the committee was created.

Mr. CLARK. I intend, after this bill has been passed, to introduce all of these 26 proposed changes in the rules, customs, and procedures of the Senate, and they will in due course be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, of which, as the Senator from Oklahoma has said, I am a member.

I would hope, when that time comes, that perhaps the Senator from Oklahoma would be willing to join me in urging that committee to have comprehensive hearings on those proposed rule changes and report them back either favorably or adversely to the floor before this session is over. The time is long overdue for the Senate to take an accounting and stock of its rules, customs, and procedures.

As the Senator knows, the composition of the Committee on Rules and Administration at present is such that, in my judgment, by a 5-to-4 vote, it is likely to insure that no change of the rules, practices, or procedures will receive favorable consideration. The Senator from Oklahoma has indicated that the situation may change. It has not for 10 years. I shall be patient perhaps through the end of 1968 and even possibly thereafter.

With that comment, Mr. President, I am prepared to vote.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, before I make the motion, I yield such time as he may need to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton].

EXTRACTS OF REMARKS OF MR. WILLIAM VERITY, PRESIDENT, ARMCO STEEL CORP.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, Mr. William Verity, president of the Armco Steel Corp., addressed the Washington Society of Investment Analysts on February 21. I have excerpts from Mr. Verity's remarks, which I commend to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpts From Remarks Made by Mr. William Verity, President, Armco Steel Corp., to the Washington Society of Investment Analysts, February 21, 1967

I am sure you are interested in a quick look at 1967. As far as the steel industry is concerned, we are in what would be called a downward trend. Some people call it a "leveling off". As far as Armco is concerned, our 1967 first quarter is not going to look as good as our 1966 first quarter. I am talking now about the shipments of steel we will make. This is caused by a falling off in the automotive markets and the appliance markets in particular. Most of the others are fairly strong.

Very frankly, we do not think that this is a signal of a recession. We think it is a leveling off that is allowing most of our customers to cut down on their inventory and actually providing, we believe, the signal of a further upturn in our whole economy. We believe this will probably take place late in 1967, or in 1968. So we are continuing to plan as we have for increased steel needs although we may be in a temporary slump for a period of months.

With that backdrop I would like to talk just for a minute about the steel industry and Washington. I am of the opinion that the steel industry's image in Washington has not been as favorable as that of other industries, and certainly we have learned the hard way several times about how important it is to build a closer relationship with Washington. So over the last several years—and I think that you'll see this particularly in 1967—our industry has been doing more to try to point out its problems and opportunities to both our elected representatives and to the Executive branch of the government.

We feel that sometimes the steel industry is misunderstood. Looking at this realistically, we find it is probably our fault because we haven't done a very good job of communications.

So we are going to spend a tremendous amount of time—my kind of time and the time of many others—in pointing out some of the problems of the industry and its plans for the future.

I would like to give you four quick examples:

One of the things that our company is vitally concerned with is pollution abatement. The pollution problem isn't really too difficult in Washington because you don't have some of the problems that we have in industrial communities, or communities such as Cleveland and New York. But there is a tremendous groundswell occurring all over the country urging that something be done to eliminate air pollution and water pollution. We couldn't agree more.

Our company has taken a searching look at the problem and we have found that to clean the air and clean the water at our nine major plants in this country is going to cost $65-million. Practically all of this $65 million will have to be spent on nonproductive facilities. Then, after we spend this money on the facilities, it will cost us $7 million a year to operate them.

We feel that the pollution problem is one that is not limited to the steel industry or to any industry. It is a real national problem, and it is created by municipalities, by agriculture, by industry and by every individual. Therefore, we feel that if this problem is to be cured fairly promptly, the Congress is going to have to provide tax incentives to industry and municipalities as quickly as possible.

We have gone on record that we are committed to attack the problem. With tax incentives and a fast write-off we think we can do it in five years. Without these, it will obviously take longer.

We are very optimistic about some Congressional help. There are now 76 bills in the House to provide tax incentives and fast depreciation write-off for industry on bona fide, non-productive pollution facilities.

There is one bill in the Senate, introduced by Senator Carlson, that has 37 co-sponsors. All of this indicates to us that Congress recognizes this as a major problem and has moved in the direction of doing something about it.

There is a further problem in the tax area with the six percent surtax proposed by the Administration. As far as we are concerned, we can't find much enthusiasm for this in Congress. We can find no enthusiasm for it in the steel industry. One of the principal reasons is that if we see ourselves in a down trend of business we wonder why somebody feels we need to take the steam out of the economy by putting a six percent surtax on.

We need no such help to take the steam out of our business at the moment.

We very frankly feel that this consideration is entirely too late, and the chances are that if it were put into effect in July of this year it might well impede the upturn we see ahead.

We also have some feelings about the 7% investment tax credit. An industry like steel requires very large investment. If we are encouraged through a 7% investment tax credit to go ahead and make major investments to keep ourselves competitive and embark on the program, and suddenly right in the middle of it someone takes the initiative away, we develop some strong feelings on the subject.

We have tried to not allow this suspension to hurt our long-range program, and we have complied with the President's request. We tried to level out our expenditures, and this meant that we reduced our expenditures in 1966 by about $20-million and we will make a similar reduction in 1967. One place where it has hurt us is at Houston. We would like very much to go ahead with a structural mill there. We had hoped to start construction about the middle of this year, but we have postponed groundbreaking until January 1, 1968, because of the tax credit suspension.

There is discussion on the Hill about putting the investment tax credit back into effect earlier than next January. We certainly hope this happens, and we would take advantage of it.

The last item that is currently news in Washington on the steel industry is the subject of imports. I think most of you are familiar with the fact that two weeks ago the industry asked Congress to consider a temporary levy—an import levy—to help the industry lick a critical problem. As far as our company is concerned, we certainly support the position of the industry.

However, we support this as a *temporary* measure. With 23 plants in 21 countries abroad, and two more going on the line this year, I think you can see that the basic philosophy of our company is free trade.

But over the past few years we have found that the problem of imports is one that really should be called to the attention of Congress and the American people because some things have developed which have become a real handicap to our steel industry.

All "developed," and many "underdeveloped," countries have their own steel industries now. But few of them can use all the steel they produce in their own domestic economies. So they would like to get rid of that steel in another country because they want full employment and they also would like to get dollars. So guess where they would like to get rid of this steel. This has become really a national policy of many, many countries, such as Japan, Germany, Belgium, France, Italy, all of whom peg production at a certain level and then offer incentives to producers or trading companies to get rid of that steel in the American market. Because of this, much of the steel coming in here is below the price at which it is sold at home—in other words it is being "dumped" here. In addition, many countries have erected such high tariff and nontariff barriers that our opportunities for export have disappeared.

We believe the important thing to keep before you and others is the need for effective administration of our present antidumping laws and the need to create those conditions which will promote international trade on an equitable and mutually beneficial basis.

APPAREL IMPORT PROBLEM

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, on yesterday the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] talked eloquently on the question of imports of textile products. I wish to add my short comments to that speech.

Approximately 10 percent of the people employed in manufacturing in the State of Kentucky rely for their incomes on the apparel industry. Today, there are about 125 apparel plants in my State, employing 25,000 workers. About half of these plants employ over 100 workers each. These larger plants are located throughout the State, many of them in rural areas, and often are the major source of income for the smaller towns in the State.

The jobs held by these people are now being threatened by a continual erosion of the domestic apparel market by imports. These imports, particularly in cotton, have been growing over the years, but in the last 4 years the problem has become particularly acute. The major cause of the severity of the problem now is the tremendous increase in imports of synthetic apparel products. Imports of synthetic apparel products have increased from negligible quantities in 1962 to the point where they now equal about 30 percent of total U.S. apparel imports.

I am particularly concerned about this rise in imports because the production of apparel in my State is concentrated in two products, men's and boys' shirts and trousers. Imports also are concentrated in these two product lines, and during the past several years these imports have been increasing rapidly. Approximately one-fifth of all imports, measured in physical quantity, are men's and boys' woven shirts and men's and boys' trousers. In just the past 3 years, imports of trousers of cotton and synthetic fabric increased 13 percent. Imports of sport shirts increased 37 percent in the same period, while the imports of dress shirts increased 75 percent. Most of the dress shirt increase is the result of a ninefold increase in imports of dress shirts made of synthetic fabrics. This amounts to a net increase in shirt imports of 12 million in cotton and synthetic fabrics in just 3 years. Obviously, no industry can withstand the onslaught of such tremendous increases in a short period of time, particularly when the ability to compete on the basis of price is nonexistent between domestic and imported products.

The apparel industry of this country faces a very bright future as far as domestic apparel demand is concerned. Between 1965 and 1985 the Bureau of the Census has estimated that our population will grow by something like 50 to 75 million people. Also, the increasing incomes and free time of these people is going to have a great impact, not only on the amount of apparel the family purchases, but also its variety. The obvious job opportunities created by such growing demand can be filled by our own citizens or by the people of other countries. The choice is ours. We can share this growing demand with foreign products, or we can give it all to them.

Competition is deemed desirable in our country, and the apparel industry welcomes competition. However, it has no way currently to compete with imports on the basis of price. Foreign labor is paid a much lower wage and many of their other costs are lower than ours. Foreign labor is less efficient than U.S. labor, but their efficiency is not as proportionately low as their wages. This gives the foreign apparel producer a price advantage over an American apparel producer.

The apparel industry is in the process of change, and it is possible in the foreseeable future that the industry could compete with imports on some equitable basis. It will not be possible to build this competitive base for the domestic industry unless we slow imports to a reasonable level. The process of change is slow. Time is required to enable the industry to complete this competitive base. Therefore, some mechanism should be established to provide reasonable access and growth for the exports of the developing nations without unduly disrupting the growth and prosperity of the domestic industry. Such a mechanism has already been established for the international trade of cotton textile and apparel products. The industry feels that an extension of this type of arrangement to cover the trade of products made of synthetic and wool fabrics is the best solution currently available.

Capital investment will be attracted to the apparel industry only if it maintains a reasonable rate of growth and stability in its markets. The industry is willing to share the growth of its markets with importers, and this can be accomplished without eroding the economic viability of the domestic industry.

A multilateral arrangement to regulate the international trade of apparel and textile products of all fibers cannot be achieved before the tariff rates on these products are cut under the authorization of the Trade Expansion Act which expires this June. The Kennedy round of tariff negotiations, which authorizes the U.S. Government to initiate tariff cuts by as much as 50 percent, is due to be concluded in the next several months with the prospect of apparel tariffs being reduced, possibly up to the maximum amount of 50 percent. A reduction of this magnitude will only serve to widen the already unbridgeable gap between the selling prices of domestic and imported apparel products. Therefore, I believe that the tariff rates on apparel and textile products should not be reduced at the present time.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial and news articles on this subject may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROTECTION FOR TEXTILE INDUSTRY

A government adviser who recommends that the United States phase out its cotton textile arrangement with 28 other nations suggests, in effect, that the domestic industry cut its throat in order to swing wide the import doors to less developed countries.

In the process, as envisioned by economist Harry G. Johnson in a study for the privately sponsored Brookings Institution, the United States textile industry would suffer and many of its workers would be thrown into the ranks of the unemployed. But little worry there, for Uncle Sam would compensate the industry and would retrain textile workers for other jobs. And the poorer countries could bask in new-found prosperity.

Little wonder that William J. Erwin, president of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, lashes back at the proposal: "This amounts to a virtual death sentence for the American textile industry, unemployment for hundreds of thousands of Americans, new and tremendous expense for the U.S. government, and a further dangerous increase in the U.S. balance of payments deficit."

Fortunately, the U.S. State Department does not follow the thinking of Mr. Johnson and others who would decrease protection for the domestic industry. It plans to continue the current cotton textile agreement for another three years after its expiration date of Sept. 30. For the benefit of home interests, Congress should see the matter in the same light.

As Mr. Erwin points out, the present agreement, "far from imposing stringent controls, has actually permitted the rapid growth of imports. Since the Long-Term Agreement went into operation cotton textile imports have jumped from a 1961 total of 720 million square yards to 1,830,000,000 square yards in 1966."

With imports of all textile fibers now amounting to three billion square yards a year, or about 10 per cent of domestic production, Mr. Erwin suggests: "Instead of turning loose a flood of cotton textiles, we should be strengthening the present controls and extending them to textiles of other fibers."

That, indeed, may be in order. A prosperous textile industry stands vital to the economy of North Carolina and a number of other states. While providing succor in merited degree at import doors to poorer lands we must, at the same time, make sure that American industry and its workers do not become starving victims of generosity we cannot afford.

[From the Daily News Record, Nov. 30, 1966]

Price Changes Seen Help in Fight Against Imports

(By Harry Jenkins)

The downturn in some important areas of the cloth market might help the industry make a case for limiting imports, mill men are saying.

As the Geneva meetings of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade get under way to consider extending the Long Term Arrangement on Cotton Textile Imports, some mill men feel the impact of the import influx is now just beginning to make itself felt here. While the upswing was under way and mills were unable to keep up with demand, making a case for import control was impossible, they admit. Now, as the cycle wanes, one executive put it Monday, the chances for a more convincing approach are better.

It is unfortunate that damage to the domestic market must occur before concrete action can be expected from the U.S. Government, it was observed, but that is the fact as far as imports are concerned.

There is no doubt in industry minds that the impact of foreign textiles is beginning to be felt. As reported elsewhere in these columns, the huge increase in blended fabric imports amounts to 94 million yards.

This considerable yardage is large enough to affect the complexion of the present blend market, these weavers claim. If this business was available to United States producers, it would not mean a booming blend market but it would mean larger mill backlogs which would have meant a stronger price situation than now prevails. As reported, polyester-cotton blends have sold at prices described by mills as being below cost.

Disagreement was expressed by one producer with the views of some mill men, as reported, that combed gingham checks were still in difficulty because of second-hands. He reported Monday there were signs of a real pickup in checks, that stocks in converter hands were low. He reported that as much as 40 per cent of his looms on these fabrics had been diverted to other areas. A second mill admitted it too had cut output. There was a sale on the 84x58 check reported at 30½ cents.

The gray cloth market was generally dull Monday. There was some inquiry on special print cloths again mostly for first quarter, but little new business.

A small yardage of the 51-inch, 60x48, 4.70 yard was sold in first-hands at 18 cents, spot delivery. The 41-inch, 78x78, 4.05 yards was sold spot in second-hands at 18¾ cents.

Cotton Textile Imports up 40 Percent in the LTA Year

Washington.—Cotton textile imports soared 40 per cent in the fourth year of the Geneva Long-Term Arrangements (LTA), the Commerce Department reported Tuesday. Imports went up from 1,232 million square yards in the previous LTA year to 1,724 million square yards in the present LTA year.

In September, the last month of the fourth year of LTA, cotton textile imports bolted to a record 184 million square yards.

The September import total was 12 million square yards higher than in July when the previous monthly record was established. The total was up 27,881 million square yards over August.

In millions of square yards, here's the total cotton textile imports in each of the four years of the LTA: 1st year 1,122; 2d year, 1,035; 3d year 1,232, and 4th year, 1,724.

The value of cotton textile imports in the fourth LTA year amounted to $449 million compared to exports of $230 million. The net import balance of $219 million compares with a net import balance of $145 million for the 3d LTA year when imports were $354 million and exports $209 million.

The report showed all groups of cotton textile imports increased during the 4th LTA year over the previous year.

Cumulative imports of yarns climbed to 78 million pounds from a level of 15 million pounds a year earlier.

Fabrics increased from 553 to 636 million square yards; apparel rose from 437 to 505 million square yards equivalent, and made-up goods and miscellaneous cotton textiles advanced from 183 to 222 million square yards equivalent.

The five leading categories of imports in the 4th LTA year were carded yarns, singles; misc. carded fabrics; carded sheeting; misc. cotton textiles, and combed yarn, singles. These five categories accounted for 43 per cent of total imports.

Japan, Hong Kong, Mexico, Portugal and Brazil were the five leading suppliers of cotton textiles to the United States during the 4th LTA year. These countries accounted for about 62 per cent of the total trade.

Mexico, Portugal and Brazil replaced India, the Republic of China and Pakistan in the first five from last year.

Imports from these latter three countries except India, increased during the past year, but not as fast as imports from the former three nations.

In thousands of square yards, here's a comparison for the 4th and 3d LTA years for these leading supplier in that order:

Japan 409,141–404,996; Hong Kong 346,-697–284,447; Mexico 112,629–9,954; Portugal 107,085–34,345; Brazil 101,257–34,549; China (Taiwan) 62,274–46,554; Pakistan 52,384–38,091; India 70,820–81,451.

RETROACTIVE EFFECT OF THE MIRANDA DECISION

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Confessed Slayer of Six Is Set Free," published in the Louisville Times of February 1, 1967.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Confessed Slayer of Six Is Set Free

New York (AP).—A factory worker who admitted slaying his wife and five small children has been freed because he was not informed of his rights as outlined in a historic U.S. Supreme Court decision last year.

His confession was the only available evidence against him.

"Even an animal such as this one, and I believe this is insulting the animal kingdom, must be protected with all the legal safeguards," said state Supreme Court Justice Michael Kern in dismissing the indictment yesterday against Jose Suarez, 22.

It was the latest such action in New York City resulting from the Supreme Court decision. Three men were freed in murder trials in New York City last month by state Supreme Court justices after rulings that they had not been informed of their right to counsel before they confessed.

Justice Kern asked the prosecutor, Asst. Brooklyn Dist. Atty. Nathan R. Schor: "Are you sure, I ask you most seriously, whether his (confession) is all you have in this case?"

"I say reluctantly, with a heavy heart, that we simply have no alternative," replied Schor. "There is no other evidence."

Suarez was arrested on April 27, 1966. Questioned by police, he signed a statement admitting that after his common-law wife, Maria Torres, 24, had cut his leg with a knife during an argument, he seized the knife and stabbed her and the five children more than 100 times. The children ranged in age from 11 months to 5 years.

The U.S. Supreme Court, in a 5-4 decision last June 13, ordered a new trial for Ernest A. Miranda, 26, who had been convicted on charges of kidnaping an 18-year-old girl from a Phoenix street, driving her into the desert and raping her.

The court ruled that Miranda's constitutional rights had been violated when he was not informed of his right to counsel before talking to police.

The Miranda decision applied to Suarez because it was made retroactive to cover all defendants who had not yet been tried.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 355) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania does not wish to use any more time, I move that the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], who is absent on official business. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay" and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announced that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senators from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—71 yeas, 7 nays, as follows:

[No. 40 Leg.]

YEAS—71

Aiken
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Hansen
Harris
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
Magnuson
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Percy
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—7

Case
Clark
Cooper
Fong
Kuchel
Mondale
Moss

NOT VOTING—22

Allott
Brooke
Church
Curtis
Dominick
Fannin
Gruening
Hart
Hatfield
Hruska
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
Montoya
Morse
Pell
Prouty
Tower
Yarborough

So Mr. MONRONEY'S motion to lay Mr. CLARK'S amendment on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I should like to notify the Sergeant at Arms that the bells are not ringing in my office and that that was the reason for my delay. I hope that something will be done to correct the condition.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. I call up my amendment No. 12, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 122 of the bill, insert the following new item:

"Sec. 123. Standing Rules of the Senate."

On page 30, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

"STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

"SEC. 123. Rule XIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

" '9. During the consideration of any measure, motion, or other matter, any Senator may move that all further debate under the order for pending business shall be germane to the subject matter before the Senate. If such a motion, which shall be nondebatable, is approved by the Senate, all further debate under the said order shall be germane to the subject matter before the Senate, and all questions of germaneness under this rule, when raised, including appeals, shall be decided by the Senate without debate.' "

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the pending amendment No. 12 would expand the present germaneness rule. The present rule, which Senators will recall was adopted in the winter of 1964, provides for a daily 3-hour period of germane debate. The pending proposal would make that rule more flexible, by adopting a procedure whereby a majority of the Senate, by nondebatable motion, could require further debate on the pending business to be germane to the subject matter before the Senate until the business was disposed of.

The pending germaneness rule was adopted early in 1964, and during the 3 years since its adoption, it has rarely been invoked, probably because of what I believe to be somewhat obsolete notions for senatorial courtesy.

The practice is well known of Senators coming in the Chamber when a matter of some importance is under consideration, often a matter of some urgency, obtaining recognition, and speaking sometimes at length, sometimes more briefly, on utterly irrelevant matters. Under the present rule, they are permitted to do so if they obtain the floor more than 3 hours after the end of the morning hour. Those speeches, in my judgment, could well be made at times other than when the Senate is in the process of legislating. They could be made during the morning hour; they could be made before a matter was laid before the Senate or after final passage. Certain days could be set aside when there would be no pending matter of urgency, to permit Senators to speak as they saw fit.

We had an example yesterday, which was entirely in accord with the pending rule, when a group of Senators headed by the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who was the author of the present germaneness rule, which group included me, held the floor of the Senate for 2 or 3 hours in order to ventilate the present problems in the textile industry. I think that would be quite appropriate because shortly before that time we had passed the supplemental military authorization bill, and there was a tacit agreement that we would not return to the Monroney-Madden bill until today.

However, on many occasions, particularly toward the close of the session, bills of some urgency are delayed in their consideration and passage by Senators coming to the Chamber and speaking on matters which are quite irrelevant.

Of course, under the current procedure Senators could, if they desired, merely read the first paragraph of a long-winded address and the last paragraph, and it would be printed in the RECORD the next day as though it had been delivered. Copies of the speech would go to the press gallery as though it had been delivered.

Perhaps some unfriendly reporter might state in his news article that the speech actually had not been delivered, but that it had been printed in the RECORD in the way I suggest. However, this is highly unlikely.

There are certain Senators who hew the line and read irrelevant material which they have released to the press of their home States. They read their speeches in full on the ground that they cannot be printed in the newspapers of their States until after they have been read on the floor of the Senate. This tends, to some extent, to disrupt the orderly conduct of legislation.

When the Pastore germaneness rule was adopted, individual views with respect thereto were filed by my colleague [Mr. SCOTT] and me to the majority report of the Committee on Rules and Administration. We stated that while we concurred that the germaneness rule would help somewhat to expedite the conduct of legislative business on the floor, we, Senator Scott and I, desired to point out what we considered to be a fundamental defect in the approach which was embodied.

The present rule automatically imposes an obligation of germaneness in debate at the close of the morning hour, or after the unfinished or pending business has first been laid before the Senate.

We further stated at that time:

> It keeps that obligation in force for a 3-hour period, unless the Senate determines to the contrary by unanimous consent or motion without debate. But it permits the germaneness requirement to expire at the end of the 3-hour period, even though debate on pending legislative business may be still underway and the measure a long way from final passage.

In the opinion of Senator Scott and me, this approach is unnecessarily rigid and mechanical. We advocated a more flexible rule which would impose a requirement of germaneness only when it was needed, but would keep it in force as long as it was needed.

We suggested that the rule should not impose a fixed daily germaneness period. It should permit the requirement of germaneness to be invoked for the duration of the debate on a particular piece of pending business, by a motion without debate. This would allow the majority leader or the manager of a bill to control the debate by a rule of germaneness only when the expeditious handling of Senate business required such a restriction. It would keep the rule in effect until the pending business had been disposed of. Of course, in many instances, Senators who had good reason to interrupt germane debate with a nongermane speech would be extended that courtesy by unanimous consent.

The views of my colleague from Pennsylvania and me did not prevail; hence the present proposal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a newspaper article entitled "Senators Ignore Attention Rule, Pay Little Mind to Pastore Plan To Confine Debate," published in the New York Times of January 22, 1964, be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Lausche in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article ordered to be printed in the Record, is as follows:

Senators Ignore Attention Rule—Pay Little Mind to Pastore Plan To Confine Debate

(By C. P. Trussell)

Washington, Jan. 22—The Senate paid little attention today to an effort to get it to pay attention.

It was asked whether it should confine itself to the business officially at hand for at least three hours of its debate each day. But the Senators wandered to so many other subjects that the decision was postponed until tomorrow.

At issue was a resolution by Senator John O. Pastore, Democrat of Rhode Island, and 30 co-sponsors from both parties, to strike a blow for efficiency in the Senate. Mr. Pastore argued that it would be both gratifying and profitable if the Senate would show some self-discipline, tighten its customary free-wheeling and informal approach to debate, and buckle down to pending business for three hours.

Members who listened nodded assent—and then promptly reverted to form. Speeches, announcements, colloquys and debate followed.

WIDE-RANGING TALKS

They discussed disarmament, the resignation of Edward R. Murrow from the United States Information Agency, nuclear test bans, Presidential succession, a pending Senate investigation, the President's economic report, the flying of the flag over the U.S.S. Utah, the plight of agriculture, the Peace Corps, and other issues equally unrelated to the business at hand.

At 4:50 P.M., Senator Pastore announced through clenched teeth that "only three measly minutes" had been devoted to the proposal to hold debate to the pending business. Meanwhile, the Senate had recessed for an hour and a quarter to permit members to go to the White House to witness the signing of the exchanges of communications relating to the Columbia River treaty.

Under the Pastore resolution, the three-hour germane debate rule would set in after the usual "morning hour" for the transaction of miscellaneous routine business. It would apply to any calendar day of Senate sitting and would bar the intrusion of extraneous matter for three hours. The ban could be broken only by unanimous consent or by a nondebatable motion on which the majority rule would prevail.

After the three-hour period members could debate at will on extraneous subjects.

BIPARTISAN PLAN KILLED

The Senate rejected, by a vote of 70 to 16, a bipartisan proposal under which any Senator could move that all further debate on the pending business be germane as long as it was before the chamber. No debate would be allowed to precede the vote on the motion.

This proposal was sponsored by Senator Joseph S. Clark, Democrat of Pennsylvania. They held that the Pastore plan was too rigid and mechanical. Mr. Clark had offered the plan as a substitute for the Pastore resolution and also as an amendment to it. The substitute was withdrawn and the amendment was rejected by tabling.

The Senate reached agreement to vote on the Pastore resolution at 4 P.M. tomorrow, thus giving Senators an opportunity to express themselves before the final decision was made. No further amendments were expected to be offered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, during the consideration of the present germaneness rule, the Senate rejected by a vote of 70 to 16 the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] and me, as I have just indicated. During the course of that debate, I suggested on the floor of the Senate that the present germaneness rule is too inflexible to be useful.

The experience of the last 3 years indicates this to be the fact. The time when we most need a germaneness rule is toward the end of the session, when Congress is in a hurry to get home and there is a vast mass of legislation to be disposed of. Nongermane interjections can seriously delay measures in the public interest which really should be passed. At that time the present 3-hour germaneness rule is not of much help. It is too inflexible. Three hours is not long enough, as experience has so shown.

Accordingly, I hope that this amendment, which is most moderate, will be approved by the Senate.

Mr. President, I observe that my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is in the Chamber. I invite his attention to the fact that the pending amendment is one which he and I cosponsored in 1964. It provides for an extension of the rule of germaneness in order to permit it to be invoked at any time in order to permit expeditious consideration of pending business.

I have, in the absence of my colleague, quoted from the joint comments which he and I made when the present germaneness rule was reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration. I have pointed out that we proposed an amendment in accordance with the business presently pending but were defeated by a rather substantial vote.

It has occurred to me that the Senator might wish to speak briefly for himself rather than to have me speak on his behalf, and I would be happy to hear from him.

Mr. SCOTT. I wish to thank my colleague from Pennsylvania and to note that at the time of the filing of the report of the Committee on Rules and Administration on September 19, 1963, we joined in a proposed amendment that the rule should not impose a fixed daily germane period.

There was the question of keeping the rule in effect until the pending business was disposed of. The notice added that in many instances Senators who had good reason to interrupt germane debate with a nongermane speech would be extended the courtesy by unanimous consent.

As Senators know, the Senate can get almost anything done by unanimous consent except on rollcall votes which we unfortunately may miss. Much business can be done by resort to the unanimous-consent rule, which operates on a sort of "live and let live" basis, without which the operations of the Senate would be greatly impeded.

I am very glad to support the amendment of my colleague from Pennsylvania, as I did in committee. I do not believe that it would work any hardship, but would, in fact, serve to expedite the business of the Senate.

All of us interject nongermane ideas into germane debate. Tolerance frequently permits it, but existence of a rule which would require the Senate to stick to the pending business, it seems to me, would be a useful and a helpful innovation.

For that reason, I am very glad to assure my senior colleague from Pennsylvania that I will be very happy to support his amendment, and thank him for yielding to me for this purpose.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank my colleague.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Let me ask the Senator from Pennsylvania, does he wish a yea and nay vote on the pending amendment?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, I would like to have a record vote.

Mr. MONRONEY. Would the Senator like to have a quorum call at this time?

Mr. CLARK. I think it would be better, in order to get enough Senators into the Chamber to ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I observe the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The assistance legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered .

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there a sufficient second? There is not a sufficient second.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may have a yea and nay vote on the anticipated motion to table.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? There is now a sufficient second. The yeas and nays are ordered on the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield myself such time as I may require.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** In addition to what the Chair has just stated, without objection, the yeas and nays are ordered on the motion to table, if and when made.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I shall not take long. The pending amendment certainly goes beyond the jurisdiction granted to the Joint Committee on Reorganization by the resolution creating it. The amendment would change and modify an existing rule of the Senate which, I think, has been of great benefit to the Senate by providing a period of at least 3 hours following the morning hour in which the Senate may devote itself to the legislation before it. Many matters have been expedited in the Senate by proper use of the Senate's time. At the present moment, we are operating under such a rule. I feel, therefore, that we would be violating not only the charter granted to the Joint Committee on Reorganization by adopting this change but, also, we would be flying in the face of a considerable degree of success with germaneness in the previous rule which passed through the Senate's Committee on Rules and Administration.

I think the very fact that the Committee on Rules and Administration did bring out a rule which was satisfactory to most Senators, and to the Committee on Rules and Administration, proves that legislation in this field is possible when there is a consensus of support for it.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I invite the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma to the fact that on yesterday we had a fine example, I thought, of how well the rule of germaneness operates, because the Senate was able to have a number of rollcall votes on important matters and then go into a long debate later in the afternoon on a matter of vital importance to the country and to many Senators. It seemed to me that this proved conclusively that the Senate has a rule of germaneness which operates well.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator from Oklahoma will yield, let me inform the Senator from South Dakota that I had already discussed yesterday's proceedings before the Senator from South Dakota came into the Chamber. I would add my own view today, that yesterday's proceedings proved nothing, that it was the first time I could remember that the rule of germaneness presently in existence was ever followed by Senators who wanted to come in and talk about anything from chickens to Vietnam.

The reason for that was, the Senator from Rhode Island was the leader of the discussion on yesterday, and he happens to be the author of the rule on germaneness.

In my view, this rule has been honored more in the breach than in its observance.

Mr. MUNDT. I think that is correct, but the Senate is a great precedent follower. We now have this excellent precedent established on yesterday. Let us give it an opportunity to operate.

Mr. MONRONEY. I feel that there is no great emergency in changing this rule. The means are there, in the Committee on Rules and Administration, to change it. It is not a highly controversial matter as to whether we should have a rule on germaneness, but what kind. The matter deserves a great deal more consideration than can be given to it on the floor of the Senate today. It is a question that goes beyond the jurisdiction of the Reorganization Committee. I must oppose its adoption, because we cannot support something which we were denied the right to recommend by the charter creating the committee. Therefore, if the Senator does not desire to use any more time, I intend to move to table his amendment.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will yield briefly, for the record, I should like to note that this is the first time he has spoken of referring matters of this kind, affecting rules having to do with floor procedure, to the committee. I must respectfully disagree with him for the reasons I have earlier stated.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The motion has been made to table the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. Fannin] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senators from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis and Mr. Hruska], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. Hatfield] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senators from Colorado [Mr. Allott and Mr. Dominick], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis and Mr. Hruska], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Fannin] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] would each vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 13, as follows:

[No. 41 Leg.]

YEAS—68

Aiken
Anderson
Baker
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Hansen
Harris
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Magnuson
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tydings
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—13

Bartlett
Brooke
Clark
Fong
Hartke
Kennedy, Mass.
McIntyre
Mondale
Moss
Nelson
Scott
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—19

Allott
Church
Curtis
Dominick
Fannin
Gruening
Hart
Hatfield
Hruska
Javits
Long, Mo.
Long, La.

Mansfield
McCarthy
Montoya
Morse
Smathers
Tower
Yarborough

So Mr. MONRONEY's motion to lay Mr. CLARK's amendment on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 13. While there are a sufficient number of Senators on the floor, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment first.

The assistant legislative clerk read, as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 122 of the bill, insert the following new item:

"Sec. 123. Standing Rules of the Senate."

On page 30, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

"Standing rules of the Senate

"SEC. 123. The Standing Rules of the Senate are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new rule:

" 'RULE XLI

" '*Amendments—germaneness*

" 'No amendment not germane or relevant to the subject matter contained in a bill under consideration shall be received; nor shall any amendment to any item or clause of such bill be received which does not directly relate thereto; and all questions of relevancy of amendments, when raised, shall be decided by the Presiding Officer, subject to appeal to the Senate to be decided without debate.' "

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I state for the information of Senators that I do not expect to take more than 5 minutes on this amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on an anticipated motion to table, the yeas and nays be ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am certainly in favor of the yeas and nays on the motion to table, but I do not like this procedure. I think it is bad practice.

Mr. MONRONEY. May I say to the Senator, we are trying to avoid the necessity for another quorum call——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understand.

Mr. MONRONEY. In case of lack of a sufficient second. The motion to table is a very well understood motion.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understand it thoroughly, but I still say I think it is bad practice to anticipate these things in advance, just as I have always objected to ordering the yeas and nays by unanimous consent.

I shall not object this time, but I merely voice my feeling that it is bad practice to follow this procedure.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think the Senator has a good point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection to the request that the yeas and nays be ordered on the motion to table, the yeas and nays are ordered if and when the motion is made.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, what this amendment provides is similar to present practice in the House of Representatives. It incorporates a general prohibition against nongermane amendments. Questions of germaneness, when raised, will be decided by the Presiding Officer, subject to appeal to the Senate without debate.

The present rule in the House provides:

> No motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

That is rule XVI, paragraph 7, of the House of Representatives.

This amendment, I believe, is needed in the Senate. There have been two occasions in recent Senate history when, in my opinion, nongermane amendments have been added to bills to the detriment of the public interest.

The first was the notorious Stella School District bill, where, as a stratagem to bring a civil rights bill before the Senate, the Senate civil rights bill was tacked on as a nongermane rider to a bill to give relief to a little school district in Missouri, in the amount of $1,500.

A long debate and filibuster ensued. In the end, it is my recollection, the civil rights bill did not pass. The Stella School District was deprived for the better part of 2 years of money to which it was clearly entitled.

I think a grave injustice was done to carry out a legitimate objective. I certainly supported the civil rights bill. But there are other ways of accomplishing this objective, one of which is if Senators are concerned that a civil rights bill would not be reported by the committee chaired by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], who is present in the Chamber, to hold the bill at the desk and take it up in that manner, which is what we did with the civil rights bill of 1964. However, to tack on a nongermane amendment to a piece of desired legislation is, I think, bad practice. It is forbidden in most State legislatures, and it is forbidden in the House of Representatives.

The other occasion in recent history when a nongermane amendment was tacked on to a piece of entirely separate legislation was when my good friend, the able minority leader, tacked on his so-called rotten borough amendment to reverse the ruling of the Supreme Court on one-man, one-vote. That amendment was tacked on to an innocuous measure dealing with American Legion baseball, which would have otherwise been promptly passed and be of benefit to certain citizens.

Accordingly, the pending amendment would require that all amendments be germane, as is the case in most legislative bodies.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I recall that the Anderson amendment to the medicare bill was a rider to a piece of nongermane legislation.

This is a two-way street. There may be times when what the Senator is attempting to do would relate to the power of a committee to bottle up legislation that would never see the light of day. The only relief that a group of individuals—liberals, if you wish—sometimes has by which to promote its cause is to add it as a rider. That is precisely what we did with relation to medicare on one occasion.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, that is not an appropriate example. We could have held the medicare bill at the desk, as we did with relation to the civil rights bill.

I say to my friend, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, that he is the last one in the Chamber whom I would expect to argue that the end justifies the means.

Mr. PASTORE. I never said anything like that. I think that my logic is well placed. As a matter of fact, I believe that it will appeal to the majority of the Senators.

Mr. CLARK. I have no doubt that it will.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, for the same reason that the committee opposed other amendments, we oppose the pending amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

I feel that the Committee on Rules and Administration is perfectly capable of considering this matter and giving it proper attention and hearing testimony. The distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania is a member of the committee.

We would certainly do violence to the charter that gives us authority if we were to recommend or support an amendment that would otherwise not be eligible for the committee to report.

Mr. President, does the Senator wish to use any more of his time?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I then move that the amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania be tabled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from

Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senators from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 13, as follows:

[No. 42 Leg.]

YEAS—68

Aiken
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Hansen
Harris
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Magnuson
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tydings
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—13

Brooke
Clark
Cooper
Fong
Hartke
Kennedy, Mass.
Lausche
McIntyre
Moss
Nelson
Randolph
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—19

Allott
Church
Curtis
Dominick
Fannin
Gruening
Hart
Hatfield
Hruska
Javits
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
Montoya
Morse
Smathers
Tower
Yarborough

So Mr. MONRONEY's motion to lay Mr. CLARK's amendment on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 31

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 31, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 122 of the bill, insert the following new item: "Sec. 123. Standing Rules of the Senate."

On page 30, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

"Standing Rules of the Senate

"SEC. 123. Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"'RULE XXII

"'*Precedence of motions—previous question*

"'1. When a question is pending, no motion shall be received but—

"'To adjourn.

"'To adjourn to a day certain, or that when the Senate adjourn it shall be to a day certain.

"'To take a recess.

"'To proceed to the consideration of executive business.

"'To lay on the table.

"'For the previous question.

"'To postpone indefinitely.

"'To postpone to a day certain.

"'To commit.

"'To amend.

Which several motions shall have precedence as they stand arranged, except that after the previous question shall have been ordered on the passage of a bill or joint resolution, no motion to lay on the table shall be in order; and the motions relating to adjournment, to take a recess, for the previous question, to proceed to the consideration of executive business, to lay on the table, shall be decided without debate.

"'2. (a) Whenever any motion or amendment to a measure pending before the Senate has received consideration for a total of not less than fifteen hours, during a total of not less than three calendar days, any Senator may move the previous question with respect to such motion or amendment.

"'(b) Whenever any measure pending before the Senate, together with any motions or amendments relating to it, has received consideration for a total of not exceeding fifteen calendar days, any Senator may move the previous question with respect to such measure and any or all motions or amendments relating to it.

"'(c) When such a motion is made and a quorum is ascertained to be present, it shall be submitted immediately to the Senate by the Presiding Officer, without debate and shall be determined by a yea-and-nay vote, a majority prevailing. A previous question may be asked and ordered with respect to one or more measures, motions, amendments, or matters, and may embrace one or more amendments to any pending measure, motion, or matter described therein, and the passage or rejection of the pending bill or resolution: *Provided, however,* That any or all motions or amendments not so embraced by the motion for the previous question shall be deemed rejected. If the previous question is so ordered as to any measure, motion, amendment, or matter, that measure, motion, amendment, or matter shall be presented immediately to the Senate for determination. One hour of debate, equally divided between opponents and proponents, shall be allowed on any motion, amendment, or matter, other than the passage or rejection of the measure, bill, or resolution on which the previous question has been ordered; and, four hours of debate, divided in the same manner, shall be allowed on the passage or rejection of the measure, bill, or resolution covered by such order.

"'All incidental questions of order arising after a motion is made for the previous question, and pending such motion, shall be decided, whether on appeal or otherwise, without debate.'"

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE POSTMASTER GENERAL OF CANADA

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am happy to announce that one of the most distinguished guests to visit this country in many, many months is honoring the Senate today with a visit. He is the distinguished Postmaster General of Canada, our sister nation to the north, and an honorable member of Parliament there, Mr. Jean-Pierre Coté.

He was entertained at luncheon today by many Senators and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

I am happy to present him at this time and I know that the Senate would like to take a very brief recess. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 5 minutes in order that Senators may greet the distinguished Postmaster General of Canada.

RECESS

Thereupon, at 2:10 o'clock p.m., the Senate took a recess until 2:15 o'clock p.m.

During the recess, the Postmaster General of Canada was greeted by Members of the Senate.

On expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair).

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 355) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] will ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment which he has presented. I intend to move to table the amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate order a rollcall that may be applicable to the motion to table the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, what is the request?

Mr. MONRONEY. The request is that we have a rollcall vote on an anticipated motion to table the amendment, while we have a quorum present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask that we not do it by unanimous consent.

Mr. MONRONEY. No; by a show of hands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous consent request is to make it possible to order the yeas and nays at this point.

Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we just asked for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second. The yeas and nays are ordered on the motion to table if and when made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum, and pending that, I think that the Senate should be alerted that the pending matter deals with rule XXII and that they ought to be here and listen. I presume my friend from Pennsylvania will not talk too long.

Mr. CLARK. I shall speak for 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would not think that members of the committee would need more than a few minutes. Senators should be here to hear the discussion.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I notify the attachés that this will be a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 43 Leg.]

Aiken
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Hansen
Harris
Hartke
Hatfield
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. CLARK. Mr President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the pending amendment would repeal rule XXII of the Senate. That cumbersome and unwieldly legislative provision would be repealed by this proposed rule. In the place of rule XXII would be substituted a split-level motion for the previous question, by which a majority of Senators present and voting could terminate debate; first, on any motion or amendment to a measure pending before the Senate after that motion or amendment had received 15 hours of consideration on not less than 3 calendar days; or, second, on the measure itself, together with any motions or amendments relating to it, after the measure, plus all related motions and amendments, had received consideration for 15 calendar days.

If the previous question were ordered, 1 hour of debate, equally divided between opponents and proponents, would be allowed as to any motion or amendment encompassed by the motion for the previous question, and 4 hours, divided in the same manner, would be allowed on final passage.

Unlike the cloture procedure under which Senators may call up for a vote after cloture any germane amendment which had previously been presented and read, this proposed procedure would limit consideration after the previous question had been ordered to amendments embraced by the motion. All other amendments would be deemed rejected.

Senators are aware of the frequent use in this body of the motion to table to put off indefinitely further consideration of a pending measure.

The motion to table has been used four times already today on rollcall votes, and will be used again when the debate on this pending amendment is finished.

My plea today is for a countervailing motion to allow a vote on the merits of a pending matter after reasonable debate.

In other words, today the Senate can say "Nyet" any time it wants to, by a motion to table. It occurs to me—to exhaust my knowledge of Russian—that we ought to be able to say "Da" on a motion to adopt a measure.

In this fast moving and ever more complex world, it occurs to me it is more important to get things done than to prevent things from being done.

The effect of rule XXII is to make it difficult, indeed, if not impossible, to pass many of those measures which, in the constantly accelerating pace of this one world, are in the public interest.

The Senate thoroughly explored earlier this year amendments to rule XXII dealing with cloture of debate. As has been the case since 1917, when rule XXII was first adopted, these tinkering efforts have gotten us nowhere, except to embroil us further in a mass of confusion, redtape, and complicated parliamentary rulings.

We took up the rule book and threw it at each other. The Vice President made some ruling in some instances in accordance with what Vice President Nixon had to say, in some cases different. We got bogged down in what I believe to be largely irrelevant procedures.

The pending amendment would cut through all of the redtape by permitting a motion which is in effect not only in the House of Representatives but in practically every other civilized parliamentary body in the world—namely, the motion for the previous question.

Historians remind us that the motion for the previous question was acceptable procedure in the Senate during the early days of the Republic. My recollection is that research sponsored by one of our previous cosponsors, the former Senator from Illinois, Mr. Douglas, revealed the fact that the motion for the previous question was used in the Senate on four occasions during the 19th century. This proposal would put it back into the Senate rules.

The U.S. Senate, from 1789 to 1806, recognized the motion for the previous question.

The motion has been used frequently in the House of Representatives for the purpose of ending debate ever since 1811, and is specifically incorporated in the House rules. Research done for us by the Library of Congress shows that the same procedure is permitted in practically all of the senates of the State legislatures of this country.

Thomas Jefferson pointed out that it was used in the British Parliament as long ago as 1604. Certainly, it cannot be considered a practice alien to sound Anglo-Saxon parliamentary procedure.

Vital senatorial business in the 1960's cannot be handled at the same leisurely pace that has characterized our deliberations in the past. Full and fair debate is desirable, even essential, to the democratic process. Unlimited debate is an abnegation of those processes. Fifteen days of debate on a given issue, especially if the debate were required to be germane, as I have previously proposed, would provide an ample opportunity for the Senate to determine whether it has exhausted the possibilities of productive debate. If not, a majority vote against the previous question motion would permit additional debate.

If a majority wished to come to a vote on the pending business, and the motion were approved, there would still be an opportunity for 1 hour of additional debate on each amendment covered by the motion, and 4 hours of additional debate on passage of the bill or resolution.

In conclusion, Mr. President, this pending amendment would create a simple and easily understood procedure for bringing debate on a pending matter, whether it be a motion, an amendment, or a bill, to an orderly end, permitting a minimum of 3 full days of debate lasting 15 hours on any ancillary motion or amendment, and 15 calendar days of full debate on the measure itself.

I suggest that, in the modern world, that is enough.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as all Senators know, this amendment proposed by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania strikes at one of the most controversial matters which comes before the Senate in every scheduled session, and which is only disposed of on determination by the test of the ability of Senators to continue to debate it as long as they possibly can. It strikes directly against the proviso that was imposed upon the committee, both in the case of the Reorganization Act of 1946, and the present one.

This proviso, in the resolution which created the present committee, is identical to the language in the case of the 1946 act. I read it again, because this is the view of the committee, and one of the main reasons this was written in—and we are realists about this—was the fear that this committee, under general jurisdiction for recommending changes and procedures, would take a hand in trying to recommend amendments to rule XXII, which provides for limitation on debate.

This paragraph in our charter reads:

> *Provided*, That nothing in this concurrent resolution shall be construed to authorize the committee to make any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, and/or precedents of either House, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House: *Provided further*, That the language employed herein shall not prohibit the committee from studying and recommending the consolidations and reorganization of committees.

It has been under that jurisdiction that we have recommended changes in the organization of committees. We have scrupulously avoided trying to recommend, in any way, changes in the floor procedures, which have been a very delicate subject in all attempts at reorganization; and while this new approach is certainly worthy of careful study by the Senate and the committees thereof, including the Reorganization Committee, we would be, I think, jeopardizing seriously the passage of any reorganization act if, in one afternoon, we were to accept or agree to take the amendment offered to us now by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

For that reason, I say that we should go forward with our work and proceed to those matters on which the Senate is strongly in agreement and not attempt to solve the insoluble in a contest here on the floor.

We have spent about 3 weeks of this session trying to resolve this matter, and it has not been resolved. I do not think this afternoon, with the new amendment, we are in any better position to do it. Therefore, since it is not within the jurisdiction of this committee, we cannot support it, and I do not feel that the Senate will.

The minority leader has asked for time, and I am happy now to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I thought when this matter was under consideration earlier this year, that by a very substantial vote we had laid this ghost. But evidently we have not, and now it appears once again in the form of a new proposal which would completely rewrite rule XXII.

The distinguished manager of the bill states the case quite well. Since Congress was so precise and so specific in the limitation it placed on this special committee, that it should not fool around with the rules or procedures of this body, and since we had been through that agony and that fuss before, I thought the committee would give heed to it. For the most part, they have. But now come all these amendments that clearly go beyond the scope of the resolution under which this special committee was created.

I know what one of the results will be, Mr. President. There will be from time to time requests for the creation of special committees, and this body will look at those with a very baleful eye, to make quite certain that if such a committee is created, its jurisdiction will be carefully and very narrowly defined.

We did go a step further than we might have by conferring jurisdiction upon this committee to report directly to the Senate floor the legislation that is presently before us. Otherwise, it would have had to take its normal course, and go to the Committee on Rules. I think, in the last analysis, that is what should have been done.

But that is neither here nor there. That is water under the bridge. Now we have to contend with rule XXII all over again, and do it by a majority vote.

There are two specifics in this amendment. In section 2(a), it says:

> Whenever any motion or amendment to a measure pending before the Senate has received consideration for a total of not less than fifteen hours, during a total of not less than three calendar days—

Fifteen hours in 3 calendar days, on any motion or amendment. Mr. President, I could think of any number of highly important amendments, like the one on 14(b), that the Senate could not possibly dispose of and get it adequately ventilated, and get the story across to the country so that they might know what was going on in this legislative body.

Subsection (b) of that section says:

> Whenever any measure—

As distinguished from a motion or amendment—

> pending before the Senate, together with any motions or amendments relating to it, has received consideration for a total of not exceeding fifteen calendar days.

Just imagine when the court packing bill was before this body—a matter of rare importance to the future of this Republic—and we put this kind of limitation, under such circumstances, upon this one body where there is still an opportunity to deliberate if we want to. If we do not wish to, that is our business, but at least the opportunity must always remain here.

This sort of thing is, after all, an eloquent testament to frustration and impatience, as shown by the very fact that they think there has to be a more expeditious way of plowing legislation upon the statute books. Many a time I have said our country is like an old, water-logged scow; it does not go very fast and it does not go very far at one time, but it does not sink. That is the important thing. And it is because of this body, more than any other, that we can say we have kept our Government in good balance. May it ever remain so, and may this body never become the victim of anybody's frustration and impatience.

From the very beginning, this effort to change rule XXII, began with civil rights legislation. I point out that in 1959, 1960, 1963, 1964, and 1965, on the overall civil rights legislation and the voting rights legislation, we did get cloture when we had to have it. That legislation did go on the books, and I had a very considerable hand in every one of those pieces of legislation when they were up for consideration.

It was only the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1966 that encountered real difficulty on this floor, and perhaps I was the difficulty because on this side I was willing to stand up and be counted and to stop it for the very simple reason that I thought they were trying to liquidate the due process clause in the Constitution of the United States.

There were enough Senators on the other side of the aisle who also resolutely stood up, and as a result the legislation did not pass in the Senate and never came up for consideration.

The proponents could not get the motion to consider agreed to, and I am delighted that it was that way.

It has been said that that is one of the safeguards in this Republic for the minority, and it is because so often our dissent is the true representation of the truth that may be involved in a proposal. However, the question is: "How do you alert the country and get them exercised and get them to respond?"

It takes time. The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] time and time again had to complain that his view and his side of the case and that of his associates was not adequately represented to the country.

It took quite a time, but the last time around they did get it brought to the attention of the country and the country responded, not in their favor but in our favor. However, when it came to 14(b), there was a regular avalanche of letters and telephone calls and postcards from union and nonunion members alike.

It was almost electric in its effect in the country. So, it took a little time to get it done and have people speak, but here comes a proposal to amend rule XXII by a majority vote so that on any motion or amendment there would be 15 hours allowed in a period of 3 days and, on the measure itself, 15 days.

They are trying to inject an absolutely new rule into the rule book, and that concerns permitting the call of the previous question as they do in the House of Representatives.

Well, I think our rules have been satisfactory. They certainly have been in all the years that I have been in the Senate. And I was in the other body almost as long. I know how it works, and I can tell you what a tragedy it is when under those restrictive rules you stand up on an amendment and get 5 minutes' time. The gavel falls. Then, only by special dispensation in the form of a unanimous-consent request, can you continue beyond that point.

When there are 435 Members, perhaps that has to be done in the interest of some expedition. But we have 100 Members in the Senate, and our rules are adequate for our purposes, and they work whenever they should work. Whenever any legislation deserves consideration, it will receive it. When legislation does not deserve consideration, it should not have it, because more likely than not it would not be in the national interest.

I trust that the Senate will reject this measure this afternoon as a tampering with the rule book, which was expressly enjoined against in the resolution under which this special committee functioned.

I trust that the motion to table, offered by the distinguished chairman of the special committee, will prevail.

I doubt that I have to say anything more on the subject at this particular time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, did the Senator from Pennsylvania have anything further to say on the matter?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, we are not on limited time.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct. We are not on limited time, but I did not want to make a motion to table until the Senator had consumed all the time he wished to consume.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it seems unnecessary to reply at any length to my good friend, the Senator from Illinois.

The arguments which he has made have been heard time after time on the floor of the Senate during the more than 10 years that I have been privileged to be a Member.

I must say that they have been voiced with perhaps equal but certainly no greater eloquence more frequently by the Senators from Mississippi, Georgia, and Alabama than they have by Senators from Illinois.

Nevertheless, my good friend has made these arguments eloquently, and I have little doubt that either the arguments made or an innate unwillingness to change the status quo will result in those arguments prevailing once more.

The Senator said he thought that perhaps the ghost of the previous question and reform of rule XXII had been laid to rest earlier this session.

Yet, may I state my own strong conviction that the issue of elimination or, in the alternative, drastic reform of present rule XXII will be back and back and back until the change is finally forced on a reluctant Senate Establishment by the necessities of the modern world. Oh, yes, we dealt with it to some extent earlier this year. And we are going to deal with it again now.

Perhaps not next year, but certainly when the 91st Congress convenes, we will deal with it again, and sooner or later we are going to change this rule. We are going to ask the old maid to leave the debutante party. We are going to acknowledge that our present procedure is utterly obsolete and unworkable in the modern world.

So, Mr. President, without further argument on a matter which has been discussed so fully before, I call upon my colleagues to abolish an unworkable and obsolete procedure which has for years brought the Senate of the United States into disrepute.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I had not intended to say a word either for or against the pending amendment of my good friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania. However, I must say that it puts all of us who have been allies of the Senator from Pennsylvania on this issue as long as they have been in the Senate in an extremely difficult position.

This is the price of serving in the Senate, and I do not say this is to seek a way to avoid it. I say it only by way of explanation to my friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I think the point of the Senator from Oklahoma is well taken, that many of us who feel that there is a real need to try to do a little shaping up and reorganization have to be very realistic about this and recognize the fact that if the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania is in fact agreed to, it would kill, for all intents and purposes, any reorganization effort.

I will support the Senator in the future, as I have in the past, on this particular issue isolated unto itself, but I am concerned, in view of the effort that the committee has made under the leadership of the Senator from Oklahoma, that agreement to the pending amendment would be the death knell to improving legislative reorganization.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAYH. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I can understand the point of view taken by my friend the Senator from Indiana. If this amendment passes, it will not kill the bill, unless it is killed by a filibuster; and it would not kill the bill if we had this rule now, because we have the votes in this Chamber to adopt something like this rule or a reasonable facsimile thereof.

So that, in effect, what the Senator from Indiana is saying is that because our procedures are undemocratic and obsolete, he feels it necessary, in order to get whatever minor benefits might come from this reorganization bill, to vote against the pending amendment. I honor him for his views; I understand them; but I suggest that a logical approach to the critical problems which confront the Senate—this is a much more critical problem, in my opinion, than anything presently in the bill—might persuade him to follow a different course.

Mr. BAYH. I certainly respect the judgment of my friend the Senator from Pennsylvania. He has been a Member of this body considerably longer than I have. But it did not take me very long, while sitting in the back row and hearing this particular issue debated, to arrive at the position that I had to take a rather practical approach and that some significant contributions will be made by the efforts of the Senator from Oklahoma and his colleagues which, from a practical standpoint, will not be possible with the proposed amendment.

I sat here and listened, and I would not have said anything, but I wished to make my position clear on this issue.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not believe that we can add anything to the volumes of debate that have occurred on the general idea of cloture or of this specific amendment.

As has been said by the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana, I believe that if the proposed amendment is added to the bill, we can dispense with any hope of ever having a reorganization bill in this session. I believe that we are near to it, and that the interjection of this matter into the bill—which many of us thought had been disposed of earlier, and for which we waited until it was completed before bringing our bill to the floor—would defeat final passage of the bill.

Therefore, I must move to table the amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. In addition to the plausible arguments of the distinguished Senator from Indiana and the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, and in addition to the many benefits to all of us that are in the proposed reorganization bill, I point out that we now have in the bill a provision to establish a separate Veterans Committee of the Senate, to which many Senators are committed; and I would hate to see that thrown out the window in the event that some amendment were added now which we all know, from the standpoint of realism, would destroy the opportunity to pass this bill in this session.

I support the position of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. If no other Senator requests time, Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Spong in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion to table. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], who is absent on official business. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The assistant legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. Fannin] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis and Mr. Hruska], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. Percy] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis and Mr. Hruska], the Senator from Arizona [Mr.

Fannin], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Percy] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 18, as follows:

[No. 44 Leg.]

YEAS—64

Aiken
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Hansen
Harris
Hatfield
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Russell
Smathers
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—18

Brooke
Clark
Fong
Hartke
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
Magnuson
McCarthy
McIntyre
Mondale
Moss
Nelson
Pastore
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Smith

NOT VOTING—18

Allott
Case
Church
Curtis
Dominick
Fannin
Gruening
Hart
Hruska
Javits
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
Montoya
Morse
Percy
Tower
Yarborough

So Mr. Monroney's motion to table Mr. Clark's amendment (No. 31) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 30

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 30, and ask that it be stated. I wish to inform Senators that this is my last amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Assistant Legislative Clerk. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] proposes an amendment:

> On page 2, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 122 of the bill, insert the following new item:
>
> "Sec. 123. Standing Rules of the Senate."
>
> On page 30, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:
>
> "STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE
>
> "Sec. 123. Rule IX of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:
>
> " 'All motions to proceed to the consideration of any matter shall be debatable, unless otherwise provided in these rules; *Provided, however,* That any Senator may file, at the desk of the clerk, a notice of intention to move to consider any matter on the Senate Calendar on the following calendar day on which the Senate is in session. The filing of such notice shall operate to limit debate upon the motion to one hour, the time to be divided equally between the proponents and opponents of the motion. The notice of intent shall be printed in the Congressional Record.' "

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to eliminate double filibusters. In my opinion, one filibuster is too many, and two filibusters are ridiculous.

The present procedure is to filibuster on a motion to take up and run that along for a number of days, and then, finally, usually the filibusterers permit a motion to take up to come to a record vote, the motion to take up carries, and they start the filibuster on the merits of the particular bill.

If this amendment were to be agreed to, it would eliminate the first of those two filibusters. Certainly the majority leader should have control of the business which comes before the Senate. If Senators object to that business, once it is laid before the Senate, they may exercise their senatorial privileges by objecting to the merits of the bill. But to have a filibuster on a motion to take up, a purely procedural motion, in my opinion, is not justifiable on any reasonable procedural basis.

In order to accomplish the desired result, the pending amendment would provide a means by which a Senator could convert a motion to proceed to any motion on the calendar, which would ordinarily be debatable, into a nondebatable motion.

This could be done by filing at the desk, with the clerk, a notice of intention to make such motion on the following calendar day on which the Senate is in session. The notice of intention would be printed in the Congressional Record when the Senate convened on the following day and the motion to take up was renewed. It would be voted upon immediately without further debate.

Mr. President, this amendment is self-explanatory. Senators will, of course, vote their consciences and their convictions.

A vote for the tabling motion—which I have no doubt will be made—would continue in effect the present system of the double filibuster. A motion to proceed to overrule the motion to table would result in our having an opportunity—one would hope—to eliminate the double filibuster.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I see no reason to debate this subject further. It is all tied in together with the problem we had earlier in the session, when we had more than half a dozen amendments affecting it.

It is beyond the scope of the committee. It goes beyond its jurisdiction. Inclusion of this kind of material in the reorganization bill would mean its certain defeat.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment. It would throw control of a motion to consider to any Member of this body. All one would have to do would be to pick out anything on the calendar and file a motion and on the next day 1 hour of debate would be provided. That would be the end. There would be no way to control it. Should this amendment be adopted, we would be cutting our own throats.

This is a very naive amendment. It is a beautiful approach, I must say, on the part of my able friend from Pennsylvania, but it is frightfully transparent. We can all see what we would be doing here. The amendment should be voted down unanimously, and even the Senator from Pennsylvania should vote against his own amendment. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Would not the use of this proposed procedure violate the policy committee's procedure under which bills are considered and cleared for consideration and then handled by the majority leader?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It violates everything in the rule book. It violates everything in the resolution under which the special committee has been operating.

Mr. HOLLAND. Would not this procedure not only negate what the policy committee wants and make it rather unnecessary for the Senate to have a policy committee; and could it not thwart the desires of the majority leader?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. I want to read from the amendment, for the benefit of the Senator from Pennsylvania, in order to show how we can embalm the language:

> All motions to proceed to the consideration of any matter shall be debatable, unless otherwise provided in these rules—

And here is the old gimmick:

> *Provided, however,* That any Senator may file, at the desk of the Clerk, a notice of intention to move to consider any matter on the Senate calendar—

Where does that leave the majority leader to whom we always defer? Continuing reading—

> on the following calendar day on which the Senate is in session. The filing of such notice shall operate to limit debate upon the motion to one hour, the time to be divided equally between the proponents and opponents of the motion. The notice of intent shall be printed in the Congressional Record.

Mr. President, jealous as I am of the rights and prerogatives of the minority, if you gave me this rule and if I did not get along with the majority leader, I could hamstring him every day of the week by just filing one motion to consider after another on the calendar, whether I liked them or not, and the majority leader could not stop it. He could not extend the time of debate because if we did that, it would have to be done by unanimous consent, and all I would have to do would be to interject a very pleasant objection and control would pass over to this side of the aisle.

That is just not fair.

Accordingly, vote down the amendment—and, Joe, you vote against your own amendment. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may we have order in the galleries—there is unseemly mirth in the Press Galleries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The galleries will be in order.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, Senators

are not particularly naive individuals. I am sure that there is no Member of this body who thinks there is anything in the pending amendment which has anything to do with the powers of the majority leader or the powers of the policy committee. Those august Members of the establishment will have exactly the same powers, if the pending amendment should be adopted, as they have today.

Let us take the situation of a humble Senator in the back row of this Chamber—possibly the senior Senator from Pennsylvania—who desires to eliminate one of the two filibusters on a civil rights bill. He files a notice, and it is printed in the Congressional Record that on the following day he will move to take up a particular measure, and that measure will come to a vote the next day at the option of a majority of the Senate with limited debate.

If the majority leader does not want that motion brought up, he will say so and the motion will be voted down. Possibly even the minority leader might be able to get word to his cohorts during the day the debate would take place, after the motion was filed, that he thinks the motion to take up should not prevail. The policy committee would not even have to meet in a special or extraordinary session. They would just get the word out, "Let us show that fellow in the back row where he gets off."

Mr. President, all the amendment would do—let us not kid ourselves to the contrary—would be to eliminate the double filibuster. It has got nothing to do with the priorities or the prerogatives or the powers of the majority and minority leaders, or the policy committee.

If the amendment is voted down—and I have no doubt that it will be—let us at least vote it down on its merits, and not on the erroneous basis that this particular provision would put into the hands of one Senator control of the Senate over the opposition of the majority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, one word. If I thought there was any danger that the amendment would be adopted, I would take the next few minutes to scrawl a little amendment to it which would read very simply: "The office of majority leader and the office of minority leader are hereby abolished." That is what the pending amendment would do.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, if there are no more comments to be made, I move that the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania be tabled.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], who is absent on official business. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], and Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya], would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. Fannin] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis and Mr. Hruska], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis and Mr. Hruska], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Fannin], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York would vote "nay".

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 13, as follows:

[No. 45 Leg.]

YEAS—69

Aiken
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Eastland
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Hansen
Harris
Hartke
Hatfield
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Magnuson
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—13

Clark
Dodd
Fong
Kennedy, Mass.
McIntyre
Mondale
Moss
Nelson
Proxmire
Scott
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—18

Allott
Case
Church
Curtis
Dominick
Ellender
Fannin
Gruening
Hart
Hruska
Javits
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
Montoya
Morse
Tower
Yarborough

So Mr. Monroney's motion to lay Mr. Clark's amendment on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 105

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I am submitting today an amendment to the Legislative Reorganization Act, S. 335, to provide to Congress what I have termed a "Legislative Attorney General."

The Congress, Mr. President, is an equal and coordinate branch of the Government, but there are certain situations in which the Congress is handicapped by the necessity to rely upon the administrative branch as its spokesman and interpreter in legal matters rather than having its own independent legal counsel with authority to speak for the legislative body. My amendment would remedy that lack.

Under it, the Legislative Attorney General would be, for one thing, the authoritative source for interpretation of legislative intent. At the present time, when it becomes necessary in legal proceedings for the courts to delve into the question of legislative intent, such opinions are rendered by the office of the Department of Justice and its Attorney General. It does not seem to me the best possible proceeding to have an officer of the administrative branch deciding and declaring what is the intent of the legislative branch in its legislative function. I am not implying that the present arrangement is anything but honest in the effort to make adequate and accurate determinations, but it would seem obvious that a Legislative Attorney General, or a Counsel to Congress, subject to supervision by the Judiciary Committees of the House and the Senate, is in a better position to represent the true intent of Congress where there is a question. The Congress, through its own Legislative Counsel, surely is a better judge of its own legislative intent than the administrative branch, which does not participate in the process of preparing and adopting the law.

Second, the Legislative Attorney General would be the centralized source for opinions concerning constitutional and statutory interpretations needed by Members of Congress, who presently must rely on a variety of committee counsel, legislative counsel, or the American Law Division of the Library of Congress in its Legislative Reference Service. There is no designated single authoritative source at present for legal opinions at the command of the Congress.

Third, the office of a Legislative Attorney General could be most useful in assisting the Congress in its function of legislative oversight of the operation of the laws we pass. The complexity of Government and the tendency of the administrative branch to carry out its duties in accordance with its own interpretation of them make it difficult for the Congress to perform as effectively as it should the oversight function.

In the area of the relationship between the law and its execution, of the will of Congress and its execution, the assistance of a designated legal office representing the Congress could help close the gap between the formulation of congressional intent and its operational embodiment. The office of the Legislative Attorney General would be the arm of the Congress through which official legal approaches to the executive could be made in a variety of helpful ways.

Fourth, the Legislative Attorney General is authorized to intervene on request of a congressional committee, or on his own motion, in any legal action involving validity or interpretation of acts of proceedings of the Congress, its committees, or officers. This authority would extend to any court where such questions are at issue, giving the Congress its own representation rather than leaving it to the Attorney General of the United States.

The Legislative Attorney General would also be authorized to be the legal representative of the Congress or its committees, officers, or agents in court actions to which they are a party. In this role, he would be authorized to take on, after notification, the powers of this nature now exercised by the Attorney General of the United States.

I might add that the proposal I am presenting specifies that the office shall be filled by appointment jointly, and without regard to political affiliation, by the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House. He would be confirmed by the Congress, and he would be subject to removal for inefficiency, misconduct, or physical or mental incapacity. His salary would be the same as that of Members of Congress.

Mr. President, I believe such an office would be a worthy addition to the means available to the Congress for carrying out its functions in the best possible manner.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

NOMINATION OF EDWARD P. GALLOGLY TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR RHODE ISLAND

Mr. **PELL**. Mr. President, it is with unreserved support, and much pleasure, that I strongly endorse Mr. Edward P. Gallogly for the position of U.S. attorney for the district of Rhode Island.

A graduate of Providence College in Providence, R.I., and the Boston University Law School, Mr. Gallogly has practiced for the past 16 years, presently being associated with the firm of Beals, Tiernan & Sweeney, considered one of the most outstanding in my State.

Serving with the Amphibious Forces of the U.S. Navy during World War II, he continued this affiliation from 1954 to 1964 in the Naval Reserve as an instructor of international law, international relations and military justice at the Reserve Officers School at Fields Point, R.I.

Elected to the Rhode Island State Senate from the fifth senatorial district in Providence in 1956, he served through 1960. In that year he was elected Lieutenant Governor and was reelected in 1962. In 1964, Mr. Gallogly was the unsuccessful Democratic nominee for Governor.

Noted primarily for his outstanding service to civic and religious organizations, he is also recognized for his activities in many professional and social organizations throughout Rhode Island, such as the Rhode Island and American Bar Associations, American Trial Lawyers' Association, board of directors—Providence College Alumni Association, and the Mayor's Advisory Committee on Urban Renewal.

Mr. Gallogly is married and the father of 11 children.

Known and admired by me for a number of years, Eddie Gallogly is considered one of the most intelligent and civic-minded residents of my State. His professional integrity is untarnished; his personal reputation unexcelled.

Mr. President, I am honored and proud to commend the nomination of Mr. Edward P. Gallogly as U.S. district attorney for Rhode Island, knowing that his duties will be performed in an objective, sincere and responsible manner.

DEATH OF PROF. HEINRICH ROMMEN

Mr. **McCARTHY**. Mr. President, Dr. Heinrich Rommen, who died last week, was an internationally known and internationally respected authority on political theory, particularly on natural law and on church and state relationships.

Heinrich Rommen was born and educated in Germany. He was strongly opposed to Hitler and the Nazis and was imprisoned for his views and writings shortly after Hitler came to power. He was later released and in 1939 he managed to come to the United States with his family.

He was a colleague of mine on the faculty of St. Thomas College in St. Paul, and I know how fully he entered into American society and how much he approved and enjoyed the American political system. In 1953, Dr. Rommen joined the Georgetown University faculty, and in recognition of his scholarship and of his many contributions to academic life at Georgetown, the university awarded him the title of "Distinguished Professor" in 1962, the first time that Georgetown had extended this honor to a member of the faculty.

Heinrich Rommen was a scholar, and his books will continue to assist students of political theory. He was dedicated to the discovery of truth and to helping others to share in that discovery. Beyond this he was a thoroughly good man, humble, and friendly.

I ask unanimous consent that the news reports about his death, which appeared in the Washington Star on February 21 and in the Washington Post, February 22, be printed at this point the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star]

Heinrich A. Rommen, 69, Professor at Georgetown University

Heinrich A. Rommen, 69, professor of government at Georgetown University, died Sunday at his home, 5401 N. 11th St., Arlington, after a long illness.

Prof. Rommen had taught graduate courses in political science, political administration and international relations at the Foreign Service School of Georgetown since 1953. The university awarded him the title of "distinguished professor" in 1962. The title permitted him to continue teaching there since he passed retirement age.

Dr. Rommen, a naturalized citizen, came to the United States from his native Germany in 1938. He taught at St. Joseph's College in West Hartford, Conn., and at St. Thomas College in St. Paul, Minn., and was guest professor at the University of Minnesota before coming to Georgetown.

He held doctoral degrees in political science from the universities of Bonn and Muenster, Germany. One of his doctoral dissertations was on the American Constitution.

Among his many books the best known are "The State in Catholic Thought," published in 1945, and "Natural Law," published in German in 1936, and later in English, French and Japanese.

Prof. Rommen held honorary doctor of law degrees from Boston College and from the University of Granada, Spain.

He spent 1956–57 teaching at the University of Nijmegen in Holland under a Fulbright grant, and also lectured on the philosophy of law at the University of Frankfurt, Germany.

Prof. Rommen headed the Brand Hitze School in the town of Muenchen-Gladbach near Cologne early in his career. The school was closed in 1933 and Dr. Rommen, who had written anti-Hitler pamphlets, was arrested and held six weeks by the Gestapo.

After he was freed, he was legal consultant to Aschinger Corp., a hotel firm in Germany, and wrote articles for scholarly periodicals.

He leaves his wife, Martha three daughters, Peggy Rommen and Mrs. Irma Caster, both of Virginia Beach, Va., and Mrs. James Murphy of San Jose, Calif.; two brothers, Joseph of Kevelael, Germany, and Karl of Muenchen-Gladbach, Germany, and six grandchildren.

Friends may call today at the Fitzgerald Funeral Home, 3245 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, Va. The Rosary will be recited there at 8 p.m.

A requiem mass will be said at 10 a.m. tomorrow at St. Ann's Catholic Church, Arlington, with burial in Calvary Cemetery, Fairfax, Va.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1967]

Heinrich Rommen Dies; Georgetown Professor

Heinrich A. Rommen, 69, a professor of government at Georgetown University, died of cancer Sunday at his home, 5401 N. 11th ave., Arlington.

A political theorist and philosopher, he was the only member of the Georgetown faculty to be named a "distinguished professor."

Dr. Rommen was born in Cologne, Germany, and received doctorates from the universities of Muenster and Bonn. In the summer of 1938 he was arrested by the Gestapo for involvement in a Catholic social-action group and was held in prison for several months.

After his release, Dr. Rommen remained in Germany to do free-lance writing and legal work for a Berlin corporation. He left in 1939, with the aid of the Episcopal Committee for Catholic Refugees, to come to the United States.

From 1938 to 1946, Dr. Rommen taught economics at St. Joseph's College in West Hartford, Conn., and for the next seven years taught political science and political philosophy at St. Thomas College in St. Paul, Minn., and the University of Minnesota. Since joining the Georgetown faculty in 1953, he had been giving courses in political theory and constitutional government and conducting a seminar in political ethics.

Dr. Rommen was the author or editor of six books in English and German, two of the best known being "The State in Catholic Thought" (1945) and "The Natural Law" (1947). While in Germany he warned in two books against the Nazi philosophy.

In 1956-57, Dr. Rommen lectured under a Fulbright grant at the University of Nijmegen in Holland. Before returning to the United States he received an honorary doctorate from the University of Granada for his first book, which defended the Spanish Jesuit theologian Francisco Suarez against conservative Catholic criticism.

Dr. Rommen also had an honorary doctorate from Boston College and had lectured there as well as at the University of Chicago, Notre Dame and Western Reserve Universities.

He is survived by his wife, Martha; and three daughters, Peggy Rommen and Irma Carter, of Virginia Beach, Va., and Monica Murphy, of San Jose, Calif.

U.S. AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTION DECREASES FOR FEBRUARY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Robert Irvin in this morning's Washington Post reports that automotive production in the United States is down 32.2 percent from February 1966. The low February production figures contribute substantially to a slack off of 24.9 percent U.S. production for January and February of 1967.

The Business and Defense Services Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce reports a percentage slowdown in January U.S. production at 16 percent—down from January 1966 production total of 797,969 to 670,129 for the first month of 1967. BDSA reports Canadian automobile production off about 14 percent from 69,456 in January 1966 to 60,161 in January 1967. Figures for Canadian production for February are not yet available. However, in view of the "letters of intent" which the Big Four automotive producers signed with the Canadian Government to qualify under the United States-Canadian Automotive Agreement, I will be interested to see what the Canadian Government does with the U.S. subsidiaries which fall below their prescribed production levels and expansion requirements in Canada.

I note, Mr. President, even though I have filed a report on the United States-Canadian Automotive Agreement and pointed up again and again that executive branch is in default of the law, we still do not have an annual report on the United States-Canadian agreement, which has been in effect since January 1965.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 O'CLOCK A.M., TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate it is anticipated that there will be rollcall votes tomorrow.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

NOMINATIONS REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nominations favorably reported earlier today by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is ordered. The first nomination will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ramsey Clark, of Texas, to be Attorney General.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this nomination was unanimously reported by the Committee on the Judiciary this morning.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I say that so far as I know, the entire Senate recommends this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read further nominations in the Department of Justice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining 12 nominations reported earlier today by the Committee on the Judiciary be considered en bloc.

Mr DIRKSEN. Mr. President, those nominations were also unanimously reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, may I make an inquiry of the majority leader?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there will be no more record votes today. Is that understanding correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct; no more votes today.

VIETNAM

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, 10,000 miles from this Chamber we are engaged in a violent conflict that has engulfed the land of Vietnam.

I discuss this war knowing that its tangled and resistant complexities make judgment difficult and uncertain; and knowing, therefore, of the grave and painful responsibility borne by the President of the United States. As he must make the ultimate decisions, he is also entitled to our hopeful sympathy, our understanding, and our support in the search for peace.

And even though we debate, as we must, the wisest course toward settlement in Vietnam, there is no comfort for our adversary in these councils. Nearly all Americans share with us the determination and intention to remain in Vietnam until we have fulfilled our commitments. There is no danger of any division—in this Chamber or in this country—now or in the future—which will erode American will and compel American withdrawal. Nor are we here to curse the past or to praise it. Three Presidents have taken action in Vietnam. As one who was involved in many of those decisions, I can testify that if fault is to be found or responsibility assessed, there is enough to go around for all—including myself.

Thus, neither the acts of the past nor the commitments of the present are now at issue here. The issue is how best to preserve the right of the people of South Vietnam to guide their own land while putting an end to war and violence. The issue is how we can best support the goal which President Johnson has proclaimed of a middle road between withdrawal and ever-widening war.

The issue, therefore, is how we can serve at once the interest of our country and the most compassionate cause of humanity—the common cause of peace.

There is not one among us, in this Chamber or this Government, who does not share that cause. There is not a man who does not desire the end of war and the return of our men to their homes. There are none who do not aspire to that secure tranquillity which can liberate the people of South Vietnam to follow their unforced will.

Still there is no peace.

We have sent more than 400,000 men into battle. Fleets of extraordinarily complex planes pour their devastation upon the paths and villages which divide an ancient jungle. The most powerful country the world has known now turns its strength and will upon a small and primitive land.

And still there is no peace.

We have talked about the necessity of negotiations and worked for them. Our emissaries have gone around the world. World figures in every continent—heads of state and leaders of religion—have pleaded for an end to the war and offered their assistance.

And still there is no peace.

The fault rests largely with our adversary. He has pursued relentless and unyielding conquest with obdurate unconcern for mounting desolation. Now his victory has eluded him, replaced by a conflict where violence breeds only endless violence.

If our enemy will not accept peace, it cannot come. Yet, we must also look to ourselves. We must have no doubt that it is not our acts or failures which bar the way; that there is nothing we have left undone which we might have done. Our own course must be subject to a ceaseless and critical examination, not with certainty that change will bring success, but in order that our own people can take comfort and strength from the knowledge that America has taken every step, done every act, and performed every deed within its power to put an end to this distant and ferocious war.

For if this war was not our doing, and is not our fault, still it is partly our responsibility. Events, many of them beyond our control, have brought the astounding might of American power upon a remote and alien people in a small and unknown land. It is difficult to feel in our hearts what this war means to the people of Vietnam. It is on the other side of the world and its people are strangers. Few of us are directly involved while the rest of us continue our lives and pursue our ambitions undisturbed by the sounds and fears of battle. To the Vietnamese, however, it must often seem the fulfillment of the prophecy of Saint John the Divine:

> And I looked, and beheld a pale horse: and his name that sat on him was Death, and Hell followed with him. And Power was given unto them over the fourth part of the earth, to kill with sword, and with hunger, and with death.

Let us reflect for a moment not on the wisdom and necessity of our cause nor on the valor of the South Vietnamese, but on the horror. For although the world's imperfections may call forth the acts of war, righteousness cannot obscure the agony and pain those acts bring to a single child. The Vietnamese war is an event of historic moment, summoning the grandeur and concern of many nations. But it is also the vacant moment of amazed fear as a mother and child watch death by fire fall from the improbable machine sent by a country they barely comprehend. It is the sudden terror of the official or the civil guard absorbed in the work of his village as he realizes the Vietcong assassin is about to take his life. It is the refugees wandering, homeless, from villages now obliterated, leaving behind only those who did not live to flee. It is the young men, Vietnamese and American, who in an instant sense the night of death destroying yesterday's promise of family and land and home.

It is a country where young men have never lived a day in peace and where families have never known a time when it was not necessary to be afraid. It is a land deafened by the unending crescendo of violence, hatred, and savage fury; where the absorbing goal for millions is not to live well or to improve their lives, but simply to survive.

It is a country where hundreds of thousands fight, but millions more are the innocent, bewildered victims of brutal passions and beliefs they barely understand. To them peace is not an abstract term describing one of those infrequent intervals when men are not killing each other, it is a day without terror and the fall of bombs. It is a family and the familiar life of their village. It is food and a school and life itself.

All we say and all we do must be informed by our awareness that this horror is partly our responsibility; not just a nation's responsibility, but yours and mine. It is we who live in abundance and send our young men out to die. It is our chemicals that scorch the children and our bombs that level the villages. We are all participants. To know this and to feel the burden of this responsibility, is not to ignore important interests, nor to forget that freedom and security must, at times, be paid for in blood. Still even though we must know, as a nation, what it is necessary to do, we must also feel, as men, the anguish of what it is we are doing.

Of course power is the instrument of war and devastation the product of power; although restraint in power's use can blend wisdom with compassion. Many such restraints have been carefully imposed by the President. Nor would I contend that the pain and death of conflict alone impel us to a swift settlement. It is not necessarily merciful nor wise to purchase a temporary respite at the price of a future disaster.

Yet our apprehension of this war's agony now joins with other mounting urgencies to command us to seek every opportunity, open every door, and tread every path which may lead to the end of the war.

We are now steadily widening the war in order, we are told, to increase the costs to Hanoi. Yet, in our concern with the price our adversary must pay, let us not omit our own costs from the war's account.

The mounting devastation of South Vietnam—the destruction of villages and burning of the countryside—is steadily eroding the fabric of that society; making the ultimate reconstruction of South Vietnam more remote and difficult. Yet, lasting peace depends upon the strength of the nation we leave behind. The war has also made far more difficult the hopeful pursuit of fresh understanding and diminishing tension between the two great nuclear powers: the United States and the Soviet Union. It has absorbed some of the energies needed if we are to exercise our full weight and responsibility in the Western Alliance. It is diverting resources which might have been used to help eliminate American poverty, improve the education of our children and enhance the quality of our national life.

Of course we are willing—we must be willing—to pay all these costs if the alternative is surrender or defeat. We cannot dishonor our commitments, nor yield the lawful interests of the Nation at any price. But neither should we deceive ourselves into thinking these are not massive and difficult debts which other generations will have to discharge.

The destruction and costs of this war are borne in pursuit of what Secretary McNamara has called limited objectives—not conquest or alliance, but the protection of South Vietnam from domination by force. It is an objective which, our Government has always said, can best be achieved at the conference table.

For years, President Johnson has dedicated his energies in an effort to achieve an honorable peace.

However, we are now at a critical turning point in pursuit of our stated limited objectives: balanced between the rising prospects of peace and surely rising war, between the promise of negotiations and the perils of spreading conflict. For our attacks are mounting in intensity, just as the evidence mounts that a new, and more hopeful moment of opportunity for settlement has been at hand.

Before reawakened hope is lost in renewed and evermore far-reaching assaults, we should test this moment with new initiatives and acts in pursuit of peaceful settlement. Whatever the disappointments of an effort which fails, the costs of continued war are certain. As our objectives are limited, they may well be secured at the conference table without further months or years of war. If our effort fails, then the conflict will continue.

Therefore, agony and interest, the limited nature of our goals and the formidable consequences of rising war combine now to compel us to embrace and not shrink from any initiative that may resolve this conflict—honorably, justly, consistent with our aims, and in peace.

We need not wait timidly for a certain outcome and sure guarantees, fearful for our dignity and anxious for our prestige. This enormous country, a nation which commands half the wealth and power of the globe, need not be fearful of North Vietnam. Vietcong guerrillas, even with their northern allies, will not drive from the battlefield an American army, backed by endless funds and towering resources. No one is going to defeat us, or slaughter our troops, or destroy our prestige, because we dare take initiatives for peace. If Pope Paul or U Thant or Prime Minister Wilson or Premier Kosygin believe they have the key to peace, let us welcome their efforts and continuously ask their help. If any among us can suggest any act which offers hope of peace, let his counsel be welcomed.

> Where no counsel is—

The Bible says—

> the people fall: but in the multitude of counselors there is safety.

I speak today for this purpose: to explore the possibilities of peace which recent weeks have illuminated.

Our Government has unequivocally said that our objective in Vietnam is a negotiated settlement with the Communists.

> The only path for reasonable men—

President Johnson said at Johns Hopkins—

> is the path of peaceful settlement.

I am sure most Americans share this conviction. The question is whether we are doing everything possible to reach that goal. It is the most important and urgent question of the American Nation.

The steps I am suggesting are intimately related. They stand together, each dependent on the other. It will do little good to go to the conference table if discussions are simply used to mask continued escalation of the war. Nor will negotiations be fruitful unless they lead to a reasonable and honorable settlement with some hope of lasting peace. Therefore, I propose that we test the sincerity of the statements by Premier Kosygin and others asserting that if the bombardment of the north is halted, negotiations would begin—by halting the bombardment and saying we are ready to negotiate within the week; making it clear that discussions cannot continue for a prolonged period without an agreement that neither side will substantially increase the size of the war in South Vietnam—by infiltration or reinforcement. An international group should be asked to inspect the borders and ports of the country to report any further escalation. And under the directions of the United Nations, and with an international presence gradually replacing American forces, we should move toward a final settlement which allows all the major political elements in South Vietnam to participate in the choice of leadership and shape their future direction as a people.

If we can follow this course, we cannot be certain that negotiations will take place, or that they will be productive. No one can give such a binding guarantee. But measures such as these will enhance the chances of peace while the risks are comparatively slight. Certainly they will help us to know we have done everything within our power to reach a settlement. Therefore, they should be pursued.

Let us explore this program in greater detail.

There are three stages toward final resolution of the war in Vietnam: beginning negotiations, continuing those discussions without increasing conflict, and a final settlement which liberates the people of South Vietnam to govern their own future.

First, we must get to the negotiating table. For almost 2 years we have proclaimed and published our unwavering desire to begin negotiations with our Communist enemy. "Anywhere and anytime," the President said. Last year we unilaterally stopped the bombing of North Vietnam for 37 days without asking any prior act, signal or statement in return, hoping our restraint might bring negotiations. Now the evidence is mounting that our initiative can finally bring the negotiations we have sought for so long if only we are willing to do what we did before.

Two weeks ago in London, Mr. Kosygin, the Premier of the Soviet Union, the principal ally of North Vietnam, said that the first step toward peace "should be the unconditional cessation of the bombing of, and all other aggressive acts against, North Vietnam. As the Foreign Minister of North Vietnam declared recently, this step is necessary to enable talks between North Vietnam and the United States to take place. The Soviet Government welcomes this statement and regards it as an important and constructive proposal for ending the war."

This declaration comes from a man of enormous authority in the Communist world, whose country helps sustain North Vietnam's effort. It does not demand that we withdraw our forces, slow down our military effort on the ground, or even halt the bombing of South Vietnam. It does not demand an indissoluble and binding guarantee that we will never use our planes again at any future time no matter what our adversary does to enlarge his effort or change the nature of the war. Demands and replies must be understood in the context of the present situation, not a drastically different one which may or may not be created in the future by our adversary. There is no longer a demand that we accept any terms or conditions, such as the Four Points, in advance of talks. We are simply informed that "to enable talks" we should stop bombing—something we have done before.

The same message has come to us in recent weeks from friends and adversaries alike, in public interviews and private communications. It was repeated again this week in a statement by Soviet President Podgorny, and again yesterday by the Foreign Minister of North Vietnam.

Often the statements are more obscure than that of Mr. Kosygin. Some have been conflicting. Yet the temper of attitudes and events has been changing and we should reach for the moment of promise which may have come.

Throughout the cold war we have moved toward peace in many crises by accepting at face value those positions of our adversaries which contain the greatest hope of swift settlement. For example, during the Cuban missile crisis, President Kennedy received two conflicting messages from Premier Khrushchev. The first, which was received on Friday night, October 26, offered to remove the missiles from Cuba. The next day, a second message demanded concessions in return for removal of the missiles in Cuba. President Kennedy simply ignored the second statement, accepted the first, and thus the crisis was resolved without further conflict. Such a proven technique might well yield fruitful results in the present situation when ambiguities in the statements of our adversaries are far less pronounced. Certainly it is worth trying.

Of course, we must realize that the escalation of the last week may have already stiffened our adversaries' position and dimmed the prospect for peace contained in the statements of the last few weeks. However, the statements still stand. They have not been retracted, and they may open the door to peace.

Let us, therefore, accept the public declarations of Mr. Kosygin and Mr. Podgorny—which in this respect were identical to the counsel offered us by Secretary General U Thant. Let us halt the bombing and bombardment of the north as a step toward a negotiated peace, and say to Mr. Kosygin, to the National Liberation Front and to Hanoi, that we are ready to begin discussions within the week.

This does not mean that we can expect a response with equal speed—only that we ourselves must be ready. There are many parties among our adversaries, some with different interests, which perhaps must be sorted out before negotiations can take place.

After so many years of conflict and mutual distrust, it will require patience and perseverance and time to achieve peaceful settlement—if indeed, it is possible at all. But it may be possible.

So let us place on the Soviet Union, on North Vietnam, the obligation to demonstrate the sincerity of their declarations by coming to the conference table. If their statements and our hopes are founded in reality, discussions may begin. If not, we will have proven to ourselves and our friends around the world that we are willing to take the initiative for peace; that it is our adversary, not America, that bars the way.

We were willing to do this a year ago, even without the evidence we now have that an end to bombing attacks on the north may well bring negotiations. A year ago it was our adversaries who publicly laid down conditions for negotiations—acceptance of the four points or withdrawal of American troops. Now Mr. Kosygin and Mr. Podgorny have said negotiation can begin on terms we clearly would have accepted then. Why then do we not try again in this far more hopeful moment?

If the passage of substantial time and events proves that our adversaries do not sincerely seek a negotiated solution, if discussions are used only as a pretext to enlarge the conflict in the south, then we can reexamine our entire military strategy—including the bombing or the possible erection of a physical barrier to block infiltration—in light of the changing nature of the war. Our actions at that time, after such a dedicated effort to secure peace, would have the increased understanding and support of our allies and of our own people. We should be generous in our search for peace, but I am also aware of the precedent of Panmunjom.

Suspension of the bombing might be more difficult if continued bombing of North Vietnam were a promising and indispensable way to secure our objectives in South Vietnam. For, as the administration has told us, we have no desire to destroy North Vietnam or overturn its Government. But the fact of the matter is that the bombing of the north can be stopped as a step toward peace without effectively weakening our position in the south; especially when it is remembered that such a cessation would not affect our attacks on the infiltration trails in Laos or on enemy forces in the south.

President Johnson told us at Johns Hopkins that we began bombing North Vietnam in 1965 for three purposes:

The first was "to increase the confidence of the brave people of South Vietnam"—assuring them they would not be abandoned. The bombing did help give such assurance. Now, however, we have 400,000 fighting men in the south, a far more effective and continuing proof of our commitment and determination.

Second, in the President's words:

> We wanted to convince the leaders of North Vietnam . . . (that) we will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw.

That purpose is also served by the enormous commitment of men, lives, and resources which we have made to South Vietnam since the bombing began. If our adversary has seen his hopes for victory destroyed, it is primarily because of the skill and bravery of our forces on the ground. Moreover, there is every sign that the bombing itself is now an insuperable obstacle to negotiations and that the North Vietnamese feel it impossible to discuss peace while bombs are falling on their country; just as the bombing of Britain only united resistance; just as we would join in unyielding determination if bombs were falling on Detroit or Chicago.

The third purpose, the President said, was "to slow down aggression." The bombing of the north would, it was hoped, reduce the flow of men and supplies from North Vietnam to the Communist forces in the south. A year ago, General Ridgway—the commander of our last ground war in Asia—predicted that air attacks could not stop the infiltration of men and supplies through the scattered jungles, trails, and hills of southeast Asia. It had not worked, he pointed out, even in the more open countryside of Korea.

Although asserting that the bombing has other values which he supports, the Secretary of Defense has recently confirmed this prediction; testifying that although the bombing has punished the north and encouraged the south:

> I don't believe the bombing up to the present has significantly reduced, nor any bombing that I would contemplate in the future would significantly reduce, the actual flow of men and materials to the south.

He is supported in this view by many greatly respected military observers, including Gen. James M. Gavin, one of our most brilliant military men, a former Ambassador to France, one of America's most decorated combat commanders.

Certainly the bombing of the north makes the war more costly and difficult and painful for North Vietnam. It is a harsh punishment indeed. But we are not in Vietnam to play the role of an avenging angel pouring death and destruction on the roads and factories and homes of a guilty land. We are there to assure the self-determination of South Vietnam, to fight the war effectively, and to protect as many lives as we can. It should be clear by now that the bombing of the north cannot bring an end to the war in the south; that, indeed, it may well be prolonging that war. None of those who have advocated a cessation of bombing—men like General Gavin, or Ambassadors Kennan, and Reischauer—would contemplate a step which might unnecessarily endanger the lives of many Americans. Our troops are being killed by the bullets and the mines of forces in the south. If by ending the bombing of the north we bring peace in South Vietnam nearer, then we will save the lives of thousands of our young men and thousands of Vietnamese.

Certainly it is not weakness for this enormous Nation to take a generous step toward ending this war. It is not bravery to refuse an act which may save thousands of lives with little risk to ourselves. Can anyone believe this Nation, with all its fantastic power and resources, will be endangered by a wise and magnanimous action toward a difficult but small adversary? Last week, commenting on the period of the New Year's truce, Prime Minister Wilson said that—"One single simple act of trust could have achieved [peace]."

We can—and should—perform that act.

Certainly at a time of such hope, an effort to achieve negotiation and not further escalation opens the most hopeful prospect to peace.

As soon as we halt the bombing of the north, international teams under the United Nations or, perhaps, a strengthened International Control Commission, should be asked to provide detached and objective information to the world about any large buildup of troops or supplies by our adversaries.

They would patrol the borders, ports and roads of Vietnam. Equipment which we now use to watch and monitor enemy movements—such as reconnaissance planes and other intelligence facilities—can be placed at their disposal.

Our next step should be to seek an understanding with our adversaries that neither side will substantially increase the rate of infiltration and reinforcements during negotiations.

For even though we begin negotiations it is not likely that peace can be discussed effectively or with confidence while the other side is preparing for a larger war. It is unrealistic to think we would sit through prolonged and fruitless negotiations while casualties mount and the war gets bigger. Thus, even if hostilities continue it will be necessary for both sides to refrain from escalating the war on the ground and trying to change the military balance.

Therefore, whether or not we are able to reach a specific agreement on this subject, the international inspection team which, hopefully, was established as soon as the bombing halted, would report any effort, by either side, to increase its strength while peace talks proceed. They would also monitor any agreement reached during the course of negotiations on suspension of military activity, including, hopefully, a cease-fire. Thus the detached and objective testimony of the international community would be witness to our sincerity, and to any attempt by North Vietnam substantially to step up its help of the NLF under cover of negotiations. And if the failure of negotiations, coupled with the actions of our adversary, make it necessary for us to reexamine our position, we would act with far clearer international understanding to our motives and necessities.

We have an important precedent for just such an action. During the Cuban missile crisis, the United States asked Secretary General U Thant if the United Nations would be willing to inspect and verify the withdrawal of Soviet missiles from Cuba. He agreed that this would be an appropriate role for the United Nations. At the same time our military commanders determined that it would be both technically feasible, and consistent with our security, to turn over many of our intelligence facilities—including high flying aircraft—to a United Nations' inspection team.

Thus we have both the demonstrated willingness of the United Nations to undertake such a task in another difficult situation, and proof that such inspection is technically feasible. Although the earlier effort was blocked by Castro's resistance—in this case, even without cooperation by the North Vietnamese, it should be possible to watch and report on most major routes of infiltration and supply. Moreover it would, if necessary, be possible to supplement this with U.S. intelligence activity.

It will not be easy to devise a workable system of international inspection in a situation so charged with complexity, conflict and clashing interests. We do know, however, that the participation of other nations can both help sustain the good faith necessary to successful talks and make a satisfactory final settlement possible. These suggestions may contribute to that necessary end.

Third, we must know and clearly state what kind of Vietnam we would like to see emerge from negotiations, and how we propose these general objectives could be best achieved. Negotiations are not the end of the road. They are the bridge to the future of South Vietnam. That future must include the right of the people of South Vietnam to self-determination. How to accomplish this is at the heart of the problem of peaceful settlement.

To speak of our objectives in advance of negotiations does not yield advantage to our adversary by "showing our cards." Discussions of peace and war are not poker games. They are decided by power and interest, reason and the knowledge, as Franklin Roosevelt said, that—

> No nation ever loses its dignity or its good standing by conciliating its differences.

Understanding of our aims will speed, not retard, the course of settlement. And since they are worthy and honorable goals they will help win us the support and sympathy of others.

The first task for the negotiators will be to dismantle the war. They will have to establish procedures for a cease-fire, for the laying down of arms and for the gradual withdrawal of foreign forces from the country. This must be accompanied by the political steps necessary to protect the safety of all sides while the war is being dismantled. The President has clearly stated to the world that for our part we neither want nor intend to keep our forces or bases in South Vietnam once peace is secure.

More difficult and intricate is the resolution of South Vietnam's tangled politics.

As I said a year ago, a negotiated settlement is a compromise. One must either defeat an enemy and compel his surrender or else settle on terms in which both sides can find some degree of satisfaction. We have not defeated the Vietcong, nor, as President Johnson said in his state of the Union message, is a military victory in sight. We must, therefore, find—and I think we can find—an agreed solution which, however imperfect, protects our basic interest in Vietnam: The self-determination of the the people of South Vietnam.

All the people of South Vietnam, Communist and non-Communist, Buddhist and Christian, should be able to choose their leaders, and seek office through peaceful political processes, free from external coercion and internal violence. All should have the opportunity to seek peacefully a share of power and responsibility through free elections. They should determine their future and the nature of their system and resolve the question of Vietnamese reunification.

We might begin moving toward this future by encouraging the South Vietnamese Government, including the present Constituent Assembly, to begin its own discussion with the National Liberation Front. Other political elements, not now represented in the Government, should share in this effort. For many years the people of South Vietnam have been divided in fierce and hostile combat. If they are to settle their own future they must at least begin to talk to each other, try to eliminate unnecessary conflicts, and search out areas of possible agreement.

And as a major combatant, we must also be ready to talk directly to all parties—north and south, Communist and non-Communist alike.

However, if we want non-Communist Vietnamese to take a major role in discussions leading to a negotiated settlement—as I believe essential—and to exert effective force and influence in competition with the NFL for future leadership, we must first encourage a free political process among non-Communist South Vietnamese. The military directory is not representative of many of the non-Communist political elements in South Vietnam. Even the Assembly, a significant step toward civilian rule, excludes important elements of the population and, though it has taken positions independent of the military, is still far weaker than the generals. Thus the forthcoming elections, if conducted freely and fairly, could result in a civilian government, far more effective than the military rule which exists at present—one willing and able to take effective part in a negotiated settlement. We should begin now to help bring this about. And obviously, for a civilian government to be effective, it must engage in far more serious efforts at political and social reform than has any in the past. Indeed, the lack of previous reform is a major reason for our present difficulties.

Finally, a lasting settlement of the war will be extremely difficult unless all parties to the present conflict are secure in the knowledge that free elections open to all will ultimately be held, and that those who win them will take office. This confidence will depend on the structure of government between the end of hostilities and elections. This may be a prolonged period. It will certainly be a period of great importance. Therefore, the rights of all major political elements must be protected by any interim governing assembly.

That, however, is not enough; suspicion and fear are now too deeply ingrained. The Communists would fear a takeover by the military, just as we might fear a Communist coup. Therefore it will be necessary to phase out the withdrawal of American and North Vietnamese forces over a period of time and, as our forces depart, to replace them by international forces to police the ceasefire, guard against violence and coercion, and supervise the elections. In this we can create the confidence necessary to agreement.

Moreover, it is both wise and right for other countries to play a part in keeping the peace of Asia. As all are menaced by conflict, all should help bear the burdens of peace. There is no reason why the United States should expend its resources and the lives of its men while others await the result. Statements by U Thant and many other leaders prove there is intense world concern about southeast Asia. This is an opportunity to encourage those concerned to share responsibility and decision.

Furthermore, the internal development of the nations of Asia could greatly benefit from disinterested assistance of international agencies; for those agencies will help carry out the farsighted and generous program of the President for southeast Asia economic development.

Thus international participation in the settlement of this war can also be an important step in widening the constructive and useful role of international agencies.

This step will not be an easy one. But the United Nations and other international organizations have already assumed such burdens among hazards and circumstances as different as Korea and Cyprus and the border between Israel and its Arab neighbors.

Once a civilian government has been freely chosen, South Vietnam will be in the hands of its own people; subject to the uncertainties, risks, and promise of the political process in a turbulent land. We can be hopeful that it will reestablish friendly relations and commerce with the other countries with whom it shares southeast Asia. Indeed, its relationship with North Vietnam, and that of the north with other countries, is critical to any lasting settlement of the conflicts in that volatile area.

For even though the war in Vietnam has its unique difficulties and dangers, its resolution must be viewed against the shifting nature of world communism. In the forties and fifties communism everywhere was guided from a single center. Communist parties in every land took their orders from Moscow. A Communist victory anywhere meant an automatic extension of the influence and power of the Soviet Union.

There is still grave danger, but the monolithic Communist system is forever shattered. The increasing independence of Eastern Europe, the death of Stalin, the bitter quarrel between China and Russia, and the failures of communism in the developing world have all combined to increase the freedom of Communist states to pursue their own national interests. A Communist state can no longer be assumed to be the automatically obedient instrument of expanding Russian or Chinese power. North Vietnam, like North Korea, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and others, can be encouraged to assert its own independence.

We should, therefore, help to demonstrate the rich possibilities open to all of Vietnam and, indeed, to all southeast Asia once steps are taken down the road to peace. In particular, we must show that peace can lead immediately to an increase in trade and communications between North Vietnam and its neighbors. We must show, perhaps in conjunction with the Soviet Union, that the security and economic welfare of North Vietnam are not in danger. And of great significance, it may be that in such a context North Vietnam will be better able to increase its independence of China, as it has struggled to do throughout much of its history.

In this way the settlement in South Vietnam may become a bridge to a solution for all southeast Asia. And perhaps from today's terrible violence can come, not only an end to conflict, but also a decisive movement toward that liberation from misery and fear which is necessary to bring fruitful tranquillity to the nations and people of southeast Asia.

There can be no guarantee that these suggestions toward peace will bring early negotiations or an enduring peace. That will be in the hands of others besides ourselves. Nor are these initiatives free from risk and difficulty. As Bernard Shaw wrote:

> In truth it is . . . not difficult to die and enormously difficult to live: That explains why, at bottom, peace is not only better than war, but infinitely more arduous.

Here let me reiterate: I do not think the expansion of this war—whether by an increase of North Vietnamese infiltration into the south, or by a widening of our efforts against the north—will bring the kind of peace we seek. The acts of obduracy of our adversaries may bring a wider war upon us; but it should not be of our doing. And even those, on either side, who think greater force the road to peace, should realize that it costs little to try negotiations now, before the war widens further. We address our adversaries, but also ourselves, when we remember the words of Edmund Burke:

> Conciliation failing, force remains; but, force failing, no further hope of reconciliation is left.

And death—Vietnamese or American—is irrevocable.

I do not offer this program as a fixed and frozen formula. They are suggestions to be refined and revised by the critical examination of other minds; enhanced by the imagination of the thoughtful and concerned; molded and reworked by shifting events, the responses of other nations and the passions of peoples whose lives and homes are at stake. I believe, however, they point in a necessary direction, and may help stimulate and encourage the debate and public discourse from which truth is chaotically forged. That, after all, is the most ancient, eminent and cherished obligation of this body.

If we pursue this program it will at least help us to know we have done everything we can be expected to do, that we have let neither pride nor fear deter us in the quest for peace. We owe no less to ourselves, our people, and to those whose land we both protect and ravage. The stakes are very high: they are the home of the child in a jungle village, the hunger of a man driven from his farm, the life of a young American even now preparing for the day's battle. There is great principle, and there is also human anguish. If we can protect the one and prevent the other, then there is no effort too great for us to make.

During the delivery of Senator KENNEDY's speech:

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, would the Senator care to complete his speech or would he tolerate interruptions?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator if he would rather proceed, but I think some of the points he is making would bear a little expansion, particularly the point he just made about the cost of the war to this country.

It is little appreciated, I believe, that much of the unrest, crime, rot, and pollution of our cities, and the alienation of many of our young people, is a subject of great importance and that it is directly influenced by the diversion not only of money but also the attention of the Government to the war. Would the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It seems to me that the point the Senator makes is worthy of expansion and further thought because it is most important.

I do not believe that those who are so eager to pursue this war and expand it in an effort, they believe, to find a way to end the war, have properly evaluated the cost of this war to this country.

I am daily impressed by the added signs of deterioration in our own domestic society, in my own State, in the rejection of simple applications for funds for sewer and water programs. Programs which should be considered basic are being turned down, as are many other programs. I know this is directly attributable to the war.

But above that there is the diversion of the attention of our Government, our people, the Members of this body, from domestic needs to the war, which is of incalculable cost to this country.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree with the Senator.

In addition to the item that the Senator mentioned, we have also had much discussion about the war on poverty. Last year we spent on the war on poverty—a struggle against a national problem facing the United States—approximately the cost of the war in Vietnam for two and a half weeks.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was impressed by an article in a newspaper—yesterday's New York Times, I believe—raising a question about the assumption that appears to have been made by the administration, that the Soviet Union is deeply interested in helping us reach a settlement in this war.

I do not wish to raise a question of the good faith of the Soviets. That is beside the point. The point I wish to make is that both the Soviet Union and China—two other great powers, one already a great power in being, and the other potential—are not bleeding or suffering seriously as a result of this war. But the strength of the United States is being seriously drained in the war. And the administration seems at the same time to believe that upon the United States rests the principal responsibility of maintaining the peace of the world for the foreseeable future—until the United Nations is strengthened. This concerns me very deeply.

The Chinese recently published in one of their newspapers an editorial, which was reprinted in the United States, to the effect that so long as the United States kept its troops at home or in Europe, neither the Chinese nor the Asians had any opportunity to destroy the "imperialistic aggressors," as they refer to us; but now that we have undertaken this vast expansion of our forces, they should be grateful to the Government of the United States, because inevitably such an engagement would seriously weaken the strength of the United States. This concerns me very much, also.

I believe that all Senators should pay close attention to this aspect of the war.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point at this time?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. I followed with interest the observations of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, and I am compelled to voice at least a mild dissent on a common assumption that is sometimes made in the Senate—namely, that if somehow we could avoid appropriations for war or avoid appropriations in defense, we would suddenly have a great deal of money available for the domestic programs at home.

I have not been a Member of the Senate many years; but I have noted from time to time that even when all is quiet, funds that might otherwise have been free are not put into good causes. I believe we really miss the issue when we argue that the money we save in a defense posture would automatically be turned over to education.

I am only raising an objection to this kind of assumption that is often used as an excuse to attack or to support a policy that seems to be unpopular on any given issue. It needs to be said that it really begs the question.

We are all deeply and intensely interested in the consequences of our presence there, in regard to what the Chinese may or may not do, or what our presence does to the Soviet Union. However, through some curious coincidence, things do seem to be coming apart at the seams inside China at this very moment that our presence might ordinarily have galvanized their military endeavors.

I believe that the record will show that what is taking place in China is the consequence of many internal sins. It would be difficult to show that there is not some coincidence with the pressure that has been heaped on China in these circumstances due to the American presence in southeast Asia.

The countries from which I have just returned are largely shifting their attitude because we are there, and their early conviction that the Chinese might be the wave of the future is no longer an obsession with them. I believe that this has made a difference.

I hope that we can assess in realistic terms the searching approaches that the Senator from New York is making, and assess them in terms of the bearing they have on the fundamental policy position of the United States.

I would trust that we not respend this money recklessly in programs that the money will not be appropriated for, anyway. Some Senators are using this as an excuse to oppose programs which they never supported when we had an opportunity to vote on them for their own merits.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. GORE. At the risk and with the reluctance of further interruption of the able Senator from New York, in any assessment of the cost to the United States, it seems to me that we must recognize the potentially greatest cost of all: whether rightly or wrongly, and for reasons difficult for us to understand, our program in southeast Asia is steadily undermining the base of moral leadership of the United States in a distraught world.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to briefly take issue with my good friend, the Senator from Wyoming, on the point he made a moment ago.

It was developed on the floor, in the course of the discussion on the supplemental authorization bill last week and earlier this week—and agreed upon by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and myself—that the Vietnamese war is costing $2 billion a month, or $24 billion a year.

I am utterly unable to believe that if that war ended and the $24 billion were available for other purposes, it would all go to tax reduction. I am confident that much of it would go to the domestic programs which the Senator from New York, the Senator from Wyoming, and I so strongly support.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to refer to what the Senator from New York read a moment ago. He stated:

> It is diverting resources which might have been used to help eliminate American poverty, improve the education of our children and enhance the quality of our national life.

That statement would seem to imply that what we are doing in the way of spending money is improper.

I now read further:

> Of course—we are willing—we must be willing, to pay all these costs if the alternative is surrender or defeat.

To me, it seems that these two sentences are ambivalent. In the one sentence is a protest about the spending because it is diverting moneys that could be used for a better purpose.

The next sentence, however, states that we must be willing to pay all these costs if the alternative is surrender or defeat.

I do not wish to make an argument, but I should like to put the question. The Senator does take the position that we cannot suffer surrender or defeat?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I do.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator also has taken the position, earlier in his statement, that we cannot pull out. Do I state the matter correctly?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator say that we should stop bombing the north?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Would the Senator permit me to continue with my speech? I believe I answered that question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If it is the position of the Senator from New York that we should stop bombing the north, then it is my argument that we should pull out.

We cannot stay in there and allow our young men to be mowed down by guns and men of the north and not give them the protection that comes from bombing.

I shall gladly listen to what the Senator has to say.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator that I, for one, would like to see him continue with his speech because I want to hear the basic facts before he gets to his recommendations.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I appreciate the statement of the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I would not have interrupted the Senator had not the Senator from Arkansas started the discussion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I withdraw the interruption. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I compliment and commend the Senator on a most thoughtful and soul-searching speech. This was not an easy speech to make, but I think it was a necessary speech.

There will be those who will read into it a divergence, a difference, between the Senator from New York and the administration. I wish that they would read the speech carefully, and take note of the calm and dispassionate tone and the provocative discussion which has and will ensue from it.

There is a good deal of agreement between the administration and the Senator from New York; and advice from him, or from any other Member of this body, is not necessarily dissent. It can be very helpful and very fruitful.

The President and the Senator both agree on the need for a suspension of the bombing; but they differ as to how and on what basis it can be accomplished. So those who try to create a gulf had better look at the picture, and recognize that there are a number of difficulties inherent in any discussion affecting the matter. Some of them may be minor, but some are major. I think that the Senator from New York has been candid and searching in what he has had to say. I think he has given us much to think about, and much to digest—not only to the Senate, but to the Congress, the American people, and the administration, because we are all in this together.

This speech has been free of rancor, but it has not been free of concern. Its counsel is worthy of attention. I commend the Senator for facing up to realities, and trying to see beyond today and look forward to tomorrow. His speech deserves every consideration, not because it offers the ultimate in the way of a solution, but because it expresses the uncertainty, the unease, the frustration which the conflict engenders. This is a speech which I think should be given a good deal more consideration than what it will receive from the Members of this body this afternoon, though I think this is about the largest gathering we have had in quite some time to listen to a speech of major significance, in the field of foreign policy..

The Senator says, on page 2:

> Our own course must be subject to a ceaseless and critical examination, not with certainty that change will bring success, but in order that our own people can take comfort and strength from the knowledge that America has taken every step, done every act, and performed every deed within its power to put an end to this distant and ferocious war.

I would say that the President, by and large, is trying to take every road he considers open to him, and travelable. I would say that the President, by and large, is trying to perform every act which he thinks will be in the interest of peace; and insofar as every deed is concerned, there is some imprecision.

Some people seem to think that the statement made by Mr. Wilson at the time of Mr. Kosygin's visit was an indication that Hanoi was willing to talk. It may or it may not have been. But the determination of whether or not it was an acceptable point lies, of course, not with this body, but with the man who, under the Constitution, is charged with the conduct of our foreign policy.

As the Senator from New York has pointed out, the President has traveled many pathways, covered many States, and sent people out to all areas of the world; and so far to no avail. But he has been trying, and he will continue to try, to find a negotiating table, to the end that an honorable peace can be achieved, just as the Senator from New York is trying in his way, just as the Senator from Montana has tried and will continue to try in his way, and just as every Member of this body all of whom are interested in finding an honorable solution to this difficulty.

On page 3, the Senator says:

> Yet our apprehension of this war's agony now joins with other mounting urgencies to command us to seek every opportunity, open every door, and tread every path which may lead to the end of the war.

Let us not permit our apprehension in this respect—and there is apprehension among many of us, myself included—slide into fatalism and into acceptance that nothing constructive can be done and that military action alone will win this war.

If there is anything which will not win the struggle in which we are engaged, it is military action, because no one wins a war any more. Everyone loses.

We can see it in our homes, and we can see it among Vietnamese people, even the so-called hostiles, as the enemy is referred to in Vietnam.

This war will be won only by a political settlement, and along those lines, the Senator from New York has given all of us some provocative suggestions.

I am delighted that he has taken the floor this afternoon. There are many questions that I would like to ask and more comments that I would like to make, but I will close because others are anxious to participate.

This is a good and a sound subject to discuss at any time and at any place, and to do so in the constructive manner which the Senator from New York has undertaken to do this afternoon is most worthy of the Senate in its best moments.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I thank as warmly as I can the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I join with the majority leader in his commendation of this speech.

I think that the Senator from New York has made a very perceptive and a very provocative speech. He is certainly provoking thought about some of the most important aspects of the Vietnam problem.

The junior Senator from New York has rendered a real service to the Senate and to the country in giving great care to the preparation of his statement.

There are one or two points—I shall not delay because I know others wish to commend the Senator also—that particularly interest me.

Midway in his remarks, the Senator suggests that a continuation of the bombing under the circumstances which he describes so well may well prolong rather than shorten the war.

It has been quite obvious from recent newspaper accounts that the theory of those who advocate an—I hesitate to use the word escalation; I am not sure what the real word is—intensification of the bombing is that it will hasten the end of the war.

There is an honest difference of opinion on that.

Another point that particularly interested me—and it would be a critical point—is later in the speech when the Senator said that a negotiated settlement is a compromise.

A compromise settlement would be quite closely dependent upon and tied to the previous point relating to the expansion or cessation of bombing. I believe what is implicit in this statement is the difference between a settlement involving a compromise which, as the Senator says, has a degree of satisfaction to both sides, and a settlement achieved by pressure which finally becomes irresistible and in effect results in a surrender which may satisfy one side and destroy the other.

Does not the Senator believe this is a very critical point?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I do. I understood that the position of the U.S. Government was that we should look for a negotiated settlement, and that we were not trying—as Gen. Maxwell Taylor explained so eloquently before the Senator's committee—to achieve another surrender such as on the battleship *Missouri*.

The majority leader said that military action will not win the war, but that we would eventually have to go to the negotiating table.

The reason I stated that the bombing of the north is prolonging the war is that statements have been made that if we suspend the bombing, we can go to the negotiating table now and perhaps resolve the differences that exist between the North Vietnamese, the South Vietnamese, the National Liberation Front, and the United States.

That is why I think it makes sense to go to the negotiating table and at least make an effort to find a solution to the problem.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator that because we stopped the bombing for 37 days approximately a year ago a stop now would not necessarily convey the same message this year. Circumstances are quite different. We have many more men there, and quite obviously there is less opportunity—I do not think any opportunity—for the other side to gain a victory. Today such a stop might result in going to the negotiating table.

I think the Senator makes the point very well.

I think the Senator has made those points extremely well. I find myself in agreement with the major points.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I also commend the Senator from New York for the efforts which he has expended in trying to find ways and means to bring the war to an end.

I am quite pleased that the Senator from New York has ascribed to the President a similar purpose and that his words today are intended to be supplementary in the search for some avenue of escape from the problem that confronts us.

I think, however, that we ought to examine some aspects of the whole problem for a moment.

On page 5 of the Senator's speech, there is the underscored statement:

> Therefore, I propose that we test the sincerity of the statement by Premier Kosygin and others asserting that if the bombardment of the North is halted, negotiations would begin—

On page 6, the Senator from New York said:

> Let us place on the Soviet Union, on North Vietnam, the obligation to demonstrate the sincerity of their declarations by coming to the conference table.

I ask the Senator from New York to either confirm or reject my narration of temporary pauses in the bombing ordered by the President of the United States. There were 5 days of the stoppage of the bombing in 1965 with no evidence of deescalation on the part of North Vietnam.

Would the Senator say that that is correct?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I do not have the information.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in that regard?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I do not have the information. Perhaps the Senator from Rhode Island has the answer.

Mr. PELL. I think press reports and the public records have shown that an effort to engage in discussion was made by the North Vietnamese Government, a matter of hours before the bombing was resumed at that time. Because of the timelag, it did not come to any fruition.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, does the Senator from Rhode Island state that there was a deescalation on the part of North Vietnam in response to the President's order that we stop the bombing?

Mr. PELL. There was no escalation. There was a demarche.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In 1966 the President ordered a cessation of the bombing and waited 37 days for some sign of deescalation on the part of the North. There was no sign of deescalation.

The Senator made a statement to that effect in his speech.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I think what I said in my speech was that we suspended bombing for 37 days.

Mr. LAUSCHE. At Christmas 1966, a bit more than 2 months ago, we stopped the bombing again and waited for a sign of the reduction of action on the part of the North Vietnamese. There was no sign of deescalation.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I have no information to the contrary.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Again on New Year's of 1967, President Johnson ordered a cessation of the bombing and waited to see if there would be some semblance of a stoppage on the part of North Vietnam, and there was not.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I have no information on that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then we go down to the Buddhist holidays, in February 1967, and the President ordered a cessation of the bombing. It continued for 6 days without any sign of deescalation on the part of the North Vietnamese.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. A number of those were periods of cease-fire.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to recite something further, and I believe that this is very significant.

The North Vietnam Ambassador to France, Mai Van Bo, according to a New York Times report of February 23, stated in Paris:

> The United States would have to declare at the outset that the halt was permanent and unconditional.

Also, Ho Chi Minh sent a message to the Vatican, to the Pope, and in that message stated:

> The United States must unconditionally and definitively stop the bombing.

That message was sent on February 13. We stopped the bombing, by way of pause, five times. Ho Chi Minh says that we must stop it permanently and unconditionally as a prerequisite of Ho Chi Minh going to the negotiating table.

I cannot subscribe to that course, and I wonder what the Senator from New York has to stay in response to these two important messages.

I wish to repeat that I know that the Senator from New York is attempting to find some way of reaching an understanding. But how far can we continue going without endangering our own men?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Did the Senator from Ohio describe the message to the Pope, a moment ago, as saying, "permanently"?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. What words did he use?

Mr. LAUSCHE. He said:

> The United States must unconditionally and definitively stop the bombing.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Did he use the word "permanently"?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No, he did not. But the Ambassador of North Vietnam used it in the statement he made in Paris. But "definitively" means an end. When you define a thing, that is the alpha and the omega, and that is what he meant by this statement.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. It is of interest, though, that he in fact did not use the word "permanently."

I go back to the 37 days' pause. In some of the other instances referred to by the Senator from Ohio there was a ceasefire, and both sides cut down on the rate of incidents. But, going back to the 37 days, we suspended the bombing to try to get negotiations. We suspended the bombing for 37 days a year ago in order to get to the negotiating table. We could not get to the negotiating table. What they have said to us now is that they will go to the negotiating table if we will suspend the bombing.

We were willing to do it a year ago. We went day after day without any assurances from the Vietnamese that they would come to the negotiating table. I recognize that. They were not prepared to come to the negotiating table; they did not do it. We suspended the bombing for 37 days. That is what we were willing to do a year ago. Why are we not willing to do it today?

Premier Kosygin, of the Soviet Union, did not use the word "permanently" when he went on satellite television, which was broadcast to the United

States. He said that all the United States has to do is to suspend the bombing and the North Vietnamese would go to the negotiating table. Mr. Podgorny said the same thing 2 days ago. Why today are we not willing to do what we were willing to do a year ago?

If we cannot reach an agreement with them, we can always go back to the war, go back to the fighting and the killing.

It seems to me that if it was worthwhile a year ago, it is worthwhile today.

Mr. LAUSCHE. All that would have to be done is for North Vietnam, through any of these men, to state that they are not asking for a permanent and unconditional cessation of the bombing, and I believe that our Government would be willing to listen, and I would expect it to listen.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. How could one have anybody more important than the Premier of the Soviet Union? He stated it publicly. He never used the word "permanently."

Mr. LAUSCHE. On February 23, the New York Times, in a report by Henry Tenor, carried the statement of Mai Van Bo that the United States would have to declare at the outset that the halt was permanent and unconditional. So, there is an uncertainty in the matter.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the Senator from New York will have to concede that President Johnson has leaned backward in trying to get them to the negotiating table.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I think he has.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Five times he stopped the bombing, each time waiting and begging them to give some signs of deescalation, and none ever appeared.

Now, the Senator also stated——

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. May I make a comment on that point?

I mention in my statement that there have been conflicting reports in connection with some of these matters. I recognize the fact that the word "permanent" has been used on occasions. But there have been enough statements, including the one to the Pope, which have not used the word "permanent."

Mr. Kosygin being such an important figure within the Communist countries, when he stated that, it seems to me that the United States would merely accept what Mr. Kosygin said.

I go back to the time of the Cuban missile crisis. On Friday night, the U.S. Government received one message; on Saturday an entirely different message. President Kennedy accepted the message on Friday, and we got to negotiations, and the missiles were removed from Cuba.

I am suggesting that we accept Mr. Kosygin at his word, and that we do the same thing we were willing to do a year ago, and we would lose very little by doing so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I listened to every word that Kosygin said. He was on television for 1 hour. For 53 minutes he discussed the relationship of Russia and China, Germany, and Poland, and other issues. In the last 7 minutes, questions were put to him about South Vietnam. He began his statement by saying, in effect, that the United States is the aggressor, the United States must unconditionally stop the bombing.

Well, I was deeply disappointed by what he said, and I think Kosygin could clear the misunderstanding, and he could possibly, if he wished to do so, get Ho Chi Minh to clear this misunderstanding.

In any event, I am grateful to the Senator from New York.

Mr. McGEE. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from New York on the point about the suspension of the bombing and the signal from Moscow.

Does the Senator have some information that would suggest that the signal the President asked for last Christmas, the signal that was asked for during Tet, is the only indication we needed that a suspension might be followed through?

The Secretary of State has said this again and again, and I am wondering if there is such a signal.

The Senator from New York talks about Mr. Kosygin being a very important man. I think Mr. Ho Chi Minh is probably a little more important in this kind of a sequence of events. Has there been such a signal?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I do not know exactly what signal we are awaiting.

I go back to the communication to the Pope by Mr. Ho Chi Minh. When he communicated with the Pope, he did not use the word "permanent" in connection with the bombing.

My only point is that we are actually interested in negotiations. A signal is only something which will ultimately lead to negotiations. That is where we want to end up.

What I am suggesting is what we were willing to do a year ago when we said we wanted negotiations and we suspended bombing at that time. I do not know what the signal was then. I understand we did that, and all I am suggesting is that we do the same thing and get them to the negotiating table.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator knows the experiences we have already had from the steps that have been taken. I hope that this is the same kind of signal that the President has suggested and thereby avoid public impatience or disappointment from a demand that we go further. There is a sensitive political climate that has been aggravated over the past years because of early efforts. But the President has made clear that we do not ask for any neon light to be flashed; that we do not ask for a broadcast from Hanoi; just some quiet, off-the-record, behind-the-scenes indication that if we were to stop the bombing there would be a disposition to try to work out the terms and conditions or ground rules for sitting down. That is why I do not see the significance of a Kosygin statement unless there is some signal that he is ready to communicate, with the assurance that he will follow through. We are not playing strictly with the intentions of Hanoi, but also the feelings in our own country about a war that is exceedingly difficult and frustrating because of the consequences of a nuclear age.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator has said there is not a neon sign. I do not know what the signal is, if it is not those that have been given in the last 2 or 3 weeks—that they will come to the negotiating table if we suspend the bombing.

Mr. McGEE. That the Vietnamese have given.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The North Vietnamese; Ho Chi Minh and his communication to the Pope, as one example. Beyond that it seems to me perhaps they want a signal from us.

Mr. McGEE. It would not be a sufficient signal from us to say we'll stop the bombing and ask for no terms or preconditions. This, it seems to me, is still lacking.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. What concerns me is that this is something we were willing to accept a year ago. I suggest we say we are going toward the negotiating table right away; that we would bring in international authority right away to see if they are sending more troops and supplies to the South, and that a report be made through the United Nations and the American people that will be clear to the people of our country and the world that it is the North Vietnamese, the Russians and the Communists who refuse to come to the negotiating table; that the United States is willing to go; and it seems to me that our position is then more tenable than it is at present.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If it is a fact that Ho Chi Minh is demanding unconditional and permanent cessation of bombing, does the Senator from New York suggest that we stop bombing?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. As I say in my statement, we cannot stop bombing permanently. We do not know what the situation will be in the future; and we cannot, as I make clear in my statement, bind ourselves to what steps we might take if they take further action. They seem to understand this. That is why they have not asked for it and why Mr. Ho Chi Minh has not asked for it. There are conflicting reports. I suggest that we say, "We will accept your offer to negotiate. Will you be there?"

Mr. LAUSCHE. I take it that the Senator from New York would also include the fact about what our position should be about keeping commitments, and stopping the Communists from expanding by aggression on the basis of what President Kennedy did, the statements which he made; the fact that there were 600 American troops in Vietnam in 1961 and 20,000 in 1963. President Kennedy felt the need of stopping the expansion of communism by aggression and violence. Am I correct in that?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I think that all of us feel that way.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I wish to commend the able Senator from New York for bringing to the floor of the Senate the discussion on this important subject. I certainly share the view of the able majority leader when he said he does not think there is very much difference here between the position taken by the able Senator from New York and by the administration on the subject of bombing.

As I read the statement of the Senator, and the heart of the statement, I noted the following:

> Therefore, I propose that we test the sincerity of the statements by Premier Kosygin and others asserting that if the bombardment of the North is halted, negotiations would begin—by halting the bombardment and saying we are ready to negotiate within the week; making it clear that discussions cannot continue for a prolonged period without an agreement that neither side will substantially increase the size of the war in South Vietnam—by infiltration or reinforcement.

It is my understanding that the administration was indirectly in touch with Mr. Kosygin during this last pause in our bombing of North Vietnam, at the time of the New Year Tet, and that during this period we indicated that we would like to see some indication from Hanoi as to their intention, some signal, as referred to earlier by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], as to Hanoi's intention regarding the movement of supplies and troops into the south—some kind of signal to indicate a military slowing down on their side, and that if there was such a signal we would be willing to discuss, and we could talk about extending the bombing pause.

It is my understanding that our message came loud and clear to the other side but that we did not get any such signal, any assurance from the other side that anything would come of a continuation of the bombing pause.

I gather that this is in part what the able Senator has in mind in the quotation. Am I correct?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. On the contrary, as I understand, during this period of the Tet cessation of the bombing, there was a substantial movement of supplies and equipment southward into areas where they could support forces fighting in South Vietnam, about enough to support four divisions of the North Vietnamese for over 50 days, and there was no signal, no indication from them that they were about to cut back on their infiltration.

The question is: Should we after this very short period of time have another bombing pause? Is that not basically what we are discussing?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I wish to ask the Senator from Washington: Did we supply our men and material during that time?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct but we were not backstopping the invasion of another country. We were in South Vietnam at the request of the South Vietnamese Government. This has been, of course, the position of three American administrations.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. But the fact is that during this period of time, while they were resupplying, as I understand the description of the Senator from Washington, we were also.

Mr. JACKSON. Yes; but they were getting into an improved position to push supplies into South Vietnam in support of their aggression. We had suspended our bombing of North Vietnam.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. We were pushing supplies into South Vietnam.

Mr. JACKSON. Yes; but there is no question that the two actions cannot be equated.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. When we talk about a signal, I do not know what signal we are waiting for.

What I have said is that they will come to the negotiating table if we suspend bombing. We were not asking for more than that a year ago. We were not sending a message to them. We just suspended the bombing for a week, 2 weeks, 3 weeks, 4 weeks, and during that time we were not waiting for anything.

I suggest that we take the same course of action, but with an added ingredient this time. They say they will come to the negotiating table. Let us see whether they will come to the negotiating table or not. I suggest in my statement that we have an international authority and adequate protection for the United States if they use that time to change the situation in the south, and we can always go back. But I do not understand, when the chances are open to us to accept what we were willing to accept a year ago, why we will not accept them at this time.

Mr. JACKSON. It seems to me, though, that what is now being suggested amounts to what we were doing just a few days ago in connection with the New Year Tet pause. In addition, we have the situation where, militarily, the North Vietnamese are really being hurt now. They have even brought in women to support and supply their forces. They are taking a real beating. It seems to me that there should be some kind of signal of the military action to be taken by the other side before we suspend our bombing again.

We have made it clear that we are not out to destroy the regime of North Vietnam. It seems to me that what my good friend is saying here is essentially what we have already tried to do.

Let me also say, the Senator makes a number of excellent points. For example, I completely agree with the Senator's thought when he says:

> An international group should be asked to inspect the borders and ports of the country to report any further escalation.

My recollection is that the United States some time ago expressed its readiness to accept the stationing of international forces between the opposing sides in Vietnam, as suggested by the President of India, but Hanoi has rejected this suggestion. I agree with that point of yours, however.

With respect to the reference to the United Nations, the United States has urged the consideration of the Vietnam problem by the United Nations and now has a resolution pending in the United Nations. The President called upon the United Nations to do everything in its power to find some way to resolve this dispute.

We fully support the idea that the Government of South Vietnam should be elected by the people of South Vietnam in free elections and we have supported the action taken by the Government of South Vietnam to extend amnesty and the hand of reconciliation to all South Vietnamese.

The Administration is interested in discussions which are not a cover for a full-scale continuation of the conflict by the other side. Alternatively, it has repeatedly attempted to engage the other side in a consideration of mutual steps of military deescalation. I understand that such questions as the cessation of infiltration and a limitation on augmentation of forces have in fact been explored without result. I have no doubt that the administration would be glad to see the authorities in Hanoi take hold of any of the many handles which have been offered to them in order to move the situation toward peace.

I do not think we are far apart here, so far as what needs to be done. The question is whether we should now do exactly what we attempted to do just a short time ago by suspending the bombing of the north.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. We did not do that several weeks ago. That was the Tet, in which there was a cease-fire on both sides. After the Tet was over—24 or 48 hours later—we began bombing again.

Mr. JACKSON. I understand that there was a lot of discussion going on and a lot of communications on this very point between our Government and the representatives involved, and that there was no signal of any kind except a clear, stepped-up activity in the movement of supplies and equipment in support of continued activity in South Vietnam. That was the only signal.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Again, I come back to the fact that maybe negotiations are not possible, but it is important that we try to get to the negotiating table. The way we will get the war over is to get to the negotiating table. We talk about suffering heavy casualties. I am aware of that. It might be that there are those within the administration who feel that we are doing better militarily now, so that it would be better not to come to the negotiating table at the present time. I have seen that written. However, it is my feeling that it would be better to come to the negotiating table, to see if we can reach some agreement.

Our objectives, as Secretary McNamara has pointed out, are limited objectives. Perhaps at the present moment, perhaps in the next 24 hours, perhaps over some longer period of time, we could achieve our limited objectives, thus saving misery and pain to the people of South Vietnam, as well as our own people. That is my only point, I might say to the Senator from Washington. It is worth while trying.

Mr. JACKSON. It must be said that we have been trying. I feel sincerely that we have been trying. It seems to me that every avenue is open to the other side, a way which would not be humiliating to them, to indicate the military action they would take if our bombing is to stop and we are going to start talking.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Why do we not suspend the bombing, and say that we will come to the negotiating table, as our spokesmen have said? Why do we, the greatest Nation in the world, have to wait for them to put up a neon sign?

Mr. JACKSON. I am sure that the Senator will agree the only signal out of Hanoi in this regard has been most equivocal.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. No, no—the Senator from Ohio read a communication to the Pope. There is Ho Chi Minh, and we also have Kosygin, and North Vietnam depends upon the Soviet Union. They say, "We accept your terms, and we will come to the negotiating table." Well, I do not understand, and I do not know what we will lose, whether one is a hawk or a dove, or a dawk or a hove, I do not know what anyone would lose by going to the negotiating table, and if we cannot achieve a peaceful settlement, and they insist on trying to take over South Vietnam by force, then we will have to go back and the fighting will go on.

Mr. JACKSON. I am not a hawk or a dove. I want to be sure, in this situation, however, that we do not become a pigeon. I am concerned that if we do not handle this right, we can get maneuvered into a position of weakness which will only encourage Hanoi to believe they can win if they just keep at it.

We have certainly tried everything possible to encourage a positive signal from the other side. We have paused in our bombing. We have waited for them. We have sent every kind of signal to them. We have been doing basically what my good friend from New York has outlined in his speech.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I do not know what we lose. What I do not understand is, I do not know what we lose by taking this step and saying to them, "We will come to the negotiating table."

We were willing to do it without such a statement by them a year ago. A year ago they said they wanted four points. They said, for example, that American troops had to get out of South Vietnam as a precondition to negotiations. Nevertheless, we suspended the bombing. They never came to the negotiating table, of course. Now they have come full circle and said that they will come to the negotiating table if we would just do what we did a year ago.

Mr. JACKSON. That is just about what we did a few days ago during the Tet. We stopped the bombing during that period, and made it clear that we would discuss extending the period of the pause if we could get some signal out of them of the military action they would take if our bombing was to be suspended. That was just a few days ago. That is why I wonder whether it is sound national policy to try the same course again that brought no positive results so short a time ago.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. We did not do it a few days ago. That was a cease-fire on both sides. They were supposed not to shoot at us and we were supposed not to shoot at them. After it was over, we turned back and bombed them and they shot at us.

Mr. JACKSON. There was a cessation of the bombing, however.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. On both sides. There was a cessation of hostilities, supposedly not completely effective but we did not take any unilateral action in connection with this matter. But the upshot of it was that we kept saying we want to have a signal. But first, I do not know what the signal is; and second, I think that what we want is not such a little signal—but a rather big signal. They have withdrawn their four points and have said that American troops do not have to get out of Vietnam and then they have said, "We are willing to sit down at the negotiating table." That is more than we asked a year ago.

Mr. JACKSON. A bigger signal is the fact that they made a stepped up effort and a continuing effort to position themselves to resupply their forces in the south. That was not, I suggest, a hopeful signal.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. We did the same thing.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr President, I had asked the President at a dinner on February 18 last to indicate the administration's position on the bombing, and I should like to place that letter in the RECORD at this point

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, would the Senator from Washington mind telling us what is in that letter?

Mr. JACKSON. I will be happy to read it to the Senate.

Mr. SMATHERS. I hope the Senator will read it.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, this letter is dated March 1, 1967, and it is addressed to me by the President.

Will the Senator from New York yield further to me for the purpose of reading this letter?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Washington for that purpose.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the letter reads, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 1, 1967.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: In further reference to our discussions at dinner on the evening of the 18th concerning the reasons for and effects of bombing, I wish to review for you the following.

We are bombing North Viet Nam because it is violating two solemn international agreements. In 1954 Hanoi agreed that North Viet Nam would not be "used for the resumption of hostilities or to further an aggressive policy."

In 1962 Hanoi agreed to withdraw all its military forces from Laos; to refrain from reintroducing such forces; and not to use the territory of Laos to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries.

Let me quote to you the recommendation made by General Maxwell Taylor to President Kennedy in his report of November 3, 1961, after Hanoi had violated the Geneva Declaration of 1954 but before the Geneva Declaration of 1962 was finally negotiated.

"While we feel that the program recommended represents those measures which should be taken in our present knowledge of the situation in Southeast Asia, I would not suggest that it is the final word. Future needs beyond this program will depend upon the kind of settlement we obtain in Laos and the manner in which Hanoi decides to adjust its conduct to that settlement. If the Hanoi decision is to continue the irregular war declared on South Viet-Nam in 1959 with continued infiltration and covert support of guerrilla bands in the territory of our ally, we will then have to decide whether to accept as legitimate the continued guidance, training and support of a guerrilla war across an international boundary, while the attacked react only inside their borders. . . .

"It is my judgment and that of my colleagues that the United States must decide how it will cope with Khrushchev's 'wars of liberation' which are really para-wars of guerrilla aggression. This is a new and dangerous Communist technique which bypasses our traditional political and military responses. While the final answer lies beyond the scope of this report, it is clear to me that the time may come in our relations to Southeast Asia when we must declare our intention to attack the source of guerrilla aggression in North Viet-Nam and impose on the Hanoi Government a price for participating in the current war which is commensurate with the damage being inflicted on its neighbors to the south."

Not for one day after the Geneva Declaration of 1962 was signed did Hanoi meet its commitment or honor its earlier commitment of 1954. Aggression against South Viet Nam was continued throughout 1962, 1963, and 1964. Its forces were never withdrawn from Laos and Laos was violated in order to attack South Viet Nam.

When I became President and surveyed the problem faced by our nation, I reserved judgment on the decision which General Taylor forecast in 1961 we might have to make. But the fact was that the North Vietnamese continued illegally to infiltrate arms and men across international frontiers. And in 1964 they radically expanded this course of action. The trails become roads. Bands of infiltrators became regular military units.

Neither of the co-chairmen of the Geneva Conference—Great Britain and the Soviet Union—proved able to stop this violation; nor did the three members of the International Control Commission—India, Canada, and Poland.

With this failure of the international machinery designed to enforce the Geneva agreements we were thrown back, therefore, on our treaty responsibilities. Under the SEATO Treaty, presented to the Senate by President Eisenhower and ratified overwhelmingly, we had agreed that in the face of "armed attack in the treaty area" we would "act to meet the common danger."

By February 1965 it was unmistakably clear there was armed attack in the most literal sense: South Vietnam was almost lost to that armed attack. And in that month, on the recommendation of the National Security Council, I decided that we had to "meet the common danger" by bringing our air power to bear against the source of the aggression.

We never believed aerial attack on North Vietnam would, alone, end the war. We did, however, have three objectives.

The first was to back our fighting men and our fighting allies by demonstrating that the aggressor could not illegally bring hostile arms and men to bear against them from the security of a sanctuary.

Second, we sought to impose on North Viet Nam a cost for violating its international agreements.

Third, we sought to limit or raise the cost of bringing men and supplies to bear against the South.

All three of these important objectives have been achieved.

First, you should note that the military leaders now responsible for the safety and morale of our men in the field, without exception, back our bombing of the North. The same is true of the military and political leaders of those fighting side by side with us; that is to say, the leaders of Australia, Korea,

> New Zealand, Philippines, Thailand, and Viet Nam. They all know that it is right and necessary for us to refuse to accept North Viet Nam as a sanctuary at a time when the government in Hanoi is explicitly violating its international commitments and conducting aggression across international borders.
>
> Second, we are, with remarkably limited cost in civilian lives, imposing a major cost on North Viet Nam for its violation of international agreements.
>
> Our attacks on military targets in North Viet Nam have diverted about half a million men to cope with effects of our attacks. They are repairing the lines of supply and are engaged in anti-aircraft and coastal defense. This figure approximates the total number of men we now have fighting in Southeast Asia. It is not much less than the number of men South Viet Nam has had to mobilize to deal with the guerrilla attack in the South.
>
> At the cost of about 500 gallant American airmen killed, captured, or missing, we are bringing to bear on North Viet Nam a burden roughly equivalent to that which the Communists are imposing through guerrilla warfare on the South—and we are doing it with far fewer civilian casualties in the North.
>
> Finally, the bombing of North Viet Nam has raised the cost of bringing an armed man or a ton of supplies illegally across the border from the North to the South. Substantial casualties are inflicted on infiltrators and substantial tonnages of supplies are destroyed en route. Those who now reach the South arrive after harassment which lowers their effectiveness as reinforcements.
>
> The bombing in the North is an action undertaken by your Government only after the most careful reflection. It is a response to a serious and systematic and protracted violation of international agreements. It is having significant consequences for those who chose to violate the agreements. It is an integral part of our total policy which aims not to destroy North Viet Nam but to force Hanoi to end its aggression so that the people of South Viet Nam can determine their own future without coercion.
>
> Both the reasons for—and the results of—the bombing of North Viet Nam make it imperative that we continue to use this instrument of support for our men and our allies. It will end when the other side is willing to take equivalent action as part of a serious effort to end this war and bring peace to the people of Southeast Asia.
>
> I take no satisfaction from the number of infiltrators killed on their way to South Viet Nam, from the number of trucks or of boats or of railroad cars destroyed or the tons of supplies destroyed. I take no satisfaction from the suffering of the people of North Viet Nam. I take no satisfaction from the fact that they have had to abandon their plans for economic and social development. I repeat what I said in Baltimore in April 1965—I look forward to the day when the government and people of North Viet Nam can join, in peace, their fellows in Southeast Asia in developing and modernizing that region so full of energy and resources and promise. And on that day they will have—if they wish—the support of the United States in providing for their people an environment of progress. But right now I wish friend and neutral and adversary to know that we shall persist with our operations in the South—we shall persist with our operations in the North—until those who launched this aggression are prepared to move seriously to reinstall the agreements whose violation has brought the scourge of war to Southeast Asia.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

I wish to thank my able colleague for his thoughtful remarks here. I think this dialog and discussion are certainly useful and helpful to us in the Senate in trying to discharge our duties. I know that my colleague has spent much time and effort in preparing his statement, and, as I said, I find many of his points to be excellent.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator. I heard his speech several days ago, which I think contributed tremendously to this subject.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. I commend the Senator from New York for a splendid speech, which certainly went into this subject in great depth. I listened to the Senator from Washington. As I understood his statement, there are substantial differences in the approaches between what we are now doing and what he suggests. If I understood the Senator correctly, he is suggesting that we are not doing now what we voluntarily did a year ago during the 37-day period in the bombing lull.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. As I said in my statement, the President of the United States has taken many initiatives toward finding a peaceful solution for the problem in Vietnam. I also suggested a course of action which I think would be productive. I would rather not characterize it.

Mr. HARTKE. Without characterization, the Senator from New York makes the statement that we are not going to do today what we voluntarily did at the end of 1965 and 1966, during the 37-day bombing lull. Is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Yes.

Mr. HARTKE. As I understand the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Washington, the administration is waiting for some type of signal, and the Senator from New York feels there has been a signal. Or am I wrong? They are signals which are different from what happened before. Is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. As I understood what the Senator from Wyoming has stated, and as I understand the President's position, he is awaiting some further signal before we will take the step of suspending the bombing.

Mr. HARTKE. And the idea is to bring peace. What the Senator from New York has done is to make one type of suggestion which he thinks would be a step toward peace. Is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Yes.

Mr. HARTKE. I do not suppose the Senator from New York is even inferring—in fact, he states to the contrary—that even if we followed the suggestion given here today, the net result could still not be a failure?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is correct. I believe, under the circumstances, with the world situation as it is, and the fact that the war is now expanding and accelerating, it is worth while making this effort toward finding peaceful answers. I think it makes some sense.

Mr. HARTKE. I think the Senator makes a significant statement when he says that the war is expanding and accelerating. That fact concerns me, as well as many other thinking Americans. We are concerned about further escalation of the war and the fact that the opportunity which may be present today may go beyond us.

But the thing that does bother me is these statements that there is this great area of consensus here about what we are doing, when there appears to me to be no such consensus.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. May I say to the Senator from Indiana, it does not worry me.

Mr. HARTKE. It concerns me greatly. I am not seeking for consensus. I am looking for a way in which we can bring this horrible war to an end. I commend the Senator again for bringing this suggestion to the floor of the Senate. I am hopeful there will be some action before, again, it is too late.

I do not wish to ascribe to the Senator any attitudes or actions of any nature whatsoever that he does not ascribe to himself. I will take responsibility for all the other assertions and characterizations.

The fact remains that we still have some of these characterizations described by other people. They were described about a year ago by Prime Minister Pearson of Canada, when he suggested a cessation of bombing. There are other persons whom I consider highly qualified individuals, who write for the papers, such as Marquis Childs, for example, and Walter Lippmann's statements. I am not saying that they in any way represent the views of the Senator from New York, but I am saying that they represent a view so closely allied to his that I am hopeful others will help confirm it in the future.

Mr. President, the language of the Mansfield amendment adopted yesterday states that Congress declares:

> Its support of efforts . . . to prevent an expansion of the war in Vietnam and to bring that conflict to an end through a negotiated settlement.

In the pursuit of that objective, which has been stated in other language time after time by the President and the administrative officers of this Government, it is essential that no opportunity be lost through lack of its pursuit.

Mr. President, it appears that there may very well be an opportunity which has been too lightly dismissed. Walter Lippmann in this morning's Washington Post, in a column entitled "Do Not Ignore the Soviets," has called attention very clearly to the situation.

Briefly the facts are that Premier Kosygin and President Podgorny have both stated unequivocally that if we were to suspend bombing of North Vietnam peace talks would follow, that this would be the reciprocal action following our initial move of bombing cessation. Secretary Rusk has said, however, that North Vietnam demands that the bombing be "unconditional and permanent," qualifications which do not appear in the Russian interpretation. As Mr. Lippmann puts it:

> It is hard to understand why Secretary Rusk refuses to deal seriously with such a momentous statement made by both the Prime Minister and the President of the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, if the will of the Senate as expressed in yesterday's vote has meaning, it would certainly support the serious exploration of this strong indication that a unilateral halt of our bombing would be fruitful. I urge upon Secretary Rusk the desirability of undertaking such explorations.

Mr. President, the probability that our cessation of bombing would meet with a response of his kind is further reported in a column by Marquis Childs which appeared in the Washington Post on Februray 20. Mr. Childs, writing from Ottawa, Canada, states that as much as a year ago the same position was relayed to our Government from Hanoi through Mr. Chester Ronning. It may be recalled that I brought the Ronning peace mission to the attention of the Senate in a speech of last June 1966. It was in effect torpedoed by our escalation of bombing with the Hanoi-Haiphong strikes at that time.

The message from Hanoi even then, which has been reiterated now by the Russian leaders, was that "If the United States will stop bombing in North Vietnam talks looking to peace can begin."

If this were done, according to Canadian officials—and it should be remembered that Canada is one of the three International Control Commission members and therefore has unusual access to Hanoi—then, after an interval, a signal would come through any one of a half-dozen channels for talks between the two sides.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article entitled "A Canadian View of the Bombing," written by Marquis Childs, and published in the Washington Post of February 20, 1967, and an article entitled "Do Not Ignore the Soviets," written by Walter Lippmann and published in the Washington Post of March 2, 1967.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 20, 1967]

A Canadian View of the Bombing

(By Marquis Childs)

Ottawa, Canada.—From Hanoi relayed by one of Canada's senior diplomats came a message nearly a year ago that puts recent events in a revealing light. The mesage was: If the United States will stop bombing in North Vietnam talks looking to peace can begin.

Chester Ronning, with a long experience in China and Southeast Asia, had sent this word. He was convinced, and this was transmitted immediately to the State Department in Washington, that if the bombing could be halted unconditionally the first step in a long and difficult road to peace would be taken.

Since this first breakthrough the same statement in even more unequivocal terms has come directly from Ho Chi Minh and other leading figures in the Hanoi government. Against the background of 12 years of service on the International Control Commission for Vietnam plus several separate missions to Hanoi, there is a strong conviction in the Canadian government that this first step could mean a start toward peace. That is why, from the top on down through apparently a wide segment of opinion in the country, there is profound regret that the United States resumed the bombing of the North after the brief lunar New Year truce.

"We understand," the American visitor is told, "that it would be hard for you to stop the bombing while it was going on. But since it had been stopped why couldn't you have waited another 10 days or two weeks? Then if there was no sign of Hanoi's willingness to talk you could have resumed."

The elite group within Canada's small but distinguished Foreign Service that has devoted so much time and thought to the problem of peace in Vietnam tries to put the bombing of the North in the perspective of Hanoi. The bombing is above and beyond the American intervention in South Vietnam. It is a violation of the territorial integrity of North Vietnam just as much as a land invasion would be.

One of the senior officials in the ministry of external affairs expressed it as follows: He compared the war in Vietnam to the civil war in Spain in the late '30s when both Communists and fascist powers intervened. Suppose at that time, he says, the Soviet Union as a further step in intervention had bombed Berlin. This is how Hanoi regards the bombing of the North; they cannot retaliate by bombing Washington but they can make it a precondition of negotiation that the attacks across the 17th Parallel stop.

What would happen if and when the United States should stop the bombing unconditionally? After an interval, the reply, is, a signal would come through any one of a half-dozen channels for talks between the two sides. The first such tentative signal had come in January, 1966, after the month-long pause and just before the bombing was resumed, it is believed here.

One phase of the debate over bombing in the North is whether America would have to announce a permanent end of bombing. In his reply to the peace appeal of Pope Paul, Ho used the French word "definitivement," which is translated as permanent. But in an interview on Jan. 28 the North Vietnamese Foreign Minister did not use "definitivement" in his call for unconditional cessation nor did Mai Van Bo, North Vietnam's Delegate General in Paris, in a statement on Jan. 6.

Because he called for a stop to the bombing in a speech in Philadelphia a year ago Canada's Prime Minister Lester Pearson is accused of being "anti-American." President Johnson was furious that Pearson made such an appeal in the United States. When recently it was proposed from Ottawa that the Prime Minister pay an informal visit to the President on his way to a Caribbean vacation the response came back, fine, Mr. Johnson will be delighted to see you, but steer clear of Vietnam.

The effort Canada has put into the ICO, the last vestige of the controls written into the Geneva accords of 1954, is certainly not anti-American. Taking the talents of Canada's abler young diplomats, it is an attempt to keep the door to negotiations open at least a crack. Sheltered in crude huts in the Demilitarized Zone representatives of the three-man ICC—India and Poland in addition to Canada—are trying to preserve a remnant of neutrality against incursions into the zone by each side.

Minister of external affairs Paul Martin is considering asking Ronning, now retired from the Foreign Service, to go back to Hanoi. Zealously, persistently Martin has searched for an opening that could mean a first small start on negotiation. And, surely, Canadians tell the visitor, this is in the interest of the United States caught in the quagmire of Vietnam.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 2, 1967]

Today and Tomorrow: Do Not Ignore the Soviets

(By Walter Lippmann)

If the President is really anxious to promote negotiations in Vietnam, he would do well to tell Secretary Rusk to clear up the difference between what the Russians say about Hanoi's position and what we are saying. Premier Kosygin, at his news conference on Feb. 9, and President Podgorny, at a state dinner in Moscow on Monday, said that peace talks would follow the suspension of U.S. bombing in North Vietnam. These two highly placed Soviet spokesmen tell us that the reciprocal action in return for suspending the bombing is the opening of peace negotiations.

Secretary Rusk, on the other hand, cites North Vietnamese spokesmen who, unlike the Russians, insist that the suspension of bombing must be "unconditional and permanent." Just what Secretary Rusk thinks the word "permanent" means, he did not spell out. But he seems to be saying that Hanoi demands the right to escalate the war in the South without interference by the United States bombers in the North. Can this really be what Hanoi and Moscow mean? It is hard to believe that it is. For the demand that the North have the right to wage unlimited war in the South while the United States can wage only a limited war in the North is an absurdity.

The word "permanent," when used in Hanoi, is, to be sure, an ambiguous and confusing word. It cannot mean anything very definite. The Soviet spokesmen do not use it. They say that the suspension of bombing will "clear the way" to a conference dealing with the whole problem of Vietnam. It is hard to understand why Secretary Rusk refuses to deal seriously with such a momentous statement made by both the Prime Minister and the President of the Soviet Union.

Until he has dealt with the Soviet offer of a peace conference as a consequence of a cease-fire in the North, the Administration will be under strong suspicion of not wanting to negotiate until Hanoi has made at least a symbolic gesture of surrender. What else does Secretary Rusk mean by demanding "military" reciprocity? Suppose Hanoi said it was stopping the infiltration? Would that be anything more than a symbolic gesture of admission that Hanoi has been the aggressor? Would it really settle anything permanently? Would it, in the absence of a true political settlement, last very long?

The crucial fact is that there exists a proposal, stated by the Soviet government, that a peace conference can be opened when the attack on North Vietnam ceases. Until that proposal is taken seriously, the President will not be widely believed when he says that he wants a negotiated settlement.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator.

I yield now to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I commend the Senator, and wish to join him in this constructive and thoughtful proposal.

The Senator recognizes that any course we take in Vietnam would involve some risk. The course the Senator recommends obviously would involve risks. When we stop the bombing, no one can fully calculate what the impact might be.

One of the things that disturbs me is that those who have been most enthusiastic about the bombing policy have not always counted the risks or the costs involved in that course of action. One of the costs which I have just checked out with the distinguished Senator from Georgia, who has more knowledge than the rest of us on the subject, is that we have lost several hundred of our very finest pilots in the bombing of the north, which is an enormous cost for any country to pay.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Yes.

Mr. McGOVERN. We have lost several hundred of our best and most modern aircraft in the bombing. The Senator from Georgia put some figures in the RECORD on February 24, when he stated:

> The number of U.S. aircraft lost in Vietnam in the calendar year 1966 from operational causes and as a result of hostile fire is 981. This total includes both fixed-wing and helicopter aircraft, and includes losses in both North Vietnam and South Vietnam. The figure is for the calendar year 1966.
>
> The value of these aircraft is difficult to establish precisely. The value of the aircraft lost in fiscal year 1966 is estimated to be $900 million.
>
> The estimated value of aircraft lost in fiscal year 1967, some of which, of course, lies ahead, is estimated to be $1,600 million.

These figures are not broken down into losses between the north and the south, but suffice it to say—I am sure this is true—that we have lost several hundred of both aircraft and pilots in the bombing of the north. So there is an enormous risk involved in the bombing, as well as any risk that might come to us from stopping the bombing.

In addition, as has been pointed out numerous times, we pay a very heavy cost in terms of world opinion. I do not know how anyone could put a price tag on the moral, political, and diplomatic influence that a great country has in the world; but it does seem clear that as far as the rest of the world is concerned, the most objectionable single feature of the war in Vietnam is the bombing of North Vietnam by American planes. We are put in the posture of a very powerful and wealthy nation bombing a very poor and very small nation, without the capacity to respond in kind, in that they are not in a position to bomb the United States.

I think for all of those reasons, we pay a very high price and take a great risk, in terms of our image to the world, by continuing the bombing.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. McGOVERN. Beyond that, as the Senator has pointed out, we take another risk. We risk passing up what may very well be an opportunity to end the war.

In other words, those who talk about protecting the rights of our fighting men in the south reflect a concern that everyone shares. If we could save the life of one of those men, it would be well worthwhile. If, in passing up the suggestion that the Senator has made here so well this afternoon, we prolong this war and miss an opportunity to get it from the battlefield into a conference room, then that becomes the greatest threat of all to our men fighting in the south.

Just one further point with regard to the price that we pay for the bombing in the north: It has always seemed strange to me that just a week before the bombing attacks on Hanoi and Haiphong, the Army Chief of Staff made a speech out in California in which he explained why we were not going to bomb Hanoi and Haiphong. He said:

> It does not make any sense; there is no strategic value that could come to us, that is worth the price we would have to pay.

And he said:

> Furthermore, destroying areas like that would just add to the cost of the postwar reconstruction program, which we may have to finance, and therefore it makes no sense to engage in that kind of bombing operation.

Then a few days later, the bombing took place.

For all of those reasons, I think we are paying a very high cost for the bombing policy, and I think the course the Senator has outlined here is an experiment worth undertaking. It does involve some risks, but they are risks dwarfed by some of the other risks we have been willing to take in this war. I commend the Senator again for a very fine speech.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator. I might, in connection with the earlier discussion, go back to Secretary NcNamara's testimony in connection with the bombing.

He said:

> I don't believe the bombing up to the present has significantly reduced, or any bombing I would contemplate in the future would significantly reduce, the actual flow of men and materiel to the South.

Yet some ask that we speed the bombing up in the face of the fact that the bombing is not significantly reducing the flow of men and materiel to the south. I see in the newspaper today, for example, that the influx of men from the north is now up to 8,000 a month. So if the bombing does not significantly reduce the flow, I just do not see the point of it.

Mr. McGOVERN. If the Senator will yield further, there does seem to be some understandable confusion as to what the signal is that our policymakers are looking for. I have been interested in observations that both the Secretary of Defense and the President have made publicly in the last 2 or 3 weeks, in which they have indicated that there has been a noticeable falloff in the infiltration from the north. I think the President made that statement in a press conference a couple of weeks ago, and the Secretary of Defense later elaborated on it when he said that the rate of manpower moving from the north into the south had fallen off very noticeably in the last few weeks.

In line with what the Senator has said on page 6 of his speech, that "Throughout the cold war we have moved toward peace in many crises by accepting at face value those positions of our adversaries which contain the greatest hope of swift settlement," would the Senator think there might be something we could fasten on there, in the statements by the President and the Secretary of Defense to the effect that the infiltration rate is falling off?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I do.

Mr. McGOVERN. Perhaps that is a signal we ought to seize on.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I would go for almost any signal that we might have.

Mr. McGOVERN. The President said he would go for almost any signal, also. It seems to me that this is one which ought to be explored.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I would say that I think the signals are even much louder, just from what we read.

Mr. McGOVERN. I agree, but this is a signal in actions as well as in words.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

I yield now to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from New York for his proposals. He has suggested a program involving a series of steps, which he hopes and we all hope would lead toward negotiations looking toward a settlement and toward peace.

As I understand it, the keystone to the success of the Senator's proposal would be the possibility of finding a way to open negotiations.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator suggests a cessation of bombing.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, as I understand it, the President has been proposing for quite a while that he would cease bombing if there were some sign, almost any sign that reciprocity would be extended by the North Vietnamese.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I would say that we have already received a number of signs which indicate that they want to have serious negotiations.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is saying that, because of the statements of Mr. Kosygin and because of the fact that North Vietnam is not insisting on certain conditions that they insisted on last year, such as the withdrawal of troops, it is time to cease bombing and see whether any response is made to the President's efforts for negotiation and for an honorable peace.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, my point is that there is no need for us to wait for a little signal or for any signal. There is no need for this, the greatest nation in the world, to wait around until they give us a little signal when we already have some signs that we can get to the negotiating table and find out quite rapidly what the situation is.

Mr. COOPER. I understand the point. I do not know all the signs we should watch for, but in simple terms, the Senator is saying that we should cease bombing without any new or significant signal other than the signals that have already been given.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I would accept the signals that we have already received.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have made some statements about this matter for many months, though I have not had as much of an audience as often does the Senator.

I made the statement about a year ago that we could extend the bombing truce of last winter, and at the beginning of this year, I made the statement that we could have done the same thing.

I have suggested in the last 2 weeks, when questioning General Gavin as he appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations, and also in the Senate the day before yesterday during discussion of the supplemental bill, that we could take this risk of a cessation of bombing to determine if negotiations could be entered.

I believe the Senator agrees in his speech that in the event it was found that no negotiations could be entered into in good faith, our Government could not limit itself and say unconditionally that it could never take such steps as were necessary to protect our troops and the security of this Nation.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree with that statement.

Mr. COOPER. We are all concerned and the whole country is concerned about the war. As I have said before, the President is deeply concerned about it, and I know of this concern because I have had the occasion to talk to him about it.

I know that the Senator from New York has made this speech with the sole aim of making suggestions that he believes would start a course of action which could lead toward negotiations and toward peace, and toward the attainment of that essential element of our purpose in being there, which is the self-determination of the people of South Vietnam.

I extend my congratulations to the Senator and say, as have others, that I think the speech of the Senator—whether it is accepted in great detail or not—is a statement which can be modified, accepted, and used. We hope it will be helpful in the changing of circumstances, and in events which might follow.

I am very glad the Senator made his speech.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I think that the speech of the distinguished Senator from New York is most praiseworthy. It certainly has brought some very constructive debate in this Chamber.

I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana.

The basic question which has been discussed in this Chamber today is whether there has been a sufficiently discernable signal for the United States to cease its bombing of the north as a way to bring all parties to the conference table.

I am persuaded that, as the Senator from New York has pointed out, we should recognize the events that have occurred as a sufficient signal once again to take these steps in an effort to go to the conference table.

In my judgment, as the Senator from New York outlined and defined his position in answer to questions from the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Kentucky, he has demonstrated that his position could not endanger the security of the United States and that it is not a radical departure but is merely a recognition of a sequence of events as being sufficient that once again the United States should take affirmative steps in an attempt to bring negotiations to conclude the war in Vietnam.

I think there is a tendency in any nation as great and as powerful as ours—particularly if one ever goes to the airfields and looks at the SAC bombers and learns that one of them can carry more destructive power than was used in the entire bombing fleets in World War II in both theaters of the war—sometimes to wish to conclude everything cleanly by forcing an unconditional surrender with no strings attached so that everything would fall into place in a neat little packet, tied up with a red ribbon.

I think history will show that this attitude has not always worked to the advantage of this country—particularly in World War II.

In the judgment of many people, our public statements during World War II that we would accept nothing but unconditional surrender, may have prolonged that war, at least in one theater, and cost many lives.

I would think that a nation as powerful as ours can afford to take affirmative steps now to bring negotiations, even if we are not absolutely certain of the signs and signals as they have been described.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, inasmuch as my name was brought into this discussion at one point.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I have promised to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CLARK. That is satisfactory.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I would hesitate to rise had my name not been brought up here.

It seems to me that as a result of this dialog the real point centers on the signal that everybody agrees we ought to be receiving.

The President has made it clear. The Secretary of State has made it clear that we can take a signal in the quietest form.

Whether Mr. Kosygin makes it in a speech or whether Mr. Ho Chi Minh makes it in a letter to the Pope can be verified, and I daresay has been verified, by those who have to take the consequences of making this decision; namely the President and the Secretary of State.

Concerning whether there is something that Kosygin knows that has not been told to us or some indication that the Pope has that there is a change of heart or an inclination toward a change of heart, does not lead me to believe this is the sort of information that enables us to shoot from the hip on, from the floor of the Senate.

I think this puts into question whether the President or the Secretary of State are, in fact, making a very genuine exploration of this—and they have assured the country they are doing this constantly.

I wonder if the Senator from New York or the Senator from Maryland knows whether or not these same pursuits have not been checked out or that in fact they may only represent pronouncements for whatever public consumption purposes they might entail.

Would not the Senator agree that they could easily pursue it through Kosygin or through the Vatican or through numerous other channels? This, it seems to me, is the missing link in the dialog.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I do not believe that it is a missing link. I think that what he said is quite clear. He said it publicly. He made a statement. I do not think there is anything further but to accept it.

Mr. McGEE. Would not the Senator agree—or does the Senator have reason to believe—that if then our proper officials were to say to Kosygin or to inquire from him privately, "Are you just making speeches again?" They could elicit from him the necessary information.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I think we can rely on what officials such as Mr. Kosygin and Mr. Podgorny say, and what Ho Chi Minh wrote to the Pope, where he did not use the word "permanent."

As I said in my speech, a number of statements made by other officials conflict with that, but I believe there is enough in that so that I would state publicly that I accept it.

We keep going back to the same point. They retreated from the four points; they retreated from the fact that American troops had to leave before negotiations. They announced, through important public officials, that they would negotiate.

Going back to the time of the Cuban missile crisis, President Kennedy did not write to Mr. Khrushchev and say, "Did you really mean what you said on Friday?" He said, "You wrote me on Friday that this is what you are willing to do, and I accept it." He made a statement, and the United States said, "We accept it."

Mr. McGEE. We know, however, that we cannot run diplomacy or foreign policy or take care of the national interest by reading a newspaper. This may have a public opinion effect.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. He was not reading the newspaper. He was on satellite television.

Mr. McGEE. Let us include the television media. My point is that each of these can be traced to a source to determine whether this is another public pronouncement—for whatever reasons we make public pronouncements in any society—or whether in fact it was evoked by some contact somewhere that gives us an opportunity to believe that we could hope for the odds being in favor of negotiation.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I understand, and I believe that is what the Senator actually stated earlier, that what the administration is waiting for is a bigger signal than that which came through on television and which came through from Mr. Kosygin—that it is not a big enough signal, and they want something else.

I am unclear as to what they want. It is supposed to be a little signal, but I do not know exactly what the little signal is. All I say is that he made a public pronouncement, and the administration feels that it is not sufficient, and they want something in addition. I believe that they should have accepted what he has already said. We do not lose anything.

Mr. McGEE. We may risk losing something.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I think there is a lot to gain.

Mr. McGEE. I am willing to take risks, and we take risks every day in this business. I am only saying that we are too precipitous if we dismiss the consequences of continued failures at negotiation by just sitting down to accommodate the public psychology, or public opinion; you cannot take that risk lightly if the responsibility is directly on your shoulders for projecting a policy that we hope leads to peace.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. But

they have never said that before. This has come in the last 2 or 3 weeks. What they were saying before was that we have to accept the four points. Now they have retreated on all those points and said they are willing to come to the negotiating table, and now we will not take our step.

Mr. McGEE. I think our step waits for some spark that Mr. Kosygin is not talking out of the blue, as McGEE on the floor of the Senate, for example; that there might be something that suggests that Kosygin knows the secret.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I do not know of any information that the U.S. Government has that Mr. Kosygin was not speaking truly or sincerely. Mr. Podgorny said the same thing 2 days ago.

Mr. McGEE. This is the real difficulty, and perhaps explains our luxury in the Senate, where we can usefully hold a dialog on this matter in order to explore even the most tenuous of gaps in the picture. But, if I were Secretary of State, I would not make judgments on the basis of simple propaganda pronouncements or psychological warfare declarations, or whatever you want to call them; or whether you can trace back if this intelligence is more than that, or whether Kosygin does know something or whether the Vatican believes that this was something more than a letter for public consumption.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Kosygin and the Russian leaders and all the others would be in great difficulty throughout the world on the matters which the Senator from South Dakota and other Senators referred to. The Senator from Wyoming knows as well as anyone else that such a person would be in great difficulty throughout the world if he has made a statement and then cannot produce or backs down and says, "I really did not mean it," and the United States accepts it, and he says, "I am sorry. It was just propaganda." I cannot believe that he could survive such a matter.

Mr. McGEE. Kosygin could survive it with American lives in North Vietnam. His responsibility is far different. It would not be the first time they have made reckless statements. If they really mean it, they likewise can trace it back; and I suspect that the Secretary of State has done this and the President has done this. That is the reason why I asked the Senator whether he knew if the same gestures he is asking we take now, on good faith, have not been traced back by those who have to take the consequences of making the decisions.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I said that they will accept those statements on face value, but they are not enough; they want a signal.

Mr. McGEE. Even a little signal would be of some help.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is not the Senator from Wyoming saying that in the Senate we do not know whether the Secretary of State has followed through and traced back and talked with the Soviets and been sufficiently assured that they were willing to come through with negotiations; and therefore he has sufficient signals that we cannot run the risk of once again stopping the bombing?

Does the Senator from Wyoming not think that, in this grave foreign policy matter, the Senate is warranted, in the face of the information which has been given to the world, to at least give its advice on the question whether further signals should be required which the Senator indicates would be necessary?

Mr. McGEE. I believe that what separates me from the Senator from Maryland in this debate is, if it causes a backfire in public opinion by setting up false hopes, or advertising another turndown, or where something else fails to produce hope and we thus escalate public anticipation, we say, "We are sorry about that; it was wrong; we should not have done it." But the fellow who is making the decisions cannot go back on that and has to take the consequences.

There is a restraining factor with respect to who is making the foreign policy and has to take the consequences. Beyond this, it has a bad effect on public opinion if we continue to run off in every direction without some basis for thinking there was even a remote chance that it might take hold. That remote chance has not been submitted.

Mr. TYDINGS. I would remind the Senator from Wyoming that the U.S. Government is a tripartite government, and that the Senate bears some responsibility in the field of foreign policy. Although the executive is one branch of the Government, this body nevertheless bears some responsibility. The people of our Nation look to us—at least I hope they do—as a coequal branch of the Government. I am not persuaded that we do not have responsibility.

Mr. McGEE. I agree with the Senator from Maryland that this body has a great responsibility. That is why our responsibility ought to be great enough to avoid the luxury of irresponsibility when we don't have to take the consequences of not knowing how far this subject is being pursued or the extent to which there may be validity or nonvalidity in the gestures that have been made.

It is really not a question of responsibility; it is, rather, whether we may be playing rather recklessly with an extremely delicate point.

Mr. TYDINGS. Certainly, when the majority leader of the Senate and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations take the position that this seems to be a wise and prudent course, I do not see how we could criticize it as not being a responsible position.

Mr. McGEE. I raise the question of the delicacy of playing with responsibility. I follow the wisdom of the majority leader and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, but I say, with all due respect, that they might even be wrong sometimes. When they are wrong, we cannot act all over again.

Mr. TYDINGS. But if we carry the Senator's point to its logical conclusion, the Senate should sit back and permit the Secretary of State at all times to conduct foreign affairs for the President, without this body's advice or consent.

Mr. McGEE. Not at all. I commend what has been taking place in the Senate this afternoon. What I thought we were spelling out in the dialog was how difficult it really is to take the chance of a step in any direction—either in not stopping the bombing, which would be serious enough—or of stopping it, as the Senator from New York has said, and calling a bluff in a public way. It is not quite so easy to act in that way, because there are unknown consequences. We cannot afford the luxury of standing in a vacuum in this dialog and saying, "Let us give it a try." I say there are consequences; therefore, we have to weigh the possibility of the consequences in the balance of our judgment.

That is all I am trying to submit. I think the more of this we have, the better. I think that the Senator from New York made a singularly strong and constructive speech today, a speech that has real depth, and the mere occurrence of the dialog on this point illustrates the difficulty of drawing a sharp line.

I thank the Senator from New York for his patience in yielding to me.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I was delighted to yield to the Senator and to discuss the matter with him.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I admire the Senator not only for his speech but for his patience. I believe the Senator has made a real contribution to the debate which has been going on in the Senate since early last Thursday on the entire problem of Vietnam; in fact, it has been going on Thursday, Friday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and today. For the first time in my memory we have had a debate in depth on our whole Vietnam policy.

I believe that the Senator has made a substantial contribution to the sanity of that debate.

I would like to point out first that yesterday the Senate adopted a declaration of policy by a vote of 72 to 19. The Senator from New York was one of the 72 and so was I.

In that declaration the Congress declared its support of the efforts being made by the President and other men of good will to prevent an expansion of the war in Vietnam and bring that conflict to an end through a negotiated settlement which will preserve the honor of the United States.

There were 19 Senators who voted against that resolution, but the vote was almost 4 to 1 in support of it. I think that this is a significant landmark in public opinion in the Senate. The resolution also urged the convening of the Geneva Conference.

With respect to the point made by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] and one or two other Senators about the signal, I completely agree with the Senator from New York and, therefore, find myself in substantial disagreement with the Senator from Wyoming. I believe that there has been a signal along the lines indicated by the Senator from New York and that we are presently ignoring it. This I deplore. I would hope that as a result of the debates which took place last week, this week, and particularly as a result of the splendid address of the Senator from New York we would have some reaction from the White

House and the State Department indicating their agreement with the amendment which was passed yesterday and the position taken by the Senator from New York.

I recognize that the Senator from New York is most anxious not to find himself publicly in any position of serious disagreement with the administration. But I am speaking for myself, and I believe that the Senator has made a real contribution. I hope it will find some action from the State Department and the White House in the immediate future.

Again, I congratulate the Senator for his address.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. Without his perseverance and dedication the resolution which was passed yesterday, to which the Senator referred, would not have been passed by the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will yield for one comment in a lighter vein, I take it that the Senator is still of the view, however, that it would be a little difficult for me to win a popularity contest in the Senate.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. No; not at all.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from New York on his eloquent and imaginative speech.

Actually, I believe that the objectives of our President and all of us who are in the Chamber are basically the same: A reasonable settlement and an opportunity to extricate ourselves from the quagmire of southeast Asia. The question is: How do we do it? Here I congratulate the Senator from New York for offering his sensible suggestion.

The only point that comes to my mind is that if we make a public announcement of a specific period of time, we have to be careful that it does not look like an ultimatum.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I am not speaking of a specific time. I said we should be ready within a week, but that we might have to be somewhat patient before receiving our answer. So I am not suggesting that the bombing be suspended for any particular time.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from New York. I think that he has made a real contribution to the discussion and the debate on Vietnam, a subject of much importance which has been debated all too little in the past in this body. The Senator has rendered a real service.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I regret that I was not in the Chamber when the distinguished Senator made his speech.

I would like to ask the question as to how long a period the Senator would suggest that a cessation of bombing cover.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I would not have any specific period of time. I would wait for the passage of such time and the course of such events that either the U.S. forces or the U.S. position is placed in danger and, therefore, a different course of action is called for by the United States. I have spelled it out in detail. I have the exact language in the speech, which was:

> If the passage of substantial time and events proves that our adversaries do not sincerely seek a negotiated solution, if discussions are used only as a pretext to enlarge the conflict in the South, then we can re-examine our entire military strategy—including the bombing or the possible erection of a physical barrier to block infiltration—in light of the changing nature of the war. Our actions at that time, after such a dedicated effort to secure peace, would have the increased understanding and support of our allies and of our own people. We should be generous in our search for peace, but I am also aware of the precedent of Panmunjon.

This is a difficult problem.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I again regret that I was not here when the Senators' speech was read. I am wondering if the Senator would indicate a specific period or what a substantial period would be during which such a cessation of bombing should endure.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. No; I do not. I said that it would depend on what events transpired in Vietnam, what the North Vietnamese did, whether they came to the negotiating table; it would depend on whether we went to the negotiating table, whether the international group observed during that period of time and reported back that it was used as a time of great buildup in South Vietnam; and whether we were making progress in the field of negotiations. All of these things would bear on the period of time for which we would suspend bombing, if we were making progress over a period of months, and if we were not making progress and the American forces were in danger, perhaps it would be a shorter period. I do not state a definite time to suspend the bombing.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator said "over a period of months." Does the Senator intend to have an open-ended cessation?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. No, if it extends over a period of months it would be to get to the negotiating table. The Senator will see in the statement that there is set forth in some detail that during that period of time we would not expect to continue negotiations if our adversaries were using that time to widen the war.

Thus, by continuing during that period of time, we would be making an effort with our adversaries to try to reach an accommodation and tone down and deescalate the fighting all over South Vietnam. I also pointed out that we are aware of the problems of Panmunjom, and the problems of prolonging this conflict and permitting the other side to develop an offensive capacity which they did not have before.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Is not the Senator suggesting that we get ourselves into a situation whereby if we bring about a cessation of bombing for 1 week and then terminate the cessation, there will be those who would say that we did not extend the period long enough? If we stop the bombing for 2 weeks, 1 month, or 2 months and without success, will there not be those who would again say we should have waited longer?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I go back to the point I made earlier, that there have been signs of considerable importance that the North Vietnamese are willing to come to the negotiating table. We would have international authority as part of the second point I made. We would have international authority to patrol the borders between South Vietnam and North Vietnam. They would report to the American people, and to the rest of the world community, as to whether North Vietnam was using the period to build up its forces in the South and still refusing to come to the negotiating table.

If that were true, then it is likely that we would have to take action. But again, we would have international opinion on our side. We would have taken a gesture in answer to the suggestions of U Thant, and the position taken publicly by leaders of the Communist world, which would lead to negotiations. We would have demonstrated to the world that the United States is willing to take the last step and walk the last mile toward peace.

I think that is a very important position for this country to be in all over the globe.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Does the Senator not think that we have already made ample effort to convince the world, indeed, that we do want peace, that we are willing to go anywhere, any time, and sit down with anyone who can speak with authority and negotiate?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Let me say to the Senator from West Virginia that the answer to that question is no. We have not convinced the world of that at all. Perhaps this country will always have difficulty convincing the world, because we are involved in a struggle with a smaller country and the sympathy of the world is, naturally, I think, to some extent, with our adversaries. But the fact is, we have not convinced the world, whether it be our frinds in Europe, in Latin America, or in any other part of the globe. We have not convinced them that this country is trying to find a peaceful solution to the struggle in Vietnam. This is difficult and offensive to us to accept, but it is a fact. That is an important part of moral leadership. I think that we must try to rectify this situation. It is not the most important step, but it is an important step toward taking that ultimate step; namely, finding a solution to the struggle in Vietnam.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. If the able Senator from New York would allow me to comment on the position he has taken, as I understand it, first, I congratulate him on his fine presentation. I know that a tremendous amount of effort has been expended in the preparation of his address. I know that the Senator genuinely seeks to find a way whereby our country can extricate itself from the very difficult situation in which we find ourselves in South Vietnam.

However, in my judgment, we have repeatedly shown to the world that our greatest wish is for peace. There will always be those who cannot be convinced or who do not wish to be convinced, of course, but the President has, time and time and time again, stated his willingness, his zealous desire to go anywhere, at any time, and to discuss this matter with anyone cloaked with sufficient authority to speak on the subject.

In my judgment, he has done this so often and so many times that North Vietnam and the Vietcong think that we are, figuratively, falling all over ourselves to get to the peace table, that we really do not have the stomach to see this thing through, and that if they but sit tight a little longer we will throw up our hands and quit.

I am afraid that, if we, without ample justification, repeat a cessation of bombing, the North Vietnamese will only receive further encouragement to hold out longer.

I think it has been demonstrated that in each of these periods of cessation of bombing, the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong have utilized the cessation to regroup, reform, and resupply. The resulting cost to ourselves has been a greater loss of American lives and a greater expenditure of our treasure.

I feel that our President—and I do not say this under any misunderstanding as to the position of the Senator from New York, because I am sure he agrees with me that the President has done everything he possibly can to bring about peace—but surely, the President must lie awake at night wondering what more he can do, or perhaps what he has not done that he should do. He has repeatedly stopped the bombing because of the exhortations of those individuals and groups who have repeatedly cried out that we should stop the bombing. But each time there has been no response from the other side.

The fact that there is such a worldwide outcry against the bombing is an indication that it is hurting. I think that is why there has been a worldwide effort to discredit the United States in its bombing of North Vietnam.

Of course, I do not mean to imply that the Senator from New York is a part of this effort.

I would view with concern another cessation of bombing at this point. We have tried it. We have tried it again and again. It has not worked. There has not been one molecule of interest in negotiations manifested by North Vietnam when we have ceased the bombing.

I feel, rather, that the time has come when we should apply more and more pressure. In this way, hopefully, the North Vietnamese may be persuaded to come to the negotiating table, where we might then, indeed, be able to stop the bombing of the north and the battles in South Vietnam.

It takes two to tango. It also takes two to negotiate. We can go to the negotiating table but there has to be a second party there.

In my judgment, there has been no indication whatsoever that the other side is willing to come to the negotiating table. They know that if they want the bombing stopped, it will be very easy for them to effectuate.

I congratulate the distinguished and able Senator once more. I feel that he has performed a valuable service both to the Senate and the country in speaking on this subject today.

I believe that the dialog which has occurred as a result of his great and well-prepared speech is also good; and I thank the Senator for his kindness in yielding to me.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ALL COMMITTEES TO MEET DURING THE SESSION OF THE SENATE TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 3, 1967, at 11 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 2, 1967:

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

Gen. William F. McKee, U.S. Air Force, retired, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration.

David D. Thomas, of Virginia, to be Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

John L. Sweeney, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation.

Maurice Cecil Mackey, Jr., of Alabama, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation.

Donald G. Agger, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The nominations beginning John R. Allums, to be captain, and ending Richard A. Schnase, to be chief warrant officer, W-4, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 15, 1967.

IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The nominations beginning Ralph J. Land, to be lieutenant commander, and ending James A. Disbrow, to be ensign, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 23, 1967.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Ramsey Clark, of Texas, to be Attorney General.

U.S. CUSTOMS COURT

Lindley G. Beckworth, of Texas, to be judge of the U.S. customs court.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

Joseph C. Waddy, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia.

Frank G. Theis, of Kansas, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Kansas to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

James A. Comiskey, of Louisiana, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

Myron L. Gordon, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Edward P. Gallogly, of Rhode Island, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Rhode Island for the term of 4 years.

Paul F. Markham, of Massachusetts, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Massachusetts for the term of 4 years.

William M. Byrne, Jr., of California, to be U.S. attorney for the central district of California for the term of 4 years.

Edward E. Davis, of Arizona, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Arizona for the term of 4 years.

U.S. MARSHALS

Luke C. Moore, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. marshal for the District of Columbia for the term of 4 years.

Elmer J. Hardegree, of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Georgia for the term of 4 years.

William F. Malchow, of Minnesota, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Minnesota for the term of 4 years.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Late Honorable John E. Fogarty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1967

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion in the compilation of memorial addresses and remarks, a set of the resolutions adopted January 30, 1967, by the Committee on Appropriations in respect to the passing of our great and good friend, the late Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island:

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION ON THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN E. FOGARTY

Whereas, on the morning of Tuesday, the tenth of January, nineteen hundred and sixty-seven, the Honorable John E. Fogarty of Rhode Island, after more than a quarter of a century in the service of his country as a Member of the House of Representatives, crossed the great threshold in response to the call of his Maker; and

Whereas he was a senior and valuable member of the Committee on Appropriations, and chairman of one of the most important subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations—the Subcommittee on the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare—longer than any other man in the history of the Committee; and

Whereas his outstanding contributions to the health, education, and welfare of the American people were such as to merit scores of high honors from schools and organizations, not only throughout this Nation, but internationally as well: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Committee on Appropriations, recognize that in the passing of our colleague, John E. Fogarty, we have lost a beloved friend and our Nation a great public servant, one of the greatest humanitarians who ever served in the Congress of the United States, a courageous and tireless worker for the good of all mankind but especially for those who could not help themselves; and be it further

Resolved, That we extend our deepest sympathy to his wife, Luise, his daughter, Mary, and other members of his family whom he loved so much; and therefore be it further

Resolved, That these resolutions be entered in the journal of this committee, that a copy be sent to Mrs. Fogarty, that a copy be sent to Miss Mary Fogarty, and that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations place a copy of these resolutions in the Congressional Record.

Adopted January 30, 1967.

Electronic Data Processing in Government Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1967

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege this week, as chairman of the Government Activities Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, to address a meeting of the Federal Management Roundtable concerning the role of electronic data processing in Government management. The roundtable is composed of the top level internal management personnel throughout the Government and meets regularly to discuss methods of improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the Federal management team.

Because of the ever-increasing importance of electronic data processing in the Government and the great potential it affords to every branch of the Government including the legislature, I am, under unanimous consent, inserting my remarks in order to make them available to my colleagues who, I believe, will find them of interest:

THE ROLE OF ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING IN GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT

Four years ago, I introduced legislation to provide a coordinated, Government-wide management system for Government data processing equipment. In October 1965, some 18 months ago, this legislation became Public Law 89-306.

Aside from the support of the President, the most significant contribution to the enactment of Public Law 89-306 was that of the auditing staff of the General Accounting Office. In the period from 1958 through October 1965, the GAO produced 105 hard-hitting, highly documented audit reports outlining costly and devastating deficiencies in the Government's management of ADP. I emphasize this contribution tonight in light of the Bureau of the Budget's announcement last week that as a result of this management improvement program, savings of the order between $100 and $300 million have already been achieved. The often thankless task of auditors does pay off, perhaps not in terms of fame and glory to individuals that do the work, but certainly to the benefit of the American taxpayers.

Progress has been made in the Government's management of this costly but essential equipment. I am particularly pleased to see that my earlier predictions of potential savings that would flow from the enactment of Public Law 89-306 have become a reality. But, many problems remain to be solved and as these problems are resolved, savings of even greater magnitude will result.

Later this session, the House Government Activities Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, will hold further hearings on Government data processing management to identify further problem areas and recommend whatever additional refinements in the management system may prove necessary.

With Government management of ADP in a state of continuing improvement, we can turn to what ADP can do to improve Government management. And it is for this reason that I am particularly pleased to be here tonight. For it is you, as well as the other members of the organizations you represent, who must take primary responsibility for this broader and more important task.

A few weeks ago, the morning of the blizzard in Washington, I addressed a Civil Service Commission seminar of ADP management. Despite the weather, almost everyone got there and it was a most successful meeting. At that time, I set $5 billion in annual savings as a reasonable objective we can reach in Government within the next four to six years through the effective use of advanced systems design and data processing techniques.

Five billion dollars a year in savings sounds like a lot of money. It *is* a lot of money in terms of national defense, education, and a better life for our poor and underprivileged. But, in fiscal terms, five billion is only about ten percent of our current administrative expenditures in Government—a comparatively small sum when you consider the almost unlimited potential for improving management that is inherent in advanced data processing techniques—techniques, I might add, which have only begun to be introduced into Federal management—techniques which can substantially improve the way we do things and substantially reduce the cost to taxpayers of what we do.

Of fundamental importance is the application of these advanced system design and data processing techniques to the budgetary and appropriation cycle. Our present budgetary and appropriation system has been subject to a number of improvements. This year, for example, five departments and agencies submitted their budgets to the Bureau of the Budget on tape. The system however, retains most of its old characteristics and it was in realization of this that the President in August 1965 instituted the new program budgeting concept.

Program budgeting, supported by a modern data processing system, will give the President and the Congress selective control over Federal expenditures far beyond the present capabilities. Nonessential or low priority items could be easily located and dispensed with and the funds allocated to meet priority requirements. In broader terms, exacting information would also be immediately available to the President and the Congress as to how the budget could be altered at any given time so as to have the most desirable impact upon our national economy. With data processing, almost no lead time would be required to make even fundamental changes in the budget. The orders of the President could be made in the evening—the result delivered to him at breakfast the next morning.

There are, of course, some individuals in the Government who don't understand. They look upon program budgeting as an interesting and useful new management tool to be used on a selective basis to make interesting studies of limited areas of Federal expenditures. But program budgeting is *not* an accessory to the traditional budget system—it is a substitute for it. A narrow view of program budgeting does not conform with the usefulness of and the need for this new approach.

The size of this Nation and the complexity of governmental affairs—the magnitude of our commitments and the nature of our responsibilities—make the adoption of a modern budgetary system such as provided by the program budgeting concept essential. It is, of course, possible to further delay adoption of this new concept—but only at great cost. And, sooner or later the Federal Government will *have to* abandon the traditional obligation approach to budgeting and appropriation if our Nation is to fulfill its commitments. We must take advantage of these new techniques as soon as possible rather than wait until circumstances force them upon us. Tens of billions in public funds can be saved and a significantly higher efficiency in governmental operations can be achieved if we move forward now.

The development of an advanced budgetary and appropriation system will, of course, require a heavy commitment from the highest echelons of government and the very best systems design experts our Nation can provide. But, the real, most challenging contribution must be made at the department and agency level. The most advanced data system in the world won't work unless proper data is available from the units of government at the functional levels. This means that this broad government-wide effort to improve our budgetary and appropriation cycle will be handicapped until all Federal departments and agencies develop adequate cost accounting systems. The program budgeting concept requires cost-oriented data. The concept will not survive on a diet of obligational information that does not associate input in public funds with the output of goods and services the public receives.

Federal departments and agencies have failed to develop acceptable cost accrual accounting systems despite the mandate of Congress and the efforts of the General Accounting Office under the financial management improvement program. I say this not as criticism at this time, but as a fact we must realize. Before the President instituted program budgeting in August 1965, deficiencies in agency accounting systems were not so obvious. Nor was the need for modern, effective cost-oriented accounting systems so great. But the time has now passed when anything but the highest priority can be given to agency accounting system improvement.

In the Federal Government, we have countless means of coordination and communication. It is incumbent upon those with responsibility in the various departments and agencies, either working through the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, or directly among themselves, to see that the standards in design, of uniformity and compatibility are observed. And, if roadblocks develop, then there is the obligation to advise officials at a proper level of the executive branch so that these obstacles can be removed.

Saving $5 billion is not going to be a very easy task. Most of the work is going to be on your shoulders; that is, those involved with the fiscal management of our Federal departments and agencies.

As we acquire this uniform data base, it will be possible for departments and agencies at all levels of management to use data processing in its most sophisticated form, that is, in the decision-making process. Aside from significant savings inherent in this more efficient budget-appropriation system, with an accurate data base, problems confronting all levels of government can be simulated and the results added to the other informational criteria traditionally used in the decision-making process. In this area, the increases in Government efficiency will be formidable.

For these reasons, I do not believe that my estimate of savings is extreme. Within the next 4 to 6 years, a significant source of additional funds to meet the pressing needs of this Nation must be found within our present budget. We must extract every nonessential expenditure that we can by every possible means so that these funds can be applied in our continuing struggle for freedom in the world and freedom from poverty, disease, and ignorance. Data processing gives us the means to accomplish this result. We must get on with the job.

Thank you.

A Defense of the Comic Strip Study by the National Foundation on Arts and Humanities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1967

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, I issued a strong criticism of a Johnson administration grant to the University of California for a study of comic strips. I asked "would you believe a comic book that cost $8,789?"

Apparently my criticism rubbed a raw nerve over at the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, and I received a letter from National Chairman Barnaby C. Keeney, who proceeded, with great vigor, to tell me why this grant for the study of comic strips was so important to the survival and well-being of the Nation.

Needless to say, Mr. B. Keeney said nothing to change my position, nor am I sure that my arguments will cause him to change his. But at least we have established a dialog, and perhaps he will accept the compromise suggestion that the University of California study instead what happens when a great university allows its campus to be taken over by nonstudents for demonstrations. Chairman B. Keeney's letter and my response, plus a news release, follows:

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS
AND THE HUMANITIES,
Washington, D.C., February 15, 1967.

Hon. DURWARD G. HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: I have read your remarks in the Evening Star about our grant for the study of strip cartoons and I am writing to tell you why we made this grant. Cartoons and comic strips are an important source for history, particularly of the history of public thinking and public attitudes. Cartoons and comic strips both have an important effect upon public thinking, which they also reflect. In the 19th century the cartoonists involved in the grant in question developed an artistic shorthand, so to speak, which enabled them to depict and even to caricature persons and attitudes, and which had a great effect on subsequent cartoonists. Both the cartoon and the comic strip have been of considerable importance in the course of American history, and they have their background in the 18th and 19th centuries. For example, the cartoonist Nast appears to have originated the Republican elephant and the Democratic donkey. He created the Tammany tiger and probably had a good deal to do with the downfall of Boss Tweed. More recently, attitudes pictured daily in such strips as "Little Orphan Annie" have been an important source of political ideas and attitudes for the young, and even of those not so young.

Therefore, I think that it is important that we understand the background of this sort of popular art, not for art's sake, but simply as a way of understanding ourselves better.

Sincerely yours,

BARNABY C. KEENEY,
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 28, 1967.

Mr. BARNABY C. KEENEY,
Chairman, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN KEENEY: Thanks for your apparently honest and intense effort of 15 February 1967 to justify the Foundation's grants for study of the origin and history of comic strips. I still maintain my position.

Mr. Keeney, I would like, for the moment, to grant that every statement you make about the comics and cartoonists is true. I readily acknowledge, in fact admire, the art and skill of the cartoonist and the comic strip writer. I grant that the political cartoonist has had a significant impact on history. I even deplore the fact that comic strips have not had even greater impact. If more members of the Supreme Court read Dick Tracy regularly, and became aware of the growing crime rate in America, perhaps we would not have had some of the decisions which have created such a flourishing climate for the rising crime rate.

But what has all this got to do with using the taxpayer's dollars to compile a history of the comic strips at a time of severe strains on the Federal Treasury, deficit spending and inflation? What possible benefit can accrue to the taxpayer from such a study? Why does the University of California not apply to a private Foundation for funds with which to make such a study? Has it tried the CIA? How can you justify this, and other grants of a similar nature, at a time when the President is asking taxpayers to dig deeper in their pockets and approve another increase in Federal taxes? Where is your sense of priority and need?

It would also seem to me that the University of California, instead of wasting such funds on a study of comic strips, might do a greater service for both itself and the nation, by making a study of what happens when a great University turns its campus over to non-students who then use it as a seed bed for riots, insurrection and anti-Vietnam demonstrations. Now there's one research project that might well be worth the effort.

Sincerely,

DURWARD G. HALL,
Member of Congress.

THIS WEEK IN WASHINGTON

(From the office of Congressman DURWARD G. HALL, Republican, of Missouri)

Just a little over one month from now, millions of Americans will go through the annual ordeal of filling out their income tax forms. Many will be shocked, angry and distressed to find they still owe Uncle Sam a whopping amount of money even after a year's withholding.

Most taxpayers will acknowledge the need for revenues to meet heavy defense expenditures and a host of other expenses of government. The chances are they would be even more shocked, angry, and distressed, if they know how the Federal Government insists on frittering away their money on some questionable and even ridiculous research projects.

A week ago, I pointed out that the tax-supported National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities had awarded a grant of $8,789 to the University of California for a study of comic strips. The grant was one of 50, whose combined total was just under one million dollars.

In challenging approval of this grant, on the floor of the House, I said the "credibility gap" will continue to widen until this Administration learns to distinguish between what is essential and what is utter nonsense, when it comes to spending the taxpayer's dollars in time of war and severe strain on the Federal Treasury.

Apparently my criticism of the comic book grant "rubbed a raw nerve," at the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. A few days ago I received a letter from its National Chairman, Barnaby C. Keeney. Chairman Keeney proceeded to tell me why this grant for the study of comic strips was so important to the survival of the nation.

"Cartoons and comic strips," he said, "are an important source for history particularly the history of public thinking and public attitudes . . . the comic strip has been of considerable importance in the course of American history . . . attitudes pictured daily in such strips as Little Orphan Annie," he admonishes, "have been an important source of political ideas and attitudes for the young, and even of those not so young."

In fact about the only thing left unsaid in Chairman Keeney's letter is whether or not the comic strips are such a vital part of American policy that they too have been receiving money from the CIA.

Chairman Keeney concludes that "it is important that we understand the background of this sort of popular art, not for art's sake but simply as a way of understanding ourselves better."

Of course the Chairman misses the whole point of my criticism. I readily acknowledge, in fact admire, the art and skill of the cartoonist and the comic strip writer. Certainly, I think the political cartoonist in America has had a significant impact on history! In some cases I deplore the fact that comic strips have not had as much impact as they perhaps should. Maybe if more Members of the Supreme Court read Dick Tracy and became aware of the growing crime rate in America we would not have had some of the decisions that have been giving crime such an attractive climate in which to grow.

But, what has all this to do, with using the taxpayer's dollars to compile a history of the comic strips? What possible benefit can accrue to the taxpayers of America from such a study, or other studies of a similar nature such as $11,000 for a social history of French medicine from 1789–1815, and another grant for $28,000 to study changing patterns of Moslem family life?

Government subsidized research and development has multiplied five times in the last ten years, and now totals 16 billion dollars a year—exceeding even the 14 billion dollar interest, paid on the public debt.

Most assuredly there may be problem areas in American life today which are worthy of consideration in the field of federal research. But it would seem to me, for example, that the University of California, instead of wasting such funds on a study of comic strip history, might do a greater service for both itself and the nation, by making a study of what happens when a great university turns its campus over to nonstudents, who then use it as seed bed for riot, insurrection and anti-Vietnam demonstrations. Now there's a research project that might well be worth the effort.

Progress Under the Educational Television Facilities Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1967

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago President Johnson made some important statements about noncommercial broadcasting in his educational message.

I thought it would be a good idea to review the operation of the Educational Television Facilities Act which began operation in May 1963 and expires this year. Frankly, I was very impressed with the progress that has been made. The Federal Government is getting surprising results from the incentives it has been providing.

When the last grant has been made, four out of every five of the 178 educational television stations now on the air or under construction will have received financial help under this act. The number of educational television stations in America has more than doubled since the first grant was made in August of 1963. These grants have gone to all parts of the country. They have been used for the activation and expansion of educational television stations in 45 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. It is expected that the $32 million will assist the start of 93 new stations and will go to the expansion or improvement of 69 existing stations. Over 50 million persons now have opportunity for educational television who did not have it in May 1963. Furthermore these grants have provided an estimated 69 million persons with improved educational television reception.

The States are moving steadily toward statewide systems of educational television broadcasting. Before this act no State had more than six stations. Today seven States have seven or more educational television stations in operation or under construction. The number of States affected at least in part by network interconnection systems in operation or under construction has tripled. The development of statewide educational television systems in each of the States is essential if the knowledge needs of all of the people are to be served efficiently, effectively, and with some degree of equity.

There has been a growing momentum in the growth of educational television facilities as a result of Federal support. During fiscal year 1964 approximately $5 million was obligated, the next year was the same, but in 1966 nearly $13 million was granted, and this year the approximately $9 million remaining available under the authorization is expected to be distributed well before the end of the fiscal year. With Federal support educational television will someday cover the country, or essential sections of the country.

The Federal Communications Commission has reserved 632 channels to assure nationwide coverage. The activation of this number of channels would mean that there would be one educational television broadcast signal in nearly every part of our country, and that in the 40 major centers of population there would be two signals. Even at the present rate of construction the goal of nationwide educational television will take over 20 years.

President Johnson placed great stress on the continuation of the Educational Television Facilities Act in his education message last week. It is important that this important growth should continue, and if anything, at a more rapid pace than in the past.

The real test of the worth of educational television is in what the station provides by way of programs—it is the programs which provide the benefits to people. These educational television stations have not had the operating funds to make possible the best in programs. For this reason the idea of an independent nonprofit corporation for public television deserves the close attention of Congress.

The airwaves represent a vital—and limited—resource owned by the American people. It is altogether proper that it be used to extend and improve individual opportunity.

The Educational Television Facilities Act runs out on July 1. It is important that we give immediate attention to educational television in order that the present rate of progress under the Federal grant program is not slowed or temporarily stopped.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that all phases of partisan political activities be kept off the air. I had heard instances where some educational television stations have slanted editorials, stories, or individual views—to the exclusion of other individuals or parties—and this is not only unfair, it is a frightening possibility. This aspect should be examined or investigated to be sure that any educational television programs are nonpartisan.

Antiboycott Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1967

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution authorizing the House Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct a study on the effectiveness of the antiboycott amendment to the 1965 Export Control Act.

The original amendment was primarily designed to protect U.S. businesses from the Arab boycott against firms dealing with Israel. Nevertheless, there is growing evidence that large and small American businesses alike are still adversely affected by the Arab boycotts. Consequently, I feel it to be appropriate that Congress undertake a study of the effectiveness of the present law so as to determine what further legislation may be needed to protect our commercial interests.

The 100th Anniversary of U.S. Office of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1967

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the year 1967 marks the 100th anniversary of the U.S. Office of Education and I do not think it inappropriate at this time to pause and reflect a bit on the great contributions which this century-old agency has made to the country which it serves.

Today the office is a vigorous agency lodged in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It employs some 2,500 dedicated people. It is administering educational programs which in the last academic year totaled some $3.3 billion and which this year total some $3.9 billion. It is taking a leading and constructive role in the great educational explosion which is now and has been beneficially shaking up this country since 1958.

History reveals, however, that the U.S. Office of Education was not always as highly regarded as it is today. And it reveals further that were it not for some farsighted men, one of them a Representative from Ohio who later became the President of the United States, there would not today be in existence a U.S. Office of Education celebrating its Centennial.

Agitation among our people for a central educational agency designed to serve the local school systems of this great country actually began in the late 1830's when Henry Barnard, subsequently the first U.S. Commissioner of Education, became convinced of the necessity of some central agency to collect and disseminate statistics relating to education throughout the country. Although some information of this sort was subsequently culled from the census of 1840, agitation for a special agency to handle this problem continued through the 1840's and 1850's. This agitation is not surprising when we remember that these were the years when the rise of the American public school system as we know it today was taking place.

After the Civil War, efforts for such an agency finally bore fruit when Representative James A. Garfield early in 1866 introduced in the House a bill for the establishment of an Office of Education to be located in the city of Washington and headed by a Commissioner of Education. Garfield's bill was the result of a memorial to Congress which had been drawn up by a group of prominent educators meeting in convention in our Capital City in February 1866. After rather stormy sessions in both Houses of Congress over its meaning and desirability, and the threat of a veto by President Andrew Johnson who apparently thought the act was just another one of the "radical" reconstruction schemes, the bill was signed into law by President Johnson on March 2, 1867.

Over the hundred years since then, the Office has served this country well and this despite the fact that in all candor, Mr. Speaker, the American people and its Congress have not always paid enough attention to the alarming facts and problems concerning the status of American education which the diligent efforts of the Office laid bare.

The midfifties, however, brought home to many, if not all, Americans the vital necessity of quality education for all Americans both for our domestic well being and worldwide posture and strength. The Office has responded magnificently to that challenge, beginning in 1958 with its administration of crucial parts of the mammoth legislation known as the National Defense Education Act and culminating in 1965 with the administration of two landmark pieces of educational legislation, the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 and the Higher Education Act of that same year. Moreover, the passage in 1964 of the Civil Rights Act placed upon the Office the delicate yet just duty of seeing that no American should be denied his just share of Federal moneys for education solely because of the color of his skin. The Office of Education has, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, addressed itself to this task forcefully, yet prudently.

As I said at the opening of my remarks the Office is today taking a leading role in helping the several States of this great country themselves put their educational houses in order. In doing this the Office is fulfilling the mandate granted to it 100 years ago this year. May the next hundred years see it continue its invaluable contributions to the well being of this Nation.

Sisters of the Holy Family of Nazareth Mark 75th Anniversary in Archdiocese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, a significant milestone was recently reached in my district, and in the city of Philadelphia at large, which I think very much deserves mention before this House.

Seventy-five years ago a remarkable order came to our city and began working to improve and contribute in a substantial way to the lives of the people who live there.

I refer to the Sisters of the Holy Family of Nazareth, who established the first mission in the archdiocese of Philadelphia in 1892. The first sisters of this order arrived in this country shortly after the Catholic Church was committed to found and maintain schools.

From the first four sisters who arrived in Philadelphia in 1892 to found a single school, these wonderful ladies now staff Holy Family College and Nazareth Academy, Nazareth Hospital, nursing homes and eight parish schools in the area.

Very Rev. Mother Neomisia Rutkowska, a Philadelphian, now is superior general of the entire order.

Mr. Speaker, the story of the Sisters of the Holy Family of Nazareth is very well told in an article which appeared February 24 in the Catholic Standard and Times of Philadelphia.

Centennial Anniversary of the U.S. Office of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1967

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the centennial anniversary of the U.S. Office of Education finds the Nation deeply committed to a far-reaching reevaluation and modernization of our system of schooling.

The 100th anniversary of the agency which administers our Federal educational effort comes at a time of virtual revolution in the field—a revolution of method, outlook, and technology—in which the Federal Government has been assigned a major role.

Let me emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that this revolution stops far short of any intention to alter the basic State and local control of school administration. Even though it will spend an estimated $4 billion on education in the current fiscal year, the Federal Government remains a junior partner to the States and their local school authorities.

Yet, through its sponsorship of experimentation in education, through its assistance of school and college construction, through its programs of financial aid to students, teachers, and researchers at all levels, the Federal Government is serving as a central conduit of educational improvement that can be tapped by the States and educational institutions.

Most of this activity stems from recent legislation, enacted in response to national policy that says our schools must bear a social responsibility far beyond the relatively simple tasks assigned them 100 years ago. This policy, as spelled out in 24 major education bills passed by the Congress in the last 3 years, charges our schoolmen with two jobs. One is to construct a true road toward universally equal educational opportunity. The second is to improve the quality of education in general.

By these means, we hope to erase those areas of poverty and deprivation that exist in a generally prosperous society. We will bring everyone within reach of a dignified and fulfilling life.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, this focus on education is a relatively recent one.

Federal efforts in the field may be said to have entered the modern age in 1958, with the passage of the National Defense Education Act. Although Federal assistance to education dates back to the founding of the Republic and beyond, its thrust for decades had been primarily in auxiliary areas, such as the gathering of statistics, and in temporary programs, such as those of special training in time of war or depression.

The National Defense Education Act had as its aim the strengthening of weak spots in education through a multifaceted system of aid. Significantly, the Office of Education undertook a major internal reorganization to meet the new and expanded duties assigned to it by NDEA and later education legislation.

This pattern of flexible adaption to new demands has been a highly significant feature of recent administration of our Federal education policy.

It was repeated in 1964, after passage of major legislation in the fields of the health professions, vocational education, manpower development and training, and library services and construction.

Administrative response to congressional emphasis on education came even more swiftly upon passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. This legislative breakthrough enacted the first modern program of general assistance to elementary and secondary schools. Upon signing the bill, President Johnson appointed a task force in education. He acted upon the recommendation of the then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and Commissioner of Education. The basic aims of the task force's recommendations were to permit a coordinated approach to administration of existing programs and provide for the assimilation of new programs.

The result has been a clear and effective assignment of functions by level of education within the Office of Education. This allows the fullest concentration of effort on each component of the Federal program of assistance. Most recently, the Office has established a Bureau of Education for the Handicapped in quick response to congressional mandates for greater activity in this field.

Mr. Speaker, the Office of Education, despite its age, is a place of youthful spirit and dynamic outlook. As such, it mirrors the determination of the Nation to remove, finally and forever, the final obstacles to full and equitable use and enjoyment of our national abundance.

Care and Treatment of Our Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1967

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which is designed to bring the Federal contribution for veterans' hospitals and domiciliary care to approximately the level which the original legislation was intended to provide.

At the present time, the Veterans' Administration reimbursement is limited to 50 percent of the operating costs not to exceed $2.50 a day per patient. In the past this amount was sufficient, but it is no longer true today. Currently, costs have risen to over $6 a day per patient and are continuing to rise, and at this time the ratio is 42 percent Federal and 58 percent State. With the rising number of patients resulting from the Korean and Vietnam wars, the needs for hospital and nursing home care and treatment of veterans will be even greater in the coming years.

It is obvious that the Federal share of the cost of operating facilities for our veterans has fallen behind present requirements. I believe we should recognize the fact that the cost of veterans' care has increased over the years and that it is time to bring the original legislation up to date by providing some relief for the States so that these costs are more equitably distributed.

It is for this reason that I am introducing a bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes.

My bill would provide $3.50 for domiciliary care per day, $5 for nursing home care, and $10 for hospital care for eligible veterans. This will result in a more equitable distribution of costs between the Federal Government and the States, and I hope will be of some assistance in alleviating their perennial budgetary problems. I commend this bill to my colleagues and urge prompt and early passage of it.

SST Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1967

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to develop interest and discussion in my bill, H.R. 12, to provide for private citizen financing of the supersonic transport aircraft, I wrote to the President early this year soliciting the views of the administration. There followed an exchange of correspondence with Mr. Schultze, of the Bureau of the Budget, in which, I believe, we explored some of the features of the measure and perhaps clarified some points where misunderstanding might occur. Believing that this will be of interest to all who are concerned with the SST project, I include with my remarks Mr. Schultze's letter of February 10, and my reply of February 23, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., Feb. 10, 1967.

Hon. FRANK T. BOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BOW: This is in further reply to your letter of January 3, 1967, to the President concerning your proposal for financing the development and production of a commercial supersonic transport airplane. Your bill would establish a Government-owned corporation to be known as the Supersonic Transport Development Authority, which would be authorized to set up a Supersonic Transport Production Corporation. The former would have authority to develop a supersonic transport and the latter to sell and otherwise exploit commercially the aircraft when it has been developed. To finance the development program the STD Authority would issue and sell up to $1.5 billion in bonds, notes, etc. with 100 percent Government guarantees.

I am in full sympathy with your desire to get maximum private financing for this venture. A preliminary analysis, however, indicates that the specific plan you propose has several serious limitations as a means of financing the development of the SST. *First,* there are practical reasons for not separating SST development from production and sales. The commercial success of the SST depends to a large extent upon judgments that must be made during the development stage on both technical and economic problems. The best way to ensure commercial success, therefore, is to put at risk the profits of those responsible for development decisions. Under your proposal this necessary tie is not made in that one organization would be responsible for development and another for production. It would be possible, for example, for the developer to profit through the contractor's fee even if commercial production and sales of the aircraft were never to go forward. Assuming a successful outcome, moreover, development and production phases of the SST would be likely to overlap, with the possible result of unnecessarily complicated arrangements for financing nonprototype tooling and other pre-production expenses.

Second, the Government would be placed in a highly unfavorable financial position. By guaranteeing the principal and interest on the Authority's bonds, the Government would assume *all* the risk. The contractors, on the other hand, would be guaranteed a profit consisting of the development fee paid, irrespective of the final outcome of the program.

Third, in the event the aircraft is not attractive to the airlines, the contractors need not join in forming the Corporation to produce and sell the SST but could settle for their riskless profit (development fee). If the program looks like a commercial success, the contractors could own most of the Production Corporation and reap monopoly profits. The Government, on the other hand, would assume all the risks of failure but would not share commensurately in the financial rewards of success.

Under financing arrangements now being considered, private industry, both manufactures and airlines, would share the risk *from the beginning* through a significant contribution to the development cost and the Government would share in the financial rewards at a level fully commensurate with its share of the risk. Through this approach, incentives to succeed would be given private industry. At the same time, the general public would be assured financial participation in the program by being enabled to purchase the corporate securities of the contractors through established private investment channels.

We appreciate the careful attention you have given to development of an efficient means of financing this venture. At a later stage in the SST program it might indeed be possible to switch to a corporate form of financing, although we do not think this is feasible now. In any event, we are both working toward the same objective, namely maximizing private participation in the program.

Sincerely,

CHARLES L. SCHULTZE,
Director.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., Feb. 23, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES L. SCHULTZE,
Director, Bureau of the of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SCHULTZE: It is noted in your letter of February 10, 1967, that you recognize that careful attention has been given to the preparation of H.R. 12 and its companion H.R. 4495, introduced by Congressman Clark MacGregor, to develop an efficient means of financing the development, commercial production and sale of the SST.

While you state that you are in full sympathy with getting maximum private financing for this venture, you raise several so-called limitations to management concepts contained in the bills. Upon analysis of these points there is a clear indication that you are not fully acquainted with the legislative intent embodied in H.R. 12 and H.R. 4495.

Accordingly, I desire to reflect on each point of limitations raised in your letter as follows:

First: Section 32 of the bills clearly provides continuity into the commercial stage for those prime and principal tier subcontractors who made technical and economic judgments on problems in the development stage. While it is proposed that there be an SST Authority and an SST Production Corporation, it is intended that the actual performance of both the development and commercial work will be accomplished by the same prime contractors and principal tier subcontractors at their respective facilities.

Since the Government will assume the greater part of the risk (cost) of development it is reasonable to require that the SST Authority supervise the contractor's performance under a normal and usual Government-contractor relationship, as provided for in Sections 2(c) and 24(k).

There is no legislative intention, as indicated in your letter, that the SST Authority will engage in a major phase of the actual development of the SST. Quite the converse is true as clearly stated in Sections 2(d) and 24(k). However, in order to protect the Government's share of the risk, and to effectuate the intent set forth in Section 35, it is proposed that special tooling etc., required for development will be Government furnished, along with any real property required or available for such purposes.

In view of the foregoing and in light of the provisions of Title III, there will be no over-lapping or duplication of contractor activity in the development and production phases, rather an orderly transition. Hence, no unnecessary complicated arrangements for financing nonprototype and other preproduction tooling can be anticipated since the respective costs, expenditures, etc., of the two phases will be separate and distinct.

Second. If you believe the Government would be placed in a highly unfavorable financial position under H.R. 12 and H.R. 4495, then the same reasoning applies to the proposed 90–10 percentage cost sharing arrangement reported to have been negotiated by FAA with the selectee contractors.

Under the provisions of our bills, the Government would effectively guarantee the payment of the principal and interest of the serial bonds to be created and issued to the public by the SST Authority. The contractors would sustain their predetermined share of the construction costs to build the prototype, as similarly required under the present FAA contract without benefit of construction fee. In effect, the SST Authority would periodically sell bonds in the principal amount necessary to cover anticipated costs for a stated duration, less the amount of the proportionate costs to be sustained and contributed by the contractors.

Since we propose that private investment sources will fund the SST authority's financial requirements over a long period, the Government's contribution of its share of the dollar costs is at least deferred. If the SST is a success, and we believe it will be, the authority's bonds will be redeemed from sources set out in Section 24(a) and by other suggested means. Hence, under our plan the Government may never be required to actually advance any money.

Since the Government's responsibility to put up dollars for development is then deferred in equity, the contractors also should be entitled to the same privilege but without abrogation of ultimate payment. However, this is a matter that Congress ultimately will determine and, if approved, our comments contained in the second paragraph under the above heading would then be modified accordingly.

Third: If you further believe there is any possibility that the selected contractors cannot produce an aircraft attractive to the airlines, then FAA may have committed a very grave error in judgment by concluding contracts for the design proposals submitted by Boeing and General Electric. The facts are, (1) the designs selected were chosen principally upon the recommendations of a great many of the airlines, (2) the airlines have reservations for 114 of the commercial SST aircraft, and (3) the airlines with reservations are reported to have been induced by the FAA to share the costs of the SST development. Under these conditions, and after Congress has appropriated over $500 million for this project, it appears a little late to interpose the possibility that the airlines might not think the aircraft attractive.

Your remarks regarding the possibility of the contractors reaping monopoly profits during production under our bills, are utterly without fact or foundation. Quite the converse is true.

Reference is made to Sections 2(e) and 24(h) *which*, in part, provide for "maximum participation of the investing public" in the SST development and commercial entities, and the Authority's responsibility to establish the SST Corporation "under such terms and conditions as * * * may be deemed necessary, appropriate and proper in the public interest." Your further attention is directed to Title IV which clearly provides for effective sanctions and restraints upon the Production Corporation.

By "maximum participation of the investing public" it is intended that prospective investors will have an opportunity to invest in the Production Corporation's debt and equity securities. In the case of the equity shares it is further intended that they be *widely* and *equitably* distributed to the general public. Under such conditions it is contemplated that at least 50 million common shares will be offered the public through normal investment channels.

The contractors who develop the prototype will be the production contractors operating under a joint venture management arrangement with the Production Corporation. The latter will have a broad and comprehensive Board of Directors representing all segments of investors who will perform under ground rules assured by the SST Authority. In following the premise of financing the production phase exclusively with private funds, it permits and assures that every one of the stockholders owning the 50 million shares outstanding will participate in the profits that may inure from this commercial operation, and not just the contractors, as you imply.

Prospective investors currently may purchase securities of Boeing and General Electric in established market places at prices determined by demand. These companies epitomize the best in American industry both in their respective product output and management accomplishments. H.R. 12 and H.R. 4495 contain no provision which can be interpreted as reflecting anything but the highest respect for the known ability, ingenuity and performance of each selectee contractor.

Through the contemplated FAA arrangement with the contractors, the Government denies the opportunity and privilege of the general public to invest in the SST venture, as such, except that they may buy into the two selected companies. Several years ago the Congress deliberated at great length as to whether the public would have an opportunity to participate in the Government's satellite program indirectly through investment in AT & T and independent telephone companies, or directly through a Government entity created for that purpose. It chose the latter route for sufficiently cogent reasons, none of which need be recited here.

Basically, in our open functioning markets a prospective investor may purchase the securities of those companies which are of his choosing, whether they be seasoned or non-seasoned, speculative or non-speculative, and whether they produce aircraft or mine metals. Rightfully, then, since the Government will be the dominant factor insuring the financial operation of the SST development, so, then, should the general public participate *directly* in the profits anticipated by the Production Corporation, in the commercial exploitation of this venture. This is assured under H.R. 12 and H.R. 4495.

Congressman MacGregor and I are not in a position to speak for other members of Congress as to whether it is appropriate and necessary to review and study the bases and reasons upon which FAA has negotiated the prototype program with Boeing and General Electric. It is our strong feeling, however, that, before Congress authorizes further funds in one form or another for this project, such facts in connection therewith will be thoroughly and minutely explored by it.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK T. BOW,
Member of Congress.

Lowering the Voting Age to 18

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSHUA EILBERG
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join an ever-growing list of Representatives and Senators who favor lowering the voting age to 18 years. I stand with those Congressmen who have proposed a constitutional amendment prohibiting denial of the vote on account of age to anyone 18 years of age or older.

Before today, nearly 20 of my distinguished colleagues have introduced resolutions which would extend the vote to young people 18 to 21 years old. I notice, too, that in the other body the majority and minority leaders have joined in a resolution to lower the voting age, indicating support from both sides of the aisle on this matter. The Members of the other Chamber have strongly supported their floor leaders' proposals.

It is time that we, the representatives of the people, extend that precious right—the right to vote—to all responsible citizens. Are our young people responsible? I say so.

Young people today are better educated than ever before. Some recent statistics may help to show this. In 1940, 50.8 percent of the 17-year-old population were high school graduates. In 1950, this figure had risen to 59 percent; by 1960, to 65.1 percent. In 1965, the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare determined that 72.7 percent of the 17-year-old population were high school graduates. Furthermore, the number of high school students who go on to college is growing each year. Not too long ago only one student in 10 was able to attend college. Today, the number of college students has increased fourfold.

Educators have shown that the more knowledge a person has, the better able he is to operate in the world around him. These highly educated young people are well equipped to meet the challenges of responsible citizenship. They should, therefore, be able to exercise our Nation's primary symbol of citizenship—the right to vote.

Education plays a big role in preparing a young person for adulthood. Yet, age itself is considered a criterion for classification as an adult. In many circumstances age 18 is regarded as the break between juvenile and adult. In most States persons 18 and above must stand trial in criminal courts, and they may be punished as adults for capital crimes.

In a number of States persons between the ages of 18 and 21 are permitted to enter into contracts. Half the States permit the execution of a will for personal property at age 18. Life insurance companies recognize an adult as being 18 years old or older. Youngsters between the ages of 18 and 21 are required to pay property and income taxes, if applicable, and many do so. Almost all States recognize 18 as old enough to marry without parental consent.

Psychologists have found that a person reaches emotional and mental maturity at age 18, and is well equipped to make choices and resolve conflicts both in his personal life and beyond his individual circumstances.

There are other valid arguments that can be made for lowering the voting age to include more than 10 million young people.

The success of the lowered voting age provisions in Kentucky, Georgia, Alaska, and Hawaii demonstrate that young people between 18 and 21 are appreciative of the meaning of their votes, and are able to cast intelligent ballots.

How well I remember the 1960 and 1964 presidential campaigns. Enthusiasm and idealism characterized those who worked to get their candidate elected. How was that so? What made these "politicos" different? Their age. Thousands of youngsters joined in rallies, worked at party headquarters and among student groups, and aided in voter registration drives. Their exuberance and idealism permeated the campaigns, and I think the Nation was better for it. If this kind of participation is demonstrated by people who, for the most part, could not vote because of their age, just think what level of involvement could be reached if 18- to 21-year-olds had the right to vote.

In conclusion, I might also add that a majority of the American people supports extending the vote to this segment of the population. For the past 11 years nearly 60 percent of those questioned in a national poll have favored lowering the age requirement.

The combination of these factors points out that Congress should pass and submit to the State a constitutional amendment extending the right to vote to citizens 18 to 21 years old. The time is now.

One Hundreth Anniversary of Office of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago our agrarian society was marked by sectional divisions and primitive communications. The establishment of the U.S. Office of Education in 1867 was an early recognition of the need for some national locus in the field of education. It was also a reaffirmation of our dedication to education.

In the century that has passed the Office of Education has grown and its leadership has changed as the Nation has developed. This growth has paralleled the expansion of our educational plant as it responded to the need for the education of leaders in every field.

Remarkable progress, for example, has answered some of our most critical needs in higher education. In just the past 3 years the Federal Government has granted over $935 million for the construction of classroom facilities, libraries, laboratories, and college housing. Of this total, nearly $780 million went for undergraduate schools and $155.5 million for graduate schools. Loans amounting to more than $230.7 million have also boosted construction on our Nation's campuses. This aid to expansion has kept college doors open for thousands of young Americans.

These statistics on major federally supported programs administered by the Office of Education frame a proud record of American progress:

Since the beginning of the National Defense Student Loan program, authorized in 1958, approximately 1 million financially needy students have borrowed about $824 million from their colleges to help pay the costs of their education. There are about 435,000 borrowers this year.

The college work-study program today provides employment for 200,000 financially needy students, who earn an average of $325 a year. This is the first Federal program to give young people from low-income families a chance to help work their way through college.

More than 124,000 young people, among the poorest in the Nation, are attending college this year with the help of Educational Opportunity Grants. This program, for extremely financially needy students only, began operation in the fall of 1966.

Approximately 190,000 students borrowed money from commercial sources under the guaranteed loan program for the fall semester of 1966. Those with adjusted family income under $15,000 a year receive Federal interest benefit payments on their behalf.

This year an estimated total of $400 million in loans will assist 480,000 students. This program is of enormous benefit to middle-income parents, families where higher education imposes a real hardship, particularly if there are several children to be sent to college.

Until recently, most of this aid went to the able student, well prepared for academic growth who is knocking on the college door and asking for help.

What about the "lost" young people—girls or boys with high promise for academic achievement and professional training? Many thousands are "lost" because the idea of college could not penetrate the darkness of poverty in which they lived.

Last summer the lives of thousands of these young people changed through the talent search program of the Office of Education.

This search—to uncover and develop the latent talents of undiscovered young people—is undertaken by colleges, State scholarship commissions, boards of education, and nonprofit institutions under grants from the Office of Education.

The search moves into the slums of our great cities, into remote rural areas, off the main roads into mountain hamlets and on to Indian reservations and the pathways of migrant workers.

Our whole society will benefit from the maximum development of skills and talents which would otherwise have been lost.

The talent search is one of the most fascinating unfinished stories in our Federal education program.

The House Prayer Breakfast Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1967

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, at the House prayer breakfast group this morning a distinguished friend and colleague delivered one of the finest speeches ever heard at one of these functions.

By unanimous consent of the group, I request that the full text of the speech by Hon. JIM WRIGHT, of Texas, be entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The full text of remarks follows:

MEDITATION FOR MARCH 2

My subject today may be somewhat unorthodox. In fact, I want to talk with you about a very unorthodox man.

You will forgive me the choice of subject, I know, when you realize that today's date—March 2—has a doubly sanctified meaning for Texans.

It was on March 2, 1836, that Texas declared its Independence from Mexico and began its short-lived career as one of the sovereign nations of the earth.

And it was on March 2, 1793, that Sam Houston was born.

The conventional moralist can find a lot wrong in the life of Sam Houston. Like everything else about this remarkable giant, his behavioral shortcomings were king-sized.

He swore profanely, so much so that the Mexicans referred to him as "Señor God Damn."

He drank copiously, seemed at one point on the verge of destroying his life and drowning his future in alcohol, and earned for himself among the Cherokees the Indian sobriquet of "Big Drunk."

Mentioned prominently in his mid-30s as a possible candidate for the Presidency, he threw away a promising political career and left the Governorship of Tennessee under a cloud of suspicion which to this day has never been cleared up.

He married three times, once without the benefit of clergy unless you count the Cherokee tribal customs.

He fought duels in violation of the law, and on one occasion was officially censured by the U.S. House of Representatives for thrashing a member on a public street.

Rather late in life he submitted to baptism in an East Texas stream. The minister intoned: "May this water wash away all your sins." Houston commented: "God pity the fish!"

But Sam Houston had one redeeming virtue: if his faults were bigger than lifesize, so was his faith.

If his crudeness was colossal, so was his basic integrity.

The structure of his life could withstand numerous flaws in exterior design because it was upheld by two steel girders: an unswerving faith in God and a deep sense of personal honor.

Perhaps it is not amiss for us—whose vices if as great are less well known—to reflect that the Almighty can use imperfect tools to achieve His purposes.

The Apostle Peter was boisterous, impetuous, irresponsible—and at one point faithless.

James and John were self-centered, personally ambitious and given to temper tantrums.

Paul began as a cold-blooded, self-righteous persecutor of Christians.

Bartholomew was prejudiced. Thomas was a skeptic. Matthew was a Quisling.

All were fallible, mortal, flawed with the failures of human imperfection—even as you and I. Yet each became an inspired central character in the most inspiring divine drama in history.

It is vastly reassuring, is it not, that He who alone is perfect does not demand perfection from the likes of us in order to work His will.

In this context, the story of Sam Houston is interesting.

Sam Houston strode into the pages of enduring history on April 21, 1836. He was 43 years of age, and at that point in life a failure.

On that day, under Sam Houston's command a hastily assembled and only partially trained civilian contingent of fewer than 800 volunteers thoroughly routed and utterly put to flight the flower and elite of a huge military empire led by a self-confessed military genius, who called himself "the Napoleon of the West."

Rarely has a military engagement been so fatefully significant. Because of that triumph at San Jacinto and the events which followed it, the United States was to stretch across the broad expanse of the continent to the Pacific Ocean, adding a million square miles to its domain and making certain the indivisible destiny of this Nation of freemen.

It is worthy of our observance today, not alone because of its historic consequence, but because it imparts a lesson as timely as tomorrow's headline.

The early Texans, lured by the promise of a new frontier and the pledged faith of a written constitution, had come to establish peaceful colonies. Yet the pledge of civil liberty and representative government was cynically betrayed by the Mexican dictator, Santa Anna, one of the cruelest and most perfidious despots in human history.

So great was their devotion to liberty that the Texans, though they were only a handful, met in a crude, unfinished building and formally declared their independence. So uncompromising was their hostility to enslavement that the entire complement of 182 defending the Alamo under Travis against a seige by perhaps 3,000 troops openly rejected surrender and knowingly elected to die on their feet rather than live on their knees—a dramatic choice without parallel in the history of heroism.

So complete was the duplicity of their oppressor that under a flag of truce he lured another group of the Texans into an open meadow at Goliad and callously slaughtered them in a withering crossfire.

It was against this backdrop that Sam Houston's little band, the last ragged remaining remnant of the army of the infant Republic of Texas, crossed Buffalo Bayou into the San Jacinto prairie over which was to hang heavy the smell of death.

General Houston paused before entering the battleground and spoke briefly and simply to his followers:

If there are any here who shrink from the issue, they need not cross the bayou. Some must perish, but victory is as certain as God reigns. Trust in the God of the just and fear not.

They crossed. Houston ordered the bridge behind them burned to seal off escape, and the unequal contest against the vaunted supremacy of the Mexician dictator's legions began. The odds seemed insuperable.

But the God of the just was worthy of their trust. The signal results of that direct onslaught reveal the presence of something more than human will. Against the Texas casualties of 8 dead and 27 wounded, the elite corps of the Mexican army lost 630 killed and 730 prisoners. Santa Anna was among the captured.

The legacy of San Jacinto is enough to strike terror to the heart of any would-be world conqueror. It is the story of the invincible spirit of free men when finally aroused to righteous rage by the inevitable excesses of despotism.

For San Jacinto does not belong to Texans alone. Present on that day were men from 14 States and the Territory of Arkansas. Its history is so inextricably interwoven into the fabric of American society that its inspiration belongs to all Americans and to all men everyhere who cherish freedom.

Nor could it ever be said that Sam Houston belongs to Texas alone.

He was born in Virginia, left home at 15 and lived for 3 years with the Indians, achieved his first military recognition against the Creeks under Andrew Jackson in what now is Alabama, began and for a time ended his political career in Tennessee.

Thereafter he wandered aimlessly for many months and was reported drunk on a Mississippi River boat.

Finally he turned up in the Oklahoma Indian Territory living again with the Cherokees.

He was sent to Texas on a special mission by President Jackson, one of the few people who never lost faith in him and the one man whom Sam Houston idolized.

When Jackson lay dying at the Hermitage, Houston took his wife and small son in a red horse-drawn coach over the primitive roads and trackless prairies from Austin, Texas to Nashville, Tennessee, in a sleepless, headlong race against death. He wanted to be at the bedside of his mentor.

He arrived, only hours too late, to learn that practically the last words his idol had spoken were of him and of his efforts in bringing Texas into the Union.

And Houston whispered to his child:

"Always try to remember, my son, that you have looked upon the face of Andrew Jackson."

Such was his devotion.

Houston was, in fact, during his life a citizen of four nations:

The United States;

The Cherokee Nation which he served for a time as its Ambassador in Washington;

The Republic of Mexico, of which he became a citizen upon going to Texas;

and the Republic of Texas which he served as President.

Through it all, strangely enough, his undivided loyalty was to the United States, and statehood the dynamic dream he shared all along with Andrew Jackson.

Sam Houston was never a citizen of the Confederacy. With all his heart, he believed secession to be treason. He vacated the Governorship of Texas rather than swear allegiance to an entity which made war upon his country.

Ironically in light of his posthumous popularity, Sam Houston died reviled and rejected by the State which claims him as its patron saint.

So unpopular were his views against secession that City Councils passed ordinances denying him the right to speak. On one such occasion when he attempted to do so, a rock thrown by a faceless member of an unreasoning mob struck the old man in the face.

Whereupon, he said:

"Follow me to yon towering oak on the battlefield of San Jacinto. There I can speak, for I've watered that ground with my blood."

Twice Governor—of two different states—and twice he relinquished the position rather than compromise a conviction.

He was no more daunted by public disfavor than he was by physical danger. Right or wrong, Houston held personal honor more valuable than public office.

The decision which caused him to leave the Tennessee Governor's chair, and the state itself, involved his young first wife, Eliza Allen, his bride of only a few weeks, and her inability—for whatever reason—to live with him.

Therein lies a mystery which has never been unriddled. Nor will it be. The nearest thing to an explanation appears in a personal note which Houston wrote, not for publication, but to the young lady's father. It reads in part as follows:

". . . I have been satisfied and believe her virtuous, as I have assured her. If mortal man had dared to charge my wife, or say ought against her virtue, I would have slain him. That I have and do love Eliza, none can doubt, and that I have ever treated her with affection, she will admit. That she is the only earthly object dear to me God will bear me witness. Eliza stands acquitted by me . . ."

and then, only this:

". . . she was cold to me, and I thought she did not love me . . ."

To the public, not even that much. While his political well-wishers plead with him to make a statement—*some* kind of statement—Houston steadfastly refused. He would say only these three words:

"She is blameless."

Importuned to consider his own reputation and his future, Houston replied with steely firmness: "Whatever the price of silence, I will pay it."

Rather than discuss the matter, he tendered his resignation as Governor.

As Houston prepared to leave Tennessee and the Governor's office—still without any explanation—a noisy rabble gathered outside his hotel. Someone posted a ribald placard, unsigned, challenging his honor.

Upon learning of this, Houston put on his coat and hat, walked out onto the porch and faced the mob.

Speaking slowly and very deliberate, he said:

"I am given to understand that someone has taken it upon himself to placard me . . . I invited him—or them—who are responsible for this denunciation to come forward to me now and and make it good."

Dead silence. Long minutes ticked by as he stood there, his eyes going over the crowd face by face. He spoke once more:

"I give notice, to each and every one of you, that though I am leaving this city, if any wretch utters so much as a whisper against Mrs. Houston, I will return and write the libel in his heart's blood!"

He let that sink in . . . descended the stairs, and walked unhurriedly toward the steamboat landing, as men hastened to get out of his way.

This story has a sequel, for which I am indebted to our former colleague, the late Percy Priest.

Upon leaving Tennessee, Sam Houston left a letter with a close trusted friend. His clear instruction was that the seal on the letter was never to be broken unless it should be necessary to defend the honor of his young wife.

Apparently it was never necessary. Nobody spoke blame against Eliza.

The letter was passed down through at least three generations, the seal still unbroken.

Finally, in the 1930's—more than a full Century having passed—it was formally agreed by the then possessor that, in the interest of history, the seal at last should be broken and the letter read.

A date was set for the public opening of the letter. Historical societies and the state of Tennessee were to be represented. It was to be an official ceremony. Percy Priest, then a newspaper reported, was to cover it for the Nashville *Banner*.

But the ceremony never took place. Three days before the date agreed upon, lighting struck the house in which the still-sealed letter was encased. The house, and everything in it, burned to the ground.

One other little-remembered episode in the life of Sam Houston seems worthy of a fleeting comment.

After he left Tennessee and before he went to Texas—during the period when he represented the Indian Nation in Washington as its Ambassador—a Representative from Ohio named William Stanberry, in the course of an attack upon the Jackson Administration on the floor of the House implied that Houston and Jackson might be involved in some underhanded conflict of interest over contracts to supply Indian rations.

Jackson took it in stride, but Houston was outraged. He called at the door of the House chamber for Stanberry, who declined to accept his note and refused to see him.

Some days later, he encountered the Congressman on Pennsylvania Avenue and demanded satisfaction. Stanberry pulled a pistol, but it misfired. Houston manhandled him rather brutally.

Stanberry, invoking the law of Congressional immunity, demanded that Houston be tried and punished by the House. Houston appeared in his own defense. He was both humble and contrite. Here is part of what he said:

"If, when deeply wronged, I have on impulse violated one of the laws of my country or trespassed the prerogatives of the House, I am willing to be held to my responsibility . . .

"I stand before this House, branded as a man of broken fortune and blasted reputation. Never can I forget that reputation, however limited, is the high boon of heaven. Though the plowshare of ruin has been driven over me and laid waste my brightest hopes, I have only to say, with the poet Byron:

" 'I seek no sympathies, nor need;
The thorns which I have reaped are the tree
I planted; they have torn me and I bleed.' "

And so, Sam Houston—former Congressman and former Governor, once mentioned as a bright prospect for the Presidency, on May 11, 1832 was officially censured by the U.S. House of Representatives.

But you can go back in the Congressional Record and read the official reprimand spoken by Speaker Andrew Stevenson. It reads more like a commendation. It contains 123 words of praise for Houston, followed by a single sentence, 28 words of censure, in which the Speaker simply said: "I forebear to say more, General Houston, than to pronounce the judgment of this House, which is that you be reprimanded by the Speaker—and I do reprimand you accordingly."

All of this happened before Texas, before San Jacinto, before his Presidency of the Republic, before his brilliant battle for Statehood, his later service in the Senate and his politically courageous though unavailing fight to help save the Union. These things came later, catapulting this strange, hot-blooded giant into a sort of immortality.

A motto for his life might well be the words he spoke on the eve of the battle at San Jacinto:

"Trust in the God of the just, and fear not."

His faults were big, but his faith was bigger.

And perhaps in that there's hope for lesser men.

Adam C. Powell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1967

Mr. **WOLFF**. Mr. Speaker, I was among the few New York Democrats who originally voted to have Adam C. Powell stand aside until the very serious charges against him were adjudicated. Had I been given the opportunity I would have again voted to have him stand aside until he had purged himself of the pending criminal citations which are outstanding against him.

Instead, contrary to the findings of the select committee that he had satisfied the constitutional requirements of membership, the House was presented with only one option—that of excluding him—barring his membership in the House for the entire 90th Congress; and legislating away the right of the people of the 18th District to representation to which they are entitled.

The resolution brought to this body by the select committee was very strong and it went far beyond censure. In addition, all of the excesses in which the Member-elect is said to have been involved have been turned over to the Justice Department for final determination. The recommendations of the select committee were unprecedented. Never before has a fine been levied. I feel that the combination of the transmittal of the case to the Justice Department and the recommendations of the select committee approached adequate punishment. I voted for the committee's recommendations, though they were voted down.

We were then faced with the question of exclusion which, although, I voted against, carried the House. The action which we have taken must ultimately be resolved by the courts. I feel certain that the courts will sustain the votes which I, as well as Representatives ALBERT and FORD, the Democratic and Republican leaders of this House, have cast.

What many Members appear to be unaware of is the gross incongruity in the resolution as finally enacted. In the preamble of the resolution the House agreed that Powell fulfilled the requirements which the Constitution set down. Then the resolution itself provided that he be "excluded"—not expelled but excluded. This may be a fine distinction; but it is by fine distinctions such as these that our constitutional rights are protected.

There is another important constitutional question to which I would draw the attention of the House. The action of the House in denying the Member-elect Powell the right to sit in the 90th Congress affects more than the right of the Member-elect. It affects also the right of the people of the 18th District of New York to choose or reelect whomever they want to represent them. It affects a right fundamental to our democracy.

I do not believe that we can tamper with the Constitution in this way. For when we do, we do damage to our rights more than we damage Powell.

Imagine the voters being told for whom they could or could not vote. Congress is no superbody. It is the electorate who must make this determination. And although the Congress has the right to expel a Member, it must do so in accordance with the constitutional provisions.

Under the precedent which the House has set, we could exclude any Member-elect for any reason by a majority vote. We could exclude a person although duly elected, on the basis of race, religion, or belief. Even any members of any political party could be excluded by the majority party.

Our forefathers, in framing the Constitution, incorporated protective devices to preclude any such actions. This dangerous precedent would affect our democracy and our basic rights too fundamentally for me to cast any other but a negative vote.

Significant Change of Policy on Pesticide Label Disclaimers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, an important forward step in protecting consumers in the use of pesticides was taken by the Department of Agriculture on November 16, 1966, as a result, I believe, of a situation called to my attention by Dr. H. E. Whitmire, president of Whitmire Research Laboratories, Inc., of St. Louis. I would like to cite it now for the purpose of indicating how a letter to a Member of Congress from an informed citizen can frequently lead to corrective action by the Federal Government.

Dr. Whitmire is a chemist who is nationally known in the insecticide field, as a manufacturer, developer, and writer. For many years, long before it became popular to do so and long before the late Rachel Carson wrote "Silent Spring," Dr. Whitmire was warning of the dangers in the use of DDT, particularly in connection with our food supply.

MANUFACTURERS' DISCLAIMERS OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR INJURY

Some time ago he wrote me that certain pesticides were being marketed bearing labels disclaiming personal injury and property damage liability whether or not the named pesticide was used according to directions on the label. He said that his own firm would never market a product which required such a disclaimer on the label in order to protect the manufacturer. This interested me and I called the matter to the attention of Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman on March 15, 1966, in the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 15, 1966.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Dr. H. E. Whitmire, a Pharmaceutical Chemist in St. Louis who is the President of Whitmire Research Laboratories, Inc., is a man whose opinions on the use of certain pesticides around food I take very seriously. He was one of the first persons I know to begin immediately after World War II to sound an alarm over the careless manner in which DDT was being used.

Much of what he has written to me and much of the material he submitted to trade organizations and professional journals over the years has been confirmed by subsequent events.

Thus I am more than casually interested in the point he now makes about the labeling of pesticides and I would like very much to have your comments and an indication of whether the law would have to be changed to effectuate the reform suggested by Dr. Whitmire. He was referring to the proposed tolerance being considered by the Food and Drug Administration for residues of certain insecticides, such as DDT, in milk, and he then said:

"Dairy or other insecticide labels should not be registered by the USDA or states when a statement is put on the label by the manufacturer disclaiming personal injury and property damage whether or not the named pesticide is used according to directions on the label. Our company will not approve or manufacture any insecticide if the above type disclaimer statement is requested to be on the label—a firm Whitmire company policy."

It seems to me that when a product is used according to the directions on the label, the manufacturer should be held accountable. Yet from information Dr. Whitmire has given me, many insecticide labels now carry such disclaimers as the following:

"Not responsible whatsoever for personal injury or property damage whether or not (X insecticide) is used per directions. The user or buyer shall be deemed to have accepted these conditions."

I am sure your experts are familiar with Dr. Whitmire's work and his reputation. He has written some excellent material on insecticide use in dairies and around dairy cows. Recently he advised me that there are many insecticides which will control dairy insects but not leave a toxic residue in milk when sprayed on cows and their foods. He added "these old well-known insecticides were used before DDT was known. They were used during World War I and World War II and the American people had enough dairy products for all Americans and their allies."

In your reply I would particularly like to know whether it is within the present powers of the Department to take the steps Dr. Whitmire recommends to refuse registration of an insecticide whose label carries the kind of disclaimer mentioned above—where the manufacturer refused to accept responsibility for the safety of the product even when used as directed. If so, I hope your reply will also explain why this authority has not been used.

Sincerely yours,
LEONOR K. (MRS. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress, Third District Missouri.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE LAUNCHES INQUIRY

Mr. Speaker, on April 18, 1966, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture George L. Mehren wrote to me that this question had not previously been raised but that "in view of the breadth of the disclaimers now being used in some instances, this Department is reviewing the matter and will take such actions as are necessary to preclude the use of any disclaimers which are in any way misleading."

Assistant Secretary Mehren's letter to me was as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., April 18, 1966.
Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
House of Representatives

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: This is in reply to your letter of March 15, 1966, concerning the use of disclaimers on the labels of pesticides.

The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 135–135k) provides that an economic poison subject thereto is misbranded if the label fails to bear certain required information. The statute further provides that an economic poison is misbranded "if its labeling bears any statement . . . which is false or misleading in any particular." There is nothing in the statute relating specifically to the use of disclaimers on the labels of pesticides. In the event the provisions of a disclaimer go so far as to be misleading, this Department could refuse to register or cancel registration of a product on the basis of the present misbranding provisions. Some types of disclaimers could be deemed to be misleading since it has been held in various civil damage actions that disclaimers do not relieve the manufacturer of all responsibility for the effectiveness or safety of its products.

At the present time, there are over 50,000 products registered under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act. In connection with each such registration, the label is closely reviewed to determine whether the required statements and information are present and are in full compliance with the statute. In the past, since no question has arisen concerning the use of disclaimers on such labels, primary emphasis has been given to making certain that the required statements and information appear thereon. However, in view of the breadth of the disclaimers now being used in some instances, this Department is reviewing the matter and will take such actions as are necessary to preclude the use of any disclaimers which are in any way misleading.

Your interest in this matter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE L. MEHREN,
Assistant Secretary.

NOTICE ISSUED TO PESTICIDES INDUSTRY

Mr. Speaker, on November 16, 1966, Dr. Harry W. Hays, Director of the Pesticides Regulation Division of the Agricultural Research Service, issued a notice to manufacturers, formulators, distributors, and registrants of economic poisons declaring that disclaimers of responsibility for the effectiveness or safety of a pesticide product when used as directed are "false and misleading, since adequate directions for use, necessary warnings and cautions, and other essential information on the safe handling and use of a product are required under the Federal Act."

Dr. Hays' statement of November 16 follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE, PESTICIDES REGULATION DIVISION,
Washington, D.C., November 16, 1966.

NOTICE TO MANUFACTURERS, FORMULATOR, DISTRIBUTORS, AND REGISTRANTS OF ECONOMIC POISONS

Attention: Person responsible for Federal Registration of Economic Poisons.

STATUS OF DISCLAIMER STATEMENTS OF PESTICIDE LABELING

The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, and the regulations promulgated thereunder, provide that an economic poison is misbranded if its labeling bears any statement, graphic representation, or design which is false or misleading in any particular.

Labeling disclaimers which negate or detract from labeling information required under the Act and regulations are not acceptable on products proposed for registration.

An example of a disclaimer which would render a product misbranded is as follows:

"The information furnished hereon is provided gratuitously by the manufacturer who assumes no responsibility whatsoever for the effectiveness or safety of this product regardless of whether or not it is used as directed."

Such a disclaimer is both false and misleading, since adequate directions for use, necessary warnings and cautions, and other essential information on the safe handling and use of a product are required under the Federal Act.

Labeling for registered products bearing disclaimer statements which are either false or misleading must be revised or deleted. Such revisions or deletions will not require reregistration by this Division. However, five copies, of such amended labeling should be submitted for our records.

HARRY W. HAYS, Ph. D.,
Director.

"TO DISCLAIM WHAT HAS BEEN CLAIMED . . . WOULD BE MISLEADING"

After learning about this notification to the pesticide industry, I asked the Department for further information on the situation this notice was intended to correct and received the following information from Assistant Secretary Mehren:

There are two parts of the disclaimer statements currently being used by many registrants of pesticides that we consider to be false and misleading: "that the information is provided gratuitously, and whether used in accordance with the directions or not." The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act requires that labeling be adequate to insure that the product will be effective for the intended use and must carry precautionary statements which, when followed, would be adequate to protect the user and the public. We feel that to disclaim what has been claimed in the application for registration would be misleading. Registration is not being withheld because of these disclaimer statements. Instead we are issuing registration and instructing the registrant to revise or delete misleading disclaimers when labels are reprinted.

Mr. Speaker, to me the incident has greater significance than the fact that a single individual's letter was responsible for moving the cumbersome machinery of Government into correcting a rather technical procedure dealing with the labeling of pesticides.

PUBLIC SAFETY AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ENHANCED

To me the significance lies in the fact that if manufacturers had continued to use these disclaimers on the label with the Government's permission and approval—and every pesticide label is subject to official review—consumers injured by such products would apparently have no recourse. In addition, manufacturers might be tempted to market products which, while presumably safe enough to pass the requirements of the law, are not safe enough to carry the manufacturer's warranty of safety. Pesticides are extremely dangerous products when misused. The consumer who uses them carefully and according to instructions is entitled to the assurance that they are safe for him to use in that manner and that the manufacturer stands behind them.

I appreciate the fact that Dr. Whitmire called this matter to my attention so that I, in turn, could take it up with appropriate officials of the Government, leading to a change in what I believe was an indefensible policy.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 3, 1967

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

Rev. Lester K. Welch, minister, Christ Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Thou who art high and lifted up, and yet whose presence is closer than breathing and nearer than hands or feet, remove the scales from our holden eyes that we may truly see Thee. Take away the callous from our consciences that we may be sensitive to the leading of Thy holy spirit.

We pause, today, in this sacred shrine, hallowed by the memory of great and noble men who held principle above price, honor above impropriety, and the sacred and holy things above the secular and shameful.

O God, suffer us not to stray from Thee who art the way, nor distrust Thee who art the truth, or rest in anything other than Thee who art the life and light of men.

We are grateful, our Father, for these men whose devotion to the common good is above self; whose passion for justice is above creed, and in whose spirit there is no rancor or retaliation. Give unto them the courage of their convictions and forbid that any, in these momentous and crucial days, should falter or fall in the heat of the battle for righteousness, justice, and peace for all people, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 2, 1967, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 665) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, all committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report of Administrator of Rural Electrification Administration

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, for the fiscal year 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Amendment of Food Stamp Act of 1964

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on Export Control

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, for the quarterly period ended December 31, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Public Television Act of 1967

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Section 13(a) of Interstate Commerce Act

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 13(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report relative to the disposal of excess military property in Turkey (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Third Preference and Sixth Preference Classifications for Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports granting third preference and sixth preference classifications for certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RATIFICATION OF PROPOSED CONSULAR TREATY—MEMORIAL

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a memorial signed by Bailey W. Lofton, and sundry other citizens of the State of Oklahoma, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed Soviet Consular Treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SAFE STREETS AND CRIME CONTROL ACT OF 1967—PETITION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the National Sheriffs' Association, Washington, D.C., favoring the administration's Crime Control Act of 1967, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Legislature of the State of South Carolina has adopted a concurrent resolution requesting the Members of Congress from South Carolina to reject in its entirety the provisions of H.R. 2158 and to do all within their power to obtain the defeat of H.R. 2158.

This concurrent resolution very clearly states the proposition that the taxation of multistate businesses is a matter which vitally affects the fiscal affairs of the several States. This legislation, which is now pending in the House of Representatives, is an attempt to lay jurisdictional guidelines upon State taxation of such business affairs. It has been brought to my attention previously that this legislation would greatly affect tax revenues of many of the States of this Union. Everyone in Congress recognizes that the State governments require more funds and should have a better tax base to be able to perform the services expected of them by the people. This is one of the best arguments used to advance tax-sharing proposals, many of which have been introduced in both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Congress should very carefully consider what it is doing before it adopts any legislation which would tend to reduce State revenue by depriving them of fields of taxation which they now have.

In view of the importance of this matter, I send this resolution to the desk on behalf of myself and my colleague, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Hollings]. I ask that the resolution be printed in the Congressional Record and referred to the appropriate committee of the Senate.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A concurrent resolution requesting the Members of Congress from South Carolina to reject in its entirety the provisions of H.R. 2158 and to do all within their power to obtain the defeat of H.R. 2158

Whereas, H.R. 2158, generally known as the "Interstate Taxation Act", has been introduced and is now pending in the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas, the taxation of multi-state businesses is a matter which vitally affects the fiscal affairs of the several States and the States are especially qualified historically and constitutionally under the principles of Federalism to undertake the solution of tax problems affecting multi-state businesses; and

Whereas, the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina is convinced that the adoption of the bill would not be in the best interests of State Government and would invoke many administrative difficulties with respect to the State of South Carolina. Now, therefore,

Be it resolved, by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

That the Honorable Members of Congress from South Carolina are hereby urged to reject in its entirety H.R. 2158, and to do all things within their power to obtain the defeat of H.R. 2158.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Strom Thurmond and the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings, members of the United States Senate from South Carolina, and the Honorable L. Mendel Rivers, the Honorable Albert W. Watson, the Honorable William J. Bryan Dorn, the Honorable Robert T. Ashmore, the Honorable Thomas S. Gettys, and the Honorable John L. McMillan, composing the South Carolina Delegation to the House of Representatives of the United States.

State of South Carolina, in the House of Representatives, Columbia, South Carolina, February 28th, 1967.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a Resolution adopted by the South Carolina House of Representatives and concurred in by the Senate.

INEZ WATSON,
Clerk of the House.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 605. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to determine that certain costs of operating and maintaining Banks Lake on the Columbia Basin project for recreational purposes are nonreimbursable (Rept. No. 61).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 303. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 62); and

S. 370. A bill to amend the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 63.)

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1166. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe safety regulations for the transportation of natural gas by pipeline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

S. 1167. A bill for the relief of Francesco Cavallo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1168. A bill to amend title II of the act of September 19, 1918 (40 Stat. 960), as amended, relating to industrial safety in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. TYDINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself and Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina):

S. 1169. A bill for the relief of the Pine Hall-Pomona Corp., successor of Pine Hall Brick & Tile Co.; and

S. 1170. A bill to provide for holding terms of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina in Greenville, N.C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 1171. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Pawnee Indian Tribe, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARRIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 1172. A bill to declare that certain land of the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma is held by the United States in trust for the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma; and

S. 1173. A bill to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARRIS when he introduced the above three bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART:

S. 1174. A bill to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act to restrict certain authorization for free or reduced rate transportation of property or passengers; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. HART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and Mr. PROUTY) (by request):

S. 1175. A bill to amend section 13(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 1176. A bill for the relief of James D. Stephens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself of Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 1177. A bill to provide for the disposition of a judgment against the United States recovered by the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Indians of the Flathead Reservation in Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself, Mr. BAYH, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. PERCY, Mr. MORTON, and Mr. COOPER):

S. 1178. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Lincoln Trail Memorial Parkway in the States of Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S.J. Res. 47. Joint resolution to designate the calendar week beginning May 1, 1967, and ending May 8, 1967, as "Woman's International Bowling Congress Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

CUTBACK ORDER OF THE HIGHWAY FUND

Mr. BROOKE submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14) relative to the cutback order of the highway fund, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. BROOKE, which appears under a separate heading.)

THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADMISSION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY INTO THE UNION

Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. MORTON) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. COOPER when he submitted the above concurrent resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

NATURAL GAS PIPELINE SAFETY ACT OF 1967

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill entitled "The Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1967." This very important bill is part of the President's consumer package, which authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to regulate the safety of operation of pipeline facilities of natural gas, manufactured gas, and other flammable gas. One of the salutary side effects is that comprehensive safety regulation for all modes of transportation will finally be in a single Federal agency, but the bill does not prevent States from adopting stricter standards.

The gas industry is to be commended for a good safety record to date. This bill looks to the future, however, to insure that the record remains good. As America grows, the pipes in the ground may lose their original resistance to stress. The deserted right-of-way of yesterday becomes the suburbia of tomorrow. The growth of the new technology of extra high voltage electric transmission may affect the nearby pipeline. The new technology of the gas industry may require adjustments in the manner of the use of pipe laid in another era.

When gas ignites, the results are awesome and terrifying. A cloud of escaping gas suddenly igniting can burn with a temperature of 2500° Fahrenheit. The result may be only blighted landscape in deserted areas; but it can also mean extensive property damage, such as occurred recently in Queens, N.Y. If it had not been for the alertness of one policeman, according to the reports I have read, there could have been scores of deaths. The most serious incident, resulting in death and injury occurred in Natchitoches, La.

The purpose of the bill is not to single out gas, which is a vital source of efficient energy. The purpose is to insure safety for employees and the public in this important segment of industry where safety heretofore has not been subject to comprehensive Federal regulation.

The subject of natural gas pipeline safety has been a matter of concern to the Committee on Commerce for some time. On July 8, 1965, the committee requested a report from the Federal Power Commission on the safety of interstate natural gas pipelines. That report was made available on April 19, 1966. During this same period of time, the committee was working with the Committee on Gas of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners to obtain additional information on State codes and other matters. In 1966, the Federal Power Commission reported to the committee on several pipeline accidents. The committee was also in contact with the industry code group, the United States of America Standards Institute, as well as many natural gas transmission companies.

These activities culminated in hearings on August 29 and 31, 1966, on S. 1553—89th Congress—a Federal Power Commission bill on the same subject, some provisions of which are incorporated in this bill.

The President, in his consumer message, February 16, 1967, said, in reference to this proposed legislation:

> If we act now—in the public interest—we can reduce significantly the possibility of tragedy later on.

Mr. President, all of us understand that the subject of pipeline safety is complex. I favor the objectives of this bill to establish gas pipeline safety, but there may be some modifications to make in the bill after the hearings, and after listening to all of the parties. I want it understood that, word for word or line for line, this is not necessarily the exact language that the Committee on Commerce will ask the Senate to consider, but it is an important step in the right direction.

The Commissioners involved in the various States, and the various State governments, as well as the industry are vitally interested in the bill and they will offer valuable testimony at the hearings.

I ask unanimous consent that, at the close of these remarks, the letter of transmittal, the bill, the section-by-section analysis, and the statement of purpose and need be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter of transmittal, the section-by-section analysis, and the statement of purpose will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1166) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe safety regulations for the transportation of natural gas by pipeline, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1166

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as "the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1967."

SEC. 2. The first full paragraph of section 831, title 18, United States Code, as amended, is amended by adding, immediately before the first "and", the following: "and any entity whether privately, publicly or cooperatively owned, which gathers, transmits or distributes natural gas, manufactured gas or other flammable gas by pipeline (whether or not regulated by the Federal Power Commission),".

SEC. 3. Section 834, title 18, United States Code, as amended, is amended by redesignating present subsection (f) as subsection (g) and adding a new subsection (f) as follows:

"(f) Such regulations concerning natural, manufactured or other flammable gas shall apply to the design, installation, inspection, testing, construction, extension, operation, replacement and maintenance of existing and proposed gas pipelines and appurtenant facilities, and may provide that safety inspections required thereby be conducted by inspection agencies which satisfy such standards of competence and independence from the owner, builder or operator of the pipeline as the Secretary of Transportation (hereinafter referred to as "the Secretary") may prescribe. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to restrict the authority of the Federal Power Commission under the Natural Gas Act, nor shall anything in this section be deemed to prohibit any State from establishing additional regulations for the safety of gas pipelines and appurtenant facilities which are not incompatible with Federal regulations prescribed pursuant to this section. The Secretary may, under procedures established by him, provide for the waiver of any gas safety regulations prescribed by him under this section. The Secretary shall maintain safety records of companies transporting gas by pipeline; notify the appropriate Federal and State agencies of violations of any gas safety regulations prescribed under this section; consult with and advise the Federal Power Commission before prescribing any regulations covering gas transmission; establish procedures under which new materials, operations, devices and processes may be qualified without undue delay to comply with gas safety regulations prescribed under this section; and upon request of the Federal Power Commission, advise the Federal Power Commission of the safety of any materials, operations, devices, or processes not expressly encompassed by such regulations. Whenever the issuance of a regulation or action upon application for waiver would affect continuity of any services authorized by the Federal Power Commission, the Secretary shall consult with and advise the Federal Power Commission before taking such a step and shall defer the effective date of his requirements until the Federal Power Commission has had reasonable opportunity to grant the authorizations it deems necessary."

The material submitted by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D.C., Feb. 28, 1967.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting herewith a proposed bill entitled "the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1967." The purpose and effect of the bill are described in the accompanying section-by-section analysis and statement of purpose and need.

As you are aware, in his message of February 16, 1967, on protection of the American consumer, the President discussed the increasing hazards of gas pipeline failures as these pipelines age and as more and more of the system lies under areas of high population density. He recommended the enactment of legislation which would authorize the promulgation and enforcement of Federal safety regulations in order to reduce the potential dangers of gas pipeline failures.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that enactment of this legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN S. BOYD.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE NATURAL GAS PIPELINE SAFETY ACT OF 1967

The general purpose of the bill is to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to regulate the safety of operation of natural, manufactured and other flammable gas pipeline facilities, thus providing the authority for comprehensive safety regulation of all modes of transportation within a single Federal agency.

Section 1—The section provides that the Act may be cited as "the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1967."

Section 2—This section amends the definition of "carrier" in 18 U.S.C. 831 to include natural gas, manufactured gas or other flammable gas pipelines. Sections 831–835 of title 18 (presently administered by the Secretary of Transportation by virtue of section 6(e)(4) of the Department of Transportation Act) govern the shipments of explosives and other dangerous articles by land and water. As presently written, section 831 refers to the Interstate Commerce Act for interpretation of the term "carrier." Section 1(1)(b) of that Act extends the applicable meaning of "carrier" to pipelines other than natural gas and water. This section of the proposed bill will have the effect of making sections 832–835 applicable to gas pipelines, the only carrier of explosives or other dangerous articles by land presently beyond the scope of Federal safety regulation.

Section 3—This adds a new subsection to 18 U.S.C. 834 (relating to the issuance of safety regulations for transportation of hazardous substances) which would extend safety regulatory authority to all aspects of gas pipeline transportation under a system of minimum regulation which would not preempt the States from adopting stricter safety standards not incompatible with Federal standards, nor restrict the regulatory authority of the Federal Power Commission under the Natural Gas Act.

Section 3 would empower the Secretary, under standards which he may prescribe, to authorize safety inspections to be performed by other than Federal agencies. This technique would permit state agencies or independent contractors to certify, for Federal safety regulation purposes, the results of inspections, thereby reducing the number of Federal inspection personnel which would otherwise be required. The Secretary is authorized to provide for waivers of gas safety regulations and required to maintain safety records of regulated companies and to notify appropriate Federal and state agencies of violations of the regulations.

This section would also direct the Secretary to consult with an advise the Federal Power Commission before prescribing safety regulations covering gas transmission; to establish procedures for prompt qualification of new materials, operations, devices and processes to comply with the regulations; to conduct the research, testing, and development which may be necessary to carry out the authority conferred by the Act; and, if requested, to advise the Commission of the safety of materials, operations, devices and processes not expressly covered by the regulations.

Finally, if any of the safety regulations of the Secretary might effect the continuity of gas service, the Federal Power Commission is to be advised and consulted and given the opportunity to grant such authorizations as the Commission believes is necessary.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED

With the passage of the Department of Transportation Act (P.L. 89–670) Federal safety regulation of air, water and land transportation (including pipelines other than natural gas and water) has been centralized in one agency to permit the coordinated and comprehensive improvement of safety in virtually all transportation modes. The only transportation area still excepted from Federal safety regulation is the movement of natural gas and other flammable gases by pipeline.

Gas pipelines traverse lands subject to multiple uses, occupying common rights-of-way with other utilities and approach close to areas of expanding population density. This is true in many parts of the country and it is becoming increasingly so. In many places pipeline design, construction, operation and maintenance is subject to no public scrutiny.

Flammable gas is transported through large diameter pipelines, up to 42 inches, at high pressures, up to 1,300 pounds per square inch or 90 times atmospheric pressure. As a result, any failure of a pipe may cause large amounts of gas to be released to the atmosphere in a relatively short period of time. Any gas thus escaping which is mixed with air may ignite and explode; the area affected can be very large depending on such variables as the gas pressure, size of the pipe and size of the break. When it burns, the gas can reach temperatures of 2500° F. According to a 1966 survey by the Federal Power Commission, the casualty rate for accidents involving 30 inch pipe is more than 6 times as great as 20 inch pipe.

In addition to such factors as the diameter and pressure of the pipe, population density has an important bearing on the potential dangers associated with a pipeline failure. As the built-up areas of our cities and towns expand, the problem of population density near transmission and distribution lines accelerates since much of this pipe was laid years ago to specification design for unpopulated areas. Moreover, the danger of injury or death is obviously greater where the population is.

Still another factor in the likelihood of pipeline failure and the danger of death or injury is the age of some of the pipeline throughout the country. This is not because age in itself causes deterioration of the pipe, but because older pipe was not protected as well from the effects of corrosion and other slowly developing causes of failure as is newer pipe. The FPC survey, referred to previously, indicates a significantly higher rate of failure in pipe laid before 1932 than in pipe laid more recently.

The Federal Power Commission has the authority to investigate pipeline accidents, to gather and analyze statistics on the causes of pipeline accidents, and to report its findings to the Congress and the public. While it can impose safety conditions in the certificates it awards, the Commission cannot exercise continuing regulation over all aspects of safe pipeline operation. And, while the Department of Transportation Act has transferred broad transportation safety regulatory powers, including those related to pipelines, gas pipelines are not within the scope of those powers.

As population density increases in many areas of the country, and as the mileage of gas transmission lines increases to meet growing demand, the absence of adequate and effective safety regulation of gas pipelines stands as a glaring exception to the efforts to insure that all modes of transportation will function in a manner which protects the public interest in the realm of safety.

Although the industry has made progress in the safety of natural gas transmission lines, most States have found it necessary to adopt safety regulations. There is, within the pipeline industry, informal nonenforceable guidance in the form of an industry code, the USASI B31.8 Code. But this code is considerably less than satisfactory because of inadequacies and the absence of legally binding effect. This code is formulated under a procedure by which any substantial segment of the industry, or even one company, can prevent the adoption of a particular safety standard. Additionally, there is a considerable variance between the programs pursued by different pipeline companies to reduce the hazards of natural gas transmission.

One prominent deficiency of the USASI Code is the fact that its requirements do not apply to pipe already in the ground. In other words, the Code has no retroactive applicability. Similarly, the Code does not require a change in operating pressures as expanding population might call into play the greater safety factors of the USASI standards for new construction. A majority of the States which regulate natural gas pipelines use the USASI Code as a basis because of staff and resources inadequate to develop standards themselves. Many of those States have either added independent safety standards or strengthened some provisions in the industry code, but this has not served to produce really adequate safety standards.

In spite of the considerable and valuable contributions made by the States, there are still large gaps in the public safety requirements. In addition to those States which have adopted no regulations, the regulations of some do not apply to interstate lines. Most State safety regulations are not retroactive.

General State regulation could resolve the problem of giving safety standards the force of law; but it is less likely that it could resolve the other basic problem, the establishment of *adequate* standards.

The Federal Government shares with the States and the industry a common goal of providing the American public the most efficient and reliable use of gas consonant with the safest possible operation of gas facilities. Federal safety standards for gas pipelines are one of the important means for attaining these objectives. The public interest requires a governmental involvement in assuring that all reasonable steps have been taken to reduce the danger from unsafe pipelines just as we do with an unsafe automobile, truck, ship, bus, airplane, train, or oil pipeline.

The efforts of the States should neither be ignored nor overridden, however. Federal regulation should be based on minimum standards which leave room for the States to establish higher standards when local circumstances require. And, unlike the movement of passengers or vehicles in interstate commerce, different regulations in different States above the minimum Federal standards would not create undue hardship on pipeline companies.

The States should be permitted to establish pipeline safety regulations which are compatible with those promulgated by the Secretary. State regulation should be permitted as to aspects of safety on which the Federal regulations are silent; and the States should also be permitted to establish more stringent requirements as to safety aspects which are covered by Federal regulations.

The proposed legislation would place the responsibility for gas pipeline safety in the Secretary of Transportation. Thus, both oil and gas pipeline safety would be in the same agency, permitting savings in manpower with the benefits of a cross-fertilization of ideas from two related technologies. Further, in the event that safety considerations between gas pipelines and other transportation modes come into conflict with each other, the Department would be ideally equipped to resolve them.

The best device for establishing Federal safety regulatory authority in this area is by expanded applicability of sections 831–835 of title 18, United States Code, to include gas pipelines. These sections cover land and water shipment of explosives and other dangerous articles and, by virtue of section 6(e) (4) of the Department of Transportation Act, the issuance and enforcement of regulations thereunder have been entrusted to the Secretary of Transportation.

The existing provisions of title 18 authorize the issuance of broad regulations; but with respect to this new authority it should specify that Federal standards will extend to design, installation, inspection, testing, construction, operation, extension, replacement and maintenance of pipe. In this way, it will be clear that the standards are to be applied to pipe already in the ground.

In this connection, it should be noted that some existing pipeline, while built to outmoded specifications, may still be safe for the service and locale in which used. It would not be the intention to require the replacement of otherwise safe pipe simply because it does not conform to the regulations for new pipe. However, there would be application to existing pipe of those regulations for operation, testing and maintenance.

Noncompliance with the Secretary's standards would, under this approach, be punishable by fine and imprisonment.

The testing and inspection burden associated with enforcement of the Federal regulations will involve a subsantial effort. The legislation should include provisions for Federal acceptance of certification of inspections by non-Federal agencies provided they are sufficiently independent of the pipeline companies whose facilities they inspect. In this way it should be possible to provide for impartial and effective enforcement without maintaining a large staff of Federal inspectors. The proposed legislation need not specifically authorize the Secretary to investigate accidents, conduct surveys, or hold hearings since this authority is already availale to him pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 835(b).

To insure that gas pipeline safety regulations will be appropriate and effective and that the most recent technological and engineering developments will be adequately evaluated, the Secretary should be given the authority to perform necessary research, development and testing. Similarly, he must have the authority to advise the Federal Power Commission of the safety of innovative materials, operations, devices and processes not theretofore described in the regulations. He must also be authorized to promptly qualify for use, after determining their safety characteristics, such materials, operations, devices and processes.

The industry itself has, of course, an important stake in evaluating and employing the latest advances in technology. The industry has invested a good deal of effort and expertise in developing voluntary codes, like the USA Standards Institute code discussed above. Such groups and codes have much to offer and the experience they represent should be of assistance to the Secretary. The Secretary would consult with appropriate industry associations to take advantage of the work they have done which will further the objectives of the Act. In addition to necessary consultation with the Federal Power Commission, the Secretary would consult with other Federal agencies and with the States to take advantage of the best thinking in this area.

The exercise of the Secretary's safety regulatory authority, to the extent compatible with the overriding need for safety, must function in a fashion which will not interfere with the Federal Power Commission's economic authority nor, particularly, threaten interruptions in gas service to the consumer. Thus, the proposed legislation should include provisions for consultation with the Commission on proposed regulations covering gas transmission and, where the continuity of service would be affected, to afford the Commission the opportunity to grant the authorizations which will be necessary to avoid service interruptions.

Enactment of the proposed legislation will enable the Department of Transportation to focus informed attention on the entire spectrum of transportation safety problems. All pipelines transporting hazardous substances will be subject to the safety regulation of a single agency; this organizational unity will promote efficiencies and economies which will not be possible if the authority is fragmented. The ultimate beneficiary of the substantive and procedural ingredients of this bill will be the American public.

CLARIFICATION OF RESPONSIBILITIES OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INDUSTRIAL SAFETY BOARD

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the District of Columbia Code, in order to clarify the responsibilities of the District of Columbia Industrial Safety Board. This bill is identical to the bill I introduced on this subject in the last Congress. Unfortunately, there was insufficient time to act on this matter then. The need for action remains, however, and I am hopeful that this bill will be approved in this Congress.

Some questions have arisen in recent years regarding the scope of the Board's responsibility toward providing for safe working conditions for employees in the District of Columbia.

Congress established the Industrial Safety Board in 1941, and declared its purpose to be to foster, promote, and develop the safety of wage earners of the District of Columbia in relation to their working conditions.

For many years, the Industrial Safety Board assumed that the scope of its responsibilities included the safety of all kinds of non-Government employees in the District of Columbia.

However, beginning about 2 years ago, through a series of opinions by the District of Columbia Corporation Counsel, the scope of the Board's jurisdiction was reduced drastically—from a field of coverage of more than 280,000 employees in the District of Columbia to a field of coverage estimated at less than 50,000 employees.

It is not my purpose to dispute the accuracy of this series of opinions.

It is my purpose to point out that, as a result of these opinions, no District of Columbia governmental agency is directly charged with looking out for, and proposing regulations to secure, the safety of the vast majority of non-Government employees in the District of Columbia.

Regardless of what Congress may have intended 25 years ago, when the Industrial Safety Board was created, I am confident Congress will now act to lodge in one responsible agency of the District of Columbia government the duty of looking after the on-the-job safety of non-Government employees in the District of Columbia and of formulating and proposing regulations to secure their safety.

Nothing in the bill I propose would change the existing relationship between the District of Columbia Commissioners and the Industrial Safety Board. The Commissioners will retain their full present authority to approve and promulgate the regulations the Industrial Safety Board proposes. The Safety Board will have no authority to promulgate its own regulations.

But the Board will have the authority and responsibility for examining the safety of the working conditions of every non-Government employee in the District of Columbia, and for proposing for the approval of the District Commissioners whatever regulations the Board deems necessary to secure employee safety.

In drafting this bill I have consulted the District of Columbia government, its Corporation Counsel, the Industrial Safety Board itself, and representatives of the affected employees. The safety bill I introduce today contains what I consider to be the best suggestions for this legislation from each of the people I have consulted. The bill provides a clear, reasonable, simple, and rational governmental apparatus for securing employee safety in the District of Columbia.

The bill continues the traditional responsibilities of the Industrial Safety Board toward proposing regulations to secure the safety of every employee, but it also continues the District Commissioners' authority to approve those regulations and to insure their harmony with other kinds of business regulation in the District of Columbia. I am confident that this is a legislative proposal which the District Commissioners, the affected business interests of the District, the Industrial Safety Board, and the employee representatives here in the District can support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1168) to amend title II of the act of September 19, 1918 (40 Stat. 960), as amended, relating to industrial safety in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. Tydings, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

CERTAIN LANDS IN TRUST FOR THE PAWNEE INDIAN TRIBE OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, for myself and my senior colleague [Mr. Monroney], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Pawnee Indian Tribe of Oklahoma, at the request of the Pawnee Indian Tribe. In support of the necessity for passage of this bill I ask unanimous consent that a certain memorandum and letters be printed at this point in the Record, together with the bill itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, memorandum, and letters will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1171) to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Pawnee Indian Tribe, Oklahoma, introduced by Mr. Harris (for himself and Mr. Monroney), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1171

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all right, title, and interest of the United States in the following described lands and improvements thereon, embraced in the Pawnee school and agency reserve, and in four cemetery sites, comprising 726.03 acres, more or less, are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the benefit of the Pawnee Tribe of Oklahoma, subject to valid existing rights-of-way and subject to the rights of the United States to use, without compensation, the tract of land comprising approximately 5.46 acres, together with facilities located thereon or hereafter installed, which is being used by the United States Public Health Service on the date of the enactment of this Act:

Indian Meridian, Oklahoma

Township 19 north, range 5 east, section 16, southwest quarter, southeast quarter, southwest quarter;

Township 21 north, range 5 east, section 18, southwest quarter, southwest quarter, southwest quarter;

Township 22 north, range 4 east, section 32, southwest quarter, southwest quarter, northeast quarter;

Township 22 north, range 5 east, section 20, northeast quarter, southeast quarter, southwest quarter; section 32, east half, east half, west half; section 33, west half.

excepting therefrom the following lands:

(1) Lot 1, comprising 88.43 acres, more or less, located in the west half, east half and east half, west half section 32, as shown on General Land Office plat approved November 5, 1907, which has been conveyed to the city of Pawnee;

(2) Lot 2, comprising 12.68 acres, more or less, and lot 3, comprising 12.86 acres, more or less, both located in the west half, east half and east half, west half section 32, as shown on General Land Office supplemental plat approved February 4, 1920, which have been conveyed to the Home Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention;

(3) The surface of 20 acres, more or less, but not the minerals therein, located in the northeast quarter section 32 conveyed to the city of Pawnee, and more particularly described in quitclaim deed dated May 31, 1957, recorded in book 2, page 610 of the Pawnee County, Oklahoma, records;

(4) The surface of 20 acres, more or less, but not the minerals therein, located in the southeast quarter and southeast quarter southwest quarter section 32, conveyed to the city of Pawnee, and more particularly described in quitclaim deed dated July 15, 1960, recorded in book 4, page 377 of the Pawnee County, Oklahoma, records.

Sec. 2. If at any time title to the surface of any land referred to in paragraph (3) or (4) of the first section of this Act reverts to the United States in accordance with the provisions of the Act of June 4, 1953 (67 Stat. 41), as amended (25 U.S.C. 293a), such title shall be held thereafter in trust for the Pawnee Tribe of Oklahoma.

Sec. 3. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the property interest placed in trust for the benefit of the Pawnee Tribe of Oklahoma by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim by such Tribe against the United States determined by the Commission.

The memorandum and letters presented by Mr. Harris are as follows:

Memorandum

The purpose of this bill is to restore to the Pawnee Indian Tribe of Oklahoma about 585 acres of land located mainly in the old Indian school and agency reserve on the Pawnee Indian Reservation in Oklahoma. All of this land formerly was the property of the Tribe.

In 1893, a part of the Pawnee Reservation was allotted to members of the Tribe, 755 acres were reserved for Indian school and agency purposes, and the balance, called "surplus" land, was sold to the United States for $1.25 per acre. But the United States paid only about one-third of the amount due the Tribe. The Senate referred the matter to the Court of Claims in 1911. Nine years later the Court ruled that the Tribe was entitled to be paid for all of the "surplus" land but not for the 755 acres set aside for Indian school and agency purposes, on the ground that the 755 acres "continues as tribal property."[1] The 585 acres covered in the bill is part of that 755 acres which the Court of Claims hold belonged to the Tribe.

Through the years, both before and after the ruling of the Court of Claims, the Government granted portions of the 755 acres to the Town of Pawnee and to a religious group for church purposes. The interests so granted are in no way affected by the bill, or included in the 585 acres.

After the Indian Claims Commission was created, the Tribe asked the Commission for compensation for those interests in the 755 acres which the United States had granted to others. The Tribe was justified in this, since the Court of Claims had held that the 755 acres belonged to the Tribe. The Indian Claims Commission ruled that the Court of Claims was wrong and that the 755 acres did not belong to the Tribe. On appeal the Court of Claims, without reference to its prior holding of title in the Tribe, reversed itself and agreed that the Pawnees did not own the land.

It is interesting that for purposes of denying payment for the 755 acres, the Court of Claims ruled that the lands "continue as tribal property". But for purposes of avoiding payment of just compensation for the portions of the 755 acres the United States sold, the Court and the Commission ruled that the 755 acres was not tribal property, but belong to the United States.[2]

The Tribe has continuously used the 755 acres, except for the portions conveyed to others. The people of the Tribe have always regarded the land as their property. It is home to about 375 members of the Tribe who live in Pawnee. The Tribe has its tribal community center and meeting hall on the land. All the tribal activities and social functions take place there.

The Tribe now uses the land under a year to year revocable permit from the Bureau of Indian Affairs. An old agency building is located on the land along with 16 housing units which are rented under tribal management. About 100 acres of the land is suitable for farming and another 400 is grazing land. There is good potential for a cattle feed lot operation. Several industries have come to the Tribe expressing interest in establishing themselves on the land. The location is favorable to market both by rail and highway. A good labor pool is available and jobs are needed in the Pawnee community.

The Tribe has organized a housing authority which is prepared to build much needed public housing units on the land.

But, nothing can be accomplished until title to the land rests in the Tribe. Industry proposals must be rejected since the Tribe does not have title to the building sites. A commitment for public housing units is not possible until the Tribe owns the housing sites. Agricultural development and improvement of the land, on the scale it deserves, is not economically feasible under a year to year revocable permit arrangement.

The City of Pawnee has given its full support to the bill as evidenced by the Council meeting of February 1, 1967. There is close liaison between the Tribal Council and the City Council. Both are interested in attracting industry, stimulating jobs, providing housing and improving the local economy.

The bill, in a small way, would restore to these fine Indian people the ownership of land which they have always regarded as their own and which they need to provide jobs and housing for the people of the Pawnee community.

THE PAWNEE COMMUNITY
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INC.,
Pawnee, Okla., February 9, 1967.

Hon. FRED HARRIS,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARRIS: I am writing on behalf of the Board of Directors of the Pawnee Chamber of Commerce to express our wholehearted support and deep interest in the project of the Business Council of the Pawnee Indian Tribe to acquire clear title—in trust—to the lands and improvements of the former Pawnee Indian Agency & Boarding School.

You introduced the bill last year, but as you know it has been rewritten and made more specific this year.

At present the Pawnee Indian Business Council is operating the property on a year by year permit from the B.I.A. They have been successful in this operation, but the fact that they do not have clear title to it prevents its ultimate development by them.

We believe that the crucial point about this proposed bill is the point that this land be delivered by Act of Congress in trust. We feel that it would be a great mistake to convey title in fee simple. It would be harmful to the best interests of the Tribe and the Pawnee Community as a whole.

If held in Trust, the property could not be dispersed or wasted at the whim of any one group then in power. It would remain under the careful supervision of the B.I.A., and there are many fine programs available, if the land remains in trust, which the Tribe could make good use of in developing the tract for industrial development, training programs, a badly needed Tribal community center, etc.

The Pawnee City Council has adopted a resolution of support also. There is no disagreement between the Chamber, City officials and Tribal officials about this matter. We stand together on the importance of carrying out this project.

Your help and assistance will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

DON JOHNSON,
Manager.

PAWNEE BUSINESS COUNCIL,
PAWNEE INDIAN TRIBE OF OKLAHOMA,
Pawnee, Okla., February 13, 1966.

Hon. FRED R. HARRIS,
U.S. Senator,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: In regards to your letter of February 10, 1967, wherein you request an answer to the official action taken by the Pawnee Indian Business Council for approval or disapproval of proposed legislation.

The Pawnee Indian Business Council, at its quarterly meeting of February 4, 1967, did go down on record as approving the proposed legislation to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Pawnee Indian Tribe of Oklahoma and asking that all right, title and interest of the United States in the described lands and improvements thereon embraced in the Pawnee School and Agency Reserve and in four-cemetery tracts and mineral interest in two 20 acre tracts conveyed to the City of Pawnee.

We will now say, the Pawnee Indian Business Council, along with the Pawnee City Council; Pawnee Chamber of Commerce; Bureau of Indian Affairs, Pawnee Agency; Anadarko Area Office and the Central Office in Washington, D.C., that the proposed legislation meets with the approval of the above mentioned parties to the proposed bill.

Very truly yours,

SAMUEL OSBORNE,
Chairman, Pawnee Business Council.

ATTEST:

LESTER L. PRATT,
Secretary-Treasurer,
Pawnee Business Council.

CITY OF PAWNEE,
Pawnee, Okla., February 2, 1967.

Hon. FRED R. HARRIS,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: During the regular meeting of our City Council evening of February 1, 1967 members of the Pawnee Indian Tribal Council, Lamont Pratt, Sam Osborn and Earl Chapman, presented to us and requested our opinions on the attached bill.

We wish to go on record (as shown in our minutes of this meeting) we are in complete agreement and support of the Pawnee Indian Tribal Council in their efforts for a successful passage of this bill.

Sincerely,

Glenn Wood, Mayor; Cecil Kelley, Councilman; Jarrett Maltsberger, Councilman; Watson Boyle, Councilman; Charles Cox, Councilman; Glennwood Haug, Councilman; Frank Gentry, Councilman; David Beaver, Councilman; Leslie Crocker, Councilman.

TRANSFER OF TITLE OF CERTAIN INDIAN LANDS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, for myself and my senior colleague [Mr. MONRONEY], I introduce today, for appropriate reference, two bills which have as their purpose the transferring of title of certain land of the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma to the United States to be held in trust for the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma. I introduce them at the request of the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes.

In support of the necessity for the passage of these bills I ask unanimous consent that a letter to me from the chairman of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Business Committee, dated January 26, 1967, and the bills be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY), were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1172

A bill to declare that certain land of the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma is held by the United States in Trust for the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, all right, title, and interest of the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma in and to the following described land, and improvements thereon, are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma:

South 1,614 feet of section 5, south 1,614 feet of section 6, east half west half, east half section 7, section 8, section 17, section 18, north half section 19, north half section 20, township 13 north, range 7 west, south 1,614 feet of east half southeast quarter section 1, east half northeast quarter section 12, lying west of the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railroad, east half northeast quarter, northwest quarter northeast quarter section 13, south half southeast quarter section 24, northeast quarter, east half northeast quarter northwest quarter section 25, township 13 north, range 8 west, Indian meridian, containing 3,894.04 acres, more or less.

---

[1] *Pawnee Indians* v. *United States,* 56 C. Cls. 1, 13 (1920).

[2] *Pawnee Tribe of Oklahoma* v. *United States,* 124 U.S. 324, 410–412 (1953).

S. 1173

A bill to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following described land, and improvements thereon, are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma:

All of the northwest quarter section 18, township 12 north, range 16 west, Indian meridian, Custer County, State of Oklahoma, except approximately 31.25 acres located in the easterly part of the east half northwest quarter described as follows:

Beginning at a point 259 feet west of the northeast corner of the east half northwest quarter section 18, township 12 north, range 16 west, thence west along the north section line of said section 18 for a distance of 426 feet; thence south 1 degree 20 minutes west for a distance of 284 feet; then south 0 degrees 50 minutes west for a distance of 987.5 feet; thence south 42 degrees 54 minutes west for a distance of 223.9 feet to the east-west quarter section line of said section 18; thence east along said quarter section line for a distance of 570 feet to the southeast corner of said northwest quarter of section 18; thence north 0 degrees 43 minutes east along the north-south quarter section line for a distance of 2,315 feet; thence west for a distance of 259 feet; thence north 0 degrees 43 minutes east for a distance of 325 feet to the point of beginning.

SEC. 2. This conveyance is subject to existing rights-of-way for waterlines, electric transmission lines, roads, and railroads.

SEC. 3. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

The letter presented by Mr. HARRIS is as follows:

CHEYENNE AND ARAPAHO TRIBES,
January 26, 1967.

Hon. FRED R. HARRIS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARRIS: Of the two bills, concerning the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma, which have been drafted for your office by the United States Department of Interior, the one concerning the surplus USPHS Clinton Indian hospital land is of primary importance to us.

We would appreciate immediate action, as is practically feasible, on this measure.

One of the priority projects on this land once it is declared to be held in trust by the United States for the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma will be the construction of a home for the elderly.

We will proceed with plannning to use that land for this purpose. I have been in communication with the local Health Service Unit of the Division of Indian Health, United States Public Health Service, and such use of this land is amenable and agreeable to them. I will also contact a reliable engineering firm to help us plan the construction of this needed facility for our Tribes.

Please keep us informed on this measure.

Very truly yours,
LAWRENCE H. HART,
Chairman, Cheyenne-Arapaho Business Committee.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 22 OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I am again introducing a bill to eliminate the preferential treatment accorded the U.S. Government in the shipment of its own goods.

Under section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, Government agencies may negotiate with rail, motor, water, and freight forwarders for free or reduced rates. Such rate deals are not subject to regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission or scrutiny by the Department of Justice or Federal Trade Commission. Under an exception to the antitrust laws, carriers may, through the medium of rate bureaus, decide what rates to charge the Government.

Except for a 1957 amendment relating to filing, the provisions of section 22 relating to Government traffic have remained essentially the same since passage of the original act to regulate commerce in 1887. At that time the Government was a comparatively small user of freight or passenger services of the carriers. Today, however, it is the largest single purchaser of transportation services. Moreover, not only have Federal Government shipments under section 22 increased, but the use by State and municipal governments of these reduced rates has mushroomed.

Government agencies claim that they save millions of dollars annually through these rate deals. If that is the case, then other shippers are paying rates that are higher than necessary, or the Government is being granted uneconomic rates which the shipping and consuming public is making up in the transportation cost of other commodities. If the Government rates are too low, this is an unseen tax on shippers.

In August 1963 I introduced S. 2075 to subject these Government deals to the scrutiny of the Interstate Commerce Commission for the limited purpose of determining if Government traffic is moving under discriminatory, preferential, or prejudicial rates.

In May 1964, I presided over hearings of the Commerce Committee on S. 2075. Government witnesses testifying at these hearings admitted that Government shipping agencies are neither competent nor appropriately staffed to weed out unfair section 22 rates, and stated that they had no objection in principle to S. 2075.

These hearings demonstrated the widespread support for a change in section 22. Testifying or submitting statements in support of a change or complete repeal of section 22 were the Interstate Commerce Commission, National Association of Railroad & Utilities Commissioners, Transportation Association of America, American Trucking Associations, Air Transport Association, Common Carrier Conference of Domestic Water Carriers, American Association of Port Authorities, Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, the National Industrial Traffic League, and many others.

In its statement to the committee, the National Industrial Traffic League, which is a nationwide organization of shippers, including in its membership chambers of commerce, boards of trade, and similar commercial organizations, pointed out:

> For 10 years the League has been urging legal and moral reform of practices which have appeared in the utilization of section 22.

The American Trucking Associations has long urged the complete repeal of section 22. As the late Frederick G. Freund, then traffic director, American Trucking Associations, concisely put it in a sentence which was quoted before the committee:

> The granting of cut rates to the Government, in effect, subsidizes the world's largest shipper, encourages destructive practices between and among the various modes of transportation and, through the encouragement of destructive practices, jeopardizes the financial stability of our transportation system.

At that time, in its 78th annual report to the Congress, the Interstate Commerce Commission recommended that section 22 be amended to limit "22" rate deals only to time of war, and to transportation which remains exempt from economic regulations under parts II and III of the act. The ICC recommended that the Government pay full tariff rates and charges for transportation services because the preferential treatment of Government traffic "has a strong tendency to increase the cost of regulated transportation services to commercial users who, when their rates become too high, resort to private carriage. Such diversions of traffic are clearly detrimental to the maintenance of a sound common carrier system. Moreover, the preferential treatment accorded the various levels of government is, in our view, inconsistent with the national transportation policy which has among its objectives 'to foster sound economic conditions in transportation' and 'to encourage the establishment and maintenance of reasonable charges for transportation services without unjust discrimination, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices.'"

In addition to the broad ramifications resulting from this preferential treatment accorded the Government, the Great Lakes ports are specifically discriminated against in that the section 22 rate deals result in actually diverting cargo that would otherwise logically flow through these ports.

On September 13, 1965, a special subcommittee of the Commerce Committee to study Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway transportation issued its report. This report pointed out that the rates granted by the railroads for the transportation of Government cargoes that originate in the Midwest and travel to the east coast are consistently lower than rates granted by the railroads for similar types of shipments originating in the Midwest and traveling the much shorter distance to a lake port. The Seaway Report concluded that legislation should be considered to change section 22 to eliminate this preferential treatment accorded to the Government.

As recently as January of this year, during the Commerce Committee hearing on the nomination of Alan Boyd to serve as Secretary of the Department of Transportation, Senator LAUSCHE referred to the work of this special subcommittee which he so ably chaired. Senator LAUSCHE specifically included section 22 rates among the items meriting the attention of the new Transportation Secretary. In referring to the report, Mr. Boyd said:

> This is a matter to which I expect to give priority.

In September 1966 the Great Lakes Task Force, which is composed of the Council of Lake Erie Ports, the Great Lakes Commission, the Great Lakes Terminals Association and the International Association of Great Lakes Ports had this to say about the discriminatory effect of section 22:

> Section 22 quotations have been and are being used to direct traffic from the Great Lakes area to coastal ports to the disadvantage of Great Lakes port. Very few section 22 rates or quotations have been offered or negotiated on traffic to Great Lakes ports.
>
> An inquiry should be made either by the Congress or the Interstate Commerce Commission to determine whether section 22 rates should be limited as proposed in 1957 [to times of war or national emergency] and whether the present implementation of that authority unduly discriminates against Great Lakes ports.

One of the most ringing denunciations of section 22 and the special hardship to Great Lakes ports that has resulted from its use was given by Mr. Louis C. Purdey, executive director of the Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority. On February 7, 1967, at a breakfast sponsored by the Council of Lake Erie Ports, Mr. Purdey had this to say:

> For purposes of transportation, the United States was chopped into a neat East, West, Gulf Coast pie . . .
>
> Cargo was rolling past our ports, in one form or another on its way to the coast. Close examination of land rates, in hundreds of cases revealed that charges were less to transport something 700 miles than 200 miles . . .
>
> We found a little "hooker" in the Interstate Commerce Act which permits carriers to move Government goods at free reduced rates . . . we tried to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by proving that carriers were frequently hauling Federal goods at a loss, making up the deficiency on commercial shipper.

Mr. Purdey's comments on the 1961 Defense Department task force study concerning the feasibility of moving military goods out of Great Lakes ports points out even more vividly the magnitude of the problem:

> The conclusions of this impartial and in-depth report confirmed many of our contentions. Perhaps we were naive, but we confidently expected a sharp increase of military movements as a result of this report. Instead, what has happened? Since 1962, the volume of military cargo flowing through the Great Lakes ports has declined steadily to the point where *more military cargo flowed out of one single East coast port in a two-week period than moved out of all of the Great Lakes ports put together during the entire 1966 season.*
>
> Doesn't this strike you as a strange situation when you realize that production points for military goods generally lie well within the gathering area of the lakes?

Because of the exceptionally concise and forceful manner in which Mr. Purdy has outlined the problems and needs of the Great Lakes ports and the St. Lawrence Seaway, I ask unanimous consent to insert his speech in the RECORD.

I fully concur with the 1961 report to the Committee on Commerce by its special study group on transportation policy—known as the Doyle report—in which it was stated:

> The policy of the Government should be that its agencies pay fair and reasonable rates, not as determined by these agencies, but as determined by an impartial judge, the regulatory agency.

Furthermore, I believe it is unconscionable that the Government should take part in freight rate discrimination against regions, ports, and shippers in the movement of its traffic.

The Department of Transportation Act, Public Law 89-670, section 4(a), makes it a duty of the Secretary of Transportation to "consult with the heads of other Federal departments and agencies on the transportation requirements of the Government, including the procurement of transportation or the operation of their own transport services in order to encourage them to establish and observe policies consistent with the maintenance of a coordinated transportation system."

Hopefully the new Secretary of Transportation will prevail upon Government shipping agencies to establish and observe policies to carry out our national transportation objectives.

Meanwhile I am again introducing the identical bill I introduced in the 89th Congress so that citizens and regions may be protected from discriminatory and unfair rates given the U.S. Government. This bill would repeal section 22 in its entirety, except in time of war or national emergency.

The chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee has also introduced a bill S. 754, by request of the ICC, dealing with section 22 which differs somewhat from the version I am introducing today. Although there are differences, the Interstate Commerce Commission repeated its statement of 2 years ago, from which I quoted earlier, concerning the need for repealing section 22. I think it is important for both approaches to be considered by the Commerce Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the speech will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1174) to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act to restrict certain authorization for free or reduced rate transportation of property or passengers, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The speech presented by Mr. HART is as follows:

REMARKS BY LOUIS C. PURDEY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, TOLEDO-LUCAS COUNTY PORT AUTHORITY, TOLEDO, OHIO

(For the annual Washington Roundup sponsored by the Council of Lake Erie Ports in cooperation with the International Association of Great Lakes Ports, Great Lakes Commission and the Great Lakes Terminals Association, Feb. 7, 1967)

Since I have prepared some bacon and eggs remarks, it is certainly fitting that they be delivered at a breakfast meeting. It would delight me no end to lay on a heavy coating of quiet and dignified rhetoric this morning, but I can't . . . for three reasons . . . many of you who know me would probably spray coffee all over your table partner if I tried it . . . second, there is nothing so sophisticated on the Great Lakes as to warrant the langauge of diplomacy . . . and third, the ideas and information I hope to transmit in just a few minutes are not "chateaubriand." They are as basic as hamburger.

As a representative port executive on the Great Lakes, my goal this morning is to touch on a few of our exposed nerve-ends . . . to re-emphasize what many of you already know so well . . . and to, hopefully, create a thirst for more information among the "unanointed."

(Gentlemen and ladies) there is very little wrong with the Great Lakes which a whole barrel-full of vision in years gone by couldn't have begun to cure. Back in the days when we were *almost* as primitive as easterners *still* think we are, better bridges of communication should have been built between the burgeoning industrial and agricultural midwest and the elected or appointed officials here in Washington.

While dedicated lakes people were preoccupied with attempts to obtain a seaway through whatever political compromises were necessary, there was total awareness on the part of opposing forces that something was happening. . . Something which threatened to interrupt the cozy status quo of national and international transportation patterns.

Even after the approval of a construction program and a bilateral agreement with Canada was reached, we still failed to put our over-all position under the microscope. It was necessary to become engrossed with nuts-and-bolts programs for providing adequate docks and getting enabling legislation on a local and state level.

For purposes of transportation, the United States was chopped up into a neat east, west, gulf coast pie. There were powerful interests which meant to see that this condition continued on into infinity.

Our real troubles began when we opened the doors for business. Of course the reaction was immediate. Captive industries were quick to use our ports and the seaway. Where local cartage could do the job, we faired very well . . . and still do. Then . . . we discovered the FMC, the ICC, the confounding labyrinth of agencies involved in the movement of cargo for our country's largest shipper . . . the United States Government, and the rambling inconsistencies of railroads and American-flag conferences.

These discoveries hit us like a pile driver . . . cargo was rolling past our ports, in one form or another . . . on its way to the coast. Close examination of land rates, in hundreds of cases, revealed that charges were less to transport something 700 miles than 200 miles.

While we were swinging hot and heavy for a decent waterway into the Midwest, little attention had been given to paving the way for transportation reforms within the inland rate structure of the United States.

We found a little "hooker" in the Interstate Commerce Act which permits carriers to move government goods at free or reduced rates. When the Department of Defense was forced to computerize to handle all of the "22" rates to coastal ports which were being filed, we tried to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by proving that carriers were frequently hauling federal goods at a loss . . . making up the deficiency on commercial shippers.

A course of action was clear. Legislative proposals were offered to amend section 22. The bills died in committee.

Inflamed senatorial action, however, resulted in a Defense Department task force study being made in 1961 concerning the feasibility of moving military goods out of Great Lakes ports. The conclusions of this impartial and in-depth report confirmed many of our contentions. Perhaps we were naive, but we confidently expected a sharp increase of military movements as a result of this report. Instead, what has happened? Since 1962, the volume of military cargo flowing through the Great Lakes ports has declined steadily to the point where *more military cargo flowed out of one single east coast port in a two-week period than moved out of all of the Great Lakes ports put together during the entire 1966 season.*

Doesn't this strike you as a strange situation when you realize that production points for military goods generally lie well within the gathering area of the lakes?

Since 1961, printed testimony, investigation reports and cargo studies have been splattered all over this town. Most of them are either collecting dust or are dead and buried.

Testimony of professional interests in the Great Lakes correctly predict the potential damage involved in the proposed increase of tolls on the St. Lawrence Seaway. Despite this, the seaway is faced with the possibility of more charges in the very near future.

As you know, 42 Great Lakes Senators and Representatives (many of whom are here today) have requested the President to defer a toll increase, until appropriate legislation can be sought to make such escalation unnecessary. They have also asked for proposals from the new Department of Transportation in this regard.

Basic changes in the laws covering the U.S. financing of the seaway must be made at the earliest possible moment. The present toll crisis must be solved. Relying on the leadership and discernment of the Great Lakes senatorial conference and our Representatives in the House, we believe that necessary legislative changes will become a reality. The organizations here today . . . which form our Great Lakes "task force" . . . are bringing their specific recommendations to these legislators.

The fate of American-flag vessels plying the Great Lakes routes, both ocean and lake freighter, is another issue of vital concern.

New ocean vessels being programmed are by design too large to transit the seaway. In fiscal 1967, not one of the 13 vessels approved for construction subsidy will be able to traverse the locks. Based on published reports, I am inclined to feel we are being designed out of business.

And, consider the plight of the U.S. lakes fleet. Since 1959 the number of lake vessels has shrunken from 322 to 220. *Not a single new American-flag lake freighter* has been built since 1960. Here again, the Great Lakes do not enjoy equal treatment.

This important segment of our merchant marine should be accorded the same depreciation, relief and construction reserve allowances as are available to their coastal counterparts.

The "laker" has been a major contributor, not to industry alone, but to the welfare of our entire country in time of war. During World War II it was the lakes fleet which supplied two basic ingredients necessary for victory—iron ore and coal. In fact, during than conflict, lakers carried nearly 900 million tons of material, more than four times the tonnage carried by the ocean merchant marine.

We urge your investigation of pending legislation designed to correct this glaring inequity.

Although some progress has been made, the growth of the seaway is still severely hampered by the rail carriers, as reflected by the consistent pattern of rate discrimination which faces the Great Lakes ports. After over 10 years of attempting to employ logic, Federal intervention and users' appeals, we are still faced with the century-old dogma of the long haul. Here's one dramatic example:

On cranes and draglines from Indianapolis, Indiana New York enjoys a rate for export of 80¢ cwt. This, for a total rail distance of 799 miles. The domestic rate to Toledo, only 211 miles, is 81¢ cwt., but this rate specifically excludes export—and the export rate via Toledo, believe it or not, is 98¢ cwt. over 20% higher for about one-quarter the distance.

How can the Great Lakes ports hope to compete when such a nonsensical policy of discrimination exists?

We urge Great Lakes legislators to request the new Department of Transportation, as one of its first orders of business to make recommendations which will insure a fair competitive situation.

So far, I have touched on only the top priority problems. An enumeration of all the aches and pains that rack the carcass of the fourth seacoast would require that we serve not only breakfast, but lunch and dinner.

Just let me add that we, on the lakes, are looking forward to early completion of the seaway de-icing study by the U.S. Corps of Engineers. This is an urgent project . . . extension of the season by only 30 days could increase U.S. toll revenues by nearly a million dollars a year. All of us are confident that the seaway season can and will be extended.

We also strongly support the Great Lakes Basin Compact. This agreement by the eight Great Lakes States fosters their mutual interests in navigation, pollution, water resources and other matters related to the Great Lakes Basin. We urge congressional approval through the consent bill now pending.

To this point, all of my comments have been of a dyspeptic nature. Believe me, it is not my intention to furnish a case of after-breakfast heartburn.

Actually, the Great Lakes area is doing very well considering it has one hand tied behind it. It is a statistical fact that the hard core of this country's industrial and agricultural productivity lies within the distribution area of the Great Lakes. Although many of the plants are puppets manipulated by long strings stretching from coastal headquarters, entrenched habit and lack of interest are being successfully broken down. Our message is beginning to be heard across the Hudson River.

I think it is pretty well agreed that there is going to be a slowdown in American industrialization of Europe. The U.S. firms which now simply *accept* export orders and then only if they are f.o.b. plant may be forced to actively *sell* their products to the world market. Industry will be working its head off in an effort to keep overseas business. Everybody will be laboring to maintain a decent U.S. balance of payments—and lower transportation charges will come to the top when U.S. firms finally are forced to cope with the production of 250 million people who will be united economically throughout Europe.

The Seaway and Great Lakes ports are here to stay. The natural laws of geography and economics guarantee our future. The unknown quantity, however, is whether the necessary reforms will be made in this generation, the next or the next.

With dedicated and expanding leadership among legislators and closer scrutiny by the national media, rightful recognition of the fourth seacoast is assured. The spotlight of truth can turn the American people from simple targets for our popguns to willing workers in the cause of our country's future.

Something vital is happening west of the Hudson River. We've grown up now and there's no good reason why we can't join the club.

Thank you!!!

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 13(a) OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, for appropriate referral, a bill to amend section 13(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act and for other purposes.

As a result of over 8 years' experience with section 13(a), which was added to the Interstate Commerce Act in 1958, the Interstate Commerce Commission has become convinced that a number of necessary changes must be made in the public interest.

The changes recommended by the Commission are as follows: First, in order to afford the public full opportunity for hearing in important train discontinuance proceedings, the Commission would be empowered to require that service be continued without change for a period of up to 7 months instead of the present limit of 4 months. The bill further provides for an additional period of up to 2 months, if needed, for the Commission to complete its work and handle administrative appeals.

Second, to eliminate the present strait-jacket requirement that the Commission must either approve or disapprove a discontinuance, and to enable the Commission to flexibly handle discontinuance proceedings, the Commission would be authorized to render decisions on a conditional basis; that is, to make its decision contingent upon modifications in factors affecting service or operations. The Commission indicates that this would open up avenues thus far untried toward arresting the decline of the passenger train.

Third, to provide equal justice for all parties to a discontinuance proceeding, any adversely affected party and not only the railroad involved would be authorized to appeal an administratively final action of the ICC which is determinative of a discontinuance proposal. In the last Congress, the Commerce Committee held hearings on Senate Resolution 284, occasioned by the position taken by a railroad in court that the Congress intended to give a right of appeal only to railroads, and intended to deny the same right to affected States and the public concerned. Section 13(a) would be amended to make clear, if it were ever in doubt, that the Congress intended to provide an equal right of appeal to the public.

Fourth, to place the burden of proof where it belongs and to insure an adequate record, the burden of proof that continuation of the service would unduly burden commerce would be specifically assigned to the railroad seeking to discontinue passenger train service. The railroad obviously possesses the material data involved, and the Commission expects that this assignment of the burden of proof would impel the railroad make a more complete initial presentation.

Fifth, the bill would make a number of technical changes, including changing the jurisdiction of the Commission so as to include service operated from a point in a State to a foreign country; dealing with the problem wherein service itself is provided only in one State but where the train, for operating convenience, operates into another State; and, requiring that 40 days' notice rather than 30 be given in advance of any proposed discontinuance or change.

The Commission is to be commended for analyzing its experience with this statute, and recommending changes to aid its carrying out of its duties with respect to railroad passenger train discontinuances.

On September 30, 1965, at the signing of the High-Speed Ground Transportation Act, President Johnson said:

> In recent decades, we have achieved technological miracles in our transportation. But there is one great exception.
>
> We have airplanes which fly three times faster than sound. We have television cameras that are orbiting Mars. But we have the same tired and inadequate mass transportation between our towns and cities that we had 30 years ago.
>
> Today, as we meet here in this historic room where Abigail Adams hung out her wash, an astronaut can orbit the earth faster than a man on the ground can get from New York to Washington. Yet, the same science and technology which gave us our airplanes and our space probes, I believe, could also give us better and faster and more economical transportation on the ground. And a lot of us need it more on the ground than we need it orbiting the earth.
>
> So I hope this meeting this morning will provide a platform for us to get that kind of transportation. We must do it. We must start getting it now. In the past 15 years, travel between our cities has more than doubled. By 1985—only 20 years away—we will have 75 million more Americans in this country. And those 75 million will be doing a great deal more traveling.

The program of research and development and demonstration projects authorized by the high-speed ground transportation law, Public Law 89–220, is designed to provide the Nation with better and faster intercity passenger service, not merely in the northeastern corridor, but between all major population centers throughout the United States.

In addition to such a program looking to the future, we must preserve existing intercity rail passenger service. If we do not, there will be no national rail passenger transportation resource to which the lessons of research and development in high-speed ground transportation can be applied.

The last few years have seen a rapid disappearance of rail passenger service. Railroad intercity passenger miles declined from 28.7 billion in 1955 to 17.5 billion in 1965.

The remaining nucleus of rail passenger operations is fast disappearing. If present trends continue, intercity rail passenger service will cease when existing passenger train equipment can no longer be maintained or renovated by processes of cannibalization and must be replaced by new equipment. Nearly 60 percent of our present railroad passenger cars are over 30 years old, and only less than 4 percent are under 6 years old. In 5 to 10 years, unless positive steps are taken by both the Congress and the railroad industry, intercity rail passenger service will disappear except in the Northeast Corridor and possibly a few other densely populated strips.

While the Commission is to be commended for recommending changes in section 13(a), piecemeal repairs of section 13(a) will not alone provide the means to establish a revitalized rail passenger service. One source of difficulty in the development of a program to preserve and promote rail passenger service has been the fragmentation of government agencies in this area. The Interstate Commerce Commission has been entrusted with the determination of whether certain services constitute a burden on interstate commerce. However, promotional efforts, such as the high-speed ground transportation law, have been placed under the responsibility of the Department of Commerce. The Department of Defense and other governmental agencies have relied increasingly on other modes of transportation to move troops, servicemen, and individual government employees. The Post Office Department has diverted a large volume of mail to air and highway transportation, and the pace of this diversion is accelerating.

The new Department of Transportation will finally provide a focus at the Cabinet level for a coordinated program to preserve and revitalize rail passenger service. In testifying in support of this legislation, I suggested that consideration be given to the establishment of an Office of Passenger Transportation, headed by an Assistant Secretary, in the new Department to give the traveling public a voice in the councils of Government. The Government Operations Committee agreed with my suggestion, but not wishing to tie the new Department for the indefinite future to a particular organizational structure, strongly urged the Secretary of Transportation in the committee report to make promotion of passenger service and representation of the public in passenger proceedings a prime concern, and to that end to assign to an Assistant Secretary, or other appropriate official in the new Department this important duty.

In recent remarks before the New York Railroad Club, Chairman Tucker of the Interstate Commerce Commission pointed out the need for a viable, modern railway passenger service designed to satisfy the accelerating requirements of our increasingly urbanized society. Such a system he suggested must include not only vastly improved medium range, high-speed intercity train service within the major metropolitan zones, but also a basic core of long-distance trains connecting the major zones to each other in overnight service.

Chairman Tucker suggested that to bring our intercity rail travel to even a minimum level of adequacy, however, will require a major new infusion of techniques, equipment, and imagination. This need, I am convinced, must be met by both industry and the Government.

At such time as hearings are scheduled on the bill, which I am today introducing, I would hope that the railroad industry, the Commission, and the Secretary of Transportation would come forward with plans for the preservation and promotion of a minimum intercity passenger service structure. The alternative to action now will be the death of intercity rail passenger service within a decade.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks entitled "Rail Passenger Service: Its Regulatory Challenge," given by William H. Tucker, Vice Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, before the New York Railroad Club on October 20, 1966, as attached be printed in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that Chairman Tucker's letter of transmittal dated March 2, 1967, and attached justification be printed in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and material will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Washington.

The bill (S. 1175) to amend section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1175

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 13(a) of Part I of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 13a) is amended to read as follows:

13a(1) A carrier or carriers subject to this part, if their rights with respect to the discontinuance or change, in whole or in part, of the operation or service of any train or ferry operated in service between a point in one State or a foreign country and a point in any other State or in the District of Columbia, are subject to any provision of the constitution or statutes of any State or any regulation or order of (or are the subject of any proceeding pending before) any court or an administrative or regulatory agency of any State, may, but shall not be required to, file with the Commission, and upon such filing shall mail to the Governor of each State in which such train or ferry is operated, and post in every station, depot, or other facility served thereby, notice at least forty days in advance of any such proposed discontinuance or change. The carrier or carriers filing such notice may discontinue or change any such operation or service pursuant to such notice except as otherwise ordered by the Commission pursuant to this paragraph, the laws or constitution of any State, or the decision or order of, or the pendency of any proceeding before, any court or State authority to the contrary notwithstanding. Upon the filing of such notice the Commission shall have authority during said forty days' notice period, either upon complaint or upon its own initiative without complaint, to enter upon an investigation of the proposed discontinuance or change. When an investigation by the Commission is instituted under this section, the carrier or carriers filing such notice shall have the burden of establishing that public convenience and necessity permit the proposed discontinuance or change, in whole or in part, and that the continued operation or service of such train or ferry without discontinuance or change, in whole or in part, will unduly burden interstate or foreign commerce. Upon the institution of such investigation, the Commission, by its investigation order served upon the carrier or carriers affected thereby at least ten days prior to the day on which such discontinuance or change would otherwise become effective, may require such train or ferry to be continued in operation or service, in whole or in part, pending hearing and decision in such investigation, but not for a longer period than seven months beyond the date when such discontinuance or change would otherwise have become effective; provided that the Commission may further require such train or ferry to be continued in operation or service, in whole or in part, for a period of no longer than two months beyond the date specified in its investigation order, pending completion of the investigation or the Commission's determination of any petition or petitions for reconsideration of its decision and order in such investigation. If, after hearing in such investigation, whether concluded before or after such discontinuance or change has become effective, the Commission finds that the public convenience and necessity do not permit the proposed discontinuance or change, in whole or in part, and that the continued operation or service of such train or ferry without discontinuance or change, in whole or in part, will not unduly burden interstate or foreign commerce, the Commission may by order require the continuance or restoration of operation or service of such train or ferry, in whole or in part, subject to such terms, conditions and modifications pertaining to operations or service as it shall find to be reasonable and just, for a period not to exceed one year from the date of such order. The provisions of this paragraph shall not supersede the laws of any State or the orders or regulations of any administrative or regulatory body of any State applicable to such discontinuance or change unless notice as in this paragraph provided is filed with the Commission. On the expiration of an order by the Commission after such investigation requiring the continuance or restoration of operation or service, the jurisdiction of any State as to such discontinuance or change shall no longer be superseded unless the procedure provided by this paragraph shall again be invoked by the carrier or carriers.

13a(2) Where the discontinuance or change, in whole or in part, by a carrier or carriers subject to this part, of the operation or service of any train or ferry operated wholly within the boundaries of a single State is prohibited by the constitution or statutes of any State or where the State authority having jurisdiction thereof shall have denied an application or petition duly filed with it by said carrier or carriers for authority to discontinue or change, in whole or in part, the operation or service of any such train or ferry or shall not have acted finally on such an application or petition within one hundred and twenty days from the presentation thereof, such carrier or carriers may petition the Commission for authority to effect such discontinuance or change. The Commission may grant such authority, in whole or in part, subject to such terms, conditions, and modifications pertaining to operations or service as it shall find to be reasonable and just, after full hearing and upon findings by it that (a) the present or future public convenience and necessity permit of such discontinuance or change, in whole or in part, of the operation or service of such train or ferry, and (b) the continued operation or service of such train or ferry without discontinuance or change, in whole or in part, will constitute an unjust and undue burden upon the interstate operations of such carrier or carriers or upon interstate commerce. When any petition shall be filed with the Commission under the provisions of this paragraph the Commission shall notify the Governor of the State in which such train or ferry is operated at least thirty days in advance of the hearing provided for in this paragraph, and such hearing shall be held by the Commission in the State in which such train or ferry is operated; and the Commission is authorized to avail itself of the cooperation, services, records, and facilities of the authorities in such State in the performance of its functions under this paragraph.

13a(3) Any State, administrative or regulatory agency of a State, or person, adversely affected or aggrieved by an order of the Commission entered after hearing pursuant to paragraphs (1) or (2) of this section, may bring suit to obtain judicial review thereof under the provisions of sections 1336, 1398, 2284, and 2321 through 2325 of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C. §§ 1336, 1398, 2284, and 2321–2325.

The material, ordered to be printed in the Record, is as follows:

Rail Passenger Service: Its Regulatory Challenge

(Remarks of William H. Tucker, Vice Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, before the New York Railroad Club, Hotel Commodore, New York, N.Y., Oct. 20, 1966)

In April last year, during the ICC hearing on the first of the New Haven Railroad's two major train discontinuance cases, the *New Yorker* magazine published a clever cartoon which perfectly reflected the dilemma of New York's commuters. The cartoon pictured a long horde of affluent-looking suburbanites marching along the New Haven Railroad's right of way toward their Manhattan offices. They had the familiar rails, ballast, and ties under foot, and the familiar electric power lines overhead—but the familiar trains were gone.

My guess was that this particular group of commuters was about two miles out of Stamford and that they had about 30 miles to walk to their offices. According to the caption, one commuter remarked to another:

I just never imagined they wouldn't come up with *some* form of government aid.

I assumed that *New Yorker* cartoonist Stevenson's thrust was at the New Haven Railroad, especially since I was then conducting hearings on the New Haven's proposal to discontinue 105 of its New York commuter trains—and also since there was lurking in the background of the case the threat of total collapse of the railroad and all of its passenger service.

One of the issues in the two New Haven train-off cases was the question whether there is any reasonable alternative to New Haven's commuter operations. The *New Yorker* cartoon's point was ultimately confirmed by our findings: There *is* no rational alternative.

I thought the cartoon was quite funny for itself, but I also got the suggestion from it that these early morning suburban marathoners were almost resigned to their fate, even if they were incredulous at it. That kind of attitude would be no laughing matter. I think it is unlikely that groups such as New Haven's 30,000 daily commuters would placidly accept abandonment of their passenger service where it is actually available and being relied upon, as in the case of the New Haven. As a public policy, the abandonment of such an urban mass transit facility would be a wholly unacceptable decision. But that fact, I believe, only reaches the threshhold of the really relevant issues.

The real danger is that public policy *will* accept and try to live with a passenger service—both within and between our metropolitan areas—at a level of adequacy lower even than present requirements—and, even if patched up and pieced together from time to time, a service which consistently lags behind the now predictable, unavoidable needs of the near future.

This result must not be allowed to occur. The scope and quality of future railway passenger service represent at least as important a national domestic issue as any other this country will face in the next decade.

We have, for example, a too deeply rooted national tradition teaching that our intercity rail passenger service is moribund and must finally die. I think we must reexamine that tradition and do all that is necessary to reshape its course for the years ahead.

While airline and highway technology, capacities, and utilization have enjoyed phenomenal development and growth in the past 30 years, railroad passenger service as a whole has moved into nearly total eclipse. It was only 8 years ago last month that an ICC hearing officer, after conducting extensive hearings into the matter, made his famous and controversial findings in the well-known *Railroad Passenger Train Deficit* case:

"For more than a century the railroad passenger coach has occupied an interesting and useful place in American life, but at the present time the inescapable fact—and certainly to many people an unpleasant one—seems to be that in a decade or so this time-honored vehicle may take its place in the transportation museums along with the stagecoach and the steam locomotive."

Although the full ICC on its review of the case did not adopt this conclusion, it did summarize and publish a great deal of statistical data which, by itself, would tend to confirm the hearing examiner's fears. For one thing, the Commission showed national cumulative "passenger deficits" of more than a half-billion dollars in each of the preceding 10 years, and a nearly ¾ billion-dollar deficit for 1957 alone. Moreover, the report stated that, except for the World War II years, railroad passenger service had recorded annual deficits without fail since 1930.

Nevertheless, railway passenger service has not disappeared in the decade following the ICC's passenger service investigation. Today there is a new need and a new opportunity to give it life and purpose.

Senator Pell's recent book, *Megalopolis Unbound*, achieves a remarkable summary of the circumstances, the trends, and the possible alternatives which face the people of our rapidly urbanizing society.

Megalopolis, the urbanized corridor extending along the East Coast from southern New Hampshire to northern Virginia, houses 20 percent of the nation's population on about 1.4 percent of its land. It accounts for about 20 percent of the nation's employment and one-third of its wages and salaries. The scale of intercity travel within this area already is at a much higher level than any other region.

A recent study estimated 4,000 auto passengers travel daily on its highways between New York and Washington, 4,800 between New York and Boston, and 12,000 between New York and Philadelphia. To these totals should also be added an estimated 2,300 daily bus passengers between New York and Washington, 1,400 between New York and Boston, and 2,100 between New York and Philadelphia.

As to the airlines, statistics for 1962 show that 5 million people—nearly 14,000 a day—flew between points *within* the megalopolitan area, representing 35 percent of all airline operations in this zone. Comparable estimates for rail patronage showed a daily volume of 1,575 passengers between New York and Washington, 1,295 between New York and Boston, and 5,400 between New York and Philadelphia.

It is not difficult to foresee an enormous increase in this kind of movement within Megalopolis when you consider the population here will increase by about 30 percent in the next 20 years. A Bureau of Public Roads study a few years ago predicted that intercity travel generally could increase by 58 percent in 1970 and 133 percent in 1980 over 1961 levels.

Trends evident in the northeastern corridor make it clear that unless a dramatic change is effected our first Megalopolis, and others to follow its lead, will eventually strangle its necessary mobility in unending ribbons of concrete and dangerously overcrowded airline traffic.

In terms of safety, speed, and economic and social cost, the proliferation of superhighways along the 600-mile northeast urban zone is not an adequate answer for predictable increases in intercity passenger travel. The *economic* cost alone of widening existing superhighways is becoming prohibitive. Senator Pell points out that it will cost about $300 million to widen a 30-mile stretch of the New Jersey Turnpike near New York City. The cost will be about two-thirds the *total* cost of the entire 132-mile highway in 1952.

Air lanes and metropolitan airfields already are congested in the northeast corridor, which has a far more dense concentration of air traffic than any other part of the country. Rising use of commercial and private aircraft within Megalopolis, and tightening demands for peak-hour air space and landing rights are beginning to tax the absolute physical limitations of present air technology. There are other severe limitations upon placing increased reliance upon air travel within Megalopolis. The incidence of bad weather still brings complete havoc to scheduled operations, even using the most advanced technology available. Incidental airport-to-city ground transportation continues to be inordinately time-consuming and inconvenient, and its improvement depends almost entirely upon feasible improvements in urban mass transit.

I think that the direction national public policy should follow is quite clear. As much as any other objective in the field of transportation, the nation needs a viable, modern, railway passenger service designed to satisfy the accelerating requirements of an increasingly urbanized society. By 1980 more than two-thirds of our population will live in about 25 compact urban zones around the country, located in a total of about 10 percent of the nation's land. Thus the travel limitations facing the northeastern Megalopolis will continually repeat themselves elsewhere, if they are not dealt with now.

Adequate railway passenger service for the future doubtless must include the provision of rapid commuter transit within individual metropolitan areas.

It must also, I am convinced, embrace both a vastly improved medium-range, high-speed intercity train service within the conglomerate megalopolitan zones, and a basic core of long-distance trains connecting the megalopolitan areas to each other in overnight service.

In many metropolitan areas substantial progress is evident in the planning, financing and building (or upgrading) of rail facilities for mass transit as parts of comprehensive programs balancing highway and railway needs. Increasingly, local area governments have come to appreciate that they must contribute a reasonable level of support for this service, as the particular circumstances in each area may require.

To bring our intercity travel even to a minimal level of adequacy, however, will require a major new infusion of techniques, equipment, and imagination. As an essential element in this effort, I believe, each passenger-carrying railroad should undertake a thorough reexamination and replanning of the entire structure of its passenger operations. With the aid of all available contemporary market analysis capabilities, each railroad should ask itself fundamental questions:

What service is really needed?

What amount of pruning of unproductive and unneeded schedules would be justified?

What kind of investment would be needed to modernize the remaining operations?

To what extent would public support be necessary and justifiable to sustain and upgrade essential passenger operations?

Only such an effort, vigorously pursued, and, where necessary, performed in cooperation with affected governmental agencies, will lead to a sound rationalization of intercity passenger-service structure.

Whatever may be the ultimate merits of the proposal itself and of its negative implications with respect to long-distance service, the recently announced plan of the New York Central to reshape its passenger operations into a "no frill," intermediate-distance, "shuttle" operation represents the kind of comprehensive planning that should be stimulated. I am convinced that we will need, by the 1970's at least, a strong network of high-speed, medium-range, passenger trains—of the Tokaido Line genre—supplemented to some degree by a viable core of long-haul, overnight trains between the emerging megalopolitan communities and to and from primary sites of national historic interest. I would like soon to see my assumptions in this regard tested by objective and searching analyses of all the relevant facts.

Planning for improved railway service will have to be supplemented by improved technology. The enactment a year ago of President Johnson's High Speed Ground Transportation Bill, with its heavy emphasis on spurring research and development, represents a heartening breakthrough in a generations-old economic barrier to progress in railway passenger service. That legislation was a 3-year, $90 million commitment by the federal government to assist in financing a broad program of basic research, market analysis, and actual demonstration testing of rapid ground transportation methods. The commitment is not limited to rail service, and the total authorization obviously is not enough to solve all problems, but it does assure the needed start in the right direction.

The technology for passenger movement by railroads has not merely lagged behind the pace of other modes. For all practical purposes, it has never really progressed beyond the depression of the thirties. That fact becomes even more compelling when you consider that more than 60 percent of rail passenger cars in operation today are more than 30 years old, and fewer than 4 percent are less than 7 years old.

A study by the National Academy of Sciences several years ago revealed that railroads were spending only $7 on passenger research out of every $10,000 of their gross operating revenues. In contrast, as Senator Pell has pointed out, the national outlay for research and development activities in recent years has stood at about $15 billion. Approximately one-third of that total is performed for the aircraft and missile industry. Commercial airlines at present reinvest in their own operations more than 85 percent of all their earnings, and they expect to spend $14 billion on new equipment in the next 10 years.

What I believe has been established by the 1965 legislation is the means to begin to overcome the vast inertia retarding rail passenger service. A pilot program grant of $9.6 million for upgrading the New York-to-Washington operations of the Pennsylvania Railroad hs been met by an investment of more than $36 million by the Pennsylvania Railroad itself. The result next year will be a vastly more attractive service between these vital centers at speeds up to 110 miles an hour. A complementary experimental program already has been authorized for trial on the lines of the New Haven on the northern side of the northeast megalopolitan corridor. In this program a $2.1 million commitment by the Federal government will be met with a $500,000 commitment by the State of Connecticut for a 1-year testing of the newly designed, lightweight gas turbine powered trains. The initial objective is to reduce the Boston-New York elapsed time by 1 hour, thus to a 3 hour and 15 minute schedule.

President Johnson, specifically recognizing that intercity passenger movements will double in volume in the next 15 years, has said that technological advances made in the northeast corridor experimental programs will be directly applicable to other regions. Under the High Speed Ground Transportation program in the past few months, the Commerce Department has awarded research and development contracts to a number of operating companies and research institutions around the country to study various technical factors essential to future high-speed railway operations, such as road beds, tracks, power catenary systems, electric motors, and the dynamic behavior of trains at high speeds.

The long decline in railway passenger service has revealed a virtual withdrawal by the railroad industry from any long-range commitment to performance of these operations. But there are current indications that, with enlightened federal assistance and a new public acceptance of appropriate responsibility to provide reasonable support for essential rail passenger service, the railroad industry may willingly join the ranks for a long-range reinvestment in, and reshaping of, a basic core of essential rail passenger service. For example, Stuart Saunders, Chairman of the Pennsylvania Railroad, has recently affirmed his company's commitment to modernizing railway passenger transportation, saying: "that the Pennsylvania Railroad is definitely interested in preserving and improving passenger business. Our goal is to produce faster, more convenient, more comfortable and more efficient passenger service which is better suited to the needs of the public that it is today.

"We on the Pennsylvania are prepared to work with governmental agencies on local, state and federal levels to achieve this objective. We are convinced that the railroads can make a vital contribution to a new era of passenger service."

Just as there is need for firmly redirecting our national attitudes concerning the utility and essentiality of rail passenger service for the next decade, the time has also come to reexamine certain primary regulatory devices affecting the shape and future of rail passenger service.

Eight years have elapsed since the enactment of Section 13a as part of the Transportation Act of 1958. In that period of time a total of 219 separate discontinuance proposals have been filed with the ICC, and the Commission has given its permission for the discontinuance of 960 interstate and intrastate passenger trains.

In 1958, the operations of Class I railroads recorded a total of 246 million passenger *train-miles* and a total of more than 23 billion *passenger-miles*. By 1965 the level of such passenger operations had declined by 178 million passenger *train-miles* and 16.8 billion *passenger-miles*, a decline of about 30 percent in each instance. The statistical passenger deficit declined from $723 million for 1957 to a reported $410 million for 1965.

The 1958 train discontinuance legislation was an authorization for emergency surgery, with limited objectives and procedures arising from the broader crises then affecting all railroad operations. We are nearing the end of a decade of use of the train-off statute, and I believe that the rail situation has changed sufficiently to warrant a reexamination of the procedures built into Section 13a.

I do not by any means suggest that the

legislation has already been effective to remove all of the unproductive and unessential segments of rail passenger service. But I am convinced that, with the many railroad corporate unifications that have taken place, the operating innovations made effective, and the new marketing techniques employed in a steadily growing national economy, the railroad industry enjoys comparative economic health as well as strong prospects for continued growth. The "railroad emergency" of the 1950's has receded substantially, and, more important, the emergency train-off procedures do not any longer measure up to the present situation's developing needs.

The present statute with its limit of 4 months in the period in which the Commission may hold in abeyance a proposed interstate train discontinuance imposes severe restrictions upon the ICC's flexibility in processing the cases. As the proposals become more complex and the issues more important to the affected public, 4 months becomes less adequate to achieve a full hearing and evaluation of all the conflicting public interests involved.

Consider, for example, the proposal of the Boston and Maine Railroad in June 1964 to discontinue all interstate train service to and from Boston, to be effective in August of that year. That proposal, embraced in 3 simultaneous Section 13a(1) cases, involved a total of 40 trains. It was processed before the Commission contemporaneously with Boston and Maine's proposal to discontinue 229 intrastate trains under Section 13a(2). A joint hearing on these cases lasted 20 days in September and October. Division 3 of the ICC decided the interstate train case on December 31, 1964, issuing a brief summary order on that date and then a full report some 2 weeks later.

The New Haven's proposal to end all interstate passenger service, 273 trains' worth, in a single proceeding under Section 13a(1), also required hearing and decision within a 4-month period. Fortunately there, however, the carrier postdated effectiveness of its proposal to give the Commission an extra 4 months to process the case. This case alone recorded 3,000 pages of hearing transcript over a period of 9 weeks. Had the New Haven sought to make its notice effective without post-dating, I doubt that an adequate hearing, deliberation, and decision would have been possible.

The reported intention of the New York Central to restructure its entire passenger service could conceivably be the subject of a single, massive Section 13a(1) proceeding, to the extent interstate trains are involved. While I do not, of course, here question whether such a proceeding would fit the jurisdiction of Section 13a, I seriously doubt that this type of major service restructuring was the kind of proceeding contemplated in 1958 when the statutory procedure for train-off cases was enacted.

While we know that hundreds of passenger trains have stopped running since 1958, and we can measure by total statistics the declining use of passenger service as a whole, there is no realistic method available to tell us exactly where we now stand in terms of realistic needs, prospects, and potential of intercity railway passenger service. Present Section 13a provisions seem to channel the railroads to a sporadic usage of its procedures. The tendency in the usual case is to remove particular trains whenever the cost and revenue data seem propitious, with no well-conceived plan to account for the consequences on such things as feeder revenues, remaining through connecting train operations, or the remaining market requirements in the area affected.

Section 13a procedure needs to be revised to provide more flexibility for both the carriers and the ICC to bring about whatever changes may be necessary to strengthen and coordinate the entire structure of a carrier's passenger service, balancing relevant factors such as the carrier's financial and operating condition, the needs of the public, and the willingness of the public to provide reasonable support for the rail service.

The formal evidence in the *New Haven* case convinced the ICC that the whole form and structure of that carrier's passenger operations should be reexamined and rationalized in a joint railroad-community planning effort to define and satisfy the real needs of the public. It was evident that the New Haven's problems could not be "solved" realistically within the narrow compass of a formal statutory investigation proceeding under Section 13a, and that any ICC decision in the case would only provide an interim solution.

However, in addition to providing the interim solution for New Haven's particular situation, the Commission stated policy guidelines which should prove helpful for comparable Section 13a train discontinuance problems. The Commission concluded that just as the railroad has an obligation to sustain and improve essential rail passenger service, the public has an obligation also to provide its support. The Commission stated: "that the reasonable level of public support should in fact be construed as that level of financial or other public assistance which will stimulate the carrier to initiate or, if already initiated, continue its own reasonable effort to sustain and improve essential and economically viable passenger services. This, we think, is the kind of creative cooperation which will most productively revitalize and invigorate the operation of America's privately-owned rail passenger operations."

Such a policy places appropriate responsibility upon both the public and private sectors. It also provides a definite basis for the Commission, in implementing future Section 13a train discontinuance proposals, to scrutinize carefully the good faith and efficacy of the cooperative efforts of all the parties.

One of the most impressive facts that comes to light from a survey of discontinuance proceedings under Section 13a is the railroads' glaring lack of precise data as to actual costs of particular schedules and as to relevant market factors. The relevant cost accounting practices vary widely among our nation's railroads. Only a comparative few maintain and analyze records which will pin down the actual costs in any reliable manner. In most instances railroads are content to rely upon statistical apportionment of their basic costs for their entire system, rather than to analyze performance records of particular trains, even if such records are maintained.

The remarkable fact is that too few railroads seem to know what it *really* costs to conduct particular train schedules or segments of passenger operations, as opposed to "average" costs, although exceedingly important management judgments are founded upon this kind of cost information.

I would think it increasingly desirable for the future for railroads to develop and observe modern cost accounting techniques that will tend to reflect to the extent possible actual profitability arising from particular passenger service operations. If such techniques will require coordination with the ICC's accounting regulations, I have no doubt that the attendant problems can be discussed and worked out.

As railroad judgments in the future regarding performance of passenger service will be more and more important to the public, use of more sophisticated cost information than is now possible would seem essential. Along with more sophisticated cost analyses must come, I am convinced, a more conscious and knowledgeable use of modern marketing techniques. It is astonishing to find, as we do all too often in passenger train-off cases, that the carrier has no clear idea of the patterns of passenger utilization of its service, except perhaps for an occasional short-term study undertaken with train discontinuance in mind. This situation must be reversed if future judgments regarding train service are to be soundly based.

The phrase "passenger deficit" has so many special emotional and technical meanings that it should be used sparingly, and only very carefully, by a regulator. I do not wish to participate in the philosophical arguments which have marked its existence, but I believe that circumstances have changed so materially in recent years that its reexamination would now be useful.

The first thing to make clear and to emphasize in any discussion of the passenger deficit s that it is not a measure of operating costs that would be eliminated upon elimination of passenger service itself. The deficit data and related statistics are used, however, as a measure of trends in the performance of railway passenger and freight operations and as a factor for consideration in rate determinations.

A basic assumption underlying the ICC's accounting rules, the so-called separation rules, by which costs are allocated between passenger service and freight service, is that each railroad performing both types of service is selling two equivalent products. The critical corollary is that both services must, therefore, jointly be assessed the entire costs of the railroad's operations in accordance with uniform units of measure such as ton miles and locomotive miles.

The separation rules, by which the passenger deficit is calculated, have been in effect without essential revision since 1936. In the meantime enough of a change in the performance of railway operations has occurred to warrant a reexamination of the basic assumption underlying the rules themselves. In 1936 the total mileage of Class I railroads operated in passenger service represented 76 percent of the total mileage operated in freight service. By 1964 the passenger mileage operated had declined to about 38 percent of the freight mileage. In absolute terms, the miles of road used for passenger service have declined by about 55 percent since 1936, while freight road mileage has dropped less than 10 percent. At the present time passenger service operations earn about 10 percent of total railway operating revenues.

To some degree, at least, passenger service as performed by many railroads may have become a by-product of the freight service, rather than the "common" product assumed by the Commission's accounting rules for allocating common costs. An appropriate change in the rules may therefore be justified at this time.

Any changes, of course, in these rules regarding apportioning expenses between freight and passenger service would have important ramifications, particularly in the area of rate making, and that factor should be given ample consideration. But if assumptions basic to the present rules lack validity, then so, too, must the uses which are made of the statistics derived therefrom, both by management and the public.

The important consideration at this stage, I would emphasize, is not whether the rules or procedures have been correctly applied in the past, but whether they are reliable for the future decision-making. The public policy issues revolving about rail passenger service—including the fair and accurate determination of its costs—are too important to leave to guesswork.

The passenger cars of our railroads traditionally have been the "windows" through which the public has observed and judged the strength and competence of the whole railway system. That tradition will probably continue. Henceforth, it seems to me, these trains will also become windows to the vitality of our entire urban society. The coming years therefore present an unavoidably important challenge to the pride and initiative of our private ownership railroad industry, and to the inventiveness of our public policy. That challenge must be met.

Interstate Commerce Commission,
Washington, D.C., March 2, 1967.
Hon. Warren G. Magnuson,
Chairman, Senate Commerce Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Chairman Magnuson: I am submitting herewith for your consideration a legislative recommendation of the Commission (with draft bill attached), to revise section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act.

We would very much appreciate your assistance in having this bill introduced and hearings scheduled thereon.

Sincerely yours,

William H. Tucker,
Chairman.

Justification

In the years since section 13a was enacted in 1958, it has become evident that the statute contains deficiencies and requires amendment. This amendment is proposed as the result of our experience in more than 200 train-discontinuance proceedings, and the criticism voiced by members of Congress, State officials, and others concerned with those proceedings.

The rail passenger problems are still with us—the patronage trend, for example, is downward, while operating costs continue their inexorable rise. In fact, the trend has been spurred most recently by the Post Office Department's policy of transferring the mail from rail to highway, thereby depriving many passenger trains of their primary sustenance and converting formerly profitable or marginal operations into clear-cut candidates for discontinuance.

Added to that are the announcements made in the press that various railroads intend to continue the pursuit of section 13a relief from certain passenger obligations. Some roads apparently contemplate major revisions in their passenger systems.

While present procedures are substantially adequate for most discontinuance cases, we feel they would be strained by certain kinds of important or exceptional cases. In such cases, particularly where the train or trains serve an extensive route with several large cities or where a system of trains is involved, a period of more than four months could well be needed in affording the people the full opportunity for hearing to which we believe they are entitled. We believe that, in the more important cases, state agencies and interested members of the public would need more time to prepare for hearing and to analyze the carrier proposals—some of which are both voluminous and complex. More time is needed in the hearings themselves, in analyzing the record, digesting the pleadings, and preparing our decisional report.

Under our proposal the Commission would be empowered to require the continuance of service unchanged for a period up to seven months rather than four. While many cases in the future, as in the past, can certainly be disposed of within four months, we want to be prepared for those cases that require additional time. Our bill also provides for an additional period up to two months, if needed, for completing the investigation and dealing with administrative appeals.

To further facilitate the investigation, the burden of proof, under the bill, is specifically assigned to the carrier, since that is the party possessing most of the material data. This assignment, in addition, would impel the carrier to make a more complete initial presentation, leaving less supplementation to be done after the hearings begin.

To better deal with situations where practical or temporary solutions might lie along lines other than a mere approval or denial of the carrier's proposal, we are requesting authority to render decisions on a conditional basis, i.e., contingent upon modifications in factors affecting service or operations. This would open up avenues thus far untried toward arresting the decline of the passenger train.

Included is a new provision making it clear that court appeal will lie as to Commission decisions affecting the outcome of a carrier's discontinuance proposal, whether the discontinuance is permitted or not. Under the present law, as interpreted by the courts, judicial review is available only in those cases in which the Commission requires the continuance of the train or ferry service in question. Although the Commission has consistently taken the position that a decision permitting a railroad to discontinue service should be appealable by a State or any other adversely affected party, certain United States District Courts have held otherwise. We believe that this matter should be clarified by Congress through enactment of our proposed section 13a(3). This new section would permit any adversely affected party, including a State, State regulatory commissions, or other persons, to appeal an administratively final action of this Commission which is determinative of a discontinuance proposal in the same manner now available to the carriers. All decisions of the Commission would be appealable except decisions not to investigate a proposed discontinuance.

The bill employs the same sound and adequate substantive tests as those in the present section 13a, and follows generally along the same procedural lines.

Draft of Proposed Legislation

(Bracket material—suggested additions to present section.)

(Italicized material—suggested deletions in present section.)

A bill to amend section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 13a of Part I of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S. Code 13a) is amended to read as follows:

13a(1) A carrier or carriers subject to this part, if their rights with respect to the discontinuance or change, in whole or in part, of the operation or service of any train or ferry *operating from* [operated in service between] a point in one State *to* [or a foreign country and] a point in any other State or in the District of Columbia, *or from a point in the District of Columbia to a point in any State*, are subject to any provision of the constitution or statutes of any State or any regulation or order of (or are the subject of any proceeding pending before) any court or an administrative or regulatory agency of any State, may, but shall not be required to, file with the Commission, and upon such filing shall mail to the Governor of each State in which such train or ferry is operated, and post in every station, depot or other facility served thereby, notice at least *thirty* [forty] days in advance of any such proposed discontinuance or change. The carrier or carriers filing such notice may discontinue or change any such operation or service pursuant to such notice except as otherwise ordered by the Commission pursuant to this paragraph, the laws or constitution of any State, or the decision or order of, or the pendency of any proceeding before, any court or State authority to the contrary notwithstanding. Upon the filing of such notice the Commission shall have authority during said *thirty* [forty] days' notice period, either upon complaint or upon its own initiative without complaint, to enter upon an investigation of the proposed discontinuance or change. [When an investigation by the Commission is instituted under this section, the carrier or carriers filing such notice shall have the burden of establishing that public convenience and necessity permit the proposed discontinuance or change, in whole or in part, and that the continued operation or service of such train or ferry without discontinuance or change, in whole or in part, will unduly burden interstate or foreign commerce.] Upon the institution of such investigation, the Commission, by [its investigation] order served upon the carrier or carriers affected thereby at least ten days prior to the day on which such discontinuance or change would otherwise become effective, may require such train or ferry to be continued in operation or service, in whole or in part, pending hearing and decision in such investigation, but not for a longer period than *four* [seven] months beyond the date when such discontinuance or change would otherwise have become effective; [provided that the Commission may further require such train or ferry to be continued in operation or service, in whole or in part, for a period of no longer than two months beyond the date specified in its investigation order, pending completion of the investigation or the Commission's determination of any petition or petitions for reconsideration of its decision and order in such investigation.] If, after hearing in such investigation, whether concluded before or after such discontinuance or change has become effective, the Commission finds that *the operation or service of such train or ferry is required by* public convenience and necessity [do not permit the proposed discontinuance or change, in whole or in part,] and [that the continued operation or service of such train or ferry without discontinuance or change, in whole or in part,] will not unduly burden interstate or foreign commerce, the Commission may by order require the continuance or restoration of operation or service *of such train or ferry,* in whole or in part, [subject to such terms, conditions and modifications pertaining to operations or service as it shall find to be reasonable and just,] for a period not to exceed one year from the date of such order. The provisions of this paragraph shall not supersede the laws of any State or the orders or regulations of any administrative or regulatory body of any State applicable to such discontinuance or change unless notice as in this paragraph provided is filed with the Commission. On the expiration of an order by the Commission after such investigation requiring the continuance or restoration of operation or service, the jurisdiction of any State as to such discontinuance or change shall no longer be superseded unless the procedure provided by this paragraph shall again be invoked by the carrier or carriers.

13a(2) Where the discontinuance or change, in whole or in part, by a carrier or carriers subject to this part, of the operation or service of any train or ferry operated wholly within the boundaries of a single State is prohibited by the constitution or statutes of any State or where the State authority having jurisdiction thereof shall have denied an application or petition duly filed with it by said carrier or carriers for authority to discontinue or change, in whole or in part, the operation or service of any such train or ferry or shall not have acted finally on such an application or petition within one hundred and twenty days from the presentation thereof, such carrier or carriers may petition the Commission for authority to effect such discontinuance or change. The Commission may grant such authority, [in whole or in part, subject to such terms, conditions and modifications pertaining to operations or service as it shall find to be reasonable and just,] *only* after full hearing and upon findings by it that (a) the present or future public convenience and necessity permit of such discontinuance or change, in whole or in part, of the operation or service of such train or ferry, and (b) the continued operation or service of such train or ferry without discontinuance or change, in whole or in part, will constitute an unjust and undue burden upon the interstate operation of such carrier or carriers or upon interstate commerce. When any petition shall be filed with the Commission under the provisions of this paragraph the Commission shall notify the Governor of the State in which such train or ferry is operated at least thirty days in advance of the hearing provided for in this paragraph, and such hearing shall be held by the Commission in the State in which such train or ferry is operated; and the Commission is authorized to avail itself of the cooperation, services, records and facilities of the authorities in such State in the performance of its functions under this paragraph.

[13a(3) Any State, administrative or regulatory agency of a State, or person, adversely affected or aggrieved by an order of the Commission entered after hearing pursuant to paragraphs (1) or (2) of this section, may bring suit to obtain judicial review thereof under the provisions of sections 1336, 1398, 2284 and 2321 through 2325 of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C. sections 1336, 1398, 2284 and 2321–2325.]

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Washington for his introduction of the bill. I have not read the bill, but I believe I know what it purports to do. The bill is long overdue.

We in Vermont have experienced rather arbitrary positions taken by the railroads. We think this bill will be of help to other sections of the country as well.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I think the real importance of the bill is that the Interstate Commerce Commission heretofore had to say yes or no on an application. They will now be able to say that the service cannot be discontinued for a certain period of time or that the service can be curtailed or that there can be a consolidation of service.

The bill would provide flexibility and would be in the public interest.

THE LINCOLN TRAIL MEMORIAL PARKWAY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today I introduce on behalf of myself, Senator BAYH, Senator DIRKSEN, Senator PERCY, Senator MORTON, and Senator COOPER, a bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Lincoln Trail Memorial Parkway—a route stretching from Hodgenville, Ky., through Lincoln City, Ind., and on to Springfield, Ill.

Although my bill authorizes the Secretary of Interior in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation to survey and select the right-of-way for such a route, it is envisioned as a broad meandering parkway with roadside parks, scenic and historical markers and links to other natural and historical sites in the three-State area.

Before I describe some of the significant points in the Lincoln Odyssey, I want to commend the Recreation Advisory Council staff for its excellent study and recommendations for scenic roads and parkways, prepared for the President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty. The study, hopefully, will trigger a system of roadways, like the Lincoln Trail Memorial Parkway, allowing tourist travel through scenic corridors of natural and historic wonders. The 50 States have recommended some 136,500,000 miles of such scenic roads and a minimum program, at least, will be authorized by this 90th Congress. All three State highway commissions, Indiana, Illinois, and Kentucky, have recommended their portions of the Lincoln family route to the Recreation Advisory Council for development in such a national scenic parkway and highway system.

The Lincoln family route should be preserved in a scenic corridor. The oldtimers and the descendants of Lincoln's family friends to whom the Lincoln lore was passed are fast disappearing from among us.

Francis M. Van Natter in his book, "Lincoln's Boyhood," tells us that Tom Lincoln, his wife, Nancy Hanks Lincoln, young Abe, and Sarah, left their cabin off the Louisville-Nashville turnpike at Knobs Creek, Ky., in the fall of 1816 and crossed the Ohio River for the "big timber country" of Indiana.

The Lincolns had lived, during the first 7 years of Abe's life, at Hodgenville, Elizabethtown, and Knobs Creek, Ky. The Lincolns walked along the Troy-Vincennes Trail northwestward to Spencer County, Ind., settling by Christmas shortly after Indiana was admitted as the 19th State to the Union, in the Pigeon Creek area on the East Fork of Buck Horn Creek.

It was in Indiana that young Abe Lincoln studied by candlelight and grew to manhood. On March 8, 1830—137 years ago, Abe was then 21, Tom Lincoln once again moved his family—leaving Nancy Hanks Lincoln, who died of buck ager or what we know today as malaria, buried in Spencer County, Ind.

The Lincolns crossed the Wabash River at Vincennes, filing past the George Rogers Clark Fort where in 1779 the famous Clark and his American Long Knives wrested control of the territory from the British General Hamilton. Thus the Lincolns moved into Illinois—its low prairie land covered by the flood-swollen Wabash and Lincoln began the third phase of his life, which he later described to a young Indiana 100th Infantry Civil War volunteer as—

> I was born in Kentucky, raised in Indiana, and lived in Illinois.

The Lincoln Trail Memorial Parkway when completed follows Abraham Lincoln's life from Hodgenville, Ky., through his boyhood home in Indiana and on to Springfield, Ill., from whence came the 16th President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1178) to provide for the establishment and administration of the Lincoln Trail Memorial Parkway in the States of Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HARTKE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

WOMAN'S INTERNATIONAL BOWLING CONGRESS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I introduce this joint resolution to mark appropriately the forthcoming Woman's International Bowling Congress.

In its 50 years the Woman's International Bowling Congress and its member organizations have made a substantial contribution in all of our communities. The value to the nearly 3 million of housewives is apparent. More than 75,000 women in my own State of Washington participate under the sponsorship of the Woman's International Bowling Congress. Undeniably, bowling provides for these women a healthy, vigorous and constructive form of recreation, where they may meet with their friends in their leisure hours.

Further, as the joint resolution points out, the presence of women at the bowling lanes has had a salutary effect on the establishments themselves. Not only have the many newly built bowling centers been beautifully decorated as a result of the feminine influence and interest, but bowling has also become a family recreation.

Mr. President, more than 50,000 women will participate in a 2-month long tournament accompanying the convention, and I think it is perfectly fitting that we take action to designate "Woman's International Bowling Congress Week."

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 47) to designate the calendar week beginning May 1, 1967, and ending May 8, 1967, as "Woman's International Bowling Congress Week," introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. J. RES. 47

Whereas the calendar year 1967 marks the fiftieth anniversary of the Woman's International Bowling Congress; and

Whereas since the founding of this organization many thousands of women have found constructive, vigorous use of leisure time by participation in its programs; and

Whereas the Woman's International Bowling Congress has a total membership of almost three million women; and

Whereas the programs and services of this organization have contributed substantially to making the sport of bowling a family recreational activity; and

Whereas the presence of women and their activities in bowling has been a material force in the improvement of the decor, facilities, and atmosphere of bowling establishments, thereby creating new community assets; and

Whereas the annual convention of the Woman's International Bowling Congress for 1967 will be held at Rochester, New York, during the period from May 1 through May 3: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the calendar week beginning May 1, 1967, and ending May 8, 1967, is hereby designated as "Woman's International Bowling Congress Week" in recognition and appreciation of the accomplishments and services of the Woman's International Bowling Congress. The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to join in the observance of such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

CUTBACK ORDER OF THE HIGHWAY FUND

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution which relates to the announcement of November 23, 1966, by the Bureau of Public Roads that there would be an immediate cutback of $1.1 billion in the Federal-aid highway program for the present fiscal year. The administration's decision to defer substantial highway construction expenditures has already been the subject of consideration in both Houses of Congress. The Committees on Public Works of the House and the Senate have completed joint hearings on the matter. And the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] has submitted a resolution—of which I am a cosponsor—declaring that it is the sense of the Congress that the highway cutback should be rescinded.

I am in full agreement with the provisions of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH]. The administration's decision to defer expenditure of the funds in question must inevitably delay the completion of the Federal-aid highway systems. Delay in construction inevitably leads to increased construction costs. The safety of the American motorist will be jeopardized by the failure to provide new and safer highways. Since general economic conditions have changed since the deferment was first announced, and inflationary trends in the Nation's economy appear to be easing, the cutback now no longer serves a sound fiscal purpose.

These factors are important and ought to be fully explored. But I believe that there is a more fundamental issue, and that is the legal justification—or lack of a legal justification—for the cutback. It is my suggestion that the cutback in question is one which could only be imposed by Congress itself. It is not a matter which may lawfully be made the subject of an order of the executive branch.

Before coming to the U.S. Senate, it was my privilege to serve as Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. During my years in that office, I had frequent occasion to consider the Federal-aid highway program statutes and to advise various State departments and agencies with respect to their implementation. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, kindly accepted a letter containing my views with respect to the legality of the administration's cutback order; this letter has been made a part of the record of the hearings held earlier this week. I ask unanimous consent that this letter appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my present remarks.

The resolution which I submit today is by no means intended to supersede the resolution already introduced by Senator BAYH. Rather, I hope that it will be viewed as a complementary resolution directed to the legal reasons for rescission of the cutback order rather than simply to policy reasons for such rescission. I hope that these resolutions may be acted upon without delay so that there may be no confusion on the part of the administration with respect to the nature of Congress reaction to what is in effect an attempt by the executive branch to amend the Federal-aid highway program statutes without resort to the legislative branch.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14) was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 14

Whereas the Congress has declared its intention that the National System of Interstate Highways be completed as nearly as practicable over a 15-year period and that the entire system in all the States be brought to simultaneous completion; and

Whereas the Congress has authorized the appropriation of substantial sums for the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, or improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the Interstate System, including extensions thereof through urban areas; and

Whereas the Congress has deliberately given top priority to the speedy completion of the Interstate System; and

Whereas the Congress has indicated its concern with the speedy completion of the Interstate System by authorizing the States to construct portions of their projects in advance of specific apportionment of funds to them, and by providing funds for the purpose of facilitating the acquisition of rights-of-way; and

Whereas the Congress has established specific formulas for the apportionment of funds to the States in connection with the Federal-aid highway programs; and

Whereas the Congress has provided that sums apportioned to any State shall be available for expenditure or obligation in that State for a period of two years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized; and

Whereas the Congress has provided that such funds shall lapse only if not expended or obligated during the above-mentioned two-year period, and for no other reason; and

Whereas the Congress has provided for the financial support of the Federal-aid highway programs by means of certain levies upon those who use the Nation's highways; and

Whereas a decision by the administration in November to defer the expenditure of Federal-aid highway construction funds clearly conflicts with the mandate of the Congress in respect to the use of such funds for the completion of the Federal-aid highway programs; and

Whereas the administration has indicated that it will release some of the funds in question for obligation and expenditure during the present fiscal year, but will not release all of the funds which would otherwise have been available for the Federal-aid highway programs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the decision to defer the expenditure of Federal-aid highway construction funds represents an unlawful attempt by the executive branch of Government to alter congressional directives with respect to the use of public funds and should be rescinded in toto, and that the States should be permitted to continue their programs of construction of Federal-aid highways in accordance with the schedules previously authorized by the Congress and as rapidly as available revenues permit.

The letter presented by Mr. BROOKE is as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING
AND CURRENCY,
February 27, 1967.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RANDOLPH: The announcement by the Bureau of Public Roads on November 23, 1966, that there would be an immediate cutback of $1.1 billion in the Federal-aid highway program for the fiscal year, ending on June 30, 1967, which cutback would affect approximately 25 percent of the new construction work which should be begun during fiscal year 1967, has provoked widespread, adverse comment throughout the country. These comments have been based primarily upon important public policy questions. It has been pointed out, for example, that the cost of highway construction has increased substantially during the past decade. Consequently, deferment of essential highway construction will inevitably result not only in substantial construction cost increases, but also in additional engineering, design and administrative expenses.

The ever increasing, tragic loss of life in automobile accidents could certainly be reduced by prompt completion of a modern and safe system of interstate highways. Contractors and other businessmen who have responded to the Federal Government's repeated requests to "stand by" and be prepared for sustained efforts so that the Federal-aid highway program could be completed on time will suffer severe financial reverses as a result of the delay in the construction schedule. Finally, since the inflationary pressures upon the nation's economy appear to be easing, the cutback now no longer serves a sound fiscal purpose; it could instead conceivably contribute to a recession, the potential for which has already been identified by a number of respected economists.

All of these factors are important. They ought to be fully explored. But I believe that a more fundamental issue has yet to be considered: specifically, the legal justification—or lack thereof—of the cutback. I respectfully suggest that the cutback in question is one which can only be imposed by Congressional action; it is *not* a matter which may lawfully be made the subject of an administrator's order.

As Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts from 1963 to 1966, I had frequent occasion to consider the Federal-aid highway program statutes and to advise the State departments and agencies with respect to their implementation. It is my belief that the legal effect of these statutes is such that the directives contained therein can be altered only by the Congress, and that accordingly the cutback announced on November 23, 1966 is unlawful and should be rescinded.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 related both to the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary systems (as well as to extensions of these systems within urban areas), and to the National Sytem of Interstate and Defense Highways, usually referred to as the "Interstate System." The Act briefly treats the questions of apportionment and expenditure with respect to the primary and secondary systems, a subject treated more fully below. It then proceeds to determine the future of the Interstate System.

The language used by the Congress in 1956 with respect to completion of the Interstate System is clear. There is no doubt as to what the Congress intended.

"It is hereby declared to be essential to the national interest to provide for the early completion of the 'National System of Interstate Highways,' as authorized and designated in accordance with section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838). *It is the intent of the Congress that the Interstate System be completed as nearly as practicable over a thirteen-year* (now fifteen-year as a result of an amendment effected by Pub. L. 88–423) *period and that the entire system in all the states be brought to simultaneous completion.*" (emphasis supplied). *Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956*, Title I, S108(a).

Thus, legislative intent was not left to conjecture. The statute speaks in terms of legislative intent, providing specifically that it was the will of the United States Congress that the Interstate System be completed by a certain year (now determined to be 1971). All of the provisions of the 1956 act, as well as subsequent amendments to it, must be interpreted in accordance with this statement of intention.

The passage from S108(a) which is quoted above is not an isolated declaration of intent. The desire of the Congress that the construction of the Interstate System be accelerated and completed by a specified date is reflected throughout the 1956 Act. Section 108(b), which authorized the appropriation of sums for Interstate System construction for the fiscal years 1957 through 1969, indicates that the early authorization is "for the purpose of *expediting* the construction, reconstruction, or improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the Interstate System, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838) . . . (emphasis supplied)". The size of the amounts authorized by S108(b), which amounts range from $1 billion to $2.9 billion per fiscal year for the period from 1957 to 1969, dramatized the fact that the Congress had thought this matter through. Congress deliberately gave top priority to the speedy completion of the Interstate System.

There are further indications in the statute that Congress wanted and expected maximum speed with respect to construction of the highways in question. Under certain conditions, states are permitted to construct portions of the Interstate System in advance of specific apportionment of funds to them; such states would subsequently be reimbursed for the amounts expended upon such construction when the necessary funds were apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce. Thus the Act provides for possible further acceleration of the highway program by individual states (see S108(h)). Still another indication of the speed desired by Congress appears in S110 which relates to the advance acquisition of rights-of-way for the Interstate System. Section 110(a) provides for the early availability of funds for such acquisitions "for the purpose of facilitating the acquisition of rights-of-way on any of the Federal-Aid Highway systems, including the Interstate System, in the most expeditious and economical manner. . . ."

It is therefore obvious that the Congress in 1956 expected that the funds authorized to be appropriated by S108(b) would be used for the purpose of early completion of the Interstate System. The 1956 Federal-Aid Highway Act is replete with references to the importance of the systems referred to therein and to the need for their speedy construction. Nothing has been added to the Act in the intervening period which would in any way indicate that the intentions so clearly expressed in 1956 have been altered. The Act read as a whole leaves no doubt that the Congress intended—*and still intends*—that the funds should be used to complete the various construction programs within the time limits specified.

The statutory provisions set forth above show Congress' intent. A reading of the statute demonstrates that the use of the authorized funds is not subject to administrative fiat. The act is not discretionary. The mandate of Congress should be carried out.

There are other significant sections of the 1956 Act which impose clear and unmistakable requirements with respect to the amounts in question. Congress has not only set forth its general intention that the highway systems be speedily completed; it has also directed with great specificity how each dollar of the authorized amounts is to be handled.

The statute carefully sets forth, for example, how the funds in question are to be apportioned among the various states. Apportionments relating to the Federal-Aid primary and secondary highway systems are to be calculated in accordance with the formulas appearing in Section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (See S102(a)(2)). Apportionments for the Interstate System are governed by S108 (c) and (d), wherein the Congress set forth further specific directions as to assignment of the authorized amounts to the states. Section 108(d) requires continuous re-estimates by the Secretary of Commerce of the cost of completion of the Interstate System, so that Congress may from time to time re-evaluate the distribution formulas.

The cutback order of November 23, 1966, alters the apportionment formulas carefully developed by Congress. There is no provision in the statute which provides for a suspension insofar as financial awards to the states is concerned. Such suspensions, in fact, directly and adversely affect the careful apportionment formulas which Congress has enacted. Congress itself has included in the statute machinery under which the program will be continually re-evaluated. But the re-evaluation must be done and decided by the Congress, not by the Executive branch of government. Congress would hardly have developed the distribution formulas at all had it anticipated that unnamed administrators would be free to apply them or not as they chose. I believe it is clear simply from the existence of the formulas that Congress intended the formulas to be applied from year to year (within the time period of the programs) and not to be subject to executive or administrative orders which would result in even the temporary suspension of their use.

But even this point has not been left to conjecture. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 contains specific directions with respect to the availability of highway funds for expenditure by the states. Section 108(b) provides, with respect to the Interstate System:

"Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State *for two years* after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized . . ." (emphasis supplied).

The section further provides that such funds shall be deemed to be expended if they are covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the construction, reconstruction or improvement of specific projects.

Similar language appears in the section of the 1956 Act relating to the Federal-aid primary and secondary highway systems (See S102 (b)). These provisions are couched in mandatory terms. It was obviously the intention of Congress that apportioned funds be available to the states for a period of two years from the close of the fiscal year for which they are authorized. Such an additional period provides time for sober and considered decision-making relative to the use of the amounts authorized. The period of availability can be altered in one way—and in one way only—by legislative action. Thus, the so-called "freeze" place upon authorized amounts which have not been obligated by the states is directly in conflict with statutory provisions which identify a specific time in which the funds may be used. The "freeze" is accordingly invalid. Likewise, the announced cutback in present authorizations further conflicts with the legislative apportionment and availability scheme. It too is invalid.

The statute does set forth specific conditions under which authorized funds may "lapse" and no longer remain available to be obligated by a particular state. Section 102(b) provides in part, with respect to the primary and secondary systems:

"Any sums apportioned to any State under this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for two years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, *and any amounts so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse. . . .*" (emphasis supplied).

Section 108(g) provides in part, with respect to the Interstate System: "Any amount apportioned to the states under the provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure under the terms of subsection (f) of this section shall lapse, and shall immediately be reapportioned among the other states in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d) of this section. . . ."

These provisions set forth the sole grounds for the lapse of funds which have been apportioned. Had Congress envisioned or intended other reasons for lapse, it would certainly have referred to them. Notwithstanding the unmistakable language of the act the order "freezing" authorized but unobligated funds seeks to create a new ground for lapse, one clearly never contemplated by the Congress. Accordingly, it must be concluded that the "freeze" contradicts the lapse provisions of the 1956 Act, and is consequently unlawful. (It is interesting to note that section 108(g) provides that Interstate System funds which lapse are to be immediately re-apportioned among the other states, a further indication that these funds have been "earmarked" for highway construction and for no other purpose.

The funds which are to be apportioned and expended for highway construction are raised by taxes and fees imposed upon those who make use of the highways. Although the income derived from such taxes and fees has frequently been referred to as being held in "trust" for the benefit of the highway program, a "trust" in the normal legal sense has not been created. It would of course be within the prerogative of Congress to re-designate the use to which such income should be put. But it has not done so. Given the clear indications contained in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 that the funds in question are to be used solely for highway construction, it is logical that such amounts be raised by levying upon those persons who will most directly benefit from improved highways. However, if the objective of accelerated highway construction is not pursued, the logic of the related revenue-raising measures disappears. The Administration's cutback order has destroyed the logic of a perfectly sound Congressional plan.

A careful examination of amendments to the 1956 Act reveals that the Congressional intention and mandate set forth eleven years ago and implemented throughout the intervening period remains intact. What Congress desired in 1956 Congress still desires—an interstate highway program completed as speedily as possible. To this end, Congress has clearly directed how and when funds are to be spent. Alteration or suspension of such directives is beyond the lawful authority of the Executive branch of government.

If the Administration believes that it is essential to the economy that the highway program be delayed, it should make recommendations to that effect to the Congress. The ultimate decision as to retention or rejection of the present statutory highway construction procedures can only be made by the Legislative branch. The Administration's cutback order—which is unsound from a public policy viewpoint as well since it discriminates against states such as the Commonwealth of Massachusetts which have moved soberly and carefully and therefore have yet to obligate all available Federal funds—cannot lawfully do the work which requires action by the Congress.

I respectfully request the Committee to take full note of the declarations of policy which appear in S116 (a) and (b) of the 1956 Act:

"It is hereby declared to be in the national interest to accelerate the construction of the Federal-aid highway systems, including the Interstate System, since many of such highways, or portions thereof, are in fact, inadequate to meet the needs of local and interstate commerce, the national and the civil defense. . . . It is further declared that one of the most important objectives of this Act is the prompt completion of the Interstate System. . . ."

The appropriation of money, and decision with respect to its use, are the responsibility of Congress. This responsibility cannot be abdicated by Congress, nor should it be usurped by the Executive branch. Nor can the courts be relied upon to protect that Congressional prerogative, for litigation begun by the states to restore frozen or cutback funds would be long and complex, and would involve perhaps insuperable "standing" obstacles to the success of the petitioners.

It must be the Congress which calls the Executive branch to account on this matter. I hope that this Committee will examine the important legal and Constitutional ramifications which the Administration's actions have raised. I hope that this Committee will do more than that for much more than the Interstate Highway System is at issue here.

I am, finally, very grateful for the opportunity to present my views.

Very truly yours,

Edward W. Brooke,
U.S. Senator.

THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADMISSION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY INTO THE UNION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on June 1, 1967, the Commonwealth of Kentucky will celebrate the 175th anniversary of its admission to the Union.

The Commonwealth and its people have a long history of dedication to the principles on which this Republic was founded.

The people who settled Kentucky were proud that on February 4, 1791, President George Washington signed the act of Congress that enabled Kentucky to be admitted to the Union.

In 1792, after the adoption of a State constitution and the election of a Governor and a legislature, the Commonwealth of Kentucky was formally admitted to the Union as the 15th State.

The people of the Commonwealth of Kentucky have worked to develop their resources and they have been ever faithful to the Union in time of war and in time of peace.

The Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, the Honorable Edward T. Breathitt, has proclaimed the year 1967 as the 175th Anniversary Year of Kentucky and he has charged the Kentucky Historical Society with executing appropriate programs memorializing this historic occasion.

In accordance with the desire of the citizens of Kentucky to observe this anniversary, it would be appropriate for the Congress to recognize this observance as proclaimed by the Governor.

For myself and my distinguished colleague, Senator Morton, who is a seventh generation Kentuckian, descended from its first settler, Dr. Thomas Walker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution expressing the commendation of Congress and extending the greetings of the Congress to the citizens of Kentucky on the 175th anniversary of its admission to the Union.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. Con. Res. 15

A concurrent resolution to recognize the one-hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the admission of the Commonwealth of Kentucky to the Union

Whereas the Commonwealth of Kentucky proudly entered the Federal Union as the fifteenth State on the 1st day of June 1792; and

Whereas from that day, the people of Kentucky have joined together to maintain, defend, and enlarge, the free institutions upon which our Nation is founded, and to develop the resources of the Commonwealth for the benefit of its people and the Nation; and

Whereas generations of its citizens have renewed their historic dedication to the principles of the Republic: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress recognize and commend the celebration of the one-hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the admission of the Commonwealth of Kentucky to the Union; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress extends its greetings and felicitations to the citizens of Kentucky upon the occasion of the celebration of this anniversary.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TO SUBMIT A REPORT ON THE SOVIET CONSULAR TREATY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations have until midnight tonight to file a report on the Consular Convention with the Soviet Union and that the report be printed together with minority and individual views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1967—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 110, 111, 112, 113, 114 AND 117

Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. Lausche) submitted six amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 355) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 115, 116, 118, AND 119

Mr. ELLENDER submitted four amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 355, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 120

Mr. HRUSKA (for himself and Mr. Dirksen) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 355, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment, when submitted by Mr. Hruska, which appears under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of Senate Joint Resolution 30, to establish a commission to formulate plans for a memorial to astronauts who lose their lives in line of duty in the U.S. space program, the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1026) to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to provide relief against discriminatory employment and housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, to extend the life of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, and for other purposes, at its next printing.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on March 14, the Senate Commerce Committee and the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution will begin joint hearings on bills to provide for research and development of electric cars or other alternatives to the internal combustion engine.

I am most interested in this field because of the favorable impact widespread use of electric cars could have on our worsening air pollution problem in this country. In the days ahead I intend to submit a statement to the hearing expressing my support for a comprehensive Federal research program into electrical propulsion of motor vehicles.

Meantime, I would like specifically to support the bills introduced by Senators Magnuson and Muskie, which provide for research and development of electric cars. I therefore ask unanimous consent that I be listed as cosponsor of S. 451, introduced by Senator

Muskie and S. 453, introduced by Senator Magnuson.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RISING FARM COSTS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, there is a growing unrest among the farmers of our Nation as a result of declining farm income and rising farm costs.

This unrest, which has been in the form of verbal protest, has now in some instances reached threatened revolt. There is sound basis for the protest.

Parity ratio has now dropped five points since a year ago, and now the parity price ratio is 74. It is interesting to note that in June 1932 it was at 53—its lowest figure. Its high was 123 in October 1946.

The parity ratio expresses the relationship between farm revenue and farm costs as compared with their relationship during the 1910–14 base period, when parity was considered to be 100.

Theoretically, therefore, in comparison with the rest of the economy, farmers currently have 74 percent of the buying power they had in 1910–14.

Most Agriculture Department economists do not regard the parity ratio as a meaningful farm indicator. They state that it fails to reflect the increasing efficiency of large-scale operations and it also fails to consider Government crop-support and land-diversion payments. However, adjusted for such payments, the parity ratio for all 1966 would have been 86 instead of 80.

I well remember when 90 percent of parity was considered only a minimum parity income. As a matter of fact, if one did not favor at least 90 percent of parity, he was regarded as unfriendly to agriculture.

Regardless of how you figure parity, one thing is certain, the farmer must buy his machinery, pay for labor costs, and pay his taxes in an economy in which he is not receiving his fair share of the national income.

Presently, the Government is urging the farmers to produce more food in order to take care of our domestic needs and our foreign distribution programs.

Having done this, the Government must also start paying a fair price for the commodities produced to meet our acknowledged responsibilities. It should acquire that food as it acquires airplanes, missiles, military supplies, or any other commodities; that is, it should buy it in the marketplace and pay a fair and profitable price to the producer.

We cannot afford to again build up surpluses that will bring about the price-depressing problems that we have had in the past.

At a meeting of the Kansas Farmers Union Board on February 13, 1967, a resolution urging farmers to plow up wheat acreage allotments unless a wheat export certificate payment is in reality by May 1, 1967, was unanimously adopted.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

February 23, 1967.

Last summer when the last increase in wheat acreage allotments was announced, The Kansas Farmers Union urged farmers not to plant the increased acreage without an assurance of a better price for wheat because we feared farmers would have to pay a major part of the cost of the "Food for Peace" program through a below the cost of production price for wheat. We have no assurance of a better price now. This problem of low wheat prices and low farm income that has resulted from less than 80% of parity prices for farm commodities during the past several years, and that affects every citizen of Kansas either directly or indirectly, was discussed extensively at the area meetings and in our board meeting here today. Farmers Union is for 100% of parity prices for farm commodities. Wheat farmers desperately need a 65c per bushel export certificate. This would not give wheat farmers 100% of parity but it would be a step in that direction. In the absence of sympathetic understanding and action on the part of President Johnson's administration or the agricultral department, we need to bring the desperate situation of wheat farmers and the plight of family farmers generally to the attention of all the citizens of the United States. It is therefore

Resolved, That the Kansas Farmers Union urges all farmers to plow up the increased wheat acreage allotments and as much more as they possibly can unless a wheat export certificate is a reality by May 1, 1967.

William D. Daniels,
President.
Kenneth S. Kerwin,
Secretary-Treasurer.

ECONOMIC SITUATION INCREASINGLY MORE SERIOUS—TAX INCREASE NOW WOULD BE A BLUNDER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Commerce Department has just reported new factory orders fell 4.6 percent in January to the lowest level in more than a year. The drop reduced the order backlog by the biggest amount since the latest recession in 1960–61. January factory shipments declined 1.7 percent from December and the continuing pile-up of inventories has brought the ratio of stocks to sales to the most unfavorable level since the last recession.

It is true that the one index most frequently recognized as the index of recession—unemployment—has not moved up. But this is a lagging index. Employers only lay off as a last resort. They cut hours, spread work, and in some cases even keep employees on the payroll for weeks when there is little to do.

But these order and inventory figures should serve as the clearest kind of warning that the proposed tax increase under present conditions could be a serious recession-provoking economic blunder.

At the same time, February was a bad month for auto producers, with GM suffering a whopping drop in sales of 23.6 percent, Ford falling off 24.1 percent, and Chrysler by 23 percent. The sharp declines featured not only February as a whole but also the final 8-day selling period of the month.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that articles from the New York Times, on the decline in auto sales and the drop in new orders while manufacturing inventories are climbing, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Auto Sales Continue To Dip—Sharp Declines Announced by All of the "Big Three" Concerns for Month—GM Total Off 23.6 Percent—Chrysler Shows 23 Percent Drop and Ford Motor 24.1 Percent—AMC Data Due Today

(By William D. Smith)

February was a raw month for the nation's auto manufacturers.

Sharp declines in new-car sales were announced yesterday by all of the "big three" car makers both for February and for the final eight-day selling period of the month.

The General Motors Corporation reported sales declined 26.3 percent for the eight days and 23.6 percent for the month as a whole.

It sold 90,767 cars in the Feb. 21–28 period, against 123,077 in the eight days last year. In February, G.M. sold 259,794 units, against 339,697 for the 1966 month.

In January, G.M.'s sales were off almost 20 percent.

New-car sales of the Ford Motor Company fell 25.4 percent in the final third of February to 45,380 units from 60,778 in the period last year. For the month as a whole, sales were off 24.1 percent to 140,434 units from 184,923 in Feb., 1966.

FORD DIVISION OFF 25 PERCENT

The company's Ford division reported a 25.6 percent sales decline for the month while the Lincoln-Mercury division was off 16.9 percent for the month.

Ford's over-all sales were off 13 percent in January.

Chrysler Corporation's sales were off 36 per cent in the final third of February to 31,135 units from 48,794 last year. A spokesman said part of the sharp drop resulted from the fact that last year there was a dealer contest, which "somewhat bloated" figures for the period.

Chrysler's sales for all of February were off 23 per cent to 90,864 units from 117,530 a year earlier.

In January, Chrysler's sales were off 17.1 per cent from last year.

The American Motors Corporation, smallest of the nation's major car makers, will release its figures today.

Thomas A. Coupe, vice president in charge of American's automotive sales, said yesterday that Rambler American sales showed a strong upsurge in the three days following last week's price reduction.

PRICE CUT MOVES CARS

He said partial reports from dealers showed that since the reduction, of more than $200, this model had increased its share of the company's total sales by about 50 per cent.

For the year to Feb. 28, G.M. sales totaled 546,202 cars, a 21.6 per cent decline from last year's 696,172 units.

Ford's sales are off 18.4 per cent to 311,341 units from 381,102 in the Jan. 1 to Feb. 28 period last year.

Chrysler sold 184,285 cars so far this year, compared with 230,215 cars in the period last year, for a decline of 20 per cent.

The dismal showing in February, following a far from satisfactory performance in January, has caused most of the nation's auto executives to trim their sales predictions for 1967.

The industry obviously has been disappointed with sales so far this year but many financial sources contend it is still too early to forecast how the year as a whole will develop.

"The first quarter of last year was a phenomenal selling period, resulting to a degree from pent-up demand because of a strike at G.M. in the latter part of 1965," one Wall Street analyst noted.

"This weather hasn't helped either," he added.

Several industry sources contend a trend will not be clearly discernible before the end of March.

MANUFACTURING INVENTORIES UP; NEW ORDERS FOR DURABLES DOWN—BACKLOG OF UNFILLED ORDERS FALLS, FOR FIRST SIGNIFICANT DECLINE IN 3 YEARS' IN UNITED STATES

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, March 2.—A heavy build-up of inventories at the manufacturing level continued in January and new orders for durable goods fell even more than indicated by a preliminary report two weeks ago, the Commerce Department disclosed today.

The backlog of unfilled orders fell by about $1 billion, which the report said was "the first significant decline in three years." This occurred because, while both orders and shipments declined, the decline in orders was much greater.

There were several features of the report on inventories.

First, the December total was revised upward by more than $200-million, meaning that the inventory build-up in that month was $1-billion, continuing the rapid pace of the preceding months.

Second, January saw a further increase of just over $1-billion, bringing the inventory total at the end of the month to $78,918,000,000. The increase was in both durable goods and nondurable goods.

Third, the ratio of inventories to shipments rose sharply, to 1.76 to 1 in January, compared with 1.71 to 1 in December and 1.61 to 1 in January a year ago.

Fourth, there were sizable increases in inventories of all levels—raw materials, work in process and finished goods.

As the inventories are worked off to bring them in closer relationship with sales and new orders, production is likely to decline.

New orders for durable goods, the report showed, were $22,364,000,000, about $300-million less than the preliminary report indicated. This was a drop of 6.7 per cent, or $1.6-billion, from December.

The backlog of unfilled orders fell $900-million for durable and nondurable, were $44,725,000.

Of the decline in new orders, about $600-million was accounted for by the relatively volatile aircraft industry and almost $900-million by the transportation equipment industries taken as a whole, which includes automobiles. But this left a sizable decline of more than $700-million elsewhere.

Total shipments, durable and nondurable, were $44,725,000,000 in January, down $800-million from December. The dip included about $450-million in durable goods and $350-million in nondurables.

PHILOSOPHY OF THE GREAT SOCIETY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most interesting and perspective columnists writing today is Carl T. Rowan, who has had a great deal of experience in Government himself. He has written an article entitled "Investing in Human Resources," which appeared recently in the Washington Star.

In the course of this article, he talks about visiting colleges at Bowling Green, Ky., and in Tennessee. He says:

> I saw that what was just a small college with 2,000 students a decade ago had blossomed into a huge university of 9,000, a dozen modern new dormitories, a new library, modern new athletic facilities—and more buildings going up.

He goes into some detail on this, and then he points out what is really the philosophy of the Great Society, which I think has been misunderstood and misstated very badly. He does that in quoting a speech delivered recently by Mr. Califano, the brilliant adviser to President Johnson, which was not reported very widely.

In this speech, Mr. Califano said:

> The President's program hands out opportunity and self-reliance—not money. It offers education, training, and a chance to develop skills—not a subsistence allowance.

Mr. Rowan's column continues:

> Califano pointed out that Roosevelt's problems were of "a deep and often unyielding economic depression" where direct payment and welfare programs were essential.
>
> But Johnson's problems "are the problems of prosperity," he emphasized. Thus the pieces of his legislative program are "part of a larger design to bring to every American the opportunity to be himself and to stand proudly before his fellow man on his own two feet."

This article by Mr. Rowan is concise and brief, and consists of only a few hundred words. Because it is such an excellent statement of the President's effort to provide opportunities for all Americans, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVESTING IN HUMAN RESOURCES

(By Carl T. Rowan)

MURFREESBORO, TENN.—I stood on a sprawling, spreading campus in Bowling Green, Ky., yesterday and felt good about America.

I saw that what was just a small college with 2,000 students a decade ago had blossomed into a huge university of 9,000 students, a dozen modern new dormitories, a new library, modern new athletic facilities—and more buildings going up.

Here, 40 miles from my boyhood home, I stand on another campus with the same feeling of progress and hope. What used to be a small normal school is today the Middle Tennessee State University, training 6,000 students.

Here, too, are new libraries, computer centers, dormitories and the sounds of more construction under way.

The vitality of America's investment in her human resources is obvious on these campuses. And the federal government is responsible for a lot of the growth of these institutions.

At Western Kentucky, about $20 million in federal loans and grants made 13 new buildings possible. Not only did the federal money pay for a lot of construction, but it was the "seed money" that induced the legislature to provide the funds that meant unprecedented educational opportunities for youngsters from mostly rural backgrounds.

Here at Middle Tennessee, millions of federal dollars went into 12 buildings (two more are under construction) without which many of the students here might be without college educational opportunities.

Seeing these two campuses reminded me of a speech given in Brooklyn by Joseph Califano Jr., special assistant to President Johnson, 10 days ago.

Califano was explaining the economic and social philosophy of Johnson and how it differs from the New Deal philosophy of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

"The President's program hands out opportunity and self-reliance—not money," Califano said. "It offers education, training, and a chance to develop skills—not a subsistence allowance."

Califano pointed out that Roosevelt's problems were "of a deep and often unyielding economic depression" where direct payment and welfare programs were essential.

But Johnson's problems "are the problems of prosperity," he emphasized. Thus the pieces of his legislative program are "part of a larger design to bring to every American the opportunity to be himself and to stand proudly before his fellowman on his own two feet."

At places like Western Kentucky and Middle Tennessee they understand what Califano it talking about when they see living evidence that a million young Americans are in college who would not be there except for money made available under the Higher Education Act.

The question is whether the public can be convinced that it is a wise investment, and not charity, or extravagant "welfare," to pour money into the neighborhood Youth Corps, Job Corps and Head Start programs, as the President wants to do.

Can the public be shown that large federal investments in people under the Manpower Development and Training Act not only erases the poverty of thousands of unfortunate Americans, but eventually enriches us all?

The President likes anonymity on the part of his aides, thus Califano and others close to Johnson do not frequently make speeches. But the success of the President's programs may require that more of his aides go to the people and talk in the understandable language that Califano used in his Brooklyn speech.

On the campuses and main streets of hundreds of Murfreesboros and Bowling Greens, there are hundreds of thousands of Americans who can be, and need to be, reminded of how much the federal government contributed to their new skills, opportunities and self-respect.

Properly reminded, they just might help clear the way for their government to put skills and opportunities within the reach of their less fortunate countrymen.

TIME TO EXPLODE SOME MYTHS ABOUT HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the human rights conventions have not escaped the virulent onslaught of a number of the self-deputized vigilantes in our Nation.

In their state of advanced paranoia, a few of these disturbed voices shrilly brand the human rights conventions as one facet of a vast, complex, and ingenious conspiracy to subvert our people and our Constitution.

I do not respond with any unrealistic hope of assuaging the vigilantes' imagined terror, but rather to place the human rights conventions in proper historical perspective for conscientious American citizens.

In September of 1956, a Supplementary Convention on Slavery was adopted and opened for signatures at Geneva. This convention has been in force since April 30, 1957. As of today a total of 67 countries have acceded to or ratified this convention, and, of course, it has been pending in the Committee on Foreign Relations for 4 years without action.

It should be emphasized and underlined that the Convention on Slavery is a supplementary convention—supplementary to the International Convention on Slavery, adopted in 1926. The original 1926 Convention on Slavery was signed by the United States during the presidency of Calvin Coolidge and ratified by the Senate during the presidency of Herbert Hoover. Nowhere in the literature of lunacy, have I seen even the most remote suggestion that either of these two Presidents was anything but a great patriot.

None of these human rights conventions would conflict with any provision of our Constitution. There exists in their provisions no inconsistency with our Federal or State statutes. The amazing fact is that the provisions of these treaties are well below the high standards Americans have already established for themselves.

The aim of the advocates of Senate ratification of the human rights conventions is really quite basic, and completely straightforward. The aim is to promote and protect individual human rights throughout the world. We recognize that the United States has been since its birth dedicated to human rights and the dignity of the individual. We recognize that the United States must lead other nations without the value of our great tradition to a world where human rights and peace are both secure.

THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made on Wednesday by the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] about the current difficulties of the textile industry. Unfortunately, a previous commitment prevented me from participating in the discussion which followed his well-documented presentation.

I hope that responsible officials at the highest levels of the executive branch will carefully read and ponder the statement of the able Senator. The threat to thousands of jobs that is posed by the alarming increase in textile imports in recent years requires prompt and effective implementation of the program announced by the late President Kennedy on May 2, 1961.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon, along with many other Members of the Senate, I listened with much interest and curiosity to the speech of my good friend and distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New York. I thought the speech was well delivered, temperate, and, to some degree, constructive. I did not comment yesterday because other Senators had a greater compulsion to answer the Senator than I. Further, it seemed to me somewhat inappropriate to ask him to yield on his time so that I might disagree with his conclusions.

Certainly, there is not a person in the United States or for that matter in the free world who does not share with the distinguished junior Senator from New York the deep desire to see the conflict in Vietnam brought to an end. However, some individuals have even more compelling personal reasons for desiring a quicker conclusion to our activities in Vietnam than others. These are the people who have sons or relatives involved in the actual combat in Vietnam and whose sons and relatives are subjected to physical hazard each and every day that this conflict goes on.

However I doubt that there is anyone who has a greater desire to see this conflict brought to an end than the President of the United States himself, for surely he, of all people, understands that not only does this conflict cost the United States immeasurably in human lives, but it also costs the United States enormous sums of money, and ineffable difficulties and frustrations. As the distinguished Senator from New York pointed out in his speech, these expenditures we make in Vietnam, are those which could so much better be spent on constructive and useful programs here in the United States and elsewhere throughout the world. And of course we in Government and the President of the United States are well aware of this.

There is no one who is more aware that his reputation and his country's place in history, under his administration will be judged by the outcome of events in Vietnam. There is no one really more personally involved than the President of the United States. I know it is frustrating for the President, who is filled with the desire to accomplish great good for his Nation and the free world in a constructive fashion, to find himself and our Nation bogged down in a war in Vietnam—a war which, in point of fact, was not of his making but one that this Nation drifted into as a result of questionable decisions made as far back as 1954.

As I listened to the speech, it seemed to me that in essence the central point of Senator from New York was that we, the United States, should once again stop our bombing in the hope this might lead to negotiation and the conference table. I thought the Senator was very candid in admitting that even if we stopped bombing, there is no certainty that negotiations would take place, or that they would be productive. The Senator had no additional information or even encouragement as to what the other side might do in the event of a bombing pause. The Senator quoted Mr. Kosygin, the Premier of the Soviet Union, as having said the first step toward peace "should be the unconditional cessation of the bombing and all other aggressive acts against North Vietnam." Then the Senator went on to quote the Foreign Minister of North Vietnam as saying that such a step "is necessary to enable discussions between North Vietnam and the United States to take place." Mr. Kosygin, according to the Senator's statement, said the Soviet Union welcomed the foreign minister's statement and regarded it as an "important and constructive proposal for ending the war."

It seems to me, Mr. President, that at the time Premier Kosygin made this statement, he stressed rather strongly that the bombing had to stop unconditionally before even preliminary talks could be undertaken. As I understand the word "unconditionally," the proposal means we must give up totally and completely without requiring or requesting any matching action by the other side. In short, we would be asked to give up one of our great strengths in this contest without anything being given up by the other side. Furthermore, the United States would be asked to take this step without even the slightest assurance or new indication that it will bring the most tentative of discussions with respect to negotiations for peace in Vietnam. Thus Mr. Kosygin's statement was not a great deal different from those made by Ho Chi Minh, who has repeatedly stated that under no conditions will his side ever consider having any discussions until the United States in effect stops the major portion of its military activities. In order to comply, with their request, we have first to assure the other side that they will not suffer a military defeat; we then have to make a tacit admission that we erred in being in Vietnam on any basis. Giving everybody credit for good motives, it would seem to me that the proposal of the distinguished Senator from New York, in the absence of any new or additional information, does not hold out any reasonable expectation of producing results, for the truth of the matter is that we have stopped bombing in North Vietnam on five different occasions, and none of these cessations produced any hopeful response whatever from Ho Chi Minh or the Vietcong; but, on the contrary, our bombing pauses were specifically used in each instance by the opposition to hurry additional supplies, weapons, manpower, and so forth, into the battle scene without fear of successful interdiction. Does this action indicate to any reasonable person that the Vietcong and North Vietnamese are, at this time, even in the slightest degree interested in starting negotiations to stop the shooting? I think it is well understood by most Members of the Senate and our Government that the most recent cessation of bombing occurred at the very time when Mr. Kosygin was having his conferences with the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Wilson. I am sure that we have valid reason to believe that our Government was in touch with Mr. Wilson and that our Government, through the President, deliberately withheld our bombing until Mr. Kosygin and Mr. Wilson had all the opportunity that they needed to make contact with North Vietnam to see whether or not there was any disposition on their part to open negotiations.

But what was the result? The result was that the other side, rather than lessening their efforts, in even the slightest degree, and rather than demonstrating any good faith observance of their own Lunar New Year, or showing a willingness to change their position of hostility, furtively and hurriedly used the opportunity presented by the cease-fire to send in ever larger amounts of men and materiel. They, in fact, stepped up the momentum of the war, as subsequent reports have shown—for they are now using rockets and other heavy field armaments, which prior to the cease-fire they did not have. For the Senator to argue that we were doing the same thing, which he did, seems to me to beg the question. Our troops did not violate the truce, and our planes did stop dropping bombs. We took no offensive action whatsoever. During this same period, the enemy did not stop anything. I need not recite for the RECORD the history of the four other pauses in the past, one of which lasted 37 days. The fact is that each such pause only gave to the opposition the opportunity to strengthen themselves.

The Senator from New York suggested that we could easily give up the bombing without doing great detriment to ourselves. On this score, I must file a strong dissent. It was just yesterday that the very able Gen. William C. Westmoreland, commander of our forces in Vietnam, stated the aerial and naval bombardment is "essential and vital to our military strategy."

General Westmoreland credited the bombing with slowing the rate of infiltration and with damaging the war economy of North Vietnam.

But most important, in my view, General Westmoreland said unequivocally that the bombing "saves American and Vietnamese lives on the battlefield as well as those of our free world allies."

General Westmoreland suggested that a new bombing pause was nothing more than a proposal to "buy a pig in a poke" and added that he did not want to pay one drop of blood for such a plan.

I could not agree more.

Mr. President, I respectfully submit that the junior Senator from New York offers a plan that is full of hope, yes, but totally lacking in realism.

Once again, he invokes the name of the United Nations as the impartial agent of truce observation and final troop dispersal. Yet the Senator must know that as long ago as January 1966, we tried to refer Vietnam to the U.N. for settlement—but without success.

And while the Senator mentions the U.N. in connection with the Cuban missile crisis, it is a fact that no inspection by the United Nations ever took place in Cuba, and that the Communists flatly rejected inspection by the U.N.

Mr. President, we have invited the U.N. to join the search for peace, but Secretary General U Thant has also been among those who have advocated an unconditional halt in the bombing. Mr. Goldberg is tireless in his efforts to get this problem before the United Nations in a meaningful way. The record is increasingly clear that the bombing is becoming ever more effective. Defecting enemy troops are on the increase. Captured Vietcong documents reveal that morale is slipping. In every case, the disgruntled cite the B-52 attacks and shortage of basic supplies as their biggest woes.

So it is apparent, Mr. President, that in taking advantage of our recent bombing pauses—in abandoning solemn pledges which date back to 1954—North Vietnam has done only those things which would improve its military position and done nothing that would indicate a sincere desire to come to the peace table.

Each demonstration of restraint on our part has, in the end, cost the United States and our allies in Vietnam. It has meant more lives lost and more casualties.

In fact, I believe there is so much hue and cry at the present time against our bombing for the very reason that we are beginning to hurt them.

From everything I have been able to learn, Ho Chi Minh and his minions have believed from the outset that the United States did not have the will, the determination, or the patience to see this expensive and painful war through to the end.

They have believed and have been encouraged to believe—by loose statements from people here at home—that their continued resistance will make us lose heart and finally call an end to the war.

This is how Ho Chi Minh beat the French in 1954. And Ho believes that, once again, the humanitarian concern of a free people can be exploited to help weaken its resolve to continue the battle.

I share with the President of the United States and others the belief that the only real opportunity we will have to negotiate peace in Vietnam is to convince Ho Chi Minh that we will see this matter through; that we are not going to be driven out; that we intend to live up to our commitments in South Vietnam; and that we will continue to use our power and muscle until they are ready to sit down and negotiate in a rational manner for the peace which all of us want.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the United States was the child of the 18th century—the age of reason and enlightenment. It is therefore altogether fitting and proper that interest in education should have characterized this Nation throughout its history.

This year marks the centennial of the Federal agency devoted to education. Yet education was recognized as a national concern within 9 years of the Declaration of Independence when, under the Survey Ordinance of 1785, the infant Republic earmarked a parcel of land in each township for the schools. Higher education being in those days the prerogative of the few, it was not until nearly 80 years later that the first act affecting higher education—the Land Grant College Act of 1862, passed in the middle of a great civil war—reached the statute books.

Four years later, the National Association of School Superintendents, in their annual meeting on February 14, 1866, drew up a memorial on the establishment of National Bureau of Education. On February 18, James A. Garfield, then a Representative from Ohio, presented this memorial to Congress, together with a bill embodying its essential provisions. On March 2, 1867, an act was approved for the establishment of a Department of Education to be directed by a Commissioner appointed by the President. It is the 100th anniversary of this Federal agency—now called the Office of Education—that we now observe.

In line with the belief and practice of the American people that responsibility for the conduct of education should remain outside the Federal Government, the Office of Education was until the middle of the present century regarded as principally an agency for the collection and dissemination of information about the state of American education. With the exception of certain acts giving support to specialized types of education, for example, various vocational education acts from 1917 on and acts authorizing financial assistance for construction and operation in areas affected by Federal activities, it was called on to assume no responsibilities beyond this.

Half a century ago, Alfred North Whitehead warned:

> In the conditions of modern life, the rule is absolute, the race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. Not all your heroism, not all your social charm, not all your wit, not all your victories on land or at sea, can move back the finger of fate. Today we maintain ourselves. To-morrow science will have moved forward yet one more step, and there will be no appeal from the judgment which will then be pronounced on the uneducated.

But protected by two great oceans, the illusion of distance, and the conviction of its own impregnability, the Nation failed to take active account of the implications for education of the onrush of science, technology, and world affairs.

This era of comparative complacency came to a close with the launching of the Russian sputnik in 1958 and the consequent passage of the National Defense Education Act in the same year. Recognizing the insufficiency of local resources to give adequate support to schools unaided, this act initiated important measures to improve school teaching and curriculums in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages; improve counseling and guidance; provide technical training; provide financial aid to students who could not otherwise afford college; and foster the preparation of college teachers in all fields through a program of fellowships. At the same time it included a program of aid to the States for the improvement of their collection and reporting of educational data.

The success of the National Defense Education Act marked it as the forerunner of an immense program of educational legislation, passed mainly by the 88th and 89th Congresses, that spanned the whole gamut of education from preschool to adult, from vocational and technical to postgraduate scholarly and professional. The titles of these great acts suggest their content: the Vocational Education Act of 1963; the Higher Education Facilities Act of the same year; the Public Library Services and Construction Act; the Education of Handicapped Children Act; the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of the same year; the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965; the Appalachian Regional Development Act of the same year; the Adult Education Act of 1966; the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act; and the International Education Act of 1966.

As a result of this massive national effort to improve the educational system, the Office of Education is during the current fiscal year responsible for the administration of appropriations totaling about $3,901 million.

It was almost to be expected that Thomas Jefferson, chief architect of the Declaration of Independence and founder of the University of Virginia, should have had some prescient remarks to make on the subject of education.

The nation—

He said on one occasion—

> that expects to be ignorant and free expects what never was and never will be.

On another:

> Laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind . . . as new discoveries are made, new truths discovered, and manners and opinions change . . . institutions must advance also to keep pace with the times.

American education—and with it the U.S. Office of Education—may now be said to be on the road to keeping pace with the times.

THE CRIME WAVE AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, as everyone knows, America is caught up in a crime wave of gigantic proportions, so much so that lawlessness threatens to erode the moral and physical health and well-being of the Nation.

Particularly distressing is the fact that more crimes are being committed by more young people than ever before. In fact, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice reported recently that in 1965 a majority of all arrests for major crimes against property were of people under age 21, as were a substantial minority of arrests for major crimes against the person. And of even greater concern is the Commission estimate that 40 percent of all male children now living in the United States will be arrested for a nontraffic offense during their lives.

It is not surprising that crime is more prevalent among teenagers who, for any one of many reasons, do not participate in organized, adult-sponsored activities. Our young men and women, some of whom do not have the benefit of parental guidance and others of whom turn elsewhere for help, need the understanding and informed counsel of concerned adults.

In Phoenix, Ariz., the young men of the community have the opportunity to join the Theodore Roosevelt Council, Boy Scouts of America, whose executive director is George F. Miller. For many, many years George Miller has helped mold the teenage boys in the community into upstanding young men, and his efforts have won him far-reaching admiration and respect, particularly among the boys themselves.

In addition to being a tireless worker, George Miller is an incisive thinker and an interesting writer, and his weekly article in the Phoenix Gazette is widely read by adults and youths alike. One of his recent articles—pertaining to crime was especially insightful, and, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DUBIOUS HONOR: SCOUTER DECRIES RISE IN CRIME

(By George F. Miller)

It is high time we started protecting ourselves against ourselves.

As the most affluent society in the world, the United States can also claim the dubious distinction of being perhaps the most lawless nation. Known murders now number more than 9,000 a year, about one every hour of the day. We are probably more safe in any of the so-called free nations of the world than we are in ours.

France and Japan have murder rates less than a third of ours; Italy less than a fifth, England only a seventh, and the Netherlands about only a sixteenth. The fact that we are involved in breaking the law is apparent when we realize that industry authorities estimate that more than $2 billion worth of goods will be stolen from department stores, supermarkets, and other retail outlets in 1966.

The most disheartening disclosure by surveys is that many employes participate in stealing from their employers. We could go on with other statistics that are frightening concerning burglaries, holdups, vandalism, and car thefts. This is not necessary, the problem is well known.

As the richest nation on earth, we have fallen into a trap by thinking that we can solve most of our problems with money. As important as money is, it is never the total solution. Alone and without personal concern and action, money becomes a means and not a way to the solution to our problems of today's society. If we are to suppress crime, we need to become personally involved in its solution. No society has ever changed its course without the action of individuals.

We will not solve our problems by doubling the number of our law enforcement officers. We need to first give them the "tools" to work with. We have "hamstrung" them with laws on top of laws. This ends in frustration and lack of action. Our lawmaking bodies and courts need to take an all inclusive look and codify the authority and the role of our law enforcement officers in protecting our lives and property. Most of us do not realize their limitations in the suppression of crime. We do not communicate face to face with our law enforcement officers as to why their role is limited by laws that are out of date and do not apply in this space age.

J. Edgar Hoover tells us that "we have substituted self indulgence and pleasure for responsibility and respect for law and authority." This is a serious indictment. Rights and responsibilities are inseparable, for every right there is a responsibility. Without acceptance of our individual responsibility, we will do away with our rights. All of us desire justice, which is not necessarily the same thing as law. Probably the best definition of justice was given by Solon, the Athenian legislator, who pointed out that justice was never fully established until each man felt that a wrong done to another was a wrong done to himself.

We have abused the bail bond system which originally intended to give an opportunity to the accused to gather evidence for his defense. The present concept seems to allow the alleged violator to repeat the offense while out on bail. It would seem reasonable to bring the alleged violator, if he again breaks the law, to trial immediately on the first offense without providing opportunity for additional violations.

It has been suggested for many years that Arizona adopt the "Missouri Plan" for the selection and appointment of our judiciary. Others feel that the American Bar Association plan for selection, appointment and removal from office should be adopted in Arizona. Judges themselves seem to be in agreement that we need to dignify the office, further remove it from politics, improve the security and provide safeguards for removal from office for incompetence.

A get tough policy in the treatment of offenders must be tempered with our humane compassion for our fellowmen. Yet, we should make sure that we are not encouraging those who break the law by letting them get off too easily. Why should we not take away a driver's license from any juvenile or adult who is guilty of stealing an automobile? Why do we continue to provide them with legal mobility of pursuing illegal activities?

Certainly we must continue to improve the working conditions, pay scale and equitable retirement of our law enforcement personnel. In today's competition for manpower by business, industry, labor, and the professions, we must either reach up or settle for less with the realization that half a loaf may be worse than none.

In spite of the clouds, there are rays of sunshine that come through to give us hope. Our churches, our schools, our parents, our children, our character building and other agencies, and our leaders in government and society are, for the most part, contributing to the moral fiber of our nation. We need to redouble our efforts with a sense of urgency that makes right dominate over wrong. This is our way of life! The answer is in our hands!

THE FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the past 30 years have produced great changes in this Nation. We have a whole new generation of problems that demand new solutions. But when we look at the Federal bureaucracy, we often find that we are attacking the problems of today with the organizations, tools, and techniques of the past.

In large part, this is due to our failure, both in the Congress and in the executive branch, to state as clearly as possible the goals and objectives of our Government programs.

A perceptive and provocative analysis of our modern bureaucracy problem has been made by Prof. James Q. Wilson, of Harvard University, in the current issue of the magazine, the Public Interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Professor Wilson's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BUREAUCRACY PROBLEM

(By James Q. Wilson)

The federal bureaucracy, whose growth and problems were once only the concern of the Right, has now become a major concern of the Left, the Center, and almost all points in between. Conservatives once feared that a powerful bureaucracy would work a social revolution. The Left now fears that this same bureaucracy is working a conservative reaction. And the Center fears that the bureaucracy isn't working at all.

Increasing federal power has always been seen by conservatives in terms of increasing *bureaucratic* power. If greater federal power merely meant, say, greater uniformity in government regulations—standardized trucking regulations, for example, or uniform professional licensing practices—a substantial segment of American businessmen would probably be pleased. But growing federal power means increased discretion vested in appointive officials whose behavior can neither be anticipated nor controlled. The behavior of state and local bureaucrats, by contrast, can often be anticipated *because* it can be controlled by businessmen and others.

Knowing this, liberals have always resolved most questions in favor of enhancing federal power. The "hacks" running local administrative agencies were too often, in liberal eyes, the agents of local political and economic forces—businessmen, party bosses, organized professions, and the like. A federal bureaucrat, because he was responsible to a national power center and to a single President elected by a nationwide constituency, could not so easily be bought off by local vested interests; in addition, he would take his policy guidance from a President elected by a process that gave heavy weight to the votes of urban, labor, and minority groups. The New Deal bureaucrats, especially those appointed to the new, "emergency" agencies, were expected by liberals to be free to chart a radically new program and to be competent to direct its implementation.

It was an understandable illusion. It frequently appears in history in the hopes of otherwise intelligent and far-sighted men. Henry II thought his clerks and scribes would help him subdue England's feudal barons; how was he to know that in time they would become the agents of Parliamentary authority directed at stripping the king of his prerogatives? And how were Parliament and its Cabinet ministers, in turn, to know that eventually these permanent undersecretaries would become an almost self-governing class whose day-to-day behavior would become virtually immune to scrutiny or control? Marxists thought that Soviet bureaucrats would work for the people, despite the fact that Max Weber had pointed out why one could be almost certain they would work mostly for themselves. It is ironic that among today's members of the "New Left," the "Leninist problem"—i.e., the problem of over-organization and of self-perpetuating administrative power—should become a major preoccupation.

This apparent agreement among polemicists of the Right and Left that there is a bureaucracy problem accounts, one suspects, for the fact that non-bureaucratic solutions to contemporary problems seem to command support from both groups. The negative income tax as a strategy for dealing with poverty is endorsed by economists of such different persuasions as Milton Friedman and James Tobin, and has received favorable consideration among members of both the Goldwater brain trust and the Students for Democratic Society. Though the interests of the two groups are somewhat divergent, one common element is a desire to scuttle the social workers and the public welfare bureaucracy, who are usually portrayed as prying busybodys with pursed lips and steel-rimmed glasses ordering midnight bedchecks in public housing projects. (Police officers who complain that television makes them look like fools in the eyes of their children will know just what the social workers are going through.)

Now that everybody seems to agree that we ought to do something about the problem of bureaucracy, one might suppose that something would get done. Perhaps a grand reorganization, accompanied by lots of "systems analysis," "citizen participation," "creative federalism," and "interdepartmental coordination." Merely to state this prospect is to deny it.

There is not one bureaucracy problem, there are several, and the solution to each is in some degree incompatible with the solution to every other. First, there is the problem of accountability or control—getting the bureaucracy to serve agreed-on national goals. Second is the problem of equity—getting bureaucrats to treat like cases alike and on the basis of clear rules, known in advance. Third is the problem of efficiency—maximizing output for a given expenditure, or minimizing expenditures for a given output. Fourth is the problem of responsiveness—inducing bureaucrats to meet, with alacrity and compassion, those cases which can never be brought under a single national rule and which, by common human standards of justice or benevolence, seem to require that an exception be made or a rule stretched. Fifth is the problem of fiscal integrity—properly spending and accounting for public money.

Each of these problems mobilizes a somewhat different segment of the public. The problem of power is the unending preoccupation of the President and his staff, especially during the first years of an administration. Equity concerns the lawyers and the courts, though increasingly the Supreme Court seems to act as if it thinks its job is to help set national goals as a kind of auxiliary White House. Efficiency has traditionally been the concern of businessmen who thought, mistakenly, that an efficient government was one that didn't spend very much money. (Of late, efficiency has come to have a broader and more accurate meaning as an optimal relationship between objectives and resources. Robert McNamara has shown that an "efficient" Department of Defense costs a lot more money than an "inefficient" one; his disciples are now carrying the message to all parts of a skeptical federal establishment.) Responsiveness has been the concern of individual citizens and of their political representatives, usually out of wholly proper motives, but sometimes out of corrupt ones. Congress, especially, has tried to retain some power over the bureaucracy by intervening on behalf of tens of thousands of immigrants, widows, businessmen, and mothers-of-soldiers, hoping that the collective effect of many individual interventions would be a bureaucracy that, on large matters as well as small, would do Congress's will. (Since Congress only occasionally has a clear will, this strategy only works occasionally.) Finally, fiscal integrity—especially its absence—is the concern of the political "outs" who want to get in and thus it becomes the concern of "ins" who want to keep them out.

Obviously the more a bureaucracy is responsive to its clients—whether those clients are organized by radicals into Mothers for Adequate Welfare or represented by Congressmen anxious to please constituents—the less it can be accountable to presidential directives. Similarly, the more equity, the less responsiveness. And a preoccupation with fiscal integrity can make the kind of program budgeting required by enthusiasts of efficiency difficult, if not impossible.

Indeed, of all the groups interested in bureaucracy, those concerned with fiscal integrity usually play the winning hand. To be efficient, one must have clearly stated goals, but goals are often hard to state at all, much less clearly. To be responsive, one must be willing to run risks, and the career civil service is not ordinarily attractive to people with a taste for risk. Equity is an abstraction, of concern for the most part only to people who haven't been given any. Accountability is "politics," and the bureaucracy itself is the first to resist that (unless, of course, it is the kind of politics that produces pay raises and greater job security.) But an absence of fiscal integrity is welfare chiseling, sweetheart deals, windfall profits, conflict of interest, malfeasance in high places—in short, corruption. Everybody recognizes *that* when he sees it, and none but a few misguided academics have anything good to say about it. As a result, fiscal scandal typically becomes the standard by which a bureaucracy is judged (the FBI is good because it hasn't had any, the Internal Revenue Service is bad because it has) and thus the all-consuming fear of responsible executives.

If it is this hard to make up one's mind about how one wants the bureaucracy to behave, one might be forgiven if one threw up one's hands and let nature take its course. Though it may come to that in the end, it is possible—and important—to begin with a resolution to face the issue squarely and try to think through the choices. Facing the issue means admitting what, in our zeal for new programs, we usually ignore: *There are inherent limits to what can be accomplished by large hierarchical organizations.*

The opposite view is more often in vogue. If enough people don't like something, it becomes a problem; if the intellectuals agree with them, it becomes a crisis; any crisis must be solved; if it must be solved, then it can be solved—and creating a new organization is the way to do it. If the organization fails to solve the problem (and when the problem is a fundamental one, it will almost surely fail), then the reason is "politics," or "mismanagement," or "incompetent people," or "meddling," or "socialism," or "inertia."

Some problems cannot be solved and some government functions cannot, in principle, be done well. Notwithstanding, the effort must often be made. The rule of reason should be to try to do as few undoable things as possible. It is regrettable, for example, that any country must have a foreign office, since none can have a good one. The reason is simple: it is literally impossible to have a "policy" with respect to *all* relevant matters concerning *all* foreign countries, much less a consistent and reasonable policy. And the difficulty increases with the square of the number of countries, and probably with the cube of the speed of communications. The problem long ago became insoluble and any sensible Secretary of State will cease trying to solve it. He will divide his time instead between *ad hoc* responses to the crisis of the moment and appearances on Meet the Press.

The answer is not, it must be emphasized, one of simply finding good people, though it is at least that. Most professors don't think much of the State Department, but it is by no means clear that a department made up only of professors would be any better, and some reason to believe that it would be worse. One reason is that bringing in "good outsiders," especially good outsiders from universities, means bringing in men with little experience in dealing with the substantive problem but many large ideas about how to approach problems "in general." General ideas, no matter how soundly based in history or social science, rarely tell one what to do tomorrow about the visit from the foreign trade mission from Ruritania or the questions from the Congressional appropriations subcommittee.

Another reason is that good people are in very short supply, even assuming we knew how to recognize them. Some things literally cannot be done—or cannot be done well—because there is no one available to do them who knows how. *The supply of able, experienced executives is not increasing nearly as fast as the number of problems being addressed by public policy.* All the fellowships, internships, and "mid-career training programs" in the world aren't likely to increase that supply very much, simply because the essential qualities for an executive—judgment about men and events, a facility for making good guesses, a sensitivity to political realities, and an ability to motivate others—are things which, if they can be taught at all, cannot be taught systematically or to more than a handful of apprentices at one time.

This constraint deserves emphasis, for it is rarely recognized as a constraint at all. Anyone who opposed a bold new program on the grounds that there was nobody around able to run it would be accused of being a pettifogger at best and a reactionary do-nothing at worst. Everywhere except in government, it seems, the scarcity of talent is accepted as a fact of life. Nobody (or almost nobody) thinks seriously of setting up a great new university overnight, because anybody familiar with the university business knows that, for almost any professorship one would want to fill, there are rarely more than five (if that) really top-flight people in the country, and they are all quite happy—and certainly well-paid—right where they are. Lots of new business ideas don't become profit-making realities because good business executives are both hard to find and expensive to hire. The government—at least publicly—seems to act as if the supply of able political executives were infinitly elastic, though people setting up new agencies will often admit privately that they are so frustrated and appalled by the shortage of talent that the only wonder is why disaster is so long in coming. Much would be gained if this constrant were mentioned to Congress *before* the bill is passed and the hopes aroused, instead of being mentioned afterward as an excuse for failure or as a reason why higher pay scales for public servants are an urgent necessity. "Talent is Scarcer Than Money" should be the motto of the Budget Bureau.

If administrative feasibility is such a critical issue, what can be done about it? Not a great deal. If the bureaucracy problem is a major reason why so many programs are in trouble, it is also a reason why the problem itself cannot be "solved." But it can be mitigated—though not usually through the kinds of expedients we are fond of trying: Hoover Commissions, management studies, expensive consultants, co-ordinating committees, "czars," and the like. The only point at which very much leverage can be gained on the problem *is when we decide what it is we are trying to accomplish*. When we define our goals, we are implictly deciding how much, or how little, of a bureaucracy problem we are going to have. A program with clear objectives, clearly stated, is a program with a fighting chance of coping with each of the many aspects of the bureaucracy problem. Controlling an agency is easier when you know what you want. Equity is more likely to be assured when over-all objectives can be stated, at least in part, in general rules to which people in and out of the agency are asked to conform. Efficiency is made possible when you know what you are buying with your money. Responsiveness is never easy or wholly desirable; if every person were treated in accordance with his special needs, there would be no program at all. (The only system that meets the responsiveness problem squarely is the free market.) But at least with clear objectives we would know what we are giving up in those cases when responsiveness seems necessary, and thus we would be able to decide how much we are willing to tolerate. And fiscal integrity is just as easy to insure in a system with clear objectives as in one with fuzzy ones; in the former case, moreover, we are less likely to judge success simply in terms of avoiding scandal. We might even be willing to accept a little looseness if we knew what we were getting for it.

The rejoinder to this argument is that there are many government functions which, by their nature, can never have clear objectives. I hope I have made it obvious by now that I am aware of that. We can't stop dealing with foreign nations just because we don't know what we want; after all, they may know what *they* want, and we had better find out. My argument is advanced, not as a panacea—there is no way to avoid the problem of administration—but as a guide to choice in those cases where choice is open to us, and as a criterion by which to evaluate proposals for coping with the bureaucracy problem.

Dealing with poverty—at least in part—by giving people money seems like an obvious strategy. Governments are very good at taking money from one person and giving it to another; the goals are not particularly difficult to state; measures are available to evaluate how well we are doing in achieving a predetermined income distribution. There may be many things wrong with this approach, but administrative difficulty is not one of them. And yet, paradoxically, it is the last approach we will probably try. We will try everything else first—case work, counseling, remedial education, community action, federally-financed mass protests to end "alienation," etc. And whatever else might be said in their favor, the likelihood of smooth administration and ample talent can hardly be included.

Both the White House and the Congress seem eager to do something about the bureaucracy problem. All too often, however, the problem is described in terms of "digesting" the "glut" of new federal programs—as if solving administrative difficulties had something in common with treating heartburn. Perhaps those seriously concerned with this issue will put themselves on notice that they ought not to begin with the pain and reach for some administrative bicarbonate of soda; they ought instead to begin with what was swallowed and ask whether an emetic is necessary. *Coping with the bureaucracy problem is inseparable from rethinking the objectives of the programs in question*. Administrative reshuffling, budgetary cuts (or budgetary increases), and congressional investigation of lower-level boondoggling will not suffice and are likely, unless there are some happy accidents, to make matters worse. Thinking clearly about goals is a tough assignment for a political system that has been held together in great part by compromise, ambiguity, and contradiction. And if a choice must be made, any reasonable person would, I think, prefer the system to the clarity. But now that we have decided to intervene in such a wide range of human affairs, perhaps we ought to reassess that particular trade-off.

PFC. HIRAM STRICKLAND—FOUGHT AND DIED FOR FREEDOM

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, it has often been said that the American fighting man in Vietnam has no idea why he is there, and as such, has no wish to be there.

I have here an AP dispatch containing a letter written by Pfc. Hiram Strickland shortly before he was killed in action. Private Strickland, who has been awarded posthumously the George Washington Award for Patriotism, was in South Vietnam, not because he had been assigned there, but because he had volunteered. In this letter, written shortly before his death and addressed to his parents, Private Strickland says more eloquently than I, or any other Senator, could ever say exactly why he was in Vietnam; and it is my belief that, if every Member of this body understood the reason he was there as well as he did, we would not present such a diverse front to the rest of the world.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire dispatch be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Soldier Fights, Dies for Freedom: "I Didn't Want To Die—But I Know It Was Part of My Job," GI Writes

Graham, N.C.—Crewcut Butch Strickland, following the footsteps of his father, enlisted in the U.S. Army June 8, 1964—eight days after graduating from Southern High School near Graham.

He trained as a radioman and was sent to Korea. After his one-year tour there, he volunteered for combat duty in Vietnam.

He arrived there Nov. 25, 1965. Just over two months later, he was dead.

Tuesday Butch was awarded posthumously the George Washington Award, the highest award for patriotism of the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge, Pa.

The award resulted from a letter addressed to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Donald Strickland. It was found in Butch's personal belongings after his death. Here is what it said:

"Dear folks,

"I'm writing this letter as my last one. You've probably already received word that I'm dead and that the government wishes to express its deepest regret.

"Believe me, I didn't want to die, but I know it was part of my job. I want my country to live for billions and billions of years to come.

"I want it to stand as a light to all people oppressed and guide them to the same freedom we know. If we can stand and fight for freedom, then I think we have done the job God set down for us. It's up to every American to fight for the freedom we hold so dear. If we don't, the smells of free air could become dark and damp as in a prison cell.

"We won't be able to look at ourselves in a mirror, much less at our sons and daughters, because we know we have failed our God, country and our future generations.

"I can hold my head high because I fought, whether it be in heaven or hell. Besides the saying goes, 'One more GI from Vietnam, St. Peter, I've served my time in hell.'

"I fought for Sandy, Nell, Gale (his sisters), Mom and Dad. But when the twins and Sandy's kids get old enough, they'll probably have to fight, too. Tell them to go proudly and without fear of death, because it is worth keeping the land free.

"I remember a story from Mr. Williams' (Thomas Williams, a teacher) English classes when I was a freshman that said, 'The cowards die a thousand times; the brave die but once.'

"Don't mourn me, Mother, for I'm happy I died fighting my country's enemies, and I will live forever in people's minds. I've done what I've always dreamed of. Don't mourn me, for I died a soldier of the United States of America.

"God bless, you all, and take care. I'll be seeing you in heaven.

"Your loving son and brother,

Butch."

Strickland's commanding officer found the letter, written on note paper, and confirmed it was in Strickland's handwriting.

Strickland's family and a group of dignitaries flew to Valley Forge Tuesday to attend the presentation ceremony. Burlington Industries, which employs Donald Strickland, provided the plane.

Donald Strickland, 49, a World War II veteran, moved to North Carolina after the war and has been a local truck driver for the Transportation division of Burlington Industries for 22 years.

THE FARMER WANTS TO KNOW

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, with the announcement by the Department of Agriculture earlier this week that parity has dropped another 1 percent and now stands at 74 percent, our Nation's farmers are beginning to wonder about their economic future and what they are to do about making plans for the planting of crops in the next few weeks.

On the one hand, they are subject to falling farm prices and lowering parity, which places them in an economic squeeze, and this with no apparent future assistance from the Department of Agriculture to reverse the trend. On the other hand, they are being asked to expand production to meet food needs around the world, even when they know, for instance, that the market price of wheat fell from $1.74 in July 1966 to $1.49 in February 1967. This is a drop of 25 cents per bushel in just a little over 6 months.

No wonder that parity has dropped 8 percent in 1 year from its high of 82 percent in February 1966, to 74 percent, where it stands on February 15, 1967.

The farmers in the Midwest want to know what they should do, with the spring planting season almost upon them. The problem is fully discussed in a Daily Radio Roundup by the GTA broadcast for Wednesday, March 1, 1967. This broadcast has an exceedingly broad base of listeners in South Dakota and other Plains States. As the broadcast so emphatically states:

> The slide in farm prices during the last six months has not been encouraging to people on the land.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the broadcast be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP

The news from the U.S. Department of Agriculture is official now—farm prices have dropped for the sixth straight month. In the month that ended February 15, the farm price drop was one percent, and this means that since August of last year farm prices have dropped almost seven and one-half percent. And, the farm-price level on February 15 was seven percent below the same date one year earlier.

That's bad enough, but what makes pain into agony is the fact that farm operating and living costs have not declined to correspond. In fact, they keep setting new high records, going up and up month after month.

The month between January 15 and February 15 was, however, an exception. Farm operating and living costs actually came down. USDA says the drop was one-third of one percent, scarcely equal to the one percent drop in farm prices for that same period. Farm operating and living expenses now are three percent above one year ago, but in order to put this into perspective, you must remember that farm prices received are seven percent *below* a year ago. That makes quite a spread, and it all comes right out of the farmer's pocket.

All these figures are in national averages, of course. There are differences by regions and areas and even individual farms. The Department of Agriculture said in its February report that lower prices for eggs, wheat, and milk accounted for most of the loss of income to farmers. Prices for broiler chickens went up some, but they had been at about the lowest prices in recorded history.

So what happened to the parity ratio—that measure of how farmers are doing in relation to the rest of the economy? Well, it fell to 74 percent of the "fair earning level", which is 100 percent of parity, and farmers haven't seen 100 percent now for 15 years.

To give you an idea of what has happened to farm prices in the last year, farmers were receiving 82 percent of parity in mid-February of 1966.

Parity is described as the price level needed by farmers to put the value of things they sell on a par with the cost of things they must buy. Based on that definition, 74 percent of parity, the present level, cannot be described as anything but a terrible squeeze on the farmer's pocketbook.

This is reason enough for the unrest that is reported from the farmlands all over the nation. Yet this is supposed to be the big year for expanding production. Many farmers are having trouble deciding just what they should do with their prices going down and, at the same time, the call sounding from Washington for more corn, wheat, soybeans, and so forth. What will happen to prices? That's what farmers want to know. The slide in farm prices during the last six months has not been encouraging to people on the land.

To borrow a phrase from GTA's M. W. Thatcher, "Farm prices are Made in Washington." With that in mind, we'll see what happens next.

AGRICULTURE YEAR 2000: RESOURCES

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago in Cincinnati, Ohio, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman delivered a splendid speech at the annual meeting of the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts.

His address, entitled "Agriculture/2000: Resources," the third in a series of "looking ahead" messages, pointed out that conservation in America developed in two great waves—forestry and then soil conservation—and that we are now at the flood of a third wave, this one more broadly concerned with the totality of man's environment: soil, air, water, and open space to move in.

The Secretary's address is a thoughtful and eloquent presentation of the present and future situation relating to the Nation's basic natural resources. It deserves the full attention of Congress and the American people.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address by Secretary Freeman was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURE 2000: RESOURCES

My message today, "Agriculture/2000: Resources," is the third in a series exploring what rural America will be like at the turn of the century, just 33 years from today.

In Tulsa, Oklahoma, in mid-January I spoke of commercial agriculture's role in the years ahead. Last week, speaking to the National Association for Community Development, I explored the rural communities of tomorrow. Today our subject is the resource and conservation challenge of the remainder of this century and the next.

It is fitting that we examine this subject together. No organization has done more to enhance the resource base of this country than the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts. The whole thrust of NASCD's efforts these past 23 years has been a better future for all America through conservation and development practices.

1967 is a good year to take a long-range look at "Resources/2000," for we are at a point in time equidistant from 1934, which marked the first full year of operation of what is now the Soil Conservation Service, and the dawn of the 21st Century.

It has been said that we view the future "through a glass, darkly." Yet we can predict with some accuracy the major outlines of the year 2000.

By the dawn of the next century, we shall have become a nation of 300 million Americans, having added to our present population the equivalent of the total populations of 10 New York Cities or 54 Washington, D.C.'s.

In the year 2000 these Americans will exist on the same number of square miles—some 3.4 million—as today. The same amount of fresh water will fall from the skies then as now, but we shall need twice as much water. We shall be fed from the same thin layer of topsoil that feeds us today, but need one third more food.

It will be a richer America, in dollars, than today. With the gross national product rising an average of $250 per person every year, the industrial and commercial output alone will top one trillion dollars in 2000.

Americans will be earning more—but working ⅓ fewer hours. The demand for outdoor recreation will have increased three times over 1967 levels.

Land use will be more intensive than today. Housing for another 100 million Americans will be built; roads for three times the number of automobiles as today will have been built; space to dispose of another million tons of solid waste every year will have been found.

This face of the future we can predict with some certainty because quantity is always easier to measure than *quality*. But what of the quality of American life in the next century? Here the glass darkens, and split-images appear.

One image reflects an almost completely-urbanized America, with 240 million people crowded into nine percent of the continental land mass in huge, sprawling, ant-hill cities. Prophets of this America see five giant strip cities housing three out of every five people in urban areas more densely populated than present-day Japan. Water will be dirtier, they say, air more full of smog, and for most Americans the solitude of open spaces will have vanished beneath the blades of the conquering bulldozer.

This particular view of the future has wide currency. *And it will happen, if nothing is done to alter present pollution trends, migration trends, resource inputs, and land use policies.*

But this is not the only image in the mirror. Other spokesmen—not many so far, but a steadily growing number—envision an entirely different America. Nothing is fixed about the future, they say. Rather the future is what we make it—for we are not the blind pawns of fate, but rather the masters of our own destiny. These prophets share the belief of that perceptive French visitor to our shores, Alexis de Tocqueville, who in 1830 observed: ". . . in the (American's) eyes what is not yet done is only what he has not yet attempted to do."

What kind of an America do these more optimistic prophets see? Thirty-three years in the future they see—

A land of 300 million Americans living in less congestion than 200 million live in today.

A countryside, USA, dotted by new towns and growing rural communities where the benefits of community life are matched by the rich beauty of the countryside.

They see an agriculture fully sharing in the national prosperity—with full parity of income an accomplished fact.

They see urban centers free of smog and blight, with ample parklands within easy reach of all.

They see a land free from devastating floods, clear rivers scrubbed of pollution and silt, and sparkling air.

And they see new industry and factories dotting rural America, providing the necessary economic underpinnings for the good life in the country.

This is the kind of America/2000 I believe in. It is the kind you believe in, too, for every program of the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts is pointed toward building this kind of America.

This is your policy. You believe that a constructive conservation and resource policy is the key to building this kind of America. And you know that such a policy is greater than just the sum of its component physical parts—water, air, and soil—that at the center of such a policy is man himself.

This basic objective is carried out in different ways. In forest management it means constant reforestation for sustained yields.

In soil conservation it means preventive and restoration measures for continued fertility of the soil. In Wilderness Areas it means stewardship of a particular geographic area so that more than one generation may see and use it. But it means use, in all three cases. For man and his ecology are one and inseparable.

There is nothing new about this concept. Gifford Pinchot, USDA's first Forest Service chief, realized this when he wrote, over half a century ago:

"From birth to death, natural resources, transformed for human use, feed, clothe, shelter, and transport us. Upon them we depend for every material necessity, comfort, convenience, and protection in our lives. Without abundant resources, prosperity is out of reach. Therefore the conservation of natural resources is the fundamental *material* problem."

I quote Pinchot for two reasons. The first is to illustrate that the U.S. Department of Agriculture has been in the conservation business for a long time, that its program and responsibilities are much broader than agricultural commodity programs alone (important as these are). Second, and more important, however, is this. Conservationists—and I thing everyone in this room is one—are often criticized for (quote)—"putting birds and bees ahead of people." (Unquote.)

No statement could be more specious. Conservation *is* people. Conservation is a *material* problem. But it goes way beyond that. The Bible says, "What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" We could well ask, "What profit it us, the richest nation on earth, if our own people have no open space to enjoy, no woods for our children to roam in, nothing within driving distance except subdivisions, concrete and No Trespassing signs?" This is what conservation is all about.

Pinchot realized this, and you realize it, but many remain unconvinced. One of our biggest jobs, it seems to me, to build the kind of U.S. we want in the year 2000, is to convince the public that conservation *is* one of the most important, if not *the* most important dollars-and-cents issues facing us today. And to become convincing advocates, we first have to understand how we got where we are today.

The conservation movement developed in three great waves, each building upon the flow of the one going before it; each cresting in reaction to widely prevalent abuses of the environment; and each separated by an ebb of public indifference and inaction.

Very roughly, the three great waves can be categorized as follows: 1. 1890–1912, the Gifford Pinchot-Theodore Roosevelt era; 2. 1933–1940, the Hugh Bennett-FDR era; and 3. The present.

1. The first great wave began to roll in, in the late 1890's with the establishment of forest reserves from what remained of the public domain. This system evolved into our present National Forest system.

It was an era of great men. John Muir, Gifford Pinchot, and others led a tide of public outrage against exploiters of the public domain, and Theodore Roosevelt, by executive order, established a system of National Forests administered by the Department of Agriculture. He named Gifford Pinchot as the first Chief of the U.S. Forest Service.

Assignment of the Forest Service to the Department of Agriculture was significant. In making it, Roosevelt said,

"In the Department all problems relating to growth from the soil are already gathered . . . and all the sciences auxiliary to forestry are at hand for prompt and effective cooperation."

Up until this time, except for isolated instances, the treatment of forests had been similar to that of the mines. The objective was simply to mine timber from the earth in the same manner gold or silver was mined. The concept of timber as a *renewable* resource was foreign to most people.

Pinchot and Roosevelt made the principle a reality, and today it is widely accepted by both public and private timber management.

The first wave also established the principle of multiple use, which can be stated as follows: The same National Forest which yields timber for human use, can also provide recreation for human use. Moreover, it can graze cattle, sustain mining, and serve as a water collector and water protector for the use of people living downstream.

All of this may seem self-evident now, in 1967, but it was a radical idea for its time, and it spawned bitter opposition.

After Pinchot and Theodore Roosevelt left the national scene an ebb-tide set in. But in the thirties, a second great conservation wave crested in response to yet another crisis. The very earth of the Great Plains was vanishing in devastating duststorms, and destructive floods in the Midwest scoured the rich heartland of America. These events were compounded by a crippling depression.

The second crusade gave birth to the Soil Conservation Service, with another great conservationist, Hugh Hammond Bennett, as its spokesman.

Bennett's policy was to develop techniques which the private landowner could apply to insure that his soil and water worked in harmony to produce for mankind.

President Franklin Roosevelt, realizing that three-fourths of the Nation's land was in private hands; that most of the soil conservation work could only be done by farmers themselves; and that conservation was an integral part—could not be separated from—farming, assigned the fledging agency to the Department of Agriculture.

The soil conservation movement flourished and has made steady progress since, firmly supported all the way by the NASCD. Today there are 3,000 local soil conservation districts. Of these, 2,400 have signed modernized working agreements. In 14 States, all districts are updated. Last year, three-fourths of the small watershed work plans completed were multi-purpose, including recreation, wildlife habitat, or municipal water benefits, as well as flood prevention.

But the broader conservation movement, of which soil conservation was a part, moved from stage center in the national arena to the wings under the impact of World War II and Cold War problems.

Yet during the ebb of two decades of inattention a third conservation wave was building and today is at the flood.

The crisis this time is equally severe and far more widespread than the two that preceded it. It affects a nation of 200 million Americans today, compared with 90 million in Pinchot's time, and 125 million in the thirties.

A similarity exists between this era and the preceding two. Again, we are faced with an abuse of natural resources. But there are also these deep, fundamental differences:

1. Whereas the first conservation wave concerned itself primarily with forests, and the second with soil and water, response to the present crisis must concern itself with the totality of man's environment: soil, air, water, open space to move in.

2. Whereas the first two crises were concerned with repairing the damages of a rampaging nature disturbed by man, the third is concerned with restoring and preserving an environment on its way to being destroyed by man himself; by his polutants, his land use practices.

3. Effects of the first two crises were limited geographically and to certain segments of the population. Today's crises is continental in scope and omnipresent in its intrusion into every American's daily life.

It is, in short, a "people" crisis. Other nations have known the cutting edge of population pressure on available resources for centuries. It is new to us, and we are bewildered. It is not a case here, as it is in India, of a shortage of resources to sustain life itself; rather it is a case of a misuse of the resources that make life worthwhile—a shortage of available open space, an excess of pollution, a piling up of too many people in too little urban space.

This is new to a frontier people who, for 300 years of their history had what Bernard DeVoto called "an internal, domestic empire" in the Great West, and space to spare elsewhere.

There is no shortage of specific examples to illustrate the people/resources problem:

Today a majority of Americans, urban and rural alike, in all sections of the country, live near polluted waters. Every major river system is polluted. Fifty-four percent of all Americans described nearby waters as "severely polluted."

Today a majority of Americans are breathing polluted air. Air in every single urban area in the United States is polluted. So is air in many rural areas, and in some, smog is doing more damage than even insects to crops.

Open space for picnicking, camping and solitude—for the 70 percent of our population living in urban areas—is fast disappearing anywhere within easy driving range.

Today's Americans, unlike any people who went before them, are living in a new environment dominated by technology, rather than by nature.

This new environment and the conservation crisis it has precipitated is one of the most serious domestic problems we face. But there is more cause for hope than despair. Paradoxically, because the crisis is touching almost every American—from fathers looking for fishing spots, to small boys looking for a patch of woods to play in—the public response to this crisis is more broadly based than ever before.

Examples of this response are all around us. At last count, five states had passed laws to preserve open space and to alleviate urban sprawl. Kentucky has just passed stiff legislation to help curb the ravages of strip mining. The conservation wave is again at flood tide and government is responding.

On the national level, the last two sessions of Congress passed more conservation, anti-pollution and natural beauty measures than any other session in history. There was Highway Beautification, the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the Water Pollution Control Act, the Clean Air Act Amendments, Amendments to P.L. 566, and authorization for Resource Conservation and Development.

Laws aren't everything, of course. The laws of the 1900's and the 1930's would not have succeeded without the wise administration of two great conservationist Presidents.

But a third great conservationist President is in the White House today, and his First Lady is the nation's leading advocate of natural beauty. Like the two Roosevelts, President Johnson is focusing the national attention on conservation, because he believes in it and because he understands it. The depth of his understanding is apparent in this statement:

"Our conservation must be not just the classic conservation of protection and development, but a creative conservation of restoration and innovation. Its concern is not with nature alone, but with the total relationship between man and the world around him. Its objects is not just man's welfare, but the dignity of man's spirit."

So now, with all these things going for us—broad based public support, new legislation, and strong Presidential concern—the central question as we look to the America/2000 we want is not—"can it be done?"—but rather, "*How* can it be done?"

Specifically, we must now turn our attention to these four broad areas in order to reach our goals: 1. Quantity of Effort. 2. Broadened Concepts of Multiple Use. 3. Planned Land Use Policy and 4. Preservation.

1. Quality of Effort: At the time President Kennedy took office in 1961, he inherited a federal budget of roughly $2.4 billion for conservation and natural resource measures. President Johnson's 1968 budget calls for $3.9 billion, *more than a 60 percent increase!* All this took place in six short years, and I don't have to tell anyone in this audience what these extra conservation dollars have accomplished.

Yet as a nation, we must be prepared to devote much more to conservation and resource development than we are now investing. American voters will make decisions on this question on each of the 16 national election days between now and the year 2000. Washington can't make that decision, only the nation can. On it will depend how many acres of forests and parks and wilderness we have, how many more National Recreation Areas we establish, how many more multi-use watershed projects are constructed.

But quantity alone is not enough. We also need—

2. Broadened Concepts of Multiple Use: Multiple-use has been a Department of Agriculture policy for more than half a century. It is a well-accepted practice in forestry management and just last year was applied to the 8 new National Recreation Areas. Multiple use, today, is an integral part of watershed development. And more and more farmers are diversifying use of their land. Many are getting help from USDA in establishing recreation for profit and pleasure on private lands.

Another 100 million Americans in the year 2000 means greatly-increased single purpose land use for housing, highways, and industry. The remaining land will have to serve more than just one use to provide the open spaces and recreational areas 300 million Americans will demand.

To do this will take new concepts in zoning, perhaps providing for farm land on the urban fringe; it will take new and expanded programs like those of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Soil Conservation Service, and Farmers Home Administration, already successful, in a modest way, in providing new recreation opportunity.

Let me make this point clear. I'm *not* talking about taking private land away from people. What I am saying is that our traditional single-purpose use of most of our lands isn't enough for the 21st century. If we are to live in and enjoy the kind of United States I spoke of earlier, we must fully utilize every acre of land.

Implicit in this concept is—

3. A Planned Land Use Policy: Soil Conservation Service estimates we have some 682 million acres of land in the contiguous 48 states suitable for cultivation. This land feeds us now, and it will have to feed us in the year 2000. Planning to preserve this prime farm land is of the utmost importance, simply because feeding our people is land's most important use—we can't exist without food.

But what are we doing? Every day, we're losing thousands of acres of this prime farm land to subdivisions, highways, airports. We're burying it under concrete or houses, and it can't be jackhammered clear again.

But more is involved than just farm land. We're also burying land needed for recreation and open space, pushing these open spaces further and further out of the reach of most people.

And so we need a sound land policy, one which sorts out the lands best suited for recreational needs, agriculture, commerce, housing and highways; a policy which establishes priorities and makes the best use of a fixed limited natural resource.

Such a policy means building highways on unproductive land, rather than across rich topsoil. It means opportunity for local communities to identify land needed for future recreation, and a way to finance the land *now,* before urban land costs have doubled again, as they did in the last decade.

Such a policy requires information of the type now being gathered in the USDA's Land Use Inventory, but on a much greater scale, and in much more detail.

This concept of planned land use incorporates two elements. The first is use—deciding the best use to make of our land. The second is preservation—preserving land suitable for crops, open space, recreation. Which brings me to our final point—

4. Preservation: The National Forest Wilderness Areas illustrate this concept in its classic sense of preserving a resource in its primeval state for human use—in this case, for people to hike, camp and boat free from the works of man. I believe in this kind of preservation and have added some two million acres of wilderness to the system, by executive order, while I have been Secretary of Agriculture.

But this isn't the only kind of preservation we need. In a somewhat different, and larger sense, preservation means "preventative conservation."

The Department's Research Service is applying it as we discover methods to practice the more intensive farming we will need in years ahead—which means more fertilizers and chemicals—without damaging man's ecology. This brand of preventative conservation consists of careful testing of pesticides and herbicides before they go into use, careful regulation and education in application, monitoring effects on the environment, and research to discover non-chemical methods to control pests.

This principle of preventative conservation needs to be applied promptly to all forms of air, water, and soil pollution at the source.

In the long run, this kind of preventative conservation is much less expensive than restorative conservation. More important, some ecologies, once destroyed by man, can never be brought back, no matter what we do. All our billions, all our technology, can never bring back the tons of top soil from the Gulf of Mexico to the American heartland. Nor can we ever bring back a single acre of wilderness, once it is destroyed.

We are a nation bedazzled by technology, and addicted to crash programs. But there are no instant ecologies or instant forests. And so, in the final analysis, we must devote much more attention in the future to *assessing* each new technological development for its ultimate impact on man. I hope it is never said of this generation, as Stephen Vincent Benét said of another . . .

"They thought, because they had power, they had wisdom also."

And finally, let me say this:

What we have discussed today is not a dream. It can be a reality. We are talking about the kind of America that President Johnson envisioned when he said:

"Here in America, we started out to do more than simply endure. We intended to live as man should live, working hard, raising families, learning, building—and breathing clean air, swimming in clean streams, finding a part of the forest or shore where nobody else was.

"If we are to have that America, we shall have to master the consequences of our own prosperity—and the time to begin is now."

Let us begin, and let us persevere, so that we may build the America we want, and we need, in the year 2000.

AWARD OF MEDAL OF HONOR TO MARINE CAPT. HARVEY C. BARNUM, JR.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, this week the Secretary of the Navy presented the Medal of Honor to Marine Capt. Harvey C. Barnum, Jr., of Cheshire, Conn.

Captain Barnum is a recent graduate of St. Anselm's College in Manchester, N.H., which makes our State doubly proud of this fine young officer.

Captain Barnum was stationed at Da Nang when, on December 18, his company set out on a search-and-destroy mission about 30 miles south of his base.

Sudden enemy fire killed or wounded dozens of his fellow marines; and, when his company commander was killed, Captain Barnum took over command and led a counterattack against heavy enemy fire.

Captian Barnum moved dangerously close to the enemy to pinpoint their fire for American artillery and Army helicopters.

Our Nation owes a tremendous debt of gratitude to the gallant men like Captain Barnum who risk their lives every day in Vietnam. New Hampshire is proud of the part it played in training this fine citizen of Connecticut; and his nation is proud of this young officer and his dedication to his country.

THE SERVICE CORPS OF RETIRED EXECUTIVES—A TRIUMPH FOR THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, it is not too often that we have the opportunity to learn about Federal programs which show creative, thoughtful, and constructive approaches to the problems of our Nation, programs carried out at practically no cost to the taxpayers but which have a dramatic effect on the wellbeing of the country.

Such a program is the Service Corps of Retired Executives, administered by the Small Business Administration.

I recently met with Mr. Irving Maness, Associate Administrator of the Small Business Administration, to review the activities of SCORE. Mr. Maness confirmed my views that this program, which encourages retired private businessmen to put their skills and knowledge to work for the benefit of their country, deserves the full support of Congress. Under the SCORE program, the retired businessmen involved have the opportunity to remain active and to perform a useful role in their communities. The businesses they advise have profited, in some cases, dramatically.

The current issue of the Reader's Digest contains a story "SCORE Spells Help for the Small Businessman" which illustrates the types of successes which SCORE has had. As the Reader's Digest points out, this program, "can only help strengthen our free enterprise system." I feel that the SCORE program is one more example of the many ways in which the Small Business Administration has carried out its mandate to aid, counsel, assist, and protect the interests of the most important sector of our economy, our small businesses.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Reader's Digest be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Reader's Digest, condensed from Harvest Years]

SCORE SPELLS HELP FOR THE SMALL BUSINESSMAN

(By Harmon Tupper)

The truck driver had given up trucking, mortgaged his home and withdrawn all his savings to buy a $15,000 diner in Denver. Business was brisk from the start, for his wife cooked delicious meals and the prices were reasonable. But the first month showed a $100 loss. The next month was worse: $200 in the red, though customers multiplied.

Baffled, the couple got in touch with the local chapter of an organization they had read about in a newspaper. A few days later, an elderly restaurant-management specialist dropped by. After sampling the food, he watched the couple serve the noontime throng—with awesome portions on the 90-cent blue plate and a free cup of coffee.

"How can you expect to make money when you provide a feast for only 90 cents?" the visitor asked. "Cut down those big servings, go easy on the bread and butter, and charge for coffee. With this excellent cooking, the regulars will stick with you." The couple adopted these recommendations, and losses soon gave way to net profits averaging $500 a month. Cost for the expert advice: not a cent.

A young woman who ran a dress shop in a small Ohio community was losing $3000 a year on gross sales of $35,000. One day she heard about the same organization that had helped the Denver couple. She wrote to its local chapter in Cleveland, and two weeks later the former merchandising manager of a famous department store walked into her shop. He learned that she ordered stock from jobbers' salesmen and sold it at a 50-percent markup. Generally, the jobbers took care of big customers first, then sent her leftovers, odd sizes and substitutes.

"Why buy from them?" he asked. "Get someone to mind the store, drive to the big wholesale markets in Pittsburgh or Cleveland, pick up exactly what you want, and save shipping costs by bringing the dresses back with you. Also, for seasonal goods like these you should take the usual 100-percent markup." Putting this advice into practice, the storeowner turned her loss into a $5000 yearly profit.

These are only two of the thousands of small enterprises put on the road to success by the fast-growing, nationwide Service Corps of Retired Executives, or SCORE. Established two and a half years ago, the organization has already enrolled more than 3000 business and professional leaders in some 800 communities to provide advice and guidance to small business.

SCORE was the bold, imaginative answer to a two-pronged problem which in 1964 faced Eugene P. Foley, then head of the Small Business Administration. In the previous five years, small enterprises had accounted for 91 percent of all business failures. In nine out of ten of these failures, bad management was the main cause. Here was, in fact, the broadest, most failure-prone segment of our economy.

The SBA had a sizable financial stake in this problem because it lends money to small companies for equipment, expansion and working capital. If loan beneficiaries fail, the SBA (and the taxpayer) loses with them. But how could the agency's 3300 field workers cope with all the ailing "little guys" in the national roster of 4,700,000 small undertakings?

Foley thought of the swelling ranks of high-caliber retirees. Why not tap this reservoir of talent? Pilot operations set up in Washington and Boston were so successful that, in October 1964, SCORE was launched full-scale from all 68 SBA offices. Hundreds of retired businessmen promptly offered their services—and owners of unsteady firms were even more responsive.

Since then the Service Corps has counseled some 21,000 small businesses (its current monthly case load is almost 1000), at minimal cost to the government. Its 185 self-governing chapters in our main trading areas hold monthly meetings at which prospective volunteers are evaluated and problems are thrashed out. If a member refuses cases without good reason, he is voted out of the chapter. Richard M. Sweeney, of the SBA Management Assistance Division in Washington, D.C., doubles as SCORE chief.

To qualify for aid, a concern must have no more than 25 employes; the premise is that such small firms cannot afford the $100-a-day fees of management consultants. Individuals who are not yet in business but want to explore opportunities can also call on SCORE. Free counseling is offered for as long as it's needed, the "client" agreeing to reimburse the SCORE counselor for out-of-pocket travel expenses (or $5 for a visit within 25 miles). In practice, many SCORE men refuse to ask for the $5.

One of the worst infirmities of small businessmen is a persistent allergy to records and paperwork. Harry Meacham, former chairman of the SCORE chapter in Richmond, Va., and a retired supervisor of eight Dun & Bradstreet offices, recalls an auto-parts dealer who asked for help with expansion plans. Meacham discovered that the man had borrowed against home, life insurance and car just to keep his business going. He kept no account of costs, didn't know the meaning of a break-even point, priced his wares at what he "guessed" would bring a good profit.

"You're not headed for expansion but for extinction," Meacham declared. He showed the man how to keep costs and sales records, then obtained a 90-day moratorium on loan payments pending SBA refinancing to consolidate debts. "Now the dealer is pulling out of the red because he knows exactly where his profits lie," Meacham reports.

In El Paso, Texas, Joe E. Walters, 59-year-old retired manager of a Sears, Roebuck retail store, was assigned a music-record retailer whose trade slumped severely in post-Christmas months. Well-versed in promotion gimmicks, Walters worked out a Washington's Birthday "Special Event" featuring give-away boxes of candied cherries with purchases of record albums. He followed up with a St. Patrick's Day sale offering shamrocks and miniature shillelaghs as bonuses. Both promotions were near-sell-out affairs and led the owner to continue with other holiday come-ons. Walters also renegotiated the store's excessively high rent lease, reshuffled advertising and suggested other economics, saving almost $5000 a year for reinvestment in the store.

While "easy" cases take an average of 12 hours a week, many SCORE volunteers make an almost full-time job of a single assignment. For instance, a retired Washington, D.C., attorney ministered for months to a mechanic who was losing $5000 a year from a truck sales and repair shop that grossed half a million. The SCOREman found that two bookkeepers were charging $200 a week for their services, and an accountant's once-a-week visit was costing $400 a month. On the adviser's recommendation, all three were fired and the mechanic's energetic wife took over the books—at a saving in excess of $15,000 a year. Beyond this, on-the-spot surveys revealed that the heavy volume of night truck traffic would more than justify the extra labor cost of a double shift instead of a single eight-hour workday. As a result, this once-failing enterprise makes a five-figure profit today.

One day a Hindu woman wearing a flowing sari came to the SCORE office in San Francisco with a business problem. She had concocted a savory curry sauce which she had been selling to hotel chefs and high-class restaurants, since 1958. But when she had tried to expand her market with an 11½-ounce jar to retail in groceries at 98 cents, she found few takers.

Ralph B. Huberman, former merchandising manager of the Rhodes of Seattle, Inc., department store considered her case. He told the woman he doubted that housewives would risk almost a dollar on an untried, unadvertised sauce. But they might take a chance if it were priced lower. The enterprising lady from India followed his suggestion, put her curry in 6½-ounce "trial special" jars to sell for 69 cents, and has since received substantial orders. Her growing firm now produces the 98-cent-size jar as well.

Hardheaded realists, most SCOREmen and SBA officials refuse to offer an all-purpose formula for success. However, they emphasize that small businessmen must use initiative and imagination to capitalize on their basic advantage over big business—a personalized customer relationship. A case in point: The owners of an unprofitable service station in Chester, Pa., saved their business when they began free home pickup and delivery of cars blocks away from their rundown neighborhood. Selling the need for "chauffeur care," they not only gassed the cars but also kept them spotless and serviced them regularly, to the benefit of car-wash, oil and grease-job sales.

The men of SCORE also agree that few small industries can make real money without modern equipment, sufficient working capital, inventory and cost controls, and an aggressive sales force. Small-scale plumbing and electrical contractors who want to grow must make service their watchword, even to the point of working after hours and on holidays to repair conked-out oil burners or refrigerators. In fact, most authorities agree that service enterprises—beauty parlors, laundries and dry-cleaning stores, for example—offer some of the most surefire opportunities for men and women wanting to be their own boss.

It is impossible to pinpoint in dollars how successful SCORE has been to date. But there is Dun & Bradstreet evidence that in 1965, a year after SCORE began, business failures had declined in those cities where strong SCORE offices are located—particularly in the Buffalo, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Chicago, St. Louis and Houston areas.

SCORE now plans to expand its membership to 5000 counselors, to establish 100 more chapters, and to handle at least 25,000 cases by the end of the year. Such expansion can only help strengthen our free-enterprise system.

DR. WOODLIEF THOMAS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I was sorry to learn of the decision of Dr. Woodlief Thomas to leave the staff of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Since 1965 Woody Thomas has done an outstanding job as chief economist of the committee. His earlier experience with the Federal Reserve System and with the World Bank in Chile provided him with a fine background and knowledge in national and international finance. I am particularly grateful to him for his invaluable counsel and assistance to me as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Finance. I have valued his judgment and expertise in wrestling with the complexities of the balance-of-payments problem.

I know that my colleagues on the Banking and Currency Committee share my high regard for Dr. Thomas and join me in wishing him every success in the future.

REVITALIZING THE AMERICAN GOLD MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on February 2, 1967, I had the honor of submitting a statement to the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which was holding a hearing on S. 49, the gold bill, which I had the pleasure of cosponsoring. I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR THOMAS H. KUCHEL

(Before the Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Feb. 2, 1967)

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity to again appear before this Committee on behalf of a bill to revitalize the American gold mining industry, S. 49.

The gold producing industry of this country is in a grave condition. It is a national disgrace that corrective action has not been taken. Help for this industry is long overdue and should be taken without delay.

Our Nation is alarmed at our ebbing gold supply. Our gold stores are being reduced at a time when the gold resources remaining in the land are far from depleted, and the public is concerned for the future. The relatively few remaining gold mining operations are threatened by ever-increasing costs of production, while the price they can get for the gold produced is frozen. Each gold mine which is forced to shut down helps to fill the unemployment rolls with skilled miners who are anxious to work.

The gold mining industry has contributed greatly to the development of our country and, in particular, to my State of California. To many, gold is California's best-known metal. It was the magnet which drew the early pioneers and stimulated the State's growth for many years.

In 1848, James W. Marshall made his historic discovery at Sutter's Mill at Colma on the American River. Soon afterward, the gold rush was in full sway as thousands of gold seekers poured into California. In a few short years, the gold rush had caused many areas of the State to be permanently settled.

Since 1848, California gold mines have yielded more than 106 million fine ounces of gold. This is more than any other single state has produced and represents about 35% of the total United States production. In 1964, California's gold production amounted to only 71,028 fine ounces, as compared to the all-time high of almost 4 million fine ounces produced in 1851, or the 1940 production of 1,455,000 fine ounces. Today, production is practically nonexistent.

The prospectors have disappeared. The mines are empty. What was once a great industry in California and throughout the West is now merely a memory—not for any lack of gold, but because that industry can no longer find a way to survive with the sadly outdated and unrealistic price ceiling that is placed on the fruits of its efforts. Today we are asking gold miners to produce one of our nation's most urgently needed commodities at a restricted price level established over thirty years ago during the depths of the depression. This is especially onerous, since gold is the only mineral with an artificially frozen price.

I believe there is far too little understanding of the tremendous investment required and the amount of raw ore that must be processed to produce a single ounce of gold. We insist that the gold mining industry produce gold in 1966 at a 1934 price. Nor do we demand that wheat or cotton or beef be produced in 1966 at a depression price level.

The gold industry finds itself in a situation not of its making, but which exists because the government has fixed an artificial price for gold considered necessary in the public interest as a basis for our monetary system. Monetary, not business, policies are slowly and surely forcing the demise of the gold mining industry and the artificial curtailment of our gold supply, which result is contrary to the public interest. What will we use as a basis for our monetary system when the artificially maintained price ceiling has caused our country's gold supply to disappear? We owe the gold industry relief to avoid continuation of a situation which verges on confiscation of property without compensation.

S. 49 will encourage the discovery, development and production of domestic gold. The bill will in no way change the current price paid for gold by the United States Treasury. The bill merely allows the Department of the Interior to subsidize the American gold mining industry by making up for the increased costs of producing gold. It will provide the incentive to rebuild our dwindling gold reserve. It will reopen many existing mines, will cause new ones to be established, and will make jobs available.

I am proud to be a sponsor of this important legislation.

Mr. W. T. Shannon, Director of the California Department of Fish and Game, has requested that I advise the Committee of a proposed amendment to prevent pollution of streams by gold mining activities. I ask consent that Mr. Shannon's letter and proposed amendment to S. 49 be placed in the record of these hearings at this point.

ADDRESS BY EDWIN M. HOOD, PRESIDENT OF SHIPBUILDERS COUNCIL OF AMERICA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Edwin M. Hood, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America, in a recent address to the Propeller Club, Port of Chicago, discussed the U.S. merchant marine. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hood's speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY EDWIN M. HOOD, PRESIDENT, SHIPBUILDERS COUNCIL OF AMERICA

At this late date, it should not be necessary to demonstrate the importance of ships and shipyards to our national well-being. But, despite the truths of history, there are those in this country who have recently suggested that the United States could get by with a lesser number of ships and with a lesser capacity to build ships. The motivation behind these suggestions is never clearly stated, though it is believed to be simply that of expediency, pennypinching and a bountiful portion of wishful thinking.

Apart from ignoring history, the downgraders of American shipping and shipbuilding fail to grasp the real facts of geography. They show little understanding of the real face of geo-politics in today's world structure. They have conveniently forgotten the tremendous demands placed on, and the remarkable achievements of, our ships and shipyards in the cause of freedom during World War II.

They discount the objectives of the communist empire to control the oceans and essential trade routes. They suffer from the hallucination that our nation should do nothing about Russia's steadily increasing power on the seas. If we did, we would outrage our allies, they say. These would be the same allies who use their ships to delivery military goods to North Vietnam in defiance of our appeals to the contrary.

To illustrate the need for enlightened—perhaps even selfish—national policies on matters related to the seas, one has only to realize that our country is for all practical purposes an island surrounded by water. Few islands are self-sufficient and ours is not alone. We must import a good many items just to survive. Our industrial complex and our military might require a total of 77 strategic materials—only 11 can be found within our borders. The remaining 66 must be obtained from foreign lands, and the only way they can be brought here in bulk is by ship. They will not be brought here by wishful thinking when ships are not available to us.

In addition to commercial exports which mark us as the leading trading nation of the world and the logistics of supplying our troops in way off places like Southeast Asia, the importation of these 66 strategic materials are the arteries of survival for our way of life and western civilization. The importation should be under our absolute control at all times.

Yet, more than 96 percent of the total volumes of these materials comes into this country aboard foreign flag vessels. Less than 4 percent is under our control. Equally alarming are the evidences that foreign flag shipping carries more than 92 percent of all of our trade and commerce, with U.S. flag shipping carrying less than 8 percent.

The reliability of foreign flag shipping in a potentially explosive international situation is marginal at best. For proof, we need only consult the history books. Moreover, DeGaulle's unpredictable politics today defy rational explanation from our point of view, and it would be foolhardy for us to predicate any national policy on the wishful thinking that French shipping—or any other country's shipping for that matter—would always be at our service.

A similar point could be made with respect to shipyards. I have no intention of repeating the phenomenal shipbuilding accomplishments of our yards during World War II. But, I will say that there was never any suggestion that the ships we so desperately needed should be built in the shipyards of other nations. First of all, our naval and military commitments—our national objectives—dictated that we should perform this task ourselves. And, secondly, when the chips were down, foreign yards could not do the job. They were preoccupied with their own national objectives and their own problems, and, in fact, we subsequently had to build many ships for them.

Against this background, the recent proposals for building merchant ships abroad deserve no more than enough attention to be promptly discarded. If anything, the present level of international instability would all the more indicate that not one ship for either the American merchant marine or the U.S. Navy should be built anywhere but here in the United States. And, I would apply the same statement to the repair of ships, except in the most extraordinary of emergencies.

The downgraders of American shipping and shipyards completely ignore the tremendous progress which has been made in the state of the art of shipbuilding in the United States. They fail to acknowledge that our yards build the best ships in the world. They overlook the vast improvements in shipyard facilities and shipbuilding techniques which have taken place in our country over the last decade. They give little or no recognition to the significant cost reductions achieved by our yards in spite of steadily increasing material and labor costs.

They overlook the fact that every State of the Union and practically every U.S. industry furnishes something that goes into the construction of every ship in an American yard. In this context, it needs to be said that of the total cost of every vessel constructed in a U.S. shipyard more than 50 percent of the dollar value flows from the shipyard to other American industries and activities. Actually, nearly two-thirds of the value, in the aggregate, goes to labor, either directly or indirectly, to subcontractors, to transportation firms, to professional services, to suppliers of components and materials and to many other endeavors.

The downgraders of American shipping and shipbuilding are, in addition, at cross purposes with our high-level concern over the troublesome balance of international payments—which is not improving. By placing more reliance on foreign-flag shipping and foreign shipyards, the presently unimproved situation would only be further aggravated. Every dollar of a shipbuilding contract placed with a foreign shipyard is or would be a total loss to our balance of payments—there is no recapture. On the other hand, the carriage of 50 percent (not the present 8 percent) of our nation's steadily expanding trade and commerce aboard U.S. flag ships would result in improving the balance of international payments by some $2 billion per year—all on the plus side.

But, how is it then that this evolution of change from a position of absolute reliance on our own ships and shipyards to only marginal essentiality has come to pass? There are many reasons. Nevertheless, to most authorities, the overriding cause has been the lack of leadership and national direction at the top. Since the days of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, no President of the United States has given the issue of sea power the attention the public interest warrants. As a consequence, our navy and our merchant marine are at this moment faced with a high degree of obsolescence.

This condition is not going to be resolved effectively until the President of the United States and/or the Congress declares without equivocation that this, this, and this are going to be done without any ifs, ands or buts. Then, and only then, will we be headed in the proper direction in terms of assuring an adequate and balanced sea power capability "for all seasons." Then, and only then, will we begin building ships in sufficient numbers, in our own shipyards, to assure that the arteries of survival will always be healthy and available.

Such a Presidential declaration would also end the bickering and buck-passing which has taken place for too many years among the various Federal agencies—especially as to funds for shipbuilding—and in carrying out the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. There is nothing wrong with that statute—its only weakness through the years has been the absence of sufficient appropriations to implement its policies and objectives which, with very little changes are as appropriate today as they were 30 years ago. The Congress has repeatedly said it would appropriate more money if the Administration asks for it—but repeatedly the Administration has found reasons—mostly of a short range pennypinching variety—not to ask for it.

For the laymen, it is not always easy to comprehend the scale of priorities which governs our nation's affairs. Obviously, national defense comes first and apparently space activities follow in second position. One can only conclude, from all usual indicators, that merchant marine and shipbuilding matters have not enjoyed a very high ranking for many, many years.

Even within top programs there appears to be a subdivision of priorities. A differentiation is made between projects of immediate strategic or military interest and those which though ultimately desirable are not straight-away urgent to the national interest. Capital expenditures in the latter category are subject to varying degrees of procrastination and vacillation. The "block obsolescence" of the naval and merchant fleets is a by-product of the latter category and has reached present proportions because solutions have been conveniently postponed.

As to the this, this, and this which might be stipulated to introduce decision-making into the present state of indecision, the following suggestions are almost self-evident; if adopted, they would provide a favorable climate for prudent and effective solutions to our present, serious maritime problems:

Most importantly, it must be clearly stated that the United States is determined, at all costs, to have a navy and a merchant marine second to none.

For all the world to hear, it must be positively asserted that no budgetary or other considerations will prevent the United States from maintaining its position as the world's leading sea power.

It should be understood by everyone in all corners of the globe that our nation is resolved to surpass the presently aggressive maritime build-up of the Soviet Union.

It must be clearly stated that the United States is determined, at all costs, to have more than 8 percent of its total trade and commerce and more than 4 percent of its strategic imports carried aboard U.S. flag shipping. The figure of 30 percent which has often been mentioned would certainly seem reasonable in both connections.

It must be clearly stated that all of the ships our country needs, both naval and maritime, will be built in United States shipyards with components of U.S. manufacture and origin.

The cost-savings applicable to the construction of identical or near-identical ships in series production should form the basis of awarding shipyard contracts.

The policies of the 1936 Merchant Marine Act must be clearly reaffirmed and unhesitatingly implemented. The provisions to the Act should be applied with equal force to all segments of the U.S. maritime fleet, including Great Lakes, domestic and other operations not now subsidized.

The real purpose of maritime subsidies—to offset higher labor wages and standards of living between the U.S. and lower foreign nations—must be clearly defined. Subsidy for essential maritime needs should not be regarded as a "bad word" as it is today in many official quarters.

The Government should take the lead in creating an environment which will encourage young people to follow shipbuilding and maritime activities as a career at all trade and professional levels.

That environment should also include the structure necessary for replacing obsolete vessels in the American merchant marine, but at the same time incorporate the means to reduce subsidy costs without jeopardy to national goals. Incentives for efficient ship performance and stable shipyard operations should be a keystone of that structure.

In concert with labor and management, the Government should sponsor research and development programs in depth to improve the quality and efficiency of ship operations, ship construction, shipyard techniques, and port operations.

The opportunity to capitalize on the background, expertise and economic potential which our country has acquired in the field of nuclear propulsion for oceangoing vessels should be energetically pursued.

Ship automation should be treated as a stepping stone toward greater sea lift capabilities, and the resulting economies through reduction of crew should be applied to the construction of more ships to enable employment for displaced and additional seagoing workers.

In making these suggestions, however, it is envisioned that ship operators, shipbuilders, ship repairers, labor unions, allied suppliers—all who have a direct or remote association with U.S. sea power—will also exert every conceivable effort to ensure that the yield per dollar invested and the productivity per person and facility will greatly improve. No segment of the sea power complex should be immune from the responsibility of developing advanced techniques, cost reductions, new market opportunities and expanding horizons. The Government alone cannot do the job.

What I am suggesting is that we upgrade shipping and shipyards on the totem pole of national, industry and individual priorities—that we regard shipbuilding as an important element of national security as well as of the national economy—and finally that we gear our policies, fiscal support, resources and manpower toward the achievement of these objectives. If we do these things, U.S. sea power will always reign supreme—and that is as it should—and must—be.

"WHERE THE ACTION IS"—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BARTLETT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, last month, in Miami Beach, a dinner was held in behalf of the National Parkinson Foundation. In company with Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, I had the high honor to be invited to be one of the speakers. It was a highly successful affair, partly or even largely due to the fact that Bob Hope came on from Hollywood and was master of ceremonies for the wonderful show which followed the dinner. Mr. Hope is national honorary chairman of the National Parkinson Foundation and for years he has devoted his time and talents to furthering this great cause. The foundation was launched and to a very considerable extent owes its continued being to Mrs. Jeanne Levey, a grand lady who is doing all she can, which means that she is doing much, for the rehabilitation of those who are suffering from this dreadful malady and for research into its origins, hopefully looking forward to prevention or cure.

I was especially glad to be there because it gave me an opportunity to salute two great men to whom all of us in America owe so much in the field of medical research. I refer, of course, to Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, and the late Representative John Fogarty, of Rhode Island. Their outstanding talents, their dedication, have been largely responsible for the tremendous expansion in medical research financed by the Federal Government over the last 20 years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the talk I made at Miami Beach.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE THE ACTION IS

(By Senator E. L. BARTLETT)

In a world of sickness, stupidity, and sorrow our generation has much to be proud of. Our generation has achieved more in the battle against disease than have all the generations before it.

Sometimes we forget how much has been done. Think about it: Malaria, yellow fever, polio, smallpox, scarlet fever, and now measles. Killers all, these diseases are all but a memory. The number of deaths caused by tuberculosis, influenza and pneumonia has dropped dramatically. Advances in immunization, treatment, surgery, prosthesis and rehabilitation have increased the average American life span by 50 percent over the last 60 years. A baby born in 1900 had a life expectancy of 47 years. That baby's grandchild born in 1960 could expect a life time of a full 70 years.

And these achievements are but the beginning. The years ahead will see major steps in the control of cancer, stroke, heart and nervous disease. The work now underway in these fields will be continued and enlarged. The federal financial contribution will be sustained and increased.

The budget request for the National Institutes of Health in 1968 stands at $1.2 billion, close to 50 times the appropriation for 1948 which was $28 million and 2500 times the original appropriation in 1938 of $460,000.

Congressional commitment to medical research is clear and unequivocal. It will not welch on its commitment.

The extent of this commitment has been due largely to two men, Senator Lister Hill of Alabama and the late Congressman John Fogarty of Rhode Island. These two men have made a brilliant record in the field of health legislation. It is my privilege to serve as a member of Senator Hill's Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommitee of the Senate Appropriations Committee. I know the intelligence, the determination and the dedication which he gives to the proposition that responsible and creative medical research will proceed as fast as it is able.

He is determined—as is the Congress I believe—to see that valuable and responsible medical research will never be halted for lack of funds.

I submit that the Congress has invested the American taxpayers' money wisely in medical research. On the whole, we have obtained full value on the dollar from our research investment.

I submit further, however, that the Congress, the Administration and the medical profession itself have failed to take equal interest in—or to give equal attention to—the treatment and the welfare of the individual patient. We have failed to make full use of our new-found medical knowledge.

And as a result, we are cheating ourselves. The medical treatment provided in our country is, like our system of government, the best in the world. But, and again like our government, it is not good enough.

We have the knowledge and the technology necessary to build the almost miraculous artificial heart and yet testimony presented to the Senate last week revealed that perhaps as high a proportion as one in four of all laboratory tests performed in the United States are faulty.

All too often, apparently, blood types are mis-classified, biopsies mis-interpreted and mis-diagnosis made. Untrained, careless technicians operating in medical laboratories with inadequate standards and controls are endangering our lives and making a mockery of medical care.

We have the knowledge and technology to transplant a kidney and yet infants and post-operative patients still die of infections contracted in the hospital. These are preventable deaths caused by lack of proper sanitation.

Nuclear medicine makes possible astonishing feats of diagnosis using the most sophisticated techniques and equipment. And yet every day in doctor's offices and hospitals across the country we are exposed to unnecessary and sometimes excessive amounts of X-rays.

It has been recommended that fluoroscopic exposure should be as low as possible and should not exceed 10 roentgens a minute. And yet, a survey taken right here in Dade County several years ago showed that out of 189 fluoroscope machines tested, 113 were found to emit more than the permitted 10 roentgens; 25 were delivering twice that much. Even though written recommendations for eliminating these hazards were left with the owners of the machines, a check made a year after the survey revealed that no more than a third of the machines had been corrected.

Antiquated machines improperly shielded, non-professional technicians improperly trained are responsible for this easily preventable overexposure.

In spite of the extraordinary success of the Hill-Burton construction program, our hospitals are over crowded. Hospital staffs and nurses are under paid. In too many cases the quality of medical attention and the degree of care the patient receives is directly related to the wealth of the patient.

Five years ago, 10 days in a New York hospital would have cost $560; today the cost is $840. Next year it is expected that the cost will be $1,000. This is for standard treatment after a standard gall bladder operation. The cost for the treatment of an expensive long-term disease such as Parkinson's is staggering.

I submit that this state of affairs is the fault of the medical profession, the Administration, and yes, the Congress. Since the creation of the National Institutes of Health in 1938 we have appropriated almost $10 billion for medical research.

Most of this has been research into the causes and cures of diseases and not into the care and treatment of patients.

These huge appropriations have given a tremendous impetus to scientific research. The federal investment has produced immense benefits but at the expense of making the medical profession research oriented. The young men, the best brains, the most talented doctors increasingly turn to research.

They turn to the laboratory because that is where the action is. And the patient in the hospital, the person for whom all this research is performed sometimes finds himself taking second place in the order of things.

I believe that too often this is the way it is. I do not believe it needs to be this way.

There is still room for the patient in medicine. The finest part of medicine is still the treatment of the patient. The physician doing research in his laboratory is important but no more so than the physician in the wards. There are perhaps as many lives to be saved in making the hospital more efficient, economical and comfortable, in making treatment both scientific and friendly. We need to emphasize that each case is a whole man and not just a collection of interesting symptoms.

Happily, more and more thought is being given to this problem. This year's budget contains funds for the construction of regional heart, cancer and stroke centers to pioneer the application of advances in these fields to the general practice of medicine. This program was authorized by the Congress last year. The budget also contains funds to study hospital procedures, to improve and modernize them, to make them more efficient and to economize.

There is no reason why we cannot maintain our research effort and at the same time, attract and train talented people to see that the patient as well as the disease receives the best of possible care.

The challenge is in the ward as well as the laboratory.

Let's spread the action around a bit.

POLARIS SUBMARINES

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the last Polaris submarine authorized by Congress, the U.S.S. *Will Rogers*, was launched recently. The occasion seems appropriate to pay tribute to the Polaris submarines, a virtually invulnerable weapon system.

Any would-be aggressor is aware that the United States, with the addition of the U.S.S. *Will Rogers*, now possesses 41 Polaris submarines. However, he does not know where they are.

Each submarine is equipped with 16 missiles having destructive power greater than that of all explosives used in World War II.

The combination of nuclear propulsion and long-range atomic missiles makes the Polaris submarines not only a virtually invulnerable weapon system, but also a highly lethal one.

Nuclear propulsion enables these ships to travel enormous distances beneath the surface of the ocean and to remain submerged for months at a time. The Polaris submarines are completely self-sustaining. They make their own air and water, and their crews maintain and repair all equipment on board.

I am proud to say that Utah has been instrumental in the production of the Polaris missiles, which serve as a deterrent to any aggressor.

Utah plays a vital role in the Polaris missile story. The solid-fuel engine for the second stage of the Navy's Polaris missile is produced in Utah, at the Bacchus plant of Hercules, Inc.

Utah's involvement in the missile story extends beyond the production of the Polaris. Hercules and Thiokol, at their Utah facilities, are conducting research and development work on the Poseidon, a submarine-launched nuclear missile with greater power than the Polaris.

Thiokol, at Brigham City, Utah, and Hercules at its Bacchus plant, have teamed up for the first stage work on the Poseidon, and Hercules is conducting second stage research.

Utah is proud to be a part of this vital offensive system.

The world's first nuclear-powered submarine, the U.S.S. *Nautilus*, was put to sea a dozen years ago. That same year the Navy began developing a ballistic missile for launching from a nuclear submarine. The first such missile was launched from the U.S. *George Washington* on July 20, 1960.

Adm. George Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations, said:

> When the *George Washington* first put to sea, she bore with her the hopes and prayers not only of all Navy men, but also of millions of Americans who were placing great faith in this symbol of United States deterrent power. Certainly we all hoped for the best, but little could we guess what incredible success would be achieved by this first of a mighty undersea fleet and her intrepid sister ships. Our dreams now are realities, our faith has been fulfilled.

And today the faith of the American people lies in the knowledge that the Polaris submarines stand ready to retaliate against any aggressor to indeed assure a land of the free.

POLITICS, GOVERNOR ROMNEY, AND VIETNAM

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the Governor of Michigan has embarked on his maiden voyage across the country, seeking support and sniffing the political winds. Inevitably, the press follows; and inevitably, the Governor is viewing with alarm every administration program and project initiated since 1964. This is to be expected.

What is unexpected is the Governor's betrayal of a tradition of bipartisanship in foreign policy that is the legacy of that great statesman from Michigan—the late Arthur Vandenburg.

Last Tuesday, for example, the Governor charged that the Johnson administration had somehow resorted to "political expediency" in dealing with the Vietnam situation and that this "political expediency" had got the Nation into trouble not only in Vietnam, but at home and elsewhere abroad.

This is a very grave charge.

It would be very serious, indeed, if the statement itself were not so ripe for political parody.

Consider the facts: the Governor made his statement in Pocatello, Idaho, and was questioned closely by the press for more details. What transpired was reported in the New York Times of February 23, from which I quote:

> . . . Gov. George Romney charged Tuesday that a resort to "political expediency" by the Johnson Administration had got the nation into trouble in Vietnam and elsewhere at home and abroad.
>
> He refused, however, to give an example of the President's alleged expediency in Southeast Asia or to document his accusation in any other way.
>
> "Can you give us an example of what you mean?" a reporter asked Mr. Romney at a news conference at the Bannock Hotel here.
>
> "No, I will not," he replied.
>
> "Why?" asked the reporter.
>
> "Because I choose not to."
>
> "Are you just going to make a charge like that and not substantiate it at all?" the reporter persisted.
>
> "For the moment, yes," Mr. Romney replied.
>
> This exchange all but ended a half-hour of sparring between the Governor and reporters on the subject of Vietnam.
>
> The questioning was based originally on his declaration that the Republican party was not locked in on Vietnam, "has not exhausted its options and is free to take a fresh approach."
>
> Asked if he meant that a Republican administration would not be obliged to back all the Vietnam commitments made by President Johnson, he replied that no one knew all those commitments and that there had been "a good deal of shifting by the Administration," anyway.

Yes, this is the stuff parodies are made of. But I am not amused. I am sad—sad that partisan politics has already begun to intrude in our vital bipartisan approach to foreign affairs.

I think we will all agree that the issues involved in Vietnam deserve the most serious discussion and study.

I think we would agree further that what is at stake in Vietnam is far too important to the peace and security of the world to become nourishment for political ambitions. We must resist blatant political campaigning on an issue that involves the security of the American people and the lives of its fighting men.

The American people are anxious to hear their political candidates discuss the issues of the day. But all of us will reject partisanship when the issues being discussed may well involve the peace and security of us all.

EPIDEMIC IN SOUTH OF MAINLAND CHINA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have noted an account in the New York Times this morning of a serious epidemic in the south of mainland China. According to a spokesman at the National Institutes of Health, the epidemic is one which is extremely damaging to the health and difficult to control.

It seems to me that perhaps here is an opportunity for the U.S. Government in cooperation with the World Health Organization to offer to assist the Chinese people in meeting the threat of this epidemic. I think joint endeavors in meeting disasters of this kind is the way one goes about building conditions which will promote peace.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Friday, Mar. 3, 1967]

CHINA ACKNOWLEDGES SERIOUS EPIDEMIC IN SOUTH—OFFICIALS IN WASHINGTON STUDY REPORTS OF MENINGITIS IN FOUR PROVINCES

(By Hedrick Smith)

WASHINGTON, March 2.—Communist China has acknowledged a serious epidemic in some of its southern provinces.

For more than six weeks, unconfirmed reports of epidemic meningitis have reached Hong Kong. In a recent provincial broadcast, the regime confirmed these reports by appealing to public health units to go into rural areas to "take precautions against epidemic diseases."

Some United States officials said they believed it was the first time in more than a decade that the regime had acknowledged an epidemic, even indirectly.

Travelers reaching Hong Kong have reported some deaths and talked of seeing people collapse on the streets of Canton and other cities of Kwangtung Province, apparently as a result of meningitis attacks, officials said.

American specialists on China said they were unable to make any realistic estimate of the number of deaths or the extent of the epidemic except that it had been reported in four large provinces—Kiangsi, Kwangtung, Hunan, and Kwangsi.

Analysts in the Government speculated that meningitis, an often fatal disease that is passed from person to person has been spread by the mass movement of thousands of Red Guards throughout China. The Red Guards are the militant Maoist youth movement formed to promote the aims of the Cultural Revolution, the name given to Mao Tsetung's campaign to introduce a more austere type of Communism. The first mass movement of Red Guards was reported last summer.

Apparently as a result of food shortages and health problems, such landmarks as Chingkanshan, Chairman Mao's mountain stronghold decades ago, are reported to have been put off limits to the Red Guards. It is in Kiangsi Province.

The broadcast acknowledging epidemics in South China originated in Nanning, capital of Kwangsi Province, about 200 miles northeast of Hanoi.

On Feb. 13, the Maoist General Headquarters for the Revolutionary Seizure of Power broadcast an exhortation that included a paragraph translated by radio monitors abroad as follows:

"Public health departments should quickly organize medical personnel to go deep into the rural areas and serve wholeheartedly the broad masses of poor and lower-middle peasants and other working masses. To take precautions against epidemic encephalitis and other epidemic diseases."

Experts said that the colloquial Chinese words for encephalitis and meningitis were were roughly translatable as "brain fever." They are almost interchangeable. But the experts said that it appeared that the broadcast referred to meningitis rather than encephalitis.

A spokesman at the National Institutes of Health explained that meningitis was a bacterial disease that inflames the membrane coverings of the spine and brain. He described encephalitis as a virus disease, carried by mosquitoes. It enters the bloodstream, infecting and inflaming the brain and nervous system.

Other broadcasts from Shanghai and Canton have called for vigorous sanitation campaigns to combat the "season of spring winter infectious disease" and for intensified water purification efforts, without referring to meningitis or to epidemic conditions.

The picture of everyday life that emerges from the Nanning broadcast and others is one of severe local administrative disorder. The Maoist forces in Nanning condemned officials for distributing grain reserves and seeds, slaughtering draft animals, sabotaging the economy and taking advantage of the "spontaneous capitalist tendency of some backward peasants." The officials were not named in the broadcast.

A similar broadcast from Nanchang, capital of Kiang-si, on Feb. 8, presented a picture of even more chaotic conditions. An urgent directive from Maoist forces sharply denounced such illegal activities as peddling ration coupons, fake medicines and objects that inspire superstition.

Another broadcast from Isingtao, south of Peking, on Feb. 12, told revolutionary rebel organizations to stop buying furniture, transportation facilities, loudspeakers, printing machines, recording machines, typewriters, radios and cameras. "We should raise our vigilance to prevent the bad people from taking advantage and engaging in embezzlement and theft, and destroying state properties," the broadcast warned.

COMMENT ON PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S MESSAGE ON THE NATION'S CAPITAL

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am very glad to report a generally favorable reaction to President Johnson's message on the Nation's Capital. I believe that the President's proposals are a sound and sensible means for creating the kind of progress that we all want for the District. I was particularly delighted to note that in its editorial on the message, the Washington Post commented that President Johnson "has done more than any of his predecessors to bring modern, democratic city government to Washington." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 28, 1967]

MESSAGE ON THE CAPITAL

Reforming Washington's city government is exceedingly difficult, as a practical matter of politics, because no six of its citizens have ever been able to agree on any one course of action. Some urge immediate reorganization of the city government, leading eventually to home rule. Others oppose home rule, but think that the city ought to be represented in Congress. Still others, mainly Congressmen, see nothing wrong with Washington but the crime rate.

In his Message on the Nation's Capital, President Johnson has done his best to reconcile these warring reforms. He proposes to move on several projects at once. In the hope of achieving general support, the President proposes some reorganization, some representation in Congress, and some crime legislation.

The most immediate improvement contained in the Message is the abolition of the three-man Board of District Commissioners. Replacing them with one Commissioner and a Council will give a unity and authority to the District Government that it has sadly lacked. It will end the use of military officers to govern a large civilian population; this violation of American tradition has been particularly damaging because it has left a brigadier general in charge of the city's urban renewal and freeway construction programs.

The Message does not make clear the manner in which the Council is to be chosen. Presumably the President will appoint the Councilmen but it would be greatly in the public interest if he were to appoint them on the basis of advisory elections, by ward, throughout the city.

The largest hole in the Message is its silence on the School Board. The Federal judges have not done a satisfactory job, over the years, in making these appointments; the law urgently needs to be changed. If we cannot have an elected Board, then the Commissioner ought to appoint it. Under the present practice, the Federal judges have all of the authority and none of the responsibility.

As for the farrago of overlapping independent agencies involved in the city's government, the President only hints at changes later. But it is important for the White House to understand that the effectiveness of its new Commissioner depends heavily upon a general consolidation of operating powers now scattered through literally dozens of agencies.

The concept of the elected, nonvoting delegate to Congress would not be a wholly unmixed blessing. Although the delegate would become inevitably the chief political figure in the city, he would have no authority in running it. But despite this danger, the delegate bill deserves support. It represents a beginning of genuine local politics in Washington; the city is better off voting for anything than voting for nothing.

The Constitutional amendment giving the city full representation in Congress is another matter. It would be as difficult to push through Congress as home rule itself and, of the two, home rule promises the greater benefits.

The Message is the work of a President who has done more than any of his predecessors to bring modern, democratic city government to Washington. If only its most immediate aims can be reached, the city will be endowed this year with a far more effective government and next year its citizens will be voting for at least one local official. The final destination remains, of course, full home rule and the President reiterates his support of it. But the campaign for home rule has been going on for decades without achieving any result. The President now proposes to make a small beginning, but a solid and tangible one from which larger gains can later be reached.

TEXAS INDEPENDENCE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it has been said that Americans never fought better than they fought in Texas in their revolution of 1835–1836.

Their battle—which began as a contest to secure their natural rights, and which ended in a victorious effort for their freedom from Mexican rule—was keynoted at San Antonio in the unflinching stand of men committed to the supreme goal: securing recognition of the essential autonomy of human lives. The memory of their stand at the Alamo will continue to inspire men as long as liberty is cherished.

One hundred and thirty-one years ago yesterday, March 2, 1836, at Washington-on-the-Brazos, Tex., the Texas Declaration of Independence was signed, thereby officially severing all direct political ties with the Republic of Mexico.

Four days after this historic event, upon the dawn of March 6, 1836, Santa Anna's numerically superior forces attacked the beleaguered army of the Alamo and took the fort after three assaults. The men of the Alamo died under the impression that they were fighting for their rights as citizens of Mexico, under the Constitution of 1824. They were not aware that the declaration of independence had been signed and that their battle would substantially contribute to the cause of complete independence from Mexico, and the establishing of the Republic of Texas, which would flourish for nearly a decade before becoming a State within the United States.

In recognition of Texas Independence Day, I shall ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD today the text of a letter sent by Col. William Barret Travis, commander of the forces of the Alamo, addressed "to the people of Texas and all Americans in the world." Travis' letter is a sublime plea, sent by and on behalf of men who would prefer and who would receive death rather than face retreat in a cause which was just.

Fighting had commenced on October 2, 1835, in response to Santa Anna's attempts to disarm the people of Texas. The soldiers of Mexico had been driven back to San Antonio, and Stephen F. Austin was called upon to take command of an army of the people in order to beseige the city. The army of less than 500 citizen-soldiers took the city after 5 days of fighting, sending the Mexican army under Cos back across the Rio Grande.

The battle had been a difficult one, and a city so hard to win was thought too important to give up. So it was that Travis and his men barricaded themselves at the Alamo in order to defend San Antonio.

From there Travis sent pleas for assistance to local leaders, the people of Texas, and "to all Americans in the world." In language both forceful and dramatic, Travis expressed the intention of the men of the Alamo to remain in the face of overwhelming odds in order to achieve victory.

That they were slaughtered is tragic; that they remained was historically important, for it allowed their countrymen a few more days to prepare to meet the advancing army under Santa Anna.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of Colonel Travis' letter of February 24, 1836.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMANDANCY OF THE ALAMO-BEJAR,
Feby. 24, 1836.

To the people of Texas and all Americans in the world—

FELLOW CITIZENS AND COMPATRIOTS—

I am besieged, by a thousand or more of the Mexicans under Santa Anna—I have sustained a continual Bombardment & cannonade for 24 hours & have not lost a man—The enemy has demanded a surrender at discretion, otherwise, the garrison are to be put to the sword, if the fort is taken—I have answered the demand with a cannon shot, & our flag still waves proudly from the walls—*I shall never surrender or retreat*. Then, I call on you in the name of Liberty, of patriotism & everything dear to the American character, to come to our aid, with all dispatch—The enemy is receiving reinforcements daily & will no doubt increase to three or four thousands in four or five days. If this call is neglected, I am determined to sustain myself as long as possible & die like a soldier who never forgets what is due to his own honor & that of his country—Victory or Death.

WILLIAM BARRET TRAVIS,
Lt. Col. comdt.

P.S. The Lord is on our side—When the enemy appeared in sight we had not three bushels of corn—We have since found in deserted houses 80 or 90 bushels and got into the walls 20 or 30 head of Beeves,

TRAVIS.

(Note in pencil:) Since the above was writ(t)en I heard a very heavy Cannonade during the whole day think there must have been an attack made upon the Alamo. We were short of Amunition when I left. Hurry on all the men you can in haste

When I left there was but 150 & determined to do or die. Tomorrow I leave for Bejar with what men I can raise . . . we will . . . (some words ill.) at all events——.

Col. Almonte is there . . . the troops are under the Command of Gen. Seisma

ALBERT MARTIN.

(Note in ink:) N. B. I hope that Every one will Randeves at Gonzales as soon poseble as the Brave Soldiers are suffering do not neglect the powder is very scarce and should not be delad one moment

L. SMITHER.

(Addressed) To: The People of Texas and All Americans

Send this to San Felipe by Express night & day ---------------.

(NOTE.—Copied from the original now on display in the Texas State Library, Archives and Library Building, Austin.)

OFFICE OF EDUCATION GUIDELINES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the autocratic actions of officials of the U.S. Office of Education in continuing to push the subsidized integration of American public schools are raising questions in the minds of the general public as to just exactly what can be meant by Federal control, exercised through Federal aid. It is obvious that the power of Federal funds is being arbitrarily used to enforce integration without regard to the resulting loss in orderly and efficient advancement of education in the school systems of the Nation.

The matter is further explored in a column by Mr. David Lawrence in the February 28 edition of the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., "An Era of Righteousness."

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

An Era of Righteousness

(By David Lawrence)

Maybe an "era of righteousness" has been inaugurated. Unfortunately, the limelight has been mistakenly focused on subsidies given to private organizations to protect national security. Very little is known by the public, however, about the huge subsidies that are distributed to all parts of the United States to protect the security of political parties and officeholders.

The sums involved in the cases that have recently been in the headlines are trivial in comparison with the billions of dollars that are flowing from the federal government to the states and cities, with no "watchdog committee" to tell the public who is getting the money and who is really benefiting from it.

There are, of course, some cries of suspicion being voiced that federal money is being improperly used to control the whole system of education in America, which is supposed to be the responsibility of the states alone. Senator Spessard L. Holland, D-Fla., has urged that there be adopted a constitutional amendment designed to prevent federal control of public schools. It would declare that the right of each state to determine the subjects taught, the kind of educational facilities, and the qualifications of personnel could not be abridged, directly or indirectly, by the federal government. This proposal is being sponsored also by Senators George Smathers, D-Fla. and Sam J. Ervin, Jr., D-N.C., and Rep. Robert Sikes, D-Fla.

But even a declaration through a constitutional amendment that the federal government shall not interfere in the educational processes would hardly be adequate. For the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare today insists that it doesn't use its power to intervene in the slightest in the handling of education by states, counties and cities. It maintains that it furnishes only "advice" and is concerned that federal funds shall not be given to those school boards which apparently are engaged in contravening the broad wishes of the federal government.

The real crux of the whole problem is the right of federal officials to withhold public funds appropriated by Congress and to do so for whatever reasons the departments themselves may devise. The new constitutional amendment might not effectively interfere with the exercise of discretion by federal officials in disbursing funds to school systems. For some time there have been members of Congress who urge that the business and professional affiliations of members of both houses should be disclosed. Codes of ethics have been proposed, but no machinery for pursuing any violations is mandatory. This is undoubtedly due to the political nature of Congress itself and the unwillingness of the leadership of a party to punish its own members unless, to be sure, some flagrant cases are publicly exposed.

Plenty of federal money, moreover, is going into projects in different parts of the country which are politically beneficial to senators and representatives of those same states. But there has never been any parallel to the present-day use of federal funds to control the action of states, counties and cities. The federal government has assumed the right to withhold public money and use its own judgment or discretion without disclosing the real motives for denial of the money.

Pressure by the federal government to change a curriculum in public schools or to select teachers and even students now is being exerted here as if it were an accepted federal function. Thus far, there has been no constitutional challenge presented to put an end to what is plainly a usurpation of power.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1967

Mr. **PROXMIRE.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The **Assistant Legislative Clerk.** A bill (S. 355) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I am about to propound a unanimous-consent request which meets with the approval of the distinguished minority leader, the manager of the pending bill, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], and the ranking minority member of the special committee, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt].

I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, at the conclusion of the routine morning business, there be an allocation of 2 hours on the Hruska amendment, the time to be equally divided between the manager of the bill, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], and the proponent and chief sponsor of the amendment, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska]; and that 2 hours of debate be allowed on the bill, the time on the bill to be equally divided between the majority leader and the minority leader, or whomever they designate.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** This unanimous-consent request is based on the assumption that the other amendments will be disposed of today. If we do not finish their consideration I shall make another appropriate request later. So pending the disposition of all other amendments today, on Monday, the Hruska amendment will be subject to a 2-hour limitation with an additional 2-hour time limitation allocated on the bill.

Mr. **PASTORE.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** I yield.

Mr. **PASTORE.** Mr. President, inasmuch as this is Friday, I wonder if the distinguished majority leader is in a position to give us a faint idea of how long we will be here today. Does the majority leader think we will be here until 5 or 6 o'clock?

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** I would hope we could remain in session until we finish all of the amendments excepting the amendment which will be offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska]. I further hope that these amendments will be disposed of in advance of 5 or 6 o'clock.

Mr. **McGEE.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** I yield.

Mr. **McGEE.** Would the majority leader venture a further opinion as to when we might start rollcall votes on the amendments today?

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** I wish I knew, but I would imagine very soon.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Does the Senator from Montana wish the unanimous-consent agreement to supersede the unanimous-consent agreement on the calendar?

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** It would be in addition to it.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

The agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Unanimous-Consent Agreement

Ordered, That, effective on Monday, March 6, 1967, at the conclusion of routine morning business, in addition to the existing agreement on the same bill, that debate on the so-called Hruska amendment affecting title V of the bill be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided between the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska].

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders or someone designated by them: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 33

Mr. **METCALF.** Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 33 and ask that it be stated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that I may be permitted to explain it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment No. 33 submitted by Mr. METCALF, is as follows:

On page 63, strike out lines 6 to 13, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(d)(1) The paragraph relating to rates of compensation of employees of the Senate, contained in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended (2 U.S.C. 72a–1a), is amended by striking out all of the second sentence thereof following the words 'First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947,' and all of the third sentence thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'the basic compensation of any employee of a standing or select committee of the Senate (including the majority and minority policy committees and the majority and minority conference of the Senate, but excluding the Committee on Appropriations), or a joint committee of the two Houses the expenses of which are paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, whose basic compensation may be fixed under such provisions at a rate of $8,000 per annum, may be fixed at a rate not in excess of $8,520, except that the basic compensation of two such employees may be fixed at a rate not in excess of $9,420 per annum, and the basic compensation of four such employees may be fixed at a rate not in excess of $9,060 per annum. The basic compensation of any employee of the Committee on Appropriations whose basic compensation may be fixed at a rate of $8,000 per annum under such provisions may be fixed at a rate not in excess of $8,520 per annum, except that the basic compensation of two such employees may be fixed at a rate not in excess of $9,420 per annum, and the basic compensation of sixteen such employees may be fixed at a rate not in excess of $9,060 per annum.'

"(2) The paragraph imposing limitations on basic and gross compensation of officers and employees of the Senate appearing under the heading 'Senate' in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended (2 U.S.C. 60a note), is amended by striking out '$8,880' and inserting in lieu thereof '$9,420,' and by striking out '$24,460' and inserting in lieu thereof '$25,890'."

On page 125, line 6, after "IV," insert "section 301(d),".

On page 125, line 8, after "III" insert "(except section 301(d) thereof)".

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, my amendment would bring the annual salaries of the professional staffs on Senate committees up to parity with those of other Government employees who perform comparable services, as well as parity with the other body.

This is not an open-end proposal. It is a modification, with limits, of existing law. The amendment would increase present limitation as to specific numbers of persons and as to specific salaries and would exempt from those limitations, as does existing statute, the number of the Appropriations Committee staff members who may receive the next-to-the-top salary.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967 makes significant and necessary improvements in the sources of information available to Members of Congress. Among these suggested improvements is an increase in the number of professional staff members authorized each standing committee of each House. My amendment would improve the act further by insuring that the Senate is equally able to attract and hold competent staff.

At present, professional staff members of House committees may be paid at a higher rate than are those of Senate committees. The disparity ranges from $1,430 to $3,600 annually. As of January 31, 34 persons employed by House committees were receiving annual compensation of $25,890.

Further, a GS–18 employee in the executive branch receives an annual salary of $25,890, while the highest paid staff member of a standing committee of the U.S. Senate is paid $24,460 annually and only one professional staff person on each committee may receive such salary. Under present law, two members of a Senate committee staff may receive an annual salary of $23,244 and three others may receive no more than $22,230.

My amendment would provide that, at the committee's option, two professional staff members may be paid $25,890, the same salary as is paid a GS–18 employee in the executive branch, instead of the present limitation of one at $24,460. It provides that four professional staff members may receive $25,103 instead of the $23,244 permitted to only two at the present time. It provides that three staff members may be paid at an annual rate of $23,583 instead of the present $22,230 permitted three members, presuming the Senate agrees to the increase in staff provided in section 105(b) and 301 of S. 355.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table comparing existing rates and contemplated increases of Senate Committee staff salaries with rates of GS–18 and GS–17—steps 4 and 2—and staff of House committees.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1

Number of positions allowed each standing committee under present law	Maximum salary allowed staff members
House of Representatives: 10	$25,890
Senate:	
1 at	24,460
2 at	23,244
3 at	22,230
4 at	10,479

Senate gross annual compensation proposed in Metcalf amendment	GS gross annual compensation
2 at $25,890	GS–18, $25,890.
4 at $25,103	GS–17 (step 4), $25,040.
3 at $23,583	GS–17 (step 2), $23,520.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I have three more tables, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, which show the maximum increase possible, assuming that every chairman of every committee actually increases the salaries to the ceiling. It is still up to the individual committee to determine the salaries to be paid its staff members within this ceiling. Very probably the increase will not be in the absolute amount that is shown in my table.

Assuming that for purposes of comparison a committee is paying nine people on the staff up to the maximum amount allowable and would continue to do so under the proposed amendment, the tables itemize salary levels as contained in S. 355 and the maximum additional cost of my amendment.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 2.—*Certain standing committee compensation limitations (other than Appropriations Committee)*

S. 355—sec. 105(b) and sec. 301*			Metcalf amendment			Metcalf amendment cost	
Number of positions	Gross per annum	Cost	Number of positions	Gross per annum	Cost	Number	Amount
1 at	$24,460	$24,460	2 at	$25,890	$51,780		
3(1*) at	23,244	69,732	4 at	25,103	100,412		
3 at	22,230	66,690	6 positions cost		152,192	On 6 positions	$14,553
2* at	22,230	44,460	3 at	23,583	70,749		
S. 355		205,342	9 positions cost		222,941	On 9 positions	17,599

Certain compensation limitations—Appropriations Committee

Present			Metcalf amendment		
Number of positions	Rate	Cost	Number of positions	Rate	Cost
1 at	$24,460	$24,460	2 at	$25,890	$51,780
17 at	23,244	395,159	16 at	25,103	401,648
Total cost		419,519	Total cost		453,428
			Metcalf amendment cost		33,909

Maximum cost table (calculated for all affected committees staffed and funded similarly to standing committees)

	6-position basis	9-position basis
16 standing committees (including Small Business)	$232,848	$281,584
3 Joint committees [1] (Atomic, Economic, Printing)	43,659	52,797
4 other committees [2] (Aging, Standards and Conduct, policy committees)	58,212	70,396
Subtotal	334,719	404,777
Appropriations Committee (18 positions)	33,909	33,909
Total	368,628	438,686

[1] Does not include organization of Congress, expiring June 30, 1967, and Federal expenditures.

[2] Does not include conference committees.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, although the House of Representatives has not placed a limit on the number of committee staff members who may be paid at the top rate, my amendment would continue to limit Senate committee staff except the Appropriations Committee, to two at the top, four at the second, and three at the third level of each standing committee. Salaries are fixed to conform to basic Senate rates but are comparable at the top to GS–18, then to GS–17, step 4 and then to GS–17, step 2. The Appropriations Committee would be allowed 16 staff members at $25,103 each and two staff members at $25,890.

My amendment would make no changes in the salaries of clerical assistants.

I remind Senators that this is an authorizing piece of legislation. There would have to be an appropriation and committee chairmen would have to decide the salaries they would pay. They would have to go before the Committee on Rules and Administration in the regular order to take advantage of the increases which would be authorized by adoption of this amendment.

Mr. President, all during the hearings before the joint committee, we were admonished that the great need in the Senate, and the great need in the other body, was to increase the quality of the staffs, that the increased business of the Government was such that we needed to have not bigger staffs, but better staffs.

I remember that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], in his testimony, went to great lengths to talk about the need for quality in our staffs. Representative PUCINSKI used his whole presentation to talk about the same thing.

In the Senate, there is not a single committee which has not, at one time or another, lost staff members to comparable House committees as a result of the disparity and inequity in salaries.

All my amendment would do is make it possible for the Senate to hold its head high, in the knowledge that it, too, was demanding staffs of proper quality, that it insists on having career service employees who will not go over to the other body as a result of inequities in salary, and that we will pay our staffs on the same level paid those in the House and in the departments downtown.

Mr. President, I submit that my amendment is simply an amendment which the pride of each of us as individual Senators should make it worthwhile voting for.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wonder whether I may ask a few questions of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. METCALF. I shall be delighted to answer any questions.

Mr. MONRONEY. I was trying to ascertain the gross payment of employees who will be paid under the provisions of the Senator's amendment. As I understand it, there will be two positions equal to grade 18 in the civil service downtown; is that not correct?

Mr. METCALF. Yes. As in the House, their salaries are based on grade 18.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. METCALF. We have made it based upon the Senate salary schedule, believing that it would be better to use our schedule rather than a civil service schedule, but it would be equivalent.

Mr. MONRONEY. The dollars come out the same.

Mr. METCALF. The dollars come out the same.

Mr. MONRONEY. This is one of the things which has been constantly embarrassing to me in the hearings, as well as in my former duties as chairman of the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee: that the House has tied its pay level to grade 18. This is the reason that House salaries have escalated to the high point of $25,890 while Senate salaries have been limited in escalation to the percentage increase provided in the two or three pay bills recently enacted.

If we do not relate the salaries at this time to the same scale to which the House relates salaries paid there, will we not again find ourselves, in a year or two, in equal or greater disparity? That is my fear. I would like to see us fix these salaries on a scale that will last. If we do not tie Senate salaries to the same figure the House has worked with, I do not see how we are going to prevent disparity.

Mr. METCALF. As the distinguished chairman recalls, from time to time we have had to work out a different pay scale for the Senate and the House, rather than this complicated pay scale that we have as legislative salaries. When I prepared this amendment, I followed exactly the language of the House bill which provides for GS–18 salary scales. Then I went to the disbursing office. I was told there that we would do much better if we tied the salaries to the regular legislative schedule. So I have provided for dollar amounts that equal the pay in the GS–18 schedules.

As the chairman has pointed out, from time to time, as we have provided for legislative pay raises, the percentages in all higher levels of the House salaries have increased, and the disparity has increased each time. But if we start at the same salary figures, we will get the same result. If there is a 5-percent increase, 5 percent of the GS–18 salary is exactly the same as the figure which would be fixed in our legislative scale.

Mr. MONRONEY. When the pay bill comes before us, it does not necessarily have an across-the-board pay increase. There will be times when the pay scales in the GS levels will be reclassified. When that occurs, the salaries paid in the House, at the GS–18 levels, and other lower levels, if I am not misinformed, will be different salaries than those which had been tied to lower than GS–18 salaries. Is that not a fact?

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Brenkworth, from the disbursing office, with whom I worked in putting this amendment together, tells me it can be worked out by fixing the ceiling so that an equalization of pay raises can be made if at this authorizing level we equalize the dollar amounts provided for the salaries. The Senator from Oklahoma is former chairman of the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee. When that part of the bill came before us, we could equalize those salaries, on a percentage level, with the GS–18 or GS–17 level, to which they were tied, as well as our own pay schedules.

We have three levels. The first level is $25,890. That is our legislative dollar level.

Mr. MONRONEY. That would be for two positions; would it not?

Mr. METCALF. For two positions.

Mr. MONRONEY. As I understand it, the House permits this level for any number of positions on its committees.

Mr. METCALF. For all those positions, as I understand it.

Mr. MONRONEY. The House is permitted, if it desires, to compensate its professional staff members at the rate of $25,890?

Mr. METCALF. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does the Senator have the numbers of staff members who are so compensated in the House?

Mr. METCALF. Thirty-four staff members of the House of Representatives are getting salaries of more than $25,000.

Mr. MONRONEY. That would be the equivalent of saying that 34 staff members——

Mr. METCALF. Thirty-four are getting $25,890, and 50 are getting more than $25,000.

Mr. MONRONEY. That would be for the next grade below in the Senator's chart.

Mr. METCALF. Yes. Going to GS–17, step 4, it is $25,040. Our Senate schedule calls for $25,103.

Mr. MONRONEY. The level of that other position would be corresponding, roughly, to GS–17?

Mr. METCALF. Yes. GS–17, step 4.

Mr. MONRONEY. The measure before us provides for one such position at that salary; does it not?

Mr. METCALF. That is right; one extra position.

Mr. MONRONEY. If the Senator's amendment is not adopted, there will be one position only. If the Senator's amendment is adopted, it will provide for a professional staff member for each of the standing committees of the Senate?

Mr. METCALF. That is right; and there will be 50 staff members in the other body drawing more than anybody on the Senate staffs.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is because their salaries are related to the GS schedules, grades 17 and 18, and those salaries were escalated higher than the pay bill permitted to be applied to staff members of the legislative branch in the Senate, not being associated with comparability with respect to GS–17 and GS–18.

Mr. METCALF. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator's proposal will raise by two the number of those who would receive $25,103?

Mr. METCALF. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. There are three other positions that are provided for in the Senate bill, establishing 51 committee staff positions at $22,230.

Mr. METCALF. That is correct. They would be raised to $23,583, which is comparable to step 2 in GS–17.

Mr. MONRONEY. Would the Senator make any change in the three positions at $22,230 provided in the Senate bill?

Mr. METCALF. Yes; I make a change in those three positions to move them up from $22,230, which is the present statutory rate, to $23,583, which is comparable to step 2 in GS–17, which was used in the House for comparable positions.

Mr. MONRONEY. That would be a lower step in grade 17?

Mr. METCALF. Step 2 in grade 17.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator estimates the cost differential to be an increase of how much? This is per committee?

Mr. METCALF. If every one of these nine positions were filled, the total cost would be $438,686. That would be for 16 standing committees, three joint committees, the two Select Committees on Aging and Standards and Conduct, the two Policy Committees, and 18 positions on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. That would be how much?

Mr. METCALF. It would be $438,686, including the extra position that is being automatically created by the bill itself.

Mr. MONRONEY. I know the difficulty we get into, having served on the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee, and I want to be sure of the facts. So the total cost as a result of the increases on the committees would be $438,686, based on the nine positions on the 16 standing committees, the three joint committees, and the two Select Committees on Aging and Standards and Conduct, the two Policy Committees, and 18 positions on the Appropriations Committees which are not changed?

Mr. METCALF. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. The 18 positions on the Appropriations Committee are not changed, are they?

Mr. METCALF. The increase allowed them amounts to almost $34,000.

Mr. MONRONEY. Bringing the total, then, to $438,686?

Mr. METCALF. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator realizes, I am sure, that in the original staffing of these committees, the top committee staff jobs were related, and generally have been considered to be related, in responsibility, to the administrative assistant position that has long been provided for the Senators.

Mr. METCALF. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does the Senator's amendment take that fact into account?

Mr. METCALF. My amendment neither takes into consideration any changes in the salaries of the Senators personal staffs nor in the salaries of employees of the Senate. This would affect only Senate committee staff personnel.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct. And it would affect them only, and would not be considered any precedent for other levels of employees on the personal staffs of Senators?

Mr. METCALF. As the Senator well knows, from his experience on the Appropriations Committee, the Appropriations Committee itself feels that it is responsible for the payment of the salaries of the employees of the Senate, such as the clerk, the Parliamentarian, and the Secretary.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct. I have no further questions at this time. The distinguished ranking minority member of the committee has some, I believe.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to this procedure. I have listened here for a considerable time to a colloquy participated in before some six or seven Members of the Senate, but affecting all 100 Senators, which indicates that this is not the right way in which to spend annually an additional one-half million dollars of the taxpayer's money in adjusting salaries for Senate staff members. I feel there is no reasonable justification for the Senate, at a time when it is preaching economy in the executive agencies, to move in the direction of thus expanding the expenditures for itself.

However, even if there is, I do not think it should be attached to this bill at this time in this way because we have presented this legislation to the public as a measure to increase the economical and efficient functioning of Congress, and we have put into the legislation some specific provisions for studying matters of this kind carefully and systematically, in their relationship to other payroll problems on the Hill, we would expect this procedure to come up with a composite and, I hope, constructive suggestion.

If we start out with one or two Senators figuring out ways in which certain Senate staff people can get increases in pay as we are doing today we immediately throw out of balance the entire pay schedule on the Hill. For example, the instant care, which is pretty complicated because we have had a lot of confusing colloquy about it, and I dare say even the handful who have heard the colloquy would not be able to give a speech about it, explaining what they are voting for or what they are buying with the additional expenditure of $500,000 a year they propose to add to our taxpayer's burdens.

Let me point out some other problems. It is true that there are differences between the pay scales of the House and those of the Senate. It is also true that there are differences in the pay scales among the various kinds of service jobs which we have here on the Hill—inexplicable differences, inequitable differences, differences which can and should be corrected by the Legislative Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and the Appropriations Committee as a whole, or differences which should and could be corrected by the kind of device we have incorporated in this proposed reorganization plan, because one of the specific functions of the joint continuing committee on the operations of Congress which this bill creates is to prevent this kind of awkward situation from developing.

As one who believes he should practice a little bit of the economy he preaches, Mr. President, I do not think it necessarily follows, when we have salaries out of balance on Capitol Hill, that the rule of thumb should be always to elevate them to the highest level, and never consider a compromise, never consider adjudicating them downward, but to take the highest salary level existing anywhere for the particular job or area of activity served in the Senate or in the House, and, when you get one up, staircase them all up spirally until you reach the peak for everyone on the public payroll.

We have reached a situation now—and every Senator here knows what I am talking about—where the salaries already paid the committee personnel, in serveral instances, are so high that Senators have difficulty keeping their personal staffs in their own offices, because understandably they would like to eat the bigger carrot held out in front of the larger horse. I do not blame them for that, because I know, as every Senator knows in his heart, that the staff members in our own offices work longer hours, work more days a week, and have tougher assignments because there are fewer of them, than if they were working for a committee chairman, a committee counsel, or the committee clerk.

So when we elevate these salaries so much higher than we, admittedly, can pay our own people in our own offices, we create a new problem. This means that soon we will be confronted with the same old Parkinson's law that we make the largest salary the average salary, and work on up from there.

We have provided in this bill for a Joint Committee on the Operation of Congress, Republicans and Democrats together, from both the House and the Senate, and one of their functions is to study this whole matrix of complicated and unbelievably contradictory pay scales which have grown up, like Topsy, largely because measures like this have been considered on the floor by a few Members of either House, and they have gotten the thing out of balance, and patched it up here and there until we have this crazy quilt before us today.

So we have provided that this joint committee on the operations of Congress shall make a comprehensive study, have hearings, and do a job for the Senate and the House at the same time, working out a pay scale which is equitable, which is fair between the two Houses, which recognizes hours of service, work loads, talent, and the kind of labors performed by the people on the Hill, and which does not diametrically and directly discriminate against Senators' own staffs and Representatives' own staffs by scattering around in the same community committee jobs paid for by the same taxpayers, whereby, for doing less work, employees can receive $2,000, $3,000, or $5,000 a year more simply by moving over to the committees.

Some way or other, the thing should be balanced out, but we will never do it by this kind of patchwork approach, because we will create more problems than we solve. I am prepared to believe there is considerable merit in suggestions made by my distinguished friend, but we cannot do it on this isolated basis, unless we wish utterly to destroy, in our body, the kind of economic efficiency we are supposed to be insisting upon increasing in the executive branch.

We give long speeches in campaigns and long speeches on the floor, and write letters back home, as to how we want to economize; and very few if any of us ever put in an asterisk for a footnote, saying, "I mean everywhere except in Congress, everywhere except in the Senate, everywhere except in the House."

Let us be honest about it. Let us in Congress do the kind of thing we expect them to do with the executive reorganization plan downtown. Many Senators have endorsed having another sort of Hoover Commission to study administrative problems in the legislative area. We have that here; it is in this bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, I certainly do not believe that the Senator's amendment is the right approach or the right method. It would start a whole spiraling program of new salary increases, poorly considered, not even subjected to the usual process we have followed in the Legislative Appropriations Committee, thus taking away, before we create it, one of the big, constructive jobs we hoped to have accomplished by this joint committee we are undertaking to create. Because the bill would give this joint committee the time, the talent, the staff, and the authority to bring salaries in the two Houses, staff salaries on committees, and salaries in the offices of Senators and Representatives into appropriate relationship with one another, it seems appropriate to lay this motion on the table and consider it before the joint committee.

It is a public secret that in some committees some staff members put in much less time than some staff members put in in the offices of some Senators.

Some chairmen ride herd on their staff rather hard. The members of their staffs are here all of the time and we do not find them off campus during working hours of the day. They are around here. However, if we try to get some others by calling the committee room at 5 o'clock, they are gone. Yet, members of our staffs stay here until 6, 7, or 8 o'clock. And we pay higher salaries to the people who disappear early in the day than we do to the people who work both later and harder.

It does not make very good sense. Understandably, the people who work and have to come to work sometimes on Saturdays and when we have an evening session and others who sometimes stay in the evening are going to make a very persuasive appeal to get their salaries moved up by this spiraling system.

I do not believe that the Senate is that profligate with the people's money, that unmindful of its economy promises, and that willing to set one set of standards for the executive and another for ourselves.

At the appropriate time I shall move to lay the measure on the table so that it can be referred to the joint committee for the kind of constructive and careful consideration to which it is entitled. But I do not want to do that until my friend, the Senator from Montana and everybody else has said everything they want to say about the measure.

At the appropriate time I shall move to lay it on the table which will cut off debate. I do not want to do that as long as Senators desire to debate the measure.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. METCALF. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it has been my experience in business that in the long run we get what we pay for and that it is better to pay, commensurate with responsibilities, salaries above the average than below.

We then have the right to ask for that needed extra effort so important in the Senate, as we consider bills which allocate to other countries and to States and cities of our own country, billions upon billions upon billions of dollars.

As a member of the Committees on Armed Services, Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and Foreign Relations, I doubt if there are any better public servants in Washington today than the heads of the staffs of those committees.

Why should the Senate be willing to send those men over to negotiate with their corresponding heads of committee staffs in the House, and at the same time stipulate that they be paid some $1,430 less than the House people holding comparable positions?

I believe that Senators who oppose this measure should also recommend that Senators themselves be paid less than Representatives because the implication is that the work of the Senate is less important.

It seems incredible to me that Senators accept salaries equal to the salaries paid Representatives and yet expect that Senate committee people be paid less than their counterparts. Surely they are just as intelligent and efficient in the handling of their work, but the inference is otherwise.

From the standpoint of experience in business, I cannot imagine anything more detrimental to the morale of the members of the Senate committee staffs than this differential in salary.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

THE ALARMING INCREASE IN CRIME

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, according to the press, former Attorney General Katzenbach, who is Chairman of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justime, feels that it is "unutterable nonsense" to say that recent 5-to-4 Supreme Court decisions, limiting and hampering police interrogation and excluding from evidence perfectly voluntary confessions and other evidence of guilt derived therefrom, are in any way responsible for the alarming increase in crime. I ask unanimous consent that news items thus quoting Mr. Katzenbach be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I completely disagree with the former Attorney General. I am convinced that Mr. Katzenbach's views are diametrically opposed to those held by millions of our citizens throughout the length and breadth of this land. I feel that his views are not shared by the vast majority of prosecuting attorneys, sheriffs, and chiefs of police who daily have practical experience in trying to enforce our laws. And, of course, we know that four of the Justices on the Supreme Court do not approve these newly fashioned exclusionary rules of evidence, nor do many, if not most, of the State supreme courts and lower Federal courts and lower Federal court judges.

On the very next day after Mr. Katzenbach was thus quoted, the Philadelphia Inquirer carried a lead editorial commenting upon a decision of the Supreme Court setting aside the conviction of two murderers in California. The editorial states that Police Commissioner Edward J. Bell, of Philadelphia, has said that Supreme Court rulings also had recently put two confessed murderers on the streets of Philadelphia, and had expressed the belief that the Court's rulings had created an unfair balance between the rights of individuals and the rights of society.

The editorial also reminds us that seven of the 19 members of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice have criticized recent Supreme Court decisions that limit police questioning of suspects and the use of voluntary confessions, declaring that these decisions have tilted the balance of justice too far in favor of the defendants.

The editorial concludes that it might be "nonsense" to Mr. Katzenbach, but that those two confessed murderers have been set loose on the streets of Philadelphia and that Police Commissioner Bell does not like it, and neither do other law-abiding citizens.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 21 be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, this editorial and the statement of Commissioner Bell, of Philadelphia, are just representative samples of the comments which the Judiciary Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, of which I have the honor to be chairman, have received from experienced law enforcement officers, district attorneys, and judges throughout the country. I ask unanimous consent that a number of representative letters from these distinguished officials, expressing views completely at variance with those of Mr. Katzenbach, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, it is difficult to understand—it is just inconceivable that a man of Mr. Katzenbach's intellect and training would characterize the comments and expressions of these dedicated public officials as "unutterable nonsense." I do not believe that he can at all sustain such a position—such a groundless charge.

When these 5-to-4 Supreme Court decisions require our trial courts throughout the country daily to turn loose self-confessed murderers and other vicious criminals upon society, even though their confessions were completely voluntary, it is difficult to see how any reasonable person could come to the conclusion, as expressed by Mr. Katzenbach, that these unrealistic decisions are not contributing to lawlessness and the increase in crime in the country.

Just as a sample of what is happening in our trial courts, I call attention again to the case in which a man in New York had confessed to having murdered his wife and five children. I cited a newspaper account of this case in my remarks in the Senate on February 24. The prosecuting attorney and the trial judge had to dismiss the indictment, not because the confession was coerced, but simply because the unreasonable and unjustified requirements of the recent Miranda decision had not in every respect been complied with. This vicious and dangerous criminal was unquestionably guilty of the murders. Nevertheless, our Supreme Court, by its 5-to-4 decisions made it mandatory that he be turned loose upon society.

The New York Times of February 23, in commenting upon the release of this murderer of his wife and five children says this:

> When the confessed murderer of his wife and five children has to be freed under the rules laid down by the United States Supreme Court—the fourth dismissal of murder charges against confessed slayers here in recent weeks—the instinctive, inevitable and right community reaction is one of outrage and apprehension.

While the editorial takes the position that a constitutional amendment "would be a bad answer to a bad problem," it concludes that voluntary confessions should be admissible in evidence, and that current cases "have made it plain that there are many instances in which confessions represent the only way to obtain a conviction of the guilty." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times editorial of February 23 be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. McCLELLAN. An article by James J. Kilpatrick, appearing in the Washington Evening Star of February 21, commenting upon this report of the President's Commission, of which Mr. Katzenbach is Chairman, says:

> A feeling will not go away that the Commission's staff talked with too many sociologists, and not with nearly enough cops. * * * But nowhere does the report suggest that the prospect of swift and certain punishment may also be a useful weapon in the war upon crime. * * * One of the Commission's answers is to provide textbooks for slum schools that are written in slum English. Okay, okay. But what can be done tomorrow, next week, next month, to lock up the hoods and thieves?

This article thus strongly emphasizes that the practical experience of law enforcement officers, prosecuting attorneys, and judges is wholly at variance with the expressed views of Mr. Katzenbach.

It also emphasizes and confirms what I said to the Senate on February 23, that the single most effective deterrent to crime is the certainty of apprehension and punishment of criminals. It also confirms that what is needed is action now by Congress to pass laws which will make apprehension and punishment more swift and certain. Long-range remedies are, of course, desirable, but the immediate step to this end simply must be action by Congress that will put a stop to the injustice and the injury that is inflicted on society by the exclusion from a criminal trial of the very best evidence of guilt, that is, an uncoerced confession and other convincing evidence deriving therefrom.

I would suggest to Mr. Katzenbach that the practice of excluding uncoerced and voluntary confessions of the murderer, the rapist, and the robber can be much more appropriately characterized as "unutterable nonsense" than can be the contention that these 5-to-4 decisions of the Court are not one of the contributing causes to the steadily increasing incidence of crime.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Kilpatrick be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 5.)

Mr. McCLELLAN. We must stop, and stop now, the release upon society of self-confessed vicious criminals because of the trivial technicalities invoked in recent decisions by five of our Supreme Court Justices—decisions which were vigorously denounced by the other four Justices as unsound and harmful to the administration of justice. I am persuaded that the vast majority of our judges, both State and Federal, also feel that these recent 5-to-4 decisions are unsound, and that they are most reluctantly having to follow them. These closely divided decisions should not be accepted as the last word. They should be reversed; nullified by a constitutional amendment; modified by statute; or, as a final resort to get relief from them, the jurisdiction of appellate courts must be limited and restricted.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Feb. 20, 1967]

KATZENBACH DEFENDS THE COURTS ON BACKING RIGHTS OF CRIMINALS

WASHINGTON, February 19.—Under Secretary of State Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, chairman of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, strongly disputed today the idea that court decisions upholding individual rights lead to higher crime rates.

Appearing on television with five other commission members, the former Attorney General declared that crime rates in the United States had not been measurably affected by court decisions. Of the assertion that crime is increasing because the courts are not doing their job, he said:

"That is unutterable nonsense."

As for another assertions that the courts are "coddling criminals," he said crime would still be a major problem in America if the Bill of Rights and all other constitutional protections of the individual were abolished.

Mr. Katzenbach apparently was replying to seven of the 19 members of the commission. When the commission made public its 308-page report of its 18-month study of crime yesterday, the seven submitted a separate report criticizing recent Supreme Court decisions that limit police interrogation and the use of confessions.

These decisions have tilted the balance of justice too far in favor of defendants, the seven said. The commission as a whole had nothing to say on the question.

Mr. Katzenbach was one of the six commission members appearing on a special hour-and-a-half production of the National Broadcasting Company's "Meet the Press."

Another on the program was Thomas J. Cahill, Police Chief of San Francisco, one of the seven commission members who criticized recent Supreme Court decisions. Mr. Cahill repeated the criticism, saying courts often forgot the victim of crime. He said that he, as a police officer, was "closest to the picture" and in a better position to know the effects of such court decisions.

Mr. Katzenbach said the public often seemed concerned with "the wrong kind of crime," such as crimes committed against one race by members of another race. Comparatively, interracial crime is rare, he said.

Whitney M. Young Jr., executive director of the Urban League, criticized those who, he said, subtly reflect racist attitudes when they complain of the problem of crime. The same persons often oppose President Johnson's domestic programs for combating conditions that lead to crime, he said.

Mr. Young said white people tend not to become excited about crime until they are threatened by it. He cited figures showing that Negroes, too, are victimized by crime. He said that in Chicago, a Negro was six times more likely than a white person to be robbed and that a Negro woman was eight times more likely to be raped.

[From The Washington Post, Feb. 20, 1967]

CRIME EXPERT DECRIES SLOGANS, SCAPEGOATS

It is time to move beyond the slogans and the scapegoats that people have used so long to think about crime, the executive director of President Johnson's crime commission said yesterday.

James Vorenberg, law professor from Harvard University, classed among the slogans and scapegoats such things as "claims that the police are handcuffed or that the young people are going to hell and that all criminals are really sick and misunderstood, that the courts are coddling criminals."

He said such claims are "something like a witch doctor chants to avoid facing the fact that the system really needs major surgery or a transfusion of money, people and new ideas."

He and other members of the commission appeared on "Meet the Press" (NBC-WRC).

Whitney M. Young Jr., executive director of the National Urban League, said the real criminals in American society are "the employer who refuses to hire, the real estate operator who refuses to rent or the builder who refuses to sell the people because of their color."

"But the Negro community," he said, "has learned to respect law because it has been through law that we got—the Supreme Court decision we got restaurants, hotels and other places open."

Prof. Herbert Wechsler, of Columbia Law School, said, "I think that everything we have seen and everything we know indicates that the Negro communities of the United States, even the most disadvantaged Negro communities of the United States, even the most unjustly treated Negro communities, have, feel and acknowledge an enormous stake in the system of public order."

[From the Washington News, Feb. 20, 1967]

COMMISSION VIEW: COURTS NOT TO BLAME

Claims that recent Supreme Court decisions and civil rights demonstrations have contributed to the nation's soaring crime rate were branded as "nonsense" today by members of the President's Crime Commission.

The commission's report on its 8-month study of crime in America is expected to give boost to the President's anti-crime legislation.

His program calls for massive Federal aid to local law enforcement, starting with $50 million the first year and $300 million the second.

The commission said several hundred million dollars a year could be spent profitably over the next decade for such Federal programs. This would bring the 10-year cost to several billion dollars.

But Chairman Nicholas Katzenbach and two other commission members, appearing on a nationwide TV program (Meet the Press), brushed aside questions that court rulings and civil rights strife may have spread disrespect for law and aggravated crime problems.

Mr. Katzenbach said the effect on crime—if most of the commission's 200 recommendations are followed—would be like changing "from witchcraft to modern medicine in the treatment of disease."

The boldest and most controversial of its proposals suggest more, not less, freedom for offenders. They include:

Pre-trial release without financial bail should be permitted for "all but that small portion of defendants who present a high risk of flight or dangerous acts."

Drunks, who account for a third of all arrests, should be taken out of the treadmill that clogs the police, court, and penal systems.

There should be greater use of probation and parole and less reliance on prisons, which cost more and often do more harm than good.

The commission said there is "an immediate need" to double the number of juvenile probation officers, triple the probation officers working with adult felons, and increase sevenfold those working with misdemeanants.

CONFESSED KILLER OF SIX FREED ON COURT EDICT

[From the Daily News, Feb. 21, 1967]

(By Edwin Ross and Arthur Mulligan)

A 23-year-old Brooklyn man who confessed slaying of his attractive wife and their five small children walked out of Brooklyn Supreme Court yesterday a free man—because, under last year's U.S. Supreme Court decision, he had not been apprised of his Constitutional rights.

Suarez, a laundry worker, who had spent six weeks in Kings Park State Hospital after supposedly attempting suicide in 1965, was arrested shortly after the bodies were discovered. He denied everything, even knowing the victim, and police let him go.

In releasing the defendant, Jose Suarez, Justice Michael Kern remarked, "there are many decisional laws with which judges don't agree but they must accept them."

"Even an animal such as this one—and I think it would be insulting the animal kingdom—must be clothed with all these safeguards," Kern said. "This is a very sad thing. It is repulsive. It makes any human being's blood run cold and his stomach turn to let a thing like this out on the streets."

Suarez had been indicted for first degree murder in the fatal stabbing of his wife, Maria, 24, and the five children, Harry, 5, Yvette, 4, Nancy, 3, Maria Antonia, 2, and Jose Jr., 11 months.

Their bodies were found last April 27 in their four-room, second-floor apartment at 301 Hooper St., Brooklyn. Authorities said they had been dead four days when found by the superintendent of the building.

Police described the couple's association as a common-law relationship and declared that Suarez admitted being the father only of the three youngest children.

PICKED UP THE SAME DAY

Suarez, a laundry worker, who had spent six weeks in Kings Park State Hospital after supposedly attempting suicide in 1965, was arrested shortly after the bodies were discovered. He denied everything, even knowing the victim, and the police let him go.

But they picked him up again the same day and yesterday Assistant District Attorney Nathan R. Schor said that Suarez confessed the mass slayings that night in the Bedford Ave. police station in the presence of an assistant district attorney.

But, Schor told the court, "Unfortunately, this defendant was not apprised of his rights at the time of his arrest. I dare say if this questioning of him at that time had contained warnings set forth under the (U.S. Supreme Court) Miranda decision, this defendant would be sitting in Sing Sing Prison, serving several life terms.

"With a heavy heart I am reluctantly constrained at this point to move for dismissal of this indictment," Schor said. "The district attorney has no other evidence but the confession."

Suarez, who was examined at Kings County Hospital following his arrest, was declared sane by psychiatrists there. The U.S. Supreme Court's Miranda decision, stating that any suspect must be told of his right to counsel and that anything he says may be used against him, was returned on June 13 Suarez was not indicted until Nov. 4.

COUNSEL MUST BE PRESENT

The court decision, returned in the case of Ernesto A. Miranda vs. the State of Arizona, also prohibits police from interrogating any suspect in custody, without his consent, unless a defense counsel is present.

Miranda, who was found guilty of kidnaping and rape in Phoenix, fought his conviction to the highest court, claiming he was denied the right of counsel and forced to make a confession following his arrest on March 13, 1963.

SHOWS NO EMOTION

In court yesterday, the slightly built, 5-foot-4 Suarez stood with his head down during the entire proceedings and showed no emotion as a Spanish interpreter kept him informed of what was being said.

His attorney, Frank Ortiz, told newsmen that Suarez would return as soon as possible to his native Puerto Rico to live with his father.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Phildelphia Enquirer, Feb. 21, 1967]

KILLERS ON THE LOOSE

The U.S. Supreme Court has set aside the conviction of a man sentenced to death and a woman sentenced to life imprisonment for a 1962 murder in California, on the grounds that their constitutional rights were violated at their trials by mention of their failure to take the witness stand.

Philadelphia's Police Commissioner Edward J. Bell has said that U.S. Supreme Court rulings have recently put two "confessed murderers" on this city's streets, and expressed his belief that high court rulings have created an unfair balance between the rights of individuals and the rights of society.

Seven of the 19 members of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, in a separate report, have criticized recent Supreme Court decisions that limit police questioning of witnesses and the use of confessions, declaring that these decisions have tilted the balance of justice too far in favor of defendants.

Chairman Katzenbach, in a television interview, insisted that crime rates in the U.S. have not been measurably affected by court decisions and that it is "unutterable nonsense" to assert that crime has increased because the courts are not doing their job.

It may be nonsense to the chairman of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, but those two "confessed murderers" have been set loose on our streets. Commissioner Bell doesn't like it, and neither do other law-abiding citizens.

EXHIBIT 3

OFFICE OF THE COUNTY ATTORNEY,
SEDGWICK COUNTY,
Wichita, Kans., February 15, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: Thank you very much for your letter of February 10, 1967, supplementing your Miranda decision letter.

The Wichita Police Department has done a considerable amount of work looking towards supplying the information requested in the last letter, and on behalf of law enforcement in this community may I please state that we appreciate what you are doing to attempt to pass legislation which will effectively combat the growing law enforcement problem which we are facing.

I am most interested in your Bill No. S. 674 as it will have a derivative value to us if passed, because it will be directly calling to the court's attention the fact that the Congress of the United States is not content to have law enforcement completely hamstrung.

Thank you very much and you may be sure we are assembling the data and we will give you further information such as we have at our disposal after having examined the contents of your latest communication.

Yours truly,

KEITH SANBORN,
County Attorney.

FULTON COUNTY LEGAL DEPARTMENT,
Atlanta, Ga., February 16, 1967.
Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: Thank you for your letter of February 10, enclosing copies of S-674, S-675 and S-678. I heartily endorse each of these Bills and hope you are successful in having same adopted.

I have read with interest your speech released on January 25, 1967, and it is comforting to know that you and others are not only aware of the great peril to the American people from the one-sided and biased philosophy of some members of our Supreme Court, but are determined to do something about it.

If certain members of our Supreme Court were openly committed to a policy of favoring criminals, they could not do greater damage to law enforcement in the United States.

I am taking the liberty of handing these bills to Mr. Lewis Slaton, Solicitor-General (Public Prosecutor) for his information. Perhaps he will want to contact you also.

With kindest regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

HAROLD SHEATS,
County Attorney.

SHELBY COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY GENERAL, 15TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF TENNESSEE,
Memphis, Tenn., January 18, 1967.
Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: Thank you for your letter of November 21, 1966, expressing your concern and desire to do something about the problems facing law enforcement.

I apologize for not answering sooner, but the press of business and a desire to fully explore the points brought up in your letter before answering same dictated this delay.

In answer to your question about the effect in this jurisdiction of *Miranda* and and similar decisions, we have had a few cases which we have been unable to prosecute, being cases mostly in which indictments were pending at the time these decisions were rendered, and which, for some reason, had not been disposed of earlier, for example, cases where defendants had fled the jurisdiction.

As I see the situation, one of the greatest problems created by these decisions formulating rules or guidelines, is that the Court does not take into consideration and make proper provision for the many cases in our files awaiting trial in court that were properly investigated under the law at the time of said investigation and indictment, but which, by subsequent decisions setting up new guidelines, and making that which was proper under the law at the time it was done, now inadmissible in court. It would certainly appear that the more reasonable administration of justice would require that new rules and procedures which change the basic responsibilities placed upon law enforcement officers should take effect on any *subsequent investigations* rather than on *all subsequent trials* in court.

We feel very fortunate in that we anticipated, after the *Escobedo* decision, the next step being the necessity of having lay police officers advise defendants of the right to counsel before interrogation. We thereafter gave all law enforcement agencies in this jurisdiction guidelines which we feel substantially complied with the later *Miranda* decision.

There is, of course, no way to tell just how many defendants have declined to give statements simply because they have been advised of the right to counsel. You see, for a number of years, our law enforcement agencies have advised defendants of their right to remain silent, and that anything they said could be used against them. Many defendants have declined to give statements under either procedure.

If at all possible, legislation should be passed which sets out in clear and concise language that can be understood by the investigator in the field, what is required before and during interrogation. When our highest courts take many pages to write opinions about the constitutional rights of defendants, and so many lawyers and courts disagree about just what these rights entail, it seems fundamentally unfair to the police officer in the field to expect him to somehow miraculously know just what is required of him before he will be allowed to testify in a court of law seeking to bring a criminal to justice.

Sincerely yours,

PHIL M. CANALE, Jr.,
District Attorney General.

P.S.—To my knowledge, no similar legislation has been enacted or proposed in the Tennessee State Legislature.

SHELBY COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY GENERAL, 15TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF TENNESSEE,
Memphis, Tenn., February 15, 1967.
Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
U.S. Senate,
Committee on Judiciary,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: Thank you very much for your letter of February 10 regarding your proposed legislation on the admissibility of voluntary confessions, wire tapping, and the outlawing of the Mafia and similar crime syndicates. It makes me feel a lot better, in fighting the day-to-day battle against crime, to know that we have someone of your stature and capabilities working to protect the law abiding people of this country, and the victims of crime.

I feel that it is most appropriate for the United States Congress to take the lead in passing this much needed legislation because, and I say this with no bitterness but in an objective manner, I feel there is no doubt but what some of our over-zealous Federal courts have placed all law enforcement agencies and the public in the present sea of confusion in which we now find ourselves.

With regard to your proposed Federal bill on wire tapping, I am enclosing herewith a bill which I drafted in 1963, to present to the Tennessee State Legislature. I did present this bill but was not successful in getting it passed. I plan to again attempt during the 1967 Tennessee Legislature to get this same bill passed. I believe that the provisions of this bill which I drafted substantially meet the requirements set out in your proposed Federal legislation as far as allowing state law enforcement officials to wire tap. In any event, if the bill you are sponsoring is passed, we would on a local level scrupulously abide by the provisions of your act.

You will also note in the bill which I have drafted that it would be unlawful to eavesdrop by electronic and other devices. I put this provision in my bill because of the insidious nature of some of our present electronic devices, and the effect the use of such devices could have if used by unscrupulous and unauthorized persons.

If I can be of any further assistance to you in your efforts to get your bills passed, I would be most happy to do so.

Respectfully yours,

PHIL M. CANALE, Jr.,
District Attorney General.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY,
BUREAU OF POLICE,
Portland, Oreg., January 10, 1967.
Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedure, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

SIR: Multnomah County District Attorney George VanHoomissen, through his Chief Criminal Deputy Desmond D. Connall replied to your recent request for experience regarding the Miranda decision. This office has been furnished a copy of this reply with a request for comment.

We are in the same position as the District Attorney's Office in that we are sure substantial damage to law enforcement has resulted from this decision. However, we find it most difficult to statistically substantiate this damage. In fact, the police are probably in a better position than others to evaluate the results of the decision as we are not only cognizant of cases lost in court, but are also acutely aware that many cases including homicides have not been solved as a direct result.

This office is particularly disappointed that the Oregon legislature is opening its biennial session this week without legislation on this subject to be considered. This is probably true because neither we on the local level nor the office of the State Attorney General can visualize legislation that would not be struck down by the United States Supreme Court.

Be assured we will watch your activities in the Congress with great interest and will forward any information coming to our attention that would be helpful.

Respectfully,

DONALD I. MCNAMARA,
Chief of Police.

STATE OF ALABAMA,
OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Montgomery, Ala., January 24, 1967.
Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: I have your letter under date of January 17, 1967.

In reply to your inquiry dated November 21, 1966, you are advised that Alabama has not yet enacted legislation as a result of *Miranda*. The State Legislature has not yet considered legislation apparently required by *Miranda*. However, an Alabama Bar Committee will recommend to the Bar the sponsorship of legislation to make it possible to comply with *Miranda*.

This proposed legislation, amending Alabama statutes already providing for State payment of counsel in indigent criminal cases, will, according to current thinking in the Bar Committee, provide for temporary appointment of counsel on request of police authorities by circuit judges at the preliminary stages of interrogation of indigents. Provision must also be made for payment of private appointed counsel fees. I expect such legislation to be introduced early in the next regular session of the Alabama Legislature with Bar approval. As stated, such legislation will make it *possible* to supply counsel at the interrogation stage as required by *Miranda* at a time that such was and is yet impossible.

Neither the attorneys or judges to whom I have talked are so naive as to believe that such legislation will be effective. The attorney appointed for interrogation will simply send word to his client to remain silent and no statements will be forthcoming.

While this legislation will probably be adopted in order to make it *possible* according to the book to comply with Miranda, it will be a futile and empty gesture because of the impossible situation created by the Supreme Court of the United States in *Miranda*. The Alabama Legislature may be of the opinion that it is useless to levy a tax and appoint and pay counsel to advise indigents to remain silent during interrogation, but I believe with Bar approval the legislation will pass.

Miranda is simply a law passed by the United States Supreme Court, which in effect prohibits the introduction into evidence of admissions or confessions or the fruits of uncounseled interrogation. This law, according to five justices, is in the Constitution. I doubt if Congress or the Alabama Legislature can by mere statute effectively amend what the present majority call the Constitution.

I respectfully suggest that you may begin thinking in terms of a constitutional amendment or amendments and hope that, if adopted, the terms thereof will be reasonably construed by the United States Supreme Court.

The excerpt from *Miranda* quoted in your inquiry may be thought by some to hold out some hope for an alternative method for complying with *Miranda*. However, I can conceive of no State or Federal legislation that could as a practical matter soften the blow that *Miranda* has struck as law enforcement. If confessions, shown to be voluntary, are again to be recognized, the strait jacket, denied by the justices in the opinion, but in fact locked on by them, can only be removed by a law enacted into the Federal constitution. Such an amendment would simply make confessions or admissions, shown to be voluntary, admissible.

I would certainly favor legislation punishing those who would coerce confessions, but I believe that reasonable persuasion by police interrogators before counsel is expressly demanded is essential to proper law enforcement.

Very truly yours,
MACDONALD GALLION,
Attorney General.
By BERNARD F. SYKES,
Assistant Attorney General.

OFFICE OF THE
COMMONWEALTH'S ATTORNEY,
Richmond, Va., December 12, 1966.
Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: Thank you for your letter of November 21, 1966, relative to the Escobedo and Miranda decisions rendered by the United States Supreme Court and the proposed legislation introduced by yourself and Senator Ervin.

The real effects of these two decisions, and more especially in the Miranda decision, are being felt in my jurisdiction. At this time, from a review of the cases now in trial, we find fewer and fewer people making any statements whatsoever to the police. Under Miranda, many persons who are guilty will go free and our law enforcement agencies will be hindered in determining the accomplice in the crime.

We have instructed our police officers that once an accused requests counsel, they can no longer talk with him. By not talking with the police, defendants enjoy a greater opportunity to make up alibis and substantiate them by witnesses to the end that truth in a criminal trial is becoming much more difficult to find. Under the decisions of the Supreme Court it appears we no longer look for the truth, but error.

I do not have any exact statistics relative to the effects of these decisions to date, but they are being kept and I hope that they will be available in the near future. From personal knowledge, I know the decisions have seriously hampered lawful and legal police investigation and that they will continue to do this.

Perhaps Congress could pass legislation removing the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court wherein a trial judge rules on the admissibility of a confession because it is voluntary and has the approval of a jury. The majority in Miranda are simply living in a classroom discussion of the admissibility of confessions and do not take a realistic approach to the subject. How are police officers, during the excitement and heat of an arrest, supposed to know an individual's constitutional rights when judges themselves, after long months of deliberation, cannot agree on the subject. It certainly makes the law look a bit foolish. That is why I suggest that the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court be taken away from the Court as to the admissibility of confessions in criminal prosecution. The trial judge and the jury would have ample opportunity to observe the credibility of the witnesses and come to a fair and just conclusion. My personal view is that juries would come to far better conclusions than judges sitting hundreds of miles away from the witnesses.

Of course, if a man requests counsel, he should never be denied this right, or if he requests to see some friend or member of his family, he should be given an opportunity to do this. Also, no one that I know wants an involuntary confession, since this would weigh heavily against chances for a conviction on the basis of truth.

Senate Bill 2578 would be of assistance to law enforcement, but I believe the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States in confession cases should be limited under the constitutional authority (Art. 3, Sec. 2 U.S. Constitution) given to Congress. Quite frankly, I feel that Congress must again accept its responsibility under the Constitution to pass laws and not abdicate this to the executive and judicial branches of the Government.

To my knowledge, the Commonwealth of Virginia does not have any proposed legislation in this field. However, when the Legislature reconvenes in 1968, I hope that some will be forthcoming to let the police know exactly what they can do and what they cannot do. After all, police officers want to obey the law and do obey the law very closely.

I would appreciate it if you could tell me how many police officers are employed by the Federal Government, or the City of Washington, D.C., to protect the Supreme Court grounds and the Justices of that Court. On my last visit to the Court, there appeared to be several police officers for every visitor there.

If I can be of any further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to contact me. I trust that through the concern of yourself and your fellow colleagues, the 90th Congress will do something constructive to assist law enforcement in its endless battle to protect persons and their property.

With every good wish, I am

Very truly yours,
JAMES B. WILKINSON,
Commonwealth's Attorney.

OFFICE OF THE PROSECUTING
ATTORNEY, MAHONING COUNTY,
Youngstown, Ohio, January 10, 1967.
Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please accept my most sincere apologies for the belated answer to your letter dated November 21, 1966. In some manner it became mixed up with other papers and was mislaid.

I am familiar, of course, with the Miranda decision as well as with other recent Supreme Court decisions involving criminal law.

It goes without saying, I think, that this case will make the obtaining of confessions and admissions much more difficult for law enforcement officers. As of this writing I know of only one case in which we feel we will not be able to use a confession because it was not obtained in accordance with Miranda. The local police officers would probably be in a better position to develop statistics than this office.

I feel it safe to assume that cases where Miranda has stopped an investigation have not been bound over to the Grand Jury in accordance with the Ohio practice. I also feel that it will be extremely difficult for anyone to draft Federal Legislation which can circumvent the very positive finding of the majority in the Miranda case, but I certainly wish you well.

If this office can be of assistance, please let us know.

Very truly yours,
CLYDE W. OSBORNE,
Prosecuting Attorney.

OFFICE OF THE PROSECUTING ATTORNEY OF KING COUNTY, WASH.,
Seattle, Wash., December 9, 1966.
Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: As Prosecuting Attorney for the most heavily populated county in the state of Washington I am vitally concerned with the current trend in the area of criminal confessions. I have an obligation to uphold the constitutional rights of those brought before the bar, but at the same time I am charged with a responsibility of protecting society.

As you are aware, a confession, given by a criminal defendant, plays an integral part of the prosecution of the case. Therefore, I would support legislation such as that outlined in Senate Bill 2587.

I am not in complete agreement with those proponents of the *Miranda* case who speculate that such a decision will lead to better and more efficient police work. It has been our experience that in some cases it is simply impossible to secure sufficient physical evidence to present to a jury without the aid of a confession. No statistics are available, but we have been unable to file many cases because defendants have refused to give statements. Other cases which were pending when the *Miranda* decision was handed down have been reduced or dismissed.

A recent situation in our county illustrates this point. Briefly, the facts are these:

On March 19, 1966, a hotel clerk was shot and killed during the course of a robbery. He was shot twice with different calibre pistols. Police investigation commenced immediately. On March 23, 1966, a suspect, who was reported as having seen the incident was questioned. The suspect was advised that he had the right to remain silent, that anything he said could be used in court against him, and that he had the right to counsel. He was further advised that when he was charged, the court would appoint an attorney for him. The suspect confessed, indicating that he had obtained a gun from one of three men in a downtown tavern and later returned the gun to this man. He stated the second gun belonged to the hotel clerk, and after the shooting he had disposed of it by throwing the gun from a pier into Elliott Bay. Police recovered both weapons and obtained statements from three men who had observed the suspect borrow and return the gun. The suspect was charged with murder in the first degree.

Following the appointment of counsel, a preliminary hearing was held and the case was bound over to our superior court for trial. A pretrial hearing was held to determine the admissibility of the confession and other evidence. This hearing was held June 27, 1966, two weeks after the *Miranda* decision was handed down.

After lengthy testimony and argument, the court suppressed the confession on the basis of the *Miranda* decision and also suppressed, as derivative evidence, the two guns and the testimony of the three men present when one of the guns was borrowed by the suspect and later returned. The state, having insufficient evidence to proceed to trial, and no other apparent remedy, was compelled to dismiss the case. The defendant now walks the streets of Seattle.

Please feel free to contact me if I may be of any further service to you or your subcommittee.

Sincerely,
CHARLES O. CARROLL,
King County Prosecuting Attorney.

DALLAS COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY,
Dallas, Tex., December 9, 1966.
Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: This is in reply to your inquiry regarding the effect of the *Miranda* and *Escabedo* decisions.

In short, the net effect has been to reduce the number of confessions taken from defendants and the number of admissible confessions.

We have no accurate statistics available as to the number of confessions before and after the decisions for the reason that our cases have never been indexed to reflect confessions, and the volume of case files makes it impractical to ascertain the number by a count at this time. However, by estimate only, we guess that whereas about one fourth of our cases previously had admissible confessions, we now have about fifteen per cent with admissible confessions.

We have not felt the impact of the decisions as have other jurisdictions because Texas has had a much less liberal rule regarding admissibility than have the other states and the Federal Jurisdiction. Let me explain the Texas situation in the hope that it will be of aid to you in drafting new legislation.

From about 1906 to January 1, 1966 our Code required that before a confession taken from a person under arrest became admissible, the State show that the confession be in writing and voluntarily signed by the defendant after he was warned (1) that he need not make any statement, and (2) that any statement he made would be used in evidence against him. The only circumstances permitting an oral confession in evidence were those situations where the defendant's oral statement led to the recovery of the fruits of a crime or the instrumentality of the crime.

This law prevented an officer testifying to conversations with a defendant unless the conversation resulted in a proper written confession or the recovery of the crime weapon or fruits of the crime. We felt that while our law was more restricting to the prosecution than that of other jurisdictions, it was fair to the defendant, workable, and not subject to the criticism that officers "made up" the confession.

Since January 1, 1966 our Code has required that before a confession be admissible, that the defendant be given a warning by a magistrate prior to the officer's warning, as before.

Set out below are the present Code provisions relating to confessions:

"Art. 15.17 Duties of arresting officer and magistrate—In each case enumerated in this Code, the person making the arrest shall immediately take the person arrested before some magistrate of the county where the accused was arrested. The magistrate shall inform the person arrested of the accusation against him and of any affidavit filed therewith, of his right to retain counsel of his right to request the appointment of counsel if he is unable to obtain counsel, and of his right to have an examining trial. He shall also inform the person arrested that he is not required to make a statement and that any statement made by him may be used against him. The magistrate shall allow the person arrested reasonable time and opportunity to consult counsel and shall admit the person arrested to bail if allowed by law.

"Art. 38.22 (727) (810) (790) When confession shall not be used—(a) The confession shall not be admissible if the defendant was in jail or other place of confinement or in the custody of an officer at the time it was made, unless:

"1. It be shown to be the voluntary statement of the accused taken before an examining court in accordance with law, or

"2. It be made in writing and signed by the accused and shows that the accused has at some time prior to the making thereof received the warning provided in Article 15.17. It must further show the time, date, place and name of the magistrate who administered the warning. It must further show that the person to whom the confession is made warned the accused: First, that he does not have to make any statement at all. Second, that any statement made by him may be used in evidence against him on his trial for the offense concerning which the confession is therein made, or

"3. In connection with said confession he makes statement of facts or circumstances that are found to be true, which conduce to establish his guilt, such as the finding of secreted or stolen property, or the instrument with which he states the offense was committed, such statement shall not be admitted in evidence, unless it is witnessed by some person other than a peace officer, who shall sign the same as a witness.

"(b) If the confession or statement has been found to have been voluntarily made and held admissible as a matter of law and fact by the court in a hearing in the absence of the jury, he shall enter an order stating his findings which shall be filed among the papers of the cause but not exhibited to the jury.

"Only thereafter may evidence pertaining to such matter be submitted to the jury and it shall be instructed that unless the jury believes beyond a reasonable doubt that such confession or statement was voluntarily made, the jury shall not consider such statement or confession for any purpose nor any evidence obtained as a result thereof.

"(c) When the issue is raised by the evidence, the trial judge shall appropriately instruct the jury, generally, on the law pertaining to such statement or confession."

The various law enforcement associations are proposing that the law be amended to in effect "scrap" our existing confession law and follow the Federal procedures by enacting the following:

"Art. 38.21 Confessions; Admissibility—The confession of a defendant may be admitted in evidence against him under the same conditions as governed the admissibility of confessions under the United States Constitution and the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure as interpreted by the United States Supreme Court."

May we suggest that a bill incorporating the features of our law plus the requirement that the defendant be advised of his right to retain or appointed counsel would be workable and also satisfy the requirements of *Miranda*, perhaps to the effect that: No confession taken of a defendant under arrest will be admitted into evidence until it has been shown to the court that the defendant was (1) advised of the accusation against him (2) advised of his right to remain silent (3) advised of his right to retained or appointed counsel prior to or during the taking of the confession (4) advised he need not make any statement at all and that (5) any statement made by him would be used in evidence against him and that thereafter (6) the statement was reduced to writing and (7) voluntarily signed by the defendant. Also, the law should provide for the admissibility of oral confessions where same resulted in the recovery of the fruits of the crime or the instrumentality of a crime.

The requirement that a confession be in writing is apparently no obstacle to the taking of confessions. The *Miranda* requirements are an obstacle. The language of the court to the effect that the court assumes that the prosecution was wrong and has the burden of proving that defendant was not overreached is an intolerable burden. Also the *Miranda* opinion states that silence is not a waiver of right to counsel. New legislation should provide that a defendant may waive his right to counsel, or any other right, if such waiver be in writing and made before a magistrate.

We appreciate your interest in this matter of so great importance to the prosecution. We are disturbed by reports that some of the Federal Judges have said that within the next five years no confessions will be admissible into evidence. Perhaps your efforts will save this portion of the law of evidence. We feel that confessions, if properly taken, are of great probative value. Not only are some crimes impossible to prove without confessions, and thus the criminal go unpunished if his confession is not admitted, but the Supreme Court overlooks the psychological compulsion of the guilty to confess.

Please call on us if we may be of any assistance to you in any matter.

Very truly yours,
HENRY WADE,
Criminal District Attorney.

OFFICE OF THE
MARICOPA COUNTY ATTORNEY,
Phoenix, Ariz., December 8, 1966.
Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: In answer to your letter of November 21, 1966, regarding the *Miranda* decision, first let me apologize for this tardy reply.

We, like other jurisdictions, have felt the impact of this decision, especially so, since the *Miranda* case arose here in Maricopa County. Results are shown by the number of cases we have had that were either dismissed or reduced to a lesser charge. Many possible defendants request attorneys and the police are unable to interrogate, thereby affecting the number of cases they are able to file. In the matter of statistics, however, we cannot furnish you with an exact number either from our own files or those of the police.

To the best of my knowledge Arizona has not and is not planning any legislation directed toward the *Miranda* decision since that decision is now the law of the land. We feel that any change would have to come from a jurisdiction superior to our own.

I really wish we could be of more help to you. I strongly feel that society is not getting the protection it is entitled to; that all the law, the last five years, has offered protection to the criminal, enabling him to return to the streets and continue his crimes.

I wish you every success in your efforts to relieve the situation. It would be helpful, not only to the prosecuting attorneys, but to the police as well.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT K. CORBIN,
County Attorney.

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY,
THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT,
Albuquerque, N. Mex., December 6, 1966.
Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: Thank you for your letter dated November 21, 1966, inquiring as to what effect the Miranda and

Escobedo decisions have had in this jurisdiction. We have not kept any statistics as to the effect on the same, although we have dismissed numerous cases because of these recent decisions. We will in the future keep statistics on investigation of major crimes which cannot be prosecuted because of the proscription laid down in the recent decisions.

We have proposed certain changes to our State Legislature in an effort to aid the law enforcement officer in other areas of the law not touched by the Miranda and Escobedo decisions. My staff joins me in the feeling that in the face of these recent decisions, legislation cannot wipe out the effects of such decisions. We are of the opinion that a change in the complexion of the State Supreme Court would be more beneficial than legislation which might have doubtful constitutional plausibility. I agree with the feeling of Eugene H. Methvin whose article appears in the recent *Reader's Digest* and is entitled "Let's Have Justice for the Non-Criminals, Too!"

My staff joins me in commending you for your continued efforts in combating crime as evidenced by your hearings on the subject.

Very truly yours,
Alexander F. Sceresse,
District Attorney.

State of West Virginia,
Office of the Attorney General,
Charleston, W. Va., December 7, 1966.
Hon. John L. McClellan,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: This is in reply to your letter of November 21, 1966, relating to the possibility of introducing legislation in Congress which would limit the affect of *Miranda v. Arizona,* 384 U.S. 436. In connection with *Miranda,* I call attention to *Lisenba v. California,* 314 U.S. 219–243, 86 L. Ed. 166, decided December 8, 1941, in which the court said that the court left the state "free to adopt, by statute or decision, and to enforce such rule as she elects, whether it conform to that applied in the federal or in other state courts. But the adoption of the rule of her choice cannot foreclose inquiry as to whether, in a given case, the application of that rule works a deprivation of the prisoner's life or liberty without due process of law."

I have considered this opinion in connection with what the court said in *Miranda* with regard to the state's search of effective ways of protecting the rights of individuals while promoting the efficient enforcement of its criminal laws. In reading what the Supreme Court has said in the two cases, I get the impression that the Supreme Court is, in effect, saying that the states may prescribe their own standards but these standards must equal those prescribed by the United States Supreme Court. In *Lisenba* the court intimated that they could develop their own standards in order to promote a harmonious relationship between Federal and state courts but, apparently, what they meant was "agree with us and we will have harmony in this relationship; otherwise, our decisions will prevail."

In view of the fact that a federal rule of evidence requires that a federal prisoner be taken immediately before the commissioner and if not, any confession made is excluded, is not based upon the constitutional ground but an evidentiary rule, I believe that Senate Bill 2578 would be of assistance in the trial of cases in the Federal Courts. A state statute along the same line might be upheld by the United States Supreme Court, but it will apparently be necessary, if the five members continue to dominate the court, to change the Fifth and Sixth Amendments to the United States Constitution in order to soften the blow struck by *Miranda v. Arizona.*

It is a well known fact that many of our worst crimes are committed under the cloak of darkness and if confessions are not obtained, convictions will seldom be had in such cases, and this means that many of our more dangerous criminals will escape punishment. Perhaps when the records reveal the impossibility of obtaining convictions in a great many serious cases, the court will then realize that it has gone too far away from what would be a proper balance in protecting the rights of the prisoner and the rights of society.

Very truly yours,
C. Donald Robertson,
Attorney General.

Office of the County Attorney,
Pima County,
Tucson, Ariz., December 2, 1966.
Hon. John L. McClellan,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator McClellan: I was very pleased to receive your inquiry on *Miranda.* Something should be done; I am glad to see that *you* are actually out to do it.

Unfortunately I have no set of statistics or obvious miscarriages of justice. I estimate that of the cases my office prosecuted last year 5% to 10% rested entirely upon confessions for a verdict; without confessions in these cases we would not have been able to prosecute. There is no doubt in my mind that we will get fewer confessions than before and thus solve fewer crimes and secure fewer convictions. Lamentable, but, I believe, definitely true.

Since *Miranda* our practice has been to have every law enforcement officer carry a card with the *Miranda* rights. This is read to everyone, including those stopped for traffic offenses. The response has been mixed. However, it does enable us to abide by *Miranda.* One noticeable effect is that a recital of these rights to a suspect actually "persuades" some not to talk. I inclose a card for your perusal.

I am very interested in "S. 2578", and will help in any way possible.

Yours very sincerely,
William J. Schafer III,
Pima County Attorney.

State of Florida, Office of the State Attorney, 13th Judicial Circuit,
Tampa, Fla., January 13, 1967.
Hon. John L. McClellan,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator McClellan: Let me first apologize for the delay of your inquiry dated November 21, 1966, but I was recently involved in a lengthy trial and could not find time to answer my correspondence.

In response to your inquiry let me say that this office has been unable to keep any definite statistics concerning the Miranda decision since it is most difficult to determine whether a conviction or failure of conviction in any given case occurs because of a confession alone, without considering the other evidence in the trial. However, we have come to the conclusion that the Miranda decision has greatly hampered law enforcement for the following reasons:

1. The decision requires that a constitutional warning be given to the suspect while in custody or *when his freedom of action is otherwise significantly restrained.* As of this date, I am unaware of any decision that clarifies the meaning of the underlined words. It has been difficult for attorneys; to say the least, police officers, to understand the meaning of the underlined words. In view of this language in the Miranda decision, it would appear that if a police officer requests witnesses to remain at a location so that he might interview them, that if one of the witnesses utters a spontaneous statement admitting the offense it might be inadmissible.

In one trial in our jurisdiction a spontaneous admission, although allowed by Miranda, was disallowed by the court where the officer, pursuant to a question, testified that the defendant was a prime suspect. The defendant was not yet arrested. Miranda says that what was meant in Escobedo by a prime suspect is one who is in custody or whose freedom of action has been significantly restrained. However, there appears to be a confusion among the members of the Bar and Judiciary as to what is meant as one can be a prime suspect and not be in custody and vice versa.

2. The Miranda decision requires an intelligent affirmative waiver of the right to have an Attorney present during the interview or to consult with one prior thereto. Without a doubt, the biggest difficulty that I have found time and time again with police officers and Attorneys is convincing them that the suspect must affirmatively waive his right to an Attorney; that the warning followed closely by a statement without an expressed affirmative waiver is insufficient.

3. In at least one instance, I have found the Miranda decision to have hampered police officers in *clearing* a suspect. Police officers are so reluctant to talk to suspects for fear that it may have an effect on the trial that in one instance a man was arrested and charged by the officers with a breaking and entering. They would not talk to the suspect to find out what he was doing at the premises. Subsequent investigation by this office disclosed that the man was merely attempting to obtain his lawn mower which he had left at the premises. The repairman had closed up shop and left the State. Although the suspect did not use good judgment there was no criminal intent. The officers would have easily been led to the truth if they had questioned him.

Trusting that this letter amply answers your inquiry, I remain,

Sincerely yours,
Paul Antinori, Jr.,
State Attorney.

Vanderburgh County Prosecuting Attorney, First Judicial Circuit,
Evansville, Ind., December 2, 1966.
Hon. John L. McClellan,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: O. H. Roberts, Jr., is presently in the hospital and has turned your letter over to me for reply. It is good to hear that you are working in this field as I am a great believer that the rights of victims are just as important as the rights of defendants. The Miranda case and similar cases have had a bad impact I feel. In police work I fear that these cases have had a psychological effect which has made many policemen defensive-minded and cautious which in many instances slows an investigation and possibly allows a guilty person to go free. I work with policemen quite a bit and it is easy to detect the psychological impact these cases have had upon them. I doubt whether these cases will change police procedures, but many policemen feel the courts are taking a slap at the police as a group.

In the field of reduced sentencing, I recently handled a case where the defendant was charged with first degree murder and the only evidence was that he was seen leaving the decedent's apartment. Later he gave a statement claiming the decedent attacked him and he left the room and picked up an iron and returned and killed the decedent thinking this was self-defense. We allowed the defendant to plead guilty to manslaughter in this case partly because if the statement would be knocked out under the Miranda rules, we would have no case at all. I definitely feel there are numerous cases which are reduced because of the Miranda decision and the doubt which now exists as to whether any confession will be admitted.

We do not keep statistics here in the office and I doubt whether the statistics would show directly the effect of the Miranda case. To have effective law enforcement, I feel that it is necessary to keep the police morale at a high level and eliminate confusion and uncertainty in the law. I feel that the Miranda decision is detrimental in both of these areas.

Very truly yours,
JAMES L. KIELY,
Deputy Prosecutor.

NATIONAL DISTRICT ATTORNEYS
ASSOCIATION FOUNDATION,
Miami, Fla., November 14, 1966.
The READER'S DIGEST,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. PINTCHMAN: I have read an article written for Reader's Digest by Eugene H. Methvin entitled "Let's Have Justice for Non-Criminals, Too!" and I consider this article to be an excellent analysis of the problems confronting prosecutors and police as a result of the recent Miranda decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

In criminal cases, the accused has all the advantages. In a criminal trial the defendant does not have to inform the State, before or during trial, or any time, of the nature of his defense nor divulge any of his evidence; he does not have to take the witness stand and no unfavorable inference can be drawn therefrom; he can be convicted only if the State proves his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt; he is presumed to be innocent no matter how many serious crimes he may have committed; if he has never been convicted of a crime he can place in evidence his good reputation and that alone can result in his acquittal. Finally, he cannot be convicted unless all of the jurors find him guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. If, in addition to all of these advantages, a defendant is also granted the advantage of having an attorney at his side from the moment of his arrest until the consummation of his trial, then convictions in criminal cases will become rare indeed. As Mr. Methvin indicates, it seems that we have overlooked the principle that society, as well as the individual defendant, is entitled to a fair trial.

For the foregoing reasons, I believe that Mr. Methvin's article should be given serious scrutiny by all law enforcement officials throughout the United States.

Very truly yours,
RICHARD E. GERSTEIN,
President.

OFFICE OF DISTRICT ATTORNEY,
FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT, CADDO
PARISH, LA.,
Shreveport, La., December 1, 1966.
Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you very much for your letter of November 21, 1966.

Needless to say, I am very familiar with the *Miranda* decision which was handled by a one vote majority by the Federal Supreme Court.

This decision has caused, and will continue to cause, a constant number of problems in effective law enforcement. Before giving you a definite answer to your letter, in which I am greatly interested, I wish to discuss this matter with the Attorneys on my staff and some of the Police Officials. But please be assured that I will answer in detail in the very near future.

In the meantime I earnestly request that you read the enclosed reprint of an article published in the December 1966 issue of the Reader's Digest. It will only take about seven minutes. Not only do I agree with almost everything set forth in the article but also I feel that it contains much "food for thought" and may lead us to some solution.

Thank you again and with best personal regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,
JOHN A. RICHARDSON,
District Attorney.

OFFICE OF THE PROSECUTING ATTORNEY,
Columbus, Ohio, November 29, 1966.
Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your letter of November 21, 1966 in which you express your intention to institute legislation to overcome the fantastic problems confronted by prosecuting attorneys and law officers by reason of the United States Supreme Court's decision in the *Miranda* case, *McNabb* case, *Mallory* case, and others creating a bevy of newly established constitutional rights.

Your bill, S. 2578, is well conceived and should be passed by both Houses of Congress. Something must be done to circumvent the unbelievable difficulties now confronting law officers and prosecutors in attempting to halt the spiraling increase in crime throughout our nation. In my opinion, your bill is an excellent step forward in meeting this problem. It is both fair to the accused and practical to enforce.

As the prosecutor of a county of approximately 800,000 people I speak with direct knowledge of how some of these decisions are hampering law enforcement. Particularly troublesome is the doctrine of the *Escobedo* case which was solidified and expanded upon in the *Miranda* decision. Members of my staff and I have had the personal experience of witnessing and actually giving the *Miranda* warnings and having the defendant ask for an appointed attorney, and then having the defendant tell in detail his part in the commission of 1st degree murder, rape, armed robbery and other serious offenses. These confessions and exculpatory statements in every instance were made without duress, force, false promises, hope of pardon or trickery of any kind. Yet, these confessions are no longer admissible in evidence.

Several weeks ago we lost a first degree murder trial because all of our case was based on a defendant's freely given confession and statements of where the murder weapon (a shot gun) could be found. Scientific tests proved that this was the gun used in committing the crime. However, because of the United States Supreme Court's "fruits of the poison tree doctrine", the gun was not admissible in evidence and, of course, because of the *Miranda* case the confession was not admissible for the reason that certain warnings were not given prior to the confession. This case was covered in Life Magazine.

Statistics in my office file disclose that in the year 1962 out of approximately 1100 felony cases processed there were confessions or exculpatory statements made in 82 per cent of these cases in which there was a conviction. Of course, there is no way of knowing how many of the defendants would have been convicted without these statements. Suffice it to say, if these cases were tried today many of them would be lost because of recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court.

It is my opinion that the United States Supreme Court majority in the *Miranda* case has greatly exceeded the clear meaning of the 5th Amendment to the United States Constitution. Something must be done to circumvent this problem. Therefore, if I may be of any help to you or your committee, either in testimony before your committee, or otherwise please do not hesitate to call upon the services of my office at any time.

Yours very truly,
C. HOWARD JOHNSON,
Prosecuting Attorney.

HOUSTON, TEX.,
November 28, 1966.
Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: Thank you for your letter concerning the proposed legislation dealing with confessions. Last February 1st, I became the District Attorney of Harris County (having replaced Mr. Frank Briscoe). Therefore, I am taking the liberty of answering your letter.

Since the decision in the Miranda case, there has been a noticeable decline in the number of confessions. Despite requests for accurate statistics to support this proposition, it is my opinion that two major factors preclude a reliable comparison of the pre-Miranda and post-Miranda confessions.

First, how can we judge whether a person would have confessed had it not been for the stringent requirements of the Miranda case? Secondly, insufficient time has elapsed to present any type of a reliable statistical survey. In my opinion, the only proper study would be to compare the number of confessions obtained to the number of offenses committed for both post and pre-Miranda times. These figures would give us only a rough idea, but would present the truest picture. This is because many potential cases or indictments never come into existence now, where the confession would be the only substantive evidence connecting the defendant to the crime.

Despite the lack of figures, it can unequivocably be stated the Miranda case has hampered the administration of justice and law enforcement. Our office has dismissed numerous felonies, including murder cases, where the defendant had made a written confession. The confession would have been inadmissable if presented in Court because of a lack of an affirmative waiver of a lawyer. There was no way this requirement could have been logically anticipated by any investigating officers under the past criterion of the Supreme Court.

We have had numerous instances where the police could have easily obtained a statement under the previous rulings but not under Miranda. The Miranda case is particularly damaging in the State of Texas because our own Code of Criminal Procedure requires any confession to be in writing.

The entire situation is absurd. I am enclosing an editorial from The Houston Post you should find most interesting. Although I favor your legislation, the Supreme Court may well overturn this statute on the basis of the right against self incrimination and/or right to counsel. The Miranda case is living proof that the original intent of the framers of the Constitution is of little consequence. Perhaps the only sure way of allowing the police to search for the truth and question a suspect or witness is to do away with the right against self incrimination. To many this would be the destruction of a doctrine as sacred as God, Country, and Motherhood. However, it is doubtful any intelligent philosopher could ascertain the existence of a sound underlying reason to justify its retention—particularly if we consider how this handicaps our search for the truth.

Statements from an accused are a very important and integral part of the administration of justice. One of the biggest misconceptions concerning evidence in criminal cases is that certain people believe that the gap left open by lack of statements can be closed through the use of scientific evidence. In the first place, scientific evidence very often comes about because of some admission of an accused person. For example, how can the police laboratory determine that the fatal bullet came from a certain weapon unless some suspect has first told the police the whereabouts of the weapon. Under the decision in the Miranda case, the gun and the comparison tests would not be admissible in evidence regardless of what the accused said unless the many requirements of Miranda had been met. In brief, confessions are very important. As one who has prosecuted hundreds of contested criminal cases to juries, I had much rather be on with a confession that had been obtained from one of our reliable law enforcement officers than have an eye witness who identifies a person he had never seen before, except for a few fleeting seconds during the commission of an offense.

In closing let me compliment you on your concern and your offer of positive legislative help. If something is not done, in the words of Justices White, Harlan and Stewart, the Miranda decision will continue "To represent poor Constitutional Law and entail harmful consequences for the country at large".

Sincerely,

CAROL S. VANCE,
District Attorney, Harris County, Tex.

[From the Houston Post, Oct. 8, 1966]

CAPOTE ON CONFESSIONS

Truman Capote's masterpiece, "In Cold Blood," now appearing in a series of 18 installments in the Houston Post, presents a grimly etched portrait of two inhuman young monsters who murdered the Clutter family in Holcomb, Kan., on Nov. 15, 1959, later confessed and were hanged for the crime.

Capote wrote his book before the United States Supreme Court's recent decision in the Miranda case requiring that suspects not only be advised of their right to counsel, but that they be furnished counsel free, if unable to afford a lawyer, and that the counsel be permitted to sit in during police interrogation.

For six years Capote researched his book before writing it. He said he became "the closest friend and confidant" of Richard Eugene Hickock and Perry Edward Smith, the criminals who savagely slaughtered the four members of the Clutter family.

Citing from his own experience as a writer on crime and the criminal mind, Capote made some interesting statements before the Senate Constitutional Rights subcommittee last summer.

"In the Clutter case—as in many others—the murders would have gone scot free had it not been for their confession to the crime," Capote testified.

Had the Supreme Court decision been in effect at the time of the Clutter murders, Hickock and Smith would have gotten a lawyer and "never have said anything," Capote testified.

"Any lawyer worth his salt would have advised the boys to say nothing," Capote told the senators. "Had they said nothing, they would not have even been brought to trial, much less convicted."

Had they been set free, they would have "killed again and followed a life of crime," Capote testified. "I have never met an innocent man who has confessed to a crime he did not commit. I have never met a murderer who would willingly confess to his crime with the protection guaranteed by the Miranda decision.

"While many in our society today are wailing about the right of the criminal suspect, why do they seem to totally ignore the rights of the victims and potential victims?"

An articulate voice of dissent, Capote referred to the case of the eight nurses murdered in Chicago and the subsequent arrest of a tattooed seaman.

"It seems to me almost unbelievable that the police force of one of our major cities is frightened to ask the prime suspect a single question for fear that their case against him might be jeopardized," Capote testified.

"This is almost like 'Alice in Wonderland,' and I deplore it. It can only lead to situations in which the losers are the helpless, the unwary, the innocent."

England, which has furnished the model for so many American laws, is also in the midst of a controversy over police questioning of criminal suspects. Only there the demand is not to limit but to enlarge the right of officers of the law to interrogate suspected criminals.

Crime has become big business in Britain, with indictable offenses having passed the one-million mark. Once a nation where the police were respected as protectors of the public rather than enforcers of the law, the British are fighting a modern crime wave where the guns of the underworld are proving more than a match for the night sticks of the bobbies.

The director of public prosecutions has urged that suspects should be required to answer police questions and defendants ordered to testify at their trials or face the consequences of adverse comment to the jury on their silence.

One of Britain's most respected lawyers, Sir Hartley Shawcross, who is now Lord Shawcross, urged in a talk on TV: ". . . suspects ought to be required to answer questions put to them by the police in investigating a crime and in searching for the truth. I don't believe there is any kind of ethical foundation for this rule about suspects not being required to incriminate themselves. Why shouldn't they be?"

Sir John Foster, a distinguished lawyer, added his voice to Lord Shawcross': "I'd like to see the rule against self-incrimination abolished. That's the same as the Fifth Amendment in America. I'd like it to be said to an accused person—it's your duty to help the police, it's your duty to answer the questions."

What will come of this remains to be seen, on either side of the Atlantic, but it is interesting to see our British cousins reacting to a situation that has stirred up many thoughtful people in America.

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO,
OFFICE OF DISTRICT ATTORNEY,
San Diego, Calif., February 21, 1967.

Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: Thank you very much for your letter and enclosures of February 10, 1967.

I am heartily in accord with your remarks in the United States Senate and with your views of the very real need for legislation such as proposed by Senate Bills 674, 675, and 678, as well as legislation which will deny Federal courts, including the Supreme Court, jurisdiction to reverse judgments of convictions in State courts which are based in whole or in part upon confessions voluntarily given.

You and the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures and the Committee on the Judiciary are performing a truly great service to our country and to the law-abiding citizens by your efforts to provide the weapons and the means by which law enforcement can carry out its duty of protecting our people and combatting the tremendous menace of crime rampant across the nation.

You have my every wish and prayer for complete success in your legislative program.

Thank you for requesting my views.

Sincerely,

JAMES DON KELLER,
District Attorney.

POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Phillipsburg, N.J., February 23, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I welcome your concern of recent Supreme Court decisions. It is hard to conceive just how the Miranda Supreme Court decision has shackled the efficiency and performance of police work.

While pursuing our obligation to preserve life and property, we are in turn very concerned with the rights of every citizen, being ourselves citizens and a member of the same society.

Our concern over the known criminal element walking free in our cities and towns has caused great dismay to every policeman dedicated to his career and his obligations to the people he serves.

It is with great hope that you, Senator, will be one of the first pioneers to make this Miranda decision more flexible in the name of every American citizen who cries out for the pursuit of happiness and the absence of fear in walking the streets of our nation.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. BUDD,
Chief of Police.

POLICE DEPARTMENT,
CITY OF NEW BOSTON,
Scioto County, Ohio, February 23, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedure, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Miranda decision is a great deterrent to effective law enforcement. I feel that the law-abiding citizens of our great country should be able to expect and receive better protection from those who commit crimes than the Miranda decision permits.

Respectfully yours,

RUSSELL IMES,
Chief of Police.

CITY OF ORLANDO,
OFFICE OF CHIEF OF POLICE,
Orlando, Fla., February 23, 1967.

Hon. JOHN MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: We have a very timely memorandum from our Executive Director, Mr. Quinn Tamm concerning the very immature decisions made by the Supreme Court, adversely affecting Law Enforcement. These, of course, being the Mapps, Mallory, Jencks, Miranda, Escobedo and the more recent extension of the Escobedo Decision.

As a member of the Law Enforcement profession, with almost forty years experience in this field, I am truly amazed by the decisions in the above cases, along with others that have handcuffed the Police throughout our nation.

We, here in our city, have an organization of five people who have been speaking to church groups and other organizations for the past year, trying to enlighten them with the bare facts and not nebulous intangibles. It is believed that we have made some progress in this direction and we will continue to make our presentations and appearances as long as we feel that the desired and ultimate goal can be reached.

It is absolutely nauseating to see the direct result of these decisions, public apathy; complacency: and failure of our parents to assume their God Given Responsibilities. We have too many houses and not enough homes in our nation today.

Then, of course, we shouldn't overlook these so-called do-gooders who are slobbering over these "so-called unfortunate individuals" in a vain effort to find excuses for their senseless transgressions.

It is my firm belief that unless the decent law-abiding Americans, which compromise aproximately ninety percent of our population, stand up and be counted as tried and true Americans, the other ten percent, which give us ninety percent of our trouble, will be dictating policies and procedures for our guidance in the future.

Maybe, Sir, my words may be a little strong, but they describe my convictions most thoroughly.

If there is anything we can do here to assist you in your wonderful undertakings, please advise.

Kindest personal regards and very best wishes.

Sincerely,

CARLISLE JOHNSTONE,
Chief of Police.

NEW JERSEY ARMORED CAR SERVICE, INC.,
Pleasantville, N.J., February 24, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: I regard with dismay recent and not so recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions which prevent law enforcement agencies from protecting us from the murderer, rapist, robber and knife wielder.

The recent release in Brooklyn, N.Y., of a confessed murderer who destroyed his wife and 5 children and walked away a free man is a case in point. How can this be possible? Daily our newspapers carry items of criminals being set free to continue their depredations of plunder and ravage.

Please do your best to nullify these bad U.S. Supreme Court decisions and as a member of the International Association of Chiefs of Police I can vouch that we are 100% behind you.

Respectfully yours,

ERNEST O. SCHEYDER.

DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,
Kirkwood, Mo., February 23, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCCLELLAN: I wish to thank you very much for introducing Senate Bill 674 which would amend Title 18 of the U.S. Code.

In the face of the many recent Supreme Court decisions that directly affect the ability of the police to serve the public, it occurs to me that we need new rules such as the one that you propose. I think too that it might be nice if it could be legislated into being that our courts recognize a certain amount of error or mis-judgment on the part of police when cases are presented for adjudication. In any event, the bill that you have proposed would certainly go a long way to assist us in law enforcement.

Thank you very much.

Yours truly,

MAX A. DURBIN,
Chief of Police.

CITY OF RALEIGH, N.C.,
February 22, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: I am sure that I only speak the sentiment of all law enforcement officers that we appreciate your and Senator Ervin's efforts to assist law enforcement officers to do their job. Recent Supreme Court decisions have handicapped us to some extent and the situation certainly needs clarifying. I believe that our people should have enough confidence in the great majority of their law enforcement agencies to trust them with the tools needed to do an acceptable job in protecting the lives, rights and property of those same people.

Best wishes to you and if either I or this department may serve you in any way, I assure you it shall be done to the best of our ability.

Sincerely,

TOM DAVIS,
Chief of Police.

POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Ringtown, Pa., February 23, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The recent Supreme Court decisions favoring the criminals at the expense of our citizens is shameful. Chief Justice Warren has set law enforcement back a hundred years. His fifth deciding vote has made it well nigh impossible to punish the guilty criminal element. The innocent public, police who are ham-strung in trying to perform their duties, judges whose hands are tied in deciding a case, all these are practically at the mercy of any person who decides to commit a criminal act.

I never arrested, or tried to convict an innocent man. To-day I fear making an arrest because of the loopholes expressly put into the law by the courts to aid a criminal to avoid paying the penalty for his misdeeds.

I am so disgusted with what we have to contend with in law enforcement since the U.S. Supreme Court saw fit to so recklessly interpret the law to benefit lawbreakers, to misinterpret the will of our law makers, that I am resigning my position as chief of police, effective 31 December, 1967.

Sincerely yours,

J. J. KENNEDY, Jr.
Chief of Police.

DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,
Danbury, Conn., February 23, 1967.

Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: First, let me tell you how happy I am that you are the Chairman of this very important Committee, also that you are such an outstanding member of the Democratic party.

It is with a deep feeling of respect and admiration for you that I ask that you do everything within your power to have S. 674, which will amend Title #18, U.S. Code, with respect to the admissibility in evidence of confessions.

All police departments are having a very difficult time in recruiting men to the departments and it is all due to the decisions which have been handed down by the Supreme Court.

With all due respect to this fine group of men, it is a general feeling that an age limit should be set for the members of this august body.

With every best wish and trust the good lord will bless you with continued health so that you can serve your country for some period of time.

Sincerely,

J. HOWARD MCGOLDRICK,
Chief of Police.

EXHIBIT 4

[From the New York Times, Feb. 23, 1967]

MURDERERS AT LARGE

When the confessed murderer of his wife and five children has to be freed under the rules laid down by the United States Supreme Court—the fourth dismissal of murder charges against confessed slayers here in recent weeks—the instinctive, inevitable and right community reaction is one of outrage and apprehension.

Unquestionably, the release of these killers and of others in other cities will build up support for a proposed constitutional amendment to allow the police and the courts much greater latitude in interrogations and the use of confessions. That proposal got impressive support last week from seven of the nineteen members of the President's Commission on Law Enforcment, among them three past presidents of the American Bar Association.

Our own belief is that the amendment would be a bad answer to a bad problem—or, more accurately, two bad problems. The first is involved in most of the confessions that are currently being thrown out of court, and it is one for which time will very quickly provide its own effective solution.

These confessions fall into a twilight zone that unpredictably blanketed defendants under charges and awaiting trial when the Supreme Court decided the landmark Miranda case last June. In an unusual—and, in our judgment, unwise—protective innovation, the Court applied retroactively to these defendants its mandate for notice to all newly arrested suspects of their right to counsel.

The result has been that confessions validly taken before June under the court precedents then in effect have become worthless, and there is often no other basis on which to convict men like the confessed slayer of six. It would seem axiomatic that such a man required psychiatric institutionalization, but lengthy examination pronounced him sane. Mental institutions cannot be used as substitutes for jails in such circumstances; the unanswered question is, what can?

Since June, however, the police in New York and elsewhere have known the new rules and presumably are living by them in obtaining confessions that will stand up in court. That brings up the second and more basic problem: Do the rules themselves go so far in protecting the civil liberties of prisoners that they leave society defenseless?

We think the Supreme Court was on sound ground in the 1964 decision that laid the foundation for the Miranda case. "No system of criminal justice can or should survive if it comes to depend for its continued effectiveness on the citizens' abdication through unawareness of their constitutional rights," the Court majority declared.

The community will survive—and so will American liberties—if it accepts only confessions given without coercion and with full knowledge by the suspect of his right to have a lawyer. What worries us is not that the present rules are too stringent but that serveral of the Court's rulings have indicated a belief on the part of some justices that all confessions should be barred as invasions of the individual's constitutional protection against self-incrimination.

The current cases—and particularly the one this week—have made it plain that there are many instances in which confession represents the only way to obtain a conviction of the guilty. It would be an act of supreme judicial irresponsibility toward society to extend the present valid rules to the point where even freely given confessions were unusable as evidence.

EXHIBIT 5

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 21, 1967]

NATIONAL CRIME REPORT AS A WHOLE FALLS SHORT

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Sunday's report of the National Crime Commission contains so much that is good and wise and constructive that one gropes uncertainly to explain just why the report as a whole falls short. It is a matter of tone, of emphasis, of attitude. A feeling will not go away that the commission's staff talked with too many sociologists, and not with nearly enough cops.

The report emerges as a textbook, indeed, it is set in the double-column design, complete with largely useless photographs, familiar in every classroom. The approach is pedantic, professorial, antiseptic. The crime that is dissected in these statistical pages is a bloodless crime; all the passion has drained out; the outraged victims are embalmed in tabulated boxes.

Nowhere in the report—or almost nowhere—does the commission perceive any nexus between crime and punishment. The very word "punishment" seldom appears. Instead, the commission addresses itself chiefly to crime and "penalty," as if the consequence of crime somehow ranked with going down two, doubled, on a three-spade bid.

In only one brief portion of the 340-page report, if a fast first reading conveys an accurate impression, is there any strong suggestion that law-abiding people have rights that ought to be made secure. This is not even in the body of the report. It appears in a supplementary statement at the very end—and only seven of the 19 commissioners were willing to join in it.

As for the rest, the body of the report implies that law-abiding people are themselves largely to blame for the criminal sickness that afflicts society. They have failed "to motivate" the young hoodlum; they arouse temptation by leaving keys in unlocked cars; they suffer from petty thefts through their own carelessness in leaving their property lying around loose.

The report goes to some pains to belabor obvious truth, that "crime" covers a multitude of sins. It is obvious, and scarcely needed saying at any length, that tax evasion and rape at knife-point are quite different crimes, and require different procedures of law enforcement. The commission itself acknowledges that public concern is not directed at such offenses as bribery and violation of antitrust laws, but rather at crime in the streets. Yet the report's medical-school approach leaves us to contemplate the different fields of crime as no more than desiccated strains of staphylococci.

Doubtless there is something to be said for this laboratory view. Surely few persons would challenge some of the elementary correlations that are drawn in the commission's report. Slums breed crime, and crime breeds slums, and there is at least a reasonable hypothesis to be advanced that if we cure the slums, we cure the crime. But one wonders, all the same, if the commission's diagnosis is correctly drawn.

Society insists that "individuals are responsible for their actions," says the report, "and the criminal process operates on that assumption. However, society has not devised ways for ensuring that all its members have the ability to assume responsibility. It has let too many of them grow up untaught, unmotivated, unwanted . . ."

But nowhere does the report suggest that the prospect of swift and certain punishment may also be a useful weapon in the war upon crime.

These reservations having been expressed, it is only fair to say that much of the report, and especially those sections dealing with improvement in police procedures and with judicial reform, ought to command the sober attention of civic groups and bar associations across the country. One quite minor recommendation—that police boxes be lighted, unlocked and designated as emergency telephones—makes great good sense. A National Criminal Research Foundation and a National Criminal Justice Statistics Center probably could contribute significantly to better law enforcement. The commission's concept of "Youth Service Bureaus," located chiefly in slum areas, may be idealistic and it may duplicate other community services, but there is much merit in the idea of working effectively with disadvantaged youngsters before they turn to serious crime.

The figures compiled by the commission on the incidence of crime are as familiar as they are appalling. They need no recapitulation. What matters to the average citizen is not so much the abstract of statistical problem, or even the sociologists' long-range solution. His concern goes to the mugger, the rapist, the dope-crazed thief, the arrogant young punks who infest his streets. What can be done about them now? One of the commission's answers is to provide textbooks for slum schools that are written in slum English. Okay, okay. But what can be done tomorrow, next week, next month, to lock up the hoods and thieves?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator is to be commended on his continuing presentation of speeches with regard to the spiraling crime rate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Spong in the chair). The Senator's 10 minutes have expired.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator has called attention to the fact that there are many people in this country who disagree with the position taken by former Attorney General Katzenbach, to which position the Senator has referred. Is it not also true that among those people who disagree is ex-Supreme Court Justice Whittaker?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, indeed. I have read some of his comments, and in general I subscribe to what he has said.

It is tragic that officials in high, responsible positions of government are demonstrating an attitude which gives the general public the impression that they are lax in their concern about law enforcement in this country.

I say that most regretfully, but I believe that that impression is becoming prevalent throughout the country.

Why cannot Washington do something about it? That is the tone of my mail. Some letters we receive are resentful of this situation. Our citizens ask "Why can't you do something about it? They have a right to wonder about the matter, as one of the editorials I have read concluded:

> When the confessed murderer of his wife and five children has to be freed under the rules laid down by the United States Supreme Court—the fourth dismissal of murder charges against confessed slayers here in recent weeks—the instinctive, inevitable and right community action is one of outrage and apprehension.

That is not my statement. It is a statement contained in an editorial of the New York Times of February 23.

It is astounding for a man of Mr. Katzenbach's stature and experience—and in view of his position as Chairman of the President's Crime Commission—to make a statement that it is unutterable nonsense for anyone to assert that these 5-to-4 decisions are having an impact on the crime rate in this country. Mr. President, we all know that the decisions are compelling courts to turn loose known and confessed criminals every day. So it is certainly a problem of great concern.

It is astounding for a statement such as that to come from a man of his stature and ability and experience. I do not believe that what the newspaper printed in this editorial is unutterable nonsense. It was a factual editorial. People throughout the country are concerned.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Does the Senator not agree that former Justice Whittaker is a very competent authority in this field, and that Mr. Whittaker has repeatedly criticized certain recent decisions of the Supreme Court which, in his opinion, have hamstrung and placed restrictions on the police, and in this way have weighted the scales in favor of the criminal and against society?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not think that Justice Whittaker is speaking without knowledge, without experience, and without wisdom on the subject.

I believe for a person to say that criticism of these close Supreme Court decisions is unutterable nonsense certainly implies a reflection on the four members of the Supreme Court who do not agree with these decisions.

I merely wanted to make these few remarks today. I wish to completely disassociate my viewpoint with anything expressed or implied in the statement of Mr. Katzenbach and to state my surprise and disappointment that he would say that it is unutterable nonsense for the Senator to say, for me to say, or for the people of this country to say that the turning of these confessed criminals loose is contributing to the increasing crime rate in this country. I cannot say anything else. These decisions encourage crime. The criminal gets a feeling that "they will not do much with me if I get caught," and he takes his chance and continues his criminal pursuits with much less fear and likelihood of punishment for any crime he may commit, however heinous it may be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks that have been made by the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas.

Apparently there is a school of thought in this country—and at the moment it seems to be prevailing, not with regard to numbers, but certainly with regard to publicity—that one must ignore the obvious fact that certain recent Supreme Court decisions have indeed straitjacketed the police and made increasingly difficult the job of the police, and ignore the equally obvious fact that swift and sure punishment consonant in severity with the type and degree of the crime is a deterrent of crime.

These two facts were ignored in the President's messages on crime, both with respect to nationwide crime and crime in the District of Columbia. As long as we ignore these two facts—that Federal court decisions have been too lenient upon the criminal, and that swift and sure punishment is a deterrent to crime—we are going to see a continuing spiraling crime rate, regardless of the amount of money that is recommended and appropriated for dealing with the crime problem. More and more money is not the sole and complete answer in dealing with this growing problem, although many aspects of the problem can be dealt with if adequate funds are provided.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Yesterday we confirmed the nomination of a very distinguished and able young attorney as Attorney General. His illustrious father served on the Supreme Court, is a present member of it, and he has disagreed with the majority opinion in these cases.

At the time of his confirmation before the committee I expressed the hope that whoever might be appointed to succeed Justice Clark when he resigns, would be a person who shares the philosophies he has expressed in his dissenting opinions in a number of these 5-to-4 decisions. It would be my hope that his son, as Attorney General, as he weighs this problem, will decide to follow the wisdom of his father, and that he will follow in the footsteps of his father. I do hope that occurs.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial which was published in the Huntington, W. Va., Advertiser on February 27, 1967, entitled "Capital Jungles Examples for Coddlers of Criminals."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Capital Jungles Examples for Coddlers of Criminals

Members of President Johnson's crime commission who tended to put the blame for rising crime on poverty instead of Supreme Court-created legal loopholes should visit two areas of Washington's jungle.

Kenilworth and Congressional Heights across the Anacostia River have stores and housing developments wrecked by vandals, people living in fear of their lives and young incorrigibles from 6 to 18 thriving on thievery, looting and intimidation.

The areas are not slums such as Harlem in New York City or Watts in Los Angeles. The people are both white and colored, and the homes are those of middle-class citizens.

A recent issue of U.S. News & World Report told of conditions reported in a series of stories by The Washington Star.

Some of the stores and other business establishments have boarded up their windows and given up the struggle. Some have employed their own private guards.

There has been talk of organizing vigilante groups.

One difficulty is that people are afraid even to prefer charges against offenders or to appear and testify against those arrested.

Police say they can do little without the cooperation of parents and the victims of the criminals.

As long as such attitudes prevail, solution of the problem will remain difficult.

But as every experienced law enforcement officer knows, the invariable solution of such problems is a sufficiently strong police force to assure prompt arrest of all offenders and protection of those who prefer charges or testify against them.

Such lawless conditions develop almost invariably from the soft-hearted and soft-headed permissiveness of people and their government.

Police authorities in Washington warned when the Supreme Court freed Andrew Mallory of a confessed rape charge only because he had been held for seven and a half hours between his arrest and his arraignment that they would have trouble thereafter enforcing the law.

Minority members of the court also gave emphatic warnings of the effects of other decisions handicapping police in questioning prisoners.

The public in many places is now reaping the whirlwind as a harvest of the wind sown by the Supreme Court in unprecedented decisions throwing protections around vicious criminals.

Besides the shocking number of confessed murderers who have been released on court-created technicalities, the seriousness of decisions making questioning of criminals more difficult is emphasized by the statements of police that in the past about 70 per cent of serious crimes have been solved by confessions.

Court members who imagine police can cope with crime under the new handicaps should try questioning some of the thousands of professional criminals associated with the vicious Cosa Nostra.

Members of Congress who have blocked the submission of constitutional amendments relaxing these impossible restrictions upon police should also try living for a time in Kenilworth or Congressional Heights.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am delighted to have heard this discussion because it refreshed my memory of my purpose, to have printed in the Record, an editorial which was published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of February 17, 1967.

Among other things, the editorial states:

> Supreme Court rulings, making it more difficult to obtain convictions, tend to embolden the criminal and dishearten law enforcement authorities.

Mr. President, during my 10 years on the bench in Cleveland, I learned clearly that penalties had to be imposed on brazen criminals to deter others from following in the course of criminality.

If the argument which is being made that the creation of barriers to protect the criminal and the removal of barriers which protect the innocent is sound, then all the history of criminal jurisprudence and the matter of imposing penalties is wiped aside.

I join with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd] in their purpose to remove from the existing laws those prohibitions which provide for the protection of the criminal and disarm the public in its efforts to protect itself.

From time immemorial, voluntary confessions made by criminals were admissible in evidence. The Supreme Court has now stated that criminals have to be advised that they are entitled to a lawyer.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And must be provided with one.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And must be provided with one.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Before he can be questioned.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If that is not done, even though the confession is absolutely voluntary, it is inadmissible in evidence.

Mr. President, if we want to preserve this democracy, we have to preserve the supremacy of the law. Criminals should not be allowed to become supreme and overpower government, and overpower communities, and the citizens who live within them.

I subscribe completely to the view expressed in the editorial to which I have referred. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Climate Favors the Criminal

For all of their concentrated and expensive efforts to control crime, American cities are not winning the battle because of the uncanny combination of conditions that is helping rather than hindering those outside the law.

Cleveland is a prime example of this national trend.

The city had a stunning increase in crime last year, armed robberies having rocketed 59.4% and homicides reaching the record high of 155. All types of crime are on the increase but the gains in these two categories are shocking.

What is giving the criminal the advantage in his duel with the law?

The police force here, as in other cities, is undermanned and the recruitment outlook only can be described as dismal.

Crime-breeding conditions are being perpetuated and broadened by technological progress that is increasing the vast army of unemployables.

Supreme Court rulings, making it more difficult to obtain convictions, tend to embolden the criminal and dishearten law enforcement authorities.

Rehabilitation is restricted by lack of facilities and properly trained personnel.

Preventive programs often are undermined by withdrawal of funds, as happened to the Police Athletic League here which has been doing such excellent work in creating rapport between policemen and young people in the disadvantaged neighborhoods.

President Johnson, in his message to Congress on crime, recounted most of the conditions reacting in favor of the criminal and proposed steps to correct them. All the steps would cost vast sums of money.

As Cleveland figures and those for other major cities show, the crime problem is a crisis of great urgency and demands the earliest attention of Congress.

No matter what a nation may accomplish, it hardly can glow with pride while its streets are unsafe and its citizens are at the mercy of the criminal.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Supreme Court by strained reasoning of five of its members speaking for the majority against four for the minority has been with increasing frequency throwing safeguards around the criminal and removing the barriers of protection against the innocent victims of crime and the public.

Voluntary confessions made by an accused should not be barred from evidence on the tenuous grounds stated by the Supreme Court that an accused has not been told before he makes his statement that he is entitled to a lawyer, or on the grounds that an accused must be forthwith, without delay, brought before a judge, and that unless that is done, any statement which he makes must be presumed to have been obtained by coercion and is, therefore, inadmissible in evidence.

I will give my full support to a constitutional amendment that will make genuine voluntary confessions admissible in evidence without conformity by the law enforcement officers to the tenuous conditions declared necessary by the Supreme Court. If the objective of making voluntary confessions admissible in evidence can be achieved otherwise than by a constitutional amendment, I will support such a procedure.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio and the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for their remarks.

I wish to remind the Senate that next Tuesday the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures of the Committee on the Judiciary will begin hearings on a number of bills that have been introduced dealing with the crime problem.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 355) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] yield to me briefly?

Mr. METCALF. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma for 5 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I requested the time of the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] because on this amendment I will leave members of the joint committee in supporting the bill we have reported or in compromise agreements that have been made to adjust differences between Members. I recognize and know this problem that we are faced with in the disparity, and it is a great disparity, between the salaries paid to our top experts and professional staff people on the Senate side and the salaries paid on the House side.

I have faced this disparity during my years as chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations.. I know the difficulties we have encountered in explaining to our faithful, able, and competent professional staff members why we could not pay them as much as the House of Representatives pays. They are patient. They are understanding, but I know it is galling to them to be continually faced with a lower rate status for doing identically the same work as their House counterparts, even more difficult work sometimes, on matters dealing with appropriations totaling well over $100 billion, as well as handling complex legislation on foreign policy, confirmation of all Federal employees, and all the other detailed, difficult, technical work which must be done by the members of our staffs.

We recognize and have recognized that this disparity is not of our creation. It was created by the House of Representatives when that body tied to the top committee jobs a similarity between legislative pay scales and the civil service pay grades in the executive branch.

The Senate did not choose to relate its pay scales for legislative staffs to the general service categories of grades, of tying salaries to grade 18 for the top jobs and grade 17 level for the intermediate professional staff jobs. Our men were frozen at a lower level for doing the same work as the staff specialists in House committees, whose salaries were increased consistent with the escalation of grades 17 and 18.

Lately, the pay bills have been on a percentage basis, but even there, because of the higher salaries related to grades 17 and 18 downtown, and the percentage increase of 3 percent to the higher figure, it still gives the benefit to the members of House staffs on each pay bill.

Thus again, our faithful Senate staff professional men are reminded that they not only are not being paid on the levels of their House counterparts, but they also are not even given the same dollar return on a percentage increase when pay bills are enacted.

Many of us have felt in the past, and feel now, that we must correct this injustice. I believe that every Member of the Senate who is familiar with this subject will admit that it is an injustice, and a continuing one, especially in view of the loyalty of these men to the jobs they hold year in and year out at a lower salary than is being paid to someone 100 yards across the Capitol for doing the same job. This cost, it seems to me, is one that we are concerned with when we consider the total salaries which will be paid, which will reach the top two employees in the top grade of $25,890. It sounds like a great deal of money, but when we consider the increase in order to bring about an equalization of the pay being paid in the House, the cost for all of this will not be a very great sum of money.

The per committee cost—we must consider that—the maximum per committee cost, if the chairman of all committees desire to meet the top-level authorization for salaries contained in the bill, will total for each committee—all nine position increases being made—$17,599 per committee. When we consider that the House has more than 50 technical staff members drawing over $25,000 a year, and that the Senate has not one single staff member drawing that amount, because the top level of a Senate staff member today is $24,460, I think we realize the necessity which exists throughout the entire professional committee staffing membership to adjust this inequity.

It can be adjusted on a $17,559 basis per committee, except for the Appropriations Committee, which has a larger staff whose high competence is required relative to House Members and House staff members. There will be a great deal of increase here because there will be more high level positions—up to 18 positions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, 18 positions would reach the $25,000 level. Two would be at the top level of $25,890, and 16 would be at the top level of $25,103, which is the lower figure paid by the House to some of its staff members.

The total cost for the Appropriations Committee to equalize pay in this important function, again dealing with the budget of $100 billion, will come to $33,909 per year.

I do not think that this is an excessive amount of money per year to try to equalize this longstanding disparity.

Accordingly, when we get all of the figures in and count the increases which can be made, if maximum use is made by committee chairmen—because each committee will be in charge of fixing the maximum rates of pay of its employees—these are the top limits which may be paid.

I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that committees, in many cases, use less money than is authorized to them for professional staff members in the first place. They sometimes spend a good deal less money on salaries than is permitted them under the authorization.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator say that the proposed increases are mandatory?

Mr. MONRONEY. No. I am saying that they are merely setting the top limits so that the Senate in its own good judgment, acting as a committee through its chairmen, can pay whatever amount it wants. There is no minimum. This is merely a maximum. I am certain that the full allotment of all of these positions will not be used, because there are many positions even now not filled, because of frugal committee chairmen who oftentimes find ways to run their committees effectively without using maximum funds. In a great many cases they pay below the total amount allowed.

But when we consider that with the amounts allocated for the maximum number of jobs which can be used for the maximum amounts which can be paid, the total cost of the adjustment to eliminate the disparity will cost the Government $438,686 a year, I believe that this is a reasonable price to pay for equalizing this disparity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 more minute.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, to have permitted this disparity for so long reflects, in my opinion, not very good business management on the part of the Senate.

It is high time, in this bill, as we try to adjust many legislative difficulties and matters, to take up this particular matter and adjust it.

I regret the necessity to leave the rest of the committee in this instance, but I think it is long overdue and now is the time to correct it.

The total cost proposed by the Senator from Montana will be $438,686, the maximum amount possible. I venture to guess that it will be perhaps $150,000 below that figure in actual practice.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, have I any time left?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator does not.

Mr. METCALF. Is the Senator ready to make his motion?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I shall make my motion after I first make a few remarks.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. What was the standing of the committee on this particular point, as to numbers for and against?

Mr. MUNDT. I do not recall that this matter was ever seriously enough considered in the committee to come to a vote. Perhaps the Senator from Montana has a better recollection of it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the committee can tell us.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, it was discussed at length but it was not brought to a final vote. There was some division among the members of the committee, mainly on the matter of timing. There was unanimity on the merits of the matter. The question of whether it was a wise thing to do was not in disagreement. It was a matter of whether it should go into this bill. It was never decided that it should be put in or that it should not be put in.

Mr. MUNDT. May I say to the Senator from Florida that it was one of the numerous items, when we got to discussing them, on which we did not have adequate background. We did not have a chance to go into the question in depth. It was a logical subject to be handled by the Joint Committee on the Operations of the Congress which was being established. This salary problem would never have arisen if we had had a joint committee such as this as long as we have had a Congress.

I served for a while on the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee. It was an interesting experience. I shifted away from it. There was, on the Senate side, lobbying on its Members all the time, with persuasive and understandable arguments. It was said, for example, that the doorkeeper got more than the policemen, or that the policemen got more than the elevator boy, and why should they not all get the top level? Someone got a little higher pay, and then those who did not receive it would ask why they did not get the top level. The same thing was true with the House.

I regret that the House has been reckless and extravagant with the taxpayers' money in this regard. The House committee dealing with salaries and expenses over there has not taken care of the taxpayers' dollars with regard to committee staffing, as we have on the Senate side.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has made a valiant fight to decrease staff membership and expenses but nothing comes of it. Now we are afforded the opportunity, at long last, to have hearings by our new joint committee; to have studies; to have expert testimony as to just what is the proper approach in the fixing of salaries for employees on Capitol Hill, with the understanding that work in the House and the Senate should be equally compensated for, as is true of Members, themselves, of the House and the Senate. These discrepancies should not continue to exist.

To suggest this approach today however by abortive action on the floor is, in my judgment, a poor expression of the needs for economy. To say that the House is spending more money, and therefore let us shovel out some more, is not the appropriate way to handle the matter. The question should be considered by the joint committee established to consider such questions. That joint committee has not had a chance to take action on it. At most, this matter would be delayed a matter of months.

I am not opposed to adjusting the salaries, but I am opposed to attempting to adjust them in this way by creating new problems, without taking a look at the whole picture. I think that is essential. I think we have a right to insist that the Congress act with prudence in the spending of the taxpayers' money, as we insist that the executive do so. I do not think the executive acts as it should in this regard in some instances. I do not think we should ask the executive to do so and then reach out for more money ourselves, without an analytical and thorough study of the question.

If a joint committee to look into such matters were not established by this legislation, I would look at the proposal somewhat differently, because there are some inequities to be corrected. But this joint committee is being established for the purpose of considering these matters. Now, instead of utilizing that committee, it is proposed to keep salaries running away, one tagging after the other, when they should be adjusted on a whole Capitol-wide basis.

I think the joint committee should be given a chance to make recommendations. It was the committee created for that purpose. Congress is a bicameral body and this question should be handled on a bicameral basis.

When we adopt proposals which may increase the cost of running our committees by some $500,000 a year, or whatever the amount is, we create new problems with respect to other staff members, who would feel that they were entitled to an increase, and undoubtedly they would be. Then other employees might feel entitled to have an increase, and perhaps they would be. I think it is clear that we would be making the same mistakes that this joint committee is being created in part to eliminate. I do not see why we should use reform legislation such as we have before us as the lever to provide a little more money for certain selected people on payrolls of the Senate of the United States.

I think the appropriate thing to do is to lay on the table this amendment, as we have other amendments. Such a motion would not kill the proposition. It would put the consideration of such matters in the joint committee created by the bill, where the committee could consider it at its first meeting.

The committee could bring back, I am sure, a comprehensive plan applying to all employees on Capitol Hill generally, instead of an increase based on the fact that some chairmen or some committees in the House of Representatives have been careless with the people's money and have gotten salaries up to a high level, which the Senate is then asked to match.

Just how serious are we about protecting the taxpayer's dollars when we give the flimsy reason that we should increase certain salaries because certain Members or committees in the House have fixed high salaries for certain employees there? I think we should, at some time, make some sense out of a pay scale program rather than merely capitulating to free spending House examples.

For those reasons, I think the best thing is to lay the amendment on the table. We can take it up later, if this bill becomes legislation. If it does not, then it will not become law. If the joint committee is established, it can undertake a study of the matter and report a measure to correct the injustices that exist and establish procedures for establishing a pay scale which will not create inequities in the future. This is a great opportunity to bring about equity and economics. The joint committee on congressional operations is just now being established. I hate to see us knock it in the head at the christening ceremonies.

Mr. President, I move to lay the amendment on the table, and ask for the yeas and nays——

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Will the Senator withhold his motion?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; I withhold my motion. But let us get the yeas and nays while enough Senators are present.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I would like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the motion to table will be withheld until a parliamentary inquiry can be made.

The Senator from Louisiana will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ELLENDER. If this amendment is adopted, would it be in order to include an amendment to strike out the whole pay provision and equalize the pay of the Senate with that of the House?

Mr. MUNDT. For certain people.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** If the Senator offered an amendment aimed at striking out only the pay provisions of this amendment, it would be out of order. On the other hand, if the Senator offered an amendment aimed at striking out all pay provisions in the bill, including this one—and the Chair understands there are others—and inserting new language in lieu thereof, then it would be in order.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Could the distinguished occupant of the chair, the Presiding Officer, state whether it was the right of this body to fix salaries of employees of the other body in motions originating on the floor of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Oklahoma that that involves an interpretation of the law, which the Chair declines to rule on.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is highly doubtful that it would be possible for the Senate to fix their salaries, any more than the House would be able to fix the salaries that would be paid here in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota to table the amendment of the Senator from Montana. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is absent on official business. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr MONDALE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of illness in the family.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 50, as follows:

[No. 46 Leg.]

YEAS—24

Aiken
Bartlett
Bennett
Boggs
Brooke
Carlson
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Ellender
Fannin
Hansen
Hatfield
Hickenlooper
Holland
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
Mundt
Pearson
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NAYS—50

Anderson
Baker
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cotton
Eastland
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Griffin
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hill
Hollings
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Smith
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—26

Allott
Dodd
Dominick
Gore
Gruening
Hayden
Hruska
Javits
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Murphy
Percy
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Sparkman
Tower
Tydings
Yarborough

So Mr. MUNDT's motion to lay Mr. METCALF's amendment on the table was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called. On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] would each vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of illness in the family.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MARTIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 25, as follows:

[No. 47 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Anderson
Baker
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cotton
Eastland
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Griffin
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Hollings
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Magnuson
McGee
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—25

Aiken
Bartlett
Bennett
Boggs
Brooke
Byrd, Va.
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Ellender
Fannin
Hansen
Hatfield
Hickenlooper
Holland
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
Mundt
Spong
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—24

Allott
Dodd
Dominick
Gore
Gruening
Hruska
Javits
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Murphy
Percy
Russell
Scott
Sparkman
Tower
Yarborough

So Mr. METCALF's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

I should like to announce, while so many Members of the Senate are present, that on Monday we expect to take up the section of the bill—title 5—providing for registration of lobbying activities, and this will be done under a 2-hour time limitation, which was agreed to yesterday. For that reason, I urge all Senators who have amendments to bring them up today, if possible, so that we will be sure to have time to discuss them properly and to act upon them. Because of the time limitation on Monday, it will be difficult to do that.

I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] has been adopted by the Senate. This amendment increases the ceilings on the salaries of certain positions in the committees of the Senate.

Historically, the fixing of ceilings on the salaries in the committees has been under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations. Within the committee, this matter is the responsibility of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee, of which I have been designated the chairman by the chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

I did not object to the amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] because I agree with the objective. However, as with many situations which we try to correct on the floor, the amendment adopted by the Senate deals only with a part of the problem and part of the inequity—the committees. But, by correcting the inequities which exist between Senate and House committee salaries, this amendment creates inequities within the Senate structure, between committees and Senators' offices, in the office of the Secretary of the Senate, in the office of the Sergeant at Arms, in the office of the legislative counsel, and so on.

Inasmuch as the Senate has indicated its desires in this matter, it is my intention to go into the matter thoroughly in connection with the legislative appropriation bill for fiscal year 1968, and to make recommendations to the Senate to provide comparability in salary ceilings for the other employees of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 107

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 107 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 66, lines 18 through 20, strike out the words "acting under the direction and supervision of the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations,".

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, this is a clarifying amendment to the legislative reorganization bill. The Committee on Rules and Administration has had the communications subject under consideration for at least 2 years. Last year the Committee on Rules and Administration adopted a resolution authorizing the Sergeant at Arms in the Senate and the Clerk in the House of Representatives to consider telephone communications, and to work with the telephone company in the District of Columbia to provide the services which are here anticipated.

The amendment would simply provide for these two committees which are now operating in connection with this matter, and have gone a long way toward bringing back what we think the Senate and the House of Representatives want, because it is joint.

The Senate pays approximately 40 percent of the telephone bill and the House of Representatives pays about 60 percent. This proposal would clarify the matter and permit it to go forward as planned.

I have discussed this matter with the chairman of the joint committee, and it has been fairly worked out. I believe that it is agreeable to the chairman.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, we discussed this matter with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration and we feel that the work that has been done by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the Clerk of the House, brings about the objective we were seeking in the coordination of the telephone service, and a joint and common exchange which we have in other matters. We hope this can be worked out to serve the needs of both bodies. The committee has been working on this matter. The Clerk of the House of Representatives has been doing a fine job. While we imposed the obligation on them to proceed under a joint committee of Congress, we feel that it is not necessary to have this language. Therefore, we are happy to agree to the

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. amendment of the Senator.
President, I ask that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 107.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 106

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I send to the desk a modified version of amendment No. 106, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, as modified, will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina proposes an amendment, as follows:

Beginning with line 19, page 68, strike out all to and including the word "Service" in line 23, page 68, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) (1) After consultation with the Joint Committee on the Library, the Librarian of Congress shall appoint the Director of the Legislative Research Service."

Beginning with line 4, page 76, strike out all to and including line 4, page 77.

On page 77, line 6, strike out "SEC. 333", and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 332".

On page 79, line 6, strike out "SEC. 334", and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 333".

On page 79, line 15, strike out "SEC. 335", and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 334".

On page 3, in the table of contents, strike out the items relating to sections 332, 333, 334, and 335 of the bill, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 332. Joint Committee on the Library.
"Sec. 333. Abolishment of Office of Coordinator of Information.
"Sec. 334. Saving provision.".

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, the Librarian of Congress appoints the Director of Legislative Research Service of the Library of Congress. In the original bill it was provided that the Joint Committee on the Library would vote to elect. The pending amendment would simply direct the Librarian to employ the Director of Legislative Research after consultation with the chairman and vice chairman of the joint committee.

I move the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, we have worked with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the vice chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress, in an attempt to work out language with which he could agree and the committee could agree to allow the benefit of consultation with the members of the Joint Committee on the Library concerning the appointment of the Director of the Legislative Research Service.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. We did not feel that it required a vote of confirmation. It would have been the type of machinery that was relatively unknown in qualifying a man for this high position. We feel that the language contained in the amendment meets the feeling on the part of many in the reorganization committee that some consideration be given to the suitability of the candidate as to the needs of Members of the House and Senate who use this service. I believe that the consultation offers this opportunity without restriction, or making political in any way the appointment of the Director of the Legislative Reference Service.

For that reason, we are glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the amendment be adopted and yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the modified amendment No. 106.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 109

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I send to the desk a modified version of my amendment No. 109 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated, as modified.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendment, as modified, will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment, as modified, submitted by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, is as follows:

Beginning with line 14 on page 77, strike out all to and including line 3 on page 79, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) In order to provide for the expeditious and efficient consideration of matters within the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee, including review of the operations of the Legislative Research Service, the Joint Committee is authorized to employ one professional staff member and not to exceed two employees as members of the clerical staff of the Committee. Such professional and clerical staff members shall be appointed by majority vote of the Committee, on a permanent basis, without regard to political affiliation, and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of their position. The staff, under the joint direction and supervision of the chairman and the vice-chairman, shall assist the Committee in the performance of its review functions with respect to matters within the general jurisdiction of the Committee and shall perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the Committee. The chairman and vice-chairman shall fix their compensation at rates authorized by section 202 (e)(1) of this Act. The Committee may terminate the employment of the members of the professional and clerical staff as it may deem appropriate.

"(c) The expenses of the Joint Committee shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, from funds appropriated for the Joint Committee, upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the Joint Committee.

"(d) In order to provide the Congress with current information regarding the operation of the Legislative Research Service and regarding other matters within the general jurisdiction of the Joint Committee, the Joint Committee shall submit to the Senate and House of Representatives an annual report with respect to (1) the activities of the Legislative Research Service and (2) such other matters within its general jurisdiction as it deems appropriate."

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, this amendment would merely clarify how the review specialist shall be employed by the joint committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the joint committee has no objection. This is technical language. The committee has no objection to the substitute amendment. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from North Carolina.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 105

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 105, as modified, with the clerk at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, as modified, will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment, as modified.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendment, as modified, will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment, as modified, submitted by Mr. HARTKE, is as follows:

On page 4, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 471 of the bill, insert the following:

"PART 7—LEGISLATIVE ATTORNEY GENERAL

"Sec. 481. Office of the Legislative Attorney General established.
"Sec. 482. Duties of the Legislative Attorney General.
"Sec. 483. Powers of the Legislative Attorney General.
"Sec. 484. Appropriations.".

On page 118, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following new part:

"PART 7—LEGISLATIVE ATTORNEY GENERAL

"LEGISLATIVE ATTORNEY GENERAL ESTABLISHED

"SEC. 481. (a) There is hereby established in the legislative branch of the Government the Office of Legislative Attorney General, which shall be under the direction and control of the Legislative Attorney General. The Legislative Attorney General shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, with the approval of the House of Representatives and the Senate, without reference to political affiliations and solely on the basis of his fitness to perform the duties of his office, and shall be subject to removal by those officers for inefficiency, misconduct, or physical or mental incapacity. He shall receive the same salary as Members of Congress.

"(b) Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Legislative Attorney General may appoint and fix the compensation of such Assistant Attorney General, clerks, and other personnel as may be necessary to carry on the work of his office. Assistants shall be appointed without reference to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of their offices.

"(c) The Legislative Attorney General shall promulgate for his office such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the duties imposed upon him by this part. He may delegate authority for the performance of any such duty to any officer or employee of such office. No person serving as an officer or employee of such office may engage in any other business, vocation, or employment while so serving.

"(d) The Legislative Attorney General shall cause a seal of office to be made for his office, of such design as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

"DUTIES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ATTORNEY GENERAL

"SEC. 482. (a) It shall be the duty of the Legislative Attorney General, under such rules as the Director and Joint Committee may provide, to—

"(1) render to committees, Members, and disbursing officers of the Congress, and to the Comptroller General, legal opinions upon questions arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States;

"(2) render to committees and Members of the Congress advice with respect to the purpose and effect of provisions contained in Acts of the Congress, or to be inserted in proposed legislative measures;

"(3) perform such duties with respect to legislative review of executive actions as shall be prescribed from time to time;

"(4) intervene, upon request of any committee of the Congress or upon his own motion, in any action pending in any court of the United States in which there is placed in issue the constitutional validity or interpretation of any Act of the Congress, or the validity of any official proceeding of or action taken by any committee, officer, office, or agency of the Congress; and

"(5) represent, upon request, any committee, officer, office, or agency of the Congress in any legal action pending in any court of the United States to which such committee, officer, office, or agency is a party and in which there is placed in issue the validity of any official proceeding of or action taken by such committee, officer, office, or agency.

"(b) Upon receipt of written notice from the Legislative Attorney General to the effect that he has undertaken pursuant to this section to perform any such specified representational service with respect to any designated action or proceeding pending or to be instituted in a court of the United States, the Attorney General shall be relieved of responsibility and shall have no authority to perform such service in such action or proceeding.

"POWERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ATTORNEY GENERAL

"SEC. 483. (a) Subject to applicable rules of practice and procedure, the Legislative Attorney General shall be entitled as of right to intervene as a party in any action described in paragraph (3) of section 482.

"(b) For the purposes of all proceedings incident to the trial and review of any action described by paragraph (4) of section 482 with respect to which the Legislative Attorney General has undertaken to provide representational service, and has so notified the Attorney General, the Legislative Attorney General shall have all powers conferred by law upon the Attorney General, any subordinate of the Attorney General, or any United States attorney.

"(c) The Legislative Attorney General, or any attorney of his office designated by him for that purpose, shall be entitled for the purpose of performing duties imposed upon him pursuant to this part to enter an appearance in any such proceeding before any court of the United States without compliance with any requirement for admission to practice before such court, except that the authorization conferred by this subsection shall not apply with respect to the admission of any person to practice before the United States Supreme Court.

"APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC 484. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Office of the Legislative Attorney General such sums as may be required for the performance of the duties of the Legislative Attorney General under this part.".

On page 83, after line 4, add the following: "(4) Establish rules for and provide direction to the Legislative Attorney General."

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, as modified, at this time, because it provides for a legislative attorney general for Congress. In substance, it would provide Congress with its own lawyer.

This proposal offers a solution for some difficult problems, including interpretation of legislative intent and the occasional conflict of attitudes between the executive and the legislative branch, which results in a very definite interference with the basic constitutional provisions for keeping the executive branch of the Government separate from the legislative branch.

This amendment would provide for a legislative attorney general, with necessary staff. This legislative attorney general would be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, subject to ratification by Congress.

Under authority of the legislation in this amendment, the legislative attorney general would be the authoritative source for interpretation of legislative intent.

At present, when it becomes necessary in any legal proceeding for the courts to look into the question of legislative intent, the opinions, generally speaking, have been obtained from the Justice Department and its Attorney General. It appears in some cases that this causes a problem we should look into, since now we have the administrative and executive part of the Government looking around and attempting to interpret what the legislative branch of the Government intended.

I do not intend in any way an implication that such opinions of the Attorney General are anything but honest; but the procedure does represent a tendency to favor the division of powers between the legislative and the executive heavily on the executive side.

By this amendment, I attempt to create a better balance and return to the original constitutional basis upon which the Constitution was founded.

In other words, this would protect Congress as a Congress, and would protect its statements.

For example, there have been speeches on the floors of both House and Senate which have raised the question of immunity of a Senator or a Representative in his statements made on the floor of the Senate or in the House of Representatives. The Constitution originally provided for complete immunity just as there is diplomatic immunity.

Diplomatic immunity is apropos with the consular treaty now before the Senate as approved by the Committee on Foreign Relations, since it bears on whether individuals who come into this country with a diplomatic status have complete diplomatic immunity. In my opinion, there is no question but that they do have it. The Secretary of State has said that they have it.

But, in regard to the question of the immunity of Members of Congress, both House and Senate, in statements made in the Congress, there have been times in which the Justice Department has found itself in complete opposition to Members of Congress; and therefore they have attempted to erode this immunity in subsequent legal action and contend that it is not absolute.

Ultimately, in the cases which have been presented, it has always been some private individual who has come to the defense of Congress. There have been cases presented, thank goodness, in which the Supreme Court has upheld the right of immunity; but in these cases it was not Congress which was protecting congressional immunity but a private individual asserting the right of a Member of Congress to have this immunity.

In other words, this is a congressional prerogative and there should be congressional protection for it.

Let me give another example. In the case of persons who testified before committees of the House of Representatives and Senate and are held in contempt of Congress, the Department of Justice becomes the prosecuting agency.

This probably presents no great difficulty for the administration where the attitudes of the administration coincide with those of the congressional committee. But in those cases where members of the executive have been held in contempt, or where there has been a question as to whether they should be held in contempt, the question immediately arises: Who will do the prosecuting?

For example, in the Dixon-Yates controversy a conflict of interest was involved. In this case, the Justice Department set up a special isolated group which was to make its decision without in any way being influenced by any other person, or the administration. But the administration found itself in the position of trying to determine whether there was a conflict of interest by one of its own administrative members.

In this case, it would have been much better for Congress to have had its own lawyer to have made that determination.

Further, where the executive branch is attempting to place itself in the position of the legislative branch, those who were not in an authoritative position to speak for the Congress have interpreted the thought of Congress concerning legislation passed by Congress, including constitutionality.

On the floor of the Senate and in the House of Representatives, there have been great debates as to whether an item of legislation, as it was being written, was actually constitutional. Sometimes items are discussed at great length as to whether a constitutional approach is being followed.

Here again there is no one in authority. There are such groups as the Legislative Reference Service, counsel on committees, individual lawyers, but there is no one in an authoritative position to really represent the position of Congress before the Court to say that for these or those reasons Congress thought legislation which it passed is constitutional.

The same thing is involved as to legislative intent. Frequently we find a wide variety of thought. Let me give a particular case. There is a difference of opinion between the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the State of Alabama on a point of legal interpretation of a law the Congress passed. In this case I personally happen to believe that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has acted correctly.

The former Governor of Alabama, Mr. Wallace, thinks there has been arbitrary action by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which is contrary to the law. But in this case, again, there is no one who speaks authoritatively for the Congress as to its legislative intent.

Let me give another example, the case of wiretapping, or, as it is known, "bugging." A law on this subject was passed in the 1930's, when relatively few so-called sophisticated devices were used for wiretapping. Now the Attorney General is trying to expand on the legislative authority granted at the time the law was enacted. There has been no factual information which could be considered from the standpoint of the intent of Congress. In other words, the Attorney General has been legislating for Congress. Someone might say, "It is time that something was done by somebody." The authority for making law does not rest in the executive branch or in the Attorney General. The authority to enact law rests in the Congress of the United States.

The same is true in other cases, where there is a complete absence of authority to speak for the legislative branch.

For example, legislation which is considered by the Finance Committee of the Senate, of which I am a member, is sometimes subject to many interpretations of tax law. Situations arise which absolutely were not considered at the time the legislation was before the committee. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, Mr. MILLS, made a speech on the floor of the House at one time in which he indicated seven different interpretations were given to one paragraph of a revenue law, none of which was the one he thought was really meant when the House was giving original consideration to that document. Yet no one has any authority to speak for the Congress. No one can represent the Congress of the United States in order to give that type of interpretation.

Another example is that of the General Accounting Office. The General Accounting Office now almost daily gives legal opinions interpreting an authorization and appropriation of money, and whether or not it is legal. I do not question the honesty and sincerity of the General Accounting Office. Although it is technically an arm of the Congress, no authorized person can go to that agency of Government and give it a legal opinion as to exactly what was involved or intended by Congress.

I wish to refer to a speech which was given on the floor of the House on June 14, 1966, by Mr. BATES, on the question of whether or not the United States should build a nuclear-powered frigate. The part of the speech to which I refer appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 10, page 13061. The problem involved was that the Legislature had specifically said the United States should build a nuclear-powered frigate. The net result was that it did not. It came back to the question of who was going to follow it through and insist on the separation of powers.

I ask unanimous consent that an extract from the speech of Representative Bates to which I have referred, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Despite the constitutional power of the Congress "to provide and maintain a Navy" the Department of Defense has refused to consider the positions which the Congress has set into law. In our opinion, this is a serious matter. As the Chief of Naval Operations has said with respect to nuclear propulsion:

"To do less is to degrade effectiveness with grave implications for national security."

After the deliberate failure of the Department of Defense in not following the program for the Navy as set forth in the statutes, the only answer is to provide that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy shall proceed with the construction of the two frigates as soon as practicable.

This is the real civilian control of the military as envisioned by our forefathers. This is the real exercise of the Congress and its constitutional power to provide and maintain a Navy.

Section 101 of S. 2950, as reported by the Committee on Armed Services, contains, in the section on naval vessels, the sentence:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy shall proceed with the design, engineering, and construction of the two nuclear-powered guided missile frigates as soon as practicable."

In my opinion, this provision is constitutional. The Constitution starts out, article I, section I:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States."

Article II, section I, on the other hand, provides:

"The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America."

What do these words mean? Legislative? Executive? What did they mean when the Constitution was written? The Dictionary of American English, 1940, University of Chicago Press, provides some help:

"Legislative: Of or pertaining to a legislature. (Citing instances from 1776 on.)

"Legislature:

"1. The body or assembly of constituted representatives of a colony, state, or territory, vested with authority to make laws for the governance of the body politic. (Citing instances from 1729 on.)

"2. The federal Congress. (Citing instances from 1787 on.) Executive department: The, or a, department of government concerned with the proper carrying out of the laws:

"1. Of a State government. (Citing instances from 1776 on.)

"2. Of the U.S. government. (Citing instances from 1787 on.)"

Thus it is that by the very terms of the first sections of both article I and article II of the Constitution, it is the function of the Congress to enact the laws of the United States, and for the President to see that those laws are carried into effect. Lest there be any doubt of this, article II, section 3 provides "he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

Under the Articles of Confederation of 1778, there was no executive to carry out the will of Congress—there was only a Congress. This was felt to be a very real drawback. Hence it was that when the Constitutional Convention met in 1787 to try to eliminate some of the shortcomings of the Articles of Confederation, the first proposal put before the Convention, that of Edmund Randolph, included the provision:

"7. Resolved, that a National Executive be instituted; to be chosen by the National Legislature for a term of ——; to receive punctually, at stated times, a fixed compensation for the services rendered, in which no increase nor diminution shall be made, so as to affect the magistracy existing at the time of increase or diminution; and to be ineligible a second time; and that, besides a general authority to execute the national laws, it ought to enjoy the executive rights vested in Congress by the Confederation. ('The Papers of James Madison, and his Reports of Debates in the Federal Convention, 1840,' p. 732.)"

The next proposal came from Charles Pinckney, including an article VIII which would include:

"The executive power of the United States shall be vested in a President of the United States of America, which shall be his style; and his title shall be His Excellency. He shall be elected for —— years; and shall be re-eligible.

"He shall from time to time give information to the Legislature, of the State of the Union, and recommend to their consideration the measures he may think necessary. He shall take care that the laws of the United States be duly executed. ('Madison Papers,' p. 742)."

Beyond the introduction and reference to the Committee on Detail and the Committee on Style, there was little further that happened to the provisions that the President "shall take care that the laws of the United States be duly executed" during the Convention.

There were several powers given to the Congress with respect to military affairs:

"To declare War . . .

"To raise and support Armies . . .

"To provide and maintain a Navy . . .

"To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and Naval Forces . . .

"To provide for calling forth the Militia . . .

"To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia . . .

"To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever . . . and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, Dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings."

The extent to which the Congress was intended to have the control over the military is best shown by the special provision in the power to raise Armies:

"But no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two years."

The Founding Fathers were so fearful of having a military imposed on the country that they even wanted to keep the moneys limited so that each Congress would be able to decide how the military would be run.

The reasons for this special provision were given in the debates:

"To the second clause Mr. Gerry objected, that it admitted of appropriations to an army for two years, instead of one; for which he could not conceive a reason; that it implied there was to be a standing army, which he inveighed against, as dangerous to liberty—as unnecessary even for so great an extent of country as this—and if necessary, some restriction on the number and duration ought to be provided. Nor was this a proper time for such an innovation. The people would not bear it.

"Mr. Sherman remarked, that the appropriations were permitted only, not required to be for two years. As the Legislature is to be biennially elected, it would be inconvenient to require appropriations to be for one year, as there might be no session within the time necessary to renew them. He should himself, he said, like a reasonable restriction on the number and continuance of an army in time of peace.

"The second clause was then agreed to, *nem. con.* ('Madison Papers,' p. 1495.)"

In the Federalist, No. 24, there was discussion of the exact relation between the Executive and the Congress:

"A stranger to our politics, who was to read our newspapers at the present juncture, without having previously inspected the plan reported by the convention, would be naturally led to one of two conclusions: either that it contained a positive injunction, that standing armies should be kept up in time of peace; or that it vested in the Executive the whole power of levying troops, without subjecting his discretion, in any shape, to the control of the legislature.

"If he came afterwards to peruse the plan itself, he would be surprised to discover, that neither the one nor the other was the case; that the whole power of raising armies was lodged in the Legislature, not in the Executive; that this legislature was to be a popular body, consisting of the representatives of the people periodically elected; and that instead of the provision he had supposed in favor of standing armies, there was to be found, in respect to this object, an important qualification even of the legislative discretion, in that clause which forbids the appropriation of money for the support of an army for any longer period than two years—a precaution which, upon a nearer view of it will appear to be a great and real security against the keeping up of troops without evident necessity."

From this discussion, it is obvious that the Founding Fathers were most fearful of a standing army and that they wanted the controls over that Army to be in the Congress, not in the Executive.

It is claimed that the President has full power over the military from his position, given him by article II, section 2:

"The President shall be commander-in-chief of the army and navy of the United States."

This position was first suggested by Mr. Charles Pinckney as part of article VIII of his proposed draft. It was incorporated in all later drafts without discussion.

The relation between the powers of the Congress to raise and support armies and to provide and maintain a navy and the position of the President as Commander in Chief were clearly spelled out in the report of this Committee on the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958:

"RESPONSIBILITIES OF CONGRESS

"While the Constitution designates the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, it places upon Congress the responsibility to provide for the common defense, to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a Navy, and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. Analysis of these constitutional provisions in comparison with the powers of the British Crown, from which the Colonies wrested their independence, clarifies the origin of the responsibilities placed upon Congress by the Constitution. The King—like the President today—had the power of command over the armed forces of Britain, but he also had the power to raise and regulate armies and navies and to govern them.

"In contrast, under the Constitution, the President's powers over military affairs were not allowed to pass to him by implication, rising from his position as the Chief Executive. His military authority was specifically designated as command only. The responsibility to provide for the common defense, to create the forces necessary for such defense, and to make necessary rules for the government of the forces thus created was placed and remains with Congress.

"This separation of powers over the military affairs of the Nation was the product of conscious and careful design. It was completely consistent with a fundamental concept upon which our Government was, and is, established; that is, that freedom can thrive only when the basic powers of government are not vested in one man or a small group of men. A firm and distinct separation of power over our military forces was to be expected from men who had experienced the tyranny of a government in which all power over military affairs was vested in one man. Indeed, the abusive employment of military force was a major complaint lodged by the Declaration of Independence against the Crown.

"It is apparent that, under the Constitution, the power of Congress over the Military Establishment is, and was intended to be, complete, save for the power to command the forces they create.

"Congress has never considered this responsibility to consist merely in providing funds as requested by the executive branch to be used or withheld at its discretion. Under this view, Congress would be unable to discharge its constitutional responsibilities or to insure that the views of the American people, as expressed by their elected representatives, are observed by the executive branch of the Government.

"The committee recognizes military power as an instrument of national policy and the necessity for close cooperation between the executive and legislative branches in shaping that policy. If, however, Congress is to perform its constitutional responsibilities and give vitality to the fundamental doctrine of separation of powers, it must retain a meaningful measure of control over the combatant functions of the Armed Forces it creates. Otherwise, the flexibility or rigidity of our military policies will come to rest entirely upon the executive branch of the Government. The legislative branch would thus abdicate its historic responsibility over the design and capabilities of our major instruments of military policy and would renounce its responsibility to provide for the common defense. The Committee on Armed Services is confident, from the testimony of representatives of the executive branch, that this is neither contemplated nor desired by the present incumbents; but it is the responsibility of Congress to insure that the law does not permit such a result.

"The committee has made no provision to give the Secretary of Defense increased control over the funds appropriated to his Department. This area of the President's recommendations are set forth in his message of April 3, 1958, was not developed in specific terms by witnesses from the executive branch. It is also an area that will require meticulous examination by Congress."

The executive department has from time to time contended, as early as 1795, that appropriations for military purposes ought to be general or even lump-sum grants to be expended at discretion by the executive rather than specific appropriations. Congress has never accepted this view as being consistent with its responsibility to insure that money is not withdrawn from the Treasury except for a specific object, to an extent, and out of a fund which has been established by law. The relationship of this control over appropriations to the constitutional responsibilities of Congress relating to the Armed Forces, which are enumerated above, is too apparent to necessitate discussion—House Report No. 1765, 85th Congress, 2d session, May 22, 1958.

That this analysis is probably correct is shown by the study made by the Library of Congress, "The Powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States"—House Document No. 443, 84th Congress, 2d session, June 14, 1956. Of the 117 instances of the use by the President of his powers as Commander in Chief cited therein, none relates to the composition of the fighting force and its equipment. Rather the instances are directed toward the tactical use of the forces and equipment available in specific instances.

That the President is bound by the legislation, in his capacity as Commander in Chief even in wartime, is shown by the message to Congress of September 2, 1942, in which President Roosevelt demanded repeal of a provision of the Emergency Price Control Act, which he felt to be a hindrance to the war effort, although he threatened to use his powers to achieve the same end if the Congress did not act.

The power of the Congress to provide a Navy was first suggested by Charles Pinckney in his proposal:

"Article VI. The Legislature of the United States shall have the power . . . To build and equip fleets. ("Madison Papers," p. 739.)

In the debates this phrase was changed to—

"To provide and maintain a Navy—("Madison Papers," p. 1360) without discussion and without dissent, as a more convenient definition of the power."

After that, the phrase was accepted by the Committee on Detail and the Committee on Style.

While it was not until 1798 that the Congress found it desirable to establish a Department of the Navy—1 Stat. 553, chap. XXXV, April 30, 1798—the Congress in 1794 authorized the President "to provide, by purchase, or otherwise, equip and employ four ships to carry 44 guns each, and two ships to carry 36 guns each."

Not only does the 1794 law provide for the number of guns; it also provides:

"That there shall be employed on board each of the said ships of forty-four guns, one captain, four lieutenants, one lieutenant of marines, one chaplain, one surgeon, and two surgeon's mates; and in each of the ships of thirty-six guns, one captain, three lieutenants, one lieutenant of marines, one surgeon and one surgeon's mate, who shall be appointed and commissioned in like manner as other officers of the United States are. (1 Stat. 350, Chap. XII, March 27, 1794.)"

The statute then goes on to provide for the number of warrant officers for each ship, and the number of men in the crews. The pay of all is set forth—"That the pay and subsistence of the respective commissioned and warrant officers be as follows."

Thus, while the Congress authorized the President to obtain the ships, it specified the armament, the manning, the pay for the officers and even the ration.

There was similar legislation in 1797:

"That the President of the United States be and he is hereby empowered, should he deem it expedient, to cause the frigates *United States, Constitution* and *Constellation*, to be manned and employed. (1 Stat. 523, Chap. VII, July 1, 1797)"

However, the balance of the law sets forth what the strength in officers and enlisted shall be, what their pay shall be and what shall be the ration.

The provisions of the law of 1799 are even more direct:

"That under the orders of the President of the United States, and in addition to the naval armament already authorized by law, there shall be built within the United States six ships of war, of a size to carry, and which shall be armed with not less than seventy-four guns each. (1 Stat. 621. Chap. XIII, February 25. 1799)"

An examination of the membership of Congress in 1794, 1797, and 1799 shows that, along with the President and Vice President, there were eight Members of Congress in 1794 who attended the Constitutional Convention and five Members of Congress in 1797 and 1799 who attended the Constitutional Convention. Although the laws directed the size of the ships, their manning, pay and rations, there was no recorded discussion on the floor of either the House or the Senate that these requirements were an infringement of the President's prerogatives. On the contrary, the bills always passed on voice votes and were signed immediately by the President.

Again, in 1809, Thomas Jefferson signed into law a bill—

"That, in addition to the frigates now employed in actual service, there be fitted out, officered and manned, as soon as may be, the four following frigates, to wit: the *United States, Essex, John Adams,* and *President* (2 Stat. 514, chap. XI, January 31, 1809)."

From the historical background, it is clear not only that the drafters of the Constitution intended the Congress to direct the President in the operation of the Navy, but that the Congress immediately after the adoption of the Constitution did direct the President as to the kinds of ships and armament he should have in the Navy. Indeed, Thomas Jefferson signed one such mandate into law.

There are several instances in recent periods where the Department of Defense has been directed by the Congress with respect to its operations.

In 1952, the Congress directed the Department of Defense to maintain the Marine Corps at a certain level. The precise language of the law—Public Law 416, 82d Congress, chapter 479, 2d session, 61 Stat. 502, June 28, 1952—includes:

"The United States Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy, shall be so organized as to include not less than three combat divisions and three air wings."

On August 10, 1956, the Congress thoroughly reexamined title 10 of the United States Code, Armed Forces, and enacted the title into law. According to House Report No. 970, 84th Congress, 2d session, the real task of preparing the new codification was carried on by the Department of Defense.

Section 101 of title 10 is "Definitions" and contains:

"(28) 'Shall' is used in an imperative sense.

"(29) 'May' is used in a permissive sense. The words 'no person may' mean that no person is required, authorized, or permitted to do the act prescribed."

While the first section after the "Definitions" is permissive—

"Sec. 121. Regulations.—The President may prescribe regulations to carry out his functions, powers, and duties under this title"—

The third section is mandatory:

"Sec. 124. Combatant Commands.—Establishment; composition; functions; administration and support—

"(a) With the advice and assistance of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the President, through the Secretary of Defense, shall—

"(1) establish unified combatant commands or specified combatant commands to perform military missions; and

"(2) shall prescribe the force structure of those commands.

"(b) The military departments shall assign forces to combatant commands established under this section to perform the missions of those commands."

Attention should also be drawn to the mandatory language of the fourth section following the definitions:

"Sec. 125. Functions, powers, and duties; transfer, reassignment, consolidation, or abolition—

"(a) Subject to section 401 of title 50, the Secretary of Defense shall take appropriate action (including the transfer, reassignment, consolidation, or abolition of any function, power or duty) to provide more effective, efficient and economical administration and operation, and to eliminate duplication, in the Department of Defense."

Note that the Secretary is directed to provide more effective efficient administration before he is directed to provide more economical administration.

It is exactly the lack of effectiveness and efficiency that has caused the Committee on Armed Services to recommend to the House that it direct the Secretary of Defense to proceed with the construction of the two nuclear frigates.

From that point on, the title on armed services is replete with mandates in the operation of the Department of Defense and of the military departments.

There are also other mandates in the United States Code directed to the Department of Defense. For example, the matter of pay is directed by the Congress. Thus in section 2211 of title 5, the pay of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force and some of their subordinates are set forth. Title 37 of the United States Code is devoted to the pay and allowances of the uniformed services. Congress sets the pay levels mandatorily. That is why it is necessary to have title III to S. 2950 as reported by the committee, when the committee believes that pay actions in other parts of the Federal Government make it equitable to increase the pay of the members of our armed services.

The mandatory language we have been discussing was taken from another statute, passed by the Congress and approved by the President. In 1957, the Congress, on the proposal of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, directed the Atomic Energy Commission to undertake various studies and research leading to the construction of some new kinds of reactors. Included in the reactors which the Congress wanted to have built, and which the Atomic Energy Commission was opposed to building, was a plutonium recycle experimental reactor. In order to be sure that this reactor was constructed the Congress wrote into the authorization act for fiscal year 1958 the following language of section 110(a):

"The Commission shall proceed with the design, engineering, and construction under contract, as soon as practicable, of the prototype power reactor facility authorized by section 101 for project 58–e–15 (plutonium recycle experimental reactor) at an installation operated by or on behalf of the Commission and the electric energy generated shall be used by the Commission in connection with the operation of such installation. (Public Law 85–162, 71 Stat. 403, August 21, 1957.)"

Similar mandatory language was included in sections 110 and 111 of the authorization act for fiscal year 1959—Public Law 85–590, 72 Stat. 490, August 4, 1958.

The mandatory language in our bill is necessary. Following the construction of the nuclear cruiser *Long Beach,* authorized in fiscal year 1957, and the nuclear frigate *Bainbridge,* authorized in fiscal year 1959, there have been no proposals from the Department of Defense to have any more nuclear escorts. In fiscal year 1962, the Congress changed one frigate, the *Truxtun,* to nuclear power and in 1963 it authorized another nuclear frigate which was later canceled by the Department of Defense.

Last year, the Congress authorized $150.5 million for another nuclear frigate and appropriated $20 million toward it. Despite the appeals of the Department of the Navy, these funds have never been released by the Department of Defense.

This year, the Secretary of Defense testified before our committee:

"There is no sense having a carrier that is nuclear powered if you don't realize the full potential of the nuclear power in the carrier because you don't have a nuclear-powered escort fleet. I think we have such a fleet. If we don't, I want to have one, because I fully accept the point that we ought to balance off these advantages we paid so heavily for."

Despite this testimony, the Secretary of Defense still has not released the $20 million appropriated last year.

Under the words and history of the Constitution, under the first statutes putting into practice the ideas of our Constitution, and under recent legislative practices drafted in part by and accepted by the executive branch, there is no doubt that the Congress has the power to prescribe the kind of ships that will be built for the Navy. In view of the history of Department of Defense defiance to the will of Congress, the power can well be exercised. The language—"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy shall proceed with the design, engineering, and construction of the two nuclear-powered guided missile frigates as soon as practicable"—is constitutional. The Congress has the power to direct the construction of the two nuclear frigates.

It seems to me the time has long since passed when we should have nuclear power for our surface ships. Let us not take two-thirds of a century again, as we did 100 years ago, in making a necessary transition. Let us cut the chains that bind our fighting ships to a pipeline.

Let us cut the umbilical cord from the mother ship so that these nuclear ships can do the kind of a job that our country and the times demand.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I have not been able to follow the statement of the Senator from Indiana, and he may have already touched on this point, but is it not true that committees, and Members of Congress as a whole, can secure legal opinions from the Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress?

Mr. HARTKE. It is true that such opinions can be obtained, but they have no more power and authority than a Member of Congress could obtain from his private lawyer. If the President wants an opinion, he goes to the Attorney General. The Attorney General's opinion has probative value on a legal viewpoint. But that is not true of the Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service at the present time.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. But there is available to Members of Congress and to committees a source from which legal opinions can be derived, it being the Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

Mr. HARTKE. Not only the Law Division, but there are also the various committee's legal counsel, and if there is a conflict between such counsel and the Law Division, a Member of Congress is left in that conflicting situation. As a matter of fact, a Member of Congress can get an opinion from a lawyer on his own staff which has the same weight as an opinion given by the Legislative Reference Service. In other words, it has no legal value. This situation places Congress in a position inferior to what the executive departments can do, which goes back to the whole question of the separation of powers.

There are several areas which do not involve the reorganization provisions which I intend to bring to the attention of Congress, but I think it is the duty of Congress to show it is still the repository of legislative authority in the United States. The power to enact law rests in the Congress of the United States, and nowhere else. I think it is absolutely necessary that we have this new officer.

Another example.

Serious questions were raised with respect to jurisdiction over atomic energy. The problems presented, not alone to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, but to other departments, were of great magnitude. The whole question was whether the military or the civilian authorities had jurisdiction over utilization of atomic energy.

There is no question in my mind that sooner or later we are going to come to this position. Either we are going to come to that position or surrender to the executive all powers and Congress is to become merely the ratifying body for whatever actions are taken by the executive.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I regret that the distinguished author of this amendment did not appear to testify on this matter. It is a most interesting approach, one which I think would grant fabulous, fantastic power over the Congress. I think we would be creating a Frankenstein under the guise of a Legislative Attorney General who would become the boss of the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate.

As I read the amendment, it would establish an authority which would provide for a Legislative Attorney General in perpetuity. The only way he could be removed or changed, after he had been appointed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, after confirmation by the Senate and House, would be upon the showing of disability or inability to carry on. No revolving term of office is provided for. He would outlast every Member of the House or Senate, no matter how young he was, who might happen to come into either body. He would not only be the chief legal officer, but, as the amendment is written, he would write his own rules, which he himself would prescribe and make a portion of his duties.

As I read the amendment—I may be wrong—that is what the Legislative Attorney General would do. The amendment reads that—

> The Legislative Attorney General shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, with the approval of the House of Representatives and the Senate, without reference to political affiliations and solely on the basis of his fitness to perform the duties of his office, and shall be subject to removal by those officers for inefficiency, misconduct, or physical or mental incapacity.

That is all it says. Then it continues:

> He shall receive the same salary as Members of Congress.

I know of no way in which the Speaker of the House or the President pro tempore would be able, in the event of the man's inability to properly represent the feeling of the majority of the Members of Congress, or to reflect the words of the

Members of Congress as spoken officially in the report of the Judiciary Committee, or other committees, to say what they actually interpret the law as doing.

This man, this perpetual Legislative Attorney General, could go on and on, with changes of Congress and changes of administration, and be able to engage in almost unlimited, unrestricted authority, and would be the most powerful spokesman in the Congress.

It would be his decision, without any direction by the Members of the Senate or the House, or the members of the Judiciary Committees, to tell us his legal opinion on questions arising before the committees under the Constitution and laws of the United States.

I thought that was what the Senate was for, what Congress was for, and what the Committee on the Judiciary was for. I am surprised indeed to see proposed such a perpetual grant of power to one man, who is never to be changed unless the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate find him subject to removal for inefficiency, misconduct, or physical or mental incapacity.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. In the first place, I call to the attention of the Senator that this will go, not under the Committee on the Judiciary, but under the joint committee, according to my modified amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. A joint subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. HARTKE. No; under the Senator's plan as presented.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would still object to that.

Mr. HARTKE. I understand. But let me make this point——

Mr. MONRONEY. Does the Senator mean to tell me that this officer would be independent of the Judiciary Committees of the two houses?

Mr. HARTKE. Under the amendment as modified, just for the clarification of the Senator from Oklahoma, the jurisdiction, instead of being under the Committee on the Judiciary, would be under the joint committee as established by the pending bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. Of course, we are establishing, with certain limited jurisdiction, a joint committee on the operation of Congress.

Mr. HARTKE. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. But we never intended to give that committee the power to direct one man, appointed for lifetime or good behavior, to supersede an action of the Attorney General of the United States, and enter into any case that he wished to, that the Attorney General of the United States might be in, but in which he would like to appear, and who would thereupon be given the sole charge of the case, as I read the Senator's amendment.

Mr. HARTKE. Yes, but let me say, if the Senator will yield, first, what the Senator says is true, that this is an appointment subject to removal. However, in the first instance, each Congress would have to ratify the appointment, because, while there may be a question as to whether the Senate is a continuing body, there is no question that the House of Representatives is not a continuing body. Therefore, the appointment would be subject to each Congress ratifying whomever is appointed.

Mr. MONRONEY. It does not say that in the amendment. Does the Senator not think it should?

I dread putting somebody into office in perpetuity, who can be removed only by the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate, and is subject to removal only for inefficiency, misconduct, or physical or mental incapacity.

This man would be in a position to tell Congress how to vote, or to tell committees what bills to report. He is to be able to interpret our innermost thoughts. I am most surprised at this proposed grant of authority, without careful consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary, at least to refine and perfect the bill.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HARTKE. Everything that the Senator from Oklahoma has said applies today with equal force and equal effect to the Attorney General of the United States, with neither direction nor control from Congress.

What I have asked for here is the same type of authority for Congress, exactly, as, at the moment is vested in the Attorney General of the United States.

As to perpetuity, the Attorney General of the United States is appointed in perpetuity. There is no limited term on the Attorney General of the United States. He is subject to removal for the same reasons specified here. By tradition and custom, of course, he submits his resignation at the end of the term of each President, but there is nothing in the law which says he is not established in perpetuity.

What I am saying here, simply and factually, is that I want the Congress of the United States to have the same representational authority now given to the executive to control Congress. If the Attorney General of the United States today can control the innermost thoughts of every Member of Congress and every Senator, that just adds to the reason why we ought to have that power here, rather than give it to the executive.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Attorney General comes up here on invitation of the committees to testify. This man would be ordered and directed to—

> (1) render to committees, Members, and disbursing officers of the Congress, and to the Comptroller General, legal opinions upon questions arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States;

There is nothing here about invitation, nothing about requests. This is the czar who is to tell the members of the Committee on the Judiciary and other committees what one man's idea is—not that of 100 Senators, or 435 Members of the House, but he will speak from Olympus, and tell us all what his advice is.

> (2) render to committees and Members of the Congress advice with respect to the purpose and effect of provisions contained in Acts of the Congress, or to be inserted in proposed legislative measures;

This proposal would give him the spokesmanship right, being the designated Legislative Attorney General, to speak for Congress on the meaning of bills we may only recently have passed, or that we may have passed a year ago, or may intend to pass in the future.

> (3) perform such duties with respect to legislative review of executive actions as shall be prescribed from time to time;

Prescribed by whom? Prescribed by the Legislative Attorney General, under such rules as the committees—it now becomes the Joint Committee on the Operation of the Congress—may prescribe.

There is nothing in here requiring all members of that committee to be lawyers, or to be members of the Committee on the Judiciary. He would act independently of the staff of able, competent attorneys employed by the Committee on the Judiciary, and I am sure the Judiciary Committee in the House also has a staff of able and competent attorneys, as well as the legislative committees. But this man is going to have supreme authority as our spokesman, as our interpreter, and as our man.

> (4) intervene, upon request of any committee of the Congress or upon his own motion, in any action pending in any court of the United States in which there is placed in issue the constitutional validity or interpretation of any Act of the Congress, or the validity of any official proceeding of or action taken by any committee, officer, office, or agency of the Congress;

This would permit the proposed Legislative Attorney General, "upon the request of any committee," not by action of the full body, to intervene in any case whatsoever.

It may be all right for him to participate, but I certainly feel that the Attorney General established under the Constitution as the chief legal officer of the United States has a duty to perform, and that we are invading that duty by substituting our own man, our Legislative Attorney General, appointed in perpetuity, to intervene wherever he wants to, on his own motion or on the request of any committee. He can move right into these court tests.

> (5) represent, upon request, any committee, officer, office, or agency of the Congress in any legal action pending in any court of the United States to which such committee, officer, office, or agency is a party and in which there is placed in issue the validity of any official proceeding of or action taken by such committee, officer, office, or agency.

The committee did foresee the need for some of this service. I call the Senator's attention to section 402(a), paragraph (3), of S. 355, which reads:

> (3) identify and call to the attention of the Congress any court proceeding or action which, in the opinion of the Joint Committee, is of vital interest to the Congress, or to either House of the Congress, as a constitutionally established institution of the Federal Government.

We have provided for the necessary intervention in a way that would not assume the authority. Further, we say:

> Subject to the approval of the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of

> the House of Representatives, and the majority and minority leaders of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, the Joint Committee is authorized to provide for appropriate representation on behalf of the Congress or either House thereof in any proceeding or action referred to in paragraph (3) of this subsection.

We do not give him a widespread hunting license, on his own motion, to enter into any case pending in any court throughout the United States.

The Senator's amendment provides:

> Upon receipt of written notice from the Legislative Attorney General to the effect that he has undertaken pursuant to this section to perform any such specified representational service with respect to any designated action or proceeding pending or to be instituted in a court of the United States, the Attorney General shall be relieved of responsibility and shall have no authority to perform such service in such action or proceeding.

That is the Attorney General of the United States. This one man, on his own motion, could relieve the Attorney General of the United States of any responsibility; and he would thereafter have no authority to perform such service in any action or proceeding.

This would be a wonderful opportunity for some man who wished to throw his weight around, and be able to say that the powers of the great Justice Department of the United States, of the Attorney General of the United States, must stand aside at his command at the gate of the court, and that this newly created legislative attorney general in perpetuity may march in and say, "Stand aside, I am here to take charge of this case."

I think perhaps this bill contains features that could be refined by presentation before a proper committee, a committee composed certainly of a staff of lawyers such as are on the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary of which the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana is a member.

I think the staff would be competent to do this, but I think we are doing a great disservice to present this matter on next to the last day of debate on this bill without any hearing whatsoever on the amendment. To pass on this measure would be to create by our own actions today a Frankenstein that I think would be the most powerful man, not in one body, but in both bodies, and perhaps a czar of the courts everywhere under the authority contained in this measure.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to order the yeas and nays on a motion which I intend to make to table the amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana. I think we should have a show of hands on the yeas and nays pertaining to the motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The yeas and nays were then ordered.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I had not seen the pending amendment until a short while ago when the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana called my attention to it.

In listening to his remarks, it seems to me that what concerns the Senator also concerns many other Senators, including the Senator from Virginia, and that is: that the opinions rendered by the Attorney General of the United States have the full force and effect of law until offset by the courts, and the Attorney General in many cases is interpreting legislation enacted by Congress.

In most States that have the so-called short ballot, only a few individuals are elected by popular vote, the Governor and, in some cases, the Lieutenant Governor. I think in all those cases the attorney general is also elected by popular vote. Thus he is independent of the executive branch of government.

As I visualize it, what the senior Senator from Indiana seeks to do is to have the Attorney General of the United States independent of the executive branch of the Government. It seems to me that would be very desirable.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator from Virginia is quite correct.

The point is that at the present time we do have the people electing representatives to the House of Representatives and to the Senate, and although they enact laws, their interpretation in some cases has been contrary to the original intent of Congress itself.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The interpretation of the Attorney General in many cases has been, as the Senator points out, contrary to the intent of Congress.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator is correct. That erosion has continued and the czar complex to which the Senator from Oklahoma refers, if it resides any place today, certainly resides in the executive branch of the Government. It certainly does not reside here.

Certainly no one would dare put the legislative counsel from the Reference Service in here as having the full force and effect of law as is done in the case of the Attorney General. It does not have the same effect. It would not be done.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, from the point of view of political philosophy and political concepts, I approve of what the Senator from Indiana is seeking to accomplish. I must say that I do agree with the senior Senator from Oklahoma insofar as this particular amendment is concerned, and the fact that, as I read it, the man would be appointed without a time limitation.

What I wanted to do was to express to the senior Senator from Indiana my feeling that he is on sound ground in the broad objective which he seeks, to have less domination by the executive department of the legislative.

I think that is what the Senator is really aiming at and interested in.

Mr. HARTKE. That is what I am aiming at. As I said before, I have some ideas along the same line, but they do not apply to the reorganization bill. I will present them later. As far as the suggested 2-year limitation is concerned, under the law the appointment of any individual by Congress—and this would obtain in this case—would automatically be subject to reappointment by each and every succeeding Congress. So there can be no question of that. There is, in effect, a 2-year limitation.

That is not true in the case of the Attorney General of the United States. The appointment of the Attorney General of the United States is not reviewed by Congress.

In the case of a Cabinet officer, the man is not the employee of Congress. However, the Legislative Attorney General would become an employee of Congress and would have to be reappointed by each and every succeeding Congress.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I am with the Senator from Indiana in spirit, but I do not believe the pending amendment has been perfected to the point where I can give it support. However, I will be glad to work with him along the broad concept he has in mind.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank the Senator from Virginia. I would like to have his support as well as his spirit, if I could.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, when I started to practice law many years ago, an old lady came into my office with a legal problem, a rather intricate one. She asked my advice concerning it.

I got out my lawbooks and studied them and then gave her my advice. She got up and started out of my office.

I said, "Wait a minute, you owe me $5."

She said, "What for?"

I said, "For my advice."

She said, "Well, I ain't agoin' to take it."

I wonder if there might not be occasions, if the amendment of the Senator from Indiana is agreed to, when one might disagree with the Legislative Attorney General and not want to take his advice. Could he emulate the example of the old lady and refuse to take his advice?

Mr. HARTKE. There is no question about that. The authority contained in the pending amendment would provide that if the Senator from North Carolina were the author of a bill and argued that his bill was constitutional, while other Senators argued that it was not, when the bill finally came before the Supreme Court of the United States, the Senator for North Carolina could ask the Legislative Attorney General to appear before the Supreme Court and present the constitutional arguments that the Senator from North Carolina presented on the floor of the Senate.

At the present time, as a matter of fact, they are frequently not presented at all.

Mr. ERVIN. That would present another problem. I have found a great divergence of views on constitutional questions in the Senate on many occasions. I have found that other Senators do not always share the same sound views that I entertain on a subject.

I am afraid that this Legislative Attorney General might wind up a schizophrenic if he were to try to reflect the views of the Senate.

Mr. HARTKE. If the Senator has that apprehension, why would his apprehension not be greater over having the matters handled by the Attorney General as at present? The Attorney General may be in a position conflicting with the legislative branch of the Government.

Why would the Senator be willing to permit the Attorney General of the United States to do this and not be willing to grant such authority to an employee of the Senate?

Mr. ERVIN. Of course, the Attorney General represents the executive branch.

Mr. HARTKE. And he represents the opinion of the United States Congress without trying to go back to the record.

Mr. ERVIN. I agree with the views of the Senator concerning the separation of powers, but I think it might be better for the country if we could have a court that would interpret congressional acts and the Constitution correctly according to their true intents.

Mr. HARTKE. That would go back to the argument made by the Senator from Oklahoma concerning the Legislative Attorney General's power.

The Senator is willing to grant this power to an employee of the U.S. Government who is not subject to the control of Congress and has no responsibility other than to interpret the law within the broad confines of his own imagination and legal skill.

At the present time he is quite willing to give this czarlike authority to the Attorney General of the United States while saying, "But I'm fearful that the Congress of the United States could not exercise the same type of judgment that the President does in selecting a person to represent the legal opinions of Congress."

This represents to me a complete abdication of the authority of Congress, and I say that the next step should be that we delegate to the Cabinet all authority to create laws, and therefore take away from Congress everything except the right of the House of Lords, to sit in approval or disapproval; and then we can go to our partymaking or perfunctory sessions and appear as U.S. Senator without portfolio.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I am interested in the suggestion of the Senator, and I am in some sort of dilemma as to how to vote.

What concerns me is what impact the authority given to this Legislative Attorney General would have with respect to constitutional questions raised during the course of debate. The able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] and I have disagreed many times in the past 10 years as to the constitutionality of particular legislation, and I have no doubt—in all good humor—that we will disagree many times in the future.

Suppose we disagree on the constitutionality of a particular question, and it is referred to the Legislative Attorney General. Is his opinion going to be binding on me, if he agrees with the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. HARTKE. No. His opinion would be an advisory opinion, which the Senator from Pennsylvania could receive today from the Legislative Reference Service.

Mr. CLARK. What other duties would he have?

Mr. HARTKE. Specifically, he could represent and appear in court on the question of constitutionality. Say, the Supreme Court has before it the matter of the interpretation of the law. Instead of the question of constitutionality being argued by the Attorney General of the United States, those arguments which were successful on the floor of the Senate or the floor of the House of Representatives would be presented by the Legislative Attorney General in accordance with the action of the bodies.

Mr. CLARK. Would that be his only function?

Mr. HARTKE. No. He could not only go into the question of constitutionality but also the question of legislative intent, the question of representation of Congress in contempt cases or whether there may be contempt of Congress.

I mentioned the Dixon-Yates case, where there was a conflict of interest, and the question arose as to how the administration could prosecute members of its own executive branch of Government.

They attempted to establish a little cell, so to speak, in the Attorney General's office, which could not be influenced by the Attorney General, himself. How much better it would have been for the congressional legislative attorney to have proceeded with those contempt proceedings.

Mr. CLARK. What duties would the Legislative Attorney General have during the drafting and consideration of legislation, both in committee and on the floor?

Mr. HARTKE. So far as the drafting is concerned, I do not believe he would be called in on drafting, but so far as advice concerning constitutionality and giving legal opinions, I think he would be consulted.

Mr. CLARK. What would happen to counsel for the legislative committee?

Mr. HARTKE. Basically, I think they could continue in their present role. It would not interfere with them.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that this Legislative Attorney General would, under his opinion, represent the case for the Government before the Supreme Court in matters testing constitutionality of our laws?

Mr. HARTKE. Only in cases that would in effect be an amicus curiae representation. The Attorney General would still proceed regularly in his cases.

Mr. MONRONEY. The section on page 4 of the amendment reads as follows:

> "(b) Upon receipt of written notice from the Legislative Attorney General to the effect that he has undertaken pursuant to this section to perform any such specified representational service with respect to any designated action or proceeding pending or to be instituted in a court of the United States, the Attorney General shall be relieved of responsibility and shall have no authority to perform such service in such action or proceeding.

As I read that section, we can be sure that in any action passed by Congress, we will have our own Legislative Attorney General pleading the case that he found to be constitutional.

Mr. HARTKE. What is wrong with that?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would feel that the dice would be loaded in favor of Congress in that test. I would much prefer to have the Department of Justice. I do not believe in throwing the Department of Justice into the ashcan.

Mr. HARTKE. I do not want the Department of Justice thrown into the ashcan.

Mr. MONRONEY. Or in dismissing the Attorney General at the will of some newly created Legislative Attorney General who will plead the case if it involves constitutionality of the law.

Mr. HARTKE. This is remarkable. The Senator wants to throw the whole Congress into the ashcan. In other words, the Senator is saying that Congress cannot be trusted to defend its own action before the Supreme Court. This is a remarkable thing. The Senator is saying that the executive branch can interpret a law in a way which is 100 percent in opposition to the legislative intent, and that the Attorney General of the United States can go before the Supreme Court and say, "I don't care what Congress said. This is what we say." And Congress would sit here idly, and the only recourse available would be to have a quick session of Congress, pass another law, and have the Attorney General subsequently report the process.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not believe that any Member of this body wishes to discharge the Justice Department from consideration of cases. I do not believe that any carte blanche authority to a so-called Legislative Attorney General, to relieve the attorney of the United States from any responsibility, would be good law.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make an observation?

Mr. HARTKE. I have approximately 2 or 3 minutes remaining. I gather that the Senator from North Carolina is going to speak in opposition. Perhaps the Senator from Oklahoma would like to yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has 16 minutes, the Senator from Indiana 1 minute.

Mr. MONRONEY. I will yield some time to the Senator from Indiana, if he wishes.

I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the situation against which this amendment is directed is a situation which is created by the court, not by the Attorney General or by the Department of Justice.

The interpretations of the acts of Congress and the interpretations of the Constitution are made by the court, not by the Attorney General and not by the Department of Justice; and wherever there has been an incorrect interpretation placed upon an act of Congress, or the Constitution that interpretation has been placed by the court.

No case gets to the court, especially the Supreme Court, unless two sides are represented. There would be two sides to present the arguments. The Senator from Indiana desires another argument to be made. In other words, he wants the Supreme Court to have the benefit of more light on the subject before them. I think that shedding more light may be fraught with some danger.

In Reconstruction times, in North Carolina, we had a Reconstruction judge, Judge Logan, who was elected to the superior court. We had a very distinguished lawyer there, Judge David Schenck, who argued a case before Judge Logan. Judge Logan decided the case against Judge Schenck. As Judge Schenck came out of the courthouse, one of his friends asked him what he thought about Judge Logan. Judge Schenck said that Judge Logan reminded him of an owl, that the more light you shed upon him, the blinder he got.

I should like to suggest to the Senator from Indiana that if he has some more light to shed for the benefit of the court on the subject before the court, the court might be like Judge Logan or the owl, and might get blinder than ever. That is one danger that this situation may be fraught with.

Mr. HARTKE. I only have 1 minute.

Mr. ERVIN. I will yield whatever time I have left.

Mr. HARTKE. I am not afraid of more light. I believe that one thing that this country would love to see in practically everything that goes on in this Government is more light and more facts and to stop hiding things and making decisions behind some door and never taking the people into its confidence. That type of illumination is the essence of democracy.

So far as the court is concerned, if there are positions which should be represented, if there are more than two approaches to a problem and positions which should be represented, there is no reason for me to think that those propositions which are legal, which are right, and which have merit should not be presented to the court.

I trust the courts.

Mr. ERVIN. The decisions are made in the seclusion of the conference room. I would support the proposal of the Senator if it made provision that the Legislative Attorney General could visit the court in the conference room and give them light there. Then, I would support it gladly.

Mr. HARTKE. I would like to have him there as amicus curiae in some of these cases so that the court might understand better the position and intent of Congress.

Although the Senator is correct that the court is the final authority on the decision as to constitutionality, the truth still remains that the opinion of the Attorney General today has the full force and effect of law until it is challenged.

At the same time, I am saying that in many cases an opinion is given where there is a complete absence of congressional intent, and in many cases it stretches congressional intent. There are some people who think that the Attorney General comes out with opinions which are directly opposite to the original intent of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I am ready to vote.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HARTKE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the motion to table. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of illness in the family.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 16, as follows:

[No. 48 Leg.]

YEAS—66

Aiken
Anderson
Baker
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Brooke
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Gore
Griffin
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Hatfield
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Magnuson
McGee
McGovern
Miller
Monroney
Mundt
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—16

Bartlett
Bayh
Byrd, W. Va.
Clark
Fulbright
Hartke
Hollings
McCarthy
McClellan
McIntyre
Metcalf
Moss
Nelson
Randolph
Russell
Talmadge

NOT VOTING—18

Allott
Burdick
Dodd
Gruening
Hayden
Hruska
Javits
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Murphy
Sparkman
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which I have just sent to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of section 136(b)(2) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 as amended by section 105 of this act add the following language: "and may request the Comptroller General to investigate and report on any matter relating to the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds under such laws."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate take up this amendment, because it applies to a section which has previously been amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, let me say that this amendment has been discussed with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator in charge of the bill, and also with the ranking minority Member, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. President, the pending reorganization bill contains language in several places to strengthen the relationship between the Congress and the General Accounting Office. I am in full support of this because I believe that congressional committees should make much more use of the services of the General Accounting Office in carrying out their review responsibilities. However, there is one serious gap in the pending bill which needs to be closed. There is nothing either in existing law or in the pending bill which gives all standing committees of Congress the authority to request the GAO to make studies and investigations for them.

Under existing law, the GAO is required to make investigations and reports ordered by committees having jurisdiction over revenue, appropriations, and expenditures. This law has been interpreted to limit such requests to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and to the House and Senate Government Operations Committees, the House Committee on Ways and Means, and the Senate Committee on Finance. Other committees have no statutory authority to request the GAO to make investigations.

I believe it is important that all standing committees of Congress have the authority to make full use of the GAO's resources to make studies, investigations, and reports. I have had prepared an amendment to the pending bill for this purpose.

I have had an amendment prepared to amend the bill for that purpose.

To make sure that my amendment would carry out the intent that I had in mind, I wrote to the Comptroller General on February 20, 1967, and on February 24, 1967, I received a reply from Mr. Frank Weitzel, Assistant Comptroller General. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have copies of this correspondence printed at this point in the RECORD.

I believe it is clear from Mr. Weitzel's letter that my amendment will provide the specific authority needed and that he sees no objections to such authority being provided by the pending bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1967.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter of February 20, 1967, refers to the following proposed amendment to S. 355 which you have had drafted:

"Strike the period after the word 'committee' in line 4, page 16 and add the following language: 'and may request the Comptroller General to investigate and report on any matter relating to the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds under such laws.' "

You state that nowhere do you find a statutory provision either in existing law or under the pending bill which specifically authorizes a standing committee of Congress to request investigations or reports by the General Accounting Office on matters relating to the review responsibility of the committee. You consider this a serious gap which should be filled. You therefore request my opinion as to whether the proposed amendment provides adequate statutory authority to have the General Accounting Office carry out investigations and studies requested by standing committees or whether I have any suggestions for a different procedure to meet this objective.

Your proposed amendment would vest authority in each standing committee of the Senate and House of Representatives to request me to investigate and report on any matter relating to the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds under laws or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee. Since the amendment restricts the investigations to matters relating to the receipt, disbursement and application of public funds, the language of the amendment appears adequate to accomplish your purpose without providing any additional specific authority to the General Accounting Office. As you know, section 312(a) of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, 31 U.S.C. 53(a) presently authorizes the Comptroller General to investigate all matters relating to the receipt, disbursement and application of public funds and to report to the Congress thereon.

While I am now required by section 312(b) of the 1921 act, 31 U.S.C. 312(b), to make such investigations and reports as shall be ordered by any committee of either House having jurisdiction over revenue, appropriations and expenditures, only the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and on Government Operations, the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance have heretofore had jurisdiction over revenues, appropriations or expenditures within the meaning of that section.

As a matter of practice, however, the General Accounting Office, within the limits of available staff, has always made investigations of matters relating to the receipt, disbursement and application of public funds at the request of any committee of the Congress. Your amendment will provide specific statutory authority to all standing committees to continue to make such requests. While the amendment might result in an increase in the number of such requests, it is assumed that this Office can still exercise some discretion within the limits of available staff since our compliance with the requests is not made mandatory.

Your amendment will give the standing committees specific authority to make such requests and I see no objections thereto nor have any alternative suggestions to meet your objective.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK H. WEITZEL,
Assistant Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], to Mr. Elmer B. Staats, Comptroller General of the United States, on February 20, 1967.

There being no objection, the letter ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS,
February 20, 1967.

Mr. ELMER B. STAATS,
Comptroller General of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STAATS: One of the important sources of assistance to Senate Committees in carrying out their legislative review responsibilities is the General Accounting Office. Investigative reports and, on occasion, special staff assistance from your Agency, have been very helpful to our Committee in making investigations and studies on the execution of laws enacted by the Congress.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967, now being considered by the Senate, contains language in several places strengthening the relationship between the Congress and the General Accounting Office. Specific language is included defining GAO's responsibilities in assisting Congressional Committees.

This is very good but I find one serious gap which I believe should be filled. Nowhere do I find a statutory provision either in existing law or under the pending bill which specifically authorizes a standing committee of Congress to request investigations or reports by the General Accounting Office on matters relating to the review responsibility of the committee.

I have asked, therefore, that an amendment be drawn up which would clarify the authority of a committee to secure this assistance.

The proposed amendment to the pending bill, S. 355, is as follows:

Strike the period after the word "committee" in line 4, page 16, and add the following language: "and may request the Comptroller General to investigate and report on any matter relating to the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds under such laws."

I should appreciate having your opinion of this amendment—whether it provides adequate statutory authority to have your Agency carry out investigations and studies requested by standing committees or whether you would suggest a different procedure to meet this objective.

Sincerely,

JOHN SPARKMAN.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe it is clear from Mr. Weitzel's letter that my amendment would cause no objection to the pending bill.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has no objection to it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, we have talked about this amendment. The members of the committee deem it a proper amendment to this section, to make more certain that congressional committees, in performing their oversight functions, will have access to studies, reports, and investigations made by the Comptroller General.

We are happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me so I may ask the Senator from Wisconsin a question?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. Will this provision permit the Comptroller General to evaluate certain programs which are under the jurisdiction of various committees?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my understanding that this amendment would permit the committees to take the initiative to request the Comptroller General to make reports. Under those circumstances, it seems to me it would permit the General Accounting Office to make evaluation if the committee so requested.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have not been able to study the amendment in its entirety, because it has just been placed at the desk. Does it apply only to standing committees or all committees of the Senate?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my understanding that it applies to all standing committees. It would not apply to the Joint Economic Committee, which has no legislative jurisdiction, but only to committees which have jurisdiction over legislation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would have no indisposition at all to this applying to the Joint Economic Committee or any other committee, but want it to apply to subcommittees. As chairman of one of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee, I have frequently requested the General Accounting Office to investigate certain matters and report, and it has done so. Is there anything in this wording that would prevent the continuance of that course of action?

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is nothing in the wording that would prohibit that in any sense. In fact, it is acknowledged that the Appropriations Committee has this authority and uses it through its subcommittees. I am sure it would be acceptable, either for the chairman to delegate to the subcommittee authority to make the request, or handle it in any way desired, so the committee may make the request and have it honored. It would have to be through the chairman of the standing committee and through the standing committee itself.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to hear it. It may be, as a matter of practice or tradition, that the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee has specifically designated the chairmen of the subcommittees to do that, but I know that not only the Senator from Florida but other chairmen of subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations have frequently asked the General Accounting Office to render services of the type covered under this language. I would not want anything in this particular amendment to disturb or interfere with that practice.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Florida has made an excellent point. I am positive that this amendment would not in any way interfere with that practice.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator made mention that joint committees do not have legislative authority——

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I interrupt and say to the Senator I think I understand his position. I was referring to the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am chairman, which is not a standing committee and has no legislative authority. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy may be entirely different. I do not speak of that committee. In fact, that committee does have legislative authority. It is a standing committee.

Mr. PASTORE. No, it is not a standing committee. It is a joint committee with legislative authority under the law. We deal with the authorization of a bill that amounts to more than $2 billion every year. I was wondering if we could not clarify the amendment to include the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I am afraid there might be an interpretation that it would not be included. I think the Senator has a good idea, but I think he ought to modify his amendment to that extent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have no objection at all. I would like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma if he would agree to that modification.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am sorry. I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Rhode Island has suggested that I modify the amendment to include the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which has legislative responsibility and authority. He has asked that it be included so there will be no question of its ability to ask the General Accounting Office to make reports to it.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would not object at all.

Mr. PASTORE. I would hope that that amendment would be made at the desk.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified to include the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy as a committee which would have authority to make requests of the General Accounting Office for such reports.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I think it should be modified to include the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I only raise the question that this body has no jurisdiction over that committee except the appointment of its members. That is a statutory committee of both Houses. I do not think we control it one way or the other.

Mr. PASTORE. It is not a matter of control. We are saying here——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am sympathetic with what the Senator is suggesting as to its authority, but the authority for the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy comes from joint authority of both Houses, rather than the rulemaking authority of either House.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct, but we are amending basic law if it precludes the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does this involve the complete Reorganization Act?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I withdraw my remarks.

Mr. PASTORE. Therefore I move that the words "including the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy" be included right after the committees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has a right to modify his amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION ONE OF THE LARGEST DEPOSITORS IN THE INTRA BANK OF BEIRUT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the January 9, 1967, issue of Barrons there appeared an article which stated that the Commodity Credit Corporation was one of the largest depositors in the Intra Bank of Beirut, which had recently been declared bankrupt. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that my letter of January 11, 1967, addressed to Mr. John S. Schnittker, President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and his reply thereto, under date of January 31, 1967, be printed in the RECORD. These letters outline the status of our accounts with that bank.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., January 11, 1967.

Mr. JOHN A. SCHNITTKER,
President, Commodity Credit Corporation,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SCHNITTKER: In the January 9, 1967, issue of "Barron's" there appeared an article which states that the Commodity Credit Corporation was one of the largest foreign depositors in the Intra Bank of Beirut, which was recently declared bankrupt. In this connection please furnish me the following information:

1. A complete report of all deposits or advancements which were made to this bank along with the dates and amounts.

2. Were these routine deposits?

a. If not, explain why such investments were made.

3. Did these deposits represent proceeds from sales under Public Law 480?

4. To what extent did they represent counterpart funds which we were obligated to spend and leave in the country and to what extent did they represent free funds available for our use?

5. Were these deposits in dollars or in their currencies?

a. If in their currencies, did we have the right to convert into dollars prior to the receivership?

6. If these funds represent counterpart funds, are we obligated to make the loss good in order to fulfill our contract with the country, and if so, to what extent are we obligated?

In referring to the above amounts in terms of the currency of the country or countries involved also give the dollar equivalent as well as any other information which you think would be pertinent in explaining this transaction.

Yours sincerely,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., January 31, 1967.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in reply to your letter dated January 11, 1967, referring to an article in Barron's" (issue of January 9, 1967) "which states that the Commodity Credit Corporation was one of the largest foreign depositors in the Intra Bank of Beirut, which was recently declared bankrupt."

A brief explanation of the nature of the transactions between Intra Bank and CCC appears to be appropriate before answering the specific questions raised in your letter.

CCC was not a depositor of either U.S. dollars or counterpart funds in Intra Bank at the time it suspended operations. The bank's obligation to CCC is in connection with letters of credit issued by its New York Branch in favor of CCC under the CCC Export Credit Sales Program. The program provides for the financing by CCC of exports of agricultural commodities by private U.S. exporters for credit periods up to a maximum of 36 months. Foreign importers arrange through U.S. exporters to purchase the agricultural commodities on credit terms. CCC finances such sales by either delivering commodities from its stocks to the U.S. exporter or delivering to him Export Commodity Certificates which entitle the holder to receive commodities from CCC stocks equivalent in value to such certificates. For all such transactions CCC requires that the parties involved submit an irrevocable letter of credit issued in favor of the Corporation by a U.S. bank or an acceptable foreign bank and guaranteeing payment in U.S. dollars at the expiration of the credit period for the value of the commodities, plus interest thereon, delivered by the Corporation under the program. The program regulations (copy attached) provide that CCC will not hold the U.S. exporter liable for non-payment of amounts due CCC under the letters of credit. However, in the event that a bank should default in its obligation under a letter of credit, CCC would be subrogated to the rights of the U.S. exporter against the foreign importer for the unpaid balance of the purchase price of the commodities.

Your questions are answered in the order presented in your letter.

1. CCC did not have any deposits in Intra Bank of Beirut. The New York Branch Office of Intra Bank issued letters of credit in favor of CCC under which exports of agricultural commodities totaling $21,010,766.91 were made by various U.S. exporters under CCC's Export Credit Sales Program. Both the New York Branch Office and the Beirut home office of Intra Bank are liable to CCC for payments when due under these letters of credit. Enclosed is a schedule of the letters of credit issued by Intra Bank in favor of CCC which were outstanding as of the date the bank suspended operations. All of these sales were made for a credit period of three years. Accordingly, the due date in each case is three years subsequent to the "Interest Begin Date."

2. As outlined above, the Intra Bank's obligations to CCC are in the nature of guarantees of payment for wheat, feed grains and dairy products exported to Lebanon ($17,606,360.95), the United Arab Republic ($2,475,997.67) and Cyprus ($928,408.29) through commercial trade channels under the CCC Export Credit Sales Program. All but $119,826.48 (butter) of these credit sales involved wheat and feed grains, the bulk of which were exported to Lebanon. USDA's decision in 1965 to approve three year credits under the CCC Export Credit Sales Program was the culmination of extended efforts dating back to 1959 to regain and expand the U.S. historic share of Lebanon's commercial wheat and flour import market which had been lost to concessionally-priced sales of Western European countries. Similar concessional price disadvantages prevented the U.S. from competing in Lebanon's rapidly expanding commercial feed grain import market. Efforts to obtain for the U.S. a share of Lebanon's grain import market through PL 480 and other export sales authorities were not successful due to the inability to meet the non-commercial price competition price competition of other suppliers.

The sales under the CCC Export Credit Sales Program accomplished USDA's objective of developing and expanding commercial markets for U.S. agricultural commodities in accordance with guidelines on export program priorities (set forth on page 59 of the House Agriculture Committee Report No. 754 of July 22, 1961, copy attached) which lists sales for short-term credit such as those under the CCC Export Credit Sales Program ahead of barter and PL 480 sales and donations. In contrast to 1964 when there were practically no exports of U.S. wheat and feed grains, 238,338 MT of wheat, 81,970 MT of corn and 4,077 MT of grain sorghums were exported to Lebanon in 1965–66.

3. PL 480 program sales proceeds were not involved. Intra Bank's obligations to CCC relate to transactions under the CCC Export Credit Sales Program and are payable in U.S. dollars.

4. Letters of credit issued in favor of CCC covering obligations incurred under the CCC Export Credit Sales Program do not involve counterpart funds.

5. Not applicable.

6. Not applicable.

Pursuant to a new statute approved by the Government of Lebanon on January 10, 1967, Intra Bank (or any other Lebanese bank which fails to make payments) will be allowed a period of six months in which to endeavor to arrange for sufficient funds to resume banking operations. This statute had the effect of nullifying the then recent decision of the Lebanese Commercial Court which declared Intra Bank to be bankrupt. An independent audit of Intra Bank was commenced about January 1, 1967 by the auditing firm of Cooper Brothers, London, England. On January 6, 1967 the Intra Bank matter was referred by USDA's General Counsel to the U.S. Department of Justice for such action as may be necessary to protect the interests of CCC. The Department of Justice has retained local counsel in Lebanon to represent the United States and CCC in any proceedings in Lebanon. If Intra Bank management fails to refinance the bank and to resume banking operations, CCC may lose some portion of the outstanding amounts under the Export Credit Sales Program for which Intra Bank is guarantor. The extent of such losses in the event of liquidation of the bank cannot reasonably be estimated until Cooper Brothers has completed their audit of the bank.

There is some reasonable basis for our hope that the management of Intra Bank will be successful in its endeavors to refinance the bank and resume banking operations on an unrestricted basis. The legislative action by the Government of Lebanon giving Intra Bank six months to endeavor to raise sufficient funds to refinance the bank, the fact that a number of parties are known to be anxious to acquire the controlling interest in Mid-East Airlines and other valuable assets of Intra Bank, the willingness of Kuwaiti interests to consider making a substantial investment in Intra Bank depending upon the results of the current audit, and the expressed willingness of American and European banks to assist in refinancing Intra Bank under appropriate conditions, cause us to believe there is still a definite possibility of Intra Bank meeting all of its obligations notwithstanding the necessary delay in working out complicated problems.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. SCHNITTKER,
Under Secretary.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 355) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, earlier today the Senate agreed to a unanimous-consent request to limit debate to 2 hours on the Hruska amendment dealing with title V of the bill and to limit debate on the bill itself to 2 hours, beginning on Monday next.

When I obtained that agreement, I expressed the hope that all amendments, except the Hruska amendment, would be disposed of today. However, the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has expressed the desire to bring up his amendments next Monday. So it is now our intent to dispose of all amendments this afternoon and then on Monday next, during the further consideration of the pending bill, the Ellender amendments will be considered immediately after the bill is laid before the Senate, to be followed by the Hruska amendment. The time limitation on the Ellender amendment will be one-half hour on each side under the pending agreement for one Ellender amendment, and one-half hour on all other Ellender amendments, the time to be equally divided between the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

I make that unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I think the Senator said we were to dispose of all other amendments today excepting those.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. I have this many amendments on my desk. How long are we going to take to do that?

Mr. MANSFIELD. As long as the Senator wants. How many is the Senator going to offer?

Mr. PASTORE. I am not going to offer any.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We checked around. This is the best we can do with what we know.

Mr. PASTORE. Has the majority leader any idea how many more there are?

Mr. MANSFIELD. One.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have three.

Mr. PASTORE. Are there any more?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then the Hruska and Ellender amendments.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the majority leader have any idea how many amendments there are?

Mr. MANSFIELD. One on this side and three there.

Mr. PASTORE. How many more do we have?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, perhaps we can have Senators hold up their hands and count the hands.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I make that suggestion relative to amendments in the form of a unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PASTORE. I object, Mr. President, unless I can get an answer to my question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has the answer. We have only four amendments that we know of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the previous unanimous-consent agreement with respect to the Hruska amendment and its consideration next Monday be modified, as necessary, to reflect this change in plans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question, or whatever it is the Senator has.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is a comment. Mr. President——

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator will suspend until order is restored.

The Senate will be in order.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this not be taken out of my time, but that it be "on the house."

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Monday, March 6, 1967, at the conclusion of routine morning business, in addition to the existing agreement on the same bill, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 355) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, debate on 10 amendments to be offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and considered immediately after the bill is laid before the Senate, is to be limited to one-half hour on each (except one to be designated by Mr. ELLENDER which will be debated for one hour) to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. ELLENDER and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and that debate on the so-called Hruska amendment affecting title V of the bill be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided between Mr. MONRONEY and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders or someone designated by them: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, some question was raised about the 2-hour limitation on the Hruska amendment, since it proposes to strike out title V, which is the so-called antilobby title.

I should point out that there are 2 hours on the bill, and I have the assurance of the majority leader that if more time is required, there will be no objection, certainly, from his side.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Of course, that is true.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. So, inasmuch as the distinguished author of the proposal appears to be unavoidably away at the present time, I am quite content to let that 2-hour limitation stand.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 13, strike out all on lines 13 to 21 inclusive and insert the following:

"(d) After the conclusion of each day of hearing, if so requested by any such committee, the staff shall prepare for the use of members of the committee a summary of the testimony given before the committee on that day. After approval by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee, each such summary may be printed as a part of the committee hearings if such hearings are ordered by the committee to be printed."

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment. All it would do would be to make it permissive for each committee to determine whether or not all the evidence submitted to it during the course of the day shall be summarized by the staff.

As everyone knows, there is an awful lot of testimony presented to all of the committees which does not deserve summarization. Some of it does, some does not. We make those summaries now, if the importance of the testimony seems to warrant it.

I do not think there ought to be a legal requirement such as this that all the evidence taken each day has got to be summarized, whether it is worth anything or not. All that the amendment would do is say "at the request of the committee." It does not say it shall not be summarized; it only says each committee shall determine whether it will be summarized or not.

I think it is a very simple and sensible amendment, and ought to be agreed to.

Mr. **AIKEN**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. I yield.

Mr. **AIKEN**. I think the Senator's amendment is a worthy one. Many times witnesses testify before a committee, and the committee members ask them for further information or data which is not available that night, and therefore a review by the staff would necessarily have to be incomplete anyway.

However, I do not think the Senator's amendment, except to strike out what the bill provides, is necessary, because the committee can direct the staff to furnish those reviews, anyway, under the present rules.

However, I see no harm in it.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. But under the bill as written, it would appear to require a summary every day.

Mr. **HOLLAND**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. I yield.

Mr. **HOLLAND**. Do I correctly understand that what the Senator's amendment would do would be to make a provision which is now mandatory, as stated in the bill, permissive only, for each committee in its own judgment?

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. For each committee to determine for itself what is worth summarizing. To do what we do now, as a matter of fact. I suspect a number of these provisions are somewhat too arbitrary. We may not take them too seriously, but I see no reason to put such a mandatory provision in the bill, and require it.

Mr. **PASTORE**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. I yield.

Mr. **PASTORE**. Is anyone opposed to this suggestion?

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. I do not know.

Mr. **PASTORE**. I cannot imagine how anyone would be opposed to it.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. I cannot, either, but as the Senator knows, there are a great many differences of opinion here in the Senate, and it is sometimes hard to know.

I do not know whether the manager of the bill is opposed to the provision or not. I hope he is not.

Mr. **MONRONEY**. Mr. President, we are opposed to deleting this section from the bill. We think testimony that is worthy of being given before such a committee as the Committee on Foreign Relations, or the Appropriations Committee, or any committee of Congress, and has consumed the time of some 14 to 18 men in open session, should be summarized.

We do not require it to be printed. We have yielded on the matter of summarization, as we had on the testimony before being given, but we feel that the hearings should completely cover the subject at hand.

Many of the members of other committees, I suppose, like ours, are often absent, perhaps for 2 or 3 days while an important piece of legislation has been going through the committee. They will be required to vote on whether to report that bill or not.

How will those Senators be able, without ruining their eyes by reading all night long, to get the time to catch up with the pattern of what transpired? I see absolutely no reason why, with the condensation capabilities that are available, this procedure could not be followed. We know from today's writing methods, such as in the Reader's Digest and other periodicals, that condensation is possible without too great a loss of substance. This proposal would afford some service to the average Member of the Senate. I am not a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, so I would like to know something about what is testified to by Dean Rusk and some of the other great men who testify before this committee, and a summarization would be helpful.

I think it would be necessary, in order not to have a supersummation, to say that we would have summarized only what was felt to be important.

Mr. **HOLLAND**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **MONRONEY**. I yield.

Mr. **HOLLAND**. Would this requirement apply to the Committee on Appropriations and its subcommittees?

Mr. **MONRONEY**. Yes.

Mr. **HOLLAND**. The hearings on some of the appropriation bills last 3 or 4 weeks. I have found no demand whatever for such summarization, except in the most unusual cases.

To require, for instance, in connection with the hearings on the agricultural appropriation bill, about which I know something, that each morning there shall be available a summary of everything that was testified to the day before, and to have that go on for 3 or 4 weeks, seems to me to be an unnecessary burden. I think the question should be left in the judgment of the committee.

Mr. **MONRONEY**. I misspoke myself. The requirement does not apply to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. **HOLLAND**. I thank the Senator.

Mr. **PASTORE**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **MONRONEY**. I yield.

Mr. **PASTORE**. Then I ask the Senator, Why not, if we are to be consistent? We devoted a whole afternoon to the question of proxy voting. We made it abundantly clear—and the Senator from Oklahoma advanced the argument—that if a Senator cared enough about any piece of proposed legislation, he ought to be present in the committee to vote. For that reason, of course, he cannot have a proxy vote.

Now we are told that we ought to be accommodated by being notified of what happened in a committee if we did not attend. We ought to be consistent. We ought to analyze the amount of work that would be involved. It would be futile to analyze every day what transpired in the hearings of the previous day. The staff would devote itself to such an analysis, it would have to be typewritten, and perhaps no one would read it anyway. There is not a committee that will not provide such service to a Member of the Senate if he will only pick up the telephone, call the director of the staff, and ask, "What happened in the committee today?" The staff director would give the Senator that information over the telephone in 5 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe that every member of a committee has the right, when he is studying proposed legislation, to have the advantages of the latest techniques, and not to have to wade through voluminous pages of copy or of hearings. Certainly we are not asking too much of our staffs to prepare such summaries. It is done in many committees today.

The Committee on Appropriations would be exempt because of the large number of documents, tables, charts, and items of that kind which are placed in the hearings, and which would be difficult, if not impossible, to summarize.

But I believe that the staffs of other committees should be glad to summarize. The task would not be onerous. A few good writers could condense the testimony taken in a 3-hour session to the equivalent of a 30-minute synopsis, such that the average member of a committee could understand just what had taken place.

The Senator says that it is done now, and is a good idea, when a Senator wants to have it done. I think all members of a committee are entitled to have such summaries, and the staffs are perfectly capable, without a large addition of personnel, to provide them.

I believe it would be a great step forward in educating, enlightening, and informing Members of the Senate of what transpires in committee meetings. Even if Senators had been in attendance, I believe it would be a good idea to condense a 6-, 8-, or 10-page statement to half a page before the committee took final action or voted, in the event that some Members had a strong doubt about the testimony or the action taken by the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the end result of the proviso which the Senator from Arkansas proposes to strike out, coupled with other provisions of the bill, would be greater staffs, higher-paid staffs, more power in the hands of the staffs, and less knowledge in the heads of the Senators.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in view of the comments of the distinguished Senators from Rhode Island, Florida, and other States, I have another amendment that might serve the purpose. Instead of having two amendments, one would suffice.

I have another amendment, the purpose of which is simply to have the privileges and immunities contained in the bill extended to the Committee on Foreign Relations as well as to the Appropriations Committee, including the exemption from preparing summaries.

I would be perfectly happy to withdraw the pending amendment and offer the other amendment. It would solve the matter of summaries as well as certain other matters contained in the bill.

The Committee on Foreign Relations is next to the largest committee in the Senate. It is not quite as large as the Committee on Appropriations, but it is next to the largest committee.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has many unique problems before it, and I think it is entitled to the same exemptions that the Committee on Appropriations is entitled to.

If it is in order, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the pending amendment and offer my amendments numbered 46, 47, and 48 and ask that they be considered en bloc. That action would serve the same purpose and dispose of my amendments.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have no objection to the Senator getting that relief for his committee. However, it seems to me that the chairman and ranking minority members of every committee ought to have that same privilege, if they want to have it, of having these résumés drawn every day.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request. We can vote on the pending amendment, and I shall then offer the amendments separately.

I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time if the Senator from Oklahoma will yield back the remainder of his time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the Senator has injected an entirely new matter into the debate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I withdrew that for the moment in view of the comment of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is the Senator willing to have a vote now on the pending amendment to leave it to the will of the staff or committee as to whether we should have summaries?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, in a Senate that costs as much money to operate as this Senate does, whose hearings involve large numbers of witnesses with lengthy statements given before our committees, this would be very helpful. If it is worthwhile to have that time taken up by the committee to hear the evidence, it is then worthwhile to have the evidence summarized not only for ourselves, but also for other Senators so that they might have the best possible information on the testimony that has been given.

Yet, I venture to guess that not 10 percent of the Senators are able to read all the voluminous, bulky volumes of testimony given before any of the congressional committees. By condensing this testimony in summary form, it would be a very easy matter for Members of Congress to have the gist of most of the information, and we would save the eyesight of 100 Senators if they were able to read in 3 minutes material that might otherwise take 15 minutes to wade through.

The Senator knows as well as I do how lengthy and verbose many of the statements made before the committees are.

I certainly feel that the pending amendment would strike out a very vital part of the modernization of Congress if we were to fail to authorize the preparation of the summaries that are provided for in the pending bill. It would be left to the committee to determine whether they wanted to take advantage of this provision.

I regret that I must oppose the amendment. I think that it would eliminate a provision which would be very helpful to the Senators—the provision for summaries.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, perhaps this is not a practice in the other committees, but we have had the longstanding practice in the Committee on Foreign Relations that on certain days we allow people to appear of their own volition on important legislation.

Much of that testimony is given freely by lobbyists who are employed for the purpose, and I am quite sure that is an example of the type of testimony that would not have to be summarized.

Mr. President, I am ready for a vote on my amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, there is nothing in the bill that would provide that a summary of a 30-page statement would have to be 10 pages.

The committee in its discretion is entitled to determine the length of the summary they might require of any given amount of evidence, basing it perhaps on the value that they themselves place on the evidence.

I see no reason why the staffs would not be able to do this. We have authorized and appropriated money for competent staffing, and I take second place to no one in my enthusiasm for providing good staffing to be made available not only to committee members, but also to Senators who are engaged in other legislation and do not have time to wade through uncondensed testimony, which is the only way we can get it today if we are not present at the hearings ourselves.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, would this provision of the pending bill apply only to hearings held at the Capitol or would it also apply to field hearings all around the country?

Mr MONRONEY. It would apply to any hearings that are reported.

Mr. HOLLAND. I remind the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, that we had extensive hearings that lasted for more than a month, as I recall, beginning in Vermont and going clear across the country and back across the country again on a certain agricultural bill.

I cannot think of anything that would have been more burdensome than to try to make that jump every night and at the same time have a summary ready every morning.

It seems to me that under such conditions—and I do not know this—that he would wish to waive the preparation of a summary because he would know that the entire hearings would be printed and available to us when we got back.

It seems to me that this provision would be unduly burdensome and expensive.

I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas will prevail, because it seems to me that that would leave it up to the good judgment of the chairman and ranking member of every committee as to what to do under given circumstances—whether to utilize these summaries or not.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would say that they have had this authority. It has existed for years.

We tried to encourage this practice in the Reorganization Act of 1946. I doubt if there are more than two or three standing committees of the Senate today that serve their members with summaries.

I think we are entitled to summaries. I think the staffs should be glad to give them to us. I think the members and the chairmen of the committees would be happy to have a better informed Senate because material and information presented in testimony has been summarized. Otherwise, Senators would not be able to wade through and possibly understand all that took place with relation to minor items.

In the matter of holding hearings on the road, I am sure that no one would insist that those be written up and processed every night as we move from place to place. But when we get back, all that testimony has to be edited, it has to be corrected, the misspellings and grammatical errors must be corrected; and the Members receive the testimony in order to correct their remarks. All these things go on, and yet the material is piled up in a stack as high as the Washington Monument, never to be read, never to be looked at.

Let us get something brief enough, with the techniques that are known today, so that the Senate can be better informed on the serious items we must take up, and not leave this in a state of "well, maybe we will and maybe we won't."

As Senators, I believe that we have a right to ask to have a rule which would provide that we have these digests. We do not require them to be printed. If it is not worthy of the cost of printing, it will be maintained in the committee records. But I believe that it will be helpful to the Members to have these digests written up. I do not see what is so sacrosanct about the time of the staffs, busy as they are, that they cannot give these digests to the Members of the Senate so that we will have this information. Why should we deny making it a little easier for Senators to know what each committee is doing?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. It is common knowledge that the transcript of the Official Reporters is not ready that night. If the staff member who would prepare the summary wanted to be accurate, he would require the official reporter's transcript, and that would not be ready until the next morning. I do not believe it would work. I think it is unnecessary.

Furthermore, this review could not be furnished to all members of the committee by the next morning, provided there were only three out of 19 or 15 present at the time of the hearing.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would think that a competent staff member, listening to the testimony, having a copy of the testimony from which the man was reading, would be able to make a sufficient number of notes to justify the summary for which I am asking. I am not asking for a complete documentation of everything that was said. That is impossible. I recognize that. The purpose of the digest would be to give an unbiased gist of the material.

It is done many times today. Military men will come before committees and present vast volumes of material, and then they will have to have something that can be condensed within a page or two, condensing the testimony that has taken perhaps an hour to give.

Mr. AIKEN. But most of their valuable information does not come from the official testimony which has been submitted in advance by the witness. It comes from the questioning of the witness. Those questions and answers must be taken down by the Official Reporter, and he will not have that transcript ready that night. If the staff can do it without the official committee reporter, what do we need the Official Reporter for?

Mr. MONRONEY. Because we need a completely documented record.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The distinguished Senator well knows that I am supporting him on this bill, and I shall support him regardless of whether or not this amendment is adopted. But I believe that it is completely unnecessary to deprive the chairman and the ranking minority members of all our various committees of the discretion and sound judgment to dispense with this expensive service when they think it may be properly dispensed with.

I believe that the Senator will have the advantage of the action which he seeks to take if the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas is adopted, because I do not believe that the distinguished Senator, should his committee want to leave a compulsory provision there—under the situation that I mentioned a short time ago, of nationwide hearings lasting a month or more—would still require this daily résumé, no matter how impossible it was to obtain.

I hope the Senator will accept this amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. May I ask one more question?

Assuming that the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of State is reporting confidential information to us. The Senator knows that that testimony and the report of the hearing are submitted to the State Department or to the Defense Department for the deletion of comments which perhaps should not be made known to the world. We do not get the testimony back that night. I do not know when we get it. Eventually, yes, we get it back, with the deletions made by the various departments, which they think are advisable in the interest of national security, would that not complicate the matter?

Mr. MONRONEY. May I ask my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Vermont, if the point he makes is that we should have language saying "shall be condensed as soon as practicable," so that we would eliminate the matter spoken of by the distinguished senior Senator from Florida as to road hearings, or even in the classified part? As the Senator knows, we do not wish to put into print anything that is classified.

My first opinion of the matter was that we would ignore the summarization of the classified material, important though it might be, because it might fall into the hands of those who are not entitled to see it.

It would be up to the committee to decide what they wish to do about summarization there. But let us get started on helping the Members once in a while, instead of burdening a Senator with a large volume of material that no one in the world can digest or understand unless he is a member of the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Much of the classified matter has appeared in the Sunday paper the week before, anyway.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is true. But I believe that the classified matter could be dispensed of by not using it.

I would be happy to agree to any amendment to make it "as soon as practicable," knowing that there may be times of heavy crowding when it would be inappropriate to attempt to summarize. Hard as our staffs work, they will not be overworked in the committees by requiring this material to be published when it is so ordered by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee, or to have it available in the office so that we could have a typewritten or mimeographed copy of the gist of the material.

The length of the material and the completeness of the digest could be strictly up to the chairman and the ranking minority member, to see that it satisfies the needs of the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I say this simply as an observation. I sympathize with the problem of the testimony that we get in many cases. It is not so much the volume of the testimony as it is the repetition that takes place before the committees.

I have often thought that we should

consider, in the joint committee of the Senator from Oklahoma, the possibility of doing what the courts long ago found they had to do—establish an independent agency, whose responsibilities are not in some cases as great as ours, with respect to national issues. This would mean the establishment of some kind of referee or people to hear certain testimony and then submit it to the committee, or direct the people who give the testimony to have an oral argument of five minutes or two minutes, or whatever is desired.

It seems to me that this is the only way we will ever get at the problem of mountains of testimony before committees. The committee would have to decide which matter should be heard by an examiner.

Every other branch of Government does this—judiciary, administrative branch—and, so far as I know, every other legislative body in the free world does this.

"Referee" may not be the proper term, but it would be someone who would hear the matter and then submit it. The people would be allowed to appear with their representatives, and they would be limited to x number of oral arguments.

The problem is not so much the lack of quality in the testimony; but I believe that the real problem is the repetition, constant repetition, because of witnesses coming from one area and devoting themselves to the same subject, and they do not know what somebody from the other areas is going to testify to. One morning there may be found five or six witnesses testifying to the same thing. We are hard pressed about this from the chairmen, once in a while. Perhaps a witness has prepared his testimony for a long time and it is an important matter for him. We cannot simply shut him off. It seems to me that they should be able to present their cases in some way. I use this as an illustration.

The volume gets greater and greater. The collective number of hearings in the Committee on Commerce alone covered 367 days last year, during the session only. I guess that the transcripts of the hearings are already as high as the Washington Monument.

Mr. MONRONEY. Perhaps higher.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Perhaps higher. I was merely using that as an illustration. Sooner or later, and maybe sooner, we will come to this.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, we are asking only that somebody on the existing staff—and perhaps they are not competent to do it, but I believe they are—summarize the daily testimony, not only for Senators who may have heard the testimony, but also for those who could not be present. It is most important that Senators who will be asked to vote on these important matters be able to keep up with what was said in the hearings—from sources other than newspapers—in order to make a decision. If this course is not followed, I think that there would be an informational loss to the Senate.

I am surprised at the position of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which needs public exposure in the Senate more than any other committee. It used to be that one could read a few newspapers and determine what was going on in connection with foreign policy, but that is no longer true. Depending on whether newspapers are supporting or opposing the policy of the President in Vietnam, it is difficult to determine what the situation is since different headlines and different emphasis are put on the news.

Mr. President, we are merely trying to increase the information level. The level of information absorbed by 100 Senators would be increased by this provision. To cut out the provision and strike it down would be a disservice to the Senate. Senators must be provided with information that has been developed in committees.

I hope that the distinguished Senator will not press his amendment, because it strikes a vital provision from the bill which would give us one hope of lessening some of the onerous workload that devolves on Members of Congress.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I request a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Wherever the phrase "standing committees" is used in this bill it shall be defined to include the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I hope that the distinguished Senator will accept the amendment.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has jurisdiction over legislation. We deal with authorizations of the atomic energy effort of this country that are ordinarily between $2¼ billion and $2½ billion.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator's committee now has the same staff privileges as all standing committees.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. The amendment would make it possible, in line with the amendment previously adopted, for the Joint Atomic Energy to have the authority advantages of all standing committees?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct; and the other sections having to do with review, and that sort of thing, because our responsibility in this is the joint effort on the part of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have no objection.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I see some objections to this measure. With all due respect to the Senator, I think that the joint committee has a unique situation in regard to its responsibility which gives it some rights and opportunities in its investigations that are not enjoyed by standing committees.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. To include them as a standing committee would curtail this responsibility or opportunity.

Mr. PASTORE. No, I would intend to provide in this measure that all of the responsibility we have under the statutory law, as the original act was passed and amended in 1954, would not in any way be violated.

I would not want the amendment to curtail our authority. I would not want to take anything away that is now existing.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I believe we have all the authority now.

Mr. PASTORE. I repeat that there is nothing in the amendment which is intended to take away anything which we enjoy today under existing law.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I agree with the Senator's position as he stated it.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I believe that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] can have every assurance that the Senator from Rhode Island stated the situation correctly. We have added certain powers, functions, authority, and rights to the committees. Inasmuch as this was a joint committee perhaps we did not spell it out; but it would take nothing from the committee.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not blame the committee which worked on the bill, because the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is the only one that has legislative power.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The joint committee has the power already to call on the agencies of Government to aid in its operation.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 46, 47, AND 48

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I call up my amendments numbers 46, 47, and 48, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments are considered en bloc. The amendments will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 46

On page 11, after line 24 insert the following new subsection:

"(f) Section 133(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 190a) is amended by inserting therein immediately after the words 'Committees on Appropriations', the words 'and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.'"

AMENDMENT NO. 47

On page 12, immediately after the word "Appropriations" on line 9, insert the words "and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate".

AMENDMENT NO. 48

On page 14 after the words "Committee on Appropriations" on line 16, insert "or the Committee on Foreign Relations".

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, if it happens to be out of order, to send to the desk an amendment to the bill on behalf of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and myself and request that it be printed.

The purpose of the amendment is to delete title V which is the so-called Federal regulation of lobbying as carried in the act of 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this deletion is directed against the amendments proposed in the pending bill. It is not directed against improvement of the present act, but rather to make possible the consideration and ultimate enactment of adequate and effective revision of the present Lobbying Act.

It is commonly agreed that the present statute which seeks to regulate lobbying in Congress is ineffective, inadequate, and too difficult to administer. On this point Senator HRUSKA will elaborate in greater detail on Monday.

The amendments proposed in title V will not sufficiently restructure and improve the existing act to make it workable. This point, too, will be further detailed in later remarks on this amendment. Deletion of title V at this time is not hostile to a regulation of Lobbying Act. It is not so intended. Nor will it have that effect. The reason is that the President will shortly transmit to the Congress recommendations for "tightening our laws regulating lobbying" as he promised he would do when he delivered his state of the Union message.

It is my understanding that the recommendations now being prepared in the Department of Justice will be wider in scope than those contained in title V of the pending bill.

To defer action on title V is the better part of wisdom. It deals with a very important subject. It is a criminal statute containing substantial penalties, both fines and imprisonment. Its provisions come into close proximity with delicate and substantial constitutional rights such as free speech, free press, and the right of petition.

Great care must be exercised in drawing its provisions. An adequate degree of care can be more readily assured by awaiting the President's recommendations on the subject. They will be based on preparation by the Department of Justice. They will be the subject of public hearings and scrutiny by the congressional committees which regularly process criminal statutes. The final product will more likely have greater workability and durability by reason of such processing.

The Congress is deeply indebted and highly grateful to the Special Committee on Organization of the Congress for its labors in formulating the pending bill, S. 355.

It delved into a subject long in need of treatment. It studied a long list and large variety of vexatious problems relating to the national legislative process. They have been patient and conscientious in their labors. For this they are to be commended.

That committee was sensitive to and aware of the inadequacies of the present statute regulating lobbying. It undertook to propose amendments which it believed would improve the present law. They are contained in title V of the pending bill.

I respectfully suggest, however, that the title V amendments will not achieve the desirable and declared goal of making the law workable, effective, and enforceable. The amendments do not sufficiently restructure and revise the present law to overcome its proven failures and breakdowns.

There are a number of understandable reasons which account for this inadequate result.

No hearings were held nor any testimony taken on title V provisions.

The Department of Justice was not asked for its opinion or recommendations.

The Comptroller General was not called upon for his analysis and suggestions, even though title V seeks to confer on him the duty of administering the act and to vest in him certain duties and powers.

Neither the bar generally nor any of its associations were given an opportunity to be heard on the wisdom, merit, or soundness of the proposed amendments.

I do hope that Members will familiarize themselves with this amendment and give consideration to the reasons that prompt its introduction so that on Monday next it will receive meaningful attention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me for 1 minute?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in view of the fact that we have just passed this amendment, which I think has a broad effect, I think we should rescind the action we took on the modification of the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]; otherwise, there will be a misconstruction.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the modification which was made to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], at my suggestion, be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, we have no objection. This refers specifically to the Atomic Energy Committee, does it not?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes, it refers particularly to that question that had to do with the General Accounting Office, and applies to every part of the new amendment we just adopted.

Mr. MONRONEY. It would give them the same rights?

Mr. PASTORE. It would give them the same rights. It does not change anything; otherwise, it would be an awkward situation, after this process.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, we have no objection to rescinding the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, these amendments are simple in nature. All they would do would make the same provisions applicable to the Committee on Foreign Relations under the bill as apply to the Committee on Appropriations.

As I stated a moment ago, the Committee on Foreign Relations is the largest committee next to Appropriations. It has many of the same problems—some of them are even more difficult. It has much classified material to handle, and a great many problems in conforming to some of the provisions of this bill governing committee procedure, such as the committee hearing procedure, and so forth. That is all the amendments would do.

Senators are familiar with the provisions relating to the Committee on Appriations. It so happens that the Committee on Foreign Relations is the only committee which has its hearing room in the Capitol along with the Committee on Appropriations. Of course, there are good reasons for that.

This question of long advance notices to witnesses, is also a problem which is very difficult for our committee.

Many of our hearings are called on short notice because of the nature of the subject matter; therefore, I would hope that the Senator from Oklahoma would accept the amendments. I think it would cause very little trouble. It would also dispense with my other amendments which would solve the major problem.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder whether the Senator would tell us in his own words just what these amendments would do, rather than merely saying that his committee is like the Appropriations Committee. What changes would it make in the committee?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Well, the Committee on Appropriations, for reasons that I think are valid, in many respects has different provisions regarding the selection of its committee staff.

My amendments would give the Foreign Relations Committee the same privileges as the Committee on Appropriations. There is a provision for example with regard to the way committee staffs are to be chosen. My amendment makes the procedure the same as the Joint Committee on Congressional Reorganization.

We presently have a bipartisan personnel subcommittee on Foreign Relations made up of two members from each party, and I think it is quite satisfactory. So far as I know, there has been no complaint about it. As it is now, it would leave it to the discretion of the committee.

For example, under present law, the Committee on Appropriations does not have to fix regular weekly, biweekly, or monthly meetings. As a matter of practice, our committee does meet practically every Tuesday in what is called a regular meeting. We do not always have it just for committee business, such as confirmation of appointments, or treaties. We often use it for some other purpose, but it is the practice to meet on Tuesdays. It is not a requirement. I understand that this is exactly the same as the Committee on Appropriations. They are not required to do so under the law. They are exempt, in other words, from that particular requirement. They do not have to announce publicly all rollcall votes. The fact is, we do announce most of them, as a matter of convenience, so that reporters will not bother members of the committee; but I can well imagine that there would be occasions when we would not wish to do so. The Committee on Appropriations does not have to do that. Many of these matters are not particularly earthshaking in their importance but I think they can be a nuisance.

Mr. MUNDT. I see no objection to those three. I was concerned about whether the Senator had placed in the amendment the same rights that the Appropriations Committee has—that is, to meet when the Senate is in session——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, that would be the same.

Mr. MUNDT. This is the thing that disturbs me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why would that disturb the Senator?

Mr. MUNDT. The situation, first, is different from the Appropriations Committee. We are up against a fiscal year deadline. This is the reason why the Appropriations Committee has to grind along whenever it finds the opportunity to do so. I believe that the second difference is that as we do not deal primarily with policy matters, and the Committee on Foreign Relations does deal with a great many vital issues dealing with peace, war, with amity among nations, and so forth, it is important to the Foreign Relations Committee members, as much as they can, to be present when foreign relations problems are being discussed.

I am only disturbed by virtue of the fact that we are going to be able to meet when the Senate is in session without losing the controls which we have already established—we relaxed them somewhat from what they were formerly—no longer does it meet with the approval of the two leaders.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me say to the Senator that if it makes that much difference to him, I would be perfectly willing to delete that part. However, my reasons for listing them—and I should like the record to so state—are that for 3 or 4 years running now, we have had difficulties with foreign aid legislation, something which is not very attractive and does not inspire a great deal of enthusiastic support in the Senate any more, and which was the main reason for delaying an adjournment of the Senate a few years ago. One of the problems was that we could not meet, as the Appropriations Committee can, when the Senate is in session. We had some problems with foreign relations action. Everyone knows my position. I was in a dilemma. It caused me to be one of the principal culprits in delaying adjournment of the Senate at the time, the Senator will remember, when we were in session way into December. I remember that I was denounced for it. Senators did not like it.

I could not help it, of course, the committee could not meet. The Appropriations Committee could meet. I was stuck with that bill. It caused me much embarrassment.

Let me say to the Senator from South Dakota, who is a member of both committees, that if he feels the way he does about it, I would be willing to amend my proposal not to exempt us from the requirement that we get permission to meet while the Senate is in session.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator would do that, I certainly would have no objection to the rest.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to amend my amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be modified as suggested by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, about these provisions, I object to the provisions of the bill as proposed by the Senator. Hearings must be announced——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Arkansas please restate the modification to his amendment so that it can be laid before the Senate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is the provision exempting the Committee on Foreign Relations from the necessity of getting permission to sit while the Senate is in session, and I ask that that part be deleted.

That is in amendment No. 48, I believe.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Amendment No. 48. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered—the amendment is so modified.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, is that the provision that is contained in the proposed bill that requires so-called 2-week notice?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Originally it was. It has been changed. But I certainly want to be exempted from that.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I certainly do. I do not know how the Foreign Relations Committee could function.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was originally 2 weeks. I think it has been changed. There have been so many changes I am not sure, but I think it was changed to 1 week.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Let me read the language as it now appears on page 12 of the bill:

> Each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives (except the Committee on Appropriations) shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted by the committee upon any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the committee determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date.

So the Foreign Relations Committee or any lesser committee is able to begin hearings on 2 days' notice. We do like to have a target date so persons can get their testimony and statements ready and witnesses can be given notice to be on hand at that particular time. I do not see any impediment or delay that would be encountered by the committee, because, the way I read the language, the committee could begin on 2 hours' notice.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That answers my question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree entirely with the statement of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Would it be in order to request the manager of the bill to have this bill reprinted showing all changes made to date, so that next Monday Members of the Senate will have before them a bill in its present form? I have had several wild goose chases trying to find out what had been done at a particular place in the bill. I wonder if the Senator would make that request so that we would have the benefit of the bill as it has been changed before us by Monday?

Mr. MONRONEY. It would be almost impossible to have printed a verified copy of the bill as it has been changed, showing the amendments that have been adopted, and any adjustments or modifications.

The committee has leaned over backward to try to comply with the many requests that have been made for changes or modifications, without affecting what the committee considered to be the needs for a reorganization bill.

Perhaps we could have a tentative print that has no standing, a working copy, but we would have to know, in all fairness, that it might not be exactly accurate when compared with the final printing of the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I certainly agree again with the statement made by the Senator from Oklahoma that he has been cooperative in literally dozens of matters where minor changes have been made. If it is difficult for the staff to do that, it might be helpful if we could get a copy of the bill with a statement made for the record that this is the best the staff was able to do in their hurried efforts. This would help Members of the Senate. I think it would be extremely helpful.

Mr. MONRONEY. We will try to do that, but from the mechanical standpoint, it may be impossible, this being a weekend, with the Printing Office operating on a limited schedule, and in view of the difficulties in obtaining a complete text of the bill with every amendment that has been adopted.

Mr. HOLLAND. It occurs to me that great help can be given to all Members of the Senate by the staff doing the very best it can in getting a reprint that is as nearly perfect as can be arranged at this time. As the Senator knows, there have been literally dozens of changes, and he has been most cooperative in the making of those changes. I think Members of the Senate should have the bill as changed in the best form that can be available. If it could not be available Monday morning, but could in the afternoon, it would be helpful.

Mr. MONRONEY. We would like to have that done. As the Senator knows, the bill is 125 pages in length. Amendments have been made to it in almost every section. We will do our best to do it.

Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, because if the Foreign Relations Committee is to be exempt from all the rules, then I do not see why we should not go the whole way and strike out all of title I which governs committee procedures, hearing procedures, and committee powers of all the standing committees, the Appropriations Committee alone excepted. However, the Appropriations Committee is required to observe a multitude of other rules which require it to do its specific job. Those are rules, too. Although the chairman may abhor certain rules, the Appropriations Committee must abide by a great number of them.

It seems to me that the Appropriations Committee has an onerous workload. I have before me a list of the committee meetings held. The Appropriations Committee had 510 committee meetings, and was first in number of committee hearings. The Judiciary Committee was second with 451. The Commerce Committee was third with 243. The Foreign Relations Committee was fourth with 229. It had fewer than half the number of hearings held by the Appropriations Committee.

If the Foreign Relations Committee is to be exempted, the Armed Services Committee will certainly want to be exempted. The Commerce Committee will certainly want to be exempted.

The Finance Committee has agreed to abide by certain rules of procedure. I see no reason why there should be a denial on the part of the Foreign Relations Committee to comply with them. The work of the Appropriations Committee is different. It meets mornings and afternoons. Its hearings consume a long time. It must go into many explanations and justifications.

I might point out to the Senator that the work of the Appropriations Committee is definitely different from that of a legislative committee. The duty of a legislative committee is to fix policy, to decide on courses of action, to take up matters of changes in the law. The Appropriations Committee must supply the necessary financing to do these vast governmental activities, and it bears little relationship to the normal work of a legislative committee.

I would deeply regret to see the exemption of the Foreign Relations Committee from the application of the very minimum amount of rules we ask them to follow. We have already repealed the requirement of the matter of having prior copies of the testimony, which applies to all other committees. I think the changes made and the rules as they are changed should apply to all committees, rather than to single out a separate legislative committee and say it is exempt.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator saying that the Committee on Appropriations does not engage in legislation?

Mr. MONRONEY. It does not engage in legislation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator seriously say that?

Mr. MONRONEY. Limitation on appropriations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator would not want to mislead the public by making such a statement; would he?

Mr. MONRONEY. There are limitations on appropriations. That work goes on from year to year. The fixing of days for hearings would not apply with cogency to the Appropriations Committee, because there are always one or two subcommittees sitting all the time. The problem is to find enough days on which the committees may meet.

There is no question about the matter of other provisions. The Appropriations Committee is held to them, as the Committee on Foreign Relations is, and must provide for open hearings, except in matters of national security.

The Appropriations Committee is required to review the budget. It has to review a multitude of programs of agencies. It is required to review contexts of committee reports. It is specifically required to have yea-and-nay votes before reporting bills. Of all the committees of the Senate, the Appropriations Committee was required to have copies of the report and the bill available for Senators 3 days before a bill could be acted upon.

So this is now coming into effect for the other committee members, but I remind the Senate that we on the Appropriations Committee have been under it for some 20 years. So I do not feel that the committee is unregulated or unrestricted by rules; we just have rules that necessarily apply to the specific jobs the Appropriations Committee has to fulfill.

I see no reason why we should exempt one legislative committee specifically, and keep all the others subject to the application of the rules.

I ask, if the Senator has no further comments, that we have a vote on this matter, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I would like to ask one question, simply for my own information. There may be other Senators in the same situation.

Would these rules which apply to the Foreign Relations Committee cover not only its legislative jurisdiction, but also its jurisdiction for hearings on treaties and conventions?

Mr. MONRONEY. The same rules that would apply to all committees would apply to it, as they should.

As to the misconception that they had to schedule a meeting a week ahead of time, a provision for not doing that when the committee feels it must act sooner is already in the bill. So there is no reason, I think, to set the Committee on Foreign Relations apart from and above the other committees, by exempting it from all the normal rules which we feel are necessary to have a smooth-working Congress.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONRONEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the understanding of the Chair that in modifying the amendments that were submitted en bloc, the Senator from Arkansas withdrew amendment No. 48. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. So the question is on agreeing, en bloc, to amendments Nos. 46 and 47.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing, en bloc, to amendments Nos. 46 and 47, offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright].

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a live pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Hollings], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Mondale], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long] are officially absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] are absent because of illness in the family.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 46, as follows:

[No. 49 Leg.]

YEAS—28

Aiken
Bayh
Carlson
Case
Church
Cooper
Ellender
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Inouye
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Mundt
Muskie
Pell
Smith
Symington
Young, Ohio

NAYS—46

Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brooke
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Cotton
Dirksen
Dominick
Ervin
Fannin
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Hatfield
Hayden
Holland
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Magnuson
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Moss
Pastore
Pearson
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Spong
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—26

Allott
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Clark
Curtis
Dodd
Eastland
Griffin
Gruening
Hollings
Hruska
Javits
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Murphy
Nelson
Sparkman
Stennis
Tower
Yarborough

So Mr. FULBRIGHT's amendments (Nos. 46 and 47) were rejected en bloc.

AMENDMENT NO. 45

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 45 and modify it by striking on page 2 from lines 3 to 23 inclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is accordingly modified and the amendment will be stated by the clerk.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Beginning with line 26 on page 56, strike out through line 5 on page 60 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"'(a) Each standing committee of the Senate and House of Representatives is authorized—

"'(1) to appoint, on a permanent basis, without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform their duties, not more than six professional staff members in addition to the clerical staff members;

"'(2) to prescribe their duties and responsibilities and

"'(3) to terminate their employment as the committee may deem appropriate.'"

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this amendment applies to the committees generally. The Committee on Appropriations is exempt. The bill itself, on approximately five pages, sets forth an elaborate, detailed system for selecting committee staffs. I wish only to substitute a simplified system, which is exactly the procedure that the Senator from Oklahoma has provided for his own committee. The new language is a simple one-paragraph provision. I believe that if that system is good enough for the Senator's Joint Committee on Congressional Operations, it should be good enough for the Committee on Foreign Relations. As a matter of practice, it is precisely the procedure we now follow in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I submit that it is a very simple amendment, and I do not quite understand why, if it is good enough for the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations, it is not good enough for the standing committees of the Senate.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does the Senator mean the Joint Committee on Congressional Reorganization?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Joint Committee on Congressional Operations.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Oklahoma has nothing to do with that committee and would not desire to have.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is the same procedure in section 404(a) of the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. This is a bipartisan board in its entirety, however.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Joint Committee on Congressional Operations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Arkansas referred to my committee. I have nothing to do with serving on that committee and do not expect to have. This is a bipartisan and a Joint Committee on Congressional Operations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The way we presently select our staff in the Committee on Foreign Relations is by a joint, bipartisan subcommittee.

Mr. MONRONEY. Then, the Senator from Arkansas has nothing to worry about. If the Senator's minority members are happy with the present staff and feel that they are not abused in the selection or are not discriminated against, there should be no fear whatever that there will be any complication. But we have heard for 6 years or more that on many of the congressional committees there has been distinct discrimination and that the minority have been left without any staff or with only a small part of the staff. Therefore, we provide for six professional staff members, two of which may be, if the minority so require, assigned to the services of the minority. This is a minimum amount that we believe the minority would have a right to expect. We would hope they would all be bipartisan selections and that each would be chosen not because of any party alinement but because of competence. But bipartisanship does not apply to all the committees in the House of Representatives, nor does it apply, perhaps, to all the committees in the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that the effect of those five pages of provisions in the bill would be to set up two staffs, one for the minority and one for the majority.

This matter has never arisen in the Committee on Foreign Relations, to my knowledge, and I see no reason to change it in the fashion that the Senator has proposed. As it now operates, it is all right.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I say to the Senator from Arkansas that there is nothing in the committee language, as presently presented, which needs to change what we have done very successfully, I quite agree, in the Committee on Foreign Relations, as long as I have been on it and for a long time prior to that, because we have been able to operate without any majority or minority staff. The Senator from Arkansas has an ad hoc committee, with two Republicans and two Democrats, that selects the staff.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. And nobody has complained about it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. So that we are not going to change that picture.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We can keep it the way it is.

Mr. MUNDT. We do not change it, because under that arrangement, the ad hoc committee will proceed as it has.

But other committees have majority staffs and minority staffs; and this provides some protection for the minority in those committees where there is not the bipartisan approach which has always existed in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would be willing to make this provision applicable only to the Committee on Foreign Relations, if the Senator would accept it and if the other Senators were agreeable. Having been defeated a moment ago in attempting to treat only with the Committee on Foreign Relations, I thought that I should make it general. I would be willing to make this provision, which I made available to all committees, applicable to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Arkansas is primarily interested in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. I speak as a member of the joint committee, which labored long and hard to provide some adjustments for those areas where adjustments were necessary. We never had in mind the

Committee on Foreign Relations. If our ranking minority members are willing, I certainly am willing to withdraw any objection if the Senator will make it applicable only to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MONRONEY. No.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am more than willing to make it applicable to more than the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Will the Senator suspend for a moment, until the Chair obtains order?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this amendment would certainly have a tremendous impact on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Committee on Appropriations is exempt. It would not apply to that committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Where does the Senator find the exemption?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that the Committee on Appropriations is exempt in the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not in the amendment. It says "each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives is authorized." There is no exemption. It would cut the staff of the Committee on Appropriations in half.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was under the impression that the Committee on Appropriations was exempt. I am willing to accept an exemption.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is a parenthetical phrase, "other than the Committee on Appropriations in each House," in another part of the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would so amend it, if the Senator wishes. As a matter of fact, I will make it applicable only to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as the Senator from South Dakota has suggested. That is what I was seeking to do. I thought it would be fair to offer it to all committees.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I point out to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that over a period of years committees such as the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Commerce and others have had before them legislation involving a distinct minority interest, and you have to have a minority staff if you are going to adequately pursue that interest. A notable exemption was the packaging bill, which we had for weeks on the floor, and that goes for other domestic legislation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Domestic legislation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the Senator's field of foreign relations, it is somewhat different. However, the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, would not be unduly happy to lose his right to the minority staff.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator suspend until order is obtained?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can make them hear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to hear the debate. It is very interesting and constructive.

The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am almost finished. The distinguished Senator from Iowa would not be a bit happy about what the Senator from Arkansas now proposes for the Committee on Foreign Relations and then to exclude all other committees. I think that what we have done, heretofore, has been rather satisfactory.

I am not unhappy with what the joint committee has brought in. When the Senator from Arkansas says that he is doing what the joint committee has done, he should not forget that that is a special committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. So is the Committee on Foreign Relations a special committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, it is not. It is a standing committee of the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Special standing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And this committee got a special dispensation to report this bill, and in my judgment is never should have happened. It should have gone to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as a standing committee, before the reorganization bill ever came to the floor. But that is neither here nor there. That is water under the bridge.

However, we cannot quite compare the two, because we are dealing with structural changes in House and Senate, and that does not lend itself particularly to a partisan note.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The effect of this amendment, in practice, would be to leave the Committee on Foreign Relations as it now operates, and we would not have to start creating another staff. I believe that this provision practically holds out that inducement, that we ought to begin a duplicate staff.

I believe that the Senator is quite right on the merits. Some committees deal with highly partisan domestic legislation, and I believe he has a point. It has not been true—and I hope it will not be true—with respect to foreign relations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Why does the Senator not streamline his amendment?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, every time I get up in the morning I genuflect three times for the Committee on Foreign Relations because I have great confidence and respect for the consideration which the chairman gives to that committee. We have had no differences on that committee since I have become the ranking Republican member.

I have never requested a staff assigned as a staff to the Republicans. I believe that we have as impartial and a reliable staff on that committee, that serves both Republicans and Democrats, as does any committee in Congress. I have been thoroughly satisfied with the staff. I rely on the word of the staff, and any research that any staff member does for Republicans and Democrats is done with great professional competence and reliability.

Therefore, I have resisted any movement to get someone assigned specifically as a Republican member of the staff because I think it would be divisive under the present circumstances. However, I would object to freezing it into law. Perhaps 2 years or 5 years from now Republican Senators will not be in the minority and the Democrats will become the minority. Perhaps some time in the future they would insist on someone being assigned to the minority. I do not believe we should foreclose that in the law.

At the present time and for the foreseeable future, as far as I am concerned, I am happy with the situation as it is and I believe that other Republican Senators on that committee are happy with the staff. That staff is as nearly impartial as any staff could be and it is reliable in its service to all Senators. I would not want to change it today, even if I could.

I think that under the rules we could, on the minority side, request that somebody be assigned as a minority staff member, but we have not seen fit to do so. We have Senators from the minority side in the Chamber now and I am sure that no one has requested that change because of the fairness of the chairman, the staff, and the impartiality of the service of the staff. I would not change the situation as it is now, but I would hate to see it frozen into law whereby it could not be changed. We do not know what is going to happen 2 years or 5 years from now.

I would like to have that option also if at some future time the minority on either side would want to exercise the same right which other committees have. I do wish to make clear that I would not propose today to ask for a specific assignment of a Republican staff member. Such a request would be divisive as far as the staff is concerned, and I do not think it would be in the best interests of the situation. I would hate to freeze it into the law, I wish to say to the chairman, who has been kind to the minority.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I was concerned with the amendment as presented. Would the purpose of the Senator be met if we strike the substitute which would say nothing about this matter, which would suit me? I thought that this would allow us to continue as we described the procedure in the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The point I am trying to make——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understand the point.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The status quo is perfectly satisfactory as far as I am concerned, and I know as far as the Republican Senators who are on the Committee on Foreign Relations are concerned. We feel that we have always been treated fairly and as long as that continues, I am sure, as far as I know, we are not going to ask for any change or specialized assignment on the staff.

I would like to feel, as I do now, and as I am sure others do, that we can ask any members of that staff to render us service in keeping with their competence and expertise—and we have a number of experts on the staff. If we start whacking that staff up I think we will find ourselves with more trouble than we would like to have. I believe that it is all right as it is, but I would not want to see it frozen into law.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I would like to associate myself with the statements of the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator. I am a member of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and we receive impartial services from an excellent staff on that committee. Although I am not a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I understand the same situation prevails.

Mr. RUSSELL. As it so happens, two of the three professional staff of the Armed Services Committee were hired when the country was in one of its lapses and elected a Republican Congress.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the statement of the Senator.

I was seeking by this amendment to achieve what I think he announced was his desire; that is, to leave the situation as it is. Perhaps I thought that is what I had accomplished by this part of the amendment. If that is not so, I would like to reconsider and see if there is a better way.

Due to the lateness of the hour, and the minority leader has suggested he feels there is some confusion about it—and it may be my fault, for I thought I was maintaining the status quo—I would like to withdraw it at this time and ask permission to resubmit it on Monday.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, we are proceeding with a program for Monday, agreed to by unanimous consent, on an entire series of amendments. We have so planned the program, to get through with this bill by Monday, that it seems to me this is a simple matter. Everyone is trying to make it confusing.

Mr. President, I yield time to myself before the amendment is withdrawn, if I may.

Mr. President, it is a good idea to understand what the committee had in mind. The majority Members of both Houses do not have the same regard for professional, nonpartisan skills that exist in the Committee on Foreign Relations, or many other committees because the complaint and the demand for protection of minority rights to staff was one of the loudest and strongest voices we heard in our committee during weeks of examination.

We were trying our best, and the language will reveal as much if Senators will study it, to provide for improving and encouraging in every way possible a bipartisan professional staff. That is the reason for the language in the bill that provides for the six professional staff members; but it is also provided:

> Such professional staff members shall be assigned to the chairman and the ranking minority member of such committee as the committee may deem advisable, except that whenever a majority of the minority members of such committee (other than the Committee on Standards and Conduct of the House of Representatives) so request, two of such professional staff members may be selected for appointment by majority vote of the minority members and the committee shall appoint any staff members so selected. A staff member or members appointed pursuant to a request by the minority members of the committee shall be assigned to such committee business as such minority members deem advisable.

This provision would require a request showing dissatisfaction and a feeling by the minority members that they were being denied just service that they were entitled to have by the committee staff. If the staff is bipartisan and serves members of the minority, there would be no reason to meet the request that must be made to supply the two professional staff members out of the six which we allocate. That was the sole reason for this proposal, because of the large number of complaints that we had heard. It is not possible to conclude that all committees operate exactly as the Committee on Foreign Relations operates.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. According to my understanding, the provision as it now exists in the bill, is very dear to a great many people in the other body, and if we were to strike it out it is very likely that it would be right back, and we would have to meet the entire situation again.

I understand that there were certain delicate negotiations where concessions were made on both sides. This may have been one of them and it would certainly make it very much more difficult for this bill to receive full acceptability in the other body.

(At this point, Mr. TYDINGS assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. MONRONEY. I think it is a safeguard, even in this body.

Mr. SCOTT. I agree.

Mr. MONRONEY. Sometimes the minority is denied access to proper staffing. When there is dissatisfaction, a majority of the minority members of the committee may request that they be assigned the two professional members. Can we not trust minority members? I can. They use this power wisely and are demanding only when the situation is so intolerable they feel they must have a separately assigned staff. I do not look on this as a pork barrel operation, that anyone is going to rush out and try to acquire staff merely for the purpose of acquiring it.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me point out to my good friend from Arkansas that I do not think there is anything that need disturb him. We can always proceed with the status quo. There is the original La Follette-Monroney Act, which guarantees one clerk—which we have never asked for. We have had this happy understanding with the chairman, who has always been eminently fair in this regard. Our staff has always performed magnificently, so that no serious harm will be done if the Senator would withdraw his amendment than before, except if the minority should get obstinate and made a request for two instead of one. However, we have no intention of doing that. We are happy with the status quo.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then what is the effect of the five pages of fine print here on the status quo? It must have been put in there for a good reason; was it not?

Mr. MONRONEY. Unless the Republicans are dissatisfied, the status quo exists.

Mr. MUNDT. This was to spell out the new rules whereby if the minority insisted, they would have two instead of one. It would provide the procedure for the minority to request it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Since the yeas and nays have not been ordered, do I have the right to withdraw this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment has already been withdrawn. The Chair considered it withdrawn, and so stated.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Do I, under the existing unanimous-consent agreement, have the right to reoffer my amendment on Monday?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator does.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That includes the Ellender and Hruska amendments?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. May I inquire of the majority leader whether there is a misunderstanding of the unanimous-consent agreement? I do not believe that anyone will be barred from offering amendments on Monday; is that not correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is right.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator wishes to offer an amendment on Monday, he can do so. We have the unanimous-consent understanding written out for the Hruska-Dirksen amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As well as the Ellender amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. In other words, it does not bar anyone from offering amendments on Monday?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida will state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. My parliamentary inquiry covers the same ground. I have consulted with the Parliamentarian and my understanding is—and I ask if this is not the case—that the unanimous-consent agreement does not bar the consideration of any amendments now on the desk, or the offering of any new amendments on Monday and thereafter?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. A parliamentary inquiry was raised a moment ago, I believe by the Senator from Florida, about the bill as it has been amended, to this point. It seems to me that this bill has become almost impossible to understand. I may be unduly disturbed about the effect of it upon my committee, but my committee is a rather difficult and a most important committee, I am sure everyone will agree; and I should like to join the Senator from Florida in urging that a clean bill be prepared, before the Senate is asked to vote on it, so that all Senators will know what they will be voting on, particularly on the procedural matters which we have been discussing, on how to run our committees.

Mr. HOLLAND. My understanding from the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is that a new bill will be prepared as accurately as possible considering the mass of detail, and it will be printed and available on Monday. The only thing we will have to realize is that there may be a few mistakes due to the shortness of time and the complexity of the task. If I have not understood this correctly, I know that the Senator from Oklahoma will correct me.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the Senator is correct. It will be impossible to get a so-called clean bill that could be verified by all the data and the recordkeeping of the Senate. We have to take the matter from the Congressional Record and submit copies, striking out the matter which has been deleted, and inserting where we can the matter which has been added. This will not be an easy task in a bill of 125 pages. Our staff, of course, will do its dead-level best to repair it, but it must be clearly understood that there may be a few mistakes in it because of the great many changes which have been made.

Many of these matters, of course, deal with important and intimate personal relations of Senators with their committees. Everyone knows better how to run his own committee than does the Committee on Reorganization. I know that to be a fact. But in trying to perfect the matter of modernization of our system here, it is necessary to make amendments where we have been able to soften the impact on some of these problems, and meet the objections of committee members. I do not want it thrown back at us that because the bill has been amended it has been the fault of the committee itself.

It has been the effort of the committee to adjust wherever possible to meet the complaints and requests of members of the committee as they came about.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 O'CLOCK A.M. ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it appears that this finishes consideration of amendments on this bill for today, and I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock on Monday morning next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION ON MONDAY NEXT

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, all committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday, March 6, 1967.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AN END TO THE ROSY ILLUSION OF UNITED STATES-CANADIAN AUTOMOTIVE AGREEMENT

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate again to the fact that there seems to be an end to the rosy illusion concerning the United States-Canadian Automotive Agreement, and also invite attention to two articles, one of them published in the Financial Times of Canada for February 27, 1967, and the other an editorial in the same paper on the same date, which deals with the same subject matter.

This describes a recent report of the Auditor General of Canada charging three automotive companies in Canada with a debt of $7 million for failure to comply with the conditions of the old tariff rebate scheme, as well as with the United States-Canadian Automotive Agreement.

The article specifically cites American Motors of Canada, Ltd., and Studebaker of Canada as owing the Canadian Government repayment of the rebate because of their failure to comply with conditions set forth in the rebate scheme and automotive agreement.

Studebaker's problems seem to be directly related to the duty-free importation of 10,918 Volkswagen cars in 1964–66.

I ask unanimous consent that a news article from the Financial Times of Canada for February 27, 1967, as well as an editorial entitled "The Automotive Agreement," published in the Financial Times of Canada for February 1967, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Financial Times of Canada, Feb. 27, 1967]

AUDITOR-GENERAL FINDS $7 MILLION OWED GOVERNMENT UNDER AUTO PACT

Ottawa.—Studebaker of Canada, American Motors (Canada) Ltd., and another company have piled up a $7 million tax liability for failing to meet their commitments in the first year of the Canada-U.S. auto agreement.

The debt—owed at March 31, 1966—was uncovered last week in the auditor general's report to Parliament. Revenue Minister Benson promised to explain it last week but did not say if it had been settled or remitted since last March.

Studebaker—which closed its Hamilton car plant on March 17, 1966—owed the government $2.4 million in customs duty for the model year that ended in July 1965. No demand for payment had been made by the following March.

American Motors owed $3 million in unpaid duty and the other company owed $1.7 million.

The report says Studebaker and AMC have received duty remissions worth $2.2 million after failing to meet conditions for duty free entry under the old British Commonwealth content regulations.

These regulations required from 40% to 60% Canadian or British content depending on the company's vehicle production.

AMC failed to meet the terms in the 1962 and 1963 model years. It got a 94% remission worth $667,000 for the 1962 model year and a 84% remission for the 1963 year—worth about $780,000.

Studebaker has received a full 100% remission for the 1964 model year, worth $750,000. The remission was granted after its Canadian plant went out of business.

Studebaker's failure to comply with the auto pact conditions is directly related to its import of 10,918 Volkswagen cars from 1964 to 1965.

In the 1965 model year it failed to maintain its ratio of Canadian produced vehicle sales to total sales because of the VW imports. This made it liable for all duty due that year on cars and parts it had imported free. It met the pact's conditions in the 1966 model year but under the law could not carry any surplus back to cover its sales "deficit" the previous year.

The VW deal—which appeared to save the two companies an estimated $2.3 million in duties—was strongly attacked when it became public last fall.

Studebaker also came to grief over VW imports from November 1963 to January 1965. It failed to meet requirements for duty free entry under arrangements that preceded the auto pact and piled up a $500,000 tax liability.

The company paid $170,000 of this debt last June and the remaining $300,000 last Nov. 23.

The auditor general urges the Department of National Revenues to strengthen its administration of the various duty free auto arrangements to make sure no revenue is lost to the government.

Duty remissions are granted under section 22 (1) of the Financial Administration Act, which allows the government to remit any tax, fee or penalty when it is in the public interest.

In 1965–66 Ford of Canada was granted remissions worth $2.2 million and GM got remissions worth $4.3 million on imports of vehicles and parts. Twelve other vehicle manufacturers also received what appeared to be routine duty remissions worth about $1.9 million.

The $2.2 million remissions to AMC and Studebaker appear to be special cases, however.

The government needs give no justification beyond "the public interest" for using its remission power and the auditor general thinks it is used too widely.

MAKERS TAKEN BY SURPRISE

Toronto.—American Motors (Canada) Ltd., and Studebaker of Canada Ltd., are unaware that they owe the federal government back tariffs for failing to meet conditions of the Canada-U.S. auto agreements.

Mr. Earl K. Brownbridge, AMC president,

said he has not heard from the government about unpaid duties on cars or parts.

Mr. G. E. Grundy, president of Studebaker, said "this is all news to me."

[From the Financial Times, February 1967]

THE AUTOMOTIVE AGREEMENT

The most significant section of the auditor-general's latest report to the House of Commons was curiously overlooked by the daily press. It deals with duty remissions in the automobile industry both before and after the trade pact of January 1965, which surely must rank among the most misunderstood of Canadian treaties.

The basis of the auditor-general's complaint is the point, repeatedly made in these columns, that the Canada-U.S. automotive pact is not an agreement for free trade in automobiles or parts. Canada's undertaking under the pact is to remit import duties otherwise payable by automobile manufacturers, if those manufacturers meet a specific set of conditions.

At the end of the period covered by the auditor-general's latest report, March 31, 1966, Canadian automobile companies owed the government duty payments estimated at well over $7 million.

The figure is still "estimated," because the government waits for annual statements from the manufacturers (and apparently waits with unusual patience) before going back over the import entries to determine whether duty is payable. The current position is described in our report on page 1.

By waiving duties which should normally be paid at the time of importation, with a hope and a prayer that the importer may eventually prove to have satisfied the conditions for free entry, the government is certainly setting a precedent in the administration of customs. Mr. A. M. Henderson, the auditor-general, tactfully skirts around the risks of non-recovery and coldly observes that "the Crown is participating in the financing of automobile production."

This adds one more to a growing list of questions about the automotive agreement.

It should, and we hope it will, put an end to any rosy illusion that the pact was a free trade arrangement. It was a bold and highly sophisticated experiment designed to reduce the intolerable strain which the U.S.-controlled automobile industry was imposing on the Canadian balance of payments, and to do so without the tariff penalties of high costs and inefficient production.

Mr. HARTKE. I wish to read from the editorial and articles.

With regard to the editorial which appeared in the Financial Times of Canada, I point out that the headline reads "The Automotive Agreement." The second paragraph is a very significant one and concerns the free trade agreement as it was represented to the U.S. Senate. The paragraph begins:

> The basis of the auditor-general's complaint is the point, repeatedly made in these columns, that the Canada-United States automotive pact is not an agreement for free trade in automobiles or parts.

I know these companies are going to be taken by surprise. I think they are taken by surprise because they did not realize the bind they were being put in by becoming parties to this agreement.

One of the subtitles in the article I placed in the RECORD reads: "Makers Taken by Surprise."

The article reads:

> American Motors (Canada) Ltd., and Studebaker of Canada Ltd., are unaware that they owe the federal government back tariffs for failing to meet conditions of the Canada-U.S. auto agreements.
>
> Mr. Earl K. Brownbridge, AMC president, said he has not heard from the government about unpaid duties on cars or parts.
>
> Mr. G. E. Grundy, president of Studebaker, said "this is all news to me."

The substance of the articles is that the Auditor General himself says that these two companies owe $7 million to the Canadian Government under the automotive agreement. It is claimed the debt was owed as of March 31, 1966, because they had failed to meet their commitments in the first year of the Canadian-United States Automotive Agreement, the agreement which was signed by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Canada, when they had a meeting in Texas, and which was later submitted to the Senate. I pointed out not so long ago that there were certain undertakings which were to be separate side agreements, which we verified in Congress. The debt was uncovered by the Auditor General in his report to Parliament. Revenue Minister Benson promised to explain it last week, but did not say if it had been settled or remitted since last March.

Studebaker, which closed its Hamilton auto plant on March 17, 1966, owed the Canadian Government $2.4 million in customs duties for the model year that ended in July 1965. No demand for payment had been made by the following March.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee, who opposed the agreement on the floor at the time it was before the Senate, with great vigor and intelligence.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. It appeared then to be, and is now demonstrated to have been, a most improvident agreement for the United States. I wonder if these factors and the unemployment compensation costs as a result of employees in the United States losing their jobs as a result of this agreement will be in the report of the President, which is required by law.

Mr. HARTKE. I have no idea. There is supposed to be an annual report. It is 25 months overdue. It is over 2 years overdue. After I made a speech on the floor of the Senate, the chairman of the Commerce Committee received a letter, which was inserted into the RECORD, which stated that a report is ready to be submitted. But it still has not come to Congress.

Mr. GORE. I hope the report will not be a perfunctory one, and that it will show the real effect on small businessmen and industry and employees in the United States, and in fact, on major automotive industries. I daresay that, while General Motors and Ford may have profited, others did not.

Mr. HARTKE. I wonder if they did. I do not mind stating publicly that I was talking to the president of General Motors, and I told him I thought he would rue the day they entered into this agreement, because it subsidized unprofitable production at the expense of American manufacturers and workers.

People have been thrown out of work as a result of the agreement. The extent of the results of the agreement must be amplified by virtue of the fact that present production of American automobiles is down 23 percent from last year, while the same drop in production has not occurred in Canada.

Mr. GORE. What was the purpose of the agreement?

Mr. HARTKE. Let me read what the Canadian press says about the agreement. It is a remarkable statement made by members of the Canadian press:

> This adds one more to a growing list of questions about the automotive agreement.
>
> It should, and we hope it will, put an end to any rosy illusion that the pact was a free trade arrangement. It was a bold and highly sophisticated experiment designed to reduce the intolerable strain which the U.S.-controlled automobile industry was imposing on the Canadian balance of payments, and to so without the tariff penalties of high costs and inefficient production.

In other words, this was a deal to take part of the American production and push it up into Canada at the expense of U.S. workers, in order to relieve the Canadian balance-of-payments problem, at the same time making our balance-of-payments problem worse.

Mr. GORE. To what extent has it succeeded?

Mr. HARTKE. It resulted in increasing the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit to the extent of $400 million, for the benefit of Canada. There are not enough cars being sold in the United States or in Canada to make up the difference.

Last week I talked to an automobile manufacturer who makes buses. He said they went up there to negotiate side agreements, which are commitments to the Government. The minister told him, "I want you to know what you are doing. You are entering into an agreement that is for the benefit of Canada, not for you."

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 355) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, this afternoon, on S. 355, which is the bill to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, I advanced an amendment; namely, to the effect that where the phrase "standing committees" appears, it should be redefined to include "Joint Committee on Atomic Energy."

The amendment was accepted by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, the manager of the bill, and was agreed to by the Senate by a voice vote.

Since the amendment was agreed to by the Senate, I have been discussing the matter with members of the staff, and certain ramifications have arisen which require further study.

Under the circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that the action of the Senate in adopting the amendment be rescinded, and that if I feel on Monday, that the offer should be renewed, I reserve the right to take that action if I deem it the appropriate action to take.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I have three technical amendments which I send to the desk and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> On page 7, in the matter inserted by Amendment No. 69, as previously modified and agreed to, strike out the words "absent Senator", and insert in lieu thereof the words "absent committee member".

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, this amendment would merely clarify what was the intention of the Senate, because it applies both to House and Senate Members.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The second technical amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> Beginning with line 23, page 48, strike out all to and including line 8, page 49, and insert in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "Sec. 231. (a) Each hearing conducted by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives or the Senate shall be open to the public except when the committee determines that the testimony to be taken at that hearing may relate to a matter of national security, may tend to reflect adversely on the character or reputation of the witness or any other individual, or may divulge matters deemed confidential under other provisions of law or government regulation. Whenever any such hearing is open to the public, that hearing may be broadcast by radio or television, or both, under such rules as the committee may adopt.".

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, this conforms the language of titles I and II, dealing with Appropriations Committee activity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next technical amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> Beginning with line 24, page 50, strike out all to and including line 9, page 51, and insert in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "Sec. 233. (a) The vote of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives or the Senate to report a measure or matter shall require the concurrence of a majority of the members of the committee who are present. No vote of any member of such committee to report a measure or matter may be cast by proxy if rules adopted by such committee forbid the casting of votes for that purpose by proxy; however, proxies shall not be voted for such purpose except when the absent committee member has been informed on the matter on which he is being recorded and has affirmatively requested that he be so recorded. Action by any such committee in reporting any measure or matter in accordance with the requirements of this subsection shall constitute the ratification by the committee of all action theretofore taken by the committee with respect to that measure or matter, including votes taken upon the measure or matter or any amendment thereto, and no point of order shall lie with respect to that measure or matter on the ground that such previous action with respect thereto by such committee was not taken in compliance with such requirements. Whenever any such committee by rollcall vote reports any measure or matter, the report of the committee upon such measure or matter shall include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor of and the votes cast in opposition to such measure or matter by each member of the committee. Nothing contained in this subsection shall abrogate the power of any committee of either House to adopt rules (1) providing for proxy voting on all matters other than the reporting of a measure or matter, or (2) providing in accordance with the rules of that House for a lesser number as a quorum for any action other than the reporting of a measure or matter.".

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, this makes the language of section 2, again dealing with the Appropriations Committee, as to the use of proxies, the identical language as that agreed to by the Senate for the legislative committees.

I urge that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 355), be printed, incorporating the amendments that have been agreed to thus far, and that such printing be entitled an unofficial committee print.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF ANTITRUST POLICY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, it has been my responsibility to conduct a number of hearings on intricate questions of antitrust policy.

The more I study antitrust problems, the more I am convinced that our business system could not survive without fairminded umpires such as those who work in our antitrust agencies, the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

But, in most cases, businessmen would probably feel that the majority of antitrust activity has a negative effect—rather than the positive, business-stimulating one we are seeking.

One of the best explanations of what antitrust policy means and what it seeks to do was given in a recent talk by Dr. Williard F. Mueller, Chief Economist and Director of the Bureau of Economics of the Federal Trade Commission, and a man whose testimony before my subcommittee was always thoughtful and well documented.

In this speech—before the North Central Regional Extension Marketing Workshop held at Camp Kett, Mich.—he contends:

> While the antitrust authorities and businessmen are not partners, neither are they mortal enemies. They share the common objective of preserving a competitive free enterprise system with a minimum of direct government intervention into business affairs.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Philosophy of Antitrust Policy [1]

(By Willard F. Mueller) [2]

This evening it is my purpose to discuss the basic philosophy underlying antitrust policy and the implementation of this policy in the real world. Much of this may seem commonplace or, worse still, quite trite. But even at the risk of boring some of you by going over familiar ground, I feel constrained to do so because some in our profession have either forgotten these fundamentals or have never really understood what public policy toward maintaining a competitive economy is all about.

The basic objective of the antitrust laws is to achieve desirable economic performance as measured by such criteria as efficient manufacturing and distributive processes, rapid technological progress, economic growth, and equity in the distribution of the fruits of this progress. Of course, a society may achieve these objectives in a variety of ways. One possibility is for the government itself to specify performance by telling business what and how much to produce; another alternative is for the government to undertake the performance of certain functions. But these approaches are in sharp contrast to the antitrust approach.

The basic philosophy of the antitrust laws is to attempt to maintain sufficiently competitive market structure and market conduct to insure that private enterprise performs in a socially acceptable manner. At the heart of this approach is the assumption that by controlling or modifying certain aspects of industrial structure and competitive conduct, we can avoid government intervention in the economically and politically hazardous thicket of specifying industrial performance. Hence the antitrust approach is different from other forms of business "regulation." It does not involve telling businessmen what and how much to produce or at what price to sell their products. Rather, the antitrust approach is directed at maintaining sufficient competition in the marketplace so that market forces will "compel" desirable economic performance.

Much of the job of antitrust enforcement involves formulating rules which govern the ways in which the competitive game is played. Economic theory suggests, and business experience verifies, that *market structure* plays a powerful role in determining or conditioning business conduct, and that *business conduct*, in turn, determines the ultimate quality of *industrial performance*.[3]

---

[1] Talk given at the North Central Regional Extension Marketing Workshop, Michigan State University, at Camp Kett, Michigan, Nov. 1, 1966.

[2] The views expressed are my own and not necessarily those of the Federal Trade Commission.

[3] The terms "market structure, conduct and performance" are used in their technical economic sense. *Market structure* refers to those "characteristics of the organization of a market which seem to influence strategically the nature of competition and pricing within the market." *Market conduct* refers to the "patterns of behavior which enterprises follow in adapting or adjusting to the markets in which they sell (or buy)". *Market performance* refers to the economic results that flow from the industry as an aggregate of firms. Joe S. Bain, *Industrial Organization*.

This, of course, is not to say that an industry's structure and conduct are the only factors determining ultimate performance. But available empirical evidence indicates that such structural characteristics as the height of entry barriers facing potential competitors, the degree of product differentiation, and the level of market concentration always *are* of some importance, and often are of decisive importance, in determining industry performance.

This is not to imply, of course, that analysis of industry structure involves no more than counting the noses of competitors. Increasingly, sophisticated exploration of the technological and other forces underlying industrial organization is essential to a realistic interpretation of structural developments.

Similarly, there is general agreement that certain forms of business conduct result in undesirable performance. For example, restrictive agreements among competitors may result in monopoly pricing even in industries which would otherwise generate competitive prices. Other forms of conduct may adversely affect market structure, and thereby ultimate industry performance. Predatory pricing is an example. Although in the short run such conduct may give consumers low prices, it may also destroy competitors and result in higher prices in the long run.

Various antitrust laws are directed at the first two of the market structure-conduct-performance trilogy. Section 1 of the Sherman Act prohibits certain forms of anticompetitive conduct, particularly restraints of trade such as conspiracies to fix prices. Similarly, Section 2 of the Clayton Act (the Robinson-Patman Act) prohibits anticompetitive price discrimination. On the other hand, Section 2 of the Sherman Act may be used to bring about structural changes by breaking up monopolies. Section 7 of the Clayton Act may prevent the emergence of anticompetitive market structures by preventing certain kinds of mergers.

The important point to grasp is that antitrust policy does not involve exhaustive investigation or analysis of *all* the factors which conceivably may have a bearing on industrial performance, nor does it involve direct specification of desired performance. This is both the great strength and weakness of the antitrust approach. Its strength derives from the fact that a maximum effect may flow from a minimum of government intervention. It is not necessary to assemble and maintain a vast bureaucracy which exercises continued intervention in and surveillance of the affairs of business. But this is precisely what is required when public policy has as its objective the identification and implementation of what constitutes desirable performance. To do this job well requires an enormous volume of regulatory resources. For example, the Interstate Commerce Commission, whose major responsibilities involve setting of rates and other performance characteristics, has twice as many employees as the combined employees in antitrust enforcement at the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice.[4] And importantly, the ICC has responsibility for just a part of the field of transportation. Quite clearly, direct specification of industry performance requires, relative to the antitrust approach, a vast amount of government resources and intervention into the day-to-day affairs of business.

But while the great virtue of the antitrust approach is that it requires a minimum of regulatory resources and intervention into business affairs, this is also its Achilles heel. Because there are no precise causal links between market structure, conduct and performance, rules of law controlling or modifying market structure and conduct necessarily are vulnerable to adverse criticism. Empirical evidence concerning the precise interrelationships between structure, conduct and performance leaves much to be desired. Consequently, nearly every rule of law dealing with important problems is open to critical comment because it conflicts with some economist's or businessman's conception of the true economic wisdom on the matter. Nor is this criticism a novelty of the 1960's. In every decade since 1890 some economists and others have urged the abandonment or substantial modification of the antitrust laws on grounds of obsolescence. While antitrust may have had its place in 1890, so this argument goes, the inexorable advance of technology has rendered archaic traditional competitive concepts.[5] And there may well be some substance to this belief. But merely asserting it does not make it so. While my task this evening is not to review empirical findings on this subject, recent studies give little support to the Schumpeterian and Galbraithian arguments that invention, innovation and economic progress demand vast industrial complexes with considerable market power.[6] I emphasize this point because it strongly suggests that the empirical basis for the antitrust approach to business "regulation" is at least as strong today as ever.

This approach has never attacked the growth of industrial bigness as such. Its basic orientation has been to place restraints on certain competitive practices which tend to frustrate the "market test" of success. The merger law is an example of this. When a company secures a strong market position by internal growth, there is strong presumption that—unless it has used predatory tactics and the like—it has bested its rivals in a fair fight, and is entitled to reap the rewards of victory. But when it does so by merger, no similar presumption is warranted.

Admittedly, because the antitrust approach deals largely with predicting the effects of structural and behavior changes, it involves judgments based on probabilities. This, of course, is what opens up the whole subject to vigorous and perennial debate.

But before critics think too harshly of the antitrust approach, I urge them to weigh it against its alternatives. Obviously, complete abandonment of business regulation is not a realistic or desirable alternative. Economic history speaks eloquently that there are no built in "natural" economic laws which make the competitive process self-perpetuating. No, the only alternative—in modern America—to the antitrust approach is more *direct* regulation of business affairs, involving direct specification of industrial performance in various important respects. Although this has been the American answer to the monopoly problem in industries of natural monopolies, our experience demonstrates the great economic and political difficulties involved in doing a satisfactory job of direct regulation even in industries with quite simple technological and marketing problems.

Moreover, American experience over the past 76 years demonstrates that the antitrust route of regulation works tolerably well. There admittedly are some intractable positions of market power which cannot be dissipated by antitrust policy alone, and other important industries are so poorly structured as to leave much to be desired in terms of industrial performance. But, importantly, such industries are the exceptions rather than the rule. The great bulk of American industries—outside those under direct regulation—are effectively competitive. Nor has there been any persistent tendency toward increased market concentration in the post-war years, thanks largely to rigorous anti-merger enforcement.

I am repeatedly amazed by the lack of understanding of the antitrust approach, even among some academicians. Often the entire appreciation of the basic character of the antitrust approach illustrates the absurdity of this criticism. Why is it then that even some seemingly sophisticated observers of day-to-day antitrust enforcement often view it as a direct assault on big business or, worse still, on the free enterprise system itself? I think much of the answer lies in the basically adversary nature of antitrust enforcement, and the fact that enforcement is primarily of a negative nature—it tells businessmen what they cannot do. And, of course, the antitrust agencies do not give out a "best-competitor-of-the-year" award. On the contrary, every antitrust complaint alleges that the business or individuals involved have committed a wrong against society in that they have violated an antitrust statute. In a word, they are charged with being law violators. Understandably those involved do not appreciate the publicity associated with such charges, nor do they relish the idea that a force external to the market—the antitrust authority—threatens to place constraints on their conduct. Consequently they do not respond passively to such charges. Moreover, additional hostility may be observed as the issues involved in a complaint are tested by a judicial process wherein the government and business are pitted as adversaries. Again, the untutored observer may view such adversary proceedings are proof positive that antitrust represents a fundamental attack on established business institutions, or as a basic conflict between government and business.

---

[4] It should be noted that even in the so-called regulated industries in our economy we depend heavily upon competition to protect the consumer. For example, most regulation in banking is concerned with protecting banks from "too much" competition. Entry is limited and ceilings are placed on how much banks may pay for borrowed funds. On the other hand, we rely on competition to protect those borrowing from banks.

[5] Interestingly, seldom have promient economists been more critical of antitrust than in the decades immediately following 1890. Many were convinced that the increased concentration caused by the great merger movement around 1900 was the result of economic imperatives. George Stigler summed up the situation aptly when he observed:

"It is sobering to reflect on the attitudes of professional economists of the period toward the merger movement. Economists as wise as Taussig, as incisive as Fisher, as fond of competition as Clark and Fetter, insisted upon discussing the movement largely or exclusively in terms of industrial evolution and the economies of scale. They found no difficulty in treating the unregulated corporation as a natural phenomenon, nor were they bothered that the economies of scale should spring forth suddenly and simultaneously in an enormous variety of industries—and yet pass over the minor firms that characteristically persisted and indeed flourished in these industries. Ida Tarbell and Henry Demarest Lloyd did more than the American Economic Association to foster the policy of competition." "Monopoly and Oligopoly by Merger," *American Economic Review,* May 1950, pp. 30–31.

The conventional economic wisdom of the early 20th century persuaded many wise men of other disciplines to believe that the Sherman Act was based on bad economics. In a moment of candor, and in confidence, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes observed, "The Sherman Act is a humbug based on economic ignorance and incompetence." *Holmes-Pollack Letters,* Harvard University Press, 1941, Vol. 1, p. 163.

It was only after antitrust policy had proven effective in several important cases that its harshest critics became tolerant of it. This was true of J. M. Clark whose approach was entirely pragmatic. As Baldwin observed, "Thus, he was opposed to the antitrust laws until they proved effective and then he supported them on the grounds that they worked." William Lee Baldwin, *Antitrust and the Changing Corporation,* 1961, p. 65.

[6] Much of the recent evidence on this subject was summarized in testimony before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, 89th Cong., *Economic Concentration, Part 3, Concentration, Invention and Innovation,* 1965, and *Part 4, Concentration and Efficiency,* 1965.

Such an interpretation is precisely false. It mistakes independence and arms-length dealing between antitrust authorities and business as evidence of open hostility and disagreement concerning the basic goals of our society. Again, those critical of antitrust must evaluate it in terms of the alternatives. Would they really prefer business and government to become partners in the rule making and enforcement process? I suspect that some persons yearning for a "government-business partnership" in the antitrust area are using the term as a euphemism for either government control of business or business control of government.

(Of course some who use the term have no well thought out notion of what they mean by it, while others employ it as a public relations gimmick in the hope that fervent and repeated cries for such a partnership will themselves create an environment conducive to amity in government-business relations.) But to resort to a sports analogy, who would propose that the players join with the umpires in a "player-umpire partnership"?

Do not misunderstand me. I am not saying that antitrust agencies cannot do much to minimize needless misunderstanding, hostility and uncertainty under the antitrust laws. For example, in the past few years the Federal Trade Commission has adopted a series of programs designed to provide greater guidance to business in some of the gray areas of antitrust and has instituted industry-wide enforcement programs aimed at eliminating, where possible, the discriminatory features of the case-by-case approach.

But when all is said and done, it is impossible to eliminate all business uncertainty. Nor is in business' interest to do so. Certainty, too, has its price. The businessman may well recall the aphorism, "better no rules than cruel rules." Ultimately, individual businesses or groups of businesses will disagree with an antitrust agency's interpretation of the law. Then the adversary approach must be resorted to in charting new rules of law and in enforcing established ones.

I hope that the next time you observe the process at work you will better appreciate its purpose and character. Do not mistake those who insist on taking an impersonal, arms length approach in matters of business regulation as being hostile to our competitive system, nor as being indifferent or insensitive to the problems of the business community. It is exactly this independence and impersonality which is the hallmark of the antitrust approach and which makes it work in the public interest. For the counterpart to the "independence" of the antitrust official is the "independence" of the businessman. It means that he may make the vast majority of his market decisions independent of government intervention.

But while the antitrust authorities and businessmen are not partners, neither are they mortal enemies. They share the common objective of preserving a competitive free enterprise system with a minimum of direct government intervention into business affairs. So the next time you observe an adversary proceeding in an antitrust matter, recall Shakespeare's admonition,

"And do as adversaries do in the law,
Strive mightily, but eat and drink as friends."

THE VICE PRESIDENT SPEAKS OUT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it was revolting to learn through news reports of the disgraceful incident at Palo Alto, Calif., when a large segment of undisciplined students attempted to mob the Vice President of the United States while he was there on February 21 to address Stanford University students. To refresh the public recollection of this incident, I am providing an article from the February 21 edition of the Washington, D.C., Post, reporting the disgraceful episode and a February 22 editorial from the same newspaper pointing out that, though citizens of this country differ about governmental policies, and have a right to express these differences, they do not have a right to send roughnecks, rowdies, and erstwhile stormtroopers into assembly areas to intimidate those with whom they do not agree.

Also, I feel that I should, in all fairness, point out that subsequent to this episode, President J. Wallace Sterling reportedly tendered apologies to the Vice President for "any inconvenience or embarrassment which it might have caused him." I note this action, because I feel it is well to bring to public attention that responsible leadership does indeed exist on the Stanford campus.

As to the Vice President's own views on the Sanford University episode, and the basic principle of student right to dissent, I am providing a report of an interview by Godfrey Sperling, Jr., staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, published in the February 27 issue of that newspaper. The high caliber of the man who is our Nation's second Chief Executive is clearly revealed therein.

Nonetheless, I continue to be concerned with the mindlessness of so-called students who participate in such demonstrations. I believe that their failure to capitalize on special opportunities to learn, such as that uniquely provided by listening to the views stated by our Nation's Vice President, leaves them diminished in mental stature and the losers of singular educational advantages.

Should any of those participants happen, on mature reflection, to decide to forgo violent resistance to knowledge and wish for another opportunity to profit by exposure to Vice President HUMPHREY's broad range of knowledge and singular experience, I recommend their reading of the August 1966 article from Diplomat magazine, entitled "Vietnam, the Case for the Administration," by Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. I am providing a copy for such purpose at this time, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD together with the news items to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1967]

SHAME! SHAME! SHAME!

The students of Stanford University who tried to mob Vice President Humphrey were right to cry "Shame! Shame! Shame!" They have uttered the precise reproach that their conduct deserves. And it is a reproach that is deserved by everyone who resorts to physical violence in a democratic society, where other means of dissent exist.

Those who are governed by a domestic or foreign tyranny sometimes have no other means of making known their resentment at governmental policy. Those who enjoy every right of freedom that our society can confer must be required to confine their methods of protest to those that are orderly and parliamentary.

The Stanford students deserve reproach because they were threatening the second-ranking constitutional officer of this Republic, and that is indefensible enough. But they deserve it, in addition, because their disorderly behavior is the typical anti-intellectual response to orderly discussion. It is the kind of violent intervention in disciplined debate that the world grew accustomed to in Germany during the rise of Nazism. The first resort of a sterile anti-intellectual fringe in a country is to rowdyism. No group in this country ought put a higher value on the right to orderly dissent than those who have a minority antigovernmental view to express. And nothing is more likely to diminish or impair that right than the empty-headed, irresponsible, irrational disorder of such demonstrations.

Citizens of this country differ about many governmental policies. And they have a right to express that difference. They have a right, moreover, to try to organize other citizens so that they may attempt to make their minority view the majority view. They do not have the right to send their roughnecks, rowdies and storm troopers into the streets or meeting places to intimidate those with whom they do not agree.

If universities and colleges cannot assure officials of the Government or other citizens of safe conduct on their campuses, the orderly debate of public issues will have to take place on other forums and prudent public men will have to decline appearance in an environment where orderly discussion is not possible.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 21, 1967]

SURGING ANTIWAR MOB FAILS TO REACH HUMPHREY

PALO ALTO, CALIF., Feb. 20.—Anti-Vietnam war demonstrators attempted to mob Vice President Humphrey today at Stanford University but were halted by a cordon of Secret Service agents and sheriff's deputies.

Some of the demonstrators called the Vice President a "war criminal."

Screaming "Shame, Shame," some 300 demonstrators rushed at Humphrey as he went to his limousine after participating in a student forum at the university auditorium.

None of the demonstrators managed to get to Humphrey. Several grappled with officers.

When Humphrey reached his car, the mob of young men and women surged to the vehicle. They banged on the windows and doors with their fists.

Some shouted, "Burn, baby, burn."

Agents ran ahead of the vehicle, shoving demonstrators out of the way. At least one person suffered minor injuries when he attempted to block the car and was pushed to the ground by an officer.

Humphrey, visibly shaken at first, smiled as the car moved past the demonstrators en-route to San Francisco.

The wild scene contrasted sharply with the reception the Vice President received from 1700 students who jammed the auditorium for the forum. He was heckled only once during the question-and-answer session involving the war. But about 100 students and teachers who had participated in an all-night teach-in staged a walkout.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 27, 1967]

HUMPHREY WEIGHS STUDENT RIGHTS

(By Godfrey Sperling, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—In an interview with this correspondent Vice-President Hubert H. Humphrey said that the students' right to dissent must be moderated by a sense of responsibility and fair play.

Speaking against the background of his recent experience with an unruly mob at Stanford University, Mr. Humphrey said, "There must be a willingness to listen as well as the opportunity to speak."

OTHER FREEDOMS INVOLVED

He called upon the "overwhelming majority of students" who, he says, believe in fair play to "take a stand if elementary standards of decency are not to become rejected as a matter of common practice."

His full comment—his detailed assessment of the students' right to dissent—follows:

"The right of dissent and the right of protest are fundamental to a democratic society. Democratic decision requires not only exposition but also dialogue.

"But there must be a willingness to listen, as well as the opportunity to speak. As there is a right to question, there is also a responsibility to hear out an opponent. The university campus, above all, should provide an environment of respectful and peaceful exchange of ideas."

Continuing:

"Of course, the university must jealously protect not only academic freedom but every other freedom—including the freedom to petition, to seek redress of grievances, to gather in peaceful assembly.

"Indeed, authority in any institution needs the moderating influence of freedom of inquiry and the right to differ with that authority. And current manifestations of dissent on college and university campuses are generally within a healthy tradition of academic life.

CHALLENGE EXPECTED

"A speaker should expect to be challenged. He may encounter organized protest and dissent, and the university authorities have an obligation to permit orderly and civilized actions."

Mr. Humphrey paused and went on:

"My experiences on college campuses convince me that most students are alert, with a high degree of social consciousness and deeply interested in current affairs. They are willing to listen, as well as to debate. This is as it should be.

"But when dissent is degraded to the level of abusive language and even violent acts, the traditions of democracy itself are assaulted. Roughhouse tactics do a disservice to the university, to scholarship, and to the just cause of dissent.

"When a Secretary of Defense is buffeted around at a great university meeting as thought it were a barroom fight, when a United States Ambassador to the United Nations and a United States Senator are heckled to the point where they can scarcely be heard, when an invited guest needs the protection of police in order to enter or leave a university campus, then it is time for those who are deeply concerned about freedoms and rights to take a hard look at what is developing.

"MEETINGS DISRUPTED

"Thirty years ago, the Hitler youth were breaking up meetings in Germany, and disciplined, militant Communist youth were breaking up meetings in France and Italy. Foul language, sheer noise, and physical violence were not then, and are not now, the tactics of democracy. They have no place in academic life.

"What to do about it? I believe that it is principally up to the students who believe in fair play, to those who believe in peaceful assembly, as well as in vigorous debate. The overwhelming majority of students want no part of the outrages of a small minority.

"But that majority must take a stand if elementary standards of decency are not to become rejected as a matter of common practice. University authorities, as well, must realize that the very structure of free university life is being threatened by the excesses of a militant and aggressive handful."

VIETNAM: THE CASE FOR THE ADMINISTRATION

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

In helping the people of South Vietnam to help themselves, the United States is aiding a developing country, as it has many others in the past two decades. Yet I think some Americans—and particularly critics of our effort in Vietnam—tend to forget this. Actually, South Vietnam shares most of the problems of other emerging countries, and has an equal claim on our understanding and tolerance.

When it achieved independence only twelve years ago, South Vietnam was a poor country, entirely dependent upon agriculture.

It lacked any practical experience in democracy.

It was sadly deficient in educated and skilled people, and particularly in trained and competent civil servants.

In other words, its heritage was very similar to that of other emergent nations—a little better in some respects, worse in others. For example, there were more French civil servants in Indo-China than there were British civil servants in the entire Indian subcontinent, and their departure therefore left an enormous gap.

South Vietnam is not unique, either, in the existence of internal religious and regional rivalries and frictions. Many of the new nations have had to struggle with divisions of this kind as they sought to achieve and maintain national unity; in a few cases, tragically, they have resulted in large-scale bloodshed.

Since its independence, South Vietnam has had a variety of governments—civilian and military, strong and weak. Here, again, it has shared the experience of all but a fortunate minority of the emerging nations.

Others among the new nations, likewise, have experienced Communist insurgencies or unprovoked aggression from neighboring Communist countries. In postwar Asia, there have been Communist insurrections in Malaya, the Philippines, and Indonesia; there is a long-continuing insurrection in Burma and an incipient one in Thailand. South Korea in 1960 and India in 1962 experienced direct Communist aggression.

South Vietnam *has* been uniquely unfortunate in suffering both an externally-inspired Communist insurrection and Communist aggression from the outside. And, while Communists played a greater or lesser role in a number of independence movements, only in Vietnam did they succeed in usurping its leadership. This is the main reason why the Communists gained a greater momentum in Vietnam than elsewhere. This put non-Communist nationalists—those who sought independence with individual freedom, rather than without it—at a serious initial disadvantage, which they have had great difficulty in overcoming.

South Vietnam does, however, have some real assets not shared by all developing nations. In the first rank I would put its people—vital, energetic, industrious and eager to acquire new skills. On the plus side, also, I would put their high degree of articulateness and political consciousness. Although it sometimes takes forms which we find disturbing, it seems to me much preferable to the enforced conformity which reigns in Hanoi or the public apathy which prevails in some other new nations.

Moreover, South Vietnam is well endowed with natural resources. It can easily feed its own people, and in times of peace has been a major exporter of rice.

On balance, therefore, South Vietnam seems to merit our help and support as much as most developing nations, and perhaps more than some. This has been the view of our government and of a majority of Americans. However, a minority takes the opposite view. They are exercising the right to dissent—a basic freedom which all Americans uphold. I believe, however, that they should give sober and serious consideration to the other side of the case.

As I see it, there are two major schools of dissenters—those who charge that American aid to South Vietnam is actually immoral, and those who simply regard it as misguided.

Those who attack the American effort as immoral base their case primarily upon the erroneous assumption that the National Liberation Front represents the great majority of the Vietnamese people—just as its namesake in Algeria did. Therefore, they claim, we are waging what is essentially a colonial war.

They seem to assume that, because the Front has mounted a major and sustained guerrilla campaign, it must enjoy the overwhelming support of the people. History does not bear this out. Such a campaign does indeed require some support, but it does not require anything like majority support. Both in Greece and in Malaya the Communists came very near to winning the insurrections they had launched—*yet* in each case subsequent elections proved them to have been very much in the minority.

There is a tendency, also, to identify the National Liberation Front with the Viet Minh, the earlier coalition headed by Ho Chi-minh, which waged the successful struggle against the French. Many non-Communist nationalists worked and fought in the Viet Minh. Some, indeed, are now officials of the South Vietnamese government or officers in its armed forces.

Ho Chi-minh has shown great skill in dealing with non-Communist nationalists, using a carrot-and-stick technique. To make it easy and attractive for them to work with him, he even went through the motions of dissolving the Vietnamese Communist Party and keeping it nominally—although not actually—out of existence for some years. On the other hand, he dealt ruthlessly with nationalists who were unwilling to go along with him.

As the years have gone by, however, Ho Chi-minh has become more and more clearly identified as a Communist rather than a nationalist leader. He has, therefore, lost most of the non-Communist supporters he once had, and has failed to attract new ones of any significance.

By comparison with the Viet Minh, the National Liberation Front is only an imitation of a genuine nationalist coalition. Its Chairman, Nguyen Huu Tho, is a lawyer and veteran fellow-traveler with little professional or political standing. Like the other non-Communists who occupy figurehead posts in the Front, he is not widely known in South Vietnam, or even by the rank-and-file fighters of the Viet Cong itself.

Hardly anyone in South Vietnam, in fact, accepts the claim of the Front to speak for anyone but the Communists. Not a single recognized leader in the country—political, religious, students or trade union—has chosen to identify himself with the Front, and this includes many who oppose the present government or were persecuted and imprisoned by President Diem.

This is not to say that there are no non-Communists in the ranks of the Viet Cong. There are undoubtedly a great many—mostly peasants, some of whom have probably never heard of communism. Some are volunteers; some, increasingly in the past year or so, are conscripts. Some took up arms against the oppressive regime of the late

President Diem—a popular cause, which the Communists shrewdly exploited to the utmost. Some joined to fight the landlords of oppressive government officials; others because their friends or relatives were already in the Viet Cong.

There is no convincing proof, however, that the majority of peasants support the Viet Cong. Indeed, there is persuasive evidence to the contrary. Nearly a million peasants have fled the regions controlled by the Viet Cong and taken refuge in government-controlled areas. Some have left because of the increasingly oppressive rule of the Viet Cong; others simply to get out of areas of large-scale fighting. All, however, had the choice of whether to come out or withdraw deeper into Viet Cong territory—and nearly all chose to come out.

In the cities, where political sophistication is higher, the Communists are weaker than in the rural areas. They have enough supporters to carry on espionage and terrorist activities, but nothing like mass backing. Twice last year (October 15 and December 19) they called a general strike, in order to show some strength in the cities. Both calls went totally unheeded. During the many political disturbances this year, they have failed—despite strenuous efforts—to play any significant role.

Not all of those who denounce the American effort as immoral base their case on the alleged nationalist character of the National Liberation Front. Instead, they hold that all intervention is illegal, and therefore immoral. To this, I think, the great nineteenth-century liberal philosopher, John Stuart Mill, gave a definitive answer when he wrote:

"The doctrine of non-intervention, to be a legitimate principle of morality, must be accepted by all governments. The despots must consent to be bound by it as well as the free states. Unless they do, the profession of it by free countries comes but to this miserable issue, that the wrong side may help the wrong, but the right must not help the right."

Had Britain and the United States not given military aid to the Greek government, Greece would be behind the Iron Curtain today. Had Britain not committed many thousands of soldiers to Malaya over a period of years, a small but determined band of Communists would have seized that country. Had the United Nations not intervened to help defend South Korea, that country would have been overrun by the Communist armies from the North.

To this day, the Communist powers have not consented in any real sense to be bound by the doctrine of non-intervention. Whatever else they may disagree about, the Soviet and Chinese Communists are in agreement on one important matter: They consider it right and proper to support "wars of national liberation" (i.e., Communist insurrections) anywhere in the world.

Other Americans, exercising their right of dissent, regard our effort in Vietnam as misguided rather than immoral.

Some of these critics go so far as to say that America has no business in Asia, or at least on its mainland.

This view, I believe, stems from a misreading of history. We are all in some degree both its heirs and its captive, and our involvement in Asia is no recent aberration, but rather a fact deeply rooted in history.

We are and have been a Pacific power from the days of New England's clipper ships in the late eighteenth century. Our traders and entrepreneurs were soon joined by our missionaries—not simply evangelists, but doctors and nurses, teachers, engineers and agricultural specialists. In the middle of the nineteenth century, American ships opened up Japan, and American citizens were leading participants in what became the greatest transfusion of people and technology ever attempted from one civilization to another.

America's role in Asia today is a direct product of the century that preceded World War II and of the war itself. For, with the end of that war, the responsibilities of victory imposed upon us a stabilizing role in Japan and Korea. With the Communist victory in China and the outbreak of the Korean War, American power was the only shield available to fragile and newly independent nations in non-Communist Asia.

This was not the role we sought, nor the peace for which we yearned. Nor is it the role we seek to perpetuate today. But the peace still eludes us, for there are those in Asia who persist in pursuing their objectives by aggression and subversion—and there are others who ask our help in meeting this threat.

There are other critics who do not go so far as to oppose any American commitment on the mainland of Asia. They do insist, however, that South Vietnam is not the correct place for us to take our stand.

In the nature of things, however, it is the aggressor who chooses the place to make his challenge; the only choice left to others is whether to respond or not.

I personally am convinced that, if we had not made our stand in Vietnam, we would sooner or later have been confronted with the same situation elsewhere. This is not to say that world communism functions as a monolith any longer; it does not. But example can be contagious. The Communists have, in a number of countries and over a period of years, developed highly sophisticated and effective techniques of guerrilla warfare. If these are permitted to succeed in one place, they are likely to be applied in another. No American, I am sure, believes that the future of a people should be determined on the basis of which group can mount the most effective guerrilla campaign. Rather, it should be left to the free choice of the people themselves, freely exercised. And I do not fear the outcome. No Communist Party has yet won a free national election anywhere in the world.

Some who question our Vietnamese policy do so on purely practical grounds. Granted that the majority of the Vietnamese people would prefer living in a non-Communist rather than a Communist South Vietnam, they question whether this can be assured without a prohibitive commitment of manpower and resources—indeed, whether or not it can be accomplished at all.

At this point it is appropriate to stress that our aims are strictly limited ones. We do not seek to topple the Hanoi regime or provoke war with Communist China. We seek no permanent bases in Southeast Asia. We are willing to leave the question of the re-unification of Vietnam to be freely decided by the Vietnamese themselves.

What we seek to assure the people of South Vietnam is, in fact, the right of self-determination.

We would much prefer to use our resources for the economic development of Southeast Asia, rather than in war. In his historic address at Johns Hopkins University last year, the President declared that our continuing concern for the welfare of the people of Southeast Asia could be tested by Asians ready to initiate cooperative ventures in peaceful development, and pledge one billion dollars to their support.

In that speech, too, the President envisaged participation by North Vietnam in constructive economic undertakings once the shooting had stopped. And again in February, he appealed to the "men of the north" to cease their aggression and join in fulfilling the unsatisfied wants of the people of all of Southeast Asia.

For our part, we are eager to move the issue from the battlefield to the peace table. We would welcome unconditional discussions. We believe that the Geneva Agreements of 1954 and 1962 provide an adequate basis for peace in Southeast Asia. And the President has said that "the Viet Cong would not have difficulty being represented and having their views represented."

We have sought the opening of peace negotiations through the United Nations and in the principal Communist and non-Communist capitals of the world. Twice we have suspended the bombing of North Vietnam in an effort to open the way to peace talks. We are still prepared to go anywhere under any auspices and to talk to anyone in the effort to achieve peace.

So far, there has been no response. It may be that our adversaries, skeptical of the staying power of democracies such as ours, believe that they can outlast us. If so, they will be disappointed.

It is not by our choice that the war continues, and that precious human lives, both combatant and non-combatant, are needlessly sacrificed. In the words of President Truman, "the only kind of war we seek is the good old fight against man's ancient enemies . . . poverty, disease, hunger, and illiteracy."

Even while the shooting war has been going on, we have been waging that other war with vigor and dedication. Our civilian officials, and our soldiers too, have been hard at work everywhere in Vietnam. They have been helping the people build a better future, helping them help themselves.

The achievements have been very substantial. Since 1954—that is, since South Vietnam attained its independence—the number of students in elementary schools has nearly tripled. The number of classrooms and the number of teachers have increased at almost the same rate.

Only a few years ago, hardly any textbooks were used in the elementary schools; teaching was mostly by rote. Now fourteen million textbooks are being printed, and seven million have already been distributed.

The growth in secondary education has been even more dramatic. There are nearly seven times as many secondary students as in 1954, and nearly six times as many teachers.

In 1954, there was not a single university in South Vietnam. Now there are four, with over 25,000 students.

In agriculture, too, the achievements are impressive. Since 1954 South Vietnam has doubled its production of rice—its basic crop. In the same period, the production of pigs has gone up more than 75 percent, and of sugar more than 100 percent. Corn production has gone up from 25,000 tons in 1962 to a current rate of about 100,000 tons. Many new crops have been introduced, as well as improved strains of traditional crops.

The prime credit for this achievement belongs to the hard work and, above all, the initiative and adaptability of the Vietnamese peasants. One of the many hopeful things about Vietnam is that they are willing and eager to adopt improved methods of cultivation and to plant new crops. But our help—in fertilizer, seed and breeding stock as well as advice—has played an essential part.

Before independence, South Vietnam had virtually no industries. Now its infant industries are thriving. Between fiscal year 1965 and fiscal year 1966, imports of capital equipment to expand existing plants and to equip new ones nearly tripled—from seven million dollars to almost twenty million. And the people have shown impressive mechanical aptitude. Air Vietnam is serviced entirely by Vietnamese mechanics, and there has not yet been a single accident due to mechanical failure.

Even in the public services, there has been significant progress. The country is still woefully short of administrators of the highest caliber. But there are thousands of trained and competent civil servants in the lower and middle grades, and they will grow in ability with experience.

These facts and figures add up to the beginning of a social and economic revolution in Vietnam—a revolution which will go forward, and which has our wholehearted and enthusiastic support. The people have already begun to reap some of its fruits, even in the face of Viet Cong sabotage and terrorism.

I believe we must brace ourselves for a struggle which may go on for a long while. I believe it is important that we do not indulge either in excessive optimism or excessive pessimism.

There is light, however, at the end of the tunnel.

South Vietnam has the people and the resources to be one of the prosperous and fortunate nations of Asia.

If conditions of peace and security can be achieved—and I believe that they can—the way will finally lie open for the ordinary Vietnamese peasant to choose his own way of life, and to make the most of it.

CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I spoke at some length earlier this week on the subject of crime. On that same date, the President sent to the Congress a District of Columbia crime message.

In my remarks, I stressed the importance of action to lessen the restrictions placed on police officers by certain recent court decisions. Because of my conviction of the necessity for remedial action in this area, I carefully reviewed the President's speech to ascertain what recommendations he might have provided in this regard. I regret to say that I found none.

After studying the District crime message, I have come to the same conclusion as that expressed in the March 1 editorial, "Our Crime-Ridden City," published in the Evening Star, of Washington, D.C.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 1, 1967]

Our Crime-Ridden City

Three days before the President's District crime message went to Congress the law-abiding residents of this community received the latest bit of bad news. Washington crime in January jumped by 42 percent over the figure for January a year ago. Ten years ago the crime index was 205.4 percent lower than it is today.

Against this dismaying background, Mr. Johnson got off to a splendid rhetorical start. "So long as I am President," he said, "I will take every step necessary to control crime in the District and to make it a community of safe streets and homes, free from crime and the fear of crime."

Unhappily, the presidential performance fell far short of promise.

This is not to say that the recommendations offered by the President would not be helpful if put into effect. Conceivably, they could be of considerable help. But of themselves they will never control crime in the District or make this a safe city, and Mr. Johnson for some incomprehensible reason seems unwilling to take the last crucial steps in his campaign against crime.

In October, after some six years of work, Congress enacted a District crime bill designed, within presumed constitutional limits, to ease some of the handicaps which the courts have clamped on the police in the investigation of crime and the interrogation of suspects. Had this bill become law, it certainly would have helped. But it was vetoed by the President because, he said, some of its provisions possibly might have been struck down by the Supreme Court. Of course this might have happened. But why couldn't he have left that question to the courts?

There is not one word in this message which asks Congress to do anything about the Mallory rule or other crippling decisions. And this despite the fact that his own District Crime Commission agreed that some legislation is needed. A majority of his National Crime Commission said that the present status of the law on bugging and wiretapping is "intolerable" and that legislation is also needed in this area. But not a word of guidance or request came from the President. And the White House has made it clear that nothing of the sort is likely to be forthcoming.

Toward the end of his message, Mr. Johnson said this: "I pledge myself—and I urge Congress—to take every step which is necessary to ultimate success in our drive against crime."

This is repetition as far as the President is concerned. But the invitation to Congress is new.

The hope for this crime-ridden city is that the legislators will take the invitation at face value, enact the best bill they can draft and send it to the White House. If his words mean anything, the President this time will sign it—and let the courts decide its constitutionality.

THE NEED FOR SELECTION OF SUPREME COURT JUSTICES WHO POSSESS PREVIOUS JUDICIAL EXPERIENCE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, David Lawrence has had a good bit to say concerning the caliber needed in appointees to the Supreme Court of the United States in his column, "Selecting High Court Justices," published in the March 2 issue of the Evening Star, of Washington, D.C.

I echo his statement that legal experience would be a valuable asset and that judicial experience would logically appear to be a basic requirement in determining the qualifications of a person to serve as a Justice in the highest court of this Republic. I hope that as nominations are submitted by the administration in the future they will reflect a realization of the values to be gained from appointment of persons with established backgrounds in legal experience and judicial service.

To see seated on the U.S. Supreme Court bench an array of representatives of our Nation's finest legal talents with previous judicial experience would be a soul-satisfying sight. It is a distinction which our Nation deserves.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, March 2, 1967]

Selecting High Court Justices

(By David Lawrence)

President Johnson is expected soon to nominate to the Supreme Court of the United States an associate justice to replace Justice Tom Clark, who has said he will retire before June. But there may be other vacancies, as at least three members of the court are already eligible to retire on full pay—Chief Justice Warren, Justice Douglas and Justice Black.

What is the duty of a President of the United States as he faces the task of selecting justices for the highest court in the land? Should he pick the most competent jurist or give priority to someone whose appointment will help him get votes from certain groups of voters in the next presidential election?

The talk around the Capitol today is that Johnson has been urged to appoint Thurgood Marshall, a Negro who is at present solicitor general in the Department of Justice and was formerly a U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals judge. Marshall is highly respected and certainly an earnest advocate of the very principles of law which the "liberal" justices have been championing.

But is Marshall the best lawyer or judge in the United States for the post? Would his appointment be regarded as a selection based on merit or on the political benefits that accrue among a large number of voters who would regard this as a break with precedent? For, from the beginning of the republic, the highest court in the land has happened unfortunately not to include a Negro.

Some speculation is heard, too, that Johnson may do the unexpected in another direction by choosing a woman to be justice of the Supreme Court. There are a number of good judges of the female sex, and lots of people probably would be pleased to see the many decades of this form of alleged discrimination also ended.

There are hints also that among Johnson's Texas friends are some lawyers and judges on one of whom he may wish to bestow the honor of a supreme court appointment. Sometimes Presidents, when a vacancy occurs, have replaced outgoing justices with someone else from the same state, and it would not be unnatural to see a Texan appointed to succeed Justice Tom Clark. It may be on the other hand, that Johnson will consider that, having appointed Justice Clark's son to be attorney general, this should take care of the Texas vote without the necessity of adding a Texan to the high court.

Certainly there are many lawyers who feel that justices of the Supreme Court should have had some experience on the bench before they were appointed to the highest court in the land. But Presidents from both political parties have ignored this concept and have too often appointed close friends or someone who had performed creditably in the executive branch of the government. Out of the present nine justices on the Supreme Court only three ever had been on any federal or state court before coming to the high court. These are Justices Harlan, Brennan and Stewart.

Johnson could establish a precedent by asking the American Bar Association to submit a list of at least five men considered to be among the outstanding judges in the country serving in the federal or state courts. At least this would be likely to direct attention to men of judicial experience who have reached a high point in the esteem of members of the legal profession.

Surely it would seem that out of 50 men who are at present the chief judicial officers of the highest court in each state, or out of the 75 or more men and women who serve on the U.S. Circuit Courts of Appeals, and the many judges in the U.S. District Courts, there should be some outstanding judges.

Justices could be appointed from this group to the Supreme Court of the United States on merit, instead of letting the appointments be made on the basis of political considerations or personal friendships. It certainly would inspire men and women on the bench if they knew that, by performing creditable service, their ability might some day be recognized by the President of the United States as he selected some of them to become justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 O'CLOCK A.M. MONDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock a.m., on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the Senate adjourned until 11 o'clock a.m., Monday, March 6, 1967.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 3, 1967:

Farm Credit Administration

The following-named persons to be members of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for the terms indicated:

Paul Arthur Dobson, of California, for the term of 6 years expiring March 31, 1971, vice Ralph K. Cooper, deceased.

Millard F. Dailey, of Minnesota, for the term of 6 years expiring March 31, 1973, vice Joe B. Zeug.

In the Navy

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following-named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate them for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving:

Rear Adm. Walter H. Baumberger, U.S. Navy.

Rear Adm. William I. Martin, U.S. Navy.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Basil A. Hensley, pastor of the Epworth Methodist Church, Ripley, W. Va., offered the following prayer:

John 1: 5: *The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness has not overcome it.*

God of our fathers and our God, at this noon hour we seek an awareness of Thy presence. Save us, we pray, from the weary of traditional religion, of formalism and hollow words and bring us into a firsthand fellowship with Thee.

In these days when darkness announces the nakedness of life and the bankruptcy of its spiritual assets and humanity rots for the want of true meaning in life, give us enough of Thy light to rescue from decay the moral abyss of men and lift them into new lives with great perspective.

Now through the bifocals of faith we recall the memories of our Nation's glorious past, and ask that Thou wouldst make us alert to the call of the present.

We offer our prayer in the name of Him who proclaimed, *The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness has not overcome it.* Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 2, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

EULOGIES TO THE LATE JOHN E. FOGARTY—CLOSING DATE

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time to call attention to all Members that the Joint Committee on Printing is ready to go to press with the eulogies expressed in Congress on the occasion of the passing of one of our most highly esteemed House Members. The publication will contain the tributes to John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, who died on January 10, 1967. In the event that any Member desires to incorporate his personal sentiments in this testimonial book, I am today advising the membership that the closing date will be March 17, 1967, for acceptance of all insertions. I hope sincerely that this statement serves as ample notice to all Members.

AN ETHICS COMMITTEE

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have written to our colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Colmer] in his capacity as chairman of the House Rules Committee, to express my support of House Resolution 18 and other similar bills which establish a House committee to consider and investigate serious charges of improprieties against Members of the House.

In my judgment, we could have taken further steps to deal with ethical problems within our own membership than were taken in the past and it is, indeed, unfortunate that action must now be considered in an atmosphere of crisis. I supported the formation of this type of committee in the 89th Congress and I believe that the committee should be made permanent.

My letter to Chairman Colmer follows:

March 2, 1967.

Hon. William M. Colmer,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
The Capitol, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: The Rules Committee is presently considering whether or not to report a rule on H. Res. 18, a bill setting up an Ethics Committee. At the same time, consideration is being given to the alternative suggestion that the House Administration Committee pass on matters of ethical misconduct on the part of Members of the House.

I am writing this letter to express my belief that the Committee should report favorably the bill setting up a separate and special Committee. I supported the formation of the Ethics Committee which died at the end of the 89th Congress and I feel strongly that such a Committee should be made permanent.

Existing Committees and present administrative arrangements have not been proven adequate to cope with problems which have arisen in the House, and I feel that the time has passed when the public will consider adequate a resort to such presently-existing arrangements.

I hope that the Rules Committee will give a favorable rule to H. Res. 18 and that the House will thereafter take favorable action on this bill.

Sincerely yours,
John S. Monagan,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D.C., FIRE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, a lot is being said at this time about the District of Columbia and it seems to be mainly bad. I want to say something good about a professional group working in the District—I speak of the Washington, D.C., Fire Department.

For some reason, which I cannot explain, last week I was at two different places where fires and fire alarms were turned in. One place was downtown in a restaurant building and the other place was our own Rayburn Building near the C Street entrance.

Having some fire volunteer experience, I observed at both of these fires that the men of the District of Columbia Department knew what they were doing. They were well-trained and prepared, and the two fires were extinguished at once.

At a time when very few compliments are being given to the public servants of the District of Columbia, I would like to pay tribute to the Metropolitan Fire Department. In the two times that I have seen them in action they have been a credit to their Department and the District of Columbia.

SALE OF AMERICAN M-16 TYPE MILITARY RIFLE TO NEUTRALIST GOVERNMENT OF SINGAPORE

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I was astounded and shocked this morning to learn through the public press of the Government's authorization for the sale of the American M-16 type military rifle to the neutralist Government of Singapore at a time when these weapons are in such great demand by our fighting men in South Vietnam. In my opinion, this is not the time for the United States to be playing games with a government which in the past has not proven wholly friendly to us and, in fact, has neglected to support us in our fight for the freedom of southeast Asia. And I might call attention to the fact that the American people will meet with dismay this act, which denies to our own troops the tools to win the war in Vietnam and maintain peace in southeast Asia.

The public reports indicate that a month's production of the M-16 type, a lightweight, fast-firing rifle is being diverted to the government of Singapore. Apparently, our men in Vietnam must then wait at least another month of bloodshed and anguish before they receive the next shipment of 25,000 of these weapons.

This action comes at a time when our military leaders in Vietnam and our men in the field are crying out for this weapon, the best the United States has to counter the Communist-made automatic weapons, which are killing and maiming our young men and women each and every day.

America has been called by fate to support the aspirations for freedom by the South Vietnamese people by giving liberally of our material and human resources. The material we can replace from the vast wealth of our Nation, but the lives of our men there lost and ravaged can never be returned to us.

It is a sin against humanity to skimp and deny to those we send to fight our battles the means to win those battles, tossing them into the grist of battle with inferior weaponry, in exchange for the elusive gratification the administration apparently expects from Singapore.

The Congress was asked early in 1965 to dramatize and demonstrate not only to our fighting men, nor merely to the American people, but to the entire world that we were committed to assist South Vietnam in its fight to preserve its freedom. The Congress assumed its responsibility and acted with haste, passing the supplemental southeast Asia appropriation bill, building up our forces in southeast Asia.

It is high time, Mr. Speaker, that the U.S. Government again demonstrate its resolve to win the war in Vietnam, to say to the world that we mean business, that we do have the will to win, and that we are going to win. This can only be done by the cancellation of the sale of the M-16 rifles to a neutralist island-state and giving them to our fighting men in Vietnam, and by the total obliteration of any and all military targets or semblance of military targets in North and South Vietnam, including the port of Haiphong. And additionally, by throwing an embargo around North Vietnam, demanding that England and Canada and the other countries receiving either direct or indirect foreign aid from the United States respect this embargo and cease trading with our mortal enemies.

Why can we not win the war in Vietnam? Why can we not win it now so that we can stop the unnecessary killing and wounding of our young men? The answer to these questions is involved in the dealing of our Government with such states as Singapore. The answer is quite simple, and the American people know it.

FIRE SAFETY IS NATIONAL PROBLEM

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, newspapers in northern California have carried stories with these headlines: "Fire Kills Two Children in San Jose," "$1 Million San Francisco Fire Sweeps Four Buildings," "$30,000 Damage in Downtown Fire," "Fire Stuns Little Church." The threat of fire, the losses from fire, the deaths and injuries caused by fires are not problems that are uniquely confined to northern California, however. Fire safety is a national problem, and it will require a national effort to reverse the trend of recent years which has seen little or no improvement in our ability to cope with unwanted fires.

The challenge was highlighted by President Johnson in his recent message to protect the American consumer. He referred to "our shameful loss of life and property resulting from fires." And he recommended action now. As chairman of the Science and Astronautics Committee, I have had occasion to observe the myriad ways in which science and technology have changed the world in which we live. Some of these changes have no doubt added to the possibility of fire hazards in our daily lives. But the techniques of science and technology can also be put to use in devising greater protection for us in the complex, urbanized world of today.

For these reasons, I have introduced the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1967, to help reduce the toll of 12,000 lives lost each year in this country through fires and the $1¾ billion lost in property damage. This bill would amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a comprehensive fire research and safety program. I should like to emphasize that the objectives of this bill would be accomplished through support and expansion of existing public and private programs.

There are a great number of such public and private organizations actively working in this field, and some of them have been in existence for many years. But in spite of their worthy efforts, the rates of human and material losses on a per capita basis either stubbornly remain unchanged or else are climbing still further.

The bill I have introduced would authorize, first, the collection, analysis, and dissemination of fire safety information; second, the initiation of a fire safety research program; third, educational efforts for those who must deal with fires; fourth, educational safety programs directed toward the general public; and fifth, pilot projects to improve and upgrade the efficiency of the firefighting profession. Grants could be made to State and local governments, as well as to other public and nonprofit institutions.

In facing up to the challenge of unwanted fires, we are dealing with a threat that is as old as history. Famous fires have been recorded from Nero's Rome to Mrs. O'Leary's cow. There is some risk in all forms of human activity, but we do not have to submit to the threat of fire as though it were inevitable and unstoppable. With the knowledge of today and with the cooperation of all who are concerned with the consequences of fires, we have it within our power to reduce the suffering and the material losses caused by fires.

Given these conditions, I see no alternative for reasonable men but to examine in good faith the proposals for a national effort to combat fires. The bill I have introduced today is a blueprint for action. I believe it is a responsible bill which acknowledges the interests of all groups concerned with fire protection. I urge every Member to study the proposal thoughtfully, and I invite support from all Members.

INDIA'S PLIGHT—SOCIALISM OR DROUGHT?

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon consider H.R. 267 calling for $275 million worth of grain to the people of India.

The merits of the proposal are concealed by an emotional smokescreen of starvation, hunger, and malnutrition. A more mature understanding of the issues suggests the cry of "drought" is more of an invented excuse while the underlying cause in the food failure is a political regime more interested in economic planning than to provide for its people.

Additionally, American intermeddling in India can but have the effect of bolstering the Socialist planners to continue on a ruinous cause. And who can deny that the present economic pattern of the Indian planners will make the masses permanent welfare charges of the American taxpayer.

For the intellectual study of my colleagues I include the comprehensive study of India by B. R. Shenoy, from Barron's for November 21, 1966, in the Record following my remarks:

Plight of India—Socialism Has Proven More Destructive Than the Drought

(By B. R. Shenoy)

Ahmedabad, India.—American housewives who have been picketing supermarkets to protest soaring food prices would do better, it has been suggested, to stage a march on Washington, where officials devise the policies which are at the root of the trouble. By the same token, why not send a small delegation of protesters to New Delhi? India's Socialist bureaucrats, far more than drought, are responsible for the near-famine here, which also has had much to do with rising U.S. food costs. To stave off hunger in India, the U.S. has shipped 7.6 million tons of wheat and other foodstuffs in the past 10 months, thereby emptying its own granaries; the threatened domestic shortage, in turn, has sent wheat, flour and bread prices skyrocketing. Moreover, New Delhi's politicos refuse to change; they are going ahead with plans which inevitably will lead to worse food shortages in coming years.

Indeed, India is launching another Five Year Plan which seems designed to reduce its 500 million people from their present state of chronic malnutrition to one of actual starvation. Ignoring fundamental laws of economics, the planners are trying to channel into investment more money than is available from savings and foreign aid; this inevitably leads to inflation and economic stagnation. Restrictions on imports further retard growth. Finally, by placing too much emphasis on industrialization, the planners are depriving Indian agriculture of the capital it needs to be able to feed the growing population.

INDIAN GIVERS

To be sure, the men who drafted the Fourth Plan, details of which were made public last month, have merely followed in a well-worn groove, committing the same faults as those who drew up previous plans. The chronic ills of the Indian economy—rising prices, ever-deepening poverty under the garish opulence of a thin upper crust, stagnant or failing per-capita income, sagging exports and a persistent deficit in the international balance of payments—all stem directly from the deficit financing of the past 15 years. Indian planners, like their counterparts in other Socialist regimes, simply refuse to recognize reality; they won't believe that total investments cannot exceed the sum of the savings—domestic and imported (via foreign aid)—available for investment.

They put the cart before the horse. Rather than making a realistic assessment of how much money will be available and then formulating a program for its utilization, Indian planners first set down their "aims" and "targets," in effect the sum of all the dreams they would like to fulfill. The new plan calls for capital expenditures totaling 237.5 billion rupees ($31.7 billion) over five years—"at June 1966 prices." Of this total, government-run businesses are to get $21.3 billion, and private enterprise must be satisfied with $10.3 billion. (Money amounts are figured at the new official exchange rate of 7.5 rupees to the dollar.)

Once the goals were set forth, devising a "scheme of financing" was relatively simple. Estimates of probable revenues were simply adjusted to fit the plan requirements. Thus, the investment needs of the public sector supposedly will be met with $9.9 billion in budgetary surpluses, $5.2 billion of private savings and $6.3 billion in foreign aid. Private sector investment funds are to come from depreciation reserves of corporations, $913 million in foreign aid, retained surplus of the Reserve Bank and $4.9 billion in private savings left over after the needs of the public sector are met.

WISHFUL THINKING

These estimates are based on a number of wishful assumptions. One is that national income will rise at an annual rate of 5%; over the past decade, however, the average gain has been 3.3%, and it has been declining. In the last five years, it has run to only 2.7%. Another futile hope is that savings will amount to 13.8% of the national income each year. This contrasts with a rate of 10% during the period of the Second Plan and 8% during the Third Plan. Apparently the rate declined to 7.5% last year and, with the economy nearly prostrate (per-capita income has declined by nearly 6%), the rate is probably a good deal lower now. Any realistic evaluation must place the total of private savings to be accumulated over the next five years at little more than half the $24.5 billion envisaged by the government.

Still another dubious projection made by the Planning Commission is that central and state governments in India will generate $9.9 billion in budgetary surpluses over the next five years. During the past five years, the sources produced exactly $1.3 billion. Finally, the $8.4 billion in foreign aid which the commission is counting on (plus $480 million worth of foodstuffs under the Food for Peace program) compares with $6 billion received under the Third Plan. In view of U.S. efforts to overcome its balance-of-payments deficit, it seems more likely that aid will be lowered than raised by 40%.

SHORTAGE OF $10 BILLION

If foreign aid is forthcoming at about the pace of the past half-decade, India realistically will be able to count on about $21.5 billion from all sources (domestic savings plus aid), or roughly $10 billion less than the planners anticipate. Attempts to invest nonexistent resources through credit creation can only lead to inflation mal-investment, lowered savings and hampered growth, as experience with the Second and Third Plans clearly showed.

Equally disruptive to growth is the Planning Commission's policy of furthering Socialist aims by channeling a disproportionate share of investment funds into government-owned enterprise. By the commission's figures, this share is 67% of the total, but actually it is well above 70%. (Investments in the private sector are conjectural and undoubtedly exaggerated; also, calculating the value of aid at the pegged exchange rate falsifies the picture.) In any case, government ventures account for only 5% of the Gross National Product, as against the 88% which comes from private enterprise (and 7% from government services).

Thus, the private sector of the economy is starved for investment money, being forced to "make do" with only 30% of the total funds available, while vast sums are lavished on such public sector projects as the construction of four big steel mills, the last of which is now being completed with Soviet assistance.

FARMING DEPRIVED

Agriculture gets the shortest shrift. Manufacturing and service businesses manage to find capital, partly because they are favored by the Planning Commission, partly as a result of their traditional collaboration with financial institutions. Their privileged position is reflected in rising industrial production, which has more than doubled in the past decade, although in the same period national product has risen only 40%.

Deterioration of the capital base of Indian agriculture, contrariwise, is shown by the following figures, compiled from surveys by the Reserve Bank of India.

Gross capital formation of farm households

[In millions of U.S. dollars]

	1951-52	1961-62
Invested in—		
Farm business	400.0	222.7
Nonfarm business	133.3	200.0
Residential housing	333.3	41.3
Total	866.6	464.0

While capital formation in the agricultural sector of the Indian economy thus was declining by almost half, total investment in the economy nearly tripled, from $1 billion to $2.7 billion. It should be noted, too, that 70% of the people in India earn their living from agriculture, and in the intervening decade the farm population increased by 22%. For the vast majority of Indians to enjoy in 1960 the subsistence standard of living they had in 1950, investment in agriculture should have increased by at least 22%; instead, as shown, it was cut almost in half.

The 87% decline in outlays for residential housing is a consequence of the drop in living standards—food comes before shelter. On the other hand, the 50% rise in investment in non-farm business by rural households was in accordance with Planning Commission priorities.

High interest rates reflect the capital starvation of Indian agriculture. Farm loans commonly yield 25%-50%.

The decline of productive efficiency in agriculture stems directly from capital deprivation. The drive to channel investment funds into industry gathered momentum in 1955-56, and it took another five years for the effects to become apparent—tools do not wear out immediately. Since 1960 there have been occasional good years, as in 1964-65, when weather conditions were favorable, but the overall trend has been down. Thus, the 16% slump in farm output in 1965-66 more than offset the previous year's increase. Official explanations blaming the weather for India's plight simply don't hold water.

HUNGRY HORDES

To feed its millions, India has been forced to hike food imports, from a nominal 600,000 tons in 1955 to 7.4 million tons last year. Imports in 1966 are expected to reach a high of 9.7 million tons, feeding one person in every eight. Today, if imports were halted, mass starvation would quickly follow. Since the Planning Commission gives no sign of reversing its foolish policies and directing more investment funds into agriculture, the hungry masses of India increasingly will become the responsibility of American farmers and taxpayers.

Along with diverting investment capital from the land, the Planning Commission has embraced other ruinous economic policies, notably import restrictions and exchange controls. Ostensibly designed to correct an adverse balance of trade and prevent an outflow of funds, these two are among the worst crimes of misfeasance which a government can inflict upon its citizens. They stifle trade, cause scarce funds to be invested in uneconomic enterprises and accentuate the balance-of-payments difficulties they were supposed to cure. The only beneficiaries are the traffickers in import licenses who profit from corruption.

UNKEPT PROMISE

The case against import restrictions is amply documented by India's foreign trade statistics. Although national output rose 44% from 1955 to 1964, exports declined from $1 billion to $840 million. At the time of the rupee devaluation early in June, Indian officials promised that import restrictions would be progressively lifted, but next-to-nothing has been achieved toward that end.

The Planning Commission shows no signs of willingness to change the policies which have brought India to its present desperate plight. Unless the international consortium which is being asked to dole out foreign aid funds to finance the Fourth Plan calls a halt, India's ruinous course will be set for another five years. Since they cannot be allowed to succumb to Communism, the hungry masses of the sub-continent will become permanent charges of the American farmer and taxpayer.

THE LATE DR. MARK DEWOLFE HOWE

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, my heart is saddened by the sudden death of Dr. Mark DeWolfe Howe, who passed away February 28. Dr. Howe was a distinguished expert on American constitutional law and was professor of the history of American law at Harvard Law School. As an alumnus of Harvard, I had the privilege and opportunity to be one of Dr. Howe's students. I know the faculty and students of Harvard Law School share this great loss with me.

I herewith include in the Congressional Record the following obituary of Dr. Howe, which appeared in the Washington Post of March 1, 1967:

Mark DeWolfe Howe, 60; Educator, Biographer

Cambridge, Mass., February 28.—A nationally recognized expert on American constitutional law, Harvard Prof. Mark DeWolfe Howe, died after a heart attack today.

Dr. Howe, 60, was Charles Warren Professor of the History of American Law at the Harvard Law School.

A legal historian and biographer, he edited the correspondence of Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes and was working on a multivolume biography of the late Justice. He was law clerk to Justice Holmes in 1933–34. The first volume of the biography, "Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes: The Shaping Years, 1841–1870," was awarded the 1957 Faculty Prize of the Harvard University Press.

Dr. Howe was born in Boston, the son of Boston biographer and editor M. A. DeWolfe Howe, and graduated from Phillips Andover Academy and from Harvard.

After practicing law in Boston he joined the law faculty of the University of Buffalo, where he was appointed dean in 1939. He joined the Harvard Law School faculty as a professor in 1946.

SENATOR SPESSARD L. HOLLAND DEDICATES FLORIDA WEST COAST INTERCOASTAL WATERWAY

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on February 25 Florida celebrated the completion of a major link in the West Coast Intercoastal Waterway which, together with the other waterways along the gulf coastal area, the Mississippi Valley system, and the Atlantic Intercoastal Waterway, will provide a modern water transportation system to bring economic benefits to the entire Nation.

Senator Spessard L. Holland, of Florida, pointed out in remarks at the dedication that our national waterway system, totaling over 25,000 miles, is designed to serve not one State but all of the States interconnected by it. Rights-of-way and maintenance, however, are the responsibility of the local authorities which request construction and operate the waterways. In return for this contribution to the Nation as a whole, local areas will benefit from boating and recreation, as well as the added convenience to industry which a water transportation system offers.

Many Floridians, and those from other States interested in water transportation, worked long and hard to bring this West Coast Intercoastal Waterway link to completion. Foremost among them, however, is Senator Holland. His contribution to Florida and the Nation cannot be measured, but should certainly be recognized on occasions such as this dedication. I include the remarks of the senior Senator from Florida on this dedication at this point in the Record:

Remarks by Senator Spessard L. Holland at the Dedication Ceremony, West Coast Inland Navigation District, Venice, Fla., February 25, 1967

It is my great pleasure to be here today with my friends on the Gulf Coast to dedicate the completion of the West Coast Inland Waterway.

There is always a feeling of great satisfaction in the completion of a worthwhile project which has consumed a long time and much effort and money. I know that all of you here today are rejoicing because of the completion of this 150-mile project through the six lovely west coast counties, which will mean so much from every standpoint to the future growth and development of the whole area and to the enjoyment of its people and their guests.

I join you wholeheartedly in this rejoicing since my own start on this project was also some years ago in the early 50's. My recollection is that I was asked to enact four alternate routes for that portion of the waterway in this very area before we ever got around to construction. You realize, of course, that there was 5.69 miles of mainland construction, where a canal had to be dug through the high land which was right here in the Venice area, and naturally there were differences of opinion about where it ought to be. After we finally got a site authorized which was generally acceptable here, we were able to get the actual construction underway.

I remember that in 1960, although there was nothing in the budget for this work, I was able to put in on the Senate side an original item of $600,000, which was reduced in conference to $546,000, to start the actual work from the Caloosahatchee River northward. Of course, our whole delegation worked together then and during every year since to secure the necessary federal funds for this work. An appropriation placed in this bill by the Senate has to be approved by the House Conferees before it can be enacted and I want you to know that your four Congressmen, Jim Haley, Paul Rogers, Bill Cramer and Sam Gibbons, all worked unceasingly to get approval of the House Conferees, and then successful work was an indispensable factor. And so, all of us, join with you in the feeling of great satisfaction that this important waterway is now completed and available for general use.

My colleagues here on the platform and I find it most difficult during sessions of Congress to return home for important events. Most of the time, because of our schedules in Washington, we have no choice but to decline invitations. Fortunately there are times when our work permits us to attend historically significant events such as this one that means so much to the local area and its people, for the region and the future development of the state. I am extremely pleased that we are able to share this occasion with you.

This ceremony formally marks the completion of one more important segment of the interconnected inland waterway system of Florida. There will be other occasions when other important segments will be completed. But each segment is important in its own right because each project is designed to serve principally the people of a particular area, in addition to being interconnected as a part of the total inland waterway system of the state and of the nation.

This great project, the Inland Waterway of the West Coast of Florida from Fort Myers to Tarpons Springs, is a very important link in the waterway system of Florida, and I hope that it will soon be interconnected with the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. Then we will have access to the vast inland waterway system of the Mississippi and its tributaries, as well as to the Atlantic Seaboard through the Cross-Florida Barge Canal that for so many years was only a dream and now, in a few years, will be a reality.

It is a happy occasion when this project is being dedicated today on the banks of the waterway in the City of Venice. It will now provide a navigation channel in six counties—Peerless Pinellas, Happy Hillsborough, Matchless Manatee, Smiling Sarasota, Challenging Charlotte and Luscious Lee—which comprise the West Coast Inland Navigation District, an agency of the State Government and local sponsor of this waterway project established in 1947 by the State Legislature, in cooperation with the Federal Government.

I know many of you will remember when this project was first recommended by the Corps of Engineers in 1939. In what was then a much less developed area—and at this point let me say that I cannot speak too highly of the wonderful work that the Corps has performed, not only here in our State of Florida but throughout the nation in the development of our water resources and harnessing them to prevent the devastation that can be caused when water is on the rampage—General Cassidy, we salute you and your fine organization.

In 1945 when the project was first authorized by Congress, the little town which is presently the thriving city of Venice, had just begun to grow. During the period 1945 and the beginning of actual construction, there were numerous studies and meetings regarding the proposed route of the waterway, and I suppose many of you remember the local differences of opinion in regard to the route the waterway was to take.

In 1954 the Corps of Engineers approved a new route and Congress authorized it in the River and Harbor Act of 1954. During the period from the time the project was authorized until construction commenced in 1960, the Navigation District was busy at work spending over a half million dollars in local tax funds in acquiring rights-of-way, primarily in Sarasota County, and meeting frequently in attempting to resolve the many problems inherent with progress.

The waterway is now basically completed except for minor so-called clean-up works and some beautification work which I am sure will shortly be undertaken.

The waterway connects with the Okeechobee Waterway at the mouth of the Caloosahatchee River and provides access to the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway via Lake Okeechobee and the St. Lucie Canal, but use is limited along that route by the small locks, narrow bridges and more restrictive channels. Perhaps, as the Okeechobee Waterway becomes more widely used, authorization can be obtained to rectify these situations and provide for much larger future navigation needs.

To the north of this Waterway, from the Anclote River to the St. Marks River, there is no existing protected waterway although such a route for that stretch of the Gulf Coast is now under study by the Corps of Engineers. This section now may only be traversed by using offshore, deep waters of the Gulf.

This particular portion of the waterway through Venice, which you can see from your position in the audience, represents an engineering achievement designed and constructed for the benefit of the community and for the enjoyment of your people. It is a monument to the cooperative efforts of all those affected and to the melding of divergent views into a single plan. I have mentioned that there were four separate authorizations subsequent to the initial authorization in 1945 with respect to the route the waterway would follow through Venice which led to approval in 1954, of the route now constructed.

During the ensuing period, until construction started in Fiscal Year 1960, local interests were busy.

Venice officials, the State Board of Conservation, including former Governor Farris Bryant and Secretary of State Tom Adams, the State Road Department and the West Coast Inland Waterway District, worked together to resolve the many serious problems, and this cleared the deck for construction to proceed through Venice, linking up the dredging that had started in June 1960, at the Caloosahatchee River in Lee County with the dredging that had started in June 1962, at the Anclote River in Pinellas County.

Dedication of this waterway stands as an example of the benefits that can be enjoyed by the public when government at all levels works together cooperatively in meeting the challenges offered by problems that sometimes appear incapable of solution.

I should like to mention a few of the public benefits in this immediate vicinity that are now being enjoyed by the people who use the facilities that have been constructed in this spirit of cooperation. These facilities include:

1. The new Albee Bridge at Nokomis and the new Manasota Bridge south of Venice, at a cost of over $1,200,000.

2. The new Englewood Bridge provided by the State at a cost of more than $750,000.

3. The new Hatchett Creek and Center Road Bridges in Venice provided by the State at a cost of over $1,300,000.

4. The new Venice Avenue Bridge, crossing the waterway virtually in downtown Venice, provided by the West Coast Inland Navigation District at a cost of $1,250,000. (Incidentally, I understand that a bill will be presented to the 1967 Legislature naming this bridge in honor of the late Colonel George Kumpe, who was Executive Director of WCIND from 1959 to 1966).

5. The new four-lane U.S. Highway 41 in the Venice area provided by the State at a cost of over $1,000,000.

6. Construction of the canal through Venice at a federal cost in excess of $1,200,000.

7. A mile of public Gulf beach granted to Venice and the public generally by the Federal Government after the original waterway route was abandoned and the Venice route was approved. This beach is now accessible to the public over a new road built by the City with funds provided by the Navigation District.

Recognition should be given to the people of the six counties comprising the West Coast Inland Navigation District who have contributed $6,405,000 to pay the non-federal share of the cost of this waterway. This represents 47% of the total project cost of $13,527,000, exclusive of the State Road Department participation. The Federal Government has appropriated $7,122,000 for this public works project as a result of support given by the entire Florida delegation in Congress.

It is with a feeling of great pride that I can report there was heavy financial contribution and support for the waterway by some counties of the District, even though there was little or no work required on the project or expenditure of funds in their county.

The leaders in those counties were farsighted in their consideration of this waterway. They are to be commended for their understanding of the great good that would be enjoyed by the people of all areas served by the project and the benefit that would accrue to the region and the State as a whole. They were willing to invest their local tax funds in solving problems that centered primarily here in Sarasota County. For this attitude and for their unselfish cooperation and support, the people of these counties and their leaders are entitled to special recognition.

This is an example of a public recognition that a waterway improvement is not local in nature, but is designed to benefit the entire region and the State. Our national waterway system, totaling over 25,000 miles of improved navigable waters, is designed to serve not one state but all of the states interconnected by it. The six counties along this West Coast of Florida, served by their 150-mile segment of the inland waterway, will soon become an important beneficiary of the national waterway system.

About 85% of the benefits of the West Coast Inland Waterway are estimated to arise from improvement of navigation conditions for recreational boating. Commercial and sport fishing users in the area indicate they generally operate from locations accessible from existing passages and inlets. They normally use the open Gulf in moving from one area to another, except during heavy weather. However, as this rapidly growing community of the West Coast develops and the population continues to expand, there will undoubtedly be heavier use of the waterway for all purposes. Recent history in America reveals that a waterway, once established, continues to expand its use far beyond the requirements originally predicted. I expect history to repeat itself here. This waterway will undoubtedly become of increasing benefit to industry and of greater value for the enjoyment and recreation of all people in this area of Florida.

As a public project, this waterway is now available for each of you to use and enjoy. I hope you will treasure it as an improvement of our natural resources, continually guarding it against pollution and other undesirable encroachments.

May the joy of this day be extended into the future for countless years—and to many thousands of people who, on this date, have never heard of this beautiful and useful waterway.

POSTAL SERVICE: DELIVERY 4 DAYS—FOUR BLOCKS

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, many of us receive complaints about the mail service, but a recent episode that happened to my own mail shows just how poor this service can be at times.

On Monday, February 27, I received a frantic telephone call from the office of the chairman of the Washington State Tax Commission asking me the whereabouts of the information that they had requested on an urgent tax matter that was being investigated by the State legislature. This matter concerned the recent purchase of property for the Canadian Consul General's official residence in Seattle. I had been asked to check with the State Department on the question of tax exemption for the property in question.

On Thursday, February 23, I received an answer to my inquiry, and in that afternoon's mail I forwarded the information to Mr. George Kinnear, chairman of the Washington State Tax Commission, via air mail, special delivery. Now, Mr. Speaker, this letter arrived and was stamped received in the Olympia, Wash., Post Office at 4 a.m. on Saturday, February 25, but it was not delivered to the commission's office until Wednesday, March 1.

Mr. Speaker, an air mail, special delivery letter taking 6 days to be delivered is simply not understandable. When the tax commission officials called the local post office in Olympia about the situation, they received a very negative type of answer. I have today directed a letter of inquiry to the Postmaster General, and I would hope that he can explain the situation even if the Olympia branch declines to give a reasonable explanation. To explain why it took the Olympia Post Office 4 days to deliver my mail four blocks will take some alibi.

STRATEGIC GOODS FOR NORTH VIETNAM CARRIED IN VESSELS FLYING THE BRITISH FLAG

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I was disturbed to read an

Associated Press news story appearing in the Washington Post of March 6, 1967, on the subject of free world trade in North Vietnam based upon information attributed to anonymous U.S. diplomats.

I do not take issue with the report that encouraging progress has been made during 1966 toward a reduction in the level of this traffic. However, I do take issue with the statement contained in the story that:

> None of the more recent free world callers at North Vietnam harbors carried strategic goods.

This does not square with the information that has been made available to me by the Department of Defense.

As I reported to the House on February 16, 1967, the information I have received from the Department of Defense clearly indicated that during January 1967 strategic goods were carried by vessels flying the British flag into North Vietnam.

I would further add that cargo information I have seen covering the last half of 1966 also revealed the presence of items that could make an important contribution toward a movement of supplies to the south.

Mr. Speaker, whether the State Department wishes to classify these as strategic or not is not the crucial issue. The point remains that free world vessels continue to help supply an enemy in a struggle to which we have committed more than 410,000 American troops. I say that this free world traffic should be eliminated entirely in order to deny the enemy the sinews of war that are prolonging this struggle.

CIVILIAN TARGETS OF VIETCONG ATTACK

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, all of us are properly concerned about innocent victims of hostilities in Vietnam. To say that we regret such casualties is, I believe, an understatement. No less fortunate, but certainly far less publicized, are those civilians who are deliberate targets of Vietcong attack. Many of these are are in what I would call the leadership group—village workers, teachers, and others to whom the mass of peasants look for guidance and assistance.

I have raised the matter of gathering some statistics on this subject with Secretary of State Rusk, Secretary of Defense McNamara, and Ambassador Lodge. Last week I received from our mission in Saigon the most complete report available on this subject. Frankly, I am disturbed that our officials have not given these figures wider circulation. In the interest of complete reporting, and in the belief that many Members of this House will find these statistics informative, I include them at this point in the RECORD:

Vietnamese leadership casualties caused by Vietcong terror, Aug. 1 through Dec. 31, 1966 [1]

	Killed	Wounded [2]	Abducted
Deputies of National Constituent Assembly	1	1	----------
Province GVN employees	9	11	1
National police	48	45	5
Police informants	1	----------	1
Village chiefs	2	----------	3
Village council member	1	----------	----------
Village administrative commissioner	1	1	1
Village youth commissioner	1	----------	----------
Village security officers	----------	----------	----------
Hamlet chiefs	13	1	15
Assistant hamlet chiefs	8	1	5
Hamlet block chiefs	----------	----------	1
Hamlet security officers	1	----------	3
Hamlet interblock chiefs	----------	----------	4
Interfamily chiefs	----------	----------	3
Quarter chiefs	1	----------	----------
Interhouse chiefs	----------	----------	2
Civil guards	1	----------	----------
Combat youth	1	----------	7
Regional forces dependents	----------	17	----------
Hoi Chanh returnees	5	24	2
Agricultural cadre	1	----------	----------
Propaganda cadre, VIS	4	----------	10
Rural reconstruction cadre	6	4	----------
Pacification cadre	----------	----------	1
Revolutionary development cadre	8	9	5
Rural pacification committee members	----------	----------	1
Grievance committee members	2	----------	----------
Schoolteachers	1	----------	2
Catholic priests	1	----------	----------
Buddhist monks	----------	----------	2
Total	118	114	74

[1] Detailed reporting by category began Aug. 1, 1966. Compiled by U.S. AID from various GVN reports. Although not considered fully accurate, these are the best consolidated statistics of this nature available.

[2] Probably substantially understated due to incomplete reporting.

Civilian casualties from Vietcong terror

	Killed	Abducted	Total
July to December 1965:			
Government officials	66	43	109
Government employees	62	42	104
General population	683	3,534	4,217
Subtotal	811	3,619	4,430
Calendar year 1966:			
Government officials	146	156	302
Government employees	179	80	259
General population	1,293	3,271	4,564
Subtotal	1,618	3,507	5,125
Totals, July 1965 through December 1966:			
July to December 1965	811	3,619	4,430
Calendar year 1966	1,618	3,507	5,125
Total	2,429	7,126	9,555

CHICAGO SUN-TIMES SAYS THAT IN MAYOR DALEY'S 12 YEARS IN OFFICE CHICAGO HAS WON RESPECT THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no head of a great municipality in any country of the world ever received the same measure of praise, commendation, and appreciation that is being given to Mayor Richard J. Daley in his campaign for an unprecedented fourth term as mayor of the city of Chicago.

The great respect, appreciation, and warm affection the people of Chicago feel for Mayor Daley is reflected in the following editorial in the Chicago Sun-Times of March 5, 1967:

RETAIN MAYOR DALEY

Twice before, under the above headline, we have urged the citizens of Chicago to re-elect Mayor Richard J. Daley. This year the reasons for urging a fourth term for Mayor Daley are far more formidable than they were in 1959 and 1963. Each year adds luster to his reputation as the greatest mayor Chicago has ever had. In Mayor Daley's 12 years in office Chicago has won respect throughout the world, not only for its stupendous physical growth but for the new and proud civic spirit that is reflected in business, the professions and the arts.

Chicago's "remarkable rebirth" (as it has been described in the London Telegraph) has been, of course, the work of many persons and organizations, private and public. Many other cities have progressed, too, during the past decade of unparalleled national prosperity and advances in urban planning. But Daley has been the right man for Chicago at the right time.

Daley has been able to take the vision and philosophy of the contemporary academic political scientist and combine them with the hardhanded, pragmatic skill a political boss must have to get things done.

And Daley has gotten things done.

At the top of the list is the reorganization of the police department; it is now a model for the world. Chicago consistently wins the National Safety Council award for traffic management.

The fire department also has been modernized; Chicago now enjoys the highest rating given to cities by the National Board of Fire Underwriters.

The Department of Health has been revitalized; communicable diseases have been virtually eliminated; new programs have been instituted for mental health, cancer, heart disease, diabetes and infant and maternal welfare. The U.S. Public Health Service has praised the campaign against rodents and vermin as the most effective in the nation. Chicago won the "cleanest big city" award for 1959, 1961, 1964, 1965 and 1966.

The Chicago Department of Buildings has caused thousands of firetrap buildings to be torn down; substandard housing has been reduced by 60 per cent. Land made available has contributed to the city's unprecedented building boom.

Since Mayor Daley has been in City Hall, the O'Hare Airport has been built (at no cost to the taxpayers); the North Water Filtration Plant has been opened to complete the goal of clean, fluoridated water for the entire city; the Civic Center and its plaza (to be decorated with Picasso's art) has been constructed; everyone who drives an auto is aware of the great changes in streets and expressways, the lighting of the avenues (and soon all alleys) and the construction of parking garages.

These are all physical improvements of which most Chicagoans are aware. There are many other changes not so apparent including the establishment of a business type department of purchasing and the creation of a department to handle citizens complaints. The financial world is well aware of the city's sound fiscal rating; it has the lowest debt of cities over 1,000,000 population, the lowest bonded per capita indebtedness of cities over 500,000 and it enjoys a higher Standard & Poor's rating than New York, Philadelphia and Detroit.

Daley's new Chicago has its problems, too, as do all urban areas today. Gravest is that of the swiftly changing racial and ethnic makeup of its residents. Into this area Mayor Daley moved firmly and courageously. He established the Chicago Commission on Human Relations which has worked quietly in neighborhoods to promote good will and to ease racial tensions. When the City Council in 1963 adopted a fair housing ordinance directed at real estate dealers, not homeowners, Daley bravely stepped into an area of bitter controversy. The ordinance, administered by the Commission on Human Relations has been upheld by the state Supreme Court and is a model for other cities and for states. It has promoted neighborhood stability and prepared the citizens for the inevitability of an open city. Mayor Daley's views on equal opportunity for all citizens have not been popular among some of his own neighbors, but one of the measures of his stature as a city leader is his dogged determination to do what is right, and not what is expedient. His handling of racial matters is an outstanding example of this and history will record that in this area, too, he was the right man at the right time.

In all of his efforts, Mayor Daley has had the wisdom to call upon specialists in urban problems and planning. The Comprehensive Plan for Chicago's next 15 years, announced in December has been described as a latter day Burnham Plan for making the city a place of beauty as well as a better place in which to live and work.

In 12 years on the job, Daley has shown that he can run Chicago's affairs and run them well. He is proud of Chicago. He fights for it. We are proud of Mayor Daley. We urge every Chicagoan to vote for him and help him in his fight for re-election.

THE GOLD COAST OBSERVES 10TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago today on March 6, 1957, the Gold Coast gained its freedom and became the new nation of Ghana.

Ghana was the first African colony to achieve statehood and it was thus the trailblazer, the source of inspiration for other African peoples who were soon to follow in the path of national sovereignty. This date, therefore, is full of meaning not only for Ghana but for all Africa as well.

As in the life of all countries, Ghana, in its decade of existence has gone through a period of struggle, difficulty, and the resolution of problems. But today Ghanaian hopes are high and its spirit to excel is combined with a will to carry on with the task of building a stable and prosperous society. The problems now facing Ghana are great, as with all young nations and as it was with us in the early years of our independence, but the imposing record of the National Liberation Council during the past 12 months shows with certainty that Ghana can surmount them.

Americans cherish Ghanaian friendship and wish Ghana nothing but good fortune in the next 10 years to come.

My colleagues in the Congress join me in personal felicitations to the Chairman of the National Liberation Council, Lt. Gen. Joseph A. Ankrah, and to the able and highly esteemed Ghanaian Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency, A. B. B. Kofi.

CHAIRMAN L. MENDEL RIVERS: AN APPRAISAL BY THE FLEET RESERVE ASSOCIATION'S MAGAZINE NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include a very fine editorial from the March 1967 issue of Naval Affairs, the magazine of the Fleet Reserve Association on the subject of the distinguished chairman of our Armed Services Committee, the Honorable L. Mendel Rivers, of South Carolina.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, that my own experience with the officers and men of the naval service, both as a Member of Congress and a member of the Naval Reserve, fully supports the conclusion of the editorial, that Chairman Rivers is indeed deeply admired and beloved by all our men in uniform for the outstanding work he has done in their behalf.

The author of the editorial is Robert W. Nolan, national executive secretary of the Fleet Reserve Association.

The editorial follows:

One Man's Opinion

(By Robert W. Nolan)

At the heart of our nation's current struggle in Vietnam there is a campaign of hate being waged on the home front which may well prove to have a far more reaching effect on the life of every member, active and retired, of our nation's Armed Forces than the war in Vietnam itself. I am speaking of the "personal war" being waged against Chairman L. Mendel Rivers, House Committee on Armed Services, by a pair of nationally syndicated newspaper columnists. The first shot was fired in print soon after Representative Rivers assumed the Chairmanship of this vital Committee. Since the convening of the 90th Congress, the volley of fire has increased to barrage-like proportions. The campaign is based on unproven accusations and the repetitious smear technique. Repetition is employed on the premise that if something is said often enough and loud enough, it will eventually be accepted by many as fact.

Honorable men in high positions are supposed to become inured to vilification. It is considered by many as part of the price of greatness. They are expected to shrug off character assassination, but when pusillanimous attacks attempt to discredit their integrity, it is time for someone to speak out.

The latest accusation to repeatedly appear in print is that Chairman Rivers is a security risk. This charge intimates that all officials of the current Administration and concerned military officials are a party to a possible breach of our nation's security. Think about it for a moment and you will realize the ridiculousness of the charge. Yet, if the statement continues to appear in print, and is passed on by word or mouth, with the inevitable embellishments these statements receive, it will not only harm Chairman Rivers and our nation's defenses, but you personally. It appears obvious the goal of this persecution is to have Chairman Rivers removed from office—by any means.

What are the credentials of these two columnists? Where did they develop their expertise on military matters and our nation's defense? Do their stints in the Service during world war conflicts equip them to be the molders of our nation's opinion? Their training comes from newspaper row and even there, yellow journalism is not practiced by responsible men. Consider how many military secrets their columns have divulged. Is it not possible that their scandalous writings have given aid and comfort to the enemy?

I, for one, am willing to compare the facts. I know of no service they have performed that has contributed to the Serviceman's welfare. On the other hand, I, like you, am a recipient of Chairman Rivers' actions. In his short time as Chairman, our benefits have increased at a gratifying rate. Military pay raises, increased medical benefits, increased housing authorization, improved leave transportation, increased tax benefits—I could go on and on. Can the words in newsprint measure up to these deeds?

In the Navy we have a name for the man who is a "team player". That name is "Shipmate". It embodies all that can be said of a fellow human. Chairman Rivers is indeed, a Shipmate. He is helping all military personnel to a better tomorrow. Why not be his Shipmate today? Tell your local editors your views of this matter and take time to explain to all the unfairness of the printed attacks against your Shipmate.

R.W.N.

THE GREAT TRANSITION: TASKS OF THE FIRST AND SECOND POSTWAR GENERATIONS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House the recent address given by Mr. Walt W. Rostow, special assistant to the President, at the University of Leeds, England, on Thursday, February 23. Due to its delivery abroad, only passing mention was made in the American press of this important lecture. I have asked for permission to have it printed in its entirety at the conclusion of my remarks.

This address, entitled "The Great Transition: Tasks of the First and Second Postwar Generations," is an elaboration on the policy theme set forth by the President in his state of the Union message this year. I see its importance, first, as a positive step in the definition of long-range foreign policy goals for the United States; second, this is a remarkable personal statement of the views and convictions of a man whose advice is respected and trusted in the highest councils of our Government; third, it is a statement of considerable clarity and obvious perspective.

It is this kind of perspective which I repeatedly find lacking in critics of American policy in Asia. It is this kind of perspective which I believe any responsible critic of our foreign policy must be prepared to develop and set forth for the view of all: so much of what we do from day to day, how we weigh our alternatives at one moment, and what decisions are made, depends on what kind of understanding we possess of history, and what hopes we have for the future of the world. I commend Mr. Rostow for his contribution to the increasing maturity of our foreign policy, and for his service to the Nation. I cannot help but share his conclusion:

> We shall achieve arrangements of authentic partnership—based on mutual respect and acknowledgment of interdependence—or we shall not deal successfully with the new agenda . . . America is now—and, I believe—will continue to be, ready to play its proper role in such partnerships.

The address follows:

THE GREAT TRANSITION: TASKS OF THE FIRST AND SECOND POSTWAR GENERATIONS

(Sir Montague Burton Lecture by W. W. Rostow, the University of Leeds, Leeds, England, February 23, 1967)

I

In his State of the Union address on January 10 of this year, President Johnson said: "We are in the midst of a great transition: from narrow nationalism to international partnership; from the harsh spirit of the Cold War to the hopeful spirit of common humanity on a troubled and threatened planet."

It is this theme that I should like to elaborate today, by looking backward over the two postwar decades and looking forward to the agenda which is emerging for the next generation.

History is rarely clean-cut in its lines of demarcation. Wars, revolutions, and other traumatic events do leave their mark on the calendar; but their clarity is sometimes illusory, distorting the timing of more profound changes they reflect. Nevertheless, I believe we are now—potentially—in a true watershed period. We can make some shape out of the major experiences through which we all have passed since 1945. We can define some of the dangers, challenges, and possibilities which are beginning to grip the world community and which will increasingly engage it in the years ahead.

To elaborate this theme, I have chosen to review the evolution of international affairs under four major headings—each of which represents a dimension of our common, central task—the building of a viable world order.

First, aggression: that is, deterring or dealing with efforts to alter the territorial or political *status quo* by one form or another of violence applied across international frontiers.

Second, economic and social progress in the world community as a whole and in the developing regions, in particular.

Third, international organization which has assumed not merely global forms, through the United Nations and related institutions, but also (as Churchill foresaw) developed increasing vitality in the various regions.

Fourth, reconciliation—the search for and the discovery of areas of agreement across ancient and recent barriers so as to reduce the dangers of conflict, to give to the world community a growing framework of unity and order, and to fulfill the injunctions of Article I of the United Nations Charter.

I shall try briefly to examine how each of these four continuing strands of policy and experience have evolved in the past twenty years, and suggest the tasks which will confront us in the days ahead.

II. THE PROBLEM OF AGGRESSION

The postwar world was shaped by two quite arbitrary processes. First, there emerged *de facto* or *de jure* lines of demarcation between the Communist and non-Communist worlds. These lines resulted principally from the disposition of military forces at the end of the Second World War; although they were also affected by events in the early postwar years—notably, Stalin's consolidation of his position in Eastern Europe and the Chinese Communist victory on the mainland.

Second, a series of new states emerged from the process of decolonization. Most of these were the product of colonial history; but in the Indian subcontinent, the Middle East, Southeast Asia, and elsewhere, the birth of new nations produced new lines on the map.

A great deal of the first postwar generation's history consists of efforts to frustrate those who sought to alter these international boundaries by force: Communists because they felt that they had the historical right and duty to move their power forward beyond them; certain new nations because they felt a sense of grievance over the lines which had emerged. And at certain points the two efforts interwove, as Communists acted to exploit post-colonial ambitions, frictions, and discontents.

III. THREE PHASES OF COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

The postwar Communist offensive had a certain shape and rhythm. There was Stalin's thrust of 1946–51, in association with Mao, from 1949; Khrushchev's of 1958–62; finally, the offensive conducted over the past four years by Mao and those who accepted his activist doctrines and policies with respect to so-called "wars of national liberation."

Starting in early 1946, Stalin consolidated into Communist states the countries of Eastern Europe where Soviet troop positions provided leverage, while pressing hard against Iran, Greece, Turkey; then via the Communist parties in Italy and France. His effort reached its climax in the Berlin blockade of 1948–49.

The West responded with the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, and the creation of NATO. A stalemate developed after the success of the Berlin airlift in 1949.

As this duel in the West proceeded, Stalin, working through the Cominform, launched an offensive in the East, which can roughly be dated from Zhdanov's speech of September 1947. It involved guerrilla warfare in Indochina, Burma, Malaya, Indonesia, and the Philippines. And after the Chinese Communists came to power in November 1949, the offensive in Asia reached its climax in the invasion of South Korea. It ended in May 1951 with the successful United Nations defense at the 38th parallel against a massive assault by the Chinese Communists; although costly fighting continued for two further painful years.

From the opening of truce talks in the summer of 1951 to the launching of the first Soviet Sputnik in October 1957, there emerged what passes in postwar history as a relatively quiet interval. It was, of course, interrupted by the Suez and Hungarian crises in 1956; but these resulted less from the tensions of the Cold War than from the dynamics of change within the non-Communist world and within the Communist bloc, respectively. During this time, the Soviet Union was mainly engaged in its post-Stalin redispositions: political, economic, and military.

Meanwhile, Communist China turned primarily to tasks of domestic development. Only in Indochina did local conditions favor major Communist momentum; but the North Vietnamese settled in 1954 for half the victory they had sought.

Khrushchev's domestic changes represented a significant softening of Stalin's harsh regime—and for Soviet citizens, historic gains. His foreign policy style, too, was different and, in its way, more flexible. Nevertheless, considerable ambitions remained embedded in Moscow's foreign policy.

And with the launching of Sputnik, a new phase of attempted Communist expansion got under way.

Khrushchev had consolidated by that time unambiguous control over the machinery of the Soviet government as well as over the Communist Party. He looked to the exploitation of two new facts on the world scene: first, the emerging Soviet capacity to deliver thermonuclear weapons over long distances as a means of forcing the West to make limited diplomatic concessions; second, the marked acceleration of nationalism and modernization in Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America, yielding an environment of endemic turbulence on those continents.

It was in this post-Sputnik period that Moscow laid down its ultimatum on Berlin; the Communist Party in Hanoi announced it would undertake to revive guerrilla warfare in South Viet Nam; Castro took over in Cuba; and Soviet military and economic aid arrangements were extended to increase their leverage not only in the Middle East, where the process had begun earlier, but also in Indonesia and elsewhere. It was then that Mao announced: "The East Wind is prevailing over the West Wind," and, in that spirit, initiated in 1958 the crisis in the Taiwan Straits.

There was a good deal of opportunistic enterprise in all this rather than a majestic grand design; but it was clearly a phase of Communist confidence and attempted forward movement.

In 1961–62, Khrushchev's offensive was met by the West as a whole at Berlin; and a further dramatic test of nuclear blackmail was faced down in the Cuba missile crisis by President Kennedy. For the time being, at least, that latter crisis answered a question which had greatly engaged Khrushchev: whether the Free World would surrender vital interests through diplomacy under the threat of nuclear war.

The answer to the second question—concerning the ability of the West to avoid successful Communist exploitation of the inherent vulnerability of the developing area—had to be given at many points by many devices:

In Laos, by an evident determination to frustrate a Communist takeover, yielding the Geneva Accords of 1962;

In Viet Nam, by President Kennedy's decision in December 1961 to enlarge our support for the South Vietnamese;

In Africa, by the whole cast of European and American approaches to the new African nations; and, in particular, support for the United Nations effort in the Congo;

In Latin America, by the isolation of Castro's Cuba.

By the end of the Cuba missile crisis in the autumn of 1962, the momentum had largely drained out of Khrushchev's post-Sputnik offensive; but Moscow's move towards moderation, symbolized by the negotiation of the atmospheric test ban treaty in 1963, had no echo in Peiping.

The Sino-Soviet split was gravely aggravated after the Cuba missile crisis and became increasingly overt as recriminations were exchange and interparty documents revealed.

The Chinese Communists sought to seize the leadership of the Communist movement, notably in the developing areas, and to unite it with the radical nationalists of Asia and Africa. They thrust hard against Soviet influence within Communist parties on every continent, fragmenting some of them; sought to bring Castro aboard; moved boldly, overplaying their hand in Africa; probably played some role in triggering the attempted Communist takeover in Indonesia; and postured aggressively during the Indo/Pak war of 1965. As a result of the problems they created, the Afro-Asian conference at Algiers in 1965 never materialized.

At one point after another this Chinese Communist offensive in the developing world fell apart, leaving the war in Viet Nam perhaps the last major stand of Mao's doctrine of guerrilla warfare.

There is a certain historical legitimacy in this outcome.

For the better part of a decade, an important aspect of the struggle within the Communist movement between the Soviet Union and Communist China had focused on the appropriate method for Communist parties to seize power. The Soviet Union had argued that the transit of frontiers with arms and men should be kept to a minimum and the effort to seize power should be primarily internal. They argued that it was the essence of "wars of national liberation" to expand Communist power without causing major confrontation with the United States and other major powers. The Chinese Communists defended a higher risk policy; but they were militarily cautious themselves. Nevertheless, they urged others to accept the risks of confrontation with United States and Western strength against which the Soviet Union warned.

Although Hanoi's effort to take over Laos and South Viet Nam proceeded from impulses which were substantially independent of Communist China, its technique constituted an important test of whether Mao's method would work even under the optimum circumstances provided by the history of the area. As General Giap has made clear, Hanoi is conscious of this link: [1] "South Viet Nam is the model of the national liberation movement in our time . . . if the special warfare that the United States imperialists are testing in South Viet Nam is overcome, this means that it can be defeated everywhere in the world."

IV

These Communist efforts to extend their power and influence beyond the truce lines of the Cold War interwove, as I suggested earlier, with a second set of problems; the dissatisfaction of various ex-colonial nations with the frontiers—and other arrangements—which had emerged from the passing of colonialism. The list is long of conflicts based on real or believed grievances of this kind: the Arab/Israeli dispute; Suez; Somali/Ethiopia; Algeria/Morocco; Kashmir; West Irian; the Indonesian confrontation of Malaysia; Cyprus, etc.

In addition, older quarrels were exacerbated by the mood of rising nationalism which swept the developing world; for example, Peru/Ecuador, Thailand/Cambodia. The Communist powers sought to exploit a number of these conflicts in order to expand their leverage in the developing world via diplomacy, subversion, arms and economic aid agreements. But their roots mainly lay in an extension of anti-colonial attitudes and doctrines from the days of struggle to the early years of independence: in a continuity of policy from rebellion to governmental policy. It seemed easier for some leaders of the new nations to create a sense of nationhood by continuing to evoke the rhetoric and methods of anti-colonialism—and xenophobic nationalism—than to turn immediately to the more mundane concepts and tasks demanded for the successful building of a viable nation.

Looking back over this whole sequence, certain general observations are possible.

First, the postwar international boundaries and truce lines have proved remarkably resistant to efforts to alter them by force. In this first postwar generation the non-Communist powers did not achieve a peaceful world community under law. But we did maintain the minimum condition for building such a community; namely, that aggression not be successful. And through persistent effort in the United Nations we have de-fused many small crises and choked off many episodes of violence which could have provoked major conflict.

Second, as the two postwar decades ended, some of the aggressive, romantic revolutionaries—Communist and non-Communist—were passing from the scene, or entering a phase of protracted frustration—for the time being, at least. We have been dealing with leaders obsessed by ambitious maps of their region (or of the world) which they tried to bring to reality: from Mao's map of the area where China has, in the remote or recent past, wielded power or influence, to Nkrumah's vision of a united black Africa led from Accra; from Castro's vision of the Andes as the Sierra Maestra of South America to Ho's image of the former French colonial empire in Asia run from Hanoi. Each has confronted both other people's nationalism—at the expense of which these maps would be fulfilled—as well as a more general resistance to changes in the territorial or political *status quo* by external violence. Resistance to the achievement of these visions, combined with the growing demand of people throughout the world for economic and social progress, has eroded both ideological and nationalist aggressive romanticism.

One sees this in the Soviet Union and throughout Eastern Europe; it is a central issue in the struggle within mainland China. This is the essence of the pragmatic tide rising through the developing nations, supplanting the slogans derived from Lenin's *Imperialism* and the struggle against colonialism, with the more austere rhetoric of economic and social development. A new generation is emerging, skeptical of the expansionist and geo-political concepts and visions that engaged their elders.

In an interesting leader of January 14, 1967—*The Last Revolution—The Economist* recently advanced the proposition that the end of Mao would be the end of a line of romantic revolutionaries reaching back to 1789. I would put the proposition this way.[2]

There have been three major types of war in modern history: colonial wars; wars of regional aggression; and massive wars to alter the Eurasian balance of power—the latter attempted by industrially mature powers.

In the first postwar generation we have had to deal with the threat of the latter, as undertaken by Stalin and Khrushchev, under inhibitions set by the nuclear age. But we have also seen a good many acts of regional aggression arising "from the dilemmas and the exuberance of newly formed national states, as they looked backward to past humiliation and forward to new opportunity, while confronting the choices open to them in the early stages of modernization." Despite their global pretensions, I would place Mao's efforts in the latter category.

Given the rhythm of modernization, with vast continents entering the early stages of modernization after the Second World War, it is natural that we should have seen a phase of regional aggression. From the record of history we should be in reasonably good heart about this phase. For these early, limited external adventures, associated with late pre-conditions or early take-off periods, appear generally to have given way to a phase of absorption in the adventure of modernizing the economy and the society as a whole. But, as I shall later emphasize, this underlying hopeful trend is potential, not inevitable; and it could be transitory.

If these aggressive impulses have diminished in the technologically mature Soviet Union, and in most of the less developed nations, we should be able to go forward in the generation ahead from the frustration of aggression and the absence of major hostilities toward settlement, reconciliation, and cooperation. This, surely, should be the object of policy in Asia, the Middle East, and Africa; and, as it is already the object of policy in the West with respect to the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and mainland China.

VI

We have had to allocate in the first postwar generation an enormous amount of our energy, talents, and resources to the frustration of aggression and the avoidance of major war. Despite this environment of tension and, to some extent, because of it, the world community has also launched programs of economic and social development of an international basis which are truly revolutionary when compared to what was done during the inter-war years or deeper in the past.

We began, of course, with the Marshall Plan and Western Europe. So quickly did Western Europe respond that—although the job was by no means completed—minds were beginning to turn to more systematic efforts in the developing areas in the winter of 1948–49; for example, at the United Nations General Assembly meeting in Paris. President Truman's Point Four proposal in January 1949 was an important benchmark in this transition. In the United States a Presidential commission was working to systematize and enlarge this turn in policy, when the attack was made in June 1950 on South Korea. The Korean War both postponed a focusing of public attention and resources on the problems of development and, through a sharp rise in raw material prices, appeared to postpone somewhat its urgency.

It was in the post-Korea phase that thought and policy began to crystallize around the problem of accelerating economic growth in developing nations. In the early 1950's the best work on development by the United States was done in places in which we had major security commitments; for example, Turkey, Taiwan, and Korea. The substantial and sustained assistance provided for security purposes was gradually put to good advantage in terms of development. But towards the end of the 1950's, doctrines took hold and institutions emerged aimed at development itself—outside a narrow security context; notably, the Development Loan Fund, the Inter-American Bank, the Wise Men's study of India and Pakistan for the World Bank, and the creation of the World Bank's soft loan window, the International Development Association.

Evidently, the United States was not alone in this transition. As colonies moved towards independence, the metropolitan powers began to provide systematic aid to the new nations for which they formerly had borne a direct responsibility. The Colombo Plan organization was set up, for example, as early as 1950.

But only in the first half of the 1960's did the world community begin to bring development policy towards the center of the stage: with the consortia arrangements of the World Bank for India and Pakistan; the Alliance for Progress; and a variety of other international consultative institutions. In the United States this transition assumed—putting aside Viet Nam—the form of a shift from military to economic support, and from generalized supporting assistance to purposeful development aid. Economic assistance of nations other than the U.S. rose by 18% from 1960 to 1965.[3]

---

[1] Quoted from *Studies on Viet Nam*, Department of External Affairs, Canberra, Australia, August 1965, p. 23. Minister of Defense Giap made the statement on the tenth anniversary of the Geneva Agreement of 1954 (July 19, at Nhan Dan).

[2] For an elaboration of this theme, see *The Stages of Economic Growth*, Cambridge, 1960, pp. 107 ff.

This barely noticed expansion in the multilateral machinery and resources available for support of developing nations was accompanied by a learning process within those nations which has been quite dramatic. One after another success story in development emerged in the sense that nations learned the trick of generating sustained and reasonably balanced growth at rates which substantially outstripped population increase. The list is now quite long: Greece, Turkey, Israel, Korea, Taiwan, Thailand, Malaysia, Pakistan, Iran, Turkey, and nations in Latin America containing perhaps three-quarters of the population of that continent.

The problems of development are, of course, by no means solved. Large parts of Africa, for example, have not yet developed the human and physical infrastructure and sufficient political unity required for a sustained take-off. And in each of the other developing regions some countries have not yet established the necessary and sufficient conditions—economic and political—for take-off.

Finally, India, with 500 million human beings, is not yet stably on the road to sustained growth. But many of the prerequisites exist and, beneath the surface of the present political and agricultural situation, important new elements of agricultural and industrial vitality give solid grounds for hope.

In general, we have made great but uneven progress thus far in the 1960's. Many of the old contentious debates have subsided as men perceived their irrelevance; for example, arguments concerning private versus public enterprise, industry versus agriculture. They have given way to a pragmatic synthesis. New concepts, working methods, and institutions have emerged which should permit vigorous growth in the developing nations in the generation ahead.

But a lion stands in the path: the food-population problem. The solution to this problem will certainly be central to the agenda of the coming generation.

The elementary facts are these. If present trends continue, the world's population will grow from some 3.4 billion today to about 4.5 billion by 1980. Nearly three-fourths of this tremendous expansion will be in the population of the development world. Population control measures instituted over this period could dampen this increase somewhat; but they could have a profound effect by the year 2000. To feed this increased population at existing levels of consumption—and allowing for the impact of urbanization and income increases on effective food demand—will require an annual rate of increase of at least 4% of food production in the developing world.[4] The overwhelming portion of this increase will have to be met from increased production in the developing world. The average rate of increase in food production over the past five years has been only slightly over 2%. To avoid mass starvation—in President Johnson's phrase—"to help bring our most basic human account into balance"—the whole world community will have to apply to its solution every device at its command. Moreover, sometime during the coming generation, mainland China will have to acknowledge more fully and act on the proposition that agriculture and population control is its fundamental problem; and it may need the help of the world community to avoid mass starvation.

As work on development moved forward, a parallel and related evolution occurred in cooperation among the industrialized nations. The OEEC, which managed European revival, was converted to the OECD in 1961, embracing Japan in 1964. It gradually became a forum for examining the economic relations among the more advanced states, generating a spirit of acknowledged interdependence among the industrialized nations which has also suffused monetary and trade policy in such world organizations as the IMF and GATT.

Much in postwar security policy was rooted in a consciousness of our tragic common failure to stop aggression in time during the 1930's. Similarly, postwar economic policy reflected the memory of the nationalistic policies which converted the recession after 1929 into a convulsive global catastrophe.

We have clearly done better in international economic policy during the first postwar generation than we did during the interwar years, although at least four major matters remain on the agenda for the years ahead:

An international aid policy, geared to self-help measures, but sufficiently expanded in scale to permit high and steady rates of growth in those developing nations prepared to take the necessary parallel domestic action.

A satisfactory international monetary system which recognizes and relates problems of liquidity to problems of international capital sources and movements and the realities of the balance of payments adjustment process.

A reconciliation of agricultural policies in the light of the overwhelming fact of the food-population problem, and the adoption and support for voluntary programs of population control in the developing world.

A satisfactory trade policy embracing the legitimate interests of developed and developing nations.

VII. INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION: THE MOVEMENT TOWARD REGIONALISM

The tasks of economic cooperation have combined with a movement towards organized interdependence in the world community—especially in regional groups—whose roots go deeper than economics. The nations of the Western Hemisphere had successfully pressed for a formal recognition of its regional grouping at the United Nations Charter Conference in San Francisco in 1945, but the postwar movement towards regionalism began, of course, in Western Europe.[5]

Essentially, the movement towards Western European unity recognized three facts:

As many Western European leaders looked ahead, starting from the devastation of the Second World War and the acute dependence on the United States of the postwar days, they reached out for a method of organization which would give them a larger voice in their own destiny.

They perceived, however, that in military, economic, and other matters, a measure of interdependence with the United States would be required for the indefinite future; and

They accepted the fact that the nation-state—even nation-states of 50 million commanding the best in modern science and technology—could not deal effectively either with the United States as a partner or with the scale of the problems which were emerging on the world scene, whether East-West or North-South.

Western European regionalism was conceived by Europeans as a method for solving this three-sided dilemma. And it had the steady support of the United States which in 1947 made—and has sustained—a conscious decision that a strong, unified Western Europe was more in its long-run interest than fragmented but less capable European partners.

In the first postwar generation, Western European unity moved forward substantially, goaded by the Soviet threat but inhibited by an understandable reluctance to surrender deeply rooted national concepts. Today—despite evident and grave problems—that movement is still alive and active despite the rising sense of security since the Berlin and Cuba missile crises of 1961 and 1962. And, as one contemplates the agenda for the coming generation, as nearly as it can now be defined, the case remains valid, strengthened by evidence that it is difficult to absorb and apply certain types of new technology without investments in research and development and markets beyond the reach of nations of 50 million. Western Europe is unlikely to make the maximum contribution that it could make to the tasks of security, human welfare, reconciliation, and institution-building in the world community unless it continues to move towards unity.

Meanwhile, in the course of the 1960's, forces similar to those which have initiated economic regionalism in Western Europe began to take hold in other parts of the world, notably in Latin America and, most recently, in Asia.

Latin American unity is an old dream—dating from the days of Bolivar. It has taken on a new vitality as Latin Americans have moved from the first stage of their industrialization, focused on the production of consumers' goods in substitution for imports, to growth centered on medium and heavy industry. In terms of stages of growth, the more advanced countries of Latin America—Mexico, the southern regions of Brazil, and Argentina, for example—are emerging from take-off and moving toward technological maturity. In Mexico, at least, that transition has been successfully made; although throughout Latin America, industrialization is hobbled by an overly protective system which has diminished competition, efficiency, and full utilization of capacity. Powerful vested interests are embedded in those national protective systems.

But as the Latin Americans move into industries of higher and more sophisticated technology, they are beginning to try to overcome this heritage of take-off. They feel acutely the constriction of national markets and the irrationality of building steel, automobile, chemical, and other industries on a national basis. They are also being pushed towards economic integration by an awareness that their traditional exports are unlikely to earn the foreign exchange needed for their further development; that they must cultivate industrial exports; but at the present time they must go through a transitional stage of regional protectionism before they can emerge with competitive efficiency on the world scene.

Meanwhile, the Central American Common Market has demonstrated that countries at a much earlier stage of development can profit greatly from a common market arrangement—a lesson worth the serious attention of Africa, the Middle East, and Southeast Asia.

Finally, the Latin Americans are beginning to look inward from the coastal cities, which have historically been the basis for their modernization. They are beginning to recognize expanding needs and possibilities for international collaboration in developing the inner frontiers of South America.

---

[3] As measured by the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD.

[4] This includes an income effect on food demand accompanying a 4% increase in GNP.

[5] Although regionalism as an active political and economic force outside Western Europe has gathered momentum only in the 1960's, it was foreshadowed by the creation of the regional economic commissions of the United Nations: the Economic Commission for Europe (1947; Asia and the Far East (1947); for Latin America (1948); Africa (1958).

These convergent and palpable economic forces making for economic cooperation and integration are supported by a sense—not unlike that which continues to motivate the European unity movement—that in the world of the present and the future, the voice of Latin America will be strengthened to the extent that Latin Americans can find common ground and common policies.

It is natural, therefore, that the currently discussed meeting of the Presidents of the American Republics should focus primary attention on economic integration and multi-national projects.

In Western Europe and Latin America those pressing towards unified action could build on a substantially common tradition. But in Asia, history offered a less promising initial base. Nevertheless, we have seen in the past two years a quite remarkable surge of regional enterprise in Asia.

From South Korea to Australia, from Japan to Singapore, there are solid and particular national reasons why the nations of Asia and the Pacific should begin to group together in mutual support. These underlying considerations were strengthened by the American commitment of major forces in Viet Nam in 1965 which has given to the region confidence that it has a future to design.

As in Europe and Latin America, the initial expression of this movement has been in the form of economic institutions: the rapid negotiation of the Asian Development Bank; the new vitality of the Mekong Committee; gatherings to survey the possibilities of regional action in education, agriculture, etc. It remains to be seen how the encouraging political impulses which underlay the Asian and Pacific Council in Seoul and the Association of Southeast Asia will evolve.

In Africa, too, where regional cooperation has existed in some regions, such as East Africa, one can detect other beginnings, at least, of the same mixture of economic and political impulses that have led to regionalism elsewhere. The Organization of African Unity has existed since May 1963. Despite political schisms—regional and ideological—it undertook to deal with two substantial African disputes—Somalia/Ethopia and Morocco/Algeria—thus avoiding the intervention of extra-African powers. On the economic side, the African Development Bank has been launched and sub-regional economic communities are being formed in Eastern and West Africa as a result of planning by the ECA. Most of Africa, as noted earlier, is in a pre-industrial stage, building slowly the pre-conditions for take-off. It makes good sense to try to create the essential physical and institutional infrastructure, in this pliant early phase of development, on a regional and sub-regional basis. This was a major consideration that led to the reshaping of the American aid program to Africa over the past year to give greater emphasis to multinational cooperation.

As the evolution of the movement towards Western European unity indicates, the building of regionalism is a long, slow process. At every stage the case for moving forward must overcome the inherent attraction and inertia of staying with familiar national modes of operation. Moreover, regionalism is no substitute for building solid national structure. Nevertheless, the next generation is likely to see real, if irregular, progress towards regional cooperation, because the political and economic impulses which underlie it are compelling. Regional cooperation—within a framework of global collective security and common efforts in development—is likely to grow, as it must, if the desires of men and governments to take a larger hand in their own destiny are to be reconciled with the inadequacies of the nation-state on the one hand, and the imperatives of interdependence on the other.

For the United States, this move towards regionalism has a particular meaning. We were drawn into world responsibility after the Second World War by the need to fill certain vacuums of power. The cost of not helping in Greece, Turkey, Western Europe, Korea, and elsewhere, was self-evident; and it was judged, case by case, to outweigh the burden of engagement. But postwar America was not interested in building a network of satellites. It looked forward eagerly to the earliest time when other nations could stand on their own feet and deal with us as partners in as safe and orderly and progressive a world community as we all could achieve.

Regionalism—in Western Europe and elsewhere—has thus commended itself to the United States as a way of permitting us to shift away from the disproportionate bilateral relations inherent in a large power working with smaller powers.

We see in regionalism a way not of returning to isolation, but of leaving the nations of the various regions to do as much for themselves as they can—and more with the passage of time—while preserving the ties of interdependence where they are judged on both sides to be in the common interest.

VIII. RECONCILIATION

The central lesson we have drawn from our experience—and from the whole sweep of events since 1914—is that our main task is the organization of a durable peace. We tend, looking back, to share Churchill's judgment of the Second World War as "unnecessary." We are conscious that, in a nuclear age, the human race cannot afford another world war. Therefore, whatever the frustrations and difficulties, we are committed to look beyond the non-Communist islands of security, progress, and order, to a settlement of the Cold War itself and the shaping of something like a true global community.

The first condition for such a community, is, I would say again, that alterations of the international *status quo* by force not be permitted to succeed. The *status quo* is, of course, not sacrosanct. It is always changing. And in the past two decades it has altered in major ways through changes within nations and by international agreement. We now have, for example, a fairly promising prospect before us in relations between the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe on the one hand, and the West on the other. But we shall forget at our peril that this prospect was created mainly by the strength and unity of the West when confronted by the challenges of Stalin and Khrushchev.

Looking ahead, we can define one aspect of the challenge of the next generation as this: whether we can, in this time span, solve the three problems which, from the early postwar years onward, have virtually defined the Cold War:

Ending the division of Germany and Europe;

Preventing further nuclear proliferation and damping the arms race in strategic nuclear weapons systems between the United States and the Soviet Union;

Bringing mainland China into a normal relation to the world community. In different ways, each of these issues is now active.

There is a growing consensus in the West that our task with respect to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe is to make the most of the forces of moderation which have emerged since 1953—and, especially, since the Cuba missile crisis—and gradually to create an environment in which the East/West confrontation is so reduced that the problem of Germany can be peacefully resolved.

No one can now perceive the time or the shape of such a resolution. But there is a common will to create an environment in which the major unresolved questions of the Cold War in Europe can be settled. Underlying this process is a dilution, at least, of the Communist commitment that they must help impose their doctrines on others; the rising tide of national and regional assertiveness in both Eastern and Western Europe; and the washing away, under the tests of performance, of the Communist conviction that their systems for organizing society are inherently superior to those of the West.

The process will not move forward automatically. It could easily be disrupted if the West fragmented and presented opportunities for renewed pressure from the East; but right now it is in at least slow motion with virtually universal support in the West.

Whereas the moment of truth in East/West relations, centering on a resolution of the German problem, may not come upon us for some time, we face in the months ahead an urgent and critical question with respect to the nuclear arms race.

We are all actively trying to find the terms for a non-proliferation agreement; and the emergence of an anti-ballistic missile defense for Moscow has posed for the United States and the Soviet Union the question of whether the nuclear arms race shall be brought under control or go into a vast and expensive round of escalation on both sides with respect to both offensive and defensive weapons.

The two issues are partially linked. It may well be argued that it will be more difficult for the non-nuclear powers to accept a non-proliferation agreement if its context is believed to be a heightening of the bilateral arms race in strategic systems between the United States and the Soviet Union. And there will be other searching questions raised by the non-nuclear-weapons states in the current meeting of the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference at Geneva and beyond which require response.

But if we fail to create a world of non-proliferation, the result would not merely be more national nuclear systems and the instabilities that might accompany such a situation, but also a fragmenting of political relations within the non-Communist world. But if we should succeed—as we must try very hard to do—the world community will be drawn closer together.

What is at stake, therefore, in the discussions and negotiations that are upon us in these days, are issues which will set much of the framework for the organization of the world community over the next generation.

In Communist China, we are seeing one of the great dramas of modern history. The Long March veterans—who worked for more than thirty years in what appeared to be remarkable unity—have now split and are engaged in an open struggle for power. Beneath the surface of the struggle for power is a debate on policy between revolutionary romantics and pragmatists. The resolution of this debate will shape mainland policy and Communist China's relations for many years ahead.

This judgment reaches back to the nature and roots of the Chinese crisis. It is clear that after their remarkable victory in 1949, Chinese Communist leaders made two grandiose errors.

First, they set in motion a pattern of economic development focused on heavy industry and the modernization of their armed forces which was historically inappropriate. They behaved as if they were at a stage similar to Stalin's Soviet Union of 1930; in fact, they were closer to that of Japan near the turn of the century. Like Japan at that time, they needed to develop in modern China—as a foundation for industrialization—an agricultural system based on strong peasant incentives, combined with the massive application of chemical fertilizers. They chose collectivization and inadequate investment in agriculture. Despite some shift in recent years toward a higher priority for agriculture, the result is a food-population position which is incompatible with rapid economic development.

Second, they chose to move out into the Asian and world scene with objectives that disregarded the realities of power in the world arena. They sought an expansion of control and influence beyond their capacity; and they failed.

In the face of these failures, the future of Chinese domestic and foreign policy are evidently now at stake as well as the future of the leaders engaged.

No one can confidently predict the timing and the sequence of the outcome. There is a decent hope, however, that soon or late, a mainland China will emerge which will accept as its primary task the modernization of the life of the nation and accept also the proposition that the international frontiers of the region shall not be changed by the use of force.

So far as the United States is concerned, President Johnson has made clear on a number of occasions that we look forward to that day and to welcoming that kind of mainland China into the community of nations.

IX

What I have asserted thus far is that the tasks of the second postwar generation may consist in:

First, moving from the mere frustration of agression to a phase of settlement, reconciliation, and cooperation with respect to endemic disputes arising either with Communist regimes or between non-Communist states;

Second, moving forward in the tasks of growth in the developing regions, and especially coming to grips—as a world community—with the food-population problem;

Third, carrying forward, refining, and consolidating the movements towards regionalism—in Western Europe and elsewhere, as well as in global cooperative enterprises in the fields of aid, trade, money, and in various technical fields which lend themselves best to universal effort;

Fourth, moving towards a liquidation of key issues of the Cold War in Europe, and towards arms control, while working to bring a more moderate Communist China into a normal relationship to Asia and the world.

Taken together they offer expanding scope for the United Nations in the years ahead. In the past two decades, the U.N. has contributed to each major dimension of international policy; but the inherent schisms and conflicts of those years often by-passed the U.N. or permitted it only a secondary or marginal role. If we can move forward on the agenda I have outlined, the U.N. may begin more nearly to fulfill the functions envisaged for it in 1945.

Having held up this challenging but essentially hopeful vision of what may lie ahead, I would now wish to underline a general proposition:[6]

"On occasion it may be proper to regard the course of history as inveitable, *ex post;* but not *ex ante.*"

There was nothing inevitable about what we achieved in the first postwar generation: the revival of Western Europe; the preservation of freedom in Turkey, Greece, and West Berlin; the saving of South Korea and Malaya; the Alliance for Progress; the removal of Soviet missiles from Cuba; and all the rest. These enterprises took brave—and often visionary—men and women of many nations. They did not rely on inevitable historical trends: they shaped historical possibilities by their commitment.

Nor were our failures over these years inevitable—explicable, as always, but not inevitable.

And there is no inevitability built into the projection I have outlined for the second postwar generation—only possibilities. And these constructive possibilities will not be made good unless we work as hard at them as we have worked in the past twenty years on a somewhat different agenda.

It would, in fact, not be difficult: surveying the forces at work within Western Europe; in East-West relations; in the dynamics of the developing regions; in the forces at play within Communist China—to project a quite different prospect: a prospect not of progressive movement towards order and reconciliation and progress, but towards disruption, fragmentation, mass hunger, and renewed danger.

For example, the great hopes for progress in East-West relations depend on the maintenance of an adequate, flexible, and integrated defense system in the West, as well as on an imaginative and creative approach to the East. There is no reason to believe that a failure of the West to stay together might not tempt Moscow again towards adventure.

Similarly, a failure of the Vietnamese and their allies to see through the engagement to an honorable peace could destroy the emerging foundation for confidence and regional cooperation in Asia, with further adverse consequences on every continent.

X

I have said little thus far about the American position on Vietnam because I wished to expose one American's view of the broad tasks of foreign policy that lie before us all. President Johnson is conducting a policy which, in fact, is already at grips with many of what I have called second-generation tasks. I come from a government which, contrary to a widespread view, is not overwhelmed and obsessed by the problem of Viet Nam.

One the other hand, we are confident that what we are seeking to accomplish in Viet Nam is right and essential if we are to move successfully through the great transition.

We are honoring a treaty which committed us to "act to meet the common danger" in the face of "aggression by means of armed attack" in the treaty area. And this commitment is also being honored by Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, and Thailand—as well as by the remarkable action of South Korea, which was not bound by treaty in this matter.

We are also dealing with the gross and systematic violation of an agreement, signed in 1962, which committed all parties, including Hanoi, to withdraw their military forces from Laos; to refrain from reintroducing such forces; and to refrain from using the territory of Laos for interference in the internal affairs of other countries.

We are also encouraged by the efforts of the people of South Viet Nam to make a transition to orderly consitutional government of the kind which the people of South Korea have accomplished with such notable success since 1961.

And we are answering, as we have had to answer on other occasions, the question: Are the word and commitment to the United States reliable? For the United States cannot be faithful to its alliances in the Atlantic and unfaithful to its alliances in the Pacific.

I know that some of the younger generation in the United States—and, I daresay, in Great Britain—believe that we in the American Government are old-fashioned in our approach to Viet Nam. It is true that we recall often the lessons of the 1930's; we recall experiences in Greece and Berlin and Korea which are not part of the living memory of those now in universities. That is, I think, because our experience has forced us to contemplate the chaos since 1914 and the reality of the task of building a durable peace. A new generation will, of course, decide what in its experience is to be remembered and set its own goals and priorities.

But in the perspective I have presented tonight, what is old-fashioned about Viet Nam is the effort by the leaders in Hanoi to make their lifelong dream of achieving control over Southeast Asia come to reality by the use of force.

It is their concept of "wars of national liberation" that is old-fashioned. It is being overtaken not merely by the resistance of the seven nations fighting there, but also by history and by increasingly pervasive attitudes of pragmatism and moderation.

History, I deeply believe, will show in Southeast Asia, as it has displayed in many other parts of the world, that the international *status quo* cannot be altered by use of external force. That demonstration is costing the lives of many South Vietnamese, Americans, Koreans, Australians, and others who understand the danger to them of permitting a change in the territorial or political *status quo* by external violence—who cherish the right of self-determination for themselves and for others.

If the argument I have laid before you is correct—and if we have the common will to hold together and get on with the job—the struggle in Viet Nam might be the last great confrontation of the postwar era.

If the Cuba missile crisis was the Gettysburg of the Cold War, Viet Nam could be the Wilderness; for, indeed, the Cold War has been a kind of global civil conflict. Viet Nam could be made the closing of one chapter in modern history and the opening of another.

XI

As benefits a world in transition, then, we in the American government, under President Johnson's leadership, are dealing with elements from the old agenda while doing what we can to define, grip, and move forward the new agenda.

President Johnson is honoring a Treaty placed before the Senate by President Eisenhower in 1954 and overwhelmingly approved. He is insisting on compliance with an international agreement made in Geneva in 1962, by the Administration of President Kennedy. But his thrust is forward. He has placed before the Congress a Space Treaty; proposals to expand East-West trade; to create the Asian Development Bank; a Consular Convention with the Soviet Union; a request for a resolution to multilateralize the American contribution to a sustained effort to win the race between food supplies and population increase.

It is clearly his hope to be able to present to the Senate a non-proliferation agreement; and we are prepared to put our best and most constructive minds to work in negotiations to head off, if possible, another major round in the arms race in strategic nuclear weapons.

In all this we are conscious that there is little we can accomplish by ourselves. The nation-state—whatever its size and resources—cannot solve the vast problems now before us or foreseeable. Nor is this any longer a bi-polar world, despite the continued disproportionate concentration of nuclear power in the United States and the Soviet Union. The dynamics of the lively first postwar generation has yielded a world arena of diverse nations determined to take a hand in their own destiny.

We shall achieve arrangements of authentic partnership—based on mutual respect and acknowledgement of interdependence—or we shall not deal successfully with the new agenda.

America is now—and, I believe—will continue to be, ready to play its proper role in such partnerships.

I concluded my last survey of American

---

[6] *British Economy of the Nineteenth Century,* Oxford, 1943, p. 143.

foreign policy from a British University platform twenty years ago with this injunction from one of our poets.[7]

> "One thought ever at the fore—
> That in the Divine Ship, the World breasting Time and Space,
> All peoples of the globe together sail, sail the same voyage,
> Are bound to the same destination."

That, I believe, will remain the spirit of America's foreign policy in the generation ahead.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 29]

Abbitt
Adams
Arends
Ashbrook
Barrett
Bell
Betts
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolling
Bow
Brasco
Bray
Brown, Ohio
Burke, Fla.
Button
Cabell
Cahill
Celler
Clancy
Cleveland
Collier
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Cramer
Dawson
Delaney
Denney
Dent
Diggs
Donohue
Dulski
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Fino
Flynt
Foley
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gardner
Green, Oreg.
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan
Halleck
Hammerschmidt
Hanna
Hays
Helstoski
Henderson
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Irwin
Jacobs
Jones, Mo.
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Kuykendall
Lukens
McDade
McEwen
Macdonald, Mass.
Martin
May
Morse, Mass.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Philbin
Pirnie
Pool
Pryor
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Resnick
Robison
Ronan
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
St Germain
Scherle
Shipley
Skubitz
Stafford
Staggers
Steiger, Wis.
Teague, Tex.
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Waggonner
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
Willis
Wyman
Zion
Zwach

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 305 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a message from the President.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, is the Clerk going to read the message from the President on the Selective Service or on the Peace Corps?

The SPEAKER. This is a message transmitting the Fifth Annual Report of the Peace Corps.

The message of the President on the Selective Service will come later.

Mr. HALL. I thank the Speaker.

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT OF PEACE CORPS—MESSAGE FROM PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read; and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Of the many efforts undertaken by this Nation to advance peace, prosperity, and understanding, few have inspired greater admiration among the people of the world than the Peace Corps. In 5 years, it has given new purpose to thousands of Americans, and new hope to millions abroad.

In 1968 Peace Corps volunteers will:

Assist more than 400,000 farmers in their struggle against hunger.

Help educate more than 700,000 schoolchildren.

Help train 55,000 teachers.

Provide health services to more than 200,000 persons.

Help 75,000 men and women help themselves through private enterprise.

Bring greater opportunity to thousands of people through community development.

By August 1967 we will have more than 16,000 volunteers serving in 53 countries and one territory. By August 1968 there will be more than 19,000 volunteers—nearly double the number in 1964—active in 60 countries.

The Peace Corps has captured the imagination of our youth; 210 schools in 30 nations are operating today because American students have voluntarily assisted them under the school partnership program which we initiated in 1964. Their support, together with the help of Peace Corps volunteers, and with labor and land donated by the host country, is providing a home for learning for a great many children around the world. We hope to build 500 schools by mid-1967 and at least 1,000 schools in 45 countries by mid-1968.

The Peace Corps has provided an opportunity for tens of thousands of idealistic and able Americans, young and old, to serve their fellow men—with little thought of self or comfort, and with little recompense other than the reward of seeing human lives made better by their efforts.

It is building a growing reserve of capable and tested citizens devoted to public service. By 1970, there will be some 50,000 returned volunteers in the United States. Many of them, directly or after completing their education, plan to enter Government service. Some have already returned to train new volunteers, and others are helping to administer programs throughout the world.

The Peace Corps produces a high yield in results, at a low budgetary cost. The number of volunteers has increased at a much faster rate than the Peace Corps budget. Over the years, the average cost of the program per volunteer has declined steadily—from a high of $9,074 in fiscal 1963 to an estimated $7,400 in 1967.

Today, the Peace Corps idea—the idea of voluntary public service abroad—is spreading to other countries. Already 18 Peace Corps, most of them based on the U.S. model, have been established by other industrialized nations. This is testimony, not only to the soundness of Peace Corps principles, but also to the living example of Peace Corps volunteers.

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress the fifth annual report of the Peace Corps. It will be gratifying reading to all who are interested in this pioneering and humane endeavor.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 6, 1967.*

COMMUNITY WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 76)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Once again we have evidence that public assistance is best achieved when we help the poor to help themselves.

This is documented by the report I transmit today on the community work and training program authorized by the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962.

These amendments gave new opportunities for community work and training to thousands of unemployed parents of dependent children.

Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 gave further impetus to this program. It reinforced the original act by providing the counseling, education, health, job placement, and other services necessary to give the individual a new start in life.

Experience under these programs has shown that many people—now unemployed and living in poverty—can help themselves. Three-fourths of the 133,000 welfare recipients who have enrolled in these programs since 1964 have been helped; 22,100 have already found jobs; 70,200 are in training for productive employment; 3,500 are taking advance vocational instruction; 6,700 now have the training and marketable skills that should enable them to find jobs soon.

In short, 102,500 Americans and their families have been given hope where hope did not exist before. This is an impressive record.

But no statistics can measure the gain in self-respect to these parents. These programs substitute a productive job for a life on welfare or in poverty. They provide the opportunity to break the vicious cycle of welfare dependency and poverty which burdens our society.

---

[7] *The American Diplomatic Revolution,* Oxford, 1948, p. 24.

I urge the Congress to extend and make permanent this program to bring help to unemployed parents and through them hope to our most disadvantaged children.

I urge the States to study the lessons we have learned and to avail themselves fully of the promise which these programs hold.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 6, 1967*.

MESSAGE ON SELECTIVE SERVICE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 75)

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

THE BACKGROUND

To the Congress of the United States:

The knowledge that military service must sometimes be borne by—and imposed on—free men so their freedom may be preserved is woven deeply into the fabric of the American experience.

Americans have been obliged to take up arms in the cause of liberty since our earliest days on these shores. From the militiaman who shouldered his musket to protect his community in the wilderness, to the young recruit of today who serves the common defense and then returns to civilian life, we have known the price of freedom as well as its glory.

In 1940, the mounting threat of Axis aggression was poised against us. The 76th Congress responded by making compulsory military service a legal obligation in peacetime as well as war. Although this was the first peacetime draft in our history, it was an action consistent with our evolving traditions and responsibilities. As President Roosevelt said on that occasion:

> America has adopted selective service in time of peace, and, in doing so, has broadened and enriched our basic concepts of citizenship. Beside the clear democratic ideals of equal rights, equal privileges and equal opportunities, we have set forth the underlying other duties, obligations and responsibilities of equal service.

Americans ever since then have come to know well those "broadened concepts of citizenship" of which Franklin Roosevelt spoke. Little more than a year later, war began. The Selective Service System established by that foresighted 76th Congress mustered the greatest military force in the history of the world.

After the end of World War II, in the face of new hostile threats, the 80th Congress met its obligation by enacting new selective service legislation. Six times since then, succeeding Congresses—the 81st, the 82d, the 84th, the 86th, and the 88th—have kept it alive as an indispensable part of our defense against an aggression which has taken different shapes but has never disappeared. Twice—in Korea, and today in Vietnam—we have borne arms in the field of battle to counter that aggression.

Thus, for more than a quarter of a century, through total war and cold war and limited war, selective service has provided the Nation with the ability to respond quickly and appropriately to the varied challenges confronting our democracy.

THE PROBLEM TODAY

The Selective Service Act under which men today are drafted into our Armed Forces is now almost two decades old, about the age of many of the men who stand watch on the frontiers of freedom throughout the world.

That generation, whose lifetime coincides with our draft law, has grown to maturity in a period of sweeping change. We are in many ways a different nation—more urban, more mobile, more populous.

The youth of the country themselves have added most heavily to our growth in numbers. In 1948, when the present act was passed, less than 1.2 million male Americans were 18 years old. Today that number has increased about 60 percent to almost 1.9 million, and will exceed 2 million in the 1970's.

Because of this population increase, many more men of their generation are available for military duty than are required.

A decade ago, about 70 percent of the group eligible for duty had to serve with the Armed Forces to meet our military manpower needs.

Today, the need is for less than 50 percent, and only about a third or less of this number must be involuntarily inducted—even under the conditions of war. When the firing stops, as we all fervently hope it will soon, the requirements will be for fewer still.

The danger of inequity is imbedded in these statistics. It arises when not every eligible man must be called upon to serve. It is intensified when the numbers of men needed are relatively small in relation to the numbers available.

Fairness has always been one of the goals of the Selective Service System. When the present act was passed in 1948, one of its underlying assumptions was that the obligation and benefits of military service would be equitably borne.

The changing conditions which have come to our society since that act was established have prompted concern—in the executive branch, in the Congress, in the Nation generally—with whether the System might have drifted from the original concept of equity.

That concern deepened as young men were called to the field of combat.

A selective service system, of course, must operate well and fairly in peace as well as in times of conflict. But it is in the glare of conflict that the minds of all of us are focused most urgently on the need to review the procedures by which some men are selected and some are not.

Last July, by Executive order, I appointed a National Advisory Commission on Selective Service, composed of 20 citizens, distinguished and diverse in their representation of important elements of our national life.

I asked that Commission, headed by Mr. Burke Marshall, to study these questions, and indeed whether the need for the draft itself was ended or soon might be.

I instructed the Commission to consider the past, present, and prospective functioning of selective service and other systems of national service in the light of the following factors:

Fairness to all citizens;

Military manpower requirements;

The objective of minimizing uncertainty and interference with individual careers and education;

Social, economic, and employment conditions and goals;

Bugetary and administrative considerations; and

Any other factors the Commission might deem relevant.

The Commission undertook this responsibility with seriousness of purpose, and a clear recognition of the abiding importance these issues hold in American life today. It consulted with or sought the opinions of national leaders, Governors, mayors, and officials of the Federal Government; educators and students; business groups and labor unions; veterans organizations, religious leaders, and others broadly representing every sector of our society. I asked people across the land to send their thoughts to the Commission and many did.

The Commission's work is now concluded. Its report has been made available to the American public. I have studied that report carefully.

I have also had the benefit of two other recent studies relating to the same problems. Another distinguished group of leading citizens reviewed the selective service situation for the House Armed Services Committee. Its conclusions have been made available to me. Earlier, at my direction, the Secretary of Defense conducted a study of the relationship of the draft to military manpower utilization policies. It was completed in June of last year.

These reports have confirmed that continuation of the draft is still essential to our national security. They have also established that inequities do result from present selection policies, that policies designed for an earlier period operate unevenly under today's condtions, creating unfairness in the lives of some, promoting uncertainty in the minds of more.

To provide the military manpower this Nation needs for its security and to assure that the system of selection operates as equitably as possible, I propose that:

1. The selective service law under which men can be inducted into the Armed Forces be extended for a 4-year year period, upon its expiration on June 30, 1967.

2. Men be inducted beginning at 19 years of age, reversing the present order of calling the oldest first, so that uncertainties now generated in the lives of young men will be reduced.

3. Policies be tightened governing undergraduate college deferments so that those deferments can never become exemptions from military service, and providing for no further postgraduate

deferments except for those in medical and dental schools.

4. Firm rules be formulated, to be applied uniformly throughout the country, in determining eligibility for all other types of deferment.

5. A fair and impartial random—FAIR—system of selection be established to determine the order of call for all men eligible and available for the draft.

6. Improvements in the Selective Service System be immediately effected to assure better service to the registrant both in counseling and appeals, better information to the public regarding the System's operation and broader representation on local boards of the communities they serve.

7. A study be conducted by the best management experts in the Government of the effectiveness, cost, and feasibility of a proposal made by the National Advisory Commission to restructure the organization of the Selective Service System.

8. The National Commission on Selective Service be continued for another year to provide a continuing review of the System that touches the lives of so many young Americans and their families.

9. Enlistment procedures for our National Guard and Reserve units be strengthened to remove inequities and to insure a high state of readiness for those units.

CONTINUATION OF THE DRAFT LAW

The United States must meet its military commitments for the national security, for the preservation of peace, and for the defense of freedom in the world. It must be able to do this under any circumstance, under any condition, under any challenge.

This fundamental necessity is the bedrock of our national policy upon which all other considerations must rest.

To maintain this ability we must continue the draft.

The volunteer tradition is strong in our Armed Forces, as it is in our national heritage. Except for the periods of major war in this century, it has been the chief source of our military manpower since the earliest days of the Republic.

It must remain so. Our Armed Forces will continue to rely mainly on those who volunteer to serve. This is not only consistent with the American tradition, it is also the best policy for the services themselves, since it assures a highly motivated and professionally competent career force.

Improving the quality of service life and increasing the rewards for service itself encourage volunteering. We have taken a number of actions toward this end and will intitiate still others:

Four military pay raises in each of the last 4 years, averaging a total increase of 33 percent in basic pay. I shall shortly recommend another increase.

A military medicare program which expands medical care for the dependents of those on active duty, as well as for retired members and their dependents.

The cold war GI bill of rights, which provides education, training, medical, and home loan benefits to returning servicemen.

The Vietnam Conflict Servicemen and Veterans Act of 1967, which I proposed last month, to provide additional benefits to members of the Armed Forces and their dependents.

I have asked the Secretary of Defense to submit to me this year a comprehensive study of the military compensation and retirement system.

To attract more physicians, dentists, and other members of the health professions to volunteer for military service, I am directing the Secretary of Defense to develop a broad program of medical scholarships. Students taking advantage of these scholarships would commit themselves to longer terms of obligated service.

At the same time that we have been increasing the incentives for volunteer service, we have also taken steps to reduce our requirements for men who must be drafted.

I have directed that the services place civilians in jobs previously held by men in uniform wherever this can be done without impairing military effectiveness. During fiscal 1967, 74,000 former military jobs will be filled by civilians. During the next fiscal year, an additional 40,000 such jobs will be so filled. If these measures were not taken, our draft calls would have to be much higher.

Starting last year, under Project 100,000, the military services have revised mental and physical standards to admit young men who were being rejected—more than half of whom had sought to volunteer. As a result, the services will accept this year 40,000 men who would have been disqualified under former standards. Next year, the Defense Department's goal is to accept 100,000 such men.

Finally, the Secretary of Defense is taking steps to expand opportunities for women in the services, thus further reducing the number of men who must be called involuntarily for duty.

But in spite of all we can and will do in this regard, we cannot realistically expect to meet our present commitments or our future requirements with a military force relying exclusively on volunteers.

We know that vulnerability to the draft is a strong motivating factor in the decision of many young men to enlist. Studies have shown that in the relatively normal years before the buildup in Vietnam, two out of every five enlistees were so motivated. Since then, the proportion has been considerably higher.

Research has also disclosed that volunteers alone could be expected to man a force of little more than 2 million.

Our military needs have been substantially greater than that ever since we first committed troops to combat in Korea in the summer of 1950. The average strength of our Armed Forces in the years between the end of hostilities in Korea and the buildup in Vietnam was 2.7 million. Today, we have 3.3 million men under arms, and this force will increase still further by June 1968 if the conflict is not concluded by then.

The question, whether we could increase incentives sufficiently to attract an exclusively volunteer force larger than any such force we have had in the past, has been subjected to intensive study.

That study concluded that the costs would be difficult to determine precisely, but clearly they would be very high.

Far more important is the position of weakness to which an exclusively volunteer force—with no provision for selective service—would expose us. The sudden need for more men than a volunteer force could supply would find the Nation without the machinery to respond.

That lack of flexibility, that absence of power to expand in quick response to sudden challenge, would be totally incompatible with an effective national defense. In short, it would force us to gamble with the Nation's security.

We look to, and work for, the day the fighting will end in Vietnam. We hope—it is the most profound hope of this administration as it is of this generation of Americans—that the years beyond that day will be years of diminishing tension in the world, of silent guns and smaller armies. The total efforts of this Government will be constantly directed toward reaching that time.

But although we are hopeful, we are realists too, with a realism bred into us through long and lasting experience. Any responsible appraisal of world conditions leads inevitably to this conclusion: We must maintain the capability for flexible response which we have today.

The draft is one of the essential and crucial instruments which assures us of that flexibility.

I recommend legislation to extend for 4 years the authority, which expires on June 30, 1967, to induct men into the Armed Forces.

THE ORDER OF CALL

The general procedure today for the selection of draft-eligible men is in the order of "oldest first"—from 26 downward.

In the period prior to the Vietnam buildup, when draft calls were small, the average age for involuntary induction was between 22 and 24 years.

All three of the recent studies of the draft reveal that the current order of call is undesirable from the point of view of everyone involved—and is actually the reverse of what it should be:

For the young men themselves, it increases the period of uncertainty and interferes with the planning of lives and careers.

For employers, it causes hardships when employees are lost to the draft who have been trained, acquired skills, and settled in their jobs.

For the Selective Service System, it proliferates the number of deferment applications and appeals. Claims for dependency and occupational deferments are much more frequent for men over the age of 20.

For the Armed Forces, it creates problems. The services have found that older recruits are generally less adaptable than are younger ones to the rigors of military training.

The time has clearly come to correct these conditions and remove the uncertainties which the present order of call promotes.

I will issue an Executive order directing that in the future, as other measures I am proposing are put into effect, men be drafted beginning at age 19.

DEFERMENT INEQUITIES

Almost 2 million young men—and soon many more—reach age 19 each year. The foreseeable requirement is to draft only 100,000 to 300,000 of them annually. We must ask: How shall those relatively few be selected? As the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service phrased it, "Who serves when not all serve?"

Past procedures have, in effect, reduced the size of the available manpower pool by deferring men out of it.

This has resulted in inequities.

Two separate groups of men have been selected out of consideration for military service:

1. REJECTEES

In the past, many thousands of men were rejected—and put into deferred categories—who could have performed satisfactorily, sharing the burdens as well as the benefits of service. Most of these were disadvantaged youths with limited educational backgrounds or in some cases, curable physical defects.

We are taking action to correct this inequity. I referred earlier to Project 100,000 established by the Secretary of Defense. Under this program, the services are taking in men who would previously have been disqualified because of educational deficiencies or minor medical ailments.

With intensive instruction, practical on-the-job training and corrective medical measures, these young men can become good soldiers. Moreover, the remedial training they receive can enable them to live fuller and more productive lives. It is estimated that about half the men who enter the Armed Forces under this program will come as volunteers, the other half as draftees.

This will be a continuing program. The Nation can never again afford to deny to men who can effectively serve their country, the obligation—and the right—to share in a basic responsibility of citizenship.

2. COLLEGE STUDENTS

The National Advisory Commission on Selective Service found the issue of college student deferments to be the most difficult problem for its consideration. The Commission could not reach unanimity. This is not surprising, for it was sufficiently representative of the Nation itself to reflect the healthy diversity of opinion which centers on this subject.

Student deferments have resulted in inequities because many of those deferments have pyramided into exemptions from military service.

Deferred for undergraduate work, deferred further to pursue graduate study, and then deferred even beyond that for fatherhood or occupational reasons, same young men have managed to pile deferment on deferment until they passed the normal cutoff point for induction.

In this regard, a recent survey revealed that only 27 percent of one age group of graduate school students past the age of 26 had served in the Armed Forces—contrasted with approximately 70 percent of men of the same ages with educational backgrounds varying from college degrees to some high school training.

There is one group of postgraduate students to whom this condition does not apply—men who are studying to be doctors and dentists. About half of them later serve as medical officers in the Armed Forces.

Their service is vital. Because their studies are essential to military manpower needs, students engaged in such programs must continue to be deferred until their education is completed.

I have concluded, however, that there is no justification for granting further deferments to other graduate school students.

To correct the inequities in the deferments of postgraduate students, I shall issue an Executive order specifying that no deferments for postgraduate study be granted in the future, except for those men pursuing medical and dental courses.

Undergraduate students present a different problem for consideration.

Many citizens—including a majority of the members of the National Advisory Commission—hold that student deferments are of themselves inequitable because they grant to one group of men a special privilege not generally available to all. Their concern was heightened by the belief that a student deferment in a time of conflict might be an even greater privilege.

They contend that such deferments cannot properly be justified as being in the national interest. Moreover it is their conviction that the elimination of a student deferment policy would have no harmful effect on the educational process in this country. Indeed, they believe that the Nation's experience with the returning veterans of other wars indicates that interruption of college studies for military service actually results for many men in a more mature approach and a greater capacity for study.

Others—including a substantial minority of the Commission—believe just as strongly that college deferments from service are not unfair—however manifestly unfair are the conditions of life which permit some to go to college while others cannot.

They agree that the unpredictability of world conditions could conceivably work to the advantage of students who were able to defer their service. But they point out that the same unpredictability could work just as easily to opposite effect, that men who were deferred as college freshmen in 1963 would be graduating this spring into a world in which they could face the hazards of combat. Finally, this point of view calls attention to the fact that the elimination of student deferments would unduly complicate the officer procurement problems of the Armed Forces, for almost four out of five officers who come into the Services each year come from the Nation's colleges.

An issue so deeply important, with so many compelling factors on both sides, cannot be decided until its every aspect has been thoroughly explored.

I hope and expect that the Congress will debate the questions this issue poses for the Nation's youth and the Nation's future.

I will welcome the public discussion which the Commission report will surely stimulate.

I shall await the benefits of these discussions which will themselves be a great educational process for the Nation.

I will then take that Presidential action which, I believe, will best serve the national interest.

A FAIR AND IMPARTIAL RANDOM—FAIR—SYSTEM OF SELECTION

The paramount problem remains to determine who shall be selected for induction out of the many who are available.

Assuming that all the men available are equally qualified and eligible, how can that selection be made most fairly?

No question has received more thoughtful attention or more careful analysis.

There is no perfect solution. For the unavoidable truth is that complete equity can never be achieved when only some must be selected and only some must serve.

But a decision cannot be avoided. It is due. The question will become more urgent with the passing months and years.

I have concluded that the only method which approaches complete fairness is to establish a fair and impartial random—FAIR—system of selection which will determine the order of call for all equally eligible men.

That FAIR system would operate generally as follows:

At age 18, all men would be examined to determine their physical and mental eligibility.

All eligible men reaching age 19 before a designated date would be placed in a selection pool.

The FAIR system would then determine their order of call.

They would be selected in that order of call, for induction at age 19, to fill draft calls placed by the Department of Defense.

Those not reached during this period would drop to a less vulnerable position on the list with the entry of the next year's group of eligible men into the selection pool.

All men would retain their vulnerability to the draft, in diminishing order by age group up to 26, in the event of a national emergency. Those who had received deferments would continue liable, as at present, until their 35th birthday.

This system, giving young men a clear indication of a likelihood of being drafted, in conjunction with the youngest first order of call, will further reduce uncertainty in the planning of futures and careers.

I am instructing the Director of Selective Service, working in collaboration with the Secretary of Defense, to develop a fair and impartial random—FAIR—system of selection to become fully operational before January 1, 1969. This system will determine the order of call for induction of qualified and available 19-year-olds and older men as their deferments expire.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The proposals I am presenting in this message have one common objective: Insofar as it is possible to do so, to make certain that men who must be called to serve their country, and fight and die for it if necessary, will be chosen equitably and justly.

The governing concept I propose for selection is one of equal and uniform treatment for all men in like circumstances.

The National Advisory Commission has reported that in order to achieve that objective in all its dimensions, the Selective Service System itself should be restructured.

The Commission presented its conviction that the System's decentralized operation, with more than 4,000 neighborhood boards, 56 State headquarters and 95 appeal boards—all functioning under general and sometimes inconsistent guidelines—is not responsive to the requirements of our Nation today. It believed that uniformity of treatment would be difficult to achieve through that System.

The Commission recommended that the Selective Service System be consolidated. It suggested a coordinated structure of eight regions, embracing from 300 to 500 area offices located in major population centers and staffed with full-time Government employees. It proposed a system modernized by means of new management techniques, communications technology, and data processing equipment.

I believe these recommendations should be exposed to further searching analysis and study by management experts building on the work the Commission has done.

The Selective Service System has done a good job for America. For a quarter of a century those who have been responsible for its operation have provided the Nation with an inspiring study of patriotic citizens volunteering their time and devotion to demanding tasks vitally affecting the national welfare.

Moreover, as I have already observed, the System itself has been flexible and responsive, meeting the widely varying calls for manpower placed on it over the past 20 years.

And beyond these considerations are others more difficult to measure, but deeply important nonetheless.

The Selective Service System is a part of America, a part of the process of our democracy, a part of our commitment to a full regard for the rights of the individual in our society. Because of the large number of registrants they must classify, many local draft boards in large cities cannot fulfill completely the function intended for them. But nonetheless the draft board concept is built on a uniquely American belief—that local citizens can perform a valuable service to the Government and at the same time personalize the Government's procedures to a young man fulfilling one of his earliest and most serious obligations of citizenship.

We cannot lightly discard an institution with so valuable a record of effectiveness and integrity.

Neither can we afford to preserve it, if we find that in practice it cannot adapt to the new controlling concept of equal and uniform treatment.

These counterbalancing considerations highlight the need to subject the System's organization to intensive study by experts skilled in management techniques and methods on the basis of the Commission's work.

I am instructing the Secretary of Defense, the Director of the Selective Service System, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget jointly to establish a task force to review the recommendations for a restructured Selective Service System made by the National Advisory Commission. This review will determine the cost, the method of implementation, and the effectiveness of the System the Commission recommends, in view of the changes in the System I am proposing in this message.

In the meantime we can make certain changes to strengthen the System.

The Commission study brought into focus areas where immediate improvement can and should be put into effect.

I am instructing the Director of the Selective Service System to:

Assure that advisers and appeal agents are readily available to all registrants.

Examine the System's appeals procedures to insure that the rights of the individual are fully protected.

Improve the System's information policies so that all registrants and the public generally will better understand the System's operations.

In conjunction with Gov. Farris Bryant, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, work with the Governors to assure that all local boards are truly representative of the communities they serve and to submit periodic reports on the progress in this area.

RESERVE POLICIES

The National Advisory Commission focused attention on the administration of enlistments into Reserve and National Guard units. The Commission expressed concern over the inequities it saw in the enlistment procedures of these units.

The Reserve forces are essential to our military posture and are an integral part of it. My first concern is that these forces be maintained at their authorized strengths, and in a state of readiness for deployment, if and when they are needed.

I also believe that the Reserve components should, like the Active Forces, be manned primarily by volunteers.

Two steps have recently been taken by the Secretary of Defense to assure greater equity in the enlistment policies of the Reserve components:

Men who meet qualification standards must be accepted into Reserve units in the order of their application.

Reservists who are not satisfactorily fulfilling their obligation will be ordered to active duty for up to 24 months.

Authority to order such reservists to duty is provided in the Department of Defense 1967 Appropriations Act. I recommend that such authority be incorporated in permanent legislation.

I have concluded that two additional actions should now be taken:

First, I am directing the Secretary of Defense to give priority to Reserve enlistees who are under draft age—those young men 17 to 18½ years of age—to encourage a maximum number of volunteers who are not immediately draft liable. Reserve deferments for men who are draft liable will be authorized only to the extent required to fill specific vacancies in Reserve components.

Second, I recommend that the Congress enact standby authority to allow the Department of Defense to draft men into Reserve and National Guard units whenever the authorized strength of these units cannot otherwise be maintained.

THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON SELECTIVE SERVICE

The work of the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service represents the most comprehensive study of this system since it began 20 years ago. Any citizen who reads the report of the Commission—and I urge all citizens to do so—will recognize that the distinguished members have provided the most penetrating analysis of selective service in our history.

To provide the American people with a continuing review of a system which touches every American family and to assure the diligent pursuit of the actions I have discussed and approved in this message, as well as other suggestions in the Commission report, I am extending the life of the National Advisory Commission for an additional year.

CONCLUSION

Service performed by the youth of our Nation honors us all.

Americans have good reason to respect the long tradition of service which is manifested in every flight line and outpost where we commit our bravest men to the guardianship of freedom.

We have witnessed in our day the building of another tradition—by men and women in the Peace Corps, in VISTA, and in other such programs which have touched, and perhaps even changed, the life of our country and our world.

This spirit is as characteristic of modern America as our advanced technology, or our scientific achievements.

I have wondered if we could establish, through these programs and others like them, a practical system of nonmilitary alternatives to the draft without harming our security.

Both the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service and the group reporting to the Congress posed this question for study.

Both found the answer to be that we cannot.

But the spirit of volunteer service in socially useful enterprises will, we hope, continue to grow until that good day when all service will be voluntary, when all young people can and will choose the kind of service best fitted to their own needs and their Nation's.

We will hasten it as we can. But until it comes, because of the conditions of the world we live in now, we must continue to ask one form of service—military duty—of our young men. We would be an irresponsible Nation if we did not—and perhaps even an extinct one.

The Nation's requirement that men must serve, however, imposes this obligation: that in this land of equals, men are selected as equals to serve.

A just nation must have the fairest system that can be devised for making that selection.

I believe the proposals I am making today will help give us that system.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 6, 1967*.

The message was, without objection, referred by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON SELECTIVE SERVICE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on the draft deserves, and I know it will get, the earnest and thorough consideration of every Member of the House. We are all in favor of a fair draft system and of eliminating any element of unfairness in the present law.

The President concludes, first of all—as he must, in the light of world conditions—that this Nation must continue to rely on a selective service system in order to be able to meet its obligations and commitments. There can be no question but what the President is right in this conclusion.

Everyone would be happier if it were possible to say the draft was no longer needed and we could fill our Armed Forces with volunteers alone. But it is not possible to say that now. The military services could not get enough volunteers unless pay and other benefits were raised so high that the cost of maintaining a military force would skyrocket.

More important still, even if we were to decide to let that cost go up, a cutoff point would have to be reached somewhere. Experience shows clearly that an exclusively volunteer force under present circumstances would total no more than 2 million men. The average size of the Military Establishment in the years before Vietnam was 2.7 million. It will probably go back to that level when the conflict in Vietnam is over.

Suppose, then, this Nation agreed to pay the additional $10 billion a year—or whatever it would cost, and no one has yet been able to come up with precise figures—to maintain a volunteer force of 2.7 million men.

At that moment, we would forfeit our flexibility to respond to any threat to our security requiring a force greater than that. To do what we have to do in Vietnam today as well as to man our defense line around the world, it is necessary to keep under arms a military force of 3.3 million.

We could never gamble so recklessly with our Nation's safety.

But if it is clear that we must continue to have a draft authority, it is no less clear that the system under which men are drafted must be just as fair as it can possibly be made.

Under the program described in the President's message, eligible men would be chosen for service through a system of impartial random selection. The key word is "eligible." All young men will first be thoroughly tested and examined to assure that they are in fact qualified for military service. Once this is done, there will be many thousands more who are eligible and available than it will be necessary to induct. The selection system the President proposes is simply a means of giving all those men the exact same chance, on the same footing—without regard to the social condition of their lives, their wealth, their educational achievements, or any other extraneous factor.

I join the President in his desire to equalize the chances of all eligible young men to be drafted.

Through all our history we have found it necessary to impose military obligation on individual men in times of crisis. But through that same period of history we have built an unmatched record of honoring individual rights.

I urge and am sure we will receive from the House prompt and earnest consideration of the President's program.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with deep interest to the President's message on selective service. In his time President Franklin Roosevelt spoke of the broadening and enrichment of our basic concepts of citizenship that had come to us with the adoption of selective service. President Johnson, in reminding us of the words of President Roosevelt, reawakens in his countrymen an all-possessing sense of patriotism, with its accompanying responsibilities and rewards, and imparts a further enrichment to our broadening concepts of citizenship.

President Johnson pleads for that which all Americans want and demand—absolute fairness in the operation of a Selective Service System that selects some men and leaves others untouched.

If we cannot obtain absolute fairness in this—a system that gives favoritism to none, a system that operates alike on the rich and the poor, the youth of wealth and of poverty—we are not worthy of the heritage of free government and abundance of opportunity that the struggle and the sacrifices and the fulfilled dreams of our ancestors have bestowed upon us.

All this is stressed in the powerful message to the reading of which I have just listened. The immediate steps ordered by President Johnson are all in this direction of absolute fairness to which President Johnson has dedicated himself and which is the keynote of today's message. On some matters on which there is honest disagreement, as pointed out by the President, the counsel and advice of all Americans is requested. That is the way decisions of prudence and wisdom best are reached in the arena of public discussion in which Americans talk and think things out together. That is the thought of President Johnson.

I was happy to note that the President would exempt students of medicine and dentistry who were completing their professional courses, and that one good reason he gave for this exemption was that there was a scarcity of doctors and dentists in the armed services as well as in civilian life and that many of these medical and dental students on graduation would become members of the medical and dental corps of the armed services.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the President's message on Selective Service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is Consent Calendar day.

The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

LEASE AND TRANSFER OF TOBACCO ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 273 to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments:

H.J. RES. 273

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 316(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

The joint resolution was engrossed, ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This ends the call of bills on the Consent Calendar.

LEASE AND TRANSFER OF TOBACCO ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to publicly thank my colleagues in the House for their favorable action today on House Joint Resolution 273, sponsored by my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MACHEN].

I sponsored an identical resolution, House Joint Resolution 274.

The purpose of the legislation is to

give our Maryland tobacco farmers, some of whom are in Virginia, leasing flexibility when their crops come under acreage controls of the Department of Agriculture.

This leasing arrangement, enjoyed by many other farmers growing other crops under acreage controls, is an option that often permits a farmer to continue growing a particular crop under the restrictions of acreage controls.

Just a few short days ago, our type 32 tobacco growers in Maryland and Virginia voted on whether or not to put their 1967 crop under proposed acreage allotment controls. By a narrow margin, the referendum failed.

Thus, for the second year in a row, type 32 tobacco will not be grown under acreage controls and will have to stand on its own.

Also, it means those of us who represent growers of type 32 tobacco will again be faced with the battle over export subsidy incentive payments.

Maryland tobacco was barred from the 5-cent-per-pound subsidy payments when the program went into effect last year. We failed to convince the Secretary of Agriculture that type 32 tobacco was deserving of the subsidy payments because of its dependence on export markets.

I believe as many others close to this problem do, that the Secretary of Agriculture is wrong and arbitrary in denying the export subsidy. We also believe the Secretary has acted in a discriminatory manner, and one which can only hurt the tobacco growers, who, after all, are farmers and the ones the Department of Agriculture and its Secretary should be working for and not against.

At this point, I do not believe the Secretary of Agriculture will change his mind and allow the export subsidy for the 1967 Maryland tobacco crop.

Thus, we have the problem again. The entire issue of what crop gets an export subsidy and what crop does not is certainly debatable.

I hope that later in this Congress we can resolve this question to the satisfaction of all, or at least work out a clarified ruling on it.

Again, let me thank my colleagues for extending a helping hand to the Maryland tobacco growers by their favorable action today.

LEASE AND TRANSFER OF TOBACCO ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, passage today of my resolution, House Joint Resolution 273 will put Maryland tobacco farmers on an equal footing with other farmers in other tobacco-producing States in the transfer of tobacco acreage allotments.

It will permit a more flexible policy of transferring small nonproducing allotments in order to consolidate them with producing acreage. We had hoped that its passage would have the effect of easing the way for a favorable vote on the marketing quota referendum last week, but our tobacco farmers did not give the referendum a large enough majority to reinstate the quotas. There was some feeling among the tobacco farmers that the reduction of Agriculture Department's overall acreage for tobacco production had an adverse effect on the farmers. However, there will be another referendum next year and it is my expectation that the necessary two-thirds majority will be given the quotas.

Certainly a liberalization of the transfer policy will be a step toward helping tobacco farmers produce more efficiently. It is clear that the purpose of the original restriction on lease and transfer of Maryland tobacco acreage allotments, which was placed on the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 in the early 1960's, no longer exists, and that it may actually be a hindrance to the efficient production of this crop, which is the major agricultural industry in my district.

Mr. Speaker I urge my colleagues in both Houses to act favorably on my resolution. At the same time I wish to express my sincere gratitude to the chairman of the Tobacco Subcommittee [Mr. Abbitt], and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. Poage], for their expeditious action on my legislation.

TOMORROW'S ABC'S—ANARCHY, BRUTALITY, AND CRIME?

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, if an award were to be made to the American who has best accepted the responsibility of citizenship I believe the prime candidate would be the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover. Because of this, I think Mr. Hoover should be heard when he addresses himself to the responsibilities of American citizenship as he did recently in an article in the February issue of the Veterans of Foreign Wars magazine.

In this instance, Mr. Hoover not only criticizes recent court decisions which have allowed "the supervisory control which courts exercise over law enforcement," but he also prods American citizens, urging them to open their eyes, call upon their intestinal fortitude, and take a stand against a judicial trend which is leading an irresponsible citizenry toward chaos.

Today the responsibilities of citizenship have eroded to a point where Americans seem to shrug at unfounded allegations of police brutality, think Escobedo and Miranda are Supreme Court Justices, and cannot be bothered with "getting involved."

A February 14, 1967, news story in the Chicago Tribune provides a synopsis of Mr. Hoover's article and states in the headline that the FBI Director "Raps Court Control Over Police," but I believe the paragraphs which discuss what lies behind the Court decisions—the "how it got that way"—are even more imperative. It seems to reduce down to the fact that each individual must become concerned if he wishes to avoid Mr. Hoover's predicted ABC's. I, therefore, include the article in the Record at this point:

Hoover Raps Court Control Over Police—Rules Pertaining to Evidence Cited

Washington, February 13.—The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in a by-lined article in the February issue of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Magazine, is critical of "the supervisory control which courts exercise over law enforcement thru the exclusionary theory whereby evidence obtained in violation of certain complex and indecisive rules cannot be used in a criminal trial."

J. Edgar Hoover's article titled "A Primer for Today" decries the fact that many of the moral precepts of our forefathers, where ". . . the line between right and wrong cut sharp and clear, and few Americans reached adulthood without any equally clear knowledge of the behavior fitting either category . . ." have been "erased."

CITES CITIZENS' APATHY

"What attitudes are being recorded in our primer for today's children to absorb? . . . unfortunately, growing numbers of citizens care nothing about American attitudes. Boredom, or apathy, reaches its unattractive height in the phenomenon summed up in the words: 'I don't want to get involved.'

"This is the excuse projected by citizens who refuse to accept the responsibilities of citizenship. It is the shamed apologia of those who can watch a killer stalk his victim without lifting a finger to dial the police or those who in the depths of the night, hear a cry for help without responding in any way."

AFFLICTED WITH CONFUSION

The FBI director charges that: "Currently, a great many good Americans appear to be afflicted with a kind of confusion which I can describe only as sentimental myopia . . . it is the shortsightedness, in instance after instance, which permits turnstile justice and judicial technicalities to nullify the most proficient police work."

It will take alert citizens, better citizens, more conscientious citizens to effect essential changes and reverse those trends which seem to be moving us almost inexorably toward the edge of chaos.

"Unless those changes are made," the article concludes, "and those trends reversed, the next generation of Americans will learn from a new primer—and its ABCs will read anarchy, brutality, and crime."

MORE ON GOVERNMENT CONTROLS

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, where government regulation at the Federal, State, or local levels seeks to control areas best left to the private sector, it seems that the individual usually is left holding the bag. Barron's, the business and financial weekly, describes briefly in its March 6, 1967, issue, the present situation in New York City under the present rent control program. Accordingly to Barron's:

> Financially, physically and morally, rent control has become a malevolent source of decay.

It will be remembered that rent controls were observed nationally in the postwar years. However, in the mid-fifties most of the major cities abolished rental controls. Today, New York City is the last of the major cities to have such regulations in force. If Barron's appraisal of the role played by rent control in the present New York housing situation is realistic, we can add another chapter to the long history of conditions in which governmental regulation failed to remedy undesirable circumstances.

I include the article, "Political Vacancy—Rent Control Will Mean a Grim Future for Fun City," in the Record, at this point:

Political Vacancy—Rent Control Will Mean a Grim Future for Fun City

"In Gotham one may peddle pornographic literature, panhandle or commit petty larceny with relative impunity; the man who really lives dangerously these days is the landlord (or slumlord, as he is usually called). With the help of a high-speed computer, the Department of Buildings has taken to compiling and publicizing lists of landlords who allegedly are habitual violators of the housing codes. Several officials have warmly endorsed rent strikes as a means of redressing tenant grievances. Finally, at last week's hearings Hortense Gabel, head of the Rent and Rehabilitation Administration, told the City Council that the housing shortage remains as acute as ever. Hence she formally requested a two-year extension of rent controls."

Thus wrote Barron's on January 27, 1964. Today the Democrat in Gracie Mansion has yielded to a nominal Republican, while Gotham, to an increasingly harassed and sullen populace, has come to be known as Fun City; otherwise not much has changed. The customary demonstration by angry landlords and aggrieved tenants took place on schedule a few days ago outside City Hall. Next week Mrs. Gabel's successor, Frederic S. Barman, will urge the City Council to give the quarter-century-old "emergency" restraints a fresh lease on life. After the customary formalities, the lawmakers, with fine bipartisanship, are sure to oblige.

So what else is new, the hardened observer of New York's political and economic scene is likely at this point to shrug. The answer is plenty. For one thing, the Lindsay Administration, unlike its predecessor, no longer troubles to conceal its aim of perpetuating rent control not merely for the duration of some fictitious "emergency," but indefinitely. Toward this end City Hall, by hook or by crook, has rebuffed all moves toward decontrol; on the contrary, a report issued recently by the ironically named Rent and Rehabilitation agency raised the threat of extending curbs from old buildings to new ones. Thanks in no small measure to such misguided public policy, large parts of the five boroughs, from the East Bronx to Coney Island, are turning into slum, while Gotham's desperate financial plight grows steadily worse. New York City may or many not plunge into bankruptcy. If it does, nobody ever need ask whether it fell or was pushed.

Of all the pushers—a long line of politicians stretching back to William O'Dwyer, if not further—the Lindsay Administration ranks as the worst. In the early postwar years rent control, whether right or wrong, at least was nationwide. By the mid-'Fifties, however, most of the U.S. had returned to a free market for shelter; since 1962, when Albany made rent control a local option, New York alone among the nation's major cities has lived under its roof. To justify it, City Hall in recent years has resorted to increasingly doubtful statistics. The latest exercise, an analysis of a 1965 Housing and Vacancy Survey of the Census Bureau, made by Prof. Chester Rapkin of Columbia University, came up with a city-wide vacancy rate of only 3.19%, well below the 5% prescribed by law as mandatory for decontrol. Hence the Mayor's office concludes that the ceilings must remain.

The Rapkin report is a curious document. It was prepared by a man who (according to a complaint recently filed in court) occupies a rent-controlled seven-room apartment, a state of affairs which plaintiff views as "a serious conflict of interests which would or might tend to prevent, obfuscate or color any objective finding or opinion . . ." Be that as it may, City Hall has been strangely reticent about his findings. Though the report constitutes its sole legal grounds for continuation of rent control, public hearings on which begin next week, copies were made available to interested parties only a few days ago, and then only after an appeal to the courts. Quick scrutiny discloses massive defects. To arrive at its findings, for one, the report (like the Census samplings) excluded from its count nearly 75,000 apartments (roughly half the unadjusted total) which, for one reason or another, were labeled "vacant but not available." By omitting completed buildings for which no certificates of occupancy had yet been issued, it also ignored another 35,000–40,000 dwelling units.

As analyzed by Hyman Sardy, professor of economics at Brooklyn College, in behalf of the Community Housing Improvement Program, Inc., a newly organized and aggressive group of property-owners and other concerned citizens, the Census data show a true vacancy rate of well over 5%. Numbers games aside, the facts are clear. Although the population of the five boroughs has increased little, more vacancies by actual count exist today than at any time since 1940, at the depth of the real estate depression. Even the low official vacancy rate now exceeds that of any other city when it opted for decontrol. More than two decades after World War II, only a doctrinaire social leveler, or a power-hungry bureaucrat, could pretend that a critical housing shortage still exists.

All of which brings us to Messrs. Lindsay, Berman et. al., who make no effort to hide their leanings. Thus, on more than one issue involving landlords' rights, the Rent and Rehabilitation Administration has been openly reluctant to carry out its legal mandate. Its inexcusable delay in making public the Rapkin report has been cited. Far more serious, although the law stipulates that various "classes" of housing (say, apartments renting for $200–$224 per month) must be decontrolled if their vacancy rate exceeds 5%, the agency, despite ample evidence, has balked either at making such a determination or even at redefining the word "class." (The case is now in the courts.) On the contrary, its thrust is all the other way. Thus, Mr. Berman seeks to recontrol any decontrolled apartment "where lack of maintenance and service result (sic) in conditions dangerous to life or health." In a thinly veiled threat to the owners of new buildings, he also warns that "the continued spiralling of rentals in the uncontrolled sector" may lead to controls.

Officialdom, in short, yearns to perpetuate and extend increasingly obvious evils. Rent control has deprived Our Town of tens of thousands of young and growing families who cannot bid in a free market for apartments preempted by an aging—and frequently well-to-do—minority of subsidized squatters. It has contributed to the deterioration of neighborhoods and the spread of slums: from 1960 to 1965, the Rapkin report concedes, "deteriorating" dwellings rose from 15% of all controlled rental units to 23%, a shocking trend which, if unchecked, will blight one-third of New York's total stock of shelter in less than another decade. It has impaired property values and endangered billions of dollars worth of mortgages held by commercial and savings banks. Finally, through the rise in real estate tax delinquencies and the loss of an estimated $200 million per year in collectible taxes, it has robbed New York City of desperately needed revenue. Financially, physically and morally, rent control has become a malevolent source of decay.

Politicians, of course, may not agree. Asked last week to take a stand, Sen. Javits (R., N.Y.) politely declined. Governor Rockefeller, by quietly pushing a bill in Albany to delay the next scrutiny of rent control till 1970, is aiding and abetting his fellow Republican downstate (whose term of office by coincidence, ends in 1969). Their default leaves the issue squarely up to those who have a stake in New York City. The time to strike a blow for the future is now.

DMSO, A PERSECUTED DRUG

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, in 1965 the Food and Drug Administration terminated the experimental use of dimethyl sulfoxide, commonly called DMSO. This decision caused widespread anguish, pain, and suffering to literally thousands of patients in this country and abroad who were experiencing relief from painful maladies through the use of this drug under careful supervision of qualified physicians. After strong and persistent protests, and after acquiring proof of the safety of the use of this drug under the care of competent physicians, the Food and Drug Administration last December with much fanfare announced that it was reopening the door to further testing.

Many physicians and thousands of sufferers rejoiced at this news, but it has developed that the announcement really was a cruel hoax to these people. The terms and conditions laid down by the FDA were so stringent that the pharmaceutical industry has not been able to make the drug available for further testing and relief.

I intend to make public as much of the record as possible during the next few weeks in connection with this sad chapter in American history.

Many knowledgeable scientists are firmly convinced that DMSO is not simply another new drug but that it is a truly significant new principle of medicine.

It is apparent that if present-day FDA guidelines were in force in years past, that the use of aspirin, penicillin, and cortisone would have been delayed many, many years.

One of the leaders in the movement to free DMSO for full clinical testing under strict supervision of medical doctors has been the very able associate professor, department of surgery, University of Oregon Medical School, Dr. Stanley W. Jacob.

The Portland Oregonian last December published an excellent editorial of initial reaction to the FDA relaxation, and I shortly thereafter received a letter from Dr. Jacob, both of which I include herewith:

[From the Oregonian, Dec. 23, 1966]

DMSO ON PAROLE

The Federal Food and Drug Administration now has said it will permit closely-controlled testing of DMSO to resume, and while this is not a complete victory for the backers of this promising new drug it is at least a foot in the door. Even with the extraordinary restrictions placed by the FDA on the test program for dimethyl sulfoxide it should be possible in time to determine scientifically whether the Oregon discoverers of its medical uses are right in their belief in its efficacy as a pain reliever and in the treatment of many stubborn ailments.

DMSO's best hope of acceptance may lie in its future in Europe. It was a prescription drug in Germany, enjoying an enormous sale, until it voluntarily was withdrawn from the market when the FDA announced its ban on further testing in the United States a year ago. Now sales in Europe will be resumed, and if DMSO continues to benefit its users without producing harmful side effects this record in time should erode the hard core of resistance which has developed against it in the conservative wing of the U.S. medical profession.

As for the U.S. drug industry, which had spent millions testing DMSO prior to the ban, the outlook is less certain. Unless drug manufacturers can see some early prospects of a green light from the FDA for the marketing of DMSO, they aren't going to be anxious to throw good money after bad.

No experimental drug in medical history has received such harsh treatment from the U.S. guardians of the public health, or on the record thus far deserved it less. Had the same rules applied to penicillin or cortisone or even aspirin in their infancy, they never would have made it to the druggist's shelves. DMSO simply has had the bad break of being the first major drug discovery to come along since the uproar over thalidomide, leaving nobody quite certain just how much testing is needed to make certain there will be no repetition of that colossal blunder. It also suffers the handicap of the widespread publicity that was inevitable when DMSO's remarkable qualities became known, but which is deplored by traditionalists in the medical profession who think the news of pharmaceutical discoveries ought to be restricted to scientific journals.

Despite all these roadblocks in DMSO's path, it one day is certain to attain full acceptance if it truly deserves it. Millions of Americans in pain know about DMSO and what it has done for the few thousands who have used it in prior tests. If it really produces the bad effects FDA seemingly continues to suspect, they will want to see the evidence of that. Really, FDA will be tested in the court of public opinion while DMSO resumes tests in the clinics.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON MEDICAL SCHOOL, DEPARTMENT OF SURGERY,
Portland, Oreg., January 1, 1967.
Representative WENDELL WYATT,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WYATT: I was naturally pleased the door was theoretically opened for future testing of DMSO in the United States by the Food and Drug Administration with their announcement in the Federal Register of December 23, 1966. Since that announcement, I have given thought to the matter and have discussed it with others, including representatives of the pharmaceutical industry.

The pharmaceutical industry is reluctant to apply to reinstitute studies at this time. The reason for the reluctance of the drug companies is that the Food and Drug Administration in their announcement established the concept of *prior approval* for experimental drugs. This has not and is not being required for the evaluation of any other compound. The companies thus believe that FDA is prejudicial in the handling of DMSO. The opinion of the representatives of the pharmaceutical industry, with whom I have spoken, is that to accede to the prior approval concept would serve as a precedent for other agents they might wish to test and increase their difficulties in bringing new drugs to the service of the American people. The real worry the drug companies have, however, is that this is another indication that FDA is not acting fairly in the DMSO matter.

The most important question as I look at it is not one of prior approval. It is simply whether or not the Food and Drug Administration, an agency of Health, Education and Welfare in the United States, is operating in the best interests of the American people. The announcement by FDA on the 23rd of December completely disregarded the following facts:

1) Over 1,300 clinical investigations evaluated DMSO in the United States during its two years of clinical investigation. This number is more than one-half percent of the practicing doctors in this country. The FDA in essence charged that these individuals were not objective in their reports. The FDA announcement ignored the safety and efficacy of DMSO as shown by the overwhelming majority of investigators who have studied it.

2) Three pharmaceutical companies (Merck, Sharp & Dohme, Syntex, and Squibb) submitted new drug applications in the spring of 1965 saying that enough data had been accumulated to release DMSO as a prescription drug in the United States. Since that time additional studies have appeared showing safety and efficacy. To relegate DMSO to the status of a "partial experimental drug" does not seem to be consistent with published data in the medical literature on dimethyl sulfoxide. The FDA announcement ignored the evidence from which 3 of the finest pharmaceutical companies in the nation based their requests almost two years ago to release DMSO for prescription use in the U.S.

3) The announcement by FDA precluded the use of DMSO by any other route except the skin. In so doing, FDA discounted the fact that DMSO administered into the eyes of patients by Dr. Dan Gordon, Associate Professor of Ophthalmology at Cornell University Medical Center, has been shown to be the first effective therapy for corneal edema. They discounted the fact that DMSO administered into the urinary bladder of patients with interstitial cystitis by Dr. Bruce Stewart of the Cleveland Clinic produced significant relief for patients with this miserable disease. They discounted the fact that DMSO injected under the skin by Dr. Arthur Scherbel, Chairman of the Department of Rheumatology at the Cleveland Clinic, was shown to be effective therapy for contractures.

4) The FDA announcement ignored preliminary evidence that mixtures of DMSO with other substances represented effective therapy for diseases not responding well to conventional treatment. For instance, a double blind study presented before the Academy of Investigative Dermatology prior to the American Medical Association meeting last June showed unequivocal benefit when topical DMSO with thiobenzadole was employed for the treatment of creeping eruption—a nasty parasitic infection of the skin. This study was reported by Drs. Robert Katz and Robert W. Hood of the University of Miami, Florida.

5) The FDA announcement ignored the possibility mentioned by Ochs in an article entitled "Topical Anesthesia for Myringotomy" reporting that a local anesthetic (tetracaine) in DMSO applied to the eardrum of patients permitted incision and drainage without pain. The alternatives of either pain or a general anesthetic are not in the best interests of the patient.

6) The FDA announcement completely disregarded the fact that DMSO with cortisone has been shown to be of value in the treatment of human cancer. Dr. Ernest Ayre of the National Cancer Cytology Center, New York, presented preliminary evidence at the recent New York Academy of Sciences Symposium in March, 1966, that DMSO-cortisone applied for the treatment of carcinoma *in situ* of the human cervix was followed by objective evidence of improvement. This was demonstrated microscopically. In this study, the unique carrying action of DMSO was utilized. Ayre concluded that the DMSO principle possessed a significant potential in human cancer therapy.

7) The FDA announcement ignored published data in the literature pointing the way to the possible use of DMSO in the treatment of cancer. Maddock, Green and Brown reported to the American Association for Cancer Research in Denver, Colorado, 1966, that anti-tumor agents dissolved in DMSO would penetrate the skin of mice and favorably influence experimental tumors. Schreck presented a paper currently in press in the Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences that DMSO was more harmful to leukemic white cells than to normal white cells. Siebert and her associates reported at the New York Academy of Sciences Symposium in March of 1966 that DMSO destroyed bacteria found in experimental cancers. Should such an agent remain in fetters?

Penicillin was, of course, a new principle in medicine. Cortisone was a new principle in medicine. If the FDA had acted in a similar way with either cortisone or penicillin, the full potential of these materials would not have been available to the public for at least 25 years after their discovery. In the case of penicillin, its usefulness in World War II would have been diminished and needless suffering would have occurred. Dr. Marion Sulzberger, Chief of Dermatologic Research at Letterman Hospital in San Francisco, mentioned at the recent New York Academy of Sciences Symposium that DMSO should be tried together with insect repellents to lessen the problem of resistant malaria in Vietnam. This, too, was precluded by the Food and Drug Administration announcement.

A recent editorial in the Oregonian entitled "DMSO on Parole" makes the statement that "no experimental drug in medical history has received such harsh treatment from the U.S. guardians of the public health, or on the record thus far deserved it less. Had the same rules applied to penicillin or cortisone or even aspirin in their infancy, they never would have made it to the druggist's shelves".

The question here is more important than DMSO. It is simply this. An agency of the Federal Government is attempting to halt the advance of medical science. History is replete with examples of previous attempts to interfere with the acquisition of knowledge. No one has ever succeeded in doing this for long.

Sincerely yours,
STANLEY W. JACOB, M.D.,
Associate Professor, Department of Surgery.

THE SEABEES ARE 25 YEARS OLD

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday March 5, one of the proudest, most unique branches of our Armed Forces celebrated its 25th anniversary. And although it is still something of a fledgling, as military traditions are reckoned, it has established a proud and honorable record in its brief quarter-century, a heritage of courage, resourcefulness, and accomplishment that is summed up in the terse motto: "Can do."

I speak, of course, of the Seabees, the construction battalion arm of the U.S. Navy.

It is no small coincidence that the 25th anniversary of my own entry into the Armed Forces also falls in 1967. For it was as a green lad, recently out of Pittsfield High School and armed with a diploma certifying my skills as a trained machine tool operator, that I joined the Seabees in the same year they were conceived—1942.

I am also rather proud of the fact that I served with the famous 11th Battalion of Seabees in the Southwest Pacific.

The record of the Seabees is indeed a proud and distinguished one. It was a necessarily novel concept in the annals of war, although a similar and equally outstanding branch of the Army known as the Combat Engineers performs similar service for that ancient and honorable service.

The Seabees were conceived in the necessity of war to develop the kind of sophisticated facilities and installations without which our increasingly complex and sophisticated weapons of war could not function.

With World War II, in the Pacific theater, at least, becoming a string of battles and campaigns fought in primitive jungle areas and tiny coral atolls that had only months before comprised the tropical paradise of Gaughin, Nordhoff, and Hall, and W. Somerset Maugham, it became necessary for the Navy and Marines to build their support bases and airfields virtually from the ground up. No cleared pastures or civil airfields existed in the South Pacific as they did in England and Europe.

To get the fighters and bombers ashore, to move trucks and supplies, and to house troops and medical centers, a new concept was needed, a new outfit capable of ripping away the jungles and volcanic wastes and establishing paved landing strips, level roadways, and buildings strong enough to withstand both the ravages of battle and the ravages of nature in the Tropics.

The Seabees were the answer—a battalion of men who were both construction experts and fighting men; troops who could handle a shovel or a bulldozer as well as a rifle or a hand grenade.

The first Seabee units were rushed to forward areas in the Pacific to construct airstrips, fortifications, and storage facilities. Other battalions were organized to take over naval construction projects that had been started by private contractors. The first battalion to do this was the 4th Naval Construction Battalion which left for Alaska's Dutch Harbor in June of 1942. During the summer and fall of 1942, Navy construction battalions relieved contractors in Iceland, Trinidad, Bermuda, and the British Isles. Most of the Seabee battalions, however, were assigned new construction projects, many of them in combat areas.

From 1942 until the end of the war, Seabees were engaged in operations in every combat theater. Seabees built and maintained more than 400 bases of all types and sizes. They handled millions of tons of cargo and performed all kinds of specialized duties. The work of the Seabees during World War II was one of the great achievements of our military history.

They served with distinction during the Korean war just as they serve today in Vietnam. The first Navy man to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor in Vietnam was a Seabee, the late Glen Shields of Seattle, Wash. This heroic young man was a construction mechanic, third class, of a U.S. Navy construction battalion.

The record of the Seabees in peacetime is equally impressive and perhaps, from the standpoint of our search for a lasting world peace, may even be more important. Trained teams of Seabees, compact and air mobile according to the new terminology of war, can be deployed on a moment's notice to virtually any area of the world. Their job is to help build schools and hospitals, roads, bridges, dams, and other civil facilities. They have assisted in training native workers to take over many tasks in such fields as plumbing, carpentry, welding, and general construction work. Such teams have already achieved tremendous results in such places as Costa Rica, Liberia, the Dominican Republic, Thailand, and, of course, South Vietnam.

Over 300,000 Americans have served in the Seabees since its inception in 1942. On March 5 of that year, the use of the term Seabee was first authorized. It has become one of the proudest words in the language. On the 25th anniversary of the Seabees, I salute every man who has ever borne that proud name.

ASKS PRESIDENT TO SET DAY, HOUR, AND PLACE FOR VIETNAM CONFERENCE

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I delivered to the White House what I believe to be a powerful but peaceful proposal for ending the Vietnam war.

In a letter I asked the President to set a specified date and hour for a peace conference at Rangoon, promising that Secretary of State Rusk will be there as allied representative and that all military action against North Vietnam will halt beginning 24 hours before the appointed time.

Under the peace plan, the President would warn Hanoi that failure to cooperate will cause the United States immediately to "review critically all of its policies of military restraint and to adopt new policies employing measures of sufficient magnitude to end the war at an early date."

The Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. U Thant, would be asked to preside at the conference.

The text of the letter follows:

MARCH 6, 1967.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In this letter I suggest a powerful but peaceful initiative to shorten the Vietnam war and end it with honor.

I do so in response to the request for suggestions on war policy you made to each of us attending a White House briefing on February 6. Two principal developments since then impell me to write: first, a tour last weekend of my Western Illinois district convinced me that my constituents are gravely disturbed over the prolonged length and present course of the war; second, as a member of the House Foreign Affairs committee, I am distressed by recent testimony at executive hearings by top-level officers of the Defense Department.

In my view, the situation requires a positive new move by those defending South Vietnam.

The move must of course contain no compromise of principle or commitment. It must demonstrate dramatically our dissatisfaction with present progress and our willingness to take whatever additional military measures are needed to bring the war swiftly to a satisfactory conclusion. At the same time it should prove conclusively that we are ready to sit down with the adversary under conditions which will immediately halt hardship to the people in North Vietnam.

Accordingly, I suggest that the United States seek approval of our allies in carrying out the following initiative.

It would take the form of a message from you, as spokesman for allied governments, to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. U Thant, setting forth an announcement of policy, a specific detailed offer to participate in peace discussions, an invitation for the participation of others and a guarantee of security terms.

The message would announce that allied governments will have a representative at a specified place on a specified day and hour, authorized and prepared to enter into peace discussions with an authorized representative of forces engaged in action against South Vietnam, which logically would be the foreign minister of North Vietnam, and any other principals the Secretary-General may deem appropriate to invite.

I suggest the meeting be held in Rangoon, Burma, starting at 10 a.m. on the earliest possible day. Burma would be a suitable place, because it is an Asian nation but one that is neutral in the present conflict. I further suggest that our Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, be designated as the allied representative.

The Secretary-General may wish to invite other nations with military personnel in the war theater to send representatives, and perhaps the three members of the International Control Commission—Poland, Canada and India—and the co-chairmen of the Geneva Conference—the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union.

In the message the Secretary-General would be:

1. Asked to preside and set the agenda, which would logically include the "14 points" of the United States, the "four points" of the Hanoi government, the program of the National Liberation Front, and the Geneva Agreements and Accords of 1954.

2. Assured that during the 24-hour period preceding the hour at which the meeting is scheduled to begin, no bombing, shelling or military action of any kind against North Vietnam will occur. This cessation will continue so long as the representative of enemy forces continues in good faith to discuss peace terms and so long as all enemy movements into South Vietnam are halted.

3. Reminded of the restraint in regard to military policies which the United States has so far imposed on itself, under which the port of Haiphong has been kept open to commerce, certain major areas and targets in North Vietnam have been identified as sanctuaries from attack, and the use of nuclear weapons has been prohibited.

4. Requested to notify the leadership of enemy forces that any of the following circumstances will cause military action against North Vietnam to be resumed automatically: if the representative of enemy forces does not show up at the appointed time; or, if, having appeared, he ceases to participate in the discussions in good faith; or, if any movement of enemy forces into South Vietnam should occur.

5. Requested to warn the leadership of enemy forces that if any of circumstances enumerated in No. 4 above should occur, the United States will immediately be forced to review critically all of its policies of military restraint and to adopt new policies employing measures of sufficient magnitude to end the war at an early date.

Mr. President, this initiative would constitute a specific reasonable offer to work out an armistice under terms which instantly remove all hardship of war from the people in North Vietnam but which do not compromise our commitments or principles in any respect.

At the same time, it would create a powerful incentive for cooperation by enemy leadership. If the cooperation is not forthcoming, it would provide allied forces defending South Vietnam with a proper opportunity to inaugurate new tactics. Through them the objectives that were not accomplished at the appointed peace meeting would be achieved by employing military means beyond those previously used.

I make these proposals with deep appreciation for your constant diligent effort to bring the war to a satisfactory conclusion.

Sincerely yours,

Paul Findley,
Representative in Congress.

JIM QUILLEN—A GOOD GUY AND GOOD VOTEGETTER

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Morton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is always a great pleasure to be able to pay tribute to and say thank you to a close friend and coworker. It is a double pleasure when the man involved is a guy like Jim Quillen, our hard-working colleague from the First District of Tennessee.

Jim Quillen's vote-getting ability is a modern legend. I hope he has not got a patent on it, because all of us here in the House of Representatives certainly want to learn his secrets.

His career in this House has been of great interest to me. Like Jim, I first came to Congress with the election of 1962. We both come from the First Congressional Districts of our States, and we both have a large number of counties in those districts. He has 14, and now I have 12, so we share the problem of having to get around when it comes to seeing our people.

Let me say to those of you who represent a portion of a city, or have just one or two counties in your districts, that you are really missing the kind of fun Jim and others like him have.

Believe me, it is something to have to work with 14 courthouses, 14 sets of county officials, and so on. Jim seems to thrive on it, because the voters back home know he is doing a good job for them, and they really like to show it when even-numbered Novembers roll around.

As a fellow member of the 88th Club, I realized very quickly that Jim Quillen was a real go-getter. It was a pleasure to be close to him in the early days, and to see the progress he has made.

His outlook and philosophy about dealing with his constituents is one that proves Congressmen do not forget about their people when they come to Washington to do the job the people have given them. For all of us, Jim Quillen's performance of "keeping in touch" is a model.

I also want to congratulate the voters of his district. With fine people like that back home, I know we will have the pleasure of serving with Jim Quillen for many more sessions of Congress.

TAXPAYER: DUCK AGAIN

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Edwards] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, last week there was distributed to my office a 254-page book, printed in two colors on very high quality paper stock, and well illustrated, called "A Proposed Program for Scenic Roads and Parkways."

Presumably each Member received a copy, along with a press release of the Department of Commerce, announcing the book and the program it projects.

The recommendation as put forth by a Presidential task force is to build a national system of scenic roads and parkways financed by an increased Federal gasoline tax.

It presents a minimum program costing $4 billion over 10 years which presumably would result from a gas tax increase of one-half cent. And it presents an expanded program costing $8 billion based on a gas tax increase of 1 cent per gallon.

Mr. Speaker, we all like scenic roads and parkways. We should have more of them. More of our people should have an opportunity to experience the beauty of our landscapes while traveling on uncluttered roads near our lakes, rivers, forests, mountains, and the sea.

But how can we expect the American taxpayer, the automobile-owning, gasoline-taxpaying American, to look favorably on this kind of program just at this time?

For several years now the American highway user has been paying substantial Federal gasoline taxes for the purpose of building a trust fund for the construction of Federal-aid highways.

It seemed to be working reasonably well until recently when the Johnson administration decided it could withhold allocations of trust funds to the States for reasons of its own.

Some $1.1 billion in highway trust funds is affected. State highway departments have been thrown into confusion over the holdback.

Last week the Public Works Committees of the House and the Senate sat down in joint session to look into the matter. On the first day of the study the administration said it was releasing $175,000 of the trust fund money, and the next day said that the rest would be released, but gave no time table.

In the elaborate book released last week one section is devoted to showing maps of each State, page by page. In each case it presents the notation: "Funds to be allocated to State" and then provides two dollar amounts, one due the State under the $4 billion program and one under the $8 billion project.

But the taxpayer is justified in asking just when these funds would be allocated to the States. When the President feels like it? Would the Nation's army of Federal gasoline taxpayers have any more assurance under this program than under the trust fund plan that the funds would be really used as promised?

Or would the Congress have to schedule hearings and then witness the spectacle of the administration throwing a bone out in the form of a token part of the funds due?

Mr. Speaker, the administration was busy on another front last week. The executive branch was pressuring the petroleum industry to cut back on the price of gasoline to motorists and operators of trucks and buses.

In other words, the executive branch simultaneously was telling the industry they ought to cut the price of gasoline while proposing an increase in the gasoline tax.

"We're looking out for your interests," says the Government to the unsuspecting motorist. "We don't want those bad old oil men to charge you too much for gas, but we'll just raise the tax a little and build some beautiful scenic highways for you—maybe."

The shallow nature of this program is revealed in what evidently is a jurisdictional dispute already underway, even before Congress has any legislation to consider.

It seems that several agencies want to get in on the act. The Bureau of Public Roads is a part of the Department of Transportation so one would think that the issue would be simple.

But for the foreword to the book, as produced by the Department of Commerce, says that both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior have claims on it.

It says that Congress will have to resolve the dispute.

Mr. Speaker, this program is particularly badly timed because we are engaged in a serious war in southeast Asia.

It is slightly appalling that while Americans are dying every day on a foreign battlefield and the executive branch of Government is scratching for more money to pay the costs of that conflict, we witness at the same time a call for better scenery.

It is very appalling that Government bureaucrats are already scrapping among themselves to see who can get the job of administering the program.

Let us stop and think carefully. Let us bring an end to the war and see through our commitment. Let us be honest with the men who have died and those who are yet to fall.

Either we are doing something worthwhile in Vietnam or we are not. If we are, and I believe we are, then let us quit trying to gloss it over in appeals for nonessential projects such as highway scenery, no matter how desirable it might be.

And certainly we should not embark on this new program while the administration is failing to live up to its commitments in the present highway program.

Let us start making some commonsense to the American people.

THE MARSHALL COMMISSION ON THE DRAFT "REARRANGING THE TEACUPS"

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the report of the National Advisory Commission on the Selective Service and the recommendations of the President offered today have been heralded as revolutionary changes in our Selective Service laws. Mr. Speaker, these reports and recommendations may fulfill some function if they at last presage some open and thorough debate by the public and in the Congress which might lead to really revolutionary changes. However, unless they do serve to stimulate further debate they will, in my judgment, have served precious little purpose because they amount to no more than "rearranging the teacups."

The Nation's military manpower procurement policies are in need of complete overhaul. Instead of scrutinizing the very premises upon which our draft laws are based, the Marshall Commission has contented itself to work within them, making tinkering adjustments—which may be equitable—but fall far short of what is needed.

We are very fortunate today to have it within our means to develop and obtain a volunteer career army. The possibility of a volunteer career army has captured the imagination of increasing numbers of Americans in and out of Congress. It offers the possibility of eleminating conscription, which, in the words of Robert Taft, Sr., "if no longer necessary, is no longer justifiable." It offers the possibility of strengthening our military posture around the world by providing a system of manpower procurement which attracts and retains the type of technically skilled manpower needed by a modern army. It offers the possibility of longrun reduction in costs through increased reenlistments, reduced training expenses, elimination of unnecessary functions now performed by the military, and the alternative costs borne in the civilian sector by shortsighted draft policies. Finally, it offers the possibility providing compensation to our men in uniform equal to what they are worth by raising their pay and benefits to a level commensurate with their civilian counterparts, and removing the unjust hidden tax borne by our servicemen who are also risking life and limb.

Yet none of these possibilities, either separately or collectively, seemed to have stirred the Commission's or the President's imagination sufficiently to probe and analyze the foundations of our manpower policies. Not one single advocate of a volunteer military was invited to testify behind the closed doors of the Commission's hearings. Only one out of some 45 papers presented to the Commission discussed the subject of the volunteer army, and this paper reportedly was written by Dr. Stuart Altman Brown, who took no stand either pro or con on the issue.

It is not surprising then that the Commission's report and the President's recommendations contain no research on the key questions pertinent to the establishment of a volunteer army. No study of the relative costs of establishing a volunteer military was presented. This incidentally, is very badly needed, to a great extent because of the muddle created by the President's previous Commission from the Department of Defense which offered last summer the meaningless estimate of $5 to $17 billion—and then refused to make available its working papers upon which these vague figures were based.

Dr. Walter Oi, former Pentagon manpower economist now at the University of Washington, has estimated that the cost of a volunteer army would be around $4.8 billion. Others have offered similar estimates. Further research is needed and the results should be made public of the cost taking into account the reductions due to reenlistment, reduced training costs, and other factors.

Regrettably, instead of probing the crucial matter of reenlistment motivation by scholastic methods and interviewing leading manpower experts, the Commission reportedly resorted to public opinion polling of American college students.

It is even less surprising that the Commission did not look beyond the area of military manpower procurement and relate policies in that area to our manpower needs in the economy as a whole. I have urged that we develop a policy that strives to coordinate the military and civilian sectors in the training and use of available manpower, including using civilian personnel in military jobs as much as possible and making full use of civilian training and educational establishments in producing military technicians, scientists, and skilled workers. Also, the Reserve units should be improved in a similar fashion so that they could serve as a means of maintaining needed skills for potential military usage, and coordinating Reserve organizations with civilian society.

Rather than explore these arguments, Mr. Speaker, the Commission took refuge in their two-page analysis of a volunteer army in statements almost too superficial to merit serious comment. They only emphasize the lack of scholarship that went into this section of the preparation of this report.

The Commission states:

> An exclusively volunteer system would be too expensive.

But in the same statement adds:

> Although the Department of Defense gives no solid estimate of how much such a system would cost.

Why did the Commission not undertake to make such an estimate considering the factors that other advocates of the volunteer army and I have so long suggested?

The Commission also darkly warns of the establishment of a "mercenary force." An all-too-ready answer—but apparently not considered by the Commission—to this ridiculous strawman argument is Mr. Bruce Chapman's remark in his recent incisive book "The Wrong Man in Uniform":

> Certainly one should not be paid for his patriotism, but neither should he be punished for it.

Finally, the Commission leans heavily on the point that an all-volunteer army would not be responsive to sudden crisis or changes in international conditions. In this regard it is pertinent to consider how poorly our draft laws have performed under the strain of Vietnam. Bruce Chapman reports that in January 1966, some 522,472 out of 640,958 men of the 1A pool were stalled in the "pipeline" or "unavailable to be called" because their papers were being processed. Also, the Commission failed to realize that part of a sound plan for a volunteer army constitutes the improvement of a Ready Reserve, whose members maintain their civilian skills for immediate transferral to the military when needed.

Mr. Speaker, in short, the Commission's 2-month-late report can only be of benefit if it serves to stimulate Congress and the public into some open and thorough dialog on the draft. Congress would be utterly foolhardy if it allowed these recommendations be any more than this.

Hopefully this Presidential Commission will make its working papers available to the Congress, and to all public unlike its predecessor. Congress needs facts, not conclusions. Given the facts, Congress can reach the proper conclusions.

TIME FOR A CHANGE AT THE FEDERAL RESERVE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, to include extraneous matter, and to insert comparative information in parallel columns.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for the past 15 months, this country has been in a monetary turmoil with interest rates skyrocketing to their highest levels in more than 40 years.

In the coming weeks, President Johnson will have a great opportunity to start reversing this disastrous trend.

First, on March 31, the term of William McChesney Martin, Jr., as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board will expire. The President will have an opportunity to select a new Chairman and thereby express in unmistakable terms his disagreement with the Martin high-interest, tight-money policies.

Second, on April 30, Federal Reserve Board Governor Charles N. Shepardson must leave the Board under the retirement regulations of the Civil Service Commission. Mr. Shepardson cannot remain on the Board without special dispensation from the President. By refusing to grant an exception to the civil service regulations, the President will have an opportunity to appoint a man of his own choosing and to once again demonstrate his opposition to the high-interest policies supported by Mr. Shepardson.

Mr. Speaker, I want to lay before the Congress and the American people the reasons why William McChesney Martin and Charles N. Shepardson should not be continued in public service.

The careers of these two men are intertwined with the high-interest policies which have been in effect at the Federal Reserve Board since the 1950's. No two men in public life more clearly exemplify the "public-be-damned" attitude surrounding our monetary policy over the past 15 years. Both Mr. Martin and Mr. Shepardson are firm believers in the concept that the Federal Reserve System was created not to serve the public but to serve the interests of the big banking community.

Mr. Martin and Mr. Shepardson do not represent the public. Their performance does not meet the test of public service. They are simply and clearly special-interest advocates, operating from within our governmental machinery.

If the test of a public official in the U.S. Government is on the basis of his service to a special economic interest, then Mr. Martin and Mr. Shepardson should indeed be reappointed. But, if the test is based on a public official's service to his country and to the public interest, without regard to special favors, then Mr. Martin and Mr. Shepardson should be removed from positions of influence.

Today, as you look around the country, you see high interest rates and restrictive credit policies everywhere. They have crept into every nook and cranny of our economy and are placing a tremendous burden on the small man—the farmer, the small businessman, the worker, and the ordinary consumer.

Certainly, Mr. Martin must share the major blame for this condition. And Mr. Shepardson has been his willing and dependable ally.

Mr. Speaker, William McChesney Martin has cost the American people $200 billion in excess interest charges since he became a member and Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board in 1951. This has been pure, absolute, and unnecessary waste of the country's resources.

During the Eisenhower years, the country was plagued with giveaways, but none came anywhere close to William McChesney Martin's all-time record for waste—$200 billion worth. This was a giveaway to the large banks of this Nation. Teapot Dome, the Dixon-Yates scandal, the manipulations of Sherman Adams—all pale beside the $200 billion giveaway of the Federal Reserve.

Mr. Speaker, when William McChesney Martin became Chairman of the Federal Reserve in 1951, the country had experienced 12 long years—through times of depression, through times of war, and through times of extreme inflationary pressures—of stable interest rates maintained by cooperation between the Federal Reserve and the Democratic administrations. During these 12 years—a period of varied economic conditions—interest rates on long-term Government obligations never did climb above 2½ percent. And during most of this period, the interest rates were actually well below the 2½-percent figure. Short-term interest rates were actually as low as three-eighths of 1 percent.

Now these were the conditions that Mr. Martin inherited when he became Chairman in 1951. He maintained this beneficial policy—a policy which saved the country billions and billions of dollars—throughout the remainder of President Truman's term.

As soon as the Republicans came into power in 1953, the manipulation started. Martin and the Republicans got rid of one issue of long-term obligations at 2⅜ percent in early 1953—just to take the heat off and to delude people into thinking that they would continue the low-interest policies of the Democratic administrations.

But it was not long before Mr. Martin and Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey figured a way to jack up interest rates. In fact, on May 15, with Eisenhower in office less than 4 months, Martin and Humphrey got together on another long-term issue which went for 3.25 percent. Now, they did not actually need the money at this time, but they wanted to sell the bonds at this higher interest rate for the purpose of breaking the Democrats' 2½-percent line.

This manipulation of the long-term market on Government obligations was the break in the dike which has brought us a flood of higher and higher interest rates. We are now reaping the sad and tragic consequences of this Martin-Humphrey-Eisenhower policy.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a table, taken from the records of the Federal Reserve, which plainly shows what has happened to yield on long-term Government obligations. This data is regarded as significant in judging the Federal Reserve's performance in protecting the public interest in the money markets. The table plainly shows that during the Democratic administrations, from 1939 to 1952, we kept yields on these bonds near 2½ percent. But look at the years after 1952, and you will see what William McChesney Martin has done to the Government bond market and to the country.

Yields on long-term Government bonds, by years, 1939 to present

[Percent per annum]

Year:	*Yield*
1939	2.36
1940	2.21
1941	1.95
1942	2.46
1943	2.47
1944	2.48
1945	2.37
1946	2.19
1947	2.25
1948	2.44
1949	2.31
1950	2.32
1951	2.57
1952	2.68
1953	2.94
1954	2.56
1955	2.84
1956	3.08
1957	3.47
1958	3.43
1959	4.08
1960	4.02
1961	3.90
1962	3.95
1963	4.00
1964	4.15
1965	4.12
1966	4.65

Mr. Speaker, this table clearly indicts the policies of the present Chairman of the Federal Reserve. These are irrefutable facts. To allow interest rates to have climbed in this manner can be the result of only two thing—either gross incompetence or behind-the-scenes manipulations. These rates did not go up by themselves; they went up because Mr. Martin and his allies in the big business world—mainly large banks—wanted it to happen.

These manipulations have added at least $43 billion in excess interest charges on the national debt since 1951. In other words, this would be $43 billion worth of the taxpayers' money that could have been saved if interest rates had been kept at the levels existing during the Democratic years from 1939 through 1952. I do not have to remind anyone here what $43 billion would do for the country if spent for some productive purpose other than paying excess interest to a handful of big bankers.

This $43 billion is just the beginning

of the story. As I mentioned earlier, $200 billion in excess interest charges taken out of the pockets of the consumer can be traced to Mr. Martin's policies. We cannot turn our backs on such a gross betrayal of the public trust.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD two tables which establish and prove the figures I have cited. Table I shows the excess interest charges on the net public and private debt. The table compares the interest costs compounded at the 1951 rate with the actual interest costs that have been paid as a result of the Martin increases. Table I follows:

TABLE I.—*Net public and private debt, total interest paid, and average rate of interest in the United States, 1951–66*

Year 1	Total debt (billions) 2	Interest paid (billions) 3	Computed average interest paid (3÷2) 4	Interest costs figured at 1951 computed rate 5
1951	$524.0	$17.8	3.397	$17.8
1952	555.2	19.7	3.548	18.9
1953	586.5	21.9	3,734	19.9
1954	612.0	23.7	3.873	20.8
1955	672.3	26.0	3.867	22.8
1956	707.5	29.8	4.212	24.0
1957	738.9	34.0	4.601	25.1
1958	782.6	36.0	4.600	26.6
1959	846.2	40.8	4.821	28.7
1960	890.2	45.7	5.134	30.2
1961	947.7	48.4	5.107	32.2
1962	1,019.3	53.4	5.238	34.6
1963	1,096.9	59.8	5.452	37.3
1964	1,174.3	66.5	5.663	39.9
1965	1,270.3	74.0	5.825	43.2
1966 (estimated)	1,368.3	82.7	6.044	46.5
Total		680.2		468.5

NOTE.—See the following table:

	Billions
Total col. 3	$680.2
Less total col. 5	−468.5
Excess cost	211.7

Source: Economic Report of the President, 1967.

Table II shows the same comparison in relation to the total interest paid on the Federal debt. Like table I, the comparison is between the interest cost compounded at the 1951 rate versus the actual payments resulting from the Martin increases. The unnecessary increases imposed by Martin have actually amounted to $43,200 million in excess interest charges as this table shows:

TABLE II.—*Total Federal debt and interest paid, fiscal 1951–68*

Fiscal year	Total Federal debt (millions)	Total interest paid (millions)	Computed annual interest rates	Computed interest cost at 1951 rate (millions)
1951	$255.3	$5.7	2.233	$5.7
1952	259.2	5.9	2,276	5.8
1953	266.1	6.6	2.480	5.9
1954	271.3	6.5	2.396	6.1
1955	274.4	6.4	2,332	6.1
1956	272.8	6.8	2.493	6.1
1957	270.6	7.3	2,698	6.0
1958	276.4	7.7	2.786	6.2
1959	284.8	7.7	2.704	6.4
1960	286.5	9.3	3.246	6.4
1961	289.2	9.0	3.112	6.5
1962	298.6	9.2	3.081	6.7
1963	306.5	10.0	3,263	6.8
1964	312.5	10.7	3.424	7.0
1965	317.9	11.4	3.586	7.1
1966	320.4	12.1	3.777	7.2
1967 [1]	327.3	13.5	4.125	7.3
1968 [1]	335.4	14.2	4.234	7.5
Total		160.0		116.8

[1] Estimated.

Source: Economic Report of the President, 1967.

We probably will never know the total cost of these higher interest rates. During the period since 1951—and particularly in the Eisenhower years—our economy has often been plagued by underutilization of resources, unemployment, and wastefully idle industrial capacity. It is true that the Vietnamese war has, in many areas, pushed the country to full use of its industrial capacity, but this is an unusual situation for which the Federal Reserve could hardly claim credit.

But it is a fact that during the Eisenhower years, the Federal Reserve's policies led directly to three recessions and to high unemployment and to an extreme waste of the country's resources.

Mr. Speaker, to illustrate this point, I quote from the Economic Report of the President, which was transmitted to the Congress last month:

> Because of the excessive unemployment and idle capital in previous years, the Nation sacrificed the opportunity to consume and invest a large amount of the output that it was capable of producing. At the trough of the recession in the first quarter of 1961, the "gap" between actual and potential GNP amounted to $57 billion (1966 prices). From 1958 to 1965, the cumulative gap totaled $260 billion.

These are the conclusions of a distinguished group of economists who make up the Council of Economic Advisers. Their findings clearly illustrate the severe and permanent damage that Mr. Martin's policies have brought to the United States. I hope the President will weigh carefully the findings of his own Council of Economic Advisers when he considers the reappointment of Mr. Martin.

I cannot overemphasize what the policies of the Federal Reserve Board have done to the programs enacted by the Congress. High interest rates in many areas—particularly in housing and education—have negated much of the effort of progressive Congresses. We have seen high interest rates wipe out more housing and more school buildings than we could ever possibly build through Federal appropriations.

Of course, the rising cost of interest on the Federal debt is placing all programs and the entire Federal budget under heavy pressure. Today, thanks to the policies of Mr. Martin, we are paying $14.2 billion in interest on the national debt. This is second only to the outlays for national defense—it surpasses every other item.

And the tragic part of this is the fact that had interest rates been kept at the 1951 levels, we would be paying only $7.5 billion on the national debt instead of $14.2 billion. So, in a single year, William McChesney Martin grabs off $6.7 billion for the bankers and a handful of others.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. I am sure this is contained in the statement of the gentleman from Texas at some point, but I wish to inquire if it is—the fact that interest rates were at 2.5 percent until 1951, because there was in existence a Federal law, passed by the U.S. Congress and signed by the President to that effect.

Mr. PATMAN. I have no knowledge of such a law. I was here at the time.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Texas will yield further, there was a law, as I recall it, directly limiting interest payable to 2.5 percent.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, no; the gentleman is mistaken. My dear friend, if there is such a law, I would like to see it.

Mr. BROCK. I will be happy to send you a copy.

Mr. PATMAN. It was done by the Federal Reserve Board, working in the public interest with a President who was also working in the public interest. They did not need any law.

Mr. BROCK. There was no requirement?

Mr. PATMAN. There was no legal requirement.

Mr. BROCK. Under a maximum ceiling?

Mr. PATMAN. No legal requirement. I went before the Committee on Ways and Means preceding that time and tried to get the committee to endorse a proposal that would mean that as long as we needed money in World War II that we should sell Government bonds providing the necessary interest rates to get that money. But when we had exhausted our efforts to get money that way, selling bonds, and nobody had any more money, and money had to be created anyway, to let the Federal Reserve create it, furnish it to the Treasury without cost instead of letting banks create it on the credit of the Nation without cost to the banks, and get interest on it.

I believe the committee was impressed with the arguments submitted and on the case we presented. We were trying to get it that way, and pay out 2.5 percent a year only on the principle, and then in 40 years the whole debt would be paid.

That is where the 2.5 percent idea was mentioned and talked about. Finally agreement was reached to the effect that interest rates not go above 2.5 percent, but the difference was we would still pay interest on that part of the debt which the banks created to help finance the war. That was the part I objected to.

Mr. BROCK. But the chairman is saying there was a ceiling of 2.5 percent?

Mr. PATMAN. No. There was an understanding between the Federal Reserve members working in the public interest that they would work with the administration in keeping interest rates down; 2.5 percent was the maximum rate that was paid.

Lots of bonds were issued for 2.25 percent or 2⅛ in the Democratic years.

When Mr. Eisenhower took the oath of office on January 20, 1953, the Republican administration floated two bond issues, one providing 2⅜ percent and another one for 2.5 percent. This showed that the interest rates passed to the Republicans by the Democrats were low rates. And after that, Mr. George Humphrey, the Secretary of the Treasury, deliberately raised the rates by authorizing and issuing 3.25-percent bonds on a little over $1 billion. He did not need the money. He had several times that much in the Treasury. But he wanted to establish a higher rate so the Republicans would start from there. This broke the Democrats' low-interest line.

This increase led immediately to higher interest rates to the people and brought on a recession—the first of three under the Republicans.

And if the gentleman will notice the table on short-term obligations, he will notice that in 1954 this short-term interest rate went way down again. That was because of the recession. We had three recessions during the 8 years of Mr. Eisenhower's administration, all caused by high interest, and all caused by Mr. Martin's Federal Reserve Board seeing inflation when there was no inflation. But it cost the people plenty, and they are paying for it now, and they will be paying for it for the next 40 or 50 years.

Mr. BROCK. If the gentleman will yield further, I am not quite sure what the gentleman is suggesting. Is the gentleman suggesting that we change the current law limiting interest on long-term debt to 4¼ percent, to reduce that to something like 2½ percent; is that correct?

Mr. PATMAN. It was not necessary to reduce it during all those years from 1939 to 1952.

It has been 4¼ percent since the law was passed February 1918. President Woodrow Wilson caused that to be placed in the law—that hereafter the U.S. government shall not be required to pay more than 4¼ percent on long-term Government bonds.

Why is it that during Mr. Eisenhower's administration the effort was made to take that ceiling off even before the rate was up to 4¼ percent? Twice the Eisenhower administration attempted to take this ceiling off. A few of us here organized groups against it and we successfully defeated both efforts. It is still 4¼ percent. If an effort is made in the future, we will be here ready to resist it and I believe we can oppose it successfully and stop it because this ceiling is in the public interest.

There is no reason why the Government should ever pay more than 4¼ percent on long-term Government bonds.

Mr. BROCK. I am not quite clear just whom the gentleman is criticising. I understand that historically he very adeptly criticises the Republicans who, of course, are not in control of the Government today.

However, it is a fact that interest rates are the highest they have been in quite a number of years—as a matter of fact for several decades.

We have had testimony before our committee and also before the Joint Economic Committee from every Secretary of the Treasury under this administration and the previous one since 1960, that perhaps it would ease their handling of the financing of this Government debt to remove the 4¼-percent ceiling.

So are you blaming the current administration and the current Secretary of the Treasury for the difficulties in which we find ourselves today?

Mr. PATMAN. No, I am blaming the Federal Reserve Board and Mr. Martin in particular. I am blaming Mr. Eisenhower's administration because he permitted them to do it. You know they never did that until Mr. Eisenhower came in. Mr. Eisenhower was the only President who ever made the mistake of saying that the Federal Reserve is independent from the Government.

Mr. Eisenhower said that at a press conference and I quote him here in this speech. This is where our trouble started—Mr. Martin having charge under Mr. Eisenhower. The Republicans let Martin seize his independence.

Now Mr. Martin was appointed by Mr. Truman—President Truman. But he was appointed with the understanding that he would not let these long-term interest rates go above 2½ percent. When the effort was made to raise interest rates, he called in the Federal Reserve and decided that the line be held.

But I do have all of that in my speech here so if the gentleman does not mind, I will go on with my remarks which will answer the gentleman's questions. Otherwise I will just be repeating my statements.

Mr. BROCK. If the gentleman will permit me one more question. The fact is, is it not, that the 2½-percent ceiling was in some measure possible due to the fact that during most of this period and until the late forties, we had wage and price controls? I think the gentleman should mention that in his speech.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, that has nothing to do with it at all. We had a good Federal Reserve Board that was working in the public interest—working for the people and not for the big banks. We had a President who was working in the public interest and not for the big banks.

If the gentleman will permit me to continue with the speech his questions will be answered. If I do not answer the gentleman's questions, I will yield to him.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency yield to me for a question?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Am I right in assuming that in your talk today you are making a case for the President of the United States not to continue Mr. Charles N. Shepardson as a member of the Federal Reserve Board. In other words you do not want him to relax the civil service rulings which would require Mr. Shepardson to retire. Your opposition is based on the decision of the Federal Reserve Board in December 1965 to increase interest rates? And you are also making a case this afternoon not to reappoint Mr. Martin on the same grounds? Am I right, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. PATMAN. You are exactly right, I will say to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Illinois, a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. The gentleman from Illinois knows what this is all about. He is well informed on this subject and represents the public interest.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to proceed for just a few minutes, I believe I will answer the questions that have been raised.

It is difficult to pin down all of the costs to the Federal Government which can be attributed to tight money and high interest policies. However, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Charles L. Schultze, gave a partial insight into this question during testimony before the Ways and Means Committee in January. I quote from that testimony:

> We estimate that the increasing shortage of credit funds and rising interest rates experienced last year are adding approximately $3 billion to the Federal budget for fiscal year 1967 as a whole.

So here, by admission of the Bureau of the Budget, the Federal Reserve's policies added $3 billion to the cost of operating the Government. And this came at a time when we were seeking to find financing for domestic programs and for the war in Vietnam.

Many on this floor often talk about budget cutting and about "waste in the Federal Government." While I do not want to debate these questions at this time, I must wonder aloud why this group never mentions the cost of high interest rates. I would suggest that those concerned about budget cutting take a look at this $3 billion in excess charges caused by interest rates in the current fiscal year. Personally, I feel that these unnecessary and extortionate interest charges should be removed from the Federal budget before we talk about cutting off funds for education, farm programs, rural electrification, or slum clearance.

But these are programs which William McChesney Martin, his banker friends, and the big business community, have always opposed. In addition to providing additional profits for the banks, these higher interest charges also accomplish the purpose of slowing down economic progress, particularly among the poor and middle income groups. High interest rates, in addition to providing bank profits, obviously retard the Great Society which the bankers and their allies were not able to defeat at the polls.

Yes, high interest policies are a means for this group to defy the will of the people of the United States. It is a means for them to override decisions arrived at by the democratic process. It is a means for them to defy the people as well as the President and the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the Federal Reserve can work with the Treasury Department to hold down interest rates. They did it while Marriner Eccles was Chairman of the Federal Reserve and Martin could do it now if he wanted to act in the public interest. I quote from the hearings of the Committee on Banking and Currency on March 5, 1947, in which Mr. Eccles testifies in answer to questions from our colleague, Mr. MONRONEY, now a distinguished Senator from Oklahoma:

> Mr. ECCLES. Now the fact that the interest is where it is, of course, is not just an accident. The interest is where it is because that is where the Federal Reserve System put it in conjunction with the Treasury—I mean with the approval of the Treasury. The rates during the twenties and during the last war, had there been an open-market committee—which there was not, in the Fed-

> eral Reserve System—they could have financed the last war and financed the Government during the twenties at prevailing rates.
>
> Mr. Monroney. Do you mean to say that with your present open-market committee, and the operation of the Federal Reserve, as it now stands, that, regardless of what the national income is, or other economic factors, that you can guarantee to us that our interest rate will remain around 2.06 per cent?
>
> Mr. Eccles. We certainly can. We can guarantee that the interest rate, so far as the public debt is concerned, is where the open market committee of the Federal Reserve desires to put it.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I would ask the gentleman how that would work? What was the device that was used? Will the gentleman explain that to the House?

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, sure. They did it by supporting the market on Government bonds.

Mr. BROCK. They purchased Government bonds. Was that correct?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. That was the method used.

Mr. BROCK. It was the primary method used.

Mr. PATMAN. It was a very effective method. It was not only purchase and sale, it was purchase and sale through the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve.

Mr. BROCK. You had to purchase the bonds to maintain lower yields?

Mr. PATMAN. Sometimes one could get a premium on 2.5-percent bonds.

Mr. BROCK. What is the impact on the economic structure, on the monetary system, of the purchase of Government bonds by the Federal Reserve System?

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, it could be either way, depending on what the situation was at the time. If we use the sale of Government bonds, we sop up money if we feel there is too much money in circulation. By selling bonds and having people pay for them, that much money would be taken out of circulation. On the other hand, if we want to put more money in circulation, the Open Market Committee buys Government bonds, and, from that, money goes into the Reserve banks. These become free reserves which do not cost the banks anything. They are high-powered dollars.

There is a difference between currency in the form of dollars and "high-powered dollars." These are high-powered dollars. On every high-powered dollar, the banks can issue from $10 to $20 which is manufactured money, for the purpose of investing or making loans. Under the Federal Reserve ruling until a few days ago, on savings, there was a 4-percent reserve requirement, this meant they could issue money, $25 to every $1 in savings. Now, in order to try to undo some of the terrible things the Federal Reserve did in December of 1965, they reduced the reserve requirements the other day to 3 percent on savings, which means they can issue $33⅓ for every dollar of reserve they have created—manufactured—without cost. This is an obvious admission that the Federal Reserve is trying to undo what they did in December of 1965.

Mr. Martin said in 1965 that the object of their raising interest rates 37½ percent—which was a terrible, scandalous thing—was not to hurt the homebuilding market. He predicted it would not hurt the homebuilding market. But just look at what happened to the homebuilding market. The gentleman from Tennessee himself will say that it put the homebuilding market in a depression; is that not right?

Mr. BROCK. Yes, I believe that fiscal and monetary policy had a great deal to do with the present crisis in the homebuilding industry.

However, the gentleman seems reluctant to pursue this logic to its ultimate conclusion. He admits that the Fed, in order to maintain a 2½-percent ceiling on interest rates, would have to go into the market and buy Government securities. He also says, and in great truth, that the purchase of such securities expands the reserves, expands the monetary supply with a multiplier effect, sometimes 10 times.

Mr. PATMAN. And now 20 times or as much as 33⅓.

Mr. BROCK. That could be, in certain circumstances, but not in this particular area.

The purchase of $3 billion of Federal securities could have an impact on monetary supply of an additional $30 billion, which is the point of the gentleman, and I entirely agree. Let us pursue it to its ultimate conclusion.

Where will the new money go? If we have a supply of money and production fairly much on an equivalent basis, and if we add another $30 or $40 or $100 billion into the money supply, what will this mean?

It will mean that the price of goods and services will rise to meet the supply of money, and then we will have inflation, which is exactly what has happened in this situation.

Mr. PATMAN. We do not have to guess. We can look back to what was done. The gentleman is talking about the past. What he is saying did not happen. It did not happen. It worked fine while the Federal Reserve supported the Government bond market.

Mr. BROCK. It certainly has happened. During the past 6 pears we have seen inflation. In the years following World War II we had inflation as soon as wage and price controls were removed.

The gentleman must admit this: under the Eisenhower administration we had the most stable price level that this country has experienced in the past three decades.

Mr. PATMAN. Now, listen, my friend. How can you say that?

Mr. BROCK. I am saying it because it is an historical fact.

Mr. PATMAN. Wait just a moment. Do not get out from under that comment. I want to hold you to that.

Mr. BROCK. Certainly.

Mr. PATMAN. How can you make that statement, when they had three recessions in 8 years under Mr. Eisenhower. And when we have not had a single recession since Mr. Eisenhower went out, with the longest term of economic growth in the history of the civilized world?

Mr. BROCK. I was pointing out to the gentleman—and he is not responding—that we had the most stable price record in history.

Mr. PATMAN. It was up and down all the time. They had a recession every 3 years and high unemployment.

Mr. BROCK. They had an average price increase in the wholesale price index of less than a half percent a year. What is expected this year? Your own Council of Economic Advisers says that it will be 2 or 2½ percent this year.

Mr. PATMAN. We have had the longest term of economic growth and prosperity in the history of any civilized country on earth under similar circumstances. Preceding this time, under the Republicans, we had one recession after another.

Mr. BROCK. And there are 3 million men in the armed services. Must we depend upon a war economy to achieve economic growth?

Mr. PATMAN. Let me finish this, and I believe I will answer some questions that way.

Mr. BROCK. Real hourly earnings last year went down, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is talking about one thing and prophesying about another. When the Federal Reserve worked with the President the system worked fine.

Let us get to something else.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. Would the gentleman from Texas advise the House as to who appoints the members of the Federal Reserve Board?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. You know, at first they were appointed for 7 or 8 years. Then during the last depression we had they were appointed to terms of 10 years. The next depression they were appointed to terms of 12 years, and the last one was for 14-year terms. They have them staggered so that a President can appoint one every 2 years. Their terms are so staggered that one term expires every 2 years. That means that during the first term of a President he will appoint two of that seven-member Board. Then, when he goes into a second term, if he has one, the first 2 years he appoints another one, and then if he becomes, you might say, in a lame duck status where he is going out, he can appoint the fourth man. That is where he gets charge of the Board, if he ever gets charge. However, he is so weak at this time, because of his lame duck status, that he can do little on monetary policy.

President Roosevelt, as you know, was elected three times, and he got charge of the Federal Reserve Board, and the interest rates went down to 2.5 percent on long-term bonds, and he kept them there 12 years.

Then when the Republicans came back into power they submitted a constitutional amendment—and no one suspected at the time what it was—providing that no President shall hereafter serve longer than two terms. It passed the Congress, which was a Republican Congress at the time. The first 20 Republican State legislatures adopted it right quick. Then it was not long until it was adopted and became a part of the Constitution. So they now have what they set out to get in the first instance—a Federal Reserve Board whose terms are staggered in a way that no President shall hereafter ever get charge of that Board and be permitted to carry out the policies of the administration that has been elected by all the people. They now have it that way. They have been rather successful in blocking the President's policies.

During his career as Chairman, Mr. Martin has been quite candid about his defiance. It has been open, blatant defiance which Mr. Martin has often bragged about. I remember well Mr. Martin's appearance before the Joint Economic Committee on February 26, 1965. He said at that time:

> The Federal Reserve Board has the authority to act independently of the President, even "despite the President."

This illustrates Mr. Martin's attitude toward the entire Federal Government, including the Congress. The Federal Reserve Board, of course, does not come to Congress for appropriations and, as a result, we have no effective check on the activities of Mr. Martin and his allies. The books of the Federal Reserve System are not even audited by the General Accounting Office, as are the books of other Federal agencies.

As many of you know, Mr. Martin has consistently defied requests for basic information on the operations of the Federal Reserve. As chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, I have repeatedly sought copies of minutes of the Federal Open Market Committee. Time after time, Mr. Martin has refused to honor these requests, despite the fact that the Banking and Currency Committee has legislative responsibility for the Federal Reserve.

Recently, a national columnist, Don MacLean, detailed just how this secrecy operates at the Federal Reserve. I place this column. "Fed Can Really Keep a Secret," in the RECORD at this point:

> [From the Denver (Colo.) Rocky Mountain News, Sept. 15, 1966]
>
> FED CAN REALLY KEEP A SECRET
>
> WASHINGTON.—All the years I've been covering this town I've been overlooking the best beat there is—the Federal Reserve Board.
>
> The reason this is a good, easy assignment is that it can't be covered. What the Federal Reserve Board does, when it does it, is secret.
>
> The newest Federal Reserve Board records Congress has to work with are those of 1960. You see, according to the law, the Fed's records are not made available until they are six years old.
>
> Before that time Congress cannot see them. In fact, according to Rep. Wright Patman (D-Texas), not even the President can see them before then.
>
> This is because the Federal Reserve Board, composed of 12 big bankers and seven Government officials, sets interest rates. The theory is that advance knowledge of what the Board is up to would allow unscrupulous men to make money in the market.
>
> Frankly, I think this is a reflection on Congress, not to mention the President.
>
> But the Fed apparently feels that some 2000 other people are far more trustworthy. Each of the bankers on the board represents the banks in his area of the country. He is allowed to tell them what he is doing.
>
> And then there are staff members—in the banks and on the board. Altogether, there are some 2000 secret-keepers.
>
> The remarkable thing is that, to my knowledge, no member of the Fed has ever broken bad. Even the Central Intelligence Agency has had agents who have blabbed to the press. But not the Federal Reserve Board.
>
> However, the two agencies are alike in one respect: Neither has to account for the money it spends. The Federal Reserve Board can dispense up to $1.5 billion without mentioning it.
>
> Exactly what it does with its budget is sort of a mystery. Rep. Patman says. The General Accounting Office, the watchdog of most other government agencies, is not allowed to snoop through the Federal Reserve's books.
>
> Frankly, I had no idea that the Fed operated behind such a thick veil of secrecy.
>
> Although its operation is somewhat beyond my shallow financial knowledge, I always assumed that somebody understood it.
>
> But now we learn that this is not the case. Congress and the President simply accept the Fed's interest rates and try to live with them—just as we all do when negotiating a loan at the bank.
>
> It all seems rather strange in a free and open society.

The incidents of defiance of the executive branch and of the Congress—and for that matter, the people—are too numerous to present here. However, all of us in the House are well aware of the Federal Reserve's most recent and most clearcut case of defiance. That occurred on December 6, 1965, when the Federal Reserve Board, without warning and without consultation with any other part of our Government, arbitrarily raised interest rates 37½ percent. This act of defiance is what set off our current wave of higher and higher interest rates and which now has our economy in such an unstable condition.

In December 1965, Mr. Martin triumphantly went down to Johnson City and, in effect, told the President off. He arrived at Johnson City with the fact already accomplished—he had raised interest rates and he let the President know that he was not backing down.

This was a sad sight. It was a monumental defiance of a Chief Executive of this great country. No other bureaucrat could do this and get away with it. Only William McChesney Martin.

The President's hands were tied. Unfortunately, the Congress was largely to blame for the fact that the President was forced to swallow his pride and accept the defiance. The Congress—through dereliction of its duty—had through the years allowed the Federal Reserve to, in effect, seize its independence. This independence was never granted by law but the Congress has slowly allowed the Federal Reserve to move into a position where it is almost a separate government in Washington, D.C.

The Congress should reform the Federal Reserve System. It should shorten the terms of the members from 14 years to something like 5 years. It should require that the Federal Reserve come to Congress for appropriations and that its books be audited. It should be required to consult with the rest of the Government and to act in harmony with prevailing economic policy. These are basic things which the Congress should take care of without delay.

However, on April 1, the President will have an opportunity to act on his own in replacing Mr. Martin as Chairman. By taking this action, the President will be telling the American people that he does not approve of the high-interest, tight-money policies that have been in existence under the Martin regime. It will be a clearcut call for lower and lower interest rates. It will be unmistakable and worth more than all the words the President might speak on this subject.

It will signal the beginning of the end of the open defiance which has existed on the Federal Reserve Board since Martin became Chairman. The naming of a new Chairman will, I am sure, bring a sigh of relief to the many hard-pressed sectors of our economy which have suffered mightily since December 1965.

Surely, the great housing industry, including those institutions which loan money to homebuilders, will greet the decision with joy. Housing construction in 1966 fell by 20 percent, resulting in the loss of 300,000 housing units.

The housing industry, as a result of Mr. Martin, is in a depression. And the many years directly concerned with housing, such as the homebuilding industry, the construction trades, the savings and loan institutions, the furniture and appliance manufacturers and dealers, all share in this depression.

They need relief now. And the end of Mr. Martin's regime will be evidence that this administration intends that they receive this relief.

The loss of these housing units in 1966, and in the early months of this year, have set the country back years in its efforts to wipe out slums and to provide decent housing for its citizens. It has cost the average homeowner thousands of dollars in added interest charges.

A 1-percent increase in interest charges on a $20,000 home loan costs the buyer $4,734 over 30 years. Most home loans have gone up from 1 to 2 percentage points since the December 1965 action of the Federal Reserve. So this means that in most cases, the homebuyer has shelled out anywhere from $4,800 to $10,000 in extra charges. With the national median income something less than $5,000, this means that the average person will be contributing at least 1 and probably 2 years' wages just to pay extra interest charges imposed by that single act of the Federal Reserve.

This is bad enough for the homebuyers caught in this situation, but it is even worst for those prospective homebuyers who were unable to obtain credit at any rate during 1966. These people were forced to remain in overcrowded housing conditions, in small apartments, and inadequate housing. In many cases, they were faced with higher rents resulting directly from the higher interest costs.

The situation in the housing industry is dramatic. But the same conditions exist to some degree throughout the economy. The 37½-percent increase imposed by the Federal Reserve raised the cost of all products in the economy. So the consumer paid, and paid heavily, every time he made a purchase in 1966, and he is still paying for the Federal Reserve's folly here in 1967. By increasing prices, the Federal Reserve fanned the fires of inflation.

The club of high interest rates has fallen unevenly on the economy since December 1965, creating especially heavy burdens for the low and middle income families. The monetary situation since December 1965 has been a burden on the poor and a bonanza for the rich.

Mr. Speaker, now let us take a look at the record of Charles N. Shepardson who has been on the Federal Reserve Board since 1955. Mr. Shepardson is listed as "agriculture's representative" on the Federal Reserve. This listing is, of course, intended to satisfy the requirements that the Federal Reserve pay some attention to the needs of the agricultural sector of our economy.

If Mr. Shepardson is indeed the representative of the agricultural interests, this fact has apparently escaped the organizations representing the great majority of farmers and rural citizens. For years, as many of you know, the farm organizations, the National Farmers Union, the National Farmers Organization, the Grange, the rural electric cooperatives, and others have been coming to Congress asking us to reform the Federal Reserve and to give them representation. These large organizations, representing the rural areas of this Nation, have consistently passed resolutions condeming the Federal Reserve and they have been particularly vocal since the December 1965 action.

I know of no evidence that Mr. Shepardson has ever consulted with the people whose position he supportedly advocates within the Federal Reserve. Has he ever met with any of these rural organizations? Has he any idea of what it means to be a farmer who cannot even get credit to put seed in the ground? Does he know what it means to a farm family who cannot receive credit to buy a home in a rural area?

Mr. Shepardson does not represent the farm and rural interests; he represents the bankers just like William McCheseny Martin. Everybody knows that, but no one knows it better than the rural organizations themselves.

And to prove this, Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a series of resolutions from farm organizations which represent millions of people living on farms and in rural areas. These resolutions prove that the rural people of this Nation do not feel that they are receiving any kind of reasonable attention in the establishment of monetary policies. I hope the President, in considering Mr. Shepardson's retirement, will take cognizance of these resolutions:

I. Resolution No. C-3 of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Adopted at the 25th Annual Meeting, February 1967

SUBJECT: TIGHT MONEY

Whereas, NRECA has repeatedly taken a stand against high interest rates and a tight money policy, and

Whereas, current Federal Reserve Board policies have resulted in a tightening of credit and an increase in interest rates at all levels of the economy, and

Whereas, the recent efforts of the Federal Reserve Board to loosen money have been a step in the right direction, but have had only a slight effect in achieving a flow of money and interest rates necessary for a growing and secure economy, and

Whereas, this places an unnecessary burden on the American Consumer; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we reaffirm our long-established position and join our friends in urging the President and the Congress to take positive action now to bring about lower interest rates and an expansion of credit.

II. 1966 Policy of the National Farmers Union, Adopted at the 64th Convention of the National Farmers Union in March 1966

NATIONAL MONETARY POLICY

We urge the approval of legislation which would abolish the Open Market Committee and reconstitute the Federal Reserve Board to include representatives of agriculture, small business and labor. Policies should be established by the Congress to make the Federal Reserve Board responsible to the Congress. Monetary policy should be consistent with the full employment goals of the President's Council of Economic Advisors. Fiscal and monetary policies should be designed to expand the money supply in proportion to the expansion of the economy to bring about low interest rates and ample credit.

We deplore the action of the Federal Reserve Board which arbitrarily raised interest rates and which will cost farmers and others billions of dollars in increased interest charges and which may bring about another recession resulting in unemployment.

III. Resolution Adopted by California Farmer-Consumer Information Committee Semiannual Meeting, December 1966

PROTECTION OF CONSUMERS, RURAL AND URBAN

(b) We reaffirm our conviction that the Federal Reserve System requires basic reforms, as proposed by Rep. Wright Patman in the 89th Congress, and urge all affiliated bodies to give serious thought to and support for all constructive measures for tax reform, at both state and federal levels.

IV. 1967 Policy Statement of the Texas Farmers Union, Adopted by Delegates to the Annual Convention, November 1966

EXPANDING NATIONAL ECONOMY

A. Monetary policies

(1) The total farm debt is the highest in the history of the United States. With credit needs of farmers and small business generally expected to increase still further in the years ahead, the monetary policy of our government should put priority on low-cost credit and ample loan funds.

(2) We deplore the activities of the Federal Reserve Board which arbitrarily raised interest rates that will cost farmers billions of additional dollars. We urge the approval of legislation which would make monetary policies a responsibility of the Congress and to place the Federal Reserve Board directly responsible to Congress. We urge a return to the policy of low interest rates.

(3) We are fully in support of the efforts of Congressman Wright Patman, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, to enact legislation to accomplish these objectives.

V. Jasper Grange, Springfield, Oreg., Adopted January 1967

Whereas, the Federal Reserve Board has independent and complete control of the money policies in the United States as explained in the Oregon Grange Bulletin of Nov. 21, 1966—page 4, and

Whereas, such independence from and lack of responsibility to the people has no place in a democracy, therefore be it

Resolved, That Jasper Grange #532 write Congressman Wright Patman, Chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee to compliment him on his efforts to remedy the situation and ask him how we may work with him and others to compel the Federal Reserve Board to make their deliberations and decisions open to the public in the same manner that they are available to bankers, and be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Lane County Pomona Grange and to Oregon State Grange.

VI. Resolutions Adopted at the 29th Annual Meeting of Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association in St. Paul, Minn., November 15–17

CREDIT AND INTEREST

We deplore the inability of the national administration to deal more promptly and effectively with the high interest rate crisis of the past year. We recall with deep concern that a number of farm depressions of the past have been ushered in by a tightening of credit, advanced interest rates, and a failure on the part of public officials to read the danger signals accurately and promptly.

VII. Consumers Information Committee on Resources and Energy (Made Up of Cooperative Groups, Rural Electric Systems, Public Power Organizations, Labor and Farm Groups) Call for Action—Adopted by Delegates, January 27, 1967, Tight Money Crisis Conference

The recent "Tight Money Crisis" conference called by the Consumers Information Committee drew over 300 delegates from across the nation. Many of the delegates came representing organizations that are not sponsors of CIC. The assembled delegates were concerned that the conference would adjourn without taking any action to correct the situation.

In an open session, the assembled delegates representing many different organizations adopted a "Call for Action" program. As the sponsor of this conference and in keeping with our policy to inform those interested in consumer problems, we are distributing this "Call for Action" agreed to by the various delegates on January 27, 1967, and CIC will continue to inform sponsors of any further developments. Delegates to this conference are expected to implement this "Call" and to make it a part of their respective organizations' legislative programs.

Tight-Money Crisis—A Call for Decisive Action

America is in a tight-money, high-interest-rate crisis which must be quickly abated before it leads us into a recession with its resulting unemployment, inadequate housing, unavailable credit, and general economic stagnation.

This crisis is man-made, primarily the product of monetary policies of the Federal Reserve System.

No one can question the significance of the role played by the Federal Reserve Board and Federal Open Market Committee and its effect on the economic well-being of the American people. The result of actions taken by the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve System in the area of monetary policy can create an environment of economic prosperity, or economic recession and ultimate depression. It can also create a climate to encourage or restrict development of our natural resources.

Monetary policy decisions made by the Federal Reserve Board since the middle of the

1950's have been major contributing factors to four recessions in the United States. The Board's action on December 5, 1965, raised the prime discount rate from 4% to 4½% and the time deposit rate from 4% to 5½%—thus increasing the cost of money respectively by 10% and 37½%. This action severely restricted the money supply, caused significant disruption between the traditional positions of our financial institutions, and has been a major cause of the depression in the housing industry.

The current Federal Reserve policy of tight money and high interest rates—rates which have soared to 40-year highs—has been detrimental to consumers, as wage earners, farmers, home builders or small businessmen. The current tight-money, high-interest-rate policy has not only thwarted, but in many cases actually wrecked President Johnson's Great Society program. Far from fighting inflation, the interest-cost push has been an engine of inflation.

The increased interest costs which will have to be paid by the American people due to increased costs of carrying Federal, State, and local debt, and the increased interest costs which the American consumer must bear for funds borrowed for home purchases and other consumption needs will amount to many billions of dollars. This burden will have to be carried by coming generations as well as the present.

Many vital programs, such as rural electrification, cooperative housing, Farmers Home Administration loans, Veterans' benefits, education aids and other programs which are dependent upon the Federal, State and local governments for direct loans or insured loans, cannot survive under current monetary policies.

No one benefits from a tight-money, high-interest-rate policy except those in the fortunate position of having funds to lend. A high-interest, tight-money policy promotes concentration of wealth rather than encouraging wide-spread distribution of income and money. The policy erodes the American tradition of advancing effective and efficient small business, home ownership, and decent standards of living for all our people.

Our present economically and socially undesirable monetary policy is a direct consequence of the refusal of the Federal Reserve Board System to operate in harmony with Congressional mandate and Executive Policy. In fact, the actions of the Federal Reserve Board and System over the last several years constitute a direct violation of the policies and objectives contained in the Employment Act of 1946.

For reasons presented in this brief review, the delegates to this National Conference call upon the Congress and the President of the United States to take positive action now in reversing the present dangerous tight-money policies and in putting the country back on the road to growth and prosperity.

Specifically, we urge an action program which will include:

1. Prompt hearings, including field hearings, by appropriate Congressional Committees to probe the impact of tight money and high interest rates on consumers and producers, be they workers, farmers, small businessmen or local units of government.

2. Enactment of legislation to make the Federal Reserve System fully responsive to the Congress.

3. We urge the President not to reappoint McChesney Martin as Chairman. If he is reappointed, we urge the Senators to reject the appointment.

4. Establishment of machinery to give representatives of consumers and other major groups of citizens an opportunity to share in the design of monetary policies.

5. Utilization of all available and appropriate new direct and guaranteed loan and credit programs wherever appropriate to strengthen the hand of the consumer—the home owner, the businessman, the farmer, the working man, the borrower, the poor, the student, the elderly—in his efforts to share fairly in the growth of America.

6. Reaffirmation of the Employment Act of 1946, which calls for continuing growth as a national goal, with full employment of manpower, maximum utilization of plant and wise use of resources recognized as major objectives in the public interest.

7. Endorsement of the principle of truth-in-lending legislation and opposition to abolition of usury laws.

As delegates of this National Conference, we are concerned that the nation be given the opportunity to move forward. We extend an urgent invitation to all our fellow citizens to join with us in a crusade for sensible monetary policies.

While the Federal Reserve Board has recently and belatedly made small efforts to loosen money, it is clear that these modest corrective policies are still ineffective to achieve the flow of money and interest rates necessary for a growing and secure economy.

Mr. Speaker, I also place in the RECORD a letter from the Montana Farmers Union to President Johnson outlining that organization's opposition to the current high-interest, tight-money policies:

MONTANA FARMERS UNION,
Great Falls, Mont., December 29, 1966.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We respectfully call upon you to use the power of your office and take effective action to improve prices and income for family-type farmers and ranchers and to reduce the abnormally high interest rates which are having a depressing impact on the rural economy.

We ask you to reverse the high interest rate policy which you allowed to be set in motion a year ago.

Farm and ranch people, farm equipment dealers and home building businesses are especially hard pressed.

High costs loaded with excessive manufacturers' profits, exorbitant interest rates and, for our area, unreasonably high freight rates are already forcing many of our people into a voluntary moratorium on buying new equipment. We note that the powerful North Dakota Farmers Union has started a campaign to encourage agricultural producers to stop buying new farm machinery including tractors, combines, pickups, trucks, and automobiles until there is evidence of constructive action to improve farm income substantially. The mood of our people in Montana is much the same. Unless improvements are soon made we foresee a marked extension of the stop-buying program.

The time has come for constructive action by the President of the United States, Federal administrative agencies and the Congress to reduce substantially the growing gap between farm prices and expenses.

To allow present conditions to go on will only bring greater hardship to farm and ranch families and those dependent upon them. However, despite their handicaps our farm and ranch people will continue to provide adequate supplies of food for the consumers of America and the hungry people of the world.

While gross farm income is at an all-time high, precious little of it remains in the hands of farm and ranch people. Expenses are higher as indicated by the parity ratio which has slid back again to 79 percent after being briefly at 82. This disparity has continued for too many years. It is small wonder that farm indebtedness is also at an all-time high.

As you know, parity measures the relationship between prices farmers and ranchers receive for their commodities and the prices they pay for goods and services used in production and family living.

Your administration has promised 100 percent of parity for family-type farmers and ranchers.

Prices farmers pay for goods and services have risen higher than the average cost of living. In the period 1960 to 1966, farm machinery prices rose 19 percent and motor vehicle prices went up 13 percent while overall consumers prices increased 10 percent. Farm machinery manufacturers raised prices again in 1966, and it is predicted their prices will rise higher during the remainder of the 1960's.

Farm machinery manufacturers are currently showing impressive gains in profits, up 30 to 40 percent over last year. We note, however, that labor costs in the manufacture of farm machinery represent only 15 percent of the retail price, so the cause of inflation lies elsewhere.

Machinery and motor vehicles are now an essential part of farming operations. To acquire this equipment new at high prices many farm operators must employ credit. With both new machinery and credit at record high levels, farm people are unduly burdened.

Interest charges, like sales taxes, have a pyramiding effect on prices paid by consumers and users. Interest rates are at the highest level in 45 years. The farmer and rancher have no way of passing these costs on to anyone.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture is ominously forecasting a drop in American farm income in 1967 while asking our farmers to produce more food.

The cost-price squeeze has done too much harm already, sending large numbers of farm people to the cities, ill-prepared to receive them, and distorting community patterns.

On behalf of our thousands of members, we call upon you for justice and fairness.

This appeal is made today by vote of the Executive Board of the Montana Farmers Union who, in addition to the undersigned, are Gordon Twedt, Rudyard, Montana, Vice President; Frank Daniels, Sidney, Montana; Henry Siderius, Kalispell, Montana; Einar Lindvig, Bozeman, Montana; Jake Frank, Park City, Montana; Earl Good, Wolf Point, Montana; and J. T. Ryan, Great Falls, Montana, Secretary-Treasurer.

Sincerely,

LEONARD KENFIELD, *President.*

Mr. Speaker, I am also inserting in the RECORD at this time a copy of an editorial from the November 1966 East River Guardian, published by the East River Electric Power Cooperative at Madison, S. Dak.:

TIGHT MONEY POLICIES ENDANGER FARM, BUSINESS

Times are critical for the American farmer. He is being forced to walk a financial tightrope.

The Agriculture Department points out farmers spent $1 out of every $7 they earned last year to pay interest charges on loans. Prospects appear darker after the Federal Reserve Board "seized independence," without benefit of law, creating chaotic financial conditions on the farm and throughout the country.

At the request of President Johnson, the Farm Credit Administration is cooperating with federal lending agencies to limit loans, supposedly reducing "inflationary pressures." But on the other hand, the Farm Credit Administration says it wants to supply money to farmers and farmer-cooperative borrowers for 1967 production needs.

The Farm Credit board has adopted a policy stand which said inflationary pressures can be lessened most effectively by making loans that result in maximum agricultural production. The board said the

> President asked that loans be made only to meet essential and non-postponable needs and that the agencies reduce borrowings in the private money market.
>
> An overpowering fact remains: farm and other credit needs will be higher in 1967 than this year. Tight money is behind the high interest rates being clamped down on farmers.
>
> High interest costs prevailing throughout the economy are the results of actions by a single agency—the Federal Reserve Board. The board, acting in defiance of the President and Congress, raised interest rates 37½ per cent on Dec. 6, 1965.
>
> Since 1953, the Federal Reserve Board has become more and more defiant. The board has warped and twisted the laws governing its operation, to move it closer to complete control by a handful of big banks holding $16.5 billion in certificates of deposit.
>
> What can we do about this? The Federal Reserve System must be brought back under the control of Congress. The Federal Reserve must be made to come to Congress for appropriations. Its books must be made subject to the General Accounting Office, as are other agencies of the government. Open market operations must be carried out in the public's interest and not in big bankers' interests.
>
> East River resolutions the last two years make it clear that we feel the Federal Reserve Board is endangering the economic well-being of the entire nation through its actions.
>
> Rising interest rates are siphoning off billions of dollars that should be channeled into productive projects. Instead, the money goes only to money-lenders.
>
> Frankly, Congress has not been doing its duty in the area of monetary affairs. Congress should take action now to make sure that monetary matters are brought under the control of the people. Only a strong demand for action from the grass roots can bring this about.
>
> Let our congressional delegation know how you feel. They want to know your views.

Mr. Speaker, the almost unanimous opposition to high interest rates voiced by rural organizations is well understood. Tight money and extortionate interest rates have always plagued the farmer and the small towns of this country. They are always the first to be cut off from credit and the first to be hit with high interest charges.

Since 1950, the interest paid by farmers, per acre, on real estate debt has risen well over 300 percent. Offhand, I cannot think of another item in any sector of our economy that has increased more rapidly. While the interest charges went up more than 300 percent, the farmer received an increase of only 2.8 percent in the price paid for his farm products. With these figures in mind, I am surprised that the farmers and the rural citizens are not perched right on the steps of the Capitol demanding action.

I hope that the President looks at these tremendous increases in interest charges to farmers when he is considering whether or not Mr. Shepardson has really represented the agricultural sector of our economy.

Mr. Shepardson has shared fully Mr. Martin's views. If one goes, the other should follow if we really want to change the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I have quoted from a list of resolutions of farm and rural organizations concerning high interest rates. But I do not want, for a minute, to indicate that the outrage is limited to this sector. The opposition to the high-interest, tight-money policy covers the gamut of consumer-oriented organizations throughout this Nation.

The AFL–CIO, the United Auto Workers, and the Industrial Union Department have been particularly vocal in demanding action against tight money and for a more responsive Federal Reserve System. The labor organizations, like the farm organizations, recognize that their members cannot prosper if wage increases and fringe benefits are destroyed through the payment of extortionate interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a number of statements by labor leaders and labor organizations which plainly illustrate a very deep concern over the drift of monetary policy:

Last September 5, AFL–CIO President George Meany spoke over the Columbia Broadcasting System's radio network. Concerning interest rates, he said:

> Now the Federal Reserve Board, which has the responsibility for monetary policy—meaning the supply of money, and the cost of money—claims it is trying to correct this inflation. But it has been using the wrong device at the wrong time. The Federal Reserve Board has repeatedly pushed up interest rates, so that they are now the highest in 40 years, and likely to go higher. In fact, the cost of money has gone up faster than any other cost—33⅓%, or a full third, since last December.
>
> This has made matters worse instead of better. It has not slowed down the profit inflation at all. But it has made the cost of living even higher . . ."
>
> The whole economy is in danger because profits and interest rates have risen enormously while wages have barely kept pace with the cost of living, and in many instances have lagged behind it. An expanding economy—an economy where productive capacity is soaring, where manhour output is breaking records—demands a comparable growth in the real buying-power of American consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I also call attention to a statement issued by Walter Reuther following a meeting of the UAW International executive board last fall:

> Rising interest rates have also siphoned off part of the gains from increased worker productivity and, in addition, have added to living costs. From July 1965 to July 1966, the average interest rate on FHA new home mortgages increased from 5.44 to 6.45 percent—a rise of 18.6 percent. This adds $2700 to the interest cost of a $15,000 mortgage payable over 25 years. Prime interest rates charged by the banks to their most favored customers have risen 33⅓ percent in nine months. The prime rate affects other rates, increasing the interest cost of installment purchases as well as other forms of consumer credit. High interests rates and tight money also make it difficult for state and local governments and boards of education to finance needed expansion of public facilities. In addition, high interest rates raise production costs compelling competitive industries with thin profit margins to raise their prices, thus giving the inflationary spiral another twist.

Mr. Speaker, the concern over interest rates is not confined to the large international unions by any means. For example, I call attention to a recent letter which I received from the Jamestown AFL–CIO Central Labor Council of Jamestown, N. Dak.:

JAMESTOWN AFL–CIO CENTRAL
LABOR COUNCIL,
Jamestown, N. Dak., February 22, 1967.
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, House Banking and Finance Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: At our last meeting, a motion receiving unanimous approval, I was directed to write you, extending our thanks to you for your efforts to hold down interest rates and bring the Federal Reserve Board under Congressional control.

We are glad that you were able to take the time to participate in the recent Washington "Tight Money Conference".

We hope that Mr. Martin will not be reappointed to the Federal Reserve Board.

Very best wishes to you.

Sincerely yours,
ROY J. SHULER,
Secretary-Treasurer.
E. H. ECKLUND,
President.

Mr. Speaker, no group has been hit harder than the building trades, and this fact was plainly outlined in a statement issued by the executive council of the building and construction trades department, AFL–CIO, in November 1966:

> On December 5, 1965, the Federal Reserve Board arbitrarily increased its discount rate to member banks from 4% to 4½% (an increase of 12½% in the basic interest rate).
>
> At the same time, the FRB raised the permissible interest rate which commercial banks could pay on Certificates of Deposit to 5½%. Prior to this action, these certificates were held at 4% or 4½% depending on the length of deposit and the amount of the deposit.
>
> Some $16 Billion in this type of deposits were held by New York and Chicago banks on December 5, 1965. Almost the entire $16 Billion dollars would have been redeemable within four months after December 5, 1965. The New York and Chicago Banks feared that the monies would have been "called" for investment in other enterprises rather than renewal at the current rates. In taking this action, the money managers have set off what could be the "set back to the Great Society". They have seriously jeopardized all the fine legislation enacted by the 89th Congress.
>
> The immediate effect of these two actions was to start an interest spiral throughout every segment of our economy from the cost of the Federal debt, to the operation of the smallest retail establishment. The interest on the public debt has been increased 1 Billion Dollars annually by this action.
>
> The cost of financing state governments, local governments and school districts has increased proportionately and many have been forced to curtail or abandon much needed capital outlays for construction and equipment in education, roads, hospitals and sanitary facilities.
>
> Every segment of the private sector of our economy has been adversely affected by this action, taken in defiance of the President, the Congress, and the American people, by a board responsible to no one including the General Accounting Office and the Comptroller General.
>
> If this policy of tight money is allowed to continue, it will surely lead to an unnecessary recession or depression and will even have an adverse effect on our international relations.
>
> The construction industry, particularly the home building field, has already seriously felt the impact of the drying up of the money supply, residential housing starts in September 1966 were off on an annual average 400,000 (down about 35%) from September 1965 at an annual rate of 1,070,000 for the year as contrasted to 1,453,000 starts in 1965.

> Housing starts in the Washington area are down about 60% as compared to 1965 and only prime borrowers can obtain construction loans slightly below a 10% interest rate.
>
> This chaotic condition has developed in less than a year. Much of the housing construction listed as statistical starts was planned and funded well in advance of the Federal Reserve Board action. Cancellation of plans and lack of financing should make this picture more bleak in the building season of 1967. Unless drastic action is taken, the homebuilding field will be in deep depression with its accompanying unemployment and vicious cycle impact on the supporting industries. For example, a drop off in 400,000 homes means *no market for, no shipping of, no manufacturing of,* and *no installation of:* 1,880 million bricks, 920 million pounds of cement, 7,600,000 gallons of paint, 40 million square feet of linoleum floor covering, 44,400,000 square feet ceramic tile, 80 million square feet asphalt tile, 4 million squares of roofing shingles, 560 million square feet of wall and ceiling insulation, 5,600,000 window frames, 4,800,000 doors, 400,000 kitchen sinks, 624,000 water closets, 400,000 kitchen ranges, 508,000 bath tubs, 292,000 warm air furnaces, 10 million electric outlets, 4,400,000 electric switches, 128,000 garbage disposals, 1,920 million square feet of gypsum board & gypsum lath.
>
> This as one can see is only a partial list, in addition, there would be the streets, sewers, telephone lines and other accompanying installations.
>
> Then there is an average original occupancy expenditure calculated at $1,500 per house (or, in this estimate a total of $240 million) for furniture, appliances and other needs.
>
> These figures certainly should illustrate the impact that housing construction has on our economy. They should show the depressing effect the tight money policy has so quickly and drastically had on this industry which has always been considered as economic bellwether.
>
> If this policy of curtailing the money supply is allowed to continue, it will quickly affect the other phases of our industry, *public construction* (already dampened) *commercial construction* and *non-building construction* as well as the many and varying supporting industries. It will certainly create further severe unemployment in an industry which contributed to 11% of the total unemployment of the nation in 1965.
>
> The members of the Executive Council of the Building and Construction Trades Department and the officers of the 18 affiliated National Unions representing over 3½ million skilled construction craftsmen in 8,000 local unions in over 600 cities throughout the 50 states are deeply concerned with the administrations policy or lack of policy on monetary management.
>
> We are deeply concerned that the administration and the Congress have alluded to the feeling that monetary management and monetary understanding is a mystique understood only by bankers and bankers' bankers. We feel that it is time, in this year of the dynamic economy, to realize that sound monetary management is the greatest factor in bringing realization to the economic stability of our nation. To do this, we need planning, understanding, review and most of all, discussion of our present policies, all directed to updating and correllating our monetary policies with the objectives of our programs of the 1960s and beyond.
>
> We shall call on the members of the 90th Congress to give leadership in helping solve this problem.
>
> We shall call on every member of the House Banking and Currency Committee and the Senate Banking and Currency Committee to undertake hearings and research on methods to correct inequities in our monetary program which is now uncontrolled by the representatives of the people. We will ask these representatives to investigate the basis for the arbitrary control of money and banking by a few with no checks and balances, a procedure unheard of in any other section of public life.
>
> We shall ask for an immediate study of the detrimental effects of this administration's "tight" money policy on not only the construction industry, but also on all other facets of our economy.
>
> We shall further advise the AFL–CIO Executive Council of this action and request that they lend their full efforts and support of our position in this matter and that they direct their Legislative Department, Community Services Department, State and Local Council Department, all to lend their efforts to bringing the full support of their members and families in this undertaking.
>
> The Building and Construction Trades Department shall alert all of their State and Local Councils, their members, their families and friends to contact all groups in their localities, their city and county law makers, their state and congressional representatives and their Senators in an all out effort to bring full and frank discussion of this problem before all of their law making bodies and particularly the U.S. Congress so that an early and sensible solution to this problem may be achieved.
>
> We in the construction industry are being maneuvered into a depression. We realize that we will not go in alone. We know that every segment and sector of industry after industry will go with us. We can stop this now if we let our views be known. It is ridiculous to talk about a housing program and then allow money mismanagement to stop the construction of 400,000 houses. It is equally ridiculous to talk about schools, highway sewers, hospitals, clinics and then make their construction impossible because of the high cost of inflated money.

Mr. Speaker, the evidence is overwhelming that Mr. Martin and his ally, Mr. Shepardson, are the enemies of the great majority of the American people. Beyond a reasonable doubt, it can be shown that the policies of the Martin-Shepardson axis have benefited only an extremely narrow segment of our economy—primarily the big banking community.

As interest rates have increased steadily since 1951, bank earnings have skyrocketed. The two figures go side by side in sharply ascending curves on the chart. Since 1950, net annual earnings of banks, after taxes, have gone up from $781 million to $2.25 billion. This is an increase of 188 percent. During this same period, the Federal Reserve has jacked up the discount rate from 1.59 percent to 4.50 percent—an increase of 183 percent. The percentage increase is almost identical.

Without question, the bankers profit from high interest rates and this fact does not escape William McChesney Martin. For example, Mr. Speaker, I quote from the October 5, 1966, issue of the Journal of Commerce, which keeps a close watch on the banking community:

> It was apparent yesterday from the vanguard of reports that bank profits are still rising and for the nine months which ended September 20 will be from 15 per cent to 24 per cent ahead of earnings for the like 1965 period. Most of the earnings reports to date show net operating earnings at all-time record highs. The explanation for the most part is that income from loans at the highest interest rates in 40 years still is running ahead of the cost of money to banks represented by interest on deposits, now held down by the Federally imposed ceiling on such rates.

The Feburary issue of Burroughs Clearing House, a publication for bank and finance officers, once again reaffirms the theory that bank profits go up with interest rates:

> Despite a liquidity squeeze that reached near panic proportions, record interest payouts on savings deposits, and a bond market that saw many institutions unload securities at heavy losses, annual reports for 1966 streaming in from banks around the country disclose fat earnings gains over the previous year. Highpoints, they show, were reached in deposits, resources and, as would be expected, loans.

Mr. Speaker, it is also significant to take a look at the average annual yield on 91-day Treasury bills, which have become a growing source of funds for the U.S. Government. The yield in 1939 was only 0.023 percent. In the latter part of 1966, 91-day bills were yielding more than 4.8 percent. This means that the yields on short-term bonds have increased 200 times.

I place in the RECORD a chart showing the steady increase of interest paid on 91-day bills, and again, you will note that the big increases came after Martin and the Republicans took office in the 1950's:

Average annual yield on 91-day Treasury bills

[Percent]

Year:	*Yield*
1939	0.023
1940	.014
1941	.103
1942	.326
1943	.373
1944	.375
1945	.375
1946	.375
1947	.594
1948	1.040
1949	1.102
1950	1.218
1951	1.552
1952	1.766
1953	1.931
1954	.953
1955	1.753
1956	2.658
1957	3.267
1958	1.839
1959	3.405
1960	2.928
1961	2.378
1962	2.778
1963	3.157
1964	3.549
1965	3.954
1966	4.811

Source: U.S. Treasury Department.

Mr. Speaker, William McChesney Martin, more than any previous Chairman, has spread the false propaganda that the Federal Reserve System is somehow "independent" from the rest of the U.S. Government. This has been the bulwark of his defense for arbitrary and damaging decisions by the Federal Reserve. Mr. Martin has consistently maintained that monetary policy is his domain and no one else's. He has maintained that the public has no right to participate.

Unfortunately, during the 1950's he received the support of the then President, Dwight D. Eisenhower. President Eisenhower, either through ignorance of the facts or by design, went along with Mr. Martin's seizure of independence.

I have here a transcript of a press conference conducted by President Eisenhower on October 5, 1956. This transcript plainly illustrates that President Eisenhower joined Mr. Martin in promoting the false notion of "independence" for the Federal Reserve:

EXCERPT FROM PRESS CONFERENCE, OCTOBER 5, 1956

SARAH MCCLENDON (El Paso Times). Mr. President, we know that many communities want more school buildings, and we know you said you wanted to help them, I believe, on the partnership basis; but how can these communities build more school buildings when the cost of doing so would be a million or two higher as a result of the interest they would have to pay, as a result of your policies on high interest?

The PRESIDENT. What are my policies on high interest? You have not explained that.

Mrs. MCCLENDON. Well, the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve Board, under your administration, have contributed to raising interest rates all over the country.

The PRESIDENT. To what extent is the Federal Reserve Board under my control?

Mrs. MCCLENDON. Well, I would imagine—I don't know, sir, but I would imagine you would have some influence.

The PRESIDENT. The only thing I am getting at is don't start out with a premise that isn't quite correct.

The Federal Reserve Board is not under my control, and I think it is proper that the Congress did set it up as an independent agency.

Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower was sadly mistaken about the "independence." The Congress did not grant the independence to the Federal Reserve. The phrase "independent Federal Reserve" does not appear anywhere in the original Federal Reserve Act or in any of the amendments thereto. Such a theory is simply propaganda to support the arbitrary actions of William McChesney Martin.

It is significant to note the startling differences between President Truman and President Eisenhower in regard to their attitudes about the so-called independence of the Federal Reserve. President Truman did not agree that the Federal Reserve was an independent agency. He felt that monetary policy was a function and a responsibility of the Federal Government, and he did not abdicate to the pressures of the Federal Reserve.

In fact, President Truman declined to reappoint Marriner Eccles as Chairman of the Federal Reserve after Eccles took action to jack up short-term interest rates after World War II. President Truman wanted to put a stop to this action and he let his position be known by refusing the reappointment of Eccles. Mr. Eccles had done a good job of keeping interest rates down through World War II, but President Truman was entirely correct in removing him when he sought to reverse that policy in the postwar era. President Truman used his appointment powers wisely to promote the public interest.

President Truman kept a constant and close watch over monetary developments. During the Korean war, the pressure was on again to raise interest rates on long-term bonds. The bankers wanted that 2½-percent lid taken off. And there were strong indications that the people at the Federal Reserve, including Mr. Martin, were about to give in. President Truman called in the entire Federal Reserve and, in effect, read the riot act to them. He told them that they were not about to raise interest rates during the Korean conflict. This made the Federal Reserve Board mighty unhappy, but they had to go along and as a result the people of this country were saved billions of dollars.

Now again in the midst of the Vietnam conflict, the same pressures are on to jack interest rates up, even higher than their present record levels.

President Johnson is cut out of the same mold as President Truman and I know that he will do everything he can to resist these pressures.

President Johnson is up against a tough crowd. He is up against a very difficult situation that was really created back in the Eisenhower days when the Federal Reserve seized its "independence." That is why the Congress must give him every bit of support it can in overcoming the tremendous pressures.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve is today doing some fantastic things. One of the most blatant is its hoarding of $44 billion worth of U.S. Government bonds in the New York Federal Reserve Bank. These are bonds which the American taxpayers have already paid for once, but the Federal Reserve continues to demand annual interest on these bonds. This year, we will pay between $1.7 billion and $1.8 billion in interest despite the fact these bonds have been paid for. Of course, the Federal Reserve uses these interest payments to finance its farflung operations, including many questionable activities. At the same time, this $44 billion makes the national debt appear larger than it actually is. This $44 billion should be retired and subtracted from the debt. It has already been paid for.

Mr. Speaker, actually, what we have in this country is a money dictatorship. The Federal Reserve System does not resemble anything else in our democratic Government. Nothing else comes close to equaling the absolute autocratic powers of the Federal Reserve.

When you take a long hard look at the structure, you come to realize that the Federal Reserve System has been shaped along the lines of agencies that are usually found in totalitarian states.

Now, I am not by any stretch of the imagination accusing the Federal Reserve, any of its members, or any banker of being communistic. I want to make that point crystal clear.

However, the parallel between the setup for the Communist Party in Russia and the Federal Reserve System in the United States is startling.

In the Soviet Union, a tightly knit clique of the Communist Party runs everything, operating in total secrecy and with total disregard for the wishes of the people and the Russian Constitution.

In the United States, the monetary affairs are run by a tightly knit clique of bankers, within the Federal Reserve System, operating in total secrecy and with total disregard for the people and for the Constitution of the United States. In both countries, a small group of people have knowledge of, and benefit from, the decisions of these tightly knit cliques.

In the United States, monetary policy is basically controlled by the seven members of the Federal Reserve Board, the 12 presidents and the 108 directors of the 12 Federal Reserve banks. These 127 people, operating in a secretive manner have absolute power over monetary decisions.

In the Soviet Union, there are 133 members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. This is the group that runs everything in Russia.

Both the Federal Reserve System and the Communist Party in Russia also have a more elite group—a small supercommittee.

In the Federal Reserve System, this group is known as the Federal Open Market Committee, and is composed of the seven members of the Federal Reserve Board and five of the 12 presidents of the Federal Reserve banks—12 in all—with the other seven presidents participating.

In the Soviet Union, this is a small committee within the Central Committee known as the Politburo. This has 11 members compared with the Federal Open Market Committee's 12.

When the Federal Open Market Committee meets every 3 weeks in Washington, it goes behind locked doors. The shades are drawn, and the "Gestapo" is put out in the hall to guard against any possible intrusion by outsiders. We never know what goes on in these meetings—until 6 years later—after the statute of limitations has run on any crime that might have been committed. It is in these sessions that the monetary decisions, interest rates, and the money supply are decided. Not even the President of the United States can attend these secret sessions.

In the Soviet Union, the Politburo meets several times a month in Moscow in totally secret sessions. No one is allowed past the armed guards. Like the Federal Open Market Committee, the decisions of the Politburo are kept secret until the party decides to release the information.

In both the Soviet Union and in the Federal Reserve System, favors are dispensed to a select few.

The decisions of the Federal Open Market Committee on monetary affairs are made known to a handful of bankers and big business allies—perhaps as many as 2,000 to 3,000 people. They are the only ones who get this favored information and, of course, they are the ones who are in a position to profit from this knowledge.

In the Soviet Union, the Central Committee and the Politburo dispense favors to select members of the Communist Party. They get the advantages, the good housing, the cars, other special privileges and favored treatment.

The Communist Party takes care of its friends in Russia, and in the United States, the Federal Reserve takes care of its banker friends.

In both countries, the people are shut out. The people do not take part in the decisions and they do not benefit from them. Only an elite few get the benefit.

Now in the Soviet Union, we might expect this situation. It is a totalitarian state and it is not surprising that these decisions benefit the few and not the many. But in the United States, it is strange—and I believe tragic—that we have a Federal Reserve System that operates in the same manner as the Communist Party. It is out of step with our other democratic institutions. It is the rotten apple in our barrel of democracy.

Again, I want to say that I am not accusing anyone of being a Communist. But I am saying that both systems operate as dictatorships against the will of the people.

Mr. Speaker, both the Congress and the executive branch must do everything they can to correct this situation and to put our monetary policies back on the track. We must return our Federal Reserve System to the people of the United States. The elected representatives of the people—the Congress and the President—must exercise the proper control over these activities just as they do over other operations of the Federal Government. We cannot run from our responsibility.

President Johnson is today faced with many critical decisions. I know that he does not have an opportunity to spend as much time as he would like on monetary policies. This is why it is even more important that the Congress fully discharge its repsonsibility in this area.

However, I hope that the President will take time to carefully weigh the two appointments coming before him in the next few weeks.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I must state categorically that it is in the public interest for the President to refuse to reappoint William McChesney Martin as Chairman. By the same reasoning, it is essential that the President let Mr. Charles N. Shepardson retire from the Federal Reserve on April 30, and that he grant no special exception to civil service regulations.

The people of this country will be watching these two decisions closely.

Now, let me show the difference—and I am not accusing any Board member of being a Communist, or any banker of being a Communist, or anything like that—but totalitarian governments, whether they are communistic or Fascist, operate just the same as the Federal Reserve Board operates.

Let me give you some parallel comparisons. Let us pick up with Soviet Russia, a Communist country:

Comparison between totalitarian country and Federal Reserve System

COMMUNIST PARTY, SOVIET UNION	FEDERAL RESERVE, UNITED STATES
1. Seized Power.	1 Seized Independence.
2. Unelected.	2. Unelected.
3. Small Committee—*133 members*—of Communist Party controls.	3. Small Group—*127 members*—of Federal Reserve Board Members and Federal Reserve Bank Presidents control monetary decisions.
4. *11 Member Politburo*—Final Decision Maker.	4. *12 Member Federal Open Market Committee*—Final Decision Maker.
5. Operates in Total Secrecy.	5. Operates in Total Secrecy.
6. Party minutes released only when favorable to party.	6. Minutes secret until six years after meetings. Released before that only when favorable to Federal Reserve.
7. Decisions Benefit Communist faithful who have inside knowledge.	7. Decisions benefit comparatively small number of bankers who have inside knowledge.
8. Favored Treatment to Communist Elite.	8. Favored treatment to bankers and their allies.
9. Ignore Constitution of Soviet Union.	9. Ignore Constitution of the United States.
10. Can Refuse Credit to citizens of the country without reason—no appeal from refusal.	10. Can Refuse Credit to citizens of the United States without reason—no appeal from refusal.
11. Allocation of Credit at most reasonable rates to small percentage of Russians who are members of the Communist Party.	11. Allocation of Credit at most reasonable rates to big bankers, big business, and those who have inside knowledge.
12. Door of opportunity closed to 99% of the people in Russia on availability of credit and equality of opportunity to receive credit.	12. Door of opportunity and equality of opportunity to receive credit closed to most people in United States.

Now that shows a comparison between totalitarian governments, and communism in particular, and what is going on here in the United States of America in broad daylight in monetary policy. This is resulting in the people being robbed and robbed and robbed every day by excessive, extortionate, and usurious interest rates. It should not be allowed to go on further.

Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROCK. I had a couple of points, before the gentleman equated the Federal Reserve with the Communist Party.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not accuse them of being in the Communist Party. I do not accuse one of them being a Communist—none of them. But I am comparing how it works with the Communist Party workings in Soviet Russia. Now you can compare it with Spain and you will find the same thing in a Fascists country. Everywhere that you have a totalitarian government, you have something similar to the Federal Reserve Board of the United States.

Mr. BROCK. If the gentleman will let me pursue my question.

Is he charging the Federal Reserve with releasing privileged information to insiders as he implied in his statement?

Mr. PATMAN. You will have to repeat that and speak a little louder because I cannot hear you.

Mr. BROCK. Are you implying that the Federal Reserve System is covertly releasing privileged information to so-called insiders in banking circles as you seem to indicate?

Mr. PATMAN. Let us just presume for a moment that we are dealing with human beings—human beings who have a very selfish interest—human beings who like to make a profit. They like to make money. Among those human beings, you will find about the same percentage that are bad as compared to other groups.

Then when you consider that there are 12 Federal Reserve banks here in the United States—and under Woodrow Wilson they were autonomous and each operated for itself. But you people were against it—your side voted against it and did not want to do a thing about the Federal Reserve Board. But after it passed anyway, the bankers got in and got the help of our Republican friends and they commenced changing this Federal Reserve.

So instead of there being 12 Federal Reserve banks, it became one big central bank.

Woodrow Wilson was against a central bank. He did not want that. But the law that was passed originally was not a central bank.

But a fellow by the name of Mellon got to be Secretary of the Treasury and he had not any more than got his seat warm in 1921 before he commenced to get these 12 presidents of these 12 Federal Reserve banks to work with him. They let him have a small committee headed by the president of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, doing everything through the New York bank and engaging in open market operations for all the banks. They agreed to that. They agreed to it—Mr. Mellon being a powerful man. It is said that three presidents served under Andrew Mellon and I think that is a correct statement—he was a powerful man.

So they agreed that the president of the Federal Reserve bank in New York would control everything. Until this good day, no banker can make a condition statement—no Federal Reserve bank in Richmond, Philadelphia, Dallas, San Francisco, or Chicago, or any other place can make a statement of their condition until it gets the information from the New York Federal Reserve Bank because every bit of it is still there.

Now Mr. Mellon did not get to stay and see all this done, but he started it.

You know I spoke here in the well of this House in January 1932 and impeached the Honorable Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, for high crimes and misdemeanors. It was so startling and shocking to the members of the other party that they let me keep going until I went so far that they could not stop me. I had an hour's time before they could even make a motion to refer it to the committee. I outlined these high crimes and misdemeanors of which he was guilty and they referred the matter to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on the Judiciary had 3 weeks of hearings on my resolution.

I sat there on one side of the long table as a counsel would with that big committee up there in the Judiciary Committee room. Mr. Mellon and his 13 lawyers sat on the other side of the table—it was just a little bit unbalanced. But for 3 weeks I presented my side of the case. When it was over the chairman said, "The committee will stand adjourned until 1:30 this afternoon."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I have 10 additional minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none.

The gentleman is recognized for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. So we recessed until 1:30 that afternoon. That was about 11:30 in the morning. By 1 o'clock the newspapers were on the street bearing the headline, "Mellon Resigns; Quits Secretary's Office." He had been appointed to the Court of St. James's in England. That was the headline.

Mr. Mellon did not come back. He never denied those charges. It was equal to a pardon by the President, Mr. Hoover, in the middle of a trial. President Hoover was greatly criticized for sending Mellon out of the country. The committee wanted to go ahead and impeach him anyway. Mr. La Guardia, of New York, was one of those. He said, "Why not impeach him anyway? He has left. He won't stay with us. We will go ahead and impeach him."

But some members said, "He is out of the way. There is no use doing anything more about it. It will only take up our time."

Finally they decided to let it go. That is the way that happened. That is the reason Mr. Mellon was not around here when laws were passed that would carry in effect what he did commencing with Harding's administration.

I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. I should like to repeat the question that I asked some time ago: Is the gentleman, either directly or indirectly, implying that members of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors are giving privileged information to so-called "insiders" or "big bankers" for the purpose of their making a profit?

Mr. PATMAN. I will give you a further example that will answer that question. Take the example of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York—and it is really the Federal Reserve System. There are nine directors that run that bank. They select Mr. Hayes, the president, who receives $75,000 a year, really from the Treasury. That is where the money comes from. That is where it would go if it were not intercepted to pay him. He is the second highest paid officer in the United States, next only to the President of the United States. That is all right. If he is worth that amount of money, I am not kicking about the salary. But they employed him to run the bank for them. You know that he is going to run it like they want it run, because they are the ones who elected him. Six of them are selected by the banks. Six of the nine are selected by the banks.

Now, you know the man who gets that $75,000 job is going to do what those six men want. You know that. You know when he goes to an Open Market Committee meeting and he comes back—in fact he probably will not wait until he gets back—he will probably be on the telephone or communicating in some other way, through a coded system or in some other way. They will know exactly what has happened, because they want to know. That is what they are on that board for. There are nine of those directors who tell the 12 banks. That is 108. There are also some directors in branch banks that are appointed by the parent bank. So there are at least two or three thousand people, including economists, staff people, clerks, and people like that in all these different meetings—at least two or three thousand know what is going on.

Now, hold on to your seats. This will shock you. There is no law, rule, or regulation that prohibits any one of those people from capitalizing on the inside knowledge they have and profiting from it—nothing to keep them from it. That is a shocking thing.

Furthermore, they have so arranged it that they will not be worried about any audits. The General Accounting Office audits practically all Government agencies, but not the Federal Reserve. The General Accounting Office cannot do that. They cannot touch their books. So they are in a storm proof cellar with all modern conveniences. Thus two or three thousand people know this and, you know some of them will operate on it for their own interest, for the inside of their big companies. And they are big business people, and they want to do things that will help their companies the most. You would probably expect them to do it. Merely from a human-nature standpoint I think you would be justified in saying many would take advantage of that.

Mr. BROCK. I am somewhat distressed, I have to be honest. I understand that Chairman Martin, when he became Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board, sold every asset he had, so he would not be in a position of violating a trust. Yet the gentleman accuses Mr. Martin and he accuses the head of the New York bank, Mr. Hayes, of violating a public trust. I believe it is most unfortunate for the gentleman to come on the floor of the House, where he is totally free from any countercharge, and make a charge like this without documentation.

Mr. PATMAN. This is the first time I have heard about Mr. Martin's divestiture of stock. I am not questioning the gentleman's word. I am assuming it is true, but that does not excuse exonerating two or three thousand people and not stopping them from capitalizing on the inside knowledge they have. His experience on the New York Stock Exchange does not qualify him to be an impartial member of the Federal Reserve Board. I do not say he learned tricks there, but we do know there are slickers who have worked around the New York Stock Exchange. They learn how to do things. I am not saying Martin does it but he is not trying to stop any of the men around him. I am saying the facts are there and the people can assume these people would capitalize from that inside knowledge.

Mr. BROCK. I am sorry for the gentleman. It indicates he has a low regard for his fellow man.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not have low regard for my fellow man. I am against the people of this country having to pay $211 billion excessive interest. It is wrong. It is two-thirds as much as we spent for World War II. It is as much money as was spent by the U.S. Government from the time of George Washington through the third term of Franklin D. Roosevelt. That is how much $211 billion is. It is a lot of money. Now the gentleman wants to excuse a fellow who causes that expenditure and not even criticize him.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe any Member of this House appreciates high interest rates. There is not one of us who appreciates high interest rates.

Mr. PATMAN. I have never heard the gentleman say much against that.

Mr. BROCK. If there is any possible way that interest rates could be lowered without crucifying the poor people of this country with inflation, we would like to lower the interest rates.

Mr. PATMAN. The poor people of the country are not crucified by lower interest rates. They are helped by lower interest rates.

Mr. BROCK. When the economy is under severe pressure, lower interest rates can cause inflation. If they are forced down without regard to supply and demand.

Mr. PATMAN. We cause inflation when we raise the interest rates. When they raised interest rates 37½ percent, they raised the cost of everything. That was inflation. That was more inflation, not less. We might as well try to put out a fire with gasoline as to stop inflation with high interest rates.

Mr. BROCK. I am not arguing with the gentleman. He was here before I was even a gleam in my father's eye. I have great regard for the gentleman's sincerity, but I do not agree with his economic philosophy. The point I am making today, the point the gentleman did not answer, is that the President of the United States appoints members to the Federal Reserve Board, and no one else.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman repeat that?

Mr. BROCK. The President of the United States appoints members to the Federal Reserve Board, but that is not the real issue at this point in our discussion.

I believe it is terribly unfortunate that we should have trial by innuendo, without any documentation, on the floor of this House of Representatives, implying that men of good faith are in violation of public confidence and public trust.

Mr. PATMAN. Let me set the gentleman straight. I have very high regard for the gentleman. He is on my committee. I know we often disagree. There is nothing personal in this.

There is no innuendo in what I said. It is direct statement, direct charges, year by year. I can give the gentleman the year, I can give the gentleman the interest rates we paid, how much we paid, how much we should have paid if we had not had to pay extortionate rates. There is no innuendo used. The gentleman ought to strike the word "innuendo." I have made direct statements; $211 billion excessive interest has been paid because of William McChesney Martin and the people with him on the Board.

I have nothing to take back and no apology to make to anybody.

Mr. BROCK. The gentleman has implied that Mr. Martin and Mr. Hayes are in violation of public trust and have revealed privileged information. I want documentation.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman wants that pinpointed. Let me pinpoint that now.

I can pinpoint that. I will tell you other places they violate the public trust.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. SMITH of Iowa). There are other special orders.

Mr. PATMAN. I am awfully sorry. I will be here tomorrow. I have a special order for 1 hour tomorrow. If the gentleman wants to pursue this I will be here, and I will answer him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, on late last Thursday, March 2, because of circumstances beyond my control, I was not present during rollcall No. 28, which was on the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] to recommit H.R. 4515 to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions.

If I had been present, I would have voted "nay."

The reason is clear.

I dislike this war as much as any Member of this House. I did not want to see us get bogged down 10,000 miles from our shores, fighting any enemy who believed himself safe behind an imaginary line of safety.

I want to see the war in Vietnam settled in a lasting and honorable manner, so that our hundreds of thousands of American troops can return to their wives and children and parents and pick up some thread of a normal life.

But until the time comes when they can return with honor, I will not be a party to any move to deny them the means to carry out the mission they have been assigned. Many Americans are serving in Vietnam against their wishes. But, in the long and glorious tradition of our Armed Forces, they were serving valiantly. They are doing the job thrust upon them, without complaining, without whining.

In my opinion, it would be criminal to deny these men the means to attack the enemy at its source, to tell the enemy it can go about its business, that it will not be bothered in the assembly and transport of men and materials of war.

The people of my district would send me packing—and properly so—if I voted to provide the enemy a refuge from which our own troops would be threatened.

To me it would be less than honorable, less than right, less than human to vote to halt the destruction of the enemy's means to make war. I could not cast that vote and it is gratifying to see that the overwhelming majority of the Members also could not.

We can do no less than provide the utmost support for our troops.

COMMENDATION OF COAST GUARD FOR SEIZURE OF RUSSIAN FISHING VESSEL FOR VIOLATING U.S. TERRITORIAL WATERS OFF ALASKA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlemen from Alaska [Mr. POLLOCK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday afternoon, only a few weeks after the fishing agreement was concluded with the Soviet Union, the United States was compelled to resort to the unprecedented seizure of a Russian fishing vessel for violating U.S. territorial waters off the Alaska Peninsula. This is the first time that the Coast Guard has seized a Russian fishing vessel, and I want to warmly commend them for a swift and vigorous enforcement in this instance.

The Russian fishing vessel, the 178-foot stern trawler *SRTM 8–413,* was located by radar in the fog a mile south of Mitrofania Island, about 300 miles southwest of Kodiak.

I have been informed that the Coast Guard cutter *Storis* proceeded to the location of the violation, and that the Russian stern trawler jettisoned their fishing gear and departed immediately for the high seas. The *Storis* followed in hot pursuit and intercepted and seized the vessel 10 or 12 miles from shore.

The commander of the Russian fishing fleet protested the seizure and requested a conference on board the *Storis,* which was granted. The commander then requested permission to contact Vladivostok, and therefore requested a second conference. The commander then stated that he was not prepared to allow the Russian vessel to proceed under seizure. The Coast Guard captain informed the Soviet fleet commander that an armed prize crew was aboard the Russian stern trawler, and that it would proceed to Sand Point, either under its own power or be towed there if necessary.

The Coast Guard captain informed the commander that there would be no release of the vessel pending arraignment before a U.S. commissioner for the captain and approximately 30 crew members of the stern trawler.

In the recently concluded fisheries agreement the Soviet Union recognized the integrity of our 12-mile fishing zone, and already there is a violation. Full enforcement will not take effect until March 15, less than 2 weeks from now. Until then the United States contemplates no arrests for violation in the 9-mile zone beyond the 3-mile limit, but intends to escort violating vessels beyond the 12-mile limit. Nevertheless, the Russian stern trawler which was seized by the Coast Guard was sighted fishing within the 3-mile zone—1 mile from shore, in fact—although the interception, boarding, and seizure took place within the 9-mile zone.

The Coast Guard is to be commended for its swift, efficient action, and I surmise that this is but a forerunner of the vigorus enforcement which will be applied within the 12-mile limit after March 15.

I am shocked and astounded that the Soviet Union would permit such a violation of our territorial waters to occur. We must make it abundantly clear that we are not going to tolerate these illegal acts. We can best demonstrate our resolute intentions by demanding maximum penalties, including confiscation of the stern trawler and its gear and supplies and by a stiff fine and possibly the imprisonment of the captain of the vessel.

I call upon the Secretary of State to register a vigorous protest to the Soviet Union.

SUSAN B. ANTHONY AND JEANNETTE RANKIN

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues have joined with the gentlewoman from Ohio, the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, in celebrating the 140th birthday of Susan B. Anthony and the 50th anniversary of the seating of the first woman elected to the House of Representatives, the Honorable Jeannette Rankin.

Today there are 11 women serving in the House of Representatives. We are getting the benefit of their wisdom and experience and ideas because of the courage and dedication of Susan B. Anthony, Jeannette Rankin, and so many others.

My colleagues have aptly described the achievements of Miss Anthony and the Honorable Jeanette Rankin. Their courage and wisdom have become synonymous with freedom and democracy.

In the same vein and tradition, I would like to take this opportunity to mention our distinguished colleague, Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON. I have the honor and privilege of serving with Mrs. BOLTON on the Foreign Affairs Committee; Mrs. BOLTON is the outstanding minority leader of the committee. She has represented Ohio's 22d District since 1940, and was the first woman to be appointed Congressional Delegate to the United Nations. MRS. BOLTON became the first woman Member of Congress to head an official mission abroad, in 1947, when she took a subcommittee to the Near East.

While we are honoring the accomplishments of Susan B. Anthony and Jeannette Rankin, I believe it is appropriate and important to recognize the achievements of one of the great American women serving with us in the House of Representatives today. MRS. FRANCES P. BOLTON is carrying on where those who went before left off. She and our other distinguished Congresswomen on both sides of the aisles are the best evidence we can offer as to why this Nation is envied throughout the world in the way we have built the position of women in our society and benefited so greatly from it.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAMS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the laudable efforts we have been making in recent years to insure equality of right and opportunity for all our people, one important area of discrimination has been largely neglected. I refer to continuing discrimination against women. Because of this situation, I have introduced today a joint resolution to guarantee equal rights under the law for men and women through an amendment to the Constitution.

Although many of the grosser forms of discrimination on account of sex have been eliminated over the years, many less obvious forms remain which, in sum, constitute a serious handicap to women in a large number of States.

Discrimination for women still persists in such areas as property rights, the right to own and control one's earnings and, in some States, the right to serve on a jury.

That any of these discriminations should remain on the statute books at this late date is a shameful denial of the ideal of equality to which this Nation is dedicated.

It has been indicated by past experience that the only way women will achieve equal rights with men is through the passage of a constitutional amendment. This requires ratification by the States.

This amendment would also serve to grant equal rights to men in circumstances where discrimination exists, such as in the professions. I cite as an example the medical field, where only in recent years have men been admitted to some schools for nurses' training.

It is hoped that this Congress will approve this resolution to clarify the rights of both sexes.

SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, thanks in large part to the tireless efforts and leadership of my good friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, Senator HART, the legislation to establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore was approved in the Senate during the 89th Congress. This was the second consecutive Congress in which the Senate had passed a Sleeping Bear Dunes bill.

Unfortunately, we in the House have not been afforded the opportunity to vote on this important and needed conservation-recreation measure. Last year the bill became bogged down in the Committee on Rules, and we adjourned before it could be brought to the floor.

In 1966, however, the bill advanced further in the House than ever before. A version of it—somewhat different from that which had passed the Senate—was reported by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which, I am delighted to say, I am now a member.

I am pleased to be a new member of the Interior Committee for several reasons. For one, it gives me the opportunity to become more involved in legislation relating to conservation of natural resources and outdoor recreation development—two fields which are going to become increasingly important to the people of our country, particularly those who live in the urban and suburban sections of America. It is in these areas where population pressures are greatest and available land the scarcest.

Another more specific reason that I am happy to be a member of the Interior Committee, Mr. Speaker, is that I will be able to work more closely and hopefully, more effectively, on the Sleeping Bear Dunes Lakeshore bill which is so important to the people of Michigan and surrounding States.

Mr. Speaker, 1967 should be the year for Sleeping Bear. This picturesque area of Michigan on the northwest shore of our Lower Peninsula was specifically recommended by the President as a national lakeshore in his message to Congress on natural beauty on February 8, 1965. The dunes area lies in Benzie and Leelanau Counties, and I want to emphasize that it is within a 1-day drive for 20 million Americans who live in the Detroit-Chicago-Cleveland area. It is 240 miles from Detroit, 300 miles from Chicago, and 400 miles from Cleveland—to mention only three of the larger cities nearby.

This, in my opinion, is most important. We have here an opportunity to create a national lakeshore which would be within relatively easy access for a significant percentage of our total population. I hope, Mr. Speaker, we will take advantage of this opportunity.

In recommending approval of the Sleeping Bear bill last year, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs pointed out:

> The Sleeping Bear proposal is one of three—the other two being the Indiana Dunes and Pictured Rocks National Lakeshores—for areas on the Great Lakes reccomended by the committee during the 89th Congress in its effort to help the National Park Service catch up in that part of the country with the ever-increasing demands being made upon it by the American people.

To its credit, the 89th Congress accomplished two-thirds of the task laid out for it by the Interior Committee. The bills to set up the Indiana Dunes and Pictured Rocks National Lakeshores have been enacted. Now we have the chance to complete the picture this year by enacting into law the bill to establish the Sleeping Bear Lakeshore.

For the information of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD a description of the Sleeping Bear Dunes area from the 1966 report of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The description follows:

> The boundaries of the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore will encompass approximately 60,000 acres. These are made up of 40,800 acres on the mainland, the whole of South Manitou Island (5,300 acres), and the whole of North Manitou Island (about 14,000 acres). The new national lakeshore will have 64 miles of coastline—31 miles on the mainland, 13 miles on South Manitou Island, and about 20 miles on North Manitou Island.
>
> The lakeshore is located in Benzie and Leelanau Counties, Mich., on the northeastern shore of Lake Michigan. A population of 20 million lives within a 1-day drive of the area and 600,000 people live within 100 miles of it. From the lakeshore to Detroit is 240 miles, to Chicago 300 miles and to Cleveland 400 miles. Readily accessible by Michigan Highway 22, U.S. 31, and other roads, it has been estimated that, within 5 years after it is established, it will attract 1¼ million visitors more than now come to the area.

Mr. Speaker, my Michigan colleague, Senator HART, who has become so closely identified with this legislation in the past few years, is today introducing the Sleeping Bear Dunes bill in the Senate. I am delighted to sponsor companion legislation in the House. Our bills are identical to that which was reported last year by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to support this important conservation-recreation bill—H.R. 6616 and include the text at this point in the RECORD:

H.R. 6616

A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) in order ot stabilize and preserve for the benefit, inspiration, education, recreational use, and enjoyment of the public a significant portion of the diminishing shoreline of the United States and its related geographic and scientific features, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to take appropriate action, as herein provided, to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

(b) In preserving the lakeshore and stabilizing its development, substantial reliance shall be placed on cooperation between Federal, State, and local governments to apply sound principles of land use planning and zoning. In developing the lakeshore full recognition shall be given to protecting the private properties for the enjoyment of the owners.

SEC. 2. The area comprising that particular land and water described in section 12 of this Act and generally depicted in a map identified as NPS–101B–SB, dated July 1966, which is on file in the office of the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior, is hereby designated for establishment as the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

SEC. 3. As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act and following the acquisition by the Secretary of all lands owned by the State of Michigan within the boundaries of the area designated for inclusion in the lakeshore and of such additional lands, if any, as are necessary to provide an area which in his opinion is efficiently administrable for the purposes of this Act, he shall establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register.

SEC. 4 (a) There is hereby established a Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore Advisory Commission. The Commission shall cease to exist ten years after the establishment of the lakeshore pursuant to section 3 of this Act.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of ten members, each appointed for a term of two years by the Secretary, as follows:

(1) Four members to be appointed from recommendations made by the counties in which the lakeshore is situated, two members to represent each such county;

(2) Four members to be appointed from recommendations made by the Governor of the State of Michigan; and

(3) Two members to be designated by the Secretary.

(c) The Secretary shall designate one member to be Chairman. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) A member of the Commission shall serve without compensation as such. The Secretary is authorized to pay the expenses reasonably incurred by the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act on vouchers signed by the Chairman.

(e) The Secretary or his designee shall consult with the Commission with respect to matters relating to the development of the lakeshore and with respect to the provisions of sections 9, 12(f), and 13 of this Act.

SEC. 5. In administering the lakeshore the Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on lands and waters under his jurisdiction in accordance with the laws of the State of Michigan and the United States applicable thereto. The Secretary, after consultation with the Michigan Department of Conservation, may designate zones and establish periods where and when no hunting shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, or public use and enjoyment and issue regulations, consistent with this section, as he may determine necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

SEC. 6. (a) The administration, protection, and development of the lakeshore shall be exercised by the Secretary, subject to the provisions of this Act and of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented, relating to the areas administered and supervised by the Secretary through the National Park Service; except that authority otherwise available to the Secretary for the conservation and management of natural resoures may be utilized to the extent he finds such authority will further the purposes of this Act.

(b) In the administration, protection, and development of the area, the Secretary shall prepare and implement a land and water use management plan, which shall include specific provisions for—

(1) development of facilities to provide the benefits of public recreation;

(2) protection of scenic, scientific, and historic features contributing to public enjoyment; and

(3) such protection, management, and utilization of renewal natural resources as in the judgment of the Secretary is consistent with, and will further the purpose of, public recreation and protection of scenic, scientific, and historic features contributing to public enjoyment.

(c) In developing the lakeshore the Secretary shall provide public use areas in such places and manner as he determines will not diminish the value or enjoyment for the owner or occupant of any improved property located thereon.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as prohibiting any governmental jurisdiction in the State of Michigan from assessing taxes upon any interest in real estate retained under the provisions of section 10 of this Act to the owner of such interest.

SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary is authorized, subject to the limitations, conditions, and restrictions imposed by this Act, to acquire the land, water, and other property, and improvements thereon, and any interests therein (including easements) comprising the area defined in section 12 of this Act by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, transfer from any Federal agency, exchange, or condemnation; except that such authority to acquire by condemnation shall be exercised only in the manner and to the extent specifically authorized in this Act.

(b) In exercising his authority to acquire property under this Act, the Secretary shall give immediate and careful consideration to any offer made by an individual owning property within the lakeshore to sell such property to the Secretary. An individual owning property within the lakeshore may notify the Secretary that the continued ownership by such individual of that property would result in hardship to him, and the Secretary shall immediately consider such evidence and shall within one year following the submission of such notice, subject to the availability of funds, purchased such property offered for a price which does not exceed its fair market value.

(c) Any property or interests therein, owned by the State of Michigan or any political subdivisions thereof, may be acquired only by donation. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any property owned by the United States on the date of enactment of this Act located within such area may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without consideration to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for use by him in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

(d) With respect to that property which the Secretary is authorized to acquire by condemnation under the terms of this Act, the Secretary shall initiate no condemnation proceedings until after he has made every reasonable effort to acquire such property by negotiation and purchase.

(e) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit the use of condemnation as a means of acquiring a clear and marketable title, free of any and all encumbrances.

(f) In exercising his authority to acquire property by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property within the area designated for inclusion within the lakeshore and in exchange therefor he may convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under his jurisdiction which he classifies as suitable for exchange or other disposal and which lies within the State of Michigan. The values of the properties so exchanged either shall be approximately equal or, if they are not approximately equal, the values shall be equalized by the payment of cash to the grantor or to the Secretary as the circumstances require. The Secretary shall report to the Congress on every exchange carried out under the authority of this Act within thirty days from its consummation; and each such report shall include a statement of the value of the properties involved and of any case in which equalization payments are made or received.

SEC. 9. (a) The Secretary shall, at the request of any township or county in or adjacent to the lakeshore affected by this Act, assist and consult with the appropriate officers and employees of such township or county in establishing zoning bylaws for the purpose of this Act. Such assistance may include payments to the county or township for technical aid.

(b) No improved property within the area designated for inclusion in the lakeshore shall be acquired by the Secretary by condemnation so long as the affected county or township has in force and applicable thereto a duly adopted, valid zoning bylaw approved by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d) of this section and the use of improved property is in compliance herewith. In the event that the affected county or township does not have in effect and applicable to any improved property a duly adopted, valid zoning bylaw so approved, the Secretary shall be prohibited from acquiring such property by condemnation, if the owner thereof notifies the Secretary in writing of such owner's agreement to use his property in a manner consistent with the applicable standard set forth in subsection (d) of this section, and such prohibition against condemnation shall remain in effect for so long as such property is so used.

(c) If the Secretary determines that any such property referred to in subsection (b) of this section covered by any such bylaw is being used in a way which is not in substantial compliance with such bylaw, or that any such property referred to in subsection (b) with respect to which an agreement has been made is being used in a manner which is not substantially consistent with such applicable standards, he shall so notify the owner of any such property in writing. Such notice shall contain a detailed statement as to why the Secretary believes that such use is not in substantial compliance with such zoning bylaw or why such use is not substantially consistent with such applicable standards, as the case may be. Any such owner shall have sixty days following the receipt by him of that written notification within which to discontinue the use referred to in such notification. Discontinuance of such use within such sixty-day period shall have the effect of prohibiting the Secretary from acquiring such property by condemnation by reason of such use. In any case in which such use is not discontinued within such sixty-day period, the Secretary may, in his discretion, acquire such property by condemnation.

(d) Any zoning bylaw or amendment thereto submitted to the Secretary for approval for the purposes of this Act shall be approved by him if such bylaw or amendment contains provisions which—

(1) contribute to the effect of prohibiting the commercial and industrial use (other than a use for a commercial purpose as authorized under section 13 of this Act) of all property within the boundaries of such area which is situated within the county or township adopting such bylaw or amendment;

(2) are consistent with the objectives and purposes of this Act so that, to the extent possible under Michigan law, the scenic and scientific values of the lakeshore area will be protected;

(3) are designed to preserve the lakeshore character of the area by appropriate restrictions upon the burning of cover, cutting of timber (except tracts managed for sustained yield), removal of sand or gravel, and dumping, storage, or piling of refuse and other unsightly objects or other uses which would detract from the natural or traditional lakeshore scene;

(4) provide that no construction, reconstruction, moving, alteration, or enlargement of any property, including improved property as defined in this Act, within the lakeshore area shall be permitted, if such construction, reconstruction, moving, alteration, or enlargement would afford less than a 50-foot setback from all streets measured at a right angle with the street line, and a 25-foot distance from the abutters' property lines. Any owner or zoning authority may request the Secretary of the Interior to determine whether a proposed move, alteration, construction, reconstruction, or enlargement of any such property would subject such property to acquisition by condemnation, and the Secretary, within sixty days of the receipt of such request, shall advise the owner or zoning authority in writing whether the intended use will subject the property to acquisition by condemnation; and

(5) have the effect of providing that the Secretary shall receive notice of any variance granted under and of exception made to the application to such bylaw or amendment.

(e) The approval of any bylaw or amendment pursuant to subsection (d) shall not be withdrawn or revoked by the Secretary for so long as such bylaw or amendment remains in effect as approved. Any such bylaw or amendment so approved shall not be retroactive in its application.

SEC. 10. (a) Any owner or owners of improved property situated within the area designated for inclusion in the lakeshore on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition to such acquisition, retain, for a term of not to exceed twenty-five years, or for a term ending at the death of such owner or owners, the right of use and occupancy of such property for any residential purpose which is not incompatible with the purposes of this Act or which does not impair the usefulness and attractiveness of the area designated for inclusion. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the value of the property on the date of such acquisition, less the value on such date of the right retained by the owner. Where any such owner retains a right of use and occupancy as herein provided, such right during its existence may be conveyed or leased for uncommercial residential purposes in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(b) Any deed or other instrument used to transfer title to property, with respect to which a right of use and occupancy is retained under this section, shall provide that such property shall not be used for any purpose which is incompatible with purposes of this Act, or which impairs the usefulness and attractiveness of such area and if it should be so used, the Secretary shall have authority to terminate such right. In the event the Secretary exercises his power of termination under this subsection he shall pay to the owner of the right terminated an amount equal to the value of that portion of such right which remained unexpired on the date of such termination.

SEC. 11. As used in this Act, the term "improved property" means a detached, one-family dwelling, construction of which was begun before December 31, 1964, together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is situated, such land being in the same ownership as the dwelling, as the Secretary shall designate to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling for the sole purpose of noncommercial residential use, together with any structures accessory to the dwelling which are situated on the lands so designated. The amount of the land so designated shall in every case be at least three acres in area, or all of such lesser acreage as may be held in the same ownership as the dwelling, and in making such designation the Secretary shall take into account the manner of noncommercial residential use in which the dwelling and land have customarily been enjoyed: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary may exclude from the land so designated any beach or waters on Lake Michigan, together with so much of the land adjoining any such beach or waters, as the Secretary may deem necessary for public access thereto. If the Secretary makes such exclusion, an appropriate buffer zone shall be provided between any residence and the public access or beach.

SEC. 12. The Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore shall consist of the following described areas, together with adjacent waters:

SOUTH MANITOU ISLAND

(a) All of an island in Lake Michigan officially designated as South Manitou Island lying in townships 30 and 31 north, range 15 west, and adjacent waters for one-quarter mile offshore.

NORTH MANITOU ISLAND

(b) All of an island in Lake Michigan officially designated as North Manitou Island lying in townships 31 and 32 north, ranges 14 and 15 west, and adjacent waters for one-quarter mile offshore.

GOOD HARBOR—SLEEPING BEAR BAY AREA

(c) Beginning on the shore of Lake Michigan at the northern line of section 6, township 29 north, range 12 west, and continuing east along said line to the east line of said section and thence south along the said east boundary to the south boundary of said section, thence west along said boundary to the north-south quarter section line of section 7, township 29 north, range 12 west,

thence south along said quarter section line to the east-west quarter section line of said section, thence west along said quarter section line and east-west quarter section line of section 12, township 29 north, range 13 west to the north right-of-way of a public road following the north shore of Little Traverse Lake,

thence in a general westerly direction along said right-of-way to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the southwest quarter of section 10, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence south to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 22, township 29 north, range 13 west,

thence west along the north boundary of said section to the northwest corner of the section, thence south along the west boundary of said section to the east-west quarter-quarter line of the northeast quarter of section 21, township 29 north, range 13 west,

thence west to the west boundary of said section, thence north to the northeast corner of section 17, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence west to the northwest corner of section 18, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence south to the southeast corner of section 24, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence west along the south boundary of said section to the east right-of-way of county highway 675, thence continuing northwesterly along said right-of-way to the projected intersection of the west right-of-way of a north-south county road in the northwest quarter, southwest quarter of section 24,

thence southerly along the said right-of-way to the south line of section 24, thence west to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the southwest quarter of section 23, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence north to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of said quarter section, thence east to the north-south quarter section line of said section,

thence north to the south boundary of section 14, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence east along said south boundary to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the southeast quarter of said section,

thence north to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter of said section, thence west 660 feet, thence north to the north boundary of said section, thence west along said boundary to the shore of Lake Michigan,

thence offshore one-quarter mile perpendicular to the shore, thence along said shore in a general easterly direction at a distance of one-quarter mile perpendicular to the shore to a point one-quarter mile offshore perpendicular of the point of beginning, thence in a straight line to the point of beginning.

GLEN ARBOR AREA

(d) Beginning on the shore of Lake Michigan at a point 1,491 feet due east of the west boundary of section 21, township 29 north, range 14 west and running south to the south boundary of said section, thence running east to north-south quarter-quarter section line of the northwest quarter section of section 27, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence south to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of said quarter section, thence east to the west right-of-way of monument 22, thence south along said west right-of-way to the north line of section 34, township 29 north, range 14 west.

thence west along the north line of section 34 to a point which is 400 feet west of the northeast corner of Government lot 1, section 34, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence south 200 feet, thence west 430 feet, thence south 805 feet,

thence west 485 feet more or less to the west line of Government lot 1, thence south on the west line of Government lot 1 to the southwest corner of Government lot 1, thence east 144 feet more or less to a point 661.49 feet west of the northeast corner of Government lot 2, section 55, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence south 8 degrees 45 minutes west 131.9 feet, thence north 81 degrees 02 minutes west 335.0 feet, thence south 8 degrees 45 minutes west 100 feet, thence south 30 degrees 37 minutes west 149 feet, thence south 89 degrees 38 minutes west 225.0 feet,

thence south 18 degrees 13 minutes west 235 feet, thence north 71 degrees 30 minutes west 45 feet, thence south 18 degrees 30 minutes west 450 feet,

thence south 71 degrees 30 minutes east 400 feet, thence south to the south line of Government lot 2, thence east on the south line of Government lot 2 to a point 418.35 feet east of Glen Lake on the south line of Government lot 2,

thence south 15 degrees 43 minutes west 100 feet, thence west 50 feet, thence south 2 degrees 59 minutes west 1,100.12 feet, thence west 43.1 feet, thence south 200 feet, thence west 50 feet, thence south 775 feet, thence west 225 feet, thence south 434 feet to the south line of section 34, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence west along the south line of section 34 to the east line of section 4, thence south along said east line to the north right-of-way of Forest Glen Road,

thence northwesterly along the north right-of-way of said public road to the north line of section 32, thence west along the north line of section 32 to the shore of Glen Lake,

thence continuing northwesterly along the shore of Glen Lake from the intersection of the shore of Glen Lake with the south line of section 29, township 29, north, range 14 west, to a point of intersection of the shore of Glen Lake with the east line of Government lot 2,

thence north along the east line of Government lot 2 to the south sixteenth latitudinal line, thence west along the south sixteenth latitudinal line to its intersection with the west line of Government lot 2, section 29, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence south on the west line of Government lot 2 to the shore of Glen Lake,

thence westerly and southerly along the shore of Glen Lake to a point 664.57 feet east and 1,308.75 feet north of the southwest corner of Government lot 1, section 29, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence north 89 degrees 39 minutes west 236.33 feet to the east right-of-way of Michigan Highway 109,

thence southerly along the east right-of-way to a stake on the east right-of-way of monument 109 located north 345.5 feet and north 89 degrees 12 minutes east 1,190 feet from the northwest corner of Government lot 1, section 31, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence from stake on east right-of-way of monument 109 north 89 degrees 12 minutes east 229.5 feet, thence south 18 degrees 03 minutes west 400.0 feet,

thence south 89 degrees 12 minutes west 1,242.0 feet to the west line of Government lot 1, section 31, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence south along the west lines of Government lots 1, 2 and 3, section 31, to the southwest corner of Government lot 3,

thence east on south line of Government lot 3 to the west right-of-way of monument 109, thence southeasterly along the west right-of-way to its intersection with the north line of section 5, township 28 north, range 14 west, thence east along the north line of section 5 to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 5,

thence by a straight line in a southeasterly direction to the intersection of the east line of section 5, township 28 north, range 14 west, and the south right-of-way of a public road lying on the south line of Government lot 5,

thence east along south right-of-way of said public road to its intersection with Michigan Highway 22,

thence east across Michigan Highway 22 to the south right-of-way, thence northeasterly along Michigan Highway 22 to a point 476.5 feet west and 1,519.0 feet north of the southeast corner of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 4,

thence south 400 feet, thence east 476.5 feet, thence north on the east line of the southeast quarter southwest quarter, section 4, to a point of intersection with the south sixteenth latitudinal line,

thence east on the south sixteenth latitudinal line to a point on the west boundary of a cemetery which point is north 89 degrees west 222.75 feet from the intersection of the south sixteenth latitudinal line with the east line of section 4,

thence south to the southwest corner of said cemetery, thence south 89 degrees east 222.75 feet to the west line of section 4, thence continuing east on the same bearing 33 feet more or less to east right-of-way of a public highway,

thence north to a point 554.2 feet south and 33 feet east of the meander corner at the north end of the west line of section 3, township 28 north, range 14 west, thence east 233.0 feet, thence north 374.14 feet to centerline of a public highway, thence south 69 degrees 55 minutes east 49.01 feet,

thence north 0 degree 47 minutes west 11.3 feet, thence east to north right-of-way of said public highway, thence southeasterly along north right-of-way of said highway to its intersection with the south right-of-way of a private road listed on the plot of McFarlane Woods numbered 2 as Beech Tree Road,

thence southeasterly along the south right-of-way of Beech Tree Road to the northeast corner of lot numbered 14 of McFarlane Woods numbered 2, thence north 37 degrees 24 minutes east of the shore of Glen Lake, thence southeasterly along the shore of Glen Lake to a point 1,850 feet due east of the west line of section 11,

thence south to the east-west quarter section line of section 14, thence west to the shore of Lake Michigan and east-west quarter section line, section 13, township 28 north, range 15 west,

thence continuing due west to a point one-quarter mile offshore, thence northerly and following along the shore at a perpendicular distance of one-quarter mile offshore to a point perpendicular to the point of beginning,

thence in a straight line to the point of beginning.

PLATTE BAY AREA

(e) Beginning on the shore of Lake Michigan at a point 700 feet due north of the south corporate line of the Village of Empire,

thence east to a point on the east said corporate line, 700 feet north of the southeast corner of said corporate line,

thence north to the north line of section 30, township 28 north, range 14 west, thence east to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter section of said section,

thence south to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of said section, thence east to the east line of said section, thence south to the southeast corner of said section, thence west to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter of section 31, thence south to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter of section 19, township 27 north, range 14 west,

thence west to a point 500 feet perpendicular to, in a general easterly direction, Michigan Highway 22 and continuing along 500 feet from Michigan Highway 22 in a general westerly direction to a point 1,500 feet west of the east line of section 31, township 27 north, range 15 west, thence north to the southerly right-of-way of Michigan Highway 22,

thence westerly along said right-of-way to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter of section 36, township 27 north, range 16 west, thence south to the east-west quarter section line of said section, thence east to the shore of Long Lake, thence southeasterly along the shore to the east line of said section,

thence south to a point 1,000 feet south of the south line of said section, thence west to the west line of section 1, township 26 north, range 16 west, thence north to the shore of Lake Michigan, thence perpendicular to the shore one-quarter mile,

thence following along the shore at a perpendicular distance of one-quarter mile to a point one-quarter mile offshore and due west to the point of beginning, thence in a straight line to the point of beginning.

SCENIC PARKWAY

(f) (1) In order to facilitate visitor travel, provide scenic overlooks for public enjoyment and interpretation of the national lakeshore and related features, and in order to enhance recreational opportunities, the Secretary is authorized to construct and administer as a part of the national lakeshore scenic roads of parkway standards generally located in accordance with the location description in paragraph (2) and lying within the parkway zone designated on map numbered NPS-101B–SB, dated July 1966. Such scenic roads shall include necessary connections, bridges, and other structural utilities. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary may procure for this purpose land, or interest therein, by donation, purchase with appropriated or donated funds, or otherwise: *Provided*, That land and interests so procured shall not exceed one hundred and fifty acres per mile of scenic road, except that tracks may be procured in their entirety in order to avoid severances. Property so acquired in excess of the acreage limitation provided in this section may be exchanged by the Secretary for any land of approximately equal value authorized for acquisition by this Act.

(2) The scenic roads authorized in paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be located in accordance with the following generally described route, in three segments:

GLEN LAKE TO EMPIRE BLUFF SEGMENT

From the national lakeshore in section 7, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence meandering southerly through section 18 and portions of sections 13 and 24, township 29 north, range 14 west, to the top of the morainal bluff overlooking Glen Lake and Sleeping Bear Bay.

thence continuing through sections 19, 30, 31 and 32, township 29 north, range 13 west, and crossing the Burdickville, Maple City Road in section 5, township 28 north, range 13 west, continuing past Bow Lake through sections 8, 7, and 18, with a spur into the kettle region of section 17,

thence continuing westerly through township 28 north, range 14 west, including sections 13, 14, 15, and 22 with an entrance and contact station in section 23, crossing M72 into sections 26 and 27,

thence traversing the rim of an ancient glacial drainage channel through sections 28, 33, 32 and 31, township 28 north, range 14 west, and section 5, township 27 north, range 14 west, meeting the national lakeshore section 36, township 28 north, range 14 west.

GLEN ARBOR SEGMENT

A shore segment connecting the Glen Haven portion of the national lakeshore with the Pyramid Point portion, traversing parts of sections 27 and 26, township 29 north, range 14 west.

PLATTE LAKE SEGMENT

A scenic drive overlooking the Platte Lakes and Crystal Lake Embayments, connecting the national lakeshore to U.S. 31 and traversing sections 12, 11, 10, 9, 4 and 5, township 26 north, range 15 west, and section 32, township 27 north, range 15 west, with an alternate spur through section 6, township 26 north, range 15 west.

SEC. 13. In any case not otherwise provided for in this Act, the Secretary shall be prohibited from condemning any commercial property used for commercial purposes in existence on December 31, 1964, so long as the use thereof would further the purposes of this Act, and such use does not impair the usefulness and attractiveness of the area designated for inclusion in the lakeshore. The following uses, among others, shall be considered to be uses compatible with the purposes of this Act: Commercial farms, orchards, motels, rental cottages, camps, craft and art studios, marinas, medical, legal, architectural, and other such professional offices, and tree farms.

SEC. 14. The Secretary shall furnish to any interested person requesting the same, a certificate indicating, with respect to any property which the Secretary has been prohibited from acquiring by condemnation in accordance with provisions of this Act, that such authority is prohibited and the reasons therefor.

SEC. 15. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $10,810,000 for the acquisition of lands and interests in lands and not to exceed $14,500,000 for the development of the lakeshore.

EVERY CONSUMER IS INDEBTED TO ESTHER PETERSON

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. Sullivan] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the President announced over the weekend the appointment of Betty Furness, one of the best known women in the United States, to succeed Mrs. Esther Peterson as his special assistant for consumer affairs, and I am sure Miss Furness will do an outstanding job. She is an extremely capable person, and knowledgeable about issues of importance to the home although, of course, she will have much to learn about the legislative process and about the operations of Government agencies. I will certainly extend every possible help to her in becoming familiar with her new duties, and I am sure all of the other members of the Subcommittee on Consular Affairs of the Committee on Banking and Currency join me in that.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend Mrs. Peterson for one of the most effective performances of any official of Government in a most difficult position, which she assumed 3 years ago with no precedents to follow—just her own excellent judgment and a warm interest in the people of this country and in their problems. I am proud of the work she has done in alerting consumers of this country to the avenues open to them to seek redress of their grievances—and they are many.

Mrs. Peterson has been handling two full-time positions in the Government during these past 3 years, and has done both of them remarkably well. But all of us close to the consumer movement recognized that it was not fair to this hard-working woman to keep her continually at two full-time jobs. The consumer position deserves the full energies of its incumbent, and so does the position Mrs. Peterson holds as Assistant Secretary of Labor. I intend to continue to call on her for guidance and advice on all subjects in which she is expert, and that is a great many.

Mr. Speaker, Esther Peterson has earned the gratitude of every consumer in this country. Each citizen is in her debt for what she has done in publicizing consumer issues and in leading the way to long-sought reforms. Many businessmen who attacked her may not have realized it but in many respects she has been one of the best friends competitive free enterprise has ever had, by insisting that American business has all the talent and initiative necessary to provide the public with safe, reliable, effective products which represent good value for the customer's dollars. I think that is all that most of us in the consumer movement really seek.

I congratulate Esther Peterson on a job exceedingly well done, and I congratulate her successor, Betty Furness, for her willingness to take on so difficult an assignment at the request of the President.

FOOD FOR INDIA

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, later this week the House will consider a resolution establishing the sense of Congress with respect to food aid for India this year. This is a vital matter, not only for India, but for the United States and I sincerely hope that all of our colleagues will give careful consideration to the resolution and to testimony given last week during hearings held by the Committee on Agriculture.

In this regard, I present herewith for inclusion in the Record, the statement I made before the Committee on Agriculture on March 1:

Statement of Congressman Richard L. Ottinger, 25th District, New York, at Hearings of House Committee on Agriculture on House Joint Resolution 262, To Provide Emergency Food Relief for India, Wednesday, March 1, 1967

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have this opportunity to appear before the Committee on Agriculture in support of a desperately needed program of food assistance to India during the balance of 1967. I want to commend the Chairman and the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Dole, for a thoughtful and keen analysis of the situation based upon their special trip to India last December at the request of the President.

I will not take the Committee's valuable time in a lengthy analysis of the food crisis in India, for it has first-hand reports from its members and detailed information both from the Administration and the Government of India. I would simply like to make these essential points:

1. India has not recovered from the drought of 1965 which held food grain production to 72 million tons, a drop of 16 million from the previous year. Not only was much of India's food reserve used up in 1966, but a dry spell in the northern and central states sharply curtailed current production to the point where the original estimate of 90 million tons has been reduced to about 79 million. Those figures tell a bleak story, especially when we consider that India's population is increasing at the rate of 12 million a year.

2. India has taken positive steps to increase agricultural production, and while these measures represent only a start, they stand as solid evidence that the Government of India is very much aware of the food crisis and is prepared to meet it. I would like to present for the record a letter I received from the Department of Agriculture in response to my request for a report it had made on self-help measures undertaken by India. It is significant that the findings of our USDA are in substantial agreement with those of the World Bank, which made a similar study.

3. It is obvious that neither India's self-help measures to increase agricultural productivity nor her efforts to reduce population growth will have a total effect in the next decade.

4. India has sought and received assistance from nations other than the United States, and has not relied merely on grants of food grains from these countries, but has purchased wheat and other grains from the United States and Australia.

These factors were given full recognition by President Johnson in his message to Congress on February 2.

I am sure that most of the Congress as well as most Americans join me in endorsing the President's proposals for a joint approach by a consortium of "have" countries in helping India meet her food problems. Certainly, if the "have" nations are to assure that the population explosion in the "have not" nations doesn't result in massive starvation the cooperation of all "have" nations will be needed. The United States cannot and should not bear the burden alone.

I support the President's proposals for sharing the food-deficit burdens, but with the understanding that the President does not intend to lock in the United States position to such an extent that starvation of Indian children becomes the principal bargaining tool to obtain contributions from other "have" countries. I am sure it could not be the President's intention to create this unfortunate situation either by setting maximum levels of U.S. food contributions unrealistically low or by applying a rigid requirement that the U.S. will not contribute more food than is matched by other consortium nations. I suspect, however, that the language of the resolution (H. J. Res. 262) read literally, might create such rigidities.

I call your attention to that portion of the resolution which states that the Congress endorses the President's policy of "equal" participation on the part of the United States with all other nations in helping India to meet its food needs, and also to the ceiling of three million tons of food grain the United States is authorized to provide, over and above the 3.6 million tons already committed.

Assuming the other nations in the India aid consortium organized by the World Bank match our three million ton commitment—an assumption which may not be justified—the total outside aid to India in 1967 would amount only to 9.6 million tons of food grain, which is below even the most conservative estimate of the amount India must import this year. Last August, the Indian Government drew up an import program calling for 10 million tons of food grains for the period from November, 1966 to December, 1967, but this was based on expectations for a normal crop year in which production would exceed 90 million tons. It is obvious now that India's food grain production may not even reach 80 million. In view of this, I fear that the limitation on the U.S. commitment in H.J. Res. 262 may be grossly unrealistic.

Of equal importance is the highly restrictive language one finds in the resolution with respect to "equal" sharing of India's food burden. By insisting on "equal" participation in meeting India's food needs, do we intend that the United States be relieved of its obligations should the consortium nations be unable or unwilling to contribute three million tons of grain—assuming just a six million ton shortage? I'm afraid such a construction may be placed on the language in the resolution, both here at home and abroad, and this could mean that the United States is backing itself into a corner—a very tight one at that—from which it will be most embarrassing to extricate itself. Certainly the Administration is making it exceedingly difficult for itself to come back to Congress and, in the face of the explicit language of this resolution, request a contribution of more than half of India's needs.

I agree with the President that equal sharing in India's food needs is a desirable goal, but we should not let our aspirations cloud the realities of the situation. We must allow ourselves sufficient flexibility in the event the crisis in India exceeds current expectations and in the event our goal of equal participation is not attained.

I urge, therefore, that the Committee substitute in line one on page three of H.J. Res. 262 for the word "equal" such a word as "appropriate" or "equitable." Let us by all means strive for equal participation, but let us not box ourselves into an almost impossible position if this cannot be accomplished.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I urge this Committee to examine closely the Administration's handling of a $25 million allocation in emergency food relief for distribution by CARE and other American voluntary agencies. These funds were sought last autumn and the Administration knew at that time that they were urgently needed to avert widespread starvation among some 10 million children in the states of Bihar and Uttar Pradesh. Although approval of this grant was fully within the Administration's authority under P.L. 480, as amended, action on it has been delayed for four full months and now we apparently find these funds included in H.J. Res. 262, and for reasons best known to the Administration. In my view, this is a poor way to handle emergency food relief, for our delay could be unfortunately interpreted by many as playing politics with the lives of children.

What puzzles me as well, is that in the third paragraph of H.J. Res. 262 we find an assertion that the United States has already committed $25 million in emergency food relief for distribution through CARE and other American voluntary agencies. The final paragraph of the resolution recommends that the President allocate an additional $25 million for this purpose. Both the Agency for International Development and the Bureau of the Budget assure me that the resolution is concerned with only one $25 million allocation. If this is so, the resolution could be amended to make this clear. However, in view of the extended delay in making this grant and the strong possibility that the food aid authorized in this resolution will be inadequate to India's needs, I urge that the resolution be amended to authorize an additional $25 million in emergency food relief on a contingency basis.

I know that many of you on the Committee are aware of these problems and sympathetic to their solution. You have done an outstanding job in dealing with them in a way that is humane and fair. You have taken the trouble to see India's problems and her efforts at first hand.

I know that you share with me the conviction that the food assistance we give to India is not just a humane act of generosity. It is vitally in our own national interest to help see to it that starvation does not tear asunder the largest free democracy in the Eastern world. India is already under great stress. We dare not add to her burdens at this critical time in her history. We dare not place ourselves in the position that "for lack of a nail, the kingdom was lost." Thank you.

COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, for the last few years the States dependent on the Colorado River as a substantial source of their water have endeavored to resolve multiple problems connected with sharing this source. A problem that is becoming increasingly acute is the growing water shortage in the Colorado River Basin.

After much discussion and negotiation, there appears to be substantial agreement on the most efficient means to insure maximum use of available water. Last year the seven States whose water interests are intimately tied to future development of the Lower Colorado River Basin agreed to the points encompassed in H.R. 4671. The basic points of agreement included:

First. The need for meaningful steps to augment the inadequate flows of the Colorado River.

Second. Adequate protection for the States and areas of origin of water exported to the Colorado, including full protection of the priorities of those areas.

Third. Recognizing the Mexican Treaty burden guaranteeing Colorado River water as a national obligation and a share of the cost of importing water should be allocated as a means of supporting treaty obligations.

Fourth. Balancing the operations of Lakes Mead and Powell in order to insure the benefits of wet years and burdens of drought shall be equitably distributed.

Fifth. Authorization for construction of five projects in Colorado.

Sixth. Reimbursement of the Upper Colorado River Basin fund for payments to compensate the reduction of the power operations at Hoover Dam that will result from filling Lake Powell.

Seventh. Authorizing construction of the Bridge Canyon Dam and powerplant.

Eighth. Creation of a basin account that will help finance the central Arizona project and water importation projects.

Ninth. Agreeing to a regional plan that includes the construction of the central Arizona project.

Tenth. In the event of insufficient water from the Colorado River needed to satisfy existing projects, previous protection programs would be insured, including guaranteeing California 4.4 million acre-feet for existing programs.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation that will incorporate these worthwhile goals. The bill I am introducing parallels similar legislation that has been introduced in the Senate by California's distinguished senior Senator, THOMAS KUCHEL. My bill also incorporates much of the same material included in the previous Congress' H.R. 4671. Last year the House Interior Committee reported this bill favorably.

The major difference between this year's version of the bill and last year's centers on the proposed Marble Canyon Dam project. This project, which has caused such heated debate, is eliminated in the bills being introduced this year. Because certain revenues that would have accrued from this dam will be lost, the language of my bill would require the central Arizona aqueduct to have a capacity of 1,800 cubic feet per second unless Arizona bears the cost of capacity in excess of that.

Two other issues remain to be dealt with. Last year, Secretary Udall, on behalf of the administration, endorsed the language set forth in H.R. 4671. This year, the Department of the Interior has chosen not to support two very important elements of the entire program.

First, the Interior Department evidently finds the need for a lower basin development fund not compelling enough to endorse. Why the change in policy from 1966 is not explained. In a report on the project proposals dated February 15, 1967, the Department merely suggests it would have "no objection" if such a fund were included in a bill passed by Congress. However, the Department does not see the need important enough to include the fund in its own version of the project legislation.

I believe the lower basin's account is vital to the success of the entire program, and it is incorporated in the legislation I am introducing. On February 7, 1967, California's TOM KUCHEL clearly pointed out on the floor of the Senate:

> Building the central Arizona project without a lower basin development fund to finance augmentation of the (Colorado) river's flow is a death sentence to economic growth in the lower basin, for, if the upper basin is allowed to use its water, the rich farmlands of the central Arizona project area will literally dry up and blow away for lack of water within 50 or 60 years.

A harsh prediction. It does, however, serve to underscore the vital relationship of adequate development financing and its consequences. Without the insurance of a lower basin development fund to finance augmentation projects, the future of the area is pocked with uncertainty. The measure I am introducing establishes such a fund, and I believe it is more attuned to the interests of the area.

The second issue is of singular importance. The bill I am introducing recognizes certain realities and provides contingencies in the event we are faced with difficult circumstances. In offering this contingency, I am following the path established by H.R. 4671, approved last year by the Interior Department, and incorporated in most of the leading measures concerning this issue introduced in this Congress.

My bill provides for adequate priority water guarantees for existing projects during those years of scarce water availability. And as Senator KUCHEL suggested, those years are the rule rather than the exception. My bill would insure that 4.4 million acre-feet of water would be used to maintain existing programs in California when shortages occur and diversions to the central Arizona project would be unbelievably shortsighted.

The administration's proposal this year, unlike its 1966 predecessor, makes no provision for priority guarantees. The Interior Department report indicates there would once again be "no objection" to agreements on priority issues that are mutually acceptable.

I am sorry that the administration has this year chosen to decline a firm position on this most vital aspect of the total regional program. Anything less than a firm guarantee carries with it the danger of reducing the water table of the Los Angeles area, an area of over 7 million inhabitants, in order to boost the table of substantially less populated areas.

The measure I am cosponsoring offers a realistic, yet comprehensive program for basin development. The bill takes into account all the elements that may play a role in shaping the circumstances of the area. Its emphasis is on regional planning and cooperation. It discourages sectional provincialism while maintaining adequate safeguards for the participating States.

I believe the proposal combines the necessary qualities that must be brought to bear in order to produce the maximum usable efficiency of available water. Under these terms, the approach authorized in the legislation I am introducing today is in the best interests of the Nation and the region the proposal is designed to serve.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—XXVIII—THE NEGRO AND THE DRAFT

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the long awaited report of the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service has finally been released.

The findings of the Commission have substantiated the evidence I already had uncovered regarding the Negro and the draft. The Commission found the Negro's participation in the draft to be "in several ways inequitable," and the report supported my statements of last week, in which I charged that the Nation's draft laws perpetuate the discrimination resulting from the economic and educational disadvantages the Negroes face.

The same economic and social injustices that bring proportionally more Negroes than whites into service also channel Negroes into combat units. Approximately 20 percent of all personnel assigned to combat occupations throughout the Army are Negro.

The racial composition of combat units is even more striking in Vietnam. The Commission reported that in late 1965, 22.8 percent of enlisted personnel in combat units were Negroes, yet Negroes made up only 11 percent of the total enlisted personnel serving in Vietnam. The Negro percentage in the Army units there totaled 14.5 percent.

> The casualty figures reflect this—

The Commission said.

> During the first 11 months of 1966, Negro soldiers comprised 22.4 percent of all Army troops killed in action.

The Commission stated that there is reason to believe that many of the statistics relating to the Negro would be comparable for some other minority groups, although specific information to establish this is not available.

The Commission shed important light on the makeup of the local boards. It found that only about 1.3 percent of the 16,632 local board members are Negroes. There are 23 States in which no Negroes serve on the local boards:

TABLE 1.8.—*Percent of local board members and percent of State population Negro and of other racial and ethnic groups*

State	Board members: Number of board members	Board members: Percent Negro	Board members: Percent other racial and ethnic groups [1]	State population: Percent State population Negro	State population: Percent State population other racial and ethnic groups [1]
Alabama	275			30.0	(2)
Alaska	20		5.0	3.0	19.8
Arizona	124	0.8	4.8	3.3	21.8
Arkansas	239			21.8	(2)
California	618	1.6	4.4	5.6	11.5
Colorado	203		2.0	2.3	9.7
Connecticut	163	1.2		4.2	.1
Delaware	26	19.2		13.6	.3
District of Columbia	80	36.2		53.9	.9
Florida	340	.9		17.8	.2
Georgia	509	.2		28.5	(2)
Hawaii	61		37.7	.8	67.3
Idaho	218		.4	.2	1.2
Illinois	1,056	2.6	.1	10.3	.3
Indiana	775			5.8	.1
Iowa	328			.9	.1
Kansas	249			4.2	.3
Kentucky	641	.2		7.1	(2)
Louisiana	442		.2	31.9	.1
Maine	66			.3	.3
Maryland	220	2.7		16.7	.2
Massachusetts	614	.6		2.2	.2
Michigan	654	2.0		9.2	.2
Minnesota	589			.7	.5
Mississippi	302		.3	42.0	.2
Missouri	581	.2		9.0	.1
Montana	192		.5	.2	3.3
Nebraska	304	1.0		2.1	0.5
Nevada	55			4.7	2.9
New Hampshire	59	1.7		.3	.1
New Jersey	176			8.5	.2
New Mexico	140		31.4	1.8	34.4
New York State (excluding New York City)	612	1.5		3.7	.3
New York City	454	3.3	1.3	14.0	.7
North Carolina	355	1.4	.3	24.5	.8
North Dakota	213		.9	.1	1.9
Ohio	403	3.5	.5	8.1	.1
Oklahoma	264	.4	1.5	6.6	2.8
Oregon	150	.7		1.0	1.0
Pennsylvania	662	1.5		7.5	.1
Rhode Island	51			2.1	0.3
South Carolina	161	.6		34.8	(2)
South Dakota	264		1.1	.1	3.9
Tennessee	330	3.0		16.5	(2)
Texas	656	1.1	5.3	12.4	15.0
Utah	109			.5	1.4
Vermont	70			.1	(2)
Virginia	401	2.2		20.6	.2
Washington	125	2.4	.8	1.7	1.8
West Virginia	183	.5		4.8	(2)
Wisconsin	390	.8	.2	1.9	.4
Wyoming	109			.7	1.5

[1] "Other racial and ethnic groups" contains Spanish American and Puerto Rican who are classified as white by the census; Japanese, Chinese, and Indians are classified nonwhite in both sources.

[2] Less than 0.1 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the findings of the Commission with respect to the Negro and the draft point out the need and urgency for a thorough revision of our selective service laws.

THE 1967 CATHOLIC CHARITIES APPEAL

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week in the city of Allentown, Pa., the 1967 Catholic charities appeal was launched by the Allentown Diocese. This diocese encompasses a five-county area in eastern Pennsylvania.

The business of this House prevented my accepting the invitation of His Excellency, the Most Reverend Joseph McShea, bishop of Allentown, to participate in the opening of this very worthwhile appeal. Nevertheless, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the objectives of this appeal and the inspiring keynote address delivered by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, of Maine.

This year, the Allentown Diocese has set a goal of $400,000 for its charities appeal. More than half of this sum is earmarked for a new 158-bed convalescent wing at Holy Family Manor in Bethlehem, Pa. There are eight charitable institutions and seven offices of the Catholic social agency which are aided through this appeal.

It is incumbent that I point out both Catholics and non-Catholics benefit from campaign proceeds. These funds are intended exclusively for projects and programs which benefit the needy. The greater portion is used for capital improvements while only 4 percent of the funds received is used for administrative expenses.

Under the sensitive guidance of Bishop McShea and through the tireless dedication of leaders and workers, the annual charities appeal has been successful in each of the past 4 years. I am confident it will be successful again this year.

I feel it is particularly significant that volunteer efforts such as the 1967 Catholic charities appeal of the Allentown Diocese are providing our Nation immeasurable assistance in the struggle to combat poverty. It is for this reason that I seek to give recognition to this fine cause by making note of it here and asking that the remarks of Senator Muskie be entered in the Record:

CHARITY AND FREE MEN

(Remarks by Senator Edmund S. Muskie, to the 1967 Catholic Charities Appeal of the Allentown Diocese, Allentown, Pa., March 1, 1967)

I am honored to be with you tonight to help launch the 1967 Catholic Charities Appeal. As some of you may know, this is my second trip to Allentown in a little over a month, so I am beginning to feel like a native! But I am delighted to be here.

The opening of this appeal—with its emphasis on charity, and with its object the alleviation of human need—is an occasion for all of us to re-appraise the role of private charity in a free society such as ours.

On the one hand, the nature of charity in Christian life remains unchanged, as an essential "obligation of every prosperous person and nation." On the other hand, changes which have taken place in society over the past few generations have altered our way of life so radically as to obscure for many of us the proper role of charity today.

In looking over the work of the Catholic social agency in this diocese—a basic objective of this appeal—we find it is directed toward the most pressing of human problems: Care for dependent children; the placement of children in foster homes; help for unwed mothers; counseling for distressed families and children; rehabilitation for troubled adolescents—the age-old griefs of mankind.

In an earlier day, these problems were almost exclusively the obligation of the church.

But there were simpler times when men were born and lived their lives in close-knit community with each other. They knew their neighbor and townsmen; they knew each other's needs and, through the teaching of the church, responded to those needs.

In some places in today's world, men still live in close communion with one another, but an increasing majority find themselves in large urban areas where the tempo of life almost prohibits any real communication with one another. In these areas the older concepts of charity often are lost in the impersonal rush of urban life.

Rapid population growth combined with the development of new technologies has produced the phenomena of a highly mobile population, so characteristic of today's America. Along with this, the political and economic shape of the world has created "big" government—increasingly concerned with the needs of all of its people but impersonal in its relations with the people it serves. All of these developments have helped to obscure man's obligation to God and to his fellow man.

Modern man too often seems to believe that the distress of his fellow man is the concern of the local welfare agency. After all, he pays his taxes, and taxes support all kinds of social programs.

Sadly, many of us move back and forth across this great land along paths that almost seem designed to prevent our seeing the victims of misfortune, poverty, and neglect who live far from the edges of the Interstate Highway System and who never see the waiting rooms of our large airports. And the 20th century miracle of the housing development with its neat lawns and convenient shopping centers isolates us even further from the discomfort of seeing our more unfortunate brothers.

So we must rely on our newspapers, television or an occasional magazine article to remind us that even the best efforts of government and of welfare agencies have fallen far short of solving these age-old problems.

I know of no way to give you an accurate account of the needy in this country. In 1963, based on a survey of income, it was estimated that 35.3 million persons were living in poverty. By 1965, that number had decreased by about 2 million, while the new higher social security benefits would raise another 500,000 above the poverty line. Despite these figures, which are admittedly based on an arbitrary figure, public assistance provided by the States—with Federal aid—covered 2.2 million aged, 3.2 million children, 154,000 blind persons. An additional 360,000 persons were helped under assistance programs not supported by Federal grants. In other words, public assistance programs—including State and Federal aid—reached less than 6 million needy people of a total of more than 30 million who were living in poverty in 1965. Even if governments could find a way to double their expenditures for these purposes, there would still be a wide gap between public expenditures and need.

Throughout history, the record shows that Americans have been a compassionate people. Both the colonial New England house raising and our modern social-service institutions attest to the deep community feelings of America.

Between these milestones in time stretches the long growth of community responsibility for helping the victims of adversity—the impoverished, the deaf, the blind, the mentally ill—and for reforming our public welfare institutions and prison regimes.

The personal concern of Americans for their fellow man spells out a history of inspired accomplishment. Let me remind you of just a few:

William Bradford, who in his 1792 preamble to the constitution of the "Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisons," said: "It becomes us to extend our compassion to that part of mankind who are the subjects of these miseries, by the aids of humanity . . .;"

Thomas Hopkins Gallaudet, who founded the first free American school for the deaf in 1817 at Hartford, Connecticut, said in his opening "sermon:" "Efforts of charity, prudently and usefully directed, never fail abundantly to repay those by whom they are made. This is true not only with regard to individuals, but also to public bodies of men. . . ."

—Clara Barton, whose founding of the American Association of the Red Cross in 1881, is well known to all of us; and

—Jane Addams and Ellen Gates Starr, who founded Hull House in Chicago in 1889, and set a precedent for settlement houses that continues to this day.

This humane generosity of America shines through its history. To a great extent, the individualized humanity of the early Republic has become institutionalized and adjusted to the needs of the people of our modern technological society. But I think we may be deluding ourselves if we give too much credit to the Government's role in alleviating human distress.

While this modern, affluent, and complex society of ours generally spells a better life for our people, it has exacted a terrible toll from those who are not full participants for one reason or another.

Out of this harried almost frantic society has come an upward surge in juvenile delinquency, mental and emotional illness, family breakdown and a host of other social ills. There is a crucial need for additional research work, counseling services, and treatment centers to deal with these problems that can cause heartbreak and tragedy in countless homes and communities.

Americans are living longer. In 1890, life expectancy at birth was about 49 years, while today it is 70 or more. In that time, the total population has doubled but the number of persons 65 or over has increased fourfold. There are now 13 million Americans 65 or over, and by 1975 the figure will exceed 20 million. A mere glance at these startling figures should convince us of the need for more facilities to enable the elderly to enjoy their added years in good health, in productive activity, and in pleasant surroundings.

More people also mean more illness, both physical and mental. While medical science has made fantastic strides in recent years, the medical profession would be the first to emphasize the long long road it must travel to conquer man's oldest enemies. Thus, the need to expand hospitals and clinics is clear.

A new "age of leisure" is upon us. A U.S. Department of Labor study, disclosing the magnitude of changes being wrought in our way of life, reports that in the past 20 years Americans have gained an incredible 10.3 billion hours in extra free time. The study also predicts that by 1976 each of us will work 161 fewer hours annually than we do now. By the year 2000, people in major industries are expected to have 406 additional leisure hours yearly. To those of my generation who could profitably use this added leisure, these are welcome statistics, and make us wish we had been born at least a generation later. But this added leisure presents some serious prospects for overall society. We wonder, for instance, whether our youth lose something in not being able to find the part-time job that used up so much of our time when we were youngsters. Yet, added leisure seems to be an inexorable trend, and we, as a free society, must provide additional recreational facilities to help Americans cope with this "explosion" of leisure.

While the U.S. Public Health Service spends much money on cancer, heart disease, mental health and other medical research, it should be remembered that most of the "breakthroughs" have come from non-governmental endeavors sponsored and underwritten by private charity. Consider the long history of individual contributions to the "March of Dimes" and the long and arduous research which these billions of dimes provided to wipe out polio.

Although the Government's participation in all of these areas is vitally needed, it cannot effectively supplant the individual contributions of free men. The Government can only supply money, and money alone is not enough to solve human problems. What is needed, in addition to money, is the personal involvement of people in social problems. This might be a rough definition of charity. People need to "feel" their contribution to their fellow man in both the sacrifice of effort and money and in the excusable pride of seeing their contribution produce results.

It seems to me that private charity forms an essential bond among free men—one that constantly reminds him that whatever is offered to a needy person is offered also to our Lord. This can never be accomplished through the impersonal payroll-tax deduction, or the filing of the Internal Revenue Service form 1040.

I think that Americans appreciate the distinction I have tried to make between private charity and the tax-supported efforts of our governments. As we have prospered, we have increased our private contributions to charity. In 1954, Americans gave a total of $5.4 billion. Ten years later this figure had risen to $10.6 billion. And *the National Association of Fund Raising Counsel, Inc.* estimates that in 1966 American charitable contributions totaled about $13 billion. Individual giving accounts for about 77 percent of the total charity dollar; foundations, 10 percent; and corporations, 7 percent.

For the men on the Bishop's Committee of the Laity who will be talking with corporate executives in March and April, this last figure might be of interest. If the 7 percent figure I mentioned is near the mark of corporate giving to charity, it means that corporations gave something on the order of a billion dollars to charity in 1966. The Federal Government allows up to 5 percent of pre-tax net income to be deducted for charitable causes. The latest survey of current business reports that corporate profits through the third quarter of 1966 were running at an annual rate of nearly $82 billion. Five percent of that would be $4 billion, which could be deducted for charitable contributions! The Internal Revenue Service reports that corporate giving, in the period 1949–1962, rose from .7 percent to 1.2 percent of net profits. If I were a member of the Bishop's Committee, I would be tempted to ask corporate executives if they were rendering to Caesar even more than Caesar demanded.

For the individual who will be contacted during the 1967 appeal, giving to charity rose from less than 2 percent to nearly 2.5 percent of disposable income in this same period.

So it would appear that both corporations and individuals should be reminded that charity involves a maximum effort—not just the allowable limits of the Internal Revenue Act. It must involve an effort which reflects his obligation as a member of the human race and a creature of God. No arrangement for man's giving short of that taught by the church will ever satisfy the need *or* the giver.

The fact that public and governmental institutions now provide for the needy is in itself a reflection of the teaching of the church. As individuals, we never question the need for mercy, sympathy or practical helpfulness. One needs only to mention them, and we agree. But it has not always been so.

Once, the parable of the good Samaritan was a novelty. For 20 centuries the church has been teaching it, and the church has made it a commonplace. The very fact that non-church agencies now perform some services for the needy is in itself proof positive that the promulgation of the Christian Gospel has been a success. The church has succeeded in Christianizing the world to that extent. The good works of non-church agencies are attributable to the church, and without the church's continued support of the basic idea of charity, the idea would wither.

It seems to me that we, as Catholics, within the context of this seventh annual appeal, have a mission that goes beyond the immediate goals of the appeal. That extra duty is to foster and increase the Christian concept of private charity. To me, the renewed vigor of the church, expressed by the Second Vatican Council, requires of each of us a renewed dedication to this basic precept of our religion.

In setting forth the dignity of the human person and the work which men have been destined to undertake, Vatican II had this to say to us, and we should remember it:

"God intended the earth and all that it contains for the use of every human being and people. Thus, as all men follow justice and unite in charity, created goods should abound for them on a reasonable basis. Whatever the forms of ownership may be, as adapted to the legitimate institutions of people according to diverse and changeable circumstances, attention must always be paid to the universal purpose for which created goods are meant. In using them, therefore, a man should regard his lawful possessions not merely as his own but also as common property in the sense that they should accrue to the benefit of not only himself, but of others.

"For the rest, the right to have a share of earthly goods sufficient for one's self and one's family belongs to everyone. The fathers and doctors of the church hold this view, teaching that men are obliged to come to the relief of the poor, and to do so not merely out of their superfluous goods."

This must be our guide to charity, as Catholics and as free men. We must, through our Government, continue to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's. But, more importantly, we must render unto God the things that are His—things which have to do with an involvement with our fellows. As children of God, and as free men, we cannot ask less of ourselves.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION: ITS MERITS

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, vocational education has been the subject of Federal legislation since 1917, with the enactment of the Smith-Hughes Act. It has proved to be, in my estimation, a most sound investment of Federal moneys. The importance and success of such programs have been evidenced by their continued expansion first under the George-Barden Act in 1946, and in 1963 under the Vocational Education Act.

A fairly recent development in this field is the growing awareness of the vital importance of adult education in the basic skills—in the need to overcome English language limitations and to better prepare individuals for occupational training. Proficiency in reading and writing has been directly linked to a marked improvement in performance during vocational training. In light of this, I proposed legislation during the 89th Congress, the Adult Education Act of 1966, to expand grants to the States for strengthening adult education programs.

I feel that it is vitally important at this stage to continue to give our full support to all programs related to occupational training, including research and evaluation—to secure the most accurate assessment of the existing needs—the work study program, and the teacher education program.

The following résumé of program activities and contributions carried out under Federal and State appropriations by the Division of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education of the Department of Education in Florida, exemplifies the merits inherent in these programs. I commend this report to my colleagues as substantive proof of good judgment in the past, and a sound basis for future action:

[From the State Department of Education, Division of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education, Tallahassee, Fla., Mar. 1, 1967]

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN FLORIDA

For many years, Florida has offered a variety of vocational education programs for youths and adults. Now, in February, 1967, at the time of the 50th Anniversary of the signing of the first National Vocational Education Act, it is appropriate that thought be given to the progress which has been made and to planning for future service. What has happened in the past 50 years is only a prelude to great new developments in vocational education in the future.

Vocational education in Florida has grown from humble beginnings in this century to become one of the state's most potent forces for educational, economic, and social development. Vocational education includes programs in agriculture, home economics, industrial education, business education, and technical and health related occupations education. Work is offered to prepare youth and adults for employment, and supplemental training is offered to retrain or upgrade people who are already employed. Of nearly 300,000 persons enrolled in vocational courses in 1966, approximately 60% were high school graduates and adults seeking job preparation or supplemental training. The others were high school students.

In addition to vocational education, related education, which is closely allied to job training in that it provides exploratory experiences prior to specialization, is offered to many thousands of persons in Florida. Related education includes high school programs of industrial arts, general business, and general economics as well as general adult education. Enrollments in vocational and related education have grown from 355,000 in 1955 to almost 750,000 in 1966 and are expected to exceed 1,000,000 by 1975.

Vocational education in Florida has been given great impetus through the recent plans for a state-wide system of area vocational-technical schools which will place a training center within reach—financially and geographically—of nearly all the residents of the state. The area schools will expand vocational training by offering many different courses and by emphasizing quality, quantity, and variety in every aspect of each program. Courses will insure a complete program for all students including youth and adults. In addition, the area schools will help many high schools become more comprehensive by providing broadened opportunities for secondary students to enroll in vocational courses.

Financial support to build area vocational schools has come primarily from state and local sources, but has been supplemented with federal funds. Currently, 29 area schools have been designated and approved for construction by the State Board for Vocational Education. These are in various stages of construction. Schools have been approved for the following counties or multicounty areas:

Bay, Bradford-Union, Brevard, Broward, Citrus-Hernando, Columbia-Baker-Gilchrist, Dade, Escambia, Hillsborough, Jackson-Calhoun, Lake, Lee, Leon, Madison-Jefferson-Lafayette, Manatee, Marion, Monroe, Okaloosa-Walton, Orange, Palm Beach, Pinellas, Polk, Sarasota, Seminole, Suwanee-Hamilton, Taylor-Dixie, Volusia, Washington-Holmes, and St. Lucie.

Nine of the area vocational schools approved by the State Board of Education will be divisions of community junior colleges; the others will be separate and independent vocational-technical centers. Some will be entirely new, while others are already existing schools which will be greatly expanded. Sixteen of the new facilities are scheduled to be completed by the fall of 1967, and five additional schools are expected to open in the spring of 1968. The remaining approved facilities are scheduled for later completion.

These new facilities will provide shops, laboratories, and classrooms for a wide variety of vocational programs including auto repair, agriculture, advertising, hotel work, typing, dental assisting, medical assisting, home economics for gainful employment, cooking, and numerous technologies. Schools already open and schools scheduled to open later this year will serve Florida counties with a combined population of over 2¼ million persons, or approximately 39% of the total population of the state. Additional schools, already approved, will serve counties with another 2¼ million persons. Thus, all schools approved will serve a population of over 4½ million persons or approximately 83% of the population of the state. In addition to schools already approved, five or six additional sites are being studied, providing, ultimately, almost complete coverage of the state.

Financial support of vocational educational education in Florida has been a joint local-state-federal undertaking, the major portion of funds coming from local and state sources. In a recent year, 83% of funds for vocational programs was from local and state sources and 17% was from the federal government. Increased financial support will be needed as facilities and personnel increase. Teachers employed in 1966 totaled 3,690 and it has been estimated that 6,670 will be needed in 1969.

The vast expansion projected for vocational education is expected to result not only from additional facilities, additional programs, additional teachers, and the like, but also because of Florida's present industrial growth. Vocational education helps counties of Florida exploit their resources more fully; it strengthens their economy; it helps enrich the lives of their people; and the monetary and intrinsic rewards have emphasis and meaning for the people themselves. Through vocational education and employment, people realize their importance as human beings and as participants in and contributors to our society.

As new area schools have been approved, special studies have been made to prescribe new and additional vocational-technical programs. These programs have been based on students' interests, employment opportunities, and on economic and social needs of people as determined in surveys and by other means. Programs have been designed for particular areas where schools are to be expanded or new schools added. Thus, programs to train waiters and waitresses may be appropriate for one area whereas electronics technology may be appropriate for another.

Jobs for students who complete vocational and technical education courses are a major concern of the Division. Studies are underway, with participants from over the state, to determine how the placement of students may be made more effective. Each county in Florida has reported past activities for placement and follow-up and plans for improvement. Thus, the Division is concerned with every facet of vocational education including adequate counseling and guidance prior and during preparatory training and also with graduates' work performance and job satisfaction.

Vocational education develops the spirit of initiative and enterprise in trainees. It provides a well-trained work force which attracts industry. It reduces unemployment. It prepares individuals for initial entrance into and advancement within an occupation or occupational cluster. It not only prepares for employment but includes supplemental training or retraining as well. Educators are alert to changes brought on by automation and by changing technologies so that new training programs can be provided.

Florida has grown mightily as new industries have moved to the state and educators have been alert to the need for trained technicians. In 1965 it was reported that 65% of the dropouts and 40% of the high school graduates, across the nation, had had no work experience during their school years. Nine dropouts out of every 10 reported no job training after leaving school. It has been and will continue to be a concern of vocational educators to provide occupational education at all instructional levels, for all classes of people and, where necessary, to offer special programs for special classes of people.

The needs of disadvantaged persons is a concern of educators throughout the state. Relatively few people choose unemployment as a way of life. Most are anxious to do well—socially, economically, and as loyal citizens in our democratic society. Poverty results when people lack skills necessary to earn a living. Florida has made impressive advances in increased per capita income. But too many people and families still earn sub-standard incomes. At the time of the last census, for example, over one-fourth of the families in Florida had less than $3000 annual income.

New studies are underway to arrange new training programs to prepare people for full-time jobs and to increase their incomes. Thus, recently, a woman in one Florida community with three part-time jobs, and children, was enrolled in a training program to be a checkout cashier in a supermarket or in a similar job. She was training so that she might be better able to support herself and her children and to become a self-supporting contributor to the economy. She finished her work and will now have five or six days of work every week instead of three part-time jobs. She will now have employment and earn higher and more steady wages. Thus vocational and technical education is concerned with human values—for human beings and for state and national values.

Vocational education helps solve problems due to technological unemployment. It also helps solve the problem created in Florida when new industries need additional employees. Recently, a "crash" program was inaugurated in one county to provide personnel trained in a number of vocations needed by a new company. The employees were trained in the schools and the company was able to meet its opening date.

Unemployment and the under-utilization of manpower resources result in vast costs against the economy of a state and nation. Economists have reported that the greatest total cost of any operation in the history of the nation was the great depression of 1930–40 when trillions of dollars were the cost of lost productivity. Recently the Council of Economic Advisers reported that the loss in gross national product from unemployment was about $50 billion in the first quarter of 1961. They reported that the unemployment rate of 4.2% in the last quarter of 1965 would account for an annual rate of about $7 billion loss to the U.S. economy.

Vocational educators in Florida are concerned with programs in research and development to help solve problems of unemployment in the state. Studies are underway to incorporate new processes which are appearing in industry, new instruments, new machines, and new techniques for work into instructional programs. Educators are alert to needs for updating curricula to meet technological and social needs. The Research Coordinating Unit of the Division acts to stimulate and coordinate research in vocational and technical education at all levels. Special studies are a continuing project to determine employment opportunities in each county and area of Florida.

Florida is also cooperating with other states in conducting research to improve vocational education. For example, the state is one of several participating in a study of the block-time laboratory approach to office education. The project is a research and development program in vocational-technical education of the Department of Secondary Education and Curriculum of Michigan State University. The objective is to improve methods of educating persons for office occupations. Simulated office conditions allow education of "the whole worker." Thus, the students and teacher view the office course in its entirety instead of as a series of disconnected tasks. Areas of instruction include classroom experiences, laboratory experiences, and problem-solving experiences. Again, classrooms and equipment are like those found in offices and businesses. The whole project is only one of many studies underway to improve educational methods and techniques.

Of major importance to Florida and to the nation are the implications of vocational and technical education for the national defense effort. Adequate and proper defense of the nation is based upon thousands of highly trained workers in a great variety of vocations and technologies. Actually, the defense, space, and atomic energy programs of the nation have generated more jobs than all other federal programs combined. The first employ over 9 million persons and the latter employ under 2 million persons.

Florida has been particularly active in fulfilling her role in the space age and is offering many vocational and technical programs to furnish trained employees. Programs include electronics, data processing, microminiaturization, electricity, drafting and comparable supportive services. Also, Florida has expanded offerings in occupations related to health. The latter include work to train for nursing, certified laboratory technician, medical assistant, surgical assistant, dental assistant, and the like.

The economy of the South and of Florida is changing. Relatively fewer people are needed in agricultural work; and, as people withdraw from the latter, they must prepare to enter new occupations. Individuals in Florida must be trained to work in the many light industries which are moving to the state. The Division of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education is alert to the needs for counseling services to inform youth and adults of job opportunities and the preparation which is required.

The Division of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education and the State Department of Education are continually engaged in planning new and more varied vocational programs to serve more people and more businesses, and to meet the changes which Florida's progress demands.

EIGHTEEN MILLION HUNTERS CONTRIBUTE TO THE WELFARE OF THIS NATION

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in all the discussions in recent months on proposed new firearms regulations, it is apparent a serious misunderstanding exists in the minds of some Members of the Congress, as well as the general public, about the true role of the hunter in this great country. Therefore, I feel it is of utmost importance to present the following factual evidence as proof of the outstanding contribution the nearly 18 million hunters make to the welfare of the Nation.

For example, it is not generally known that hunters and fishermen pay for the support of all 50 State fish and game agencies through license purchases. The money does not come from general revenue channels as most people believe.

Hunting and fishing are unique among most outdoor recreational activities in that the participants directly pay for the support and increase of their favorite sport.

These fish and game departments are charged by law with the protection of all wildlife. The public is not aware that refuges, paid for by hunters' money, support hundreds of species of nonhunted wildlife. The public does not know that law enforcement personnel, supported by money from hunters, is charged by law with protecting nonhunted species such as shore birds, songbirds, certain hawks and owls, and mammals which everyone enjoys.

Refuges bought and paid for by hunters' money support more species of nonhunted wildlife than game. In most cases, refuges are open to the general public which pays nothing. The picnicker and hiker do not know that quite often the land they enjoy has been bought by hunters' money. The nature lover seldom understands that the preservation and increase of wildlife he enjoys seeing is made possible only through funds supplied by hunters.

All States have programs of land acquisition with hunters' money. The nonhunting public usually has free access to these lands for picnics, hiking, and camping. The hunter is glad that his money pays for outdoor recreation enjoyed by the nonpaying public. However, the hunter seldom gets any thanks or credit from the public.

Hunters spend millions of dollars developing private lands into wildlife habitat. Although exact figures are not available, a conservative estimate is that hunters spend over $100 million a year improving private lands. Thousands of sportsmen devote countless hours planning and working on habitat development. This habitat supports more nonhunted species, such as songbirds, than game species. As 80 percent of the land in America is privately owned, it is obvious that much of the future of wildlife depends on private development of habitat.

No game species in America is in danger of being overharvested by hunters. The public, and too often the hunter, does not understand the careful surveys made by State and Federal agencies before hunting seasons and bag limits are set. Many species of game, such as whitetailed deer and mourning doves, are more abundant than when the white man first came to this country.

When a game species is in short supply, the hunter is not only the first to yell for action but puts up the money to employ biologists and make sure this species is protected and increased.

The species of wildlife that are endangered in America are not game species. The population of bluebirds, which has never been hunted, has declined drastically the last decade. If this had been a game species, hunters would have put up millions of dollars to find the cause of decrease and remedy it.

The general public does not understand that the hunter goes to bat to make sure that such species as the panther survive. Hunters do not wish to see any species of wildlife become endangered, whether it is a game or nongame species.

Wildlife cannot be stockpiled. One of the most difficult biological facts to explain to the public is that hunting has very little to do with the population of most species. The public does not understand that if certain species are not hunted the total population still does not increase. For instance, the bobwhite quail and mourning dove have an annual mortality of about 75 percent whether they are hunted or not.

The public does not realize that too many deer may destroy a range or winter starvation kills thousands of deer which might otherwise have been taken by hunters. The changing patterns of agriculture and forestry affect the increase or decline of many species more than hunting.

Hunters and fishermen have been the leaders in every conservation movement in the past 75 years. The hunter is the first to notice a shortage of game and do something about it. The fisherman is the first to see fish dying from pollution and urge remedial action. Hunters and fishermen were the first to decry the ravages of soil erosion, forest fires, and all the despoliation that came with our expanding civilization and increasing population.

For decades, the hunter has been a voice in the wilderness calling for programs that are only just now being popularized in Washington by the current administration. But while the outdoorsman got little help or sympathy from the general public, he paid for the organization and support of State fish and game agencies. The hunter has been a strong force for all conservation for over half a century but has received almost no credit from the public.

Hunters, along with other outdoorsmen, support such excellent organizations as the National Wildlife Federation, Ducks Unlimited, Izaak Walton League of America, Wildlife Management Institute, and hundreds of regional and local organizations.

The hunter has never received recognition by the general public for his countless hours of work and generous dollars in supporting the programs of these outstanding organizations. The public, which is an increasingly traveling public, enjoys the fruit of the hunters' work but has no inkling of who planted the seed.

Hunters and the shooting industry asked to be taxed on the sale of sporting arms and ammunition in 1937 with the money to be used for wildlife development. Hunters and the shooting industry are unique in all of America in asking that this excise tax not be removed during the 1965 reductions made by Congress at the request of the administration.

Over $300 million has been collected through the tax on sporting arms and ammunition and prorated back to the States for wildlife work under the Pittman-Robertson Act. The general public, which enjoys wildlife but pays nothing, benefits as much as the hunter who picks up the tab.

The hunter, although the public is unaware of it, benefits many facets of the Nation's economy. Hunters pour about $1.5 billion a year into the general economy, much of the amount being for conservation projects. The other is spent for hunter travel, food, guides, hunting clothes, boats, camping equipment and related expenses. Many rural States and areas greatly depend on hunter expenditures to maintain and improve their economy. In some areas, hunter money is the chief source of income.

In summary, the millions of American hunters contribute to the general well-being and welfare of the Nation and its economy out of all proportion to their numbers, yet the public has seldom known about the extent of their contributions, or has the hunter received credit for them. Therefore I am proud to put the case for the hunter before the House in the hope that it will better inform the Members and the public of the vast number of worthwhile and essential services supported and sponsored by these millions of law-abiding sportsmen and citizens.

UNITED STATES SELLS SINGAPORE RIFLES GI'S NEED IN VIETNAM

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Fulton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's Washington Post, I was confronted with a very disturbing news article relating to the alleged sale of some 23,000 M–16 type rifles to Singapore by Colt Industries. There is purportedly a shortage of these weapons for use by our forces and allies in Vietnam, yet, if the facts in this story are correct, these much needed weapons are being diverted to a neutralist government despite our pressing military needs.

The article, "Rifles Needed by GI's Sold to Singapore," was a copyrighted piece of Field Enterprises, Inc., Chicago Daily News Service and was written by Mr. Charles Nicodemus. I ask unanimous consent to include the article in the Record at this point.

Rifles Needed by GI's Sold to Singapore

(By Charles Nicodemus)

The U.S. Government has authorized the sale of 23,000 hard-to-get M–16-type rifles, which are in strong demand in Vietnam, to the neutralist government of Singapore.

The State Department, which agreed to the export, refused to discuss the sale. So did producers of the rifles, Colt Industries, referring all questions to Singapore.

A Department of Defense spokesman said the Department had cleared the transaction because the 25,000 M-16s a-month the military is now receiving—virtually Colt's total production—are all that the U.S. and its fighting allies can effectively utilize.

That explanation appeared to contrast sharply with the facts that:

The Army is now secretly negotiating with Colt for at least a doubling of production to meet burgeoning demands for the light, fast-firing weapon.

Gen. William C. Westmoreland, U.S. commander in Vietnam, has told Congress he wants every fighting man under him equipped with the smaller-caliber, high-velocity M–16, instead of the older, heavier M–14, which is out gunned by the increasing flow of Communist-made automatic rifles.

The South Vietnamese, as well as two other allies with troops in Vietnam—South Korea and the Philippines—have publicly complained, sometimes bitterly, about their inability to get the weapon.

The Air Force, whose pioneer testing of the privately developed M–16 played a key role in its eventual belated adoption by the Army, has now ordered 65,000 more of the guns. The Navy wants an added 10,000. But neither can begin to get the weapons until 1968, because of the short supply and the Army's soaring requirements.

Coloring the situation was the Army's long-time, little-publicized foot-dragging on acceptance of the M–16, which is now proving costly to the war effort, and the Pentagon's continuing disagreement with Colt over how, when and at what price production on the gun can be expanded.

On the diplomatic front, the sale appears certain to provoke curiosity and perhaps resentment among U.S. allies who have been vying for the gun, since U.S.-Singapore relations have not always been ideal.

The island-state's brilliant Prime Minister, Lee Kuan Yew, is anti-Communist but leftist, prone to blunt comments such as his prediction that China, not the United States, will win the Asian cold war.

In 1965, he embarrassed the United States by revealing that the Central Intelligence Agency had offered him a $3 million bribe to hush up the 1960 arrest of a U.S. spy in Singapore.

[Lee also has won high praise in private from many officials, including President Johnson, for describing United States actions in Vietnam as a checkmate to Communist expansion in Southeast Asia.

[The strategically located former British colony of Singapore is regarded by the United States as a determinedly independent outpost that warrants favorable treatment.]

The impression that the United States has been quietly courting favor with Singapore was reinforced when several firms competing with Colt reportedly were told by Singapore defense officials that the U.S. State Department had guaranteed in writing that Colt would be permitted to deliver the rifles, starting with a 6,000-gun shipment in March—despite U.S. military needs.

The State Department refused to comment on reports of the letter or the delivery schedule, as did Colt and Singapore officials.

This morning I have been in communication with both the Department of State and Department of Defense.

From State, I learned very little about the sale which the Department allegedly authorized.

However, Secretary McNamara's office told me that the weapons being sent to Singapore are not M–16 types but the civilian type M–15.

I was also advised that the 65,000 rifles ordered by the Air Force would be delivered in fiscal 1967, or before the end of June this year, and not delayed until calendar 1968 as the article implies. The same was the case for the 10,000 weapons sought by the Navy.

The conflicts between the article and the information given me by the Department of Defense are obvious and raise important questions.

Is there actually a shortage of these weapons in Vietnam?

Is the Army now secretly negotiating with Colt for at least a doubling of production?

If so, why is Colt continuing to produce the M–15 when their production facilities are required to meet our military needs?

If they are M–15, are they being currently produced or are they items which are on inventory whose delivery to Singapore would not require additional production?

Are these M–15 or M–16 type weapons which are going to Singapore?

How does the Singapore government propose to utilize these weapons?

What guarantee do we have that these weapons will not eventually find their way into Red China or North Vietnam through theft, black market or other clandestine means?

At best, this situation represents a misunderstanding which should be resolved by proper departmental authorities. At worst, it is a serious error which could undermine our military operations in South Vietnam and those of our allies.

Therefore, I am offering a resolution requesting President Johnson to take all measures necessary to halt the sale of these weapons until the proper congressional committees have had an opportunity to determine and review all the facts.

A 20-YEAR FIGHT TO SAVE ART TREASURES

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, last autumn Italy was ravaged by the most severe storms and floods in its long history. Particularly hard hit was the city of Florence, long recognized as a veritable treasure trove of art and culture.

When the Arno River overflowed its banks and practically inundated that great city, world-famous paintings, statues, books, and other works of art were either destroyed or severely damaged. When the flood water receded, a tremendous effort was initiated to salvage and, if possible, restore these priceless treasures; and the best informed estimates of how long it will take to complete what can be done in this connection range from 20 to 30 years.

For each type of art, the salvage problems are different and difficult. It was reported that paintings on wood swelled up like sponges and world-famous paintings on canvas went slack. Sculpture and statues were damaged by floating, black fuel oil and other debris. An estimated 2 million irreplaceable books, many with costly hand-tooled leather bindings, were soaked into near pulp.

Of course, I am not unmindful of the tragedy that brought human suffering and death to a very large number of people in Italy by the unusual storms and floods. Immediate disaster relief was given by various agencies, but not enough was done in reclaiming, repairing, and restoring the works of art which have been ravaged by the unleased fury of the violent storms that struck Italy.

We, here in the Congress, are justly proud of the great art in our Capitol. Only recently, we issued an interesting book on this subject for art lovers everywhere, and this demonstrates our appreciation of the importance of art to culture. What a drab and dreary world it would be without art.

The Sun, Baltimore's respected and influential newspaper, on February 5, 1967, published an article entitled "After Flood—20-Year Fight To Save Art Treasures," written by Gerald Miller. It describes the unique and agonizing battle to save the great art treasures damaged by the recent Italian floods.

Because of our deep sympathy for the brave Italian people in their plight and our acknowledging the fact that Italy has made vast contribution to world culture, private groups in the United States, such as the Maryland Committee for Italian Flood Relief and the Washington Area Committee to Rescue Italian Art, were formed to aid and assist in reclaiming and restoring the art objects that were damaged by those floods. I strongly urge and recommend that all Americans interested in preserving the heritage of the past and increasing culture do their part, not so much for Italy, but for the world, by sending contributions to organizations formed to rescue the storm-damaged art in Italy.

I ask unanimous consent that the previously mentioned article, which appeared in the Sun, be included in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order that as many people as possible will know of the urgent need to salvage priceless art treasures.

The article is as follows:

AFTER FLOOD—20-YEAR FIGHT TO SAVE ART TREASURES

(By Gerald Miller)

FLORENCE, ITALY.—As the ordinary people of Florence strive for a normal life once more, a unique and agonizing battle is being waged in odd corners of the city—in museum basements, in the chill rooms of an ancient fortress, in a garden shed, in the boiler room of a heating plant.

The battle is to save the paintings, statues and books damaged by the November 4 flood. The heroes are the experts armed with arcane knowledge and the volunteers from many lands who have only willingness and a love for art.

Emerging as one of their biggest enemies is a mold that attacks damp paintings and stubbornly refuses to die. Officials fear it is becoming immune to fungicide used to wipe it from cherished masterpieces.

Most of the city seems unaware of how desperate and complicated the fight is or how long it will have to go on. The specialists and their volunteers work in conditions that range from painfully uncomfortable to physically dangerous.

And the best informed estimates of how long it will take to complete what can be done range from 20 to 30 years.

SALVAGE PROBLEMS

The heroism began at the very start, when the waters of the Arno River receded. For weeks volunteer students, tourists and soldiers, standing hip-high in muck and wearing gas masks against the poisonous stench, groped in chilly mud for paintings and books inundated in the basements of museums and libraries.

For each type of art the salvage problems were different. And for all they were difficult. Priceless paintings on wood swelled up like sponges. Soaked canvases went slack. Black fuel oil carried by the floods sank deep into the stone of statues. An estimated 2,000,000 books, many with costly hand-tooled leather bindings, were soaked into near pulp. Frescoes were stained and the supporting walls became impregnated with dampness.

In the midst of the general misery in the city, a terrible period of shortages and confusion crippled the salvage operation.

Workers trying to keep color from flaking off soaked paintings ran out of Japanese rice paper. Emergency calls for more went to Japan, England, the United States.

Meantime they used almost anything they could put their hands on, including toilet and tissue paper.

Shipments of blotting paper arrived from abroad to help dry out books. It was discovered later that the paper was untreated with fungicide and though the pages interleaved with the paper dried, they fell victim to mold.

SPECIALISTS BICKER

In the frantic atmosphere that sprang up as specialists rushed to apply first aid before it was too late, bickering broke out over materials and techniques.

For cleaning the oil-stained statues almost every specialist seemed to have his own type of solvent to recommend.

Various solvents were tried—including secret formulas rushed in by plane from England and Germany. The formulas have not been disclosed but they are described as similar to solvents used to soak up petroleum washed up on bathing beaches.

The experts were appalled when, after first application of solvents, some of the time-mellowed statues emerged from the washing glaringly clean.

Prof. John Gilmore, head of the Harvard Center of Renaissance Studies at Florence and director here of the American Committee for the Rescue of Italian art, said: "The statues came out bright white. They looked like marzipan."

Subsequent washings appeared to have toned down the whiteness, but it may be years before many of the statues lose the sheen that makes them look like fresh plaster.

Much of the tension and trouble in the early stages was caused by the complexities of Italian customs regulations. Shipments of absorbent paper and dehumidifying equipment were caught up in the red tape of bureaucracy and held at customs houses while the specialists pleaded for them.

There was confusion abroad as well. Orders went to England for portable dehumidifiers. Air conditioners arrived instead.

WASTED TRIP FOR RESTORERS

The very willingness of the international art community caused a certain amount of confusion.

Highly qualified restorers rushed to Florence from all over Italy and the rest of the world only to find that for most of them it was a wasted trip. They had come too soon. First the damaged works had to undergo months of drying before any actual restoration could begin.

An exception was Lawrence Majewski, head of the department of conservation of the New York Fine Arts Institute. At the recommendation of art authorities, Dr. Ugo Procacci, superintendent of Florence galleries, invited Majewski to come. In art circles Majewski is regarded with special awe as an experts' expert.

He arrived eleven days after the flood, made a quick survey and planned an emergency first aid program utilizing whatever materials were at hand.

He saved Sixteenth Century painted leather shields in the Bargello Museum by ransacking pharmacies for lanolin and neutral benzine solution, and rubbing the mixture into the ancient, water-soaked leathers.

First aid for the water-bloated paintings consisted of brushing absorbent paper on them with a resin solution to keep the color from cracking off. Then the paintings were laid out on chairs, to get a flow of air around them.

As this was done, teams of workmen labored around the clock for nearly two weeks to convert a 300-foot-long garden shed behind the Pitti Palace—called the Limonaia—into a sealed "hospital" fitted with air heaters and blowers.

RATE OF DRYING

The crucial problem is to control the rate of drying because the ancient woods, the chalk base for the painting and the mastic or glue to fix the base to the wood all expand at different temperatures. Random drying would crumble the masterpieces into so much colorful junk.

It took five United States Army trucks lent from the American NATO base at Vicenza, north of Florence, three days to gather the 300 wood paintings from museums, galleries and churches and bring them into the hospital.

As each painting arrived attendants dressed in white sprayed them with an anti-mold gas, placed them on racks covered with plastic sheets and inserted thermometers beside them.

The best known patient there is the Crucifixion painted by Cimabue. But the massive work, which weighs nearly 1,500 pounds, will never recover. Restorers say that with 80 per cent of its paint washed away it is now just a relic.

It is uncomfortable and unhealthy to work in the hospital. In the early stages the humidity rate was kept so high attendants fell ill. But they do not complain.

For them the big nightmare is mold. Every day every painting is washed front and back with some kind of fungicide. But every morning the mold is back again.

Restorer Massimo Seroni calls the situation desperate. He said there are perhaps 30 to 40 types of mold to fight and that it was feared they might get used to the daily doses of fungicide and grow stronger.

Mold is also the horror of the handful of book experts flown to Florence by the British Museum to save the volumes of the National Library.

The head of the team is Roger Powell, of Petersfield, Hampshire, who at 70 is rated perhaps the world's foremost practitioner of what he himself wryly calls "the dying craft of hand bindery."

PRIMITIVE METHOD

Across the river on the edge of downtown Florence, Dorothy Cumpstey, who teaches bookbinding at St. Mary's College in Bangor, North Wales, supervises a primitive washing and drying operation set up among the roaring boilers and hot pipes of the heating plant for the railroad station.

It was the only place immediately after the flood with warm running water. Here, as engineers move among them to check meters and guages, more than 50 volunteers—mainly American and English students—sit in the stifling heat under naked light bulbs and gently pass books a page at a time through improvised troughs running with tepid water.

The pages are hung on clotheslines to dry like a housewife's wash, then bound in brown manila to await passage through a specially built vacuum chamber filled with poisonous anti-mold gas.

"Once this is done," says Powell, "they can go to a bindery. There has been no binding yet. There are so few hand binders left in the world it will take probably 30 years before the job can be done. We'll have to send books out to any country that can help."

A GREAT MAN PASSED AWAY—DR. CARL J. MURPHY

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most respected Negro leaders in my city of Baltimore, Dr. Carl J. Murphy, recently passed away and his untimely death has left a great void in the ranks of all who work for equal rights and justice for all people. This articulate man was the distinguished publisher of the influential Afro-American newspapers and his wise counsel and impartial approach to solving many of Baltimore's problems gained him the respect and admiration of State and community leaders.

For many years, I was privileged to count Dr. Murphy as my friend. He was a man of many talents—an able linguist, a noted educator, and a respected member of the fourth estate. In the latter capacity, he was never a racist in the narrow sense of the term, but an able spokesman for all men whose cause for justice and equality he championed through the medium of his press.

On February 25, 1967, the Evening Sun of Baltimore, printed an article about his life and accomplishments. Because of his service as a journalist, newspaper publisher, and concerned citizen, I ask unanimous consent that this article be reprinted in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is as follows:

CARL MURPHY, PUBLISHER OF AFRO-AMERICAN, DIES

Dr. Carl J. Murphy, publisher of the Afro-American Newspapers for more than 50 years, died at 6:30 A.M. today at Johns Hopkins Hospital. He was 78.

Winner of the 1955 Spingarn Medal, Dr. Murphy had been the chairman of the board of trustees for Morgan State College and was recognized as one of the foremost of the nation's Negro leaders.

The son of John Henry Murphy, founder of the Afro-American Newspapers 75 years ago, Dr. Murphy took over the paper and became its president and chairman of the board upon his father's death.

RELINQUISHES PRESIDENCY

In 1961 he turned over the presidency of the paper to John H. Murphy 3d, a nephew, but remained as chairman of the board.

Mayor McKeldin, upon learning of Dr. Murphy's death said, "This city and indeed the State and the nation has suffered a great loss."

The Mayor, a long-time friend and associate of the publisher "for many years" described Dr. Murphy as "a first class public spirited citizen who was concerned for all the people of the city."

"He was a stabilizer and his influence and wise counsel will be greatly missed," the mayor said.

GOVERNOR AGNEW'S STATEMENT

Governor Agnew said of the Mr. Murphy, "I had an opportunity to have a more than a casual contact with Dr. Murphy during the past five years.

"His continuing dedication to the many social causes in which he was interested was unusual because of his calm and balanced approach. He was no less interested in equal rights for Negroes than equal rights for all people."

Dr. Murphy has been the recipient of more than six honorary doctorate degrees. Included among these are Morgan College and Howard University.

SUFFERED A STROKE

Dr. Murphy entered Hopkins for treatment of a slipped disc and suffered a stroke early this morning.

Credited with being the chief architect of Morgan College's expansion program Dr. Murphy was a member of Morgan's board of trustees since 1939 and became its chairman in 1953.

The Fine Arts Building and auditorium, located on the campus is named in his honor.

A graduate of Howard University in 1911, Dr. Murphy later became an instructor and professor of German at that institution.

After obtaining his master's degree from Harvard University, Dr. Murphy returned to Howard in 1913 and headed the German language department until 1918.

President Truman in 1952 selected the publisher to represent the United States at the inauguration of the first president of Liberia, William Tubman.

KENNEDY APPOINTMENT

In 1963, President Kennedy appointed Dr. Murphy to a six-member advisory board to the United States Post Office.

An ardent civil rights leader, Dr. Murphy revived the Baltimore branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in 1935. He served as the chairman of its board of directors for more than twenty years.

Dr. Murphy has been a member of the national board of directors for the N.A.A.C.P. since 1931.

SURVIVORS LISTED

Surviving are his wife, the former Lillian Parrott, five daughters and two brothers.

The daughters are Mrs. Elizabeth P. Moss, Mrs. Ida M. Smith, Mrs. Carlita Jones, Mrs. Vashti Matthews and Mrs. Frances Henderson.

His brothers are John J. Murphy, Jr., and D. Arnett Murphy.

Funeral arrangements are incomplete.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION CENTENNIAL

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Office of Education is observing the 100th anniversary of its establishment by the 39th Congress and President Andrew Johnson. The record of its past history and accomplishments, I believe, has been ably detailed by other Members of this distinguished House. I would like to add to that record, however, a few remarks about the present position of the Office of Education and its future promise as I see it.

My colleagues may be interested to know, as I was, that during the first 90 years of its existence the Congress appropriated approximately $2.9 billion to the Office of Education. Over the last 10 years, appropriations to the Office have totaled approximately $12.4 billion, more than four times the total for the previous 90 years. This fiscal year alone, the Office has a budget of nearly $4 billion.

Impressive as the figures may sound, it seems to me that their magnitude diminishes when one considers these facts: Total expenditures for education by all U.S. schools this year alone are estimated to be about $47.5 billion. And the total Federal support for education this fiscal year, provided by 10 Cabinet-level departments and 15 other agencies, is estimated to be roughly $11 billion.

The whole picture, then, appears to indicate that until very recently the Office of Education played a very small part in the Nation's educational enterprise. And that even today it is only a junior partner among State and local governments and a minor contributor among Federal agencies as a whole.

This image of the Office may be entirely appropriate. For its original mandate and most of its subsequent activities focused on "collecting such statistics and facts as shall show the condition and progress of education in the several States and territories." Moreover, the traditional responsibility for American education has been in the hands of State and local governments.

But I see, emerging from its present position and without a change in tradition, a new role for the Office of Education. I say a new role, actually though, it may be just a new and timely application of its charter to "promote the cause of education throughout the country." This new image I see of the Office is that of a catalyst for change in education.

Recent Congresses have established through legislation two major priorities for American education. They are the expansion of educational opportunities for all Americans and the equalization of these opportunities, especially among members of minority groups. In view of the Nation's advancing technology, I would suggest another priority—the individualization of instruction, so each child, each American can learn at his own pace and according to his own level of achievement.

In practical terms, these priorities have been translated into specific programs in schools around the country. There are special educational, health, recreational, and cultural programs for disadvantaged and exceptional children; loans, scholarships, part-time jobs for needy college students; immense efforts to desegregate school facilities and change community attitudes; pilot programs to reach each child through computer-assisted instruction, teams of teachers, and programed instruction.

But these programs, where they are in effect, and despite their far-reaching benefits, have not been implemented without some agony of change on the part of educators and local communities. And there are still many schools that have yet to play their part in this national concern. And many, many more private citizens and organizations still are not convinced that these priorities are the right ones.

A catalyst, Webster says, enables a reaction "to proceed under milder conditions than otherwise possible." In this age of rising expectations, and sometimes violent changes, I see a bright promise in this new role of the Office of Education. For acting as a catalyst, it can help in easing the way toward those necessary changes in our educational system on which the future of this Nation and so many of its citizens depends.

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I think the House acted very, very unwisely in voting to exclude Mr. Adam Clayton Powell, of New York, from membership in this body. I regard the possibility as very great that we will live to regret that vote. I do not believe that the decision of the House was reached after mature, sober reflection. It is clear, I think, that the vote compounded the problem raised by the conduct of Mr. Powell, rather than resolve it.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives, more than any other institution in our country, is obligated to be faithful to the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution is quite explicit on the qualifications established for membership in this body. They concern age, citizenship, and place of residence. Beyond doubt, Mr. Powell met these qualifications. It was, in my view, beyond the purview of the House to deny him his seat. It was a mistake to have done so.

The committee under Chairman CELLER brought in recommendations for the disciplining of Mr. Powell that were exceedingly harsh. I believe they were unduly harsh and, had the Conyers amendment reached the floor for a vote, I would have supported it. But the committee resolution had, whatever one may think of its provisions, the virtue of being legal, constitutional, and within the framework of the prerogatives of the House. But that, in my opinion, was not the case with the House action.

The next step for Mr. Powell, in all likelihood, is the appeal to the courts of his exclusion and I think there is a strong possibility that the courts will sustain him. Whether or not the courts sustain Mr. Powell, there is nothing to prevent him from presenting himself to his constituency once again for reelection. None of us here are doubtful of what the outcome would be.

In either case, we will be right back where we started. What will we do then? Will we then have another opportunity to approve the recommendations of the Celler committee? Will the House then act to expel Mr. Powell by a two-thirds vote? Will we keep going around in circles? I am afraid I do not know the answer. But I know that this body was unwise in its action last Wednesday.

The House of Representatives disciplined Mr. Powell for behaving in a manner inconsistent with law. I think the House itself has behaved in a manner inconsistent with law in excluding him. Mr. Powell earned punishment. I believe the wrong punishment was chosen. The day will come when we will have to rectify this error, and the dignity of the House—which those who voted to exclude seemed so determined to preserve—will seriously suffer.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Corman, for the week of March 6, on account of official business.

Mr. Helstoski (at the request of Mr. Fountain), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Dorn, for 60 minutes, on Thursday.

Mr. Landrum, for 60 minutes, on Thursday.

Mr. Whitener, for 60 minutes on Thursday.

Mr. Pollock (at the request of Mr. Wyatt), for 10 minutes today and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Dole (at the request of Mr. Wyatt), for 15 minutes, on March 7; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. Wyatt), for 30 minutes, on March 8; and to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Patman, for 60 minutes, on Monday, March 13; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Purcell (at the request of Mr. Gibbons), for 60 minutes, on March 8; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Rogers of Florida.

Mr. Kupferman.

Mr. Kee.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Wyatt) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Smith of California.

Mr Steiger of Arizona.

Mr. Utt.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Gibbons) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. McCarthy.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 7, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

481. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report concerning protective payments made in connection with the aid to families with dependent children program (H. Doc. No. 73); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed with accompanying papers.

482. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on Information, transmitting the 22d report of the Commission, dated February 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 80–603 (H. Doc. No. 74); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

483. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for International Affairs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report by the Secretary, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 84–540; to the Committee on Agriculture.

484. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; to the Committee on Agriculture.

485. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 78th quarterly report for the fourth quarter 1966, pursuant to the provisions of the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

486. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting the Agency's 27th semiannual report, covering the period July 1, 1966, to December 31, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 80–402; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

487. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the appropriation of funds to carry out the activities of Federal Committees for Development Planning in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

488. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation titled "Mental Health Amendments of 1967"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

489. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation titled "Public Television Act of 1967"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

490. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

491. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare transmitting a report on the advisory committees which assist the Secretary in carrying out functions under the Social Security Act, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 87–543; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 3136. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a study to determine the advantages and disadvantages of increased use of the metric system in the United States (Rept. No. 33). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DADDARIO: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 5404. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to make changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 34). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 267. Joint resolution to support emergency food assistance to India; with amendment (Rept. No. 67). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6098. A bill to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 68). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1562. A bill for the relief of Michael P. Buckley (Rept. No. 35). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1574. A bill for the relief of Bryce A. Smith; with amendment (Rept. No. 36). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1526. A bill for the relief of Cecil A. Rhodes (Rept. No. 37). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1528. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John T. Knight (Rept. No. 38). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1536. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Howard H. Adelberger (Rept. No. 39). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1586. A bill granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to render judgment on certain claims of N. M. Bentley against the United States (Rept. No. 40). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1587. A bill for the relief of Richard L. Bass; with amendment (Rept. No. 41). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1646. A bill for the relief of Mrs. A. E. Housley (Rept. No. 42). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1785. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose Thomas; with amendment (Rept. No. 43). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1880. A bill for the relief of Gerald Levine (Rept. No. 44). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MESKILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1945. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Harwell (Rept. No. 45). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1971. A bill for the relief of Arline and Maurice Loader (Rept. No. 46). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2048. A bill for the relief of William John Masterton, George Samuel Konik, and Louis Vincent Nanne; with amendment (Rept. No. 47). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2207. A bill for the relief of Elmer O. Erickson (Rept. No. 48). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2434. A bill for the relief of Nora Austin Hendrickson; with amendment (Rept. No. 49). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2455. A bill for the relief of Dean P. Bartelt (Rept. No. 50). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2652. A bill for the relief of Corbie F. Cochran; with amendment (Rept. No. 51). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2653. A bill for the relief of the American Journal of Nursing; with amendment (Rept. No. 52). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2661. A bill for the relief of E. F. Fort, Cora Lee Fort Corbett, and W. R. Fort; with amendment (Rept. No. 53). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MESKILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2756. A bill for the relief of Arley L. Beem, aviation electrician's mate chief, U.S. Navy; with amendment (Rept. No. 54). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2762. A bill for the relief of C.W.O. Bernhard Vollmer, U.S. Navy (retired). (Rept. No. 55). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EILBERG: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3222. A bill for the relief of William J. Hurley. (Rept. No. 56). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3403. A bill for the relief of Harry LeRoy Jones. (Rept. No. 57). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3715. A bill for the relief of Charles J. Arnold; with amendment (Rept. No. 58). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3716. A bill for the relief of Edward G. Beagle, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 59). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3887. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Solomon S. Levadi (Rept. No. 60). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3889. A bill for the relief of the Standard Meat Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 61). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4445. A bill for the relief of Aurex Corp. (Rept. No. 62). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4566. A bill for the relief of Mary F. Thomas (Rept. No. 63). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EILBERG: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4809. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Willifred S. Shirley (Rept. No. 64). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4930. A bill for the relief of Mr. Robert A. Owen (Rept. No. 65). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MESKILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5677. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Miller and Mildred M. Miller (Rept. No. 66). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 6586. A bill to provide for a more effective and equitable draft system by amending the Universal Military Training and Service Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6587. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual may be entitled to child's insurance benefits based on a disability which began at any time before he attained age 22 (instead of only if the disability began before he attained age 18 as under present law); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 6588. A bill to reserve certain public lands and other lands for a nationwide system of scenic rivers, to provide a procedure for adding additional lands to the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 6589. A bill to insure that public buildings financed with Federal funds are so designed and constructed as to be accessible to the physically handicapped; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 6590. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 6591. A bill to improve the safety of railroad transportation under the jurisdiction of the Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6592. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 6593. A bill to incorporate Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6594. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide credit against income tax for an employer who employs older persons in his trade or business, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6595. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 6596. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exclude agriculture employees employed on a seasonal basis from the act's minimum wage and overtime compensation requirements; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 6597. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6598. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a study to determine the advantages and disadvantages of increased use of the metric system in the United States; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 6599. A bill relating to the National Italo-American War Veterans, Inc., and the status of that organization under certain laws of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 6600. A bill to provide for the establishment and development of the Kenilworth National Capital Park in the District of Columbia for the benefit of the people of the United States and, in particular, children; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 6601. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 6602. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in certain lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of such lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 6603. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6604. A bill to protect the public health and safety by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish special controls for depressant and stimulant drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 6605. A bill to amend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 to permit States to construct certain highways in advance of availability of Federal funds; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 6606. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6607. A bill to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, to provide temporary assistance where public school buildings are destroyed by natural causes or fire disaster; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6608. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the disposal of surplus personal property to State and local governments, Indian groups under Federal supervision, and volunteer firefighting and rescue organizations at 50 percent of the estimated fair market value; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 6609. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of Commerce to carry out a survey and investigation of the feasibility of constructing and operating a passenger monorail train system between Suffern, N.Y., and Hoboken, N.J., over the rights-of-way of the main line of the Erie-Lackawanna Railroad; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6610. A bill to amend section 5(1) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide benefits for children of deceased railroad employees who are over the age of 18 and below the age of 22 and are attending an educational institution as full-time students; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6611. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to the retirement fund or that the individual be reimbursed; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6612. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 10-percent benefit increase, to provide a minimum $100 a month benefit for certain individuals with 25 years' service, to liberalize the retirement test, to provide health insurance benefits for individuals entitled to disability insurance benefits, to increase the earnings base for benefit and tax purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways Means.

By Mr. MAYNE:

H.R. 6613. A bill to amend the Uniform Time Act of 1966 in order to provide that daylight saving time shall be observed in the United States from the first Sunday following Memorial Day to the first Sunday following Labor Day; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 6614. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit States, under Federal-State agreements, to provide for coverage for hospital insurance benefits for the aged for certain State and local employees whose services are not otherwise covered by the insurance system established by such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 6615. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to abolish the renewal requirement for licenses in the safety and special radio services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 6616. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 6617. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6618. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 6619. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 6620. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma:

H.R. 6621. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 6622. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 6623. A bill to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to permit certain service-connected disabled veterans who are retired members of the uniformed services to receive compensation concurrently with retired pay, without deduction from either; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 6624. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 6625. A bill to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 6626. A bill to exclude certain State employees from the application of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 6627. A bill to establish a national cemetery in New England; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 6628. A bill to provide assistance to students pursuing programs of higher education in fields of law enforcement and of correctional treatment of law violators; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 6629. A bill to provide for the distribution of judgment funds among members of the Confederated Bands of the Ute Indian Tribes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 6630. A bill to amend title 37 of the United States Code so as to substantially increase the rates of basic pay of members of the uniformed services so as to promote voluntary enlistments and reenlistments in those services and make unnecessary involuntary inductions under the Universal Military Training and Service Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 6631. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to acquire certain real property in the District of Columbia determined to be necessary for use as a headquarters site for the Organization of American States or as sites for offices of other international organizations or governments of foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 6632. A bill to restore to the Custis-Lee Mansion located in the Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Va., its original historical name, followed by the explanatory memorial phrase, so that it shall be known as Arlington House—The Robert E. Lee Memorial; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 6633. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to improve and expand the authority to conduct or assist research relating to air pollutants, to assist in the establishment of regional air quality commissions, to authorize establishment of standards applicable to emissions from establishments engaged in certain types of industry, to assist in establishment and maintenance of State programs for annual inspections of automobile emission devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 6634. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide pensions for widows of certain retired members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 6635. A bill to establish a nationwide system of trails, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 6636. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to acquire certain real property in the District of Columbia determined to be necessary for use as a headquarters site for the Organization of American States or as sites for offices of other international organizations or governments of foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 6637. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a fire research and safety program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 6638. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to acquire certain real property in the District of Columbia determined to be necessary for use as a headquarters site for the Organization of American States or as sites for offices of other international organizations or governments of foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 6639. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 6640. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that the commander, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Department of the Navy, shall have the rank of vice admiral; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 6641. A bill to transfer from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions the authority to waive certain provisions relating to the issuance of a marriage license in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 6642. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 6643. A bill to provide that the Commissioners may accept or permit the acceptance of the performance by volunteers of services for and on behalf of the municipal government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 6644. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salary rates and provide certain benefits for purposes of recruitment and retention of privates in the Metropolitan Police force, to establish the rank of master patrolman, to change the titles of certain Metropolitan Police officials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 6645. A bill to amend the act approved August 17, 1937, so as to facilitate the addition to the District of Columbia registration of a motor vehicle or trailer of the name of the spouse of the owner of any such motor vehicle or trailer; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 6646. A bill to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, as amended, and the act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto, approved June 6, 1892, as amended, to exempt from licensing thereunder physicians and dentists employed by the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 6647. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the annual inspection of all motor vehicles in the District of Columbia," approved February 18, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 6648. A bill to amend title 5 of the United States Code with respect to pay received by public school teachers of the District of Columbia for employment during the summer vacation period; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 6649. A bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, to shorten the name of the Bank, to extend for 5 years the period within which the Bank is authorized to exercise its function, to increase the Bank's lending authority and its authority to issue, against fractional reserves, export credit insurance and guarantees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 6650. A bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, to shorten the name of the Bank, to extend for 5 years the period within which the Bank is authorized to exercise its functions, to increase the Bank's lending authority and its authority to issue, against fractional reserves, export credit insurance and guarantees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.J. Res. 389. Joint resolution in honor of Joan Merriam Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.J. Res. 390. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.J. Res. 391. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.J. Res. 392. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.J. Res. 393. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution preserving the rights of the States with respect to public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.J. Res. 394. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim April 9, 1967, as Bataan-Corregidor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 395. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER:

H. Con. Res. 256. Concurrent resolution to recognize the 175th anniversary of the admission of the Commonwealth of Kentucky to the Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H. Con. Res. 257. Concurrent resolution to provide early appropriations for Federal educational programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MINISH:

H. Con. Res. 258. Concurrent resolution reaffirming the support of the Congress for United Nations peacekeeping and peacemaking operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Con. Res. 259. Concurrent resolution to support self-determination for the people of South Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 260. Concurrent resolution marking the 175th anniversary of the admission of Kentucky to the Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. Con. Res. 261. Concurrent resolution marking the 175th anniversary of the admission of Kentucky to the Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H. Res. 362. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H. Res. 363. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the sale of certain rifles to the Government of Singapore; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. Res. 364. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 312; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

46. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to striking section 14(b) from the Taft-Hartley law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

47. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to water storage projects in Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

48. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to the determination and maintenance of a stabilized water level on Lake Francis Case, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 6651. A bill for the relief of Wei Tack Lick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 6652. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alberto Fernandez-Bravo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6653. A bill for the relief of Dr. Anselmo S. Alvarez-Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6654. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lucio A. Travieso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 6655. A bill for the relief of Mary Jane Orloski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 6656. A bill for the relief of Andrzej Lepionka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6657. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Geranio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 6658. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rolando Pozo y Jimenez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6659. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pedro Augusto Ruiz y Cue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 6660. A bill for the relief of Dorotea Caporrimo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6661. A bill for the relief of Emanuel Alaimo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 6662. A bill for the relief of Eagle Lake Timber Co., a partnership, of Susanville, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 6663. A bill for the relief of Jesse W. Stutts, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 6664. A bill for the relief of Petra Elena P. Banogon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 6665. A bill for the relief of Anastacia C. Bala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 6666. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marilyn Sharette; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 6667. A bill for the relief of Antonino Troia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6668. A bill for the relief of Calogero Troia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H.R. 6669. A bill for the relief of Jose Angel Arturo Lavastida y Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6670. A bill for the relief of Dr. Virgilio A. Ganganelli Valle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6671. A bill for the relief of Kai-Loo Huang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 6672. A bill for the relief of Hossein Sayad Safai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 6673. A bill for the relief of Lee Ok Ja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 6674. A bill for the relief of Spencer Tracey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6675. A bill for the relief of Shirley Williamson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

40. By the SPEAKER: Petition of National Sheriffs' Association, Washington, D.C., relative to the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

41. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Oreg., relative to the creation of the Lake of the Woods National Park in Minnesota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following reports for the third calendar quarter of 1966 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Allen & Murden, Inc., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30–32 St. Mary Axe, London E.C. 3, England; and Norwegian Shipowners Association, Post Office Box 1452, Oslo, Norway.

D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,265.70.

A. Nicholas E. Allen and Merrill Armour, 444 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 228 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. 60601.

D. (6) $1,575. (9) $155.75.

A. The American Beekeeping Federation, Minco, Okla., representing Nation's honey producers.

D. (6) $7,465.50. E. (9) $10,235.89.

A. The American Beekeeping Federation, Minco, Okla., representing Nation's honey producers.

D. (6) $3,025.50. E. (9) $3,458.85.

A. American Cancer Society, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $7,716.64.

A. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $650. E. (9) $568.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, Inc., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $3,517.88. E. (9) $3,517.88.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, Inc., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $3,105.52. E. (9) $3,105.52.

A. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $3,181.06. E. (9) $3,181.06.

A. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $9,231.52. E. (9) $9,231.52.

A. The American Legion, 700 North Penn Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) $1,072.86. E. (9) $34,322.35.

A. Allen & Murden, Inc., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Informal Committee of 18 European & Other Foreign Cruise Ship Lines, care of Mr. Vincent Demo, chairman; Cunard Steam Ship Co., Ltd., 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $10,500. E. (9) $999.77.

A. American Library Association, 50 East Huron, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $275.30. E. (9) $16,320.66.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y. Alvin Shapiro, executive vice president, American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $1,800.

A. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $500.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, care of E. C. Connor, treasurer, 224 Ellington Road, Longmeadow, Mass.

D. (6) $1.35.

A. American Thrift Assembly, Suite 1023, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $450. E. (9) $112.54.

A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $21,892.39. E. (9) $500.

A. Robert E. Ansheles, Suite 718, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $350. E. (9) $51.07.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1100 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.

D. (6) $314.50. E. (9) $729.95.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Braniff Airways, Inc., Exchange Park, Dallas, Tex.

E. (9) $6.45.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Commissioner of Baseball, 680 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

E. (9) $204.60.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Floor Covering Committee Affiliated with National Council of American Importers, 295 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Lever Bros. Co., 390 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Margaret Lee Weil (an individual), 33 West 67th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $206.53.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Margaret Lee Weil (an individual), 33 West 67th Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $37.51.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $6,249.99. E. (9) $21.83.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Rockwell-Standard Corp., 300 Sixth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

E. (9) $47.07.

A. The Arthritis Foundation, 1212 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $953.99.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $26,359.77. E. (9) $26,359.77

A. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, Suite 1208, RCA Building, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $260.

A. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, Suite 1208, RCA Building, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $305.

A. The Association of Western Rys., 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Atlanta Committee for Democratic Republican Independent Voter Education, 2540 Lakewood Avenue SW., Atlanta, Ga.

D. (6) $2,250.22. E. (9) $1,693.16.

A. Atlanta Committee for Democratic Independent Voter Education, 2540 Lakewood Avenue SW., Atlanta, Ga.

D. (6) $4,252.19. E. (9) $4,679.01.

A. Atlanta Committee for Democratic Republican Independent Voter Education, 2540 Lakewood Avenue SW., Atlanta, Ga.

D. (6) $2,269.50. E. (9) $2,404.99.

A. Atlanta Committee for Democratic Republican Independent Voter Education, 2540 Lakewood Avenue SW., Atlanta, Ga.

D. (6) $1,325.50. E. (9) $1,522.93.

A. Atlanta Committee for Democratic Republican Independent Voter Education, 2540 Lakewood Avenue SW., Atlanta, Ga.

D. (6) $87. E. (9) $146.29.

A. Atlanta Committee for Democratic Republican Independent Voter Education, 2540 Lakewood Avenue SW., Atlanta, Ga.

D. (6) $7,389.85. E. (9) $146.29.

A. Atlanta Committee for Democratic Republican Independent Voter Education, 2540 Lakewood Avenue SW., Atlanta, Ga.

D. (6) $6,744. E. (9) $11,447.05.

A. (Mrs.) Dita Davis Beard, ITT Building, 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,600. E. (9) $3,535.

A. Reed A. Benson, for The John Birch Society, Suite 1004, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The John Birch Society, Inc., 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont Mass.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW, Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joel D. Blackmon, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver Colo.

D. (6) $400.

A. William Blum, Jr., 1815 H Street NW., Suite 1200, Washington, D.C.

B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $4,893. E. (9) $891.27.

A. Fred F. Bockman, 405 Luhrs Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94105; the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $200. E. (9) $1,230.10.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.

B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $614.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, 325 Pioneer Building, Chattanooga, Tenn.

B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Pioneer Building, room 325, Chattanooga, Tenn.

A. *Col.* A. A. Brackett, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Brady, room 122, Sheraton Gibson Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio.

B. National Coordinating Committee of the Beverage Industry.

E. *(9) $167.80.*

A. Braniff Airways, Inc., Exchange Park, Dallas, Tex.

A. Florence I. Broadwell, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,686.60.

A. W. S. Bromley, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Pulpwood Association, 605 *Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.*

A. J. D. Brown, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $200.

A. James E. Bryan, president, James E. Bryan, Inc., 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Blue Shield Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,434.07.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

B. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 803 Rosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

A. Lowell A. Burkett, 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Vocational Association, 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gustave Burmeister, American Farm Bureau Federation, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,531.25.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $135. E. (9) $135.

A. Charles S. Burns, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $584.50. E. (9) $458.73.

A. George H. Buschmann, Mehler & Smollar, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $2,500.

A. Dan L. Butler, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $262.50.

A. Dan L. Butler, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Dan L. Butler, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

A. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 803 Rosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Col. John T. Carlton, 333 Pennsylvania *Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.*

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8323 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Richard M. Carrigan, legislative consultant, National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,765.59. E. (9) $70.96.

A. Casey, Lane & Mittendorf, 26 Broadway, New York, NY.

B. South African Sugar Association, Post Office Box 507, Durban, South Africa.

E. (9) $878.22.

A. *Ceramic* Tile Manufacturers *of* the United States, Inc., care of Norris E. Phillips, president, 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.

D. (6) $6,078.77. E. (9) $6,078.77.

A. Col. Joseph L. Chabot, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hal M. Christensen, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Dental Association (Washington office), 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,250.

A. David Cohen, 1223 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1223 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,230.02. E. (9) $174.56.

A. David Cohen, 1223 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1223 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,280.02. E. (9) $490.43.

A. David Cohen, 1223 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1223 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,178.48. E. (9) $365.40.

A. David Cohen, 1223 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1223 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,541.56. E. (9) $343.40.

A. Nicholas S. Collins, Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $278. E. (9) $11.82.

A. Paul G. Collins, Director of Information, American Bankers Association, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $125.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, Room 2702, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Paul Conrad, National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $190.23.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 211 East Chicago *Avenue, Chicago, Ill.*

B. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,231.

A. J. Milton Cooper, The Coronet, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, the Coronet, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.

A. *Council of State Chambers of Commerce,* 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $768.22. E. (9) $768.22.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association, 122 *East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.*

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Linen Supply Association of America, 975 Arthur Godfrey Boulevard, Miami Beach, Fla.

E. (9) $27.75.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. American Corn Millers Federation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

A. C. B. Culpepper.

B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.

A. C. B. Culpepper.

B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.

A. C. B. Culpepper.

B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.

A. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

D. (6) $1,598.63. E. (9) $257.80.

A. John C. Datt, assistant director of Washington office, American Farm Bureau Federation, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $19.84.

A. Aled P. Davies, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $687.50. E. (9) $457.05.

A. James J. Delaney, Jr., 1003 Lancaster Drive, Anchorage, Alaska.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $17.60. E. (9) $17.60.

A. Horace J. DePodwin Associates, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., care of Norris E. Phillips, president, 6430 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,253.45.

A. William C. Doherty, 400 First Street NW., suite 704, Washington, D.C.

B. Mail Order Association of America, 612 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $625.

A. William C. Doherty, 400 First Street NW., suite 704, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Uniform Manufacturers, 112 East 19th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $225.

A. Franklin B. Dryden, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Tobacco Institute.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $553.14.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $26.14.

A. Harold E. Edwards, legislative representative, United Steelworkers of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $3,370. E. (9) $300.

A. J. C. B. Ehringhaus, Jr., special counsel, Southern Railway System, Post Office Box 1776, Raleigh, N.C.

B. Southern Railway System, Post Office Box 1808, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5,250. E. (9) $1,640.30.

A. Elliott & Naftalin, Suite 201, 1330 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Audio Visual Association, 3150 Spring, Fairfax, Va.

A. Warren G. Elliott, Assistant General Counsel, Life Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street, Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $570. E. (9) $37.06.

A. Perry R. Ellsworth, 1025 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retail Jewelers of America, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John W. Emeigh, secretary, National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $481. E. (9) $16.

A. Ethyl Corp., 611 Madison Office Building, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $759.67.

A. Edward L. Felton, Holland, Va.

B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Joe G. Fender, 2033 Norfolk Street, Houston, Tex.

B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.

D. (6) $809.29.

A. Joe G. Fender, attorney, 2033 Norfolk, Houston, Tex.

B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.

D. (6) $216.66.

A. Mello G. Fish, legislative representative, United Steelworkers of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $2,835. E. (9) $300.

A. Roger Fleming, Secretary-Treasurer, American Farm Bureau Federation, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,300.

A. Floyd O. Flom, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 E. 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Bldg., Bunnell, Fla.

A. National Association of Building Owners & Managers, 134 S. LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $82.64.

A. Milton Fricke, Papillion, Nebr.

B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Frank W. Frisk, Jr., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $500.

A. William A. Geoghegan, Pierson, Ball & Dowd, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Soap & Detergent Association, 295 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,500.

A. Mary Condon Gereau, Legislative Consultant, National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,180.25. E. (9) $247.47.

A. Harry J. Gerrity, 907 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Building Owners & Managers, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $105.02.

A. Robert Glicker, 1642 South 52d Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

B. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.

A. John A. Gosnell, National Small Business Association, 1225 19th Street NW., Suite 307, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,833.34.

A. George Gross, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $134.96

A. Charles A. Hamilton Associates, Suite 715, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., care of Norris Phillips, President, 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.

D. (6) $326.25. E. (9) $649.25.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $75. E. (9) $38.25.

A. Robert N. Hampton, Director of Marketing Services, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,000.02. E. (9) $471.

A. Franklin Hardinge, Jr., 1444 Wentworth Avenue, Pasadena, Calif.

B. California Savings & Loan League, Post Office Box R (1444 Wentworth Avenue), Pasadena, Calif.

D. (6) $600. E. (9) $584.91.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, Legislative Counsel, American Farm Bureau Federation, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,875.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert W. Healy, Esq., Attorney at Law, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Smith & Pepper, Attorneys at Law, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Christopher O. Henderson, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $550. E. (9) $25.

A. Carey W. Hilliard, president, National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $420. E. (9) $27.

A. Lawrence S. Hobart, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $425.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, legislative director, United Steelworkers of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. John W. Holton, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $5,039.72.

A. Harold A. Hosier, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.
B. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.

A. Harold K. Howe, manager, Washington Office, American Institute of Laundering, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Automatic Merchandising Association, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, Inc., 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Howrey, Simon, Baker & Murchison, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., care of Norris E. Phillips, president, 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,032.50. E. (9) $4,176.07.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Buckley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Buckley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Meryle V. Hutchison, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,787.60.

A. International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,551.18.

A. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $400.

A. Rear Adm. Alexander Jackson, Jr., 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles E. Jackson, Consultant, Charles E. Jackson & Associates, 715 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $11.50.

A. Ralph K. James, Executive Director, Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $440. E. (9) $32.61.

A. Charlies W. Jones, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $33.

A. Mrs. Fritz R. Kahn, 9202 Ponce Place, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $28.35.

A. Jerome J. Keating, president, National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. Cornelius B. Kennedy, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John A. Killick, secretary, Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12.50.

A. John A. Killick, executive secretary, the National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $270.83.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, vice president and general counsel, Life Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $378.88. E. (9) $20.03.

A. Kirkland, Ellis, Hodson, Chaffetz & Masters, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. George W. Koch, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Lloyd R. Kuhn, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,752. E. (9) $593.65.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of ASCS County Office Employees, care of Clyde R. Payne, secretary-treasurer, Jasper, Fla.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $125.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $125.

A. Edith M. Lesser, 2924 Rittenhouse Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,039.98.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,053.91. E. (9) $4,053.91.

A. John J. Linnehan, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of United States of America, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,249.99. E. (9) $696.22.

A. John M. Lumley, Director, Division of Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,241.98. E. (9) $409.23.

A. John C. Lynn, Legislative Director, American Farm Bureau Federation, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,593.75. E. (9) $32.64.

A. J. L. McCaskill, assistant executive secretary, State and Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, State and Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $100.

A. Alfred R. McCauley, 720 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Magnavox Co., Bueter Road, Fort Wayne, Ind.

A. Alfred R. McCauley, 720 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Scientific Apparatus Makers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $119.90.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, Legislative Representative, United Steelworkers of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,370. E. (9) $300.

A. Stanley J. McFarland, Assistant Director, Division of Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,308.48. E. (9) $49.47.

A. F. Howard McGuigan, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,692. E. (9) $322.03.

A. Marvin L. McLain, assistant legislative director, American Farm Bureau Federation, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,350. E. (9) $39.22.

A. William H. McLin, assistant director, National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,308.48. E. (9) $57.97.

A. Ralph J. McNair, vice president, Government Relations, Life Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $310. E. (9) $14.20.

A. P. H. Mathews, assistant vice president, Association of American Railroads, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,294.41. E. (9) $463.56.

A. Albert E. May, assistant executive director, Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $382. E. (9) $52.67.

A. Anthony Mazzocchi, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers International Union, 1840 California Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,437.50. E. (9) $227.50.

A. Donald Melvin, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $636.13. E. (9) $117.12.

A. Joseph L. Miller, management consultant, 918 16th Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Northern Textile Association and National Parking Association.

A. Stephen A. Mitchell, attorney, Post Office Box 486, Taos, N. Mex.

A. Curtis Morris, Premier Building, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Micah H. Naftalin, Elliott & Naftalin, Attorneys at Law, Suite 201, 1330 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ethyl Corp., 611 Madison Office Building, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Blue Shield Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,434.07.

A. National Association of Building Owners & Managers, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $82.64.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $53,546.33. E. (9) $26,894.34.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $484.84.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $492,473.34. E. (9) $11,254.40.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $626,355.32. E. (9) $18,513.67.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.; 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $54,938.31. E. (9) $51,272.79.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.; 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,490. E. (9) $2,490.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $40,942.64. E. (9) $682.50.

A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, c/o Dr. A. B. Baker, Division of Neurology, University of Minnesota Hospital, Minneapolis, Minn.
E. (9) $5,500.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Central Scientific Co., 2600 South Kostner Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $397.33.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $154.76.

A. State and Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $17,478.32.

A. National Farmers Organization, Corning, Iowa.
E. (9) $5,153.66.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $45,478.55. E. (9) $267.97.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $409,254.30. E. (9) $1,556.60.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $112,156.60. E. (9) $13,666.65.

A. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,615.05. E. (9) $1,976.95.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,035.99.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,689. E. (9) $973.

A. National Retired Teachers Association, American Association of Retired Persons, Washington, D.C.
B. National Retired Teachers Association, American Association of Retired Persons, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington D.C.
E. (9) $1,431.45.

A. National Retired Teachers Association, American Association of Retired Persons, Washington, D.C.
B. National Retired Teachers Association, American Association of Retired Persons, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,277.67.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,223. E. (9) $11,359.

A. National Small Business Association, 1225 19th Street NW., Suite 307, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $2,562.52.

A. National Tax Equality Association, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,570. E. (9) $8,605.60.

A. The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $1,680.13. E. (9) $3,116.50.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,051.18.

A. Ivan A. Nestingen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wisc.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $101.18.

A. Ben Paul Noble-Andrew McR. Barnes-Allan M. Ephraim, 2022 R Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. Hallmark Inc., Westminster Time Corp., Phoenix Industries, Inc.; Stratton Watch Co., Agana, Guam.
D. (6) $8,496.25. E. (9) $826.73.

A. Ira H. Nunn, 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 505, Washington, D.C.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $250.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $386. E. (9) $2,221.

A. Francis J. O'Rourke, National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $347.02.

A. Francis J. O'Rourke, National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $558.01.

A. Francis J. O'Rourke, National Tax Equality Association & National Association Businessmen, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $437.28.

A. Francis J. O'Rourke, National Tax Equality Association & National Association Businessmen, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $307.46.

A. Francis J. O'Rourke, National Tax Equality Association & National Association Businessmen, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $273.67.

A. Francis J. O'Rourke, National Tax Equality Association & National Association Businessmen, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $294.87.

A. J. Allen Overton, Jr., 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Geo. F. Parrish, West Virginia Railroad Association, Charleston, W. Va.
B. West Virginia Railroad Association, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
E. (9) $153.86.

A. Brig. Gen. John L. Person, USA, retired, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Peter J. Pestillo, 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 505, Washington, D.C.

B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $125.

A. Andrew A. Pottis, Room 512–513, H.A.L.C.A. Building, 100 Indiana Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. IUMSNA–C.S.B., 534 Cooper Street, Camden, N.J.
D. (6) $4,711. E. (9) $3,044.84.

A. Pierson, Ball & Dowd, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Federal Cartridge Corp., 2700 Foshay Tower, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $30.50.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Milton M. Plumb, Switchmen's Union of North America, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Switchmen's Union of North America, 3 Linwood Avenue, Buffalo, N.Y.

A. Richard M. Powell, National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, New York, N.Y.; Arthritis Foundation, New York, N.Y.; National Comm. for Research in Neurological Disorders, Minneapolis, Minn.; National Multiple Sclerosis Society, New York, N.Y.; United Cerebral Palsy Associations, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $13,649.97. E. (9) $7,324.31.

A. James H. Rademacher, National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Alex Radin, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $202.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Bermuda Trade Development Board, Hamilton, Bermuda.
D. (6) $1,666.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Bulk Food Carriers, Inc., 311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $900.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Sea-Land Service, Inc., Post Office Box 105, Elizabeth, N.J.
D. (6) $900.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. South Atlantic & Caribbean Line, Inc., 250 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Stimson Lumber Co., Post Office Box 68, Forest Grove, Oreg.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $3,390.35.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Elisabeth von Oberndorff, 200 East 66th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $21.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 6815 Prestonshire, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Drawer 747, Durant, Okla.
D. (6) $190.34. E. (9) $39.34.

A. Stanley Rector, Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc., 720 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Robert E. Redding, Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Retired Officers Tax Credit Committee, Post Office Box 1965, Annapolis, Md.
D. (6) $582.50. E. (9) $662.71.

A. Harry H. Richardson, lawyer, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.
B. Louisiana railroads.
D. (6) $32.50. E. (9) $87.57.

A. Earl F. Rieger, 400 First Street NW., suite 704, Washington, D.C.
B. William C. Doherty & Associates, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $85.

A. John J. Riley, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $47.95.

A. John Rippey, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $662.55. E. (9) $39.50.

A. Stephen Philip Robin, Counsel, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Public Relations Co., Ltd., (New York) doing business as Japan Steel Information Center, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,100. E. (9) $300.

A. James A. Rock, Assistant to Director, Washington Office, American Farm Bureau Federation, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $0.73.

A. Rockwell-Standard Corp., 300 Sixth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
E. (9) $47.07.

A. Nathaniel H. Rogg, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,312.50. E. (9) $81.44.

A. John F. Rolph III, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500.

A. Mrs. Edward F. Ryan, 110 Bridge Street, Manchester, Mass.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $201.57.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 1300 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Business Press, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $1,148.24.

A. Stanley W. Schroeder, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,243.28. E. (9) $66.12.

A. Theodore A. Serrill, National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $106.37.

A. John J. Sheehan, United Steelworkers of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $300.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $575.

A. A. Z. Shows, WILMAC Corp., 1800 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Representing the WILMAC Corp., 1800 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $1,535.50.

A. Gerald A. Simmons, American Farm Bureau Federation, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,437.50. E. (9) $35.43.

A. E. Stratford Smith, Esq., Attorney at Law, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Smith & Pepper, Attorneys at Law, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James E. Smith, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $310.

A. Smith & Pepper, Attorneys at Law, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Carroll M. Shaw, 6326 Southcrest Drive, Shreveport, La.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, Post Office Box 3714, Georgetown Station, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $17,439.99. E. (9) $8,915.05.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, Post Office Box 3719, Georgetown Station, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,777.53 E. (9) $10,451.59.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, Post Office Box 3719, Georgetown Station, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,267.15. E. (9) $8,424.26.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, drawer 747, Durant, Okla.
E. (9) $229.68.

A. Lawrence Speiser, in care of American Civil Liberties Union, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Chester S. Stackpole, Managing Director, American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Philip W. Stroupe, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $43.65.

A. Walter B. Stults, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Monroe Sweetland, Legislative Consultant, National Education Association, 1705 Murchison Drive, Burlingame, Calif.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $335. E. (9) $50.

A. Swidler & Freeman, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Jackson Purchase Rural Electric Cooperative Corp., 2315 Broadway, Paducah, Ky.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $186.56.

A. Swidler & Freeman, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Jackson Purchase Rural Electric Cooperative Corp., 2315 Broadway, Paducah, Ky.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $292.49.

A. C. M. Tarr, president.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,244.43. E. (9) $675.

A. Craig L. Thomas, assistant legislative director, American Farm Bureau Federation, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,712.50. E. (9) $23.16.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trans World Airlines, 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, president, Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John N. Thurman, Pacific American Steamship Association, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 635 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $807.90.

A. Dwight D. Townsend, Cooperative League of U.S.A., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cooperative League of U.S.A., 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $5,985.

A. Trade Relations Council of the United States, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $646.34.

A. Richard S. Tribbe, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trans World Airlines, 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Matt Triggs, Assistant Legislative Director, American Farm Bureau Federation, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $31.66.

A. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $423.40. E. (9) $1,832.69.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,393.34.

A. F. Bourne Upham III, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $580.

A. Charles R. Van Horn, Washington Representative, C. & O.–B. & O. Railroads, 17th and H Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., and Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., Charles and Baltimore Streets, Baltimore, Md.

A. R. K. Vinson, Machinery Dealers National Association, 1400 20th Street NW., Post Office Box 19128, Washington, D.C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1400 20th Street NW., Post Office Box 19128, Washington, D.C.

A. The Voice of the People in Action (The Society of the People, Inc.), 621 Sheridan Street, Chillum, Md.
B. Dr. Russell Forrest Egner.

A. Volume Footwear Retailers Association, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $2,557.37.

A. Harold S. Walker, Jr., American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Paul H. Walker, Life Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $395.68. E. (9) $10.24.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,313. E. (9) $2,388.75.

A. Robert P. Will, 487 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, 1111 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,600. E. (9) $902.65.

A. Kenneth Williamson, American Hospital Association, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,717.69. E. (9) $245.05.

A. Nathan T. Wolkomir, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,815.40. E. (9) $365.85.

A. J. H. Yingling, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Football League, 280 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. J. H. Yingling, 906 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. First National City Bank, 399 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $25.

A. J. H. Yingling, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Business Development Corps., 45 Milk Street, Boston, Mass.
E. (9) $10.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1966:

(Note.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the Record, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

File One Copy With the Secretary of the Senate and File Two Copies With the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

Place an "X" Below the Appropriate Letter or Figure in the Box at the Right of the "Report" Heading Below:

"Preliminary" Report ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"Quarterly" Report: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19______ ◀

REPORT

Pursuant to Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

Note on Item "A".—(a) In General. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) Separate Reports. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. Organization or Individual Filing:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

Note on Item "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. Employer.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

Note on Item "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. Legislative Interests, and Publications in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◀

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◀

Note on Item "D."—(*a*) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(*b*) **If This Report Is for an Employer.**—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(*c*) **If This Report Is for an Agent or Employee.**—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. Receipts (Including Contributions and Loans):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $________Dues and assessments
2. $________Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $________Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $________Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $________Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)

6. $________**Total** for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $________Received during previous Quarters of calendar year

8. $________**Total** from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $________**Total** now owed to others on account of loans
10. $________Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $________Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $________"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more
(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?

Please answer "yes" or "no": ________

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor*
	(*"Period"* from Jan. 1 through __________________, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	**Total**

Note on Item "E".—(*a*) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(*b*) **If This Report Is for an Agent or Employee.** In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. Expenditures (Including Loans) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $________Public relations and advertising services
2. $________Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $________Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $________Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $________Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $________Telephone and telegraph
7. $________Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $________All other expenditures

9. $________**Total** for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $________Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $________**Total** from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $________**Total** now owed to person filing
13. $________Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $________Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7–11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7–15, 8–15, 9–15: Britten & Blaten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	**Total**

PAGE 2

A. Charles D. Ablard, Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 1629 K Street NW., Suite 603, Washington, D.C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $13.62.

A. Robert L. Ackerly, Sellers, Conner & Cuneo, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chemical Specialties Manufacturers Association, Inc., 50 East 41st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $336.84.

A. Ad Hoc Committee of the Construction Industry Advancement Funds, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence G. Adamy, National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association, Post Office Box 5800, Washington, D.C.

A. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., Suite 409, ARBA Building, 525 School Street SW., Washington, D.C.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,367.72. E. (9) $3,367.72.

A. Mrs. Donna Allen, 3306 Ross Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, 555 North Western Avenue, Room 2, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,120. E. (9) $1,643.87.

A. Kenneth D. Allen, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Louis J. Allen.

A. Nicholas E. Allen and Merrill Armour, 444 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 228 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $295.74.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street, Washington, D.C.

A. The American Beekeeping Federation, Minco, Okla.
D. (6) $6,133.11. E. (9) $3,344.42.

A. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $709. E. (9) $620.

A. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $38,120. E. (9) $38,120.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $44,401.67.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,279.60. E. (9) $4,497.62.

A. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Humane Association, 5351 South Roslyn Street, Englewood, Colo.
E. (9) $1,500.

A. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,425. E. (9) $1,425.

A. American Insurance Association, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,062. E. (9) $6,062.

A. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Suite 720, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $375.33. E. (9) $577.22.

A. American Justice Association, Inc., Defense Highway, Gambrills, Md.
D. (6) $2. E. (9) $2.

A. The American Legion, 700 North Penn Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $176.72. E. (9) $31,836.50.

A. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $231.54. E. (9) $37.13.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $8,891.63.

A. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill., Mutual Fire & Casualty Trade Association.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $11,563.12. E. (9) $11,563.12.

A. American Optometric Association, Inc., care of Dr. Melvin D. Wolfberg, 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $7,369.98. E. (9) $7,369.98.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $855.10. E. (9) $855.10.

A. American Parents' Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,023.40. E. (9) $683.68.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,427. E. (9) $6,969.

A. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,451.01.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $360.

A. American Restaurant Institute, 1414 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,200. E. (9) $6,065.47.

A. American Stock Yards Association, 1712 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $900.

A. American Surveys, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Taxpayers Association, 326 Pennsylvania Building.
D. (6) $893. E. (9) $2,421.03.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, 224 Ellington Road, Longmeadow, Mass.
D. (6) $0.63.

A. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $12,873.60. E. (9) $12,873.60.

A. American Transit Association, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,325. E. (9) $25,000.

A. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $20,847.63.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., Suite 502, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,995. E. (9) $1,995.

A. Cyrus T. Anderson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Football League, 1 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Cyrus T. Anderson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spiegel, Inc., 2511 West 23d Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Jerry L. Anderson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Alabama Railroad Association, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $378. E. (9) $613.10 (includes $80.62 applicable to third quarter).

A. Mrs. Erma Angevine, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1100 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.

A. Carl F. Arnold, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,623.87.

A. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Railroad Station—Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, Room 202, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, Inc., 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $525.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,620. E. (9) $7,620.

A. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $127.15.

A. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. A. V. Atkinson, Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,940.92.

A. Atlanta Committee for Democratic Republican Independent Voter Education, 2540 Lakewood Avenue SW., Atlanta Ga.

D. (6) $6,464. E. (9) $7,655.58.

A. Atlantic Richfield Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Robert L. Augenblick, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Richard W. Averill, Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael H. Bader, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harry S. Baer, Jr., 1725 De Sales Street NW., No. 400, Washington, D.C.

B. National AeroSpace Services Association, 1725 De Sales Street NW., No. 400, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $62.50.

A. Charles B. Bailey, Sr., National Legislative Representative, Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $3,249.94. E. (9) $421.66.

A. Donald Baldwin, Suite 926, Cafritz Building, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Northern Pacific Railway Co., St. Paul, Minn.; Great Northern Railway Co., St. Paul, Minn.; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $300.

A. Ernest L. Barcella, Manager, Washington Office, General Motors Corp., Washington, D.C.

B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Barnes, Richardson & Colburn, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, DC.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $250. E. (9) $22.92.

A. Irvin L. Barney, Room 820, 400 First Street NW., Washington, DC.

B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.

D. (6) $3,600.

A. A. Wesley Barthelmes, 2133 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Insurance Company of North America, Life Insurance Co. of North America.

D. (6) $453.30. E. (9) $264.33.

A. James P. Bass, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Airlines, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Roy Battles, director, Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 917 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 917 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Beattie, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,050.

A. John H. Beidler, Director, Legislative Department, Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO.

B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,690. E. (9) $483.28.

A. James F. Bell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $750. E. (9) $57.03.

A. Ernest H. Benson, National Legislative Representative, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) $5,500.

A. Reed A. Benson, for the John Birch Society, Suite 1004, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The John Birch Society, Inc., 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont, Mass.

A. Helen Berthelot, Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $2,077.23.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, Federation of Trades and Labor Unions, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5,670. E. (9) $424.95.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John H. Bivins, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $670.

A. Robert W. Blair, New Process Co., Warren, Pa.

E. (9) $1,172.20.

A. Wm. Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. C. B. Blankenship, Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $3,791.37.

A. Blumberg, Singer, Ross & Gordon, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $16,250.

A. Fred F. Bockmon, 405 Luhrs Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $150. E. (9) $375.15.

A. Maurice G. Boehl, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.

B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert T. Borth, General Electric Co., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $310.35. (Does not include any allocations of overhead. clerical, etc., services provided by employer.)

A. Melvin J. Boyle, assistant to international secretary, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL–CIO–CLC, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,328.52.

A. Samuel E. Boyle, 328 South Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

B. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $1,272.81. E. (9) $227.55.

A. Col. A. A. Brackett, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles N. Brady, Highway Department, American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Brady, Room 122, Sheraton Gibson Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio.

E. (9) $206.50.

A. Thomas C. Brickle, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Lumber & Building Material Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,000.

A. Parke C. Brinkley, the Madison Building, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wally Briscoe.

B. National Community Television Association, Inc., 535 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. David A. Brody, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 315 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) Approximately $200.

A. W. S. Bromley, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $750. E. (9) $75.

A. Derek Brooks, National Retail Furniture Association, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Furniture Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $861.45.

A. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $6,982.27. E. (9) $6,982.27.

A. J. Robert Brouse, Animal Health Institute, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Animal Health Institute, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. D. Brown, 919 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., 2 Rector Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $812.49.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Co., Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $860.96.

A. Robert W. Bruce, 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. The Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $119.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $8.33. E. (9) $25.49.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $69. E. (9) $21.11.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 893 Rosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

A. George S. Bullen, National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, 15th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Norman D. Burch, National Retail Merchants Association, 1317 F Street NW., Suite 800, Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $51.01.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. George J. Burger, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $30,324.22. E. (9) $677.25.

A. Hollis W. Burt, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $62.50.

A. Herbert H. Butler, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington D.C.
B. United States Independent Telephone Association, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $25.

A. Robert B. Byrnes, 1514 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 2403 East 75th Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $74.18.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 840, Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $760.20. E. (9) $53.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000 (estimate). E. (9) $478.

A. Donald L. Calvin, New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Carl Campbell, Room 502, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $37.50.

A. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 805 Rosselle St., Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union-Metal Trades Council, AFL–CIO, Post Office Box 471, Baboa Heights, C.Z.
D. (6) $2,754.35. E. (9) $266.23.

A. Marvin Caplan, Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,799. E. (9) $204.97.

A. Michael H. Cardozo, Association of American Law Schools, 1521 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Law Schools, 1521 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Col. John T. Carlton, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. James R. Carnes, Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Braxton B. Carr, Suite 502, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., Suite 502, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $224.58.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8323 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Blue A. Carstenson.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,464.57. E. (9) $118.59.

A. Eugene C. Carusi, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. E. Michael Cassady, Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meremec, Suite 1032T, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meremec, Suite 1032T, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Francis R. Cawley, Room 1015, Shoreham Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Label Manufacturers National Association, Inc.; Agricultural Publishers Association, Room 1015, Shoreham Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $27.50. E. (9) $7.40.

A. Central Arizona Project Association, 1124 Arizona Title Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
D. (6) $5,920. E. (9) $22,669.93.

A. Col. Joseph L. Chabot, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Chapman, DiSalle & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Alaska Pipeline Co., Post Office Box 6554, Houston 5, Tex.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $69.12.

A. Chapman, DiSalle & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Strohmeyer & Arpe Co., 139–141 Franklin Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,050. E. (9) $74.90.

A. Chapman, DiSalle & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Union Nacional de Productores de Azucar, S.A. de C. V., Balderas 36, Primer Piso, Mexico D. F., Mexico.
D. (6) $35,000. E. (9) $82.02.

A. James W. Chapman, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,708.50.

A. Charitable Contributors Associates, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
E. (9) $1.76.

A. Chemical Specialties Manufacturers Association, Inc., 50 East 41st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. A. H. Chesser, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $100.

A. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,512.68. E. (9) $5,271.59.

A. Edwin Christianson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., 1012 14th Street, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $153.26.

A. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $30,074.28. E. (9) $50.30.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 712, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,589.72. E. (9) $10,264.24.

A. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 335, Washington, D.C.

A. William F. Claire, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Allen C. K. Clark, Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Earl W. Clark.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,294. E. (9) $34.

A. Mr. Robert M. Clark, the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, Post Office Box 13125, Kansas City, Mo.
E. (9) $4,162.05.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 917 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $293.09.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Oil Shale Corp., 680 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. P. Lorillard Co.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philip Morris Inc.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute.

A. David Cohen, 1223 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1223 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,360.02. E. (9) $316.94.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Committee for a Reasonable World Trade Center, 450 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $850. E. (9) $53.30.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $68.34.

A. Joseph Cohen, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750.

A. Richard G. Cohen, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Universal Consolidated Industries, 1 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) Under $150.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Collier, Shannon & Rill, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125.

A. Collier, Shannon & Rill, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Footwear Manufacturers Association, Inc., 324 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $153.50.

A. Collier, Shannon & Rill, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tool & Stainless Steel Industry Committee, Carpenter Steel Co., Reading, Pa.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $575.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,395.24. E. (9) $1,395.24.

A. Committee for Automobile Excise Tax Repeal, 9th Floor, Farragut Building, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Committee for a Free Cotton Market, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington. D.C.
E. (9) $1,830.15.

A. Committee for an Interstate Taxation Act, 1209 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New Process Co., Warren, Pa. and Columbia Broadcasting Co., 51 West 52d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $250.

A. Ralph T. Compton, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturer.

A. Paul B. Comstock, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Raymond F. Conkling, Texaco Inc., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texaco Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $86.10.

A. John D. Conner, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert J. Conner, Jr., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $160. E. (9) $28.

A. Harry N. Cook, Suite 200, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Waterways Conference.

A. Edward Cooper.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John Shepherd Cooper, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $320. E. (9) $2,163.85.

A. Joshua W. Cooper, 626 South Lee Street, Alexandria, Va.
B. Portsmouth-Kittery Armed Services Committee, Inc., Post Office Box 506, Portsmouth, N.H.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $2,713.23.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Forest Industries, 1477 West Pender Street, Vancouver, B.C., Canada.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Footwear Division, Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,750.

A. Council for a Livable World, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $13,601.61. E. (9) $42,845.06.

A. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, 29 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Lightweight Aggregate Percentage Depletion Committee, care of John W. Roberts, chairman, Post Office Box 9138, Richmond, Va.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. A. P. Møller, 8 Kongens Nytorv, Copenhagen, Denmark.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mortgage Insurance Companies, care of William A. Granberry, Post Office Box 2976, Raleigh, N.C.
E. (9) $20.16.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Wisconsin Corp., 500 Union Street, Seattle, Wash.
E. (9) $54.65.

A. H. C. Crotty, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. J. A. Crowder, 1200 17th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. Steele Culbertson, National Fish Meal & Oil Association, 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Fish Meal & Oil Association, 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $27.55.

A. C. B. Culpepper.
B. National Conference of Nonprofit Shipping Associations, Inc., Post Office Box 1736, Atlanta, Ga.

A. John T. Curran, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,250. E. (9) $1,903.07.

A. John R. Dalton, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. F. Gibson Darrison, Jr., New York Central Railroad Co., 1010 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Central Railroad Co., 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Aled P. Davies, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $68.75. E. (9) $43.15.

A. Charles W. Davis 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 901 West 22d Street, Oak Brook, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $320.17.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $25,000. E. (9) $264.75.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Union Tank Car Co., 111 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $150.72.

A. Lowell Davis, 601 Ross Avenue, Mart, Tex.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $150.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. CIT Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. D.C. Transit System, Inc., 3600 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Guild of Prescription Opticians, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Oceanic Properties, Inc., Post Office Box 2780, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Admiral Time, Inc., Belair Time Corp., Unitime Corp., St. Croix, V.I., Multi-Jewell Corp., St. Thomas, V.I.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association, Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Nursing Home Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,500. E. (9) $75.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. CIT Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Export Agency Division, Calcutta, India.
D. (6) $20,000. E. (9) $823.37.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Laundry-Dry Cleaning Association of D.C., 2401 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Peoples Life Insurance Co., Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Equitable Life Insurance Co., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Responsive Environments Corp., 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Tony T. DeChant.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $158.30.

A. L. E. Deilke, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Interstate Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. L. E. Deilke, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Co.'s, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. John deLaittre, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,600. E. (9) $4,185.

A. James J. Delaney, Jr., 1003 Lancaster Drive, Anchorage, Alaska.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $122.25.

A. Ronald W. De Lucien, National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $325. E. (9) $75.

A. Max A. Denney, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $675.

A. John M. Dickerman, 900 17th Street NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,600.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $587.50. E. (9) $77.44.

A. George S. Dietrich, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association On Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water Resources, State of California, Post Office Box 388, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,231.85. E. (9) $206.85.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 6201 S Street, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $1,091.95. E. (9) $41.95.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Yuba County Water Agency, Marysville, Calif.
D. (6) $1,228.35. E. (9) $28.35.

A. Disabled American Veterans, National Service Headquarters, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $10,875. E. (9) $586.52.

A. Robert H. Distelhorst, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375.

A. James F. Doherty, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,836. E. (9) $444.23.

A. Paul R. M. Donelan, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $83.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, American Insurance Association, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Jasper N. Dorsey, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Room 906, Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Room 906, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,177.10. E. (9) $245.

A. Leonard E. Dowiak, American Hotel & Motel Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Franklin B. Dryden, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute.

A. P. Frederick Dryer, 3911 Madison Street, Hyattsville, Md.

A. Evelyn Dubrow, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,715.44. E. (9) $1,001.70.

A. R. Michael Duncan.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold E. Edwards, United Steelworkers of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,370. E. (9) $300.

A. Walter A. Edwards, 1700 K Street NW., Suite 1306, Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (5) $250. E. (8) $100.

A. George V. Egge, Jr., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James B. Ehrlich, Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $516.25. E. (9) $302.55.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C. (Address changed as of January 3, 1967, to 5500 Quincy Street, Hyattsville, Md.)
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $569.10.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $65.

A. Perry R. Ellsworth, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Jewelers of America, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $9.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $26.30.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Basic Management, Inc., Post Office Box 2065, Henderson, Nev.
D. (6) $2,700.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Coachella Valley County Water District, Coachella, Calif.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 111 North Hope Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $800.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Las Vegas Valley Water District, 3700 West Charleston Boulevard, Las Vegas, Nev.
D. (6) $2,700.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $4,102.50.

A. Myles W. English, 202 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 202 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Grover W. Ensley, National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $18.80.

A. John D. Fagan, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S.
D. (6) $2,150. E. (9) $26.

A. Family Tax Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
E. (9) $417.16.

A. William J. Fannin, Chamber of Commerce of the U.S., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union) 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $63,013.59. E. (9) $24,269.79.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, REA Express, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $600.

A. Arthur S. Fefferman, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, Suite 335, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward L. Felton, Holland, Va.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Joe G. Fender, 802 Houston First Savings Building, Houston, Tex.
B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.
D. (6) $695.81.

A. Josiah Ferris, Suite 309, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Sugar Cane League of the U.S.A., 414 Whitney Building, New Orleans, La.; Florida Sugar Cane League, Post Office Box 1148, Clewiston, Fla.

A. Maxwell Field, care of New England Shoe & Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
B. New England Shoe & Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $46.70.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Forest Industries of British Columbia, 1477 West Pender Street, Vancouver 5, British Columbia, Canada.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $125.

A. Mello G. Fish, United Steelworkers of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,835. E. (9) $300.

A. William J. Flaherty, Disabled American Veterans, 1701 18th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,375. E. (9) $94.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $1,200.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

A. Gordon Forbes, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $27.73.

A. Frederick W. Ford.
B. National Community Television Association, Inc., 535 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Foristel, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $537.50. E. (9) $25.37.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1730 K Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. John G. Fox, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $159.

A. Morley E. Fox, Hotel Congressional, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Central Arizona Project Association, 1124 Arizona Title Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
D. (6) $120.51. E. (9) $51.20.

A. Charles A. Francik, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corning Glass Works, Corning, N.Y.
D. (6) $420.

A. R. Frank Frazier, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125.

A. James H. French, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph Freni, Jr., 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Milton Fricke, Papillion, Nebr.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Friends Committee of National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $36,665. E. (9) $8,387.

A. Frank W. Frisk, Jr., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $250.

A. John Baxter Funderburk, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $500.

A. Gadsby, Maguire, Hannah & Merrigan, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Aris Gloves, Inc., 10 East 38th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $166.20. E. (9) $717.93.

A. Gadsby, Maguire, Hannah & Merrigan, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Federated Investors, Inc., 719 Liberty Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa., and Vance Sanders & Co., Inc., 111 Devonshire Street, Boston, Mass.

D. (6) $15,000. E. (9) $1,331.71.

A. Henry E. Gardiner, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Anaconda Co., 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $875. E. (9) $75.50.

A. William B. Gardiner, Disabled Amerivan Veterans, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $2,500.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $25. E. (9) $3.70.

A. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,500.

A. Aubrey D. Gates, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $170.

A. Arthur P. Gildea, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink & Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $118.27.

A. Ginsburg & Feldman, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Tobacco Distributors, 360 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $3.89.

A. Glassie & Molloy, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Atlantic Richfield Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

D. (6) $100.

A. Glassie & Molloy, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5. E. (9) $1.53.

A. Glassie & Molloy, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. E. Leitz, Inc., 468 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $6,105.83. E. (9) $148.49.

A. Glassie & Molloy, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $225. E. (9) $19.27.

A. Don A. Goodall, Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, Ltd., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Florists' Transworld Delivery Association, 900 West Lafayette Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $500.

A. Government Employees' Council, AFL–CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 509, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $10,360.71. E. (9) $3,684.87

A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 500 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $3.25.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 15401 Detroit Avenue, Lakewood, Cleveland, Ohio.

D. (6) $7,320.78. E. (9) $7,320.78.

A. Cornelius R. Gray, American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James A. Gray, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Citizens Committee for UNICEP, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $152.50. E. (9) $62.71.

A. Samuel A. Grayson, Union Pacific Railroad Co., 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.

B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

E. (9) $1,099.62.

A. J. S. Grigsby, Jr., 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.

B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.

D. (6) $2,600.

A. John F. Griner, American Federation of Government Employees, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $8,076.95. E. (9) $807.70.

A. Ben H. Guill, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Automobile Dealers Association and American Zinc Co.

D. (6) $4,100. E. (9) $1,800.

A. Jerome R. Gulan, National Federation of Independent Business, Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, 15th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert W. Haack, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $692.31. E. (9) $67.75.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock.

B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,294. E. (9) $131.

A. Harlan V. Hadley, Automobile Manufacturers Association, 1710 H Street NW., Suite 416, Washington, D.C.

B. Automobile Manufacturers Association, 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) $625.

A. Hal H. Hale, Association of American Railroads, 421 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Randolph M. Hale, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. G. Hall, General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich.

B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW, Washington, D.C.

B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $6,875.10.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Comisión Nacional para el Estudio de la Caña y el Azucar, La Paz, Bolivia.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Lake Carriers Association, Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $337.90.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Sheraton Time Corp., Agana, Guam.

D. (6) $1,662.50. E. (9) $67.50.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Tejon Ranch Co., Post Office Box 1560, Bakersfield, Calif.

D. (6) $1,350.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William E. Hardman, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Bryce N. Harlow, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $56.

A. Mildred B. Harman, National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 212 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $707.49. E. (9) $352.14.

A. William B. Harman, Jr., American Life Convention, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $40.24.

A. R. A. Harris, Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Burr P. Harrison, Graichen Building, Winchester, Va.
B. Savage Arms, Westfield, Mass.; Redfield Gun Sight Co., Denver, Colo.; O. F. Mossberg & Sons, Inc., New Haven, Conn.; High Standard Corp., Hamden, Conn., Browning Arms Co., Morgan, Utah.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene B. Hayden, Jr., 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Crop Quality Council, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $4,125.

A. Hays & Hays, 920 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $1,891.83. E. (9) $147.42.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. Hazen, National Retail Merchants Association, 1317 F Street NW., Suite 800, Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $37.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $175. E. (9) $41.50.

A. Robert W. Healy, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Smith & Pepper, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents' Committee Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 2107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Motorola, Inc., 4545 West Augusta Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, National League of Insured Savings Associations, Suite 700, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, Suite 700, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $263.30.

A. John K. Herbert, Magazine Publishers Association, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y., and 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $396.27.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Football League, 1 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Savage Arms, Westfield, Mass.; Redfield Gun Sight Co., Denver, Colo.; O. F. Mossberg & Sons, Inc., New Haven, Conn.; High Standard Corp., Hamden, Conn.; Browning Arms Co., Morgan, Utah.
D. (6) $625.

A. Hester & Stone, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Brewers Association, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $51.80.

A. John W. Hight, Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125.

A. Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Norman Hill, Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $804.79.

A. William Bentley Hitchcock II, 2413 Enfield Road, Austin, Tex.
B. International Public Relations, Inc., 315 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio.

A. Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, National Security and Foreign Affairs, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,166.67. E. (9) $159.45.

A. Lawrence S. Hobart, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $140.

A. Claude E. Hobbs, Room 1103, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Westinghouse Electric Corp., 3 Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $120.

A. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Irvin A. Hoff, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $67.95.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, United Steelworkers of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Hogan & Hartson, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Kaiser Industries Corp., Kaiser Center, Oakland, Calif.

A. Hogan & Hartson, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Proprietary Association, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $310.63.

A. Hogan & Hartson, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Society of Independent Gasoline Marketers of America, Clayton, Mo.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $219.12.

A. Hogan & Hartson, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Territory of Guam, Agana, Guam.

A. Fuller Holloway, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $12,400. E. (9) $1,254.87.

A. Lee B. Holmes, 829 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Edwin M. Hood, Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald E. Horton, American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles L. Huber, Disabled American Veterans, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $492.52.

A. W. T. Huff, Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 919 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $352.50.

A. Everett Hutchinson, National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Philip A. Hutchinson, Jr., the American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,297.88.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.
B. Hugo W. Zugnoni, Rochester, N.Y.
E. (9) $397.

A. Frank N. Ikard, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, Room 801, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,107.

A. Bernard J. Imming, United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,227.50.

A. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,820.11. E. (9) $10,820.11.

A. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,905.08.

A. Institute of Appliance Manufacturers, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. International Armament Corp., 10 Prince Street, Alexandria, Va.
E. (9) $6,500.

A. International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,635.81.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $20,667.57.

A. International Union of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,000.

A. The Interstate Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $2,975. E. (9) $2.47.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., 1000 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $1,004.74. E. (9) $6,647.92.

A. Alexander Jackson, Jr., 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Jackson, American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., Suite 840, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $223.65.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Daniel Jaspan, National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500.51. E. (9) $29.75.

A. Chas. B. Jennings, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Stock Yards Association, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400.

A. Glendon E. Johnson, American Life Convention, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $140. E. (9) $14.03.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,876.99. E. (9) $162.14.

A. Spencer A. Johnson, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ned Johnston, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Charlie W. Jones, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Carpet Institute, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N.Y.
D. (6) $545. E. (9) $36.

A. Geo. Bliss Jones, Alabama Railroad Association, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $11.25.

A. Karelsen, Karelsen, Lawrence & Nathan, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $166.23.

A. Allan M. Kearney, 1001 Broad Street, Johnstown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Electric Co., 1001 Broad Street, Johnstown, Pa.

A. William J. Keating, 500 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Howard B. Keck, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $300.

A. W. M. Keck, Jr., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1110, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $275.

A. Charles C. Keeble, Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. Thomas John Kehoe & Associates, 1904 Rockwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $2,723.

A. Robert H. Kellen, Mayonnaise & Salad Dressings Institute, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Mayonnaise & Salad Dressings Institute, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert H. Kellen, National Preservers Association, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Preservers Association, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. James C. Kelley, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John T. Kelly, Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. Thomas A. Kelly, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,112.50.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street, NW., Suite 720, Washington, D.C.

A. Cornelius B. Kennedy, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $435. E. (9) $174.10.

A. Cornelius B. Kennedy, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Motorola, Inc., 9401 West Grand Avenue, Franklin Park, Ill.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, Marathon Oil Co., 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
E. (9) $84.30.

A. James J. Kennedy, Jr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $635.

A. J. Don Kerlin, Suite 818, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Reuben H. Donnelley Corp., 235 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $110.

A. J. Don Kerlin, Suite 818, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $125.

A. J. Don Kerlin, Suite 818, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Time, Inc., Rockefeller Center, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $125.

A. William J. Kerwin, National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, Suite 700, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Edward W. Kiley, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph T. King, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Equipment Distributors and Sprinkler Irrigation Association.
D. (6) Approximately $12,000 to $15,000 per year. E. (9) $1,474.73.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750.

A. Mr. and Mrs. Harry L. Kingman, Citizens Lobby for Freedom and Fair Play.
D. (6) $680. E. (9) $680.

A. Kirkland, Ellis, Dodson, Chaffetz & Masters, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $13.50.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $345. E. (9) $29.31.

A. Ernest A. Kistler, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
D. (6) $22.58. E. (9) $38.42.

A. Ralph W. Kittle.
B. International Paper Co., 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., Mayer, Kline & Rigby, 430 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Fishing Tackle Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Suite 2014, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $47.86.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., Mayer, Kline & Rigby, 430 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Bowling Proprietors Association of America, Inc., West Higgins Road, Hoffman Estates, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $132.71.

A. James F. Kmetz, 1427 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,802.

A. George J. Knaly, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL–CIO & CLC, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,999.99.

A. John D. Knodell, Jr., Suite 1011, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $1,175.49.

A. George W. Koch, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert M. Koch, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $30.

A. William L. Kohler, American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $465.95.

A. Germaine Krettek, American Library Association, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $5,294.01.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,462.50. E. (9) $1,783.76.

A. June Kysilko, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.; 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $9,477.20.

A. Laborers' Political Action League, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,726,11. E. (9) $13,500.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,292. E. (9) $5,682.

A. Richard H. Lane, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing.

A. Glenn T. Lashley, American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District of Columbia Division, American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. L. Edward Lashman, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, Federation of Trades & Labor Unions.
D. (6) $3,924. E. (9) $787.54.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $525.

A. George H. Lawrence, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $312.50. E. (9) $103.78.

A. John V. Lawrence, American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. League of Americans Residing Abroad, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $36.25. E. (9) $108.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $146.

A. G. E. Leighty, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Nils A. Lennartson, Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $9,250.12.

A. Donald Lerch & Co., Inc., 1522 K Street NW., Suite 808, Washington, D.C.
B. Shell Chemical Co., 110 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Edith M. Lesser, 2924 Rittenhouse Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,299.99.

A. Roy T. Lester, M.D., 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $103. E. (9) $5.

A. Morris J. Levin, 1632 K Street NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Morris J. Levin, 1632 K Street NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Hal Leyshon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Federation of Musicians, 641 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $675.98.

A. Lightweight Aggregate Percentage Depletion Committee, John W. Roberts, Post Office Box 9138, Richmond, Va.
D. (6) $1,465. E. (9) $590.54.

A. Lester W. Lindow, Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $35.

A. Charles B. Lipsen, Active Ballot Club Department, Retail Clerks International Association, AFL–CIO, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, AFL–CIO, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Zel E. Lipsen, Suite 203, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators & Paperhangers of America, AFL–CIO, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators & Paperhangers of America, AFL–CIO, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,575.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Co., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $343.75. E. (9) $41.15.

A. Basil R. Littin, Continental Oil Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
B. Continental Oil Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. John J. Long, room 608, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union of North America, Pressmen's Home, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $80.

A. Paul H. Long, 1612 K Street NW., room 400, Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $291.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., Roanoke, Va.
D. (6) $600.

A. Donald C. Lubick, 800 M. & T. Building, Buffalo, N.Y.
B. Ransburg Electro-Coating Corp., Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $150.93.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District of Columbia Bankers Association, 1708 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Robert W. Johnson, Jr., Johnson & Johnson, New Brunswick, N.J.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Medical Corp., 415–423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. William R. Lucas, Non-Commissioned Officers Association of the U.S.A., Post Office Box 2268, San Antonio, Tex.
B. Non-Commissioned Officers Association of the U.S.A., Post Office Box 2268, San Antonio, Tex.
E. (9) $160.

A. Milton F. Lunch, National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. John M. Lynham, Drury, Lynham & Powell, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Charles and Katrushka J. Parsons, 310 Park Avenue, Pasay City, Manila, Philippines.
E. (9) $313.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 11th & L Building, Sacramento, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 11th & L Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,812.50.

A. Breck P. McAllister, 25 Broadway, Room 1012, New York, N.Y.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert C. McCandless.
B. International Paper Co., 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $160. E. (9) $68.25.

A. John A. McCart, Government Employes' Council, AFL–CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government Employes' Council, AFL–CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,730.84.

A. Alfred R. McCauley, 720 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Magnavox Co., Bueter Road, Fort Wayne, Ind.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $122.39.

A. McClure & Trotter, Suite 405, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Coca-Cola Co., Post Office Drawer 1734, Atlanta, Ga.

A. McClure & Trotter, Suite 405, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. McClure & Trotter, Suite 405, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Packers, Ltd., 410 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. E. L. McCulloch, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Room 814 Railway Labor Building, 400 1st Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L. E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Albert L. McDermott, American Hotel & Motel Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Angus H. McDonald.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,661.50. E. (9) $214.45.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, United Steelworkers of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,370. E. (9) $300.

A. Mrs. Barbara D. McGarry, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul J. McGowan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Virgin Islands Legislature, Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas, V.I.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $242.77.

A. Marshall C. McGrath.
B. International Paper Co., 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $187.50. E. (9) $89.18.

A. F. Howard McGuigan, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,976. E. (9) $206.64.

A. Clarence H. McIntosh, Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,095.29. E. (9) $250.97.

A. William F. McKenna, National League of Insured Savings Associations, Suite 700, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, Suite 700, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10.

A. William F. McManus, General Electric Co., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $227.75.

A. Shane McCarthy, 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Printing Industries of America, 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $475. E. (9) $925.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., MacCracken, Collins & Hawes, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., Dr. Melvin D. Wolfberg, 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. John G. Macfarlan, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. REA Express, 210 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,290. E. (9) $315.50.

A. H. E. Mahlman, American Optometric Association, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., Dr. Melvin D. Wolfberg, 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $812.50. E. (9) $54.40.

A. Carter Manasco, 5932 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,400. E. (9) $119.03.

A. Rufus W. Manderson, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $3,000.

A. Mrs. Olya Margolin, 924 Dupont Circle Building, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,296.20. E. (9) $141.90.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1427 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,802.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Ford Motor Co., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $87.50.

A. Raymond E. Marks, Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. David M. Marsh, American Insurance Association, RCA Building, Suite 1001, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Insurance Association, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $25.04.

A. Michael Marsh, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $396.16.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Paul Marshall, Association of American Railroads, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $231.52. E. (9) $266.40.

A. Thomas A. Martin, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $90.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, American Committee on Japan, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, Japanese American Citizens League, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Walter J. Mason, Building & Construction Trades Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Room 603, Washington, D.C.
B. Building & Construction Trades Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Room 603, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,999.93. E. (9) $1,124.44.

A. J. M . Massey, Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $522.59.

A. P. H. Mathews, Association of American Railroads, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $555.57. E. (9) $288.28.

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $29.09.

A. Charles E. Mattingly, National Legislative Commission, the American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,664. E. (9) $39.88.

A. C. V. and R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Georgia Power Co., 270 Peachtree Street, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Mayonnaise & Salad Dressings Institute, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. John S. Mears, National Legislative Commission, the American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,240. E. (9) $78.41.

A. Carl J. Megel, American Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO, 1343 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO, 716 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $8,800.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,256. E. (9) $290.21.

A. Lawrence C. Merthan, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 580, Washington, D.C.
B. Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc., 235 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $237.40.

A. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. M. Barry Meyer, American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $868.62.

A. Midland Cooperative Dairy Association, Principal Office: Shawano, Wis. Branch Office: Box 128, Cazenovia, N.Y.

A. Capt. A. Stanley Miller, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce, Dallas, Tex.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association, 2211 South Coast Building, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1815 Capitol Plaza, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1815 Capitol Plaza, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $763.23.

A. Lloyd S. Miller, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $119.04.

A. Luman G. Miller, 912 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Oregon Railroad Association, 912 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg.
E. (9) $1,112.09.

A. Jim M. Milligan, 402 Barclay Building, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.
B. National Water Co., Conference, 402 Barclay Building, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.

A. Othmer J. Mischo, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Missouri Railroad Committee, W. W. Dalton, Frisco Lines, 906 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
E. (9) $514.80.

A. Clarence Mitchell, Washington Bureau, NAACP, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. G. Merrill Moody, Association of American Railroads, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Moody, National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $625.

A. Carlos Moore, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Jennelle Moorhead, 1250 Emerald, University Campus, Eugene, Oreg.

A. Henry J. Moreschi, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $449.13.

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Humane Association, Post Office Box 1266, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $3.24.

A. Morison, Clapp, Abrams & Haddock, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $1,600. E. (9) $1,987.33.

A. John J. Murphy, Wileliner Estates, Route 2, Box 113–D, Edgewater, Md.
B. National Customs Service Association.

A. William E. Murray, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Augustus Nasmith, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.
B. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.

A. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Associated Businessmen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,090.05. E. (9) $1,681.16.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Co., 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $15,000. E. (9) $8.98.

A. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $419.66. E. (9) $7,993.94.

A. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $200.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Maurice G. Herndon, 801 Warner Building, 13th & E Streets, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $396.27.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,448.40. E. (9) $1,448.40.

A. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $890.77. E. (9) $890.77.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25,000. E. (9) $8,161.87.

A. National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $431.13. E. (9) $485.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $32,954.41. E. (9) $682.50.

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
E. (9) $345.58.

A. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $250.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, 555 North Western Avenue, Room 2, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,643.87. E. (9) $1,643.87.

A. National Community Television Associates, Inc., 535 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Box 23, Memphis, Tenn.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $4,068.50. E. (9) $4,068.50.

A. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 239 Beach Road, Alameda, Calif.
E. (9) $36.40.

A. National Council of Technical Service Industries, 888 17th Street NW., Suite 702, Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Technical Service Industries, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $726.64. E. (9) $766.85.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Farmers Organization, Corning, Iowa.
E. (9) $3,056.06.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 920 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $23,315.58. E. (9) $23,315.58.

A. National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $253.59. E. (9) $286.63.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 632, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $16,120.25. E. (9) $17,576.56.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, Suite 700, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,106.05. E. (9) $360.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,837.50. E. (9) $1,837.50.

A. National Livestock Feeders Association, 309 Livestock Exchange Building, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $1,333. E. (9) $1,333.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,962.72. E. (9) $3,962.72.

A. National Preservers Association, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $5,005.02.

A. National Retired Teachers Association, American Association of Retired Persons, Washington, D.C.
B. National Retired Teachers Association, American Association of Retired Persons, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,439.64.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,310.50.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $91,757. E. (9) $2,484.

A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Utility Contractors Association, Inc., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,375.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Alan M. Nedry, 888 17th Street NW., Suite 218, Washington, D.C.
B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $2,246.62.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,950. E. (9) $2,555.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists, & Aerospace Workers, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,135.81.

A. New England Shoe & Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $446.70. E. (9) $446.70.

A. Carle E. Newton, 2 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Boston & Maine Corp., North Station, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Patrick J. Nilan, United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $697.35.

A. Stanley D. Noble, 29 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
B. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, 29 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Non-Commissioned Officers Association of the U.S.A., Post Office Box 2268, San Antonio, Tex.
E. (9) $160.

A. Charles M. Noone, 410 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $578.50.

A. Joseph A. Noone, 514 Madison Building, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $30.97.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harry E. Northam, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, Inc., 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Graham T. Northup, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,600. E. (9) $2,770.

A. Michael J. Norton, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $496.35.

A. Ira H. Nunn, 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 505, Washington, D.C.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $250.

A. Seward P. Nyman, D.S.C., 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $650.

A. William B. O'Connell, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $200.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 1303, Washington, D.C.
B. American Transit Association, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25,000.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 1303, Washington, D.C.
B. El Paso Natural Gas Co., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $18,000. E. (9) $885.50.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 1303, Washington, D.C.
B. Upper Mississippi Towing Corp., 7703 Normandale Road, Room 110, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $37.75.

A. John A. O'Donnell, American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Jane O'Grady, Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,030. E. (9) $370.67.

A. Richard C. O'Hare, 1120 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Harness Tracks of America, 333 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
E. (9) $3,382.15.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 501 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 500 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Samuel Omasta, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $5.50.

A. Francis J. O'Rourke, National Tax Equality Association & National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.

A. Kermit Overby, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $185.

A. Raymond S. Page, Jr., Mill Creek Terrace, Gladwyne, Pa.
B. Campbell Soup Co., 375 Memorial Avenue, Camden, N.J.

A. Walter Page, Box 128, Cazenovia, N.Y.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Mississippi Valley Association, Post Office Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramac, Suite 1032T, St. Louis, Mo.

A. J. D. Parel, Association of American Railroads, 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $41.43. E. (9) $72.

A. James D. Parriott, Jr., Marathon Oil Co., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. Marathon Oil Co., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.

A. Robert D. Partridge, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $127.50.

A. Michael Pasternak, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Family Tax Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
D. (6) $400.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. The Pitcairn Co., 100 West 19th Street, Wilmington, Del.

A. D. V. Pensabene, Suite 1204, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, Suite 1204, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $25.

A. J. Carter Perkins, Shell Oil Co., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shell Oil Co., 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Peter J. Pestillo, 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 505, Washington, D.C.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $125.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) $3,600. E. (9) $43.50.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, Post Office Box 20155, Orlando, Fla.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $3.

A. Kenneth T. Peterson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hotel & Restaurant Employees & Bartenders International Union, 6 East Fourth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,500.03.

A. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph D. Phelan, 485 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Colorado River Association, 417 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,300. E. (9) $1,305.

A. John P. Philbin, 510 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $43.75.

A. Richard N. Philleo, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,462.50. E. (9) $208.13.

A. Tom Pickett, Association of American Railroads, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $19.58.

A. Bruce O. Pike, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $510.

A. James F. Pinkney, American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $57.35.

A. T. E. Pinkston, Kentucky Railroad Association, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.
E. (9) $321.35.

A. James H. Pipkin, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texaco Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $1,560.

A. The Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) $33,338.05. E. (9) $1,350.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, Washington Bureau, NAACP, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James K. Polk, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N.Y.

A. John W. Pompelli, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $178.25.

A. Robert R. Poston, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $193.57.

A. Ramsay D. Potts, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. William J. Potts, Jr., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association On Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard M. Powell, National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. William I. Powell, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4.10.

A. Thomas W. Power, 1414 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Restaurant Institute, 1414 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Graydon R. Powers, Jr., Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10.

A. William C. Prather, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $400.

A. John H. Pratt, 905 American Security Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ransburg Electro-Coating Corp., Indianapolis, Ind.
E. (9) $31.94.

A. William H. Press, Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Forrest J. Prettyman, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $187.50.

A. Earle W. Putnam, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL-CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William A. Quinlan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $23.38. E. (9) $5.59.

A. Alex Radin, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward F. Ragland, 6917 Marbury Road, Bethesda, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,658.12. E. (9) $1,658.12.

A. Alan R. Rains, United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $45.72.

A. Carl R. Ramsey, 239 Beach Road, Alameda, Calif.
B. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 239 Beach Road, Alameda, Calif.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $118.77.

A. Ransburg Electro-Coating Corp., Indianapolis, Ind.
E. (9) $6,932.87.

A. James A. Ransford, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tidewater Oil Co.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 6015 Prestonshire, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Drawer 747, Durant, Okla.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $39.34.

A. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $6,576.71.

A. Robert E. Redding, Committee for Time Uniformity, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Time Uniformity, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert E. Redding, Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. W. O. Reed, 6254 Woodland Drive, Dallas, Tex.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $799.98. E. (9) $138.70.

A. Robert E. Reiser, 6649 Holland Street, McLean, Va.
B. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $161,134.49.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Room 906, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,167.30. E. (9) $9,281.74.

A. Theron J. Rice, 1710 H Street NW., Suite 303, Washington, D.C.
B. Continental Oil Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Richards, Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,133.34. E. (9) $12.74.

A. Dorsey Richardson, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Co. Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.

A. James W. Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. William Neale Roach, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. William Neale Roach, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Armament Corp. (Interarmco), 10 Prince Street, Alexandria, Va.
D. (6) $6,500.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Austin L. Roberts, Jr., Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875.

A. Clyde E. Roberts, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Roberts & Holland, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Furman-Wolfson Corp., 1440 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $25.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, care of Dr. Melvin D. Wolfberg, 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Animal Health Institute, Robert Brouse, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $183.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Cos., 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $562.50.

A. Frank W. Rogers, Suite 605, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Oil & Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $526.

A. James H. Rowe, Jr., 1120 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Harness Tracks of America, 333 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Royal, Koegel & Rogers, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ad Hoc Committee of Publishing Co., 60-62 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Royall, Koegel & Rogers, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pinkerton's, Inc., 154 Nassau Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Royall, Koegel & Rogers, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Power Authority of the State of New York, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $94.37.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. Harland J. Rue.
B. New Process Co., Warren, Pa.
E. (9) $246.66 (reimbursed by employer).

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $570. E. (9) $189.40.

A. J. T. Rutherford, 1616 P Street, Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $479.20.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title and Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco; Shell Oil Co., Mobil Oil Co., Richfield Oil Corp., Phillips Petroleum Co., Union Oil Co., Signal Oil & Gas Co., Gulf Oil Corp., all Los Angeles; Humble Oil & Refining Co., Midland, Tex.

A. William H. Scheick, American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Leslie J. Schmidt Associates, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Beer Wholesalers' Association of America, 6310 North Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $200.

A. C. Herschel Schooley, Washington Office, Independent Bankers Association of America, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Bankers Association of America, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $2,458.19.

A. Scribner, Hall & Casey, 1209 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $3.

A. Scribner, Hall & Casey, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for an Interstate Taxation Act, 1209 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $230.

A. Durward Seals, United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ashley Sellers, Sellers, Conner & Cuneo, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
General Time Corp., 355 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. David C. Sharman, American Optometric Association, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., Dr. Melvin D. Wolfberg, 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $1,093.75. E. (9) $686.55.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $604.

A. Arnold F. Shaw, 503 D Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Comite de Productores De Azucar, Lima, Peru (Sugar Producers of Peru).

A. Kenneth D. Shaw, Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $474.99.

A. Shaw, Pittman, Potts, Trowbridge & Madden, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. League of Americans Residing Abroad, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Sheehan, United Steelworkers of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $300.

A. Ira Shesser, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Max Shine, 900 F Street NW., Room 901, Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Room 901, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $992.50. E. (9) $20.

A. Alvin V. Shoemaker, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $280.

A. Robert L. Shortle, Mississippi Valley Association, 1147 International Trade Mart Tower, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, Suite 1032T, St. Louis, Mo.

A. George Shuff, Tennessee Railroad Association, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I railroads in Tennessee.

A. Charles B. Shuman, American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $825. E. All expenditures incurred in connection with the legislative interests are paid by the American Farm Bureau Federation.

A. Sidley, Austin, Burgess & Smith, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Silver Users Association, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $564.50. E. (9) $2,895.65.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $13,350. E. (9) $15,202.50.

A. Harold S. Skinner, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
B. Continental Oil Co.

A. Carstens Slack, Phillips Petroleum Co., 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

A. Harold Slater, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $487.50. E. (9) $13.33.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $9,100.

A. W. A. Smallwood, Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald E. Smiley, Suite 1011, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $211.36.

A. T. W. Smiley, Room 801, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, Room 801, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,107.

A. E. Stratford Smith, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Smith & Pepper, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gordon L. Smith, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, Ltd., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $31.38.

A. Irvin A. Smith, North Dakota Railway Lines, 418 East Rosser, Box 938, Bismarck, N. Dak.
E. (9) $42.60.

A. Smith & Pepper, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert B. Smith, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.
B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 712 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,231.90. E. (9) $2,308.98.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 829 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, Ford Motor Co., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $305.19. E. (9) $66.10.

A. Lyle O. Snader, Association of American Railroads, 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $87.20. E. (9) $68.

A. Frank B. Snodgrass, 1726 M Street NW., Suite 204, Washington, D.C.
B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $302.25.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, Post Office Box 3719, Georgetown Station, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,580.50. E. (9) $2,682.48.

A. Carl A. Soderblom, Nevada Railroad Association, 1 East First Street, Room 803, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 1 East First Street, Room 803, Reno, Nev.
E. (9) $430.06.

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103–11 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $39,596.46. E. (9) $5,502.52.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Drawer 747, Durant, Okla.
E. (9) $189.34.

A. William W. Spear, 214 Fremont National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $729.17. E. (9) $6.12.

A. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Melvin L. Stark, American Insurance Association, RCA Building, Suite 1001, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Insurance Association, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $150.

A. Mrs. Nell May Ferguson Stephens (Georgia), Post Office Box 6234, Northwest Station, Washington, D.C.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hamilton Watch Co. and Elgin National Watch Co.
D. (6) $7,200. E. (9) $57.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

A. Francis W. Stover, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $4,350. E. (9) $301.15.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Box 168, Peach Springs, Ariz.
D. (6) An indeterminate fraction of $939.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laguna Pueblo of New Mexico, Laguna, N. Mex.
D. (6) An indeterminate fraction of $3,000.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Metlakatla Indian Community, Box 142, Metlakatla, Alaska.
D. (6) An indeterminate fraction of $1,000.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New York Mercantile Exchange, 6 Harrison Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, Idaho.
D. (6) An indeterminate fraction of $1,500.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Box 907–X, Route 1, Scottsdale, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.
D. (6) $939.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Seneca Nation of Indians, Box 231, Salamanca, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tuscarora Nation of Indians, Tuscarora Reservation, Lewiston, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Wards Co., Inc., 1705 Brook Road, Richmond, Va.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Room 901, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Room 901, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. Alexander Stewart, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $27,120.48. E. (9) $7,492.25.

A. Ronnie J. Straw, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Herald E. Stringer, National Legislative Commission, The American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $4,625.06. E. (9) $367.35.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 520 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $216.32.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Walter B. Stults, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Co., 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, Schenley Industries, Inc., 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. C. Austin Sutherland, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Swidler & Freeman, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Jackson Purchase Rural Electric Cooperative Corp., 2315 Broadway, Paducah, Ky.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $16.39.

A. Gary Tabak, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Ralph L. Tabor, American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles P. Taft, Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee, Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Warren G. Taylor, 604–5 Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee, 604–5 Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
E. (9) $240.59.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trans World Airlines, 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Wm. B. Thompson, Jr., Association of American Railroads, Room 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $93.36. E. (9) $74.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. E. Linwood Tipton, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 2355 Alameda Street, Vallejo, Calif.
B. Armed Services Committee, Vallejo Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $147.50.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,422.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $121.17.

A. Dr. Frank A. Todd, Washington Representative, American Veterinary Medical Association, 1522 K Street NW., Room 328, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $545.

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Wholesale Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. David R. Toll, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $562.50. E. (9) $189.42.

A. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,563.79. E. (9) $2,519.10.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $39.38.

A. Trades Relations Council of the United States, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard S. Tribbe, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trans World Airlines, 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,107.50. E. (9) $34.

A. Paul T. Truitt, president, National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mr. Galen Douglas Trussell, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Dick Tullis, 307 Maple Terrace, Dallas, Tex.
B. Superior Oil Co., Houston, Tex., and Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $150.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Range Association, Suite H, 375 North Fulton Street, Fresno, Calif.
E. (9) $145.50.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
E. (9) $835.14.

A. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,617,799.83. E. (9) $88,078.56.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $213.70.

A. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $29,256.43.

A. Charles R. Van Horn, C. & O.-B. & O. Railroads, 17th and H Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., and Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., Charles and Baltimore Streets, Baltimore, Md.

A. George C. Van Nostrand, Development Corp. International, 1010 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eaton Yale & Towne, Inc., 100 Erieview Plaza, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $4,980.91.

A. John M. Vansant, Jr., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Lois W. Van Valkenburgh, 1673 Preston Road, Alexandria, Va.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard E. Vernor, American Life Convention, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $51.30. E. (9) $23.10.

A. Mr. L. T. Vice, Suite 1204, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, Suite 1204, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $110.

A. R. K. Vinson, Machinery Dealers National Association, 1400 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Asociation, 1400 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. The Voice of the People in Action (The Society of the People, Inc.), 621 Sheridan Street, Chillum, Md.
B. Dr. Russell Forrest Egner, 621 Sheridan Street, Chillum, Md.

A. E. R. Wagner, 888 17th Street NW., Suite 702; Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Technical Service Industries; 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $188.48. E. (9) $25.36.

A. Franklin Wallick, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Solidarity House, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,570.35. E. (9) $980.37.

A. Thomas G. Walters, American Federation of Government Employees, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,500. E. (9) $2,199.96.

A. Lauck Walton, 2 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Boston & Maine Corp., North Station, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $200.

A. William A. Walton, Suite 312, Garlinghouse Building, 820 Quincy Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. Kansas Railroad Committee, Suite 312, Garlinghouse Building, 820 Quincy Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,553.60. E. (9) $3,086.15.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Steptoe & Johnson, Attorneys, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $962.50.

A. Waterways Bulk Transportation Council, Inc., 1750 Brentwood Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

A. E. E. Webster, 400 First Street NW., Room 801, Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Clarence M. Weiner, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $8,615.44. E. (9) $50.30.

A. Dr. Frank J. Welch, 3724 Manor Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Welch, 1630 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Wellington Management Co., 1630 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Don White, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $881.25. (9) $396.11.

A. John C. White, Fulbright, Crooker, Freeman, Bates & White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $29.82.

A. Marc A. White, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Donald S. Whyte, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450.

A. Louis E. Whyte, Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1120 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington D.C.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $250.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 360 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $25.55.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Indian Tribe, Fort Washakie, Wyo.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. KSL, Inc., 145 Social Hall Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinaielt Indian Tribe, Taholah, Wash.

A. Robert P. Will, 487 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, 1111 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,600. E. (9) $760.65.

A. Mr. John Willard, Montana Railroad Association, Box 1172, Helena, Mont.
B. Montana Railroad Association, Helena, Mont.

A. Harding deC. Williams, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,916. E. (9) $101.75.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $158.05.

A. Clark L. Wilson, Room 714, Associations Building, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consultant to the Lead-Zinc Producers Committee.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $253.67.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,451.

A. Richard W. Wilson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $235.14.

A. Everett T. Winter, Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramac, Suite 1032–T, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Mermamec, Suite 1032–T, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Richard F. Witherall, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,395.24. E. (9) $1,395.24.

A. Lawton B. Wolfe, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Russell J. Woodman, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation-Communication Employees Union, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Flying Tiger Line Inc., Los Angeles International Airport, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Hal J. Wright, 1612 K Street NW., Room 400, Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. J. H. Yingling, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Football League, 280 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $10.

A. J. H. Yingling, 905 16th Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Business Development Corp., 45 Milk Street, Boston, Mass.
E. (9) $10.

A. J. Banks Young, Room 502, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $108. E. (9) $24.34.

A. Kenneth Young, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,976. E. (9) $325.71.

A. Sidney Zagri, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,006.

A. Robert C. Zimmer, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Zimring, Gromfine and Sternstein, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1966:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19______ ◄

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◄

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◄

A. Herbert F. Alfrey, Vice President, National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Cotton Compress & Warehouse Association, 1707 L Street NW., Room 460, Washington, D.C.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Braniff Airways, Inc., Exchange Park, Dallas, Tex.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Rockwell-Standard Corp., 300 Sixth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. Eugene T. Bartkowiak, 3829 W Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Polish Americans, Inc., 3829 W Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Vincent Gerrard Barnett, 1725 I Street NW., Room 504, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30–32 St. Marys Avenue, London, England.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., Suite 840, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.

A. Braniff Airways, Inc., Exchange Park, Dallas, Tex.

A. Monroe Butler, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1106, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1110, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Donald L. Calvin, New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Ralph E. Casey, President, American Merchant Marine Institute, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Col. Joseph L. Chabot, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Harrison Combs, Jr., 1427 I Street NW., Room 404, Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Committee for an Interstate Taxation Act, 1209 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Group consisting of New Process Co., Warren, Pa., and Columbia Broadcasting Co., 51 West 52d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Darrell Coover, 1 Farragut Square S., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Cox, Langford & Brown, 1521 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Collegiate Athletic Association, Midland Building, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Richard A. Dell, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harry J. Donohue, executive assistant, National Legislative Service, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

A. Harold R. Farrow, 1506 Latham Square Building, Oakland, Calif.

A. Joe G. Fender, attorney, 2033 Norfolk Street, Houston, Tex.
B. National Conference of Nonprofit Shipping Associations, Inc.

A. Charles E. Foster, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Kaiser Industries Corp., 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Henry E. Gardiner, vice president, The Anaconda Co., 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Anaconda Co., 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. William A. Geoghegan, Pierson, Ball & Dowd, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ambulance Manufacturers Association, 8959 Blue Ash Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. G. E. Gilleland, United Voters Service, Waco, Tex.

A. Mr. George O. Gray, consultant, Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Student Aid Funds, Inc., 845 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Dale W. Hardin, special counsel, American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clifford J. Harvison, assistant managing director, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hedrick & Lane, Attorneys, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Motorola, Inc., 4545 W. Augusta Boulevard, Chicago 51, Ill.

A. Robert R. Humphreys, assistant to vice president, Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Stuart H. Johnson, Jr., King, St. George & Friedman, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. League of Americans Residing Abroad, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Cornelius B. Kennedy, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Motorola, Inc., 9401 West Grand Avenue, Franklin Park, Ill.

A. Thomas P. Kerester, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. Robert Lowenstein, attorney, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Edlow and Isbrandtsen Associates, 1372 Grandview Avenue, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Donald C. Lubick, attorney, 800 M & T Building, Buffalo, N.Y.
B. Ransburg Electro-Coating Corp., Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Robert L. Maier, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Kaiser Industries Corp., 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward C. Mathews, associate director, VFW Memorial Building, Suite 410, 200 Maryland Avenue NE, Washington, D.C.
B. State of Oklahoma, Industrial Development and Park Department.

A. Carl A. Modecki, Legal Department, American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. The National Association of Polish Americans, Inc., 3829 W Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Walter T. Phair, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Kaiser Industries Corp., 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph D. Phelan, 485 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Colorado River Association, 417 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Joseph M. Pollard, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 206, Washington, D.C.
B. County of Los Angeles, State of California, Hall of Administration, 500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. John H. Pratt, attorney, 905 American Security Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ransburg Electro-Coating Corp., Indianapolis, Ind.

A. William A. Raleigh, Jr., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ransburg Electro-Coating Corp., Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Rockwell-Standard Corp., 300 Sixth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. W. O. Senter, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Lynn E. Stalbaum, legislative consultant, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Newton I. Steers, Jr., financial consultant, Suite 202, 10400 Connecticut Avenue, Kensington, Md.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, attorney, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Steptoe & Johnson, attorneys, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 6, 1967

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rabbi Gerald Lerer, Congregation Beth Ohr, Jewish Community Center of Madison Township, Old Bridge, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, ruler of the universe, we earnestly seek and invoke Thy blessing upon our country, the Government of this freedom-loving Republic, the President of these United States, and all who exercise just and rightful authority. Guide and guard them in all their worthy endeavors, so that they may administer all affairs of state in justice and equity, while advancing the cause of freedom and democracy throughout the world.

Help us today and every day to be deserving of our rich heritage in this land of the free and home of the brave. Let Thy sacred light penetrate our midst, so that we may recognize our duties through the fog and mist of our times. Grant us the necessary courage and perseverance, so that we may fulfill our responsibilities, despite the cost and sacrifice.

Inspire those who stand at the helm of our ship of state to continue with even greater zeal and determination their valiant and noble efforts toward making these United States a powerful force for universal peace and freedom from fear. May this country grow from strength to greater strength in the cause of justice and righteousness; and may we, in concert with all people who cherish freedom, speedily achieve the ultimate triumph of Thy kingdom of true and everlasting peace and brotherhood on earth. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 3, 1967, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

SELECTIVE SERVICE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 75)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which, without being read, will be referred to the appropriate committee, and will be printed in the RECORD.

The message from the President was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

THE BACKGROUND

To the Congress of the United States:

The knowledge that military service must sometimes be borne by—and imposed on—free men so their freedom may be preserved is woven deeply into the fabric of the American experience.

Americans have been obliged to take up arms in the cause of liberty since our earliest days on these shores. From the militiaman who shouldered his musket to protect his community in the wilderness to the young recruit of today who serves the common defense and then returns to civilian life, we have known the price of freedom as well as its glory.

In 1940, the mounting threat of Axis aggression was poised against us. The 76th Congress responded by making compulsory military service a legal obligation in peacetime as well as war. Although this was the first peacetime draft in our history, it was an action consistent with our evolving traditions and responsibilities. As President Roosevelt said on that occasion:

> America has adopted selective service in time of peace, and, in doing so, has broadened and enriched our basic concepts of citizenship. Beside the clear democratic ideals of equal rights, equal privileges and equal opportunities, we have set forth the underlying other duties, obligations and responsibilities of equal service.

Americans ever since then have come to know well those "broadened concepts of citizenship" of which Franklin Roosevelt spoke. Little more than a year later, war began. The Selective Service System established by that foresighted 76th Congress mustered the greatest military force in the history of the world.

After the end of World War II, in the face of new hostile threats, the 80th Congress met its obligation by enacting new selective service legislation. Six times since then, succeeding Congresses—the 81st, the 82d, the 84th, the 86th, and the 88th—have kept it alive as an indispensable part of our defense against an aggression which has taken different shapes but has never disappeared. Twice—in Korea, and today in Vietnam—we have borne arms in the field of battle to counter that aggression.

Thus, for more than a quarter of a century, through total war and cold war and limited war, selective service has provided the Nation with the ability to respond quickly and appropriately to the varied challenges confronting our democracy.

THE PROBLEM TODAY

The Selective Service Act under which men today are drafted into our Armed Forces is now almost two decades old, about the age of many of the men who stand watch on the frontiers of freedom throughout the world.

That generation, whose lifetime coincides with our draft law, has grown to maturity in a period of sweeping change. We are in many ways a different nation—more urban, more mobile, more populous.

The youth of the country themselves have added most heavily to our growth in numbers. In 1948, when the present act was passed, less than 1.2 million male Americans were 18 years old. Today that number has increased about 60 percent to almost 1.9 million, and will exceed 2 million in the 1970's.

Because of this population increase, many more men of their generation are available for military duty than are required.

A decade ago, about 70 percent of the group eligible for duty had to serve with the Armed Forces to meet our military manpower needs.

Today, the need is for less than 50 percent, and only about a third or less of this number must be involuntarily inducted—even under the conditions of war. When the firing stops, as we all fervently hope it will soon, the requirements will be for fewer still.

The danger of inequity is imbedded in these statistics. It arises when not every eligible man must be called upon to serve. It is intensified when the numbers of men needed are relatively small in relation to the numbers available.

Fairness has always been one of the goals of the Selective Service System. When the present act was passed in 1948, one of its underlying assumptions was that the obligation and benefits of military service would be equitably borne.

The changing conditions which have come to our society since that act was established have prompted concern—in the executive branch, in the Congress, in the Nation generally—with whether the System might have drifted from the original concept of equity.

That concern deepened as young men were called to the field of combat.

A selective service system, of course, must operate well and fairly in peace as well as in times of conflict. But it is in the glare of conflict that the minds of all of us are focused most urgently on the need to review the procedures by which some men are selected and some are not.

Last July, by Executive order, I appointed a National Advisory Commission on Selective Service, composed of 20 citizens, distinguished and diverse in their representation of important elements of our national life.

I asked that Commission, headed by Mr. Burke Marshall, to study these questions, and indeed whether the need for the draft itself was ended or soon might be.

I instructed the Commission to consider the past, present, and prospective functioning of selective service and other systems of national service in the light of the following factors: Fairness to all citizens; military manpower requirements; the objective of minimizing uncertainty and interference with individual careers and education; social, economic, and employment conditions and goals; budgetary and administrative considerations; and any other factors the Commission might deem relevant.

The Commission undertook this responsibility with seriousness of purpose, and a clear recognition of the abiding importance these issues hold in American life today. It consulted with or sought the opinions of national leaders, Governors, mayors, and officials of the Federal Government; educators and students; business groups and labor unions; veterans organizations, religious leaders and others broadly representing every sector of our society. I asked people across the land to send their thoughts to the Commission and many did.

The Commission's work is now concluded. Its report has been made available to the American public. I have studied that report carefully.

I have also had the benefit of two other recent studies relating to the same problems. Another distinguished group of leading citizens reviewed the selective service situation for the House Armed Services Committee. Its conclusions have been made available to me. Earlier, at my direction, the Secretary of Defense conducted a study of the relationship of the draft to military manpower utilization policies. It was completed in June of last year.

These reports have confirmed that continuation of the draft is still essential to our national security. They have also established that inequities do result from present selection policies, that policies designed for an earlier period operate unevenly under today's conditions, creating unfairness in the lives of some, promoting uncertainty in the minds of more.

To provide the military manpower this Nation needs for its security and to assure that the system of selection operates as equitably as possible, I propose that:

First. The selective service law under which men can be inducted into the Armed Forces be extended for a 4-year period, upon its expiration on June 30, 1967.

Second. Men be inducted beginning at 19 years of age, reversing the present order of calling the oldest first, so that uncertainties now generated in the lives of young men will be reduced.

Third. Policies be tightened governing undergraduate college deferments so that those deferments can never become exemptions from military service, and providing for no further postgraduate deferments except for those in medical and dental schools.

Fourth. Firm rules be formulated, to be applied uniformly throughout the country, in determining eligibility for all other types of deferment.

Fifth. A fair and impartial random—FAIR—system of selection be established to determine the order of call for all men eligible and available for the draft.

Sixth. Improvements in the Selective Service System be immediately effected to assure better service to the registrant both in counseling and appeals, better information to the public regarding the system's operation, and broader representation on local boards of the communities they serve.

Seventh. A study be conducted by the best management experts in the Government of the effectiveness, cost and feasibility of a proposal made by the National Advisory Commission to restructure the organization of the Selective Service System.

Eighth. The National Commission on Selective Service be continued for another year to provide a continuing review of the system that touches the lives of so many young Americans and their families.

Ninth. Enlistment procedures for our National Guard and Reserve units be strengthened to remove inequities and to insure a high state of readiness for those units.

CONTINUATION OF THE DRAFT LAW

The United States must meet its military commitments for the national security, for the preservation of peace and for the defense of freedom in the world. It must be able to do this under any circumstance, under any condition, under any challenge.

This fundamental necessity is the bedrock of our national policy upon which all other considerations must rest.

To maintain this ability we must continue the draft.

The volunteer tradition is strong in our Armed Forces, as it is in our national heritage. Except for the periods of major war in this century, it has been the chief source of our military manpower since the earliest days of the Republic.

It must remain so. Our Armed Forces will continue to rely mainly on those who volunteer to serve. This is not only consistent with the American tradition, it is also the best policy for the services themselves, since it assures a highly motivated and professionally competent career force.

Improving the quality of service life and increasing the rewards for service itself encourage volunteering. We have taken a number of actions toward this end and will initiate still others:

Four military pay raises in each of the last 4 years, averaging a total increase of 33 percent in basic pay. I shall shortly recommend another increase.

A military "medicare" program which expands medical care for the dependents of those on active duty, as well as for retired members and their dependents.

The cold war GI bill of rights, which provides education, training, medical and home loan benefits to returning servicemen.

The Vietnam Conflict Servicemen and Veterans Act of 1967, which I proposed last month, to provide additional benefits to members of the Armed Forces and their dependents.

I have asked the Secretary of Defense to submit to me this year a comprehensive study of the military compensation and retirement system.

To attract more physicians, dentists and other members of the health professions to volunteer for military service, I am directing the Secretary of Defense to develop a broad program of medical scholarships. Students taking advantage of these scholarships would commit themselves to longer terms of obligated service.

At the same time that we have been increasing the incentive for volunteer service, we have also taken steps to reduce our requirements for men who must be drafted.

I have directed that the services place civilians in jobs previously held by men in uniform wherever this can be done without impairing military effectiveness. During fiscal 1967, 74,000 former military jobs will be filled by civilians. During the next fiscal year, an additional 40,000 such jobs will be so filled. If these measures were not taken, our draft calls would have to be much higher.

Starting last year, under Project 100,000, the military services have revised mental and physical standards to admit young men who were being rejected—more than half of whom had sought to volunteer. As a result, the services will accept this year 40,000 men who would have been disqualified under former standards. Next year, the Defense Department's goal is to accept 100,000 such men.

Finally, the Secretary of Defense is taking steps to expand opportunities for women in the services, thus further reducing the number of men who must be called involuntarily for duty.

But in spite of all we can and will do in this regard, we cannot realistically expect to meet our present commitments or our future requirements with a military force relying exclusively on volunteers.

We know that vulnerability to the draft is a strong motivating factor in the decision of many young men to enlist. Studies have shown that in the relatively normal years before the buildup in Vietnam, two out of every five enlistees were so motivated. Since then, the proportion has been considerably higher.

Research has also disclosed that volunteers alone could be expected to man a force of little more than 2 million.

Our military needs have been substantially greater than that ever since we first committed troops to combat in Korea in the summer of 1950. The average strength of our Armed Forces in the years between the end of hostilities in Korea and the buildup in Vietnam was 2.7 million. Today, we have 3.3 million men under arms, and this force will increase still further by June 1968 if the conflict is not concluded by then.

The question, whether we could increase incentives sufficiently to attract an exclusively volunteer force larger than any such force we have had in the past, has been subjected to intensive study.

That study concluded that the costs would be difficult to determine precisely, but clearly they would be very high.

Far more important is the position of weakness to which an exclusively volunteer force—with no provision for selective service—would expose us. The sudden need for more men than a volunteer force could supply would find the Nation without the machinery to respond.

That lack of flexibility, that absence of power to expand in quick response to sudden challenge, would be totally incompatible with an effective national defense. In short, it would force us to gamble with the Nation's security.

We look to, and work for, the day the fighting will end in Vietnam. We hope—it is the most profound hope of this administration as it is of this generation of Americans—that the years beyond that day will be years of diminishing tension in the world, of silent guns and smaller armies. The total efforts of this Government will be constantly directed toward reaching that time.

But although we are hopeful, we are realists too, with a realism bred into us through long and lasting experience. Any responsible appraisal of world conditions leads inevitably to this conclusion: We must maintain the capability for flexible response which we have today.

The draft is one of the essential and crucial instruments which assures us of that flexibility.

I recommend legislation to extend for 4 years the authority, which expires on June 30, 1967, to induct men into the Armed Forces.

THE ORDER OF CALL

The general procedure today for the selection of draft-eligible men is in the order of "oldest first"—from 26 downward.

In the period prior to the Vietnam buildup, when draft calls were small, the average age for involuntary induction was between 22 and 24 years.

All three of the recent studies of the draft reveal that the current order of call is undesirable from the point of view of everyone involved—and is actually the reverse of what it should be:

For the young men themselves, it increases the period of uncertainty and interferes with the planning of lives and careers.

For employers, it causes hardships when employees are lost to the draft who have been trained, acquired skills, and settled in their jobs.

For the Selective Service System, it proliferates the number of deferment applications and appeals. Claims for dependency and occupational deferments are much more frequent for men over the age of 20.

For the Armed Forces, it creates problems. The services have found that older recruits are generally less adaptable than are younger ones to the rigors of military training.

The time has clearly come to correct these conditions and remove the uncertainties which the present order of call promotes.

I will issue an Executive order directing that in the future, as other measures I am proposing are put into effect, men be drafted beginning at age 19.

DEFERMENT INEQUITIES

Almost 2 million young men—and soon many more—reach age 19 each year. The foreseeable requirement is to draft only 100,000 to 300,000 of them annually. We must ask: How shall those relatively few be selected? As the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service phrased it, "Who serves when not all serve?"

Past procedures have, in effect, reduced the size of the available manpower pool by deferring men out of it.

This has resulted in inequities.

Two separate groups of men have been selected out of consideration for military service:

1. REJECTEES

In the past, many thousands of men were rejected—and put into deferred categories—who could have performed satisfactorily, sharing the burdens as well as the benefits of service. Most of these were disadvantaged youths with limited educational backgrounds or in some cases, curable physical defects.

We are taking action to correct this inequity. I referred earlier to Project 100,000 established by the Secretary of Defense. Under this program, the services are taking in men who would previously have been disqualified because of educational deficiencies or minor medical ailments.

With intensive instruction, practical on-the-job training and corrective medical measures, these young men can become good soldiers. Moreover, the remedial training they receive can enable them to live fuller and more productive lives. It is estimated that about half the men who enter the Armed Forces under this program will come as volunteers, the other half as draftees.

This will be a continuing program. The Nation can never again afford to deny to men who can effectively serve their country, the obligation—and the right—to share in a basic responsibility of citizenship.

2. COLLEGE STUDENTS

The National Advisory Commission on Selective Service found the issue of college student deferments to be the most difficult problem for its consideration. The Commission could not reach unanimity. This is not surprising, for it was sufficiently representative of the Nation itself to reflect the healthy diversity of opinion which centers on this subject.

Student deferments have resulted in inequities because many of those deferments have pyramided into exemptions from military service.

Deferred for undergraduate work, deferred further to pursue graduate study and then deferred even beyond that for fatherhood or occupational reasons, some young men have managed to pile deferment on deferment until they passed the normal cutoff point for induction.

In this regard, a recent survey revealed that only 27 percent of one age group of graduate school students past the age of 26 had served in the Armed Forces—contrasted with approximately 70 percent of men of the same ages with educational backgrounds varying from college degrees to some high school training.

There is one group of postgraduate students to whom this condition does not apply—men who are studying to be doctors and dentists. About half of them later serve as medical officers in the Armed Forces.

Their service is vital. Because their studies are essential to military manpower needs, students engaged in such programs must continue to be deferred until their education is completed.

I have concluded, however, that there is no justification for granting further deferments to other graduate school students.

To correct the inequities in the deferments of postgraduate students, I shall issue an Executive order specifying that no deferments for postgraduate study be granted in the future, except for those men pursuing medical and dental courses.

Undergraduate students present a different problem for consideration.

Many citizens—including a majority of the members of the National Advisory Commission—hold that student deferments are of themselves inequitable because they grant to one group of men a special privilege not generally available to all. Their concern was heightened by the belief that a student deferment in a time of conflict might be an even greater privilege.

They contend that such deferments cannot properly be justified as being in the national interest. Moreover it is their conviction that the elimination of a student deferment policy would have no harmful effect on the educational process in this country. Indeed, they believe that the Nation's experience with the returning veterans of other wars indicates that interruption of college studies for military service actually results for many men in a more mature approach and a greater capacity for study.

Others—including a substantial minority of the Commission—believe just as strongly that college deferments from service are not unfair—however manifestly unfair are the conditions of life which permit some to go to college while others cannot.

They agree that the unpredictability of world conditions could conceivably work to the advantage of students who were able to defer their service. But they point out that the same unpredictability could work just as easily to opposite effect, that men who were deferred as college freshmen in 1963 would be graduating this spring into a world in which they could face the hazards of combat. Finally, this point of view calls attention to the fact that the elimination of student deferments would unduly complicate the officer procurement problems of the Armed Forces, for almost four out of five officers who come into the services each year come from the Nation's colleges.

An issue so deeply important, with so many compelling factors on both sides, cannot be decided until its every aspect has been thoroughly explored.

I hope and expect that the Congress will debate the questions this issue poses for the Nation's youth and the Nation's future.

I will welcome the public discussion which the Commission report will surely stimulate.

I shall await the benefits of these discussions which will themselves be a great educational process for the Nation.

I will then take the Presidential action which, I believe, will best serve the national interest.

A FAIR AND IMPARTIAL RANDOM (FAIR) SYSTEM OF SELECTION

The paramount problem remains to determine who shall be selected for induction out of the many who are available.

Assuming that all the men available are equally qualified and eligible, how can that selection be made most fairly?

No question has received more thoughtful attention or more careful analysis.

There is no perfect solution. For the unavoidable truth is that complete equity can never be achieved when only some must be selected and only some must serve.

But a decision cannot be avoided. It is due. The question will become more urgent with the passing months and years.

I have concluded that the only method which approaches complete fairness is to establish a fair and impartial random—FAIR—system of selection which will determine the order of call for all equally eligible men.

That FAIR system would operate generally as follows:

At age 18, all men would be examined to determine their physical and mental eligibility.

All eligible men reaching age 19 before a designated date would be placed in a selection pool.

The FAIR system would then determine their order of call.

They would be selected in that order of call, for induction at age 19, to fill draft calls placed by the Department of Defense.

Those not reached during this period would drop to a less vulnerable position on the list with the entry of the next year's group of eligible men into the selection pool.

All men would retain their vulnerability to the draft, in diminishing order by age group up to 26, in the event of a national emergency. Those who had received deferments would continue liable, as at present, until their 35th birthday.

This system, giving young men a clear indication of a likelihood of being drafted, in conjunction with the "youngest first" order of call, will further reduce uncertainty in the planning of futures and careers.

I am instructing the Director of Selective Service, working in collaboration with the Secretary of Defense, to develop a fair and impartial random—FAIR—system of selection to become fully operational before January 1, 1969. This system will determine the order of call for induction of qualified and available 19-year-olds and older men as their deferments expire.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The proposals I am presenting in this message have one common objective: Insofar as it is possible to do so, to make certain that men who must be called to serve their country, and fight and die for it if necessary, will be chosen equitably and justly.

The governing concept I propose for selection is one of equal and uniform treatment for all men in like circumstances.

The National Advisory Commission has reported that in order to achieve that objective in all its dimensions, the Selective Service System itself should be restructured.

The Commission presented its conviction that the System's decentralized operation, with more than 4,000 neighborhood boards, 56 State headquarters and 95 appeal boards—all functioning under general and sometimes inconsistent guidelines—is not responsive to the requirements of our Nation today. It believed that uniformity of treatment would be difficult to achieve through that System.

The Commission recommended that the Selective Service System be consolidated. It suggested a coordinated structure of eight regions, embracing from 300 to 500 area offices located in major population centers and staffed with full-time Government employees. It proposed a System modernized by means of new management techniques, communications technology and data processing equipment.

I believe these recommendations should be exposed to further searching analysis and study by management experts building on the work the Commission has done.

The Selective Service System has done a good job for America. For a quarter of a century those who have been responsible for its operation have provided the Nation with an inspiring study of patriotic citizens volunteering their time and devotion to demanding tasks vitally affecting the national welfare.

Moreover, as I have already observed, the System itself has been flexible and responsive, meeting the widely varying calls for manpower placed on it over the past 20 years.

And beyond these considerations are others more difficult to measure, but deeply important nonetheless.

The Selective Service System is a part of America, a part of the process of our democracy, a part of our commitment to a full regard for the rights of the individual in our society. Because of the large number of registrants they must classify, many local draft boards in large cities cannot fulfill completely the function intended for them. But nonetheless the draft board concept is built on a uniquely American belief—that local citizens can perform a valuable service to the Government and at the same time personalize the Government's procedures to a young man fulfilling one of his earliest and most serious obligations of citizenship.

We cannot lightly discard an institution with so valuable a record of effectiveness and integrity.

Neither can we afford to preserve it, if we find that in practice it cannot adapt to the new controlling concept of equal and uniform treatment.

These counterbalancing considerations highlight the need to subject the System's organization to intensive study by experts skilled in management techniques and methods on the basis of the Commission's work.

I am instructing the Secretary of Defense, the Director of the Selective Service System, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget jointly to establish a task force to review the recommendations for a restructured Selective Service System made by the National Advisory Commission. This review will determine the cost, the method of implementation, and the effectiveness of the System the Commission recommends, in view of the changes in the System I am proposing in this message.

In the meantime we can make certain changes to strengthen the System.

The Commission study brought into focus areas where immediate improvement can and should be put into effect.

I am instructing the Director of the Selective Service System to:

Assure that advisers and appeal agents are readily available to all registrants.

Examine the System's appeals procedures to insure that the rights of the individual are fully protected.

Improve the System's information policies so that all registrants and the public generally will better understand the System's operations.

In conjunction with Governor Farris Bryant, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, work with the Governors to assure that all local boards are truly representative of the communities they serve and to submit periodic reports on the progress in this area.

RESERVE POLICIES

The National Advisory Commission focused attention on the administration of enlistments into Reserve and National Guard units. The Commission expressed concern over the inequities it saw in the enlistment procedures of these units.

The Reserve forces are essential to our military posture and are an integral part of it. My first concern is that these forces be maintained at their authorized strengths, and in a state of readiness for deployment, if and when they are needed.

I also believe that the Reserve components should, like the active forces, be manned primarily by volunteers.

Two steps have recently been taken by the Secretary of Defense to assure greater equity in the enlistment policies of the Reserve components:

Men who meet qualification standards must be accepted into Reserve units in the order of their application.

Reservists who are not satisfactorily fulfilling their obligation will be ordered to active duty for up to 24 months.

Authority to order such reservists to duty is provided in the Department of Defense 1967 Appropriations Act. I recommend that such authority be incorporated in permanent legislation.

I have concluded that two additional actions should now be taken:

First, I am directing the Secretary of Defense to give priority to Reserve enlistees who are under draft age—those young men 17 to 18½ years of age—to encourage a maximum number of volunteers who are not immediately draft liable. Reserve deferments for men who are draft liable will be authorized only to the extent required to fill specific vacancies in Reserve components.

Second, I recommend that the Congress enact standby authority to allow the Department of Defense to draft men into Reserve and National Guard units whenever the authorized strength of these units cannot otherwise be maintained.

THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON SELECTIVE SERVICE

The work of the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service represents the most comprehensive study of this system since it began 20 years ago. Any citizen who reads the report of the Commission—and I urge all citizens to do so—will recognize that the distinguished members have provided the most penetrating analysis of selective service in our history.

To provide the American people with a continuing review of a system which touches every American family and to assure the diligent pursuit of the actions I have discussed and approved in this message, as well as other suggestions in the Commission report, I am extending the life of the National Advisory Commission for an additional year.

CONCLUSION

Service performed by the youth of our Nation honors us all.

Americans have good reason to respect the long tradition of service which is manifested in every flight line and outpost where we commit our bravest men to the guardianship of freedom.

We have witnessed in our day the building of another tradition—by men and women in the Peace Corps, in VISTA, and in other such programs which have touched, and perhaps even changed, the life of our country and our world.

This spirit is as characteristic of modern America as our advanced technology, or our scientific achievements.

I have wondered if we could establish, through these programs and others like them, a practical system of nonmilitary alternatives to the draft without harming our security.

Both the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service and the group reporting to the Congress posed this question for study.

Both found the answer to be that we cannot.

But the spirit of volunteer service in socially useful enterprises will, we hope, continue to grow until that good day when all service will be voluntary, when all young people can and will choose the kind of service best fitted to their own needs and their Nation's.

We will hasten it as we can. But until it comes, because of the conditions of the world we live in now, we must continue to ask one form of service—military duty—of our young men. We would be an irresponsible Nation if we did not—and perhaps even an extinct one.

The Nation's requirement that men must serve, however, imposes this obligation: that in this land of equals, men are selected as equals to serve.

A just nation must have the fairest system that can be devised for making that selection.

I believe the proposals I am making today will help give us that system.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 6,1967*.

COMMUNITY WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 76)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to community work and training program, which, without being read, will be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

The President's message was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Once again we have evidence that public assistance is best achieved when we help the poor to help themselves.

This is documented by the report I transmit today on the community work and training program authorized by the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962. These amendments gave new opportunities for community work and training of thousands of unemployed parents of dependent children.

Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 gave further impetus to this program. It reinforced the original act by providing the counseling, education, health, job placement, and other services necessary to give the individual a new start in life.

Experience under these programs has shown that many people—now unemployed and living in poverty—can help themselves. Three-fourths of the 133,000 welfare recipients who have enrolled in these programs since 1964 have been helped: 22,100 have already found jobs, 70,200 are in training for productive employment, 3,500 are taking advance vocational instruction, 6,700 now have the training and marketable skills that should enable them to find jobs soon.

In short, 102,500 Americans and their families have been given hope where hope did not exist before. This is an impressive record.

But no statistics can measure the gain in self-respect to these parents. These programs substitute a productive job for a life on welfare or in poverty. They provide the opportunity to break the vicious cycle of welfare dependency and poverty which burdens our society.

I urge the Congress to extend and make permanent this program to bring help to unemployed parents and through them hope to our most disadvantaged children.

I urge the States to study the lessons we have learned and to avail themselves fully of the promise which these programs hold.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 6, 1967*.

THE PEACE CORPS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to the Peace Corps, which, without being read, will be appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

The message was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Of the many efforts undertaken by this Nation to advance peace, prosperity, and understanding, few have inspired greater admiration among the people of the world than the Peace Corps. In 5 years, it has given new purpose to thousands of Americans, and new hope to millions abroad.

In 1968 Peace Corps volunteers will assist more than 400,000 farmers in their struggle against hunger, help educate more than 700,000 schoolchildren, help train 55,000 teachers, provide health services to more than 200,000 persons, help 75,000 men and women help themselves through private enterprise, and bring greater opportunity to thousands of people through community development.

By August 1967 we will have more than 16,000 volunteers serving in 53 countries and one territory. By August 1968 there will be more than 19,000 volunteers—nearly double the number in 1964—active in 60 countries.

The Peace Corps has captured the imagination of our youth; 210 schools in 30 nations are operating today because American students have voluntarily assisted them under the school partnership program which we initiated in 1964. Their support, together with the help of Peace Corps volunteers, and with labor and land donated by the host country, is providing a home for learning for a great many children around the world. We hope to build 500 schools by mid-1967 and at least 1,000 schools in 45 countries by mid-1968.

The Peace Corps has provided an opportunity for tens of thousands of idealistic and able Americans, young and old, to serve their fellow men—with little thought of self or comfort, and with little recompense other than the reward of seeing human lives made better by their efforts.

It is building a growing reserve of capable and tested citizens devoted to public service. By 1970, there will be some 50,000 returned volunteers in the United States. Many of them, directly or after completing their education, plan to enter Government service. Some have already returned to train new volunteers, and others are helping to administer programs throughout the world.

The Peace Corps produces a high yield in results, at a low budgetary cost. The number of volunteers has increased at a much faster rate than the Peace Corps budget. Over the years, the average cost of the program per volunteer has declined steadily—from a high of $9,074 in fiscal 1963 to an estimated $7,400 in 1967.

Today, the Peace Corps idea—the idea of voluntary public service abroad—is spreading to other countries. Already 18 "Peace Corps," most of them based on the U.S. model, have been established by other industrialized nations. This is testimony, not only to the soundness of Peace Corps principles, but also to the living example of Peace Corps volunteers.

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress the Fifth Annual Report of the Peace Corps. It will be gratifying reading to all who are interested in this pioneering and humane endeavor.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 6, 1967*.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 3, 1967,

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, on March 3, 1967, reported favorably, without reservation, Executive D, 88th Congress, second session, the Consular Convention between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, together with a protocol relating thereto, signed at Moscow on June 1, 1964, and submitted a report (Ex. Rept. No. 4) thereon, together with the individual views of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] which was printed.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE OF THE STATE OF MONTANA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the Senate of the State of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

S. Res. 9

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Montana requesting Congress to provide Federal assistance to domestic gold producers

Whereas, since 1934, domestic gold producers have been required to sell their product only to the Federal Government at the established price of $35 per ounce, and

Whereas, costs of producing this precious metal have continued to increase at an alarming rate reflecting the impact of inflation upon the economics of gold mining and milling operations with the result that virtually all gold producers in the United States have closed down their properties, and

Whereas, domestic gold production, which amounted to approximately 5,000,000 ounces in 1940, has now dropped to an annual rate slightly in excess of 1,500,000 ounces while current domestic gold consumption for defense and space needs, industrial requirements, the arts and crafts, and dental use has rapidly risen to a significant rate of approximately 6,000,000 ounces per annum, over three times our United States production rate, and

Whereas, the continuing outflow of gold and failure to solve our balance of payments deficit continues to be of ever greater national concern, and

Whereas, the disparity between domestic consumption and production imposes an additional substantial drain upon the monetary gold reserves of the United States, and

Whereas, Federal relief legislation revitalizing the United States gold mining industry could well end continuing substantial depletion of our monetary gold reserves to supply United States internal domestic gold consumption which should alleviate to some extent concern in foreign circles over our monetary policies, and

Whereas, such legislation to stimulate domestic gold production is definitely in the national interest; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana, That the members of the Senate of the State of Montana respectively request the Congress of the United States to provide Federal financial assistance payments to domestic gold producers to stabilize the few existing United States gold properties, to reopen dormant gold mines, and to encourage aggressive exploration for new gold ore reserves in this country: be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each member of the Congress from the State of Montana.

I hereby certify that the within Resolution was adopted by the Senate of the Fortieth Legislative Assembly of the state of Montana on the 13th day of February, 1967.

James J. Pasma,
Secretary of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Alfred Robert Zipf, of California, to be a member of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service; and

Dr. Kathryn M. Smith, of Colorado, to be a member of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service.

By Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

William P. Kelly, Jr., of Virginia, to be an Assistant Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity; and

William H. Crook, of Texas, to be an Assistant Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Elzie H. Wooten, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1179. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to prohibit the sales of alcoholic beverages to persons under 21 years of age; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Scott when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 1180. A bill for the relief of Ana Jacalne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUYE (for himself, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Fong, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Holland, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Moss, Mr. Pell, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Scott, Mr. Smathers, and Mr. Yarborough):

S. 1181. A bill to exempt a member of the Armed Forces from service in a combat zone when such member is the sole surviving son of a family, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Inouye when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio:

S. 1182. A bill to provide for the appointment of congressional pages or messengers from among young men and women between the ages of 17 and 22 who are attending college; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. Young of Ohio when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1183. A bill for the relief of Benjamin De Kylin;

S. 1184. A bill for the relief of Miss Mariel Madamba; and

S. 1185. A bill for the relief of Sofia Michaelidou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Fong, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Morse, Mr. Pell, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Yarborough):

S. 1186. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to provide a grant-in-aid program to assist the States in furnishing aid and services with respect to children under foster care; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Williams of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1187. A bill to establish Cedar Breaks National Monument as Cedar Breaks National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bennett when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 1188. A bill for the relief of Manual J. Tavis; and

S. 1189. A bill for the relief of Sheung Wan Ng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1190. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for inclusion of certain periods of reemployment of annuitants for the purpose of computing annuities of their surviving spouses; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 1191. A bill to provide for the disposition of a judgment against the United States recovered by the Southern Ute Tribe of the Southern Ute Reservation in Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HART:

S. 1192. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hart when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. Muskie):

S.J. Res. 48. Joint resolution to designate the 13th day of March in 1967 as "National Electric Car Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

PROHIBITION OF SALES OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES TO PERSONS UNDER 21 YEARS OF AGE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase in the District of Columbia the minimum age for the purchase of any alcoholic beverage.

At the present time the minimum age for the sale of hard liquor is to persons 21 or older. But there is an exception that permits the sale of beer and light wines to persons 18 and older. This bill would eliminate that exception.

In doing so, I want to serve notice that I will exert every effort to have this bill enacted or to have its provisions incorporated into other legislation by amendment.

Meanwhile, Mr. President, I have noted with interest the reintroduction, in the other body as H.R. 822, of legislation, to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act. This bill would implement recommendations made some years ago by a blue-ribbon commission appointed by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to review the operations of the act.

H.R. 822 contains a mischievous, if innocent looking, provision. I refer to paragraph (5) of section 1 which, by adding the words "an original" to section 14 of the precent act, is an attempt to hamper the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board's right to review a license application to assure conformity with the criteria specified in section 14 to an original application only and not to the subsequent annual applications for license renewals. This "sleeper" was incorporated into H.R. 10744 during its consideration in the other body last year at the suggestion of the local restaurant operators, but was vehemently opposed by the District Commissioners and the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board.

It would be presumptuous for a Senator to give advice to Members of the other body on legislation coming before them. As an interested citizen, however, I hope that in committee or on the floor they will see fit to delete that little provision from H.R. 822 and, for good measure, to add the substance of the bill which I am introducing today. Otherwise, I assure the Senate that I stand ready to do these things when H.R. 822 or its Senate companion, which has not yet been introduced, comes before the Senate for action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Byrd of West Virginia). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1179) to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to prohibit the sale of alcoholic beverages to persons under 21 years of age, introduced by Mr. Scott, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXEMPTION OF A MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES FROM SERVICE IN A COMBAT ZONE WHEN SUCH MEMBER IS THE SOLE SURVIVING SON OF A FAMILY

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators Anderson, Byrd of Virginia, Burdick, Cannon, Eastland, Fong, Fulbright, Hatfield, Holland, Jackson, Kennedy of New York, Long of Missouri, Magnuson, Mansfield, Mondale, Moss, Pell, Randolph, Scott, Smathers, and Yarborough, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to exempt a member of the Armed Forces from service in a combat zone when such member is the sole surviving son of a family, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1181) to exempt a member of the Armed Forces from service in a combat zone when such member is the sole surviving son of a family, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Inouye (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the manpower demands of our present conflict in Vietnam are most unique. Of those eligible to serve, many are able to defer their military service for the period of their college education and longer. Others enjoy exemptions on the basis of family support. I have no quarrel with these provisions for under the circumstances of this war, which is not a national emergency, such exemptions are wise and necessary.

Nevertheless, it is paradoxical that when so few must bear the burdens of so many, some families are assuming double risk and suffering, while other families remain virtually untouched by the tragic conflict. There have been instances in my own State of Hawaii where two men within a single family were killed as a result of the Vietnam conflict. Also, there have been cases where two brothers were seriously wounded while serving concurrent tours of duty in the combat area. I am sure that in each of your States these situations can be duplicated and multiplied.

At the present time, Department of Defense regulations offer two bases for deferment of military service in a combat area:

First. When one or more members of a family have been killed, or have died from injuries incurred in a combat area, the sole surviving son will be exempt from combat duty if he so requests.

The member of the military service must initiate the action by giving this information to his superiors. If, however, he wishes to stay on, he may sign a waiver forfeiting his right to be removed from the combat area.

Second. No two members of the same family are sent into a combat zone at the same time, provided one of the two members requests to have his service delayed.

But the member of the military service must initiate the action by giving this information to his superiors. If, however, he wishes to stay on, he must sign a waiver forfeiting his right to be transferred out of the zone for the length of time the other member of the family is serving there.

At the present time, the Department of Defense does not keep records which would reveal death of a next of kin, or concurrent duty of a next of kin.

My proposal would deny any surviving member of a family in which one or more members have been killed or died as a result of injuries incurred in a combat area, the option of serving in a combat zone. Second, this bill would forbid the assignment of a second member of the same family to concurrent duty in a combat area unless the two specifically volunteered for such service.

I believe the requirement that the member of the military service initiate the action in these circumstances is an unfair obligation to assume. I am sure all of us understand how a young man filled with esprit de corps after training with his unit might easily sign a waiver to enable him to stay with his friends and buddies. He could, of course, refuse to sign the waiver and by so doing avoid combat. But he would suspect that his leaving was a cowardly act. Certainly, it might appear so to his buddies. Also, a member of the armed services often is motivated by a deep sense of service and patriotism. Each of these are pressures which constrain him from exercising his rights as now delineated in Armed Forces regulations.

Not only his interests but the interests of his loved ones are involved. Part of the right to make a decision must be freedom from coercion. With a decision of such far-reaching implications as this, and in view of the availability of so many men, no coercion should be possible.

Out of consideration, therefore, to his family and to the young man himself, I solicit your support for these reforms.

YOUNGSTERS OF COLLEGE AGE AS SENATE MESSENGERS—SCRAP ARCHAIC PAGE SYSTEM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the present method of selecting congressional pages is archaic and troublesome. The time is long past due for the Congress to give serious consideration to establishing a more equitable and sensible system of hiring pages

Under the present system pages may be employed in the House of Representatives at the age of 14 and continue until they are 18. In the Senate pages start at 14 and some remain in this employment until they are too large to serve inconspicuously—a rather nebulous standard for terminating employment.

The boys who presently serve as pages in the Senate and the House of Representatives are fine boys. However, they are a part of a system which developed historically but has no validity today.

Historically, the custom of hiring pages goes back to the first Congress. In those days Members of Congress who knew of young orphan boys in destitute circumstances had their sympathies aroused and they were successful in having officers of the House of Representatives employ these boys as runners.

Originally, in 1789, a few runners were employed. The earliest records show that in the 20th Congress, which sat from 1827 to 1829, three boys were employed as runners. In succeeding Congresses the number changed, but the custom continued.

Through the years this practice has been modified, so that today a large number of boys between the ages of 14 and 18 are hired to serve at salaries in excess of $5,000 a year. This is indeed a handsome salary for a young boy just out of grade school who answers telephones and delivers messages and documents. It is more money than is paid to many officers and soldiers serving in combat in Vietnam.

When these youngsters come to Washington they are left on their own to secure adequate housing and meals. They are without the benefit of the parental guidance that is so necessary for young people. They attend the Capitol Page School for 3 hours daily and sometimes work as much as 40 hours a week, or longer. This schedule would not be tolerated in any job covered by Federal child labor regulations.

Difficulties in the past have caused some Senators to propose that the Federal Government provide a $1 million dormitory for the 80-odd youngsters who work as pages. I spoke out against that proposal in July 1964, at that time urging that the page system be abolished. This would be an unconscionable waste of taxpayers' money. It would only serve to compound an already unwieldy situation and perpetuate an outmoded, unnecessary, archaic, and unjustified system.

In my judgment consideration should be given at this time to the advisability of employing college students, young men and women, from the ages of 17 to 22 to serve as pages in both Houses of Congress. This would give youngsters who are college students the valuable opportunity to view the work of Congress firsthand, help them to pay their way through college, and relieve Members of Congress of the responsibility of looking after the welfare of very young boys, many of whom are on their own for the first time, far from their parents and homes.

Today, most Capitol policemen, elevator operators, Post Office employees, and other patronage jobs on Capitol Hill are filled by young men attending colleges and universities in the Washington area. This has provided a wonderful opportunity for them, and I am sure has helped many a young man to graduate who otherwise might not financially have been able to make his way through college.

I realize that whenever a long-established tradition or custom is set aside, very careful consideration should be given to the reasons for doing so. I am convinced that in this fast-moving space age of change and challenge, the present method of selecting very young teenage boys as pages for Congress is outmoded and really serves no useful purpose.

Therefore, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the appointment of congressional messengers from young men and women between the ages of 17 and 22 who are attending college. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record at this point as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1182) to provide for the appointment of congressional pages or messengers from among young men and women between the ages of 17 and 22 who are attending college, introduced by Mr. Young of Ohio, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1182

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no person shall serve as a page of the Senate or House of Representatives—

(1) before he or she has attained the age of seventeen years, or during any session of the Congress which begins after he or she has attained the age of twenty-three years; or

(2) during any period when he or she is not regularly pursuing a full-time course of study in a recognized college or university, if such period exceeds (i) thirty days, or (ii) four months if the period is between school years and such person has a bona fide intention to pursue a full-time course of study in a recognized college or university during the semester (or other period into which the school year is divided) immediately following such period.

Sec. 2. (a) Section 243 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 88a), and the proviso in the paragraph under the heading "Education of Senate and House Pages" in title I of the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947 (2 U.S.C. 88b), are hereby repealed.

Sec. 3. This Act shall become effective at the beginning of the first session of the Ninety-first Congress.

CARE OF FOSTER CHILDREN

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators Inouye, Fong, Fulbright, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Long of Missouri, McCarthy, Morse, Pell, Randolph, and Yarborough, I am reintroducing proposed legislation to establish a new program of grants to the States to provide aid to children in foster care.

The Federal Government acknowledges the fact that it has a definite responsibility for the well-being of our needy. This philosophy holds true especially when we concern ourselves with the plight of dependent children.

It is unfortunate that the law makes a distinction between a foster child and a dependent children living with his family. No child is more dependent on outside help than the child separated from his parents by death or disaster. Until now, because of an arbitrary distinction in the law, the Government has, in practical effect, ignored the plight of the foster child.

Aid to families with dependent children—AFDC—provided under title IV of the Social Security Act, is a typical example. The purpose of this program is to provide needy children with the economic support they need for their health *and development. Presently Federal* law requires that a foster child receiving AFDC aid must have been placed in foster care by court order and he must also have received aid from the State AFDC program in or for the month in which court proceedings were initiated. Furthermore, AFDC funds are not available to children in public child-care institutions.

Although foster care is included in the definition of child-welfare services under title V, Federal funds are not earmarked specifically for foster care purposes. Moreover, appropriations for title V programs are limited, and the results have been that States have seen fit to use Federal funds to bolster other child-welfare programs.

Today, there are approximately 300,000 children in foster care. The financial burden of providing care and services for these children falls primarily upon State and local governments and upon voluntary agencies supported by charitable contributions.

Because the bill that I am reintroducing establishes a new program exclusively for children in foster care, funds received under this program would in no way reduce a State's share of Federal money for general child-welfare programs under title V of the Social Security Act.

This bill provides that each State may receive a Federal grant, on a 50-percent-matching basis, of not more than $45 a month for each child living in a foster family home.

This bill also provides that each State would receive a nonmatching Federal grant of $20 a month for each child receiving care in a public or private nonprofit child-care institution.

In addition, the Federal Government would provide 75 percent of the cost of those services provided by State and local personnel which have been determined necessary to promote the welfare of children in foster care, and the Federal Government would underwrite the total cost as determined necessary for training personnel for work with the State and local agencies. Fifty percent of the cost necessary for the efficient administration of this program would be underwritten by the National Government.

In order to qualify for assistance under this program, each State would be required to have its plan of welfare and related services for children in foster care approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Criteria for the State plan are modeled after those required for States for aid to families with dependent children. In addition, States would be required to take appropriate steps to assure that Federal funds will not replace State and local funds now used to finance foster care services.

The provision in this bill for maximum Federal grants of $45 a month for children in foster family homes is intended to help more families assume responsibility for foster children. Except for the child who is unable to conform to a normal family life, it seems to be the consensus among the experts that foster family care is preferable to institutional care.

A foster child's needs are extremely *complex. Their often deeply imbedded* hostilities toward adults make it extremely difficult for a foster couple to establish a true parental relationship with the child. In fact the turnover among foster parents runs as high as 33 percent a year. *It is hoped that the provisions of this bill for professional services* and the training of personnel will greatly assist remedying these situations.

I believe New Jersey is representative of the basic programs of other States. In New Jersey each child boarding in a foster home receives $77 a month in State and local funds.

For children requiring specialized programs for treatment of physical handicaps or emotional disturbance, the State of New Jersey will pay up to $153 a month.

Although the New Jersey program is not substantially different from foster care programs in other States, there are, however, notable variations. In New Jersey the cost of foster care services generally is borne equally by the State and county governments. Several States rely almost exclusively on State funds. A few States, however, provide virtually no State money or administrative machinery for foster care programs, preferring instead to allow local governments and voluntary agencies to do the job.

Approximately 75 additional children each month enter the New Jersey foster care program. As of November 1966, 8,616 children boarded in foster homes.

Numerous State and Federal officials I have talked to express increasing concern. They view the already substantial increase in the number of foster children with alarm in view of the inadequate foster care services available. Many States' budgets are now so overburdened that only limited numbers of new children can be admitted into foster care.

It seems clear that Federal assistance is mandatory.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Record at this point an explanation of this proposal and that the bill be permitted to lie on the desk for additional cosponsors for a period of 10 days.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier I introduced a bill and asked unanimous consent that it lie at the desk for additional cosponsors. The bill deals with grants-in-aid for children in foster care.

I ask unanimous consent to withdraw that part of my request, that it remain at the desk for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanation will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1186) to amend title V of the Social Security Act to provide a grant-in-aid program to assist the States in furnishing aid and services with respect to children under foster care, introduced by Mr. Williams of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1186

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title V of the Social Security Act is amended by (1) redesignating part 5 thereof as part 6, (2) by redesignating section 541 as section 551, and (3) by inserting after part 4 thereof the following new part:

"PART 5—GRANTS TO STATES FOR AID TO CHILDREN UNDER FOSTER CARE

"APPROPRIATIONS

"Sec. 541. For the purpose of facilitating the proper foster care of children whose welfare can best be advanced through such care by enabling each State to furnish financial assistance and needed welfare services, as far as practicable under the conditions in such State, to children placed under foster care, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year a sum sufficient to carry out the purposes of this part. The sums made available under this section shall be used for making payment to States which have submitted, and had approved by the Secretary, State plans for aid and services to children under foster care.

"STATE PLANS FOR AID AND SERVICES TO CHILDREN UNDER FOSTER CARE

"Sec. 542. (a) A State plan for aid and services to children under foster care must—

"(1) provide that it shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State, and, if administered by them, be mandatory upon them;

"(2) provide for financial participation by the State;

"(3) provide that the State public-welfare agency which administers the child-welfare services plan developed as provided in part 3 of this title shall be designated as the State agency to administer, or supervise the administration of, the State plan under this part;

"(4) provide for granting an opportunity for a fair hearing before the State agency to any person whose claim for aid to children under foster care is denied or is not acted upon with reasonable promptness;

"(5) provide such methods of administration (including methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Secretary shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods) as are found by the Secretary to be necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the State plan;

"(6) provide that the State agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may from time to time require, and comply with such provisions as the Secretary may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

"(7) provide that (A) the amount of aid, if any, to be provided under the State plan with respect to any child under foster care shall be determined on the basis of his need therefor, taking into consideration any income and resources of such child which are available to defray the expenses of his care; and (B) the State agency shall not deny or limit the amount or extent of the aid otherwise available under the State plan to any child, on the ground of his lack of need for such aid, until such agency is fully satisfied, as the result of affirmative evidence, that there is a lack of need on the part of such child for such aid;

"(8) provide safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients of aid to children under foster care to purposes directly connected with the administration of the State plan (except that this requirement shall not be applicable in the case of aid under such plan provided to children placed in a child-care institution);

"(9) provide that all persons wishing to make application for aid to children under foster care shall have opportunity to do so, and that such aid shall be furnished with reasonable promptness to all eligible persons;

"(10) provide that aid to children under foster care will not be provided to any child with respect to any period for which such child is receiving aid under the State plan of such State approved under section 402 of this Act;

"(11) provide for the development and application of a program for such welfare and related services for each child who receives aid to children under foster care as may be necessary to promote the welfare of such child, and provide for the coordination of such program, and any other services provided for children under the State plan, with the child-welfare services plan developed as provided in part 3 of this title, with a view toward providing welfare and related services which will best promote the welfare of such child;

"(12) provide for the development, with respect to each child who receives aid to children under foster care, an individual welfare plan, which shall include a continuing study of the child's needs, of the most suitable available home in which he can be placed, and a periodic review of his case, and provide that, in carrying out such welfare plan, use may be made of services of private nonprofit child-care agencies and organizations; and

"(13) contain or be supported by assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that amounts payable to such State under section 543 to carry out the State plan will be so used as to supplement the level of non-Federal funds that would, in the absence of such amounts, be available in the State for the purpose of providing aid and welfare services to children who are under foster care in such State.

"PAYMENT TO STATES

"Sec. 543. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary shall pay to each State which has a plan approved under this part, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1967—

"(1) an amount equal to 50 per centum of the total amount expended under the State plan during such quarter as aid to children under foster care with respect to children in foster family homes (including expenditures for insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $90 multiplied by the total number of children who were recipients of such aid for such month (which total number, for purposes of this subsection, means (A) the number of children in foster family homes with respect to whom such aid in the form of money payments is paid for such month, plus (B) the number of other children in such homes with respect to whom expenditures were made in such month as aid to children under foster care in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care);

"(2) an amount equal to 100 per centum of the total amount expended under the State plan during such quarter as aid to children under foster care with respect to children in child-care institutions (including expenditures for insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $20 multiplied by the total number of children in such institutions who were recipients of such aid for such month;

"(3) an amount equal to 75 per centum of (A) the total amount expended during such quarter in providing services (as prescribed by the Secretary under regulations) necessary to promote the welfare of children receiving aid to children under foster care under the State plan, plus (B) the total amount expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary for the training of personnel employed or preparing for employment by the State agency or by the local agency administering the plan in the political subdivision; plus

"(4) an amount equal to one-half of the total sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, including services and training referred to in paragraph (2) and provided in accordance with the requirements of this part and regulations promulgated by the Secretary.

The services referred to in paragraph (3) (A) shall include only services provided by the staff of the State agency, or the local agency administering the State plan in the political subdivision, except that, subject to limitations prescribed by the Secretary, there may be included services provided by nonprofit private agencies under contract with the State agency, if, in the judgment of the State agency, the State agency cannot provide such services as economically or as effectively by its staff or through a local agency as such services can be provided under contract with nonprofit private agencies.

"(b)(1) Prior to the beginning of each quarter, the Secretary shall estimate the amount to which a State will be entitled under subsection (a) for such quarter, such estimate to be based on (A) a report filed by the State containing its estimate of the total sum to be expended in such quarter in accordance with the provisions of such subsection, and stating the amount appropriated or made available by the State and its political subdivisions for such expenditures in such quarter, and if such amount is less than the State's proportionate share of the total sum of such estimated expenditures, the source or sources from which the difference is expected to be derived, and (B) such other investigation as the Secretary may find necessary.

"(2) The Secretary shall then pay, in such installments as he may determine, to the State the amount so estimated, reduced or increased to the extent of any overpayment or underpayment which the Secretary determines was made under this section to such State for any prior quarter and with respect to which adjustment has not already been made under this subsection.

"(3) The pro rata share to which the United States is equitably entitled, as determined by the Secretary, of the net amount recovered, during any quarter by the State or political subdivision thereof with respect to aid to children under foster care, shall be considered an overpayment under this subsection.

"(4) Upon the making of any estimate by the Secretary under this subsection, any appropriations available for the payments under this section shall be deemed obligated.

"OPERATION OF STATE PLANS

"SEC. 544. If the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of the State plan approved under this part, finds—

"(1) that the plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 542; or

"(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision;

the Secretary shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made to the State (or, in his discretion, that payments will be limited to categories under or parts of the State plan not affected by such failure) until the Secretary is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied he shall make no further payments to such State (or shall limit payments to categories under or parts of the State plan not affected by such failure).

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 545. For the purposes of this part—

"(a) The term 'child' means a needy child who (1) has not attained the age of eighteen, (2) has been deprived of parental support or care, and (3) is not (and upon making proper application therefor would not be) entitled to receive aid to families with dependent children under the State plan, approved under section 402 of this Act, of the State in which he lives;

"(b) The term 'aid,' when applied to a child under foster care, means (1) money payments with respect to such child, plus (2) medical care in behalf of or any type of remedial care recognized under State law in behalf of such child;

"(c) The term 'foster family home' means a private family home, which is licensed by the State in which it is situated or has been approved, by the agency of such State responsible for licensing homes of this type, as meeting the standards established for such licensing;

"(d) The term 'child-care institution' means a public or nonprofit private institution which provides foster care for children and which is licensed by the State in which it is situated or has been approved, by the agency of such State for licensing institutions of this type, as meeting the standards established for such licensing.

"(e) A child shall be considered to be 'under foster care' only if (1) he is actually living in a foster family home or a child-care institution, and (2)(A) he has been placed in such home or institution as a result of a determination, by a court of competent jurisdiction or of a public welfare or other public agency having a legal responsibility for his welfare, to the effect that his welfare can best be promoted by his placement therein, or (B) his having been placed in such a home or institution is approved by a State or local welfare agency having legal responsibility for his welfare."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 408 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "Effective for the period beginning May 1, 1961" and inserting in lieu thereof "Effective for the period beginning May 1, 1961, and ending with the close of June 30, 1968.).

(b)(1) Section 1116(a)(1) of such Act is amended by inserting "or part 5 of title V," after "XIX,".

(2) Section 1116(a)(3) of such Act is amended by inserting "544," after "404,".

(3) Section 1116(b) of such Act is amended by inserting ", or part 5 of title V," after "XIX".

(4) Section 1116(d) of such Act is amended by inserting ", or part 5 of title V," after "XIX".

(c)(1) Clause (1) of the first sentence of section 1901 of such Act is amended by inserting "and needy dependent children under foster care entitled to benefits under part 5, title V" after "families with dependent children".

(2)(A) Section 1902(a)(10) of such Act is amended by inserting ", and part 5 of title V" after "XVI".

(B) Section 1902(a)(17) is amended by inserting ", or part 5 of title V" after "XVI".

(3) Section 1902(c) of such Act is amended by inserting ", or part 5 of title V" after "XVI".

(4) Section 1903(a)(1) of such Act is amended by inserting "or part 5 of title V" after "XVI,".

(d) Section 121(b) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 is amended by inserting ", or part 5 of title V" after "XVI".

The explanation presented by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF BILL TO AMEND TITLE V OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO PROVIDE GRANTS TO THE STATES FOR AID AND SERVICES TO CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE

The bill provides a Federal contribution equal to one-half the amount appropriated by the state, up to $45 of Federal money per month, for each child living in a foster family home.

In addition, each State would receive a non-matching Federal grant of $20 a month for each child receiving care in a public or private nonprofit child-care institution.

The Federal Government would provide 75% of the cost of those services provided by State and local personnel which have been determined necessary to promote the welfare of children in foster care. Under certain conditions the services of private nonprofit agencies under contract with the State agency may also be included.

The Federal Government would also underwrite the total cost determined necessary for training personnel for work with the State and local agencies.

And, the Federal Government would underwrite 50% of the cost necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the program.

Because the bill establishes a new program exclusively for children in foster care, funds received under this program would in no way reduce a State's share of Federal money for general child-welfare programs under Title V of the Social Security Act.

The bill authorizes an open-end appropriation and requires that States take appropriate steps to assure that Federal funds will not be used to replace State and local funds now used to finance foster care services.

The bill includes standard provisions establishing the method for making payments to the States for reimbursement in the case of overpayment, and for the termination of payments under specified circumstances.

Any child under age 18 who is living in a foster family home or in a public or private nonprofit child-care institution would be eligible for aid under this program.

The program will be administered by the State agency responsible for other child-welfare programs operating in the State. In most cases, this agency will be the State Welfare Agency.

In order to qualify for assistance under this program, each State would be required to submit to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for his approval a plan of welfare and related services for children in foster care.

Requirements for the State plan parallel the statutory requirements now in effect for assistance under Title IV of the Social Security Act which provides aid to families with dependent children.

The State plan must call for the development of an individual welfare plan for each child receiving aid under this program. Individual welfare plans will include a continuing study of the child's needs and of the most suitable available home in which he can be placed, and a periodic review of his case. In carrying out each plan, the services of private nonprofit child-care agencies and organizations may be used.

States are required to permit all persons seeking aid under this program to apply for such aid and to furnish aid to eligible individuals within a reasonable time.

Children in foster care will also be eligible for medical benefits provided under Title XIX of the Social Security Act in States where the Kerr-Mills program is in effect.

The provisions for foster care, Title IV, Section 408 of the Social Security Act (Aid to Families with Dependent Children) will be allowed to expire and foster children who received AFDC aid will be entitled to assistance under this program.

CEDAR BREAKS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, situated high on a plateau in southern Utah, 23 miles from Cedar City, is the grand mountainside amphitheater known as Cedar Breaks National Monument. An immense half bowl, 2,000 feet deep, 4 miles long, 2½ miles wide, and covering almost 10 square miles, Cedar Breaks exhibits what is probably the world's most breathtaking exposure of flamboyant color.

Within the steep-walled amphitheater, visitors see limestone eroded into many fantastic shapes that have been formed by the never-ending efforts of rain, wind, snow, and ice.

Geologists tell us that this all started about 55 million years ago when a limy ooze was deposited in shallow lakes on a land surface near sea level. About 13 million years ago the land surface was slowly uplifted to its present elevation of around 10,000 feet. As the plateau lifted, it produced a steep, westerly facing escarpment of limestone, which became exposed to the elements of erosion. The rock, varying in hardness, became susceptible to the rain and snow water rushing down the cliffs and aided by frost and wind, erosion occurred, some slow and some quickly, leaving us the resistant spires and ridges we have today.

The first protection afforded this unique region was in 1905 when it was included as part of the Sevier—now Dixie—National Forest and was administered by the Forest Service. On August 22, 1933, the area was placed under the National Park Service administration as a national monument.

Now, Mr. President, the time has come to designate this region as a national park.

I am, therefore, introducing today legislation to change the designation of the Cedar Breaks National Monument to Cedar Breaks National Park.

My proposal is another step in upgrading Utah's tourist potential and giving proper recognition to the outstanding scenic attractions of the State.

The establishment of a Cedar Breaks National Park has long been a dream of local civic leaders and other State officials since it would give the Cedar Breaks attraction the status which it well deserves in the national system of recreational areas. In addition, Cedar Breaks would receive greater development and much wider recognition and promotion which would attract many additional visitors to the tourist mecca of southern Utah which is fast coming to be known as the Land of the Rainbow Canyons.

Under my bill there would be no acreage increases over the current 10 square miles within the national monument boundaries.

Earlier this year interested parties came to me with a proposal to add the so-called Bristlecone Pine Tree area to my Cedar Breaks National Park plan. I asked for a review and a report from persons involved in the area, from the U.S. Forest Service, mining, grazing, and other interests as well as making a study of my own on the merits of adding the bristlecone pine region to Cedar Breaks.

After reviewing all of the information gathered I am inclined to agree with a majority of those involved that the 1,400 acres proposed for addition should remain a part of the Dixie National Forest. However, in making my study I called attention to the Forest Service that some protection should be given to the ancient bristlecone pine trees which eke out an existence on the relatively poor limestone soil that is along the rim of the amphitheater.

I have been told that the bristlecone pine area has been and will continue to be of major interest to the Forest Service and that its value for recreation and research is fully recognized.

I feel, and I think the Forest Service agrees, that added emphasis should be given to protection for the bristlecone pine from vandalism and destruction. Along these lines the Forest Service has developed a plan for access roads, barriers, trails, camp and picnic facilities, as well as signs and informational programs for the protection, development, and public use of the entire Cedar Breaks, bristlecone pine complex.

In this manner, the 1,400 acres can remain under the Forest Service multiple use program which would eliminate the significant economic impact on grazing, hunting, and other resource uses in the area.

Mr. President, it is obvious to me from the interest generated by my proposal this year and in the past that a Cedar Breaks National Park has widespread support. I am hopeful that the Interior Department's National Park Service and the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee will give my proposal early consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1187) to establish Cedar Breaks National Monument as Cedar Breaks National Park, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1187

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Cedar Breaks National Monument in the State of Utah is hereby established as the Cedar Breaks National Park to be administered as a national park under the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1916 as amended and supplemented.

THE SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish in Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

My colleagues are thoroughly familiar with this proposal. On two previous occasions the Senate has acted favorably on it. S. 936 of the 89th Congress died in the House Rules Committee in the last days of the session.

The bill I am introducing today is identical to the measure reported favorably by the House Interior Committee last year. It calls for a 61,171-acre park that includes both North and South Manitou Islands and numbers 64 miles of shoreline, half of it on the mainland. The House Interior Committee added to the Senate-passed measure the 14,100-acre North Manitou Island plus a buffer zone along M–22 on the mainland.

This bill is the product of a great deal of Committee work, both in House and Senate.

The need for action was forcefully stated last Wednesday at a luncheon meeting of the Michigan delegation and executives of the State conservation department.

Ralph MacMullan, the department's director, made it clear that the State administration wholeheartedly backs the park as necessary to maintain decent recreational facilities in the State.

Last year 55,700 families were turned away from crowded Michigan State parks. There is urgent need to get this national lakeshore established.

Hopefully the introduction of this "finished product" will help speed it through the congressional committees. It represents the fullest consideration of the Senate Interior Committee, the Senate, and the House Interior Committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial of October 18, 1966, from the Bay City Times, which in turn is a reprint from the Grand Rapids Press, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1192) to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The editorial presented by Mr. HART is as follows:

[From the Bay City (Mich.) Times, Oct 18, 1966]

WHAT OTHERS THINK: "JOB ON PARKS ONLY HALF DONE"—THE GRAND RAPIDS PRESS

Completion of congressional action on a proposal to establish Pictured Rocks National Seashore preserves for the enjoyment of all Americans one of Water Wonderland's most scenic attractions.

Aside from the benefits Michigan will reap from the tourist trade this newest of the national parks will attract, the important thing is that an area of rare beauty is being saved.

Commenting on completion of congressional action on the Pictured Rocks proposal, Rep. Raymond F. Clevenger, who cosponsored it with Sen. Philip A. Hart, said, "We are looking forward for everyone in the Middle West to come to Michigan's Upper Peninsula and see what we have been looking at and enjoying for years."

Why just the Middle West? As a national park, embracing the Grand Sable sand dunes and numerous colorful waterfalls, the Pictured Rocks National Park is a magnet for any travel-minded American.

It is only to be regretted that members of the House and Senate should regard approval of Pictured Rocks park as lessening the need for similar approval of Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in the lower peninsula's beautiful Lake Leelanau country.

The Washington news story reporting approval of Pictured Rocks park said of the Sleeping Bear bill, "It still has a chance for House passage, but there is opposition to giving Michigan two parks in one year."

Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore should be considered solely on the basis of merit. It is geographically located within easy accessibility of the midcontinent's peak population density, with its unsatisfied demands for pleasant outdoor space for vacation and recreation.

Long before Congress, the need for this national park has been amply substantiated through repeated and exhaustive studies, and the bill has been tailored to meet any reasonable objection from residents of the proposed park area. Supported by Sen. Hart, a Democrat, Sen. Griffin, a Republican, and by all state agencies in any way involved, Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore should be made a reality now.

NATIONAL ELECTRIC CAR DAY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate referral, a joint resolution to declare the 13th day of March in 1967 as National Electric Car Day.

On March 14, the Committees on Commerce and Public Works will open hearings on S. 451 and S. 453, bills to promote the development of electric vehicles and other alternatives to the internal combustion engine. Enactment of these bills, authored by Senator MUSKIE and myself, would be a great step forward in combating the increasing air pollution problem and in alleviating the snarl of urban congestion.

On March 13, in the upper level garage of the New Senate Office Building, the two committees will sponsor an exhibit of electric vehicles. This exhibit will help answer arguments about feasibility which many have raised. Some of these detractors of the electric car who have been looking too hard at their mathematical calculations can now look at actual vehicles.

All Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, their staffs, and the public, are invited to this exhibition.

The American Public Power Association has been a leader in promoting electric vehicles. Alex Radin, the general manager, has suggested this resolution. I ask unanimous consent that this letter and the joint resolution be printed at the close of my remarks. I am pleased to have Senator MUSKIE as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 48) to designate the 13th day of March in 1967 as "National Electric Car Day," introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. MUSKIE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 48

Whereas air pollution results in environmental discomfort and may be injurious to public health; and

Whereas there is a great need to develop an additional and practical source of transportation for use in urban and suburban areas of the United States; and

Whereas the development of electrically powered vehicles capable of reducing air pollution and performing transportation tasks should be encouraged: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the 13th day of March in 1967 as "National Electric Car Day" and inviting the Governors of the several States and the chief officials of local governments and the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate activities.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., February 23, 1967.
Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Senate Commerce Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: The joint hearings planned by the Senate Commerce Committee and the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Public Works Committee concerning electric vehicle research and development afford an excellent opportunity to inform the people of this nation about the progress being made in the development of practical and non-polluting electric vehicles. It also seems to me that the demonstration of currently operating vehicles which is planned during the week of the hearings will be an effective way of showing that electrically powered vehicles already are capable of performing a variety of transportation tasks.

In order to attract further attention to the hearings and the demonstration, I urge you to introduce the enclosed resolution which would designate March 13, 1967, the day of the demonstration, "National Electric Car Day". Such a resolution would help alert Members of Congress and the public to the importance of the hearings scheduled to begin the next day.

Sincerely,

ALEX RADIN.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing the names of my colleague from California [Mr. MURPHY] and the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] may be added as cosponsors of S. 889, to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 275) to provide full and fair disclosure of the nature of interests in real estate subdivisions sold through the mails and instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce, and to prevent frauds in the sale thereof, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] be added as a cosponsor of the resolution (S. Res. 14) establishing a Standing Committee on Urban Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 883) to permit a compact or agreement between the several States for the uniform treatment of certain matters related to taxation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 5—THE TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions of the Banking and Currency Committee will begin hearings on Thursday, April 13, on S. 5, the truth-in-lending bill. The hearings will commence at 10 a.m., in room 5302, New Senate Office Building, and will continue on April 14, 17, 18, and 19.

Persons desiring to testify or to submit written statements in connection with this bill should notify Mr. Kenneth A. McLean, professional staff member, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510, telephone 225-3860.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON SALINE WATER PROGRAM

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on April 3 the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee will conduct hearings on S. 1101, to authorize the appropriations for the saline water conversion program, to expand the program, and for other purposes.

The program for the development of saline water conversion processes is making significant progress in its efforts to develop economic methods for producing fresh water from saline and brackish waters. It has also supplied the incentive for the development of desalting technology and has encouraged the growth of an increasingly valuable and scientific program.

The program originally authorized under the act of July 3, 1952, was focused primarily upon basic research. These efforts must continue, but the program is at a stage now where it must place more emphasis on the practical application of the research efforts. To achieve this purpose it is necessary to increase the conversion program authorization in order to provide for fiscal years 1968 through 1970.

Anyone interested in testifying on the proposal is welcome and should so advise the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

The hearing will begin at 10 a.m., in room 3110, New Senate Office Building.

LEAD-ZINC HEARINGS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senate Interior Committee I announce that the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels has scheduled an open, public hearing for April 12 on S. 289, a measure designed to bring stability to our lead-zinc industry which is so basic to our security and economic development. S. 289 was sponsored by the very distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico, Senator ANDERSON, for himself and 27 other Senators of both political parties and from several different areas of our country.

S. 289, the title of which is the "Lead and Zinc Act of 1967," would provide for calculation and application of an import quota on either lead or zinc ores and metal, if domestic stocks of either metal reach levels defined in the legislation as being well above normal inventories required to service the needs of consumers of lead and zinc. Accumulation of stocks of these metals above those levels have in past years resulted in marked market disruption and instability which has proved detrimental to all phases of the lead-zinc industry—producers, smelters, fabricators, and consumers alike. The term of the legislation and the terms for quotas are limited to permit a reevaluation of the measure by the Congress at the expiration date and to provide the executive departments an opportunity to formulate a minerals policy for this as well as other mining industries.

The sponsors are convinced that authority for application of quotas should be enacted during the current period of improved business conditions, so that prompt action could be taken when and if needed.

The committee will welcome participation in this hearing by all Members of Congress and other interested persons.

NATIONAL CARIH ASTHMA WEEK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 63, Senate Joint Resolution 4.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 4) authorizing the President to proclaim "National CARIH Asthma Week."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I am obligated to the Senator from Montana for bringing up Senate Joint Resolution 4 at this time. I hope that it will receive immediate and favorable action. I also hope that the resolution will receive priority attention from the House of Representatives.

This resolution authorizes and requests the President to proclaim the week beginning May 1 as "National CARIH Asthma Week." This will focus the Nation's attention on the Children's Asthma Research Institute and Hospital located in Denver, Colo., and will bring this remarkable institution the recognition it so well deserves.

This unique national institution sponsors the only program solely concentrated on allergic diseases of which asthma is the most severe. CARIH provides treatment and care for intractable asthmatic children from all parts of the country. The care offered emphasizes the "total child" and is much more than just treatment. Education, recreation, and other normal pursuits are stressed equally in the program, accompanied by careful medical treatment.

CARIH's research facilities, under the supervision of its dedicated physicians and scientists, are being used in answering many of the questions now unanswered about the disease of asthma. A recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post described CARIH's efforts as "calm and thoroughgoing, with emphasis on frequent medical consultation." The article says that CARIH has proved that asthma "can be controlled—even conquered." Entitled, "Kids Who Conquer Asthma," the article is worthy of careful reading by all of us, and for this reason I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KIDS WHO CONQUER ASTHMA

(By Steven M. Spencer)

Hidden in a pile of stones on top of Mount Morrison, in the Rockies west of Denver, sits a gallon jar containing a list of names—Stanton Chew, of San Francisco; William Heinig, of Chicago; Jack Lazar, of Windsor, Ontario; Mike Gallagher, of Henrietta, N.Y., and some 30 more. Each summer the list lengthens as new groups of hikers toil up the trail, lift a few rocks off the cairn, reopen the jar and proudly add their signatures.

Thousands of youngsters climb mountains every year; and except for the sense of achievement that surges through them there is nothing very remarkable about it. But the kids who planted their names on Mount Morrison did so to mark a crucial turning point in their lives—lives which often had been swathed in the soft, cottony wrappings of caution and overprotectiveness. Some of them, before coming to Denver, had never walked to school alone, much less climbed a mountain. Most had lived in panicky fear of the penalties of overexertion. All of them carried, though concealed now like spare socks in their rucksacks, the label of chronic, severe and intractable asthma.

The hikers were resident patients of the Children's Asthma Research Institute and Hospital (shortened to C.A.R.I.H.), a free, privately operated establishment in Denver. For many years it was known as the Jewish National Home for Asthmatic Children, but it is nonsectarian. In its cluster of small buff-brick buildings on a 17½-acre campus it houses and treats, for periods of one and a half to two years, 165 of the most difficult asthma patients (ages 6 to 16) encountered by doctors all over the United States and in many foreign countries. A hand-lettered sign outside one residence cottage room reads: No budy here only Moshe Frankel, Haifa, Israel.

The cairn on Mount Morrison is not the only symbol these youngster have raised in triumph over near-invalidism. Most of them participate in C.A.R.I.H.'s full sports program, which includes competition with healthy children from Denver's public schools and community centers. Last summer the "Asthmatic Nine," mostly fifth- and sixth-graders, won the league baseball championship.

The team's youngest member was eight-year-old Mark Campbell, of Orange, Calif. Allergic from birth and racked by asthma from the age of one and a half, Mark had never been able to play ball at home. Yet a few months after arriving at C.A.R.I.H. he was displaying his new-found talents at second base and in the outfield. In a 33-to-3 walkaway over the Jewish Community Center Dodgers last August, just before his ninth birthday, Mark chalked up four runs and, in his own words, "stoled from first base all the way home."

Such records are genuine miracles for youngsters whose lives had previously been ruled by a steady stream of such maternal admonitions as:

"Don't play too hard."

"Don't get too hot."

"Don't get excited."

These warnings have not all been without justification. The asthmatic child teeters on a precarious ledge. A few grains of pollen, a nibble of chocolate, a single peanut, a romp with a dog, a family argument over neglected homework—any of these may pitch him into a dangerous bout of wheezing and gasping for breath. His face turns blue, and in panic he cries out for help. Usually he can be brought around with a few puffs of bronchodilator medicine from a nebulizer, one or more adrenalin injections, or, if those don't work, a mad dash to the hospital. But each year in this country 5,000 such asthmatic attacks end in death.

Asthma affects some 5,400,000 persons in the United States, of whom more than three million are children up to 16. And the problem continues to grow. A Boston allergist has reported that children's hospital admissions for acute asthma have doubled there and in several other cities since 1960. Allergies are involved in a majority of cases, and many patients have both hay fever and asthma. As in other allergic conditions there is a strong hereditary tendency. Polluted air, infections and emotional disturbances are major contributing causes. But the psychological factors are so difficult to weigh, and all the troublesome ingredients are so subtly intermixed, that much of asthma is a mystery and each patient is an individual puzzle.

The symptoms are produced by a sudden narrowing of the smaller bronchial tubes in the lungs. This narrowing may result from muscle spasm, from swelling of the tissues, from mucus plugs or from all three. The victim struggles with all his strength to draw his breath in and force it out. The National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, which allocates over nine million dollars a year to research in allergy and related immunology, warns that repeated asthmatic attacks may eventually cause a stretched-lung condition known as emphysema and may place an extra load on the heart.

The majority of asthmatic children are kept under fair control by bronchodilator medicines, by avoidance of allergenic foods and by injection of pollen and dust extracts to reduce their sensitivity. But about 10 percent are so seriously afflicted that they gain little help from any therapy. These are the refractory or intractable cases—about 300,000 in this country—from which C.A.R.I.H. and 13 smaller homes in the United States and Canada draw their 625 patients.

Nearly all chronic diseases disrupt family life, but few can match asthma in its demand on the patience and resources of the parents. They drag the sick child from doctor to doctor, try one medicine after another, move to what they've been told is a more favorable climate, exhaust their savings and run up debts, resent the fruitless expenditure of money and then feel guilty about feeling resentful. The youngsters miss weeks or months of school. ("I missed all of the fifth grade, half of the eighth and half of the ninth," a 14-year-old California boy told me.) Frequent respiratory illnesses and sharply restricted diets leave many children frail and scrawny. About one in five of those on prolonged thereapy with cortisone and related hormone products is severely stunted in growth by these drugs. Frustrated by their inability to keep pace and by their exclusion from normal fun and games, the asthmatic children become irritable and tense, and their emotional episodes touch off more attacks of asthma.

How to break this cycle is the challenge being taken up by the residential research and treatment centers, among which C.A.R.I.H. is the pioneer and world's largest, and the one to which many of the most stubborn cases are brought. In Tucson, Ariz., 13-year-old Connie Swanick, a sweet, poised, freckle-faced child who aspires to be a ballerina, had been fighting asthma since she was three. Her family had been advised to move from their old home to a new house in a supposedly more dust-and-pollen-free suburb, but Connie did not improve. She was so chronically short of breath that she attended school only half days and spent the afternoons in her air-conditioned home. Excitement, contact with animals, being away from home and suddenly finding she'd forgotten her medicine—any of these situations would throw Connie into an asthmatic attack. On family outings—she is one of eight children—she was often left at home for her own protection.

Finally, early last year, Connie was brought to Denver. "I was homesick at first," she said later, "but now I love it." Connie now plays freely and goes on hikes. Her hopes about ballet, dimmed at home because asthma prevented her from taking lessons, have revived. "And if I can't become a professional ballet dancer—after all, thirteen is pretty old to start—I'd like to take it just for fun, and study to be a doctor," she says.

Just what happened in Denver to quiet Connie's asthma? How does C.A.R.I.H. transform intractable "cases" into healthy, vigorous, near-normal youngsters? First, the doctors appreciate the complexity of the disease. They know that a child is seldom allergic to just one thing but is explosively reactive to many elements of his environment. He suffers, as a New York psychiatrist once put it, from an "allergy to life." One secret of C.A.R.I.H.'s success is that so many aspects of the child's life are changed all at once. Suddenly, he is free of the old household allergens and family frictions. "We've jokingly said the rate of improvement seems proportional to the distance traveled," observed C.A.R.I.H.'s medical director, Dr. Constantine J. Falliers.

Although all the patients have long histories of severe asthma, and 90 percent are on cortisone-type drugs when they arrive, the vast majority of the whole group—about 80 percent—are rehabilitated at Denver. Fewer than 25 percent continue to require corticosteroids and are classed as "steroid dependent," and even for them the dosage levels are usually tapered down. About 40 percent can be controlled with milder forms of medication. And what is most astonishing, 30 percent of the arriving patients—the so-called "rapid remitters"—begin to improve the moment they step off the plane and stay well with almost no medication for the rest of their residence period.

"It may, of course, be partly the change in climate," Dr. Falliers says. "Denver is five thousand feet high and the air is fairly clear and dry, although recently it has become smoggier and this may be why the proportion of 'rapid remitters' has declined somewhat."

However, Dr. Falliers knows that questions cannot be left half-answered if the improvements the child makes in Denver are to be maintained when he goes home. Although the word "cure" isn't used, follow-up studies are continued for at least two years after the children return home from C.A.R.I.H. and show that 80 percent maintain a remarkable degree of improvement, and many never suffer another asthmatic episode.

In dealing with a disease that fluctuates notoriously from hour to hour, day to day and season to season, the C.A.R.I.H. doctors find it essential to observe everything. The large and closely organized staff includes 8 full-time pediatricians and allergists, 7 psychologists, 17 nurses, 20 house parents, 5 night attendants, a dietitian and her helpers and a number of research chemists and laboratory technicians. These skilled observers note the way the young patient eats and plays and sleeps. Some of them are making a study of dreams as a possible trigger of night attacks. They watch how a child reacts to exercise and games and other children. A program is under way to monitor several hours of his daily routine with microphones that pick up his conversation and his breath sounds. Are asthma symptoms more often touched off by anger and aggression, the doctors ask, or by anxiety and withdrawal?

The research tasks are endless. Just the symptoms alone may present a confusing combination of factors. "A child may eat eggs in the winter without bad effects," Dr. Falliers points out, "but if he eats an egg during the August ragweed season, he may have trouble. He may have even more trouble if at the same time he gets into an argument with his parents about why he can't go swimming. By feeding all the data into computers, we can detect the interplay of many factors. We can see the variations in biological rhythms, the daily, weekly or monthly changes that may, for example, suggest that medication is more effective at one hour of the cycle than at another."

The total environment at C.A.R.I.H. provides a kind of instant therapy. The new arrival, previously alone in his terrifying battle for breath, is immediately sustained and encouraged by 164 other youngsters who have successfully faced the same threat, and whose lives are obviously now freer of restrictions than his own has been.

Everything is at hand to cope with an emergency, and the young patients know it. At the first hint of trouble the child may leave a baseball game, run to the hospital in the center of the grounds, take a few deep breaths from a "neb" (a bronchodilator nebulizer), rest for several minutes and then dash back to the game. Even the severe night attack, which at home often meant a terrified child, a distraught family, a struggle for breath during the long ride to the hospital and an oxygen tent, is here dealt with simply and calmly. The child who feels his symptoms coming on climbs out of bed, pushes a button near the dormitory door to flash a light alerting the nurses, and walks with his house parent the few steps to the hospital.

Nor is there panic in class. C.A.R.I.H. children attend public schools—and their teachers know all about asthma and have medication on hand.

At times familiarity breeds a youthful contempt for the common enemy, an almost reckless disregard that calls for adult measures of caution. This is true especially of the boys, who predominate here in a ratio of 2½ to 1, about usual for asthma.

"I've watched these kids at ball games," a nurse said. "Sometimes they'll turn blue and almost fall on their faces before they'll ask for help."

A typical C.A.R.I.H. experience was that of Howard Kipnes, a slender 15-year-old with an engaging grin, who returned home to the Bronx last summer after 20 months in Denver, six inches taller and a lot healthier.

"Howard had never really known anyone with asthma before he went out there," explained his mother, Mrs. Irving Kipnes. "And when he saw boys who had been worse off than he, but who were able to do so many things without having attacks, that made a lot of difference in his attitude."

In Denver, Howard played baseball and basketball, swam and went on camping trips. "We weren't coddled out there," he said. "If you coddle kids too much they don't get enough evercise, and exercise is what helps us. It's what improves our breathing capacity."

Mrs. Kipnes smiled. "Yes, but there were times when you had to be coddled. When you were about six years old you asked me one day—you were having a terrible time getting your breath—whether you were going to die."

Although it costs $6,000 a year to house and treat a child at C.A.R.I.H. the parents are not charged. They supply only $20 or $30 a month for clothing and spending allowances. The institution's support comes almost entirely from private contributions, including about half a million dollars a year raised by a nationwide network of 140 women's auxiliary chapters.

A happy discovery most patients make as they settle into the life at C.A.R.I.H. is that they aren't allergic to as many things as they thought. On the wall of the big, sunny kitchen is a blackboard where Mrs. Jo Ann Pegues, a dietitian, keeps an up-to-date list of who can't eat what.

"Usually when a child first comes in he has a whole list of things he is allergic to," she said. "Then as the doctors test and study him the list narrows down to two or three items.

"No one here gets peanuts or peanut butter. But next to that there are more fish and egg allergies than anything else. We've had as many as thirty children sensitive to fish at one time."

Few threads in the puzzling skein of allergic asthma are so snarled in notions, upproved theories and rampant controversy as this business of food. At C.A.R.I.H. the task of straightening out the tangle has been assigned to a brisk, outspoken young peditrician named Edwin Bronsky.

"Some doctors say all intractable asthma is due to food allergy," he told me. "Others believe that forty percent is directly caused by food and forty percent has some connection with food. And a few doctors are positive asthma is *never* caused by food. All of them get together at conventions and argue. So we are trying here to find out just what part food does play."

In an effort to get an exact picture, Dr. Bronsky is placing a few children at a time on a program in which he knows the ingredients of every bite of food each consumes. He can then watch closely to see what symptoms or measured differences in breathing follow.

Virtually all species of family pets, with the possible exception of goldfish and turtles, are assumed allergically guilty until proven otherwise. But so strong are personal attachments for a dog or cat that parents will sometimes refuse to give it up, or will deny its existence when filling out an application for a child's admission to the treatment center. One family replied "none" to the dog-or-cat question, only to be found out later when their son, discussing with a C.A.R.I.H. doctor the parents' forthcoming visit, asked "Can they bring Spot with them?"

Parent-child relationships have long been the favorite hunting ground of the psychologists and psychiatrists. Many have discussed the effect, in asthma, of a type of "smother-love" that originally flows from concern about the youngster's health but eventually expresses itself in oversolitious or overrestrictive behavior. Some parents, on the other hand, have been described as resentful of the burden that the child's asthma places on them, or as holding an ambivalent attitude of love and rejection.

Today's debate often focuses on whether the emotional tensions between parent and child are primary causes of asthma or are only secondary effects which then enter into the cycle that aggravates and perpetuates the condition. The C.A.R.I.H. physicians and psychologists believe asthma is a heterogeneous symptom, and that it is important to identify for the individual patient which factors are primary and which secondary. They don't see parent-child emotional conflicts in every case, but in many families the evidence is so clear that they recommend phychological counseling for parents and child.

A youngster from the Midwest illustrates the common theme of the child whipsawed between conflicting parental attitudes toward him. The father was a violent, overbearing and demanding man, and insisted on high academic marks. The mother was clinging and overprotective. Neither parent would admit his own faults, and each blamed the other for the child's problems. "Donald is afraid of his father," the mother told a psychiatric interviewer. "No wonder he wheezes and gasps." Said the father, "I'm sure I've had nothing to do with his symptoms. But my wife simply spoils the boy, and that's why his asthma doesn't get better." Donald, timid, shy and in the middle, was made to feel guilty because his asthma caused so much parental wrangling, and yet the only way he could stop the painful, accusatory quarreling was to bring on asthmatic attacks to divert their attention.

The fact that so many children suddenly improve when separated from their parents is seen by some observers as proof that family stresses and conflicts are, indeed, a major causative element. "Our ultimate goal," says Dr. Falliers, "is the happy and healthy reunion of child and family. But we believe that temporary separation is helpful to the parents as well as to the child. Most parents need a rest. And getting the child away does relieve tensions and permit the family to settle down, take a fresh look at things and perhaps develop a calmer atmosphere for the child to come home to."

Searching for helpful leads in the parent-child relationship, a C.A.R.I.H. psychologist, Dr. Kenneth Purcell, compared the parents of the "rapid remitters," with parents of the "steroid dependent" youngsters, those who continued to require medication. He discovered that the parents of the "rapid remitters"—those who get better as soon as they leave home—were more apt to be authoritarian and restrictive in their ideas on child-rearing.

A high proportion of the parents of the "rapid remitters" expressed agreement with such concepts as:

"It is sometimes necessary for the parents to break the child's will."

"A good spanking is often the only way to convince children you mean it when you tell them to go to sleep."

Such an approach is hardly recommended, even for the infant under 18 months, but, says Doctor Purcell, if continued as the child grows and strives for independence, it can cause trouble.

"It is during this period of early childhood stress," the psychologist concludes, "that the child may be highly motivated to learn to use asthma as a neurotic response to cope with neurotic conflict and anxiety." He may do this subconsciously or deliberately. Several children, talking with C.A.R.I.H. psychologists about what seemed to turn their wheezing on and off, frankly admitted they had been able to bring it on at home by breathing hard, coughing or running. Why did they do it? Usually, they said, to get out of something they didn't want to do. It was encouraging, though, Dr. Purcell commented, to find that some youngsters who were once adept at producing asthmatic attacks were later, after some months at Denver, unable to do so.

Asthma specialists have always wondered why so many of the attacks come at night. Now Dr. William Hahn, a young psychologist and physiologist at C.A.R.I.H., is looking into the possible role of dreams.

He told of a girl of about 12 who reported that she had a recurring dream of falling into a monster's mouth. She would then wake up in an asthmatic attack. "By her account the dream caused the attack," said Dr. Hahn. "But did it? Or did the discomfort of the asthma cause the nightmare?"

To help Dr. Hahn find the answers, teenage patients volunteer to sleep in his laboratory. Electrodes are taped to the patient's head to record brainwaves, which indicate the various depths of sleep. Wires from the eyelids record the rapid eye movements that accompany dreams, and chest leads measure respiration and signal the on-set of wheezing.

Eventually the dream project and other research studies may lead to better ways of managing this vicious affliction. And in the meantime C.A.R.I.H.'s calm and thoroughgoing approach, with its emphasis on frequent medical consultation, has proved that the disease can be controlled—even conquered. For the fortunate youngsters at Denver, asthma has finally lost its terror.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, we in Colorado are extremely proud of this national institution, and I am pleased that the Senate has seen fit to give recognition to CARIH through Senate Joint Resolution 4.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I rise to join with my colleagues in their remarks and express my deep personal satisfaction in seeing this laudable resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 4—adopted by the Senate.

By authorizing the President to proclaim the week beginning May 1, 1967, as National CARIH Asthma Week, we give deserving recognition and support to the tremendous work and research being done by the Children's Asthma Research Institute and Hospital.

CARIH was organized to fight a disease which today afflicts 5,400,000 Americans. It is the largest asthma facility in the Western Hemisphere. The techniques pioneered by this organization have been freely shared with physicians and clinics all over the world.

There remains a great deal to be learned about the care, treatment and cure of asthma. CARIH's research center is attempting to answer many of the questions still left unanswered about the disease. This clinical research is backed up and paralleled by the only basic research program in the United States exclusively devoted to asthma.

It has been estimated that 80 percent of the children who have been treated at CARIH have become asthma-free or greatly improved. The great effort, time, and money that have been expended have benefited these children and asthmatics elsewhere beyond measure.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this resolution and am hopeful that Governors of the States and territories of the United States will issue proclamations for like purposes and recognize the outstanding contributions being made in asthma treatment, care, and research by the Children's Asthma Research Institute and Hospital.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 4) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 4

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation (1) designating the week beginning May 1, 1967, as "National CARIH Asthma Week", (2) inviting the Governors of the States and territories of the United States to issue proclamations for like purposes, and (3) recognizing the outstanding contributions being made in asthma treatment, care, and research by the Children's Asthma Research Institute and Hospital (CARIH), the national facility at Denver.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 60), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the joint resolution is to authorize and request the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning May 1, 1967, as "National CARIH Asthma Week."

STATEMENT

This resolution was introduced in the U.S. Senate by 36 Senators to call attention to a broad program of clinical and basic research at the Children's Asthma Research Institute and Hospital in Denver, Colo., and is the only program working solely in the field of allergic diseases, of which asthma is the most severe. The incidence of asthma in the United States was estimated to be 5,020,000 in 1961 to 1963. With the population increase since then, there are approximately 5,400,000 bronchial asthmatics in this country. This figure may be compared with the 830,000 people in the United States under treatment for cancer in 1964.

The patients treated at the Children's Asthma Research Institute and Hospital are ones who do not improve at home but who in many instances improve markedly when placed in a specialized treatment care center such as CARIH. Only children with intractable asthma are eligible for the free care and treatment offered at CARIH.

Established in 1907 as the Denvel Sheltering Home, CARIH was originally a haven for orphaned or homeless children of tubercular parents who had come to the high, dry mountain city of Denver in hopes of a cure. Founders of the home had been a small group of philanthropic Jewish women, who shortly developed it into the National Home for Jewish Children. Then when TB was virtually conquered in the late thirties, the trustees decided that the facilities and services of the home should be used for the treatment of intractable asthma in children. Since then the home has been open to severely asthmatic children of every race, color, and creed, from every State in the Union and several foreign countries.

The care at Children's Asthma Research Institute and Hosptial is free. Selection of applicants is based on the severity of the disease and a number of other factors as well as need.

The institution is concerned with the whole child, not just his asthma. Dentists, dermatologists, eye specialists, and other consultants regularly check on the youngsters. Still every child is treated more as a child than as a patient and goes to school every day that he possibly can.

Unfortunately, a great deal still remains to be learned about the care, treatment, and cure of asthma. CARIH's research center is attempting to answer many of the questions still left unanswered about this disease. This clinical research is backed up and paralleled by the only basic research program in the United States exclusively devoted to asthma.

The committee is of the opinion that this resolution has a meritorious purpose and will call to the attention of the people of the United States the great work done in the treatment of asthma.

Accordingly, the committee recommends favorable consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 4, without amendment.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGES P. VANIER, GOVERNOR GENERAL OF CANADA

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, we are saddened this morning to learn of the death of Maj. Gen. Georges P. Vanier, Governor General of Canada.

Not only do we mourn him as Governor General of Canada, but as a man who has served in the interest of his country and of humanity for nearly 50 years.

During this period, he became widely known for his service as a soldier and a diplomat and since September 15, 1959, as Governor General of his native Canada.

He was not only the first French Canadian, but actually the first native Canadian to be appointed to this high position.

General Vanier's record has been long and varied and most praiseworthy.

I am sure that his loss will be mourned by all the Members of this Senate.

To Mrs. Vanier and his sons and daughter, I wish to express our deepest sympathy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to join with the distinguished Senator from Vermont, the ranking Republican in this body and the chairman of the Canadian-United States parliamentary group, in expressing the deep regret of the Senate on the passing of the Governor General of Canada, Georges P. Vanier.

The Governor General has had an exceedingly outstanding record, as the Senator from Vermont has indicated, as a soldier in two World Wars, as a diplomat of outstanding abilities, and as a man who has conducted the office of Governor General with dignity and decorum. He has been an asset to the nation which he has so ably and proudly represented, and he has always been a Canadian first in his heart and in his thoughts.

We mourn his passing, but he has left behind monuments which will live long after he is gone.

HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS REPRESENT NEW INTERNATIONAL EFFORT TO SECURE WORLD PEACE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as I rise again today to urge Senate ratification of the human rights conventions, I wish to answer the criticism that these conventions are a marked departure from our traditional American concept of the treatymaking power.

As I pointed out last week on the Senate floor, the United States was a signatory to and ratified the 1926 Convention on Slavery. This convention, submitted by President Coolidge and ratified during the administration of President Hoover, was the intellectual and diplomatic ancestors of the human rights convention now before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The human rights conventions—forced labor, genocide, political rights of women, and slavery—represent a concerted universal effort to promote human rights throughout the world. These conventions constitute a recognition that world peace is ultimately a matter of human rights; that any nation which is dedicated to the preservation and protection of human rights at home is very unlikely to jeopardize the human rights of others through foreign aggression. Human rights and world peace are intimately related and frequently interdependent.

The human rights conventions are a departure from the traditional treatymaking function of settling commercial and promoting international trade. But who can maintain that the immediate promotion of human rights and the ultimate preservation of human peace is not a far better, far nobler, and far wiser exercise of the treatymaking power?

We have seen and been victim to international failure to protect human rights. The horrors of World War II had their preview in the total disregard of the human rights of the Axis Powers' own citizens.

During those crucial hours, when the world could have averted the holocaust to come, the Western nations cringed—frozen in a moral neutrality. These human rights conventions are not merely pretty platitudes on legislative sermonizing. They are far more than that. They are a conscientious and positive effort to establish minimum universal standards of human dignity and achieve world peace.

John Morley perhaps best characterized the case for U.S. ratification of the human rights conventions when he wrote almost a century ago:

> Those who would treat politics and morality apart will never understand the one or the other.

WASTE IN FEDERALLY FINANCED RESEARCH UNVEILED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this is not the first time I have risen to speak out against what has become a national scandal—the totally uncoordinated and leaderless state of federally financed research.

This year we will be asked to appropriate $16 billion to be tossed into the bottomless pit labeled "research." Research has become one of those magic, politically positive, unchallengable words. A spender who says "research" is 90 percent of the way home. If you are against research, you are against the future. How silly. Some research programs are necessary. Many are not. No Senator here is unaware of some vital research programs that must be continued. Those programs will need money this year they will need it in the years to come.

But the sad thing is that no single department, no one agency, no office, or no one person is in charge of this wild spending.

Now, we have available a detailed and documented report of wasted money and uncorrelated research—all financed by the Federal Government. William Schulz, a Washington reporter, has produced a devastating and penetrating study of the waste disguised as research for the March issue of Reader's Digest.

So that my colleagues might have the advantage of this important analysis, I ask unanimous consent at this time that Mr. Schulz' report be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT RESEARCH BOONDOGGLE

(By William Schulz)

Last October in Washington, D.C., newsmen were summoned to a press conference in the offices of the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc. There publication was announced of a new book in which the Federal Bureau of Investigation was assailed for exaggerating the nation's crime rate.[*]

Headlines carried the sweeping attack. Less publicized was this fact: the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) ladled out $231,000 to finance the study. Why? Simply because NASA thought that sponsoring such research, so remote from its official mission, would, in the words of a Washington *Post* reporter, lend it an image of "social concern"!

Fantastic as it may seem, the foregoing is a fairly typical episode in today's Washington. At this moment, when we are being told that government is paring expenditures to the bone, scores of similar projects are being financed in the sacrosanct name of "research" by a maze of government bureaus. What we have is, quite literally, a federal research craze, and it has mounted to absurd proportions.

No one denies that U.S.-supported research has led to gains in military technology, health and science. But this government-subsidized "research and development," now the second largest item in the bloated federal budget, has multiplied *five times* in the past decade—to a staggering total of $16 billion a year. Inevitably, this unchecked proliferation has brought on vast boondoggles, and also a regrettable waste of scientific manpower.

Researchers and scientists are alarmed. Famed biologist Dr. Paul A. Weiss, now on the staff of New York's Rockefeller University, says that the excessive federal largess has encouraged "shoddy, redundant, uncritical and ill-conceived research." Basil O'Connor, president of the National Foundation-March of Dimes, says, "The log-rolling and sheer waste which accompany ill-advised, massive government appropriations could undermine the public's confidence in the whole scientific enterprise."

Most concerned of all is Congress. A half-dozen committees have launched full-scale investigations, audited books, held hearings, quizzed federal officials and issued reports. After years of hacking his way through the complex jungle of federal research, Rep. Richard Roudebush, of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, concludes that there have been "senseless, tragic abuses of legitimate scientific inquiry." The Indiana lawmaker says bluntly: "The public has been taken."

Here are the main reasons why:

Everybody's in the act. Recently, the Library of Congress attempted to index the government's sprawling research program. After months of digging, the Library's experts reported that *no one* in the federal government knows precisely how many government-supported laboratories are in operation where they are located or what they are doing.

The Defense Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation and NASA are the giants of federal research. But more than 30 other agencies have hopped aboard the bandwagon. The Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare spends more than $100 million a year on research ventures, among them: "Understanding the Fourth-Grade Slump in Creative Thinking." The Department of Agriculture spent five years revising pickle standards, spelling out in minute detail the difference between curved and crooked pickles.

---

[*] The FBI flatly denies the charge. "The high volume of crime nationally," says Director J. Edgar Hoover, "is a fact which cannot be rationalized away."

The Commerce Department hired a private accounting firm to determine why shipping rates are lower on imported goods than on exported ones. Among the explanations: It is "more expensive to load and stow cargo than to unload it." Chairman John Rooney, of the House appropriations subcommittee overseeing Commerce, blew up. "Did you have to spend $95,000 to find that out?" he asked. "Any hatch boss on the Brooklyn waterfront could have given you the answer, without cost."

One consequence of the research craze is that federal agencies have orbited into areas far beyond their legitimate purview. For example, despite the reams of election analyses offered by news media, the National Science Foundation has doled out taxpayers dollars for a computerized study of the 1966 Maryland gubernatorial campaign.

Much of the federally financed research fails to meet what a House Government Operations subcommittee has termed "the test of urgency." The number of trivial projects has led one prominent scientist to exclaim: "We see bewildered youngsters composing research papers like abstract paintings, picking some colorful and fashionable words from recent literature, then reshuffling and recombining them into another conglomerate, both undigested and indigestible. Narrow specialists lavish their pet techniques in yet another dozen ways on what has already been superabundantly established to everyone's satisfaction."

Many projects are "makework." Sen. William Proxmire, of the Senate Appropriations Committee, has repeatedly accused federal officials of engaging in "research for the sake of research," in costly projects of little benefit to the taxpayer. "And the worst offender of all," Proxmire adds, "is the National Institutes of Health." The Senator maintains that there can be no justification for NIH support last year of such marginal projects as "A Social History of French Medicine, 1789–1815" ($11,782); "Emergence of Political Leadership: Indians in Fiji" ($10,917); and "Changing Patterns of (Moslem) Family Life" ($28,755).

The research bug has also bitten the commanding generals of the War on Poverty. Hardly a month goes by that the Office of Economic Opportunity does not award lucrative contracts to private researchers who operate what the magazine *New Republic* terms a "profitable parasite industry at the fringes of government." National Analysts Inc., a Philadelphia research firm, was asked, for instance, to gauge "low-income" reaction to "It's What's Happening, Baby!", a nationally televised rock 'n' roll show extolling the Job Corps. Critics roasted the program as "tasteless, degrading and obscene," but OEO shelled $39,000 to determine why some underprivileged youths reacted favorably to it, while others did not.

The National Science Foundation has financed individual foreign junkets of what might well be considered dubious worth. Consider the case of Stephen Smale, a University of California mathematician working on an NSF project who spent the summer of 1966 traveling in Europe, with taxpayers picking up the $6556 tab. A virulent foe of U.S. policy in Vietnam, Smale had organized California demonstrations aimed at halting troop trains. In Paris, he helped drafting an anti-American resolution. In Moscow for a mathematicians' convention, he held a press conference at which—although he attacked Moscow's repressive intellectual atmosphere—he called what his own government was doing in Vietnam "much more dangerous and brutal" than the Soviets' massacre of Hungarian freedom fighters ten years earlier.

Outraged, Representative Roudebush fired off an angry letter to NSF director Leland Haworth, insisting that federal tax funds should not be used to send abroad individuals who would "run down the policies of the United States government."

Universities scramble for the dollars. Government agencies annually underwrite $2 billion in university research alone. Intensive investigation convinced the members of the House Subcommittee on Research and Technical Programs that massive research grants have actually harmed higher education by "excessively diverting scientific manpower from teaching."

Rep. Henry S. Reuss, chairman of this group, estimates that more than 40,000 faculty members have left the classrooms to work on federally financed research. He echoes the warning of Dr. W. T. Lippincott, a professor of chemistry at Ohio State University, that government support of research is "potentially the most powerful destructive force the higher education system has ever faced."

One institution, the University of California, receives $400 million a year in federal research funds—and leading members of its faculty are apprehensive about this. Sociology professor Robert A. Nisbet recently charged that many of the research projects at California and other large public universities could "more easily and appropriately be placed in non-university settings." He noted disapprovingly the growing practice in many universities of opening Washington offices, manned by "experts in the art of catching the scent of dollars over the horizon." (More than two dozen colleges and universities now employ Washington lobbyists.)

Several colleges receive more than 40 percent of their operating budgets from federal research projects. The vast majority of these grants go to a relatively few universities. Result? Says a North Dakota educator: "The small institutions have been subject to so much faculty raiding by the more successful applicants for federal research funds that higher education of acceptable quality is moving beyond the reach of many young Americans."

Smoke screens veil waste. It is difficult for any member of Congress to question the massive research expenditures earmarked for "national defense." But the Special Investigating Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee uncovered a shocking situation when it probed the Aerospace Corporation, a "non-profit," Pentagon-created missile-research firm. To put it bluntly—and the subcommittee did—Aerospace officials have been getting fat at the public trough. For instance, president Ivan Getting received a pay hike of $45,000 when he left private industry (Raytheon Co.) and joined Aerospace at $90,000 a year—a salary more than double that paid to Defense Secretary Robert McNamara. In addition, Getting was given a $350,000 life-insurance policy, a retirement program that costs taxpayers $9000 a year, and an expense account that covered such incidentals as $3113 for transporting his yacht from Massachusetts to California.

Investigators for the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee uncovered a similar situation when they audited the books of another government-financed research firm. One of its vice presidents, apparently unable to make ends meet an a $42,900 salary plus a $5000 expense account, was handed another $22,381 in taxpayer funds for the mortgage payments and caretaker fees of his private estate. From 1956 to 1964, the Pentagon funneled more than $40 million into this firm. Yet nowhere in the government files are records of its contract negotiations to be found. Appropriations Committee Chairman George Mahon says flatly that the records, required by law, "do not exist."

Then consider the infamous care of Project Mohole, unveiled in 1961 as a "truly exciting" attempt to gain knowledge of our planet's structure by boring a hole three miles beneath the bottom of the Pacific Ocean into the mantle of the earth. National Science Foundation officials assured Congress that the project would cost no more than $20 million. Within five years they had hiked the price tag to $127 million!

Why the spiraling cost? The record shows that an NSF panel set up in 1961 to review potential contractors rated the Texas firm of Brown and Root as least qualified of five companies under consideration. Nevertheless, Brown and Root (with virtually no experience in deep-water or deep-well drilling, but with White House connections) was later awarded the Mohole contract, at a price almost double the lowest bid.

By 1966, Project Mohole was so far behind schedule that disgusted members of the House Appropriations Committee refused to approve that year's $19.7 million request. But at this point the President made an extraordinary appeal for the restoration of funds, as did administration lobbyists.

Then came the bombshell. It became known that shortly before the President turned the screws on a reluctant Congress, the family of Brown and Root's board chairman, George Brown, had contributed $23,000 to the "President's Club," a Democratic fund-raising group. Outraged Congressmen now killed off Mohole—at least temporarily.

Research dollars are used to influence public opinion. The Pentagon, often accused of news management, contracted in 1966 for a $69,400 study of public reaction to controlled press releases and the withholding of information. The project was canceled only after Rep. John Moss, crusading chairman of the House Subcommittee on Government Information, denounced the plan as "totally inappropriate to our free society."

The Office of Economic Opportunity announced with fanfare last year that it would hire prominent social scientists to conduct "independent" appraisals of the War on Poverty. What the OEO didn't say was that anti-poverty officials would retain absolute authority to prohibit publication of the investigators' findings. "These scholarly studies of the War on Poverty will be used to defend future budget requests and to persuade public opinion," the Washington *Post* commented sharply. "The public, which is paying for them, would like to see the adverse results as well as the favorable ones."

Fifteen miles from downtown Washington, in Springfield, Va., stands the Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information, a brick-and-glass monument to government's obsession with research. Occupied for less than three years, the 30,000-square-foot warehouse is already bulging at the seams. Nearly half a million federally financed scientific reports are stacked in piles 15 feet high, and as many as 65,000 more are expected this year.

Government publicists grandiosely speak of a federally spurred "knowledge explosion," but leading scientists dissent. Dr. Paul Weiss, for one, argues that the sheer number of reports is no more indicative of progress than "the amount of junk mail reflects economic growth." It is time, he says, to replace the fetish of unfettered research with the maxim that scientific inquiry "should have a purpose and be selected with a sense of relevance."

At its current rate of increase, the annual price tag for federal research is expected to reach $20 billion by 1970. Here is an opportunity for all political leaders who believe in responsbile government to express themselves. Here is a specific area where, irrefutably, the monstrous federal budget can be cut—*now*.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 64, 65, and 66.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Proxmire in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

BANKS LAKE RECREATIONAL AREA

The bill (S. 605) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to determine that certain costs of operating and maintaining Banks Lake on the Columbia Basin project for recreational purposes are nonreimbursable, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate is S. 605. This bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to determine that certain costs of operating and maintaining Banks Lake on the Columbia Basin project for recreational purposes are nonreimbursable.

Banks Lake is an equalizing reservoir on the Columbia Basin project. Under the original authorization and at present, the lake is operated for purposes of irrigation alone. As a result, the water level is subject to periodic surges and fluctuations of as much as 18 feet. These fluctuations have the effect of making the use of the lake for recreational purposes almost impossible.

The purpose of the bill is to permit the Secretary of the Interior to determine that limited costs related to pumping water to stabilize the lake's level are nonreimbursable. The Department's report estimates that these costs would average about $21,000 per year. The recreational benefits which would accrue are estimated at over $60,000 per year.

The bill proposes an interim arrangement, as the authorization runs for only 6 years, at which time the arrangement would be reevaluated in light of studies now being made of recreational opportunities on Federal water projects.

Banks Lake is an important recreational resource in the eastern half of the State of Washington. In addition to being an excellent area for fish and wildlife, it is a popular recreational area that is used by residents from all over the State when water level conditions permit.

In view of the small cost involved, the uniqueness of the situation, and the present trend of allocating an increased cost of water facilities for recreation and wildlife purposes, the committee, following public hearings which were held on February 23, 1967, unanimously endorses the enactment of S. 605 and urges its passage by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 605

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That pending additional development of the Columbia Basin project, Washington, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, when estimated added benefits will at least equal added costs, to operate and maintain Banks Lake of said project for recreational purposes consistent with authorized project functions, valid contracts, and within limits of pump and canal capacities, and that any increased operation and maintenance costs for filling of Banks Lake and for maintaining water levels for the benefit of recreational purposes, including fishing and hunting, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable: *Provided,* That the provisions of this Act shall not extend beyond the end of the sixth calendar year following the date of enactment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 61), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to provide that certain costs of operating and maintaining Banks Lake on the Columbia Basin project for recreation purposes are nonreimbursable. Qualifications imposed by the bill are that the estimated additional benefits shall, at least, equal the added costs and that the operation shall be consistent with authorized project functions, valid contracts, and within limits of pump and canal capacities. This bill is intended as an interim arrangement pending complete development of the Columbia Basin project. It was testified that a comprehensive long-range study of total project operations and benefits is now underway.

Under the present irrigation operation, Banks Lake fluctuates considerably during the year. These fluctuations are normal for such equalizing and reregulating reservoirs in an irrigation system, but they have a very detrimental effect upon recreational and fish and wildlife uses. There are years when the available water supply and other conditions would permit pumping additional water to reduce reservoir fluctuations, but this would involve additional pumping costs. Under the present project authorizations such operating costs are reimbursable. The committee does not believe it is appropriate or consistent with longstanding policy to include such costs in the water charges of the irrigation districts.

The best information available estimates that the benefits resulting from the reduction of reservoir fluctuations would provide recreational benefits estimated to be $60,000 for Banks Lake. The average annual costs are estimated to be about $21,000.

The committee anticipates that annual reports will be furnished by the Bureau of Reclamation as to the costs and effects of the approval of this proposal.

In view of the present trend of allocating an increased cost of water facilities for recreation and wildlife purposes the committee in executive session unanimously endorses the enactment of S. 605.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR THE PACIFIC TRUST TERRITORY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 303) to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$32,000,000" and insert "$25,000,000"; in line 8, after "$35,000,000", to strike out "for fiscal year 1968" and insert "for each of the fiscal years 1968 and 1969"; on page 2, line 10, after the word "Pacific", to insert "Islands"; in line 11, after the word "Pacific", to insert "Islands"; in line 13, after the word "Pacific", to insert "Islands"; in line 14, after the word "Pacific", to insert "Islands"; and, in line 16, after the word "Pacific", to insert "Islands"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 303

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act of June 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 330), as amended (76 Stat. 171), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $25,000,000 for fiscal year 1967 and $35,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1968 and 1969, to remain available until expended, to carry out the provisions of this Act and to provide for a program of necessary capital improvements and public works related to health, education, utilities, highways, transportation facilities, communications, and public buildings: *Provided,* That except for funds appropriated for the activities of the Peace Corps no funds appropriated by any Act shall be used for administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands except as may be specifically authorized by law."

Sec. 2. The offices of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and the Deputy High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall hereafter be known as the Governor of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and the Lieutenant Governor of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, respectively. Appointment hereafter made to the office of the Governor of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall be made by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Senate is about to approve vital and important legislation. By its action in the next few months, this House of Congress will have placed its stamp of approval on a measure leading to fulfillment of our Nation's obligation to the people who now live in the trust territory. These islands in the Far Pacific are administered by the United States under a trusteeship agreement with the United Nations.

There are some 2,100 of these islands spread in a sea as large as continental United States. Yet their total land area is about one-half that of Rhode Island. Ninety-seven of these islands are inhabited. They are home to some 90,000 persons of diverse languages, customs, and origins.

America's goal as trustee is to develop the conditions of life of the peoples of the trust territory so that they can assume the responsibilities of self-government, to stimulate them to become as nearly economically self-sufficient as possible, and to encourage them to foster respect for their culture while affording them an opportunity to take on those aspects of Western life which will enable them to lead richer lives. S. 303 will help to turn those words into reality.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I

wish to join the distinguished acting minority leader in what he has just said.

I am afraid that for too many years since the end of the Second World War we have been treating the trust territory as a poor relation. This bill attempts to go further in giving to the people of the trust territory the rights, the consideration, and the privileges which are their due, and which have long been overdue.

I hope that the stepchild relationship between this Government and the trust territory will be overcome, and that the people of the trust territory will be given a good deal more than they have had in the way of rights, confidence, and in the way of a reasonably good and profitable future.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that appropriate excerpts from the excellent report which accompanies the bill from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 303, introduced by Senator Jackson, is to authorize increased appropriations for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for civil works and administrative costs. The bill, as amended, increases the present appropriation authorization of $17,500,000 annually to a maximum of $25 million for fiscal year 1967 and $35 million for fiscal years 1968 and 1969. The bill also designates the High Commissioner and Deputy High Commissioner as Governor and Lieutenant Governor, respectively, and provides that appointment hereafter made to the office of Governor of the trust territory shall be made by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

BACKGROUND

The islands which form the trust territory lie in three major archipelagoes to the north of the Equator in the western Pacific. The land area totals less than 700 square miles, but it is scattered over almost 3 million square miles of open ocean. About 97 of the more than 2,000 islands are inhabited: they range from low-lying coral atolls to high islands of volcanic origin. The Marianas Islands, which stretch to the north of Guam, and the western Caroline Islands, are typically high islands, although coral atolls, such as Ulithi, do occur. The eastern Caroline Islands are similarly a mixture of high islands and coral atolls. The Marshalls are entirely low coral atolls, usually a loose string of narrow sandy islands surrounding a lagoon.

These islands were governed between World War I and World War II by the Japanese as a League of Nations mandate. Converted into military bases by the Japanese, they were captured by allied forces during World War II and placed under Navy military government. Japanese colonists and military personnel were returned to their homeland after the war and in July 1947 the United States placed the former mandate under the newly established United Nations trusteeship system. Under a trusteeship agreement, the United States has undertaken to promote the educational, social, political, and economic development of the people of the territory.

U.S. authority is vested in a High Commissioner, who is presently appointed by the Secretary of the Interior. The High Commissioner's legislative authority was granted to the Congress of Micronesia on the day of its first session in 1965, but the High Commissioner retains veto power over measures passed by the Congress of Micronesia.

Six administrative districts, which roughly conform to geographic and ethnic divisions, have been established and have formed basic elements in American administration of the area.

During the period of July 1, 1951, through the end of fiscal year 1966, a total of $121,905,000 has been appropriated to the Department of the Interior for administration of the area, including capital improvements. (This total is exclusive of funds appropriated to the Navy for the northern Mariana Islands during the years 1953–62.) For fiscal years 1952 through 1962 the annual appropriation ranged from $4,271,000 to a high of $6,304,000 in fiscal year 1962. These funds were within the $7.5 million authorization approved in 1954, and provided minimal basic services to a people who were largely on a subsistence economy.

Enactment of Public Law 87–541 in 1962 increased the Federal appropriation authorization for the trust territory from $7.5 to $15 million for fiscal year 1963 and $17.5 million thereafter.

The following information furnished the committee in May 1966 by the Department of the Interior indicates recent achievements in the trust territory and the projects and development recommended for completion in the next few years.

HEALTH

Under the accelerated program commenced in fiscal year 1963, improvement in health services to the Micronesian people has been considerable.

At the present time, funds are available for the first increments (at about $1 million each) for new hospitals at Truk and Ponape, but funds are not available for their completion. Nor do we have amounts available for construction of a badly needed 100-bed hospital at Yap; replacement of completely inadequate subdistrict health centers at Ebeye and Kusaie; construction of regional health centers; and urgently needed community dispensaries. If we are to bring the medical facilities of the trust territory to an acceptable level reasonably soon, that is, in 5 years, an expenditure of $30 million must be anticipated.

These funds would provide for completely new hospitals of 200 beds at Truk, 150 beds at Ponape, and 100 beds at Yap; additional beds and improvements to those at Palau, Majuro, and Saipan; and construction of seven subcenter health facilities of 30- to 50-bed capacity in Ebeye, Kusaie, Jaluit, the northern Marshalls, the Mortlocks, Woleai, and Ulithi. In order to provide adequate services, some of these regional service centers must be provided with small support vessels. These vessels would not only be medical vessels but would also provide for the transportation of other personnel, such as education supervisors and agricultural extension agents who would be working directly with the communities. At present time a need is foreseen for four service vessels to be stationed at Jaluit and Ebeye, in the Marshalls; in the Mortlocks, at Truk; and at Ulithi in the Yap District. These vessels would primarily be personnel carriers of less than 100 feet which could respond swiftly to emergencies, be in constant radio contact with the regional service center and the smaller communities, and generally provide the vital link that would bring governmental services to people living on small islands.

The other service centers are close enough to the district centers to be supported by present vessels. In addition to the vessels, there is the distinct possibility that small support aircraft with water landing capabilities will be utilized.

These funds would also provide for about 75 community dispensaries, of two to four beds each, which would be located in smaller communities in outer-island areas throughout the trust territory. These communities are now served by tin or thatched-roof dispensaries. We would propose that radio equipment be installed at each community so that word of emergencies and other illnesses could be received at the pertinent district center or the regional service center. These improvements are considered to be the minimum needed by 1972. The public health operational program must be greatly improved over the next 5 years in order to bring more effective health services to the people of Micronesia. Under the proposed bill, additional doctors would be recruited to augment the doctors now practicing. It is planned that 20 medical doctors would be added to the staff by 1972 in order to bring the total number of medical doctors and medical practitioners to 60.

Registered nurses would be recruited both for medical care in the hospitals and for public health duty. By 1972 a total of 36 registered nurses and 13 to 21 public health nurses should be added to the staff to provide improved medical care, training for Micronesian nurses, and increased public health services to many communities.

Adequate medical and paramedical staff should be employed to operate district center facilities, regional health centers, and outlying dispensaries. Laboratory technicians, X-ray technicians, hospital administrators, and health workers of all kinds should be recruited. The trust territory will, of course, train and employ as many Micronesians as possible for these posts.

Special programs for the detection, isolation, treatment, and rehabilitation of patients ill with tuberculosis, leprosy, filariasis, and other diseases would be mounted. Provision should be made for close cooperation with the U.S. Public Health Service, as well as bringing short-term consultants on special problems to the trust territory.

The estimated cost of the operational program for public health by fiscal year may be seen in attachment II, which indicates that the cost will range from an estimated $4,500,000 in fiscal year 1967 to an estimated $7,400,000 in fiscal year 1972.

EDUCATION

The accelerated program from 1963 to the present has resulted in 330 new classrooms for the trust territory school system, and enrollment has increased to about 21,500 pupils. Of this 21,500, about 19,000 are in elementary school, compared to about 12,000 in 1960. Approximately 2,500 are attending public secondary schools, compared to 135 in 1960.

The construction of sufficient classrooms and related facilities, including teachers' quarters to house adequately all eligible elementary pupils by the fall of 1972 will cost an estimated $28 million. This will provide 834 classrooms, for a total enrollment of more than 29,000 pupils. A construction program for secondary and vocational facilities, including teachers' quarters, in order to house adequately all eligible secondary students by 1972, will cost an estimated $49 million. At that time, an enrollment of more than 8,000 is anticipated at 13 high schools located at the six district centers and the regional centers.

The entire secondary program must be evaluated in terms of the goals of Micronesians and special emphasis must be placed on training for the employment opportunities which economic development specialists see as the future of the trust territory. Guidance for the high school students should be provided and opportunities must be provided beyond high school for those who will be seeking employment in specialized, technical, or professional skills.

The adult segment of the population should be helped to understand the nature of the change that is taking place in Micronesia and to bring to that change the old values that make for strength in newly emerging Micronesia. In addition, all who can be taught to read and write English should have that opportunity and other skills should not be neglected.

Special teacher training courses have already been set up at Ponape for Micronesian teachers. These courses would be greatly expanded and opportunities for teacher training provided in other districts. The teacher training program will augment the ongoing college training program.

The estimated program cost for education ranges from an estimated $6 million in fiscal year 1967 to an estimated $16,500,000 in fiscal year 1971.

HOUSING

It is proposed to initiate a territorywide low-cost housing program to be administered by the government and to function in the pattern established by HUD for the self-help Indian housing program.

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS

Improvements in transportation and communication facilities are of the utmost importance if health, education, and economic advances are to be expected.

Airfields which have been built must be surfaced and protected from erosion; runway lights should be installed; the airport at Ponape must be completed; and other airport improvements should be provided, such as runway lighting, navigational aids, parking ramps, and terminal facilities. The estimated amount for airport capital improvement purposes is $7 million.

One of the most vital elements of supporting facilities is the network of communications among the islands. Health, education, and economic development cannot be expected to function effectively without adequate communications. Urgently needed communications facilities include improved radio equipment at each district center and regional service center, and the installation of two-way radio communication equipment in each community in the trust territory with a population over 50, to connect with the regional service centers. A microwave system is planned for the Guam-Saipan circuit in order to enable voice communication between Saipan and Guam, and on to the mainland United States. It is also necessary to provide adequate telephone systems within the district centers for both commercial and government use. Installation of new and improved communications facilities is estimated to cost $2.8 million.

If the improved sea transportation schedule is to be made most effective and if regional service centers are to be adequately supplied by sea transportation, additional investment must be made in docks and related facilities. Needed dock facilities and harbor improvements are estimated in the amount of $2 million.

HIGHWAYS

An adequate road system is essential in order to transport children to school. With a road system it will be possible to consolidate elementary schools on many islands and achieve better educational results as well as significantly lower costs. In addition, many of the high school children will be able to live at home in a family atmosphere instead of having to live in a dormitory at the school—an expensive and frequently unrewarding means of education at the secondary level. Adequate roads are also essential for transporting patients to medical facilities and for transporting agricultural and other products to marketing or shipping centers, thereby encouraging commercial and agricultural production. As to this last point, it has been estimated that if suitable roads were available on the major islands, for improved copra collection and transport, the production of this valuable crop would double. Copra is now the leading source of commercial income, and a major source of tax revenue.

It is planned to construct some 290 miles of road at an estimated cost of $10.7 million. On a district basis, there is need for 70 miles in the Marianas, 90 in Palau, 25 in Yap, 30 in Truk, 70 in Ponape, and 5 in the Marshalls. Of the total, 190 miles would be gravel or coral surfaced at an estimated cost of $30,000 per mile, and 100 miles would be asphalt surfaced at an estimated cost of $50,000 per mile.

UTILITIES

In order to provide the utility systems needed, $7 million will be needed to construct the necessary sewage disposal facilities, $13 million will be needed to provide pure water supplies, and $12 million will be needed to provide generating and distribution systems.

These estimates anticipate that adequate water, sewage disposal, and power services would be installed to meet the need of both public and private consumers at each of the six district center communities as well as the seven regional service centers. By this means approximately 40 percent of the people of the trust territory would have these services. It is planned, of course, that these services would be available for commercial and home consumption.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The economic resources of the trust territory are limited, yet with suitable guidance and assistance, the potentials that exist can be developed. At the present time most of the population is on a subsistence economy. However, at least in the district centers and on Ebeye, this pattern is changing and there is significant movement into a limited cash economy.

Exports from the trust territory in 1964 totaled $2,700,000, of which all but $400,000 represented copra sales. The largest single employer is the trust territory government with some 3,000 employees receiving close to $4 million annually. Another 2,000 to 3,000 are employed in the private sector, with total wages of $2 million to $3 million annually.

At the present time a thorough analysis of the economic structure of the territory is underway. This analysis is being conducted by a team from Robert R. Nathan Associates and will not only involve a comprehensive economic development plan but will assist in implementation of promising potential projects.

While the economic development plan is not yet complete, some indications of the future are already becoming clear. It is almost self-evident that the resources of the sea will play a major role in the economic future of Micronesia. A tuna freezing plant at Palau has been extremely successful and planning is proceeding for construction of additional plants in Palau, in Truk, and possibly in Ponape. Other fishery resources remain to be explored.

There are other promising aspects of possible economic development which appear to hold promise. Tourism, which is largely undeveloped, appears to be a major possibility. The beauty of these islands, the warm water of the lagoons, the increasing ease of transportation as well as other factors are making the territory increasingly attractive as a tourism investment area.

Agriculture, even though the land area is limited, is capable of greatly increased production. Cattle raising, specialty crops such as cacao and pepper, increase of copra production and market gardening all present distinct possibilities.

The economic effect of the proposed capital improvement and operations program cannot be overestimated. Planned in connection with a coherent economic development program it will provide a powerful stimulus to development but superimposed painlessly on the narrowly based economy of the trust territory, the effect could be devastating.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

KENNEWICK IRRIGATION DIVISION EXTENSION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 370) to amend the Act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments on page 2, at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "to the extent they may be in excess of Yakima project net power revenues in that period after meeting the requirements specified in (1), (2), and (3) above shall be returned to the reclamation fund from revenues derived by the Secretary from the disposition of power marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration from the McNary Dam project: *Provided,* That section 5 of this Act shall not be applicable to the revenues derived from the McNary Dam project." " and insert "shall be charged to and returned to the reclamation fund in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of June 14, 1966 (80 Stat. 200), as amended by section 6 of the Act of September 7, 1966 (80 Stat. 707): *Provided,* That section 5 of this Act shall not be applicable to the revenues derived from the Federal Columbia River power system. Power and energy required for irrigation water pumping for the Kennewick extension shall be made available by the Secretary from the Federal Columbia River power system at charges determined by him." "; and, on page 3, at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "$5,155,000 (October 1964 prices)" and insert "$5,352,000 (October 1966 prices)"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 370

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), is hereby amended as follows:

(a) Insert the words "and Kennewick division extension", after the words "Kennewick division" in section 1 and add the following items to the principal units listed in said section: "Kiona siphon" and "Relift pumping plants".

(b) Insert at the end of section 3 the following: "Costs of the Kennewick division extension allocated to irrigation which are determined by the Secretary to be in excess of the water users' ability to repay within a fifty-six-year repayment period following a ten-year development period, shall be charged to and returned to the reclamation fund in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of June 14, 1966 (80 Stat. 200), as amended by section 6 of the Act of September 7, 1966 (80 Stat. 707): *Provided*, That section 5 of this Act shall not be applicable to the revenues derived from the Federal Columbia River power system. Power and energy required for irrigation water pumping for the Kennewick extension shall be made available by the Secretary from the Federal Columbia River power system at charges determined by him."

Sec. 2. No water shall be delivered to any water user on the Kennewick division extension for a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this authorizing Act for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

Sec. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated for the new works associated with the Kennewick division extension *$5,352,000* (*October 1966 prices*) plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the cost of construction work of the types involved therein, as shown by engineering cost indexes, and, in addition, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain the extension.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate is S. 370. This bill would provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick Division Extension, Yakima project, in the State of Washington.

The purpose of S. 370 is to bring 6,300 acres of land in the Kennewick Division under irrigation. This would be accomplished through appropriate amendments to the act of June 12, 1948, which authorized the Kennewick Division. The act of 1948 authorized the Secretary of the Interior to construct extra capacity in the division's main canal to provide for future irrigation of approximately 7,000 acres. S. 370 would make use of this extra capacity and bring operating capacity of the division up to full efficiency.

This bill is, with the exception of two amendments, identical to S. 794 which passed the Senate in the 89th Congress. The first amendment substitutes the entire Federal Columbia River power system for McNary Dam as the source of financial assistance for the project. This conforms the project to legislation which was passed last year establishing a Columbia Basin account. The second amendment updates the cost figures in the project authorization to October 1966 prices.

This project has an extremely high benefit-to-cost ratio in excess of 3.5 to 1.

While the Kennewick division extension is basically an irrigation development which will be especially suitable for the production of specialty crops, there would also be substantial benefits to wildlife resources.

Following hearings which were held on February 23, 1967, the committee ordered the bill favorably reported on March 3, 1967. The committee unanimously endorses the enactment of S. 307, and recommends its prompt passage by the Senate.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 63), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF MEASURE

The purpose of S. 370, which is sponsored by Senators Jackson and Magnuson, is to bring an additional 6,300 acres of land under irrigation in the Yakima River Valley in the southern part of the State of Washington. This purpose would be attained through amendment to the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), the measure authorizing the parent Kennewick division of the Yakima project, to provide for construction, operation, and maintenance of the necessary additional works to the existing facilities of the Kennewick division. The presently proposed extension was contemplated in the construction of the existing facilities.

Almost all of the lands in the extension area are dry, supporting for the most part only sagebrush and native grasses used for livestock grazing and other uses are impracticable under present conditions. When irrigated, the land will be especially suitable for production of general row crops, and for specialty crops and fruits, such as grapes, sweet cherries, prunes, peaches, and apricots.

The project has a benefit-cost ratio of 3.5 to 1.

S. 370 is similar to S. 794, 89th Congress, as approved by the Senate on February 10, 1965; final action was not taken in the House prior to adjournment.

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

The existing Kennewick division serves approximately 19,000 acres of land. It is the most recent of the six operating divisions of the Yakima project. Section 6 of the 1948 authorization act provided for extra capacity in the division's main canal sufficient to irrigate approximately 7,000 acres over and above the lands in the division, and recognized the cost of the construction of such extra capacity as a deferred obligation.

The extension proposed in S. 370 would fully utilize this previously provided capacity, built at a cost of $341,000. Major new facilities would be a third pump at Chandler pumping plant, the mile-long Kiona siphon, six small relift pumping plants, 24 miles of canals and conduits, a lateral distribution system, and drainage facilities.

The average annual diversion requirement for the extension would be 31,500 acre-feet and would consist primarily of return flows from irrigated lands upstream, supplemented by natural flows of Yakima River. In 1931 the Bureau of Reclamation obtained a permit from the State of Washington for the Kennewick Irrigation District to divert up to 1,600 cubic feet per second for irrigation and power purposes. This permit fully covers the diversions to the extension lands.

The Kennewick division extension is basically an irrigation development, but benefits to wildlife resources will also be realized. The Fish and Wildlife Service reports that irrigation of these lands will be beneficial to upland game birds. Opportunities to develop significant benefits to recreation, flood control, municipal and industrial water supply or other purposes are not available.

COSTS

The total investment in the Kennewick division extension would be $6,141,700, reflecting an updating of the cost estimate in our feasibility report (H. Doc. 296, 88th Cong.) which was $5,250,400 (January 1962 prices). This current estimate is made up of $5,353,000 in construction costs (October 1966 prices); $341,400 in deferred costs of the Kennewick division attributable to enlarged main canal capacity and assignable to the division extension; $189,000 for the extension's pro rata share of storage costs of the Yakima project, $27,000 for settlers assistance, and a $259,300 suballocation of the commercial power allocation of the Federal Columbia River power system costs to irrigation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], and the ranking minority member, the senior Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], and all members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for the dispatch which they have shown year after year in reporting good legislation, and the active interest they have provided in trying to bring about the corrections in certain areas under their jurisdiction, such as the trust territory and other parts of the country.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to say to my friend the majority leader that there is not a finer, more hardworking committee in the Senate than the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which has as its chairman your friend and mine, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson]. The Democratic majority and the Republican minority work together with a minimum of friction and a minimum of politics. I am delighted to have been able to have tenure on that committee while I have been in the Senate.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, March 6, 1967, marks the 100th anniversary of the creation of the Committee on Appropriations of the U.S. Senate. For that reason, I wish to make a few remarks about the committee which was formulated on March 6, 1867, and consisted of seven members. I believe it is worthwhile to name these members. They were Lott M. Morrill, of Maine, who was the first chairman; James W. Grimes, of Iowa; Timothy O. Howe, of Wisconsin; Henry Wilson, of Massachusetts; Roscoe Conkling, of New York; James Guthrie, of Kentucky; and Cornelius Cole, of California.

As a personal note, may I say that at the age of 99, Cornelius Cole came from California to Washington, and on June 26, 1922, I heard him deliver a brief but interesting address on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Since its formulation the committee has been presided over by 16 different chairmen. There have been a total of 209 members.

To call the roll of these members would be to name some of the most illustrious patriots who have guided the course of this Nation in the past 100 years. I shall name but a few of them. Two who became Presidents served on the committee: Lyndon B. Johnson and Harry S. Truman. Three Vice Presidents have also been members: HUBERT HUMPHREY, Charles Curtis, and Henry Wilson. Two Justices of the Supreme Court were committee members: Harold H. Burton and James F. Byrnes. Another, Roscoe Conkling, was appointed to the Supreme Court but declined to serve. Among the Presidents pro tempore of the Senate who have been committee members were Carter Glass, Kenneth McKellar, and Styles Bridges.

Appropriations enacted during the period total over $2.3 trillion. These appropriations have not only affected the lives and well-being of every living American, but in relatively recent years have profoundly and beneficially influenced the welfare of countless millions spread over the surface of the entire globe.

The committee has, in its routine procedure, provided year after year the funds which the departments and agencies of the Federal Government have required for their normal operations. The importance of this must not be underestimated, for through the actions of the committee and the Congress the work of the Government has been maintained.

Equally important has been the influence of the committee's judgment in initiating new measures and giving impetus to lagging programs through the appropriations process.

In a deeper sense the accomplishments of the committee are a tribute to the understanding and cooperation of the members of the committee, the Congress itself and, behind this, that of the American people. This spirit is the cornerstone of our democracy.

I think that the seven members who comprised the committee 100 years ago would look with pride and satisfaction at the work of the committee since then. Today we can pay tribute to them, and to those who followed them, in formulating the policies and procedures in the appropriating process which today provides one of the great stabilizing factors in our Federal Government. This process did not present itself full blown upon the national scene, but was hewn with patriotic sweat and fervor from the forests of trial and error. The stability of our system of checks and balances among the three coordinate branches of the Government owes much to the evolution of the present appropriations process.

Thus it is only fitting that we salute those members of the committee, past and present, who through the years have demonstrated a minimum of partisanship and a maximum of national interest, representing their constituencies to the full degree but never obscuring the larger objective, the welfare of our Nation.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in his remarks concerning the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

I have had the honor and privilege of serving under three of the 16 chairmen who have presided over the committee since its establishment. I am sure that no chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has been more faithful, more effective, and more able than our present chairman, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. He has a long and commendable record as a member of the committee and as its chairman.

Mr. President, there is an old saying that in order to be popular as a Member of Congress one should vote for all appropriations and vote against all tax measures. I wish to state from my experience in serving on the appropriation committee that oftentimes one has to vote against appropriations that have great merit and appropriations that one might even vote for if one were not a member of the committee.

The committee has served a most useful purpose over the years. I think that the combined judgment of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives results in a better final judgment than we would have if only one committee were handling appropriations matters.

I am indeed happy to join with the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] in commemorating this 100th anniversary of the Committee on Appropriations.

LETTER FROM ASIAN PEOPLES' ANTI-COMMUNIST LEAGUE

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, a letter written last fall has just come to my attention. Addressed to all Americans, the letter comes from the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League, and it sets forth a formidable series of arguments against recognition of the Red China regime by the United States or its admission to the United Nations. As a matter of fact, words set down in this letter of last November seem particularly pertinent in light of the tremendous political upheaval in Red China at the present time.

It is extremely interesting that before the United States was fully aware of the ramifications of the Red Guard revolution, the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League was setting forth a fairly accurate picture of today's developments.

Mr. President, I think the letter warrants close attention by all members of the Senate, particularly in view of our wholehearted and deserved preoccupation with our present problems in southeast Asia, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASIAN PEOPLES' ANTI-
COMMUNIST LEAGUE,
November 15, 1966.

DEAR AMERICAN FRIENDS: For the last several months, some self-styled "China experts" in your country have opposed aid to South Vietnam, have demanded the withdrawal of American troops from that country, and now have gone so far as to urge a policy of "containment without isolation" toward the Chinese Communist regime. They seek to appease the Chinese Reds through enlarged contacts and even admitting the Peiping regime into the United Nations. In so doing, they hope to transform the militant, bellicose Chinese Communists and persuade them to coexist peacefully and amiably with the United States and other free world countries.

We are well aware of the heavy responsibilities your country is shouldering and the price you have paid to check Communist aggression and safeguard freedom. We appreciate your anxieties and those of your government about the international situation and your earnestness in seeking world peace. However, we wish to point out that although peace is the common goal of all free men, a peace obtained by surrender, appeasement or even compromise is dishonorable and will only lead to an earlier war. Without freedom, peace is impossible. Many far-sighted people in your country long have recognized the truth of these words. But others are now advocating a softer U.S. policy toward Red China. If this tendency continues, the policies of your government will be affected, the confidence of the Asian peoples in the United States will be undermined, and the Communists' Asian appetite will grow larger. The result will be the exposure of your continent to direct Communist threat, and the jeopardizing of world peace, with all the ensuing implications for America. In view of the traditional friendship between America and the Asians, and of our common destiny, we the members and participants of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League feel honor-bound to offer our since counsel to you our American friends.

It seems to us that intellectuals of your country who advance the policy of containment of Peiping without isolation, believe that the Red regime is firmly established and in effective control of the Chinese mainland. They also believe that the Peiping leadership will become less aggressive in future, and that the second-generation Chinese Communists will undergo a peaceful transformation. They see Chinese Communism as merely transformed Chinese cultural tradition which does not seek to communize the world.

But these suppositions are based on either incomplete knowledge or on preconceived ideas. The Chinese Communists have certainly had the Chinese mainland under their despotic rule for more than 17 years. Yet only a few Asian countries have recognized the Peiping regime, and anti-Communist uprisings on the Chinese mainland are mounting in fury. Anti-Mao, anti-Communist sentiment has so increased among the masses as well as among intellectuals, Communist Party cadres and even members of the Red armed forces, that the government has been compelled to undertake a bloody purge in the name of the "great cultural revolution". The mainland had been thrown into chaos by the outrageous acts of the "Red Guards" who have been officially described as destroying the old and establishing the new. What they are actually doing is to terrorize and impoverish the population. They ramsack private homes leaving desolation behind them. They are reducing the people to rags once again wiping out any possible improvement in their standard of living. At the same time, they are building up a smear and slander campaign against non-conforming party leaders and members who are more flexible in their thinking and believe in good sense in policy making. These fanatical, militant "Red Guards" are the "second generation" that the Chinese Communists are cultivating. But the "Red Guard" so far from being less aggressive, has clamored to march on to the world stage and bury all the people of the free world. How can such "successors" be expected to make a transition to peace?

China's cultural heritage emphasizes ethics, morals, benevolence, love for mankind, and peace. These values are the opposite of those of Communism, which sneers at ethics and morals, propagates hatred, and is militantly bellicose. China's culture stresses humanitarianism and is an important part of the Oriental humanitarian system. The materialism of the Chinese Communists has contrary values. Humanitarianism regards man as of supreme importance; materialism views man as a vehicle for exploitation and enslavement. The Chinese Communists are carrying out the great cultural revolution in order to negate China's history and destroy China's cultural heritage. Mao Tse-tung and Lin Piao have vowed to uproot China's old culture and thought. Communism is no product of China's cultural heritage.

We know from bitter experience that Communism is at the root of all calamities in East Asia and is the public enemy number one of freedom-loving peoples. Only when it is overthrown can the freedom and peace of Asia and all the free world be preserved. So at a time when the Chinese Reds are encouraging the Viet Cong to enlarge the VN war rather than accept peace talks, and are planning for encroachment upon and invasion of their Asian countries, we must place our earnest hopes on your country as leader of the free world. We trust that you and your government will reject the illusion appeasing the Communists through containment without isolation and will act in accordance with the U.S. tradition of upholding freedom and justice. In Vietnam, we hope you will adopt a policy of winning total victory, for only so can you restore peace and security to Asia. We sincerely trust that you will take a resolute stand against the admission of the Chinese Communist regime by the United Nations. For Peiping plots to sabotage the world body from within. We are unanimously of the view that this is the time to support wholeheartedly the effects of the Republics of China, Korea, and Vietnam to destroy the Asian Iron Curtain and overthrow the Communist regimes installed in parts of these countries.

We are wholly convinced that the aggressiveness of the Chinese Communists betrays their internal weaknesses. The Reds are not invincible. But the hesitation and vacillation of the democracies could make them so. The United States is the leader of the free world. Your policy toward the Peiping regime will have a direct bearing on the future of Asia and the rest of the world. We sincerely hope therefore that your government and people, upholding the glorious tradition of freedom and justice, will adopt a wise and correct Asian Policy under the strong and able leadership of President Lyndon B. Johnson. We appeal to you to abandon all illusions of appeasement, see the Communists for what they are and act accordingly against them without compromise.

SIGNATORIES

Member units

Mr. Chung Yul Kim, Chairman of the 12th APACL Conference.

Australia, Hon. Marie Breen O. B. E., Senator.

Ceylon, Mr. Valentine S. Perera, President of APACL Ceylon Chapter.

China, Dr. Ku Cheng-kang, President of the China Chapter, APACL; Member of National Assembly and Vice Chairman of Commission for the Study on Constitutional Affairs.

Hong Kong, Mr. Chang Kuo-sin, Director of the Asia Publishing Company.

India, Mr. Rama Swarup, Responsible person of APACL India Chapter.

Iran, Dr. Parviz Kazemi, Senator.

Japan, Prof. Juitsu Kitaoka, Secretary General of APACL Japan Chapter.

Jordan, Mr. Hani Tabbara, Responsible person of APACL Jordan Chapter.

Kenya, Hon. John Okwanyo, Member of Parliament.

Korea, Dr. Choi Doo Sun, Former Premier of the Republic of Korea.

Laos, Hon. Cho Sopsaisana, Congressman of Laos.

Liberia, Hon. Nathan Ross, Mayor of Monrovia.

Libya, Mr. Zahri Muntassern, Entrepreneur.

Macao, Hon. Leonel Borralho, Senator.

Malaysia, Hon. Dato Hussein, Member of Parliament.

New Zealand, Mr. E. O. E. Hill, Chairman of Wellington Branch, the Labor Party.

Pakistan, Dr. Mahmud Brelvi, Professor.

Philippines, Hon. Cornelio T. Villareal, Speaker of House of Representatives.

Ryukyus, Mr. Tsai Chang, External Minister, Nationalist Party.

Thailand, Dr. Vibul Thamavit, Professor; Chairman of APACL Thailand Chapter.

Turkey, Hon. Fethi Tevetoglu, Senator.

Vietnam, Dr. Nguyen Tien Hy, Secretary General of National Party, former Minister of Education.

Observer units

The American Afro-Asian Educational Exchange, Prof. David N. Rowe, Member of Board of Directors and concurrently Chairman of Publication Committee of AAAEE.

All-American Conference of Combat Communism, Mr. Donald L. Miller, Executive Director of AACCC.

Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, Mr. Yaroslav Stetsko, Chairman of ABN.

Assembly of Captive European Nations, Mr. Vaclovas Sidzikauskas, Chairman of ACEN.

Belgium, Knight Chevalier Marcel De Roover, Chairman of Belgium Committee of C.I.A.S.

Chile, Hon. Sergio Fernandez Larrain, former Senator and Ambassador to Spain.

International Conference on Political Warfare of the Soviets, Madame Suzanne Labin, Writer, Publicist and Sponsor of the CIGP.

Congo (Leopoldville), Mr. Philibert Luyeye, President of Anti-Communist League of Congo.

Denmark, Hon. Ole Bjorn Kraft, former Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Free Pacific Association, Father Raymond de Jaegher, Representative of FPA.

Inter-American Confederation for the Defense of the Continent, Admiral Carlos Penna Botto, Chairman of IACDC.

West Germany, Prof. Theodor Oberlander, former Refugee Minister of West Germany.

Italy, Hon. Ivan Matteo Lombardo, former Trade Minister of Italy.

Lebanon, Mr. George Elias Bitar, Beirut Bureau Manager of UPI.

National Captive Nations Committee, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, Chairman of NCNC.

Union of Russian Solidarists, Mr. Vladmir Poremsky, Chairman of NTS.

Saudi Arabia, Mr. Shakeeb Amawi, Writer.

Spain, Hon. Alberto Martin Artajo, former Spanish Foreign Minister.

Sweden, Mr. Arvo Horm, Secretary General of the Baltic Committee.

THE UNITED STATES–U.S.S.R. CONSULAR TREATY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, unusual attention has been devoted to the United States–U.S.S.R. Consular Convention, both in the Senate and by the general public. Any proposed change, no matter how slight, in our relation with the Soviet Union, must be weighed solely in terms of its effect on the interests of the American people.

The Consular Convention is not a dramatic new proposal to remake our policy toward the Communist world. Negotiation of this treaty is part of the course of normal diplomatic relations. There may be those who believe that the United States should never have recognized the Soviet Union. In my opinion, their view ignores history and accepts the argument that even communication with a potential Communist adversary means eventual submission to its false ideology. Today the need for communication between our two nations, which jointly control a near monopoly of the obliterating power of the world's nuclear weapons, is vitally important if we are to try to avoid nuclear war.

The issue of a Consular Convention is neither partisan nor new. The first concrete proposal to negotiate a treaty came 26 years after the establishment of diplomatic relations, when General Eisenhower proposed it to Premier Khrushchev at Camp David in 1959. Subsequent administrations continued this initiative. General Eisenhower endorsed the finished product as recently as February 2, 1967, when he announced to the press:

> I have not changed my belief that such a convention is in our national interest, that it will not impair our national security, that it should enlarge our opportunities to learn more about the Soviet people and that it is necessary to assure better protection for the many thousands of Americans who visit the Soviet Union each year.

The Consular Convention is not a proposal which the Soviets have sought to push down our throats. On the contrary, our Government proposed it, rather than the other way around. If the conclusion of a consular treaty were a vital Soviet objective, why was it up to us to press for negotiations? If the reciprocal establishment of consulates is so important to the Soviets, why did they not jump at Vice President Nixon's 1959 offer to exchange consulates in Leningrad and New York? Clearly the Soviets did not believe these moves were as much in their interests as we have believed they are in ours.

The Consular Convention is not a measure which this administration has forced on Congress. It has been before us for 3 long years—and before it was even signed, the Under Secretary of State discussed its draft provisions with the Foreign Relations Committee. It has been given careful consideration in public hearings in 1965 and 1967 and it has been fully aired in public.

The Consular Convention is not a threat to our internal security. The President and the Secretary of State have given assurances that if an exchange of consulates is proposed, with, or without a treaty, some 10 to 15 Soviet consular personnel would come to this country. President Johnson, General Eisenhower, the Attorney General, and FBI Director Hoover are all on record as saying that such an influx of Soviet officials on top of the 1,018 already here would create no problems with which the FBI cannot deal effectively and efficiently.

The Consular Convention does not provide aid and comfort to the enemy in Vietnam. It offers timely and prudent protection to American citizens who are in the Soviet Union. In these crucial times, they badly need such protection, as the tragic case of Newcomb Mott clearly demonstrates. Refusal to ratify this treaty which the United States asked for and worked for, would not be a blow to the Russians, but a denial of our own self-interest.

What, then, is this treaty? I believe it is a necessary step which ought to benefit the United States more than the Soviet Union. The convention provides us with something we very much need—better tools to aid and protect our fellow citizens. Last year, 18,000 Americans visited the Soviet Union. The treaty will not, of course, cloak American tourists with immunity from Soviet law—nor Soviet tourists with immunity from American law. But its concrete, carefully negotiated provisions for prompt notification will serve to bring every case of arrest of an American traveling in the U.S.S.R. to the attention of our Government within 3 days so that we can seek at once to provide assistance to him and to obtain his release. At the same time, such cases will be brought to the attention of the highest levels of the Soviet Government, where they can be considered from the point of view of Soviet foreign policy and national interest, rather than the narrow point of view of the internal police policy of the KGB. Access by U.S. consular officials within 4 days after the arrest of an American and on a continuing basis thereafter, will enable us to break down the isolation in which all prisoners are held in the Soviet Union and reassure them that their Government will not rest until they are free.

The treaty provides far better rights of access and notification for Americans than the Soviet Union gives its own citizens. These rights are vital to an American under continuous interrogation in a police state where hope dies fast.

The treaty also provides reciprocal authority for the conduct of normal consular activities, such as the rendering of commercial information to American businessmen, the issuance of passports and visas, the drafting of legal documents, and the usual services rendered in maritime and estate matters.

The treaty provides that the consular officials of both countries will be immune from criminal prosecution by the host nation in exactly the same manner that diplomatic personnel of the two countries, now serving in Washington and Moscow are immune. In a police state like the Soviet Union it is essential that this immunity not only cover our consular officers, but secretaries, code clerks, and other consular staff members who are conducting the business of the American people. In view of the many difficulties encountered by American Foreign Service personnel in conducting their official duties behind the Iron Curtain, I believe that the extension of immunities both to our officers and their staff is essential. A Soviet employee arrested in the United States, even if he had no immunity would be treated fairly, I have no doubt. But, from our point of view, this is not so in the Soviet Union, where a person may be held for investigation for as long as 9 months without being charged or having access to counsel.

There are a number of safeguards, should any aspects of the treaty fail to serve American interests. All nominees for consular assignments are to be screened in advance by the receiving state. If they do not respect the standard of conduct expected, they can be declared persona non grata and expelled from this country. As a final protection against abuse, there is a provision for termination of the treaty by either party by giving 6 months' notice.

In short, I do not believe this treaty represents any sort of dramatic development, nor any vast change in our dealings with the Soviet Union. Examined on its own merits as an agreement which we worked for over many years on a bipartisan basis and obtained on favorable terms, I believe it deserves the support of Senators regardless of their position on bridge building or détente. It is not a question of extending a hand of friendship to the Soviet Union but rather our extending a hand of ready and constant assistance to American travelers, assistance they may badly need if they run afoul of Soviet authorities during a period of strained United States-Soviet relations.

America is an open society; the Soviet Union is closed. Many more Americans go to Russia than Russians visit here. I, for one, believe we will benefit from this treaty and that its ratification is justified solely in the interest of service to the American people.

General Eisenhower supports this treaty. Barry Goldwater supports it. Our leader in the Senate, EVERETT DIRKSEN, supports it. But, however persuasive these endorsements, this treaty ought not to be judged on a partisan basis. The sole, relevant question is: does it serve the interests of the United States? After careful study, I have concluded that it does.

LIMITATIONS IMPOSED ON AMERICAN MILITARY COMMANDERS IN VIETNAM

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, this morning I invite the attention of the Senate to a portion of a newspaper column written for publication yesterday by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers.

Mr. Hearst protests strongly that—

> American fliers are still not permitted to bomb the communist airfields in North Viet Nam. If ever there was a more ironic demonstration of the foolishness of this particular kind of restraint, it would have to top what happened at Da Nang.

The incident at Da Nang to which Mr. Hearst referred occurred a week ago today when Russian-made and Russian-supplied 140 millimeter artillery rockets were fired on the American airbase there. These were the most powerful weapons the Vietcong has used in the war to date.

They were fired from a distance of almost 2 miles from 134 emplacements. In one attack, Mr. Hearst pointed out, they killed 12 Americans and wounded 32 more. Some 35 South Vietnamese troops were killed at the same time and 70 wounded. Eleven of our planes were damaged.

Mr. Hearst asks this question:

> Did you hear any of our companions speak out that the North was escalating the war? I didn't.

The veteran newspaper editor who has been to southeast Asia many times said:

> I am convinced that from now on the only way to get the enemy to talk peace and really mean it is for us to make the going too rough even for him.

To me, this seems logical. Bear in mind that the United States is suffering 1,000 casualties a week, or an annual rate of 50,000. During the calendar year just passed, the calendar year of 1966, American casualties totaled 35,000.

To me, this seems logical.

The attack on the American airbase at Da Nang last week by Russian-made and Russian-supplied artillery rockets dramatizes the need to remove the limitations now imposed upon American military commanders in Vietnam.

To me it is tragic that we should have 415,000 ground troops in Vietnam fighting in the jungles and swamps and caves—and yet simultaneously prevent the military commanders from hitting vital military targets in North Vietnam.

The airfields of North Vietnam which now are in effect a sanctuary—safe from attack—is the dramatic case in point.

Like Mr. Hearst it does not seem logical to me that American fliers should be prevented from bombing and straffing this obvious and meaningful military target.

I want to say again, as I said on the floor of the Senate on January 23, and again on February 15, that so long as we have great masses of American troops in Vietnam, more freedom must be given our military leaders in determining how best to protect American troops and to bring the war to an early and honorable conclusion.

I say today that the place to start in removing those restrictions would be to permit the bombing of the enemy airfields and the bombing or straffing of those enemy planes on the airfields.

The American airbase has been attacked. Yet American military commanders are prevented from attacking the enemy airfields. Does this make sense? To my way of thinking, it does not.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, today is the beginning of Law Enforcement Week, and significantly tomorrow the Judiciary Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures begins the first of a series of hearings on various bills designed to strengthen the arm of law-enforcement officials in the fight on crime.

One of these bills is the President's proposed Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967, a long-range measure entitled "A bill to assist States and local governments in reducing the incidence of crime, to increase the effectiveness, fairness, and coordination of law enforcement and criminal justice systems at all levels of government, and for other purposes."

While that type of approach to the problem is necessary, and I support it, the more immediate, pressing, and urgent question is what can be done now to stop our trial courts from having to turn loose upon the public unpunished murderers, rapists, and other dangerous and vicious criminals, solely because of recent ill advised, unsound, and unjust 5-to-4 Supreme Court decisions.

Mr. President, every newspaper we pick up contains some news item like the following in the Washington Daily News of February 28 under a New York dateline:

> A 21-year-old confessed rapist was freed in Bronx Supreme Court yesterday when the court was told he had not been advised of his Constitutional rights before he made his confession.
>
> The defendant, Michael Stern, was arrested on February 27, 1965, and charged with first degree rape of a 75-year-old widow. Her name with withheld.
>
> Bronx Assistant District Attorney Seymour Rotker told State Supreme Court Justice Mitchell D. Schweitzer that while Stern had signed a confession it was invalid in the light of the U.S. Supreme Court's 5–4 decision in the *Miranda* case of June 13, 1966. Judge Schweitzer dismissed the case without comment.

On March 3, at my request, there was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial by James J. Kilpatrick, published in the Washington Evening Star of February 21. After commenting upon the long-range proposals made by the President's National Crime Commission, Mr. Kilpatrick concluded:

> The figures compiled by the commission on the incidence of crime are as familiar as they are appalling. They need no recapitulation. What matters to the average citizen is not so much the abstract of statistical problem, or even the sociologists' long range solution. His concern goes to the mugger, the rapist, the dope-crazed thief, the arrogant young punks who infest his streets. What can be done about them now? One of the commission's answers is to provide textbooks for slum schools that are written in slum English. Okay, okay. But what can be done tomorrow, next week, next month, to lock up the hoods and thieves?

Mr. President, I agree with the sentiment expressed in this editorial. Congress needs to pass legislation that will be effective, and produce some corrective results, now—not just laws that it is hoped will reduce crime in future years. We need to enact some laws that will put a stop now to this utterly ridiculous spectacle of justice denied that is frightening and dismaying our people, demoralizing our law enforcement personnel, and contributing immeasurably to the alarming increase in the incidence of violent crime.

Many, many letters are pouring into my office from police chiefs and other law enforcement officers, from all over our country, urging action and commending those of us in the Congress who are seeking the enactment of legislation to alleviate the conditions resulting from recent 5-to-4 Supreme Court decisions. Their damaging effect, foreseen and predicted by the dissenting opinions of the other four Justices, is now being positively and painfully demonstrated. We do not need to rely on the views of police officials, district attorneys, and lower court judges to thus characterize these majority rulings. The predictions of the other four Justices as to the harvest that would be reaped by these rulings are now daily coming to pass.

Those who speak of our being able to live with these decisions—and what a sad commentary that is, to live with—do not take into consideration the thousands of criminal cases that will go unsolved and the countless number of vicious criminals who will go unpunished because police officers, under these restrictive and obstructive decisions, cannot act with commonsense in the performance of their duties to solve crimes and bring the guilty to the bar of justice.

One chief of police writes me:

> The entire situation is absurd * * * Despite the lack of figures, the *Miranda* case has hampered the administration of justice and law enforcement. Our office has dismissed numerous felonies, including murder cases, where the defendant had made written confessions. The confession would have been inadmissible if presented in court because of a lack of an affirmative waiver of a lawyer.

Another police chief characterizes the present deplorable situation in our criminal courts as a farce. Another writes that he is so disgusted with what he has to contend with, as a result of what he considers the reckless interpretation of the law by the Supreme Court, that he is resigning. His letter is rather brief. Listen to it:

> The recent Supreme Court decisions favoring the criminals at the expense of our citizens is shameful. Chief Justice Warren has set law enforcement back a hundred years. His fifth deciding vote has made it well nigh impossible to punish the guilty criminal element. The innocent public, police who are hamstrung in trying to perform their duties, judges whose hands are tied in deciding a case, all these are practically at the mercy of any person who decides to commit a criminal act.
>
> I never arrested, or tried to convict an innocent man. Today I fear making an arrest because of the loopholes expressly put into the law by the courts to aid a criminal to avoid paying the penalty for his misdeeds.
>
> I am so disgusted with what we have to contend with in law enforcement since the U.S. Supreme Court saw fit to so recklessly interpret the law to benefit lawbreakers, to misinterpret the will of our law makers, that I am resigning my position as chief of police, effective 31 December 1967.

Another police chief writes in part:

> Senator, as a career man in law enforcement and Chief of Police for the past thirty-four years, I am wholehartedly in favor of your bill to try to give the police officers part of the rights back that rightfully belong to them. We are operating under conditions now where the criminal is the most respected person and the law enforcement officer is the out-cast. Unless the law enforcement men of this country get some relief from some of the Supreme Court decisions rendered, then I feel that in a matter of a few years true law enforcement will become a thing of the past and the criminal element will take charge. I am sure you are aware of what this will mean to society and our way of life.

Common Pleas Judge Vincent A. Carroll is quoted in an editorial in the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 4 as saying:

> Maudlin sentimentality gets in the way of proper law enforcement and there has been a wave of hysteria about rights in the last ten years. But there doesn't seem to be much heard about the rights of those who get hurt.

Peter J. Gannon, Chief, Bureau of Navigation, Trenton, N.J., has forwarded to me a memorandum prepared by Mr. William H. Fennecken, who is division chief of the marine patrol. This memorandum so well expresses, from the policeman's viewpoint, the plight of law-enforcement officers that has been brought about by the present majority on the Supreme Court, that I feel it highly appropriate to quote it in full:

> It is common knowledge today that a police officer's lot is not a happy one. Pressures from all sides, particularly in the field of civil rights and recent Supreme Court decisions, has lowered the police image to below that of the local garbage collector. With the bombardment of his image, his morale has also tumbled. The average Cop today is a disgruntled individual, who is doing only what is necessary in the performance of his duties; to have a spark and be energetic is to look for trouble and further criticism.
>
> The picture was not always thus. When I first entered the police field thirteen years ago, it was on the way to becoming an honorable profession. I can recall how proud I was when I first donned the uniform. Walking my post as the local symbol of justice, I felt more like a knight in shining armor, ready to protect the proverbial damsel in distress. No apprehension entered my mind. All people from all walks of life were treated with equal candor.
>
> As a police officer, I soon learned that in Rome you do as the Romans do. As I gained experience I learned to size people up. Basic philosophy began to take hold. I found that all people desire to be treated as individuals, to be accepted for their own sake regardless of their position in life. Everyone wants to be understood and in their own way be important. The wise guy had his underlying motive, the recidivist his.
>
> Today the task of getting to the underlying motive has all but vanished. The police officer's approach to people has, by mandate, radically changed. The violator of public trust seeks no help because he expects none from the man in blue. The once human bond, the old avenue to justice is as cold as a weather front from Canada.
>
> Recent Supreme Court decisions have heaped coals upon the relationship between the law enforcement officer and the accused. The policeman, must of necessity, change his entire outlook bringing into enforcement a different approach. An approach that is cold and calculating. For an officer with years of experience, this becomes a bitter pill to swallow and is not easily comprehended.
>
> Most police officers today are disillusioned men, fighting frustration at every turn. Nothing to an officer can be more heartbreaking than to see weeks of work for naught, because of some court technicality. When the criminal is turned loose to ply again on the public, the officer wonders why he ever pinned a badge on in the first place.
>
> Something must be done in the immediate future to restore the policeman to the symbol of old; the pillar of the community; respected as the protector of every citizen's rights, and a very pleasant help in time of trouble.

The foregoing are but representative samples of the letters I have received within the past 2 weeks from police chiefs in villages, towns, and cities in practically every State of the Union. I could go on and on quoting similar comments, but time will not permit. I ask unanimous consent that a representative group of such letters be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do, however, want to take time to call attention of my colleagues to another editorial that has come to my attention. It is written by a professor of law at Northwestern University, Prof. Fred E. Inbau. It is published in the Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science in the December 1966 issue. It is entitled "Playing God: 5 to 4."

Professor Inbau reminded his readers that for several years prior to the Miranda decision the American Law Institute had devoted a tremendous amount of time and effort toward the formulation of a proposed tentative legislative code prescribing interrogation procedures for the police, and that the printed draft had been disseminated at least 3 months before the Miranda decision. He also called attention to the fact that the American Bar Association's Committee on Minimum Standards of Criminal Justice had been working closely with the institute members, and the President's Commission on Law Enforcement was also deeply engaged in a study of the problem, as was the District of Columbia Crime Commission, the Georgetown Law Center, and others under a Ford Foundation grant. He concluded the editorial as follows:

> All of these efforts would have resulted in a full airing of the interrogation-confession problem, based upon practical as well as legal consideration. But a one man majority of the Court in *Miranda* "pulled the rug" from underneath all of these studies and research groups, and effectively foreclosed a final evaluation of their ultimate findings and recommendations. * * *
>
> Considering the complexity of the interrogation-confession problem, a summary 5 to 4 nullification of much of the aforementioned group efforts directed toward the preparation of the legislation guidelines is awesomely inconsistent with fundamental democratic concepts.
>
> It's more like "Playing God: 5 to 4."

Mr. President, in conclusion, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. President, as I came to the Senate Chamber this morning, I was handed the March 1967 issue of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin. The initial article in the issue is a message from the Director, John Edgar Hoover.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD first among the articles immediately following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. McCLELLAN. I read three short paragraphs from the editorial:

> The American public is seeking and sorely needs, a proven formula to deter crime. The people are growing tired of substitutes. Swift detection and apprehension, prompt prosecution, and proper and certain punishment are tested crime deterrents. As we have seen, however, this combination of deterrents can be ineffective because of breakdowns in one or all of its phases. That is why we cannot expect high-quality police service alone to bring full relief from the crime problem. If the hardened criminal is arrested but not punished, he is not long deterred from his criminal pursuits.
>
> One State supreme court justice recently stated that it is completely unrealistic to say that punishment is not a deterrent to crime. "It is simply contrary to human nature" the justice explained, "not to be deterred from a course of action by the threat of punishment." This is the kind of reasoning and straight talk that makes sense to both the public and law enforcement. It is a refreshing contrast to the weak theories which rationalize criminal behavior and make villains of all policemen.
>
> Coddling of criminals and soft justice increase crime; denials to the contrary have no valid support. Yet these truths are still lost in the maze of sympathy and leniency heaped upon the criminal. Lame excuses and apologies offered for the lawbreaker are exceeded only by the amount of violence he commits. Meantime, law-abiding people who have a right to expect protection from criminals have this right abused and ignored.

Mr. Hoover concludes his article with this statement:

> Let the public remember, however, that detecting and apprehending criminals are not the whole answer. The criminal must know that his destiny also includes prompt prosecution and substantial punishment.

I wish that some of that sentiment, logic, and profound wisdom would become and have a guiding influence upon the Supreme Court of our land, especially those five Justices who, I think, have so grossly erred in their opinions that the law now favors the criminal to the detriment of society.

I hope that all Senators will attentively follow the hearings which commence tomorrow, and give us the benefit of their counsel, so that when the bills reach the floor for consideration we will be able to speedily pass the most effective legislation we are collectively able to formulate. The gravity of the situation, and the great public concern require it.

EXHIBIT 3

MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR

Could it be that 1967 will be remembered as the year the American people demanded respect for law and order and a halt to rising crime in our country?

While this hope may not fully materialize, there are some promising symptoms of growing public concern. In many areas, citizens are genuinely alarmed, and rightly so, by increasing criminal violence. Indications are that more and more people want effective enforcement of the law and realistic punishment of those who break it. Federal, State, and local governments are initiating new and broader programs to aid law enforcement and to provide better training and equipment for the enforcement officer. Civic and patriotic groups are rallying to support police and are calling for citizens to obey the law and to help prosecute those who refuse to obey it. These are encouraging signs.

Actually, the American public is seeking, and sorely needs, a proven formula to deter crime. The people are growing tired of substitutes. Swift detection and apprehension, prompt prosecution, and proper and certain punishment are tested crime deterrents. As we have seen, however, this combination of deterrents can be ineffective because of breakdowns in one or all of its phases. That is why we cannot expect high-quality police service alone to bring full relief from the crime problem. If the hardened criminal is arrested but not punished, he is not long deterred from his criminal pursuits.

One State supreme court justice recently stated that it is completely unrealistic to say that punishment is not a deterrent to crime. "It is simply contrary to human nature," the justice explained, "not to be deterred from a course of action by the threat of punishment." This is the kind of reasoning and straight talk that makes sense to both the public and law enforcement. It is a refreshing contrast to the weak theories which rationalize criminal behavior and make villains of all policemen.

Coddling of criminals and soft justice increase crime; denials to the contrary have no valid support. Yet, these truths are still lost in the maze of sympathy and leniency heaped upon the criminal. Lame excuses and apologies offered for the lawbreaker are exceeded only by the amount of violence he commits. Meantime, law-abiding people who have a right to expect protection from criminals have this right abused and ignored.

Certainly, the American public must soon take positive action to curtail crime and violence. Good intentions are worthless. Funds for better law enforcement will help, but will not do the complete job. Community and civic authorities, educators, religious leaders, and prominent men and women from all walks of life must speak out, demand justice for law-abiding citizens, and unite the people in a forceful campaign against crime. There is nothing wrong with the clergy's warning against excessive compassion for the criminal at the expense of innocent victims. There is nothing wrong with educators' denouncing rabble rousers and agitators who disrupt the orderly processes of the academic community and defy authority. And there is nothing wrong with community and city officials' crusading to rid their streets of thugs, rapists, and robbers.

Law enforcement, of course, is gratified with the great strides that have been made in the profession in recent years. It is also appreciative of new efforts to make its fight against crime more effective. Law enforcement will take full advantage of all aid and assistance and meet its obligations with a determination to give the public adequate protection. Let the public remember, however, that detecting and apprehending criminals are not the whole answer. The criminal must know that his destiny also includes prompt prosecution and substantial punishment.

J. EDGAR HOOVER,
Director.

EXHIBIT 1

POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Huntington, W. Va., March 2, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Law abiding citizens have every right to be concerned over the rapid rise in the crime rate. Each day there is an increase in the citizen's chance of becoming a victim of crime. Even if they are not involved they are exposed to the higher cost of crime, inadequate police protection, lessening of their personal liberties, and the ever present fear for their life and property.

The plight of the law enforcement officer whose duty it is to protect life and property is becoming more and more difficult. The law enforcement effectiveness is being curtailed by some recent U.S. Supreme Court rulings.

The citizens in many parts of the United States are now paying because of some of the recent Supreme Court rulings that seem to serve the purpose of throwing protection around the criminal. Those who think that the police officer can cope with crime under these conditions should try to question a criminal. The police depend a great deal on their ability to interview and interrogate. Approximately seventy percent (70%) of the major crimes are solved by interviews and confessions.

Locally in the City of Huntington, West Virginia, our criminal judge will not allow a confession or statement entered as evidence in his court even if the officer has obtained a waiver.

The responsibility of a police officer is great. The police officer's daily task is not one of research, nor are his decisions made in the quiet of the Judge's Chambers with time to arrive at a decision with all the rules and guidelines to study. Instead, his decision is made hurriedly and most often amidst disorder and confusion. Not only must the officer protect the innocent, find the guilty, but he must also protect the public. Ours is a government of laws—not men. Woodrow Wilson once said, "The first duty of the law is to keep sound the society it serves."

The law enforcement officer today already has a greater responsibility than he can fully understand and is capable of discharging. We feel the Scales of Justice have been dipped too far in favor of the criminal. You are in the position of possibly bringing the scales more in balance and giving the officer an equal chance. You can be assured of our one hundred percent (100%) cooperation in this mutual effort.

Sincerely,

G. H. KLEINKNECHT,
Chief of Police.
By Sgt. SAM WATKINS,
Commander, Investigations Unit.

OKLAHOMA CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Oklahoma City, Okla., February 28, 1967.
Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: I join with, I am certain, the overwhelming majority of law enforcement officers in wishing success for your efforts to improve the condition under which officers must operate. While there is an abundance of groups and individuals arguing the cause of the criminal, there is a dearth of such advocates on the side of law and order.

For too many years, the psyche of social welfare has been allowed to supplant social responsibility and one of the results is reflected in a growth of lawlessness that threatens the roots of this nation in a way exceeding the wildest dreams of the international communist conspiracy. The most recent example of this philosophy was evidenced in the Miranda decision, but despite the notoriety of Miranda, it would be inaccurate to blame much of what is now history on that or indeed, any single ruling of the Court.

Too often, in fact *ordinarily*, the concern of society has been with protecting the rights of accused, including analyzing his subconscious, without regard for the rights of society or the victim of crime. If, as some say, the criminal is the product of his environment, then what of the other and much larger public that is of this same environment but respects the law? Responsibility, or the absence thereof, is the difference between orderly and lawless society.

A second element appears in the recent decision of the Supreme Court: that is the obvious and announced intent to "control" the police. Repeated reference is made to the Wickersham Crime Report of the early 1930s as though law enforcement had not had enough sense to change one whit in over thirty years.

The Court has confused the understandable desire of the framers of this Constitution to escape oppression at the hands of a foreign king with the right of a housewife to escape assault in the parking lot of a supermarket.

Consider the "police" that were known to colonial times and imagine their effectiveness in any matter of more consequence than discovering a fire. The power was then and is now in the military establishment. The police are neither capable nor desirous of overthrowing the government. They are capable of enforcing the criminal laws but are not allowed to do so. The early distrust of the Crown has been transferred to the police operating in a field foreign to that which gave rise to the historical distrust. To this mania to control the police has been added the psyche of social welfare so that now a man is not even responsible for what he says, much less what he does, and especially so if he says he did it and can show that he is of humble origin or is a member of a minority.

The "blameless" philosophy is exemplified in the bit of doggerel by the unknown author who paraphrased the story of Tom the Piper's Son to show the current thinking of those who say the criminal is the misunderstood product of psychological trauma, as follows:

"The pig was hissed, but Tom was kissed
And sent to see a psychiatrist."

This sounds extreme and even silly, but really is this not the case when automobile owners are told that *they* are to blame for car thefts by virtue of leaving their vehicles unattended? Such thinking zeros in with deadly accuracy on the entire system of property rights as known in this nation. It is but a matter of degree to shift the blame for bank robbery to those wicked bankers who have all that money lying around . . . and besides, it's all insured so nobody really gets hurt!

The insurance is a story by itself. It has advanced to such a degree that it would come as no surprise if a professional thief's policy were placed on the market with low monthly premium, providing a policy to cushion the impact of arrest with its attendant inconvenience and expenses. (Ultimately, I suppose the "Company" would provide a substitute to serve the "insured's" time if all legal appeals failed.)

This department has noticed, as I am sure have others, a growing trend by victims of crime, especially national chain stores, to provide only sketchy details of crimes which appear to have their base in some sort of company policy related to the concept that whether solved or unsolved, the loss is insured and if solved, there could be recupercussions in the form of law suit, producing of records, witness time away from the job, intimidation of witnesses, and other related phenomena. If the police feel that they are in some way being "used" it is because they know that the insurance companies uniformly require that crime be reported before a settlement can be made. We receive daily numerous reports of crimes that were discovered days and sometimes weeks earlier. The delay is explained by the victim when he reports that his company required that the incident be reported to the police. The age of insurance and irresponsibility seems to be upon and a part of us. There is hope though that a distinction can be made that will distinguish between asocial acts and anti-social acts.

Whether a man pay his bills, support his children, work for a living or not do these things should have no bearing on his personal responsibility if he decides to steal, rob, rape or murder. There is a difference between flunking school and stealing cars. There is a difference between assembly and petition and looting and burning. Illiteracy should not be confused with burglary. Surely, the United States of America and the several states have the ability and the sovereign right to make such distinctions that will prevent establishment, on an all-encompassing front, of a police state but will assure responsibility for those acts which have, since recorded time, been crimes. It is perfectly reasonable to set all sorts of technical rules around technical crimes. It is an absurdity to so surround crimes at common-law.

Sincerely yours,

HILTON GEER,
Chief of Police.

[From the Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, December 1966]

"PLAYING GOD:" 5 TO 4

(The Supreme Court and the Police)

Over the past several years, whenever the Supreme Court of the United States rendered a decision that imposed a new restriction upon the police, many persons were heard to say: "If only the police, prosecuting attorneys, the organized bar, the state courts, or the legislatures had taken the initiative and done something about the situation there would have been no need for the Court to step in." To some of us this always seemed to be a naivé explanation of the motivation of a majority of the Justices.

Recent developments have established, to my satisfaction, the fact that the Court's majority has been determined all along to do its own policing of the police *regardless* of what any other group or any other branch of government might do by way of attempting to solve the law enforcement problems about which the Court has been so concerned. The Court's one man majority was going to continue to "play God". And "play God" it did in its June, 1966 decision in *Miranda* v. *Arizona* (384 U.S. 436).

For the past several years an American Law Institute committee, composed of lawyers, law teachers, and judges, with divergent viewpoints upon the subject, has devoted a tremendous amout of time and effort toward the formulation of a proposed tentative legislative code prescribing interrogation procedures for the police to follow. These endeavors of the American Law Institute began a year before the Court's 5 to 4 decision of June, 1964 in *Escobedo* v. *Illinois* (378 U.S. 478), and the tentative draft of the Committee's proposed code had been printed and disseminated at least three months before the *Miranda* decision.

As the Institute's committee was working on its project, so was a comparably composed American Bar Association Committee on Minimum Standards of Criminal Justice. One of its sub-committees had been assigned to deal specifically with the police interrogation problem and to make recommendations, and it was working closely with the Institute's committee toward that end. Its existence and activities were also known to the Court long before the *Miranda* decision.

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Criminal Justice was also deeply engaged in a study of many aspects of criminal investigation that inevitably would have produced facts and figures helpful to a full consideration of the interrogation-confession problem. And other studies were underway, such as those by the District of Columbia Crime Commission and the Georgetown Law Center. Also, the Ford Foundation had recently awarded a grant of $1,000,000, in part, for a study of arrests and confessions in New York.

Here, then, was action—in truly democratic fashion—seeking to find a proximate solution to some very difficult problems.

All of these efforts would have resulted in a full airing of the interrogation-confession problem, based upon practical as well as legal considerations. But a one man majority of the Court in *Miranda* "pulled the rug" from underneath all of these studies and research groups, and effectively foreclosed a final evaluation of their ultimate findings and recommendations. It did so by branding as unconstitutional a substantial segment of the very practices and procedures that were under consideration by these various groups. As Justice Harlan said in his dissenting opinion in *Miranda*, "the legislative reforms" that may have emanated from such group efforts "would have had the vast advantage of empirical data and comprehensive study" and "they would allow experimentation and use of solutions not open to the courts". Also in Justice Harlan's opinion, "they would restore the initiative in criminal law reform to those forums where it truly belongs."

With its *Miranda* limitations upon the validity of a suspect's waiver of the Court's newly conceived "rights" about which he must be informed, there will be many instances where police investigators are deprived of an essential means for the solution of a substantial percentage of the serious crimes that now plague this country. Only by a deliberate evasion of the *Miranda* rules might the police prevent this consequence; and this they should not do! Legally, as well as morally, the police have no alternative but full and good faith compliance. Whatever deleterious effects their compliance may bring with respect to the safety and security of law abiding citizens do not constitute a responsibility with which they should concern themselves. To use the words of one of the Supreme Court Justices in another context, "There are others who must shoulder much of that responsibility".

Considering the complexity of the interrogation-confession problem, a summary 5 to 4 nullification of much of the aforementioned group efforts directed toward the preparation of legislative guidelines is awesomely inconsistent with fundamental democratic concepts.

It's more like "Playing God: 5 to 4".

FRED E. INBAU, *Editor-in-Chief.*

CITY OF XENIA, OHIO,
DIVISION OF POLICE,
March 3, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: Thank you for your request asking for my views and suggestions regarding the decisions of the Supreme Court. Although many of the decisions of the Supreme Court have affected the Police Service, I doubt whether all of them collectively have caused an impact such as the Miranda decision.

It seems to me that the Supreme Court has attempted to right the wrongs of a few policemen by penalizing all of us. There is no denying that many citizens were denied their constitutional rights before we started to train our men; there is no denying that many policemen guarded the citizen's constitutional rights and obtained convictions through the practice of proper investigation techniques, thus giving society proper protection and service—these officers have been slapped down for doing a good job for the actions of a few.

It seems inconceivable that we, as police officers, are not allowed to question a suspect without the suspect's council present. Are we allowed to be present when the suspect confers with his attorney?

I do not advocate an unreasonable period of time for questioning, however, it seems that we should be allowed a sufficient period of time to question a suspect in proper surroundings, without interference from outside sources. Proper questioning will many times eliminate suspicions from a subject completely. Proper questioning will many times solve a case in a very short time. Thus, with proper questioning, under proper conditions, without interference or outside influences, we would be able to serve the citizens of our City in the manner they demand.

How are crimes to be solved when the required evidence is non-existent?

We are not asking for complete freedom in our investigations; we are asking for realistic procedures that we can follow with the knowledge that our properly conducted investigations will be accepted and not thrown out of court by a technicality.

Yours very truly,

HAROLD W. MILLER,
Chief of Police.

BOROUGH OF RIVER EDGE,
POLICE DEPARTMENT,
River Edge, N.J., February 28, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: In compliance with your request that members of the International Association of Chiefs of Police write to you expressing their views and offering suggestions regarding the Supreme Court decisions, I am writing to you to give you an example of one instance in which the efforts of this department were thwarted in the prosecution of complaints of larceny against two adults and one juvenile. The matter was dismissed upon the mere allegation that the defendants had not been advised of their rights.

I realize that the instance I cite is indeed minor compared to the many perpetrators of heinous crimes who have gone scot-free because of the effect of recent Supreme Court decisions. Not only have these culprits gone unpunished for the crimes they have committed but also are free to prey upon society with what amounts to immunity from the law.

The last thing that those of us in law enforcement desire to do is to deprive any individual of his rights. It is part of our duty to protect the rights of the citizenry. It is also part of our duty to protect life, limb and property and to apprehend those people who have violated the laws of the land so that they may be brought to the bar of justice.

We do not want to judge the guilt or innocence of any defendant but we do want to have the tools with which to gather the true facts of a case and present the evidence found as the result of a good and honest investigation, made in good faith and taking every reasonable means to protect the rights of the accused. It cannot be expressed too emphatically that to lose the right to interrogate a suspect is tantamount to losing the ability to fight crime at all.

The seasoned criminal does not have any need for advice as to what his rights are, because he knows them better than anyone else. He is hoping for the police to make that one mistake which will enable him to claim a violation of his rights so that any physical evidence which may be used against him will be barred from being introduced into the proceedings. This is not an individual viewpoint; it is an actual fact.

I cannot express too emphatically the disastrous effect that recent decisions have had upon the morale of the police. This effect is even being felt by the dedicated policeman who, in the past, has risen above the obstacles placed in his path in his fignt against crime. How much longer can he be expected to dedicate himself to his job if he is thwarted and frustrated in his every effort?

We, in law enforcement, hope that men such as you will take up this fight and return to the police those tools which are necessary for them to do an honest job of protecting *all* of the Citizenry.

With thanks for anything you may be able to do in aiding the fight for law enforcement against crime, I am,

Respectfully yours,

EVERETT M. CRANDELL,
Chief of Police.

THE TOWNSHIP OF BRIDGEWATER,
POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Somerville, N.J., March 1, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: I have been informed that you, as Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, have scheduled hearings on March 7, 8 and 9, 1967, regarding the United States Supreme Court decisions which have so much affected local law enforcement.

The most recent decisions have placed a severe hardship on the local enforcement officer and his supporting taxpayers, as an example; this department was bothered by a rash of break, entry and larcenies in one section of our municipality where there are new homes being erected. At 3:00 a.m. one morning, one of our patrol cars found a man coming out of a woods in the midst of this housing development. This person is well known to the department because of his prior criminal record. When the officer stopped to question the man and informed him of his rights under the recent Supreme Court decision, the suspect stated that he did not wish to be questioned and our man could go no further because if he were detained and brought to headquarters, we would be violating his constitutional rights by questioning him in a "custodial atmosphere."

I am sure you are well aware of the recent bitter dismissal in New York State, of murder convictions against a man who very frankly admitted killing six people. It is horrible to think that this person is free to roam the streets and commit his atrocities again.

I don't believe any police department is seeking a completely free hand in the apprehension of criminals or would deny anyone the due process of law, but we do very strongly feel that the Supreme Court has overstepped its bounds, especially in the Miranda et al case.

I realize you are fighting a tremendous uphill battle in attempting to lessen the burden placed on police officials, and I wish you the very best in your endeavors.

Very truly yours,

DIX R. M. FETZER,
Chief.

MARYLAND POLICE TRAINING COMMISSION,
Pikesville, Md., February 27, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

SIR: The International Association of Chiefs of Police has called to my attention the hearing scheduled before your Committee on March 7, 8 and 9, 1967, relative to S. 674 intended to amend Title 18, U.S. Code with respect to the admissibility in evidence of confessions.

Without commenting in any way as to the correctness of recent Supreme Court decisions dealing with the conduct of law enforcement in the course of criminal investigation, I cannot help but express my sympathy with any legislation having as its object the lessening of such restrictions placed upon law enforcement. I am completely mindful of the necessity for zealously protecting the rights of individuals, which rights have been granted to them by the Constitution of the United States. I cannot help but wonder, however, at the necessity of some decisions, particularly where there has been a close division in opinion on the part of Justices when such decisions obviously favor the rights of an individual over the seemingly more important rights of society, particularly with respect to the protection of society against the actions of criminal and subversive elements.

Accordingly I should like to commend your Subcommittee for its concern in this respect and its efforts within the framework of the Constitution to make easier the role of law enforcement in the protection of society.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT L. VAN WAGONER.

CITY OF GRANDVIEW HEIGHTS,
Columbus, Ohio, February 24, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: With respect to your proposed legislation, S. 674, I would like to offer the support of our small municipal police agency. We are a suburban community of approximately 10,000 population, located in the metropolitan area of Columbus, Ohio.

The resultant theory to the recent Escobedo, Miranda, Mapp, and other Supreme Court decisions, that police investigations must rest basically upon scientific evidence is, in my opinion, a gross injustice to the law abiding American citizen. It is unreasonable to believe that the majority of enforcement agencies can equip, train, or hire personnel so as to conduct criminal investigations with the same professional approach as that of the Federal Agencies or the large metropolitan departments.

We, of course, cannot permit police misconduct, third degree tactics, nor the abridgment of our civil liberties, however, I sincerely believe that the rights of the innocent must take precedent to those of the criminal.

I, therefore, urge and support your committee's efforts to correct, through legislation, the adverse effects imposed upon local law enforcement by the United States Supreme Court.

Very truly yours,

D. L. MILLER,
Chief, Division of Police.

OFFICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,
Saugus, Mass., February 24, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is gratifying to know that someone knows about the problems of Law Enforcement Agencies and is doing something about it. You are to be congratulated for your stand in reference to the recent U.S. Supreme Court one-man majority decisions.

Much has been said about these decisions and how they hamper the normal process of reasonable criminal investigations, and whatever I may say would be superfluous.

I do find from my own personal experience, as a law enforcement officer, that many cases have been lost in court as the result of these decisions and some cases did not even reach the court because the police were unable to interrogate the suspect.

Time will not permit me to give you the facts on every case but here are a few examples.

1) A short while ago we had an epidemic of school, church and hospital fires. We apprehended the culprit responsible for the school and church fires because he did not invoke his constitutional rights. The person responsible for the hospital fires refused to say anything and although our investigation disclosed that he was responsible for the fires, the evidence was not sufficient to prosecute. Needless to say he committed similar crimes with the same results.

2) Two burglaries occurred one night in Saugus. A few days later culprits were arrested in another jurisdiction for crimes committed there. At the time of the arrest property was seized including property that had been stolen in two Saugus burglaries. The subjects refused to speak invoking their constitutional rights. When brought before the court the judge sustained a motion to suppress all evidence for the illegal search and seizure and the case was dismissed. Is it any wonder that the crime rate is increasing enormously year after year in every city and town of our country? With the ridiculous decisions of individual rights for the criminals, the crime rate is going to increase rather than diminish.

I believe that greater latitude should be given to Law Enforcement Officers in the field of Arrest, Search & Seizure and interrogation in order to combat crime.

Thank you for your cooperation and with deep personal regards I am,

Very truly yours,

FRED FORNI,
Chief, Saugus Police Department.

DEPARTMENT OF POLICE, CITY OF
MEQUON, WIS.,
Mequon, Wis., February 23, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee, Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: My purpose in corresponding with you is to commend you for your * * * personnel. Recent decisions involving Miranda and Escobedo have certainly tipped the scales of justice directly in favor of the criminal element.

Another impending decision, namely U.S. versus Lewis could effectively decision law enforcement out of existence, should the U.S. Supreme Court reverse the lower court decisions.

Although our agency has complied with the requirements of the Fifth Amendment for many years, we have found that this is not sufficient for it is incumbent upon the prosecution to prove not only that the suspect was properly advised of his rights, but further that he thoroughly understood them. You might be interested in knowing that our agency lost a court decision in Circuit Court that involved the arrest and subsequent prosecution of an intoxicated driver of a motor vehicle involved in a fatal auto accident wherein an innocent person was killed. The court held that although the arresting officers had twice advised the suspect of his Constitutional Rights, it felt that because the subject was so intoxicated, he was unable to properly understand them. The burden placed upon law enforcement today is truly difficult to contend with.

It is my opinion that the U.S. Supreme Court has read this "advising" requirement into the Fifth Amendment, for exhaustive research on my part fails to delineate any directives requiring that police officers must so do.

Yours truly,

ROBERT L. MILKE,
Chief of Police.

CITY OF NORTH OLMSTED,
POLICE DEPARTMENT,
North Olmstead, Ohio, February 24, 1967.

Re bill, S. 674.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: It is very gratifying to see legislation being introduced on the above Bill.

If it takes an unanimous decision of the jury to find a defendant guilty of a felony, I feel that there should be a greater majority than five to four in handing down decisions which become the law of the land.

I had the occasion to attend a seminar in Ann Arbor, Michigan on August 1, 1966. There were mostly Defense Attorneys present and the common thought among them was that "they at last had the law enforcement officer where they wanted him." A few examples were mentioned concerning "police brutality," but none were recent occasions. They were all at least forty to fifty years ago.

I wholeheartedly agree with rights for the individual, but all I have been noticing in recent decisions is "rights for the criminal." When is the law abiding citizen going to have representation?

Any person who has any law enforcement experience knows that confession alone does not make a case. There should be some coordinating evidence to build a case. At the same time, one of the most important points of investigation is interrogation. Many times during an interrogation the smartest suspect may unconsciously drop a remark which presents a lead to the crime. Even this is ruled out now. For example; a woman's scream is heard from a house at 3:00 A.M.. A male runs from behind the house. The law officer stops suspect and asks the following questions.

1. Who are you?
2. Where do you live?
3. Where have you been?
4. Where are you going?

If the officer did not advise the suspect of his rights before he asked questions three and four, the officer has violated the suspects rights.

My honest feeling is that we are going overboard to protect the criminal in recent decisions and it is about time to protect the honest and law abiding citizen. It is about time the cases were tried on the merits of the cases instead of technicalities.

As I said before, it is highly appreciated that a person of your status and importance as taken an interest in our problems. I sincerely hope you will receive the response and support for the Bill S. 674.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY W. HIRD,
Chief of Police.

CITY OF CUDAHY, WIS.
POLICE DEPARTMENT,
February 25, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: As Chief of Police in the City of Cudahy, I heartily endorse any legislation that will lift some of the burdensome restrictions brought about by the Miranda Decision.

The full impact of this decision cannot be adequately assessed by merely comparing the number of confessions obtained before and after the decision was rendered. A more realistic picture is presented when one considers the following:

Witnesses and other people with pertinent information are now reluctant to cooperate with investigators, especially after the required warnings are recited.

Physical evidence at crime scenes is overlooked, or its value to the prosecution deteriorates, because investigators are prohibited from making the necessary inquiries that would lay proper foundation for introduction in court.

Many prosecutors have become so sensitive to the rules set down by Miranda that they often talk the defendant out of cooperating by long, detailed and repetitious warnings with regard to the defendant's rights. There also seems to be a good deal of confusion among prosecutors and some members of the judiciary as to the application of these rules.

It is now impossible to find two officers of the court who will give similar answers to questions on such matters as Tacit Admissions, Res Gestae Declarations, etc.

Probably the most damaging result of these decisions has been its effect on the public's attitude toward police. Many people feel that the laws and ordinances can be violated with impunity. Matters that were once treated as routine incidents now require extensive investigation and sometimes lengthy court proceedings.

This is having an adverse effect on the efficiency and morale of the police.

I honestly feel that unless some of the restrictions on questioning suspects prior to arrest are removed, crime figures will soar and conviction rates will drop.

Very truly yours,

ANTHONY M. WISE,
Chief of Police.

DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,
Muskegon Heights, Mich.,
February 24, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am very pleased, and in accord with your dismay in regard to the U.S. Supreme Court decisions of late. That this affects the ability of local law enforcement is certainly very disturbing. In the relatively short time that these decisions have been in effect, they have had adverse effects on even the very smallest police agency. I believe that this is a very important and the most significant fact concerning this matter.

Every law abiding citizen in the land is deprived of common sense law enforcement. I am sure that we are, or at least should be, cognizant of the fact that our society was founded and has been built on voluntary obedience to the law. Without this voluntary obedience by the great majority of the populace there would be utter chaos. This I am sure is evident to everyone. However, the recent Miranda decision is a great step against being part of the law abiding community. In a small department such as ours, we regard crime prevention as our number one job. The education of our youth is of prime concern, for in their hands will rest the reins of government in the future. This is most difficult when confirmed criminals are set free because of some small technicality of the law. It seems that there are factions in our society that would make it appear that voluntary obedience to the law is not what our forefathers meant in drafting the Constitution. Many of our laws refer to "reasonable and prudent person", but it certainly appears that some of the most recent decisions of the Supreme Court have disregarded reason.

We as law enforcement officers have a definite responsibility—to ourselves for choosing this profession, and to the people we serve, for their faith and confidence in us to maintain a peaceful society. I am sure they realize we cannot do the job alone, and it is most gratifying that you have shown your position by the introduction of S. 674. As a small community police department, the examples and statistics I could give you would be minute compared to the larger cities, but I can tell you this—it has affected our arrests, and most important to us, it has affected police performance. It has made police recruiting ten fold more difficult.

I sincerely thank you for the opportunity to make this brief expression and wish you all the success in your endeavors. You are an extremely popular Senator in the eyes of law enforcement and I hope all law abiding citizens. Your immediate constituents can be very proud of their man in the Senate.

Respectfully,

JAMES J. FARKAS,
Chief of Police.

CITY OF STREATOR, ILL.,
Streator, Ill., February 24, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

YOUR HONOR: Law enforcement in our time is very difficult and trying operation. Breaking and entering, Larceny and Burglary is taken for granted by many persons to be their legal right.

In Chicago during their heavy snow, breaking into business establishments, carrying and hauling away merchandise was a huge operation and when officers attempted to make arrest, resistance occurred and they were accused of brutality as they were when the so called peaceful demonstrations were held.

After arrests are made, proof beyond doubt is demanded by attorneys for their clients.

Under present conditions a person is not safe in his own home. Forced entries are made, occupants are threatened, tortured, raped, tied up, valuables stolen and some are murdered and the offender is not easily apprehended. If and when apprehension is made, proof must be established of guilt.

We know we must inform those who are placed under arrest as to what their Constitutional rights are.

Release on Bond, especially on offenses in Chapter 38 of the Criminal Code of the IRS., is a simple matter. Once out on bond, many commit other crimes and some fail to appear in court on date set for them.

Long delays in bringing cases to trial. Changes of location for trial to be held takes additional time. All such actions pile up a backlog and bring on discouragement.

I do not believe that the Founding Fathers of our Constitution intended for the criminals to be protected as they are today. I believe that this protection be given to the Law Abiding Citizens.

In recent years, Attorneys for the Defense have used and are using every technicality to sway Jurors and Judges to point out and define a Statute in a manner that their Client is innocent of the offense committed.

Even Attorneys do not agree on definitions many times of the Statutes.

The Supreme Court of the United States has laid down Rules that we as Officers must follow. We have been Handcuffed. Crime can be reduced. We as officers have the knowledge, ability and are willing to enforce the State laws and City Ordinances and assist each other of any department and the F.B.I. We are and there is no doubt every department has and is. The Handcuffs Must Be Removed from us.

The pendulum has swung too far in favor of the criminals. It must swing back to ours and swiftly. When it does, there will be a reduction.

Allocating of monies to fight crime is necessary. Just as necessary are, Amendments or Enactments of laws which will permit officers to protect Law abiding citizens and our free way of life.

Respectfully yours,

ANDREW KOLESAR,
Chief of Police.

CITY OF MERIDIAN,
Meridian, Miss., February 24, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am in receipt of a memorandum dated February 21st, 1967 from the International Association of Chiefs of Police of which I am a member and it is my understanding in this letter that you have introduced Bill No. S. 674, which is to amend Title 18, U.S. Code with respect to the admissibility in evidence of confessions.

Senator, as a career man in law enforcement and Chief of Police for the past thirty-four years, I am whole heartedly in favor of your bill to try to give the police officers part of the rights back that rightfully belong to them. We are operating under conditions now where the criminal is the most respected person and the law enforcement officer is the out-cast. Unless the law enforcement men of this country get some relief from some of the Supreme Court decisions rendered, then I feel that in a matter of a few years true law enforcement will become a thing of the past and the criminal element will take charge. I am sure you are aware of what this will mean to society and our way of life.

I would like to relate a case we recently had in our County: There was a sailor at the McCain Air Force Base who beat his two year old son to death and threw his body into a nearby lake. The Navy personnel handled this case. He was indicted at the last term of the Grand Jury and the District Attorney, Mr. George Warner felt under the "Miranda" decision that he had no alternative but to noll-process this case and send it to file.

This case was an unusual one and when this happened the public became highly indignant. Nevertheless, the man was set free.

It is time for true Americans who love their country more than anything else stand up and be counted and you can put me down as one of these. It is my prayer and my earnest hope that you will meet with unanimous approval and favorable consideration in the passage of your bill which will enable us to start back on the long road of forcing the criminals of our country to respect and fear the laws of the land.

Sincerely, your friend,

C. L. GUNN,
Chief of Police.

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE,
POLICE DEPARTMENT,
February 28, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am convinced that recent United States Supreme Court decisions have put a burden on police in the nation and have affected every law abiding citizen of this country.

These decisions, in effect, have not caused less respect for law and order by criminals and hoodlums because they have none to begin with. It has caused a lack of respect for the police, being unable to enforce the law, and a lessening of fear for the consequences, if caught.

The police can adjust to the interpretations of the Court but the law abiding citizen will never be able to understand why we cannot protect his rights from the criminal and hoodlum.

It is my opinion that Mr. Average Citizen does not appreciate nor understand the release of admitted murderers, sex criminals, etc., merely because the accused had not conferred with an attorney before the admission.

Sincerely,

PAUL A. SHAVER,
Chief of Police.

WAUSAU POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Wausau, Wis., February 27, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Law and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to take this opportunity to express my views and objections to the problems fostered on the police by the Supreme Court Decisions in the Escobedo and Miranda decisions.

We have experienced a great deal of difficulty in clearing cases involving criminals with previous records. These persons, when apprehended, are hiding behind their so called rights and refuse to answer questions, consequently only cases with physical evidence and witnesses are being cleared. We are not having any problems with the first offenders. These persons willingly waive their rights and confess to their crimes.

The retroactive order of the Miranda Decision suppressed evidence secured by a statement in a vicious sex murder case in Wausau in July 1966. The statement was suppressed in its entirety due to the ruling. Included in the statement was an account of happenings leading to the crime which were not witnessed by anyone except the victim and the murderer. As a result the Murderer pleaded insanity and was found insane which would not have been possible had the statement been allowed as evidence.

Other points that I wish to make and feel are important are: the many man hours needed to secure evidence enough for conviction of the criminal and the great lack of available laboratory facilities to examine the evidence secured.

Then also the image of Law Enforcement has been harmed. The feeling of the man on the street is that the police have "goofed" and had to be put in their place by the Court. There has been relatively no feeling exhibited for the victims of crime.

These are only a few of the views and as time goes by the real damage will be noted. As a policeman for the past thirty years I wish God's speed in correcting a bad situation.

Sincerely,
EVERETT GLEASON,
Chief of Police.

DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,
Manteca, Calif., February 28, 1967.
Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: I would like to add my support to your bill (S. 674). It is my opinion, related on my personal experience, that the Supreme Court has gone past a reasonable man's interpretation of the Constitution. I think it is time the rights of the victims of crimes be considered and society's right to be protected against violence and crime be brought to the forefront.

Guilt or innocence no longer seems to be a factor in our courts. The contest now is to see if the defense can find any minute detail that may have been overlooked by the police to free a guilty person and return him to prey on society.

Very truly yours,
DAVID WALSH,
Chief of Police.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY,
Baton Rouge, February 28, 1967.
Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: I have just received a memorandum from Mr. Quinn Tamm, Executive Director, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc., regarding hearings by the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures scheduled March 7, 8, and 9, 1967.

Law enforcement agencies join you and the other Senators and Representatives in your concern with regard to recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions which are adversely affecting the ability of those agencies to fulfill their responsibilities.

This will advise you that the under-signed strongly favors legislation such as S. 674, which I understand is a bill to amend Title 18, U.S. Code with respect to the admissibility in evidence of confessions. Such legislation, I believe will do much to relieve the almost impossible situation law enforcement agencies have been faced with since the Miranda decision.

With best wishes for success in this matter, I am

Yours very truly,
THOMAS D. BURBANK,
Director.

LANE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE,
Eugene, Oreg., February 28, 1967.
Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: I was requested by Quinn Tamm, Executive Director, of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc., of which I am a member, to contact you regarding the Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures. I would like to express my opinion as follows:

The lack of statements from accused criminals has forced the police to pursue a more painstaking and expensive type of investigation than was formerly necessary prior to the Supreme Court Decisions which re-defined the rights of the accused.

Formerly the police interrogated a subject and in most cases there was no reluctance on the part of the suspect to give a statement. This eliminated the painstaking technical search of each and every crime scene for physical evidence necessary to connect the suspect with the crime.

This time consuming police work coupled with the expensive laboratory work necessary to process evidence obtained has posed the problem of obtaining more personnel, more laboratory space and equipment. Personnel, time, laboratory expense, all run into vast amount of money which is absolutely uncalled for in this writer's opinion. The accused was never mistreated by any enlightened enforcement officer and in most cases was always willing to admit a crime in which he was involved. The scientific crime scene search and laboratory evaluation has merely replaced scientific interrogation with no advantage to the criminal, but adding a great burden on the taxpayer.

We in law enforcement certainly feel that the recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions are adversely affecting the ability of local law enforcement agencies to fulfill our responsibilities.

Very truly yours,
HARRY H. MARLOWE,
Sheriff, Director of Public Safety.

CITY OF COLUMBIA, S.C.,
February 28, 1967.
Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am in receipt of a memorandum from Mr. Quinn Tamm, Executive Director of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, relative to Bill S. 674, which is a Bill to amend Title 18, U.S. Code, with respect to the admissibility in evidence of confessions.

Senator, I have looked at several major cases which were committed recently in our city. Frankly, I could cite many, many cases of this nature. We've found that the Supreme Court rulings have caused us considerable hardship in preparing cases for Court. They have not only tied our hands in readying a case for Court, but burdened us in that three or four days are now required to prepare a case. In many instances, the suspects have gone free, when we knew they were guilty.

It is my personal feeling as a veteran law officer with 37 years' service, 26 as Chief of Police, that the Supreme Court rulings have hindered law enforcement far more than anything that I can recall during my long career. The demonstrations by the youth on the Civil Rights issues were the beginning of crime increase in our nation. In addition to this, the Supreme Court rulings have added a "stumbling block" to the enforcement of law and order in our present day society.

Very truly yours,
L. J. CAMPBELL,
Chief of Police.

Attachment.

RECENT U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISIONS AFFECTING LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT

It is our opinion that the recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions in the "Miranda Case" have hindered law enforcement. The Supreme Court should give thought to the rights of law-abiding citizens as well as the undesirables. Under presently-existing conditions, the law-abiding citizens, who are victims of rape, murder, and other type crimes, have no rights. The Supreme Court has leaned over so far that they have fallen off the cliff in favor of the criminals, in guaranteeing them of their personal rights.

CASE ILLUSTRATION NO. 1

A subject was apprehended running from a resident yard at 2:00 a.m. The residence had been burglarized. This subject was warned of his rights, that anything he said could be used against him in Court, that he had the right to engage an attorney before answering questions, and, if he could not financially afford one, the Court would appoint one, without cost. This *hardened criminal* was allowed to go free as he refused to answer any questions. The owner of this residence was unable to identify subject.

CASE ILLUSTRATION NO. 2

The Crystal Linen Service, 803 Main Street, this City, was entered on Christmas Day, 1966. The owner came by his business at which time two burglars ran out the back door. The owner could only describe them as two white males. The police apprehended two men, one fleeing approximately two blocks from the business, who was later identified as one Kenneth Chapman. He refused to answer any questions, giving only the name of Bill Spivey, which was false. During his incarceration (bond was set, but he was unable to make it), a report of his fingerprints was received, indicating that he was an escaped prisoner from the State of Georgia, where he was serving twelve years for bank robbery.

Subject #2 in this case, one Walter Turner, refused to make any statement and demanded an attorney. After getting his prints off to the Bureau in Washington and a report therefrom, he had been released on bond, and it was learned that he was wanted for parole violation. As of this date, the subject is still at large. His car was found less than a block from the Crystal Linen Service with a complete set of burglary tools in it. The car was properly registered to Walter Turner of Georgia. He was indicted in this city for possession of burglary tools. These two subjects had entered this business establishment, moved the safe to the rear of the building where they were performing a "peel" job, and was surprised by the owner. They did not enter the safe.

This case was marked "cleared" by the arrest of Chapman. His attorney advised him that, through the Police Department returning him to Georgia with no prosecution on this end, we were able to clear this case. Through advice of his attorney, he reenacted the crime for us, so there is no doubt concerning this crime.

CASE ILLUSTRATION NO. 3

A man died and an autopsy was performed to ascertain the cause of death. Findings revealed poisoning. During the investigation, it was revealed that his wife had taken out a $5,000 life insurance policy on subject several months prior to death. The wife was brought to headquarters for questioning, but prior to leaving home she called her attorney who met her at headquarters. On the very first question, in the presence of her attorney, she was asked, "can you tell us about your husband having been poisoned;" and this concluded the interrogation. The case is still unsolved.

I could, without any difficulty, cite many other cases where the "Miranda Case" has hindered law enforcement. Since this decision by the U.S. Supreme Court, cases that usually took one day to investigate, now take three to four days.

DRAPER POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Draper, N.C., February 28, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

SIR: As one who has been in law enforcement work for seventeen years, I wish to protest the U.S. Supreme Court Decisions affecting local law enforcement.

The Miranda decision has practically paralyzed the Police Departments' efforts to make an honest investigation and is an insult to American intelligence.

Anything that can be done to relieve this situation and allow the Police Departments to help make our Country a safer place for honest God-fearing citizens, will be appreciated.

Yours very truly,
WILLIE H. ADKINS,
Chief of Police, Town of Draper, Draper, N.C.

MONMOUTH COUNTY POLICE CHIEFS
ASSOCIATION, INC., OF NEW JERSEY,
February 27, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: Our Association wishes to advise that we are entirely in accord with your expressions and actions relative to the hearings to be held by the United States Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, March 7, 8 and 9, 1967 regarding U.S. Supreme Court decisions affecting local law enforcement.

We forward this communication to you for use at said hearings as we would like our position noted on the record. We greatly respect all laws of our country but feel that recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions have adversely affected the ability of local law enforcement agencies to fulfill their responsibilities, to the greatest degree possible.

We respect and protect the rights of all citizens but do not feel that the public's welfare should be jeopardized by unreasonable legislation or judicial interpretation that unreasonably hampers law enforcement activities.

We feel that the degree of limitation as to the obtaining of confessions should be specifically delineated in legislation so that investigative procedures by law enforcement agencies would grant unto such agencies the ability to interrogate suspects in such latitude to protect everyone's interest and to still have justice preserved.

The broad spectrum of recent court decisions, including the Miranda case goes, we feel, beyond reasonable limitations and does in many instances create situations which are adverse to the public's best interests.

We trust that our experience and our views based thereon, will be of aid concerning this vital issue.

Respectfully yours,
MONMOUTH COUNTY POLICE CHIEFS
ASSOCIATION OF NEW JERSEY,
FRANCIS M. SCALLY, *President.*

DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,
Grand Forks, N. Dak., February 18, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We, in law enforcement, are sincerely interested in the recent Supreme Court decisions affecting law enforcement over the nation. Most people fail to realize that law enforcement is the first line of defense of our nation and unless we are able to do the task assigned, then, certainly we all must fail.

Today's youngsters are losing their respect for law enforcement and the courts because of the conditions imposed upon law enforcement and on the ability to handle juveniles with dispatch and clarity.

In the past few days we have arrested one-eighteen year old and two-sixteen year old boys involved in approximately fifteen burglaries. The eighteen year old was treated as an adult and placed in jail. The two-sixteen year olds had to be turned loose to go on their way and supposedly in charge of their parents. Equal treatment is not for all this day and age.

Changes must be made to *protect* the *citizen* for he is the *forgotten person* in the United States today.

Yours for equal law enforcement with justice,
S. D. KNUTSON, N.A.,
Chief of Police.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY,
BUREAU OF POLICE, CITY OF
MOUNT VERNON, N.Y.,
March 1, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Re U.S. Senate hearing regarding U.S. Supreme Court decisions.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: I wish to congratulate you for the fine speech that you delivered before the Senate recently. As a member of the IACP and as a professional police officer since 1932, I too have expressed dismay with regard to recent United States Supreme Court Decisions which are adversely affecting the ability of local police officers to fulfill their responsibilities in combatting the ever mounting acceleration of crime.

The Court seems to prey on the victims of crime instead of safeguarding society against the vicious confirmed criminals. The Court is not even certain of its own findings in giving 5 to 4 decisions and is committed to the illogical pursuit of tenuous technicalities which it recklessly invokes to nullify the convictions of confirmed criminals. These decisions affect every city, village and hamlet.

As Inspector of Police of Mount Vernon, New York Police Department in 1953, I investigated the apprehension and conviction for murder of one Chester Lee. Thirteen years later, in 1966, as a result of the Miranda decision, a retrial disputing the statement taken by a District Attorney, resulted in the release of the defendant. I enclose a newspaper article from the New York Daily News which illustrates the case in point.

I exhort your Senate colleagues to vote favorably on your Bill S. 674 to amend Title 18, U.S. Code, with respect to the admissibility in evidence of confessions.

I also recommend the national legal use of wiretapping and eavesdropping to curb the accelerating rise of the sale of narcotics, the violation of gambling laws, the vicious felonies that terrorize our residents and homeowners and the destruction of crime syndicates.

It is time that the people support and the Legislators enact laws that favor police investigation and police action to deter the rise of crime.

Rest assured of our cooperation in all matters of mutual concern.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE F. KUMMERLE,
Commissioner of Public Safety, City of Mount Vernon, N.Y.

CITY OF BINGHAMTON, N.Y.,
February 28, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: This is in response to the memorandum forwarded to members of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc., by Mr. Quinn Tamm, Executive Director regarding Supreme Court decisions concerning the function.

I will restrict myself to one consideration only which to my knowledge I have never heard come under discussion. This is the necessity for police officers to give, what has come to be called "The Miranda Warning" to suspects.

Specifically, that this places an unfair burden on a policeman in that he is required to "educate" citizens as to their constitutions contents. Were the suspect an alien I could understand and appreciate this warning but I feel that all citizens should know the U.S. Constitution forward and backwards.

But, my main thought on this matter is that this requirement places another opportunity for corruption in an enforcement officer's hands in that he could effect the release of a defendant by failing or stating he failed to comply with this requirement.

If for no other reason I oppose this requirement.

Respectfully yours,
JOHN V. GILLEN,
Chief of Police.

ST. CLOUD, MINN.,
March 2, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Criminal Law and Procedure, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: We have recently received a letter from the Executive Director of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, which indicates that your committee will hold hearings on proposed changes in the laws of admissibility of confessions in criminal procedures. In the letter, it was indicated that you requested correspondence from members of the IACP regarding Supreme Court decisions, with emphasis on the recent Miranda decision. I would presume that you have received replys from Police Administrators throughout the country, and that some of them will be heard before your committee. As a police officer I am vitally interested in the outcome of the hearings, and more important, the possibility of remedial legislation.

We in the police profession have been plagued in recent years with adverse decisions which have allowed criminals to go free, even though guilty, and in many cases being set free before any criminal prosecution is started, simply because of a narrow Supreme Court decision. I think it is important to point out that Police officers generally agree that the rights of the accused are important, but they do not agree with the methods of the court in setting up guidelines in how these rights should be protected.

The reason for my writing to you is that I sincerely hope that not all of your witnesses are Police Chiefs or Police Commissioners of large cities. I would hope that you would talk to the Police Officer who is out doing the work. The detective or Police patrolman is much nearer the problem in many instances, than the Police administrator. The administrator will bring out statistics on the number of cases that have been lost because of the court decision, but the Police officer will be able to testify to the actual difficulties involved in attempting to remain within the law in clearing a case.

St. Cloud is not a large city, population is about 40,000, but our problems in this area are the same as those in Chicago, New York City & Los Angeles. Our crime rate is probably not as high, but when we come in contact with a suspected criminal, our procedure is the same as that in any other part of the country. You have requested specific examples of cases involving the Miranda decision. In the past week our department recovered a stolen car under circumstances that if the Miranda decision had not been made, a charge of unauthorized use of a motor vehicle would certainly been made. Due to a recent snow our officers tracked an individual to his home. He was a known car thief, but was not contacted on the nite in question. The following day he was picked up on a warrant on another charge and lodged in the County Jail. When one of our Detectives attempted to question him regarding the car theft he first advised him of his rights and the person in custody refused to talk to him. An auto theft may not seem too important in an isolated instance of this nature, but multiplied nationally it becomes a very grave problem.

A case I was involved in may, or may not be affected by the Miranda decision, even though the Miranda warning was given. I was assigned to investigate a possible violation of the National Firearms Act at a local manufacturing plant. The case involved the possession of a sawed off shotgun by one of the employees. I entered the office of the personnel manager and he, his assistant and another man were present. The personnel manager was examining the gun in question and stated that the foreman had informed him that one of the employees had the gun in the plant. Since this was a violation of the company rules, the manager explained that he had gone to the work area in question and had confiscated the gun. I questioned him for several minutes and then turned to the third man in the room, presuming him to be the foreman and asked him about the situation. It turned out that this individual was the owner of the gun and he stated that it was his and that he had modified it himself. He stated that he had brought it to the plant with the intention of showing it to another employee with the possibility of selling it to him. It was at this point that I informed him of his rights based on the Miranda decision. There is the possibility that the Government may not prosecute this individual under the National Firearms Act, but merely content themselves with collecting the tax due on the weapon. However, if the Federal District Attorney should decide to prosecute on the charge, I suppose that the possibility exists that the admissibility of the man's statements might be successfully argued by a defense attorney. This of course involves a great deal of speculation, and I am quite sure that you would be able to secure much better cases to illustrate the effects of the Miranda decision, but I did want to point out that *all* Police officers are bound by the same rules.

In closing I would like to make one more plea to have at least some of the working force of Police departments testify before your committee. Only by talking to the men directly involved, and hearing from them the number of times that they have had to abandon a sure case merely because they have not been able to question a suspect, will your committee have an opportunity to assess the real impact of these decisions.

I would like to add that the Supreme Court has had one good effect on the Police Profession. Because of the increasing demands on law enforcement, it has become incumbent on police administrators to attempt to attract highly qualified people to the careers in the Police service. Our department has become aware of the need of careful selection of qualified persons for the department. We have had a difficult time in the last few years to fill vacancies, but our Chief would rather run a man or two short, rather than hire an unqualified person for the mere sake of being at full strength.

I would like to thank you for the interest you and your committee have shown in the problems of the Police Profession. I sincerely hope that some remedial legislation will be forthcoming as a result of recommendations of your committee.

Sincerely yours,

Sgt. JAMES J. MOLINE,
Saint Cloud Police Department.

CITY OF CASPER, WYO.,
DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,
Casper, Wyo., March 1, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: I am in receipt of a letter from the International Association of Chiefs of Police in regard to your work on the Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures.

I wish to commend you in your efforts to restore some logic in the handling of statements taken from defendants and evidence obtained during investigation through interrogation. A typical case of injustice through the recent supreme court decision was in the City of Douglas, Wyoming, in 1965.

On December 27, 1965, Lynette Powell, age 16, disappeared from a home where she was babysitting. The following morning her body was found in the river and she had been stabbed twice in the chest. A short time later Richard Rogers was arrested, advised of his rights, and confessed to the murder. He showed the law enforcement officers where he had hidden the knife he had used in the stabbing of the girl and told them where he had thrown the body in the river. This case was not taken to trial because the judge ruled under the supreme court decision that no evidence could be allowed through interrogation. Richard Rogers was turned loose and never tried for the crime.

I hope through your efforts that at least common sense can be used in the handling of prisoners, and again, I want to commend you for all the work you have done to help the law enforcement profession.

Respectfully,

PAUL V. DANIGAN,
Chief, Casper Police Department.

CITY OF KNOXVILLE, TENN.,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY,
February 28, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As Chief of Police of Knoxville, Tennessee, I should like to express our sincere appreciation for your introduction of Senate Bill 674, and to assure you of our support of any legislation designed to free Law Enforcement from the shackles of recent Supreme Court decisions.

Every person with any knowledge of Law Enforcement realizes that interrogation is a necessary part of Police investigative procedure and that, in many cases, it is the only key to the solution of the crime. If we apprehend a known criminal in the vicinity of a burglary, with the loot therefrom in his possession, must we have his attorney present before we ask him how he came by that stolen property? If, because of the overwhelming circumstantial evidence against him, he confesses his guilt to the Officers bringing him to Police Headquarters, shall the court rule out his subsequent confession because his attorney was not present when he made his original admission of guilt?

We make no attempt to justify the isolated instances of abuse of Police powers in the past. In common with Law Enforcement Agencies everywhere, we guard zealously against even the appearance of such abuse. We have no "third degree"; officers interrogating suspects are very careful to offer neither threats nor promises. For many years, our State Courts have provided counsel if the defendant in a criminal trial is unable to afford an attorney.

With these policies, we are in wholehearted agreement. However, to arrest a criminal under suspicious circumstances and to be unable to even question him regarding his guilt; or to be unable to use as evidence his voluntary statement regarding that guilt is an illogical overemphasis on the constantly-increasing rights of the criminal, while totally ignoring the declining rights of his victims—the right of society as a whole to protection under the law. It is emasculation of Law Enforcement, to the point where Police and the Courts are well-nigh impotent in the performance of our sacred trust as guardians of the public safety.

We offer you the whole-hearted cooperation of this Office and of this Department, in your commendable efforts to remedy this situation.

Sincerely yours,

H. C. HUSKISSON,
Chief of Police.

CITY OF MENASHA, WIS.,
DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,
March 1, 1967.

Re Senate Hearings, bill S. 674.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: As a representative of law enforcement, I strongly support a change in the law regarding the admissibility of confessions. The quagmire produced by recent court decisions is effecting police operations because of the lack of operational guidelines.

In many circumstances, a confession is readily available from a suspect when he is confronted with facts relating to the case. The restrictions set forth in the Miranda rulings and the various interpretations given in the news media confuse everyone involved.

I am certain that no one who lives in this country wants to lose any of his rights granted under the Constitution. By the same token, a truly professional enforcement officer does not want to violate those rights.

The rights of law enforcement should also be considered and liberalized, and such legislation is long overdue.

Very truly yours,

LESTER D. CLARK,
Chief.

DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,
Danbury, Conn., February 23, 1967.

Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: First, let me tell you how happy I am that you are the Chairman of this very important Committee, also that you are such an outstanding member of the Democratic party.

It is with a deep feeling of respect and admiration for you that I ask that you do everything within your power to have S. 674, which will amend Title #18, U. S. Code, with respect to the admissibility in evidence of confessions.

All police departments are having a very difficult time in recruiting men to the departments and it is all due to the decisions which have been handed down by the Supreme Court.

With all due respect to this fine group of men, it is a general feeling that an age limit should be set for the members of this august body.

With every best wish and trust the good lord will bless you with continued health so that you can serve your country for some period of time.

Sincerely,

J. HOWARD MCGOLDRICK,
Chief of Police.

DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,
Kirkwood, Mo., February 23, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCCLELLAN: I wish to thank you very much for introducing Senate Bill 674 which would amend Title 18 of the U.S. Code.

In the face of the many recent Supreme Court decisions that directly affect the ability of the police to serve the public, it occurs to me that we need new rules such as the one that you propose. I think too that it might be nice if it could be legislated into being that our courts recognize a certain amount of error or mis-judgment on the part of police when cases are presented for adjudication. In any event, the bill that you have proposed would certainly go a long way to assist us in law enforcement.

Thank you very much.

Yours truly,
KIRKWOOD POLICE DEPARTMENT,
MAX A. DURBIN, *Chief of Police.*

CITY OF RALEIGH, N.C.,
February 22, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: I am sure that I only speak the sentiment of all law enforcement officers that we appreciate your and Senator Ervin's efforts to assist law enforcement officers to do their job. Recent Supreme Court decisions have handicapped us to some extent and the situation certainly needs clarifying. I believe that our people should have enough confidence in the great majority of their law enforcement agencies to trust them with the tools needed to do an acceptable job in protecting the lives, rights and property of those same people.

Best wishes to you and if either I or this department may serve you in any way, I assure you it shall be done to the best of our ability.

Sincerely,

TOM DAVIS,
Chief of Police.

POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Phillipsburg, N.J., February 23, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I welcome your concern of recent Supreme Court decisions. It is hard to conceive just how the Miranda Supreme Court decision has shackled the efficiency and performance of police work.

While pursuing our obligation to preserve life and property, we are in turn very concerned with the rights of every citizen, being ourselves citizens and a member of the same society.

Our concern over the known criminal element walking free in our cities and towns has caused great dismay to every policeman dedicated to his career and his obligations to the people he serves.

It is with great hope that you, Senator, will be one of the first pioneers to make this Miranda decision more flexible in the name of every American citizen who cries out for the pursuit of happiness and the absence of fear in walking the streets of our nation.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. BUDD,
Chief of Police.

CITY OF ORLANDO,
Orlando, Fla., February 23, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: We have a very timely memorandum from our Executive Director, Mr. Quinn Tamm concerning the very immature decisions made by the Supreme Court, adversely affecting Law Enforcement. These, of course, being the Mapps, Mallory, Jencks, Miranda, Escobedo and the more recent extension of the Escobedo Decision.

As a member of the Law Enforcement profession, with almost forty years experience in this field, I am truly amazed by the decisions in the above cases, along with others that have handcuffed the Police throughout our nation.

We, here in our city, have an organization of five people who have been speaking to church groups and other organizations for the past year, trying to enlighten them with the bare facts and not nebulous intangibles. It is believed that we have made some progress in this direction and we will continue to make our presentations and appearances as long as we feel that the desired and ultimate goal can be reached.

It is absolutely nauseating to see the direct result of these decisions, public apathy; complacency; and failure of our parents to assume their God Given Responsibilities. We have too many houses and not enough homes in our nation today.

Then, of course, we shouldn't overlook these so-called do-gooders who are slobbering over these "so-called unfortunate individuals" in a vain effort to find excuses for their senseless transgressions.

It is my firm belief that unless the decent law-abiding Americans, which compromise approximately ninety percent of our population, stand up and be counted as tried and true Americans, the other ten percent, which give us ninety percent of our trouble, will be dictating policies and procedures for our guidance in the future.

Maybe, Sir, my words may be a little strong, but they describe my convictions most thoroughly.

If there is anything we can do here to assist you in your wonderful undertakings, please advise.

Kindest personal regards and very best wishes.

Sincerely,

CARLISLE JOHNSTONE,
Chief of Police.

POLICE DEPARTMENT,
CITY OF NEW BOSTON, OHIO,
February 23, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Miranda decision is a great deterrent to effective law enforcement. I feel that the law-abiding citizens of our great country should be able to expect and receive better protection from those who commit crimes than the Miranda decision permits.

Respectfully yours,

RUSSELL IMES,
Chief of Police, New Boston, Ohio.

NEW JERSEY ARMORED CAR SERVICE, INC.,
Pleasantville, N.J., February 24, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: I regard with dismay recent and not so recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions which prevent law enforcement agencies from protecting us from the murderer, rapist, robber and knife wielder.

The recent release in Brooklyn, N.Y. of a confessed murderer who destroyed his wife and 5 children and walked away a free man is a case in joint. How can this be possible? Daily our newspapers carry items of criminals being set free to continue their depredations of plunder and ravage.

Please, do your best to nullify these bad U.S. Supreme Court decisions and as a member of the International Association of Chiefs of Police I can vouch that we are 100% behind you.

Respectfully yours,

ERNEST O. SCHEYDER.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, December 1966]

"PLAYING GOD": 5 TO 4—THE SUPREME COURT AND THE POLICE

(NOTE.—With this number of the Journal a practice is inaugurated of publishing editorial comments upon controversial subjects in the field of criminal law, criminology, police science, and police administration.

(Upon some occasions one of the editors, or an editorial consultant, will present an issue and express his own views upon it; at other times the initiative may come from writers not associated with the Journal. In either event an opportunity will always be afforded for responsible response. The response, however, must fall within the space confines of editorial comment.

(Following is an expression of a viewpoint by the Journal's Editor-in-Chief that will unquestionably draw opposing comment—very likely from one or more of the Journal's own editorial consultants.)

Over the past several years, wherever the Supreme Court of the United States rendered a decision that imposed a new restriction upon the police, many persons were heard to say: "If only the police, prosecuting attorneys, the organized bar, the state courts, or the legislatures had taken the initiative and done something about the situation there would have been no need for the Court to step in." To some of us this always seemed to be a naivé explanation of the motivation of a majority of the Justices.

Recent developments have established, to my satisfaction, the fact that the Court's majority has been determined all along to do its own policing of the police *regardless* of what any other group or any other branch of government might do by way of attempting to solve the law enforcement problems about which the Court has been so concerned. The Court's one man majority was going to continue to "play God". And "play God" it did in its June, 1966 decision in *Miranda v. Arizona* (384 U.S. 436).

For the past several years an American Law Institute committee, composed of lawyers, law teachers, and judges, with divergent viewpoints upon the subject, has devoted a tremendous amount of time and effort toward the formulation of a proposed tentative legislative code prescribing interrogation procedures for the police to follow. These endeavors of the American Law Institute began a year before the Court's 5 to 4 decision of June, 1964 in *Escobedo v. Illinois* (378 U.S. 478), and the tentative draft of the Committee's proposed code had been printed and disseminated at least three months before the *Miranda* decision.

As the Institute's committee was working on its project, so was a comparably composed American Bar Association Committee on Minimum Standards of Criminal Justice. One of its sub-committees had been assigned to deal specifically with the police interrogation problem and to make recommendations, and it was working closely with the Institute's committee toward that end. Its existence and activities were also known to the Court long before the *Miranda* decision.

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Criminal Justice was also deeply engaged in a study of many aspects of criminal investigation that inevitably would have produced facts and figures helpful to a full consideration of the interrogation-confession problem. And other studies were under way, such as those by the District of Columbia Crime Commission and the Georgetown Law Center. Also, the Ford Foundation had recently awarded a grant of $1,000,000, in part, for a study of arrests and confessions in New York.

Here, then, was action—in truly democratic fashion—seeking to find a proximate solution to some very difficult problems.

All of these efforts would have resulted in a full airing of the interrogation-confession problem, based upon practical as well as legal considerations. But a one man majority of the Court in *Miranda* "pulled the rug" from underneath all of these studies and research groups, and effectively foreclosed a final evaluation of their ultimate findings and recommendations. It did so by branding as unconstitutional a substantial segment of the very practices and procedures that were under consideration by these various groups. As Justice Harlan said in his dissenting opinion in *Miranda*, "the legislative reforms" that may have emanated from such group efforts "would have had the vast advantage of empirical data and comprehensive study" and "they would allow experimentation and use of solutions not open to the courts". Also in Justice Harlan's opinion, "they would restore the initiative in criminal law reform to those forums where it truly belongs."

With its *Miranda* limitations upon the validity of a suspect's waiver of the Court's newly conceived "rights" about which he must be informed, there will be many instances where police investigators are deprived of an essential means for the solution of a substantial percentage of the serious crimes that now plague this country. Only by a deliberate evasion of the *Miranda* rules might the police prevent this consequence; and this they should not do! Legally, as well as morally, the police have no alternative but full and good Latin compliance. Whatever deleterious effects their compliance may bring with respect to the safety and security of law abiding citizens do not constitute a responsibility with which they should concern themselves. To use the words of one of the Supreme Court Justices in another context, "There are others who must shoulder much of that responsibility".

Considering the complexity of the interrogation-confession problem, a summary 5 to 4 nullification of much of the aforementioned group efforts directed toward the preparation of legislative guidelines is awesomely inconsistent with fundamental democratic concepts.

It's more like "Playing God: 5 to 4".

FRED E. INBAU,
Editor-in-Chief.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Arkansas for his excellent, thought-provoking speech on the problem which confronts the people of the United States more than any other except that of Vietnam. This matter demands some remedy against the abuses that are being practiced by the many individuals who defy law and order.

I think it must be said that encouragement has been given to them because of the breakdown of our legal processes resulting primarily from the decisions of the Supreme Court, so excellently discussed by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank my distinguished colleague.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I wish to join the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Arkansas in calling this matter to the attention of the Senate, and I hope that at an early date this Congress will enact some remedial legislation which will protect the innocent as well as give protection to the accused.

The members of the Supreme Court, who were so zealous in trying to protect the constitutional rights of these criminals, should also be reminded that each of these criminals has destroyed the constitutional rights of a law-abiding American citizen.

Mr. McCLELLAN. To be safe in his home, in the streets, and in his place of business.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is a constitutional right that certainly is equal to all the so-called civil rights of any individual. He should have equal consideration.

In conclusion, I should like to remind Senators that the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures of the Committee on the Judiciary will begin a series of hearings tomorrow, and we earnestly invite each Member to give thought and consideration to the problem that is confronting us, and we solicit from them every counsel and any contribution they feel they can possibly make toward a solution of this problem.

COST-PRICE SQUEEZE TIGHTENS ON KANSAS WHEATGROWERS AND CATTLEMEN

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, Kansas wheatgrowers and cattlemen have been experiencing an ever-tightening cost-price squeeze which has been of several months' duration.

In a period when the Government encourages production, when our foodstuffs are needed to still starvation in many parts of the world, the genius of America's farm production experiences price declines while cost increases. Labor, machinery, and land costs are all up.

It has been written that bankers in some farm communities are reporting a strong demand still for credit to buy machinery and land, and even to provide for the cost of living.

In the drought conditions which affect the wheatgrowers of Kansas—indeed, it is said that only the eastern part of Kansas now shows the green of the winter wheat which was planted late last fall—reports of farmers plowing under wheat acreage to bring supply-demand more in line may be premature. For the truth of the matter is, Mr. President, that the Kansas wheat producers do not revolt nor do the Kansas cattlemen go on strike as the press so often characterizes their concern. Yet the situation today approaches the point of a farm economy crisis.

Mr. Ray Frisbee, president of the Kansas Farm Bureau Federation, recently stated:

> The economic scale is terrifyingly out of balance . . . farmers have got to have more for their produce or there is going to be a deterioration of agriculture which could affect this nation's economy.

I am advised that the following is the wheat situation in Kansas: last year at harvesttime, wheat was $1.86 a bushel, and in the anticipation that it would rise to $2 a bushel, many producers and growers sought to hold out until the market went up. The situation, instead, was that the market went down; and as the producers waited, the price dropped further, and last week the price had fallen to $1.47 a bushel. Perhaps this discipline on the part of the farmer is having some effect, because last week, for the first time in 8 months, the price of wheat in Kansas markets went up after the low of 2 weeks ago.

Under these circumstances, it is a matter of great concern that the Secretary of Agriculture, who previously seemed so confident of his plans and farm policies, can now only be quoted as saying that the Government is "exploring every possible avenue" to halt the price slide.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PEARSON. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 4 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PEARSON. I would suggest that one of the avenues that the Secretary should explore to the fullest possible extent and as soon as possible is that of how to correct the image which has developed over the past 12 to 18 months that the administration is committed to a policy of keeping the lid on farm prices and, in fact, is quite willing to pursue those actions which will depress farm prices.

On February 23 I wrote to Secretary Freeman, asking for his explanation of the drastic drop in wheat prices over the past 8 months. His reply, in a letter of March 3, stated:

> The decline from wheat prices quoted last summer has been attributed to a reduction in speculative activity, and the prospect of an increased world production of wheat.

Mr. President, I have quoted only part of the letter. I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary's entire letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, March 3, 1967.

Hon. JAMES B. PEARSON,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your letter of February 23 concerning a drop in wheat prices in Kansas and suggesting advance distribution of the 1967 wheat certificate payments. I, too, am concerned with farm prices weakening, costs rising, and agriculture in general still a long way from parity of income.

Commodity prices are determined by many factors. The marketing factors bringing about the decline from the wheat prices quoted late last summer have been attributed to a reduction in speculative activity, and the prospect of an increased world production of wheat. Last week the wheat market showed a considerable strengthening in cash prices and futures. We now have a free market in action. Reduction of stocks has created a greater flexibility in market prices and wider price fluctuations are being experienced more than during the years of burdensome stocks when market prices closely paralleled loan rates. The market is now more independent of government pricing than at any time in more than 30 years.

We have not made advance payments under the wheat program because the time between signup and final payment has been relatively short. Funds have not been included in the current fiscal year budget. We are studying the possibility of making our payments somewhat earlier than last year, including some payment before June 30, but we cannot be sure we will be able to do it.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I would suggest that the price rise last summer occurred partly because the Department of Agriculture had considerably underestimated world wheat production. The decline in what prices then began after the Department's report in late fall that world production would be at an alltime record high, and shortly after the Department had called for an additional increase in domestic wheat acreage of 15 percent. Furthermore, about this time reports began to circulate that wheat shipments under the Public Law 480 program were to be cut by at least 25 percent.

Mr. President, I do not suggest that the earlier miscalculations about the size of the world wheat crop were deliberate on the part of the Department of Agriculture. However, the fact remains that the Johnson administration during the first part of 1966 had taken a whole series of actions designed to freeze or roll back farm prices. These earlier actions, combined with the call for an increase in wheat acreage of 32 percent, plus the curtailment of wheat exports, have had the effect of creating the distinct impression that the administration would not allow open market farm prices to achieve a level that provides fair and honest return to the American family farmer.

The current farm price situation is unjustified and intolerable. One cannot help continuing to wonder at the paradox of abundance in America and starvation abroad while the genius of American farm technology is being rewarded only by a decreasing compensation.

REVISION OF THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, over the weekend President Johnson released the report of the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service. It is an event of high significance.

For the report is an insistent call to Congress for action. It spotlights the inequities plaguing our present system of Selective Service, and then makes sound recommendations for their elimination. We in the Congress cannot tolerate the continuance of these inequities in a system charged with heavy responsibility of choosing some few who will bear the risk of bearing arms from among the many who will not. The report calls for action, and act we must: the induction authority under the Universal Military Training and Service Act expires this June 30.

When we do act, we must construct a system as just, as fair, and as equitable as possible. Our system must be flexible, to meet changing manpower needs of the military. And it must be predictable, to allow our young men to plan their lives free from draft-eligible years of uncertainty.

The Commission's recommendations go far toward meeting these goals. They give us a sound framework within which our work can proceed. The Chairman of the Commission, former Attorney General Burke Marshall, deserves the thanks of every one of us in this Chamber for the Report he guided to completion.

Our newspapers, reflecting the intense concern generated by the prospect of draft reform, have given the report thorough coverage. They have as well made many constructive analyses of the problems the draft reform proposals face. I ask unanimous consent that several of these articles and editorials be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Globe, Mar. 5, 1967]

DRAFT REPORT URGES: END STUDENT DEFERMENTS

(By Martin Nolan)

WASHINGTON.—A presidential advisory commission has called for the abolition of all student draft deferments as part of its plan for revamping the Selective Service System.

The 21-member commission, which has examined the draft since July, released its findings Saturday in a 218-page report called "In Pursuit of Equity: Who Serves When Not All Serve?"

President Johnson is expected to incorporate many of the commission's findings in his message to Congress next week. The draft law expires July 1 and presumably a new law will take effect this Summer.

The commission was headed by former Assistant Attorney General Burke Marshall, now general counsel of I.B.M. Six college teachers or administrators were members of the group, along with businessmen, labor leaders, and four former Pentagon officials.

Besides calling for an end to "further student or occupational deferments," the commission urged the reversal of drafting oldest men first to a policy of drafting youngest men first, beginning at age 19.

It also proposed a lottery, which it defined as "an order of call which has been impartially and randomly determined," as well as procedural changes within the Selective Service System itself to reduce the autonomy of local draft boards and to make standards for induction more uniform.

The commission also urged the armed services to make more use of women volunteers and to tighten standards for enlistment in the National Guard and Reserves.

Most of the reforms had been urged by Sen. Edward M. Kennedy in speeches a year ago, as well as by Pentagon studies and other reports on the nation's draft system.

But the far-reaching changes involving students are the most controversial aspects of the report. These recommendations may ignite a debate on the draft as widespread as that accompanying the reintroduction of peacetime conscription 20 years ago.

The commission report admitted that the abolition of student deferments had caused the deepest division within the commission during its seven months of work.

"No issue received such prolonged and thorough deliberation," the report said. "Only on this issue did the commission contain a substantial division of opinion."

Both sides agreed on one thing concerning deferments, that they "should never be allowed to become, in effect, exemptions".

"All members agreed that one of the gravest inequities in the present system is that what starts out as a temporary deferment for college enrollment is easily extended into a de facto exemption—by graduate school, by occupation, by fatherhood, and ultimately by the passage of time and advance of age."

The report cited statistics showing that of men between 27 and 34, only 27 per cent of those who went to graduate school have seen any military service. Of those whose education stopped at high school, 74 per cent wore uniforms.

In this age bracket, 70 percent of those who finished college have served, the same percentage as high-school dropouts.

College dropouts in this age category had a rate of 68 per cent in uniform. At the other end of the educational spectrum, 41 per cent of those with eight grade or lower educational level have served.

MAJORITY VIEWPOINT

The majority viewpoint noted the effects of the new GI Bill, which rewards veterans with a chance for college, and said that "the educational processes would not be harmed, and indeed may well be strengthened, by the abolishment of student deferments."

The minority argument was the same as that advanced by Sen. Kennedy last week, that deferments "be continued through the baccalaureate degree," i.e., at least four years.

Yale President Kingman Brewster Jr., a member of the commission, was one of the first to call attention to the inequity of college students and the military when he referred last year to the ability of collegians "to hide in the endless catacombs of formal education."

In a New York speech Friday, Brewster also spoke with favor of a "break" between high school and college to aid young men's maturity.

All commission members agreed that the "endless catacombs" of graduate school would be sealed up.

OFFICER SHORTAGE?

One of the minority's objections, that absence of deferments would create an officer shortage, was answered in one of the four exceptions to the no-deferment policy: "Men who undertake officer training programs in college should be deferred, provided they commit to serve in the Armed Forces as enlisted men if they do not complete their officer programs."

Another exception covered "hardship deferments, which defy rigid classification, but which must be judged realistically on individual merits." Local boards would do the judging.

Also, college students whose number came up in the lottery "would be permitted to finish their sophomore year before induction."

The fourth exemption provided for a phase-out of the present system, allowing those in school or in apprentice training "to complete the degrees or programs for which they are candidates. Upon termination of those deferments, they will be entered into the random selection pool with that year's 18-year-olds."

The majority based its stand on total abolition of deferments on the war in Vietnam. "A chance to postpone service right now might mean the difference betwen the obligation to serve in a shooting war and the possibility of serving later when the war might have come to an end.

SPOTLIGHTED BY WAR

The report's introduction said that the draft was "floodlighted today by the war in Vietnam. The echo of American battle fire impels, as it always should, the hard probe for better solutions.

The war was also cited in rejecting the "National service" concept proposed by Defense Secretary McNamara last May. "No fair way exists to equate voluntary service programs with military service," the report said.

The report also rejected an all-volunteer army as an inflexible means of obtaining military manpower in an emergency. It added that "some members of the commission see unfortunate social consequences in an all-volunteer military force sustained only by financial incentive . . . a mercenary force unrepresentative of the nation."

The commission's advocacy of a lottery involved no specifics, saying only that "the computer and the fishbowl are two that have been suggested." It did recommend that the "order of call could be done once a year, or at more frequent intervals if found practicable."

"Men would be called for induction in the order determined. Every man in the eligible pool would know where he stood on the list."

IMPARTIAL METHOD

The commission based its arguments for a lottery on population figures showing two million men reaching 18 every year, of whom the draft requires between 100,000 and 300,000. The random-selection process, it said, is "as impartial a manner as can be devised." The system would require a full year of "maximum vulnerability" to the draft. Of the expected 1.5 million men in the pool (after immediate physical examinations had rejected some 500,000), beefed-up and more glamorous recruitment programs would lure some 450,000 men, the commission said. This would leave 150,000 men who "could be sure of being drafted at some point during the year."

But because many of the 150,000 chosen would enlist in other services, "many men immediately below the first 150,000 would also expect to be drafted."

Those at the bottom of the order that year would be safe while those in the middle of the 1.5 million pool "might have some uncertainty about their situation for the duration of the year."

After the year, however, all "would retain a diminishing vulnerability to the draft until they reached 26," barring a larger war.

The commission devoted much of its report to internal reforms with the 27-year-old Selective Service System, taking away much of the power of the 4000 local boards and saying that it urged "the rule of law to replace the rule of discretion."

Although calling for pay raises for the clerks of the local boards, it urged new faces on the boards themselves. Noting that the average age of board members was 58, it also pointed out that 12 members are over 90, 400 over 80 and that one-fifth of all local board members are over 70 years old.

The commission reproduced questionnaires showing that some boards consider college students more important than fathers and vice versa, showing a haphazard pattern of equity.

NEW BOARDS

It called for changes in appointing new boards including a maximum retirement age, a maximum of five years' service, the eligibility of women to serve on the boards and changing "their composition to represent all elements of the public they serve."

Most board members, even in Negro areas, are white and most are professional men or white-collar workers even in areas where most of the registrants are from lower-income classes.

The commission concluded that the doctors' and dentists' drafts would have to continue despite the "double jeopardy" such men who had already served at age 19 might face. The new draft system would compensate for this, the commission said, by placing veterans at the bottom of the induction list when drafting doctors and dentists.

[From the Boston Globe, Mar. 5, 1967]

STUDENTS PREFER LOTTERY

(By Jeremiah V. Murphy)

Greater Boston college students viewed with mixed reactions Saturday the changes proposed by the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service.

A survey at Harvard, Boston College and Boston University revealed one point of agreement—the need for changes in the existing draft laws.

Most students felt that a lottery system would be fairer, would not discriminate against young men with neither the financial nor intellectual ability to attend college and thus be deferred from military service.

Several others said the lottery leaves "too much to chance."

One Harvard student said, "I don't like the idea of my life being used up, perhaps by a name being pulled out of a hat."

Following are student reactions:

Andrew Effron, 18, of Poughkeepsie, N.Y., a Harvard freshman—"I think they should abolish student deferments altogether. The lottery should start the year a student gets out of high school. The way things are now, the draft is keyed on a social class level. Some fellows can't afford college or don't have the educational background. Today they're drafted. It is not fair."

Philip Boswell, 17, of Washington, Harvard freshman—"A lottery would be more moral, but student deferments are more practical. The lottery is much fairer to everyone. Generally, I would favor the new proposals."

Robert Mintz, 18, of Burbank, Calif., Harvard freshman—"Improvements in the draft law are necessary, but I don't like the lottery idea—too much hit or miss. I do not like the idea of my life being used up, perhaps, by a name being pulled out of a hat. We need a more rational system, but it is difficult to decide who should be killed and who should live. The existing system is unfair to those who can't go to college."

Mrs. Pamela Salvatore, 23, of Milbrae, Calif., Harvard graduate student—"It is an improvement over our present system, but I don't think it is the total answer."

Stephen Ryack, 24, Brookline, University of Chicago student at Harvard—"The plan is unfair, because the country needs to maintain its leadership. I think the whole proposal is misdirected. Would be better if we used all our resources to eliminate reasons for the need for a draft."

Robert Wood Jr., 19, Harvard sophomore—"I don't think a lottery would be fair . . . too much left to chance, random."

Edward Jakush, 21, of Chicago, M.I.T. senior—"A lottery system would be cruel. You'd never know who is going to get drafted. You'd take people for military service who have no particular qualifications. It would be square pegs in round holes."

Michael Pabts, 21, of Milwaukee, Boston College senior—"The new plan is short sighted. I'm willing to serve but I think I would be more valuable after I finish school when I am a biochemist. The plan would be a waste of talent for idealistic reasons."

William Brobowski, 21, of Norwich, Ct., Boston College senior—"I wouldn't want to see student deferments abolished, but a lottery would be more democratic."

William Schoenfield, 21, of Bradford, Boston College senior—"I am in favor of military training for everyone. With a lottery, some people—with luck—wouldn't serve."

Julian Podbereski, 19, of Toronto, Boston University sophomore "I am a pacifist, so I am opposed to the draft in any form, but I think a lottery would be fairer. It would not discriminate against those not in college."

Emily Hassen, 20, of New York, Boston University junior—"It would be a better system, because everyone would have an equal opportunity to serve. Student deferments are unfair to those who can't afford to go to college."

Warren Cohen, 23, of Newton, Boston University graduate student—"The new plan is a good idea. Gets them when they are young, easier to train."

[From the Boston Globe, March 5, 1967]

THE REACTION: "EXCELLENT JOB" . . . "OVERDUE"

(By Richard J. Connolly)

Proposals by President Johnson's National Advisory Commission on Selective Service stirred a wave of reaction among educators, government officials and civil rights activists Saturday night.

Sen. Edward M. Kennedy hailed the commission's study as "an excellent job, pointing up the inequities" of the draft system.

"There can be little question that the present system is uncertain, unfair and unjust because of its crazy-quilt pattern of deferments, its geographical disparities and its inherent lack of predictability," he said.

He had called for the basic reforms in a Senate resolution last week.

John C. Carr, state selective service director, said, "I wouldn't be at all unhappy if no changes are made at all.

"It's impossible to eliminate inequalities entirely. I think the present system has smoothed out many of the possible inequities."

He said a proposal to grant deferments only to college students in technical fields would appear to discriminate against students with a liberal arts talent.

He added, however, that any of the programs proposed by the commission would be easy to administer if they become law.

The commission's recommendations regarding student deferments prompted Staton Curtis, dean of students at Boston University, to point out that students have had an almost blanket deferment.

"I would certainly favor revision of the draft which would eliminate this inequity because I think the college student, under the present system, has enjoyed a kind of preferential treatment which is thereby an inequity," Curtis said.

If there is a proposal for revision of the draft system, which would tend to eliminate or minimize this inequity, I'd be in favor of it. College students themselves are quite aware of this inequity."

Dr. Asa S. Knowles, president of Northeastern University, said there are many inequities in the draft and a revision is long overdue.

"I'll be happy to see the report of the commission, this should bring greater equity. It's a complicated question and should be carefully studied."

He added that all inequities could not be removed until everyone is drafted.

Very Rev. Michael P. Walsh, president of Boston College, said that perhaps the draft has been unfair in allowing total de facto exemptions.

"But I think it would be unwise not to defer students. There is a broader need in this country than defense. We still need scientists, engineers and medical personnel."

Even in World War II and the Korean War, he pointed out, students in particular fields were deferred.

Dean Harold L. Hazen of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Graduate School said education up to the top level is the only way for the country to develop foundations for leadership.

"The question is whether our society can afford, statistically speaking, to dispense with a significant fraction of such people," he added.

He said the subject dealt with a basic philosophy involving the wise use of manpower, the contributions of leadership by specially qualified in the fields of medicine, science and engineering.

Bob Eubanks, co-chairman of Afro-Americans Against the War in Vietnam, said, "It comes as no surprise that they would admit that an inequity against Blacks exists, but it will take a complete change and overhaul of the draft system to change it."

His group sponsored a "funeral march" Saturday through Roxbury to "mourn the deaths of 2,500 black men in Vietnam."

"More blacks are always going to be drafted than whites under the present system," he said, "because of their lower education and lack of the kind of jobs that would give them a deferment.

"The main thing is not that more blacks are being drafted than whites, but that blacks have nothing to fight for in Vietnam in the first place."

Local Draft Boards Would Be Dropped

San Antonio, Tex.—The nation's 4,100 local draft boards—survivors of a century-old concept of having men chosen by their own neighbors for military service—would go out of business under proposals by President Johnson's Selective Service Advisory Commission.

The boards would be replaced by 300 to 500 "area offices," operated by hired personnel who would register and classify youths for induction under "clear and binding" national standards. The local boards are run by volunteers operating under standards which vary from place to place.

There still would be volunteer "local boards"—but only 300 to 500 of them, working in conjunction with the area offices and limited to hearing appeals from inductees. They would be the first court of appeal.

Instead of the 50 state offices which now exist, there would be 8 regional offices, where regional appeal boards as well as administrative functions would be housed, and the national headquarters, with its presidential appeal board would remain as presently constituted.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 5, 1967]

Presidential Unit Asks Draft by Lot of 19-Year-Olds—Panel Urges Youngest of All Eligibles Be Called First, With Few Exemptions—No Student Deferment—More Uniformity Proposed—Negro "Inequities" Noted—White House Pleased

(By Max Frankel)

San Antonio, Tex., March 4.—A radical reorganization of the military draft, altering the methods and standards of selection, has been proposed to President Johnson by the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service.

The panel, which was appointed by the President, calls for a virtual lottery among eligible 19-year-olds, which would work impartially throughout the country and determine a young man's fate at an early stage of his career. It would also replace the nation's 4,100 neighborhood draft boards with no more than 500 area centers applying uniform policies of classification and appeal.

The Texas White House published today the commission's plan, which was also released in Washington, with evident enthusiasm but without formal comment. The President is expected to endorse most of the recommendations in a special message on Monday, inviting Congress to help arrange their gradual adoption.

After an exhaustive seven-month study, the select commission concluded that the youngest of all qualified men should be drafted first, starting at age 19, and that they should be summoned in a random and impartial order, in effect, by lot.

EXEMPTION CHANCES IMPROVE

However, fewer than half of these men would be needed by the armed services, even in a sizable war such as that in Vietnam. The rest, having escaped call-up in their period of "maximum vulnerability," would therefore become virtually exempt, more certainly so with each passing year as ever larger groups of younger men were enrolled.

The commission also called special attention to what it called the Negro's "inequitable" status, partly reflecting social and economic injustice, and perhaps, it hinted, more direct discrimination in the selection of fewer Negroes as officer and technical trainees.

A majority of the commission urged the abolition of almost all student and occupational deferments so as to subject nearly all physically and mentally fit 19-year-olds to one simultaneous risk of induction.

But a substantial minority, seven or eight of the 20 commission members, favored continued deferments for undergraduate study, provided that the beneficiaries were required, upon graduation, to expose themselves to random selection with the next group of 19-year-olds.

The majority, officials indicated, was led in this argument by the commission chairman, Burke Marshall, former Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, who is now vice president and general counsel of the International Business Machines Corporation.

REEDY HEADS MINORITY

The minority forces are said to have been led by George E. Reedy Jr., President Johnson's former press secretary, who is now President of the Struthers Research and Development Corporation.

The panel differed from a civilian advisory group on the draft appointed by Congress. This committee, whose recommendations to the House Armed Services Committee were released this morning, called for severe measures against draft evaders and draft card burners, and found the Selective Service Law basically fair.

All the members of the Presidential commission agreed that too many students had parlayed deferments into exemptions, and they urged strict safeguards against "one of the gravest inequities in the present system." They advised against deferments for most graduate students.

The unanimous recommendations also included the following:

That men eligible for the draft should not gain immunity by direct enlistment in the Reserves or National Guard.

That possible shortages in the Reserves or Guard be filled by the draft, with the same random selection system.

That the need for draftees be reduced by creating more military jobs for the surplus of women volunteers and by developing programs to train men who volunteer but do not meet induction standards.

That policies toward aliens be modified to exempt tourists and other temporary visitors and give immigrants time to adjust.

That study begin at once on the feasibility of an "ideal" peacetime system that would let all drafted men decide when, between the ages of 19 and 23, they wish to serve.

Some of the commission's most far-reaching proposals, including random selection, the drafting of younger men first and the abolition of most deferments, could be decreed by Executive order of the President without new legislation.

EXECUTIVE ORDERS SUGGESTED

The Selective Service Act, which expires in June, would be renewed under the commission's plan for four years, with the same flexibility for the President. It would be altered, however, to "consolidate" the system under more centralized administration, to make new regional appeal boards more representative of different population groups and to provide equitable appeal procedures.

The commission met for more than 100 hours and read hundreds of reports on the views of all major organizations and manpower experts, students and Cabinet officials, all 50 Governors and many Mayors. It studied the need for the draft and all proposed variants and known consequences thereof.

It began with these central facts—that about two million men will reach draft age in the coming years, three-fourths of whom will qualify under current standards; that of that 1.5 million, only 600,000 to one million will be needed; and of these, only between 100,000 and 300,000 may have to be drafted. Then it asked how they should be chosen.

Raising standards or expanding deferments, the commission decided, will only promote "harmful and undesirable" injustices. It decided that the drafting of older men first, as at present, would leave all men in uncertainty for many years and impose unequal risks of selection.

Accordingly, it suggested a complete reversal of concept. It proposed the universal testing of all young men, for social as well as draft purposes, soon after they registered at the age of 18. Soon thereafter, those found physically and mentally eligible for the draft pool would be ranked at random in an order of call, a list from which the Defense Department would draw the needed number when they turned 19.

Whether the random ranking should be done by computer or by the drawing of numbers from a fishbowl, according to registration numbers, birth dates or otherwise, must be determined by special studies, the report said.

In addition, the report asked for a total overhaul of the Selective Service administration. Though restrained in its language, the panel was highly critical of the existing structure, which it portrayed as diffuse, inefficient, often arbitrary and indifferent to the rights and needs of the registrants and society.

Top officials in the system are "heavily oriented toward the military," the commission said. Local board members, it found, are all male, mostly veterans and white-collar workers and almost exclusively white—96.3 per cent, with only 1.3 per cent Negro members. The average age is 58, with 20 per cent over 70.

The commission would create a centralized system built around eight regional centers directing the work of 300 to 500 area centers. It would install modern data handling equipment and synchronize all policies.

Attached to each center, but independent of it, would be appeal boards of volunteer citizens representing all elements of the public, serving five-year terms on Presidential appointment, allowing a month for appeal, recording decisions in writing and assisting the appellant in every way.

The percentage of Negroes qualified for service is considerably smaller than that of whites, the report said. Yet 30.2 per cent of the qualified Negroes are drafted, against only 13.8 per cent of the qualified whites.

Fewer Negroes get into Reserve and officer training programs, it was found. Fewer Negroes in the Army get jobs requiring technical skills, thus leaving the path to an infantry division as "the only one entirely open."

FEWER NEGROES CHOSEN

Though the over-all proportion of all Negro enlisted men in Vietnam is only 11 per cent, the report said, their percentage in Army units there is 14.5 per cent, their representation in combat units is appreciably higher still and they account for 22.4 per cent of all Army troops killed in action.

Nonetheless, the commission rejected the idea of using the compulsory draft for the "worthwhile objectives" of rehabilitating the millions of men who are being rejected for educational or health deficiencies—700,000 in the fiscal year 1966 and five million men between those now aged 18½ and 34.

This, the report said, is a "national shame" and "threat to the national security," the report said, but a system of universal training to promote fitness, training, discipline and patriotism, it added, cannot be justified on the grounds of military need and should therefore be attacked by other means.

The commission also rejected the elimination of the draft and the total reliance on volunteers, above all because this would rob the nation of a flexible system capable of rapid mobilization in crisis.

Also rejected were the many proposals for compulsory national service of some kind, such as in the Peace Corps abroad or in Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) at home, or for voluntary service as an alternative to military duty. These pose difficult policy and constitutional issues, the commission said.

Moreover, it could find no fair way of equating civilian with military service. It questioned the quality of volunteer programs that became draft alternatives and recommended the rigid separation of programs on military as opposed to educational and social needs.

After a side study, the commission voted to stand by the existing rules for conscientious objectors, recognized only if they are morally opposed to war in all forms, not just a particular war.

One or two commission members supported the idea of permitting a so-called "selective pacifism," but the majority thought this was essentially a political rather than a moral expression that ought to be channeled through the recognized political processes.

By far the most prolonged and thorough debate inside the commission dealt with student deferments.

The majority concluded that the inequity of giving students a special privilege had been compounded by the administrative inequities invited by a system of discretionary student deferment. The system was said to have bred cynicism about military service and education.

ALTERNATE SYSTEMS SEEN

The dominant view held that educational processes would not be harmed by an end of deferments. It expressed confidence that the armed forces, which draw about 80 per cent of their new officers from the colleges, could develop alternate recruiting systems.

The majority would not cancel the deferments of students who were already enrolled for degrees when the system change occurred. But thereafter, it would defer only to the end of the sophomore year those students already at college whose order of call was randomly determined at age 18. Full student deferments would be offered only to men in officer programs bound by contract to serve as officers, or as enlisted men in case of default.

The minority, concerned about the military need for officers and by the general need for physicians and dentists, favored deferments for students in a "serious" college undertaking and for medical students in professional school provided they accepted an irrevocable commitment for eventual military service.

The Johnson Administration's enthusiasm for the report and admiration for the manner in which it was compiled were evident from comments by staff members and the care with which it was released.

Also, the unusual release of the report just two days before the President's own statement on the subject suggested that he was willing to give the report's release precedence and welcome a comparison of his proposals with those of the commission.

The concept of drafting younger men first has won almost universal favor. It has long been pressed by the Defense Department and was endorsed by the special study commissioned by the House Armed Services Committee, conducted by Gen. Mark Clark, retired. But that study favored most college deferments, except for "noncritical" graduate students, and rejected random selection.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara is on record favoring a lottery of some kind and Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Democrat of Massachusetts, anticipated this and most of the other major recommendations of the National Advisory Commission in a resolution he submitted to the Senate. Mr. Marshall, the commission chairman, is a close friend of the Kennedy family.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 5, 1967]

CALL-UP TIME IS NEAR FOR DRAFT REVISION

(By John Herbers)

WASHINGTON, March 4.—"It seems to me," a 24-year-old soldier wrote Senator Edward M. Kennedy from Thailand, "that society demands the young men of our era to somehow accomplish three objectives between his 18th and 25th birthdays.

"He is supposed to attain a position of security in life; he is supposed to defend his country; and he is supposed to get married."

The soldier then went on to enumerate in detail the conflicts and confusion that a young man encounters in trying to achieve all three. He ended with a plea for the Government to help by straightening out the military draft.

What to do about the draft is causing almost as much perplexity for the Government as the young man encounters in trying to accommodate to a system that is now widely acknowledged to be outdated, frequently unfair and an inefficient use of manpower.

RELUCTANT CONGRESS

Congress has been reluctant to come to grips with these problems, even though they have been accumulating over a period of years. The present draft law was renewed for four years in 1963 without study or debate.

But now both Congress and the Administration have been driven by political necessities to initiate reforms. Several factors have intensified the crisis.

The present law expires July 1. The draft is biting deeply to provide manpower for Vietnam, a war that in itself is bitterly controversial. Youths, parents and educators are bringing pressures for change.

The trouble is that there are deep-seated disagreements on how the procedures should be changed. This was apparent in the commission that President Johnson appointed last summer to make a study and recommendations on the draft.

DIVIDED ON DEFERMENTS

This commission, which was chosen to represent a cross-section of society, was deeply divided over the question of student deferments. In its report released today by the White House, the commission recommended, among other things, that student deferments be ended with these exceptions; that those now in school be permitted to complete the degrees for which they are candidates; and that thereafter those in college when selected be permitted to finish their sophomore year before induction.

Earlier in the week, the House Armed Services Committee released a report of its own study conducted by a commission headed by Gen. Mark W. Clark (U.S. Army retired).

The study had been ordered last fall to give Congress an independent basis for action. One of its chief recommendations was that student deferments be continued except for graduate students in noncritical fields.

This disagreement between the two study commissions points up the fact that there is yet no consensus even within the Government on many important aspects.

There does, however, seem to be a consensus on some points. Both commissions and many other concerned with the draft agree that the younger men should be drafted first—a reversal of the present practice of taking the oldest first from the pool of men between the ages of 18 and 26.

Further, there is general agreement that the system should be more uniform from state to state and district to district. As Senator Edward Kennedy pointed out in a recent speech, some cities draft 19-year-olds while others draft 22-year-olds, and married men are called up in one state while many thousands of single men remain untouched in another.

But the areas of agreement soon run out and disagreements emerge. The Administration and Senator Kennedy are promoting a random selection system for picking those to be inducted from the pool of those declared to be most eligible. But the Clark commission rejected outright use of any lottery.

The outcome depends to a large degree on President Johnson. Many of the changes—taking the youngest first, for example—can be accomplished by Executive order without any change in the law.

But the President must look to Congress to give him the kind of law that will permit him to put the reforms he desires into effect. And Congress, responding to political pressure, is taking the initiative in seeking reforms.

NEW HEARINGS SCHEDULED

The House Armed Services Committee will renew hearings on the draft in April. A Senate subcommittee on employment, manpower and poverty, with Senator Kenedy presiding, will begin hearings on March 14.

The Kennedy subcommittee does not have jurisdiction. That belongs to the Armed Services Committee headed by Richard B. Russell of Georgia. But after the young Massachusetts Democrat took the initiative in draft reforms, Senator Russell announced he would be glad to let him conduct the hearings with the understanding, of course, that the Russell committee would decide what kind of bill is reported out.

[From the Washington Post, March 5, 1967]

PANEL WOULD DRAFT 19-YEAR-OLDS FIRST, ABOLISH STUDENT AND JOB DEFERMENTS—JOHNSON COMMISSION URGES LOTTERY-TYPE SELECTION OF INDUCTEES

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., March 4.—A basic reorganization of the Selective Service System with the ending of student and occupational deferments and the calling of the youngest men first was proposed to President Johnson today by a presidential advisory commission.

It recommended that a "random" selection system using a fishbowl or computer be devised to pick those men to be drafted. The word "lottery" was not used, but it was implied. If approved, the system proposed would mean that in the future 19-year-olds would be drafted first instead of the "oldest first." Those not drafted when 19—barring a greater national emergency—probably would never be called.

President Johnson has been studying the report, published today, for about a month, officials said, and plans to make his recommendations on it to Congress on Monday.

The President appointed the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service last July. Burke Marshall, former Assistant Attorney General and now vice president and general counsel of International Business Machines Corp, was chairman of the 20-man Commission.

SUPPORT INDICATED

Officials declined to say whether the President's recommendations to Congress would follow the Commission's recommendations.

The college deferment issue is among the most controversial in the Commission's far-ranging report.

Deferred students now in school would be permitted to complete the degrees for which they are candidates, but upon termination of the deferments they would be entered into the random selection pool with that year's 18-year-olds.

In the future, those already in college when called would be permitted to finish their sophomore year before induction.

All young men on reaching 18 would be examined and those qualified for service would be classified 1-A. When they are 19 they would be included in a pool from which that year's inductions would be made.

For the year they are 19, they would "undergo their maximum vulnerability to the draft," the report said.

When the period of maximum vulnerability elapsed an order of call would be determined for a new group of 19-year-olds and those who were not inducted would be called only if military circumstances required.

In the year ending June 30, 1966, some 340,000 men were drafted. Draft calls in the latter half of 1966 ran about 50,000 a month. This year the calls are between 11,000 and 15,000 a month.

No new student or occupational deferments would be granted, but hardship deferments "judged realistically" would be granted.

With nearly 2-million men reaching draft age each year—more than the armed services require—some kind of "random" selection is the fairest possible way of choosing those to be inducted, the Commission said.

At present, the Armed Forces need only from a half to a third of the 2 million men annually reaching draft age.

The Commission rejected proposals to eliminate the draft, to adopt a system of universal training (proposed by former President Eisenhower), or to establish a compulsory national service or a volunteer service as an alternative to military service. All these, it said, were objectionable for one reason or another.

The Commission proposed what one official called a "total" reorganization of the Selective Service system, but its continuance. The law expires June 30.

The boards should represent all elements of the population they serve, the Commission said, and women should be eligible to serve on them. It proposed that board members serve a maximum of five years and that a maximum retirement age be established.

"The application of universal rules will remove the need for most of the routine decision-making which now is the chief function of local boards," the Commission said. "Elimination of most deferments and the policy of selecting youngest men first for induction will make classification far more an impartial and standardization procedure than it presently is."

THIRTY DAYS FOR APPEALS

The Commission said that registrants could make appeals to local boards regarding their classifications and should be given 30 days to do so instead of 10 days as at present.

The Commission refused to recommend a major change in the rules regarding conscientious objectors. A minority in the Commission wanted to recognize an objector's opposition to a particular war, but the majority said the present rule requiring objection to all wars was fair.

It cited the Supreme Court's 1965 U.S. vs. Seeger decision, which broadened the definition of religious beliefs that conscientious objectors may cite. The Court said "a sincere and meaningful belief which occupies in the life of its possessor a place parallel to that filled by the God of those admittedly qualifying for the exemption comes within the statutory definition." The Court did not take up other, even broader arguments of objectors in this decision.

The Commission called for "an adequate number of special panels" to hear conscientious objector appeals. At present, the Justice Department conducts such hearings, as well as prosecuting those who refuse to serve.

The report said that its study impressed on it that there are "serious defects in our national life" since one-fourth to one-third of registrants are found ineligible for service because of educational or health deficiencies.

MORE NEGROES REJECTED

It said it found that Negroes were insufficiently represented on draft boards. But it said that the number of Negroes in the Armed Services is not out of proportion to their number in the population.

A far greater percentage of Negroes than whites are rejected for service. Enlistment rates are about equal for qualified white and Negro men.

"However, Negroes already in the service re-enlist at a substantially higher rate than do white servicemen—their first-term reenlistment rates have been more than double that of whites in recent years," the report said.

The over-all proportion of Negroes in relation to all enlisted personnel in Vietnam is only 11 per cent, the report said. As of late 1965, however, it added, 22.8 per cent of the enlisted men in combat units in Vietnam were Negro. And during the first 11 months of 1966, Negro soldiers comprised 22.4 per cent of all Army troops killed in action.

The Commission was unanimous on most issues, but it was divided on the question of college deferments. The majority, however, argued against all future deferments.

"There is no evidence, in the opinion of most members of the Commission, that the abolishment of student deferments would deter young men selected for service from going to college, or returning to college, when their service was completed," the report said.

MORE WOMEN URGED

"This being so, the actual effect of student deferments as these members see it is unrelated to the national interest. Quite to the contrary, they believe, student deferments have become only a convenient device to shrink the ever-increasing pool of available manpower."

The Commission urged that more women be permitted to serve in noncombat roles, and officials reported that the Defense Department was undertaking plans to increase the number of women in uniform from about 32,000 to more than 37,000.

The Board said that men who undertake officer training programs in college should be deferred, but only if they commit themselves to serve as enlisted men if they do not complete their officer programs.

The Commission urged a study to determine whether a plan could be worked out which would permit those selected at 18 for induction to decide when, between the ages of 19 and 23, they wish to serve.

Most of the recommendations for reorganization of the system would require legislation; most of the proposals affecting deferments and drafting 19-year-olds first could be put into effect by presidential order.

SYSTEM OUTGROWN

"The United States has outgrown its Selective Service System," the report said, adding that 4000 local boards can no longer be called "neighborhood" committees.

Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.) said last night he was opposed to any kind of a draft lottery system. Jackson, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, said men with certain skills should be deferred.

Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.), a long-time critic of the current draft system, said Mr. Johnson's Commission had "done an excellent job in pointing up the inequities of the draft system and recommending solutions for them."

Sen. Richard B. Russell (D-Ga.), chairman of the Armed Services Committee, declined to comment. He said his committee probably would begin considering the Commission's proposals by mid-April.

THE FACTS ARE THESE

Some 2 million men will be reaching draft age each year. Nearly three-fourths of them will be qualified for service under current Department of Defense standards. Of that 1.5 million, only 600,000 to 1 million—varying with the circumstances—will be required to serve. And of these, between 100,000 and 300,000 may have to be inducted. The problem is: How shall those men be selected?

[From the Washington Post, March 5, 1967]

ONE OF REPORT'S CONCLUSIONS: QUALIFIED NEGRO IS FOUND TO RECEIVE INEQUITABLE TREATMENT UNDER DRAFT

(By William Chapman)

Under the current military service system the qualified Negro is more apt to be drafted, to be placed in a combat unit, and to meet death in Vietnam than the white man.

These are conclusions drawn from the report of the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service which found the Negro's participation in the draft to be "in several ways inequitable."

The report issued yesterday did not label the draft itself inequitable, but said that the Negro's long-standing social and economic handicaps have led to his unfair status in the military.

By extensively documenting these inequities, the report confirmed the charges of many civil rights leaders and other analysts that the draft burden falls more heavily on Negroes than on whites.

It expressed hope that the Commission's recommendations for draft revision, which include a random selection system and an end to most student deferments, will correct the inequities.

The report also recommended that new local draft boards represent all elements, "including ethnic" elements, of the population. At present, the Commission found, only about 1.3 per cent of the 16,632 local board members are Negroes.

The report found that the number of Negroes called to service is not out of proportion to their total population. However, many more Negroes than whites are rejected by the draft, primarily because they fail written tests.

From the remaining pool of service-qualified men, the report found, a much higher percentage of Negroes than whites is finally drafted. In one test year, the Commission found that 30.2 per cent of the qualified Negro group was drafted, as against only 18.8 per cent of the qualified whites.

The major reason for this, it said, is the inability of Negroes to get into reserve programs or into officers' programs. The Commission also pointed out that in low-income slum areas of a sample-study state were found the fewest student deferments.

EFFECTS OF HANDICAPS

The same educational and social handicaps that bring proportionately more Negroes than whites into service also channel Negroes into combat units. Fewer of them are qualified for technical training, and they may therefore look on infantry service as the only open path to advancement.

"Approximately 20 per cent of all personnel assigned to combat occupations throughout the Army are Negro," the report added.

The racial composition of combat units is even more striking in Vietnam. The report found that in late 1965, 22.8 per cent of enlisted personnel in combat units were Negroes; yet Negroes made up only 11 per cent of the total enlisted personnel serving in Vietnam.

"The casualty figures reflect this," the Commission said. "During the first 11 months of 1966, Negro soldiers comprised 22.4 per cent of all Army troops killed in action."

DRAFT BOARD MEMBERSHIP

In an extensive questionnaire survey of local draft boards, the Commission found 23 states in which no Negroes serve as members. None serve in Mississippi, for example, although 42 per cent of the State's population is Negro.

Forty per cent of the District of Columbia's board members are Negro, it found. But only 2.7 per cent of Maryland's and 2.2 per cent of Virginia's are Negroes.

Three members of the presidential Commission were Negroes and one of them, Vernon E. Jordan Jr. is of draft age. Jordan is director of the Southern Regional Council's voter education project.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 5, 1967]

Centralization of Draft Power Is Urged

(By George C. Wilson)

"The United States has outgrown its Selective Service System," a presidential advisory commission said yesterday in recommending that local draft boards be stripped of their authority to classify young men.

The National Advisory Commission on Selective Service recommended that the power to draft should be vested instead in a centralized system.

A central office in Washington would lay down the rules and then let area offices in each state implement them.

Instead of some 4000 draft boards across the Nation deciding the fate of young men in their areas, computers as impartial as traffic lights would do much of the selecting.

President Johnson must decide how much of the Commission's report to adopt. His message outlining proposed draft changes will go to Congress on Monday.

The Commission noted that the local draft board concept dates back to right after the Civil War, when a report recommended putting the power to draft in the hands of "civilian neighbors."

While the local boards are still portrayed as giving personalized service, the Commission said America has urbanized so much in the last century that few people know the draft board members in their community.

The Commission drew this picture of the 16,632 local draft board members—the first such national portrait:

All are male and almost all of them white. Only 1.3 per cent are Negro, 0.8 per cent Puerto Rican, 0.7 per cent Spanish American.

Average age is 58, with one-fifth over 70—including 400 members over 80 and 12 between 90 and 99.

Almost half have served more than 10 years; 1335 members have served more than 20 years.

About 67 per cent are veterans.

They are above average in education—with one-third of them college graduates, as compared with 10 per cent in the general population of that age group.

Seventy per cent are in white-collar jobs, with 20 per cent of that portion in the professions. This means that craftsmen and laborers are not represented proportionally on the boards.

More distressing, said the Commission, is the fact that the 4000 draft board in acting as independent units often have conflicting rules for deciding who goes to war. Student deferment policies were cited as an example.

The members themselves usually can give little time to the day-to-day work of the draft boards, the Commission found, and thus entrust much authority to the clerks, often underpaid.

The appeal boards, where men can protest the draft status given them by their local board, also are in a jumbled state, the Commission found. Their work loads and rules vary widely.

"To the Commission," the report said, "all of these factors together strongly describe a critical need for policy uniformity through the application of clear regulations consistently applied. Many local board members themselves agree."

This is how the Commission would reorganize the Selective Service System to substitute "the rule of law" for the "rule of discretion:"

Keep the national headquarters, which now exists in Washington.

Establish a regional office in each of the eight regions of the Office of Emergency Planning. The eight cities where emergency planning regional headquarters are situated: Harvard, Mass.; Olney, Md.; Thomasville Ga.; Battle Creek, Mich.; Denton, Tex.; Denver, Colo.; Santa Rosa, Calif. and Everett, Wash.

Create 300 to 500 area offices—at least one in each state—near population centers.

"Clear and binding policy regarding classifications, exemptions and deferments would be established at the national level," the report said. The rules would go to the regional offices and then to the area offices.

Young men would register at the area offices near their home. Clerks from the existing local boards might be hired for these area offices. Computers would do much of the paperwork at the headquarters level.

While the present local boards would have no authority to classify young men at the outset under this proposed system, the format of these boards would be kept for the 300 to 500 appeal boards that would be established, one for each of the area offices.

There would also be appeal boards for each of the eight regional offices and also a National Appeal Board. A young man could appeal within 30 days after being classified, instead of the present 10-day limit.

The Commission recommended that these appeal boards at the area offices be more typical of the community around them. This would mean primarily, more Negro members. A term of five years would be set as well as a maximum age. Women now barred would be allowed as members. Finally the President would not be limited to Governors selections in naming appeal board members.

[From the Washington Post, March 5, 1967]

Vote To Abolish Apparently Was Close—Student Deferments Split Board

(By William Chapman)

Eliminating student deferments from the Selective Service System was the most divisive issue confronting the presidential commission on the draft.

It apparently was by a narrow margin that the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service voted to abolish, with few exceptions, the policy of deferring college students.

GROWING CONTROVERSY

The close division indicates the ticklish nature of President Johnson's problem in deciding whether to recommend abolition of student deferments. He is expected to make his position known early this week.

College deferrals have been a center of controversy in recent years. Critics contend they lead to a permanent exemption of upper and middleclass young men who remain in college on the graduate level simply to evade the draft. Draft boards have been accused of favoritism in granting or withholding deferrals and universities are entangled in arguments over whether grade records should be made available to selective service authorities.

In its key finding, the Commission majority held that college deferrals do not, as originally intended, serve the national interest. They had been granted on the assumption that a steady flow of college-trained manpower is necessary for the economy and other national purposes.

"There is no evidence, in the opinion of most members of the Commission, that the abolishment of student deferments would deter young men selected for service from going to college, or returning to college, when their service was completed," the report said.

DETRIMENTAL EFFECT

"This being so, the actual effect of student deferments, as these members see it, is unrelated to the national interest. Quite to the contrary, they believe, student deferments have become only a convenient device to shrink the ever-increasing pool of available manpower."

Even if administration were improved to prevent deferments from becoming virtually permanent, a privileged group—the college students—would be permitted to decide when it would start military service, the commission said.

The group, for example, could choose deferment now when a shooting war is under way in Vietnam and hope the fighting ended before its turn came, the majority pointed out.

The majority contended that few students deemed necessary for national interest pursuits would be diverted from studies by a two-year interruption for military service. "Indeed, it was felt that many young men might gain in educational ambition, motivation, maturity and capacity for achievement as a result of such a detour," it declared.

OFFICER RECRUITMENT

The minority warned that abolishing college deferments would seriously impede the military's procurement of officers, since almost 80 percent of new officers come from the campus.

The majority replied that officer-recruitment problems could be overcome and cited a Defense Department statement which said these problems are "not insuperable." The report suggested that Defense augment its ROTC programs, granting deferments to those students accepting binding contracts to serve as officers or enter the draft.

The minority contended that criticism of the deferments is based not on the principle but on administrative abuses. If the abuses are corrected, making it impossible for deferrals to be stretched into permanent exemptions, the system would work satisfactorily, the minority said.

The majority found that deferrals had fostered "a degree of cynicism about both military service and education." It cited reports of both students and educators that young men increasingly looked upon college as a haven from the draft.

[From the Washington Post, March 5, 1967]

Guard and Reserve Hit as Evaders' Haven

(By John Maffre)

Two high-level commissions urged the President this week to rule out the National Guard and the Reserve as a draft evaders' haven.

But to some extent, Pentagon action has already begun to overtake suggestions of the President's National Advisory Commission on Selective Service and of the House Civilian Advisory Panel on Military Manpower Requirement.

Both groups focused attention on "REP," the inactive man in, or trying to enter the Reserve Enlistment Program that calls for six months active duty training and 5½ years of hometown drills.

The Presidential Commission, headed by Burke Marshall, would rule out draft immunity for new reservists with no prior service, except those who enlist before being classified 1–A. It would also use the proposed lottery induction system to fill reserve ranks if voluntary enlistment fell short.

The House panel headed by Gen. Mark W. Clark, proposed that REPs be liable for more active duty if for any reason they failed to complete their reserve obligation, as long as they still had up to 15 months of unserved active duty. But the panel rejected the lottery system for either filling reserve ranks or drafting men outright.

In mid-February when both these reports were at the printer's, the Pentagon said it would soon begin to call some 31,000 REPs with little or no active duty and who belong to no unit. The Army alone has more than 55,000 men with no unit affiliation.

This is the first exercise of authority granted—but not sought—by Congress for the President to call individual reservists without declaring a national emergency.

The chief problem facing would-be reservists is that virtually every Guard and Reserve unit in the nation has a full complement, and a waiting list as long as its roll call. In Maryland, for example, the Guard has for more than a year been up to its 8300-man ceiling and has only one under strength unit—a Special Forces company that imposes stiff requirements.

Some reservists of long experience said that unless draft calls became much higher, both the Marshall and the Clark proposals would have relatively little effect, and that their chief value would be in the public relations sense.

One officer said he was puzzled and disturbed by the suggestion that a "mix" of voluntary enlistment and induction be used to keep inactive unit ranks filled.

"That's bad—the reserve outfits have always done pretty well on the volunteer system," he said. "I'm always unhappy when somebody talks about a draft for the reserves."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star Mar. 5, 1967]

DRAFT THE 19-YEAR-OLDS FIRST, CUT DEFERMENTS, PANEL URGES—LOTTERY-TYPE PLAN GIVEN TO JOHNSON

(By Garnett D. Horner)

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.—A lottery-like system of selecting draftees, starting at age 19, and a general ban on future student and occupational deferments were recommended to President Johnson last night.

Centralizing the Selective Service System to apply draft rules uniformly across the nation—doing away with local boards as now known—also was urged by the President's National Advisory Commission on Selective Service.

The commission's recommendations were contained in a 218-page report formally submitted to the President last week and made public at the Texas White House last night.

One practical effect of the commission's proposals would be to reverse the present policy of drafting the oldest first and limit the draft to 19-year-olds unless there should be a sharp increase in military manpower needs. If a youth were not drafted at 19, his chances of being called up would grow less and less each year until he reached 26.

Adoption of the recommendations also probably would mean that more youths would put off their higher education until they completed military service and then go to college with GI bill benefits.

AIM FOR EQUAL TREATMENT

Major aims of the commission, headed by former Asst. Atty. Gen. Burke Marshall were to assure the most equitable treatment possible and to make it easier for each youth to predict when he would be called up if he was going to be.

The President, who received a draft copy of the report three or four weeks ago before getting a printed copy last week, is expected to reveal his own ideas about revision of the draft system in a special message to Congress early this week.

The fact that the White House made public the commission's report shortly before the President's message was due seemed to indicate that he generally approves its recommendations, but he could approve some and reject others or delay action on some of the more controversial proposals.

Officials said the bulk of the most controversial of the commission proposals—including random selection of draftees from a nationwide pool of qualified youths and abolition of most deferments—could be put into effect by executive order or Selective Service rule changes without legislation.

Congressional action is necessary, however, to extend any draft law at all beyond its expiration date of June 30. Legislation also would be needed to centralize administration of the Selective Service System as recommended.

Under the commission proposals, youths would register at 18 through one of 300 to 500 "area offices" taking the place of local boards. Soon thereafter they would be tested to determine whether they qualified for military service under Defense Department physical, mental and moral standards.

Those qualified would go into a nationwide pool. The order for calling them into military service at age 19 would be determined through "a system of impartial random selection."

Avoiding use of the word "lottery," which it considered might be misleading, the commission said "random selection" could work in one of several ways such as "fishbowl" drawing, a computer system or simply in order of birthdays.

Men in the pool would have "maximum vulnerability" to the draft for a year or less. Then another pool of 19-year-olds would come along. Those left over from the previous pool would not be called up later unless military needs required calling up first all those in the new group—and so on to age 26.

TRANSITION PERIOD

While further student or occupational deferments would be generally banned, students in school and men in recognized apprentice training when the proposed plan went into effect would be permitted to complete the degrees or program for which they were candidates. Then they would go into the "random selection pool" with that year's 18-year-olds.

After this transition period, men already in college when randomly selected for service would be permitted to finish their sophomore year before induction.

Men who join the ROTC or other officer training programs in college could be deferred only if they committed themselves to serve in the armed forces as enlisted men if they did not complete their officer programs.

Hardship deferments would continue to be granted.

The commission decided that determining the order of callup from among eligible 19-year-olds eliminates any need, under present circumstances at least, for occupational deferments or deferments for volunteers in the Peace Corps or Vista. It suggested, however, that any deferred Peace Corps volunteers overseas when the proposed plan goes into effect be permitted to complete their contracts before entry into the random selection pool.

MOST CONTROVERSIAL ISSUE

The student deferment issue was the most controversial studied by the commission. A "substantial" minority, said by an official to amount to a little more than one third of the 20 members of the commission, favored continuing student deferments.

The minority group argued that elimination of student deferments would seriously interrupt the output of college-trained men to meet essential needs of the civilian economy.

The majority argued that in any truly random selection system college students and potential students would be drafted in the same proportion as other elements of the population. For example, they contended that in any year in which one-fourth of the eligible 19-year-olds were drafted, three-fourths of the draft-eligible student group would be free to continue their studies.

Most members of the commission also felt, they reported, that few of those drafted would be permanently diverted from college by waiting two years. They contended that many youths might gain in educational ambition, motivation, maturity and capacity for achievement as a result of a detour in military service.

PRAISED BY KENNEDY

Another major argument by the minority favoring continued student deferment was that ending such deferments would hamper procurement of officers by the military forces through the ROTC and other college sources. The majority concluded that this problem could be solved by the Defense Department.

In Washington, Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., who has advocated basic changes to assure fairness in the draft system, praised the commission's proposals particularly in connection with student deferments.

"The problem of student deferments is a very difficult one," he said. "I am not certain that the commission's suggestion that service begin after completion of the sophomore year is the best we can devise. But it is extremely significant that the commission has dealt with the problem of deferments. That is a part of the draft system which produces considerable unfairness."

Sen. Henry M. Jackson, D-Wash., said he was opposed to any kind of a draft lottery system because in his view men with certain skills should be deferred.

Sen. RICHARD B. RUSSELL, D-Ga., chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, said his committee probably would begin considering the commission's proposals by mid-April.

NATIONAL POLICIES URGED

Under its centralization proposals, the commission said National Selective Service headquarters should issue "clear and binding policies" concerning classifications, exemptions and deferments "to be applied uniformly throughout the country."

It proposed setting up eight regional offices, with some 300 to 500 "area offices" located according to population, with at least one in each state.

The area offices would handle the registering of youths for the draft and classifying them. This is now done by some 4,100 local boards of volunteers.

"New local boards" would be set up only in connection with the area offices and would enter the draft picture only as the registrants' first court of appeal.

The registration and classification at area offices would be handled by civil service employes instead of by volunteers as under the present local board system.

LOCAL BOARD CHANGES

The commission proposed that "all elements of the public they serve" should be represented on the new local boards acting as appeal agencies. It also urged that members' terms be limited to 5 years; a maximum retirement age should be fixed; the president's power to appoint members should not be limited to those nominated by state governors, and women should be eligible.

The commission found many things wrong with local boards as now set up. It reported all board members now are male; only 1.3 percent are Negro; one-fifth are over 70, and 400 of these are over 80.

The commission recalled that when the system was established in 1940, the local board concept was thought to be fair because it meant having a man chosen for the draft by his neighbors.

But only in rural areas does this "personalized concept" appear to be true today, the report said. It explained that urban board members usually work in anonymity, and rarely know the men they classify.

In fact, the commission found that "the United States has outgrown its Selective Service System" which under present conditions generates "needless inequities and confusion."

BACKGROUND DIFFERENCES

It noted a "substantial degree of difference" in chances of men with differing educational and economic backgrounds being drafted.

While low-income slum areas have the greatest number of men rejected because they fail to meet Defense Department standards, high income areas usually have a high proportion of student deferments.

Men with less than an eighth-grade education and Negro high school dropouts are less likely to enter service because they fail the written examinations, while graduate students are less likely to see active duty because many continue student deferments until they become, in effect, exemptions.

The commission found the Negro's position in the total military picture "in several ways inequitable."

It said the Negro does not serve in the armed forces out of proportion to his representation in the population as a whole. The proportion of Negroes in relation to all enlisted personnel in Vietnam is about 11 percent.

But the commission found that 30.2 percent of a qualified Negro group was drafted, while only 18.8 percent of the qualified whites were. Among reasons cited for this were that fewer Negroes are admitted into reserve or officer programs.

While Negroes made up only 11 percent of all enlisted personnel in Vietnam, the commission reported that as late as 1965, 22.8 percent of the enlisted men in combat units in Vietnam were Negro.

The commission said its proposals amounted to replacing the "rule of discretion" with the "rule of law."

It argued that "fairness, uniformity, and equal treatment for all can best be achieved through a system administered without regard for any geographical boundaries."

YOUNGEST FIRST ARGUMENTS

Even simple reversal of the present policy of drafting 26-year-olds first, then 25-year-olds, and so on down the line, and starting with 19-year-olds will make classification more impartial than it now is, the report contended.

Arguing for drafting men in the "youngest first" order, the commission said:

"Interruption of a man's life at that time (19) is less serious than at an older age. The uncertainty which now confuses many in their 20s as they attempt to set their careers in order would be reduced, if not eliminated.

Fewer men are married at that age. Fewer, too, have acquired skills in industry.

SERVICES PREFER

"The order is also preferable to the services, who believe that younger men are better able to respond to military training, and in general make better soldiers."

To remove present inequities in Reserve and National Guard programs, the commission recommended that "direct enlistment into Reserve and National Guard forces should not provide immunity from the draft for those with no prior service except for those who enlist before receiving their 1-A classification."

The commission also recommended a national computer file of draft-eligible doctors and dentists to help make sure their drafting would cause the least possible disruption in the medical needs of the community where they are living, and liberalization of policies regarding drafting of aliens in the United States.

Among ideas considered but rejected by the commission were reliance on an all-volunteer army instead of the draft, universal training, compulsory national service, and volunteer national service as an alternative to military service.

A substantial majority also refused to recommend recognizing as conscientious objectors those who might oppose the Vietnam war, or any particular war, rather than war in any form.

"The majority believes," the report said, "that the status of conscientious objection can properly be applied only to those who are opposed to all killing of human beings under any circumstances.

"Legal recognition of selective pacifism could open the doors to a general theory of selective disobedience to law, which could quickly tear down the fabric of government."

The commission—which included three Negroes—was named by President Johnson last July 2. In its study, the commission invited opinions from more than 120 organizations—veterans, religious and civil rights, among others; some 250 editors of college student newspapers; each of the 4,100 local draft boards and 97 appeal boards; every state governor; many mayors, and others.

TWO MANPOWER POOLS FEATURE REVISED DRAFT SYSTEM PLAN

Here, step by step, is the way the draft system proposed to President Johnson by an advisory commission would work:

1. At age 18, as now, all men would register. As soon as possible, they would be given the standard physical, education and moral tests.

2. Those classified 1A after the testing procedure would be included in a pool of men subject to first call for military service if they would reach age 19 before a designated date. Those reaching 19 after that date would be placed in a second pool.

3. Through a random, lottery-type process, those in the first pool would be arranged in the order in which they would be subject to induction, if needed. These men would be most vulnerable to the draft for a period of one year, possibly less.

4. After the period of maximum vulnerability had elapsed, names of all men in the next-in-line pool would be ranged by a lottery-type procedure and the process would begin all over again with that group. Meanwhile, men in first pool who were not inducted would not be called unless military circumstances first required the call-up of all men in the second pool.

[From the National Observer, Mar. 6, 1967]

THE DRAFT BLOWS UP A STORM AS EXPERTS REPORT—VOLUNTEER ARMY, LOTTERY, UNIVERSAL TRAINING WIN VOCAL FOES AND FRIENDS

"The whole system is honked up," grouses a 29-year-old San Diego father of one daughter. Asks George Feldman, a round-faced psychology major at Yale University, of the proposals of an all-volunteer army: "No matter what they pay you, who would volunteer to get shot at?" Students can easily win draft deferments until they are out of school, says the editor of Georgia Tech's student newspaper. "Then if you're smart," counsels this Atlantan, John Gill, "you go get married and manufacture another deferment."

All across the nation last week the topic on target was the military draft and what Congress should do about it. In Washington, D.C., the President's special National Advisory Commission on Selective Service, after an eight-month study, recommended far-reaching reforms in the nation's 27-year-old Selective Service System.

The report's conclusion: "The United States has outgrown its Selective Service System." The committee's recommendations, prepared under the direction of former assistant Attorney General Burke Marshall, would reduce the power of the nation's 4,061 local draft boards and eliminate inconsistencies in their administration, curtail student and occupational deferments, and reverse the present "oldest-first" order of call so the youngest men, beginning at age 19, would be taken first.

A National Observer survey of dozens of draftees, college students, draft-board officials, wives of soldiers in Vietnam, and community leaders in 13 States from Connecticut to California tapped the growing uneasiness over the draft system. Uneasiness over the draft, has, of course, been a continuing matter since before World War II. But certainly there is a new flurry of it.

Not everyone favors changes now. "The hysteria to change the draft law has come because of our involvement in war in Vietnam," reflects the Rev. Derian Yalian, pastor of the United Presbyterian Church of Solana Beach, Calif. Had the present "hysteria" prevailed during World War I or II, says the minister, "I don't think any of us would have to worry about the draft—we would be conscripted by a dictator and have no choice in the matter."

Saying he's a hawk and defending the present law, which "uses everyone's potential where he fits best," the Rev. Mr. Yalian protests: "Let's not cripple ourselves so we can't defend ourselves. I get awfully tired of people who say let's divorce ourselves from the past. Let's do something brand new. To think this way is national suicide."

Yet Congress must act. The present Selective Service law, which was adopted in 1940, expires June 30. Before then, Congress must decide whether to continue the present system, overhaul it, or replace it with an entirely new procedure for filling the nation's military manpower needs.

SPECIAL COMMISSION REPORTS

Several alternatives and dozens of alterations are being debated. Among them are a volunteer army, a national lottery, universal military training, and optional national service in groups such as the Peace Corps. Spokesmen for each of these plans will express their views at public hearings of the House Armed Services Committee, probably sometime in April. A special House commission headed by Gen. Mark W. Clark (U.S. Army, Ret.) last week presented a study of its own; this study will become the focal point for the April hearings.

General Clark's panel recommended that the youngest men, rather than the oldest, be drafted first. It also called for the restricting of graduate-school deferments to those fields judged to be "critical to the national security." Yet unlike the Presidential commission, the House committee rejected the use of a random-selection system.

President Johnson's proposals on the draft were being prepared over the weekend. With ferment in the air, Congress seems destined to overhaul the Selective Service for the first time since just after World War II.

"You shouldn't ask me about this, because I'm bitter," warns Dick Floberg, the 29-year-old San Diego father of one daughter, a former professional baseball pitcher, and now a golf professional.

I WAITED FOR 18 MONTHS

"I wanted to go when I got out of high school, get in my six months, and get out," he explains. "But Selective Service rejected me. Said I had a bad leg and bad back from baseball. Then I got married—and they called me! I took the exam and I liquidated everything. I even quit my job. I waited for 18 months. Nothing happened. So I wrote my congressman.

"Six months went by and I got a 1-Y classification, whatever that is. I never did go. If you want my opinion, the draft should be for both men and women—get them off mama's apron strings. Then we wouldn't have so many Berkeleys. If they all went in at say 16 and came out at about 18, they would be better men and women."

John Wilson, a 21-year-old Northwestern University advertising major from Wilmington, Del., agrees. "I would much rather have served at 18," he says. "Now I'm anxious to start a career, but I'm faced with the prospect of two years of service." If he were killed in Vietnam, he complains, "it would be a net loss of $20,000 spent on my education."

Gaylord Fagerhand, a Moorhead, Minn., Air Force veteran and a church-choir director, would like to see some of the college loopholes tightened up. He winces: "There are too many ways of getting out of the draft. You go to school and get a deferment and then keep going from one deferment to another. I think when you complete one deferment you should be drafted."

EXPELLED, THEN DRAFTED

Even students have trouble justifying such deferments. Britt Kolar, a beefy junior from Texas who plays linebacker on Yale's football team, recalls a classmate who was expelled for a fight and subsequently drafted. "He made a slip his freshman year, and now he's in Vietnam," moans Mr. Kolar. "Those guys over there fighting are just like us—maybe not quite so smart—but that shouldn't make them less qualified to be living when the war's over."

Says Keith Marshall, 20, a Yale student from New Orleans: "I'd have more trouble justifying draft-dodging than I would justifying fighting in Vietnam if I were drafted." He doesn't weigh the war philosophically. "I've made it very simple. It's my country, right or wrong."

Others are unhappy that some people escape the draft. "If you have money and connections, you're OK," notes a draftee standing in line at the Whitehall Street induction center in New York City. "Look how Cassius Clay and George Hamilton have avoided the draft."

George Hamilton, the film star who occasionally courts the President's daughter, Lynda Bird, received a "hardship" deferment because his socialite mother depends on his $250,000 annual income; she lives in a 39-room Beverly Hills mansion. Cassius Clay, the heavyweight boxing champ, has been trying to avoid induction by arguing that his Black Muslim religion entitles him to deferment as a conscientious objector or as a minister.

A HOUSEWIFE'S VIEW

A slender, brunet San Diego housewife, Mrs. Betty Daun, a mother of three little girls, steps from her 1967 Volkswagen camper, protesting: "Why shouldn't George Hamilton go? I don't see any reason why he shouldn't. They say he is sole support of his mother. Why can't she get up and get a job? If we're going to fight wars, I think the rich and poor should go just the same."

Shaking his head in disagreement is James A. Nelson, 22, a University of Nevada senior who is single. "There are many complaints about Clay and Hamilton, but they've just been made scapegoats by the public," he believes. "The guy who would criticize Clay's not being drafted is probably trying to keep his own kid out of the service."

When it comes to alternatives to the present system, few have any well-thought-out ideas. One exception is Francis N. Connolly, editor and publisher of the Tempe (Ariz.) Daily News. He favors a form of universal military training for all Americans for a minimum of one year. "There's something everybody can do—even those in a wheel chair," he argues.

J. W. Mitchell, a Negro veteran from Atlanta, rejects the voluntary-army idea. He asks, "How would you volunteer for something you didn't want in the first place?"

THE BOTTOM OF THE BARREL

"I guess the lottery would be fair," comments the Rev. George Hagen, associate minister at the First Congregational Church in Branford, Conn., on a proposal for selecting draftees at random from a general pool. "But I'm sure our government can come up with something with a little more meat to it. A lottery would be scraping the bottom of the barrel."

Says Gerald Bankers, a chemistry major at North Dakota State University in Fargo: "This lottery idea stinks. First of all, those guys who aren't doing anything might just as well go into the service. And second, I don't think a guy should be jerked out of school. I don't want to be in the middle of a quarter and get jerked out."

The Rev. Mr. Hagen sees an expanded choice as an answer to the "traitor-patriot" division some say is created by the present Selective Service procedure. "There are very interesting possibilities in VISTA-like national service corps," he says. He suggests this option to the draft would be better administered through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Office of Economic Opportunity than through the Defense Department.

"There is something wrong with a system which casts you either as a patriot if you're willing to bear arms in Vietnam or a non-patriot if you object to fighting in this war," he laments.

A 21-year-old El Centro, Calif., professional photographer, Bert Hope, senses the immense difficulty of the task ahead for Congress. "Sure, the law is full of loopholes," he says. "And the law should be tightened. But then you can't build a bureaucracy big enough to screen every case. There are too many people in this country."

KEY POINTS IN DRAFT REPORT

The President's special National Advisory Commission on Selective Service, after an eight-month study, recommended far-reaching reform of the nation's Selective Service System. In all, the commission made 13 major recommendations and dozens of minor ones. Here are the main points in the report:

The system's administration would undergo a major reorganization. The commission would phase out the system's current decentralization in 4,061 local draft boards and replace it with a more centralized administration characterized by a strong national headquarters. The goal would be to eliminate inconsistencies in local administration. The new structure would include 8 regional offices and 300 to 500 area offices. Local boards, composed of volunteer citizens, would serve as the registrants' court of first appeal on complaints.

The present "oldest-first" order of call would be reversed so that the youngest men, beginning at age 19, would be taken first.

No further student or occupational deferments would be granted, with minor exceptions. Gone would be widespread deferment for undergraduate and graduate study. Present deferments would be allowed to continue. But thereafter, men who are already in college when they are randomly selected for service would be permitted to finish only their sophomore year before induction.

Draft-eligible men would be inducted into service as needed according to an order of call that would be impartially and randomly determined. Eliminated would be some local-board procedures that encourage consideration of special circumstances, such as performance in school and family environment.

Direct enlistment into Reserve and National Guard forces would not continue to provide immunity from the draft for those with no prior service except for those who enlist before receiving their 1-A classifications.

If Reserve and National Guard units were not able to maintain their force level with volunteers, they would be filled by inductions. Inductions would be determined by the order of call for active-duty service.

The commission proposes further study to determine the feasibility of a plan that would permit all men who are selected for induction at 18 to decide themselves when, between 19 and 23, to fulfill their military obligation.

The commission rejected several widely discussed alternatives to the Selective Service System. Among them were reliance on an all-volunteer military force, a system of universal training for all young Americans, and a system of optional service in groups such as the Peace Corps.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 6, 1967]

A FAIRER MILITARY DRAFT

President Johnson's National Advisory Commission on Selective Service has made generally admirable proposals for eliminating the inequities of the present military draft.

Obviously, no formula that puts on 19-year-olds—men too young to vote—the primary responsibility for fighting the Vietnamese war is going to evoke cheers in the streets. But the commission has effectively documented its conclusion that the present system discriminates grossly against the poor, particularly the Negroes, and that most alternatives would aggravate, not cure, the existing unfairness.

Its own proposals are geared to the special needs of the war in Vietnam, a conflict that imposes a substantial drain on the nation's treasure of young men without approaching the dimensions of total war. The worldwide commitments the United States has undertaken are too great to be met through reliance on a volunteer military force unless the inducements for enlistment are made so alluring that the country would risk creating an army of mercenaries.

Yet these commitments are not so demanding that the nation requires an elaborate selection system to guard against the danger of crippling gaps in its homefront reservoir of scientific and industrial specialists to fill essential jobs.

Student deferments under the present system have in too many cases turned into outright exemptions, thus accentuating the burden on those who are already the most deprived of America's citizens. Indeed, deferment standards are becoming increasingly quixotic under pressure of the movement on many campuses to withhold data on class standings from the draft authorities.

Beguiling as is the notion of offering youngsters the option of national service in areas remote from the battlefield and valuable as such service can be, the commission is right in believing that no fair way exists for equating it with military duty in a shooting war.

In assessing the post-Vietnam outlook, the commission envisages a situation in which those chosen by lot from among each group of 19-year-olds will have maximum latitude in deciding whether to serve at once or at any time up to their 24th birthday. It is not at all clear why some such latitude cannot be introduced even now, especially if new incentives are established to encourage early service.

Congress will undoubtedly insist on exploring more closely this possibility. It will also encounter politcial resistance to the proposed abolition of local draft boards, which served with distinction in World War II and the Korean war. But we believe the special requirements of the current conflict make advisable changes along the lines of the commission's report. The cause of equity in national defense will be advanced by approval of its recommendations.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 6, 1967]

OUTGROWN SYSTEM

No one who takes time to read the report of the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service is likely to question the need for a change. The system by which men are now drafted for military service is virtually the same as it was when the legislation was passed in 1940 on the eve of World War II. But the needs are very different. The Commission concluded that "the United States has outgrown its Selective Service System."

The original concept was that men would be drafted by a local board made up of their neighbors. Except in a few rural communities, this concept has been lost in the complexities of our urban society. Members of the local draft board are rarely known to the men whom they classify. Much of their work is routine, and the impression prevails that they do little more than rubberstamp the decisions of their clerks.

The current dissatisfaction with the work of the boards stems largely from the wide variations in the standards they apply. The Commission found that some boards never reclassifiy men with deferments in effect and others shift men into the A–1 category before their deferments expire. Confusion and inequity often result from the fact that instructions go out to local boards from state directors as well as from national headquarters. Some states allow a student to be deferred if he carries 12 semester hours; others require 15. Some local boards take into account a student's self-support in college; others disregard it.

During the first five months of 1966, 90 per cent of the local boards in the States of Washington and Alabama had to induct married men to fill their quotas. But none of the boards in Connecticut drafted married men. The Commission also noted a strong tendency for local boards to draft men who have moved out of their community, and appeal boards more sympathetic to the individual in his new location reverse many of these decisions.

Although the Commission found that the Negro does not serve in the armed forces out of proportion to his representation in the population as a whole, he encounters inequities at several points in the system. This is one of many factors pointing to the need for uniform standards and greater consistency in their application. The President's message to Congress today will indicate the extent to which the Commission's recommendations are to have Administration support, but it is quite apparent that the reorientation of the Selective Service will need to be drastic.

THE CIA AND STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the recent furor over CIA funding of student organizations' activities abroad has caused many observers to condemn both giver and recipient. It has caused others to question why such secret methods of finance were used. Indeed, it has caused a great deal of discussion and given writers many a story. I think, however, that the most rational statement concerning the CIA link to American student organizations is a column published in the Washington Star yesterday. It is in defense of the CIA.

I ask unanimous consent that the column, authored by Howard K. Smith, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN DEFENSE OF USING CIA FUNDS FOR STUDENTS

(By Howard K. Smith)

The most constant feature of real life is its inconstancy. It is a distressingly untidy process which confounds every effort to make a system of ideas fit or explain it.

Prof. Arnold Toynbee, who tried to schematize the record of life more elaborately than anybody since Marx and failed—for life simply bulged right out of the complex corset of system he designed for it—was once tempted to think that only one theory would fit it: The "it's-just-one-damned-thing-after-another" theory of history.

Life does not even accommodate high principle very well. The recent trouble over the CIA is an example. There is no doubt whatever that in principle it is wrong for a secret spy agency to finance, and therefore compromise the purposes of, a free organization of American students. Yet, there is also no doubt that this method of financing the students worked when no other way would have.

Consider the circumstances in which the method was begun. It was in the early fifties. The Communists had tried to take Greece and failed; they had tried to strangle Berlin by blockade and failed. So the violent phase of the Cold War in Europe was ending and the contest was turning into a competition of ideas and images between America and Russia.

International student conferences were proving good arenas for this competition to impress students from the underdeveloped lands of Africa, Asia and Latin America, future sources of trouble.

American students arrived at the conferences in limited delegations and possessing only the money acquired from dues, which barely paid their keep. The Communists arrived with abundant financing, bushels of expensive literature and squads of agents to keep them informed as to which delegates from the new countries were most susceptible of influence.

The richly endowed Communist delegations danced rings around the impoverished Americans. In the eyes of the neutral delegations, precisely, the images designed by Moscow were created: The Americans were sluggish representatives of a way of life clearly on the way out. The Communists were dynamic examples of a way of life sure to be the future's wave.

It became obvious that the American students were suffering from lack of what their nation had most of: money. Two general sources of funds were scouted. First, private sources were tried but found ungenerous. Then the thought of asking Congress for open appropriations of funds was considered. But that appeared equally unpromising, for two reasons:

To begin with, paying students to go to yakking sessions was just the kind of vague do-goodism that Congress was, and is, stingy about; so it would have appropriated too little. And, then, it would have demanded student conformism as compensation for its handout.

As an example of the latter problem, everyone remembered the art exhibit the USIA put on in Berlin in order to compete with the Communists. To prove new art forms were being sought, some pretty farout American paintings were exhibited. Some junketing Congressmen saw the avant-garde pieces and blew up at this misuse of the taxpayers' money. So the art had to be replaced with some non-controversial photographs of American life.

Had Congress appropriated some inadequate "smallesse"—the opposite of largesse—its members would have become apoplectic at the first student delegation who dissented from an American policy in public. Since dissent comes as naturally to students as speechifying does to congressmen, there would have been an embarrassing brouhaha and a cutting off of funds.

It is one of life's little perversities that only a secret spy agency could permit freedom to dissent at government expense. And that vision—of American students free to dissent confronting Communists harnessed to a strict party line—was exactly the right one to display to the students from the new nations. So, that is what was done.

That Cold War emergency is over and we have come out of it just fine. So the procedure of CIA financing of students could be—or should have been some time back—stopped. It is a pity it was ever necessary. But that is the way life is.

ACCELERATED CONSTRUCTION OF BONNEVILLE AND OTHER UNITS OF CENTRAL UTAH PROJECTS—RESOLUTION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the Utah State Legislature, now in session, has adopted a resolution, in which the Governor of Utah concurs, requesting the acceleration of construction of the Bonneville unit and other units of the central Utah project.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, we who have been in Congress since 1956, when the upper Colorado River storage project became a reality, have been fighting almost annually for enough construction money to keep this great project on the track.

Some years have been good, and some have been lean. We are now in a lean time in the history of this project; however, it is my hope that after 2 extremely lean years we have made the turn and are heading toward added emphasis of one of the major participating projects, the central Utah project.

So that the Senate and the country can be made aware of the importance of this project to Utah's future, I join in the request of my colleague from Utah [Mr. Moss] to have printed in the RECORD a resolution passed by the Utah State Legislature requesting Congress, the President, and the Department of the Interior to accelerate the construction of the Bonneville unit and the planning and construction of the other units—Upalco, Jensen, Uintah, and Ute Indian—of the central Utah project.

The resolution was one of the first items of business to be passed by the Utah State Legislature, and I agree with it wholeheartedly.

It asks support for the $11.1 million which provided in the fiscal year 1968 construction program for the Bonneville unit.

It also asks for $25 million for fiscal year 1969, and for the acceleration of many of the related projects, as well.

I think that the resolution represents a fair and accurate cross section of the thinking of the people in my State and I hope that Congress, the President and the Department of the Interior will see fit to concur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senators from Utah?

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. Con. Res. 1

(By Wallace H. Gardner, Ernest H. Dean, and W. Hughes Brockbank)

A concurrent resolution of the senate and house of representatives of the thirty-seventh Legislature of the State of Utah, the Governor concurring therein, requesting the Congress, the President, and the Department of the Interior of the United States to accelerate the construction of the Bonneville unit and the planning and construction of the other units (Upalco, Jensen, Uintah, and Ute Indian) of the Central Utah Project

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah, the Governor concurring therein:

Whereas the record is replete with evidence that water development projects constructed by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation contribute materially to the national welfare, and, in addition, reimbursable costs of such projects are repaid to the Federal Treasury; and

Whereas the continued economic growth of the state of Utah is directly dependent upon the development and utilization of Utah's legal entitlement of Colorado River water, as set forth in the Colorado River Compact of 1922 and the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact of 1948 in order to provide water to meet increasing municipal, industrial, and agricultural requirements of the state; and

Whereas units of the Central Utah Participating Project of the Colorado River Storage Project are under construction and in various stages of planning by the United States Bureau of Reclamation; and

Whereas funds appropriated by the Congress for fiscal year 1966 for the Bonneville Unit of the Central Utah Project were diverted to other uses and of the $7.5 million appropriated by Congress for fiscal year 1967, with direction from the Congress that these funds be spent exclusively on the Bonneville Unit, only $4.6 million has been programmed by the United States Bureau of Reclamation for the current fiscal year; and

Whereas the President of the United States included in his Budget Request an $11.145 million program for fiscal year 1968 for continuing construction of the Bonneville Unit of the Central Utah Project.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Thirty-seventh Legislature of the State of Utah, the Governor concurring therein, does hereby unanimously support the President's budget request of $11.145 million to continue construction of the Bonneville Unit of the Central Utah Project.

Be it further resolved, that the Congress of the United States is urged to appropriate the necessary funds to accomplish the President's program, and, that the Department of the Interior proceed with construction of works to utilize these funds during fiscal year 1968.

Be it further resolved, that to meet the future water requirements of Utah all of the Units of the Central Utah Project will be required at the earliest practicable date, and it is therefore urged that the Congress of the United States, the President, and the Department of the Interior continue to accelerate the construction of the Central Utah Project by authorizing the necessary works, appropriating the necessary funds, and issuing pertinent directives to the Bureau of Reclamation to accomplish the following:

(1) A progressive and economic construction program on the Bonneville Unit of the Central Utah Project amounting to at least $25 million for fiscal year 1969; and

(2) The completion of advance planning reports and initiation of construction on the Congressionally-authorized Upalco and Jensen units of the Central Utah Project prior to 1969; and

(3) The completion of feasibility reports prior to 1972 on the Uintah and Ute Indian units of the Central Utah Project.

Be it further resolved, that the Secretary of State of the State of Utah be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to the Upper Colorado River Commission and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Utah in Congress.

THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, almost two decades ago—in 1948—an act of Congress established the Selective Service System. Men who were infants that year are today being drafted under that system for military duty. Moreover, the basic system itself, which was in effect reactivated by the 1948 legislation, was created in 1940. Men who were born that year—the same year the System was born which has had such a dominating influence on the lives of an entire generation—are today too old for the draft. Those who have received deferments are technically still vulnerable, but even so the draft rarely touches men above the age of 26.

The Selective Service System has endured all these years, substantially without modification, because it was, to an extent, effective and responsive to the country's needs.

It was also considered a fair system when it was established. It was built on the assumption that men who were called through the draft to serve their country would be chosen equitably.

It might well have remained that same way had the world—and the Nation with it—remained unchanged.

But change has come—change so vast that our vital statistics sound like those of a different Nation from that which existed a quarter of a century ago. Some of those changes, particularly those in our population growth, have brought with them conditions out of which inequities arise when young men are selected to serve.

Today more men are available for the draft than the Armed Forces need. The basic condition is as simple as that. But the steps the Selective Service System has taken to accommodate that condition have not been simple at all. They have involved an extremely complicated program of deferments of various kinds which have in practical effect exempted large numbers of men from the draft, placing the burden of involuntary service increasingly on one group.

The President's message to Congress offers a way and is open to suggestions to bring back to the Selective Service System the principle of equity which Congress always intended for it.

It would subject all eligible men equally and fairly to the process of selection. None would be favored. All would be treated as complete equals.

So long as we must continue to have a draft—and it is obvious that a draft will be necessary for at least the years ahead that we can now foresee—we must have the fairest draft system that a democratic nation can devise.

I believe the program the President has submitted is a proposal worth our most serious consideration. The Senate will scrutinize his recommendations carefully and scrupulously and will consider changes which will treat all as equitably as possible and endeavor to do away with inequities wherever they may exist.

NATIONAL CARIH ASTHMA WEEK

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to commend my distinguished colleague from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] for the introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 4, authorizing the President to proclaim "National CARIH Asthma Week."

It gives me much pleasure to be a cosponsor of this joint resolution, and I do so with deep regard for the devotion of those Americans who have taken up the challenge of transforming intractable asthmatic children into healthy, vigorous youngsters.

Mr. President, this remarkable institution continues to provide for the needs of severely asthmatic children of every race, color, and creed from every State in this Nation. We owe a great debt of gratitude not only to the CARIH institution itself, but also to the dedicated efforts of the 140 CARIH auxiliaries throughout the country who, through private effort, provide the funds for this nonprofit institution.

Mr. President, I urge the speedy adoption of this joint resolution.

JACK W. HALL—LEADER OF LABOR MOVEMENT IN HAWAII

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, in the relatively brief history of the labor movement in Hawaii, one name stands alone in terms of leadership, aggressiveness, and a determination to secure a fair share of the fruits of our society for workers. That name belongs to Jack W. Hall, regional director of the International Longshoremen & Warehousemen's Union.

In a recent speech, Mr. Hall outlined the philosophic approach of the ILWU in Hawaii to social problems and economic change. Because of the union's success in helping to resolve human problems created by industrial change, I know that Mr. Hall's remarks will be of interest to my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mr. Hall's speech be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Human Costs of Progress

(Editor's Note.—In a recent speech, Jack W. Hall, regional director, set forth the philosophic approach which he said has motivated his union, the I.L.W.U., in its approach to social problems and technological change.

(Because the I.L.W.U. has been a major force in re-shaping post-World War II Hawaii, the text is reprinted in full.)

(By Jack W. Hall, ILWU Regional Director)

Let me start off by stating how trade unions as they function today in the United States see their primary responsibility. A union's first responsibility is to the members it represents. It must be able to safeguard the jobs and conditions of the members in its ranks, not those it has represented in the past, or those it may organize in the future.

From this point of view we in the I.L.W.U. have been in the forefront in seeking new answers to the technologically-created problems of our members. In a moment I will describe some of the answers we found—new approaches which were first developed in Hawaii.

Before I do, I want to say that the narrow view of labor's responsibilities which I have given you does not meet the larger social problems. This narrow view is generated by the system within which we operate. It reflects the correspondingly narrow view which most employers take of their responsibility under a free enterprise system. As a matter of fact, a great deal of the freedom of free enterprise has been precisely the freedom from responsibility for the social and human consequences of the enterprise.

Our traditional ideology . . . and let me say right here that I don't believe this ideology corresponds to the facts of modern life, which include giant corporations and imperfect competition . . . but the tradition, nevertheless, does hold that the employer's first responsibility is to profits and that if each employer pursues this interest energetically and efficiently, some will fail, but the best will succeed and—as Adam Smith expressed it—as if guided by an "unseen hand," all this self-centered striving will result in general economic and social progress which will benefit us all. (Here in Hawaii we never really believed that, of course. We know we cannot permit some of our basic industrial firms to fail even if they are not the "best.")

This progress Adam Smith spoke of is evident enough, however.

Less well understood by those who should know is the terrible human cost of much of this progress . . . the cost to millions of lowly, inarticulate people whose lives have been destroyed or blighted by the shifting demands and upsetting effects of the industrial revolution which has been transforming life on our planet at an ever faster pace for more than two centuries.

The progress has always left a frightful human wreckage in its wake—from the mill-towns in 19th century England and the modern slums and mines of South Africa and South America to the black ghettos of our own country or our urban and rural slums right here in Hawaii.

It hasn't been progress at all—it has been a disaster for millions of individuals . . . for underpaid workers in unregulated industries, for middle-aged workers whose skills have become obsolete, for uneducated Negroes replaced by cotton-picking machines, for slum-reared youngsters who drop out of school and can't find a job in a society which demands more and more education.

Trade unions were born as workers sought to defend themselves against the socially irresponsible use of economic power. In many countries this effort produced socialist parties, striving to establish a political-economy in which the criterion for economic decisions would be the general welfare, rather than private profit.

In the United States, for the past 80 years, the labor movement has generally concentrated on winning recognition and defending the interests of its members within a given industry. I believe that unions have an important secondary responsibility to be activists and agitators for solutions to broader social problems which cannot be met by collective bargaining. Only once in my lifetime has the American labor movement undertaken anything like structural reforms in our society, however. That was when the C.I.O., led by John L. Lewis, backed Roosevelt's New Deal and initiated our present system of social security and public welfare measures.

These measures, along with the Keynesian concept that government fiscal policy could be used to stabilize the economy, recognized the fact that economic change and progress create human problems which cannot be prevented or resolved by private decisionmaking, and that society as a whole has a responsibility to its members who are the victims of change. A high-water mark of this thinking was the Full Employment Act of 1946. That Act in its declaration of policy says:

"The Congress hereby declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy, with the assistance and cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

The cold war prevented us from building further on these foundations, until very recent years.

Finally, shocked by revelations of widespread poverty, persistent unemployment, human deterioration and waste, in the midst of general affluence, we started to take some relatively small-scale public steps under the slogans "A War on Poverty" and a "Great Society." Unfortunately, these beginnings are starving in the cradle because of our disastrous involvement in Vietnam, with its overwhelming cost of more than $2 billion a month.

I say all this to indicate how narrow our own achievement has been, and to indicate that we are aware of this. We have simply concentrated on those solutions which were possible for us within the context in which we worked.

There are some unique features of Hawaii's industry which favored our efforts to make employers accept responsibility for helping to resolve the human problems created by industrial change. These include:

1—Insularity which makes problems like unemployment more critical. They have to be solved by us here. There is no frontier or neighboring state, to take the pressure off. Also, insularity makes it easier to trace the effects of economic decisions back to their causes.

2—Concentration of ownership. The Big Five were the decision-makers and everyone here knew it.

3—Importation of the Labor Force by the Big Five. Workers were brought in from many countries, but by one group, for one purpose. They may have worked for several companies, or for several industries, but still they worked for the same general group of employers and thought of themselves as having had their fate determined by the Big Five.

4—The union to be successful was compelled to forge an inter-racial solidarity, which is unique in America.

On the mainland, the late-comer immigrant group has always been the shock absorber of industrial change. As each group was assimilated, it escaped from the problems and left them to the group which took its place. The Negro is the last of these, with no replacements in sight. This is one reason for a general lack of social solidarity and responsibility in American life. It also helps us understand the Negro crisis.

In Hawaii only an inter-racial, statewide union could cope with the Big Five. To hold the union together we had to represent the interest of every racial group.

5—Changes came faster in Hawaii. Within 15 years after the war, the workforce in sugar and pineapple was cut in half.

With this background, how did the Union seek to discharge its responsibilities to its members and the community?

In the sugar industry more than 15 years ago, the union made the basic decision not to waste its strength in a losing fight against mechanization and job eliminations. Instead it demanded that the workers be given a share in the benefits of the machine and be protected against victimization. This required workers as well as employers to act in a responsible way.

In the sugar industry, for example, instead of permitting layoffs of younger, low seniority workers, who would have to join the ranks of the unemployed and who then and for several years after would become public welfare burdens, we initiated two programs—designed to shrink the work-force from the top—both at the expense of larger wage increases:

1—Incentives—in the form of separation pay and repatriation allowances—were provided to encourage the older worker to voluntarily leave the workforce. Older workers were permitted to substitute for younger workers who would otherwise have been laid off. Repatriation incentives encouraged older workers, particularly Philippine nationals, to return permanently to their homeland before normal retirement age, with sizeable sums of American dollars, which vastly expanded in purchasing power in the Philippines. These repatriates on reaching normal retirement age were all eligible for social security and collective bargaining pensions.

2—We took money that would otherwise have gone to active employees to buy pensions for older workers so they could afford to leave the workforce and we negotiated for them and their spouses the best medical plan in the nation for retired workers.

A similar program was followed in pineapple.

Together with the above efforts to get older workers out of the workforce, the union encouraged the employers, with some degree of success, to retrain workers displaced by technological change for more skilled jobs. Rate protection was assured for extended periods depending on length of service.

In the longshore industry, the displacement problem has been relatively much greater and has come in a much shorter period of time.

Containerization and bulk shipment of practically all Matson cargo to Hawaii has had a tremendous impact on jobs and work opportunity here in Hawaii. Hawaii is the destination point of all Matson cargo flowing out of the Pacific Northwest, the San Francisco Bay Area and Southern California.

In less than 10 years, Hawaii's longshore workforce has been cut in half, and work opportunity for the individual has gone down by a third. The outer-islands have been hit hardest.

How did we go about easing the impact of these changes? We did it by:

1—Providing jobs for men who wanted to transfer to the Pacific Coast ports where work was plentiful and giving them travel allowances of $850 for family men ($325 for single employees).

2—Permitting employees to repatriate to home lands with lump-sum settlements of pension equities. Some left with as much as $20,000.

3—Offering generous severance allowances to older workers. Employees leaving or retiring at age 60 under the old agreement, in addition to all other pension and severance arrangements received a supplemental severance bonus of $6,000.

Today the statewide longshore work force is down to what seems to be minimum needs for the next several years. The problem now is the distribution of work opportunity between ports. Out-ports, especially Kauai and Hilo, have the minimum number of men required to handle a conventional ship but barging of containers has cut work opportunity to less than subsistence level.

We are meeting this problem in current negotiations by establishing a statewide labor pool with hours equalized on a statewide basis. Workers will be moved from port to port by air to accomplish this equalization and if work opportunity falls below an average of 38 hours weekly, over a four-week period, wage supplementation will be paid from Mechanization Funds to bring earnings to that average.

We are now engaged in energetic efforts to promote and to organize Hawaii's newest industry—tourism—with the hope that this expanding industry will be the source of decent jobs at union wages and conditions for those displaced by future economic change and for our young people entering the labor market for the first time.

We are supporting and encouraging training programs, government and private, so these displaced and new workers will have the skills to fill these new jobs.

I am confident that through the process of collective bargaining we will be able to handle the problems of our present members as economic change continues. But this is only a small part of the overall State and national problems. The big job will have to be done by government, labor and business working together. Only in this way can the larger social problems be mitigated, let alone solved.

NEW YORKERS ARE BEING SOLD OUT TO IOU'S

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the New York press is providing excellent coverage of the big, but generally unreported stories of our times. I refer to the overcharge exacted by the investor-owned utilities, the failure of State regulatory bodies to regulate and the arrogant efforts of the IOU's to attain complete monopoly on their essential electricity by excluding city-owned and customer-owned power systems from essential wholesale power supply.

The situation is worse in some other States than it is in New York. But it is bad there, and I compliment newspapers such as the New York Times, the New York World Journal Tribune, and the Watertown Daily Times for their coverage and editorials.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record two editorials entitled "Selling Out on Power," published in the March 2 and March 3 issues of the Watertown, N.Y., Daily Times, and the March 4 editorial, entitled "Assessing the PSC" published in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Watertown (N.Y.) Daily Times, Mar. 2, 1967]

Selling Out on Power

The proposal for an $8,000,000,000 atomic power program in New York state is a sellout to the private power companies. No other conclusion can be reached because the New York state power authority will be forbidden to construct atomic power plants in the future and will at the same time be confined to hydroelectric considerations as an operator of Niagara and Massena and a coordinator in other hydroelectric matters. This proposal must receive legislative enactment. May the legislature insist that the authority be given as many rights to the construction of nuclear plants as the private utilities.

The statement is made by Gov. Rockefeller that the New York utilities must double their annual electricity production in the next ten years, from 17,000,000 kilowatts to 35,000,000 kilowatts. This sounds big, but it is absolutely the same program that the utilities have set for themselves ever since World War II, namely an increase of ten per cent a year. So suddenly a deal is made that will enable them to keep up what they have been doing in the past, in return for which the power authority, which was conceived as an agency to represent the citizens' interests in power making and power distribution, will be shoved over into the corner and given a job of keeping the old power plants swept out.

Incidentally, the power authority today is producing approximately a little more than one-fifth of the state's annual power production. By 1977, if the scheme is accepted by the legislature, the authority will produce a little more than one-twelfth of the annual production. Many people fought the better part of 40 years to assure the state of an adequate share of the power production. Suddenly in the prospect of an $8,000,000,000 expansion, the state's role is downgraded so that the private needs for capital can be advanced, with the lenders being assured that they will not have any increase in the amount of competition from the power authority. The statement is made in news stories that there will be no competition insofar as the atomic power production is concerned; continue to limit the state power authority to hydroelectric operations to avoid competition with the utilities in the field of nuclear energy.

There is language in the announcement about a role for the power authority. It is supposed to make power available to municipalities and public power districts in greater amounts through a withdrawal of power from private utilities. They in turn would get their increased electricity requirements from the nuclear plants. This seems to be saying that public power will go to publicly owned installations primarily, and privately built nuclear power will go toward the industrial needs of consumers.

We cannot believe that the farsighted programs in this state, originally conceived by the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, enhanced and enlarged by the late Gov. Herbert H. Lehman, brought to culmination by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, should now by a simple legislative enactment be placed in a deep freeze.

[From the Watertown (N.Y.) Daily Times, Mar. 3, 1967]

Selling Out on Power—II

Continuing the comments against the Albany power plan that would deny the New York State Power authority the right to construct nuclear plants, we call attention to the efforts during the past seven years to broaden the state power franchise. The suddenness of the announcement Wednesday that the private utilities would be given free rein in the field of nuclear electricity production might lead some citizens to think that a major need had only recently been discovered, and the cost of meeting that need was particularly high, $8,000,000,000, over the next ten years, and finally there was an immediacy about accomplishing the objective.

In 1960 the New York State Power authority publicly called attention to the role that the authority should be given in meeting the needs of the electricity consumers during the years to the 1980's. In 1960 the authority sought permission of the legislature to build and operate nuclear power plants. At the time two temporary committees on power resources had recommended against the authority's request for nuclear privileges, although the authority was the one state agency that was supposed to be responsible for publicly owned electric power production. The authority itself had made studies and the then chairman, Robert Moses, had sought with his persuasiveness the opportunity at legislation. Again in 1961, he and the authority asked for atomic privileges.

The Power Authority Act was confined to hydroelectric developments, nuclear power not being in the picture when the early laws were passed. Never, however, did the authority seek to restrict the private utilities from the nuclear field. The thinking has been that both the privately owned and the publicly owned utilities had an important role in meeting consumer needs.

In 1965 the authority went at it again, proving conclusively that in behalf of the public it should have a nuclear opportunity. The 1965 effort, however, was made behind the scenes, although the justification and the statistics amply supported authority recommendation. Although the proposal never saw the light of day, suggested amendments to the Power Authority Act were couched in terms that the public interest requires "that the state as well as the private utility companies should participate in the development of electric power from nuclear fields and other forms of atomic energy."

There was apparent rejection of this in Albany, although the public never had a chance to express itself.

In 1966 the authority came at it again, unfortunately in an informal manner, and got nowhere. This is the kind of issue that should have been in the forefront of the campaign, but for reasons that aren't understood never a mention was made. Late in 1966, once again the authority prepared documentation as to why it should be given the right to build nuclear power plants.

As soon as word of its efforts got out, there was a gang-up against it so that within a period of a little more than a month the authority recommendations were rejected as though they never existed, and the governor, together with the speaker of the assembly, Mr. Travia, are proposing to introduce legislation that is 100 percent against the interests of the state power authority, the traditional power agency of the state. It has been said that the power authority will be given permission to develop electricity on some settling pools, but this isn't the big power producer of the future. Nuclear power will be the big producer. Yet Albany says that it is going to limit the state power authority to hydroelectric operations to avoid competition with the utilities in the field of nuclear energy.

Is there anyone in the state who is ready to rise up and head off the legislative embargo against the authority's entering the nuclear power development? Who will stand up and assist the agency in carrying out the public power policy of this state which dates back for 40 years. Certainly there has been no mandate for reversal, but that seems to be what is happening.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 4, 1967]

Assessing the PSC

The city's request for greater control over utilities comes too late in this legislative session for comprehensive consideration. But it will be unfortunate if it does not become the basis for a thorough study of the state's regulatory laws and of the operation of the Public Service Commission.

Mayor Lindsay's proposal that the PSC be required to hold public hearings before authorizing rate increases follows his unsuccessful protests in November when the commission granted a $32.4-million rate boost to Consolidated Edison first and ordered hearings afterward. These hearings, now in adjournment, are to be resumed March 14. Meanwhile, New Yorkers are paying bigger electric bills.

The Mayor's bill and alternative proposals should be considered by a Joint Legislative Committee, which could hold hearings over the summer. Its job would be to evaluate the commission's work, and to revise and update the state's laws in this field. The Transportation Corporations Law, for example, unchanged since 1840, is more attuned to conditions in primitive rural communities than to the aggravating problem of urban life, yet this law sets many of the standards for utility regulation today. Such a committee also could consider qualifications for PSC membership and staff. Politics often seems to have been the primary requisite in past appointments.

A real assessment of the commission and a dispassionate look at its decisions are doubly important in the light of the program just announced by Governor Rockefeller and the state's public utilities for an $8-billion expansion program in the next decade. New York's need for much more power is clear, but the public is entitled to assurance that it has an effective watchdog in deciding how that power is produced and what it costs.

THE QUIET PAIR OF PHILANTHROPISTS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, it has been more than a month since the small airplane carrying Mr. and Mrs. Stephen Currier vanished over the Caribbean. It must now be presumed that they are lost.

These were remarkable individuals. Born to great wealth, they made a pact to invest their inheritances in solving social problems in the United States, rather than investing in their own pleasure. They preferred to remain anonymous; and made more efforts to escape publicity than most people make to get it.

Mrs. Currier was the daughter of our Ambassador to Great Britain, the Honorable David Bruce, and granddaughter of Andrew Mellon. In 1955, while a student at Radcliffe, she married Stephen Currier, son of the late painter Richard Currier.

In 1958 the couple set up the Taconic Foundation. Through this outlet, they poured funds into the struggle to obtain equal opportunities for Negroes, although it was not then fashionable to do so.

More recently, the attention of the Curriers turned to the growing urban problem. Last year, Mr. Currier formed Urban America, Inc., which is studying such problems as bad housing and inadequate urban planning. The couple had also been working on plans for beautifying the Washington area.

Stephen Currier was not a philanthropist from afar. He spent time in the slums he sought to improve. He saw his role as that of catalyst in problem-solving; typically, when the Federal Government authorized funds for mental health research, the Taconic Foundation departed from the field.

Characteristic of the couple is the fund known as the Harvard Gamble, which provides means for worthy students wishing to go to Harvard, but are below the scholarship level and are without funds.

Mr. President, many eloquent tributes have been made to the Curriers in this Chamber. Many others have appeared in the press and have been broadcast on radio and television. One of the best was delivered by Edward P. Morgan over the American Broadcasting network on February 3. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Morgan's fine remarks be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Edward P. Morgan and the News, February 3, 1967

Almost everybody wants to make more money but too many people who strike it rich leave a trail of trampled bodies and ideals behind. And then, sour grapes or not, a lot who don't make it automatically equate wealth with evil, sin, reckless living and the exploitation of society.

History brims with the depredations of cruel, selfish captains of industry, the ruthless rascality of the robber barons and their ilk. But perhaps the greatest mistake Karl Marx ever made was to overlook the fact that there is a little avarice in almost all of us. The appetite for tangible gain is a human one; keeping up with the Joneses—or, preferably, passing them on the curves—can have as much motive power as an ideology. There is another truth which Marx missed and a lot of the rest of us are inclined to forget. It is that many men—and women—of wealth have been powerful influences for good. Maybe some are activated by a feeling of guilt over "ill-gotten gains." But there is another breed consisting of people who use money joyously as a tool to build, so to speak, a social structure that lends a little more grace to the landscape of civilization than existed before they came along. Very likely they would have drawn the same plans without a bankroll but it is marvelous how money can help translate a blueprint into an edifice.

Seventeen days ago Mr. and Mrs. Stephen R. Currier were lost on a chartered flight from Puerto Rico to the Virgin Islands. They were virtually unknown to most Americans. But their generosity, commitment and deep, energetic concern for the human race warmed and lit up the lives of countless people so that while the loss of this young couple is a cruel tragedy it is counterbalanced by the glowing fact that they did such an incredible amount of good in such a breathlessly short time.

Inevitably, most of the news stories about the missing Curriers zeroed in on their wealth. Audrey Currier, 33, was the daughter of David K. E. Bruce, now U.S. ambassador to Britain, and granddaughter of Andrew Mellon, Pittsburgh banker and multimillionaire who was Secretary of the Treasury under Presidents Harding, Coolidge and Hoover. Steve Currier, 36, stepson of Edward M. W. Warburg, himself a prominent philanthropist and patron of the arts, was a Harvard dropout who enhanced his own fortune, small by comparison to his wife's, with wise investment.

But the real story involves what the Curriers, who leave three small children, did with themselves and their money. They did it so quietly that their immediate families are only now beginning to discover the extent of their activities. They created a private foundation, Taconic, and no tax dodge, it. The young man who never finished Harvard and the girl who finished Radcliffe with honors, used it to help through college students who just missed qualifying for other scholarships. The number of "Taconics," as they are called, on the Harvard campus today would be hard to count. Before Birmingham Police Chief Bull Connor made civil rights a national issue with his dogs and firehoses, Currier was unobstrusively immersing himself in the cause. Through Potomac Institute, financed by the Taconic Foundation, he contributed money to hire expert help in the drafting of civil rights legislation in the mid-60s, so inadequate were Congressional staffs dealing with it. He substantially supported the NAACP Legal Defense Fund and the Southern Regional Council. He went to Harlem, not to "slum" but to try to find answers to social problems. He was instrumental in organizing Urban America, Incorporated, to fight poverty and prejudice in conjunction with governmental efforts. He became enormously and expertly interested in conservation, gave an important private boost to Lady Bird Johnson's beautification program.

Currier designed himself the fabulous home they built in the Virginia hunt country and Audrey Currier did her own interior design and decoration. The magnificent estate, after their children's use of it, will be left to the U.S. government hopefully as a sort of American Chequers where presidents can take important guests for quiet weekends as British prime ministers have done in that famous country place in England.

The Curriers were not of the jet set and they shunned publicity. Indeed protecting their near-anonymity was one of the assignments of Currier's public relations men, though they were far from recluses and once organized with the other Warburg children a huge and hilariously happy weekend party as a wedding anniversary presents for Steve's mother and step-father.

Eddie Warburg once encountered a moving passage in a collection of quotations which, he remembers, struck Steve as a creed worth living. It runs like this: "I shall pass through this world but once. Any good thing therefore that I can do, any kindness that I can show to any human being, let me do it now. Let me not defer it nor neglect it, for I shall not pass this way again."

It would hardly have mattered if Stephen and Audrey Currier had never heard that creed for they lived it anyway.

FARM BUREAU SUPPORTS MARKETING RIGHTS BILL

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the current issue of Nation's Agriculture, monthly publication of the American Farm Bureau, discusses the Agricultural Producers Marketing Act. The bill is designed to stop unfair practices affecting producers of farm products and their marketing associations.

It is my belief that any sound farm policy should support the farmer's independence and at the same time encourage and protect his right to take collective action as a means of improving the price received. That is why the bill, supported by the Farm Bureau, makes good sense: it gives the farmer protection when exercising his right to bargain.

As this article points out:

> The market system provides an opportunity for what, in reality, is an economic contest between buyer and seller. . . . Farmers have little or no negotiating strength and . . . the handlers are winning the contest—buying at the lowest possible cost.

I am pleased to have added my name to that of Senators Aiken, Young of North Dakota, and Lausche as a sponsor of the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the article "Farm Bureau United Behind Marketing Rights Bill" be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Farm Bureau Unites Behind Marketing Rights Bill

Marketing rights for farmers and their marketing and bargaining associations will be a major issue in the 90th Congress.

The Agricultural Producers Marketing Act —a bill which received widespread support at hearings last year—has been re-introduced by Senators George D. Aiken (R.) of Vermont, Frank Lausche (D.) of Ohio and Milton Young (R.) of North Dakota.

The bill—designed to stop unfair practices affecting producers of farm products and their marketing associations—is strongly supported by Farm Bureau.

The Aiken-Lausche-Young bill will be known as S. 109, the same number assigned to it during the past Congress. Similar bills are being introduced by prominent members of the House of Representatives.

The marketing rights bill would forbid handlers to:

Deny any producer his right to join and belong to an association of producers.

Discriminate—or threaten to discriminate—against a producer because of his membership in or contract with an association of producers.

Coerce or intimidate a producer into withdrawing from his association.

Offer any inducement or reward to a producer for refusing to join or ceasing to belong to an association of producers.

The need for such legislation was made very clear at hearings on S. 109 held last year by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Chuck B. Shuman, President of the American Farm Bureau Federation, pointed out to the Senators that since the early 1920's public policy has encouraged farmers to form marketing associations which could negotiate contracts for farm products.

"These laws," Shuman said, "in effect granted farmers the right to market cooperatively through their own marketing associations. Unfortunately, farmers have been discouraged from exercising their right to act cooperatively because of reprisals and fears of reprisals from some processors."

The Senators heard testimony from several farmers who had participated in cooperative marketing activities and who had—as a consequence—experienced acreage cuts and unusual treatment by processors. There can be no doubt that farmers' marketing rights have been denied and thwarted by some processors.

Today, processors deny that they practice the unfair acts set out in S. 109. Even if that is true, processors know they can use the unfair practices without suffering legal penalties, and farmers know it, too. A poor market is better than no market at all; so many farmers do not join cooperative marketing efforts for fear of reprisals such as loss of acreage or termination of a contract.

Those who recognize the need for better marketing also recognize the desirability of protecting farmers' rights to cooperatively market their products. Legislation which will establish "rules of fair play' on the part of processors and others in their business relationships with farmers should eliminate these threats of discrimination against farmers for having joined a marketing association.

President Shuman has said, "This is moderate legislation that is truly in the best long-time interests of producers and processors who are really interested in responsible marketing practices."

One would think, from an ordinary knowledge of agricultural marketing, that S. 109 is a fairly straight-forward idea that will quickly become law. Such is not necessarily the case.

The market system provides an opportunity for what, in reality, is an economic contest between buyer and seller—one trying to buy at the lowest possible cost and the other trying to sell under the most favorable terms. However, there is little opportunity for millions of farmers, acting individually, to be very effective in the contest when the buying, processing and distribution of agricultural products is concentrated in the hands of a relatively few large processors.

The processors know that, under the present rules of the game, the cards are stacked on their side of the table, that farmers have little or no negotiating strength, and that the handlers are winning the contest—buying at the lowest possible cost.

Opponents to S. 109 are opposing a fair game. And there is danger that they may win in the legislative halls just as they have won in the fields of crops and pens of livestock. One way farmers may do better at the market place is to support "rules of fair play" to govern conduct there.

Consequently, Farm Bureau is strongly urging the enactment of legislation, such as S. 109, which will prohibit unfair practices designed to discourage voluntary farmer participation in marketing associations. Farmers should not be denied the right to market their products because of voluntary membership in their associations.

THE SEARCH FOR ALTERNATIVES TO GAULLISM IN EUROPE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President—

> Some new sounds are being heard in Europe and they aren't The Star-Spangled Banner.

This is the opening sentence in a most provocative editorial entitled "Seeking Alternatives to De Gaulle," published in the February 10 issue of Life magazine.

The "new sounds" to which the editorial refers are Harold Wilson's "playing it a little anti-American" in order to gain admission to the Common Market and Chancellor Kiesinger's renewal of close French-German collaboration.

The editorial observes:

> They're all talking De Gaulle's language these days.

Life then goes on to outline an alternative to De Gaulle's policy, an alternative based on four propositions:

> Britain's admittance to Europe, Europe technologically independent of us, Bridge-building to the East and a Germany free to be itself.

Life concludes that "our job is to refine these ingredients of Atlantic policy so that we are able to pose to Europeans a clear alternative—as we do not at present—to all that is narrow and inadequate in De Gaulle's policy."

I commend the Life editorial to the attention of Senators. The editorial carries a step further some of the thoughts I included in an article I wrote in the October 1966 issue of Foreign Affairs. I concluded that article by saying:

> For our fundamental national interests can easily accommodate the changing mood of Europe. We need sacrifice nothing to keep our policies relevant. But only by so doing can we preserve our influence in the Europe of today—and tomorrow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Seeking Alternatives to De Gaulle

Some new sounds are being heard in Europe and they aren't *The Star-Spangled Banner.* Harold Wilson urges Britain's acceptance into the Common Market "so that we can speak from strength to our Atlantic partners." He added, "Let no one here doubt Britain's loyalty to NATO and the Atlantic Alliance. But loyalty must never mean subservience." As Germany's Willy Brandt said, Wilson had to play it "a little anti-American" if he expects Britain to be admitted. West Germany's new Chancellor Kurt Kiesinger is out to make friends with Communist East Europe and has already won diplomatic recognition from Romania. He pursues this new "great policy" in collaboration with France. They're all talking De Gaulle's language these days.

It's possible to dismiss such European developments as being beyond our concern. As Europe grows more prosperous and more independent of us, we even like to think that we planned it that way. In a sense, we did. We knew that our relative ascendency in the Western alliance would gradually diminish and generously looked forward to the economic rivalry of a strong and independent Europe—though in the context of what Jack Kennedy called "a mutually beneficial partnership."

It isn't quite working out that way. There are other trends to note in Europe: NATO humiliatingly evacuating its headquarters, with a gaping hole in its defenses; De Gaulle feting Kosygin and denouncing the U.S.; Britain wondering whether it can any longer play a world role; West Germany outgrowing its policy of close dependence on the U.S.

What has gone wrong is not the health of Western Europe, in which we can rejoice, but the health of the alliance. "Treaties are like young girls and roses," Charles de Gaulle has said. "They last while they last." He expects the West to take his Westernness for granted while he seeks an accommodation with the East. He believes, as the foreign editor of *Le Monde* puts it, that "it is unnecessary for Western Europe to pay anything for American protection against the Soviets since it clearly is in the American interest to provide it." From this De Gaulle proceeds to his next conclusion: "I am not displeased to have the U.S.S.R. as a counterweight to American hegemony—and I am no more displeased to have the United States as a counterweight to Soviet hegemony." Here is the core of Gaullism.

We are often assured that *of course* and *at heart* De Gaulle is a Westerner, a believer in the Atlantic Alliance. This would be true of him if the West were faced with a threat of imminent Soviet attack. But the kind of Europe, and world, that De Gaulle seeks in his own maneuvering has some important differences from our goals, including his desire to use Russia and us as counterbalances. In this sense, he is not on our "side" at all. He wants the cold war ended—fine; but he also believes it is the U.S.—and not Soviet Russia—that threatens the peace and jeopardizes the détente. In his New Year's message he proclaimed that France, having "regained her independence," seeks "continental rapprochement" and a "European Europe." "While Europe thus takes the road to peace," the U.S. wages its "unjust war" in Vietnam, a "detestable war, since it leads a great nation to ravage a small one." From these attitudes it can be seen that De Gaulle, if an ally, is an ally on Judgment Day only.

He has regained his "independence." We accordingly have a right to ours.

It would be merely annoying, and dismissable as "typically French," if De Gaulle's thesis was confined to him alone. But his thinking appeals to an increasing segment of European opinion. Nationalism is back in style in Europe, *reinforced* by the economic advantages of a larger community. De Gaulle also speaks to some basic European instinct about itself; that it should not be allowed to harden any longer into a divided continent, with the division running dangerously down the center of Germany. His vision of opening relations with Eastern Europe was earlier than ours. But, alas, this initiative, and all the good it might bring to Europe, is also perverted by the narrow French ambitions it serves.

We could more easily accept the loss of our Atlantic Partnership dreams if we thought De Gaulle's own conception of Europe would work. But his is a vision hauntingly dated by 19th Century notions of maintaining France's key role, which is too small for the modern necessities of Europe. If De Gaulle's formula fails, as it very well may, we must have an acceptable alternative at hand. This alternative may have no success while De Gaulle's veto is in force, but it needs to exist to be ready when he is gone. Here are some of the ingredients of such an alternative:

Britain's admittance to Europe. A Britain wholeheartedly in Europe's councils will certainly not speak captively with America's voice, as De Gaulle fears. But with its worldwide experience and traditions parallel to ours, it will help to break up some of that claustrophobic Franco-German atmosphere.

Europe technologically independent of us. Harold Wilson warns against the dangers of "industrial helotry" if Europe is too dependent on "American business for the sophisticated apparatus which will call the tune in the '70s and '80s." This European concern is legitimate, and the ground rules need to be worked out.

Bridge-building to the East. The U.S. should join this effort to draw back into Europe those Communist nations which are no longer satellites. President Johnson has already so urged us, but the Vietnamese war inhibits both East European countries and U.S. congressmen.

A Germany free to be itself. Now that it is no longer a "client" of ours and is taking its own initiatives, we are freed from having to think of MLF or other intricate nuclear roles for Germany and, in doing so, stirring up bad memories. The Germans will have to weigh their own sacrifices in the pursuit of a unified nation, and this is healthier all around. "We seek neither national control nor national ownership of atomic weapons," Kiesinger has promised. Territorial pledges to the East will come next.

The danger is that these new German sacrifices will not produce reunification either. If in the future there emerges a frustrated and nationalistic Germany, this will be chargeable to De Gaulle.

At this point, if not much sooner, the Atlantic connection and what is left of NATO will be plainly relevant. For Russia, which recognizes only real power, shows little readiness to make any hard concessions to De Gaulle. The help of the U.S. will be required to bring unity to divided Germany. The pullback of Russian forces can be purchased only by a reciprocal pullback by the U.S. So long as our intentions are made clear to our allies in advance, it is not too soon for the U.S. to consider bringing home one or two of its five German-based divisions now. Our Atlantic and NATO commitment will still be there. Even many of the French, after De Gaulle, will come to see that with the superpower of Russia as a neighbor, there is no safe Europe except in an Atlantic context. Our job is to refine these ingredients of Atlantic policy so that we are able to pose to Europeans a clear alternative (as we do not at present) to all that is narrow and inadequate in De Gaulle's policy.

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON CONSULAR TREATY WITH U.S.S.R.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, since the Senate will soon be confronted—probably later this week—with the monumental and precedent-shattering decision on how to vote on the proposed ratification of the consular treaty with Russia and its close tie in with the administration's companion effort to increase East-West trade with Communist countries, I submit for publication in the Record some highly interesting editorials on these matters coming to my attention from various sections of the country.

The first editorial is one from my home State—the Daily Plainsman of Huron, S. Dak., and is entitled "Consular Treaty With U.S.S.R. Should Wait on End of Red Aid to Hanoi." It tells its own persuasive story.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Consular Treaty With U.S.S.R. Should Wait on End of Red Aid to Hanoi

One of the many strange maneuvers in the current confused world political situation is the emphasis which the administration is putting on ratification this year of a consular treaty with Russia.

Last year the proposal did not come to the Senate for a vote. But Senator Karl Mundt, who has vigorously opposed ratification during Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings, predicts that the issue will come to the floor this time as a presidential "must" measure.

Proponents of the consular treaty argue that it will help our government to assist and protect a handful of tourists in Russia and that it will open more channels of communication which might help in some fashion to build more amicable relations with the Soviet Union.

Opponents of the treaty—the American Legion is one of the most vocal—argue that it is not in the national interest to enter into an agreement of this nature with a Communist power that is providing massive military assistance to a third party with whom the United States is engaged in combat.

Regardless of the good or bad long term effects of a consular agreement, there are many reasons why this does not seem to be the correct time for Senate ratification.

No one questions the fact that the Soviet government is furnishing massive aid to the North Vietnamese—sophisticated military hardware without which the war could not be continued. Senate acceptance of any type of treaty at this time implies condonation of this conduct.

The Red Chinese have reportedly informed Hanoi that peace overtures must not be made through Russia, and the British claim that there are now 100,000 Red Chinese in North Vietnam for the prime purpose of stiffening resistance against anything unsatisfactory to Peking. Obviously any agreements with Russia at this time will serve only to stiffen Red Chinese resistance to all efforts to end the Vietnamese conflict.

Soviet leaders alternately plead an interest in peace and threaten increased military assistance to North Vietnam. All of their ideas for a settlement in Vietnam are equally as unacceptable to the U.S. as those emanating from Hanoi.

In fairness to the nearly half-million service men now on duty in Vietnam—the men whose lives are risked daily to Soviet Russian weapons—the United States Senate should either table the consular treaty, or demand the cessation of hostilities in Vietnam on terms acceptable to this country as a condition for ratification of such a treaty.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the second editorial to which I invite careful consideration comes from the Mount Washington Press, of Cincinnati, Ohio, and is entitled "Advertising Legerdemain." From it, many Senators may learn for the first time that the Russian Communists are now advertising in our metropolitan press, urging Americans to support expanded trade with Russia. Indeed, this is a most unusual and brash attempt by a foreign government to supply its economic deficiencies at the very time it is providing every sophisticated weapon the North Vietnamese need and use to prolong the war and to expand our American casualties in that war. I think Senators and others will find the last three paragraphs of the Mount Washington Press editorial especially illuminating and shocking.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Mount Washington Press,
Feb. 16, 1967]

Advertising Legerdemain

This newspaper, like most, relies heavily on advertising revenue. We do reserve the right to refuse certain advertisements, as do most papers. But in general we think the businessman is entitled to tell the public of his services or products in his own language.

However, a piece of advertising legerdemain was managed last month which requires comment. We refer to that big, eye-catching two page spread which appeared in the New York Times under the banner: "Foreign Trade—Two Way Traffic." It was purchased by the USSR. The date is important: January 16, 1967, pages 56 and 57.

On page 67 of that newspaper, one finds a three-column news story headed: "Soviet Ad Seeks Wider U.S. Trade." The lead paragraph reads: "A Two-page Soviet advertisement in the New York Times today is viewed by observers as the most important positive response President Johnson has yet received in his effort to build a trade bridge to the Soviet Union."

Seven paragraphs further along we find this: "In his State of the Union message last week, President Johnson indicated that he would press again at this session of Congress for passage of the East-West trade bill. This measure would give the President authority to extend most-favored-nation treatment to Communist countries, to conclude bilateral trade and other economic agreements with them, and to extend some types of commercial credits to them . . ."

Having read this long story, we turn back to inspect that big U.S.S.R. advertisement inviting Americans to advertise their products in the U.S.S.R. The advertisement even tells us that "direct mail advertising will be an effective channel through which to inform the Soviet market of foreign products." That invitation, from a country where a letter is about as private as a bulletin board by the time the censors finish.

Knowing something about newspapers and advertising, it dawned on us that it would have been a superhuman task for this ad to have been written, laid-out, artwork done, type set, and copy submitted in a period of just six days between the President's State of the Union speech and the publication date. How then could it be a response?

We decided to find out. We did. For this special edition the New York Times rate card stipulated: "Closing Date: Tuesday, December 27, 1966. All material, copy and layouts must be in New York by this date." The price: $6,240 per full page, for the U.S. edition.

Since the Soviets couldn't have been responding to Mr. Johnson, do you think it possible that Mr. Johnson was . . . ? I don't even want to say it.

—Lyle H. Munson.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the third editorial comes from the State of Oregon and was published in the Hillsboro Argus, Hillsboro, Oreg., under the title, "Wishful Thinking Seen." It makes excellent and effective use of information available to all of us from the great weekly magazine, U.S. News & World Report, to point out the futility and the bad judgment of encouraging increased exports of American supplies to Russia and of approving the consular treaty as a step toward that objective at the very time when American boys are dying every day on the Vietnam battle front, solely because of the weapons of war the Russians are sending the Vietnamese to be used for that purpose.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Hillsboro (Oreg.) Argus, Feb. 6, 1967]

Wishful Thinking Seen

The snow job that has been coming out of Washington in recent years relative to the possibility of Russia serving as an intermediary in bringing peace in Asia is, it seems to us, based on wishful thinking rather than horse sense.

High officials talk of the need to become closer to Russia because the Soviets want peace. Why shouldn't people have occasion to wonder why US seeks to make one deal after another with the Russian Communists considering their stated longstanding goal of "burying us?" Their vital role of supply to North Vietnam and the Viet Cong is prolonging the war and bringing death and wounds to more and more of America's young men every day in the effort to spread Communism further into SE Asia.

US officials back space treaties, airline pacts, establishment of more consulates in both countries and expandsion of East-West trade. All the while war goes on with Russia the principal supplier of war material for the forces fighting against us.

We have long felt that it is a waste of time to think that Russia would work to bring about peace and take us off the hook in Vietnam. What could suit their long range goals any more than to lend encouragement and materiel to bleed us white in manpower and dollars as we get more and more mired down in jungle warfare? And this comes in many instances as our hands are tied behind our backs through political conduct of the war that has now put Hanoi out of bounds to US bombing.

The U.S. News & World Report, in its issue of Jan. 30, clearly points to the role of Russia in Vietnam with facts and figures that leave little room for question on our part and anyone not governed by wishful thinking.

We certainly wish there were grounds for hope that Russia was changing its attitude and sincerely wants peace. The whole history of Communist Russia's relations with the US and violation of past treaties, however, belies this.

Mr. MUNDT. Finally, Mr. President, I invite attention to a recent editorial entitled "The Russian Enemy," with the subhead, "When Will We Learn?" published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. Starting with the blunt opening sentence—

> The greatest continuing miscalculation in the Vietnam war is our looking to the Russians as a hope for peace—

The editorial hammers hard at the unprecedented policies of President Johnson, whereby he urges ratification of the consular treaty with Communist Russia and expanding American exports to the Communists, when every report from the battlefront lists American casualties resulting from the arms and weapons that the Russians are giving our enemy in Vietnam in steadily expanding numbers. It is an editorial all should read.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Feb. 16, 1967]

When Will We Learn?—The Russian Enemy

The greatest continuing miscalculation in the Vietnam war is our looking to the Russians as a hope for peace.

The real enemy in Vietnam is not Red China or even the North Vietnamese. It is the Russians.

More than 80 per cent of all the war materiel used to kill American troops comes from Russia, at a cost to them of $1,000,000,000 a year.

There would be no war today in Vietnam if it were not for the Russians.

The Red Chinese have no industrial capacity and are more than occupied with the chaotic state of their own affairs.

The North Vietnamese have few industrial or transportation facilities and are utterly incapable of mounting any offensives or even maintaining the gains which they have made, except through Russian aid.

The formidable enemy, the enemy who keeps the war alive, is Russia and Russia only.

Under these facts it makes absolutely no sense whatsoever to treat the Russians as if they have the same desire for peace that we have, or to have any hope at all that they will seek to bring peace except on the terms of American surrender.

Notwithstanding, the fatuous Prime Minister of Great Britain, Harold Wilson, pleads with Premier Kosygin to use his good influences for peace. This makes as much sense as talking to the hungry lion as he contemplates the sacrificial goat.

President Johnson speaks of "building bridges" of understanding by increased trade with Russia and the satellites. All that this trade does is release Russian industrial capabilities for supplying more war materiel to Southeast Asia.

At the same time, the President is urging the Senate to ratify the Consular Treaty with Russia which gains nothing for the United States except the rights which were granted when President Roosevelt first recognized Russia in 1933, but which have been denied then and since.

If, in one-third of a century, the Russians have not kept their promises, what reason have we to hope that they will suddenly change and keep them now?

These are the same Russians of duplicity who allied with Hitler in World War II. When Hitler characteristically turned on them, we gave them billions of dollars in aid—because at the very least we were fighting a common foe.

The Russians were never truly our allies but only co-belligerents. They never cooperated with us in the slightest meaningful way. As soon as World War II was over, they began their campaign against those who had helped them so enormously.

The result was the virtual seizure of Berlin and the Russian offensives in Greece, Turkey and the Middle East; the arming of Cuba as a base of operations against the Western Hemisphere, and continuing efforts to overthrow governments in Latin America, Africa and throughout the world.

American Presidents over the years have gone to inconceivable lengths trying to pacify and make decent world citizens of the Russians.

Roosevelt tried when he first recognized them in 1933 and when he gave them vast concessions at Tehran and Yalta to satiate their greed for power.

Truman continued the Roosevelt policy at Potsdam and after the surrender of the Japanese in the Pacific which had already been promised—although it must be said for him that he and President Eisenhower recognized the Russian evil for what it was more than other Presidents.

Eisenhower once again extended the olive branch at Camp David and Khrushchev's answer was to subvert Cuba and establish a missile base 90 miles from our shores.

Kennedy went back to the Roosevelt policy of sweet reasonableness and almost cost us our country in the missile crisis in Cuba, and gave away our strength in Southeast Asia by virtually consigning Laos and Cambodia to the Communist camp in the vain hope that the Communists could be appeased.

Now, finally, President Johnson scarcely gets off his knees in trying to give away more and more to the Russians in the hope that they will embrace peace. The Consular Treaty, the nuclear treaty which has allowed the Russians to carry on while our nuclear capabilities stand still, the "building bridges" by trade and aid to Communists and Communist dominated states, all have failed and failed miserably.

All will continue to fail until we speak the one language the international bullies can understand—the language of strength.

Until we recognize that the real enemy is Russian and apply meaningful restraints, the USSR will continue to nibble away at us—both at our armed might and our solvency—until there is nothing left.

The old slogan, "The devil is a devil though he may come in the guise of an angel" never applied more to any country in the history of the world than to Communist Russia today.

Unless we recognize this fact and act decisively while there is still time, we will be bled dry in Asia and bankrupted at home.

The facts of history are staring President Johnson in the face. Every conceivable alternative has failed. We shall have peace only when he recognizes the Russian enemy for the enemy he is—and tries strength, not abject appeasement as a solution to our problems.

THE PRECEDENT OF PANMUNJOM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal for today, March 6, contains an editorial entitled "Precedent of Panmunjom," which I believe makes much sense.

In Korea, in 1951, the United Nations forces had the Red Chinese and the North Koreans on the run. The Communists, as we now know, entered into negotiations at Panmunjom at that time hoping to take the military initiative away from our troops and gain time to regroup their own defeated forces. That is precisely what happened, and the war continued for two more long years, during which some 20,000 Americans were killed.

This country is currently engaged in a struggle in Vietnam that is surrounded by confusion and conflicting opinions. My own view on this subject is well known, but I do not care to get involved in a discussion about what course we should or should not follow at this time. I merely say that I believe it is imperative that we profit from our past experiences in dealing with the Communists, if we are to be successful in our present efforts in Vietnam.

The Wall Street Journal editorial of today clearly brings out this obvious fact, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 6, 1967]

Precedent of Panmunjon

Senator Robert Kennedy solemnly assures the nation he is aware of the precedent of

Panmunjon, but his proposals make us wonder.

In any event, the lessons of the Korean War negotiations deserve more than the passing mention they received last week in the Senator's speech urging that the U.S. stop bombing North Vietnam to "test the sincerity" of Communist hints that negotiations might follow.

In April and May of 1951, the Eighth Army broke two Red Chinese offensives in Korea and launched a highly promising drive of its own. The Chinese were in ragged retreat; in one week during June, 10,000 of them surrendered. "In June, 1951, we had them whipped," General James A. Van Fleet said afterwards. "They were definitely gone."

On June 23, Soviet UN delegate Jacob Malik suggested negotiations. The first meeting was held on July 8. One history of the episode records that a New York Times dispatch warned against excessive optimism; "fighting for several weeks is foreseen by Washington."

The fighting lasted two more years. With the U.S. offensive called up short, the Communists proved willing to sit across the table from us, but only to hurl invective. During the talks, as the South Koreans recently reminded Ambassador Goldberg, the U.S. lost some 20,000 of the 54,000 dead it suffered in that war.

Now, the Communists have been hinting that if only the U.S. would unconditionally stop bombing North Vietnam, they would condescend to sit with us at another negotiating table. Senator Kennedy may be right that these hints are evidence of "a new and more hopeful moment of opportunity for settlement." On the other hand, as he also recognizes, they may be merely an attempt to get U.S. concessions in return for meaningless talks, or even, if you look suspiciously at what the North Vietnamese say, perhaps for no talks at all.

The Senator's "plan" to deal with the second eventuality is worthy of any good high school debating team. There would be an international control commission to tell the world if the Communists used the talks to build up their military forces, notwithstanding that none of the several such commissions has ever been effective in policing anything about any Communists.

And if the other side did step up its military effort, the U.S. could simply walk out of the talks and resume bombing. We would then gain "far clearer international understanding of our motives and necessities."

In the real world, though, precisely the opposite would be more likely to happen if the U.S. ever did break up even the most pointless negotiations under the mere provocation of more Red infiltration. The cries of the hypocrites would reach an unprecedented roar, and "world opinion" would condemn not the Communists but the U.S.

The lesson of Panmunjom, then, is the old one that negotiations are not an end in themselves, but merely a means to a settlement. There is no point, and considerable risk, in making concessions to the Communists for nothing more than the dubious pleasure of their company at a negotiating table. Any concessions must be based on some assurance they are sincerely willing to see talks through to a settlement.

How do we judge if the Communists are willing not only to talk but to settle? That seems to us fairly simple. If they want negotiations without settlement they will demand U.S. concessions matched by none of their own. If they are willing to settle, they ought to be ready to express that willingness in not only words but acts; that is, they ought to match any substantive concessions the U.S. makes.

These lessons seem to elude Senator Kennedy and other stop-the-bombing advocates. Certainly we need to "test the sincerity" of the barrage of negotiation hints from the Communists. That is precisely what the Administration is doing in demanding, so far vainly, some token of Communist good faith to match the token we would offer in calling off our planes.

Like many other Americans, we are uneasy about this war—whether it is advancing the nation's best interests. But on the specific question of the bombings the case seems clear.

Until a token of Communist willingness to settle is forthcoming, the bombings, even if contrary to common sense they had no military effect, serve an essential purpose. Our determination not to stop them without a reciprocal slowdown by the Communists is our best protection against another Panmunjom.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION WITH COLOMBIA

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, it is the practice of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to inform the Senate when any proposed agreement for cooperation concerning the peaceful uses of atomic energy has been submitted to the committee pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. In accordance with that practice I, as chairman of the Joint Committee's Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation, wish to inform the Senate that on February 24, 1967, a proposed amendment to this country's civil agreement for cooperation with the Republic of Colombia was submitted to the committee.

The amendment, which has been negotiated by the State Department and Atomic Energy Commission and approved by the President, would extend the existing research-type agreement for another 10 years, to March 28, 1977. Among the more significant revisions in the agreement which this amendment would effect, perhaps the most noteworthy is that providing for the transfer to the International Atomic Energy Agency of the responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities transferred under the agreement for cooperation. Presently, safeguards against the diversion of these materials and facilities to military purposes are administered by the United States.

Under the terms of the Atomic Energy Act, this amendment must lie before the Joint Committee for a period of 30 days while Congress is in session before becoming effective. It is anticipated that, in accordance with the general practice of the Joint Committee, a public hearing on this matter will be held prior to expiration of this statutory waiting period.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment to the agreement with Colombia together with supporting correspondence be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the amendment and correspondence were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1967.

Hon. John O. Pastore,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

Dear Senator Pastore: Pursuant to Section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, there are submitted with this letter:

a. a proposed "Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Colombia Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy";

b. a copy of a letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the amendment; and

c. a copy of a letter from the President to the Commission containing his determination that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and approving the amendment and authorizing its execution.

The proposed amendment, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, revises and extends the Agreement for Cooperation between the United States of America and the Republic of Colombia which was signed at Washington on April 9, 1962.

Article I of the amendment incorporates in Article I of the Agreement definitions for terms listed in the present formulation of the Agreement, but currently defined only by reference to definitions of the same terms in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

Article II updates the formulation of language specifying types of information which may be exchanged. It also provides that information may be exchanged on matters of health and safety related to all the areas of information specified in Article II, Paragraph A, of the Agreement, rather than just to research and materials testing reactors and reactor experiments.

Article IV of the amendment modifies Article IV of the Agreement to permit the transfer to Colombia of material enriched to more than 20% in the isotope U–235 when there is a technical or economic justification for such a transfer for use in fueling research reactors, materials testing reactors, and reactor experiments. Article IV of the amendment further modifies the Agreement by deleting the obsolete requirement that Colombia retain title to enriched uranium until private users in the United States are permitted to acquire title to such material.

Article VI reflects the "Private Ownership" legislation of 1964 by permitting arrangements for the transfer of special nuclear material to be made between either Party or authorized persons under its jurisdiction and authorized persons under the jurisdiction of the other Party. Such arrangements would be in addition to the government-to-government transactions currently allowed and would be subject to applicable laws, regulations, policies, and license requirements of Colombia and the United States.

Article VII provides that the International Atomic Energy Agency will promptly be requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under the Agreement for Cooperation. This article envisages suspension of bilateral safeguards during the time when Agency safeguards are in effect.

Article VIII extends the Agreement for ten years, through March 28, 1977. The remaining articles provide editorial modifications.

The amendment will enter into force on the day on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements to bring the amendment into force.

Cordially,

Glenn T. Seaborg,
Chairman.

U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C., February 6, 1967.

The President,
The White House.

Dear Mr. President: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Colombia Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The Department of State supports the Commission's recommendation.

The proposed amendment which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would revise and extend the Agreement for Cooperation between the United States of America and the Republic of Colombia which was signed at Washington on April 9, 1962, and which expires on March 28, 1967.

The proposed amendment would extend the Agreement for ten years, through March 28, 1977. In accordance with the policy of the United States, Article VII of the amendment provides that the International Atomic Energy Agency will promptly be requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under the Agreement for Cooperation. This Article envisages suspension of bilateral safeguards during the time when Agency safeguards are in effect.

In addition to editorial modifications and deletion of the obsolete requirement that Colombia retain title to enriched uranium until private users in the United States are permitted to acquire title to such material, the proposed amendment contains the provisions discussed below. These provisions are designed basically to reflect new policies or to extend to Colombia benefits already included in other research-type Agreements for Cooperation, as well as to improve and reformulate language to conform with current usage.

(a) In lieu of relying on cross-references to an internal law of the United States, namely the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, Article I of the amendment would incorporate definitions for terms listed in, but currently defined only by reference in the present formulation of, Article I of the Agreement.

(b) Proposed Article II updates and expands the formulation of language specifying types of information which may be exchanged. Information could be exchanged on health and safety related to all the areas of information specified in Article II, Paragraph A, of the Agreement rather than just to research reactors, materials testing reactors, and reactor experiments, as is presently the case.

(c) As in several recent amendments to other Agreements for Cooperation, for example those with Turkey, Austria, the Philippines, China, and Israel, Article IV would permit the transfer of uranium enriched to more than 20% in U–235 when there is a technical or economic justification for such a transfer for use in fueling research reactors, materials testing reactors, and reactor experiments.

(d) Article VI would reflect the "Private Ownership" legislation of 1964, by permitting arrangements for the transfer of special nuclear material to be made between either Party or authorized persons under its jurisdiction and authorized persons under the jurisdiction of the other Party. Such arrangements would be in addition to the government-to-government transactions currently allowed and would be subject to applicable laws, regulations, policies, and license requirements of Colombia and the United States.

Following your approval, determination, and authorization, the proposed amendment will be formally executed by appropriate authorities of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Colombia. In compliance with Section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the amendment will then be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully yours,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 10, 1967.

Hon. GLENN T. SEABORG,
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington.

DEAR DR. SEABORG: In accordance with Section 123a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to me by letter dated February 6, 1967, a proposed Amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Columbia Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy and has recommended that I approve the proposed Amendment, determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution.

Pursuant to the provisions of 123b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and upon the recommendation of Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby:

(a) approve the proposed amendment and determine that the performance of the Agreement, as amended, will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States of America;

(b) authorize the execution of the proposed amendment on behalf of the Government of the United States of America by appropriate authorities of the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF COLOMBIA CONCERNING THE CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Colombia,

Desiring to amend the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of American and the Government of the Republic of Colombia Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, signed at Washington on April 9, 1962 (hereinafter referred to as the "Agreement for Cooperation"),

Agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

Article I of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"For the purposes of this Agreement:

"(a) 'Atomic weapon' means any device utilizing atomic energy, exclusive of the means for transporting or propelling the device (where such means is a separable and divisible part of the device), the principal purpose of which is for use as, or for development of, a weapon, a weapon prototype, or a weapon test device.

"(b) 'Byproduct material' means any radioactive material (except special nuclear material) yielded in or made radioactive by exposure to the radiation incident to the process of producing or utilizing special nuclear material.

"(a) 'Commission' means the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

"(d) 'Equipment and devices' and 'equipment or device' means any instrument, apparatus, or facility and includes any facility, except an atomic weapon, capable of making use of or producing special nuclear material, and component parts thereof.

"(e) 'Parties' means the Government of the United States of America, including the Commission on behalf of the Government of the United States of America, and the Government of the Republic of Colombia. 'Party' means one of the above 'Parties'.

"(f) 'Person' means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, group, government agency, or government corporation but does not include the Parties to this Agreement.

"(g) 'Research reactor' means a reactor which is designed for the production of neutrons and other radiations for general research and development purposes, medical therapy, or training in nuclear science and engineering. The term does not cover power reactors, power demonstration reactors, or reactors designed primarily for the production of special nuclear materials.

"(h) 'Restricted Data' means all data concerning (1) design, manufacture, or utilization of atomic weapons; (2) the production of special nuclear material; or (3) the use of special nuclear material in the production of energy, but shall not include data declassified or removed from the category of Restricted Data by the appropriate authority.

"(i) 'Source material' means (1) uranium, thorium, or any other material which is determined by the Commission or the Government of the Republic of Colombia to be source material; or (2) ores containing one or more of the foregoing materials, in such concentration as the Commission or the Government of the Republic of Colombia may determine from time to time.

"(j) 'Special nuclear material' means (1) plutonium, uranium enriched in the isotope 233 or in the isotope 235, and any other material which the Commission or the Government of the Republic of Colombia determines to be special nuclear material; (or) any material artificially enriched by any of the foregoing."

ARTICLE II

Paragraph A of Article III of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"A. Subject to the provisions of Article II, the Parties hereto will exchange information in the following fields:

"(1) Design, construction, operation, and use of research reactors, materials testing reactors, and reactor experiments;

"(2) The use of radioactive isotopes and source, special nuclear, and byproduct material in physical and biological research, medicine, agriculture, and industry; and

"(3) Health and safety problems related to the foregoing."

ARTICLE III

Articles IV and IX of the Agreement for Cooperation are amended by deleting the words "international organization" wherever they appear and substituting in lieu thereof the words "group of nations".

ARTICLE IV

A. Paragraph C of Article IV of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"C. The Commission may, upon request and in its discretion, make all or a portion of the foregoing special nuclear material available as uranium enriched to more than twenty percent (20%) by weight in the isotope U–235 when there is a technical or economic justification for such a transfer for use in research reactors, materials testing reactors, and reactor experiments, each capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed eight (8) kilograms of the isotope U–235 contained in such uranium."

B. Paragraph D of Article IV of the Agreement for Cooperation is deleted in its entirety and Paragraphs E, F, G, and H of said Article are relettered, respectively, as D, E, F, and G.

ARTICLE V

References to Paragraphs E, F, and G of Article IV of the Agreement for Cooperation in Articles IV and VIII of the Agreement for

Cooperation are changed, respectively, to Paragraphs D, E, and F.

ARTICLE VI

Article VII of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"With respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information referred to in Article III, it is understood that arrangements may be made between either Party or authorized persons under its jurisdiction and authorized persons under the jurisdiction of the other for the transfer of materials, including special nuclear material, and equipment and devices, and for the performance of services. Such arrangements shall be subject to:

"(a) Article II;

"(b) The limitations applicable to transactions between the Parties under Article IV; and

"(c) Applicable laws, regulations, policies, and license requirements of the Parties."

ARTICLE VII

Article X of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"A. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Colombia, recognizing the desirability of making use of the facilities and services of the International Atomic Energy Agency, agree that the Agency will be promptly requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under this Agreement. It is contemplated that the necessary arrangements will be effected without modification of this Agreement through an agreement to be negotiated between the Parties and the Agency which may include provisions for suspension of the safeguard rights accorded to the Commission by Article VIII of this Agreement, during the time and to the extent that the Agency's safeguards apply to such materials and facilities.

"B. In the event the Parties do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement on the terms of the trilateral arrangement envisaged in Paragraph A of this Article, either Party may, by notification, terminate this Agreement. In the event of termination by either Party, the Government of the Republic of Colombia shall, at the request of the Government of the United States of America, return to the Government of the United States of America all special nuclear material received pursuant to this Agreement and still in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction. The Government of the United States of America will compensate the Government of the Republic of Colombia for its interest in such material so returned at the Commission's schedule of prices then in effect domestically."

ARTICLE VIII

Paragraph A of Article XI of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"A. This Agreement shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such Agreement and shall remain in force for a period of fourteen years."

ARTICLE IX

This Amendment shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such Amendment and shall remain in force for the period of the Agreement for Cooperation, as hereby amended.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Amendment.

DONE at Washington, in duplicate, this twenty-fourth day of February, 1967.

FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

ROBERT M. SAYRE
GLENN T. SEABORG

FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF COLUMBIA:

HERNAN ECHAVARRIA

Certified to be a true copy, February 24, 1967.

BARBARA H. THOMAS, AEC.

EXPEDITING PATENTS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, recently President Johnson urged Congress to join with him in modernizing the patent laws of this country. The basic laws have remained fundamentally unchanged for over a century. During that time, the United States has changed from an agricultural society to a highly sophisticated technological society. The number of patents issued has risen from 109 in 1836 to more than 60,000 this year. There are long delays in the issuance of patents today and the backlog of applications is very high. Clearly, modernization is long overdue.

In 1965, President Johnson appointed a special Commission to study this problem. Their report was released last year, and legislation based upon the Commission's recommendations has been introduced in Congress for the purpose of overhauling the procedures of the Patent Office. There is near unanimity on the need for this action, as is attested to by an editorial in the Wall Street Journal of February 28, 1967. I urge Senators to read the editorial, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 28, 1967]

A SWIFTER PACE FOR PATENTS

Under present Governmental procedures, an inventor can only hope that he'll live long enough to obtain a patent on a new idea. The average time required for processing a patent is two and one-half years, and complex applications often take up to a decade.

Correctly deciding that the long delays make little sense, the Administration is recommending the first major changes in the patent system in more than a century. While there may be quarrels with a few of the proposal's specifics, the aim is impeccable: To help cut the maximum patent-issuing time to a year and a half.

This nation enjoys the world's highest standard of living in part because gains in technology have come more rapidly here than anywhere else, despite the patent lag. There is reason to wonder whether the pace would have been quite so rapid if inventors had not been assured, with patents finally in hand, that success would bring them a respectable return for their labors. If the paper work is speeded, they should be even better off.

Then there is the bearing of patents on research. Though U.S. research is not always ideally directed, it is sure to continue to be of considerable size. The need to provide jobs for a growing labor force and the intensifying pressures of competition, both at home and abroad, will see to that.

The U.S. effort is so energetic that it attracts growing numbers of scientists, not only from American universities but from other nations—the "brain drain" that understandably concerns those countries. With all the research that's going on, it's not surprising that 93,482 patent applications were filed last year, an increase of 19% from 1960.

It is this influx of ideas, and the growing backlog at the Patent Office, that makes reform necessary—lest technological progress be snarled in the wheels of antique bureaucracy.

THE CONSULAR CONVENTION WITH THE SOVIET UNION—SOME QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in the near future, the Senate will consider whether to give its advice and consent to ratification of the Consular Convention with the Soviet Union.

I assume that Senators will wish to inform themselves before we begin the consideration of the convention. The hearings and the committee report were distributed to all Senators' offices this morning.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of some questions and answers on the convention, prepared by the Department of State, which I think provide much useful information on some of the questions that have been raised about the convention.

There being no objection, the questions and answers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES-U.S.S.R. CONSULAR CONVENTION—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. *What was the historical origin of the Convention?*

When we first established relations with the USSR in 1933 an exchange of letters between President Roosevelt and Soviet Foreign Minister Litvinov stated that it had been agreed that a consular convention would be negotiated "immediately following the establishment of relations between our two countries." Other problems intervened, however, and negotiations were never begun.

It was President Eisenhower's proposal at the 1955 Geneva Summit Conference for "concrete steps" to lower "the barriers which now impede the opportunities of people to travel anywhere in the world" and subsequent relaxation by the Bulganin-Khrushchev regime of tight Stalinist controls which led to greatly increased American travel to the USSR and to the realization that we needed to protect U.S. citizens by negotiating an explicit consular convention with the Soviet Union. At the Camp David talks in 1959, Secretary of State Christian Herter proposed such a treaty to Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko. Drafts were exchanged in early 1960 but there was little further activity because of subsequent strains in US-Soviet relations until September 1963 when formal negotiations began in Moscow. After 8 months of hard negotiations, the Convention was signed on June 1, 1964, and submitted to the Senate by President Johnson on June 12, 1964.

2. *What is the basic purpose of the Convention?*

We need this treaty to secure rights for Americans in the Soviet Union that they do not now have. Under present Soviet law Soviet citizens and foreigners alike can be held incommunicado for nine months or more during investigation of a criminal charge. The Consular Convention contains major concessions by the USSR. It specifies that U.S. officials will be notified immediately (within 1–3 days) when an American citizen is arrested or detained in the USSR and it stipulates that these officials will have rights of visitation without delay (within

2–4 days) and on a continuing basis thereafter.

3. *Why do we need additional protection for American citizens?*

Because increasing numbers of them travel to the Soviet Union and the number which encounters difficulties rises proportionally. Between 1962 and 1966 the number of Americans travelling to the USSR rose by 50% to 18,000, while the number of Soviet travelers remained static at about 900 per year. Since the Convention was signed in 1964, more than 20 arrests or detentions of American citizens in the USSR have come to our attention. In none of these cases have we been notified of the incident or allowed to visit the American within a reasonable period and certainly not within the time limits specified in this treaty. Meanwhile, our own constitutional system and democratic society automatically provide Soviet travelers here with protections similar to those our travelers would obtain from the convention.

Without the protection of such an agreement, Americans have frequently been isolated in Soviet prisons for long periods and kept from contact with American Embassy consular officers. One, Newcomb Mott, died in Soviet hands under these circumstances. During periods of strained US-USSR relations such as the present Soviet treatment of Americans accused of violating their law is likely to be harsher than usual.

4. *Does the Convention provide for the opening of new Soviet consulates in the US?*

No. It does not authorize, propose, suggest, provide for or require the opening of a single US consulate in the USSR or a single Soviet consulate in the US. It does not permit the Soviets to send a single extra person to this country nor does it let us send anyone to the USSR. What it does do is to provide ground rules for the protection of American citizens in the USSR—ground rules which we badly need.

Under the Constitution, the President's approval is all that is needed to permit foreign governments to establish consulates in the US. Between 1934 and 1948 there were three Soviet consulates in the US and an American consulate in the USSR, though there was no US-USSR consular agreement in force.

5. *Why do we grant Soviet consular officers immunity from our criminal jurisdiction?*

Because we believe it is vital to have the same protection for American consular officers and clerical employees in the USSR. Since 1946, 31 Americans at our Embassy in Moscow have been expelled by the Soviets, most often on allegations of espionage. Without immunity our consular employees could be jailed or suffer even harsher punishment on similar trumped-up charges. Furthermore, action against American consular personnel serving in the USSR without immunity could be a temptation to Soviet authorities whenever a Soviet citizen is arrested in this country for espionage. Other governments similarly protect their officials and clerical employees in the USSR; the British and the Japanese recently negotiated consular conventions with the Soviet Union containing immunity provisions modeled after those in the US-USSR agreement.

6. *Is it right to extend this immunity to clerical employees as well?*

We believe that the American secretaries, file clerks and communications and administrative personnel whom we might send to a consulate in the USSR need and deserve the protection of immunity as much if not more than the consular officers. Clerical employees we would send to a consulate in the Soviet Union would often be young women and it would be both unfair and from a security point of view unwise to give them less protection than we give our experienced officers.

Of course, the Soviets would not be allowed to station a staff of Soviet nationals at a consulate in the US larger than the number of Americans we send to the USSR. If we send a staff of 10 to the USSR the Soviets may have a total of ten here.

7. *What is the prospect for the reciprocal opening of consular offices?*

There are no formal proposals or plans pending for the opening of separate consular offices of either country in the other. If at a later date it was decided to be appropriate to open one outside the respective capitals, it would be the subject of careful negotiation on a strict quid-pro-quo basis. Such an office would probably involve 10 to 15 Americans in the Soviet Union, with the Soviets permitted to send the same number here. In accordance with Secretary Rusk's statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, we would plan to consult that body and the state and local officials of the community to be affected, before concluding such an agreement. While, as noted, such an arrangement would be reciprocal, the fact that the Soviet society is a closed one while the United States is open, and that the U.S. citizens needing service and protection while travelling in the Soviet Union far outnumber Soviet citizens with like needs in the U.S., indicate that the balance of advantage would be on our side.

8. *If a Soviet consulate were eventually opened would it represent a threat to the security of the US?*

The opening of one Soviet consulate in the US would not materially affect our internal security. The number of Soviet citizens now enjoying immunity, 452, would be increased by only 10 or 15 persons. We have the right under the treaty to screen the personnel of such an office before agreeing to their assignment. We are also authorized by the treaty to prevent them from travelling to sensitive areas in the country and to expel them if they prove to be undesirable. We could close a Soviet consulate in the US whenever we wished, and we could cancel the Consular Convention on six months' notice. Both Acting Attorney General Ramsey Clark and FBI Director Hoover have stated that 10 to 15 additional Soviet officials in this country would not place an undue burden on their organizations.

9. *What effect will the immunity provisions have on our agreements with other countries? Would immunities received by the Soviets be automatically extended under MFN clauses to other countries?*

We have 35 agreements in force with other countries which require us, on the basis of reciprocity, to extend most favored nation treatment to consular officers and occasionally consular employees. A recent survey shows that 27 of these countries have consular offices here with about 577 personnel. Should these countries agree to grant immunity from criminal jurisdiction to the 424 American consular officers and employees stationed there, we would have to extend the same treatment to their people here. All twenty-seven of these countries can be described as either friendly or neutral.

Our Embassies in these 27 countries were asked to estimate whether their host country would ask for most favored nation treatment—and give it to us in return. The replies indicated that at most 11 might make such requests, with 290 officers and employees. Assuming that we eventually decide to open a consulate in the USSR with 15 people, we would permit the opening of a Soviet consulate with 15 people here. In this case a total of 305 foreign consular officers and employees would be affected. This compares with the estimate of 9400 foreign diplomatic officers, members of their families and employees who now enjoy full diplomatic immunity in the US.

10. *What do other countries do about their consular relations with the USSR?*

Prior to the negotiation of the US-USSR convention the Federal Republic of Germany and Austria were the only non-communist countries which had consular treaties with the USSR. Neither of these treaties contained firm guarantees on notification and access similar to those in the US-USSR treaty.

Since 1964 the French, Finns, British, Japanese and Italians have negotiated consular conventions with the USSR. The British and Japanese conventions are modeled after the US treaty both in the guarantees on notification and access and in the immunities provision. Of the non-communist countries, India and Turkey have consulates in the USSR. Italy, Japan and Finland hope to open consulates soon.

11. *What effect does the Convention have on estate and tax matters in the US?*

The estate and tax provisions of this convention are the same as those in other consular conventions which the US has negotiated recently. The United States made no concessions about estates in this Convention. In the negotiations the Soviet Government attempted to obtain wide powers for its consular officials in the settlement of estates of American citizens where a Soviet citizen is a beneficiary, or in the settlement of estates of Soviet citizens who die in the United States. The Soviet Government did not obtain these powers.

The Convention provides that consuls can play a role in the settlement of estates *only if permissible under the existing applicable local law.* If the Convention is ratified, therefore, the laws of the individual states would continue, as they do now, to govern the extent to which a Soviet consul can play a part in the settlement of an estate.

This convention, like many others to which the US is a party, exempts the consular personnel of the sending state from Federal and State taxes with certain exceptions. Also, property used for a consulate or as residence for consular and diplomatic personnel would be exempt from real estate taxes. This is normal international practice.

12. *In view of the Soviet record of treaty violations, how can you make them observe this one? And what can be done if they don't?*

It is true that, particularly in the Stalin years, the Soviet Union violated a number of international agreements and treaties. A careful study of serious violations can be found in "Background Information on the Soviet Union in International Relations" prepared by the Department of State in 1961.

Despite its earlier record of repeated violations of international obligations, the Soviet Union is party to a number of multilateral and bilateral agreements which it has not been accused of violating. There may have been infractions of some of these agreements, but the Soviet Government can be said to have generally found it to be in its interest to live up to them. Among the most important of these agreements are the Austrian State Treaty (1955), the Antarctic Treaty (1959) and the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (1963).

Treaties between sovereign governments are negotiated on the basis of mutual self-interest, not as rewards for good behavior or as evidences of good faith. We believe there are areas where the US and Soviet interests coincide, though these areas must be carefully delineated and explored before arriving at any agreement. The Limited Test Ban Treaty, the Treaty on Outer Space which we have just signed, and the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons which is now under discussion are examples of agreements covering such areas. Each of these agreements either has built-in safeguards or is self-enforcing. The consular treaty is no exception—it is carefully drafted to provide full protection against abuse.

Should the Soviet Union violate the terms of this agreement we could suspend it or, with six months' notice, terminate it. Should a Soviet consulate be opened in this country and should its personnel violate our laws or the standards of behavior we would expect, we could expel them or close the consulate.

13. *Does the Convention prejudice the position of subject peoples incorporated against their will into the Soviet Union?*

No, it does not. The United States Government has never recognized the forcible annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Ratification of this convention would in no way change our policy in this respect, nor would any subsequent opening of a consulate or demarcation of a consular district. Recognition of incorporation of states into the Soviet Union would require a positive statement or act by the United States. The convention contains no such statements and provides for no such act. It is United States policy to support the just aspirations of all peoples of the world and to look forward to the day when all will be able to express these aspirations freely. The ratification of this treaty will not change this policy—any more than did the signing of more than 105 other bilateral and multilateral agreements which we have entered into with the U.S.S.R.

THE MENACE OF AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] expressed his views to the Senate on February 17 on the menace of air and water pollution. The Senator outlined steps that business firms in his State are taking to combat this continuing problem.

I congratulate the people of Washington for taking vigorous action to eradicate pollution. They have shown foresight in utilizing a program already available from the Federal Government. I refer to the business loan program of the Small Business Administration.

Having served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency from 1959 through the last session of Congress, I am acutely aware of the problems that small firms face, and I know the excellent programs the SBA has developed to deal with these problems. The President and his administration are making a concerted effort to define all of the problems that face the Nation and to develop programs that will deal effectively with these problems.

In his state of the Union message, President Johnson said:

> We should vastly expand the fight for clean air with a total attack on pollution at its sources. And because air, like water, does not respect man-made boundaries, we shall set up "regional airsheds" throughout this great land.
>
> We should continue to carry to every corner of the Nation our campaign for a Beautiful America, to clean up our towns, to make them more beautiful.

I concur with the President's remarks. We must not wait, we must act now with the resources we have at our command.

My constituents in Wisconsin, as other citizens throughout the country, are faced with the problem of reducing and if possible eliminating air and water pollution. I am pleased to say that small firms in Wisconsin also have made extensive use of the financing available from SBA to install pollution abatement systems and to manufacture devices to cut down pollution. As a matter of fact, eight SBA loans to firms in my State were made to help combat the pollution problem. I want to state for the record the names of these firms that are actively trying to reduce air and water pollution in the State:

Exhaust Aid Corp., Milwaukee, is using funds from a $15,000 loan to make devices which reduce auto exhaust; Brisko's Mileage Saver, an Ojibwa, Wis., firm also makes these devices for automobiles and received a $29,000 SBA loan; Carm Grain Co., of Sheboygan used an $80,000 loan to install a dust collector in a grain elevator; the Oconomowoc Electro Plating Co. used a $96,000 loan to install new acid vats which eliminate drainage into the sewer system.

A Platteville firm, Platteville Dairy, obtained a $150,000 loan to install equipment to dry whey and keep waste out of the river adjacent to the dairy. Milk Products, Inc., of Weyauwega, used a $275,000 loan for the same purpose. Jaski Construction Co., of Green Bay, which installs sanitary and storm sewers, obtained a $175,000 loan, and Engels Plumbing & Heating firm, in Kewaunee, obtained $7,500 for use in its business for special equipment required by State law in installing septic tanks.

I concur wholeheartedly with the Senator from Washington that the problem of pollution is one of the most urgent problems of the day. I join with the Senator in recommending that small firms throughout the Nation explore the possibility of using this valuable SBA program to help in eradicating the pollution problem.

THE NATION'S THIRD GREAT CRISIS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, Howard K. Smith has been a highly respected news commentator and writer for some years.

I have often found his commentaries on events and men to be among the most enlightened and informative of anyone's.

An interesting article, entitled "A Nation Heading for Its Third Great Crisis," written by Mr. Smith, was published in the Washington Star a few days ago.

He describes this crisis as follows:

> It involves the quality of American life which declines ever faster as the Nation grows ever richer.

He then goes on to describe crime, pollution of the air and water, and traffic jams, in Washington, a city which suffers from pretty much the same problems and in the same magnitude and degree of severity as any other city its size.

> The point is not that these features are bad—

Which they are, of course—

> but that they grow worse at breath-taking tempo. One cannot guess what forms they will take, but at the present rate of defilement, grave emergencies are bound to break out,

Mr. Smith continues.

I do not agree with his view that the British, or parliamentary system, is vastly superior for meeting modern problems. I am convinced that with strong and effective leadership, such as President Johnson has shown during his years in office, we can meet these problems and master them, in our own way.

But I do agree with Mr. Smith's concluding paragraph:

> As our system is not about to be changed, the only alternative is an awakened public alarm. This recourse had better make itself felt soon or Great Crisis number three is as certain as tomorrow.

The problems of our cities already seem insoluble, or almost so, and we do seem to be "careening downhill" to a great crisis.

I hope that the people and we in Congress will take this article to heart, and will awaken to the seriousness of the situation.

I ask unanimous consent that Howard K. Smith's article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Nation Heading for Its Third Great Crisis

(By Howard K. Smith)

In its short life the U.S. has had but two really searing crises with enduring traumatic effects. One was the Civil War whose poisons still run in our veins. The other was the Great Depression whose central feature of utter impotence amid great might scarred at least one generation. Next to those two, the Cold War and the World wars were slight in effect, or were even beneficial.

The U.S. is now headed like an uncontrolled vehicle careening downhill to its third great crisis. It is as different from the other two as they were from one another. It involves the quality of American life which declines ever faster as the nation grows ever richer. People talk about it so much that it has become a cliche. There is an abiding assumption that something is being done, but in fact nothing effective is even projected. And, sure as sunset, it is going eventually to do permanent damage.

The elements of the trouble are well known. But it may be useful to cite the specific example of Washington, D.C. It should be noted, however, that—contrary to the fulminations of rural congressmen—Washington is not exceptional; it is about the median for American cities of its size.

The other day the head of the city's biggest drugstore chain repored that in 56 weeks his stores have suffered 62 burglaries and 31 armed robberies. Money losses were $116,000. But the terrifying feature was violence to employes, one of whom was kidnaped in his home, forced to reopen the store, then pistol-whipped to unconsciousness. The chain can stand the losses, but smaller businesses have shut up shop and quit.

The lovely stream that runs through the city's central park, Rock Creek, has become so polluted that it is described as an open sewer and may have to be covered over. The Potomac River, in whose lucid waters John Quincy Adams and Theodore Roosevelt swam, is so filthy that a fall into it justifies preventive hospitalization.

Washington is a city without industry. Yet when the weather is wrong, the air becomes pure poison, so bad is exhaust from multiplying cars and burnings of trash from its swelling population. Traffic congeals so badly at some hours that one fears a crisis in communications could occur in the nation's government.

The point is not that these features are bad, but that they grow worse at breathtaking tempo. One cannot guess what forms they will take, but at the present rate of defilement, grave emergencies are bound to break out.

There are surveys galore. They emphasize two problems: first, remedy will take lots of money, and second, getting action from government is like trying to move Gibraltar with a crowbar.

Of these two problems, the easier to meet is cost. A nation really concerned about the wreckage of its environment would agree to devote the whole increment in its GNP for several years to meeting the troubles.

The really hard problem is getting action from government. If systems of government were named after their most conspicuous functional feature, ours would be known not as republican or democratic but as a disaster form of government. Only catastrophe triggers action. It is an ambulance rather than a preventive clinic.

The point has been made that our Civil War could have been prevented by timely action, as the British acted to pass the Great Reform Bill of 1832 and avoided civil conflict. Our Depression could have been mitigated and shortened, had Congress followed Europe's example and passed welfare and other mechanisms at the turn of the century instead of waiting till disaster had struck in the mid-thirties.

Our essential trouble is that, two centuries later, we are still fighting George III. Our form of government is designed to prevent strong executive action by means of a hobbling system of negatives. Yet it is hard to think of an instance in which our nation has really been endangered by strong executive action, and it is easy to list disasters caused by our system of "checks and balances" which is nothing more than a way of preventing action. The British system which allows an executive the power to carry out a program until he loses his mandate is vastly superior for meeting modern problems.

As our system is not about to be changed, the only alternative is an awakened public alarm. This recourse had better make itself felt soon or Great Crisis number three is as certain as tomorrow.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1967

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 355, the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 355) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair recognize the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me so that I may make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time taken by the Senator from Ohio not be taken from either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOHN W. DONAHEY—A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, last Thursday John W. Donahey, one of Ohio's outstanding citizens, died in Columbus, Ohio, at the age of 61.

Few men in my State of Ohio have had as long and as distinguished a record as a public servant. He was elected Lieutenant Governor of Ohio in 1958. I have a happy personal recollection of campaigning with him throughout Ohio day after day in the summer and fall of that year. He served with distinction in the office of Lieutenant Governor of Ohio for 4 years.

Before that period he served in various capacities as an official in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. At the time of his death he was regional director of the southern district of Ohio for the Small Business Administration. I know from personal conversations with the present SBA Administrator and his predecessor that John Donahey was one of the most valued officials in that important agency.

John Donahey was a member of one of the prominent political families in Ohio. He was an outstanding citizen of Ohio by reason of his knowledge, ability, and industry. He was most personable—a most attractive man, and a fine friend to many thousands of Ohio men and women. I am sure that some of my colleagues will recall his father, the late Vic Donahey, who was Governor of Ohio from 1923 to 1929, and U.S. Senator from 1935 to 1941.

John W. Donahey was a fine human being, a great statesman, and a dedicated public servant. As Lieutenant Governor of Ohio he was the presiding officer of the Ohio Senate. On one occasion he made a statement which perhaps exemplifies the type of leader he was when he said:

> Everyone who has a right to speak in the Senate will always be given the chance to be fully heard. Partisanship makes no difference.

Mr. President, Ohio has lost a great public servant, a very fine son. I have lost a very dear personal friend. John and his attractive wife, Gertrude, have been guests in my home. For many years John Donahey has been my very dear friend. Mrs. Young and I extend our deepest and most heartfelt sympathy to his lovely wife, Gertrude, his son, John W. Donahey, Jr., and to all the members of the Donahey family.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to associate myself with my colleague in the words of condolence he has expressed on the passing of John W. Donahey.

John Donahey came from a distinguished Ohio family. His father was a three-term Governor, having served from 1923 to 1928. John Donahey, whose death we mourn, was possessed of an excellent character and reputation. He was deeply devoted to the rendition of public service. He was unselfish, and, in my opinion, had a reverence for the State of Ohio that was surpassed but in very few instances.

I also campaigned with John W. Donahey. He was an indefatigable worker. He fought cleanly but vigorously.

I join with my colleague and the people of Ohio in the expression of condolences to his wife and son, and to the members of the Donahey family, in particular, for the deep bereavement which they have suffered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, my colleague and I both have a feeling of sadness that is shared by many thousands of citizens of Ohio.

I ask unanimous consent that newspaper articles from the newspapers of Columbus, Ohio, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Citizen Journal]

J. DONAHEY, EX-OHIO AIDE, IS DEAD AT 61

COLUMBUS.—Services will be 11 a.m. Monday for John W. Donahey, a former Democratic lieutenant governor whose father was a governor and U.S. senator. He died in Grant Hospital here yesterday at the age of 61.

A graveside service will be 3 p.m. Monday in New Philadelphia. Calling hours at the Schoedinger Funeral Home, E. State St., in Columbus, will extend from noon Sunday.

Donahey, who had been administrator of the Columbus district office of the U.S. Small Business Administration, served as lieutenant governor from 1959 to 1963 under the administration of Michael V. DiSalle.

Donahey, a native of New Philadelphia, entered the hospital last week for gall bladder surgery. It was reported that complications had developed from a heart condition and he was placed in an oxygen tent.

Donahey's father, the late Vic Donahey, was Ohio governor from 1923 to 1929. He was U.S. senator from 1935 to 1941.

Survivors include his wife, Gertrude, secretary in the Columbus office of Sen. Stephen M. Young; and a son, John Jr., of Nashville, Tenn.

Donahey was defeated for state auditor in 1962 by Roger W. Tracy, a Republican, who also has died.

As lieutenant governor, he was presiding officer of the Ohio Senate. He had been quoted as having said, "Everyone who has a right to speak in the Senate will always be given the chance to be fully heard. Partisanship makes no difference."

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch]

DONAHEY, FORMER LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR, DIES OF HEART ATTACK AT AGE 61

John W. Donahey, 61, former Ohio lieutenant-governor and son of a former governor and U.S. senator, died Thursday afternoon in Grant Hospital.

He had undergone surgery Feb. 24 and had been convalescing satisfactorily. Death was due to a heart attack.

The state's lieutenant-governor in the DiSalle administration, Donahey had been district director of the Small Business Administration since leaving the state position.

He was born Aug. 26, 1905, at New Philadelphia, one of the 12 children of Mr. and Mrs. A. Vic Donahey. His father was Ohio governor from 1923 to 1928 and U.S. senator from 1935 to 1941.

Donahey received his early education in New Philadelphia and attended Ohio State University and Cleveland College.

His first positions were as commission clerk for the state, field supervisor for Motorists' Mutual Insurance Co., and general agent for the Donahey Insurance Agency.

From the mid-30s until the late 40s he was associated with various offices of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. In 1952, he made his first bid for elective office in an unsuccessful race for the nomination for U.S. Senate.

Donahey was defeated again in a 1954 bid for the Democratic nomination for state treasurer. He was nominated for the post in 1956, but lost in the general election. He won the nomination for lieutenant-governor in a seven-way contest in 1958 and was elected to the office that November.

An advocate of economy in government, Donahey believed in it down to the string-saving level and prided himself on turning back something from his office budget each year.

He also good-naturedly accepted the jibes of skeptics for his work with grain enzymes, research which he pursued during his years in state office and which he confidently believed would some day yield some miracle products.

He was a member of Christ Episcopal Church and the Masonic Lodge.

Surviving are his wife, the former Gertrude Walton, of the residence, 2338 Sherwood Rd.; one son, John Jr., Nashville, Tenn.; three sisters, Mrs. Park G. Ogden, Toronto, Ohio; Mrs. James B. Johnson, Sarasota, Fla., and Mrs. H. Lloyd Smith, Marion, and five brothers, Robert F., Shaker Heights; Hal and Richard, Logan; Jim, Reynoldsburg, and Vic Jr., Worthington, and three grandchildren.

Funeral will be Monday at 11 a.m. in the Schoedinger State St. chapel, where friends may call after noon Sunday. Burial will be in New Philadelphia.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 355) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to offer an amendment, notwithstanding the previous unanimous-consent agreement, as it would apply to the Ellender amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware proposes an amendment:

On page 67, between lines 14 and 15 insert the following new section:

"CONVERSION OF PAY RATES OF SENATE EMPLOYEES TO GROSS RATE BASIS

"SEC. 324. The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate is requested to prepare, and make recommendations to the Senate at the earliest practicable date with respect to—

"(1) a plan for the conversion to a gross rate basis of pay rates of employees of the Senate who are being paid on a basic plus additional compensation basis;

"(2) a schedule of gross salary rates to be applicable in fixing and adjusting pay rates of such employees; and

"(3) a plan for the conversion of Senator's clerk hire allowances from an aggregate basic salary basis to an aggregate gross salary basis.

Such recommendations shall include, or be in the form of, legislative proposals designed to carry into effect the plans and schedule referred to in this section."

On page 3, in the table of contents, after item 323 insert the following new item:

"SEC. 324. Conversion of Pay Rates of Senate Employees to Gross Rate Basis."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield himself time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have discussed this amendment with the manager of the bill. I understand he is willing to accept it.

The bill as it is presented to us now contains a provision that in the House of Representatives the pay scale will be converted from the present use of a basic rate to one of gross payments. This is a step in the right direction. For a number of years I have advocated that the Senate follow such a procedure.

Last week I advised the chairman of the committee, the manager of the bill, that it was my intention to offer today an amendment which would make the same provision applicable to the Senate employees as it now provides for employees of the House of Representatives.

Over the weekend, however, working with legislative counsel we encountered a drafting problem. I concluded that the proposal needs more legislative consideration than we are able to provide by acting on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, the problem is different in the Senate. The House of Representatives can freeze the basic allowances for Members of the House because the population bases of congressional district are quite evenly divided. Senators, however, represent both small States and large States, and to freeze the gross as it is today would freeze a different level for Senators from States with the same population.

Perhaps the two Senators from the same State are now using different allowances, yet the gross allowance should be the same. The entire matter needs more consideration than we might obtain by acting on the floor of the Senate.

Nevertheless, something should be done to correct the condition because it is utterly ridiculous to have the base rate as one figure and the gross amount received as an entirely different one.

The proposed amendment would instruct the Committee on Appropriations to report a legislative proposal which would provide the maximum allowance, based on population, that would be allowed each State, with such allowance computed on a gross salary basis rather than at the present formula.

This proposal certainly should be adopted to pave the way for a change to the gross formula. I wish I had an answer to offer today, but at this moment I do not. I therefore offer this amendment in order to put the Senate on record as favoring this change.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time the Senator from Delaware has remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has used only 5 minutes of his time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the Senator from Delaware. It is one which was studied at considerable length by the Joint Committee on Reorganization, in an effort to simplify the salary scale by reducing it to the gross figure only. The existence of both a basic and a gross figure has been confusing to everyone, including Senators.

As the Senator has well said, this problem is more complicated than it seems at first blush.

Because the congressional districts are similar in size, we could convert the system in the House to the one gross pay schedule. In the Senate, the various positions and numbers of States having different populations, and the different ways in which the pay scale has been used, means that the total salary breakout in gross can be considerably more for a particular employee on the payroll than would be possible if more higher paid workers are employed in Senators' offices.

Because of the flexibility required by the average Senator in meeting the needs of his own State, it was inappropriate for us to rush this. As the Senator has stated, he has himself found, in checking the matters out, that is a difficult and complicated system to change without damage to the present-day allowances that each Senator is using, or can continue to use, perhaps if present employees in his office were to be replaced by others.

For this reason, it seems to me that the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware is acceptable. It would request the Senate Appropriations Committee, which is the proper committee, to study the matter and report back recommendations in legislative form for the adoption of a gross pay scale and the elimination of the basic pay scale which is now the rule of the Senate.

I am happy to accept the Senator's amendment to the bill, as it merely provides for a study to be made by the proper committee of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator for accepting the amendment.

Let me add that last week I thought I had a solution to the problem, but on discussing this with legislative counsel, additional problems were pointed out. We were unable to come up with a solution for a vote today. For that reason I merely ask that the Senate go on record that it will instruct the committee to consider all these problems and then report back to the Senate the necessary legislation.

I will make available to the committee the results of the study which I have made and the solution we have found to some of the problems as well as point out to it a couple of the remaining problems for which we as yet have not found a solution. I am more than confident that it can be worked out if we just sit down and determine that we want to change the present cumbersome and antiquated method of computing legislative salaries.

The present method of listing a clerk's salary as $2,220 basic when in reality that means a gross salary of around $6,437 is a farce.

It should have been corrected long ago.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think such a solution will take a great deal more time than we can devote to it this morning.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I came to the same conclusion, but I am still convinced that it can be solved. The thing to do is just sit down and solve it.

Mr. MONRONEY. As the Senator has wisely and correctly stated, the present report on the employment of Senate staff on committees is now printed and available and is in the gross amount rather than the basic amount.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. There is nothing confusing from the standpoint of reporting. The present system conceivably could lead to abuse by utilizing the lowest ratio in the basic formula and an inflated expenditure obtained.

A correction of the situation is long past due. The time has come to overhaul the system, prevent possible abuses, and put it on a realistic basis. I am sure that this amendment will be a step which will lead in that direction.

For example, a Member now can list an employee as receiving a basic salary of only $60, yet this employee would receive $1,142.52.

This is misleading and is wide open for abuse. Let us correct it before it develops into a scandal.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I feel certain that the committee will work hard and diligently and report its recommendations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment I am about to propose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator offer his amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. It is amendment No. 110.

Mr. President, in that connection, since the amendment was printed, the words "in addition to" on page 16, lines 7 and 8, appear in the new unofficial print at the bottom of page 18a and top of 18b.

I now ask unanimous consent that I may modify my amendment so as to direct it to the words "in addition to" where they now appear in the bill.

The amendment is as follows:

In the language of section 105 of the bill which amends section 136(c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, strike out "in addition to" and insert "within".

Beginning with line 23, page 56, strike out all to and including line 6, page 60, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 301. (a) Section 202 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 72), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

" '(g) (1) Each standing committee of the Senate or'."

On page 61, line 17, strike out "(j), and insert in lieu thereof "(h)", and reletter the following subsections.

Beginning with line 8, page 64, strike out all to and including line 12, page 64.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is so modified.

Will the Senator renew his request for the yeas and nays?

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Louisiana yield himself?

Mr. ELLENDER. Ten minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, last Friday I submitted a series of amendments to S. 355, the bill now before the Senate. Most of them deal with the number of employees added by the bill to those now provided for under the act of 1946 and in addition to those provided by the various resolutions. Since at least four or five of these amendments deal with the question of the overall number of employees, I have asked that I be given a little more time on my first amendment, so that I can go into a little more detail in discussing the subject and can cover at one time the reasons why these five amendments should be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the pending amendment, then, the amendment on which the Senator requested more time?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; No. 110.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a half hour on this amendment and 15 minutes on each of the other amendments.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Before I am through I may ask unanimous consent, with the approval of my friend from Oklahoma, that I may take time from the other amendments on this amendment, which will merely reduce the time on the other amendments. It will not add to the time taken. If that should occur, I shall ask unanimous consent for additional time on this amendment. I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma will not object, provided I do not go over all the time provided for all the amendments I am offering.

This amendment would strike out the provisions of the bill which authorize or require additional staff for committees.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 authorized a staff of 10 for each committee, consisting of four professional and six clerical members. Each committee may appoint this number without special authority from the Senate. Where a greater number can be justified, authority to hire them can be obtained from the Senate or House. The report on this bill—page 8—points out that 27 of the 36 standing committees now exceed the statutory provision and each of the 27 has more than 12 staff positions.

The bill, by increasing the number of positions which may be filled without a showing of need to 13, and by providing that the additional three shall be in addition to any other additional staff members authorized prior to January 1, 1968, may encourage waste. In addition to these three additional professional staff members, section 301(c) of the bill provides in certain circumstances for the appointment of two additional professional staff members and one additional clerk for the minority, making a total possible addition of six staff members as the bill has been amended by the Metcalf amendment. The additional professional staff members could each be paid as high as $23,583.70. Counting only the three professionals that could be employed under all circumstances, the cost of their salaries alone for each committee could come to almost $70,000. For 36 committees this would be over $2,520,000. They would, of course, require office space, secretarial assistance, travel expenses, and other items which would increase the cost considerably. They might also prepare reports which are not prepared today because of the lack of need for them, and these reports would be printed and distributed at Government expense.

The changes made at page 16 of the bill by this amendment would require the review specialist to be included within, rather than be additional to, the four professional staff members now authorized.

The balance of the amendment would strike out those provisions of the bill which first, increase the authorized professional staff from four to six; second, permit a majority of the minority to appoint two of the professional staff members and one of the clerical staff members; and, third, permit the staff appointees of a majority of the minority to be in addition to the 13 authorized staff members where there are no vacancies at the time of their appointment.

As I informed the Senate a few days ago, when we considered the various resolutions dealing with so-called temporary employees, it has been my privilege for the past 15 years, or more, to question the advisability of providing so many more employees each year than that authorized by the act of 1946.

Mr. President, when the Reorganization Act of 1946 was adopted, we reduced from 30-odd to 15 the number of standing committees. We provided 10 employees for each committee, four of whom would be professionals and six clericals.

To facilitate the work of the committees, to make possible for each committee the necessary research, and to enable the administrative assistants and the office forces of Senators to have ways and means of obtaining information, we created the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress. That Service was to be for the benefit of all Senators and all committees. As I pointed out last week, we spend for the Legislative Reference Service $3,428,000, and there are presently employed 304 specialists in various lines to give information to the committees through their staffs, to the Senators through their staffs, and, of course, to the Senators directly.

It was my belief then that such a procedure would not only be workable, but, would alleviate much of the load in the Senator's offices, by enabling them to to make a telephone call to the Legislative Reference Service and obtain much of the information necessary to conduct the affairs of the committees as well as the work of Senators.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the pending amendment or one of those which will later be offered by the Senator deal with the question as to whether or not the additional committee employees provided by the bill before us are to be in addition to or without regard to employees authorized and employed by special resolutions, and paid from the contingent funds?

Mr. ELLENDER. Special authority to obtain additional employees is not affected by my amendment at all. It deals only with the additional employees provided under this act, in amending the 1946 act.

In other words, Mr. President, my point is this: We have 15 standing committees. Those standing committees now have, in addition to the employees provided by the original act of 1946, a total of 465 additional employees.

My amendment does not disturb that situation, as much as I should like it to. Those employees remain intact. And, Mr. President, I wish to make the point clear that even though this amended bill is enacted, the Senate will still have the right to make provision for subcommittees each year, as in the past.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator. My question does not go to the argument whether or not a particular committee should have a certain number of employees, or a few more or a few less. I do think it is important that the Senate and the Committee on Rules understand the issue. Perhaps the author of the bill can help clarify the problem I have in mind.

A number of committees have been provided additional staffing under resolutions which have passed, which will carry through all of calendar year 1967.

This bill, if enacted, will take effect soon after it passes and is approved. In the case of a committee that has sought and obtained from the Committee on Rules and from the Senate funds from the contingent fund to employ additional employees, will this bill give such a committee employees in addition to those?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. That is what I am trying to take from the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. It does not differentiate between the committee that has not sought additional employees to be paid from the contingent funds, and the committee that has?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. In other words, Mr. President, under the original act of 1946, we had provided four professionals and six clericals. This amendment adds three for each committee, whether they need them or not, and whether or not they are provided for by special resolution.

In other words, Mr. President, let us take for example the Committee on Aeronautics and Space Sciences. That committee, under the act of 1946 and the resolution recently adopted, now has six professionals. It also has eight clericals, for a total of 14 employees.

If this bill passes, it will give that committee three additional professionals, whether it wants them or not.

Mr. President, I think it would be horrible for a thing like that to happen. I do not believe any committee which has applied for additional employees did not receive the number of employees desired. I think it is extravagant to pile up for each committee employees additional to the number it now has, whether they are needed or not.

Mr. CURTIS. I agree with the Senator, but I also think that the fact that this bill would take effect, perhaps, in the middle of the year, also creates an odd situation. In passing on the funds from the contingent fund, there is no opportunity to take into account what the committees are entitled to by statute.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, of course, all employees——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 10 minutes which the Senator allotted himself have expired. Does the Senator wish to use additional time?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 5 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I say further to my good friend that under resolutions heretofore adopted, eight of the committees now have additional permanent professionals. They do not have to come back each year and obtain funds, as is the case with employees provided by resolutions.

For instance, last week the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare obtained seven new professionals who will be permanent. They do not have to come back each year and ask for money for those eight new professionals; the funds will be provided automatically, just the same as would be the case in the event this bill is enacted and the additional employees are provided.

What I seek to do, Mr. President, is simply to say to the Senate that the number of employees now employed will be retained—that is, the four professionals and the six clericals for each committee, provided by statutes, and the additional employees made available by the committees by resolution are not disturbed. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, this bill does not in any manner change the law or the rules or regulations to prevent special committees, subcommittees, or standing committees from coming before the Senate and asking for more people.

Mr. President, I wish again to reiterate how wrong I think it would be to provide additional unneeded employees for such committees as the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which now has 50 employees—24 professionals and 26 clericals. The bill would provide three more professionals whether they are needed or not.

Senators know what will happen if the bill in its present form is enacted. Of course the additional employees will be put on the payroll. The urge will be there to put them on—all this in addition to what the law now provides.

There is another quirk in the pending bill to which my pending amendment is directed. A provision in the pending legislation would give the majority of the minority party the right to select two additional professional employees and one clerical should there be no vacancies in the committee. For example, the minority on the Committee on Finance could demand, by a majority of the minority, three additional employees and the majority would have to furnish those three employees to them.

The majority, on the other hand, would have the right to curtail the number of employees on the committee, but those employees who were placed on the committee staff by the majority of the minority cannot be affected unless the majority of the minority takes action against them.

I am sure that my good friend, the senior Senator from Oklahoma, did not intend to do that, but yet that provision is contained in the bill.

The bill provides for more professionals and more clericals for the benefit of the minority. As to whether these employees are needed, the majority of the minority party merely has to state that they want them. If one of them makes a motion that they need three additional men and the motion is carried, the majority of the committee would have to accept that demand. I do not think it is right.

I am sure that no standing committee has been reticent in coming before the Senate and asking for additional employees.

It happens that there are only two committees that have not come before the Senate to ask for additional employees. These committees are the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which I am chairman, and the Committee on the District of Columbia. Those are the only two committees that have not come before the Senate to ask for additional employees. Every other committee has presented resolutions every year to the Senate asking for additional employees.

As I have just indicated, some of the committees have actually had resolutions to make these employees permanent.

I think it is wrong for us at this time to amend the present law and add other employees to the employees that are now employed by the committees. It would greatly increase the cost of running the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment, principally to try to straighten out the numbers confusion that exists.

We are talking here about a total of three professional employees authorized in the bill. Two of these three professional employees may be employed at the beginning of next year if the Republican members of the standing committees claim that they need additional staff because the present staff is imbalanced as a result of the vast majority of the staff devoting its time to serving the majority party.

We are talking about three employees in the professional classification and two in the clerical, one of which would be hired from the regular staff. One new clerical position is provided.

The reason why that date is contained in the bill is that by that time they will be coming before the Senate for additional resolution money with which to operate the staff. Provision is contained in the bill for two employees with reference to the minority staff, and the one man in the review specialist classification will be taken into consideration, I am sure, by the Committee on Rules and Administration when it requests additional money for the staffing of these standing committees.

The committee is aware, I am certain, that the very diligent, energetic, and distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana will be watching, because there will then be three additional professional staff members authorized for employment. If committees have employed them, I am sure the Senator will not be willing to give them three additional staff members merely because they come in with a resolution.

This is the control that we have over the additional members who are not included here, except for the review specialists this year. The other two will be subject to the decision of the committee as to when they should be put on as members to serve the minority as regular members of the duly constituted staff. The question was whether the committees should come in on a year-to-year basis, as they sometimes do, to ask for additional professional staff members with which to conduct public business requirements of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, suppose that there were no vacancy. What does the language of the Senator mean when it states that even though there is no vacancy at the time, if the majority or the minority should desire to press its case, they can be appointed.

Mr. MONRONEY. That would not take effect until January 1. That is on page 125.

Mr. ELLENDER. I refer to page 9.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am talking about the effective date of the act. Part of the suggestion of the Senator relates to that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why is it then necessary to include in section 202 the suggestion that if there are no vacancies the majority of the minority can force the issue, and if they vote to put on additional employees the majority of the committee must accede to that request?

Mr. MONRONEY. The minority would not otherwise have any right to staff unless it were given to them by the majority.

We are trying to provide—and we have stated it a number of times and written the language as clearly as we know how—that when the majority complains that they are not getting the staff help that they need, there will be two professional positions that are authorized and can be filled by the minority.

That would be effective, with reference to parts 2 and 3 of title II, on January 1, 1968. That is to be found on page 125.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senator can look at the language and see that in the original act of 1946——

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, may the Senator be charged with his time and I with mine. I want the Senator to ask questions, but I do want to keep from running out of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana want to ask questions on his own time?

Mr. ELLENDER. Not on my own time. I am just asking questions.

Mr. MONRONEY. I was trying to divide the time. I do want to answer all of the questions.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wonder why the new law seems to change the original law, in that the original law intended that these people be appointed on a nonpartisan, permanent, and career basis.

If that be the case, why did the committee put in the bill the language that these two employees selected by the minority will serve the minority and not the full committee? That is what I cannot understand. We would veer away from the original concept of the act of 1946.

Mr. MONRONEY. The testimony was irrefutable that there was an imbalance in many committees. Many other committees scrupulously observed the nonpartisanship of the career staff, but there are cases that need adjustment.

In order to provide this, we did authorize, when requested by the minority because there was not adequate staffing—and I am sure they will not abuse that provision—the employment of two professional staff members.

That is a cheap price to guarantee bipartisanship in the consideration of these matters.

The situation is worse in the other body. Complaints in the House have been much more numerous than they have been in the Senate, because our Senate committees go on and on for several years, and they have become generally nonpartisan as they have worked together. We received not too many complaints in the Senate, but we had many in the House. For that reason, we provided for the two extra staff members, if requested by the minority leadership, and they would be requested on the basis that adequate staffing cannot otherwise be achieved.

I do not believe that any member of the majority really wants to monopolize committee staff or to prevent the minority from having access to information and to staff work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

We in the majority have men downtown—or are suspected, at least, of having them—in the executive departments who do much extra work in giving us information and research on legislation. I do not see it, but it is claimed that we do have, and for that reason we wanted to make sure that the minority will have this equal access.

I would hate to see the review specialist cut out, because the majority leader has specified that we need to do extra work, to follow up on legislation we have passed, and this gives us a man who will devote his time to that work. Commonsense experience over the years indicates that unless you have a staff member appointed for that specific duty, you will not have that work done. It is a specific performance that will be required, and for that reason we have the review specialist and the two staff specialists who will be used by the minority. If they are not used by the minority, I would say that they are entitled to work as career staff members, and thus they would be reduced from the numbers that would be voted on as the resolutions for extra money are presented in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MONRONEY. On the time of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana?

The PRESIDINIG OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator has stated that there is an imbalance in some things—the minority is not adequately represented, the majority is overrepresented—and therefore it has been decided, in justice, to give the minority the right to select two members when it does so by a majority vote of the minority.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Now, then, if all the

posts are filled and the minority desires two members, two new men will go on the posts. My question is this: "Why not remove two of the employees of the majority, to give the minority proper and just representation?"

Mr. MONRONEY. None of these staff members will be appointed until January 1968.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That does not change the situation at all.

Mr. MONRONEY. The resolution money expires at that time, and many of the staff members are on the resolution. The matter can be taken into consideration at that time, when we authorize additional money in the resolutions, which we do in great amounts, for additional professional staff members.

This gives the distinguished Committee on Rules and Administration—and the distinguished Senator from Louisiana—the right to make sure that reductions are made in the staff if the minority has asked for these two staff specialists.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My question is this: "Why not remove two staff members from those of the majority, so that two could be given to the minority, instead of increasing the total number by two?

Mr. MONRONEY. It is up to the committee. They can do that. They do not have to add two more. But the distinguished Senator from Ohio knows, and I know, that the staff of these committees must be valued and experienced men. The extra men are employed on a year-to-year basis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I will permit the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I rise to support the argument so ably presented by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma in opposition to amendment No. 110, offered by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

The review specialist, who would be eliminated by the action of the resolution in the form of an amendment by the Senator from Louisiana, is, in my opinion, one of the most important reforms we have encompassed in this entire piece of legislation. If this review specialist, operating as he does under the direction of the majority leader and the minority leader, remains in the bill, this will provide all Members of the Senate with valuable information, which inevitably will result in a great saving to the taxpayer, because it provides, for the first time, the means whereby legislative committees can fulfill a function which they are presumed to be able to fulfill but never have fulfilled. It will mean that not only the Committee on Government Operations, on which the Senator from South Dakota serves as ranking minority member, will have this responsibility, but also that each legislative committee will be empowered and authorized and directed to make these annual reviews and to make the facts known to Congress.

Our able, overworked Committee on Government Operations cannot begin to do the supervisory job which the legislative branch should engage in concerning the executive departments, to determine whether or not, first, they are carrying out the intent of Congress; second, whether there are duplications and overlapping of efforts and ways by which the situation could be corrected if the facts were brought to the attention of Congress and the Committee on Appropriations.

I am surprised that the Senator from Louisiana, who has been a consistent exponent of economy in this country, would object to establishing the tools required in order that the Senate and the House can bring about these economies. We cannot shoot in the dark. We must get the information. We spent literally days and weeks, as the members of our joint committee know, attempting to work out a formula which would be both effective and just and which would result in the programs we have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows that we have as our watchdog the GAO. They do a good job. Under the act of 1946, each committee can call on them. I know that we do it in our committee.

Mr. MUNDT. We do it, but not nearly so well as we should do it. We should supervise more carefully a great many operations of the Department of Agriculture. We have an excellent staff, which serves on a bipartisan basis; and I salute the chairman for his selection of it. But it does not have the manpower to get the job done adequately.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have never heard of any complaints.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator may not have heard of any complaints because of the respect that we generally have for the chairman. But the job has not been done adequately, and the Senator recognizes that the size of our staff is utterly inadequate to cover an operation as broad as the Department of Agriculture.

The General Accounting Office does a good job. It sends up the reports. We do not even have the staff members and the time necessary to devote adequate analysis to what the reports provide when they come from the GAO.

As to the other aspect, I do not believe that our chairman is partisan. He never proved that when I served on the committee. I do not believe that the leopard changed his spots.

We had much testimony before a joint committee of the Senate and the House, where this situation does not obtain; and if we believe in bipartisan government—which we do—we should give at least this small recognition to the minority. It is not very large. In the whole staff, it reserves only two for that purpose, and then only where conditions prevail so that the minority feels that in order to have have an adequate "look-see" and the necessary information, it should provide the necessary staff.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will not destroy the hard work of this joint committee by deleting from it two of the most important reforms which we put in by unanimous vote.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator answer this question?

Mr. MUNDT. Surely.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I pointed out to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], we had in mind that the staff of all committees would be selected by the majority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

We had in mind that the staff of all committees would be selected by the majority, and be assigned by the chairman and the ranking member.

These additional employees and staff members appointed pursuant to request by the minority members of the committee in this instance shall be assigned to such committee business as such minority members deem advisable.

We are getting away from the original concept of the act of 1946, whereby the employees of the committee are to serve all of the members. Here they could be serving a majority of the minority group only.

Mr. MUNDT. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator that we would not be getting away from the original concept. It provided for one position for the minority. On the Committee on Government Operations, of which the chairman is the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and on which I have the honor to serve, we are faithfully following the right of the minority to pick this single member.

If the minority feels that it can be best served by Democratic employees, they all serve the full committee, and they would in this case.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the bill, as I read it, it would not do that.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, may I have 30 seconds?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. This section would provide exactly as is now provided, but it provides a safeguard for the minority where it becomes necessary to have someone serve them. If that becomes necessary, then they can have someone. But in 90 percent of the cases, the member picked by the majority and the minority will serve the full committee.

I am shocked that the Senator says the majority picks them all and they serve the full committee. I think that the majority should pick most of them, and the minority should pick a part of them, and they would all serve the full committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 1 minute?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 1 minute to the junior Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Actually, the testimony before the committee was to the effect that the system that we had before had not worked in some of the committees, mostly in the other body.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. METCALF. We tried to take care of the problem to protect the rights of the minority. In many cases the chairmen and acting minority chairmen came in and testified that they were satisfied. We who serve on the Committee on Government Operations are satisfied. Apparently those who serve on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry are satisfied. However, there were instances where the minority was not satisfied, and we were anxious to take care of the problem. Is that correct?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I support the proposal of the Senator from Louisiana. I begin with the premise that on some committees of the Senate the minority is inadequately represented by staff members; and I subscribe to the proposal that the minority, in order to function efficiently, should have adequate representation on the staff to keep it informed and to provide information and papers for it.

But the weakness of what is happening is that in the effort to cure a wrong, the minority—and I address this remark to the minority—have taken the plum by which they are supposed to get some assignments, but allow the majority to remain with an imbalance of strength. There are violations of the old principle.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I cannot yield. I have only 5 minutes.

Too many employees are on one side of the staff. Instead of reducing the number of the majority, they are allowing the majority number to remain intact, and are then adding two employees to the number they now have on the staff membership.

I have read the document, and I understand clearly what it says. If and when a majority of the minority determines that it wants representation and it so votes, it shall be given two members, provided there are vacancies, one would think; but the language further states that if there are no vacancies, the staff number shall be increased by two.

Mr. President, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as this session continues, one will find argument being made, especially during the authorization and the appropriation periods, for a reduction of expense in order to avoid the imposition of a surtax. That argument will be resounding through the Chamber day after day.

Buried in this bill is a proposal of $950,000 for new employees for 15 committees. Three new employees for each committee would mean a total of 45. The salaries will be about $22,500 a year. I figure that to mean $900,000. But that is not all.

Two weeks ago we added new employees, new staff members. When the Reorganization Act of 1946 was passed, it was contemplated that there should be four professionals and four clerks on each committee. Manifestly, that number is not adequate. But throughout the 20 years since 1946, the number of professionals has been expanded and the number of clerks has been expanded.

In 1946, the Committee on Commerce, of which I am a member, was given four professionals and six clerks. It now has how many?

Mr. ELLENDER. It now has 44.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It has 22 clerks and 22 professionals. This proposal would give that committee three more employees. The taxpayers bleed and sweat. The burden will be heaped upon them with increasing frequency as this Congress goes on.

If there is to be economy in Government, I respectfully submit that the place to start is in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. If there is to be obedience to law and order, respect for constitutional government, and the sovereign strength of the State, obedience must first began in Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We will demand economies from all. We will be yelling for the maintenance of law and order so far as it pertains to activities outside Congress; but within Congress, anything goes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has 14 minutes remaining; the Senator from Louisiana has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have 14 minutes remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Louisiana is using a full hour on this amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the following question: Does the wording of the bill mean that the seniority system on the minority side is eliminated and that the chairman of the committee deals with the majority of the minority members, rather than doing business at all with the ranking member?

Mr. MONRONEY. There are some essential questions involved here. Page 57 of the bill states:

> Such professional staff members shall be assigned to the chairman and the ranking minority member of such committee as the committee may deem advisable, except that whenever a majority of the minority members of such committee (other than the Committee on Standards and Conduct of the House of Representatives) so request, two of such professional staff members may be selected for appointment by majority vote of the minority members and the committee shall appoint any staff members so selected.

This is customarily the uniform practice of all of us. Committee employees are assigned to the chairman and ranking minority member, but the committee as a whole authorizes the selection, usually by resolution.

Mr. AIKEN. It means also that the minority ranking member has no more to say about selection of who shall be assigned to him than any of the other members on the committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. No. The ranking minority member of each committee——

Mr. AIKEN. Would be assigned to him, yes; but the selection is made by the majority of the minority.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is right. Authority to select committee staff generally is delegated to the ranking minority member by the minority side, and to the chairman by the majority side. That is the custom. But the law requires, uniformly, that all committee employees be selected by a majority of the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. If the majority of the minority party on a committee have a lack of friendly feeling for the ranking member, they could select a staff member who might not work with him, could they not—but who would be assigned to him?

Mr. MONRONEY. The minority.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

The other question which I had is on page 59, where it states:

> (g) In any case in which a request for the appointment of a minority staff member under subsection (a) or subsection (c) is made at any time when no vacancy exists to which the appointment requested may be made, the person appointed pursuant to such request may serve in addition to any other staff members authorized by such subsections and may be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate or House of Representatives, as the case may be, until such time as such a vacancy occurs, at which time such person shall be considered to have been appointed to such vacancy.

On the two additional members presently appointed to the staff, what pay would they get? Would they be expected to receive the same pay as the regular members of the staff?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would say that they would, but this would be only until the first of the year. This is to take care of the contingency.

Mr. AIKEN. That means that they might become regular members of the staff after 15 or 20 years if a vacancy occurs then?

Mr. MONRONEY. If there is no vacancy on the staff until the first of the year, we would provide for the contingency and keep them on as staff members until the new funds were adjusted by resolution, or by the thinning down of the number on the committee, or by addition under a section of the bill which would provide for the additional two staff members after January 1, 1968.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. Would they be listed in such a way that they would receive full retirement credit?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. It is intended that that should be the case?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to read to my good friend from Vermont—he raised a very important question as to the change of concept on the way we have been going on:

> That that staff member and members all appointed pursuant to request by minority members of the committee shall be assigned to such committee business as such minority members deem advisable.

Mr. AIKEN. We might find a campaign going on to get the majority of the minority membership on a committee which might agree with someone who had some particular idea to promote.

Mr. ELLENDER. This is a change of concept, as I said. In the bill as now written, if it is enacted next week, the minority members are desirous of increasing the amount. All they need to do is meet, and we can adopt two or three—whatever the number is.

Mr. AIKEN. And the ranking minority member in order to protect himself would have to see to it that the new members coming on his committee were, perhaps, sympathizers, or at least would not tend to thwart him.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have complete faith in the minority. They will be fair and not request the two additional staff members——

Mr. AIKEN. I have been in the Senate long enough to know that we cannot take everything on faith.

Mr. MONRONEY. I still have that faith. I am certain that it will work out. There are few exceptions in the Senate—perhaps more in the other body—where there is unfair or a disproportionate division of the staffing. But, if that is the case, that would be intolerable to me and should be corrected. I am willing to risk the fairness of the minority rather than leave that situation——

Mr. AIKEN. I would not want to see even one instance of unfairness. I hope that it would never come to light.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am sure that the minority would not unfairly use this provision.

Mr. President, the Senator's amendment would delete two provisions of the bill which I think are quite important and which are recommended by the committee on a unanimous vote: first, in correcting the staff situation, the committee felt it was quite important that one staff position should be separated completely from the others; namely, the position of review specialist. If we feel that the job of looking backward to see how the programs we have enacted are actually working out is an important task, there must be someone to attend to that job. In all likelihood, the job probably will fall to a senior, present-day staff member. There will be new people coming to the committee staff, but more than likely there will be promotion of a present outstanding staff member to the position of review specialist. I think it is necessary that we have this provision in the bill. If we are going to look backward at our mistakes on many pieces of legislation, review the faulty administration of many programs where the bureaucrats, those appointed to administer the programs, do not follow the wishes or the expectations of the mandate of Congress, we need a review specialist on each of the appropriate committees.

I would desperately hate to see the review specialist provisions cut out of the bill because what is everyone's business is no one's business. We have to have someone on the staff following up the programs we passed last year.

The other matter—of striking the provision for minority staffing—would be cruel. I think it would be destructive of a very necessary but probably little used provision in the rules where the staffs are out of balance.

Another point relates to the Rules Committee and the very diligent and vigilant efforts of the Senator from Louisiana for the control of cutting down of the provisions for professional members when money is requested in the resolutions at the first of the year. With the addition of the two additional minority staff members who are possible under the provisions of the bill, many people who are presently requested in these resolutions would not be necessary. The professionals can be cut out of the resolution money, and certainly if it is the feeling of the Senate itself and the Rules Committee that the position of the staff member who has been made the review specialist is not needed to be filled, then they can cut that money out. But there are dozens and dozens and dozens of professional jobs that go through these resolutions, and this is the place to cut, not in the bill providing the permanent professional staff which we need so badly and which as the Senator says, is costly; but I repeat again that the entire cost of running House and Senate together is less than the cost of operation of the office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me for 2 minutes?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. I take this time primarily to answer the misimpression that the Senator from Ohio apparently has, concerning the operation of minority staff members. There is nothing in the legislation at all which indicates this is in addition to the staff. As the chairman of the joint committee has pointed out, that is in the way staffs are selected. At the beginning of a Congress, we decide among ourselves as committee members the size of the staff which we will need to do the job, and prepare a budget which goes to the Rules Committee. That budget includes the salaries of those who are appointed by the majority of minority members. It does not add anyone else. The Rules Committee ordinarily—not always—gives the amount of money that the committee requires. Then it comes up on the Senate floor. But we are dealing with a changed budget. We are not adding additional expenditures simply because a part of the staff finds that such has been agreed to by a committee session, or simply because two members of that staff are going to be appointed by the minority ranking member on the committee.

I would point out that this particular section—I ask the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] to correct me if I am wrong—becomes effective on the first day of the next calendar year. So we have this maxim established for developing a staff suitable to do the job, no more or no less in the aggregate than if the minority continued to be ignored. It operates precisely in conformity with the existing policy on the committee that I mentioned, on which I serve, the Government Operations Committee, that, according to the Reorganization Act of 20 years ago, the minority nominates its fair quota and they are a part of the package.

Concern has been expressed that they are serving minority interests; we propose that they serve with the staff as a part of the staff team. There is no division there. There is a feeling that a staff picked by the majority and directed by it to carry out its position is not satisfactory. Whatever needed safeguards may be necessary in the House committees, it is necessary in only a few committees of the Senate. I hope we do not destroy that which has now been accorded us by unanimous consent thus far from the joint committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Louisiana has 4 minutes remaining and the Senator from Oklahoma has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am willing to yield back my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not like to repeat myself too often, but as Senators know, for the past 15 years I have been interested in trying to keep the subcommittees in line. Over the years, I cannot claim to have been very successful. Every year there is an increase in the number of employees on practically every subcommittee. More money is being requested. Now, we are told, "Provide in the bill two addiitonal employees for the minority, and next year, when the subcommittees are created, we are going to lop them off."

As I recall, Mr. President, in practically every resolution that was adopted creating the subcommittees, the minority was pretty well taken care of. I recall that practically every resolution had some wording in it whereby the patronage—because that is what it is—will be divided up, not equally, but the minority will have so many, and majority will have so many.

What I resent, and what I think is wrong, is that we are getting away from the act of 1946, under which employees on these committees represented both sides, Republicans and Democrats. No preference was shown. It was supposed to be bipartisan. However, under this language, as I understand it—and I challenge any one to read it and not come to this conclusion—the members of the minority that are appointed on it will owe allegiance to the majority of the minority. Even the ranking Republican on a committee will not have any say if the majority of the minority decides against his wishes.

I repeat, it changes the entire concept of the act of 1946.

I shall place in the Record at this time a table to indicate what is happening. The cost of running the Congress has been on the increase every year, particularly with respect to the subcommittees. In the 84th Congress the amount expended was $4,769,598.02. In the 89th Congress, it was just double that amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for 1 minute on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator ask unanimous consent?

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to take another minute from the time allotted on the next amendment that I intend to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Hearing none, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I said, the cost for the subcommittees has grown greatly from the 84th Congress. The amount of expenditures has doubled. Now, instead of trying to remedy the situation, we are simply making it possible for each standing committee to have three additional members appointed. Of course, it applies to a large number of committees in the House as well.

We are not trying to cure the evil that I have been pointing out for the past 15 years. Even though we are increasing the number of employees for each committee, the fact remains that next year, and the year after, the chairmen of the subcommittees will be able to come before the Senate, and I am sure with success, judging from the past, and continue to increase this number.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Record at this point a table showing the cost of running the subcommittees alone.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Summary of committee authorizations and expenditures for inquiries and investigations, 84th through 90th Cong., 1st sess.

	Authorized	Expended
84th Cong. (1955-56):		
Inquiries and investigations	$6,578,859.94	$4,530,074.67
Routine	315,000.00	239,523.35
Total	6,893,859.94	4,769,598.02
85th Cong. (1957-58):		
Inquiries and investigations	7,958,780.14	5,696,275.34
Routine	320,000.00	210,445.89
Total	8,278,780.14	5,906,721.23
86th Cong. (1959-60):		
Inquiries and investigations	10,458,231.37	7,619,895.65
Routine	300,000.00	214,326.52
Total	10,758,231.37	7,834,222.17
87th Cong. (1961-62):		
Inquiries and investigations	9,458,700.00	7,308,844.72
Routine	283,300.00	215,888.67
Total	9,742,000.00	7,524,733.39
88th Cong. (1963-64):		
Inquiries and investigations	$9,802,933.00	$7,716,828.20
Routine	280,000.00	202,089.85
Total	10,082,933.00	7,918,918.05
89th Cong. (1965-66):		
Inquiries and investigations (total)	12,298,415.00	[1] 9,597,682.49
90th Cong., 1st sess.:		
Inquiries and investigations (projected) (total)	5,896,000.00	------------

[1] Through Dec. 31, 1966.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I pointed out a while ago that we have now on the books resolutions that provide for 465 employees in addition to the ones provided by the act of 1946, at a cost of $6.5 million.

My time is up, I think.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield back his time?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I only wish to say that the Senate itself can correct the imbalances in staffing if too many are being hired. The Senator from Louisiana need make no apology to anyone for the fight he has made for economy. The chairmen of the committees should be interested in cutting down on so-called part-time employment of committee professionals provided for by resolutions. I think it is far better to have a complete staffing pattern by way of permanent appropriations, so the committees will have the benefit of the knowledge, skill, and understanding of highly trained professional employees.

This amendment would delete a very valuable part of the organization proposal by striking out the provision for a review specialist. Without such a staff member, we will not have a specialist who can follow up on legislation that has already been passed, a function that has been needed for so long.

I feel that there is an exaggeration of the problem of over-staffing, particularly in the Senate, by saying that minority staff professionals will be placed on every single committee. I doubt that. I think that only a few committees will ask for them, when they feel the need, in justice, to have an equal opportunity to have staff help.

I yield back the remainder of my time. I think the yeas and nays have already been ordered on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired or been yielded back.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Are we voting on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote is on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, as modified.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. Metcalf in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment (No. 110) of the Senator from Louisiana. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with my senior colleague, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Wyoming, [Mr. McGee], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Mondale], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Hollings], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea" and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Hansen], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Hatfield] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator

from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Hansen], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 51, as follows:

[No. 50 Leg.]

YEAS—23

Aiken
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Curtis
Eastland
Ellender
Fulbright
Hill
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Lausche
McCarthy
Pastore
Russell
Smathers
Spong
Stennis
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—51

Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Case
Clark
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Fannin
Fong
Gore
Griffin
Harris
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McClellan
McGovern
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Nelson
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Scott
Smith
Symington
Thurmond
Tydings
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—26

Bartlett
Bayh
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cooper
Ervin
Gruening
Hansen
Hartke
Hatfield
Hollings
Javits
Long, La.
Magnuson
McGee
McIntyre
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Muskie
Randolph
Sparkman
Tower
Yarborough

So Mr. Ellender's amendment (No. 110) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Tydings in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 113

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 113.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> Beginning on page 64, with line 15, strike out all through line 13 on page 65.
>
> Renumber succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not think it will take very long to consider the pending amendment.

The pending bill would provide for an additional legislative assistant for each Senator. The funds with which to pay these legislative assistants are not to come from the regular amount allotted to each Senator for his other employees.

With respect to the State of Louisiana, which I represent in part, $57,000 is allotted to each Senator to operate his office. That is the base amount that I receive.

I do not care to have everyone do what I am trying to do, although I am sure many are, but each year I return to the Treasury approximately $75,000 which I could use to operate my office. However, if I were to use all of it, I would feel like a burglar because I have no need for it.

The great trouble that I find today with the operation of the Senate is that Senators have too many advisers. They have too many people telling them what they ought to do. And I doubt that all Senators do the job that should be done.

We now have administrative assistants and they are paid for out of the regular allotment of each Senator. The base is $8,880, out of the $57,000 base that I am allotted. There is added to that from the contingent fund an amount sufficient to pay each administrative assistant as much as $24,460.

Mr. President, in addition to that help, we now propose to add a legislative assistant for each Senator. According to the committee report, section 321(a) authorizes the employment by each Senator of a legislative assistant to assist him in the performance of duties involving legislation.

I wonder what the administrative assistant does for the Senator? What does his staff do for him?

Is this person to be employed by a Senator to look into only legislative matters? I think we are simply overdoing it.

The report provides:

> The basic compensation of the legislative assistant may be fixed by the Senator at a rate not in excess of $8,460 per annum.

That is the base.

The report further provides:

> The compensation of this employee would not be chargeable to a Senator's regular clerk hire allowance, and no part of the amount available for the payment of such compensation could be paid to any other employee in the Senator's office. Subsection (b), of section 321 makes a technical amendment to the provisions of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, to make it clear that the legislative assistant would be in addition to the other two Senate employees in a Senator's office whose basic compensation may be fixed at an annual rate of $8,460.

As I understand the purpose of the proposed legislation, this legislative assistant will be limited to looking into legislative matters only, and I am wondering where we are going.

As I pointed out earlier the cost of operating the Senate has increased tremendously since the 84th Congress. For the life of me, I cannot see why each Senator, irrespective of the size of his State, should be entitled to a legislative assistant whose salary could be as much as $23,244.66. That would mean that each Senator, whether he needs him or not, would have the opportunity to appoint this legislative assistant, who evidently would be a specialist in legislation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The authority to appoint a legislative assistant does not disturb me nearly as much as does the listing of the base salary of $8,460 a year. Will the Senator advise us what the real salary of this person would be?

Mr. ELLENDER. $23,244.66.

Mr. AIKEN. And can the Senator tell me why, when we read the salaries paid by the House, the base salary is made public, I believe, whereas in the Senate the exalted salary is the one that is always published, making it appear that the Senate pays it employees about three times as much as the House? What is the use of carrying on this deception against the public any more?

We do not pay legislative assistants $8,460. We pay them almost three times that, and the Government takes nearly half of it for taxes, of course. But that is a deception on the public which ought to be eliminated.

Mr. ELLENDER. That has been my contention all along. I will not say it is a deception, because each year—in fact, every 6 months—a publication is issued by the Secretary of the Senate——

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. In which is set forth the exact amount received for each quarter by a Senator's employees.

As I pointed out earlier, I employ 12 people in my office. I take out of my base pay about two-thirds of the base pay, and then the contingent fund adds to that, to make the salaries increase from the base pay of $8,860 to $24,460.

Under the Base Pay Act, you could use $60, as I recall, of your base pay, and the contingent fund would put in about $1,700 more. So that by taking $60 out of your base pay, you could hire somebody who would get $1,800. I do not like that system, but that is the method we have been using for quite some time.

As I have said, in my opinion, each Senator has enough money to properly operate his office; and for us to add another employee who will be paid $23,244.66 merely to look into the legislative aspects of the work of the Senator, I believe we are simply outdoing ourselves.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I say to the Senator that the Senator from Florida has had a legislative assistant in his office for a great many years who draws pay at the second rate permitted under the pay scale, which I think is something like $1,000 under the maximum. I have understood that many Senators have followed that same course, having both an administrative assistant and a legislative assistant. Does this mean that we are going to have a second legislative assistant?

Mr. ELLENDER. It does. And he will be a real one, because the intention is that he do nothing but that, and he will not be paid out of the same funds as the Senator's present legislative assistant.

Florida having about 4 million people——

Mr. HOLLAND. Six million.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume that in operating his office, the base pay of the Senator from Florida is over $60,000, perhaps $70,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. Whatever it is, not only are we getting along on it, but also, we have an administrative assistant and a legislative assistant, whom I have just mentioned, and 13 others, and still do not quite use up our allowance.

Am I correct in my understanding that this amount, while it is paid out of another fund—of course, it comes from the same Government—will not be shown in the law as added to our allowance for our office?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator's

understanding is correct. It will be paid out of a separate fund, and the Senator's present allowance will not thereby be affected.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thoroughly agree with the Senator in his approach on this amendment, and I expect to support him.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

This is a provision of the bill on which I believe the committee was unanimous, to put additional emphasis on the primary job that we are sent to the Senate to do, and that is to legislate.

I do not know how many committee assignments Senators average, but I would guess that we would average at least three, and in many cases four, counting the special, joint, and other committee efforts.

I do not know how many conflicts other Members experience each day in committee meetings, but scarcely a day passes when I do not have at least one conflict in getting to one of the subcommittees on appropriations or to subcommittees on commerce or in providing myself time to go to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. We all have these conflicts.

We are sent to the Senate primarily to legislate. Providing a legislative assistant who could cover a meeting in the compelled absence of the Senator he represents, who must be at another committee meeting, and detail to the Senator the proceedings of the testimony and the discussion that took place, would be the next best arrangement we could institute to having the Senator himself present. It will require a man of some ability to be able to gather and understand the testimony, to be able to switch back and forth among several committees, to report to the Senator what occurred, to bring back the information as to why the request perhaps for a billion dollars, $2 billion, or $10 billion additional is necessary, in the appropriations subcommittee or in the authorization committee at which he was present.

We set this aside as a matter in which we desired economy. Most of the committee members and those who testified before us believe that the job of administrative assistant is filled well. But we all know that this man generally must take care of the multitude of problems that are waiting to be solved back in the Senator's home State, problems which require some agency or departmental checkup by someone of high skills and talents in the office. He must handle the problems of constituents by the hundreds who ask for guidance in finding information regarding their economic interests or problems.

The administrative assistant must handle almost all of the service problems, and the problems of constituents, upon which a Senator must render assistance. If the offices of other Senators are like mine, this service has been escalating at a tremendous rate, to the point where an administrative assistant no longer has the time to double in brass and become an expert in legislation and also take care of the problems which the administrative assistant was employed to help the Senator handle. Above all, the administrative assistant must followup, after he gets the problem, to see that the agency or the department of Government involved makes some interpretation on what this problem is.

For those reasons, I believe that there is a clear need for the legislative assistant.

He does not have to be paid $23,244 per year. At no time has this committee ever released a figure lower than the gross figures because we feel, since we are compelled to act on a basic figure, we owe it to the public to translate that into a clear listing of what it is going to cost.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is speaking of the Senate.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I have seen salary figures emanating from the other body—whether the House of Representatives does it as a practice, I do not know—listing the base pay, which make it appear that the Senate is paying three times as much for the same help that the House of Representatives is paying.

I realize that there are some States where a Senator needs more money. Whether he needs 70 or 80 employees would be another question. However, it seems to me that it would be a simple matter to add more money to the amount available to Senators from States of 3 million to 5 million people or more.

Mr. MONRONEY. We have been doing that lately.

Mr. AIKEN. I think that would be the better way to handle the situation.

Mr. MONRONEY. Before the Senator from Vermont entered the Chamber we had agreed to an amendment which was offered by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], to request that the Committee on Appropriations work out a schedule that would reflect only the actual pay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. We are trying to work out this matter. It is not as easy as it would sound. Even though we have tried to work it out, an answer has not been found that would treat all Senators fairly.

Mr. AIKEN. If the House of Representatives would do that, it would not make the Senate look so extravagant.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I know of no Senator who would want to use this legislative assistant position if he did not need it. The reason we did not add it to the general pay was that we did not feel we wanted to put $23,000 more in the clerical account and have it used for employees back home, or low pay salaries for clerks, secretaries, or stenographers. We wanted to specify that this was to be used only in the event that the Senator felt he needed the services of a legislative assistant who would report to him on the dozens of committee matters each month which the Senator might miss, or to report to him on hearings, and advise him of things that he should know with respect to legisaltion that is going to come up which is of vital importance. Since we are here to legislate primarily, it is proper to have a man, if we feel we need him, who can supplement the limited time that we have to inform ourselves about the legislation we are called upon to consider.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. MONRONEY. We are on a limitation of 30 minutes to an amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senator now has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. President, I have not addressed the Senate, as the Chair knows, in any way on this bill. In my humble opinion, and based on my experiences here, there is not a greater need that the average Senator has, that the average Senator needs, than a qualified, competent, permanent legislative assistant; a chance to pay him enough money to get the man in the first place who is qualified, and keep him after he gets him. I have had some good ones but lost them to industry.

The way legislation sails through this Chamber, without a proper chance, as I see it, for the average Senator to know what is in it, is becoming a very serious matter for the Congress and for the country.

I voted for the last amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] a few minutes ago. He is sincere, he is always alert, and he is the hardest worker in the Senate. He is an outstanding chairman of an important, major committee, and he has all of that staff at his beck and call. He does an excellent job as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations. His service there is outstanding and he has the benefit of that staff. However, the average Senator does not have added staff members at their call.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] told me a few years ago in the appropriations bill for the Department of Agriculture alone, as I recall the number, there were 3,100 different line items that have to be passed on. I am on that subcommittee. It is impossible for a member who is on that subcommittee to have personal knowledge of that many items. He must have a great deal of assistance and it must be qualified if he is to keep up with the items affecting his State.

Last year I saw appropriation bills sail through this Chamber with $4 billion to $6 billion in them. They were reported one night and passed the next morning. I recall in the case of one bill that was brought in of about that magnitude, the report was not filed until the next morning around 10 or 11 o'clock. There was not a scintilla of testimony from the hearings until just before the bill was voted on; still it sailed through the Senate like a kite.

I am on the Committee on Appropriations and I have a chance to know something about those matters. My legislative assistant had a long list of items about which I needed information in order to protect my State. We need a highly superior man to do this work.

Sometimes these bills are reported one night, there is no report available, and the next morning the bill is passed. That usually happens near the end of a session. Many other bills are passed in the same way.

I now have more money available than I am using for the staff, but there have been times when I did not have enough. I recall 2 or 3 years ago in my office I said to one of my secretaries, "It looks like things are piling up in the office." She said, "Senator, we are all just tired to death, and we have been for almost a year." There is no secretary on the Hill who is superior to her and she was never a complainer. I have no drones on my staff, and whenever I have had one they did not stay long.

Mr. President, I think that this matter presents one of the gravest problems that could possibly confront the Senate. The idea that too many of these people are employed now, that they do not do anything, and that the Senator would be better off with less help around him, with all deference to my friend, is exactly contrary to my experience over the years; not only now, but over the years. I think that the problem is becoming graver every day. I hope that we retain this provision.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 2 minutes?

Mr. MONRONEY. I had told the Senator from Colorado that I would yield to him. I have 4 minutes remaining. Is that correct, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I shall yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and 1 minute to the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY. I shall be pleased with whatever time is yielded to me.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words on this matter, and I say them with this background.

Everyone in the Senate knows that there is no harder working Senator than the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. In addition to that, we admire him for his adherence to principle and his courage.

However, I have to disagree with him this afternoon. I do not exactly like the way this particular problem has been brought out in this bill. I had hoped that they would expand the opportunities for the employment of specialists in given areas. This could be done now. It is rarely done, so that we have more committee background in given areas and committee advice, independent advice on certain phases of legislation. I wish to give the following example. I serve on the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, on which the Senator from Louisiana serves. We have matters coming before us dealing with space, FAA, or did have, CAB, all regulatory agencies, housing, and veterans. We run the whole gamut on our committees such as HEW on which the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and I serve. There is involved there questions of medicine. I felt, and so testified before the committee, that what we needed was independent expert advice. We needed legislative assistance. They have gone at it the other way, but I think it is an improvement.

I rise today because of some of the things the Senator from Louisiana has said that have a negative reaction on some of our problems.

I have 15 people in my office. I do not think any of them are overpaid. I have never, at any time, carried on any kind of business or any remnants of my law practice in my office.

It is devoted completely, wholly, 100 percent, to the legislative business of the Senate and the servicing of my constituents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Colorado from the time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator.

The people in my office—and I believe this to be true in many offices—work 9 and 10 hours a day—sometimes longer. The girls in the office, particularly, work every other Saturday at least a half day, so that they are putting in more work than we could get anyone to work in private employment almost anywhere. I do not feel that any of my employees are overpaid in any respect. The point is, they are doing only one thing. They are helping me take care of my legislative business. They are not taking care of any business outside the Senate, either for me or for anyone else. They are not moonlighting. Frankly, I am proud of my loyal staff. I am proud of their competency.

As I say, I did not quite agree with the way the committee worked this out. I think perhaps it would be better to put this in the form of legislative history. It could be a part of the budget of each individual Senator including limitation as to how the money could be used.

Frankly, I feel that with the expanding science and technology apparent on every side of us in this country, with so few of us in the Senate being educated along mathematical or scientific lines, we badly need—I repeat, badly, because it is costing us hundreds of millions of dollars a year—people on our staffs, and on committee staffs, on whom we can depend for an independent voice, independent thought, who can bridge the gap—soon to become a big gap, an ever-enlarging gap—between testimony which comes to us from the scientific community. I think, for example, of NASA and other places, of the gap which exists between those scientists who appear as witnesses, and the training which most Senators have had.

Thus, Mr. President, while I would rather have done this another way, I want to support the distinguished chairman of the committee. I think that we should not agree to the pending amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. I am going to vote for the amendment, perhaps not for the same reasons as the Senator from Louisiana, but because I think that the timing of this provision is very unfortunate. Here we are, talking in terms of a $135 billion budget—even if the 6 percent surtax is imposed, we are going to end up with a deficit in that budget of $8.1 billion, and if we do not impose the 6 percent surtax, the deficit will be over $13 billion. Furthermore, we are the one body in Congress which should be setting an example to the country at a time when the country is talking in terms of guns or butter; but what are we doing in the Senate?

We are going to increase our staffs to the total of $23,000 a year more for each Senator.

I say that this is unfortunate, because the minute this is done for the Senate, the House will do the same thing and there will be 435 extra jobs in the House.

Here we are at a very sensitive time in the fiscal stability of the Nation, when we are spending $2 billion a month in Vietnam and do not know what the end will be; yet we are setting this questionable example.

I ask the proponents of the reorganization bill which provides for the extra jobs: What have we been doing up to now? What has been the deficiency of the Senate? I think that we have been doing a pretty good job. We have done our work with the existing help we have. We have no apologies to make. But if we are to increase the number of our employees, why do we not do it in the regular way? Let us do away with all this hocus-pocus of paying for it out of a special fund.

The basic argument I make in support of the amendment is: This is the wrong time and the wrong place for the Senate to be increasing its help.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from California on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I join with other Senators in my admiration for the Senator from Louisiana. I would also like to point out, in deference to the Senator from Rhode Island, that possibly had the staffs been more able, previously enacted programs might be working better and more efficiently. Perhaps, we might have avoided the precarious financial position we find ourselves in today.

I should like to point out that I represent a State, with a population of 19 million persons, over 1,000 letters come to my office each day. I have a staff which completely uses up my budget. I have had to put people on at my own expense, in order to get the work done.

I reiterate what has been said by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], that these youngsters come in and they work 10, 11, and 12 hours a day. They come in on Saturdays. They also come in on Sundays, if necessary. The work is endless.

In all my life—which has been a long one—I have never seen a more conscientious or harder working group than those who work in my office.

Thus, I assure the Senate that there would be no wasted money.

Let me suggest that a State as large as California has many, many problems. It has air space, yes—lots of it. It has fisheries. It has lumber. It has mining. It has the motion picture industry, of course. The list is endless.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MURPHY. It has many military installations, shipping, and transportation industries, and a great agriculture industry.

I can therefore assure the Senate that the addition of a legislative assistant in my office would not only increase its efficiency—and I already have one good legislative assistant and he works full time, but the workload is impossible. There is enough work for another full-time expert—but I am also quite certain it would also more than pay for itself in a short period of time.

If this did not prove to be so, I am sure that Senators know my reputation for economy, I would be against the pending amendment.

In this particular case, I think it is something which is badly needed. I know that I would greatly appreciate having another legislative assistant. One is clearly needed in my office at this time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, we talk about eliminating the Teachers Corps, doing away with rent subsidies, doing away with other programs affecting the well-being of our people—the poor and the poverty stricken. We talk in terms of cutting those things out, yet we talk in terms of increasing jobs in our offices.

I say that we are working under a double standard. We should do unto others what we do unto ourselves. We should do to ourselves what we are trying to do to others.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not criticize the point of view of any Senator. I merely wish to call attention to the fact that nearly every Senator has a legislative assistant. I have had one ever since I came to the Senate. He has been paid, as I recall it, something like $1,000 less per year than the administrative assistant; yet I have had no difficulty in obtaining very able men for that job.

The pending amendment provides for an additional legislative assistant. My feeling on that is this: If we get a second top level man, that will mean another clerical worker, too. We cannot do it any other way.

If any Senator thinks there is room for 200 additional workers over there in the two Senate office buildings, he is mistaken. I think it means that we will be committing ourselves to the expansion and completion of the New Senate Office Building right away.

I think this is the wrong thing, at the wrong time, for the wrong reason, and is being done in the wrong way. When the time comes that we need extra assistants, we should put it in a bill so that everybody will see that we are increasing the allowance of a Senator in proportion to the size of his State. That is the proper and appropriate way to do it.

I shall support this amendment because I think that otherwise we are committing ourselves to a long-term and expansion of the Senate if we ever vote for the provision in the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche].

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it has been argued that, because of the complexities of a multitude of issues that come before us, we Senators need additional help. If that argument is applicable to each Senator, I submit that it is also irrefutably applicable to each of the Members of the House. Each Member of the House of Representatives is confronted with the same multitude of problems that I am. If I am entitled to another legislative assistant, it cannot be argued logically that a Member of the House is not entitled to one.

The bill does not provide for a legislative assistant for each Member of the House; but if each Member of the House demands it, how can I, or any Member on this floor, say that an individual in the House does not need the help, but he, the individual Member of the Senate, does need it?

We added an expenditure of $900,000 by voting down the amendment that was just offered. The pending amendment will impose a potential cost of 100 times $23,000—in other words, $2.3 million. If the House demands what we are giving to ourselves, it will be 435 times $23,000, or $10 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I have a half a minute more, please?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio be granted 1 minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator. I doubly thank him.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It means that we are already adding to the costs of the taxpayers about $13 million, and we are not through.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for 15 seconds?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I would like to make the observation that late last year the House of Representatives passed legislation providing each Member of the House with a legislative assistant.

Mr. LAUSCHE. They asked for another one after we set this great example of thrift with the taxpayers' money; and that remark is directed to that side of the aisle in the main.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I merely wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that, in the construction of my State of California, the complexity of the entire State does not always affect each individual Member of the House of Representatives from my State. For instance, we may have a man who represents a certain district. The population for that activity may be increasing, but the problems involved are nearly the same. Another man may represent a district interested in timber. The same thing takes place there. As Senators, we must face and answer all the problems of all the State. Our focus is not only on a single district.

With regard to the two Senators from my State, Senator Kuchel and myself, the complexity increases as new industries come into our State. Ours is not a regional approach; ours has to be an overall, complete knowledge.

I am sure the Senator from Ohio will understand the importance of staff to a man of my background and experience coming into this distinguished body. I have had no legal training and no former knowledge of the complicated rules and procedures of this high Chamber. The Senator will understand the problems placed on such a man who must answer on how he votes and how properly to represent his State.

I assure the Senator that I am for cutting costs. I assure him that I do not want to spend one unproductive dollar. But I assure him that, coming from the No. 1 State of the Union, I would like to try to represent the people of my State to the best of my ability. Therefore, I assure him that everyone employed in my office, as is now the case, will be a hard working employee. There is a crying need for large States, like I represent, for the additional staff.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana (No. 113). On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from

Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 55, as follows:

[No. 51 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Aiken
Anderson
Bible
Cannon
Church
Dirksen
Ellender
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
Miller
Pastore
Prouty
Russell
Smith
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—55

Allott
Baker
Bennett
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cotton
Curtis
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Harris
Hart
Hollings
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
McGee
McGovern
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Nelson
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Scott
Smathers
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.

NOT VOTING—19

Bartlett
Bayh
Brooke
Burdick
Cooper
Ervin
Gruening
Hansen
Hartke
Hatfield
Hayden
Long, La.
Magnuson
McIntyre
Montoya
Muskie
Randolph
Sparkman
Yarborough

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendment (No. 113) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 117

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I call up my amendments numbered 117, and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] proposes amendments, as follows:

On page 114, strike out lines 7 through 21, and insert the following:

"(e) Each employee of the professional staff, and each employee of the clerical staff, of each standing or select committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate (including the majority and minority policy committees of the Senate, the majority conference of the Senate, and the minority conference of the Senate), and of each joint committee of the two Houses, shall receive a per annum (gross) rate of compensation, constituting his total rate of compensation, to be fixed by the chairman, which is not in excess of $24,460."

On page 115, beginning in line 9 with the words "the highest" strike out all through the word "Code" in line 11, and insert "$24,460".

On page 64, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

"(g)(1) The paragraph relating to rates of compensation of employees of committees of the Senate, contained in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended (2 U.S.C. 72a–1a and 72a note), and Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, as amended (2 U.S.C. 72a–1), are repealed.

"(2) The paragraph imposing limitations on basic and gross compensation of officers and employees of the Senate appearing under the heading 'SENATE' in the Legislative Appropriations Act, 1956, as amended (74 Stat. 304; sec. 302(h) of Public Law 89–504), is amended by inserting before the word 'law' the following 'section 202(e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 or other'."

On page 78, line 4 strike out "(1)".

On page 78, line 11, strike out "(1)".

On page 85, line 5, strike out "(1)".

On page 85, line 18, strike out "(1)".

On page 87, line 17, strike out "(1)".

On page 117, line 12, after "section" insert "(other than subsections (f) and (g))".

On page 125, line 5, after the second comma, insert "and".

On page 125, beginning in line 6 with the comma strike through the word "Act" in line 7.

On page 125, in line 9 before the period, insert a comma and the following: "except that section 301(g) shall take effect on the thirty-first day after the date of enactment of this Act".

On page 125, beginning in line 12 with the second comma, strike out all through line 21, and insert the following: "sections 471(f) and 471(g) shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment of this Act."

On page 125, after line 21, insert the following:

"(4) This section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

Does the Senator request that these several amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, these amendments would reduce the top pay for employees of House committees to $24,460; and give Senate committee chairmen the authority to pay any employees of their committees that amount. It would thus provide equal authority for House and Senate committee chairmen, and permit equal pay for positions of equal responsibility.

At present House committee chairmen can pay any member or members of their committee staffs any amount up to $25,890. Senate committee chairmen are limited to one at not more than $24,460, two at not more than $23,244.66, three at not more than $22,230.09, four at not more than $10,479.21.

The restrictions on Senate committee chairman were imposed by Public Law 4, 80th Congress, and the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, all of which conflict with section 202(e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Public Law 4 and the conflicting portions of the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, would be repealed or made inapplicable by the amendment. The amendment would also extend section 202(e) to select and joint committees and Senate minority and majority policy committees and Senate majority and minority conferences. All of these, except House select committees and joint committees paid other than from the contingent fund of the Senate, are now covered by the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956.

The provisions of this amendment would be effective beginning with the 31st day after the date of enactment of the bill. It would then supersede the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] which the Senate adopted yesterday.

Mr. President, judging from the results of the last two votes, I can see the futility of having any more record votes on the remaining amendments I propose to offer.

Nevertheless, I am compelled to say that we should not aggravate the situation that I have been complaining about for quite some time. That situation is one in which the House of Representatives is able to pay its employees a greater rate of pay than we in the Senate can pay our employees for the same work.

We are aggravating the situation by consenting to the pending bill. That bill would provide for three additional positions for each standing committee of the Senate and the House.

In the Senate the top amount that could be paid to one of these employees is $23,583.70, whereas in the House for an employee doing the identical work the pay would be $25,890.

We would provide, in other words, in the pending bill for three additional positions on the standing committees of the Senate and the House, and the most that could be paid by the Senate for any one of these positions is $23,583.70, whereas the House could pay $25,890 for each of the three positions.

I think that is unfair. It leads to pirating. As I stated on the floor of the Senate last week, it happened in my committee.

I was not able under the rules to pay the same amount as the House could pay for an attorney for the committee. So an attorney who had been with the Senate and with the committee of which I am chairman for a total of about 20 years was able to obtain more money from the House committee than I was permitted to pay. What did he do? He resigned from my committee so that he would get $25,890 from the House.

Mr. President, I think pirating is wrong. My amendment seeks to equalize the payments and have the same pay on each side.

My good friend, the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], had an amendment last week to raise the pay. My amendment would put the pay at the same level.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. The amendment of the Senator from Louisiana would lower the pay to the Senate level and wipe out the amendment agreed to last week which would increase the pay of the Senate employees to that of the House level?

Mr. ELLENDER. That would be the effect of it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator is one which would strike at comity between the two Houses. It would raise a problem that I think we would regret to raise.

Nothing ties the two bodies together except the good will, spirit of cooperation, and friendship that have existed down through the decades. We have no more chance of successfully telling the House to reduce the pay of its top staff people in charge of their committees than I have of telling any Senator how much he is going to pay a stenographer or a clerk in his office.

It has been an historic right of the two Houses to act independently.

The distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and I am sure he is aware when an appropriations bill comes over from the House that we do not have—because of comity between the two Houses that has existed down through the years the right to cut the salaries that the House pays to its staff people whether they be office, committee, or other employees.

The Parliamentarians are paid according to the level the House sets for them. Our Parliamentarians are paid at the level that we set. Our doorkeepers are paid the sums that we set over here.

The House of Representatives does not attempt to dictate to us, and we do not dictate to them. Such action would result in the destruction of the pending bill.

I am familiar enough with House procedures, having served there for a great many years, to know that if we were to send a bill over there cutting the House salaries, saying we are doing this because we are going to lower the salaries to what we think the House should pay, which is what we pay here, we would have no bill at all.

I do not think we want to get into the position of building this clash between the House and the Senate into a full head-on collision. We would accomplish nothing by such action.

The House would not even sit down and discuss the matter.

I feel, for that reason, that agreement to this amendment would be extremely dangerous to the relationship existing between the two Houses. It would accomplish nothing because the bill would not be agreed to. It might result in the defeat of any legislation for the modernization and reorganization of Congress.

For that reason, I ask that the amendment—which is, I think, ill-conceived in the light of what the distinguished Senator from Montana has accomplished—be rejected.

We held out for about 4 years by example, hoping that the House would meet the lower figures we were paying for our top assistants on our committee staff.

The House would not do so. So the junior Senator from Montana offered his amendment after a long period of waiting and wishful thinking that they might readjust. We felt sure they would not, but our people were compelled, as the Senator said, to take less pay for the same work over a great many years.

Our only course, I think, is to accept this scale, because every Senator knows that the top staff members of the Senate can go downtown and work in departments at higher pay or can be hired by national trade associations at higher pay.

We would be not only stirring up unnecessary disagreement with the House on this matter, but we would also run the risk of losing our top staff people to private employment and other employment, if we were to attempt at this point to roll back the approximate 5-percent raise in top salaries that was necessary to bring the two in line. I ask, therefore, that the amendment be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I simply want to bring to the attention of the Senate the import of the Metcalf amendment.

My amendment, as I said, would bring the House to the level of the Senate. If my amendment is rejected, it means that even under the Metcalf amendment we do not equalize the figures at all.

As I understand the Metcalf amendment, no effort is made to cut back on what the House can do. Under the Metcalf amendment the House can pay all of its help the top figure of $25,890, whereas the Metcalf amendment provides for only two employees at $25,890, four at $25,100, and three at $23,583.70, and four at $10,479.20.

It can readily be seen that the Metcalf amendment will increase the cost to the Senate but still leave that inequity, still leave the House committees with the capability of being able to pay all their employees the full $25,890. It is a wrong that should be corrected, and the purpose of my amendment is simply to put the House on the same basis as the Senate.

I yield.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a few minutes to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the amendment I have submitted is subject to the inequity that the Senator from Louisiana has presented. In the House, they can pay every employee of a committee $25,890. They do not. They have not abused that privilege.

My amendment attempts to bring some of the chief staff officers of the Senate up to the level of the House employees, some of the other staff officers to the level of the other staff officers in the House, so that we would have equality.

I do not believe that we should come into the Chamber and say that we should be permitted to pay every clerical employee $25,000 a year. In the House of Representatives, 50 employees of the staff are paid $25,000 or more. Thirty-four employees of the staff in the House receive the maximum amount. Under my statement, we would permit the chief clerk and the chief counsel and other members of our staff to receive an equal amount.

We approached the matter from a different angle. We said that we would not go to the Civil Service Commission and get a GS-19; we would try to apply own own Senate pay schedule. In dollars, it comes out the same.

Actually, under my amendment, there cannot be any more raiding of Senate committees by the House. Under my amendment, the morale in the Senate would be the same as in the House. There would be a possibility of every Senate staff employee reaching the top staff salary, just as any House employee can reach the top staff salary in the House.

But if we adopt the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, it would mean that we would cut everybody in the House back to the Senate level.

I have served in the House, and the Senator from Oklahoma has served in the House. We know very well what will happen there. They will not accept it. This amendment, if it is adopted, will not only correct the inequities that the Senator from Louisiana is speaking of, but will also kill the bill. It will absolutely kill all the other changes and all the other improvements that have been made in the proposed legislation.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois such time as he may require.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me make two points with respect to the proposed amendment.

I served on the joint committee with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma in 1945 and 1946. Well, that is a little over 20 years ago. And we encountered the same difficulty then that is encountered now.

I remember that in many of the tiffs that we had with the House, they simply and politely said, "Well, suppose you go and fry your own fish, and we'll fry ours." They insisted always that that comity of relationship between the two bodies be maintained. They have done that always in every respect of which I have any knowledge.

When, for instance, we violated the rule with respect to appropriations, they were quick to send a resolution over here, telling us to mind our own business. They have done that so far as the constitutional provision is concerned with respect to taxes, and we have always tried to be mindful of those limitations and considerations, because we have to maintain a good relationship.

That very philosophy runs through our own rule book. No Member can get up on this floor and speak disparagingly of a House Member without violating the rules of the Senate; and yet, they would figure that we were trying to disparage their privileges and prerogatives if we tried to tell them what to pay for their help. It simply is not being done. It has not been done. And I am just as confident as I stand on this Senate floor today that it will not successfully be done, because the House will just politely tell us, "Mind your own business."

So, rather than fracture this relationship, which has been delicate but has been preserved rather nicely in all these years, an amendment of this type should not be adopted. I think when they took care of it by the amendment of the Senator from Montana, that took care of it, and they lifted the pay so as to be at parity with that of the House.

There is one other consideration. I never cease to marvel at the fact that we can be so meager with respect to our own help. There can be these emotional outbursts about the welfare of everybody and everything. But how does this work get done in a country where the population will reach over 200 million people before the year 1967 is out? I have been watching the census figures, and it can probably be early in the fall when the United States of America will be a country of 200 million people or more.

Well, obviously, a staff that would do in the days of Abraham Lincoln, when the population certainly did not exceed 32 million, would not do so far as 1967 is concerned. The country grows, the needs grow, the activities grow, and certainly the activities of Congress grow. You have to keep pace, and, in addition, you have to be able, in a competitive market, to pay a salary that is reasonably comparable.

We adopted the comparability principle so far as the Post Office is concerned. We tried to equalize it so that at the different pay levels they would be paid for comparable responsibilities what is paid in industry today. Well, if we expect to get the kind of talent that we so richly deserve, to carry on the business of the legislative branch, we have to be competitive in the brains market. It is just that simple. I think the wise solution was to bring up the Senate level and let it go at that.

I make one other point. I remember that whole series or articles, published either last year or 2 years ago, written by the well-known Columnist Roscoe Drummond, in which he unmercifully scolded Congress for its failure to adequately staff itself. The executive branch does not go about it in so restrained and delicate a fashion. When they need somebody, they get him, and they pay whatever they have to pay in order to get that talent.

Well, the situation is no different here. There are many abstruse problems that require a high degree of skill and competence, so let us pay for it, because we are not going to get them any other way. And by all odds, let us not fracture that relationship that has existed so long and has been so beautifully balanced between the Senate and the House of Representatives.

This noon I made a little telecast on the question of electing the President by the direct popular vote of the people, and it occurred to me that while we have made some modest changes, we have followed that old system for nearly 177 years. It is a testimony to the viability and robustness of our form of government. In that scheme of government are these two branches of Congress, which have to operate together and in tandem, to pass upon matters of congressional importance before they are ever inscribed upon lawbooks of the country.

We cannot afford to ruin or fracture that relationship, and for that reason I think that the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana ought to be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time is yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 66, as follows:

[No. 52 Leg.]

YEAS—14

Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Ellender
Hickenlooper
Holland
Lausche
McClellan
Miller
Pastore
Smathers
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—66

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Harris
Hart
Hill
Hollings
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Nelson
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Scott
Smith
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—20

Bartlett
Bayh
Brooke
Burdick
Cooper
Ervin
Gruening
Hansen
Hartke
Hatfield
Hayden
Long, La.
Magnuson
McIntyre
Montoya
Muskie
Randolph
Russell
Sparkman
Yarborough

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendment (No. 117) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 111

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 111 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> Beginning on page 15, with line 11, strike out all up to but not including line 6 on page 20.
>
> On page 20, line 7, strike "SEC. 106." and insert "SEC. 105."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senate partially voted on this matter a while ago. I merely wanted to make the complete record.

This amendment would strike out the provisions of the bill dealing with legislative review by standing committees. It would strike out: First, the provision authorizing each standing committee to employ a review specialist, who would be additional to the number of other professional employees authorized by law; second, the detailed list of review activities required of each standing committee; third, the requirements for an annual report by each committee on its oversight activities and for transmission of those reports to various officials; and fourth, exemption of the Appropriations

Committee from legislative review requirements.

This amendment would leave the existing provisions of section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which provides for legislative oversight, exactly as they are today.

All committees today review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, operation, administration, and execution of the laws within their jurisdiction. When correction or improvement in administration is required they may recommend such action as may be necessary to the Executive or to the Senate. This type of oversight, which results in real improvements in the laws and their administration, can be handled by the regular committee staff which works on the legislation and legislative reports handled by the committee. With this effective type of oversight, the annual report would largely be a report on matters which had already been corrected or matters which needed no correction. However, if the committee is required to make such a report, it would be required to employ the necessary staff to conduct the review and make the report.

Furthermore, the Congress has created the General Accounting Office as its investigative arm to oversee all agencies of Government. The General Accounting Office is responsible directly to the Congress for conducting independent reviews, audits and investigations of programs, activities and financial transactions of Federal agencies. It is responsible for the rendition of legal decisions relating to Government fiscal matters; for developing, reviewing, and evaluating Federal agency accounting systems; and for advising and assisting the Congress and Government agencies on matters relating to public funds. In addition, the General Accounting Office stands ready to make any special reviews or investigations desired by the Congress. As a matter of fact, on occasions the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has requested certain reviews, all of which have been highly beneficial. The proposed budget for the General Accounting Office for 1968 amounts to $52,965,000. It is authorized a total of 4,600 permanent positions and the average GS salary is $10,196. With this huge reservoir of trained and specialized manpower at the beck and call of the Congress, I can see little purpose in adding one review specialist to each standing committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, this section of the Reorganization Act has been discussed a great deal during the course of debate. In order to avoid any misunderstanding, the cost of this was $42 million, was it not—that was the cost of the GAO?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, sir. We are printing that money. We are adding on to it.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is a very important figure because at the present time there is no organized or general committee pattern for any one in charge to follow up in detail the reports made by the GAO on many departments and agencies of government which it inspects and investigates.

The reports kick around in Congress. Sometimes, someone will pick them up and discuss them and talk about them on the floor, or introduce legislation to correct the failures; but there is no regular committee procedure to deal with amplifying, or utilizing, or having this as evidence to correct failures in the various departments. It is left up to the legislative requirements, or talks about normal rules of economy in matters of this kind.

We feel—and I think the vote was unanimous in the committee—that one of the purposes of a legislative review specialist is to vitalize and make effective recommendations of the General Accounting Office. We do not have anyone to follow through on reports, to call such matters to the attention of the committee, to propose changes in legislation as a result of discoveries and failures reported by the General Accounting Office. Without such a review specialist, we are not going to have many corrections. A legislative review specialist is needed to follow through and determine whether programs enacted by Congress are being carried out by administrators in accordance with the intent of Congress. We need someone to carefully review these matters and recommend changes in law, if certain administrators or certain activities are not in line with what the committee or Congress had in mind at the time the legislation was enacted.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The law as it now is gives each committee such power; does it not?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes, the committee has such power. The purpose of this provision is to see that it uses the power.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator means that is to be done simply by employing more people?

Mr. MONRONEY. By employing a review specialist, by making it mandatory that he report to the committee, and check up on information that may have been provided, to correct the errors found. The greatest trouble with the committees is that they never look back to see what they have done or what has happened to legislation passed last year; they are always thinking of legislation to be passed next year.

For that reason, I think it is essential that the committees have one man who can follow up on legislation or inquiries made by Members of the Congress or the Senate or committees, so that the committees can have a real review function performed which will require the full time of the man working in that position. He could be a man from a committee's own staff, who would be identified as the review specialist, if there are staff members on that com- who could do that work and who are not otherwise too busy with other committee work. Most of the specialists will be selected from members of the staff, who will be promoted to this responsible position. I think it is highly important to the committees that they have such a review specialist looking into programs that cost a great deal of money.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment (No. 111) was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 112.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment (No. 112), as follows:

On page 57, beginning in line 7 with the comma, strike out all through the word "advisable" in line 16.

On page 57, beginning in line 19 with the word "and", strike out all through the word "request" in line 22.

On page 58, beginning with the comma at the end of line 12, strike out all through the word "selected" in line 18.

Beginning on page 58 with the comma in line 22, strike out all through the word "work" in line 4 on page 59.

Beginning on page 59 in line 6 with the word "and", strike out all through line 5 on page 60, and insert a period, closing quotation marks, and another period.

Redesignate succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to advise the Senate that there was quite a discussion of this same matter earlier in the day. This amendment would strike out the provision for appointment to the committee of employees by a majority of the minority members.

As I pointed out, we are simply changing the complexion of the act of 1946. As I see it, from this point on, we will not have employees on the committees who will serve the majority of the committee, but will have appointees by a majority of the minority who will stand separate and apart from those appointed by a majority of the committee.

This amendment would strike out the provisions for the apppointment of committee employees by a majority of the minority members of a committee.

The law now provides for the appointment of professional staff members "without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office." Such staff members are to be "assigned to the chairman and ranking minority member of such committee as the committee may deem advisable." The clerical staff members are "to be attached to the office of the chairman, to the ranking minority member, and to the professional staff, as the committee may deem advisable." This rule is completely fair. It provides equitably for both the majority and minority, and leaves the committee in complete control of its staff.

The proposed rule, on the other hand, is manifestly unfair and unwise. It gives the minority rights that are not possessed by the majority or even by the whole committee. It permits the committee's business to be controlled in part by a minority, and concentrates greater authority in minority members as the size of the minority diminishes.

Let us consider a 15-member committee consisting of 10 majority members and five minority members. A majority of the majority—six members—have no authority to appoint a single staff member, while a majority of the minority—three members—can appoint three staff members. Furthermore, the professional employees appointed by a majority of the whole committee are to be assigned to the chairman and ranking minority member as the committee may deem advisable, while the professional employees appointed by a majority of the minority are to be assigned to such committee business as such minority members deem advisable. Thus, the three least senior minority members might have two professional employees under their direction, while nine members of the majority and one member of the minority would not be entitled to have any staff members under their direction. In addition, a clerical staff member appointed by a majority of the minority would handle committee correspondence and stenographic work for the minority members of the committee. Majority members are not accorded a similar right.

In addition, a majority of the committee could not discharge an unsatisfactory employee hired by a majority of the minority, no matter how objectionable he might be.

Committee staff members should be employed by, work for, and be answerable to the committee to which they are attached.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

This is the second half of the amendment that we voted on earlier to eliminate the provision for two staff members for the minority when members of the minority request them on the basis that they cannot get fair treatment as the staff exists. I feel it is fair to have this provision for extra staffing. There is no use further debating it, because the amendment, relating to the legislative review section, was rejected by an overwhelming majority only a few moments ago. Therefore, I seek the defeat of the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield back his time?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment (No. 112) was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 114.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 18, line 10, strike the word "shall" and insert "which during the immediately preceding calendar year has employed a Review Specialist shall, and each other standing committee of the Senate and House of Representatives may,".

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I was in hopes that the distinguished chairman of the committee would accept this amendment. It is a very simple one. It makes reporting optional for committees not appointing review specialists. The amendment simply means that if a committee decides not to appoint a specialist, it will not be compelled to make a report on review activities. It would be made if the committee appointed a specialist. It is that simple. I hope my friend from Oklahoma will accept at least this amendment.

As I understand it, under the bill it is optional whether the committee appoints a specialist. Under the amendment, if it appoints a specialist, then it will have to file a report of its review activities. The specialist will have to make a final report. If a committee decides not to appoint a specialist and decides to act as it has done heretofore, it will have the privilege of so doing.

The salary of a review specialist and such clerical assistance as he might need would probably approximate $30,000 per year per committee, or $1,080,000 for 36 standing committees. In addition, the chairman, ranking minority member, the committee as a whole, and other staff personnel would undoubtedly be required to devote considerable time to supervision and assistance in the work of the review specialist, increasing the cost by a further considerable amount, not counting the cost of reports, materials, and additional work on the part of the executive which would be generated by the review specialist.

All committees today review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, operation, administration, and execution of the laws within their jurisdiction. When correction or improvement in administration is required they may recommend such action as may be necessary to the executive or to the Senate. This type of oversight, which results in real improvements in the laws and their administration, can be handled by the regular committee staff which works on the legislation and legislative reports handled by the committee. With this effective type of oversight, the annual report would largely be a report on matters which had already been corrected or matters which needed no correction. However, if the committee is required to make such a report, it would be required to employ the necessary staff to conduct the review and make the report.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I regret that I must oppose the amendment. As the Senator has said, the employment of a review specialist is optional, and who is appointed is optional with the committee. We did it on the same basis that the Senator referred to; namely, that this function can be performed by a committee's present staff. But if a member of the staff can perform the function of the review specialist by being assigned from his present position, that does not and should not relieve the requirement of a report which the entire Senate is entitled to from any one of the committees, whether it be the Commerce Committee, the Banking and Currency Committee, or any other committee. The Members of the whole Senate are entitled to a report as to what the committee believes has been done with respect to the operation of legislation which has passed under its jurisdiction. It is the only way we can check on it. It is the only way to have a better function. It is an inexpensive way to require the bureaus and agencies to explain whether legislation is being administered within the perimeters and aims and objectives that Congress had in mind when the legislation was enacted.

So even if the committees have persons on their staffs whom they feel they want to serve as review specialists, this fact should not relieve them from reports giving details of legislation over which committees have had jurisdiction.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not want to change the present law to force a committee to file an unnecessary report. If a committee sees fit to review past legislation at length and has a reason for it, leave it to the committee. If this amendment is not adopted, it means that each committee will be compelled to employ a specialist. I know what is going to happen. What I am proposing to do is to leave the law as it now stands. If the committee thinks it is necessary to make an annual report, it can now do so. However, if a committee hires a review specialist then it should be compelled to file a report on review activities.

We have done it for my committee every year. I do not see why we should impose on committees and more or less force them to employ specialists by forcing them to make the reports.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask the chairman of the committee if he knows of any instances when this privilege of providing for a review or not has been abused by any Senate committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is the Senator's inquiry addressed to me, or to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. AIKEN. I ask the Senator from Oklahoma, on this compulsory feature of the provision, have there been abuses on the part of Senate committees?

Mr. MONRONEY. There has been very little action or operation of the legislative oversight function. It was written into the act 20 years ago, and there has been almost a negative response throughout the House and the Senate.

It was to bring that 20-year-old provision more closely into line that this review specialist procedure was instituted. We feel that it will do a great deal toward formalizing and regularizing the function of reporting how the laws passed last year or the year before have been found to operate by the committee generating the legislation, and whether or not it is meeting the objectives the Senate had in mind.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it the contention of the Senator from Oklahoma that the failure of Senate committees to take advantage of this review privilege provided in the LaFollette-Monroney Act——

Mr. MONRONEY. Actually, it was not intended to be a privilege. It was a direction which the committees should have followed.

Mr. AIKEN. It is the Senator's contention that the failure of the committees to follow through on this privilege, or duty, if the Senator wishes to call it that, is in itself a failure on the part of our committees.

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe this is the one important reason we have gone to recommending a review specialist, because that man will have this as his principal duty, to collect the information from the General Accounting Office reports and other sources, together with complaints, perhaps, from outside sources, or from the industry that may be affected, and call the matter to the attention of the committee having jurisdiction.

Mr. AIKEN. What do we do when a review has been made and submitted to the members of the committee? Do the members of the committee then read, analyze, and digest the review, or is there something in this bill which will permit them to hire other staff members to read, analyze, and digest the review? Is there any end to it?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would say that committee members, once they have the reports of the staffs, would then be ready to issue that report to the Senate for action, or have it printed in the Congressional Record or as a separate document.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator from Oklahoma reasonably sure that all members of committees would read the reviews?

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe it would be read, and would be helpful. I am not saying that all 100 Senators would read it. I am saying that many beyond the scope of the committee would read it. Certainly the Appropriations Committee should read it.

Mr. AIKEN. I can tell the Senator one thing: If the review related to transferring the functions of the Department of Agriculture to an urban committee, the Senator from Vermont would certainly read it.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think that it would serve to add to the information that Congress otherwise obtains on the workings of the legislation it has passed. I believe that it is an important item, an important detail that we are not carrying out, and the committee feels that by the employment of this mechanism, the information can be reported and made available to Congress, to help to call attention to what Congress had in mind at the time the Act was passed and turned over to the executive departments for administration.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont hits the nail on the head when he states that these reviews will not be read by too many Senators.

If my amendment were adopted, it would simply mean that the committees would keep on reporting as they have in the past, and only if they appoint a specialist would they be required to make this type of report. If the amendment is not adopted, it means we are forcing the committees to make these reports, and of course, if the reports must be made, they are going to employ a specialist, and probably four or five or six clericals to assist him.

In other words, we are simply giving ourselves more and more work. I should not be a bit surprised, as I heard a Senator state a while ago, if we would be required not only to complete the New Senate Office Building, but build a new and separate additional one. All of this means a great deal more work for the Senate, and more work means more employees. I am trying to prevent that if I can.

Mr. President, I do not see why an amendment of this kind is not acceptable. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the thing Congress needs most in its work and effort is brief, well-chosen, well-organized, concise information on the job being done downtown. We can save millions of dollars by spending a very few dollars in organizing for adequate review, properly prepared and presented, by a committee.

I think this is an important part of the bill, and I ask for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment (No. 114) of the Senator from Louisiana [putting the question].

The nays appear to have it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

Mr. MONRONEY. I ask for a rollcall vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Hollings], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea" and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea" and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Hansen], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Hatfield] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Hansen] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 55, as follows:

[No. 53 Leg.]

YEAS—23

Aiken
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Church
Curtis
Eastland
Ellender
Fulbright
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Jordan, N.C.
Lausche
McCarthy
Miller
Pearson
Smathers
Smith
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J
Williams, Del.

NAYS—55

Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Clark
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Fannin
Fong
Gore
Griffin
Harris
Hart
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Scott
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Tydings
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—22

Bartlett
Bayh
Brooke
Burdick
Cooper
Ervin
Gruening
Hansen
Hartke
Hatfield
Hayden
Hollings
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McIntyre
Montoya
Muskie
Randolph
Russell
Sparkman
Yarborough

So Mr. Ellender's amendment (No. 114) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 119

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] be added as a cosponsor to my amendment No. 119.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 119.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read, as follows:

On page 118, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

"PART 7—MISCELLANEOUS

"Stationery Allowances of Senators and Representatives

"Sec. 481. (a) The paragraph under the heading 'Stationery (revolving fund)' in the appropriations for the Senate in title IV of the Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1964 (77 Stat. 864; 2 U.S.C. 46a), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The allowance for stationery shall hereafter be available only for (1) purchases made through the Senate stationery room of stationery and other office supplies for use for official business, and (2) reimbursement upon presentation, within thirty days after the close of the fiscal year for which the allowance is provided, of receipted invoices for purchases elsewhere of stationery and other office supplies (excluding items not ordinarily available in the Senate stationery room) for use for official business in an office maintained by a Senator in his home State. Any part of the allowance for stationery which remains unobligated at the end of any fiscal year shall be withdrawn from the revolving fund established by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957 (71 Stat. 188; 2 U.S.C. 46a–1), and covered into the general fund of the Treasury.'

"(b) The stationery allowance, as authorized by law, for each Member of the House of Representatives and each Resident Commissioner shall hereafter be available only for (1) purchases made through the House stationery room of stationery and other office supplies for use for official business, and (2) reimbursement upon presentation, within thirty days after the close of the session for which the allowance is provided, of receipted invoices for purchases elsewhere of stationery and other office supplies (excluding items not ordinarily available in the House stationery room) for use for official business in an office maintained by a Member in his home State. Any part of the stationery allowance which remains unobligated at the end of the session for which it is available shall be withdrawn from the revolving fund established by the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1948 (61 Stat. 366; 2 U.S.C. 46b–1), and covered into the general fund of the Treasury."

On page 125, after line 21, add the following:

"(4) Section 481(a) shall take effect with respect to the stationery allowance for the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act. Section 481(b) shall take effect with respect to the stationery allowance for the first session of Congress beginning after the date of enactment of this Act."

On page 4, in the table of contents, below the description of section 471, insert the following:

PART 7—MISCELLANEOUS

"Sec. 481. Stationery Allowances of Senators and Representatives."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I regret that the last amendment offered by me was rejected. As I recall, about 18 Senators were present during the debate. The amendment was really adopted by standing vote. The Senators who were present in the Chamber and heard the debate were convinced, but then the Senator from Oklahoma requested a rollcall, and it was then rejected. I have three more amendments to offer, but I am not going to offer them. It would be useless. This will be the last one.

This amendment is No. 119. It would provide that the stationery allowances for Members of the House and Senate be used only for stationery and office supplies, and that any part not so used be returned to the Treasury. It is the same in substance as the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] on July 28, 1966, to H.R. 15456, 89th Congress, the current Legislative Appropriation Act, and which was adopted by the Senate by a vote of 56 to 25. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] was one of those who voted for it. However, it was omitted in conference.

As Senators know, each year we are allowed so much for telephone expense, so much for telegraph expense, and that part which is not used goes back to the Treasury. Each Senator gets so much for stationery, and the part unused should go to the Treasury. But in many cases it does not.

If the Government makes an allowance of $2,400 for stationery, that money should be used by the Senators and the House Members for stationery; and if they do not use the money for that purpose, they should not be permitted to withdraw it and keep it as income. We have raised the salaries of Senators two or three times since I have become a Senator, and it strikes me that the way to do it is to do it openly. If Representatives and Senators need additional pay, let us be honest and give it to them. But whenever we make available to Senators and to Members of the House a certain specified amount for stationery, they should not pocket that money if they do not use it to buy stationery.

That is all this amendment would do. It would not cut the stationery allowance at all. I would not want to do that. I understand that some Senators spend more than the amount allowed. I would have no objection to raising the amount. But whatever amount we raise it to, the portion not used by the Senator or the Representative should go back to the Treasury.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. Under the terms of the Senator's amendment, if a Senator should purchase from private sources, stationery or other supplies necessary for the operation of his office, this would not apply?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. It is not supposed to, unless it is used by the Senator for official business in an office maintained by him in his home State.

Mr. MORTON. In other words, if I get $2,400 and I say that I am going to spend $1,000 of it in New Orleans at a printing shop and I am going to spend the rest at the stationery store of the Senate——

Mr. ELLENDER. Well, if the stationery is used in the office of the Senator in Washington it has to be obtained from the Senate stationery room. If it is to be used in his home State it may be purchased elsewhere. In either case it must be used for official business.

Mr. MORTON. That is what I mean. It must be used for my business as a U.S. Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is right, for official business.

Mr. MORTON. And anything that remains I must return, as I do with my telephone expense?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORTON. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from New Hampshire complains—I do not blame him—that the amount allotted now is not sufficient. Well, if it is not sufficient, let us give him more. And if he does not use all that is allotted to him, let him give the money back to the Treasury and not pocket it.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? He mentioned my name.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thought I would answer the Senator's question before he asked it.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator from Louisiana answered it by talking about my putting money in my pocket. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question, if it is not too long, because I have only 15 minutes.

Will the Senator from Oklahoma yield some time?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire such time as he may require.

Mr. COTTON. I simply wish to bring up what the Senator from New Hampshire has brought up before on the floor of the Senate. I believe that other Senators are in a similar situation, although perhaps not to the same degree.

Up until World War II, in addition to the stationery allowance, each Senator could draw envelopes and offset printing paper which was used for the newsletters and reports which most Senators, and I believe many Representatives, send back to their States.

In the interest of conserving paper during World War II, instead of allowing each Senator an unlimited amount—it was only for his use—this was cut back so that each Senator was allowed 10,000 sheets and 10,000 envelopes a month. For some reason or other, after the war was over, this arrangement was not changed.

In the case of the Senator from New Hampshire, for many years he has maintained a mailing list of a little over 100,000 addresses in his State. Getting the mailing list, which he pays for himself, is expense enough. But he sends two mailings, two newsletters, each month, to over 100,000 addresses. Those newsletters cannot be political for himself, because they are checked by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate. They are reports of what takes place in the Senate and are a legitimate use of the frank and a legitimate use of the paper. But by the second month of each fiscal year, this Senator has exhausted his entire stationery alowance, and from then on he has to put in from $500 to $700 a month out of his own pocket, in order to maintain this service to his constituents.

I made the complaint several years in succession, and the good minority leader took up the cudgels for me. He came back all smiles and said, "NORRIS, I've succeeded in winning your case." When I was a lawyer and I told someone I had won their case, they said, "What have you done?"

The minority leader said, "I've got you 15,000 sheets instead of 10,000. Each Senator may have these each month."

Fifteen thousand sheets and envelopes, when you are sending out 230,000 each month, is not enough.

Of course, I can be very generous about this, because I have never been able to draw a cent out of the stationery allowance in all the years I have been in the Senate. I have needed the paper.

If you are going to provide that only the stationery allowance that is actually used in official duties as a Senator shall be permitted, and there shall be no refunds, then I believe that coupled with it in this bill should be a provision—I do not ask for an unlimited amount—to allow 50,000, if it is so desired, or 60,000 sheets of offset printing paper and envelopes for the use of Senators. I am willing to pay my share if I am sending more than other Senators are sending—more than this amount.

In other words, let us go both ways. I am perfectly willing to have the stationery allowance revert, but if we are going to do that, I think that something should be done about this need which is, in some cases—and certainly in my case for I am not a man of personal means—very costly and a real hardship.

Mr. President, I wanted to get that plea in. I have made it every year for 12 years. As I have said, I did at one time succeed in getting 5,000 sheets and 5,000 envelopes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, as a cosponsor with the Senator from Louisiana I join in supporting this amendment.

The amendment would not in any way change the existing law as to the stationery allowance of Senators. It would not restrict or expand the right of a Senator to use his stationery allowance.

I appreciate the problem of the Senator from New Hampshire, but if that is to be dealt with we should increase the amount of that type of paper and get an allowance in that category.

The pending amendment merely provides that if there are any funds left over, to the extent that any moneys are not spent for stationery, those moneys revert to the Treasury. Why should they not revert to the Treasury? We have passed laws providing that the businessman must account for his expense allowance; otherwise it is not allowable as a deduction on his income tax return.

This amendment provides that Members of Congress would not be able to pocket a profit on the stationery expense account for operating their offices. I have supported this measure each time there has been a question of increasing the amount. I know that for some of the larger States the amount is not adequate. I would support whatever amount is necessary to pay for the legitimate operation of a Senator's office for official stationery use. That should be paid, but at the same time if there is $1 left over it should be handled in the same manner as we now handle the allowance for Western Union, telephones, and other allowances whereby if the amount is not spent it automatically reverts to the Treasury. That is all that is involved in this amendment. Unexpended funds would revert to the Treasury.

Mr. President, I had an experience several years ago in this connection, in which I had not used all of the allowance. This had been going on for 4 or 5 years. The Treasury Department ruled that I would have to pay taxes on that amount even though I had not collected a refund. They said that it was there for me and therefore it was taxable. That matter was straightened out, and the ruling was withdrawn. The Comptroller General ruled in that case that not only would a Member not have to take the unexpended funds but also that he had no right to take it unless it was needed to pay for stationery used to conduct official duties of his office.

Mr. President, the amendment should be adopted. I hope that the Senator from Oklahoma is willing to accept the amendment. If not I would ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I shall take only a moment on this amendment because the amendment involves the same principle that we had a while ago in trying to set salaries for the top legislative assistants for the House of Representatives. The same principle applies, in that we have no right under traditional and long adopted comity between the two Houses to fix the allowance of or decide what the House of Representatives shall pay for its stationery or the requirements under which it will be done.

I have voted in the past to eliminate any refunding of the stationery allowance, as far as Senators are concerned.

When we took a proposal that was almost identical to this proposal to conference a couple of years ago, the House of Representatives adamantly refused and broke up the conference under the threat that they would not submit to any deductions by the Senate on their stationery account.

I am afraid, again, that we would endanger the bill by including in it a limitation on the House stationery account, because this matter must be resolved by sitting down and working it out. We have provided in the bill for a joint committee on congressional operation, and I would hope that we can begin to sit down and arrive at some standardized amounts by joint agreement.

I know from past experience the adamant feeling that the House of Representatives has in connection with any attempt by the Senate to limit this account in the House of Representatives. They are sovereign in their right to run their side of the Capitol, and for that reason it would be a mistake to pass any legislation to include a limitation on expenditures over which the House, for a long period of time, has had the right to make its own decision in this matter.

Therefore, I cannot agree with the amendment, although I would agree to all provisions provided for in connection with the Senate. However, I do not feel that we would foster a reorganization or have any hope of getting a bill through Congress which contains a limitation, such as this does, in connection with the House of Representatives in connection with how they shall handle the matter of their stationery account.

I want to make it clear that I am not speaking in opposition to the merit of the Senator's proposal but only to the form in which it is presented: that is, as an amendment to this reorganization bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield such time as the Senator from Florida requires.

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that we have no business putting this amendment on the bill. It presents to those in conference the possibility of no bill at all in this sincere effort to reorganize the Congress.

However, I go further than the Senator from Oklahoma does, because I think this amendment, as drawn, does not cover the real purposes now existing for which the stationery account is granted. In the beginning, years ago, when stationery accounts were granted, as such, obviously they were of limited effect because in those days practically the full communication between Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and their constituents, was through correspondence.

The real purpose of this provision in the law was and is to allow for the cost of communication between Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives and their constituents back home.

I fully agree with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] that those who use newsletters, as he has for a long time, are certainly within the provisions of this law, because that is the method that they have adopted for communication with their constituents.

The Senator from Florida has used that method for many years and he agrees entirely with his friend from New Hampshire. But he goes further than that. Many Senators, instead of relying upon newsletters, rely upon radio communications. In the case of the Senator from Florida, the last time he used radio communications they were carried, as a matter of public service, by over 80 radio stations in his State, but the cost of preparing the radio tapes was very considerable. The cost of mailing the radio tapes was very heavy. Later, some of us have gone into the use of television in the same way. The cost of the making of the television films and the mailing of them is heavier than is the cost of radio transcriptions.

So we have improved our methods of communication but I do not think that we have changed at all the original principle that this allowance is to enable the Senator or Representative to communicate with his people, to give them the benefit of information as to what he is doing, and what Congress is doing that affects them vitally in their business and otherwise.

Of course, many of us through the years have decided that one of the means of communication is through the purchase of daily newspapers in our States. In the case of the Senator from Florida, he believes that he buys most of the daily papers in his State—perhaps not all, but certainly most of them, as anyone can see who comes into my office, because they are kept there and are examined as they come through as to editorial comment, favorable or otherwise, relating to what I am doing, and to enable me to make appropriate responses, or to see how contributors to "Letters to the Editor" columns feel on certain subjects and what is going on in the State which demands my attention.

I know that other Senators have spent large sums on this method of communication, to make sure that their people receive the information which they say they want, either through the editorials, or contributors of letters printed in the paper, or otherwise.

I would be very happy to vote for this measure if it applied only to the Senate, and if it included all of these methods of communication between ourselves and our constituents, because all are for the same purpose and are of the same pattern. Long, long ago, when this measure was first enacted, it was called a stationery allowance which does not affect at all the fact that the real purpose of the allowance was to enable Members of Congress to communicate with their people back home.

Thus, I would not vote for this measure in the form in which it is presently drafted, even if it applied only to the Senate, not because I want a dime out of any unexpended balance or because I think any other Senator or House Member, wants to make any profit of any sort, but because it is not drawn up in a form which includes the actual purpose of the allowance to Members of Congress for funds to help them to communicate with the people back home, or elsewhere, either, because we represent the whole Nation, who want to know about our points of view and who write us requesting the reasons for our actions, or requesting our expressions, or requesting help of one kind or another.

Thus, the Senator from Florida would not vote for this matter even if it were reduced to a form where it covered only the Senate's so-called stationery funds.

Of course, I agree completely with the distinguished Senator handling the bill, that to put it in the bill in the form now presented would be an exercise in futility, because we know that the House would not accept it, that they would take it as an effort to control their actions by the Senate in dealing with their own stationery fund, which is set up in accordance with their own desires.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I believe I have 6 minutes remaining; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Chair. I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I want to point out that this same amendment was offered several years ago as applying only to the Senate. At that time the argument was made—most effectively and successfully to defeat it—on the basis that it was not fair to single out the Senate but that if we were going to change the rules we should change them for both the House and the Senate.

Today the amendment as offered is applicable to both the House and the Senate and is offered to a bill which reorganizes both House and Senate.

The amendment would not, in one iota, attempt to tell the House of Representatives how much it should allow for stationery. It would not increase or decrease the amount in any present or future figure.

Under the amendment the House could increase its allowances in the years to come if it thought it necessary. The House could do this without even asking the Senate. The Senate could do likewise. This amendment would not expand or reduce the stationery allowance. The items covered by this allowance are not changed one iota from that which is now permissible under the law.

All the amendment would do is accept the stationery allowance as fixed by the House and Senate at whatever figure they wish and then say that to the extent that there is any left over and not spent for the purpose outlined under the rules of the Senate or the House, it would automatically go back to the Treasury Department.

Why should it not? Why should any Member of Congress be permitted, under any circumstances, to put a part of the stationery allowance into his pocket to defray his campaign expenses or any other kind of living expense which may not be listed and provided for under the rules of either the House or Senate?

I repeat, all the amendment would do, without changing in any way at all the rules of either the House or Senate, would be merely to state that if a House Member or a Senator does not spend all of the money for the purpose for which it is appropriated it will revert to the Treasury Department, as is true in every other expense allowance of the Senate.

I think the amendment should be adopted, and unanimously.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time, but first I wish to reiterate that when we start fixing the means of repayment for an allowance made for Members of the House by the House of Representatives, we will be getting into very deep water. We have worked for a longer period of time on this bill than on any bill that I can remember. We have considered in the neighborhood of 100 amendments. Here we are on the last day, apparently, and we want to set a time fuse which could blow us right out of the water.

It has been my experience with the House of Representatives in dealing with an appropriation which would attempt to restrict, by Senate dictation, any House action in the way the House would like to handle its own financial affairs, that we will be accused of absorbing and assuming control over that body, which justly claims to be coequal. I believe that is would be a great mistake to include them in our individual amendments, and I ask that the pending amendment be rejected.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a very quick question on that point?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I will be happy to yield time to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield myself 3 minutes from the time on the bill in order to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let the Senator from Delaware yield the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I have the recollection that we had a similar situation in regard to the privilege of the so-called bulk mail.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. COTTON. The Senate did not permit itself that privilege and cut it out of the bill. The House retained the privilege. When the conference committee met, the House kept that privilege, but the Senate did not.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COTTON. Is there anything to prevent the same thing from happening in this case?

Mr. MONRONEY. Not at all, because we had that case—and one parallel—where we attempted to control the House in the matter of handling its own stationery account, and we were thrown out of the conference the first day. The House would not accept the limitation, not even on an appropriation bill for all legislative affairs.

They were unwilling to accept any limitation whatsoever.

Mr. COTTON. My point is we should go ahead and adopt the amendment. I have always felt disposed to support such a measure. When the conference committee meets, we can give up that privilege easily enough and the House can retain it.

Mr. MONRONEY. But they will not agree to accept an amendment, in my opinion, that would deal with their method of handling anything. They just will not consider it in conference.

Mr. COTTON. My point is that they could reject it in conference.

Mr. MONRONEY. They did.

Mr. COTTON. In the case of the bulk mail, we offered a compromise which permitted the House to govern and restrain its use of money. It would not affect them. The conference committee agreed to it. That is what happened in that case, was it not?

Mr. MONRONEY. But an exactly parallel case on this matter is that they would not consider the bill at all, as long as that was in the bill. It had to be stricken out completely before they would go forward with the conference. That is exactly the point.

Mr. COTTON. It could be stricken out——

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not think the

House would permit it as part of the amendment.

Mr. COTTON. What is to prevent our trying it?

Mr. MONRONEY. Nothing, except that I think it would jeopardize the chance of their agreeing to go to conference as long as they were tied into this by Senate dictation. That is what riles the House on legislation requiring them to conform to Senate dictation.

This is the issue that is before us. I think the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to take just 30 seconds to say that the previous amendment was attached to an appropriation bill, and the argument was made that such legislation should not be attached to an appropriation bill. This is legislation, a reorganization bill, which applies to the practices, rules, and procedures of the House and Senate. It is a most appropriate vehicle on which to attach this amendment since it deals with both Houses.

I yield back all remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time on the amendment has been yielded back or used. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], and the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 18, as follows:

[No. 54 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bennett
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Cotton
Curtis
Dodd
Dominick
Ellender
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Hart
Hickenlooper
Hill
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McClellan
McGovern
Miller
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Smith
Spong
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—18

Bible
Cannon
Clark
Eastland
Harris
Holland
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
McCarthy
McGee
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Moss
Pearson
Scott
Smathers
Stennis

NOT VOTING—23

Bartlett
Bayh
Brooke
Burdick
Cooper
Dirksen
Ervin
Gruening
Hansen
Hartke
Hatfield
Hayden
Hollings
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McIntyre
Montoya
Muskie
Russell
Sparkman
Tydings
Yarborough

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendment (No. 119) was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I ask our friend, the majority leader, what he plans for the remainder of the day and for tomorrow, and any other pertinent and relevant information he might give us.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Colorado call up his amendment, and then yield to me while he has the floor?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am happy to comply with the request of the Senator from Montana.

AMENDMENT NO. 97

Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 97. Since the explanation of it will be full, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 97) of Mr. ALLOTT is as follows:

At an appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SECTION 1. The Congress declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to promote and encourage the orderely development of science and technology, while seeking to eliminate nonproductive duplication in Government-sponsored or Government-supported research, and to assure that the benefits of science and technology are used most effectively in the interests of national security and the general welfare.

"REPORT ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

"SEC. 2. (a) To aid in the development and assessment of measures designed to carry out the policy enunciated in section 1 of this Act, the President shall transmit to the Congress not later than January 20 of each year a Report on Science and Technology (hereinafter referred to as "the science report") setting forth (1) the existing major policies, plans, and programs of science and technology of the various departments, agencies, bureaus, offices, foundations, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, and changes proposed to be made in those policies, plans, and programs; (2) major plans and programs of science and technology of non-Federal agencies, organizations, and institutions so far as the same may be known; (3) the status of coordination of the policies, plans, and programs of the various departments, agencies, bureaus, offices, foundations, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, both among themselves and with non-Federal agencies, organizations, and institutions, and further steps anticipated or proposed to foster such coordination; (4) the impact of recent major scientific and technical developments and programs, whether developed by the Federal Government or non-Federal agencies, organizations, or institutions, and the anticipated impact of foreseeable, future developments and programs on national policy and the general welfare; (5) major goals of the Federal Government and, to the extent they may be known, of non-Federal agencies, organizations, and institutions, in the fields of science and technology, major problems foreseen in such fields, and progress anticipated in meeting the problems and achieving the goals so set forth; (6) the level of funding proposed for science and technology in the Federal budget submitted for the fiscal year beginning July 1 of the calendar year such science report is transmitted to the Congress, and the estimated amount which will be invested by non-Federal agencies, organizations, and institutions in science and technology during such fiscal year; and (7) any recommendations of the President, including any recommendations for legislation which he may deem necessary or desirable, for carrying out the policy declared in section 1 of this Act.

"(b) The President may transmit from time to time to the Congress supplementary reports, each of which shall include such supplementary or revised recommendations as he may deem necessary or desirable.

"(c) The science report, and all supplementary reports transmitted under subsection (b) of this section, shall, when transmitted to Congress, be referred to the joint committee created by section 3 of this Act.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

"SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established a Joint Committee on Science and Technology (hereinafter referred to as the "joint committee") to be composed of eight Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and eight Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each case, the majority party shall be represented by five Members and the minority party shall be represented by three Members.

"(b) The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members at the beginning of each Congress. The vice chairman shall act in place of the chairman in the absence of the chairman. The chairmanship shall alternate between the Senate and House of Representatives with each Congress. The chairman shall be chosen by the Members from the House which is entitled to the chairmanship, and the vice chairman shall be chosen from the House other than that of the chairman by the Members from that House.

"(c) Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner in which original appointments thereto are made.

"DUTIES OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE

"SEC. 4. (a) It shall be the function of the joint committee—

"(1) to make a continuing study of matters relating to the science report and supplements thereto;

"(2) to study means of coordinating policies, plans, and programs of science and technology of the Federal Government, both within the Federal Government and with non-Federal agencies, organizations, and institutions, in order to further the policy of this Act; and

"(3) as a guide to the several committees of the Congress dealing with legislation relating to the science report and supplements thereto, not later than March 1 of each year (beginning with the year 1967) to file a report with the Senate and the House of Representatives containing its findings and recommendations with respect to each of the main recommendations made by the President in the science report or supplements thereto, and from time to time to make such other reports and recommendations to the Senate and House of Representatives as the joint committee deems advisible.

"(b) No proposed legislation shall be referred to the joint committee and such committee shall not have the power to report by bill, or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

"POWERS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE

"SEC. 5. (a) For the purposes of this Act, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Congress as it deems advisable; and, within the limitations of its appropriations, the joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, constultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems necessary and advisible.

"(b) With the prior consent of the department or agency concerned, the joint committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, and facilities of the departments and agencies of the Government, and also of private research agencies, and employ on a reimbursable basis or otherwise the services of such personnel of any such department or agency as it deems advisable. With the consent of any standing select, or special committee of either House of Congress, or any subcommittee thereof, the joint committee may utilize the facilites and the services of the staff of such committee or subcommittee whenever the chairman of the joint committee determines that such action is necessary and appropriate.

"EXPENSES

"SEC. 6. (a) The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate from funds appropriated for the joint committee, upon vouchers approved by the chairman. The cost of stenographic service to report public hearings shall not be in excess of the amounts prescribed by law for reporting the hearings of standing committees of the Senate. The cost of stenographic service to report executive hearings shall be fixed at an equitable rate by the joint committee.

"(b) Members of the joint committee, and its employees and consultants, while traveling on official business for the joint committee within or outside the United States, may receive either the per diem allowance authorized to be paid to Members of the Congress or its employees, or their actual and necessary expenses provide an itemized statement of such expenses is attached to the voucher.

"SECURITY SAFEGUARDS

"SEC. 7. The joint committee may classify information originating within the committee, in accordance with standards used generally by the executive branch for classifying restricted data or defense information. All committee records, data, charts, and files shall be the property of the joint committee and shall be kept in the offices of the joint committee or such other places as the joint committee may direct under such security safeguards as the joint committee shall determine to be required in the interest of the national defense and security."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Now, Mr. President, will the Senator yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to the question raised by the distinguished acting minority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], it is my understanding that the Senate has completed action on the amendments which will be offered today, except for the pending amendment; that the pending amendment will be the last one to be considered; and that there will be no rollcall vote on the pending amendment, if I am correctly informed.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Therefore, Mr. President, if that be the case—and it is the case so far as the leadership knows—I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 355) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that before the Senate concludes its business today, the so-called Hruska amendment be laid before the Senate, so that it will be the pending business at the conclusion of morning business tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that is all the information I have as to the order of business tomorrow.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the majority leader.

A HISTORY OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Democrats throughout the Nation will soon again commemorate the founding of the Democratic Party—the oldest political party in the world—through our traditional Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners. This year has special meaning and significance; we celebrate on these occasions our 175th anniversary of dedicated service, constructive leadership, and progressive accomplishment benefiting generations of our fellow American citizens down through the years.

It was in May 1792, that our founder, Thomas Jefferson, characterized our party in a letter to President Washington. In the years that followed, organizational substance and philosophic alternatives to the prevailing Federalist viewpoints were developed. By 1798 a vigorous party had grown up, which 2 years later elected Jefferson as the first Democratic President of the United States.

Some 20 years later, a vigorous frontier Democrat took his place on the national scene—Andrew Jackson of Tennessee. The hero of the Battle of New Orleans in 1815, Jackson's words and actions caught the imagination of Americans everywhere. Southern farmers, small planters, pioneer farmers of the newly settled Northwest Territory, German and Irish immigrants, countryfolk of New England and New York—all rallied to the Democratic Party. Workers in the cities, in the process of forming the Nation's first labor unions, saw in the Democratic Party principles then—as now—a sympathy for their own aspirations. This new coalition elected Andrew Jackson the seventh President of the United States in 1828.

These two pioneer founders and leaders of the Democratic Party are being honored in Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners in this our 175th anniversary year. We could very well add the illustrious names of other great Democratic Presidents who by their courage, leadership, and dedication to the principles of our Nation and our party have helped make possible the tremendous advancement of our civilization—Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry Truman, John F. Kennedy, and our current occupant of the White House, President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Mr. President, our party has made a record down through the years of which we can all be proud. The Democratic Party is truly the party of the people. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the text of an excellent document entitled "A History of the Democratic Party" so that this historic record of accomplishment may be properly commemorated in this 175th anniversary year of its founding.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A History of the Democratic Party

CHAPTER 1: THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY IS BORN

The year was 1966. Speaking to the people, President Lyndon B. Johnson said:

"Our party has greatly contributed to the American Experiment. We have never represented a single interest; we have never represented a single section of the country. The Democratic Party has endured and prospered because it rested on the belief that a party exists to advance the freedom and the welfare of all the people."

The year was 1962. President John F. Kennedy, delivering his State of the Union Message before a joint session of the Congress said:

"A strong America cannot neglect the aspirations of its citizens—the welfare, of the needy, the health care of the elderly, the education of the young. For we are not developing the nation's wealth for its own sake. Wealth is the means—and people are the ends."

And the year was 1824. Thomas Jefferson, author of our Declaration of Independence, was asked how his new political party differed from its opponents. He said:

"Men by their constitutions are naturally divided into two parties; those who fear and distrust the people, and wish to draw all powers from them into the hands of the higher classes; and those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish and consider them as the most honest and safe . . . The appellation of aristocrats and democrats . . . expresses the essence of them both."

In the span of more than a century and a half from Jefferson to Johnson, a great nation, and the world's oldest democracy, has sprung from the waiting lands of a continent and the hearts of a people—and spread across the waters beyond. And across that nation, as in the words of Harry Truman, is inscribed the record of the Democratic Party—its belief in the people.

This belief in the people has shaped Democratic thinking in every field of government. It has meant that government should do what it can to insure the richest, fullest possible life to all the people. It has led to the belief that every citizen should have the chance to take some part in politics. It has commanded the preservation of certain personal liberties, without which man's dignity would be lost. And it has based its foreign policy on a sincere concern for the people of every other nation in the world. Much of the story of the Democratic Party is the story of how these goals were fought for, won, lost, and fought for again in the never ending conflict with those with little trust in the people.

Perhaps the most eloquent testimony of the wisdom and vitality of the principles of the Democratic Party is the fact that it is the oldest political party in the world. It is difficult to fix an exact birthday for the Democratic Party—the most usual date given is May 23, 1792, the date of a letter from Jefferson to Washington giving a name to the party then headed by Washington. But the event primarily responsible for breathing life into the party was the fight for the Bill of Rights. These rights, which insure freedom of religion, speech and press, and guarantee fair trials to the accused, had been left out of the original draft of the Constitution. The delegates to the Constitutional Convention, mostly plantation owners and merchants, had been so concerned with building a government able to keep the peace and protect property rights, that they failed to provide these necessary safeguards. Thomas Jefferson was not at the Convention; but when he saw of the omission, he moved into action. In letters to friends and followers throughout the country, the author of the Declaration of Independence declared:

"A Bill of Rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth, and what no just government should refuse . . ."

Despite opposition, Jefferson rallied enough support to make acceptance of the Bill of Rights a condition of the Constitution's approval. The organization he built up in this fight became the core of Jefferson's new party; and the principle of individual liberty became a guiding star in the Democratic constellation.

Thomas Jefferson, founder of the Democratic Party, was the leading Democrat of his day. Despite his aristocratic upbringing, he shunned powdered wigs and finery, and greeted callers in an old brown coat and breeches. An optimist, he believed in the inevitable improvement of the world and its people. A religious man, he carried his faith into his politics. "I have sworn upon the altar of God," he said, "eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man." A respecter of property rights, he nevertheless believed that in any conflict between property and men, the rights of men came first.

But most strongly of all, Jefferson believed in the inherent worth of the common man. "Every man, and every body of men on earth," he wrote, "possess the right of self-government." He was certain that given the facts, the people would use that right correctly. So, to educate the people, Jefferson called for the founding of schools, newspapers and libraries. Especially in the frontier states, his followers reshaped the laws to give every man a vote.

Jefferson's party first sought office in opposition to the governing class of the time, the Federalists. The Federalists had done much to bring the new American nation to life. They had been the driving force behind the Constitution, and, under George Washington, had started the operations of the new Federal Government. But the Federalists' view of government was naturally limited by their own aristocratic backgrounds, and by the administrations of monarchs among the then-great nations of Europe. As their leader, Alexander Hamilton, put it, "Our real disease is democracy." "All communities," Hamilton believed, "divide themselves into the few and the many, the first are rich and the well-born, the other the mass of the people. The people are turbulent and changing, they seldom judge or determine right." Hamilton believed that support of the rich was necessary, and that the Government could not last unless the wealthy people of the country could make money under it. To assure this, the Federalists passed a tariff law, founded a national bank, and made other moves to benefit the creditors, merchants and propertied interests.

Thus, the issue of government for the many versus government for the few was drawn before the United States was 10 years old. Jefferson's party took up the challenge laid down by the Federalists. It was no easy job. The riot and bloodshed of the French Revolution had momentarily discredited the idea of democracy, and the Federalist press interpreted every criticism of the Government as a foreign revolutionary plot. As historian Wilfred Binkley has said, "The Federalists succeeded, to their own satisfaction, in making the terms 'Federalist' and 'patriot' synonymous." But this did not check the Jeffersonians. Through their own newspapers and speeches, they aimed a running fire of criticism at the Federalist government. Small farmers, workers and frontiersmen were urged to use their votes to give themselves a voice in the Government.

By 1798, a vigorous party had grown up. Because the word "democrat" was then in disrepute, Jefferson's party took the name "Republican," to show its determination to keep the nation a republic. As the strength of the party increased, the Federalists took alarm. Exploiting fear of foreign infiltration, they passed an Alien Law, which eased deportation of political objectionables, and a Sedition Law, which made possible the punishment of anyone who dared criticize the Government. But the laws backfired. They smacked too much of kingly tyranny, against which a Revolutionary War had just been fought. The state legislatures of Virginia and Kentucky denounced them as unconstitutional and called on other states to join in resisting them. Following their example, the common people in other states rose in protest and, in 1800, voted in Thomas Jefferson as the first Democratic President of the United States.

If the Democrats have been the party of strong Presidents, Jefferson was the first. In 1803, he negotiated the Louisiana Purchase, bringing into the nation the most productive river valley in the world. In 1804, he sent Lewis and Clark to blaze a trail through what was to become the Great Northwest. Less daring Presidents might have hesitated before taking these steps, thus holding up development of the Western states. But Jefferson's vision stretched across a continent and through a hundred years of history. Foreseeing the rich returns the Mississippi Valley would someday repay, he proceeded to use the power of the Presidency to its fullest to double America's size.

In 1808, when Jefferson retired to his home in Monticello, he left the Government in the hands of his two trusted lieutenants, James Madison and James Monroe. Madison had been a general in the fight to ratify the Constitution. His faith in the American form of government had been intensified by a lifetime spent studying every other government history had known. Drawing on his vast knowledge, Madison taught the nation the benefits of government through political parties, and the danger of allowing one group to gain control of the Government. The party behind Madison, made up as it was of Southern planters, city workers, small farmers and frontiersmen, was as diverse for a nation its size as is the Democratic Party today. Some thought it hypocritical that conflicting groups should unite to support the same candidate and program. To them, Madison said:

"In the extended republic of the United States and among the great variety of interests, parties and sects which it embraces, a coalition of a majority of the whole society could seldom take place on any other principles than those of justice and the general good."

Madison was elected President twice. His first administration was harassed by war with England, but his second was peaceful and prosperous. The small nation beside the Eastern Seaboard was growing strong, and it was building the Cumberland Road and the Erie Canal to clear its way westward. The frontier, pushing its way across the Appalachian forests toward the Mississippi, acted as a generator of democracy. There were no extremes of wealth or social classes on the frontier. Men were measured by what they could do with their hands. Because everyday life was dangerous every man was needed, and a spirit of cooperation developed between towns and families. Such people were naturally drawn to Jeffersonian democracy, and their votes helped keep it in office from 1800 to 1824.

James Monroe was President for the last eight of these years. He was the last of the "cocked hats"—leaders of the Revolution—to be President. During his Administration, the principles underlying Democratic Party foreign policy were first put into action. Relations with other countries were as important in Monroe's day as they are now—but for a different reason. The United States was a new nation, fighting for respectability among the world's powers. It could have cut itself off from the world and dealt with other countries only when threatened. But a party and a nation that believed, with Jefferson, that man's worth and his right to self-government were universal, could not close its eyes to world events. So when Europe cast eyes on the new states of South America, President Monroe gave notice that America would protect its neighbors from foreign interference. Designs on the independence of these countries, Monroe said, would be interpreted as designs on America itself. In a sense, this was America's first security pact. It was a daring gamble for a young nation, but it worked. And ever since, the principles of the Monroe Doctrine have been the root and core of American foreign policy. Despite times when the Democratic Party has followed the national trend toward isolationism, it has always come back to the fundamental principle that the safety and rights of the common people cannot long be protected if protection stops at the shores of our oceans.

CHAPTER TWO: OLD HICKORY COMES TO WASHINGTON—PEOPLE VERSUS PRIVILEGE

During Jefferson's and Madison's terms, the Federalist Party was withering away. In Monroe's years, it died. In 1820, Monroe was reelected without opposition. Everyone in public life proclaimed himself a Jeffersonian as the nation embarked on its political "Era of Good Feeling."

But the truce did not last long. Broad as it was, the Democratic Party could not embrace every region and every interest group in the nation. Party unity became increasingly strained until, in 1824, it burst. Four different candidates ran for President of the United States.

Amid this confusion, the Democratic Party temporarily lost sight of its Jeffersonian principles. The men of wealth and privilege, in whose hands Hamilton had unsuccessfully tried to place the reins of government, were quick to seize upon the Democratic split. During the Administration of John Quincy Adams, they regained influence in government. Rallying, as Jefferson had feared, behind the Bank of the United States, they seized control of the nation's credit and used this to try to get control of the nation.

The time was ripe for a new champion of the common people, and in Andrew Jackson the Democratic Party had a man to meet the occasion. A true son of the frontier, Jackson had lived in the backwoods, fought Indians and beaten the British in the War of 1812. He was tall and raw-boned, and his soldiers had nicknamed him "Old Hickory," after the toughest thing they could think of. Stern and upright, Jackson possessed an intense patriotism, a razor-sharp sense of honor, and a burning dedication to the common man.

Entering politics, Jackson and his followers fashioned many of the tools of political democracy. The national convention, the party platform, and the election campaign, were their inventions, and through them, men from all walks of life were given an opportunity to take part in politics. In the election of 1828, three times as many people voted as in any election up to that time, and Jackson was elected President.

Fortified by his victory, Jackson went after the Bank of the United States. As the official depository of the nation's funds, the Bank had become a vast monopoly, controlling all banking transactions and credit in the country. It kept newspapers and Congressmen on its payrolls, and they ruthlessly attacked anyone who interfered with the Bank's activities. Near the end of Jackson's first term, Congress extended the Bank's charter. But Jackson vetoed the bill, and withdrew all government deposits from the Bank. In a veto message which reasserted basic Democratic principles, Jackson said:

"Every man is equally entitled to protection by law; but, when the laws undertake to add to those natural and just advantages artificial distinctions, to grant titles, gratuities and exclusive privileges, to make the rich richer and the powerful more potent, the humble members of society—the farmers, mechanics and laborers—who have neither the time nor the means to secure like favors to themselves, have a right to complain of the injustice of their government."

Jackson's words and actions caught the imagination of common people throughout the country. Southern yeomen and small planters, pioneer farmers in the Northwest, German and Irish immigrants, plain country folk of New England and New York—all rallied to the Democratic Party. City workers, forming their first unions for the improvement of working conditions, saw in Democratic principles a sympathy for their own aspirations. These were the people behind Jacksonian Democracy. Their votes re-elected him President. With Jackson as their leader, they so impressed their spirit upon American life that history marks Jackson's terms as the era of "the rise of the common man."

In 1836, Jackson returned to his beloved home, the Hermitage, in Tennessee. His successor in the White House was Martin Van Buren, former Secretary of State, who had become Jackson's most trusted adviser. Van Buren, a skillful politician, was one of the earliest leaders of the political organizations of the large Northern cities. But he did not inspire the other elements of the Democratic Party as Jackson had. Van Buren's attempts to extend Jacksonian Democracy were thwarted by a financial panic which hit the country in 1837. In the resulting depression, the common people suffered most. Van Buren, in his bid for a second term, became the first President to be punished at the polls because of a depression during his Administration.

The party that ousted Van Buren from office called itself the "Whigs," after a British party of the same name. As historian Roger Butterfield says, "the Whigs . . . took their political technique from the Democrats themselves, improving it as they went along. The Whigs were the new party of business and property, but they carefully suppressed—in public, at least—the old Federalist prejudice against 'the people.' Since Jackson had won his battles by appealing to the common man, the Whigs announced they were common men, too, and their campaign posters showed them with their shirtsleeves rolled up, hammering at a forge or following a "plow." Behind a military hero, William Henry Harrison, the Whigs scored a sweeping victory in the election of 1840. The era of Jacksonian Democracy was ended, but it was to remain as a model for Democratic leaders of the future.

The story of the Democratic Party from 1840 to the Civil War is closely bound up with the breakup of the Union. Although Jackson had declared "Our union—it must be preserved," forces were at work in both North and South to destroy it. Slavery was an issue beyond the reach of politics. The Northern abolitionist and the Southern planter had between them none of the common ground necessary to political compromise. As their anger at each other rose in pitch, their political parties were swept up in the bitterness that led to secession and war. Abolitionist Democrats, unable to gain control of their party, helped form the Free Soil Party, which tried to keep slavery out of the new Western lands. In 1848 they called Van Buren out of retirement to run for President on the Free Soil ticket. Northern Democrats gave him strong support. Thus Democrats were early leaders in the anti-slavery fight, even though the party itself was split over the great issue.

Despite growing sectional divisions, the Democratic Party accomplished three important goals in these years: the acquisition of the remainder of the West, the expansion of trade, and the suppression of racial and religious intolerance in the Know-Nothing movement.

Much of the credit for the Western expansion goes to James K. Polk, a Democratic President of the 1840s. Polk believed that it was the nation's "manifest destiny" to bring all the land to the Pacific under the American flag—by negotiation if possible, but by war if need be. By settlement with Britain, he won title to the Pacific Northwest. Texas entered the Union peacefully, but a war with Mexico was necessary to gain the California country. Thus, in four years, Polk had added half a million square miles of some of the richest and most spectacular country on the continent, finishing the task that had begun with Jefferson's Louisiana Purchase.

It was in Polk's Administration also that the Democrats passed the Walker Tariff. The Democratic Party has always favored moderating tariff charges on imports from abroad, both to aid the consumer and to improve relations with countries whose economies depend on what we buy from them. The Walker Tariff did both. So sound was it economically, that it remained unchanged until the Civil War.

History credits the Democratic Party with lowering the tariff and gaining the West. But almost forgotten is the strong stand the Party took against the Know-Nothing movement. The Know-Nothings were organized to end the immigration from Europe which, even in the 1850s, had reached 600,000 a year. Since most of the immigrants were of the Catholic faith, the ugly mark of religious bigotry stained Know-Nothing beliefs. Members of the organization burned churches and beat up immigrants on the streets. When questioned about their activities, they replied, "I know nothing."

By 1856, the Know-Nothing Party had elected seven Governors, and was threatening to make a party of intolerance a major political force in America. But the Democratic National Convention unanimously adopted this resolution:

"Resolved, that a political crusade in the nineteenth century, and in the United States of America, against Catholics and foreign born, is neither justified by the past history or the future prospects of the country, nor in unison with the spirit or toleration and enlightened freedom which particularly distinguished the American system of popular government."

This united Democratic opposition broke the back of the Know-Nothing movement. In the spirit of Jefferson and the Bill of Rights, the Democratic Party had spoken up for the rights of minorities. More than this, the defeat of the Know-Nothings showed the common people of Europe that America welcomed them to a new life. Our Western lands would have been of little use without people to fill them. The Democratic sympathy for the immigrant quickened the movement that sent strong men Westward to build a nation.

Towering over all other events of the period was the widening gulf between North and South. Some Democrats, led by the "Little Giant," Stephen A. Douglas, strove to compromise the differences. In his famed doctrine of "squatter sovereignty," Douglas proposed that the people of each new state decide for themselves whether to allow slavery. But it was too late for compromise. By 1860 the Democratic Party had split again, the Northern wing supporting Douglas for President, the Southern behind John T. Brekenridge. The result was a victory for the newly-formed Republican Party, led by Abraham Lincoln.

CHAPTER THREE: WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN—REDEDICATES THE PARTY

From 1860 onward, the newly-born Republican Party was to provide the main opposition for the Democrats. When first formed, the Republicans were a party of free soil and idealism, attracting many believers in Jefferson's principles. Lincoln himself was a devoted Jeffersonian. It was he who said that "the principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of a free society."

But with Lincoln's assassination the founders of the Republican Party were rudely shoved aside. The new leaders, called "Radical Republicans," were men with blood in their eyes. Disregarding Lincoln's plea for "malice toward none," they set up a military dictatorship in the South, and almost impeached a President who would not go along with their wishes. By their Reconstruction Acts and Force Bills, they held up progress in the South for many years.

The Democrats tried to fight these actions, but they were seriously weakened. Republican leaders had disfranchised the Democratic South, and had massed behind their postwar candidate, Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, the voting strength of the Grand Army of the Republic. When Democrats criticized Reconstruction measures, their opponents accused them of being rebels and traitors, unfit to govern the country. By waving the "bloody shirt" of the War, historian Charles Beard says, "the Republicans managed . . . to make party loyalty equivalent to national patriotism and voting the opposition ticket identical with sedition."

It was after the Civil War that American big business made its historic alliance with the Republican Party. The need for production and credit during the War had forced the government into measures which greatly profited industrialists and financiers of the North. After the war, the bankers, railroad magnates and the other industrial giants agreed with the party in power, to exchange campaign contributions for beneficial legislation. At first, the people did not mind this. They admired the men who were forging an industrial America, and were dazzled by their show of wealth. They even got the idea that the tremendous amounts of money being amassed at the top would trickle down to improve their own living standards. Events were soon to prove this theory wrong.

Grant's Administration provided the perfect setting for business domination of the Government. Grant himself admired and liked to associate with the millionaires and manipulators of the day—Jay Cooke, Jay Gould, and Jim Fiske, the speculators whose names have survived as symbols of financial piracy. Although personally honest, Grant, as he later admitted, let crooked friends take advantage of his trust. As a result, not only was Grant's Administration run openly and notoriously for the benefit of big business, but corruption flourished on a wide scale. The Vice President, members of the Cabinet and chairman of Congressional committees took bribes and graft. They made money on government contracts and tax frauds. As historian Allen Nevins says, "The Grant era stands unique in the comprehensiveness of its rascality."

This stealing did not stop with money, but extended to national elections. In 1876, the Democrats nominated for President Samuel J. Tilden, the brilliant reform Governor of New York. He had broken the Tweed Ring in New York City, and was pledged to break the ring of thieves around Grant. With the people aroused to Republican corruption, Tilden's integrity was a welcome change. He appeared to have won the election, 4,300,590 votes to 4,026,298 and 196 electoral votes to 173. But through bribery and forgery, the Republicans changed the totals in three Southern states, where Federal troops still were stationed under the Reconstruction Acts. A Republican Electoral Commission ratified the changes. It was the only stolen election in American Presidential history. More impulsive Democrats were ready to don their war uniforms and take the White House by force, but the calm hand of Samuel Tilden restrained them. Putting his respect for orderly government above both party and personal advantage, Tilden acquiesced in the decision of the Electoral Commission and retired to private life.

By 1884, the Republicans had been in power for 24 years. The "bloody shirt" of the "rebellion" was being waved more and more feebly, and people were becoming tired of men who looked upon government service simply as a road to personal profit. So they elected to the White House another Democratic reformer from New York, Grover Cleveland. A big, gruff man whose honesty was unshakable, Cleveland devoted his two terms to raising the moral standard of government. His motto was: "A public office is a public trust." Where Presidents before him had allowed raids on the Treasury for private pensions and pork-barrel appropriations, Cleveland used the Presidential veto to prevent them. He relaxed the demands of patronage and put more workers under the Civil Service system. Officials who had a stake in the old system, including some Democrats, resented Cleveland's reforms. But the voters agreed with his nominator, Daniel Dougherty, when he said of Cleveland: "We love him for the enemies he has made."

But honest and devoted as he was, Cleveland did not fully sense the needs of the common people. In fact, a large segment of the Democratic Party had fallen under the influence of the big industrialists and their retainers. There followed a period of years in which, from the standpoint of party program, the average voter could not tell one major party from the other.

The Democratic Party needed a transfusion of new leadership and spirit. And in the agrarian movements of the Middle West, this was found. Between 1870 and 1895, the nation witnessed a series of depressions, the historic price of unrestrained industrial development. True, the small businessman of the East had suffered. Twenty-three thousand small firms had failed in one 3-year period alone. True, the workingman was putting in 12 to 14 hours a day, and his attempts to organize unions were being frustrated by unsympathetic legislatures and courts. But the farmers were destitute. Crop prices had fallen 40 to 50 per cent under the impact of Republican high tariff laws. Farms were mortgaged to Eastern bankers to the sum of a billion dollars. The cost of selling farm produce was steadily rising as the trusts and railroad monopolies levied their annual tribute upon the plain people of America.

So, organizing for political action, the men of the Midwest brought new blood and spirit into the Democratic Party. Their wants, by our standards, were not radical: they desired a graduated income tax, regulation of railroad rates, popular election of Senators, and relaxation of the Gold Standard, which held them in perpetual debt to the financiers of the East. But their opponents called these measures "the dreams and fantasies of Karl Marx," and cried to the voters to "stop this communist march on private property."

Out of the Midwest came these agrarian reformers, and into the Democratic Convention of 1896. Their leader was William Jennings Bryan of Nebraska, and the speech he made at that convention stands as perhaps the greatest in American political history. Picture Bryan, with his enormous head, strong, flashing eyes, and vibrant voice, 20,000 delegates and spectators hanging on his words:

"When you come before us and tell us that we are about to disturb your business interests, we reply that you have distributed our business interests by your course. We say to you that you have made the definition of a businessman too limited in its application. The man who is employed for wages is as much a businessman as his employer. The farmer who goes forth in the morning and toils all day, and by the application of brain and muscle to the natural resources of this country creates wealth, is as much a businessman as the man who goes upon the Board of Trade and bets upon the price of grain. The miners who go a thousand feet into the earth to bring forth from their hiding places the precious metals to be poured in the channels of trade are as much businessmen as the few financial magnates who in the back room corner the money of the world. We come to speak for this broader class of businessmen. . . . We have petitioned, and our petitions have been scorned. We have entreated and our entreaties have been disregarded. We have begged, and they have mocked when our calamity came. We beg no longer; we entreat no more; we petition no more. We defy them . . . Having behind us the producing masses of this country and the world, supported by the commercial interests, the laboring interests and the toilers everywhere, we will answer their demand for gold standard by saying to them: You shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns. You shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold."

Jefferson or Jackson would have felt at ease delivering this speech.

In Bryan, the Democratic Party had found its voice. With a great shout, the convention nominated him for President, and he went forth to wage one of the most exciting campaigns in American history. Bryan was the first modern Presidential candidate. He traveled 18,000 miles and addressed more than 5 million people—a remarkable feat for the days before radio and television.

Alarmed by Bryan's strength, the Republicans got busy. Their leader, Mark Hanna, shook down insurance companies, railroad and trusts for an estimated $16 million, the biggest campaign fund yet collected. Fourteen hundred speakers were sent out to answer Bryan. Contracts were made contingent on his defeat. Workers were told that if Bryan won on Tuesday, they need not show up for work on Wednesday. The pressure paid off: Bryan lost the election. But in so doing, he rededicated the Democratic Party to the common people.

CHAPTER FOUR: WOODROW WILSON MAKES AMERICA A WORLD LEADER—REFORM AT HOME AND WAR ABROAD

For the 16 years following his first race for the Presidency in 1896, William Jennings Bryan was his party's acknowledged leader. And though he lost three times for the Presidency, the influence of his cause spread beyond his own party. In the opposition ranks, it inspired a new breed of Republican, which called itself, at various times, Bull Moose or Progressive. Its aims as expressed by Republican William Allen White, included "cleaning up local politics, ending the wholesale buying of state legislatures, and giving a new chance to the economic underdog." The names of their leaders are well known: Robert LaFollette of Wisconsin, George W. Norris of Nebraska, and, of course, the leader of the Bull Moose Party, Theodore Roosevelt. These men were true followers of Lincoln, but the rest of the Republican leadership, known as the Old Guard, fought them as much as they did the Democrats.

Under Bryan's leadership in foreign affairs, the Democrats opposed much of the imperialism arising from the war with Spain. Many Americans thought it great sport to shake "the big stick" at the small nations of South America. Republican foreign policy reversed the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine by declaring that, although Europe could not interfere in South American affairs, the United States could. These actions caused a resentment among our Latin American neighbors that still colors their view of the United States. But the basic sympathies of the Democrats were opposed to taking this advantage of the people of weaker nations.

The Democrats worked on more than just the national level during these years. The campaign of 1896 had invigorated the party on the state and local level as well. In the West and South, Democrats listened to stump speakers, voted in primary elections, and burned bonfires on election night. Democratic state administrations served as testing grounds for railroad regulation, minimum wages, and many other programs later to be adopted by the Federal Government.

With the quickening of immigration, the Democratic organizations of the large cities had a special task: to cast new citizens in the mold of the Republic. Millions of immigrants were streaming into America each year. Democratic ward leaders found them living space, helped them secure their citizenship, brought them food and coal when times were hard. True, the immigrants gave their votes in return. But there were other reasons for these services. The ward leaders had been immigrants themselves, not too long ago. They knew that, with a little help, these "foreigners" could become worthy Americans. One of the marvels of America is how these different ethnic groups, whose countrymen were fighting each other so bitterly in Europe, could live beside each other in the great cities in peace. Much of the credit must go to the understanding help of the politicians.

The tireless work of Bryan and his followers bore fruit in 1912. A split in the Republican Party between the Old Guard and Progressives allowed an easy Democratic Presidential victory. The President-elect, Woodrow Wilson, pledged himself to remedy the evils exposed by earlier Democrats. As he said in his inaugural speech:

"We have been proud of our industrial achievements, but we have not hitherto stopped thoughtfully enough to count the human cost, the cost of lives snuffed out, of energies overtaxed and broken, the fearful physical and spiritual cost to the men and women and children upon whom the dead weight and burden of it all has fallen . . . There can be no equality of opportunity, the first essential of justice in the body politics, if men and women and children are not shielded from the consequences of great industrial and social processes which they cannot alter, control, or singly cope with."

As President, Wilson put the strength of the Federal Government behind improvement of the life of the common man. He believed, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, that "the legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do for themselves."

Applying this philosophy, Wilson's Democratic Administration built an impressive record of achievement. The Federal Reserve Act took the control of the nation's currency, which had been centered in Wall Street, and dispersed it among 12 regional Federal Banks. The Clayton Act attacked monopolistic trade practices, and expressly declared that "the labor of human beings is not a commodity or an article of commerce." An income tax law was passed, to distribute equitably the burden of running the Government.

The dreams of the reformers of the 1890s had been realized.

Also during Wilson's Administration, women won the right to vote. This doubled the size of the electorate and destroyed the last artificial barrier on the road to full citizen participation in government.

But impressive as were Wilson's achievements, history will remember him as a leader of the world. For in this broader task, his idealism and eloquence, his ability to plumb the moral reserves of the people, found fullest expression. America had been lucky. An ocean had isolated her from the continual strife in Europe, allowing her to develop in peace. But now that she had grown large and powerful, as the world's most successful democracy, she was destined to lead the cause of democracy in the world.

Wilson did not want to enter the First World War. But with the German forces overrunning peaceful nations and sinking American shipping, the time came when, in his words, "the right was more precious than the peace."

To achieve victory, the country equipped a large army, mobilized the home front, and greatly enlarged government services to coordinate the war effort. But, according to historian Mark Sullivan, "the largest single factor in the war was the mind of Woodrow Wilson." Wilson's thoughts and words were weapons. In the most discouraging days of the war, they gave the Allied nations fresh awareness of a reason for their sacrifices.

During this period, Wilson gave classic expression to the principles of Democratic Party foreign policy. The national interest would best be served, he said, by the attainment and preservation of world peace. He knew that just as war arose out of ill-feeling between nations, peace could only be based on mutual understanding and mutual respect. To achieve this, he proposed a League of Nations, where each country would have a voice in settling international differences.

But beyond the elimination of war, Wilson had the vision of the world becoming more democratic—not by force, not by economic coercion and "dollar diplomacy;" but by the strength of the American example. This was the hope behind Wilson's Fourteen Points, a series of peace aims which not only shortened the War, but made Wilson the greatest leader for peace in the world.

To make his vision a reality, Wilson went to Europe at the close of the war to help construct the League of Nations. But when he returned, he found Congress, controlled by isolationist forces, unwilling to accept his plans. So Wilson toured the nation, carrying his fight for the League to the people. If the League were not approved, he warned, "I can predict with absolute certainty that within another generation there will be another world war." But too many people would not listen, Wilson lost his fight, and in the process, his health and strength as well. He returned to Washington a broken man, comforted only by the pioneer's knowledge that history would show him to be right.

CHAPTER FIVE: F.D.R. LEADS AMERICA TO NEW FRONTIERS—FROM "NORMALCY" TO THE NEW DEAL

When the Republicans took over the national Government in 1921, back into control came the men representing the same groups that were the favored interests of Hamilton's day. They moved more carefully now. They hired high-priced publicity men to dress up their schemes in fine-sounding slogans like "normalcy" and "rugged individualism." Instead of openly opposing laws which regulated big business in the public interest, they sabotaged their administration.

But the results were the same: The tariff went up; speculation and credit schemes increased, creating an illusion of prosperity. There was a series of scandals and a long farm depression. Then the whole economy came toppling down in the greatest depression in history.

Deprived of Wilson's leadership, Democrats became confused once again. The party became tangled up in the prohibition issue. But although the party lost three consecutive elections, some victories were achieved. Led by Sen. Thomas Walsh of Montana, Democrats in Congress exposed the corruption of Teapot Dome, a plot to rob the people of hundreds of millions in oil reserves. These were the years of bitter struggle for farm relief legislation. Though the McNary-Haugen farm bill was vetoed by Coolidge, and again by Hoover, and though the farm program which was written into law in 1929 was an inadequate stop-gap, the champions of farm parity in this period laid solid groundwork for the constructive measures for agricultural recovery which came in the New Deal years.

One of the Democratic leaders of this time deserves special mention. His career shows how, in the Democratic Party, men from the humblest beginnings have been able to make important contributions to good government. Al Smith was an orphan boy. He grew up in a tenement house in New York's lower East Side, where lived Irish, Italians, Poles and other new Americans. Al Smith never had a formal education. But he had a deeper understanding of the common people, of which he was surely one, than any leader of the time. He started in politics at the bottom: poll watching for his ward organization. Through native brilliance and hard effort, he worked his way through every level of government to become four times the Governor of New York. In his administrations were nurtured many of the programs later to be adopted on a national scale. Nominated for President by the Democratic Convention of 1928, Smith was beaten in a campaign in which religious bigotry was callously exploited for political advantage. But, like Bryan before him, he had awakened a new spirit which was to contribute enormously to the party's future success.

What ultimately brought victory, setting the stage for the longest continuous period of Democratic Government the nation had seen, was 1) the inability of the Republican Hoover Administration to deal with the Great Depression, and 2), the Democratic response to that challenge. Volumes have been written trying to explain the causes of the national catastrophe which struck the country in 1929 and deepened through the next three years. But whatever the cause, the Republicans had no cure. Trapped by their own philosophy of negative government, they waited vainly for the stricken business community to right itself. At the depth of the depression, unemployment stood at 14 million persons. Wages were down 60 per cent, business income down 50 per cent. One of every four farms was bankrupt, and two thirds of the nation's banks were closed. Without jobs, often without food, millions saw their savings disappear and their years of work and education go for nothing.

In this crisis,. the people turned once again to the Democratic Party. They elected as President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who had pledged them a "New Deal" and fresh opportunity in their economic life. From that day and for the next 20 years, under Roosevelt and later under Harry S. Truman, the Democratic Party worked to make good on these promises. The story of the Democratic Party during these years is partly the story of how a party helped a country convert economic disaster into unparalleled prosperity, partly the story of how a great leader turned the country away from isolationism to undertake tasks which made it the foremost nation in world affairs.

Few need to be reminded of Franklin D. Roosevelt. The confident smile, the jauntily-tilted cigarette holder, the magnetic personality are deeply etched into the American memory. Roosevelt combined Jefferson's philosophy and Jackson's courage with Wilson's ability to tap the moral reserves of the people.

When he took office, Roosevelt frankly surveyed the desperate conditions about him, but he did not despair. "The only thing we have to fear," he said, "is fear itself." He regarded the crisis as an opportunity for a modern application of Jefferson's faith in the people and the pioneers' faith in themselves. He said:

"These unhappy times call for plans that build from the bottom up instead of from the top down . . . that put their faith once more in the forgotten man at the bottom of the economic pyramid . . . I, for one, do not believe that the era of the pioneer is at an end; I only believe that the area for pioneering has changed. The period of geographical pioneering is largely finished. But, my friends, the period of social pioneering is only at its beginning. And make no mistake about it—the same qualities of heroism and faith and vision that were required to bring the forces of nature into subjection will be required—in even greater measure—to bring under proper control the forces of modern society."

With these words, the Roosevelt Administration set in motion a program that reached to every major source of economic distress.

In retrospect, the speed and the orderliness of the New Deal achievements seem almost equally as remarkable as their magnitude. These features of the Roosevelt leadership are emblazoned on the record of F.D.R.'s "first hundred days."

In that relatively brief period, the main structure of the New Deal was built. All of that was done without any semblance of Executive dictation. Measures were submitted to the full test of unfettered debate in Congress and the other public forums. Action resulted not from the cracking of Executive or Legislative whips, but from general recognition that the proposals constituted urgently needed reforms. This represented Executive leadership and governmental teamwork in their finest sense.

From the White House came a series of Presidental messages dealing with emergency banking legislation, economy in government, repeal of prohibition, agricultural and unemployment relief, a new farm program, safeguards on stockmarket trading, mortgage relief, railroad coordination, government reorganization, industrial recovery, world disarmament and other major questions.

From Congress came legislative enactments which set the nation on the high road to recovery and expansion—the Emergency Banking Act, Agricultural Adjustment Act, Civilian Conservation Corps, National Recovery Administration, Public Works Administration, Securities and Exchange Act, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Home Owners Loan Corporation, Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Farm Credit Act, among others.

None of these programs passed without opposition. Roosevelt's New Deal was accused of subverting the American system of free enterprise. Actually, it was designed to save it. The New Deal was based on a concept it took America five depressions to learn: that the roots of free enterprise are in a prosperity that is broadly shared by all elements of the population. The soundness of these programs show up in the fact that, 25 years later, they are an accepted part of American life.

At the same time that it combatted the depression, the Democratic New Deal had vision enough to make longer range plans for the prosperity of the country. America's soil and forests had become depleted through reckless use. A large-scale conservation program was instituted, so that Americans in the future could have the full benefit of this natural wealth.

The potentialities of another resource, water power, had long been neglected. But in programs like the Tennessee Valley Authority, it was used to bring the comforts of modern civilization to people who had never seen an electric light.

Under President Truman's leadership, the major New Deal programs were broadened and extended. The fight against monopoly was stepped up, and slum clearance projects were started to give decent housing to those whom large-city life had crowded together. At the end of 20 Democratic years, the nation could look with pride at this record:

Unemployment:	
1932 (million)	14
1952 (million)	1.9
National income:	
1932 (billion)	$87.8
1952 (billion)	$328
National product:	
1932 (billion)	$110
1952 (billion)	$328
Worker's weekly paycheck:	
1932	$17
1952	$65
Net farm income:	
1932 (billion)	$1.9
1952 (billion)	$14.1
Corporation income (after tax):	
1932 (billion)	—$3.4
1952 (billion)	$18.3

CHAPTER SIX: DEMOCRACY ON TRIAL IN WAR AND IN PEACE—COMBATING THE FASCISTS AND THE COMMUNISTS

The Democratic Party rolled up victory after victory in the elections of the 20 years, 1932–52. The biggest vote-getter was Roosevelt, four times the unbeaten champion of American politics. In 1936, he topped his opponent by 11 million popular votes and 523 electoral votes—the biggest majority in American history.

President Truman, also undefeated, had a political style all his own. With his simple, direct approach to the voters, he was able, in 1948, to score an amazing political upset.

Harry Truman did not mind being called a politician. "Politics," he once said, "is public service." The tarnish that clung to the word could be removed if enough citizens, through their parties, took part in politics. So, working behind Roosevelt and Truman, were countless Democrats of lesser fame but equal dedication. They manned sound trucks, rang doorbells, watched polls and cheered speeches, in that great turmoil of democracy that is an American campaign.

It was important for the people of the world that the faith of Americans in democratic government had been restored by the Roosevelt Administration's battle against the depression. For history had chosen America to lead the democratic countries in the historic struggles of the 20th century, against Fascism and Soviet Communism. These twin dictatorships, to whom popular government and individual liberty meant nothing, were to challenge the democracies first in a global hot war, then in a cold war. The stakes were to be no less than the freedom of every person on earth. It was a fight that was to test all the nerve and strength America could muster.

For a democracy to meet this challenge first involved a great risk of popular education. During the 1920s, the United States had become increasingly isolationist. Minds had to be changed, people convinced that the world had become so small as to make events in other lands bound to affect the well-being of America itself. President Roosevelt pointed up the evils of the Fascist dictatorships. He also took action to strengthen the bastions of freedom. A reciprocal trade program was passed to promote friendship through increased trade. In South America, the "big stick" was replaced by the policy of the Good Neighbor. Over bitter opposition from isolationist forces, a Democratic Congress approved, in 1940–41, a peacetime draft. This provided at least partial preparation for the war launched by the treacherous Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

Pearl Harbor changed minds quickly. It unified America as never before. The mighty story of victory over Germany and Japan is too recent to need retelling. No political party can take credit for winning that struggle and ending the war. To do so would be to disparage the work of the Armed Forces and the performance of the great industrial machine on the home front. But directing the entire effort was Franklin D. Roosevelt. Despite his concern with the fighting, he never ceased to plan for permanent peace. His declaration of the Four Freedoms and the Atlantic Charter were eloquent statements of the peace aims of democracy. The entire allied world hailed him as the supreme spokesman in the struggle for the preservation of liberty. But on the eve of victory, exhausted by his labors, he died. Although an entire world poured out its grief, the most fitting epitaph was that on his tombstone: "Died in Action."

But victory over the Axis meant the end of only one form of dictatorship. Russia, America's wartime ally, also had designs on the freedom of the people of the world. The free world scarcely had time to catch its breath before the well-organized forces of world Communism moved into the power vacuums Fascism had left.

After four years of sacrifice and war, many in America wanted to relax. But the Truman Administration kept a close eye on Russian actions. One of the earliest and most important examples of President Truman's alertness to Russian tactics occurred in 1946, when the Russians failed to live up to their agreement to evacuate their troops from strategic, oil-rich Iran. As a result of President Truman's forceful insistence, the Russians finally backed down and withdrew their troops.

In February, 1947, with Communist guerrilla activities gaining in intensity in Greece, Britain advised the U.S. that it could no longer maintain its forces in Greece and Turkey, and would be forced to withdraw them in a matter of weeks. President Truman made a quick, bold decision. On March 12, before a joint session of Congress, he enunciated the now famous Truman Doctrine—a policy of U.S. intervention where necessary to save nations in danger of being taken over by a dictatorship—and asked Congress to authorize a $400 million program of economic and military aid to Greece and Turkey.

The Truman Doctrine is now regarded as a major turning point in the cold war with the Communists, for it told the world that America was determined to lead the free world in the fight against Communism and its causes. It was followed by a series of dramatic programs that literally saved Western Europe from the grip of Communism: an emergency aid program that helped Europe survive the cold winter of 1947–48; the historic Marshall Plan (a long-range coordinated aid program to take the place of previous piecemeal programs) and the Berlin Airlift another dramatic example of U.S. determination to resist every Russian pressure.

As the economic strength of the free world began to grow, the Truman Administration turned to the task of shoring up its military strength. The North Atlantic Treaty became the first in a series of collective security pacts, designed to prevent Communist aggression by making it plain that any attacker of free nations would have to contend with the armed might of the U.S. This treaty was supplemented by a program of U.S. military aid to the member nations.

While building these safeguards, the Truman Administration did not neglect the United Nations, the dream of Franklin Roosevelt as the right institution for lasting peace. The crucial test of the UN came in Korea in 1950, where troops from UN countries turned back a naked act of aggression on the part of Soviet and Chinese Communism. The heavy sacrifices made by the American people in this combat put a brake to Communist expansion in the Far East, paving the way for a relaxation of world tensions in the following years.

Thus, in 20 years, the American people, under Democratic leadership, had revolutionized their thinking about world affairs. They had accepted the responsibilities of being the greatest nation on earth. They had defeated Fascism and built up a strong network of defense against Communism. The entire economy had adjusted to the fact that, as long as aggressors exist, the only sure way to keep peace was to keep strength. Democratic foreign policy was so well-grounded in the realities of the world situation, that the Republican Party, despite its criticisms, found it could not do away with a single major program when it came to power.

As the cold war progressed, defenses against Communists also had to be raised within the United States. The Communist Party in America was at peak strength during the Hoover Administration, when 103,000 persons voted the Communist ticket for President. During World War II, some of these Communists had taken advantage of the spirit of wartime friendship to try to infiltrate government and industry. But as soon as the postwar aggression became evident, the Democratic Party began to dig them out.

When the Democrats left office in 1952, there was only one-fourth as many Communists in the country as 20 years earlier. The top leadership of the Communist Party had been wiped out—prosecuted and imprisoned by Democratic Administrations. New laws were added to the statute books, a loyalty program was set up in the Government, and the protective strength of the Federal Bureau of Investigation greatly increased.

To administer a successful internal security program required a delicate balancing between the dangers of subversion and the importance of individual freedom. The disloyal had to be separated from the dissenter, and the old-style progressive not confused with the Communist. The Democratic Party opposed those who tried to use fear of Communist infiltration to check social progress and defame minority groups. In fashioning its internal security programs, it tried to be guided by the warning of President Roosevelt: that "if the fires of freedom and civil liberties burn low in other lands, they must be made brighter in our own."

The program to extend the New Deal and defend democracy from Communism occupied most of Harry Truman's terms in office. After seven of the most eventful years in history, he retired, and in 1952 the Democratic Convention selected Adlai Stevenson as its Presidential candidate. Stevenson, despite his disinguished record as Governor of Illinois, was not well known nationally at the time of his nomination. But beginning with his famous acceptance speech, in which he sounded the keynote for the Democratic campaign—"Let's talk sense to the American people"—the eloquence and forthrightness of Stevenson's campaign speeches made a quick and deep impression on the voters in the short period between the convention and the election. Although defeated by a military hero who had been in the public eye for a full decade before Stevenson appeared on the national scene, the Illinois Governor received more votes than any other Presidential candidate in history except two: Franklin Roosevelt and Dwight Eisenhower.

General Eisenhower's victory was not a victory for the Republican Party. Notwithstanding his personal popularity, the party won the Congress by the narrowest of margins, and quickly lost it two years later. Nor was the Eisenhower victory a repudiation of the Democratic legislation of the previous 20 years. Public pressure forced Eisenhower to embrace the New Deal in his campaign to keep the basic domestic and foreign programs intact during his terms in office.

Not content merely to oppose, Democratic-controlled Congresses from 1953 to 1960 fashioned constructive programs of their own. They passed the first civil rights legislation in 85 years. They launched a massive program of research into the prevention of cancer and heart disease. They provided the funds through which America reached out into the exploration of space.

But direction from the Republican Administration was badly lacking in the 1950s. New problems, new needs, challenged the nation, at home and abroad. Without positive, assertive Administration leadership, America drifted. People's hopes for better futures were clouded by spreading slums, crowded schools, high medical costs, technological changes that eliminated jobs. Three recessions in seven years wracked the economy, the final one leaving almost seven million unemployed. Abroad, communism found new ways to encroach upon the free world through subversion and guerrilla warfare. Among friends, allies and uncommitted peoples of the world, who looked vainly to America to lead the way to peace and progress, American prestige hit bottom.

Among millions of those increasingly disturbed by America's drift in such perilous times was Senator John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts, who looked forward and saw a New Frontier of "uncharted areas of science and space, unsolved problems of peace and war, unconquered pockets of ignorance and prejudice, unanswered questions of poverty and surplus." As the 1960 Democratic Presidential nominee, Kennedy asked all Americans to join as "new pioneers on that New Frontier"—and in a close, hardfought campaign marked by four precedent-shattering television confrontations between him and his Republican opponent, Richard M. Nixon, Kennedy was elected 35th President of the United States.

In his first words as Chief Executive, President Kennedy made it clear "that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans" and that America would pay any price, bear any burden, "to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

Once again the Democratic Party had provided a leader to summon the Nation to greatness.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, with his incisive sense of history, will be remembered as the man who fought for peace in a turbulent, diversified world. He will be remembered for his leadership in obtaining the nuclear test-ban treaty, the first tentative step toward lasting peace.

President Johnson has eloquently summarized the Kennedy legacy this way:

"The dream of conquering the vastness of space—the dream of partnership across the Atlantic—and across the Pacific as well—the dream of a Peace Corps in less-developed nations—the dream of education for all our children—the dream of jobs for all who seek them and need them—the dream of care for our elderly—the dream of an all-out attack on mental illness—and above all, the dream of equal rights for all Americans whatever their race or color—these and other American dreams have been vitalized by his drive and by his dedication."

President Kennedy, after taking office, moved swiftly to implement his programs.

Acting in the Democratic tradition that produced the Good Neighbor Policy, Lend Lease, Point Four and the Marshall Plan, he moved to recapture the initiative in foreign affairs.

The Peace Corps was initiated to give young Americans a chance to help underdeveloped countries help themselves. This program captured the imagination of the world and enhanced the prestige of America.

Programs like the Alliance for Progress for Latin America were developed to give peoples of the world's under-developed nations new hope for a better life, stable governments and social justice.

Above all, President Kennedy sought to blaze a trail to lasting peace, realizing that such a peace could only be negotiated from a position of strength. Our Defense establishment was streamlined, strengthened and readied to meet any of the diverse challenges of the nuclear age.

The United States stood ready to meet any threat to its security and freedom—from a guerrilla uprising to a nuclear confrontation.

The Communist tide of expansion was repelled in the Congo, blocked in Berlin, held in Vietnam, stalemated in Laos.

In October 1962 the Soviet Union attempted to establish offensive missile bases on the island of Cuba, precipitating the first direct confrontation between two nuclear powers.

The iron will of President Kennedy, backed by our vast military strength, forced a humiliating Soviet backdown and removal of offensive missiles and bombers. President Kennedy had acted judiciously and with restraint. A situation that might have ended in a nuclear holocaust was resolved without violence.

The Cuban confrontation was a turning point in the cold war. It convinced the Soviet Union of the determination of the United States to protect its interests and drove home the horrors of possible nuclear destruction.

It was only after Cuba that the Soviets reversed a long-standing policy and agreed to sign a test-ban treaty with the United States. The treaty, forbidding atmospheric nuclear testing, was hailed around the world as a first step in the long, hard journey toward a lasting peace in the nuclear age. More than a hundred nations signed the treaty.

In the critical area of space exploration President Kennedy fought to help the United States achieve supremacy. He named Vice President Johnson to head a newly-created National Aeronautics and Space Council to coordinate this national effort. More than 130 vehicles were placed in orbit. The United States assumed a position of preeminence as it met man's great new challenge—space.

While he was reasserting United States leadership abroad and in space, President Kennedy did not forget the importance of meeting our problems at home, nor did he forget the heritage and traditions of the Party of the People.

In the crucial area of Civil Rights, he became the architect of a comprehensive program to insure all Americans an equal opportunity to develop and utilize their talents. The government was mobilized to fight segregation in housing, employment, transportation and voting. An executive order forbade any discrimination in the Federal government. Qualified Negroes were appointed to key posts in the Administration. The Equal Employment Opportunities Commission was established and, under the energetic leadership of Vice President Johnson, worked to eliminate discrimination both in Federal Service and in companies doing business with the Federal government. A civil rights bill to guarantee all citizens full participation in American life, a bill to enable men of good will to work out their problems within the framework of law and order, was drawn up and submitted to Congress.

The President also moved to strengthen our economy and improve the lot of our people.

His first executive order released surplus food to the families of the unemployed; steps were taken to extend unemployment benefits to the victims of the recession which held the country in its grip when President Kennedy took office.

Area redevelopment was initiated to help communiites eroded by economic change diversify their economies and provide more jobs. Accelerated public works were initiated to create more job opportunities as well as provide needed public facilities. The Manpower Development and Training program was started to teach workers new skills that would enable them to gain employment in our increasingly more complex societies.

Incentives were provided to encourage greater business investment, strengthening the economy and providing more jobs. The development of small business was encouraged.

The Kennedy programs to increase the Nation's educational opportunities were the most comprehensive since the land grant college act was passed almost a century ago. Existing programs were expanded and new programs were begun—such as the comprehensive bill to aid medical education and the $1.2 billion college facilities construction act.

The first extension in the history of the minimum wage act was secured, and the minimum wage was raised. The Nation's first Equal Pay Act was passed to protect the rights of working women. New programs to aid rural development were begun while agricultural surpluses were cut and food prices stabilized.

Under these programs the number of employed rose to record heights, while the number of unemployed was reduced. The Gross National Product climbed to a record $600 billion, factory wages topped $100 per week for the first time in history, and industrial production, profits and personal income went up.

Despite these gains our economic growth rate remained below its potential and close to 4 million Americans remained unemployed. To counter this situation, to attack the waste of resources and the human suffering President Kennedy proposed a tax cut. The tax cut was designed to stimulate the economy by generating increased activity in the private sector of the economy, rather than through increased government spending.

President Kennedy moved the Nation ahead on other fronts too. He focused attention on the problems of our rapidly expanding cities, mapped a bold new approach to the problems of mental illness and mental retardation, increased consumer protection and undertook many other important programs.

On November 22, 1963, President Kennedy was tragically assassinated. His Presidency had lasted scarcely more than a thousand days, yet, in that time, he left his stamp indelibly on the Nation. He brought a standard of excellence to everything he did—whether it was the appointment of an Ambassador or the encouragement of American culture. He renewed America's faith in itself, its tradition and its future.

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE PRESIDENCY OF LYNDON B. JOHNSON—"LET US CONTINUE . . ."

Lyndon B. Johnson became the 36th President of the United States upon the death of John F. Kennedy. His energy, skill and knowledge were quickly evident as he moved to carry on the work begun by the late President. And the dignity and strength with which he grasped the reins of government reassured the Nation and the world.

In a special message to Congress delivered just three days after he took office, and again in his State of the Union message, President Johnson reviewed his philosophy and outlined his programs.

Not surprisingly, his concerns were those that had always been at the core of the Democratic Party's philosophy—the vision of American greatness and the desire that the United States play its rightful role of leadership in world affairs; the desire that the national interest be placed above all else; the concern for the welfare of the common man; the desire to see all Americans—regardless of their economic background or their race or their religion—receive an equal opportunity for full participation in our society.

President Johnson began his political career as an ardent supporter of Franklin D. Roosevelt. As a government administrator and a young Congressman he gave his full support to the Roosevelt programs. President Roosevelt, in turn, took an interest in young Johnson and helped further his career. Lyndon Johnson never forgot the lessons he learned from F.D.R. President Johnson's interest in the common man, his concern that the U.S. maintain its greatness as a nation and assume its responsibilities in Foreign affairs are a part of this heritage.

"Our principles, our programs, our achievements represent the hopes and needs of the great majority of the American people—in every walk of life and in every part of the country," Lyndon Johnson has said of the Democratic Party.

As a good Democrat, Lyndon Johnson was above narrow partisanship. As Vice President he had explained, "We are partisans not merely for the fact of partisanship, but because through the Democratic Party we have found a way of organizing ourselves to do for the Nation those things we feel must be done."

The President of the United States, regardless of Party, knew that Lyndon Johnson would give his full support to those programs and policies which were genuinely in the national interest, regardless of any political reaction his position might cause. For almost eight years he was the leader of the opposition party in the United States Senate. Never during that period did he allow the Democratic Party to fall into a pattern of negativism. When, in a matter of vital importance to national security, the President needed the support of the Democrats, he received it.

And as Vice President Lyndon Johnson fought for the principles of equal opportunity that are the foundation of the Democratic Party. As head of the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission he was in the vanguard of the fight to obtain equal opportunity for all Americans (just as he had been in the Senate where he guided the first Civil Rights legislation since the Civil War to passage). He fought to maintain United States leadership in world affairs, carrying the message of his government to 33 countries in more than 150 speeches.

President Johnson sensed while a Senator the implications of a Russian Sputnik derisively circling the globe. The Preparedness Subcommittee which he headed investigated the nation's space and missile activities and recommended a 17-point program to revitalize them.

His interest played a key role in the drive by American technology to surpass the Russian space effort.

As Vice President he became head of the National Aeronautics and Space Council where he continued to preach the importance of supremacy in space.

So Lyndon Johnson came to the Presidency well grounded in the principles of the Democratic Party, skilled in the art of politics, and tempered by the responsibilities of national leadership.

Two of the hallmarks of Lyndon Johnson's career had been his tremendous capacity for work and his ability to "get things done." President Johnson threw himself into the Presidency with characteristic energy.

For example, he pushed for passage of the tax cut bill and signed it into law. In the short run the new tax cut will increase the take home pay and improve the living conditions of every American wage earner. In the long run it will give the economy a needed boost and provide the increased revenues that will lead the way ultimately to a balanced budget.

While cutting taxes, the President initiated a strenuous drive to cut government costs and maintain economy in government. The American taxpayer, he said, deserved "a dollar of value for a dollar spent."

The President explained his approach this way in his Budget Message to Congress:

"When vigorous pruning of old programs and procedures releases the funds to meet new challenges and opportunities, economy becomes the companion of progress . . .

"This, is, I believe, a budget of economy and progress."

So the new President reaffirmed by word and action his party's interest in people, in seeing that all Americans shared in the American dream.

One of his first acts was to declare his unequivocal support of the Civil Rights bill before Congress. President Johnson pledged to do all he could to secure the bill's passage and dedicated his Administration to the principles that underlie the bill.

President Johnson also moved to help the Nation's poor and underprivileged. Declaring all-out war on poverty, he outlined a comprehensive plan, national in scope but geared to local initiative, to give the Nation's poor a chance to help themselves. The President's anti-poverty program was designed to help those who have been forced into poverty by circumstance and who cannot escape without outside help.

In 1964 President Johnson and Democratic candidates for Congress campaigned on a platform of precise, forthright proposals designed to answer the Nation's need in the mid-1960's. The American people responded with overwhelming approval at the polls, returning Lyndon Johnson—with Vice President Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota—to the White House with the largest plurality ever accorded a candidate. The President and the Democratic 89th Congress turned to the task of enacting the 1964 Democratic platform, keeping the promise to the voters. The result was the greatest record of creative legislation in the Nation's history, surpassing both the 63rd Congress under Woodrow Wilson and the historic 73rd under Franklin Roosevelt.

More than 90% of the President's 170 major recommendations were enacted by the 89th Congress. But statistics tell only a small part of the story, for the achievements of the 89th were registered by breaking through obstacles that had blocked earlier efforts—and passing legislation that answered the needs of all Americans.

This historic partnership between the White House and Congress overcame the barriers that had held up federal funds so vital to insuring every child the best possible education. Landmark actions were the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which provided federal grants administered under local control and specialized aids for school districts with a high concentration of poor families, and a Higher Education Bill authorizing scholarship grants and loans to college students.

With the passage of Medicare legislation in 1965, a two-decades old controversy was resolved in favor of 19 million older Americans who now receive the medical attention they need—and often cannot afford. Medicare provides a basic hospital insurance program under Social Security, a voluntary health insurance program, and expanded Social Security benefits.

Meeting the President's challenge to build the Great Society, Congress expanded the 1964 Economic Opportunity Act, to bring new weapons into the arsenal to defeat poverty—rent supplements, Teachers Corps, the Model Cities program, an economic development program for the depressed 11-state Appalachia region, and expanded manpower retraining programs.

In other important legislation the President was supported in his call for a new cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development to administer federal housing and urban development programs, a new Department of Transportation, a Voting Right of Act to insure against local discrimination, major steps to combat water and air pollution, the beautification program, a minimum wage increase and extension of coverage, excise tax reductions to stimulate the economy, immigration law reform, and the long-awaited Truth in Packaging bill to protect consumers.

There can be little doubt that historians, reviewing the achievements of the Democratic 89th Congress, will agree with President Johnson's assessment: "An inspired group of Americans, representing a sense of national purpose, has written for the United States a new chapter in greatness."

The world has changed in the 175 years that have passed since the beginning of the Democratic Party, but the principles and ideals that are the foundation of the Party are still valid. Proud of its traditions, secure in its heritage, the Democratic Party welcomes the challenge of the future. The Party of the architect of this Nation's beginnings is today the Party that maintains the vision of American greatness in the nuclear age. The mantle of Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, Roosevelt, Truman and Kennedy has passed to Lyndon Johnson. President Johnson set the tone of his Administration in his first address to Congress.

"Let us continue," he said.

CHAPTER SEVEN: DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES AND OUTSTANDING DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

Thomas Jefferson, third President of the United States

Life: born April 13, 1743, in Albemarle County, Virginia . . . educated, William and Mary College . . . married Martha Skelton . . . six children, four of whom died in infancy. . . died July 4, 1826 at Monticello, Virginia.

Career: lawyer, writer, scientist and architect . . . Justice of the Peace, member of the Virginia Legislature, Governor of Virginia . . . member of the Continental Congress . . . minister to France and Secretary of State in Washington's cabinet . . . President from 1801 to 1808 . . . close advisor to Presidents from 1808 to 1826.

Achievements: wrote the Declaration of Independence . . . wrote the Virginia Declaration of Religious Freedom . . . Founded the University of Virginia and planned its architecture . . . wrote the Northwest Ordinance . . . As President, negotiated the Louisiana Purchase—800,000 square miles for 15 million dollars; initiated Lewis and Clark Expedition; fought Alien and Sedition laws, sent armed forces to Tripoli to protect American trade from Mediterranean pirates.

Jefferson on the future of democracy: "Whenever the people are well-informed, they can be trusted with their own government; whenever things get so far wrong as to attract their notice, they may be relied upon to set them to rights . . . I have no fear, but that the result of our experiment will be, that men may be trusted to govern themselves without a master. Could the contrary of this be proved, I should conclude, either that there is no God, or that he is a malevolent being."

James Madison, Fourth President of the United States

Life: born March 16, 1751, at Port Conway, Virginia . . . educated at the College of New Jersey (now Princeton) . . . married Dorothy Payne Todd . . . died June 28, 1836, at Montpelier, Virginia.

Career: lawyer and political scientist . . . member of the Virginia legislature . . . delegate to the Continental Congress and the Constitutional Convention . . . member of the House of Representatives from Virginia . . . Secretary of State under Jefferson . . . President from 1809 to 1817.

Achievements: "Father of the Constitution" and leader in the fight for its ratification . . . helped write the Bill of Rights . . . As President, fought the War of 1812 and strengthened the permanent military and naval forces.

Madison on the separation of powers: "The great security against a concentration of powers . . . consists in giving to those who administer each department the necessary constitutional means and personal motives to resist encroachments of the others . . . It may be a reflection on human nature, that such devices should be necessary to control the abuses of government. But what is government itself, but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, controls on government would not be necessary . . . In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and then oblige it to control itself."

James Monroe, Fifth President of the United States

Life: born in Westmoreland County, Virginia, April 28, 1758, educated at William and Mary College . . . married Elizabeth Kortwright . . . two children . . . died July 4, 1831, in New York City.

Career: soldier in the Revolution . . . member of the Virginia legislature . . . Governor of and U.S. Senator from Virginia . . . minister to France and England . . . Secretary of State under Madison . . . President from 1817 to 1825.

Achievements: as President, fought Seminole Indian War; acquired Florida Territory from Spain; announced Monroe Doctrine, basis of American foreign policy for 100 years.

Monroe on equal rights for all: "If all enjoy rights, merit is rewarded, and punishment inflicted only on those who have committed crimes; the number of discontended and disorderly will be inconsiderable, the great mass will cling to and cherish the government which is strictly their own."

John Quincy Adams, Sixth President of the United States

Life: born July 11, 1767, in Quincy, Massachusetts . . . educated at Harvard . . . married Louisa Catherine Johnson . . . died in Washington, D.C., February 23, 1848.

Career: lawyer and professor . . . member of the Massachusetts Legislature and U.S. Senator from Massachusetts . . . minister to Portugal, the Netherlands, Russia and Great Britain . . . Secretary of State under Monroe . . . President from 1825 to 1829 . . . after leaving the Presidency, served in Congress for many years until his death.

Achievements: wrote Monroe Doctrine . . . helped acquire Florida from Spain . . . advocated roads and canals, a national university, and national aid to scientific enterprise.

Adams on national preparedness: "The firmest security of peace is the preparation during peace of the defenses of war."

Andrew Jackson, seventh President of the United States

Life: born March 15, 1767, in Union County, South Carolina . . . no formal education . . . married Rachel Donelson . . . died at Hermitage, Tennessee, June 8, 1845.

Career: soldier and lawyer . . . judge of Tennessee Supreme Court . . . Congressman and Senator from Tennessee . . . President from 1829 to 1837.

Achievements: fought the Seminole and Creek Indians . . . led American forces in Battle of New Orleans . . . helped write the Constitution of Tennessee . . . as President, vetoed the re-chartering of the United States Bank, and withdrew public deposits from the Bank . . . prevented state nullification of national tariff law . . . paid off the entire United States debt.

Jackson on the dangers of special privilege: "Many of our rich men have not been content with equal protection and equal benefits, but have besought us to make them richer by Act of Congress. By attempting to gratify their desires we have in the results of our legislation arrayed section against section, interest against interest, and man against man. . . . There are no necessary evils in government. Its evils exist only in its abuses. If it would confine itself to *equal* protection, and, as Heaven does its rains, shower its favors alike on the high and the low, the rich and the poor, it would be an unqualified blessing."

Martin Van Buren, eighth President of the United States

Life: born at Kinderhook, Columbia County, New York, December 5, 1782 . . . no formal education . . . married Hannah Hoes . . . 4 children . . . died at Kinderhook, July 24, 1862.

Career: lawyer . . . member of New York State Senate . . . Attorney-General and Governor of New York . . . United States Senator from New York . . . Secretary of State under Jackson . . . Vice President, 1833 to 1837 . . . President, 1837 to 1841.

Achievements: widened the suffrage in New York . . . fought to end imprisonment for debt . . . helped to kill the Bank of the United States . . . as President, initiated independent treasury plan; opposed speculation in public lands; and instituted a maximum 10-hour working day in all Federal public works.

Van Buren on public opinion: "The sober, second thought of the people is never wrong, and always efficient."

James Knox Polk, 11th President of the United States

Life: born November 2, 1795, at Mecklenburg County, North Carolina . . . educated at the University of North Carolina . . . married Sarah Childress . . . no children . . . died June 15, 1849, in Nashville, Tennessee.

Career: lawyer . . . Congressman from Tennessee . . . Speaker of the House of Representatives . . . Governor of Tennessee . . . first "dark horse" candidate for the Presidency . . . President from 1845 to 1849.

Achievements: as President, annexed the Oregon territory . . . won the Mexican War . . . re-established an independent treasury system . . . reduced the tariff . . . acquired territory comprising California, Utah and New Mexico.

Polk reaffirms the Monroe Doctrine: "The nations on the continent of America have interests peculiar to themselves. Their free forms of government are altogether different from the monarchial institutions of Europe . . . To tolerate any interference on the part of European sovereigns with controversies in America, or to suffer them to establish new colonies of their own, would be to make, to some extent, a voluntary sacrifice of our independence. . . . Liberty here must be allowed to work out its natural results, and these will, ere long, astonish the world."

Franklin Pierce, fourteenth President of the United States

Life: born November 23, 1804, at Hillsboro, New Hampshire . . . educated at Bowdoin College . . . married Jane Means Appleton . . . two children . . . died October 8, 1869, at Concord, New Hampshire.

Career: lawyer . . . member of New Hampshire legislature . . . Congressman and Senator from New Hampshire . . . Federal District Attorney . . . fought and wounded in Mexican War . . . President from 1853 to 1857.

Achievements: sent Commodore Perry to open up Japan . . . reorganized diplomatic service . . . paved way for transcontinental railroad to Northwest . . . acquired 50,000 square miles of Southwest Territory in Gadsden Purchase.

Pierce's political creed: "Our forefathers of the thirteen united colonies in acquiring their independence and founding this Republic, have devolved upon us, their descendants, the greatest and the most noble trust ever committed to the hands of man. . . . We have to maintain inviolate the great doctrine of the inherent right of popular self-government; to harmonize a sincere and ardent devotion to the institutions of religious faiths with the most universal religious toleration; to carry forward every social improvement to the uttermost limit of human perfectibility, by the free action of mind upon mind, not by the obtrusive intervention of misapplied force; and to cherish with loyal fealty and devoted affection this Union, as the only sure foundation on which the hopes of civil liberty rest."

James Buchanan, fifteenth President of the United States

Life: born April 23, 1791, in Franklin County, Pennsylvania . . . educated at Dickensen College . . . unmarried . . . died in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, June 1, 1868.

Career: lawyer . . . member of Pennsylvania Legislature . . . Congressman and Senator from Pennsylvania . . . Ambassador to Great Britain and Russia . . . Secretary of State under Polk . . . President from 1857 to 1861.

Achievements: as Secretary of State, wrote the peace treaty with Mexico . . . as President, lowered the tariff; opposed secession; tried to prevent civil war by enforcing the Fugitive Slave Act and advocating popular sovereignty.

Buchanan on economy in government: "We ought never to forget that true public economy consists, not in withholding the means necessary to accomplish important national objects . . . but in taking care that the money appropriated for these purposes shall be faithfully and frugally expended."

Grover Cleveland, twenty-second and twenty-fourth President of the United States

Life: born in Caldwell, New Jersey, March 18, 1837 . . . one of nine children . . . married Frances Folsom while President . . . five children . . . died at Princeton, New Jersey, June 24, 1908.

Career: lawyer . . . Sheriff and Mayor of Buffalo, New York . . . Governor of New York . . . President from 1885 to 1889 and again from 1893 to 1897.

Achievements: greatly enlarged the Civil Service . . . vetoed "pension grab" bills . . . built a Treasury surplus . . . fought for a lower tariff . . . encouraged arbitration of disputes between Europe and South American countries.

Cleveland on the forms of communism: "Communism is a hateful thing. But the communism of combined wealth and capital is not less dangerous than the communism of oppressed poverty and toil."

Woodrow Wilson, twenty-eighth President of the United States

Life: born December 28, 1856, in Staunton, Virginia . . . educated at Princeton University . . . married Ellen Louise Axson and after her death Married Edith Bolling Galt . . . three children . . . died in Washington, D.C., February 3, 1924.

Career: historian and political scientist . . . President of Princeton University . . . reform Governor of New Jersey . . . President from 1913 to 1921.

Achievements: led American participation in World War I . . . enunciated the Fourteen Points for lasting peace . . . fought for the establishment of the League of Nations. His domestic policy, the "New Freedom," initiated the Federal Reserve Act, Federal Trade Commission Act, Clayton Anti-Trust Act, Railway Hours Bill, National War Labor Board, United States Employment Service, Espionage Act . . . settled differences with Mexico and prepared the Philippines for self-government.

Wilson on the importance of liberty: "A patriotic American is a man who is not selfish in the things that he enjoys that make for human liberty and the rights of man. He wants to share them with the whole world, and he is never so proud of the great flag under which he lives as when it comes to mean to other people as well as to himself a symbol of hope and liberty . . . I would rather belong to a poor nation that was free than to a rich nation that had ceased to be in love with liberty. We shall not be poor if we love liberty."

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, thirty-second President of the United States

Life: born January 30, 1882, at Hyde Park, New York . . . educated at Harvard University . . . married Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, a sixth cousin . . . five children . . . died at Warm Springs, Georgia, April 12, 1945.

Career: lawyer . . . New York State Senator . . . Assistant Secretary of the Navy under Wilson . . . candidate for Vice President in 1920 . . . Governor of New York . . . President from 1933 to 1945.

Achievements of his Administrations

Recovery measures: bank holiday, Gold Embargo, Relief, WPA and CCC Act, Agricultural Production and Marketing laws, Home Owner's Loan Corporation, Securities and Exchange Act.

Welfare and resource development measures: Tennessee Vally Authority, Wagner Act, Social Security Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, Farm-Tenant Act.

Anti-monopoly legislation: Robinson-Patman Act, Public Utility Holding Company Act, Rural Electrification Act.

Foreign policy: Reciprocal Tariff Act, Good Neighobr Policy, Lend-Lease Act, Four Freedoms, Atlantic Charter, laid groundwork for United Nations Organization.

Roosevelt on the bases of world peace: "Today we seek a moral basis for peace. It cannot be a real peace if it fails to recognize brotherhood. It cannot be a lasting peace if the fruit of it is oppression, or starvation, or cruelty, or human life dominated by armed camps. It cannot be a sound peace if small nations must live in fear of powerful neighbors. It cannot be a moral peace if freedom from invasion is sold for tribute. It cannot be an intelligent peace if it denies free passage to that knowledge of those ideals which permit men to find common ground. It cannot be a righteous peace if worship of God is denied. . . . We must as a united people keep ablaze on this continent the flames of human liberty, of reason, of democracy, and of fair play as living things to be preserved for the better world that is to come."

Harry S. Truman, thirty-third President of the United States

Life: born May 8, 1884, in Lamar, Missouri . . . no college education . . . married Bess Wallace . . . one daughter.

Career: drug clerk, bank clerk, farmer and haberdasher . . . artilleryman in World War I . . . county judge . . . Senator from Missouri . . . Vice President under Franklin D. Roosevelt . . . President from 1945 to 1953.

Achievements: Marshall Plan, Truman Doctrine, breaking of Berlin Blockage, North Atlantic Treaty . . . halting of Communist aggression in Korea, Greece, Turkey, Iran . . . re-armament programs . . . Point Four program . . . raised minimum wage, extended Social Security, extended farm price-support program . . . established housing and slum-clearance programs . . . recognized new State of Israel . . . fought for Civil Rights program . . . Atomic Energy Act . . . unified the Armed Services . . . established National Science Foundation.

Truman on equal rights for all: "Eventually, we are going to have an America in which freedom and opportunity are the same for everyone. There is only one way to accomplish that great purpose; that is to keep working for it and never to take a backward step . . . We know that our democracy is not perfect. But we do know that it offers a fuller, freer, happier life to our people than any totalitarian nation has ever offered."

John F. Kennedy, thirty-fifth President of the United States

Life: born May 29, 1917, Brookline, Massachusetts, first President born in the 20th Century . . . educated at Harvard University . . . married Jacqueline Lee Bouvier . . . two children . . . died in Dallas, Texas, Nov. 22, 1963.

Career: decorated by the Navy for "courage, endurance and excellent leadership" demonstrated when he towed injured crew members to safety and brought them through enemy lines after his PT boat was rammed and sunk in World War II . . . newspaper correspondent at San Francisco Founding United Nations Conference, the Potsdam Conference and the British election of 1945 . . . author of *Why England Slept,* the Pulitzer Prize winning *Profiles in Courage,* and *The Strategy of Peace* . . . Congressman and Senator from Massachusetts . . . Inaugurated President January 20, 1961.

Achievements and goals of his administration: President Kennedy gave the Nation a program for greatness in the nuclear age . . . achieved a treaty enacting a ban on atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons—an historic first step in the long journey toward peace . . . captured the imagination of the world by initiating the Peace Corps to help under-developed nations to help themselves . . . initiated programs like the Alliance for Progress to give peoples of the world new hope for a better life . . . strengthened and increased the flexibility of our military establishment, thus fashioning the weapons to halt the spread of Communism and cause a humiliating Soviet defeat in Cuba by forcing the Communists to remove all offensive missiles . . . initiated programs like Area Redevelopment, Accelerated Public Works and Manpower Development and Training to help communities eroded by economic change and teach workers new skills for and increasingly more complex society . . . led the drive to obtain equal opportunity for all Americans—fighting against discrimination in education, employment and voting . . . architect of the tax cut and the civil rights bill.

Kennedy on the role of Americans today: "In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and the glow from that fire can truly light the world.

"And so, my fellow Americans: ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

—Inaugural Address
January 20, 1961

Lyndon B. Johnson, thirty-sixth President of the United States

Life: born in Johnson City, Texas, August 27, 1908 . . . educated at Southwest Texas State Teachers College . . . married Claudia Alta Taylor . . . two children . . .

Career: Administrator of the National Youth Administration for State of Texas . . . United States Congressman . . . Lt. Cmdr., U.S. Navy . . . United States Senator . . . Senate Majority Whip and Leader . . . Vice President of the United States . . . Inaugurated President November 22, 1963 . . . and won 1964 Presidential election with largest plurality ever accorded a candidate.

Accomplishment and goals: set up and headed the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee which uncovered military waste and inefficiency in the 1950's . . . outlined program for U.S. to gain supremacy in space following the first Sputnik . . . secured passage of the Civil Rights bills of 1957 and 1960—the first civil rights legislation to win Congressional approval since the Civil War . . . as Vice-President headed the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity and the National Aeronautics and Space Council . . . As President, he led the fight to obtain equal opportunity for all Americans—the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, secured passage of the tax cut, Department of Housing and Urban Development, rent supplements, Model Cities program, Department of Transportation, Beautification program, Elementary and Secondary Education measure . . . other historic legislation enacted by the 89th Congress under his leadership included air and water pollution control measures, water resources, Medicare and social security improvements, reform of the immigration laws, health and consumer protection measures, highway safety, expansion of the minimum wage law, extension of the GI Bill of Rights . . . also the Appalachia program, Federal and postal employees pay raises, mine safety, Manpower Development and Training expansion, the anti-poverty program, farm program, improvements, and an expansion of Food for Peace . . . our economic and military commitments to preserve freedom in Vietnam and other parts of the world have been courageously honored.

Johnson's faith in America: "The treasure of America today as always is its young people. We must not permit that treasure to be lost or wasted."—Feb. 22, 1963.

"I happen to believe that a strong, vibrant economy is as essential to our leadership of the free world as the military hardware."—Dec. 13, 1963.

"This nation is going to be solvent, because this Administration believes that you can be frugal and thrifty without being reactionary."—Jan. 28, 1964.

". . . we do not intend to allow the tempo of America's unprecedented prosperity to ever muffle the cries of those who are denied a fair share of it."—Apr. 24, 1964

"If a nation is to keep its freedom it must be prepared to risk war. When necessary, we will take that risk. But as long as I am President, I will spare neither my office nor myself in the quest for peace."—June 20, 1964

"The task of achieving a life of quality and dignity in rural as well as in urban America is one that will engage our minds and our energies for a lifetime . . . the unparalleled harvest of today's rural America has been achieved because our ancestors said this too was a reasonable goal."—Feb. 4, 1965

"Our conservation must be not just the classic conservation of protection and development, but a creative conservation of restoration and innovation. Its concern is not with nature alone, but with the total relation between man and the world around him. Its object is not just man's welfare but the dignity of man's spirit."—Feb. 8, 1965

"America has become a highly urbanized nation, and we must face the many meanings of this new America . . . in the next 35 years, we must literally build a second America—putting in place as many houses, schools, apartments, parks and offices as we have built through all the time since the Pilgrims arrived on these shores. . . ."—Sept. 9, 1965

"Our beautiful America was built by a nation of strangers. From a hundred different places or more, they have poured forth into an empty land, joining and blending into one mighty and irresistible tide."—Oct. 3, 1965

"The . . . most important principle of our foreign policy is support of national independence—the right of each people to govern themselves and to shape their own institutions. For a peaceful world order will be possible only when each country walks the way that it has choosen to walk for itself."—Jan. 12, 1966

"We have threatened no one, and we will not. We seek the end of no regime, and we will not. Our purpose is solely to defend against aggression. To any armed attack we will reply. We have measured the strength and weakness of others, and we think we know our own. . . . We will build freedom while we fight, and we will seek peace every day by every honorable means. But we will persevere along the high hard road of freedom. We are too old to be foolhardy and we are too young to be tired. We are too strong for fear and too determined for retreat."—Feb. 23, 1966

"Our goal is not just a job for every worker. Our goal is to place every worker in a job where he utilizes his full productive potential, for his own and for society's benefit."—Mar. 8, 1966

"This Administration has pledged that as long as racial discrimination denies opportunity and equal rights in America, we will honor our Constitutional and moral responsibility to restore the balance of justice."—Apr. 28, 1966

"Let us start here and now to build a new ideal of what ought to be the meaning of growing old. Let us here proclaim a bill of rights for older Americans. Let us make it our guide in the years ahead. . . ."—June 3, 1966

"Our Nation is stronger today than ever before. We need not, indeed we dare not, forsake our basic goals of peace, prosperity, and progress. The pursuit of peace is essential for the continued advancement of our Nation and all mankind. Prosperity and progress will lead us toward a society where all can share in the bounty of nature and the products of man's ingenuity and creativity. . . ."—Jan. 24, 1967

Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice President of the United States

Life: born in Wallace, South Dakota, May 27, 1911 . . . education at Denver College of Pharmacy, University of Minnesota, Louisiana State University . . . married Muriel Buck . . . four children.

Career: Mayor of Minneapolis, Minn. United States Senator . . . Senate Majority Whip . . . elected Vice President, 1964 . . . serves as Chairman, President's Council on Equal Opportunity, Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, National Aeronautics and Space Council, Council on Youth Fitness, Economic Opportunity Council, and the National Security Council

Accomplishments and goals: authored legislation that created the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Peace Corps, Food Stamp Program, Food for Peace Program, National Defense Education Act, Drug Regulation Act, International Health Act . . . as Majority Whip he played leading role in the enactment of every major bill during the Kennedy-Johnson Administration.

Humphrey on America's future: "I am one who believes this nation is as strong, not as the Chase National Bank, not as the stock market, not even as the great powerful corporations, but the nation is only as strong as the productivity, the intelligence, the health, and the education of its people."

"We do not seek to make America strong for purposes of aggression, but actually to safeguard freedom. We do not want America's wealth just for the purpose of luxury, but rather for the enrichment of life; yes, the beautification of our country and the betterment of our education, the improvement of our cultural standards and cultural institutions, so that the wealth, the economic wealth of an economic system is in a sense partially used to bring about the spiritual wealth of a social structure."

"I believe the people of America . . .

Desire a safer more peaceful world for themselves and their children;

Support the efforts of the Kennedy-Johnson Administration to expand the full rights of citizenship everywhere in this country;

Seek an end to poverty and deprivation for all peoples everywhere;

Want to provide security and dignity to our elderly;

Desire to improve and expand our educational system to prepare every child for a wholesome and productive life;

Seek to transform our cities into pleasant, stimulating and decent communities.

"The hard facts of life are simply these: we cannot afford to be anything but a prosperous, booming America. We must have increased productivity, rising sales, increased employment, higher wages and bigger profits. Only under these conditions does the Great Society have meaning. These goals are clearly within reach. Our free-enterprise economy still possesses an enormous capacity to grow—and thereby to contribute to greater economic and social justice for every citizen."

Adlai E. Stevenson

Life: Born in Los Angeles, California, February 5, 1900 . . . educated at Princeton University . . . married Ellen Borden . . . three sons . . . died July 14, 1965, in London.

Career: reporter and lawyer . . . Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy during World War II . . . Assistant to the Secretary of State . . . delegate to the United Nations Governor of Illinois . . . Democratic candidate for President in 1952 and 1956 . . . U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. from 1961 to 1965.

Achievements: helped rebuild Italian economy after World War II . . . helped get United Nations Organization under way . . . as Governor of Illinois, built new roads and schools, reorganized the Mental Health Program, strengthened the civil service, achieved Constitutional reforms, and effected numerous economies to balance the budget . . . as Democratic spokesman and United Nations Ambassador, Stevenson won worldwide admiration for his integrity, eloquence, and humanitarian vision.

Stevenson on the struggle against communism: "The preservation of the free world hangs upon our ability to win the allegiance of those millions and millions of people throughout the world who have not yet made their choice between our democratic system, on the one hand, and the promises which Communism offers, on the other. That choice will be mainly shaped by our own performance. It will turn upon such things as our ability to avoid the disruptions of depression, to guarantee equality of opportunity, to narrow the gulfs separating economic status, to preserve freedom of thought and action, to make democracy accord in practice with its premise and professions of faith . . . No one can be certain about the meaning of peace. But we all can be certain about the meaning of war. The future is still open—open for disaster, if we seek peace cheaply or meanly, but open for real peace if we seek it bravely and nobly."

Alfred E. Smith

Life: born in New York City, December 30, 1873 . . . no formal education . . . married Catherine Dunn . . . five children . . . died October 4, 1944, in New York City.

Career: trucking hand and fish peddler . . . . member of New York State Assembly . . . Sheriff of New York County . . . Governor of New York, 1918 to 1920 and 1922 to 1928 . . . Democratic candidate for President in 1928.

Achievements: as Governor: factory safety laws, child welfare programs, housing and mental institutions, veteran's bonus . . . revised New York State Constitution and reorganized the State Government.

Al Smith on religion in politics: "I can think of no greater disaster to this country than to have the voters of it divide upon religious lines. Nothing could be so out of line with the spirit of America . . . I do not wish any member of my faith in any part of the United States to vote for me on any religious grounds. I want them to vote for me only when in their hearts and consciences they become convinced that my election will promote the best interests of our country. By the same token, any person who votes against me simply because of my religion is not, to my way of thinking, a good citizen . . . The absolute separation of State and Church is part of the fundamental basis of our Constitution. I believe in that separation, and in all that it implies. That belief must be a part of the fundamental faith of every true American."

James M. Cox

Life: born March 31, 1870, at Jacksonburg, Ohio . . . married Margaretta Blair . . . four children . . . died July 15, 1957.

Career: school teacher, reporter, newspaper publisher, author . . . Congressman . . . Governor of Ohio, 1913–15, 1917–21 . . . Democratic candidate for President in 1920.

Achievements: as Governor of Ohio, achieved workmen's compensation, budget reform, school reorganization, public utility regulation and state banking code.

Cox on democratic progress: "Some people have been saying of late: 'We are tired of progress, we want to go back to where we were before; to go about our business; to restore "normal" conditions.' They are wrong. This is not the wish of America. We can never go back . . . For our eyes are trained ahead—forward to better new days . . . We cannot anchor our ship of state in this world tempest, nor can we return to the placid harbor of long years ago. We must go forward or founder."

Williams Jennings Bryan

Life: born in Salem, Illinois, March 19, 1860 . . . married Mary Elizabeth Baird . . . three children . . . died at Dayton, Tennessee, July 26, 1925,

Career: editor, orator, reporter and lawyer . . . Colonel in the Spanish-American War . . . Congressman from Nebraska . . . Secretary of State under Wilson . . . Democratic candidate for the Presidency in 1896, 1900 and 1908.

Achievements: fought the gold standard and protection in trade . . . foe of imperialism and trusts . . . as Secretary of State, worked for arbitration as method for peaceful settlement of international dispute . . . instrumental in establishment of popular election of Senators, the Income Tax, Woman Suffrage and the Department of Labor.

Bryan on the importance of agriculture: "Burn down your cities and leave our farms, and your cities will spring up again as if by magic; but destroy our farms, and the grass will grow on the streets of every city in the country."

Samuel J. Tilden

Life: born in New Lebanon, New York, February 9, 1814 . . . educated at University of New York City . . . unmarried . . . died in Yonkers, New York, August 4, 1886.

Career: lawyer and essayist . . . chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee . . . member of the New York Assembly . . . reform Governor of New York . . . Democratic candidate for President in 1876.

Achievements: exposed the Tweed Ring in New York City . . . fought corruption in State and in the Grant Administration.

Tilden on the dangers of corrupt government: "Eliminating corruption does not alone effect the saving of dollars and cents. You cannot preserve your present system of government unless you purify administration and purify legislation. The evils of corrupt government are not confined to the taking of money from the people to enrich those who are not entitled to its enjoyment, but the growth of such a system saps all public virtue and all public morality; and at last 'a government of the people, and for the people' will cease to exist."

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 355) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Florida for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the Senator from Florida, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for yielding. My inquiry is, what is the time allotted under the unanimous-consent agreement that will bind the Senate in the morning for the consideration of the so-called Hruska amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two hours, one hour to each side.

Mr. HOLLAND. May I propound another parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may.

Mr. HOLLAND. What is the time agreed upon for the debate upon final passage of the bill, and how much of that time remains?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may answer that question, there was 2 hours on the bill, the great majority of which, if not all of it, is still remaining.

It is anticipated, barring the offer of further amendments, that it is quite likely we will be able to finish within a 4-hour period after morning business is concluded.

However, the distinguished minority leader, on Friday last, did make a statement to the Senate that if further time was needed, it would be forthcoming; and I am sure that the Senator from Florida would agree to that.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the majority leader and the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, by this amendment I am proposing the establishment in the Congress of a Joint Committee on Science and Technology because I feel strongly that the time is overdue for the Congress to organize itself in a manner enabling it to respond more adequately and intelligently to the challenge posed by the phenomenal growth of science and technology in this Nation in the past 25 years, and to take a greater lead in developing and guiding our national science policy.

It is now commonplace to recognize that we are living in the midst of a scientific revolution, the impact of which affects the lives of each and every citizen in profound and often unpredictable ways. This revolution is manifested particularly by developments in the military sciences, agriculture, medicine, biology, transportation, communications, new systems for the accumulation and retrieval of information, by the introduction of atomic power, and by the opening up of whole new areas of scientific endeavor aimed toward the exploration and conquest of outer space.

The Federal Government has become deeply committed to and heavily involved in research and development programs in all these and many other areas. A recent National Science Foundation publication lists 35 departments and agencies supporting or engaged in scientific and technical research and development.[1]

This involvement increasingly has become a major factor of our political life since the Second World War, when there first developed a national awareness of the essential relationship between the utilization of science and technology and the national welfare. According to figures compiled by the National Science Foundation, Federal expenditures for research and development in 1940 amounted to only $74 million,[2] or less than 1 percent of the total Federal budget.[3] By 1945 Federal R. & D. expenditures amounted to $1,591 million, a little less than 2 percent of the Federal budget; by 1960 to $7,738 million or 10 percent of the budget and by 1965 to $14,875 million, or 15 percnt—a level at which such expenditures have been fairly consistently maintained.[4]

Concomitant with the growth of Federal support has been a great expansion on the body of related knowledge and information. However, because of our highly compartmentalized congressional committee structure, with its dispersed legislative authorities and jurisdictions, I find it difficult to obtain the comprehensive information describing the total Federal, scientific, and technical effort. And, although the Appropriations Committees of both Houses review all Federal spending, I have found it impossible, even as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, to gain an overall picture of our research and development programs because the enormity of the Federal budget necessitates its apportionment among the various appropriations subcommittees.

In the Congress as a whole, scientific and technical programs are reviewed in a fragmented manner by various committees and subcommittees, according to their jurisdiction over specific departments or agencies. As revealed in a survey made in 1965 by the Science Policy Research Division of the Legislative Reference Service, there are in the House and Senate combined a total of 32 committees and 109 subcommittees having jurisdictional interest in scientific and technological activities.[5] These include a number of subcommittees in each House which exercise oversight of the Government's research and development activities. The problem is not, therefore, one of a lack of review, but a lack of coordination of reviews.

---

[1] National Science Foundation. *Federal Funds for Research, Development and Other Scientific Activities.* Vol. XV, NSF 66–25. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966, pp. 82–83. (The Departments of Defense, Army, Navy and Air Force are counted separately.)

[2] *Loc cit.*, p. 4.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] Donnelly, Warren H. and Brezina, Dennis W. *Listing of Congressional Committees and Subcommittees Indicating Jurisdictional Interests in Scientific and Technological Activities.* Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, 89th Congress, 1st session. 1965, 28 pages.

For this reason, I am advocating the establishment within the Congress of a Joint Committee on Science and Technology which, although lacking in legislative authority and jurisdiction, would be empowered to review Federal scientific and technical programs on a continuing basis, and could make recommendations to the appropriate committees having jurisdiction over specific agency programs, to the Congress as a whole, and to the executive agencies and departments.

What is perhaps most important, it would provide a congressional focal point for the gathering of relevant, significant, and detailed information on all governmental and nongovernmental scientific and technical plans and programs. Thus centralized, this information would become more readily accessible to all the Members. This is essential to our purposes as the number of pressing bills dealing with science and technology grows with each congressional session. A very significant indicator of this legislative activity is contained in a recent bibliography of congressional publications prepared in the Legislative Reference Service entitled "An Inventory of Congressional Concern With Research and Development."[6] Although it deals only with the 88th Congress and the first session of the 89th, it is 120 pages long and contains approximately 1,400 entries.

We of the Congress will increasingly be called upon to make major decisions with respect to our support of science and technology. These will be among the most significant we have ever faced, for, not only are vast expenditures involved, but the scientists have warned us that our very survival on this earth has become more completely dependent than ever before on the wise use of scientific knowledge.

The most politically sophisticated of the scientists recognize that many problems are created by technological developments that they alone cannot solve; that there are social, economic, and political considerations involved in the decisions that have to be taken; and that the Members of Congress, who daily make decisions in which all these considerations have to be weighed, must bring their practical experience to bear upon them.

Certainly we of the Congress do not wish to hamper our national scientific progress in any way, but I consider it our duty to see to it that our Federal scientific programs are more thoroughly coordinated, systematically prosecuted, and economically administered; to help formulate national goals and objectives; and to clarify the scope of Government involvement in scientific activities.

More specifically, we shall have to consider such problems as the establishment of priorities in terms of our national goals for support of programs in space, agriculture, health services, education, oceanography, and so forth. We shall have to determine how best to allocate our resources in terms of scientific manpower, money, facilities, and natural resources. These are not unlimited, and choices will have to be made as to how best they are to be utilized for maximum public benefit.

We should examine the relationship between governmental and nongovernmental organizations engaged in scientific and technical pursuits to find what measure of cooperation exists between them.

There is the problem of distributing Federal research grants and contracts in a manner that will be geographically equitable without sacrificing the quality of research obtained.

All these problems and issues can be considered adequately and responsibly only if the Congress provides itself with such machinery as I propose in the form of a Joint Committee on Science and Technology where a proper perspective can be achieved by viewing them in the context of total governmental and nongovernmental involvement.

It is frequently said in the Congress that too much power has shifted to the executive branch of the Government. I believe that we have been somewhat at fault, because in the past we have been prone to accept programs which are conceived in and proposed by the executive branch with too little question, and this is especially true of programs having major scientific and technical content. Furthermore, we must realize that the executive branch perhaps responded to the challenge of modern science and technology with more foresight than we. Within the Executive Office of the President there is a Special Assistant for Science and Technology, the President's Science Advisory Committee, the Office of Science and Technology, and the Federal Council for Science and Technology. Through these bodies the Executive has immeasurably strengthened its hand both with respect to shaping national science policy and to drafting legislation designed to implement that policy.

However, despite the establishment of the above-mentioned offices, the executive branch has not demonstrated that it is able to guarantee the efficient management of Federal programs or their effective intergovernmental coordination. For example in a recent case study of Federal laboratory resources, significant management deficiencies were revealed. I quote from the report:

> The Federal Government appears to know only approximately how many laboratories it has, where they are, what kinds of people work there, and what they are doing. Equipment is purchased, capitalized, and often forgotten. It seldom appears to reenter the management purview as a cost of laboratory operation. The laboratories themselves appear to be eternal. As national goals change, as agency missions shift to meet new public needs, and as the public becomes aware of these needs, new laboratories are created and present laboratories expand. Rarely are existing laboratories cut back or terminated. There is little evidence to suggest that Federal laboratories are treated as a national resource to be continuously challenged by the assignment of important problems, requiring a continuing appraisal of capabilities and alternative courses of action.[7]

With specific reference to laboratories working on environmental pollution the report states:

> It was learned that well in excess of 1,000 projects related to research and development on environmental pollution are being conducted in from 100 to 200 installations in at least 9 agencies and departments. In many instances this work was indicated as being unrelated to the primary missions of either the laboratories or the agencies.[8]—

And suggested that—

> This situation may prevail for many multiagency programs of the Federal Government.[9]

It becomes apparent, therefore, that the Congress must assume greater responsibility for the thorough surveillance of Federal scientific and technical programs, and for suggesting new courses of action and fresh approaches to problems. We shall also have to demand more adequate accounting from the executive branch with regard to its conduct of its research and development programs. That it has been deficient in this respect has been acknowledged within the executive branch itself. In the words of Mr. William D. Carey:

> If the Congress feels starved for facts, if it is baffled at finding science behind every bureaucratic rock, if it fails to see intrinsic merit in the more arcane nooks of basic science, if it hunts vainly for signs of a broad strategy for science, if it cannot identify priorities for scientific choice, we have ourselves to blame.[10]

The bill I propose would require submission by the President of an annual report, similar in nature to the Economic Report now rendered periodically to the Joint Economic Committee. This report would be reviewed by means of hearings to be held by the Joint Committee on Science and Technology. It should describe all relevant plans and programs and the steps being taken to insure their efficient management, such as the extent of the application of cost-benefit analyses; outline the methods being used to effect coordination within the Government and between the Government and nongovernmental organizations; account for expenditures each fiscal year; and estimate anticipated future expenditures.

With respect to the latter, I feel it especially important that the executive branch be required to provide information to Congress on its long-range scientific and technical planning in order that we may get a more definite idea of the extent of the commitment of public funds and resources that may be involved in future plans and programs which we will be asked to support. The executive branch has been reluctant to inform us along these lines, but I think it altogether necessary that we receive such information if Congress is to fulfill the responsibilities imposed upon it by the Constitution to promote the general welfare of the American people. And, as a consequence, I should hope to see a more creative relationship develop between the executive and legislative branches of Government in the interest of obtaining the greatest public good and healthy economic growth through wiser utilization of all our resources.

---

[6] U.S. Congress, Senate. Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Government Research. Committee Print: *An Inventory of Congressional Concern with Research and Development:* a Bibliography. 89th Congress, 2d session. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966, 120 pages.

[7] U.S. Congress, House. Committee on Government Operations, Research and Technical Programs Subcommittee. Committee Print: *A Case Study of the Utilization of Federal Laboratory Resources.* 89th Congress, 2d session. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966, p. 56.

[8] *loc. cit.*, p. 59.

[9] *Ibid.*

[10] Carey, William D. A Proposal for a Yearly Presidential Report on Science. Saturday Review of Literature, November 6, 1965, p. 57.

Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the manager of the bill, the Senator from Oklahoma, and he has informed me that although he thought this might pertain somewhat to the bill, he did not feel that he could accept this amendment. I should like to inquire of him at this time if he is still of that mind, or if he has yet seen the great light.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my colleague, the Senator from Colorado, for the opportunity of hearing his address on this very much needed joint committee operation which he has so clearly outlined. He has made a very important proposal.

Had we had the advantage of this matter prior to the last day of the discussion on the bill, which has taken some 3 or 4 weeks of the Senate's time, I believe that would have been very helpful to the Senate. However, as the Senator knows, we have just about completed the actions on the bill. I wish the distinguished Senator would present this matter to the legislative committee, the Committee on Rules and Administration, which I am sure would be glad to hear and consider it. Without any testimony having been given in the joint committee, the House would be completely oblivious to the reasons given by the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado for the establishment of this committee, and therefore I would appreciate his withholding action on it at this time.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator. He has been completely frank, and I am not surprised at his remarks, but I appreciate them, anyway.

Mr. President, this being the situation, I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry. If this amendment is introduced as a bill, will it go to the Committee on Rules and Administration?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would have to study that matter.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am prepared to discuss the matter privately, with the Parliamentarian and with the Chair, at the conclusion of the session.

I will withdraw the amendment at this time.

I should like to announce for the benefit of the Senate that this bill was introduced last summer. It is a matter on which I have been working a long time, and, much to my surprise, I found a very great and wide interest in it all over the United States.

Therefore, in view of the present situation, parliamentary and otherwise, I will withdraw the amendment. But I also wish to announce that I will introduce this amendment as a bill on Wednesday, March 15, and I would be happy to have such Senators who are interested and would desire to cosponsor it contact my office in the meantime.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 120

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the previous unanimous-consent agreement, the clerk will report the Hruska amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 4, in the table of contents, strike out all matter relating to title V of the bill.

On page 4, in the table of contents, strike out "TITLE VI" and insert in lieu thereof "TITLE V".

On page 4, in the table of contents, strike out "SEC. 601." and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 501.".

Beginning with line 8, page 118, strike out all to and including line 18, page 124.

On page 125, line 1, strike out "TITLE VI" and insert in lieu thereof "TITLE V".

On page 125, line 3, strike out "SEC. 601" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 501".

On page 125, line 8, immediately after the words "title III," insert "and".

On page 125, line 9, strike out ", and title V."

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 7, 1967, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mrs. Katie Callaham's 100th Birthday March 11

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1967

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, March 11, marks the 100th birthday anniversary of Mrs. Katie Callaham, who now resides at Hillhaven Convalescent Home, 2210 East First Street, Santa Ana, Calif.

Mrs. Callaham lived in Orange County for over 40 years, and her sons, daughters, grandchildren, and great grandchildren all live near her. A reception will be held in her honor on Sunday, March 12.

It is a great accomplishment to reach such an age, and particularly when one considers the comparative hardships which Mrs. Callaham's generation experienced in their younger years.

President Johnson will join me in sending a congratulatory message to pay tribute to my constituent on that special occasion.

Society for Nondestructive Testing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on April 1 of this year, the western New York section of the Society for Nondestructive Testing will hold its first symposium, at Erie County Technical Institute in Williamsville, N.Y.

I believe that this group—first organized a quarter century ago at Canisius College in Buffalo, N.Y.—deserves national recognition at this time.

Its first symposium comes in a day when the entire Nation is concerned about air and water pollution and the dangerous results of jet-radiated energy. And its 25-year history has placed it in high regard as a national pioneering group.

Founded after the college offered a training program in X-ray inspection of war materials during World War II, its members are highly trained and respected scientists. I feel that their presence in western New York is a boon to those associated with the many industrial and technical activities of the area, as well as to the Nation at large.

Salute to Morocco, America's Longtime Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1967

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in the course of our Nation's history there are several sovereign States which have bonded with us since our inception and kept that alliance and friendship.

Morocco is one of those nations. So on this, the Moroccan National Day, I would like to join other Americans in extending a hand of gratitude for this friendship and alliance.

The bonds that have been welded between our two nations is not a new one. Nor one formed out of expediency.

Morocco was one of the first nations in the world to sign treaties with the infant United States of America in 1786. Since then we have enjoyed continued peaceful relations.

An indication of the maturity of this relationship is the recent visit of His Royal Highness, Hassan the Second. During his visit to our country he reaffirmed the bonds between our two nations.

I had the great pleasure of meeting the King and was impressed with his dedication, friendship, and humanitarian spirit. The United States is fortunate, indeed, to have such a friend.

His Majesty has selected as his representative to the United States an outstanding Ambassador, His Excellency, Dr. Ahmed Laraki, an effective and dedicated person. Washington has been greatly impressed by His Excellency and his charming wife.

I offer my congratulations on this day to King Hassan and the people of Morocco on this, their National Day. May the flag of Morocco fly over a prosperous and joyous nation forever and may our friendship endure as long.

H.R. 6416 Inadvertently Introduced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1967

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, on January 16, 1967, I suffered a heart attack and was hospitalized for 23 days. Subsequently I was confined for a period of time at home in connection with my recuperation. Lest any of the Members of this distinguished body get the impression that my recent incapacitation affected either my faculties or my loyalty to California, I wish to state explicitly for the record that neither diagnosis is correct. One might say, rather, that something rather funny happened on the way to the "bill hopper."

Through an understandable misunderstanding on the part of a well-meaning staff member, a Colorado River basin project bill bearing my name was filed with the Clerk on March 1. It was numbered H.R. 6416 and it bore a startling—to use a mild expletive—resemblance to legislation introduced earlier in the current session by my good friends of the Arizona delegation.

Now, of course, I realize that those very able gentlemen are possessed of a certain sense of urgency in their pursuit of water for their delightfully arid State. However, my approach to the solution of that problem does not necessarily coincide with that of my thirsty neighbors. Like all good Californians I sympathize deeply with their plight, but it must be admitted, even by them, that cosponsorship of their legislation is carrying friendship to the brink. Amity is one thing in the West; water is another. So, I hasten to inform my colleagues in particular and Californians generally, that the error will be rectified this very day.

Although this private faux pas is unprecedented in my congressional career, so was my heart attack. California has a very vital stake in any legislation affecting the Colorado River water supply and it is my intention, as always, to protect her rights, entitlements and citizens' welfare.

Therefore, I am today introducing—personally—a bill which not only attempts to serve the best purposes of California, but the six States of the Colorado River basin as well. It is identical with proposed legislation filed previously by four of my California House colleagues and by California's senior Senator. In addition to other virtues, these proposals have the endorsement of the Colorado River Board of California and will provide that elusive water for our longsuffering Arizona friends.

The Kee Report: Arms Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report." The subject discussed is arms control.

The newscast follows:

This is Jim Kee, bringing you the Kee Report:

One of the smallest agencies in the Federal Government is trying to solve one of the most perplexing problem this country has ever faced. The agency is the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the problem is the expanding race in atomic weapons.

The problem of the arms race is not new. Throughout history, one nation has sought to gain an advantage over its neighbor by building a bigger military stockpile. Unfortunately, this sort of competition has always ended in war. The difference is that this time, total war waged with mass destruction weapons will result in unbelievable horror. Just one of the big bombs now in existence could destroy the largest city in the world.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, which is grappling with the problem, was established by the late President John F. Kennedy during his first year in the White House. Its job is to explore every path which might lead to effective arms control without endangering the security of the United States. In the search for positive peace two steps have been taken. The First was the treaty banning atomic testing in the atmosphere. The second was the agreement reached in the United Nations last year to ban military weapons in outer space. Thus far, these two steps represent the only lessening of the arms race.

However, even if atomic war never comes, this present arms race is imposing tragic costs upon the whole human race. Expanding military budgets are eating up the earth's substance. The annual outlay for the Department of Defense in this country is now in excess of 70 billion dollars a year, a sum exceeded only twice in World War II and never before in peacetime.

But Uncle Sam also spends more than 2 billion dollars annually to run the Atomic Energy Commission, and the bulk of this is devoted to military purposes. The result is that more than half the funds spent by the Federal Government is devoted to defense and military purposes.

If this sum could be cut in half, just think what this money could do to relieve poverty in the United States, and to help our neighbors in Central and South America, and to aid developing nations on every continent. This is what I mean by saying that the whole human race is the loser because of the waste involved in the current arms race.

In deploring this situation, however, I wish to emphasize that the guilt for this arms race rests upon Communist Russia and Communist Russia alone. The United States is innocent of any wrong-doing. On the contrary, to avoid this arms race, the United States and its allies made the most generous offer in history.

After World War II, the free nations had a monopoly of the most powerful military weapons in history, because they alone possessed the secret of the atomic bomb. But the United States had no desire to use this weapon for conquest. Its sole purpose was to promote the peace. With this in mind, the free nations offered to give up their monopoly in return for iron-clad control of all atomic development by the United Nations. When this plan came to a vote, every nation in the world voted its approval except Soviet Russia and its satellites.

This was the Communist origin of the present arms race. Despite this, our country will continue to do everything it can to promote peace.

Tigers of Tammany: Nine Men Who Ran New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1967

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, those of us in this honorable body who, from time to time, take an interest in politics, will find a fascinating study of the Democratic Party in New York City in the recently issued "Tigers of Tammany: Nine Men Who Ran New York," by Alfred Connable and Edward Silberfarb, published by Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.

"Tigers of Tammany" traces the influence of New York's Democratic leaders from the founding of the Society of Saint Tammany on May 12, 1789, to the Democratic defeat of November 8, 1966. It focuses on the political wars of Aaron Burr, Martin Van Buren, Mayor Fernando Wood, Boss Tweed, Honest John Kelly, Richard Croker, Charles Murphy, Carmine DeSapio, and J. Raymond Jones.

I had the pleasure of reading the book and reviewing it for the Villager, a newspaper published for people in the Greenwich Village and surrounding area in my district, and it was published on March 2.

The review follows:

NEW YORK: FROM VAN BUREN TO DE SAPIO

(*Tigers of Tammany: Nine Men Who Ran New York, by Alfred Connable and Edward Silberfarb. 384 pp. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., $6.95.*)

(By Theodore R. Kupferman, Congressman, 17th District, Manhattan, New York)

Villagers with memories of Democratic leadership primary fights will find a fascinating reference work in the *Tigers of Tammany*.

The name derives from Tamanend, sachem of the Delaware Tribe, who signed a contract with William Penn in 1683. The Society of Saint Tammany was founded in 1789 by William Mooney, a Manhattan furniture dealer. There was a "Wigwam" in each of the original thirteen new states with an animal symbol for each. New York had an "eagle," and Pennsylvania the "tiger." It was a truly national organization only for a short time, dedicated to a plebian democracy.

While the center of action was New York City, there was eventually a Wigwam even in Texas. Gradually, however, it developed into a solid New York City political machine from the original fraternal-type order.

When the Democratic Party was born in the summer of 1791 with Thomas Jefferson and James Madison as architects, among its foundations was the New York Tammany, led by a young United States Senator, Aaron Burr.

It is Aaron Burr, Thomas Jefferson's Vice-President and Alexander Hamilton's nemesis, founder of modern politics, who is the first Tammany Tiger of the book, and it is Councilman Ed Koch's Democratic County Leader, J. Raymond Jones, also known as the "Gray Fox," who is the last Tiger discussed.

In between we find seven others: (1) One time President Martin Van Buren, Andrew Jackson's choice and the only Tammany man to reach the White House; (2) Mayor Fernando Woods, who gave us Central Park before the Civil War and Tom Hoving; (3) William Marcy Tweed, who started as a "reformer" and wound up in jail; (4) Honest John Kelly, who really "organized"; (5) Richard Croker, who believed in "honest graft"; (6) Charles Murphy, who ruled in the Golden Years of Tammany; and (7) Greenwich Village's own Carmine De Sapio.

Although most of the Indian relics in the Tammany museum were sold to P. T. Barnum with the modest remainder now in a room at the National Democratic Club on Madison Avenue, Tammany still lives in legend.

Many men were elected by Tammany, but many also, both Republicans like Teddy Roosevelt, Rockefeller, LaGuardia, and Lindsay, and Democrats like Tilden, Cleveland, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, were elected by opposition to Tammany.

Former Mayor Robert F. Wagner had it both ways, winning with De Sapio in 1953, and winning against him in 1961.

Probably the most respected Tammany Man was Governor Al Smith.

While the history of Carmine De Sapio may still have to be written, as of this date it is interesting to note that Tammany reached its peak of reform in his espousal of permanent personal registration and direct election of district leaders, all of which made it easier for him to be defeated.

With a political history, you must look to the credentials of the authors to establish the basis for acceptance.

Alfred Connable was a writer on the staff of Mayor Wagner, who, we must admit, made good speeches, and now works for Nassau County's Eugene Nickerson. Edward Silberfarb is one of our own, a resident of Greenwich Village. He was one of the most respected City Hall reporters, writing for *The New York Herald Tribune* until brought down by the last newspaper strike, and now works for New York City in the Housing and Urban Renewal area.

When they tell you that Edward Costikyan was the first Protestant leader of Tammany Hall since Boss Tweed, you can rely on the fact, although they do err occasionally.

Village Assemblyman William F. Passannante gets a credit line for an assist on the book.

For a well-written historical saga which mirrors politics in New York City and features our own area, this book will bring nostalgic moments and valuable insight.

Statement of Congressman Sam Steiger, Entered Into the Record of the Joint Hearings of the House and Senate Public Works Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1967

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's desire to appear to combat inflation and achieve budget sleight of hand was accomplished, when the Federal Highway Administration was ordered, on November 23, 1966, to withhold substantial funds from the States during fiscal year 1967. Secretary Boyd's unfreezing a portion of the money this week was insufficient to restore a vital portion of our economy.

The Army Corps of Engineers, not funded from a supposedly inviolate trust, as is the Federal Highway Administration, receives money directly from the general fund and in 1967 had virtually $1.3 billion appropriated; it is only suffering a 4.6-percent cutback.

One of the reasons for this withholding, is clearly to lessen the deficits of the various fiscal 1968 budgets. Having the highway trust fund purchase participation certificates, which is already planned, although denied by Secretary Boyd, decreases the administrative budget deficit to $8.1 billion from $13.1 billion in 1968.

An effective public relations campaign has seemingly minimized the actual amount of this cutback. Not the $700 million announced, but $1,105.6 million is the amount of the decrease in funds going to the States. When pre-1967 unobligated funds and the 1967 differential between apportionments and the amount following the freeze are taken into account, a figure of 25 percent is arrived at rather than the 17.5 percent pictured by the administration. Allocations for fiscal 1968 have been made and when this is included the total percentage frozen comes to 48.7.

As the Secretary of Commerce made the 1968 apportionment on October 2, 1966, only slightly better than 2 months before the withholding was announced, it would also seem to indicate that in this administration the left and right hands truly do not know what the other is doing.

Others who have testified before these committees are better able to give detailed analyses of the effects throughout the country from this curtailment. If it has not already been introduced as an exhibit, I would like to have the statement of Mr. Clifton W. Enfield, minority counsel of the House Committee on Public Works included in this hearing's record—contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within the detailed report on this situation by the Honorable WILLIAM C. CRAMER, of Florida, on February 6, 1967.

This withholding of funds will have an important adverse effect upon the State of Arizona. At this point, I would like to include a letter by Mr. Justin Herman, the Arizona highway director:

JANUARY 20, 1967.

Mr. A. E. JOHNSON,
Executive Secretary, American Association of State Highway Officials, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: In answer to your wire of January 19, the following are answers to each of the questions you posed.

1. How much of your 1967 Fiscal Year Planned Program, expressed both in money value and percentage, did the cutback of November 23, 1966, reduce scheduled lettings for the 1967 Fiscal Year?

Reduced by approximately $15,000,000 or approximately 17 per cent.

2. How is the November 23 cutback affecting your department personnel and work schedule?

Has disrupted our work schedule, has caused us to postpone several Interstate surfacing projects that have been graded and drained. Has not seriously affected our department personnel as yet but will cause layoffs if continued much beyond July 1, 1967.

3. Are you able to reassign affected personnel to other tasks or is there any possibility that you will have to release personnel if the cutback continues past July 1, 1967?

Due to work already under contract, we have been able to keep our personnel busy but with many of these projects nearing completion, we will need to start laying personnel off if cutback continues beyond July 1, 1967. These people would then be difficult to re-acquire at resumption of the full scale program.

4. Do you have sufficient competent personnel to carry on the full amount of the Highway Program without adversely affecting the quality of the finished product?

This cutback certainly has *not* been beneficial to our Highway Program in Arizona. We are geared to efficiently complete the Interstate program in Arizona by the original completion date if the money is available as well as carry on our normal A.B.C. work.

5. Will the November 23 slowdown result in a benefit to your State by allowing any needed urban transportation planning to proceed?

No. We are well along on our Urban Transportation planning at present.

6. What adjustments have you made in your departmental operation and programs because of the November 23 cutback:

(a) Are you proceeding with engineering work or are you slowing down this activity?

We are proceeding as usual at present.

(b) Are you using State funds that would have been used for matching Federal-Aid to finance State construction?

Not at this time. However, we are acquiring Interstate Right of Way in Stage 1 programming with State funds in order to use as much money for construction as possible.

(c) Are you reducing Interstate work in favor of A.B.C. projects?

Yes.

(d) Other effects.

This has resulted in our postponing completion of work we had hoped to accomplish to aid us in reducing the highway death toll in Arizona.

This cutback is also causing us difficulty in getting our required appropriations for next year through our legislature, which is now in session.

7. As a result of the November 23 cutback, what is the money value of contracts that you can award during the remaining part of the 1967 Fiscal Year?

Approximately $25,000,000.

8. In your opinion, is the highway cutback adversely affecting the economy of your State? If so, in what regard and to what degree?

Yes. Highway construction contributes heavily to Arizona's economy and the full effect of the cutback will be felt later this spring in unemployment of construction personnel.

9. In case an additional 400 million dollar highway cutback for the 1967 Fiscal Year is ordered (presumably this would all be deducted from the last and remaining fiscal year quarterly allotment);

(a) What would be the total dollar value of highway lettings that could be awarded during the remaining part of the 1967 Fiscal Year?

$15,000,000. Under our present already reduced schedule we would not be advertising additional highway contracts for approximately the last four months of this fiscal year, if an additional $400,000,000 is cut.

(b) What would be the effect on your personnel of this additional cutback?

We would undoubtedly be required to start laying off people who would be extremely difficult to re-acquire upon resumption of full scale operations.

(c) Any additional observations or pertinent remarks? Your replies will be placed in the Committee Hearing Records.

Additional cutback would doubtless throw many of our contractors into bankruptcy and thus eventually increase the public cost by decreased competition upon resumption of a full scale program.

It should not be necessary to point out that these cutbacks would have a serious effect on safety to the traveling public. With the urgent need for increased attention to safety efforts, it seems inconsistent to cut back on highway construction which would aid in this battle against highway accidents.

Yours very truly,

Justin Herman,
State Highway Director.
Wm. N. Price,
State Highway Engineer.

According to contractors in Arizona, the construction industry has had a 50-percent work reduction as a result of the November action. Three thousand two hundred construction jobs were eliminated. The president of the Building and Construction Trades Council in Arizona stated that their records show 40-percent unemployment in the unions among those in highway construction. He is taking into account the winter weather.

Another direct effect of this administration decision is a probable drop in employment among related, support industries. Each 39 man-hours of highway construction work sustains 61 additional hours of employment in related support roles and industries.

The long leadtime necessary before implementation of highway construction programs will have a most detrimental effect in trying to reestablish the lost ground resulting from the withholding. State employees, contractors, and construction workers will disperse and be hard to acquire when this policy is dispensed with.

Estimates indicate that at least 6 months and perhaps up to 2 years' delay will result. The world situation today certainly does not show any lessening of our need for adequate interstate highways. Yet that was one of the initial—and still valid—reasons for the program.

These factors are basically applicable throughout the Nation and have, I am sure, been fully brought to these committees' attention. An English clergyman, Caleb Colton said:

> The excesses of our youth are drafts upon our old age, payable with interest, about 30 years after date.

Because of this administration decision our bill will come due long before 30 years are up.

Among the obvious short—and considering ramifications—long-term debits are: increase in construction firms bankruptcy rate; corresponding rise in unemployment among construction and support industry employees; and, subsequent dispersal of these important men and skills. Should last year's 7-percent increase in program cost due to inflation continue, the probable 2-year delay will add unnecessary cost. Or at worst, produce a reduction in mileage to be completed under the program, when in fact, possible additions should be considered.

Initially, Federal aid for highway construction had as one of its basic premises our needs for defense purposes. From 1940 to 1964 motor vehicle freight traffic has moved up to take 22.49 percent of the total from a 9.53 percentage base. The world's condition today has not lessened the imperativeness of a truly first-class interstate highway system. It is believed that 8,000 lives per year would be saved by completion of these 40,000-plus miles of highway. Certainly, this alone would be a valid reason to continue the program at an efficient pace.

The West is growing. A nationwide applicability of this withholding will affect the efforts of the States to most adequately serve their expanding populations.